

# BASE-SQL: A powerful open source Text-To-SQL baseline approach

**Lei Sheng\***  
Wuhan University  
of Technology, China  
xuanfeng1992@whut.edu.cn

**Shuai-Shuai Xu**  
University of Science and  
Technology of China, China  
sa517432@mail.ustc.edu.cn

**Wei Xie**  
Independent  
researcher, China  
xiedaren95@gmail.com

## Abstract

The conversion of natural language into SQL language for querying databases (Text-to-SQL) has broad application prospects and has attracted widespread attention. At present, the mainstream Text-to-SQL methods are mainly divided into in-context learning (ICL) based methods and supervised fine-tuning (SFT) based methods. ICL-based methods can achieve relatively good results thanks to the use of the most advanced closed-source models. However, in real-world application scenarios, factors such as data privacy, SQL generation efficiency and cost need to be considered. SFT-based methods have certain advantages. At present, methods based on fine-tuning of open source models lack easy-to-implement and effective (cost-effective) baseline methods. We propose a pipeline-based method using open source model fine-tuning, referred to as BASE-SQL, which includes four components: Schema Linking, Candidate SQL Generate, SQL Revision and SQL Merge Revision. Experimental results show that BASE-SQL uses the open source model Qwen2.5-Coder-32B-Instruct, and achieves an accuracy of 67.47% on the BIRD development set and 88.9% on the Spider test set, which is significantly better than other methods using open source models, and even exceeds several methods using the GPT-4o closed-source model. At the same time, BASE-SQL is easy to implement and highly efficient (on average, only five calls to the large language model are required to generate SQL once). The code will be open sourced at [https://github.com/CycloneBoy/base\\_sql](https://github.com/CycloneBoy/base_sql).

## 1 Introduction

Text-to-SQL task is to convert natural language into Structured Query Language (SQL) for querying database, which has received more and more attention (Qin et al., 2022; Katsogiannis-Meimarakis and Koutrika, 2023; Liu et al., 2024; Shi et al.,

2024). It can reduce the difficulty of interaction between users and databases, especially in the fields of data analysis, business intelligence, intelligent customer service and other broad application prospects. With the rapid development of deep learning technology, Text-to-SQL tasks have made rapid progress, from only being able to answer the domain-specific single-table questions before, to being able to solve cross-domain multi-table complex problem SQL generation. On the famous Spider (Yu et al., 2019) benchmark, it has achieved an accuracy rate of 90%.

Early Text-to-SQL methods were mainly based on the sequence-to-sequence (Seq2Seq) generation method (Wang et al., 2020; Guo et al., 2019; Li et al., 2023a). The current mainstream is the method based on large language models (LLMs), which can be roughly divided into in-context learning (ICL) based methods and supervised fine-tuning (SFT) based methods (Liu et al., 2024). ICL-based methods (Pourreza and Rafiei, 2023; Gao et al., 2023; Lee et al., 2024; Pourreza et al., 2024) mainly use the most advanced closed-source LLMs (such as: GPT-4, GPT-4o, Gemini-1.5 Pro, etc.), and then use various strategies to improve state-of-the-art (SOTA) performance without considering the efficiency and cost of SQL generation. Benefiting from the powerful reasoning ability of the model, it often achieves better results. SFT-based methods use open source LLMs for fine-tuning to improve the effect of SQL generation (Pourreza and Rafiei, 2024; Li et al., 2024a; Yang et al., 2024b). Due to the small size of the model used, it often performs worse than ICL-based methods.

In real-world Text-to-SQL application scenarios, the following factors will be considered: data privacy, efficiency and cost of SQL generation. Therefore, the method of SFT-based on open source models has certain advantages. CodeS (Li et al., 2024a) uses a specially curated SQL-centric cor-

<sup>1</sup>Corresponding authors.

pus for incremental pre-training, and combines it with a two-way data augmentation technique for SFT, which ultimately exceeds the methods that use a large number of closed-source models, but it relies on a large amount of data for incremental pre-training. SENSE(Yang et al., 2024b) uses data synthesized by closed-source models to fine-tune small models, demonstrating the effectiveness of its synthetic data, but it relies on closed-source models for data synthesis. DTS-SQL(Pourreza and Rafiei, 2024) simplifies SQL generation by fine-tuning schema linking and SQL generation separately, but lacks detailed analysis. CHESS(Talaei et al., 2024) uses a pipeline method to generate SQL in multiple steps, proving the superiority of the pipeline method. MSc-SQL(Gorti et al., 2024) generates candidate SQL by fine-tuning multiple different models, and then uses a selection model to select the final results. Although these methods are comparable to the methods using the closed-source model like GPT-4, they are lower than the methods using the most advanced closed-source models like GPT-4o and Gemini 1.5 pro. At the same time, the SFT-based methods lack a high cost-effectiveness baseline method, which also hinders the development of SFT-based methods.

In order to solve the challenges faced by the open source model SFT method, we propose a new method BASE-SQL based on the pipeline method. BASE-SQL mainly consists of four components: Schema Linking, Candidate SQL Generate, SQL Revision and SQL Merge Revision. In the Schema Linking component, we only perform table-linking, not column-linking. Table-linking is obtained by fine-tuning an open source model. Candidate SQL Generate is also obtained by fine-tuning an open source model. SQL Revision uses another open source model combined with Full Schema to perform SQL error correction. Finally, SQL Merge Revision is used to generate the final SQL through two rounds of merge correction. Through detailed experiments, we analyzed the effects of different components under different parameter configurations. Finally, our method BASE-SQL only uses two 32B open source models Qwen2.5-Coder-32B-Instruct(Hui et al., 2024) and Qwen2.5-32B-Instruct(Yang et al., 2024a), and achieved an accuracy of 67.47% on the BIRD(Li et al., 2024b) development set and 88.9% on the Spider test set. BASE-SQL is much more efficient than other state-of-the-art methods. On average, it only needs to call the large model 5 times for one generation. In

addition, the cost of reproducing BASE-SQL is also very low. There is no need to use additional data for incremental pre-training. In general, BASE-SQL is a cost-effective Text-to-SQL baseline method.

In summary, our main contributions are as follows:

1. We analyzed the advantages and disadvantages of the current SFT-based Text-to-SQL methods and proposed a new pipeline-based method BASE-SQL.
2. Through a large number of comparative experiments, we analyzed the SQL generation effects of different components of our method under different parameter configurations, providing a certain reference for subsequent research.
3. We only use two 32B open source models, and on the BIRD and Spider datasets, we outperform all other methods using open source models, and even surpass several methods using GPT-4o closed source models. At the same time, it has high inference efficiency and low reproduction cost, indicating that BASE-SQL is a cost-effective baseline method. Our source code will be published at [https://github.com/CycloneBoy/base\\_sql](https://github.com/CycloneBoy/base_sql).

## 2 Related Work

Early Text-to-SQL methods are mainly based on the Seq2Seq method. The natural language and database schema are semantically encoded through the encoder, and then decoded through the decoder to generate the corresponding SQL statement(Zhong et al., 2017). Since the SQL language has certain grammatical rules, it is easy to make errors when generating SQL models directly through the decoder. On this basis, slot filling methods are based on SQL grammatical rules (Wang et al., 2020; Guo et al., 2019; Yu et al., 2018b) and sketch-based methods (Lyu et al., 2020; Yu et al., 2018a) are proposed. For example, (Li et al., 2023a) proposes a ranking-augmented encoder to alleviate the workload of schema linking and a skeleton-aware decoder to implicitly guide the SQL generation of skeletons. These methods are limited by the capabilities of the basic model, the model generalization ability is not strong, and a large amount of data is required for fine-tuning for databases in different domains.

With the rapid development from pre-trained language model to large language model, LLM-based Text-to-SQL methods have become mainstream. DIN-SQL(Pourreza and Rafiei, 2023) decomposes the generation problem into multiple sub-problems and uses GPT-4 for ICL, and finally defeats a large number of fine-tuned models. DAIL-SQL(Gao et al., 2023) explores the advantages and disadvantages of different schema representations, example selections, and example organizations through a large number of comparative experiments, providing effective suggestions for subsequent research. MCS-SQL(Lee et al., 2024) uses different prompts to explore a broader search space to generate multiple candidate SQLs, then filters them based on confidence scores, and finally uses multiple-choice selections to obtain the final results. (Wang et al., 2024; Cen et al., 2024) use a multi-agent collaboration framework and use different agents to complete specific subtasks and finally complete SQL generation. CHASE-SQL(Pourreza et al., 2024) found that the widely used self-consistency strategy could not effectively select the best SQL from a large amount candidate SQL pools, so it proposed a sorting strategy based on pairwise comparisons and combined three innovative strategies to generate diverse and high-quality candidate SQL, achieving SOTA on the BIRD dataset. Since the ICL-based method does not require additional computing resources for model fine-tuning and has high flexibility and generalization, it is currently a widely used method.

Due to issues such as data privacy and efficiency, methods based on SFT have certain advantages. (Pourreza and Rafiei, 2024; Li et al., 2024a; Gorti et al., 2024) selected open source LLM for fine-tuning and achieved good results, surpassing many methods that use proprietary closed source LLM. CodeS(Li et al., 2024a) combines schema linking, data enhancement, and pre-training methods to achieve SOTA results on multiple datasets, and open-sources pre-trained models from 1B to 15B. SENSE(Yang et al., 2024b) uses strong LLM to synthesize weakly supervised data to train small LLM. The experimental results show the effectiveness of its synthetic data. MSc-SQL(Gorti et al., 2024) first filters the schema by schema linking, then uses multiple small LLM to fine-tune to generate a variety of candidate SQLs, and finally uses a selector to select the final SQL. CHESS(Talaei et al., 2024) and XiYan-SQL(Gao et al., 2024) combine the advantages and disadvantages of ICL and

model fine-tuning, based on a pipeline approach, including entity and context retrieval, schema linking, and fine-tuned LLM for SQL generation and SQL selection, proving the effectiveness of the combination of ICL and SFT methods.

### 3 Methodology

The framework of BASE-SQL we proposed is shown in Figure 1, which includes four components: Schema Linking, Candidate SQL Generate, SQL Revision and SQL Merge Revision.

#### 3.1 Schema Representation

In order for LLM to generate the corresponding SQL, the table structure information of the database needs to be included in the prompt context so that LLM can fully understand the database schema. There are many ways to represent database table structure information(Gao et al., 2023), including code structure representation(Nan et al., 2023), Alpaca SFT Prompt representation(Lee et al., 2024), Chess representation(Talaei et al., 2024), M-Schema representation(Gao et al., 2024), etc. More and more representations include sample values of columns, which allows LLM to understand the data in the table. The M-Schema representation proposed by XiYan-SQL(Gao et al., 2024) recently shows the column name, data type, column descriptor, primary key information and sample value of each column in the database, which performs better than the code structure representation. Although each column contains the corresponding sample value, our experiment found that adding a three-column table result of random query of the current table after each table can further improve LLM’s understanding of the database table structure. Figure 2 shows different representation methods.

#### 3.2 Schema Linking

Schema linking is to identify the database tables and column information necessary to convert natural language into SQL, and filter out the noise information brought by redundant table columns. It can significantly improve the accuracy of SQL generation. Currently, it mainly includes three methods: database entity linking, table linking, and column linking(Liu et al., 2024). Among them, the column linking is the most difficult, because missing any column will cause the subsequent SQL generation to fail. In order to improve the recall rate of column linking, many methods usually need to call




Figure 1: Overview of the proposed BASE-SQL framework, which consists of four components: 1) Schema linking: Identify the most relevant tables through a fine-tuned model; 2) Candidate Generation: Generate candidate SQL1 through a fine-tuned model; 3) SQL Revision: Use the all table schema, candidate SQL1 and its execution results to perform SQL correction and generate candidate SQL2 and candidate SQL3; 4) SQL Merge Revision: Use candidate SQL1, candidate SQL2 and candidate SQL3 to perform combined correction to generate the final SQL.

LLM multiple times in this part, resulting in low efficiency of SQL generation. For example, XiYan-SQL(Gao et al., 2024) and CHESS(Talaei et al., 2024) both use Column Selector to filter irrelevant column. It needs to judge whether each column in the database and the user question needs to be retained.

Like MSc-SQL(Gorti et al., 2024), we only use table linking to identify the table names related to the question through a fine-tuned model. We do not use column linking for the following three reasons: 1) The open source model we use is relatively small, and the low recognition accuracy of column linking will reduce the accuracy of subsequent SQL generation; 2) We found through experiments that for our model, even if the column linking is completely accurate, the improvement in SQL generation accuracy is not significant (see experimental results from Table 3). 3) In order to take into account the efficiency of overall SQL generation, reduce the number of calls to the LLM.

### 3.3 Candidate Generation

We use the powerful open source model Qwen2.5-Coder-32B-Instruct(Hui et al., 2024) as the base model. It has achieved SOTA performance on multiple code-related benchmarks. Inspired by MSc-SQL(Gorti et al., 2024), in order to simulate the redundant noise caused by identifying redundant tables in the Schema Linking process, we randomly selected 10% of the samples based on the ground-truth table in the training samples accord-

ing to the results of Schema Linking to add noise (randomly add 1 to 2 additional tables after excluding the ground-truth table from the selected samples).

Thanks to the powerful Qwen2.5-Coder(Hui et al., 2024) pre-trained model, we found in the experiment that the model can achieve high accuracy by fine-tuning only a small number of samples (1k-4k) using LoRA(Hu et al., 2021) fine-tuning (see experimental results from Figure 3).

### 3.4 SQL Revision

The generated candidate SQL may contain logic and syntax errors. Most methods(Talaei et al., 2024; Pourreza et al., 2024; Gao et al., 2024) use multiple rounds of SQL correction to improve the accuracy of SQL. They usually input the table structure after Schema Linking, the generated candidate SQL and its execution results into LLM, and use LLM to correct potential errors in SQL. Through experiments, we found that using the table structure information before Schema Linking can further improve the accuracy of correction, because some table recognition errors will exist after Schema Linking. We use the M-Schema representation and M-Schema With Sample representation of all tables to perform secondary independent corrections and generate candidate SQL2 and candidate SQL3 respectively.

### 3.5 SQL Merge Revision

The process of LLM generation is a probabilistic sampling process. It is generally difficult to guarantee that the best result is generated once. Therefore, many methods (Gao et al., 2024; Pourreza et al., 2024; Gorti et al., 2024; Lee et al., 2024) will generate multiple candidate SQLs and then select the final SQL in different ways. Typical methods include: self-consistency, re-ranking method, selection method. Self-consistency has certain limitations and cannot guarantee that the most consistent result is the correct result. Recently, model selection methods have received attention and achieved significant performance improvements. At present, the selection model needs to be fine-tuned with the corresponding data. The effect of the un-fine-tuned selection model is not ideal (see experimental results from Table 7). However, there is currently a lack of corresponding open source datasets.

Therefore, we propose a merge correction method, which combines the characteristics of correction and selection and generates the final SQL through multiple merge corrections. SQL merge correction is only required when the execution results of two candidate SQLs are inconsistent. Otherwise, we select the first candidate SQL. First, the table columns that appear in the two candidate SQLs are used as the table structure information for merge correction. Then, the two candidate SQLs and their corresponding execution results are listed, and LLM generates a new SQL instead of selecting one of them as the candidate SQL. The candidate SQL2, SQL3 and candidate SQL1 before correction obtained by the SQL correction step are merged and corrected three times to obtain the final candidate SQL.

## 4 Experiments

### 4.1 Experiments Setting

**Datasets** We evaluate our method on two widely used Text-to-SQL datasets: Spider (Yu et al., 2019) and BIRD (Li et al., 2023c). The detailed information of the two datasets is shown in Appendix A.1.

**Metrics** Execution accuracy (EX): The accuracy of the predicted SQL is evaluated by comparing the results of the predicted SQL execution with the results of the GOLD-SQL execution in the validation database. It is the official metric used by Spider and BIRD as their leaderboards, and is also the main metric for our experimental comparison.

**Implementation details** See Appendix A.2 for implementation details.

### 4.2 Main Results

**BIRD results** We compared with the most advanced methods, and the results are shown in Table 1. Among the methods that use open source LLMs (the middle and lower results), our method (use Qwen2.5-Coder-32B-Instruct) achieves the best on the development set, 1.87 points higher than the second place MSc-SQL (Gorti et al., 2024) and 9.07 points higher than the original Qwen2.5-Coder-32B-Instruct. Compared with the methods that use closed source LLMs (the top part), our method is competitive, surpassing four methods that use GPT-4 and three methods that use GPT-4o on the development set. After BASE-SQL adopts the 33B DeepSeek-Coder basic model, the performance is improved by 15.84%; even if the 14B Qwen2.5-Coder-32B-Instruct is adopted, the performance can be improved by 6.92%, which shows the effectiveness of BASE-SQL.

Our method only uses two open source LLMs with 32B parameters, while CHASE-SQL, XiYan-SQL, and CHESS uses the most advanced closed source LLMs and generate a large number of candidate SQLs, and then filter out the final SQL through different strategies. Overall, the generation cost is expensive and the efficiency is low. CHASE-SQL (Pourreza et al., 2024) uses three chain-of-thought prompting techniques to generate 21 candidate SQLs, and then combines a fine-tuned binary selection model to filter out the final SQL. XiYan-SQL (Gao et al., 2024) uses additional data for fine-tuning and combines the ICL method to generate 5 candidate SQLs, and finally uses a fine-tuned binary selector to filter out the final SQL. CHESS (Talaie et al., 2024) generates 20 candidate SQLs and 10 test cases to filter out the final SQL. Among them, XiYan-SQL and CHESS use column filtering for Schema Linking, which is very inefficient. It needs to perform binary classification on each column of the database and the user question to determine whether the column is related to the user question, thereby filtering out columns that are not related to the user question. Overall, our method has achieved a certain balance in performance, cost, and efficiency.

**Spider results:** Table 5 shows the results of our method on the Spider data set. Our method achieves EX of 86.9% on the development set and 88.9% on the test set, surpassing all methods using

Method	Type	Model	Size	EX(Dev)	EX(Test)
CHASE-SQL(Pourreza et al., 2024)	ICL	Gemini 1.5 pro	UNK	<b>74.46</b>	74.79
XiYan-SQL(Gao et al., 2024)	ICL+SFT	GPT-4o	UNK	73.34	<b>75.63</b>
CHESS(Talaei et al., 2024)	ICL	Gemini 1.5 pro	UNK	68.31	71.10
Distillery(Maamari et al., 2024)	SFT	GPT-4o	UNK	67.21	71.83
RSL-SQL(Cao et al., 2024)	ICL	GPT-4o	UNK	67.21	-
E-SQL(Caferoğlu and Ulusoy, 2024)	ICL	GPT-4o	UNK	65.58	66.29
MCS-SQL(Lee et al., 2024)	ICL	GPT-4	UNK	63.40	65.50
PTD-SQL(Luo et al., 2024)	ICL	GPT-4	UNK	57.0	-
TA-SQL(Qu et al., 2024)	ICL	GPT-4	UNK	56.19	59.14
DIN-SQL(Pourreza and Rafiei, 2023)	ICL	GPT-4	UNK	50.72	55.90
MSc-SQL(Gorti et al., 2024)	SFT	Mistral-v0.3,...	9B	65.60	-
CHESS(Talaei et al., 2024)	ICL+SFT	Llama-3	70B	61.50	-
Distillery(Maamari et al., 2024)	ICL	Llama-3.1	405B	59.18	-
CodeS(Li et al., 2024a)	SFT	StarCoder	15B	58.47	60.37
CodeS(Li et al., 2024a)	SFT	StarCoder	7B	57.17	59.25
DTS-SQL(Pourreza and Rafiei, 2024)	SFT	DeepSeek-Coder	7B	55.80	-
SENSE(Yang et al., 2024b)	SFT	CodeLlama	13B	55.48	63.39
SENSE(Yang et al., 2024b)	SFT	CodeLlama	7B	51.80	59.30
Qwen2.5-Coder(Hui et al., 2024)	ICL	Qwen2.5-Coder	32B	58.40	-
<b>BASE-SQL(Ours)</b>	SFT	Qwen2.5-Coder	32B	<u>67.47</u> (↑9.07)	-
DeepSeek-Coder(Daya Guo, 2024)	ICL	DeepSeek-Coder	33B	49.54	-
<b>BASE-SQL(Ours)</b>	SFT	DeepSeek-Coder	33B	<u>65.38</u> (↑15.84)	-
Qwen2.5-Coder(Hui et al., 2024)	ICL	Qwen2.5-Coder	14B	56.90	-
<b>BASE-SQL(Ours)</b>	SFT	Qwen2.5-Coder	14B	<u>63.82</u> (↑6.92)	-

Table 1: Performance Comparison of different Text-to-SQL methods on BIRD dev and test dataset. The Type column represents the type of method, including: In-context learning(ICL), supervised fine-tuning(SFT), and ICL+SFT. The Size column represents the number of parameters of the model, where UNK represents unknown size and B represents billions. EX represents execution accuracy. The underline represents the best result of our method.

Method	BIRD EX(Dev)	$\Delta$ EX	BIRD EX(Dev)	$\Delta$ EX	Spider EX(Test)	$\Delta$ EX
model	Qwen2.5-Coder(32B)	-	DeepSeek-Coder(33B)	-	Qwen2.5-Coder(32B)	-
BASELINE	56.84	-	45.37	-	82.16	-
+ M-Schema	58.21	+1.37	49.54	+4.17	83.42	+1.26
+ Data Samples	59.71	+1.50	44.26	-5.28	85.61	+2.19
+ Schema Linking	61.54	+1.83	50.59	+6.33	85.10	-0.51
+ Supervised Fine-tuning	64.21	+2.67	59.06	+8.47	87.47	+2.37
+ SQL Revision	66.04	+1.83	64.41	+5.35	88.12	+0.65
+ SQL Merge Revision	<b>67.47</b>	+1.43	<b>65.38</b>	+0.97	<b>88.87</b>	+0.75

Table 2: Ablations of our method on BIRD development dataset and Spider test dataset.

open source LLMs and even surpassing CHASE-SQL(Pourreza et al., 2024) and CHESS(Talaei et al., 2024) on the test set. It is only 0.8% lower than the SOTA methods XiYan-SQL(Gao et al., 2024) and MCS-SQL(Lee et al., 2024). MCS-SQL uses the ICL method to generate up to 20 candidate SQLs, and then uses the Multiple-Choice Selection method to select the best SQL, while our method only generates 3 candidate SQLs. Among them, the 14B version of our method BASE-SQL is extremely competitive, only 0.1% lower than the 32B version on the development set and 1.0% lower on the test set. The experimental results show that BASE-SQL has strong generalization properties.

### 4.3 Ablation Studies

We conducted ablation experiments on the BIRD development set and the Spider test set to analyze the impact of different components on the overall SQL generation. The experimental results are shown in Table 2. Our baseline setting uses the entire schema in code representation. We take the BIRD development set as an example for analysis. After replacing code representation schema with M-Schema, the performance improved by 1.37%, demonstrating the superiority of M-Schema. Then we adopted M-Schema with sample representation, and the performance further improved by 1.5%, indicating that adding table content can further help LLM understand the table structure information from a global perspective, although the description of each column in M-Schema already contains several sample values of the current column. After adding Schema-linking, the performance improved by 1.83%, indicating that Schema-linking can reduce the noise in schema. After performing supervised fine-tuning, the largest performance improvement of 2.67% was obtained, indicating the importance of supervised fine-tuning for LLM to perform downstream tasks. After SQL revision, the performance further improved by 1.83%, indicating that LLM can correct errors in some candidate SQLs by using candidate SQLs and their execution results. Finally, SQL merge revision were performed, and the performance was improved by 1.43%, indicating that LLM can use multiple candidate SQLs and corresponding results to further improve the accuracy of SQL generation using SQL generated in different ways.

The performance improvement in the Spider test set was similar, except that the performance decreased by 0.51% after adding schema linking, in-

dicating that inaccurate schema linking will cause subsequent SQL performance to degrade(Maamari et al., 2024), so we use entire schema for SQL revision to reduce the impact of performance loss caused by inaccurate schema linking.

### 4.4 Analysis

#### 4.5 Impacts of Schema Linking

In order to analyze the impact of Schema Linking on SQL generation, we conducted experiments on the BIRD development set. The experimental results are shown in Table 3. The Gold Table Schema method uses all gold Tables as schemas, the Gold Column Schema method uses all gold columns as schemas, our Schema Linking method uses only a single model for fine-tuning, the Schema Linking one method uses two different models for voting, and the Schema Linking two method uses five different models for voting. By comparing the results of Gold Table Schema and Gold Column Schema, we found that their EX metric are not much different, especially the EX after fine-tuning is only 1.04% different. Therefore, we comprehensively consider the performance and the efficiency of SQL generation, and only perform table linking instead of column linking.

By comparing the following three methods, although the Schema Linking one method and the Schema Linking two method achieve more than 95% recall through multi-model voting, the EX is lower than that of our Schema Linking method. This shows that Schema Linking cannot focus too much on the Recall metric, and the accuracy of table prediction also needs to be considered. Our Schema linking method achieved a certain balance between precision and recall through a single model approach. After fine-tuning, the EX reached 64.21%, which is only 3.07% lower than the upper limit of Schema linking (using the Gold Table Schema method).

#### 4.6 Impacts of Different SQL Revision Methods

We compared and analyzed different SQL revision methods, and the experimental results are shown in Table 4. First, we used three different models and four different schemas for comparison under the same pre-revision result (EX is 64.15). The experimental results are shown in columns 2, 3, and 4 in the table. When Qwen2.5-32B-Instruct is used as the SQL revision model and

Method	Accuracy	Recall	Avg Precision	Avg Recall	Avg F1	EX	EX(SFT)
Full Schema	1	100	29.72	100	45.82	59.71	62.19
Gold Table Schema	100	100	100	100	100	64.02	67.28
Gold Column Schema	100	100	100	100	100	63.89	68.32
<b>Our Schema Linking</b>	<b>82.39</b>	89.83	<b>94.83</b>	95.51	<b>95.17</b>	<b>61.54</b>	<b>64.21</b>
Schema Linking one	64.34	95.31	85.45	97.95	91.27	59.84	63.75
Schema Linking two	36.05	<b>97.00</b>	70.09	<b>98.69</b>	81.97	59.39	63.23

Table 3: Experimental results using different schema linking methods. Accuracy indicates the accuracy of a predicted result that is completely consistent with the Gold table. Recall indicates the accuracy of a predicted result that includes all current Gold tables. Avg is the abbreviation for average, which calculates the precision, recall, and F1 of each predicted result and Gold table, and finally calculates the average of all three metrics. EX represents execution accuracy on the BIRD development set. SFT represents supervised fine-tuning.

Full Schema, the SQL revision effect is the best. We speculate that this is because the pre-revision result is obtained by fine-tuning the same Coder model, and the model capabilities are not much different, so it is not possible to find errors well. The general Qwen2.5-32B-Instruct is used for SQL revision, which can better find SQL errors and correct them. Then, under the same SQL revision model (Qwen2.5-32B-Instruct), we used three different pre-revision results and four different Schemas for comparison. The experimental results are shown in columns 5, 6, and 7 in the table. The experimental results show that the better the pre-revision result, the better the effect after SQL revision. The Full Schema has a better effect than the schema after Schema Linking. This shows that the Full Schema post-revision model can correct some samples that were previously incorrectly identified by Schema Linking.

#### 4.7 Impacts of Other Analysis

See Appendix B for more analysis details.

## 5 Conclusion

In this paper, we proposed the BASE-SQL framework, a pipeline-based Text-to-SQL method, which mainly consists of Schema Linking, Candidate SQL Generate, SQL Revision and SQL Merge Revision. We conducted detailed experiments and analyzed the impact of each component under different parameter configurations, providing a certain reference for subsequent research. BASE-SQL only uses two 32B open source models and achieves competitive results on BIRD and Spider datasets, even surpassing most methods using GPT-4 and

GPT-4o. At the same time, BASE-SQL is easy to implement and has high SQL generation efficiency. It is a strong baseline method suitable for use in real-world application scenarios.

## 6 Limitations

Although our method shows competitive results in various aspects, the research in this paper still has certain limitations. First, due to resource and time constraints, we cannot fully verify the effects of other open source LLMs (such as: Llama-3.3-70B-Instruct, Mistral-Large-Instruct-2411). Secondly, we only use open source LLMs for experiments, and have not verified the BASE-SQL effect of closed source LLMs (such as: GPT-4o, Gemini 1.5 pro). Then we only performed Table Linking in Schema Linking, and did not perform Column Linking. In the case of a large number of columns in the table in real-world application scenarios (hundreds or even thousands of columns), the prompt will be particularly long, which may affect the effect of SQL generation.

## References

- Hasan Alp Caferoğlu and Özgür Ulusoy. 2024. [E-SQL: Direct Schema Linking via Question Enrichment in Text-to-SQL](#).
- Zhenbiao Cao, Yuanlei Zheng, Zhihao Fan, Xiaojin Zhang, and Wei Chen. 2024. Rsl-sql: Robust schema linking in text-to-sql generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.00073*.
- Jipeng Cen, Jiaxin Liu, Zhixu Li, and Jingjing Wang. 2024. [SQLFixAgent: Towards Semantic-Accurate SQL Generation via Multi-Agent Collaboration](#). *arXiv preprint*. ArXiv:2406.13408 [cs] version: 1.



- Dejian Yang Zhenda Xie Kai Dong Wentao Zhang Guanting Chen Xiao Bi Y. Wu Y.K. Li Fuli Luo Yingfei Xiong Wenfeng Liang Daya Guo, Qihao Zhu. 2024. *Deepseek-coder: When the large language model meets programming – the rise of code intelligence*.
- 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 [cs] version: 4.
- Yingqi Gao, Yifu Liu, Xiaoxia Li, Xiaorong Shi, Yin Zhu, Yiming Wang, Shiqi Li, Wei Li, Yuntao Hong, Zhiling Luo, Jinyang Gao, Liyu Mou, and Yu Li. 2024. *Xiyan-sql: A multi-generator ensemble framework for text-to-sql*. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.08599*.
- Satya Krishna Gorti, Ilan Gofman, Zhaoyan Liu, Jia-peng Wu, Noël Vouitsis, Guangwei Yu, Jesse C Cresswell, and Rasa Hosseinzadeh. 2024. *Msc-sql: Multi-sample critiquing small language models for text-to-sql translation*. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.12916*.
- 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*. In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 4524–4535, Florence, Italy. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Edward J Hu, Yelong Shen, Phillip Wallis, Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yuanzhi Li, Shean Wang, Lu Wang, and Weizhu Chen. 2021. *Lora: Low-rank adaptation of large language models*. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.09685*.
- Binyuan Hui, Jian Yang, Zeyu Cui, Jiayi Yang, Dayiheng Liu, Lei Zhang, Tianyu Liu, Jiajun Zhang, Bowen Yu, Keming Lu, et al. 2024. *Qwen2. 5-coder technical report*. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.12186*.
- George Katsogiannis-Meimarakis and Georgia Koutrika. 2023. *A survey on deep learning approaches for text-to-SQL*. *The VLDB Journal*, 32(4):905–936.
- 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 [cs] version: 1.
- Haoyang Li, Jing Zhang, Cuiping Li, and Hong Chen. 2023a. *Resdsq: Decoupling schema linking and skeleton parsing for text-to-sql*. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 37(11):13067–13075.
- Haoyang Li, Jing Zhang, Cuiping Li, and Hong Chen. 2023b. *RESDSQL: Decoupling Schema Linking and Skeleton Parsing for Text-to-SQL*. *arXiv preprint*. ArXiv:2302.05965 [cs] version: 3.
- 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*. *arXiv preprint*. ArXiv:2402.16347 [cs] version: 1.
- Jinyang Li, Binyuan Hui, Ge Qu, Jiayi Yang, Binhua Li, Bowen Li, Bailin Wang, Bowen Qin, Rongyu Cao, Ruiying Geng, Nan Huo, Xuanhe Zhou, Chenhao Ma, Guoliang Li, Kevin C. C. Chang, Fei Huang, Reynold Cheng, and Yongbin Li. 2023c. *Can LLM Already Serve as A Database Interface? A Big Bench for Large-Scale Database Grounded Text-to-SQLs*. *arXiv preprint*. ArXiv:2305.03111 [cs] version: 3.
- 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.
- Xinyu Liu, Shuyu Shen, Boyan Li, Peixian Ma, Runzhi Jiang, Yuyu Luo, Yuxin Zhang, Ju Fan, Guoliang Li, and Nan Tang. 2024. *A Survey of NL2SQL with Large Language Models: Where are we, and where are we going?* *arXiv preprint*. ArXiv:2408.05109 [cs].
- Ruilin Luo, Liyuan Wang, Binghuai Lin, Zicheng Lin, and Yujiu Yang. 2024. *PTD-SQL: Partitioning and targeted drilling with LLMs in text-to-SQL*. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 3767–3799, Miami, Florida, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Qin Lyu, Kaushik Chakrabarti, Shobhit Hathi, Souvik Kundu, Jianwen Zhang, and Zheng Chen. 2020. *Hybrid ranking network for text-to-sql*. *Preprint*, arXiv:2008.04759.
- Karime Maamari, Fadhil Abubaker, Daniel Jaroslawicz, and Amine Mhedhbi. 2024. *The Death of Schema Linking? Text-to-SQL in the Age of Well-Reasoned Language Models*. *arXiv preprint*. ArXiv:2408.07702 [cs].
- Linyong Nan, Yilun Zhao, Weijin Zou, Narutatsu Ri, Jaesung Tae, Ellen Zhang, Arman Cohan, and Dragomir Radev. 2023. *Enhancing text-to-SQL capabilities of large language models: A study on prompt design strategies*. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, pages 14935–14956, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Mohammadreza Pourreza, Hailong Li, Ruoxi Sun, Yeounoh Chung, Shayan Talaei, Gaurav Tarlok Kakkar, Yu Gan, Amin Saberi, Fatma Ozcan, and Sercan O Arik. 2024. *Chase-sql: Multi-path reasoning and preference optimized candidate selection in text-to-sql*. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.01943*.

- Mohammadreza Pourreza and Davood Rafiei. 2023. [DIN-SQL: Decomposed In-Context Learning of Text-to-SQL with Self-Correction](#). *arXiv preprint*. ArXiv:2304.11015 [cs] version: 3.
- Mohammadreza Pourreza and Davood Rafiei. 2024. [DTS-SQL: Decomposed text-to-SQL with small large language models](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2024*, pages 8212–8220, Miami, Florida, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Bowen Qin, Binyuan Hui, Lihan Wang, Min Yang, Jinyang Li, Binhua Li, Ruiying Geng, Rongyu Cao, Jian Sun, Luo Si, Fei Huang, and Yongbin Li. 2022. [A Survey on Text-to-SQL Parsing: Concepts, Methods, and Future Directions](#). *arXiv preprint*. ArXiv:2208.13629 [cs] version: 1.
- Ge Qu, Jinyang Li, Bowen Li, Bowen Qin, Nan Huo, Chenhao Ma, and Reynold Cheng. 2024. [Before Generation, Align it! A Novel and Effective Strategy for Mitigating Hallucinations in Text-to-SQL Generation](#). *arXiv preprint*. ArXiv:2405.15307 null version: 1.
- Liang Shi, Zhengju Tang, and Zhi Yang. 2024. [A Survey on Employing Large Language Models for Text-to-SQL Tasks](#). *arXiv preprint*. ArXiv:2407.15186 [cs] version: 1.
- Shayan Talei, Mohammadreza Pourreza, Yu-Chen Chang, Azalia Mirhoseini, and Amin Saberi. 2024. [CHESS: Contextual Harnessing for Efficient SQL Synthesis](#). *arXiv preprint*. ArXiv:2405.16755 [cs] version: 1.
- 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*, pages 7567–7578. Online. 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, and Zhoujun Li. 2024. [MAC-SQL: A Multi-Agent Collaborative Framework for Text-to-SQL](#). *arXiv preprint*. ArXiv:2312.11242 [cs] version: 3.
- 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 [cs] version: 1.
- An Yang, Baosong Yang, Beichen Zhang, Binyuan Hui, Bo Zheng, Bowen Yu, Chengyuan Li, Dayiheng Liu, Fei Huang, Haoran Wei, Huan Lin, Jian Yang, Jianhong Tu, Jianwei Zhang, Jianxin Yang, Jiayi Yang, Jingren Zhou, Junyang Lin, Kai Dang, Keming Lu, Keqin Bao, Kexin Yang, Le Yu, Mei Li, Mingfeng Xue, Pei Zhang, Qin Zhu, Rui Men, Runji Lin, Tianhao Li, Tingyu Xia, Xingzhang Ren, Xuancheng Ren, Yang Fan, Yang Su, Yichang Zhang, Yu Wan, Yuqiong Liu, Zeyu Cui, Zhenru Zhang, and Zihan Qiu. 2024a. Qwen2.5 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.15115*.
- Jiayi Yang, Binyuan Hui, Min Yang, Jian Yang, Junyang Lin, and Chang Zhou. 2024b. [Synthesizing Text-to-SQL Data from Weak and Strong LLMs](#). *arXiv preprint*. ArXiv:2408.03256 [cs] version: 1.
- Tao Yu, Zifan Li, Zilin Zhang, Rui Zhang, and Dragomir Radev. 2018a. [TypeSQL: Knowledge-based type-aware neural text-to-SQL generation](#). In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 2 (Short Papers)*, pages 588–594, New Orleans, Louisiana. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Tao Yu, Michihiro Yasunaga, Kai Yang, Rui Zhang, Dongxu Wang, Zifan Li, and Dragomir Radev. 2018b. [SyntaxSQLNet: Syntax tree networks for complex and cross-domain text-to-SQL task](#). In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 1653–1663, Brussels, Belgium. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- 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. 2019. [Spider: A Large-Scale Human-Labeled Dataset for Complex and Cross-Domain Semantic Parsing and Text-to-SQL Task](#). *arXiv preprint*. ArXiv:1809.08887 [cs] version: 5.
- Victor Zhong, Caiming Xiong, and Richard Socher. 2017. [Seq2sql: Generating structured queries from natural language using reinforcement learning](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:1709.00103.

## A Experiments Setting

### A.1 Dataset

Spider(Yu et al., 2019) is a complex cross-domain text-to-SQL benchmark that includes 10,181 questions and 5,693 independent complex SQLs in 200 databases, covering 138 different domains. It has been divided into non-overlapping training, development, and test sets. Unlike Spider, BIRD(Li et al., 2023c) focuses on real-world application scenarios, including dirty and noisy database values, external knowledge grounding between natural language questions and database values, and the efficiency of SQL execution in the context of massive databases. It includes 12,751 question and SQL pairs in 95 databases in 37 professional domains, with a total database size of 33.4GB. BIRD

Method	SFT Coder	Coder	Qwen	Qwen	Qwen	Qwen
Before SQL revision	64.15	64.15	64.15	63.62	64.15	64.21
Schema Linking Schema	63.04	64.41	65.25	64.41	65.25	65.65
Schema Linking With Sample Schema	63.43	64.21	65.19	64.67	65.19	65.45
Full Schema	63.95	64.28	<b>65.91</b>	64.73	65.91	<b>66.04</b>
Full With Sample Schema	63.62	64.80	65.58	64.73	65.58	65.91

Table 4: Execution accuracy(EX) of different schema representations and different revision model on the BIRD development set. SFT represents supervised fine-tuning. Coder represents Qwen2.5-Coder-32B-Instruct and Qwen represents Qwen2.5-32B-Instruct.

has been divided into public training and development sets, and its unpublished test set is used as an independent and fair verification dataset.

## A.2 Implementation Detail

We used the open source model Qwen2.5-Coder-32B-Instruct as the basic model for Schema Linking and Candidate Generation, and used LoRA(Hu et al., 2021) to fine-tune. Fine-tuning was performed using LoRA(Hu et al., 2021), with a LoRA rank of 32, a LoRA  $\alpha$  of 16, and a dropout rate of 0.1. We fine-tune target model with accumulation batch size of 8, a learning rate of 4e-5, and a max context length of 4,096. All our experiments were performed using two NVIDIA A800 GPUs with 80GB of VRAM. SQL Revision uses Qwen2.5-32B-Instruct as the basic model, and SQL Merge Revision uses Qwen2.5-Coder-32B-Instruct as the basic model.

## B Analysis

### B.1 Impacts of Different Schema Representations

In order to show the impact of different schema representations on SQL generation, we used full-schema to conduct experiments on the BIRD development set. The experimental results of three different sizes of Qwen2.5-Coder and its supervised fine-tuning are shown in Table 6. Through the experimental results, we found that the M-Schema representation is more advantageous than the Code representation after adding different sample values of the column, and the performance of SQL generation can be further improved after adding table content. Whether before or after fine-tuning, the M-Schema with sample representation has the best performance.

### B.2 Impacts of Candidate Generation

In Figure 3, we use models of different sizes for fine-tuning, showing the relationship between the number of fine-tuning steps and EX. We can see that for models of the same size, the M-Schema with sample representation is better than the M-Schema representation. The 32B and 14B models tend to stabilize after about 150 steps (about 1.2k samples are trained), and the 7B model tends to stabilize after about 250 steps (about 4k samples), which shows that Qwen2.5-Coder has a strong generalization ability and can achieve good results by fine-tuning only on a small number of samples.

### B.3 Impacts of Different SQL Section Methods

Recently, the model-based SQL selection method has received attention and achieved good results (Gao et al., 2024; Gorti et al., 2024; Pourreza et al., 2024). Therefore, we selected two candidate SQLs and then used Qwen2.5-Coder-32B-Instruct model to conduct comparative experiments with different SQL selection methods. The results are shown in Table 7. It can be seen from the table that our merge revision method is better than the method based on Selection Prompt.

In order to show the intermediate process of our merge revision method in detail, we used different initialization settings to conduct SQL revision experiments. The experimental results are shown in Table 8. From the results, we can find that candidate SQL1 can get the best performance by only performing one round of sql revision and three merge revision (SQL5, SQL6, SQL8). Merge revision is only required when the results of the two candidate SQLs are inconsistent after execution. If the execution results are consistent, the first SQL is directly output. Therefore, there are not many cases where merge revision is really needed.

Method	Type	Model	Size	EX(Dev)	EX(Test)
XiYan-SQL(Gao et al., 2024)	ICL+ SFT	GPT-4o	UNK	-	<b>89.7</b>
MCS-SQL(Lee et al., 2024)	ICL	GPT-4	UNK	<b>89.5</b>	89.6
RSL-SQL(Cao et al., 2024)	ICL	GPT-4o	UNK	-	87.9
CHASE-SQL(Pourreza et al., 2024)	ICL	Gemini 1.5 pro	UNK	-	87.6
CHESS(Talaei et al., 2024)	ICL	Gemini 1.5 pro	UNK	-	87.2
DEA-SQL(Xie et al., 2024)	ICL	GPT-4	UNK	85.4	87.1
DAIL-SQL(Gao et al., 2023)	ICL	GPT-4	UNK	83.6	86.6
DIN-SQL(Pourreza and Rafiei, 2023)	ICL	GPT-4	UNK	-	85.3
SENSE(Yang et al., 2024b)	SFT	CodeLLaMA	13B	84.1	86.6
SENSE(Yang et al., 2024b)	SFT	CodeLLaMA	7B	83.2	83.5
MSc-SQL(Gorti et al., 2024)	SFT	Mistral-v0.3,...	9B	-	84.7
CodeS(Li et al., 2024a)	SFT	StarCoder	15B	84.9	-
CodeS(Li et al., 2024a)	SFT	StarCoder	7B	85.4	-
DTS-SQL(Pourreza and Rafiei, 2024)	SFT	DeepSeek	7B	-	84.4
RESDSL(Li et al., 2023b)	SFT	T5	3B	84.1	79.9
Qwen2.5-Coder(Hui et al., 2024)	ICL	Qwen2.5-Coder	32B	85.1	85.6
<b>BASE-SQL(Ours)</b>	SFT	Qwen2.5-Coder	32B	<u>86.9</u> ( $\uparrow$ 1.8)	<u>88.9</u> ( $\uparrow$ 3.3)
Qwen2.5-Coder(Hui et al., 2024)	ICL	Qwen2.5-Coder	14B	84.1	85.1
<b>BASE-SQL(Ours)</b>	SFT	Qwen2.5-Coder	14B	<u>86.8</u> ( $\uparrow$ 2.5)	<u>87.9</u> ( $\uparrow$ 2.8)

Table 5: Performance Comparison of different Text-to-SQL methods on Spider dev and test dataset.

Method	32B	SFT-32B	14B	SFT-14B	7B	SFT-7B
Full Code	56.84	60.63	56.45	55.67	49.48	41.40
Full M-Schema	58.21	61.73	56.39	60.04	50.33	41.79
Full Code + Sample	59.39	<b>62.78</b>	56.71	58.74	<b>50.91</b>	44.65
Full M-Schema + Sample	<b>59.71</b>	62.19	<b>57.50</b>	<b>60.82</b>	50.59	<b>45.31</b>
Schema Linking Code	56.78	61.93	55.67	58.87	51.30	55.48
Schema Linking M-Schema	59.71	63.56	57.50	61.34	53.46	58.41
Schema Linking Code + Sample	59.65	63.49	<b>60.43</b>	61.93	53.72	57.82
Schema Linking M-Schema + Sample	<b>61.54</b>	<b>64.21</b>	58.08	<b>62.32</b>	<b>54.95</b>	<b>58.74</b>

Table 6: Execution accuracy(EX) of different schema representations on the BIRD development set.

Code Representation	Code With Sample Representation	M-Schema Representation	M-Schema With Sample Representation
<pre>CREATE TABLE `frpm` (   CDSCode TEXT PRIMARY KEY REFERENCES schools (CDSCode),   `Academic Year` TEXT,   `County Code` TEXT,   `District Code` INTEGER,   `School Code` TEXT );  CREATE TABLE `schools` (   CDSCode TEXT PRIMARY KEY,   District TEXT,   School TEXT,   Zip TEXT,   Charter INTEGER );</pre>	<pre>CREATE TABLE `frpm` (   CDSCode TEXT PRIMARY KEY REFERENCES schools (CDSCode),   `Academic Year` TEXT,   `County Code` TEXT,   `District Code` INTEGER,   `School Code` TEXT );  Sample rows from: `frpm`: 01100170109835, 2014-2015, 01, 10017, 0109835 01100170112607, 2014-2015, 01, 10017, 0112607 01100170118489, 2014-2015, 01, 10017, 0118489  CREATE TABLE `schools` (   CDSCode TEXT PRIMARY KEY,   District TEXT,   School TEXT,   Zip TEXT,   Charter INTEGER );  Sample rows from: `schools`: 01100170000000, Alameda County Office of Education, None, 94544-1136, None 01100170109835, Alameda County Office of Education, FAME Public Charter, 94560- 5359, 1 01100170112607, Alameda County Office of Education, Envision Academy for Arts &amp; Technology, 94612-3355, 1</pre>	<pre>[DB_ID] california_schools [Schema] # Table: frpm [ (CDSCode:TEXT, Primary Key, Examples: [01100170109835, 01100170112607, 01100170118489]), (Academic Year:TEXT, Examples: [2014- 2015]), (County Code:TEXT, Examples: [01, 02, 03]), (District Code:INTEGER, Examples: [10017, 31609, 31617]), (School Code:TEXT, Examples: [0109835, 0112607, 0118489]) ] # Table: schools [ (CDSCode:TEXT, Primary Key, Examples: [01100170000000, 01100170109835, 01100170112607]), (District:TEXT), (School:TEXT, Examples: [FAME Public Charter]), (Zip:TEXT, Examples: [94544-1136, 94560- 5359, 94612-3355]), (Charter:INTEGER, Examples: [1, 0]) ] [Foreign keys] frpm.CDSCode=schools.CDSCode</pre>	<pre>[DB_ID] california_schools [Schema] # Table: frpm [ (CDSCode:TEXT, Primary Key, Examples: [01100170109835, 01100170112607, 01100170118489]), (Academic Year:TEXT, Examples: [2014-2015]), (County Code:TEXT, Examples: [01, 02, 03]), (District Code:INTEGER, Examples: [10017, 31609, 31617]), (School Code:TEXT, Examples: [0109835, 0112607, 0118489]) ] Sample rows from: `frpm`: 01100170109835, 2014-2015, 01, 10017, 0109835 01100170112607, 2014-2015, 01, 10017, 0112607 01100170118489, 2014-2015, 01, 10017, 0118489  # Table: schools [ (CDSCode:TEXT, Primary Key, Examples: [01100170000000, 01100170109835, 01100170112607]), (District:TEXT), (School:TEXT, Examples: [FAME Public Charter]), (Zip:TEXT, Examples: [94544-1136, 94560-5359, 94612-3355]), (Charter:INTEGER, Examples: [1, 0]) ] Sample rows from: `schools`: 01100170000000, Alameda County Office of Education, None, 94544-1136, None 01100170109835, Alameda County Office of Education, FAME Public Charter, 94560-5359, 1 01100170112607, Alameda County Office of Education, Envision Academy for Arts &amp; Technology, 94612-3355, 1  [Foreign keys] frpm.CDSCode=schools.CDSCode</pre>

Figure 2: Examples of database schema representation methods: Code Representation, Code With Sample Representation, M-Schema Representation, and M-Schema With Sample Representation.

Method	BIRD EX(Dev)
src	65.78 + 64.28
upper bound	68.25
XiYan-SQL Selection Prompt	66.62
MSc-SQL Selection Prompt	66.56
CHASE-SQL Selection Prompt	66.43
Our Merge Revision	<b>66.95</b>

Table 7: Execution accuracy(EX) of different SQL selection methods on the BIRD development set.

## C Prompt Templates

### C.1 Prompt for Schema Linking

```
{DATABASE SCHEMA}
```

```
-- Given the previous table schema combined
with the additional information provided, help
me find all the table names associated with
answering the user's question.
```

```
Question: {QUESTION}
```

```
-- External Knowledge: {EVIDENCE}
```

```
Remember not to generate SQL, but reply
with the relevant table names. Please reply in
JSON format:
```

```
```json
{
  "tables": ["table1", "table2", ..]
}
```
```




Figure 3: After using Qwen2.5-Coder of different sizes for Supervised Fine-tuning, the execution accuracy on the BIRD development set after evaluating different steps. The batch size of the 32B and 14B models is 8, and the batch size of the 7B model is 16. In the legend, 32B, 14B, and 7B use the M-Schema representation, while 32B\_sample, 14B\_sample, and 7B\_sample use the M-Schema with sample representation.

| Method                        | 1-time revision | 2-time revision | 1-time revision | 2-time revision |
|-------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| SQL1                          | 64.21           | 64.21           | 64.15           | 64.15           |
| SQL2(Full Schema)             | 66.04           | 66.30           | 65.91           | 66.23           |
| SQL3(Full With Sample Schema) | 65.91           | 65.84           | 65.58           | 65.58           |
| SQL4(SQL1+SQL2)               | 66.69           | 66.95           | 66.43           | 66.69           |
| SQL5(SQL2+SQL3)               | 67.14           | 66.82           | 66.88           | 66.62           |
| SQL6(SQL1+SQL3)               | 67.01           | 66.95           | 66.75           | 66.62           |
| SQL7(SQL4+SQL5)               | 67.34           | <b>67.41</b>    | 67.14           | <b>66.95</b>    |
| SQL8(SQL5+SQL6)               | <b>67.47</b>    | 67.14           | <b>67.21</b>    | <b>66.95</b>    |
| SQL9(SQL4+SQL6)               | 67.14           | 67.14           | 66.95           | 66.75           |

Table 8: Detailed evaluation results of SQL revision and SQL merge revision using different initial candidate SQL1 on the BIRD development set. 1-time revision means that only one round of SQL revision is performed on candidate SQL1 to generate SQL2 and SQL3, and 2-time revision means that two rounds of SQL revision are performed on candidate SQL1 to generate SQL2 and SQL3. SQL4 (SQL1+SQL2) means that candidate SQL4 is generated after merge revision of SQL1 and SQL2. The generation process of other SQL5-SQL9 is similar.

## C.2 Prompt for Candidate SQL Generate

```
{DATABASE SCHEMA}

-- Using valid SQLite and understanding
External Knowledge, answer the following
questions for the tables provided above.

Question: {QUESTION}
-- External Knowledge: {EVIDENCE}

Please output only the final SQL query, starts
with keyword 'SELECT'.
```

## C.4 Prompt for SQL Merge Revision

```
{DATABASE SCHEMA}

-- Using valid SQLite and understanding
External Knowledge, answer the following
questions for the tables provided above.

Question: {QUESTION}
-- External Knowledge: {EVIDENCE}

Here are some corresponding draft SQL and
execute result:
1. {PREDICT_SQL1}
Execution result
{EXECUTE_RESULT1}

2. {PREDICT_SQL2}
Execution result
{EXECUTE_RESULT2}

Please output only the final SQL query, starts
with keyword 'SELECT'.
```

## C.3 Prompt for SQL Revision

```
{DATABASE SCHEMA}

-- Using valid SQLite and understand-
ing External Knowledge, revise the SQL
query that answers the following questions of
the above table schema based on the predicted
SQL and SQL execution results. If the current
SQL query is correct, return the query directly.

Question: {QUESTION}
-- External Knowledge: {EVIDENCE}

Predicted SQL query: {PREDICT_SQL}
SQL execute result: {EXECUTE_RESULT}

Please output only the final revised SQL query,
starts with keyword 'SELECT'.
```