

Table A1: Average performance when the query budget is increased to 500 iterations. The performance increased as compared to Table 2 of the original paper. The gaps between EASE and baselines are still significant.

Tasks (10% noise)	Evo	Best-of-N	EASE
LR	70.0 $\pm$ 0.0	70.0 $\pm$ 0.0	78.3$\pm$1.7
LP-variant	73.3 $\pm$ 1.7	66.7 $\pm$ 1.7	78.3$\pm$1.7
AG News Remap	40.0 $\pm$ 0.0	50.0 $\pm$ 0.0	55.0$\pm$0.0
SST5 Reverse	40.0 $\pm$ 0.0	41.7 $\pm$ 1.7	51.7$\pm$1.7

Table A2: Average performance for tasks involving reasoning chains. The advantages of EASE are significant.

Tasks	Evo	Best-of-N	EASE
MATH (Hendrycks et al., 2021)	61.7 $\pm$ 1.7	60.0 $\pm$ 0.0	66.7$\pm$4.4
GSM8K (Cobbe et al., 2021)	70.0 $\pm$ 2.9	68.3 $\pm$ 1.7	75.0$\pm$2.9
AQuA-RAT (Ling et al., 2017)	46.7 $\pm$ 1.7	43.3 $\pm$ 1.7	50.0$\pm$2.9

Table A3: Extension of Appendix D.3 ablation for NeuralUCB and OT on real tasks. Evaluations are done on the below three open-ended real tasks.

Tasks	OT	NeuralUCB	EASE
auto_categorization	5.0 $\pm$ 0.0	30.0$\pm$0.0	30.0$\pm$0.0
taxonomy_animal	58.3 $\pm$ 1.7	86.7 $\pm$ 1.7	88.3$\pm$2.7
word_sorting	85.0 $\pm$ 0.0	90.0 $\pm$ 0.0	91.7$\pm$1.4

Table A4: Average performance on benchmarks used in the TEMPERA paper.

Tasks	Evo	Best-of-N	EASE
MR	95.0 $\pm$ 0.0	95.0 $\pm$ 0.0	96.7$\pm$1.7
Yelp P.	95.0$\pm$0.0	95.0$\pm$0.0	95.0$\pm$0.0
CR	100.0$\pm$0.0	100.0$\pm$0.0	100.0$\pm$0.0
MNLI	81.7$\pm$1.7	80.0 $\pm$ 0.0	81.7$\pm$1.7
MRPC	81.7$\pm$1.7	81.7$\pm$1.7	81.7$\pm$1.7

Table A5: Average performance on Meta’s newest open-weight model Llama-3.1-8B-Instruct.

Tasks	Evo	Best-of-N	EASE
LR	11.7 $\pm$ 1.7	15.0 $\pm$ 2.9	30.0$\pm$2.9
LP-variant	11.7 $\pm$ 1.7	15.0 $\pm$ 0.0	23.3$\pm$1.7
AG News Remap	31.7 $\pm$ 1.7	31.7 $\pm$ 1.7	33.3$\pm$3.3
SST5 Reverse	31.7 $\pm$ 3.3	30.0 $\pm$ 0.0	33.3$\pm$3.3

Table A6: Results for the setting that allows different number exemplars to be selected (i.e., allowing a range instead of a fixed k . EASE outperforms Best-of-N. We also observe high-performing prompts usually consist of more exemplars (i.e., larger average k).

Tasks	n	Max k	Best-of-N		EASE	
			Acc	Avg. best k	Acc	Avg. best k
LR	100	5	60.0 $\pm$ 2.9	5.0 $\pm$ 0.0	76.7$\pm$1.7	4.7 $\pm$ 0.3
LP-variant	100	5	60.0 $\pm$ 0.0	2.7 $\pm$ 0.7	75.0$\pm$2.9	5.0 $\pm$ 0.0
AG News Remap	100	5	31.7 $\pm$ 1.7	3.0 $\pm$ 0.0	48.3$\pm$1.7	4.7 $\pm$ 0.3
SST5 Reverse	100	5	31.7 $\pm$ 1.7	4.3 $\pm$ 0.7	43.3$\pm$1.7	5.0 $\pm$ 0.0
AG News Remap	1000	50	45.0 $\pm$ 2.9	25.0 $\pm$ 0.0	51.7$\pm$1.7	49.3 $\pm$ 0.7
SST5 Reverse	1000	50	60.0 $\pm$ 0.0	38.3 $\pm$ 8.8	61.7$\pm$1.7	41.3 $\pm$ 2.7

Table A7: The average performance of random exemplar in-context prompting in “out-of-distribution” tasks. It only achieves 17.6% accuracy on average, indicating that the model has little knowledge about the task. The performance gain from EASE is relatively large.

Task	Noise	Random	EASE	Gap
LR	0%	34.4 $\pm$ 0.0	81.7 $\pm$ 3.6	47.3
	10%	28.0 $\pm$ 0.1	73.3 $\pm$ 3.6	45.3
	30%	18.2 $\pm$ 0.1	78.3 $\pm$ 1.4	60.1
	50%	10.8 $\pm$ 0.1	71.7 $\pm$ 2.7	60.9
	70%	4.2 $\pm$ 0.1	66.7 $\pm$ 3.6	62.5
	90%	0.5 $\pm$ 0.0	53.3 $\pm$ 2.7	52.8
LP-variant	0%	46.3 $\pm$ 0.1	75.0 $\pm$ 0.0	28.7
	10%	44.1 $\pm$ 0.2	75.0 $\pm$ 2.4	30.9
	30%	36.0 $\pm$ 0.2	73.3 $\pm$ 1.4	37.3
	50%	27.5 $\pm$ 0.1	76.7 $\pm$ 2.7	49.2
	70%	16.8 $\pm$ 0.1	75.0 $\pm$ 0.0	58.2
	90%	3.6 $\pm$ 0.1	63.3 $\pm$ 1.4	59.7
AG News Remap	0%	9.2 $\pm$ 0.1	53.3 $\pm$ 3.6	44.1
	10%	8.6 $\pm$ 0.1	56.7 $\pm$ 2.7	48.1
	30%	8.1 $\pm$ 0.1	51.7 $\pm$ 1.4	43.6
	50%	7.5 $\pm$ 0.0	56.7 $\pm$ 1.4	49.2
	70%	7.0 $\pm$ 0.1	51.7 $\pm$ 1.4	44.7
	90%	6.8 $\pm$ 0.1	55.0 $\pm$ 2.4	48.2
SST5 Reverse	0%	18.8 $\pm$ 0.0	50.0 $\pm$ 0.0	31.2
	10%	18.2 $\pm$ 0.1	50.0 $\pm$ 0.0	31.8
	30%	17.5 $\pm$ 0.1	41.7 $\pm$ 3.6	24.2
	50%	16.9 $\pm$ 0.1	43.3 $\pm$ 1.4	26.4
	70%	16.8 $\pm$ 0.1	45.0 $\pm$ 2.4	28.2
	90%	17.3 $\pm$ 0.0	31.7 $\pm$ 1.4	14.4
Mean		17.6	60.4	42.8

Table A8: The average performance of random exemplar in-context prompting in Instruction Induction (II) tasks. It achieves 64.7% accuracy on average, indicating that the model has much knowledge about the task. The performance gain from EASE is relatively small.

Task	Random	EASE	Gap
active_to_passive	100.0 $\pm$ 0.0	100.0 $\pm$ 0.0	0.0
antonyms	79.3 $\pm$ 0.0	90.0 $\pm$ 0.0	10.7
auto_categorization	5.4 $\pm$ 0.1	30.0 $\pm$ 0.0	24.6
diff	6.5 $\pm$ 0.0	100.0 $\pm$ 0.0	93.5
first_word_letter	100.0 $\pm$ 0.0	100.0 $\pm$ 0.0	0.0
larger_animal	83.3 $\pm$ 0.1	100.0 $\pm$ 0.0	16.7
letters_list	100.0 $\pm$ 0.0	100.0 $\pm$ 0.0	0.0
negation	94.7 $\pm$ 0.0	95.0 $\pm$ 0.0	0.3
num_to_verbal	100.0 $\pm$ 0.0	100.0 $\pm$ 0.0	0.0
object_counting	52.9 $\pm$ 0.1	73.3 $\pm$ 1.4	20.4
orthography_starts_with	50.7 $\pm$ 0.1	78.3 $\pm$ 1.4	27.6
rhymes	56.7 $\pm$ 0.2	100.0 $\pm$ 0.0	43.3
second_word_letter	23.8 $\pm$ 0.1	50.0 $\pm$ 0.0	26.2
sentence_similarity	20.5 $\pm$ 0.2	56.7 $\pm$ 1.4	36.2
sentiment	89.8 $\pm$ 0.2	100.0 $\pm$ 0.0	10.2
singular_to_plural	100.0 $\pm$ 0.0	100.0 $\pm$ 0.0	0.0
sum	12.5 $\pm$ 0.0	100.0 $\pm$ 0.0	87.5
synonyms	21.3 $\pm$ 0.1	30.0 $\pm$ 0.0	8.7
taxonomy_animal	51.5 $\pm$ 0.2	88.3 $\pm$ 2.7	36.8
translation_en-de	84.4 $\pm$ 0.0	90.0 $\pm$ 0.0	5.6
translation_en-es	94.1 $\pm$ 0.1	100.0 $\pm$ 0.0	5.9
translation_en-fr	78.7 $\pm$ 0.0	88.3 $\pm$ 1.4	9.6
word_sorting	84.5 $\pm$ 0.1	91.7 $\pm$ 1.4	7.2
word_unscrambling	61.5 $\pm$ 0.1	78.3 $\pm$ 2.7	16.8
Mean		64.7	20.3