



HiBench: Benchmarking LLMs Capability on Hierarchical Structure Reasoning

Zhuohang Jiang*
zhuohang.jiang@connect.polyu.hk
The Hong Kong Polytechnic
University
Hong Kong

Pangjing Wu*
pang-jing.wu@connect.polyu.hk
The Hong Kong Polytechnic
University
Hong Kong

Ziran Liang*
ziran.liang@connect.polyu.hk
The Hong Kong Polytechnic
University
Hong Kong

Peter Q. Chen*
peter-q.chen@connect.polyu.hk
The Hong Kong Polytechnic
University
Hong Kong

Xu Yuan*
xander.yuan@connect.polyu.hk
The Hong Kong Polytechnic
University
Hong Kong

Ye Jia*
ye-aimeng.jia@connect.polyu.hk
The Hong Kong Polytechnic
University
Hong Kong

Jiancheng Tu*
jiancheng.tu@connect.polyu.hk
The Hong Kong Polytechnic
University
Hong Kong

Chen Li
richard-chen.li@polyu.edu.hk
The Hong Kong Polytechnic
University
Hong Kong

Peter H.F. Ng
peter.nhf@polyu.edu.hk
The Hong Kong Polytechnic
University
Hong Kong

Qing Li†
csqli@comp.polyu.edu.hk
The Hong Kong Polytechnic
University
Hong Kong

Abstract

Structure reasoning is a fundamental capability of large language models (LLMs), enabling them to reason about structured common-sense and answer multi-hop questions. However, existing benchmarks for structure reasoning mainly focus on horizontal and coordinate structures (e.g. graphs), overlooking the hierarchical relationships within them. Hierarchical structure reasoning is crucial for human cognition, particularly in memory organization and problem-solving. It also plays a key role in various real-world tasks, such as information extraction and decision-making. To address this gap, we propose HiBench, the first framework spanning from initial structure generation to final proficiency assessment, designed to benchmark the hierarchical reasoning capabilities of LLMs systematically. HiBench encompasses six representative scenarios, covering both fundamental and practical aspects, and consists of 30

tasks with varying hierarchical complexity, totaling 39,519 queries. To evaluate LLMs comprehensively, we develop five capability dimensions that depict different facets of hierarchical structure understanding. Through extensive evaluation of 20 LLMs from 10 model families, we reveal key insights into their capabilities and limitations: 1) existing LLMs show proficiency in basic hierarchical reasoning tasks; 2) they still struggle with more complex structures and implicit hierarchical representations, especially in structural modification and textual reasoning. Based on these findings, we create a small yet well-designed instruction dataset, which enhances LLMs' performance on HiBench by an average of 88.84% (Llama-3.1-8B) and 31.38% (Qwen2.5-7B) across all tasks. The HiBench dataset and toolkit are available here to encourage evaluation.

CCS Concepts

• Computing methodologies → Natural language processing.

Keywords

Hierarchical Reasoning, Benchmark, Natural Language Processing, Large Language Models

ACM Reference Format:

Zhuohang Jiang, Pangjing Wu, Ziran Liang, Peter Q. Chen, Xu Yuan, Ye Jia, Jiancheng Tu, Chen Li, Peter H.F. Ng, and Qing Li. 2025. HiBench: Benchmarking LLMs Capability on Hierarchical Structure Reasoning. In . ACM, Toronto, ON, Canada, 28 pages. <https://doi.org/XXXXXXXXXXXXXX>

*Authors contributed equally to this research.
†Corresponding Author.

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.
Conference'17, Washington, DC, USA

© 2025 Copyright held by the owner/author(s). Publication rights licensed to ACM.
ACM ISBN 978-1-4503-XXXX-X/2018/06
<https://doi.org/XXXXXXXXXXXXXX>


1 Introduction

Recently, Large Language Models (LLMs) have shown remarkable performance across a variety of tasks, such as conversational AI [4, 7, 40], text summarization [27, 68], language translation [23, 29, 36], programming assistance [35, 45]. These advancements have driven substantial progress in practical applications, including healthcare [24, 42, 50], finance [60, 66, 71], and software development [33, 39, 59]. Notably, the emergent cognitive abilities in LLMs have been observed to increasingly mirror certain aspects of human intelligence, which suggests potential parallels between LLMs' behavior and human cognitive processes, arousing discussions about possible pathways to artificial general intelligence (AGI) [19, 72]. One fundamental principle of human cognition is hierarchical reasoning, which is essential for memory organization, problem-solving, and decision-making [20, 43, 49], allowing humans to understand and organize complex relationships with structured knowledge effectively. Consequently, assessing whether and how well hierarchical reasoning is exhibited in LLMs is significant for further investigating the alignment between LLMs' capabilities and human cognition.


While numerous benchmarks have been developed to assess various cognitive capabilities of LLMs, such as memory retrieval[28], commonsense understanding[30, 47], and structure reasoning[44, 73], there remains a significant gap when it comes to evaluating hierarchical reasoning. Existing structure reasoning benchmarks for LLMs focus primarily on tasks involving horizontal or coordinate structures, such as graph [12, 13, 55] or table [52, 57], but overlook the critical hierarchical nature of cognitive reasoning, where information is processed at different levels of abstraction. This absence hinders a comprehensive understanding of LLMs' true cognitive abilities. To fill the essential gap in current evaluation frameworks for LLMs, we propose **HiBench**, the first benchmark specifically designed to evaluate LLMs' capability on hierarchical structure reasoning, providing a systematic framework for assessing how LLMs organize, process, and reason with multi-level information across multiple capability dimensions and scenarios.

As diverse task demands drive the evolution of cognitive competencies, HiBench proposes 30 carefully designed tasks with 39,519 queries to assess LLMs' hierarchical reasoning capabilities, which are systematically organized across six distinct scenarios, encompassing both fundamental and practical aspects of hierarchical reasoning. The fundamental aspect comprises three scenarios: *Binary Tree*, *Multiple Tree*, and *JSON*, accounting for 22 tasks. These scenarios were selected to assess LLMs' behavior in processing and manipulating abstraction hierarchical structures, which reflect basic yet essential hierarchical reasoning capabilities. The practical aspect includes three real-world scenarios: *Code*, *Formula*, and *Paper*, consisting of eight specific tasks. These scenarios embed the complexity within the application context into hierarchical reasoning to assess how well LLMs handle hierarchical information in various practical domains, serving as a robust indicator of advanced hierarchical reasoning capabilities.

To provide a comprehensive and thorough assessment of LLMs' hierarchical reasoning capabilities, HiBench establishes a multi-dimensional evaluation system comprising five essential dimensions: *Relationship Awareness*, *Structural Understanding*, *Structural*



(a) Performance of each Family's State-of-the-art Models over Five Hierarchical Reasoning Capability Dimensions.



(b) Overall Performance of LLM Families on HiBench.

Figure 1: Performance Distribution of LLM Model Families on HiBench.

Manipulation, Analytical Reasoning, and Textual Reasoning. These dimensions capture distinct yet progressive aspects of hierarchical reasoning, from recognizing and navigating structures to performing complex reasoning tasks. Furthermore, HiBench incorporates comparative experiments across varying *structure complexity*, *contextual learning paradigms*, and *structure representations*, enabling the investigation of critical factors affecting LLMs' performance across the five evaluation dimensions. As summarized in Figure 1, extensive experimental results demonstrate that current popular LLMs from various families possess preliminary hierarchical reasoning capabilities with general performance over 40.0% accuracy. Our findings reveal several key insights: 1) LLMs generally demonstrate more substantial capabilities in relationship awareness, structural understanding, and analytical reasoning than structural manipulation and textual reasoning; 2) As the complexity of the hierarchical structure increases, whether in depth or breadth, the challenge for LLMs also intensifies; 3) Structure representation with explicit hierarchical information enhances LLMs' reasoning capabilities; 4) LLMs perform more effectively when contextual semantics align with real-world hierarchical relationships; 5) Contextual learning strategies can enhance LLMs' performance, while the benefits of simple chain-of-thought (CoT) prompting are limited.




Figure 2: Comprehensive Breakdown of Hierarchical Scenarios Categories and Tasks in HiBench.

Since LLMs still have room for improvement in their hierarchical structure reasoning capabilities, we construct a small yet well-designed instruction dataset consisting of 14,623 question-answer pairs across six scenarios based on our findings. The dataset was designed to target LLMs’ weaknesses in hierarchical reasoning, focusing on complex structures, implicit representations, and counterfactual configurations. After instruction fine-tuning, two small-scale LLMs, Llama-3.1-8B [18] and Qwen2.5-7B [63], achieved higher performance on HiBench by 88.84% (Llama-3.1-8B) and 31.38% (Qwen2.5-7B) across all tasks, compared to their vanilla versions. They even exceed large-scale models like LLaMA-3.1-405B by up to 7.31% (Llama-3.1-8B) and 18.06% (Qwen2.5-7B), and the GPT-4 [2] by up to 6.53% (Qwen2.5-7B) and 0.2% (Llama-3.1-8B), which indicates a small-scale high-quality dataset can inspire LLMs’ hierarchical reasoning capabilities. However, the performance on some tasks remains far less than average, making it an open question to comprehensively boost LLM’s hierarchical reasoning ability.

Our contributions are summarized as follows:

- We propose HiBench, the first benchmark specifically designed to evaluate hierarchical reasoning capabilities in LLMs.
- We conduct extensive experiments evaluating 20 LLMs from 10 families, uncovering both the capabilities and challenges of LLMs in hierarchical reasoning, and providing new insights for further improvement.
- By constructing an instruction dataset that targets LLMs’ weaknesses in hierarchical reasoning and finetuning small-scale LLMs, we enhance their effectiveness in hierarchical reasoning tasks, outperforming GPT-4 by 6.53% at most.

2 Related Works

2.1 LLMs on Structure Reasoning

With the popularity of LLMs, researchers have begun to deeply explore the combination of these LLMs and structure data (e.g., graph). Early research mainly focused on empirical performance evaluation. For example, GraphBERT [69], GraphTransformer [67], and GraphT5 [31] are all exploring whether LLM can understand structured graph data. These studies lay a solid foundation for applying LLM in graph data. In addition, Luo *et al.* [38] systematically evaluated LLM’s capability to perform graph reasoning tasks

through GraphInstruct. At the same time, Dai *et al.* [13] pointed out that there is still a significant gap in LLM’s understanding of graph structures. However, most of these studies are limited to horizontal graph reasoning tasks, ignoring the importance of evaluating LLM’s capability for hierarchical structure reasoning. This limitation prompts us to further explore the application potential of LLM in more complex graph structures.

2.2 Implicit Hierarchical Thinking in LLMs

The investigation into *Implicit Hierarchical Thinking* via LLMs has emerged as a prominent research focus in recent years. It was noted that LLMs may not always exhibit a step-by-step reasoning process in implicit reasoning but rather output results directly through their internal hierarchical structure. For example, Deng *et al.* [15] proposed a transition method from the explicit CoT to implicit CoT to improve the reasoning capability of LLMs through knowledge distillation. Regarding task planning, LLMs can solve complex problems through hierarchical decomposition. For example, Yao *et al.* [64] proposed the Tree of Thoughts framework to optimize LLMs’ problem-solving capability through a hierarchical structure. In addition, He *et al.* [25] proposed a dual-process framework for dialogue planning that simulates human hierarchical thinking in planning tasks. Research on implicit hierarchical thinking in LLMs has significantly progressed in various areas. However, there is still a need to explore further how to utilize the hierarchical thinking capabilities of LLMs better to enhance their performance in complex tasks.

3 Task Taxonomy

This section provides an overview of task taxonomy in HiBench, illustrated in Figure 2, focusing on their design principles. Since diverse task scenarios demand varying hierarchical reasoning capabilities in LLMs, our taxonomy systematically categorizes tasks based on their complexity and cognitive requirements, encompassing fundamental and practical aspects. This categorization reveals the core requirement of LLMs for hierarchical reasoning capability and facilitates a precise evaluation of LLMs’ abilities across different contexts, offering targeted insights for future model improvements.




Figure 3: Overview of the Paradigm for HiBench: Hierarchical Construction and Evaluation Architecture.

3.1 Fundamental Aspect

Fundamental tasks focus on assessing LLMs' hierarchical reasoning capability to understand and manipulate structures over hierarchical structure data, such as tree structure and semi-structured JSON files. These tasks aim to evaluate whether LLMs can effectively perform hierarchical reasoning on diverse hierarchical data representations.

Scenario 1: Binary Tree. Binary trees are a fundamental data structure widely used in computer science. Using the generalized random structure generator, we constructed the corresponding binary tree with varying difficulty in multiple dimensions of depth, then designed six hierarchical tasks, *Balance*, *Prefix Traversal*, *Infix Traversal*, *Postfix Traversal*, *Traversal Order Verification* and *Mirror Tree* to evaluate LLM's hierarchical understanding of tree structures.

Scenario 2: Multiple Tree. Multiple trees are widely utilized in diverse domains such as database indexing, file systems, and network architectures, where they excel in representing complex hierarchical arrangements that surpass the limitations of binary trees. Therefore, we use a randomized tree generator to construct multinomial trees of varying difficulty in multiple dimensions of breadth and depth, then developed nine hierarchical tasks: *Add Node*, *All Ancestor*, *All Children*, *Common Ancestor*, *Isomorphic*, *Remove Node*, *Node Depth*, *Leaf* and *Root*. These tasks are designed to fully evaluate the hierarchical reasoning capabilities of LLMs.

Scenario 3: JSON. JSON is a semi-structured data interchange format that can represent hierarchical data structures using nested objects and arrays. As a standardized format, JSON is widely supported and understood. Therefore, we randomly generated JSON files with different breadth and depth and designed the following seven tasks: *Child Count*, *Node Depth*, *Level Count*, *Node Attribute*, *Level Nodes*, *Path Finding* and *Nearest Ancestor*. These tasks examine

the LLM's capability to parse JSON data, understand hierarchies, and analyze paths in multiple dimensions.

3.2 Practical Aspect

In contrast to the fundamental aspect, the practical aspect emphasizes real-world applications ranging in information format and structural diversity, such as formulas, code, and academic papers. These tasks assess the versatility and capability of LLMs to apply hierarchical reasoning in addressing noisy and complex real-world challenges.

Scenario 4: Formula. Mathematical formulas can exhibit certain hierarchical information in prefix, infix, and postfix notations. Therefore, we randomly generated a series of formulas of varying difficulty using formula length, number size, and symbolic complexity as variables and constructed three types of formula comprehension tasks: *Conversion*, *Calculation* and *Equivalence*, to assess LLM's formula hierarchical understanding capability.

Scenario 5: Code. The structure and logic of the code are hierarchical. Therefore, we collected different types of C++ and Python code on the LeetCode platform and constructed two types of tasks, *Space Complexity* and *Time Complexity*, aiming at evaluating the capability of the LLM to understand and analyze the code.

Scenario 6: Paper. Papers are hierarchically structured textual information, so we carefully screened several papers as datasets based on the QASPER [14] dataset and assessed LLM's hierarchical reasoning capabilities on academic papers based on three types of tasks *Contextual QA*, *Disordered Section* and *Outline Extraction*.

4 The HiBench

In this section, we introduce the overall architecture of HiBench, a comprehensive and systematic benchmark developed to assess

the hierarchical reasoning capabilities of LLMs, thereby facilitating user adoption and utilization by ensuring a well-established workflow. The architecture is organized into two main components: *Hierarchical Dataset Constructor* and *Evaluator*. *Hierarchical Dataset Constructor* systematically generates benchmark data with varying complexity. *Evaluator* quantifies model performance from five refined capability dimensions. An overview of this architecture is illustrated in Figure 3, with more details provided in Appendix B.

4.1 Hierarchical Dataset Generator

In this section, the generation process of HiBench is introduced, consisting of three main stages: *Structure Generator*, *Query-Answer Generation*, and *Prompting Production*. Firstly, building upon the previously mentioned task taxonomy in Section 3, the difficulty of specific tasks within each scenario varies due to the intricacy of their hierarchical structures. To ensure a thorough evaluation, *Structure Generator* constructs various hierarchical structures for subsequence processes across different scenarios. Secondly, *Query-Answer Generation* utilizes these pre-constructed structures to generate corresponding queries for sub-tasks in different scenarios. Finally, *Prompting Production* refines these queries into well-structured prompts, adapting them for LLMs and ensuring consistency across evaluations.

Structure Generator. Given that the task taxonomy of HiBench encompasses diverse application scenarios characterized by specialized requirements and varying levels of complexity, tailoring structure generators is necessary. For the four scenarios, Binary Tree, Multiple Tree, JSON, and Formula, their structure generators autonomously and efficiently construct large-scale, diverse structure instances, providing rich and challenging hierarchical structures to support comprehensive evaluation. Specifically, the tree generator constructs hierarchical tree data based on key features such as out-degree, depth, and node number. The JSON generator constructs data by considering two key dimensions: width and depth, while the formula generator constructs data based on numerical complexity, symbolic complexity, and length of formulas to ensure varying degrees of complexity. In contrast, for the other two scenarios, Code and Paper, their structure generators collect a large amount of hierarchically structured data from existing real-world sources as initial data. Specifically, the code generator collects code samples from GitHub¹ and LeetCode², while the paper generator reorganizes paper data from QASPER [14]. These data encompass the hierarchical structures of codes and papers, ensuring their diversity and real-world representativeness.

Query-Answer Generator. Since each task scenario consists of multiple sub-tasks, we generate corresponding query-answer pairs based on the structures constructed in the previous section. Various algorithms are employed to tailor queries to specific sub-tasks. For instance, the prefix traversal algorithm generates query-answer pairs for the corresponding sub-task based on the binary tree structure. Notably, we use manual annotations to generate query-answer pairs for paper scenarios without fixed answers.

¹<https://github.com>

²<https://leetcode.com/>

Table 1: Basic Statistics of HiBench.

Scenarios	Tasks	Sub-Tasks	Queries	Avg. Length
Binary Tree	6	216	4,968	2,824.3
Multiple Tree	9	162	9,558	915.0
JSON	7	300	2,586	1,349.8
Formula	3	1,458	18,954	516.8
Code	2	12	1,200	1,296.9
Paper	3	9	2,253	26,759.2
HiBench	30	2,157	39,519	1,725.9

Prompting Producer. To optimize query-answer pairs for LLM-generated responses, we develop a set of carefully crafted prompts, including In-context Learning (ICL) [16], and CoT [70], enabling comprehensive evaluation across different requirements. We also provide instructions to restrict the output format, ensuring responses align with specific structural or stylistic guidelines.

Table 1 provides a detailed statistical summary of HiBench across various scenarios, comprising 30 tasks and 39,519 queries. Our benchmark dataset offers a robust foundation for evaluating the hierarchical reasoning capabilities of LLMs across diverse queries.

4.2 Evaluator

Hierarchical reasoning in human cognition progresses from understanding local relationships to grasping global structures, performing structural operations, and reasoning within increasingly complex information contexts, reflecting a growing demand for advanced reasoning capabilities.

Building on this progression, we define five key dimensions to evaluate LLMs' hierarchical reasoning capabilities, mirroring the stages of human cognition progress in hierarchical reasoning:

- *Local Relationship Awareness* assesses the capability to recognize immediate connections, such as parent-child relationships in trees or code dependencies.
- *Global Structural Understanding* extends this to comprehending the overall organization of a structure.
- *Structural Manipulation* evaluates the capability to modify structures, such as code refactoring or tree transformations.
- *Analytical Reasoning* measures the capability to derive insights through logical and quantitative analysis.
- *Textual Reasoning* examines the capacity to generate coherent and contextually appropriate descriptions of hierarchical structures.

Based on the characteristics of each task, we categorize LLMs' performance into these five evaluation dimensions, as illustrated in Figure 2. It aligns tasks with the cognitive and computational demands of structured data processing, forming an integral framework for assessing hierarchical reasoning capabilities.

5 Experimental Results

In this section, we present the experimental results evaluating the performance of LLMs on hierarchical reasoning using our HiBench. We use *Accuracy* as the primary metric to assess LLM performance, defined as $Accuracy = \frac{\#Correct}{\#Total}$.

Table 2: HiBench Leaderboard: Categorizing Models by Open-Source Status and Family.*

Model Family	Model Name	Fundamental Aspect			Practical Aspect			Average	Rank
		Binary	Multiple	JSON	Code	Formula	Paper		
Closed-Sourced									
OpenAI	GPT-3.5 [46]	39.19	54.22	53.49	66.50	<u>54.54</u>	-**	53.59	6
	GPT-4 [2]	56.29	<u>73.64</u>	63.59	<u>70.75</u>	54.37	38.35	<u>59.50</u>	2
Open-Sourced									
01-AI	Yi-1.5-9B [65]	26.18	47.67	54.23	66.75	42.42	10.27	41.25	9
Qwen	Qwen2.5-0.5B [63]	1.99	15.03	15.31	2.50	8.83	3.98	7.94	19
	Qwen2.5-1.5B [63]	19.43	43.30	35.47	56.75	21.17	25.54	32.02	17
	Qwen2.5-3B [63]	24.32	48.95	39.71	60.25	39.78	32.38	40.52	10
	Qwen2.5-7B [63]	33.11	59.01	48.58	69.25	41.27	42.08	49.93	7
	QwQ-32B [53]	42.91	74.12	<u>73.80</u>	13.75	16.82	17.22	39.77	12
	Qwen2.5-72B [63]	45.61	63.08	70.50	69.25	51.75	39.72	56.65	3
Baichuan Inc.	Baichuan-7B [61]	2.62	1.75	4.33	0.25	0.93	0.00	1.65	20
DeepSeek	DeepSeek-V3 [34]	70.23	72.59	77.65	72.50	57.40	<u>42.99</u>	65.56	1
Meta	Llama-3.2-1B [18]	9.57	20.45	23.18	44.25	17.02	13.30	21.30	18
	Llama-3.2-3B [18]	31.79	34.70	29.31	60.50	23.20	28.07	34.59	15
	Llama-3.1-8B [18]	14.74	28.76	49.29	61.75	26.35	16.23	32.85	16
	Llama-3.1-70B [18]	54.73	65.04	63.03	68.75	42.14	43.71	56.24	4
	Llama-3.1-405B [18]	<u>64.49</u>	59.95	55.61	53.37	63.45	16.46	55.53	5
Microsoft	Phi-3.5-mini-3.8B [1]	27.36	38.24	57.52	65.25	41.76	11.51	40.27	11
Mistral	Mistral-7B [26]	26.14	31.00	49.19	58.75	40.08	27.10	38.71	13
SHAILib	InternLM2.5-7B [6]	34.28	39.02	54.62	65.75	23.27	6.24	37.20	14
THUDM	GLM-4-9B [22]	36.72	46.26	48.60	66.50	32.11	37.60	44.63	8
Average Performance		33.08	44.61	49.94	55.53	34.43	23.83	40.48	-

* The best results for each category are marked in **bold**, and the second-best results are marked with underline.

** Queries exceed the maximum context token limitation of GPT-3.5.

5.1 LLMs' Performance on HiBench

Overview. Table 2 presents the performance of the 20 most popular and powerful LLMs across tasks in our HiBench categorized by model families and scenarios. Current LLMs achieve an average score of 40.48% over our HiBench, demonstrating the general level of hierarchical reasoning capabilities. Specifically, DeepSeek-V3 [34] stands out with the highest performance, achieving a mean score of 65.56%. It surpasses the benchmark average by 62.0% and outperforms the most powerful closed-sourced LLM, GPT-4 [2], by 10.2%. Although many LLMs demonstrate basic hierarchical reasoning capabilities in managing Multiple Tree, JSON, and Code scenarios, these LLMs still face challenges in more complex scenarios, especially in the practical aspects. These findings highlight the importance of continued model refinement to enhance LLMs' behavior on more advanced and nuanced hierarchical tasks.

Scenario Performance. Figure 4 presents the performance of LLMs across various hierarchical reasoning tasks, categorized by different scenarios such as Multiple Tree, JSON, Code, Formula, Paper, and Binary Tree. The results show that LLMs perform well on

tasks such as *Root Identification*, *Level Counting*, and *Node Attribute Recognition*, with performance values reaching up to 70%. These tasks, which require minimal reasoning complexity and exhibit clear structural patterns, allow LLMs to achieve high accuracy. In contrast, tasks like *Path Finding*, *Mirror Tree*, and *Calculation* are generally below 30% and pose significant challenges due to their requirements for multi-step reasoning, structural transformations or numerical computations. The average performance across all tasks is 41.2%.

Capability Dimensions. As illustrated in Figure 1 (a), LLMs perform well in local relationship awareness, global structural understanding, and analytical reasoning but struggle with structural modifications and textual reasoning. DeepSeek-V3 leads overall, scoring 75.96 in local relationship awareness, 66.77 in global structural understanding, and 64.95 in analytical reasoning, yet still lags in structural modifications and textual reasoning. Similarly, GPT-4 and Qwen2.5-72B-Instruct maintain strong local relationship awareness and analytical reasoning scores but steeply decline in structural modifications. Smaller models, including Yi-1.5-9B and Phi-3.5-mini-3.8B, perform poorly in structural modifications and




Figure 4: Average Performance of LLM Tasks across Capability Dimensions and Scenarios.

TR. Baichuan-7b fails in all dimensions, and we conduct case studies in Appendix F.1 to discuss its failure. The performance disparity underscores that while LLMs recognize and analyze hierarchical structures well, they struggle with modifying and reasoning through hierarchical text, highlighting further gains in these tasks.




Figure 5: Impact of Structural Complexity on LLM Hierarchical Reasoning Capabilities.

Structure Complexity Impact. Figure 5 presents the performance of LLMs across varying structure complexity levels. The results demonstrate that LLMs perform significantly better on simpler structures, with accuracy peaking for the *easy* structures in all scenarios. In contrast, as structure complexity increases, performance declines noticeably, with the *hard* structures yielding only 19.6% accuracy in the Binary Tree scenario and 37.0% in the JSON scenario. These findings suggest that while LLMs can effectively handle tasks with simpler structures and clear patterns, they struggle with more complex hierarchical structures, highlighting the need for further model development to address more challenging hierarchical structures.

5.2 Insightful Findings

5.2.1 Structure Representation affect LLM Reasoning. As the structure representation mode can affect an LLM’s capability to capture hierarchical information, we explore the impact of different representation modes on hierarchical reasoning performance. Specifically, we compare two representation modes: *edge* representation and *text tree* representation, over binary and multiple tree tasks. The edge representation describes the hierarchical structure through a list of directed edges, while the text tree representation uses structure symbols to depict the structure. As shown in Figure 6 (a), LLMs with text tree representation achieve better performance than

those with edge representation on both binary tree and multiple tree tasks, with performance values of 39.6% and 38.4%, respectively, indicating that the input representation can affect the LLM’s hierarchical reasoning capability. As shown in Figure 9, the text tree representation provides global hierarchical information, while the edge representation focuses only on local connections, which may limit its effectiveness in capturing the overall structure. It suggests that the text tree representation is more beneficial for tasks requiring a global understanding of the hierarchy.

5.2.2 Expression of Explicit Structures Improves LLM Comprehension. In practical aspects, such as Code and Paper scenarios, hierarchical structures may present with either implicit or explicit structural constraints. In the Code scenario, C++ utilizes explicit structural constraints where double braces mark each block, while Python relies on indentation to represent hierarchical relationships implicitly. In the Paper scenario, papers formatted in an XML-like style [8] offer clear structural indicators, whereas those based on plain text lack explicit hierarchical cues. Figure 6 (b) and (c) investigate how these kinds of structural constraints impact LLMs’ hierarchical reasoning capabilities. It demonstrates that inputs with explicit structural constraints consistently outperform those with implicit or no structure. Specifically, C++ outperforms Python by 4.7% in the Code scenario, while structured inputs surpass unstructured ones by 1.1% in the Paper scenario. The superior performance can be attributed to the clarity and consistency of explicit structural formats, such as C++’s strict syntactic rules and XML’s hierarchical markers, which define clear boundaries and reduce ambiguity, allowing LLMs to capture the hierarchical information more effectively. It highlights the critical role of explicit hierarchical structural constraints in enhancing the hierarchical reasoning capabilities of LLMs in practical aspects.




Figure 6: Impact of Input Mode on LLM Hierarchical Reasoning Capabilities.

5.2.3 Semantics Enhances LLM Hierarchical Structure Reasoning.

To investigate whether LLMs have captured essential hierarchical reasoning capability from real-world corpora during pre-training, we compare their performance on real-world hierarchical structures and nonsense structures in the JSON scenario. The original JSON scenario is based on real-world hierarchical structures containing semantically meaningful values. We construct nonsense structures involving hierarchies with randomly shuffled labels or meaningless values for comparison. As shown in Figure 6 (d), LLMs achieve a significantly higher accuracy of 42.4% with real-world semantic structures compared to 37.7% with nonsense structures. This improvement suggests that LLMs have likely learned basic hierarchical structure from real-world data, enabling them to better parse and reason over nested JSON hierarchies.

5.2.4 Impact of CoT. CoT is known to improve performance in various tasks by prompting models to break down problems into step-by-step logical sequences. To evaluate its impact on LLM hierarchical reasoning, we conducted experiments of Qwen2.5-7B [63] and QwQ-32B [53] on Binary Tree and Multiple Tree scenarios. As shown in Table 3, CoT slightly improved Qwen2.5-7B’s accuracy in the Multiple Tree task by 3.33% but had minimal degradation on the Binary Tree task. However, for QwQ-32B, CoT led to a 0.9% accuracy decrease in Binary Tree and a substantial 31.26% drop in Multiple Tree performance. These results indicate that CoT does not consistently enhance hierarchical reasoning and may introduce unnecessary steps that complicate intermediate reasoning, as further analyzed in our case study (Appendix F.2).

Table 3: Performance Comparison of Models Using CoT Reasoning Versus Standard One.

	Binary Tree	Multiple Tree
Qwen2.5-7B w/ CoT	33.11	54.86
Qwen2.5-7B w/o CoT	33.06	58.19
Δ_{CoT}	-0.05 ↓	3.33 ↑
QwQ-32B w/ CoT	42.91	74.12
QwQ-32B w/o CoT	42.01	42.86
Δ_{CoT}	-0.9 ↓	-31.26 ↓

5.3 Potential Improvement

Given the nascent state of LLMs’ performance in hierarchical reasoning, we conducted a series of experiments, including ICL and instruction fine-tuning, to assess the effectiveness of these methods in improving their hierarchical reasoning capabilities.

Figure 7 demonstrates ICL’s impact on LLMs over our HiBench, where zero-shot learning results in the lowest performance, one-shot learning shows moderate improvement and few-shot learning significantly enhances LLMs’ hierarchical reasoning capabilities. This trend demonstrates that LLMs benefit from additional context through ICL and that more examples lead to substantially better performance across hierarchical reasoning tasks. However, in some scenarios, such as Binary Tree, JSON, and Code, one-shot learning

Table 4: Instruction Finetuning Performance on HiBench.

Aspects	Qwen2.5-7B		Llama-3.1-8B	
	Vanilla	Finetuned	Vanilla	Finetuned
Fundamental	42.32	65.74	25.89	63.59
Practical	54.17	61.05	37.20	55.60
Average	48.25	63.39	31.55	59.59




Figure 7: Impact of ICL on Hierarchical Reasoning.

performs poorly compared to zero-shot. Our case study (Appendix F.3) suggests that LLMs may develop an unintended inductive bias when only a single example is provided, leading to incorrect generalization. This effect is particularly pronounced when the example contains high-frequency patterns or structural repetitions, causing the model to overfit spurious correlations rather than accurately grasping the hierarchical relationships. It highlights the importance of instance diversity in few-shot settings to mitigate biases and enhance LLMs’ hierarchical reasoning capabilities.

To further enhance the hierarchical reasoning capabilities of LLMs, we conducted instruction fine-tuning on the Llama-3.1-8B and Qwen2.5-7B models using a well-designed instruction dataset with 14,623 examples targeted to hierarchical reasoning. The dataset focuses more on scenarios with complex hierarchical structures, implicit structural representations, and counterfactual hierarchical configurations. This design aims to enhance LLMs’ reasoning across the weaker aspects. As shown in Table 4, fine-tuning led to significant performance improvements across fundamental and practical aspects. Specifically, Llama-3.1-8B improved from 31.55% to 59.59% on average, and Qwen2.5-7B improved from 48.25% to 63.39%. The fine-tuning results highlight the importance of finetuning LLMs to enhance hierarchical reasoning, especially for complex tasks.

6 Conclusion

In this paper, we propose HiBench, the first benchmark dedicated explicitly to evaluating the hierarchical reasoning capabilities of LLMs. HiBench spans two key aspects, six scenarios, and 30 tasks, comprising 39,159 queries. Experimental results demonstrate that while existing LLMs show proficiency in basic hierarchical reasoning tasks, they still struggle with more complex hierarchical challenges. In addition to improving LLM performance through ICL, we demonstrate that finetuning small-scale LLMs on our constructed high-quality instruction dataset leads to significant improvements of up to 6.53% over the leading close-source LLM GPT-4. These findings highlight the potential for further advancements in enhancing LLMs’ hierarchical reasoning capabilities.

References

- [1] Marah Abdin, Jyoti Aneja, Hany Awadalla, Ahmed Awadallah, Ammar Ahmad Awan, Nguyen Bach, Amit Bahree, Arash Bakhtiari, Jianmin Bao, Harkirat Behl, et al. 2024. Phi-3 technical report: A highly capable language model locally on your phone. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.14219* (2024).
- [2] Josh Achiam, Steven Adler, Sandhini Agarwal, Lama Ahmad, Ilge Akkaya, Florencia Leoni Aleman, Diogo Almeida, Janko Altmenschmidt, Sam Altman, Shyamal Anadkat, et al. 2023. Gpt-4 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774* (2023).
- [3] Iz Beltagy, Kyle Lo, and Arman Cohan. 2019. SciBERT: A Pretrained Language Model for Scientific Text. In *Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. 3615–3620.
- [4] Anissa M Bettayeb, Manar Abu Talib, Al Zahraa Sobhe Altayasinah, and Fatima Dakalbab. 2024. Exploring the impact of ChatGPT: conversational AI in education. In *Frontiers in Education*, Vol. 9. Frontiers Media SA, 1379796.
- [5] Matthew M Botvinick. 2008. Hierarchical models of behavior and prefrontal function. *Trends in cognitive sciences* 12, 5 (2008), 201–208.
- [6] Zheng Cai, Maosong Cao, Haojiong Chen, Kai Chen, Keyu Chen, Xin Chen, Xun Chen, Zehui Chen, Zhi Chen, Pei Chu, et al. 2024. Internlm2 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.17297* (2024).
- [7] Avyay Casheekar, Archit Lahiri, Kanishk Rath, Kaushik Sanjay Prabhakar, and Kathiravan Srinivasan. 2024. A contemporary review on chatbots, AI-powered virtual conversational agents, ChatGPT: Applications, open challenges and future research directions. *Computer Science Review* 52 (2024), 100632.
- [8] Tian-Yi Che, Xian-Ling Mao, Tian Lan, and Heyan Huang. 2024. A Hierarchical Context Augmentation Method to Improve Retrieval-Augmented LLMs on Scientific Papers. In *Proceedings of the 30th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*. 243–254.
- [9] Aaron Clauset, Christopher Moore, and Mark EJ Newman. 2008. Hierarchical structure and the prediction of missing links in networks. *Nature* 453, 7191 (2008), 98–101.
- [10] Karl Cobbe, Vineet Kosaraju, Mohammad Bavarian, Mark Chen, Heewoo Jun, Lukasz Kaiser, Matthias Plappert, Jerry Tworek, Jacob Hilton, Reiichiro Nakano, Christopher Hesse, and John Schulman. 2021. Training Verifiers to Solve Math Word Problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.14168* (2021).
- [11] Arman Cohan, Sergey Feldman, Iz Beltagy, Doug Downey, and Daniel S Weld. 2020. SPECTER: Document-Level Representation Learning using Citation-informed Transformers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.07180* (2020).
- [12] Xinnan Dai, Haoahou Qu, Yifei Shen, Bohang Zhang, Qihao Wen, Wenqi Fan, Dongsheng Li, Jiliang Tang, and Caihua Shan. 2025. How Do Large Language Models Understand Graph Patterns? A Benchmark for Graph Pattern Comprehension. In *The Thirteenth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- [13] Xinnan Dai, Qihao Wen, Yifei Shen, Hongzhi Wen, Dongsheng Li, Jiliang Tang, and Caihua Shan. 2024. Revisiting the Graph Reasoning Ability of Large Language Models: Case Studies in Translation, Connectivity and Shortest Path. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.09529* (2024).
- [14] Pradeep Dasigi, Kyle Lo, Iz Beltagy, Arman Cohan, Noah A Smith, and Matt Gardner. 2021. A Dataset of Information-Seeking Questions and Answers Anchored in Research Papers. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*. 4599–4610.
- [15] Yuntian Deng, Yejin Choi, and Stuart Shieber. 2024. From Explicit CoT to Implicit CoT: Learning to Internalize CoT Step by Step. *arXiv:2405.14838* [cs.CL] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2405.14838>
- [16] Qingxiu Dong, Lei Li, Damai Dai, Ce Zheng, Jingyuan Ma, Rui Li, Heming Xia, Jingjing Xu, Zhiyong Wu, Baobao Chang, et al. 2024. A Survey on In-context Learning. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. 1107–1128.
- [17] Zhengxiao Du, Yujie Qian, Xiao Liu, Ming Ding, Jiezhong Qiu, Zhilin Yang, and Jie Tang. 2022. GLM: General Language Model Pretraining with Autoregressive Blank Infilling. *arXiv:2103.10360* [cs.CL] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2103.10360>
- [18] Abhimanyu Dubey, Abhinav Jauhri, Abhinav Pandey, Abhishek Kadian, Ahmad Al-Dahle, Aiesha Letman, Akhil Mathur, Alan Schelten, Amy Yang, Angela Fan, et al. 2024. The llama 3 herd of models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.21783* (2024).
- [19] Tao Feng, Chuanyang Jin, Jingyu Liu, Kunlun Zhu, Haoqin Tu, Zirui Cheng, Guanyu Lin, and Jiaxuan You. 2024. How Far Are We From AGI. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.10313* (2024).
- [20] Kurt W Fischer. 1980. A theory of cognitive development: The control and construction of hierarchies of skills. *Psychological review* 87, 6 (1980), 477.
- [21] Tim Genewein, Felix Leibfried, Jordi Grau-Moya, and Daniel Alexander Braun. 2015. Bounded rationality, abstraction, and hierarchical decision-making: An information-theoretic optimality principle. *Frontiers in Robotics and AI* 2 (2015), 27.
- [22] Team GLM, Aohan Zeng, Bin Xu, Bowen Wang, Chenhui Zhang, Da Yin, Dan Zhang, Diego Rojas, Guanyu Feng, Hanlin Zhao, et al. 2024. Chatglm: A family of large language models from glm-130b to glm-4 all tools. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.12793* (2024).
- [23] Jia Gong, Lin Geng Foo, Yixuan He, Hossein Rahmani, and Jun Liu. 2024. LLMs are good sign language translators. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 18362–18372.
- [24] Sagar Goyal, Eti Rastogi, Sree Prasanna Rajagopal, Dong Yuan, Fen Zhao, Jai Chintagunta, Gautam Naik, and Jeff Ward. 2024. Healai: A healthcare llm for effective medical documentation. In *Proceedings of the 17th ACM International Conference on Web Search and Data Mining*. 1167–1168.
- [25] Tao He, Lizi Liao, Yixin Cao, Yuanxing Liu, Ming Liu, Zerui Chen, and Bing Qin. 2024. Planning Like Human: A Dual-process Framework for Dialogue Planning. In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*. 4768–4791.
- [26] Albert Q. Jiang, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Arthur Mensch, Chris Bamford, Devendra Singh Chaplot, Diego de las Casas, Florian Bressand, Gianna Lengyel, Guillaume Lample, Lucile Saulnier, Léo Renard Lavaud, et al. 2023. Mistral 7B. *arXiv:2310.06825* [cs.CL] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2310.06825>
- [27] Hanlei Jin, Yang Zhang, Dan Meng, Jun Wang, and Jinghua Tan. 2024. A comprehensive survey on process-oriented automatic text summarization with exploration of llm-based methods. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.02901* (2024).
- [28] Tomoyuki Kagaya, Thong Jing Yuan, Yuxuan Lou, Jayashree Karlekar, Sugiri Pranata, Akira Kinose, Koki Oguri, Felix Wick, and Yang You. 2024. RAP: Retrieval-Augmented Planning with Contextual Memory for Multimodal LLM Agents. In *NeurIPS 2024 Workshop on Open-World Agents*.
- [29] Roman Koshkin, Katsuhito Sudoh, and Satoshi Nakamura. 2024. TransLLaMa: LLM-based Simultaneous Translation System. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2024*. 461–476.
- [30] Minae Kwon, Hengyuan Hu, Vivek Myers, Siddharth Karamcheti, Anca Dragan, and Dorsa Sadigh. 2024. Toward grounded commonsense reasoning. In *2024 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*. IEEE, 5463–5470.
- [31] Jinyang Li, Binyuan Hui, Reynold Cheng, Bowen Qin, Chenhao Ma, Nan Huo, Fei Huang, Wenyu Du, Luo Si, and Yongbin Li. 2023. Graphix-t5: Mixing pre-trained transformers with graph-aware layers for text-to-sql parsing. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, Vol. 37. 13076–13084.
- [32] Xingxuan Li, Ruochen Zhao, Yew Ken Chia, Bosheng Ding, Shafiq Joty, Soujanya Poria, and Lidong Bing. 2023. Chain-of-knowledge: Grounding large language models via dynamic knowledge adapting over heterogeneous sources. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.13269* (2023).
- [33] Feng Lin, Dong Jae Kim, et al. 2024. When llm-based code generation meets the software development process. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.15852* (2024).
- [34] Aixun Liu, Bei Feng, Bing Xue, Bingxuan Wang, Bochao Wu, Chengda Lu, Chenggang Zhao, Chengqi Deng, Chenyu Zhang, Chong Ruan, et al. 2024. Deepseek-v3 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.19437* (2024).
- [35] Fang Liu, Yang Liu, Lin Shi, Houkun Huang, Ruifeng Wang, Zhen Yang, Li Zhang, Zhongqi Li, and Yuchi Ma. 2024. Exploring and evaluating hallucinations in llm-powered code generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.00971* (2024).
- [36] Yinquan Lu, Wenhao Zhu, Lei Li, Yu Qiao, and Fei Yuan. 2024. LLaMAX: Scaling Linguistic Horizons of LLM by Enhancing Translation Capabilities Beyond 100 Languages. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2024*. 10748–10772.
- [37] Linhao Luo, Jiaxin Ju, Bo Xiong, Yuan-Fang Li, Gholamreza Haffari, and Shirui Pan. 2023. Chatrule: Mining logical rules with large language models for knowledge graph reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.01538* (2023).
- [38] Zihan Luo, Xiran Song, Hong Huang, Jianxun Lian, Chenhao Zhang, Jinqi Jiang, Xing Xie, and Hai Jin. 2024. GraphInstruct: Empowering Large Language Models with Graph Understanding and Reasoning Capability. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.04483* (2024).
- [39] Sanwal Manish. 2024. An autonomous multi-agent llm framework for agile software development. *International Journal of Trend in Scientific Research and Development* 8, 5 (2024), 892–898.
- [40] Siddhant Meshram, Namit Naik, VR Megha, Tanmay More, and Shubhangi Kharche. 2021. Conversational AI: chatbots. In *2021 International Conference on Intelligent Technologies (CONIT)*. IEEE, 1–6.
- [41] Jürgen Mihm, Christoph H Loch, Dennis Wilkinson, and Bernardo A Huberman. 2010. Hierarchical structure and search in complex organizations. *Management science* 56, 5 (2010), 831–848.
- [42] Tala Mirzaei, Leila Amini, and Pouyan Esmaeilzadeh. 2024. Clinician voices on ethics of LLM integration in healthcare: A thematic analysis of ethical concerns and implications. *BMC Medical Informatics and Decision Making* 24, 1 (2024), 250.
- [43] Mortimer Mishkin, Wendy A Suzuki, David G Gadian, and Faranek Vargha-Khadem. 1997. Hierarchical organization of cognitive memory. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series B: Biological Sciences* 352, 1360 (1997), 1461–1467.
- [44] Sam Musker, Alex Duchnowski, Raphaël Millièvre, and Ellie Pavlick. 2024. Semantic Structure-Mapping in LLM and Human Analogical Reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.13803* (2024).
- [45] Daye Nam, Andrew Macvean, Vincent Hellendoorn, Bogdan Vasilescu, and Brad Myers. 2024. Using an llm to help with code understanding. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/ACM 46th International Conference on Software Engineering*. 1–13.

- [46] OpenAI. 2022. Chatgpt: Optimizing language models for dialogue. <https://openai.com/blog/chatgpt>
- [47] Benedikt Perak, Slobodan Beliga, and Ana Meštrović. 2024. Incorporating Dialect Understanding Into LLM Using RAG and Prompt Engineering Techniques for Causal Commonsense Reasoning. In *Proceedings of the Eleventh Workshop on NLP for Similar Languages, Varieties, and Dialects (VarDial 2024)*. 220–229.
- [48] Bharat Prakash, Tim Oates, and Tinoosh Mohsenin. 2023. LLM Augmented Hierarchical Agents. *arXiv* (11 2023). doi:10.48550/arXiv.2311.05596 arXiv:2311.05596
- [49] Braden A Purcell and Roozbeh Kiani. 2016. Hierarchical decision processes that operate over distinct timescales underlie choice and changes in strategy. *Proceedings of the national academy of sciences* 113, 31 (2016), E4531–E4540.
- [50] Jianing Qiu, Kyle Lam, Guohao Li, Amish Acharya, Tien Yin Wong, Ara Darzi, Wu Yuan, and Eric J Topol. 2024. LLM-based agentic systems in medicine and healthcare. *Nature Machine Intelligence* 6, 12 (2024), 1418–1420.
- [51] Darryl W Schneider and Gordon D Logan. 2006. Hierarchical control of cognitive processes: switching tasks in sequences. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General* 135, 4 (2006), 623.
- [52] Yuan Sui, Mengyu Zhou, Mingjie Zhou, Shi Han, and Dongmei Zhang. 2024. Table meets llm: Can large language models understand structured table data? a benchmark and empirical study. In *Proceedings of the 17th ACM International Conference on Web Search and Data Mining*. 645–654.
- [53] Qwen Team. 2024. QwQ: Reflect Deeply on the Boundaries of the Unknown. <https://qwenlm.github.io/blog/qwq-32b-preview/>
- [54] Hugo Touvron, Thibaut Lavril, Gautier Izacard, Xavier Martinet, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Timothée Lacroix, Baptiste Rozière, Naman Goyal, Eric Hambro, Faisal Azhar, Aurelien Rodriguez, Armand Joulin, Edouard Grave, and Guillaume Lample. 2023. LLaMA: Open and Efficient Foundation Language Models. arXiv:2302.13971 [cs.CL] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2302.13971>
- [55] Heng Wang, Shangbin Feng, Tianxing He, Zhaoxuan Tan, Xiaochuang Han, and Yulia Tsvetkov. 2023. Can language models solve graph problems in natural language? *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 36 (2023), 30840–30861.
- [56] Heng Wang, Shangbin Feng, Tianxing He, Zhaoxuan Tan, Xiaochuang Han, and Yulia Tsvetkov. 2024. Can language models solve graph problems in natural language? *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 36 (2024).
- [57] Zilong Wang, Hao Zhang, Chun-Liang Li, Julian Martin Eisenschlos, Vincent Perot, Zifeng Wang, Lesly Miculicich, Yasuhisa Fujii, Jingbo Shang, Chen-Yu Lee, et al. 2024. Chain-of-Table: Evolving Tables in the Reasoning Chain for Table Understanding. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- [58] Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Fei Xia, Ed Chi, Quoc V Le, Denny Zhou, et al. 2022. Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 35 (2022), 24824–24837.
- [59] Chunqiu Steven Xia, Yinlin Deng, Soren Dunn, and Lingming Zhang. 2024. Agentless: Demystifying llm-based software engineering agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.01489* (2024).
- [60] Frank Xing. 2025. Designing Heterogeneous LLM Agents for Financial Sentiment Analysis. *ACM Trans. Manage. Inf. Syst.* 16, 1 (2025), 24.
- [61] Aiyuan Yang, Bin Xiao, Bingning Wang, Borong Zhang, Ce Bian, Chao Yin, Chenxu Lv, Da Pan, Dian Wang, Dong Yan, et al. 2023. Baichuan 2: Open large-scale language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.10305* (2023).
- [62] An Yang, Baosong Yang, Binyuan Hui, Bo Zheng, Bowen Yu, Chang Zhou, Chengpeng Li, Chengyuan Li, Dayiheng Liu, Fei Huang, Guanting Dong, Haoran Wei, Huan Lin, Jialong Tang, Jialin Wang, Jian Yang, Jianhong Tu, Jianwei Zhang, Jianxin Ma, Jianxin Yang, Jin Xu, Jingren Zhou, Jinze Bai, Jinzheng He, Junyang Lin, Kai Dang, Keming Lu, Keqin Chen, Kexin Yang, Mei Li, Mingfeng Xue, Na Ni, Pei Zhang, Peng Wang, Ru Peng, Rui Men, Ruize Gao, Runji Lin, Shijie Wang, Shuai Bai, Sinan Tan, Tianhang Zhu, Tianhao Li, Tianyu Liu, Wenbin Ge, Xiaodong Deng, Xiaohuan Zhou, Xingzhang Ren, Xinyu Zhang, Xipin Wei, Xuancheng Ren, Xuejing Liu, Yang Fan, Yang Yao, Yichang Zhang, Yu Wan, Yunfei Chu, Yuning Liu, Zeyu Cui, Zhenru Zhang, Zhifang Guo, and Zhihao Fan. 2024. Qwen2 Technical Report. arXiv:2407.10671 [cs.CL] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2407.10671>
- [63] An Yang, Baosong Yang, Beichen Zhang, Binyuan Hui, Bo Zheng, Bowen Yu, Chengyuan Li, Dayiheng Liu, Fei Huang, Haoran Wei, et al. 2024. Qwen2. 5 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.15115* (2024).
- [64] Shunyu Yao, Dian Yu, Jeffrey Zhao, Izhak Shafran, Tom Griffiths, Yuan Cao, and Karthik Narasimhan. 2023. Tree of thoughts: Deliberate problem solving with large language models. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 36 (2023), 11809–11822.
- [65] Alex Young, Bei Chen, Chao Li, Chengen Huang, Ge Zhang, Guanwei Zhang, Guoyin Wang, Heng Li, Jiangcheng Zhu, Jianqun Chen, et al. 2024. Yi: Open foundation models by 01. ai. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.04652* (2024).
- [66] Yangyang Yu, Zhiyuan Yao, Haohang Li, Zhiyang Deng, Yuechen Jiang, Yupeng Cao, Zhi Chen, Jordan Suchow, Zhenyu Cui, Rong Liu, et al. 2025. Fincon: A synthesized llm multi-agent system with conceptual verbal reinforcement for enhanced financial decision making. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 37 (2025), 137010–137045.
- [67] Seongjun Yun, Minbyul Jeong, Raehyun Kim, Jaewoo Kang, and Hyunwoo J Kim. 2019. Graph transformer networks. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 32 (2019).
- [68] Haopeng Zhang, Philip S Yu, and Jiawei Zhang. 2024. A Systematic Survey of Text Summarization: From Statistical Methods to Large Language Models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.11289* (2024).
- [69] Jiawei Zhang, Haopeng Zhang, Congying Xia, and Li Sun. 2020. GraphBert: Only Attention is Needed for Learning Graph Representations. arXiv:2001.05140 [cs.LG] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2001.05140>
- [70] Zhuosheng Zhang, Aston Zhang, Mu Li, and Alex Smola. 2023. Automatic Chain of Thought Prompting in Large Language Models. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- [71] Huaqin Zhao, Zhengliang Liu, Zihao Wu, Yiwei Li, Tianze Yang, Peng Shu, Shaochen Xu, Haixing Dai, Lin Zhao, Gengchen Mai, et al. 2024. Revolutionizing finance with llms: An overview of applications and insights. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.11641* (2024).
- [72] Tianyang Zhong, Zhengliang Liu, Yi Pan, Yutong Zhang, Yifan Zhou, Shizhe Liang, Zihao Wu, Yanjun Lyu, Peng Shu, Xiaowei Yu, et al. 2024. Evaluation of openai o1: Opportunities and challenges of agi. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.18486* (2024).
- [73] Pei Zhou, Jay Pujara, Xiang Ren, Xinyun Chen, Heng-Tze Cheng, Quoc V Le, Ed Chi, Denny Zhou, Swaroop Mishra, and Huaixiu Steven Zheng. 2025. Self-discover: Large language models self-compose reasoning structures. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 37 (2025), 126032–126058.

A Author Contributions

The authors' contributions are: **Zhuohang Jiang**: benchmark design, the coding leader, and manuscript writing. **Pangjing Wu**: implements Binary Tree scenario tasks, evaluation, and manuscript writing. **Ziran Liang**: implements Multiple Tree scenario tasks and manuscript writing. **Peter Q. Chen**: implements JSON scenario tasks and manuscript writing. **Xu Yuan**: implements Paper scenario tasks and manuscript writing. **Ye Jia**: implements Code scenario tasks and manuscript writing. **Jiancheng Tu**: implements Formula scenario tasks and manuscript writing. **Chen Li**: project advising. **Peter H.F. Ng**: project advising. **Qing Li**: General project supervisor and manuscript writing.

B Modular Codebase

Our benchmark code is designed in a modular fashion, which facilitates the swift construction of new benchmarks. As Fig 8 shown, the codebase is divided into five distinct modules: the **Hierarchical Structure Construction**, **Query Generator**, **Prompting**, **Model Zoo**, **Evaluator**, and **Finetune**.

B.1 Hierarchical Structure Construction

We first employ a hierarchical structure constructor to generate a hierarchical structure. Precisely, in Binary Tree and Multiple Tree scenarios, the complexity of hierarchical structures is controlled by the number of leaf nodes, *a.k.a* width, and tree height *a.k.a* depth.

B.2 Query Generator

Dataset Generator is a tool for automated dataset generation, including *Binary Tree QA Generator*, *Multiple Tree QA Generator*, *JSON QA Generator* and *Formula QA Generator*, which can flexibly generate data of different difficulty levels according to the parameters set by the user. The level of task data is determined according to the parameters set by the user. For example, we tested LLMs' understanding of various representations using tree representations, including edge and hierarchical representations. An Example has been shown in Figure 9.

B.3 Prompting

Dataloader is an efficient tool dedicated to dataset organization and query generation, which mainly consists of two parts: *Data Management* and *Query Generator*.

- **Data Management** We provide configuration parameters to manage our dataset, and subsequent evaluations are performed based on these configuration files.
- **Query Generator** To reduce system coupling, we split the query and QA modules to achieve a modularized design, allowing quick modifications and adjustments. Specifically, we unified the dataset format and generated an LLM-matched alpaca prompt format for queries driven by configuration files. This design meets the needs of many subsequent tasks and has strong scalability and flexibility to respond to future iterations and optimize functionality effectively.

B.4 Model Zoo

Our Model Zoo is extensively integrated with resources from Hugging Face, Azure, and Fireworks, covering 20 LLMs from 10 families. We have standardized all models' input and output interfaces through a unified design, allowing for flexible invocation of different models through parameter configuration only. The data imported by the Dataloader can be directly input into the LLM model, and the model's response can be quickly obtained, thus allowing efficient and convenient model application and extension. In the Hibench benchmarking process, two proprietary models, GPT-3.5 and GPT-4, were selected for evaluation. Additionally, 18 open-source models of various sizes were chosen from nine different families. These open-source models include Llama, Qwen, DeepSeek, ChatGLM, InternLM, BaiChuan, Yi, Phi, and Mistral.

B.5 Evaluator

Our evaluator mainly consists of an answer extractor and an answer evaluator. Specifically, we designed five types of matching patterns to fit different types of outputs accurately. By comparing the answers generated by LLM with the standard answers, we calculate the accuracy and hit rate and categorize the evaluation results in five dimensions. This all-encompassing evaluation approach can comprehensively measure the performance of LLM in different tasks, which provides strong support for in-depth profiling of model performance.

B.6 Finetune

Our fine-tuning module, built upon the Unsloth framework, has been developed to optimize the performance of LLMs through targeted fine-tuning. This approach aims to enhance the LLMs' capabilities in hierarchical comprehension, thereby improving their capability to effectively process and understand complex, layered information structures.

C Benchmark Detail

In this section, we will define the scope of the task in depth and give a detailed description of the dataset used. We will describe our task comprehensively and in-depth in two dimensions: the *Fundamental Aspect* and the *Practical Aspect*. Detailed information is presented in Fig. 10.

C.1 Fundamental Aspect

In exploring the fundamental aspect of the task, we focus on evaluating the capability of LLMs to understand different underlying hierarchical structures, such as *Binary Tree Scenario*, *Multiple Tree Scenario*, and *JSON Scenario*.

C.1.1 Binary Tree Scenario. Binary Tree, a widely used basic hierarchical structure, has up to two children per node. Based on this feature, we can propose a series of challenging binary tree scenario tasks designed to deeply test LLM's capability to understand and manipulate this simple but critical data structure.

Task Definition. The Binary Tree Scenario covers six tasks that focus on evaluating the capabilities of LLM models in three key areas: structural modification and relationship understanding.




Figure 8: The Modular Codebase of HiBench.

- *Mirror Tree*: Given a binary tree, give its mirror tree.
- *Balance*: Given a binary tree, Determine if it is balanced.
- *Prefix Traversal*: Given a binary tree, find its prefix traversal result

- *Postfix Traversal*: Given a binary tree, find its postfix traversal result
- *Infix Traversal*: Given a binary tree, find its infix traversal result




Figure 9: Different Representations of Hierarchical Tree Structure in Fundamental Task.

- *Traversal Order Verification*: Given a binary tree and a specific traversal result, it is necessary to determine which traversal the result belongs to.

Random Binary Tree Generator. We have designed a random binary tree generator to comprehensively evaluate the LLM model’s understanding capabilities over multiple tree data. We can generate multiple tree structures with different difficulty levels by defining the depth D and the number N of nodes.

Table 5: Structure Statistics of Binary Tree Scenario.

Complexity	#Structure	#Node	#Layer	#Degree
Easy	48	2~15	2~4	2
Medium	54	16~255	5~7	2
Hard	36	256~511	8~9	2

Binary Tree Dataset Statistics.

C.1.2 Multiple Tree Scenario. As a hierarchical structure with high complexity, a multiple tree can accurately measure an LLM’s basic reasoning of hierarchical architectures. With this in mind, we have crafted a series of challenging tasks designed to comprehensively test the LLM’s capability to understand and manipulate hierarchical data.

Task Definition. The Multiple Tree Scenario covers nine tasks that focus on evaluating the capabilities of LLM models in three

key areas: structural modification, relationship understanding, and structural analysis.

- *Add Node*: Given a new node, add it to the tree under the specified node and output the new tree structure.
- *Remove Node*: Delete the specified node in the tree and output the new tree structure. If the deleted node is the root node, the first child of the root node needs to be taken as the new root node, and other children are taken as children of the new root node.
- *Leaf*: Determine if a specified node in a tree is a leaf node.
- *All Ancestor*: Given two nodes, determine their lowest dimension common ancestor.
- *All Children*: Given a node, determine all its child nodes.
- *Common Ancestor*: Given two nodes in the same tree, determine which node is the nearest common ancestor.
- *Node Depth*: Given a node, determine its depth in the tree.
- *Root*: Given a tree, determine which node is its root node.
- *Isomorphic*: Given two trees, determine if they are isomorphic, i.e., structurally identical.

Random Multiple Tree Generator. We have designed a random multiple tree generator to comprehensively evaluate the LLM model’s understanding capabilities over multiple tree data. We can generate numerous tree structures with different difficulty levels by defining the maximum out-degree W of the tree, the depth D , and the number N of nodes.

Multiple Tree Dataset Statistics. The HiBench designs three datasets of different sizes that vary in nodes, node degree, and depth. As shown in Table 6, the number associated with each dataset of different difficulty levels is the size of the dataset, the number of nodes in the tree, the number of layers in the tree, and the out-degree of the nodes in the tree, respectively.


Table 6: Structure Statistics of Multiple Tree Scenario.

Complexity	#Structure	#Node	#Layer	#Degree
Easy	33	2~13	2~3	2~3
Medium-1	36	2~13	2~3	3~4
Medium-2	36	3~34	3~4	2~3
Hard-1	36	4~32	2~3	5~6
Hard-2	36	13~212	5~6	2~3

Additionally, we tested LLMs’ understanding of various representations using tree representations, including edge and hierarchical representations. An Example has been shown in Figure 9.

C.1.3 JSON Scenario. JSON (JavaScript Object Notation) is a lightweight semi-structured data exchange format. It is text-based and adopts a structure consisting of key/value pairs and ordered lists, which enables the effective representation of hierarchical information. Given this, we designed a series of challenging JSON scenario tasks to test the capability of LLM to reason about hierarchical data.

Task Definition. The JSON Scenario covers seven tasks that focus on evaluating the capabilities of LLM models in two key areas: relationship understanding and structural analysis.



Formula

Conversion

Given an infix (prefix or postfix) expression, convert to a prefix (infix or postfix) expression.

Q: Given the prefix expression $1+2*3$. What is its postfix expression?

Equivalence

Given two infix (prefix or postfix) expressions, which may have different forms, determine whether the two formulas are equivalent.

Q: Given the Infix $1+2*3$ and postfix $123*+$ expressions. Do these two expressions equivalence?

Calculation

Given an infix (prefix or postfix) expression, compute the value of the expression.

Q: Given the prefix expression $1+1*2$. What is the value of this expression

Code

Space Complexity

Given a piece of code, find its space complexity.

Q: Giving the Code: class Solution { public: int addDigits(int num) { return (num - 1) % 9 + 1; } };

What is the space complexity of this code?

Figure 10: HiBench Tasks: A Comprehensive Introduction.

- **Path Finding:**
 - **Path Between Nodes:** Given two nodes, determine the path between the two nodes.
 - **Path Down to Up:** Given a node, determine the path from the root to the node.
 - **Path Up to Down:** Given a node, determine the path from the node to the root.
- **Nearest Ancestor:**
 - **Shared Ancestor Same Level:** Given two nodes in the same level, determine the lowest common ancestor of two nodes.

- *Shared Ancestor Diff Level*: Given two nodes in different levels, determine the lowest common ancestor of two nodes.
- *Node Depth*: Given a node, determine the depth of this node.
- *Child Count*: Given a node, determine the child node number of this node.
- *Level Count*: Given a level depth, calculate the node number in this level.
- *Level Nodes*: Given a level depth, determine all nodes in this level.
- *Node Attribute*: Given a node, determine the node attribution.

Random JSON Generator. We designed a random JSON generator to comprehensively evaluate the LLM model’s capability to understand multi-tree data. We can generate multiple JSON structures with different difficulty levels and meanings by defining the maximum degree W , depth D , and node meaning M of JSON.

JSON Dataset Statistics. The JSON dataset comprises seven types of questions derived from two categories of datasets: normal and nonsense. The normal dataset contains JSON structures with realistic and meaningful semantics, such as university names that closely resemble real-life entities. In contrast, the nonsense dataset includes JSON structures with meaningless content, such as departments named with random words or numbers. Please refer to Table 7 for detailed information about the JSON dataset.

Table 7: Statistics of JSON Datasets.

Complexity	#Depth	#Width
Small	4	2
Medium-1	5	2
Medium-2	4	4
Large-1	6	2
Large-2	4	6

C.2 Practical Aspect

In exploring the application level of hierarchical understanding, we focus on evaluating the capability of LLM to understand hierarchical structures in different application scenarios, such as *Code Scenario*, *Formula Scenario* and *Paper Scenario*.

C.2.1 Code Scenario. Code is the basic unit of composition of a computer program with a strict hierarchical structure, where blocks of code at different levels clearly define the hierarchical relationships to which they belong, utilizing indentation, curly brackets, etc. Based on this, we propose a series of challenging Code Scenario tasks designed to deeply test LLM’s capability to understand and manipulate this complex hierarchical structure.

Task Definition. The Code Scenario covers two tasks that focus on evaluating the capabilities of LLM models in Analytical Reasoning areas.

- *Space Complexity*: Given a piece of code, find its space complexity.
- *Time Complexity*: Given a piece of code, find its time complexity.

Table 8: Statistics of Code Understanding Datasets.

Programming Language	Python	C++
Script Content	LeetCode	LeetCode
Script Length	11 - 86 lines	6 - 37 lines
No. of scripts	100	100
Question no. of Type 1	100	100
Question no. of Type 2	100	100

Code Dataset Collection. The dataset comprises Python and C++ codes sourced from GitHub repositories, specifically targeting LeetCode problems. The questions on LeetCode cover a broad spectrum of topics, ranging from basic data structures to complex algorithms, making them highly representative of real-world programming challenges.

Code Dataset Statistics. The dataset consists of 100 Python and 100 C++ scripts, each containing two questions about time and space complexity. Please refer to Table 8 for the details of the datasets.

C.2.2 Formula Scenario. Formulas are an essential tool for expressing complex relationships and laws in scientific research and engineering applications. They consist of elements such as symbols, variables, and operators, forming a form of expression with a strict hierarchical structure. Based on this, we propose a series of challenging formula scenario tasks designed to test the capability of LLM to understand and manipulate this complex hierarchical structure deeply.

Task Definition. The Formula Scenario covers three tasks that focus on evaluating the capabilities of LLM models in Analytical Reasoning areas.

- *Calculation*: Given an infix (prefix or postfix) expression, compute the value of the expression.
- *Conversion*: Given an infix (prefix or postfix) expression, convert it to a prefix (infix or postfix) expression.
- *Equivalence*: Given two infix (prefix or postfix) expressions, which may have different forms, determine whether the two formulas are equivalent.

Random Formula Generator. We design a stochastic Formula generator to comprehensively evaluate the LLM model’s capability to comprehend multi-tree data. Multiple formula structures with different difficulty levels can be generated by defining the length L , symbolic complexity S , and numeric complexity N of the formulas.

Formula Dataset Statistics. As shown in Table 9, we constructed a system of formulas of different complexity in the Formula task in four dimensions: Type, Range, Symbolic, and Length, and generated the corresponding prefix, infix, and postfix expressions. These expressions are systematically assigned to Conversion, Calculation, and Equivalence tasks. Specifically, in the Formula scenario, the Conversion task contains 5022 queries, the Calculation task contains 2511 queries, and the Equivalence task contains 7533 queries, resulting in a total of 15066 task instances.

C.2.3 Paper Scenario. A dissertation typically consists of multiple levels, including an introduction, methods, results, discussion, and

Table 9: Multidimensional Formula Complexity System.

Complexity	Easy	Medium	Hard
Type	int	-	float
Range	1 - 10	-50 - 50	-100 - 100
Symbolic	+ - * /	+ - * / ()	+ - * / () ^
Length	3	6	9

Table 10: Statistics of Paper Understanding Datasets.

Task	Splits	#Samples	#Avg Tokens
Outline Extraction	train	179	6045
	dev	42	5865
	test	80	5528
Disordered Section	train	354	5981
	dev	85	5815
	test	163	5569
Contextual QA	train	404	5975
	dev	144	5694
	test	237	5336

conclusion sections, with a strong hierarchical relationship between these sections. For this reason, we propose a series of challenging paper scenario tasks designed to deeply test LLM’s capability to understand and manipulate this complex hierarchical structure.

Task Definition. The Paper Scenario covers three tasks that focus on evaluating the capabilities of LLM models in Textual Reasoning areas.

- *Contextual QA:* Asking LLMs to answer questions by seeking relevant evidence across multiple passages.
- *Disordered Section:* Asking LLMs to point out disordered parts of the paper.
- *Outline Extraction:* LLMs are required to extract the high-level structure of the given scientific paper and output the hierarchical outline with exact section names.

Paper Dataset Collection. We chose the Qasper dataset [14] as the source of scientific papers to construct our task’s training and test sets. Specifically, Qasper covers 1,585 papers and 5,049 questions, which are asked by natural language processing practitioners who have only read the title and abstract of the corresponding paper and aim to obtain information from the full text of the paper. After filtering those questions requiring information on figures and tables, we get 3,570 question-answer pairs for our contextual question answering. We convert these papers into document trees by analyzing their structures before feeding them to the LLMs.

Paper Dataset Statistics. As Table 10 shows, this dataset focuses on tasks related to academic paper understanding, encompassing three sub-tasks: Outline Extraction, Disordered Section Identification, and Contextual Question Answering. It aims to evaluate the capability of models to comprehend the structure and content of scholarly articles. The dataset is divided into training, development,

and testing sets, with each sub-task dataset containing thousands of samples and an average token count ranging from 5,300 to 6,000.

D Experimental Setup

D.1 Model Introduction

In the HiBench, we evaluated 20 LLMs from 10 model families. These models are categorized into four main groups, namely the *GPT family*, the *Llama family*, the *Qwen family*, and *Other Open-source Models*. Table 11 shows the information of different models.

- *GPT Family:* The GPT family is a series of advanced large-scale language models developed by OpenAI and known for their superior natural language processing capabilities. GPT-3.5 and GPT-4 perform well in several benchmarks. In our HiBench benchmarks, we have chosen GPT-3.5 and GPT-4 for evaluation to fully demonstrate the performance of the GPT family in different tasks.
- *Llama Family:* The Llama Family is a family of open-source large-scale language models from Meta, noted for their excellent multilingual support, extended context processing capabilities, and efficient architectural design. We selected five models for our benchmarking: Llama-3.2-1B, Llama-3.2-3B, Llama-3.1-8B, Llama-3.1-70B, and Llama-3.1-405B.
- *Qwen Family:* Qwen Family is a family of open-source large-scale language models developed by Alibaba Dharma Institute, which is highly regarded for its strong multilingual support, extended context processing capabilities, and efficient architectural design. For our benchmarks, we have selected the following models from the Qwen2.5 family: Qwen2.5-0.5B, Qwen2.5-1.5B, Qwen2.5-3B, Qwen2.5-7B, QwQ-32B, and Qwen2.5-72B.
- *Other Open-source LLMs:* Our benchmark also covers representative models from seven other model families, including ChatGLM, Phi, InternLM, Yi, Baichuan, Mistral, and DeepSeek, which demonstrate their respective strengths in multilingual comprehension, complex reasoning, and code generation tasks. By introducing these diverse models, our benchmarks provide a more comprehensive picture of current large-scale language models’ performance levels and trends.

D.2 Hyperparameters

In this model setup, we make specific configurations for key parameters to ensure the model runs as intended. Expressly, we set the temperature to 0 to ensure the stability and consistency of the generated content. At the same time, we fix the seed of the local model to 0 to facilitate the reproduction and validation of the results. In addition, we set the new token length to 2048, which allows the model to generate longer textual content to support complex tasks such as writing lengthy articles, generating detailed reports, or engaging in in-depth dialogues.

D.3 Hardware Configurations

Experiments involving open-source LLMs smaller than 14B parameters were completed on multiple independent workstations, each equipped with two NVIDIA GeForce RTX 3090 or RTX A6000 GPUs.

Table 11: Overview of LLMs: Publish Date, Company, Size, and Source.

Model	Publish Date	Company	Source
GPT-3.5	2023	OpenAI	Proprietary
GPT-4	2023	OpenAI	Proprietary
Llama-3.2-1B	2024-09	Meta	Open Source (Apache 2.0)
Llama-3.2-3B	2024-09	Meta	Open Source (Apache 2.0)
Llama-3.1-8B	2024-07	Meta	Open Source (Llama 3.1 License)
Llama-3.1-70B	2024-07	Meta	Open Source (Llama 3.1 License)
Llama-3.1-405B	2024-07	Meta	Open Source (Llama 3.1 License)
Qwen2.5-0.5B	2024-09-18	Alibaba	Open Source (Apache 2.0)
Qwen2.5-1.5B	2024-09-18	Alibaba	Open Source (Apache 2.0)
Qwen2.5-3B	2024-09-18	Alibaba	Open Source (Qwen Research License)
Qwen2.5-7B	2024-09-18	Alibaba	Open Source (Apache 2.0)
QwQ-32B	2024-11-28	Alibaba	Open Source (Apache 2.0)
Qwen2.5-72B	2024-09-18	Alibaba	Open Source (Qwen License)
ChatGLM-4-9B	2024	Tsinghua University/Zhipu AI	Open Source (Apache 2.0)
Phi-3.5-mini-3.8B	2024-12	Microsoft Azure	Open Source (MIT License)
InternLM2.5-7B	2024	Shanghai AI Laboratory	Open Source (Apache 2.0)
Yi-1.5-9B	2024	01.AI	Open Source (Apache 2.0)
Baichuan-7B	2023	Baichuan Inc.	Open Source (Apache 2.0)
Mistral-7B	2023-09	Mistral AI	Open Source (Apache 2.0)
DeepSeek-V3	2024-12-25	DeepSeek	Open Source (MIT License)

In contrast, experiments with LLMs larger than 14B parameters were conducted by calling API from Fireworks platform³ and Azure platform⁴.

D.4 Evaluation Details

Algorithm 1 shows an example of the evaluation process. All experiments are based on the codebase we developed. We first generate a complete query request (query) using a file and a query template, feed it into a large language model (LLM), and wait for the model’s response. Subsequently, we format and extract the response data from the LLM, compare it with the correct answer, and finalize the evaluation.

E Result Analysis

This section systematically analyses the performance of Large Language Models (LLMs) in HiBench benchmarks, focusing on their performance in several key areas.

E.1 Main Results

Figure 11 illustrates the relationship between hierarchical reasoning ability and model size for different Large Language Models (LLMs) in HiBench tests. It can be observed that there is a positive correlation between model size and average performance, i.e., as the number of model parameters increases, the model’s performance on hierarchical reasoning tasks tends to improve. For example, models with billions or even more parameters, such as Llama-3.1-70B and Qwen2.5-72B, show higher average performance scores, while

Algorithm 1 Simple Evaluation Process

```

1: procedure EVALUATE(task, source, target, args)
2:   source ← lowercase(extract_answer(source))
3:   target ← lowercase(target)
4:   if source = NULL then
5:     return False
6:   end if
7:   source ← refine_string(source)
8:   target ← refine_string(target)
9:   switch task
10:    case "number_match":
11:      return target = source
12:    case "string_match":
13:      if args.skip ≠ NULL then
14:        source, target ← remove_pattern(source, target, args.skip)
15:      end if
16:      return target = source ∨ target ∈ source
17:    case "list_match":
18:      if args.remove_blank then
19:        source, target ← remove_whitespace(source, target)
20:      end if
21:      return sorted(split(source, args.sep))
22:    case "hierarchical_structure_match":
23:      return remove_non_digits(source)
24:    default:
25:      return False
26: end procedure

```

models with a smaller number of parameters perform relatively lower.

³<https://fireworks.ai>

⁴<https://azure.microsoft.com>




Figure 11: Different LLM’s Capability of Hierarchical Structure Reasoning in HiBench.

Table 12: Instruction Finetuning Performance of Qwen2.5-7B and Llama-3.1-8B on HiBench.

Scenario	Qwen2.5-7B		Llama-3.1-8B	
	Origin	Finetune	Origin	Finetune
Binary Tree	33.11	67.34	14.74	66.70
Multiple Tree	54.86	83.20	28.76	82.61
JSON	39.00	46.67	34.18	41.45
Formula	69.25	80.05	61.75	78.64
Code	51.17	84.75	33.63	82.50
Paper	42.08	18.34	16.23	5.65
Ave.	48.25	63.39	31.55	59.58

In addition, the figure reveals significant differences in performance between models. Some large-scale models, such as DeepSeek-V3, GPT-4, and Phi-3.5-mini, are not only large in scale but also show excellent performance in inference tasks. This suggests that for application scenarios requiring complex reasoning capabilities, choosing these large-scale, high-performance models may be more appropriate. However, the figure also shows that some medium-sized models have the potential to improve their performance, suggesting that in addition to size, the model’s structural design and training strategy are also key factors affecting its reasoning ability.

E.2 Finetune Result

As Table 12 shows, instruction fine-tuning significantly enhanced the performance of Qwen2.5-7B and Llama-3.1-8B on the HiBench benchmark across tasks such as Binary Tree, Multiple Tree, JSON, Formula, and Code, with average scores improving from 48.25 to 63.39 for Qwen2.5-7B and from 31.55 to 59.58 for Llama-3.1-8B. However, in the Paper task, both models exhibited a notable decline in performance, with Qwen2.5-7B dropping from 42.08 to 18.34 and Llama-3.1-8B from 16.23 to 5.65. This decline is attributed to

the Paper task’s emphasis on textual comprehension rather than merely hierarchical information processing, rendering fine-tuning focused on hierarchical capabilities less effective. Overall, Qwen2.5-7B consistently outperformed Llama-3.1-8B across all tasks, while the latter demonstrated greater relative improvement potential in tasks with lower initial performance.

E.3 Binary Tree

Table 13 illustrates the leaderboard for the HiBench binary tree scenario, showing the performance of the Model name for different Model Families on multiple tasks. As can be seen from the table, DeepSeek’s DeepSeek-V3 model performs best on all tasks, ranking first with an average score of 70.23. It is followed by Meta’s Llama-3.1-405B model with an average score of 64.49, and in third place is OpenAI’s GPT-4 model with an average score of 56.29. The best performer among the open-source models is Llama-3.1-405B, while the best performer among the closed-source models is GPT-4.

E.4 Multiple Tree

Table 14 illustrates the leaderboard for HiBench multi-tree scenarios, showing the performance of the Model name on multiple tasks for different Model Families. The table includes both Closed-Sourced and Open-Sourced models. The performance of each model is given in the form of scores on different tasks. In addition, the table provides the Average and overall Rank for each model. As can be seen from the table, Qwen’s Qwen2.5-32B model performed the best among all the tasks, ranking first with an average score of 74.12, followed by OpenAI’s GPT-4 model with an average score of 73.64 and third place was DeepSeek’s DeepSeek-V3 model with an average score of 72.59.

E.5 JSON

Table 15 illustrates the leaderboard for HiBench JSON scenarios, showing the performance of different Model Families and Model names on multiple tasks. As you can see from the table, DeepSeek’s

Table 13: HiBench Binary Tree Scenario Leaderboard.*

Model Family	Model Name	Mirror Tree	Balance	Prefix Traversal	Postfix Traversal	Infix Traversal	Traversal Order Verification	Average	Rank
<i>Closed-Sourced</i>									
OpenAI	GPT-3.5	1.00	41.55	63.39	43.94	46.99	38.27	39.19	7
	GPT-4	38.16	39.12	78.97	60.34	53.63	67.52	56.29	3
<i>Open-Sourced</i>									
01-AI	Yi-1.5-9B	0.00	38.54	43.94	34.49	32.29	7.79	26.18	13
Qwen	Qwen2.5-0.5B	0.00	10.19	0.77	0.00	0.35	0.62	1.99	20
	Qwen2.5-1.5B	0.69	41.55	13.85	11.61	14.43	34.42	19.43	16
	Qwen2.5-3B	3.09	36.34	29.36	14.62	14.93	47.61	24.32	15
	Qwen2.5-7B	7.64	41.55	40.97	30.32	29.40	48.77	33.11	10
	QwQ-32B	7.18	45.37	65.20	29.17	46.95	63.58	42.91	6
	Qwen2.5-72B	28.16	48.15	64.05	41.17	43.06	49.07	45.61	5
Baichuan Inc.	Baichuan-7B	0.00	3.38	0.00	0.00	0.00	12.36	2.62	19
DeepSeek	DeepSeek-V3	<u>41.63</u>	56.48	93.67	75.77	76.93	76.89	70.23	1
Meta	Llama-3.2-1B	0.00	41.17	4.01	1.97	2.78	7.52	9.57	18
	Llama-3.2-3B	0.69	39.97	44.06	25.31	34.22	46.49	31.79	11
	Llama-3.1-8B	0.00	14.31	36.88	12.23	16.74	8.26	14.74	17
	Llama-3.1-70B	22.88	44.45	77.70	70.06	68.17	45.14	54.73	4
	Llama-3.1-405B	42.05	50.54	<u>81.02</u>	<u>71.14</u>	<u>74.54</u>	<u>67.63</u>	<u>64.49</u>	2
Microsoft	Phi-3.5-mini-3.8B	0.42	37.36	37.27	30.00	27.13	33.16	27.56	12
Mistral	Mistral-7B	2.08	41.90	30.05	23.84	23.88	35.11	26.14	14
SHAILib	Internlm2.5-7B	2.39	<u>51.04</u>	53.32	28.67	26.51	43.75	34.28	9
THUDM	GLM-4-9B	5.17	50.54	48.92	38.19	36.27	41.21	36.72	8
Average Performance		10.16	38.67	45.37	32.14	33.46	38.76	33.09	-

* The best results for each category are marked in **bold**, and the second-best results are marked with underline.

Table 14: HiBench Multiple Tree Scenario Leaderboard.*

Model Family	Model Name	Add Node	All Ancestor	All Children	Common Ancestor	Isomorphic	Leaf	Node Depth	Remove Node	Root	Average	Rank
<i>Closed-Sourced</i>												
OpenAI	GPT-3.5	1.43	59.37	75.21	64.94	54.69	91.73	17.59	30.32	92.72	54.22	8
	GPT-4	<u>69.47</u>	95.39	88.53	<u>89.14</u>	47.90	96.40	13.49	63.41	99.03	<u>73.64</u>	2
<i>Open-Sourced</i>												
01-AI	Yi-1.5-9B	12.33	45.90	64.33	64.52	43.69	57.87	16.48	35.44	88.51	47.67	9
Qwen	Qwen2.5-0.5B	0.23	8.31	12.92	9.87	15.59	41.69	15.55	2.40	28.70	15.03	19
	Qwen2.5-1.5B	2.17	19.53	17.53	17.30	34.32	47.14	<u>35.73</u>	11.11	48.65	25.94	17
	Qwen2.5-3B	12.46	38.85	59.37	35.31	40.17	51.07	13.64	7.98	77.93	37.42	13
	Qwen2.5-7B	57.28	47.77	75.80	56.48	40.87	53.98	20.92	50.25	90.41	54.86	7
	QwQ-32B	86.66	<u>93.05</u>	90.51	86.64	49.60	83.69	12.75	<u>64.15</u>	100.00	74.12	1
	Qwen2.5-72B	11.62	91.54	<u>89.08</u>	83.73	<u>50.95</u>	94.17	12.56	34.05	100.00	63.08	6
Baichuan Inc.	Baichuan-7B	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.18	0.23	10.25	1.85	0.00	0.23	1.75	20
DeepSeek	DeepSeek-V3	52.65	91.58	90.97	92.11	49.37	<u>99.77</u>	12.99	64.61	<u>99.26</u>	72.59	3
Meta	Llama-3.2-1B	7.57	4.46	5.43	16.14	39.01	46.53	37.08	3.14	24.64	20.45	18
	Llama-3.2-3B	10.56	32.05	8.21	49.01	48.72	58.08	20.73	12.18	72.79	34.70	14
	Llama-3.1-8B	4.61	6.54	14.88	55.52	10.94	55.51	14.37	7.93	88.55	28.76	16
	Llama-3.1-70B	45.56	92.65	67.47	77.32	38.55	94.78	9.89	57.14	100.00	64.82	5
	Llama-3.1-405B	63.49	96.02	67.40	87.42	46.42	100.00	9.89	45.06	100.00	68.41	4
Microsoft	Phi-3.5-mini-3.8B	9.53	34.83	21.55	52.70	48.55	61.30	18.65	14.63	82.47	38.24	12
Mistral	Mistral-7B	6.27	26.35	38.19	38.49	34.97	44.45	21.19	10.42	58.71	31.00	15
SHAILib	Internlm2.5-7B	5.70	38.28	36.26	47.43	49.47	64.21	22.58	6.19	92.15	40.25	11
THUDM	GLM-4-9B	14.48	56.46	35.71	55.20	49.29	81.25	16.63	20.75	86.62	46.26	10
Average Performance		23.70	48.95	47.97	54.12	39.67	66.69	17.23	27.06	76.57	44.66	-

* The best results for each category are marked in **bold**, and the second-best results are marked with underline.

DeepSeek-V3 model performs the best on all tasks, ranking first with an average score of 77.65. This is followed by Qwen’s Qwen2.5-32B

model with an average score of 73.80, and in third place is Qwen’s

Table 15: HiBench JSON Scenario Leaderboard.*

Model Family	Model Name	Child Count	Level Count	Level Nodes	Node Attribute	Node Depth	Path Finding	Nearest ancestor	Average	Rank
<i>Closed-Sourced</i>										
OpenAI	GPT-3.5	75.93	60.00	<u>45.00</u>	75.00	44.00	22.37	52.11	53.49	11
	GPT-4	89.09	100.00	50.00	100.00	9.95	40.70	55.38	63.59	4
<i>Open-Sourced</i>										
01-AI	Yi-1.5-9B	<u>86.23</u>	80.00	50.00	60.00	56.92	2.05	44.42	54.23	10
Qwen	Qwen2.5-0.5B	23.61	40.00	0.00	26.67	7.69	0.00	9.23	15.31	19
	Qwen2.5-1.5B	70.39	80.00	25.00	45.00	31.59	0.51	50.58	43.30	16
	Qwen2.5-3B	49.83	<u>90.00</u>	<u>45.00</u>	73.33	30.05	0.00	54.42	48.95	14
	Qwen2.5-7B	81.82	100.00	50.00	80.00	48.77	20.19	32.31	59.01	7
	QwQ-32B	89.09	100.00	50.00	100.00	<u>66.26</u>	40.71	70.58	<u>73.80</u>	2
	Qwen2.5-72B	89.09	100.00	50.00	83.33	60.67	<u>48.59</u>	61.83	70.50	3
Baichuan Inc.	Baichuan-7B	3.64	0.00	0.00	26.67	0.00	0.00	0.00	4.33	20
DeepSeek	DeepSeek-V3	89.09	100.00	50.00	100.00	86.15	54.66	<u>63.65</u>	77.65	1
Meta	Llama-3.2-1B	43.01	50.00	0.00	53.33	11.49	2.14	2.31	23.18	18
	Llama-3.2-3B	71.71	30.00	0.00	70.00	1.54	4.59	27.31	29.31	17
	Llama-3.1-8B	80.20	<u>90.00</u>	0.00	100.00	56.36	0.00	18.46	49.29	12
	Llama-3.1-70B	89.09	100.00	50.00	83.33	30.72	28.10	60.00	63.03	5
	Llama-3.1-405B	89.09	100.00	40.00	<u>91.67</u>	0.00	37.56	61.35	59.95	6
Microsoft	Phi-3.5-mini-3.8B	82.60	100.00	50.00	66.67	39.54	16.15	47.69	57.52	8
Mistral	Mistral-7B	75.35	100.00	40.00	83.33	28.72	3.08	13.85	49.19	13
SHALib	Internlm2.5-7B	82.60	60.00	50.00	73.33	42.26	12.82	61.35	54.62	9
THUDM	GLM-4-9B	82.60	40.00	50.00	76.67	55.49	5.64	29.81	48.60	15
Average Performance		72.20	76.00	34.75	73.42	35.41	16.99	40.83	49.94	-

* The best results for each category are marked in **bold**, and the second-best results are marked with underline.

Qwen2.5-72B model with an average score of 70.50. The best performer among the open-source models is Qwen2.5-32B, while the best performer among the closed-source models is GPT-4. The table also shows the specific scores of the different models on the various tasks, which helps to understand the strengths and weaknesses of each model in a particular task. The overall average performance score of 49.94 provides a benchmark for model performance.

E.6 Formula

Table 16 illustrates the leaderboard of HiBench formula scenarios showing the performance of the Model name on multiple tasks for different Model Families. The table includes both Closed-Sourced and Open-Sourced models. The performance of each model is given in the form of scores on different sub-tasks, including Calculation, Conversion, and Equivalence. In addition, the table provides the Task Average and overall Rank for each model. As can be seen from the table, DeepSeek’s DeepSeek-V3 model performs the best among all tasks, ranking first with an average score of 57.40, followed by Meta’s Llama-3.1-405B model with an average score of 53.37, and OpenAI’s GPT-4 model in third place with an average score of 54.37. Of the open-source models, The best-performing open-source model is Llama-3.1-405B, while the best-performing closed-source model is GPT-4.

E.7 Code

Table 17 illustrates the leaderboard of HiBench code scenarios showing the performance of Model name on code-related tasks for different Model Families. The table includes both Closed-Sourced and

Open-Sourced models. The performance of each model is given in the form of scores on different tasks including Space Complexity and Time Complexity. In addition, the table also provides the average task scores and the overall ranking for each model. As can be seen from the table, DeepSeek’s DeepSeek-V3 model performs the best among all tasks, ranking first with an average score of 72.5, followed by Meta’s Llama-3.1-405B-Instruct model with an average score of 70.5, and in third place is THUDM’s GLM-4-9B-chat model with an average score of 66.5. The best-performing open-source model is Llama-3.1-405B-Instruct, while the best-performing closed-source model is GPT-4.

E.8 Paper

Table 18 is a leaderboard of HiBench paper scenarios showing the performance of Model name on multiple tasks for different Model Families. The table includes both Close-Sourced and Open-Sourced models. The performance of each model is given in the form of scores on different tasks, including Contextual QA, Outline Extraction, and Disordered Section. In addition, the table also provides the average task scores and overall ranking for each model. From the table, it can be seen that Meta’s Llama-3.1-70B model performs the best among all the tasks with an average score of 43.71, followed by DeepSeek’s DeepSeek-V3 model with an average score of 42.99, and Qwen’s Qwen2.5-7B model with an average score of 42.08 in the third place. open source models The best-performing open-source model is Llama-3.1-70B, while the best-performing closed-source model is GPT-4.

Table 16: HiBench Formula Scenario Leaderboard.*

Model Family	Model Name	Calculation	Conversion	Equivalence	Average	Rank
<i>Closed-Sourced</i>						
OpenAI	GPT-3.5	6.08	<u>92.36</u>	65.18	<u>54.54</u>	2
	GPT-4	8.55	88.08	66.48	54.37	3
<i>Open-Sourced</i>						
01-AI	Yi-1.5-9B	3.99	66.10	57.17	42.42	6
Qwen	Qwen2.5-0.5B	4.98	0.44	21.07	8.83	19
	Qwen2.5-1.5B	3.03	5.08	55.40	21.17	16
	Qwen2.5-3B	4.22	60.14	54.97	39.78	11
	Qwen2.5-7B	4.94	54.54	64.34	41.27	9
	QwQ-32B	7.41	14.39	28.68	16.82	18
	Qwen2.5-72B	8.17	80.34	66.73	51.75	5
Baichuan Inc.	Baichuan-7B	0.00	0.00	2.79	0.93	20
DeepSeek	DeepSeek-V3	11.30	93.31	<u>67.58</u>	57.40	1
Meta	Llama-3.2-1B	0.92	0.04	50.11	17.02	17
	Llama-3.2-3B	3.90	10.89	54.80	23.20	15
	Llama-3.1-8B	6.81	21.78	50.46	26.35	13
	Llama-3.1-70B	7.79	52.71	65.94	42.14	7
	Llama-3.1-405B	<u>8.64</u>	82.34	69.14	53.37	4
Microsoft	Phi-3.5-mini-3.8B	4.18	57.69	63.41	41.76	8
Mistral	Mistral-7B	1.90	58.69	59.64	40.08	10
SHAILib	Internlm2.5-7B	4.56	10.02	55.24	23.27	14
THUDM	GLM-4-9B	5.22	37.50	53.60	32.11	12
Average Performance		5.33	44.32	53.64	34.43	-

* The best results for each category are marked in **bold**, and the second-best results are marked with underline.

F Case Study

F.1 Baichuan Cases

To explore the reasons behind Baichuan-7B’s unexpectedly poor performance on HiBench, we conduct case studies on the *balance* task in the Binary Tree scenario and the *equivalent* task in the Formula scenario. As shown in Figure 12, Baichuan-7B struggles to correctly understand and repeat the instructions. Further improvements are needed to enhance its ability to comprehend human instructions.

F.2 Chain-of-Thought Cases

To investigate why CoT leads to slightly worse performance in the Multiple Tree scenario, we conduct a case study using QwQ-32B on the *all children* task. As shown in Figure 13, the CoT prompting strategy introduces unnecessary steps that complicate intermediate reasoning, causing the model to ultimately fail in generating all correct answers.

F.3 In-context Learning Cases

To investigate why one-shot ICL sometimes performs worse than zero-shot learning, we conduct a case study using Llama-3.1-8B

on the *space complexity* task. As shown in Figure 14, the one-shot example contains high-frequency patterns, which lead the model to overfit spurious correlations instead of accurately capturing the hierarchical relationships.

G Prompts

In this section, we present a series of prompt templates designed to benchmark LLMs across various tasks in our HiBench framework. Table 20 presents prompt templates of Binary Tree scenario, Table 19 presents prompt templates of Multiple Tree scenario, Table 21 presents prompt templates of JSON scenario, Table 23 presents prompt templates of Code scenario, Table 22 presents prompt templates of Formula scenario, and Table 24 presents prompt templates of Paper scenario.

Table 17: HiBench Code Scenario Leaderboard.*

Model Family	Model Name	Space Complexity	Time Complexity	Average	Rank
<i>Closed-Sourced</i>					
OpenAI	GPT-3.5	68.50	64.50	66.50	7
	GPT-4	<u>72.50</u>	<u>69.00</u>	<u>70.75</u>	2
<i>Open-Sourced</i>					
01-AI	Yi-1.5-9B	68.50	65.00	66.75	6
Qwen	Qwen2.5-0.5B	3.50	1.50	2.50	17
	Qwen2.5-1.5B	56.50	57.00	56.75	14
	Qwen2.5-3B	63.50	57.00	60.25	12
	Qwen2.5-7B	71.50	67.00	69.25	4
	QwQ-32B	16.50	11.00	13.75	16
	Qwen2.5-72B	70.00	68.50	69.25	4
Baichuan Inc.	Baichuan-7B	0.50	0.00	0.25	18
DeepSeek	DeepSeek-V3	75.50	69.50	72.50	1
Meta	Llama-3.2-1B	35.00	53.50	44.25	15
	Llama-3.2-3B	60.00	61.00	60.50	11
	Llama-3.1-8B	63.50	60.00	61.75	10
	Llama-3.1-70B	70.00	67.50	68.75	5
	Llama-3.1-405B	72.00	<u>69.00</u>	70.50	3
Microsoft	Phi-3.5-mini-3.8B	64.50	66.00	65.25	9
Mistral	Mistral-7B	59.00	58.50	58.75	13
SHAILib	InternLM2.5-7B	68.00	63.50	65.75	8
THUDM	GLM-4-9B	70.50	62.50	66.50	7
Average Performance		56.48	54.58	55.53	-

* The best results for each category are marked in **bold**, and the second-best results are marked with underline.

Table 18: HiBench Paper Scenario Leaderboard.*

Model Family	Model Name	Contextual QA	Outline Extraction	Disordered Section	Average	Rank
<i>Close-Sourced</i>						
OpenAI	GPT-4	16.40	81.37	17.29	38.35	5
<i>Open-Sourced</i>						
01-AI	Yi-1.5-9B	8.71	18.31	3.80	10.27	16
Qwen	Qwen2.5-0.5B	8.92	2.43	0.60	3.98	18
	Qwen2.5-1.5B	15.64	50.73	10.26	25.54	10
	Qwen2.5-3B	16.98	70.87	9.30	32.38	7
	Qwen2.5-7B	16.48	84.51	25.25	42.08	3
	QwQ-32B	12.68	36.43	2.56	17.22	11
	Qwen2.5-72B	<u>23.25</u>	<u>84.70</u>	11.23	39.72	4
Baichuan Inc.	Baichuan-7B	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	19
DeepSeek	DeepSeek-V3	27.61	94.57	6.78	<u>42.99</u>	2
Meta	Llama-3.2-1B	9.14	25.95	4.81	13.30	14
	Llama-3.2-3B	10.49	50.22	23.50	28.07	8
	Llama-3.1-8B	10.59	12.41	<u>25.70</u>	16.23	13
	Llama-3.1-70B	20.05	83.37	27.71	43.71	1
	Llama-3.1-405B	20.00	11.63	17.75	16.46	12
Microsoft	Phi-3.5-mini-3.8B	6.85	20.92	6.77	11.51	15
Mistral	Mistral-7B	14.56	55.66	11.09	27.10	9
SHAILib	Internlm2.5-7B	2.78	13.37	2.56	6.24	17
THUDM	GLM-4-9B	18.95	57.15	36.72	37.60	6
Average Performance		13.69	44.98	12.82	23.83	-

* The best results for each category are marked in **bold**, and the second-best results are marked with underline.

Prompt

SystemPrompt: As an AI agent, you are tasked with performing hierarchical structure reasoning to assist in understanding and analyzing complex organizational frameworks", Please return the answer in JSON format directly like {"answer": 1}, where 1 is the node's depth, and do not feedback the detailed process.

UserPrompt: Given the hierarchical structure 3 -> 1, 1 -> 4, 4 -> 0, 0 -> 2, please find out all the children of node 3.\nPlease return the answer in JSON format directly like {"answer": 1, 2, 3}, where 1, 2, and 3 are the node ID of children nodes and split by comma, if there is no children nodes, please return {"answer": None}

Answer

0, 1, 2, 4

Response

{"answer": [1, 4, 0, 2]}

(a) Non-CoT Case over All Children Task.

Prompt

SystemPrompt: As an AI agent, you are tasked with performing hierarchical structure reasoning to assist in understanding and analyzing complex organizational frameworks, please think step by step.

UserPrompt: Given the hierarchical structure 3 -> 1, 1 -> 4, 4 -> 0, 0 -> 2, please find out all the children of node 3. Please return the answer in JSON format directly like {"answer": 1, 2, 3}, where 1, 2, and 3 are the node ID of children nodes and split by comma, if there is no children nodes, please return {"answer": None}.

Answer

0, 1, 2, 4

Response

So I've got this hierarchical structure described by these arrows: 3 -> 1, 1 -> 4, 4 -> 0, 0 -> 2. I need to find all the children of node 3. Okay, let's break this down.

First, I need to understand what a hierarchical structure is. It's like a tree, where each node can have children nodes, and those children can have their own children, and so on. In this case, the arrows show the parent-child relationships. So, 3 -> 1 means that 3 is the parent of 1, and 1 is a child of 3.

So, looking at the first relationship: 3 -> 1. That directly tells me that 1 is a child of 3.

Next, 1 -> 4. This means that 1 is the parent of 4. But since 1 is a child of 3, that makes 4 a grandchild of 3.

Then, 4 -> 0, so 4 is the parent of 0, making 0 a great-grandchild of 3.

Finally, 0 -> 2, meaning 0 is the parent of 2, so 2 is a great-great-grandchild of 3.

But the question is asking for the children of node 3, not all descendants. So, only direct children, which from the first relationship is only node 1.

Wait, but maybe I need to consider if there are multiple children. Let's check if there are any other arrows that start from 3.

Looking back, the only arrow starting from 3 is 3 -> 1. There are no other arrows like 3 -> something else. So, node 3 only has one child, which is node 1.

Therefore, the answer should be {"answer": 1}.

But the instruction says to return the answer in JSON format with the answer key, and if there are multiple children, to list them separated by commas. Since there's only one child, it's straightforward.

Just to be thorough, let's make sure there are no other relationships that might imply additional children for node 3.

Looking at 1 -> 4: this is node 1's child, not node 3's.

Similarly, 4 -> 0 and 0 -> 2 are further down the hierarchy, but not direct children of 3.

So, yes, only node 1 is a direct child of node 3.

Therefore, the JSON response should be {"answer": 1}.

I think that's it. straightforward once I map out the relationships.

****Final Answer**:**
`{ "answer": 1 }`

(b) CoT Case over All Children Task.

Figure 13: CoT Case Study on All Children Task.

SystemPrompt: As an AI agent, you are tasked with performing code reasoning to assist in understanding and analyzing complex code snippets. Prompt

UserPrompt: Given a code snippet:

```
class Solution {
public:
vector<vector<int>> updateMatrix(vector<vector<int>>& matrix) {
for (int i = 0; i < matrix.size(); ++i) {
for (int j = 0; j < matrix[0].size(); ++j) {
if (matrix[i][j]) {
continue;
}
matrix[i][j] = numeric_limits<int>::max();
if (i > 0 && matrix[i-1][j] != numeric_limits<int>::max()) {
matrix[i][j] = min(matrix[i][j], matrix[i-1][j] + 1);
}
if (j > 0 && matrix[i][j-1] != numeric_limits<int>::max()) {
matrix[i][j] = min(matrix[i][j], matrix[i][j-1] + 1);
}
}
}
for (int i = matrix.size() - 1; i >= 0; --i) {
for (int j = matrix[0].size() - 1; j >= 0; --j) {
if (matrix[i][j]) {
continue;
}
if (i < matrix.size() - 1 && matrix[i+1][j] != numeric_limits<int>::max()) {
matrix[i][j] = min(matrix[i][j], matrix[i+1][j] + 1);
}
if (j < matrix[0].size() - 1 && matrix[i][j+1] != numeric_limits<int>::max()) {
matrix[i][j] = min(matrix[i][j], matrix[i][j+1] + 1);
}
}
}
return matrix;
};
```

Calculate its space complexity. Please return the answer in JSON format directly like:{"answer": "O(1)"} Answer

O(1) Response

{"answer": "O(1)"} Response

(a) Zero Shot Case over the Space Complexity Task.

SystemPrompt: As an AI agent, you are tasked with performing code reasoning to assist in understanding and analyzing complex code snippets. Prompt

UserPrompt: Here is one example.

The input is:

```
class Solution(object):
def sum(self, num1, num2):
return num1 + num2
```

What is the Space Complexity?
The answer is: {"answer": "O(1)"} Prompt

Given a code snippet:

```
class Solution(object):
def updateMatrix(self, matrix):
for (int i = 0; i < matrix.size(); ++i) {
for (int j = 0; j < matrix[0].size(); ++j) {
if (matrix[i][j]) {
continue;
}
matrix[i][j] = numeric_limits<int>::max();
if (i > 0 && matrix[i-1][j] != numeric_limits<int>::max()) {
matrix[i][j] = min(matrix[i][j], matrix[i-1][j] + 1);
}
if (j > 0 && matrix[i][j-1] != numeric_limits<int>::max()) {
matrix[i][j] = min(matrix[i][j], matrix[i][j-1] + 1);
}
}
}
for (int i = matrix.size() - 1; i >= 0; --i) {
for (int j = matrix[0].size() - 1; j >= 0; --j) {
if (matrix[i][j]) {
continue;
}
if (i < matrix.size() - 1 && matrix[i+1][j] != numeric_limits<int>::max()) {
matrix[i][j] = min(matrix[i][j], matrix[i+1][j] + 1);
}
if (j < matrix[0].size() - 1 && matrix[i][j+1] != numeric_limits<int>::max()) {
matrix[i][j] = min(matrix[i][j], matrix[i][j+1] + 1);
}
}
}
return matrix;
};
```

Calculate its space complexity. Please return the answer in JSON format directly like:{"answer": "O(1)"} Answer

O(1) Response

{"answer": "O(matrix.size() * matrix[0].size())"} Response

(b) One Shot Case over the Space Complexity Task.

SystemPrompt: As an AI agent, you are tasked with performing code reasoning to assist in understanding and analyzing complex code snippets. Prompt

UserPrompt: Here are few examples.

The input is:

```
class Solution(object):
def sum(self, num1, num2):
return num1 + num2
```

What is the Space Complexity?
The answer is: {"answer": "O(1)"} Prompt

The input is:

```
class Solution(object):
def sum(self, num1, num2):
return num1 + num2
```

What is the Space Complexity?
The answer is: {"answer": "O(1)"} Prompt

Given a code snippet:

```
class Solution(object):
def updateMatrix(self, matrix):
for (int i = 0; i < matrix.size(); ++i) {
for (int j = 0; j < matrix[0].size(); ++j) {
if (matrix[i][j]) {
continue;
}
matrix[i][j] = numeric_limits<int>::max();
if (i > 0 && matrix[i-1][j] != numeric_limits<int>::max()) {
matrix[i][j] = min(matrix[i][j], matrix[i-1][j] + 1);
}
if (j > 0 && matrix[i][j-1] != numeric_limits<int>::max()) {
matrix[i][j] = min(matrix[i][j], matrix[i][j-1] + 1);
}
}
}
for (int i = matrix.size() - 1; i >= 0; --i) {
for (int j = matrix[0].size() - 1; j >= 0; --j) {
if (matrix[i][j]) {
continue;
}
if (i < matrix.size() - 1 && matrix[i+1][j] != numeric_limits<int>::max()) {
matrix[i][j] = min(matrix[i][j], matrix[i+1][j] + 1);
}
if (j < matrix[0].size() - 1 && matrix[i][j+1] != numeric_limits<int>::max()) {
matrix[i][j] = min(matrix[i][j], matrix[i][j+1] + 1);
}
}
}
return matrix;
};
```

Calculate its space complexity. Please return the answer in JSON format directly like:{"answer": "O(1)"} Answer

O(1) Response

{"answer": "O(matrix.size() * matrix[0].size())"} Response

(c) Few Shot Case over the Space Complexity Task.

Figure 14: ICL Case Study on Space Complexity Task.

Table 19: The Prompt Template of Multiple Tree Scenario.

Task Name	Prompt Template	Output Format Template
Fundamental - Multiple Tree		
Add Node	Given the hierarchical structure <STRUCTURE>, <QUESTION>	{“answer”: <new structure>} following the input structure format
All Ancestor	Given the hierarchical structure <STRUCTURE>, <QUESTION>	{“answer”: 1, 2, 3}, where 1, 2, and 3 are the node ID of ancestors and split by comma, if there is no ancestors, please return {“answer”: None}
All Children	Given the hierarchical structure <STRUCTURE>, <QUESTION>	{“answer”: 1, 2, 3}, where 1, 2, and 3 are the node ID of children nodes and split by comma, if there is no children nodes, please return {“answer”: None}
Common Ancestor	Given the hierarchical structure <STRUCTURE>, <QUESTION>	{“answer”: 1}, where 1 is the node ID
Isomorphic	Given the hierarchical structure <STRUCTURE_ #0>, <STRUCTURE_ #1>, <QUESTION>	{“answer”: true} if it is isomorphic, or {“answer”: false} if it is not
Remove Node	Given the hierarchical structure <STRUCTURE>, <QUESTION>	{“answer”: <new structure>} following the input structure format, if there are no edges, please return {“answer”: No edges}
Node Depth	Given the hierarchical structure <STRUCTURE>, <QUESTION>	{“answer”: 1}, where 1 is the node’s depth
Leaf	Given the hierarchical structure <STRUCTURE>, <QUESTION>	{“answer”: true} if it is leaf node, or {“answer”: false} if it is not
Root	Given the hierarchical structure <STRUCTURE>, <QUESTION>	{“answer”: 1}, where 1 is the node ID

Table 20: The Prompt Template of Binary Tree Scenario.

Task Name	Prompt Template	Output Format Template
Fundamental - Binary Tree		
Balance	Given the binary tree-liked hierarchical structure <STRUCTURE>, <QUESTION>	{“answer”: true} if it is a balance binary tree, or {“answer”: false} if it is not
Prefix Traversal	Given the binary tree-liked hierarchical structure <STRUCTURE>, <QUESTION>	{“answer”: 1, 2, 3}, where 1, 2, and 3 are the node ID in prefix traversal order and split by comma
Infix Traversal	Given the binary tree-liked hierarchical structure <STRUCTURE>, <QUESTION>	{“answer”: 1, 2, 3}, where 1, 2, and 3 are the node ID in infix traversal order and split by comma
Postfix Traversal	Given the binary tree-liked hierarchical structure <STRUCTURE>, <QUESTION>	{“answer”: 1, 2, 3}, where 1, 2, and 3 are the node ID in postfix traversal order and split by comma
Traversal Order Verification	Given the binary tree-liked hierarchical structure <STRUCTURE>, <QUESTION>	{“answer”: preorder} if it is the preorder, {“answer”: inorder} if it is the inorder, and {“answer”: postorder} if it is the postorder
Mirror Tree	Given the binary tree-liked hierarchical structure <STRUCTURE>, <QUESTION>	{“answer”: <new structure>} following the input structure format

Table 21: The Prompt Template of JSON Scenario.

Task Name	Prompt Template	Output Format Template
Fundamental - JSON		
Child Count	Given a JSON object <JSON> <QUESTION>.	{"answer": 1}
Node Depth	Given a JSON object <JSON> <QUESTION>.	{"answer": "Employees"}
Level Count	Given a JSON object <JSON> <QUESTION>.	{"answer": 1}
Node Attribute	Given a JSON object <JSON> <QUESTION>.	{"answer": "XXX"}
Level Nodes	Given a JSON object <JSON> <QUESTION>.	{"answer": ["Faculty of Science", "Faculty of Arts"]}
Path Finding	Given a JSON object <JSON> <QUESTION>.	{"answer": "Student -> Program -> Department -> Faculty"}
Nearest Ancestor	Given a JSON object <JSON> <QUESTION>.	{"answer": "Faculty of Science"}

Table 22: The Prompt Template of Formula Scenario.

Task Name	Prompt Template	Output Format Template
Practical - Formula		
Calculation	Given a mathematical formula <FORMULA>, calculate its result.	{"answer": 1}
Conversion	Given a mathematical <FORMAT1> formula <FORMULA>, convert it to <FORMAT2> notation.	{"answer": $319 * 924.20 * ((460 + 352.48) + 98)$ }
Equivalence	Given two mathematical formulas <FORMULA1> and <FORMULA2>, determine if they are equivalent.	{"answer": "True"}

Table 23: The Prompt Template of Code Scenario.

Task Name	Prompt Template	Output Format Template
Practical - Code		
Space Complexity	Given a code snippet <CODE>, calculate its space complexity.	{"answer": $O(1)$ }
Time Complexity	Given a code snippet <CODE>, calculate its time complexity.	{"answer": $O(n)$ }

Table 24: The Prompt Template of Paper Scenario.

Task Name	Prompt Template	Output Format Template
Practical - Paper		
Contextual QA	Given the following paper: <PAPER>, <QUESTION>	{"answer": "XXX"}
Disordered Section	Given the following paper: <PAPER>, <QUESTION>	{"answer": "XXX"}
Outline Extraction	Given the following paper: <PAPER>, <QUESTION>	{"answer": "XXX"}