

# GraphInstruct: Empowering Large Language Models with Graph Understanding and Reasoning Capability

Zihan Luo<sup>1\*</sup>, Xiran Song<sup>1\*</sup>, Hong Huang<sup>1\*†</sup>, Jianxun Lian<sup>2</sup>, Chenhao Zhang<sup>1</sup>,  
Jinqi Jiang<sup>1</sup>, Xing Xie<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Huazhong University of Science and Technology, Wuhan, China

<sup>2</sup> Microsoft Research Asia, Beijing, China

{zihanluo, xiransong, honghuang, ch\_zhang, u202115133}@hust.edu.cn,

{jianxun.lian, xingx}@microsoft.com

## Abstract

Evaluating and enhancing the general capabilities of large language models (LLMs) has been an important research topic. Graph is a common data structure in the real world, and understanding graph data is a crucial part for advancing general intelligence. To evaluate and enhance the graph understanding abilities of LLMs, in this paper, we propose a benchmark named **GraphInstruct**, which comprehensively includes 21 classical graph reasoning tasks, providing diverse graph generation pipelines and detailed reasoning steps. Based on GraphInstruct, we further construct GraphLM through efficient instruction-tuning, which shows prominent graph understanding capability. In order to enhance the LLM with graph reasoning capability as well, we propose a step mask training strategy, and construct a model named GraphLM+. As one of the pioneering efforts to enhance the graph understanding and reasoning abilities of LLMs, extensive experiments have demonstrated the superiority of GraphLM and GraphLM+ over other LLMs. We look forward to more researchers exploring the potential of LLMs in the graph data mining domain through GraphInstruct. Our code for generating GraphInstruct is released publicly at: <https://github.com/CGCL-codes/GraphInstruct>.

## 1 Introduction

Recently, the rise of large language models (LLMs) has showcased their powerful generalization abilities in various domains such as mathematics (Yang et al., 2023), programming (Luo et al., 2023), and dialogue (Ouyang et al., 2022), and researchers are aspiring to leverage LLMs to achieve the artificial general capabilities. With this goal in mind, many

\* Authors are affiliated with the National Engineering Research Center for Big Data Technology and System, Service Computing Technology and Systems Laboratory, Cluster and Grid Computing Lab, School of Computer Science and Technology, Huazhong University of Science and Technology.

† Hong Huang is the corresponding author.




Figure 1: Case study on graph reasoning task that general LLMs fail to handle.

researchers have begun efforts to assist LLMs in understanding diverse forms of input data, including images (Alayrac et al., 2022), audios (Huang et al., 2023) and so on. However, this body of work has overlooked the capability of LLMs to comprehend data in the form of graphs. In fact, as a common data structure in the real world, graphs are prevalent in many scenarios like social networks, urban infrastructure, and biological molecules. What's more, many logical reasoning tasks also fundamentally exist in the form of graphs (Zhu et al., 2024). Facilitating LLMs in understanding graph data is a crucial step toward advancing their general capabilities.

In fact, numerous researchers have already started investigating the understanding capabilities of LLMs on graph data, such as GPT4Graph

(Guo et al., 2023), NLGraph (Wang et al., 2023b), Yamada et al. (Yamada et al., 2023), and others. Fatemi et al. (Fatemi et al., 2023) examine the impact of different graph description languages on the understanding of graph data by LLMs. These exploratory works consistently find that, in most cases, LLMs perform significantly below expectations. As shown in Figure 1, we conduct case studies on a classical graph reasoning task, implying that existing LLMs struggle to comprehend and address reasoning tasks based on graph data. GraphLLM (Chai et al., 2023) and GraphGPT (Tang et al., 2023) further contemplate ways to enhance the performance of LLMs in graph-related tasks by concatenating encoded information from graph neural networks (GNNs) into LLMs. This aids in understanding graph structure information but has only been tested on a limited set of tasks, with insufficient generalization capabilities. In summary, addressing the challenge of enabling LLMs to truly understand graph data remains an unresolved issue.

In this paper, to facilitate LLMs in comprehending graph-structured data and thereby equipping them with the ability to address graph-related tasks, we have curated and introduced a novel benchmark – **GraphInstruct** designed for assessing and fine-tuning LLMs. Specifically, the benchmark comprises 21 classical tasks on graph structures with varying levels of difficulty, including elementary ones like node degree, connectivity, and common neighbors, as well as more complex ones such as Maximum flow, Shortest path, MST, and so forth. Similar to the concept of Chain-of-Thought (CoT) (Kojima et al., 2022; Wei et al., 2022), to aid LLMs in better understanding the problem-solving approaches, we provide detailed reasoning steps for each question in the benchmark for training purposes. We conduct instruction-tuning on our proposed benchmark GraphInstruct using Vicuna-7b-1.5 (Chiang et al., 2023) and construct GraphLM with superior graph understanding capabilities. Experimental results demonstrate a significant improvement in GraphLM’s performance across multiple classic graph reasoning tasks, which is comparable to ChatGPT. To further enhance the reasoning capability of LLMs, we introduce a step mask training strategy, and propose GraphLM+, which even demonstrates better graph reasoning capability.

The contributions of this paper are as follows:

- We propose a benchmark GraphInstruct for

enhancing and evaluating the capabilities of LLM towards graph data. Different from existing benchmarks like NLGraph, GraphLLM, and others, our benchmark encompasses the most comprehensive set of tasks with diverse graph generation pipelines. We also provide a detailed chain of thought for each task, laying the groundwork for future advancement in enhancing graph reasoning capability.

- We propose an LLM namely GraphLM, which is specifically for graph reasoning tasks through instruction-tuning. Comprehensive experiments show that GraphLM exhibits superior graph understanding abilities.
- Thanks to the detailed intermediate reasoning steps provided by GraphInstruct, we further propose a step mask training strategy and construct a model namely GraphLM+. Extensive experiments verify the effectiveness of our strategy and the prominent graph reasoning capability of GraphLM+.

## 2 Related Work

### 2.1 LLM on Graph Data Understanding

With the rise of LLMs, researchers are increasingly exploring the integration of these models with graph data. Early researchers conduct empirical performance evaluations, such as NLGraph (Wang et al., 2023b), GPT4Graph (Guo et al., 2023), TAPE (He et al., 2023) and Chen et al. (Chen et al., 2023), each exploring whether LLMs can comprehend graph-structured data. Fatemi et al. (Fatemi et al., 2023) systematically investigate the impact of different graph description languages on LLMs’ understanding of graph data. Additionally, Yamada et al. (Yamada et al., 2023) explore the spatial understanding capabilities of LLMs on grid-based graph data. These early works pave the way for applying LLMs to the field of graph data and consistently reveal the current inadequacy of LLMs in understanding graph data. Inspired by these works, many researchers have started fine-tuning LLMs on graph data to enhance their performance on graph-related tasks, as seen in works like GraphLLM (Chai et al., 2023), GraphGPT (Tang et al., 2023), etc. However, their scope has remained relatively limited to several specific tasks, and the challenge of enabling LLMs to possess a universal understanding of graph data remains an urgent problem to be addressed.




Figure 2: GraphInstruct Overview

## 2.2 LLM Enhancement

Although LLMs are widely applied in various fields such as conversation, mathematics, and programming due to their outstanding generalization abilities, researchers have found that fine-tuning through specific instructions can further enhance LLMs' performance in more targeted domains. For instance, Bao et al. (Bao et al., 2023) utilize instruction fine-tuning to apply LLMs to recommendation scenarios. Li et al. (Li et al., 2023a) create a dedicated dataset, EcomInstruct, for the e-commerce domain and fine-tune a specialized large model, EcomGPT. Moreover, researchers have explored the application of LLMs in various areas such as math (Yang et al., 2023), medicine (Li et al., 2023b; Wang et al., 2023a), law (Cui et al., 2023), and finance (Wu et al., 2023). These successful attempts demonstrate that fine-tuning LLMs can enhance their understanding of different types of data, enabling their application in diverse domains.

## 3 The GraphInstruct Benchmark

In this section, we will introduce our GraphInstruct benchmark, which is designed to evaluate and enhance the graph understanding and graph reasoning capability of LLMs. In general, GraphInstruct covers various graph structure distributions, graph sizes, and graph descriptions. The overview of GraphInstruct is illustrated in Figure 2. As shown in Figure 3, we comprehensively consider a broad range of graph reasoning tasks in GraphIn-

struct from three perspectives, including *Node level*, *Node-pair level*, and *Graph level*, which cover most classical graph reasoning tasks such as Depth-First Search (DFS) and Shortest Path. The details of GraphInstruct will be further introduced in the following subsections.

### 3.1 Graph Generation

As the foundation in GraphInstruct, the graphs generated in GraphInstruct should be as diverse as possible, so that the performance on these graphs could reflect the intrinsic capability of LLMs. To this end, we provide various kinds of options during the graph generation process, as shown in Figure 2 (a), which can be summarized as follows:

**Graph Structure Distribution** To provide a diverse range of graph structures, we mainly consider three types of graph structure distributions: 1) random networks; 2) small-world networks (Watts and Strogatz, 1998); and 3) BA scale-free networks (Barabási and Albert, 1999). More details will be discussed in the Appendix. Besides, both directed and undirected graphs are also considered and generated randomly in the GraphInstruct.

**Graph Size** Following the line of prior work (Chai et al., 2023; Wang et al., 2023b), GraphInstruct consists of four levels of graph size, namely Tiny (5-7 nodes), Small (8-15 nodes), Medium (16-25 nodes), and Large (26-35 nodes). Intuitively, the larger graph sizes indicate higher difficulty levels



Figure 3: The complete task schema of GraphInstruct

for a task.

### 3.2 Graph Description

Given prior investigation provided by (Fatemi et al., 2023), GraphInstruct provides three effective graph description languages as shown in Figure 2 (b): edge list, adjacency table, and adjacency table in natural language (the default setting during training). Besides different graph description languages, we also provide two optional node ID representations including integer and random letters.

### 3.3 Task Definition

In this part, we briefly summarize the definitions for the 21 tasks involved in GraphInstruct. For each sample, we randomly generate a graph  $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ , where  $\mathcal{V}$  is the set of nodes and  $\mathcal{E}$  is the set of edges.

- **Neighbor** Given a node  $u$ , output its neighbor nodes  $\mathcal{N}(u)$ .
- **Degree** Given a node  $u$ , output the degree of it:  $|\mathcal{N}(u)|$ .
- **Predecessor** Given a directed graph  $G$  and a node  $u$ , output the set of predecessor nodes of  $u$ :  $\mathcal{P}(u) = \{v | (v, u) \in \mathcal{E}\}$ .
- **PageRank** Find the node with the largest PageRank value (Jeh and Widom, 2003) after several rounds of iteration. The damping value is 0.85, and the iteration number is 3. The initialized PageRank value for each node is  $1/|\mathcal{V}|$ .
- **Clustering Coefficient** Calculate the clustering coefficient value of node  $u$ . For a directed graph, the clustering coefficient is  $C = \frac{T}{D(D-1)}$ , where  $T$  is the number of edges between neighbors of  $u$ , and  $D$  is the out-degree of  $u$ . For an undirected graph, the clustering coefficient for a node  $u$  is  $C = \frac{2T}{D(D-1)}$ .
- **Common Neighbor** Output the number of common neighbors of node  $u$  and node  $v$ :  $CN = |\mathcal{N}(u) \cap \mathcal{N}(v)|$ .
- **Jaccard** Calculate the Jaccard Coefficient value  $J$  between node  $u$  and node  $v$ , where  $J = \frac{|\mathcal{N}(u) \cap \mathcal{N}(v)|}{|\mathcal{N}(u) \cup \mathcal{N}(v)|}$ .
- **Edge** Determine if there is an edge in the graph with node  $u$  pointing to node  $v$ .
- **Shortest Path** Given a weighted graph (we randomly set an integer weight value from 1 to 10 for each edge), output the distance of the shortest path from node  $u$  to node  $v$ .
- **Connectivity** Determine if there is a path from node  $u$  to node  $v$ .
- **Maximum Flow** Given a weighted graph, calculate the maximum amount of flow from node  $u$  to node  $v$ .
- **Depth-First Search** Starting from node  $u$ , output a sequence of nodes in the order of depth-first search traversal.
- **Breadth-First Search** Starting from node  $u$ , output a sequence of nodes in the order of breadth-first search traversal.
- **Cycle** Determine if there exists an cycle in the graph. A cycle is a closed path that traverses through a sequence of nodes and edges, eventually returning to the starting node.
- **Connected Component** Given a node  $u$ , output the set of nodes in the same connected component of  $u$ .
- **Diameter** Calculate the diameter of the graph, which is the maximum distance over all pairs of nodes in the graph.
- **Bipartite** Given a bipartite graph, find a maximum matching (a list of node pairs).
- **Topological Sort** Given a directed acyclic graph, output the topological sorting, which is a linear ordering of the nodes such that for every directed edge, the source node comes before the end nodes in the ordering.
- **Minimum Spanning Tree (MST)** Given a graph, calculate the total weight of the minimum spanning tree.
- **Euler Path** Find an Euler path in the graph. An Euler path in a graph is a path that traverses each edge exactly once, but not necessarily every node. The starting node and ending node may be different.
- **Hamiltonian Path** Find a Hamiltonian path in

the graph. A Hamiltonian path in a graph is a path that visits each node exactly once, traversing along edges, and the starting node and ending node may be different.

### 3.4 Intermediate Steps Generation

To help the model better understand and accomplish the graph tasks, we generate intermediate reasoning steps for training samples. As illustrated in Figure 2 (c), the step-wise information encodes accurate intermediate results, which can be used as both supervision signals and CoT prompts. With the help of intermediate steps, we can empower LLMs with stronger graph reasoning capability, which will be further discussed in Section 6.

### 3.5 Evaluation

We parse the LLM’s output and use exact-match accuracy for evaluation. There are mainly the following kinds of output type: boolean (e.g. Connectivity), integer (e.g. Degree), float (e.g. Jaccard), single node (e.g. PageRank), node list (e.g. Depth-First Search), node set (e.g. Neighbor), and edge list (e.g. Bipartite). For float type output, we require a relative error of 3% or less. For tasks where multiple solutions exist (e.g. Depth-First Search), we examine if the output is a valid answer.

## 4 GraphLM: Training Large Language Model on GraphInstruct

Thanks to the diversity inherent in GraphInstruct, we posit that this benchmark holds the potential to enhance LLMs with graph understanding and graph reasoning capabilities. With Vicuna-7b (Chiang et al., 2023) as the foundational model, we construct a model named GraphLM through instruct-tuning on the GraphInstruct. Specifically, we employ LoRA (Hu et al., 2022) as the fine-tuning strategy, which is adapted to both attention modules and feed-forward networks. Adam (Kingma and Ba, 2015) is used as the optimizer, with the learning rate set of  $1e^{-6}$  and weight decay of 0. The batch size is set to 3 during the training process, and a cosine learning rate scheduler is utilized. Note that, only final answers are used as supervision signals here, and the roles of reasoning steps provided in GraphInstruct will be further discussed in Section 6. We fine-tune the model for 2 epochs, and all experiments are conducted on a server with 16 AMD EPYC 7763 64-core Processors and a 48GB NVIDIA A6000 GPU.

## 5 Experiment

### 5.1 Experimental Settings

**Dataset split** The tasks in GraphNL are divided into two groups according to whether the tasks appear in the training data during fine-tuning the model, which we call *In-domain tasks* and *Out-of-domain tasks*. In detail, we choose four relatively difficult tasks namely BFS, Cycle, Clustering Coefficient, and Euler Path as the Out-of-domain tasks, and the rest as In-domain tasks. The reasons are two-fold: 1) These four tasks are relatively challenging, requiring LLMs to possess a certain level of graph comprehension and reasoning abilities to complete. 2) These four tasks comprehensively cover node-level, node pair-level, and graph-level aspects, and the output for each problem involves boolean, numerical values, and node sets, which are quite diverse. For each in-domain task, 800 samples are randomly selected as the training set, which consists of 400 samples with tiny-level graph size and 400 samples with small-level graph size. As for test, we randomly select 100 samples as the test set for each task, which results in a final test set with 2100 samples.

**Baselines** Besides Vicuna-7b (Chiang et al., 2023), we also evaluate multiple powerful LLMs including Llama2-7b (Touvron et al., 2023), Phi-2<sup>1</sup>, Mistral-7b (Jiang et al., 2023) and two closed-source LLMs namely GPT-3.5-turbo and GPT4 (OpenAI, 2023). To be concrete, for all baselines, the temperature  $\tau$  is set to 0 for obtaining determined answers.

### 5.2 Main Experiments

In this part, we first investigate the performance of GraphLM and several powerful LLMs on GraphInstruct. Specifically, the zero-shot accuracy on 17 in-domain tasks is reported, since we contend that the performance in the zero-shot setting more accurately reflects the LLM’s fundamental comprehension of graph data. The results are shown in Figure 4, from which we can observe that:

- For open-sourced LLMs like Phi-2 and Vicuna-7b with relatively small model sizes, their performance on GraphInstruct is poor, which implies LLMs’ lack of capability towards graph data, especially for models with fewer parameters.

<sup>1</sup><https://huggingface.co/microsoft/phi-2>




Figure 4: Comparison of several LLMs on 17 in-domain tasks of GraphInstruct

- Following fine-tuning, GraphLM demonstrates a substantial improvement over Vicuna-7b across the majority of tasks, showcasing performance that is comparable or even superior to GPT-3.5-turbo. For example, Vicuna-7b achieves a mere 10% accuracy in the *Neighbor* task, whereas GraphLM attains an impressive 99% accuracy, surpassing even the performance of GPT-3.5-turbo and GPT4 by a slight margin.
- Despite the impressive performance on certain tasks, such as straightforward graph reasoning tasks like *Degree* and *Neighbors*, both GPT4 and GraphLM exhibit less satisfactory results when tackling more complex graph reasoning tasks, including *MST* and *Maximum Flow*. This underscores the existing challenges that LLMs face in comprehending graph-structured data.

### 5.3 Generalization Analysis

This section focuses on analyzing the generalization capabilities of GraphLM from the following four perspectives: diverse graph sizes, distinct graph description languages, various node representation methods, and out-of-domain tasks.

**Graph size** Throughout the training process, GraphLM has exclusively encountered tiny and small graphs. Consequently, we aim to explore whether GraphLM maintains its graph understanding capabilities when confronted with graphs featuring more nodes and intricate structures. In detail, we conduct experiments on graphs of different scales across four graph reasoning tasks, including *Degree*, *Common Neighbor*, *Bipartite* and *Shortest*




Figure 5: Zero-shot performance on 4 classical graph reasoning tasks with different graph sizes.

*Path*. It can be seen from Figure 5 that: 1) As the number of nodes and the complexity of the graph structure increase, both Vicuna-7b and GraphLM consistently experience a decline in performance. This aligns with our expectations, given that more complex graphs inherently pose more challenging reasoning tasks for LLMs. 2) Notably, despite the increased difficulty, GraphLM consistently outperforms Vicuna-7b, even on previously unseen graph sizes such as *medium* and *large*. This observation underscores the robustness of GraphLM in handling diverse graph sizes.

**Graph description language** To delve deeper into the generalization capabilities of GraphLM across diverse graph description languages, we conduct experiments on four classic graph reasoning tasks using two unseen graph description lan-

		Degree	CN	Bipartite	SP
Edge list	GPT-3.5-turbo	0.57	0.33	0.17	0.19
	Vicuna-7b	0.06	0.08	0.00	0.05
	Ours	0.38	0.22	0.44	0.18
Adj	GPT-3.5-turbo	0.93	0.40	0.18	0.16
	Vicuna-7b	0.11	0.07	0.00	0.04
	Ours	0.63	0.20	0.78	0.12

Table 1: Zero-shot performance on 4 classical graph reasoning tasks with different graph description language. For conciseness, *Common Neighbor* and *Shortest Path* are abbreviated as *CN* and *SP*, respectively.

	Degree	CN	Diameter	Edge
GPT-3.5-turbo	0.70	0.34	0.10	0.71
Vicuna-7b	0.14	0.10	0.03	0.07
Ours	0.54	0.22	0.09	0.86

Table 2: Zero-shot performance on 4 classical graph reasoning tasks with different node ID representation. *Common Neighbor* is abbreviated as *CN*.

guages: edge list and adjacency table (adj). The results, as illustrated in Table 1, reveal that although there is a performance decrease when compared to that using the adjacency table in natural language, GraphLM still consistently surpasses Vicuna-7b, and achieves comparable performance with GPT-3.5-turbo despite the significant difference in parameter size. The above observations verify GraphLM’s capability to retain a substantial portion of its graph understanding capabilities when facing different graph description languages.

**Node ID representation** In contrast to the integer node IDs utilized in the training process (e.g., Node 1) of GraphLM, we perform generalization tests by substituting node IDs in the test set with random letters (e.g., Node XTE). The results, depicted in Table 2, highlight that even with the altered node IDs, GraphLM consistently outperforms the baseline model, affirming its retention of graph understanding capabilities.

**Out-of-domain tasks** At last, we evaluate the performance of GraphLM on four out-of-domain tasks, namely *BFS*, *Cycle*, *Clustering Coefficient*, and *Euler Path*. The zero-shot accuracy is presented in Table 3. It is evident that the performance on out-of-domain tasks is less satisfactory compared to that on in-domain tasks, particularly for *Clustering Coefficient* and *Euler Path*. This observation indicates that currently the data fed to GraphLM may be still insufficient, and GraphLM fails to figure out how to solve unseen graph reasoning tasks, which we leave as future work.

	BFS	Cycle	CC	EP
GPT-3.5-turbo	0.40	0.47	0.14	0.00
Vicuna-7b	0.03	0.22	0.00	0.00
Ours	0.05	0.46	0.00	0.00

Table 3: Zero-shot performance on 4 OOD graph reasoning tasks. *Clustering Coefficient* and *Euler Path* are abbreviated as *CC* and *EP*, respectively.




Figure 6: Toy graph for illustrating the concept of label mask training strategy.

## 6 Towards Graph Reasoning

Previous experiments have demonstrated that GraphLM possesses a certain level of graph understanding capability after fine-tuning. However, relying solely on supervision with final answers might limit its graph reasoning capability. In other words, GraphLM may only have an intuitive understanding of graph data without being able to provide the reasoning steps for each answer. In this part, we further explore how to utilize the intermediate reasoning steps provided by GraphInstruct to enhance the graph reasoning capability of LLMs.

### 6.1 Methodology

Different from the training approach in Section 3, we incorporate intermediate steps as supervised signals into the training data as well to empower LLMs with graph reasoning capability, and construct a new model namely GraphLM+. Specifically, unlike mathematical reasoning tasks (Yang et al., 2023), intermediate steps in graph reasoning tasks may contain numerous repetitive and redundant words, as shown in Figure 6, which could obscure crucial node ID information. Therefore, we employ a label mask training strategy, where the supervised signals corresponding to unimportant words are ignored with a certain probability  $\gamma$ , not contributing to the final loss function, while preserving information relevant to node IDs entirely. Through this approach, we filter out a significant amount of redundant supervised signals, retaining essential graph structure information from intermediate reasoning steps for training LLMs.

	Common Neighbor	Predecessor	DFS
<b>Vicuna-7b</b>	0.26	0.01	0.05
<b>GraphLM</b>	0.11	0.06	0.08
<b>GraphLM+</b>	0.92	0.31	0.40

Table 4: One-shot CoT performance on 3 classical graph reasoning tasks.




Figure 7: Ablation study of GraphLM+

## 6.2 Results

**Main performance** To be concrete, we utilize 10,000 training samples for each task, and set  $\gamma$  to 0.8. For evaluating the reasoning capability of GraphLM+, we employ one-shot CoT techniques for generating the answers with detailed steps. The results are reported in Table 4, from which we can observe that, after incorporating intermediate steps into the supervision signals, GraphLM+ exhibits significantly improved performance across three tasks compared to the baseline. For instance, in the *Common Neighbor* task, GraphLM+ achieves an accuracy of up to 92%, more than triple that of the Vicuna-7b model. In contrast, GraphLM achieves unsatisfactory results compared with GraphLM+. Unlike the zero-shot setting, we believe that in the one-shot CoT context, the LLM needs to possess a certain level of graph reasoning ability to correctly produce intermediate step outputs and derive the final answer, which is hard for GraphLM due to the lack of reasoning steps during fine-tuning.

**Ablation study** In this part, we conduct ablation experiments to analyze the effectiveness of intermediate steps and label mask training strategy. Specifically, we consider the following two variants. 1) *Without Steps*: The intermediate steps are removed from the supervision signals, and only answers are involved in the training; 2) *Without Mask*: we remove the label mask strategy under this setting, which means all tokens in the intermediate steps will be treated as supervision signals during fine-tuning. As shown in Figure 7, either remov-

	Common Neighbor		Predecessor		DFS	
	Answer	Steps	Answer	Steps	Answer	Steps
<b>Without Steps</b>	0.21	0.01	0.09	0.04	0.05	0.00
<b>GraphLM+</b>	0.92	0.90	0.31	0.30	0.40	0.21

Table 5: Manual evaluation results on the reasoning steps of LLMs.

ing steps or masks will bring severe performance deterioration, and we believe that the reasons are two-fold: 1) after removing intermediate steps, it’s hard for LLMs to generate reasoning steps under the CoT settings. Both incorrect and incomplete intermediate reasoning steps will result in incorrect final answers. 2) without label mask, a large amount of redundant words are involved in the training process, which makes it hard for LLMs to capture the key information about graph structure in the intermediate steps.

**Steps evaluation** To further evaluate the effectiveness of GraphLM+ on graph reasoning, we check the correctness of the reasoning steps output by GraphLM+ manually, which contains 100 test samples for each task. Table 5 presents the results of three classical graph reasoning tasks under the one-shot CoT setting, from which we can observe that: When fine-tuning without using intermediate reasoning steps as supervised signals, the model’s intermediate reasoning step outputs often turn out to be incorrect. For example, in the *Common Neighbor* task, although 21 final answers are correct, only one sample has correct intermediate step outputs. The possible reason for this issue is that when only using final answers as supervised signals, the fine-tuned LLM may only develop a shallow understanding of graph data, unable to provide correct reasoning processes and explanations. In contrast, GraphLM+ maintains much higher accuracy in intermediate reasoning steps across all three tasks. Note that, in the DFS task, GraphLM+ only has correct intermediate reasoning step outputs for 21 samples out of 40 correct samples. Nevertheless, after in-depth analysis, it is found that the errors in the remaining 19 samples are not fatal and do not affect the correctness of the final answers, which will be discussed in the Appendix.

## 7 Conclusion

To enhance the graph understanding capability and graph reasoning capability of LLMs, we propose a benchmark called GraphInstruct in this paper, which comprehensively provides 21 classic



graph reasoning tasks with diverse graph generation pipelines and detailed reasoning steps. Based on GraphInstruct, we construct GraphLM and GraphLM+ through fine-tuning, which then demonstrate superior graph understanding capability and reasoning capability. We expect that GraphInstruct could serve as a fertile soil for future researchers to enhance LLMs' capabilities in graph data mining.

## Limitations

In this paper, we propose a benchmark named GraphInstruct aimed at enhancing the graph comprehension of LLMs, and we construct GraphLM and GraphLM+ through fine-tuning. However, we observe that our models still underperform when facing some complex graph reasoning tasks and out-of-domain tasks. We plan to address this issue in the future by increasing the volume of training data and adopting more powerful baseline models. Additionally, the current GraphInstruct is limited to abstract graph reasoning tasks without specific applications. Exploring the construction of more graph reasoning tasks relevant to real-world scenarios such as urban computing is also one of our future directions.

## Ethics Statement

In this study, we construct GraphInstruct and evaluate the performance of multiple powerful LLMs. Although the performance of many models may not be satisfactory, it does not necessarily reflect their capabilities in other domains. We still remain optimistic about the future development of these LLMs for enhancing their capabilities towards graph-structured data.

## References

Jean-Baptiste Alayrac, Jeff Donahue, Pauline Luc, Antoine Miech, Iain Barr, Yana Hasson, Karel Lenc, Arthur Mensch, Katherine Millican, Malcolm Reynolds, Roman Ring, Eliza Rutherford, Serkan Cabi, Tengda Han, Zhitao Gong, Sina Samangooei, Marianne Monteiro, Jacob L. Menick, Sebastian Borgeaud, Andy Brock, Aida Nematzadeh, Sahand Sharifzadeh, Mikolaj Binkowski, Ricardo Barreira, Oriol Vinyals, Andrew Zisserman, and Karén Simonyan. 2022. [Flamingo: a visual language model for few-shot learning](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 35: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2022, NeurIPS 2022, New Orleans, LA, USA, November 28 - December 9, 2022*.

Keqin Bao, Jizhi Zhang, Yang Zhang, Wenjie Wang, Fuli Feng, and Xiangnan He. 2023. [Tallrec: An effective and efficient tuning framework to align large language model with recommendation](#). In *Proceedings of the 17th ACM Conference on Recommender Systems, RecSys '23*, page 1007–1014, New York, NY, USA. Association for Computing Machinery.

Albert-László Barabási and Réka Albert. 1999. [Emergence of scaling in random networks](#). *Science*, 286(5439):509–512.

Ziwei Chai, Tianjie Zhang, Liang Wu, Kaiqiao Han, Xiaohai Hu, Xuanwen Huang, and Yang Yang. 2023. [Graphllm: Boosting graph reasoning ability of large language model](#). *CoRR*, abs/2310.05845.

Zhikai Chen, Haitao Mao, Hang Li, Wei Jin, Hongzhi Wen, Xiaochi Wei, Shuaiqiang Wang, Dawei Yin, Wenqi Fan, Hui Liu, and Jiliang Tang. 2023. [Exploring the potential of large language models \(llms\) in learning on graphs](#). *CoRR*, abs/2307.03393.

Wei-Lin Chiang, Zhuohan Li, Zi Lin, Ying Sheng, Zhanghao Wu, Hao Zhang, Lianmin Zheng, Siyuan Zhuang, Yonghao Zhuang, Joseph E Gonzalez, et al. 2023. [Vicuna: An open-source chatbot impressing gpt-4 with 90%\\* chatgpt quality](#). See <https://vicuna.lmsys.org> (accessed 14 April 2023).

Jiaxi Cui, Zongjian Li, Yang Yan, Bohua Chen, and Li Yuan. 2023. [Chatlaw: Open-source legal large language model with integrated external knowledge bases](#).

Bahare Fatemi, Jonathan Halcrow, and Bryan Perozzi. 2023. [Talk like a graph: Encoding graphs for large language models](#). *CoRR*, abs/2310.04560.

Jiayan Guo, Lun Du, and Hengyu Liu. 2023. [Gpt4graph: Can large language models understand graph structured data? an empirical evaluation and benchmarking](#). *CoRR*, abs/2305.15066.

Xiaoxin He, Xavier Bresson, Thomas Laurent, and Bryan Hooi. 2023. [Explanations as features: Llm-based features for text-attributed graphs](#). *CoRR*, abs/2305.19523.

Edward J. Hu, Yelong Shen, Phillip Wallis, Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yuanzhi Li, Shean Wang, Lu Wang, and Weizhu Chen. 2022. [Lora: Low-rank adaptation of large language models](#). In *The Tenth International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2022, Virtual Event, April 25-29, 2022*. OpenReview.net.

Rongjie Huang, Mingze Li, Dongchao Yang, Jiaotong Shi, Xuankai Chang, Zhenhui Ye, Yuning Wu, Zhiqing Hong, Jiawei Huang, Jinglin Liu, Yi Ren, Zhou Zhao, and Shinji Watanabe. 2023. [AudioGPT: Understanding and generating speech, music, sound, and talking head](#). *CoRR*, abs/2304.12995.

Glen Jeh and Jennifer Widom. 2003. [Scaling personalized web search](#). In *Proceedings of the Twelfth International World Wide Web Conference, WWW*

- 2003, *Budapest, Hungary, May 20-24, 2003*, pages 271–279. ACM.
- Albert Q. Jiang, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Arthur Mensch, Chris Bamford, Devendra Singh Chaplot, Diego de Las Casas, Florian Bressand, Gianna Lengyel, Guillaume Lample, Lucile Saulnier, L lio Renard Lavaud, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Pierre Stock, Teven Le Scao, Thibaut Lavril, Thomas Wang, Timoth e Lacroix, and William El Sayed. 2023. [Mistral 7b](#). *CoRR*, abs/2310.06825.
- Diederik P. Kingma and Jimmy Ba. 2015. [Adam: A method for stochastic optimization](#). In *3rd International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2015, San Diego, CA, USA, May 7-9, 2015, Conference Track Proceedings*.
- Takeshi Kojima, Shixiang Shane Gu, Machel Reid, Yutaka Matsuo, and Yusuke Iwasawa. 2022. [Large language models are zero-shot reasoners](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 35: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2022, NeurIPS 2022, New Orleans, LA, USA, November 28 - December 9, 2022*.
- Yangning Li, Shirong Ma, Xiaobin Wang, Shen Huang, Chengyue Jiang, Hai-Tao Zheng, Pengjun Xie, Fei Huang, and Yong Jiang. 2023a. [Ecomgpt: Instruction-tuning large language models with chain-of-task tasks for e-commerce](#). *CoRR*, abs/2308.06966.
- Yunxiang Li, Zihan Li, Kai Zhang, Ruilong Dan, Steve Jiang, and You Zhang. 2023b. [Chatdoctor: A medical chat model fine-tuned on a large language model meta-ai \(llama\) using medical domain knowledge](#). *Cureus*, 15(6).
- Ziyang Luo, Can Xu, Pu Zhao, Qingfeng Sun, Xubo Geng, Wenxiang Hu, Chongyang Tao, Jing Ma, Qingwei Lin, and Daxin Jiang. 2023. [Wizardcoder: Empowering code large language models with evol-instruct](#). *CoRR*, abs/2306.08568.
- OpenAI. 2023. [GPT-4 technical report](#). *CoRR*, abs/2303.08774.
- Long Ouyang, Jeffrey Wu, Xu Jiang, Diogo Almeida, Carroll L. Wainwright, Pamela Mishkin, Chong Zhang, Sandhini Agarwal, Katarina Slama, Alex Ray, John Schulman, Jacob Hilton, Fraser Kelton, Luke Miller, Maddie Simens, Amanda Askell, Peter Welinder, Paul F. Christiano, Jan Leike, and Ryan Lowe. 2022. [Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 35: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2022, NeurIPS 2022, New Orleans, LA, USA, November 28 - December 9, 2022*.
- Jiabin Tang, Yuhao Yang, Wei Wei, Lei Shi, Lixin Su, Suqi Cheng, Dawei Yin, and Chao Huang. 2023. [Graphgpt: Graph instruction tuning for large language models](#).
- Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajjwal Bhargava, Shrutu Bhosale, Dan Bikel, Lukas Blecher, Cristian Canton-Ferrer, Moya Chen, Guillem Cucurull, David Esibou, Jude Fernandes, Jeremy Fu, Wenyin Fu, Brian Fuller, Cynthia Gao, Vedanuj Goswami, Naman Goyal, Anthony Hartshorn, Saghar Hosseini, Rui Hou, Hakan Inan, Marcin Kardas, Viktor Kerkez, Madian Khabsa, Isabel Kloumann, Artem Korenev, Punit Singh Koura, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Thibaut Lavril, Jenya Lee, Diana Liskovich, Yinghai Lu, Yuning Mao, Xavier Martinet, Todor Mihaylov, Pushkar Mishra, Igor Molybog, Yixin Nie, Andrew Poulton, Jeremy Reizenstein, Rashi Rungta, Kalyan Saladi, Alan Schelten, Ruan Silva, Eric Michael Smith, Ranjan Subramanian, Xiaoqing Ellen Tan, Binh Tang, Ross Taylor, Adina Williams, Jian Xiang Kuan, Puxin Xu, Zheng Yan, Iliyan Zarov, Yuchen Zhang, Angela Fan, Melanie Kambadur, Sharan Narang, Aur lien Rodriguez, Robert Stojnic, Sergey Edunov, and Thomas Scialom. 2023. [Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models](#). *CoRR*, abs/2307.09288.
- Haochun Wang, Chi Liu, Nuwa Xi, Zewen Qiang, Sendong Zhao, Bing Qin, and Ting Liu. 2023a. [Hu-atuo: Tuning llama model with chinese medical knowledge](#).
- Heng Wang, Shangbin Feng, Tianxing He, Zhaoxuan Tan, Xiaochuang Han, and Yulia Tsvetkov. 2023b. [Can language models solve graph problems in natural language?](#) In *Thirty-seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- Duncan J Watts and Steven H Strogatz. 1998. [Collective dynamics of ‘small-world’ networks](#). *nature*, 393(6684):440–442.
- Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Brian Ichter, Fei Xia, Ed H. Chi, Quoc V. Le, and Denny Zhou. 2022. [Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 35: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2022, NeurIPS 2022, New Orleans, LA, USA, November 28 - December 9, 2022*.
- Shijie Wu, Ozan Irsoy, Steven Lu, Vadim Dabravolski, Mark Dredze, Sebastian Gehrmann, Prabhajan Kambadur, David S. Rosenberg, and Gideon Mann. 2023. [Bloomberggpt: A large language model for finance](#). *CoRR*, abs/2303.17564.
- Yutaro Yamada, Yihan Bao, Andrew K. Lampinen, Jungo Kasai, and Ilker Yildirim. 2023. [Evaluating spatial understanding of large language models](#). *CoRR*, abs/2310.14540.
- Zhen Yang, Ming Ding, Qingsong Lv, Zhihuan Jiang, Zehai He, Yuyi Guo, Jinfeng Bai, and Jie Tang. 2023. [GPT can solve mathematical problems without a calculator](#). *CoRR*, abs/2309.03241.

Kaijie Zhu, Jiaao Chen, Jindong Wang, Neil Zhenqiang Gong, Diyi Yang, and Xing Xie. 2024. [Dyval: Graph-informed dynamic evaluation of large language models](#). In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.

## A Appendix

### A.1 Graph Structure Details

In Section 3, we introduce different graph structure distributions used in GraphInstruct, and here we provide more detailed descriptions for better understanding.

- **Random networks:** Given  $N$  nodes, they are connected pairwise with a probability of  $p$  to form a graph.
- **Scale-free networks:** Networks that the node degree distribution follows a power-law distribution. Various networks such as social networks, biological networks, and trade networks exhibit scale-free network characteristics.
- **Small-world networks:** In small-world networks, most nodes are not directly connected to each other, but the majority of nodes can be reached from any other node through a few intermediate steps.

### A.2 Discussion about the Reasoning Steps

As described in Section 6, we find that the errors in reasoning outputs of GraphLM+ are not fatal. Here we will elaborate on this observation with detailed case studies for better understanding. As shown in Table VI, the red part indicates incorrect output by GraphLM+, and it can be seen that, GraphLM+ makes a relatively small mistake on determining the whole neighbor set of node 0, which actually will not affect the search route and final answer.

### A.3 Question Examples

Here we briefly list the question examples utilized in GraphInstruct for each task. For conciseness, the graph information is abbreviated as "{}". For tasks where the directionality is crucial, we provide question examples under both undirected graphs and directed graphs for reference.

- **BFS:**

```
Given an undirected graph:
{}
Start from node 4, output a sequence of
traversal in breadth-first search (BFS)
order.
Answer:
```

---

### DFS

---

**Input:** Given an undirected graph:

Node 1 is connected to nodes 5, 3, 0, 2, 8.  
Node 5 is connected to nodes 1, 0, 8, 7, 9, 4.  
Node 3 is connected to nodes 1, 10, 6, 2.  
Node 0 is connected to nodes 1, 5, 6, 8, 9.  
Node 2 is connected to nodes 1, 3, 4, 7.  
Node 8 is connected to nodes 1, 5, 4, 0.  
Node 7 is connected to nodes 5, 2, 6.  
Node 9 is connected to nodes 5, 6, 0.  
Node 4 is connected to nodes 5, 2, 8.  
Node 10 is connected to nodes 3, 6.  
Node 6 is connected to nodes 10, 3, 9, 0, 7.  
Start from node 9, output a sequence of traversal  
in depth-first search (DFS) order.  
Let us answer this question step by step to make  
it correct.  
Answer:

**GraphLM+:** Let's run depth-first search (DFS)  
step by step.

Visit node 9. Neighbors of node 9: [5, 6, 0].  
Visit node 0. Neighbors of node 0: [6, 2, 8].  
Visit node 8. Neighbors of node 8: [1, 5, 4, 0].  
Visit node 4. Neighbors of node 4: [5, 2, 8].  
Visit node 2. Neighbors of node 2: [1, 3, 4, 7].  
Visit node 7. Neighbors of node 7: [5, 2, 6].  
Visit node 6. Neighbors of node 6: [10, 3, 9, 0,  
7].  
Visit node 3. Neighbors of node 3: [1, 10, 6, 2].  
Visit node 10. Neighbors of node 10: [3, 6].  
Visit node 1. Neighbors of node 1: [5, 3, 0, 2, 8].  
Visit node 5. Neighbors of node 5: [1, 0, 8, 7, 9,  
4].  
So the DFS traversal is <<<<[9, 0, 8, 4, 2, 7, 6,  
3, 10, 1, 5]>>>>

---

Table VI: Case study on the output of GraphLM+ with incorrect reasoning steps.

- **Bipartite:**

```
Given an undirected graph:
{}
Find a maximum matching in the bipartite
graph. Nodes set 1 contains: 0 1 2 3. Nodes
set 2 contains: 4 5 6 7 8
Answer:
```

- **Clustering Coefficient:**

(1) Undirected Graph:

Given an undirected graph:  
 {}  
 What is the clustering coefficient of node 0?  
 Answer:

(2) Directed Graph:

Given a directed graph:  
 {}  
 What is the clustering coefficient of node 1? For a directed graph, we consider a node's successors as its neighbors.  
 Answer:

• **Common Neighbor:**

(1) Undirected Graphs:

Given an undirected graph:  
 {}  
 Calculate the number of common neighbors of node 0 and node 5.  
 Answer:

(2) Directed Graph:

Given a directed graph:  
 {}  
 Calculate the number of common neighbors of node 7 and node 0. In the context of a directed graph, we consider a node's successors as its neighbors.  
 Answer:

• **Connected Component:**

(1) Undirected Graph

Given an undirected graph:  
 {}  
 Find the connected component containing node 8.  
 Answer:

(2) Directed Graph

Given a directed graph:  
 {}  
 Find the strongly connected component containing node 14.  
 Answer:

• **Connectivity:**

(1) Undirected Graph:

Given an undirected graph:  
 {}  
 Is there a path between node 0 and node 5?  
 Answer:

(2) Directed Graph:

Given a directed graph:  
 {}  
 Is there a directed path from node 10 to node 5?  
 Answer:

• **Cycle:**

(1) Undirected graph:

Given an undirected graph:  
 {}  
 Does the graph have a cycle? For an undirected graph, a cycle is a closed path that traverses through a sequence of nodes and edges, eventually returning to the starting node.  
 Answer:

(2) Directed graph:

Given a directed graph:  
 {}  
 Does the graph have a cycle? For a directed graph, a cycle is a closed path that traverses through a sequence of nodes and directed edges, eventually returning to the starting node.  
 Answer:

• **Degree:**

(1) Undirected graph:

Given an undirected graph:  
{}  
What is the degree of node 8?  
Answer:

(2) Directed graph:

Given a directed graph:  
{}  
What is the out-degree of node 8?  
Answer:

• **DFS:**

Given an undirected graph:  
{}  
Start from node 8, output a sequence of traversal in depth-first search (DFS) order.  
Answer:

• **Diameter:**

Given an undirected graph:  
{}  
Calculate the diameter of the graph. The diameter is the maximum distance over all pairs of nodes in the graph.  
Answer:

• **Edge:**

(1) Undirected graph:

Given an undirected graph:  
{}  
Is there an edge between node 3 and node 6?  
Answer:

(2) Directed graph:

Given a directed graph:  
{}  
Is there a directed edge from node 5 to node 10?  
Answer:

• **Euler Path:**

Given an undirected graph:  
{}  
Find an Euler path in this graph. An Euler path in a graph is a path that traverses each edge exactly once, but not necessarily every node. The starting node and ending node may be different.  
Answer:

• **Hamiltonian Path:**

Given an undirected graph:  
{}  
Find a Hamiltonian path in this graph. A Hamiltonian path in a graph is a path that visits each node exactly once, traversing along edges, and the starting node and ending node may be different.  
Answer:

• **Jaccard:**

(1) Undirected graph:

Given an undirected graph:  
{}  
Calculate the Jaccard coefficient of node 9 and node 8.  
Answer:

(2) Directed graph:

Given a directed graph:  
{}  
Calculate the Jaccard coefficient of node 13 and node 7. For a directed graph, we consider a node's successors as its neighbors.  
Answer:

• **Maximum Flow:**

Given a directed graph:  
{}  
Calculate the maximum flow between node 2

and node 3 in this graph. Given a directed graph with capacities assigned to its edges, the maximum flow from a source node to a sink node is the maximum amount of flow that can be sent from the source to the sink, respecting the capacity constraints on each edge. The goal is to find the optimal way to route flow through the network to maximize the flow from source to sink.

Answer:

- **MST:**

Given a directed graph:

{}

Output the total weight of the minimum spanning tree (MST) for this graph.

Answer:

- **Neighbor:**

(1) Undirected graph:

Given an undirected graph:

{}

Which are the neighbor nodes of node 0?

Answer:

(2) Directed graph:

Given a directed graph:

{}

Which are the neighbor nodes of node 4? In the context of a directed graph, we consider a node's successors as its neighbors.

Answer:

- **PageRank:**

Given an undirected graph:

{}

Which node has the largest PageRank value? The damping factor is 0.85. The number of iterations is 3. The initial PageRank values for all nodes are initialized equally as  $1/N$ , where  $N$  is the number of nodes.

Answer:

- **Predecessor:**

Given an undirected graph:

{}

Which are the predecessor nodes of node 0?

A predecessor of  $n$  is a node  $m$  such that there exists a directed edge from  $m$  to  $n$ .

Answer:

- **Shortest Path:**

(1) Undirected graph:

Given an undirected graph:

{}

Calculate the distance of the shortest path from node 10 to node 8.

Answer:

(2) Directed graph:

Given a directed graph:

{}

Calculate the distance of the shortest path from node 2 to node 8.

Answer:

- **Topological Sort:**

Given a directed graph:

{}

Output the topological sorting of this graph. Topological sorting is a linear ordering of the nodes of a directed acyclic graph (DAG) such that for every directed edge, the source node comes before the end nodes in the ordering.

Answer: