
Graph-R1: Unleashing LLM Reasoning with NP-Hard Graph Problems

Yuyao Wang*, Bowen Liu*, Jianheng Tang, Nuo Chen, Yuhan Li, Qifan Zhang, Jia Li†
Hong Kong University of Science and Technology (Guangzhou)
✉ Primary contact: jialeee@ust.hk

Abstract

Reasoning Large Language Models (RLLMs) have recently achieved remarkable progress on complex reasoning tasks, largely enabled by their long chain-of-thought (**Long CoT**) capabilities. However, developing these Long CoT behaviors relies heavily on post-training with high-quality datasets, which are typically costly and human-curated (e.g., mathematics and code), leaving **scalable** alternatives unexplored. In this work, we introduce **NP-hard (NPH) graph problems** as a novel synthetic training corpus, as they inherently require deep reasoning, extensive exploration, and reflective strategies—the core characteristics of Long CoT reasoning. Building on this insight, we develop a two-stage post-training framework: (i) Long CoT Supervised Fine-Tuning (SFT) on rejection-sampled NPH graph instances, which substantially enhances reasoning depth, and (ii) Reinforcement Learning (RL) with a fine-grained reward design, which sharpens reasoning efficiency. Our flagship model, **Graph-R1-7B**, demonstrates strong generalization across mathematics, coding, STEM, and logic, and surpasses QwQ-32B on NPH graph problems in both accuracy and reasoning efficiency. These results position NPH graph problems as an effective and scalable resource for advancing Long CoT reasoning in LLMs, opening a new frontier for LLM post-training. Our implementation is available at <https://github.com/Graph-Reasoner/Graph-R1>, with models and datasets hosted in our Hugging Face collection HKUST-DSAIL/Graph-R1.

1 Introduction

Reasoning Large Language Models (RLLMs) [20, 32–34, 16, 9] have demonstrated significant performance leaps in complex reasoning tasks such as mathematics and coding. A defining characteristic that distinguishes these RLLMs from traditional LLMs is their long chain-of-thought (**Long CoT**) capabilities, which enable more detailed and iterative processes of exploration and reflection, thereby enhancing performance on intricate problems [7]. As a result, scaling Long CoT capabilities in general reasoning tasks has become a central focus in recent LLM research.

The emergence of Long CoT abilities in RLLMs primarily stems from post-training. Extensive efforts have focused on post-training strategies, with Supervised Fine-Tuning (SFT), Reinforcement Learning (RL), or their combination being proven effective [16]. Specifically, SFT allows LLMs to imitate advanced reasoning behaviors through step-by-step supervision, while RL encourages self-learning with only question-answer pairs, and their combination often yields superior results.

Despite the growing interest in post-training strategies, the role of **training corpora in eliciting Long CoT behavior** remains relatively underexplored. In domains such as math and coding, high-quality

*Equal contribution

†Corresponding author

data often rely on costly human curation. Therefore, exploring new training corpora that are both **synthetically scalable** and capable of inducing Long CoT behaviors is a promising direction.

According to [7], Long CoT behaviors manifest in three critical dimensions: **(1) Deep Reasoning**, requiring logical depth to sustain extended reasoning chains; **(2) Extensive Exploration**, involving transitions from known to unknown reasoning paths and generation of uncertain or parallel logic; and **(3) Feasible Reflection**, encompassing self-correction, refinement, and feedback on logical structures. To induce such behaviors in LLMs, we seek training corpora that either *demonstrate* these patterns (for imitation-based SFT) or *stimulate* them (for self-learning via RL).

We identify **NP-hard (NPH) graph problems** as particularly well-suited for this purpose, owing to the following properties. First, NPH graph problems exhibit exponential worst-case complexity, meaning that even small-scale instances can require extremely long reasoning chains—an excellent match for the demands of **Deep Reasoning**. Second, the absence of known polynomial-time solutions forces the model to autonomously explore unknown optimal strategies, fostering **Extensive Exploration**. This extensive exploration is further enriched by the intrinsic complexity of graph problems, which elicits diverse reasoning patterns, including topological analysis, logical deduction, enumeration, precise computation, and case decomposition [51]. Third, due to the diversity of graph structures and the availability of brute-force algorithms for small-scale NPH graph problems, these tasks enable scalable generation of solution-verifiable synthetic datasets, thereby facilitating **Feasible Reflection** and enabling large-scale post-training. To validate these theoretical advantages, we conduct empirical experiments using QwQ-32B [45] on small-scale NPH graph problems. After applying rejection sampling based on answer correctness, the resulting samples exhibit an **average length exceeding 11k tokens**—more than **2.3× longer** than the widely used high-quality Long CoT dataset s1K [28], whose average length is only 4.7k tokens. This substantial length difference underscores the potential of NPH graph problems to elicit stronger Long CoT capabilities in LLMs.

Building on these insights, we propose a novel two-stage framework that leverages NPH graph problems to enhance the Long CoT capabilities of LLMs. In the first stage, we perform **Long CoT Supervised Fine-Tuning (SFT)** on base models (Qwen2.5-7B-Instruct-1M [44] and Qwen2.5-1.5B [43]) using small-scale NPH graph problems generated by prompting QwQ-32B [45] and applying rejection sampling based on correctness. This stage substantially increases both the response length and performance across diverse complex reasoning tasks. However, we also observe that the model exhibits severe reasoning redundancy, which not only undermines reasoning efficiency but also leads to significant performance degradation on certain tasks. This motivates the introduction of the second training stage. In the second stage, we apply **Reinforcement Learning (RL)** to promote more efficient and broadly applicable Long CoT reasoning. We design a fine-grained, outcome-based reward function that incorporates: (1) a repetition penalty to directly reduce redundant reasoning, (2) a graph-specific solution quality reward to encourage concise yet effective solutions, and (3) a format reward to promote structured reasoning. To control computational cost, we adopt Group Relative Policy Optimization (GRPO) [40] combined with a budget-aware curriculum learning strategy. This stage produces our Graph-R1-series models: Graph-R1-7B and Graph-R1-1.5B.

Our **Graph-R1-7B** model demonstrates significantly enhanced Long CoT capabilities, evidenced by strong generalization across diverse complex reasoning tasks. We examine this generalization along two dimensions: (1) *In-task generalization*: Although trained exclusively on small-scale graph problems, Graph-R1-7B achieves a remarkable $16\times$ improvement on large-scale instances, even outperforming the much larger model QwQ-32B. This indicates that our model has learned generalizable reasoning strategies rather than memorizing specific solutions. (2) *Cross-domain generalization*: Graph-R1-7B attains notable gains in other complex reasoning domains, including mathematics, coding, STEM, and logical reasoning. Beyond these explicit improvements on general reasoning tasks, we also uncover implicit evidence that Graph-R1-7B has genuinely advanced its Long CoT capabilities: (1) a substantial increase in response length, aligning with the *Deep Reasoning* characteristic of Long CoT; (2) significant improvements in *pass@k*, suggesting a more diverse exploration space consistent with *Extensive Exploration*; (3) a marked rise in reflection frequency, corresponding to the *Feasible Reflection* feature of Long CoT.

In summary, our main contributions are as follows:

- We are **the first to introduce NP-hard graph problems as a vehicle for eliciting Long CoT capabilities** in LLMs during the post-training stage.

- We propose a novel two-stage post-training framework that combines Long CoT SFT guided by rejection-sampled NP-hard graph instances, and RL with a fine-grained reward design, thereby effectively fostering both effective and efficient Long CoT reasoning.
- We empirically demonstrate that our flagship model, Graph-R1-7B, exhibits strong Long CoT capabilities, achieving superior generalization across mathematics, coding, STEM, and logic, while outperforming QwQ-32B on NP-hard graph problems in both accuracy and reasoning efficiency.
- We conduct comprehensive experiments to evaluate the contribution of each component in our framework, which provide key insights into scalable post-training strategies for improving the complex reasoning abilities of LLMs.




Figure 1: Overview of Graph-R1.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 NP-Hard Graph Problems

NP-hard (NPH) graph problems constitute a set of computationally intractable challenges in theoretical computer science, characterized by exponential computational complexity in worst-case scenarios and the absence of efficient polynomial-time algorithmic solutions. We select three representative NPH graph problems from GraphArena [42]: Graph Edit Distance (GED), Traveling Salesman Problem (TSP), and Maximum Clique Problem (MCP). These tasks are chosen for their **structural** and **operational diversity**: GED evaluates the similarity between graph pairs via edit operations,

TSP identifies optimal paths in weighted graphs, and MCP seeks dense substructures in unweighted graphs. This diversity minimizes overlap in solution strategies and graph characteristics, thereby introducing a rich variety of reasoning paradigms. The remaining three NPH graph problems in GraphArena are not included in our training set, as they are closely related to the selected ones: the Maximum Independent Set (MIS) and MCP are equivalent via graph complementation; MIS and Minimum Vertex Cover (MVC) are complementary within the same graph; and there exists a quantitative relationship between the Maximum Common Subgraph (MCS) and GED.

The formal definitions of these tasks are as follows:

1. **Graph Edit Distance (GED):** Given two graphs $G_1 = (V_1, E_1)$ and $G_2 = (V_2, E_2)$, the Graph Edit Distance is defined as the minimum cost sequence of edit operations (insertions, deletions, or substitutions of nodes or edges) required to transform G_1 into G_2 [39].
2. **Traveling Salesman Problem (TSP):** The Traveling Salesman Problem seeks to determine the shortest possible cycle that visits each vertex exactly once and returns to the origin in a weighted graph $G = (V, E)$ [12].
3. **Maximum Clique Problem (MCP):** The Maximum Clique Problem involves finding the largest subset of vertices $C \subseteq V$ in an unweighted graph $G = (V, E)$ where every pair of vertices in C is connected by an edge [4].

2.2 Graph Serialization Format

We convert graph structures into a human-readable text format following the well-established methodology introduced in GraphArena. This approach ensures that the language model receives all necessary structural information—nodes, edges, and their attributes—in a simple, sequential format. Here is a condensed example for TSP, while the full templates are presented in Appendix A.3.

Prompts 2.2.1: A condensed example for graph serialization format

```
- Airports to visit: BVC, URA, SMR, KOK, MTV, TFF, FLN, YZF
- Travel distances (in kilometers) between each pair of airports:
BVC to KOK: 6401
FLN to YZF: 11826
```

3 Methodology

Our method consists of two stages: Long Chain-of-Thought (CoT) Supervised Fine-Tuning (SFT) and Reinforcement Learning (RL). The SFT stage first equips the model with Long CoT reasoning capabilities, while the RL stage is further applied to enhance reasoning efficiency.

3.1 Long CoT Supervised Fine-Tuning

Long CoT Supervised Fine-Tuning (SFT) consists of two components: (1) constructing a Long CoT reasoning dataset via distillation, and (2) training the model through SFT to acquire a systematic, step-by-step long reasoning paradigm from this dataset.

3.1.1 Long CoT Dataset Construction

We construct a Long CoT dataset comprising 9,000 samples by prompting QwQ-32B with NP-hard graph problems and applying **rejection sampling** [48] to retain only those with correct answers. Each sample is a QA tuple (G, x, r, y) , where G denotes the graph structure, x is the task-specific question, r contains the CoT reasoning path, and y is the final answer. The rejection sampling process is adapted from the validation pipeline of GraphArena, ensuring that only well-formed, feasible, and correct solutions are preserved through a multi-round quality control procedure:

1. Response Extraction: We first parse **structured solutions** rather than purely numerical answers from the LLM outputs using regular expressions. Responses with formatting errors that prevent successful parsing are immediately discarded as infeasible. For NP-hard graph problem evaluation, structured solutions provide finer granularity and higher reliability compared to numerical answers. The expected formats are:




Figure 2: Methodology of Graph-R1.

- **TSP**: A list representing the visiting route.
- **GED**: A list specifying the node mapping between two graphs.
- **MCP**: A list of node IDs in the clique.

2. Feasibility Check: Parsed solutions are then verified against task-specific constraints to ensure logical validity:

- **TSP**: All nodes must be visited exactly once, and the path must form a valid tour.
- **GED**: The node mapping must cover all nodes without repetition.
- **MCP**: The returned nodes must form a clique (i.e., a complete subgraph).

3. Correctness Check: Solutions that pass the feasibility check are further validated by an algorithmic verifier. Objective values are compared with the ground truth—rather than raw strings—to accommodate semantically equivalent but syntactically different outputs:

- **TSP**: The total path length must match the ground truth.
- **GED**: The computed edit distance must equal the ground truth value.
- **MCP**: The clique size must match the known maximum.

Only responses passing all three stages are retained, ensuring that the resulting SFT dataset exclusively consists of well-structured, feasible, and correct examples.

In addition to correctness, although all samples involve small-scale graphs, the dataset spans a wide range of problem complexities. We define problem complexity based on the number of nodes in the graph, and maintain a balanced distribution across different complexity levels.

This construction process guarantees the **quantity**, **quality**, and **difficulty** of our Long CoT dataset, thereby providing a solid data foundation for the subsequent SFT stage.

3.1.2 Supervised Fine-Tuning

Following dataset construction, we conduct Supervised Fine-Tuning (SFT) to endow the model with Long Chain-of-Thought (CoT) reasoning capabilities. Given a graph G and a question x as input, the model is trained to generate a reasoning path r and subsequently the final answer y . We adopt a

standard language modeling objective, defined as:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{SFT}} = - \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^{M_i} \log P(r_{i,j}, y_i | G_i, x_i; \theta), \quad (1)$$

where N is the total number of QA pairs, M_i denotes the number of reasoning steps in the CoT sequence of the i -th sample, and θ represents the model parameters.

This stage not only drives the model to produce long, informative reasoning chains capable of solving NP-hard graph problems, but also implicitly encourages the development of systematic, step-by-step reasoning skills for tackling general complex reasoning tasks.

3.2 Reinforcement Learning

The goal of the RL stage is to address the reasoning inefficiency that emerge after the Long CoT SFT stage. By designing fine-grained reward functions, we guide the model to reduce redundant reasoning while maintaining solution quality, thereby producing more efficient reasoning paths.

3.2.1 Fine-grained Reward Design

Our reward function targets reasoning efficiency from three complementary perspectives. First, we directly penalize specific redundancy patterns in reasoning, which we implement via the *repetition reward*. Second, we implicitly promote efficient reasoning by rewarding high-quality solutions generated within a fixed context window, implemented as the *solution quality reward*. Third, we encourage outputs that follow a specific structured format to reduce disorganized reasoning, implemented via the *format reward*. Formally, the reward function consists of three core components: *repetition reward*, *solution quality reward*, and *format reward*.

Repetition Reward Effectively detecting and mitigating redundancy in Long CoT reasoning—particularly overthinking—has recently attracted significant attention in the research community. However, because overthinking is highly context-dependent, it is challenging to identify using efficient, robust algorithms. Therefore, most existing RL-based approaches instead adopt a response length reward to indirectly discourage overthinking by penalizing overly long responses [50]. While this method can shorten answers, it may also limit the model’s capacity for deep exploration, as reasoning length is not inherently correlated with redundancy.

We therefore focus on reducing overthinking based on the *content* of the reasoning process rather than its *length*. Through detailed analysis of model outputs, we identify a prevalent and detrimental overthinking pattern—*repetition*—and develop an efficient algorithm for its detection. Repetition refers to the phenomenon that LLM repeatedly generates the same statements until it reaches the context length limit. Such repetition not only undermines reasoning efficiency but also disrupts logical progression, often leading to lower-quality solutions.

We define repetition as any substring of at least 20 characters repeated consecutively 5 times within a model response. This parameter setting, derived from empirical observations, effectively captures genuine repetition while avoiding false positives on valid reasoning. We adopt a linear-time repetition detection algorithm based on suffix trees [3, 10] (see Appendix C.2). When repetition is detected, we apply a fixed penalty of -1 to the total reward.

Solution Quality Reward We assess the quality of solutions generated within context window, thereby indirectly encouraging concise yet effective reasoning. Our maximum limit for response length is 8192 tokens, which provides sufficient space for broad exploration while ensuring timely convergence to a solution. Evaluation follows similar principles as in Long CoT dataset construction, involving detailed verification of the solution. Specifically, model responses are categorized into three types: *optimal*, *suboptimal*, and *hallucinated*. Optimal solutions yield the exact correct answer and receive the highest reward of 2.0. Suboptimal solutions satisfy the core problem constraints (i.e., pass the feasibility check) but fail to achieve optimality, often due to premature termination or inefficient exploration. For these, we assign a reward scaled between 0 and 0.5 based on the ratio between the achieved objective value and the optimal value (see Appendix C.1 for details). Hallucinated solutions that violate fundamental problem constraints (e.g., invalid tours in the TSP, infeasible edit

sequences in GED, or non-clique structures in MCP) are penalized with a reward of -1 to discourage unproductive exploration by the model.

Format Reward We assign a format reward of 1.0 if the model response begins with the token "`<think>`". This encourages the model to show explicit reasoning phase before producing the final answer, thereby reducing disorganized thought patterns and improving overall reasoning coherence.

3.2.2 GRPO with Curriculum Learning

Given computational constraints, we adopt Group Relative Policy Optimization (GRPO) for its strong performance and low memory consumption, achieved by replacing the critic network with group-based advantage estimation. We follow the standard implementation from DeepSeek-R1 [16], where it has shown strong empirical results.

To further enhance efficiency, we integrate curriculum learning by stratifying training samples into five difficulty levels based on graph size, training sequentially from easiest to hardest. This staged design ensures homogeneous token requirements within each phase, enabling precise budget control. For example, in TSP tasks ranging from 5 to 9 nodes, a mixed-difficulty setting would require the maximum context window (8192 tokens) throughout training. In contrast, our curriculum learning progressively scales the window from 4096 to 8192 tokens, reducing RL computational cost by approximately 30% without compromising performance.

4 Experiments

4.1 Experimental Protocols

In this section, we conduct extensive experiments to evaluate Graph-R1, guided by the following research questions: **-RQ1** How does Graph-R1 perform in general reasoning tasks? **-RQ2** How does Graph-R1 perform in NP-hard graph problems? **-RQ3** How does Graph-R1 elicit the Long Chain-of-Thought (CoT) capabilities of LLMs?

4.1.1 Datasets and Metrics

We evaluate our approach by assessing its performance on a wide range of complex reasoning tasks. The evaluated tasks fall into two categories: (1) **Unseen complex reasoning problems** for testing the model’s generalization ability, including AIME25/24 [30], MATH-500 [23], GSM8K [8], and AQUA [14] for mathematical reasoning; CRUX [15] for code reasoning; MMLU_STEM [18] for scientific reasoning; Zebra-grid [24] for logical reasoning; Hamilton Path for NP-complete problem reasoning [6]; and Shortest Distance Problem and Common Neighbor Problem for graph reasoning [42]. (2) **Seen NP-hard graph problems** from the training stage, including TSP, GED, and MCP provided by GraphArena [42]. The evaluation covers two settings: *small-scale* and *large-scale* problems. Notably, only small-scale samples are used during training, while large-scale datasets are employed to assess the model’s transferability to broader problem instances and its potential for practical applications.

For most unseen complex reasoning problems, we adopt the evaluation metrics used in their original benchmarks, which are primarily single-test accuracy. However, for the exceptionally challenging mathematical datasets AIME25/24 and MATH-500, we employ more robust metrics, namely *avg@k* and *pass@k*. *avg@k* computes the average performance across all k attempts, while *pass@k* measures the probability that at least one of k attempts is correct. For the seen NP-hard graph problems, the evaluation metrics include *accuracy* and *feasibility*. Accuracy measures the probability of obtaining the optimal solution, and feasibility measures the probability that the solution satisfies the basic problem constraints. Further details on the datasets and metrics are provided in Appendix A.1.

4.1.2 Baselines

For evaluation on unseen complex reasoning problems, we adopt Qwen2.5-7B-Instruct-1M, the base model of our Graph-R1-7B, as the baseline. For evaluation on seen NP-hard graph problems, we consider both general-purpose language models and graph-oriented models. The general-purpose models include: (i) closed-source models, GPT-4o [31] and Claude-3.5-Sonnet [2]; (ii) open-source reasoning models, QwQ-32B [45], S1.1-7B [29], and DeepScaleR-1.5B-Preview [27]; and (iii)

open-source non-reasoning models Llama3-70B-Instruct [1] and our base models (Qwen2.5-7B-Instruct-1M [44] and Qwen2.5-1.5B [43]). The graph-oriented models include Llama-8B-GT [19] and Graphwiz-7B-DPO [6]. Additional details about these baselines are provided in Appendix A.2.

4.1.3 Implementation Details

We fine-tune Qwen2.5-7B-Instruct-1M and Qwen2.5-1.5B to obtain Graph-R1-7B and Graph-R1-1.5B, respectively, using PyTorch on 8 NVIDIA H100 (80GB) GPUs. In the Long CoT SFT stage, we leverage Ring Flash Attention within the 360-LLaMA-Factory framework [17] for efficient LLM fine-tuning. In this stage, we employ a batch size of 8 and a cosine learning rate scheduler with an initial rate of 1×10^{-5} and a warmup ratio of 0.1, training the model for 2 epochs. To accommodate long-chain reasoning, we set the context length to 128,000 tokens and a zigzag-ring sequence parallel size of 8. In the RL stage, we adopt the Verl framework [41] with the following fixed hyper-parameters: a batch size of 128, a PPO mini-batch size of 32, a rollout number of 8, a sequence parallel size of 4, a KL coefficient of 1×10^{-3} , and a learning rate of 1×10^{-6} . Other hyper-parameters are dynamically adjusted during training. The training follows a curriculum learning strategy with five stages, each trained for a single epoch. In each stage, we construct a mixed dataset containing 3,000 training samples per task, selected to match the target difficulty level. For TSP and GED, difficulty levels 1–5 correspond to instances with 5–9 nodes (increasing by one node per level). For MCP, levels 1–5 correspond to graphs with 5–6, 7–8, 9–10, 11–12, and 13–14 nodes, respectively. The maximum response lengths for the five stages are 4,096, 5,120, 6,144, 7,168, and 8,192 tokens, respectively. The temperature is fixed at 1.0 for the first three stages and increased to 1.1 and 1.2 in the fourth and fifth stages, respectively. More implementation details can be found in Appendix A.3.

4.2 Main Results

4.2.1 Effect on General Reasoning Tasks (RQ1)

Table 1 presents a detailed comparison between our Graph-R1-7B model and its base counterpart, Qwen2.5-7B-Instruct-1M, across various reasoning tasks, including mathematics, coding, logical reasoning, STEM, NP-complete problem reasoning, and graph reasoning. Overall, Graph-R1-7B attains an average accuracy of 61.0%, representing a substantial improvement of **10.6%** over the base model’s 50.4%. A closer inspection of the results reveals three primary capability enhancements:

- (1) Mathematical and Symbolic Reasoning.** On AQUA, a multiple-choice mathematical word problem benchmark, Graph-R1-7B achieves a 13.3% absolute gain (65.7% vs. 52.4%), indicating a marked improvement in multi-step algebraic reasoning from natural language descriptions. Furthermore, on the challenging logic dataset Zebra-grid, our model delivers a 21.4% relative gain (11.9% vs. 9.8%), validating enhanced deductive reasoning for constraint satisfaction puzzles. To further examine this ability, we evaluate both models on a set of challenging mathematical reasoning benchmarks requiring advanced symbolic manipulation and long-horizon reasoning, namely AIME25, AIME24, and MATH-500, using both *avg@k* and *pass@k* metrics. As shown in Table 2, Graph-R1-7B surpasses its base model in 4 out of 6 metrics and achieves a higher overall average score (39.2% vs. 37.9%). The improvements are particularly evident in AIME25 (*pass@64*: +6.6%) and MATH-500 (*pass@8*: +1.8%), indicating stronger generalization to difficult competition problems. We attribute these gains to three factors: (i) the natural-language formulation of NP-hard problems in our training data, grounded in realistic contexts (e.g., TSP on flight route networks, GED on molecular graphs, MCP on academic collaboration networks), which strengthens the model’s ability to abstract complex scenarios into solvable mathematical structures; (ii) the inherent computational intensity of NP-hard tasks, which fosters numerical precision and robust comparison-based reasoning; and (iii) the requirement for progressive optimization under complex constraints, aligning closely with the multi-step deductive paradigms observed in mathematical problem solving.
- (2) Cross-domain Knowledge Integration.** Graph-R1-7B also demonstrates superior scientific knowledge application, achieving an 11.8% relative gain on MMLU_STEM. This improvement reflects the model’s enhanced ability to integrate domain knowledge with reasoning strategies, enabling more accurate and contextually grounded decision-making in technical disciplines.
- (3) Structured and Relational Reasoning.** Graph-R1-7B demonstrates substantial advancements on previously unseen graph reasoning tasks, achieving an accuracy of 52.0% on the Shortest Distance task (compared to 29.6% for its base model) and 87.0% on the Common Neighbor task (compared

to 54.0%). Moreover, for the Hamilton Path problem—an NP-complete task characterized by exponential complexity—the model attains a 7.5% relative improvement. These results collectively highlight the model’s enhanced ability to operate on relational representations, maintaining high reasoning performance even under conditions of substantial combinatorial complexity.

While the improvements are substantial in most domains, some tasks show relatively modest gains. For example, on the code reasoning benchmark CRUX, the performance increase is marginal (+1.3%), likely due to the training corpus focusing exclusively on graph-related algorithms without explicit coverage of broader programming patterns.

Table 1: Performance comparison with the base model on various complex reasoning tasks. Cells highlighted indicate the best results. †Qwen2.5-7B-1M refers to Qwen2.5-7B-Instruct-1M.

Models	Mathematics		Code	Logic	STEM	NP-Complete	Graph		Avg.
	AQUA	GSM8K	CRUX	Zebra-grid	MMLU_STEM	Hamilton Path	Distance	Neighbor	
Qwen2.5-7B-1M†	52.4	86.1	58.5	9.8	64.6	48.2	29.6	54.0	50.4
Graph-R1-7B	65.7	87.1	59.8	11.9	72.2	51.8	52.0	87.0	61.0

Table 2: Performance comparison with the base model on challenging mathematical datasets. Cells highlighted indicate best results. †Qwen2.5-7B-1M refers to Qwen2.5-7B-Instruct-1M.

Models	Mathematics						Avg.
	AIME25(pass@64)	AIME25(avg@64)	AIME24(pass@64)	AIME24(avg@64)	MATH-500(pass@8)	MATH-500(avg@8)	
Qwen2.5-7B-1M†	26.7	4.2	33.3	7.6	86.2	69.6	37.9
Graph-R1-7B	33.3	5.8	30.0	7.0	88.0	71.2	39.2

4.2.2 Effect on NP-hard Graph Problems (RQ2)

We also evaluate our Graph-R1-series models on NP-hard graph problems, which pose major challenges for LLMs due to their high complexity. Since our models are trained exclusively on NP-hard graph problems, we benchmark them not only against base models but also against state-of-the-art reasoning-oriented and graph-oriented language models. Two settings are considered: (1) small-scale graphs, consistent with training, and (2) large-scale graphs, which are substantially more difficult and used to assess generalization and real-world applicability.

Results are reported in Table 3 and Table 4. Graph-R1-7B surpasses all baselines, including the cutting-edge reasoning model QwQ-32B and the graph-specialized language model LLaMA-8B-GT, achieving the highest average accuracies of 85.7% and 27.0% on small- and large-scale graphs, respectively. Even Graph-R1-1.5B outperforms most open-source baselines, including much larger models such as LLaMA3-70B-Instruct. These results demonstrate that our models deliver strong NP-hard graph reasoning capabilities beyond the limitations of parameter size.

Although trained only on small-scale tasks, our models generalize well to large-scale ones. For instance, Graph-R1-7B improves accuracy by 16× (from 1.6% to 27.0%) over its base model, even surpassing its teacher model QwQ-32B. This indicates genuine generalization rather than memorization, validating the effectiveness of our approach in stimulating complex reasoning. While closed-source models exhibit slightly higher success rates in producing feasible solutions on large-scale tasks, our models achieve notably higher accuracy. This suggests a trade-off: closed-source models may favor constraint propagation for ensuring feasibility, whereas our models emphasize deeper exploration of the solution space to improve accuracy.

Beyond accuracy, the Graph-R1 series also demonstrates strong token efficiency. As shown in Figure 3, Graph-R1-7B requires only 8,264 tokens on average, a 47.3% reduction compared to QwQ-32B (15,684 tokens). A full comparison against all baselines is provided in Appendix B.1, highlighting the favorable balance between accuracy and efficiency achieved by our models.

Table 3: Performance comparison of baseline models on **small-scale** TSP, GED, and MCP tasks (Accuracy (%) and Feasibility (%)). Acc. and Fea. denote Accuracy and Feasibility, respectively. Best results are **bold**; second-best are underlined.

Category	Model	TSP		GED		MCP		Average	
		Acc.	Fea.	Acc.	Fea.	Acc.	Fea.	Acc.	Fea.
Closed-source	Claude-3.5-sonnet	45.4	100.0	37.2	94.2	62.2	88.0	48.3	94.1
	GPT-4o	44.2	<u>99.8</u>	32.6	98.6	62.4	79.6	46.4	92.7
Reasoning	QwQ-32B	<u>89.4</u>	100.0	70.2	99.2	<u>96.2</u>	<u>97.0</u>	<u>85.3</u>	98.7
	S1.1-7B	33.8	56.4	22.8	81.0	46.2	80.4	34.3	72.6
	DeepScaleR-1.5B	23.2	44.6	21.0	64.6	17.0	66.4	20.4	58.5
Non-reasoning	LLaMA3-70B-Ins	23.2	<u>99.8</u>	31.6	97.0	42.8	44.2	32.5	80.3
	Qwen2.5-7B-Ins-1M	19.2	62.6	23.8	72.8	34.0	60.2	25.7	65.2
	Qwen2.5-1.5B	2.2	12.6	6.4	30.2	5.4	34.0	4.7	25.6
Graph-oriented	LLaMA-8B-GT	39.2	/	46.0	/	95.2	/	60.1	/
	GraphWiz-7B-DPO	0.4	1.0	2.4	17.0	1.6	39.6	1.5	19.2
Graph-R1	Graph-R1-7B (<i>Ours</i>)	91.8	99.2	<u>68.2</u>	<u>97.8</u>	97.0	99.2	85.7	98.7
	Graph-R1-1.5B (<i>Ours</i>)	44.6	60.2	28.4	62.8	53.0	95.4	42.0	72.6

Table 4: Performance comparison of baseline models on **large-scale** TSP, GED, and MCP tasks (Accuracy (%) and Feasibility (%)). Acc. and Fea. denote Accuracy and Feasibility, respectively. Best results are **bold**; second-best are underlined.

Category	Model	TSP		GED		MCP		Average	
		Acc.	Fea.	Acc.	Fea.	Acc.	Fea.	Acc.	Fea.
Closed-source	Claude-3.5-sonnet	2.8	<u>99.6</u>	3.4	83.6	19.0	<u>79.8</u>	8.4	87.7
	GPT-4o	0.8	<u>95.6</u>	2.4	97.2	15.2	<u>63.2</u>	6.1	<u>85.3</u>
Reasoning	QwQ-32B	<u>7.6</u>	100.0	7.4	<u>94.0</u>	64.6	74.6	<u>26.5</u>	89.5
	S1.1-7B	0.0	21.0	1.0	42.0	2.2	51.0	1.1	38.0
	DeepScaleR-1.5B	0.0	1.6	0.6	23.6	0.4	39.8	0.3	21.7
Non-reasoning	LLaMA3-70B-Ins	0.0	84.6	1.8	82.0	10.6	16.4	4.1	61.0
	Qwen2.5-7B-Ins-1M	1.2	58.8	1.2	58.8	2.4	30.2	1.6	49.3
	Qwen2.5-1.5B	0.0	1.2	0.4	23.0	0.0	28.6	0.1	17.6
Graph-oriented	LLaMA-8B-GT	3.6	/	0.8	/	63.4	/	22.6	/
	GraphWiz-7B-DPO	0.0	0.0	0.0	18.0	0.0	50.8	0.0	22.9
Graph-R1	Graph-R1-7B (<i>Ours</i>)	11.2	71.0	<u>6.2</u>	<u>94.0</u>	<u>63.6</u>	81.2	27.0	82.1
	Graph-R1-1.5B (<i>Ours</i>)	1.8	33.0	3.4	85.8	21.4	64.6	8.9	61.1




Figure 3: Token efficiency compared to QwQ-32B.

4.2.3 Effect on Long CoT Capabilities (RQ3)

We further investigate whether Graph-R1 truly incentivizes the Long CoT capabilities of LLMs by examining whether our model exhibits the three core characteristics of Long CoT in complex reasoning problems: *Deep Reasoning*, *Extensive Exploration*, and *Feasible Reflection*.

Deep Reasoning To evaluate the model’s *deep reasoning* ability, we measure the average response length across various tasks, as longer reasoning chains generally reflect more thorough decomposition of problems and step-by-step verification. As shown in Table 5, Graph-R1-7B produces substantially longer responses than its base model on almost all datasets. For example, on AIME25 and AIME24, the responses are **6.6**× and **5.0**× longer, respectively, indicating a marked improvement in reasoning depth. The magnitude of increase varies by task: AQUA and GSM8K lengths roughly double, while MMLU_STEM shows a slight decrease. This variation aligns with task nature—competition-level problems such as AIME24/25 demand more elaborate reasoning, whereas MMLU_STEM emphasizes precise knowledge application. Notably, on MMLU_STEM, Graph-R1-7B achieves a higher accuracy (64.6% → 72.2%) despite shorter responses, demonstrating improved logical coherence and token efficiency. These findings confirm that Graph-R1-7B adapts its reasoning depth to task-specific demands, a core competence for maintaining *deep reasoning* within the Long CoT framework.

Table 5: Response length comparison with the base model (tokens). Cells highlighted indicate the longer ones. †Qwen2.5-7B-1M refers to Qwen2.5-7B-Instruct-1M.

Models	Mathematics					STEM	Avg.
	AIME25	AIME24	MATH-500	AQUA	GSM8K	MMLU_STEM	
Qwen2.5-7B-1M†	1113	1814	747	351	308	303	773
Graph-R1-7B	7371	9070	1982	685	642	284	3339

Extensive Exploration While deep reasoning focuses on a single reasoning path, *extensive exploration* assesses the model’s ability to search diverse solution paths and identify correct answers. We adopt *pass@k* on the most challenging mathematics datasets—AIME25, AIME24 and MATH-500—to measure the probability that at least one of *k* sampled outputs is correct. A larger *k* allows *pass@k* to better approximate the model’s upper-bound capability in exploring the solution space. To balance reliability and computational costs, we select *pass@64* for AIME25/24, and *pass@8* for MATH-500. As shown in Table 2, Graph-R1-7B achieves substantial absolute gains on AIME25 (+6.7%) and MATH-500 (+1.8%), while AIME24 shows a modest drop (-3.3%). This pattern suggests stronger exploration when tackling truly unseen problems, such as AIME25, which postdates all training data and thus requires unbiased navigation of novel solution spaces. The slight decline on AIME24 may indicate reduced reliance on memorized patterns, trading recall of past solutions for genuine exploratory reasoning. These results highlight Graph-R1-7B’s enhanced capacity for broad and flexible problem-space search, a critical aspect of *extensive exploration* in Long CoT reasoning.

Feasible Reflection Inspired by [13], we employ an LLM-as-a-judge framework to quantify the occurrence frequency of self-reflection behaviors before and after training. We select both seen and unseen tasks for observation: the TSP problem (seen during training), Zebra-grid (unseen) and Common Neighbor Problem (unseen). These tasks involve minimal domain-specific knowledge, thereby reducing potential confounding factors and ensuring more reliable statistics. For the TSP problem, we track the frequencies of three reflective reasoning paradigms that are crucial to its solution strategies: *verification*, *backtracking*, and *heuristic strategies*. For the logical reasoning and Common Neighbor problem, we retain the verification and backtracking categories, but adapt *heuristic strategies* to *hypothesis testing* according to the task characteristics. Figure 4 illustrates a significant increase in self-reflection frequency across all evaluated reasoning tasks. These results indicate that our approach substantially enhances the model’s ability to refine its strategies through self-reflection, providing further evidence of its effectiveness in improving Long CoT capabilities. More details of our LLM-as-a-judge framework and case study are demonstrated in Appendix B.2.




Figure 4: Self-reflection behavior statistics before and after training.

4.3 Ablation Study

Effect of Each Training Stage. We analyze the contribution of each training stage (i.e., Long CoT SFT and RL) to the model’s reasoning ability from two perspectives: *effectiveness* (solution accuracy) and *efficiency* (response length). The results are summarized in Table 6 and Table 7.

In particular, the Long CoT SFT stage substantially extends the model’s reasoning length (average response length increases from 1.1k to 11.4k tokens, a $10.4\times$ growth) and enhances its performance on complex reasoning tasks (notable improvements on 4 out of 5 mathematics benchmarks and all NP-hard graph problems). However, this stage also introduces drawbacks: on AQUA and MMLU_STEM, accuracy drops sharply while response length grows excessively. A closer examination reveals that the model tends to produce severe repetition when handling multiple-choice questions. This indicates the necessity of further refinement to make the model more broadly applicable.

The RL stage addresses these limitations and brings two key benefits: (1) Token efficiency is greatly improved while maintaining Long CoT reasoning capability. The average response length is reduced to about 4.9k tokens, which remains $4.6\times$ that of the base model (1.1k) but represents a 56.2% reduction compared to the Long CoT SFT model. (2) General reasoning ability continues to advance. On benchmarks where the Long CoT SFT model underperformed, such as AQUA and MMLU_STEM, accuracy increases substantially—even exceeding the base model by +13.3% and +7.6%, respectively. Moreover, performance on NP-hard graph problems further improves, surpassing that of the much larger QwQ-32B model.

In summary, through the two-stage process of Long CoT SFT and RL, **Graph-R1-7B** strikes an effective balance between *reasoning capability* and *token efficiency*.

Table 6: Ablation study of training stages on accuracy (%). Best results are **bold**. †Qwen2.5-7B-1M refers to Qwen2.5-7B-Instruct-1M. "(S)" and "(L)" refers to small-scale and large-scale, respectively.

Models	Mathematics				STEM		NP-Hard Graph					Avg.	
	AIME25	AIME24	MATH-500	GSM8K	AQUA	MMLU_STEM	TSP(S)	GED(S)	MCP(S)	TSP(L)	GED(L)		MCP(L)
Qwen2.5-7B-1M†	4.2	7.6	69.6	86.1	52.4	64.6	19.2	23.8	34.0	1.2	1.2	2.4	30.5
+ Long CoT SFT	6.9	8.2	71.4	89.6	9.8	16.7	82.6	60.8	85.8	4.6	5.4	33.2	39.6
+ RL(Graph-R1-7B)	5.8	7.0	71.2	87.1	65.7	72.2	91.8	68.2	97.0	11.2	6.2	63.6	53.9

Table 7: Ablation study of training stages on response length (tokens). Cells highlighted indicate best results. †Qwen2.5-7B-1M refers to Qwen2.5-7B-Instruct-1M.

Models	Mathematics				STEM		NP-Hard Graph					Avg.	
	AIME25	AIME24	MATH-500	GSM8K	AQUA	MMLU_STEM	TSP(S)	GED(S)	MCP(S)	TSP(L)	GED(L)		MCP(L)
Qwen2.5-7B-1M†	1113	1813	747	308	351	303	3614	636	521	1205	807	1682	1092
+ Long CoT SFT	10495	12267	3207	831	9325	11628	10747	16898	5948	19472	22123	13369	11359
+ RL(Graph-R1-7B)	7371	9070	1982	642	685	284	5334	4757	3024	11205	8364	6991	4976

Effect of Fine-grained Reward Function. Our fine-grained reward function substantially outperforms the binary reward baseline by simultaneously enhancing token efficiency and solution feasibility. This improvement arises from two key modifications: (1) the introduction of a *repetition reward*, which effectively reduces redundant reasoning steps; and (2) an enhanced *solution quality reward* that explicitly encourages valid sub-optimal solutions, thereby increasing the likelihood of generating outputs that satisfy complex constraints. As shown in Figure 5 and Table 8, Graph-R1-7B trained with the fine-grained reward produces more concise and effective reasoning traces. Its response length distribution becomes smoother with a markedly diminished long-tail effect, leading to a 21% reduction in average length (8264 tokens vs. 10490 tokens). At the same time, solution feasibility improves from 88.1% to 90.4%. These results confirm that the fine-grained reward not only reduces inefficiency but also strengthens the model’s ability to generate high-quality feasible solutions under complex constraints.





Figure 5: Ablation study on fine-grained reward.

Table 8: Ablation on the effect of fine-grained reward on solution feasibility of NP-hard graph problems (%), with the best results highlighted in **bold**.

Models	NP-hard Graph						Avg.
	TSP(S)	GED(S)	MCP(S)	TSP(L)	GED(L)	MCP(L)	
binary reward	98.8	98.8	98.8	56.8	87.6	87.6	88.1
fine-grained reward (Graph-R1-7B)	99.2	97.8	99.2	71.0	94.0	81.2	90.4

Effect of Curriculum Learning in Reinforcement Learning. We compare the training dynamics of curriculum learning with those of mixed-difficulty training. As shown in Figure 6, our curriculum learning strategy enhances training efficiency by reducing token consumption by approximately 30% while maintaining comparable validation performance. This improvement stems from the carefully designed progression of task difficulty, which enables more effective and adaptive budget control.



(a) Token consumption comparison.

(b) Validation performance comparison.

Figure 6: Ablation study on curriculum learning.

5 Related Work

Post-training Techniques for Reasoning Language Models. Post-training methods have become essential for enhancing the reasoning capabilities of language models. Early techniques, such as prompt engineering and few-shot learning, offered initial improvements but exhibited limited effectiveness on complex reasoning tasks [26]. In contrast, Supervised Fine-Tuning (SFT) provides a more systematic approach by guiding models to imitate reasoning patterns from curated datasets. Its effectiveness is further amplified by rejection sampling [48], which enables the automatic acquisition of large volumes of high-quality reasoning traces without additional human effort. This combination has led to substantial performance improvements on challenging reasoning benchmarks.

Subsequent methods moved beyond imitation learning. Direct Preference Optimization (DPO) [37] offers a computationally efficient means to align models with human preferences, though its effectiveness remains constrained by the quality and diversity of preference data and it struggles with exploring complex solution spaces. More recently, Reinforcement Learning (RL) has proven particularly powerful by directly optimizing for solution quality rather than mere pattern imitation. RL enables models to explore diverse reasoning strategies while receiving targeted feedback, thus facilitating continuous improvement beyond the limitations of fixed training datasets. Approaches such as Reinforcement Learning from Human Feedback (RLHF) [35] and Proximal Policy Optimization (PPO) [38] have achieved notable success in complex reasoning domains [22, 49]. To mitigate the high computational cost of standard RL methods, efficient variants have been proposed, among which Group Relative Policy Optimization (GRPO) [40] stands out by delivering superior performance while significantly reducing training overhead through relative reward comparison within sample groups. Motivated by these advances, we adopt GRPO as the reinforcement learning framework in our work.

Language Models for Graph Tasks. Recent progress in graph language models has primarily focused on leveraging LLMs to solve graph problems, with relatively few efforts examining how graph tasks themselves might serve as a training signal for enhancing general reasoning. Most existing approaches treat LLMs as task-specific solvers. For example, GraphLLM [5] integrates GNNs with LLMs via prefix tuning; GraphWiz [6] applies instruction tuning with SFT and DPO across diverse graph tasks; GraphTeam [21] formulates graph reasoning as multi-agent collaboration with retrieval and code execution; and GraphThought [19] introduces thought scaffolding for graph combinatorial optimization. While effective within their respective scopes, these methods seldom investigate how graph reasoning could generalize across domains, limiting their broader applicability.

More recently, researchers have begun to explore graph problems as a corpus for cultivating transferable reasoning ability. NLGift [52] introduces a benchmark to evaluate whether LLMs trained on synthetic graph data acquire generalizable reasoning skills, revealing that many models remain confined to pattern memorization. GraphPRM [36] leverages step-wise supervision in graph tasks to train process reward models, while GraphMind [51] employs large-scale graph corpora for continued pretraining. Both demonstrate promising transfer beyond graph reasoning tasks, yet their explanations largely remain at the level of hypothesis and lack deeper evidence on the mechanisms of transfer.

In contrast, our framework provides a more principled perspective by identifying a key driver of cross-domain generalization: the development of long-chain-of-thought (Long-CoT) reasoning ability. We show that NP-hard graph problems naturally elicit long-horizon reasoning traces, which act as an effective training signal for cultivating transferable reasoning. By coupling these traces with a Long-CoT SFT + RL pipeline, we deliver not only strong empirical improvements but also concrete evidence for the underlying mechanism of transfer. This yields a scalable path toward building LLMs with more robust and general reasoning capabilities.

6 Conclusion and Limitation

In this work, we introduce NP-hard (NPH) graph problems as a new training corpus to elicit Long CoT capabilities in LLMs. We propose a two-stage post-training framework that combines Long CoT SFT on rejection-sampled NPH graph instances with RL guided by fine-grained reward design. The resulting Graph-R1 series models demonstrate significant improvements in both effectiveness and efficiency of Long CoT reasoning, with Graph-R1-7B achieving strong generalization across multiple domains and even outperforming QwQ-32B on NPH graph problems. Our study positions NP-hard graph problems as a scalable and powerful corpus for advancing complex reasoning in LLMs.

Despite these promising results, our work has several limitations. The training corpus is restricted to only three types of NPH graph problems, constraining its diversity and scope. In addition, the training methodology relies on the widely adopted SFT+RL paradigm without exploring alternative post-training strategies. We believe these issues can be effectively addressed in future work by expanding the range of NPH problems and investigating broader training paradigms.

References

- [1] AI@Meta. Llama 3 model card. *Github*, 2024.
- [2] Anthropic. Claude 3.5 sonnet. <https://www.anthropic.com/news/claude-3-5-sonnet>, 2024.
- [3] Anselm Blumer, J. Blumer, David Haussler, R. McConnell, and Andrzej Ehrenfeucht. Linear size finite automata for the set of all subwords of a word: An outline of results. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 1987.
- [4] Immanuel M Bomze, Marco Budinich, Panos M Pardalos, and Marcello Pelillo. The maximum clique problem. In *Handbook of Combinatorial Optimization*. Springer, 1999. doi: 10.1007/978-1-4613-0303-9_1.
- [5] Ziwei Chai, Tianjie Zhang, Liang Wu, Kaiqiao Han, Xiaohai Hu, Xuanwen Huang, and Yang Yang. Graphllm: Boosting graph reasoning ability of large language model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.05845*, 2023.
- [6] Nuo Chen, Yuhan Li, Jianheng Tang, and Jia Li. Graphwiz: An instruction-following language model for graph problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.16029*, 2024.
- [7] Qiguang Chen, Libo Qin, Jinhao Liu, Dengyun Peng, Jiannan Guan, Peng Wang, Mengkang Hu, Yuhang Zhou, Te Gao, and Wanxiang Che. Towards reasoning era: A survey of long chain-of-thought for reasoning large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.09567*, 2025.
- [8] Karl Cobbe, Vineet Kosaraju, Mohammad Bavarian, Mark Chen, Heewoo Jun, Lukasz Kaiser, Matthias Plappert, Jerry Tworek, Jacob Hilton, Reiichiro Nakano, Christopher Hesse, and John Schulman. Training verifiers to solve math word problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.14168*, 2021.
- [9] G. et al. Comanici. Gemini 2.5: Pushing the frontier with advanced reasoning, multimodality, long context, and next generation agentic capabilities. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2507.06261*, 2025.
- [10] Max Crochemore. An optimal algorithm for computing the repetitions in a word. *Information Processing Letters*, 1981.
- [11] Quy-Anh Dang and Chris Ngo. Reinforcement learning for reasoning in small llms: What works and what doesn't. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.16219*, 2025.
- [12] George B Dantzig, D R Fulkerson, and Selmer M Johnson. Solution of a large-scale traveling-salesman problem. Technical Report P-510, RAND Corporation, 1954.
- [13] Kanishk Gandhi, Ayush Chakravarthy, Anikait Singh, Nathan Lile, and Noah D. Goodman. Cognitive behaviors that enable self-improving reasoners, or, four habits of highly effective stars. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.01307*, 2025.
- [14] Mononito Goswami, Vedant Sanil, Arjun Choudhry, Arvind Srinivasan, Chalisa Udompanyawit, and Artur Dubrawski. Aqua: A benchmarking tool for label quality assessment, 2024.
- [15] Alex Gu, Baptiste Rozière, Hugh Leather, Armando Solar-Lezama, Gabriel Synnaeve, and Sida I. Wang. Cruxeval: A benchmark for code reasoning, understanding and execution. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.03065*, 2024.
- [16] Daya Guo, Dejian Yang, Haowei Zhang, Junxiao Song, Ruoyu Zhang, Runxin Xu, Qihao Zhu, Shirong Ma, Peiyi Wang, Xiao Bi, et al. Deepseek-r1: Incentivizing reasoning capability in llms via reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.12948*, 2025.
- [17] Shousheng Jia Haosheng Zou, Xiaowei Lv and Xiangzheng Zhang. 360-llama-factory. <https://github.com/Qihoo360/360-LLaMA-Factory>, 2024.
- [18] Dan Hendrycks, Collin Burns, Steven Basart, Andy Zou, Mantas Mazeika, Dawn Song, and Jacob Steinhardt. Measuring massive multitask language understanding. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021.

- [19] Zixiao Huang, Lifeng Junjie Sheng Guo, Haosheng Chen, Wenhao Li, Bo Jin, Changhong Lu, and Xiangfeng Wang. Graphthought: Graph combinatorial optimization with thought generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.11607v1*, 2025.
- [20] Aaron Jaech, Adam Kalai, Adam Lerer, Adam Richardson, Ahmed El-Kishky, Aiden Low, Alec Helyar, Aleksander Madry, Alex Beutel, Alex Carney, et al. Openai o1 system card. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.16720*, 2024.
- [21] Xin Li, Qizhi Chu, Yubin Chen, Yang Liu, Yaoqi Liu, Zekai Yu, Weize Chen, Chen Qian, Chuan Shi, and Cheng Yang. Graphteam: Facilitating large language model-based graph analysis via multi-agent collaboration. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.18032*, 2024.
- [22] Hunter Lightman, Vineet Kosaraju, Yura Burda, Harri Edwards, Bowen Baker, Teddy Lee, Jan Leike, John Schulman, Ilya Sutskever, and Karl Cobbe. Let’s verify step by step. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.20050*, 2023.
- [23] Hunter Lightman, Vineet Kosaraju, Yura Burda, Harri Edwards, Bowen Baker, Teddy Lee, Jan Leike, John Schulman, Ilya Sutskever, and Karl Cobbe. Math-500 dataset. <https://huggingface.co/datasets/HuggingFaceH4/MATH-500>, 2023.
- [24] Bill Yuchen Lin, Ronan Le Bras, Kyle Richardson, Ashish Sabharwal, Radha Poovendran, Peter Clark, and Yejin Choi. ZebraLogic: On the scaling limits of llms for logical reasoning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2025.
- [25] Wang Ling, Dani Yogatama, Chris Dyer, and Phil Blunsom. Program induction by rationale generation: Learning to solve and explain algebraic word problems. In *Proceedings of the 55th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 2017.
- [26] Pengfei Liu, Weizhe Yuan, Jinlan Fu, Zhengbao Jiang, Hiroaki Hayashi, and Graham Neubig. Pre-train, prompt, and predict: A systematic survey of prompting methods in natural language processing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.13586*, 2023.
- [27] Michael Luo, Sijun Tan, Justin Wong, Xiaoxiang Shi, William Y. Tang, Manan Roongta, Colin Cai, Jeffrey Luo, Li Erran Li, Raluca Ada Popa, and Ion Stoica. Deepscaler: Surpassing o1-preview with a 1.5b model by scaling rl, 2025. Notion Blog.
- [28] Niklas Muennighoff, Zitong Yang, Weijia Shi, Xiang Lisa Li, Li Fei-Fei, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, Luke Zettlemoyer, Percy Liang, Emmanuel Candès, and Tatsunori Hashimoto. Simple test-time scaling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.19393*, 2025.
- [29] Niklas Muennighoff, Zitong Yang, Weijia Shi, Xiang Lisa Li, Li Fei-Fei, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, Luke Zettlemoyer, Percy Liang, Emmanuel Candès, and Tatsunori Hashimoto. s1: Simple test-time scaling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.19393*, 2025.
- [30] Mathematical Association of America (MAA). American invitational mathematics examination – aime. https://artofproblemsolving.com/wiki/index.php/AIME_Problems_and_Solutions., 2025.
- [31] OpenAI. GPT-4 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774v6*, 2023.
- [32] OpenAI. o3: Reasoning model. <https://platform.openai.com/docs/models>, 2025.
- [33] OpenAI. o3-mini: Reasoning model. <https://platform.openai.com/docs/models>, 2025.
- [34] OpenAI. o4-mini: Multimodal model. <https://platform.openai.com/docs/models>, 2025.
- [35] Long Ouyang, Jeffrey Wu, Xu Jiang, Diogo Almeida, Carroll Wainwright, Pamela Mishkin, Chong Zhang, Sandhini Agarwal, Katarina Slama, Alex Ray, et al. Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 2022.

- [36] Miao Peng, Nuo Chen, Zongrui Suo, and Jia Li. Rewarding graph reasoning process makes llms more generalized reasoners. In *ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, 2025.
- [37] Rafael Rafailov, Archit Sharma, Eric Mitchell, Christopher D. Manning, Stefano Ermon, and Chelsea Finn. Direct preference optimization: Your language model is secretly a reward model. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2023.
- [38] John Schulman, Filip Wolski, Prafulla Dhariwal, Alec Radford, and Oleg Klimov. Proximal policy optimization algorithms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1707.06347*, 2017.
- [39] Francesc Serratos. Redefining the graph edit distance. *SN Computer Science*, 2021.
- [40] Zhihong Shao, Peiyi Wang, Qihao Zhu, Runxin Xu, Junxiao Song, Xiao Bi, Haowei Zhang, Mingchuan Zhang, YK Li, Y Wu, et al. Deepseekmath: Pushing the limits of mathematical reasoning in open language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.03300*, 2024.
- [41] Guangming Sheng, Chi Zhang, Zilingfeng Ye, Xibin Wu, Wang Zhang, Ru Zhang, Yanghua Peng, Haibin Lin, and Chuan Wu. Hybridflow: A flexible and efficient rlhf framework. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.19256*, 2024.
- [42] Jianheng Tang, Qifan Zhang, Yuhan Li, and Jia Li. Grapharena: Benchmarking large language models on graph computational problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.00379*, 2024.
- [43] Qwen Team. Qwen2.5: A party of foundation models. <https://qwenlm.github.io/blog/qwen2.5/>, September 2024.
- [44] Qwen Team. Qwen2.5-1m: Deploy your own qwen with context length up to 1m tokens. <https://qwenlm.github.io/blog/qwen2.5-1m/>, January 2025.
- [45] Qwen Team. Qwq-32b: Embracing the power of reinforcement learning. <https://qwenlm.github.io/blog/qwq-32b/>, March 2025.
- [46] Frank F. Xu, Uri Alon, Graham Neubig, and Vincent Josua Hellendoorn. A systematic evaluation of large language models of code. In *Proceedings of the 6th ACM SIGPLAN International Symposium on Machine Programming*, 2022.
- [47] An Yang, Anfeng Li, Baosong Yang, Beichen Zhang, Binyuan Hui, Bo Zheng, Bowen Yu, Chang Gao, Chengen Huang, Chenxu Lv, Chujie Zheng, Dayiheng Liu, Fan Zhou, Fei Huang, Feng Hu, Hao Ge, Haoran Wei, Huan Lin, Jialong Tang, Jian Yang, Jianhong Tu, Jianwei Zhang, Jianxin Yang, Jiayi Yang, Jing Zhou, Jingren Zhou, Junyang Lin, Kai Dang, Keqin Bao, Kexin Yang, Le Yu, Lianghao Deng, Mei Li, Mingfeng Xue, Mingze Li, Pei Zhang, Peng Wang, Qin Zhu, Rui Men, Ruize Gao, Shixuan Liu, Shuang Luo, Tianhao Li, Tianyi Tang, Wenbiao Yin, Xingzhang Ren, Xinyu Wang, Xinyu Zhang, Xuancheng Ren, Yang Fan, Yang Su, Yichang Zhang, Yinger Zhang, Yu Wan, Yuqiong Liu, Zekun Wang, Zeyu Cui, Zhenru Zhang, Zhipeng Zhou, and Zihan Qiu. Qwen3 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.09388*, 2025.
- [48] Zheng Yuan, Hongyi Yuan, Cheng Li, Guanting Dong, Chuanqi Tan, and Chang Zhou. Scaling relationship on learning mathematical reasoning with large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.01825*, 2023.
- [49] Zheng Yuan, Hongyi Yuan, Cheng Li, Guodong Dong, Chao Tan, and Chao Zhou. Scaling instruction-finetuned language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.01825*, 2023.
- [50] Linan Yue, Yichao Du, Yizhi Wang, Weibo Gao, Fangzhou Yao, Li Wang, Ye Liu, Ziyu Xu, Qi Liu, Shimin Di, and Min-Ling Zhang. Don't overthink it: A survey of efficient rl-style large reasoning models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2508.02120*, 2024.
- [51] Qifan Zhang, Nuo Chen, Zehua Li, Miao Peng, Jing Tang, and Jia Li. Improving LLMs' generalized reasoning abilities by graph problems. In *Conference On Language Modeling*, 2025.
- [52] Yizhuo Zhang, Heng Wang, Shangbin Feng, Zhaoxuan Tan, Xiaochuang Han, Tianxing He, and Yulia Tsvetkov. Can llm graph reasoning generalize beyond pattern memorization? In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP*, 2024.

- [53] Yuqi Zhu, Jia Li, Ge Li, YunFei Zhao, Jia Li, Zhi Jin, and Hong Mei. Hot or cold? adaptive temperature sampling for code generation with large language models. In *Association for the Advancement of Artificial Intelligence*, 2024.

A More Experiment Details

A.1 Details of Datasets and Metrics

All datasets used in our study are previously published and cover a wide spectrum of domains. The detailed descriptions of these datasets and their associated evaluation metrics are as follows:

- **AIME.** The AIME [30] dataset consists of competition-level mathematics problems from the American Invitational Mathematics Examination. Each problem requires multi-step reasoning and often integrates knowledge across algebra, geometry, number theory, and combinatorics. To increase the difficulty, we select the most recent 2024 and 2025 problems (AIME24/25) for evaluation. Model performance is typically evaluated using accuracy, determined by whether the predicted solution exactly matches the correct answer.
- **MATH-500.** The MATH-500 [23] dataset is a curated evaluation subset of the MATH benchmark, which originally comprises over 12K competition and textbook-level problems across diverse mathematical domains. MATH-500 contains 500 carefully selected problems of varying difficulty, designed for standardized evaluation of LLMs’ mathematical reasoning ability. Similar to other math benchmarks, performance is measured by accuracy.
- **GSM8K.** The GSM8K [8] dataset contains 8.5K high-quality, diverse grade school math word problems. Designed to evaluate LLMs’ multi-step numerical reasoning ability, the benchmark emphasizes arithmetic problem-solving. Performance is typically measured by accuracy.
- **AQUA.** The AQUA [25] dataset focuses on algebraic word problems that require executing a sequence of arithmetic operations to arrive at a final answer. Given the complexity of inducing programs directly from question-answer pairs, the dataset introduces answer rationales—sequences of natural language explanations and human-readable mathematical expressions that derive the solution through intermediate steps. This scaffolding facilitates learning structured problem-solving without explicit program annotations. Evaluation is based on accuracy.
- **CRUX.** The CRUX [15] dataset consists of 800 Python programming problems, each paired with corresponding functions and input-output test cases. It defines two reasoning tasks: input prediction (inferring the input given the function and output) and output prediction (inferring the output given the function and input). Model performance is evaluated using the pass@1 metric, measuring the proportion of problems solved correctly on the first attempt.
- **MMLU_STEM.** The MMLU [18] dataset evaluates multi-task accuracy across 57 subjects, spanning domains such as mathematics, science, history, and law. In the generalization evaluation of Graph-R1, we adopt the STEM subset of MMLU, which comprises approximately 3K problems centered on science, technology, engineering, and mathematics. The standard evaluation metric is the average accuracy across all tasks in the subset.
- **Zebra-grid.** The Zebra-grid [24] dataset is developed under the ZebraLogic framework and consists of logic grid puzzles derived from constraint satisfaction problems (CSPs). These puzzles enable systematic control over complexity and constraint diversity, making the benchmark well-suited for evaluating the logical reasoning capabilities of LLMs. Model performance is assessed using accuracy, based on whether the predicted answer satisfies all constraints of the puzzle.
- **GraphArena.** The GraphArena [42] dataset is a comprehensive benchmark suite for evaluating LLMs on real-world graph computational problems. It encompasses ten distinct tasks, including four polynomial-time problems and six NP-hard problems. In the original benchmark, model predictions are categorized into four outcomes: *correct*, *suboptimal*, *hallucinatory*, and *missing*. For simplicity and consistency, we aggregate these outcomes into two evaluation dimensions: *accuracy*, measuring the probability of obtaining the exact optimal solution, and *feasibility*, measuring the probability of generating a valid solution that satisfies all constraints. In Graph-R1, we utilize the TSP, GED, and MCP subsets for training and in-task evaluation, and the Neighbor and Distance subsets for generalization evaluation.
- **GraphInstruct.** The GraphInstruct [6] dataset is an instruction-tuning corpus designed to enhance LLMs’ ability to solve a variety of graph reasoning tasks via explicit multi-step reasoning paths. It includes nine graph problems of varying complexity, and model performance is measured using accuracy. In Graph-R1, we report the zero-shot accuracy on the Hamilton Path subset for generalization evaluation.

A.2 Details of Baselines

We incorporate 10 language models as baseline models, including two closed-source language models, three open-source reasoning models, three open-source non-reasoning models and two graph-oriented language models. Below are detailed descriptions of these models:

- **Closed-source Models.**
 - **Claude-3.5-Sonnet** [2] is a proprietary model developed by Anthropic. It excels in general reasoning, code understanding, and agentic workflows.
 - **GPT-4o** [31] is OpenAI’s flagship multimodal model. It demonstrates strong performance in language understanding, code generation, and multilingual tasks across a broad range of applications.
- **Reasoning Models.**
 - **QwQ-32B** [45] is a 32B parameter reasoning model that performs on par with DeepSeek-R1, which activates 37B out of 671B parameters. QwQ-32B integrates agentic capabilities and is trained via a multi-stage reinforcement learning (RL) pipeline. In the early stages, it is optimized for math and coding tasks using automated verifiers and code execution servers. In later stages, it is fine-tuned on general instruction-following, preference alignment, and tool use.
 - **S1.1-7B** [29] is a 7B parameter reasoning model fine-tuned from Qwen2.5-7B-Instruct using the s1K-1.1 dataset, which includes high-quality math problems and their reasoning traces. It introduces a test-time technique called “budget forcing” which enhances performance by encouraging double-checking and iterative thinking without human intervention.
 - **DeepScaleR-1.5B-Preview** [27] is a 1.5B parameter reasoning model fine-tuned from DeepSeek-R1-Distilled-Qwen-1.5B [16] using a resource-efficient RL pipeline. With only 3,800 A100 GPU hours, it achieves 43.1% Pass@1 on AIME 2024 and outperforms OpenAI’s o1-preview, showcasing the promise of low-cost training for reasoning tasks.
- **Non-reasoning Models.**
 - **LLaMA-3-70B** [1] is a 70B open-source model developed by Meta. It shows competitive results across common NLP benchmarks and is widely used for general-purpose applications.
 - **Qwen2.5-7B-Instruct-1M** [44] is a 7B parameter model featuring extended context length up to 1 million tokens. It employs long-context pretraining, progressive fine-tuning, and efficient inference frameworks (e.g., sparse attention and chunked prefill optimization) to deliver 3x–7x faster performance on long-context tasks without sacrificing short-context performance.
 - **Qwen2.5-1.5B** [43] is a compact 1.5B parameter language model designed for general-purpose tasks, emphasizing efficiency and accessibility while retaining strong performance across standard benchmarks.
- **Graph-oriented Language Models.**
 - **LLaMA-8B-GT** [19] is a language model fine-tuned from LLaMA-3-8B-Instruct to solve graph combinatorial optimization (GCO) problems. It introduces a novel “Optimal Thoughts Design” framework and matches the performance of larger models like OpenAI o1-mini on the GraphArena benchmark.
 - **GraphWiz-7B-DPO** [6] is a language model fine-tuned from LLaMA-2-7B to solve complex graph problems. It integrates Direct Preference Optimization (DPO) and achieves strong average accuracy across nine diverse graph tasks—outperforming GPT-4.

A.3 More Implementation Details

During the training phase, we utilize synthetically generated small-scale instances of NP-hard graph problems. For evaluation, we adopt both small-scale and large-scale instances provided by GraphArena [42]. To ensure data quality and prevent data leakage, we employ GraphArena’s official data generation script with different random seeds (43 for SFT data and 45 for RL data, compared to seed 0 in the official dataset). Additionally, we implement a rigorous de-duplication pipeline to guarantee the uniqueness of all samples.

Moreover, we maintain a balanced distribution of samples across tasks and difficulty levels throughout both training stages. In the SFT stage, we generate an equal number of instances for each task and

distribute them uniformly across difficulty levels, creating a fully mixed training dataset. Specifically, for TSP and GED, we generate 500 instances for each graph size ranging from 4 to 9 nodes, while for MCP, we generate 250 instances for each graph size between 4 and 15 nodes, yielding a total of 9,000 training instances across the three tasks. For the RL stage, we refine our difficulty stratification approach. Since the model acquires substantial reasoning capabilities through SFT, we exclude 4-node instances during RL training. To facilitate curriculum learning across multiple tasks, we establish a unified 5-level difficulty framework. For TSP and GED, instances with 5 to 9 nodes correspond to difficulty levels 1 through 5, respectively. For MCP, difficulty levels 1 to 5 correspond to graphs with node counts of 5–6, 7–8, 9–10, 11–12, and 13–14, respectively.

We also design stage-specific prompt templates to optimize training effectiveness. For the SFT phase, we modify GraphArena’s official templates by removing in-context examples, enabling the teacher model to explore more diverse reasoning paths without being constrained by predetermined demonstrations. In the RL phase, we incorporate additional guidance for the base model—which typically possesses more limited reasoning ability—through carefully crafted prompt instructions. Specifically, we encourage a structured "think first, then answer" approach, explicitly discourage code-based solutions, and emphasize systematic step-by-step reasoning. The complete prompt templates for all three tasks are presented below. It is worth noting that the system prompt is only applied during the RL stage, while the others are shared in both training stages.

Prompts A.3.1: System prompt in the RL stage

You are a helpful assistant. The assistant first thinks about the reasoning process in the mind and then provides the user with the answer.
The reasoning process and answer must be formatted exactly as follows:<think>[your reasoning process here]</think><answer>[your answer here]</answer>.
You can choose to imitate the reasoning process of relevant algorithms or explore an appropriate solution on your own. DO NOT use code, and remember to focus on the logical flow.

Prompts A.3.2: Example of prompt for TSP

You are required to solve the Travelling Salesman Problem for an undirected flight route network. Your objective is to determine the shortest possible route that visits each of the listed airports exactly once and returns to the starting point.

Problem to Solve

- Airports to visit: BVC, URA, SMR, KOK, MTV, TFF, FLN, YZF

- Travel distances (in kilometers) between each pair of airports:

BVC to KOK: 6401

BVC to YZF: 9193

BVC to TFF: 5716

BVC to FLN: 5667

BVC to SMR: 8046

BVC to URA: 8349

BVC to MTV: 20125

URA to KOK: 3138

URA to YZF: 11132

URA to TFF: 13590

URA to FLN: 13463

URA to SMR: 13193

URA to MTV: 14802

SMR to KOK: 11079

SMR to YZF: 7927

SMR to TFF: 4079

SMR to FLN: 5562

SMR to MTV: 16291

KOK to YZF: 8634

KOK to TFF: 11307

KOK to FLN: 11987

KOK to MTV: 16203

MTV to YZF: 12733
MTV to TFF: 18200
MTV to FLN: 14727
TFF to YZF: 9491
TFF to FLN: 3676
FLN to YZF: 11826

Please calculate the shortest tour and format your answer as follows: [Airport A, Airport B, Airport C, ..., Airport A]

Prompts A.3.3: Example of prompt for GED

You are required to solve the Graph Edit Distance problem between two molecules. Each edit operation (adding or deleting an edge, adding or deleting an isolated node, or relabeling a node) has the identity cost. Your objective is to establish a mapping between the atom IDs from Molecule A to Molecule B, ensuring that each atom ID in Molecule A corresponds to exactly one atom ID in Molecule B. The mapping corresponds to the minimum edit cost between the two graphs.

****Problem to Solve****

You are given the following two molecules:

Molecule A:

- Atoms: Cl (atom 0), C (atom 1), Cl (atom 2), Cl (atom 3).
- Bonds: 0-1, 1-2, 1-3.

Molecule B:

- Atoms: Cl (atom 0), Ge (atom 1), Cl (atom 2), Cl (atom 3).
- Bonds: 0-1, 1-2, 1-3.

Represent the node mapping as a list of integers, where the position in the list corresponds to the atom ID in Molecule A and the value at that position indicates the corresponding atom ID in Molecule B. For instance, if atom 0 in Molecule A corresponds to atom 1 in Molecule B, atom 1 in Molecule A corresponds to atom 0 in Molecule B, and atom 2 remains unchanged, the mapping would be represented as [1, 0, 2, ...].

Prompts A.3.4: Example of prompt for MCP

You are required to solve the Maximum Clique Problem for an undirected academic network. In this network, nodes represent authors and edges represent research collaborations. Your objective is to find the largest subset of nodes such that every pair of vertices in this subset is connected by an edge.

Problem to Solve

- Authors in the network: Gang Zhou, Jean-Dominique Decotignie, Michel Misson, Pascale Minet, Gary V. Yee, Bhaskar Krishnamachari, Rana Diab, Erwan Livolant
- Research collaborations between these authors: Gang Zhou and Bhaskar Krishnamachari, Gang Zhou and Michel Misson, Gang Zhou and Rana Diab, Jean-Dominique Decotignie and Michel Misson, Michel Misson and Pascale Minet, Michel Misson and Bhaskar Krishnamachari, Michel Misson and Gary V. Yee, Michel Misson and Erwan Livolant, Michel Misson and Rana Diab, Pascale Minet and Bhaskar Krishnamachari, Pascale Minet and Erwan Livolant, Bhaskar Krishnamachari and Erwan Livolant.

Identify the clique with the maximum number of authors in this network. Present your answer in the following format: [AuthorA, AuthorB, AuthorC, AuthorD, ...].

B More Experiment Results

B.1 More Results on NP-hard Graph Problems

Token Efficiency We evaluate both solution accuracy and average response length of the Graph-R1 series on small-scale NP-hard graph problems, compared with baseline models, as shown in Figure 7. The results indicate that the Graph-R1 series achieves a strong balance between accuracy and token efficiency. In terms of accuracy, Graph-R1-7B outperforms all baselines, including the large reasoning model QwQ-32B. Graph-R1-1.5B attains performance close to QwQ-32B and two proprietary models, Claude-3.5-sonnet and GPT-4o, despite having far fewer parameters. From the perspective of token usage, the Graph-R1 series generates substantially shorter responses than all existing reasoning models. Notably, the average response length of Graph-R1-7B is only about one-third that of the similarly sized S1.1-7B, reflecting a clear advantage in output compactness. Overall, Graph-R1 combines the strengths of reasoning-oriented and general-purpose models—delivering competitive or superior accuracy while keeping responses concise and efficient.




Figure 7: Token efficiency comparison with all baselines.

Repetition Probability Language models often display repetitive behavior in complex reasoning tasks, particularly within structured domains such as graph reasoning. Such redundancy not only reduces efficiency but may also induce reasoning loops, hindering logical progression and degrading solution quality. Minimizing repetition is therefore critical to improving both the effectiveness and efficiency of the reasoning process.

We begin by comparing the repetition probability of Graph-R1 against baseline models under GraphArena’s default settings, where Graph-R1 demonstrates substantial advantages. For example, Graph-R1-1.5B exhibits a repetition probability of only 2.4% on the TSP task, whereas the equivalently sized S1.1-1.5B [28] and Open-RS3-1.5B [11] reach 91.8% and 59.2%, respectively—38 and 26 times higher than our model.

Since repetition probability is influenced by sampling temperature, and optimal temperature settings differ across models, we further conduct evaluations over a broader range beyond GraphArena’s

default ($T=0.1$). In general, existing LLMs employ temperatures between 0.0 and 1.0: lower values are recommended for tasks requiring precision and factual accuracy (e.g., code generation, technical writing, question answering), while higher values encourage creativity (e.g., storytelling, poetry, brainstorming) [46, 53]. Given that NP-hard graph problems demand both precision and creativity, we systematically examine repetition probability under multiple temperatures, as shown in Figure 8.

The results reveal that Graph-R1 consistently maintains repetition rates below 5% across all temperature settings. Although other reasoning models show reductions in repetition at higher temperatures, they consistently underperform compared to Graph-R1. For instance, while S1.1-1.5B decreases its repetition rate to 9.4% at $T=0.8$, this remains substantially higher than Graph-R1-1.5B’s 1.8%. These findings provide strong evidence that Graph-R1 not only mitigates repetitive behavior but also sustains reliable reasoning across diverse sampling conditions.




Figure 8: Repetition probability comparison.

B.2 More Results on Long CoT Capabilities

Inspired by [13], we investigate how self-reflection behaviors evolve in the Graph-R1 models, aiming to uncover the mechanisms underlying their performance improvements on complex reasoning tasks. We focus on three typical types of self-reflection: *verification* (checking correctness), *backtracking* (revising earlier steps), and *heuristics* (using shortcuts or hypothesis testing).

To quantify these behaviors, we employ the LLM-as-a-judge framework with Qwen3-8B [47], a lightweight yet state-of-the-art model. The prompts are adapted to the nature of each task to ensure consistent annotation—for example, heuristics are reframed as hypothesis testing in contexts where this interpretation better reflects the reasoning process.

The complete set of prompts is listed in Prompts B.2.1–B.2.3. As illustrative evidence, Figures 9 and 10 present case studies demonstrating the substantial increase in reflective behaviors in Graph-R1 compared with its base model.

Prompts B.2.1: Prompt template for identifying self-reflection behaviors on TSP task

1. Distance Verification
The following is the reasoning process of a language model solving a TSP (Traveling Salesman

Problem) task: [your reasoning process here]

Evaluate whether this reasoning process includes steps for verifying distance calculations. Verification steps may include: checking the correctness of distances between two points, verifying total path length calculations, or confirming if a certain path is indeed the shortest. Examples include: "The distance is $116+79+180+189=564$ " or "Verifying the total distance: $44+114+132+142=432$ ".

Count the number of such verification steps and provide this number between the tags `<count></count>`. If there are no verification steps, return `<count>0</count>`.

2. Backtracking Behavior

The following is the reasoning process of a language model solving a TSP (Traveling Salesman Problem) task:[your reasoning process here]

Evaluate whether this reasoning process includes backtracking behavior, where the model realizes the current path may not be optimal and returns to try different paths. For example, the model might try a path "0->1->2->3->0", find it's not optimal, and then try "0->2->1->3->0".

Count the number of distinct backtracking instances and provide this number between the tags `<count></count>`. If there is no backtracking behavior, return `<count>0</count>`.

3. Heuristic Strategies

The following is the reasoning process of a language model solving a TSP (Traveling Salesman Problem) task:[your reasoning process here]

Evaluate whether this reasoning process uses explicit heuristic strategies, such as the greedy algorithm (always choosing the nearest next city), minimum spanning tree, nearest neighbor algorithm, etc. For example: "Starting from city 0, the nearest city is city 2 with a distance of 44" demonstrates a greedy/nearest neighbor strategy.

Count the number of distinct heuristic strategies explicitly used and provide this number between the tags `<count></count>`. If no heuristic strategies are explicitly used, return `<count>0</count>`.

Prompts B.2.2: Prompt template for identifying self-reflection behaviors on common neighbor task

1. Connection Verification

The following is the reasoning process of a language model solving a neighbor query task on a graph:[your reasoning process here]

Evaluate whether this reasoning process includes steps for verifying connections between nodes. Verification steps may include: checking if edges exist between specific nodes, validating relationships, or confirming the presence of connections. Examples include: "X is connected to Y" or "Verifying that Z is a neighbor of both A and B".

Count the number of such verification steps and provide this number between the tags `<count></count>`. If there are no verification steps, return `<count>0</count>`.

2. Backtracking Behavior

The following is the reasoning process of a language model solving a neighbor query task on a graph:[your reasoning process here]

Evaluate whether this reasoning process includes backtracking behavior, where the model realizes the current approach may not be correct and returns to try different approaches. For example: "Let me reconsider the connections" or "But let me check if this path is valid".

Count the number of distinct backtracking instances and provide this number between the tags `<count></count>`. If there is no backtracking behavior, return `<count>0</count>`.

3. Hypothesis Testing

The following is the reasoning process of a language model solving a neighbor query task on a graph:[your reasoning process here]

Evaluate whether this reasoning process includes instances where the model proposes and tests hypotheses about node relationships or graph properties. Examples include: "Let's check if X could be a common neighbor of A and B" or "If we assume this graph is connected, then..."

Count the number of distinct hypothesis testing instances where the model makes temporary

assumptions and provide this number between the tags <count></count>. If there is no evidence of hypothesis testing, return <count>0</count>.

Prompts B.2.3: Prompt template for identifying self-reflection behaviors on logic puzzle task

1. Constraint Validation

The following is the reasoning process of a language model solving a logic puzzle (zebra/Einstein puzzle):[your reasoning process here]

Evaluate whether this reasoning process includes steps for validating constraints or checking if a potential solution satisfies the given clues. Examples include: "This placement satisfies clue 3" or "Let's check if this arrangement meets all constraints."

Count the number of distinct constraint validation instances and provide this number between the tags <count></count>. If there are no validation steps, return <count>0</count>.

2. Backtracking Behavior

The following is the reasoning process of a language model solving a logic puzzle (zebra/Einstein puzzle):[your reasoning process here]

Evaluate whether this reasoning process includes backtracking behavior, where the model realizes the current path or assumption may not be correct and returns to try different approaches. For example: "This assumption leads to a contradiction, so let's try another possibility" or "Let's reconsider our initial placement for Person X."

Count the number of distinct backtracking instances and provide this number between the tags <count></count>. If there is no backtracking behavior, return <count>0</count>.

3. Hypothesis Testing

The following is the reasoning process of a language model solving a logic puzzle (zebra/Einstein puzzle):[your reasoning process here]

Evaluate whether this reasoning process includes instances where the model proposes and tests hypotheses or makes tentative assumptions to explore possibilities. Examples include: "Let's assume Person X is in House Y and see if this works..." or "If we temporarily place the red house at position 3, then..."

Count the number of distinct hypothesis testing instances where the model makes temporary assumptions to test outcomes and provide this number between the tags <count></count>. If there is no evidence of hypothesis testing, return <count>0</count>.

(A) Output (Qwen2.5-7B-Instruct-1M):

Starting from city 0, the shortest path to city 1 is 152. From city 1, the shortest path to city 2 is 26. From city 2, the shortest path to city 3 is 47. From city 3, the shortest path to city 4 is 27. From city 4, the shortest path to city 5 is 38. From city 5, the shortest path to city 6 is 66. From city 6, the shortest path to city 7 is 117. From city 7, the shortest path to city 8 is 116. From city 8, the shortest path to city 9 is 141. From city 9, the shortest path to city 10 is 72. **The total distance is 152+26+47+27+38+66+117+116+141+72=824.** The path is 0->1->2->3->4->5->6->7->8->9->10->0.1. Create a graph with 5 nodes and 9 edges.

Wrong
Simply guessing

(B) Output (Graph-R1-7B):

<think>Okay, let's see. I need to solve this TSP for the given cities. Hmm, there are 11 cities, so the number of possible routes is (11-1)!/2, which is a huge number. But since it's a competition, maybe there's a smart way to do this without checking all possibilities.

Let me start by looking at the distances from each city to others to see if there are any obvious patterns or short connections. **Heuristics**

First, let me list all the distances from city 0 to others. So the closest to 0 are 6 (34), then 3 (52), 4 (55), 2 (95), 1 (152), 10 (154), 5 (125), 7 (81), 8 (68), 9 (176). So maybe starting at 0, go to 6 first since it's the closest. So the path is 0->6->2->5->4->3->9->7->8->10->1->0.

But maybe there's a shorter path. Let me see if I can find a better path. Alternatively, maybe the path can be improved by swapping some cities.

Let's see

Backtracking

Wait, no, let's see the path so far: 0,6,2,5,4,3,9,10,8,1. So missing 7. So that's a problem. So that path is invalid **Verification**

Is there a way to make it shorter? Let's see. Suppose instead of going from 9 to 7, maybe go to 10 first? Let me try: 0 ->6 ->2 ->5 ->4 ->3 ->9 ->10 ->1 ->7 ->8 ->0. (backtracking)</think>

<answer>{'Path': '0->6->2->5->4->3->9->7->1->10->8->0', 'TotalDistance': '568'}</answer>

Correct

Applying heuristics, verification and backtracking

Figure 9: Case study for TSP task.

(A) Output (Qwen2.5-7B-Instruct-1M):
 Based on Clue 1, Arnold loves beach vacations. Since Arnold cannot be in the first house (Clue 2), Arnold must be in House 2. Therefore, Eric, who loves mountain vacations, must be in House 1.

Wrong
 Cannot reason step-by-step

(B) Output (Graph-R1-7B):
 First, list all the people: Eric, Bob, Alice, Peter, Arnold, Carol. Each has a unique flower, height, color, cigar, and phone model. The clues are numbered and need to be interpreted.
 Clue 1: The iPhone 13 user loves white. Since Alice is the only one with white as a favorite color (Clue 6), Alice must be the iPhone 13 user. So House 1 -> Alice, PhoneModel: iPhone 13, Color: white. Clue 26: Alice loves roses. Verification
 Wait, Clue 26 says Alice loves roses, but she's already assigned to House 1. So maybe there's a mistake here. Wait, let me recheck the clues.
 Wait, the people are Eric, Bob, Alice, Peter, Arnold, Carol. So Alice is one of them. So maybe Clue 26 is a separate clue. Let me note that. Backtracking
 So, let's start assigning step by step.
 First, assign Alice (House 1) with iPhone 13 and white. Next, Peter (Clue 2) must be in a house with red. Let's see who else has red.....
 Now, check all the clues again to ensure they are satisfied. Hypothesis Testing
 Thus, the final answer and explanation is:
 1. **House 1 (Alice):** - **Color:** White (Clue 6: Alice loves white). - **Phone Model:** iPhone 13 (Clue 1: iPhone 13 user loves white).
 - **Flower:** Lily (assigned to match height and other constraints).

 6. **House 6 (Bob):** - **Cigar:** Blue Master (Clue 4: Blue Master and Dunhill are next to each other). Long chain-of-thought with verification, backtracking and hypothesis testing
 - **Phone Model:** OnePlus 9 (Clue 24: OnePlus 9 and Samsung are next).

Correct

Figure 10: Case study for Logic Puzzle task.

B.3 More Sensitivity Analysis

Sensitivity to Training Data Volume We investigate the sensitivity of model performance on NP-hard graph problems to the volume of training data, considering both the Supervised Fine-Tuning (SFT) phase and the Reinforcement Learning (RL) phase. Three experimental settings are examined: (i) models trained solely with SFT, to establish how pure SFT models scale with data volume; (ii) models trained with both SFT and RL, varying SFT data while keeping RL data fixed, to assess how SFT data influences the performance ceiling of hybrid models; and (iii) models trained with both SFT and RL, fixing SFT data while varying RL data, to isolate the effect of RL data volume.

The SFT dataset is stratified into three tiers: low, mid, and high, corresponding to 1,800, 5,400, and 9,000 samples. Similarly, RL data is categorized into three levels: low and mid correspond to 1,000 and 3,000 samples per task per difficulty level, respectively, while the high tier augments the mid level with an additional 3,000 samples from the highest difficulty level of each task.

Models are named using a standardized convention: {model-size}-SFT-{SFT-level}-RL-{RL-level}. For example, *7B-SFT-mid-RL-high* refers to a 7B-parameter model trained with mid-level SFT data and high-level RL data.

Results Our analysis yields three key findings:

1. **High sensitivity of pure SFT models.** Performance improves substantially with increased SFT data, and this sensitivity scales with parameter size. For instance, *7B-SFT-high* surpasses *7B-SFT-low* by 10.4%, whereas the gain for 1.5B models under the same comparison is only 1.5%.
2. **Reduced sensitivity under hybrid training.** Models combining SFT and RL benefit from larger data volumes in both phases, but exhibit much weaker sensitivity compared to pure SFT models. For example, *7B-SFT-high-RL-mid* outperforms *7B-SFT-mid-RL-mid* by just 0.3%.
3. **Importance of data distribution.** Beyond volume, the composition of training data strongly influences performance. For instance, *7B-SFT-mid-RL-high*, which differs from *7B-SFT-mid-RL-mid* only by including additional high-difficulty samples, achieves higher accuracy on unseen large-scale problems (25.3% → 26.5%) but slightly lower accuracy on small-scale problems (86.7% → 86.3%). This highlights the role of difficulty-targeted data in shaping specialization-generalization trade-offs.

Implications These findings provide practical guidance for training reasoning models:

1. Larger models benefit more from straightforward scaling of training data volume, while smaller models are less sensitive to such increases.
2. The distribution of training data should be tailored to the specific needs of the model. A balanced distribution across difficulty levels yields strong overall performance, whereas skewing toward more difficult data can enhance performance on challenging tasks but often comes at the cost of reduced general capability.

Table 9: Effect of data volume on accuracy on NP-hard graph problems, reporting accuracy (%), with the best results highlighted in **bold**.

Models	Small			Large			Avg.		
	TSP	GED	MCP	TSP	GED	MCP	Small	Large	All
<i>SFT only, 1.5B:</i>									
1.5B-SFT-low	22.8	23.6	18.6	0.0	0.8	0.4	21.7	0.4	11.0
1.5B-SFT-mid	35.4	21.4	22.0	0.2	1.6	1.6	26.3	1.1	13.7
1.5B-SFT-high	38.4	23.2	22.2	0.0	2.0	3.6	27.9	1.9	14.9
<i>SFT only, 7B:</i>									
7B-SFT-low	65.8	54.0	76.4	0.6	1.2	12.2	65.4	4.7	35.0
7B-SFT-mid	77.6	56.8	84.0	1.0	3.8	21.2	72.8	8.7	40.7
7B-SFT-high	82.6	60.8	85.8	4.6	5.4	33.2	76.4	14.4	45.4
<i>SFT & RL, Change Data Volume in SFT:</i>									
7B-SFT-low-RL-mid	86.6	73.4	95.6	5.6	9.6	59.8	85.2	25.0	55.1
7B-SFT-mid-RL-mid	92.6	71.6	96.0	7.8	5.8	62.2	86.7	25.3	56.0
7B-SFT-high-RL-mid	91.8	68.2	97.0	11.2	6.2	63.6	85.7	27.0	56.3
<i>SFT & RL, Change Data Volume in RL:</i>									
7B-SFT-mid-RL-low	87.2	64.8	97.8	8.0	6.0	62.6	83.3	25.5	54.4
7B-SFT-mid-RL-mid	92.6	71.6	96.0	7.8	5.8	62.2	86.7	25.3	56.0
7B-SFT-mid-RL-high	91.0	71.2	96.6	9.0	6.6	63.8	86.3	26.5	56.4

B.4 More Ablation Study

Effect of Curriculum Learning in Reinforcement Learning. We have compared the curriculum learning strategy with mixed training in the main text, leaving other sampling strategies such as anti-curriculum learning unexplored. Anti-curriculum learning refers to a training paradigm where the model starts with the most difficult samples and gradually transitions to easier ones. This approach also enables budget control at each stage and may appear resource-efficient in theory.

To evaluate its practical effectiveness, we adopt anti-curriculum learning during the RL stage and compare the resulting model with our Graph-R1-7B, which is trained using curriculum learning. As shown in Table 10, the model trained under anti-curriculum learning exhibits a significant performance drop, with average accuracy declining from 56.3% to 53.2%. This decline can be attributed to the lack of foundational skill development when training begins with the hardest samples. Without first acquiring essential problem-solving strategies on simpler tasks, the model struggles to effectively optimize its policy or generalize to a wider range of problem scales. These findings highlight the importance of task ordering in reinforcement learning and reinforce the effectiveness of curriculum learning in guiding the model through a smoother and more progressive training process.

Table 10: Ablation study of curriculum learning on NP-hard graph problems, reporting accuracy (%) with the best results highlighted in **bold**.

Models	Small			Large			Avg.
	TSP	GED	MCP	TSP	GED	MCP	
anti-curriculum learning	61.2	85.2	96.6	5.6	6.6	64.0	53.2
Graph-R1-7B	91.8	68.2	97.0	11.2	6.2	63.6	56.3

C More Details of Methodology

C.1 Solution Quality Reward

We apply consistent reward assignments across all tasks for both optimal and hallucinated solutions. Specifically, optimal responses are assigned a reward of 2.0, while hallucinated solutions are penalized with -1.0 . For suboptimal solutions, we design task-specific reward functions scaled between 0 and 0.5, determined by the ratio between the predicted solution and the corresponding optimal value. The formulations are as follows:

- **TSP**: $R_{\text{sub}} = \left(\frac{ans}{d}\right)^2 \times 0.5$, where d denotes the predicted tour length.
- **GED**: $R_{\text{sub}} = \frac{ans}{c} \times 0.5$, where c denotes the predicted edit cost.
- **MCP**: $R_{\text{sub}} = \frac{s}{ans} \times 0.5$, where s denotes the predicted clique size.

Notably, we apply squaring only for TSP, as its objective values span a much broader range than GED or MCP. In this setting, the raw ratio $\frac{ans}{d}$ changes very little near optimality, making fine-grained improvements difficult to capture. Squaring alleviates this issue by amplifying differences among near-optimal tours while compressing rewards for poor solutions. In contrast, GED and MCP operate within narrower ranges, where the linear ratio already provides sufficiently informative feedback.

In addition, the exact range of suboptimal rewards does not need to be strictly followed; it only needs to be distinguishable from the rewards for optimal (2.0) and hallucinated (-1.0) solutions. The lower bound of 0 arises naturally from the ratio, while the upper bound is set to 0.5—instead of approaching 1.0—to further widen the gap between suboptimal and optimal solutions. This design produces a steeper reward signal, improving the model’s sensitivity to solution quality.

C.2 Repetition Detection Algorithm

Our approach (Algorithm 1) identifies repetitive patterns by building a suffix automaton from the model’s output. The process involves topologically sorting states and calculating occurrence counts through bottom-up propagation. This allows us to detect meaningful repetitions that exceed predefined thresholds for length and frequency, with prioritization based on frequency, length, and position. Moreover, it achieves $O(n)$ time complexity, facilitating real-time detection even in extensive outputs. This efficiency makes it particularly valuable for reward design in resource-intensive reinforcement learning, as well as for broader applications in production environments and interactive systems.

Algorithm 1 Repetition Detection via Suffix Automaton

Require: String S , minimum length L_{min} , minimum repetitions R_{min}

Ensure: Detection result (*has_repetition, substring, count, length, start*)

- 1: Build suffix automaton SA for S $\triangleright O(|S|)$ time complexity
 - 2: Topologically sort states by decreasing length
 - 3: Compute cumulative occurrence counts via bottom-up propagation
 - 4: $best \leftarrow null$
 - 5: **for** each non-initial state $s \in SA$ **do**
 - 6: $L_{effective} \leftarrow \max(len(s.link) + 1, L_{min})$
 - 7: **if** $L_{effective} \leq len(s)$ and $s.occ \geq R_{min}$ **then**
 - 8: Update $best$ based on prioritization criteria \triangleright Prioritize by frequency, length, and position
 - 9: **end if**
 - 10: **end for**
 - 11: **return** Detection result
-