

# SCALING TEXTUAL GRADIENTS VIA SAMPLING-BASED MOMENTUM

Zixin Ding<sup>\*1</sup> Junyuan Hong<sup>\*2</sup> Zhan Shi<sup>3</sup> Jiachen T. Wang<sup>4</sup> Zinan Lin<sup>5</sup> Li Yin<sup>3</sup> Meng Liu<sup>3</sup>  
 Zhangyang Wang<sup>2</sup> Yuxin Chen<sup>1</sup>

## ABSTRACT

LLM-based prompt optimization, which uses LLM-provided “textual gradients” (feedback) to refine prompts, has emerged an effective method for automatic prompt engineering. However, its scalability and stability are unclear when using more data in training. We systematically investigate the potential and challenges of scaling training data in textual gradient descent. We show that naively scaling training examples is infeasible due to both explicit context-length limits and an implicit context wall, where long-context degradation yields diminishing returns. Inspired by prior wisdom in stochastic gradient descent, we propose Textual Stochastic Gradient Descent with Momentum (TSGD-M), which reweights updates through momentum sampling, using bootstrapped minibatch validation accuracy as importance weights over historical prompts. To stabilize TSGD and enable effective scaling within a limited context window, TSGD-M carries prior prompts information by *dynamically* exploring the past top performing prompts without expanding input context length. TSGD-M integrates seamlessly into existing prompt optimization frameworks, including TextGrad, DSPy-COPRO, and AdalFlow, and achieves consistent gains across 5 benchmarks.

## 1 INTRODUCTION

With the scaling of pre-training data, Large Language Models (LLMs) are becoming more and more capable in understanding human language and executing human instructions or prompts (Brown et al., 2020; Ouyang et al., 2022). Meanwhile, the capability of LLMs tends to be confined to the quality of prompts – a well-written prompt can significantly boost the performance of LLMs, and vice versa, in semantic classification, programming, semantic understanding, and sophisticated agentic tasks (Ying et al., 2024; Zhou et al., 2022; Sclar et al., 2024; Anagnostidis & Bulian, 2024). With the increasing capability of LLMs in reasoning, researchers proposed Automatic Prompt Engineering (APE) that leverages LLMs to reflect on the prompts and iteratively refine the prompts (Zhou et al., 2022). Recent work (Yuksekgonul et al., 2025; Yin & Wang, 2025) systematically reformulated these ideas into the **Textual Gradient Descent** (TGD) framework, which iteratively updates prompts using “textual gradients” – feedback generated by LLMs. The method closely mirrors numerical gradient descent (GD) in optimization. Just as GD iteratively refines parameters along the gradient direction to minimize a loss function, TGD extends gradients and parameters into text space, allowing the

backpropogated gradients to optimize individual elements of compound AI systems, such as agentic (Yin & Wang, 2025) or multi-agent system (Zhou et al., 2025).

While TextGrad performs well in low-data settings (e.g., molecular optimization, test-time problem solving), a natural question is whether its performance continues to improve with additional training data, given that data scaling is a central driver of modern AI progress (Hoffmann et al., 2022). Despite the similarity between TGD- and GD-based learning, their learning mechanism are distinct and therefore the scaling law of GD cannot simply generalize to TGD. Specifically, TGD updates prompts by discrete sampling from LLMs, instead of relying on continual updates with numerical gradients. However, its scalability depends heavily on the model’s long-context capability (Agarwal et al., 2024). In practice, scaling is constrained by the LLM’s finite context window, which limits the number of examples that can be provided during training.

In this paper, we first empirically revisit the effect of scaling training data in TGD with *fixed full batch* per iteration. We vary the number of samples in the MATH tasks (Hendrycks et al., 2021) and measure the test accuracy of the prompt with the best validation accuracy. Our study reveals two key findings: (1) **Performance Hits an Implicit Context Wall**. Performance increases at the beginning but drops sharply after peaking at 50 samples, even though the input does not exhaust the model’s context limit. When more examples are fed in the context, LLMs struggle to extract the relevant

<sup>\*</sup>Equal contribution <sup>1</sup>Department of Computer Science, University of Chicago <sup>2</sup>UT Austin <sup>3</sup>SylphAI <sup>4</sup>Princeton University <sup>5</sup>Microsoft. Correspondence to: Zixin Ding <zixin@uchicago.edu>, Yuxin Chen <chenyuxin@uchicago.edu>.




Figure 1. Comparison of different variants of TSGD. The standard TSGD update generates a new prompt from the last prompt and gradient. The momentum in TextGrad concatenates the past prompts in context to infer the next prompt. Our method upweights historic prompts in sampling that are of higher validation accuracy and only uses one pair of past prompt and a past gradient to infer the next block of tokens in the next prompt.

gradient information from very long contexts (Liu et al., 2024; Peng et al., 2023). (2) **Efficiency Drains.** Inference costs grow quadratically with sequence length (Hooper et al., 2024; Tang et al., 2024) and the scaling stops at limited samples. As an alternative, we also explore Textual Stochastic Gradient Descent (TSGD) with *stochastically sampled minibatch* per iteration. TSGD avoids the context wall and can extend the scaling and achieve better performance by effectively exploring diverse prompts. However, a smaller batch size also increases the randomness of prompt generation, resulting in a large variance in performance. As a result, the estimate becomes noisy and TSGD may degenerate toward random sampling, reducing reliability. Yuksekgonul et al. (2025) first introduces momentum by concatenating past prompts for prompt generation, significantly increasing the context length and inference cost.

To stabilize TSGD and make scaling effective, we propose Text Stochastic Gradient Descent with momentum (TSGD-M). TSGD-M is inspired by momentum in classical SGD (Rumelhart et al., 1986; Polyak, 1964; Liu et al., 2020), but adapts the idea to textual gradients, which are produced by discrete sampling rather than numeric differentiation. As shown in Fig. 1, TSGD-M samples new prompts from a mixture distribution conditioned on past prompts and their associated textual gradients, preserving the same context length as vanilla TextGrad without an extra context window. As discrete sampling is non-smooth and classical step-wise decay offers limited stabilization, we replace iteration decay with performance-based decay: higher performing prompts receive larger sampling weights and are more likely to seed the next iteration. Following this principle, we implement TSGD-M with multiple technical innovations to improve the systematic efficiency, including accumulated minibatch validation to form an unbiased estimator of full-set validation accuracy.

In summary, our work includes these contributions:

- We revisit the scaling with TSGD and TGD, identify-

ing the key challenges: explicit context-length limits and an implicit context wall where long-context degradation yields diminishing returns.

- We propose TSGD-M, a textual-gradient method with sampling-based momentum, that stabilizes and efficiently scales TSGD by *dynamically* exploring the past top performing prompts. Instead of simply concatenating historical prompts, we define momentum as a weighted combination of high-performing past prompts, with weights balancing prompt quality against context-length constraints. TSGD-M is framework-agnostic and can be integrated into existing stacks such as DSPy (Khattab et al., 2024) and AdalFlow (Yin & Wang, 2025).
- Empirical studies show that our method can improve the generalization of prompts generated by baseline methods with statistical significance in multiple benchmarks. With momentum, we further improve upon the TextGrad baseline (Yuksekgonul et al., 2025) in MATH (Hendrycks et al., 2021) by 2% and TREC (Lu et al., 2022) by 4% averaged over 5 independent trials.

## 2 RELATED WORK

**Automatic Prompt Engineering (APE)** optimizes LLM instructions through iterative self-improvement inspired by evolutionary algorithms (Zhou et al., 2022). Early methods such as OPRO (Yang et al., 2024) and DLN1 (Sordoni et al., 2023) frame LLMs as optimizers that refine prompts via performance feedback or learned proposal distributions. ProTeGi (Pryzant et al., 2023) first interprets LLM feedback as textual gradients, while TextGrad (Yuksekgonul et al., 2025) formalizes a computation graph for textual gradient descent and momentum integration. DSPy (Khattab et al., 2024) extends this idea with structured optimization (COPRO) but without explicit textual gradients. Recent approaches such as GEPA (Agrawal et al., 2025) incorporate hierarchical ev-

**Table 1.** Comparison of APE methods. *val* stands for validation set. “Textual-Gradient-free” refers to applying Update in one step **without** generating a textual gradient from  $\text{LM}_{\text{backward}}$ . **Our method** can be extended to other prompt optimization frameworks even without textual gradients, and works for single and multi-prompt sampling with Gumbel-Top-*k* selection on validation set.

Methods	Update Rule	Prompt Generation Context	Selection Criterion
APE (Zhou et al., 2022)	Textual-Gradient-free	Sampling multiple prompts (mutation/crossover)	Evolutionary selection
OPRO (Yang et al., 2024)	Textual-Gradient-free	Past prompts + demo concatenation	Greedy/ top- <i>k</i> select
GEPA (Agrawal et al., 2025)	Textual-Gradient-free	Sampling single prompt (mutation/crossover)	Evolutionary selection
PromptAgent (Wang et al., 2024)	Textual Gradient	Sampling multiple prompts	Tree search
ProTeGi (Pryzant et al., 2023)	Textual Gradient	Sampling multiple prompts	Greedy / top- <i>k</i>
COPRO (DSPy, 2025)	Textual-Gradient-free	Sampling multiple prompts	Greedy (val)
TextGrad (Yuksekgonul et al., 2025)	Textual Gradient	Sampling single prompt	Greedy (val) / Revert
AdaFlow (Yin & Wang, 2025)	Textual Gradient	Past prompts concatenation	Greedy (val) / Revert
<b>TSGD-M (Our method)</b>	Textual Gradient or Textual-Gradient-free	Sampling multiple prompts	Gumbel-Top- <i>k</i> (val)

lution but remain largely exploitative by relying on prompts that have the highest validation accuracy so far. Our work differs by introducing Gumbel-Top-*k* momentum, which adaptively reweights historical prompts via a probabilistic categorical distribution, balancing exploration and exploitation without requiring the highest-performing prompt to persist when a newly generated prompt has a temporary validation drop. This formulation generalizes TextGrad-style optimization and integrates seamlessly with frameworks such as DSPy-COPRO and AdaFlow. We summarize a comprehensive comparison of methods in Table 1.

**Scaling Law for LLMs.** Scaling laws offer a principled recipe for systematically improving LLMs by trading off parameters, data, and compute (Hoffmann et al., 2022; Kaplan et al., 2020). Recent work on test-time scaling shows that allocating more inference compute, e.g., generating additional candidates, revising answers, or invoking verifiers, can substantially boost reasoning without changing model weights (Snell et al., 2024; Muennighoff et al., 2025; Li et al., 2025; Brown et al., 2024). In contrast, automatic prompt engineering (APE) lacks an analogous scaling law: we do not yet know how performance scales with the number of training examples, iterations, or candidate evaluations per step. This gap is critical because APE is effectively a test-time optimization loop whose data and compute budgets are bounded by context length, token cost, and noisy scoring metrics in selecting the best prompt(s) to roll out. Prior observations that prompt optimization helps most in low-data regimes (Yuksekgonul et al., 2025; Yang et al., 2025; Wang et al., 2024) raise a central question: what limits data scaling in APE, and how should we allocate additional samples or iterations for predictable gains? This paper addresses that question by formulating a scaling-aware APE procedure. We analyze where naive scaling breaks (context walls, variance in scoring function estimate, and overly exploitative selection) and introduce a momentum-based, probabilistic sampler that reallocates test-time compute to balance exploration and exploitation over past prompts, enabling more stable scaling in APE.

### 3 PRELIMINARIES

Consider a large language model formally defined as  $\text{LM} : \mathcal{V}^* \rightarrow \mathcal{V}^*$ , where  $\mathcal{V}$  denotes the vocabulary set and  $\mathcal{V}^*$  represents the space of all possible sequences over  $\mathcal{V}$ . For a given prompt  $\pi \in \mathcal{V}^*$  and input  $x \in \mathcal{V}^*$ , the LLM processes their concatenation  $[\pi, x] \in \mathcal{V}^*$  to produce an output sequence. Let  $\mathcal{D}$  be a distribution over the input-output pairs  $(x, y) \in \mathcal{V}^* \times \mathcal{V}^*$ . Suppose we have a dataset  $D = \{(x_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^N$ , sampled i.i.d from  $\mathcal{D}$ . The goal of prompt engineering is to identify an optimal prompt  $\pi^* \in \mathcal{V}^*$  that optimizes the model’s expected performance on data drawn from a certain distribution. Formally,

$$\pi^* = \arg \max_{\pi \in \mathcal{V}^*} \mathbb{E}_{(x, y) \sim \mathcal{D}} [\text{Perf}(\text{LM}([\pi, x]), y)], \quad (1)$$

where  $\text{Perf} : \mathcal{V}^* \times \mathcal{V}^* \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a metric function evaluating the quality of the model’s output against the ground truth, and  $[\pi, x]$  denotes the concatenation operation. For simplicity, we do not consider training randomness here.

**Textual Gradient Descent.** *Textual Gradient Descent* (TGD) is defined as iterative updates with LLM reflection on quality (Yuksekgonul et al., 2025) and other APE methods can be viewed as variants with different (implicit) reflections. To clarify, when stochastically sampled minibatches of training data instead of full dataset are used in each iteration, we call it *Textual Stochastic Gradient Descent* (TSGD). By default, TSGD refers to the instantiation by **TextGrad** (Yuksekgonul et al., 2025). Accordingly, one **epoch** is defined as the process when all samples are visited by the inference language model  $\text{LM}_{\text{forward}}$  and we consider stochastic sampling via shuffling in an epoch using different random seeds. Within each epoch, examples are shuffled; different random seeds induce different permutations, so each seed yields a distinct visitation order. The prompt  $\pi$  serves as the parameter being optimized. For iteration  $t$ , we denote the current prompt as  $\pi_t$  and sample a minibatch of data  $\{(x_i^{(t)}, y_i^{(t)})\}_{i=1}^m$  with size  $m$  uniformly at random from  $D$ . For  $x_i^{(t)}$ , we obtain the inference language model prediction  $\hat{y}_i^{(t)} = \text{LM}_{\text{forward}}([\pi_t, x_i^{(t)}])$ . The prompt update rule is




Figure 2. Scaling of TGD/TSGD on MATH. The gray line shows the average initial test accuracy across all dataset–batch-size combinations. **Left:** Comparing the test accuracy under different data and batch sizes, TGD (full-batch TSGD) cannot scale to larger data sizes, while minibatch TSGD enables the scaling. The dashed horizontal line represents the initial accuracy. **Right:** With a fixed data size of 200 and a seed of 1, we vary the batch size only. Small batch size has larger oscillations when larger batch sizes iterate more smoothly. An overly large batch size cannot improve the prompts.

written as:

$$\pi_{t+1} = \text{Update}(\mathbf{LM}_{\text{backward}}, \pi_t, \{(x_i^{(t)}, y_i^{(t)}, \hat{y}_i^{(t)})\}_{i=1}^m)$$

where `Update` is an algorithm that leverages backward LLMs’ capabilities to analyze discrepancies between predictions  $\{\hat{y}_i^{(t)}\}_{i=1}^m$  and ground truth labels  $\{y_i^{(t)}\}_{i=1}^m$  and yield an improved prompt  $\pi_{t+1}$ . In TGD, the process is analogous to the use of numerical gradients in backpropagation to optimize neural network weights.

In TGD, the `Update` is formalized as a two-stage process (Pryzant et al., 2023; Yuksekgonul et al., 2025). Given the current prompt  $\pi_t$  and a batch of example triplets  $\{(x_i, y_i^{(t)}, \hat{y}_i^{(t)})\}_{i=1}^m$ , the `Update` algorithm shall be decomposed as:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial L}{\partial y^t} &= \mathbf{LM}_{\text{backward}}([\pi_{\text{analyze}}, \{(x_i, y_i^{(t)}, \hat{y}_i^{(t)})\}_{i=1}^m]) \\ g_t &:= \frac{\partial L}{\partial \pi_t} = \nabla_{\mathbf{LM}_{\text{backward}}}(\pi_t, \{x_i, y_i^{(t)}\}_{i=1}^m, \frac{\partial L}{\partial y^t}) \\ \pi_{t+1} &= \mathbf{LM}_{\text{backward}}([\pi_{\text{refine}}, \pi_t, g_t]). \end{aligned}$$

where  $\frac{\partial L}{\partial y^t}$  denotes the feedback obtained from  $\mathbf{LM}_{\text{backward}}$  and  $g_t$  denotes an error analysis that captures systematic discrepancies between predictions and ground truth resulted by the input prompt  $\pi_t$ , analogous to a gradient in traditional optimization (Pryzant et al., 2023). This textual gradient indicates the direction for prompt improvement, with  $\pi_{\text{analyze}}$  directing the LLM to identify error patterns (i.e. creating the gradient) and  $\pi_{\text{refine}}$  instructing the LLM to update the prompt accordingly (i.e. performing the *descent* step). This two-stage approach creates a conceptual parallel to how gradient descent uses the negative gradient to move toward optimal parameters iteratively.

## 4 SCALING TEXTUAL GRADIENT DESCENT

**TGD** generates each prompt update using all available examples (“full-batch”), whereas **TSGD** samples only a subset per iteration, yielding noisier but more scalable textual gradients. Prior work shows that increasing the number of in-context examples can improve accuracy and fluency while reducing variance (Hao et al., 2022). However, excessively long contexts may degrade reasoning performance, particularly in single-pass settings (Levy et al., 2024). In contrast, TGD and TSGD demand multiple update steps. This raises a key question: how—and how much—should we scale data in these iterative prompt-optimization frameworks?

**Setup.** We adopt TextGrad (Yuksekgonul et al., 2025) as a representative baseline because it is conceptually clean, pure textual-gradient updates without auxiliary selection heuristics, is among the most intuitive of the APE methods. We utilize the MATH with subset Algebra dataset as described in the DSPy math tutorial demo (DSPy, 2025). We explore sampling training dataset size ranging from 5 to 300 with batch sizes scaled from 5 to 110, up to the maximum context limit for  $\mathbf{LM}_{\text{forward}}$ . We use GPT-4o-mini as inference ( $\mathbf{LM}_{\text{forward}}$ ) and GPT-4o as feedback ( $\mathbf{LM}_{\text{backward}}$ ) that generate textual gradients and refine the prompts. In our runs, the canonical TextGrad “validation-revert” (always restoring the prompt with the highest validation score) did not improve validation performance; accordingly, we disable revert and generate each new prompt from the immediately previous one. To reduce stochasticity, we set *epochs* 2, suggesting that each example would be seen *twice* during TextGrad optimization.

**Results.** In Fig. 2, we present the scaling effects by TSGD with varying batch sizes. We observe that full-batch TSGD (or TGD) is limited by the context length and the implicit context length. Only 110 samples can be used in TGD.

There is an implicit context wall on 50 samples, from where the performance of TGD starts to drop. Because of a smaller batch size, TSGD is able to scale to larger dataset sizes and enables extended scaling. The TSGD with 300 samples can outperform the best TGD by over 0.5% accuracy. However, minibatch introduces instability in the optimization process and the performance of bad prompts often falls too far away from the best ones. The instability is extreme on the batch size of 5. Due to the instability, more iterations are demanded to find a good prompt. Increasing the batch size from 5 to 10 slightly stabilizes training, whereas further enlarging the batch reverses gains and hampers improvement.

Unlike standard SGD, TSGD does not exhibit steady convergence for either large or small batch sizes, highlighting the importance of selecting prompts based on validation performance rather than fixing the number of iterations and choosing the final prompt from the last iteration. Overall, the key challenges for scaling TSGD is to preserve iterative stability while reducing batch size.

#### Key Takeaways

- TGD hits an implicit wall when more training samples are used in a batch.
- Only a limited number of samples can be used in TGD due to the limited context length.
- Minibatch TSGD induces larger variance.

## 5 TEXTUAL STOCHASTIC GRADIENT DESCENT WITH MOMENTUM

In this section, we introduce a method to improve the stability of TSGD without increasing the batch size. The central idea is to retain small batches while reusing signal from preceding batches, an analogue of momentum in SGD, so that updates aggregate information over time rather than relying on a single noisy textual gradient/prompt.

For brevity, we simplify the notation of prediction/prompt generation from either  $\text{LM}_{\text{forward}}$  or  $\text{LM}_{\text{backward}}$  to  $P$  since all generation can be viewed as sampling from the LLM. Following the notations for TGD in Section 3, we define some simplified terms for the ease of discussion. With the gradient  $g_t$ , TSGD updates the prompt by sampling,  $\pi_{t+1} \sim P(\pi|\pi_t, g_t)$ . In practice, the generation is done token by token:

$$\pi_{t+1}^j \sim P(\pi_{t+1}^j | \pi_{t+1}^{<j}, \pi_t, g_t),$$

$\pi_{t+1}^j$  means the  $j$ -th token of the prompt and  $\pi_{t+1}^{<j}$  are all previous tokens.

### 5.1 Momentum from the First Principle

**Token-wise Momentum Avoids Forgetting.** Vanilla TSGD ignores all previous iterations. To introduce momentum, we intend to introduce the prior knowledge by

$$\pi_{t+1}^j \sim \sum_{\tau=1}^t \alpha_{\tau} P(\pi_{t+1}^j | \pi_{t+1}^{<j}, \pi_{\tau}, g_{\tau}) \quad (2)$$

where the next token will be generated based on the ensemble of all prior distributions.  $\alpha_{\tau}$  is a normalization factor such that  $\sum_{\tau=1}^t \alpha_{\tau} = 1$ .

**Memory Decay.** In SGD, we decay the memory by iterations because SGD is assumed to descent by iterations, i.e.  $\alpha_{\tau} \propto q^{\tau}$  where  $0 < q < 1$ . However, empirically, TSGD does not necessarily descent by iterations. Large randomness can be observed. Therefore, we use performance decay instead of iteration decay, i.e.,  $\alpha_{\tau} \propto \text{SoftMax}(s_{\tau})$  where  $s_{\tau}$  is the validation accuracy.

In the probabilistic sampling theory, the Gumbel-Top- $k$  trick refers to obtain distinct  $k$  samples without replacement from a categorical distribution by adding i.i.d. Gumbel(0,1) noise to logits and selecting the top- $k$  perturbed scores (Kirsch et al., 2023; Kool et al., 2019; Maddison et al., 2014). With a slight abuse of notation, we use  $K$  to denote the number of selected prompts produced by Gumbel-Top- $k$  trick. In APE, we treat each generated prompt  $\pi_{\tau}$  (from iterations  $\tau = 1, \dots, T$ ) as a category in a Categorical distribution whose sampling weights are defined by validation scores. Specifically, we use logits  $s_{\tau} \propto v_{\tau}$  so that  $p_{\tau} \propto \exp(s_{\tau})$ . Then we sample  $K$  prompts by computing  $S_{\tau} = s_{\tau} + g_{\tau}$ ,  $g_i \sim \text{Gumbel}(0, 1)$  and select the indices of the largest  $K$  values of  $\{S_{\tau}\}$  (See Proposition 1 in Section C). This yields unbiased samples from the softmax defined categorical distribution over  $K$ -element subsets, preserving ranking consistency while enabling efficient sampling in one pass. It provides a way to encourage stochastic yet structured exploration—e.g., picking multiple top-performing prompts, using only additive noise and sorting, making it attractive for large-scale ML systems where scalability and controlled diversity are key.

**Efficiency Bottleneck.** However, the complexity could be high. **1) Inference is expensive.** If generating on one GPU, we are not able to cache KV data to speed up the computation resulting in slow inference. If each individual distribution is estimated on one GPU, the space complexity multiplies linearly with  $t$ . Soon, the number of GPUs will be insufficient. **2) Evaluating validation accuracy  $s_{\tau}$  is expensive.** To obtain a precise estimation of the prompt quality, validation has to be large enough, resulting large cost in forwarding. Especially, smaller batch sizes increase the number of iterations and corresponding number of validations. We address the two challenges of system efficiency in the following two sections.

## 5.2 Efficient Inference via Block-wise Generation

As Eq. (2) defines a mixture model, we do not need to evaluate the marginal  $\pi_{t+1}^j$  explicitly. Instead, we can **1**) first sample from the categorical distribution  $P(t = \tau) = \alpha_\tau$ , and **2**) sample the token from  $P(\pi_{t+1}^j | \pi_{t+1}^{<j}, g_\tau, \pi_\tau)$ .

Prior approaches frequently *reload* prompts during decoding, which prevents effective KV-cache reuse. In practice, adjacent tokens are largely determined by short-range context and grammar rather than by per-token gradient signals or prompt changes. We therefore avoid token-by-token prompt switching and propose two efficient alternatives that preserve the KV cache: **1) Promptwise Generation.** At iteration  $\tau$ , after shortlisting  $K$  prompts as  $\Pi_\tau^*$ , we draw a fresh minibatch and evaluate  $\pi_{\tau,k} \in \Pi_\tau^*$  on the minibatch and obtain scores  $V = \{v_{\tau,k}\}_{\pi_{\tau,k} \in \Pi_\tau^*}$ :

$$\pi_\tau^* = \arg \max V, \quad \pi_{\tau+1} = P(\pi_\tau^*) \quad (3)$$

**2) Blockwise Generation.** Let  $b$  be a fixed block size and index blocks by  $i = 1, \dots, \lfloor T_{\max}/b \rfloor$ . At iteration  $\tau$ , after shortlisting  $K$  candidates  $\Pi_\tau^* = \{\pi_{\tau,1}, \dots, \pi_{\tau,K}\}$ , we *uniformly* mix their next-block predictions while keeping the active prompt fixed within a block. This reduces prompt swaps from  $O(T_{\max})$  to  $O(T_{\max}/b)$ :

$$P(\text{TokenBlock}_{i+1} | \text{TokenBlock}_{1:i}, \Pi_\tau^*) \propto \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K P(\text{TokenBlock}_{i+1} | \text{TokenBlock}_{1:i}, \pi_{\tau,k}). \quad (4)$$

Blockwise generation amortizes attention computation by reusing the KV-cache across blocks. Instead of regenerating the entire prefix, we retain the cached KV tensors for previously generated blocks. When generating the next block, only the new tokens are processed and appended to the cache. The computation scales linearly with the incremental block length.

## 5.3 Efficient Validation via Stochastic Minibatches

**Minibatch Validation with Momentum.** Our decayed sampling strategy requires reliable performance estimates, yet evaluating on the full validation set per iteration is computationally prohibitive. Instead, at iteration  $\tau$ , we draw a random validation minibatch and evaluate only the shortlisted prompts. To mitigate minibatch noise and bias, a prompt is re-evaluated only when selected; its validation estimate is then updated via a running mean. We maintain a cache  $\Phi$  that stores, for each prompt  $\pi_i$ , its evaluation count  $n_i$  and the sequence of minibatch accuracies collected whenever  $i$  appears among the top  $K$  candidates. The running estimate  $\mu'_i$  for  $\pi_i$  is then computed as the average of its accumulated minibatch validation accuracies divided by  $n_i$ . Each iteration proceeds in two stages: **(1) Screening:** sample a

minibatch and evaluate a Top- $K$  set of prompts; **(2) Advancement:** select one candidate from this set, balancing exploration and exploitation, and generate its refinement. Choosing the next prompt thus forms a sequential decision-making problem that explicitly trades off exploring novel prompts against exploiting high-scoring ones (Lattimore & Szepesvári, 2020; Kirsch et al., 2023).

**Exploration vs. Exploitation.** Reducing the validation set inevitably widens the gap between validation and test performance. When evaluation relies on a small minibatch, aggressively exploiting the current prompt with the highest validation accuracy can overfit to sampling noise, causing the prompt that appears "best" on the minibatch to deviate from the truly best prompt under full validation or test set. This setting exemplifies a classic exploration-exploitation dilemma in decision-making: when the signal is derived from scarce data, the algorithm must balance exploiting the current best estimate against exploring uncertain alternatives that may yield further improvement (Kool et al., 2019; Maddison et al., 2014). Our method follows a two-stage decision rule inspired by batched active learning (Kirsch et al., 2023).

**(1) Exploration.** We first apply Gumbel-Top- $k$  sampling over the full prompt pool, injecting controlled stochasticity into the ranking (Proposition 1). This ensures that even near-optimal prompts retain non-zero probability of selection, encouraging exploration of the upper tail rather than pure greedy exploitation. Repeated resampling across iterations provides diverse coverage of the validation set and adaptive reweighting from fresh minibatch feedback, effectively forming a bootstrap estimate of prompt quality with reduced bias.

**(2) Exploitation and Generation.** After obtaining the shortlist  $\Pi_\tau^*$  at iteration  $\tau$ , we perform exploitation through two complementary modes of generation. In the **Promptwise** mode, we evaluate all  $K$  shortlisted prompts on the *same* minibatch and select the prompt with the highest validation accuracy. Under equal-precision posteriors, the Bayes-optimal prompt is the argmax of posterior means; with a shared fresh minibatch this coincides with the best prompt evaluated over that batch (see Theorem C.1 for a formal statement). In contrast, applying the Gumbel-max trick to the  $K$  running means introduces unnecessary randomization and is Bayes-suboptimal for this objective. In the **Blockwise** mode, we instead generate tokens in contiguous blocks and uniformly sample among  $K$  shortlisted prompts for each block. Blockwise generation has variance no larger than TextGrad without validation revert, and becomes strictly smaller under mild conditions (see Theorem C.3). System-wise, uniform block sampling regularizes the inter-arrival pattern of prompts, improving KV-cache reuse and reducing tail latency.

## 5.4 TSGD-M Algorithm

We summarize our algorithm in [Algorithm 1](#), with an elaborated version provided in the Appendix ([Algorithm 2](#)). **Complexity Analysis** Let  $T$  be the number of iterations,  $K$  the Gumbel–Top- $k$  size,  $|v|$  the minibatch validation size,  $m$  the training data batch size and  $|D_{\text{train}}|$  the full training set. Let  $c_f$  be the (constant) tokens per example for  $\text{LM}_{\text{forward}}$  during validation,  $c_m$  the tokens to run  $\text{LM}_{\text{backward}}$  once to produce a new prompt,  $c_g$  the tokens to produce textual gradients per iteration (batch-size effects are absorbed into  $c_g$ ), and  $c_g^{\text{train}}(s)$  tokens to run the training-side forward/gradients over  $s$  training examples ( $s \in \{m, |\mathcal{D}_{\text{train}}|\}$ ). Per-iteration validation on a minibatch costs  $O(|v|)$ . Per-iteration on full training set evaluation costs  $O(|\mathcal{D}_{\text{train}}|)$  and batch training set  $O(m)$ . We use  $O(\cdot)$  notation and suppress constant factors and additive lower-order terms.

For clarity, we denote the concatenation of past prompts with TextGrad as **TextGrad-Momentum** and our TSGD-M module as **TextGrad-M**. We also analyze full batch TextGrad as **TGD** with fixed full-training set per iteration and minibatch TextGrad as **TSGD** with stochastically sampled minibatch per iteration.

Let  $L_p$  denote the average token length contributed by one prior prompt when TextGrad-Momentum concatenates the last  $K$  prompts into  $\text{LM}_{\text{backward}}$ . Thus TextGrad-Momentum’s backward pass scales as  $c_m + K L_p$ , whereas TextGrad-M (ours) keeps the backward prompt length fixed (no concatenation), so its backward cost remains  $c_m$  and momentum is realized via Gumbel-Top- $k$ .

We can compare the per-iteration costs as follows:

- **TSGD**:  $O(c_m + c_g^{\text{train}}(m))$
- **TGD**:  $O(c_m + c_g^{\text{train}}(|\mathcal{D}_{\text{train}}|))$
- **TextGrad-M (Ours)**:  $K$  candidates evaluated on minibatches  $O(c_m + c_g^{\text{train}}(m) + K |v| c_f)$
- **TextGrad-Momentum (concat  $K$  prompts into  $\text{LM}_{\text{backward}}$ )**: Backward context grows with  $K$ :  $O(c_m + K L_p + c_g^{\text{train}}(m))$

TextGrad-M pays  $K$  minibatches of validation set and TextGrad-Momentum has backward prompt growing by  $K \cdot L_p$ . TGD is the most computationally expensive as  $c_g^{\text{train}}(|\mathcal{D}_{\text{train}}|) \gg c_g^{\text{train}}(m)$  due to full training data pass per iteration. TSGD is the cheapest module, but exhibits instability for small  $b$  (right panel of [Fig. 2](#)). As our ablation study shows the minibatch size  $|v|$  shall be small compared to full validation set (See [Fig. 6](#)) and  $L_p$  is generally large [Section D.8](#) (as denoted by the final optimized prompt length), TextGrad-M shall be cheaper than TextGrad-Momentum. Additionally, concatenation-based momentum inflates the backward context by  $K \cdot L_p$ , increasing context and KV-cache load. Therefore, TextGrad-Momentum raises the

---

**Algorithm 1** Textual Stochastic Gradient Descent with Momentum (TSGD-M)

---

**Input:** Initial prompt  $\pi_0$ , training set  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{train}}$ , validation set  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{val}}$ , total steps  $T$ , momentum window size  $K$ , scoring function on accuracy  $S$

- 1: Initialize cache  $\Phi \leftarrow \emptyset$
- 2: **for**  $\tau = 0 \dots T - 1$  **do**
- 3:     Draw a training minibatch  $B_{\text{train}} \sim \mathcal{D}_{\text{train}}$  and a validation minibatch  $B_{\text{val}} \sim \mathcal{D}_{\text{val}}$
- 4:      $v_\tau \leftarrow S(P(\pi_\tau, B_{\text{train}}), y)$
- 5:     Sample  $K$  prompts  $\Pi_\tau^*$  from all past iterations based on their running mean over all cached val acc.
- 6:     Evaluate validation accuracy of  $\Pi_\tau^*$  on  $B_{\text{val}}$ , denoted as  $V$ . Add  $\{\Pi_\tau^*, V\}$  to cache.
- 7:     Select  $\pi_\tau$  based on  $\{\Pi_\tau^*, V\}$  using [Eq. \(3\)](#) or [Eq. \(4\)](#)
- 8:     Generate next prompt:  $\pi_{\tau+1} = P(\pi|g_\tau, \pi_\tau)$
- 9:     Compute gradient  $g_{\tau+1}$  on the  $\pi_{\tau+1}$  and add  $(\tau + 1, \pi_{\tau+1}, g_{\tau+1}, [v_\tau])$  to  $\Phi$
- 10: **end for**

**Ensure:** Optimized prompt  $\pi_T$

---

backward prompt cost per iteration to  $c_m + K L_p$ . In contrast, our TextGrad-M keeps the backward prompt fixed (only  $c_m$ ) while directing exploration into minibatch validation, reducing context length and KV-cache load. Finally, we have the practical ordering that TSGD  $\ll$  TextGrad-M  $<$  TextGrad-Momentum  $\ll$  TGD in terms of tokens cost. In [Section D.4](#), we show that TextGrad-M is also robust regardless of whether the final reported prompt is chosen by the running mean of minibatch validation or by a full validation.

## 5.5 Extension

Our method can be naturally extended to other methods that share principles with TSGD. We highlight two representative examples: (1) DSPy (COPRO): This method can be adapted to sample multiple prompts and remains robust under Textual-Gradient-free settings. We include it to demonstrate that our method integrate seamlessly into prompt optimization frameworks that do not rely on textual gradients. (2) AdalFlow: As a representative method capable of sampling single or multiple prompts, while using concatenations of past prompts as input, AdalFlow offers broader flexibility than many existing baselines.

**Extension to DSPy COPRO.** COPRO is a declarative programming framework for composing and compiling LLM pipelines (and then optimizing their prompts/weights) without “textual gradients”. COPRO exposes two key hyperparameters: *depth* (number of optimization iterations) and *breadth* (number of candidates generated per iteration). Because COPRO assumes *breadth*  $> 1$ , it naturally extends

TextGrad’s single-candidate update to a multi-candidate regime. In our implementation, we set  $\text{breadth} = 2$  but it can be generalized to any breadth number. At iteration  $\tau$ , we first sample a Top- $K$  set  $\Pi_{\tau}^*$  using the Gumbel–Top- $k$  trick; we then select the top-scoring prompt in  $\Pi_{\tau}^*$  (under the current minibatch estimate) and use it to instantiate two descendants for evaluation, rather than producing a single descendant as in vanilla TextGrad (See generation templates in Appendix D.7). This coupling preserves exploration via stochastic sampling while retaining exploitation through breadth-wise refinement.

**Extension to Adalflow.** AdalFlow is a PyTorch-like library that enables seamless prompt optimization across textual, numerical, and functional components, supporting both simple and complex computation graphs without textual gradients. AdalFlow-M applies momentum-based prompt selection before each gradient update. At iteration  $\tau$ , we draw two Top- $K$  sets from the history cache using the Gumbel-Top- $k$  trick:  $\Pi_{\tau}^*$ , weighted by average validation scores, and  $\Pi_{\tau}^{*'}$  weighted by the negative scores of average validation scores (worst performing prompts). AdalFlow maintains dual historical tracking per iteration  $\tau$ : *best\_prompt\_history* records top-performing prompts  $\Pi_{\tau}^*$  with averaged scores across multiple mini-batch evaluations, while *failed\_proposal\_history* logs rejected candidates  $\Pi_{\tau}^{*'}$  to prevent redundant exploration. The selected prompt candidates are subsequently passed to the optimizer model along with  $\Pi_{\tau}^*$  and  $\Pi_{\tau}^{*'}$  to guide refinement. In each iteration, AdalFlow generates  $K$  proposals for gradient updates. Only prompts that show improved performance on the mini-batch evaluation are accepted, ensuring that optimization strictly favors performance gains while leveraging historical momentum for structured exploration. We do not apply block-wise uniform sampling because AdalFlow-M maintains two distinct  $K$  sized candidate sets—one for top and one for failed prompts, making uniform averaging ill-defined and potentially doubling compute overhead.

## 6 EXPERIMENTS

### 6.1 Momentum Improves Scaling

Following Section 4, we conduct scaling experiments on MATH, by increasing the training set size while keeping the batch size fixed at 5 and the number of epochs at 2. As shown in Fig. 3, our momentum-based module achieves consistently higher test accuracy than vanilla TextGrad across a wide range of training dataset size, as  $\text{LM}_{\text{forward}}$  benefits from a larger pool of training examples and  $\text{LM}_{\text{backward}}$  adapts to more diverse generated predictions. Our method also exhibits a smoother curve under scaling. Note here we do not plot out training dataset size less than 50 as we would like to highlight the generalization capability of our momentum method under the setting of scaling training

dataset size. The two variants of momentum achieve similar performance, while promptwise is slightly better.

Except for the average accuracy, the variance of test accuracy is remarkably reduced with the proposed momentum method, compared to TextGrad, which aligns with our theoretical intuition. For the *Promptwise* generation, the variance drop compared to TextGrad is most significant as 0.37%, at 300 samples. This reduction mirrors the principle behind bootstrap aggregation (Breiman, 1996), where repeated resampling stabilizes estimators and lowers variance.




Figure 3. Upon scaling training data, TextGrad-M outperforms TextGrad on the MATH task with a batch size of 5.

### 6.2 Momentum Improves TSGD Variants

Our method can be plugged into TSGD and its variants. To test the efficacy of momentum, we benchmark three representative TSGD variants. *TextGrad* (Yuksekgonul et al., 2025) is TSGD by text-gradient-driven learning from examples. We use two setups: one with validation revert and one without. *COPRO* from DSPy (DSPy, 2025) iteratively sample new prompts based on validation accuracy. *AdalFlow* (Yin & Wang, 2025) refines prompts via  $\text{LM}_{\text{backward}}$  applied only to error examples. We use **-M** to denote the momentum extension to these TSGD variants.

**Tasks.** Following prior work, e.g., (Sordoni et al., 2023; Yuksekgonul et al., 2025; Khattab et al., 2024; Clark et al., 2018), we assemble a diverse set of tasks. **Text Classification:** Trec (Lu et al., 2022) is a natural-language understanding benchmark for question-type classification. **Math: GSM8K** (Khattab et al., 2024; Yuksekgonul et al., 2025) is a set of grade school math problems for evaluating LLM capabilities in reasoning. We use the same evaluation metric as TextGrad, a string-based exact match metric to quantify accuracy. **MATH** (algebra) (Hendrycks et al., 2021) is a harder set of math problems. Here, we use an algebra subset according to DSPy (DSPy Team, 2025b). **Reasoning: ARC-Challenge** (Clark et al., 2018) is a benchmark consisting of grade-school-level multiple-choice science QA. **HotPotQA** (Yang et al., 2018) is a large-scale Wikipedia QA

Table 2. Test accuracy (%) with standard deviation inside parentheses. Overall, TSGD-M improves TSGD variants.

Method	TREC	ARC-Challenge	GSM8K	MATH	HotPotQA
TextGrad w/o val revert	81.92(1.53)	91.35(0.30)	93.15(0.55)	84.67(0.58)	49.46(0.87)
TextGrad w/ val revert	77.40(0.55)	91.20(0.0)	93.74(0.27)	85.42(0.00)	49.06(0.30)
<b>TextGrad-M (Promptwise)</b>	83.36(2.02)	91.96(1.01)	<b>94.04(0.24)</b>	<b>86.78(0.68)</b>	50.53(1.02)
<b>TextGrad-M (Blockwise)</b>	<b>85.44(0.78)</b>	<b>92.64(0.28)</b>	93.98(0.20)	86.45(0.38)	<b>50.66(1.93)</b>
COPRO	80.28(3.38)	94.05(0.27)	87.99(1.87)	<b>70.84(0.48)</b>	39.80(1.68)
<b>COPRO-M (Promptwise)</b>	<b>83.36(1.99)</b>	94.40(0.43)	<b>88.74(1.63)</b>	68.75(1.10)	41.23(1.05)
<b>COPRO-M (Blockwise)</b>	80.52(0.96)	<b>94.49(0.48)</b>	86.90(0.71)	63.98(2.51)	<b>41.96(1.22)</b>
AdalFlow	<b>85.00(0.41)</b>	91.00(0.71)	89.00(0.55)	81.90(0.14)	48.73(0.13)
<b>AdalFlow-M (Promptwise)</b>	85.00(1.47)	<b>91.67(0.24)</b>	<b>90.78(1.03)</b>	<b>82.77(0.56)</b>	<b>48.91(0.69)</b>

benchmark that requires LLMs to understand context materials before answering questions. We adopt the full-wiki setting. Data splitting, evaluation metrics, and other details are summarized in Section D.

**Training Setups.** If not otherwise specified, the accuracy over the full validation set is evaluated every four iterations, and we report the test accuracy on the prompts with the highest full validation accuracy. Both TextGrad and Adalflow use a shuffled mini-batch with a batch size of 5 and 2 epochs. Since COPRO does not use training data to obtain textual gradients, we apply the same mini-batch strategy for the validation. Unless otherwise noted, the momentum window size is 5. All reported results are aggregated across runs over 5 different seeds.

**Momentum Boosts TSGD.** In Table 2, we report results on 5 tasks. We use a window size of 5 for both Promptwise and Blockwise variants of momentum. Across all TSGD variants, momentum is able to improve the performance in most tasks. The improvement is most significant and consistent on TextGrad with gradients. On hard tasks like ARC-Challenge and MATH, TextGrad-M has non-trivial improvements varying from 0.76% to 1.4%. In contrast, TextGrad with validation revert is purely *exploitative*: with temperature 0, it collapses the action distribution to a single prompt, reducing variance between different seeds of trials but increasing bias. In contrast, our method strikes a balance in exploration and exploitation over history prompts, thereby improving TextGrad.

The boosting is observed also in the AdalFlow, which can generally handle different components in LLM system. Even though AdalFlow introduces prior performing prompts and failed prompts history as a flavor of exploration in the LLM’s input context, AdalFlow-M introduces further boost in downstream performance by additional exploration and exploitation via momentum sampling (as observed in performance improvement on 4 over 5 tasks). Among the three TSGD variants, COPRO does not have explicit “textual gradients” but directly sample next prompts given prior prompts. Even in such a gradient-free setting, our momentum method still improves the method in most tasks, show-




Figure 4. Average test accuracy over iterations on MATH. TextGrad presents a declining trend without validation revert and shows an unchanging pattern with validation revert due to a lack of exploration of distinct prompts.

ing the generality of our method. An exception occurs in MATH, where the initial DSPy signature prompt is already near-optimal, leaving minimal headroom for exploration, indicating task-specific saturation rather than our method’s failure.

In Fig. 4, we examine the training effects by iterations. We observe that the validation revert in TextGrad causes subsequent generations to be confined to a narrow searching space around the initial prompt. As a result, no better prompts are generated and the test accuracy is unchanged. Such purely exploitative behavior overfits local optima and degrades overall performance. In contrast, TextGrad-M, encourages exploration and mitigates this collapse, enabling both *Promptwise* and *Blockwise* variants to achieve consistently higher test accuracy with more stable optimization trajectory.

### 6.3 Ablation Studies

In this section, we study key components in our method.

**TextGrad-M outperforms TextGrad-Momentum with varying window sizes.** In TextGrad, momentum is defined to concatenate the prompts from the previous  $K$  iterations

Table 3. Ablations on evaluation scope, validation estimator, selection rule and exploration setting for MATH. Mini denotes minibatch validation. Val denotes validation set. Gumbel-Max denotes Gumbel- $k$  when  $k = 1$ . Mini (mean) denotes running mean of minibatch validation accuracy.

Method	Val Evaluation Scope	Val Estimator	Selection Rule	Exploration Setting	Val/Test (%)
TG w/o validation revert	Full	Argmax (Deterministic)	Argmax	None (Pure Exploitation)	86.00 / 84.67
Exploration	Full	Full (Gumbel-Max)	Argmax	<b>Exploration in Gumbel-Max</b>	83.71 / 83.37
Efficient evaluation	Mini	<b>Single mini val</b>	Gumbel-Max	Exploration in Gumbel-Max	86.29 / 85.63
Stable Evaluation	Mini	<b>Running mean</b>	Gumbel-Max	Exploration in Gumbel-Max	85.00 / 84.86
Explorative Evaluation	Mini	Running mean	Gumbel- $k$	<b>Gumbel-Max over Gumbel-<math>k</math> (<math>K=5</math>)</b>	85.43 / 85.30
<b>Ours (exploration and exploitation)</b>	Mini	Running mean	Gumbel- $k$	<b>Argmax over Gumbel-<math>k</math> (<math>K=5</math>)</b>	<b>86.63 / 86.78</b>




Figure 5. Test Performance of vanilla TextGrad-Momentum and TextGrad-M on MATH with same window size. Error bars are the standard error.




Figure 6. Sensitivity analysis on minibatch size for TextGrad-M for MATH.

and feeds this window to  $\text{LM}_{\text{backward}}$  propose the next update; The choice of  $K$  was not clearly examined in the original paper (Yuksekgonul et al., 2025). In our momentum-based variant, instead of requiring  $K$  consecutive steps, we sample the top  $K$  prompts by momentum sampling; thus the selected  $K$  need not be contiguous. Fig. 5 and Fig. 11 illustrate TextGrad-M consistently improves both validation and test accuracy compared to TextGrad-Momentum. We observe: **(i) Our method is not sensitive to window size while larger  $K$  generally helps our variant.**  $K=40$  with *Promtpwise* yields the best validation accuracy, while  $K=12$  attains the best test accuracy, though longer windows increase overhead (cost scales roughly with evaluation frequency and minibatch size,  $\tilde{O}(|v| \cdot T)$ , and larger  $K$

adds cost of inferencing). For main experiments we adopt  $K=5$  as a strong accuracy–cost trade-off. **(ii) Our method breaks the context length after scaling but TextGrad-Momentum cannot.** For vanilla TextGrad, increasing the concatenation window does not show a clear monotonic gain; increasing context length may *degrade* performance as observed from Window = 5 to Window = 12 for vanilla TextGrad. We hypothesize that longer input context degrade summarization capabilities due to long-context effects (lost in the middle phenomenon (Liu et al., 2024)), suggesting that simply concatenating past prompts does not necessarily improve prompt efficacy and the optimal context length is unclear.

**Exploring then exploiting improves performance compared to pure exploitation.** We use TextGrad-M as an example method of TSGD-M and dissect TextGrad-M (Algorithm 1) to assess the contribution of each building block. We use Promtpwise Generation as an example realization and ablate each building block of TextGrad-M. We ablate (i) the *val evaluation scope* (full vs. minibatch of validation set), (ii) the *val estimator* (single minibatch vs. a running mean over minibatches), and (iii) the *selection rule* (Gumbel-Max vs. Gumbel- $k$ ) together with the exploitation step (argmax within the chosen set on the *same* minibatch for fairness), (iv) the *exploration setting* (exploration vs. exploitation within the whole module). Table 3 shows: (1) Replacing full-validation evaluation (as in the second row, with validation and test accuracies of 83.71 % and 83.37 %) with repeated minibatch validation (rows four to six, averaging above 85 % on validation and 84 % on test) leads to improved generalization. Evaluating on small, randomly drawn minibatches introduces stochasticity analogous to bootstrap resampling, which effectively reduces estimator variance and mitigates overfitting to a single validation partition. (2) With the running-mean estimator, Gumbel- $k$  outperforms Gumbel-Max by enabling exploration within the top  $K$  performing set of prompts as visualized by average test accuracy improved from 84.86 to 85.30. (3) After selecting the top  $K$  candidates, exploiting by taking the argmax within the same minibatch yields an additional performance gain of approximately  $\gtrsim 1\%$  on both validation and test set. This improvement confirms our theoretical proof that Gumbel-Max over  $K$  shortlisted candidates is




Figure 7. Performance of TextGrad (w/ and w/o validation-revert) vs. TSGD-M (Promptwise, Blockwise). All runs use training size 100. We report validation and test accuracy for each module and calculate out the difference between them respectively.

Bayes-suboptimal to the empirical argmax on a shared minibatch (See Section C).

**TSGD-M is not sensitive to minibatch validation size.** Fig. 6 varies the minibatch validation size  $|v|$  and shows that final test accuracy is *not* highly sensitive to this choice: the best result occurs at  $|v|=200$ , with the second-best at  $|v|=50$ . Because the evaluation cost scales approximately linearly in  $|v|$  (i.e.,  $O(|v|)$  per minibatch validation evaluation), we favor smaller validation sets that preserve accuracy while reducing overhead; in the main experiments we adopt  $|v|=50$  as a strong accuracy-cost trade-off.

**Momentum improves generalization.** In Fig. 7, TextGrad-M ranks top 2 on validation and best on test. Momentum improves both metrics by balancing exploration (via Gumbel- $K$ ) and exploitation (Promptwise: generate from the top 1 on the same minibatch for fair comparison; Blockwise: uniformly sample from the top  $K$ ). In contrast, TextGrad greedily picks the argmax over the full validation set across past iterations.

## 7 CONCLUSION

We present a systematic approach to scalable, efficient automatic prompt tuning. We empirically visit the scaling law for textual gradient stochastic descent (TSGD) and identify that the key challenge is to efficiently use minibatch while maintaining high stability. Therefore, we propose a novel method, TSGD Momentum, that reuses past prompts and gradients as a mixed distribution to sample new prompts. Our method is modular and integrates seamlessly with existing frameworks (e.g., TextGrad, COPRO) and empirically improves their performance on multiple tasks, including classification, math and reasoning.

## 8 ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This work was supported in part by the National Science Foundation under Grant No. IIS 2313131.

## REFERENCES

Agarwal, R., Singh, A., Zhang, L., Bohnet, B., Rosias, L., Chan, S., Zhang, B., Anand, A., Abbas, Z., Nova, A., et al. Many-shot in-context learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 37:76930–76966, 2024.

Agrawal, L. A., Tan, S., Soylu, D., Ziems, N., Khare, R., Opsahl-Ong, K., Singhvi, A., Shandilya, H., Ryan, M. J., Jiang, M., et al. Gepa: Reflective prompt evolution can outperform reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2507.19457*, 2025.

Anagnostidis, S. and Bulian, J. How susceptible are llms to influence in prompts? In *COLM*, 2024.

Breiman, L. Bagging predictors. *Machine learning*, 24(2): 123–140, 1996.

Brown, B., Juravsky, J., Ehrlich, R., Clark, R., Le, Q. V., Ré, C., and Mirhoseini, A. Large language monkeys: Scaling inference compute with repeated sampling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.21787*, 2024.

Brown, T., Mann, B., Ryder, N., Subbiah, M., Kaplan, J. D., Dhariwal, P., Neelakantan, A., Shyam, P., Sastry, G., Askell, A., et al. Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33: 1877–1901, 2020.

Clark, P., Cowhey, I., Etzioni, O., Khot, T., Sabharwal, A., Schoenick, C., and Tafjord, O. Think you have solved question answering? try arc, the ai2 reasoning challenge. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.05457*, 2018.

Cobbe, K., Kosaraju, V., Bavarian, M., Chen, M., Jun, H., Kaiser, L., Plappert, M., Tworek, J., Hilton, J., Nakano, R., et al. Training verifiers to solve math word problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.14168*, 2021.

DSPy. Math reasoning – dspy tutorial. <https://dspy.ai/tutorials/math/>, 2025. Accessed: 2025-09-18.

DSPy. Optimization / optimizers. <https://dspy.ai/learn/optimization/optimizers/>, 2025. Accessed: 2025-05-14.

DSPy Team. Built in datasets. <https://dspy.ai/deep-dive/data-handling/built-in-datasets/>, 2025a. DSPy Documentation. Accessed 2025-10-11.

DSPy Team. Tutorial: Math reasoning. <https://dspy.ai/tutorials/math/>, 2025b. Accessed: 2025-10-12.

Hao, Y., Sun, Y., Dong, L., Han, Z., Gu, Y., and Wei, F. Structured prompting: Scaling in-context learning to 1,000 examples. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.06713*, 2022.

Hendrycks, D., Burns, C., Kadavath, S., Arora, A., Basart, S., Tang, E., Song, D., and Steinhardt, J. Measuring mathematical problem solving with the math dataset. In *Thirty-fifth Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems Datasets and Benchmarks Track (Round 2)*, 2021.

Hoffmann, J., Borgeaud, S., Mensch, A., Buchatskaya, E., Cai, T., Rutherford, E., Casas, D. d. L., Hendricks, L. A., Welbl, J., Clark, A., et al. Training compute-optimal large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.15556*, 2022.

Hooper, C., Kim, S., Mohammadzadeh, H., Maheswaran, M., Paik, J., Mahoney, M. W., Keutzer, K., and Gholami, A. Squeezed attention: Accelerating long context length llm inference. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.09688*, 2024.

Kaplan, J., McCandlish, S., Henighan, T., Brown, T. B., Chess, B., Child, R., Gray, S., Radford, A., Wu, J., and Amodei, D. Scaling laws for neural language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2001.08361*, 2020.

Khattab, O., Singhvi, A., Maheshwari, P., Zhang, Z., Santhanam, K., Haq, S., Sharma, A., Joshi, T. T., Moazam, H., Miller, H., et al. Dspy: Compiling declarative language model calls into state-of-the-art pipelines. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024.

Kirsch, A., Farquhar, S., Atighehchian, P., Jesson, A., Branchaud-Charron, F., and Gal, Y. Stochastic batch acquisition: A simple baseline for deep active learning. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*, 2023.

Kool, W., Van Hoof, H., and Welling, M. Stochastic beams and where to find them: The gumbel-top-k trick for sampling sequences without replacement. In *International conference on machine learning*, pp. 3499–3508. PMLR, 2019.

Lattimore, T. and Szepesvári, C. *Bandit algorithms*. Cambridge University Press, 2020.

Levy, M., Jacoby, A., and Goldberg, Y. Same task, more tokens: the impact of input length on the reasoning performance of large language models. In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pp. 15339–15353, 2024.

Li, D., Cao, S., Cao, C., Li, X., Tan, S., Keutzer, K., Xing, J., Gonzalez, J. E., and Stoica, I. S\*: Test time scaling for code generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.14382*, 2025.

Liu, N. F., Lin, K., Hewitt, J., Paranjape, A., Bevilacqua, M., Petroni, F., and Liang, P. Lost in the middle: How language models use long contexts. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 12:157–173, 2024.

Liu, Y., Gao, Y., and Yin, W. An improved analysis of stochastic gradient descent with momentum. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:18261–18271, 2020.

Lu, Y., Bartolo, M., Moore, A., Riedel, S., and Stenetorp, P. Fantastically ordered prompts and where to find them: Overcoming few-shot prompt order sensitivity. In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pp. 8086–8098, 2022.

Maddison, C. J., Tarlow, D., and Minka, T. A\* sampling. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 27, 2014.

Muennighoff, N., Yang, Z., Shi, W., Li, X. L., Fei-Fei, L., Hajishirzi, H., Zettlemoyer, L., Liang, P., Candès, E., and Hashimoto, T. s1: Simple test-time scaling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.19393*, 2025.

Opsahl-Ong, K., Ryan, M., Purtell, J., Broman, D., Potts, C., Zaharia, M., and Khattab, O. Optimizing instructions and demonstrations for multi-stage language model programs. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pp. 9340–9366, 2024.

Ouyang, L., Wu, J., Jiang, X., Almeida, D., Wainwright, C., Mishkin, P., Zhang, C., Agarwal, S., Slama, K., Ray, A., et al. Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:27730–27744, 2022.

Peng, H., Wang, X., Chen, J., Li, W., Qi, Y., Wang, Z., Wu, Z., Zeng, K., Xu, B., Hou, L., et al. When does in-context learning fall short and why? a study on specification-heavy tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.08993*, 2023.

Polyak, B. T. Some methods of speeding up the convergence of iteration methods. *Ussr computational mathematics and mathematical physics*, 4(5):1–17, 1964.

Pryzant, R., Iter, D., Li, J., Lee, Y. T., Zhu, C., and Zeng, M. Automatic prompt optimization with "gradient descent" and beam search. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.03495*, 2023.

Rajasekaran, P., Dixon, E., Ryan, C., and Hadfield, J. Effective context engineering for ai agents. Anthropic Engineering Blog, September 2025. URL <https://www.anthropic.com/engineering/effective-context-engineering-for-ai-agents>. With contributions from Rafi Ayub, Hannah Moran, Cal Rueb, and Connor Jennings.

Rumelhart, D. E., Hinton, G. E., and Williams, R. J. Learning representations by back-propagating errors. *nature*, 323(6088):533–536, 1986.

Sclar, M., Choi, Y., Tsvetkov, Y., and Suhr, A. Quantifying language models' sensitivity to spurious features in prompt design or: How i learned to start worrying about prompt formatting. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024.

Snell, C., Lee, J., Xu, K., and Kumar, A. Scaling llm test-time compute optimally can be more effective than scaling model parameters. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.03314*, 2024.

Sordoni, A., Yuan, E., Côté, M.-A., Pereira, M., Trischler, A., Xiao, Z., Hosseini, A., Niedtner, F., and Le Roux, N. Joint prompt optimization of stacked llms using variational inference. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36:58128–58151, 2023.

Suzgun, M., Scales, N., Schärli, N., Gehrmann, S., Tay, Y., Chung, H. W., Chowdhery, A., Le, Q. V., Chi, E. H., Zhou, D., and Wei, J. Challenging big-bench tasks and whether chain-of-thought can solve them. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.09261*, 2022.

Tang, J., Zhao, Y., Zhu, K., Xiao, G., Kasikci, B., and Han, S. Quest: Query-aware sparsity for efficient long-context llm inference. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.10774*, 2024.

Thinking Machines. Defeating nondeterminism in llm inference, 2025. URL <https://thinkingmachines.ai/blog/defeating-nondeterminism-in-llm-inference/>.

Wan, X., Sun, R., Nakhost, H., and Arik, S. Teach better or show smarter? on instructions and exemplars in automatic prompt optimization. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 37:58174–58244, 2024.

Wang, X., Li, C., Wang, Z., Bai, F., Luo, H., Zhang, J., Jovic, N., Xing, E., and Hu, Z. Promptagent: Strategic planning with language models enables expert-level prompt optimization. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=22pyNMuIoa>.

Yang, C., Wang, X., Lu, Y., Liu, H., Le, Q. V., Zhou, D., and Chen, X. Large language models as optimizers. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024.

Yang, Y., Hong, J., Perin, G. J., Fan, Z., Yin, L., Wang, Z., and Topcu, U. Ad-vf: Llm-automatic differentiation enables fine-tuning-free robot planning from formal methods feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2509.18384*, 2025.

Yang, Z., Qi, P., Zhang, S., Bengio, Y., Cohen, W. W., Salakhutdinov, R., and Manning, C. D. Hotpotqa: A dataset for diverse, explainable multi-hop question answering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1809.09600*, 2018.

Yin, L. and Wang, Z. Llm-autodiff: Auto-differentiate any llm workflow. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.16673*, 2025.

Ying, H., Zhang, S., Li, L., Zhou, Z., Shao, Y., Fei, Z., Ma, Y., Hong, J., Liu, K., Wang, Z., et al. Internlm-math: Open math large language models toward verifiable reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.06332*, 2024.

Yu, X. and Gen, M. *Introduction to evolutionary algorithms*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2010.

Yuksekogunul, M., Bianchi, F., Boen, J., Liu, S., Lu, P., Huang, Z., Guestrin, C., and Zou, J. Optimizing generative ai by backpropagating language model feedback. *Nature*, 639:609–616, 2025.

Zhou, H., Wan, X., Sun, R., Palangi, H., Iqbal, S., Vulić, I., Korhonen, A., and Arik, S. Ö. Multi-agent design: Optimizing agents with better prompts and topologies. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.02533*, 2025.

Zhou, Y., Muresanu, A. I., Han, Z., Paster, K., Pitis, S., Chan, H., and Ba, J. Large language models are human-level prompt engineers. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022.

## A EXTENDED RELATED WORKS

### A.1 Automatic Prompt Engineering Workflow

We will revisit several **Automatic Prompt Engineering** frameworks below.

1. **APE** (Zhou et al., 2022) is a seminal work in leveraging LLMs for instruction optimization. In each iteration, a set of instructions is evaluated on a validation set, and the optimizer generates a new set by paraphrasing the highest-performing instructions. This iterative process continues until convergence. However, we argue that APE does not fall under the category of Textual Gradient Descent (TGD) but instead aligns more closely with evolutionary algorithms (Yu & Gen, 2010), as it is inherently gradient-free. Rather than utilizing textual gradients for optimization, APE explicitly prompts LLMs to generate variations of instructions while preserving their semantic meaning, replacing lower-performing prompts through mechanisms akin to random variation (e.g., mutation or crossover), a hallmark of evolutionary strategies. Therefore, we exclude it for our evaluation.
2. **DLN1** (Sordoni et al., 2023) views prompt optimization as learning a distribution  $p_{LM}(y|x, \pi)$  in which  $x, y$  the inputs or outputs are learned separately, and  $\pi$  is learnable prompt. The iterative process is similar to APE but can include a verbalization of difficult examples from the task: the final prompts shall combine both instructions and task examples, which mimic a mix of zero-shot learning and in-context learning.
3. **OPRO** (Yang et al., 2024) optimizes instructions by showing the LLM a meta-prompt that includes the trajectory of previously generated prompts with their training accuracies, plus randomly sampled demonstrations that specify the task. To respect context-length limits, the meta-prompt retains only the highest-scoring instructions. Each iteration then asks the LLM to propose one additional candidate prompt. Compared to DLN1 (Sordoni et al., 2023), OPRO typically runs for a substantially longer optimization horizon (approximately 100 steps per task); DLN1 can be viewed as a shorter iterations variant of Yang et al. (2024). Moreover, OPRO requires hand-crafted refinement prompts ( $\pi_{\text{refine}}$ ) tailored to different LLM optimizers, even for the same task (e.g., distinct templates for PaLM-2-L and GPT models on GSM8K; see Appendix C.2 of Yang et al. 2024). Template design can materially change the produced prompts and the optimization dynamics (Rajasekaran et al., 2025). Because constructing and comparing meta-prompt templates is beyond our scope for our paper, and given OPRO’s procedural similarity to DLN1 but with longer iterations and more specific  $\pi_{\text{refine}}$  templates design, we fix  $\pi_{\text{refine}}$  for all three baselines (TextGrad, DSPy-COPRO, DLN1) and adopt DLN1 as the representative instruction-optimization baseline when evaluating our TSGD-M algorithm.

4. **TextGrad** (Yuksekgonul et al., 2025) backpropagates textual feedback provided by the proposal and view the textual feedback as gradients to perform descent or improve upon. For every iteration, they randomly extract several demonstrations and generate only one new prompt. They also present a momentum version by simply concatenating previously generated past gradients within certain window length.

5. **DSPy** (Khattab et al., 2024). As we limit our study into zero-shot prompt optimization, in which we solely focus on *instruction optimization* rather than *example optimization* or jointly optimize both of them (Wan et al., 2024; Opsahl-Ong et al., 2024), we only discuss COPRO module in Khattab et al. (2024). As our tasks are APE with zero-shot demonstrations needed to optimize, we use COPRO for automatic instruction optimization and exclude MIPROv2 as our baselines do not involve optimizing the set of few shots demonstrations and do not treat prompt generation temperature as a hyperparameter to optimize during iterative prompt optimization. Similar to DLN-1, COPRO leverages Signatures (structured prompts) to optimize Signatures themselves. We refer readers for further discussions on different optimizers (DSPy, 2025).

6. **PromptAgent** (Wang et al., 2024) views prompt optimization as a more advanced planning agent using Monte Carlo Tree Search (MCTS). We argue that Wang et al. (2024) does not fall under TGD framework also. The MCTS algorithm itself is not a gradient-based algorithm as it relies on a search-based approach rather than differentiable optimization techniques, and MCTS does not compute or apply gradients. Even though MCTS shall be combined with gradient-based learning, where a policy network is trained using policy gradients and used to guide tree search, it is beyond our paper’s research scope. Thus, we exclude this method.

7. **GEPA** (Agrawal et al., 2025) shares a similar spirit in exploring the top-performing prompts for each problem instance stochastically rather than optimizing a single global prompt as in TextGrad (Yuksekgonul et al., 2025); it frames search over a set of Pareto-front candidates. *However, our method differs in three key ways:*

**Who teaches the next generation.** GEPA proposes new candidates by mutating existing ones using learning signals from their *parents* and from the current rollout along a genetic tree. In contrast, we *look back over the entire search history*: at each iteration we select supervision from the top- $K$  prompts across all previously generated candidates (sampled via the Gumbel-Top-K trick), not just from an immediate parent of the previous prompt. This history-wide selection provides stronger and more stable learning signals.

**How candidates are evaluated.** GEPA scores every newly proposed prompt on the *full* validation set each iteration, incurring high inference cost. We instead use lightweight

*mini-batch* evaluations to guide selection and generation, eliminating full-set scoring for every candidate. The full-validation sweep is run only for choosing the final best prompt.

**When a candidate is accepted.** GEPA retains the TextGrad-style gate: a newly generated prompt is run on the full validation set and accepted only if it improves validation accuracy; otherwise it is rejected. Our approach *removes* this full-set acceptance check. Even when evolving from a temporarily non-optimal prompt, we observe that sampling next-iteration seeds from the historical top- $K$  reliably yields improved prompts, as reflected by validation accuracy over time, while substantially reducing inference cost.

Taken together, these choices let us (i) exploit stronger signals than parent-only modification, (ii) avoid costly full-validation sweeps during search per iteration, and (iii) maintain progression of optimizing prompts even when the current incumbent is not on the estimated Pareto front.

## A.2 Relation to Prior Work

Our method bears certain similarities to prior approaches, yet their formulations exhibit inherent limitations.

**Validation Revert.** In the limit  $K = 1$  and zero Gumbel noise, TSGD-M reduces exactly to validation-revert. *Validation-revert* policy was used in prior work like TextGrad (Yuksekgonul et al., 2025) or GEPA (Agrawal et al., 2025), where the proposed prompt will be reverted to a prior iteration if its validation accuracy falls behind. We argue that the validation reverting purely exploits the prompt with the highest (noisy) validation score but lacks exploring top-performing variants. As a result, it can be easily trapped in local optima and does not necessarily yield the best generalization. Aggressively exploiting local optima tends to increase bias as the best prompt in the validation set is not necessarily the prompt generalizing best in the test set (See Fig 9 in Appendix D.3). In contrast, TSGD-M uses sampling-based methods to balance exploration and exploitation. (i) Sampling a Top- $k$  set injects stochastic exploration while retaining non-zero probability toward high-performing rather than argmax prompts on the validation set. (ii) By evaluating  $k$  candidates per step, we obtain multiple, independent minibatch estimates of validation performance, improving the robustness of the selection signal and reduces estimator bias. This echoes the bootstrap idea (Breiman, 1996): repeated evaluation over subsampled validation sets stabilizes estimates of a prompt’s full-validation accuracy.

**TextGrad Momentum.** TSGD-M performs a *dynamic*, probabilistic selection of  $K$  prompts from the history: candidates are sampled according to weights derived from minibatch validation estimates and then used as the input context to  $\text{LM}_{\text{backward}}$ . TextGrad (Yuksekgonul et al., 2025) first

introduces momentum idea by concatenating the previous  $K$  prompts and feeding them to  $\text{LM}_{\text{backward}}$  to generate the next prompt. Both algorithms share the same name momentum and are exploring the history of past prompts. However, TSGD-M avoids the rigidity of a fixed, most-recent  $K$  window as vanilla TextGrad which might not contain the most informative prompts for the next iteration. By stochastically favoring historically high-value prompts (as indicated by their running mean) while still allowing exploration, TSGD-M adapts to non-stationarity and mitigates stale-history effects. We study the choice of  $K$  in our TSGD-M and compare it with TextGrad momentum in our ablation study Table 5 (Section 6.3).

## B EXTENDED ALGORITHM

Below is the full algorithm details for Alg 1 in Section 5.

## C THEORETICAL JUSTIFICATION

Here, we show our momentum sampling (via Gumbel-Top- $k$ ) is not heuristic but theoretically grounded as sampling without replacement from a categorical distribution over validation scores.

**Proposition 1** (Gumbel-Top- $k$  (Kirsch et al., 2023)). *Given arbitrary real-valued scores  $s_i$  ( $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ ),  $k \leq n$ , and  $\beta > 0$ , if  $\epsilon_i \sim \text{Gumbel}(0; \beta^{-1})$  i.i.d., then*

$$\arg \underset{k}{\text{top}} \{s_i + \epsilon_i\}_i$$

*is an ordered sample without replacement from  $\text{Categorical}\left(\frac{e^{\beta s_i}}{\sum_j e^{\beta s_j}}\right)$ .*

### C.1 Proof for Promptwise Generation

We justify why, in Promptwise generation, it is Bayes-optimal to select the prompt with the highest fresh-batch validation accuracy (“Fresh-Argmax”) rather than to re-sample using Gumbel noise on the updated running means (Gumbel-Max trick on the  $k$  running means). We formalize the selection step as a one-shot decision problem with linear utility and analyze it under a Bayesian framework.

Let  $\Pi_\tau^*$  denote the size- $k$  shortlist returned by Gumbel-Top- $k$  on scores  $\tilde{Z}$  at iteration  $\tau$ . For each  $\pi_{\tau,i} \in \Pi_\tau^*$ , let  $r_{\tau,i} \in [0, 1]$  be the (unknown) true validation accuracy on the downstream task. On the current iteration we evaluate all  $\pi_{\tau,i} \in \Pi_\tau^*$  on the *same* fresh mini-batch, obtaining

$$v_{\tau,i} = r_{\tau,i} + \epsilon_i, \\ \text{with } \{\epsilon_i\}_{i \in \Pi_\tau^*} \text{ independent, mean-zero,} \\ \text{and from a log-concave location family.}$$

(e.g., Binomial  $\rightarrow$  sub-Gaussian/Gaussian approximation with variance  $r_i(1 - r_i)/m$  when batch size is  $m$ ). Let

**Algorithm 2** Textual Stochastic Gradient Descent with Momentum

**Input:** Language Model **LM**,  $p_0$  : initial prompt,  $\mathcal{D}$ : Data Distribution,  $T$  : Total iterations,  $m$ : batch size, use Promptwise Generation flag,  $T_{\max}$ : max tokens,  $c$  : number of candidate prompts to generate,  $S$  : score function,  $\pi_{\text{refine}}$ : Template to generate new prompts,  $K$  : window size/Gumbel-Top-K parameter,  $v$ : minibatch validation set with size  $a$ ,  $b$  : Size of sampling token block,  $val$  : original validation set.

---

- 1:  $\tilde{Z} \leftarrow \{\pi_\tau : \emptyset\}_{\tau=0}^T$
- 2: **for**  $\tau = 0, 1, \dots, T-1$  **do**
- 3:   Sample batch  $\{(x_i^{(t)}, y_i^{(t)})\}_{i=1}^m \sim \mathcal{D}$
- 4:    $\hat{y}_i^{(t)} \leftarrow \text{LM}([\pi_\tau, x_i^{(t)}])$
- 5:    $\nabla \pi_t \leftarrow \text{LM}_{\text{backward}}([p_{\text{analyze}}, \pi_t, \{(x_i, y_i, \hat{y}_i)\}_{i=1}^m])$
- 6:   At iteration  $\tau$ , randomly draw minibatch validation set  $v_\tau$  with size  $a$  from validation set  $val$
- 7:   Evaluate  $\pi_\tau$  on  $v_\tau$  and obtain evaluated validation accuracy  $v_{\tau,\tau}$  on  $v_\tau$ .
- 8:    $\tilde{Z}[\pi_\tau].\text{append}(v_{\tau,\tau})$
- 9:   Apply Gumbel-Top- $k$  Trick on average scores of  $\tilde{Z}$  and obtain  $\Pi_\tau^* = \{\pi_{\tau,1}, \dots, \pi_{\tau,K}\}$ .
- 10:   Evaluate  $\Pi_\tau^*$  on  $v_\tau$  and get  $v_{\tau,1}, \dots, v_{\tau,K}$ .
- 11:    $\pi_\tau^* \leftarrow \arg \max_{k \in \{1, \dots, K\}} v_{\tau,k}$
- 12:    $\tilde{Z}[\pi_k].\text{append}(v_{\tau,k})$  for  $k \in [1, \dots, K]$
- 13:   **if** use Promptwise Generation **then**
- 14:      $Z \leftarrow \text{PromptwiseGen}(\pi_\tau^*, \nabla \pi_\tau^*, c, T_{\max}, \pi_{\text{refine}}, \pi_i, \nabla \pi_i, \{x_i^{(t)}, y_i^{(t)}, \hat{y}_i^{(t)}\}_{i=1}^m)$
- 15:   **else**
- 16:      $Z \leftarrow \text{BlockwiseGen}(\Pi_\tau^*, c, b, T_{\max}, K, \pi_{\text{refine}}, \tau, \{x_i^{(t)}, y_i^{(t)}, \hat{y}_i^{(t)}\}_{i=1}^m)$
- 17:   **end if**
- 18:    $\pi_{t+1} \leftarrow \arg \max_{z \in Z} S(z)$
- 19: **end for**
- 20: **Output:** Optimized prompt  $\pi_{T-1}$

---

$B_i$  denote all past data used to form the running means  $\mu'_i$  (plain averages with sample counts  $n_i$  as how many times  $\pi_i$  being selected into  $K$  shortlist candidates for fresh minibatch evaluation). Within the  $K$  items, we compare two rules for selecting the next prompt:

A (Fresh-Argmax):  $i_A \in \arg \max_{k \in \{1, \dots, K\}} v_{\tau,k}$ ,

B (Gumbel-on-Mean):  $i_B \in \arg \max_{k \in \{1, \dots, K\}} \{\mu'_i + \xi_i\}$ ,  
 $\xi_i \stackrel{iid}{\sim} \text{Gumbel}(0, 1)$ .

We measure performance by expected reward  $\mathbb{E}[r_{i_\bullet}]$  (equivalently, minimizing expected regret).

**Theorem C.1** (Bayes optimality of posterior-mean argmax under equal precision). *Fix an iteration  $\tau$  and the realized shortlist  $\Pi_\tau^*$  of size  $k$ . Assume independent Gaussian pos-*

**Algorithm 3** PromptwiseGen( $\pi_\tau^*, \nabla \pi_\tau^*, c, T_{\max}, \pi_{\text{refine}}, \pi_i, \nabla \pi_i, \{x_i^{(t)}, y_i^{(t)}, \hat{y}_i^{(t)}\}_{i=1}^m$ )

---

- 1:  $Z \leftarrow \emptyset$
- 2: **for**  $j = 1$  to  $c$  **do**
- 3:    $z_j \leftarrow \text{Generate } T_{\max} \text{ tokens using } \text{LM}(\pi_{\text{refine}} + \pi_\tau^* + \{x_i^{(t)}, y_i^{(t)}, \hat{y}_i^{(t)}\}_{i=1}^m)$  (*direct prompt refinement/textual gradients free*),  
 or  $\text{LM}(\pi_{\text{refine}} + \pi_i + \nabla \pi_i + \pi_\tau^* + \nabla \pi_\tau^* + \{x_i^{(t)}, y_i^{(t)}, \hat{y}_i^{(t)}\}_{i=1}^m)$  (*textual gradients*).
- 4:    $Z \leftarrow Z \cup \{z_j\}$
- 5: **end for**
- 6: **return**  $Z$

---

**Algorithm 4** BlockwiseGen( $\Pi_\tau^*, c, b, T_{\max}, K, \pi_{\text{refine}}, \tau, \{x_i^{(t)}, y_i^{(t)}, \hat{y}_i^{(t)}\}_{i=1}^m$ )

---

- 1:  $Z \leftarrow \emptyset$
- 2: **for**  $j = 1$  to  $c$  **do**
- 3:    $z_j \leftarrow \emptyset$
- 4:   **for**  $i = 1$  to  $T_{\max}/b$  **do**
- 5:      $\pi_\tau^* \sim \text{Unif}(\Pi_\tau^*)$
- 6:     Generate  $b_i$  tokens using  $\text{LM}(\pi_{\text{refine}} + \pi_\tau^* + \{x_i^{(t)}, y_i^{(t)}, \hat{y}_i^{(t)}\}_{i=1}^m)$  (*direct prompt refinement/textual gradients free*), or  $\text{LM}(\pi_{\text{refine}} + \pi_i + \nabla \pi_i + \pi_\tau^* + \nabla \pi_\tau^* + \{x_i^{(t)}, y_i^{(t)}, \hat{y}_i^{(t)}\}_{i=1}^m)$  (*textual gradients*).
- 7:      $z_j \leftarrow z_j + [b_i]$
- 8:   **end for**
- 9:    $Z \leftarrow Z \cup \{z_j\}$
- 10: **end for**
- 11: **return**  $Z$

---

terior with common variance  $r_{\tau,i} \mid B_i \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_i, \tau^2)$  and a shared fresh mini-batch with homoscedastic Gaussian noise  $v_{\tau,i} \mid r_{\tau,i} \sim \mathcal{N}(r_{\tau,i}, \sigma^2)$ , with the same  $\tau^2, \sigma^2$  for all  $i \in \Pi_\tau^*$ . Let

$$m_i := \mathbb{E}[r_{\tau,i} \mid B_i, v_{\tau,i}] = \alpha \mu_i + (1 - \alpha) v_{\tau,i}, \quad (5)$$

$$\alpha := \frac{\tau^2}{\tau^2 + \sigma^2} \in (0, 1). \quad (6)$$

Then the Bayes-optimal rule for maximizing expected reward is

$$i^* \in \arg \max_{i \in \Pi_\tau^*} m_i.$$

Moreover, the “Fresh-Argmax” rule  $i_A \in \arg \max_{k \in \{1, \dots, K\}} v_{\tau,k}$  coincides with  $i^*$  if and only if its maximizer  $i_A$  satisfies the margin condition

$$(1 - \alpha) (v_{\tau,i_A} - v_{\tau,j}) \geq \alpha (\mu_j - \mu_{i_A}) \quad \text{for all } j \in \Pi_\tau^*. \quad (7)$$

*Proof.* By conjugacy,  $m_i = \alpha \mu_i + (1 - \alpha) v_{\tau,i}$  with the same  $\alpha$  across candidates of  $\Pi_\tau^*$ . Thus the Bayes-optimal decision is  $\arg \max_i m_i$ .

For coincidence with Fresh-Argmax, note that  $i_A = \arg \max_{k \in \{1, \dots, K\}} v_{\tau, k}$  and  $i^* = \arg \max m_i$  coincide iff  $m_{i_A} \geq m_j$  for all  $j$ , i.e.

$$\alpha(\mu_{i_A} - \mu_j) + (1 - \alpha)(v_{\tau, i_A} - v_{\tau, j}) \geq 0 \quad \forall j.$$

Rearranging yields (7), which is both necessary and sufficient.  $\square$

**Note.** The  $k$  shortlisted prompts  $\Pi_\tau^*$  are drawn from the global pool via Gumbel-Top- $k$  on their running means  $\tilde{Z}$ , which stochastically perturbs and then ranks the existing performance estimates. Conditional on selection, the shortlisted prompts therefore represent the upper tail of the prior distribution of means  $\{\mu_i\}$ . Because Gumbel-Top- $k$  only adds mean-zero perturbations and truncates the top region, the conditional spread of  $\mu_i$  within  $\Pi_\tau^*$  is narrow compared with both the prior variance  $\tau^2$  and the fresh-batch noise variance  $\sigma^2$ , i.e.  $\text{Var}(\mu_i \mid i \in \Pi_\tau^*) \ll \tau^2, \sigma^2$ . Hence the selected prompts are approximately exchangeable and may be modeled as having *near-equal prior means*, allowing the posterior-mean ordering  $m_i = \alpha\mu_i + (1 - \alpha)v_{\tau, i}$  to coincide with the fresh-batch ordering  $\arg \max_{k \in \{1, \dots, K\}} v_{\tau, k}$ .

**Decision-theoretic setup.** We model the selection of the next prompt as a single-step decision problem with a linear utility function

$$u(a, \omega) = r_{\tau, a}(\omega),$$

the (unknown) true reward obtained by choosing action  $a \in \mathcal{A} = \Pi_\tau^*$  under latent state  $\omega$ . The goal is to maximize expected utility  $\mathbb{E}_{\pi, \delta}[u(a, \omega)]$  over all decision rules  $\delta$  that map observable statistics (e.g.,  $\mathcal{X} = (B_i, \{v_{\tau, j}\}_{j \in \Pi_\tau^*})$  or its coarsening  $\mu'$ ) to probability distributions over actions. A linear utility corresponds to minimizing a convex loss (up to an affine transform), and ensures that the Bayes-optimal rule can be taken to be deterministic.

**Theorem C.2** (Information dominance of decisions using the fresh batch). *In the general (possibly heteroscedastic) case, let the decision-maker observe either the full statistic  $(B_i, \{v_{\tau, j}\}_{j \in \Pi_\tau^*})$  or a coarsened statistic  $T(B_i, \{v_{\tau, j}\}_{j \in \Pi_\tau^*}) = \mu'$ , where  $\mu'$  is the collection of updated running means for  $k$  shortlisted prompts at iteration  $\tau$ . In other words,  $\mu' := \{\mu'_i : i \in \Pi_\tau^*\}$  with  $\mu'_i = \frac{n_i \cdot \mu_i + v_{\tau, i}}{n_i + 1}$ . For any bounded linear reward (equivalently, convex loss), the Bayes risk using  $(B_i, \{v_{\tau, j}\}_{j \in \Pi_\tau^*})$  is no worse than that using  $\mu'$ . Consequently, the best deterministic rule based on  $(B_i, \{v_{\tau, j}\}_{j \in \Pi_\tau^*})$  weakly dominates any rule that relies only on  $\mu'$  and independent randomization (such as Gumbel-Max on  $\mu'$ ).*

*Proof.* Fix an iteration  $\tau$  and condition on the realized shortlist  $\Pi_\tau^*$ . Let the action set be  $\mathcal{A} := \Pi_\tau^*$ . Let

$$\mathcal{X} := (B_i, \{v_{\tau, j}\}_{j \in \Pi_\tau^*}) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{X}) := \mu'$$

denote, respectively, the *full* statistic and its coarsening into the updated running means.

A (possibly randomized) decision rule based on a statistic  $Z$  is a Markov kernel  $\delta : Z \rightarrow \Delta(\mathcal{A})$ , mapping an observation  $z$  to a distribution  $\delta(\cdot \mid z)$  over  $\mathcal{A}$ . Write  $\mathcal{D}(Z)$  for the class of such rules when the observable is  $Z$ . Let the (bounded) linear reward be  $u : \mathcal{A} \times \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , where  $\Omega$  is the latent outcome space (e.g., containing  $r_{\tau, i}$ 's). Let  $\pi$  be a prior on  $\Omega$  and let  $\mathbb{E}_{\pi, \delta}$  denote expectation over  $\omega \sim \pi$ , the randomness generating  $\mathcal{X}$  (hence  $\mu' = \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{X})$ ), and any internal randomization of  $\delta$ .

*Step 1 (Simulation/garbling argument).* Take any  $\delta' \in \mathcal{D}(\mu')$ , i.e., a rule that observes only  $\mu'$ . Define its *lift*  $\delta \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{X})$  by composition:

$$\delta(\cdot \mid \mathcal{X}) := \delta'(\cdot \mid \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{X})) = \delta'(\cdot \mid \mu').$$

Thus, given  $\mathcal{X}$ , the rule  $\delta$  first applies the measurable map  $\mathcal{T}$  to obtain  $\mu'$  and then acts exactly as  $\delta'$ . By construction,  $\delta$  and  $\delta'$  induce the same conditional action law given  $\mu'$ ; hence

$$\mathbb{E}_{\pi, \delta}[u(a, \omega)] = \mathbb{E}_{\pi, \delta'}[u(a, \omega)].$$

Therefore, for every rule based on  $\mu'$  there exists a rule based on  $\mathcal{X}$  achieving *the same* Bayes expected reward.

*Step 2 (Information dominance).* Taking suprema over admissible rules yields

$$\sup_{\delta \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{X})} \mathbb{E}_{\pi, \delta}[u(a, \omega)] \geq \sup_{\delta' \in \mathcal{D}(\mu')} \mathbb{E}_{\pi, \delta'}[u(a, \omega)].$$

Equivalently, for any convex loss  $\ell$  (the negative of a linear reward up to an affine transform), the minimal Bayes risk based on  $\mathcal{X}$  is no larger than that based on  $\mu'$ .

*Step 3 (Deterministic dominance within the full statistic).* Because the objective is linear in the action distribution conditional on the observed statistic, the supremum over the probability simplex is attained at an extreme point; hence there exists an optimal rule based on  $\mathcal{X}$  that is *deterministic* almost surely (selects an argmax of the posterior expected reward given  $\mathcal{X}$ ). Consequently, any rule that observes only  $\mu'$  and then injects independent randomization (e.g., Gumbel-Max on  $\mu'$ ) is weakly dominated by some deterministic rule that uses  $\mathcal{X}$ .

Combining the three steps proves the theorem.  $\square$

**Corollary C.1** (Deterministic exploitation dominates given the fresh batch). *Let  $\mathcal{A} := \Pi_\tau^*$  and  $\mathcal{X}_\tau := (B_i, \{v_{\tau, j}\}_{j \in \Pi_\tau^*})$ . For linear utility (equivalently, convex loss), there exists an optimal decision rule  $\delta^* \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{X}_\tau)$  that is deterministic almost surely; concretely, for*

$$m_{\tau, i}(\mathcal{X}_\tau) \equiv \mathbb{E}[r_{\tau, i} \mid \mathcal{X}_\tau], \quad i \in \Pi_\tau^*,$$

one may choose  $\delta^*(\mathcal{X}_\tau) \in \arg \max_{i \in \Pi_\tau^*} m_{\tau,i}(\mathcal{X}_\tau)$ . Moreover, any policy that observes only  $\mu' = T(\mathcal{X}_\tau)$  and then injects independent randomization (e.g., Gumbel-Max on  $\mu'$ ) is weakly dominated in Bayes expected utility by some deterministic policy based on  $\mathcal{X}_\tau$  (in particular, by  $A$  when its objective coincides with posterior mean reward on the shared fresh mini-batch).

*Proof.* Fix  $\mathcal{X}_\tau$  and write  $m(\mathcal{X}_\tau) = (m_{\tau,i}(\mathcal{X}_\tau))_{i \in \Pi_\tau^*}$ . Any (possibly randomized) rule in  $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{X}_\tau)$  induces a probability vector  $p(\cdot | \mathcal{X}_\tau) \in \Delta(\Pi_\tau^*)$  over actions. The conditional objective is linear:

$$\mathbb{E}[r_{\tau,a} | \mathcal{X}_\tau] = \sum_{i \in \Pi_\tau^*} p(i | \mathcal{X}_\tau) m_{\tau,i}(\mathcal{X}_\tau).$$

A linear functional on the simplex attains its maximum at an extreme point; hence there exists an optimal deterministic selector (almost surely)  $\delta^*(\mathcal{X}_\tau) \in \arg \max_i m_{\tau,i}(\mathcal{X}_\tau)$ . By measurability of  $\arg \max$  on a finite set,  $\delta^*$  is a valid decision rule.

For dominance, apply Theorem C.2 with full statistic  $\mathcal{X}_\tau$  and coarsening  $T(\mathcal{X}_\tau) = \mu'$ . The theorem implies

$$\sup_{\delta \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{X}_\tau)} \mathbb{E}[r_{\tau,\delta}(\mathcal{X}_\tau)] \geq \sup_{\delta \in \mathcal{D}(\mu')} \mathbb{E}[r_{\tau,\delta}(\mu')].$$

Because the left-hand supremum is attained by a deterministic extreme point  $\delta^*$  (as shown above), no policy that observes only  $\mu'$  and then randomizes (including Gumbel-Max on  $\mu'$ ) can exceed its Bayes expected utility; at best it ties in degenerate cases (exact ties in posterior scores). This proves the claim.  $\square$

**Corollary C.2** (Design implication for our loop). *With average updates and a shared fresh mini-batch over the  $k$  shortlisted prompts, the principled policy is: (i) use Gumbel-Top- $k$  for exploration at shortlist time; then (ii) exploit by selecting  $\arg \max_{k \in \Pi_\tau^*} v_{\tau,k}$  on the shared fresh batch. Replacing step (ii) by Gumbel-Max on  $\mu'$  introduces uninformed randomization and cannot improve and generally degrades the expected reward.*

**Remarks.** (i) The equal-precision assumption in Thm. C.1 holds exactly when all shortlisted items are evaluated on the same fresh batch and past precisions are comparable; it is a standard homoscedastic setting as all compared random variables have the same variance (equal noise level due to fixed  $\mathbf{LM}_{\text{forward}}$  and shared batch) and matches our implementation.

## C.2 Proof for Blockwise Generation

**Theorem C.3** (TSGD-M (Blockwise) has no larger variance compared to TSGD). *Fix a blockwise prefix*

*TokenBlock<sub>1:i-1</sub>. For each candidate  $j$  let the stochastic textual gradient satisfy*

$$\mathbb{E}[g_j] = r_j, \quad \text{Var}(g_j) \leq \sigma^2.$$

*Let  $\Pi_\tau^*$  be the Gumbel-Top- $K$  set at iteration  $\tau$ . TSGD uses the full-validation argmax  $I_\tau$  and applies  $g_{I_\tau}$ . TSGD-M (Blockwise) samples  $A \sim \text{Unif}(\Pi_\tau^*)$  and averages  $m$  such terms  $\hat{g}_{\text{TSGD-M}} = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{t=1}^m g_{A_t}$  with mean pairwise correlation  $\rho \in [0, 1)$  across the  $m$  terms (conditioned on the prefix). Define the in-band spread*

$$\alpha = \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1}{K} \sum_{j \in \Pi_\tau^*} (r_j - \bar{r})^2 \right], \quad \bar{r} = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{j \in \Pi_\tau^*} r_j.$$

*Then*

$$\text{Var}(\hat{g}_{\text{TSGD-M}}) \leq \frac{1 + (m-1)\rho}{m} \sigma^2 (1 + \alpha) \leq \text{Var}(g_{I_\tau}) \leq \sigma^2,$$

*whenever  $\frac{1 + (m-1)\rho}{m} \leq \frac{1}{1 + \alpha}$ . In particular, if the Top- $K$  band is tight ( $\alpha \approx 0$ ) and  $m > 1$  with  $\rho < 1$ , TSGD-M (Blockwise) has strictly smaller variance than TSGD.*

*Proof.* (1) Law of total variance with  $A \sim \text{Unif}(\Pi_\tau^*)$  gives  $\text{Var}(g_A) \leq \sigma^2 + \text{Var}(r_A) = \sigma^2(1 + \alpha)$ . (2) Averaging  $m$  terms with mean correlation  $\rho$  yields  $\text{Var}(\hat{g}_{\text{TSGD-M}}) \leq \frac{1 + (m-1)\rho}{m} \sigma^2(1 + \alpha)$ . (3) TextGrad fixes  $I_\tau$  (no selection variance), so  $\text{Var}(g_{I_\tau}) \leq \sigma^2$ . Combine (2) and (3) to obtain the claim under  $\frac{1 + (m-1)\rho}{m} \leq \frac{1}{1 + \alpha}$ ; tight  $\alpha$  and  $m > 1$ ,  $\rho < 1$  imply strict inequality.  $\square$

## D MORE EXPERIMENT DETAILS

### D.1 Experiment Setup

In Table 4, we list the split of data. Below, we elaborate on how the data and evaluation are set up.

**TREC.** We evaluate a system’s prediction by comparing its output string with the ground-truth label provided in the dataset, assigning a score of 1 for an exact match and 0 otherwise. Before comparison, both the model output and ground-truth strings are normalized to mitigate differences due to tokenization and capitalization.

**GSM8K** We use the same evaluation metric as TextGrad, a string-based exact match metric to quantify accuracy.

**MATH(algebra)** We use the built-in dataset MATH with subset algebra from DSPy Tutorials for MATH Reasoning (DSPy Team, 2025b). We follow the same setup with 350 and 350 question-answer pairs sampled from the official test set for development/validation set and test set. Same as GSM8K, we evaluate the accuracy of the final numerical value that appears in the **LM** output.

Table 4. Data splitting of benchmark datasets.

Task and Source	original train	validation	test
Trec (Lu et al., 2022)	400	250	250
GSM8K (Cobbe et al., 2021)	200	300	1319
MATH (Algebra) (Hendrycks et al., 2021)	350	350	487
Big Bench Hard(Object Counting) (Suzgun et al., 2022)	50	100	100
Arc Challenge (Clark et al., 2018)	1120	299	1170
HotpotQA (full wiki) (Yang et al., 2018)	90.4k	7.41k	7.41k

**Big Bench Hard (Object Counting)** We adopt the same standard reasoning dataset from TextGrad. We adopt the same setting with validation/test as 100/100. We use the same evaluation metric, a string-based exact match metric to quantify accuracy.

**ARC-Challenge** We use the challenge subset. We randomly sample 500 examples from the original 1,170-question test set and use the original validation set containing 299 examples. We evaluate **LM** performance using a string-based exact match metric.

**HotPotQA** (Yang et al., 2018) is a large-scale Wikipedia QA benchmark. We adopt the *full-wiki* setting. Following DSPy Team (2025a), we use 300/300 for validation/test split. We evaluate HotpotQA under two configurations. For TextGrad, which targets reasoning tasks and does not implement multi-hop retrieval (RAG is listed as future work), we provide the questions *with their context* directly to  $\text{LM}_{\text{forward}}$ , following the same setup as reasoning experiments in which the input to the inference model is the question LLM needs to solve, ours have one more context component. For DSPy and AdalFlow, we use a retrieval-augmented (RAG) setup: BM25 retrieves candidate passages from Wikipedia, and a chain-of-thought program performs *vanilla RAG* for two components with retriever and generator. We uses exact match (Yang et al., 2018).

## D.2 Extended Scaling Experiment

Because TGD/TSGD exhibit large run-to-run variability, we plot standard-error bars in the left subplot of Fig. 2 as Fig 8. Full-batch TGD attains the highest mean test accuracy at dataset size = 50, yet it also shows the largest standard error among all batch sizes, indicating poor stability. As the dataset size increases, mini-batch TSGD tends to yield higher mean accuracy than full-batch TSGD(TGD), but the variance grows substantially for smaller batches. Overall, both TGD and TSGD display an unfavorable accuracy–stability trade-off and do not scale reliably across data sizes. These observations motivate a stability-oriented LLM prompt optimizer. We introduce our method (momentum-based sampling) that reduces standard error across seeds while improving average test accuracy when scaling training

dataset size (See Fig. 3).

## D.3 Validation vs. Test accuracy

In Fig. 9, we illustrate that under vanilla TextGrad the prompt with the highest validation accuracy is not necessarily the prompt that generalizes best in the test set. Therefore, we should keep a window with size  $K$  of top performing prompts in the validation set and encourage exploration within  $K$  top performing prompts instead of *the best* performing prompt on the validation set.

## D.4 Mean of Minibatch Validation vs. Full Validation

In this section, we compare two final-prompt selection rules for TextGrad-M (Promptwise): (i) picking the prompt with the highest *running mean* of minibatch validation accuracy, and (ii) picking the prompt with the highest accuracy on the *full* validation set. Throughout, we fix the training batch size  $m = 5$  and epochs  $E = 2$ , and vary the training set size  $|\mathcal{D}_{\text{train}}|$ . The number of optimization iterations is  $T = \left\lceil \frac{E|\mathcal{D}_{\text{train}}|}{b} \right\rceil$ . In Fig. 10, we observe that for small  $|\mathcal{D}_{\text{train}}|$  (few iterations), the running-mean estimator is noisy and can select suboptimal prompts due to large bias between empirical estimates and true validation accuracy. As  $|\mathcal{D}_{\text{train}}|$  grows (with more iterations and resamples), the running-mean estimate concentrates and matches the full-validation selection, yielding comparable test performance.

## D.5 Momentum Window

We provide the underlying statistics of two interpretations of momentum with window size comparison for both TextGrad and TSGD-M in Table 5. The test performance is Fig 5 and the validation performance is Fig 11. Both Fig. 5 and Fig. 11 showcase our method shall break the context window by reducing input tokens via momentum sampling with improved performance (both test and validation) compared to TextGrad-Momentum.




Figure 8. Scaling of TGD/TSGD on MATH (Algebra) with standard error. Full-batch TGD peaks at dataset size at 50 but exhibits the largest standard error; smaller mini-batches raise mean accuracy yet increase variance compared to larger batch size as the dataset size scales up. This instability motivates our proposed method, which achieves higher accuracy with lower standard error for most tasks.




Figure 9. **Test (solid lines)** and **Validation (dashed lines)** accuracy over one run on MATH, GSM8K, and ARC for vanilla TextGrad w/o validation revert. We fix the data size to 100, batch size to 5, and seed to 1, and vary only the dataset. The highest test accuracy is marked with a solid dot, and the highest validation accuracy with a dashed circle. Across all three tasks, the prompt achieving the highest validation accuracy is not the one that generalizes best on the test set, suggesting that pure exploitation over the argmax shall not lead to the global optimal.




Figure 10. Minibatch running mean vs. full validation for final-prompt selection. Error bars show standard error. For small  $|\mathcal{D}_{\text{train}}|$  (few iterations), the minibatch running mean is high-variance and can underperform full validation. With larger  $|\mathcal{D}_{\text{train}}|$ , more iterations reduce variance and both criteria select prompts with comparable test accuracy.




Figure 11. Validation Performance of vanilla TextGrad-Momentum and TSGD-M on MATH(algebra). Error bars denote standard error. Momentum Window in TextGrad-Momentum is the number of past prompts concatenated; in TSGD-M it is the window size  $K$  for Gumbel-Top- $k$ . Promptwise generation yields consistently stable and higher validation accuracy as  $K$  increases, while blockwise generation fluctuates heavily for small  $K$ , reflecting instability from frequent KV-cache resets and token-level sampling noise. The baseline **TextGrad+ Momentum** improves modestly with larger windows but remains consistently below our TextGrad-M variants, confirming the advantage of structured exploration and historical reweighting.

Table 5. Performance of TextGrad-M and TextGrad variants with-/without validation revert on MATH(algebra). TG stands for TextGrad. Momentum Window in TextGrad is the number of past prompts concatenated; in TextGrad-M Window stands for  $K$  in Gumbel-Top- $k$ .

Method	Val Accuracy (%)	Test Accuracy (%)
TG w/ validation revert	$84.00 \pm 84.00$	$85.42 \pm 0.00$
TG w/o validation revert	$86.23 \pm 0.42$	$84.67 \pm 0.58$
TG + Momentum Window=3	$85.03 \pm 1.18$	$83.38 \pm 1.53$
TG-M + Window=3 + Promptwise	$86.69 \pm 0.53$	<b><math>86.70 \pm 0.56</math></b>
TG-M + Window=3 + Blockwise	<b><math>86.63 \pm 0.68</math></b>	$86.48 \pm 0.64$
TG + Momentum Window=5	$85.77 \pm 0.21$	$85.34 \pm 1.15$
TG-M + Window=5 + Promptwise	<b><math>87.09 \pm 0.21</math></b>	<b><math>86.78 \pm 0.68</math></b>
TG-M + Window=5 + Blockwise	$86.40 \pm 0.80$	$86.45 \pm 0.86$
TG + Momentum Window=9	$85.43 \pm 0.62$	$84.94 \pm 1.59$
TG-M + Window=9 + Promptwise	<b><math>86.10 \pm 0.94</math></b>	<b><math>85.94 \pm 1.19</math></b>
TG-M + Window=9 + Blockwise	$83.80 \pm 1.00$	$85.15 \pm 1.01$
TG + Momentum Window=12	$85.22 \pm 1.23$	$85.22 \pm 1.23$
TG-M + Window=12 + Promptwise	$85.77 \pm 0.12$	<b><math>87.35 \pm 0.79</math></b>
TG-M + Window=12 + Blockwise	<b><math>87.20 \pm 0.49</math></b>	$86.24 \pm 0.89$
TG + Momentum Window=40	$85.94 \pm 0.86$	$84.52 \pm 2.09$
TG-M + Window=40 + Promptwise	<b><math>87.43 \pm 0.65</math></b>	<b><math>86.98 \pm 1.22</math></b>
TG-M + Window=40 + Blockwise	$86.93 \pm 0.51$	$85.88 \pm 0.64$

## D.6 Tasks and Prompt Initialization

We provide all initial prompts in Table 6 for tasks reported in Table 4.

Table 6. Prompt initializations for all tasks.

Task	Initialization
Trec	Read the following question, then choose whether it is about a description, entity, expression, human, location or number.
GSM8K	You will answer a mathematical reasoning question. Think step by step. The last line of your response should be of the following format: 'Answer: \$VALUE' where VALUE is a numerical value.
MATH(Algebra)	You will answer a mathematical reasoning question. Think step by step. The last line of your response should be of the following format: 'Answer: \$VALUE' where VALUE is a numerical value.
Big Bench Hard(Object Counting)	You will answer a reasoning question. Think step by step. The last line of your response should be of the following format: Answer: \$VALUE where VALUE is a numerical value.
Arc Challenge	You will answer a multiple-choice science question. Respond with the label of the correct option (A–D or 1–4). The last line must be 'Answer: \$ X' where X is that label.
HotpotQA(full wiki)	You are a precise multi-hop QA assistant. Use ONLY the context to answer the question concisely. Output ONLY the final answer. The last line of your response should be of the following format: 'Answer: \$STRING' where STRING is what the question is EXACTLY asking for.

## D.7 Templates

For *Promptwise* generation, we use the original DSPy instruction-generation template unchanged. In iteration  $\tau$ , we shortlist seeding prompts  $K$  with Gumbel–Top- $k$  and feed them to the template.

For *Blockwise* generation, we employ a dedicated template that instructs  $\text{LM}_{\text{backward}}$  to continue the current instruction by exactly  $b$  tokens per block. Concretely, after applying Gumbel–Top- $k$  to obtain  $\Pi_{\tau}^* = \{\pi_{\tau,1}, \dots, \pi_{\tau,K}\}$ , we *uniformly sample* the number of width prompts from  $\Pi_{\tau}^*$  to generate each block  $i$  of length  $b$  (referred to as `more_tokens` in the template). Thus, every block is produced by sampled prompts, and the template explicitly asks the model to “generate  $b$  more tokens” continuing from the current text.

### Instruction Generation Prompt Template (Blockwise)

You are an instruction optimizer for large language models. I will give some task instructions I've tried, along with their corresponding validation scores. The instructions are arranged in increasing order based on their scores, where higher scores indicate better quality. Your goal is to CONTINUE the instruction from the exact last character of more\_tokens that will lead a good language model to perform the task even better. Don't be afraid to be creative. Do not restart, repeat, or reformat. Only continue writing additional tokens that extend more\_tokens. In practice, we set more\_tokens as 50.

**Attempted\_instructions:** {{ attempted\_instructions = dspy.InputField() }}

**More\_tokens:** {{ More\_tokens = dspy.InputField() }}

**Instruction:** {{ proposed\_instruction = dspy.OutputField(desc="The improved instructions for the language model. One-paragraph instruction. Less than 120 words.") }}

**Prefix:** {{ proposed\_prefix\_for\_output\_field = dspy.OutputField(desc="The string at the end of the prompt, which will help the model start solving the task. A short prefix. Less than 10 words.") }}

For reference, we also provide the original instruction-generation template below.

### Instruction Generation Prompt Template (Original DSPy)

You are an instruction optimizer for large language models. I will give some task instructions I've tried, along with their corresponding validation scores. The instructions are arranged in increasing order based on their scores, where higher scores indicate better quality. Your task is to propose a new instruction that will lead a good language model to perform the task even better. Don't be afraid to be creative.

**Attempted\_instructions:** {{ attempted\_instructions = dspy.InputField() }}

**Instruction:** {{ proposed\_instruction = dspy.OutputField(desc="The improved instructions for the language model") }}

**Prefix:** {{ proposed\_prefix\_for\_output\_field = dspy.OutputField(desc="The string at the end of the prompt, which will help the model start solving the task") }}

## D.8 EXAMPLES OF BEST PROMPTS FOR BENCHMARK

Below we show best prompts selected by the highest validation set accuracy for TextGrad (with and without validation revert). Note here we fix seed as 1 and report the validation accuracy and test accuracy for all tasks and optimizers for fair comparison.

We would like to report that even for the same prompt the validation accuracy and test accuracy might vary by 1% difference with temperature as 0 due to nondeterminism in LLM inference (Thinking Machines, 2025). The original setup in (Yuksekgonul et al., 2025) is run with validation revert and we observe that on all tasks, the best prompt selected by the highest validation accuracy would stay the same as the initial prompt always has the highest validation accuracy (i.e. pure exploitation).

**Task: TextGrad Trec**      **Model: GPT-4o-mini + GPT-4o**

**Sample Question:** *x: How did serfdom develop in and then leave Russia ? y: description,*

**Base Template instruction (with validation accuracy 74.22 and test accuracy 77.0):** Read the following question, then choose whether it is about a description, entity, expression, human, location or number.

**TextGrad (w/ revert) (with validation accuracy 74.22 and test accuracy 77.0):** Read the following question, then choose whether it is about a description, entity, expression, human, location or number.

**TextGrad (w/o revert) (with validation accuracy 82.03 and test accuracy 82.8):** Identify the main category of the question from the given options: description, entity, expression, human, location, or number. Provide the category directly without additional context or explanation. - **Task Objective**: Choose the category that best describes the main subject of the question. - **Category Definitions**: - **Description**: Questions seeking detailed explanations or historical context. \*Example: Why is the sky blue?\* Edge Case: Questions about functions or roles, e.g., What function does homeostasis have on the existence of an organism?\* - **Entity**: Questions about specific non-human objects, concepts, or works of art, including contact information. \*Example: What is the capital of France?\* Edge Case: Questions about books or artworks, e.g., What John Steinbeck novel portrays the Joad family?\* - **Expression**: Questions about phrases or idioms. \*Example: What does 'break the ice' mean?\* - **Human**: Questions about people, individuals, roles, or characters. \*Example: Who is

the current president of the United States?\* - **Location**: Questions about places, cities, or regions. \*Example: Where is the Eiffel Tower located?\* - **Number**: Questions involving numerical data, quantities, or specific dates. \*Example: How many continents are there?\* Include dates and birth years, e.g., When was Babe Ruth born?\* - **Handling Ambiguity**: In cases of ambiguity, prioritize the category that most directly relates to the question's main subject. Use a detailed decision tree approach to resolve ambiguities, such as prioritizing human for roles or names, and entity for contact information. Example: If a question involves both a person and a date, prioritize number for birthdates. Provide a step-by-step example or flowchart for constructing this decision tree. - **Consistency and Synonyms**: Ensure consistency by recognizing synonyms and related terms that align with the chosen category. Maintain and dynamically update a list of synonyms, such as amount and quantity for number, and name and character for human, based on feedback. Implement a mechanism for suggesting new synonyms during categorization, using recent categorizations and user feedback. - **Feedback Loop**: Use past categorizations to refine your understanding and improve decision-making. Log categorizations and review them periodically to identify patterns or errors, especially in numerical and ambiguous contexts. Implement specific metrics for evaluating past performance, such as accuracy rates for each category or error rates in ambiguous contexts, and set improvement goals. - **Output Format**: Output the category as a single word string. Reinforce this format with examples of correct and incorrect outputs, especially in edge cases. - **Minimalism with Clarity**: Use minimal text to convey the category, ensuring clarity and precision. Verify categorizations internally before outputting. Introduce a verification step to ensure alignment with the question's main subject, specifying checks or criteria for verification. - **Numerical Precision**: Emphasize accuracy in numerical contexts, considering numerical reasoning and calculations when applicable. For questions involving dates or quantities, prioritize numerical reasoning. Suggest using external tools or APIs for complex calculations, and provide examples of when and how to use these tools. - **Error Analysis**: Reflect on decision-making processes and adjust based on past errors to improve future performance. Categorize errors by type and implement targeted strategies for each, such as misclassification or synonym recognition. Provide a framework for analyzing common misclassifications, detailing how errors are categorized and addressed.

\*\*Contextual Awareness\*\*: Consider the broader context of the question, including surrounding text or previous questions, to better understand the main subject. Use contextual cues to guide categorization, such as recognizing names or characters as human. Specify techniques for identifying relevant context, such as keyword extraction or context windowing.

\*\*Iterative Improvement\*\*: Encourage iterative improvement by setting specific goals for accuracy and incorporating user feedback into the learning process. Establish a formal process for setting and reviewing these goals, such as regular performance reviews or user feedback sessions. Use SMART criteria for goal-setting, providing examples of specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and time-bound goals.

\*\*Robustness to Query Variations\*\*: Ensure robustness to variations in query phrasing by training on diverse phrasings and contexts. Introduce a mechanism for asking clarifying questions when faced with ambiguous inputs, specifying when and how to generate these questions, along with examples.

**TSGD-M (Promptwise)** (with validation accuracy 84.77 and test accuracy 86.0): Read the question and classify it into one of the following categories: description, entity, expression, human, location, or number. Follow these streamlined steps to ensure accurate classification:

1. **Identify Key Elements**: Focus on the main subject, action, and specific details in the question. Consider any implicit assumptions or common knowledge that might influence the category.
2. **Contextual Analysis**: Analyze the broader context and any implicit clues within the question. Recognize synonyms or related terms that might imply the same category.
3. **Category Definitions**: Use the following refined definitions to guide your classification:
  - **Description**: Questions seeking detailed explanations or characteristics. Example: "What is a virtual IP address?"
  - **Entity**: Questions about specific objects, people, or concepts that can be named or identified. Example: "What was the first domesticated bird?"
  - **Expression**: Questions involving phrases or idiomatic expressions. Example: "What does 'break the ice' mean?"
  - **Human**: Questions specifically about individuals or groups of people, especially in roles or titles. Example: "Who created 'The Muppets'?"
  - **Location**: Questions about places or geographical areas. Look for terms like "city," "state," or "country."
  - **Number**: Questions involving numerical values or calculations, including dates or quantities. Pay attention to temporal indicators like "when."
4. **Ambiguity Handling**: If the question is ambiguous, note the ambiguity and suggest

possible clarifications. Provide a ranked list of potential categories if necessary.

5. **Efficiency and Precision**: Provide a direct and concise response with the category label only. Ensure your response aligns with the expected category label exactly as provided in the options.

6. **Feedback and Learning**: Implement a feedback mechanism to learn from past classification errors. Review previous misclassifications and the correct category to refine decision-making.

7. **Example-Driven Learning**: Include more examples and analogies to illustrate the reasoning process for each category. This will help the model better understand the nuances of each classification and apply them more effectively.

8. **Interactive Learning Component**: Engage in a dialogue to clarify uncertainties, asking follow-up questions or seeking additional information to ensure accurate classification.

9. **Explicit Numerical Focus**: Pay special attention to numerical indicators and prioritize numerical reasoning when classifying questions related to numbers. Verify numerical classifications by considering alternative interpretations or performing a quick mental check.

10. **Synonym Recognition and Flexibility**: Actively search for synonyms or related terms during classification, using a dynamic thesaurus or external linguistic resources to enhance understanding.

11. **Incorporate Specificity in Responses**: When the question requires a specific answer, ensure to name the exact entity or fact. Provide a concise explanation for your choice, highlighting the key elements that led to this decision.

12. **Cultural and Contextual Nuances**: Consider cultural or contextual nuances that may influence the interpretation of the question, ensuring your response is complete and coherent. By following these guidelines, you can enhance the accuracy and reliability of your classification decisions.

**TSGD-M (Promptwise) (with validation accuracy 83.59 and test accuracy 85.4)**: Classify the given question into one of the following categories: description, entity, expression, human, location, or number.

- A question about a description seeks to explain or characterize a general concept or thing, focusing on its nature or function. Example: "What is Tyvek?" asks for a description of Tyvek's characteristics and uses.
- A question about an entity seeks to identify a specific non-human person, place, organization, or thing, such as a historical landmark or company. Example: "What is the rarest coin?" seeks to identify a specific coin, making it an entity.
- A question about an expression involves evaluating or calculating a mathematical or logical expression. Example: "What is HDLC?" might require understanding technical details or calculations.

A question about a *human* asks to identify or provide information about a person, including their name or role. Example: What are the first names of the famous husband-and-wife acting team of Lunt and Fontanne? A question about a *location* asks for information about a place, geographic area, or virtual space, such as an internet site. Consider the geographical or spatial context. Example: What is the most useful site on the Internet? focuses on the virtual space of the internet, classifying it as a location. - A question about a *number* asks for a specific numerical value or count. Carefully read the question, consider any technical, descriptive, entity-specific, or spatial aspects, and determine which category it belongs to. Provide your reasoning and then give the final classification.

**Task: TextGrad ARC-Challenge**  
**GPT-4o-mini + GPT-4o**

**Model:**

Sample Question: *x: George wants to warm his hands quickly by rubbing them. Which skin surface will produce the most heat? "text": [ "dry palms", "wet palms", "palms covered with oil", "palms covered with lotion" ], "label": [ "A", "B", "C", "D" ] y: A*

**Base Template instruction (with validation accuracy 92.31 and test accuracy 91.33):** You will answer a multiple-choice science question. Respond with the label of the correct option (A–D or 1–4). The last line must be 'Answer: X' where X is that label.

**TextGrad (w/ revert) (with validation accuracy 92.31 and test accuracy 91.33):** You will answer a multiple-choice science question. Respond with the label of the correct option (A–D or 1–4). The last line must be 'Answer: X' where X is that label.

**TextGrad (w/o revert) (with validation accuracy 92.31 and test accuracy 91.33):** You will answer a multiple-choice science question. These questions are based on general science knowledge and reasoning. Follow these steps:

1. **Evaluation**: Begin by evaluating each option thoroughly, prioritizing the elimination of those that contradict fundamental scientific principles. Select the option that aligns best with scientific principles or common knowledge. Provide a brief summary of the reasoning process for each option evaluated, even if the option is incorrect.

2. **Response Format**: After evaluation, respond with the label of the correct option (A–D or 1–4). Ensure your answer matches the format of the choices provided. The last line must be: 'Answer: X'.

3. **Confidence Assessment**: Internally evaluate

your confidence in the chosen answer using a confidence scale (high, medium, low). If confidence is low, provide a brief note and flag the response for review.

4. **Handling Ambiguity**: Proactively identify and address any potential ambiguities in the question or options. Provide a brief explanation of the ambiguity and proceed with the most likely answer. Prioritize addressing ambiguities that most affect the correctness of the answer.

5. **Critical Thinking**: Engage in critical thinking by considering alternative interpretations of the question or options. Document and evaluate potential alternatives internally.

6. **Cross-Verification**: Cross-verify your reasoning with known scientific principles or facts. Reference reliable scientific sources or databases if needed. Clearly reference specific criteria or data points used in the analysis to ensure precision and reduce ambiguity.

7. **Feedback Mechanism**: Be open to user feedback and acknowledge any corrections or suggestions for refining future responses. Incorporate feedback into future responses through a brief internal review process. Review past responses and incorporate lessons learned to continuously improve the accuracy and clarity of future answers.

8. **Conciseness and Clarity**: Use complete sentences and avoid ambiguity if an explanation is required. Encourage conciseness in explanations to ensure clear and direct answers. Use a conversational tone and break down complex information into simpler terms to make the response more engaging and accessible.

By following these steps, you will consistently provide accurate, clear, and well-reasoned answers to multiple-choice science questions.

**TSGD-M (Promptwise) (with validation accuracy 92.31 and test accuracy 93.20):** You will answer a multiple-choice science question. These questions are based on general science knowledge and reasoning. Follow these guidelines to ensure clarity, accuracy, and educational value: 1. **Evaluate Options and Justify**: Carefully consider each option and select the one that best fits the question based on scientific reasoning. Provide a concise explanation for your choice, directly linking it to key scientific principles. Ensure explanations are succinct and directly support the answer. 2. **Handle Uncertainty with Confidence**: If uncertain, choose the option that is most logically consistent with the question's context. Clearly state any assumptions made and provide a confidence score or rationale to indicate the certainty of your response.

3. **\*\*Maintain Response Format\*\*:** Adhere strictly to the format: 'Answer: X'. Ensure consistency in this format across all responses to maintain clarity and uniformity. 4. **\*\*Use Clear and Engaging Language\*\*:** Use clear and precise language to avoid ambiguity. Avoid technical jargon unless necessary, and consider using examples or analogies to make explanations more relatable and engaging. Prioritize brevity and clarity to ensure the main point is communicated effectively. 5. **\*\*Adapt to Question Formats\*\*:** Adapt your approach if the question format varies slightly, focusing on the core scientific principles involved. Provide examples of how to adapt to different question formats when necessary. 6. **\*\*Implement Error Handling\*\*:** Identify and address potential errors or ambiguities in the question. Provide examples of common errors and how to address them. Review your response for ambiguous terms and provide clarifications to prevent misinterpretation. 7. **\*\*Incorporate Feedback and Learn\*\*:** Implement a feedback loop to reflect on your reasoning process and learn from any mistakes. Use user feedback to refine predictions and improve accuracy. Consider alternative answers and why they were not chosen to enhance future decision-making. 8. **\*\*Enhance Educational Value\*\*:** When applicable, provide additional context or interesting facts related to the question to enhance the educational value of your response. By following these guidelines, you will ensure that your responses are accurate, clear, and contextually relevant, aligning more closely with the objective function.

**TSGD-M (Blockwise) (with validation accuracy: 92.64 and test accuracy: 92.60):** Answer a multiple-choice science question by providing the correct option label (A–D or 1–4). Ensure your response is concise and accurate, formatted as 'Answer: X'. Use logical reasoning to support your answers. Identify areas for improvement and incorporate feedback to refine your approach. Verify calculations and scientific principles to ensure accuracy. If you detect an error in the question or choices, provide the best possible answer and note the error. Maintain a balance between brevity and informativeness for improvement in conciseness and formatting. Strive to make your responses educational by explaining underlying principles or concepts, thereby enhancing the user's understanding. Encourage continuous improvement by reflecting on feedback and adapting your responses over time. By following these guidelines, you will use simple language to ensure clarity and accessibility for all audiences. To counter ambiguous or poorly worded questions, choose the most likely answer based on available information and provide a brief note on the ambiguity. Regularly review past responses to identify areas for improvement in conciseness and formatting. Strive to make your responses educational by explaining underlying principles or concepts, thereby enhancing the user's understanding. Encourage continuous improvement by reflecting on feedback and adapting your responses over time. By following these guidelines, you will enhance your ability to make complex concepts more understandable and ensure your responses are both informative and engaging for the user.

provide a brief note on the ambiguity. Regularly review past responses to identify areas for improvement and incorporate feedback to refine your approach. To counter ambiguous or poorly worded questions, choose the most likely answer based on available information and provide a brief note on the ambiguity. Regularly review past responses to identify areas for improvement in conciseness and formatting. Strive to make your responses educational by explaining underlying principles or concepts, thereby enhancing the user's understanding. Encourage continuous improvement by reflecting on feedback and adapting your responses over time. By following these guidelines, you will enhance your ability to make complex concepts more understandable and ensure your responses are both informative and engaging for the user.

**Task: TextGrad GSM8K Model: GPT-4o-mini + GPT-4o**

Sample Question: *x: Natalia sold clips to 48 of her friends in April, and then she sold half as many clips*

*in May. How many clips did Natalia sell altogether in April and May? y: 72*

**Base Template instruction (with validation accuracy 93.00 and test accuracy 93.86):**

You will answer a mathematical reasoning question. Think step by step. The last line of your response should be of the following format: 'Answer: \$VALUE' where VALUE is a numerical value.

**TextGrad (w/ revert) (with validation accuracy 93.00 and test accuracy 93.86):**

You will answer a mathematical reasoning question. Think step by step. The last line of your response should be of the following format: 'Answer: \$VALUE' where VALUE is a numerical value.

**TextGrad (w/o revert) (with validation accuracy 94.67 and test accuracy 92.57):**

You will answer a mathematical reasoning question. Focus on delivering the final numerical answer succinctly, formatted as 'Final Answer: VALUE' with the numerical value clearly visible. Prioritize brevity and directness, especially for straightforward problems, by providing the final answer directly without additional context or breakdowns. Use bullet points or numbered lists to maintain clarity for multi-step problems, and break down complex problems into smaller, manageable parts, explaining each step logically with necessary assumptions and formulas. Clearly define all numerical values and their significance within the problem context to prevent ambiguity. Use simple mathematical notation in plain text to ensure accessibility and maintain consistency in units. Include units in the final answer only if explicitly required by the question. Eliminate non-essential details or steps that do not directly contribute to deriving the final answer. Implement a primary verification mechanism for the final answer, using a secondary method only if needed, and perform a verification step after completing calculations to ensure accuracy. Specify what constitutes a secondary method for verification, providing examples or guidelines, such as cross-verifying with a different formula or using estimation techniques. Identify and mention common pitfalls or errors, providing strategies to avoid them, and incorporate examples of such pitfalls, like misinterpreting units or overlooking edge cases. Offer a general approach or formula when applicable, to enable users to apply the solution to similar problems. Engage the user for clarifications only when the problem context is ambiguous, and include strategies for identifying ambiguity, such as looking for missing information or unclear terms. Ensure the response is contextually relevant and accurately reflects

the specific scenario presented. Emphasize accuracy in calculations by double-checking each step and ensuring the final result aligns with expected outcomes. Specify the level of precision required for the final answer, including rounding rules if necessary, and provide guidelines on determining the appropriate level of precision, with examples. Use consistent terminology and formatting throughout the response, aligning with the expected ground truth, and provide specific examples or templates for common mathematical terms and formats. Implement a final verification step to ensure the output format and numerical value align with the expected ground truth, correcting any discrepancies before finalizing the response. Focus on delivering precise and concise information, omitting additional context unless it directly contributes to the accuracy of the final answer. Explicitly declare all assumptions made during the problem-solving process, emphasizing their importance. Engage in a feedback loop to learn from past errors and adjust strategies for continuous improvement, maintaining a log of common errors and successful strategies for future reference, and specify how to prioritize learning from these logs, focusing on the most frequent errors or those with the highest impact on accuracy. Ensure the final answer is clearly stated at the end of the response. If the problem is simple and the final answer is evident, provide the answer directly without additional explanation. Use a consistent format for the final answer, such as 'Answer: followed by the numerical value. Implement intermediate checks after each calculation step to catch potential errors early. Consider potential edge cases or variations in the problem and prepare to handle them, offering examples of common edge cases in mathematical reasoning and strategies for addressing them. Provide a brief summary or conclusion that reiterates the final answer and its significance, focusing on the most challenging aspects of the problem or the most significant takeaways. Adapt the complexity of your response based on the problem's difficulty, providing direct answers for simple problems and detailed breakdowns for complex ones. Use illustrative examples to clarify complex steps and ensure all variables and terms are explicitly defined to eliminate ambiguity. Provide a brief introduction that contextualizes the problem and outlines the steps to be taken. Use analogies or relatable examples to make explanations more engaging. Maintain a log of common errors and successful strategies, focusing on learning from the most frequent or impactful mistakes. Begin with a brief contextual overview of the problem scenario to enhance user comprehension. Conclude with a reflective sum-

mary that emphasizes the most challenging aspects of the problem and the key takeaways. Prioritize brevity and directness for simple problems, providing only the final numerical answer without additional context or breakdown. Ensure the final answer is presented as a standalone number to facilitate direct comparison and reduce parsing requirements. Include a brief contextual introduction to the problem, summarizing key elements such as initial conditions and relevant details. Conclude with a sentence that not only states the final answer but also reiterates the key findings and the significance of the solution. Implement a mechanism for error detection and correction by comparing the final answer with expected values or using alternative methods for verification. Ensure clarity and conciseness by eliminating unnecessary steps and providing self-contained responses. Adapt responses based on problem complexity, and incorporate a feedback loop for continuous improvement. Emphasize the importance of providing complete and explicit reasoning for each step in the problem-solving process, avoiding ellipses or shorthand. Maintain a clear and logical flow with transitions between ideas, and ensure consistent variable usage. Include a verification or justification step for the final answer, and avoid ambiguous language by clearly stating assumptions and external information. Encourage learning from past interactions by maintaining a log of feedback and incorporating it into future responses. Ensure the final answer format aligns with the expected ground truth, omitting currency symbols or decimal places unless specified. Explicitly state each step in the calculation process, including the context and significance of each numerical value. Identify the primary focus of the question and tailor the response to address that aspect directly. Use language that directly corresponds to the question's focus, such as 'Total cost' or 'Total number of stickers,' to ensure clarity and alignment with the expected answer format. Implement a verification step to compare the final answer with the expected format and value, and adjust if discrepancies are found. Maintain a log of feedback and incorporate it into future responses to continuously improve accuracy and alignment with expected outcomes.

**TSGD-M (Promptwise) (with validation accuracy 94.67 and test accuracy 94.39):** You will answer a mathematical reasoning question. Begin by carefully reading and interpreting the question, ensuring you fully understand the problem statement. Explicitly introduce and define any variables used in your calculations. Provide a concise explanation, focusing on key steps, and ensure calculations are simplified. Use clear

and consistent mathematical notation, breaking down complex equations into simpler parts. Present the final answer directly in the format: 'Answer: VALUE' without any additional text or symbols. Avoid redundancy and ensure each step adds unique value. Verify your calculations and logic before finalizing the answer, performing a final verification check to ensure accuracy and consistency with the input data. If the question involves multiple steps or data points, offer a brief explanation of the calculation process to enhance understanding, but prioritize conciseness. Implement checks to identify potential errors in input data or calculations, using alternative methods or estimation techniques for cross-verification. If an error is detected, address it before providing the final answer. Ensure the final answer matches the expected format, such as presenting numbers without additional symbols unless specified. If the input query is ambiguous, request clarification or make reasonable assumptions, clearly stating and justifying them in the response. Pay attention to contextual clues such as discounts or special conditions that might affect the calculation. Example: For the question 'What is  $2 + 2$ ?', respond with 'Answer: 4'.

**TSGD-M (Blockwise) (with validation accuracy: 93.67 and test accuracy: 93.71):** You will answer a mathematical reasoning question. Follow these guidelines to ensure clarity, accuracy, and completeness:

- Step-by-Step Reasoning:** Break down the problem into clear, logical steps. Articulate each step fully that ensue your response includes all necessary details.
- Verification and Reflection:** After deriving the answer, verify it by substituting back into the problem to ensure consistency. Reflect on the reasoning process and consider potential errors or alternative approaches before finalizing the answer.
- Conciseness and Clarity:** Provide clear and the format: 'Answer: VALUE', where VALUE is a plain numerical result. Ensure it matches the format of the ground truth, avoiding unnecessary symbols or decimal precision.
- Error Handling:** Identify and address potential ambiguities or errors in the input. **Contextual Adaptability:** Tailor your explanation to the context of the question, ensuring that your response is relevant and understandable. **Use of Visual Aids:** If applicable, use diagrams or visual aids to simplify complex problems and provide additional clarity.
- Interaction:** Engage with the user by providing additional context or explanations when necessary to enhance that your response includes all

necessary details.

2. **Verification and Reflection\*\*:** After deriving the answer, verify it by substituting back into the problem to ensure consistency. Reflect on the reasoning process and consider potential errors or alternative approaches before Simplification and Language Alignment\*\*. Simplify language to align with the user's level of understanding, ensuring clarity and preventing misunderstandings. Conduct a quick error analysis to ensure that it remains effective in diverse scenarios.

10. **Continuous Learning\*\*:** Encourage the model to learn from site actions by incorporating feedback refining strategies over time. This will enhance the model's ability to deliver accurate and contextually relevant answers. This structured approach will help the language model deliver precise, concise, and contextually relevant answers, ultimately improving the accuracy and engagement of its responses to mathematical reasoning questions.

**Task: TextGrad Object Counting**  
**GPT-4o-mini + GPT-4o**

**Model:**

Sample Question: *x: I have a flute, a piano, a trombone, four stoves, a violin, an accordion, a clarinet, a drum, two lamps, and a trumpet. How many musical instruments do I have? y: 8*

**Base Template instruction (with validation accuracy 90.0 and test accuracy 93.0):** You will answer a reasoning question. Think step by step. The last line of your response should be of the following format: 'Answer: \$VALUE' where VALUE is a numerical value.

**TextGrad (w/ revert) (with validation accuracy 91.0 and test accuracy 92.0):** You will answer a mathematical reasoning question. Think step by step. The last line of your response should be of the following format: 'Answer: \$VALUE' where VALUE is a numerical value.

**TextGrad (w/o revert) (with validation accuracy 90.00 and test accuracy 93.00):** You will answer a reasoning question. Think step by step. The last line of your response should be of the following format: 'Answer: \$VALUE' where VALUE is a numerical value.

**TSGD-M (Promptwise) (with validation accuracy 94.00 and test accuracy 95.00):** You will answer a reasoning question. Begin by assessing the complexity of the question. For straightforward questions, provide a direct answer without unnecessary elaboration. For more complex questions, focus on the essential

steps and avoid redundant information. Clearly outline each step of your reasoning process, ensuring that each step logically follows from the previous one. List and count each item individually, ensuring no item is overlooked. Identify and correctly interpret grouped items or quantities in the input. After calculating the total, re-evaluate each step to ensure accuracy and consistency with the input data. If the input is unclear or incomplete, request clarification or make reasonable assumptions to provide an accurate response. Clearly state the criteria for identifying items relevant to the question and provide a detailed count of each category. Consider potential variations in definitions or counting methods, and clarify any assumptions made during the reasoning process. After reaching a conclusion, verify your calculations by reviewing each step to ensure accuracy. Always conclude with a statement summarizing the result, formatted as 'Answer: \$VALUE' where VALUE is a numerical value. Ensure the final line is formatted as 'Answer: \$VALUE' without additional text. Engage with the user by asking if further clarification is needed, especially in complex scenarios.

**TSGD-M (Blockwise) (with validation accuracy:**

**98.00 and test accuracy: 97.00):** Answer the reasoning question by providing a concise explanation. Explicitly list each item mentioned in the input, using a consistent format such as 'Item: Count' to ensure clarity. After listing, perform a step-by-step calculation to determine the total count. Clearly state any criteria or assumptions used for classification, and handle potential ambiguities by making reasonable assumptions and stating them explicitly. Verify your calculations by re-reading the list and the total count to ensure accuracy. Present the final answer on a new line as 'Answer: \$VALUE' where VALUE is the numerical result. Avoid redundancy by stating the answer only once. Encourage user interaction by asking for confirmation or additional information if needed. The response is easy to parse. Consider the efficiency of your response by minimizing unnecessary text and focusing on essential information. If applicable, provide a brief example to illustrate the reasoning process. Reiterate on past tasks to improve accuracy and adapt your reasoning to different contexts. Maintain a conversational tone and, if relevant, include interesting facts related to the prompt. Ensure the final answer is clearly separated from the text for easy extraction. This structured approach will guide the language model to produce responses that are accurate, concise, and aligned with the objective of providing a correct and precise prediction. Feedback from past interactions

tionfiisppoh nd nhance future responses. This iterative process will help the model adapt to various contexts and provide more reliable and precise answers over time. Encourage the model to reflect on past tasks to improve accuracy in reasoning and countingugfed rfine its approach andstructured system prompt hlp ensure that the model's responses are not on accurate but also clear, concise, and efficient, ultimately enhancing the overall user experience and achieving the desired outcomes in the QA task.

**Task: TextGrad MATH(algebra)** **Model: GPT-4o-mini + GPT-4o**

Sample Question:  $x$ : Let

$$f(x) = \begin{cases} ax + 3, & \text{if } x > 2, \\ x - 5 & \text{if } -2 \leq x \leq 2, \\ 2x - b & \text{if } x < -2. \end{cases}$$

Find  $a + b$  if the piecewise function is continuous (which means that its graph can be drawn without lifting your pencil from the paper).  $y$ : 0

**Base Template instruction (with validation accuracy 84.00 and test accuracy 85.42):** You will answer a mathematical reasoning question. Think step by step. The last line of your response should be of the following format: 'Answer: \$VALUE' where VALUE is a numerical value.

**TextGrad (w/ revert) (with validation accuracy 84.00 and test accuracy 85.42):** You will answer a mathematical reasoning question. Think step by step. The last line of your response should be of the following format: 'Answer: \$VALUE' where VALUE is a numerical value.

**TextGrad (w/o revert) (with validation accuracy 86.00 and test accuracy 84.80):** You will answer a reasoning question. Think step by step. The last line of your response should be of the following format: 'Answer: \$VALUE' where VALUE is a numerical value.

**TSGD-M (Promptwise) (with validation accuracy 85.42 and test accuracy 86.65):** You will answer a mathematical reasoning question. Follow these steps to ensure clarity and correctness:

1. **\*\*Restate the Problem\*\*:** Begin by summarizing the question in your own words to ensure understanding.

2. **\*\*Identify Variables and Conditions\*\*:** Clearly define all variables and note any specific conditions or constraints mentioned in the problem.

3. **\*\*Step-by-Step Solution\*\*:** Break down the prob-

lem into smaller, manageable parts. For each step:

- Identify applicable mathematical properties or rules.
- Explain the reasoning and calculations clearly.
- Use consistent and clear mathematical notation.

4. **\*\*Verification\*\*:** After finding the solution, verify it by substituting the value back into the original equations to ensure it satisfies all conditions.

5. **\*\*Final Answer\*\*:** Present the final answer in the following format: 'Answer: VALUE' where VALUE is a numerical value. Ensure the answer is clear, concise, and directly related to the original question.

6. **\*\*Avoid Ambiguity\*\*:** Do not use ambiguous symbols or language. Provide specific details and avoid redundancy in your explanation.

By following these guidelines, you will produce a response that is robust, clear, and reliable.

**TSGD-M (Blockwise) (with validation accuracy:**

**85.71 and test accuracy: 86.65):** You will answer a mathematical reasoning question. Start by restating the problem concisely to capture key information and assumptions. Define all variables and express relationships using equations. Solve the problem step-by-step, focusing on essential steps and avoiding unnecessary details. Use clear and consistent mathematical notation, and ensure all calculations are precise. After finding the to facilitate easy parsing and verification is a numerical value. Ensure the output is in plain text without additional formatting or symbols.

**Task: TextGrad HotPotQA Model: GPT-4o-mini + GPT-4o**

Sample Question:  $x$ : Which magazine was started first Arthur's Magazine or First for Women? Context: "title": [ "Radio City (Indian radio station)", "History of Albanian football", "Echosmith", "Women's colleges in the Southern United States", "First Arthur County Courthouse and Jail", "Arthur's Magazine", "2014–15 Ukrainian Hockey Championship", "First for Women", "Freeway Complex Fire", "William Rast" ], "sentences": [ [ "Radio City is India's first private FM radio station and was started on 3 July 2001.", "It broadcasts on 91.1 (earlier 91.0 in most cities) megahertz from Mumbai (where it was started in 2004), Bengaluru (started first in 2001), Lucknow and New Delhi (since 2003).", ... Details omitted y: "Arthur's Magazine" ] ]

**Base Template instruction (with validation accuracy 48.67 and test accuracy 53.00):** You are a precise multi-hop QA assistant. Use ONLY the context to answer the question concisely. Output ONLY the

final answer. The last line of your response must be: 'Answer: \$STRING'.

**TextGrad (w/ revert) (with validation accuracy**

**48.67 and test accuracy 53.00):** You are a precise multi-hop QA assistant. Use ONLY the context to answer the question concisely. Output ONLY the final answer. The last line of your response must be: 'Answer: \$STRING'.

**TextGrad (w/o revert) (with validation accuracy**

**49.33 and test accuracy 49.33):** You will answer a reasoning question. Think step by step. The last line of your response should be of the following format: 'Answer: \$VALUE' where VALUE is a numerical value.

**TSGD-M (Promptwise) (with validation accuracy**

**50.33 and test accuracy 51.67):** "You are a precise and concise multi-hop QA assistant.

Use ONLY the context to answer the question, prioritizing context that directly relates to the entities in the question.

Identify key entities and perform keyword matching to filter relevant information.

Use multi-hop reasoning to connect different pieces of context that relate to the question.

Provide the shortest possible answer that directly addresses the question.

Do not include any additional context or explanations beyond what is necessary to answer the question.

Avoid repeating information unnecessarily; mention each relevant detail only once.

State the answer directly and succinctly, without elaboration.

Ensure the final answer is accurate and directly supported by the context.

The last line of your response must be: 'Answer: \$STRING'.

**TSGD-M (Blockwise) (with validation accuracy**

**50.00 and test accuracy 54.00):** You are a precise and concise multi-hop QA assistant. Use **only** the provided context to derive your answer. Provide a direct answer that matches the expected format. **Core task.**

Prioritize the most relevant information, analyze past errors, and adjust strategies. Allow for synonymous terms and alternative expressions. Ensure numerical data are interpreted correctly and match the expected format. **Structured organization.** Organize instructions into distinct sections: "Context Utilization", "Verification", and "Final Answer". When you form the answer, ensure it aligns with the ground truth; check corroborating details within the context.

**Confidence scoring.** Assign a confidence score to indicate reliability. If the answer does not match the

ground truth, learn from the error and improve. **Disambiguation and ambiguity handling.** Use robust string matching to handle language variation. When ambiguous, provide short clarification or request more specific information. Pay attention to case, punctuation, and format so the output exactly matches the expected answer. **Feedback loop.** Learn from feedback and prior errors; adjust strategies accordingly.

**Verification mechanism.** Before finalizing, verify with corroborating evidence in the context to ensure consistency and accuracy. **Training and adaptation.**

Use diverse examples to handle varied contexts effectively. **Error analysis.** Analyze mistakes and refine strategies. Briefly explain discrepancies when helpful.

**Exact matches and synonyms.** Recognize synonyms, but prioritize exact matches when the ground truth requires a specific format. Keep responses consistent in format. **Clarity and conciseness.** Remove redundancy; consolidate similar directives. Highlight key words or phrases tied to the question. **Human review.**

For low-confidence answers, suggest human review. **Output.** Provide the shortest possible answer that directly addresses the question. **Contextual reference.**

When helpful, cite the specific context snippet that supports your answer. **Handling multiple candidates.**

If multiple possible answers appear, select the one that best matches the question's criteria and briefly justify. **Error logging.** Note cases where your prediction diverges from the ground truth and why. **Final verification.** Re-check the answer against the context before finishing.

Below prompts are COPRO for DSPy modules. Note here we fix seed 1 and only report sample prompts from all 4 modules per one run.

**Task: COPRO Trec**

**Model: GPT-4o-mini +**

Sample Question: *x: How did serfdom develop in and then leave Russia ? y: description,*

**Base Template instruction (with validation accuracy 77.34 and test accuracy 79.8):** Read the following question, then choose whether it is about a description, entity, expression, human, location or number.

**COPRO (with validation accuracy 80.25 and test accuracy 78.8):** Review each question thoroughly to determine its core subject and function. Assign to each the most fitting category, choosing among a description, entity, expression, human, location, or number. Evaluate the context beyond words analyzing just

what kind of query it is but also what is implied or explicitly requires attention, whether qualitative, identifying references, quoting sources, referencing individuals and roles, highlighting geographical places, or pursuing factual, quantitative information. Maintain precise insight as you categorize each inquiry to ensure keen accuracy across thematic dimensions.

Prefix:

Identified Category:

**TSGD-M (Promptwise) (with validation accuracy 82.42 and test accuracy 83.0):** Propose a user-centric approach to classify questions into six distinct categories: Description, Entity, Expression, Human Information, Location Identification, and Numeric Details. Begin by sparking natural comprehension of the question's intent by analyzing themes, syntactic structures, and emblematic sensory fields. Develop structured mental maps to identify how emotional palette variances inoculate this progression. Next, innovate with technologies that automate reasoning behind human-centric path categorization, carving intellectual conduits for determination replay, repeatedly framing challenging readiness for scalability emotions media-consuming agriculture underscore commentary. Prefix: Classification Class: [Autonomous Labeling Choice] with Intellectual Cognition process Sustainability:

**TSGD-M (Blockwise) (with validation accuracy 79.69 and test accuracy 80.6):** Categorize each question into primary categories: description, entity, expression, human-being, location, or numerical detail. Examine them for keywords and underlying messages that reveal their true intent. Clearly articulate your classification by employing critical thinking and analytical skills, while systematically reducing ambiguity. Aim for clarity and precision throughout the classification process, ensuring each determination increases understanding and captures the intricacies of language. Your classifications should encourage deeper engagement with the context behind each inquiry presented. [[ ## proposed understanding and captures the intricacies of language. Ensure you highlight key aspects of each question, positioning your insights to be both relatable and informative. Strive for consistency through defined categorization while focusing on providing interpretations that genuinely mirror the intent behind queries across each context. This classification should reinforce understanding not just for yourself, but also for those who may refer to your insights.</p>

Prefix: Categorization and analysis of queries.

**Task: COPRO ARC-Challenge**  
**GPT-4o-mini + GPT-4o**

**Model:**

Sample Question: *x: George wants to warm his hands quickly by rubbing them. Which skin surface will produce the most heat? "text": [ "dry palms", "wet palms", "palms covered with oil", "palms covered with lotion" ], "label": [ "A", "B", "C", "D" ] y: A*

**Base Template instruction (with validation accuracy 91.97 and test accuracy 93.77):** Given the fields "question", produce the fields "answer". Reasoning: Let's think step by step in order to

**COPRO (with validation accuracy 93.65 and test accuracy 93.85):** Refine and craft exceptionally articulate answers to a broad spectrum of questions, including factual, conceptual, and open-ended types. Begin by thoroughly analyzing both explicit and implicit aspects of the questions provided. Deliver your insights in precise detail, ensuring clarity with relevant context to enhance the audience's understanding. Strategically leverage existing knowledge to approach even the most complex inquiries with insightful, logic-supported answers. Aim for balance in fluency and depth in your explanations, effectively utilizing partial information when needed, and frequently refining your approach for optimal outcomes. Prioritize seamless and intuitive comprehension while fostering the incrementally enhanced learning of readers, focusing on maintaining their engagement with concise, rich context-building solutions.

Prefix: Start the Response:

**TSGD-M (Promptwise) (with validation accuracy 94.31 and test accuracy 94.37):** Formulate a comprehensive and articulate response to the derived question, focusing on an extensive analysis and cohesive integration of pertinent information. Evaluate the question nuances, delving into diverse perspectives and assumptions, and uphold your arguments with context-relevant examples. Aim for an engaging response that harmonizes detail, sophistication, and clarity to thoroughly inform and captivate the reader. Enhance accessibility through memorable insights and examples that ensure precision and sustained reader interest.

Prefix: Comprehensive and articulate response:

**TSGD-M (Blockwise) (with validation accuracy 93.98 and test accuracy 94.97):** Imagine you are an expert guide dedicated to nurturing understanding and curiosity in users. Your primary role is to intuitively address their queries by weaving elaborate cross-references and metaphors, providing creatively structured clarifications with comprehensive detail. Incorporate relatable examples that resonate

with various experience levels and foster a collaborative atmosphere. Conclude your answers by inviting further exploration and suggesting actionable take-aways that promote independent learning and engagement. Your mission is to illuminate the topic at hand while empowering users with practical knowledge and inspiring them to pursue their inquiries beyond your response. Remember to advocate for ongoing curiosity and present resources for users to deepen their understanding further.

Prefix: Foster inquiry and guide exploration. practical knowledge and inspiring them to pursue their inquiries beyond your response. Remember to advocate for ongoing curiosity and present resources for users to deepen their understanding further. Provide prompts or thought-provoking questions that encourage users to think critically about the topic...

**Task: COPRO GSM8K Model: GPT-4o-mini + GPT-4o**

Sample Question: *x: Natalia sold clips to 48 of her friends in April, and then she sold half as many clips in May. How many clips did Natalia sell altogether in April and May? y: 72*

**Base Template instruction (with validation accuracy 86.67 and test accuracy 90.37):** Given the fields "question", produce the fields "answer". Reasoning: Let's think step by step in order to

**COPRO (with validation accuracy 80.25 and test accuracy 87.79):** Instruction: Aim to create an answer deeply intertwined with the contours of the question using explicit and nuanced articulation. Take signals from emerging and established paradigms relevant to the topic at hand, intercropping contextual cues against cautioned creative suppositions whose innovations underline advancing conclusions responsibly balanced by certifiable sources. Harness a gentle verbosity that cordially scripts the marvel and mystery beneath levels of interpretation for enriched consumption while honoring dimensional diverse ecosystems of argument, domains maturation grew past doubt remnants, paving lunar-run constructs toward satisfactory synapses stretch.

Prefix: The upcoming narrative weaves sophisticated outlines into clarified charisma, commenced now yet ever evolving alongside the intellectual taceting offered later as follows:

**TSGD-M (Promptwise) (with validation accuracy 88.33 and test accuracy 90.45):** Instruction: Thoroughly dissect the given question by first

establishing key variables and identifying extraneous details. Aim to provide a solution based on systematic, logical deduction. Ensure clarity by prioritizing and organizing concepts in a logical progression that highlights the strength of the final argument.

Prefix:

Comprehensive Deduction:

**TSGD-M (Blockwise) (with validation accuracy 84.0 and test accuracy 86.96):** Instruction: Read each question carefully and consider how best to break down complex concepts into manageable pieces. Use your comprehensive understanding to address the inquiry with structured, detailed explanations that remain concise. Engage readers by integrating context and relevant insights, enriching understanding while balancing brevity. Ensure each answer promotes clarity, effectively satisfying the core question and maintaining an inviting dialogue throughout your response, thus fostering better comprehension and engagement.

Prefix: Deliver engaging and clear explanations. Ensure clarity, effectively satisfying the core question and maintaining an inviting dialogue throughout your response, thus fostering better comprehension and engagement., focusing on clarifying complexities inherent in the subjects. Your goal is to create a smooth flow of information, maintaining coherence that allows readers to effectively follow your insights. This will ultimately enhance their grasp of various concepts while reinforcing the communicative value of your...

**Task: COPRO Object Counting Model: GPT-4o-mini + GPT-4o**

Sample Question: *x: I have a flute, a piano, a trombone, four stoves, a violin, an accordion, a clarinet, a drum, two lamps, and a trumpet. How many musical instruments do I have? y: 8*

**Base Template instruction (with validation accuracy 87.0 and test accuracy 92.0):** Given the fields "question", produce the fields "answer". Reasoning: Let's think step by step in order to

**COPRO (with validation accuracy 90.0 and test accuracy 95.0):** You are provided with a series of questions. Your task is to produce well-reasoned and thorough answers for each question. Consider the query's context and explicitly convey critical details succinctly. Ensure clarity and precision in responses. Prefix: Here is the comprehensive answer:

**TSGD-M (Promptwise) (with validation accuracy**

**TBD and test accuracy 94.0:** Craft a focused and engaging response to the presented question by prioritizing discernibility and relevance. Kick-off with the essence of the topic, and unwrap complex ideas through intuitive metaphors aligned with everyday experiences. Thoughtfully weave in hyperlinks and references only where they amplify understanding and allure, making your exploration as interactive as it is on-point. Firmly ground your depictions with current factual data, prominently showcasing groundbreaking ideas and insights. Fuel an atmosphere of alluring intellect, inspiring even novice learners whilst comfortably satisfying critical learners or passionate aficionados in gradated discourse.

Prefix: Initiate your engaging narrative with clarity here:

**TSGD-M (Blockwise) (with validation accuracy**

**91.0 and test accuracy 92.0:** Craft a thoughtful and engaging response to the given query by thoroughly analyzing its core elements. Present unique perspectives and harness credible sources, such as data, anecdotes, and academic studies, to substantiate your arguments. Prioritize logical structure and foster coherent discussions that lift the conversation to new heights. Aim both to enlighten and to cultivate intellectual curiosity, instigating reflection and engagement that transcends basic understanding.

Prefix: Engage through deeper considerations while facilitating an interactive dialogue. Inspire readers to connect foundational knowledge with advanced ideas, encouraging everyone to explore the nuances of the discussion. Offer relevant content that enhances appreciation for complex themes, ensuring clarity and fostering meaningful exchange throughout. Engaging your audience Ensuring clarity and fostering meaningful exchange throughout. This transcends mere discussion to inspire a culture of inquisitive thought substantiate your insights with strong connections to both established and emergent themes in order to broaden the audience's understanding and provoke vibrant dialogue.

**Task: COPRO MATH(algebra)**

**GPT-4o-mini + GPT-4o**

**Model:**

Sample Question:  $x$ : Let

$$f(x) = \begin{cases} ax + 3, & \text{if } x > 2, \\ x - 5 & \text{if } -2 \leq x \leq 2, \\ 2x - b & \text{if } x < -2. \end{cases}$$

*Find  $a + b$  if the piecewise function is continuous (which means that its graph can be drawn without lifting your pencil from the paper).  $y$ : 0*

**Base Template instruction (with validation accuracy**

**74.86 and test accuracy 71.87:** Given the fields 'question', produce the fields 'answer'. Reasoning: Let's think step by step in order to

**COPRO (with validation accuracy 69.61 and test accuracy 71.67):** Given the fields 'question', produce the fields 'answer'.

**TSGD-M (Promptwise) (with validation accuracy**

**70.00 and test accuracy 69.82):** Analyze the provided "question" carefully using critical thinking and comprehensive understanding. Synthesize an accurate answer leveraging logical reasoning and assimilating relevant knowledge or past learning experiences. Aim to craft a response that is not only correct but also concise and elucidative.

Prefix: Suggested solution:

**TSGD-M (Blockwise) (with validation accuracy**

**64.29 and test accuracy 64.27):** To solve this task, provide concise and direct answers based on the questions provided. Your response should clarify concepts or straightforwardly address inquiries, tailored to suit general comprehension. Focus on delivering precise information that captures the spirit of the given topics or queries. Ensure your interactions are engaging while maintaining the clarity required for better understanding. Always align your answer format with the style of the inquiry to enhance engagement and accuracy in responses.

Prefix: Response to the given question, Rephrase if necessary to maintain clarity and precision, embracing elements that keep the response targeted while providing a layered understanding of more complex subjects when needed. Ensure each answer aims to satisfy any underlying context or key points drawn from the inquiries raised. It's crucial that when contextual clues are present, your solutions explicitly weave in these aspects for a holistic understanding. Taking care to leverage optimal instructional formats further ampl

Below prompts are for Adalfow method. Similar to COPRO, we fix seed 1 and only report sample prompts from 3 modules per one run.

**Task: Adalfow Trec**

**Model: GPT-4o-mini + GPT-4o**

Sample Question:  $x$ : How did serfdom develop in and then leave Russia ?  $y$ : description,

**Base Template instruction (with validation accuracy 73.0 and test accuracy 77.2):** Classify the given question into one of the following categories: description, entity, expression, human, location, or number. A question about a "description" asks for information that describes a concept or thing. A question about an "entity" asks to identify a specific person, place, organization, or thing. A question about an "expression" asks to evaluate or calculate a mathematical or logical expression. A question about a "human" asks to identify or provide information about a person. A question about a "location" asks for information about a place or geographic area. A question about a "number" asks for a specific numerical value or count. Carefully read the question and determine which category it belongs to. Provide your reasoning and then give the final classification.

**Adalflow, (with validation accuracy 83.5 and test accuracy 84.5):** "Classify the given question into one of the following categories: description, entity, expression, human, location, or number. A question about a "description" asks for information that describes a concept or thing. Example: "How do you buy stocks?" - This asks for a method, fitting the "description" category. A question about an "entity" asks to identify a specific person, place, organization, or thing. Example: "What explosive do you get by mixing charcoal, sulfur, and saltpeter?" - This identifies a chemical compound, fitting the "entity" category. A question about an "expression" asks to evaluate or calculate a mathematical or logical expression. A question about a "human" asks to identify or provide information about a person. A question about a "location" asks for information about a place or geographic area. Example: "What sprawling U.S. state boasts the most airports?" - This asks about a specific geographic region, fitting the "location" category. A question about a "number" asks for a specific numerical value or count. Example: "How tall was the animated King Kong?" - This seeks a numerical value, fitting the "number" category. Carefully read the question and determine which category it belongs to. Provide your reasoning and then give the final classification."

**Adalflow-M (Promptwise) (with validation accuracy 80.0 and test accuracy 84.5):** Classify the given question into one of the following categories: description, entity, expression, human, location, or number. A question about a "description" asks for information that explains or describes a concept, action, or event. For example, "What is the Lost Colony?" should be classified as "description" because it seeks an explanation of the historical context rather than merely identi-

fying it. A question about an "entity" seeks to identify a specific person, place, organization, or thing. Pay close attention to whether the question is about defining characteristics or identifying a specific entity type. For example, "What constitutes an adult?" should be classified as "entity" because it seeks to define a specific category rather than explain a concept. A question about an "expression" asks to evaluate or calculate a mathematical or logical expression. A question about a "human" asks to identify or provide information specifically about a person. For example, "What 4-foot-9 actress in 1984 became the first performer to win an Oscar for playing a character of the opposite sex?" falls under "human" as it seeks information about a specific person. A question about a "location" asks for information about a place or geographic area. Ensure to consider broader contexts like the global nature of the Internet. A question about a "number" asks for a specific numerical value or count. Carefully read the question and determine which category it belongs to. Provide your reasoning and then give the final classification. Ensure that your reasoning is logical and aligns with the category definitions. Example: For the question What is Bill Gates of Microsoft's email address?; consider whether the focus is on a personal identifier or a geographical identifier (e.g., the domain part of the email). In this case, the domain could relate to a geographical or organizational context, classifying it under "location." Additional Example: For the question "Who painted the Mona Lisa?", identify that it is asking for information about a person. It seeks the name of an individual associated with a specific artwork, thus classifying it as "human."

**Task: Adalflow ARC-Challenge**  
**GPT-4o-mini + GPT-4o**

**Model:**

Sample Question: *x: George wants to warm his hands quickly by rubbing them. Which skin surface will produce the most heat? "text": [ "dry palms", "wet palms", "palms covered with oil", "palms covered with lotion" ], "label": [ "A", "B", "C", "D" ] y: A*

**Base Template instruction (with validation accuracy 92.5 and test accuracy 90.00):** You will answer a multiple-choice science question. Read the question carefully and consider all the answer choices. Think through the problem step by step: 1. Understand what the question is asking 2. Review each option carefully 3. Use your knowledge to determine which option is correct 4. Provide your reasoning Respond with the label of the correct option. The last line must be 'Answer: X' where X is that label.

**Adalflow (with validation accuracy 93.0 and test accuracy 91.5):**

You will answer a multiple-choice science question. Read the question carefully and consider all the answer choices. Think through the problem step by step: 1. Understand what the question is asking 2. Review each option carefully 3. Use your knowledge to determine which option is correct 4. Provide your reasoning Example: Question: During which phase of the Moon could a solar eclipse take place? Choices: A. full B. new C. quarter D. crescent Reasoning: A solar eclipse occurs when the Moon passes between the Earth and the Sun, which can only happen during the new phase of the Moon. During the full phase, the Moon is on the opposite side of the Earth from the Sun, making a solar eclipse impossible. The quarter and crescent phases also do not align the Earth, Moon, and Sun in the necessary configuration for a solar eclipse. Therefore, the correct answer is B. new. Respond with the label of the correct option. The last line must be 'Answer: X' where X is that label.

**Adalflow-M (Promptwise) (with validation accuracy 93.0 and test accuracy 92.0):** You will answer a multiple-choice science question. Read the question carefully and consider all the answer choices. Think through the problem step by step: 1. Understand what the question is asking. 2. Review each option carefully, focusing on the scientific principles and relevant information related to each choice. 3. Use your knowledge to determine which option is correct. 4. Provide your reasoning, explicitly connecting it to relevant scientific concepts and principles. 5. Verify your reasoning and calculations to ensure they logically support the answer and align with expected results. Example: - Question: Earth's distance from the Sun helps the planet sustain life. If the Sun were larger, what would most likely also have to be true for Earth to sustain life? - Choices: A. Earth would have to be further from the Sun. B. Earth would have to be closer to the Sun. C. Earth would have to be smaller. D. Earth would have to be larger. - Reasoning: If the Sun were larger, it would likely emit more energy and heat. To sustain life, Earth would need to be further away from the Sun to avoid excessive heat and radiation. This means option A is the most logical choice, as increasing the distance would help maintain a suitable temperature for life. - Answer: A Respond with the label of the correct option 4. The last line must be 'Answer: X' where X is that label.

**Task: Adalflow GSM8K Model: GPT-4o-mini + GPT-4o**

Sample Question: *x: Natalia sold clips to 48 of her friends in April, and then she sold half as many clips in May. How many clips did Natalia sell altogether in April and May? y: 72*

**Base Template instruction (with validation accuracy 78.0 and test accuracy 82.0):**

You will answer a mathematical reasoning question from GSM8K. Think step by step and show your reasoning clearly. Key requirements: 1. Break down the problem into clear steps 2. Show all calculations explicitly 3. Verify your logic at each step 4. The last line must be: 'Answer: \$VALUE' where VALUE is a numerical value 5. Double-check your final answer Example format: Step 1: [reasoning] Step 2: [calculation]...Answer: 42

**Adalflow (with validation accuracy 97.0 and test accuracy 89.67):**

You will answer a mathematical reasoning question from GSM8K. Think step by step and show your reasoning clearly. Key requirements: 1. Break down the problem into clear, explicitly numbered steps. 2. Show all calculations explicitly and check each one for accuracy. 3. Verify your logic at each step and ensure consistency throughout, comparing intermediate results with expected totals. 4. Carefully interpret and apply all given constraints and overlaps. 5. The last line must be: 'Answer: \$VALUE' where VALUE is a numerical value. 6. Double-check your final answer for correctness, ensuring alignment with the problem's requirements. Example format: Step 1: [reasoning] Step 2: [calculation]...Answer: 42 Example question: A river is to be used for a boat race. If each boat is 3 feet across and they must have at least 2 feet between them or the riverbank, how many boats can race in a river that is 42 feet across? Example reasoning: Step 1: Calculate the total width occupied by one boat and its required spacing. Each boat is 3 feet wide, and there must be 2 feet of space on each side, totaling  $3 + 2 + 2 = 7$  feet per boat. Step 2: Determine how many boats can fit in the river. The river is 42 feet wide, so divide the total width of the river by the width occupied by each boat:  $42 \text{ feet} / 7 \text{ feet per boat} = 6 \text{ boats}$ . Step 3: Verify the calculation: 6 boats would occupy  $6 * 7 = 42$  feet, which fits perfectly within the 42 feet of the river, confirming that the calculation is correct. Answer: 6 Example question: Louise is baking cakes for a gathering. She needs 60 cakes in total, and has already produced half this many. Today, she calculates how many cakes she has left to make and bakes half this amount. The next day, she again calculates how many cakes she has left to make and bakes a third

of this amount. How many more cakes does Louise need to bake? Example reasoning: Step 1: Determine the total number of cakes Louise needs to bake. She needs 60 cakes in total. Step 2: Calculate how many cakes Louise has already produced. She has produced half of 60, which is 30 cakes. Step 3: Calculate how many cakes she has left to make. Total cakes needed (60) minus cakes produced (30) gives  $60 - 30 = 30$  cakes left. Step 4: Louise bakes half of the remaining cakes. Half of 30 is 15 cakes, so after baking, she has  $30 - 15 = 15$  cakes left. Step 5: The next day, she calculates how many cakes she has left to make again. She has 15 cakes left. Step 6: She bakes a third of the remaining cakes. A third of 15 is 5 cakes, so after baking, she has  $15 - 5 = 10$  cakes left. Step 7: Finally, calculate how many more cakes Louise needs to bake. She needs to bake the remaining 10 cakes. Answer: 10

**Adafloow-M (Promptwise) (with validation accuracy 93.0 and test accuracy 91.67):** You will answer a mathematical reasoning question from GSM8K. Think step by step and show your reasoning clearly. Key requirements: 1. Break down the problem into clear steps. 2. Show all calculations explicitly. 3. Verify your logic and calculations at each step, ensuring accuracy. 4. Re-evaluate your steps if the result seems incorrect. 5. Double-check your final answer. 6. Carefully interpret key terms and relational phrases in the problem. Consider alternative interpretations if necessary, ensuring your understanding aligns with the question's context. 7. Cross-check interpretations and calculations with the problem statement to prevent misinterpretation. 8. Track changes day by day, especially when dealing with problems involving time progression or consumption. 9. Ensure the total remains consistent with the constraints given in the problem. 10. Perform a final check to ensure all steps and calculations are consistent. 11. Pay special attention to summing and aggregating different parts of the solution accurately. 12. The last line must be: 'Answer: \$VALUE' where VALUE is a numerical value. 13. After solving, ask yourself if the solution logically fits the problem context. 14. Ensure that interpretations are consistent with any constraints or specific conditions given in the problem. Example format: Step 1: [reasoning] Step 2: [calculation] ... Answer: 42 Example: Question: A bookstore sold 120 books last week. This week, they sold 40 more books than last week. How many books did they sell this week? Step 1: Determine the number of books sold last week. Last week's books = 120 Step 2: Calculate the number of additional books sold this week. Additional books = 40 Step 3: Calculate the total number of books sold

this week by adding last week's sales to the additional books. This week's books =  $120 + 40 = 160$  Step 4: Verify calculations and logic to ensure accuracy. Step 5: Confirm that 160 logically fits the context of the question. Answer: 160

**Task: Adafloow Object Counting**

**Model:**

**GPT-4o-mini + GPT-4o**

Sample Question: *x: I have a flute, a piano, a trombone, four stoves, a violin, an accordion, a clarinet, a drum, two lamps, and a trumpet. How many musical instruments do I have? y: 8*

**Base Template instruction (with validation accuracy 92.0 and test accuracy 87.0):** Count the objects in the question carefully. Look at the image or description and identify each object type. Provide a detailed explanation of your counting process and then give the final count. Ensure your count is accurate and matches all objects mentioned in the question. Format your final answer clearly with the numerical count.

**Adafloow (with validation accuracy 98.0 and test accuracy 91.0):** Count the objects in the question carefully. Look at the image or description and identify each object type. Provide a detailed explanation of your counting process and then give the final count. Ensure your count is accurate and matches all objects mentioned in the question. Format your final answer clearly with the numerical count. Example: Question: "I have a duck, a peach, a strawberry, a fish, two chickens, a bear, and a banana. How many animals do I have?" Reasoning: "I identified the animals mentioned in the question. The total includes: 1 duck, 1 fish, 2 chickens, and 1 bear. Adding these together:  $1 + 1 + 2 + 1 = 5$ ." Answer: "5" Example: Question: "I have three oranges, a pig, a frog, a cow, three bananas, a nectarine, and a snail. How many animals do I have?" Reasoning: "I identified the animals mentioned in the question. The total includes: 1 pig, 1 frog, 1 cow, and 1 snail. Adding these together:  $1 + 1 + 1 + 1 = 4$ ." Answer: "4"

**Adafloow-M (Promptwise) (with validation accuracy 95.0 and test accuracy 92.0):** Count the objects in the question carefully. First, verify your understanding of each object type mentioned. Look at the image or description and identify each object type. If applicable, categorize objects clearly, such as distinguishing between vegetables and non-vegetables. Count each object type step-by-step, ensuring not to double-count or miss any. After counting, explicitly verify the addition of counts for accuracy. Provide

a detailed explanation of your counting process and then give the final count. Double-check your count to ensure accuracy and that it matches all objects mentioned in the question. After deriving the final count, review your reasoning to verify its correctness. Format your final answer clearly with the numerical count.

**Task: Adalflow MATH(algebra)**  
**GPT-4o-mini + GPT-4o**

**Model:**

Sample Question:  $x$ : Let

$$f(x) = \begin{cases} ax + 3, & \text{if } x > 2, \\ x - 5 & \text{if } -2 \leq x \leq 2, \\ 2x - b & \text{if } x < -2. \end{cases}$$

Find  $a + b$  if the piecewise function is continuous (which means that its graph can be drawn without lifting your pencil from the paper).  $y$ : 0

**Base Template instruction (with validation accuracy 80.0 and test accuracy 82.0):** You will answer a mathematical reasoning question from GSM8K. Think step by step and show your reasoning clearly. Key requirements: 1. Break down the problem into clear steps 2. Show all calculations explicitly 3. Verify your logic at each step 4. The last line must be: 'Answer: \$VALUE' where VALUE is a numerical value 5. Double-check your final answer Example format: Step 1: [reasoning] Step 2: [calculation] ... Answer: 42

**Adalflow (with validation accuracy 84.0 and test accuracy 81.67):** You will answer a mathematical reasoning question from GSM8K. Think step by step and show your reasoning clearly. Key requirements: 1. Break down the problem into clear steps 2. Show all calculations explicitly 3. Verify your logic and calculations at each step to ensure accuracy 4. Carefully interpret key phrases, especially comparative phrases like "times more," and rephrase them if necessary to ensure correct understanding 5. Convert units and values carefully, double-checking conversions and ensuring consistent unit usage 6. Use a systematic approach to verify totals and sums 7. The last line must be: 'Answer: \$VALUE' where VALUE is a numerical value 8. Double-check your final answer. Example format: Step 1: [reasoning] Step 2: [calculation]... Answer: 42 Example: Question: "A YouTube video got 3000 likes and 100 more than half as many dislikes. If the video gets 1000 more dislikes and 0 more likes, how many dislikes does the video have?" Step 1: Determine the number of dislikes based on the given likes. The problem states that the

video has 3000 likes and 100 more than half as many dislikes. Step 2: Calculate half of the likes: half of 3000 is 1500. Step 3: Add 100 to half of the likes to find the dislikes:  $1500 + 100 = 1600$ . Step 4: Now, the video gets 1000 more dislikes. To find the total number of dislikes after this increase, add 1000 to the current number of dislikes:  $1600 + 1000 = 2600$ . Step 5: Verify calculations: Starting dislikes were 1600, and adding 1000 gives 2600, which is correct. Answer: 2600

**Adalflow-M (Promptwise) (with validation accuracy 83.0 and test accuracy 83.0):** You will answer a mathematical reasoning question from GSM8K. Think step by step and show your reasoning clearly. Key requirements: 1. Break down the problem into clear steps 2. Restate key information from the problem as needed 3. Clearly state any assumptions made during problem-solving and verify them against the problem's requirements 4. Show all calculations explicitly, ensuring each arithmetic operation is correct 5. Verify your logic and calculations at each step, correcting any errors 6. Ensure unit consistency throughout calculations and in the final answer 7. Apply proper rounding rules when necessary to achieve the expected result 8. The last line must be: 'Answer: \$VALUE' where VALUE is a numerical value 9. Double-check your final answer 10. Review your solution to ensure all steps and calculations are consistent 11. Ensure all components from the problem are included and verified against the description 12. Cross-verify calculations by considering alternative approaches or checks to eliminate errors 13. Use estimation to cross-check calculations where applicable 14. Explicitly verify assumptions and logic at each step to maintain consistency and correctness 15. Encourage self-consistency by reviewing each step to ensure assumptions and logic hold true. Example format: Step 1: Identify the problem's requirements and restate key details. Step 2: Break down the problem into manageable parts. Step 3: Perform calculations, verifying each step. Step 4: Check units and consistency. Step 5: Cross-verify using a different method if possible. Example 1: Question: "A box contains 3 red, 5 blue, and 2 green balls. What is the probability of drawing a blue ball?" Step 1: Restate the total number of balls:  $3 \text{ red} + 5 \text{ blue} + 2 \text{ green} = 10 \text{ balls}$ . Step 2: Identify the number of favorable outcomes (drawing a blue ball): 5 blue balls. Step 3: Calculate the probability: Number of favorable outcomes / Total number of outcomes =  $5/10$ . Step 4: Simplify the fraction:  $5/10 = 1/2$ . Step 5: Verify by

considering another approach: Check the total and ensure the math is consistent. Answer: 1/2 Example 2: Question: "If a train travels 60 miles in 1.5 hours, what is its average speed in miles per hour?" Step 1: Restate the key details: 60 miles in 1.5 hours. Step 2: Calculate the average speed: Distance / Time = 60 miles / 1.5 hours. Step 3: Perform the division: 60 / 1.5 = 40 miles per hour. Step 4: Verify the calculation: Ensure the division and units are consistent. Step 5: Confirm understanding by considering speed over different intervals. Answer: 40 miles per hour

### Task: Adalflow HotPotQA Model: GPT-4o-mini + GPT-4o

Sample Question: *x: Which magazine was started first Arthur's Magazine or First for Women? Context: "title": [ "Radio City (Indian radio station)", "History of Albanian football", "Echosmith", "Women's colleges in the Southern United States", "First Arthur County Courthouse and Jail", "Arthur's Magazine", "2014–15 Ukrainian Hockey Championship", "First for Women", "Freeway Complex Fire", "William Rast" ], "sentences": [ [ "Radio City is India's first private FM radio station and was started on 3 July 2001.", "It broadcasts on 91.1 (earlier 91.0 in most cities) megahertz from Mumbai (where it was started in 2004), Bengaluru (started first in 2001), Lucknow and New Delhi (since 2003).", ... Details omitted by: "Arthur's Magazine"*

**Base Template instruction (with validation accuracy 42.0 and test accuracy 38.9):** You will answer a multi-hop question by finding supporting facts from the provided context. Key requirements: 1. Read and understand the question carefully 2. Identify the supporting facts needed to answer the question 3. Reason through the facts step-by-step to derive the answer 4. The answer should be a single sentence or short phrase 5. Be concise and direct in your final answer Example format: Question: [question] Supporting Facts: [fact1], [fact2] Reasoning: [step-by-step reasoning] Answer: [your answer].

**Adalflow (with validation accuracy 51.4 and test accuracy 48.70):** You will answer a multi-hop question by extracting and reasoning through only the essential supporting facts from the provided context. If the context lacks critical information, you must integrate external data sources to verify current details and fill in gaps. Key requirements: 1. Read and understand the question carefully, identifying the central figure or entity relevant to the question. 2. Thoroughly

search the context to identify and list all essential supporting facts, including dates, details, and roles needed to answer the question precisely. Verify exact birth years, numerical values, and platform-sharing details. 3. Ensure geographical and contextual accuracy by correctly mapping details to the specified locations or entities mentioned in the question, especially when verifying identity. 4. Prioritize explicit information provided in the context over inferred information, ensuring that identified entities directly match the question requirements. 5. Explore all potential connections between entities, even if not explicitly detailed in the context, to identify critical relationships and roles. 6. Use clear, step-by-step reasoning to connect these facts and derive the answer, ensuring each entity is evaluated against all criteria mentioned in the question. Focus on role-based answers when required. 7. Verify each step with the context to ensure accuracy and avoid assumptions, emphasizing the identification of entities and their specific roles or affiliations. 8. When necessary, integrate external data sources to verify or supplement missing information from the context, especially for multi-hop questions. Ensure that external information is accurately aligned with the context, and cross-reference critical details such as names, associations, and specific dates. 9. Include all relevant entities mentioned in the context in your answer, particularly when they jointly contribute to the task in question. 10. Accurately determine timelines and prioritize entities based on relevance to the question and expected answer, ensuring alignment with the context. 11. Ensure the final answer is concise and matches the exact expected format and terminology, using precise terms, abbreviations, and phrasing as required. 12. Distinguish clearly between broad concepts and specific details, ensuring the answer's specificity matches the question's requirements. 13. Self-verify the answer to confirm it aligns with the context and question criteria. 14. Provide binary or succinct answers when questions require a straightforward yes/no response. 15. Output must be structured correctly as valid JSON, including all necessary fields. Ensure the final answer format aligns exactly with the ground truth, using the precise terms provided. 16. Double-check all entity names and associations for accuracy and completeness, especially when context hints at specific connections or roles. Example format: Question: [question] Supporting Facts: [fact1], [fact2] Reasoning: [step-by-step reasoning] Answer: [exact answer] Examples: Question: "What is the specific type of literature contributed to by Aspasia that medieval scholars later expanded?" Supporting Facts:

"Aspasius wrote commentaries on Aristotle's works, which were later built upon by medieval scholars." Reasoning: "The question requires identifying a specific type of literature. Aspasius is noted for writing commentaries on Aristotle, which medieval scholars expanded upon. Therefore, the specific literature is 'Commentaries on Aristotle.'" Answer: "Commentaries on Aristotle" Question: "What martial arts philosophy, abbreviated as JKD, is associated with Wing Chun Kung Fu?" Supporting Facts: "Jeet Kune Do, abbreviated JKD, is a martial arts philosophy founded by Bruce Lee, influenced by Wing Chun Kung Fu." Reasoning: The question seeks the broader philosophy associated with Wing Chun Kung Fu, abbreviated JKD. Jeet Kune Do fits this description as Bruce Lee's martial arts philosophy influenced by Wing Chun." Answer: "Jeet Kune Do"

**Adafly-M (Promptwise) (with validation accuracy 54.0 and test accuracy 49.8):** You will answer a multi-hop question by finding and verifying supporting facts from the provided context.

Key requirements: 1. Read and understand the question thoroughly, including all entities mentioned. 2. Identify and extract all supporting facts for each part of the question. 3. Ensure all entities and components of the answer are addressed and verified against the context. 4. Cross-check each supporting fact to ensure they directly relate to the question and are accurate. 5. Reason through the facts step-by-step, linking them explicitly to derive the answer. 6. Ensure the answer matches exactly the expected format without additional words or variations. 7. The answer should be a single sentence or short phrase. 8. Be concise and direct in your final answer. 9. Verify the final answer for exact wording and format compliance. 10. Focus on extracting specific details relevant to the question's focus.

Example format: Question: [question] Supporting Facts: [fact1], [fact2] Reasoning: [step-by-step reasoning] Answer: [your answer, exactly as required]