
A Schema-Guided Reason-while-Retrieve framework for Reasoning on Scene Graphs with Large-Language-Models (LLMs)

Yiye Chen¹ Harpreet Sawhney² Nicholas Gydé² Yanan Jian² Jack Saunders³ Patricio Vela¹ Ben Lundell²

Abstract

Scene graphs have emerged as a structured and serializable environment representation for grounded spatial reasoning with Large Language Models (LLMs). In this work, we propose **SG-RwR**, a Schema-Guided Retrieve-while-Reason framework for reasoning and planning with scene graphs. Our approach employs two cooperative, code-writing LLM agents: a (1) *Reasoner* for task planning and information queries generation, and a (2) *Retriever* for extracting corresponding graph information following the queries. Two agents collaborate iteratively, enabling sequential reasoning and adaptive attention to graph information. Unlike prior works, both agents are prompted only with the *scene graph schema* rather than the full graph data, which reduces the hallucination by limiting input tokens, and drives the Reasoner to generate reasoning trace abstractly. Following the trace, the Retriever programmatically query the scene graph data based on the schema understanding, allowing dynamic and global attention on the graph that enhances alignment between reasoning and retrieval. Through experiments in multiple simulation environments, we show that our framework surpasses existing LLM-based approaches in numerical Q&A and planning tasks, and can benefit from task-level few-shot examples, even in the absence of agent-level demonstrations. Project code will be released.

(Rana et al., 2023). Despite the progress, the challenge of grounding the LLMs reasoning to situated environments remains unsolved, primarily due to the absence of an environmental representation that LLMs can effectively process (Huang et al., 2023c). While LLMs can interface with external tools to directly process perceptual data such as images (Liang et al., 2023; Huang et al., 2023b), they are unable to comprehend the intermediate, non-textual outputs from those tools, which prohibits generating the grounded reasoning trace. In contrast, **scene graphs** represent environments as hierarchical graphs that encapsulate spatial relationships and semantic attributes in a structured and serializable format (Zhu et al., 2021; Hughes et al., 2022). As a result, scene graphs have emerged as a scalable, high-level environment representation for LLM-based spatial reasoning and planning, showing effectiveness in both simulation-based (Yang et al., 2025) and real-world applications (Rana et al., 2023; Gu et al., 2024; Ni et al., 2023; Cheng et al., 2024).

Leveraging Large Language Models (LLMs) for reasoning with scene graphs remains a challenging and under-explored problem. Recent research explores graphs-as-text as the input for the single generation (Fatemi et al., 2024; Gu et al., 2024), categorized as "Reason-only" methods in Fig. 1, showcasing LLMs' preliminary capacity to interpret graph topology. Yet, they are prone to hallucinations or exceed token limits when handling large graphs (Wang et al., 2023). To address the issues, the "Retrieve-then-Reason" strategy is proposed (Luo et al., 2024; Sun et al., 2023; Rana et al., 2023), wherein the LLM first identifies the sub-graph pertinent to a given task before reasoning on the retrieved part. While this strategy is adept at information collection, it struggles with complex tasks requiring comprehensive graph understanding and dynamically shifting focus based on the reasoning process, restricting the utility of LLMs in understanding complex scenes from textualized graphs. The aforementioned limitations restrict the utility of LLMs in understanding complex scenes from textualized graphs.

Recent advances on iterative retrieve-augmented generation (Yao et al., 2022; Jiang et al., 2023; Press et al., 2022; Shao et al., 2023) provides promising solutions to this challenge. By interleaving generation with retrieval, these methods aggregate relevant information throughout the reasoning

1. Introduction

With the remarkable prowess in language interpretation and reasoning (Achiam et al., 2023; Touvron et al., 2023), Large Language Models (LLMs) have been increasingly adopted in the embodied planning tasks (Huang et al., 2023a; 2022; Zeng et al., 2022), including plan generation (Song et al., 2023), interaction (Joubin et al., 2024), and action selection

¹Georgia Institute of Technology ²Microsoft ³University of Bath. Correspondence to: Yiye Chen <yychen2019@gatech.edu>.




Figure 1: **LLM Graph Processing Framework Comparison.** (a) Reason-Only: A Reasoner LLM is directly prompted with a full textualized graph. (b) Retrieve-then-Reason: A Retriever LLM filters out a task-related sub-graph for use by another Reasoner LLM as text inputs. (c) Reason-while-Retrieve (Ours): A Reasoner and a Retriever collaborate in solving a task by attending to the graph dynamically based on the progress in solving the task. Both Retriever and Reasoner LLMs write code to process information to avoid hallucinations and to enhance numerical and spatial reasoning.

process, reducing factual inaccuracies and improving task performance. However, adapting these methods to scene graph reasoning is non-trivial. Designed primarily for reasoning with text corpora, they retrieve information via API call that returns contents semantically relevant to the past reasoning context (Trivedi et al., 2022; Yao et al., 2022). For the scene graphs, typical built-in graph APIs only return information satisfying local constraints, such as the attributes or adjacency of a queried node, which might lead to large semantic gap between the retrieved information and reasoning demands.

In this work, we exploit the *scene graph schema* as the bridge between the reasoning and graph interaction. Rybiński (1987) shows the existence of an abstract logical description associated with any database schema, enabling formulating queries based on atomic database operations. Inspired by the work, we propose *SG-RwR*, a **S**chema-**G**uided **R**eason-**w**hile-**R**etrieve framework for scene graph reasoning, illustrated in Figure 1. The framework features two cooperative LLM-powered agents: a *Reasoner* that decomposes the task and generates information queries for subsequent steps; and a *Retriever* that processes the queries and retrieves related graph information for the Reasoner. Unlike previous approaches that prompt LLMs with the entire graph, both agents are **prompted only with the graph schema**, which provides meta-information about the graph, including the types and formats of the encoded semantic and spatial relationships. The Reasoner uses the schema to determine *what* information is needed to solve a task, while the Retriever **writes code** to dynamically query the graph as a database. The code-writing retrieval strategy enables dynamic formulation based on atomic graph operations, allowing logical and global attention on the graph information to address free-form queries raised by the Reasoner. We also equip Reasoner with the code-writing mechanism to conduct precise numerical reasoning (Lyu et al., 2023) and employ external tools for atomic sub-problems, further enhancing

the framework’s capability to handle complex scene understanding and planning tasks. Unlike prior iterative methods, *SG-RwR* features a two-agent design, where two agents only exchange task-critical messages without redundant thought process. This design ensures seamless coordination between reasoning and retrieval stages, reducing misguidance from irrelevant contents in the conversation history.

We evaluate our method with two simulation environments: BabyAI (Chevalier-Boisvert et al., 2018), a 2D grid world environment; and VirtualHome (Puig et al., 2018), a large-scale indoor multi-room environment. Our experiments on numerical Q&A and planning tasks show that *SG-RwR* greatly improves the reasoning ability of LLMs on scene graphs. We also observe that *SG-RwR* can effectively leverage end-to-end task-level few-shot examples *without requiring module-level demonstrations*. Additionally, compared to direct graph prompting methods, *SG-RwR* can better extrapolate from few-shot examples to unseen tasks without suffering from severe performance degradation. Specifically, on the traversal plan generation task in BabyAI, our method outperforms baselines by 18.5 percentage points (pp) in the zero-shot prompt setting, and by 3pp and 60pp in seen and unseen environments in the few-shot prompt setting.

In summary, our contributions include:

- A two-agent Reason-while-Retrieve (*SG-RwR*) framework with reasoning-oriented information gathering mechanism for task solving on scene graphs.
- Schema-based grounding and code-writing for graph information retrieval and processing that reduces hallucination and improves the reasoning ability of LLMs on complex tasks.
- We show that *SG-RwR* performs competitively in two distinct environments that encompass a wide range of tasks under both zero-shot and few-shot settings.

2. Method

2.1. Problem Statement

Our problem setting involves a natural language task instruction I and a scene graph $\mathcal{G} = (V, E)$, where V and E denote vertices and edges, respectively. Each node V_i represents an object along with its attributes, such as coordinates or colors, while each edge indicates a type of spatial relationship, such as inside or on top of. Additionally, we assume access to the *scene graph schema* \mathcal{S} , which is a textual description of types, formats, and the semantics of the graph vertices and edges. Our objective is to generate the solution of I using LLMs, based on the available information above, expressed as $\mathcal{A} = f(I, \mathcal{G}, \mathcal{S}; LLMs)$.

2.2. Overview of *SG-RwR*

We explore grounding the reasoning process to scene graphs based on the scene graph schema \mathcal{S} and the code-writing ability of LLMs. We develop *SG-RwR*, a two-agent framework that iteratively reasons through the next steps and retrieves necessary information from the graph. As shown in Figure 2, our method contains two LLM agents: a *Reasoner* and a *Retriever*. The system initializes with the Scene Graph Schema, the Environment Description, general Guidance to direct the cooperation process, and task-dependent information such as the description of Agent Actions and Reasoning Tools. Given a task, the Reasoner determines the next substep to approach the task and identifies necessary scene graph information. It then raises a natural language query to the Retriever for this information. Upon receiving the query, the Retriever processes the scene graph through code-writing and sends the data back to Reasoner. By iteratively performing these steps, both agents collaborate to solve the task. Formally, at each time step t :

$$a_t, q_t = \text{Reasoner}(\{a_0, q_0, \mathcal{G}'_0\}, \{a_1, q_1, \mathcal{G}'_1\}, \dots; \mathcal{S}) \quad (1)$$

$$h_t = \text{Retriever}(q_t; \mathcal{S}) \quad (2)$$

$$\mathcal{G}'_t = h_t(\mathcal{G}) \quad (3)$$

where a denotes the current analysis by the Reasoner; q denotes natural language query for the graph information; h denotes the retrieval code following the query; and \mathcal{G}' denotes the retrieved information by executing the code on the scene graph \mathcal{G} .

Importantly, unlike previous iterative methods (Yao et al., 2022; Shao et al., 2023) that uses a single LLM to process the entire history, the two agents in *SG-RwR* only exchange the query q and the corresponding graph data \mathcal{G}' , excluding the underlying thought process, such as a and h . As we will show, this agent-level context filtering, enabled by our two-agent design, is critical for eliminating the interference from irrelevant conversation history, thereby ensuring a seamless

and automated cooperative task-solving process.

2.3. Reasoner

Reasoner is the central agent steering the task-solving iterations. We prompt it with the schema \mathcal{S} , environment and task information (such as action description for the planning task), annotations of reasoning tools, general guidance to ensure automated task-solving conversation, and optionally, few-shot task-level examples. Reasoner then initiates the conversation with Retriever to solve a given task.

Concretely, without any knowledge about the graph data initially, the Reasoner analyzes only the task I and graph schema \mathcal{S} , generates the first analysis a_0 , and sends out the first associated query q_0 to the Retriever. At the t^{th} round of conversation, the Reasoner consumes past analyses, queries, and retrieved information: $\{(a_0, q_0, \mathcal{G}'_0), \dots, (a_{t-1}, q_{t-1}, \mathcal{G}'_{t-1})\}$. It then generates the next corresponding analysis a_t and query q_t , where a_t involves intermediate conclusions and the next subtask to be solved, which informs and justifies q_t . For example, in the 2^{nd} round of conversation shown in Figure 2, Reasoner processes previously retrieved agent and red box room and location $(\{(a_0, q_0, \mathcal{G}'_0), (a_1, q_1, \mathcal{G}'_1)\})$, identifies that the next subtask is to find "the path between two rooms" (a_2), and then query for the "door IDs and attributes" that connect two rooms (q_2) for solving the subtask. In this way, each reasoning step is grounded to the environment by factoring in the retrieved information.

The analysis a_t might involve solving complex spatial subproblems, such as navigation and object search. Past literature shows that LLMs give unreliable solutions to quantitative problems (Ahn et al., 2024). To circumvent the deficiency, we follow prior work (Schick et al., 2024; Paranjape et al., 2023) to enable code-writing and tool-use for the Reasoner. We provide programmatic functions to address atomic problems critical to the given task family. As shown in Figure 2, at the t^{th} round of conversation, the Reasoner uses the provided pathfinding tool `traverse_room` to identify obstacles that need to be removed to traverse to the key, a problem beyond the capacity of LLMs. We include tool annotations in the prompt to guide the Reasoner in querying for the information necessary. The introduction of tools prevents hallucination on complex problems and reduces the burden of LLMs by leveraging known algorithms.

2.4. Retriever

The Retriever assists the Reasoner by processing its free-form queries and returning the requested information from the graph. Specifically, given a query q , the Retriever generates code h that executes on the scene graph to retrieve the required information \mathcal{G}' . Here, V' and E' denote subsets of graph nodes and edges, respectively. While the Reasoner






Figure 2: **SG-RwR Workflow**. It solves tasks on scene graphs through the cooperation of two LLM agents: Reasoner and Retriever. Reasoner iteratively queries Retriever for graph information and reasons based on the received data from the Retriever. The scene graph schema is prompted to synergize the reasoning and retrieval. Additionally, both agents employ the code-writing skill: Retriever programs to retrieve graph information based on the schema, while the Reasoner writes code to utilize external tools for solving complex atomic problems. In the graph,  and  represent code writing and execution, respectively. They retrieve graph information G' or enhance the analysis a .

may query for either the entire node or edge or just a subset of their attributes, we use V' and E' as the general representation for either case. The code-writing strategy offers significant advantages over traditional API-calling methods. As shown in Fig. 2, it enables efficient graph traversal by iterating through nodes, edges, or attributes using loops. It also supports query-oriented information filtering through logical structures such as conditional statements. These capabilities ensure that the retrieved information is well-aligned with the reasoning demands.

Similar to the prompt for the Reasoner, the prompt for the Retriever includes the environment description, the scene graph schema S , and general guidance. The key difference is that S guides the Retriever in writing the information retrieval code. Confusion is avoided by ensuring that both agents communicate using the same terms from the schema.

2.5. Self-debugging and Error prevention in code-writing

Even with adequate context, LLMs are not guaranteed to write executable code in a single attempt. Therefore, we introduce a self-debugging mechanism to both the Retriever and the Reasoner to ensure the successful code execution (Chen et al., 2024). Specifically, we establish an inner itera-

tion between the code-writing LLM and the code executor. At each round, we prompt the history of attempts, including the initial query q , previous programs h_0, \dots, h_{i-1} , and execution outcomes $h_0(G), \dots, h_{i-1}(G)$, back to the LLM. If execution errors exist, the code-writing LLM corrects the code and repeats the process. Conversely, if the code execution is successful, then the debugging iteration terminates.

What's more, we observe hallucination in the code written by LLMs as prior work (Liu et al., 2024). In our case, the Reasoner might hallucinate about scene information without querying for it from the Retriever. To prevent this, we design a reprompting technique based on keyword detection. Specifically, we detect the keywords "assuming" and "assume" in the code written by LLMs, and prompt the code back to the Reasoner with the query to remove any assumptions in the code. We observe that the simple technique prevents scene information hallucination in most cases.

3. Experimental Settings

We evaluate our methods on a series of numerical Q&A (NumQ&A) and planning tasks in the BabyAI (Chevalier-Boisvert et al., 2018; Chevalier-Boisvert et al., 2023) and VirtualHome (VH) (Puig et al., 2018) environments. For each environment, we provide an unified scene graph




Figure 3: **Experiment Settings.** (Best viewed in color) The environment and tasks for evaluation. (a) BabyAI Trv-1 task with single-side door obstacle; (b) BabyAI Trv-2 task with double-side door obstacles; (c) BabyAI Numerical Q&A task; (d) Two VirtualHome household environments (left: VH-1; right: VH-2) and an exemplar task.

schema consistent across epoches with potentially distinct scene graphs. Each task requires reasoning on both the spatial structure and the semantic information encoded in the graph. We use the **success rate** as our evaluation metric, where success is defined as either providing the correct answer or achieving the desired outcome with simulation, depending on the task. Note that all experiments in this paper are conducted in the static setting, where the tested methods generate solutions solely based on the initial scene graph without interacting with the environment that will modify the graph. We also provide preliminary results under the dynamic settings in Appendix E.

We use GPT-4o for both *SG-RwR* and baselines. *SG-RwR* is implemented using AutoGen (Wu et al., 2023). The detailed prompts are shown in Appendix A.

Baselines Following NLGraph (Wang et al., 2023), we compare our approach against direct reasoning methods based on whole graph prompting, including three zero-shot approaches: **zero-shot prompting** (ZERO-SHOT), **Zero-Shot Chain-of-Thought** (0-COT) (Kojima et al., 2022), **Least-to-Most** (LTM) (Zhou et al., 2022); and three few-shot methods: **Chain-of-Thought** (COT) (Wei et al., 2022), **Build-a-Graph** (BAG) (Wang et al., 2023), **Algorithmic Prompting** (ALGORITHM) (Wang et al., 2023). In addition to the few-shot examples, ALGORITHM also require a language description of the task solving method. We also compare against **SayPlan** (Rana et al., 2023), a retrieve-then-reason baseline specifically designed for the scene graphs, and **ReAct** (Yao et al., 2022), a generic iterative reasoning and acting approach that invokes database APIs to aggregate information. We test two versions of ReAct, one with graph-traversal actions only (REACT) and the other with an additional `traversal_room` function in BabyAI traversal task as explained in Sec. 3.2 (REACT-TRV). Both SayPlan and ReAct are provided with graph APIs for retrieving graph data. Please refer to Appendix C for more details.




Figure 4: **BabyAI Scene Graph Representation.** Graph nodes represent **items**, **agents**, **rooms**, and **doors**. Edges indicate items or agents located inside a room, or doors that connect rooms. Room nodes are connected to a root node.

Few-shot *SG-RwR* We investigate the performance of *SG-RwR* in both zero-shot and few-shot settings. For the latter, we examine two types of few-shot prompting: ***SG-RwR* + FewShot(*SG-RwR*-FS)**, which incorporates additional in-context learning examples, and ***SG-RwR* + Algorithm(*SG-RwR*-A)**: which adds both in-context examples and algorithmic prompts following ALGORITHM. Notably, we do not provide any fine-grained agent-level exemplar operations as in SayPlan (Rana et al., 2023), which can be impractical to collect and may constrain the reasoning flexibility of LLMs. Instead, we examine whether our framework can leverage task-level annotations to enhance its reasoning capacity.

Next few subsections describe the environment and task details. The scene graph node and edge information described in the schema are shown in Appendix B.1.

3.1. 2D Grid World Numerical Q&A

Our first experiment is on a numerical Q&A task in a customized 9-room 2D BabyAI (Chevalier-Boisvert et al., 2018) environment, as shown in Figure 3(c). We generate scene graph representation of the environment following the hierarchical graph design from 3DSG (Armeni et al., 2019), illustrated in Figure 4. Specifically, the graph represents the

spatial scene layout through three levels: root, rooms, and objects, with additional door nodes connecting room pairs. Please check Appendix B.1 for more details.

Following SayPlan (Rana et al., 2023), we design the following question template: find the color of the {TARGET_OBJECT} in a room next to the room with {NUM_IDENTIFIER} {COLOR_IDENTIFIER} {IDENTIFIER_OBJECT}, where contents in curly brackets are populated based on each environment instance. The environment and question pairs are designed to ensure that there is only one answer.

We test each method in 100 task instances. For few-shot methods, we sample two instances and manually annotate the solutions as the in-context prompt.

3.2. 2D Grid World Traversal Planning

We also test on the traversal planning in BabyAI, where the task is to generate a sequence of node-centric actions to pick up a target item. We design three atomic actions, including (1) `pickup(nodeID)`: Walk to and pickup an object by the node ID; (2) `remove(nodeID)`: Walk to and remove an object by the node ID; (3) `open(nodeID)`: Walk to and open a door by the node ID.

As shown in Figure 3(a)(b), the traversal planning task is tested in two related double-room environments, both of which require the agent to pick up the key of the correct color to unlock the door, remove any obstacle that blocks the door, open the door, and pick up the target. The difference is that the first environment, dubbed **Trv1**, contains only the agent-side obstacle, whereas the second environment, dubbed **Trv2**, contains another target-side obstacle. We generate the in-context examples *only in Trv1*, and test if the methods can extrapolate to Trv2. As before, we evaluate each method in 100 times in different instance of both types of the environment. For *SG-RwR*, we provide the reasoning function `traversal_room` programmed based on the A^* algorithm, which identifies the item to remove in order to reach from an initial to a desired location within the same room. As we will show, *SG-RwR* is able to leverage this external tool to compensate for the limited mathematical problem solving ability of LLMs.

3.3. Household Task Planning

The last evaluation is in two VirtualHome (VH) (Puig et al., 2018) environments shown in Figure 3(d), denoted as **VH-1** and **VH-2**, respectively. We use the built-in environmental graph as the scene graph. Compared to BabyAI, VH environments have larger state space and action space, containing 115 object instances, 8 relationship types, and multiple object properties and states. Hence, VH environments are more challenging with richer information in the graphs. For each

environment, we adopt the 10 household tasks from Prog-Prompt (Singh et al., 2023), such as "put the soap in the bathroom cabinet", and query each method for the action sequence in the VH action format to accomplish the task. We use two of the tasks, together with the ground truth actions, as the few-shot examples, and test with the other eight. We follow CoELA (Zhang et al., 2024) to specify the task as the desired states. For example, the task of above is specified as `soap INSIDE bathroomcabinet`. For more details, please refer to Appendix B.2.

4. Results and Analysis

4.1. Experiment Results

Numerical Q&A Results The results are collected in Table 1. Zero-shot *SG-RwR* outperforms the best baseline by 30 percentage points (pp), even without taking advantage of the few-shot examples. Few-shot methods do not show significant advantage over zero-shot methods, as the reasoning trace for this task is simple. However, they all tend to make mistakes when addressing the substeps such as counting the item or locating the neighboring rooms. The retrieval mechanisms in both ReAct and SayPlan further degrades the performance. SayPlan cannot effectively retrieve information, due to its retrieve-then-reason framework that does not condition the retrieval on intermediate reasoning. ReAct employs the iterative reasoning, but API-calling is less effective for large scene graphs. In contrast, *SG-RwR* retrieves information that better facilitate reasoning.

2D Traversal Results Table 1 also reports the success rate in the traversal task. In the seen Trv1 environment, our method achieves 38pp and 3pp higher success rate against the best performing baselines under zero-shot and few-shot settings, respectively. While few-shot baselines perform more than 10pp better compared to zero-shot baselines, they perform even worse in the unseen settings, achieving $\leq 1\%$ success rate. This indicates that although few-shot examples is helpful in the seen tasks, LLMs do not *learn* the reasoning process to extrapolate to similar unseen tasks. Rather, LLMs might only *memorize* the heuristic mechanism in the solution, such as always removing the item on the left of the door. On the other hand, by not directly processing scene graphs, the Reasoner in *SG-RwR* better learns the reasoning process essential for the task, and can thus extrapolate well to similar problems. SayPlan and ReAct achieve inferior results *SG-RwR*, indicating that their heuristic or API-based retrieval methods are less suitable for complex tasks concerning global information.

Household Task Planning Results The planning success rate on the 8 tasks in the 2 VH environments are shown in Table 2. We observe that all baselines con-

Task	Zero-Shot				Few-Shot							
	ZeroShot	0-CoT	LTM	<i>SG-RwR</i>	CoT	BAG	Alg	ReAct	ReAct-Trv	SayPlan	<i>SG-RwR</i> (FS)	<i>SG-RwR</i> (Alg)
NumQ&A	55%	48%	52%	95%	53%	51%	65%	24%	24%	35%	94%	97%
Trv-1	20%	23%	17%	61%	34%	35%	64%	13%	62%	18%	67%	64%
Trv-2	11%	7%	6%	56%	1%	1%	0%	0%	56%	0%	61%	56%

Table 1: **Results in BabyAI** *SG-RwR* achieves the best performance across all tasks in both zero-shot and few-shot settings, showing that *SG-RwR* (1) is effective in solving spatial tasks; (2) can harness the information from in-context examples and extrapolate better to unseen tasks. We highlight the top-1 performance under the zero-shot setting and top-2 performances, including ties, under the few-shot setting.

Method	Few-Shot Examples	VH-1	VH-2
ZeroShot		87.5%	75%
0-CoT		87.5%	75%
LTM		87.5%	62.5%
CoT	✓	87.5%	75%
BAG	✓	87.5%	62.5%
RwR		100%	100%

Table 2: **Results in VirtualHome**. The superior performance of *SG-RwR* shows that it is capable of grounding its plan to the environmental states.

sistently fail to address the precondition of the planned action. For example, all of them failed to generate [open] <garbagecan> (ID) before [putin] <plum> (ID) <garbagecan> (ID), forgetting that the state of the garbage can is state:{CLOSED} from the extensive graph input. On the other hand, *SG-RwR* doesn't process the entire graph. Instead, it queries for the specific object information, which helps to better determine the action parameter and examine the action preconditions.

We also present qualitative results in Appendix D.1 (BabyAI), Appendix D.2 (VirtualHome), and Appendix G (Baseline failure cases). We provide analysis on the compute cost with the iterative design in Appendix F.

4.2. Ablation

Setup To further validate the designs of *SG-RwR* framework, we conduct an ablation study for the key component of our method. To this end, we compare against the following variants of *SG-RwR*:

- **SingleCoder**: Single-shot code writing with LLMs to address a given task, without iterative retrieval and reasoning or multiple generation. This variant verifies the benefit of **the iterative retrieval-generation**. The SingleCoder is prompted with the combination of the information for both the Reasoner and the Retriever in *SG-RwR*, including the environment and action space

information, scene graph schema, and tool annotations. The self-debugging mechanism is also enabled.

- ***SG-RwR-T***: Language-only two-agent iterative method, without the schema-based code-writing or tool-using mechanism. Both agents cooperate purely in the language space, and the graph is directly prompted to the retriever as texts. This variant validates the **schema-based code-writing** design. We also use an additional LLM-based action format corrector following (Song et al., 2023; Huang et al., 2023c), as it consistently fails to generate actions in the executable format.
- ***SG-RwR-S***: An one-agent version of *SG-RwR* with both code-writing and iterative mechanism. This variant verifies the benefits of the **two-agent** design against one-agent. Specifically, the one-agent *SG-RwR-S* is fed with the union of the Reasoner and Retriever prompts. At each iteration, it processes the entire reasoning and retrieval history to generate the next step:

$$a_t, q_t, h_t = LLM(\{a_0, q_0, h_0, \mathcal{G}'_0\}, \dots; \mathcal{S}) \quad (4)$$

$$\mathcal{G}'_t = h_t(\mathcal{G}) \quad (5)$$

All variants are tested in BabyAI under the zero-shot setting.

Results The ablation study results are demonstrated in Table 3, where all variants are out-performed by the original *SG-RwR*, justifying the core designs. Specifically, *SingleCoder* is capable of solving numerical problems, but is unable to address complex planning tasks without the iterative cooperation. *SG-RwR-T* can better break the task down with iterative task solving, but cannot consistently obtain the correct solution for each substep without code-writing. For example, queried with "Find all rooms that contain 5 green balls", the non-code-writing Retriever might struggle with the counting problem in the language space. *SG-RwR-S* performs both iterative reasoning and code-writing, but can be misguided by the redundant historical information when addressing complex tasks.

Method	Code-Writing & Tool-Use	Iterative Reason	Two-Agent	Numerical Q&A	Trv-1	Trv-2
SingleCoder	✓			80%	33%	25%
<i>SG-RwR-T</i>		✓	✓	57%	18%	8%
<i>SG-RwR-S</i>	✓	✓		90%	46%	31%
<i>SG-RwR</i>	✓	✓	✓	95%	61%	56%

Table 3: **Ablation in BabyAI traversal and numerical Q&A.** The best result is achieved by combining both Reason-while-Retrieve framework and the code-writing, justifying the key designs in our method.

5. Related Literature

Language models for Task and Motion Planning Many existing efforts harness the power of large language models for decision making (Xi et al., 2023; Chen et al., 2023; Liu et al., 2023) and robotic control (Dalal et al., 2024; Zhang et al., 2023; Lin et al., 2023; Chen et al., 2021; Hatori et al., 2018). With rich built-in knowledge and in-context learning ability, language models are used for generating task-level plans (Raman et al., 2022; Gao et al., 2024), action selection (Ahn et al., 2022; Nasiriany et al., 2024), processing environmental or human feedback (Skreta et al., 2023), training or finetuning language-conditioned policy models (Team et al., 2024; Padalkar et al., 2023; Szot et al., 2023), and more. To factor in the environment during planning, recent studies have explored using LLMs for programmatic plan generation (Singh et al., 2023), combining knowledge from external perception tools (Liang et al., 2023; Huang et al., 2023b) or grounded decoding (Huang et al., 2023c), and value function generation (Yu et al., 2023). While proven effective, those methods are limited to small scale environments, and rely on expert perception models to extract task-related states from the scene representation with implicit spatial structure. In this work, we study using pretrained LLMs to process the the global representation of large environments with explicit structure.

Graph as the Scene Representation The scope of the solvable task is largely determined by the state representation. Compare to sensory representation such as images or point clouds, scene graphs are compact thus scalable to large environments (Greve et al., 2024), structured to represent spatial layout explicitly (Hughes et al., 2022; Wu et al., 2021), and efficient in representing diverse states of the environment (Armeni et al., 2019). Therefore, they have been used in various manipulation or navigation tasks (Ravichandran et al., 2022; Zhu et al., 2021). In this paper, we exploit these favorable features of the scene graph representation to ground the reasoning process of LLMs to the environment.

LLMs for Reasoning on Graph Leveraging language models to reason with graphs is a growing area. While prior works trains to integrates graph and language knowledge (Ye et al., 2023; Ni et al., 2023), recent study explores se-

rializing graph-structured data as prompts for pretrained LLMs (Wang et al., 2023; Fatemi et al., 2024). This strategy has been successfully used in knowledge-graph-enhanced LLMs reasoning (Sun et al., 2023; Luo et al., 2024) and scene-graph-based robotic task planning (Gu et al., 2024). Closest to our work, SayPlan (Rana et al., 2023) prompts scene graphs to LLMs and designs a Retrieve-then-Reason framework for robotic planning. However, its room-by-room retrieval heuristic is only effective in the object search task. Instead, we design the Reason-while-Retrieve framework for general spatial reasoning with scene graphs.

6. Conclusion and Future Work

In this work, we have proposed *SG-RwR*: an iterative, two-agent framework that grounds LLMs in a physical environment through scene graphs, and enables them to reason using both natural and, crucially, programming languages. Specifically, *SG-RwR* facilitates reasoning on large scene graphs by enabling LLMs to write code that retrieves task-related information *during* the reasoning process.

Our ablation study shows that all the core designs, involving the iterative reason-retrieval, the two-agent cooperation, *and* the code-writing are crucial to the framework’s enhanced performance. Iterative reason-retrieval ensures that the environment information enters the planning process in a just-in-time manner, two-agent framework reduces interference across the planning, and code-writing enables prompting with a data *schema* rather than the data itself. In short, all of these limit “information overload” in the Reasoner.

Future work could explore the flexibility of *SG-RwR* framework to seamlessly integrate additional agents with new specialties. Potential new agents involve a verifier agent to correct the solution using graph information and new modality agent to process richer information. Reasoning trace optimization could also be explored, as the conversation rounds scale with task difficulty and agent numbers.

Impact Statement

The paper presents a framework that enables Large Language Models to solve spatial tasks with scene graphs. Due to the wide usage of scene graphs as the environmental

representation in both simulators and real world, the proposed framework can be potentially embedded in numerous applications. Such applications involve high-level task planning (Rana et al., 2023; Gu et al., 2024), data collection (Yang et al., 2025; Cheng et al., 2024), and building autonomous agent in the gaming or Virtual Reality (VR) environments (Hu et al., 2024). In summary, the framework has the potential to serve as a key module in autonomous systems, enhancing the ability to reason spatially and interact with the environments.

References

- Achiam, J., Adler, S., Agarwal, S., Ahmad, L., Akkaya, I., Aleman, F. L., Almeida, D., Altenschmidt, J., Altman, S., Anadkat, S., et al. Gpt-4 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774*, 2023.
- Ahn, J., Verma, R., Lou, R., Liu, D., Zhang, R., and Yin, W. Large language models for mathematical reasoning: Progresses and challenges. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.00157*, 2024.
- Ahn, M., Brohan, A., Brown, N., Chebotar, Y., Cortes, O., David, B., Finn, C., Fu, C., Gopalakrishnan, K., Hausman, K., et al. Do as i can, not as i say: Grounding language in robotic affordances. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.01691*, 2022.
- Armeni, I., He, Z.-Y., Gwak, J., Zamir, A. R., Fischer, M., Malik, J., and Savarese, S. 3d scene graph: A structure for unified semantics, 3d space, and camera. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*, pp. 5664–5673, 2019.
- Chen, H., Du, Y., Chen, Y., Tenenbaum, J., and Vela, P. A. Planning with sequence models through iterative energy minimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.16189*, 2023.
- Chen, X., Lin, M., Schärli, N., and Zhou, D. Teaching large language models to self-debug. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024.
- Chen, Y., Xu, R., Lin, Y., and Vela, P. A. A joint network for grasp detection conditioned on natural language commands. In *2021 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, pp. 4576–4582. IEEE, 2021.
- Cheng, A.-C., Yin, H., Fu, Y., Guo, Q., Yang, R., Kautz, J., Wang, X., and Liu, S. Spatialrgpt: Grounded spatial reasoning in vision language model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.01584*, 2024.
- Chevalier-Boisvert, M., Bahdanau, D., Lahlou, S., Willems, L., Saharia, C., Nguyen, T. H., and Bengio, Y. Babyai: A platform to study the sample efficiency of grounded language learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.08272*, 2018.
- Chevalier-Boisvert, M., Dai, B., Towers, M., Perez-Vicente, R., Willems, L., Lahlou, S., Pal, S., Castro, P. S., and Terry, J. Minigrad & miniworld: Modular & customizable reinforcement learning environments for goal-oriented tasks. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 36, New Orleans, LA, USA, December 2023*.
- Dalal, M., Chiruvolu, T., Chaplot, D., and Salakhutdinov, R. Plan-seq-learn: Language model guided rl for solving long horizon robotics tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.01534*, 2024.
- Fatemi, B., Halcrow, J., and Perozzi, B. Talk like a graph: Encoding graphs for large language models. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024.
- Gao, J., Sarkar, B., Xia, F., Xiao, T., Wu, J., Ichter, B., Majumdar, A., and Sadigh, D. Physically grounded vision-language models for robotic manipulation. In *2024 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, pp. 12462–12469. IEEE, 2024.
- Greve, E., Büchner, M., Vödisch, N., Burgard, W., and Valada, A. Collaborative dynamic 3d scene graphs for automated driving. In *2024 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, pp. 11118–11124. IEEE, 2024.
- Gu, Q., Kuwajerwala, A., Morin, S., Jatavallabhula, K. M., Sen, B., Agarwal, A., Rivera, C., Paul, W., Ellis, K., Chelappa, R., et al. Conceptgraphs: Open-vocabulary 3d scene graphs for perception and planning. In *International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, pp. 5021–5028. IEEE, 2024.
- Hagberg, A., Swart, P. J., and Schult, D. A. Exploring network structure, dynamics, and function using networkx. Technical report, Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL), Los Alamos, NM (United States), 2008.
- Hatori, J., Kikuchi, Y., Kobayashi, S., Takahashi, K., Tsuboi, Y., Unno, Y., Ko, W., and Tan, J. Interactively picking real-world objects with unconstrained spoken language instructions. In *2018 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, pp. 3774–3781. IEEE, 2018.
- Hu, S., Huang, T., Ilhan, F., Tekin, S., Liu, G., Kompella, R., and Liu, L. A survey on large language model-based game agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.02039*, 2024.
- Huang, J., Yong, S., Ma, X., Linghu, X., Li, P., Wang, Y., Li, Q., Zhu, S.-C., Jia, B., and Huang, S. An embodied generalist agent in 3d world. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.12871*, 2023a.

- Huang, W., Xia, F., Xiao, T., Chan, H., Liang, J., Florence, P., Zeng, A., Tompson, J., Mordatch, I., Chebotar, Y., et al. Inner monologue: Embodied reasoning through planning with language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2207.05608*, 2022.
- Huang, W., Wang, C., Zhang, R., Li, Y., Wu, J., and Fei-Fei, L. Voxposer: Composable 3d value maps for robotic manipulation with language models. In *Conference on Robot Learning*, pp. 540–562. PMLR, 2023b.
- Huang, W., Xia, F., Shah, D., Driess, D., Zeng, A., Lu, Y., Florence, P., Mordatch, I., Levine, S., Hausman, K., et al. Grounded decoding: Guiding text generation with grounded models for robot control. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.00855*, 2023c.
- Hughes, N., Chang, Y., and Carlone, L. Hydra: A real-time spatial perception system for 3d scene graph construction and optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.13360*, 2022.
- Jiang, Z., Xu, F. F., Gao, L., Sun, Z., Liu, Q., Dwivedi-Yu, J., Yang, Y., Callan, J., and Neubig, G. Active retrieval augmented generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.06983*, 2023.
- Joublin, F., Ceravola, A., Smirnov, P., Ocker, F., Deigmoeller, J., Belardinelli, A., Wang, C., Hasler, S., Tanneberg, D., and Gienger, M. Copal: corrective planning of robot actions with large language models. In *2024 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, pp. 8664–8670. IEEE, 2024.
- Kojima, T., Gu, S. S., Reid, M., Matsuo, Y., and Iwasawa, Y. Large language models are zero-shot reasoners. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35: 22199–22213, 2022.
- Liang, J., Huang, W., Xia, F., Xu, P., Hausman, K., Ichter, B., Florence, P., and Zeng, A. Code as policies: Language model programs for embodied control. In *International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, pp. 9493–9500. IEEE, 2023.
- Lin, K., Agia, C., Migimatsu, T., Pavone, M., and Bohg, J. Text2motion: From natural language instructions to feasible plans. *Autonomous Robots*, 47(8):1345–1365, 2023.
- Liu, B., Jiang, Y., Zhang, X., Liu, Q., Zhang, S., Biswas, J., and Stone, P. Llm+ p: Empowering large language models with optimal planning proficiency. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.11477*, 2023.
- Liu, F., Liu, Y., Shi, L., Huang, H., Wang, R., Yang, Z., and Zhang, L. Exploring and evaluating hallucinations in llm-powered code generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.00971*, 2024.
- Luo, L., Li, Y.-F., Haf, R., and Pan, S. Reasoning on graphs: Faithful and interpretable large language model reasoning. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024.
- Lyu, Q., Havaldar, S., Stein, A., Zhang, L., Rao, D., Wong, E., Apidianaki, M., and Callison-Burch, C. Faithful chain-of-thought reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.13379*, 2023.
- Nasiriany, S., Xia, F., Yu, W., Xiao, T., Liang, J., Dasgupta, I., Xie, A., Driess, D., Wahid, A., Xu, Z., et al. Pivot: Iterative visual prompting elicits actionable knowledge for vlms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.07872*, 2024.
- Ni, Z., Deng, X., Tai, C., Zhu, X., Xie, Q., Huang, W., Wu, X., and Zeng, L. Grid: Scene-graph-based instruction-driven robotic task planning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.07726*, 2023.
- Padalkar, A., Pooley, A., Jain, A., Bewley, A., Herzog, A., Irpan, A., Khazatsky, A., Rai, A., Singh, A., Brohan, A., et al. Open x-embodiment: Robotic learning datasets and rt-x models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.08864*, 2023.
- Paranjape, B., Lundberg, S., Singh, S., Hajishirzi, H., Zettlemoyer, L., and Ribeiro, M. T. Art: Automatic multi-step reasoning and tool-use for large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.09014*, 2023.
- Press, O., Zhang, M., Min, S., Schmidt, L., Smith, N. A., and Lewis, M. Measuring and narrowing the compositionality gap in language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.03350*, 2022.
- Puig, X., Ra, K., Boben, M., Li, J., Wang, T., Fidler, S., and Torralba, A. Virtualhome: Simulating household activities via programs. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pp. 8494–8502, 2018.
- Raman, S. S., Cohen, V., Rosen, E., Idrees, I., Paulius, D., and Tellex, S. Planning with large language models via corrective re-prompting. In *NeurIPS 2022 Foundation Models for Decision Making Workshop*, 2022.
- Rana, K., Haviland, J., Garg, S., Abou-Chakra, J., Reid, I., and Suenderhauf, N. Sayplan: Grounding large language models using 3d scene graphs for scalable task planning. In *7th Annual Conference on Robot Learning*, 2023. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=wMpOMO0Ss7a>.
- Ravichandran, Z., Peng, L., Hughes, N., Griffith, J. D., and Carlone, L. Hierarchical representations and explicit memory: Learning effective navigation policies on 3d scene graphs using graph neural networks. In *International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, pp. 9272–9279. IEEE, 2022.

- Rybiński, H. On first-order-logic databases. *ACM Transactions on Database Systems (TODS)*, 12(3):325–349, 1987.
- Schick, T., Dwivedi-Yu, J., Dessì, R., Raileanu, R., Lomeli, M., Hambro, E., Zettlemoyer, L., Cancedda, N., and Scialom, T. Toolformer: Language models can teach themselves to use tools. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.
- Shao, Z., Gong, Y., Shen, Y., Huang, M., Duan, N., and Chen, W. Enhancing retrieval-augmented large language models with iterative retrieval-generation synergy. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.15294*, 2023.
- Singh, I., Blukis, V., Mousavian, A., Goyal, A., Xu, D., Tremblay, J., Fox, D., Thomason, J., and Garg, A. Prog-prompt: Generating situated robot task plans using large language models. In *2023 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, pp. 11523–11530. IEEE, 2023.
- Skreta, M., Yoshikawa, N., Arellano-Rubach, S., Ji, Z., Kristensen, L. B., Darvish, K., Aspuru-Guzik, A., Shkurti, F., and Garg, A. Errors are useful prompts: Instruction guided task programming with verifier-assisted iterative prompting. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.14100*, 2023.
- Song, C. H., Wu, J., Washington, C., Sadler, B. M., Chao, W.-L., and Su, Y. Llm-planner: Few-shot grounded planning for embodied agents with large language models. In *International Conference on Computer Vision*, October 2023.
- Sun, J., Xu, C., Tang, L., Wang, S., Lin, C., Gong, Y., Shum, H.-Y., and Guo, J. Think-on-graph: Deep and responsible reasoning of large language model with knowledge graph, 2023.
- Szot, A., Schwarzer, M., Agrawal, H., Mazouze, B., Metcalf, R., Talbott, W., Mackraz, N., Hjelm, R. D., and Toshev, A. T. Large language models as generalizable policies for embodied tasks. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023.
- Team, O. M., Ghosh, D., Walke, H., Pertsch, K., Black, K., Mees, O., Dasari, S., Hejna, J., Kreiman, T., Xu, C., et al. Octo: An open-source generalist robot policy. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.12213*, 2024.
- Touvron, H., Martin, L., Stone, K., Albert, P., Almahairi, A., Babaei, Y., Bashlykov, N., Batra, S., Bhargava, P., Bhosale, S., et al. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09288*, 2023.
- Trivedi, H., Balasubramanian, N., Khot, T., and Sabharwal, A. Interleaving retrieval with chain-of-thought reasoning for knowledge-intensive multi-step questions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.10509*, 2022.
- Wang, H., Feng, S., He, T., Tan, Z., Han, X., and Tsvetkov, Y. Can language models solve graph problems in natural language? In *Thirty-seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2023. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=UDqHhbqYJV>.
- Wei, J., Wang, X., Schuurmans, D., Bosma, M., Xia, F., Chi, E., Le, Q. V., Zhou, D., et al. Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:24824–24837, 2022.
- Wu, Q., Bansal, G., Zhang, J., Wu, Y., Zhang, S., Zhu, E., Li, B., Jiang, L., Zhang, X., and Wang, C. Autogen: Enabling next-gen llm applications via multi-agent conversation framework. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.08155*, 2023.
- Wu, S.-C., Wald, J., Tateno, K., Navab, N., and Tombari, F. Scenegrphfusion: Incremental 3d scene graph prediction from rgb-d sequences. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pp. 7515–7525, 2021.
- Xi, Z., Chen, W., Guo, X., He, W., Ding, Y., Hong, B., Zhang, M., Wang, J., Jin, S., Zhou, E., et al. The rise and potential of large language model based agents: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.07864*, 2023.
- Yang, J., Dong, Y., Liu, S., Li, B., Wang, Z., Tan, H., Jiang, C., Kang, J., Zhang, Y., Zhou, K., et al. Octopus: Embodied vision-language programmer from environmental feedback. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pp. 20–38. Springer, 2025.
- Yao, S., Zhao, J., Yu, D., Du, N., Shafran, I., Narasimhan, K., and Cao, Y. React: Synergizing reasoning and acting in language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.03629*, 2022.
- Ye, R., Zhang, C., Wang, R., Xu, S., Zhang, Y., et al. Natural language is all a graph needs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.07134*, 4(5):7, 2023.
- Yu, W., Gileadi, N., Fu, C., Kirmani, S., Lee, K.-H., Arenas, M. G., Chiang, H.-T. L., Erez, T., Hasenclever, L., Humplik, J., et al. Language to rewards for robotic skill synthesis. In *Conference on Robot Learning*, pp. 374–404. PMLR, 2023.
- Zeng, A., Attarian, M., Ichter, B., Choromanski, K., Wong, A., Welker, S., Tombari, F., Purohit, A., Ryoo, M., Sindhwani, V., et al. Socratic models: Composing zero-shot multimodal reasoning with language. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.00598*, 2022.

Zhang, H., Du, W., Shan, J., Zhou, Q., Du, Y., Tenenbaum, J. B., Shu, T., and Gan, C. Building cooperative embodied agents modularly with large language models. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024.

Zhang, J., Zhang, J., Pertsch, K., Liu, Z., Ren, X., Chang, M., Sun, S.-H., and Lim, J. J. Bootstrap your own skills: Learning to solve new tasks with large language model guidance. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.10021*, 2023.

Zhou, D., Schärli, N., Hou, L., Wei, J., Scales, N., Wang, X., Schuurmans, D., Cui, C., Bousquet, O., Le, Q., et al. Least-to-most prompting enables complex reasoning in large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.10625*, 2022.

Zhu, Y., Tremblay, J., Birchfield, S., and Zhu, Y. Hierarchical planning for long-horizon manipulation with geometric and symbolic scene graphs. In *2021 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, pp. 6541–6548. IEEE, 2021.

A. Prompt Templates for *SG-RwR*

SG-RwR adopts template-based prompt generation for both the Reasoner and Retriever. The templates for them are shown in Table 5 and Table 4. The prompt is generated by populating the red contents in the template with the specific graph information.

Table 4: Retriever Prompt Template

Retriever Prompt Template
<p>You are a excellent graph information retrieval agent. Given the environment description and the schema of the graph representaiton of the environment, you are good at writing code to obtain information from a graph following language queries.</p> <p>Environment Description: {ENVIRONMENT PROMPT}</p> <p>Scene Graph Schema: {SCENE GRAPH SCHEMA PROMPT}</p> <p>Please follow the guidance below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">* Please write python code to retrieve information from the graph. Please include node id in your result and print out the result in your code.* If there is no required information stored in the graph, print None in your code.* The code execution result will be send back to you. Please check the result. If the information is retrieved, summarize the information and replay 'INFO RETRIEVED' in a separate paragraph following the format below: <pre>[Summary] Summarize the required information INFO RETRIEVED</pre>

Table 5: Reasoner Prompt Template

Reasoner Prompt Template

You are a planning agent that is excellent at collaboration and code writing. Given the environment description, schema of the graph representaiton of that environment, a retriever agent that can retrieve information from the graph, and a set of user defined reasoning tool(s), you know what information to ask from the retriever and how to use them as well as the reasoning tool(s) to solve a planning task. Then you can generate a plan executable by the agent to achieve the given mission.

Environment Description:

{ENVIRONMENT PROMPT}

Scene Graph Schema:

{SCENE GRAPH SCHEMA PROMPT}

Agent Actions:

{AGENT ACTIONS}

Please follow the guidance below:

- * Solve tasks step-by-step. Figure out the next step that can help you get closer to the solution.
- * If you need any information from the graph based on the graph schema, raise a language query. A retriever will return the information to you.
- * If you have enough information to solve the next substep, use your reasoning and code writing skill to solve it. If you write code, print out the result with succint explanation. The code execution output will be sent back to you.
- * You might be provided with reasoning tools. They are a set of python functions for solving an atomic subproblem, which might be helpful for your task. Please use the tools whenever suitable. The annotation of the tools will be provided at end of the guidance.
- * When asking the retriever for information:
 - Raise language queries that are clear, self-contained, and addressable by traversing through the graph.
 - Communicate using the terms in the graph schema.
 - Please break questions into simpler queries and raise them one-by-one. Avoid asking for all necessary information at once.
- * When the task is solved, summarize the solution and reply 'TASK TERMINATE' in a separate paragraph. Do this ONLY when you obtain the complete solution.
- * Format your information query message in the following way:


```
[Explanation]
Explane why querying for the information.
[Query]
The information retrieval query to the retriever.
```
- * Format your code writing message in the following way:


```
[Explanation]
Explain what your code does.
[Code]
Python code that solves a subproblem. Wrap the code in the python code block.
```
- * Format your entire solution summary message in the following way:


```
[Summary]
Summarize the enire solving process.
[Actions]
[ACTION1, ACTION2, ...]
TASK TERMINATE
```

B. Environment Details

B.1. BabyAI Environment and Scene Graph Details

Node attributes The node attributes in BabyAI scene graph involve:

- **"type"**: String. The type of the element type. Choices:
root, room, agent, key, door, box, ball
- **"color"**: String. For doors and items. The color of the element.
- **"coordinate"**: List of integer. Exist for all types of nodes except for the root node. For room nodes, the top left corner coordinate. For other nodes, the 2D coordinate in the grid.
- **"is_locked"**: Binary. For door. State indicating if a door is locked or not.
- **"size"**: List of integer. For room. The size of a room.

B.2. VirtualHome Environment and Scene Graph Details

Node attributes The node attributes in VirtualHome involve:

- **'id'**: Int. Node id.
- **'category'**: Str. Meta category. E.g. "Room".
- **'class_name'**: Str. Specific class name. E.g. "bathroom".
- **'prefab_name'**: Str. Instance name.
- **'obj_transform'**: Dict. 'position': 3D vector, 'rotation': Quaternion form as 4D vector, 'scale': 3D vector
- **'bounding_box'**: Dict. 'center': 3D vector, "size": 3D vector
- **'properties'**: List. Object properties. Determine the action that can act upon it.
- **'states'**: List. Object states. Full list of available states: ['CLOSED', 'OPEN', 'ON', 'OFF', 'SITTING', 'DIRTY', 'CLEAN', 'LYING', 'PLUGGED_IN', 'PLUGGED_OUT', 'HEATED', 'WASHED']

Edge attributes The edge attributes in VirtualHome involve:

- **'from_id'**: Int. Id of node in the from relationship.
- **'to_id'**: Int. Id of node in the to relationship.
- **'relationships'**: Str. Relationship between the 2 objects. Available relationships:
 - **'ON'**: Object from_id is on top of object to_id.
 - **'INSIDE'**: Object from_id is inside of object to_id.
 - **'BETWEEN'**: Used for doors. Door connects with room to to_id.
 - **'CLOSE'**: Object from_id is close to object to_id (< 1.5 metres).
 - **'FACING'**: Object to_id is visible from objects from_id and distance is < 5 metres. If object1 is a sofa or a chair it should also be turned towards object2.
 - **'HOLDS_RH'**: Character from_id holds object to_id with the right hand.
 - **'HOLD_LH'**: Character from_id holds object to_id with the left hand.
 - **'SITTING'**: Character from_id is sitting in object to_id.

Action Space

- **[walk]** `<class_name> (id)`: Walk to an object.
- **[grab]** `<class_name> (id)`: Grab an object. Requires that the agent has walked to that object first.
- **[open]** `<class_name> (id)`: Open an object. Requires that the agent has walked to that object first.
- **[close]** `<class_name> (id)`: Close an object. Requires that the agent has walked to that object first.
- **[switchon]** `<class_name> (id)`: Turn an object on. Requires that the agent has walked to that object first.
- **[switchoff]** `<class_name> (id)`: Turn an object off. Requires that the agent has walked to that object first.
- **[sit]** `<class_name> (id)`: Sit on an object. Requires that the agent has walked to that object first.
- **[putin]** `<class_name1> (id1) <class_name2> (id1)`: Put object 1 inside object 2. Requires that the agent is holding object 1 and has walked to the object 2.
- **[putback]** `<class_name1> (id1) <class_name2> (id1)`: Put object 1 on object 2. Requires that the agent is holding object 1 and has walked to the object 2.

Example Task and State-based Specifications in VH-1 We show the 5 example tasks and their desired final state in the VH-1 environment in Table 6.

Task Name	State Specification
Watch TV	tv ON
Turn off tablelamp	tablelamp OFF
put the soap in the bathroomcabinet	barsoap INSIDE bathroomcabinet
throw away plum	plum INSIDE garbagecan
make toast	breadslice INSIDE toaster; breadslice HEATED

Table 6: State-based Task Specification in VirtualHome

C. Baseline Details

C.1. ReAct

For ReAct, we create the following graph information retrieval APIs in the list below. Each of them is a wrapper of a basic NetworkX (Hagberg et al., 2008) operation:

- **get_nodes ()**: Get all node IDs in the scene graph.
- **get_links ()**: Get all links in the scene graph.
- **get_attrs (node_id)**: Get the all attributes of a target node;
- **get_neighbors (node_id)**: get all neighbor node IDs of a target node.

C.2. SayPlan

SayPlan (Rana et al., 2023) is tested in BabyAI tasks. We follow the original work to create the following APIs for the room-level graph traversal purpose:

- **collapse (\mathcal{G})** for retaining only room and root nodes;
- **expand (node_id)** for revealing all nodes rooted from a given room node;




Figure 5: Example *SG-RwR* Traversal task solving process (Reasoner-side). It shows the queries or analysis generated by the Reasoner (in black), information obtained from the Retriever (in yellow), the intermediate conclusion obtained through code-writing that processes the graph information (in green), and the derived plan (in red). The final plan can successfully achieve the mission shown on the left.




Figure 6: **VirtualHome Qualitative Demonstration**. **Top row**: Plan Execution; **Middle row**: Generated plan in the VirtualHome action format. **Bottom row**: *SG-RwR* Snippet of the Reasoner-side generation leading to the plan.

- **contract (node_id)** for removing all nodes rooted from a given room node;

We don’t assume a graph simulator available for validating and refining the solution as is done in the original paper. Instead, we evaluate the LLM-generated plan by executing it directly in the BabyAI.

D. Qualitative results

D.1. Qualitative Results in BabyAI Traversal Task

We qualitatively demonstrate how *SG-RwR* addresses a challenging BabyAI traversal task in Figure 5. It shows the task solving process from the Reasoner’s perspective, including the information queried from the Retriever as well as the intermediate solution obtained through its own code writing. It clearly demonstrates that *SG-RwR* is able to ground the plan to the environment by iteratively retrieving graph information based on the task solving process and establishing the next step towards solution based on the past retrieved information.

D.2. Qualitative results in VirtualHome

The exemplar result in VirtualHome is shown in Figure 6. Due to the prolonged output from the Retriever, we only show the core outputs from the Reasoner-side. The result shows that the Reasoner is able to generate the correct reasoning trace solely based on the graph schema, raising corresponding queries, and use the returned information to generate the correct plan for a given task.

E. Results in Partially Observable Environments with Dynamic Scene Graphs.

Table 7: Retriever Prompt Template

Retriever Prompt Template
<pre> * Agent commanding action. Command the agent to execute an action. Format: [Explanation] Explain in one sentence why executing this action. [Action] Action for the agent to execute. Must be one of the Agent Actions. e.g. pickup(10) </pre>

We show that our iterative framework can naturally extend to partially observable environments with dynamically changing scene graphs. To show this, we modify the BabyAI scene graph settings, where the scene graph visible to the agent only contains visited rooms in the past and the newly revealed room by the door opening actions. After the execution of each action, the scene graph is updated to reflect the revised visibility. The environment also provides action feedback, including the execution result (successful or failed) and the agent’s updated location.

We update the prompt of *SG-RwR* to allow generating individual BabyAI action to interact with the environment, as opposed to only generate the action sequence at the end without interaction in the main manuscript. Specifically, we remove the `solution summary` message from the Reasoner prompt, and add an additional BabyAI action command message type, as shown in Table 7. The dynamic version of *SG-RwR* is tested on the BabyAI traversal tasks under the zero-shot settings. The results are shown in Table. 8, together with the performance in the static settings as a reference. We do not compare with any baselines as designing the optimal strategy for the dyanmic scene graphs is not the focus of this paper. Nonetheless, even by simple updating the prompts, *SG-RwR* performs well in the dynamic settings, even better than that in the static settings due to the opportunity of exploring the environments and processing the feedback. This shows that our method can be adopted for dynamic scene graphs.

	Dynamic	Static
Trv1	76%	61%
Trv2	58%	56%

Table 8: Results in Partially Observable BabyAI.

F. Analysis on the Computational Cost

We show the number of the token processed by our method by iterations and average conversation rounds required to solve a query for the BabyAI tasks in Figure 7. We also plot the token counts of the scene graph and the CoT baseline input. As a direct whole-graph prompting method, the compute required by CoT is determined by the graph size. So the processed token for NumQ&A is 4 times larger than that for the Trv-1, despite that the former is a simpler task requiring less reasoning steps.

On the other hand, *SG-RwR* processed token number monotonically increase along the iteration, as it processes the cumulative conversation history. Hence, the compute required by *SG-RwR* also depends on the task difficulty. However, thanks to the code-writing-based retrieval design, *SG-RwR* only processes limited tokens in early iterations. Thus, for simpler task such

as NumQ&A, *SG-RwR* process less tokens compared to graph prompting method such as CoT at each iteration, which is helpful for reducing hallucination over redundant information. For the traversal task, the processed token count of our method grows beyond even the graph size. This trade-off in compute cost yields superior performance, as demonstrated in Table 1.




Figure 7: **Compute Analysis.** We show average conversation rounds and processed token counts at each iteration by *SG-RwR* Reasoner for both NumQ&A (left) and Trv-1 (right) tasks. We also demonstrate the average token counts of the textualized environment scene graph and CoT input for reference.

G. Exemplar Baseline Hallucinations and how *SG-RwR* Avoids Them via Code-writing

In Figure 8, we qualitative show how *SG-RwR* avoids hallucination problems happened on baselines under several scenarios from our tasks. We use the zero-shot **0-CoT** and the few-shot **CoT** as comparison. To focus on the key difference, we only show snippets of reasoning processes for each referent subtask. We show that when reasoning in language, baselines have the tendency to hallucinate in the interpretation of the spatial layout from the scene graph structure, and in address simple quantitative reasoning (e.g. counting) tasks. On the other hand, based on the scene graph schema understanding, *SG-RwR* is able to solve these subtasks more reliably via code-writing.

<p>Cropped Environment Room-door-level node IDs</p>	<p>Q: find the color of the box in a room next to the room with 4 red ball</p>					
	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>0-CoT</th> <th>CoT</th> <th>RwR(ours)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td> <p>1. Identify the room with 4 red balls: ...</p> <p>2. Determine the rooms adjacent to room 27: - Room 27 is connected to <u>room 54 (door 28)</u>, room 34 (door 8), and <u>room 10 (door 24)</u>.</p> <p>3. Check for the presence of a box in any of these adjacent rooms: ...</p> <p>[Answer] blue, green, yellow ❌</p> </td> <td> <p>The room with 4 red balls is room 27. <u>The rooms next to it are 54, and 25.</u> Among these rooms, the boxes present are: ...</p> <p>[Answer] None ❌</p> </td> <td> <p>[Query] Find the rooms that are connected to the room 27 through a door.</p> <pre> for node in G.nodes: if G.nodes[node]['type'] == 'door': neighbors = list(G.neighbors(node)) if room_id in neighbors: connected_doors.append(node) # Find the other room connected by this door other_room = [n for n in neighbors if n != room_id] if other_room: connected_rooms.append(other_room[0]) </pre> <p>Door ID: 7; Other room ID: 34</p> <p>...</p> <p>[Answer] green. ✅</p> </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	0-CoT	CoT	RwR(ours)	<p>1. Identify the room with 4 red balls: ...</p> <p>2. Determine the rooms adjacent to room 27: - Room 27 is connected to <u>room 54 (door 28)</u>, room 34 (door 8), and <u>room 10 (door 24)</u>.</p> <p>3. Check for the presence of a box in any of these adjacent rooms: ...</p> <p>[Answer] blue, green, yellow ❌</p>	<p>The room with 4 red balls is room 27. <u>The rooms next to it are 54, and 25.</u> Among these rooms, the boxes present are: ...</p> <p>[Answer] None ❌</p>
0-CoT	CoT	RwR(ours)				
<p>1. Identify the room with 4 red balls: ...</p> <p>2. Determine the rooms adjacent to room 27: - Room 27 is connected to <u>room 54 (door 28)</u>, room 34 (door 8), and <u>room 10 (door 24)</u>.</p> <p>3. Check for the presence of a box in any of these adjacent rooms: ...</p> <p>[Answer] blue, green, yellow ❌</p>	<p>The room with 4 red balls is room 27. <u>The rooms next to it are 54, and 25.</u> Among these rooms, the boxes present are: ...</p> <p>[Answer] None ❌</p>	<p>[Query] Find the rooms that are connected to the room 27 through a door.</p> <pre> for node in G.nodes: if G.nodes[node]['type'] == 'door': neighbors = list(G.neighbors(node)) if room_id in neighbors: connected_doors.append(node) # Find the other room connected by this door other_room = [n for n in neighbors if n != room_id] if other_room: connected_rooms.append(other_room[0]) </pre> <p>Door ID: 7; Other room ID: 34</p> <p>...</p> <p>[Answer] green. ✅</p>				

(a) Baseline Hallucination: Spatial layout understanding.

<p>Cropped Environment</p> <p>Rooms & Blue Boxes Node IDs</p>	<p>Q: find the color of the ball in a room next to the room with 3 blue box</p>					
	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>0-CoT</th> <th>CoT</th> <th>RwR(ours)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td> <p>Identify the room with 3 blue boxes: <u>Room 26 has blue boxes with IDs 17 and 42; Room 33 has blue boxes with IDs 30...</u></p> <p><u>None of the rooms have exactly 3 blue boxes.</u> ...</p> <p>[Answer] None ❌</p> </td> <td> <p>The room with 3 blue boxes is <u>room 33.</u> The rooms next to it are ...</p> <p>[Answer] Gray ❌</p> </td> <td> <p>[Query] Find the room that contains 4 gray keys</p> <pre> # Iterate through all nodes to find rooms for node in G.nodes: if G.nodes[node]['type'] == 'room': room_id = node grey_key_count = 0 # Check all items in the room for neighbor in G.neighbors(room_id): if G.nodes[neighbor]['type'] == 'key' and G.nodes[neighbor]['color'] == 'grey': grey_key_count += 1 # Check if the room contains exactly 4 grey keys if grey_key_count == 4: target_room_id = room_id; break </pre> <p>Room that contains 3 blue boxes: 26</p> <p>...</p> <p>[Answer] green. ✅</p> </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	0-CoT	CoT	RwR(ours)	<p>Identify the room with 3 blue boxes: <u>Room 26 has blue boxes with IDs 17 and 42; Room 33 has blue boxes with IDs 30...</u></p> <p><u>None of the rooms have exactly 3 blue boxes.</u> ...</p> <p>[Answer] None ❌</p>	<p>The room with 3 blue boxes is <u>room 33.</u> The rooms next to it are ...</p> <p>[Answer] Gray ❌</p>
0-CoT	CoT	RwR(ours)				
<p>Identify the room with 3 blue boxes: <u>Room 26 has blue boxes with IDs 17 and 42; Room 33 has blue boxes with IDs 30...</u></p> <p><u>None of the rooms have exactly 3 blue boxes.</u> ...</p> <p>[Answer] None ❌</p>	<p>The room with 3 blue boxes is <u>room 33.</u> The rooms next to it are ...</p> <p>[Answer] Gray ❌</p>	<p>[Query] Find the room that contains 4 gray keys</p> <pre> # Iterate through all nodes to find rooms for node in G.nodes: if G.nodes[node]['type'] == 'room': room_id = node grey_key_count = 0 # Check all items in the room for neighbor in G.neighbors(room_id): if G.nodes[neighbor]['type'] == 'key' and G.nodes[neighbor]['color'] == 'grey': grey_key_count += 1 # Check if the room contains exactly 4 grey keys if grey_key_count == 4: target_room_id = room_id; break </pre> <p>Room that contains 3 blue boxes: 26</p> <p>...</p> <p>[Answer] green. ✅</p>				

(b) Baseline Hallucination: Spatial counting problem.

Figure 8: **Qualitative demonstration on how *SG-RwR* avoids hallucination.** We show how baselines might hallucinate under the following subtasks: (a) Interpreting spatial layout from the scene graphs, where they identify the incorrect neighbor rooms; (b) Addressing the counting problem under spatial constraint, where they miscount the number of a target item type in the room. *SG-RwR* is able to avoid the hallucination via code-writing, which filters and processes the graph information more reliably.