

# Enhancing Reasoning Capabilities of Large Language Models: A Graph-Based Verification Approach

Lang Cao

University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign  
Department of Computer Science  
langcao2@illinois.com

## Abstract

Large Language Models (LLMs) have showcased impressive reasoning capabilities, particularly when guided by specifically designed prompts in complex reasoning tasks such as math word problems. These models typically solve tasks using a chain-of-thought approach, which not only bolsters their reasoning abilities but also provides valuable insights into their problem-solving process. However, there is still significant room for enhancing the reasoning abilities of LLMs. Some studies suggest that the integration of an LLM output verifier can boost reasoning accuracy without necessitating additional model training. In this paper, we follow these studies and introduce a novel graph-based method to further augment the reasoning capabilities of LLMs. We posit that multiple solutions to a reasoning task, generated by an LLM, can be represented as a reasoning graph due to the logical connections between intermediate steps from different reasoning paths. Therefore, we propose the Reasoning Graph Verifier (RGV) to analyze and verify the solutions generated by LLMs. By evaluating these graphs, models can yield more accurate and reliable results. Our experimental results show that our graph-based verification method not only significantly enhances the reasoning abilities of LLMs but also outperforms existing verifier methods in terms of improving these models' reasoning performance.

## Introduction

Large Language Models (LLMs) have demonstrated exceptional capabilities in a variety of human tasks (Zhao et al. 2023). Among the many abilities LLMs possess, their reasoning capacity is of paramount importance (Kojima et al. 2023; Huang and Chang 2023). This has been substantiated by recent progresses (Wei et al. 2022; Zhou et al. 2023; Lampinen et al. 2022a). Equipped with the ability to reason, especially in a multi-step manner, LLMs can decompose complex problems into simpler tasks, thereby facilitating their resolution. In everyday life, many complex tasks typically require multi-step solutions. A prime example of a reasoning task is arithmetic reasoning, also known as solving math word problems (Zhang et al. 2019). These math word problems represent simplified versions of complex real-life situations.

The reasoning ability is inherent in Large Language Models (LLMs), but it necessitates specific methods for manifestation. To activate the robust reasoning capability of LLMs,

Chain-of-thought Reasoning in Math Word Problem	
Exemplars with Step-by-step Solution	<p><b>Q:</b> Janet's ducks lay 16 eggs per day. She eats three for breakfast every morning and bakes muffins for her friends every day with four. She sells the remainder at the farmers' market daily for \$2 per fresh duck egg. How much in dollars does she make every day at the farmers' market?</p> <p><b>A:</b> Step 1: Janet sells <math>16 - 3 - 4 = 9</math> duck eggs a day. Step 2: She makes <math>9 * 2 = 18</math> every day at the farmer's market. Step 3: <b>### 18</b> ..... (More Exemplars) .....</p>
Current Question	<p><b>Q:</b> A robe takes 2 bolts of blue fiber and half that much white fiber. How many bolts in total does it take?</p>
LLM's Generated Solution	<p><b>A:</b> Step 1: It takes <math>2/2 = 1</math> bolt of white fiber. Step 2: So the total amount of fabric is <math>2 + 1 = 3</math> bolts of fabric. Step 3: <b>### 3</b></p>

Figure 1: An example of chain-of-thought reasoning in a math word problem, using data from the GSM8K dataset (Cobbe et al. 2021a). Large language models learn from exemplars that provide step-by-step solutions, subsequently generating their reasoning path for the current question.

the use of specially designed prompts should be considered. Numerous methods have been proposed to tap into this potential, among which chain-of-thought reasoning (Wei et al. 2022) and in-context learning (Lampinen et al. 2022b) are two notable approaches. Chain-of-thought reasoning can elucidate the reasoning paths during the process. In-context learning furnishes LLMs with exemplary cases, thereby enabling them to learn from and simulate these examples for improved results. In the arithmetic reasoning scenario, GPT-4 can achieve an accuracy of 92% on the GSM8K dataset using 5-shot chain-of-thought prompts (Cobbe et al. 2021a). This represents a level of difficulty that a bright middle school student should be capable of handling. As depicted in Figure 1, this illustrates a multi-step arithmetic reasoning process in LLMs.

In addition to further training of LLMs and prompt design, some methods have been proposed to enhance the reasoning capabilities of LLMs from the perspective of output verification. The primary idea is to have LLMs generate reasoning paths multiple times, and then design a verifier to evaluate these paths and deliver the final results. (Wang et al. 2023) introduces the concept of *self-consistency*, based on the intuition that a complex reasoning problem usually allows for multiple thought processes, all leading to a unique correct answer. (Li et al. 2023) also proposes *All Roads Lead to Rome*, which introduces a step-aware verifier to analyze reasoning paths not just through the entire path, but at every step. However, both methods treat each reasoning path as an independent entity and do not consider the potential interrelation and interaction between different reasoning paths. Once reasoning paths are disassembled into steps, intermediate steps from one path may bear reasoning relations to other reasoning paths. These methods do not perceive all LLM outputs for a given input as a collective entity, thereby failing to analyze the internal relations of all candidate paths in depth.

Inspired by these observations, we propose **Reasoning Graph Verifier (RGV)** in this paper. We posit that reasoning paths of one question can form reasoning graphs, where similar intermediate reasoning steps can be merged into the same node. With a graph structure, we can more effectively model and capture the reasoning logic between intermediate steps from different reasoning paths. Specifically, we first construct a reasoning graph based on all outputs from LLMs, and then train a verifier to learn the relationship between the graph structure and the final answer. During the prediction stage, we process the data in the same way as in the training stage, and use the verifier to evaluate each reasoning graph. We then select the reasoning graph with the highest score, using its answer as the final answer. To the best of our knowledge, we are the first to approach reasoning logic of LLMs from a graph perspective. We conduct extensive experiments to demonstrate the improvements over the original LLMs, and show that our method outperforms other verifiers.

In summary, our contributions are as follows:

- We propose a graph-based verification method, RGV, aimed at significantly enhancing the reasoning capabilities of large language models without the need for additional training of LLMs.
- We establish an arithmetic reasoning benchmark using three Math Word Problem datasets to illustrate the fundamental reasoning performance of large language models, and to provide a fair comparison of the performance of various existing verifiers.
- Our experimental results indicate that the method proposed in this paper outperforms other enhancement methods. We also provide an extensive analysis of the limitations and future potential of RGV.

## Related Works

**Reasoning of Fine-tuning Models** has been extensively studied. It focuses on addressing reasoning tasks using a general sequence-to-sequence approach, enhanced by

reasoning-aware pre-training or fine-tuning of language models. (Cobbe et al. 2021a) proposed training a verifier to rank solutions sampled from fine-tuned language models. (Yoran, Talmor, and Berant 2022; Wang et al. 2022) suggested equipping language models with reasoning abilities by generating training examples with human-designed templates. (Pi et al. 2022) proposed injecting reasoning capabilities into language models by continually pre-training on program execution data.

Several studies have focused on imbuing PLM with reasoning ability for specific tasks, such as arithmetic reasoning (Cobbe et al. 2021a; Miao, Liang, and Su 2020; Patel, Bhattamishra, and Goyal 2021), commonsense reasoning (Talmor et al. 2019), and inductive reasoning (Sinha et al. 2019). For instance, various strategies have been proposed to improve language models’ performance on arithmetic reasoning tasks, often referred to as math word problems. (Xie and Sun 2019) proposed a tree-structured decoder to generate an equation tree, while (Zhang et al. 2020) applied graph convolutional networks to extract relationships of quantities in math problems. (Li et al. 2022) used contrastive learning to better learn patterns in math word problems. However, (Valmeekam et al. 2023; Rae et al. 2022) suggested that reasoning, particularly multi-step reasoning, is often a weakness in language models and other NLP models.

**Reasoning of Large Language Models** has garnered significant attention and demonstrated immense potential. Recent advancements in LLMs suggest that the ability for multi-step reasoning is already embedded within these large-scale models (Kojima et al. 2023; Huang and Chang 2023), such as PaLM (Chowdhery et al. 2022), GPT-4 (OpenAI 2023). Therefore, providing an adequate prompt is sufficient to utilize this reasoning ability. For example, the prompting method proposed by (Kojima et al. 2023; Wei et al. 2022), which is based on a chain-of-thought, could aid LLMs in generating text with arithmetic reasoning and common factual knowledge. Following (Wei et al. 2022), experiments on current language models demonstrated that chain-of-thought prompting could enhance the accuracy of solving math problems from 18% to 57%. (Lampinen et al. 2022b) included explanations in the in-context examples and tested the influence of explanations by evaluating the score between *explain-then-predict* and *predict-then-explain*. Moreover, (Zhou et al. 2023) suggested a two-stage prompting strategy, *least-to-most* prompting, which breaks down a complex problem into a series of subproblems and solves them step-by-step. (Li et al. 2023) proposed sampling multiple times from diverse prompts to enhance the variety of responses.

In addition to designing prompts, adopting additional strategies like verifier has contributed to enhancing the performance of reasoning abilities of large language models. For instance, (Wang et al. 2023) proposes *self-consistency*, which involves sampling different reasoning paths from the language model, and then returning the most consistent final answer via majority voting. (Li et al. 2023) used a step-aware voting verifier to enhance the reasoning ability of




Figure 2: The framework of RGV. In the training stage, RGV processes generated solutions from LLMs to construct reasoning graphs, and then trains a verifier to judge them according to graph classification. In the prediction stage, RGV evaluates candidate solutions to assign a score, and selects the solution with the highest score as the final answer.

LLMs from two perspectives. These methods strive to augment the reasoning abilities or yield superior reasoning results without necessitating additional training of LLMs. Our work continues this research direction, with a specific focus on developing a novel graph-based verifier to boost the reasoning capabilities of LLMs.

## Methodology

### RGV Framework

#### Problem 1 (Reasoning to Solve Math Word Problems)

Given a set of  $n$  math word problems  $\mathbf{Q} = \{Q_1, Q_2, \dots, Q_n\}$ , where each  $Q_i$  is represented by the text description of a single math word problem, the goal of reasoning to solve math word problems is to generate the answers  $\mathbf{A} = \{A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n\}$  for these problems. Here, each  $A_i$  represents the generated text of the corresponding answer. During the process of large language models generating answers, a set of  $n$  reasoning paths for solutions  $\mathbf{S} = \{S_1, S_2, \dots, S_n\}$  is also produced. Each solution  $S_i$  is represented as  $S_i = \{Q, \text{Step}_1, \text{Step}_2, \dots, \text{Step}_l, A\}$ , where each  $\text{Step}_i$  denotes the intermediate steps in the step-by-step solutions.

We propose RGV to verify the solutions generated by LLMs in order to improve the final answer accuracy. This method is a graph-based verification technique that analyzes reasoning paths from generated solutions from a graph perspective. The final answer is obtained without modifying the

original LLMs, functioning much like a plugin. As illustrated in Figure 2, there are two steps in the training stage: *Graph Construction* and *Graph Classification*. In the *Graph Construction* step, we obtain the generated solution from LLMs with the specific designed prompt and group them according to their final answers. We split reasoning paths by steps and then merge intermediate steps with identical expression to form reasoning graphs. In the *Graph Classification* step, we classify these reasoning graphs with the additional feature of the sum of scores from the *base verifier* to train the integrated verifier model. In the prediction stage, the candidate solutions are first generated by LLMs. We process them in the same manner as in the training stage, then we use trained verifier to evaluate the scores of each candidate solution. The best solution, denoted by the highest score, is selected as the final predicted answer. We will now provide a detailed introduction to the entire process.

### Prompt Design

To improve the output of Language Models (LLMs) in providing solutions, it is essential to design effective prompts. We incorporate chain-of-thought and in-context learning to enable LLMs to generate step-by-step answers for math word problems. The language models generate output  $\mathbf{y}$  based on the input  $\mathbf{x}$  using the following equation:

$$p(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{C}, \mathbf{x}) = \prod_{t=1}^{|\mathbf{y}|} p_{LM}(\mathbf{y}_t|\mathbf{C}, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} < t), \quad (1)$$

where,  $C$  represents the input provided to the LLMs prior to the current math word problem’s question.  $C$  is a concatenation of  $k$  exemplars, denoted as:

$$C = [(Q_1, S_1, A_1); (Q_2, S_2, A_2), \dots; (Q_k, S_k, A_k)], \quad (2)$$

where,  $Q_i$  represents the question,  $S_i$  represents the intermediate steps of the solution, and  $A_i$  represents the answer. We set  $k$  to five in this study, resulting in a prompt that consists of five question-answer pairs sampled from the training split of a math word problem dataset. Therefore, the prompt can be denoted as:

$$\text{Prompt} = [C; Q], \quad (3)$$

where  $Q$  represents the question of the current math word problem.

Using a greedy decoding approach to sample one output from LLMs may not be robust. It can lead to instability and occasional errors. To address this, (Wang et al. 2023) propose the concept of *self-consistency*. This approach involves sampling different reasoning paths from the language model and then selecting the most consistent final answer through majority voting. Instead of using greedy decoding to sample only once and verify, they utilize sampling decoding to sample  $N_1$  times. We also follow the idea presented by (Li et al. 2023) in their work named *All Roads Lead to Rome*. This approach involves generating  $N_2$  diverse prompts for LLMs to produce multiple outputs. By employing multiple sampling decodes on diverse prompts, we can obtain generated solutions from different sources. Specifically, we obtain  $N = N_1 \times N_2$  diverse reasoning paths for each question. In our main experiments, we set  $N_1 = 10$  and  $N_2 = 3$ . These solutions will be further processed and verified using our designed verifier.

### Reasoning Graph Construction

After generating multiple solutions for a question, it becomes necessary to construct reasoning graphs based on the reasoning paths taken by these solutions.

We begin by grouping all the generated solutions for a particular question according to their final answer. Since these solutions originate from the same question, their reasoning paths will share the same starting point. Similarly, solutions with the same final answer will have the same endpoint, as their reasoning paths converge. Therefore, a group of generated solutions with the same final answer can form a reasoning graph with a uniform start node (question node) and end node (answer node). We define this division process as follows:

$$\mathbf{S} = \{S_{A_1}, S_{A_2}, \dots, S_{A_n}\}, \quad (4)$$

where  $\mathbf{S}$  represents the set of generated solutions for a question, and  $S_{A_i} = \{S_1, S_2, \dots, S_m\}$  is the subset of generated solutions that all have the same final answer  $A_i$ .

For each subset of generated solutions  $S_{A_i}$ , we construct a reasoning graph. This construction is motivated by the understanding that each step in the reasoning path of a generated solution does not exist in isolation from the other solutions. The steps from one solution’s reasoning path can impact the steps from another solution, enhancing the overall




Figure 3: The process of reasoning graph construction. The primary operation here is the merging of identical intermediate steps in reasoning paths into a single graph node.

reasoning process. We utilize the graph structure to model and capture these relationships between steps from different solutions. As the different reasoning paths can benefit each other, we construct a reasoning graph to link these paths together. As shown in Figure 3, the primary operation here is the merging of identical intermediate nodes in reasoning paths into a single graph node. We first compare the reasoning steps from any two solution reasoning paths. If they have the same intermediate steps of arithmetic expression, we merge them into the same node, and if they differ, we do not. For reasoning math word problems here, we define reasoning steps as the current arithmetic expression without other language text in the current reasoning step for clarity. It can help us simplify construction of reasoning graphs in the reasoning task. The detailed algorithm for constructing a reasoning graph is shown in Algorithm 1.

The generated solutions, divided by their final answers  $\{S_{A_1}, S_{A_2}, \dots, S_{A_n}\}$ , can be transformed into  $n$  reasoning graphs of generated solutions  $\{G_{A_1}, G_{A_2}, \dots, G_{A_n}\}$ .

Regarding the node features in the graph, we select the score from the *Base Verifier* and the node degree. We believe the score from the *Base Verifier* encapsulates the semantic information of solutions, and the node degree contains information about the graph structure. The *Base Verifier* is trained independently from the whole framework. It is designed to judge whether a single reasoning path of one solution is correct, which is a binary text classification task. After training, it can be used to verify any single solution and assign a *score*  $\in (0, 1)$  to evaluate the likelihood of the solution being correct, where *score* = 0.99 suggests a 99% probability of the solution being correct. We use the score from the *Base Verifier* to better incorporate solution semantic information because, according to our experiments, it is challenging to model semantic information while modeling reasoning logic information. The score of a step is the same

---

**Algorithm 1: Reasoning graph construction algorithm**

---

**Input:** generated solutions  $S_{A_i}$  which have the same final answers

**Output:** a reasoning graphs  $G_{A_i}$

```
1:  $node\_num \leftarrow 0$ 
2:  $node2id \leftarrow dict()$ 
3:  $edges \leftarrow list()$ 
4: for each  $reason\_path$  in  $S_{A_i}$  do
5:   for each  $step$  in  $reason\_path$  do
6:     if  $step$  not in  $node2id.keys()$  then
7:        $node2id[step] \leftarrow node\_num$ 
8:        $node\_num \leftarrow node\_num + 1$ 
9:     end if
10:  end for
11: end for
12: for each  $reason\_path$  in  $S_{A_i}$  do
13:   for each  $step$  in  $reason\_path$  do
14:      $start\_node \leftarrow node2id[last\_step]$ 
15:      $end\_node \leftarrow node2id[step]$ 
16:     if  $(start\_node, end\_node)$  not in  $edges$  then
17:        $edges.add((start\_node, end\_node))$ 
18:     end if
19:      $last\_step \leftarrow step$ 
20:   end for
21: end for
22:  $G_{A_i} \leftarrow graph(node2id, edges)$ 
```

---

as its solution score. Therefore, for one step node  $V$ , it has many scores  $\{score^a, score^b, \dots, score^c\}$  from different solutions. The feature of one node  $V_i$  in the graph is then concatenated by the selected feature, which can be represented as:

$$\mathbf{V} = [score_i^{mean}, score_i^{max}, score_i^{min}, score_i^{num}, in\_degree_i], \quad (5)$$

where  $\mathbf{V} \in \mathbb{R}^5$ ,  $score_i^{mean}$  is the mean of all scores of one step  $V_i$ ,  $score_i^{max}$  is the maximum score,  $score_i^{min}$  is the minimum score,  $score_i^{num}$  is the number of scores, and  $in\_degree_i$  is the in-degree of the step node  $V_i$ .

In this way, we can obtain multiple reasoning graphs to represent all generated solutions from LLMs for a single math word problem question.

### Verifier Design

Our designed verifier  $RGV$ , is used to evaluate the answer of a generated solutions group, which is also represented as a reasoning graph. This verifier has two inputs: the graph and the sum of solution scores. We employ the Graph Isomorphism Network (GIN) (Xu et al. 2019) to perform node feature propagation, thereby encoding the information from the reasoning graphs we obtained. The node feature is propagated and aggregated as follows:

$$h_v^{(k)} = MLP^{(k)}((1 + \varepsilon^{(k)}) \cdot h_v^{(k-1)} + \sum_{u \in N(v)} h_u^{(k-1)}), \quad (6)$$

where  $h_v^{(k)}$  represents the state of node  $v$  after the  $k^{th}$  update.  $MLP^{(k)}$  refers to a multi-layer perceptron in the  $k^{th}$

layer.  $N(v)$  denotes all the neighbors of node  $v$  and  $\varepsilon$  is a learnable parameter. Then, we perform a sum readout to obtain the representation of the reasoning graph:

$$h_G = \sum_{v \in G} h_v^{(k)}, \quad (7)$$

where  $h_G \in \mathbb{R}^5$ . We set  $k$  to 3, signifying the application of three layers of GIN. Concurrently, the sum of the scores of solutions with the same final answer,  $A_i$ , denoted as  $score_{A_i}$ , is represented as follows:

$$score_{A_i} = \sum_{i \in S_A} score_i. \quad (8)$$

Then a reasoning graph can then be represented as:

$$\mathbf{G} = [h_G, score_{A_i}], \quad (9)$$

where  $\mathbf{G} \in \mathbb{R}^6$ .

The target label of the graph  $\mathbf{y} \in \{0, 1\}$  indicates whether the final answer matches the correct final answer. We compute the loss and train the verifier model by:

$$\mathcal{L} = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{L}_{BCE}(label_i, f(\mathbf{G}_i)), \quad (10)$$

where  $i$  represents the number of solution subset among all  $n$  subsets after grouping solutions. The corresponding reasoning graph for this subset is denoted by  $\mathbf{G}_i$ , and  $f(\cdot)$  is a linear classifier.

### Answer Verification

During the prediction stage, all generated solutions are processed in the same way as in the training stage. The trained verifier is then used to evaluate the scores of each reasoning graph, each of which represents a group of solutions that yield the same final answer. The final answer associated with the highest score is selected as our final predicted answer:

$$\hat{\mathbf{y}} = \mathbf{Answer}[\arg \max_i score_i], \quad (11)$$

where  $score_i$  denotes the score of the reasoning graph  $\mathbf{G}_i$ , as determined by our verifier.  $\mathbf{Answer}$  represents the list of all candidate final answers. By predicting the number of the optimal reasoning graph, we can determine the final predicted result of the current reasoning task.

## Experiments

In this section, we conducted extensive experiments to demonstrate the performance of  $RGV$ , along with a more in-depth analysis. Universally, we reproduced all types of verifiers to report their results based on the same generated solutions. We ensured a fair comparison by setting the same random seed, using the same hardware environment, and applying similar hyperparameters. We used accuracy as the metric to evaluate the ability of solving math word problems, which determines whether the final answer is correct or not.

	GSM8K	SVAMP	ASDiv-a
Fine-tuning SOTA	57 <sup>a</sup>	57.4 <sup>b</sup>	75.3 <sup>c</sup>
9–12 year olds	60	-	-
<u>gpt-3.5-turbo:</u>			
Greedy Decode	72.7	78.7	93.0
Self-Consistency (Voting)	82.3	82.9	95.6
Simple Verifier	66.9	73.1	92.8
Voting Verifier	85.4	84.8	96.9
DIVERSE (Step-aware Voting Verifier)	85.0	85.1	96.9
<b>Reasoning Graph Verifier (Ours)</b>	<b>85.7</b>	<b>85.4</b>	<b>97.0</b>

Table 1: The comparison experiment results of RGV, other verifiers, and other baselines. We primarily compare RGV with other verifiers which are all based on the same generated solutions from *gpt-3.5-turbo*.

## Datasets

We compared RGV with other methods on three different math word problem datasets: **GSM8K** (Cobbe et al. 2021a), **SVAMP** (Patel, Bhattamishra, and Goyal 2021), and **ASDiv-a** (Miao, Liang, and Su 2020). We selected the subset ASDiv-a (arithmetic) from the original dataset ASDiv, which only involves arithmetic operations.

These three datasets are more challenging than other math word problem datasets, making them more suitable for testing the reasoning capability of LLMs with a verifier. As the GSM8K dataset is the only one providing step-by-step solutions as chain-of-thought exemplars, we chose exemplars from the GSM8K training dataset and tested them on all three datasets. Additionally, the training data for the verifier also used the GSM8K training data. In this setting, we could also demonstrate the transfer learning and generalization ability of our method. The size of the training split from GSM8k is 1000. The test data sizes for GSM8K, SVAMP, and ASDiv-a are 1319, 1000, and 1218, respectively.

## Baselines

In our evaluation, we consider the following baselines:

- **Greedy Decode** is a simple method that uses a greedy decoding strategy to sample once.
- **Self-Consistency (Voting)** (Wang et al. 2023) samples multiple times and selects the final answers based on majority voting.
- **Simple Verifier** (Cobbe et al. 2021b), which is also known as the Sampling and Re-ranking strategy, uses a verifier to assign scores to sampled solutions and selects the final answer with the highest score.
- **Voting Verifier** (Li et al. 2023) combines the Voting and Verifier approaches. It assigns total scores to answers from scores of all candidate solutions and selects the final answer with the highest score.
- **DIVERSE (Step-aware Voting Verifier)** (Li et al. 2023), which is the state-of-the-art method, considers the reasoning steps throughout the entire reasoning path. It recognizes that not all steps in an incorrect reasoning

path are equally wrong and that some steps may still be useful for reasoning.

We primarily compare RGV with other verifiers using the same generated solutions from *gpt-3.5-turbo*. Additionally, we include some previous Fine-tuning state-of-the-art methods to reflect the strong reasoning ability of LLMs. The previous Fine-tuning SOTA methods are denoted as follows: a: (Cobbe et al. 2021b), b: (Pi et al. 2022), c: (Miao, Liang, and Su 2020).

## Training Details

For LLMs sampling, we use *gpt-3.5-turbo* as our base LLMs and set the temperature  $t$  to 1. All verifiers use the same LLMs’ output. Regarding verifier training, we fine-tune on *bert-base-uncased* (Devlin et al. 2019). We employ the AdamW optimizer (Loshchilov and Hutter 2019) to optimize the model parameters during training. We apply differential learning rates, setting the learning rate of the final linear classifier to 4e-2, while the other graph neural network layers are set to 4e-3. The activation layer between them is ReLU (Agarap 2019). The batch size in each training step is set to 2. The batch size is small because the verifier needs to verify multiple reasoning graphs for a single question.

To ensure a fair comparison between the Voting Verifier, Simple Verifier, and RGV, we use the same trained base verifier for all three approaches.

## Main Results

We present the main results in Table 1. As can be seen from the table, RGV significantly enhances the original *gpt-3.5-turbo*’s reasoning abilities across all three datasets, for instance, improving accuracy by 13.0% (72.7%  $\rightarrow$  85.7%) on GSM8K. It is also evident that our method surpasses other verifier methods with the same output from LLMs and achieves the state-of-the-art on all three datasets.

Additionally, the Step-aware Voting Verifier improves upon the Voting Verifier by recognizing that not all steps in an incorrect reasoning path are equally erroneous, and some steps may still be useful for reasoning. We believe this hypothesis is overly simplistic and cannot describe complex

	GSM8K	▽	SVAMP	▽	ASDiv-a	▽
<b>Reasoning Graph Verifier (Ours)</b>	<b>85.7</b>	-	<b>85.4</b>	-	<b>97.0</b>	-
w/o solution semantic from base verifier	81.2	-4.5	83.1	-2.3	94.3	-2.7
w/o solution scores sum	82.8	-2.9	83.2	-2.2	95.6	-1.4
w/o reasoning graphs	85.4	-0.3	84.8	-0.6	96.9	-0.1

Table 2: The ablation experiment results of RGV. Missing each component leads to a decline in the final result.

logical relationships among steps. According to Table 1, it leads to some metric decline, and the same finding also observed in the original paper. However, our paper consistently improves upon the Voting Verifier by considering complex relationship between different reasoning paths through reasoning graphs. We enhance the previous method, which did not consider relations in steps between different solutions, by 0.3% (85.4%  $\rightarrow$  85.7%), 0.6% (84.8%  $\rightarrow$  85.4%), and 0.1% (96.9%  $\rightarrow$  97.9%) across the three datasets.

Moreover, RGV yields only a slight improvement in performance on ASDiv-a, and the results are nearly identical. One reason for this is that the math word problems from ASDiv-a are simpler compared to those in the other two datasets, based on our observations. In most cases, these problems do not require complex reasoning from a graph perspective to generate a satisfactory answer. It demonstrates that our method is particularly well-suited for such situations. We believe that RGV can offer more substantial improvements in the more complex scenario.

### Ablation Study

We conducted an ablation study to evaluate the impact of each component on the overall performance of our method. Table 2 presents the results of this study, highlighting how these modules contribute to the improvement of the base model in distinct ways. It can be observed that the omission of any component leads to a decline in the final result. The solution semantics from the base verifier appear to be most crucial to RGV. The current method still relies on semantic information, which is reasonable since reasoning steps from different solutions require semantic information for better reasoning. We also notice that reasoning graphs bring a slight improvement to the entire method, thereby proving effectiveness of graph structure. The improvement is not substantial because we do not model the graph structure and semantic information simultaneously, and create a training gap here. Another essential factor is the complexity of graph classification, compounded by the presence of noise and limitations in our training data.

### Limitations

There are several limitations in the current research that contribute to performance that is not as good as expected:

- **Computing Resources.** Despite the impressive performance it achieves, our framework requires large language models like GPT3.5. Inference with these models is more time-consuming and costly than fine-tuning

models like BERT (Devlin et al. 2019). Some experiments, such as hyperparameter analysis, have already been conducted in related previous work and are not replicated here. Furthermore, due to limited computing resources, we have not conducted experiments with additional LLMs. We have chosen solely to use the representative LLM, GPT3.5, to compare the performance of the verifiers.

- **Labeled chain-of-thought data.** RGV is a complex verifier method that builds on graph classification, which requires more labeled data with well-annotated chain-of-thought reasoning paths for training. In the training of RGV, we use reasoning paths from LLMs’ output which may introduce significant noise. If the training data included labeled reasoning graphs, the performance would improve significantly.
- **Other Reasoning Tasks.** There are many types of reasoning tasks beyond math word problems, such as Commonsense Reasoning (Talmor et al. 2019), Inductive Reasoning (Sinha et al. 2019), etc. Given that graph construction is a complex process, we have focused solely on solving math word problems (Arithmetic Reasoning). This focus allows for a more convenient implementation of the merging of intermediate steps. In other cases, identifying similar steps can be challenging. On the other hand, a math word problem typically presents a greater variety of potential solutions.

Nevertheless, we believe that future studies, conducted by us or others, can overcome these limitations and further improve upon our approach.

### Conclusion

In this paper, we propose RGV, a novel and general method to enhance the reasoning abilities of large language models. Our method is the first to approach reasoning logic of large language models from a graph perspective and verifies candidate reasoning paths accordingly. We demonstrate the superiority of RGV through extensive experiments.

There are many avenues for future research, including jointly training the base verifier within the entire framework, effectively incorporating semantic information directly into the graph, and training the verifier using labeled chain-of-thought data. Despite current limitations, we believe that the verifier presents an efficient method to enhance the reasoning capabilities of large language models. There remains considerable scope for exploration, and we hope our work can inspire further research aimed at improving the reasoning abilities of large language models better.



## References

- Agarap, A. F. 2019. Deep Learning using Rectified Linear Units (ReLU). arXiv:1803.08375.
- Chowdhery, A.; Narang, S.; Devlin, J.; Bosma, M.; Mishra, G.; Roberts, A.; Barham, P.; Chung, H. W.; Sutton, C.; Gehrmann, S.; Schuh, P.; Shi, K.; Tsvyashchenko, S.; Maynez, J.; Rao, A.; Barnes, P.; Tay, Y.; Shazeer, N.; Prabhakaran, V.; Reif, E.; Du, N.; Hutchinson, B.; Pope, R.; Bradbury, J.; Austin, J.; Isard, M.; Gur-Ari, G.; Yin, P.; Duke, T.; Levsikaya, A.; Ghemawat, S.; Dev, S.; Michalewski, H.; Garcia, X.; Misra, V.; Robinson, K.; Fedus, L.; Zhou, D.; Ippolito, D.; Luan, D.; Lim, H.; Zoph, B.; Spiridonov, A.; Sepassi, R.; Dohan, D.; Agrawal, S.; Omernick, M.; Dai, A. M.; Pillai, T. S.; Pellat, M.; Lewkowycz, A.; Moreira, E.; Child, R.; Polozov, O.; Lee, K.; Zhou, Z.; Wang, X.; Saeta, B.; Diaz, M.; Firat, O.; Catasta, M.; Wei, J.; Meier-Hellstern, K.; Eck, D.; Dean, J.; Petrov, S.; and Fiedel, N. 2022. PaLM: Scaling Language Modeling with Pathways. arXiv:2204.02311.
- Cobbe, K.; Kosaraju, V.; Bavarian, M.; Chen, M.; Jun, H.; Kaiser, L.; Plappert, M.; Tworek, J.; Hilton, J.; Nakano, R.; Hesse, C.; and Schulman, J. 2021a. Training Verifiers to Solve Math Word Problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.14168*.
- Cobbe, K.; Kosaraju, V.; Bavarian, M.; Chen, M.; Jun, H.; Kaiser, L.; Plappert, M.; Tworek, J.; Hilton, J.; Nakano, R.; Hesse, C.; and Schulman, J. 2021b. Training Verifiers to Solve Math Word Problems. arXiv:2110.14168.
- Devlin, J.; Chang, M.-W.; Lee, K.; and Toutanova, K. 2019. BERT: Pre-training of Deep Bidirectional Transformers for Language Understanding. arXiv:1810.04805.
- Huang, J.; and Chang, K. C.-C. 2023. Towards Reasoning in Large Language Models: A Survey. arXiv:2212.10403.
- Kojima, T.; Gu, S. S.; Reid, M.; Matsuo, Y.; and Iwasawa, Y. 2023. Large Language Models are Zero-Shot Reasoners. arXiv:2205.11916.
- Lampinen, A.; Dasgupta, I.; Chan, S.; Mathewson, K.; Tessler, M.; Creswell, A.; McClelland, J.; Wang, J.; and Hill, F. 2022a. Can language models learn from explanations in context? In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2022*, 537–563. Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates: Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Lampinen, A. K.; Dasgupta, I.; Chan, S. C.; Mathewson, K.; Tessler, M. H.; Creswell, A.; McClelland, J. L.; Wang, J. X.; and Hill, F. 2022b. Can language models learn from explanations in context? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.02329*.
- Li, Y.; Lin, Z.; Zhang, S.; Fu, Q.; Chen, B.; Lou, J.-G.; and Chen, W. 2023. Making Language Models Better Reasoners with Step-Aware Verifier. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, 5315–5333. Toronto, Canada: Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Li, Z.; Zhang, W.; Yan, C.; Zhou, Q.; Li, C.; Liu, H.; and Cao, Y. 2022. Seeking Patterns, Not just Memorizing Procedures: Contrastive Learning for Solving Math Word Problems. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2022*, 2486–2496. Dublin, Ireland: Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Loshchilov, I.; and Hutter, F. 2019. Decoupled Weight Decay Regularization. arXiv:1711.05101.
- Miao, S.-y.; Liang, C.-C.; and Su, K.-Y. 2020. A Diverse Corpus for Evaluating and Developing English Math Word Problem Solvers. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 975–984.
- OpenAI. 2023. GPT-4 Technical Report. arXiv:2303.08774.
- Patel, A.; Bhattamishra, S.; and Goyal, N. 2021. Are NLP Models really able to Solve Simple Math Word Problems? In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, 2080–2094. Online: Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Pi, X.; Liu, Q.; Chen, B.; Ziyadi, M.; Lin, Z.; Fu, Q.; Gao, Y.; Lou, J.-G.; and Chen, W. 2022. Reasoning Like Program Executors. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, 761–779. Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates: Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Rae, J. W.; Borgeaud, S.; Cai, T.; Millican, K.; Hoffmann, J.; Song, F.; Aslanides, J.; Henderson, S.; Ring, R.; Young, S.; Rutherford, E.; Hennigan, T.; Menick, J.; Cassirer, A.; Powell, R.; van den Driessche, G.; Hendricks, L. A.; Rauh, M.; Huang, P.-S.; Glaese, A.; Welbl, J.; Dathathri, S.; Huang, S.; Uesato, J.; Mellor, J.; Higgins, I.; Creswell, A.; McAleese, N.; Wu, A.; Elsen, E.; Jayakumar, S.; Buchatskaya, E.; Budden, D.; Sutherland, E.; Simonyan, K.; Paganini, M.; Sifre, L.; Martens, L.; Li, X. L.; Kuncoro, A.; Nematzadeh, A.; Gribovskaya, E.; Donato, D.; Lazaridou, A.; Mensch, A.; Lespiau, J.-B.; Tsimpoukelli, M.; Grigorev, N.; Fritz, D.; Sottiaux, T.; Pajarskas, M.; Pohlen, T.; Gong, Z.; Toyama, D.; de Masson d’Autume, C.; Li, Y.; Terzi, T.; Mikulik, V.; Babuschkin, I.; Clark, A.; de Las Casas, D.; Guy, A.; Jones, C.; Bradbury, J.; Johnson, M.; Hechtman, B.; Weidinger, L.; Gabriel, I.; Isaac, W.; Lockhart, E.; Osindero, S.; Rimell, L.; Dyer, C.; Vinyals, O.; Ayoub, K.; Stanway, J.; Bennett, L.; Hassabis, D.; Kavukcuoglu, K.; and Irving, G. 2022. Scaling Language Models: Methods, Analysis & Insights from Training Gopher. arXiv:2112.11446.
- Sinha, K.; Sodhani, S.; Dong, J.; Pineau, J.; and Hamilton, W. L. 2019. CLUTRR: A Diagnostic Benchmark for Inductive Reasoning from Text. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*, 4506–4515. Hong Kong, China: Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Talmor, A.; Herzig, J.; Lourie, N.; and Berant, J. 2019. CommonsenseQA: A Question Answering Challenge Targeting Commonsense Knowledge. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, 4149–4158. Minneapolis, Minnesota: Association for Computational Linguistics.



Valmeekam, K.; Olmo, A.; Sreedharan, S.; and Kambhampati, S. 2023. Large Language Models Still Can't Plan (A Benchmark for LLMs on Planning and Reasoning about Change). arXiv:2206.10498.

Wang, S.; Zhong, W.; Tang, D.; Wei, Z.; Fan, Z.; Jiang, D.; Zhou, M.; and Duan, N. 2022. Logic-Driven Context Extension and Data Augmentation for Logical Reasoning of Text. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2022*, 1619–1629. Dublin, Ireland: Association for Computational Linguistics.

Wang, X.; Wei, J.; Schuurmans, D.; Le, Q.; Chi, E.; Narang, S.; Chowdhery, A.; and Zhou, D. 2023. Self-Consistency Improves Chain of Thought Reasoning in Language Models. arXiv:2203.11171.

Wei, J.; Wang, X.; Schuurmans, D.; Bosma, M.; Chi, E.; Le, Q.; and Zhou, D. 2022. Chain of thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.11903*.

Xie, Z.; and Sun, S. 2019. A Goal-Driven Tree-Structured Neural Model for Math Word Problems. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Eighth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI-19*, 5299–5305. International Joint Conferences on Artificial Intelligence Organization.

Xu, K.; Hu, W.; Leskovec, J.; and Jegelka, S. 2019. How Powerful are Graph Neural Networks? In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.

Yoran, O.; Talmor, A.; and Berant, J. 2022. Turning Tables: Generating Examples from Semi-structured Tables for Endowing Language Models with Reasoning Skills. In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, 6016–6031. Dublin, Ireland: Association for Computational Linguistics.

Zhang, D.; Wang, L.; Zhang, L.; Dai, B. T.; and Shen, H. T. 2019. The Gap of Semantic Parsing: A Survey on Automatic Math Word Problem Solvers. arXiv:1808.07290.

Zhang, J.; Wang, L.; Lee, R. K.-W.; Bin, Y.; Wang, Y.; Shao, J.; and Lim, E.-P. 2020. Graph-to-Tree Learning for Solving Math Word Problems. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 3928–3937. Online: Association for Computational Linguistics.

Zhao, W. X.; Zhou, K.; Li, J.; Tang, T.; Wang, X.; Hou, Y.; Min, Y.; Zhang, B.; Zhang, J.; Dong, Z.; Du, Y.; Yang, C.; Chen, Y.; Chen, Z.; Jiang, J.; Ren, R.; Li, Y.; Tang, X.; Liu, Z.; Liu, P.; Nie, J.-Y.; and Wen, J.-R. 2023. A Survey of Large Language Models. arXiv:2303.18223.

Zhou, D.; Schärli, N.; Hou, L.; Wei, J.; Scales, N.; Wang, X.; Schuurmans, D.; Cui, C.; Bousquet, O.; Le, Q.; and Chi, E. 2023. Least-to-Most Prompting Enables Complex Reasoning in Large Language Models. arXiv:2205.10625.