
Unraveling the Mechanics of Learning-Based Demonstration Selection for In-Context Learning

Hui Liu

City University of Hong Kong
Hong Kong
liuhui3-c@my.cityu.edu.hk

Wenya Wang

Nanyang Technological University
Singapore
wangwy@ntu.edu.sg

Hao Sun

Peking University
Beijing, China
sunhao@stu.pku.edu.cn

Chris XING TIAN

City University of Hong Kong
Hong Kong
xingtian4-c@my.cityu.edu.hk

Chenqi Kong

Nanyang Technological University
Singapore
chenqi.kong@ntu.edu.sg

Xin Dong

NVIDIA
America
xind@nvidia.com

Haoliang Li

City University of Hong Kong
Hong Kong
haoliang.li@cityu.edu.hk

Abstract

Large Language Models (LLMs) have demonstrated impressive in-context learning (ICL) capabilities from few-shot demonstration exemplars. While recent learning-based demonstration selection methods have proven beneficial to ICL by choosing more useful exemplars, their underlying mechanisms are opaque, hindering efforts to address limitations such as high training costs and poor generalization across tasks. These methods generally assume the selection process captures similarities between the exemplar and the target instance, however, it remains unknown what kinds of similarities are captured and vital to performing ICL. To dive into this question, we analyze the working mechanisms of the learning-based demonstration selection methods and empirically identify two important factors related to similarity measurement: 1) The ability to integrate different levels of task-agnostic text similarities between the input of exemplars and test cases enhances generalization power across different tasks. 2) Incorporating task-specific labels when measuring the similarities significantly improves the performance on each specific task. We validate these two findings through extensive quantitative and qualitative analyses across ten datasets and various LLMs. Based on our findings, we introduce two effective yet simplified exemplar selection methods catering to task-agnostic and task-specific demands, eliminating the costly LLM inference overhead.

1 Introduction

While advanced large language models have demonstrated impressive zero-shot capabilities across various tasks, in-context learning (ICL) remains a promising paradigm that employs a sequence of demonstration exemplars as prompts to assist LMs in effectively performing unseen tasks [6, 35]. However, the performance of ICL can be sensitive to the choice, format, and order of the in-context examples [51, 52, 38, 22]. Our work delves into the choice perspective and unravels important factors contributing to selecting good in-context exemplars to enhance LLMs' performances [33, 44, 1, 37, 18, 24].

In-context exemplar selection assumes the availability of a demonstration set \mathcal{D} containing input-output examples (x, y) for a specific task. Given a test case x^t , ICL relies on selecting effective examples from \mathcal{D} to inform the prediction of x^t . To achieve that, most studies select demonstration exemplars based on a similarity measurement between x and x^t . Some work utilizes surface similarity computed by BM25 and semantic similarity¹ computed by off-the-shelf text encoders [21, 1]. Recent studies (which we refer to as learning-based methods) [33, 44, 19], however, separately train a retriever for each task by composing positive exemplars x^+ and negative exemplars x^- via interacting with LLMs. This data creation process often requires hundreds of thousands of queries to LLMs for a single task to collect sufficient positive/negative data.

The use of learning-based methods, as discussed in references [33, 44, 19], has demonstrated notable performance improvements over traditional models such as BM25 or standard text encoders in specific tasks. However, these approaches are not without limitations, including the costly process of data collection and poor generalization across different tasks. These challenges underscore the need for a deeper and more thorough understanding of the underlying similarities these methods capture and how these similarities correlate with their performance. By exploring these aspects, it will be beneficial to develop more efficient and generalizable methods for exemplar selection in the future.

In this work, we identify two dimensions of similarity: **task-agnostic** and **task-specific**. Task-agnostic similarity encompasses multi-level aspects including surface, syntactic, and semantic features. These are general linguistic features that can be shared across various tasks. In contrast, task-specific similarity measures the distance from an arbitrary exemplar to a test case sample from a specific task. We find that existing learning-based methods learn a subset of these similarities, which explains their varied performance across different tasks. We summarize our findings as follows:

\mathcal{F}_1 : After training, the retriever is analogous to an ensemble model which adaptively integrates multi-level similarities from different layers of the encoder between the exemplar input (x) and test cases (x^t) for different tasks. Compared to off-the-shelf encoders which only adopt the last layer or BM25 which focuses on surface-level similarities, the learning-based retriever encompasses diverse task-agnostic similarities.

\mathcal{F}_2 : Beyond input similarities (x and x^t), the training process of learning-based methods further encourages selecting exemplars with similar output (y) to the hidden output of the test case (y^t), implicitly predicted during retrieval. This enhances the model’s discriminative power for a specific task.

Extensive quantitative experiments are conducted to support our findings. Drawing insights from these findings, we further propose two cost-effective variants for learning-based methods: 1) Multi-level Similarity Maximization (MLSM) retriever that aims to maximize agreement across different similarities during the inference time of LLMs. 2) Test Task Fine-tuning (TTF) retriever, which uses labeled data from the demonstration set to fine-tune the retriever to learn task-specific discriminative information. Both retrievers eliminate the need for expensive interactions with LLMs, catering to cross-task and task-specific demands respectively. To validate the effectiveness of these methods, we conducted experiments across three distinct LLMs and a range of tasks, which not only confirms the versatility of our assumptions but also provides valuable insights for future research in ICL.

2 Preliminary

2.1 Learning-based Demonstration Selection

Demonstration selection aims to identify a sequence of high-quality in-context examples from the demonstration set as prompt to enhance test case accuracy on LLMs. Prior studies [21, 9] find that good exemplar exhibit similarities with the test case. They employ the pre-trained text encoder like BERT [7] as the retriever to encode inputs and take the average embedding of all tokens from the final layer of this model to represent test cases and exemplars. Subsequently, cosine similarity measures are computed between test cases and exemplars to retrieve the top-K most similar exemplars as prompts.

¹Surface, syntactic and semantic similarity focus on comparing texts based on word or phrase overlap, structural and grammatical similarity and the underlying meaning of texts, respectively [13, 23]




Figure 1: **Left:** Top-10 retrieval accuracy using each of the twelve layers of the original BERT to retrieve positive exemplars to solve the proxy task of EPR across ten tasks. Different colors represents different layers. Top-10 accuracy refers to the percentage of times the positive exemplar is retrieved within the top 10 predictions. **Middle:** CKA scores between twelve layers of original BERT and the final layer of BERT of EPR trained on ten tasks and the training-free BERT. **Right:** CKA scores between each layer of the original BERT. These CKA scores are min-max normalized for better visualization. We use GPT-Neo [5] as the LLM.

While the pipeline of learning-based demonstration selection methods[33, 44, 19] is similar to the above strategy, they further exploit LLMs to label positive and negative exemplars to construct a proxy task to fine-tune BERT, aiming to learn a better similarity metric. Specifically, let \mathcal{D} denote the demonstration set. Given an exemplar (x_i, y_i) in \mathcal{D} , Rubin et al. [33] propose EPR to sample a sequence of candidate examples from \mathcal{D} , denoted as $S = \{(\bar{x}_1, \bar{y}_1), \dots, (\bar{x}_m, \bar{y}_m)\}$ and score them by $s(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) = P_{\text{LLM}}(Y = y_i | (\bar{x}, \bar{y}), x_i)$, representing the probability of producing correct output y_i for x_i conditioned on (\bar{x}, \bar{y}) using an LLM. Subsequently, the \bar{x} with the highest score is selected as the positive sample, denoted as x^+ and the lowest as the hard negative sample, denoted as x^- for x_i . These samples are then used to train the retriever (BERT) by increasing the similarity between x and x^+ and decreasing the similarity between x and x^- via contrastive learning. In subsequent sections, without special note, we conduct analysis on EPR to unravel the mechanics of learning-based demonstration selection. We adopt BERT² consisting of twelve transformer layers as the retriever.

2.2 Layers of BERT as Anchors of Multi-level Linguistic Similarity

Previous studies [13, 23] have empirically showed that the intermediate layers of BERT encode a rich hierarchy of linguistic information with surface features at the bottom, syntactic features in the middle, and semantic features at the top through probing tasks. For each layer l , given two texts s_1 and s_2 , we can extract the text embeddings of all tokens from this layer and compute the average pooling of these tokens to represent each text, denoted as x_1^l and x_2^l . The similarity corresponding to different layers can then be calculated by computing the cosine similarity between these embeddings: $\cos(x_1^l, x_2^l)$. While surface, syntactic, and semantic similarities aim to compare texts based on word or phrase overlap, structural and grammatical patterns, and underlying meanings, we propose that the different layers of the original BERT (i.e., BERT without task-specific fine-tuning) can serve as anchors to represent such task-agnostic multi-level linguistic similarities between different text inputs because BERT has been pre-trained on a huge corpus capturing general linguistic features that can be utilized for a wide range of tasks.

3 Rethinking Learning-based Demonstration Selection

This section proposes two key findings regarding the underlying similarity mechanisms of learning-based exemplar selection methods: (\mathcal{F}_1) The learning-based retriever is analogous to an ensemble model which adaptively aggregate multi-level similarities from different layers between the input of exemplar and test cases (x and x^t) for different tasks. (\mathcal{F}_2) The learning-based retriever favors selecting exemplars with similar output (y) to the output of the test case (y^t). Moreover, the quantitative validation is conducted for both findings.

3.1 Multi-level Similarity (\mathcal{F}_1)

When considering similarity-based methods for demonstration selection, it’s important to note there exists multiple levels of linguistic similarities, encompassing surface, syntactic, and semantic levels. Although semantic similarity generally excels in text retrieval, our observations show that surface-level similarity (e.g., BM25) can sometimes outperform semantic counterpart in demonstration retrieval for ICL, especially on NI2Bash [20] and SWAG [46]. Thus, we speculate that a critical aspect which makes the learning-based exemplar retriever effective lies in its ability to potentially learn different levels of similarities within the text encodings which is task-agnostic and integrate these similarities (\mathcal{F}_1). We empirically find that the learning-based method EPR acts as a dynamic similarity selector that ensembles different layers from an off-the-shelf BERT encoder, detailed in the following sections.

Quantitative Validation. As a first step, we validate our assumption that different layers of the text encoder (representing different levels of linguistic characteristics), when used as a retriever, exhibit different behaviors for different tasks. To do that, following EPR which builds a positive set $\{(x_i, x_i^+)\}_i^N$ based on x_i using an LLM (Section 2.1), we treat each x_i^+ as a gold exemplar to be retrieved for x_i . Then we utilize different layers of the original pre-trained BERT as anchors to retrieve/rank exemplars (as discussed in Section 2.2) given each x_i and evaluate the Top-10 retrieval accuracy compared with the gold exemplar. The results on four tasks are illustrated in Fig. 1 (Left), which reveal that different tasks exhibit distinct preferences towards specific layers, emphasizing different linguistic properties. More information on these tasks can be found in Section 5. While it is a prevalent practice to employ features from the final layer of original BERT for exemplar retrieval [21, 48], it is not consistently optimal, likely due to potential inclusion of irrelevant information relevant to BERT’s pre-training tasks.

In the next step, we investigate what is encapsulated in the retriever learned using EPR. As the retriever utilises the last layer to compute similarities, we extract the representations from the last layer and compare those with the representations given by each layer of the original BERT to study the correlations between the learned retriever and each prior linguistic knowledge encoded in the original BERT layers. For this purpose, We introduce CKA [14], which effectively identifies correspondences between representations in different networks. Let $X^a \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p_1}$ denote a matrix of activations of p_1 neurons for n examples and $X^b \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p_2}$ denote a matrix of activations of p_2 neurons for the same n examples. The core insight of CKA lies in measuring the similarity between two matrices X^a and X^b by considering the inter-sample similarities. Specifically, CKA computes K^a and K^b to derive the inter-example similarity structures for X^a and X^b , where $K_{ij}^a = k^a(x_i^a, x_j^a)$, $K_{ij}^b = k^b(x_i^b, x_j^b)$, and k^a, k^b represents two kernels. Then CKA metric can be formulated as follows:

$$CKA(K^a, K^b) = \frac{HSIC(K^a, K^b)}{\sqrt{HSIC(K^a, K^a)HSIC(K^b, K^b)}}, \quad HSIC(K^a, K^b) = \frac{1}{(n-1)^2}tr(K^a H K^b H).$$

Here H is the centering matrix $H_n = I_n - \frac{1}{n}J_n$ where I_n is the identity matrix of size n and J_n is a n -by- n all-ones matrix.

We use CKA to measure the similarity between the last layer of the trained retriever and each layer of the original BERT. To do that, we randomly sample $n = 2000$ instances from the demonstration set \mathcal{D} (If $|\mathcal{D}| < 2000$, $n = |\mathcal{D}|$) for each task. Denote X^{EPR} as the matrix composing n rows of last-layer representations from the trained retriever on each of the ten tasks, and X^l as the matrix composing n rows of the l -th-layer representations from the original BERT model. Then we can calculate the CKA scores $CKA(K^{EPR}, K^l)$ for each task.

The results are illustrated in Fig. 1 (Middle). Each row reflects the CKA similarity between the trained retriever for a specific task and each layer of the original BERT (regardless of tasks). Obviously, the CKA distribution across various tasks exhibits significant diversity among different pretrained BERT layers. This finding supports \mathcal{F}_1 that learning-based methods can learn to adaptively aggregate multi-level(layer) linguistic similarities catering to different tasks. For instance, the results suggest that the exemplar retriever trained on NI2Bash and SWAG tasks may prioritize low-level features,

²<https://huggingface.co/google-bert/bert-base-uncased>




Figure 2: **Left:** Comparison of similarity between the input/output of positive and negative demonstration examples and the input/output of the test case across ten tasks for EPR. **Right:** Difference in average similarity between the output of test case and retrieved example for EPR and each of the three learning-free prompt retrieval methods. We use GPT-Neo [5] as the LLM.

corroborating our experimental results where the BM25-based method outperforms higher-level semantic-based ones on these datasets.

3.2 Output Similarity (\mathcal{F}_2)

When employing the learning-based paradigm to acquire better similarity mechanics between exemplars and test cases for ICL, the expectation is that such mechanics can perform well on unseen tasks, thus justifying the high cost of data collection. However, the sub-optimal generalization performance revealed by Ye et al. [44] suggests that the exemplar retriever, trained on the proxy task, primarily learns task-specific information. As data and training objective can serve as a lens to analyze the behaviors of neural network models, we first investigate the data generated based on LLM feedback involving positive and negative pairs, as shown in Fig. 2 (Left), which reveals the similarities between the input of positive/negative exemplars and the test case as well as the output of positive/negative exemplars and the test case. Specifically, for the input similarity, we compute text similarity using sentence-transformers³ for all tasks, while we compute the exact match for the first three classification tasks and the text similarity for other QA and generation tasks for the output similarity. Let (x, y) , (x^+, y^+) , (x^-, y^-) denote the test case and corresponding positive and negative exemplars. The results indicate that the similarity between x^+ and x is significantly higher than that between x and x^- , affirming the efficacy of similarity-based heuristic methods. Moreover, it is noteworthy that the similarity between y^+ and y is also markedly higher than that between y and y^- . Additionally, in the SST-5 dataset, even when the output of positive and negative exemplars are extremely similar to y to provide useful patterns, x^+ remains more similar to x than x^- , demonstrating the importance of input similarities.

Acknowledge that the training objective of the proxy task is to push the embedding of x and x^+ closer and push x and x^- away through contrastive learning in the embedding space. As a result, during the training phase, demonstration examples with similar outputs will resemble each other in this space due to the strong correlation between y and y^+ . This leads to a higher probability of selecting exemplars with outputs similar to the test case as prompts when the test case’s output is unknown. Therefore, we suggest that the success of learning-based approaches partly stems from the implicit prediction of the output of test cases (i.e., $P(Y|X)$) during exemplar retrieval (\mathcal{F}_2), which can be viewed as computing similarity of the joint input-output distribution between the test case and exemplar.

Quantitative Validation. After training the exemplar retriever on the proxy task, we utilize it to assess the similarity between the input of test case and exemplars from the demonstration set and select top-K exemplars as prompts. To validate \mathcal{F}_2 , we evaluate the retriever’s ability to learn the output similarity by computing the average similarity between the output of test cases and that of these retrieved exemplars. We compare EPR trained using GPT-Neo against learning-free methods (i.e., Random, Top-K BM25 and Top-K BERT), as illustrated in Fig. 2 (Right). We compute the output similarity for all tasks in the same way as experiments in 2 (Left). The results demonstrate that

³<https://huggingface.co/sentence-transformers/paraphrase-MiniLM-L6-v2>

the exemplar chosen by EPR have outputs more akin to the test case compared to the learning-free competitors, particularly in classification tasks where the output similarity can be well-captured by exact match. Similar validation is conducted for EPR with GP2-XL, and the results in Fig. 4 align with those obtained for GPT-Neo, thus providing consistent support for \mathcal{F}_2 .

4 Methodology

Given the above two findings and analyses, we propose two simple yet effective methods inspired from the two findings, respectively. Specifically, we propose 1) Multi-level Linguistic Similarity Maximization (**MLSM**) accounting for a better ensemble of task-agnostic layer-wise anchors from BERT to achieve better task generalization given \mathcal{F}_1 , and 2) Test Task Fine-tuning (**TTF**) to explicitly infuse task-specific information to the retriever according to \mathcal{F}_2 which significantly enhances performances on classification tasks. These methods and results serve as further validation of the effectiveness of both findings. In addition, both methods do not require interacting with LLMs to construct positive and negative exemplar sets, significantly reducing implementation cost.

4.1 Multi-level Linguistic Similarity Maximization (MLSM)

\mathcal{F}_1 emphasizes that learning-based methods are capable of adaptively integrating diverse linguistic similarities which can be captured through different layers of a pretrained text encoder (e.g., BERT) from bottom to top. Inspired by ensemble learning [28, 3, 49], each layer can work as an expert for exemplar selection. Our goal is to integrate the insights from all these experts by maximizing their agreement during the inference of LLMs.

However, as depicted in Fig. 1 (Right), each layer of BERT (without task-specific fine-tuning on the proxy task of EPR) shows a higher similarity to adjacent layers due to the residual design of transformers. Hence, our initial step involves filtering out redundant layers to avoid overfitting to specific levels of linguistic similarity and reduce computational overhead. Specifically, given a task and its corresponding demonstration set \mathcal{D} , we sample a subset of unlabeled exemplars from \mathcal{D} and compute layer-wise CKA scores between every pair of BERT layers, forming a similarity matrix $\mathbf{S} \in \mathbb{R}^{12 \times 12}$ where $S_{i,j}$ signifies the similarity between the i -th and j -th layers of BERT. We then employ unsupervised K-means clustering algorithm to derive n_l clusters, maximizing the intra-cluster CKA score while minimizing the inter-cluster CKA score, and designate the central node in each cluster as the representative layer. Finally, we attain a set of refined layers, denoted as $L = \{l_i\}_{i=1}^{n_l}$, to represent the linguistic similarity at varying levels.

For a given test case x^t , we first sample a mini training set $\mathcal{D}_p = \{x_j\}_{j=1}^{n_p}$ and validation set $\mathcal{D}_v = \{x_j\}_{j=1}^{n_v}$ from \mathcal{D} . Then, for each $l_i \in L$, we compute the average of all token embeddings extracted from the corresponding layer (l_i) of the original BERT model as the representation of x^t (denoted as \mathbf{h}^t) and demonstration examples $x_j \in \mathcal{D}_p$ (denoted as \mathbf{h}_j). Following this, we compute their cosine similarity as $\mathbf{r}_i = [\cos(\mathbf{h}^t, \mathbf{h}_1), \dots, \cos(\mathbf{h}^t, \mathbf{h}_{n_p})]$, and normalize it to obtain the probability distribution of these exemplars via $\mathbf{y}_i = \text{softmax}(\frac{\mathbf{r}_i}{\tau})$ for layer l_i , where τ is the temperature parameter. Intuitively, such distribution represents the ranking distribution of the demonstration examples when using the linguistic knowledge captured at l_i to perform the similarity metric. After collecting the output distribution of all experts in L , we aggregate experts with learnable aggregation weights, denoted as $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_l}$ and get the ensembled prediction as $\hat{\mathbf{y}} = \text{softmax}(\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n_l} w_i \mathbf{r}_i}{\tau})$, where \mathbf{w} is normalized before aggregation, i.e., $\sum_{i=1}^{n_l} w_i = 1$. Subsequently, to encourage agreement among all levels of experts, we minimize the loss $\mathcal{L} = -\sum_{i=1}^{n_l} \hat{\mathbf{y}} \cdot \mathbf{y}_i$. The optimal \mathbf{w} can be determined based on the loss on the validation set \mathcal{D}_v by early stopping strategy to prevent overfitting.

In our work, we focus on the scenario involving online streaming test data, where only one test point is observed during inference to align with the demand of real-world applications [47, 39, 49]. However, **MLSM** can enable batch inference by updating \mathbf{w} using a batch of test cases during the training phase, thereby enhancing computational efficiency. Notably, **MLSM** focuses on general layer-wise linguistic information regardless of specific tasks, and thus does not rely on any label information from the demonstration set.

Table 1: The statistics of ten datasets. We report the number of training instances after deduplicating.

Type	Dataset	Task	Train	Validation
Classification	SST-5 [34]	Sentiment Analysis	8,534	1,101
	MRPC [8]	Paraphrase Detection	3,668	408
	QNLI [40]	Natural Language Inference	104,707	5,463
	CMSQA [36]	Commonsense Reasoning	9,740	1,221
	HellaSwag [46]	Commonsense Reasoning	52,611	20,006
Generation	WebQs [4]	Open-Domain QA	3,778	2,032
	GeoQuery [45]	Code Generation	404	280
	NI2Bash [20]	Code Generation	7,441	609
	MTOP [17]	Semantic Parsing	15,564	2,235
	SMCalFlow [2]	Semantic Parsing	102,491	14,751

4.2 Test Task Fine-tuning (TTF)

\mathcal{F}_2 posits that the learning-based demonstration retriever inherently acquires the output similarity between exemplars and test cases for one specific test task when training on the proxy task. However, such proxy task relies on costly interactions with LLMs for each distinct task. To alleviate this issue, we propose to infuse the output information to the retriever by fine-tuning it with additional modules customized for distinct tasks using the labeled data from the demonstration set \mathcal{D} . We consider two different fine-tuning frameworks tailoring classification tasks and generation tasks, respectively.

For convenience, let f_θ denote the retriever and q_ϕ denote the extra module, containing θ and ϕ as learnable parameters. For classification tasks, q_ϕ will be instantiated through various classification heads. Given a test input x , assuming a linear classifier, the predication is derived by taking the argmax over the approximated probability distribution:

$$\arg \max_{y_i} q_\phi(Y = y_i | f_\theta(x)) = \frac{\exp(\mathbf{z} \cdot \phi_i)}{\sum_j \exp(\mathbf{z} \cdot \phi_j)}, \tag{1}$$

where $\mathbf{z} = f_\theta(x)$ and ϕ_i is the i -th component of the weights ϕ corresponding to label y_i . Essentially, the prediction is determined by evaluating the distance between ϕ_i and \mathbf{z} . Consequently, test cases with a similar output are more likely to exhibit a smaller distance in the semantic space, as they are situated closer to their corresponding ϕ . Furthermore, previous research [50, 12] has leveraged \mathbf{z} as a pseudo-prototype for each label to construct non-parameter classifiers, providing evidence that **TTF** can effectively encapsulate the input-output relationship (i.e., $P(X|Y)$) in the wild classification application.

For generation tasks, while decoder-only frameworks are unsuitable to derive sentence embeddings without prompting or fine-tuning [25], we adopt the encoder-decoder architecture, where q_ϕ is instantiated by the decoder and the retriever f_θ works as the encoder. However, determining which part of the model contains effective input-output relationship remains challenging. Considering that the decoder generates new tokens based on the encoder’s output, allowing the encoder’s output to naturally capture pertinent input-output information, we follow Ni et al. [26] to use the average pooling of all token embeddings extracted from the last layer of the encoder to represent test cases and exemplars. However, such method dose not perform well for demonstration selection for generation task, which will be discussed in Sec. 5.

5 Experiments

Datasets. We conduct experiments on ten datasets spanning seven distinct categories of NLP tasks: sentiment analysis, paraphrase detection, natural language inference, commonsense reasoning, open-domain question answering, code generation and semantic parsing. As certain datasets lack a test set, we take the training split as the demonstration set and the validation split for evaluation across all datasets. The statistics of all dataset are listed in Table 1. A detailed description of these datasets and prompts to reproduce our experimental results are shown in Appendix A.1.

Baselines. In line with previous studies [33, 44, 19], we consider the following prompt retrievers:

- **RANDOM**: The method randomly selects in-context examples from the demonstration set without repetition.
- **TOP-K BM25**: This sparse retriever employs BM25 [31], an extension of TF-IDF, to retrieve the Top-K most similar exemplars based on surface text similarity.
- **TOP-K BERT**: Utilizing BERT [7] as a text encoder, this dense retriever generates text representations by averaging token embeddings from the final layer and retrieve the Top-K most similar exemplars based on semantic similarity.
- **EPR [33]**: This learning-based retriever uses Top-K BM25 to generate demonstration candidates and scores them using LLMs to construct a proxy task. It further finetunes BERT in TOP-K BERT using this task.
- **CEIL [44]**: This method uses EPR to generate demonstration sequence candidates, scores them using LLMs to construct a proxy task, and also further finetunes BERT using this task. It balances diversity and relevance using a trade-off parameter and search optimal exemplar combination using Determinantal Point Processes [16].

We categorize the baselines into two groups, namely unsupervised and supervised methods, based on their utilization of labeled data from the demonstration set. While we mainly utilize BERT as the retriever model of **MLSM** and **TTF**, we also try *T5* for **TTF**, denoted as **TTF (T5)** on the generation tasks. The implementation detail of our methods and all baselines can be found in Appendix. A.2.

Experiment settings. We employ GPT-Neo [5] with 2.7B parameter as the main LLM for inference in our study. Additionally, we conduct experiments on a smaller GPT-2 XL [29] (1.5B) and text-davinci-002 to verify the transferability of our findings and corresponding methods. Due to computational constraints and different maximum context sizes among LMs, we restrict the number of in-context examples to 20. These exemplars are sorted based on their similarities to the input of test cases in ascending order following prior practices [33, 1, 21]. Additionally, in accordance with Ye et al. [44], we assess the performance of all methods by comparing the predicted output with ground truth and report Accuracy (Acc.) and Exact Match (EM) for classification tasks and generation tasks, respectively.

Main Results. We compare **MLSM** and **TTF** with existing unsupervised (using off-the-shelf models directly) and supervised learning-based baselines on classification tasks (Table 2) and generation tasks (Table 3). The results demonstrate that **MLSM** consistently outperforms all unsupervised baselines in most cases, achieving an average improvement of 1.42% over the best baseline, Top-K BERT (semantic similarity), on classification tasks, and an average improvement of 2.11% over the best baseline, Top-K BM25 (surface similarity), on generation tasks. This indicates that while different similarities excel at different tasks, **MLSM** can adaptively integrate multi-level similarities for various tasks by updating the aggregation weight of each expert for each test case, thus providing evidence for \mathcal{F}_1 . Additionally, learning-based methods like EPR and CEIL show a clear advantage over **MLSM**, especially on classification tasks. However, our **TTF** surpasses both learning-based methods, achieving over 5% absolute improvements without costly integration with LLMs. This suggests that fine-tuning on the target task is a more effective way than proxy tasks to learn input-output mapping, further validating \mathcal{F}_2 . Nevertheless, **TTF** underperforms on generation tasks. We speculate this is primarily because fine-tuning in generation tasks typically requires substantial data, especially when the decoder initialized by BERT lacks sufficient training due to the random initialization of external cross-attention models. When transitioning from BERT to T5, **TTF** still obtains further improvements

Table 2: Main results on the classification task.

Method	SST-5	MRPC	QNLI	CMSQA	SWAG	Avg.
<i>Unsupervised</i>						
Random	28.61	65.93	55.08	42.34	41.39	46.67
Top-K BM25	32.06	65.93	60.11	35.79	43.35	47.45
Top-K BERT	32.70	69.12	60.94	35.87	41.09	47.94
MLSM	33.15	69.87	65.02	37.26	41.49	49.36
<i>Supervised</i>						
EPR	36.88	81.37	77.87	38.74	43.39	55.65
CEIL	37.69	77.94	80.58	38.90	43.84	55.79
TTF	42.14	74.51	85.08	47.83	55.72	61.06

Table 3: Main results on the generation tasks.

Method	WebQs	GeoQ.	NL2B.	MTOP	SMCal.	Avg.
<i>Unsupervised</i>						
Random	3.79	25.36	31.27	3.98	3.70	13.62
Top-K BM25	14.17	65.71	58.81	49.66	44.02	46.48
Top-K BERT	14.17	64.64	52.45	51.36	44.76	45.48
Top-K T5	11.52	59.64	46.37	38.12	39.05	38.94
MLSM	16.14	68.93	56.11	54.05	47.72	48.59
<i>Supervised</i>						
EPR	17.62	73.21	77.87	60.82	60.49	53.43
CEIL	17.08	70.71	53.66	63.40	56.30	52.23
TTF	10.97	47.86	28.69	31.59	13.36	26.49
TTF (T5)	12.11	63.57	48.73	43.27	40.52	41.64




Figure 3: **Left:** Comparison of transferability between EPR and MLSM. We show the absolute improvement of MLSM over EPR. **Right:** Comparisons of different batchsize for MLSM.

Table 4: Results of cross-LLM Transferability Validation. We show the absolute improvement of TTF and MLSM over Top-K BERT.

LLM	TTF					MLSM				
	SST-5	MRPC	QNLI	CMSQA	Avg.	SST-5	MRPC	GeoQ.	NL2Bash	Avg
GPT-2 XL (1.5B)	3.54	0.00	5.35	6.38	3.82	1.54	0.00	1.07	4.57	1.74
GPT NEO (2.7B)	9.45	5.39	24.14	11.96	12.73	0.05	0.75	4.29	3.66	2.29
text-davinci-002	3.27	1.51	18.52	1.15	6.11	1.82	1.47	3.21	3.02	2.38

over Top-K T5, thereby providing additional validation for our speculation regarding the failure of **TTF** in generation tasks.

Transfer across Tasks for MLSM. We compare EPR and **MLSM** on cross-task experiments, where EPR is trained on a source task and then transferred to a target task, as shown in Fig. 3 (Left). The results show that EPR generally underperforms compared to **MLSM**, particularly when transferring between classification and generation tasks. This suggests that learning-based methods like EPR may overfit to task-specific characteristics during proxy task training, making it challenging to justify the high costs of data collection and the need for extensive labeled data in the demonstration set. In contrast, **MLSM** proves to be a practical solution for cross-task demands, as it only leverages information from the test case to adapt to different tasks during LLM inference.

Ablation of Batchsize for MLSM. Although we assume only one test case is available to learn the aggregation weight w for different similarity levels, we conduct an ablation study to investigate the effect of increasing the batch size in Fig. 3 (Right). The results indicate that **MLSM** generally benefits from a larger batch size, especially on classification tasks, showing over 4% average improvements when the batchsize equals to 8. This improvement can be attributed to the fact that different test cases in the same batch share a similar pattern of multi-level analogs (i.e., similar w). These findings further demonstrate that multi-level analogs are versatile characteristics for selecting good demonstration exemplars.

Transfer across LLMs. We validate the versatility of our proposed **TTF** and **MLSM** methods on GPT-2 XL (1.5B), GPT-NEO (2.7B), and text-davinci-002, comparing the results with Top-K BERT in Table 4. The results indicate that both **TTF** and **MLSM** can enhance ICL performance across different large language models and datasets. **TTF** consistently outperforms **MLSM**, demonstrating the effectiveness of acquiring task-specific output similarity between exemplars and test cases. However, **TTF** exhibits high variance in performance across different LLMs, whereas **MLSM** provides more stable enhancements. This suggests that different LLMs have varying abilities to exploit exemplars with similar outputs to the test case. Additionally, the better performance of **TTF** on GPT-NEO compared to text-davinci-002 suggests that the latter’s stronger inference ability makes it more resilient to prompt choices.

Limitations. Due to page limitations, we discuss two main limitations of our work in Appendix B: 1) Why not combine MLSM and TTF? and 2) Are there better methods to achieve \mathcal{F}_2 ? We recommend reading this section for detailed information.

6 Conclusion

In this work, we delve into the inner-working mechanism of learning-based demonstration exemplar selection methods. Through a series of experiments and analyses, we speculate the advantages of these methods possibly stem from their ability to integrate diverse linguistic similarities for exemplar selection (\mathcal{F}_1) and their capacity to choose exemplars with similar outputs to the test case (\mathcal{F}_2). Drawing insight from both findings, we introduce two effective but simple exemplar section methods, **MLSM** and **TTF**, tailored to address task-agnostic and task-specific demands without requiring costly interactions with LLMs. The effectiveness of both methods, as well as quantitative validations, provide substantial evidence in favor of these assumptions. Our work not only provides insights into the efficient and effective utilization of LLMs in practical applications but also contributes empirical evidence to existing explanation of ICL, which we discuss in Appendix C. While we acknowledge limitations of our work, we leave it for further exploration.

References

- [1] S. An, B. Zhou, Z. Lin, Q. Fu, B. Chen, N. Zheng, W. Chen, and J. Lou. Skill-based few-shot selection for in-context learning. In *EMNLP*, pages 13472–13492. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2023.
- [2] J. Andreas, J. Bufo, D. Burkett, C. Chen Jr, J. Clausman, J. Crawford, K. Crim, J. DeLoach, L. Dorner, J. Eisner, et al. Task-oriented dialogue as dataflow synthesis. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 8:556–571, 2020.
- [3] D. Barber and C. M. Bishop. Ensemble learning for multi-layer networks. In *NIPS*, pages 395–401. The MIT Press, 1997.
- [4] J. Berant, A. Chou, R. Frostig, and P. Liang. Semantic parsing on Freebase from question-answer pairs. In *Proceedings of the 2013 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 1533–1544, Seattle, Washington, USA, Oct. 2013. Association for Computational Linguistics. URL <https://www.aclweb.org/anthology/D13-1160>.
- [5] S. Black, L. Gao, P. Wang, C. Leahy, and S. Biderman. GPT-Neo: Large Scale Autoregressive Language Modeling with Mesh-Tensorflow, Mar. 2021. URL <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.5297715>.
- [6] T. B. Brown, B. Mann, N. Ryder, M. Subbiah, J. Kaplan, P. Dhariwal, A. Neelakantan, P. Shyam, G. Sastry, A. Askell, S. Agarwal, A. Herbert-Voss, G. Krueger, T. Henighan, R. Child, A. Ramesh, D. M. Ziegler, J. Wu, C. Winter, C. Hesse, M. Chen, E. Sigler, M. Litwin, S. Gray, B. Chess, J. Clark, C. Berner, S. McCandlish, A. Radford, I. Sutskever, and D. Amodei. Language models are few-shot learners. In *NeurIPS*, 2020.
- [7] J. Devlin, M. Chang, K. Lee, and K. Toutanova. BERT: pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. In *NAACL-HLT (1)*, pages 4171–4186. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2019.
- [8] W. B. Dolan, C. Quirk, and C. Brockett. Unsupervised construction of large paraphrase corpora: Exploiting massively parallel news sources. In *COLING 2004: Proceedings of the 20th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, pages 350–356, 2004.
- [9] T. Gao, A. Fisch, and D. Chen. Making pre-trained language models better few-shot learners. In *ACL/IJCNLP (1)*, pages 3816–3830. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2021.
- [10] D. Halawi, J.-S. Denain, and J. Steinhardt. Overthinking the truth: Understanding how language models process false demonstrations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09476*, 2023.
- [11] F. C. Heilbron, V. Escorcia, B. Ghanem, and J. C. Niebles. Activitynet: A large-scale video benchmark for human activity understanding. In *2015 IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition (CVPR)*, pages 961–970. IEEE, 2015.
- [12] Y. Iwasawa and Y. Matsuo. Test-time classifier adjustment module for model-agnostic domain generalization. In *NeurIPS*, pages 2427–2440, 2021.
- [13] G. Jawahar, B. Sagot, and D. Seddah. What does BERT learn about the structure of language? In *ACL (1)*, pages 3651–3657. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2019.

- [14] S. Kornblith, M. Norouzi, H. Lee, and G. E. Hinton. Similarity of neural network representations revisited. In *ICML*, volume 97 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 3519–3529. PMLR, 2019.
- [15] J. Kossen, T. Rainforth, and Y. Gal. In-context learning in large language models learns label relationships but is not conventional learning. *CoRR*, abs/2307.12375, 2023.
- [16] A. Kulesza and B. Taskar. k-dpps: Fixed-size determinantal point processes. In *ICML*, 2011.
- [17] H. Li, A. Arora, S. Chen, A. Gupta, S. Gupta, and Y. Mehdad. Mtop: A comprehensive multilingual task-oriented semantic parsing benchmark. In *Proceedings of the 16th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Main Volume*, pages 2950–2962, 2021.
- [18] X. Li and X. Qiu. Finding support examples for in-context learning. In *EMNLP (Findings)*, pages 6219–6235. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2023.
- [19] X. Li, K. Lv, H. Yan, T. Lin, W. Zhu, Y. Ni, G. Xie, X. Wang, and X. Qiu. Unified demonstration retriever for in-context learning. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 4644–4668, Toronto, Canada, July 2023. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2023.acl-long.256.
- [20] X. V. Lin, C. Wang, L. Zettlemoyer, and M. D. Ernst. Nl2bash: A corpus and semantic parser for natural language interface to the linux operating system. In *LREC*. European Language Resources Association (ELRA), 2018.
- [21] J. Liu, D. Shen, Y. Zhang, B. Dolan, L. Carin, and W. Chen. What makes good in-context examples for gpt-3? In *DeeLIO@ACL*, pages 100–114. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2022.
- [22] 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 (I)*, pages 8086–8098. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2022.
- [23] X. Ma, Z. Wang, P. Ng, R. Nallapati, and B. Xiang. Universal text representation from BERT: an empirical study. *CoRR*, abs/1910.07973, 2019.
- [24] A. Milios, S. Reddy, and D. Bahdanau. In-context learning for text classification with many labels. *CoRR*, abs/2309.10954, 2023.
- [25] N. Muennighoff. SGPT: GPT sentence embeddings for semantic search. *CoRR*, abs/2202.08904, 2022.
- [26] J. Ni, G. H. Ábrego, N. Constant, J. Ma, K. B. Hall, D. Cer, and Y. Yang. Sentence-t5: Scalable sentence encoders from pre-trained text-to-text models. In *ACL (Findings)*, pages 1864–1874. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2022.
- [27] C. Olsson, N. Elhage, N. Nanda, N. Joseph, N. DasSarma, T. Henighan, B. Mann, A. Askell, Y. Bai, A. Chen, T. Conerly, D. Drain, D. Ganguli, Z. Hatfield-Dodds, D. Hernandez, S. Johnston, A. Jones, J. Kernion, L. Lovitt, K. Ndousse, D. Amodei, T. Brown, J. Clark, J. Kaplan, S. McCandlish, and C. Olah. In-context learning and induction heads. *CoRR*, abs/2209.11895, 2022.
- [28] R. Polikar. Ensemble learning. *Scholarpedia*, 4(1):2776, 2009.
- [29] A. Radford, J. Wu, R. Child, D. Luan, D. Amodei, and I. Sutskever. Language models are unsupervised multitask learners. 2019.
- [30] G. Reddy. The mechanistic basis of data dependence and abrupt learning in an in-context classification task. *CoRR*, abs/2312.03002, 2023.
- [31] S. Robertson and H. Zaragoza. The probabilistic relevance framework: Bm25 and beyond. *Foundations and Trends in Information Retrieval*, 3:333–389, 01 2009. doi: 10.1561/15000000019.
- [32] A. Rohrbach, A. Torabi, M. Rohrbach, N. Tandon, C. Pal, H. Larochelle, A. Courville, and B. Schiele. Movie description. *International Journal of Computer Vision*, 123:94–120, 2017.
- [33] O. Rubin, J. Herzig, and J. Berant. Learning to retrieve prompts for in-context learning. In *NAACL-HLT*, pages 2655–2671. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2022.
- [34] 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*, pages 1631–1642. ACL, 2013.

- [35] H. Su, J. Kasai, C. H. Wu, W. Shi, T. Wang, J. Xin, R. Zhang, M. Ostendorf, L. Zettlemoyer, N. A. Smith, and T. Yu. Selective annotation makes language models better few-shot learners. In *ICLR*. OpenReview.net, 2023.
- [36] A. Talmor, J. Herzig, N. Lourie, and J. Berant. CommonsenseQA: A question answering challenge targeting commonsense knowledge. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, pages 4149–4158, Minneapolis, Minnesota, June 2019. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/N19-1421. URL <https://aclanthology.org/N19-1421>.
- [37] J. Tonglet, M. Reusens, P. Borchert, and B. Baesens. SEER : A knapsack approach to exemplar selection for in-context hybridqa. In *EMNLP*, pages 13569–13583. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2023.
- [38] A. Voronov, L. Wolf, and M. Ryabinin. Mind your format: Towards consistent evaluation of in-context learning improvements. *CoRR*, abs/2401.06766, 2024.
- [39] V. VS, P. Oza, and V. M. Patel. Towards online domain adaptive object detection. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision*, pages 478–488, 2023.
- [40] A. Wang, A. Singh, J. Michael, F. Hill, O. Levy, and S. Bowman. Glue: A multi-task benchmark and analysis platform for natural language understanding. In *Proceedings of the 2018 EMNLP Workshop BlackboxNLP: Analyzing and Interpreting Neural Networks for NLP*, pages 353–355, 2018.
- [41] A. Williams, N. Nangia, and S. R. Bowman. A broad-coverage challenge corpus for sentence understanding through inference. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1704.05426*, 2017.
- [42] T. Wolfson, M. Geva, A. Gupta, M. Gardner, Y. Goldberg, D. Deutch, and J. Berant. Break it down: A question understanding benchmark. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 8:183–198, 2020.
- [43] J. Yan, J. Xu, C. Song, C. Wu, Y. Li, and Y. Zhang. Understanding in-context learning from repetitions. *CoRR*, abs/2310.00297, 2023.
- [44] J. Ye, Z. Wu, J. Feng, T. Yu, and L. Kong. Compositional exemplars for in-context learning. In *ICML*, volume 202 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 39818–39833. PMLR, 2023.
- [45] J. M. Zelle and R. J. Mooney. Learning to parse database queries using inductive logic programming. In *AAAI/IAAI*, pages 1050–1055, Portland, OR, August 1996. AAAI Press/MIT Press. URL <http://www.cs.utexas.edu/users/ai-lab?zelle:aaai96>.
- [46] R. Zellers, A. Holtzman, Y. Bisk, A. Farhadi, and Y. Choi. Hellaswag: Can a machine really finish your sentence? In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 2019.
- [47] M. Zhang, S. Levine, and C. Finn. Memo: Test time robustness via adaptation and augmentation. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:38629–38642, 2022.
- [48] S. Zhang, X. Xia, Z. Wang, L. Chen, J. Liu, Q. Wu, and T. Liu. IDEAL: influence-driven selective annotations empower in-context learners in large language models. *CoRR*, abs/2310.10873, 2023.
- [49] Y. Zhang, B. Hooi, L. Hong, and J. Feng. Self-supervised aggregation of diverse experts for test-agnostic long-tailed recognition. In *NeurIPS*, 2022.
- [50] Y. Zhang, X. Wang, K. Jin, K. Yuan, Z. Zhang, L. Wang, R. Jin, and T. Tan. Adanpc: Exploring non-parametric classifier for test-time adaptation. In *ICML*, volume 202 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 41647–41676. PMLR, 2023.
- [51] Z. Zhao, E. Wallace, S. Feng, D. Klein, and S. Singh. Calibrate before use: Improving few-shot performance of language models. In *ICML*, volume 139 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 12697–12706. PMLR, 2021.
- [52] H. Zhou, X. Wan, L. Proleev, D. Mincu, J. Chen, K. A. Heller, and S. Roy. Batch calibration: Rethinking calibration for in-context learning and prompt engineering. *CoRR*, abs/2309.17249, 2023.

A Experimental Setup

Table 5: Datasets with corresponding prompts and examples used in the experiments.

Dataset	Prompt	Example
SST-5	{input} It is {output}	Input: this is a stunning film , a one-of-a-kind tour de force . Output: very positive
MRPC	{input1} Can we say "{input2}"? {output}	Input1: The company didn 't detail the costs of the replacement and repairs. Input2: But company officials expect the costs of the replacement work to run into the millions of dollars . Output: No
MNLI	{input1} Can we say "{input2}"? {output}	Input1: yeah i know and i did that all through college and it worked too Input2: I did that all through college but it never worked Output: No
QNLI	{input1} Can we know "{input2}"? {output}	Input1: As of that day, the new constitution heralding the Second Republic came into force. Input2: What came into force after the new constitution was herald? Output: Yes
CMSQA	{input} {output}	Input: Sammy wanted to go to where the people were. Where might he go? Output: populated areas
HellaSwag	{input} {output}	Input: Members of the procession walk down the street holding small horn brass instruments. A drum line Output: passes by walking down the street playing their instruments
WebQs	{input} {output}	Input: what does jamaican people speak? Output: Jamaican Creole English Language
GeoQuery	{input}\t{output}	Input: what is the population of montana ? Output: answer(A,(population(B,A),const(B,stateid(montana))))
NL2Bash	{input}\t{output}	Input: find all executable files in /home directory. Output: find /home -type f -perm /a=x
Break	{input}\t{output}	Input: How many large metallic items are there? Output: 1#) return items 2#) return #1 that are large 3#) return #2 that are metallic 4#) return number of #3
Mtop	{input}\t{output}	Input: Resume the timer in 10 seconds Output: [IN:RESUME_TIMER [SL:METHOD_TIMER timer] [SL:DATE_TIME in 10 seconds]]
SMCalFlow	{input}\t{output}	Input: Can you create me a new meeting on thursday morning? Output: (Yield (CreateCommitEventWrapper (CreatePreflightEventWrapper (Event.start_? (DateTimeConstraint (Morning) (NextDOW (Thursday)))))))

A.1 Datasets

Following existing work [44], we conduct experiments on five classification and five generation tasks⁴ While we advise readers to refer to the detail of each dataset in the original work [44], we provide the prompts and examples for each dataset in Table 5 and offer a detailed description of each dataset below for completeness.

SST-5 [34] is a sentiment classification benchmark containing five fine-grained classes including ‘very positive’, ‘positive’, ‘neutral’, ‘negative’, and ‘very negative’.

MRPC [8] is a corpus of sentence pairs automatically extracted from online news sources, with human annotations for whether the sentences in the pair are semantically equivalent.

MNLI [41] is a crowdsourced collection of sentence pairs with textual entailment annotations. Given a premise sentence and a hypothesis sentence, the task is to predict whether the premise entails the hypothesis (entailment), contradicts the hypothesis (contradiction), or neither (neutral).

QNLI [40] is a question-answering dataset consisting of question-paragraph pairs, and the task is to determine whether the context sentence contains the answer to the question.

CMSQA [36] (short for CommonsenseQA) is a multiple-choice question-answering dataset that requires different types of commonsense knowledge. The task is to predict the correct answer out of five provided candidate answers.

HellaSwag [46] is a large-scale dataset of grounded commonsense reasoning. There are four candidate answers for each question: a video caption from ActivityNet Captions [11] and the Large

⁴We exclude MNLI [41] to reduce computation cost and Break [42] because of failure to reproduce its evaluation method.

Scale Movie Description Challenge [32]. The three incorrect answers are adversarially generated and human validated to deceive machines. The correct answer is the actual video caption for the subsequent occurrence in the video.

WebQs [4] is question-answer pairs obtained from the web. The questions are selected using Google Suggest API, and the answers are entities in Freebase.

NI2Bash [20] is a dataset for the problem of mapping English sentences to Bash commands. The corpus consists of text-command pairs, where each pair consists of a Bash command scraped from the web and an expert-generated natural language description.

GeoQuery [45] contains a parallel corpus of 880 English questions about US geography paired with Prolog queries.

Break [42] is a dataset that maps complex natural language questions into a language-based meaning representation. The question is decomposed into an ordered list of atomic steps, which is used as the target sequence. We use the low-level Break subset following [33].

MTOP [17] is a multilingual task-oriented semantic parsing dataset covering 6 languages and 11 domains. The target commands are complex queries featuring nested intent-slot prediction. Similar to past work [33], we use the English subset of MTOP.

SMCalFlow [2] is a large dialogue dataset, featuring natural conversations about tasks involving calendars, weather, places, and people. The meaning representation is an executable dataflow program featuring API calls, function composition, and complex constraints.

A.2 Implementation Details

We employ the implementation⁵ from Ye et al. [44] for all baselines. Specifically, for EPR and CEIL, we limit the maximum instances in the proxy task to 4,000 ($|\mathcal{D}^s| = 4,000$) and sample 50 candidates for each instance to create positive and negative pairs. It is worth noting it is pretty expensive and time-consuming to collect these data for both methods (i.e., 200,000 queries to LLMs), especially for CEIL where each candidate sequence involves 16 exemplars.

For our proposed **MLSM**, we randomly sample 1,000 examples ($n_c = 1,000$) from the demonstration set \mathcal{D} to compute layer-wise CKA scores and obtain three representative layers through clustering ($n_l = 3$). Then for each test case, we randomly sample 256 and 64 examples ($n_t = 256$ and $n_v = 64$) from \mathcal{D} as mini training and validation set, respectively. The temperature of softmax function is set to 0.01 ($\tau = 0.01$). We utilize Adam optimizer with batch size 32 and learning rate 0.1 to learn the aggregation weight w in fewer epochs.

For our proposed **TTF**, we instantiate f_θ with BERT and q_ϕ with different task heads for classification tasks. Concretely, for SST-5, MRPC and QNLI, we utilize the sequential classification head⁶ and train the model using Adam optimizer with batchsize 32, learning rate 5e-4 and weight decay 1e-4. For SWAG and CMSQA, we adopt the multi-choice head⁷ and also train the model using Adam optimizer with batchsize 8, learning rate 5e-4 and weight decay 1e-4. Additionally, we instantiate f_θ with BERT and q_ϕ with decoder for generation tasks. For all tasks, we utilize Adam optimizer with batchsize 16, learning rate 5e-5. Especially, for **TTF** (T5), we instantiate f_θ and q_ϕ using the encoder and decoder of T5⁸ and utilize to Adam optimizer with batchsize 8, learning rate 4e-5 and weight decay 0.01.

Furthermore, we conducted all experiments for EPR and CEIL on two NVIDIA A100 GPUs (40GB), while the remaining experiments were performed on two NVIDIA V100 GPUs (30GB).

⁵<https://github.com/HKUNLP/icl-ceil>

⁶https://huggingface.co/docs/transformers/model_doc/bert#transformers.BertForSequenceClassification

⁷https://huggingface.co/docs/transformers/model_doc/bert#transformers.BertForMultipleChoice

⁸<https://huggingface.co/google-t5/t5-base>

Each experiment is repeated three times using different random seeds to mitigate the effects of randomness.

B Limitations

The section discusses two main limitations of our work.

Why not combine MLSM and TTF? **MSLM** and **TTF** are designed for distinct scenarios: **MSLM** addresses cross-task situations by maximizing agreement across different similarities, while **TTF** targets task-specific situations by fine-tuning the retriever with labeled data to learn task-specific information. However, it is worth exploring whether combining these methods could enhance performance in task-specific situations. To investigate this, we utilize the BERT model trained in **TTF** to replace the original BERT in **MSLM** and conduct experiments on five classification tasks using the same implementation detailed in Appendix A.2. As shown in Table 6, although the combined approach of TTF and MSLM significantly outperforms MSLM with an average improvement of around 4%, it falls short of TTF by over 6%. This performance drop suggests that input-output-based similarity is superior to similarities from other layers. While TTF’s final layer effectively captures task-specific input-output-based similarity, integrating it with other sub-optimal similarities introduces noise, negatively impacting exemplar selection for ICL.

Any better method to achieve \mathcal{F}_2 ? We empirically find that learning-based methods acquire output similarity between exemplars and test cases, significantly enhancing task-specific performance in demonstration selection. However, when we simulate this similarity mechanism using **TTF**, it proves ineffective for generation tasks due to the difficulty in pinpointing which model components contain effective input-output relationships and the extensive data required for fine-tuning generation task heads. In a further attempt, akin to EPR, we tried selecting the exemplar with the most similar output to the test case as a positive pair and the most dissimilar one as a negative pair. We then fine-tuned BERT on this task, similar to EPR. However, this approach led to a performance collapse. We suggest this failure is primarily due to the complexity of accurately modeling the nuanced input-output relationships necessary for generation tasks and the inherent limitations of fine-tuning process (e.g., the lack of comprehensive hyperparameter and framework searching).

C Connection with Explanatory Work of ICL

Qualitative Validation of \mathcal{F}_1 . While learning-based prompt retrieval methods are capable of retrieving exemplars with multi-level analogs to the test case, we demonstrate that such exemplar will help LLMs to make correct predictions at a higher possibility than dissimilar ones when all of them include correct patterns pertinent to the test case. Previous investigation [27, 30] proposed a possible inner working of ICL that LLMs can learn from surface patterns in the demonstration sequence such as copying tokens from contextual prompts. Furthermore, recent research [43] empirically demonstrated that the connection between two tokens will be strengthened by increased contextual co-occurrences during generation caused by the maximizing likelihood objective of LLMs. These insights suggest that effective demonstration examples may manifest more token or phrase-level correspondence with the test case corresponding to anchors at lower and middle layers, exerting a more significant influence on LLMs’ output, further supporting \mathcal{F}_1 .

Qualitative Validation of \mathcal{F}_2 . In line with the qualitative validation of \mathcal{F}_1 , we illustrate the exemplar with similar output to test cases contributes to the performance of ICL. Prior work have demonstrated ICL typically learn input-output relation from exemplars even for a genuinely novel task the LLM cannot know from pre-training [15, 10]. Moreover, Kossen et al. [15] further proposed LLMs exhibit a preference for utilizing information closer to the query rather than treating all available information equally. Hence, if the exemplar selection method successfully learns the output similarity via the proxy task, it not only selects demonstration examples exhibiting useful input-output correlations for the test case due to their shared relevant input-output correlations but also positions it closely to the test query in the prompt. These advantages align with the previously mentioned underlying working mechanisms of LLMs, thereby validating \mathcal{F}_2 .

Table 6: Experimental results for the combination of MLSM and TTF

Method	SST-5	MRPC	QNLI	CMSQA	SWAG	Avg.
MLSM	33.15	69.87	65.02	37.26	41.49	49.36
TTF	42.14	74.51	85.08	47.83	55.72	61.06
TTF and MLSM	36.14	71.07	65.31	45.61	50.27	53.69




Figure 4: **Left:** Comparison of similarity between the input/output of positive and negative demonstration examples and the input/output of the test case across ten tasks for EPR. **Right:** Difference in average similarity between the output of test case and retrieved example for EPR and three learning-free prompt retrieval methods. We use GPT-2 XL [5] as the LLM.

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: In this work, we delve into the inner-working mechanism of learning-based

2. Limitations

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

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: We discuss two main limitations of our work in Appendix B.

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: [NA]

Justification: Our paper does not include theoretical results.

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 implementation detail of our work is discussed in Appendix A.2.

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: We submit our codes in supplemental material with instructions. We will clean up the code after paper accepted.

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 implementation detail of our work is discussed in Appendix A.2.

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: [No]

Justification: We reported the averaging results of three runs with different random seeds for all experiments.

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: We discuss this point in Appendix A.2.

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: This work conform with the NeurIPS Code of Ethics.

10. **Broader Impacts**

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

Answer: [NA]

Justification: Our work aims to unravel the mechanics of learning-Based demonstration Selection to improve the efficiency of ICL. As such, our work will not produce potential malicious impacts to our society.

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: Our paper poses no such risks.

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: We have cited the original paper that produced the code package or dataset.

13. **New Assets**

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

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: We follow the requirements of NIPS.

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: Our paper does not involve crowdsourcing nor research with human subjects.

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: Our paper does not involve crowdsourcing or research with human subjects.