

MAG-SQL: Multi-Agent Generative Approach with Soft Schema Linking and Iterative Sub-SQL Refinement for Text-to-SQL

Wenxuan Xie^{1*}, Gaochen Wu², Bowen Zhou^{2†},
¹South China University of Technology, ²Tsinghua University,
 lancelotxie601@gmail.com, zhoubowen@tsinghua.edu.cn

Abstract

Recent In-Context Learning based methods have achieved remarkable success in Text-to-SQL task. However, there is still a large gap between the performance of these models and human performance on datasets with complex database schema and difficult questions, such as BIRD. Besides, existing work has neglected to supervise intermediate steps when solving questions iteratively with question decomposition methods, and the schema linking methods used in these works are very rudimentary. To address these issues, we propose MAG-SQL, a multi-agent generative approach with soft schema linking and iterative Sub-SQL refinement. In our framework, an entity-based method with tables' summary is used to select the columns in database, and a novel targets-conditions decomposition method is introduced to decompose those complex questions. Additionally, we build a iterative generating module which includes a Sub-SQL Generator and Sub-SQL Refiner, introducing external oversight for each step of generation. Through a series of ablation studies, the effectiveness of each agent in our framework has been demonstrated. When evaluated on the BIRD benchmark with GPT-4, MAG-SQL achieves an execution accuracy of 61.08%, compared to the baseline accuracy of 46.35% for vanilla GPT-4 and the baseline accuracy of 57.56% for MAC-SQL. Besides, our approach makes similar progress on Spider.

1 Introduction

Aiming at automatically generating SQL queries from natural language questions, Text-to-SQL is a long-standing challenge which is critical for retrieving database values without human efforts (Qin et al., 2022). There are two main categories of LLM-based Text-to-SQL approaches, In-Context Learning method (ICL) and Supervised

*The work was done when he worked as an intern at Tsinghua University, China

†Corresponding authors

Natural Language Question
What was the difference in the number of crimes committed in East and North Bohemia in 1996?
Database Schema
Database ID: financial account: account_id(integer), district_id(integer), frequency(text), ... District: district_id (integer), A2(text), A3(text), Trans: trans_id(integer), account_id(integer), date(date), ...
External Knowledge
1. Difference in no. of committed crimes between 2 regions = Total no. of committed crimes in 1996 in North Bohemia – Total no. of committed crimes in 1996 in East Bohemia. 1. A3 refers to region. 2. Data about no. of committed crimes 1996 appears in A16
Ground Truth (Gold SQL)
SELECT SUM(IIF(A3 = 'East Bohemia', A16, 0)) - SUM(IIF(A3 = 'North Bohemia', A16, 0)) FROM district
Difficulties
1. Complex question (multiple conditions) 2. Large database schema and ambiguous columns such as 'A2' 3. External Knowledge Reasoning 4. Various SQL keyword, such as SUM, IFF

Figure 1: A hard example in BIRD. Each data in the BIRD dataset consists of a natural language questions, the database schema, related external knowledge, and gold SQL. The difficulties corresponding to these four parts are listed above.

Fine-Tuning method (Gao et al., 2023). Earlier work has reached human levels on the Spider dataset (Yu et al., 2018), but there is still a large gap with human performance on the BIRD dataset (Li et al., 2024b). A hard example in BIRD dataset is shown in Figure 1.

Previous work has begun to focus on model collaboration (Wang et al., 2024), but it failed to break the 60% EX accuracy on BIRD dataset. Besides, some recent work has achieved significant improvements, but these improvements are achieved through large-scale fine-tuning on LLMs (Talaie et al., 2024) or relying on large-scale sampling from LLMs (Lee et al., 2024). In order to




Figure 2: The overview of our MAG-SQL workflow which consists of four agents: (i)Soft Schema Linker, which picks out related schema and construct database schema prompt based on soft selection, (ii)Targets-Conditions Decomposer, which decomposes the question at a fine-grained level, (iii)Sub-SQL Generator, which predict the next Sub-SQL based on the previous Sub-SQL each time, and (iv)Sub-SQL Refiner, which correct the wrong SQL based on the self-refine ability of LLMs.

address the challenges of datasets with large-Scale database like BIRD in a more cost-effective way, we introduce MAG-SQL, a multi-agent generative approach connecting natural language questions with database queries. The multi-agents workflow of our method is shown in Figure 2.

For the column selection, we choose soft selection approach and present an **Entity-based Schema Linking Method** which is enhanced by **Table Summarization** and **Value Retrieval**. The Entity-based Schema Linking Method and Table Summarization are implemented with LLMs through few-shot learning, while the Value Retrieval is based on the LCS algorithm which is used to calculate the match score. To decompose a complex question into a series of cascading sub-questions, we propose a new method called **Targets-Conditions Decomposition** which decomposes the question into targets and conditions and then combine them iteratively. For SQL generation, we design an **Iterative Generating Module**, where the generator generates the next Sub-SQL based on the previous Sub-SQL with Chain of Thoughts prompting, and each generated Sub-SQL has to be checked and corrected by the Refiner.

We have successively evaluated MAG-SQL on the BIRD dataset and Spider dataset leveraging GPT-3.5 and GPT-4 as the backbone of all agents, respectively. Compared to the multi-agent

framework MAC-SQL (Wang et al., 2024), MAG-SQL+GPT-3.5 achieves 57.62% in execution accuracy which is much higher than 50.56% of MAC-SQL+GPT-3.5 on BIRD, while MAG-SQL+GPT-4 reaches 61.08% compared with 57.56% for MAC-SQL+GPT-4 and 46.35% for vanilla GPT-4.

In summary, our contributions are as follows:

- We propose MAG-SQL, an advanced multi-agent generative approach for Text-to-SQL, comprising Soft Schema Linker, Targets-Conditions Decomposer, Sub-SQL Generator and Sub-SQL Refiner.
- We design a novel Soft Schema Linker with a new Entity-based Schema Linking Method and some useful components which are employed for Table Summarization and Value Retrieval.
- We present a new approach called Targets-Condition Decomposition to decompose Natural Language Queries into a sequence of Sub-queries.
- We construct an Iterative Generating Module which involves a Sub-SQL Generator and a Sub-SQL Refiner, which introduces the supervision and correction of Sub-SQL at each intermediate step in the generation process.

- We evaluate MAG-SQL on the BIRD dataset and conduct series of ablation experiments, which demonstrates the superiority of our method.

2 Related Work

Text-to-SQL has been a popular task in the NLP community, and the development of the technology associated with this task has also gone through several different phases. Early work for this task (Zelle and Mooney, 1996) automated the process of parsing database query by using inductive logic programming, but required heavy human efforts. With the development of deep learning, the use of neural networks for Text-to-sql parsing made a noticeable progress. Sequence-to-sequence model (Sutskever et al., 2014) implements the mapping of input sequences to output sequences through an encoder-decoder structure, and achieves even better performance since the introduction of the attention mechanism (Vaswani et al., 2017).

Over the past few years, encoders and decoders have received various improvements respectively (Qin et al., 2022). IRNet (Guo et al., 2019) used bi-directional LSTM to encode the question and used self-attention mechanism to encode the database schema, along with a decoder to generate the intermediate representation called SemQL query. SQL-Net (Xu et al., 2017) first proposed the sketch-based decoding method and performed well on the WikiSQL (Zhong et al., 2017) dataset. Due to the superior performance of pre-trained language models (PLMs) on multiple Natural Language Processing (NLP) tasks, SQLova (Hwang et al., 2019) first used BERT as the encoder and achieve human performance in WikiSQL dataset.

To better capture the relationship between the database schema, RAT-SQL (Wang et al., 2020) construct the encoder with the relation-aware self-attention mechanism, which broke new ground on the Spider (Yu et al., 2018) dataset. Furthermore, SADGA (Cai et al., 2021) and LGESQL (Cao et al., 2021) utilized graph neural network to encode the relational structure between the database schema and a given question. To enhance sketch-based decoding method, RYANSQL (Choi et al., 2021) employed convolutional neural network (CNN) with dense connection (Yoon et al., 2018) to encode each word of question and columns, and SDSQL (Binyuan et al., 2021) presented the Schema Dependency guided method to substitute previous

execution-guided (EG) decoding strategy (Wang et al., 2018).

These traditional methods cannot achieve human performance on the Spider (Yu et al., 2018) testing dataset. After the large language models (LLMs) have proved to be powerful in most of the NLP tasks, the text-to-SQL abilities of LLMs are evaluated on multiple benchmarks (Rajkumar et al., 2022). Early LLM based methods including QDecomp (Tai et al., 2023), C3 (Dong et al., 2023), QDMR (Wolfson et al., 2021) and DIN-SQL (Pourreza and Rafiei, 2023) focused on the strategy for task decomposition and reasoning, such as Chain of Thoughts (CoT) (Wei et al., 2022), least-to-most prompting (Zhou et al., 2022) and self-correction. To enhance the Text-to-SQL ability of LLM with In-context few-shot Learning (Brown et al., 2020), DAIL-SQL (Gao et al., 2023) proposed a new prompt engineering method based on question representation, demonstration selection and demonstration organization. Additionally, DTS-SQL (Pourreza and Rafiei, 2024) and CodeS (Li et al., 2024a) explored the potential of open source LLMs via supervised fine-tuning. Beyond those end-to-end generation methods, DEA-SQL (Xie et al., 2024) and MAC-SQL (Wang et al., 2024) adopted multi-agent framework or workflow paradigm to deal with complex databases and difficult problems such as BIRD dataset (Li et al., 2024b).

3 Methodology

As shown in Figure 2, our proposed framework consists of four Agents: **Soft Schema Linker**, **Targets-Conditions Decomposer**, **Sub-SQL Generator** and **Sub-SQL Refiner**. Among them, the Sub-SQL Generator and Sub-SQL Refiner together form the **Iterative Generating Module**.

Concretely, Soft Schema Linker performs soft column selection on the large database schema to reduce the amount of irrelevant information being described, while the Targets-Conditions Decomposer divides the question into a series of sub-questions. After that, the Sub-SQL Generator generates Sub-SQL for the current Sub-question each time based on the previous Sub-question and the previous Sub-SQL. Meanwhile, the Sub-SQL Refiner employs an external tool for Sub-SQL execution to get the feedback, and then refines incorrect SQL queries. The details of these agents will be introduced in the following sections.

3.1 Soft Schema Linker

Aiming to filter the large database schema and provide helpful information for SQL generator, the task of Soft Schema Linker can be divided into 5 parts: Schema Representation, Table Summarization, Value Retrieval, Entity-based Schema Linking and Soft Schema Construction .

3.1.1 Schema Representation

Before further analysis and processing of the database schema, we need to determine the database schema representation method. We serialise the information from a table into a **list**, and each item in the list is a **tuple** representing the information of a column. For each column, there is *column name*, *data type*, *column description* and *value examples*. Besides, *primary keys* and *foreign keys* also need to be listed additionally because of their importance. Therefore, the complete database schema of a specific database can be represented as:

$$S = \overline{T_1 : [C_1^1, \dots, C_1^n] \dots T_m : [C_m^1, \dots, C_m^n]; K_P; K_F} \quad (1)$$

$$C_m^n = (N_m^n < d_m^n >, D_m^n, V_m^n) \quad (2)$$

where T_m indicate the m-th table in this database, C_m^n denote the n-th column in T_m . As for each column, N_m^n is its name, $< d_m^n >$ is its data type such as INTEGER, D_m^n is its description, and V_m^n is the list of value examples in this column.

3.1.2 Table Summarization

In previous work, LLM was expected to select useful columns directly based on the relevance of each column to the natural language question. However, this could lead to a consequence that LLM is prone to errors if two or more columns in different tables have similar names, descriptions, and stored values. In reality, when SQL engineers see a table, they will first make a summary of the information stored in this table based on the columns in this table. And after seeing the question, they will find the most suitable table according to the specific needs at the first time, and then pick the corresponding columns. Therefore, we propose an extra step called Table Summarization, let LLM first make a summary of the information in each table, and then prompt LLM with both the summary and the complete database schema for column selection. We ask LLM to respond in the JSON format, as described in Figure 3.

```
```json
{
 "Table_1": Summary of Table_1,
 "Table_2": Summary of Table_2,
 ...,
 "Table_n": Summary of Table_n
}
```
```

Figure 3: Output Format of the Summary

3.1.3 Value Retrieval

Since LLM can't browse tables directly, LLM may select the incorrect columns when values of TEXT type appear in natural language questions, such as names of people, places, and other items. For example, for the question "Please list the zip code of all the charter schools in Fresno County Office of Education", the value "Fresno County Office of Education" is in the column $<District Name>$. However, LLM is only able to know 'Fresno County Office of Education' is a place name, which make it difficult to select the right one out of the multiple columns describing place names. In our experiment, LLM prefers to treat this value as the value of the column $<County>$ instead of $<District Name>$. If LLM is provided with matched database content, the possibility of choosing the correct column is greatly increased. In this work, we use longest common substring (LCS) algorithm to retrieved question-related values from database. We only apply this algorithm on data of text type and finally linearise the matched data and values to text, here is an example: *frpm. 'District Name'='Fresno County Office of Education';*

3.1.4 Entity-based Schema Linking

Since the columns in the SQL query statement and the entities in the natural language problem are one-to-one mapping, we present the **Entity-based Schema Linking** in order to achieve fine-grained column selection. The chain of thought approach is used to prompt LLM to complete the following steps:

- Extract the entities from the natural language question.
- Analyses the relevance based on Summary, Database schema and Hints.
- For each entity, find at least three most relevant columns (top3 columns sorted by rele-

vance), and then write this result into JSON format which is displayed in Figure 4:

```
```json
{
 "Entity_1": [Column_1,Column_2,Column_3],
 "Entity_2": [Column_1,Column_2,Column_3],
 ... ,
 "Entity_n": [Column_1,Column_2,Column_3],
}
```
```

Figure 4: Output Format of Linked Schema

3.1.5 Soft Schema Construction

In Text-to-SQL tasks, the database schema can be very large, but only a small percentage of the columns are really needed to be used. Besides, providing detailed information for all columns is costly, not to mention that irrelevant information will cause disturbance. Therefore, we need to pre-process the database schema, keeping only the information about useful columns. There are two approaches for columns selection, soft column selection and hard column selection (Sun et al., 2023). Soft column selection keep entire schema but add additional detailed descriptions for selected columns, while hard column selection removes all non-selected columns and retains the details of the chosen columns. In our work, we choose **soft column selection** because this method is able to reduce the length of the prompt while allowing the model to have access to the entire database schema, and we mark the additional information of the chosen columns as *Detailed description of tables and columns*. Figure 5 is an example of the whole soft schema which is constructed after schema linking:

```
[Database schema]
# country: [origin (INTEGER), country(TEXT)]
# price: [ID (INTEGER), price (REAL)]
# data: [...]
...
[Primary keys]
country.`origin` | price.ID | ...
...
[Foreign keys]
data.ID = price.ID
[Detailed descriptions of tables and columns]
country.`origin`: ... (Description). Value examples:[1,2,3].
country.`country`: ... (Description). Value examples: ['USA', 'Japan', 'Europe'].
```

Figure 5: Example of Soft Schema

3.2 Targets-Conditions Decomposer

Given the increasing complexity of natural language questions in Text-to-SQL tasks, generating SQL query in one step is not an good option. Therefore, recent work decompose a complex question into a series of sub-questions before solving them step by step. Nevertheless, previous work just gives LLM some (*Question, Sub-questions*) pairs as examples, and does not propose a decomposition criterion, which may lead to inconsistent granularity of question decomposition. In a word, the essence of question decomposition in Text-to-SQL tasks is ignored.

Therefore, we propose a **Targets-Conditions Decomposition** method, which ensures that all questions are decomposed according to the same criteria. This approach is based on the fact that all **queries** can be decomposed into the **targets** to be queried and the **conditions** used to filter the targets, including natural language questions in text-to-SQL task. Besides, the decomposition idea of Least-to-most Prompting proved to be effective in Text-t-SQL tasks, and this idea is also used in our method.




Figure 6: The Targets-Conditions Decomposer Agent

As shown in Figure 6, each sub-question is obtained by adding a condition to the previous sub-question except for the first one, while the first question is composed of targets and the first condition. If the number of conditions is less than or equal to one, then the original question does not need to be decomposed.

3.3 Sub-SQL Generator

As one of the most important Agents in our framework, the Sub-SQL Generator predicts Sub-SQL for the current Sub-question based on the previous Sub-question and the previous Sub-SQL. When

```

Given a [Database schema] description, a knowledge [Evidence] , a [Question] , a [Subquestion] extracted from [Question] and a [Sub-SQL] for the [Subquestion] , you need to use valid SQLite and understand the database and knowledge, and then generate a complete SQL for the [Question] based on [Sub-SQL] .
When generating SQL, we should always consider constraints:
[Constraints]
- In `SELECT <column>`, just select needed columns in the [Question] without any unnecessary column or value
- In `FROM <table>` or `JOIN <table>`, do not include unnecessary table
- If use max or min func, `JOIN <table>` FIRST, THEN use `SELECT MAX(<column>)` or `SELECT MIN(<column>)`
- If [Value examples] of <column> has 'None' or None, use `JOIN <table>` or `WHERE <column> IS NOT NULL` is better
- If use `ORDER BY <column> ASC|DESC`, add `GROUP BY <column>` before to select distinct values
- If include more than one table, use `JOIN <table>`
- If use `JOIN <table>`, the connected columns should be in the [Foreign keys]
- If evidence gives a formula for calculating a value, try to use that formula
- If use `ORDER BY <column> ASC LIMIT <n>`, please use `ORDER BY <column> ASC NULLS LAST LIMIT <n>` to make sure the null values will not be selected
=====
... #Few-shot demonstrations
=====
[Soft-linked database schema]
... #Soft-linked database schema including [Database schema] , [Primary keys] , [Foreign keys] and [Detailed descriptions of tables and columns]
[Evidence]
... #External knowledge
[Question]
... #Current Sub-question
[Subquestion]
... #Last Sub-question
[Sub-SQL]
... #Last Sub-SQL
[Matched values]
... #Retrieved values

[Subquestion] is decomposed from [Question] , now we provide Sub-SQL corresponding to Subquestion, you just need to complete the remaining conditions based on Sub-SQL to generate SQL for [Question] . Consider [Constraints] , extract hints from [Evidence] if [Evidence] is related to the [Question] , and then generate SQL after thinking step by step:

```

Figure 7: Prompt Template of Sub-SQL Generator

processing the first Sub-question, it will generate the first Sub-SQL directly. The purpose of this design is to allow the generator to add only one condition at a time to the previous Sub-SQL, which greatly reduces the difficulty of reasoning. In order to avoid the accumulation of errors that can be caused by previous incorrect Sub-SQL, we use the Sub-SQL Refiner to introduce intermediate supervision for the entire generation process.

As a Text-to-SQL dataset close to real-world applications, BIRD (Li et al., 2024b) highlights the new challenges of dirty and noisy database values, external knowledge grounding between NL questions and database values. Therefore, a wide variety of complex information will be put into the prompt, which poses a challenge for LLM to generate SQL query through in-context learning. To help LLM better understand and utilise the various pieces of information in the prompt, we adopt the CoT prompting method to explicitly take information from different parts of the prompt in the reasoning steps. The complete Prompt template for Sub-SQL Generaotr is shown in Figure 7, and the Chain of Thoughts example we provided is shown in Figure 9.

3.4 Sub-SQL Refiner

Since LLMs proved to have strong self-refine ability, we design the Sub-SQL Refiner to correct the

Sub-SQL with the feedback obtained after executing the Sub-SQL. If the currently processed Sub-question is not the last one, then the Sub-SQL corrected by the Refiner is returned to the Generator and used to generate the next Sub-SQL. Thus, Sub-SQL Generator and Sub-Refiner work together to form the Iterative Generating Module, allowing every intermediate step of the generating process to be supervised and calibrated.




Figure 8: The Sub-SQL Refiner Agent

As shown in Figure 8, after receiving the generated Sub-SQL, the Refiner will employ an execution tool to test the Sub-SQL’s execution feasibility. If the Sub-SQL can be executed successfully, the Refiner is about to determine whether the result retrieved from the database is empty or not, and

then a null value detection will be performed. If the executable validation is not passed, the Sub-SQL will be corrected by LLM based on the error information. Then the modified SQL statement will go through execution test again, and if it still fails the test, the process is going to be repeated until the result is correct or the maximum number of corrections is reached.




Figure 9: (a) The left image illustrates the CoT used to solve the first Sub-question, (b) The right image illustrates the CoT used for the other Sub-questions

4 Experiments

4.1 Experimental Setup

4.1.1 Datasets

Spider (Yu et al., 2018) is a large-scale, complex and cross-domain dataset which is widely used as a basic benchmark for Text-to-SQL, including 10,181 questions and 5,693 queries across 200 databases. Since earlier work had achieved near-human level results on Spider, we chose to focus on more difficult datasets. The recently proposed BIRD dataset (Li et al., 2024b) is a challenging benchmark including 95 large-scale real databases with dirty values, containing 12,751 unique question-SQL pairs. Compared with Spider, BIRD comprises more complex SQL queries and introduces external knowledge.

4.1.2 Metrics

Execution Accuracy (EX) EX indicates the correctness of the execution result of the predicted SQL. This metric takes into account different SQL representations for the same question, allowing for a more reasonable and accurate measurement of the results.

Valid Efficiency Score (VES) VES is a new metric introduced by BIRD dataset, measuring the efficiency of a valid SQL query based on the execution time. Our method also achieves an improvement in VES, but we do not include it in the experimental analyses because this metric is susceptible to environmental effects.

4.2 Baselines

We compare the proposed MAG-SQL approach with the following baselines based on In-context Learning methods with GPT-4:

GPT-4 (Achiam et al., 2023) uses the zero-shot prompt for Text-to-SQL task.

DIN-SQL (Pourreza and Rafiei, 2023) adopts task decomposition and applies different prompts for task with different complexity. The self-correction ability of LLM is also used in DIN-SQL.

DAIL-SQL (Gao et al., 2023) focuses on question representation, demonstration selection and demonstration organization.

MAC-SQL (Wang et al., 2024) first employs multi-agent framework to solve Text-to-SQL task based on three agents.

4.3 Results and Analysis

4.3.1 BIRD Results

Since the test set of the BIRD benchmark is not available, we evaluated MAG-SQL on the dev set. Especially, we assessed our approach using both GPT-4 and GPT-3.5. As indicated in Table 1, MAG-SQL achieved significant performance gains on the BIRD dataset.

| Method | BIRD dev |
|--------------------------|--------------|
| MAG-SQL + GPT-4 | 61.08 |
| MAG-SQL + GPT-3.5 | 57.62 |
| MAC-SQL + GPT-4 | 57.56 |
| DAIL-SQL + GPT-4 | 54.76 |
| DIN-SQL + GPT-4 | 50.72 |
| MAC-SQL + GPT-3.5 | 50.56 |
| GPT-4 | 46.35 |

Table 1: BIRD results

It can be noticed that the result of MAG-SQL is 3.52% better than that of MAC-SQL when using GPT-4 as backbone, with a 14.73% performance

| Method | Simple | Moderate | Challenging | All |
|------------------------|--------|----------|-------------|-------|
| MAG-SQL + GPT3.5 | 65.94 | 46.24 | 40.97 | 57.62 |
| w/o Soft Schema Linker | 62.05 | 39.78 | 36.81 | 52.93 |
| w/o Decomposer | 64.86 | 44.08 | 33.33 | 55.60 |
| w/o Sub-SQL Refiner | 57.73 | 34.41 | 32.64 | 48.31 |

Table 2: Execution accuracy of MAG-SQL on BIRD dev set in agents ablation study

| Method | Simple | Moderate | Challenging | All |
|-------------------------|--------|----------|-------------|-------|
| MAG-SQL + GPT3.5 | 65.94 | 46.24 | 40.97 | 57.62 |
| w/o Table Summarization | 64.21 | 45.81 | 38.89 | 56.26 |
| w/o Value Retrieval | 64.00 | 45.37 | 38.19 | 55.93 |

Table 3: Execution accuracy of MAG-SQL on BIRD dev set in Soft Schema Linker’s components ablation study

improvement over using a single GPT-4. Moreover, MAG-SQL + GPT-3.5 has outperformed MAC-SQL + GPT-4, attaining the highest performance among all previous methods based on GPT-3.5, which proves that our method can greatly stimulate the potential of LLMs.

4.3.2 Spider Results

To demonstrate the generalisability of our approach, we also evaluated MAG-SQL on the Spider dataset. Without any modification, MAG-SQL obtained 11.9% improvement over GPT-4 (zero-shot), which proves the robustness of our method. However, since the Spider dataset lacks column description and external knowledge that would occur in real life problems, many components in MAG-SQL don’t work, and the CoT templates and demonstrations in our prompt differ a little from the data in Spider. Therefore, our method do not reach its full potential on the Spider dataset without adjustments.

| Method | Spider dev | Spider test |
|------------------------|-------------|-------------|
| MAG-SQL + GPT-4 | 85.3 | 85.6 |
| MAC-SQL + GPT-4 | 86.8 | 82.8 |
| DAIL-SQL + GPT-4 | 84.4 | 86.6 |
| DIN-SQL + GPT-4 | 82.8 | 85.3 |
| GPT-4 (zero-shot) | 73.4 | - |

Table 4: Spider results

4.3.3 Ablation Study

Agents Ablation Table 2 presents the execution accuracy (EX) on BIRD dev set across various difficulty levels, where different agents are removed. Specifically, for the experiment of MAG-SQL without Targets-Conditions Decomposer, not only did

we omit the Decomposer, but we also changed the iterative generating module to a one-time generating module and modified the prompt with CoT to keep it consistent. The findings show that each agent in MAG-SQL is important for performance enhancement, as removing any of them will result in decreased accuracy across all difficulty levels.

Components Ablation In MAG-SQL, the work of Soft Schema Linker consists of four parts: Table Summarization, Value Retrieval, Entity-based Schema Linking and Soft Schema Construction. Since Entity-based Schema Linking and Soft Schema Construction are indispensable, we conducted the ablation experiments of the components in Soft Schema Linker by omitting Table Summarization or Value Retrieval. As reported in Table 3, every component plays a positive role in the process of schema linking.

5 Conclusion

In this paper, we propose a novel multi-agent generative approach for efficient Text-to-SQL, with different agents performing their respective roles. Concretely, our workflow consists of four LLM-based agents, which provides new ideas for schema-linking, question decomposition, SQL generation and SQL correction. We have conducted fine-grained task decomposition and detailed task planning for Text-to-SQL, which fully unleashes the potential of LLMs. With equivalent model configurations, our approach achieves better performance on the BIRD dataset than all previous work at the time of writing this paper. Moreover, the results achieved by using GPT-3.5 as the backbone of our method have approached or even surpassed those of some previous GPT-4 based methods.

6 Limitations

Although our approach has achieved significant improvements on the Text-to-SQL task, there is still a gap compared to human performance. Every agent in our method could benefit from further improvements. Besides, there are three limitations in our work.

Single closed-source backbone Currently, MAG-SQL is implemented based on a closed-source LLM, and the results are likely to be further improved if we use open-source domain-specific LLMs instead of closed-source general LLMs. For instance, the Sub-SQL Generator could be replaced with an open-source LLM that have been fine-tuned to generate SQL statements.

Fixed Workflow We have pre-defined the workflow of MAG-SQL, thus the pipeline is fixed during the whole process, which reduces the flexibility of the multi-agent framework. In the future, we hope to implement a multi-agent system that can autonomously plan tasks and dynamically invoke various tools. Moreover, we believe that the multi-agent collaboration mechanisms can be further optimised by methods such as reinforcement learning.

Unstable Output There is another phenomenon to be aware of. Since the output of the LLM is probability-based and not stable, it is often the case that for the same instance, the LLM can get it right one time and wrong the next time. One current solution is using a large number of samples from LLMs, but this approach is costly, and if there is a better solution to this problem, then the final result will achieve a significant breakthrough. We leave this for future work.

References

- Josh Achiam, Steven Adler, Sandhini Agarwal, Lama Ahmad, Ilge Akkaya, Florencia Leoni Aleman, Diogo Almeida, Janko Altenschmidt, Sam Altman, Shyamal Anadkat, et al. 2023. Gpt-4 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774*.
- Hui Binyuan, Xiang Shi, Ruiying Geng, Binhua Li, Yongbin Li, Jian Sun, and Xiaodan Zhu. 2021. Improving text-to-sql with schema dependency learning. *Cornell University - arXiv, Cornell University - arXiv*.
- T.B. Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Askell Amanda, Sandhini Agarwal, Ariel Herbert-Voss, Gretchen Krueger, Henighan Tom, Rewon Child, A. Ramesh, Daniel M. Ziegler, Jeffrey Wu, Clemens Winter, Christopher Hesse, Mark Chen, Eric J. Sigler, Mateusz Litwin, Scott Gray, Chess Benjamin, Jack Clark, Christopher Berner, McCandlish Sam, Alec Radford, Ilya Sutskever, and Dario Amodei. 2020. Language models are few-shot learners. *arXiv: Computation and Language, arXiv: Computation and Language*.
- Ruichu Cai, Jinjie Yuan, Boyan Xu, and Zhifeng Hao. 2021. Sadga: Structure-aware dual graph aggregation network for text-to-sql. *Neural Information Processing Systems, Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- Ruisheng Cao, Lu Chen, Zhi Chen, Yanbin Zhao, Su Zhu, and Kai Yu. 2021. Lgesql: Line graph enhanced text-to-sql model with mixed local and non-local relations. In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)*.
- DongHyun Choi, Myeong Cheol Shin, EungGyun Kim, and Dong Ryeol Shin. 2021. Ryansql: Recursively applying sketch-based slot fillings for complex text-to-sql in cross-domain databases. *Computational Linguistics*, page 1–24.
- Xuemei Dong, Chao Zhang, Yuhang Ge, Yuren Mao, Yunjun Gao, Jinshu Lin, Dongfang Lou, et al. 2023. C3: Zero-shot text-to-sql with chatgpt. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.07306*.
- Dawei Gao, Haibin Wang, Yaliang Li, Xiuyu Sun, Yichen Qian, Bolin Ding, and Jingren Zhou. 2023. Text-to-sql empowered by large language models: A benchmark evaluation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.15363*.
- Jiaqi Guo, Zecheng Zhan, Yan Gao, Yan Xiao, Jian-Guang Lou, Ting Liu, and Dongmei Zhang. 2019. Towards complex text-to-sql in cross-domain database with intermediate representation. *arXiv: Computation and Language, arXiv: Computation and Language*.
- Wonseok Hwang, Jinyeung Yim, Seung-Hyun Park, and Minjoon Seo. 2019. A comprehensive exploration on wikisql with table-aware word contextualization. *Cornell University - arXiv, Cornell University - arXiv*.
- Dongjun Lee, Choongwon Park, Jaehyuk Kim, and Heesoo Park. 2024. Mcs-sql: Leveraging multiple prompts and multiple-choice selection for text-to-sql generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.07467*.
- Haoyang Li, Jing Zhang, Hanbing Liu, Ju Fan, Xiaokang Zhang, Jun Zhu, Renjie Wei, Hongyan Pan, Cuiping Li, and Hong Chen. 2024a. Codes: Towards building open-source language models for text-to-sql. *Proceedings of the ACM on Management of Data*, 2(3):1–28.

- Jinyang Li, Binyuan Hui, Ge Qu, Jiayi Yang, Binhua Li, Bowen Li, Bailin Wang, Bowen Qin, Ruiying Geng, Nan Huo, et al. 2024b. 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.
- Mohammadreza Pourreza and Davood Rafiei. 2023. Din-sql: Decomposed in-context learning of text-to-sql with self-correction. *NeurIPS 2023*.
- Mohammadreza Pourreza and Davood Rafiei. 2024. Dts-sql: Decomposed text-to-sql with small large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.01117*.
- Bowen Qin, Binyuan Hui, Lihan Wang, Min Yang, Jinyang Li, Binhua Li, Ruiying Geng, Rongyu Cao, Jian Sun, Luo Si, et al. 2022. A survey on text-to-sql parsing: Concepts, methods, and future directions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2208.13629*.
- Nitarshan Rajkumar, Raymond Li, and Dzmitry Bahdanau. 2022. Evaluating the text-to-sql capabilities of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.00498*.
- Ruoxi Sun, Sercan Ö Arik, Alex Muzio, Lesly Miculicich, Satya Gundabathula, Pengcheng Yin, Hanjun Dai, Hootan Nakhost, Rajarishi Sinha, Zifeng Wang, et al. 2023. Sql-palm: Improved large language model adaptation for text-to-sql (extended). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.00739*.
- Ilya Sutskever, Oriol Vinyals, and QuocV. Le. 2014. Sequence to sequence learning with neural networks. *arXiv: Computation and Language, arXiv: Computation and Language*.
- Chang-You Tai, Ziru Chen, Tianshu Zhang, Xiang Deng, and Huan Sun. 2023. Exploring chain-of-thought style prompting for text-to-sql. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.14215*.
- Shayan Talaei, Mohammadreza Pourreza, Yu-Chen Chang, Azalia Mirhoseini, and Amin Saberi. 2024. Chess: Contextual harnessing for efficient sql synthesis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.16755*.
- Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, AidanN. Gomez, Lukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. 2017. Attention is all you need. *Neural Information Processing Systems, Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- Bailin Wang, Richard Shin, Xiaodong Liu, Oleksandr Polozov, and Matthew Richardson. 2020. [Rat-sql: Relation-aware schema encoding and linking for text-to-sql parsers](#). In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*.
- Bing Wang, Changyu Ren, Jian Yang, Xinnian Liang, Jiaqi Bai, Linzheng Chai, Zhao Yan, Qian-Wen Zhang, Di Yin, Xing Sun, et al. 2024. Mac-sql: A multi-agent collaborative framework for text-to-sql. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.11242*.
- Chenglong Wang, Kedar Tatwawadi, Marc Brockschmidt, Po-Sen Huang, Yi Mao, Oleksandr Polozov, and Rishabh Singh. 2018. Robust text-to-sql generation with execution-guided decoding. *arXiv: Computation and Language, arXiv: Computation and Language*.
- 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.
- Tomer Wolfson, Daniel Deutch, and Jonathan Berant. 2021. Weakly supervised text-to-sql parsing through question decomposition. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.06311*.
- Yuanzhen Xie, Xinzhou Jin, Tao Xie, MingXiong Lin, Liang Chen, Chenyun Yu, Lei Cheng, ChengXiang Zhuo, Bo Hu, and Zang Li. 2024. Decomposition for enhancing attention: Improving llm-based text-to-sql through workflow paradigm. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.10671*.
- Xiaojun Xu, Chang Liu, and Dawn Song. 2017. Sqlnet: Generating structured queries from natural language without reinforcement learning. *Cornell University - arXiv, Cornell University - arXiv*.
- Deunsol Yoon, Dongbok Lee, and SangKeun Lee. 2018. Dynamic self-attention: Computing attention over words dynamically for sentence embedding. *arXiv: Learning, arXiv: Learning*.
- Tao Yu, Rui Zhang, Kai Yang, Michihiro Yasunaga, Dongxu Wang, Zifan Li, James Ma, Irene Li, Qingning Yao, Shanelle Roman, Zilin Zhang, and Dragomir Radev. 2018. [Spider: A large-scale human-labeled dataset for complex and cross-domain semantic parsing and text-to-sql task](#). In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*.
- JohnM. Zelle and RaymondJ. Mooney. 1996. Learning to parse database queries using inductive logic programming. *National Conference on Artificial Intelligence, National Conference on Artificial Intelligence*.
- Victor Zhong, Caiming Xiong, and Richard Socher. 2017. Seq2sql: Generating structured queries from natural language using reinforcement learning. *Cornell University - arXiv, Cornell University - arXiv*.
- Denny Zhou, Nathanael Schärli, Le Hou, Jason Wei, Nathan Scales, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Claire Cui, Olivier Bousquet, Quoc Le, et al. 2022. Least-to-most prompting enables complex reasoning in large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.10625*.

A Prompts

A.1 Prompt of Entity-based Schema Linking

As an experienced and professional database manager, your task is to analyze a user question and a database schema to select relevant information. The database schema consists of table descriptions, each containing multiple column descriptions. Your goal is to extract the entities from question and identify the relevant tables and columns based on these entities and the evidence provided.

##Instruction:

1. Extract the mentioned entities from the user question. Make sure all of the entities are extracted.
2. For each entity, keep at least 3 related columns.
4. Your output should include entity extraction, analysis and related database schema.
5. The related database schema should be in JSON format.
6. Each column's information in provided [Schema] is in this format: (column, description. Value examples<optional>)

##Requirements:

1. Sort the related columns in each list corresponding to each entity in descending order of relevance.
2. The chosen columns should be in this format: <table.column>.
3. Make sure each chosen list is not empty. The value [] will be punished.
- 4.[Matched values] may contain redundant or useless information in addition to the correct matching values, so you need to select the useful information in conjunction with the specific column names and descriptions.
5. An entity may not have a corresponding evidence, which requires you to find the relevant columns yourself through your understanding of the database schema.

Here is a new example, please start answering:

[DB_ID]

[Schema]

[Primary keys]

[Foreign keys]

[Question]

[Evidence]

[Matched values]

Since some of the specific values in Question and evidence match the data in the database, here are some matches retrieved from the database that may help you in selecting columns (You need to ignore matches that are not relevant to the question):

[Answer]

Table 5: Instruction of Entity-based Schema Linking

```

[DB_ID] banking_system
[Schema]
# Table: account
[
(account_id <INTEGER>, the id of the account. Value examples: [11382, 11362, 2, 1, 2367].),
(district_id <INTEGER>, location of branch. Value examples: [77, 76, 2, 1, 39].),
(frequency <TEXT>, frequency of the account. Value examples: ['POPLATEK MIESICNE', 'POPLATEK TYDNE', 'POPLATEK PO OBRATU'].),
(date <DATE>, the creation date of the account. Value examples: ['1997-12-29', '1997-12-28'].)
]
# Table: client
[
(client_id <INTEGER>, the unique number. Value examples: [13998, 13971, 2, 1, 2839].),
(gender <TEXT>, gender. Value examples: ['M', 'F']. And F: female . M: male ),
(birth_date <DATE>, birth date. Value examples: ['1987-09-27', '1986-08-13'].),
(district_id <INTEGER>, location of branch. Value examples: [77, 76, 2, 1, 39].),
(first_name <TEXT>, first_name.),
(last_name <TEXT>, last_name.)
]
# Table: loan
[
(loan_id <INTEGER>, the id number identifying the loan data. Value examples: [4959, 4960, 4961].),
(account_id <INTEGER>, the id number identifying the account. Value examples: [10, 80, 55, 43].),
(date <DATE>, the date when the loan is approved. Value examples: ['1998-07-12', '1998-04-19'].),
(amount <INTEGER>, the id number identifying the loan data. Value examples: [1567, 7877, 9988].),
(duration <INTEGER>, the id number identifying the loan data. Value examples: [60, 48, 24, 12, 36].),
(payments <INTEGER>, the id number identifying the loan data. Value examples: [3456, 8972, 9845].),
(status <TEXT>, the id number identifying the loan data. Value examples: ['C', 'A', 'D', 'B'].)
]
# Table: district
[
(district_id <INTEGER>, location of branch. Value examples: [77, 76].),
(A2 <REAL>, area in square kilometers. Value examples: [50.5, 48.9].),
(A4 <INTEGER>, number of inhabitants. Value examples: [95907, 95616].),
(A5 <INTEGER>, number of households. Value examples: [35678, 34892].),
(A6 <REAL>, literacy rate. Value examples: [95.6, 92.3, 89.7].),
(A7 <INTEGER>, number of entrepreneurs. Value examples: [1234, 1456].),
(A8 <INTEGER>, number of cities. Value examples: [5, 4].),
(A9 <INTEGER>, number of schools. Value examples: [15, 12, 10].),
(A10 <INTEGER>, number of hospitals. Value examples: [8, 6, 4].),
(A11 <REAL>, average salary. Value examples: [12541.5, 11277].),
(A12 <REAL>, poverty rate. Value examples: [12.4, 9.8].),
(A13 <REAL>, unemployment rate. Value examples: [8.2, 7.9].),
(A15 <INTEGER>, number of crimes. Value examples: [256, 189].)
]
[Primary keys]
account.`account_id` | client.`client_id` | loan.`loan_id` | district.`district_id`
[Foreign keys]
client.`district_id` = district.`district_id`
[Question]
What is the gender of the youngest client who opened account in the lowest average salary branch and when did this client open the account? Please list their full name.
[Evidence]
Later birthdate refers to younger age; A11 refers to average salary; Full name refers to first_name, last_name
[Matched values]
Since some of the specific values in Question and evidence match the data in the database, here are some matches retrieved from the database that may help you in selecting columns (You need to ignore matches that are not relevant to the question):
No matched values.
[Answer]
The entities extracted from the [Question] are:
1. gender;
2. youngest client;
3. account;
4. lowest average salary branch;
5. when did this client open the account;
6. full name

Extract the related evidence in [Evidence] for entities if [Evidence] is not None:
1. gender --no related evidence **the columns about gender are related**
2. youngest client --Later birthdate refers to younger age; **the columns about birth date of client and the id of client are related**
3. account --no related evidence **the columns about account or account ids are related**
4. lowest average salary branch --A11 refers to average salary **the columns about average salary and branch are related**
5. when did this client open the account --no related evidence **the columns about time or date of the account are related**
6. full name --Full name refers to first_name, last_name **the columns about first_name, last_name of the client are related**

Therefore, we can select the related database schema based on these entities with [Evidence] :
```json
{
 "gender": ["client.gender", "client.client_id", "loan.status"],
 "youngest client": ["client.birth_date", "client.client_id", "account.date", "loan.date"],
 "account": ["account.account_id", "loan.account_id", "account.date"],
 "lowest average salary branch": ["district.A11", "district.district_id", "district.A13"],
 "when did this client open the account": ["account.date", "loan.date", "client.birth_date"],
 "full name": ["client.first_name", "client.last_name", "client.client_id"]
}
```
Question Solved.

```

Figure 10: ICL example of Entity-based Schema Linking

A.2 Prompt of Table Summarization

##instruction

Given the database schema, you need to summarise the data stored in each table in one sentence, based on the name of the table and the columns in the table.

##Requirements

- Your output should be in json format
- The Summary of each table is supposed to be expressed in one sentence

Here is a new case:

[DB_ID]

[Schema]

[Summary]

Table 6: Instruction of Table Summarization

A.3 Prompt of Targets-Conditions Decomposition

##Instruction

Given a [query], you need to understanding the intent of Query, and then deecompose it into Targets and Conditions. Then you need to combine Targets and Conditions into Subquerys step by step. For the case where Conditions is NULL, consider Targets as the final Subquery directly. For the case where Conditions are not NULL, combine Targets and the first Condition to get the first Subquery, then combine this Subquery and the next Condition into a new Subquery until all Conditions are used (which means the content of the last Subquery and the original Query is the same).

##Requirements

- Try not to overlap Targets and Conditions.
- Make sure the decomposed Target and Condition can cover all of the information in Query.
- Don't change any information (specific value) in Query!
- Mark each Subquery with ## in front of it.

Here is a new query need to be decomposed:

[Query]

[Evidence]

[Decomposition]

Table 7: Instruction of Decomposition

[Query]
Show the stadium name and the number of concerts in each stadium. Please also list the year the stadium was built.
[Evidence]
NULL

[Decomposition]
Targets: List the stadium name, the year the stadium built and the number of concerts in each stadium
Conditions: NULL

Subqueries:
1. Since Conditions is NULL, the final Subquery is the Targets.
##Subquery: List the stadium name, the year the stadium built and the number of concerts in each stadium
=====

[Query]
What is the qualification rate for the H-11 products produced in 2023/11/2?
[Evidence]
qualification rate = `Numqualified(H-11)` / `production(H-11)`

[Decomposition]
Targets: List the qualification rate for the H-11 Products
Conditions:
1. produced in 2023/11/2 --Condition_1

Subqueries:
1. Combine Targets and Condition_1 to get the first Subquery.
##Subquery: List the qualification rate for the H-11 Products produced in 2023/11/2
=====

[Query]
List the race of institutions in Alabama with number of students greater than the 90% of average number of students of all institutions?
[Evidence]
Alabama refers to state = 'Alabama'; number of students greater than the 90% of average = MULTIPLY(AVG(student_count), 90%) < student_count

[Decomposition]
Targets: List the race of institutions
Conditions:
1. in Alabama --Condition_1
2. number of students greater than the 90% of average number of students of all institutions --Condition_2

Subqueries:
1. Combine Targets and Condition_1 to get the first Subquery.
##Subquery: List the race of institution in Alabama
2. Combine the first Subquery and Condition_2 to get the second Subquery.
##Subquery: List the race of institutions in Alabama with number of number of students greater than the 90% of average number of students of all institutions
=====

[Query]
Which president got a higher approval rating, Joseph Biden or Donald Trump?
[Evidence]
NULL

[Decomposition]
Targets: List the name of the president who got a higher approval rating between Joseph Biden or Donald Trump
Conditions:
NULL

Subqueries:
1. Since Conditions is NULL, the final Subquery is the Targets.
##Subquery: List the name of the president who got a higher approval rating between Joseph Biden or Donald Trump
=====

[Query]
For movie id 1269, how many users, who was a paying subscriber and was eligible for trial when he rated the movie, gave the movie a rating score of less than or equal to 2?
[Evidence]
NULL

[Decomposition]
Targets: List the number of users
Conditions:
1. was a paying subscriber --Condition_1
2. was eligible for trial --Condition_2
3. for movie id 1269, gave the movie a rating score of less than or equal to 2 --Condition3

Subqueries:
1. Combine Targets and Condition_1 to get the first Subquery.
##Subquery: List the number of users who was a paying subscriber
2. Combine the first Subquery and Condition_2 to get the second Subquery.
##Subquery: List the number of users who was a paying subscriber and was eligible for trial
3. Combine the second Subquery and Condition_3 to get the third Subquery.
##Subquery: List the number of users who was a paying subscriber and was eligible for trial and gave the movie whose id is 1269 a rating score of less than or equal to 2

Figure 11: ICL examples of Decomposition

A.4 Prompt of Sub-SQL Generation

Given a [Database schema] description, a knowledge [Evidence] and a [Question], you need to use valid SQLite and understand the database and knowledge so that you can generate a good SQL for the [Question]. When generating SQL, we should always consider constraints:

[Constraints]

- In 'SELECT <column>', just select needed columns in the [Question] without any unnecessary column or value
- In 'FROM <table>' or 'JOIN <table>', do not include unnecessary table
- If use max or min func, 'JOIN <table>' FIRST, THEN use 'SELECT MAX(<column>)' or 'SELECT MIN(<column>)'
- If [Value examples] of <column> has 'None' or None, use 'JOIN <table>' or 'WHERE <column> is NOT NULL' is better
- If use 'ORDER BY <column> ASCIDESC', add 'GROUP BY <column>' before to select distinct values
- If include more than one table, use 'JOIN <table>'
- If use 'JOIN <table>', the connected columns should be in the [Foreign keys]
- If evidence gives a formula for calculating a value, try to use that formula
- If use 'ORDER BY <column> ASC LIMIT <n>', please use 'ORDER BY <column> ASC NULLS LAST LIMIT <n>' to make sure the null values will not be selected

[Database schema]

[Primary keys]

[Foreign keys]

[Detailed descriptions of tables and columns]

[Evidence]

[Question]

[Matched values]

Since some of the specific values in Question and evidence match the data in the database, here are some matches retrieved from the database that may help you to generate SQL (Matched values may contain useless information and you should ignore matches that are not relevant to the question):

Consider [Constraints], extract hints from [Evidence] if [Evidence] is related to the [Question], select columns from [Database schema] and then generate SQL for [Question], you need to think step by step:

Table 8: Instruction of First-step Generation


```

Database schema]
# country: [origin (INTEGER), country(TEXT)]
# price: [ID (INTEGER), price (REAL)]
# data: [ID (INTEGER), mpg (REAL), cylinders (INTEGER), displacement (TEXT), horsepower (REAL), weight (REAL), acceleration (REAL), model (TEXT), car_name (TEXT)]
# production: [ID (INTEGER), model_year (INTEGER), country (INTEGER)]
  [Primary keys]
country.`origin` | price.`ID` | data.`ID` | production.`ID`
  [Foreign keys]
data.`ID` = price.`ID`
production.`ID` = price.`ID`
production.`ID` = data.`ID`
production.`country` = country.`origin`
  [Detailed descriptions of tables and columns]
country.`origin`: The column 'origin' in Table <country> has column descriptions of "the unique identifier for the origin country". Value examples: [1, 2, 3].
country.`country`: The column 'country' in Table <country> has column descriptions of "the origin country of the car". Value examples: ['USA', 'Japan', 'Europe'].
data.`horsepower`: The column 'horsepower' in Table <data> has column descriptions of "horse power associated with the car".
data.`acceleration`: The column 'acceleration' in Table <data> has column descriptions of "acceleration of the car in miles per squared hour".
production.`country`: The column 'country' in Table <production> has column descriptions of "country id to which the car belongs". Value examples: [1, 2, 3].
  [Evidence]
the fastest refers to max(horsepower); name of the car refers to car_name
  [Question]
What is the fastest car made by Japan?
  [Matched values]
Since some of the specific values in Question and evidence match the data in the database, here are some matches retrieved from the database that may help you to
generate SQL (Matched values may contain useless information and you should ignore matches that are not relevant to the question):
country.`country` = 'Japan'

Consider [Constraints] , extract hints from [Evidence] if [Evidence] is related to the [Question] , select columns from [Database schema] and then
generate SQL for [Question] , you need to think step by step:
  [Question] : What is the fastest car made by Japan?
Targets for "SELECT": the name of the fastest car
hints from [Evidence] : the fastest refers to max(horsepower); name of the car refers to car_name
For the entities in the [Question] , get corresponding columns from [Database schema] with hints: car refers to data.`car_name`, the fastest refers to
MAX(data.`horsepower`), Japan refers to country.`country`
Connection of tables: includes tables <data> and <country>, since <data> and <country> are not connected directly, use <production> as a bridge, get connected keys
from [Foreign keys] : production.`ID` = data.`ID`, production.`country` = country.`origin`
Final SQL:
```sql
SELECT T1.`car_name`
FROM data AS T1
INNER JOIN production AS T2
ON T1.`ID` = T2.`ID`
INNER JOIN country AS T3
ON T3.`origin` = T2.`country`
WHERE T3.`country` = 'Japan'
ORDER BY T1.`horsepower` DESC LIMIT 1
```
Question Solved.

```

Figure 12: ICL examples of First-step Generation

Given a [Database schema] description, a knowledge [Evidence] and a [Question], you need to use valid SQLite and understand the database and knowledge so that you can generate a good SQL for the [Question]. When generating SQL, we should always consider constraints:

[Constraints]

- In 'SELECT <column>', just select needed columns in the [Question] without any unnecessary column or value
- In 'FROM <table>' or 'JOIN <table>', do not include unnecessary table
- If use max or min func, 'JOIN <table>' FIRST, THEN use 'SELECT MAX(<column>)' or 'SELECT MIN(<column>)'
- If [Value examples] of <column> has 'None' or None, use 'JOIN <table>' or 'WHERE <column> is NOT NULL' is better
- If use 'ORDER BY <column> ASCIDESC', add 'GROUP BY <column>' before to select distinct values
- If include more than one table, use 'JOIN <table>'
- If use 'JOIN <table>', the connected columns should be in the [Foreign keys]
- If evidence gives a formula for calculating a value, try to use that formula
- If use 'ORDER BY <column> ASC LIMIT <n>', please use 'ORDER BY <column> ASC NULLS LAST LIMIT <n>' to make sure the null values will not be selected

[Database schema]

[Primary keys]

[Foreign keys]

[Detailed descriptions of tables and columns]

[Evidence]

[Question]

[Subquestion]

[Sub-SQL]

[Matched values]

Since some of the specific values in Question and evidence match the data in the database, here are some matches retrieved from the database that may help you to generate SQL (Matched values may contain useless information and you should ignore matches that are not relevant to the question):

[Subquestion] is decomposed from [Question], now we provide Sub-SQL corresponding to Subquestion, you just need to complete the remaining conditions based on Sub-SQL to generate SQL for [Question]. Consider [Constraints], extract hints from [Evidence] if [Evidence] is related to the [Question], and then generate SQL after thinking step by step:

Table 9: Instruction of Next-step Generation

```

【Database schema】
# institution_details: [unitid (INTEGER), chronname (TEXT), city (TEXT), state (TEXT), site (TEXT), student_count(TEXT)]
# institution_grads: [unitid (INTEGER), gender (TEXT), race (TEXT), cohort (TEXT)]
【Primary keys】
institution_details.`unitid` | institution_grads.`unitid`
【Foreign keys】
institution_grads.`unitid` = institution_details.`unitid`
【Detailed descriptions of tables and columns】
institution_details.`unitid`: The column 'unitid' in Table <institution_details> has column descriptions of "Education Unit ID number".
institution_details.`state`: The column 'state' in Table <institution_details> has column descriptions of "Institution state".
institution_details.`student_count`: The column 'student_count' in Table <institution_details> has column descriptions of "Total number of undergraduates in 2010".
institution_grads.`race`: The column 'race' in Table <institution_grads> has column descriptions of "race/ethnicity of students". Value examples: ['X', 'AI', 'A', 'B', 'H'].
【Evidence】
Alabama refers to state = 'Alabama'; number of students greater than the 90% of average = MULTIPLY(AVG(student_count), 90%) < student_count
【Question】
List the race of institutions in Alabama with number of students greater than the 90% of average number of students of all institutions?
【Subquestion】
List the race of institutions in 'Alabama'.
【Sub-SQL】
...
SELECT DISTINCT T1.`race` FROM institution_grads AS T1 INNER JOIN institution_details AS T2 ON T1.`unitid` = T2.`unitid` WHERE T2.`state` = 'Alabama'
...
【Matched values】
Since some of the specific values in Question and evidence match the data in the database, here are some matches retrieved from the database that may help you to
generate SQL (Matched values may contain useless information and you should ignore matches that are not relevant to the question):
institution_details.`city` = 'Alabama'; institution_details.`state` = 'Alabama'

【Subquestion】 is decomposed from 【Question】 , now we provide Sub-SQL corresponding to Subquestion, you just need to complete the remaining conditions
based on Sub-SQL to generate SQL for 【Question】 . Consider 【Constraints】 , extract hints from 【Evidence】 if 【Evidence】 is related to the 【Question】 , and
then generate SQL after thinking step by step:
hints from 【Evidence】 : Alabama refers to state = 'Alabama'; number of students greater than the 90% of average = MULTIPLY(AVG(student_count), 90%) <
student_count
There is a formula in 【Evidence】 , so we can turn it into SQL format: institution_details.`student_count` > ( SELECT AVG('student_count') * 0.9 FROM
institution_details )
Find necessary columns from 【Database schema】 in addition to Sub-SQL: number of students refers to institution_details.`student_count`
Connection of tables: the table <institution_details> is already in Sub-SQL, no more connection is needed
Final SQL:
```sql
SELECT DISTINCT T1.`race`
FROM institution_grads AS T1
INNER JOIN institution_details AS T2
ON T1.`unitid` = T2.`unitid`
WHERE T2.`student_count` > (
 SELECT AVG('student_count') * 0.9 FROM institution_details
)
AND T2.`state` = 'Alabama'
...
Question solved.

```

Figure 13: ICL examples of Next-step Generation

## A.5 Prompt of Sub-SQL Refinement

---

[Instruction]

When executing SQL below, some errors occurred, please fix up SQL based on query and database info. Solve the task step by step if you need to. Using SQL format in the code block, and indicate script type in the code block. When you find an answer, verify the answer carefully. Include verifiable evidence in your response if possible.

[Constraints]

- The SQL should start with 'SELECT'
- In 'SELECT <column>', just select needed columns in the [Question] without any unnecessary column or value
- In 'FROM <table>' or 'JOIN <table>', do not include unnecessary table
- If use 'JOIN <table>', the connected columns should be in the Foreign keys of [Database schema]

[Response format]

Your response should be in this format:

Analysis:

\*\*(Your analysis)\*\*

Correct SQL:

```
““sql
(the fixed SQL)
““
```

[Attention]

Only SQL statements are allowed in (the fixed SQL), do not add any comments.

[Evidence]

[Query]

[Database info]

[Primary keys]

[Foreign keys]

[Detailed descriptions of tables and columns]

[old SQL]

[SQLite error]

[Exception class]

Now please fixup old SQL and generate new SQL again. [correct SQL]

---

Table 10: Zero-shot prompt for general case

```

[Typical examples]
For the error called "no data selected", a possible cause is:
When using nested SQL, using the MIN or MAX function in the sub-SQL may result in null data in the end. Because when multiple tables are joined, they are connected
by foreign keys and contain only some data in common, the maximum or minimum value of a column in a table may not be in the joined table.
Here are some typical examples.
1. Wrong SQL:
...
SELECT T1.`date` FROM recordtime AS T1 INNER JOIN information AS T2 ON T1.`id` = T2.`id` WHERE T2.`viewers` = (SELECT MAX(`viewers`) FROM information)
...
Analysis: **Using the MAX function in a nested SQL statement will result in a mismatch because the maximum or minimum value of the column may not be in the
joined table, so use `ORDER BY`!**
Correct SQL:
```sql
SELECT T1.`date`
FROM recordtime AS T1
INNER JOIN information AS T2
ON T1.`id` = T2.`id`
ORDER BY T2.`viewers` DESC
LIMIT 1
...
2. Wrong SQL:
...
SELECT T1.`idea` FROM work AS T1 INNER JOIN student AS T2 ON T1.`ID` = T2.`ID` WHERE T2.`final_score` = ( SELECT MIN(`final_score`) FROM student)
...
Analysis: **Using the MIN function in a nested SQL statement will result in a mismatch because the maximum or minimum value of the column may not be in the
joined table, so use `ORDER BY`!**
Correct SQL:
```sql
SELECT T1.`idea`
FROM work AS T1
INNER JOIN student AS T2
ON T1.`ID` = T2.`ID`
ORDER BY T2.`final_score` ASC
LIMIT 1
...

Here is a new case for you.
[Evidence]
{evidence}
[Query]
-- {query}
[Database info]
{desc_str}
[Primary keys]
{pk_str}
[Foreign keys]
{fk_str}
[Detailed descriptions of tables and columns]
{detailed_str}
[Matched values]
{matched_content}
[old SQL]
```sql
{sql}
...

[SQLite error]
{sqlite_error}
[Exception class]
{exception_class}

Now please fixup old SQL and generate new SQL again.
[correct SQL]

```

Figure 14: Additional examples for a special case

B Packages List

Package name	Version
openai	0.28.1
pandas	2.2.2
protobuf	5.26.1
sql_metadata	2.11.0
sqlparse	0.5.0
tiktoken	0.5.2
tqdm	4.66.1
transformers	4.40.1
func_timeout	4.3.5
nltk	3.8.1
numpy	1.26.4
