
LangTopo: Aligning Language Descriptions of Graphs with Tokenized Topological Modeling

Zhong Guan
Tianjing University

Hongke Zhao
Tianjing University

Likang Wu
University of Science and Technology of China

Ming He
AI Lab at Lenovo Research

Jianpin Fan
AI Lab at Lenovo Research

Abstract

Recently, large language models (LLMs) have been widely researched in the field of graph machine learning due to their outstanding abilities in language comprehension and learning. However, the significant gap between natural language tasks and topological structure modeling poses a nonnegligible challenge. Specifically, since natural language descriptions are not sufficient for LLMs to understand and process graph-structured data, fine-tuned LLMs perform even worse than some traditional GNN models on graph tasks, lacking inherent modeling capabilities for graph structures. Existing research overly emphasizes LLMs' understanding of semantic information captured by external models, while inadequately exploring graph topological structure modeling, thereby overlooking the genuine capabilities that LLMs lack. Consequently, in this paper, we introduce a new framework, LangTopo, which aligns graph structure modeling with natural language understanding at the token level. LangTopo quantifies the graph structure modeling capabilities of GNNs and LLMs by constructing a codebook for the graph modality and performs consistency maximization. This process aligns the text description of LLM with the topological modeling of GNN, allowing LLM to learn the ability of GNN to capture graph structures, enabling LLM to handle graph-structured data independently. We demonstrate the effectiveness of our proposed method on multiple datasets.

1 INTRODUCTION

Text-attributed graphs (TAGs) are ubiquitous in the real world Berge (2001), appearing in academic citation networks Wang et al. (2020), web pages Mernyei and Cangea (2020), e-commerce platforms Shchur et al. (2018), and search services. These graphs are characterized by nodes that contain rich textual attributes, making them complex and challenging to analyze. Research on TAGs has become a significant area within graph machine learning, primarily focusing on Graph Neural Networks (GNNs) based on message-passing mechanisms to exploit adjacency spaces effectively Defferrard et al. (2016); Kipf and Welling (2016); Veličković et al. (2017).

Recently, the advent of large language models (LLMs) like ChatGPT OpenAI (2023) and Llama Touvron et al. (2023) has sparked significant interest in their application to graph machine learning tasks due to their impressive potential across various fields Singh et al. (2023); Driess et al. (2023). Some studies have explored enhancing node embeddings Duan et al. (2023); He et al. (2023) and reinforcing graph topological structures using LLMs Guo et al. (2024); Wang et al. (2024). However, unlike




Figure 1: **Prompt**: LLMs make predictions based solely on natural language descriptions. **Access external**: LLMs leverage external models (typically GNNs) to extract information for enhanced predictions. **Ours LangTopo**: Aligning the textual descriptive power of LLMs with the topological modeling capabilities of GNNs in terms of model processing and operation.

GNNs, which are based on message passing, LLMs grounded in natural language often struggle to describe and process node connections, leading to suboptimal performance on graph-related tasks Chen et al. (2024a); Huang et al. (2023).

Combining the structural modeling capacity of GNNs with the text processing capability of LLMs presents a promising approach to addressing these challenges. A straightforward solution involves using an external GNN to extract spatial structure embeddings, followed by training a projection layer or adapter to inject these embeddings into the LLM, as illustrated in Figure 1(b). Recent approaches have enhanced LLM performance in graph tasks through such methods Chen et al. (2024b); Huang et al. (2024); Zhang et al. (2024). However, LLMs still lack the ability to handle graph data independently and continue to rely on external models during inference. Furthermore, aligning the embedding spaces is redundant in the context of text-attributed graphs because GNNs’ embedding spaces already encapsulate natural language information. The fundamental issue is that LLMs lack the capability to model graph structures. Consequently, we posit that the crux of the problem is modeling, not embedding.

To address this issue, we propose LangTopo, a novel learning paradigm that aligns language descriptions of graphs with tokenized topological modeling from a view of consistent modeling methods for text and structure. Initially, we employ a graph neural network to introduce a modality-specific codebook for graphs, capable of quantizing both textual and spatial information of nodes. By incorporating Gumbel-softmax Jang et al. (2016), we transform discrete quantization into continuous, differentiable quantization through relaxation techniques. Through this process, we efficiently extract the modeling prowess of GNNs into two components: **Relaxed Distribution**, indicating the allocation patterns of subgraph structures relative to the codebook, and **Quantized Embeddings**, representing precise subgraph structures with respect to the codebook. Subsequently, the LLM describes the graph structure in natural language and obtains these two components based on the codebook embeddings. Driven by the goal of achieving similarity between the corresponding components produced by the LLM and GNN, LangTopo aligns the LLM’s natural language description of the graph structure with the graph structure modeled by GNN, ultimately enhancing the LLM’s aptitude for modeling spatial architectures.

The main contributions of this work are summarized below:

- We propose LangTopo, a novel framework for learning graph structures using LLMs. Through the adoption of Vector Quantized-Variational Autoencoder (VQ-VAE), we quantify the modeling

capabilities of LLMs and GNNs for graph topological structures and enable LLMs to learn GNNs’ ability to model graph structures through supervised learning.

- We achieve alignment between the natural language descriptive text in LLMs and the processing and operation of GNN models by constructing a codebook for the graph data modality and thereby ensuring that the quantized embeddings and relaxation distributions are similar between LLMs and GNNs.
- Unlike existing paradigms that usually introduce external modules to recognize graph structures, LangTopo endows the LLM itself with the ability to model graph structures, obviating the need for external data or model integration during inference. LangTopo demonstrates excellent results across multiple datasets.

2 RELATED WORK

LLM for Graph. Recent studies have explored the application of Large Language Models (LLMs) in the field of graph structures Wu et al. (2024). GLEM Zhao et al. (2022) and others Yang et al. (2021); Li et al. (2021b) have investigated the joint training of LLMs and graph neural networks (GNNs). TAPE He et al. (2023) utilizes LLMs to predict the ranking classification of nodes and provides detailed explanations to enhance the embedding quality of GNNs. Sun et al. Sun et al. (2023) leverage LLMs for pseudo-labeling generation to improve the topological structure information of graphs. Furthermore, more research focuses on enhancing LLMs’ direct processing of text graphs. InstructGLM Ye et al. (2023) first uses LLM-based instruction tuning to describe the structure of graphs and node features, and solve graph tasks. GraphText Zhao et al. (2023) introduced a generic graph reasoning framework for in-context learning and directed fine-tuning of graph structures. Despite these advancements, LLMs struggle with structured data translated into natural language, often yielding suboptimal results. To overcome this challenge, LLaGA Chen et al. (2024b) reformulates node link information as sequential data, applying instruction tuning that LLMs can comprehend while maintaining structural node information. UniGraph He and Hooi (2024) adopts a masked strategy for joint LLM and GNN training under co-training, achieving generalization across various graphs and datasets. GraphAdapter Huang et al. (2024) employs a GNN model as an adapter, collaborates with LLMs for TAG tasks, and facilitates task-specific fine-tuning through external access. Nevertheless, these methods do not empower LLMs with the ability to improve themselves, and LLMs still lack the knowledge and capabilities to handle graph data structures.

Graph neural network. Graph Neural Networks (GNNs), standing at the forefront of graph machine learning, have solidified their position as paramount instruments in graph-based learning scenarios. Their prowess lies in effectively modeling complex relational structures within graphs. Pioneering work was conducted by Kipf et al Kipf and Welling (2016). with the development of Graph Convolutional Networks (GCNs), ingeniously aggregating features from one-hop neighbors for each node. Following suit, the advent of GAT Veličković et al. (2017) and GraphSAGE Defferrard et al. (2016) marked significant success in tackling graph learning challenges, with a common strategy of using a message passing mechanism. Based on this, research has further ventured into addressing issues of heterophily Luan et al. (2022); Zhu et al. (2021); Li et al. (2022); Ma et al. (2021); Wu et al. (2023) in graph learning tasks and the oversmoothing phenomenon in graph convolutions Li et al. (2021a); Liu et al. (2020); Chen et al. (2020); Giraldo et al. (2023).

3 PRELIMINARIES

Vector Quantised-Variational AutoEncoder (VQ-VAE). VQ-VAE Van Den Oord et al. (2017) is a vector quantizer that generates discrete codes by applying quantization to encoded continuous variables and is capable of reconstructing the original data based on the latent variables corresponding to the discrete codes. It is trained jointly by updating the quantization codebook as well as the encoder and decoder. Formally, VQ-VAE first encodes the input x via encoder into $z_e(x)$. Then, based on the nearest neighbor lookup between $z_e(x)$ and the codebook $e_i, i = 1, 2, \dots, K$, the potential variable $z_q(x)$ is found ($z_q(x) = e_i$, where $i = \operatorname{argmin}_j \|z_e(x) - e_j\|$). The potential variable $z_q(x)$ is then passed to the decoder, which attempts to reconstruct the input x . VQ-VAE, like the VAE, optimizes the Evidence Lower Bound (ELBO) Kingma and Welling (2013).

$$\mathcal{L}(\theta, \phi; x) = -D_{KL}(q_\phi(z|x)||p_\theta(z)) + \mathbb{E}_{q_\phi(z|x)}[\log p_\theta(x|z)] \quad (1)$$




Figure 2: The model architecture of our proposed LangTopo framework for graph structure learning.

At the same time, some modifications were made, and the loss function is as follows:

$$\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathcal{L}_{\text{recon}} + \|\text{sg}[\mathbf{z}_e(\mathbf{x})] - \mathbf{z}_q(\mathbf{x})\|_2^2 + \beta \cdot \|\text{sg}[\mathbf{z}_q(\mathbf{x})] - \mathbf{z}_e(\mathbf{x})\|_2^2 \quad (2)$$

wherein, $\mathcal{L}_{\text{recon}}$ is the reconstruction loss function, $\|\text{sg}[\mathbf{z}_e(\mathbf{x})] - \mathbf{z}_q(\mathbf{x})\|_2^2$ is the codebook loss, used only for updating the codebook to make the selected \mathbf{z}_q close to the encoder’s output \mathbf{z}_e , where sg is the stop-gradient operation. $\beta \cdot \|\text{sg}[\mathbf{z}_q(\mathbf{x})] - \mathbf{z}_e(\mathbf{x})\|_2^2$ is the commitment loss, applicable only to the encoder weights, which encourages the encoder’s output to stay close to the selected code, preventing it from fluctuating too frequently between code vectors. Additionally, since the prior distribution is uniform, and each codeword in $q_\phi(z|x)$ is a discrete integer, the KL divergence is constant.

Text-Attributed Graph (TAG). We define a TAG as a graph where each node has corresponding text. Define TAG as $G = (V, A, X)$ with nodes V and adjacency matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{|V| \times |V|}$, and node attributes as the $|V| \times d$ feature matrix X . In this paper, our research objective is node classification in TAG. Given a few labeled nodes y_L of $L \subseteq V$, the goal is to predict the labels y_U for the remaining unlabeled objects $U = V \setminus L$.

4 METHODOLOGY

Our framework consists of two parts:

(i) *Quantization of Modeling Ability.* By training the codebook based on the textual and spatial information of the TAG, we obtain quantized embeddings and relaxed distributions, alongside a codebook that encapsulates diverse graph structural information. These quantized embeddings and relaxed distributions represent the model’s capability to model graph structures.

(ii) *LLM’s graph structure learning.* Train LLM adapted for graph tasks and evaluate its graph structural modeling ability using established codebook. Further, improve the graph structural modeling capability through alignment with GNN’s quantized embeddings and relaxed distributions.

4.1 Quantization of GNN Modeling Ability

In this section, we will discuss the training of a codebook that accounts for both node text and spatial structure using VQ-VAE. Through the graph modality-specific codebook, we obtain quantized embeddings and relaxed distributions that represent the GNN’s ability to model graph structure. As illustrated in Stage 1 of Figure 2

4.1.1 Quantization of Text and Spatial Structure. First, we extract node embeddings $h_{node}^{(l)}$ and $h_{edge}^{(l)}$ by multi-layer aggregation through two GNN models. Then, according to the specific quantization selection method, we obtain a codeword z_{node}, z_{edge} from $E = e_1, e_2, \dots, e_K$. This can be described as follows:

$$h_{node}^{(l)} = \sigma(AGG_{\phi}(MSG_{\phi}(h_{NB(node)}^{(l-1)}, A), A), h_{edge}^{(l)} = \sigma(AGG_{\theta}(MSG_{\theta}(h_{NB(edge)}^{(l-1)}, A), A) \quad (3)$$

$$z_{node} = Lookup(E, h_{node}), z_{edge} = Lookup(E, h_{edge}) \quad (4)$$

Here, θ and ϕ respectively denote the GNN models focusing on node text information and spatial structure, while "Lookup" represents the method for selecting discretized codewords from the codebook. In the context of VQ-VAE, the embedding of the codebook is obtained through a nearest neighbor search. To enhance the representativeness of the quantized vectors, Section 4.1.2 introduces the utilization of the Gumbel-softmax relaxation technique for acquiring codebook vectors.

Subsequently, the codebook vectors z_{node} and z_{edge} are respectively passed through a simple linear projection layer ($p_{\omega} : z \rightarrow \hat{v}_i$) for node feature reconstruction and adjacency matrix reconstruction.

4.1.2 Gumbel softmax related disturbtion. Gumbel Softmax relaxation is a technique for handling discrete variables by allowing us to approximate the probability distribution of a discrete variable using a continuous, differentiable function. The discretization step in VQ-VAE, where a single codeword is selected, inherently neglects the structural information encapsulated by other codewords in the codebook, thereby limiting the comprehensive assessment of a GNN’s capacity to model intricate graphs. This shortfall motivates our choice of employing the Gumbel-Softmax relaxation technique. Formally, it can be expressed as:

$$g_i = -\log(-\log(u)), u \sim Uniform(0, 1) \quad (5)$$

$$p_i = \frac{\exp((\log(\pi_i) + g_i)/\tau)}{\sum_{j=1}^K \exp((\log(\pi_j) + g_j)\tau)}, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, K \quad (6)$$

$$z = \sum_{j=1}^k p_j z_j, j = 1, 2, \dots, k \quad (7)$$

Wherein, g_i denotes a sample from the Gumbel distribution, p_i represents the probability of selecting each codeword, and z signifies the quantized embedding. Following the application of Gumbel-Softmax, we obtain the quantized embedding Z and the relaxed distribution P , which effectively represent the model’s modeling of the graph modality. The temperature coefficient τ significantly governs the relaxation level of the distribution: higher values of τ promote a distribution closer to uniformity, whereas diminished values steer the distribution towards a sharper, nearly one-hot form. In our experiments, we adopt an annealing strategy to gradually decrease the value of τ over time.

We demonstrate in **Appendix G** that after using Gumbel softmax, the new random variable z is the same as the random variable π , that is, the probability of taking z is the same as the probability of taking π .

4.1.3 Optimization. Similar to VAE, we also optimize the ELBO(Eq 1), with the loss function as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{Stage1} &= \mathbb{E}_{q_{\phi}(z|x)}[\log p_{\theta}(x|z)] - D_{KL}(q_{\phi}(z|x)||p_{\theta}(z)) \\ &= \mathcal{L}_{edge_recon} + \alpha_{node} \mathcal{L}_{node_recon} + \beta_{KL} KL(q_{\phi}(z|x)||p_{\theta}(z)) \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{node_recon} = \underbrace{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left(1 - \frac{v_i^T \hat{v}_i}{\|v_i\| \cdot \|\hat{v}_i\|}\right)^{\gamma}}_{\text{node reconstruction}}, \gamma > 1 \quad (9)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{edge_recon} = \underbrace{\|A - \sigma(X \cdot X^T)\|_2^2}_{\text{edge reconstruction}} \quad (10)$$

Wherein, \mathcal{L}_{node_recon} is the reconstruction loss for node features, and the reconstruction loss is measured using the cosine error. Furthermore, a scalable variant, the Scaled Cosine Error γ , is introduced to further refine the cosine error metric. \mathcal{L}_{edge_recon} is the reconstruction loss for edges. Additionally, the term $KL(q_{\phi}(z|x)||p_{\theta}(z))$ embodies the Kullback-Leibler divergence, which serves

to encourage the posterior distribution of codeword selections, $q_\phi(z|x)$, to closely align with the prior distribution $p_\theta(z)$, which is uniform.

4.1.4 Other Methods for Selecting Vectors. A straightforward approach for selecting codebook vectors involves employing the argmax operation for nearest neighbor search. We conducted comparative experiments in Section 5.2 and found that using Gumbel Softmax has better performance. Additionally, we juxtaposed it with Gumbel-Argmax; however, both methods were found to inadequately capture a broader spectrum of graph structural variations, thereby underlining the advantage of the Gumbel-Softmax approach in retaining richer structural representations.

4.2 LLM’s graph structure learning

After Stage 1, we acquire the quantized embeddings and relaxed distributions representing both node text and spatial information. Next, we utilize the same approach to obtain the two components of the LLM and harmonize the GNN’s modeling capacity in an aligned manner. As Figure 2 Stage2

4.2.1 Alignment of Graph Structure Modeling Ability. We input the nodes’ linkage and textual information into the LLM and fine-tune it for the specific main task. Concurrently, we derive the quantized embeddings and relaxed distributions of the LLM utilizing the trained codebook according to Equations 567. Subsequently, we perform alignment of the two components separately.

Formally, for each node, we obtain the embeddings of the last layer of the LLM, h_{llm} , and the embedding extracted by the GNN, h_{gnn} . Then, through Gumbel Softmax relaxation processing, we obtain the weights for different codewords, p_{llm} and p_{gnn} , and the quantized embeddings, z_{llm} and z_{gnn} .

$$\begin{aligned} z_{llm}, p_{llm} &= \text{Gumbel_softmax}(h_{llm}) \\ z_{gnn}, p_{gnn} &= \text{Gumbel_softmax}(h_{gnn}) \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

The overall training loss of the LLM is

$$\mathcal{L}_{Stage2} = \mathcal{L}_{CE} + \alpha_{mse} \mathcal{L}_{MSE}(z_{llm}, z_{gnn}) + \beta_{kl} KL(p_{llm} || p_{gnn}) \quad (12)$$

Wherein, \mathcal{L}_{CE} is the loss function for node classification of the LLM, \mathcal{L}_{MSE} and KL divergence are the loss functions for measuring the LLM and GNN in terms of quantized embeddings and relaxed distributions. α_{mse} and β_{kl} are the corresponding hyperparameters.

4.2.2 LLM inference. During the inference stage, our model diverges from existing approaches by dispensing with the necessity of employing GNNs for extracting structural information or integrating supplementary external data. It is capable of performing robust inference tasks using textual information and link information alone. We successfully develop a codebook tailored to the graph data modality, thereby achieving alignment between the textual description of the graph and its topological structure in the LLM’s processing and execution.

4.3 Theoretical analysis

Our objective centers on learning the optimal quantized embedding value, z_{llm}^* , at the LLM end. Both z_{llm} and z_{gnn} (the quantized embedding at GNN end) are representations derived from graph structural information, which is informed by prior knowledge y . Specifically, we aim to learn z_{llm}^* by maximizing the conditional probability framework, refining these embeddings to encapsulate the structural essence conveyed by the graph under the guidance of y .

$$e^* = \arg \max \mathbb{E}_{p(z_{llm}, z_{gnn})} [p(y, z_{gnn} | z_{llm})] \quad (13)$$

Theorem. Maximizing the posterior probability given prior information y , represented as $E_p(z_{llm}, z_{gnn}) [p(y, z_{gnn} | z_{llm})]$, is equivalent to maximizing the mutual information $I(z_{llm}; z_{gnn})$ between the quantized embeddings z_{llm} from the LLM side and z_{gnn} from the GNN side.

Proof. Notably, the training process unfolds in stages, wherein the quantized embedding z_{gnn} from the GNN end is treated as static while optimizing the quantized embedding z_{llm} at the LLM end.

Type	Model	Arxiv	Pubmed	Cora	Arxiv2023	Average
Shallow embedding	GCN	0.7182	0.8031	0.8778	0.6760	0.7687
	GraphSage	0.7171	0.8881	0.8824	0.6906	0.7945
	GAT	0.7366	0.8328	0.8595	0.6784	0.7768
	RevGAT	0.7402	0.8850	0.8911	0.6979	0.8035
	DRGAT	0.7416	0.8962	0.8977	0.7003	0.8089
Raw text(title)	UniGraph	0.7291	0.7433	0.8184	—	—
	InstructGLM	0.7297	0.9105	0.8977	0.7651	0.8258
	GraphMAE2	0.7201	0.6983	0.8011	0.7163	0.7340
	LangTopo	0.7365	0.9287	0.8998	0.7738	0.8347
GNN transformer	Graphformer	0.6725	0.7699	0.8044	0.6287	0.7188
	Nodeformer	0.6960	0.7958	0.8848	0.6744	0.7627
LLM enhance GNN	GLEM	0.7580	0.9459	0.8856	0.7858	0.8438
	GraphEdit	0.7578	0.9409	0.9090	0.7966	0.8510
Embedding by LLM	LLaGA	0.7666	0.9503	0.8922	0.8037	0.8532
	ENGINE	0.7602	0.9477	0.9148	0.7976	0.8550
	LangTopo	0.7681	0.9667	0.9158	0.8126	0.8658

Table 1: Main Results. Experiments were conducted comparing four categories of baseline models. The evaluation metric used was accuracy, with top-performing results emphasized in **bold**.

This sequential approach permits us to derive the following insights:

$$\begin{aligned}
E_{p(z_{llm}, z_{gnn})}[p(y, z_{gnn} | z_{llm})] &\propto E_{p(z_{llm}, z_{gnn})} \log \int_Z \frac{p(y, z_{gnn} | z_{llm})}{p(z_{gnn})} dz \\
&= E_{p(z_{llm}, z_{gnn})} \log \frac{\int_Z p(y, z_{llm} | z_{gnn}) dz}{p(z_{llm})} \\
&= E_{p(z_{llm}, z_{gnn})} \log \frac{p(z_{llm} | z_{gnn})}{p(z_{llm})} = I(z_{llm}, z_{gnn}).
\end{aligned} \tag{14}$$


5 EXPERIMENTS

Dataset Settings. We evaluate the proposed model using several widely used public benchmark datasets (Cora, Pubmed), and one OGB dataset (Arxiv, Arxiv-2023) Hu et al. (2020). And Arxiv-2023 is employed to avoid data leakage issues. Details can be found in Appendix D.

Baselines. To evaluate the effectiveness of our proposed method, we compare it with several baselines from four categories. (1) Traditional GNN models including GCN Kipf and Welling (2016), GAT Veličković et al. (2017), GraphSage Defferrard et al. (2016), (2) Graph Transformers models such as Graphormers Yang et al. (2021) and NodeFormer Wu et al. (2022), (3) LM+GNN methods including GLEM Zhao et al. (2022) and GraphEdit Guo et al. (2024), (4) LLM-based methods, which are further divided into two subcategories: raw text input (UniGraph He and Hooi (2024), InstructGLM Ye et al. (2023), GIANT-XRT+GraphMAE2 Hou et al. (2023)) and embedding input (LLaGA Chen et al. (2024b), GraphAdapter Huang et al. (2024), ENGINE Zhu et al. (2024)). Details of these methods are in Appendix A.

Implementation Details. For fair comparison, we adopt GraphSAGE as the GNN model and shallow embedding. We employ the Llama-2-7B model as the base model. In the embedding input category of LLM-based methods, we use TAPE. Additionally, we compare different embeddings in the Appendix B. In terms of codebook training, we adjust the hyperparameters such as codebook dimension and size based on different datasets, with more details provided in the Appendix E. The computing resource is NVIDIA RTX A800 80G.

Figure 3: The distribution of codebook embeddings with different strategies on the unit hypersphere.



5.1 Main Result

We evaluate LangTopo against several baseline models on three public datasets, and the results are summarized in Table 1. It is evident that LangTopo demonstrates remarkable performance across all datasets. Whether employing raw text as input or utilizing preprocessed embeddings, LangTopo consistently outperforms other models with LLM integration. Furthermore, we observe that using raw text directly yields inferior outcomes compared to using text embeddings. We attribute this discrepancy to the potential challenge LLMs face in handling lengthy texts, as raw texts tend to be extensive.

5.2 Codebook Analysis

In this subsection, we conduct a detailed analysis and comparison of the performance and effectiveness of the codebook.

Different Methods for selecting Vectors. Our experiments employed Gumbel softmax relaxation for the calculation of quantized embeddings. Additionally, we compared the selection of quantized embeddings using Argmin cosine, euclidean distance, and Gumbel argmax.

Table 2 showcases the evaluation of codebooks constructed via differing strategies, revealing that Gumbel-softmax relaxation notably excels in creating a codebook with a high utilization rate. This characteristic is particularly advantageous for accurately modeling intricate graph datasets. In comparison, using argmax Euc yields the worst results, while the effects of cosine distance and Gumbel argmax are similar. In Figure 3, we visualized the distribution of codebook embeddings with different strategies on the unit hypersphere, further demonstrating the effectiveness of the Gumbel softmax relaxation. Its embedding distribution is more uniform and exhibits better generalization performance.

Table 2: code perplexity and usage rate. Code perplexity represents the model’s average usage of the codebook, while the usage rate indicates the model’s utilization of the codebook. Generally, higher values are preferable.

Methods	Gumbel softmax	Gumbel argmax	argmax Cos	argmax Euc
#perplexity	2263	1230	1168	778
#usage	0.7324	0.493	0.501	0.323

5.3 Ablation Study

Loss Ablation. To delve deeper into understanding the influence of different loss functions on codebook construction and enhance the graph structural modeling capability of LLMs, we conducted an ablation study on the arxiv dataset, as shown in Figure 4 .

As evident from the table, each loss function in the LangTopo structure plays a crucial role, and we observe a positive correlation between the improved codebook utilization by LLMs and the accuracy in LLM node classification, further validating the correctness of the design direction of the LangTopo architecture.




Figure 4: Our investigation into diverse loss functions within the LangTopy architecture has substantiated the importance and efficacy of individual loss functions. The left figure examines the efficacy of node reconstruction and edge reconstruction loss functions, while the right figure delves into the importance of relaxed distributions and quantized embeddings in the learning process of LLMs.

Effect of different Hop. We conducted an ablation study to investigate the contributions of our varying hop ranges to LangTopo’s performance. To this end, we examined the impact of different hop ranges – 0-hop, 1-hop, and 2-hop – on LangTopo’s efficacy across three datasets, as well as the contribution of these different hop ranges to LLMs’ graph task-solving abilities without the LangTopo framework. The results, visible in Table 3, lead us to the following conclusions:

- (i) Compared to scenarios without LangTopo, the use of LangTopo yields superior performance in both 1-hop and 2-hop settings. However, in the 0-hop configuration, LangTopo does not exhibit any difference in effect, which aligns with expectations. Because LangTopo cannot model graph structure effectively without structural information, as it is inherently designed to leverage such details.
- (ii) LangTopo achieves its best performance in the 2-hop setting, whereas the without LangTopo only attains optimal results in the 1-hop scenario. These experiments further substantiate that LangTopo enhances the LLM’s capability to model graph structures.

Methods	hop	ARXIV	Pubmed	Cora
w/o LangTopo	0-hop	73.88	94.09	85.64
	1-hop	76.01	94.60	89.31
	2-hop	75.78	94.01	89.12
w LangTopo	0-hop	73.85	94.17	85.49
	1-hop	76.64	96.53	91.45
	2-hop	76.81	96.67	91.58

Table 3: Effect comparison under different hop counts between with LangTopo and without LangTopo.

Effect of different LLM. In our main experiment, Llama-2-7B serves as the foundational model. We extend our study beyond Llama-2-7B, considering alternative models such as Vicuna-7B Chiang et al. (2023), and OPT-2.7B Zhang et al. (2022). The results after substituting these models are presented in Table 9

Table 4: Performance comparison using different LLM.

LLM	Arxiv	Pubmed	Cora
OPT-2.7B	0.7677	0.9629	0.9184
vicuna-7B	0.7679	0.9654	0.9177
Llama-2-7B	0.7681	0.9667	0.9158

Others. We assess the impact of different embeddings in Appendix B, examine the influence of selecting different GNNs on model performance in Appendix F, provide details on prompt design in Appendix H, and investigate the differing outcomes of rich versus minimal text in Appendix C.

6 CONCLUSION

We present an innovative graph structural learning framework, LangTopo, tailored for LLMs. This framework harnesses an approach to quantify the graph modeling capacities of GNNs and LLMs, thereby achieving a substantial enhancement in LLMs' comprehension of graph topologies. Moreover, LangTopo transcends the limitations of prevailing paradigms that necessitate external models to apprehend graph structures during the inference phase. Standing as a pioneering work, LangTopo is poised to furnish a robust benchmark for guiding future advancements within this domain.

Limitation. A limitation in our experimental setup is the unexplored scenario of jointly training with multiple datasets for graph modality codebooks. Presently, our evaluations are confined to individual datasets. In future, we intend to investigate the generalizability and scalability of LangTopo.

References

- Claude Berge. 2001. *The theory of graphs*. Courier Corporation.
- Deli Chen, Yankai Lin, Wei Li, Peng Li, Jie Zhou, and Xu Sun. 2020. Measuring and relieving the over-smoothing problem for graph neural networks from the topological view. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, Vol. 34. 3438–3445.
- Runjin Chen, Tong Zhao, Ajay Jaiswal, Neil Shah, and Zhangyang Wang. 2024b. LLaGA: Large Language and Graph Assistant. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.08170* (2024).
- Zhikai Chen, Haitao Mao, Hang Li, Wei Jin, Hongzhi Wen, Xiaochi Wei, Shuaiqiang Wang, Dawei Yin, Wenqi Fan, Hui Liu, et al. 2024a. Exploring the potential of large language models (llms) in learning on graphs. *ACM SIGKDD Explorations Newsletter* 25, 2 (2024), 42–61.
- Wei-Lin Chiang, Zhuohan Li, Zi Lin, Ying Sheng, Zhanghao Wu, Hao Zhang, Lianmin Zheng, Siyuan Zhuang, Yonghao Zhuang, Joseph E Gonzalez, et al. 2023. Vicuna: An open-source chatbot impressing gpt-4 with 90%* chatgpt quality, March 2023. URL <https://lmsys.org/blog/2023-03-30-vicuna> 3, 5 (2023).
- Michaël Defferrard, Xavier Bresson, and Pierre Vandergheynst. 2016. Convolutional neural networks on graphs with fast localized spectral filtering. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 29 (2016).
- Danny Driess, Fei Xia, Mehdi SM Sajjadi, Corey Lynch, Aakanksha Chowdhery, Brian Ichter, Ayzaan Wahid, Jonathan Tompson, Quan Vuong, Tianhe Yu, et al. 2023. Palm-e: An embodied multimodal language model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.03378* (2023).
- Keyu Duan, Qian Liu, Tat-Seng Chua, Shuicheng Yan, Wei Tsang Ooi, Qizhe Xie, and Junxian He. 2023. Simteg: A frustratingly simple approach improves textual graph learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.02565* (2023).
- Jhony H Giraldo, Konstantinos Skianis, Thierry Bouwmans, and Fragkiskos D Malliaros. 2023. On the trade-off between over-smoothing and over-squashing in deep graph neural networks. In *Proceedings of the 32nd ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management*. 566–576.
- Zirui Guo, Lianghao Xia, Yanhua Yu, Yuling Wang, Zixuan Yang, Wei Wei, Liang Pang, Tat-Seng Chua, and Chao Huang. 2024. GraphEdit: Large Language Models for Graph Structure Learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.15183* (2024).
- Xiaoxin He, Xavier Bresson, Thomas Laurent, Adam Perold, Yann LeCun, and Bryan Hooi. 2023. Harnessing explanations: Llm-to-lm interpreter for enhanced text-attributed graph representation learning. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Yufei He and Bryan Hooi. 2024. UniGraph: Learning a Cross-Domain Graph Foundation Model From Natural Language. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.13630* (2024).
- Zhenyu Hou, Yufei He, Yukuo Cen, Xiao Liu, Yuxiao Dong, Evgeny Kharlamov, and Jie Tang. 2023. Graphmae2: A decoding-enhanced masked self-supervised graph learner. In *Proceedings of the ACM Web Conference 2023*. 737–746.
- Weihua Hu, Matthias Fey, Marinka Zitnik, Yuxiao Dong, Hongyu Ren, Bowen Liu, Michele Catasta, and Jure Leskovec. 2020. Open graph benchmark: Datasets for machine learning on graphs. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 33 (2020), 22118–22133.
- Jin Huang, Xingjian Zhang, Qiaozhu Mei, and Jiaqi Ma. 2023. Can llms effectively leverage graph structural information: when and why. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.16595* (2023).
- Xuanwen Huang, Kaiqiao Han, Yang Yang, Dezheng Bao, Quanjin Tao, Ziwei Chai, and Qi Zhu. 2024. Can GNN be Good Adapter for LLMs? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.12984* (2024).
- Eric Jang, Shixiang Gu, and Ben Poole. 2016. Categorical Reparameterization with Gumbel-Softmax. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.

- Diederik P Kingma and Max Welling. 2013. Auto-encoding variational bayes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1312.6114* (2013).
- Thomas N Kipf and Max Welling. 2016. Semi-Supervised Classification with Graph Convolutional Networks. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Chaozhuo Li, Bochen Pang, Yuming Liu, Hao Sun, Zheng Liu, Xing Xie, Tianqi Yang, Yanling Cui, Liangjie Zhang, and Qi Zhang. 2021b. Adsgnn: Behavior-graph augmented relevance modeling in sponsored search. In *Proceedings of the 44th international ACM SIGIR conference on research and development in information retrieval*. 223–232.
- Guohao Li, Matthias Müller, Bernard Ghanem, and Vladlen Koltun. 2021a. Training graph neural networks with 1000 layers. In *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 6437–6449.
- Xiang Li, Renyu Zhu, Yao Cheng, Caihua Shan, Siqiang Luo, Dongsheng Li, and Weining Qian. 2022. Finding global homophily in graph neural networks when meeting heterophily. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 13242–13256.
- Meng Liu, Hongyang Gao, and Shuiwang Ji. 2020. Towards deeper graph neural networks. In *Proceedings of the 26th ACM SIGKDD international conference on knowledge discovery & data mining*. 338–348.
- Sitao Luan, Chenqing Hua, Qincheng Lu, Jiaqi Zhu, Mingde Zhao, Shuyuan Zhang, Xiao-Wen Chang, and Doina Precup. 2022. Revisiting heterophily for graph neural networks. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 35 (2022), 1362–1375.
- Yao Ma, Xiaorui Liu, Neil Shah, and Jiliang Tang. 2021. Is homophily a necessity for graph neural networks? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.06134* (2021).
- Péter Mernyei and Cătălina Cangea. 2020. Wiki-cs: A wikipedia-based benchmark for graph neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.02901* (2020).
- R OpenAI. 2023. Gpt-4 technical report. arxiv 2303.08774. *View in Article* 2, 5 (2023).
- Oleksandr Shchur, Maximilian Mumme, Aleksandar Bojchevski, and Stephan Günnemann. 2018. Pitfalls of Graph Neural Network Evaluation. *arXiv e-prints* (2018), arXiv–1811.
- Ishika Singh, Valts Blukis, Arsalan Mousavian, Ankit Goyal, Danfei Xu, Jonathan Tremblay, Dieter Fox, Jesse Thomason, and Animesh Garg. 2023. Progprompt: Generating situated robot task plans using large language models. In *2023 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*. IEEE, 11523–11530.
- Shengyin Sun, Yuxiang Ren, Chen Ma, and Xuechang Zhang. 2023. Large language models as topological structure enhancers for text-attributed graphs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.14324* (2023).
- Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajjwal Bhargava, Shruti Bhosale, et al. 2023. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09288* (2023).
- Aaron Van Den Oord, Oriol Vinyals, et al. 2017. Neural discrete representation learning. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 30 (2017).
- Petar Veličković, Guillem Cucurull, Arantxa Casanova, Adriana Romero, Pietro Lio, and Yoshua Bengio. 2017. Graph attention networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1710.10903* (2017).
- Kuansan Wang, Zhihong Shen, Chiyuan Huang, Chieh-Han Wu, Yuxiao Dong, and Anshul Kanakia. 2020. Microsoft academic graph: When experts are not enough. *Quantitative Science Studies* 1, 1 (2020), 396–413.
- Xinyuan Wang, Liang Wu, Liangjie Hong, Hao Liu, and Yanjie Fu. 2024. LLM-Enhanced User-Item Interactions: Leveraging Edge Information for Optimized Recommendations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.09617* (2024).

- Likang Wu, Zhaopeng Qiu, Zhi Zheng, Hengshu Zhu, and Enhong Chen. 2024. Exploring large language model for graph data understanding in online job recommendations. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, Vol. 38. 9178–9186.
- Likang Wu, Hongke Zhao, Zhi Li, Zhenya Huang, Qi Liu, and Enhong Chen. 2023. Learning the explainable semantic relations via unified graph topic-disentangled neural networks. *ACM Transactions on Knowledge Discovery from Data* 17, 8 (2023), 1–23.
- Qitian Wu, Wentao Zhao, Zenan Li, David P Wipf, and Junchi Yan. 2022. Nodeformer: A scalable graph structure learning transformer for node classification. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 35 (2022), 27387–27401.
- Junhan Yang, Zheng Liu, Shitao Xiao, Chaozhuo Li, Defu Lian, Sanjay Agrawal, Amit Singh, Guangzhong Sun, and Xing Xie. 2021. Graphformers: Gnn-nested transformers for representation learning on textual graph. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 34 (2021), 28798–28810.
- Ruosong Ye, Caiqi Zhang, Runhui Wang, Shuyuan Xu, and Yongfeng Zhang. 2023. Natural language is all a graph needs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.07134* (2023).
- Mengmei Zhang, Mingwei Sun, Peng Wang, Shen Fan, Yanhu Mo, Xiaoxiao Xu, Hong Liu, Cheng Yang, and Chuan Shi. 2024. GraphTranslator: Aligning Graph Model to Large Language Model for Open-ended Tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.07197* (2024).
- Susan Zhang, Stephen Roller, Naman Goyal, Mikel Artetxe, Moya Chen, Shuohui Chen, Christopher Dewan, Mona Diab, Xian Li, Xi Victoria Lin, et al. 2022. Opt: Open pre-trained transformer language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.01068* (2022).
- Jianan Zhao, Meng Qu, Chaozhuo Li, Hao Yan, Qian Liu, Rui Li, Xing Xie, and Jian Tang. 2022. Learning on large-scale text-attributed graphs via variational inference. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.14709* (2022).
- Jianan Zhao, Le Zhuo, Yikang Shen, Meng Qu, Kai Liu, Michael Bronstein, Zhaocheng Zhu, and Jian Tang. 2023. GraphText: Graph reasoning in text space. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.01089* (2023).
- Jiong Zhu, Ryan A Rossi, Anup Rao, Tung Mai, Nedim Lipka, Nesreen K Ahmed, and Danai Koutra. 2021. Graph neural networks with heterophily. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, Vol. 35. 11168–11176.
- Yun Zhu, Yaoke Wang, Haizhou Shi, and Siliang Tang. 2024. Efficient Tuning and Inference for Large Language Models on Textual Graphs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.15569* (2024).

A Baseline

Traditional GNNs: This work employs five simple yet widely-used GNN models, namely GCN Kipf and Welling (2016), GraphSAGE Van Den Oord et al. (2017), GAT Veličković et al. (2017), DR-GAT Li et al. (2021a), and RevGAT Luan et al. (2022).

GraphFormers Yang et al. (2021): These are graph transformers with nested GNN layers originally designed for link prediction tasks.

NodeFormer Wu et al. (2022): It is an efficient large-graph transformer tool that devises a kernelized Gumbel-Softmax operator.

GLEM Sun et al. (2023): This is an effective framework, integrating large language models (LLMs) with GNNs via a variational EM framework during training.

GraphEdit Guo et al. (2024): It enhances the reliability of graph structure learning by effectively denoising noisy inputs through the leveraging of LLMs.

UniGraph He and Hooi (2024): It adopts a masking strategy to facilitate joint training of LLMs and GNNs under cascaded structures, enabling generalization to other graphs and datasets.

InstructGLM Ye et al. (2023): It utilizes LLM-based instruction fine-tuning to describe the geometric structure of graphs and node features, tackling graph tasks thereby.

LLaGA Chen et al. (2024b): It reformats link information between nodes into sequential data, feeding LLM-compatible sequential inputs while preserving node structure, achieved through instruction fine-tuning.

ENGINE Zhu et al. (2024): By devising tunable side structures, it combines LLMs with GNNs and employs various strategies to expedite model training and inference.

B Effect of different Embedding

To evaluate the impact of different embeddings on model performance, we selected OGB embeddings and GIANT embeddings for comparison with various GNN models, and the results are as shown in the table. It can be observed that LangTopo consistently outperforms GNN models across different embedding scenarios.

Table 5: Performance comparison using different embeddings(arxiv).

LM	GCN	SAGE	GAT	RevGAT	DRGAT	LangTopo
OGB	0.7174	0.7119	0.7366	0.7402	0.7416	0.7451
GIANT	0.7329	0.7435	0.7416	0.7590	0.7611	0.7624

C rich and scarce text

We have delved into the capacity of LLMs to utilize textual information, categorizing it into two primary types: 1) Rich Text, comprising both summaries and titles, and 2) Scarce Text, which is limited to titles only. The outcomes, as depicted in the table 6, indicate that LLMs experience a notable enhancement when furnished with rich text.

Table 6: Performance comparison between rich text(abstract title) and scarce text(title). raw text

LLM	Arxiv	Pubmed	Cora
rich	0.7598	0.9395	0.9085
title	0.7365	0.9287	0.8998

D Dataset

We have compiled statistical measures for each dataset, as illustrated in the table 7 provided. Furthermore, we employed the arxiv2023 dataset, which compiles scholarly articles from the arXiv website for the year 2023. This strategic choice was made to circumvent potential data leakage issues arising from the use of corpus included in the dataset during the pre-training phase of the LLMs.

Table 7: Statistics of the evaluation datasets.

Dataset	Arxiv	Pubmed	Cora	arxiv23
#Nodes	169343	19717	2708	46198
#edges	1166243	44338	5429	78548
#Classes	40	3	7	40
#Split ratio(%)	54/18/28	60/20/20	60/20/20	60/20/20

E Hyperparameters

Table E furnishes the hyperparameters for LangTopo across various datasets. For more detailed configurations, please refer to our source code.

Table 8: Hyperparameters for the Arxiv, Pubmed, and Citeseer.

Hyperparameters	Arxiv	Pubmed	Citeseer
GNN			
layers	3	2	2
hidden dim	512	256	256
learning rate	0.001	0.005	0.005
dropout	0.5	0.5	0.5
epoch	1000	1000	1000
early stop	50	50	50
codebook size	4096	2048	2048
α_{node}	10	10	10
β_{KL}	1e-2	1e-2	1e-2
LLM			
learning rate	5e-5	5e-5	5e-5
warmup	0.05	0.05	0.05
gradient accumulation steps	8	8	8
batch size	4	4	4
α_{mse}	0.5	0.1	0.1
β_{kl}	1e-4	1e-4	1e-4

F Effect of different GNN

We conducted an exploration of LangTopo by substituting it with different GNN models.

Table 9: Performance comparison using different GNN.

LLM	Arxiv	Pubmed	Cora
GCN	0.7640	0.9566	0.9012
GraphSage	0.7681	0.9667	0.9158
GAT	0.7704	0.9633	0.9123

G Gumbel softmax

We will show that using gumbel softmax does not change the selection probability distribution. Consider a K -dimensional output vector where each component is denoted x_k . The probability of obtaining each dimension via the softmax function is:

$$p_{i_k} = \frac{e^{x_k}}{\sum_{k'=1}^K e^{x_{k'}}} \quad (15)$$

If we add independent standard Gumbel noise (with scale parameter 1 and location parameter 0) to each x_k , and select the dimension corresponding to the maximum value as the output, it is claimed that the resulting probability remains π_k . We proceed to prove this assertion. The probability density function (PDF) of a Gumbel distribution (with scale 1 and location μ) is:

$$f(z; \mu) = e^{-(z-\mu)-e^{-(z-\mu)}},$$

and its cumulative distribution function (CDF) is:

$$F(z; \mu) = e^{-e^{-(z-\mu)}}.$$

Assuming the k -th Gumbel distribution corresponds to x_k , yielding $z_k = x_k + G_k$, where G_k follows a Gumbel distribution with location parameter x_k , we aim to show that the probability of obtaining z_k is indeed π_k , i.e.,

$$P(z_k \geq z_{k'}, \forall k' \neq k | \{x_{k'}\}_{k'=1}^K) = \pi_k.$$

The conditional cumulative probability for z_k is then:

$$P(z_k \geq z_{k'}, \forall k' \neq k | z_k, \{x_{k'}\}_{k'=1}^K) = \prod_{k' \neq k} e^{-e^{-(z_k - x_{k'})}}.$$

Integrating over z_k to obtain the marginal probability yields:

$$\begin{aligned} & P(z_k \geq z_{k'}, \forall k' \neq k | \{x_{k'}\}_{k'=1}^K) \\ &= \int P(z_k \geq z_{k'}, \forall k' \neq k | z_k, \{x_{k'}\}_{k'=1}^K) \cdot f(z_k; x_k) dz_k \\ &= \int \prod_{k' \neq k} e^{-e^{-(z_k - x_{k'})}} \cdot e^{-(z_k - x_k) - e^{-(z_k - x_k)}} dz_k \\ &= \int e^{-\sum_{k' \neq k} e^{-(z_k - x_{k'})} - (z_k - x_k) - e^{-(z_k - x_k)}} dz_k \\ &= \int e^{-\sum_{k' \neq k} e^{-(z_k - x_{k'})} - (z_k - x_k) - e^{-(z_k - x_k)}} dz_k \\ &= \int e^{-\sum_{k'=1}^K e^{-(z_k - x_{k'})} - z_k + x_k} dz_k \\ &= \int e^{-e^{-z_k + \ln(\sum_{k'=1}^K e^{x_{k'}})} - z_k + x_k} dz_k \\ &= e^{-\ln(\sum_{k'=1}^K e^{x_{k'}}) + x_k} \int e^{-e^{-(z_k - \ln(\sum_{k'=1}^K e^{x_{k'}}))} - (z_k - \ln(\sum_{k'=1}^K e^{x_{k'}}))} dz_k \\ &= \frac{e^{x_k}}{\sum_{k'=1}^K e^{x_{k'}}} \int e^{-e^{-(z_k - \ln(\sum_{k'=1}^K e^{x_{k'}}))} - (z_k - \ln(\sum_{k'=1}^K e^{x_{k'}}))} dz_k \\ &= \frac{e^{x_k}}{\sum_{k'=1}^K e^{x_{k'}}} \int -e^{-(z_k - \ln(\sum_{k'=1}^K e^{x_{k'}}))} - e^{(z_k - \ln(\sum_{k'=1}^K e^{x_{k'}}))} dz_k \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

Inside the integral, we consider a Gumbel distribution characterized by $\mu = \ln(\sum_{k'=1}^K e^{x_{k'}})$, from which it is known that the integral evaluates to 1. Consequently, this leads us to the conclusion that

$$P(z_k \geq z_{k'}, \forall k' \neq k | \{x_{k'}\}_{k'=1}^K) = \frac{e^{x_k}}{\sum_{k'=1}^K e^{x_{k'}}},$$

which is consistent with the output of the softmax function.

H Prompt in different dataset

	Prompt
Cora	"<User>: Given a node {text attribute}. the node connect {link information}. Categorize the nodes into groups 'theory', 'reinforcement learning', 'neural networks', 'probabilistic methods', 'case based', and 'rule learning', according to the given information. the node {text attribute} is classified as <Assistant>: {label}"
Pubmed	"<User>: Given a node {text attribute}. the node connect {link information}. Categorize the nodes into groups 'Diabetes Mellitus, Experimental', 'Diabetes Mellitus, Type 2', and 'Diabetes Mellitus, Type 1' according to the given information. the node {text attribute} is classified as <Assistant>: {label}"
Arxiv	"<User>: Given a node {text attribute}, the node connect {link information}. We need to classify the node into 40 classes: 'Numerical Analysis', 'Multimedia', 'Logic in Computer Science', 'Computers and Society', 'Cryptography and Security', 'Distributed, Parallel, and Cluster Computing', 'Human-Computer Interaction', 'Computational Engineering, Finance, and Science', 'Networking and Internet Architecture', 'Computational Complexity', 'Artificial Intelligence', 'Multiagent Systems', 'General Literature', 'Neural and Evolutionary Computing', 'Symbolic Computation', 'Hardware Architecture', 'Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition', 'Graphics', 'Emerging Technologies', 'Systems and Control', 'Computational Geometry', 'Other Computer Science', 'Programming Languages', 'Software Engineering', 'Machine Learning', 'Sound', 'Social and Information Networks', 'Robotics', 'Information Theory', 'Performance', 'Computation and Language', 'Information Retrieval', 'Mathematical Software', 'Formal Languages and Automata Theory', 'Data Structures and Algorithms', 'Operating Systems', 'Computer Science and Game Theory', 'Databases', 'Digital Libraries', 'Discrete Mathematics'. the node {text attribute} is classified as <Assistant>: {label}"
Arxiv2023	"<User>: Given a node {text attribute}, the node connect {link information}. We need to classify the node into 40 classes: 'Numerical Analysis', 'Multimedia', 'Logic in Computer Science', 'Computers and Society', 'Cryptography and Security', 'Distributed, Parallel, and Cluster Computing', 'Human-Computer Interaction', 'Computational Engineering, Finance, and Science', 'Networking and Internet Architecture', 'Computational Complexity', 'Artificial Intelligence', 'Multiagent Systems', 'General Literature', 'Neural and Evolutionary Computing', 'Symbolic Computation', 'Hardware Architecture', 'Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition', 'Graphics', 'Emerging Technologies', 'Systems and Control', 'Computational Geometry', 'Other Computer Science', 'Programming Languages', 'Software Engineering', 'Machine Learning', 'Sound', 'Social and Information Networks', 'Robotics', 'Information Theory', 'Performance', 'Computation and Language', 'Information Retrieval', 'Mathematical Software', 'Formal Languages and Automata Theory', 'Data Structures and Algorithms', 'Operating Systems', 'Computer Science and Game Theory', 'Databases', 'Digital Libraries', 'Discrete Mathematics'. the node {text attribute} is classified as <Assistant>: {label}"

Table 10: A table with different prompt

NeurIPS Paper Checklist

1. Claims

Question: Do the main claims made in the abstract and introduction accurately reflect the paper's contributions and scope?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: The abstract and introduction have accurately expressed the topic of the paper

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the abstract and introduction do not include the claims made in the paper.
- The abstract and/or introduction should clearly state the claims made, including the contributions made in the paper and important assumptions and limitations. A No or NA answer to this question will not be perceived well by the reviewers.
- The claims made should match theoretical and experimental results, and reflect how much the results can be expected to generalize to other settings.
- It is fine to include aspirational goals as motivation as long as it is clear that these goals are not attained by the paper.

2. Limitations

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

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: The relevant limitations of the paper have been discussed, and the relevant exploration has been insufficient.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper has no limitation while the answer No means that the paper has limitations, but those are not discussed in the paper.
- The authors are encouraged to create a separate "Limitations" section in their paper.
- The paper should point out any strong assumptions and how robust the results are to violations of these assumptions (e.g., independence assumptions, noiseless settings, model well-specification, asymptotic approximations only holding locally). The authors should reflect on how these assumptions might be violated in practice and what the implications would be.
- The authors should reflect on the scope of the claims made, e.g., if the approach was only tested on a few datasets or with a few runs. In general, empirical results often depend on implicit assumptions, which should be articulated.
- The authors should reflect on the factors that influence the performance of the approach. For example, a facial recognition algorithm may perform poorly when image resolution is low or images are taken in low lighting. Or a speech-to-text system might not be used reliably to provide closed captions for online lectures because it fails to handle technical jargon.
- The authors should discuss the computational efficiency of the proposed algorithms and how they scale with dataset size.
- If applicable, the authors should discuss possible limitations of their approach to address problems of privacy and fairness.
- While the authors might fear that complete honesty about limitations might be used by reviewers as grounds for rejection, a worse outcome might be that reviewers discover limitations that aren't acknowledged in the paper. The authors should use their best judgment and recognize that individual actions in favor of transparency play an important role in developing norms that preserve the integrity of the community. Reviewers will be specifically instructed to not penalize honesty concerning limitations.

3. Theory Assumptions and Proofs

Question: For each theoretical result, does the paper provide the full set of assumptions and a complete (and correct) proof?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: Hypotheses and proofs are provided in the body and appendix

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not include theoretical results.
- All the theorems, formulas, and proofs in the paper should be numbered and cross-referenced.
- All assumptions should be clearly stated or referenced in the statement of any theorems.
- The proofs can either appear in the main paper or the supplemental material, but if they appear in the supplemental material, the authors are encouraged to provide a short proof sketch to provide intuition.
- Inversely, any informal proof provided in the core of the paper should be complemented by formal proofs provided in appendix or supplemental material.
- Theorems and Lemmas that the proof relies upon should be properly referenced.

4. Experimental Result Reproducibility

Question: Does the paper fully disclose all the information needed to reproduce the main experimental results of the paper to the extent that it affects the main claims and/or conclusions of the paper (regardless of whether the code and data are provided or not)?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: We provide the data and code

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not include experiments.
- If the paper includes experiments, a No answer to this question will not be perceived well by the reviewers: Making the paper reproducible is important, regardless of whether the code and data are provided or not.
- If the contribution is a dataset and/or model, the authors should describe the steps taken to make their results reproducible or verifiable.
- Depending on the contribution, reproducibility can be accomplished in various ways. For example, if the contribution is a novel architecture, describing the architecture fully might suffice, or if the contribution is a specific model and empirical evaluation, it may be necessary to either make it possible for others to replicate the model with the same dataset, or provide access to the model. In general, releasing code and data is often one good way to accomplish this, but reproducibility can also be provided via detailed instructions for how to replicate the results, access to a hosted model (e.g., in the case of a large language model), releasing of a model checkpoint, or other means that are appropriate to the research performed.
- While NeurIPS does not require releasing code, the conference does require all submissions to provide some reasonable avenue for reproducibility, which may depend on the nature of the contribution. For example
 - (a) If the contribution is primarily a new algorithm, the paper should make it clear how to reproduce that algorithm.
 - (b) If the contribution is primarily a new model architecture, the paper should describe the architecture clearly and fully.
 - (c) If the contribution is a new model (e.g., a large language model), then there should either be a way to access this model for reproducing the results or a way to reproduce the model (e.g., with an open-source dataset or instructions for how to construct the dataset).
 - (d) We recognize that reproducibility may be tricky in some cases, in which case authors are welcome to describe the particular way they provide for reproducibility. In the case of closed-source models, it may be that access to the model is limited in some way (e.g., to registered users), but it should be possible for other researchers to have some path to reproducing or verifying the results.

5. Open access to data and code

Question: Does the paper provide open access to the data and code, with sufficient instructions to faithfully reproduce the main experimental results, as described in supplemental material?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: We provide the corresponding data and code in zip file

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that paper does not include experiments requiring code.
- Please see the NeurIPS code and data submission guidelines (<https://nips.cc/public/guides/CodeSubmissionPolicy>) for more details.
- While we encourage the release of code and data, we understand that this might not be possible, so “No” is an acceptable answer. Papers cannot be rejected simply for not including code, unless this is central to the contribution (e.g., for a new open-source benchmark).
- The instructions should contain the exact command and environment needed to run to reproduce the results. See the NeurIPS code and data submission guidelines (<https://nips.cc/public/guides/CodeSubmissionPolicy>) for more details.
- The authors should provide instructions on data access and preparation, including how to access the raw data, preprocessed data, intermediate data, and generated data, etc.
- The authors should provide scripts to reproduce all experimental results for the new proposed method and baselines. If only a subset of experiments are reproducible, they should state which ones are omitted from the script and why.
- At submission time, to preserve anonymity, the authors should release anonymized versions (if applicable).
- Providing as much information as possible in supplemental material (appended to the paper) is recommended, but including URLs to data and code is permitted.

6. Experimental Setting/Details

Question: Does the paper specify all the training and test details (e.g., data splits, hyper-parameters, how they were chosen, type of optimizer, etc.) necessary to understand the results?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: We provide the corresponding data and code in zip file

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not include experiments.
- The experimental setting should be presented in the core of the paper to a level of detail that is necessary to appreciate the results and make sense of them.
- The full details can be provided either with the code, in appendix, or as supplemental material.

7. Experiment Statistical Significance

Question: Does the paper report error bars suitably and correctly defined or other appropriate information about the statistical significance of the experiments?

Answer: [No]

Justification: For LLM, the effect of repeated experiments is stable

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not include experiments.
- The authors should answer "Yes" if the results are accompanied by error bars, confidence intervals, or statistical significance tests, at least for the experiments that support the main claims of the paper.
- The factors of variability that the error bars are capturing should be clearly stated (for example, train/test split, initialization, random drawing of some parameter, or overall run with given experimental conditions).
- The method for calculating the error bars should be explained (closed form formula, call to a library function, bootstrap, etc.)
- The assumptions made should be given (e.g., Normally distributed errors).
- It should be clear whether the error bar is the standard deviation or the standard error of the mean.

- It is OK to report 1-sigma error bars, but one should state it. The authors should preferably report a 2-sigma error bar than state that they have a 96% CI, if the hypothesis of Normality of errors is not verified.
- For asymmetric distributions, the authors should be careful not to show in tables or figures symmetric error bars that would yield results that are out of range (e.g. negative error rates).
- If error bars are reported in tables or plots, The authors should explain in the text how they were calculated and reference the corresponding figures or tables in the text.

8. Experiments Compute Resources

Question: For each experiment, does the paper provide sufficient information on the computer resources (type of compute workers, memory, time of execution) needed to reproduce the experiments?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: We provided the appropriate information

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not include experiments.
- The paper should indicate the type of compute workers CPU or GPU, internal cluster, or cloud provider, including relevant memory and storage.
- The paper should provide the amount of compute required for each of the individual experimental runs as well as estimate the total compute.
- The paper should disclose whether the full research project required more compute than the experiments reported in the paper (e.g., preliminary or failed experiments that didn't make it into the paper).

9. Code Of Ethics

Question: Does the research conducted in the paper conform, in every respect, with the NeurIPS Code of Ethics [https://neurips.cc/public/EthicsGuidelines?](https://neurips.cc/public/EthicsGuidelines)

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: Our experiment is ethical

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the authors have not reviewed the NeurIPS Code of Ethics.
- If the authors answer No, they should explain the special circumstances that require a deviation from the Code of Ethics.
- The authors should make sure to preserve anonymity (e.g., if there is a special consideration due to laws or regulations in their jurisdiction).

10. Broader Impacts

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

Answer: [NA]

Justification: Our experiment didn't make a difference

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that there is no societal impact of the work performed.
- If the authors answer NA or No, they should explain why their work has no societal impact or why the paper does not address societal impact.
- Examples of negative societal impacts include potential malicious or unintended uses (e.g., disinformation, generating fake profiles, surveillance), fairness considerations (e.g., deployment of technologies that could make decisions that unfairly impact specific groups), privacy considerations, and security considerations.
- The conference expects that many papers will be foundational research and not tied to particular applications, let alone deployments. However, if there is a direct path to any negative applications, the authors should point it out. For example, it is legitimate to point out that an improvement in the quality of generative models could be used to

generate deepfakes for disinformation. On the other hand, it is not needed to point out that a generic algorithm for optimizing neural networks could enable people to train models that generate Deepfakes faster.

- The authors should consider possible harms that could arise when the technology is being used as intended and functioning correctly, harms that could arise when the technology is being used as intended but gives incorrect results, and harms following from (intentional or unintentional) misuse of the technology.
- If there are negative societal impacts, the authors could also discuss possible mitigation strategies (e.g., gated release of models, providing defenses in addition to attacks, mechanisms for monitoring misuse, mechanisms to monitor how a system learns from feedback over time, improving the efficiency and accessibility of ML).

11. Safeguards

Question: Does the paper describe safeguards that have been put in place for responsible release of data or models that have a high risk for misuse (e.g., pretrained language models, image generators, or scraped datasets)?

Answer: [NA]

Justification: the paper poses no such risks.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper poses no such risks.
- Released models that have a high risk for misuse or dual-use should be released with necessary safeguards to allow for controlled use of the model, for example by requiring that users adhere to usage guidelines or restrictions to access the model or implementing safety filters.
- Datasets that have been scraped from the Internet could pose safety risks. The authors should describe how they avoided releasing unsafe images.
- We recognize that providing effective safeguards is challenging, and many papers do not require this, but we encourage authors to take this into account and make a best faith effort.

12. Licenses for existing assets

Question: Are the creators or original owners of assets (e.g., code, data, models), used in the paper, properly credited and are the license and terms of use explicitly mentioned and properly respected?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: We followed the relevant protocols

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not use existing assets.
- The authors should cite the original paper that produced the code package or dataset.
- The authors should state which version of the asset is used and, if possible, include a URL.
- The name of the license (e.g., CC-BY 4.0) should be included for each asset.
- For scraped data from a particular source (e.g., website), the copyright and terms of service of that source should be provided.
- If assets are released, the license, copyright information, and terms of use in the package should be provided. For popular datasets, paperswithcode.com/datasets has curated licenses for some datasets. Their licensing guide can help determine the license of a dataset.
- For existing datasets that are re-packaged, both the original license and the license of the derived asset (if it has changed) should be provided.
- If this information is not available online, the authors are encouraged to reach out to the asset's creators.

13. New Assets

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

Answer: [Yes] ,

Justification: We made the relevant Settings

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not release new assets.
- Researchers should communicate the details of the dataset/code/model as part of their submissions via structured templates. This includes details about training, license, limitations, etc.
- The paper should discuss whether and how consent was obtained from people whose asset is used.
- At submission time, remember to anonymize your assets (if applicable). You can either create an anonymized URL or include an anonymized zip file.

14. **Crowdsourcing and Research with Human Subjects**

Question: For crowdsourcing experiments and research with human subjects, does the paper include the full text of instructions given to participants and screenshots, if applicable, as well as details about compensation (if any)?

Answer: [NA]

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

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not involve crowdsourcing nor research with human subjects.
- Including this information in the supplemental material is fine, but if the main contribution of the paper involves human subjects, then as much detail as possible should be included in the main paper.
- According to the NeurIPS Code of Ethics, workers involved in data collection, curation, or other labor should be paid at least the minimum wage in the country of the data collector.

15. **Institutional Review Board (IRB) Approvals or Equivalent for Research with Human Subjects**

Question: Does the paper describe potential risks incurred by study participants, whether such risks were disclosed to the subjects, and whether Institutional Review Board (IRB) approvals (or an equivalent approval/review based on the requirements of your country or institution) were obtained?

Answer: [NA]

Justification: the paper does not involve crowdsourcing nor research with human subjects

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not involve crowdsourcing nor research with human subjects.
- Depending on the country in which research is conducted, IRB approval (or equivalent) may be required for any human subjects research. If you obtained IRB approval, you should clearly state this in the paper.
- We recognize that the procedures for this may vary significantly between institutions and locations, and we expect authors to adhere to the NeurIPS Code of Ethics and the guidelines for their institution.
- For initial submissions, do not include any information that would break anonymity (if applicable), such as the institution conducting the review.