

Unmasking Database Vulnerabilities: Zero-Knowledge Schema Inference Attacks in Text-to-SQL Systems

Dorđe Klisura and **Anthony Rios**

Department of Information Systems and Cyber Security

The University of Texas at San Antonio

{Dorde.Klisura, Anthony.Rios}@utsa.edu

Abstract

Relational databases are integral to modern information systems, serving as the foundation for storing, querying, and managing data efficiently and effectively. Advancements in large language modeling have led to the emergence of text-to-SQL technologies, significantly enhancing the querying and extracting of information from these databases and raising concerns about privacy and security. Our research extracts the database schema elements underlying a text-to-SQL model. Knowledge of the schema can make attacks such as SQL injection easier. By asking specially crafted questions, we have developed a zero-knowledge framework designed to probe various database schema elements without knowledge of the database itself. The text-to-SQL models then process these questions to produce an output that we use to uncover the structure of the database schema. We apply it to specialized text-to-SQL models fine-tuned on text-SQL pairs and generative language models used for SQL generation. Overall, we can reconstruct the table names with an F1 of nearly .75 for fine-tuned models and .96 for generative.

1 Introduction

Text-to-SQL systems are designed to convert natural language questions into executable SQL queries (Yaghmazadeh et al., 2017; Zhong et al., 2017; Yu et al., 2018a; Zelle and Mooney, 1996). This advancement in database management allows users to interact with databases without a prior understanding of SQL syntax or the database structure, enhancing database accessibility and broadening the usability of data-driven applications. Given that text-to-SQL models can provide access to data to more users in an easy-to-use framework, organizations are now using them locally, and cloud providers are releasing systems as a service (Obeng et al., 2024; Eusebius et al., 2024). Moreover, there is increasing interest in text-to-SQL in sensitive




Figure 1: Reconstructing database schema by interacting with text-to-SQL model and using surrogate LLM.

domains such as healthcare (Tarbell et al., 2023; Lee et al., 2022; Wang et al., 2020b).

Although natural language interfaces to databases offer many benefits, research on their security aspects has been limited despite the acknowledged security concerns (Peng et al., 2022, 2023). Generally, the systems input two pieces of information: the database schema and a query. The schema can be hidden from the user, so they only need to write a natural language question. Many organizations hide information from various users on a need-to-know basis, including database schema information. The schema can provide users with propriety information, which companies want to protect. For example, an AI company may collect and store unique data sources, resulting in a leading AI solution. If adversaries know what information is used to train the AI solutions, they could replicate that work. Furthermore, the organization can be more easily attacked if unauthorized users can access information embedded within the text-to-SQL model.

The reliance of these systems on database schema for SQL query generation also makes organizations susceptible to SQL injection attacks, among the most prevalent security threats (Clarke-

Salt and Clarke, 2012; Halfond et al., 2006). Specifically, knowing the database architecture can enable attackers to craft precise SQL injection attacks, leading to unauthorized data access, modification, or deletion of critical data, exploiting vulnerabilities, and causing severe data breaches (Yeole and Meshram, 2011; Zhang et al., 2023). Given the growing reliance of organizations on these systems for various applications, it is important to address these security concerns to ensure the integrity and security of text-to-SQL technologies. However, there has not been research into whether an adversary can gain access to the entire database schema without direct access to the model in a black-box testing setup.

To address this gap, we propose a framework that probes the database schema elements underlying text-to-SQL models without prior knowledge of the database. The framework employs automatic question generation and leverages a surrogate model to interpret responses from the attacked model. This process involves iterative probing and analysis, ultimately leading to a detailed reconstruction of the database schema. Figure 1 illustrates our approach at a high level.

It is important to emphasize that text-to-SQL systems are built using two general approaches: fine-tuning and prompt-engineering. Fine-tuned text-to-SQL models are specifically trained on text-SQL pairs, which could include the exact data used in the database and real-world SQL statements, potentially enabling them to achieve higher accuracy in targeted datasets and domains (Rai et al., 2023; Li et al., 2023; Qi et al., 2022). Fine-tuned models will generally only return SQL statements. In contrast, generative large language models (LLMs) using prompt-based frameworks are designed to handle various tasks, generating SQL queries from natural language input based on extensive pre-training on diverse data corpora (Gao et al., 2023; Pourreza and Rafiei, 2024; Dong et al., 2023). In this paper, we show that our system can reproduce the database schema independent of the specific text-to-SQL model type.

Overall, our contributions are as follows:

- (i) We introduce a novel zero-knowledge framework for probing database schema elements underlying text-to-SQL models.
- (ii) We comprehensively evaluate the framework across multiple datasets and various types of

models: two fine-tuned and four generative language models.

- (iii) We introduce and evaluate a simple protection mechanism for generative large language models using prompting to mitigate our attacks directly, yet we show they are still vulnerable.

2 Related Work

Our research is related to two lines of work: Text-to-SQL models and security in NLP and LLMs.

Text-to-SQL. Text-to-SQL semantic parsing has been extensively studied to develop language agents for database applications (Dahl et al., 1994; Zelle and Mooney, 1996). Since the release of many large-scale text-to-SQL datasets (Zhong et al., 2017; Wang et al., 2020b; Yu et al., 2018b), many parsers have been developed on top of language models to understand various database schemas better. Most methods fall into one of two approaches: Fine-tuned or prompt-based systems.

Fine-tuned methods focus on adapting pre-trained models like BERT (Devlin et al., 2018) and T5 (Raffel et al., 2020) to the specific task of SQL generation from natural language queries. For example, SQLova (Hwang et al., 2019) and BRIDGE (Lin et al., 2020) leverage BERT’s ability to understand complex language structures and apply additional layers or mechanisms to tailor the model for SQL prediction. SQLova uses BERT to encode input questions and schemas, applying a sketch-based method to predict the SQL components in a structured manner (Deng et al., 2022). Meanwhile, pre-trained models specifically designed for tabular data have also been introduced. For instance, TaPas (Herzig et al., 2020) and TaBERT (Yin et al., 2020) extend BERT’s capabilities to handle tables by incorporating table-specific embeddings and objectives during pre-training (Qin et al., 2022). Recent advancements also include models like Grappa (Yu et al., 2020), which uses a grammar-augmented pre-training framework that integrates table schema linking, significantly improving the accuracy of generated SQL queries by effectively capturing relational structures within the data (Deng et al., 2022).

On the other hand, LLM-based methods for text-to-SQL have gained prominence due to their ability to perform zero-shot reasoning and generalize across domains (Zhang et al., 2024). These methods have repeatedly set new benchmarks on

the Spider leaderboard. For instance, C3 (Dong et al., 2023), a zero-shot Text-to-SQL method built on ChatGPT, achieved an execution accuracy of 82.3% by optimizing model input, bias, and output. DIN-SQL (Pourreza and Rafiei, 2024) introduced a decomposition approach, breaking the task into smaller, manageable sub-tasks, and reached an accuracy of 85.3% on Spider. DAIL-SQL (Gao et al., 2023) further pushed the accuracy to 86.6% through supervised fine-tuning and a systematic study of in-context learning, focusing on selecting and organizing helpful examples in prompts. These LLM-based methods leverage the in-context learning, semantic understanding, and reasoning capabilities of LLMs. For example, C3 exploits ChatGPT’s zero-shot learning capability, while DIN-SQL simplifies the task by focusing on schema linking, difficulty classification, and SQL generation (Li et al., 2024b). DAIL-SQL combines in-context learning with supervised fine-tuning to enhance LLM performance further. Advanced reasoning methods, such as chain-of-thought and self-reflection, are also incorporated to improve the accuracy and robustness of SQL generation (Zhang et al., 2024).

With regard to this paper, fine-tuned and prompt-based systems have different pros and cons from a performance and security standpoint. Fine-tuned training can work well when the training data closely or exactly matches what is used at test time. However, this can result in more security vulnerabilities. Fine-tuned models can leak the database schema, but worse, they may be prone to data inference attacks that can access the training data explicitly. On the other hand, prompt-based solutions may not perform well as highly fine-tuned in-domain models, but they outperform fine-tuned systems on out-of-domain data. Moreover, they are not trained on the actual organization’s data. However, these systems are still prone to database schema leaks. In this paper, we evaluate how each model type is more susceptible to attacks that leak the database schema.

Security in NLP and LLMs Security in this context primarily concerns the robustness of NLP models to adversarial attacks, the potential for model misuse, and safeguarding sensitive data during model training and deployment (Morris et al., 2020; Goyal et al., 2023; Yao et al., 2024; Zhang et al., 2020).

Adversarial attacks threaten NLP model secu-

rity by introducing subtle input perturbations that lead to incorrect or harmful outputs (Szegedy et al., 2013; Qiu et al., 2022; Coalson et al., 2023). Consequently, various methods for generating natural adversarial texts have been introduced (Li et al., 2020; Ebrahimi et al., 2017; Ren et al., 2019; Li et al., 2018; Jin et al., 2020; Garg and Ramakrishnan, 2020; Guo et al., 2021). Furthermore, similar approaches have been shown to affect LLMs, with carefully crafted prompts inducing aligned LLMs to generate malicious content (Wei et al., 2024). Unlike traditional adversarial examples, these jailbreaks are crafted manually, making them labor-intensive. Although there has been some progress in automatic prompt-tuning for adversarial attacks on LLMs (Shin et al., 2020; Wen et al., 2024; Jones et al., 2023), this remains a challenging task due to the discrete nature of token inputs in LLMs.

Apart from the security risks associated with adversarial attacks, LLMs that are trained and fine-tuned on sensitive, domain-specific data face significant privacy concerns due to their tendency to retain and reproduce verbatim text from their training data (Anil et al., 2023; Carlini et al., 2019, 2021, 2022). Recent work (Panda et al., 2024) proposes a data extraction attack that enables adversaries to target and extract sensitive information, including credit card numbers, from a model trained on user data. Furthermore, state-of-the-art privacy attacks against LLMs have shown that over 50% of the fine-tuning datasets can be extracted from a fine-tuned LLM in natural settings (Wang et al., 2024). A recent survey by (Yan et al., 2024) highlights the urgency of addressing these vulnerabilities with comprehensive privacy protection mechanisms, such as differential privacy and federated learning, to safeguard sensitive data across all stages of LLM development.

Our work extends prior research on NLP and LLM security by focusing on the vulnerabilities of text-to-SQL systems. By examining how these models can infer database schema elements without prior knowledge, we highlight significant risks to database security. Understanding these vulnerabilities is critical, as it informs the development of better defenses for text-to-SQL systems and other LLM applications interacting with structured data.

3 Method

Intuitively, our goal is to reconstruct the database schema underlying the text-to-SQL model, includ-




Figure 2: **Overview of the Schema Reconstruction Process.** In the first step, we generate initial input questions, including both random and adversarial queries, which are processed by the text-to-SQL model. The second step involves preliminary schema interpretation using a surrogate LLM (GPT-4) to analyze the model’s outputs and formulate an initial schema. In the third step, the surrogate model generates new questions targeting the identified schema elements to refine the schema understanding. The final fourth step is schema reconstruction, where the surrogate model consolidates all the information to produce a detailed database schema.

ing table names, column names, and their corresponding data types, without having direct access to it. In this section, we describe the method we developed to achieve this.

We begin by formally defining the task. Given a set of natural language questions $\{Q_1, Q_2, \dots, Q_n\}$, and their corresponding SQL query outputs $\{Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_n\}$ generated by a text-to-SQL model, the objective is to reconstruct database schema $S = (T, C, D)$, where $T = \{t_1, \dots, t_m\}$ represents table names, $C = \{c_1, \dots, c_p\}$ represent columns names and $D = \{d_1, \dots, d_p\}$ represents their corresponding data types. The process of generating an SQL query Y by a large language model M can be defined as a conditional probability distribution:

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{Y} | \mathcal{P}(Q, S)) = \prod_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{Y}|} \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{M}}(Y_i | \mathcal{P}(Q, S), Y_{1:i-1})$$

where $\mathcal{P}(Q, S)$ represents the prompt combining the natural language question Q and the schema S , Y_i denotes the i -th token of the SQL query Y , and $|\mathcal{Y}|$ denotes the length of Y .

Intuitively, given the model is prompted with the schema, it is liable to leak information at generation time. Hence, we introduce a novel zero-knowledge framework for reconstructing a database schema underlying text-to-SQL models. Our approach consists of four stages: 1) initial input generation, 2) preliminary schema interpretation, 3) dynamic question generation and refinement, and 4) schema reconstruction. Figure 2 provides an overview of

this process. In the following subsections, we describe each stage in detail.

Step 1: Initial Input Generation. We begin by crafting inputs to the text-to-SQL system, categorized into two distinct types: random input strings and “adversarial” input questions.

We assume that even when a random input is passed to the text-to-SQL model, the text-to-SQL model that has either been trained to produce a specific response or just prompted with schema information may inadvertently leak schema information included in the prompt. By feeding the model a series of random strings, we aim to exploit this tendency for information leakage. The goal is to collect as much hidden schema information as possible from the outputs generated in response to these random inputs. The reasoning is that with sufficient random inputs, we can maximize the likelihood of extracting useful schema details embedded in the model’s responses. Here is an example of the random input we used to feed the model: *3qio#jwfi@Qaaijf*.

In addition to random inputs, we include adversarial input questions specifically designed to prompt the generative models to reveal database schema details directly. Some examples of adversarial questions include the following: (1) Identify tables that contain geospatial data types (2) Show the table names in the database (3) List columns

with enumerated types and their possible values. Generative LLMs are more susceptible to these simple adversarial questions, producing outputs ranging from SQL queries to fragments of the database schema.

We generate an initial set of input questions, including random input strings and adversarial queries. These inputs are then fed into the text-to-SQL model, which processes them and generates the corresponding outputs used in the next step.

Step 2: Preliminary Schema Interpretation (PSI). This step leverages the interpretive capabilities of GPT-4 (Achiam et al., 2023) to synthesize a preliminary understanding of the database structure, laying the foundation for more refined schema reconstruction in subsequent steps. We employ GPT-4 as a surrogate LLM to analyze and interpret the outputs from step 1. The generated responses from the text-to-SQL model are passed to GPT-4, which is then prompted to provide an initial assumption of the database schema, including the database context, table names, column names, and data types. Based on these tables and columns, GPT-4 is also prompted to infer what other tables it would expect to see in the database. For example, if the model returns a query:

```
SELECT name FROM STUDENTS;
```

GPT-4 can infer that name is a column and STUDENTS is a table. The model is further instructed to estimate the data types of the columns. In this case, GPT-4 understands that the column name is likely stored as a text data type in the STUDENTS table. Furthermore, GPT-4 is prompted to estimate the presence of related tables that were not directly mentioned in the output, such as COURSES, ENROLLMENTS, or GRADES, each with its relevant columns and their data types. This predictive step helps hypothesize a more comprehensive schema that will lead us to craft better questions in Step 3.

Step 3: Dynamic Question Generation and Refinement. After obtaining the initial estimation of the schema, we prompt the surrogate model to craft natural language questions for the text-to-SQL model that target the identified tables and help us infer other unknown schema elements. We use the prompt

Given the initial estimation of the schema {schema}, generate random natural language questions to help infer other

unknown schema elements. We are using these questions for a text-to-SQL model.

where {schema} is the currently estimated schema from Step 2. Once we have these new questions, they are passed back to the text-to-SQL model to obtain refined outputs.

To illustrate the idea behind this, let's consider our example of the STUDENTS table. Based on the preliminary schema interpretation (Step 2), we know that the schema consists of a table STUDENTS that has columns name and age. We now want the model to craft questions that not only help us collect more information about other unknown elements in table STUDENTS but also potentially reveal new schema components. For instance, a question targeting a known or estimated schema element might be:

What are the names of all courses that students are enrolled in?

When we pass this question to the text-to-SQL model, if these elements exist in the schema, we might receive an SQL query like:

```
SELECT course_name
FROM COURSES
JOIN ENROLLMENTS ON COURSES.
    course_id = ENROLLMENTS.
    course_id
JOIN STUDENTS ON ENROLLMENTS.
    student_id = STUDENTS.
    student_id;
```

From this output, we can draw several conclusions about new tables, columns, and data types:

- **New tables:** The query reveals the existence of the COURSES and ENROLLMENTS tables.
- **New columns:** We learn about new columns such as course_id in both COURSES and ENROLLMENTS, student_id in STUDENTS and ENROLLMENTS, and course_name in COURSES.
- The query indicates that ENROLLMENTS serves as a linking table between STUDENTS and COURSES, with foreign keys student_id and course_id establishing these relationships.

By crafting these questions, we prompt the text-to-SQL model to generate outputs that can continue to reveal relationships between tables and uncover additional tables. Through this iterative process, the model refines our understanding of known schema elements and helps discover new ones, ultimately

Dataset	# DB	# Tables/DB	# Domains
Spider	200	5.1	138
BIRD	95	7.38	37

Table 1: Data Statistics.

leading to a more comprehensive and accurate reconstruction of the database schema.

Step 4: Schema Reconstruction. In the final step, we use surrogate LLM to analyze the outputs from Step 3 and Step 1 to reconstruct the database schema. We prompt the model to extract table names, column names, and the data types of the columns. This detailed analysis enables the model to piece together a comprehensive schema.

For example, if the previous steps have revealed table names like STUDENTS, COURSES, and ENROLLMENTS, along with columns such as student_id, name, course_id, and course_name, the model will identify these elements and determine their respective data types, such as integer for student_id and course_id, and text for columns name and course_name. This step results in a detailed schema reconstruction, accomplished without prior knowledge of the database, i.e., we pass random strings as input. Finally, we note that Steps 1, 2, and 3 can be repeated multiple times, refining the schema iteratively. In our experiments, we only make one complete cycle of the process in Figure 2.

4 Evaluation

In this section, we evaluate the effectiveness of our approach, detailing the data used, the baselines for comparison, and the results obtained.

Data. The evaluation uses two datasets: Spider (Yu et al., 2018b) and BIRD (Li et al., 2024a). Spider is a large-scale, complex, and cross-domain text-to-SQL dataset. On the other hand, BIRD (BIG Bench for LaRge-scale Database Grounded Text-to-SQL Evaluation) is a novel dataset that addresses the gap between academic benchmarks and real-world applications by focusing on the challenges posed by database value comprehension and handling massive databases. The data statistics are summarized in Table 1.

Metrics. To evaluate how well we can reconstruct the database schema, we use precision, recall, and F1 as our performance metrics in three scenarios: table, column, and data type performance. For ta-

Model	Execution Accuracy
T5-Large	82.67
SQLCoder	73.69
Code Llama	61.26
GPT-4	72.61
LLAMA 3	60.38
LLAMA 2	50.32

Table 2: Model execution accuracy.

bles, we define a true positive (TP) for a given table name t_i if our predicted table name \hat{t}_i matches. We define a TP for columns when the predicted table and column name tuple (t_i, c_i) matches the actual tuple (\hat{t}_i, \hat{c}_i) . This implies that even if we predict a correct column, but match it to the wrong table, it would be a false positive (FP) and a false negative (FN). For the data types, we define a TP when the predicted table name, column name, and data type triple $(\hat{t}_i, \hat{c}_i, \hat{d}_i)$ matches the actual triple (t_i, c_i, d_i) . Like columns, predicting the correct data type but associating it with the wrong column or table would result in an FP and FN. We calculate example-like precision, recall, and F1-score by evaluating these metrics for each database individually and then averaging the scores across all databases. Additionally, following the work of Wang et al. (2020a), we evaluated the performance of the models used in our study for the text-to-SQL task in terms of execution accuracy.

Baselines. In our study, we establish a baseline by testing the ability of different models to directly output the database schema. We test four generative models: GPT-4, LLAMA 3 (AI@Meta, 2024), LLAMA 2 (Touvron et al., 2023), and Code Llama (Roziere et al., 2023), along with two fine-tuned models: T5-Large (Raffel et al., 2020) and SQLCoder (Ping and Srivastava, 2023). To establish a baseline, we use a simple prompt to assess each model’s ability to output the database schema directly. The baseline prompt used for all models is as follows:

Output the database schema. Output tables, columns, and data types.

We employ GPT-4 to analyze the results from the baseline prompt. The results from this baseline evaluation provide a reference point to measure the improvements and effectiveness of our proposed schema reconstruction methodology.

Additionally, we introduce a simple protection mechanism for generative LLMs using prompting to mitigate our attacks directly. This is the prompt we use is

			Table			Table+Col			Table+Col+Type		
			Prec	Rec	F1	Prec	Rec	F1	Prec	Rec	F1
Baseline	Fine-tuned	T5 Large	.371	.184	.228	.111	.039	.053	.102	.035	.048
		SQLCoder	.211	.189	.192	.078	.039	.047	.039	.017	.021
	Gen. LLMs	LLAMA 3	.097	.053	.064	.072	.031	.042	.067	.029	.039
		LLAMA 2	.071	.029	.038	.136	.061	.079	.056	.032	.038
		Code LLAMA 2	.556	.532	.535	.215	.122	.146	.201	.112	.134
		GPT 4.0	.799	.769	.782	.815	.774	.787	.818	.772	.787
	Gen. LLMs (Sec)	LLAMA 3	.052	.018	.027	.112	.034	.048	.027	.013	.017
		LLAMA 2	.023	.007	.010	.070	.034	.041	.033	.016	.019
		GPT 4.0	.712	.625	.666	.734	.648	.688	.743	.658	.698
	PSI	Fine-tuned	T5 Large	.621	.688	.625	.336	.289	.296	.302	.253
SQLCoder			.262	.416	.306	.121	.142	.122	.100	.114	.100
Gen. LLMs		LLAMA 3	.247	.302	.255	.219	.281	.233	.180	.235	.194
		LLAMA 2	.191	.290	.213	.338	.507	.375	.279	.418	.310
		Code LLAMA 2	.666	.746	.673	.695	.782	.702	.554	.626	.559
		GPT 4.0	.957	.910	.927	.991	.938	.957	.900	.828	.854
Gen. LLMs (Sec)		LLAMA 3	.026	.083	.037	.104	.207	.129	.079	.146	.096
		LLAMA 2	.118	.158	.128	.335	.518	.372	.296	.451	.326
		GPT 4.0	.940	.879	.900	.964	.704	.792	.814	.572	.655
Schema Reconstruction		Fine-tuned	T5 Large	.764	.792	.746	.425	.359	.369	.372	.297
	SQLCoder		.611	.715	.659	.407	.334	.343	.266	.231	.231
	Gen. LLMs	LLAMA 3	.755	.591	.601	.750	.380	.459	.494	.262	.316
		LLAMA 2	.738	.874	.767	.758	.573	.604	.169	.159	.158
		Code LLAMA 2	.910	.934	.906	.880	.838	.840	.766	.710	.721
		GPT 4.0	.993	.948	.965	.980	.823	.881	.837	.686	.741
	Gen. LLMs (Sec)	LLAMA 3	.741	.518	.547	.672	.233	.316	.207	.078	.106
		LLAMA 2	.761	.835	.756	.727	.523	.560	.182	.122	.133
		GPT 4.0	.989	.892	.921	.973	.611	.718	.796	.483	.571

Table 3: Performance results on the Spider dataset.

If the natural language question is not relevant to the schema or is nonsensical (gibberish), respond with "Question not valid."

This protection mechanism aims to prevent the model from releasing SQL statements if the question is unrelated to the database schema.

Results. Our study evaluates the effectiveness of our schema reconstruction approach across multiple text-to-SQL models and datasets, comparing it against baseline methods and preliminary schema interpretation (PSI). The results are summarized in Tables 3 and 4. We also report the execution accuracies of the text-to-SQL models in table 2.

First, we report the general text-to-SQL performance in Table 2. Overall, the fine-tuned T5-Large model performs the best, scoring 82.67. The next best methods are SQLCoder and GPT-4, with 73.69 and 72.61, respectively. The worst method was LLAMA 2, yet it still shows that it can generate the correct SQL statement more than half the time.

For the spider results in Table 3, our schema reconstruction method substantially outperforms the baseline and PSI approaches. For fine-tuned models, T5-Large achieved an F1 score of 0.746 for

table reconstruction, while SQLCoder reached an F1 score of 0.659. These scores indicate substantial improvements over the baseline F1 scores of 0.228 and 0.192, respectively. Similarly, the Code LLAMA 2 model achieved an F1 score of 0.906.

Generative models also showed notable improvements with our schema reconstruction method. GPT-4, in particular, achieved an F1 score of 0.965 for table reconstruction, far surpassing the baseline score of 0.782 and the PSI score of 0.927. Other generative models, such as LLAMA 3 and LLAMA 2, also demonstrated enhanced performance with our approach, achieving F1 scores of 0.601 and 0.767, respectively, compared to their baseline scores. The most interesting results are for GPT-4, which can sometimes have slightly worse results with our method than the baseline and PSI. The reason is that GPT-4 is highly likely to return the entire schema if asked simply. We experimented with various prompts that explicitly asked it not to return the schema as a security feature, yet it did not work.

The BIRD dataset results, presented in Table 4, further confirm the effectiveness of our schema reconstruction method. For fine-tuned models, T5-Large achieved an F1 score of 0.636, and SQLCoder

			Table			Table+Col			Table+Col+Type		
			Prec	Rec	F1	Prec	Rec	F1	Prec	Rec	F1
Baseline	Fine-tuned	T5 Large	.366	.139	.185	.161	.050	.065	.134	.033	.049
		SQLCoder	.148	.135	.139	.184	.095	.112	.181	.085	.104
	Gen. LLMs	LLAMA 3	.056	.028	.035	.164	.076	.094	.159	.065	.085
		LLAMA 2	.175	.069	.091	.191	.075	.100	.178	.066	.090
		Code LLAMA 2	.440	.350	.369	.234	.155	.172	.197	.117	.136
		GPT 4.0	.744	.616	.655	.778	.645	.685	.775	.637	.677
	Gen. LLMs (Sec)	LLAMA 3	.035	.016	.021	.176	.076	.096	.164	.066	.087
		LLAMA 2	.140	.059	.071	.233	.079	.108	.197	.062	.086
		GPT 4.0	.653	.554	.584	.697	.578	.611	.690	.573	.606
	PSI	Fine-tuned	T5 Large	.670	.621	.609	.288	.222	.228	.200	.150
SQLCoder			.315	.445	.356	.139	.209	.158	.108	.157	.119
Gen. LLMs		LLAMA 3	.688	.387	.456	.361	.126	.171	.278	.073	.102
		LLAMA 2	.914	.860	.873	.436	.387	.379	.370	.318	.315
		Code LLAMA 2	.872	.790	.801	.394	.400	.379	.342	.330	.320
		GPT 4.0	.933	.829	.862	.722	.674	.676	.602	.547	.553
Gen. LLMs (Sec)		LLAMA 3	.761	.346	.433	.423	.129	.168	.330	.091	.120
		LLAMA 2	.886	.770	.785	.419	.342	.329	.351	.270	.268
		GPT 4.0	.952	.874	.896	.670	.469	.510	.549	.365	.404
Schema Reconstruction		Fine-tuned	T5 Large	.720	.631	.636	.326	.204	.229	.253	.151
	SQLCoder		.504	.709	.526	.251	.304	.250	.208	.239	.208
	Gen. LLMs	LLAMA 3	.903	.450	.559	.465	.172	.225	.371	.118	.164
		LLAMA 2	.881	.821	.825	.424	.330	.343	.320	.238	.251
		Code LLAMA 2	.919	.844	.866	.415	.431	.403	.340	.343	.326
		GPT 4.0	.982	.871	.904	.557	.436	.456	.421	.322	.339
	Gen. LLMs (Sec)	LLAMA 3	.895	.423	.528	.471	.160	.216	.366	.118	.163
		LLAMA 2	.844	.733	.748	.428	.284	.298	.337	.230	.239
		GPT 4.0	.983	.836	.884	.614	.363	.417	.438	.253	.289

Table 4: Performance results on the BIRD dataset.

reached 0.526, both showing significant improvements from their baseline scores of 0.185 and 0.139, respectively. Code LLAMA 2 also exhibited strong performance with an F1 score of 0.866.

Among the generative models, GPT-4 again demonstrated exceptional improvements with our method, achieving an F1 score of 0.904 for table reconstruction, compared to the baseline score of 0.655 and the PSI score of 0.862. LLAMA 3 and LLAMA 2 models achieved F1 scores of 0.559 and 0.825, respectively, showcasing improvements over their baseline scores. Again, though, we find weird numbers for the columns and some datatypes for GPT-4. This can happen because of noise introduced into the system, given that the model has a high chance of regurgitating the schema. Still, our schema reconstruction approach is more robust than baseline and PSI across all model types. Moreover, we want to point out that the table name is generally the most important feature from an attack perspective (e.g., for SQL injections). Moreover, nothing stops an attacker from using all three approaches and manually interpreting the estimated schemas; hence, recall will be the most important attribute. Moreover, our main finding is that the text-to-SQL models are prone to attacks and more

research is needed to mitigate them.

5 Conclusion

This study highlights the significant security risks associated with text-to-SQL models by demonstrating a novel zero-knowledge framework capable of reconstructing database schema underlying text-to-SQL model. The ability to uncover schema elements without prior knowledge of the database underscores security threats, like sophisticated SQL injection attacks, which pose a substantial threat to data security and privacy.

We evaluated the effectiveness of our approach through an extensive evaluation of the Spider and BIRD datasets, where we achieved high F1 scores, particularly with generative models like GPT-4. The study underscores the urgent need for enhanced security measures in text-to-SQL systems. Future work should focus on developing more robust defense mechanisms to protect against schema leakage and other potential security threats. Furthermore, given the explosion of prompting-based methods in industry, our approach can be seen as a method to steal pieces of a prompt and could be extended to non-text-to-SQL tasks as well.

6 Limitations

Despite the promising results achieved in our study, several limitations must be acknowledged. First, the evaluation was conducted on the Spider and BIRD datasets, which, although large and diverse, may not fully represent all real-world database schemas. The schemas in these datasets are primarily academic or benchmark datasets, potentially limiting the generalizability of our findings to more complex or proprietary database schemas in industry applications. These databases are relatively small, with an average of 5 to 7 tables in each database. Real-world databases can contain hundreds or thousands of tables.

Additionally, the performance of our schema reconstruction approach varies significantly across different text-to-SQL models. While GPT-4 demonstrated high accuracy in schema reconstruction, other models like LLAMA 2 and 3 showed lower performance. This variability indicates that our approach may be more effective with certain models, particularly those with advanced language understanding and generation capabilities. Also, our approach uses GPT-4 as a surrogate model to interpret the outputs of the text-to-SQL model and generate new probing questions. The success of this step is contingent upon the surrogate model’s ability to accurately understand and predict database schema elements, which may not always align perfectly with the schema used by the text-to-SQL model.

While we introduced a simple protection mechanism for generative LLMs to mitigate our attacks, this approach may not be comprehensive. More sophisticated security measures need to be explored and evaluated to ensure the robustness of text-to-SQL systems against schema inference attacks. Finally, our method involves iterative querying and analysis, which may be computationally intensive and time-consuming, particularly for large databases with complex schemas. Optimizing the efficiency of this process is essential for practical deployment in real-world scenarios.

Addressing these limitations will be critical in future work to enhance the robustness, generalizability, and efficiency of our schema reconstruction approach and ensure its applicability across a wider range of text-to-SQL systems and database environments.

7 Ethical Implications

The methods and findings presented in this paper carry significant ethical implications. While our research aims to highlight and address vulnerabilities in text-to-SQL systems, the techniques developed could potentially be misused by malicious actors to infer and steal sensitive information from databases. This underscores the dual-use nature of our work, where advancements in understanding and mitigating security risks also present opportunities for exploitation.

Researchers and practitioners must consider the ethical responsibilities of developing and deploying such technologies. Ensuring that security measures and protections are robust and effective is paramount to preventing unauthorized access and safeguarding sensitive data. Furthermore, it is essential to promote awareness and adherence to ethical guidelines within the research community to mitigate the potential misuse of these techniques.

Our findings highlight the urgent need for comprehensive security frameworks and practices to protect against schema inference attacks and other vulnerabilities in text-to-SQL systems. By advancing our understanding of these risks and developing more resilient defenses, we aim to contribute positively to the field while acknowledging and addressing the associated ethical challenges.

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*.
- AI@Meta. 2024. [Llama 3 model card](#).
- Rohan Anil, Andrew M Dai, Orhan Firat, Melvin Johnson, Dmitry Lepikhin, Alexandre Passos, Siamak Shakeri, Emanuel Taropa, Paige Bailey, Zhifeng Chen, et al. 2023. Palm 2 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.10403*.
- Nicholas Carlini, Daphne Ippolito, Matthew Jagielski, Katherine Lee, Florian Tramèr, and Chiyuan Zhang. 2022. Quantifying memorization across neural language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.07646*.
- Nicholas Carlini, Chang Liu, Úlfar Erlingsson, Jernej Kos, and Dawn Song. 2019. The secret sharer: Evaluating and testing unintended memorization in neural networks. In *28th USENIX security symposium (USENIX security 19)*, pages 267–284.
- Nicholas Carlini, Florian Tramèr, Eric Wallace, Matthew Jagielski, Ariel Herbert-Voss, Katherine Lee, Adam Roberts, Tom Brown, Dawn Song, Úlfar Erlingsson, et al. 2021. Extracting training data from large language models. In *30th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 21)*, pages 2633–2650.
- Justin Clarke-Salt and Justin Clarke. 2012. *SQL injection attacks and defense*. Elsevier.
- Zachary Coalson, Gabriel Ritter, Rakesh Bobba, and Sanghyun Hong. 2023. Bert lost patience won’t be robust to adversarial slowdown. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36:62561–62578.
- Deborah A Dahl, Madeleine Bates, Michael K Brown, William M Fisher, Kate Hunnicke-Smith, David S Pallett, Christine Pao, Alexander Rudnicky, and Elizabeth Shriberg. 1994. Expanding the scope of the atis task: The atis-3 corpus. In *Human Language Technology: Proceedings of a Workshop held at Plainsboro, New Jersey, March 8-11, 1994*.
- Naihao Deng, Yulong Chen, and Yue Zhang. 2022. [Recent advances in text-to-SQL: A survey of what we have and what we expect](#). In *Proceedings of the 29th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, pages 2166–2187, Gyeongju, Republic of Korea. International Committee on Computational Linguistics.
- Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2018. Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.04805*.
- 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*.
- Javid Ebrahimi, Anyi Rao, Daniel Lowd, and Dejing Dou. 2017. Hotflip: White-box adversarial examples for text classification. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1712.06751*.
- Nitin Eusebius, Arghya Banerjee, and Randy DeFauw. 2024. [Generating value from enterprise data: Best practices for text2sql and generative ai](#). Amazon Bedrock, Generative AI, Intermediate (200).
- 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*.
- Siddhant Garg and Goutham Ramakrishnan. 2020. Bae: Bert-based adversarial examples for text classification. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.01970*.
- Shreya Goyal, Sumanth Doddapaneni, Mitesh M Khapra, and Balaraman Ravindran. 2023. A survey of adversarial defenses and robustness in nlp. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 55(14s):1–39.
- Chuan Guo, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Hervé Jégou, and Douwe Kiela. 2021. Gradient-based adversarial attacks against text transformers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.13733*.
- William G Halfond, Jeremy Viegas, Alessandro Orso, et al. 2006. A classification of sql-injection attacks and countermeasures. In *Proceedings of the IEEE international symposium on secure software engineering*, volume 1, pages 13–15. IEEE Piscataway, NJ.
- Jonathan Herzig, Paweł Krzysztof Nowak, Thomas Müller, Francesco Piccinno, and Julian Martin Eisen-schlos. 2020. Tapas: Weakly supervised table parsing via pre-training. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.02349*.
- Wonseok Hwang, Jinyeong Yim, Seunghyun Park, and Minjoon Seo. 2019. A comprehensive exploration on wikisql with table-aware word contextualization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1902.01069*.
- Di Jin, Zhijing Jin, Joey Tianyi Zhou, and Peter Szolovits. 2020. Is bert really robust? a strong baseline for natural language attack on text classification and entailment. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, volume 34, pages 8018–8025.
- Erik Jones, Anca Dragan, Aditi Raghunathan, and Jacob Steinhardt. 2023. Automatically auditing large language models via discrete optimization. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 15307–15329. PMLR.
- Gyubok Lee, Hyeonji Hwang, Seongsu Bae, Yeonsu Kwon, Woncheol Shin, Seongjun Yang, Minjoon Seo, Jong-Yeup Kim, and Edward Choi. 2022. Ehrsql: A practical text-to-sql benchmark for electronic health records. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:15589–15601.

- Dianqi Li, Yizhe Zhang, Hao Peng, Liquan Chen, Chris Brockett, Ming-Ting Sun, and Bill Dolan. 2020. Contextualized perturbation for textual adversarial attack. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.07502*.
- Haoyang Li, Jing Zhang, Cuiping Li, and Hong Chen. 2023. Resdsq: Decoupling schema linking and skeleton parsing for text-to-sql. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 37, pages 13067–13075.
- Jinfeng Li, Shouling Ji, Tianyu Du, Bo Li, and Ting Wang. 2018. Textbugger: Generating adversarial text against real-world applications. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1812.05271*.
- Jinyang Li, Binyuan Hui, Ge Qu, Jiayi Yang, Binhua Li, Bowen Li, Bailin Wang, Bowen Qin, Ruiying Geng, Nan Huo, et al. 2024a. 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.
- Zhishuai Li, Xiang Wang, Jingjing Zhao, Sun Yang, Guoqing Du, Xiaoru Hu, Bin Zhang, Yuxiao Ye, Ziyue Li, Rui Zhao, et al. 2024b. Pet-sql: A prompt-enhanced two-stage text-to-sql framework with cross-consistency. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.09732*.
- Xi Victoria Lin, Richard Socher, and Caiming Xiong. 2020. Bridging textual and tabular data for cross-domain text-to-sql semantic parsing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2012.12627*.
- John Morris, Eli Lifland, Jin Yong Yoo, Jake Grigsby, Di Jin, and Yanjun Qi. 2020. Textattack: A framework for adversarial attacks, data augmentation, and adversarial training in nlp. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing: System Demonstrations*, pages 119–126.
- Adam Obeng, J.C. Zhong, and Charlie Gu. 2024. [How we built text-to-sql at pinterest](#). Pinterest Engineering Blog.
- Ashwinee Panda, Christopher A Choquette-Choo, Zhengming Zhang, Yaoqing Yang, and Prateek Mittal. 2024. Teach llms to phish: Stealing private information from language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.00871*.
- Xutan Peng, Yipeng Zhang, Jingfeng Yang, and Mark Stevenson. 2022. On the security vulnerabilities of text-to-sql models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.15363*.
- Xutan Peng, Yipeng Zhang, Jingfeng Yang, and Mark Stevenson. 2023. On the vulnerabilities of text-to-sql models. In *2023 IEEE 34th International Symposium on Software Reliability Engineering (ISSRE)*, pages 1–12. IEEE.
- Wendy Aw Wong Jing Ping and Rishabh Srivastava. 2023. [Open-sourcing sqlcoder2-15b and sqlcoder-7b](#). Accessed: 2024-06-15.
- Mohammadreza Pourreza and Davood Rafiei. 2024. Din-sql: Decomposed in-context learning of text-to-sql with self-correction. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36.
- Jiexing Qi, Jingyao Tang, Ziwei He, Xiangpeng Wan, Yu Cheng, Chenghu Zhou, Xinbing Wang, Quanshi Zhang, and Zhouhan Lin. 2022. Rasat: Integrating relational structures into pretrained seq2seq model for text-to-sql. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 3215–3229.
- 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*.
- Shilin Qiu, Qihe Liu, Shijie Zhou, and Wen Huang. 2022. Adversarial attack and defense technologies in natural language processing: A survey. *Neurocomputing*, 492:278–307.
- Colin Raffel, Noam Shazeer, Adam Roberts, Katherine Lee, Sharan Narang, Michael Matena, Yanqi Zhou, Wei Li, and Peter J Liu. 2020. Exploring the limits of transfer learning with a unified text-to-text transformer. *Journal of machine learning research*, 21(140):1–67.
- Daking Rai, Bailin Wang, Yilun Zhou, and Ziyu Yao. 2023. Improving generalization in language model-based text-to-sql semantic parsing: Two simple semantic boundary-based techniques. In *The 61st Annual Meeting Of The Association For Computational Linguistics*.
- Shuhuai Ren, Yihe Deng, Kun He, and Wanxiang Che. 2019. Generating natural language adversarial examples through probability weighted word saliency. In *Proceedings of the 57th annual meeting of the association for computational linguistics*, pages 1085–1097.
- Baptiste Roziere, Jonas Gehring, Fabian Gloeckle, Sten Sootla, Itai Gat, Xiaoqing Ellen Tan, Yossi Adi, Jingyu Liu, Tal Remez, Jérémy Rapin, et al. 2023. Code llama: Open foundation models for code. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.12950*.
- Taylor Shin, Yasaman Razeghi, Robert L Logan IV, Eric Wallace, and Sameer Singh. 2020. Autoprompt: Eliciting knowledge from language models with automatically generated prompts. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.15980*.
- Christian Szegedy, Wojciech Zaremba, Ilya Sutskever, Joan Bruna, Dumitru Erhan, Ian Goodfellow, and Rob Fergus. 2013. Intriguing properties of neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1312.6199*.
- Richard Tarbell, Kim-Kwang Raymond Choo, Glenn Dietrich, and Anthony Rios. 2023. Towards understanding the generalization of medical text-to-sql models

- and datasets. In *AMIA Annual Symposium Proceedings*, volume 2023, page 669. American Medical Informatics Association.
- Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajjwal Bhargava, Shruti Bhosale, et al. 2023. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09288*.
- Bailin Wang, Richard Shin, Xiaodong Liu, Oleksandr Polozov, and Matthew Richardson. 2020a. 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.
- Jeffrey G Wang, Jason Wang, Marvin Li, and Seth Neel. 2024. Pandora’s white-box: Increased training data leakage in open llms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.17012*.
- Ping Wang, Tian Shi, and Chandan K Reddy. 2020b. Text-to-sql generation for question answering on electronic medical records. In *Proceedings of The Web Conference 2020*, pages 350–361.
- Alexander Wei, Nika Haghtalab, and Jacob Steinhardt. 2024. Jailbroken: How does llm safety training fail? *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36.
- Yuxin Wen, Neel Jain, John Kirchenbauer, Micah Goldblum, Jonas Geiping, and Tom Goldstein. 2024. Hard prompts made easy: Gradient-based discrete optimization for prompt tuning and discovery. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36.
- Navid Yaghmazadeh, Yuepeng Wang, Isil Dillig, and Thomas Dillig. 2017. Sqlizer: query synthesis from natural language. *Proceedings of the ACM on Programming Languages*, 1(OOPSLA):1–26.
- Biwei Yan, Kun Li, Minghui Xu, Yueyan Dong, Yue Zhang, Zhaochun Ren, and Xiuzheng Cheng. 2024. On protecting the data privacy of large language models (llms): A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.05156*.
- Yifan Yao, Jinhao Duan, Kaidi Xu, Yuanfang Cai, Zhibo Sun, and Yue Zhang. 2024. A survey on large language model (llm) security and privacy: The good, the bad, and the ugly. *High-Confidence Computing*, page 100211.
- AS Yeole and BB Meshram. 2011. Analysis of different technique for detection of sql injection. In *Proceedings of the International Conference & Workshop on Emerging Trends in Technology*, pages 963–966.
- Pengcheng Yin, Graham Neubig, Wen-tau Yih, and Sebastian Riedel. 2020. Tabert: Pretraining for joint understanding of textual and tabular data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.08314*.
- Tao Yu, Zifan Li, Zilin Zhang, Rui Zhang, and Dragomir Radev. 2018a. Typesql: Knowledge-based type-aware neural text-to-sql generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1804.09769*.
- Tao Yu, Chien-Sheng Wu, Xi Victoria Lin, Bailin Wang, Yi Chern Tan, Xinyi Yang, Dragomir Radev, Richard Socher, and Caiming Xiong. 2020. Grappa: Grammar-augmented pre-training for table semantic parsing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.13845*.
- Tao Yu, Rui Zhang, Kai Yang, Michihiro Yasunaga, Dongxu Wang, Zifan Li, James Ma, Irene Li, Qingning Yao, Shanelle Roman, et al. 2018b. Spider: A large-scale human-labeled dataset for complex and cross-domain semantic parsing and text-to-sql task. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1809.08887*.
- John M Zelle and Raymond J Mooney. 1996. Learning to parse database queries using inductive logic programming. In *Proceedings of the national conference on artificial intelligence*, pages 1050–1055.
- Bin Zhang, Yuxiao Ye, Guoqing Du, Xiaoru Hu, Zhishuai Li, Sun Yang, Chi Harold Liu, Rui Zhao, Ziyue Li, and Hangyu Mao. 2024. Benchmarking the text-to-sql capability of large language models: A comprehensive evaluation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.02951*.
- Jinchuan Zhang, Yan Zhou, Binyuan Hui, Yaxin Liu, Ziming Li, and Songlin Hu. 2023. Trojansql: Sql injection against natural language interface to database. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 4344–4359.
- Wei Emma Zhang, Quan Z Sheng, Ahoud Alhazmi, and Chenliang Li. 2020. Adversarial attacks on deep-learning models in natural language processing: A survey. *ACM Transactions on Intelligent Systems and Technology (TIST)*, 11(3):1–41.
- Victor Zhong, Caiming Xiong, and Richard Socher. 2017. Seq2sql: Generating structured queries from natural language using reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1709.00103*.

A Performance analysis across different database sizes

To further assess the effectiveness of our schema reconstruction framework, we conducted an experiment where we split the databases of the BIRD dataset into three categories based on the number of tables they contain: 1-4 tables, 5-9 tables, and 10+ tables. This allowed us to evaluate how well our method performs across databases of varying complexity. The results of this analysis are illustrated in Figure 3 and they show the F1 score for database schema tables in the Schema Reconstruction step.

Our findings indicate that the schema reconstruction method performs consistently across different




Figure 3: Reconstructing database schema by interacting with text-to-SQL model and using surrogate LLM.

database sizes, although there is a noticeable variation in performance based on the number of tables. The performance generally decreases as the number of tables increases, with the highest F1 scores achieved in databases with 1-4 tables. Overall we conclude that:

- **Fine-tuned Models:** T5-Large shows a significant drop from an F1 score of 0.7 in databases with 1-4 tables to 0.45 in databases with 10+ tables. SQLCoder, on the other hand, performs better with databases containing 5-9 tables than with those containing 1-4 tables.
- **Generative LLMs:** GPT-4 demonstrates strong performance across all categories, with an F1 score of 0.97 for databases with 1-4 tables and 0.76 for databases with 10+ tables. LLAMA models also show a similar trend but with lower overall F1 scores compared to GPT-4.
- **Generative LLMs (Sec):** The addition of a security mechanism reduces the F1 scores across all models and categories. However, the models still achieve respectable performance, indicating that our method can effectively handle databases of varying complexity even with security measures in place.

These results demonstrate that our schema reconstruction framework is robust and effective across different database sizes and complexities.

B Error Analysis

In our schema reconstruction process, we encountered two major types of errors: semantic substitutions and suffix mismatches.

Semantic Substitutions. The first type of error involved the use of semantically similar words instead of the exact terms used in the schema. For example, instead of using the exact table name SocialSecurity, the model might predict SSN. This type of error often occurred when the model substituted abbreviations or alternate names that were not present in the original schema, resulting in false predictions.

Suffix Mismatches. The second type of error involved incorrect suffix usage, particularly with singular and plural forms. This occurred when the model predicted a table name, column name, or data type in a different form than it appeared in the actual schema. For instance, if the actual table name was STUDENTS and the model predicted STUDENT (singular), this discrepancy led to a false result. Similarly, column names and data types were sometimes written with the wrong suffix, causing inconsistencies in the final schema reconstruction.