#### **000 001 002 003** HIERARCHICAL DEMONSTRATION ORDER OPTIMIZA-TION FOR MANY-SHOT IN-CONTEXT LEARNING

Anonymous authors

Paper under double-blind review

### ABSTRACT

In-Context Learning (ICL) is a technique where large language models (LLMs) leverage multiple demonstrations (i.e., examples) to perform tasks. With the recent expansion of LLM context windows, many-shot ICL (generally with more than 50 demonstrations) can lead to significant performance improvements on a variety of language tasks such as text classification and question answering. Nevertheless, ICL faces demonstration order instability (ICL-DOI), which means that performance varies significantly depending on the order of demonstrations. Moreover, the ICL-DOI phenomenon persists and can sometimes be more pronounced in many-shot ICL, validated by our thorough experimental investigation. Current strategies handling ICL-DOI, however, are not applicable to many-shot ICL, since they cannot overcome two critical challenges: (1) Most metrics measuring the quality of demonstration order rely on subjective judgment, lacking a theoretical foundation to achieve precise quality characterization. These metrics are thus non-applicable to many-shot situations, where the order quality of different orders is less distinguishable due to the limited ability of LLMs to exploit information in long input context. (2) The requirement to examine all orders is computationally infeasible due to the combinatorial complexity of the order space in many-shot ICL. To tackle the first challenge, we design a demonstration order evaluation metric based on information theory for measuring order quality, which effectively quantifies the usable information gain of a given demonstration order. To address the second challenge, we propose a hierarchical demonstration order optimization method named HIDO that enables a more refined exploration of the order space, achieving high ICL performance without the need to evaluate all possible orders. Extensive experiments on multiple LLMs and real-world datasets demonstrate that our HIDO method consistently and efficiently outperforms other baselines. Our code can be found at <https://anonymous.4open.science/r/HIDO-B2DE/>.

### <span id="page-0-0"></span>1 INTRODUCTION

**039 040**

**041 042 043 044 045 046 047 048 049 050 051 052 053** Large language models (LLMs) have demonstrated remarkable performance in few-shot In-Context Learning (ICL), i.e., adapting to new tasks or situations by utilizing demonstrations (examples) in the input prompt without additional training or fine-tuning [\(Brown et al., 2020;](#page-10-0) [Dong et al.,](#page-10-1) [2022;](#page-10-1) [Zhao et al., 2023\)](#page-11-0). Recent research advancements have enabled the deployment of LLMs with vastly expanded context windows, paving the way for many-shot ICL [\(Agarwal et al., 2024;](#page-10-2) [Jiang et al., 2024;](#page-10-3) [Li et al., 2023a;](#page-10-4) [Bertsch et al., 2024;](#page-10-5) [Moayedpour et al., 2024\)](#page-11-1). This approach, typically involving more than 50 demonstrations, has achieved significant performance gains across various NLP tasks, including text classification [\(Min et al., 2022\)](#page-11-2) and question answering [\(Li et al.,](#page-10-6) [2023b\)](#page-10-6). However, a critical challenge in few-shot ICL is *demonstration order instability* (ICL-DOI), which refers to the significant performance variance of ICL when the same set of demonstrations is arranged in different orders [\(Lu et al., 2022\)](#page-11-3). For instance, [Lu et al.](#page-11-3) [\(2022\)](#page-11-3) claims that for a text classification task, different orders can cause performance to fluctuate dramatically, ranging from 90% accuracy to random guessing. Unfortunately, through exploratory experiments shown in Fig. [1](#page-1-0) (see complete results in Appendix [C.2\)](#page-18-0), we observe that the ICL-DOI phenomenon persists in many-shot ICL scenarios and can be even more pronounced than in few-shot situations.

<span id="page-1-0"></span>

**065 066 067 068** Figure 1: Accuracy difference between many-shot ICL performance (150 shots) and few-shot ICL (10 shots) on TREC. We randomly select different demonstration orders and test against 256 queries to determine the average times the model predicts the correct answer. This figure shows that ICL performance variance w.r.t. demonstration orders remain significant under many-shot scenarios.

**069 070 071 072 073 074 075 076 077 078 079 080 081 082 083 084 085 086** Several studies tackle the issue of ICL-DOI in few-shot scenarios. One thread of research design stabilization methods to lower performance variance of ICL with different demonstration orders [\(Chen](#page-10-7) [et al., 2023;](#page-10-7) [Zhang et al., 2024;](#page-11-4) [Xiang et al., 2024\)](#page-11-5), while others search for the optimal demonstration orders such that the LLM achieves the highest prediction accuracy for the ICL task [\(Lu](#page-11-3) [et al., 2022;](#page-11-3) [Xu et al., 2024;](#page-11-6) [Liu et al., 2024b\)](#page-10-8). Although these proposed methods achieve satisfying performance under few-shot ICL, they can hardly be adapted to many-shot scenarios [\(Agarwal](#page-10-2) [et al., 2024\)](#page-10-2) due to two fundamental challenges: (1) Lack of precise quality-measuring metric for demonstration order: Existing research relies on subjective judgments when designing heuristic metrics for evaluating demonstration order quality. Thus, these metrics lack a theoretical foundation and can be noisy. However, LLMs are prone to pay more attention to the content in the beginning and the end (known as exhibit primacy bias and recency bias) in large context windows [\(Liu et al.,](#page-10-9) [2024a\)](#page-10-9). Therefore, for a large number of demonstrations, if the relevant demonstration is in the middle of the context, it would be difficult to distinguish the better order as the LLM may output results with subtle performance gap. (2) Infeasibility of evaluating all demonstration orders: Unlike few-shot ICL, where the existing demonstration order optimization methods evaluate every possible demonstration order, it is infeasible to conduct exhaustive demonstration order evaluations in many-shot scenarios. This is because evaluating one demonstration order requires at least one inference call, which is both costly and time-consuming. Meanwhile, the demonstration order space expands super-exponentially  $(n!)$  with the increase of demonstration numbers.

**087 088 089 090 091 092 093 094 095 096** In this paper, we aim to take the initial step to address the issue of ICL-DOI in many-shot ICL by searching for an effective demonstration order. Specifically, to tackle the first challenge, we introduce the In-Context Demonstration Order V -information (ICD-OVI) score. This metric, grounded in information theory, measures how effectively an LLM, with a certain ordered demonstration as context, extracts usable information from a query to infer its corresponding answer. This metric measures the expected usable information that an ordered demonstration provides, which is interpretable and can utilize the information of test samples, computationally viable, and proved effective with extensive experiments. To address the second challenge, we introduce a HIerarchical Demonstration Order optimization (HIDO) framework that enables more refined exploration in the order space thus achieving satisfactory ICL performance without evaluating all possible demonstration orders.

**097 098 099 100 101 102 103** We summarize our contributions as follows: (1) A Novel Metric with Theoretical Justification: We introduce a novel score function ICD-OVI based on information theory for evaluating demonstration orders which is able to utilize the information from the probing set.  $(2)$  **A Fundamental** Optimization Framework: We propose a hierarchical demonstration order optimization framework termed HIDO for many-shot learning with vast demonstration permutation spaces. (3) **Exten**sive Empirical Evaluations: We conduct extensive experiments on multiple LLMs and real-world datasets, demonstrating the effectiveness and efficiency of our HIDO.

**104 105**

**106**

### 2 PRELIMINARIES AND PROBLEM DEFINITION

**107** *Notations*. Without further specification, we denote a demonstration as  $d := (q, a)$ , where q is its query and  $a$  is its answer. For example, a demonstration for sentiment classification can be

**108 109 110 111 112 113 114 115 116** in the form of  $(q, a) =$  ("My paper is accepted to ICLR2025!", "positive"). To transform the query-answer pair into a pure-text version suitable for LLM input, we apply a transformation  $\mathcal{T}$ . This transformation organizes the pair into a standardized text format using the following template:  $\mathcal{T}(q, a)$  = "input: "q, "type: "a. By denoting the transformed text of the *i*th in-context demonstration  $(q_i, a_i)$  as  $\mathcal{T}_i = \mathcal{T}(q_i, a_i)$ , the demonstration set to be ordered can be written as  $\mathcal{D} := \{\mathcal{T}_i\}_{i=1}^n$ (*n* is the number of demonstrations). An order permutation function, denoted as  $\pi$ , is defined as a bijective mapping from the set  $\{1, ..., n\}$  to itself. We use  $\Pi(\mathcal{D})$  to represent the text of concatenated demonstrations, ordered according to the permutation  $\pi,$  i.e.,  $\Pi({\cal D}):= {\cal T}_{\pi(1)}\oplus...\oplus {\cal T}_{\pi(n)},$  where  $\oplus$ represents text concatenation operation.

**117 118 119 120 121 122 123 124 125 126 127** *Preliminaries*. The ICL-DOI phenomenon was first proposed by [Lu et al.](#page-11-3) [\(2022\)](#page-11-3), who then developed two demonstration order evaluation metrics, GlobalE and LocalE, to assess the quality of a demonstration order given a set of LLM-generated probing samples  $\hat{\mathcal{D}} := \{(\hat{q}_i, \hat{a}_i)\}_{i=1}^T$ . Specifically, given ordered demonstrations  $\Pi({\cal D})$ , GlobalE evaluate it with GlobalE $(\Pi({\cal D})) = - \Sigma_i {\bf f}_i \log {\bf f}_i.$ Here, the f is the LLM prediction label frequency vector, i.e.,  $f = \frac{\sum_i \mathbb{I}[\arg \max P_{\text{LLM}}^{\Pi,i}(a)]}{T}$ , where  $P_{\text{LLM}}^{\Pi,i}(a) := P_{\text{LLM}}(a|\Pi(\mathcal{D}) \oplus \hat{q}_i)$  denotes the output distribution (i.e., logits vector) of the LLM,  $\mathbb{I}(\cdot)$  the indicator function transforming an integer to its corresponding one-hot vector with length equal to the number of possible labels. GlobalE measures the diversity of labels given by the LLM under various probing samples. [Lu et al.](#page-11-3) [\(2022\)](#page-11-3) claim that label diversity maintains a high positive correlation with the accuracy of LLM predictions empirically. Therefore, demonstrations with higher GlobalE values are considered preferable.

**128 129 130 131 132 133 134 135 136** Additionally, LocalE is calculated as the average entropy of LLM prediction (i.e., logits vector) on probing sets, i.e., Local $E(\Pi(\mathcal{D})) = \frac{1}{T} \left[ \Sigma_i \Sigma_a P_{LLM}^{\Pi,i}(a) \log P_{LLM}^{\Pi,i}(a) \right]$ . Unlike GlobalE, which measures the label frequency distribution across probing samples, LocalE focuses on the average uncertainty of the model's predictions for individual samples. Higher LocalE values indicate that the model has less confidence in its predictions, which helps prevent the LLM from being overconfident and poorly calibrated. However, GlobalE and LocalE are heuristic metrics inspired by their empirical observations and do not utilize the label information of the probing samples as they are not able to verify the correctness of those labels.

**137 138 139 140 141 142 143** Another existing demonstration order quality metric is probability distribution optimization (PDO) metric [\(Xu et al., 2024\)](#page-11-6) defined as PDO =  $D_{KL}(\frac{1}{T} \Sigma_i P_{LLM}^{\Pi,i}(a) || U_A)$ , in which  $U_A$  is the uniform probability distribution of the label space. This metric aims to minimize the prediction label distribution discrepancy produced by LLM and the prior distribution (i.e., uniform distribution), which is guided under their assumption that well-ordered in-context examples should produce label distributions matching the prior label distribution. Nevertheless, the prior distribution of sample labels is not necessarily uniform, which has led to debates about its effectiveness and generalizability.

**144 145 146** *Problem Definition*. Here, we formulate the in-context learning demonstration order optimization task as finding the order that minimizes the distribution discrepancy between the LLM output and the original input. Specifically, we have the following definition:

**147 148 149 150 151 Definition 1.** For a demonstration data distribution  $P(\cdot)$ , where each data sample are in the shape *of (query, answer), given* n *demonstrations i.i.d. drawn from* P*, denoted as* D*, we aim to find the demonstration order* πˆ *of the* n *i.i.d. samples such that the label prediction distribution produced by LLM approximates* P*, i.e.,*

$$
\hat{\pi} = \min_{\Pi} KL(P_{LLM}(a|\Pi(\mathcal{D}) \oplus q)||P(a|q)).
$$
\n(1)

**156**

## 3 IN-CONTEXT DEMONSTRATION ORDER V -USABLE INFORMATION

**157 158 159 160 161** Before introducing our proposed HIDO model, we first present a novel evaluation metric termed In-Context Demonstration Order V-usable Information (ICD-OVI). Unlike traditional heuristic ICL demonstration order metrics such as GlobalE [\(Lu et al., 2022\)](#page-11-3), LocalE [\(Lu et al., 2022\)](#page-11-3), and PDO [\(Xu et al., 2024\)](#page-11-6), our ICD-OVI is the first metric to evaluate the quality of an ICL demonstration order with a theoretical foundation built on information theory and is capable of using the label information from the probing samples, hence being data efficient.

**182**

**204**

**162 163 164 165 166** The design of ICD-OVI is inspired by *V*-usable information [\(Xu et al., 2023;](#page-11-7) [Lin et al., 2023\)](#page-10-10), a widely recognized information-theoretic metric measuring the amount of information an ML model can capture from input queries random variable Q to predict their corresponding labels random variable A. Specifically, for a predictive family  $V$  (i.e., possible set of a model's configurations), the V-usable information is defined as  $H_V(A) - H_V(A|Q)$ , where

$$
H_V(A|Q) = \inf_{f \in V} \mathbb{E}_{(q,a)\sim P}[-\log f[q](a)],
$$
  
\n
$$
H_V(A|\emptyset) = \inf_{f \in V} \mathbb{E}_{(q,a)\sim P}[-\log f[\emptyset](a)].
$$
\n(2)

**171 172 173 174 175 176 177 178** Here, P is the input data distribution,  $f[q](a)$  is the predicted answer distribution given the information received from the query  $q$ . This metric has been shown to have multiple advantages: (1) *Interpretable*: This metric measures the amount of information (in units of "bits") of Q that a model with predictive family  $V$  can capture to predict  $A$ , which is easily human-comprehensive. (2) **Computationally Viable**: Although the data distribution  $D$  is not accessible, it can be efficiently approximated by Monte Carlo with a theoretical precision guarantee [\(Xu et al., 2023\)](#page-11-7). (2) *Empirically Effective*: the metric is empirically proven with a high correlation with the correctness of the predicted label [\(Lin et al., 2023;](#page-10-10) [Yang et al., 2024;](#page-11-8) [Wang et al., 2024\)](#page-11-9).

**179 180 181** Enlightened by  $\mathcal V$ -usable information, our ICD-OVI, measures the usable information that an LLM can capture from ordered demonstrations  $\Pi(\mathcal{D})$ . First, we define the predictive family corresponding to the ordered demonstrations  $\Pi(\mathcal{D})$  as

$$
\mathcal{V}_{\Pi} := \{ P_{\text{LLM}}(\cdot | \Pi(\mathcal{D}) \oplus q) | q \in \mathcal{Q}_P \} \cup \{ P_{\text{LLM}}(\cdot | q) | q \in \mathcal{Q}_P \},\tag{3}
$$

**183 184 185 186 187** where  $\mathcal{Q}_P$  represents the set of all possible queries in the sample space of task distribution  $P$ , and  $\{P_{\text{LLM}}(\cdot|q)|q \in \mathcal{Q}_P\}$  is added to satisfy the optimal ignorance requirement for a predictive family [\(Xu et al., 2023\)](#page-11-7). Then, ICD-OVI, the information that the model can capture from  $\Pi(\mathcal{D})$ , can be defined as the expected information the model with predictive family  $V_{\Pi}$  can capture from query random variable  $Q$  for predicting label random variable  $A$ , i.e.,

<span id="page-3-0"></span>
$$
\begin{split} \text{ICD-OVI} &= H_{\mathcal{V}_{\Pi}}(A) - H_{\mathcal{V}_{\Pi}}(A|Q), \\ &= \inf_{f \in \mathcal{V}_{\Pi}} \mathbb{E}_{q,a \sim \mathcal{D}}[-\log f[\emptyset](a)] - \inf_{f \in \mathcal{V}_{\Pi}} \mathbb{E}_{q,a \sim \mathcal{D}}[-\log f[q](a)], \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{(q,a) \sim P}[\log_2 P_{\text{LLM}}(a|\Pi(\mathcal{A}) \oplus \emptyset) - \log_2 P_{\text{LLM}}(a|\Pi(\mathcal{D}) \oplus q)], \end{split} \tag{4}
$$

where  $\Pi(\mathcal{A}) := \bigoplus_{i=1}^n \mathcal{T}(\emptyset, a_{\pi(i)})$ . The third equation follows the definition of in-context V-information from Eq. 1 of [Lu et al.](#page-10-11) [\(2023\)](#page-10-11). Practically, denoting  $P_{\text{LLM}}^i(\hat{a}) := P_{\text{LLM}}(\hat{a}|\hat{q}_i)$ , we may approximate the Eq. [4](#page-3-0) with the probing samples  $\hat{D}$  generated by LLM with

<span id="page-3-1"></span>
$$
\frac{1}{|\hat{D}|}\Sigma_i(-\log_2 P_{\text{LLM}}^{\Pi,i}(\hat{a}) + \log_2 P_{\text{LLM}}^i(\hat{a})).
$$
\n(5)

**199 200 201 202 203** Nevertheless, Eq. [5](#page-3-1) involves the LLM-generated labels  $\hat{a}$ s for the probing samples, which can be factually incorrect. Utilizing those incorrect labels may lead to bias in the computation of ICD-OVI. Fortunately, the theory of V-usable information [\(Ethayarajh et al., 2022;](#page-10-12) [Lu et al., 2023\)](#page-10-11) provide a effective tool called point-wise V-informationn threshold (*PVI threshold*) which assists deciding if one generated probing sample label is reliable. Here, PVI is defined as

<span id="page-3-2"></span>
$$
PVI_{(\hat{q},\hat{a})}^{(\Pi(\mathcal{D}))} = -\log_2 P_{\text{LLM}}(\hat{a}|\Pi(\mathcal{D}) \oplus \hat{q}) + \log_2 P_{\text{LLM}}(\hat{a}|\Pi(\mathcal{A}) \oplus \hat{q}).
$$
\n(6)

**205 206 207 208 209** By Eq. [6,](#page-3-2) the ICD-OVI is the mean of PVIs for all probing samples  $\hat{\mathcal{D}}$ . Built upon PVI, the PVI threshold is a scalar characterizing the likelihood of the correctness of the sample label. Specifically, when the PVI of a probing sample  $(\hat{q}, \hat{a})$  is smaller than  $\tau$ , the label  $\hat{a}$  is possibly incorrect; otherwise, the label  $\hat{a}$  is highly likely to be correct for query  $\hat{q}$ . The existence of a PVI threshold is extensively validated by [Ethayarajh et al.](#page-10-12) [\(2022\)](#page-10-12); [Lu et al.](#page-10-11) [\(2023\)](#page-10-11) in various datasets and LLMs.

**210 211 212 213 214 215** With the aid of the PVI threshold, we can address the potential bias caused by incorrect LLMgenerated labels. Specifically, for a probing sample  $(\hat{q}, \hat{a})$ , we first calculate its PVI; if it is higher than a predefined V-information threshold  $\tau$ , then we adopt the PVI of the sample  $(\hat{q}, \hat{a})$  into the ICD-OVI calculation of ordered demonstrations  $\Pi(\mathcal{D})$ . Otherwise, we relax the PVI to its expectation for labels set  $\{a|a \in \mathcal{A}\},$  i.e.,

$$
\text{EPVI}_{(\hat{q},\hat{a})}^{\Pi(\mathcal{D})} = \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \left[ -P_{\text{LLM}}^{\Pi,\hat{q}}(a) \log_2 P_{\text{LLM}}^{\Pi,\hat{q}}(a) + P_{\text{LLM}}^{\hat{q}}(a) \log_2 P_{\text{LLM}}^{\hat{q}}(a) \right].\tag{7}
$$

**216** Conclusively, by denoting point-wise ICD-OVI (PICD-OVI) as

$$
\text{PICD-OVI}_{(\hat{q},\hat{a})}^{\Pi(\mathcal{D})} = \mathbb{I}(\text{PVI}_{(\hat{q},\hat{a})} \ge \tau) \text{PVI}_{(\hat{q},\hat{a})} + \mathbb{I}(\text{PVI}_{(\hat{q},\hat{a})} < \tau) \text{EPVI}_{(\hat{q},\hat{a})},\tag{8}
$$

our ICD-OVI can be approximated as

<span id="page-4-0"></span>
$$
ICD-OVI(\Pi(\mathcal{D})) \approx \frac{1}{|\hat{D}|} \Sigma_{(\hat{q},\hat{a})} PICD-OVI_{(\hat{q},\hat{a})}.
$$
\n(9)

Thus, our proposed ICD-OVI can effectively estimate the V -usable information despite noisy labels. Specifically, we have the theorem:

**Theorem 1.** *Under mild condition, for any two ordered demonstrations*  $\Pi_1(\mathcal{D})$  *and*  $\Pi_1(\mathcal{D})$ *, given a probing sample*  $(\hat{q}, \hat{a})$ *, if* 

$$
PICD\text{-}OVI_{(\hat{q},\hat{a})}^{\Pi_1(\mathcal{D})} > PICD\text{-}OVI_{(\hat{q},\hat{a})}^{\Pi_2(\mathcal{D})},\tag{10}
$$

*then we have*

$$
PVI_{(\hat{q},a^*)}^{\Pi_1(\mathcal{D})} > PVI_{(\hat{q},a^*)}^{\Pi_2(\mathcal{D})},\tag{11}
$$

where the  $a^*$  is the ground-truth label corresponding to the generated query  $\hat{q}$ . Therefore, if  $\Pi_1(\mathcal{D})$ *is more performant demonstration order than*  $\Pi_2(\mathcal{D})$ *, i.e., Eq. [14](#page-13-0) establish for any probing sample*  $(\hat{q}, \hat{a})$ *, then ICD-OVI*( $\Pi_1(\mathcal{D})$ ) > *ICD-OVI*( $\Pi_2(\mathcal{D})$ )*.* 

**236 237 238 239 240 241 242** Notably, although each probing sample  $(\hat{q}, \hat{a})$  appears to require two LLM inference calls (one inference call for  $\Pi(\mathcal{D})\oplus\hat{q}$ , the other for  $\Pi(\mathcal{A})\oplus\emptyset$ ) in Eq. [9,](#page-4-0) we only need to calculate  $P_{\text{LLM}}(\hat{a}|\Pi(\mathcal{A})\oplus\emptyset)$ once for one demonstration order regardless of the choice of probing sample  $(\hat{q}, \hat{a})$ . This ensures that ICD-OVI has comparable computational complexity to traditional heuristic metrics. Our ICD-OVI is the first information-theoretic metric for ICL demonstration order evaluation and inherits all the benign properties of V-information in the scenario of ICL-DOI. Extensive empirical validations in our section of experiments show the effectiveness of our proposed ICD-OVI.

### 4 METHODOLOGY

**244 245**

<span id="page-4-1"></span>**249**

**251**

**260**

**243**

**246 247 248** In this section, we first present the motivations behind the key characteristics of our HIDO model design. Then, we provide an overview of our HIDO framework, followed by a detailed elaboration on each component in the framework.

#### **250** 4.1 MOTIVATION OF MODEL DESIGN

**252 253 254 255 256 257 258 259** As mentioned in the Section [1,](#page-0-0) simply evaluating all possible demonstration orders is infeasible. Thus, we adopt a clustering method to more effectively search the permutation space. In this case, we transform the ICL-DOI problem to a hierarchical optimization, which solely requires determining the optimal order of demonstrations within each cluster and the optimal inter-cluster orders. This procedure significantly restricts the permutation search space from  $n!$  ( $n$  is the number of demonstrations in D) to k!  $\left[\frac{n}{k}\right]$ ! (k is the number of clusters). For example, if  $n = 15$ ,  $k = 5$ , then the search space size will decrease from  $1.3 \times 10^{12}$  to 720. To perform the hierarchical optimization, we first optimize the demonstration orders within each cluster. Then, with the fixed optimal demonstration order within each cluster, we optimize the inter-cluster orders.

**261 262 263 264 265 266 267 268 269** In both intra-cluster and inter-cluster order optimization, a crucial step is evaluating the optimized order with our proposed ICD-OVI metric. However, ICD-OVI requires a probing set generated from LLM, which should model the distribution of the input data. For data efficiency, we assume that the demonstration order optimized for answer prediction also works well for sample generation, reflecting the input data distribution effectively. This assumption is empirically justified in Appendix [C.3](#page-20-0) and Appendix [C.5.](#page-28-0) Based on this assumption, we can optimize the estimation precision of ICD-OVI by generating higher-quality probing sets (i.e., reducing the discrepancy between the probing sample distribution and the task data distribution) with the current optimized order after each intracluster and inter-cluster iteration (see details in Section [4.6\)](#page-6-0). The newly generated probing sets are then used to evaluate the next iteration's optimized order, but the estimated ICD-OVI become more precise due to the increased quality of the probing sets.

<span id="page-5-0"></span>

Figure 2: Overview of our proposed in-context demonstration order optimization framework HIDO.

4.2 HIDO OVERVIEW

Fig. [2](#page-5-0) illustrates the workflow of our proposed HIDO framework. In summary, HIDO first clusters the embeddings of the input demonstration texts and then performs  $k$  iterations of hierarchical order optimizations. In each iteration, the process first determines the near-optimal order within each cluster. Then, while maintaining these intra-cluster orders, it searches for the most effective order of the clusters themselves. This alternating focus on intra- and inter-cluster optimization may be iterated multiple rounds during which the probing samples are imporved (see detailed rationale in Section [4.6\)](#page-6-0) to achieve more accurate assessment of the demonstration order quality using ICD-OVI.

<span id="page-5-1"></span>4.3 DEMONSTRATION CLUSTERING

**290 291 292 293 294 295 296 297** According to Section [4.1,](#page-4-1) clustering demonstrations would substantially reduce the permutation space, allowing for more efficient search of the best order. Additionally, embeddings within the same cluster would be closer together, meaning less variance between the intra-cluster demonstrations. Thus, we apply a  $K$ -means algorithm [\(Macqueen, 1967\)](#page-11-10) to the text embeddings of the demonstrations. These text embeddings are generated using the text embeddings API from [OpenAI](#page-11-11) [\(2024a\)](#page-11-11). We limit the number of clusters to be small (typically no more than four), as a larger number would cause a combinatorial explosion during HIDO's inter-cluster order optimization stage, where all possible orders are evaluated.

**298 299**

### <span id="page-5-2"></span>4.4 INTRA-CLUSTER ORDER OPTIMIZATION

**300 301 302 303 304 305 306 307** In Section [4.3,](#page-5-1) we restrict the cluster number to be small (typically no more than four) so that we can evaluate all the inter-cluster orders. This implies that demonstrations within one cluster, despite sharing similar latent embeddings, can be large in quantity. For instance, a typical many-shot in-context learning process requires between 50 and 150 demonstrations [\(Ye et al., 2023;](#page-11-12) [Agarwal et al., 2024\)](#page-10-2), so the number of samples within a cluster can be as large as 30, making it impossible to evaluate all their permutation combinations. Nevertheless, the intra-cluster demonstrations share proximate embeddings, which significantly decreases ICL performance variance when demonstration orders vary. This allows a less thorough order search while still achieving satisfactory precision.

**308 309 310 311 312** Hence, we design a demonstration order space exploration strategy as follows (see the illustration in Fig. [3\)](#page-6-1): we first randomly generate a demonstration order as the starting point. Then, in each iteration, we explore its "neighborhood" by randomly flipping 10% of its positions, which ensures sufficient variation between selected orders while constraining exploration within a defined radius of the anchor order, as measured by rank correlations. Specifically, we have (see proof in Appendix [B\)](#page-12-0)

**313 314 315 316 317** Theorem 2. *Randomly flipping* K *entries from a sequence of length* N *will always keep the rank correlation within a range characterized by the lower bound*  $1-6\sum_{i=1}^{K}(a_i-a_{K+1-i})^2/N(N^2-1)$ *and upper bound* 1*. The upper bound is achieved with a extremely low probability of* 1/K! *when the perturbed sequence is identical to the original sequence.*

**318 319 320 321 322 323** For each candidate intra-cluster order, we evaluate its quality using the ICD-OVI metric, which relies on a probing set generated by a language model (LLM). Here, the probing set generation process leverages information from the previous optimization iteration. Specifically, we start with the top  $k$  effective intra-cluster orders for the cluster of interest from the previous optimization iteration. For each of these  $k$  orders, we create  $k$  distinct sets of ordered demonstrations by combining: *(i)* The *optimal inter-cluster order* from the previous iteration (fixed); *(ii)* The *optimal intra-cluster orders for all other clusters* from the previous iteration (fixed); *(iii)* The

<span id="page-6-2"></span><span id="page-6-1"></span>

Figure 4: Illustration for dynamic update of the score function.

*current candidate intra-cluster order* (from the k orders) for the cluster being optimized. The k distinct ordered demonstrations differ only in the order of demonstrations within the cluster of interest. We then prompt the LLM with each of the  $k$  sets, generating  $k$  different probing sample sets. These k probing sets are collectively used to evaluate the quality of the candidate intra-cluster order with the ICD-OVI metric. Using multiple probing sets derived from the top performing orders of the previous iteration, we achieve a more robust and comprehensive candidate order evaluation.

### <span id="page-6-3"></span>4.5 INTER-CLUSTER ORDER OPTIMIZATION

**351 352 353 354 355 356** Having obtained the near-optimal demonstration orders within each cluster, we now focus on finding the optimal order of the clusters themselves. As we have limited the number of clusters to typically no more than four, it becomes feasible to evaluate all possible cluster orders, as illustrated in Fig. [3](#page-6-1) (b). Similar to the intra-cluster optimization process, we generate a probing set to evaluate each possible inter-cluster order. However, in this case, we employ all possible cluster orders, while fixing the optimal intra-cluster demonstration orders obtained from the previous iteration.

**357 358 359 360 361 362** Specifically, we first consider all possible permutations of cluster orders, then prompt the LLM with this complete set of ordered demonstrations (combining the cluster order being evaluated and the fixed optimal intra-cluster orders) to generate a probing set. Each generated probing set is used to evaluate its corresponding inter-cluster order using the ICD-OVI metric. This approach allows us to comprehensively assess different cluster arrangements while leveraging the optimized intra-cluster orders, potentially leading to a globally optimized demonstration order.

<span id="page-6-0"></span>**363 364** 4.6 DYNAMIC UPDATE OF THE SCORE FUNCTION

**365 366 367 368 369** Our HIDO performs multiple rounds of intra- and inter-cluster optimization, during which the score function (ICD-OVI evaluation) is refined through updated probing sets, which is illustrated in Fig. [4.](#page-6-2) A higher-quality probing set reduces distribution discrepancy between probing and input data samples, enabling more precise ICD-OVI estimation. This procedure further improves accuracy in identifying effective demonstration orders for answer prediction.

**370 371 372 373 374 375 376 377** This procedure is separately introduced in the Section [4.4](#page-5-2) and Section [4.5,](#page-6-3) therefore, we briefly concluded it as follows. In each iteration of in-context demonstration order optimization, we cache the top  $k$  intra-cluster demonstration orders for all clusters. For intra-cluster optimization in the subsequent iteration, we apply the cached top  $k$  orders for the cluster being optimized, while maintaining the optimal intra-cluster orders from the previous iteration for all other clusters. We combine these with the optimal inter-cluster order from the previous iteration to generate new probing sets. For inter-cluster optimization, we consider all possible cluster arrangements. For each arrangement, we apply the optimal intra-cluster demonstration orders obtained from the previous iteration to generate probing sets for evaluating each inter-cluster arrangement.

**378 379** Table 1: Metadata of the LLMs tested. "Lan. models", "Con. window" indicates the language models, and context window size.

Lan. models	<b>GPT-3.5T</b>	GPT40M	SciPhi	Zephyr	LlaMa3
Con. window	16.385	128,000	32.768	32.768	1.048.576
Max output	4.096	16.384	n/a	n/a	n/a
Model size	175B	n/a	7B.	7B	8Β

<span id="page-7-0"></span>Table 2: The performance of our HIDO along with baselines on various datasets. The best performance for each dataset and model combination is bolded.



**410 411 412 413 414** This approach is based on the assumption in Section [4.1](#page-4-1) that the optimal demonstration order is also effective for sample generation. With this, we can reuse the most effective orders found for label prediction from the previous iteration when generating high-quality probing samples in the current iteration, which significantly reduces computational costs. By iteratively refining our probing sets for both intra-cluster and inter-cluster optimizations, we aim to improve the accuracy of our order evaluations progressively, leading to better optimized orders over time.

**415 416**

#### **417** 5 EXPERIMENTS

**418 419**

In this section, we first introduce our experimental setup, including the datasets, baselines, and LLMs utilized. Then, we present the main results demonstrating the effectiveness of HIDO compared to the baseline methods. Finally, we conduct ablation studies to examine the utility of different components and perform parameter sensitivity analysis to test the robustness of our approach. In particular, we focus on answering the three research questions via extensive experiments: RQ1: How does HIDO perform compared to existing demonstration order optimization methods across different datasets and language models?  $RQ2$ : What is the impact of each key component in  $HIDO$  on its overall performance? **RQ3:** How sensitive is HIDO to its main hyperparameters?

- **425 426 427 428**
- 5.1 EXPERIMENT SETUP
- **429 430** Here, we introduce the various settings for our experimental evaluation.
- **431** *Baselines*: (1) GlobalE: Randomly select 24 orders and measure the entropy of the frequency distribution of the prediction labels on probing datasets [Lu et al.](#page-11-3) [\(2022\)](#page-11-3); (2) LocalE: Analogously to [Lu](#page-11-3)

**432 433 434 435** [et al.](#page-11-3) [\(2022\)](#page-11-3), randomly select 24 demonstration orders and calculate the average entropy of their predicted logits given by LLM. (3) **Probability Distribution Ordering (PDO)**: Randomly sample 24 orders and calculate the KL divergence between the frequency distribution of the prediction labels on probing datasets and the uniform distribution [\(Xu et al., 2024\)](#page-11-6).

**436 437 438 439 440 441** *Datasets*: We adopt nine text classification datasets, namely AGNews [\(Zhang et al., 2015\)](#page-11-13), CB [\(De Marneffe et al., 2019\)](#page-10-13), CR [\(Hu and Liu, 2004\)](#page-10-14), DBPedia [\(Zhang et al., 2015\)](#page-11-13), MPQA [\(Wiebe](#page-11-14) [et al., 2005\)](#page-11-14), MR [\(Pang and Lee, 2005\)](#page-11-15), RTE [\(Dagan et al., 2005\)](#page-10-15), SST-5 [\(Socher et al., 2013\)](#page-11-16) and TREC [\(Voorhees and Tice, 2000\)](#page-11-17). Those datasets cover various semantic scenarios, including sentiment classification and textual entailment (see Appendix [C.4](#page-22-0) for demonstration examples). For evaluation, we sub-sample 256 instances from each dataset due to budget constraints.

**442 443 444 445 446** *Large Language Models*: We adopt "GPT-3.5-Turbo-0125" [\(OpenAI, 2024b\)](#page-11-18) and "GPT-4o-Mini-2024-07-19" [\(OpenAI, 2024c\)](#page-11-19) from OpenAI, "SciPhi-Mistral-7B-32k" [\(Huggingface, 2024b\)](#page-10-16), "Zephyr-7b-beta" [\(Huggingface, 2024c\)](#page-10-17) and "LlaMa-3-8B-Instuct-Gradient-1048k" [\(Huggingface,](#page-10-18) [2024a\)](#page-10-18) from HuggingFace. We select the OpenAI models due to their affordability and the HuggingFace models due to their large context windows.

**447 448**

**449**

**462**

**464**

5.2 EFFECTIVENESS OF HIDO

**450 451 452 453 454 455 456 457 458 459 460 461** In this section, we aim to answer  $RQ1$ . In Table [2,](#page-7-0) we measure the accuracy of the output demonstration orders produced by HIDO and the baselines on various datasets and LLMs. We observe that HIDO achieves the highest prediction accuracy in most settings, proving the effectiveness of our framework. Notably, our method can achieve significant performance leads in GPT-3.5T on CB (51.19%), GPT-4oM on SST-5 (56.64%), SciPhi on TREC (80.47%), and LlaMa3 on MPQA (63.80%). Additionally, we make the following observations from Table [2:](#page-7-0) (1) Model-agnostic: HIDO achieves the best performance on both large and small LLMs, implying that our framework is model agnostic; it can be used on different models and find relatively high-performing orders. (2) Low variance: In general, HIDO has a smaller variation in performance on most dataset model combinations in contrast to that of the baselines, especially in GPT-3.5T on CB (2.73%), GPT-4oM on DBPedia (0.81%), and SciPhi on TREC (0.78%). This indicates that  $HIDO$  can consistently find the order that gives the best performance. (3) Runner-up on non-optimal datasets: In those cases that HIDO does not perform the best, the results are still comparable to the best-performing baseline.

**463** 5.3 ABLATION STUDY

**465 466 467 468 469 470 471 472** In this subsection, we address  $RQ2$  by examining four variants of our HIDO model: (1) **HIDO-NC**: This variant tests the effectiveness of our clustering procedure by randomly assigning samples to clusters. For a fair comparison, we maintain the same number of clusters and demonstrations per cluster as in the original HIDO. (2) HIDO-NIntra: Instead of optimizing each intra-cluster demonstration order, this variant randomly selects demonstration orders within clusters while keeping all other components the same as HIDO. (3) **HIDO-NInter**: After the intra-cluster demonstration order optimization stage, this variant randomly selects an inter-cluster order as the optimal inter-cluster order. (4) HIDO-ND: This variant removes the dynamic update scheme for the score function. It outputs the best demonstration order after only one optimization iteration.

**473 474 475 476 477 478 479** From Fig. [5a,](#page-9-0) we observe that removing each component causes performance degradation. More specifically, we have the following observations: (1) HIDO-NC has the largest difference, indicating that grouping the samples based on distance allows HIDO to find the best order while maintaining efficiency. (2) HIDO-ND has relatively small increase, which implies that HIDO is able to find the best order within a small number of optimization iterations. (3) HIDO-NInter and HIDO-NIntra have similar impacts on the performance. This highlights the significance of hierarchical optimization in finding the best order. Additional results can be found in Appendix [C.1.](#page-17-0)

**480 481 482**

### 5.4 PARAMETER SENSITIVITY

**483 484 485** In this subsection, we address **RQ3**. Although our model has numerous hyperparameters, we focus our analysis on two we consider most significant: the number of clusters  $k$  and the maximum number of optimization iterations l. Fig. [5b](#page-9-0) illustrates our model's performance with varying k and l on the TREC and MPQA datasets using the Sciphi model. We observe that performance generally

<span id="page-9-0"></span>

Figure 5: Combined results of ablation study and parameter analysis.

improves as  $l$  increases, indicating that more iterations of  $HIDO$  tend to produce better-performing demonstration orders. Regarding the number of clusters, we find that performance peaks at  $k = 2$  for MPQA and  $k = 3$  for TREC. This variation suggests that different datasets require specific numbers of clusters to optimally partition the data and yield the best-performing demonstration orders.

6 RELATED WORK

#### **508** 6.1 MANY-SHOT IN-CONTEXT LEARNING

**509 510 511 512 513 514 515 516 517** With the expanded context window of recently developed LLMs, the models can process a larger number of demonstrations within a single prompt, resulting in further research observing the effect of large number of demonstrations (i.e. more than 50) on ICL [\(Agarwal et al., 2024;](#page-10-2) [Jiang et al.,](#page-10-3) [2024;](#page-10-3) [Li et al., 2023a;](#page-10-4) [Bertsch et al., 2024;](#page-10-5) [Moayedpour et al., 2024\)](#page-11-1). [Li et al.](#page-10-4) [\(2023a\)](#page-10-4) develop a long-range language model EVALM that achieves higher accuracy when using many shot ICL; however, the model cannot maintain the same performance consistently, indicating that ICL-DOI still exists. Some emprirical results from [Agarwal et al.](#page-10-2) [\(2024\)](#page-10-2) provides early evidence for manyshot demonstration order sensitivity by showing how one order that gives the best performance on one subset of a dataset can perform poorly on a different subset of the same original dataset.

**518 519**

### 6.2 OPTIMIZATION TECHNIQUES FOR VAST PERMUTATION SPACES

**520 521 522 523 524 525 526 527 528 529** The problem of finding optimal orderings in large permutation spaces is not unique to ICL and has been studied in various domains. Traditional approaches like simulated annealing [\(Kirkpatrick](#page-10-19) [et al., 1983\)](#page-10-19) and genetic algorithms [\(Tomassini, 1995\)](#page-11-20) have been applied to similar combinatorial optimization problems. However, these methods often struggle with the scale of permutations encountered in ICL scenarios. Recent work in combinatorial optimization has introduced hierarchical and decomposition-based approaches to tackle large-scale permutation problems [\(Goh et al., 2022;](#page-10-20) [Luo et al., 2023;](#page-11-21) [Pan et al., 2023\)](#page-11-22). For instance, [Pan et al.](#page-11-22) [\(2023\)](#page-11-22) proposed a hierarchical optimization framework for solving large-scale traveling salesman problems, demonstrating the effectiveness of dividing the problem into manageable sub-problems. Enlightened by those ideas, we tackle specific challenges of ICL demonstration ordering.

**530 531**

**532**

## 7 CONCLUSION

**533 534 535 536 537 538 539** This paper introduces HIDO, a novel approach to perform demonstration order optimization in incontext learning (ICL). HIDO efficiently navigates vast permutation spaces to find effective demonstration orders, significantly reducing search time while maintaining high prediction utility. Our key contributions include a score function with solid theoretical foundation based on information theory for evaluating demonstration orders, a hierarchical optimization framework, and a dynamic update mechanism. Extensive experiments on multiple LLMs and datasets demonstrate that our HIDO outperforms existing baselines. We hope that our work will shed light on new promising methods for unleashing in-context learning performance.

#### **540 541 REFERENCES**

- <span id="page-10-2"></span>**542 543 544** R. Agarwal, A. Singh, L. M. Zhang, B. Bohnet, L. Rosias, S. C. Chan, B. Zhang, A. Faust, and H. Larochelle. Many-shot in-context learning. In *ICML 2024 Workshop on In-Context Learning*, 2024.
- <span id="page-10-5"></span>**545 546** A. Bertsch, M. Ivgi, U. Alon, J. Berant, M. R. Gormley, and G. Neubig. In-context learning with long-context models: An in-depth exploration. *arXiv*, 2024.
- <span id="page-10-0"></span>**547 548** T. B. Brown et al. Language models are few-shot learners. . In *NeurIPS*, 2020.
- <span id="page-10-15"></span><span id="page-10-13"></span><span id="page-10-7"></span>**549 550** L. Chen, H. Wang, Y. Deng, W. C. Kwan, Z. Wang, and K.-F. Wong. Towards robust personalized dialogue generation via order-insensitive representation regularization. In *Findings of ACL*, 2023.
	- I. Dagan, O. Glickman, and B. Magnini. The pascal recognising textual entailment challenge. In *Machine learning challenges workshop*, 2005.
	- M.-C. De Marneffe, M. Simons, and J. Tonhauser. The commitmentbank: Investigating projection in naturally occurring discourse. In *proceedings of Sinn und Bedeutung*, 2019.
	- Q. Dong, L. Li, D. Dai, C. Zheng, Z. Wu, B. Chang, X. Sun, J. Xu, and Z. Sui. A survey on in-context learning. *arXiv*, 2022.
- <span id="page-10-20"></span><span id="page-10-12"></span><span id="page-10-1"></span>**559 560** K. Ethayarajh, Y. Choi, and S. Swayamdipta. Understanding dataset difficulty with v-usable information. In *ICML*, 2022.
	- S. T. Goh, J. Bo, S. Gopalakrishnan, and H. C. Lau. Techniques to enhance a qubo solver for permutation-based combinatorial optimization. In *Proceedings of the Genetic and Evolutionary Computation Conference Companion*, pages 2223–2231, 2022.
	- M. Hu and B. Liu. Mining and summarizing customer reviews. In *SIGKDD*, 2004.
	- Huggingface. Llama-3-8b-instruct-gradient-1048k. <https://huggingface.co>, 2024a. Available at <https://huggingface.co>.
- <span id="page-10-18"></span><span id="page-10-16"></span><span id="page-10-14"></span>**569 570** Huggingface. Sciphi-mistral-7b-32k. <https://huggingface.co>, 2024b. Available at <https://huggingface.co>.
- <span id="page-10-19"></span><span id="page-10-17"></span><span id="page-10-4"></span><span id="page-10-3"></span>**571 572 573** Huggingface. Zephyr-7b-beta. <https://huggingface.co>, 2024c. Available at [https:](https://huggingface.co) [//huggingface.co](https://huggingface.co).
	- Y. Jiang, J. A. Irvin, J. H. Wang, M. A. Chaudhry, J. H. Chen, and A. Y. Ng. Many-shot in-context learning in multimodal foundation models. In *ICML Workshop on In-Context Learning*, 2024.
	- S. Kirkpatrick, C. D. Gelatt Jr, and M. P. Vecchi. Optimization by simulated annealing. *science*, 1983.
	- M. Li, S. Gong, J. Feng, Y. Xu, J. Zhang, Z. Wu, and L. Kong. In-context learning with many demonstration examples. *arXiv*, 2023a.
	- T. Li, X. Ma, A. Zhuang, Y. Gu, Y. Su, and W. Chen. Few-shot in-context learning on knowledge base question answering. In *ACL*, 2023b.
	- Y. T. Lin, A. Papangelis, S. Kim, S. Lee, D. Hazarika, M. Namazifar, D. Jin, Y. Liu, and D. Hakkani-Tur. Selective in-context data augmentation for intent detection using pointwise v-information. In *EACL*, 2023.
- <span id="page-10-10"></span><span id="page-10-9"></span><span id="page-10-6"></span>**587 588 589** N. F. Liu, K. Lin, J. Hewitt, A. Paranjape, M. Bevilacqua, F. Petroni, and P. Liang. Lost in the middle: How language models use long contexts. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 12:157–173, 2024a.
- <span id="page-10-8"></span>**590 591 592** Y. Liu, J. Liu, X. Shi, Q. Cheng, and W. Lu. Let's learn step by step: Enhancing in-context learning ability with curriculum learning. *arXiv*, 2024b.
- <span id="page-10-11"></span>**593** S. Lu, S. Chen, Y. Li, D. Bitterman, G. K. Savova, and I. Gurevych. Measuring pointwise v-usable information in-context-ly. In *EMNLP2023*, 2023.

<span id="page-11-22"></span><span id="page-11-21"></span><span id="page-11-19"></span><span id="page-11-18"></span><span id="page-11-16"></span><span id="page-11-15"></span><span id="page-11-11"></span><span id="page-11-10"></span><span id="page-11-3"></span><span id="page-11-2"></span><span id="page-11-1"></span>**594 595 596 597 598 599 600 601 602 603 604 605 606 607 608 609 610 611 612 613 614 615 616 617 618 619 620 621 622 623 624 625 626 627 628 629 630 631 632 633 634 635 636 637 638 639 640 641 642 643 644 645 646 647** Y. Lu, M. Bartolo, A. Moore, S. Riedel, and P. Stenetorp. Fantastically ordered prompts and where to find them: Overcoming few-shot prompt order sensitivity. In *ACL*, 2022. F. Luo, X. Lin, F. Liu, Q. Zhang, and Z. Wang. Neural combinatorial optimization with heavy decoder: Toward large scale generalization. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36:8845–8864, 2023. J. Macqueen. Some methods for classification and analysis of multivariate observations. In *Proceedings of 5-th Berkeley Symposium on Mathematical Statistics and Probability*, 1967. S. Min, M. Lewis, L. Zettlemoyer, and H. Hajishirzi. Metaicl: Learning to learn in context. In *NAACL*, 2022. S. Moayedpour, A. Corrochano-Navarro, F. Sahneh, S. Noroozizadeh, A. Koetter, J. Vymetal, L. Kogler-Anele, P. Mas, Y. Jangjou, S. Li, et al. Many-shot in-context learning for molecular inverse design. *arXiv*, 2024. OpenAI. New embedding models and API updates. [https://openai.com/index/](https://openai.com/index/new-embedding-models-and-api-updates/) [new-embedding-models-and-api-updates/](https://openai.com/index/new-embedding-models-and-api-updates/), 2024a. OpenAI. Gpt-3.5-turbo-0125. <https://openai.com>, 2024b. Available at [https://](https://openai.com) [openai.com](https://openai.com). OpenAI. Gpt-4o-mini-2024-07-19. <https://openai.com>, 2024c. Available at [https://](https://openai.com) [openai.com](https://openai.com). X. Pan, Y. Jin, Y. Ding, M. Feng, L. Zhao, L. Song, and J. Bian. H-tsp: Hierarchically solving the large-scale traveling salesman problem. In *AAAI*, 2023. B. Pang and L. Lee. Seeing stars: exploiting class relationships for sentiment categorization with respect to rating scales. In *ACL*, 2005. R. Socher, A. Perelygin, J. Wu, J. Chuang, C. D. Manning, A. Y. Ng, and C. Potts. Recursive deep models for semantic compositionality over a sentiment treebank. In *EMNLP*, 2013. M. Tomassini. A survey of genetic algorithms. *Annual reviews of computational physics III*, 1995. E. M. Voorhees and D. M. Tice. Building a question answering test collection. In *SIGIR*, 2000. Z. Wang, C. Li, Z. Yang, Q. Liu, Y. Hao, X. Chen, D. Chu, and D. Sui. Analyzing chain-of-thought prompting in black-box large language models via estimated v-information. In *LREC-COLING*, 2024. J. Wiebe, T. Wilson, and C. Cardie. Annotating expressions of opinions and emotions in language. *LREC*, 2005. Y. Xiang, H. Yan, L. Gui, and Y. He. Addressing order sensitivity of in-context demonstration examples in causal language models. *arXiv*, 2024. Y. Xu, S. Zhao, J. Song, R. Stewart, and S. Ermon. A theory of usable information under computational constraints. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023. Z. Xu, D. Cohen, B. Wang, and V. Srikumar. In-context example ordering guided by label distributions. In *Findings of NAACL*, 2024. W. Yang, W. Tan, H. Zhang, and B. Yan. Maximizing v-information for pre-training superior foundation models. *arXiv*, 2024. J. Ye, Z. Wu, J. Feng, T. Yu, and L. Kong. Compositional exemplars for in-context learning. In *ICML*, 2023. K. Zhang, A. Lv, Y. Chen, H. Ha, T. Xu, and R. Yan. Batch-icl: Effective, efficient, and orderagnostic in-context learning. *arXiv*, 2024. X. Zhang, J. Zhao, and Y. LeCun. Character-level convolutional networks for text classification. *NeurIPS*, 2015. W. X. Zhao, K. Zhou, J. Li, T. Tang, X. Wang, Y. Hou, Y. Min, B. Zhang, J. Zhang, Z. Dong, et al.

<span id="page-11-20"></span><span id="page-11-17"></span><span id="page-11-14"></span><span id="page-11-13"></span><span id="page-11-12"></span><span id="page-11-9"></span><span id="page-11-8"></span><span id="page-11-7"></span><span id="page-11-6"></span><span id="page-11-5"></span><span id="page-11-4"></span><span id="page-11-0"></span>A survey of large language models. *arXiv*, 2023.

#### **648 649** A LIMITATIONS

**650 651 652 653 654 655 656 657 658** In this work, several limitations exist that should be acknowledged for a balanced understanding of the results and methodology. First, while the Hierarchical Demonstration Order Optimization (HIDO) framework effectively reduces the search space for many-shot in-context learning (ICL), its reliance on clustering introduces an additional layer of complexity that may not always generalize well to all datasets or language models. The clustering process itself, especially with a limited number of clusters, may not capture intricate interdependencies between demonstrations. Furthermore, although the dynamic update mechanism improves the accuracy of the score function, it also increases the overall computational cost, particularly when applied to very large datasets or when running a high number of optimization iterations.

**659 660 661 662 663 664** Additionally, the current framework assumes that performance improvements arise primarily from the optimized demonstration order, but factors such as the inherent instability of large language models (LLMs) across varying contexts might also contribute to observed fluctuations. Finally, the probing set generation step introduces potential noise, and while the system attempts to mitigate this through iterative updates, inaccuracies in probing may still affect the final demonstration order selection.

### <span id="page-12-0"></span>B THEOREMS AND PROOFS

<span id="page-12-1"></span>**Lemma 1.** Let  $f(x_1,...,x_n) = \sum_{i=1}^n x_i \log x_i$  be defined for  $x_i > 0$ , with the constraint  $\sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i = c$ , where  $0 < c < \frac{1}{e}$ . Then:

*1. f reaches its minimum when all*  $x_i$  *are equal, i.e.,*  $x_i = \frac{c}{n}$  *for all i.* 

2.  $f$  *reaches its maximum when one*  $x_i$  *equals*  $c$  *and the rest are zero.* 

*Proof.* We will use the method of Lagrange multipliers.

Let  $g(x_1,...,x_n) = \sum_{i=1}^n x_i - c = 0$  be our constraint. The Lagrangian is:

$$
L(x_1,\ldots,x_n,\lambda)=\sum_{i=1}^n x_i\log x_i-\lambda(\sum_{i=1}^n x_i-c)
$$

We set the partial derivatives to zero:

$$
\frac{\partial L}{\partial x_i} = \log x_i + 1 - \lambda = 0 \quad \text{for } i = 1, ..., n
$$

$$
\frac{\partial L}{\partial \lambda} = \sum_{i=1}^n x_i - c = 0
$$

 $x_i = e^{\lambda - 1}$ 

**686 687 688**

From  $\frac{\partial L}{\partial x_i} = 0$ , we get:

This shows that all  $x_i$  are equal at the critical points.

**Minimum Point:** When all  $x_i$  are equal, let  $x_i = \frac{c}{n}$  for all *i*. The function value is:

$$
f(\frac{c}{n}, \dots, \frac{c}{n}) = c \log \frac{c}{n}
$$

**Maximum Point:** Consider  $x_1 = c$  and  $x_i = 0$  for  $i > 1$ . The function value is:

f(

$$
f(c,0,\ldots,0)=c\log c
$$

To show that  $f(\frac{c}{n}, \dots, \frac{c}{n}) < f(c, 0, \dots, 0)$ , we need to prove:

$$
c\log\frac{c}{n} < c\log c
$$

**702** This is equivalent to fraccn  $\lt c$ , which is true for  $n > 1$  and  $c > 0$ . Therefore, we have shown that **703** the minimum occurs when all  $x_i = \frac{c}{n}$ , and the maximum occurs when one  $x_i = c$  and the rest are **704** zero.  $\Box$ **705**

**706 707 Theorem 1** We assume that given a LLM, a probing sample  $(\hat{q}, \hat{a})$  and an ordered demonstration *text*  $\Pi(\mathcal{D})$ *,* 

- When  $PU_{(\hat{q},\hat{a})}^{\Pi(\mathcal{D})} \geq \tau$ , then  $\hat{a} = a^*$ , where the  $a^*$  is the ground-truth label corresponding to *the generated query*  $\hat{q}$ *.*
- The LLM predict the label  $\hat{a}$  with the highest probability when query by  $\hat{q}$  with  $\Pi(\mathcal{D})$  *as its context, i.e.,*  $P(\hat{a}|\Pi(\mathcal{D}) \oplus \hat{q}) = \arg \max_{a \in \mathcal{A}} P(a|\Pi(\mathcal{D}) \oplus \hat{q}).$
- Assume that for any two ordered demonstration texts  $\Pi_1(\mathcal{D})$  and  $\Pi_2(\mathcal{D})$ , the  $P_{LLM}(a|\Pi_1(\mathcal{A})\oplus\emptyset) = P_{LLM}(a|\Pi_2(\mathcal{A})\oplus\emptyset)$  *for all*  $a \in \mathcal{A}$ *.*

*Without loss of generalizability, for any two ordered demonstrations*  $\Pi_1(\mathcal{D})$  *and*  $\Pi_1(\mathcal{D})$ *, there is a*  $\epsilon(\frac{1}{e} \leq \epsilon \leq 1)$  such that  $P(\hat{a} | \Pi_i(\mathcal{D}) \oplus \hat{q}) > 1 - \epsilon$ . We additionally assume that when  $PVI_{(\hat{q},\hat{a})}^{(\mathcal{D})} < \tau$ :

- *The* a ∗ *is the second most probable label given by the LLM when prompted by query*  $\hat{q}$  *with any ordered demonstration context*  $\Pi(D)$ *, i.e.,*  $P(a^*|\Pi(D) \oplus \hat{q}) =$  $\argmax_{a \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{a\}} P(a | \Pi(\mathcal{D}) \oplus \hat{q})$ ; we write  $P(a^* | \Pi_i(\mathcal{D}) \oplus \hat{q}) = \lambda_i \epsilon$ , where  $0 \leq \lambda_i \leq 1$ ,  $i \in \{1, 2\}.$
- By symmetry, we only consider the case  $\lambda_1 < \lambda_2$ . In this case, we assume that  $\frac{1}{2} \delta <$  $\lambda_1 < \frac{1}{2} + \delta$  ( $\delta$  *is a constant) such that*

<span id="page-13-5"></span>
$$
(\lambda_1 \epsilon) \log \lambda_1 \epsilon + (1 - \lambda_1 \epsilon) \log (1 - \lambda_1 \epsilon) < \epsilon \log \epsilon - (2 - \lambda_1) \epsilon.
$$
 (12)  
Meanwhile, we require  $\lambda_2 - \lambda_1 > (1 - \frac{1}{\log(n-2)})(1 - \lambda_1).$ 

*With the assumptions above, if*

$$
PICD-OVI_{(\hat{q},\hat{a})}^{\Pi_1(\mathcal{D})} > PICD-OVI_{(\hat{q},\hat{a})}^{\Pi_2(\mathcal{D})},\tag{13}
$$

*then we have*

<span id="page-13-0"></span>
$$
PVI_{(\hat{q},a^*)}^{\Pi_1(\mathcal{D})} > PVI_{(\hat{q},a^*)}^{\Pi_2(\mathcal{D})}.
$$
\n(14)

*Therefore, if*  $\Pi_1(\mathcal{D})$  *is more performant demonstration order than*  $\Pi_2(\mathcal{D})$ *, i.e., Eq.* [14](#page-13-0) *establish for any probing sample*  $(\hat{q}, \hat{a})$ *, then* 

$$
ICD-OVI(\Pi_1(\mathcal{D})) > ICD-OVI(\Pi_2(\mathcal{D})).
$$
\n(15)

*Proof.* First, in the case that  $PVI_{(\hat{q},\hat{a})}^{(\Pi(\mathcal{D}))} \geq \tau$ , by Assumption 1, we have  $\hat{a} = a^*$ . Therefore, we have

<span id="page-13-1"></span>
$$
\text{PICD-OVI}_{\hat{q},\hat{a}}^{\Pi(\mathcal{D})} = P(\hat{a}|\Pi(\mathcal{D}) \oplus \hat{q}) - P(\hat{a}|\Pi(\mathcal{A}) \oplus \emptyset) = \text{PVI}_{\hat{q},\hat{a}}^{\Pi(\mathcal{D})} = \text{PVI}_{\hat{q},a^*}^{\Pi(\mathcal{D})}.
$$
 (16)

Eq. [16](#page-13-1) enforces the establishment of Eq. [14.](#page-13-0)

**742 743 744** Next, in the case where  $\text{PVI}_{(\hat{q},\hat{a})}^{\Pi(\mathcal{D})} < \tau$ , with Assumption 3, it suffices to prove that  $|\lambda_1 \epsilon \log \lambda_1 \epsilon| \geq$  $|\lambda_2 \epsilon \log \lambda_2 \epsilon|$  gives rise to

<span id="page-13-2"></span>
$$
|\lambda_1 \epsilon \log \lambda_1 \epsilon + \sum_{\sum_i x_i = (1 - \lambda_1)\epsilon} x_i \log x_i + x_{\hat{a},1}| \geq |\lambda_2 \epsilon \log \lambda_2 \epsilon + \sum_{\sum_i x_i = (1 - \lambda_1)\epsilon} x_i \log x_i + x_{\hat{a},2}|
$$
. (17)  
\nNow, by utilizing the Assumption 5, we claim that Eq. 17 establish, thus the theorem is proved.

To prove Eq. [17,](#page-13-2) we start from the known inequivality

<span id="page-13-3"></span>
$$
\lambda_2 - \lambda_1 > (1 - \frac{1}{\log(n-2)})(1 - \lambda_1). \tag{18}
$$

For simplicity, we represent  $\lambda_2 - \lambda_1$  as  $\Delta$  in the following texts. We rewrite the Eq. [18](#page-13-3) as

<span id="page-13-4"></span>
$$
\Delta > \frac{1 - 1/\epsilon \log e^{-\epsilon(1-\lambda_1) - \epsilon + \log_2}/2}{\log (n-2)} + (1 - \lambda_1),
$$
  
= 
$$
\frac{1}{\epsilon} \left[ \frac{\epsilon (\log \epsilon - \log 2) + (\log 2 - \epsilon(2 - \lambda_1))}{\log (n-2)} \right] - \frac{\log \epsilon}{\log (n-2)} + (1 - \lambda_1) + \frac{1}{\log (n-2)}.
$$
(19)



Figure 6: Illuestration of the observation of Eq. [23](#page-14-0) and Equ [24.](#page-14-1) The red, orange, and blue curves are  $x \log x$ ,  $\log \epsilon x$  and  $\log \frac{\epsilon}{n-2}x$  (where  $n = 6$  and  $\epsilon = 0.2$ ), respectively. It is clear that  $x \log x \le$ log  $\epsilon x$  between point E and A;  $x \log x \le \log \frac{1}{n-2} \epsilon x$  between point E and B.

By Assumption 5, we substitute terms appears in Eq. [19](#page-13-4) with left hand side (LHS) of Eq. [12,](#page-13-5) further relax the bound as

$$
\Delta > \lambda_1 \frac{\log \lambda_1 \epsilon}{\log (n-2)} - \frac{\log \epsilon}{\log (n-2)} + (1 - \lambda_1) + \frac{1 - \lambda_1}{\log n - 2} \log \left[ (1 - \lambda_1) \epsilon \right] + \frac{1}{\log (n-2)}
$$
  
= 
$$
-\frac{1}{\epsilon \log (n-2)} [\lambda_1 \epsilon \log \lambda_1 \epsilon + \epsilon \log \epsilon - \log (n-2) \left[ (1 - \lambda_1) \epsilon \right] - (1 - \lambda_1) \epsilon \log (1 - \lambda_1) \epsilon - \epsilon].
$$
(20)

By multipling  $\epsilon \log(n-2)$  to both sides of the inequivality, we have

<span id="page-14-2"></span>
$$
-\lambda_1 \epsilon \log \left(\lambda_1 \epsilon\right) + \epsilon \log \epsilon - [\log \left(n-2\right)](1-\lambda_1-\Delta)\epsilon - (1-\lambda_1)\epsilon \log \left(1-\lambda_1\right)\epsilon - \epsilon > 0. \tag{21}
$$

Eq. [21](#page-14-2) is equivalent to

<span id="page-14-3"></span>
$$
-\lambda_1 \epsilon \log \lambda_1 \epsilon + \log \epsilon (\lambda_1 + \Delta) \epsilon + (n-2) \frac{(1-\lambda_1-\Delta)\epsilon}{n-2} \log \frac{\epsilon}{n-2} - (1-\lambda_1)\epsilon \log (1-\lambda_1)\epsilon - \epsilon > 0.
$$
\n(22)

Now, we observe that since  $\lambda_1 + \Delta = \lambda_2 < 1$ , thus  $(\lambda_1 + \Delta)\epsilon < \epsilon$ . Therefore

<span id="page-14-0"></span>
$$
(\lambda_1 + \Delta)\epsilon \log (\lambda_1 + \Delta)\epsilon \le -\log \epsilon (\lambda_1 + \Delta)\epsilon. \tag{23}
$$

Here, the log  $\epsilon$  is the slope of the linear function composed by  $(0, 0)$  and  $(\epsilon, \epsilon \log \epsilon)$ . Analogously, we have

<span id="page-14-1"></span>
$$
\frac{1 - \lambda_1 - \Delta}{\epsilon} \log \frac{1 - \lambda_1 - \Delta}{n - 2} \epsilon \le \log \frac{\epsilon}{n - 2} \frac{(1 - \lambda_1 - \Delta)\epsilon}{n - 2}.
$$
 (24)

By substituting the terms of RHS of Equ [23](#page-14-0) and Equ [24](#page-14-1) appeared in Equ [22](#page-14-3) with the LHS of Equ [23](#page-14-0) and Equ [24,](#page-14-1) we further relax our inequivality as

<span id="page-14-4"></span>
$$
-\lambda_1 \epsilon \log \lambda_1 \epsilon + (\lambda_1 + \Delta)\epsilon \log (\lambda_1 + \Delta)\epsilon + (1 - \lambda_1 - \Delta)\epsilon \log \left(\frac{1 - \lambda_1 - \Delta}{n - 2}\epsilon\right) - (1 - \lambda_1)\epsilon \log (1 - \lambda_1)\epsilon + (1 - \epsilon) \log 1 - \epsilon > 0.
$$
 (25)

We now rearrange the Eq. [25](#page-14-4) and substitute  $\lambda_1 + \Delta$  with  $\lambda_2$ , we have

<span id="page-14-5"></span>
$$
-\lambda_1 \epsilon \log \lambda_1 \epsilon - (1 - \lambda_1) \epsilon \log (1 - \lambda_1) \epsilon >
$$
  
 
$$
-(\lambda_2 \epsilon) \log (\lambda_2 \epsilon) - (1 - \lambda_2) \epsilon \log (\frac{1 - \lambda_1 - \Delta}{n - 2} \epsilon) - (1 - \epsilon) \log (1 - \epsilon).
$$
 (26)

**810 811** We observe that, by Lemma [1,](#page-12-1) we have that

$$
\min_{(x_1,\ldots,x_{n-2})} \sum_{\sum x_i = (1-\lambda_2)\epsilon} x_i \log x_i = (1-\lambda_2)\epsilon \log \left(\frac{1-\lambda_2}{n-2}\epsilon\right),
$$

$$
\max_{(x_1,\ldots,x_{n-2})} \sum_{\sum x_i = (1-\lambda_1)\epsilon} x_i \log x_i = (1-\lambda_1)\epsilon \log \left(1-\lambda_1\epsilon\right).
$$

$$
\max_{(x_1,\ldots,x_{n-2})} \sum_{\Sigma x_i = (1-\lambda_1)\epsilon} x_i \log x_i = (1-\lambda_1)\epsilon \log (1-\lambda_1\epsilon).
$$

In other words,

$$
\max_{\substack{(x_1,\ldots,x_{n-2})\\ \min\limits_{(x_1,\ldots,x_{n-2})}} |\Sigma_{\Sigma x_i=(1-\lambda_2)\epsilon} x_i \log x_i| = -(1-\lambda_2)\epsilon \log\left(\frac{1-\lambda_2}{n-2}\epsilon\right),\tag{28}
$$
\n
$$
\min_{\substack{(x_1,\ldots,x_{n-2})}} |\Sigma_{\Sigma x_i=(1-\lambda_1)\epsilon} x_i \log x_i| = -(1-\lambda_1)\epsilon \log\left(1-\lambda_1\epsilon\right).
$$

Besides, it is direct to show that

$$
(1 - \epsilon) \log (1 - \epsilon) \le x_{\hat{a},i} \log x_{\hat{a},i} \le 0,
$$
\n<sup>(29)</sup>

(27)

**825**

i.e.,

**837**

**839**

**841**

**843**

$$
-(1 - \epsilon)\log(1 - \epsilon) \ge |x_{\hat{a},i}\log x_{\hat{a},i}| \ge 0,
$$
\n(30)

Hence, we rewrite the Eq. [26](#page-14-5) to

$$
|\lambda_1 \epsilon \log \lambda_1 \epsilon| + \min_{(x_1, \ldots, x_{n-2})} |\Sigma_{\Sigma x_i = (1-\lambda_1)\epsilon} x_i \log x_i| + \min |x_{\hat{a},1} \log x_{\hat{a},1}| >
$$
  
 
$$
|(\lambda_2 \epsilon) \log (\lambda_2 \epsilon)| + \max_{(x_1, \ldots, x_{n-2})} |\Sigma_{\Sigma x_i = (1-\lambda_2)\epsilon} x_i \log x_i| + \max |x_{\hat{a},2} \log x_{\hat{a},2}|.
$$
 (31)

Therefore, we are able to write that

$$
|\lambda_1 \epsilon \log \lambda_1 \epsilon + \sum_{\sum_i x_i = (1 - \lambda_1)\epsilon} x_i \log x_i + x_{\hat{a},1}| \ge |\lambda_2 \epsilon \log \lambda_2 \epsilon + \sum_{\sum_i x_i = (1 - \lambda_1)\epsilon} x_i \log x_i + x_{\hat{a},2}|, (32)
$$
  
which is exactly Eq. 17.

**836**

**838 840 842 Theorem 2.** Randomly flipping  $K$  entries from a sequence of length  $N$  will always keep the rank correlation within a range characterized by the lower bound  $1-6\sum_{i=1}^{K} (a_i - a_{K+1-i})^2/N(N^2-1)$ and upper bound 1. Here  $a_i$  is the original position index of the *i*-th perturbed element. The lower bound is achieved with a probability of  $1/K!$  when the perturbed sequence is the reverse of the original sequence. The upper bound is achieved with a probability of  $1/K!$  when the perturbed sequence is identical to the original sequence.

**844** To prove the above theorem, we first present the lemma:

**Lemma 2.** *Given a list of* N *integers*  $\{a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_N\}$  *with*  $a_i < a_{i+1}, i = 1, 2, \ldots, N-1$  *and its* random perturbation  $\{a_1^*, a_2^*, \ldots, a_N^*\}$ , the maximum value of  $\sum^N$  $\sum_{i=1}$   $(a_i - a_i^*)^2$  is achieved by reversing *the list, i.e.,*  $a_i^* = a_{N+1-i}$ .

*Proof.* To prove that the maximum value of the sum:

$$
S = \sum_{i=1}^{N} (a_i - a_i^*)^2
$$

is achieved by reversing the list  $\{a_i^*\}_{i=1}^N$ , we need to show that this arrangement maximizes the squared differences between the original list  $\{a_i\}_{i=1}^N$  and the perturbed list  $\{a_i^*\}_{i=1}^N$ , where  $a_i^*$  is the perturbed element in the  $i$ -th position.

**859** We know that

**860 861**

$$
a_1 < a_2 < \cdots < a_N.
$$

**862 863** Considering the sum  $S = \sum_{i=1}^{N} (a_i - a_i^*)^2$ , each term in this sum is of the form  $(a_i - a_i^*)^2$ , which measures how far apart  $a_i$  and  $a_i^*$  are. Thus, to maximize the sum, we need to maximize each individual squared difference  $(a_i - a_i^*)^2$ .

**864 865 866 867** The largest possible difference between any two elements of the list  $\{a_i\}_{i=1}^N$  occurs when the largest element  $a_N$  is paired with the smallest element  $a_1$ , the second largest element  $a_{N-1}$  is paired with the second smallest element  $a_2$ , and so on. In other words, the maximum possible difference occurs when  $a_i^* = a_{N+1-i}$  for all i. This arrangement is precisely the reverse of the original list.

**868 869 870 871 872** To prove that reversing the list maximizes the sum, we propose to prove that when swapping any two elements in the perturbed list, the sum will always decrease. Suppose we swap two elements  $a_p^*$  and  $a_q^*$  (with  $p < q$ , without loss of generality) in the reversed list. Before the swap, the contributions to the sum from the two positions are:

$$
(a_p - a_p^*)^2 + (a_q - a_q^*)^2.
$$

After swapping  $a_p^*$  and  $a_q^*$ , the new contributions become:

$$
(a_p - a_q^*)^2 + (a_q - a_p^*)^2.
$$

The change in the sum,  $\Delta S$ , is the difference between these two expressions:

$$
\Delta S = ((a_p - a_q^*)^2 + (a_q - a_p^*)^2) - ((a_p - a_p^*)^2 + (a_q - a_q^*)^2).
$$

We expand these terms as follows:

- Before the swap:

$$
(a_p - a_p^*)^2 + (a_q - a_q^*)^2 = (a_p - a_{N+1-p})^2 + (a_q - a_{N+1-q})^2
$$

- After the swap:

$$
(a_p - a_q^*)^2 + (a_q - a_p^*)^2 = (a_p - a_{N+1-q})^2 + (a_q - a_{N+1-p})^2
$$

Because  $a_p < a_q$  and the list is ordered, swapping two elements in the reversed list *decreases* the squared differences, leading to a decrease in the sum  $S$ . Thus, reversing the list maximizes the absolute differences  $|a_i - a_i^*|$  for all i, and any deviation from the reversed order will result in a smaller sum.  $\Box$ 

With this lemma, now we prove Theorem 2.

*Proof.* Given two ranking sequences  $\{s_i\}_{i=1}^N$  and  $\{s_i^*\}_{i=1}^N$ , the Spearman's rank correlation coefficient is represented as follows:

$$
\rho = 1 - \frac{6 \sum_{i=1}^{N} (s_i - s_i^*)^2}{N(N^2 - 1)}.
$$
\n(33)

**905 906** In our case, one ranking sequence is obtained by perturbing  $K$  elements in another ranking sequence. Denote the selected elements as  $\{a_i\}_{i=1}^K$ , and the elements after perturbation as  $\{a_i^*\}_{i=1}^K$ 

**907 908 909 910 911** according to Lemma 2, we know the maximum value of  $\sum_{i=1}^{K} (a_i - a_i^*)^2$  is achieved when  $a_i^* =$  $a_{K+1-i}$ . For other elements that are not perturbed satisfy that their  $d_i$  equals 0. Therefore, the Spearman's rank correlation coefficient reaches the minimum value:

$$
\rho_{\min} = 1 - \frac{6 \sum_{i=1}^{K} (a_i - a_{K+1-i})^2}{N(N^2 - 1)}.
$$
\n(34)

**916** Similarly, the maximum value is  $\rho_{\text{max}} = 1$  when the perturbed sequence is exactly the same as the original sequence. Since each perturbation has an equal probability, and there are  $K!$  different **917** perturbations, we know the probabilities are both  $1/K!$ . ⊔

## C SUPPLEMENTARY EXPERIMENTS

### <span id="page-17-0"></span>C.1 ABLATION EXPERIMENT RESULTS

**918 919**



**969 970 971** Figure 7: The performance of our proposed HIDO and its variants tested with different LLMs on various datasets. The first one or two characters indicate the dataset (i.e. 't' represents TREC and 'mp' represents 'MPQA'). The remaining characters represent the model (i.e. 'z' represents Zephyr and '3.5' represents GPT-3.5T).

### <span id="page-18-0"></span>C.2 ACCURACY DIFFERENCE BETWEEN FEW-SHOT (10 SHOTS) AND MANY-SHOT (150) ICL

As mentioned earlier, we want to confirm that ICL-DOI still exists in many shot ICL. Thus, we randomly select orders with 10 or 150 demonstrations and measure the model accuracy. The following figures present the distribution of model performance under few-shot and many-shot settings on various datasets.



Figure 8: AGNews. Many shot ICL generally improves the best model accuracy (i.e. increases maximum accuracy), which causes the range to be larger.



Figure 9: CB. Here, the figure shows that many shot learning causes model performance to degrade. This could be a result of CB having less test samples (56 samples compared to 256 samples for other datasets). Regardless, there is large variance in the results, indicating demonstration order instability.







 Figure 11: DBPedia. Many shot learning improved model performance for all models; however, for LlaMa3, the variance becomes smaller but stays the same or increases for the other models. Taking a look at DBPedia, the samples in general give more context in comparison to the others, which suggests that LlaMa3 is better at retaining and exploiting the information given from the demonstrations when completing the task of interest.



Figure 12: MPQA. Again, many shot ICL improved model accuracy, but also caused the variance to increase in general. LlaMa3 especially exhibits the problem of ICL-DOI with over 25% difference between the best and worst accuracy.



 Figure 13: MR. Model performance only improved for LlaMa3, but the other two models illustrate a wider variance. For SciPhi and Zephyr, the model performance under the few-shot and many shot settings is comparable, but in many-shot, the worst accurcy is much lower than that of few-shot performance.



 Figure 14: TREC. Increasing the number of demonstrations increased average accuracy for all models, and the variance did not improve much, other than for LlaMa3. LlaMa3 has 8 billion paramters, compared to only 7 billion for the other two models, which means that it has more capability to learn and retain information. This can potentially be the reason for its superior performance against the other two LLMs.

 

### <span id="page-20-0"></span>C.3 QUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS OF GENERATED PROBING SETS

 

 In Sec [4.1,](#page-4-1) we assume that the demonstration order optimized for answer prediction can also be used for sample generation. Since each additional iteration of HIDO optimizes the order such that it can achieve a higher accuracy, the probing set from the inter-cluster optimization round is generated from the current optimized order. Thus, we can compare the probing set to the original demonstrations, which should be of high quality. Ideally, as the number of iterations increases (i.e. the order becomes more optimized), the distance between the two should decrease (i.e. the quality of the probing set increases). The following figures measure the average  $L_2$  norm between the demonstration embeddings and the probing set embeddings generated by various LLMs on different datasets. In general, the experiments support the assumption, presenting a negative trend between iterations and distance.







 



 Figure 16: CR. Similar to the previous figure, the probing sets generated by LlaMa3 and Zephyr consistently drop, and SciPhi displays a peak and then a major drop in embedding distance. The figures suggest that after some iterations (i.e. as the order becomes more optimal), the LLM can generate samples close to the original text.



 Figure 17: DBPedia. All models demonstrate a negative trend between distance and iteration. The figure for SciPhi displays a plateau between the second and third iteration, which could imply that the probing set (i.e. the actual text) or the semantics did not change much.



 Figure 18: MPQA. The figures in general demonstrate a negative trend. For SciPhi, the distance increases first then drops after the second iteration. However, the difference is relatively small, about 0.05 difference, indicating that the generated samples are similar to the demonstrations.



#### <span id="page-22-0"></span> C.4 EXAMPLE SAMPLES FROM EACH DATASET

- 
- 
- Below, we provide some samples in each dataset, which can be compared to the probing sets presented in [C.5.](#page-28-0)

**1293 1294 1295**

# Table 3: Example Samples in AGNews



# Table 4: Example Samples in CB



# Table 6: Example Samples in DBPedia







# Table 10: Example Samples in SST5





<span id="page-28-0"></span>

**1566 1567 1568 1569 1570** Table 13: Generated Probing Set using LlaMa3 on AGNews. The probing set from the beginning iterations are of the same sample with no diversity, indicating low quality. At the fourth iteration, the probind set consists of different samples, meaning that quality increased, but some of the samples are labeled incorrectly. In the last iteration, the new labels better fit the generated samples, further increasing the quality of the probing set.



**1616**

**1617**

 Table 14: Generated Probing Set using SciPhi on AGNews. For the first iteration, the model generates a variety of samples but the labels are the same with some not matching the corresponding sample. In the next iteration, SciPhi generates a better label for repeated samples. Additionally, the samples makes more sense, such as "Apple to Open First Retail Store in India" changed to "Apple to Launch New MacBook Pro Models." In the third iteration, the LLM only generates one sample, but it contains very specific names. For the fourth iteration, SciPhi generates more diverse samples with correct labels, indicating a very high quality probing set. Lastly, in the last iteration, the sample is very vague, which means the quality dropped.





 

 

 

 

 

 

 

 

 

**1674 1675 1676 1677 1678 1679 1680 1681 1682 1683** Table 15: Generated Probing Set using Zephyr on AGNews. In the first iteration, Zephyr generates diverse samples, but the syntax for some samples is invalid, like " Facebook to launch cryptocurrency Libra in 2020" and "Amazon to split second headquarters between New York City and Northern Virginia." In the next iteration, the samples are still very diverse, and all samples follow the same syntax of a subject followed by a verb. However, the sample "Commonwealth chief meets Indian foreign minister (AFP)" is vague in who the chief is. For the third iteration, the LLM replaces the sample mentioned earlier with a more specific one, and this probing set has the highest quaility. In the fourth iteration, the labels are less diverse than before, indicating the quality decreased. For the last iteration, the samples become less logical (i.e. "Biden administration announces \$1 billion for electric school buses" becomes "Biden administration extends eviction moratorium").



 Table 16: Generated Probing Set using LlaMa3 on CR. Samples from iteration one and iteration two are very similar, but those in iteration two have more diversity in syntax (i.e. samples in iteration one are descriptions in the format [subject] is [adjective]. For the third iteration, there's only positive labeled samples, but many of the samples are in first person, which follows the dataset. Further iterations continue to improve the samples.



 

 Table 17: Generated Probing Set using SciPhi on CR. As the number of iterations increases, the samples become more clear in expressing the sentiment. For example, the sample from the first iteration "The customer service was terrible, I had a really hard time getting my issue re- solved" becomes "The customer service was terrible, I had a lot of issues with my order" in the third iteration, which is more direct in conveying discontent.



 Table 18: Generated Probing Set using Zephyr on CR. The samples in the first iteration contains some phrases that are questionable, like "making navigation a breeze" and "rich and detailed audio." In further iterations, the LLM modifies the samples to be more clear. An interesting observation is that the third and fourth iteration generate the same probing sets with the only difference being the order, possibly due to the optimized order for those rounds being similar.



**1890 1891 1892** Table 19: Generated Probing Set using LlaMa3 on DBPedia. The probing sets become more detailed as the number of iterations increases, including more specific names of different locations and iconic landmarks. The labels also become more diverse, indicating an increase in quality.



**1944 1945 1946 1947** Table 20: Generated Probing Set using SciPhi on DBPedia. The first iteration probing set has a variety of samples, but the sample "The 2018 Winter Olympics, officially known as the XXIII Olympic Winter Games, were held from 9 to 25 February 2018 in Pyeongchang, South Korea" is labeled incorectly. Future iterations repeat the same sample, which means low quality probing sets.



**1959**

**1954**

**1960**

**1961 1962**

**1963**

**1964**

**1966 1967 1968 1969 1970 1971 1972** Table 21: Generated Probing Set using Zephyr on DBPedia. Throughout the iterations, the probing sets maintain high diversity and detailed samples. There is a slight increase in quality as indicated by the sample from the third iteration: "The Silence in My Heart is a compilation album in the Emo Diaries series released in 2001 by Deep Elm Records. It features a variety of artists and does not strictly adhere to the emo genre." It is modified in the next iteration to become clearer in the reason for why the album has a variety of artists.

1973	Iteration	Query	Label
1974		The Eiffel Tower is a wrought-iron lattice tower located on the Champ de Mars in	building
1975		Paris, France.	
1976		The Great Barrier Reef is the world's largest coral reef system composed of over	nature
1977		290 reefs and 900 islands stretching for 234 kilometers over an area of approxi-	
		mately 34,400 square kilometers.	
1978		The Silence in My Heart is a compilation album in the Emo Diaries series released	album
1979	2	in 2001 by Deep Elm Records. It features a variety of artists and does not strictly	
1980		adhere to the emo genre.	
1981		The Capitol Skyline Hotel is a historic building located near the United States Capi- tol in Washington D.C. It was once part of the Best Western chain.	building
1982		The Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts is a school located in Old Lyme, Con-	school
1983		necticut, dedicated to fine arts education.	
1984	3	The Silence in My Heart is a compilation album in the series The Emo Diaries,	album
1985		released in 2001 by Deep Elm Records. It features a variety of emo-inspired music,	
1986		as the label allowed for open submissions.	
1987		Meridix Creative Inc. is a technology services company founded in 2003 and incor-	company
		porated in the state of Illinois originally to broadcast live local high school sports	
1988		online. It now offers a broad range of technology services.	
1989		Dream.ZONE.Achieve is the third studio album by American rapper Smoke DZA.	album
1990	$\overline{4}$	Meridix Creative Inc. Was founded in 2003 and was incorporated in the State of	company
1991		Illinois originally to broadcast live local high school sports online though the com-	
1992		pany now offers a broad range of technology services. Bulbophyllum henrici is a species of orchid.	plant
1993		The Silence in My Heart is a compilation album in the emo genre released in 2001	album
1994	5	by Deep Elm Records.	
1995		The Sikorsky S-69 was a compound co-axial helicopter developed as the demon-	transport
1996		strator of the Advancing Blade Concept under US Army and NASA funding.	
		The Wall Street Journal Europe is a daily English-language newspaper that covers	book
1997		global and regional business news for Europe, the Middle East, and Africa.	

**1998 1999 2000 2001 2002 2003** Table 22: Generated Probing Set using LlaMa3 on MPQA. As the number of iterations increase, the generated probing set consists of more specific samples. For instance, from the second iteration, one sample is "The weather forecast is not looking good." In the fourth iteration, the sample becomes "The weather forecast is predicting a heatwave," which conveys the reason for negative sentiment. Furthermore, the samples from the beginning iterations mainly focus on business and government, but later on, the probing set includes samples of various topics.



 Table 23: Generated Probing Set using SciPhi on MPQA. Tbe samples become more detailed as the number of iterations increase. Comparing the first iteration to the last iteration, the samples from the last one are much longer, providing more context and conveying the sentiment clearer.



**2106 2107 2108 2109** Table 24: Generated Probing Set using Zephyr on MPQA. The generated labels first start out as all positive and, at the third iteration, the label distribution becomes more balanced. The samples gradually become shorter, which follows the format of the original dataset. This indicates that the LLM is able to mimic the syntax fromt he demonstrations and generate similar samples.



**2154**

**2155**

**2156**

**2157**

**2158 2159**

**2160 2161 2162 2163 2164 2165** Table 25: Generated Probing Set using LlaMa3 on MR. In the earlier iterations, the generatd labels are incorrect. For example, "The plot twists and turns in this movie are so unpredictable that you'll be on the edge of your seat the whole time" is labeled negative when it conveys a positive sentiment. In the following iterations, the model generates correct labels for the corresponding sample except for the last iteration. This could indicate that the optimal number of iterations is three or four, and exceeding that value will cause the model to generate worse probing sets.



**2210 2211**

**2212**

**2214 2215 2216 2217 2218** Table 26: Generated Probing Set using SciPhi on MR. The samples in the probing set for the first iteration is very direct, following the format of the subject followed by adjectives. As the number of iterations increase, the samples typically suggest a reason of the opposite sentiment before stating the main clause, such as "The film's visuals are stunning, but the plot is lackluster." This increases the complexity of the samples as it is harder to determine the sentiment.



**2268 2269 2270 2271 2272** Table 27: Generated Probing Set using Zephyr on MR. The syntax of the samples shift from complete sentences to incomplete sentences as the number of iterations increase. This is likely due to the original dataset being human reviews of movies, so the datset contains samples of this format. Note that the probing sets of the fourth and the fifth iteration ar ethe same, indicating that the LLM reached the optimal point in generating samples (or order optimization) in an earlier iteration.



**2322 2323 2324 2325 2326 2327** Table 28: Generated Probing Set using LlaMa3 on TREC. The probing set from the first iteration have many repetitive questions. In the next iteration, the LLM generates a better set, removing the repeated samples. However, the questions are still similar to each other, asking for the largest entity. For the third iteration, the same problem persists. Lastly, the model only generates one sample for the fourth and fifth iteration, possibly because it cannot generate better samples without repeating itself.



**2376 2377 2378 2379** Table 29: Generated Probing Set using SciPhi on TREC. The topics of the probing sets remain relatively the same in the first few iterations. There is repetition within the probing sets, such as multiple questions about the capital of a state. In the last iteration however, there is muore variety in the samples, diverging from the topics of capitals and chemical symbols.



**2430 2431 2432 2433** Table 30: Generated Probing Set using Zephyr on TREC. When comparing different probing sets, the topics of the samples become more diverse with each additional iteration. Additionally, the samples increase in difficulty as the questions from the first iteration's probing set revolve around pop culture, but subsequent probing sets are more technical and require specialized knowledge.

