

TANQ: An open domain dataset of table answered questions

Mubashara Akhtar^{* † ‡} and Chenxi Pang^{* †}

Andreea Marzoca[†] and Yasemin Altun[†] and Julian Martin Eisenschlos[†]

[◊]King’s College London, UK

mubashara.akhtar@kcl.ac.uk

[†]Google Deepmind, Switzerland

{chenxipang, andreeam, altun, eisenjulian}@google.com

Abstract

Language models, potentially augmented with tool usage such as retrieval are becoming the go-to means of answering questions. Understanding and answering questions in real-world settings often requires retrieving information from different sources, processing and aggregating data to extract insights, and presenting complex findings in form of structured artifacts such as novel tables, charts, or infographics. In this paper, we introduce TANQ,¹ the first open domain question answering dataset where the answers require building tables from information across multiple sources. We release the full source attribution for every cell in the resulting table and benchmark state-of-the-art language models in open, oracle, and closed book setups. Our best-performing baseline, GPT4 reaches an overall F1 score of 29.1, lagging behind human performance by 19.7 points. We analyse baselines’ performance across different dataset attributes such as different skills required for this task, including multi-hop reasoning, math operations, and unit conversions. We further discuss common failures in model-generated answers, suggesting that TANQ is a complex task with many challenges ahead.

1 Introduction

Understanding and solving problems in real-world scenarios often requires reasoning across multiple documents and data modalities. This includes (i) retrieving information from different sources, (ii) processing and aggregating data to extract insights, and (iii) presenting complex findings in a structured format, for example tables, charts or infographics, to communicate them to readers. Previous studies show that knowledge workers across

^{*}Equal contributions.

[†]Work done during Google internship.

¹Datasets at github.com/google-deepmind/tanq

Question: Which Indian movies were both directed and written by Kamal Haasan and who were their composers? Order them by release year.

Sample evidence from Wikipedia passages, tables, and infoboxes:

Virumaandi is a 2004 Indian Tamil-language action drama film written, co-edited, produced, and directed by Kamal Haasan, who also performed ...

Ghibran: Discography

Year	Title	Language	
	Vishwaroopam 2	Tamil	Bilingual Film
	Vishwaroop 2	Hindi	
	Aan Devathai		
			Won, Flaj TV award for Best Music (
			Won, LATCA Los Angeles Theatrical
			Won, Oniros Film Awards for Best S
			Won, Diamond Film Awards for Best
			Won, Best Sagrada Familia Soundtr
			Won, Los Angeles Film Awards for I
2018	Ratsasan	Tamil	Won, Hollywood International Movir
			Won, International Independent Fil




Table answer:

Movie	Composer	Release Year
Chachi 420	Vishal Bhardwaj	1998
Hey Ram	Ilaiyaraaja	2000
Virumaandi	Ilaiyaraaja	2004
Vishwaroopam	Shankar-Ehsaan-Loy	2013
Sabaash Naidu	Ilaiyaraaja	2016
Vishwaroopam II	Mohamaad Ghibran	2018

Figure 1: An example question in TANQ and its corresponding table answer. Supporting evidence from multiple pages in a Wikipedia snapshot is provided for each data point inside the table. We highlight the rationale inside each snippet in yellow. LLMs are evaluated with or without access to the evidence.

domains, e.g. finance, science, and economics, spend around 20% of their time searching and gathering information from different files into one document to extract insights and consequently answer information-seeking questions (Chui et al., 2012). As a result, one of most challenging tasks for workers is to aggregate data and turn it into insights. Tables as a structured representation of data are ubiquitous in real-world sources and are commonly used to communicate complex information. Hence, they can be the perfect modality to answer complex questions.

Large language models (LLMs), commonly augmented with external tools such as retrieval,

Dataset	Open Domain	Multi Doc	Answer Type	Document Type		
				Text	Table	Infobox
InfoTabs (Gupta et al., 2020)			short text			✓
FeTAQA (Nan et al., 2022)			free form text		✓	
FinQA (Chen et al., 2021b)			short text	✓	✓	
TATQA (Zhu et al., 2021)			short text	✓	✓	
MultiHiertt (Zhao et al., 2022)			numeric	✓	✓	
OTTQA (Chen et al., 2021a)	✓		short text		✓	
NQ-TABLES (Herzig et al., 2021)	✓		short text		✓	
HybridQA (Chen et al., 2020b)		✓	short text	✓	✓	
MultiTabQA (Pal et al., 2023)		✓	table		✓	
TANQ	✓	✓	table	✓	✓	✓

Table 1: Comparison of TANQ to related (table) question-answering datasets.

have become the go-to means for answering questions. State-of-the-art question-answering (QA) systems integrate LLMs in various ways, from decomposing complex queries to retrieving documents using external tools or generating context data from knowledge acquired during model training. However, their evaluation is mostly limited to simple datasets, e.g. TabFact (Chen et al., 2020a) or HotpotQA (Yang et al., 2018), whose questions can be answered by reasoning over a single table or text document and generating a short text sequence as answer. This limits the applicability of such systems to perform complex multi-step research explorations. Moreover, it differs from real-world needs where relevant information can be spread across documents and represented in different forms (e.g. text or tables). Moreover, more often than not, generating a short text as answer is not sufficient for more complex information-seeking questions.

In this paper, we investigate LLMs’ capabilities in reasoning over multiple data sources and formats (i.e. text, tables, infoboxes) to answer entity-centric questions and generate table answers as structured artifacts. To address these challenges, we introduce **TANQ**, an open-domain, multi-hop question-answering (QA) dataset. TANQ requires retrieving and aggregating data from multiple documents to compile and communicate answers as tables. To solve TANQ, models require different skills in addition to data retrieval such as filtering, maths, and name normalization. We create TANQ applying a five-step, automated data collection process. We use QAMPARI (Amouyal et al., 2022) as seed dataset and Wikidata as well as the Wikipedia corpus as data sources. For automated evaluation of different data collection and processing substeps, we use PaLM-2 (Anil et al., 2023b).

We evaluate several state-of-the-art LLMs on

TANQ, including close, oracle and open book evaluation setups. Finally, we study model-generated answer tables and discuss common failure cases and challenges related to TANQ. Our evaluation of models across skills can further inform future tools and evaluation setups for LLMs to improve models for complex, information-seeking questions.

To summarise, our **contributions** are as follows:

- (a) We introduce TANQ, the first open-domain question-answering benchmark that requires building answers in form of tables from multiple information sources.
- (b) We benchmark state-of-the-art language models in oracle, open and closed book setups, reaching an overall F1 score of 29.1 with our best-performing (oracle) baseline.
- (c) We evaluate model performance across different dataset characteristics (e.g. reasoning skills and question types) and discuss challenges and common failure types.

2 Related Work

Various benchmarks for QA have been released in recent years. Each one addresses different challenges related to the task. Table 1 provides an overview and comparison of benchmarks.

QA with text and/or table input. A number of datasets use text and one or multiple tables for QA. While both text and tables have been considered as input modalities, the output of the datasets is mostly limited to short textual answers. HybridQA (Chen et al., 2020b), for example, is a multi-hop QA dataset that requires reasoning over




Figure 2: TANQ creation pipeline consisting of five steps: 1. Extending QAMPARI questions; 2. Evidence extraction from Wikipedia; 3. Evidence evaluation and answer table extraction; 4. Question rephrasing; 5. Augmentation with additional skills. We include a running example at the bottom with a TANQ example at the end.

one table and multiple Wikipedia passages related to entities occurring in the table. HybridQA answers are short texts with location names being the most common answer types, followed by numbers, dates, and person names. Moreover, many QA benchmarks for reasoning over text and tabular context concentrate on the finance domain. For example, the MultiHiertt (Zhao et al., 2022) benchmark is created from financial reports. Questions require reasoning over texts and multiple tables. The answers are short numerical values with a focus on numerical reasoning. Other financial QA benchmarks are FinQA (Chen et al., 2021b) and TATQA (Zhu et al., 2021) where the context is one table and minimum two paragraphs related to the table. TATQA answers are short texts consisting of either one or multiple text spans from context paragraphs/tables or are free-form answers. MultimodalQA is a multi-hop, open-domain QA dataset that takes one table and related images and text paragraphs as input with answers similar to previously described datasets.

Open-domain benchmarks. Most of the earlier described datasets have context provided in form of text and/or tables, whereas open-domain QA datasets first require extracting the relevant context, before answering the given question. The majority of open-domain QA datasets, such as WikiQA (Yang et al., 2015), TriviaQA (Joshi et al., 2017), RobustQA (Han et al., 2023), are limited to textual context. NQ Tables (Herzig et al., 2021) extends table-QA to an open-domain setting where first top- k tables are retrieved from a given corpus. These tables are processed by a reader component for generating the correct short-

text answer. Built on HybridQA, the Open Table-and-Text Question Answering (OTT-QA) benchmark (Chen et al., 2021a) extends this setting by requiring to extract both tables and texts given multi-hop questions.

QA with table answers. The work closest to ours with respect to input and output modalities, is MultiTabQA (Pal et al., 2023). MultiTabQA seeds on the Spider dataset, a text-to-SQL dataset containing SQL queries, database tables, and natural language translations of the queries. Pal et al. (2023) use table names occurring in SQL queries to extract the input tables and query Spider databases for answer table generation. While the dataset also generates answers as tables, it has certain limitations: (i) the benchmark input is limited to tables; (ii) the input and output tables are highly structured database tables which differ from real-world scenarios where tables occur in documents and websites in various formats; (iii) the questions are limited to SQL queries formulated in natural language.

3 Building the TANQ benchmark

TANQ evaluates the capability to answer open domain, multi-hop questions by aggregating data and generating answer tables.

3.1 Task definition

A TANQ dataset instance is a triple (q, t, D) , consisting of an entity-centric question q , a table answer t , and a document set D (see Figure 1). To answer the multi-hop question q , first multiple *sub-answers* are extracted from the document

Question Type	Example Question
1. Simple	Which Belgian Grand Prix did Michael Schumacher win, and when did that happen?
2. Intersection	For which movie did Chris Columbus receive credits as both director and writer and what was their composer, publication year, duration, and genre?
3. Composition	Who choreographed a work that was produced by the Royal Ballet? What was their date of birth, place of birth, occupation, and which awards did they receive?
Skill	
1. No skill	What filmmaker directed a movie written by Val Guest and what is their place of birth, date of birth, occupation, date of death, and place of death?
2. Filtering numeric	Which film was directed and produced by Mel Brooks and what was their composer and duration? Filter the answer table for duration equal to or larger than 88 minutes.
3. Filtering time	Which Italian footballer transferred to Pro Sesto in summer of 2020 and what is their date of birth, place of birth? Filter the answer table for date of birth equal to or after 1985.
4. Filtering entity	What pieces of writing did Gregory Benford edit? What were their publication dates and publishers? Filter the answer table for publisher equal to Bantam Books.
5. Date-to-year conversion	Who were the members of Black Sabbath and what was their year of birth , genre, instrument, and occupation?
6. Quantity conversion	What work did Michael Mann write and direct and what was their publication date, duration in hours , genre, director of photography?
7. Time calculation	Which governor of Connecticut died while in office? What was their place of birth, occupation, date of death, date of birth, political party and how many years did they live?
8. Approximation	What are the townships in Harper County, Kansas and what is their population rounded to the nearest ten?

Table 2: An overview of question types in TANQ and additional skills we use for augmenting the TANQ questions for more complex reasoning beyond retrieval.

set D . The answer is generated in table form $t = \{t_{i,j} | i \leq n, j \leq m\}$ consisting of n rows (i.e. one per extracted entities) and m columns. The documents in D provide supporting evidence for each cell of the answer table $t_{i,j}$. D is either provided as input to models (oracle setting) or retrieved from the Wikipedia corpus as D' (open book) and can consist of texts, tables and infoboxes.

3.2 Preliminaries

QAMPARI. We use QAMPARI as seed dataset which is an open-domain QA dataset with lists of entities as answers. QAMPARI further includes Wikipedia text as supporting evidence for each entry of the answer list. Different to prior QA datasets with short textual answers, they align to natural questions which require a list of answers extracted from multiple sources. The dataset is semi-automatically created with Wikidata and Wikipedia as data sources. Moreover, Amouyal et al. (2022) ask human annotators to validate each QAMPARI question.

WikiData. Following Amouyal et al. (2022), we use Wikidata (WD) as a source for question generation. Wikidata (Erxleben et al., 2014) is a collaborative knowledge graph consisting of triples of entities and relations, i.e. (e_1, r, e_2) .

Type	Count	Freq (%)
WD Item	57.6k	79.1
Time	11.9k	16.4
Numeric	3.2k	4.4
Text	46	0.1

Table 3: Extension entities (1st pipeline step).

Entities e_i are values (e.g. 1990) or items that represent a real-world concept, object, or a topic.² Relations are edges connecting entities, e.g. $(DonaldTrump, instanceOf, human)$. Whereas “*Donald Trump*” is the head entity and “*human*” the tail entity. We follow the notion for formal queries over Wikidata introduced by Amouyal et al. (2022) for QAMPARI. Applying a relation r as query over WD items e_i results in a set of (tail) entities: $[[r(e)]] = \{e_i | (e_i, r, e) \in WD\}$.

Wikipedia. We extract supporting evidence in the form of sentences, tables and infoboxes (entity-tables at the top right corner of Wikipedia articles) from Wikipedia (WP).

3.3 TANQ benchmark pipeline

Figure 2 provides an overview of the TANQ pipeline outlining all steps for data collection, pro-

²<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikidata>

Question Type	Count	Freq (%)
1. Simple	504	36.1
2. Composition	320	22.9
3. Intersection	571	40.9
Skill		
1. No skill	385	27.6
2. Filtering numeric	85	6.1
3. Filtering time	236	16.9
4. Filtering entity	342	24.5
5. Date-to-year conversion	310	22.2
6. Quantity conversion	95	6.8
7. Time calculation	45	3.2
8. Approximation	94	6.7
Skills per question		
1. No skill	385	27.6
2. One skill	843	60.4
3. Two skills	137	9.8
4. Three skills	30	2.2

Table 4: Question types and skills in TANQ. *Simple* denotes questions which require neither composition nor intersection. See Table 2 for exemplary questions.

cessing and evaluation. We use QAMPARI, Wikidata and Wikipedia as data sources, as well as PaLM-2 (Anil et al., 2023b) for paraphrasing and validation. Applying a five-step process, we create various dataset entries with different question types and skills.

Step 1. Extending QAMPARI questions Starting with the QAMPARI questions and answer lists of entities, we extend each question q with additional WD relations using the answer entities e_a . QAMPARI questions are classified in either simple, composition (e.g. “Who directed movies screen-written by Steven Spielberg?”) or intersection (e.g. the example in Figure 1). We first query the WD knowledge graph to extract additional relations r_{ext} linked to e_a , i.e. $r[e_a] = \{e_{ext} | (e_a, r_{ext}, e_{ext}) \in \text{WD}\}$. Hence, each extension is a WD triple linking the QAMPARI answer e_a (e.g. *Hey Ram* in Figure 1) through the relation r_{ext} (i.e. *composer*) to a new extended entity e_{ext} , i.e. *Ilaiyaraaja* for relation *composer* and answer entity *Hey Ram* in Figure 1. We only select a relation which fulfils two conditions. First, it is part of a predefined relation set R , i.e. $r_{ext} \in R$. We manually specify R based on the WD relation used to create QAMPARI questions. Second, the relation exists for all answers e_a of question q . Given n extension relations, which fulfil these conditions, we extend the question q in a template-style fashion: “[q] and what is their [r_{ext1}], [r_{ext2}], [...] and [r_{extn}].” For example, the question in Fig. 1, was generated based on the initial question “Which In-

dian movies were both directed and written by Kamal Haasan?” through extending with the WD relations *composer* and *release year*. Additionally, we extract all extension entities e_{ext} of the extension triple.

Step 2. Evidence extraction from Wikipedia

Next, we collect for each extension triple (e_a, r_{ext}, e_{ext}) supporting evidence using Wikipedia as an evidence source. Hereby, we search for supporting text, tables and infoboxes in the WP articles of e_a and e_{ext} . We apply simple heuristics and search for mentions of e_a in the e_{ext} article and vice versa. Moreover, we extend our queries with additional (heuristic-based) query words, for example considering different forms of representing numeric or time-related information occurring in queries.

Step 3. Evidence evaluation & answer table generation

To evaluate the correctness of the previously collected evidence texts, tables and infoboxes, we employ PaLM-2 as an evidence evaluator. We prompt the LLM to evaluate the extracted evidence in a natural language inference setting. For each extension triple (e_a, r_{ext}, e_{ext}) , we construct template-based sentences s : “ $\langle e_a \rangle \langle r_{ext} \rangle \langle e_{ext} \rangle$ ”, e.g. “Hey Ram *composer* Ilaiyaraaja” for row two in Figure 1. We query the LLM to label the sentence s as “supported”, “refuted”, “not enough information” based on the provided evidence in form of a sentence, table or infobox entry. We then only consider the triples supported by at least one piece of evidence.³

Answer table. Each extended relation corresponds to a column in the answer table (e.g. column “*Composer*” in Figure 1). Since the question in Figure 1 is extended with two additional relations (i.e. *composer* and *release year*), the resulting answer table has three columns. Hence, each cell in the answer table corresponds to a WD triple. For example, cell “*Ilaiyaraaja*” corresponds to triple (*Hey Ram*, *composer*, *Ilaiyaraaja*).

Step 4. Question rephrasing This step increases the naturalness of template-based extension questions generated in Step 1. Similarly to the earlier step, we prompt a PaLM-2 model in a few-shot setting. To ensure the question meaning is preserved during rephrasing, we add structured

³See Appendix A for the prompt template.

Question: Which indian movies were both directed and written by Kamal Haasan and who were their composers?




Figure 3: Baseline models evaluated on TANQ: closed book, oracle, and open book with augmented tools.

annotations in parenthesis to questions with the name of each relation (e.g. “Which Indian movies were both directed (*directed_by*) and written by (*written_by*) Kamal Haasan?”). We run up to 5 iterations of rephrasing and stop if all relations are present, or discard the question otherwise.⁴

Step 5. Augmenting with skills Finally, to generate more challenging questions requiring further reasoning capabilities beyond retrieval, we extend TANQ questions by asking for realistic post-processing steps. Overall, we augment questions with the following additional skills: (i) **Filtering** of answer table given a numeric, time, or attribute condition (rows 2. – 4 in Table 2); (ii) **Conversion** of numbers, dates, locations and corresponding units (rows 5. – 7 in Table 2); (iii) **Calculation** and introduction of an additional table column based on time attributes (e.g. “*lifespan*” in the 8. row in Table 2). (iv) **Approximating** numbers to the nearest ten, hundred, etc., see last row (Table 2). We use up to three distinct skills for augmenting TANQ questions. Table 4 provides a breakdown of TANQ dataset samples across skills.

⁴See Appendix A for the prompt template.

3.4 Dataset statistics and analysis

Overall, the generated TANQ dataset has 1395 entries, 36.1% of question type *simple*, 40.9% *intersection*, and 22.9% *composition* questions. Approximately 72.4% dataset instances (i.e. 1,010) require at least one additional skill to answer the question. See Table 4 for a breakdown of skills and question types in TANQ. TANQ questions have an average a length of 21 tokens and require extracting information about three relations on average which are related to the answer entities (similarly to *composer* and *release year* in Figure 1). On average, TANQ answer tables have 6.7 rows and *four* columns. Table 3 given an overview of extension entities used. We further plan to release a TANQ training set with approximately 42k samples.

4 Baselines & Evaluation

We evaluate TANQ in (i) closed book, (ii) oracle, and (iii) open book setups. We give an overview of the different approaches in Figure 3.

Closed book. For all experiments, we use the PaLM-2 Unicorn model (Anil et al., 2023b),

Model	simple			composition			intersection			all		
	P	R	F1	P	R	F1	P	R	F1	P	R	F1
Oracle setting												
PaLM-2	16.8	17.7	15.4	13.3	14.1	11.6	20.1	23.8	19.5	17.3	19.4	16.2
Gemini	56.1	15.4	14.3	53.8	10.1	9.7	48.9	16.2	13.9	52.6	14.5	13.1
GPT4	44.3	29.7	29.0	34.8	20.1	22.7	35.7	23.8	22.0	45.7	29.4	29.1
Human										54.6	48.6	48.8
Closed book setting												
PaLM-2	17.2	17.1	13.6	17.0	10.3	10.4	26.4	22.0	21.1	20.9	17.5	15.9
Gemini	32.8	11.0	8.4	37.1	6.4	5.9	31.8	17.9	16.0	33.4	12.7	10.9
GPT4	32.5	20.7	17.4	27.3	12.5	12.6	45.1	26.0	24.3	37.3	21.5	19.6
Open book setting												
Tool LM	13.4	12.5	9.7	21.5	14.1	15.1	19.4	19.2	15.7	17.3	15.8	13.2

Table 5: Baseline performance by question type. For all question types, we observe GPT4 to outperform other baselines in oracle, closed, and open book settings, resulting in an overall F1 score of 29.1 for all question types.

Model	Filter num			Filter time			Filter entity			Date2Year			Quantity conv			Time calc			Approx			
	P	R	F1	P	R	F1	P	R	F1	P	R	F1	P	R	F1	P	R	F1	P	R	F1	
Oracle setting																						
PaLM-2	16.3	19.6	16.5	15.8	20.2	16.0	14.3	18.6	14.0	19.8	20.8	19.2	14.3	11.3	10.7	17.0	14.8	14.9	11.7	14.8	10.0	
Gemini	47.7	12.2	10.1	58.4	13.0	11.2	58.0	9.3	8.1	46.0	18.5	16.8	45.6	14.5	14.1	51.4	7.7	8.0	42.7	12.6	11.5	
GPT4	24.0	20.1	21.1	42.6	26.4	27.0	27.7	30.0	28.0	44.7	23.7	23.3	34.6	14.7	15.2	56.7	28.0	29.5	24.3	7.7	7.7	
Closed book setting																						
PaLM-2	16.7	18.0	16.0	16.2	16.0	14.1	23.0	16.7	15.2	30.2	25.2	23.6	19.9	17.3	16.4	12.9	6.4	7.3	15.4	12.0	12.0	
Gemini	28.2	14.5	11.1	23.7	13.9	11.3	37.3	10.2	8.2	36.0	18.0	16.0	19.0	15.0	13.6	51.5	1.6	1.8	33.0	9.8	9.3	
GPT4	36.7	16.6	15.1	34.7	25.8	22.1	31.5	23.0	22.4	49.7	22.0	20.2	71.6	7.3	5.7	44.6	1.4	2.0	36.5	19.1	19.3	
Open book setting																						
Tool LM	16.7	21.1	17.1	15.7	11.1	10.9	21.0	20.6	16.4	20.3	17.5	16.0	9.7	10.8	9.7	28.9	13.0	10.7	16.0	19.9	15.2	

Table 6: Baseline performance by skills: **Filtering** with **numerical/datetime/entity** conditions, date-to-year (**Date2Year**), quantity **conversion**, time **calculation**, and **approximation**. In the oracle setting GPT4 outperforms other baselines for most skills, while PaLM-2 performs better on some skills in closed book evaluation.

GPT4 (Brown et al., 2020),⁵ and Gemini Pro (Anil et al., 2023a). We evaluate all baselines in a few-shot setting with three examples provided in the prompt (see top left prompt in Figure 3). The closed book setup evaluates LLMs’ capabilities in extracting relevant information acquired during training to answer TANQ questions.

Oracle. In the oracle setup, we provide models source attribution for every cell of the answer table in form of oracle documents (i.e. text, tables, and infoboxes). Hence, the prompt consists of the TANQ question and multiple evidence sentences, infobox entries and/or tables (see bottom left prompt in Figure 3). To provide further context, we include the Wikipedia page title, for text evidence also sub-/section titles, from where the evidence was extracted. Moreover, we add randomly selected oracle documents from other questions with similar attributes. This makes the oracle setting more challenging and requires models to filter the correct evidence from all provided ones first.

⁵<https://platform.openai.com/docs/models/gpt-4-and-gpt-4-turbo>

Open book. For the open book baseline, we extend the PaLM-2 Unicorn model with external tools for search and calculation. The Wikipedia-based search tools aim to mimic the human search approach on Wikipedia similar to Yao et al. (2023). The agent model can access Wikipedia information through three tools: (1) `WikiSearch(keywords)`: a keyword based Wikipedia search that returns the Wikipedia article most relevant to the provided keywords; (2) `FindEvidence(article, keywords)`: a article-specific search that returns matched sentences, tables and infobox entries given keywords and a Wikipedia article; (3) `GetIntro(article)`: returns the introduction section of a Wikipedia article. For calculations, we provide the model a Python engine as an external tool, (4) `Python(calculation)`. We design the agent model to decompose and solve the TANQ task in multiple sub-tasks, consisting of (i) retrieving requested entities in an iterative manner (e.g. movies in Figure 1), (ii) searching for entity-related information (e.g. release year), (iii) post-processing information (e.g. filtering, calculation, etc.), and (iv) finally aggregating the information in form of a table. For

some sub-tasks (e.g. entity retrieval), a separate sub-agent augmented with the required tools (e.g. WikiSearch) is spawned.

Human baseline. We compare model performance against human performance based on 50 answer tables generated by annotators. We provided the annotators the same input prompt as the models in the oracle setting (i.e. TANQ questions and evidence for each answer table cell).

Evaluation metrics We evaluate answer tables using the *RMS* metrics introduced by (Liu et al., 2023). RMS views tables as unordered collections of mappings from row/column headers to values. Hence, the metric is invariant to transpositions and column/row permutations. It allows small errors between tables keys/values of target and reference tables using the Normalized Levenshtein Distance (Biten et al., 2019) with a threshold, which we set to 0.5. The metrics returns both precision and recall scores.

5 Results & Discussion

In this section, we discuss the following research questions: (1) Is TANQ a challenging dataset for state-of-the-art models? (2) How well can models answer TANQ questions in a close book setting relying on knowledge acquired during training vs. extracted from provided context (oracle)? (3) How well do tool-augmented models perform on TANQ? (4) What are particular challenges related to question types, reasoning skills, complexity of questions, and the size of desired answer tables found in TANQ? (5) What are common failure cases of evaluated models?

5.1 Question types

In Table 5, we compare the performance of all oracle, close, and open book baselines on TANQ. We find GPT4 consistently outperforming other models with overall F1 scores of 29.1 and 19.6 in oracle and closed book setting, respectively. While outperforming the other baselines, a large gap remains compared to our **human baseline** of 48.8. While Gemini Pro (oracle) demonstrates higher precision compared to GPT4 (oracle), there is still a meaningful gap for recall scores, indicating that Gemini successfully generates answer “subtables” containing only some of the requested rows. This aligns with our findings in Table 10, showing “missing entities” as the most prevalent

Model	One skill			Two skills			Three skills		
	P	R	F1	P	R	F1	P	R	F1
Oracle setting									
PaLM-2	17.1	20.1	16.5	14.8	14.7	13.4	9.6	12.0	10.4
Gemini	54.3	13.9	12.3	42.2	12.6	11.4	58.0	8.9	8.1
GPT4	46.1	30.9	30.6	25.3	12.8	14.1	-	-	-
Closed book setting									
PaLM-2	23.2	18.7	17.2	18.1	15.5	14.6	19.9	20.9	18.8
Gemini	33.0	13.2	11.2	33.1	12.6	11.0	25.7	16.0	12.8
GPT4	35.6	22.7	20.8	59.8	11.5	10.6	-	-	-
Open book setting									
Tool LM	20.1	17.5	15.3	15.5	15.1	12.5	14.8	22.1	16.8

Table 7: Baseline performance by number of skills used to augment TANQ questions.

failure type in Gemini (oracle) answers. In the oracle setup, most models perform best on simple questions, followed by composition and intersection. In the closed book setting, we observe higher performance on intersection questions than other types.

5.2 Reasoning skills

We further augmented TANQ questions to generate more challenging questions requiring further skill sets in addition to search. Next, we discuss insights gained from baseline evaluation on each skill (see Table 6).

PaLM-2 (oracle/close/open). For PaLM-2, we observe that the model struggles particularly with questions requiring numeracy, i.e. approximation of numerical values, quantity conversion, calculations based on datetime attributes. This issue persists for the tool augmented model. While having the Python tool available for questions requiring calculations, the agent model often ignores this tool for calculations. Moreover, the tool augmented counterpart demonstrates better performance on filtering tables with numerical and entity conditions (17.1 and 16.4 respectively) but there is still a meaningful gap for filtering based on datetime conditions.

Gemini Pro (oracle/close). Comparing to other baselines, we find Gemini Pro struggling particularly with the filtering skill for both oracle and close book evaluation. Filtering the answer table based on an entity condition is seemingly more challenging for the model than the other filtering categories. Moreover, we observe in Table 6 a substantial decrease of the F1 score for the skill “time calc” (i.e. calculations based on datetime attributes) when comparing oracle and close book evaluation and a substantial gap to other baselines in the oracle setting.

Model	One Relation			Three Relations			Five Relations			Ten Relations		
	P	R	F1	P	R	F1	P	R	F1	P	R	F1
Oracle setting												
PaLM-2	18.3	23.4	17.3	18.1	20.2	17.6	14.7	13.0	12.5	13.5	13.9	13.3
Gemini	62.2	15.6	13.2	53.6	15.0	14.0	38.7	13.1	13.3	20.8	6.6	7.8
GPT4	40.2	39.8	35.9	39.7	22.2	24.5	68.2	20.1	21.0	38.1	14.0	12.3
Closed book setting												
PaLM-2	20.2	19.0	15.4	20.5	17.0	15.4	15.8	12.3	12.3	20.5	17.7	18.5
Gemini	31.6	14.4	11.2	31.4	11.2	9.8	42.9	5.5	5.0	26.8	8.0	9.4
GPT4	32.7	32.9	27.9	29.2	15.9	15.1	43.8	5.3	6.5	25.5	0.2	0.3
Open book setting												
Tool LM	16.0	19.2	14.3	15.6	14.4	12.3	14.0	7.7	6.2	3.8	2.0	2.4

Table 8: Baseline performance by number of requested relations in TANQ questions. This results in columns of answer tables as demonstrated in Figure 1. PaLM-2 outperforms other baselines as the number of relations increases.

GPT4 (oracle/close). Across all skills except approximation, the GPT4 (oracle) baseline outperforms its counterparts. In the oracle setup, GPT4 struggles however with numerical filtering, quantity conversion, and approximation of numerical values. On the other hand, it outperforms other baselines in entity filtering and time calculation. In the closed book setting the model demonstrates decreased performance compared to other closed book baselines for multiple skills, such as numerical filtering, date-to-year conversion, and time calculation.

Number of skills. Table 7 shows baseline performance by the number of skills required to generate the correct answer table. Naturally, we observe across baselines a decrease of performance as the number of skills increases and questions become more complex. However, for Gemini and PaLM-2 this gap is smaller than for GPT4 (both oracle and closed book).

5.3 Relations in TANQ questions

Table 8 demonstrates baselines’ performance across the number of relations in the given question. For example, in Figure 1 two additional relations, i.e. composer and release year, are requested for the movies specified in the question. While all models show a performance decrease with an increasing number of relations, this gap is particularly significant for the tool augmented model where the F1 score decrease by almost twelve points comparing questions requiring one relations vs. ten. Moreover, we observe for all baselines (oracle/close/open book) little performance drops comparing questions with one relation to those with three. The performance gaps increase as the number of relations increases further, i.e. from

Model	Short			Medium			Long		
	P	R	F1	P	R	F1	P	R	F1
Oracle setting									
PaLM-2	12.8	20.2	12.9	14.7	19.9	14.0	18.8	19.1	17.4
Gemini	57.9	9.9	6.0	57.3	11.0	8.6	50.1	16.3	15.5
GPT4	37.6	40.2	38.4	39.2	34.4	34.0	49.1	26.7	26.5
Closed book setting									
PaLM-2	16.8	17.6	11.6	17.8	16.6	13.3	22.6	18.0	17.3
Gemini	41.5	8.1	3.5	31.9	12.1	8.5	34.3	13.1	12.2
GPT4	19.4	25.6	20.0	27.9	23.5	19.4	42.3	20.4	19.7
Open book setting									
Tool LM	5.9	17.8	7.4	13.8	19.6	13.5	19.2	13.7	13.1

Table 9: Baseline performance by length of answer tables. **Short** tables have up to three rows, **medium** table up to six, and **long** table seven or more rows. For our best-performing baseline, GPT4 (oracle), we observe a significant F1 decrease with increasing table size.

three to five and from five to ten.

5.4 Answer table length

Table 9 gives an overview of model performance across different answer table lengths: short answer tables (up to three rows), medium (up to six), and long tables (seven or more rows). A model seemingly struggling with longer tables is GPT4 (oracle). The F1 score decreases by -4.4 points comparing short to medium size tables and by further -7.5 points for long tables. It is apparent that the model struggles with extracting relevant information from the growing list of provided oracle documents as the table size increases. This is obviously not the case for close book evaluation as no oracle documents are given as part of the input.

5.5 Failures types

We further study common failures cases of oracle baselines. The aim is to understand challenges related to TANQ when the model has access to necessary information, in form of oracle documents, for answer table generation.

Failure Type	Gemini	PaLM-2	GPT4	Tool LM
Rel missing	37.3	33.3	0	3.9
No header	27.5	3.9	0	5.9
Filter issues	15.7	15.8	4.0	5.9
Halluc. relations	5.9	9.8	5.9	2.0
Halluc. other	0	15.7	0	7.8
Missing entity	80.4	58.8	27.5	78.4
Non-table	31.4	21.6	0	15.7
Partial answers	3.9	23.5	2.0	0
Wrong answer	14.9	7.8	9.8	13.7

Table 10: Common failure types of oracle and open book baselines: **relations missing** in answer table, **no column header**, **filter** issues (e.g. filter condition ignored), **hallucinated relations**, **other** types of **hallucinations**, **missing entity** (i.e. row), output **not in table** format, **partial answers** given in one or multiple table cells, **wrong answer** given in one or multiple cells. Scores given as percentages (%) of all annotated samples.

Therefore, we manually evaluate a subset of model predictions to identify common failure cases which we organise in the following categories: 1.) **Relation missing**: At least one relation which corresponds to a column in the answer table is missing; 2.) **No table header** for the answer table is generated; 3.) **Filtering** (attribute, numeric, dates): Filtering conditions ignored or not applied correctly; 4.) **Hallucinated relations**: The answer table has columns which were not requested in the question; 5.) **Hallucinations other** other types of hallucination than additional relations or table format; 6.) **Missing entity**: entities, which correspond to rows in the table, are missing; 7.) **Non-table Answers**: Instead of generating a table as an answer, the model returns simple text or output in a different form than the table format provided in the prompt; 8.) **Partial Answers**: For a given entity and attribute only a partial answer is provided (e.g. only one university a person attended for relation “alma mater” although more exist); 9.) **Wrong Answer (cell)**: Given answer (in a cell) is not correct.

Comparing open and oracle baselines, our observations show that the best performing model, w.r.t least failures, is GPT4 (oracle). The only significant failure category we identify for GPT4 are missing entities in generated answer tables. The most present issue we observe for Gemini Pro (oracle) are missing entities, missing relations, resulting in answer tables with a subset of columns, non-table outputs, and missing headers of generated tables. Similarly, multiple aspects

pose a challenge for PaLM-2 (oracle), including hallucinations, missing entities/relations, and applying filtering conditions correctly. For the tool augmented model, one failure type is particularly prominent, namely missing entities that is followed by non-table outputs.

6 Conclusion

This paper introduces TANQ, the first open domain question answering dataset where the answers require building tables from information across multiple sources. To create TANQ, we design and apply an automated dataset pipeline using large language models and Wikipedia and Wikidata as knowledge sources. We further release for each cell of the answer tables source attribution in form of text, tabular or infobox proofs. We evaluate our dataset on state-of-the-art models in three different setting: oracle documents provided, closed, and open book setting. Our results and analysis suggest that TANQ is a complex task with many challenges ahead.

References

- Samuel Joseph Amouyal, Ohad Rubin, Ori Yoran, Tomer Wolfson, Jonathan Herzig, and Jonathan Berant. 2022. [QAMPARI: : An open-domain question answering benchmark for questions with many answers from multiple paragraphs](#). *CoRR*, abs/2205.12665.
- Rohan Anil, Sebastian Borgeaud, Yonghui Wu, Jean-Baptiste Alayrac, Jiahui Yu, Radu Soricut, Johan Schalkwyk, Andrew M. Dai, Anja Hauth, Katie Millican, David Silver, Slav Petrov, Melvin Johnson, Ioannis Antonoglou, Julian Schrittwieser, Amelia Glaese, Jilin Chen, Emily Pitler, Timothy P. Lillicrap, Angeliki Lazaridou, Orhan Firat, James Molloy, Michael Isard, Paul Ronald Barham, Tom Hennigan, Benjamin Lee, Fabio Viola, Malcolm Reynolds, Yuanzhong Xu, Ryan Doherty, Eli Collins, Clemens Meyer, Eliza Rutherford, Erica Moreira, Kareem Ayoub, Megha Goel, George Tucker, Enrique Piqueras, Maxim Krikun, Iain Barr, Nikolay Savinov, Ivo Danihelka, Becca Roelofs, Anaïs White, Anders Andreassen, Tamara von Glehn, Lakshman Yagati, Mehran Kazemi, Lucas Gonzalez, Misha Khalman, Jakub Sygnowski, and et al. 2023a. [Gemini:](#)

- A family of highly capable multimodal models. *CoRR*, abs/2312.11805.
- Rohan Anil, Andrew M. Dai, Orhan Firat, Melvin Johnson, Dmitry Lepikhin, Alexandre Passos, Siamak Shakeri, Emanuel Taropa, Paige Bailey, Zhifeng Chen, Eric Chu, Jonathan H. Clark, Laurent El Shafey, Yanping Huang, Kathy Meier-Hellstern, Gaurav Mishra, Erica Moreira, Mark Omernick, Kevin Robinson, Sebastian Ruder, Yi Tay, Kefan Xiao, Yuanzhong Xu, Yujing Zhang, Gustavo Hernández Ábrego, Junwhan Ahn, Jacob Austin, Paul Barham, Jan A. Botha, James Bradbury, Siddhartha Brahma, Kevin Brooks, Michele Catasta, Yong Cheng, Colin Cherry, Christopher A. Choquette-Choo, Aakanksha Chowdhery, Clément Crepy, Shachi Dave, Mostafa Dehghani, Sunipa Dev, Jacob Devlin, Mark Díaz, Nan Du, Ethan Dyer, Vladimir Feinberg, Fangxiaoyu Feng, Vlad Fienber, Markus Freitag, Xavier Garcia, Sebastian Gehrmann, Lucas Gonzalez, and et al. 2023b. [Palm 2 technical report](#). *CoRR*, abs/2305.10403.
- Ali Furkan Biten, Rubèn Tito, Andrés Mafla, Lluís Gómez, Marçal Rusiñol, Minesh Mathew, C. V. Jawahar, Ernest Valveny, and Dimosthenis Karatzas. 2019. [ICDAR 2019 competition on scene text visual question answering](#). In *2019 International Conference on Document Analysis and Recognition, ICDAR 2019, Sydney, Australia, September 20-25, 2019*, pages 1563–1570. IEEE.
- 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*.
- Wenhu Chen, Ming-Wei Chang, Eva Schlinger, William Yang Wang, and William W. Cohen. 2021a. [Open question answering over tables and text](#). In *9th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2021, Virtual Event, Austria, May 3-7, 2021*. OpenReview.net.
- Wenhu Chen, Hongmin Wang, Jianshu Chen, Yunkai Zhang, Hong Wang, Shiyang Li, Xiyu Zhou, and William Yang Wang. 2020a. [Tabfact: A large-scale dataset for table-based fact verification](#). In *8th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2020, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, April 26-30, 2020*. OpenReview.net.
- Wenhu Chen, Hanwen Zha, Zhiyu Chen, Wenhan Xiong, Hong Wang, and William Yang Wang. 2020b. [HybridQA: A dataset of multi-hop question answering over tabular and textual data](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2020*, pages 1026–1036, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Zhiyu Chen, Wenhu Chen, Charese Smiley, Sameena Shah, Iana Borova, Dylan Langdon, Reema Moussa, Matt Beane, Ting-Hao Huang, Bryan Routledge, and William Yang Wang. 2021b. [FinQA: A dataset of numerical reasoning over financial data](#). In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 3697–3711, Online and Punta Cana, Dominican Republic. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Michael Chui, James Manyika, Jacques Bughin, Richard Dobbs, and Charles Roxburgh. 2012. [The social economy: Unlocking value and productivity through social technologies](#).
- Fredo Erxleben, Michael Günther, Markus Krötzsch, Julian Mendez, and Denny Vrandečić. 2014. [Introducing wikidata to the linked data web](#). In *The Semantic Web - ISWC 2014 - 13th International Semantic Web Conference, Riva del Garda, Italy, October 19-23, 2014. Proceedings, Part I*, volume 8796 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 50–65. Springer.
- Vivek Gupta, Maitrey Mehta, Pegah Nokhiz, and Vivek Srikumar. 2020. [INFOTABS: Inference](#)

- on tables as semi-structured data. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 2309–2324, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Rujun Han, Peng Qi, Yuhao Zhang, Lan Liu, Juliette Burger, William Yang Wang, Zhiheng Huang, Bing Xiang, and Dan Roth. 2023. **RobustQA: Benchmarking the robustness of domain adaptation for open-domain question answering**. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2023*, pages 4294–4311, Toronto, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jonathan Herzig, Thomas Müller, Syrine Krichene, and Julian Eisenschlos. 2021. **Open domain question answering over tables via dense retrieval**. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 512–519, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Mandar Joshi, Eunsol Choi, Daniel Weld, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2017. **TriviaQA: A large scale distantly supervised challenge dataset for reading comprehension**. In *Proceedings of the 55th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1601–1611, Vancouver, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Fangyu Liu, Julian Eisenschlos, Francesco Piccinno, Syrine Krichene, Chenxi Pang, Kenton Lee, Mandar Joshi, Wenhua Chen, Nigel Collier, and Yasemin Altun. 2023. **DePlot: One-shot visual language reasoning by plot-to-table translation**. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2023*, pages 10381–10399, Toronto, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Linyong Nan, Chiachun Hsieh, Ziming Mao, Xi Victoria Lin, Neha Verma, Rui Zhang, Wojciech Kryściński, Hailey Schoelkopf, Riley Kong, Xiangru Tang, Mutethia Mutuma, Ben Rosand, Isabel Trindade, Renusree Bandaru, Jacob Cunningham, Caiming Xiong, Dragomir Radev, and Dragomir Radev. 2022. **FeTaQA: Free-form table question answering**. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 10:35–49.
- Vaishali Pal, Andrew Yates, Evangelos Kanoulas, and Maarten de Rijke. 2023. **MultiTabQA: Generating tabular answers for multi-table question answering**. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 6322–6334, Toronto, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Yi Yang, Wen-tau Yih, and Christopher Meek. 2015. **WikiQA: A challenge dataset for open-domain question answering**. In *Proceedings of the 2015 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 2013–2018, Lisbon, Portugal. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Zhilin Yang, Peng Qi, Saizheng Zhang, Yoshua Bengio, William Cohen, Ruslan Salakhutdinov, and Christopher D. Manning. 2018. **HotpotQA: A dataset for diverse, explainable multi-hop question answering**. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 2369–2380, Brussels, Belgium. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Shunyu Yao, Jeffrey Zhao, Dian Yu, Nan Du, Izhak Shafran, Karthik R. Narasimhan, and Yuan Cao. 2023. **React: Synergizing reasoning and acting in language models**. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2023, Kigali, Rwanda, May 1-5, 2023*. OpenReview.net.
- Yilun Zhao, Yunxiang Li, Chenying Li, and Rui Zhang. 2022. **MultiHiertt: Numerical reasoning over multi hierarchical tabular and textual data**. In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 6588–6600, Dublin, Ireland. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Fengbin Zhu, Wenqiang Lei, Youcheng Huang, Chao Wang, Shuo Zhang, Jiancheng Lv, Fuli Feng, and Tat-Seng Chua. 2021. **TAT-QA: A question answering benchmark on a hybrid of tabular and textual content in finance**. 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), pages 3277–3287, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.

A TANQ Dataset

A.1 Prompt templates

This section lists prompt templates we used for different steps of the TANQ dataset pipeline: evidence evaluation (Figure 4) and question rephrasing (Figure 5).

Evidence Evaluation Prompt

Given a statement and a proof, decide if the statement is "verifiable" or "not verifiable". Only use the information provided in the proof and no background knowledge. A statement is not verifiable if the proof is missing some information. Reason step-by-step and then give a label for the prediction.

Examples:

Statement: Spartacus (film) director Stanley Kubrick.

Proof from Wikipedia page http://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/St Stanley_Kubrick: Stanley Kubrick (July 26, 1928 - March 7, 1999) was an American film director, producer, screenwriter and photographer.

Output: While Stanley Kubrick was a film director, the proof doesn't mention if he directed Spartacus (film). Not verifiable.

Statement: Albert Einstein inventor theory of relativity.

Proof from Wikipedia page http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Albert_Einstein: Best known for developing the theory of relativity, he also made important contributions to quantum mechanics, and was thus a central figure in the revolutionary reshaping of the scientific understanding of nature that modern physics accomplished in the first decades of the twentieth century.

Output: The proof clearly mentions that Albert Einstein invented the theory of relativity. Verifiable.

Statement: Harmony Korine director Spring Breakers.

Proof from Wikipedia page http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Harmony_Korine: movie|original language|publication date|title|narrative location|country of origin|genre|distributed by

Spring Breakers|English|2013-03-19|Spring Breakers|Florida|United States of America|comedy film|A24

Trash Humpers|English|2009|Trash Humpers|Tennessee|United States of America|comedy horror|Drag City

Julien Donkey-Boy|English|1999|Julien Donkey-Boy|New York|United States of America|drama film|Fine Line Features

Mister Lonely|English|2007|Mister Lonely|Paris|France|comedy drama|IFC Films

The Beach Bum|English|2019-03-22|The Beach Bum|Florida|United States of America|comedy film|Neon

Gummo|English|1997|Gummo|Ohio|United States of America|teen film|Fine Line Features

Output: The proof mentions the movie Spring Breakers but not if Harmony Korine directed it. Not verifiable.

Figure 4: Prompt used for evidence evaluation. We prompt a language model to evaluate the extracted evidence in a natural language inference setting. The LLM labels the input statements as “verifiable” or “not verifiable” based on evidence provided in form of a sentence, table or infobox.

Question Rephrasing Prompt

Rewrite the given question, following this instruction:

1. The rewritten question should sound natural.
2. If the question has errors (grammar, typos, etc.), correct them but don't change the meaning of the question.
3. The question has one or multiple words in parenthesis, for example "(distributed_by)". While rewriting keep the text in parenthesis unchanged!

Examples:

Question: Which film was directed and produced by Mel Brooks and what was their producer (producer), genre (genre), screenwriter (screenwriter), country of origin (country_of_origin), distribution format (distribution_format), distributed by (distributed_by), cast member (cast_member), original language (original_language)?

Rewritten question: What is the genre (genre), country of origin (country_of_origin), distribution format (distribution_format) and original language (original_language) of films directed and produced by Mel Brooks? Moreover, who are their screenwriters (screenwriter), producer (producer), distributors (distributed_by), and cast members (cast_member)?

Question: Albert Uderzo illustrated what comic and what was their has author (has_author), publication date (publication_date), country of origin (country_of_origin), language (language), media franchise (media_franchise)?

Rewritten question: Albert Uderzo illustrated which comics and who were their authors (has_author)? When and in which countries (country_of_origin) were they published (publication_date)? Provide also information about the language (language) of the comics and the names of their media franchises (media_franchise).

Question: Who transferred to Pro Sesto in summer of 2020 who was an Italian footballer and what was their date of birth (date_of_birth), place of birth (place_of_birth), occupation (occupation)?

Rewritten question: Which Italian footballer transferred to Pro Sesto in summer of 2020 and what is their date of birth (date_of_birth), place of birth (place_of_birth), and occupation (occupation)?

Figure 5: Rephrasing questions increases the naturalness of template-based extension questions. To ensure the question meaning is preserved during rephrasing, we add structured annotations in parenthesis to questions with the name of each relation.