

KGLAMP: Knowledge Graph-guided Language model for Adaptive Multi-robot Planning and Replanning

Chak Lam Shek^{1,2} Faizan M. Tariq¹ Sangjae Bae¹ David Isele¹ Piyush Gupta¹


Abstract—Heterogeneous multi-robot systems are increasingly used in long-horizon missions requiring coordinated planning across diverse capabilities. However, existing planning approaches struggle to construct accurate symbolic representations and maintain plan consistency in dynamic environments. Classical PDDL planners require manually crafted symbolic models, while LLM-based planners often ignore agent heterogeneity and environmental uncertainty. We introduce *KGLAMP*, a knowledge-graph-guided LLM planning framework for heterogeneous multi-robot teams. The framework maintains a structured knowledge graph encoding object relations, spatial reachability, and robot capabilities, which guides the LLM in generating accurate PDDL problem specifications. The knowledge graph serves as a persistent, dynamically updated memory that incorporates new observations and triggers replanning upon detecting inconsistencies, enabling symbolic plans to adapt to evolving world states. Experiments on the MAT-THOR benchmark show that *KGLAMP* improves performance by at least 25.3% over both LLM-only and PDDL-based variants.

I. INTRODUCTION

Heterogeneous multi-robot systems are increasingly used in real-world missions such as disaster response, warehouse logistics, and large-scale inspection [1]. By combining robots with diverse capabilities, they can tackle tasks beyond the reach of homogeneous teams. However, this heterogeneity introduces significant challenges in long-horizon planning, including task allocation and coordinated action in dynamic, uncertain environments [2]. Recent work has therefore focused on planning strategies that better integrate robots with diverse roles and capabilities.

Despite recent progress, effective planning for heterogeneous teams remains challenging [3], [4]. Planning Domain Definition Language (PDDL)-based approaches offer strong guarantees for long-horizon planning but depend on manually crafted domain and problem specifications [5]. These specifications are labor-intensive to construct, and even minor modeling errors can induce brittle behavior, as planners assume complete and consistent environmental representations.

Recent advances in large language models (LLMs) reduce the need for manual domain specification [6] and enable flexible high-level reasoning for long-horizon planning [7]. Prior work shows that LLMs can generate PDDL and support symbolic planners [8]. However, applying LLMs to



(a) Without relational knowledge (b) With appropriate knowledge graphs

Fig. 1: Impact of relational knowledge on task planning. (a) Without relational graphs, PDDL models miss object relationships, leading to failed plans. (b) Incorporating relationship, property, and reachability graphs enables accurate PDDL generation and feasible plans.

heterogeneous multi-robot systems remains challenging [9], as most approaches assume shared action models and identical capabilities, limiting reasoning over embodiment, skills, and task feasibility [10]. As illustrated in Fig. 1, lacking relational context often leads to plans that miss inter-robot dependencies, coordination, and shared resource constraints essential for effective cooperation.

Another limitation is the assumption of complete and accurate environment knowledge. In real-world settings, object states, spatial layouts, and task-relevant properties are often inconsistent or incomplete [11], causing mismatches between symbolic representations and actual conditions. Effective systems must therefore update their knowledge and adapt plans as new information arrives, which is crucial for reliable long-horizon planning in heterogeneous teams.

To address these challenges, we propose *KGLAMP*, a knowledge-graph-guided LLM planning framework for heterogeneous multi-robot systems. *KGLAMP* represents environment structure and robot capabilities as a structured knowledge graph capturing object relations, spatial connectivity, and agent-specific properties (Fig. 1b). This representation guides the LLM to generate more accurate planning domain and problem descriptions.

The knowledge graph also acts as a persistent, updatable memory, integrating new observations, resolving inconsistencies, and triggering replanning when needed. This enables robust adaptation to evolving environments and supports reliable coordination in heterogeneous multi-robot teams.

The main contributions of this work are:

- 1) A unified *knowledge-graph representation that grounds LLM-based planning* by modeling object relations, spa-

¹Honda Research Institute, USA, San Jose, CA, 95134.

²University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742, USA.

All work was performed during the internship of Chak Lam Shek while he was employed at HRI.

Corresponding author: piyush.gupta@honda-ri.com.

This work has been submitted to the IEEE for possible publication. Copyright may be transferred without notice, after which this version may no longer be accessible.

tial reachability, and semantic properties.

- 2) An incremental knowledge-graph update mechanism that integrates new observations, maintains consistency, and enables *replanning in dynamic environments*.
- 3) An empirical evaluation on heterogeneous multi-robot tasks showing improved robustness and coordination over LLM-only and PDDL-based baselines.

II. RELATED WORK

Recent work has extended long-horizon planning to more realistic settings [12]. However, traditional symbolic planners like PDDL struggle with real-world complexity and uncertainty, motivating LLM-based approaches [13].

Structured representations improve interpretability and robustness in complex tasks. Hierarchical methods such as Planning with Hierarchical Trees [14] and Behavior Trees [15] enable scalable behavior through modular decomposition. In open-world settings, skill graphs (e.g., Plan4MC [16]) and iterative frameworks like PLAN-AND-ACT [17] further enhance long-horizon reliability. These ideas extend to multi-agent settings [2], where coordination is critical. Approaches like SMART-LLM [18] and graph-enhanced LLMs [19], [20] model dependencies to improve coordination.

Recent work has moved beyond homogeneous teams to heterogeneous systems with diverse capabilities, introducing challenges in competency-aware task allocation, cross-skill coordination, and dynamic role adaptation. Approaches such as compositional coordination [21], LLM-guided collaboration [22], and LLM-driven PDDL planning [10] address these issues. Despite strong benchmark results, many methods struggle to generalize due to inconsistent reasoning and the lack of persistent, task-relevant state—issues amplified in heterogeneous systems requiring shared understanding. While prior work explores memory mechanisms for long-horizon reasoning—including multi-memory architectures [23], retrieval-augmented planning [24], spatio-temporal navigation memory [25], hybrid multimodal memory [26], long and short term memory systems [27], and lifelong planning memory [28]—most lack structured representations for tracking evolving goals, heterogeneous agent states, and environmental changes across planning iterations. Motivated by these limitations, we introduce a memory-management framework for heterogeneous multi-agent planning that enables persistent, structured state retention and improves coordination among robots.

III. PROBLEM FORMULATION AND PRELIMINARIES

We study long-horizon planning in heterogeneous multi-robot systems with diverse skills and constraints. For example, in a household setting, robots collaborate to prepare food from high-level natural language instructions that omit explicit actions and constraints. Solving such tasks requires inferring task structure, decomposing it into sub-tasks, reasoning about dependencies, and allocating responsibilities across robots that can act in parallel when possible.

```
(:predicates (at ?r ?l) (connected ?l1 ?l2))
(:action move
:parameters (?r ?from ?to)
:precondition (and (at ?r ?from) (connected ?from ?to))
:effect (and (not (at ?r ?from)) (at ?r ?to)))
```

(a) Domain PDDL (STRIPS action schema)

```
(:objects robot1 room1 room2)
(:init (at robot1 room1) (connected room1 room2))
(:goal (and (at robot1 room2)))
```

(b) Problem PDDL (task instance)

Fig. 2: Minimal STRIPS PDDL example illustrating (a) Domain PDDL and (b) Problem PDDL

A. Multi-Agent Planning (MAP) Formulation

We formulate the problem as a cooperative Multi-Agent Planning (MAP) framework, defined by $\langle \mathbb{R}, \mathbb{D}, \{\mathbb{A}_i\}_{i=1}^n, \mathbb{P}, I, G \rangle$, where $\mathbb{R} = \{r_1, \dots, r_n\}$ is the set of robots. Each robot r_i has a domain $d_i \in \mathbb{D}$ capturing its capabilities and constraints, and an action set \mathbb{A}_i defining its state transitions. The environment state is represented by logical predicates \mathbb{P} , with initial state $I \subseteq \mathbb{P}$ and goal conditions $G \subseteq \mathbb{P}$.

A plan is defined as $\Pi = (\Delta, \prec)$, where Δ is a set of instantiated robot actions and \prec is a partial order capturing causal and temporal constraints. The plan is valid if executing it from I reaches a state satisfying G .

B. Planning Domain Definition Language (PDDL)

In PDDL, a planning task is specified by a domain file (Fig. 2a) and a problem file (Fig. 2b). The domain encodes reusable knowledge, including predicates and parameterized action schemas with preconditions and effects defining deterministic state transitions. We focus on STRIPS-style planning [29], where preconditions are conjunctions of positive literals and effects are add–delete lists.

The problem file defines a specific instance with a set of objects, an initial state I (under the closed-world assumption), and a goal condition G as a conjunction of ground literals. A planner then computes a sequence of grounded actions that achieves G from I .

IV. METHODOLOGY

In cluttered real-world scenes, even with object inventories, LLM-based PDDL generation from unstructured memory is error-prone, often producing missing constraints, hallucinated predicates, or invalid specifications. Grounding LLMs with a structured knowledge graph organizes entities and relations, reducing context overload and improving reliability. To this end, we introduce *KGLAMP*, a knowledge-graph–guided LLM-based long-horizon planning framework for heterogeneous multi-robot teams. *KGLAMP* consists of two key components: (1) knowledge graphs that ground the LLM in structured representations of the environment and robot capabilities, and (2) a replanning module that updates plans online when execution deviates from expectations.

As shown in Fig. 3, the framework converts natural language instructions into executable plans using specialized




Fig. 3: Overview of KGLAMP framework. Environment and robot information are encoded as relationship, property, and reachability knowledge graphs. LLM agents generate goal, relational, property, and reachability predicates in a dependency-aware manner to synthesize a PDDL problem, execute the resulting plan, and iteratively update the graphs and replan upon execution failures.

LLM agents. It encodes instructions and visual observations into structured symbolic representations via knowledge graphs. Then, LLM_{goal} , $LLM_{relation}$, $LLM_{property}$, and LLM_{reach} extract goals, spatial relations, object states, and navigation constraints. These are combined to form a PDDL problem, which is solved by a planner (e.g., Fast Downward [30]) to produce an action sequence. The plan is executed with failure monitoring, and upon failure, a replanning procedure (Alg. 1) uses a VLM to update the knowledge graph and generate a corrected plan (see Section IV-C).

All LLM modules in our framework (LLM_{goal} , $LLM_{relation}$, etc.) use the same base model (GPT-5 [31]) with task-specific prompts. They operate in a sequential pipeline, where each stage produces structured outputs (e.g., goal predicates, relational tuples) that are passed to subsequent modules, ensuring dependency-aware reasoning. Intermediate outputs are validated against the knowledge graph and object states to maintain consistency and improve the correctness of the generated PDDL.

A. Knowledge Graph

A knowledge graph provides a structured representation of world information by encoding entities and their relations. Formally, a knowledge graph $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{E})$ consists of entities \mathcal{V} , relation types \mathcal{R} , and directed edges $\mathcal{E} \subseteq \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{R} \times \mathcal{V}$ represented as triplets. Each triplet is of the form (subject, relation, object) or (entity, relation, property), capturing both inter-entity relations and attribute-level information in a unified representation.

In KGLAMP, the knowledge graph (Fig. 4) is defined as

$$\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{G}_{relation} \cup \mathcal{G}_{property} \cup \mathcal{G}_{reach}, \quad (1)$$

where each component captures a distinct type of relational knowledge for planning. This decomposition simplifies predicate extraction, as task descriptions often omit semantic, physical, or spatial details, and LLMs struggle to infer them jointly. Splitting the graph turns this into smaller, tractable subproblems. Specifically, the

Relationship graph, $\mathcal{G}_{relation}$, captures semantic and geometric object relationships that inform action preconditions and task structure (e.g., (cup, on, table)); the Property graph, $\mathcal{G}_{property}$, encodes object attributes and robot capabilities, constraining feasible actions and ensuring that planning respects physical and functional limitations (e.g., (robot_A, has_capability, pickup)); and the Reachability graph, \mathcal{G}_{reach} , links entities to discrete locations, enabling navigability reasoning by grounding goals to reachable target locations (e.g., (microwave, at_location, location_1)).

The initial knowledge graph is constructed from AI2-THOR simulator metadata by extracting object-level attributes such as unique identifiers, semantic labels, spatial positions, and containment relationships. These are converted into triplets, e.g., (cup, in, drawer), forming the basis of the graph. Unique object identifiers ensure consistent entity disambiguation across all components.

B. PDDL Generation Using knowledge graphs

Generating correct PDDL is challenging, as small inconsistencies in objects, relations, or properties can invalidate the entire specification. This is amplified in multi-robot settings with ambiguous tasks and complex interactions. To address this, we use a structured pipeline where multiple LLMs incrementally construct the PDDL problem, grounded in the knowledge graph.

1) *Goal Extraction*: The process begins by translating a natural-language *Task* into a formal goal specification. Since human instructions are often ambiguous or misaligned with the environment, contextual grounding is required. Conditioning LLM_{goal} on the environment *Objects* produces a goal consistent with the available entities, attributes, and relations:

$$Goal = LLM_{goal}(Task, Objects). \quad (2)$$

2) *Relationship Extraction*: After extracting the goal, $LLM_{relation}$ infers object-object relations needed for planning. These relations capture structural dependencies and constrain




Fig. 4: An example knowledge graph. (a) G_{relation} captures semantic and geometric relationships among objects. (b) G_{property} encodes object attributes and robot capabilities. (c) G_{reach} models spatial connectivity.

```
# Relationship Agent Prompt Structure

This flow demonstrates how the
'generate_relationship_condition' function constructs the
prompt to define the scene's physical hierarchy (containers and
surfaces).

## 1. Give Contextual Example
> "Given examples: {self.context}"
> * **Containment**:: Definitions for `(inside ?obj ?container)`.
> * **Support**:: Definitions for `(on ?obj ?surface)`."

## 2. Define the Scenario
> "Goal: {goal}"
> "Task: {task}"

## 3. Define the Spatial Data
> "Scene Tuples: {scene_tuples}"
> *Raw list of spatial relationships detected in the scene.*"

## 4. Define the Output Constraints
> "Generate relationship condition as PDDL `(:init)` format.
> 1. **Relations**:: Only show content relative to 'contain'
(inside) or 'on' (supported by).
> 2. **Relevance**:: Only include objects that are related to
the 'Goal' or 'Task' (ignore irrelevant background clutter)."
```

Fig. 5: An example of LLM prompt for LLM_{relation} . This prompt utilizes contextual examples, scenario definition, spatial data, and output constraints to extract relevant spatial tuples.

action feasibility and ordering (e.g., reachability or containment). Identifying these relations before action generation is therefore critical, as they define the structural constraints governing valid action sequences. This inference is grounded in G_{relation} , yielding:

$$Relation = LLM_{\text{relation}}(Goal, Task, G_{\text{relation}}). \quad (3)$$

3) *Property Assignment*: With relational structure defined, LLM_{property} assigns object attributes and robot capabilities that constrain feasible actions. These properties determine action participation and whether robots have the required skills to achieve the goal. Accurate assignment is critical to avoid infeasible actions and ensure goal achievability. This inference step leverages G_{property} , yielding:

$$Property = LLM_{\text{property}}(Goal, Task, Relation, G_{\text{property}}). \quad (4)$$

4) *Navigation Structure*: We decouple navigation from object interaction, as jointly reasoning over spatial motion and manipulation constraints substantially increases planning complexity. Navigation reasoning concerns spatial reachability, path feasibility, and inter-robot interference, while object interaction involves manipulation-specific preconditions and

effects. Jointly inferring these heterogeneous constraints often yields incomplete or inconsistent predicates. By isolating navigation reasoning, LLM_{reach} focuses on identifying accessible locations and feasible robot motions while avoiding conflicts. Grounded in G_{reach} , which encodes spatial layout and connectivity, this step produces navigation predicates with greater consistency and reliability:

$$Reach = LLM_{\text{reach}}(Relation, Property, G_{\text{reach}}). \quad (5)$$

5) *Problem PDDL*: Finally, the goal, relational structure, object properties, and navigation constraints are integrated to construct the PDDL problem. LLM_{PDDL} synthesizes a coherent symbolic representation that captures both environment constraints and robot capabilities:

$$Prob_{\text{PDDL}} = LLM_{\text{PDDL}}(Goal, Relation, Property, Reach). \quad (6)$$

This structured workflow ensures each PDDL component is explicitly grounded rather than implicitly inferred. By decomposing goal, relation, property, and navigation extraction, it reduces common inconsistencies such as missing predicates, invalid preconditions, and incorrect object bindings. As a result, the generated PDDL more accurately reflects the environment and agent capabilities, producing executable and coherent plans, as evidenced by the results in Section V.

6) *Prompt Design*: Prompt design follows five key principles (see Fig. 5). First, clear task definition specifies the objective explicitly. Second, structured output formats enforce consistency in model responses. Third, explicit constraints bound feasible reasoning and define logical and spatial limits. Fourth, step-by-step decomposition guides multi-stage inference for complex tasks. Fifth, few-shot examples improve robustness and reduce ambiguity.

C. Replanning for Symbolic Execution Failures

Symbolic planners are highly sensitive to inconsistencies in domain specifications, where even minor errors in PDDL can cause failure. Such issues often stem from missing preconditions, affordances, or state transitions. For instance, encoding a box as (box, has_state, closed) without specifying that it is openable prevents the planner from retrieving its contents. These failures are common in long-horizon tasks, motivating the need for a robust replanning

mechanism to detect and correct incomplete or inconsistent representations.

To address these failures, we first diagnose execution errors by extracting an error signal e , indicating planner failure (no plan), execution failure (violated preconditions), or perception failure (missing objects). Conditioned on e , we invoke the refinement procedure (Alg. 1), where the LLM proposes candidate updates to the knowledge graph:

$$\{H_1, \dots, H_k\}, \{\pi_1, \dots, \pi_k\} = \text{LLM}_{\text{replan}}(k, e, \mathcal{G}). \quad (7)$$

Each H_i represents a potential correction (e.g., adding missing affordances, states, or relations), k is the number of candidates, and π_i denotes its estimated likelihood of that candidate.

Each hypothesis is evaluated by updating the knowledge graph, regenerating the PDDL domain and problem, and re-running the planner. If a valid plan is found, we compute the plan cost difference Δc_i ; otherwise, the candidate is discarded. Selection is performed using the probability–cost objective:

$$H^* = \arg \max_i \frac{p_i}{(\Delta c_i)^\lambda}, \quad (8)$$

where $p_i = \pi_i / \sum_{j=1}^k \pi_j$ is the normalized candidate probability. The parameter λ balances plausibility and minimal symbolic change (we use $\lambda = 2$). Plan cost is defined as PDDL plan length, providing a simple, domain-agnostic measure of complexity without bias from parallel execution. Replanning stops when a valid plan is found or after three iterations. For partial observability, a CLIP-based VLM processes egocentric RGB observations.

By coupling failure diagnosis, LLM-guided repair, and planner-in-the-loop validation, the replanning module enables recovery from symbolic inconsistencies and improves reliability in long-horizon manipulation tasks.

D. VLM-Based Discovery under Partial Observability

Due to partial observability, the initial knowledge graph may be incomplete. To address this, we use a VLM to analyze visual observations after execution or upon failure. The VLM detects previously unseen entities and infers their spatial relations, which are converted into semantic tuples and added to the knowledge graph. These updates enable dynamic replanning, allowing the symbolic planner to incorporate newly discovered information and recover from incomplete world states.

V. EXPERIMENTS

In this section, we provide details of our experiments.

A. Dataset

We evaluate our framework on the MAT2-THOR benchmark [32], a multi-agent long-horizon dataset built on AI2-THOR [33]. It includes 49 indoor multi-robot tasks across seven floor plans, categorized as: (i) 25 *Simple Tasks* with short horizons and one to two subgoals (e.g., ‘‘Open the laptop and turn it on’’); (ii) 17 *Complex Tasks* requiring coordinated execution by heterogeneous robots (e.g., ‘‘Slice the

Algorithm 1: KGLAMP Replanning

```

1: Initialize iteration counter  $t \leftarrow 0$ , error  $e$ , number of
   candidates  $k$ , knowledge graph  $\mathcal{G}$ , trade-off coefficient  $\lambda$ ,
   domain  $d$ , problem PDDL  $\text{Prob}_{PDDL}$ 
2: while  $e \neq \emptyset$  do
3:    $\{H_1, \dots, H_k\}, \{\pi_1, \dots, \pi_k\} \leftarrow \text{LLM}_{\text{replan}}(k, e, \mathcal{G})$  {top- $k$ 
   candidate fixes using current error}
4:   for  $i = 1, \dots, k$  do
5:      $p_i \leftarrow \pi_i / \sum_{j=1}^k \pi_j$  {normalize probabilities}
6:   end for
7:   for  $i = 1$  to  $k$  do
8:      $\mathcal{G}_{\text{temp}}^{(i)} \leftarrow \mathcal{G} \cup H_i$  {update knowledge graph}
9:      $\text{Prob}_{PDDL,i}^{\text{new}} \leftarrow \text{GENERATEPDDL}(\mathcal{G}_{\text{temp}}^{(i)})$  {get PDDL}
10:     $\text{plan}_i, e_i \leftarrow \text{PLANNER}(d, \text{Prob}_{PDDL,i}^{\text{new}})$  {get new plan;
    capture new error message if any}
11:    if  $\text{plan}_i$  is valid then
12:       $\Delta c_i \leftarrow \text{cost}(d, \text{Prob}_{PDDL,i}^{\text{new}}) - \text{cost}(d, \text{Prob}_{PDDL})$ 
    {change in cost evaluation}
13:    else
14:       $\Delta c_i \leftarrow \infty$ 
15:    end if
16:    end for
17:     $H^* \leftarrow \arg \max_i \frac{p_i}{(\Delta c_i)^\lambda}$  {best candidate selection}
18:     $\mathcal{G} \leftarrow \mathcal{G} \cup H^*$  {updated knowledge graph}
19:     $\text{Prob}_{PDDL} \leftarrow \text{GENERATEPDDL}(\mathcal{G})$  {get final PDDL}
20:     $\text{plan}, e \leftarrow \text{PLANNER}(d, \text{Prob}_{PDDL})$  {get updated plan}
21:  end while
22: return  $\mathcal{G}, \text{Prob}_{PDDL}, \text{plan}$ 

```

lettuce, trash the mug, and switch off the light’’); and (iii) 7 *Vague Command Tasks* with underspecified instructions (e.g., ‘‘Prepare ingredients for cooking a sandwich tomorrow’’).

B. Qualitative Analysis: Symbolic Replanning

An example of replanning improving robustness is shown in Fig. 6 for the task: *Put the watch and keychain inside the drawer*. The goal is encoded as (watch, in, drawer) and (keychain, in, drawer). Execution fails because the model omits the precondition that the drawer must be open, causing failure at *Action 3*. The system identifies the missing precondition, updates the knowledge graph, and inserts a drawer-opening action. The repaired plan then succeeds, illustrating effective recovery through symbolic replanning.

C. Evaluation Metrics and Baselines

We utilize five evaluation metrics that capture task success, action validity, and temporal efficiency. *Task Completion Rate (TCR)* measures the percentage of tasks in which all goal conditions are satisfied. *Goal Condition Recall (GCR)* quantifies the proportion of ground-truth goal conditions achieved in the final state. *Executability Rate (ER)* reports the percentage of planned actions that are successfully executed in the simulator, independent of task relevance. *Planning Time (PT)* denotes the time required to generate the final multi-robot plan, while *Execution Time (ET)* measures the time to execute the plan in AI2-THOR. Together, these metrics are widely used in the literature [10], [18] and assess correctness, robustness, and operational efficiency.



Fig. 6: Qualitative example of planning and replanning. In the task *Put the watch and keychain inside the drawer*, the robot fails when placing the watch into a closed drawer. It recovers by replanning to open the drawer and completes the task.

We compare against six representative baselines. (i) *LLM-as-Planner* [34] treats the language model as a standalone planner that directly generates action sequences without structural constraints or verification. (ii) *LLM-as-Planner with Chain-of-Thought (CoT)* [35] elicits explicit reasoning before plan generation, with plans manually converted into executable actions. (iii) *LLM+P* [6] adds a post-hoc execution-phase validator that detects invalid actions but provides no planning-time guidance. (iv) *LaMMA-P* [10] incorporates structured knowledge and adaptive multi-agent reasoning to improve plan coherence and execution reliability. (v) *SayPlan* [36] leverages structured scene graphs to ground LLM reasoning, but relies on static graph representations. (vi) *HVR* [37] employs retrieval-augmented generation (RAG) to incorporate relevant textual knowledge, but depends on unstructured retrieved context. We set a 300-second planning time limit, and use GPT-5 [31] for all methods to ensure a fair comparison.

D. Performance in Full Knowledge Graph

As shown in Table I, our method achieves the highest task completion rate, outperforming the strongest baseline, *LaMMA-P*, by 25.3% across all 49 tasks. We compare against four categories of methods. The first includes *LLM-as-Planner* and *LLM-as-Planner + CoT*, which directly generate action sequences from task descriptions. While efficient, they struggle with complex or long-horizon tasks due to error accumulation and lack of grounding in environmental structure and constraints.

The second category, *LLM+P*, uses an LLM to generate a PDDL problem and a classical planner for execution. While effective when the PDDL is accurate, it often fails due to invalid or incomplete specifications, such as incorrect predicates, action schemas, or object definitions, leading to planner failure or infeasible plans.

The third category, *LaMMA-P*, introduces explicit task decomposition, translating each subtask into a separate PDDL problem. Although this improves scalability, it does not explicitly model inter-agent coordination or object-level dependencies across subtasks. Consequently, when task preconditions depend on other agents’ actions or shared object states, the resulting plans can be inconsistent or incomplete.

The fourth category integrates graph-based grounding and retrieval-augmented reasoning, exemplified by *SayPlan* and

HVR. While these methods improve grounding on simpler tasks, their reliance on static graphs or unstructured retrieval limits multi-step reasoning and adaptability, leading to degraded performance in complex, long-horizon scenarios.

In contrast, our method uses a unified framework that jointly coordinates all robots while explicitly modeling object-level dependencies. By leveraging a knowledge graph capturing semantic, spatial, and relational structure, it enables grounded reasoning and reliable execution, achieving the highest overall success rate.

E. Heterogeneity Evaluation

To evaluate heterogeneity-aware planning, we focus on tasks requiring coordination among robots with distinct capabilities. In MAT2-THOR, 19 out of 49 tasks involve heterogeneous robots with disjoint skill sets, making capability-aware task allocation necessary for successful execution.

In our framework, heterogeneity is encoded via the property graph G_{property} , which represents robot-specific capabilities and constrains action feasibility during PDDL generation, enabling implicit capability-conditioned task allocation.

On these heterogeneous tasks, our method achieves a TCR of 73.7%, consistent with overall performance, demonstrating robustness to capability asymmetry. In contrast, baselines that assume shared action models often produce infeasible plans by assigning actions to incapable robots.

Qualitatively, in the task “slice the lettuce and put it in the fridge,” we observe three robots with limited skills that make their roles unique and irreplaceable. The slicing action is strictly assigned to the specific robot possessing that capability, transport is handled by the other robot, and the third is left unassigned, illustrating clear role specialization where agents cannot substitute for one another.

F. Ablation Study

As shown in Table II, the ablation study shows that each component is critical and non-redundant. Removing any module degrades performance, with the largest drop occurring when all graph structures are removed, highlighting the importance of structured semantic, property, and relational information for guiding manipulation.

Specifically, G_{property} identifies which objects must be manipulated, G_{relation} encodes affordances for action selection, and G_{reach} enforces spatial and relational consistency to support correct coordinate-frame reasoning and collision avoidance. The replanning module further improves robustness by enabling recovery from execution failures and partial observability, such as when a target object is initially enclosed and must first be exposed. Across the evaluation set, replanning is triggered in 12 out of 49 tasks ($\sim 24.5\%$), indicating that execution failures and symbolic inconsistencies are common in long-horizon settings. This highlights the practical importance of the replanning module, which plays an active role in recovering from errors and ensuring successful task completion. This behavior is particularly critical in complex tasks (Table I), where failure recovery significantly contributes to improved task completion rates.

Method	Basic					Complex					Vague				
	TCR(%)	GCR(%)	ER(%)	PT(s)	ET(s)	TCR(%)	GCR(%)	ER(%)	PT(s)	ET(s)	TCR(%)	GCR(%)	ER(%)	PT(s)	ET(s)
LLM-as-Planner	32.0	44.0	76.0	32.6	45.0	10.5	22.8	69.8	39.9	55.9	14.3	21.4	12.1	53.5	106.6
LLM-as-Planner (CoT)	36.0	44.0	77.2	27.6	54.0	26.3	46.5	77.9	36.9	69.2	14.3	21.4	35.7	43.1	35.2
LLM + P	20.0	36.0	60.1	61.1	35.4	15.8	32.4	15.9	83.1	52.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.7	0.0
LaMMA-P	60.0	74.0	90.0	131.8	114.8	36.8	60.1	74.3	190.9	163.9	57.1	57.1	63.7	167.7	199.0
SayPlan	65.0	74.0	92.0	4.7	70.9	27.0	55.0	83.0	5.6	79.5	29.0	29.0	80.0	5.3	50.1
HVR	60.0	76.0	88.0	54.1	84.1	24.0	55.0	81.0	73.8	95.2	43.0	60.0	89.0	94.4	88.1
Ours w/o replan	72.0	80.0	91.3	171.4	95.5	47.4	52.6	68.9	236.6	89.4	57.1	57.1	92.9	169.1	172.2
Ours	84.0	85.2	97.5	181.7	67.7	68.4	60.3	94.9	284.3	144.8	71.4	71.4	94.3	301.5	77.4

TABLE I: Performance comparison across methods.

Method	TCR(%)	GCR(%)	ER(%)	PT(s)	ET(s)
Ours	76.5	74.0	96.1	236.4	97.75
Ours w/o replan	60.7	60.2	83.1	195.4	103.7
Ours w/o \mathcal{G}_{reach}	58.8	64.7	83.8	181.7	99.0
Ours w/o \mathcal{G}_{reach} and $\mathcal{G}_{property}$	52.9	60.2	80.6	156.5	83.7
Ours w/o \mathcal{G}_{reach} , $\mathcal{G}_{property}$ and $\mathcal{G}_{relation}$	37.2	48.4	68.6	95.6	76.8

TABLE II: Ablation results with different graph structures.

Method	TCR(%)	GCR(%)	ER(%)	PT(s)	ET(s)
llama3.2 3B	39.2	53.3	71.0	24.9	67.5
phi3:mini 7B	41.2	53.3	72.9	13.9	86.4
mistral 7B	41.2	54.9	73.0	16.5	59.6
qwen2:7B	45.0	56.9	73.2	18.8	80.5

TABLE III: Performance comparison across models.

G. Symbolic Consistency Analysis

To assess symbolic quality, we measure planner success rate, defined as the percentage of generated PDDL problems solvable by the planner. Our method achieves 86.2%, indicating that most PDDL specifications are syntactically and semantically valid. Remaining failures stem from incomplete or inconsistent representations, such as missing critical objects or incorrect preconditions. This analysis highlights the effectiveness of knowledge-graph grounding in improving symbolic consistency, while also identifying areas for further improvement in handling ambiguous or partially observed environments.

H. Task Planning under Partial Observability

To evaluate robustness under environmental uncertainty, we consider partial observability by omitting 12 critical objects (e.g., *Tomato*, *Laptop*) from the initial world model, requiring VLM-driven object discovery and replanning. Our method achieves a TCR of 64.0% and a GCR of 74.0%, substantially outperforming *LaMMA-P*, which attains a TCR of 12.0% and a GCR of 36.1% due to plan inconsistency.

These results demonstrate the effectiveness of our replanning mechanism in dynamically updating the knowledge graph as new entities are perceived. The remaining gap relative to full-observability settings highlights challenges in active perception, where VLM recognition errors and sub-optimal viewpoints can hinder reliable object identification in cluttered scenes. Despite these limitations, integrating VLM feedback into graph-based planning yields significantly more robust long-horizon task execution than existing baselines.

I. Local Environment Model Comparison

We evaluate several open-source language models in a controlled local setting using the `ollama` framework. All experiments are conducted on an Ubuntu 22.04 workstation with an AMD Ryzen Threadripper 7960X CPU, 128 GB RAM, and an NVIDIA GeForce RTX 5080 GPU. The evaluated models include Llama 3.2 3B [38], Phi 3 Mini 7B [39], Mistral 7B [40], and Qwen 2 7B [41]. As shown in Table III, the models exhibit broadly similar performance across tasks. Qwen 2 7B achieves the strongest results, with a 5.8% higher TCR than Llama 3.2, though the gap remains modest,

indicating limited sensitivity to model choice under identical hardware and runtime conditions.

Inference efficiency is comparable across models, with all achieving response times under 25 seconds, indicating practical responsiveness for local deployment. Their smaller sizes (3B–7B) relative to frontier models like GPT-5 (>100B parameters) contribute to this efficiency. However, as these models are not optimized for complex reasoning, their performance may be limited on more challenging tasks.

VI. CONCLUSION

We presented *KGLAMP*, a knowledge-graph-guided LLM planning framework for long-horizon planning in heterogeneous multi-robot systems. By grounding planning in unified structured graphs encoding object relations, spatial reachability, and robot capabilities, *KGLAMP* enables LLMs to generate task representations that better reflect real-world constraints. Experiments show that *KGLAMP* substantially outperforms LLM-only and PDDL-based baselines, achieving a 25.3% improvement in task completion rate and a 15.3% reduction in execution failures relative to the strongest baseline across all tasks. Moreover, incremental knowledge-graph updates improve robustness by enabling adaptation to incomplete or evolving environment information, maintaining performance in dynamic settings.

Overall, *KGLAMP* demonstrates that coupling LLM-based reasoning with structured, continuously updated knowledge representations is a promising direction for reliable, scalable, and context-aware planning in heterogeneous multi-robot teams. Future work will explore deployment on physical robots, training smaller distilled models via knowledge distillation [42], tighter integration with perception and feedback loops, and scaling to increasingly unstructured environments.

VII. LIMITATIONS

Despite its effectiveness, our approach has several limitations. First, it relies on sufficiently detailed environmental and task information to construct the knowledge graph; while LLMs can infer missing attributes, such inference may introduce noise or inconsistencies. Second, coordinating multiple LLM components incurs significant computational overhead, limiting scalability for real-time or large-scale deployment.

Third, even with explicitly specified domain symbols and type definitions, general-purpose LLMs may generate PDDL predicates or action schemas that violate syntactic or semantic constraints, yielding invalid planning domains without additional verification or correction mechanisms.

REFERENCES

- [1] Yulun Zhang, Matthew C Fontaine, Varun Bhatt, Stefanos Nikolaidis, and Jiaoyang Li. Multi-robot coordination and layout design for automated warehousing. In *Proceedings of the International Symposium on Combinatorial Search*, volume 17, pages 305–306, 2024.
- [2] Ruofei Bai, Ronghao Zheng, Meiqin Liu, and Senlin Zhang. Multi-robot task planning under individual and collaborative temporal logic specifications. In *International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS)*, pages 6382–6389. IEEE, 2021.
- [3] Piyush Gupta, Shaunak D Bopardikar, and Vaibhav Srivastava. Incentivizing collaboration in heterogeneous teams via common-pool resource games. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 68(3):1902–1909, 2022.
- [4] Piyush Gupta, Shaunak D Bopardikar, and Vaibhav Srivastava. Achieving efficient collaboration in decentralized heterogeneous teams using common-pool resource games. In *58th Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, pages 6924–6929. IEEE, 2019.
- [5] Ruikai Liu, Guangxi Wan, Maowei Jiang, Haojie Chen, and Peng Zeng. Autonomous robot task execution in flexible manufacturing: Integrating PDDL and behavior trees in ARIAC 2023. *Biomimetics*, 9(10):612, 2024.
- [6] Bo Liu, Yuqian Jiang, Xiaohan Zhang, Qiang Liu, Shiqi Zhang, Joydeep Biswas, and Peter Stone. LLM+P: Empowering large language models with optimal planning proficiency. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.11477*, 2023.
- [7] Allen Z Ren, Anushri Dixit, Alexandra Bodrova, Sumeet Singh, Stephen Tu, Noah Brown, Peng Xu, Leila Takayama, Fei Xia, Jake Varley, et al. Robots that ask for help: Uncertainty alignment for large language model planners. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.01928*, 2023.
- [8] Lin Guan, Karthik Valmeekam, Sarah Sreedharan, and Subbarao Kambhampati. Leveraging pre-trained large language models to construct and utilize world models for model-based task planning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36:79081–79094, 2023.
- [9] Barbara Arbanas Ferreira, Tamara Petrović, Matko Orsag, J Ramiro Martínez-de Dios, and Stjepan Bogdan. Distributed allocation and scheduling of tasks with cross-schedule dependencies for heterogeneous multi-robot teams. *IEEE access*, 12:74327–74342, 2024.
- [10] Xiaopan Zhang, Hao Qin, Fuquan Wang, Yue Dong, and Jiachen Li. LaMMA-P: Generalizable multi-agent long-horizon task allocation and planning with LM-driven PDDL planner. In *International Conference on Robotics and Automation*, pages 10221–10221. IEEE, 2025.
- [11] Liancheng Gong, Wang Zhu, Jesse Thomason, and Li Zhang. Zero-shot iterative formalization and planning in partially observable environments. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.13126*, 2025.
- [12] Shivam Goel, Yichen Wei, Panagiotis Lymperopoulos, Klára Churá, Matthias Scheutz, and Jivko Sinapov. NOVELGYM: A flexible ecosystem for hybrid planning and learning agents designed for open worlds. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.03546*, 2024.
- [13] Haoqiang Kang, Enna Sachdeva, Piyush Gupta, Sangjae Bae, and Kwonjoon Lee. GFlowVLM: Enhancing multi-step reasoning in vision-language models with generative flow networks. In *Proceedings of the Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Conference*, pages 3815–3825, 2025.
- [14] Piyush Gupta, David Isele, Enna Sachdeva, Pin-Hao Huang, Behzad Dariush, Kwonjoon Lee, and Sangjae Bae. Generalized mission planning for heterogeneous multi-robot teams via LLM-constructed hierarchical trees. In *2025 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, pages 10187–10193, 2025.
- [15] Yue Cao and CS Lee. Robot behavior-tree-based task generation with large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.12927*, 2023.
- [16] Haoqi Yuan, Chi Zhang, Hongcheng Wang, Feiyang Xie, Penglin Cai, Hao Dong, and Zongqing Lu. Skill reinforcement learning and planning for open-world long-horizon tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.16563*, 2023.
- [17] Lutfi Eren Erdogan, Nicholas Lee, Sehoon Kim, Suhong Moon, Hiroki Furuta, Gopala Anumanchipalli, Kurt Keutzer, and Amir Gholami. PLAN-AND-ACT: Improving planning of agents for long-horizon tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.09572*, 2025.
- [18] Shyam Sundar Kannan, Vishnunandan LN Venkatesh, and Byung-Cheol Min. Smart-LLM: Smart multi-agent robot task planning using large language models. In *2024 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems*, pages 12140–12147. IEEE, 2024.
- [19] Piyush Gupta, Sangjae Bae, and David Isele. Graph-grounded LLMs: Leveraging graphical function calling to minimize LLM hallucinations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.10941*, 2025.
- [20] Fangru Lin, Emanuele La Malfa, Valentin Hofmann, Elle Michelle Yang, Anthony Cohn, and Janet B Pierrehumbert. Graph-enhanced large language models in asynchronous plan reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.02805*, 2024.
- [21] Zhehui Huang, Guangyao Shi, Yuwei Wu, Vijay Kumar, and Gaurav S Sukhatme. Compositional coordination for multi-robot teams with large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2507.16068*, 2025.
- [22] Kehui Liu, Zixin Tang, Dong Wang, Zhigang Wang, Xuelong Li, and Bin Zhao. COHERENT: Collaboration of heterogeneous multi-robot system with large language models. In *International Conference on Robotics and Automation*, pages 10208–10214. IEEE, 2025.
- [23] Yanfang Zhou, Yanfang Zhou, Xiaodong Li, Yuntao Liu, Yongqiang Zhao, Xintong Wang, Zhenyu Li, Jinlong Tian, and Xinhai Xu. M2PA: A multi-memory planning agent for open worlds inspired by cognitive theory. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2025*, pages 23204–23220, 2025.
- [24] Tomoyuki Kagaya, Thong Jing Yuan, Yuxuan Lou, Jayashree Karlekar, Sugiri Pranata, Akira Kinose, Koki Oguri, Felix Wick, and Yang You. RAP: Retrieval-augmented planning with contextual memory for multimodal LLM agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.03610*, 2024.
- [25] Abrar Anwar, John Welsh, Joydeep Biswas, Soha Pouya, and Yan Chang. REMEMBER: Building and reasoning over long-horizon spatio-temporal memory for robot navigation. In *International Conference on Robotics and Automation*, pages 2838–2845. IEEE, 2025.
- [26] Zaijing Li, Yuquan Xie, Rui Shao, Gongwei Chen, Dongmei Jiang, and Liqiang Nie. OPTIMUS-1: Hybrid multimodal memory empowered agents excel in long-horizon tasks. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 37:49881–49913, 2024.
- [27] Zixuan Wang, Bo Yu, Junzhe Zhao, Wenhao Sun, Sai Hou, Shuai Liang, Xing Hu, Yinhe Han, and Yiming Gan. KARMA: Augmenting embodied ai agents with long-and-short term memory systems. In *International Conference on Robotics and Automation*, pages 1–8. IEEE, 2025.
- [28] Krish Agarwal, Yuqian Jiang, Jiaheng Hu, Bo Liu, and Peter Stone. L3M+ P: Lifelong planning with large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2508.01917*, 2025.
- [29] Diego Aineto, Sergio Jiménez, and Eva Onaindia. Learning STRIPS action models with classical planning. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Automated Planning and Scheduling*, volume 28, pages 399–407, 2018.
- [30] Malte Helmert. The fast downward planning system. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, 26:191–246, 2006.
- [31] OpenAI. GPT-5. <https://openai.com/gpt-5/>, 2025. Accessed: 2025-12-03.
- [32] Piyush Gupta, Sangjae Bae, Jiachen Li, and David Isele. Scale-Plan: Scalable language-enabled task planning for heterogeneous multi-robot teams. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2603.08814*, 2026.
- [33] Eric Kolve, Roozbeh Mottaghi, Winson Han, Eli VanderBilt, Luca Weihs, Alvaro Herrasti, Matt Deitke, Kiana Ehsani, Daniel Gordon, Yuke Zhu, et al. AI2-THOR: An interactive 3D environment for visual AI. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1712.05474*, 2017.
- [34] Zihao Zhou, Bin Hu, Chenyang Zhao, Pu Zhang, and Bin Liu. Large language model as a policy teacher for training reinforcement learning agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.13373*, 2023.
- [35] Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Fei Xia, Ed Chi, Quoc V Le, Denny Zhou, et al. Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:24824–24837, 2022.
- [36] Krishan Rana, Jesse Haviland, Sourav Garg, Jad Abou-Chakra, Ian Reid, and Niko Suenderhauf. SayPlan: grounding large language models using 3d scene graphs for scalable task planning. In *7th Annual Conference on Robot Learning*, 2023.
- [37] Flavio Petruzzellis, Cristina Cornelio, and Pietro Lio. Hierarchical planning for complex tasks with knowledge graph-rag and symbolic

verification. In *Forty-Second International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, 2025.

- [38] Llama Team, AI @ Meta. The Llama 3 herd of models, 2024.
- [39] Marah Abdin, Jyoti Aneja, Harkirat Behl, Sébastien Bubeck, Ronen Eldan, Suriya Gunasekar, Michael Harrison, Russell J Hewett, Mojan Javaheripi, Piero Kauffmann, et al. Phi-4 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.08905*, 2024.
- [40] Albert Q. Jiang, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Antoine Roux, et al. Mistral 7b, 2023.
- [41] An Yang, Baosong Yang, Binyuan Hui, et al. Qwen2 technical report, 2024.
- [42] Piyush Gupta, David Isele, and Sangjae Bae. Towards scalable & efficient interaction-aware planning in autonomous vehicles using knowledge distillation. In *2024 IEEE Intelligent Vehicles Symposium (IV)*, pages 2735–2742. IEEE, 2024.