
How to Auto-optimize Prompts for Domain Tasks? Adaptive Prompting and Reasoning through Evolutionary Domain Knowledge Adaptation

Yang Zhao Pu Wang Hao Frank Yang *

Johns Hopkins University

{yzhao229, pwang80, haofrankyang}@jhu.edu

Project page: <https://miemieyang.github.io/EGOPrompt/>

Abstract

Designing optimal prompts and reasoning processes for large language models (LLMs) on domain-specific tasks is both necessary and challenging in real-world applications. Determining how to integrate domain knowledge, enhance reasoning efficiency, and even provide domain experts with refined knowledge integration hints are particularly crucial yet unresolved tasks. In this research, we propose Evolutionary Graph Optimization for Prompting (EGO-Prompt), an automated framework to designing better prompts, efficient reasoning processes and providing enhanced causal-informed process. EGO-Prompt begins with a general prompt and fault-tolerant initial Semantic Causal Graph (SCG) descriptions, constructed by human experts, which is then automatically refined and optimized to guide LLM reasoning. Recognizing that expert-defined SCGs may be partial or imperfect and that their optimal integration varies across LLMs, EGO-Prompt integrates a novel causal-guided textual gradient process in two steps: first, generating nearly deterministic reasoning guidance from the SCG for each instance, and second, adapting the LLM to effectively utilize the guidance alongside the original input. The iterative optimization algorithm further refines both the SCG and the reasoning mechanism using textual gradients with ground-truth. We tested the framework on real-world public health, transportation and human behavior tasks. EGO-Prompt achieves 7.32%–12.61% higher F1 than cutting-edge methods, and allows small models to reach the performance of larger models at under 20% of the original cost. It also outputs a refined, domain-specific SCG that improves interpretability.

1 Introduction

Foundation models, particularly Large Language Models (LLMs), are increasingly being adapted for domain-specific tasks, providing reasoning and decision support across real-world applications, such as public health [1–3], transportation [4–7], medical treatment [8, 9], and robotics [10–12]. For these models to be used effectively in particular domains, additional task adaptations are usually necessary. Prompt engineering has emerged as the primary, flexible, and cost-effective method for this adaptation [4, 13–16]. In this process, domain experts generally incorporate specialized knowledge and priors into prompt design by structuring the prompts and excluding irrelevant information to enhance the reasoning process. However, experts can also inadvertently introduce assumptions, mechanisms, even biases in prompt engineering [17, 18]. Therefore, critical questions arise – **how can we optimize prompts and reasoning procedures, and discover better combinations that integrate structured domain knowledge for domain-specific tasks? Furthermore, how can we automate this prompt-and-reasoning optimization?**

*Corresponding author.

Seeking the potentially better prompt and reasoning procedure for domain-specific tasks without fine-tuning involves three challenges: **1) Domain-knowledge Adaptation** involves organizing extensive domain knowledge in textual form to maximize task performance while minimizing bias [19, 20]. For example, in traffic crash modeling [4, 21], LLMs must consider a broad range of textual inputs, including driver attributes, vehicle characteristics, infrastructure conditions, environmental factors, and driving behaviors, etc. Although these elements are represented in text, factors such as word choice, linguistic description, level of detail, and paragraph organization can influence how effectively the model learns and reasons about the domain. **2) Optimal Domain-adaptive Reasoning** recognizes that even with high-quality textual descriptions, physical priors still play a crucial role. Domain-specific conditional distributions and causal graphs strongly influence the reasoning process and performance [22]. Leveraging these priors can further guide the reasoning procedure, resulting in a more efficient overall process [23]. Without explicit guidance, LLMs may overlook key domain relationships [19], leading to hallucinations or outputs lacking verifiable evidence. To bridge the gap between a model’s general reasoning abilities and the domain-specific priors needed for robust inference, it is crucial to incorporate causal structures and other form of domain representations. **3) Task Evolutionary** then considers whether LLMs can continue refining their reasoning once domain knowledge and causal relations are effectively integrated. For instance, can active knowledge or ground truth data help a domain-adaptive prompt match or surpass state-of-the-art legacy models? If so, the resulting improved domain knowledge and causal relations can further support evolving domain knowledge and uncover hidden factors, thereby reinvigorating expert-driven research.

In response, a promising approach is to leverage graph-based structural domain knowledge to guide both prompt design and the reasoning process [24]. Graph data offers explicit representations of entities and their conditional relationships, capturing key domain features correlations, whether factual (e.g., alcohol involvement increases crash severity regardless of consumption level) or causal (e.g., how alcohol consumption, road-surface conditions, and other factors jointly affect crash severity). By integrating these explicit relational structures, LLMs can better connect textual descriptions to domain-specific causal dependencies, reducing the likelihood of overlooked relationships or unsupported conclusions. Recent work has explored knowledge and causal graphs to enhance LLM reasoning [24–26], often via Retrieval-Augmented Generation (RAG) [27–29], which retrieves relevant subgraphs or facts to guide the model during inference [24, 25]. While this line of research is promising, there remain critical challenges for adaptive reasoning:

1. **Limited and Incomplete Domain Knowledge and Graphs.** In real-world settings, domain experts often have access only to partial knowledge or graphs for prompt design and reasoning [30]. However, many methods assume the availability of fully curated knowledge or causal graphs [26, 31], which is an unrealistic and task-inflexible requirement (e.g., in RAG scenarios where no relevant knowledge graphs exist).
2. **Interpretability and Knowledge Refinement.** Information in external graph databases may be inaccurate, yet existing methods often treat it as a ground-truth reference, potentially leading to performance degradation [18, 32, 33].
3. **Fixed External Priors.** Many current methods depend on fixed, external graph databases that can lack coverage or fail to actively evolve with the domain, limiting their adaptability to emerging contexts or newly available information [24–26].
4. **Automated Evolution.** In existing methods, the interaction is typically one-way: external knowledge is used to strengthen LLM reasoning, but the model does not feed back corrections or enhancements to the experts. As a result, experts must invest additional effort to extract new insights from the model’s outputs [24–26].

Given these constraints, effectively adapting LLMs to novel tasks often requires an active process of graph integration and evolution for improved prompt design and reasoning. In this research, we propose **EGO-Prompt** (Evolutionary Graph Optimization for Prompt) for evolutionarily incorporating domain structural knowledge into more effective reasoning in LLMs. As shown in Figure 1, we begin by representing expert knowledge as an active, expert-constructed Semantic Causal Graph (SCG) $\mathcal{G}$. EGO-Prompt then decomposes the graph-guided reasoning process into two stages: 1) Generating instance-specific reasoning guidance $z^*(x, \mathcal{G})$ derived from the SCG $\mathcal{G}$ and the input data x , subject to output constraints, and 2) Performing reasoning conditioned on this guidance. This process can be abstracted as the following equation:




Figure 1: Overview of the proposed EGO-Prompt. (a) LLMs often struggle with domain-specific tasks due to the optimal prompt design and domain knowledge gap. Existing methods rely on the external database or established graph. In comparison, EGO-Prompt evolutionarily incorporates expert knowledge with minimal cost. (b) We represent external knowledge as a graph-based structure. A graph-enhanced prompt is then generated to guide the LLM’s reasoning. Both the graph and the prompt are iteratively optimized using textual gradients from ground-truth data.

$$p(y | x, \mathcal{G}) = p(y | x, \overbrace{z^*(x, \mathcal{G})}^{\text{Instance-specific Reasoning Guidance}}) \quad (1)$$

where y is the target reasoning result. The derivation is provided in Appendix 8.1. With this reasoning workflow, both the SCG and the reasoning process are then jointly refined through an evolutionary optimization algorithm that learns factual patterns from ground-truth data. This dynamic adaptation not only enhances the model’s reasoning accuracy but also improves the quality of the SCG and its alignment with the prompt. Experiments across three domain-specific tasks demonstrate that EGO-Prompt consistently outperforms previous methods, achieving an average F1 improvement of 7.32%–12.61% over the strongest baseline. Moreover, EGO-Prompt enhances the performance of lightweight models such as GPT-4o mini, surpassing reasoning models like o4-mini and o1, despite their inference costs being 6 to 140 times higher.

2 Related Works

Generalized Multi-step Reasoning. Currently, enhancing the multi-step reasoning capabilities of LLMs is primarily achieved through two turning-free approaches [34]: 1) In-Context Learning (ICL) [35–37] and Chain-of-Thought (CoT) [14, 15, 38], 2) Prompt Optimization [39, 40]. The open-ended nature of the reasoning space in ICL makes identifying optimal demonstrations and paths challenging [38, 41]. Prompt optimization aims to find the best prompt to guide LLMs towards better reasoning, with Automatic Prompt Optimization (APO) automating this process through candidate generation, evaluation, and filtering [13, 42]. A recent APO framework, TextGrad [16], draws inspiration from deep learning optimization methods (e.g., PyTorch [43]). However, it is highly prone to overfitting the training set after several iterations, where the adjusted prompt focuses on case-by-case details rather than general feature distribution.

Recent works have also explored using Reinforcement Learning (RL) to edit and optimize prompts for LLM reasoning [44–52]. TEMPERA [46] employs an attention-based policy model to edit prompts for LLMs and uses the logits difference between the LLM’s predictions and the ground truth [45] as the reward function to fine-tune the policy. This approach effectively improves performance by producing

higher-quality prompts. However, such methods rely on access to the model’s logits during training. Recent studies have extended this RL framework to black-box LLMs by adopting logit-free reward designs [50, 49]. While these RL methods can be more stable after careful fine-tuning compared to APO methods (thanks to their numerical optimization framework) they still require fine-tuning a policy model. Importantly, the policy model must be reasonably strong, ideally not much weaker than the target LLM (typically 7B parameters or larger), which imposes substantial demands on fine-tuning expertise and computational resources. In our tasks, the motivation is to leverage available LLMs for better adaptation to domain-specific applications (e.g., public health, transportation), where end users are often domain experts with limited access to large-scale computation.

Table 1: Taxonomy of related literature. The $\checkmark$ represents the technique is used or implemented by the method. The $\triangle$ means the method needs manual designed prompts as seeds to start the optimization process.

	Prompt Engineering		Domain Knowledge Database		Graph-Enhanced Reasoning	
	Manual Optimization	Automated Optimization	Knowledge Reference	Active Knowledge	Reasoning Guidance	Graph Correction
RAG [27]	$\checkmark$		$\checkmark$			
ICL [35]	$\checkmark$					
Zero-Shot-CoT [14]	$\checkmark$					
APE [13]	$\triangle$	$\checkmark$				
ProTeGi [42]	$\triangle$	$\checkmark$				
CoK [31]	$\checkmark$		$\checkmark$			
Li et al. [24]	$\checkmark$		$\checkmark$			
RoG [25]	$\checkmark$		$\checkmark$		$\checkmark$	
PHP [37]	$\checkmark$					
G^2 -Reasoner[26]	$\checkmark$		$\checkmark$		$\checkmark$	
TextGrad [16]	$\triangle$	$\checkmark$				
Luo et al. [53]	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$		$\checkmark$	
EGO-Prompt	$\triangle$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$

Domain Adaptive Reasoning. LLMs often need external knowledge for effective reasoning in applicable or evolving domains (e.g., robotics [10], public health modeling [1], urban planning [54, 55], traffic safety [4, 56], autonomous driving [57, 58]). Retrieval-Augmented Generation (RAG) [27] is one of the solutions by retrieving relevant information from a corpus based on the input query. **However, suitable text corpora are not always available, and simply incorporating retrieved text does not guarantee improved reasoning processes [59].** To address this, structured knowledge representations like **Knowledge Graphs and Causal Graphs** offer promising alternatives. Knowledge Graph can explicitly represent entities and relations, enabling more structured reasoning guidance compared to raw text retrieval. Existing methods focus on retrieve related paths from knowledge graph database to guide LLMs’ reasoning [24, 31]. Causal Graph, in particular, offer detailed causal information distinct from general KGs [53, 60]. Most existing mentioned graph integration methods are static, utilizing pre-defined graph database, which limits the generalization capabilities of LLMs and may introduce biases originating from domain-specific graphs (see Table 1). Therefore, the primary objective of this research is to develop an evolutionary information integration approach that organically merges structural graph priors with the flexibility of textual information, thereby enabling an optimal reasoning process for real-world domain applications.

3 Prompt Optimization through Textual Gradients

Textual gradients is one type of automatic prompt optimization method that leverages the natural language feedback generated by LLMs to iteratively refine and enhance various components of AI systems [42, 16]. The core idea is to emulate the forward-backward learning paradigm in deep learning frameworks such as PyTorch [43], enabling the system to update prompts through a loop of evaluation and revision. The entire process can be divided into a textual forward and a textual backward phase [61]:

Textual Forward. For a classification task, given a system prompt $\mathcal{P}_{\text{sys}}$, input data x_i , and its corresponding label y_i , the forward model $\mathcal{M}_F$ generates a prediction $\hat{y}_i = \mathcal{M}_F(x_i; \mathcal{P}_{\text{sys}})$.

Textual Backward. Distinct from traditional numerical learning frameworks, the textual gradients method [42, 16] leverages a text-based loss function $\mathcal{L}$ to evaluate the alignment between the prediction $\hat{y}_i$ and the ground truth y_i . For example:

$$\mathcal{L}(\hat{y}_i, y_i) = \begin{cases} \text{"Prediction matches the ground truth."}, & \text{if } \hat{y}_i = y_i \\ \text{"Prediction does not match."}, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

In conventional deep learning frameworks such as PyTorch [43], gradients are computed numerically and used to update parameters via gradient descent. In contrast, textual gradients emulate this process by using LLMs to generate natural language feedback that guides prompt revision such as The prompt can be improved by [strategies]. The textual gradient of $\mathcal{P}_{\text{sys}}$ with respect to the loss is defined as:

$$\begin{aligned}\nabla_{\mathcal{P}_{\text{sys}}} \mathcal{L}_i &= \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_i}{\partial \mathcal{P}_{\text{sys}}} = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_i}{\partial \hat{y}_i} \cdot \frac{\partial \hat{y}_i}{\partial \mathcal{P}_{\text{sys}}} \quad (\text{Chain Rule}) \\ &= \mathcal{M}_B \left(\mathcal{P}_{\text{sys}}, \hat{y}_i, \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_i}{\partial \hat{y}_i} \right) \quad (\text{Implementation}),\end{aligned}\tag{3}$$

where $\mathcal{M}_B$ denotes the **textual backward engine**, typically stronger than the forward model $\mathcal{M}_F$. The system prompt for the $\mathcal{M}_B$ is omitted here. The quantity $\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_i}{\partial \hat{y}_i} = \mathcal{M}_B(\hat{y}_i, \mathcal{L}_i)$ represents the feedback generated by the backward engine, indicating the improvement direction for the predictions. This gradient follows from the chain rule and can be accumulated across iterations by concatenating past gradients [16]. The updated system prompt $\mathcal{P}'_{\text{sys}}$ is then obtained by applying the textual gradient:

$$\mathcal{P}'_{\text{sys}} = \mathcal{M}_B(\mathcal{P}_{\text{sys}}, \nabla_{\mathcal{P}_{\text{sys}}} \mathcal{L}_i)\tag{4}$$

4 Domain-Specific Reasoning with Expert Knowledge Guidance

4.1 Human-guided Graph Initialization

Textualization of Raw Data. Domain-specific tasks often involve knowledge and information in heterogeneous formats, such as numerical, textual and tabular data. To enable LLMs to process the structured data, a common first step is to construct manually designed templates that convert relevant information into textual prompts [1, 4]. Prompt 4.1 shows an example of partial prompt used in crash prediction task. The full prompt can be found in the Appendix 8.7.

Prompt 4.1: Organized Prompt Example of Crash Prediction Task

Predict the crash severity based on the crash event details [...]
[Time] The crash occurred on April 29, 2022 at hour 16.
[Dynamic Conditions] The light condition is Daylight. The weather condition is Clear. [...]

Graph Establishment. To better leveraging the reasoning process of LLMs with causal information, we propose the **Semantic Causal Graph (SCG)** as a Directed Acyclic Graph (DAG), where nodes represent entities or events extracted from the organized prompt, and edges denote causally-related semantic relations inferred from expert knowledge. Since this graph is not used for strict causal inference, we do not require it to satisfy the causal Markov assumption or the faithfulness assumption [62]. Formally, SCG for a domain-specific task can be represented as $\mathcal{G} = \{(n_i, r_{ij}, n_j) \mid n_i, n_j \in \mathcal{N}, r_{ij} \in \mathcal{R}\}$, where $\mathcal{N}$ is the set of semantic nodes and $\mathcal{R}$ is the set of semantic causal relations. Each node $n_i \in \mathcal{N}$ corresponds to a information block extracted from the organized prompt. Each edge $r_{ij} \in \mathcal{R}$ denotes a directed causal relation from n_i to n_j , capturing the semantic causal link between them as expressed in natural language. In EGO-Prompt, the initial construction of the SCG relies on expert knowledge or external data analysis.

The biggest difference between the proposed work and most existing works is that the original input of the SCG does not need to be perfectly accurate or complete, given the evolutionary process of graph growth. Automatic correction will be involved and discussed in the Section 6.2. Below is an example SCG prompt for the crash prediction task and a full SCG is shown in the Appendix 8.8.

Prompt 4.2: SCG Example for Crash Prediction Task

CAUSAL STATEMENT 1: **[Person Status]** affects **[Severity]**.
The driver’s Blood Alcohol Content (BAC) significantly increases the probability of fatal crashes. [...]




Figure 2: The optimization process of EGO-Prompt. The graph model generates reasoning guidance from the SCG and input prompt, which the prediction model uses to produce an output. Textual gradients are used to update the system prompt and refine the SCG through targeted operations.

4.2 Reasoning with Instance-specific Guidance

Given the expert-constructed SCG $\mathcal{G}$, our goal is to maximize the likelihood of the ground-truth label y conditioned on the input x and $\mathcal{G}$, i.e. $p(y \mid x, \mathcal{G})$. Because $\mathcal{G}$ is a global description that (i) always contains information irrelevant to the current case and (ii) can be partially missing for a particular instance (e.g. the BAC field may be None in Prompt 4.2), feeding it directly to the predictor is sub-optimal. Instead, as shown in Eq. (1), we first distill instance-specific reasoning guidance, denoted $z^*(x, \mathcal{G})$, from the graph $\mathcal{G}$ based on the input x . This guidance is then used for predicting the final results. As shown in Fig. 2, a graph description model $\mathcal{M}_F$ produces the reasoning guidance z_i^* for each input x_i :

$$z_i^* = \mathcal{M}_F(x_i; \mathcal{P}_{\text{cau}}, \mathcal{G}), \quad (5)$$

where $\mathcal{P}_{\text{cau}}$ is a causal-system prompt steering $\mathcal{M}_F$ to ground its deterministic generation process with x_i and $\mathcal{G}$. The predictor $\mathcal{M}_{F'}$ then reasons jointly over x_i and z_i^* :

$$\hat{y}_i = \mathcal{M}_{F'}(x_i, z_i^*; \mathcal{P}_{\text{sys}}), \quad (6)$$

with $\mathcal{P}_{\text{sys}}$ instructing $\mathcal{M}_{F'}$ to integrate the original description and the generated reasoning guidance. This two-stage factorization filters out extraneous or missing details in $\mathcal{G}$ while preserving its causal structure, yielding cleaner and more informative context for the final prediction (see Section 6.1).

4.3 Optimizing SCG and Reasoning Process Through Textual Gradients

Optimization through Textual Gradients. Ideally, a well-constructed SCG and an effective system prompt can substantially enhance the model’s reasoning process and predictive performance. However, the performance may vary due to two issues: (1) the SCG is incomplete or flawed, and (2) the system prompt fails to guide the model effectively. To address this, we innovated textual gradients method with graph priors [16, 42] to update flawed SCGs and optimize the system prompt, thereby enabling more effective SCG-based reasoning. We define the loss function $\mathcal{L}_i = \mathcal{L}(\hat{y}_i, y_i)$ similar to Eq. (2) to evaluate the difference between the final prediction $\hat{y}_i$ and the ground truth y_i . To improve the system prompt, we compute its textual gradients $\nabla_{\mathcal{P}_{\text{sys}}} \mathcal{L}_i$ using the chain rule in Eq. (3), which estimates how changes in the system prompt $\mathcal{P}_{\text{sys}}$ influence the loss through the model’s output. The textual gradients for the SCG $\mathcal{G}$ and the causal system prompt $\mathcal{P}_{\text{cau}}$ can be formulated as:

$$\nabla_{\mathcal{G}} \mathcal{L}_i = \nabla_{z_i^*} \mathcal{L}_i \cdot \frac{\partial z_i^*}{\partial \mathcal{G}}, \nabla_{\mathcal{P}_{\text{cau}}} \mathcal{L}_i = \nabla_{z_i^*} \mathcal{L}_i \cdot \frac{\partial z_i^*}{\partial \mathcal{P}_{\text{cau}}} \quad (7)$$

where $\nabla_{z_i^*} \mathcal{L}_i = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_i}{\partial \hat{y}_i} \cdot \frac{\partial \hat{y}_i}{\partial z_i^*}$ is the textual gradients for the reasoning guidance z_i^* .

With textual gradients, the system prompt, SCG, and causal system prompt can be updated based on Eq. (4). As shown in Figure 2, SCG refinement is constrained to three operations: (1) **Add** a node from the candidate set $\mathcal{N}$ with its causal description and links; (2) **Delete** a node and its associated descriptions; and (3) **Edit** existing descriptions which is incorrect or unnecessary.

Iterative Optimization. The goal of the proposed optimization is to identify the optimal system prompt $\mathcal{P}_{\text{sys}}$, SCG $\mathcal{G}$, and causal system prompt $\mathcal{P}_{\text{cau}}$. These components are co-optimized by two optimizers in our framework (see Figure 2), each governed by distinct update rules. Performing all updates with a single LLM in a single iteration may lead to suboptimal performance due to conflicting update signals. Therefore, we adopt an iterative optimization strategy that updates the SCG and prompt components separately. One component is updated only when it yields an individual performance improvement while the other component is fixed. We perform a fixed number of optimization steps per task. The full optimization procedures are shown in Algorithm 1.

Algorithm 1 EGO-Prompt Iterative Optimization

Require: $P_{\text{sys}}^0, P_{\text{cau}}^0, \mathcal{G}^0$, dataset $\mathcal{D} = \{(x_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^N$, steps T

- 1: $P_{\text{sys}}, P_{\text{cau}}, \mathcal{G} \leftarrow P_{\text{sys}}^0, P_{\text{cau}}^0, \mathcal{G}^0$
- 2: Test on validation set and get F1 $f \leftarrow F_1(P_{\text{sys}}, P_{\text{cau}}, \mathcal{G}; \mathcal{D})$
- 3: **for** $t = 1$ **to** T **do**
- 4: Sample $(x_i, y_i) \sim \mathcal{D}$; derive reasoning guidance z_i^* (Eq. (5))
- 5: $\hat{y}_i \leftarrow \text{Eq. (6)}; \mathcal{L}_i \leftarrow \text{Eq. (2)}$
- 6: $(\nabla_{\text{sys}}, \nabla_{\text{cau}}, \nabla_{\text{SCG}}) \leftarrow \text{Eqs. (3) and (7)}$
- 7: **Stage 1: Update system prompt**
- 8: $P'_{\text{sys}} \leftarrow \text{Apply}(P_{\text{sys}}, \nabla_{\text{sys}})$
- 9: $f' \leftarrow F_1(P'_{\text{sys}}, P_{\text{cau}}, \mathcal{G})$
- 10: **if** $f' > f$ **then** $P_{\text{sys}}, f \leftarrow P'_{\text{sys}}, f'$ **end if**
- 11: **Stage 2: Update SCG & causal prompt**
- 12: $P_{\text{cau}} \leftarrow \text{Apply}(P_{\text{cau}}, \nabla_{\text{cau}}); \mathcal{G}' \leftarrow \text{Apply}(\mathcal{G}, \nabla_{\text{SCG}})$
- 13: $f' \leftarrow F_1(P_{\text{sys}}, P_{\text{cau}}, \mathcal{G}')$
- 14: **if** $f' > f$ **then** $(P_{\text{cau}}, \mathcal{G}, f) \leftarrow (P'_{\text{cau}}, \mathcal{G}', f')$ **end if**
- 15: **end for**
- 16: **return** $(P_{\text{sys}}, \mathcal{G}, P_{\text{cau}})$

5 Experiments on Three Domain Tasks

Experimental Objectives for Testing the Proposed EGO Prompt. We evaluate the proposed EGO Prompt based on three main criteria: 1) **Performance Improvement:** compare the performance of EGO Prompt with existing prompt-optimization frameworks to determine whether it yields better results. 2) **Generalization:** assess how well EGO Prompt generalizes across a wide range of real-world tasks on diverse LLM model zoos [63, 64]. 3) **Efficiency and Cost-Effectiveness:** examine whether a smaller-parameter, lower-reasoning-capacity model (e.g., GPT-4o mini) can achieve comparable performance to a larger model (e.g., o4-mini or o1) after optimization using EGO Prompt. Measure the resulting cost savings relative to the performance level of the larger model.

5.1 Datasets for Public Health, Transportation, and Human Behavior Modeling

To assess the generalization and cross-domain adaptivity of EGO Prompt, we evaluate its performance using three real-world applications with publicly available datasets: Pandemic [1], TrafficSafe [4], and Swissmetro [65]. These datasets span the domains of public health, traffic safety, and human behavior, respectively. LLMs have been extensively utilized in these domains due to their capability to interpret complex textual inputs (e.g., crash reports) and generalize knowledge across diverse scenarios (e.g., from COVID-19 to future pandemics). Specifically, as shown in table in Table 2:

- 1) **Public Health - Pandemic Hospitalization Dataset** [1, 66] consists of textual descriptions for forecasting pandemic hospitalization trends. It is constructed from CDC COVID-19 reports [67], reformulated into human-designed prompts. Each instance includes demographic information, COVID-19 case counts, vaccination rates, and hospitalization patterns for individual states, with the target variable being the hospitalization trend for the subsequent week.
- 2) **Crash Modeling for Transportation – TrafficSafe Dataset** [4, 68–71] comprises structured textual records derived from real-world crash reports across the United States [72]. Each entry provides details about crash time, location, weather conditions, road surface conditions, vehicle maneuvers, and driver behaviors, paired with the corresponding crash severity outcomes.
- 3) **Human Behavior Modeling – Travel Mode Choice Dataset** [65, 73] originates from a stated-preference survey conducted in Switzerland. It presents respondents with hypothetical travel scenarios, prompting them to choose

between Swissmetro, traditional trains, and cars based on various factors including travel time, cost, and comfort.

Table 2: Overview of the Datasets Employed in This Study.

Dataset	Domain	Prediction Targets	Domain Task labels	Dataset Size
Pandemic [1]	Public Health	Pandemic Trends	substantial decreasing, moderate decreasing, stable, moderate increasing, substantial increasing	5,200
TrafficSafe [4]	Traffic Safety	Traffic Crash Severity	no apparent injury, minor injury, serious injury, fatal	16,188
Swissmetro [65]	Human Behavior	Travel Mode Choice	swissmetro, car, train	10,728

5.2 Settings

Experimental Settings. Following prior work on automatic prompt optimization [16, 42], we randomly sample a balanced subset from each dataset: 100 instances for validation, 100 for testing, and the rest for training. Due to the inherent stochasticity of LLM API calls (see Section 8.5), we repeat each experiment three times and report the best result to represent the achievable upper-bound performance under identical settings (same random seed). We report weighted F1 and accuracy, using a batch size 3 to perform 6 to 12 optimization steps per task.

Models. We use gpt-4o-2024-08-06 [63] as the backward engine $\mathcal{M}_B$ across all experiments, as it is considered more powerful than the forward engine [74]. For the forward engine $\mathcal{M}_F$, we evaluate several mainstream commercial models [63, 64], including gpt-4o-mini-2024-07-18, gpt-4.1-mini-2025-04-14, gemini-2.0-flash, and gemini-2.5-flash-preview-04-17. The graph description model $\mathcal{M}_{F'}$ is always set to be the same as $\mathcal{M}_F$.

Baseline Methods. We compare our approach against two APO methods: 1) **ProTeGi** [42]. ProTeGi is the first framework to use natural language “gradients” to generate feedback for prompt optimization, combining beam search with bandit-based selection to identify the optimal prompts. 2) **TextGrad** [16]. This method is introduced in Section 3. We further incorporate three prompt engineering methods: 3) **Zero-Shot-CoT** approach [14], which enables step-by-step reasoning without in-context examples; 4) **PHP** [37], which progressively integrates historical model predictions as hints appended to the prompt to guide reasoning; and 5) **Auto-CoT** [75], which is an automatic prompting method that generates diverse CoT demonstrations using LLMs. RAG-based methods are excluded due to the lack of accessible domain-specific graph databases for our datasets. We also include the 6) **Expert Organized Prompt**, which uses the original input (specifically, the initial x_i and $\mathcal{P}_{\text{sys}}$) to make direct predictions.

5.3 Results Comparison and Summary

Comparison with Cutting-edge Baselines. Table 3 shows the performance of EGO-Prompt compared to baselines on the Pandemic, TrafficSafe, and Travel Mode Choice datasets. EGO-Prompt consistently outperforms all methods, achieving average F1 gains of 7.32% with GPT-4o mini, 12.61% with Gemini 2.5 Flash, and 9.07% with GPT-5-mini over the best baseline. In contrast, some methods such as TextGrad show limited or even negative improvement in certain cases (e.g., Pandemic with GPT-4o mini, F1 score only improve from 0.347 to 0.359). This is primarily attributed to the tendency of these methods to overfit the validation set (e.g., potentially generating overly long prompts with TextGrad), leading to a performance decline on the test set.

Generalization. EGO-Prompt also brings consistent improvements across different backbone models. As shown in Figure 3, it enhances performance on all three tasks when using GPT-4o mini, GPT-4.1 mini, GPT-5o mini, Gemini 2.0 Flash, and Gemini 2.5 Flash as the forward engine. Specifically, EGO-Prompt achieves relative F1 score gains ranging from 13.3% to 37.0% compared to the organized prompt baseline, showing robust generalization capability across both models and domains. See Appendix 8.2 for more results for commercial and open-source models.

Efficiency and Cost-Effectiveness. EGO-Prompt enables smaller LLMs to rival or exceed the accuracy of larger, costlier models. As illustrated in Figure 3, EGO-Prompt effectively boosts the average performance of compact models, matching the effectiveness of the reasoning model o4-mini. Moreover, as shown in Figure 4, the mean inference cost per 100 samples using EGO-Prompt is only \$0.057, substantially lower than that of o4-mini (\$0.33) and other reasoning models.

Table 3: Performance comparison with baselines.

Forward Engine	Method	Venue/Journal	Pandemic		TrafficSafe		Mode Choice		Mean F1	
			Acc	F1	Acc	F1	Acc	F1	Value	Imp.
GPT-4o mini	Organized Prompt	—	0.360	0.347	0.300	0.232	0.459	0.406	0.328	—
	Zero-Shot-CoT [14]	NeurIPS'22	0.370	0.361	0.280	0.221	0.494	0.435	0.339	3.2%
	ProTeGi [42]	EMNLP'23	0.370	0.361	0.370	0.304	0.529	0.481	0.382	16.3%
	Auto-CoT [75]	ICLR'23	0.380	0.352	0.320	0.220	0.447	0.462	0.345	5.0%
	PHP [37]	ICLR'24	0.330	0.327	0.320	0.268	0.376	0.370	0.322	-2.0%
	TextGrad [16]	Nature'25	0.380	0.359	0.300	0.243	0.506	0.432	0.345	5.0%
	EGO-Prompt	This work	0.410	0.399	0.380	0.333	0.506	0.498	0.410	24.9% ²
Gemini 2.5 Flash	Organized Prompt	—	0.470	0.470	0.340	0.319	0.459	0.392	0.394	—
	Zero-Shot-CoT [14]	NeurIPS'22	0.490	0.490	0.400	0.390	0.482	0.398	0.426	8.1%
	ProTeGi [42]	EMNLP'23	0.470	0.482	0.420	0.400	0.494	0.425	0.435	10.6%
	Auto-CoT [75]	ICLR'23	0.380	0.352	0.340	0.230	0.447	0.462	0.348	6.0%
	PHP [37]	ICLR'24	0.520	0.515	0.360	0.334	0.494	0.436	0.428	8.6%
	TextGrad [16]	Nature'25	0.470	0.483	0.380	0.374	0.494	0.428	0.428	8.6%
	EGO-Prompt	This work	0.540	0.546	0.430	0.428	0.518	0.499	0.491	24.6%
GPT-5-mini	Organized Prompt	—	0.420	0.387	0.330	0.265	0.435	0.435	0.362	—
	Zero-Shot-CoT [14]	NeurIPS'22	0.430	0.415	0.330	0.281	0.424	0.428	0.375	3.4%
	ProTeGi [42]	EMNLP'23	0.420	0.413	0.320	0.267	0.471	0.454	0.378	4.4%
	Auto-CoT [75]	ICLR'23	0.410	0.408	0.310	0.280	0.506	0.470	0.386	6.6%
	PHP [37]	ICLR'24	0.430	0.397	0.320	0.240	0.435	0.431	0.356	-1.8%
	TextGrad [16]	Nature'25	0.430	0.415	0.250	0.230	0.494	0.485	0.377	4.0%
	EGO-Prompt	This work	0.460	0.448	0.340	0.305	0.529	0.511	0.421	16.3%




Figure 3: Mean F1 Score Across 3 Datasets.




Figure 4: Mean F1 Score and Mean Price with Reasoning Models.

6 Analysis and Insights

6.1 Ablation Study

Instance-specific Reasoning Guidance. The instance-specific reasoning guidance mechanism in Eq. (1) plays a critical role in enhancing optimization effectiveness. As shown in Table 4, removing the decomposition process in Eq. (1) and using a single model leads to noticeably worse performance. Specifically, the F1 scores across the three tasks drop from 0.399, 0.333, and 0.498 to 0.397, 0.247, and 0.445, respectively.

Model Components. We conduct an ablation study to evaluate the contribution of the graph description model (with variables $\mathcal{G}$ and $\mathcal{P}_{\text{cau}}$) and the prediction model (with variable $\mathcal{P}_{\text{sys}}$) to the overall performance. As shown in Table 5, our full framework, where both components are used and updated during optimization, achieves the best performance across all three tasks. Fixing either the graph description model or the prediction model leads to noticeable performance drops. Furthermore, removing the graph description model entirely (i.e., only using the prediction model, similar to the TextGrad method [16]) results in consistently lower F1 scores.

Table 4: Ablation Study of Instance-specific Reasoning Guidance. GPT-4o mini is used for all the ablation study and analysis experiments.

Base Model	Pandemic		TrafficSafe		Swissmetro	
	Acc	F1	Acc	F1	Acc	F1
Single Model	0.390	0.397	0.340	0.247	0.482	0.445
EGO-Prompt	0.410	0.399	0.380	0.333	0.506	0.498

²See Appendix 8.5 for the distribution.

Table 5: Ablation Study of Model Components. A checkmark (✓) indicates the component is used and updated during optimization, while a triangle (△) indicates it is used but kept fixed.

G & $\mathcal{P}_{\text{cau}}$	$\mathcal{P}_{\text{sys}}$	Pandemic		TrafficSafe		Swissmetro	
		Acc	F1	Acc	F1	Acc	F1
△	✓	0.380	0.359	0.300	0.243	0.506	0.432
✓	△	0.370	0.337	0.270	0.246	0.471	0.418
✓	△	0.370	0.354	0.330	0.257	0.471	0.418
✓	✓	0.410	0.399	0.380	0.333	0.506	0.498

Iterative Optimization. We conduct an ablation study to assess the effectiveness of our optimization strategy by comparing three variants: (1) removing the optimization process entirely (W/O OPT.), (2) disabling the iterative optimization process (W/O ITERATIVE OPT.), and (3) using the full strategy in EGO-Prompt. As shown in Table 6, the absence of optimization results in reduced performance, with F1 scores dropping to 0.359, 0.293, and 0.434 on three tasks, respectively. When iterative refinement is removed, the F1 scores are moderately improved (0.369, 0.272, and 0.447) but still lag behind the full model.

Table 6: Ablation Study of Iterative Optimization.

Base Model	Pandemic		TrafficSafe		Swissmetro	
	Acc	F1	Acc	F1	Acc	F1
W/O OPT.	0.360	0.359	0.340	0.293	0.471	0.434
W/O ITERATIVE OPT.	0.410	0.369	0.310	0.272	0.447	0.447
EGO-Prompt	0.410	0.399	0.380	0.333	0.506	0.498

6.2 Automatic SCG Correction

EGO-Prompt automatically refines a human-designed SCG during iterative optimization by restricting the graph description updates to three operations: addition, deletion, and modification of causal description. These targeted updates correct biases or flaws in the expert-constructed SCG, guided by ground-truth data. Figure 5 illustrates this correction process on the Pandemic dataset, where EGO-Prompt identifies and incorporates missing connections (e.g., from Healthcare System Condition to Hospitalization per 100k) and removes weak or incorrect ones (e.g., from Demographic Information to Restriction Policy Response). The system prompt is also co-optimized throughout this process. Additional corrected SCGs and adjusted system prompts for other datasets are provided in Appendix 8.9.




Figure 5: Automatic SCG Correction for the Pandemic Dataset. Green line denotes newly added relations; red dash denotes deleted relation.

7 Conclusion

We propose a novel method called EGO-Prompt, which integrates expert knowledge to enhance the adaptivity and interpretability of LLMs for domain-specific tasks. By decomposing graph-based reasoning into two stages: generation of reasoning guidance and model reasoning conditioned on that guidance, EGO-Prompt not only outperforms existing prompt optimization baselines, but also enables automatic correction of the SCG and refinement of the reasoning process. In future work, EGO-Prompt holds promise not only for a broader range of domain-specific applications but also in other emerging directions such as Dynamic RAG (real-time updates to the graph database), domain-specific knowledge graph construction, and causal discovery. One noticeable limitation of EGO-Prompt is that it requires additional computational resources for causal-guided textual gradient, especially when scaling to larger sample sets. Another limitation is the results can be unstable due to API variability and the inherent sensitivity of the Textual Gradients method (see Appendix 8.5 and 8.6 for details).

Acknowledgments

Yang Zhao acknowledge the fellowship from JHU + Amazon Initiative for Interactive AI (AI2AI).

References

- [1] Hongru Du, Jianan Zhao, Yang Zhao, Shaochong Xu, Xihong Lin, Yiran Chen, Lauren M Gardner, and Hao Frank Yang. Advancing real-time pandemic forecasting using large language models: A covid-19 case study. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.06962*, 2024.
- [2] Jianing Qiu, Kyle Lam, Guohao Li, Amish Acharya, Tien Yin Wong, Ara Darzi, Wu Yuan, and Eric J Topol. Llm-based agentic systems in medicine and healthcare. *Nature Machine Intelligence*, 6(12):1418–1420, 2024.
- [3] Jan Clusmann, Fiona R Kolbinger, Hannah Sophie Muti, Zunamys I Carrero, Jan-Niklas Eckardt, Narmin Ghaffari Laleh, Chiara Maria Lavinia Löffler, Sophie-Caroline Schwarzkopf, Michaela Unger, Gregory P Veldhuizen, et al. The future landscape of large language models in medicine. *Communications medicine*, 3(1):141, 2023.
- [4] Yang Zhao, Pu Wang, Yibo Zhao, Hongru Du, and Hao Frank Yang. Safetraffic copilot: adapting large language models for trustworthy traffic safety assessments and decision interventions. *Nature Communications*, 16(1):8846, 2025.
- [5] Zijian Zhang, Yujie Sun, Zepu Wang, Yuqi Nie, Xiaobo Ma, Peng Sun, and Ruolin Li. Large language models for mobility in transportation systems: A survey on forecasting tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.02357*, 2024.
- [6] Xusen Guo, Qiming Zhang, Junyue Jiang, Mingxing Peng, Meixin Zhu, and Hao Frank Yang. Towards explainable traffic flow prediction with large language models. *Communications in Transportation Research*, 4:100150, 2024.
- [7] Li Chen, Penghao Wu, Kashyap Chitta, Bernhard Jaeger, Andreas Geiger, and Hongyang Li. End-to-end autonomous driving: Challenges and frontiers. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 2024.
- [8] Arun James Thirunavukarasu, Darren Shu Jeng Ting, Kabilan Elangovan, Laura Gutierrez, Ting Fang Tan, and Daniel Shu Wei Ting. Large language models in medicine. *Nature medicine*, 29(8):1930–1940, 2023.
- [9] Karan Singhal, Shekoofeh Azizi, Tao Tu, S Sara Mahdavi, Jason Wei, Hyung Won Chung, Nathan Scales, Ajay Tanwani, Heather Cole-Lewis, Stephen Pfohl, et al. Large language models encode clinical knowledge. *Nature*, 620(7972):172–180, 2023.
- [10] Jiaqi Wang, Enze Shi, Huawen Hu, Chong Ma, Yiheng Liu, Xuhui Wang, Yincheng Yao, Xuan Liu, Bao Ge, and Shu Zhang. Large language models for robotics: Opportunities, challenges, and perspectives. *Journal of Automation and Intelligence*, 2024.
- [11] Michael Ahn, Debidatta Dwibedi, Chelsea Finn, Montse Gonzalez Arenas, Keerthana Gopalakrishnan, Karol Hausman, Brian Ichter, Alex Irpan, Nikhil Joshi, Ryan Julian, et al. Autort: Embodied foundation models for large scale orchestration of robotic agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.12963*, 2024.
- [12] Bingqian Lin, Yunshuang Nie, Ziming Wei, Jiaqi Chen, Shikui Ma, Jianhua Han, Hang Xu, Xiaojun Chang, and Xiaodan Liang. Navcot: Boosting llm-based vision-and-language navigation via learning disentangled reasoning. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 47(7):5945–5957, 2025. doi: 10.1109/TPAMI.2025.3554559.
- [13] Yongchao Zhou, Andrei Ioan Muresanu, Ziwen Han, Keiran Paster, Silviu Pitis, Harris Chan, and Jimmy Ba. Large language models are human-level prompt engineers. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022.

- [14] Takeshi Kojima, Shixiang Shane Gu, Machel Reid, Yutaka Matsuo, and Yusuke Iwasawa. Large language models are zero-shot reasoners. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:22199–22213, 2022.
- [15] Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Fei Xia, Ed Chi, Quoc V Le, Denny Zhou, et al. Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:24824–24837, 2022.
- [16] Mert Yuksekgonul, Federico Bianchi, Joseph Boen, Sheng Liu, Pan Lu, Zhi Huang, Carlos Guestrin, and James Zou. Optimizing generative ai by backpropagating language model feedback. *Nature*, 639(8055):609–616, 2025.
- [17] Aniket Vashishtha, Abbavaram Gowtham Reddy, Abhinav Kumar, Saketh Bachu, Vineeth N Balasubramanian, and Amit Sharma. Causal inference using llm-guided discovery. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.15117*, 2023.
- [18] Stephanie Long, Tibor Schuster, and Alexandre Piché. Can large language models build causal graphs? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.05279*, 2023.
- [19] Rohan Alur, Manish Raghavan, and Devavrat Shah. Human expertise in algorithmic prediction. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 37:138088–138129, 2024.
- [20] Xinyuan Wang, Chenxi Li, Zhen Wang, Fan Bai, Haotian Luo, Jiayou Zhang, Nebojsa Jojic, Eric P Xing, and Zhiting Hu. Promptagent: Strategic planning with language models enables expert-level prompt optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.16427*, 2023.
- [21] Hao Zhen and Jidong J Yang. Crashesage: A large language model-centered framework for contextual and interpretable traffic crash analysis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.07853*, 2025.
- [22] Bailin Wang, Zi Wang, Xuezhi Wang, Yuan Cao, Rif A Saurous, and Yoon Kim. Grammar prompting for domain-specific language generation with large language models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36:65030–65055, 2023.
- [23] Alon Talmor, Oyvind Tafjord, Peter Clark, Yoav Goldberg, and Jonathan Berant. Leap-of-thought: Teaching pre-trained models to systematically reason over implicit knowledge. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:20227–20237, 2020.
- [24] Shiyang Li, Yifan Gao, Haoming Jiang, Qingyu Yin, Zheng Li, Xifeng Yan, Chao Zhang, and Bing Yin. Graph reasoning for question answering with triplet retrieval. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.18742*, 2023.
- [25] Linhao Luo, Yuan-Fang Li, Gholamreza Haffari, and Shirui Pan. Reasoning on graphs: Faithful and interpretable large language model reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.01061*, 2023.
- [26] Haoang Chi, He Li, Wenjing Yang, Feng Liu, Long Lan, Xiaoguang Ren, Tongliang Liu, and Bo Han. Unveiling causal reasoning in large language models: Reality or mirage? *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 37:96640–96670, 2024.
- [27] Patrick Lewis, Ethan Perez, Aleksandra Piktus, Fabio Petroni, Vladimir Karpukhin, Naman Goyal, Heinrich Küttler, Mike Lewis, Wen-tau Yih, Tim Rocktäschel, et al. Retrieval-augmented generation for knowledge-intensive nlp tasks. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:9459–9474, 2020.
- [28] Boci Peng, Yun Zhu, Yongchao Liu, Xiaohe Bo, Haizhou Shi, Chuntao Hong, Yan Zhang, and Siliang Tang. Graph retrieval-augmented generation: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.08921*, 2024.
- [29] Qinggang Zhang, Shengyuan Chen, Yuanchen Bei, Zheng Yuan, Huachi Zhou, Zijin Hong, Junnan Dong, Hao Chen, Yi Chang, and Xiao Huang. A survey of graph retrieval-augmented generation for customized large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.13958*, 2025.
- [30] Zhou Yu, Xuecheng Ouyang, Zhenwei Shao, Meng Wang, and Jun Yu. Prophet: Prompting large language models with complementary answer heuristics for knowledge-based visual question answering. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 47(8):6797–6808, 2025. doi: 10.1109/TPAMI.2025.3562422.

- [31] Jianing Wang, Qiushi Sun, Xiang Li, and Ming Gao. Boosting language models reasoning with chain-of-knowledge prompting. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.06427*, 2023.
- [32] Bingcong Xue and Lei Zou. Knowledge graph quality management: A comprehensive survey. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, 35(5):4969–4988, 2022.
- [33] Kai Guo, Harry Shomer, Shenglai Zeng, Haoyu Han, Yu Wang, and Jiliang Tang. Empowering graphrag with knowledge filtering and integration. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.13804*, 2025.
- [34] Wayne Xin Zhao, Kun Zhou, Junyi Li, Tianyi Tang, Xiaolei Wang, Yupeng Hou, Yingqian Min, Beichen Zhang, Junjie Zhang, Zican Dong, et al. A survey of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.18223*, 1(2), 2023.
- [35] Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, et al. Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:1877–1901, 2020.
- [36] Andrew K Lampinen, Ishita Dasgupta, Stephanie CY Chan, Kory Matthewson, Michael Henry Tessler, Antonia Creswell, James L McClelland, Jane X Wang, and Felix Hill. Can language models learn from explanations in context? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.02329*, 2022.
- [37] Chuanyang Zheng, Zhengying Liu, Enze Xie, Zhenguo Li, and Yu Li. Progressive-Hint Prompting Improves Reasoning in Large Language Models, October 2024. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2304.09797>. arXiv:2304.09797 [cs].
- [38] Denny Zhou, Nathanael Schärli, Le Hou, Jason Wei, Nathan Scales, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Claire Cui, Olivier Bousquet, Quoc Le, and Ed Chi. Least-to-Most Prompting Enables Complex Reasoning in Large Language Models, April 2023. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2205.10625>. arXiv:2205.10625 [cs].
- [39] Han He, Qianchu Liu, Lei Xu, Chaitanya Shivade, Yi Zhang, Sundararajan Srinivasan, and Katrin Kirchhoff. Crispo: Multi-aspect critique-suggestion-guided automatic prompt optimization for text generation. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 39, pages 24014–24022, 2025.
- [40] Kiran Ramnath, Kang Zhou, Sheng Guan, Soumya Smruti Mishra, Xuan Qi, Zhengyuan Shen, Shuai Wang, Sangmin Woo, Sullam Jeoung, Yawei Wang, Haozhu Wang, Han Ding, Yuzhe Lu, Zhichao Xu, Yun Zhou, Balasubramaniam Srinivasan, Qiaojing Yan, Yueyan Chen, Haibo Ding, Panpan Xu, and Lin Lee Cheong. A Systematic Survey of Automatic Prompt Optimization Techniques, April 2025. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2502.16923>. arXiv:2502.16923 [cs].
- [41] Zhuosheng Zhang, Aston Zhang, Mu Li, and Alex Smola. Automatic Chain of Thought Prompting in Large Language Models, October 2022. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2210.03493>. arXiv:2210.03493 [cs].
- [42] Reid Pryzant, Dan Iter, Jerry Li, Yin Tat Lee, Chenguang Zhu, and Michael Zeng. Automatic prompt optimization with "gradient descent" and beam search. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.03495*, 2023.
- [43] A Paszke. Pytorch: An imperative style, high-performance deep learning library. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1912.01703*, 2019.
- [44] Han Guo, Bowen Tan, Zhengzhong Liu, Eric P Xing, and Zhiting Hu. Efficient (soft) q-learning for text generation with limited good data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.07704*, 2021.
- [45] Mingkai Deng, Jianyu Wang, Cheng-Ping Hsieh, Yihan Wang, Han Guo, Tianmin Shu, Meng Song, Eric P Xing, and Zhiting Hu. Rlprompt: Optimizing discrete text prompts with reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.12548*, 2022.
- [46] Tianjun Zhang, Xuezhi Wang, Denny Zhou, Dale Schuurmans, and Joseph E Gonzalez. Tempera: Test-time prompting via reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.11890*, 2022.

- [47] Chengzhengxu Li, Xiaoming Liu, Yichen Wang, Duyi Li, Yu Lan, and Chao Shen. Dialogue for prompting: A policy-gradient-based discrete prompt generation for few-shot learning. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 38, pages 18481–18489, 2024.
- [48] Shivam Shandilya, Menglin Xia, Supriyo Ghosh, Huiqiang Jiang, Jue Zhang, Qianhui Wu, and Victor Rühle. Taco-rl: Task aware prompt compression optimization with reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.13035*, 2024.
- [49] Weize Kong, Spurthi Amba Hombaiah, Mingyang Zhang, Qiaozhu Mei, and Michael Bendersky. Prewrite: Prompt rewriting with reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.08189*, 2024.
- [50] Minchan Kwon, Gaeun Kim, Jongsuk Kim, Haeil Lee, and Junmo Kim. Stableprompt: Automatic prompt tuning using reinforcement learning for large language models, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2410.07652>.
- [51] Paweł Batorski, Adrian Kosmala, and Paul Swoboda. Prl: Prompts from reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.14412*, 2025.
- [52] Anita Kriz, Elizabeth Laura Janes, Xing Shen, and Tal Arbel. Prompt4trust: A reinforcement learning prompt augmentation framework for clinically-aligned confidence calibration in multimodal large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2507.09279*, 2025.
- [53] Hang Luo, Jian Zhang, and Chujun Li. Causal graphs meet thoughts: Enhancing complex reasoning in graph-augmented llms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.14892*, 2025.
- [54] He Zhu, Wenjia Zhang, Nuoxian Huang, Boyang Li, Luyao Niu, Zipei Fan, Tianle Lun, Yicheng Tao, Junyou Su, Zhaoya Gong, et al. Plangpt: Enhancing urban planning with tailored language model and efficient retrieval. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.19273*, 2024.
- [55] Yu Zheng, Longyi Liu, Yuming Lin, Jie Feng, Guozhen Zhang, Depeng Jin, and Yong Li. Urbanplanbench: A comprehensive urban planning benchmark for evaluating large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.21027*, 2025.
- [56] Hao Zhen, Yucheng Shi, Yongcan Huang, Jidong J Yang, and Ninghao Liu. Leveraging large language models with chain-of-thought and prompt engineering for traffic crash severity analysis and inference. *Computers*, 13(9):232, 2024.
- [57] Ming Nie, Renyuan Peng, Chunwei Wang, Xinyue Cai, Jianhua Han, Hang Xu, and Li Zhang. Reason2drive: Towards interpretable and chain-based reasoning for autonomous driving. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 292–308. Springer, 2024.
- [58] Shili Sheng, Erfan Pakdamanian, Kyungtae Han, Ziran Wang, John Lenneman, David Parker, and Lu Feng. Planning for automated vehicles with human trust. *ACM Transactions on Cyber-Physical Systems*, 6(4):1–21, 2022.
- [59] Scott Barnett, Stefanus Kurniawan, Srikanth Thudumu, Zach Brannelly, and Mohamed Abdelrazek. Seven failure points when engineering a retrieval augmented generation system. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/ACM 3rd International Conference on AI Engineering-Software Engineering for AI*, pages 194–199, 2024.
- [60] Junda Wu, Tong Yu, Xiang Chen, Haoliang Wang, Ryan Rossi, Sungchul Kim, Anup Rao, and Julian McAuley. Decot: Debiasing chain-of-thought for knowledge-intensive tasks in large language models via causal intervention. In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 14073–14087, 2024.
- [61] Dengyun Peng, Yuhang Zhou, Qiguang Chen, Jinhao Liu, Jingjing Chen, and Libo Qin. Dlpo: Towards a robust, efficient, and generalizable prompt optimization framework from a deep-learning perspective. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.13413*, 2025.
- [62] Judea Pearl. Causal inference in statistics: An overview. 2009.
- [63] OpenAI. Gpt-4o technical report. <https://openai.com/research/gpt-4o>, 2024.

- [64] Google DeepMind. Gemini 1.5 technical report. <https://deepmind.google/technologies/gemini/>, 2024.
- [65] Kay W. Axhausen. Swissmetro. <https://www.research-collection.ethz.ch/handle/20.500.11850/69494>, 2013. ETH Zurich Research Collection. Survey data collected in March 1998 on trains between St. Gallen and Geneva, Switzerland.
- [66] Kin On Kwok, Tom Huynh, Wan In Wei, Samuel YS Wong, Steven Riley, and Arthur Tang. Utilizing large language models in infectious disease transmission modelling for public health preparedness. *Computational and Structural Biotechnology Journal*, 23:3254–3257, 2024.
- [67] Ensheng Dong, Hongru Du, and Lauren Gardner. An interactive web-based dashboard to track covid-19 in real time. *The Lancet infectious diseases*, 20(5):533–534, 2020.
- [68] Yanyong Guo, Jibiao Zhou, Yao Wu, and Jingxu Chen. Evaluation of factors affecting e-bike involved crash and e-bike license plate use in china using a bivariate probit model. *Journal of advanced transportation*, 2017(1):2142659, 2017.
- [69] Ramina Javid, Eazaz Sadeghvaziri, Seyedmirsajad Mokhtarimousavi, and Hananeh Omid. Predicting bicycle-involved crashes in the scag region: A machine learning analysis using hsis data from california state. In *International Conference on Transportation and Development 2024*, pages 305–314, 2024.
- [70] Dominique Lord and Fred Mannering. The statistical analysis of crash-frequency data: A review and assessment of methodological alternatives. *Transportation research part A: policy and practice*, 44(5):291–305, 2010.
- [71] Kundan Parajulee, Joshua Q Li, and Cody Hamblin. Multi-scale temporal analysis of connected vehicle data for safety analysis. In *International Conference on Transportation and Development 2025*, pages 533–543, 2025.
- [72] U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration. Highway Safety Information System (HSIS). <https://highways.dot.gov>, 2025. Accessed: January 13, 2025.
- [73] Weike Lu, Jun Liu, Xing Fu, Jidong Yang, and Steven Jones. Integrating machine learning into path analysis for quantifying behavioral pathways in bicycle-motor vehicle crashes. *Accident Analysis & Prevention*, 168:106622, 2022.
- [74] Lianmin Zheng, Wei-Lin Chiang, Ying Sheng, Siyuan Zhuang, Zhanghao Wu, Yonghao Zhuang, Zi Lin, Zhuohan Li, Dacheng Li, Eric. P Xing, Hao Zhang, Joseph E. Gonzalez, and Ion Stoica. Judging llm-as-a-judge with mt-bench and chatbot arena, 2023.
- [75] Zhuosheng Zhang, Aston Zhang, Mu Li, and Alex Smola. Automatic chain of thought prompting in large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.03493*, 2022.
- [76] Jinze Bai, Shuai Bai, Yunfei Chu, Zeyu Cui, Kai Dang, Xiaodong Deng, Yang Fan, Wenbin Ge, Yu Han, Fei Huang, et al. Qwen technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.16609*, 2023.
- [77] Aixin Liu, Bei Feng, Bing Xue, Bingxuan Wang, Bochao Wu, Chengda Lu, Chenggang Zhao, Chengqi Deng, Chenyu Zhang, Chong Ruan, et al. Deepseek-v3 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.19437*, 2024.
- [78] Aaron Grattafiori, Abhimanyu Dubey, Abhinav Jauhri, Abhinav Pandey, Abhishek Kadian, Ahmad Al-Dahle, Aiesha Letman, Akhil Mathur, Alan Schelten, et al. The llama 3 herd of models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.21783*, 2024.
- [79] Horace He and Thinking Machines Lab. Defeating nondeterminism in llm inference. *Thinking Machines Lab: Connectionism*, 2025. doi: 10.64434/tml.20250910. <https://thinkingmachines.ai/blog/defeating-nondeterminism-in-llm-inference/>.

NeurIPS Paper Checklist

1. Claims

Question: Do the main claims made in the abstract and introduction accurately reflect the paper's contributions and scope?

Answer: [\[Yes\]](#)

Justification: The motivation is detailed in Section 1. The method is described in Section 4. The results are listed in Section 5.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the abstract and introduction do not include the claims made in the paper.
- The abstract and/or introduction should clearly state the claims made, including the contributions made in the paper and important assumptions and limitations. A No or NA answer to this question will not be perceived well by the reviewers.
- The claims made should match theoretical and experimental results, and reflect how much the results can be expected to generalize to other settings.
- It is fine to include aspirational goals as motivation as long as it is clear that these goals are not attained by the paper.

2. Limitations

Question: Does the paper discuss the limitations of the work performed by the authors?

Answer: [\[Yes\]](#)

Justification: The limitation section is included in Section 8.6

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper has no limitation while the answer No means that the paper has limitations, but those are not discussed in the paper.
- The authors are encouraged to create a separate "Limitations" section in their paper.
- The paper should point out any strong assumptions and how robust the results are to violations of these assumptions (e.g., independence assumptions, noiseless settings, model well-specification, asymptotic approximations only holding locally). The authors should reflect on how these assumptions might be violated in practice and what the implications would be.
- The authors should reflect on the scope of the claims made, e.g., if the approach was only tested on a few datasets or with a few runs. In general, empirical results often depend on implicit assumptions, which should be articulated.
- The authors should reflect on the factors that influence the performance of the approach. For example, a facial recognition algorithm may perform poorly when image resolution is low or images are taken in low lighting. Or a speech-to-text system might not be used reliably to provide closed captions for online lectures because it fails to handle technical jargon.
- The authors should discuss the computational efficiency of the proposed algorithms and how they scale with dataset size.
- If applicable, the authors should discuss possible limitations of their approach to address problems of privacy and fairness.
- While the authors might fear that complete honesty about limitations might be used by reviewers as grounds for rejection, a worse outcome might be that reviewers discover limitations that aren't acknowledged in the paper. The authors should use their best judgment and recognize that individual actions in favor of transparency play an important role in developing norms that preserve the integrity of the community. Reviewers will be specifically instructed to not penalize honesty concerning limitations.

3. Theory assumptions and proofs

Question: For each theoretical result, does the paper provide the full set of assumptions and a complete (and correct) proof?

Answer: [\[Yes\]](#)

Justification: See Section 8.1.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not include theoretical results.
- All the theorems, formulas, and proofs in the paper should be numbered and cross-referenced.
- All assumptions should be clearly stated or referenced in the statement of any theorems.
- The proofs can either appear in the main paper or the supplemental material, but if they appear in the supplemental material, the authors are encouraged to provide a short proof sketch to provide intuition.
- Inversely, any informal proof provided in the core of the paper should be complemented by formal proofs provided in appendix or supplemental material.
- Theorems and Lemmas that the proof relies upon should be properly referenced.

4. Experimental result reproducibility

Question: Does the paper fully disclose all the information needed to reproduce the main experimental results of the paper to the extent that it affects the main claims and/or conclusions of the paper (regardless of whether the code and data are provided or not)?

Answer: [\[Yes\]](#)

Justification: The settings are listed in Section 5.2, and the full prompts needed are listed in the Appendix.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not include experiments.
- If the paper includes experiments, a No answer to this question will not be perceived well by the reviewers: Making the paper reproducible is important, regardless of whether the code and data are provided or not.
- If the contribution is a dataset and/or model, the authors should describe the steps taken to make their results reproducible or verifiable.
- Depending on the contribution, reproducibility can be accomplished in various ways. For example, if the contribution is a novel architecture, describing the architecture fully might suffice, or if the contribution is a specific model and empirical evaluation, it may be necessary to either make it possible for others to replicate the model with the same dataset, or provide access to the model. In general, releasing code and data is often one good way to accomplish this, but reproducibility can also be provided via detailed instructions for how to replicate the results, access to a hosted model (e.g., in the case of a large language model), releasing of a model checkpoint, or other means that are appropriate to the research performed.
- While NeurIPS does not require releasing code, the conference does require all submissions to provide some reasonable avenue for reproducibility, which may depend on the nature of the contribution. For example
 - (a) If the contribution is primarily a new algorithm, the paper should make it clear how to reproduce that algorithm.
 - (b) If the contribution is primarily a new model architecture, the paper should describe the architecture clearly and fully.
 - (c) If the contribution is a new model (e.g., a large language model), then there should either be a way to access this model for reproducing the results or a way to reproduce the model (e.g., with an open-source dataset or instructions for how to construct the dataset).
 - (d) We recognize that reproducibility may be tricky in some cases, in which case authors are welcome to describe the particular way they provide for reproducibility. In the case of closed-source models, it may be that access to the model is limited in some way (e.g., to registered users), but it should be possible for other researchers to have some path to reproducing or verifying the results.

5. Open access to data and code

Question: Does the paper provide open access to the data and code, with sufficient instructions to faithfully reproduce the main experimental results, as described in supplemental material?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: The code will be shared in GitHub upon paper's acceptance.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that paper does not include experiments requiring code.
- Please see the NeurIPS code and data submission guidelines (<https://nips.cc/public/guides/CodeSubmissionPolicy>) for more details.
- While we encourage the release of code and data, we understand that this might not be possible, so “No” is an acceptable answer. Papers cannot be rejected simply for not including code, unless this is central to the contribution (e.g., for a new open-source benchmark).
- The instructions should contain the exact command and environment needed to run to reproduce the results. See the NeurIPS code and data submission guidelines (<https://nips.cc/public/guides/CodeSubmissionPolicy>) for more details.
- The authors should provide instructions on data access and preparation, including how to access the raw data, preprocessed data, intermediate data, and generated data, etc.
- The authors should provide scripts to reproduce all experimental results for the new proposed method and baselines. If only a subset of experiments are reproducible, they should state which ones are omitted from the script and why.
- At submission time, to preserve anonymity, the authors should release anonymized versions (if applicable).
- Providing as much information as possible in supplemental material (appended to the paper) is recommended, but including URLs to data and code is permitted.

6. Experimental setting/details

Question: Does the paper specify all the training and test details (e.g., data splits, hyper-parameters, how they were chosen, type of optimizer, etc.) necessary to understand the results?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: The settings are listed in Section 5.2.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not include experiments.
- The experimental setting should be presented in the core of the paper to a level of detail that is necessary to appreciate the results and make sense of them.
- The full details can be provided either with the code, in appendix, or as supplemental material.

7. Experiment statistical significance

Question: Does the paper report error bars suitably and correctly defined or other appropriate information about the statistical significance of the experiments?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: Please see Appendix 8.5 for the evaluation of variability of our method.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not include experiments.
- The authors should answer "Yes" if the results are accompanied by error bars, confidence intervals, or statistical significance tests, at least for the experiments that support the main claims of the paper.
- The factors of variability that the error bars are capturing should be clearly stated (for example, train/test split, initialization, random drawing of some parameter, or overall run with given experimental conditions).
- The method for calculating the error bars should be explained (closed form formula, call to a library function, bootstrap, etc.)
- The assumptions made should be given (e.g., Normally distributed errors).
- It should be clear whether the error bar is the standard deviation or the standard error of the mean.

- It is OK to report 1-sigma error bars, but one should state it. The authors should preferably report a 2-sigma error bar than state that they have a 96% CI, if the hypothesis of Normality of errors is not verified.
- For asymmetric distributions, the authors should be careful not to show in tables or figures symmetric error bars that would yield results that are out of range (e.g. negative error rates).
- If error bars are reported in tables or plots, The authors should explain in the text how they were calculated and reference the corresponding figures or tables in the text.

8. Experiments compute resources

Question: For each experiment, does the paper provide sufficient information on the computer resources (type of compute workers, memory, time of execution) needed to reproduce the experiments?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: See Section 8.4 for a detailed discussion of both inference and training costs.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not include experiments.
- The paper should indicate the type of compute workers CPU or GPU, internal cluster, or cloud provider, including relevant memory and storage.
- The paper should provide the amount of compute required for each of the individual experimental runs as well as estimate the total compute.
- The paper should disclose whether the full research project required more compute than the experiments reported in the paper (e.g., preliminary or failed experiments that didn't make it into the paper).

9. Code of ethics

Question: Does the research conducted in the paper conform, in every respect, with the NeurIPS Code of Ethics <https://neurips.cc/public/EthicsGuidelines>?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: Our research does not involve human subjects, sensitive data, or applications with foreseeable societal impact. All datasets used are publicly available and ethically sourced.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the authors have not reviewed the NeurIPS Code of Ethics.
- If the authors answer No, they should explain the special circumstances that require a deviation from the Code of Ethics.
- The authors should make sure to preserve anonymity (e.g., if there is a special consideration due to laws or regulations in their jurisdiction).

10. Broader impacts

Question: Does the paper discuss both potential positive societal impacts and negative societal impacts of the work performed?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: See Section 8.6.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that there is no societal impact of the work performed.
- If the authors answer NA or No, they should explain why their work has no societal impact or why the paper does not address societal impact.
- Examples of negative societal impacts include potential malicious or unintended uses (e.g., disinformation, generating fake profiles, surveillance), fairness considerations (e.g., deployment of technologies that could make decisions that unfairly impact specific groups), privacy considerations, and security considerations.

- The conference expects that many papers will be foundational research and not tied to particular applications, let alone deployments. However, if there is a direct path to any negative applications, the authors should point it out. For example, it is legitimate to point out that an improvement in the quality of generative models could be used to generate deepfakes for disinformation. On the other hand, it is not needed to point out that a generic algorithm for optimizing neural networks could enable people to train models that generate Deepfakes faster.
- The authors should consider possible harms that could arise when the technology is being used as intended and functioning correctly, harms that could arise when the technology is being used as intended but gives incorrect results, and harms following from (intentional or unintentional) misuse of the technology.
- If there are negative societal impacts, the authors could also discuss possible mitigation strategies (e.g., gated release of models, providing defenses in addition to attacks, mechanisms for monitoring misuse, mechanisms to monitor how a system learns from feedback over time, improving the efficiency and accessibility of ML).

11. Safeguards

Question: Does the paper describe safeguards that have been put in place for responsible release of data or models that have a high risk for misuse (e.g., pretrained language models, image generators, or scraped datasets)?

Answer: [NA]

Justification: NA.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper poses no such risks.
- Released models that have a high risk for misuse or dual-use should be released with necessary safeguards to allow for controlled use of the model, for example by requiring that users adhere to usage guidelines or restrictions to access the model or implementing safety filters.
- Datasets that have been scraped from the Internet could pose safety risks. The authors should describe how they avoided releasing unsafe images.
- We recognize that providing effective safeguards is challenging, and many papers do not require this, but we encourage authors to take this into account and make a best faith effort.

12. Licenses for existing assets

Question: Are the creators or original owners of assets (e.g., code, data, models), used in the paper, properly credited and are the license and terms of use explicitly mentioned and properly respected?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: All datasets and models used are publicly available and properly cited with their licenses respected.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not use existing assets.
- The authors should cite the original paper that produced the code package or dataset.
- The authors should state which version of the asset is used and, if possible, include a URL.
- The name of the license (e.g., CC-BY 4.0) should be included for each asset.
- For scraped data from a particular source (e.g., website), the copyright and terms of service of that source should be provided.
- If assets are released, the license, copyright information, and terms of use in the package should be provided. For popular datasets, paperswithcode.com/datasets has curated licenses for some datasets. Their licensing guide can help determine the license of a dataset.
- For existing datasets that are re-packaged, both the original license and the license of the derived asset (if it has changed) should be provided.

- If this information is not available online, the authors are encouraged to reach out to the asset’s creators.

13. **New assets**

Question: Are new assets introduced in the paper well documented and is the documentation provided alongside the assets?

Answer: [\[Yes\]](#)

Justification: All new assets are well documented and provided in anonymized form for review.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not release new assets.
- Researchers should communicate the details of the dataset/code/model as part of their submissions via structured templates. This includes details about training, license, limitations, etc.
- The paper should discuss whether and how consent was obtained from people whose asset is used.
- At submission time, remember to anonymize your assets (if applicable). You can either create an anonymized URL or include an anonymized zip file.

14. **Crowdsourcing and research with human subjects**

Question: For crowdsourcing experiments and research with human subjects, does the paper include the full text of instructions given to participants and screenshots, if applicable, as well as details about compensation (if any)?

Answer: [\[NA\]](#)

Justification: NA.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not involve crowdsourcing nor research with human subjects.
- Including this information in the supplemental material is fine, but if the main contribution of the paper involves human subjects, then as much detail as possible should be included in the main paper.
- According to the NeurIPS Code of Ethics, workers involved in data collection, curation, or other labor should be paid at least the minimum wage in the country of the data collector.

15. **Institutional review board (IRB) approvals or equivalent for research with human subjects**

Question: Does the paper describe potential risks incurred by study participants, whether such risks were disclosed to the subjects, and whether Institutional Review Board (IRB) approvals (or an equivalent approval/review based on the requirements of your country or institution) were obtained?

Answer: [\[NA\]](#)

Justification: NA.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not involve crowdsourcing nor research with human subjects.
- Depending on the country in which research is conducted, IRB approval (or equivalent) may be required for any human subjects research. If you obtained IRB approval, you should clearly state this in the paper.
- We recognize that the procedures for this may vary significantly between institutions and locations, and we expect authors to adhere to the NeurIPS Code of Ethics and the guidelines for their institution.
- For initial submissions, do not include any information that would break anonymity (if applicable), such as the institution conducting the review.

16. Declaration of LLM usage

Question: Does the paper describe the usage of LLMs if it is an important, original, or non-standard component of the core methods in this research? Note that if the LLM is used only for writing, editing, or formatting purposes and does not impact the core methodology, scientific rigorousness, or originality of the research, declaration is not required.

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: Our method incorporates LLMs (e.g., GPT-4o) as core components for reasoning and optimization in domain-specific tasks. Their usage is clearly described in the methodology and experimental setup.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the core method development in this research does not involve LLMs as any important, original, or non-standard components.
- Please refer to our LLM policy (<https://neurips.cc/Conferences/2025/LLM>) for what should or should not be described.

8 Technical Appendices and Supplementary Material

8.1 Generation of Reasoning Guidance

Derivation. Let x denote the structured prompt for the domain-specific task, $\mathcal{G}$ the semantic causal graph (SCG), and z the reasoning guidance distilled from $(x, \mathcal{G})$. Starting from the product rule,

$$p(y \mid x, \mathcal{G}) = \sum_z p(y, z \mid x, \mathcal{G}) \quad (8)$$

$$= \sum_z p(y \mid x, \mathcal{G}, z) p(z \mid x, \mathcal{G}). \quad (9)$$

(A1) Conditional independence. Because the SCG $\mathcal{G}$ is identical for every data point, once (x, z) are given, the remaining information in $\mathcal{G}$ is irrelevant to y :

$$p(y \mid x, \mathcal{G}, z) = p(y \mid x, z).$$

Applying (A1) to (9) yields

$$p(y \mid x, \mathcal{G}) = \sum_z p(y \mid x, z) p(z \mid x, \mathcal{G}). \quad (10)$$

(A2) Deterministic guidance. To guarantee that the graph description model $\mathcal{M}_{F'}$ yields a single, repeatable guidance for each $(x, \mathcal{G})$, we impose the following output constraint in the optimizer:

Prompt 8.1: Output Constraint for the Graph-Description Model

Format

<Causal Description>

Provide a numbered list of causal statements grounded in the supplied causal relations and crash details. Each statement must explicitly articulate the causal mechanism whenever it is available.

</Causal Description>

Because every instance is processed with the same causal system prompt $\mathcal{P}_{\text{cau}}$ and this constraint, the model behaves almost deterministically, inducing the mapping

$$z^*(x, \mathcal{G}) = \mathcal{M}_{F'}(x, \mathcal{G}; \mathcal{P}_{\text{cau}}).$$

so that the posterior over z collapses to a Dirac delta, $p(z \mid x, \mathcal{G}) = \delta(z - z^*(x, \mathcal{G}))$. Substituting this into (10):

$$\begin{aligned} p(y \mid x, \mathcal{G}) &= p(y \mid x, z^*(x, \mathcal{G})) \sum_z \delta(z - z^*(x, \mathcal{G})) \\ &= p(y \mid x, z^*(x, \mathcal{G})). \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

Equation (11) shows that, under assumptions (A1)–(A2), the global graph $\mathcal{G}$ can be replaced by the sample-specific deterministic guidance $z^*(x, \mathcal{G})$ without losing any predictive information.

8.2 Performance Comparison of Open Source Models and Commercial Models

In addition to the commercial models GPT-4o-mini, GPT-4.1-mini, GPT-5-mini, Gemini 2.5 Flash, and Gemini 2.0 Flash, we extended our experiments to evaluate EGO-Prompt on open-source models, including Qwen3 (1.7B, 8B, 14B, 32B) [76], DeepSeek-V3 [77], and Llama-3.3 (8B, 70B), and Llama-4-Scout-17B [78]. Table 7 shows the experiment results. Several findings can be summarized:

- **EGO-Prompt is effective for open source models.** EGO-Prompt boosts the performance of open-source models by 49.9%, which is substantially higher than its improvement on commercial models (22.7%).
- **Commercial models achieve better and more stable performance.** Across both the initial organized prompt and the optimized settings, commercial models consistently outperform open-source models, achieving higher F1 scores and greater robustness across tasks compared with open-source models (0.427 vs. 0.351).
- **Model size substantially influences the performance ceiling.** Models with more parameters achieve better optimized performance, consistent with the scaling law. For example, the Qwen3 series improves from an F1 score of 0.265 for the 1.7B model to 0.390 for the 32B model. DeepSeek-V3, with 671B parameters, achieves the highest performance among the open-source models. These results suggest that our method can consistently enhance performance across models of varying sizes.
- **EGO-Prompt enhances reasoning in smaller models.** Models such as Qwen3-1.7B and Qwen3-8B fail to generate structured outputs under the initial organized prompt. However, with EGO-Prompt, they are able to produce more structured predictions and follow certain reasoning paths to make predictions, although their overall performance remains limited.

Table 7: Performance comparison of open source models and commercial models across three datasets.

Type	Base Model	Pandemic		TrafficSafe		Mode Choice		Mean F1 (↑%)
		Acc	F1	Acc	F1	Acc	F1	
Open Source	Qwen-1.7B	0.120	0.158	0.110	0.120	0.047	0.084	0.121
	Qwen-1.7B with EGO	0.190	0.178	0.200	0.230	0.412	0.386	0.265 (↑119.5%)
	Qwen-8B	0.060	0.080	0.220	0.100	0.059	0.096	0.092
	Qwen-8B with EGO	0.140	0.199	0.290	0.202	0.459	0.427	0.276 (↑200.1%)
	Qwen-14B	0.360	0.299	0.330	0.227	0.424	0.309	0.279
	Qwen-14B with EGO	0.390	0.339	0.340	0.271	0.471	0.457	0.356 (↑27.7%)
	Qwen-32B	0.340	0.284	0.310	0.229	0.412	0.321	0.278
	Qwen-32B with EGO	0.430	0.405	0.350	0.285	0.494	0.481	0.390 (↑40.3%)
	DeepSeek-V3	0.210	0.231	0.340	0.211	0.459	0.457	0.300
	DeepSeek-V3 with EGO	0.460	0.464	0.400	0.371	0.506	0.501	0.445 (↑48.7%)
	LLaMA-3.3-8B	0.350	0.274	0.310	0.210	0.310	0.210	0.231
	LLaMA-3.3-8B with EGO	0.370	0.326	0.330	0.289	0.377	0.335	0.316 (↑36.8%)
	LLaMA-3.3-70B	0.370	0.317	0.250	0.176	0.400	0.275	0.256
	LLaMA-3.3-70B with EGO	0.420	0.378	0.340	0.273	0.459	0.419	0.357 (↑39.5%)
	Llama-4-Scout-17B	0.360	0.307	0.260	0.237	0.294	0.287	0.277
	Llama-4-Scout-17B with EGO	0.420	0.376	0.320	0.268	0.482	0.459	0.368 (↑33.0%)
	Average	0.279	0.248	0.271	0.193	0.313	0.262	0.235
	Average with EGO	0.361	0.341	0.324	0.275	0.461	0.438	0.351 (↑49.9%)
Commercial	GPT-4o-mini	0.360	0.347	0.300	0.232	0.459	0.406	0.328
	GPT-4o-mini with EGO	0.410	0.399	0.380	0.333	0.506	0.498	0.410 (↑24.9%)
	GPT-4.1-mini	0.400	0.374	0.350	0.246	0.506	0.468	0.363
	GPT-4.1-mini with EGO	0.430	0.420	0.370	0.292	0.553	0.522	0.411 (↑13.2%)
	GPT-5-mini	0.420	0.387	0.330	0.265	0.435	0.435	0.362
	GPT-5-mini with EGO	0.460	0.448	0.340	0.305	0.529	0.511	0.421 (↑16.3%)
	Gemini-2.5-Flash	0.470	0.470	0.340	0.319	0.459	0.392	0.394
	Gemini-2.5-Flash with EGO	0.540	0.546	0.430	0.428	0.518	0.499	0.491 (↑24.6%)
	Gemini-2.0-Flash	0.300	0.268	0.330	0.264	0.259	0.351	0.294
	Gemini-2.0-Flash with EGO	0.430	0.412	0.400	0.327	0.506	0.470	0.403 (↑37.0%)
	Average	0.390	0.369	0.330	0.265	0.424	0.410	0.348
	Average with EGO	0.454	0.445	0.384	0.337	0.522	0.500	0.427 (↑22.7%)

8.3 Human-Expert Involvement Evaluation

To assess how human involvement and the completeness of the SCG affect the reasoning process, we evaluate our method under several SCG completeness settings (Table 8): 1) **Reversed SCG**. To test sensitivity to incorrect causal structures, we reversed all edges in the expert-designed SCGs used in the main experiments (see Figure 6). This allows us to compare performance differences between mostly correct and mostly incorrect SCGs. 2) **Empty SCG**. We removed the initial SCG and let the model construct it during optimization. This tests whether providing a good initial SCG improves performance and whether SCG can be constructed automatically. 3) **33% and 66% SCG**. These settings randomly retain only 33% or 66% of the original causal edges, reflecting different degrees of SCG completeness. The key observations are as follows:

- **Incorrect SCG degrades reasoning performance.** On the Pandemic dataset, the reversed SCG substantially degrades the performance (F1 from 0.359 to 0.303), suggesting that incorrect prior knowledge can misguide the optimization process.
- **Randomly removing causal edges can impair the model’s reasoning capability.** The initial SCG represents a complete reasoning path. Although it may not be entirely correct, it maintains structural integrity and connected as a DAG. Random removal of edges disrupts this structure, leading to degraded performance. For example, the 33% SCG setting yields a lower mean F1 score than the Empty SCG, indicating that a partially broken causal graph may be worse than having no guidance at all.
- **Greater completeness in the SCG supports better reasoning.** The 66% SCG setting achieves performance close to that of the full SCG, suggesting that more complete causal guidance helps the model reason more effectively.
- **If a user is unsure about the completeness or correctness of the SCG, it is advisable to start with an empty SCG and iteratively refine it.** This allows gradual construction of a reliable causal graph without risking the adverse effects of incorrect or incomplete edges.




Figure 6: Reversed Pandemic SCG.

Table 8: Performance under different SCG settings. We use GPT-4o-mini as the forward engine.

SCG Setting	Pandemic		TrafficSafe		Mode Choice		Mean F1
	Acc	F1	Acc	F1	Acc	F1	
No SCG	0.380	0.359	0.300	0.243	0.506	0.432	0.345
Reversed	0.310	0.303	0.290	0.260	0.482	0.457	0.350
Empty	0.370	0.372	0.330	0.317	0.506	0.470	0.394
33%	0.390	0.389	0.300	0.270	0.459	0.462	0.378
66%	0.400	0.387	0.310	0.314	0.506	0.493	0.402
Full	0.410	0.399	0.380	0.333	0.506	0.498	0.421

8.4 Analyzing the Trade-off Between Performance and Cost

As shown in Table 9, we evaluate the inference performance and cost of our model compared to mainstream reasoning models, including OpenAI models (o3-mini-2025-01-31, o4-mini-2025-04-16, o1-2024-12-17, o3-2025-04-16) and Google’s gemini-2.5-pro-preview-05-06. Costs for OpenAI models were recorded based on actual API platform expenses, while costs for Google models were estimated from input and output token counts. Results show that our EGO-Prompt (GPT-4o mini) matches the performance of o4-mini at roughly one-sixth the cost, and outperforms o1 at over one-hundredth the cost.

Table 9: Comparison of model performance with their price. Price is measured in USD per 100 inferences.

Model	Pandemic			TrafficSafe			Swissmetro		
	Acc	F1	Price	Acc	F1	Price	Acc	F1	Price
o3-mini	0.390	0.383	\$0.50	0.330	0.282	\$0.57	0.494	0.442	\$0.45
o4-mini	0.430	0.418	\$0.33	0.380	0.334	\$0.26	0.494	0.456	\$0.29
o1	0.410	0.409	\$10.19	0.310	0.219	\$7.18	0.541	0.496	\$7.04
o3	0.450	0.425	\$3.06	0.410	0.385	\$2.12	0.506	0.444	\$3.32
Gemini 2.5 pro	0.400	0.399	\$0.79	0.410	0.411	\$0.45	0.471	0.402	\$0.19
EGO-Prompt (GPT-4o mini)	0.410	0.399	\$0.04	0.380	0.333	\$0.08	0.506	0.498	\$0.05
EGO-Prompt (Gemini 2.5 Flash)	0.540	0.546	\$0.06	0.430	0.428	\$0.07	0.518	0.499	\$0.13

As our model optimizes the reasoning process using ground truth data, the training incurs additional cost. The cost of our method throughout the optimization process is evaluated using GPT-4o-mini as the forward engine and GPT-4o as the backward engine. Each optimization step includes two forward passes through both the graph description model and the prediction model, two backward passes to iteratively update the SCG, system prompt, and causal system prompt, as well as two evaluations on the validation set and zero or one evaluation on the test set (see Algorithm 1). We recorded the actual costs using the OpenAI API platform during the optimization and reported the average cost over three steps for each task. As shown in Table 10, each optimization step for the three tasks costs approximately \$0.3–\$0.4. Given that each task typically requires 6 to 12 optimization steps, the total cost for the full optimization process ranges from approximately \$2 to \$5 per task. However, in real-world domain-specific tasks, such as traffic safety modeling with hundreds of thousands of crashes reported annually in a single state, the training cost becomes relatively negligible compared to the inference cost.

Table 10: Optimization cost per step for each dataset, measured in USD.

Dataset	Opt. Cost per Step (USD)
Pandemic	0.310
TrafficSafe	0.403
Swissmetro	0.313

8.5 Variability of the Performance

Due to the inherent non-deterministic nature of LLM outputs (unstable even when temperature=0) [79], as well as the instability of the Textual Gradient method, our results exhibit fluctuations within a certain range. Figure 7 presents the box plots of the performance of the organized prompt and EGO-Prompt across 10 independent runs on three tasks. We observe that our method may exhibit up to 20% variability in performance across the three tasks. In some cases, as only a very limited number of training examples are used in our method, the model may overfit to the validation set in certain training step, leading to degraded performance on the test set. Addressing this issue will be an important direction for future work.




Figure 7: Performance of organized prompt and EGO-Prompt across 10 independent runs on three tasks. We use GPT-4o-mini as the forward engine.

8.6 Limitations

The primary limitation of our work lies in the inherent variability introduced by the API-based inference process. To explore the upper-bound performance under identical settings (same random seed), we perform multiple runs for each experiment and report best results. However, similar to other prompt optimization methods, this stochasticity cannot be fully eliminated and may still influence performance evaluation. Additionally, due to the relatively small number of validation and test examples (consistent with prior work on prompt optimization) there is a risk of overfitting to the validation set in certain runs. Future work may address these challenges by incorporating more robust evaluation protocols and exploring prompt tuning strategies that are less sensitive to sampling noise.

In addition, our method can enhance the performance of LLMs on domain-specific tasks, thereby enabling more effective decision support (e.g., identifying turning points in pandemic trends). However, the reasoning processes of LLMs may produce incorrect or unreliable results for certain cases. Future research could focus on improving the trustworthiness of LLMs in such domain-specific applications.

8.7 Example of Organized Prompts

Prompt 8.2: Example of Organized Prompts for Pandemic Dataset

[System Prompt] Predict the trend of hospitalizations for the next week based on the pandemic details provided between <Pandemic Description> and <\Pandemic Description>.

Provide a single prediction enclosed in < > using one of the following labels:

<substantial decreasing>, <moderate decreasing>, <stable>, <moderate increasing>, <substantial increasing>.

Definitions:

- "Substantial" refers to changes greater than 3.
- "Moderate" corresponds to changes between 1 and 3.
- "Stable" is defined as changes between -1 and 1.

The final line of your response must follow this format: <VALUE>, where VALUE is your prediction.

<Pandemic Description>

[Demographic Information] Vermont, with one of the smallest populations and one of the smallest Black demographic groups, voted Democratic in the recent Presidential election.

[Healthcare System Condition] During the pandemic, Vermont's healthcare systems performed among the best, with above-national-average Access and Affordability, excellent Prevention and Treatment, better-than-average population health conditions, and reduced Income Disparity.

[ICU and Hospital Staffing Condition] Vermont had ICU stress levels near the national average, but hospital staffing shortages worse than the national average.

[Vaccination Coverage] As of now, 81% of the population has received at least one vaccine dose (Rapid Increase trend), 71% are fully vaccinated (Moderate Increase trend), and 23% received boosters (Rapid Increase trend).

[Population Immunity] Around 28% of the population reported infections in the past three months, and population immunity is showing a Rapid Increase.

[Restriction Policy Response] School closures were recommended, but there were no restrictions for workplaces or gatherings among elderly patients. Isolation was recommended, and visitor restrictions were in place.

[Hospitalization per 100k] The average number of COVID-19 hospitalizations per 100K over the past five weeks was 9.8. Hospitalizations remained relatively stable, mostly between 9.0 and 11.2. A slight increase was observed in the most recent week, with a rate of change of 1.2. Volatility in hospitalization numbers was minimal, indicating consistent trends.

[Reported Cases per 100k] In the most recent five weeks, reported COVID-19 cases per 100K showed a fluctuating trend. The average was 292.6. Cases declined from 263.8 to 216.0 over the first three weeks, then sharply increased to 340.1 in the fourth week and 398.7 in the fifth. These changes indicate a significant uptick in recent weeks, with inconsistent weekly trends.

<\Pandemic Description>

[Trend of Hospitalization (Ground Truth)] <moderate increasing>

Prompt 8.3: Example of Organized Prompts for TrafficSafe Dataset

[System Prompt] Predict the crash severity reasoning on the causal descriptions provided between the crash event details provided between <Crash Description> and <\Crash Description>.

Provide a single prediction enclosed in < > using one of the following labels:

<no apparent injury>, <minor injury>, <serious injury>, <fatal>.

The last line of your response should only be of the following format: <VALUE> where VALUE is your prediction.

<Crash Description>

[Time] The crash occurred on April 29, 2022 at hour 16.

[Position] The crash occurred in Champaign, within an Unincorporated area. It did not occur in a work zone.

[Dynamic Conditions] The light condition is Daylight and the weather condition is Clear.

[Infrastructure] The crash is not at an intersection. The traffic control device is Other Regulatory Sig.

[Road Surface] The road surface condition is Dry. The road defect condition is nan.

[Road Level] The trafficway is Not Divided Two-way. The functional class of the roadway is Minor Arterial. The roadway class is Rural 2 Lane Roads.

[Driver Behavior] The primary behavior is Driving On Wrong Side/Wrong Way, and the secondary behavior is Improper Lane Usage. The crash is not a hit-and-run incident.

[Vehicle 1 Vehicle Information] The vehicle had a defect of None and was manufactured in 2004.

[Vehicle 2 Vehicle Information] The vehicle had a defect of None and was manufactured in 2002.

[Vehicle 1 Vehicle Status] The unit locates at On Pavement (Roadway). The vehicle's maneuver prior to the crash was Passing/Overtaking and it was traveling in the North direction.

[Vehicle 2 Vehicle Status] The unit locates at On Pavement (Roadway). The vehicle's maneuver prior to the crash was Straight Ahead and it was traveling in the South direction.

[Person 1 Person Information] This person was in Vehicle Unit 1. The person involved is a Driver, aged 39. Gender is Male.

[Person 2 Person Information] This person was in Vehicle Unit 2. The person involved is a Driver, aged 70. Gender is Male.

[Person 1 Person Status] The driver's blood alcohol content is .000. Distraction status: No. Safety equipment used: Shoulder and Lap Belt Used.

[Person 2 Person Status] The driver's blood alcohol content is Not Tested. Distraction status: No. Safety equipment used: Shoulder and Lap Belt Used.

<\Crash Description>

[Crash Severity (Ground Truth)] <fatal>

Prompt 8.4: Example of Organized Prompts for Swissmetro Dataset

[System Prompt] Predict the travel mode choice reasoning on the causal descriptions provided between <Causal Description> and <\Causal Description>, and the traveler details provided between <Traveler Description> and <\Traveler Description>. Provide a single prediction enclosed in < > using one of the following labels:

<swissmetro>, <car>, <train>.

The final line of your response must follow this format: <VALUE>, where VALUE is your prediction.

<Traveler Description>

[trip_purpose] The purpose of the trip is business.

[trip_paid_by] Traveler trip is paid by oneself.

[luggage] Traveler has no luggage.

[first_class] The traveler earns 100,000 CHF and does not travel in first class.

[rail_pass] Traveler does not have a rail-system annual season ticket.

[origin_destination] This trip starts at VD and ends at ZH.

[options_count] Traveler has two possible travel options.

[swissmetro_time_cost] Swissmetro's travel time is 63 minutes and it costs 57 CHF.

[swissmetro_headway] The headway of Swissmetro is 10 minutes.

[train_time_cost] Train's travel time is 192 minutes and it costs 52 CHF.

[train_headway] The headway of train is 30 minutes.

[income] Traveler's annual income is between 50,000 and 100,000 CHF.

[age_range] The traveler is between 39 and 54 years old.

[gender] The traveler is female.

<\Traveler Description>

[Travel Mode Choice (Ground Truth)] <car>

8.8 Initial SCG

Prompt 8.5: Initial SCG for Pandemic Dataset

CAUSAL STATEMENT 1: [Demographic Information] affects [Vaccination Coverage] and [Restriction Policy Response].

Older or vulnerable populations often have higher vaccination uptake and are more likely to be targeted by stricter restrictions.

CAUSAL STATEMENT 2: [Healthcare System Condition] affects [Vaccination Coverage] and [Population Immunity].

Regions with better healthcare access can distribute vaccines more effectively and maintain higher baseline immunity.

CAUSAL STATEMENT 3: [ICU and Hospital Staffing Condition] affects [Restriction Policy Response].

When ICU beds are full or staffing is limited, governments tend to implement stricter control policies.

CAUSAL STATEMENT 4: [Vaccination Coverage] affects [Population Immunity].

Higher vaccination coverage directly increases the proportion of immune individuals in the population.

CAUSAL STATEMENT 5: [Population Immunity] affects [Reported Cases per 100k] and [Hospitalization per 100k].

Stronger immunity reduces both the number of new infections and the chance of severe cases needing hospitalization.

CAUSAL STATEMENT 6: [Reported Cases per 100k] affects [Hospitalization per 100k] and [Restriction Policy Response].

A rise in reported cases usually precedes more hospital admissions and can trigger policy tightening.

CAUSAL STATEMENT 7: [Hospitalization per 100k] affects [Restriction Policy Response].

High hospitalization levels often lead to immediate government intervention to limit further spread.

CAUSAL STATEMENT 8: [Hospitalization per 100k] and [Restriction Policy Response] affect [Change of Hospitalization Next Week].

The trends of hospitalization in past weeks have strong relation with change of hospitalization next week.

Prompt 8.6: Initial SCG for TrafficSafe Dataset

CAUSAL STATEMENT 1: [Person Status] affects [Severity].

The driver's Blood Alcohol Content (BAC) significantly increases the probability of fatal crashes.

CAUSAL STATEMENT 2: [Position] affects [Severity].

Work zones can increase the probability of serious and fatal crashes. Driving in work zones after drinking is especially likely to cause severe or fatal crashes.

CAUSAL STATEMENT 3: [Driver Behavior] affects [Severity].

Aggressive driving and impairment-related behavior pose higher risk than other driver behaviors.

Prompt 8.7: Initial SCG for Swissmetro Dataset

CAUSAL STATEMENT 1: [Gender] and [Age] affect [Trip Purpose] and [Luggage].

Younger travelers are more likely to travel for education or leisure and carry luggage; older travelers more often travel for business with less luggage.

CAUSAL STATEMENT 2: [Income] affects [First Class], [Rail Pass], and [Trip_Paid_By].

High-income travelers are more likely to choose first class, own a rail pass, and pay for the trip themselves.

CAUSAL STATEMENT 3: [Trip Purpose] affects [Trip_Paid_By] and [Luggage].

Business trips are often employer-paid and involve less luggage; leisure trips are usually self-paid and involve more.

CAUSAL STATEMENT 4: [Origin and Destination] determine [Travel Options], [Travel Time], and [Headway].

Major city pairs offer more modes, shorter travel time, and higher frequency.

CAUSAL STATEMENT 5: [Trip Purpose] affects [Travel Mode Choice].

Business travelers tend to prefer faster, more reliable modes; leisure travelers may prioritize cost or flexibility.

CAUSAL STATEMENT 6: [First Class] affects [Travel Mode Choice].

Travelers choosing first class are more likely to select Train or Swissmetro over Car for comfort.

CAUSAL STATEMENT 7: [Rail Pass] affects [Travel Mode Choice].

Travelers with a rail pass are more likely to use Train or Swissmetro due to lower perceived cost.

CAUSAL STATEMENT 8: [Luggage] affects [Travel Mode Choice].

Travelers with heavy or bulky luggage may prefer Train or Car.

CAUSAL STATEMENT 9: [Trip_Paid_By] affects [Travel Mode Choice].

If the trip is employer-paid, travelers tend to choose faster or more comfortable modes like Swissmetro; if self-paid, they prefer cheaper options like standard Train or Car.

CAUSAL STATEMENT 10: [Travel Time] and [Headway] affect [Travel Mode Choice].

Business travelers are more sensitive to time and prefer faster and frequent modes; leisure travelers may tolerate longer travel time or wait if the mode is cheaper or more flexible.

8.9 Refined SCG

Prompt 8.8: Refined SCG for Pandemic Dataset (Compared to Initial)

CAUSAL STATEMENT 1: [Demographic Information] affects [Vaccination Coverage] ~~and [Restriction Policy Response]~~.

Older or vulnerable populations often have higher vaccination uptake. ~~and are more likely to be targeted by stricter restrictions.~~

CAUSAL STATEMENT 2: [Healthcare System Condition] ~~affects [Vaccination Coverage]~~ and affects [Population Immunity].

~~Regions with better healthcare access can distribute vaccines more effectively and~~ maintain higher baseline immunity.

CAUSAL STATEMENT 3: [ICU and Hospital Staffing Condition] affects [Restriction Policy Response].

When ICU beds are full or staffing is limited, governments tend to implement stricter control policies.

CAUSAL STATEMENT 4: [Vaccination Coverage] affects [Population Immunity].

Higher vaccination coverage directly increases the proportion of immune individuals in the population.

CAUSAL STATEMENT 5: [Population Immunity] affects [Reported Cases per 100k] ~~and [Hospitalization per 100k]~~.

~~Stronger immunity reduces both the number of new infections and the chance of severe cases needing hospitalization.~~ Stronger immunity reduces the number of new infections.

CAUSAL STATEMENT 6: [Reported Cases per 100k] affects [Hospitalization per 100k]. ~~and [Restriction Policy Response]~~

A rise in reported cases usually precedes more hospital admissions. ~~and can trigger policy tightening.~~

CAUSAL STATEMENT 7: [Hospitalization per 100k] affects [Restriction Policy Response].

High hospitalization levels often lead to immediate government intervention to limit further spread.

CAUSAL STATEMENT 8: [Hospitalization per 100k] and [Restriction Policy Response] affect [Change of Hospitalization Next Week].

The trends of hospitalization in past weeks have strong relation with change of hospitalization next week.

CAUSAL STATEMENT 9: [Healthcare System Condition] affects [Hospitalization per 100k].

Poor healthcare system performance can lead to higher hospitalization rates due to inadequate prevention and treatment measures.

Prompt 8.9: Refined SCG for TrafficSafe Dataset (Compared to Initial)

CAUSAL STATEMENT 1: [Person Status] affects [Severity].

The driver's Blood Alcohol Content (BAC) will significantly increase the probability of <FATAL> crashes.

CAUSAL STATEMENT 2: [Position] affects [Severity].

Work zone can increase the probability of <SERIOUS INJURY> and <FATAL> crashes. Driving in a work zone after drinking is very likely to cause <SERIOUS INJURY> or <FATAL> crashes.

CAUSAL STATEMENT 3: [Driver Behavior] affects [Severity].

Aggressive driving and impairment-related behavior are more risky than other driver behaviors.

CAUSAL STATEMENT 4: [Road Conditions] affects [Severity].

Icy road conditions can significantly increase the likelihood of <SERIOUS INJURY> or <FATAL> outcomes due to loss of vehicle control.

CAUSAL STATEMENT 5: [Safety Equipment] affects [Severity].

The use of safety equipment, such as shoulder and lap belts, is likely to reduce the severity of injuries in the event of a crash.

CAUSAL STATEMENT 6: [Road Level] affects [Severity].

Two-way undivided roads can increase the likelihood of <SERIOUS INJURY> or <FATAL> outcomes due to the potential for head-on collisions.

CAUSAL STATEMENT 7: [Dynamic Conditions] affects [Severity].

Daylight and clear weather conditions are generally associated with lower crash severity, reducing the likelihood of <SERIOUS INJURY> or <FATAL> outcomes.

CAUSAL STATEMENT 8: [Infrastructure] affects [Severity].

The presence of traffic control devices, such as stop signs, can influence crash severity by regulating vehicle flow and reducing collision risks.

CAUSAL STATEMENT 9: [Vehicle Information] affects [Severity].

Older vehicles or those with unknown defects may contribute to higher crash severity due to potential safety feature limitations.

Prompt 8.10: Refined SCG for Swissmetro Dataset (Compared to Initial)

CAUSAL STATEMENT 1: [Gender] and [Age_Range] affect [Trip Purpose] and [Luggage]. Younger travelers are more likely to travel for education or leisure and carry luggage; older travelers more often travel for business with less luggage.

CAUSAL STATEMENT 2: [Income] affects [First_Class], ~~[rail-pass]~~ and [Self-Paid]. high-income travelers are more likely to choose first class, own a rail pass, and pay for the trip themselves.

CAUSAL STATEMENT 3: [Trip Purpose] affects [Self-Paid] and [Luggage]. Business trips are often employer-paid and involve less luggage; leisure trips are usually self-paid and involve more.

~~CAUSAL STATEMENT 4: {Origin-and-destination}-determine {travel-options}, {travel-time}, and {headway}
(major city pairs offer more modes, shorter travel time, and higher frequency)~~

~~CAUSAL STATEMENT 5: {Trip-purpose}-affects {travel-mode-choice}
(business travelers tend to prefer faster, more reliable modes; leisure travelers may prioritize cost or flexibility)~~

~~CAUSAL STATEMENT 6: {First-class}-affects {travel-mode-choice}
(travelers choosing first class are more likely to select Train or Swissmetro over Car for comfort)~~

CAUSAL STATEMENT 4: [Rail Pass] affects [Travel Mode Choice]. Travelers with a rail pass are more likely to use Train or Swissmetro due to lower perceived cost.

~~CAUSAL STATEMENT 8: [Luggage]-affects {travel-mode-choice}
(travelers with heavy or bulky luggage may prefer Train or Car)~~

CAUSAL STATEMENT 5: [Trip_Paid_By] affects [Travel Mode Choice]. If the trip is employer-paid, travelers tend to choose faster or more comfortable modes like Swissmetro; if self-paid, they prefer cheaper options like standard Train or Car.

CAUSAL STATEMENT 6: [Travel Time] and [Headway] affect [Travel Mode Choice]. Business travelers are more sensitive to time and prefer faster and frequent modes; leisure travelers may tolerate longer travel time or wait if the mode is cheaper or more flexible.

8.10 Constraints for SCG Optimizer

Prompt 8.11: Constraints for SCG Optimizer for Pandemic Dataset

Prompt Format

Your revised prompt must follow the structure below:

- <SYSTEM PROMPT>
(system prompt)
<\SYSTEM PROMPT>
- <Causal Relations>
(causal relations)
<\Causal Relations>
- <Output>
(output format, fixed, don't revise this)
<\Output>

Causal Relations Guidelines

Only include causal relations between nodes for which corresponding information is available in the input description:

- | | |
|---|---------------------------------|
| • [Demographic Information] | • [Population Immunity] |
| • [Healthcare System Condition] | • [Restriction Policy Response] |
| • [ICU and Hospital Staffing Condition] | • [Hospitalization per 100k] |
| • [Vaccination Coverage] | • [Reported Cases per 100k] |

Operations

You can only use the following operations:

[1] Add new causal relations if they are clearly supported by the input. Do not make assumptions without evidence. Use the format:

[Node A] affects [Node B]
(Explanation of how [Node A] affects [Node B])

Both [Node A] and [Node B] must come from the list above. You may include node-to-node relations not involving the final prediction target to support broader reasoning and imputation.

[2] Modify existing causal relations. You may:

- Replace [Node A] affects [Node B] with a more accurate link such as [Node A] affects [Node C]
- Update the explanation for clarity or correctness

[3] Delete any causal relation that is unsupported or may negatively impact model inference. Remove both the relation and its explanation.