### Algorithm 1 CAPO: Cost-Aware Prompt Optimization

```
Require: Dataset \mathcal{D} = \{(X_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^n, Meta-LLM \Phi(x), Downstream LLM \phi(x),
     Cost function \ell(y, \hat{y}), Initial instructions \Lambda = \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_p, Population size p,
     Block size b, Number of iterations n, Number of crossovers per iteration c
  1: for \lambda \in \Lambda do
          num\_shots \sim U(lower, upper)
  2:
          \xi \leftarrow \text{sample}(X, \text{num\_shots})
  3:

    Sample few shot examples

  4:
          \theta \leftarrow \phi(\lambda||\xi)
                                                             ▶ Generate few shots with reasoning
  5:
          \pi \leftarrow (\lambda, \theta)
          \Pi \leftarrow \Pi.append(\pi)
  6:
  7: end for
  8: Divide dataset \mathcal{D} into blocks \mathcal{B} = \{B_1, ..., B_k\} where |B_i| = b
  9: for i = 1 to n do
          \Pi_{\text{off}} \leftarrow \text{cross\_over}(\Pi, c)
10:
          \Pi_{\text{off}} \leftarrow \text{mutate}(\Pi_{\text{off}})
11:
          \Pi \leftarrow \text{do\_racing}(\Pi \cup \Pi_{\text{off}}, k = p)
12:
13: end for
14: best_prompt \leftarrow do_racing(\Pi, k = 1)
15: return best_prompt
```

Is reasoning always necessary? Maybe this is not important for simple tasks and costs a lot of tokens. (Idea: some few shot examples can be included without reasoning)

#### Algorithm 2 cross\_over

```
Require: Population \Pi, Meta-LLM \Phi(x), Cross-Over-Meta-Prompt \lambda_{\mathbf{C}}, Number of crossovers c
```

```
1: \Pi_{\text{off}} \leftarrow []
  2: for j = 1 to c do
                                                                                                                                                          \triangleright P_1 = (\lambda_1, \theta_1)\triangleright P_2 = (\lambda_2, \theta_2)
                P_1 \leftarrow \text{sample}(\Pi, 1)
  3:
                 P_2 \leftarrow \text{sample}(\Pi, 1)
  4:
                 \lambda_{\text{off}} \leftarrow \Phi(\lambda_{\text{C}}||\lambda_1||\lambda_2)
                                                                                            \triangleright Let Meta-LLM cross over the prompts
  5:
                \theta_{\text{off},j} \leftarrow \text{sample}(\theta_1 \cup \theta_2, \left\lfloor \frac{|\theta_1| + |\theta_2|}{2} \right\rfloor) \triangleright \text{Sample from all few-shot examples}
  6:
                \pi_{\text{off},j} \leftarrow (\lambda_{\text{off},j}, \theta_{\text{off},j})
  7:
                 \Pi_{\text{off}} \leftarrow \Pi_{\text{off.append}}(\pi_{\text{off},j})
  9: end for
10: return \Pi_{\text{off}}
```

Currently we do a random parent selection. In EvoPrompt they do a roulette wheel selection based on the fitness scores. This would require us to find a way of already having scores here.

We have to clarify where the new few-shot examples are coming from. Extra Split:

+ no data leakage (fair, comparable assessment of prompts)

## Algorithm 3 mutate

**Require:** Population of offsprings  $\Pi_{\text{off}}$ , Meta-LLM  $\Phi(x)$ , Mutation-Meta-Prompt  $\lambda_{\text{M}}$ , Dataset samples X

```
1: for \pi_{\text{off}} \in \Pi_{\text{off}} do
              \lambda_{\text{off}} \leftarrow \Phi(\lambda_{\text{M}}||\lambda_{\text{off}})
  2:
             num\_shots \sim U(lower, upper)
  3:
             num\_new\_shots \sim U(lower, num\_shots)
  4:
             \xi \leftarrow \operatorname{sample}(X, \operatorname{num\_new\_shots})
                                                                                            ▷ Sample new few shot examples
  5:
  6:
              \theta_{\text{new}} \leftarrow \phi(\lambda_{\text{off}}||\xi)
                                                                                     ▶ Generate few shots with reasoning
             \theta_{\text{old}} \leftarrow \text{sample}(\theta_{\text{off}}, \text{num\_shots} - \text{num\_new\_shots})
  7:
             \theta \leftarrow \theta_{\text{old}} \cup \theta_{\text{new}}
              \theta \leftarrow \text{shuffle}(\theta)
 9:
10:
              \pi_{\text{off}} \leftarrow (\lambda_{\text{off}}, \theta)
11: end for
12: return \Pi_{\text{off}}
```

- constrained pool of few-shot examples (how to get this pool?) - potentially smaller dev Split

#### From Train Split:

- data leakage (prompts that contain eval data point already as few-shot examples which are already confirmed as correct have advantages)
- + we can use the full train set

#### Algorithm 4 do\_racing

```
Require: Prompts \Pi, Top-k k, cost function \ell(y, \hat{y}), blocks \mathcal{B}, Downstream LLM \phi(x), number of evaluations a
```

```
1: survivors \leftarrow \Pi

2: i \leftarrow 0

3: scores \leftarrow [0] * \operatorname{len}(\Pi)

4: shuffle(\mathcal{B})

5: while len(survivors) > k \land i < \operatorname{len}(\mathcal{B}) do

6: i \leftarrow i + 1

7: scores \leftarrow \frac{1}{i} (evaluate(\Pi, B_i) + (i - 1) * scores)

8: survivors \leftarrow racing_elimination(\Pi, scores, i * b, \alpha, k)

9: end while

10: return survivors
```

# Algorithm 5 racing\_elimination

```
Require: Prompts \Pi, scores S, confidence level \alpha, top-k k
  1: z_{\alpha} \leftarrow \Phi^{-1}(1 - \alpha/2)
2: survivors \leftarrow \Pi
                                                                                                                        \triangleright Critical value
  3: for \pi_i \in \Pi do
             n_subst_better \leftarrow \sum_{j \neq i} \mathbf{1}_{\left[(s_j - s_i)\sqrt{a} > z_{\alpha}\right]} if n_subst_better \geq k then
  4:
  5:
                    survivors \leftarrow survivors \setminus \{\pi_i\}
                                                                                                                         \triangleright \text{ Eliminate } \pi_i
  6:
             end if
  7:
  8: end for
  9: return survivors
```