

In-Context Learning on a Budget: A Case Study in Named Entity Recognition

Uri Berger^{1,2}, Tal Baumel³, Gabriel Stanovsky¹

¹School of Computer Science and Engineering, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem

²School of Computing and Information Systems, University of Melbourne

³Microsoft Corporation

{uri.berger2, gabriel.stanovsky}@mail.huji.ac.il

tal.baumel@microsoft.com

Abstract

Few shot in-context learning (ICL) typically assumes access to large annotated training sets. However, in many real world scenarios, such as domain adaptation, there is only a limited budget to annotate a small number of samples, with the goal of maximizing downstream performance. We study various methods for selecting samples to annotate within a predefined budget, specifically focusing on the named entity recognition (NER) task, which has real-world applications, is expensive to annotate, and is relatively less studied in ICL setups. Across different models and datasets, we find that a relatively small pool of annotated samples can achieve results comparable to using the entire training set. Moreover, we discover that random selection of samples for annotation yields surprisingly good performance. Finally, we observe that a diverse annotation pool is correlated with improved performance. We hope that future work adopts our realistic paradigm which takes annotation budget into account.

1 Introduction

In-context learning (ICL) has emerged as a highly efficient and robust method for various textual tasks. In this paradigm, a large language model (LLM) is exposed to a small number of annotated samples, termed *demonstration examples*, which are provided as part of the prompt, before the sample which the model is required to annotate, which we will refer to as *inference sample* henceforth. While the reasons for ICL’s success are still contested (Min et al., 2022; Liu et al., 2022), it has been observed that ICL prompts commonly outperform zero-shot prompts, where no demonstration examples are provided (Brown et al., 2020).

Furthermore, a recent line of work has found that *the choice of demonstration examples* can lead to improved results over random demonstration selection. For example, Liu et al. (2022) found that choosing the nearest neighbors of the inference

sample in the training set leads to improvements over random demonstration selection on 6 tasks, such as sentiment analysis or question answering. In all of these, the demonstration examples are chosen from large annotated training sets, ranging from 3.5K samples up to 78K samples.

In this work, we address the following research question: *How can we maximize ICL performance on a given annotation budget?* This question is particularly relevant for real-world domain adaptation settings, where a large pool of annotated samples is unavailable for selecting demonstration examples. Instead, there are large sets of unannotated samples (e.g., raw text in the target domain), and a fixed budget to annotate only a small portion of them. As depicted in Figure 1, we define the task as *pool selection*, i.e., selecting a small pool of k examples out of a large corpus of raw texts. These samples are annotated and serve as the available pool for demonstration examples.

We implement various methods for pool selection, e.g., clustering the train set and selecting a representative example from each cluster. Within the scope of this paper, we focus on the task of named entity recognition (NER), as it has various applications in real-world downstream tasks (e.g., finance, biomedical (Pakhale, 2023)), it is relatively understudied in the context of ICL (Chen et al., 2023), and is expensive to annotate due to the need for linguistic expertise and domain-specific knowledge (Chen et al., 2015).

We evaluate several state-of-the-art LLMs on two NER benchmarks. We first replicate previous findings of the strong effect of choice of demonstrations on performance. Second, we find that a relatively small pool (~ 200 samples) allows LLMs to perform over 88% as when demonstrations are selected from the full training set. However, when compared to NER state-of-the-art models, the performance gap remains considerable in some cases. Additionally, we find that in some scenarios *ran-*




Figure 1: Our proposed approach for ICL on a budget, illustrated in four steps: (1) we assume a large pool of *raw train* and potentially *test* texts in the target domain; (2) a *pool selection strategy* chooses a subset of k train texts to maximize downstream ICL performance; (3) annotations are collected for the selected pool; (4) an inference prompt is instantiated by choosing the *nearest examples* in the pool to the *inference sample*. We focus on step (2), experimenting with various pool selection strategies.

domly selecting samples for the annotation pool performs similarly to more carefully designed methods. Finally, we show that across models and datasets, a more diverse pool is correlated with improved performance.

We hope that our paradigm is adopted in future work in order to report more realistic ICL performance, and explore new methods for sample selection for other tasks and domains.

2 ICL on a Budget

Here we propose a conceptual framework for ICL in a realistic domain adaptation setting (depicted in Figure 1), where there are no apriori annotated datasets for the target task. Instead, we assume that there is a large corpus of raw texts in the target domain, and a fixed budget for annotating a small portion of them, such that they can serve as potential demonstration exemplars during inference. Intuitively, the goal of the annotation process is to maximize downstream ICL performance.

Below we formalize the task of pool selection, and describe 5 selection strategies, which aim to maximize different aspects, e.g., coverage of the training set versus coverage of the test set. In the following section we evaluate these approaches for the NER task.

2.1 Pool Selection: Task Definition

Formally, a *pool selection strategy* is a function:

$$S : (\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{D}) \cup \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{T})) \mapsto \mathcal{D}^k \quad (1)$$

Where \mathcal{D} represents an unannotated “training” distribution (e.g., all texts in a certain domain), \mathcal{T}

similarly represents a “test” distribution, $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{D})$ and $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{T})$ are the power sets of \mathcal{D} , \mathcal{T} respectively, and $k > 0 \in \mathbb{N}$ is the annotation budget, i.e., the number of samples to annotate. Intuitively, S maps raw train and test sets to k train samples (the pool), which are then annotated. In all that follows we denote the input train set by $D \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{D})$ and test set by $T \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{T})$. Typically, $k \ll |D|$ and $k \ll |T|$, indicating that the annotation budget for a new domain can only annotate a small portion of its available texts.

Furthermore, we assume a similarity function ϕ :

$$\phi : ((\mathcal{D} \cup \mathcal{T}) \times (\mathcal{D} \cup \mathcal{T})) \mapsto \mathbb{R} \quad (2)$$

In the scope of this work (similar to previous work (Liu et al., 2022)) samples are embedded into \mathbb{R}^m , where m is the text embedding dimension, and ϕ is the cosine similarity of these vectors. In particular, we use a sentence transformer (Reimers and Gurevych, 2019) trained over MPNet (Song et al., 2020).

2.2 Pool Selection Strategies

Below we describe 5 pool selection strategies which follow the definition in Equation 1. Each of these may be better suited for different settings and downstream applications.

The first two strategies (largest mean and cluster test) assume that the test set *distribution* \mathcal{T} is known. These may be best for a well-delineated downstream application. In contrast, the last three strategies (cluster train, vote-K, and random) do not assume the distribution on which the model will be tested (i.e., \mathcal{T} is unknown) and hence apply more widely.

Largest mean. For each sample $d \in D$, compute its mean similarity to all samples in T :

$$\text{mean_sim}(d) = \frac{1}{|T|} \sum_{t \in T} \phi(d, t)$$

Next, choose the k samples from D with the largest mean_sim value. Intuitively, this approach seeks the k train samples which are closest on average to the test set.

Cluster test. Cluster T into k clusters using ϕ as the similarity method. For each cluster center choose the most similar sample from D . Intuitively, this approach tries to maximize the coverage of the test set distribution.

Cluster train. Cluster D into k clusters and for each cluster center choose the most similar sample from D . In contrast to the *cluster test* strategy, *cluster train* aims to maximize the coverage of the expected training distribution. This strategy was proposed in Chang et al. (2021) for selecting examples for fine-tuning.

Vote-k (Su et al., 2022). Selects a k -sized subset of D such that the samples are diverse and dissimilar from one another, through a two-step process which uses the LLM’s confidence to bucket the different samples. See Su et al. (2022) for more details.

Random. Randomly select k samples from D .

3 Evaluation

We focus on the NER task, as it is both applicable in real-world settings, while traditionally expensive to annotate at scale. Importantly, as is commonly done in active learning scenarios (e.g., Shen et al., 2018; Liu et al., 2020), we use existing NER datasets in various domains, allowing us to *simulate* the process shown in Figure 1, where instead of collecting manual annotations, we sample from the existing annotations.

3.1 Experimental Setup

Datasets and models. We use two English datasets for NER: Ontonotes 5.0 (Hovy et al., 2006),¹ and the recently introduced Universal NER (UNER; Mayhew et al., 2023). Both datasets contain texts from various domains, including news, conversational, weblogs, web forums, and more.

¹We use the HuggingFace version with the *english_v12* configuration.

Due to budget constraints we limit the size of each test set by randomly sampling 1000 samples.

We experiment with a diverse set of 9 different LLMs, ranging from open to closed models in various parameter sizes: Llama-2 (Touvron et al., 2023), Mistral (Jiang et al., 2023), Starling (Zhu et al., 2023), Vicuna (Chiang et al., 2023), Mixtral (Jiang et al., 2024), phi-2 (Jawaheripi et al., 2023), GPT-4 (Achiam et al., 2023), Claude 3 Haiku,² and Gemini 1.5 Pro (Reid et al., 2024).

Prompt and evaluation metric. We prompt the models by describing the NER task and the types of entities, followed by 5 demonstration examples and the current inference sample. Following Zhao et al. (2021), we sort the examples such that the most similar example is the last one, based on the similarity function ϕ described in Equation 2. See Appendix A for the full prompt template.

We evaluate all models with the standard *strict* matching evaluation metric for NER (Segura-Bedmar et al., 2013), where a predicted entity is considered correct if it matches both exact span boundaries and entity type.

Pool sizes. We experiment with sample pools of size 0.1% - 10% of the maximum pool size, defined as the number of unique samples used when considering the full training set as the sample pool.

Oracle. To better understand the performance of different pool selection strategies, we report the performance of using the full training set for each dataset and model, compared to our budget-constrained approach.

3.2 Results

Results for the three best-performing models (Claude 3 Haiku, GPT-4, and Gemini 1.5 Pro) on both of our datasets are presented in Figure 2. The other smaller models we test are not able to produce outputs of the requested format in more than 50% of the cases, and hence cannot be meaningfully compared against these models, which adhere to the correct format in roughly 97% of the cases.³ We now discuss findings reflected in these results and conduct further analysis.

The choice of few-shot examples matter in NER. We observe a large variation in performance when selecting different demonstration examples in all

²www.anthropic.com/news/claude-3-family

³Gemini 1.5 Pro was unable to produce the requested format for small pool sizes in UNER, and we omit these results.




Figure 2: F1 score for strict matching using Claude 3 Haiku (left), GPT4 (middle) and Gemini 1.5 Pro (right) on Ontonotes (top) and UNER (bottom), as a function of the size of sample pool. In methods with a random component we run 3 trials and plot error bars showing the standard deviation. Oracle: using the full training set as the pool.

configurations. While this was observed in other tasks (Zhang et al., 2022), to the best of our knowledge, this is the first time this was shown for NER.

Most pool selection methods perform similarly, random is surprisingly good. None of the five methods demonstrated a significant improvement or decline in performance compared to the others, with the exception of largest mean, which showed notably lower scores. Surprisingly, we note that random performs similarly to other methods. We note that this is true even for selection strategies that are allowed access to the test set distribution.

Very small pool sizes can approximate the full training corpus. With the exception of the low-performing largest mean, all sampling methods require a pool of only 220 samples for Ontonotes, and 147 samples for UNER, to achieve over 88% of the oracle performance across all configurations.

ICL on a budget approaches state-of-the-art on UNER, but lags behind on Ontonotes. We compare the ICL results to state-of-the-art results in Table 1 in Appendix B. In the well studied Ontonotes, fine-tuned methods vastly outperforms using a limited annotation budget. In the relatively new UNER dataset, using 147 samples achieves more than 90% of the state-of-the-art.

The label diversity in a sample pool is correlated with its ICL performance. Min et al. (2022) find that the coverage of the label space by the demonstration examples has a strong effect on performance. Drawing inspiration from their findings, we examine whether the diversity in the *labels* of demonstration examples is correlated with performance. To this end, for each dataset, pool selection method, and pool size, we count how many instances of each entity were presented in the demonstration examples in the sample pool, and compute the entropy of these counts as a proxy for diversity. For each model, we then compute the Pearson correlation between these entropy values and the model’s scores. We find that the diversity of labels in the demonstration examples is indeed significantly correlated with performance across all models and datasets. See Table 2 in Appendix C for the correlation values.

4 Conclusion

We proposed the framework of ICL on a budget and studied different methods for pool selection, focusing on NER. We hope this work will inspire more realistic assumptions on the amount of labeled data used in different ICL settings. In future work we will extend this analysis to additional tasks with high annotation costs.

5 Limitations

We tested our ICL on a budget approach on a single task (NER), because it has real-world applications, high annotation cost, and it was relatively less studied in the context of ICL. It is possible that other tasks will show different trends, hence we stress that the contribution here is the methodological approach, rather than advocating for one particular sampling strategy.

References

- Josh Achiam, Steven Adler, Sandhini Agarwal, Lama Ahmad, Ilge Akkaya, Florencia Leoni Aleman, Diogo Almeida, Janko Altschmidt, Sam Altman, Shyamal Anadkat, et al. 2023. [Gpt-4 technical report](#). *ArXiv preprint*, abs/2303.08774.
- Tom B. Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Sandhini Agarwal, Ariel Herbert-Voss, Gretchen Krueger, Tom Henighan, Rewon Child, Aditya Ramesh, Daniel M. Ziegler, Jeffrey Wu, Clemens Winter, Christopher Hesse, Mark Chen, Eric Sigler, Mateusz Litwin, Scott Gray, Benjamin Chess, Jack Clark, Christopher Berner, Sam McCandlish, Alec Radford, Ilya Sutskever, and Dario Amodei. 2020. [Language models are few-shot learners](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 33: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2020, NeurIPS 2020, December 6-12, 2020, virtual*.
- Ernie Chang, Xiaoyu Shen, Hui-Syuan Yeh, and Vera Demberg. 2021. [On training instance selection for few-shot neural text generation](#). In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 2: Short Papers)*, pages 8–13, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jiawei Chen, Yaojie Lu, Hongyu Lin, Jie Lou, Wei Jia, Dai Dai, Hua Wu, Boxi Cao, Xianpei Han, and Le Sun. 2023. [Learning in-context learning for named entity recognition](#). In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 13661–13675, Toronto, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Yukun Chen, Thomas A Lasko, Qiaozhu Mei, Joshua C Denny, and Hua Xu. 2015. A study of active learning methods for named entity recognition in clinical text. *Journal of biomedical informatics*, 58:11–18.
- Wei-Lin Chiang, Zhuohan Li, Zi Lin, Ying Sheng, Zhanghao Wu, Hao Zhang, Lianmin Zheng, Siyuan Zhuang, Yonghao Zhuang, Joseph E. Gonzalez, Ion Stoica, and Eric P. Xing. 2023. [Vicuna: An open-source chatbot impressing gpt-4 with 90%* chatgpt quality](#).
- Eduard Hovy, Mitchell Marcus, Martha Palmer, Lance Ramshaw, and Ralph Weischedel. 2006. [OntoNotes: The 90% solution](#). In *Proceedings of the Human Language Technology Conference of the NAACL, Companion Volume: Short Papers*, pages 57–60, New York City, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Mojan Javaheripi, Sébastien Bubeck, Marah Abdin, Jyoti Aneja, Sebastien Bubeck, Caio César Teodoro Mendes, Weizhu Chen, Allie Del Giorno, Ronen Eldan, Sivakanth Gopi, et al. 2023. [Phi-2: The surprising power of small language models](#). *Microsoft Research Blog*.
- Albert Q Jiang, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Arthur Mensch, Chris Bamford, Devendra Singh Chaplot, Diego de las Casas, Florian Bressand, Gianna Lengyel, Guillaume Lample, Lucile Saulnier, et al. 2023. [Mistral 7b](#). *ArXiv preprint*, abs/2310.06825.
- Albert Q Jiang, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Antoine Roux, Arthur Mensch, Blanche Savary, Chris Bamford, Devendra Singh Chaplot, Diego de las Casas, Emma Bou Hanna, Florian Bressand, et al. 2024. [Mixtral of experts](#). *ArXiv preprint*, abs/2401.04088.
- Xiaoya Li, Xiaofei Sun, Yuxian Meng, Junjun Liang, Fei Wu, and Jiwei Li. 2020. [Dice loss for data-imbalanced NLP tasks](#). In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 465–476, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jiachang Liu, Dinghan Shen, Yizhe Zhang, Bill Dolan, Lawrence Carin, and Weizhu Chen. 2022. [What makes good in-context examples for GPT-3?](#) In *Proceedings of Deep Learning Inside Out (DeeLIO 2022): The 3rd Workshop on Knowledge Extraction and Integration for Deep Learning Architectures*, pages 100–114, Dublin, Ireland and Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Mingyi Liu, Zhiying Tu, Zhongjie Wang, and Xiaofei Xu. 2020. [Ltp: a new active learning strategy for bert-crf based named entity recognition](#). *ArXiv preprint*, abs/2001.02524.
- Stephen Mayhew, Terra Blevins, Shuheng Liu, Marek Šuppa, Hila Gonen, Joseph Marvin Imperial, Börje F Karlsson, Peiqin Lin, Nikola Ljubešić, LJ Miranda, et al. 2023. [Universal ner: A gold-standard multi-lingual named entity recognition benchmark](#). *ArXiv preprint*, abs/2311.09122.
- Sewon Min, Xinxin Lyu, Ari Holtzman, Mikel Artetxe, Mike Lewis, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2022. [Rethinking the role of demonstrations: What makes in-context learning work?](#) In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 11048–11064,

- Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Kalyani Pakhale. 2023. [Comprehensive overview of named entity recognition: Models, domain-specific applications and challenges](#). *ArXiv preprint*, abs/2309.14084.
- Machel Reid, Nikolay Savinov, Denis Teplyashin, Dmitry Lepikhin, Timothy Lillicrap, Jean-baptiste Alayrac, Radu Soricut, Angeliki Lazaridou, Orhan Firat, Julian Schrittwieser, et al. 2024. [Gemini 1.5: Unlocking multimodal understanding across millions of tokens of context](#). *ArXiv preprint*, abs/2403.05530.
- Nils Reimers and Iryna Gurevych. 2019. [Sentence-BERT: Sentence embeddings using Siamese BERT-networks](#). In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*, pages 3982–3992, Hong Kong, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Isabel Segura-Bedmar, Paloma Martínez, and María Herrero-Zazo. 2013. [SemEval-2013 task 9 : Extraction of drug-drug interactions from biomedical texts \(DDIExtraction 2013\)](#). In *Second Joint Conference on Lexical and Computational Semantics (*SEM), Volume 2: Proceedings of the Seventh International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval 2013)*, pages 341–350, Atlanta, Georgia, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Yanyao Shen, Hyokun Yun, Zachary C. Lipton, Yakov Kronrod, and Animashree Anandkumar. 2018. [Deep active learning for named entity recognition](#). In *6th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2018, Vancouver, BC, Canada, April 30 - May 3, 2018, Conference Track Proceedings*. OpenReview.net.
- Kaitao Song, Xu Tan, Tao Qin, Jianfeng Lu, and Tie-Yan Liu. 2020. [Mpnnet: Masked and permuted pre-training for language understanding](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 33: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2020, NeurIPS 2020, December 6-12, 2020, virtual*.
- Hongjin Su, Jungo Kasai, Chen Henry Wu, Weijia Shi, Tianlu Wang, Jiayi Xin, Rui Zhang, Mari Ostendorf, Luke Zettlemoyer, Noah A Smith, et al. 2022. [Selective annotation makes language models better few-shot learners](#). *ArXiv preprint*, abs/2209.01975.
- Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajwal Bhargava, Shrubti Bhosale, et al. 2023. [Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models](#). *ArXiv preprint*, abs/2307.09288.
- Yiming Zhang, Shi Feng, and Chenhao Tan. 2022. [Active example selection for in-context learning](#). In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 9134–9148, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Zihao Zhao, Eric Wallace, Shi Feng, Dan Klein, and Sameer Singh. 2021. [Calibrate before use: Improving few-shot performance of language models](#). In *Proceedings of the 38th International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2021, 18-24 July 2021, Virtual Event*, volume 139 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 12697–12706. PMLR.
- Banghua Zhu, Evan Frick, Tianhao Wu, Hanlin Zhu, and Jiantao Jiao. 2023. [Starling-7b: Improving llm helpfulness & harmlessness with rlaif](#).

A Prompt Template

In this section we describe the prompt template we use in our experiments.

We first describe the task:

You are an NER classifier that identifies the following entities: Person `__PER__`, Organization `__ORG__`, Geo-Political `__GPE__`, Location `__LOC__`, Facility `__FAC__`, Work-of-Art `__WOA__`, Event `__EVE__`, Product `__DUC__`, Language `__ANG__` use angle brackets to tag in-line, please don't include any additional information other than the annotated sentence and keep original spacing.

Next, we add the demonstration examples. For GPT and Claude we add the demonstration examples as follows. For each demonstration example, we use LangChain's⁴ `HumanMessage` class for the original sentence, followed by an `AIMessage` for the annotated sentence. Finally, we add the inference sample as a `HumanMessage`.

In Gemini, for which these classes are not implemented, we choose a different strategy: for each demonstration example, we add the original sentence followed the separator token `[TAGS]`, and then the annotated sentence. Finally, we add the inference sample, followed by the separator token. Figure 3 demonstrates a prompt for Gemini.

B Comparison to State-of-the-Art

Table 1 presents the percentage in performance of the best performing model, GPT-4 out of the state-of-the-art, in each dataset: Ontonotes (92 strict f1-score; Li et al., 2020) and UNER (86 strict f1-score; Mayhew et al., 2023).

⁴langchain.com




Figure 3: An example prompt used in our study.

	Ontonotes	UNER
Cluster train	75	91
Cluster test	76	93
Largest mean	67	88
Vote-k	78	91
Random	78	91

Table 1: GPT-4 percentage in performance out of the state-of-the-art, when using 5% of the samples used in the fully labeled train set method.

	GPT	Claude	Gemini
Ontonotes	0.54	0.36	0.46
UNER	0.36	0.40	0.44

Table 2: Pearson correlation of performance with label diversity in the sample pool, as measured by the entropy of entities. All results are significant.

C Performance-Diversity Correlation

In Section 3.2 we computed the Pearson correlation of performance with diversity, as measured by the entropy of counts of entities. Table 2 presents the correlations.