

# Adaptive Dependency-aware Prompt Optimization Framework for Multi-Step LLM Pipeline

Minjun Zhao Xinyu Zhang Shuai Zhang Deyang Li Ruifeng Shi

Huawei Poisson Lab

{zhaominjun1, zhangxinyu35, zhangshuai117, lideyang2, shiruifeng}@huawei.com

## Abstract

Multi-step LLM pipelines invoke large language models multiple times in a structured sequence and can effectively solve complex tasks, but their performance heavily depends on the prompts used at each step. Jointly optimizing these prompts is difficult due to missing step-level supervision and inter-step dependencies. Existing end-to-end prompt optimization methods struggle under these conditions and often yield suboptimal or unstable updates. We propose ADOPT, an Adaptive Dependency-aware Prompt Optimization framework for multi-step LLM pipelines. ADOPT explicitly models the dependency between each LLM step and the final task outcome, enabling precise text-gradient estimation analogous to computing analytical derivatives. It decouples textual gradient estimation from gradient updates, reducing multi-prompt optimization to flexible single-prompt optimization steps, and employs a Shapley-based mechanism to adaptively allocate optimization resources. Experiments on real-world datasets and diverse pipeline structures show that ADOPT is effective and robust, consistently outperforming state-of-the-art prompt optimization baselines.

## 1 Introduction

**Background and Motivation.** Recent years have witnessed large language models (LLMs) achieving remarkable performance across a broad spectrum of tasks (Yang et al., 2024a; Bubeck et al., 2023). However, despite the continuous advancement of individual LLMs, they still exhibit notable limitations when solving complex, multi-faceted problems. To address these limitations, recent research has explored multi-step LLM pipelines (Ma et al., 2025; Lin et al., 2025), where a task is decomposed into multiple steps and executed through programs composed of coordinated LLM calls. Such multi-step approaches extend the capability boundaries of




Figure 1: An example of the optimization problem we explore for a multi-step pipeline.

LLM systems and improve robustness and success rates when tackling intricate real-world tasks.

Nevertheless, current multi-step LLM pipelines still face several challenges, particularly in optimizing multiple prompts. Since the prompts used at each step directly shape intermediate outputs and error propagation throughout the pipeline, effective prompt optimization is crucial for improving the end-to-end success rate of such systems. On the one hand, manual prompt optimization is highly heuristic, labor-intensive, and difficult to scale, practitioners often need to iteratively refine prompts across many steps, and modifying the prompt for one step may inadvertently disturb the behavior of others, leading to a "robbing Peter to pay Paul" effect where local improvements do not necessarily yield better end-to-end performance. On the other hand, existing automated prompt optimization methods (Pryzant et al., 2023; Prasad et al., 2023; Guo et al., 2025; Fernando et al., 2023) are primarily designed for optimiz-

ing prompts in single-step LLM calls. In multi-step LLM pipelines, only end-to-end supervision is available, and intermediate outputs are further processed before producing the final result, making it difficult to obtain labels for individual LLM calls within the pipeline.

**Limitations of Existing Studies.** Recently, several data-driven, end-to-end multi-prompt optimization methods have been proposed to address the aforementioned challenges, such as Dspy-MIPRO (Opsahl-Ong et al., 2024), TextGrad (Yüksekgönül et al., 2025), Trace (Cheng et al., 2024), and GEPA (Agrawal et al., 2025). These approaches have demonstrated certain capabilities in enabling the automatic optimization of multi-step LLM pipelines. However, they also exhibit notable limitations. First, some methods (Opsahl-Ong et al., 2024) fail to effectively utilize feedback from erroneous cases, resulting in unclear optimization directions and inefficient exploration of the prompt search space. Second, although methods using backpropagation textual gradients (Yüksekgönül et al., 2025; Cheng et al., 2024) can propagate feedback signals across steps, they rely on LLMs to perform the backward reasoning, which introduces model-induced interpretations that often distort or attenuate the gradients. Not only that, these methods struggle to determine whether an error stems from the current step or from upstream steps, leading to unstable and unreliable optimization suggestions. Besides, these methods are difficult to apply to pipelines containing looping structures, which are commonly used in complex tasks. As a result, the improvements achieved by existing end-to-end multi-prompt optimization methods are limited.

**Our Solutions.** Motivated by these limitations, we propose ADOPT, an Adaptive Dependency-aware prompt OPTimization framework for multi-step LLM pipelines. ADOPT consists of three components. (1) First, it analyzes execution traces to identify how each LLM step in the pipeline influences the final outcome. Based on these dependencies, ADOPT examines erroneous cases from a global perspective and distributes the high-level improvement signals to individual steps, producing a step-level adjustment direction that plays a role similar to a partial derivative with respect to each prompt. This process is analogous to computing an analytic gradient based on the functional relationship between the parameters and the final output. It avoids relying on LLMs to reason backward about

where an error originates, a process that often introduces interpretation bias or severely weakens the signal. The mechanism resembles a team receiving general suggestions for improvement, where each member naturally identifies the part relevant to their own responsibilities. (2) Second, ADOPT separates the generation of these adjustment directions from the optimization procedure. Each LLM step can independently apply an appropriate single-prompt optimizer, and the system then searches for an effective combination of these local updates at the pipeline level. This design makes ADOPT flexible and compatible with a broad range of optimization strategies. (3) Third, ADOPT allocates optimization effort according to the estimated contribution of each step. Using a Shapley-based measure, LLM steps that provide greater improvement receive more optimization resources in subsequent iterations. Through dependency-guided adjustment signals, flexible local optimization, and principled resource allocation, ADOPT offers a stable and effective solution for optimizing multiple prompts in complex multi-step LLM pipelines.

**Contributions.** Our main contributions are as follows. (1) We introduce ADOPT, a dependency-aware prompt optimization framework that derives step-level adjustment directions in multi-step LLM pipelines without relying on LLM-based backward reasoning. (2) We decouple adjustment-direction estimation from prompt optimization, enabling flexible use of single-prompt optimizers and effective combination of local updates. (3) We design a Shapley-based strategy that allocates optimization resources according to each step’s contribution. (4) Experiments on real-world datasets and diverse pipeline structures show that ADOPT consistently improves end-to-end performance over existing methods.

## 2 Preliminaries

### 2.1 Multi-Step LLM Pipelines

We formalize a multi-step LLM system as

$$\Phi = (C, M, \Pi), \quad (1)$$

where  $C$  denotes all executable code in the system other than the LLMs themselves. This includes the control-flow logic, tool calls, data preprocessing and postprocessing routines, conditional branches, loops, retries, and any additional operations that orchestrate the overall pipeline. The




Figure 2: Dependency-aware Textual Gradient Estimation.

set  $M = \{M_1, \dots, M_m\}$  collects the LLM parameters of each LLM step used in the system, and  $\Pi = \{p_1, \dots, p_m\}$  denotes the natural language prompts associated with these LLM steps. Each LLM step is determined by a pair  $(M_i, p_i)$ .

Given an input  $x$ , the system executes  $C$ , which in turn triggers LLM steps  $(M_i, p_i)$  whenever their corresponding operations are reached. The execution may follow arbitrary program logic, including sequential execution, branching, iterative refinement, or tool-augmented steps. After completing all operations specified by  $C$ , the system produces a final output, which we denote by  $\Phi(x; C, M, \Pi)$ .

For notational simplicity, since  $C$  and  $M$  are fixed in our setting, we write  $\Phi(x; \Pi)$  when only the prompts are treated as learnable parameters. This formulation remains general and can naturally extend to settings in which additional components of the system,  $C$  and  $M$ , are also subject to optimization.

## 2.2 Problem Formulation

The multi-step LLM system  $\Phi$  takes an input  $x$  and produces a final output  $\Phi(x; \Pi)$ , where the prompts  $\Pi = \{p_1, \dots, p_m\}$  serve as the learnable parameters and all other system components remain fixed. Intermediate results generated during execution are not supervised, and only the end-to-end output is available for evaluation.

Given a training set  $D_{\text{train}} = \{(x_j, y_j)\}$  and a task metric  $T(\cdot, \cdot)$  that evaluates the final output relative to the ground-truth label, the goal is to optimize the prompts so that the overall system performance is maximized on the training set. Formally, we define the optimization problem as

$$P^* = \arg \max_{P \in S^m} \sum_{(x,y) \in D_{\text{train}}} T(\Phi(x; P), y), \quad (2)$$

where  $S$  denotes the space of natural language strings. This problem is challenging because the search space  $S^m$  is extremely large, supervision is available only at the end-to-end level, and the execution of  $\Phi$  is non-differentiable, making it difficult

to determine which LLM steps are responsible for errors and how they should be adjusted.

### 3 Methodology

In this section, we present ADOPT, an adaptive dependency-aware prompt optimization framework for multi-step LLM pipelines. ADOPT aims to improve end-to-end performance by systematically determining how each LLM step should adjust its prompt based on the dependencies present in the pipeline’s execution.

The framework operates in three stages. First, ADOPT analyzes execution traces to derive step-specific adjustment directions, which approximate analytical partial derivatives with respect to individual prompts and do not rely on backward reasoning by LLMs. Second, it decouples the estimation of these adjustment directions from the optimization procedure, allowing each step to employ an appropriate single-prompt optimizer while the system searches for an effective combination of local updates at the pipeline level. Third, ADOPT allocates optimization effort dynamically using Shapley value-based attribution, focusing computation on the steps that contribute most to performance improvement.

Together, these components enable stable, targeted, and scalable optimization of prompts in complex multi-step LLM pipelines. We use LLM-based optimizers to optimize multi-step LLM pipelines. To avoid ambiguity, we will hereafter refer to LLM-based optimizers simply as “optimizers.”

#### 3.1 Dependency-aware Textual Gradient Estimation

A central challenge in optimizing multi-step LLM pipelines is determining how end-to-end supervision should be decomposed into step-level update directions. ADOPT first analyzes how each step influences the final output and derives the final output dependency on every step. Based on the feedback produced by the optimizers, which describes the discrepancy in textual form, ADOPT then generates a global optimization direction. Finally, using the inferred dependencies, ADOPT decomposes this global direction into step-level update directions.

During each training iteration, ADOPT runs the pipeline  $\Phi(x; p_1, \dots, p_m)$ , where  $p_i$  is the prompt of step  $i$ , on a minibatch from the training set and partitions the resulting examples into *good cases*

and *bad cases* according to the task metric  $\mathcal{M}$ . We refer to the end-to-end inputs and outputs, together with the inputs and outputs of each LLM step during execution, as the *trace* of a case. ADOPT retains the traces of both good and bad cases for use in the subsequent optimization procedure.

**Analyzing Final Output Dependency on Step.** To simulate the effect of computing analytical partial derivatives, ADOPT must first determine how each LLM step functionally influences the final pipeline output. ADOPT begins with a direct analysis stage, in which an optimizer  $E_1$  examines the workflow code together with the prompts of all steps to infer the overall task and the intended role of each step within the pipeline.

Building on this structural understanding, ADOPT then performs a data-driven analysis using the traces collected from good cases. For each LLM step, optimizer  $E_2$  is provided with the direct-analysis results, the step’s input–output pairs, and the corresponding end-to-end traces. The optimizer analyzes how variations in the step’s output affect the final result, yielding a final output *dependency* on that step. This dependency characterizes the step’s functional contribution to successful execution and its influence on the end-to-end behavior.

**Computing Global Textual Gradient.** For each bad case, ADOPT first uses optimizer  $E_3$  to identify the metric-defined discrepancy  $\mathcal{L}$  between the pipeline output and the ground truth. This discrepancy, referred to as *textual loss* or *feedback* in our setting, explicitly enumerates the errors responsible for the score reduction and provides a fine-grained and interpretable description of the mismatch, serving as the natural-language counterpart of an error signal. In essence, the optimization objective is to minimize this textual loss  $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{M}(F(x; p_1, \dots, p_m))$ , that is, to eliminate the discrepancy as much as possible.

ADOPT then invokes optimizer  $E_4$  to transform this textual loss into a *global textual gradient*.  $E_4$  performs a diagnostic analysis that explains why each discrepancy arises, producing a global description of the failure mode of the final output. This yields a distilled correction direction expressed at the level of the final output itself. The resulting global textual gradient functions as an analogue of the derivative of  $\mathcal{L}$  with respect to the textual loss, that is,  $g^{\text{global}} = \nabla_{\text{Output}}^{\text{text}} \mathcal{L}$ .

**Computing Local Textual Gradient.** Given the global textual gradient and the final output depen-

dependencies inferred for each step, ADOPT uses optimizer  $E_5$  to compute a *local textual gradient* for every node. For each step,  $E_5$  receives the global textual gradient, the step’s final output dependency, the step-level input–output pair, and the final output, and then produces a step-specific natural-language optimization direction that constitutes the local textual gradient. Formally, this direction serves as the textual analogue of an analytical partial derivative,  $g_i^{\text{local}} = \nabla_{p_i}^{\text{text}} \mathcal{L}$ .

### 3.2 Prompt Optimization for Pipeline

After deriving step-level local textual gradients, the remaining challenge is to convert these textual optimization directions into executable prompt updates while achieving effective coordination across a multi-step LLM pipeline. Pipeline-level prompt optimization requires not only that each step independently updates its prompt according to its local signal, but also that the resulting prompts interact coherently in an end-to-end manner. To address this, ADOPT adopts a prompt optimization strategy that combines step-level prompt optimization guided by local textual gradients with pipeline-level prompt selection based on a search algorithm.

**Decoupled Step-level Prompt Optimization.** For each bad case, ADOPT uses the local textual gradient of step  $i$  to generate a *revised step output* that represents the desired behavior of this step under the given input. This revised output specifies how the step’s output should change in order to reduce the end-to-end loss and correct the final pipeline error. Formally, for step  $i$  with input  $x_i$ , the revised output  $\hat{y}_i$  is generated by optimizer  $E_6$  guided by the local textual gradient.

Across multiple bad cases, ADOPT aggregates pairs of step-level inputs and their corresponding revised step outputs, forming a step-specific dataset

$$\mathcal{D}_i = \{(x_i^{(k)}, \hat{y}_i^{(k)})\}_{k=1}^K. \quad (3)$$

This dataset serves as supervision for updating the prompt  $p_i$  of LLM step  $i$  using a single-prompt optimization procedure.

Crucially, ADOPT decouples the generation of optimization directions from the choice of the prompt optimization algorithm. For each LLM step, any existing single-prompt optimizer can be applied to  $\mathcal{D}_i$  to update  $p_i$ , without modifying the dependency analysis or textual gradient computation stages. This design makes the framework

modular and extensible, allowing different prompt optimizers to be incorporated as interchangeable components.

In this work, we consider two representative optimizers. The first is an instruction optimizer that updates only the instruction component of the prompt. The second jointly optimizes the instruction and automatically selects representative examples to be included as in-context learning demonstrations. Each round of step-level optimization produces multiple candidate prompts for each LLM step, which are subsequently evaluated and coordinated at the pipeline level.

**Global Prompt Selection.** The step-level prompt optimization procedure produces multiple candidate prompts for each LLM step, which gives rise to a pipeline-level selection problem. Let  $\mathcal{P}_i = \{p_i^{(1)}, \dots, p_i^{(n_i)}\}$  denote the candidate prompt set generated for step  $i$ . The objective is to select a prompt configuration  $(p_1, \dots, p_m) \in \mathcal{P}_1 \times \dots \times \mathcal{P}_m$  that maximizes the end-to-end performance of the pipeline. Since the effect of a prompt at one step may depend on the prompts chosen at other steps, this problem cannot be decomposed into independent per-step decisions and instead constitutes a combinatorial optimization problem over the joint prompt space.

ADOPT addresses this challenge by formulating pipeline-level prompt selection as a global search problem and solving it with search-based optimization methods. In this work, Bayesian Optimization is employed to efficiently explore the space of prompt configurations under a limited evaluation budget.

### 3.3 Shapley-based Resource Allocation

Prompt updates in multi-step LLM pipelines typically yield uneven returns across steps. After several optimization rounds, certain steps may become saturated and contribute little additional improvement, while other steps remain critical to the end-to-end metric. Treating all steps equally, therefore, wastes optimization budget. ADOPT addresses this issue by allocating step-level optimization resources according to each step’s estimated contribution to end-to-end performance, and adopts Shapley-style attribution as a principled measure of contribution.

Before optimization begins, each step has the same optimization resources, i.e., how many candidates can be generated during step-level opti-



mization. At the end of each round, the global prompt selector evaluates a set of prompt configurations and records their end-to-end scores under the task metric  $\mathcal{M}$ . For each step  $i$ , we consider two prompt states, a *weak* prompt  $p_i^{\text{weak}}$  representing the prompt used in the previous round, and a *strong* prompt  $p_i^{\text{strong}}$  representing the best-performing prompt selected from the current candidate set  $\mathcal{P}_i$ . Among all evaluated configurations, ADOPT considers only those in which each step adopts either its weak or strong prompt. These configurations can thus be represented by a coalition  $S \subseteq \{1, \dots, m\}$ , where  $i \in S$  indicates that step  $i$  uses  $p_i^{\text{strong}}$  and  $i \notin S$  uses  $p_i^{\text{weak}}$ . Let  $P(S)$  denote the corresponding prompt assignment, and define the value function

$$v(S) = \mathcal{M}(\Phi(x; P(S))). \quad (4)$$

The Shapley value for step  $i$  measures its average marginal contribution across all coalitions,

$$\phi_i = \sum_{S \subseteq [m] \setminus \{i\}} w(S) (v(S \cup \{i\}) - v(S)), \quad (5)$$

where  $w(S) = \frac{|S|!(m-|S|-1)!}{m!}$ . Computing  $\{\phi_i\}$  exactly requires evaluating  $v(S)$  for an exponential number of coalitions, which is prohibitively expensive because each evaluation corresponds to running the full pipeline. ADOPT therefore estimates step contributions using Kernel SHAP, which approximates Shapley values from a limited number of observed coalitions. Concretely, ADOPT applies Kernel SHAP to the prompt configurations that have already been evaluated during the pipeline-level search. Each evaluated configuration provides a binary indicator vector  $z \in \{0, 1\}^m$  for its coalition membership and an observed score  $v(z)$ . Kernel SHAP then fits a weighted linear model over these samples and uses the fitted coefficients as efficient approximations of Shapley-style contributions.

The resulting contribution estimates are used only for resource allocation in subsequent rounds. Steps with larger estimated contributions are assigned larger candidate budgets, while steps with smaller contributions receive fewer candidates. This reallocation preserves the overall evaluation budget. The number of pipeline-level prompt configurations evaluated per round is kept fixed, and no additional pipeline executions are introduced for contribution estimation. In this way, ADOPT concentrates optimization effort on the steps that

most strongly influence end-to-end performance while maintaining stable computational cost across rounds.

## 4 Experiments

### 4.1 Experimental Setup

We compare ADOPT with four methods: Chain-of-Thought (CoT) (Wei et al., 2022), no CoT, MIPRO (Opsahl-Ong et al., 2024), GEPA (Agrawal et al., 2025). For CoT, we add "let's think step by step" to the prompt of each agent in the tested programs.

We implement two multi-step pipelines to thoroughly evaluate the effectiveness of our proposed ADOPT and baselines. And we use two real-world datasets, i.e., HotPotQA (Yang et al., 2018), HoVer (Jiang et al., 2020), as benchmarks for different multi-step pipelines separately.

Throughout the experiments, every large language model used in the multi-step pipeline and the LLM-based optimizers is Qwen2.5-72B-Instruct. We used it with the temperature set to 0, top p to 1.

### 4.2 Main Results

Table 1 reports the overall performance of ADOPT and baseline methods on two real-world multi-step benchmarks. ADOPT consistently achieves the strongest performance across all evaluated datasets, demonstrating its effectiveness for optimizing multi-step LLM pipelines under end-to-end supervision. Compared with prompting-based baselines such as No-CoT and CoT, ADOPT yields substantial performance gains, indicating that merely encouraging step-by-step reasoning is still insufficient to address errors arising from complex interactions among multiple pipeline steps. ADOPT also outperforms existing multi-prompt optimization methods, including MIPRO and GEPA. MIPRO generates candidate prompts only from correctly solved examples and selects an optimal combination among them, without iteratively refining prompts based on erroneous cases, while GEPA incorporates bad cases but directly optimizes prompts using only final feedback, analogous to the textual loss in our framework, without explicitly reasoning about how individual steps should be adjusted. In contrast, ADOPT leverages textual loss to derive global textual gradient and uses dependencies to decompose end-to-end supervision into step-specific optimization signals, i.e., local textual gradients, enabling more precise and coordinated step-level

Table 1: Overall performance of ADOPT and baselines on different real-world datasets.

Dataset	No-COT	COT	MIPRO	GEPA	ADOPT-Instruct	ADOPT-Joint
HotPotQA	0.52	0.58	0.62	0.63	0.67	0.68
HoVer	0.55	0.58	0.62	0.63	0.69	0.71




Figure 3: Convergence of ADOPT

optimization across the pipeline, which leads to consistently better end-to-end performance. Taken together, the results indicate that ADOPT provides a more effective mechanism for improving end-to-end performance in multi-step LLM systems than existing methods.

### 4.3 Convergence Analysis

To examine the convergence behavior of ADOPT, we track the end-to-end accuracy over successive optimization iterations. As shown in Figure 3, ADOPT demonstrates steady performance improvements from the initial iteration, with accuracy increasing rapidly in the early stages and continuing to improve over subsequent iterations. While minor fluctuations are observed in later iterations, the overall trend remains stable and convergent, and the performance does not degrade as optimization proceeds. This behavior indicates that the step-level local textual gradients provide consistent and informative optimization signals, enabling iterative prompt updates to accumulate constructively at the pipeline level. The results suggest that ADOPT supports stable convergence in multi-step LLM pipelines despite the discrete and interdependent nature of prompt optimization.

Table 2: Comparison of different resource allocation methods.

Allocation	Average	Random	Shapley
Iterations	6.6	6.7	3.7

### 4.4 Ablation Studies

**Effect of Step-level Prompt Optimizers.** ADOPT decouples dependency-aware textual gradient estimation from the choice of the step-level prompt optimization algorithm, allowing different single-prompt optimizers to be applied without modifying the upstream analysis. To assess the effect of this design, we instantiate ADOPT with two representative optimizers at the step level: an instruction-only optimizer that updates the natural-language instruction in each prompt, and a joint instruction-and-example optimizer that additionally selects representative in-context learning examples based on the same step-level supervision constructed from revised step outputs. Under identical local textual gradients and step-level training data, both optimizers consistently improve end-to-end performance over the baselines, while the joint optimizer achieves further gains, indicating that enriching step prompts with selected examples can better capture step-specific behaviors when accurate local supervision is available. These results demonstrate that ADOPT’s performance is not tied to a particular prompt optimizer and that its decoupled formulation enables the framework to benefit from more expressive optimization strategies as they become available.

**Effect of resource allocation module.** Table 2 evaluates the effect of different resource allocation strategies by measuring the average number of optimization iterations required to reach a pre-defined target performance. Uniform allocation and random allocation exhibit nearly identical convergence behavior, indicating that naive redistribution of optimization resources does not meaningfully improve efficiency. In contrast, the Shapley-based resource allocation significantly reduces the

required number of iterations, converging in 3.7 iterations on average compared to over 6.6 iterations for the other strategies. This result demonstrates that contribution-aware allocation effectively concentrates optimization effort on the most impactful steps, substantially accelerating convergence without increasing the overall optimization budget.

## 5 Related Work

### Prompt Optimization for Single-Step Tasks

Single-step prompt optimization typically refines a static prompt. APE (Zhou et al., 2022) uses Monte Carlo search with LLM-generated candidates; Evo-Prompt (Guo et al., 2025) evolves prompts via LLM-driven mutation and crossover. OPRO (Yang et al., 2023) iteratively proposes variants based on performance feedback. ProTeGi (Pryzant et al., 2023) applies LLM-generated critiques as textual gradients to guide beam search. AMPO (Yang et al., 2024b) explores multiple prompt trajectories in parallel to enhance robustness. While effective for static tasks, these methods do not exploit multi-step pipeline structures.

### Prompt Optimization in Multi-Step Pipelines

Recent advances extend prompt optimization to multi-step settings. MIPRO (Opsahl-Ong et al., 2024) jointly optimizes module instructions and examples using a surrogate model and meta-optimization to assign inter-module credit. However, it assumes a fixed task decomposition, limiting its ability to target true bottlenecks. TextGrad (Yuksekgonul et al., 2024) introduces gradient-like textual feedback propagated across components for global optimization, but relies on a static pipeline and cannot reassign responsibilities or handle loops. Trace (Cheng et al., 2024) leverages execution traces for structured feedback and explicit inter-module dependency modeling, yet also assumes a fixed, acyclic workflow, restricting its applicability to dynamic or iterative pipelines.

## 6 Conclusion

We propose ADOPT, a dependency-aware prompt optimization framework for multi-step LLM pipelines that decomposes end-to-end supervision into coherent step-level optimization signals via textual gradients. By decoupling local prompt optimization from pipeline-level prompt selection, ADOPT enables modular integration of existing prompt optimizers while maintaining effective

global coordination. Experiments demonstrate that ADOPT improves end-to-end performance.

## References

- Lakshya A Agrawal, Shangyin Tan, Dilara Soylu, Noah Ziemis, Rishi Khare, Krista Opsahl-Ong, Arnav Singhvi, Herumb Shandilya, Michael J Ryan, Meng Jiang, and 1 others. 2025. Gepa: Reflective prompt evolution can outperform reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2507.19457*.
- Sébastien Bubeck, Varun Chandrasekaran, Ronen Eldan, Johannes Gehrke, Eric Horvitz, Ece Kamar, Peter Lee, Yin Tat Lee, Yuanzhi Li, Scott Lundberg, Harsha Nori, Hamid Palangi, Marco Tulio Ribeiro, and Yi Zhang. 2023. *Sparks of artificial general intelligence: Early experiments with gpt-4*. *Preprint*, arXiv:2303.12712.
- Ching-An Cheng, Allen Nie, and Adith Swaminathan. 2024. Trace is the next autodiff: Generative optimization with rich feedback, execution traces, and llms. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 38: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2024, NeurIPS 2024, Vancouver, BC, Canada, December 10 - 15, 2024*.
- Chrisantha Fernando, Dylan Banarse, Henryk Michalewski, Simon Osindero, and Tim Rocktäschel. 2023. *Promptbreeder: Self-referential self-improvement via prompt evolution*. *Preprint*, arXiv:2309.16797.
- Qingyan Guo, Rui Wang, Junliang Guo, Bei Li, Kaitao Song, Xu Tan, Guoqing Liu, Jiang Bian, and Yujie Yang. 2025. *Evoprompt: Connecting llms with evolutionary algorithms yields powerful prompt optimizers*. *Preprint*, arXiv:2309.08532.
- Yichen Jiang, Shikha Bordia, Zheng Zhong, Charles Dognin, Maneesh Singh, and Mohit Bansal. 2020. Hover: A dataset for many-hop fact extraction and claim verification. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2011.03088*.
- Xuanrui Lin, Chao Jia, Junhui Ji, Hui Han, and Usman Naseem. 2025. *Ask, acquire, understand: A multimodal agent-based framework for social abuse detection in memes*. In *Proceedings of the ACM on Web Conference 2025, WWW 2025, Sydney, NSW, Australia, 28 April 2025- 2 May 2025*, pages 4734–4744. ACM.
- Jiatong Ma, Linmei Hu, Rang Li, and Wenbo Fu. 2025. *Local: Logical and causal fact-checking with llm-based multi-agents*. In *Proceedings of the ACM on Web Conference 2025, WWW 2025, Sydney, NSW, Australia, 28 April 2025- 2 May 2025*, pages 1614–1625. ACM.
- Krista Opsahl-Ong, Michael J. Ryan, Josh Purtell, David Broman, Christopher Potts, Matei Zaharia, and Omar Khattab. 2024. Optimizing instructions and demonstrations for multi-stage language model



- programs. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, EMNLP 2024, Miami, FL, USA, November 12-16, 2024*, pages 9340–9366. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Archiki Prasad, Peter Hase, Xiang Zhou, and Mohit Bansal. 2023. [Grips: Gradient-free, edit-based instruction search for prompting large language models](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2203.07281.
- Reid Pryzant, Dan Iter, Jerry Li, Yin Tat Lee, Chenguang Zhu, and Michael Zeng. 2023. Automatic prompt optimization with "gradient descent" and beam search. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.03495*.
- Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Brian Ichter, Fei Xia, Ed H. Chi, Quoc V. Le, and Denny Zhou. 2022. Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 35: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2022, NeurIPS 2022, New Orleans, LA, USA, November 28 - December 9, 2022*.
- Chengrun Yang, Xuezhi Wang, Yifeng Lu, Hanxiao Liu, Quoc V Le, Denny Zhou, and Xinyun Chen. 2023. Large language models as optimizers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.03409*.
- Jingfeng Yang, Hongye Jin, Ruixiang Tang, Xiaotian Han, Qizhang Feng, Haoming Jiang, Shaochen Zhong, Bing Yin, and Xia Hu. 2024a. Harnessing the power of llms in practice: A survey on chatgpt and beyond. *ACM Transactions on Knowledge Discovery from Data*, 18(6):1–32.
- Sheng Yang, Yurong Wu, Yan Gao, Zineng Zhou, Bin Benjamin Zhu, Xiaodi Sun, Jian-Guang Lou, Zhiming Ding, Anbang Hu, Yuan Fang, Yunsong Li, Junyan Chen, and Linjun Yang. 2024b. [Ampo: Automatic multi-branched prompt optimization](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2410.08696.
- Zhilin Yang, Peng Qi, Saizheng Zhang, Yoshua Bengio, William Cohen, Ruslan Salakhutdinov, and Christopher D Manning. 2018. Hotpotqa: A dataset for diverse, explainable multi-hop question answering. In *Proceedings of the 2018 conference on empirical methods in natural language processing*, pages 2369–2380.
- Mert Yuksekgonul, Federico Bianchi, Joseph Boen, Sheng Liu, Zhi Huang, Carlos Guestrin, and James Zou. 2024. Textgrad: Automatic "differentiation" via text. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.07496*.
- Mert Yükekgönül, Federico Bianchi, Joseph Boen, Sheng Liu, Pan Lu, Zhi Huang, Carlos Guestrin, and James Zou. 2025. [Optimizing generative AI by backpropagating language model feedback](#). *Nature*, 639(8055):609–616.
- Yongchao Zhou, Andrei Ioan Muresanu, Ziwen Han, Keiran Paster, Silviu Pitis, Harris Chan, and Jimmy Ba. 2022. Large language models are human-level
- prompt engineers. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*.