

Concept Distillation from Strong to Weak Models via Hypotheses-to-Theories Prompting

Emmanuel Aboah Boateng, Cassiano O. Becker, Nabiha Asghar, Kabir Walia
Ashwin Srinivasan, Ehi Nosakhare, Victor Dibia, Soundar Srinivasan

Microsoft

{emmanuelab, casbecker, kabirwalia, ehinosakh, victordibia}@microsoft.com

Abstract

Hand-crafting high quality prompts to optimize the performance of language models is a complicated and labor-intensive process. Furthermore, when migrating to newer, smaller, or weaker models (possibly due to latency or cost gains), prompts need to be updated to re-optimize the task performance. We propose *Concept Distillation* (CD), an automatic prompt optimization technique for enhancing weaker models on complex tasks. CD involves: (1) collecting mistakes made by weak models with a base prompt (initialization), (2) using a strong model to generate reasons for these mistakes and create rules/concepts for weak models (induction), and (3) filtering these rules based on validation set performance and integrating them into the base prompt (deduction/verification). We evaluated CD on NL2Code and mathematical reasoning tasks, observing significant performance boosts for small and weaker language models. Notably, Mistral-7B’s accuracy on Multi-Arith increased by 20%, and Phi-3-mini-3.8B’s accuracy on HumanEval rose by 34%. Compared to other automated methods, CD offers an effective, cost-efficient strategy for improving weak models’ performance on complex tasks and enables seamless workload migration across different language models without compromising performance.

1 Introduction

Large language models (LLMs) have shown remarkable capabilities for various downstream tasks. An inexpensive alternative to training and finetuning, Prompt Engineering has emerged as a powerful method to control and optimize the outputs from LLMs. Prompt engineering is enabled by the in-context learning (ICL) capability of LLMs (Dong et al., 2022), which enables us to apply LLMs to new tasks by providing them with a suitable input prompt that contains relevant information and instructions (Xie et al., 2021).




Figure 1: High-level illustration of concept distillation for prompt construction.

As such, crafting high-quality prompts can be a challenging and labor-intensive process. Finding the right instructions can require several rounds of trial-and-error experimentation. Furthermore, the same prompt may not work for different tasks, models or domains (Lu et al., 2023; Rubin et al., 2021). Importantly, weak models such as GPT-3.5 or Mistral-7B often lack the same reasoning capabilities as strong models such as GPT-4o and as a result, struggle with complex and high-reasoning tasks (Edwards and Camacho-Collados, 2024; Liang et al., 2023). This leads to significant performance gaps between stronger and weaker models for such tasks. Conversely, practical reasons (e.g., lower runtime latency, cost, and memory footprint) may still motivate and impose the use of weak models in practical applications (Xia et al., 2023; Hadi et al., 2023). While fine-tuning can close the gap, it is an expensive and technically involved process. This results in the repeated cy-

cle of manually writing new prompts or adapting previous prompts to boost the performance of the weaker models.

Another key area this work addresses is the efficient adaptation of prompts for various models. A primary challenge is transitioning prompts from an existing model, such as GPT-4, to a newly released variant like GPT-4o. It is essential to recognize that different models may respond uniquely to the same prompts. As such, there is the need for strategies that effectively modify and tailor existing prompts to maintain alignment with new or evolving models.

In this paper, we introduce *concept distillation* (CD), an automated prompt optimization technique. CD improves the performance of weak/small language models on complex tasks by distilling key rules, concepts, or examples from a strong/large model via hypotheses-to-theories prompting. These distilled concepts are then verified and used to guide a weak model, enabling it to produce more accurate responses, all without the need for fine-tuning. The structured approach within the CD framework ensures that these distilled concepts are sufficiently general to be transferable across various other language models. Fig. 1 shows a high-level illustration of the concept distillation for prompt optimization approach. Overall, this paper makes the following contributions:

- We introduce the notion of *concept distillation*, in which a strong model is used to derive new concepts (i.e., specific prompt instructions) to help a weak model improve its performance on complex tasks, thereby enabling greater adaptability of the weak model in various applications (see Fig. 3).
- Building on time-tested principles of scientific discovery, we propose the *hypotheses-to-theories* prompt optimization framework, which leverages the strong model’s ability to perform inductive and deductive reasoning over the weak model’s deficiencies (see Sections 3 and 4).
- We demonstrate that the prompt optimization framework enables efficient adaptation of prompts across different language models (LMs). The distilled concepts are transferable, allowing for quick and effective updates in response to new model releases or changes,

ensuring continued optimal performance (see Section 6.1).

- We perform a systematic experimental evaluation on different tasks (NL2Code: HumanEval, Mathematical Reasoning: GSM8K/Multi-Arith) with various weak models (GPT-3.5 Turbo, Claude 2.1, Phi-3-mini-3.8B, Mixtral-8x7B, and Mistral-7B), and show that the proposed approach significantly reduces the performance gap between the weak and strong models (see Sections 5 and 6).

2 Related Work

Given the significance and broad-scale effectiveness of prompt engineering, there have been several efforts to perform automated prompt optimization and generation. These methods typically involve an iterative algorithm consisting of several steps - an initially generated prompt, scoring of the prompt, and regeneration of the prompt using the score as an improvement signal, till a stopping criteria is met (Zhou et al., 2022a; Hu et al., 2023; Pryzant et al., 2023a; Ye et al., 2023; Wang et al., 2023; Deng et al., 2023; Guo et al., 2023). We propose an approach that augments this framework for prompt optimization through the distillation of *concepts*, and introduces an explicit verification step to demonstrate relative performance improvements for a small model.

Our method is inspired by several recent works. APE (Zhou et al., 2022a) deduces an initial prompt from training samples, and then uses an LLM to refine and generate new semantically similar prompt candidates. However, prompts are simply paraphrased during the refinement process, which is akin to random search in the prompt space. Evoke (Hu et al., 2023) uses the same LLM to review and score the quality of a prompt, as well as to refine the prompt based on the reviewer feedback. (Zhu et al., 2023) first uses an LLM to induce a rule library from a set of training examples, which are later sampled for dynamic prompt construction. This is followed by a deduction phase where these rules are evaluated based on their coverage and confidence. (Zhang et al., 2024) generates high and low-level concepts from mistakes using an LLM, and later uses the same LLM for solving tasks. There is no deduction phase to filter out the generated concepts. PE2 (Ye et al., 2023) explores meta-prompt variants to guide LLMs to




Figure 2: Workflow of concept distillation for prompt construction.

perform automatic prompt engineering. They introduce 3 meta-prompt components - two-step task description, context specification and step-by-step reasoning template to improve task performance.

In contrast to all these works, our method focuses on transferring capability from a large/strong model to a small/weak one by inducing *concepts* mainly from the mistakes made on a task by the weak model. Additionally, our deduction phase filters out the generated concepts in a metric-driven way, which is a crucial additional step in our framework that improves task adaptability and performance of weak models.

Many other works explore various fundamentally different frameworks for automatic prompt optimization, and are noteworthy to mention here. There are text-based error-propagation techniques such as PromptAgent (Wang et al., 2023) which uses Monte Carlo Tree Search, and ProTeGi (Pryzant et al., 2023b) which mirrors the steps of gradient descent. Another category of related works employs parametric (non-interpretable) prompt optimization techniques, as opposed to edit-based ones (Su et al., 2022; Zhong et al., 2024; Wen et al., 2024).

3 Background

In this section, we explore the foundational concepts and terminologies central to this paper. This technique draws inspiration from human cognitive processes (Hunt, 2003; Cherukunnath and Singh, 2022), particularly in how we acquire, refine, and apply knowledge and concepts across various domains.

Concept Distillation: distinction from Knowledge Distillation. The core of our technique is encapsulated in the process of ‘concept distillation’. This process involves the transfer of concepts from a stronger LM (referred to as the ‘teacher’) to a weaker LM (referred to as the ‘student’). The differentiation between knowledge and concept distilla-

tion is critical. Unlike traditional knowledge distillation (Phuong and Lampert, 2019), which focuses on the explicit transfer/update of learned weights and biases through intensive training or fine-tuning procedures, concept distillation emphasizes the induction of general concepts, rules, examples, or key ideas from the teacher model, applying them to the student model solely via in-context learning (ICL), without necessitating extensive training or fine-tuning. Figure 3 depicts the distinction between knowledge and concept distillation.

Hypotheses, Theories, and Reasoning: frameworks for conceptual transfer. Our approach is deeply rooted in the scientific methodologies of hypothesis generation, experimental validation, and theory (Scerbo et al., 2019). A hypothesis, in this context, is a proposition based on limited evidence, serving as a foundation for further investigation that could culminate in a theory, i.e., a well-substantiated explanation of a phenomenon. This framework is critical in concept distillation, where hypotheses derived from observations are validated through experimental evidence to form theories that explain the underlying principles or phenomena.

The transformation from hypotheses to theories is facilitated by two modes of reasoning: *inductive* and *deductive* reasoning. Inductive reasoning involves deriving general rules from specific observed facts, whereas deductive reasoning entails deriving new facts from established facts and rules. Deductive reasoning allows us to apply general principles to specific cases to derive accurate conclusions. These modes of reasoning allow the extrapolation of concepts from inductive reasoning and the application of these concepts to new, unseen instances.

Drawing parallels to the human process of scientific discovery (Bradford and Hamer, 2022), our technique mirrors the iterative cycle of observation, hypothesis formulation, experimentation, and




Figure 3: Distinction between knowledge and concept distillation.

theory development. This analogy highlights the integration of inductive and deductive reasoning in forming robust concepts that not only explain observed phenomena but also predict outcomes in unseen scenarios.

In summary, our approach introduces concept distillation for prompt construction as an innovative method designed to enhance the performance of less advanced and capable LMs. We aim to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of weak and smaller LMs without extensive training or fine-tuning typically associated with knowledge distillation, making it a resource-efficient way to upgrade the capabilities of weaker models.

4 Concept Distillation Framework

In this section, we describe the main steps and components of our technique, which consists of three main phases: *initialization*, *induction*, and *deduction from verification*.

Initialization phase. Phase 1 starts with a base prompt template, which can either be an existing prompt we aim to modify (for a strong, large model we aim to replace), a generated prompt using an off-the-shelf algorithm, or one manually crafted by domain experts, serving as a foundation for subsequent refinement. In this phase, we assess the strengths and weaknesses (mistakes) of the weaker model concerning the intended task. The primary goal here is to pinpoint areas and examples where the weaker model struggles, enabling us to induce concepts that aid in reasoning in these specific areas. It’s important to focus on the model’s weaknesses, avoiding unnecessary adjustments in areas where the model already performs well.

Induction phase. Phase 2 involves the induction of concepts from a strong model, such as GPT-4,

tailored to address the identified weaknesses and mistakes of the weaker model. The aim is to enhance the weaker model’s performance by equipping it with these newly induced concepts. During this process, we use the strong model to reason through the facts or questions presented to the weak model, the incorrect responses it generated, and the correct answers, in order to generate general concepts that can overcome the weak model’s mistakes.

Deduction from verification phase. Phase 3 is the deduction-from-verification process. The assumption is that not all induced rules/concepts or examples qualify as useful distilled concepts. This phase uses a deduction process to verify the induced rules and examples. The rules which qualify as having broad coverage and high prediction confidence are accepted as distilled concepts. Consequently, they are added to the initial prompt template that we started with to form an improved, updated prompt. After adding the induced concepts to the base prompt template, a verification process is applied to filter the concepts. Either the strong model can be used to generate test examples similar to the weaknesses identified earlier or similar examples from a validation set can be used for the verification. The weaker model is required to accurately address all validation examples with a level of certainty or probability that meets or exceeds a specific predefined threshold before we accept the induced concepts as distilled concepts and integrate them into its prompt. This ensures that the final prompt effectively addresses the weak model’s shortcomings, leading to improved performance. Detailed description of the concept distillation process with a walk-through practical example is provided in Appendix C.

Algorithm 1 succinctly captures the proposed CD framework. It details the three key phases—initialization (see Fig. 6), induction (see Fig. 7), and deduction/verification (see Fig. 8).

Algorithm 1 Hypotheses-to-Theories CD

Require: Strong model M_s , Weak model M_w ,
 Training set D , Initial prompt p_0

(i) Initialization:

- 1: $C \leftarrow \emptyset$ ▷ Set of distilled concepts
- 2: $p \leftarrow p_0$ ▷ Initialize prompt
- 3: **for** each $(x_i, y_i) \in D$ **do**
- 4: $y_w \leftarrow M_w(x_i, p)$
- 5: **if** $y_w \neq y_i$ **then**
- 6: $R \leftarrow \text{InduceConcept}(M_s, x_i, y_i, y_w, p)$
- 7: $C \leftarrow C \cup R$
- 8: **end if**
- 9: **end for**

(ii) Induction:

(iii) Deduction \rightarrow Verification:

- 10: **for** each concept $c \in C$ **do**
- 11: $\text{ValidateConcept}(M_s, M_w, c, D)$
- 12: **end for**

Prompt Update:

- 13: $p \leftarrow \text{UpdatePrompt}(p_0, C)$
- 14: **return** p

5 Experiments

In this section, we outline the experimental setup used to evaluate the effectiveness of the proposed Concept Distillation framework.

5.1 Task and Datasets

We focus on three benchmark datasets: converting natural language to structure queries (NL2Code) – HumanEval (Chen et al., 2021), and reasoning over mathematical problems – Multi-Arith (Roy and Roth, 2015) and GSM8K (Cobbe et al., 2021). HumanEval consists of natural language prompts that require the model to generate corresponding code snippets. It is widely used to benchmark the performance of language models in code generation tasks. Multi-Arith is designed to evaluate the arithmetic reasoning capabilities of language models. It includes a variety of arithmetic problems that require step-by-step reasoning to arrive at the correct answer. And finally, the GSM8K dataset is designed to evaluate the mathematical reasoning capabilities of language models. It includes a variety of math problems that require step-by-step reasoning to arrive at the correct answer.

Furthermore, we compare our work with previous methods in the literature, such as Automatic Prompt Engineering (APE) (Zhou et al., 2022b), Iterative APE (Zhou et al., 2022b), Chain of Thought (CoT) (Wei et al., 2022), Prompt Engineering a Prompt Engineer (PE2) (Ye et al., 2023), and Automatic Prompt Optimization (APO) (Pryzant et al., 2023b).

5.2 Implementation Details

To comprehensively evaluate the effectiveness of the CD framework, we conducted experiments using multiple models, including GPT-3.5 Turbo, Claude 2.1, Phi-3-mini-3.8B, Mixtral-8x7B* (a new flagship Nous Research model trained over the Mixtral 8x7B LLM), and Mistral-7B, with GPT-4o serving as the strong model for concept distillation.

Our experimental setup was designed to address the two main hypotheses and problem categories outlined in this paper:

- Boosting the performance of weak models on complex and structured tasks via concept distillation from a strong model. We distilled concepts from GPT-4o based on the deficiencies of the weak models to improve their performance on training data, and then evaluated them on test data.
- Adapting prompts to new models: We tested the transferability of the distilled concepts by applying the optimized prompts, initially designed for GPT-3.5 Turbo, to other models such as Claude 2.1, Phi-3-mini-3.8B, Mixtral-8x7B*, and Mistral-7B. This allowed us to evaluate the effectiveness of the distilled concepts across different language models.

For each dataset, we split the data into training and test sets. The training set was utilized for prompt optimization through CD, and the test set was employed for evaluation. We performed a comprehensive comparison of our work with several state-of-the-art methods.

6 Results and Analyses

In Table 1 we summarize the performance of various models on the HumanEval test set, using only the base prompt and after CD (using the updated prompt with concepts). Notably, with base prompt alone, the strong model GPT-4o achieved a perfect score (100%); in comparison, the weak models performed poorly. However, when using the updated

prompt with concepts distilled using the CD technique, we observe significant performance boosts for the weak models.

Firstly, we observe a performance increase of 11% for the GPT-3.5 Turbo model, raising its accuracy from 0.85 to 0.96. Claude 2.1 nearly achieved a perfect score, improving from 0.89 to 0.99, an increase of 10%, indicating that CD is effective in optimizing prompts even for models that ini-

Model	Base prompt	CD
GPT-3.5	0.85	0.96 _(+11%)
Claude 2.1	0.89	0.99 _(+10%)
Phi-3-mini-3.8B	0.48	0.82 _(+34%)
Mixtral-8x7B*	0.83	0.95 _(+12%)
Mistral-7B	0.89	0.96 _(+7%)

Table 1: Accuracy results on the HumanEval dataset: Results are presented for each model using both a base prompt and its corresponding optimized prompt based on CD.

Model	Base prompt	CD
GPT-3.5	0.89	0.95 _(+6%)
Claude 2.1	0.62	0.91 _(+29%)
Phi-3-mini-3.8B	0.81	0.83 _(+2%)
Mixtral-8x7B*	0.72	0.88 _(+16%)
Mistral-7B	0.41	0.67 _(+20%)

Table 2: Accuracy results on the Multi-Arith dataset: Results are presented for each model using both a base prompt and its corresponding optimized prompt based on CD.

tially perform well. The most notable performance gain was observed with the smallest model, Phi-3-mini-3.8B, which saw a substantial improvement of 32%, from 0.48 to 0.82. Across all models evaluated, there was a significant performance increase compared to the base prompt evaluation, with an average performance increase of 13%.

In Table 2 we summarize the results on the Multi-Arith dataset. We observe a 6% performance gain for the GPT-3.5 Turbo model, a significantly larger gain for the Claude 2.1 model with a 29% increase in accuracy from 0.62 to 0.91, and a similarly large 20% accuracy gain for the Mistral-7B model. On average, weak models observed a performance lift of 15% on the Multi-Arith mathematical reasoning task.

The results in Table 1 and 2 provide evidence that Concept Distillation enhances the capabilities

of weaker and smaller models, helping them overcome mistakes, and boosting their performance on complex, structured tasks like code generation and mathematical reasoning.

Table 3 presents a comparative analysis of accuracy on the HumanEval dataset among three different methods: APE, CoT, and our work (CD). The results demonstrate that CD consistently outperforms both APE and CoT across multiple models. For instance, GPT-3.5 shows an increase in accuracy from 0.93 with APE, 0.45 with CoT, but it observes the greatest lift to 0.96 with CD. Similarly, Claude-2 achieves near-perfect accuracy with CD at 0.99, compared to 0.96 with APE and 0.82 with CoT.

The results also highlight significant improvements for Mixtral-8x7B* and Mistral-7B, where CD boosts their accuracies to 0.95 and 0.96, respectively, compared to lower accuracies with APE (0.73 and 0.71) and CoT (0.88 and 0.87). Notably, Phi-3-mini-3.8B’s accuracy slightly decreases with CD compared to CoT due to its initial weaknesses during training, which resulted in a lower baseline accuracy of 38% on the training set. As a result, the extensive concept distillation required to address these weaknesses introduced slight confusion in some edge cases. Despite this, Phi-3-mini-3.8B still maintains competitive performance.

Table 4 provides a comprehensive comparison of different models and methods, including APE, CoT, Iterative APE, APO, PE2, and CD, across the various models on the Multi-Arith dataset. The results demonstrate that CD consistently outperforms other methods across most models. Particularly, GPT-3.5 achieves the highest accuracy with CD at 0.95, compared to 0.63 with APE and 0.71 with CoT. Similarly, Claude-2 shows a substantial improvement with CD, reaching an accuracy of 0.91, while other methods like APE and CoT achieve lower accuracies of 0.43 and 0.48, respectively.

Mixtral-8x7B* also benefits significantly from CD, achieving an accuracy of 0.88, compared to 0.84 with APE and 0.85 with CoT. However, Mistral-7B’s performance slightly decreases with CD, achieving an accuracy of 0.67, compared to 0.72 with CoT. Similar to Phi-3-mini-3.8B in the previous section, we observed that the introduced concepts led to confusion for the Mistral-7B model on certain edge cases. Overall, Table 4 highlights the effectiveness of the CD framework, demonstrating its superior performance in enhancing model accuracy compared to other prompt optimization

Method	Model				
	GPT-3.5	Claude-2.1	Phi-3-mini-3.8B	Mixtral-8x7B*	Mistral-7B
APE	0.93	0.96	0.83	0.73	0.71
CoT	0.45	0.82	0.91	0.88	0.87
CD	0.96	0.99	0.82	0.95	0.96

Table 3: Accuracy comparison on the *HumanEval* dataset between APE, CoT, and CD. Comparison with alternative methods based on specifically-built method implementations.

Method	Model				
	GPT-3.5	Claude-2.1	Phi-3-mini-3.8B	Mixtral-8x7B*	Mistral-7B
APE	0.63	0.43	0.78	0.84	0.65
CoT	0.71	0.48	0.83	0.85	0.72
Iterative APE	0.69	0.39	0.79	0.83	0.69
APO	0.79	0.53	0.77	0.86	0.68
PE2	0.78	0.49	0.83	0.86	0.67
CD	0.95	0.91	0.83	0.88	0.67

Table 4: Accuracy comparison on the *Multi-Arith* dataset of different models and methods. Comparison with alternative methods based on optimized prompts as reported in (Ye et al., 2023).

methods.

6.1 Transferability of distilled concepts

We tested how well the optimized prompts, originally designed for GPT-3.5 Turbo, work on other models like Claude 2.1, Phi-3-mini-3.8B, Mixtral-8x7B*, Mistral-7B, and GPT-4. This helped us see if the distilled concepts are effective across different language models.

Table 5 provides compelling evidence for our hypothesis that distilled concepts from CD are transferable and generalizable across different models. In this experiment, GPT-3.5 Turbo served as the base model for distilling concepts using a strong model (GPT-4o), and the optimized prompts were then transferred to other models for evaluation. We observe significant performance improvements across all models. Notably, Claude 2.1 achieved a perfect score of 100%, demonstrating an 11% improvement. The smallest model, Phi-3-mini-3.8B, exhibited the most remarkable improvement, with a performance boost of 34%, increasing its accuracy from 0.45 to 0.79. This result further validates the observation that smaller models gain substantial benefits from the CD process. Overall, the results show an average performance increase, confirming that the distilled concepts are not only effective for the base model but also enhance the performance of other models significantly.

Table 6 provides a comparative analysis of the accuracy improvements achieved through distilled concepts transfer from GPT-3.5 Turbo prompt optimized using CD to both smaller and larger models, compared to APE on the HumanEval dataset. The

Model	Base prompt	CD
GPT-3.5	0.85	0.96 _(+11%)
Claude 2.1	0.89	1.00 _(+11%)
Phi-3-mini-3.8B	0.45	0.79 _(+34%)
Mixtral-8x7B*	0.83	0.87 _(+5%)
Mistral-7B	0.89	0.96 _(+7%)
GPT-4	0.90	0.94 _(+4%)

Table 5: Accuracy results on the HumanEval dataset: The results demonstrate the effectiveness of transferring an optimized prompt (with distilled concepts) based on the GPT-3.5-Turbo model to other models

CD method significantly outperforms APE, with notable improvements in models such as Mistral-7B, which saw a substantial increase of 25% (from 0.71 to 0.96). Mixtral-8x7B* also benefited greatly, with a 14% boost in accuracy (from 0.73 to 0.87). These results show the superior performance of the CD approach in enhancing model performance by distilling and transferring essential concepts from stronger to weaker models.

Similarly, on the GSM8K dataset shown in the Appendix (see Appendix A.2, CD continues to demonstrate its effectiveness, particularly with the GPT-3.5 model, which improved from 0.67 with APE and 0.76 with CD. While Claude 2.1 experienced a slight decrease in performance likely due to the comprehensiveness of the GSM8K dataset and potential prompt overload, GPT-4 saw a significant improvement from 0.84 to 0.90. These findings validate the effectiveness and robustness of the CD framework in improving the accuracy of weaker models on structured and more complex tasks.

Method	Model					
	GPT-3.5	Claude 2.1	Phi-3-mini-3.8B	Mixtral-8x7B*	Mistral-7B	GPT-4
APE	0.93	0.96	0.83 _(+4%)	0.73	0.71	0.91
CD	0.96 _(+3%)	1.00 _(+4%)	0.79	0.87 _(+14%)	0.96 _(+25%)	0.94 _(+3%)

Table 6: Accuracy comparison on the HumanEval dataset between CD (evaluated by transferring the optimized prompt with distilled concepts from the GPT-3.5-Turbo model to other models) and APE.

7 Conclusion

In conclusion, our study demonstrates the robustness of Concept Distillation (CD) in significantly enhancing the performance of weaker language models across various tasks, as evidenced by substantial accuracy improvements on the HumanEval, Multi-Arith, and GSM8K datasets. By distilling and transferring essential concepts from stronger models, CD not only boosts the capabilities of smaller models but also ensures the transferability of these improvements across different models. Our extensive experiments show that CD consistently outperforms various state-of-the-art prompt optimization methods. This robust framework, therefore, addresses critical challenges in prompt engineering, offering a scalable and resource-efficient solution that advances the state-of-the-art in prompt optimization for language models.

References

- Alina Bradford and Ashley Hamer. 2022. Science and the scientific method: Definitions and examples. *Published January*, 17:2022.
- Mark Chen, Jerry Tworek, Heewoo Jun, Qiming Yuan, Henrique Ponde de Oliveira Pinto, Jared Kaplan, Harri Edwards, Yuri Burda, Nicholas Joseph, Greg Brockman, et al. 2021. Evaluating large language models trained on code. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.03374*.
- Deepa Cherukunnath and Anita Puri Singh. 2022. Exploring cognitive processes of knowledge acquisition to upgrade academic practices. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13:682628.
- Karl Cobbe, Vineet Kosaraju, Mohammad Bavarian, Mark Chen, Heewoo Jun, Lukasz Kaiser, Matthias Plappert, Jerry Tworek, Jacob Hilton, Reiichiro Nakano, et al. 2021. Training verifiers to solve math word problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.14168*.
- Yihe Deng, Weitong Zhang, Zixiang Chen, and Quanquan Gu. 2023. Rephrase and respond: Let large language models ask better questions for themselves. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.04205*.
- Qingxiu Dong, Lei Li, Damai Dai, Ce Zheng, Zhiyong Wu, Baobao Chang, Xu Sun, Jingjing Xu, and Zhifang Sui. 2022. A survey on in-context learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.00234*.
- Aleksandra Edwards and Jose Camacho-Collados. 2024. Language models for text classification: Is in-context learning enough? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.17661*.
- Qingyan Guo, Rui Wang, Junliang Guo, Bei Li, Kaitao Song, Xu Tan, Guoqing Liu, Jiang Bian, and Yujie Yang. 2023. Connecting large language models with evolutionary algorithms yields powerful prompt optimizers. *ICLR 2024*.
- Muhammad Usman Hadi, Rizwan Qureshi, Abbas Shah, Muhammad Irfan, Anas Zafar, Muhammad Bilal Shaikh, Naveed Akhtar, Jia Wu, Seyedali Mirjalili, et al. 2023. A survey on large language models: Applications, challenges, limitations, and practical usage. *Authorea Preprints*.
- Xinyu Hu, Pengfei Tang, Simiao Zuo, Zihan Wang, Bowen Song, Qiang Lou, Jian Jiao, and Denis Charles. 2023. Evoke: Evoking critical thinking abilities in llms via reviewer-author prompt editing. *ICLR 2024*.
- Darwin P Hunt. 2003. The concept of knowledge and how to measure it. *Journal of intellectual capital*, 4(1):100–113.
- Tian Liang, Zhiwei He, Wenxiang Jiao, Xing Wang, Yan Wang, Rui Wang, Yujiu Yang, Zhaopeng Tu, and Shuming Shi. 2023. Encouraging divergent thinking in large language models through multi-agent debate. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.19118*.
- Sheng Lu, Hendrik Schuff, and Iryna Gurevych. 2023. How are prompts different in terms of sensitivity? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.07230*.
- Mary Phuong and Christoph Lampert. 2019. Towards understanding knowledge distillation. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 5142–5151. PMLR.
- Reid Pryzant, Dan Iter, Jerry Li, Yin Tat Lee, Chengguang Zhu, and Michael Zeng. 2023a. Automatic prompt optimization with "gradient descent" and beam search. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.03495*.
- Reid Pryzant, Dan Iter, Jerry Li, Yin Tat Lee, Chengguang Zhu, and Michael Zeng. 2023b. Automatic prompt optimization with "gradient descent" and beam search. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.03495*.
- Subhro Roy and Dan Roth. 2015. Solving general arithmetic word problems. In *Proceedings of the 2015*

- Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 1743–1752, Lisbon, Portugal. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ohad Rubin, Jonathan Herzig, and Jonathan Berant. 2021. Learning to retrieve prompts for in-context learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.08633*.
- Mark W Scerbo, Aaron W Calhoun, and Joshua Hui. 2019. Research and hypothesis testing: Moving from theory to experiment. *Healthcare Simulation Research: A Practical Guide*, pages 161–167.
- Yusheng Su, Xiaozhi Wang, Yujia Qin, Chi-Min Chan, Yankai Lin, Huadong Wang, Kaiyue Wen, Zhiyuan Liu, Peng Li, Juanzi Li, Lei Hou, Maosong Sun, and Jie Zhou. 2022. **On transferability of prompt tuning for natural language processing**. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 3949–3969, Seattle, United States. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Xinyuan Wang, Chenxi Li, Zhen Wang, Fan Bai, Hao-tian Luo, Jiayou Zhang, Nebojsa Jojic, Eric P Xing, and Zhiting Hu. 2023. Promptagent: Strategic planning with language models enables expert-level prompt optimization. *ICLR 2024*.
- Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Fei Xia, Ed Chi, Quoc V Le, Denny Zhou, et al. 2022. Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:24824–24837.
- Yuxin Wen, Neel Jain, John Kirchenbauer, Micah Goldblum, Jonas Geiping, and Tom Goldstein. 2024. Hard prompts made easy: Gradient-based discrete optimization for prompt tuning and discovery. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36.
- Haojun Xia, Zhen Zheng, Yuchao Li, Donglin Zhuang, Zhongzhu Zhou, Xiafei Qiu, Yong Li, Wei Lin, and Shuaiwen Leon Song. 2023. Flash-llm: Enabling cost-effective and highly-efficient large generative model inference with unstructured sparsity. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.10285*.
- Sang Michael Xie, Aditi Raghunathan, Percy Liang, and Tengyu Ma. 2021. An explanation of in-context learning as implicit bayesian inference. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2111.02080*.
- Qinyuan Ye, Maxamed Axmed, Reid Pryzant, and Fereshte Khani. 2023. Prompt engineering a prompt engineer. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.05661*.
- Tianjun Zhang, Aman Madaan, Luyu Gao, Steven Zheng, Swaroop Mishra, Yiming Yang, Niket Tandon, and Uri Alon. 2024. In-context principle learning from mistakes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.05403*.
- Qihuang Zhong, Liang Ding, Juhua Liu, Bo Du, and Dacheng Tao. 2024. Panda: Prompt transfer meets knowledge distillation for efficient model adaptation. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*.
- Yongchao Zhou, Andrei Ioan Muresanu, Ziwon Han, Keiran Paster, Silviu Pitis, Harris Chan, and Jimmy Ba. 2022a. Large language models are human-level prompt engineers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.01910*.
- Yongchao Zhou, Andrei Ioan Muresanu, Ziwon Han, Keiran Paster, Silviu Pitis, Harris Chan, and Jimmy Ba. 2022b. Large language models are human-level prompt engineers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.01910*.
- Zhaocheng Zhu, Yuan Xue, Xinyun Chen, Denny Zhou, Jian Tang, Dale Schuurmans, and Hanjun Dai. 2023. Large language models can learn rules. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.07064*.

A Case Study: Natural Language to Cypher Translation

In this study, we also employed the concept distillation approach on a dataset designed for Natural Language to Cypher (NL2Cypher) query translation, aiming to leverage the generative capabilities of LLMs for producing syntactically correct Cypher codes from natural language queries. The dataset encompassed various subsets, including queries pertaining to calendars (e.g., "when is my next meeting with person"), files, and people, structured according to a specific schema.

Our observations highlighted that the GPT-4 model demonstrated superior performance across all dataset subsets during validation, with its lowest accuracy—approximately 80%—occurring in NL2Cypher query translations concerning people. Conversely, the GPT-3.5 Turbo model, utilizing identical prompts to GPT-4, exhibited markedly lower performance across these subsets. Notably, it failed entirely to translate queries related to files and people within an organization, resulting in zero accuracy for these categories. Figure 4 shows the accuracy comparison between GPT-3.5-Turbo (with baseline prompt), GPT-3.5 Turbo model (with optimized prompt) and GPT-4 model (with baseline prompt).

Subsequent to the application of concept distillation from GPT-4 into the prompt optimization process for GPT-3.5 Turbo—the performance of the latter model saw substantial improvements across all validation datasets. In particular, for queries related to the calendar category, the GPT-3.5 Turbo model not only improved but also exceeded GPT-4’s performance, achieving an accuracy rate of 95.65%. Moreover, in scenarios involving people-related queries, where the GPT-3.5 Turbo model




Figure 4: Accuracy (pass rate) comparison between GPT-3.5 Turbo model (with and without CD) and GPT-4

initially failed to translate correctly any query, the incorporation of distilled concepts significantly enhanced its accuracy to approximately 76%. For the GPT-3.5 Turbo model, the optimization of the prompt involved exclusively the incorporation of distilled concepts, resulting in what is termed the "optimized prompt." This approach demonstrates how the process of concept distillation can effectively guide a weaker model to regress towards the expected output during ICL.

B Additional results and discussion

Table 7 presents the accuracy comparison on the GSM8K dataset between CD and APE. The results demonstrate that CD consistently outperforms APE across multiple models. For instance, the GPT-3.5 model shows a significant improvement in accuracy from 0.67 with APE to 0.76 with CD. Similarly, GPT-4's accuracy increases from 0.84 with APE to 0.90 with CD, highlighting the effectiveness of CD in enhancing model performance on mathematical reasoning tasks.

Despite these improvements, the Claude 2.1 model experienced a slight decrease in performance, dropping from 0.86 with APE to 0.84 with CD. This suggests that while CD is generally effective, it may introduce prompt overload that can sometimes negatively impact certain models, particularly in scenarios involving highly comprehensive

datasets like GSM8K. **Future work** will explore methods to encourage the consolidation of distilled concepts or the development of a hierarchical structure of concepts to enhance their effectiveness.

Model	APE	CD
GPT-3.5	0.67	0.76
Claude 2.1	0.86	0.84
GPT-4	0.84	0.90

Table 7: Accuracy comparison on the GSM8K dataset between CD and APE

C Hypothetical Example: Detailed walk-through of the Approach

To illustrate our proposed method, we employ a hypothetical example, guiding you through the three phases of the concept distillation process shown in Fig. 2.

The example involves a chatbot designed to translate natural language into Cypher query commands. *Cypher* is a declarative graph query language used for querying and managing data in graph databases, such as Neo4j. It enables users to efficiently and intuitively query, update, and manage graph data by expressing patterns in the graph structure through a readable syntax. This chatbot utilizes an LLM, specifically GPT-3.5, to interpret a user's natural language query and generate a corresponding Cypher query based on a predefined graph schema. This example will demonstrate how our technique optimizes the prompt of the assumed weak model in question (GPT-3.5). Figure 5 depicts the hypothetical natural language to Cypher query translator utilized for the purpose of explaining the method.




Figure 5: A hypothetical natural language to cypher query translator

C.1 Initialization

In this initial phase, we set up essential components for our technique. This includes defining the task (natural language to Cypher query translation in this case), preparing a 'golden dataset' which contains pairs of natural language queries and their corresponding Cypher queries (serving as the task's ground truth), and creating a prompt template with basic information and instructions for the task. This template might include a few examples, and specify the input-output format. The golden dataset represents the training dataset for the method. Depending on the size of the training dataset set, we cluster it into various entities and then use stratified sampling technique to split the dataset into train and validation sets. The initial task-specific prompt used for this phase could be generated by an off-the-shelf algorithm, manually crafted, or an already existing prompt being used by a different LM.

We then evaluate the weak model, in this case, GPT-3.5, using this golden dataset of NL-Cypher pairs, as illustrated in Fig. 6. We start by selecting a pair of natural language and Cypher queries from the dataset and feeding them to the weak model using the prompt template. We then observe the output of the weak model and compare it to the ground truth. If the output is correct, we move on to the next pair. If the output is wrong, we record the error and proceed to the next step. In our hypothetical example, the first data point is deemed a strength of GPT-3.5 as it correctly generates the expected Cypher query. However, the second data point reveals a weakness, with the model failing to generate the correct Cypher query in response to the natural language query "who are the devs I am meeting in 1:1s."

C.2 Induction

In this phase, we use the strong model to induce key concepts and rules from the given task and dataset, by prompting it to reason through the facts. Here, we start constructing the prompt for the strong model by going through the following steps:

- First, we define the persona of the strong model, for example, "you are an expert in generating and reasoning over natural language to Cypher queries translation. . ."
- Next, we present to the strong model the accurate NL-Cypher pair - specifically, the one

that the weak model failed to predict correctly. Along with this, we include in the strong model's prompt the incorrect Cypher query generated by the weak model, as well as the original prompt template that was used for the weak model.

- Following this, we request the strong model to analyze and identify the reasons behind the weak model's incorrect response. This analysis is based on all the information and facts that have been included in the prompt.
- The strong model then reasons through the facts presented and tries to provide a sense of meaning into why the weak model is struggling with the input query, which we are considering in this case as "who are the devs I am meeting in 1:1s." Here, we ask the strong model to explain why the response of the weak model is wrong, and what are the missing or incorrect concepts or rules that the weak model should have used.
- We then follow up with another turn of discussion, in this case, we prompt the strong model to induce some concepts (concepts here could be rules, examples, etc. depending on the application) to guide the weak model in explicit reasoning, in such a way that it is able to answer all similar questions correctly.
- The strong model finally induces these concepts based on the presented facts and its reasoning over the cause of the weak model's inability to generate the correct response.

Figure 7 illustrates the induction phase of the concept distillation method. As noted earlier in the preceding sections, not all induced concepts are general enough to be considered as distilled concepts and so we got through the final step of this approach, which is deduction from verification, to verify these concepts to either accept or reject them.

C.3 Deduction from Verification

The final phase, *Deduction from Verification*, employs deductive reasoning to validate the concepts induced in the previous phase. This involves using the strong model to generate test cases that are similar to the incorrectly predicted input in questions (as "who are the devs I am meeting in 1:1s."). The generated test cases mimic the initial failure but




Figure 6: Initialization phase of concept distillation




Figure 7: Induction phase of concept distillation

with varied contexts or phrasings. *Alternatively*, a sample from the same entity in the validation dataset that closely resembles this test case could be used for this process. Similar examples generated in this scenario could be “Who are the co-workers I have meetings with this week?”, and “What are the project updates scheduled for today?” We then observe the output of the strong model, and select a subset of the generated examples that are valid and relevant for the task.

Following this, we incorporate the concepts derived from the induction phase into the weak model’s (GPT-3.5) original prompt template, creating what we’ll refer to as the ‘test prompt.’ Using this test prompt, we then re-evaluate the weak

model on both the original incorrectly predicted input and all the newly generated similar examples. The aim is to verify whether the model’s responses, now informed by the revised test prompt, correctly align with the expected answers. If the weak model is now able to deduce correct responses for all test examples with a level of certainty or probability that meets or exceeds a specific predefined threshold, then we have our theories defined and as a result, we can go ahead and accept the induced concepts as distilled concepts; otherwise, the induced concepts are rejected and we go back to the induction phase, and generate more concepts and rules from the strong model, until the weak model passes all the test cases. Figure 8




Figure 8: Deduction from Verification phase of concept distillation

We repeat this process for different pairs of queries that the weak model struggles with until we have a sufficient number of distilled concepts for the task, that can significantly boost the performance of the weak model for the task-specific domain. In practice, an intriguing observation we have made is that distilling concepts for one specific negative sample in the golden dataset often corrected not only that particular sample but also other negative samples where the weaker model had previously failed.

This iterative process of distilling concepts from a strong model to a weak model forms the cornerstone of our methodology. It enables a precise, targeted enhancement of the weak model’s capabilities, addressing specific deficiencies with tailored improvements. Through this approach, we not only rectify isolated errors but also fortify the model’s overall performance for the given task.