

QDA-SQL: Questions Enhanced Dialogue Augmentation for Multi-Turn Text-to-SQL

Yinggang Sun¹, Ziming Guo², Haining Yu¹, Chuanyi Liu³, Xiang Li¹,
Bingxuan Wang¹, Xiangzhan Yu¹, Tiancheng Zhao²

¹Harbin Institute of Technology, ²Harbin University of Science and Technology,
³Harbin Institute of Technology, Shenzhen

Correspondence: liuchuanyi@hit.edu.cn

Abstract

Fine-tuning large language models (LLMs) for specific domain tasks has achieved great success in Text-to-SQL tasks. However, these fine-tuned models often face challenges with multi-turn Text-to-SQL tasks caused by ambiguous or unanswerable questions. It is desired to enhance LLMs to handle multiple types of questions in multi-turn Text-to-SQL tasks. To address this, we propose a novel data augmentation method, called QDA-SQL, which generates multiple types of multi-turn Q&A pairs by using LLMs. In QDA-SQL, we introduce a novel data augmentation method incorporating validation and correction mechanisms to handle complex multi-turn Text-to-SQL tasks. Experimental results demonstrate that QDA-SQL enables fine-tuned models to exhibit higher performance on SQL statement accuracy and enhances their ability to handle complex, unanswerable questions in multi-turn Text-to-SQL tasks. The generation script and test set are released at <https://github.com/mcxiaoxiao/QDA-SQL>.

1 Introduction

Text-to-SQL, a notable challenge in natural language processing (NLP), focuses on translating natural language questions into executable SQL queries. It aims to bridge the gap between natural language and SQL on relational databases, thereby building a natural language interface for databases. Recently, by the powerful understanding and encoding capabilities, LLMs have become a new paradigm for Text-to-SQL. Fine-tuning open-source LLMs achieve impressive results (Sun et al., 2023; Scholak et al., 2021) in various Text-to-SQL tasks, such as Spider (Yu et al., 2018) and CoSQL (Yu et al., 2019a).

The dynamism and uncertainty inherent in the real world necessitate effective human-machine interaction. Users often explore data by posing multiple interrelated questions, some of which may not

be adequately answered using SQL (Wang et al., 2023). Even fine-tuned Text-to-SQL models still exhibit insufficient performance in the above scenarios. As shown in Figure 1, three types of questions cannot be directly answered by SQL: (1) *Ambiguous*: For instance, the term "Glenn" in the user's first question may map to different columns in different tables, such as "donator_name" or "school_name." The system should avoid providing potentially incorrect answers and instead seek clarification from the user. (2) *Unanswerable*: For instance, if the database lacks information about the "country" of donors in the user's third question, the system needs to articulate the reasons for its inability to answer the question. (3) *Improper*: For instance, the user's fourth question pertains to everyday conversation unrelated to the database, where the system should refrain from responding with SQL.

The above cases reveal the limitations of previous Text-to-SQL models. Existing approaches predominantly focus on enhancing the SQL generation ability of LLMs, without consideration of multiple types of questions. This may result in incorrect responses for questions that cannot be answered using SQL. The weakness may be further exacerbated if LLMs are fine-tuned on datasets that only include Question-SQL samples such as Spider, SParC (Yu et al., 2019a), and CHASE (Guo et al., 2021). To enhance the ability of Text-to-SQL systems to handle multiple types of questions, TriageSQL (Zhang et al., 2020) and DTE (Wang et al., 2023) introduce question type recognition and sample generation methods. However, these methods primarily classify question types but lack SQL generation or explanatory features. Additionally, current data augmentation methods, such as those proposed by Liu et al. (2022), Wang et al. (2024), and Zhang et al. (2024), primarily focus on generating single-turn or multi-turn dialogues that only include SQL queries, without consider-




Figure 1: User-LLM dialogues with various question types.

ing multiple question types. Our research aims to refine data augmentation methods to enhance applicability by generating more challenging and diverse training samples. This approach will accommodate a broader range of query requirements, ultimately improving the model’s reliability and trustworthiness for users.

In this work, we introduce a new method to automatically generate large batches of Text-to-SQL samples that include multiple types of multi-turn Q&A, **Questions Enhanced Dialogue Augmentation** for multi-turn Text-to-SQL named **QDA-SQL**. With multi-turn Text-to-SQL samples generated by QDA-SQL, fine-tuned LLMs can handle complex multi-turn Text-to-SQL tasks involving various question types. Evaluation across metrics shows our approach’s effectiveness.

Our main contributions are summarized as follows:

- We propose a new method (i.e., QDA-SQL) to automatically generate large batches of multiple types of multi-turn Text-to-SQL samples, thereby significantly enhancing the robustness of Text-to-SQL LLMs.
- We conceptualize the Text-to-SQL inference process as StateFlow and decompose the training data generated by QDA-SQL, improving

the model’s accuracy and effectiveness in handling complex Text-to-SQL tasks.

- We validate the effectiveness of our approach across a range of evaluation metrics, showing that QDA-SQL enhances the model’s ability to handle complex multi-turn questions.

2 Preliminary

2.1 Thematic Relation

Understanding the thematic relation between the current question and previous questions is crucial for the model to accurately respond in multi-turn dialogues. Referring to the definitions by Bertomeu et al. (2006) and the further refinements in SPaRC (Yu et al., 2019b), we categorize the relationships between current and prior questions into four distinct types, as shown in Table 1. The first three Thematic Relation types pertain to the relationship between a question and a previous question, while the last type pertains to the relationship between a question and the answer to the previous question.

2.2 Question-Answer Type

Question types can be categorized into four categories: Answerable, Unanswerable, Ambiguous, and Improper. Among these, Ambiguous and Unanswerable contain questions that present particular challenges. Ambiguous questions include (1) Column Ambiguity, where certain terms in the question can map to multiple columns, and (2) Value Ambiguity, where certain terms in the question can map to multiple cell values in the table. Unanswerable questions include (1) Column Unanswerable, where the concepts mentioned in the question do not exist in the table’s columns. (2) Value Unanswerable, where the cell values mentioned in the question do not exist in the table. and (3) Out of Scope, where the question exceeds the system’s operational scope, such as attempting to invoke a web search within an SQL system. For specific examples and detailed descriptions, please refer to Table 8.

3 Methods

3.1 Task Formulation

The problem under consideration is formulated as follows: Given a dialogue context C_t , a current user query Q_t , and a database D at each turn t ($1 \leq t \leq N$), the Text-to-SQL system is required to identify the type of the user’s query T_t and provide the

Relation Category	Description	Example
Constraint Refinement	Ask for the same type of entity as the previous question with a different constraint.	Prev_Q: Which major has the <u>fewest students</u> ? Cur_Q: What is the <u>most popular one</u> ?
Topic Exploration	Ask for other properties about the same entity as the previous question.	Prev_Q: What is the capacity of Anonymous Donor Hall ? Cur_Q: List <i>all of the amenities</i> that it has.
Participant Shift	Ask for the same property about another entity.	Prev_Q: Tell me the <i>rating</i> of the episode named "Double Down" . Cur_Q: How about for "Keepers" ?
Answer Exploration	Ask for a subset of entities from a previous question's answer or inquire about a specific entity mentioned in the answer.	Prev_Q: Please list all the different department names . Cur_Q: What is the <i>average salary</i> of all instructors in the Statistics department ?

Table 1: Relation categories between the previous question and the current question. The entities (**bold**), properties (*italics*), and constraints (underlined) are highlighted in each question.




Figure 2: Overview of QDA-SQL processes.

appropriate response R_t . The response R_t varies depending on the query type. It may be an SQL query, a clarification question to the user, a natural language response, or an explanation of why the query cannot be answered.

$$p(\mathcal{T}_t, \mathcal{R}_t \mid \mathcal{Q}_t, \mathcal{C}_t, \mathcal{D}) \quad (1)$$

3.2 Generate Interactions

As shown in Figure 2, we construct a Chain-of-Thought (CoT) (Wei et al., 2022) and randomly combine a Q-A Type and a thematic relation, thereby guiding the LLM to generate diversified and contextually related multi-turn Q&A pairs.

Goal SQL Employing the approach outlined by Liu et al. (2022), We use the original dataset’s SQL as Goal SQL. We enable LLMs to iteratively generate contextually relevant questions and answers. Each interactive exchange is aligned with the Goal SQL. This method enhances the quality and rele-

vance of the generated multi-turn Q&A pairs, aligning them more closely with real-world application scenarios.

Random Combination To enhance diversity in multi-turn interactions, we incorporate randomized thematic relation types and Q-A Types during the Q&A generation process in QDA-SQL. Without specific guidance, the generated Q&A pairs tend to be limited to common thematic relations and Q-A Types. To counter this, we establish a limit of N rounds of Q&A, assigning a predefined thematic relation and Q-A Type to each round randomly. This strategy directs the LLM to produce richer and more varied Q&A pairs, drawing on the content of previous rounds and the chosen thematic relation. Furthermore, if a generated Q&A pair is deemed Improper and suggests an end to the conversation, we cease further generation to maintain the dialogue’s natural flow and coherence. This approach of randomization and precise control effectively en-

ables the LLM to create high-quality, diverse, and logically coherent multi-turn Q&A samples.

CoT The CoT employs Gemini Pro as a superior LLM for knowledge distillation to guide the generation process. It facilitates N rounds of diverse Q&A pairs creation, grounded in schemas, conversation history, and SQL queries, ensuring coherence through contextual reference. To enhance answer quality, five answerable questions accompanied by SQL queries are validated through database execution. Unexecutable SQL queries are filtered out, and the LLM is prompted for complex queries featuring nested structures and multi-table joins, thereby introducing iteration variations to enrich dialogue diversity.

3.3 Verify and Refine

The LLM’s sample generation based on classification may overlook correctness, leading to misaligned and erroneous results. To improve sample quality, we designed the Verify and Refine process, which directs the LLM through three key steps as shown in Figure 2:

(1) *Verifying Alignment*: The LLM checks each Q&A pair for alignment with its intended question-answer type and removes misaligned pairs to uphold classification standards.

(2) *Optimizing Expression*: Following Madaan et al. (2024), we refine the language in user queries and system responses through iterative feedback to ensure they mimic natural language, thus improving readability and naturalness.

(3) *Scoring SQL Execution*: For answerable type questions, the LLM scores the SQL execution for the generated answers, ranging from 0 to 10. Higher scores indicate better quality and alignment for the user’s question. Answers with scores above a set threshold are retained for their high accuracy and reliability.

Following above steps, we can obtain validated multi-turn Q&A samples.

3.4 StateFlow Design

Following the work of Bertomeu et al. (2006) and Wu et al. (2024), we conceptualize the Text-to-SQL reasoning process as a state machine model named StateFlow. As shown in Figure 3, we define the following states and transition rules for implementing the Text-to-SQL system, denoted by (*Initial, Intent Recognition, Solve, Verify*). (1) *Initial*: Load database info, Q&A history, question types, user

input, and initialize an error log. (2) *Intent Recognition*: Classifies and parses the user’s question. If the question can be answered via SQL, proceed to the *Solve* state; otherwise, respond to the user and then ends the interaction. (3) *Solve*: Generate SQL syntactically compliant. (4) *Verify*: Checks if the query executes successfully. If the query executes successfully, it transitions to the *End* state, completing the task. If not, it logs errors and redirects to the *Solve* state to correct the query.

This dynamic prompting and state management mechanism ensures that the LLM receives pertinent guidance at each step, facilitating a structured problem-solving process. The *Verify* stage detects errors, triggers corrections, and boosts robustness.

To train the LLM for reasoning within the StateFlow model, we organize dialogue samples generated by QDA-SQL to meet the requirements of StateFlow. This method constructs a multi-task training dataset encompassing various tasks in intent recognition and SQL generation. By formatting the dataset to align with the states in the StateFlow model, we ensure logical coherence and effective training.

4 Data Statistics and Analysis

As shown in table 2, we summarize the statistics of several existing multi-turn datasets. CoSQL provides datasets for SQL generation and intent recognition for single queries. We generated 10,874 dialogues, consisting of 65,393 turns, from the SparC and CoSQL training sets, which we designated as Goal SQL.

Analyzing QDA-SQL output involved comparing to the training set based on AST (Abstract Syntax Tree) depth, dialogue length, and augmentation impacts. Figure 4 illustrates the distribution of SQL AST tree depths for both enhanced and original samples. The SQL generated in the enhanced dataset demonstrates greater tree depths, suggesting that QDA-SQL is capable of producing more complex queries. This complexity aims to improve the model’s ability to handle intricate problems. Figure 5 displays the distribution of dialogue lengths for both enhanced and original samples. These findings suggest that QDA-SQL generates longer dialogues, thereby creating more challenging scenarios. This is intended to improve the model’s performance in multi-turn dialogues.




Figure 3: Overview of StateFlow processes

Dataset	Multi-Type Q	# Dialogues	# Turns	# Databases	# Tables	Avg. # Q turns
SParC	✗	4,298	12,726	200	1,020	3.0
CoSQL	✓	3,007	15,598	200	1,020	5.2
CHASE	✗	5,459	17,940	280	1,280	3.3

Table 2: Comparison of cross-domain context-dependent Text-to-SQL datasets.

5 Experiment

5.1 Experiment Setup

We evaluated our methods using two large-scale benchmark datasets: SParC and CoSQL. To achieve a balanced distribution of samples between the question type recognition and SQL task within the training set, we implemented a negative sampling strategy, as detailed in Appendix B. Additionally, we curated the MMSQL¹ dataset from the CoSQL data, which we refer to as the multiple types multi-turn Text-to-SQL test set (MMSQL). For the evaluation, we developed the Accuracy with SQL Matching (AccS) metric. The LLMs are fine-tuned using QLoRA (Dettmers et al., 2024); for detailed settings, please refer to Appendix C.

5.2 Evaluation Metrics

To evaluate our methods, we employ two official metrics: Question Match (QM) and Interaction Match (IM) (Yu et al., 2019b). QM measures whether the predicted SQL query matches the ground truth at the single-turn level, while IM assesses whether all predicted SQL queries

in a multi-turn interaction achieve QM. Furthermore, we present detailed analyses of precision, recall, and F1 scores for user dialogue act prediction across multiple question types. For a comprehensive assessment, we have devised an integrated metric, AccS, that combines question type recognition with SQL query generation metrics. AccS integrates User Dialogue Act Prediction Accuracy (Acc) (Yu et al., 2019a) with Question Match (QM), providing a comprehensive measure of performance.

User Dialogue Act Prediction Accuracy (Acc)

Acc is used to evaluate the system’s ability to classify questions. It is defined as the proportion of instances where the predicted type matches the expected reference type among all predicted questions. Formally, for a dataset comprising N questions, where C_i denotes the expected classification and \hat{C}_i represents the predicted classification for the i -th question, Acc is computed as follows:

$$Acc = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{I}(C_i = \hat{C}_i) \quad (2)$$

where $\mathbb{I} = 1$ if \hat{C}_i matches C_i , and $\mathbb{I} = 0$ otherwise.

¹<https://github.com/mcxiaoxiao/MMSQL>




Figure 4: AST depths in enhanced vs. original samples




Figure 5: Dialogue lengths in enhanced vs. original samples




Figure 6: QM performance on SQL of different difficulty levels




Figure 7: QM performance on problems with different turn numbers

Acc with SQL Matching (AccS) In the context of a database querying dialogue system, it is imperative not only to accurately classify the type of user query but also to furnish the appropriate SQL queries for those answerable questions. To comprehensively evaluate the system’s performance, we enhance Acc by integrating Question Match (QM). This integration results in a comprehensive metric, AccS, which assesses both the system’s proficiency in question classification and its precision in SQL query generation within multi-turn dialogues. For a given set of N questions, where S_i denotes the ground truth SQL query and \hat{S}_i represents the predicted SQL query, AccS is computed as follows:

$$\text{AccS} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \begin{cases} I(C_i = \hat{C}_i) \cdot \text{QM}(S_i, \hat{S}_i) & \text{(a)} \\ I(C_i = \hat{C}_i) & \text{(b)} \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

(a) $C_i = \text{'Answerable'}$
(b) otherwise

where $\text{QM} = 1$ if \hat{S}_i matches S_i , and $\text{QM} = 0$ otherwise.

AccS can be computed at both the single-turn level and interaction levels. For Interaction Level AccS (IAccS), if all the predicted SQL queries and question types in an interaction are correct, the IAccS score is 1; otherwise, the score is 0.

5.3 Experiment Result

In the QDA-SQL process, we expanded the training sets of SPaRC and CoSQL to include 10,874 dialogues encompassing 65,393 turns. These were subsequently used to train CodeLlama (CodeLlama-7b-Instruct) and Codegemma (Codegemma-7b-it). Additionally, we conducted a zero-shot evaluation of several recent state-of-the-art general and domain-specific LLMs using QM and IM metrics with the development sets of SPaRC and CoSQL.

As shown in Table 3, open-source models without fine-tuning exhibit significantly inferior performance compared to state-of-the-art closed-source

Model	SPaRC		CoSQL	
	QM	IM	QM	IM
GPT-3.5-turbo	34.1	17.1	32.2	10.4
GPT-4-turbo	31.4	18.8	33.6	10.8
Gemini-1.5 pro	36.6	18.3	36.7	9.9
Nsql-7b	5.6	0.2	3.4	0.0
+ QDA-SQL	51.4	32.7	46.9	19.8
Sqlcoder-7b-2	0.5	0.0	0.7	0.0
+ QDA-SQL	53.9	35.8	48.1	22.2
Codellama-7b	20.6	2.1	6.4	1.4
+ QDA-SQL	56.2	38.2	50.9	24.2
Codegemma-7b	29.7	12.6	24.5	6.8
+ QDA-SQL	57.6	42.4	56.5	28.7

Table 3: Model QM and IM performances on the SPaRC and CoSQL.

models, such as GPT-3.5-turbo², GPT-4-turbo³, and Gemini⁴. However, after fine-tuning with the augmented dataset, the performance of models such as Nsql-7b (NumbersStationAI, 2023), Sqlcoder-7b-2 (DefogAI, 2023), Codellama-7b, and Codegemma-7b exceeded that of these closed-source LLMs in both QM and IM.

To evaluate the impact of samples generated by QDA-SQL on model fine-tuning, we conducted a comparative analysis of LLMs trained with augmented data versus those trained with original datasets across various dialogue turns and difficulty levels. These difficulty levels were defined according to the Spider standard, encompassing easy, medium, hard, and extra hard. Figure 6 illustrates the QM of SQL outputs for Answerable-type questions across these difficulty levels, comparing results from models trained with original data to those trained with the enhanced dataset. Notably, models fine-tuned with the augmented dataset demonstrated significant improvements in QM, especially for high-difficulty questions. Figure 7 presents the QM performance across different turn numbers, contrasting models trained with

²<https://platform.openai.com/docs/models/gpt-3-5-turbo>

³<https://openai.com/index/gpt-4>

⁴<https://gemini.google.com>

Model	Sparc		CoSQL	
	QM	IM	QM	IM
Codellama-7b	20.6	2.1	6.4	1.4
SFT	55.3	39.6	47.1	20.1
QDA-SQL w/ IS	56.2	38.2	50.9	24.2
QDA-SQL wo/ IS	62.5	41.1	56.7	28.0
Codegemma-7b	29.7	12.6	24.5	6.8
SFT	57.5	41.2	55.1	27.3
QDA-SQL w/ IS	57.6	42.4	56.5	28.7
QDA-SQL wo/ IS	61.3	44.1	57.3	30.0

Table 4: Performance of models trained on different datasets. "SFT" refers to fine-tuning on a combined CoSQL and SparC training set. "w/ IS" includes both SQL prediction and intent recognition samples, while "w/o IS" does not include intent recognition samples.

the original data versus the enhanced dataset. The enhanced training dataset demonstrated marked improvements in QM for multi-turn dialogues across varied difficulty levels, thereby highlighting its efficacy in complex dialogue scenarios.

5.4 Ablation Study

In this study, we evaluated the performance of several widely used LLMs, including GPT-3.5-Turbo, GPT-4-Turbo, Gemini-1.5 Pro, Codellama-7b, and Codegemma-7b. We conducted ablation studies to ascertain the efficacy of training models with samples generated by QDA-SQL. According to the results in Table 4, models trained with the complete set of QDA-SQL samples, which include both intent recognition and SQL generation tasks, demonstrated superior performance compared to those trained solely on SQL generation tasks. Although models trained exclusively on SQL tasks showed proficiency in these tasks, they displayed significant limitations in addressing questions that cannot be answered using SQL. This deficiency was especially evident, as shown in the "QDA-SQL w/o IS" section of Table 5, where these models demonstrated inadequate capabilities in effectively recognizing unanswerable and ambiguous questions.

As shown in Table 6, the QDA-SQL model, equipped with Intent Recognition (w/ IS) samples, significantly outperforms the SFT model, achieving an average F1 score of 57.8. Conversely, the QDA-SQL model without Intent Recognition (w/o IS) shows improvement in Question Match (QM) but faces challenges in recognizing diverse question types. These findings underscore the effectiveness of multi-task learning strategies in enhancing the model’s robustness in complex interactive environments.

To assess the impact of various states on model

Model	Precision	Recall	F1
SFT			
Answerable	82.4	99.3	90.1
Unanswerable	0	0	0
Ambiguous	6.5	0.9	1.6
Improper	100.0	79.5	88.6
average	47.2	44.9	45.1
QDA-SQL w/o IS			
Answerable	88.5	98.0	93.0
Unanswerable	0	0	0
Ambiguous	3.2	0.9	2.4
Improper	100.0	85.1	92.0
average	47.9	46.2	46.8
QDA-SQL w/ IS			
Answerable	90.5	94.8	92.6
Unanswerable	21.1	19.0	20.0
Ambiguous	30.8	14.8	20.0
Improper	97.5	99.7	98.6
average	60.0	57.1	57.8

Table 5: Performance in recognizing question types by Codellama-7b on the CoSQL dev set.

Method	QM	Avg. Pre	Avg. Rec	Avg. F1
Codellama-7b	6.4	51.1	46.1	46.4
SFT	47.1	47.2	44.9	45.1
QDA-SQL w/ IS	55.9	60.0	57.1	57.8
QDA-SQL w/o IS	56.7	47.9	46.2	46.8

Table 6: Experimental results on the CoSQL dev set.

performance, we conducted ablation studies. (1) Removing the Verify State: The SQL generated by the model is accepted as the final answer without any verification. (2) Removing Intent Recognition: Without this feature, the model skips the decision-making process for the next step (End or Solve) based on question classification and proceeds directly to Solve, thereby directly addressing the question.

As shown in Table 7, removing either state results in a decline in performance. The removal of the Verify state results in lower AccS and IAccS values, and higher error rates, underscoring its critical importance. The removal of the Intent Recognition state leads to reduced IAccS, as the LLM faces difficulties with questions that cannot be answered using SQL. This is consistent with the idea that the Intent Recognition state improves the LLM’s capability to comprehend the types of questions posed.

Method	AccS \uparrow	IAccS \uparrow	ERROR % \downarrow
QDA-SQL	50.4	12.0	1.7
No_Verify	49.9	10.6	2.5
No_Intent	29.6	0.4	2.3

Table 7: Ablation study results for StateFlow states on the MMSQL test set. 'No_Verify' excludes error correction, and 'No_Intent' excludes intent recognition.

6 Limitations and Future Work

Our methodology utilizes LLMs to generate samples from Goal SQL, however, creating Goal SQL still necessitates labor-intensive manual annotation. Furthermore, the dialogue samples produced may not cover all conceivable real-world scenarios. Future research will concentrate on automating the generation of diverse Text-to-SQL Q&A pairs. This encompasses scenarios that require external knowledge and complex reasoning processes. Our objective is to refine augmentation techniques to enhance their applicability, aiming to generate more challenging and varied samples that accommodate a broader range of database structures and querying requirements.

7 Related Work

7.1 Text-to-SQL

Text-to-SQL, which transforms natural language queries into SQL queries, is a significant research area with numerous applications. Prominent datasets include single-turn datasets such as Spider BIRD (Li et al., 2024), and multi-turn datasets such as CHASE, SPaC, and CoSQL, which serve as benchmarks for evaluating Text-to-SQL systems. Initial studies employed graph neural networks to encode dialogue history and database schema information (Hui et al., 2021), or utilized pre-trained language models (e.g., T5, BERT, BART) to enhance semantic representation. More recent approaches have adopted powerful closed-source LLMs and in-context learning strategies, or have fine-tuned large pre-trained language models to enhance performance.

Recent works note that not all user queries can be answered with SQL in practical applications (Lee et al., 2024; Wang et al., 2023). To address this issue, datasets such as TriageSQL, DTE, and CoSQL have incorporated question type detection, thereby increasing the complexity of the task. Our research aligns with these developments by integrating unanswerable questions into multi-turn Text-to-SQL augmentation, thus creating a more realistic multi-turn Text-to-SQL task.

7.2 Data augmentation for Text-to-SQL

Annotating Text-to-SQL samples is costly and time-consuming due to the need for SQL experts. Consequently, data augmentation has become a widely utilized strategy (Zhang et al., 2024; Liu et al.,

2022). Early efforts focused on generating single-turn samples using syntax-and-table-aware semantic parsers, copy-based latent variable models (Guo et al., 2018), or predefined transformation rules (Wang et al., 2024). Other methods used Abstract Syntax Tree (AST) grammar for SQL generation and hierarchical models for SQL-to-question generation (Wu et al., 2021).

For multi-turn questions, some methods use a self-play strategy, where two models simulate the system and user to generate consecutive question-answer pairs (Liu et al., 2022). Regarding the generation of multiple question types, some researchers have modified existing database structures to transform answerable samples into ambiguous or unanswerable samples (Zhang et al., 2020; Wang et al., 2023). With the advancement of LLMs, the automatic generation of training samples using LLMs has become prevalent. We employ this approach to generate complex multi-turn Text-to-SQL training data, utilizing the CoT process to ensure a diversity of training samples.

8 Conclusion

In this paper, we introduce QDA-SQL, a novel data augmentation method for multi-turn Text-to-SQL tasks. QDA-SQL enhances the diversity and quality of training data by generating high-quality multi-turn Q&A pairs. Integrated within the StateFlow framework, it refines LLM training and inference processes. Our experiments conducted on SPaC and CoSQL demonstrate enhanced SQL accuracy and improved handling of various question types. By conceptualizing Text-to-SQL tasks as a state machine within the StateFlow framework, we guide LLMs through multi-step reasoning processes, thereby enhancing accuracy and robustness in real-world applications.

References

- Núria Bertomeu, Hans Uszkoreit, Anette Frank, Hans-Ulrich Krieger, and Brigitte Jörg. 2006. Contextual phenomena and thematic relations in database qa dialogues: results from a wizard-of-oz experiment. In *Proceedings of the Interactive Question Answering Workshop at HLT-NAACL 2006*, pages 1–8.
- DefogAI. 2023. *Defog sqlcoder*.
- Tim Dettmers, Artidoro Pagnoni, Ari Holtzman, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2024. Qlora: Efficient finetuning of quantized llms. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36.

- Daya Guo, Yibo Sun, Duyu Tang, Nan Duan, Jian Yin, Hong Chi, James Cao, Peng Chen, and Ming Zhou. 2018. Question generation from sql queries improves neural semantic parsing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1808.06304*.
- Jiaqi Guo, Ziliang Si, Yu Wang, Qian Liu, Ming Fan, Jian-Guang Lou, Zijiang Yang, and Ting Liu. 2021. [Chase: A large-scale and pragmatic chinese dataset for cross-database context-dependent text-to-sql](#). 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 2316–2331.
- Binyuan Hui, Ruiying Geng, Qiyu Ren, Binhua Li, Yongbin Li, Jian Sun, Fei Huang, Luo Si, Pengfei Zhu, and Xiaodan Zhu. 2021. Dynamic hybrid relation exploration network for cross-domain context-dependent semantic parsing. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, volume 35, pages 13116–13124.
- Gyubok Lee, Woosog Chay, Seonhee Cho, and Edward Choi. 2024. Trustsql: A reliability benchmark for text-to-sql models with diverse unanswerable questions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.15879*.
- Jinyang Li, Binyuan Hui, Ge Qu, Jiayi Yang, Binhua Li, Bowen Li, Bailin Wang, Bowen Qin, Ruiying Geng, Nan Huo, et al. 2024. Can llm already serve as a database interface? a big bench for large-scale database grounded text-to-sqls. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36.
- Qi Liu, Zihuiwen Ye, Tao Yu, Phil Blunsom, and Linfeng Song. 2022. Augmenting multi-turn text-to-sql datasets with self-play. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.12096*.
- Aman Madaan, Niket Tandon, Prakhar Gupta, Skyler Hallinan, Luyu Gao, Sarah Wiegrefe, Uri Alon, Nouha Dziri, Shrimai Prabhumoye, Yiming Yang, et al. 2024. Self-refine: Iterative refinement with self-feedback. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36.
- NumbersStationAI. 2023. [Nstext2sql: An open source text-to-sql dataset for foundation model training](#).
- Torsten Scholak, Nathan Schucher, and Dzmitry Bahdanau. 2021. Picard: Parsing incrementally for constrained auto-regressive decoding from language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.05093*.
- Ruoxi Sun, Sercan O Arik, Hootan Nakhost, Hanjun Dai, Rajarishi Sinha, Pengcheng Yin, and Tomas Pfister. 2023. Sql-palm: Improved large language model adaptation for text-to-sql. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.00739*.
- Bing Wang, Yan Gao, Zhoujun Li, and Jian-Guang Lou. 2023. Know what i don’t know: Handling ambiguous and unknown questions for text-to-sql. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2023*, pages 5701–5714.
- Dingzirui Wang, Longxu Dou, Wanxiang Che, Jiaqi Wang, Jinbo Liu, Lixin Li, Jingan Shang, Lei Tao, Jie Zhang, Cong Fu, et al. 2024. Conda: state-based data augmentation for context-dependent text-to-sql. *International Journal of Machine Learning and Cybernetics*, pages 1–12.
- Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Fei Xia, Ed Chi, Quoc V Le, Denny Zhou, et al. 2022. Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:24824–24837.
- Kun Wu, Lijie Wang, Zhenghua Li, Ao Zhang, Xinyan Xiao, Hua Wu, Min Zhang, and Haifeng Wang. 2021. Data augmentation with hierarchical sql-to-question generation for cross-domain text-to-sql parsing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.02227*.
- Yiran Wu, Tianwei Yue, Shaokun Zhang, Chi Wang, and Qingyun Wu. 2024. Stateflow: Enhancing llm task-solving through state-driven workflows. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.11322*.
- Tao Yu, Rui Zhang, He Yang Er, Suyi Li, Eric Xue, Bo Pang, Xi Victoria Lin, Yi Chern Tan, Tianze Shi, Zihan Li, et al. 2019a. [Cosql: A conversational text-to-sql challenge towards cross-domain natural language interfaces to databases](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.05378*.
- Tao Yu, Rui Zhang, Kai Yang, Michihiro Yasunaga, Dongxu Wang, Zifan Li, James Ma, Irene Li, Qingning Yao, Shanelle Roman, et al. 2018. [Spider: A large-scale human-labeled dataset for complex and cross-domain semantic parsing and text-to-sql task](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:1809.08887*.
- Tao Yu, Rui Zhang, Michihiro Yasunaga, Yi Chern Tan, Xi Victoria Lin, Suyi Li, Heyang Er, Irene Li, Bo Pang, Tao Chen, et al. 2019b. [Sparc: Cross-domain semantic parsing in context](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.02285*.
- Yiyun Zhang, Gengsheng Huang, et al. 2024. Se-hcl: Schema enhanced hybrid curriculum learning for multi-turn text-to-sql. *IEEE Access*.
- Yusen Zhang, Xiangyu Dong, Shuaichen Chang, Tao Yu, Peng Shi, and Rui Zhang. 2020. Did you ask a good question? a cross-domain question intention classification benchmark for text-to-sql. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.12634*.

A Example and Detailed Description of each question-answer type

B Negative Sampling

or intent recognition samples, we retain all Unanswerable and Ambiguous types in the training sample generation, while randomly selecting an equal amount from the remaining types. No negative sampling is performed for SQL task samples.

Question Category	Answer Category	Example
Ambiguous	Clarify	Q: What's the id of Glenn ? A: Do you mean the location of the school named "Glenn"? <i>Note: The token "Glenn" is ambiguous as it may appear in multiple locations within the tables. The system needs to request clarification from the user</i>
Answerable	SQL	Q: What's the id of Glenn ? A: Do you mean the location of the school named "Glenn"? <i>Note: The token "Glenn" is ambiguous as it may appear in multiple locations within the tables. The system needs to request clarification from the user</i>
Unanswerable	Sorry	Q: What's the id of Glenn ? A: Do you mean the location of the school named "Glenn"? <i>Note: The token "Glenn" is ambiguous as it may appear in multiple locations within the tables. The system needs to request clarification from the user</i>
Improper	Regular	Q: What's the id of Glenn ? A: Do you mean the location of the school named "Glenn"? <i>Note: The token "Glenn" is ambiguous as it may appear in multiple locations within the tables. The system needs to request clarification from the user</i>

Table 8: Question-Answer Types in QDA-SQL. *Note*(italics) explains the rationale for the classification and the requirements for the system’s response. **Bold** font indicates the problematic column description.

C Experiment Settings

Training settings include lora_rank set to 64, lora_alpha set to 16, and learning rate set to 5e-5. During inference, the temperature is set to 0.1. Our experiments are conducted on a server with an Intel(R) Xeon(R) Gold 6133 CPU @ 2.50GHz and an NVIDIA A800 80GB PCIe GPU.

D Prompts

We defined the subsections in Table 10-11 for prompts to form complete prompts.

D.1 Prompt for Chain-of-Thought in QDA-SQL

Based on {Conversation History} {Current Q-A Type Requirement} {Current Thematic Relation Requirement} {Database Description} {Table Data Example} Based on the above content, referring to {Goal SQL} generate a new dialogue based on the previous conversation. The newly generated SQL can differ from the target SQL. The question you ask needs to be difficult enough that it requires the use of complex SQL to answer it. Output 5 questions and corresponding SQL in the format: [{"text":"", "sql":""}, {"text":"", "sql":""}, ...] Output only in JSON format.

Note: For answerable types of questions, the LLM needs to generate 5 such questions along with their corresponding SQL answers simultaneously. These answers will be validated through database execution. Only those answers that are

executable and yield non-empty results will be retained to ensure that the generated samples contain more meaningful Q&A.

D.2 Prompt for Verify and refine in QDA-SQL

Verifying Alignment

Based on {Conversation History} {Database Description} {Table Data Example} {Q-A Types Definition} {Multi-turn Dialogue Sample}[-2] and {Multi-turn Dialogue Sample}[-1] Based on the above content, is the classification correct? (For Unanswerable: can this question be achieved with more complex SQL or multi-table join query for valid SQL?) (For Ambiguous: To make sure that the question is indeed impossible to answer directly based on the information above) If correct, output {"type": "yes"} otherwise {"type": "no"} Output nothing else except JSON.

Optimizing Expression

Based on {Database Description} {Table Data Example} {Q-A Types Definition} {expression and Context Coherence Requirements:} Modify the {Multi-turn Dialogue Sample} based on the above requirements, and output in the same format after revision.

Scoring SQL Execution

Based on {Conversation History} {Database Description} {Current

Question Type Recognize Task				SQL Task
Answerable	Unanswerable	Ambiguous	Improper	
22054	13797	10406	2149	14,735

Table 9: Sample Distribution for Question Type Recognition Task and SQL Task

Question} {SQL answer to Current
 Question} {SQL Execution Result} Does
 the SQL and its execution result fully
 meet the user’s needs? Output the rating
 of the system’s response (1-10), output
 the rating result {"score":""} Output
 nothing else except JSON.

D.3 Prompt for Intent Recognition State in StateFlow

Based on {Database Description} {Q-A
 Types Definition} {Conversation History}
 {Current Question} Categorize and
 answer user questions based on database
 structure, output in JSON format
 {"type":[""], "reply":""} don’t output
 other text or explanation

D.4 Prompt for Intent Solve State in StateFlow

Based on {Database Description}
 {Conversation History} Answer the
 {Current Question} using only SQL.
 Carefully check wrong SQL queries and
 write a new corrected SQL different from
 {Error}

E Licenses for Open-source Databases

We acknowledge that we have exclusively utilized the CoSQL and SParC datasets, both licensed under CC BY-SA 4.0. CC-BY-SA Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International This license is one of the open Creative Commons licenses. It allows users to share and adapt the dataset so long as they give credit to the creator and distribute any additions, transformations, or changes to the dataset under this license.

<p>{Conversation History} User: What amenities are available in Smith Hall? System: SELECT T3.amenity_name FROM dorm AS T1 JOIN has_amenity AS T2 ON T1.dormid = T2.dormid JOIN dorm_amenity AS T3 ON T2.amenid = T3.amenid WHERE T1.dorm_name = 'Smith Hall' ORDER BY T3.amenity_name User: What amenities are available in dorms that house students who are at least 19 and are female? System:SELECT T3.amenity_name FROM dorm AS T1 JOIN lives_in AS T2 ON T1.dormid = T2.dormid JOIN student AS T4 ON T2.stuid = T4.StuID JOIN has_amenity AS T5 ON T1.dormid = T5.dormid JOIN dorm_amenity AS T3 ON T5.amenid = T3.amenid WHERE T4.Age >= 19 AND T4.Sex = 'F' GROUP BY T3.amenity_name ORDER BY T3.amenity_name</p>
<p>{Database Description} museum (Museum_ID:museum id Type:number Name:name Type:text Num_of_Staff:num of staff Type:number Open_Year:open year Type:text) visitor (ID:customer id Type:number Name:name Type:text Level_of_membership:level of membership Type:number Age:age Type:number) visit (Museum_ID:museum id Type:number visitor_ID:customer id Type:text Num_of_Ticket:num of ticket Type:number Total_spent:total spent Type:number)</p>
<p>{Table Data Example} museum (1,Plaza Museum,62,2000) (2,Capital Plaza Museum,25,2012) (3,Jefferson Development Museum,18,2010) visitor (1,Gonzalo Higuaín ,8,35) (2,Guti Midfielder,5,28) (3,Arjen Robben,1,27) visit (1,5,20,320.14) (2,5,4,89.98) (4,3,10,320.44)</p>
<p>{Goal SQL} Find the first name of students who are living in the Smith Hall.</p>
<p>{Current Question} What amenities are available in dorms that house students who are at least 19 and are female and live in Smith Hall?</p>
<p>{SQL answer to Current Question} SELECT T3.amenity_name FROM dorm AS T1 JOIN has_amenity AS T2 ON T1.dormid = T2.dormid JOIN dorm_amenity AS T3 ON T2.amenid = T3.amenid JOIN lives_in AS T4 ON T1.dormid = T4.dormid JOIN student AS T5 ON T4.stuid = T5.stuid WHERE T1.dorm_name = 'Smith Hall' AND T5.age >= 19 AND T5.sex = 'F' ORDER BY T3.amenity_name</p>
<p>{SQL Execution Result} ('4 Walls'), ('4 Walls'), ('4 Walls'), ('4 Walls'), ('Carpeted Rooms'), ('Carpeted Rooms'), ('Carpeted Rooms'), ('Carpeted Rooms'), ('Heat'), ('Heat')</p>
<p>{Current Q-A Type Requirement} The user's question is clear, and the queried column exists. The system needs to provide an SQL query based on the context. <i>Note: Refer to 2.2 and table 8, randomly select an item, in this case, Answerable.</i></p>
<p>{Current Thematic Relation Requirement} The Current Question asks for the same property about another entity. <i>Note: Refer to 2.1 and Table 1, randomly select an item, in this case, Participant Shift.</i></p>
<p>{Expression and Context Coherence Requirements} 1 The user's question and the system's answer match the type of behavior, and the system gives a completely correct and detailed answer that fully satisfies the user's needs. 2 The system's answer is completely relevant to the user's question, with no extraneous or jumping content, and excellent coherence. 3 The system's answers are completely relevant to the user's question, with no irrelevant or off-topic content. 4 The system's answers show a high degree of variability, with a high degree of diversity in language expression and content, and a high degree of innovation and novelty. 5 If there is CANNOT_ANSWER please focus on its question (text) according to the Database Description is not likely to be answered, please determine that this type of question is not possible to generate SQL, you have to modify the Q&A into right type. 6 For AMBIGUOUS questions, making the Q&A more ambiguous makes their CLARIFY follow-up questions more meaningful. makes it completely impossible to generate the corresponding SQL. 7 If the type is incorrectly labeled, please change it. Note: there are only five combinations of type. isuser:"True" means this is a user question, in the tone of the user's question. isuser:"false" means this is a system answer, in the tone of the system answer. Make the text field sentences of user questions and system responses express a tone that is appropriate to their role type and indicates the type of behavior, if it does not match the description, then modify the Q&A, if the deviation is large, then delete the group of Q&A. Case-by-case checking for fulfillment of requirements to filter and modify the Q&A.</p>

Table 10: Subsections of prompts

{Q-A Types Definition}

The user question type can be the following dialogue behaviors:

INFORM SQL: Users provide requests through natural language questions. If the user's question can be answered through SQL, the system needs to write SQL and explain (don't need to explain based on the SQL results)

INFER SQL: If the user's question must be answered through SQL and human inference. For example, if the user's question is a "yes/no" question, or about "the third oldest...", SQL cannot return the answer directly (or is too complex), but we can infer the answer based on the SQL results.

AMBIGUOUS: The user's question is ambiguous and the system needs to reconfirm the user's intent (e.g., "Did you mean...?") or ask the user to specify which columns or values to return.

AFFIRM: Confirm what the system said (the user agrees/affirms).

NEGATE: Negate what the system said (the user disagrees/denies it).

CANNOT_ANSWER: The question contains additional information not found in the database. (When the user is unfamiliar with the database schema or its implications) The system cannot easily answer the user's question via SQL, and the system informs the user of its limitations. The system needs to detect what information the user needs but is not included in the database.

IMPROPER: Inappropriate questions, such as small talk or questions asking for advice. The system should provide smooth and reasonable daily answers

For the system, define the following dialog behavior:

CONFIRM SQL: The system creates a natural language response describing the SQL and results table and asks the user to confirm that the system understood his/her intent.

CLARIFY: Asks the user to reconfirm and clarify his/her intentions when their question is ambiguous.

REJECT: Tells the user that the system did not understand/cannot answer his/her question, or that the user's question is irrelevant to the topic.

REQUEST MORE: Ask the user if they need more information.

GREETING: Greeting the user.

SORRY: Apologize to the user.

WELCOME: Tell users you are welcome!

Only 5 Q&A combinations are allowed

Type 1:INFER_SQL-CONFIRM_SQL

Type 2:INFORM_SQL-CONFIRM_SQL

Type 3: AMBIGUOUS-CLARIFY-INFER_SQL/INFORM SQL

Type 4:CANNOT_ANSWER-SORRY

Type 5: IMPROPER-REQUEST_MORE /GREETING /SORRY /WELCOME /GOOD_BYE

Note: To diversify the content and make the evaluation process more straightforward, we use the Q-A Types defined by CoSQL during generation. However, in the subsequent evaluation, we simplify these into the four clearer categories presented in this paper. For example, questions of the Answerable type during generation can be INFORM_SQL or INFER_SQL. For specific definitions, refer to (Yu et al., 2019a).

{Multi-turn Dialogue Sample}

type: "INFER_SQL" isUser: true text: "What amenities are available in Smith Hall?",

type: "CONFIRM_SQL" isUser: false query:"SELECT T3.amenity_name FROM dorm AS T1 JOIN has_amenity AS T2 ON T1.dormid = T2.dormid JOIN dorm_amenity AS T3 ON T2.amenid = T3.amenid WHERE T1.dorm_name = 'Smith Hall' ORDER BY T3.amenity_name",

type: "INFORM_SQL" isUser: true text: "What amenities are available in dorms that house students who are at least 19 and are female?",

type: "CONFIRM_SQL" isUser: false query:"SELECT T3.amenity_name FROM dorm AS T1 JOIN lives_in AS T2 ON T1.dormid = T2.dormid JOIN student AS T4 ON T2.stuid = T4.stuid JOIN has_amenity AS T5 ON T1.dormid = T5.dormid JOIN dorm_amenity AS T3 ON T5.amenid = T3.amenid WHERE T4.Age >= 19 AND T4.Sex = 'F' GROUP BY T3.amenity_name ORDER BY T3.amenity_name",

type: "INFORM_SQL" isUser: true text: "What amenities are available in dorms that house students who are at least 19 and are female and live in Smith Hall?",

type: "CONFIRM_SQL" isUser: false query:"SELECT T3.amenity_name FROM dorm AS T1 JOIN has_amenity AS T2 ON T1.dormid = T2.dormid JOIN dorm_amenity AS T3 ON T2.amenid = T3.amenid JOIN lives_in AS T4 ON T1.dormid = T4.dormid JOIN student AS T5 ON T4.stuid = T5.stuid WHERE T1.dorm_name = 'Smith Hall' AND T5.age >= 19 AND T5.sex = 'F' ORDER BY T3.amenity_name"

{Error}

These are the wrong SQL query: Observation Error executing query:SELECT c.'Maker' FROM 'Car_Names' AS c LEFT OUTER JOIN 'Model_List' AS m ON (c.'Id' = m.'Maker') LEFT OUTER JOIN 'Car_Makers' AS k ON (m.'Maker' = k.'Id') WHERE c.'Country' LIKE '%USA%' GROUP BY c.'Maker' ORDER BY COUNT(DISTINCT m.'Model') DESC;-no such column: c.Maker Observation Error executing query:SELECT DISTINCT Maker, Country FROM Car_Makers CROSS JOIN Model_List ML EXCEPT SELECT Maker, COUNTRY FROM cars_Data CD RIGHT JOIN Car_Makers CA MONGO THRU model_LIST WHERE NOT EXISTS (SELECT * FROM cars_DATA EXCEPT SELECT makeID FROM Car_Makers) AND country !=" INTERSECT SELECT maker , COUNTRY FROM Model_List MD INNER JOIN Car_Makers MC OND MD.maker=MC.id;-near "MONGO": syntax error"

Table 11: Subsections of prompts