

# Graph-defined Language Learning with LLMs

Huachi Zhou\*

huachi.zhou@connect.polyu.hk  
The Hong Kong Polytechnic  
University  
Hung Hom, Kowloon, Hong Kong

Jiahe Du\*

jiahe.du@connect.polyu.hk  
The Hong Kong Polytechnic  
University  
Hung Hom, Kowloon, Hong Kong

Chuang Zhou

chuang-qzj.zhou@connect.polyu.hk  
The Hong Kong Polytechnic  
University  
Hung Hom, Kowloon, Hong Kong

Chang Yang

chang.yang@connect.polyu.hk  
The Hong Kong Polytechnic  
University  
Hung Hom, Kowloon, Hong Kong

Yilin Xiao

yilin.xiao@connect.polyu.hk  
The Hong Kong Polytechnic  
University  
Hung Hom, Kowloon, Hong Kong

Yuxuan Xie

yuxuan.xie@connect.polyu.hk  
The Hong Kong Polytechnic  
University  
Hung Hom, Kowloon, Hong Kong

Xiao Huang<sup>✉</sup>

xiaohuang@comp.polyu.edu.hk  
The Hong Kong Polytechnic  
University  
Hung Hom, Kowloon, Hong Kong

## Abstract

Recent efforts leverage Large Language Models (LLMs) for modeling text-attributed graph structures in node classification tasks. These approaches describe graph structures for LLMs to understand or aggregate LLM-generated textual attribute embeddings through graph structure. However, these approaches face two main limitations in modeling graph structures with LLMs. (i) Graph descriptions become verbose in describing high-order graph structure. (ii) Textual attributes alone do not contain adequate graph structure information. It is challenging to model graph structure concisely and adequately with LLMs. LLMs lack built-in mechanisms to model graph structures directly. They also struggle with complex long-range dependencies between high-order nodes and target nodes.

Inspired by the observation that LLMs pre-trained on one language can achieve exceptional performance on another with minimal additional training, we propose **Graph-Defined Language for Large Language Model (GDL4LLM)**. This novel framework enables LLMs to transfer their powerful language understanding capabilities to graph-structured data. GDL4LLM translates graphs into a graph language corpus instead of graph descriptions and pre-trains LLMs on this corpus to adequately understand graph structures. During fine-tuning, this corpus describes the structural information of target nodes concisely with only a few tokens. By treating graphs as a new language, GDL4LLM enables LLMs to model graph

structures adequately and concisely for node classification tasks. Extensive experiments on three real-world datasets demonstrate that GDL4LLM outperforms description-based and textual attribute embeddings-based baselines by efficiently modeling different orders of graph structure with LLMs.

## CCS Concepts

• **Computing methodologies** → **Artificial intelligence**; • **Information systems** → **Data mining**.

## Keywords

Large Language Models, Text-attributed Graph, Node Classification

## ACM Reference Format:

Huachi Zhou, Jiahe Du, Chuang Zhou, Chang Yang, Yilin Xiao, Yuxuan Xie, and Xiao Huang<sup>✉</sup>. 2018. Graph-defined Language Learning with LLMs. In *Proceedings of Make sure to enter the correct conference title from your rights confirmation email (Conference acronym 'XX)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 11 pages. <https://doi.org/XXXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>

## 1 Introduction

Text-attributed graphs have become essential data representations in various domains, spanning from social networks to biological systems [11, 17]. In these graphs, each node is associated with textual attribute and class label. The pioneering studies indicate that a node's class label is influenced not only by the attributes of its immediate neighbors but also by those several hops away [5]. Consequently, accurate class label predictions require capturing graph structural information when aggregating attributes from nodes across different hops. Graph neural networks (GNNs) address this through message-passing mechanisms, enabling concise and effective capture of graph structures [22, 31].

Large language models (LLMs), such as GPTs [1], have demonstrated exceptional text manipulation capabilities across various machine learning tasks. Recent efforts have aimed to leverage these capabilities for modeling graph structures in text-attributed graphs

\*Huachi Zhou and Jiahe Du are co-first authors. Both authors contributed equally to this research.

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than the author(s) must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from [permissions@acm.org](mailto:permissions@acm.org).  
*Conference acronym 'XX, June 03–05, 2018, Woodstock, NY*

© 2018 Copyright held by the owner/author(s). Publication rights licensed to ACM.  
ACM ISBN 978-1-4503-XXXX-X/18/06  
<https://doi.org/XXXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>

for node classification [28, 41]. These approaches could be broadly categorized into two main classes: (i) Utilize graph descriptions to enable LLMs to understand graph structures, enumerating nodes and their connections [3, 10, 37]; (ii) Utilize LLMs to embed textual attributes and applying Graph Neural Networks (GNNs) to aggregate embeddings [18, 42].

However, these approaches face two main limitations in leveraging LLMs to model graph structures: (i) **Graph descriptions become excessively verbose in describing high-order graph structure.** Graph structures are complex, and the intricate connections among nodes often become convoluted when translated into descriptions [8]. These verbose descriptions potentially hinder LLMs' ability to capture high-order graph structural information for target nodes. (ii) **Textual attributes alone do not contain adequate graph structure information.** The textual attribute embedding is learned by LLMs, separate from the aggregation of neighboring nodes performed by GNNs [16]. This separate training approach makes it challenging for the LLM itself to learn adequate graph structural information in the optimization.

It is challenging to model graph structures adequately and concisely with LLMs for two primary reasons: (i) **LLM constraints in modeling graphs:** while proficient in processing natural language, LLMs lack built-in mechanisms like message passing in GNNs to directly model graph structures. They struggle to utilize the high-order graph structural information from verbose natural language descriptions. (ii) **Long-range Dependency:** Complex relationships between high-order nodes and target nodes, i.e., long-range dependency are crucial for accurate node classification. Failing to capture these long-range dependencies may result in information loss and inaccurate predictions.

To bridge this gap, we draw inspiration from an intriguing observation: LLMs pre-trained on one language (e.g., English) can achieve exceptional performance on another language (e.g., Chinese) with only **a small portion of corpora** in the target language [43]. Building on this insight, we propose **Graph-Defined Language for Large Language Model (GDL4LLM)**, a simple yet effective graph language learning framework. GDL4LLM enables LLMs to model graph structures concisely and adequately in a manner analogous to learning a new language for node classification. Specifically we create this new graph language by translating graphs into a graph language corpus instead of graph descriptions and pre-training LLMs to familiarize them with the graph language. Notably, we prove that the pre-training objective enables LLMs to learn graph structural information. We then sample from this corpus to describe graph structural information centered around target nodes. The corpus captures different orders of structural information using only a few tokens. GDL4LLM enables LLMs to model graph structures adequately and concisely. Compared with the textual attribute embedding-based approach, GDL4LLM directly applies LLMs to adequately understand graph structure, rather than solely embedding textual attributes. In contrast to the description-based approach, we use graph language with a few tokens to represent different orders of graph structure concisely, rather than enumerating nodes and their connections. Extensive experiments on three real-world datasets show that GDL4LLM excels in node classification compared with description-based and textual attribute embeddings-based baselines. Our contributions can be summarized as follows:

- We convert the problem of modeling graph structures for LLMs into a graph language learning problem. We justify this approach by proving that the graph language learning objective enables LLMs to learn graph structural information.
- We introduce GDL4LLM, a simple yet effective framework. This framework generates a graph language corpus from the given graph and pre-trains LLMs on this corpus. Then the framework samples from the graph language corpus to describe graph structure centered around target nodes for node classification.
- Through extensive experiments on three real-world datasets, we demonstrate that GDL4LLM outperforms competitive baselines. It surpasses both description-based and textual attribute embedding-based approaches by efficiently modeling different orders of graph structure with LLMs.

## 2 Preliminary

**Notation.** The text-attributed graph could be represented by a triple  $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{X})$ , where  $\mathcal{V}$  denotes the set of nodes  $\{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_{|\mathcal{V}|}\}$  with the size  $|\mathcal{V}|$ ;  $\mathcal{E} \subseteq \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}$  represents the set of edges between nodes with the size  $|\mathcal{E}|$ . And the edge set  $\mathcal{E}$  is encoded in the adjacency matrix  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{V}| \times |\mathcal{V}|}$ , where  $A_{ij} = 1$  if there is an edge between nodes  $v_i$  and  $v_j$ ,  $A_{ij} = 0$  otherwise;  $\mathcal{X} = \{\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{|\mathcal{V}|}\}$  represents the text attributes associated with each node, where  $\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathcal{X}$  is the node attribute associated with node  $v_i \in \mathcal{V}$ . The node attribute  $\mathbf{x}_i$  could be a paper abstract, an item description, or other textual documents.

**Node Classification Task.** Given the graph  $\mathcal{G}$ , we aim to learn an embedding vector  $\mathbf{t}_i$  for each node that captures both the structural information from the graph  $\mathcal{G}$  and the semantic information from the node attribute  $\mathbf{x}_i$  to predict the node class label.

For each class, a linear transformation projects the embedding  $\mathbf{t}_i$  to a score  $l_i^c$  and the scores  $l_i^c$  are passed through a softmax function to obtain the predicted probabilities  $\hat{y}_i^c$  for class  $c$ :

$$\hat{y}_i^c = \frac{\exp(\mathbf{w}_c^\top \mathbf{t}_i + b_c)}{\sum_{\hat{c}} \exp(\mathbf{w}_{\hat{c}}^\top \mathbf{t}_i + b_{\hat{c}})}, \quad (1)$$

where  $\mathbf{w}_c$  and  $b_c$  are the weights and bias for class  $c$ . Then we calculate the classification loss  $y_i$  associated with each node based on the predicted probabilities  $\hat{y}_i^c$ .

We adopt the cross-entropy loss and calculate the loss as follows:

$$\mathcal{L}_{CE} = - \sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{V}|} \sum_{c=1}^C y_i^c \log(\hat{y}_i^c) \quad (2)$$

where  $C$  is the number of classes,  $y_i^c$  is the true class label (1 if node  $i$  belongs to class  $c$ , otherwise 0), and  $\hat{y}_i^c$  is the predicted probability of class  $c$ .

**Low Rank Adaption.** To fine-tune LLMs efficiently, we leverage Low-Rank Adaptation (LoRA), a widely used parameter-efficient fine-tuning technique that accelerates the learning process with less memory consumption. LoRA incorporates the trained matrices into each layer of the LLM [15] through low-rank decomposition. Specifically, given the weight matrix of one layer of LLM  $\mathbf{W}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times k}$ , LoRA introduces  $\mathbf{W}_0 + \Delta\mathbf{W} = \mathbf{W}_0 + \mathbf{B}\mathbf{A}$ , where  $\mathbf{B} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times r}$ ,  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times k}$ , and the rank  $r \ll \{d, k\}$ , for LLM optimization.  $\mathbf{A}$  is initialized with Gaussian distribution and  $\mathbf{B}$  is initialized with zero, therefore,  $\Delta\mathbf{W} = \mathbf{B}\mathbf{A}$  is zero at the beginning of the fine-tuning. During the

optimization, the introduced  $\Delta\mathbf{W}$  is trained to adapt to the new training data while the original weight matrix  $\mathbf{W}_0$  remains frozen.

### 3 Methodology

In this section, we introduce GDL4LLM, a graph language learning framework. As illustrated in Figure 1, LLMs learn the graph language through two primary stages. The first pre-training stage involves collecting a graph language corpus and pre-training LLMs on this corpus to learn the underlying language patterns. The second fine-tuning stage applies the learned graph language to represent the subgraph centered around the target nodes for fine-tuning pre-trained LLMs. And we demonstrate how to incorporate the memory bank to assist graph language in handling large-scale graph.

#### 3.1 Graph-defined Language Pre-training

We begin by defining the fundamental concepts in graph language, such as graph tokens and graph sentences. We then demonstrate how to derive graph sentences from a given graph to create a graph language corpus and pre-train LLMs on this corpus. And we prove that the pre-training objective encodes graph structural information in each step under certain assumptions.

**3.1.1 Graph Token and Graph Sentence. Graph Node as Graph Token.** In graph language, we define the graph token set as equivalent to the node set  $\mathcal{V}$ . To facilitate the recognition and processing of graph tokens, we extend the LLM tokenizer vocabulary by assigning each node in the given graph a unique token identifier. For instance, node 1 in the graph is represented as "<node\_1>" in the graph language. These graph tokens serve as the fundamental units of computation in graph language.

**Graph Path as Graph Sentence.** In graph language, we define a graph sentence as a sequence of edges connecting a series of graph tokens. For example, in Figure 1, the first graph sentence in the pre-training stage is <node\_8><node\_3><node\_10><node\_12><node\_9>. We traverse the graph and translate the graph into a collection of sampled graph sentences formed as a graph language corpus  $C$ , i.e.,  $C = \{s_i\}, i = \{1, 2, \dots\}$ . This corpus inherently encodes graph structural information; for instance, graph tokens associated with high degree nodes will appear frequently in the corpus. Next we introduce how to traverse the graph and sample sentences.

**Table 1: Mapping of GDL4LLM concept to graph concept.**

GDL4LLM Concept	Graph Equivalent
Token	Node
Sentence	Path
Token embedding	Node embedding

**3.1.2 Graph Corpus Sampling.** The key idea in sampling graph sentences is to capture local graph structural information centered around each node. Any graph token can serve as the start token for a graph sentence. To traverse the graph and extend the graph sentence from the start token, we employ random walks to control the traversal process. Given a node  $v_i$ , the probability of node  $v_j$  becoming the next graph token is:

$$P(v_j|v_i) = \begin{cases} \frac{A_{ij}}{\sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}(v_i)} A_{ij}}, & v_j \in \mathcal{N}(v_i), \\ 0, & v_j \notin \mathcal{E}, \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

where  $\mathcal{N}(v_i)$  represents the set of nodes directly connected to  $v_i$ . By initiating  $k$  random walks of length  $l$  beginning with each graph token, we can explore both local and high-order graph structural information for each node. Given  $|\mathcal{V}|$  nodes, this process samples a corpus of graph language sentences with  $k \times |\mathcal{V}|$  size for the entire graph. An LLM is then pre-trained on this corpus to learn the underlying graph language patterns, implicitly capturing the graph structure.


**3.1.3 Pre-training LLMs on the Corpus.** To project out-of-vocabulary graph tokens into a token embedding space comprehensible to LLMs, we utilize off-the-shelf text encoding models, such as LLM itself, to summarize the textual attribute  $x_i$  into a unified initial graph token embedding. To facilitate the incorporation of graph structural information into the graph token embedding, we introduce a learnable linear projector  $\mathbf{W}_p \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ , which aligns the initial graph token embeddings with the graph structure information.

With graph token embeddings in hand, we adopt the language modeling objective to pre-train the LLMs on the corpus. First, we initialize the LoRA weight  $\Delta\mathbf{W}_1$  and  $\mathbf{W}_p$  for optimization. During pre-training,  $\mathbf{W}_p$  maps graph token embeddings that appear in similar contexts to similar embeddings in the transformation, while the additive weight  $\Delta\mathbf{W}_1$  learns the graph token transition patterns in the graph sentences. We achieve this by iteratively predicting on the graph language corpus, maximizing the likelihood of the correct graph token appearing next in a graph sentence:

$$\mathcal{L}_{pre} = - \sum_{i=1}^{k|\mathcal{V}|} \sum_{q=1}^l \log P(v_q^i | v_1^i, v_2^i, \dots, v_{q-1}^i; \mathbf{W}_p, \Delta\mathbf{W}_1, \mathbf{W}_h), \quad (4)$$

where the inner product between the trainable LLM head  $\mathbf{W}_h \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times |\mathcal{V}|}$  and the hidden representation of the next graph token  $t_q^i$  generated by LLMs calculates the predicted score for each candidate graph token. We select the graph token with the highest predicted score as the next graph token  $v_q^i$ .

**3.1.4 Connection between Pre-training and Graph Learning.** The graph language bridges the gap between linguistic and structural representations by leveraging the statistical pattern of node degrees in the prompt. Since we use this inner product to rank the next candidate graph token, the pre-training objective increases the inner products between the hidden representation of the next graph token  $t_q^i$  and the next graph token weight vector  $\mathbf{W}_{h,q}^i$  in  $\mathbf{W}_h$ . For frequently sampled graph sentences, the representation of their next graph token will be well optimized and closer to the next graph token weight vector. The sampling frequency of a specific graph sentences correlates with the node degree of each graph token in the sentence. For example, consider two graph sentences of equal length sampled from areas with different connection densities. The probability of sampling a specific sequence is lower in densely connected regions compared to sparsely connected ones. This is because densely connected areas offer more potential graph sentences, reducing the likelihood of any particular sentence being



**Figure 1: The figure demonstrates a comparison between mainstream methods and GDL4LLM for node-classification task. Figure (a) utilizes LLMs to embed node attributes and leverages GNN to aggregate the embeddings. Figure (b) presents the descriptions of graph structure centered around target nodes. Figure (c) illustrates how LLMs are pre-trained to capture graph structures through graph language learning, and how textual attributes are further integrated to enhance LLMs fine-tuning.**

sampled. To further understand how the inner product in the pre-training objective encodes graph structure information, we propose the following theorem and put the proof into the section 7:

**THEOREM 3.1.** *Assume a language model with sufficient capacity can well construct the inner product between  $\mathbf{W}_{h,q}^i$  and  $\mathbf{t}_q^i$ . Given  $s_q$  with degree  $d_q$ , then  $\mathbf{W}_{h,q}^i \cdot \mathbf{t}_q^i \propto \log \left( \frac{\mathbb{I}_{(s_{q-1}, s_q) \in \mathcal{A}} \cdot \sum \mathcal{A}}{d_q} \right)$ .*

This theorem 3.1 demonstrates how node degrees in the graph sentences influence the pre-training objective under certain assumptions. If the node degree associated with the next graph token in a sampled graph sentence is large, the optimal inner product value in the pre-training objective will be low. Conversely, if the next node degree is small, the sampled graph sentence is more certain and the inner product will be high. By iteratively pre-training LLMs to predict the next graph token in the graph language corpus, LLMs learn adequate knowledge about graph structural information, i.e., node degrees and their connections.

## 3.2 Graph Structure-aware Fine-tuning

We first introduce how to fine-tune pre-trained LLMs with graph language for node classification. Then, we discuss how to integrate node textual attributes with graph language in the prompt to enhance both the pre-training and fine-tuning stages.

**3.2.1 Absorbing Graph Structure Knowledge.** We integrate the learned graph structure knowledge into the LLMs by merging the pre-trained LoRA weights. The additive parameters of LoRA learned in the pre-training stage contain the knowledge of the graph structure. Fine-tuning the same LoRA weights may risk forgetting the knowledge acquired in the pre-training stage. Therefore, we initialize

another set of LoRA weights  $\Delta \mathbf{W}_2$  to adapt LLMs to the fine-tuning stage. The parameters of LLMs are now composed as follows:

$$\mathbf{W} = \mathbf{W}_0 + \Delta \mathbf{W}_1 + \Delta \mathbf{W}_2 \quad (5)$$

Here, the parameters  $\mathbf{W}_0$  and  $\Delta \mathbf{W}_1$  remain fixed, while  $\Delta \mathbf{W}_2$  are the learnable parameters in the fine-tuning stage. The weights in the head layer have to be reinitialized as  $\hat{\mathbf{W}}_h \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times C}$  to adapt to the class label, while the weights in the projector remain fixed. We use LoRA to add additional trainable parameters to the projector and obtain  $\hat{\mathbf{W}}_p$ . We then use these parameters to perform node classification in the subsequent fine-tuning process.

**3.2.2 Fine-tuning with Graph Language.** To classify a node  $v_i$ , we sample multiple graph sentences  $\{s_1, s_2, \dots, s_k\}$  of length  $l$  originating from the same graph token associated with node  $v_i$ , following the method described in sub-subsection 3.1.2. We then concatenate these graph sentences into a small graph language corpus. This corpus describes the different orders of graph structural information centered around the target node  $v_i$  and provides sufficient context for classification. The overall classification loss is defined as follows:

$$\mathcal{L}_{CE} = - \sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{V}|} \log P(y_i | s_1, s_2, \dots, s_k; \hat{\mathbf{W}}_p, \Delta \mathbf{W}_2, \hat{\mathbf{W}}_h). \quad (6)$$

The corpus used to predict the label of node  $v_i$  balances graph exploration with a focus on the starting node, capturing both local and high-order graph structural information. It can be viewed as a long random walk with a periodic restart mechanism, ensuring that graph sentences avoid getting trapped in less relevant parts of the graph for node classification. By frequently returning to the starting node, the corpus captures local graph structures and provides detailed information about the local neighborhood. Simultaneously,

setting an appropriate  $l$  for the corpus allows it to reach distant nodes, enabling the capture of higher-order graph structures.

In summary, this two-stage process offers two main advantages: (i) Through pre-training on the graph language corpus, LLMs can independently learn to process graph structures adequately as if processing the language, eliminating the need for graph neural networks. (ii) During the fine-tuning stage, we can sample a small set of graph language corpus with a few tokens to concisely represent the different orders of graph structures centered around the target nodes. The two advantages bring benefits to the accurate node classification.

**3.2.3 Fine-tuning with Textual Node Attributes.** We could further combine the graph language corpus with the textual attributes of each node to form a composite document, enriching the information in the prompt. While graph language captures structural information, it does not explicitly utilize textual attributes and semantic information of attributes is insufficiently captured. Our goal is to preserve these textual attributes in the prompt, rather than merely using them to generate initial graph token embeddings. To achieve this, we first start with an empty document; traverse each graph token in the graph language corpus and append the visited graph tokens’ textual attributes to the document. This document is then included in the prompt besides the graph language in the both pre-training and fine-tuning stages. LLMs could leverage the powerful natural language comprehension abilities of this document to comprehend node connection and generate accurate node classification results.

**3.2.4 Dynamic Memory Bank.** Each node is represented as a unique token, which can lead to unacceptable memory costs when dealing with large-scale graphs. To address this issue, we introduce a memory bank mechanism to efficiently handle large-scale graphs in the graph language framework. (i) To reduce GPU memory usage, we dynamically look up and retrieve text embeddings and weights of  $\mathbf{W}_h$  from the memory bank. This allows the framework to focus only on the embeddings relevant to the current computation, reducing overhead. (ii) During training, sampled softmax is performed by using other nodes in the current batch as negative samples. This ensures that the retrieved nodes serve both as positive and negative samples, avoiding the need to compare all nodes in the graph. After each batch, relevant weights in the memory bank are dynamically updated to reflect the latest training progress, ensuring consistency and accuracy across iterations.

## 4 Experiments

In this section, we examine the effectiveness and efficiency of our model and understand how it behaves. Comprehensive experiments across five datasets have been conducted. Our study aims to address the following four research questions:

- **RQ1:** How effective is GDL4LLM compared to state-of-the-art text-attributed frameworks for node classification?
- **RQ2:** How do the pre-training stage and textual attributes in the prompt contribute to the overall model performance?
- **RQ3:** How sensitive is GDL4LLM to hyperparameter selection, such as the length of sampled graph sentences, and the choice of different LLM backbones?

- **RQ4:** How efficiently does GDL4LLM model different orders of graph structures in terms of token usage?

### 4.1 DATASET

We evaluate the performance of GDL4LLM using five datasets: ACM, Wikipedia, Amazon, OGBN-Arxiv and OGBN-Products. Three of these datasets have been manually created from the raw corpus along with their respective descriptions while two of them are classic graph neural networks benchmarking. The division into training, validation, and test sets follows the settings used in previous studies [37] The statistics for these three datasets are presented in Table 2.

**Wiki.** The raw data consists of text in all languages from Wikipedia articles, encoded in UTF-8<sup>1</sup>. The processed dataset regards cleaned articles as nodes and their relationships as edges. We extract the primary content of each article as attributes, and hyperlinks in the articles as their relationships. A text-attributed graph is then created based on the hyperlink connections between the articles.

**ACM.** The ACM dataset contains papers published in flagship conferences, such as KDD and SIGMOD. This dataset comprises 48,579 documents from the Association for Computing Machinery (ACM) [32]. The papers are treated as nodes, with their abstracts used as textual attributes, and a directed graph is built based on citation links of these papers. The papers are categorized under different topics, which serve as labels.

**Amazon.** The Amazon dataset comprises product reviews and associated metadata from the famous e-commerce website [25]. The products are treated as nodes. The review texts are treated as node textual attributes, and edges represent node relationships like co-purchasing or co-viewing.

**Ogbn-Arxiv.** The OGBN-Arxiv dataset is a citation network of 169,343 arXiv papers, where nodes represent papers and directed edges indicate citations. The textual attributes contain the article title and abstract. The task is to predict the subject area of each paper among 40 classes.

**Ogbn-Products.** The OGBN-Products dataset is a large Amazon co-purchasing network with 2,449,029 nodes and 61,859,140 undirected edges. The task is to classify products into 47 categories. This dataset is ideal for evaluating the scalability of models on large-scale node classification tasks.

**Table 2: Statistics of datasets in our experiment.**

Datasets	#nodes	#edges	#classes
ACM	48,579	193,034	9
Wiki	36,501	1,190,369	10
Amazon	50,000	632,802	7
Ogbn-Arxiv	169,343	1,166,243	40
Ogbn-Products	2,449,029	61,859,140	47

### 4.2 BASELINES

We incorporate the following state-of-the-art baselines in our main comparison.

<sup>1</sup><http://www.matmahoney.net/dc/textdata>

- GCN [19] learns to establish node representations by incorporating attributes from neighboring nodes.
- GraphSAGE [12] originates node embeddings by sampling and comprising features from a node’s local neighborhood, enabling scalable learning on large graphs.
- GAT [34] utilizes attention mechanisms to dynamically measure the weight of neighboring nodes and improve node embeddings to enhance graph representation learning.
- MPAD [26] illustrates textual documents as word co-occurrence networks and enhances document understanding by leveraging message passing and attention mechanisms to capture relationships efficiently.
- GLEM framework [42] incorporates graph structures with language representations to enhance the understanding and processing of complicated relationships in textual data.
- GraphFormers [36] combines GNN and transformer architectures to model and investigate graph-structured data effectively, leveraging both local neighborhood knowledge and global context.
- LLAGA [3] integrates large language models with graph data to improve reasoning and knowledge retrieval across complex datasets.
- Llama [33] is a family of open-sourced foundational LLMs designed to perform various natural language processing tasks concisely with high adaptability.
- InstructGLM [37] operates natural language to establish and query graph structures effectively, strengthening the integration of language understanding and graph-based knowledge representation.
- GraphAdapter [16] integrates LLMs with GNNs in an ensemble approach to efficiently model text-attributed graphs.

Besides these baselines, we also incorporate several variants of GDL4LLM for comparison:

- GDL4LLM w/o pre-train: removes the pre-training stage of GDL4LLM and preserve the fine-tuning stage.
- GDL4LLM w/ attr: incorporates the textual attributes within the prompt of GDL4LLM.
- GDL4LLM w/ attr w/o pre-train: removes the pre-training stage of GDL4LLM.

**Implementation Details.** We conduct experiments on a server with eight 80 GB NVIDIA A100 GPUs. The primary comparison focuses on micro and macro classification accuracy for the test set, with validation set results also provided. To select the hyperparameters, the length of the graph sentences  $l$ , and the numbers of graph sentences  $k$ , are searched using grids  $\{2, 3, 4, 5\}$  and  $\{2, 4, 6, 8, 10\}$ , respectively. The LoRA dropout rate, rank, and  $\alpha$  are set to 0.2, 8, and 16, respectively. Weight decay is set to  $1e-2$  to prevent the overfitting. We implement the proposed framework in PyTorch, with a learning rate of  $1e-4$  and a batch size of 32. Our approach uses the Adam optimizer and includes early stopping based on validation set accuracy. In the main comparison, we use the publicly available

<sup>2</sup>Including graph descriptions or textual attributes in the prompt significantly extends the training and inference time to unacceptable levels in large-scale graphs. Therefore, we only use GDL4LLM in Ognb-products

**Table 3: Performance comparison among state-of-the-art baselines w.r.t. Micro-F1.**

LMs	GNNs	Ognb-arxiv		Ognb-products	
		Val.	Test.	Val.	Test.
<b>Fine-tuned LMs + GNNs</b>					
Bert	-	71.8	69.8	82.2	69.4
	GCN	71.7	70.5	92.1	78.8
	GAT	72.9	70.6	93.0	81.5
	GraphSAGE	70.9	68.5	91.9	78.6
Roberta	-	69.8	67.1	80.8	66.5
	GCN	71.5	69.2	92.1	78.0
	GAT	72.6	70.3	92.8	81.3
	GraphSAGE	70.2	67.6	92.4	78.6
<b>Specialized Frameworks for Text-Attributed Graphs</b>					
	MPAD	68.2	63.9	77.6	63.9
	GLEM	<u>76.9</u>	75.9	<u>93.2</u>	<u>84.7</u>
	GraphFormers	70.4	68.4	75.0	60.3
	LLAGA	77.5	76.1	92.4	84.2
	InstructGLM	76.9	<u>76.2</u>	-	-
	<b>GDL4LLM</b>	<b>77.7</b>	<b>76.5</b>	<b>93.9</b>	<b>85.4</b>
<b>Fine-tuned LLMs + GNNs</b>					
GraphAdapter	-	<u>77.3</u>	<u>76.5</u>	-	-
Llama3-8b	-	73.0	72.5	-	-
Llama3-8b	GraphSAGE	76.8	76.1	-	-
	<b>GDL4LLM w/ attr</b>	<b>77.6</b>	<b>76.6</b>	<sup>-2</sup>	-

Llama2-7B [33] as the backbone and employ Llama3-8B for the different backbone experiments. For all baselines, we use publicly released codes to ensure fairness. We use accuracy to evaluate the performance of node classification.

### 4.3 Main Comparison (RQ1)

Table 3 and 4 presents a main comparison of GDL4LLM with other baselines across five datasets with respect to the micro-F1 score while Table 8 and 7 shows the macro-F1 score. To evaluate the effectiveness of our module, we include various techniques from both description-based and textual embedding-based approaches. The baselines are categorized into three groups: (1) textual embedding-based: using fine-tuned LM embeddings in GNNs for label classification; (2) description-based frameworks for text-attributed graphs, some of which use graph descriptions to describe the graph structure centered around target node, e.g., InstructGLM, LLAGA and some of which are specialized text-attributed graph frameworks; and (3) textual embedding-based: using fine-tuned LLMs to embed textual attributes and GNNs for aggregation.

The first group fine-tunes small LMs plus GNN are capable of achieving satisfactory results, but the small LMs themselves can not achieve very good performance. The performance is largely due to the advantages offered by the GNN in capturing graph structural information. These methods are limited by both the capacity of the language model and lack of structural information in the textual attributes. Therefore these approaches could not achieve further promising results.

**Table 4: Performance comparison among state-of-the-art baselines w.r.t. Micro-F1.**

LMs	GNNs	ACM		Wiki		Amazon	
		Val.	Test.	Val.	Test.	Val.	Test.
<b>Fine-tuned LMs + GNNs</b>							
Bert	-	77.8	75.0	69.6	69.8	90.8	90.5
	GCN	80.6	<u>80.3</u>	71.0	70.3	93.6	93.3
	GAT	81.0	79.9	73.5	72.8	93.7	93.6
	GraphSAGE	80.8	79.7	73.2	72.0	93.8	92.9
Roberta	-	76.2	76.4	72.1	70.6	88.9	88.5
	GCN	80.5	79.9	70.8	69.0	93.6	93.5
	GAT	80.9	80.1	<u>73.7</u>	<u>73.0</u>	94.0	93.5
	GraphSAGE	80.9	79.5	73.2	70.4	94.3	94.1
<b>Specialized Frameworks for Text-Attributed Graphs</b>							
	MPAD	80.1	78.9	68.8	68.0	93.1	92.8
	GLEM	<u>81.4</u>	79.8	73.6	71.2	94.5	<u>94.3</u>
	GraphFormers	75.3	75.1	66.8	67.5	85.6	86.4
	LLAGA	77.2	77.5	71.7	72.0	90.1	90.8
	InstructGLM	75.4	74.5	72.2	70.6	<u>94.3</u>	94.2
	<b>GDL4LLM</b>	<b>81.9</b>	<b>81.4</b>	<b>74.3</b>	<b>73.2</b>	<b>94.6</b>	<b>94.6</b>
<b>Fine-tuned LLMs + GNNs</b>							
GraphAdapter	-	80.8	80.4	71.9	71.7	<u>94.1</u>	<u>93.4</u>
Llama3-8b	-	80.7	80.6	71.9	71.2	92.0	91.6
Llama3-8b	GraphSAGE	<u>82.0</u>	<u>81.3</u>	<u>72.8</u>	<u>73.0</u>	93.1	92.8
	<b>GDL4LLM w/ attr</b>	<b>83.9</b>	<b>82.8</b>	<b>74.0</b>	<b>73.4</b>	<b>95.8</b>	<b>95.5</b>


Some approaches in the second group try to leverage the graph descriptions to model graph structural information. However, they can only exploit first-order or second-order graph structural information due to lengthy prompts. Our model can concisely model graph structure with a few graph tokens and could explore more beneficial high-order graph structural information.

In the third group, LLMs provide representations of higher quality compared with the first group. And the high-quality textual attribute embeddings significantly boost the performance. However, LLMs do not deeply couple in node-level aggregation and could not capture the adequate structural information. Our model unleashes the power of LLMs in understanding graph structure akin to learning a new language and further applies the natural language understanding ability to the textual attributes. These abilities further boost LLMs to achieve better performance.

#### 4.4 Ablation Studies (RQ2)

In this section, we investigate the effects of different training strategies on the performance of the GDL4LLM model. We show the results on the test set in Figure 2. We explore two variants that include pre-training stages and additional textual attribute, emphasizing their impact on enhancing models' capabilities. Specifically, we analyze the role of pre-training by comparing models that are initialized from a pre-trained state against those trained from scratch, assessing improvements in generalization and performance on downstream tasks. Furthermore, we explore the impact of incorporating additional textual attributes within the prompt,

to evaluate whether these enhancements lead to significant performance gains. Through this ablation study, we aim to reveal the critical factors that influence the effectiveness of GDL4LLM, contributing to a deeper understanding of how GDL4LLM behaves. Figure 2 indicates that the pre-training stage results in an average improvement of about 1% accuracy. The pre-training is similar to language pre-training for language models, as it utilizes insights from graph sentences derived from the graph. Additionally, incorporating textual attributes within the prompt, alongside the original graph language corpus, further enhances performance. This demonstrates that adding textual attributes leverages the natural language understanding abilities of LLMs. Both modules collectively boost overall performance.

**Figure 2: Accuracy comparison of different GDL4LLM variants on the test set across three datasets.**

#### 4.5 Backbones & Hyperparameters (RQ3)

**Backbones.** In this section, we examine the impact of the backbone on GDL4LLM model performance and show the results in Figure 3. While our main comparison uses Llama-2, we also evaluate Llama-3 to assess how different LLMs affect overall results. Comparing these two versions highlights their varying capabilities and performance metrics. Our analysis reveals that Llama-3 slightly outperforms Llama-2 within the framework. This improvement may be attributed to several factors, including advancements in Llama-3's architectural design and enhanced training data quality. Furthermore, we conduct an ablation study for Llama-3, which demonstrates the benefits of the pre-training objective in improving performance of different LLM backbones.

**Hyperparameters.** Additionally, we investigate the effects of hyperparameters, particularly focusing on the length of sampled graph sentences  $l$  and the number of sampled graph sentences  $k$ . By experimenting with varying sentence lengths, we understand how this parameter influences the model's exploration and representation of high-order structure information in the pre-train and fine-tuning, respectively. Figure 4 demonstrates that the optimal results occur with a sentence length of 8 and a sampling number of 6. Further increasing these values yields only marginal improvements. The improvement in the figure shows that our framework can effectively model high-order structural information. For example, when






Figure 3: Replacement of the backbone with Llama3 on the validation and test sets across three datasets.

the length is 5, fifth-order high-order structural information can be used. At the same time, we only need dozens of graph tokens to efficiently model different orders of graph structural information. Besides these results also confirm our insight: LLMs only need a small portion of another language corpus to achieve promising performance. Through this analysis, we have examined the roles of different backbones and hyperparameters, providing insights into optimizing the GDL4LLM model. These findings offer valuable guidance for enhancing the model’s performance.




Figure 4: Visualizations of the impact of graph sentence length  $l$  and graph sentence length  $k$  on performance.

#### 4.6 Token Efficiency Analysis (RQ4)

To evaluate the efficiency of our proposed GDL4LLM framework in leveraging high-order structural information, we conduct a comparison of token usage and computational time. As shown in Table 5, GDL4LLM significantly reduces token usage compared to InstructGLM and LLAGA-HO. While LLAGA-HO uses GNNs to summarize each hop of neighbors, its prompts remain verbose due to natural language task descriptions. In contrast, GDL4LLM employs succinct graph language prompts, eliminating the need for natural language and further enhancing efficiency. This reduction in token usage not only alleviates the computational burden but also enables the exploration of higher-order graph information compared with InstructGLM. Table 6 further highlights GDL4LLM’s computational advantage, achieving faster training and inference times across

most datasets. For example, on the ACM dataset, GDL4LLM reduces inference time from 6 minutes and 41 seconds (InstructGLM) and 4 minutes and 41 seconds (LLAGA-HO) to just 2 minutes and 6 seconds. Similarly, on the larger Ogbn-Arxiv dataset, GDL4LLM reduces inference time to 6 minutes and 44 seconds, compared to 42 minutes (InstructGLM) and 1 hour 44 minutes (LLAGA-HO). These results demonstrate the scalability and practicality of GDL4LLM, which balances token and computational efficiency while maintaining high-order structural modeling.

## 5 Conclusion

In this paper, we identify two key limitations of using natural language alone to model text-attributed graphs with LLMs: (i) Graph descriptions become excessively verbose, particularly when modeling high-order neighbors, and (ii) textual attributes often lack sufficient structural information, limiting LLMs’ ability to capture high-order graph structures. We address two main challenges: (i) the absence of a built-in mechanism in LLMs, akin to message passing in GNNs, and (ii) the long-range dependencies between high-order neighbors and target nodes. To overcome these challenges, we propose the GDL4LLM framework, which enables LLMs to model text-attributed graphs as if learning a new language. GDL4LLM consists of two main stages: (i) sampling a graph language corpus and pre-training LLMs on this corpus to adequately understand the graph, and (ii) fine-tuning LLMs with these graph language tokens to concisely represent graph structures centered around the target node. This approach allows LLMs to effectively capture graph structural information of various orders. Extensive experiments on five datasets demonstrate the efficiency and effectiveness of GDL4LLM in modeling text-attributed graphs for node classification tasks.

## 6 Related Work

### 6.1 GNNs for Text-attributed Graph

In traditional pipelines for text-attributed graph analysis, natural language processing techniques are first employed to extract features from textual data, which are then utilized in graph neural networks (GNNs) for graph propagation. Common NLP methods include Bag of Words [39], fixed embeddings like Word2Vec and GloVe[27], as well as the use of pre-trained models such as BERT and fine-tuned variations [9, 24]. These approaches establish the foundational representation of textual information within the graph structure. However, more recent advancements have led to the development of tailored graph learning methods specifically designed for text-attributed graphs. Notable examples include Graphformers [36] and MPAD [26], which represent word-adjacent relationships as graphs, offering an alternative perspective to text-attributed graph representations. GLEM [42] integrates graph structure and language learning using a variational Expectation-Maximization framework. Other tailored approaches [4, 7] aim to improve the flexibility and efficacy of graph-based analyses from complex and structured data.



**Table 5: Comparison w.r.t. the number of tokens in the prompt and the order of graph structure modeled (Token/(order)).**

LLMs	ACM		Wiki		Amazon		Ogbn-Arxiv		Ogbn-Products	
	Val	Test	Val	Test	Val	Test	Val	Test	Val	Test
InstructGLM	146(1)	149(1)	1024(2)	319(1)	532(2)	538(2)	460(0)	463(0)	-	-
LLAGA-HO	155(4)	155(4)	130(4)	130(4)	140(4)	140(4)	492(4)	492(4)	370(4)	370(4)
GDL4LLM	54(4)	54(4)	72(4)	72(4)	72(4)	72(4)	106(4)	106(4)	106(4)	106(4)
<b>Reduction (%)</b>	<b>63.01</b>	<b>63.01</b>	<b>44.62</b>	<b>44.62</b>	<b>48.57</b>	<b>48.57</b>	<b>76.96</b>	<b>76.96</b>	<b>71.35</b>	<b>71.35</b>

**Table 6: Training and inference time comparison across LLMs for five datasets. Times are presented in ‘hh:mm:ss’ format.**

LLMs	ACM		Wiki		Amazon		Ogbn-Arxiv		Ogbn-Products	
	Train	Inference	Train	Inference	Train	Inference	Train	Inference	Train	Inference
InstructGLM	5:59:04	0:06:41	4:30:16	0:05:01	6:07:02	0:07:08	102:29:23	0:42:20	N/A	N/A
LLAGA-HO	<b>0:47:26</b>	0:04:41	0:35:18	0:01:57	0:49:29	0:04:04	3:09:03	1:44:12	5:33:11	143:01:12
GDL4LLM	0:52:05	<b>0:02:06</b>	<b>0:34:03</b>	<b>0:01:17</b>	<b>0:32:15</b>	<b>0:01:45</b>	<b>2:40:06</b>	<b>0:06:44</b>	<b>5:03:39</b>	<b>6:29:13</b>

## 6.2 LLMs for Text-attributed Graph

Deep learning on graphs has also achieved great success, ranging from recommendation system [14, 40, 44], representation learning [18] and molecular graph detection [30]. State-of-the-art frameworks can be broadly categorized into three types: convolution-based operations [34, 35, 38], sampling-based techniques [12] and spectral networks [2]. Recent advancements in large language models [23] have introduced novel opportunities for tasks involving text-attributed graphs. These models, known for their robust reasoning capabilities, can be leveraged to enhance graphical representations through the use of prompting techniques. By properly designing prompts, researchers can instruct LLMs to generate contextually enriched node and edge representations, facilitating various downstream tasks such as node classification [13, 29, 45]. Efficiently training such LLMs has become a priority. Recent techniques such as LoRA (Low-Rank Adaptation) [6, 15] enable fine-tuning of pre-trained models by injecting trainable adapters, significantly reducing memory usage and computational costs. Besides, prefix-tuning [20, 21] optimizes model performance by learning a fixed set of prefixes that condition the model’s responses without modifying the entire architecture. We incorporate these ideas into model design and achieve a higher accuracy without sacrificing efficiency.

## 7 Proof of Theorem 3.1

### References

- [1] Josh Achiam, Steven Adler, Sandhini Agarwal, Lama Ahmad, Ilge Akkaya, Florencia Leoni Aleman, Diogo Almeida, Janko Altenschmidt, Sam Altman, Shyamal Anadkat, et al. 2023. Gpt-4 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774* (2023).
- [2] Joan Bruna, Wojciech Zaremba, Arthur Szlam, and Yann LeCun. 2014. Spectral networks and locally connected networks on graphs. In *The Second International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- [3] Runjin Chen, Tong Zhao, Ajay Jaiswal, Neil Shah, and Zhangyang Wang. 2024. Llag: Large language and graph assistant. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.08170* (2024).
- [4] Eli Chien, Wei-Cheng Chang, Cho-Jui Hsieh, Hsiang-Fu Yu, Jiong Zhang, Olga Milenkovic, and Inderjit S Dhillon. 2021. Node feature extraction by self-supervised multi-scale neighborhood prediction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2111.00064* (2021).
- [5] Diane J Cook and Lawrence B Holder. 2006. *Mining graph data*. John Wiley & Sons.
- [6] Tim Dettmers, Artidoro Pagnoni, Ari Holtzman, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2024. Qlora: Efficient finetuning of quantized llms. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 36 (2024).
- [7] 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).
- [8] Bahare Fatemi, Jonathan Halcrow, and Bryan Perozzi. 2024. Talk like a Graph: Encoding Graphs for Large Language Models. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- [9] Tianyu Gao, Xingcheng Yao, and Danqi Chen. 2021. Simcse: Simple contrastive learning of sentence embeddings. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.08821* (2021).
- [10] Zhong Guan, Hongke Zhao, Likang Wu, Ming He, and Jianpin Fan. 2024. Lang-Topo: Aligning Language Descriptions of Graphs with Tokenized Topological Modeling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.13250* (2024).
- [11] Zirui Guo, Lianhao 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).
- [12] Will Hamilton, Zhitao Ying, and Jure Leskovec. 2017. Inductive representation learning on large graphs. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 30 (2017).
- [13] Xiaoxin He, Xavier Bresson, Thomas Laurent, Adam Perold, Yann LeCun, and Bryan Hooi. 2024. Harnessing Explanations: LLM-to-LM Interpreter for Enhanced Text-Attributed Graph Representation Learning. *arXiv:2305.19523*
- [14] Xiangnan He, Kuan Deng, Xiang Wang, Yan Li, Yongdong Zhang, and Meng Wang. 2020. Lightgcn: Simplifying and powering graph convolution network for recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 43rd International ACM SIGIR conference on research and development in Information Retrieval*. 639–648.
- [15] Edward J Hu, Yelong Shen, Phillip Wallis, Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yuanzhi Li, Shean Wang, Lu Wang, and Weizhu Chen. 2021. Lora: Low-rank adaptation of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.09685* (2021).
- [16] Xuanwen Huang, Kaiqiao Han, Yang Yang, Dezheng Bao, Quanjin Tao, Ziwei Chai, and Qi Zhu. 2024. Can GNN be Good Adapter for LLMs?. In *Proceedings of the ACM on Web Conference 2024*. 893–904.
- [17] Xiao Huang, Qingquan Song, Yuening Li, and Xia Hu. 2019. Graph recurrent networks with attributed random walks. In *Proceedings of the 25th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining*. 732–740.
- [18] Zhongyu Huang, Yingheng Wang, Chaozhao Li, and Huiguang He. 2022. Going deeper into permutation-sensitive graph neural networks. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 9377–9409.
- [19] Thomas N Kipf and Max Welling. 2016. Semi-supervised classification with graph convolutional networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1609.02907* (2016).
- [20] Brian Lester, Rami Al-Rfou, and Noah Constant. 2021. The power of scale for parameter-efficient prompt tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.08691* (2021).
- [21] Xiang Lisa Li and Percy Liang. 2021. Prefix-tuning: Optimizing continuous prompts for generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2101.00190* (2021).
- [22] Yuhua Li, Zhixun Li, Peisong Wang, Jia Li, Xiangguo Sun, Hong Cheng, and Jeffrey Xu Yu. 2023. A survey of graph meets large language model: Progress and future directions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.12399* (2023).
- [23] Yuhua Li, Zhixun Li, Peisong Wang, Jia Li, Xiangguo Sun, Hong Cheng, and Jeffrey Xu Yu. 2024. A Survey of Graph Meets Large Language Model: Progress

- and Future Directions. arXiv:2311.12399
- [24] Yinhan Liu. 2019. Roberta: A robustly optimized bert pretraining approach. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.11692* (2019).
- [25] Jianmo Ni, Jiacheng Li, and Julian McAuley. 2019. Justifying recommendations using distantly-labeled reviews and fine-grained aspects. In *Proceedings of the 2019 conference on empirical methods in natural language processing and the 9th international joint conference on natural language processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*. 188–197.
- [26] Giannis Nikolentzos, Antoine Tixier, and Michalis Vazirgiannis. 2020. Message passing attention networks for document understanding. In *Proceedings of the aaai conference on artificial intelligence*, Vol. 34. 8544–8551.
- [27] Jeffrey Pennington, Richard Socher, and Christopher D Manning. 2014. Glove: Global vectors for word representation. In *Proceedings of the 2014 conference on empirical methods in natural language processing (EMNLP)*. 1532–1543.
- [28] Xubin Ren, Jiabin Tang, Dawei Yin, Nitesh Chawla, and Chao Huang. 2024. A survey of large language models for graphs. In *Proceedings of the 30th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*. 6616–6626.
- [29] Hyunjin Seo, Taewon Kim, June Yong Yang, and Eunho Yang. 2024. Unleashing the Potential of Text-attributed Graphs: Automatic Relation Decomposition via Large Language Models. arXiv:2405.18581
- [30] Ruoxi Sun, Hanjun Dai, and Adams Wei Yu. 2022. Does gnn pretraining help molecular representation? *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 35 (2022), 12096–12109.
- [31] Yanchao Tan, Hang Lv, Xinyi Huang, Jiawei Zhang, Shiping Wang, and Carl Yang. 2024. MuseGraph: Graph-oriented Instruction Tuning of Large Language Models for Generic Graph Mining. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.04780* (2024).
- [32] Jie Tang, Jing Zhang, Limin Yao, Juanzi Li, Li Zhang, and Zhong Su. 2008. Ar-netminer: extraction and mining of academic social networks. In *Proceedings of the 14th ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining*. 990–998.
- [33] Hugo Touvron, Thibaut Lavril, Gautier Izacard, Xavier Martinet, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Timothée Lacroix, Baptiste Rozière, Naman Goyal, Eric Hambro, Faisal Azhar, et al. 2023. Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.13971* (2023).
- [34] Petar Veličković, Guillem Cucurull, Arantxa Casanova, Adriana Romero, Pietro Lio, and Yoshua Bengio. 2017. Graph attention networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1710.10903* (2017).
- [35] Felix Wu, Amauri Souza, Tianyi Zhang, Christopher Fifty, Tao Yu, and Kilian Weinberger. 2019. Simplifying graph convolutional networks. In *International conference on machine learning*. 6861–6871.
- [36] 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.
- [37] Ruosong Ye, Caiqi Zhang, Runhui Wang, Shuyuan Xu, and Yongfeng Zhang. 2024. Language is all a graph needs. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EACL 2024*. 1955–1973.
- [38] Anthony Zaknich. 1998. Introduction to the modified probabilistic neural network for general signal processing applications. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing* 46, 7 (1998), 1980–1990.
- [39] Yin Zhang, Rong Jin, and Zhi-Hua Zhou. 2010. Understanding bag-of-words model: a statistical framework. *International journal of machine learning and cybernetics* 1 (2010), 43–52.
- [40] Yiding Zhang, Chaozhuo Li, Xing Xie, Xiao Wang, Chuan Shi, Yuming Liu, Hao Sun, Liangjie Zhang, Weiwei Deng, and Qi Zhang. 2022. Geometric Disentangled Collaborative Filtering. In *Proceedings of the 45th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*. 80–90.
- [41] Ziwei Zhang, Haoyang Li, Zeyang Zhang, Yijian Qin, Xin Wang, and Wenwu Zhu. 2023. Graph meets llms: Towards large graph models. In *NeurIPS 2023 Workshop: New Frontiers in Graph Learning*.
- [42] 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).
- [43] Wayne Xin Zhao, Kun Zhou, Junyi Li, Tianyi Tang, Xiaolei Wang, Yupeng Hou, Yingqian Min, Beichen Zhang, Junjie Zhang, Zican Dong, et al. 2023. A survey of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.18223* (2023).
- [44] Huachi Zhou, Shuang Zhou, Hao Chen, Ninghao Liu, Fan Yang, and Xiao Huang. 2024. Enhancing explainable rating prediction through annotated macro concepts. In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*. 11736–11748.
- [45] Yun Zhu, Yaoke Wang, Haizhou Shi, and Siliang Tang. 2024. Efficient Tuning and Inference for Large Language Models on Textual Graphs. arXiv:2401.15569

**Table 8: Performance comparison among state-of-the-art baselines w.r.t. Macro-F1.**

LMs	GNNs	Ogbn-Arxiv		Ogbn-Products	
		Val.	Test.	Val.	Test.
<b>Fine-tuned LMs + GNNs</b>					
Bert	-	52.5	50.8	59.2	46.2
	GCN	53.3	51.6	69.5	55.8
	GAT	55.6	53.7	70.4	56.8
	GraphSAGE	50.2	48.4	65.7	54.0
Roberta	-	52.4	50.6	58.0	44.8
	GCN	53.1	51.8	68.4	55.0
	GAT	55.7	53.4	69.2	55.5
	GraphSAGE	49.1	48.4	64.8	53.7
<b>Specialized Frameworks for Text-Attributed Graphs</b>					
	MPAD	48.6	43.5	57.6	43.2
	GLEM	57.4	55.9	<u>73.6</u>	<u>64.7</u>
	GraphFormers	49.4	44.8	54.3	42.1
	LLAGA	<u>60.4</u>	<u>60.2</u>	72.1	64.3
	InstructGLM	60.1	59.8	-	-
	<b>GDL4LLM</b>	<b>60.9</b>	<b>60.5</b>	<b>74.3</b>	<b>65.5</b>
<b>Fine-tuned LLMs + GNNs</b>					
GraphAdapter	-	<b>60.9</b>	<u>60.4</u>	-	-
Llama3-8b	-	56.5	54.7	-	-
Llama3-8b	GraphSAGE	59.6	60.0	-	-
	<b>GDL4LLM w/ attr</b>	<u>60.6</u>	<b>60.5</b>	-	-

## A Macro-F1 Score

**Table 7: Performance comparison among state-of-the-art baselines w.r.t. Macro-F1.**

LMs	GNNs	ACM		Wiki		Amazon	
		Val.	Test.	Val.	Test.	Val.	Test.
<b>Fine-tuned LMs + GNNs</b>							
Bert	-	73.6	69.0	59.7	58.4	87.7	86.9
	GCN	75.9	<u>74.6</u>	61.0	58.7	91.5	90.1
	GAT	76.2	74.1	62.3	60.8	91.6	90.6
	GraphSAGE	76.3	74.1	61.8	59.5	91.8	90.0
Roberta	-	71.2	70.7	60.4	57.6	85.8	83.9
	GCN	75.6	74.1	60.0	56.1	91.3	90.7
	GAT	76.1	74.2	62.6	<u>61.2</u>	91.6	90.5
	GraphSAGE	76.0	74.1	61.2	57.5	90.6	90.4
<b>Specialized Frameworks for Text-Attributed Graphs</b>							
	MPAD	72.2	71.6	56.2	53.9	90.4	88.6
	GLEM	<u>76.6</u>	73.9	<u>62.8</u>	58.3	<u>91.8</u>	<u>90.9</u>
	GraphFormers	71.0	65.4	53.5	51.2	85.2	82.2
	LLAGA	72.8	72.1	60.9	60.5	89.5	88.6
	InstructGLM	70.1	68.9	62.1	58.1	90.8	89.6
	<b>GDL4LLM</b>	<b>77.2</b>	<b>75.9</b>	<b>63.0</b>	<b>61.5</b>	<b>92.1</b>	<b>91.3</b>
<b>Fine-tuned LLMs + GNNs</b>							
GraphAdapter	-	77.4	75.7	61.6	59.9	<u>91.7</u>	<u>90.0</u>
Llama3-8b	-	75.9	73.8	61.7	59.0	88.9	88.3
Llama3-8b	GraphSAGE	<u>78.5</u>	<u>76.4</u>	<u>62.0</u>	<u>60.6</u>	90.9	89.6
	<b>GDL4LLM w/ attr</b>	<b>79.7</b>	<b>77.7</b>	<b>63.0</b>	<b>61.5</b>	<b>93.1</b>	<b>92.4</b>