

Query Rewriting via Large Language Models

Jie Liu
University of Michigan
jiezliu@umich.edu

Barzan Mozafari
University of Michigan
mozafari@umich.edu

ABSTRACT

Query rewriting is one of the most effective techniques for coping with poorly written queries before passing them down to the query optimizer. Manual rewriting is not scalable, as it is error-prone and requires deep expertise. Similarly, traditional query rewriting algorithms can only handle a small subset of queries: rule-based techniques do not generalize to new query patterns and synthesis-based techniques cannot handle complex queries. Fortunately, the rise of Large Language Models (LLMs), equipped with broad general knowledge and advanced reasoning capabilities, has created hopes for solving some of these previously open problems.

In this paper, we present GENREWRITE, the first holistic system that leverages LLMs for query rewriting. We introduce the notion of Natural Language Rewrite Rules (NLR2s), and use them as hints to the LLM but also a means for transferring knowledge from rewriting one query to another, and thus becoming smarter and more effective over time. We present a novel counterexample-guided technique that iteratively corrects the syntactic and semantic errors in the rewritten query, significantly reducing the LLM costs and the manual effort required for verification. GENREWRITE speeds up 22 out of 99 TPC queries (the most complex public benchmark) by more than 2x, which is 2.5x–3.2x higher coverage than state-of-the-art traditional query rewriting and 2.1x higher than the out-of-the-box LLM baseline.

PVLDB Reference Format:

Jie Liu and Barzan Mozafari. Query Rewriting via Large Language Models. PVLDB, 14(1): XXX-XXX, 2020.
doi:XX.XX/XXX.XX

PVLDB Artifact Availability:

The source code, data, and/or other artifacts have been made available at URL_TO_YOUR_ARTIFACTS.

1 INTRODUCTION

Inefficient queries are a major problem in almost any organization that uses a database product. These poorly-written queries—which can be authored by inexperienced users or auto generated by business intelligence (BI) or other tools—are often a main driver of slow performance (and excessive costs in case of a cloud database, such as Snowflake [12] or BigQuery [16]). As a result, query rewriting (SQL-to-SQL) is a critical step in improving performance and reducing costs, as the chances of the query optimizer finding a more efficient query plan is significantly lower if it is given a poorly-written

query to begin with. Query rewriting, whether done manually or automatically, has remained a challenging task.

Challenges of manual query rewriting. The poorly-written queries that have the biggest impact on the overall cost and performance tend to be quite complex too. For example, it is not uncommon for OLAP queries that are auto generated by Looker [3] to span multiple pages. Ensuring the rewritten query preserves the semantics of the original requires a deep understanding of the database schema, constraints, and the query intent, and is therefore a time-consuming and error-prone task, even for seasoned database experts. The fact that there can be thousands, if not millions, of such queries makes the manual approach a monumental undertaking.

Limitations of traditional approaches to automated query rewriting. Despite a large body of research, automated rewriting techniques suffer from major drawbacks that have long inhibited their effectiveness in practice. Here, the most common approach is to rely on a set of “rewrite rules”, which are syntactic transformations based on pattern matching. If the pattern expressed in the rule matches the input query, the rule replaces the matched part with a counterpart, generating a semantically equivalent query that is likely to run faster. Regardless of whether the rules are developed and provided by experts [8, 10, 32] or are inferred automatically [14, 41], a rule-based query rewriter is as effective as the set of rewrite rules provided to it. By definition, rule-based query rewriters¹ are limited to situations where the input query matches one of their existing rules, and thus fundamentally incapable of optimizing new query patterns that have not been seen before [15]. Although synthesis-based query-rewriting does not require prior rules [15], in practice it only handles simple queries (e.g., SlabCity [15] can only optimize 2 out of 22 TPC-H queries and 3 out of 99 TPC-DS queries).

Large language models (LLMs). The shining success of large language models (LLMs) in performing complex and open-ended tasks has created new hopes for solving some of the hardest database problems as well. While researchers have used LLMs for Text-to-SQL [17, 18, 24, 33, 37] and a few other areas, e.g., data cleaning and integration [31, 36], table processing [27, 29] and database diagnosis [45], their potential for query rewriting has remained largely unexplored. In instances where human experts or existing rules cannot rewrite a query, say for complex queries or new query patterns, could LLMs be leveraged to uncover rewrite opportunities due to their broad general knowledge and advanced reasoning capabilities? If so, this could drastically lower the burden on human experts and allow for a much larger set of queries to benefit from rewriting. To the best of our knowledge, this paper is the first to

This work is licensed under the Creative Commons BY-NC-ND 4.0 International License. Visit <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/> to view a copy of this license. For any use beyond those covered by this license, obtain permission by emailing info@vldb.org. Copyright is held by the owner/author(s). Publication rights licensed to the VLDB Endowment.

Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment, Vol. 14, No. 1 ISSN 2150-8097.
doi:XX.XX/XXX.XX

¹Rule-based query *rewriting* should not be confused with rule-based query *optimization*; the latter is simpler, and thus much more common in practice [19].

focus on answering this question: how to best leverage LLMs for query rewriting and how to address the challenges involved.

Challenges of using LLMs. There are several challenges in using LLMs for query rewriting: (1) the naïve strategy, whereby the prompt simply asks the LLM to “rewrite the given query into a more efficient form while preserving equivalence”, can only rewrite a small subset of queries (§ 5.2); (2) many of the queries generated by LLMs using the naïve strategy are semantically or syntactically incorrect, i.e., lead to incorrect results or simply do not parse, due to the intricacies of the SQL language and also due to the so-called “hallucination” problem [38, 43], whereby LLMs produce untrustworthy responses; (3) since LLMs cannot run experiments and lack a database-specific cost model, their rewritten queries are in many cases no faster than the original ones; (4) invoking an LLM multiple times can be expensive, in terms of both time and cost; and finally (5) while providing hints can help the LLM, providing too many or irrelevant hints can also confuse the LLM, leading to incorrect responses.

Our approach. To address the above challenges, we present **GENREWRITE**, the first holistic system that leverages LLMs for query rewriting. We introduce the notion of a Natural Language Rewrite Rule (NLR2), which is a textual explanation summarizing the rewrite. We use the LLM itself to produce the NLR2s, which are then used for three purposes. The NLR2s 1) serve as hints assisting the LLM to provide better rewrites, 2) make the rewrites easier to understand and verify by offering a human-readable explanation, and, most importantly, 3) allow GENREWRITE to transfer the knowledge gained from rewriting one query to another and thus become smarter and more effective over time. Since NLR2s are void of confidential information (such as column or schema names), one can even bootstrap GENREWRITE’s NLR2 repository for a new workload using the repository of a previously trained GENREWRITE on another workload.

To avoid redundant rules, which can in turn confuse the LLM, we maintain a utility score for each NLR2 to supply only those rules to the LLM as hints that are most relevant to the query at hand. Finally, to minimize the LLM cost and minimize the human effort needed for manual verification, GENREWRITE does not discard incorrect rewrites. Instead, it uses a novel counterexample-guided technique to iteratively correct the syntactic and semantic errors in the rewritten query.

High-level workflow. GENREWRITE takes as input a workload,² expressed as a set of input queries Q , and returns $\{(q, q', e) \mid q \in Q_{opt}\}$, where $Q_{opt} \subseteq Q$ is the optimizable subset of the input queries, q' is the rewritten query that is equivalent to q but likely to run faster, and e is a human-readable explanation of the rewrite. Figure 1 shows the overall workflow, which is an iterative process. In each iteration, every query in the workload goes through three phases to find a better rewrite than the one found in previous iterations: ① suggesting rewrites, ② correcting rewrites, ③ evaluating rewrites. Additionally, GENREWRITE maintain a Natural Language Rewrite Rule (NLR2) repository for knowledge transfer across queries in the workload. ① selects appropriate NLR2s from to serve as hints for suggesting new rewrites. ① also incorporates any newly discovered

²A streaming setting is a special case, whereby queries are presented and rewritten one at a time.




Figure 1: High-level Workflow of GENREWRITE

NLR2s back into the repository. ② iteratively refines rewrites based on the counterexamples provided by the LLM to eliminate semantic and syntactic errors. ③ evaluates the rewrites for equivalence and performance, and updates the utility score of the used NLR2s accordingly. This process continues until no additional improvement is found and the set of rewrites stabilizes.

Target use case. GENREWRITE uses a default at time budget of 30 seconds, but users have the flexibility of choosing a different time or monetary budget. This one-time cost per query is well justified for any scenario where the same query is executed many times. For example, a Business Intelligence (BI) dashboard runs the same queries each day on the latest data, and so those queries need to be rewritten and optimized once and reused many times. Other examples include database-backed web applications, reporting tools, batch jobs, and dbt [1] and other data transformation scripts. In fact, over 60% of the jobs in Microsoft clusters are recurrent [23], which means users can invoke GENREWRITE as a final step to identify any optimizations before running the workload to minimize execution time and resource consumption.

Contributions. We make the following contributions:

- (1) We provide, to the best of our knowledge, the first in-depth analysis of LLMs for query rewriting, highlighting both the challenges and opportunities for future research in this area (§3).
- (2) We present GENREWRITE, a holistic tool leveraging LLMs for autonomous query rewriting. It addresses the key challenges of using LLMs by introducing (i) the notion of Natural Language Rewrite Rules (NLR2) for finding better rewrites and effective knowledge transfer, (ii) a utility score for NLR2s to minimize LLM confusion caused by irrelevant or too many rules, and (iii) a counterexample-guided iterative correction method. (§4).
- (3) We evaluate GENREWRITE on TPC-DS, the most complex public benchmark, speeding up 22 out of 99 queries by more than a 2x, which is 2.5x–3.2x higher coverage than state-of-the-art traditional query rewriting and 2.1x higher than the out-of-box LLM performance (§5).

2 BACKGROUND AND MOTIVATION

2.1 Limitations of Traditional Query Rewriting

Despite decades of effort by human experts in crafting an extensive set of rewrite rules, many queries still fail to be rewritten into a more efficient form by the rule-based approaches [15]. This is because query patterns captured by rewrite rules are fundamentally limited. In instances where a rewrite opportunity eludes existing rules, leveraging general knowledge becomes crucial as general knowledge plays a vital role in discerning redundancies in calculations and exploring alternative methods to achieve the same result. To illustrate this point, we present an example query from TPC-DS [6], an industry-standard benchmark modeling the challenges of business intelligence systems.

```
1 with year_total as (  
2   select ..., 's' sale_type  
3   from store_sales, customer, date_dim  
4   ...  
5   union all  
6   select ..., 'w' sale_type  
7   from web_sales, customer, date_dim  
8   ...  
9 )  
10 select  
11   s_99.customer_id,  
12   s_99.customer_email_address  
13 from  
14   year_total s_98,  
15   year_total s_99,  
16   year_total w_98,  
17   year_total w_99  
18 where  
19   s_99.customer_id = s_98.customer_id  
20 and s_98.customer_id = w_99.customer_id  
21 and s_98.customer_id = w_98.customer_id  
22 and s_98.sale_type = 's'  
23 and s_98.dyear = 1998  
24 and w_98.sale_type = 'w'  
25 and w_98.dyear = 1998  
26 and s_99.sale_type = 's'  
27 and s_99.dyear = 1998 + 1  
28 and w_99.sale_type = 'w'  
29 and w_99.dyear = 1998 + 1  
30 and w_99.y_total / w_98.y_total >  
31   s_99.y_total / s_98.y_total
```

Listing 1: TPC-DS Q11 aims to find the customers whose web sales growth rate from 1998 to 1999 is higher than their store sales growth rate over the same period.

The example query in Listing 1, derived from Q11 of the TPC-DS benchmark for better readability, aims to find the customers whose web sales growth rate from 1998 to 1999 is higher than their store sales growth rate over the same period. The query first creates a Common Table Expression (CTE) `year_total` that combines the store and web sales data for each customer for each year (lines 2-4 and lines 6-8) using **UNION ALL** (line 5). It then applies filters to the sale type and year columns to extract store and web sales data for each customer specifically for the years 1998 and 1999 (lines 22-29) and joins the results on customer id to facilitate a comparison of sales data for the same customer across different years and sale types (lines 19-21). Finally, it filters for customers whose web sales

```
1 with store_sales_total as (  
2   select ...  
3   from store_sales, ...  
4   ...  
5 )  
6 web_sales_total as (  
7   select ...  
8   from web_sales, ...  
9   ...  
10 )  
11 select  
12   s_99.customer_id,  
13   s_99.customer_email_address  
14 from  
15   store_sales_total s_98,  
16   store_sales_total s_99,  
17   web_sales_total w_98,  
18   web_sales_total w_99  
19 where  
20   s_99.customer_id = s_98.customer_id  
21 and s_98.customer_id = w_99.customer_id  
22 and s_98.customer_id = w_98.customer_id  
23 and s_98.dyear = 1998  
24 and w_98.dyear = 1998  
25 and s_99.dyear = 1998 + 1  
26 and w_99.dyear = 1998 + 1  
27 and w_99.y_total / w_98.y_total >  
28   s_99.y_total / s_98.y_total
```

Listing 2: Rewrite TPC-DS Q11 to an equivalent query where two CTEs are created for store and web sales respectively.

growth rate is higher than their store sales growth rate (lines 30-31). More generally, a poorly written query may employ **UNION ALL** to combine multiple data sources, using a single column to label each part, and then apply filters on the label column to use each part separately. In such cases, the combining and the filtering operations cancel each other's effect and should be removed from the query for better performance and readability. The revised query, as presented in Listing 2, only makes two changes: (1) generates two CTEs for store and web sales data separately instead of combining them into one, (2) removes filters regarding sale type in the main query. Consequently, the observed speedup, when tested on PostgreSQL with TPC-DS scale factor set to 10, is approximately 9x, reducing the execution time from 18 minutes to 2 minutes. The significant speedup is not solely attributed to avoiding all computations associated with **UNION ALL** and predicates on the sale type column. Rather, the observed performance gap is also attributed to the fact that in PostgreSQL the trend to underestimate cardinalities is more pronounced with more predicates in the query. Clearly, the original query has more predicates than the revised one and PostgreSQL chose nested-loop joins over sort-merge joins for the original query due to the severe cardinality underestimates. In addition to the performance boost, this rewrite also enhances modularity and maintainability.

To address this kind of computational redundancy through pattern-matching rules, the initial challenge lies in identifying the label column(s). Then it is essential to track how the subquery's result is utilized and determine whether the combined result remains unused. This usage may occur in predicate clauses, case when clauses, or essentially any part within the outer query blocks. Given the

```
[input query]
Rewrite this query to improve performance.
```

Figure 2: A simple prompt

multitude of possible patterns, we may still fall short of covering all cases for eliminating the unnecessary `UNION ALL` despite devising numerous rules. However, a human observer, when presented with the above example, would intuitively recognize that the process of “combining and then splitting” actually does nothing and should be removed from the query. This intuition stems from general knowledge rather than explicit rules. Given the limited time and resources of human experts, manually scrutinizing every query for potential redundancies is not feasible. While human wisdom remains invaluable, large language models (LLMs) like GPT-4 and beyond, which encode vast amounts of general knowledge, could be a potential game-changer, enabling the automatic identification and exploitation of rewrite opportunities.

2.2 Background on LLMs

This section provides a brief overview of LLM-related terminology used in the rest of this paper.

Tokens. Tokens are the units or building blocks that LLMs use to process language. For example, the string “tokenization” is decomposed as two tokens “token” and “ization”, while a short common word like “the” is represented as a single token [4]. The cost of using LLMs is typically determined by the number of tokens in both the input and the output.

Zero-shot prompting vs few-shot prompting. The key to successfully using LLMs is to find the optimal prompt, commonly known as *prompt engineering*[5]. Prompt engineering is classified into two scenarios, depending on the number of examples provided in the prompt: zero-shot prompting[18] and few-shot prompting [21]. In zero-shot prompting, no example is provided. Figure 2 shows a simple prompt which only includes the input query itself and a concise one-sentence rewriting instruction. Conversely, in few-shot prompting, a limited number of examples are provided to the LLM, allowing it to identify explicit or implicit patterns from the input examples and generate corresponding output. For instance, in the context of Text-to-SQL, an example in the few-shot prompt may include a database schema, a natural language query and the corresponding SQL queries as a solution.

3 LESSONS LEARNED FROM EMPLOYING LLMs FOR QUERY REWRITING

We conducted a comprehensive experiment to study the applicability of LLMs for rewriting of a variety of queries and improving their performance. Specifically, we carefully reviewed each rewrite suggested by LLMs and evaluated it for correctness and latency. We paid particular attention to discerning which problems could be effectively addressed and which could not, along with identifying conditions under which the latter could be transformed into the former. Our study not only provided valuable insight into the capabilities of LLMs and the challenges associated with using it for query rewriting but also contributed to the development and refinement

of GENREWRITE that is presented in §4. Below we summarize the main lessons that have informed GENREWRITE’s design decisions.

Lesson 1: LLMs are quite effective on certain workloads even with a simple prompt. Reasoning the performance issues of queries and ensuring correct rewriting is a non-trivial task. Surprisingly, even with the simple prompt shown in Figure 2, LLMs, by understanding the semantics inherent in the query, can find many rewrite opportunities that significantly improve performance but are ignored by rewrite rules or even human experts. Zero-shot prompting works best on queries with low complexity and high frequency in LLMs’ training corpus. A prime example is the LeetCode workload [2]. For instance, consider LeetCode problem #176, wherein the goal is to find the second highest salary from the Employee table. Q1 in Figure 3 is the human-written solution for this problem (submitted by LeetCode participants) while Q2 emerges as a rewrite generated by LLMs. Q2 is approximately 2000x faster than Q1 when executed on a database randomly populated with one million rows. The optimization process involves a deep understanding of the query intent through reasoning: (1) identifying that the goal of Q1 is to find the second-highest salary, (2) realizing that there is an alternative way to achieve the same thing, i.e., first find the maximum salary using a subquery and then compare all salaries with this maximum salary to find the second maximum, and finally (3) recognizing that Q2 achieves performance improvement by reducing the number of comparisons required.

```
1 select max(a.salary) as xxx
2 from employee as a, employee as b
3 where a.salary < b.salary

Q1: Cartesian product

1 select max(salary) as xxx
2 from employee
3 where salary < (select max(salary) from employee)

Q2: with subquery
```

Figure 3: Finding the second highest salary

Lesson 2: LLMs struggle in identifying rewrite opportunities as the query complexity increases. While LLMs have showcased remarkable capabilities in understanding the semantics of data, performing reasoning, and generating code, it is well-known that their capacity is not limitless. Similarly, as queries become more intricate, the LLM’s ability to identify rewriting opportunities diminishes. While it remains possible for LLMs to discover rewrite opportunities, the decreasing likelihood necessitates more iterations of LLM runs, resulting in significantly higher costs. In §2.1, we demonstrated how Q11 could be optimized into a more efficient form by eliminating the unnecessary `UNION ALL`. Q4 and Q74 from the TPC-DS benchmark present similar issues. Q4, in particular, is the more complex one, with the highest token count (1,170 for Q4, compared to 723 for Q11 and 591 for Q74), the most segments combined with `UNION ALL` (3, versus 2 in the others), and the highest number of joins (5 for Q4 against 3 for the others). Despite multiple attempts (10 runs with the prompt presented in Figure 2), none of the rewrites for Q4 recommended removing `UNION ALL`, a modification that could markedly reduce execution time. Conversely, 4 of

10 attempts for Q11 and 6 of 10 for Q74 moved towards a correct rewriting direction. This observation raises the question of whether we can bridge the gap between queries that LLMs can optimize and those LLMs cannot optimize through knowledge transfer, thereby enabling LLMs to optimize a broader range of queries, particularly those that are highly complex. This is the main motivation behind our notion of NLR2s.

Note that a correct rewriting direction, such as the suggestion to eliminate unnecessary **UNION ALL** in Q74’s rewrites, does not guarantee an error-free or equivalent rewrite to the original query. The complexity of such queries exacerbates the challenge of manipulating their elements without introducing errors.

Lesson 3: LLMs can optimize queries that they previously struggled to optimize when provided with suitable rewrite hints in the prompt. As zero-shot prompting is not universally effective for query rewriting task, it becomes essential to incorporate precise guidance within the prompts. Drawing inspiration from the few-shot prompting used in Text-to-SQL tasks [37], one approach is to provide LLMs with examples that include both the input query and its optimized version. Yet, an alternative strategy also holds promise. Consider the scenario where a human expert analyzes two queries that can be optimized using the same idea, for example, Q4 and Q74. The insight coming to one’s mind is that both queries can benefit from “avoid the unnecessary **UNION ALL**”. In fact, integrating this insight as a hint in the prompt consistently leads LLMs to suggest removing **UNION ALL** across different attempts. This latter method offers two benefits over the few-shot prompting approach: (1) it requires fewer tokens, thereby reducing costs and accelerating the rewrite generation process, and (2) the hints are easily interpretable by humans, facilitating quicker debugging. However, due to the time constraints of human experts, manually analyzing each query and suggesting beneficial rewrite hints is impractical. Therefore, there is a need for an automated method to identify rewrite hints tailored for each query.

4 OUR APPROACH

In this section, we describe our proposed algorithm, which incorporates the lessons presented in §3.

GENREWRITE is comprised of three main components: (1) suggesting high-quality candidate rewrites, (2) iteratively correcting these rewrites for equivalence, and (3) evaluating their effectiveness. Additionally, it uses a natural language rewrite rule (NLR2) repository to facilitate better knowledge transfer and a more fine-grained control over the rewriting process.

GENREWRITE’s top-level algorithm is presented in Algorithm 1. Initially, a set of queries Q is provided for optimization, with both the NLR2 repository and the set of optimized queries being empty. During each iteration, GENREWRITE explores the NLR2 repository to identify the most relevant rules, integrating them into the prompt. The LLM suggests candidate rewrites, accompanied by explanations detailing the applied NLR2s and the conditions under which they are applicable. Through iterative correction and feedback mechanisms, GENREWRITE progressively converges towards generating more accurate rewrites, thereby largely mitigating the issue of inequivalence. Semantic correction feedback is obtained from language models, while syntax correction relies on feedback from the

Algorithm 1: Algorithm

Input: Q : queries, \mathcal{L} : LLM, \mathcal{D} : database, \mathcal{T} : tester, B : budget, θ : user-specified minimum desirable speedup
Output: $Res = \{(q, q', e) | \forall q \in Q_{opt} \subseteq Q, \text{ where } Q_{opt} \text{ is the optimizable subset of } Q\}$: Optimized queries & associated explanations

- 1 $Res \leftarrow \{\}$;
- 2 natural language rewrite rules $\mathcal{R} \leftarrow \{\}$;
- 3 **while** Q is not empty **do**
- 4 **for each** query q in Q **do**
- 5 $\tilde{q}, e \leftarrow$ Suggest-and-explain ($q, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{R}$);
- 6 $q' \leftarrow$ Correct-for-equivalence ($q, \tilde{q}, \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{D}$);
- 7 $equiv, speedup \leftarrow$ Evaluate-rewrite ($q, q', \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{T}$);
- 8 **if** $equiv$ is true **then**
- 9 $\mathcal{R} \leftarrow$ Update-rules ($\mathcal{R}, e, speedup$);
- 10 **if** $speedup > \theta$ **then**
- 11 $Res.add(\langle q, q', e \rangle)$;
- 12 **if** Res does not change **or** budget B is exhausted **then**
- 13 **return** Res ;
- 14 Remove queries in Res from Q ;

database. Subsequently, our tool evaluates rewrites for equivalence and performance. Equivalence is assessed using an off-the-shelf tester or verifier, whereas performance is evaluated either by actual execution or by estimation through a database cost model. It also updates the selected rules and their benefits in the NLR2 repository. With each iteration, a larger set of optimized queries and a more comprehensive collection of NLR2s with more precise benefit estimates are obtained. Eventually, once the set of optimized queries stabilizes (or the budget is exhausted), the rewritten queries are presented to the user for final inspection.

4.1 Suggesting Candidate Rewrites

Since simple zero-shot prompts do not consistently yield effective results, especially for highly complex queries, it is essential to incorporate proper hints into the prompt to guide the LLM. In GENREWRITE, hints are represented as a set of NLR2s.

Natural Language Rewrite Rules (NLR2s) differ fundamentally from traditional pattern-matching rewrite rules. A traditional rewrite rule is comprised of two key components: (1) a transformation that maps a source query pattern to a corresponding destination query pattern, and (2) a set of constraints under which the rule can be safely applied. These pattern-matching rules are typically described using a domain-specific language, which can be challenging for both humans and LLMs to understand. Directly integrating rules presented in the internal language as rewrite hints therefore do not provide the necessary guidance for the LLM. Instead, our NLR2s briefly summarize beneficial rewrites or transformations in natural language. Compared to pattern-matching rewrite rules, NLR2s offer enhanced flexibility and expressiveness. Below are some example NLR2s used in GENREWRITE:

- Pre-calculate aggregates in subqueries
- Remove unnecessary **UNION ALL** operation

<p>Input: {Input query} Rewrite this query to improve performance. Describe the rewrite rules you are using (you must not include any specific query details in the rules, e.g., table names, column names, etc). Be concise. Here are some hints that you might consider when rewriting the query: {Hints: a list of NLR2s for LLM to consider}</p> <p>Answer: {Candidate rewrite} {Explanation: a list of NLR2s actually applied}</p>

Figure 4: The prompt to suggest candidate rewrites

- Avoid using arithmetic operations in WHERE clause
- Replace implicit JOINS with explicit JOINS
- ...

At a higher level, we meticulously curate a set of NLR2s in the rule repository. These NLR2s fulfill a dual role: they act as both guiding hints for LLMs and explanations for users. When incorporated into the prompts for LLMs, these rules provide appropriate guidance for the rewriting direction. Meanwhile, presenting these rules alongside suggested that the rewrites enable users to better understand the rationale behind the proposed modifications to their input queries. Figure 4 shows an example prompt that is used to suggest candidate queries.

Since manual inspection is often not feasible due to the limited time budget of human experts, we must devise a method to learn from the past instances, and automatically generate appropriate hints with minimal human intervention.

4.1.1 Collecting NLR2s. Compared to the simple zero-shot prompt in Figure. 2, our prompt for suggesting candidate queries incorporates two changes. The first change is to include a list of NLR2s as rewrite hints. We defer the details of how to select the most relevant NLR2s to later sections. However, it is not possible to select and apply the appropriate rules before we collect them, which is precisely the problem the second change aims to address. We use the LLM itself to produce the NLR2s involved in the rewrite by adding “Describe the rewrite rules you are using” to the prompt template. In traditional query optimization, multiple rewrite rules can be applied on the same query as long as the changes they make do not conflict with each other. Similarly, one candidate rewrite is usually associated with several NLR2s. These NLR2s, alongside the candidate rewrites, provide users with a succinct explanation of the changes made by the LLM.

If candidate rewrites prove to be effective, corresponding NLR2s are very likely to provide significant value, and we tend to apply these rules to similar queries for better performance. However, if the NLR2s extracted from previous queries contains different column names or table names compared to the incoming queries, they may confuse the LLM when used as hints, potentially lowering the quality of the rewrites. Therefore, NLR2s should be relatively general, not tied to a specific query but rather focusing on the transformation itself. To mitigate this issue, we explicitly instruct the LLM to exclude query-specific information in the prompt. Furthermore, we introduce an additional round of prompting to prompt

1	Use explicit join syntax instead of comma-separated tables in the FROM clause.
2	Replace implicit joins with explicit joins.
3	Use JOIN instead of WHERE for linking tables.
4	Use JOIN instead of WHERE for combining tables.
5	Use explicit join conditions.
6	Move conditions from WHERE clause to ON clause in JOINS.

Table 1: Semantically Equivalent NLR2s

the LLM to specify the conditions for applying the rule, providing us with more insights into the rule and aiding in a more thorough analysis of the collected rules in subsequent processing steps.

Without any input from human experts, we are able to collect candidate rewrites and associated NLR2s for each input query through the utilization of the LLM. Before using them as rewrite hints, however, we need to gain a better understanding of the potential benefits each rule can offer, which will be addressed in the next section.

4.1.2 Estimating the Utility Score of NLR2s. Compared to traditional pattern-matching rewrite rules, NLR2s, when combined with powerful LLMs, offer higher flexibility and expressiveness by understanding the intent of the original query. However, the lack of rigor can also cause problems. We observe that it is common for two NLR2s to be essentially the same while their descriptions are quite different. For instance, NLR2s in Table 1 are actually identical despite their different descriptions, as they all involve replacing implicit joins with explicit joins. If we fail to identify their relations, we would miscalculate the utility of specific NLR2s. Consider a scenario where applying Rule 1 in Table 1 on a query results in a 1000x speedup, while applying Rule 2 on another query yields no discernible difference. In such a case, one might mistakenly conclude that Rule 1 is much more valuable than Rule 2. However, these two rules should be regarded as one, and we should realize that this rule can provide a substantial performance boost in certain instances while making no differences in others. In addition, by grouping semantically equivalent NLR2s together, we obtain a larger sample size to estimate the utility score of the NLR2, significantly reducing estimation errors.

The grouping of NLR2s consists of two steps: (1) k-nearest neighbor (k-NN) search based on NLR2s’ embeddings and (2) group prediction by the LLM. Solely relying on embedding model leads to inaccurate grouping results. For instance, “Remove unnecessary columns from the GROUP BY clause” and “Remove unnecessary table joins” are neighboring rules in embedding space but have distinct focuses and cannot be grouped together. This issue can be largely addressed by LLMs with advanced reasoning ability. However, using the LLM to check the equivalence of every pair would be prohibitively costly. Hence, we employ k-NN search to propose

candidates and leave the final decision to the LLM, aiming to strike a balance between efficiency and effectiveness.

k-Nearest Neighbor Search. Our observation is that NLR2s, which are essentially identical, often share common or semantically related words and are proximate in the embedding space. We employ *bert-base-uncased* as our embedding model. Its ability to generate dense matrices facilitates the calculation of Euclidean distances between similar vectors.

When a new NLR2 is added into the repository, we calculate the Euclidean distance between its embedding and those of existing NLR2s, selecting the top-k most similar NLR2s as candidates for the LLM’s subsequent evaluation. Note that each of the top-k most similar NLR2s should come from different groups for two reasons (1) Comparing two equivalent NLR2s to an incoming rule is computationally inefficient. (2) Deduplication enhances the diversity of candidate rules presented to the LLM, allowing LLM to correct any inaccuracies introduced by the embedding model.

Group Prediction by the LLM. Given top-k most similar NLR2 as candidates, the LLM determines which one is semantically equivalent to the target NLR2 and thus which group it belongs to. If the LLM find none of the candidates equivalent, a new group will be created for it. One example prompt is shown in Figure 5.

Chain-of-Thought (CoT) prompting is a technique used to guide LLMs in solving complex tasks by breaking them down into intermediate steps. Instead of asking the model to directly output the final answer, CoT prompting encourages the model to generate a sequence of thoughts or reasoning steps that lead to the final answer. This approach can significantly improve the model’s performance on tasks requiring reasoning. We adopt this idea, explicitly pushing the LLM to reason by using “give your explanation” indications in the prompt. In our example, the LLM correctly matches the target NLR2 to candidate No.3. It explains its choice by pointing out a key intermediate step: “Implicit joins are indicated by comma-separated tables in the FROM clause and join conditions in the WHERE clause”, which is one of the general knowledge encoded in the model. This shows how well LLMs can reason through problems, using general knowledge to support each step of their thinking.

Once a candidate rewrite passes the equivalence checking, the associated NLR2s undergo the above grouping process to be categorized into a specific rule group. Subsequently, we assess the rewrite’s effectiveness and update the rule group’s utility score based on the newly observed performance improvement or regression.

However, accurately estimating utility score of an NLR2 is challenging for several reasons: Firstly, a candidate rewrite usually corresponds to multiple NLR2s, necessitating individual tests for each rule on the input query to ascertain its specific contribution to performance improvements. This process can be very resource-intensive. Secondly, NLR2s may exhibit interdependencies; in certain scenarios, applying one rule might not directly yield a notable speedup but could open up the possibility of applying other useful rules. Thus, the combined application of NLR2s is essential for realizing their full benefit, and isolating rules for testing fails to capture their collective impact. Testing all possible combinations, however, would be prohibitively expensive. Thirdly, the benefit of applying a NLR2 varies within each query, suggesting that the rule’s benefit should ideally be modeled as a function of the input query. This

Input:

Replace implicit joins with explicit joins
Please select the rewrite rule that is strictly the same as the above rule and give your explanation (just give one answer). If not, please select the first item “Unseen rule”.

Options:

1. Unseen rule
2. Replace subqueries with join
3. Use explicit join syntax instead of comma-separated tables in the from clause
4. Use a CTE to calculate the average

Answer:

Use explicit join syntax instead of comma-separated tables in the from clause

Explanation: Both the original rule and this rewritten rule are about replacing implicit joins with explicit joins. **Implicit joins are indicated by comma-separated tables in the FROM clause and join conditions in the WHERE clause.**

The rewritten rule suggests replacing this with explicit join syntax for better readability and performance, which is the same objective as the original rule.

Figure 5: The prompt to predict the group to which the rule belongs

approach require a comprehensive training set with a variety of queries.

To alleviate these issues, we employ a straightforward yet effective method for estimating the benefit of the rule group. Instead of doing individual tests to determine its specific contribution, we assume that the observed speedup from a candidate rewrite relative to the input query is the benefit of each associated NLR2 independently and is used to update the benefit of the corresponding rule group. For instance, if q' is the candidate rewrite for q , which achieves a 10x speedup, and rewriting q to q' involves three NLR2s $\{r_1, r_2, r_3\}$, we assume that each rule ($r_1, r_2,$ and r_3) could independently facilitate a 10x speedup for this specific query. To estimate the overall benefit of this group, we calculate the geometric mean of the speedup ratios of all the NLR2s within the group. The geometric mean is preferred due to its modest sensitivity to outliers compared to arithmetic mean and harmonic mean. The assumption we made simplifies the estimation process without significantly compromising the accuracy of our estimates. Even if we overestimate the benefit of a less impactful rule under our assumption (attributing the performance boost to this rule when another is the key factor), the overall estimate is balanced by the aggregate performance across various cases within the workload.

4.1.3 Selecting NLR2 as Hints. We select a set of NLR2s as hints for the input query when zero-shot prompt cannot optimize it. Prior to the selection, we have gathered a collection of NLR2s and evaluate their benefits. The generation of hints is guided by two principles: Firstly, the rewrite hints must be specifically tailored to the input query, ensuring relevance and applicability. Secondly, the rewrite hints should have demonstrated effectiveness in previous instances, validating their utility and reliability. Guided by these principles, we formulate a robust selection strategy. At a high level, GENREWRITE first identifies the top-k most similar queries in historical data and retrieves the corresponding NLR2s; Then we rank

these rules by considering both the overall benefit of its rule group and the degree of similarity between the input query and the query where the rule proved effective; Finally, the highest-ranked rules are integrated as rewrite hints in the prompt.

We find similar queries for the input query based on the similarity between query embeddings. For this purpose, Longformer model from Hugging Face, known for its large context window, is used as the embedding model. The input for generating embeddings is the query itself. Other options such as the query plan produced by the database may be explored in the future. Suppose that we identify top-k nearest neighbor $\{n_1, \dots, n_k\}$ for the input query q . For each NLR2 related to these neighbors, we ascertain the group label of the rule and apply the following formula to compute the importance score for the rule group:

$$score(rg) = \sum_{i=1}^k weight(n_i) * indicator(n_i, rg) * benefit(rg)$$

where

$$weight(n_i) = \frac{1/distance(q, n_i)}{\sum_i 1/distance(q, n_i)}$$

$$indicator(n_i, rg) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } rg \cap n_i.rules \neq \emptyset \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

We choose to evaluate the score for the rule group, denoted as $score(rg)$, over individual candidate rules to more precisely reflect their overall benefit. The weighting of neighbor queries increases with their similarity to the input query, which guarantees that the suggested rules align as close as possible with the input query, in accordance with Principle 1. A higher benefit of the rule group correlates with a higher likelihood of being ranked at the top, which reflects the Principle 2. We select one NLR2 from each of top-k rule groups with highest importance scores. In cases where multiple candidate NLR2s originate from the same group, we prefer the rule linked to the most similar neighboring query.

Our selection strategy works well with the benefit estimation module. In instances where a NLR2 is only used by a single query and yields an extremely high speedup, we would not recommend it to every input query. This is because we retrieve candidate NLR2 by first searching for similar queries, thereby implicitly accounting for query frequency in the workload. Consequently, the estimation error arising from a small sample size does not significantly affect our recommendations.

4.2 Correcting Candidate Rewrites

Unlike traditional rewrite rules, which are verified for correctness, LLM-generated rewrites lack guaranteed accuracy, even with appropriate rewrite hints. While many tools can assess query equivalence with varying degrees of capability and efficiency, our requirements extend beyond this. Our goal is not only to verify the equivalence of the rewrite to the input query but also to correct the rewrite until it matches the original query. Otherwise, repeatedly invoking the LLM in hopes of obtaining a correct rewrite is inefficient and wastes computing resources.

Errors generally fall into two categories: 1) Executable with incorrect outcomes, such as a mismatch where the input query aims

Input:

q1:{Input query}

q2:{Candidate rewrite}

q1 is the original query, q2 is the rewritten query of q1.

For q1, break it down step by step and then describe what it does in one sentence. Do the same for q2.

Give an example, using tables, to show that these two queries are not equivalent if there’s any such case. Otherwise, just say they are equivalent.

Answer:

Not equivalent.

{Breakdown and analysis}

{A counterexample}

Input:

Based on your analysis, which part of q2 should be modified so that it becomes equivalent to q1? Show the modified version of q2.

Answer:

{Revised candidate rewrite}

Figure 6: The prompt for semantic correction

to find the second-highest salary, whereas the candidate rewrite seeks the highest salary—this type of error is termed a semantic error. and 2) Unexecutable due to various issues, such as incorrect column names or table names—this type is referred to as a syntax error. These two categories of errors are relatively independent of each other. Inspired by these observations, we develop a two-stage counterexample-guided correction approach. During the semantic correction stage, our focus is on ensuring the candidate rewrite accomplishes the same objective as the input query, while temporarily setting aside syntax errors. In the syntax correction stage, we address all issues impacting query execution.

4.2.1 Semantic Correction. Given the input query as the gold standard, we iteratively refine the candidate rewrite to ensure its convergence towards the gold standard answer. We adopt the idea of Chain-of-Thought prompting in our design: break down the problem-solving process into smaller, more manageable parts, making it easier for the model to understand and process the query. Specifically, in each iteration, the LLM first analyzes the purpose and action of each query through summarization.; Subsequently, it seeks a counterexample to demonstrate the inequivalence between the two, utilizing previously extracted information, and then determines their equivalence.; If deemed “not equivalent”, the LLM then adjusts the current candidate rewrite based on the analysis and counterexamples, aiming to produce a revised version that more closely aligns with the input query. The revised candidate query will be reviewed and adjusted in the next iteration until the LLM determines it is equivalent to the input query. Figure. 6 shows an example prompt used for semantic correction.

Using TPC-DS Q11 from Section 2 as an illustration, 4 of 10 rewriting attempts for Q11 correctly identify the need to eliminate redundant **UNION ALL** operations and decompose the CTE into smaller ones. However, none of the rewrites are equivalent and error-free. For intricate queries like Q11, it proves exceedingly difficult for the LLM to match the semantics of the input query precisely while avoiding syntax errors. The initial attempt at rewriting Q11 often results in fewer joins than the correct version, overlooking

the essential role of these joins in facilitating the comparison of sales data for the same customer across different years and types of sales. In our experiments, achieving a good rewrite of Q11 without semantic errors requires at least three iterations, even then, minor syntax errors such as incorrect table aliases remained, which are addressed during the syntax correction phase.

4.2.2 Syntax Correction. Syntax correction adopts a philosophy similar to semantic correction, with a notable distinction: syntax correction depends on feedback from executing the EXPLAIN command on the candidate rewrite to guide its refinement process. In contrast, semantic correction relies on counterexamples identified by the LLM through logical reasoning. Typical errors addressed include incorrect column or table names and inconsistent table aliases. The use of EXPLAIN, which does not execute the query, minimizes overhead, making it an efficient method to decide whether the rewrite is executable or not.

4.3 Evaluating Candidate Rewrites

Our ultimate goal is to find equivalent queries that are *faster*. To this end, we evaluate rewrites for both equivalence and performance. For assessing equivalence, off-the-shelf testers or verifiers can be employed, depending on the available time budget and query complexity. Currently, we utilize a tester from Slabcity. For performance evaluation, we could either use EXPLAIN cost estimates as a proxy for the actual performance or use the actual query latency by executing candidate queries against the database. The latter approach is particularly justified for workloads with recurring queries of fixed periodicity (mostly daily or weekly). Our default setting is using actual latency. In later section, we conduct an ablation study to examine the effects of relying on EXPLAIN cost estimates versus actual query latency on the performance of candidate rewrites.

5 EVALUATION

The evaluation aims to answer the following questions:

- (1) How does GENREWRITE compare to a straightforward application of the out-of-the-box LLM? In other words, do our NLR2s, counterexample-based correction algorithm, and utility score make a considerable impact on boosting LLM’s performance? (§5.2)
- (2) How does GENREWRITE compare to state-of-the-art rule-based query rewriting approaches? Specifically, which approach can optimize more queries and which approach yields more speedup for the rewritten queries? (§5.3)
- (3) How much does each of GENREWRITE’s components contribute to its overall success (ablation study)? (§5.4)
- (4) What is the cost of using the LLM for query rewriting? (§5.5)
- (5) How does the choice of the LLM influence the effectiveness of GENREWRITE’s rewrites (GPT-4 vs. GPT-3.5 Turbo)? (§5.6)

5.1 Experimental Setup

Testbed. Our experiments are all conducted on Amazon EC2 r5.large instances, with 16GB RAM, 200GB gp2 SSD and Xeon E5-2686 v4 CPU running Ubuntu 22.04. We use PostgreSQL 14.9. To evaluate

query latency accurately, we execute each query 3 times and take their average as the final latency value. Before each run, we restart the PostgreSQL service and clear the database cache. Additionally, we use an off-the-shelf tester from [15] to check query equivalence followed by manual inspection.

Choice of LLM. We select GPT-4 (8K tokens) as the default large language model in GENREWRITE. Due to its broader general knowledge and advanced reasoning capabilities, GPT-4 can solve difficult problems with greater accuracy than previous models such as GPT-3.5-turbo.

Workload. TPC-DS is a widely recognized, industry-standard decision support benchmark, which is designed to provide relevant, objective performance data to industry users. Even though TPC-DS may not perfectly model the recurring workloads seen in production environments, it still serves as a valuable reference for assessing the efficacy of different query rewriting techniques on complex, real-life queries. We generated 10 GB of TPC-DS dataset and considered all of the 99 queries in the benchmark.

Baselines. We compare GENREWRITE against a strawman LLM-based approach and two state-of-the-art traditional query rewriting techniques:

- **Baseline LLM** employs a zero-shot prompting technique illustrated in Figure 2 to generate candidate queries without any correction mechanism. This baseline represents the straightforward application of out-of-the-box LLM.
- **LR** (or LearnedRewrite) is a state-of-the-art rule-based query rewriter [44] which uses Monte Carlo Tree Search to guide the rule-based rewriting process. LR uses rewrite rules from Calcite [9], which is the most popular library for query rewriting rules.
- **Fusion** Computation Reuse via Fusion [10] is a technique for rewriting complex SQL queries in Amazon Athena. It focuses on minimizing computational redundancy by identifying and merging repeated operations, including instances where the common expressions are not exactly the same.

We intentionally excluded [41] from our experiments because it was not able to rewrite any of the 99 TPC-DS queries.

5.2 Comparison with Baseline LLM

For GENREWRITE, we conduct 4 initial rounds with zero-shot prompts to identify easily accessible rewrite opportunities (low-hanging fruits) and collect useful NLR2s. Then, we conduct a final round utilizing prompts augmented with the selected NLR2 hints. Each round incorporates both semantic and syntax corrections. For Baseline LLM, we conduct 5 rounds using zero-shot prompts without any correction effort. If a method fails to produce an equivalent rewrite for a particular query, we deem the speedup ratio for that query as 1 indicating a fallback to the original query.

Table 2 shows a direct comparison between GENREWRITE and Baseline LLM. Notably, 30.3% of Baseline LLM’s rewrites are un-executable (due to syntax error), compared to only 4.3% for GENREWRITE. The percentage of rewrites leading to semantic errors (i.e., non-equivalent rewrites) for Baseline LLM is 29.3%, compared to only 6.1% for GENREWRITE. Both results demonstrate the effectiveness of our iterative correction strategy.

GENREWRITE results in only 2 performance regressions from 93 queries with equivalent rewrites—defined as those with over 5% longer execution time than the original query—while Baseline LLM experiences 23 performance regressions out of 70 equivalent rewrites. Moreover, GENREWRITE achieves more than a 2x speedup in its rewrites twice as often as Baseline LLM. These two statistics show the effectiveness of our knowledge transfer.

Overall, these results show the effectiveness of GENREWRITE in drastically improving the quantity and quality of rewrites that one can achieve by naively invoking the LLM.

5.3 Comparison with Traditional Query Rewriting

In rule-based query rewriting, a set of pattern-matching rewrite rules define a fixed search space, resulting in consistent query outcomes across multiple runs. In contrast, due to the probabilistic nature of LLMs, additional LLM runs increases the likelihood of uncovering new rewrite possibilities and thereby improving performance. To ensure a fair comparison, we impose a limit on the number of LLM runs per query, consistent with the setup outlined in Section 5.2. Here, again, if a method fails to produce an equivalent rewrite for a particular query, we deem the speedup ratio for that query as 1 indicating a fallback to the original query.

Table 3 and Figure 7 present the performance evaluation results for various the algorithms on TPC-DS. Analysis of Table 3 shows that GENREWRITE consistently surpasses the two rule-based baselines in terms of the number of queries optimized, regardless of the desired speedup threshold. Table 3 reports the percentage by dividing the number of queries by the total number of TPC-DS queries, which is 99. For instance, GENREWRITE manages to enhance 21 queries to at least a 2x speedup, in contrast to LR and Fusion, which optimize 5 and 6 queries, respectively, to the same speedup level. When considering queries that achieve at least a 10x speedup, GENREWRITE leads with 9 queries, compared to 4 for both LR and Fusion. In summary, this demonstrates GENREWRITE can optimize a much wider range of queries (2.25–4.2x) than traditional query rewriting techniques where the rewrite opportunities are often missed by the existing pattern-matching rewrite rules.

In addition to GENREWRITE’s higher coverage, we also analyze the quality of the rewrites in terms of the speedup achieved from the rewrite. In Figure 7, we analyze 24 queries for which at least one method achieves a speedup of 2x or greater, comparing the speedup ratios of different methods for the same input queries. GENREWRITE provides the highest speedup for most queries, with only three exceptions: Fusion’s rewrite is faster for Q9, LR’s rewrite is faster for Q52, and both outperform GENREWRITE for Q95. This indicates that GENREWRITE usually leads to faster rewrites for the same input queries compared to two rule-based approaches.

Discussion. At first glance, Fusion might seem least effective, achieving a speedup of 10% or more on 8 queries and 50% or more on 7 queries, the lowest among the three methods. However, Fusion’s rewrites often yield better speedup than LR’s. In other words, Fusion performs better than LR for specific types of queries, but it is applicable to fewer queries. Furthermore, we observe that Q61 could in principle benefit from Fusion’s strategy of eliminating duplicate computations. However, the two Common Table Expressions (CTEs)

in Q61 are nearly identical except for a unique predicate. This small deviation from the standard pattern inhibits Fusion’s applicability, highlighting the limitations of rule-based approaches in addressing unanticipated query patterns. In contrast, GENREWRITE, incorporating the LLM, offers greater flexibility by aiming to comprehend the semantics of the queries, rather than depending solely on rigid, predefined syntactic patterns.

Finally, while LR is capable of rewriting a broader range of queries than Fusion, the quality and quantity of its rewrites are inferior to GENREWRITE’s. In particular, LR’s performance on the TPC-DS workload is hindered due to the absence of rules specifically tailored for optimizing queries with multiple similar sub-expressions.

5.4 Detailed Analysis and Ablation Study

In this section, we conduct a detailed ablation study to validate our design decisions in GENREWRITE and the contribution of each component therein towards the overall performance.

Impact of semantic and syntax correction. For each TPC-DS query, we conduct 4 independent runs to generate 4 candidate rewrites. In each run, we use zero-shot prompting (Baseline LLM) to suggest candidate queries and adopt one of the following correction strategies before assessing the correctness and performance of the rewrite.

- (1) No correction.
- (2) Only semantic correction.
- (3) Only syntactic correction.
- (4) Two-stage correction (semantic correction and then syntax correction).

We set the maximum iteration count 5 for both semantic and syntax correction.

Table 4 compares cumulative equivalent rewrites generated by various correction strategies over successive runs, with each cell showing the number of TPC-DS queries equivalently rewritten by a specific strategy up to that point (the highest possible is 99). The analysis clearly demonstrates that the two-stage correction strategy outperforms others, and not applying any correction yields the least effective results, with the remaining strategies falling in between. In a direct comparison between “Only semantic correction” and “Only syntax correction”, the latter shows a quicker ability to produce executable and equivalent rewrites for simpler queries in the first few runs. However, its effectiveness is limited by a lower ceiling due to a lack of understanding regarding the queries’ intent, leading to executable but inequivalent rewrites for more complex queries. When combining these two strategies together, semantic correction interprets the intent, ensuring the rewrite’s objectives align with the original query, and then syntax correction refines the rewrite to be executable. The two-stage strategy (i.e., semantic + syntax) identifies equivalent rewrites for 70 of the 99 TPC-DS queries in the first run. It then adds 3 more in the second run and 6 in the third, ultimately achieving equivalent rewrites for 90 of the 99 queries.

Delving deeper into the two-stage correction strategy, it generally achieves convergence quickly, usually within 5 iterations, except for a small number of cases involving overly complex queries. However, there is still a gap between the queries deemed equivalent by the LLM and those that are truly equivalent. The non-cumulative




Figure 7: Comparison of speedup achieved by different approaches on queries where at least one method attains a 2x or greater speedup. The y-axis is on a log scale.

	Syntax errors	Semantic error	Regression (i.e., speedup < 1x)	>2x speedup
GENREWRITE	4.3%	6.1%	2.0%	21.2%
Baseline LLM	30.3%	29.3%	25.3%	10.1%

Table 2: Comparison between GENREWRITE and Baseline LLM on percentage of syntax error, syntax error, performance regression, more than 2x speedup

speedup	>10%	>50%	>2x	>10x	>100x
GENREWRITE	33.3%	24.2%	21.2%	9.1%	3.0%
LR	14.1%	9.1%	5.1%	4.0%	2.0%
Fusion	8.1%	7.1%	6.1%	4.0%	3.0%

Table 3: Comparison of the percentage of queries optimized by GENREWRITE and rule-based approaches

	run 1	run 2	run 3	run 4
No correction	45	56	65	69
Only semantic	51	66	76	82
Only syntactic	60	68	73	76
Semantic + syntactic	70	81	87	90

Table 4: Cumulative count of equivalent rewrites using different correction strategies over multiple runs.

count of queries verified as equivalent in each run are 69, 75, 69, and 70, respectively. When aggregating results from all runs, 90 unique queries are equivalent, indicating that the sets of queries identified as equivalent in each run vary.

Impact of NLR2s as hints. After conducting 4 rounds of zero-shot prompting, we reach a stable state where additional rounds fail to bring improvements in terms of the number of rewrites that are both equivalent and faster. This suggests that we effectively capture most of low-hanging fruits. A comparative analysis between an additional iteration using zero-shot prompting and another leveraging prompts augmented with specific NLR2 hints reveals a pronounced superiority of the latter. The queries solvable exclusively through hint-augmented prompts are presented in Table 5.

input	speedup	inspired by	NLR2s
Q4	5.68x	Q74	Avoid UNION ALL if not necessary; Split complex queries into simpler ones using WITH clause
Q11	10.3x	Q74	Avoid UNION ALL if not necessary; Split complex queries into simpler ones using WITH clause
Q20	9.89x	Q12	Use CTE (Common Table Expressions) to break down complex queries; Reduce the number of tables in the join operation
Q29	6.85x	Q25	Aggregate before join; Use subqueries to break down complex queries
Q76	9.77x	Q61	Combine multiple queries into a single query; Move WHERE clause filters to ON clause in JOINS

Table 5: NLR2s inspired speedups

Q4, Q11, and Q74 all see improvements by eliminating the unnecessary **UNION ALL**, which has been discussed in earlier sections. Q20 benefits from NLR2s learned from its neighboring query Q12. Inspired by the rule “Use CTE to break down complex queries”, the actual transformation applied is a group-by pushdown. Q29 is solved using similar ideas but exhibits a different query pattern and learns from Q25. For Q76, where multiple segments each join two common tables across several subqueries, the rewrite strategy is to combine these segments with **UNION ALL** before conducting a join with the common tables, thereby avoiding duplicate computation. This strategy is inspired by the rule “Combine multiple queries into one query” from Q61. These instances underscore the value of employing NLR2s for effective knowledge transfer across queries.

speedup	>10%	>50%	>2x	>10x	>100x
Using latency	33.3%	24.2%	21.2%	9.1%	3.0%
Using EXPLAIN cost	23.2%	16.2%	13.1%	7.1%	3.0%

Table 6: Comparison of the percentage of queries optimized when using latency and EXPLAIN cost as the evaluation metric

At the conclusion of our experiments, we collect 156 groups of rewrite rules, with an average of 7 rules per group.

EXPLAIN cost vs. actual latency. When evaluating rewrites, we can either utilize the database’s own cost estimates as a surrogate for actual performance (i.e., using EXPLAIN) or measure the latency by actually running candidate queries directly on the database or a small sample of it. The latter approach, while offering greater accuracy, also results in higher costs, which is justifiable when the query is optimized once and rewritten many times (see target use case in §1). The goal of this experiment is to quantify the negative impact of using inaccurate cost estimates on GENREWRITE’s performance.

We examine two variants of GENREWRITE, differing only in their choice of evaluation metric. One variant calculates the utility scores of NLR2s based on actual latency while the other relies on EXPLAIN’s cost estimates. The comparison between the two variants is detailed in Table 6. We observe that both coverage and latency reduction ratios are lower when EXPLAIN is used for query evaluation. This is expected: (1) cost estimates do not accurately reflect actual latency, meaning a rewrite with a lower cost estimate does not guarantee lower latency; (2) the speedup ratios derived from cost estimates can be disproportionately high, not aligning with the actual latency improvements, thereby impacting the effectiveness of NLR2s. Despite these issues, the variant that rely on EXPLAIN cost still outperforms all other baselines.

5.5 Cost analysis of LLM

Utilizing the LLM for a complete round, which includes rewrite suggestions, semantic correction, and syntactic corrections, results in a monetary cost of approximately \$0.168 and a total duration of 29.6 seconds on average. The breakdown of this monetary cost is as follows: rewrite suggestions (35.45%), semantic adjustments (49.51%), and syntactic corrections (15.04%). The time taken by each of these steps is 10.81%, 45.61%, and 43.5%, respectively. The expense associated with using the LLM for clustering the rules is minimal. The overall cost is linear in the number of rounds.

5.6 Choice of the LLM

The performance of components in GENREWRITE critically depends on the knowledge and reasoning capabilities of the chosen LLM. If LLMs cannot optimize any of the queries, then there is no knowledge to be transferred. Moreover, if an LLM fails to accurately outline a query’s objective, it is unlikely to identify relevant counterexamples. OpenAI claims that GPT-4 markedly outperforms its predecessors in complex reasoning tasks. In order to quantify its impact, we follow the experimental setup described in Section 5.6, with the LLM selection being the only variable. Here, GPT-3.5 Turbo manages to enhance 3 queries beyond a 2x speedup, while GPT-4

achieves this for 21 queries, reflecting a 7x improvement. This underscores the substantial gap in reasoning capabilities between the two models and highlights the critical role of such capabilities in query rewriting tasks.

6 RELATED WORK

In this section, we summarize the most relevant lines of related work.

Traditional query rewriting. Manual query rewriting, even when supplemented with some assistant tools (e.g., ARe-SQL [13]) that automatically recommend applicable rules based on statistics, does not scale and is prone to error. Much of the work in automated query rewriting is rule-based [8, 19, 26, 30, 32, 34]. More recently, LearnedRewrite [44] explores how to find the optimal order of applying rules, maximizing the utility of the given rules; Fusion [10] has introduced several innovative rules for addressing common expressions in complex queries. Both techniques are considered state-of-the-art and are used in our experiments (§5). Despite variations in the quality and quantity of their rules, rule-based techniques are fundamentally incapable of optimizing new query patterns that have not been seen before. Though synthesis-based approaches [15] are not constrained by rules, they struggle with complex queries, such as those in the TPC-DS benchmark, which require navigating an enormously large search space.

Text-to-SQL. Text-to-SQL automates the process of generating SQL queries for databases from natural language text, which is crucial to enhance database accessibility without requiring expertise of SQL. This line of research is orthogonal to query rewriting but shares some common challenges, e.g., handling syntactic or semantic errors. It is also a long standing open problem [20]. Earlier techniques are mostly rule-based [7, 28], while more recent methods exploit deep learning solutions and achieve better results [22, 25, 35, 37, 39, 40]. In short, the main goal in Text-to-SQL is improving user experience while the main goal in query-rewriting is improving query performance.

LLMs in databases. Beyond Text-to-SQL, Large Language Models (LLMs) have been recently applied to a variety of other database-related tasks. These include data cleaning and integration [31, 36], table processing [27, 29], database diagnosis [45], and root cause analysis [11]. Specifically, DB-GPT [42] is a vision paper that explores the use of LLMs for accomplishing database tasks, with query rewriting being briefly mentioned, however, it primarily focuses on DB-specific model pre-training and fine-tuning.

7 CONCLUSION

This paper presents GENREWRITE, the first holistic system that leverages LLMs for query rewriting. We introduce Natural Language Rewrite Rules (NLR2s) for transferring knowledge from rewriting one query to another, thereby enhancing the system’s effectiveness over time. We present a novel counterexample-guided technique that iteratively corrects the syntactic and semantic errors in the rewritten query. Our empirical analysis demonstrates that GENREWRITE optimize a wider range of complex queries and achieve faster speedup than state-of-the-art query-rewriting techniques.

REFERENCES

- [1] dbt Labs | Transform Data in Your Warehouse. <https://www.getdbt.com/>.
- [2] LeetCode. <https://leetcode.com/problemset/database/>.
- [3] Looker business intelligence platform embedded analytics. <https://cloud.google.com/looker>.
- [4] OpenAI Introduction. <https://platform.openai.com/docs/introduction/tokens>.
- [5] Prompt Engineering for Generative AI. <https://developers.google.com/machine-learning/resources/prompt-eng>.
- [6] TPC-DS Benchmark. <https://www.tpc.org/tpcds/>.
- [7] Katrin Affolter, Kurt Stockinger, and Abraham Bernstein. 2019. A comparative survey of recent natural language interfaces for databases. *The VLDB Journal* 28 (2019), 793–819.
- [8] Rafi Ahmed, Allison Lee, Andrew Witkowski, Dinesh Das, Hong Su, Mohamed Zait, and Thierry Cruanes. 2006. Cost-based query transformation in Oracle. In *VLDB*, Vol. 6. 1026–1036.
- [9] Edmon Begoli, Jesús Camacho-Rodríguez, Julian Hyde, Michael J Mior, and Daniel Lemire. 2018. Apache calcite: A foundational framework for optimized query processing over heterogeneous data sources. In *Proceedings of the 2018 International Conference on Management of Data*. 221–230.
- [10] Nicolas Bruno, Johnny Debrodt, Chujun Song, and Wei Zheng. 2022. Computation reuse via fusion in Amazon Athena. In *2022 IEEE 38th International Conference on Data Engineering (ICDE)*. IEEE, 1610–1620.
- [11] Yinfang Chen, Huaibing Xie, Minghua Ma, Yu Kang, Xin Gao, Liu Shi, Yunjie Cao, Xuedong Gao, Hao Fan, Ming Wen, Jun Zeng, Supriyo Ghosh, Xuchao Zhang, Chaoyun Zhang, Qingwei Lin, Saravan Rajmohan, Dongmei Zhang, and Tianyin Xu. 2023. Automatic Root Cause Analysis via Large Language Models for Cloud Incidents. [arXiv:2305.15778 \[cs.SE\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2305.15778)
- [12] Benoit Dageville, Thierry Cruanes, Marcin Zukowski, Vadim Antonov, Artin Avanes, Jon Bock, Jonathan Claybaugh, Daniel Engovatov, Martin Hentschel, Jiansheng Huang, et al. 2016. The snowflake elastic data warehouse. In *Proceedings of the 2016 International Conference on Management of Data*. 215–226.
- [13] Arlino HM de Araújo, José Maria Monteiro, José Antônio F de Macêdo, Júlio A Tavares, Angelo Brayner, and Sérgio Lifschitz. 2014. AR-SQL: An Online, Automatic and Non-Intrusive Approach for Rewriting SQL Queries. *Journal of Information and Data Management* 5, 1 (2014), 28–28.
- [14] Haoran Ding, Zhaoguo Wang, Yicun Yang, Dexin Zhang, Zhenglin Xu, Haibo Chen, Ruzica Piskac, and Jinyang Li. 2023. Proving Query Equivalence Using Linear Integer Arithmetic. *Proceedings of the ACM on Management of Data* 1, 4 (2023), 1–26.
- [15] Rui Dong, Jie Liu, Yuxuan Zhu, Cong Yan, Barzan Mozafari, and Xinyu Wang. 2023. SlabCity: Whole-Query Optimization Using Program Synthesis. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment* 16, 11 (2023), 3151–3164.
- [16] Sérgio Fernandes and Jorge Bernardino. 2015. What is bigquery?. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Database Engineering & Applications Symposium*. 202–203.
- [17] Han Fu, Chang Liu, Bin Wu, Feifei Li, Jian Tan, and Jianling Sun. 2023. CatSQL: Towards Real World Natural Language to SQL Applications. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment* 16, 6 (2023), 1534–1547.
- [18] Dawei Gao, Haibin Wang, Yaliang Li, Xiuyu Sun, Yichen Qian, Bolin Ding, and Jingen Zhou. 2023. Text-to-SQL Empowered by Large Language Models: A Benchmark Evaluation. [CoRR abs/2308.15363 \(2023\)](https://arxiv.org/abs/2308.15363). [arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.15363 \(2023\)](https://arxiv.org/abs/2308.15363).
- [19] Goetz Graefe. 1987. *Rule-based query optimization in extensible database systems*. Technical Report. University of Wisconsin-Madison Department of Computer Sciences.
- [20] Bert F Green Jr, Alice K Wolf, Carol Chomsky, and Kenneth Laughery. 1961. Baseball: an automatic question-answerer. In *Papers presented at the May 9-11, 1961, western joint IRE-AIEE-ACM computer conference*. 219–224.
- [21] Zihui Gu, Ju Fan, Nan Tang, Lei Cao, Bowen Jia, Sam Madden, and Xiaoyong Du. 2023. Few-shot Text-to-SQL Translation using Structure and Content Prompt Learning. *Proceedings of the ACM on Management of Data* 1, 2 (2023), 1–28.
- [22] Jiaqi Guo, Zecheng Zhan, Yan Gao, Yan Xiao, Jian-Guang Lou, Ting Liu, and Dongmei Zhang. 2019. Towards complex text-to-sql in cross-domain database with intermediate representation. [arXiv preprint arXiv:1905.08205 \(2019\)](https://arxiv.org/abs/1905.08205).
- [23] Alekh Jindal, Konstantinos Karanasos, Sriram Rao, and Hiren Patel. 2018. Selecting subexpressions to materialize at datacenter scale. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment* 11, 7 (2018), 800–812.
- [24] George Katsogiannis-Meimarakis and Georgia Koutrika. 2023. A survey on deep learning approaches for text-to-SQL. *The VLDB Journal* (2023), 1–32.
- [25] Hyeonji Kim, Byeong-Hoon So, Wook-Shin Han, and Hongrae Lee. 2020. Natural language to SQL: Where are we today? *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment* 13, 10 (2020), 1737–1750.
- [26] Alon Yitzchak Levy and Inderpal Singh Mumick. 1997. Query optimization by predicate move-around. US Patent 5,659,725.
- [27] Peng Li, Yeye He, Dror Yashar, Weiwei Cui, Song Ge, Haidong Zhang, Danielle Rifinski Fainman, Dongmei Zhang, and Surajit Chaudhuri. 2023. Tablegpt: Table-tuned gpt for diverse table tasks. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.09263 \(2023\)](https://arxiv.org/abs/2310.09263).
- [28] Yunyao Li, Davood Rafiei, and HV Jagadish. 2018. *Natural language data management and interfaces*. Springer.
- [29] Weizheng Lu, Jiaming Zhang, Jing Zhang, and Yueguo Chen. 2024. Large Language Model for Table Processing: A Survey. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.05121 \(2024\)](https://arxiv.org/abs/2402.05121).
- [30] M Muralikrishna et al. 1992. Improved unnesting algorithms for join aggregate SQL queries. In *VLDB*, Vol. 92. Citeseer, 91–102.
- [31] Avánika Narayan, Ines Chami, Laurel Orr, Simran Arora, and Christopher Ré. 2022. Can foundation models wrangle your data? [arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.09911 \(2022\)](https://arxiv.org/abs/2205.09911).
- [32] Hamid Pirahesh, Joseph M Hellerstein, and Waqar Hasan. 1992. Extensible/rule based query rewrite optimization in Starburst. *ACM Sigmod Record* 21, 2 (1992), 39–48.
- [33] Mohammadreza Pourreza and Davood Rafiei. 2024. Din-sql: Decomposed in-context learning of text-to-sql with self-correction. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 36 (2024).
- [34] Praveen Seshadri, Joseph M Hellerstein, Hamid Pirahesh, TY Cliff Leung, Raghu Ramakrishnan, Divesh Srivastava, Peter J Stuckey, and S Sudarshan. 1996. Cost-based optimization for magic: Algebra and implementation. In *Proceedings of the 1996 ACM SIGMOD international conference on Management of data*. 435–446.
- [35] Peng Shi, Patrick Ng, Zhiguo Wang, Henghui Zhu, Alexander Hanbo Li, Jun Wang, Cicero Nogueira dos Santos, and Bing Xiang. 2021. Learning contextual representations for semantic parsing with generation-augmented pre-training. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, Vol. 35. 13806–13814.
- [36] Yoshihiko Suhara, Jinfeng Li, Yuliang Li, Dan Zhang, Çağatay Demiralp, Chen Chen, and Wang-Chiew Tan. 2022. Annotating columns with pre-trained language models. In *Proceedings of the 2022 International Conference on Management of Data*. 1493–1503.
- [37] Ruoxi Sun, Sercan Ö Arik, Hootan Nakhost, Hanjun Dai, Rajarishi Sinha, Pengcheng Yin, and Tomas Pfister. [n.d.]. Sql-palm: Improved large language model adaptation for text-to-sql. [CoRR, abs/2306.00739, 2023a](https://arxiv.org/abs/2306.00739). doi: 10.48550/arXiv.2306.00739 ([n. d.]).
- [38] SM Tommoy, SM Zaman, Vinija Jain, Anku Rani, Vipula Rawte, Aman Chadha, and Amitava Das. 2024. A comprehensive survey of hallucination mitigation techniques in large language models. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.01313 \(2024\)](https://arxiv.org/abs/2401.01313).
- [39] Bailin Wang, Richard Shin, Xiaodong Liu, Oleksandr Polozov, and Matthew Richardson. 2019. Rat-sql: Relation-aware schema encoding and linking for text-to-sql parsers. [arXiv preprint arXiv:1911.04942 \(2019\)](https://arxiv.org/abs/1911.04942).
- [40] Wenlu Wang, Yingtao Tian, Haixun Wang, and Wei-Shinn Ku. 2020. A natural language interface for database: Achieving transfer-learnability using adversarial method for question understanding. In *2020 IEEE 36th International conference on data engineering (ICDE)*. IEEE, 97–108.
- [41] Zhaoguo Wang, Zhou Zhou, Yicun Yang, Haoran Ding, Gansen Hu, Ding Ding, Chuzhe Tang, Haibo Chen, and Jinyang Li. 2022. Wetune: Automatic discovery and verification of query rewrite rules. In *Proceedings of the 2022 International Conference on Management of Data*. 94–107.
- [42] Guoliang Li Xuanhe Zhou, Zhaoyan Sun. 2023. DB-GPT: Large Language Model Meets Database.
- [43] Yue Zhang, Yafu Li, Leyang Cui, Deng Cai, Lemao Liu, Tingchen Fu, Xinting Huang, Enbo Zhao, Yu Zhang, Yulong Chen, et al. 2023. Siren’s song in the AI ocean: a survey on hallucination in large language models. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.01219 \(2023\)](https://arxiv.org/abs/2309.01219).
- [44] Xuanhe Zhou, Guoliang Li, Chengliang Chai, and Jianhua Feng. 2021. A learned query rewrite system using monte carlo tree search. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment* 15, 1 (2021), 46–58.
- [45] Xuanhe Zhou, Guoliang Li, Zhaoyan Sun, Zhiyuan Liu, Weize Chen, Jianming Wu, Jiessi Liu, Ruohang Feng, and Guoyang Zeng. 2023. D-bot: Database diagnosis system using large language models. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.01454 \(2023\)](https://arxiv.org/abs/2312.01454).