

Interleaving Pre-Trained Language Models and Large Language Models for Zero-Shot NL2SQL Generation

Zihui Gu
Renmin University of
China, China
guzh@ruc.edu.cn

Ju Fan
Renmin University of
China, China
fanj@ruc.edu.cn

Nan Tang
QCRI, HBKU
Qatar
ntang@hbku.edu.qa

Songyue Zhang
Renmin University of
China, China
zhangsongyue@ruc.edu.cn

Yuxin Zhang
Renmin University of
China, China
zhangyuxin159@ruc.edu.cn

Zui Chen
Tsinghua University
China
chenzui19@mails.tsinghua.edu.cn

Lei Cao
University of Arizona/MIT
USA
lcao@csail.mit.edu

Guoliang Li
Tsinghua University
China
liguoliang@tsinghua.edu.cn

Sam Madden
MIT CSAIL
USA
madden@csail.mit.edu

Xiaoyong Du
Renmin University of
China, China
duyong@ruc.edu.cn

ABSTRACT

Zero-shot NL2SQL is crucial in achieving natural language to SQL that is adaptive to new environments (e.g., new databases, new linguistic phenomena or SQL structures) with zero annotated NL2SQL samples from such environments. Existing approaches either *fine-tune* pre-trained language models (PLMs) based on annotated data or use prompts to guide *fixed* large language models (LLMs) such as ChatGPT. PLMs can perform well in schema alignment but struggle to achieve complex reasoning, while LLMs is superior in complex reasoning tasks but cannot achieve precise schema alignment. In this paper, we propose a ZERO NL2SQL framework that combines the complementary advantages of PLMs and LLMs for supporting zero-shot NL2SQL. ZERO NL2SQL first uses PLMs to generate an SQL sketch via schema alignment, then uses LLMs to fill the missing information via complex reasoning. Moreover, in order to better align the generated SQL queries with values in the given database instances, we design a predicate calibration method to guide the LLM in completing the SQL sketches based on the database instances and select the optimal SQL query via an execution-based strategy. Comprehensive experiments show that ZERO NL2SQL can achieve the best zero-shot NL2SQL performance on real-world benchmarks. Specifically, ZERO NL2SQL outperforms the state-of-the-art PLM-based methods by 3.2% to 13% and exceeds LLM-based methods by 10% to 20% on execution accuracy.

1 INTRODUCTION

Natural language to SQL (NL2SQL), which translates a natural language question into an SQL query allows non-technical users to easily access and analyze data, and thus can be very useful for business intelligence, data analytics, and other data-driven applications. Figure 1 illustrates how a question Q posed over a database D can be translated into an SQL query S .

Zero-shot NL2SQL. Although existing NL2SQL methods [17, 36, 41] have shown impressive performance on well-known benchmarks (e.g., Spider [44]), their results are obtained in a setting that test data follows the same distribution as training data. However, in many practical scenarios, test environments for NL2SQL may be different from the training environments. This gap tends to dramatically degrade the performance of existing methods [27]. For example, an NL2SQL method trained on academic databases may not perform well on financial databases [15], or when test data has varying linguistic phenomena or SQL structures [3].

To address the above problem, this paper studies *zero-shot NL2SQL*, aiming to build an NL2SQL model that is adaptive to various test environments with *zero* annotated NL2SQL samples required from the test environments. To achieve this, we have to solve the following three intrinsic challenges that arise in zero-shot NL2SQL.

- (1) **Database schema alignment.** In NL2SQL tasks, understanding the structure of the underlying database is crucial for generating accurate SQL queries. However, correctly aligning the natural language question with the appropriate tables, columns, and relationships in the database schema can be challenging, especially when there are multiple tables that potentially match the question. For example, in Figure 1, both table Course and table Student contain a column course, making it hard to select the appropriate table.
- (2) **Complicated natural language reasoning.** NL2SQL tasks often involve complex natural language questions that require advanced reasoning capabilities. Understanding the question’s semantics, resolving ambiguities, and performing

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than ACM must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from permissions@acm.org.

Conference’17, July 2017, Washington, DC, USA

© 2023 Association for Computing Machinery.

ACM ISBN 978-x-xxxx-xxxx-x/YY/MM... \$15.00

<https://doi.org/10.1145/nnnnnnn.nnnnnnn>

A Text Question Q

Which course has the highest score for the student named timothy ward?

Snippets of a Database D

Course	id	course	teacher
	001	math	jordy wu

Student	id	given_name	last_name	score	course
	1	timmy	ward	92	math

A Correct SQL Query S w.r.t. Q

```
SELECT course FROM Student
WHERE given_name = 'timmy' AND last_name = 'ward'
ORDER BY score LIMIT 1;
```

Figure 1: A sample NL2SQL translation.

logical deductions are necessary for generating precise SQL queries. For example, in Figure 1, an effective NL2SQL model must have the power to infer column given_name and column last_name based on “student named timothy ward”. These tasks become even more challenging when the queries involve complex joins, nested conditions, or aggregations.

- (3) **Database instance alignment.** This involves mapping the information provided in the natural language question to the relevant data values stored in the database. In NL2SQL tasks, the model needs to understand the intent of the question and identify the specific predicates that match both the question and the database content. For example, in Figure 1, the NL2SQL model needs to generate an SQL predicate given_name = ‘timmy’ (rather than ‘timothy’) which is aligned with the question and exists in the database.

State-of-the-Art : Strengths and Limitations. The state-of-the-art (SOTA) solutions for NL2SQL mainly rely on Transformer-based language models, which fall into two categories: pre-trained language models (PLMs) and large language models (LLMs).

- **PLM-based methods** (e.g., RASAT [29], PICARD [36], and RESDSQL [17]) are fine-tuned on annotated training sets such as Spider [44] to adapt to the NL2SQL task. PLM-based methods have shown promise in generating accurate SQL queries on downstream datasets through fine-tuning on numerous annotated NL2SQL samples.

- **LLMs** (e.g., PaLM [6], ChatGPT, and GPT4 [24]) have demonstrated remarkable complex reasoning abilities across a range of domains and tasks, without requiring fine-tuning for specific datasets; and they are usually accessible through API calls.

We conducted an in-depth analysis to gain insights into the strengths and limitations of the SOTA solutions for zero-shot NL2SQL. Our analysis revealed valuable observations regarding the performance of different approaches on addressing the respective difficulties, as summarized in the first two rows of Figure 2.

- **PLMs: (Pros)** PLMs exhibit exceptional proficiency in schema-alignment sub-tasks. Specifically, they excel in determining the appropriate attributes to include in the SELECT clause and identifying the relevant tables to include in the FROM clause. **(Cons)** They are not good at *complex reasoning* in the zero-shot setting.

	Schema Alignment	Complicated Natural Language Reasoning	Instance Alignment
PLMs	++	+	-
LLMs	+	++	-
ZERONL2SQL	++	++	++

Figure 2: Comparing approaches for zero-shot NL2SQL.

```
SELECT course FROM Student
WHERE given_name = 'timothy ward'
ORDER BY score LIMIT 1;
```

Figure 3: An SQL query S’ translated by a PLM

```
SELECT Course.course, Student.score
FROM Student JOIN Course ON Student.id = Course.id
WHERE given_name = 'timothy' AND last_name = 'ward'
ORDER BY score LIMIT 1;
```

Figure 4: An SQL query S’’ translated by a LLM

Consider S’ in Figure 3, given “student named timothy ward”, it failed differentiating between given_name and last_name, and only selected one column given_name that is similar to the word “named”.

- **LLMs: (Pros)** LLMs demonstrate superior performance in complex reasoning tasks, particularly when dealing with predicates under the WHERE clause. These methods are capable to handle intricate logical deductions and interpret the semantics of the question. **(Cons)** LLMs cannot achieve precise schema alignment; they tend to choose more columns (e.g., score) and tables (e.g., course) to cover the input content, leading to incorrect execution results. Consider S’’ in Figure 4, the LLM got wrong columns in both SELECT and FROM clauses.

Moreover, both PLMs and LLMs demonstrate competence in other components of SQL queries, such as ORDER BY and LIMIT. However, it is important to note that neither of the methods excels in database instance alignment. For example, both S’ and S’’ use the value ‘timothy’ without being able to align with the correct value ‘timmy’ stored in the database.

Our Proposed Framework. Our key observation is that PLMs and LLMs could complement each other in addressing zero-shot NL2SQL tasks. That is, the pros of PLMs (database schema alignment) are the cons of LLMs, while the pros of LLMs (complex natural language reasoning) are the cons of the PLMs. Intuitively, were we able to intelligently combine PLMs and LLMs and thus unify the best of the two worlds, the zero-shot NL2SQL problem would be solved much more effectively. Moreover, although both PLMs and LLMs cannot handle database instance alignment, potentially we can leverage the LLM’s interaction ability to address this issue by calibrating the translated SQL query using the provided datasets.

Based on the above observation, we propose a framework ZERONL2SQL that interleaves tunable PLMs and fixed LLMs to achieve zero-shot NL2SQL, effectively addressing all the three challenges in zero-shot NL2SQL, as shown in the last row of Figure 2. ZERONL2SQL mainly consists of two key steps. Firstly, **SQL Sketch Generation** utilizes tunable PLMs to perform database schema alignment and generate an *SQL sketch*, which includes (1) attributes

to SELECT, (2) tables included in FROM, and (3) necessary keywords (e.g., ORDER BY) for composing the SQL query. Secondly, **SQL Query Completion** leverages LLMs to fill the missing information in the SQL sketch and calibrates the predicates by aligning with data values from the database, e.g., from “timothy” to “timmy”, thanks to the sophisticated natural language reasoning and interaction capabilities of LLMs.

Effectively realizing our ZERO NL2SQL framework raises two major technical challenges. The first challenge is how to generate accurate SQL sketches via tunable PLMs in our zero-shot setting where test data differs from training data. To address the challenge, we first introduce an SQL sketch learning framework equipped with an adaptive and database-aware serialization strategy to generate candidate SQL sketches. Next, as the beam search decoding process of PLMs can be susceptible to local optima and fail to find the globally best solution [13, 19], we retain the top- k hypotheses for re-evaluation and refinement. Specifically, we preserve the top- k SQL candidate sketches, rather than directly taking the best one, and then propose a *question-aware aligner* to rank the SQL sketches based on the semantics of the question. The second challenge is how to guide LLMs to complete SQL queries based on the database instances and output the correct SQL query. To address this challenge, we design a predicate calibration method to suggest suitable database instances to the LLM. Moreover, we propose an execution-based selection strategy to choose the optimal SQL query, inspired by our observation that the results of an SQL execution reflect its quality.

Contributions. We summarize our contributions as follows.

(1) **The ZERO NL2SQL framework.** In this paper, we study the problem of zero-shot NL2SQL, and introduce a novel framework ZERO NL2SQL that first generates SQL sketches then completes the SQL queries, to solve the two intrinsic NL2SQL challenges step-by-step. (Section 3)

(2) **Optimizations.** We propose novel techniques to tackle the challenges of the following problems: SQL sketch generation via PLMs (Section 4) and SQL query completion via LLMs (Section 5).

(3) **New SOTA Zero-shot NL2SQL Result.** We conduct comprehensive zero-shot NL2SQL evaluation on two benchmarks: Dr.Spider [3] and KaggleDBQA [15], with a total of 18 test sets. The experimental results show that ZERO NL2SQL can improve the average execution accuracy of ChatGPT on the NL2SQL tasks by 10% to 20%, and its performance surpasses the state-of-the-art specific PLM-based models (Exp-1 & Exp-2), as well as in-context learning methods (Exp-3). Our code and models are available at Github¹. (Section 6)

2 PRELIMINARIES

2.1 Zero-shot NL2SQL

Let Q be a natural language question Q , and D a relational database consisting of n tables $\{T_1, T_2, \dots, T_n\}$, where c_{ij} denotes the j -th column of the i -th table T_i .

The problem of **NL2SQL** is to generate a correct SQL query S , given the question Q and a provided database D .

According to previous work [3, 15, 46], the problem of **zero-shot NL2SQL** refers to the inference environment $\mathcal{D}_{test} = \{(D_i, Q_i, S_i)\}_{i=0}^M$

¹<https://github.com/ruc-datalab/ZeroNL2SQL>




Figure 5: An illustration of ZERO NL2SQL

not appearing in the training set $\mathcal{D}_{train} = \{(D_j, Q_j, S_j)\}_{j=0}^N$, which mainly includes the following three situations:

- (1) **Test on new databases.** The databases $\{D_i\}_{i=0}^M$ used for testing are different in terms of schema and instance from the databases $\{D_j\}_{j=0}^N$ used for training. For example, the training database contains column name, but the testing database contains column given_name and last_name. As a further example, the training database is about science, while the testing database is about finance.
- (2) **Test on new questions.** The questions $\{Q_i\}_{i=0}^M$ used for testing are different in terms of linguistic phenomena from the questions $\{Q_j\}_{j=0}^N$ used for training. For example, questions in the training set explicitly mention column or table names in the database schema, while the words in the testing questions do not explicitly show in the database schema or show as synonyms (e.g., the question in Figure 1 can also be expressed as “What is timothy ward’s best performing course?”).
- (3) **Test on new SQLs.** The SQL queries $\{S_i\}_{i=0}^M$ used for testing are different in terms of local semantics and complexity from the SQL queries $\{S_j\}_{j=0}^N$ used for training. For example, only a small number of SQL queries in the training set contain nested clauses, while a large number of SQL queries in the test set contain nested clauses.

The goal of this work is to push the SOTA zero-shot NL2SQL performance by interleaving PLMs and LLMs.

2.2 SQL Sketch

In this paper, an SQL Sketch consists of the following three parts:

- **SELECT.** Attributes that need to be returned to the user, e.g., course in Figure 5.
- **FROM.** Tables used to obtain data, e.g., student in Figure 5.
- **KEYWORDS.** Keywords representing sub-clauses, e.g., SELECT, FROM, ORDER BY, LIMIT, as shown in Figure 5.

2.3 Language Models

Language models (LMs), typically based on Transformers [40], aim to understand and generate human-like text. These models utilize sophisticated algorithms and vast amounts of training data to learn the patterns, structures, and semantics of language. Technically, LMs are trained to model the generative likelihood of word sequences, thereby enabling them to estimate the probability of subsequent tokens based on the provided input context. They have proven to be invaluable in various applications, such as natural language processing.

LMs are typically pre-trained on large corpora and have exhibited excellent performance on many downstream tasks such as translation, summarization, and question answering.

In this paper, we distinguish between two specific terms: pre-trained language models (PLMs) and large language models (LLMs).

- **PLMs** refer to the models that can be hosted locally by normal users and fine-tuned for different downstream tasks, such as BERT [9], BART [16], and GPT2 [30].

- **LLMs** refer to giant language models that are only accessible through web services or API calls, such as ChatGPT, PaLM [6], GPT4 [24] and GLam [10].

Although both PLMs and LLMs pre-train on a large amount of text data, the former mainly adapts to downstream tasks through fine-tuning, while the latter achieves zero-shot complex reasoning through *in-context learning* and *instruction following* [45], without changing the model parameters.

2.4 Language Models for NL2SQL

Recent work [20, 32] formulates the NL2SQL task as an end-to-end translation task, and leverages appropriate prompts P to guide LMs:

$$\text{LM}(Q, D, P) \rightarrow S$$

Therefore, the design of the prompt P is the key to the quality of generating SQL queries. The existing methods include only using task description (e.g., “Translate the user question into an SQL query.”) as the prompt [20], or adding some manually annotated example pairs (*Question, SQL*) to the prompt [47].

Recent studies show that LMs can learn from just a few examples within a given context (i.e., *in-context learning*) [1, 4, 22]. These works demonstrate that *in-context learning* is effective in enabling LMs to perform a range of complex tasks. Therefore, considering the complexity of the NL2SQL task, *in-context learning* can be adopted to guide LMs to better generate SQL queries.

3 AN OVERVIEW OF ZERONL2SQL

We introduce a framework ZERONL2SQL that interleaves tunable PLMs and fixed LLMs to achieve zero-shot NL2SQL generation. As illustrated in Figure 6, ZERONL2SQL mainly consists of the following two key steps.

- (1) **SQL sketch generation by PLMs.** Given a user question Q and a database schema D_{schema} , an *SQL Sketch Generation* Module generates a list of SQL sketch candidates $\mathcal{D}_{\text{sketch}} = (\text{SELECT}, \text{FROM}, \text{Keywords})$ and passes it to a fixed LLM.

- (2) **SQL query completion by LLMs.** Given a set of SQL sketch candidates $\mathcal{D}_{\text{sketch}}$, an *SQL Query Completion* Module powered by LLM completes in the details and select the optimal SQL query as final output.

EXAMPLE 1. Figure 5 illustrates our idea, which tackles NL2SQL in two successive steps.

Step 1: It first uses PLMs to generate an SQL sketch and performs the sub-task of database schema alignment, i.e., the *SELECT* and *FROM* clauses are complete.

Step 2: It then uses LLMs to fill the missing information, because LLMs are good at complicated natural language reasoning. Finally, it calibrates the predicates by aligning with data values from the database, e.g., from ‘timothy’ to ‘timmy’.

To support the above framework, we develop two key modules, namely *SQL Sketch Generation* and *SQL Query Completion*, to effectively unify the advantages of tunable PLMs (e.g., T5 [31], Bart [16]) and fixed LLMs (e.g., ChatGPT), which will be introduced as follows.

SQL Sketch Generation. Given a user question Q and a database schema D_{schema} , this module generates a ranked list of SQL sketch candidates $\mathcal{D}_{\text{sketch}}$. A straightforward implementation of *SQL sketch generation* is to model it as a sequence-to-sequence generation problem and use an Encoder-Decoder based PLM to generate the SQL sketch, i.e.,

$$t = \text{PLM}_{\text{decode}}(\text{PLM}_{\text{encode}}(Q, D_{\text{schema}}))$$

where $\text{PLM}_{\text{encode}}(\cdot)$ is the PLM’s encoder for converting the input (Q, D_{schema}) into a high-dimensional hidden vector x , and $\text{PLM}_{\text{decode}}(\cdot)$ is the PLM’s decoder for generating an SQL sketch t based on x via beam search.

However, it is non-trivial to train such an *SQL Sketch generation* module to provide accurate SQL sketch in our zero-shot setting where test data differs from training data. To this end, we first use an SQL sketch learning framework equipped with a database-aware serialization strategy to empower the model to generate a list of valid SQL sketches in different test environments. We then introduce a question-aware aligner to further rank the SQL sketches based on the fine-grained semantics of user questions. More details of *SQL Sketch Generation* will be discussed in Section 4.

SQL Query Completion. Given a ranked list of SQL sketches, this module leverages LLMs to complete the SQL queries and selects the optimal SQL query as final output. There are two main challenges in this module: (1) How to achieve database instance alignment, and (2) How to select the optimal SQL query.

To address the first challenge, we design a predicate calibration method to provide the LLM with appropriate predicate recommendations that are both in line with the original SQL query and grounded on the database. Specifically, this module takes the predicate predicted by the LLM as input, denoted as $(\text{column}^0, \text{value}^0)$. We start from column^0 and gradually expand the matching range of value^0 to the entire database to obtain the best predicate $(\text{column}, \text{value})$, which is then fed back to the LLM for rewriting the SQL query. In addition, we explore different similarity calculation methods based on the type of value, such as abbreviations or synonyms.

To address the second challenge, based on the observation that the results of SQL execution can reflect the quality of SQL, we design an execution-based selection strategy to choose the optimal




Figure 6: An overview of ZERO NL2SQL. Given a user question Q and a database schema D_{schema} , (1) an **SQL Sketch Generation Module** generates a list of SQL sketch candidates, and (2) an **SQL Query Completion Module** completes the SQL queries and selects the optimal SQL query as the final result.

SQL query that is executable and can return high-quality data. More details of SQL query completion module will be discussed in Section 5.

4 SQL SKETCH GENERATION

This section presents *SQL Sketch Generation* that generates a ranked list of SQL sketches, as illustrated in Figure 7. We first introduce an SQL sketch learning framework equipped with a database-aware serialization strategy in Section 4.1, and then develop question-aware alignment in Section 4.2 to further rank the SQL sketches based on the semantics of question Q in NL2SQL.

4.1 SQL Sketch Learning

Given a user question Q and a database schema D_{schema} , we need to generate three parts: SELECT, FROM, Keywords in the SQL sketch, which are called *sub-tasks* for ease of presentation. We formulate this problem as a sequence-to-sequence generation problem and adopt an Encoder-Decoder pre-trained language model (PLM) as the backbone. We enable the Encoder-Decoder PLM to learn to generate these parts through multi-tasking learning, which is shown in Figure 7. Next, we introduce the two key steps of this SQL Sketch Learning component: database-aware serialization and parameter learning.

Database-aware serialization. Given a user question Q and the database schema D_{schema} , we combine them with different instructions to construct specific inputs for each sub-task as:

$$[INS] \text{ question} : [Q] \text{ database} : S([D_{schema}])$$

where INS is the instruction for each sub-task, and $S(\cdot)$ is a serialization function for serializing the structured database schema D_{schema} into a text sequence.

Figure 7 shows the instructions corresponding to each sub-task, following the previous works [1, 35, 42], which are mainly composed of the task descriptions. For example, for FROM generation sub-task, the corresponding instruction is "Generate the relevant tables of this question according to the database.". The main intuition is that different instructions can enable the PLM to understand different sub-tasks in order to achieve the desired output.

For database schema serialization, previous PLM-based works [17, 29, 36, 37] directly concatenate the table/column names and require the model to output these names to form an SQL query. However, PLM is obliged to generate valid table/column names that exist in the database. Previous methods [17, 29, 36, 37] cannot guarantee this when test environment changes. Example 2 and Figure 8-(1) provides a detailed explanation.

EXAMPLE 2 (DIRECT TABLE/COLUMN NAME SERIALIZATION). *Most existing works use the Spider dataset [44] as the training set, which has high column mention percentage in user questions [8]. We have an observation that the PLM often directly copies column/table names from the question Q during training, rather than selecting from the database. We design an experiment to explore the impact of data distribution shift on the PLM. We train the T5-3B model [31] on the Spider dataset by directly generating column/table names. Figure 8-(1) shows the test results of the fine-tuned T5-3B model, where column "attendance" does not exist in the database.*

To address this, we propose a simple yet effective database-aware serialization strategy to enable the PLM to choose the valid database tables or columns. Specifically, we achieve this by training the PLM to refer to the column/table in the database by their *indexes*. Specifically, given D_{schema} named D_{name} that contains n tables $\{T_0, T_1, \dots, T_n\}$, and c_{ij} is the j -th column of the i -th table T_i , we use parentheses and indexes to the different parts to serialize the database, as shown below:

$$S([D_{schema}]) = [D_{name}] \text{ t0 : } T_0(\text{c0 : } c_{00}, \text{c1 : } c_{01}, \text{c2 : } \dots) \\ \text{ t1 : } T_1(\text{c0 : } c_{10}, \text{c1 : } c_{11}, \text{c2 : } \dots) \\ \dots$$

For example, in Figure 7, the serialized representation of the database "car_1" is "car_1: t0: model_list (c0: modelid, c1: maker, c2: model) t1: continents (c0: contid, c1: continent) t2: car_names (...)". In addition, for tables containing foreign key relationships (e.g., in Figure 7, column "id" of table "cars_data" has a foreign key "makeid" in table "car_names"), we append it in the form of "t4.c0 = t2.c0" after the serialized table "cars_data".

In this way, we enforce the PLM to choose the table/column index that best matches the user question rather than directly copying it from the question. Finally, the index is automatically translated back to the original column/table names. Example 3 and Figure 8-(2) illustrate our database-aware serialization strategy.

EXAMPLE 3 (DATABASE-AWARE SERIALIZATION). *Continuing with Example 2, we use Spider as the training set. The difference is that we require the model to learn how to use indexes to refer to corresponding tables or columns. Figure 8-(2) illustrates the test result, the model first outputs SELECT t0.c2, which is then automatically translated into column and table names in the database: SELECT stadium.highest.*

Based on the comparison results, we can see that Database-aware serialization strategy can enable the model to select valid table and column names from the database, rather than directly copying words from the question.




Figure 7: An overview of the SQL Sketch Generation module. (a) A PLM is used to generate a list of candidates \mathcal{D}_{SELECT} , \mathcal{D}_{FROM} , and $\mathcal{D}_{Keywords}$ after SQL sketch learning (Section 4.1). (b) A Question-Aware Aligner is used to further rank the SELECT and Keywords candidates based on fine-grained question semantics (Section 4.2). The top-1 SELECT and Keywords are combined with \mathcal{D}_{from} to form the ranked SQL sketch candidate set \mathcal{D}_{sketch} .

As discussed previously, to alleviate the local optimal problem of beam search, we retain top- k hypotheses generated by the PLM as candidates instead of only considering the best one. Thus, for the three parts of an SQL sketch, our SQL sketch learning method produces $\mathcal{D}_{SELECT} = \{\text{SELECT}_i\}_{i=0}^{K_1}$, $\mathcal{D}_{FROM} = \{\text{FROM}_i\}_{i=0}^{K_2}$, and $\mathcal{D}_{Keywords} = \{\text{Keywords}_i\}_{i=0}^{K_3}$.

Parameter Learning. To train such a model to generate SQL sketches, we perform supervised fine-tuning on an Encoder-decoder PLM (e.g., T5 [31] and BART [16]) on a set of annotated data. Specifically, we first extract training data for three sub-tasks from an annotated NL2SQL dataset (e.g., Spider [44]). The obtained dataset $\mathcal{M} = \{(INS, Q, DB_{schema}, L)\}$ consists of instruction INS , database schema DB_{schema} and user question Q for input, and label L for target. Note that the instructions and labels for different sub-tasks are different. The PLM is fine-tuned on three sub-tasks simultaneously and optimize parameters θ by minimizing the maximum likelihood:

$$\mathcal{L}(\theta) = -\mathbb{E}_{(INS, Q, DB_{schema}, L) \in \mathcal{M}} \log P_{\theta}(L | INS, Q, DB_{schema})$$

4.2 Question-Aware Aligner

For SQL sketch learning, the PLM generates SQL sketches based on the database schema. However, it is still lack of fine-grained optimization at the semantic-level for different parts. Specifically, for SELECT and Keywords parts, they need to be closely aligned

with the question’s intention and the question’s requirements, respectively. For example, in Figure 6, as the question’s intention is “which course”, the corresponding SELECT part should be “SELECT course”. In addition, as the question’s requirements are “has the highest score”, the corresponding Keywords part should include “ORDER BY”.

To bridge this gap, we design a question-aware aligner to further prune SQL sketch candidates by selecting the best SELECT and Keywords. Note that we do not perform question-based filtering on FROM part here, because the FROM part also depends on complex foreign key connections and cannot be inferred directly based on the semantics of the question. Specifically, we take the Cartesian product of set \mathcal{D}_{SELECT} and set $\mathcal{D}_{Keywords}$ to obtain the final candidate set $\mathcal{D} = \{(\text{SELECT}_i, \text{Keywords}_j) | \text{SELECT}_i \in \mathcal{D}_{SELECT}, \text{Keywords}_j \in \mathcal{D}_{Keywords}\}$. Then, for each candidate from \mathcal{D} , we concatenate it with the user question Q to form an input sequence, i.e.,

[CLS] user question : Q . our solution : $\text{SELECT}_i, \text{Keywords}_j$ [SEP]

where [CLS] and [SEP] are special tokens that represent the start and end of the input sentence, respectively. The input sequence is converted to a high-dimensional representation $H_{[CLS]}$ through an Encoder-based PLM (e.g., BERT [9], RoBERTa [23], and DeBERTa [11]). $H_{[CLS]}$ is further fed into a fully connected layer $FC(\cdot)$ to obtain the alignment score $a_{ij} = \sigma(FC(H_{[CLS]}))$ between $(\text{SELECT}_i, \text{Keywords}_j)$ and Q , where σ is the softmax function.




Figure 8: Comparison of direct table/column name serialization and database-aware serialization.

Finally, we combine \mathcal{D}_{FROM} with the best (SELECT, Keywords) selected by the question-aware aligner to form the SQL sketch candidate set \mathcal{D}_{sketch} .

Parameter Learning. Similar to Section 4.1, we perform supervised fine-tuning on an Encoder-based PLM to training our question-aware aligner. Specifically, for each question Q in the training set \mathcal{M} , we obtain the candidate set \mathcal{D} as above. For each sample (SELECT _{i} , Keywords _{j}) $\in \mathcal{D}$, if and only if both SELECT _{i} and Keywords _{j} are correct, the alignment label L_a is 1, otherwise the alignment label L_a is set to 0. In this way, we can automatically convert \mathcal{D} into a training set $A = \{(Q, \text{SELECT}, \text{Keywords}, L_a)\}$. Then, we optimize the parameters $\theta_{aligner}$ (including the parameters of the Encoder-based PLM and the fully connected layer) by minimizing the cross entropy loss on the training set A .

5 SQL QUERY COMPLETION

In this section, we present our SQL query completion method that leverages LLM to fill the missing information in the SQL sketch. To achieve this, we first introduce a predicate calibration method to help LLM complete SQL queries that are consistent with the database content (Section 5.1). Then, we design a selection strategy to obtain optimal SQL queries (Section 5.2).

5.1 Predicate Calibration

Predicate calibration module aims to ensure consistency between the SQL query and the database, *i.e.*, the *database instance alignment* presented in the Introduction. To achieve this, we first introduce a *multi-level matching* process to provide appropriate predicate recommendations to the LLM. In this process, we explore different




Figure 9: An overview of the predicate calibration module in ZERO NL2SQL.

similarity calculation methods. An overview of predicate calibration is shown in Figure 9.

Multi-Level Matching. Given the predicate (column⁰, value⁰) predicted by the LLM, there are two types of errors: incorrect predicted value and incorrect predicted column. For the former, we can directly find the value that is most similar to value⁰ in column⁰. On the other hand, for the latter, we need to expand the matching range to the entire database. However, directly setting the matching range as the entire database may introduce completely unrelated columns. Therefore, we consider gradually expanding the matching range in three levels. As illustrated in Algorithm 1, we match the predicate’s value on the column, table, and database in sequential order (Line 2). In any level of matching range, if we find a value that is close enough to value⁰ (Line 7), we terminate the matching process and directly return the value and its corresponding column as a new predicate to LLM. Note that we consider values with a similarity higher than r to be sufficiently close to value⁰.

Similarity Calculation. Given (value⁰, value¹), the typical methods for similarity calculation can be generally divided into two categories, namely character-based and semantic-based.

For character-based similarity calculation, the similarity score can be calculated by fuzzymatch method [12], *i.e.*,

$$1 - \frac{\text{IndelDistance}(value^0, value^1)}{\min[\text{length}(value^0), \text{length}(value^1)]}$$

where IndelDistance() is the minimum amount of insertions and deletions to convert one sequence into another sequence, length() represents the length of a string.

For semantic-based similarity calculation, we first convert the two values into two high-dimensional vector-based representations. Then, we obtain the similarity score by calculating the inner product of these two representations. Specifically, to obtain the vector-based

Algorithm 1: Multi-Level Matching

Input: database D , SQL S' , similarity threshold r
Output: Rewritten SQL S''

```

1  $feedback = []$ ;
2  $levels = [column, table, database]$ ;
3 for  $(column^0, value^0)$  in  $extractPredicate(D, S)$  do
4   for  $level$  in  $levels$  do
5      $getCandidateValues(level, D) \rightarrow \mathcal{V}$ ;
6      $SimilarityCalculation(\mathcal{V}, value^0) \rightarrow$ 
        $(column', value')$ ;
7     if  $closeEnough(value^0, value', r)$  then
8        $break$ ;
9     end
10  end
11   $feedback.append((column', value'))$ ;
12 end
13  $feedbackToLLM(feedback) \rightarrow S''$ ;
```

representation, we consider two representative methods, namely word2vec-based and PLM-based.

- For word2vec-based method, we utilize the pre-trained GloVe dictionary [26]. We first tokenize each value into several tokens $\{tok_i\}_{i=0}^n$, and look up in the dictionary to obtain the word embedding emb_i for each token tok_i . Then the value is represented by averaging the word embeddings $\{emb_i\}_{i=0}^n$.

- For PLM-based method, we utilize Sentence Bert (SBERT) [33] to encode each value. Unlike word2vec-based method, after obtaining the initial word embeddings $\{emb_i\}_{i=0}^n$, SBERT uses a bidirectional attention mechanism to model the overall semantic interaction to obtain the encoded embeddings $\{emb'_i\}_{i=0}^n$, and averages them to obtain the final representation of the value.

5.2 SQL Query Selection

Based on each SQL sketch candidate obtained in Section 4, LLM completes the SQL query to select the optimal query as the final output. To achieve this, we design a selection strategy based on execution results. Our main intuition is that the execution result of an SQL query indicates the quality of the query itself. For instance, if the query execution results in an error or a *NULL* value, it may indicate that there is an issue with the SQL query.

Algorithm 2 illustrates the overall process of our selection strategy. Given an SQL sketch candidate $t_i \in \mathcal{D}_{sketch}$, together with the question Q and the database schema D_{schema} , they are fed into the LLM to generate an SQL query S^0 . Then S^0 is subjected to executable check, and an executable query S' is obtained by continuously feeding back error information to the LLM. Please note that we set the number of feedback times not to exceed p ; otherwise we discard t_i and repeat the above steps with the next candidate t_{i+1} . S' is passed to the predicate calibration module to obtain an SQL query S'' grounded on the database. If the execution result of S'' is not *NULL*, we return S'' as the final SQL query. Otherwise, we discard t_i and repeat the above steps for the next candidate t_{i+1} .

Algorithm 2: SQL Query Selection

Input: Question Q , Database schema D_{schema} , Database D , candidate set \mathcal{D}_{sketch} , Execution patience p
Output: The final SQL query S''

```

1 for each  $t_i \in \mathcal{D}_{sketch}$  do
2    $LLM(Q, D_{schema}, t_i) \rightarrow S^0$ ;
3    $ExecutionCheck(S^0, D, p) \rightarrow S'$ ;
4   if  $S'$  then
5      $PredicateCalibration(S', D) \rightarrow S''$ ;
6      $GetExecutionResult(S'', D) \rightarrow result$ ;
7     if  $result \neq NULL$  then
8        $break$ ;
9     else
10       $continue$ ;
11    end
12  else
13     $continue$ ;
14  end
15 end
16 return  $S''$ ;
```

6 EXPERIMENTS

6.1 Experimental Setup

6.1.1 Datasets. We use a well-adopted NL2SQL dataset, Spider [44], as the training set and evaluate our method using two NL2SQL benchmarks with various zero-shot difficulties: (1) Dr.Spider [3], which comprises 17 distinct types of perturbation test sets based on Spider; (2) KaggleDBQA [15], which contains real-world questions and databases. Overall, each test set in Dr.Spider is different from Spider in terms of user question, database, or SQL, whereas KaggleDBQA diverges entirely from Spider across all three aspects. **Spider** is a well-known NL2SQL benchmark [44], which contains 200 databases that cover 138 domains, such as colleges, clubs, TV shows, government, etc. Specifically, each instance of the Spider dataset contains a user question, a database schema and an SQL query, which are annotated manually. Overall, there are 10,181 instances with 5,693 unique SQL queries. Among them, Spider randomly selects 7000 annotated instances as the training set.

Dr.Spider is a comprehensive benchmark [3] based on Spider, which is designed for evaluating the performance of NL2SQL methods in new test environments, *i.e.*, the zero-shot setting studied in our paper. The basic idea is to make perturbations on the Spider dataset to simulate new test sets. Specifically, there are 3 test sets with *database perturbation*, 9 test sets with *question perturbation*, and 5 test sets with *SQL perturbation*. Database perturbation simulates the situations where data is represented in various ways in databases, by considering three perturbation ways, namely *schema-synonym*, *schema-abbreviation*, and *column-equivalence*. Question perturbation simulates various task-specific linguistic phenomenon, by considering 9 perturbation ways, namely *keyword-synonym*, *keyword-carrier*, *column-synonym*, *column-carrier*, *column-attribute*, *column-value*, *value-synonym*, *multitype* and *others*. SQL perturbation simulates the changes of SQL structures, by considering 5

perturbation ways, namely *comparison*, *sort-order*, *nonDB-number*, *DB-text* and *DB-number*.

KaggleDBQA is a test set [15] for NL2SQL task that is designed to closely mimic the data and questions that an NL2SQL model might encounter in real-world scenarios. The databases used in KaggleDBQA are sourced from Kaggle², a widely popular platform for hosting data science competitions and sharing datasets and code. To ensure that the test set is as realistic as possible, each database’s schema is deliberately not normalized, and its content and formatting are in accordance with its domain-specific usage. The questions in KaggleDBQA are annotated to ensure that they reflect the interests of real users. Importantly, the annotators are instructed to avoid using exact phrases from the database schema in the questions. Furthermore, KaggleDBQA has more complex SQL query structures than the Spider dataset [15].

6.1.2 Evaluation Metrics. As SQL expression styles used in the LLMs may differ from the ground truth in the NL2SQL benchmarks [39], traditional string-based evaluation metrics such as Exact Match Accuracy [44] are not appropriate for evaluation in our paper. Therefore, following previous works [20, 32, 47], we leverage Execution Accuracy (EX) metric, which compares the execution results of a generated and the corresponding ground-truth SQL queries retrieved from the database.

6.1.3 Baselines. We consider the following two types of baselines. The first type is the SOTA PLM-based models fine-tuned on the Spider training set, including SMBOP [34], T5-3B LK [37], Picard [36] and RESDSQL [17]. The other type is the LLM-based methods, including vanilla LLMs, LLM + In-Context Learning, and DIN-SQL [28]. We briefly describe these methods as follows.

SMBOP introduces a semi-autoregressive bottom-up NL2SQL model as an alternative approach to top-down autoregressive model. SmBoP constructs the top- k sub-trees of height $\leq t$ at decoding step t , allowing for parallel decoding of sub-trees with logarithmic runtime complexity.

T5-3B LK explores how an Encoder-Decoder PLM struggles with compositional generalization in natural language. This method proposes a semantic parsing approach that can handle both natural language variation and compositional generalization, and introduces new train/test splits of non-synthetic datasets. The method demonstrates the limitations of existing approaches and proposes a hybrid model, which outperforms other models in handling compositional generalization.

Picard is a method for enhancing the auto-regressive decoder in PLMs by using incremental parsing to reject invalid tokens and ensure valid output sequences. PICARD is compatible with any existing auto-regressive decoder, and does not require large beam sizes. It is not involved in pre-training or fine-tuning, and can be easily enabled during SQL query generation.

RESDSQL introduces a new framework for improving the efficiency of NL2SQL. It proposes a ranking-enhanced encoding method that selects the most relevant schema items to inject into the encoder. Additionally, a skeleton-aware decoding technique is employed to generate a skeleton before generating the SQL query.

²<https://www.kaggle.com/>

Vanilla LLM refers to directly applying an LLM to the NL2SQL task without any other task-specific designs. Specifically, we input the user question, the database schema, and the task instruction “Translate the user question into an SQL query.” to the LLM to guide it in completing the Text-to-SQL task.

LLM + In-Context-Learning refers to adding some (user question, SQL) examples to the input of the LLM to facilitate its understanding and reasoning [1]. Considering that different example selection methods may produce different results [21], we consider two typical ways to select examples, one is to randomly select from an example pool, and the other is to select the examples that are similar to the user question.

DIN-SQL focuses on breaking down complex text-to-SQL tasks into sub-tasks to enhance the performance of LLMs in reasoning. By decomposing SQL queries into sub-problems, we show that feeding their solutions to the LLMs can significantly improve their performance, reducing the gap between fine-tuned models and prompting approaches.

6.1.4 Implementation Details. We present the implementation details as follows.

Large Language Model: In this work, we conduct experiments on ChatGPT³ based on OpenAI’s gpt-3.5-turbo, which is currently widely used, as the backbone blackbox LLM. Specifically, we set the generation temperature to 0.0, frequency penalty to 0.0, and top- p to 1.0. It is worth noting that this work does not specifically design for a certain type of LLMs, and thus it can be easily applied to other LLMs, such as PaLM [6], GPT4 [24] or GLaM [10].

SQL Sketch Generation. For SQL sketch learning, we adopt T5-3B⁴ as the backbone Encoder-Decoder PLM. We set the batch size to 32, the learning rate to 0.00005, and the maximum number of training epochs to 20. The parameters are optimized using Adafactor [38]. In question-aware aligner, we adopt DeBERTaV3-Large⁵ as the backbone Encoder PLM. We set the batch size to 4, the learning rate to 0.000005, and the maximum number of training epochs to 20. The parameters are optimized using Adam [14]. In addition, for the number of hypotheses retained for different parts, we set K_1 , K_2 , and K_3 to 4, 2, and 2 respectively, and set p to 1 for the execution check part.

SQL Query Completion. In this module, we use Sentence Bert⁶ and pre-trained GloVe dictionary⁷ containing 200-dimensional representations of 400K English words to obtain the embedding of the value. We set the similarity threshold r in Algorithm 1 to 0.65 which is determined by a hyper-parameter search in our evaluation.

All the experiments are implemented using PyTorch [25], and evaluated on 1 NVIDIA RTX A6000 48G.

6.1.5 Experiments. We conduct experiments to answer the following key questions:

Exp-1: What is the zero-shot reasoning ability on Dr.Spider (*i.e.*, single perturbation per test set)?

³<https://openai.com/blog/chatgpt/>

⁴<https://huggingface.co/t5-3b>

⁵<https://huggingface.co/microsoft/deberta-v3-large>

⁶<https://huggingface.co/sentence-transformers/bert-base-nli-stsb-mean-tokens>

⁷<https://nlp.stanford.edu/projects/glove/>

Exp-2: What is the zero-shot reasoning ability on kaggleDBQA (*i.e.*, the distribution of databases, user question and SQL all changes)?

Exp-3: How does ZERONL2SQL compares with the PLM-based SOTA models given varying numbers of training samples?

Exp-4: How does our model compare with LLM-based methods of performance and cost?

Exp-5: What is the effect of each component in the SQL sketch generation module?

Exp-6: Which value matching method should be employed in predicate calibration?

6.2 Comparison with PLM-based Methods

First, we compare ZERONL2SQL and previous PLM-based SOTA models on different zero-shot test environments (**Exp-1** and **Exp-2**) and varying numbers of training samples (**Exp-3**).

Exp-1: What is the zero-shot reasoning ability on Dr.Spider (*i.e.*, single perturbation per test set)? We conduct experiments on the Dr.Spider benchmark [3] containing 17 test sets, and Table 1 reports the experimental results. Overall, ChatGPT + ZERONL2SQL outperforms all the baselines, including the PLM-based SOTA models (74.9% VS. 71.7%) and the vanilla ChatGPT (74.3% VS. 63.5%). Specifically, from the comparison of different perturbation types, the perturbations on database and user questions have the greatest impact on NL2SQL performance, while SQL perturbation has a smaller impact. Comparing the previous PLM-based SOTA model and vanilla ChatGPT, we can see that there is a gap on the average performance between the two methods, which is also reported in the existing work [20]. However, ChatGPT exhibits relatively stable performance in different zero-shot tests and does not show a particularly significant performance declines due to certain types of perturbations. For example, on the *DBcontent-equivalence* test set, the EX accuracy of SMBOP [37] is only 37.2%, which is much worse than its average performance. In contrast, the EX accuracy of ChatGPT is 54.5%, which is close to its average performance. Moreover, after combining with ZERONL2SQL, ChatGPT shows better and more stable NL2SQL performance than the PLM-based SOTA models, especially on very difficult test sets. For example, on the *value-synonym* test set, the PLM-based SOTA models have an EX accuracy between 29.1% and 53.2%, while ChatGPT + ZERONL2SQL achieves an EX accuracy of 70.6%, which shows a significant improvement of 17.4%.

The result shows that our method combines the complementary advantages of PLMs and LLMs for supporting zero-shot NL2SQL.

Exp-2: What is the zero-shot reasoning ability on KaggleDBQA (*i.e.*, the distribution of databases, user question and SQL all changes)? We conduct experiments on the KaggleDBQA dataset [15], which has a completely different style of databases, user questions, and SQL queries compared to the Spider dataset [44] used for training. Therefore, compared with the Dr.Spider benchmark [3], KaggleDBQA presents greater zero-shot challenges. Table 2 reports the experimental results on KaggleDBQA. Comparing the PLM-based SOTA model (RESDSL) and vanilla ChatGPT, we can see that the gap between these two methods has been narrowed to 7.6%. This indicates that the end-to-end NL2SQL ability obtained by fine-tuning is difficult to transfer to completely different NL2SQL datasets. In contrast, ChatGPT exhibits relatively stable ability as it

is not affected by the gap between the training set and the test set. Furthermore, after incorporating ZERONL2SQL, the EX accuracy of ChatGPT + ZERONL2SQL significantly exceeds the PLM-based model by 13.0%. This indicates that when using the same training set, ZERONL2SQL can exhibit better zero-shot reasoning ability on completely different test sets.

Exp-3: How does ZERONL2SQL compare with the PLM-based SOTA models given varying numbers of training samples? To further compare our method with PLM-based methods, we conduct a comparison based on different sizes of the training set. Specifically, we randomly extract 2k, 4k, and 7k training samples from the official spider training set. In our method, these samples are used to train the SQL sketch generation module, while for PLM-based methods, the samples are directly used to train an end-to-end NL2SQL model. Figure 10 presents the experimental results on four test sets, using the current SOTA PLM-based method RESDSL [17] as the baseline. Firstly, we can see that ZERONL2SQL can significantly improve ChatGPT even if only 2k training samples are used. For example, on the *column-carrier* test set, our method improves 10.5% (68.4% vs. 57.9%) on Execution Accuracy, compared with ChatGPT. Moreover, compared with the PLM-based method RESDSL, our method has more stable performance on various training data sizes. For example, from 7k training data to 2k training data, the execution accuracy of ChatGPT + ZERONL2SQL decreases between 0.9% and 3.3%, while RESDSL decreases between 3.8% and 9.3%. In addition, on some datasets (*e.g.*, *column-carrier*), RESDSL outperforms vanilla ChatGPT using 7k training data, and its performance is worse than vanilla ChatGPT using 2k training data. This indicates that PLM-based NL2SQL models are hungry for training data.

6.3 Comparison with LLM-based Methods


Exp-4: How does our model compare with LLM-based methods in terms of performance and cost? A typical method of applying LLMs to a specific task is *in-context learning*. For In-context learning, we use the Spider training set as the example pool and utilize two typical sampling methods (*i.e.*, random-based and similarity-based) to select examples.

Table 3 presents the experimental results on EX accuracy. Comparing different in-context learning schemes, we can see that there is little difference between the random sampling method and the similarity-based sampling method. Moreover, the number of examples has a slight impact on the performance. For example, the average accuracy of “+ random 20-shot” has increased by 2.2% compared to “+ random 10-shot”. However, compared with in-context learning, our method can bring more significant improvements on KaggleDBQA and achieve more stable improvements to ChatGPT. For example, on the *DBcontent-equivalence* test set, in-context learning results in poor ChatGPT performance (54.5% VS. 54.2%), while our method does not (54.5% VS. 56.8%). Furthermore, on the KaggleDBQA test set, we can see that, when there is a significant gap between the example pool and the test set, our method can bring greater improvement to ChatGPT than in-context learning.

Then, we compare the methods on costs, *i.e.*, the average number of tokens used by different method to call the ChatGPT API. As shown in Figure 11, the number of tokens consumed by our method

Table 1: Comparison of the execution accuracy (%) between ZERONL2SQL and the previous SOTA models on the Dr.Spider dataset. “DB” represents perturbations on the database, “NLQ” represents perturbations on user issues, and “SQL” represents perturbations on SQL queries. We report macro-average scores over multiple perturbations.

Type	Perturbation	# Test	SMBOP [34]	T5-3B LK [37]	Picard [36]	RESDSQL [17]	ChatGPT	ChatGPT + ZERONL2SQL
DB	schema-synonym	2619	53.9	46.9	56.5	68.3	58.7	69.8
	schema-abbreviation	2853	59.0	53.3	64.7	70.0	64.7	74.8
	DBcontent-equivalence	382	37.2	40.8	43.7	40.1	54.5	56.8
	Average	-	50.0	47.0	55.0	59.4	59.3	67.1
NLQ	keyword-synonym	953	64.3	62.6	66.3	72.4	57.1	74.0
	keyword-carrier	399	79.2	76.4	82.7	83.5	85.7	88.2
	column-synonym	563	48.7	51.3	57.2	63.1	51.2	62.7
	column-carrier	579	64.6	61.7	64.9	63.9	57.9	71.7
	column-attribute	119	58.0	48.7	56.3	71.4	58.0	70.6
	column-value	304	58.9	58.6	69.4	76.6	64.5	76.0
	value-synonym	506	29.1	46.4	53.0	53.2	54.9	70.6
	multitype	1351	46.1	51.1	57.1	60.7	52.2	66.4
	others	2819	73.7	73.1	78.3	79.0	68.6	79.4
Average	-	58.1	58.9	65.0	69.3	61.1	73.2	
SQL	comparison	178	65.2	62.4	68.0	82.0	61.2	73.6
	sort-order	192	76.6	70.3	74.5	85.4	52.1	80.2
	nonDB-number	131	71.8	73.3	77.1	85.5	88.5	92.4
	DB-text	911	63.1	58.3	65.1	74.3	72.3	80.7
	DB-number	410	84.4	83.7	85.1	88.8	78.0	86.1
	Average	-	72.2	69.6	74.0	83.2	70.5	82.6
All	Average	-	60.8	59.9	65.9	71.7	63.5	74.9

**Figure 10: Performance comparison of different methods, given varying numbers of training samples.****Table 2: Comparison of the execution accuracy (%) between ZERONL2SQL and the previous SOTA models on the KaggleDBQA dataset.**

Dataset	RESDSQL [17]	ChatGPT	ChatGPT + ZERONL2SQL
KaggleDBQA	31.9	24.3	44.9

is close to the vanilla ChatGPT and much lower than various in-context learning methods. The main reason is that our method does not directly feed the examples to LLMs. Instead, our method learns from the examples and converts them into customized SQL sketch for LLMs to achieve more accurate guidance.

The above two experiments demonstrate that compared to the LLM-based methods, ZERONL2SQL can provide LLMs with more effective prompts through tunable PLMs, thus achieving superior execution accuracy and cost for zero-shot NL2SQL.


**Figure 11: Comparison of the average number of tokens used by different LLM-based methods to call the ChatGPT API.**

Table 3: Comparison of the execution accuracy (%) between ZERO NL2SQL and different LLM-based methods. We report macro-average scores over datasets. † represents that the method does not use database content.

Dataset	ChatGPT	+ random 10-shot	+ random 20-shot	+ similarity 10-shot	+ similarity 20-shot	+ DIN-SQL † [28]	+ ZERO NL2SQL
DBcontent-equivalence	54.5	51.3	54.2	51.3	53.9	48.7	56.8
column-value	64.5	64.5	67.4	64.5	66.1	51.6	76.0
DB-text	72.3	75.7	75.6	75.3	76.9	61.7	80.7
KaggleDBQA	24.3	26.5	29.7	27.6	28.1	27.0	44.9
Average	51.6	54.5	56.7	54.7	56.3	47.3	63.9

Table 4: Ablation on different components in the SQL sketch generation module. The experiments report the string match accuracy (%) of the three different parts: SELECT, FROM and KEYWORDS. The experiments are conducted on the KaggleDBQA dataset.

Approach	select	keywords	from
ZERO NL2SQL	61.1	68.6	81.6
w/o database-aware serialization	55.1	66.5	76.8
w/o question-aware aligner	58.3	68.1	81.6

6.4 Ablation Study

Exp-5: What is the effect of each component in the SQL sketch generation module? Table 4 shows the impact of different parts on the string match accuracy of generating SQL sketch. Overall, database-aware serialization strategy has the greatest impact on generating SQL sketches, avoiding the model from over-focusing on user questions and enabling the model to generate valid SQL sketches based on the database schema. Secondly, *question-aware aligner* has a gain on the SELECT part and the KEYWORDS part, indicating that further aligning these two parts with the user question can help SQL sketch generation.

Exp-6: Which value matching method should be employed in predicate calibration? To evaluate the effectiveness of *multi-level matching*, we compare this method with *in-column matching* and *in-database matching*, which represent only matching in the predicted column and directly matching throughout the entire database, respectively. We conduct experiments on two test sets and report the experimental results in Table 5. Overall, *multi-level matching* achieves the best performance. The main reason is that *in-column matching* does not consider LLM’s mis-prediction of columns, and thus matching in the wrong columns and feeding noisy information back to the LLM causes further errors. In addition, *in-database matching* completely disregards the predicted column, resulting in feedback to be significantly deviated from the original reasoning.

To explore the best similarity calculation method for this scenario, we compare different representative methods in Table 6. Specifically, fuzzy matching method [12] can better capture character-level similarity, and thus it performs well in abbreviation/full name matching, e.g., “HI” and “Hawaii”. The GloVe method [26], as a representative semantic level matching method, can better handle synonym situations, such as “putty” and “dog”. However, GloVe only considers the co-occurrence of words in a text corpus, while may not capture more complex semantic relationships between words (e.g., order). Moreover, due to the use of a bidirectional attention mechanism, SBERT [33] can better capture the overall meaning of the value. Therefore, SBERT exhibits more stable and excellent performance than both GloVe and fuzzy matching methods.

Table 5: Ablation on different matching methods in predicate calibration. The experiments report the execution accuracy (%) of using different methods.

Approach	column-value	DB-text	Average
in-column matching	71.7	81.0	76.4
in-database matching	62.8	64.7	63.8
multi-level matching	76.0	80.9	78.5

Table 6: Ablation on different methods for similarity calculation in predicate calibration. The experiments report the execution accuracy (%) of using different methods.

Approach	column-value	DB-text	Average
Fuzzy [12]	73.4	81.0	77.2
GloVe [26]	74.6	78.0	76.3
SBERT [33]	76.0	80.9	78.5

7 RELATED WORK

7.1 PLM-based NL2SQL

Recently, many works have applied pre-trained language models (PLMs) to the NL2SQL task, as pre-training on large amounts of text corpus enables PLMs to better model the semantic relationship between user question and database schema. Overall, The PLMs used in these works is mainly divided into two types: Encoder-only PLMs (e.g., BERT [9], ELECTRA [7]) and Encoder-Decoder PLMs (e.g., BART [16], T5 [31]). For Encoder-only PLMs, RATS SQL [41] and LGESQL [2] leverage BERT [9] to encode the user question and database schema, and further adopt graph neural network to model the foreign keys and schema links. Then the encoded representation is fed into a grammar-based syntactic neural decoder to generate a SQL query. For Encoder-Decoder PLMs, PICARD [36], RASAT [29] and RESDSQL [17] formulate the NL2SQL task as an end-to-end translation problem and leverage the T5 model [31] to directly translate user question into SQL query. In addition, task-specific strategies such as relation-aware self-attention [29], schema selection [17], and constrained decoding [36] further improve the accuracy of Encoder-Decoder PLMs in generating SQL queries. Different from previous methods, the goal of ZERO NL2SQL is to enable PLMs to generate accurate SQL sketches on new test environments. Therefore, we focus on the impact of test environment changes on PLMs and propose adaptive methods to address this challenge.

7.2 LLM-based NL2SQL

With the excellent performance of large language model (LLMs) in many natural language processing tasks, recent work attempts to apply LLMs to the NL2SQL task. [32] evaluates the zero-shot NL2SQL capabilities of CodeX model [5]. [47] further validates the robustness of the Codex model on NL2SQL task and proposes effective example sampling method to enhance robustness. More recently, with the popularity of ChatGPT, [20] conducts experiments

to explore its zero-shot NL2SQL inference ability and points out that it still has a certain gap with existing fine-tuned PLM-based methods, but it exhibits strong robustness on new datasets. To improve the NL2SQL effectiveness of LLMs, DIN-SQL [28] enables LLMs to generate SQL queries step by step by adding examples of different sub-tasks. Different from the above methods, ZERONL2SQL generates fine-grained guidance (*i.e.*, SQL sketch) for a fixed LLM through tunable PLMs, significantly improving NL2SQL accuracy while ensuring high efficiency.

8 CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK

In this paper, we have proposed a ZERONL2SQL framework, that interleaves tunable PLM and fixed LLM to achieve zero-shot NL2SQL generation. ZERONL2SQL mainly consists of two modules: *SQL sketch generation* by PLMs, *SQL query completion* by LLMs, in response to the intrinsic challenges of zero-shot NL2SQL. Our extensive experiments demonstrate that ZERONL2SQL can achieve the best zero-shot NL2SQL performance, compared with the PLM-based methods and LLM-based methods.

For future work, we believe that the ZERONL2SQL framework can be extended to different NL2SQL scenarios. First, considering the excellent interaction ability of LLMs, ZERONL2SQL can be applied to conversational NL2SQL tasks [43]. Second, considering the effective predicate calibration method in ZERONL2SQL, it can also be extended to extra large databases after efficiency optimization [18].

REFERENCES

- [1] Tom B. Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Sandhini Agarwal, Ariel Herbert-Voss, Gretchen Krueger, Tom Henighan, Rewon Child, Aditya Ramesh, Daniel M. Ziegler, Jeffrey Wu, Clemens Winter, Christopher Hesse, Mark Chen, Eric Sigler, Mateusz Litwin, Scott Gray, Benjamin Chess, Jack Clark, Christopher Berner, Sam McCandlish, Alec Radford, Ilya Sutskever, and Dario Amodei. 2020. Language Models are Few-Shot Learners. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 33: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2020, NeurIPS 2020, December 6-12, 2020, virtual*, Hugo Larochelle, Marc'Aurelio Ranzato, Raia Hadsell, Maria-Florina Balcan, and Hsuan-Tien Lin (Eds.). <https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2020/hash/1457c0d6bfc4967418fb8ac142f64a-Abstract.html>
- [2] Ruisheng Cao, Lu Chen, Zhi Chen, Yanbin Zhao, Su Zhu, and Kai Yu. 2021. LGE2SQL: Line Graph Enhanced Text-to-SQL Model with Mixed Local and Non-Local Relations. In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing, ACL/IJCNLP 2021, (Volume 1: Long Papers), Virtual Event, August 1-6, 2021*, Chengqing Zong, Fei Xia, Wenjie Li, and Roberto Navigli (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, 2541–2555. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2021.acl-long.198>
- [3] Shuaichen Chang, Jun Wang, Mingwen Dong, Lin Pan, Henghui Zhu, Alexander Hanbo Li, Wuwei Lan, Sheng Zhang, Jiarong Jiang, Joseph Lilien, Steve Ash, William Yang Wang, Zhiguo Wang, Vittorio Castelli, Patrick Ng, and Bing Xiang. 2023. Dr.Spider: A Diagnostic Evaluation Benchmark towards Text-to-SQL Robustness. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=Wc5bmZZU9cy>
- [4] Mingda Chen, Jingfei Du, Ramakanth Pasunuru, Todor Mihaylov, Srinu Iyer, Veselin Stoyanov, and Zornitsa Kozareva. 2022. Improving In-Context Few-Shot Learning via Self-Supervised Training. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, NAACL 2022, Seattle, WA, United States, July 10-15, 2022*, Marine Carpuat, Marie-Catherine de Marneffe, and Iván Vladimir Meza Ruiz (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, 3558–3573. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2022.naacl-main.260>
- [5] Mark Chen, Jerry Tworek, Heewoo Jun, Qiming Yuan, Henrique Pondé de Oliveira Pinto, Jared Kaplan, Harrison Edwards, Yuri Burda, Nicholas Joseph, Greg Brockman, Alex Ray, Raul Puri, Gretchen Krueger, Michael Petrov, Heidy Khlaaf, Girish Sastry, Pamela Mishkin, Brooke Chan, Scott Gray, Nick Ryder, Mikhail Pavlov, Alethea Power, Lukasz Kaiser, Mohammad Bavarian, Clemens Winter, Philippe Tillet, Felipe Petroski Such, Dave Cummings, Matthias Plappert, Fotios Chantzis, Elizabeth Barnes, Ariel Herbert-Voss, William Hebgon Guss, Alex Nichol, Alex Paino, Nikolas Tezak, Jie Tang, Igor Babuschkin, Suchir Balaji, Shantanu Jain, William Saunders, Christopher Hesse, Andrew N. Carr, Jan Leike, Joshua Achiam, Vedant Misra, Evan Morikawa, Alec Radford, Matthew Knight, Miles Brundage, Mira Murati, Katie Mayer, Peter Welinder, Bob McGrew, Dario Amodei, Sam McCandlish, Ilya Sutskever, and Wojciech Zaremba. 2021. Evaluating Large Language Models Trained on Code. *CoRR abs/2107.03374* (2021). arXiv:2107.03374 <https://arxiv.org/abs/2107.03374>
- [6] Aakanksha Chowdhery, Sharan Narang, Jacob Devlin, Maarten Bosma, Gaurav Mishra, Adam Roberts, Paul Barham, Hyung Won Chung, Charles Sutton, Sebastian Gehrmann, Parker Schuh, Kensen Shi, Sasha Tsvyashchenko, Joshua Maynez, Abhishek Rao, Parker Barnes, Yi Tay, Noam Shazeer, Vinodkumar Prabhakaran, Emily Reif, Nan Du, Ben Hutchinson, Reiner Pope, James Bradbury, Jacob Austin, Michael Isard, Guy Gur-Ari, Pengcheng Yin, Toju Duke, Anselm Levskaya, Sanjay Ghemawat, Sunipa Dev, Henryk Michalewski, Xavier Garcia, Vedant Misra, Kevin Robinson, Liam Fedus, Denny Zhou, Daphne Ippolito, David Luan, Hyeontaek Lim, Barret Zoph, Alexander Spiridonov, Ryan Sepassi, David Dohan, Shivani Agrawal, Mark Omernick, Andrew M. Dai, Thanumalayan Sankaranarayanan Pillai, Marie Pellat, Aitor Lewkowycz, Erica Moreira, Rewon Child, Oleksandr Polozov, Katherine Lee, Zongwei Zhou, Xuezhi Wang, Brennan Saeta, Mark Diaz, Orhan Firat, Michele Catasta, Jason Wei, Kathy Meier-Hellstern, Douglas Eck, Jeff Dean, Slav Petrov, and Noah Fiedel. 2022. PaLM: Scaling Language Modeling with Pathways. *CoRR abs/2204.02311* (2022). <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2204.02311>
- [7] Kevin Clark, Minh-Thang Luong, Quoc V. Le, and Christopher D. Manning. 2020. ELECTRA: Pre-training Text Encoders as Discriminators Rather Than Generators. In *8th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2020, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, April 26-30, 2020*. OpenReview.net. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=r1xMH1BtvB>
- [8] Xiang Deng, Ahmed Hassan Awadallah, Christopher Meek, Oleksandr Polozov, Huan Sun, and Matthew Richardson. 2021. Structure-Grounded Pretraining for Text-to-SQL. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, NAACL-HLT 2021, Online, June 6-11, 2021*, Kristina Toutanova, Anna Rumshisky, Luke Zettlemoyer, Dilek Hakkani-Tür, Iz Beltagy, Steven Bethard, Ryan Cotterell, Tanmoy Chakraborty, and Yichao Zhou (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, 1337–1350. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2021.naacl-main.105>
- [9] Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2019. BERT: Pre-training of Deep Bidirectional Transformers for Language Understanding. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, NAACL-HLT 2019, Minneapolis, MN, USA, June 2-7, 2019, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, Jill Burstein, Christy Doran, and Thamar Solorio (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, 4171–4186. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/n19-1423>
- [10] Nan Du, Yanping Huang, Andrew M. Dai, Simon Tong, Dmitry Lepikhin, Yuanzhong Xu, Maxim Krikun, Yanqi Zhou, Adams Wei Yu, Orhan Firat, Barret Zoph, Liam Fedus, Maarten Bosma, Zongwei Zhou, Tao Wang, Yu Emma Wang, Kellie Webster, Marie Pellat, Kevin Robinson, Kathleen Meier-Hellstern, Toju Duke, Lucas Dixon, Kun Zhang, Quoc V Le, Yonghui Wu, Zhifeng Chen, and Claire Cui. 2022. GLaM: Efficient Scaling of Language Models with Mixture-of-Experts. arXiv:2112.06905 [cs.CL]
- [11] Pengcheng He, Xiaodong Liu, Jianfeng Gao, and Weizhu Chen. 2020. DeBERTa: Decoding-enhanced BERT with Disentangled Attention. *CoRR abs/2006.03654* (2020). arXiv:2006.03654 <https://arxiv.org/abs/2006.03654>
- [12] Heikki Hyyrö. 2004. Bit-parallel LCS-length computation revisited. In *Proc. 15th Australasian Workshop on Combinatorial Algorithms (AWOCA 2004)*. Citeseer, 16–27.
- [13] Amol Kelkar, Rohan Relan, Vaishali Bhardwaj, Saurabh Vaichal, and Peter Relan. 2020. Bertrand-DR: Improving Text-to-SQL using a Discriminative Re-ranker. *CoRR abs/2002.00557* (2020). arXiv:2002.00557 <https://arxiv.org/abs/2002.00557>
- [14] Diederik P. Kingma and Jimmy Ba. 2015. Adam: A Method for Stochastic Optimization. In *3rd International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2015, San Diego, CA, USA, May 7-9, 2015, Conference Track Proceedings*, Yoshua Bengio and Yann LeCun (Eds.). <http://arxiv.org/abs/1412.6980>
- [15] Chia-Hsuan Lee, Oleksandr Polozov, and Matthew Richardson. 2021. KaggleDBQA: Realistic Evaluation of Text-to-SQL Parsers. In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)*. Association for Computational Linguistics, Online, 2261–2273. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2021.acl-long.176>
- [16] Mike Lewis, Yinhan Liu, Naman Goyal, Marjan Ghazvininejad, Abdelrahman Mohamed, Omer Levy, Veselin Stoyanov, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2020. BART: Denoising Sequence-to-Sequence Pre-training for Natural Language Generation, Translation, and Comprehension. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics, ACL 2020, Online, July 5-10, 2020*, Dan Jurafsky, Joyce Chai, Natalie Schluter, and Joel R. Tetreault (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, 7871–7880. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2020.acl>

- main.703
- [17] Haoyang Li, Jing Zhang, Cuiping Li, and Hong Chen. 2023. REDSQL: Decoupling Schema Linking and Skeleton Parsing for Text-to-SQL. *CoRR abs/2302.05965* (2023). <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2302.05965>
 - [18] Jinyang Li, Binyuan Hui, Ge Qu, Binhua Li, Jiayi Yang, Bowen Li, Bailin Wang, Bowen Qin, Rongyu Cao, Ruiying Geng, Nan Huo, Chenhao Ma, Kevin Chen-Chuan Chang, Fei Huang, Reynold Cheng, and Yongbin Li. 2023. Can LLM Already Serve as A Database Interface? A Big Bench for Large-Scale Database Grounded Text-to-SQLs. *CoRR abs/2305.03111* (2023). <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2305.03111>
 - [19] Jiwei Li, Will Monroe, Alan Ritter, Dan Jurafsky, Michel Galley, and Jianfeng Gao. 2016. Deep Reinforcement Learning for Dialogue Generation. In *Proceedings of the 2016 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. Association for Computational Linguistics, Austin, Texas, 1192–1202. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/D16-1127>
 - [20] Aiwei Liu, Xuming Hu, Lijie Wen, and Philip S Yu. 2023. A comprehensive evaluation of ChatGPT's zero-shot Text-to-SQL capability. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.13547* (2023).
 - [21] Jiachang Liu, Dinghan Shen, Yizhe Zhang, Bill Dolan, Lawrence Carin, and Weizhu Chen. 2022. What Makes Good In-Context Examples for GPT-3?. In *Proceedings of Deep Learning Inside Out: The 3rd Workshop on Knowledge Extraction and Integration for Deep Learning Architectures, DeLio@ACL 2022, Dublin, Ireland and Online, May 27, 2022*, Eneko Agirre, Marianna Apidianaki, and Ivan Vulic (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, 100–114. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2022.deelio-1.10>
 - [22] Yixin Liu and Pengfei Liu. 2021. SimCLS: A Simple Framework for Contrastive Learning of Abstractive Summarization. In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing, ACL/IJCNLP 2021, (Volume 2: Short Papers), Virtual Event, August 1-6, 2021*, Chengqing Zong, Fei Xia, Wenjie Li, and Roberto Navigli (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, 1065–1072. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2021.acl-short.135>
 - [23] Yinhan Liu, Myle Ott, Naman Goyal, Jingfei Du, Mandar Joshi, Danqi Chen, Omer Levy, Mike Lewis, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Veselin Stoyanov. 2019. RoBERTa: A Robustly Optimized BERT Pretraining Approach. *CoRR abs/1907.11692* (2019). <http://arxiv.org/abs/1907.11692>
 - [24] OpenAI. 2023. GPT-4 Technical Report. *CoRR abs/2303.08774* (2023). <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2303.08774>
 - [25] Adam Paszke, Sam Gross, Francisco Massa, Adam Lerer, James Bradbury, Gregory Chanan, Trevor Killeen, Zeming Lin, Natalia Gimelshein, Luca Antiga, Alban Desmaison, Andreas Köpf, Edward Z. Yang, Zachary DeVito, Martin Raison, Alykhan Tejani, Sasank Chilamkurthy, Benoit Steiner, Lu Fang, Junjie Bai, and Soumith Chintala. 2019. PyTorch: An Imperative Style, High-Performance Deep Learning Library. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 32: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2019, NeurIPS 2019, December 8-14, 2019, Vancouver, BC, Canada*, Hanna M. Wallach, Hugo Larochelle, Alina Beygelzimer, Florence d'Alché-Buc, Emily B. Fox, and Roman Garnett (Eds.), 8024–8035. <https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2019/hash/bdbca288fee7f92f2bfa9f7012727740-Abstract.html>
 - [26] Jeffrey Pennington, Richard Socher, and Christopher D Manning. 2014. Glove: Global vectors for word representation. In *Proceedings of the 2014 conference on empirical methods in natural language processing (EMNLP)*. 1532–1543.
 - [27] Octavian Popescu, Irene Manotas, Ngoc Phuoc An Vo, Hangu Yeo, Elahe Khoshnashani, and Vadim Sheinin. 2022. Addressing Limitations of Encoder-Decoder Based Approach to Text-to-SQL. In *Proceedings of the 29th International Conference on Computational Linguistics, COLING 2022, Gyeongju, Republic of Korea, October 12-17, 2022*, Nicoletta Calzolari, Chu-Ren Huang, Hansaem Kim, James Pustejovsky, Leo Wanner, Key-Sun Choi, Pum-Mo Ryu, Hsin-Hsi Chen, Lucia Donatelli, Heng Ji, Sadao Kurohashi, Patrizia Paggio, Nianwen Xue, Seokhwan Kim, Younggyun Hahm, Zhong He, Tony Kyungil Lee, Enrico Santus, Francis Bond, and Seung-Hoon Na (Eds.). International Committee on Computational Linguistics, 1593–1603. <https://aclanthology.org/2022.coling-1.137>
 - [28] Mohammadreza Pourreza and Davoud Rafiei. 2023. DIN-SQL: Decomposed In-Context Learning of Text-to-SQL with Self-Correction. *arXiv:2304.11015 [cs.CL]*
 - [29] Jiexing Qi, Jingyao Tang, Ziwei He, Xiangpeng Wan, Yu Cheng, Chenghu Zhou, Xinbing Wang, Quanshi Zhang, and Zhouhan Lin. 2022. RASAT: Integrating Relational Structures into Pretrained Seq2Seq Model for Text-to-SQL. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, EMNLP 2022, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates, December 7-11, 2022*, Yoav Goldberg, Zornitsa Kozareva, and Yue Zhang (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, 3215–3229. <https://aclanthology.org/2022.emnlp-main.211>
 - [30] Alec Radford, Jeffrey Wu, Rewon Child, David Luan, Dario Amodei, Ilya Sutskever, et al. 2019. Language models are unsupervised multitask learners. *OpenAI blog* 1, 8 (2019), 9.
 - [31] Colin Raffel, Noam Shazeer, Adam Roberts, Katherine Lee, Sharan Narang, Michael Matena, Yanqi Zhou, Wei Li, and Peter J. Liu. 2020. Exploring the Limits of Transfer Learning with a Unified Text-to-Text Transformer. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.* 21 (2020), 140:1–140:67. <http://jmlr.org/papers/v21/20-074.html>
 - [32] Nitarshan Rajkumar, Raymond Li, and Dzmitry Bahdanau. 2022. Evaluating the text-to-sql capabilities of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.00498* (2022).
 - [33] Nils Reimers and Iryna Gurevych. 2019. Sentence-BERT: Sentence Embeddings using Siamese BERT-Networks. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. Association for Computational Linguistics. <http://arxiv.org/abs/1908.10084>
 - [34] Ohad Rubin and Jonathan Berant. 2021. SmBoP: Semi-autoregressive Bottom-up Semantic Parsing. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, NAACL-HLT 2021, Online, June 6-11, 2021*, Kristina Toutanova, Anna Rumshisky, Luke Zettlemoyer, Dilek Hakkani-Tür, Iz Beltagy, Steven Bethard, Ryan Cotterell, Tanmoy Chakraborty, and Yichao Zhou (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, 311–324. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2021.naacl-main.29>
 - [35] Victor Sanh, Albert Webson, Colin Raffel, Stephen H. Bach, Lintang Sutawika, Zaid Alyafeai, Antoine Chaffin, Arnaud Stiegler, Arun Raja, Manan Dey, M Saiful Bari, Canwen Xu, Urmish Thakker, Shanya Sharma Sharma, Eliza Szczechla, Taewoon Kim, Gunjan Chhablani, Nihal V. Nayak, Debajyoti Datta, Jonathan Chang, Mike Tian-Jian Jiang, Han Wang, Matteo Manica, Sheng Shen, Zheng Xin Yong, Harshit Pandey, Rachel Bawden, Thomas Wang, Trishala Neeraj, Jos Rozen, Abheesht Sharma, Andrea Santilli, Thibault Févry, Jason Alan Fries, Ryan Teehan, Teven Le Scao, Stella Biderman, Leo Gao, Thomas Wolf, and Alexander M. Rush. 2022. Multitask Prompted Training Enables Zero-Shot Task Generalization. In *The Tenth International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2022, Virtual Event, April 25-29, 2022*. OpenReview.net. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=9Vrb9D0W14>
 - [36] Torsten Scholak, Nathan Schucher, and Dzmitry Bahdanau. 2021. PICARD: Parsing Incrementally for Constrained Auto-Regressive Decoding from Language Models. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, EMNLP 2021, Virtual Event / Punta Cana, Dominican Republic, 7-11 November, 2021*, Marie-Francine Moens, Xuanjing Huang, Lucia Specia, and Scott Wen-tau Yih (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, 9895–9901. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2021.emnlp-main.779>
 - [37] Peter Shaw, Ming-Wei Chang, Panupong Paspapat, and Kristina Toutanova. 2021. Compositional Generalization and Natural Language Variation: Can a Semantic Parsing Approach Handle Both?. In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing, ACL/IJCNLP 2021, (Volume 1: Long Papers), Virtual Event, August 1-6, 2021*, Chengqing Zong, Fei Xia, Wenjie Li, and Roberto Navigli (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, 922–938. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2021.acl-long.75>
 - [38] Noam Shazeer and Mitchell Stern. 2018. Adafactor: Adaptive Learning Rates with Sublinear Memory Cost. In *Proceedings of the 35th International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2018, Stockholm, Sweden, July 10-15, 2018 (Proceedings of Machine Learning Research)*, Jennifer G. Dy and Andreas Krause (Eds.), Vol. 80. PMLR, 4603–4611. <http://proceedings.mlr.press/v80/shazeer18a.html>
 - [39] Richard Shin, Christopher Lin, Sam Thomson, Charles Chen, Subhro Roy, Emmanouil Antonios Platanios, Adam Pauls, Dan Klein, Jason Eisner, and Benjamin Van Durme. 2021. Constrained Language Models Yield Few-Shot Semantic Parsers. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. Association for Computational Linguistics, Online and Punta Cana, Dominican Republic, 7699–7715. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2021.emnlp-main.608>
 - [40] Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N. Gomez, Lukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. 2017. Attention is All you Need. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 30: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2017, December 4-9, 2017, Long Beach, CA, USA*, Isabelle Guyon, Ulrike von Luxburg, Samy Bengio, Hanna M. Wallach, Rob Fergus, S. V. N. Vishwanathan, and Roman Garnett (Eds.), 5998–6008. <https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2017/hash/3f5ee243547dee91fbd053c1c4a845aa-Abstract.html>
 - [41] Bailin Wang, Richard Shin, Xiaodong Liu, Oleksandr Polozov, and Matthew Richardson. 2020. RAT-SQL: Relation-Aware Schema Encoding and Linking for Text-to-SQL Parsers. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics, ACL 2020, Online, July 5-10, 2020*, Dan Jurafsky, Joyce Chai, Natalie Schluter, and Joel R. Tetreault (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, 7567–7578. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2020.acl-main.677>
 - [42] Jason Wei, Maarten Bosma, Vincent Y. Zhao, Kelvin Guu, Adams Wei Yu, Brian Lester, Nan Du, Andrew M. Dai, and Quoc V. Le. 2022. Finetuned Language Models are Zero-Shot Learners. In *The Tenth International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2022, Virtual Event, April 25-29, 2022*. OpenReview.net. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=gEzRgCozdqR>
 - [43] Tao Yu, Rui Zhang, Heyang Er, Suyi Li, Eric Xue, Bo Pang, Xi Victoria Lin, Yi Chern Tan, Tianze Shi, Zihan Li, Youxuan Jiang, Michihiro Yasunaga, Sungrok Shim, Tao Chen, Alexander Fabbri, Zifan Li, Luyao Chen, Yuwen Zhang, Shreya Dixit, Vincent Zhang, Caiming Xiong, Richard Socher, Walter Lasecki, and Dragomir

- Radev. 2019. CoSQL: A Conversational Text-to-SQL Challenge Towards Cross-Domain Natural Language Interfaces to Databases. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*. Association for Computational Linguistics, Hong Kong, China, 1962–1979. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/D19-1204>
- [44] Tao Yu, Rui Zhang, Kai Yang, Michihiro Yasunaga, Dongxu Wang, Zifan Li, James Ma, Irene Li, Qingning Yao, Shanelle Roman, Zilin Zhang, and Dragomir R. Radev. 2018. Spider: A Large-Scale Human-Labeled Dataset for Complex and Cross-Domain Semantic Parsing and Text-to-SQL Task. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, Brussels, Belgium, October 31 - November 4, 2018*, Ellen Riloff, David Chiang, Julia Hockenmaier, and Jun'ichi Tsujii (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, 3911–3921. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/d18-1425>
- [45] Wayne Xin Zhao, Kun Zhou, Junyi Li, Tianyi Tang, Xiaolei Wang, Yupeng Hou, Yingqian Min, Beichen Zhang, Junjie Zhang, Zican Dong, Yifan Du, Chen Yang, Yushuo Chen, Zhipeng Chen, Jinhao Jiang, Ruiyang Ren, Yifan Li, Xinyu Tang, Zikang Liu, Peiyu Liu, Jian-Yun Nie, and Ji-Rong Wen. 2023. A Survey of Large Language Models. arXiv:2303.18223 [cs.CL]
- [46] Victor Zhong, Mike Lewis, Sida I. Wang, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2020. Grounded Adaptation for Zero-shot Executable Semantic Parsing. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, EMNLP 2020, Online, November 16-20, 2020*, Bonnie Webber, Trevor Cohn, Yulan He, and Yang Liu (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, 6869–6882. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2020.emnlp-main.558>
- [47] Terry Yue Zhuo, Zhuang Li, Yujin Huang, Yuan-Fang Li, Weiqing Wang, Gholamreza Haffari, and Fatemeh Shiri. 2023. On Robustness of Prompt-based Semantic Parsing with Large Pre-trained Language Model: An Empirical Study on Codex. arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.12868 (2023).