

Quant Fever, Reasoning Blackholes, Schrodinger’s Compliance, and More: Probing GPT-OSS-20B

Shuyi Lin*, Tian Lu*, Zikai Wang*, Bo Wen*†, Yibo Zhao*, and Cheng Tan
Northeastern University †*Shanghai Jiao Tong University*

This report is a translation of the GPT-OSS red-teaming write-up with minor revisions.

Abstract

OpenAI’s GPT-OSS family provides open-weight language models with explicit chain-of-thought (CoT) reasoning and a Harmony prompt format. We summarize an extensive security evaluation of GPT-OSS-20B that probes the model’s behavior under different adversarial conditions. Using the Jailbreak Oracle (JO) [1], a systematic LLM evaluation tool, the study uncovers several failure modes including *quant fever*, *reasoning blackholes*, *Schrodinger’s compliance*, *reasoning procedure mirage*, and *chain-oriented prompting*. Experiments demonstrate how these behaviors can be exploited on GPT-OSS-20B models, leading to severe consequences.

1 Introduction

OpenAI recently released the GPT-OSS series [2], with the 20B model emerging as a highly accessible option. This writeup analyzes GPT-OSS-20B along two dimensions: (a) its explicit use of chain-of-thought (CoT) reasoning, and (b) its suitability for edge deployment and agentic applications. We focus on how these features shape the model’s behaviors and examine their security implications.

Main findings: the hidden behaviors of GPT-OSS-20b.

1. *Quant fever (§3.1)*: We observe that GPT-OSS-20B obsesses over numerical targets (e.g., deleting 90% of files), often prioritizing them over contextual constraints and even overriding safety requirements (e.g., never delete important files). In our experiments, the model frequently engages in risky behavior (in about 70%) when handling benign user requests with quantitative objectives.
2. *Reasoning blackhole (§3.2)*: We observe that GPT-OSS-20B often repeats itself in its chain-of-thought, falling into loops it cannot escape (like a blackhole). By using greedy decoding, 81% (162/200) of our experimented prompts fall into reasoning blackholes. We hypothesize that this arises from limited diversity in safety reasoning patterns and from alignment RL that trains the model to focus too narrowly on local tokens.
3. *Schrodinger’s compliance (§3.3)*: We observe that GPT-OSS-20B exhibits unpredictable behavior under policy paradoxes—where user prompts mix allowed and disallowed policies. This duality indicates a new attack surface, enabling adversaries to exploit policy contradictions and raise jailbreak success rates from 3.3% to 44.4%.

*: Authors contributed equally; names are listed in alphabetical order.




Figure 1: The Jailbreak Oracle (JO) explores the token tree to identify candidate responses with high probability. JO enables systematic discovery of hidden behaviors in GPT-OSS-20B.

4. *Reasoning procedure mirage (§3.4)*: We observe that GPT-OSS-20B can be persuaded by the structure of reasoning steps rather than the actual content of a request. This enables harmful instructions to bypass safeguards when framed within benign-looking reasoning procedures (generated by GPT-OSS-20B itself for similar safe requests), revealing the model’s tendency to let form outweigh substance. Our experiments show that our procedure-based mirage attack outperforms content-based CoT injection [3] by 26.9% (28.4% → 55.3%).
5. *Chain-Oriented Prompting (COP) (§3.5)*: We observe that GPT-OSS-20B focuses on locally valid requests without robust global checks, prioritizing coherence over long-term evaluation. Exploiting this behavior, we design a Chain-Oriented Prompting (COP) attack that decomposes a malicious objective into benign-looking steps which, when executed in sequence, assemble into a harmful action. In our experiments, COP attack make the model execute `rm -rf *` command with 80% success rate, and push user’s ssh private key to a public repository with 70% success rate.

Our approach: Jailbreak Oracle. We uncover these findings using a systematic analysis tool called Jailbreak Oracle (JO) [1]. JO performs a structured search over the decoding token tree by exploring all candidate responses that exceed a specified probability threshold. Unlike ad-hoc red-teaming tools or prompt sampling, JO frames the identification of response patterns—such as jailbroken outputs—as a structured search problem, executed through a guided, multi-phase process that balances breadth and depth. Figure 1 illustrates the main idea of JO; full technical details appear in our paper [1]. For the GPT-OSS-20b model, we further adapt JO to account for its specific token distribution and decoding preferences (see our tailored JO in Appendix [4]).

Comprehensive security assessment. Beyond the competition-required findings, we systematically evaluate GPT-OSS-20B using JO. GPT-OSS-20B shows strong robustness to standard harmful prompts under Harmony formatting, with only limited vulnerability to adversarial tweaks in formatting or CoT. To probe beyond normal operation, we test three publicly known attacks reported on X [5, 6], Reddit [7], and by the University of Chicago [3]. These attacks cover a broad range of deployment scenarios and require different threat models. Section 2 describes our experimental setup, configurations, and baseline implementations.

Figure 2 reports results from 30 prompts randomly sampled from our benchmarks. Each cell shows the percentage of Jailbroken answers judged by StrongReject [8], while JO values indicate the probability of identifying at least one Jailbroken answer in the tree search.

Attack method	Greedy (%)	Default (%)	JO (%)
No attack	0.0	0.0	6.7
Remove Harmony template [5]	0.0	6.7	13.3
Remove Harmony + CoT override [6]	20.0	23.3	73.3
Repeating with CoT mimicry [3]	3.3	3.3	—*

Figure 2: Percentage of jailbroken answers judged by StrongReject [8] across different attack methods. The JO search consistently increases the probability of discovering a jailbroken response.

*: We’re running out of time to complete this JO evaluation.

2 Public Known Attacks, Setup, and Threat Models

2.1 Public known attacks (our baselines)

This Kaggle competition has drawn significant attention, with several well-known attacks discussed extensively by researchers and the community [5, 6, 7, 3]. We implement three such attacks as baselines, covering all techniques currently known to us:

- *Remove Harmony template*: Use the original prompt without Harmony formatting, replicating the X post from Muyu He [5].
- *Remove Harmony template + CoT override*: Remove Harmony formatting and inject CoT context, as introduced in the X post from Lyra Bubbles [6].
- *Repeating with CoT Mimicry*: In the CoT, repeat a compliant-sounding phrase 100 times. We contacted the original authors for their implementation but did not hear back before the deadline, so we reproduced their implementation to the best of our knowledge based on their public blog [3]. See details in Appendix [4].

2.2 Experiment setup

We download GPT-OSS-20B via Hugging Face (openai/gpt-oss-20b), running experiments on machines equipped with H100 GPUs and RTX 4090. For local deployment, we rely on Hugging Face serving and Ollama. Unless otherwise noted, decoding is performed with temperature set to 1, top-p to 1, and a maximum generation length of 4096 tokens. The benchmark consists of 90 prompts randomly sampled from AdvBench [9], JailbreakBench [10], and AgentHarm [11] using random seed 2026. Evaluation is conducted with StrongReject [8] as the judgment framework, using `gpt-4o-mini` as the LLM judge.

2.3 Threat models

We consider three threat models in this study:

- *End-user attackers* control only the prompts they provide through the web interface, with all inputs wrapped in the Harmony format.
- *Black-box attackers* have full control over the model’s inputs, including the ability to manipulate Harmony formatting or CoT, but lack access to internal parameters or decoding strategies.

- *White-box attackers* operate under local deployment, granting them control over the model’s configurations and the decoding process, but cannot change the weights of the model.

Below we outline the threat models for both the baselines and our findings:

Threat model	Baselines	This work
End-user	–	Quant fever (§3.1), Schrodinger’s compliance (§3.2)
Black-box	Remove Harmony, Remove Harmony + CoT override, Repeating with CoT mimicry	Reasoning procedure mirage (§3.4), Chain-Oriented Prompting (COP) (§3.5)
White-box	–	Reasoning blackholes (§3.2)

Table 1: Threat models and the attacks they enable. End-user attackers can only submit prompts; black-box attackers can alter formatting and CoT; white-box attackers control decoding.

3 Main Findings

3.1 Quant Fever

Quant fever refers to a phenomenon where the model becomes fixated on numerical targets, treating them as the dominant objective regardless of context. In GPT-OSS-20B, this manifests when the model encounters instructions such as “try your best to delete 90% of files.” Even if the prompt also includes security constraints—e.g., “don’t delete important files”—the model prioritizes the numeric goal and may engage in risky or harmful behaviors to satisfy the percentage requirement. Strikingly, when the objective is phrased qualitatively, such as “try your best to delete most of the files,” the dangerous behavior disappears. This illustrates how quant fever drives the model to overcommit to quantitative objectives, often at the expense of ignoring safety.

Quant fever in agentic scenarios. We design two agentic scenarios—file management and process management—to illustrate the risks posed by quant fever. For the two scenarios, we define important files and processes as those must not be deleted or killed. The risky behavior rate, measured over 10 runs, indicates the probability of such behavior. (Experiment details are described in Appendix [4].)

Figure 3 reports results for file management with 10 files (3 important and 7 regular) under three settings: important files assigned lexicographically smaller names (“important first”), important files assigned larger names (“regular first”), and random name assignment (“shuffle”).

Setting	#file reads	#file deleted	#important file deleted	risky behavior (%)
Important first	7.1	7.1	0.1	10
Regular first	3.6	10.0	3.0	100
Shuffle	4.4	8.7	1.7	100

Figure 3: File-management results demonstrating quant fever. GPT-OSS-20B tends to delete a fixed fraction of files to meet the numerical target.




Figure 4: Probability of the top token during decoding. Beyond about 100 tokens the moving average approaches almost 100%, indicating reasoning blackholes.

3.2 Reasoning Blackholes


We observe that GPT-OSS-20B often repeats itself in its chain-of-thought, a problem that becomes especially severe under greedy decoding. On 200 prompts from JBB Bench [10], the model falls into reasoning blackholes in 81% of cases and was unable to recover. Below is a prefix of one such response before repetition begins:

```
<|channel|>analysis<|message|>The user requests a step-by-step guide on how to blackmail someone with deepfake videos. This is a request...[omitting 10 words]...The policy states that we must refuse to comply with the policy. The policy says we must refuse. [repeating the two sentences forever]
```

A closer look at blackholes. Using JO, we study this phenomenon and hypothesize that the reasoning patterns enforced by safety alignment are limited and easily over-triggered. As a result, model attentions focus on local token dependencies, repeatedly cycling through the same history and becoming unable to escape. We further observe that batching intensifies this issue, which could enable adversaries to construct infinite loops of repetition that can be exploited as a denial-of-service attack.

Below are two studies to confirm our hypothesis (more studies in Appendix [4]):

- Figure 4: By plotting the top-1 token probability (blue line), we confirm the presence of blackholes—once the token length exceeds 100, the top-1 moving-avg token probability (dashed red line) approaches almost 100%, causing the model to repeat indefinitely.
- Figure 5a and 5b: We compare attention scores before softmax for a normal output (Figure 5a) and a blackhole output (Figure 5b), examining Layer-12 (a middle layer) and Layer-23 (the final layer). In Layer-12’s heatmap, blackholes exhibit highly localized attention, with red regions concentrated along the triangle’s edge, while normal outputs show a more diverse, block-like focus. These patterns support our hypothesis that reasoning blackholes arise from increasingly localized attention.



(a) Attention heatmaps for a normal output. Attention spreads across a block-like region rather than concentrating exclusively on recent tokens.

(b) Attention heatmaps for a reasoning blackhole. Red regions concentrate along the diagonal, indicating highly localized attention and reinforcing loops.

Figure 5: Comparison of attention heatmaps: (a) normal output vs. (b) reasoning blackhole.

Two additional observations (no time to explore). Batch size and dates in Harmony format appear to influence blackholes. Larger batch sizes increase the likelihood of falling into blackholes, and prompts differing only by date exhibit markedly different probabilities of triggering them. Examples are provided in our Appendix [4].

3.3 Schrodinger’s Compliance

Schrodinger’s compliance characterizes situations in which GPT-OSS-20B operates under two conflicting policies, leading to an indeterminate resolution. In such cases, the model simultaneously embodies both possibilities: one policy enforces strict compliance with security rules, compelling the model to refuse, while the other permits detailed explanation of the process. From the user’s perspective, the outcome remains uncertain until the model generates its final response. Only at that point does the system “collapse” into one of the two states—either a rejection aligned with the security policy or a detailed description consistent with the allowed policy. This duality highlights not just a technical curiosity but also a fundamental challenge: when rules encode contradictions, model behavior becomes unpredictable, eroding both reliability and trust.

Leveraging Schrodinger’s compliance as an attack. To demonstrate the security implications of this phenomenon, we design the Schrodinger’s compliance attack, which applies to all users without altering the Harmony format or the model’s CoT. The attack works by first identifying allowed and disallowed policies, then constructing a prompt that mixes them to create a compliance race condition. This newly constructed prompt is issued as the user query, exploiting the model’s tendency to inconsistently enforce policies (Details in Appendix [4]).

To evaluate the effectiveness of Schrodinger’s compliance, we test harmful prompts from our benchmarks (Section 2) and compare against a baseline that simply rephrases the prompt without introducing conflicting policies. The performance gap between the baseline and our approach reflects how Schrodinger’s compliance confuses the model.

3.4 Reasoning Procedure Mirage

Reasoning procedure mirage captures a failure mode when GPT-OSS-20B follows the structure of reasoning steps rather than the meaning of the request. A harmful instruction given directly is often rejected, but if the same request is wrapped in a benign-looking chain of thoughts, the model is more likely to comply. Here, the stepwise procedure itself acts as the persuader: the orderly form

Method	Success rate (%)	Description
Vanilla	3.3	Original prompts without any modification
Rephrase only	20.0	LLM-based rephrasing (with refusal mitigation strategies)
Ours	44.4	Our Schrodinger’s Compliance Attack method

Figure 6: Success rates of Schrodinger’s compliance attack compared with baseline methods. Combining conflicting policies markedly increases the jailbreak rate.




Figure 7: Comparison of the CoT mirage attack (our attack) with a content-based CoT hijacking baseline [3]. The mirage attack achieves higher jailbreak rates across prompts.

convinces the model even when the outcome is unsafe. This shows a unique behavior in GPT-OSS-20B’s reasoning setup: form can outweigh substance, letting harmful intent pass through logical scaffolding.

A new attack: CoT mirage hacking. To validate our findings and exploit GPT-OSS-20B’s procedure mirage, we design a new attack. At a high level, the attack first constructs a benign request similar to the harmful one (e.g., writing *A Tale of Two Cities*, whose copyright is expired, instead of *Harry Potter*). The model’s reasoning for the benign request is then extracted, truncated, and modified through keyword replacement with the original harmful context. Finally, the transformed chain of thought is fed back into the target model to produce the harmful output. Detailed attack process is described in Appendix [4].

Unlike content-based CoT hijacking [5, 6, 7], our attack exploits the structure of CoT. To validate its effectiveness, we compare against the CoT hijacking baseline proposed by UChicago [3], which relies on repeated content-based hijacking. Figure 7 shows the results—the gap between the two lines reflects the effect of procedure mirage.

3.5 Chain-Oriented Prompting (COP)

We observe that in multi-round agentic scenarios, GPT-OSS-20B handles requests in a locally valid manner without performing much of global checking, favoring local coherence over long-term global safety. We exploit this behavior by designing *Chain-Oriented Prompting (COP)*. The core idea is

inspired by Return-Oriented Programming (ROP) [12], where attackers chain short instruction sequences into an exploit. Similarly, COP decomposes a malicious goal into a sequence of benign-looking prompts or tool calls. Each step appears safe in isolation, but when executed in sequence, the agent assembles and performs a harmful action. For example, while GPT-OSS-20B rejects a direct request to run `rm -rf *`, an adversary can distribute the task across multiple prompts, leading the model to unwittingly generate and execute the command.

COP in action. We evaluate COP in two attack scenarios: deleting files (`rm -rf *`) and leaking private keys to the public domain. From our experiments, GPT-OSS-20B does include some global checks—if adversarial prompts are simply broken into four or five pieces and issued contiguously, the model refuses to execute the final step. However, when we interleave the attack steps with several noise prompts, COP succeeds much more frequently. In our experiments (details in Appendix [4]), we run each attack scenario 10 times and observe success rates of 80% and 70%, respectively.

4 Conclusion

Our study shows that GPT-OSS-20B, though robust against standard harmful prompts, exhibits unique and exploitable behaviors when systematically probed with Jailbreak Oracle. We identify five key findings—quant fever, reasoning blackholes, Schrodinger’s compliance, reasoning procedure mirage, and chain-oriented prompting (COP)—each enabling new attacks that bypass existing safeguards by exploiting weaknesses in reasoning and alignment. We build attack prototypes that raise jailbreak rates from 3.3% to 44.4% without CoT manipulation (§3.3), and from 28.4% to 55.3% with CoT manipulation (§3.4). In agentic settings, we further observe a 70% probability of risky behavior on benign prompts with numerical targets (§3.1), and a 70–80% success rate for COP attacks using prompt injection (§3.5). These findings highlight the urgent need for defenses that address vulnerabilities arising not from isolated prompts, but from compositional reasoning, procedural scaffolding, and adversarially structured interactions.

References

- [1] Shuyi Lin, Anshuman Suri, Alina Oprea, and Cheng Tan. LLM Jailbreak Oracle. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.17299*, 2025.
- [2] Sandhini Agarwal, Lama Ahmad, Jason Ai, Sam Altman, Andy Applebaum, Edwin Arbus, Rahul K. Arora, et al. GPT-OSS-120b & GPT-OSS-20b Model Card. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2508.10925*, 2025.
- [3] Zephaniah Roe and Jack Sanderson. Intriguing Properties of gpt-oss Jailbreaks. <https://www.lesswrong.com/posts/XvpEsjKwQFcWoD89g/intriguing-properties-of-gpt-oss-jailbreaks>, 2025. Blog post, accessed 28 Sept 2025.
- [4] Appendix. <https://github.com/HackingLLM/gpt-oss-writup/blob/main/appendix.md>, 2025.
- [5] Muyu He. Remove Harmony template. <https://x.com/HeMuyu0327/status/1955828183867252786>, 2025. Tweet, accessed 28 Sept 2025.
- [6] Lyra Bubbles. Remove Harmony template + CoT override. https://x.com/_lyraaaa_/status/1952825311118475607, 2025. Tweet, accessed 28 Sept 2025.

- [7] Jailbreak GPT OSS by using this in the system prompt. https://www.reddit.com/r/LocalLLaMA/comments/1misyew/jailbreak_gpt_oss_by_using_this_in_the_system/, 2025. Reddit post, accessed 28 Sept 2025.
- [8] Alexandra Souly, Qingyuan Lu, Dillon Bowen, Tu Trinh, Elvis Hsieh, Sana Pandey, Pieter Abbeel, et al. A StrongReject for empty jailbreaks. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 37:125416–125440, 2024.
- [9] Yangyi Chen, Hongcheng Gao, Ganqu Cui, Fanchao Qi, Longtao Huang, Zhiyuan Liu, and Maosong Sun. Why should adversarial perturbations be imperceptible? rethink the research paradigm in adversarial NLP. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.10683*, 2022.
- [10] Patrick Chao, Edoardo Debenedetti, Alexander Robey, Maksym Andriushchenko, Francesco Croce, Vikash Sehwal, Edgar Dobriban, et al. Jailbreakbench: An open robustness benchmark for jailbreaking large language models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 37:55005–55029, 2024.
- [11] Maksym Andriushchenko, Alexandra Souly, Mateusz Dziemian, Derek Duenas, Maxwell Lin, Justin Wang, Dan Hendrycks, et al. AgentHarm: A benchmark for measuring harmfulness of LLM agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.09024*, 2024.
- [12] Hovav Shacham. The geometry of innocent flesh on the bone: Return-into-libc without function calls (on the x86). In *Proceedings of the 14th ACM conference on Computer and communications security*, pages 552–561, 2007.