

Text-to-SQL based on Large Language Models and Database Keyword Search

Eduardo R. Nascimento¹, Caio Viktor S. Avila^{1,4}, Yenier T. Izquierdo¹, Grettel M. García¹, Lucas Feijó L. Andrade¹, Michelle S.P. Facina², Melissa Lemos¹, Marco A. Casanova^{1,3}

¹ Instituto Tecgraf, PUC-Rio, Rio de Janeiro, RJ, Brazil CEP 22451-900

² Petrobras, Rio de Janeiro, RJ, Brazil CEP 20231-030

³ Departamento de Informática, PUC-Rio, Rio de Janeiro, RJ, Brazil CEP 22451-900

⁴ Departamento de Computação, UFC, Fortaleza, Brazil, CEP 60440-900

{rogerrsn,ytorres,ggarcia,lucasfeijo,melissa}@tecgraf.puc-rio.br; caioviktor@alu.ufc.br; michelle@petrobras.com.br; casanova@inf.puc-rio.br

Keywords: Text-to-SQL, Database Keyword Search, Large Language Models, Relational Databases.

Abstract: Text-to-SQL prompt strategies based on Large Language Models (LLMs) achieve remarkable performance on well-known benchmarks. However, when applied to real-world databases, their performance is significantly less than for these benchmarks, especially for Natural Language (NL) questions requiring complex filters and joins to be processed. This paper then proposes a strategy to compile NL questions into SQL queries that incorporates a dynamic few-shot examples strategy and leverages the services provided by a database keyword search (KwS) platform. The paper details how the precision and recall of the schema-linking process are improved with the help of the examples provided and the keyword-matching service that the KwS platform offers. Then, it shows how the KwS platform can be used to synthesize a view that captures the joins required to process an input NL question and thereby simplify the SQL query compilation step. The paper includes experiments with a real-world relational database to assess the performance of the proposed strategy. The experiments suggest that the strategy achieves an accuracy on the real-world relational database that surpasses state-of-the-art approaches. The paper concludes by discussing the results obtained.

1 INTRODUCTION

The *Text-to-SQL* task is defined as “given a relational database D and a natural language (NL) sentence Q_N that describes a question on D , generate an SQL query Q_{SQL} over D that expresses Q_N ” (Katsogiannis-Meimarakis and Koutrika, 2023; Kim et al., 2020).

Numerous tools have addressed this task with relative success (Affolter et al., 2019; Katsogiannis-Meimarakis and Koutrika, 2023; Kim et al., 2020; Shi et al., 2024) over well-known benchmarks, such as Spider – Yale Semantic Parsing and Text-to-SQL Challenge (Yu et al., 2018) and BIRD – BIG Bench for Large-scale Database Grounded Text-to-SQL Evaluation (Li et al., 2024). The leaderboards of these benchmarks point to a firm trend: the best text-to-SQL tools are all based on Large Language Models (LLMs) (Shi et al., 2024).

Text-to-SQL tools must face several challenges. To begin with, they must be able to process NL questions that require multiple SQL constructs (Yu et al.,

2018). For example, processing the NL question:

“Which has more open orders, $P-X$ or $P-Y$?”

requires:

- Recognizing that $P-X$ and $P-Y$ are industrial installations;
- Joining installations and orders;
- Understanding what is an open order;
- Computing the number of open orders for each of the installations.
- Returning the installation with the largest number of open orders.

Omitting the details, the following SQL query would answer the above NL question:

```
SELECT t.name,
       COUNT(*) AS number_open_orders
FROM Installation t JOIN Order o
     ON t.code = o.installation_code
WHERE (t.name = 'P-X' OR t.name = 'P-Y')
```

```

AND LOWER(o.status) LIKE LOWER ('%Open%')
GROUP BY t.code
ORDER BY number_open_orders DESC
FETCH 1

```

This is an example of a challenging NL question that the strategy proposed in this paper can compile into a correct SQL query.

In addition, *real-world databases* raise a different set of challenges for several reasons, among which:

1. The relational schema is often large, in the number of tables, columns per table, and foreign keys – which may lead to queries with many joins, which are difficult to synthesize.
2. The relational schema is often an inappropriate specification of the database from the point of view of the LLM – the table and column names are often different from the terms the users adopt to formulate their NL questions.
3. The data semantics are often complex; for example, some data values may encode enumerated domains, which implies that the terms the users adopt to formulate their NL questions must be mapped to this internal semantics.
4. Metadata and data are often ambiguous, which influences the behavior of an LLM-based text-to-SQL tool, leading to unexpected results.

Indeed, the performance of some of the best LLM-based text-to-SQL tools on real-world databases is significantly less than that observed for the Spider and BIRD benchmarks (Nascimento et al., 2024a; Lei et al., 2024).

This paper then addresses the *real-world text-to-SQL problem*, which is the version of the text-to-SQL problem for real-world databases. Albeit the original problem has been investigated for some time, this version is considered far from solved, as argued in (Floratos et al., 2024; Lei et al., 2024).

The first contribution of the paper is a novel strategy to compile NL questions into SQL queries that leverages the services provided by a database keyword search (KwS) platform, called DANKE (Izquierdo et al., 2021; Izquierdo et al., 2024). The proposed strategy is the first one to explore a symbiotic combination of a KwS platform and a prompt strategy to process NL questions.

Briefly, Section 4.3 details how the combination of DANKE’s data dictionary with a dynamic few-shot examples strategy improves the precision and recall of the schema-linking process, that is, the process of finding a set of tables that suffice to compile an input NL question. Then, Section 4.4 shows how the SQL query compilation step is also improved by calling DANKE to synthesize a view V that captures the

required joins to answer the input NL question Q_N , and then calling an LLM to compile Q_N into an SQL query Q_{SQL} over V , which can be remapped to the database schema with the help of the definition of V .

The second contribution of the paper is a set of experiments with a real-world benchmark to assess the performance of the proposed strategy. The benchmark is built upon a relational database with a challenging schema, which is in production at an energy company, and a set of 100 NL questions carefully defined to reflect the NL questions users submit and to cover a wide range of SQL constructs (Spider and BIRD, two of the familiar text-to-SQL benchmarks, were not adopted for the reasons explained in Section 2.1). These new results, combined with results from (Nascimento et al., 2024a), indicate that the proposed strategy performs significantly better on the real-world benchmark than LangChain SQL-QueryChain, SQLCoder¹, “C3 + ChatGPT + Zero-Shot” (Dong et al., 2023), and “DIN-SQL + GPT-4” (Pourreza and Rafiei, 2024).

This paper is an extended version of (Nascimento et al., 2025).

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 covers related work. Section 3 describes the database keyword search platform adopted in the paper. Section 4 details the proposed text-to-SQL strategy. Section 5 presents the experiments, including the real-world benchmark used. Finally, Section 6 contains the conclusions.

2 RELATED WORK

2.1 Text-to-SQL Datasets

The Spider – Yale Semantic Parsing and Text-to-SQL Challenge (Yu et al., 2018) defines 200 datasets, covering 138 different domains, for training and testing text-to-SQL tools.

For each database, Spider lists 20–50 hand-written NL questions and their SQL translations. An NL question S , with an SQL translation Q_N , is classified as easy, medium, hard, and extra-hard, where the difficulty is based on the number of SQL constructs of Q_N – GROUP BY, ORDER BY, INTERSECT, nested sub-queries, column selections, and aggregators – so that an NL query whose translation Q_N contains more SQL constructs is considered more complex. The set of NL questions introduced in Section 5.1.2 follows this classification, but does not consider extra-hard NL questions.

¹<https://huggingface.co/defog/sqlcoder-34b-alpha>

Spider proposes three evaluation metrics: *component matching* checks whether the components of the prediction and the ground-truth SQL queries match exactly; *exact matching* measures whether the predicted SQL query as a whole is equivalent to the ground-truth SQL query; *execution accuracy* requires that the predicted SQL query selects a list of gold values and fills them into the correct slots. Section 5.2 describes the metric used in the experiments of this paper, which is a variation of execution accuracy.

Most databases in Spider have very small schemas – the largest five databases have between 16 and 25 tables, and about half have schemas with five tables or fewer. Furthermore, all Spider NL questions are phrased in terms used in the database schemas. These two limitations considerably reduce the difficulty of the text-to-SQL task. Therefore, the results reported in the Spider leaderboard are biased toward databases with small schemas and NL questions written in the schema vocabulary, which is not what one finds in real-world databases.

Spider has two interesting variations. Spider-Syn (Gan et al., 2021a) is used to test how well text-to-SQL tools handle synonym substitution, and Spider-DK (Gan et al., 2021b) addressed testing how well text-to-SQL tools deal with domain knowledge.

BIRD – Big Bench for LaRge-scale Database Grounded Text-to-SQL Evaluation (Li et al., 2024) is a large-scale, cross-domain text-to-SQL benchmark in English. The dataset contains 12,751 text-to-SQL data pairs and 95 databases with a total size of 33.4 GB across 37 domains. However, BIRD still does not have many databases with large schemas – of the 73 databases in the training dataset, only two have more than 25 tables, and, of the 11 databases used for development, the largest one has only 13 tables. Again, all NL questions are phrased in the terms used in the database schemas.

Finally, the `sql-create-context`² dataset also addresses the text-to-SQL task, and was built from WikiSQL and Spider. It contains 78,577 examples of NL questions, SQL `CREATE TABLE` statements, and SQL queries answering the questions. The `CREATE TABLE` statement provides context for the LLMs, without having to provide actual rows of data.

Despite the availability of these benchmark datasets for the text-to-SQL task, and inspired by them, Section 5.1 describes a benchmark dataset constructed specifically to test strategies designed for the real-world text-to-SQL task. The benchmark dataset consists of a relational database, three sets of LLM-friendly views, specified as described in Section 5.1.3,

²<https://huggingface.co/datasets/b-mc2/sql-create-context>

and a set of 100 test NL questions and their ground-truth SQL translations. The database schema is inspired by a real-world schema and is far more challenging than most of the database schemas available in Spider or BIRD. The database is populated with real data with a semantics which is sometimes not easily mapped to the semantics of the terms the users adopt (such as “`criticality_level = 5`” encodes “critical orders”), which is a challenge for the text-to-SQL task not captured by unpopulated databases, as in Spider. Finally, the NL questions mimic those posed by real users, and cover a wide range of SQL constructs (see Table 1 in Section 5.1.2).

2.2 Text-to-SQL Tools

A comprehensive survey of text-to-SQL strategies can be found in (Shi et al., 2024), including a discussion of benchmark datasets, prompt engineering, and fine-tuning methods, partly covered in what follows.

The Spider Web site³ publishes a leaderboard with the best-performing text-to-SQL tools. At the time of this writing, the top 5 tools achieved an accuracy that ranged from an impressive 85.3% to 91.2% (two of the tools are not openly documented). Four tools use GPT-4, as their names imply. The three tools that provide detailed documentation have an elaborate first prompt that tries to select the tables and columns that best match the NL question. Therefore, this first prompt is prone to failure if the database schema induces a vocabulary disconnected from the NL question terms. This failure cannot be fixed by even more elaborate prompts that try to match the schema and the NL question vocabularies, but it should be addressed as proposed in this paper.

The BIRD Web site⁴ also publishes a leaderboard with the best-performing tools. At the time of this writing, out of the top 5 tools, two use GPT-4, one uses CodeS-15B, one CodeS-7B, and one is not documented. The sixth and seventh tools also use GPT-4, appear in the Spider leaderboard, and are well-documented.

The Awesome Text2SQL Web site⁵ lists the best-performing text-to-SQL tools on WikiSQL, Spider (Exact Match and Exact Execution) and BIRD (Valid Efficiency Score and Execution Accuracy).

The DB-GPT-Hub⁶ is a project exploring how to use LLMs for text-to-SQL. It contains data collection, data preprocessing, model selection and building, and

³<https://yale-lily.github.io/spider>

⁴<https://bird-bench.github.io>

⁵<https://github.com/eosphoros-ai/Awesome-Text2SQL>

⁶<https://github.com/eosphoros-ai/DB-GPT-Hub>

fine-tuning weights, including LLaMA-2, and evaluating several LLMs fine-tuned for text-to-SQL.

Several text-to-SQL tools were tested in (Nascimento et al., 2024a) against the benchmark used in this paper – SQLCoder, LangChain SQLQueryChain, C3, and DIN+SQL.

SQLCoder⁷ is a specialized text-to-SQL model, open-sourced under the Apache-2 license. The sqlcoder-34b-alpha model features 34B parameters and was fine-tuned on a base CodeLlama model, on more than 20,000 human-curated questions, classified as in Spider, based on ten different schemas.

LangChain⁸ is a generic framework that offers several pre-defined strategies to build and run SQL queries based on NL prompts.

“C3 + ChatGPT + Zero-Shot” (Dong et al., 2023) (or briefly C3) is a prompt-based strategy, originally defined for ChatGPT, that uses only approximately 1,000 tokens per query and achieves a better performance than fine-tuning-based methods. C3 has three key components: *Clear Prompting* (CP); *Calibration with Hints* (CH); *Consistent Output* (CO). At the time of writing, C3 was the sixth strategy listed in the Spider leaderboard, achieving 82.3% in terms of execution accuracy on the test set. It outperformed state-of-the-art fine-tuning-based approaches in execution accuracy on the test set.

“DIN-SQL + GPT-4” (Pourreza and Rafiei, 2024) (or briefly DIN) uses only prompting techniques and decomposes the text-to-SQL task into four steps: *schema linking*; *query classification and decomposition*; *SQL generation*; and *self-correction*. When released, DIN was the top-performing tool listed in the Spider leaderboard, achieving 85.3% in terms of execution accuracy.

Despite the impressive results of C3 and DIN on Spider, and of SQLCoder on a specific benchmark, the performance of these tools on the benchmark used in this paper was significantly lower (Nascimento et al., 2024a), and much less than that of the strategy described in Section 4. A similar remark applies to LangChain SQLQueryChain, whose results are shown in Line 1 of Table 3.

2.3 Retrieval-Augmented and Dynamic Few-shot Examples Prompting

Retrieval-Augmented Generation (RAG), introduced in (Lewis et al., 2020), is a strategy to incorporate data from external sources. This process ensures that the responses are grounded in retrieved evidence, thereby

significantly enhancing the accuracy and relevance of the output. There is an extensive literature on RAG. A recent survey (Gao et al., 2024) classified RAG strategies into *naive*, *advanced*, and *modular* RAG. Naive RAG follows the traditional process that includes indexing, retrieval, and generation of document “chunks”. Advanced RAG introduces various methods to optimize retrieval. Modular RAG integrates strategies to enhance functional modules, such as incorporating a search module for similarity retrieval and applying a fine-tuning approach in the retriever.

As for text-to-SQL, recent references include a RAG technique (Panda and Gozluklu, 2024) to retrieve table and column descriptions from a metadata store that are related to the NL question, based on similarity search.

LangChain offers a dynamic few-shot examples prompting technique⁹ also based on similarity search. Given an NL question Q_N , the prompting strategy includes the examples most relevant to Q_N , retrieved by a similarity search between Q_N and a set of examples previously stored in a vector database.

A retrieval-augmented prompting method for a LLM-based text-to-SQL framework is proposed in (Guo et al., 2024), involving sample-aware prompting and a dynamic revision chain. The method uses two strategies to retrieve questions sharing similar intents with input questions. Firstly, using LLMs, the method simplifies the original questions, unifying the syntax and thereby clarifying the users’ intentions. To generate executable and accurate SQL queries without human intervention, the method incorporates a dynamic revision chain, which iteratively adapts fine-grained feedback from the previously generated SQL queries.

A similar strategy is proposed in (Coelho et al., 2024), that also describes a technique to create synthetic datasets with sets of examples (Q, S) where Q_N is an NL question and S is its SQL translation.

3 A DATABASE KEYWORD QUERY PROCESSING TOOL

DANKE is the keyword search platform currently deployed for the industrial database described in Section 5.1 and used for the experiments. The reader is referred to (Izquierdo et al., 2021; Izquierdo et al., 2024) for the details of the platform.

DANKE operates over both relational databases and RDF datasets, and is designed to compile a key-

⁷<https://huggingface.co/defog/sqlcoder-34b-alpha>

⁸<https://python.langchain.com>

⁹https://python.langchain.com/v0.1/docs/use_cases/sql/prompting/

word query into an SQL or SPARQL query that returns the best data matches. For simplicity, the description that follows uses the relational terminology.

DANKE’s architecture comprises three main components: (1) *Storage Module*; (2) *Preparation Module*; and (3) *Data and Knowledge Extraction Module*.

The *Storage Module* houses a centralized relational database, constructed from various data sources. The database is described by a *conceptual schema*, treated in what follows as a relational schema, again for simplicity.

The *Storage Module* also holds the data indices required to support the keyword search service. The indexing process is enriched to create a *keyword dictionary* containing:

- for each table T , an entry of the form (T, T_S) , where T_S is a list of terms users adopt to refer to table T .
- for each column A of a table T , an entry of the form (A, T, A_S) , where A_S is a list of terms that users adopt to refer to column A in the context of table T .
- for each indexed value v , an entry of the form (v, T, A) , where $T[A]$ is the table/column where v occurs.

The *Preparation Module* has tools for creating the conceptual schema and for constructing and updating the centralized database through a pipeline typical of a data integration process. The conceptual schema is defined by de-normalizing the relational schemas of the underlying databases and indicating which columns will have their values indexed.

The *Data and Knowledge Extraction Module* has two main sub-modules, *Query Compilation* and *Query Processing*.

Given a keyword query, represented by a list of keywords, the *Query Compilation Module* has three major steps:

1. (*Matching Discovery*) Match each keyword in the keyword query with table and column names or data values in the keyword dictionary.
2. (*Matching Optimization*) Select the most relevant matches.
3. (*Conceptual Query Compilation*) Compile a *conceptual query* over the conceptual schema from the most relevant matches.

The *Query Processing Module*, in turn, has two major steps:

1. (*Query Compilation*) Compile the conceptual query into an SQL query.

2. (*Query Execution*) Submit the SQL query for execution, collect the results, and display them to the user.

Let R be the referential dependencies diagram of the database schema in question, where the nodes of R are the tables and there is an edge between nodes t and u iff there is a foreign key from t to u or vice-versa. Given a set of keywords K , let T_K be a set of table schemes whose instances match the largest set of keywords in K . The conceptual query compilation step first constructs a Steiner tree S_K of R whose end nodes are the set T_K . This is the central point since it guarantees that the final SQL query will not return unconnected data, as explored in detail in (García et al., 2017). If R is connected, then it is always possible to construct one such Steiner tree; otherwise, one would have to find a Steiner forest to cover all tables in T_K .

Using the Steiner tree, the Query Compilation step compiles the keyword query into an SQL query that includes restriction clauses representing the keyword matches and join clauses connecting the restriction clauses. Without such join clauses, an answer would be a disconnected set of tuples, which hardly makes sense. The generation of the join clauses uses the Steiner tree edges.

Lastly, DANKE’s internal API was expanded to support the text-to-SQL strategy described in Section 4. Briefly, it now offers the following services:

- *Keyword Match Service*: receives a set K of keywords and returns the set K_M of pairs (k, d_k) such that $k \in K$ and d_k is the dictionary entry that best matches k , using the matching optimization heuristic mentioned above. The dictionary entry d_k will be called the *data associated with k* .
- *View Synthesis Service*: receives a set S' of tables and returns a view V that best joins all tables in S' , using the Steiner tree optimization heuristic mentioned above.

4 A STRATEGY FOR THE TEXT-TO-SQL TASK

4.1 Outline of the Proposed Strategy

Briefly, the proposed strategy comprises two modules, *schema linking* and *SQL query compilation*, as typical of text-to-SQL prompt strategies. Figure 1 summarizes the proposed strategy, leaving the details to the next sections.

The two modules run under LangChain. They use a dynamic few-shot examples strategy that retrieves a set of samples from a *synthetic dataset D* ,




Figure 1: Proposed strategy.

indexed with the help of the FAISS similarity search library¹⁰. The key point is the use of services provided by DANKE to enhance schema linking and simplify SQL compilation, as explained in the following sections. In particular, DANKE will generate a single SQL view containing all data and encapsulating all joins necessary to answer the input NL question.

The current implementation runs in-house: LangChain, FAISS, DANKE, and Oracle. The experiments used the OpenAI GPT-4 and its variations, as detailed in Section 5.

4.2 Synthetic Dataset Construction

Let DB be a relational database with schema S . A *synthetic dataset* D for DB contains pairs (Q_N, Q_{SQL}) , where Q_N is an NL question and Q_{SQL} is its SQL translation. Such pairs should provide examples that help the LLM understand how the database schema is structured, how the user’s terms map to terms of the database schema, and how NL language constructions map to data values.

The synthetic dataset construction process repeatedly calls Algorithm 1 to generate as many pairs (Q_N, Q_{SQL}) as desired. The parameter n is set in each call to determine how many tables the SQL query should involve.

Step 1 (on Line 2) selects a set T of n tables from the database schema S . The selection process employs a weighted random distribution, which reflects the likelihood of each table being chosen by an average user. Note that users may choose some tables more often than others, which justifies employing a weighted random distribution, obtained from the users’ access log.

Step 2 (on Line 3) selects column pairs for each

Algorithm 1: Generating examples for the synthetic dataset.

Data: the number n of tables to select, the database DB , the database schema S , and the database documentation DB_{doc} , if available.

Result: a pair (Q_N, Q_{SQL}) where Q_N is an NL question and Q_{SQL} is the corresponding SQL query.

1 **Function** $CreateExample(n, DB, S, DB_{doc})$:

2 $T \leftarrow SelectTables(n, S)$;

3 $C \leftarrow SelectColumns(T, S)$;

4 $L \leftarrow CreateDDL(T, C)$;

5 $Q_{N'} \leftarrow CreateQuestion(L)$;

6 $Q_{SQL} \leftarrow GenerateSQL(Q_{N'}, L)$;

7 $Q_N \leftarrow ImproveQuestion(Q_{N'}, S, DB_{doc})$;

8 **return** (Q_N, Q_{SQL}) ;

table chosen in Step 1. The first column selected is always the primary key of the table, and the second column is chosen based on the weighted random distribution of each column in the database schema S .

Step 3 (on Line 4) creates a simplified Data Definition Language (DDL) statement L , encompassing only the columns and tables involved. Column and table names are renamed to their respective names in the conceptual schema views (see Section 5.1.3).

Step 4 (on Line 5) creates an NL question $Q_{N'}$ by prompting GPT-4 with the simplified DDL statement L and sample values of each column from the database DB . In addition, the prompt includes the type of restriction to be incorporated into the NL question, which depends on the data type of each column. For example, numeric-type columns can be used to create queries with aggregations. Finally, the prompt includes instructions that indicate that $Q_{N'}$ must be generated in the database vocabulary; that is, the table and column names must be kept to facilitate the generation of the SQL corresponding to the NL question.

Step 5 (on Line 6) calls GPT-4 to translate $Q_{N'}$ into an SQL query that responds to the NL question by providing $Q_{N'}$ and L . This process is facilitated by the fact that the SQL query should use the database schema vocabulary; that is, the prompt provides clues about which tables, columns, and values are involved.

The key point is to explore the column type to decide which SQL construct must be used to express a restriction for the column. For example, given a string B , if column `INSTALLATION_NAME` were of type `STRING` and not a key, the prompt would guide GPT-4 to create a restriction of the form

`INSTALLATION_NAME LIKE '%B%'`

¹⁰<https://ai.meta.com/tools/faiss/>

However, if column `INSTALLATION_NAME` were a key, then the prompt would guide GPT-4 to create a restriction of the form

`INSTALLATION_NAME = 'B'`

Finally, Step 6 (on Line 7) calls GPT-4 to translate $Q_{N'}$ into an improved NL question Q_N , using the database documentation DB_{doc} , which includes the description of each column and table, along with synonyms. During this step, the LLM is instructed to rephrase the NL question by translating from the database schema vocabulary to the user’s vocabulary, preserving the original NL question intent.

4.3 Schema Linking

Let DB be a relational database with schema S and D be the synthetic dataset created for DB . Let Q_N be an NL question over S .

The schema linking module primarily finds a minimal set $S' \subset S$ such that S' has all tables in S required to answer Q_N . It has the following major components (see Figure 2):

Keyword Extraction and Matching

1. Receives as input an NL question Q_N .
2. Calls the LLM to extract a set K of keywords from Q_N .
3. Calls the DANKE Keyword Matching service to match K with the dictionary, creating a final set K_M of keywords and associated data.
4. Returns K_M .

Dynamic Few-shot Examples Retrieval (DFE)

1. Receives as input an NL question Q_N .
2. Retrieves from the synthetic dataset D a set of k examples whose NL questions are most similar to Q_N , generating

$$L = [(Q_1, SQL_1), \dots, (Q_k, SQL_k)]$$

3. Creates a list T of pairs by retaining only the table names in the `FROM` clauses, that is,

$$T = [(Q_1, F_1), \dots, (Q_k, F_k)]$$

where F_i is the set of tables in the `FROM` clause of SQL_i .

4. Returns T .

Schema Linking

1. Receives as input an NL question Q_N , a set K_M of keywords and associated data, and a list T as above.
2. Retrieves the set of tables in S and their columns.
3. Calls the LLM to create S' prompted by Q_N , K_M , S , and T .
4. Returns S' and K_M .




Figure 2: Schema linking module.

4.4 SQL Query Compilation

The SQL query compilation module receives as input the NL question Q_N , the set of tables S' , and the set K_M of keywords and associated data, and returns an SQL query Q_{SQL} . It has the following major components (see Figure 3):

View Synthesis

1. Receives as input a set of tables S' .
2. Calls the DANKE View Synthesis service to synthesize a view V that joins the tables in S' .
3. Returns V .

Question Decomposition

1. Receives as input an NL question Q_N .
2. Decomposes Q_N into sub-questions Q_1, \dots, Q_m .
3. Returns Q_1, \dots, Q_m .

Dynamic Few-shot Examples Retrieval (DFE)

1. Receives as input a list of NL questions Q_1, \dots, Q_m .
2. Let $p = \lceil k/m \rceil$. For each $i \in [1, m]$, retrieves from the synthetic dataset D a set of p examples whose NL questions are most similar to Q_i and whose SQL queries are over S' , generating a list
$$L_i = [(Q_{i_1}, SQL_{i_1}), \dots, (Q_{i_p}, SQL_{i_p})]$$
in decreasing order of similarity of Q_{i_j} to Q_i .
3. Creates the final list L , with k elements, by intercalating the lists L_i and retaining the top- k pairs.
4. Returns L .

SQL Compilation

1. Receives as input a view V , a set K_M of keywords and associated data, an NL question Q_N , and a list L as above.

2. In each SQL query SQL_{i_j} in L , replaces all tables in the FROM clauses by V , creating a new list L' .
3. Retrieves from DB a set M of row samples of V .
4. Calls the LLM to compile Q_N into an SQL query Q_{SQL} over V , when prompted with Q_N , V , K_M , M and L' .
5. Returns Q_{SQL} .




Figure 3: SQL query compilation module.

4.5 Limitations and Examples

If the proposed text-to-SQL strategy can compile an NL question Q_N into an SQL query Q_{SQL} , then Q_{SQL} is such that:

- Q_{SQL} is defined over a single table V .
- V is a view defined by an SQL query over a single table or a block of equijoin clauses, with no WHERE clause and no optional clauses (GROUP BY, HAVING, ORDER BY, and LIMIT clauses).

These conditions reflect the way the text-to-SQL strategy is structured. Indeed, first, observe that, in the *SQL Query Compilation* module, the *View Synthesis* step calls DANKE’s *View Synthesis Service* to create a view V , defined by a set of equijoin clauses over the set of tables S' passed by the schema linking module. This step improves the (manual) approach proposed in (Nascimento et al., 2024b).

Then, the *SQL Compilation* step prompts the LLM with view V to generate the SQL query. View V then facilitates the translation of an NL question into an SQL query since the LLM no longer needs to discover which joins to include in the SQL query.

The predicted SQL queries and the views in Tables 5 and 6 at the end of the paper provide examples of

such NL questions, SQL queries, and views, two of which are discussed in more detail in what follows.

As a very simple example, consider Question 24 in Table 5, which requires joining tables *Recommendation* and *Installation*, as its ground-truth SQL query indicates. The schema linking module can compute that Question 24 requires these two tables. Then, the *View Synthesis* step calls DANKE, which receives the relational schema (see Table 4) and these two tables, finds the required join, and synthesizes the following view (some details of the view definition are omitted here for brevity):

```
CREATE VIEW
Recommendation_Installation AS
SELECT r.id AS
Recommendation_id,
r.situation AS
Recommendation_situation,
...
FROM Recommendation r
JOIN Installation p
ON r.installation_name =
p.name
```

As a result, the SQL compilation step generates an SQL query without explicitly including this join (see the predicted SQL query for Question 24 in Table 5).

The SQL compilation step prompts this view to the LLM as if it were a table in DDL format:

```
CREATE TABLE
Recommendation_Installation
(Recommendation_id,
Recommendation_situation,...)
```

However, this very simple example does not fully illustrate the power of using DANKE to join any number of tables. A slightly more complex example goes as follows.

Consider Question 93 in Table 6, which requires joining tables *Maintenance_request*, *Maintenance_recommendation*, and *Maintenance_order*, as its ground-truth SQL query indicates. Again, the schema linking module can compute that Question 93 requires these three tables. Then, the *View Synthesis* step calls DANKE, which receives the relational schema and these three tables, finds the required two joins, and synthesizes the following view (again, some details of the view definition are omitted here for brevity):

```
CREATE VIEW
Request_Recommendation_Order AS
SELECT m.id AS Request_id,
r.id AS Recommendation_id,
o.id AS Order_id,
```



```

...
FROM Maintenance_request m
JOIN Maintenance_recommendation r
  ON m.id = r.note_id
JOIN Maintenance_order o
  ON r.order_id = o.id

```

As a result, the SQL compilation step generates an SQL query without explicitly including these joins (see the predicted SQL query for Question 93 in Table 6).

The SQL compilation step prompts this view to the LLM as if it were a table in DDL format:

```

CREATE TABLE
  Request_Recommendation_Order
  (Request_id,
   Recommendation_id,
   Order_id,...)

```

5 EXPERIMENTS

5.1 A Benchmark Dataset

This section describes a benchmark to help investigate the real-world text-to-SQL task. The benchmark consists of a relational database, a set of 100 test NL questions and their SQL *ground-truth* translations, and a set of *partially extended views*.

5.1.1 The Relational Database

The selected database is a real-world relational database (in Oracle) that stores data related to the integrity management of an energy company’s industrial assets. The relational schema of the adopted database contains 27 relational tables with, in total, 585 columns and 30 foreign keys (some multi-column), where the largest table has 81 columns.

Figure 4 shows the referential dependencies diagram of a much-simplified and anonymized version of the relational schema of the real-world database, where an arrow represents a foreign key and points to the referenced table, as usual. Note that the diagram is a connected graph, which implies that, given any set of tables T of the relational schema, it is always possible to create a Steiner tree of the diagram that covers all tables in T . This implies that Step 1 of the SQL Query compilation process will always succeed in creating the required view.

5.1.2 The Set of Test Questions and their Ground-Truth SQL Translations

The benchmark contains a set of 100 NL questions that consider the terms and questions experts use when requesting information related to the maintenance and integrity processes. The ground-truth SQL queries were manually defined over the conceptual schema views so that the execution of a ground-truth SQL query returns the expected answer to the corresponding NL question.

An NL question is classified into *simple*, *medium*, and *complex*, based on the complexity of its corresponding ground-truth SQL query, as in the Spider benchmark (extra-hard questions were not considered). The set L contains 33 simple, 33 medium, and 34 complex NL questions, with the basic statistics shown in Table 1. Tables 4, 5, and 6 at the end of the paper show three examples of each of these classes.

Table 1: Basic statistics of the sets of queries (Nascimento et al., 2024a).

	Query Type	#cols.	#joins	#filters	#aggr
Average	complex	2,00	3,03	2,55	0,39
	medium	1,44	2,47	1,68	0,29
	simple	1,30	0,21	0,82	0,15
Maximum	complex	19	5	4	2
	medium	9	5	3	2
	simple	6	2	2	1

5.1.3 The Set of Partially Extended Views

The benchmark also includes a set of *partially extended views* (Nascimento et al., 2024b) that rename table and column names of the relational schema to end users’ terms. Such views also have new columns that pre-define joins that follow foreign keys and import selected columns from the referenced tables to facilitate SQL query compilation.

They are maintained in the benchmark since they were used in the earlier experiments reported in Lines 1 to 3 of Table 3.

5.2 Evaluation Procedure

The experiments used an automated procedure to compare the *predicted* and the *ground-truth* SQL queries, entirely based on column and table values, and not just column and table names. Therefore, a text-to-SQL tool may generate SQL queries over the relational schema or any set of views, and the resulting SQL queries may be compared with the ground-truth SQL queries based on the results returned. The results of the automated procedure were manually checked to eliminate false positives and false nega-




Figure 4: The referential dependencies diagram of a simplified and anonymized version of the industrial database schema.

tives. The reader is referred to (Nascimento et al., 2024a) for the details.

5.3 Experiments with Schema Linking

5.3.1 Experimental Setup

The first set of experiments evaluated several alternatives for performing the schema linking task.

The experiments adopted the benchmark described in Section 5.1. For each NL question, the ground-truth minimum sets of tables necessary to answer the NL question is the set of tables in the FROM clause of the ground-truth SQL query. The experiments used GPT-3.5 Turbo and GPT-4, but only the results obtained with GPT-4 were noteworthy.

Table 2 presents the results of the experiments for the following alternatives:

1. (*LLM*): A strategy that prompts an LLM with Q_N and S to find the set of tables S' .
2. (*DANKE*): A strategy that, first, uses DANKE to extract a set of keywords K from Q_N , and then extracts the set of tables S' from the information associated with K in DANKE’s dictionary.
3. (*LLM+DFE*): A strategy that, first, finds a set of examples T from D using Q_N , and then prompts an LLM with Q_N , S , and T to find the set of tables S' .
4. (*LLM+DANKE*): A strategy that, first, uses an LLM to extract a set K of keywords from Q_N , and then extracts the set of tables S' from the information associated with K in DANKE’s dictionary.
5. (*LLM+DANKE+DFE*): A strategy that, first, uses an LLM to extract a set K of keywords from Q_N , retrieves the information associated with K from

DANKE’s dictionary, creating a set K_M , finds a set of examples T from D using Q_N , and then prompts an LLM with Q_N , S , K_M , and T to find the set of tables S' .

6. (*Complete*): The entire Schema Linking process.

5.3.2 Results

Table 2 presents the precision, recall, and F1-score for the experiments using the Schema Linking process. Briefly, the results show that:

1. (*LLM*): Alternative 1 obtained an F1-score of 0.851. It had a performance poorer than Alternative 2, which used just DANKE.
2. (*DANKE*): Alternative 2 obtained an F1-score of 0.900. Note that DANKE achieved a better result than Alternatives 1 and 3 (which do not use DANKE), although DANKE does no syntactic or semantic processing of the user question Q_N , and may incorrectly match terms in Q_N to terms in the database schema or to data values.
3. (*LLM+DFE*): Alternative 3 obtained an F1-score of 0.868. The use of DFE improved the results achieved by Alternative 1, but the results were still lower than those of Alternative 2.
4. (*LLM+DANKE*): Alternative 4 increased the F1-score to 0.930. Enriching the prompt with the keywords extracted by DANKE from Q_N yielded consistent improvements in both precision and recall. This is due to DANKE’s ability to find references to column values, associating them with the table/column where the value occurs. This feature allowed DANKE to find implicit references that were previously impossible for the LLM to discover since it had no knowledge about the database instances.

5. (*LLM+DANKE+DFE*): Alternative 5 increased the F1-score to 0.950.
6. (*Complete – GPT-4*): The complete Schema Linking process achieved an F1-Score of 0.996, the best result. Using the LLM to extract keywords from Q_N improved the results of DANKE. Although DANKE may still return incorrect terms, the LLM corrects them.
7. (*Complete – GPT-4o*): Using GPT-4o resulted in a slight decrease in the F1-score to 0.995.

Table 2: Results for the schema linking alternatives (all with GPT-4, except the last line).

#	Method	Precision	Recall	F1-score
1	LLM	0.864	0.886	0.851
2	DANKE	0.860	0.983	0.900
3	LLM+DFE	0.940	0.843	0.868
4	LLM+DANKE	0.930	0.930	0.930
5	LLM+DFE+DANKE	0.993	0.983	0.950
6	Complete – GPT-4	0.993	1.000	0.996
7	Complete – GPT-4o	1.000	0.995	0.995

In general, these results show that DANKE, together with the LLM, performed effectively in the Schema Linking process for NL questions. Considering that the complete Schema Linking process achieved a recall of 1.0, it returned all tables required to answer each NL question. Thus, the Schema Linking process does not impact the SQL Query Compilation step, although the extra tables may create distractions for the LLM (see Section 5.4).

5.4 Experiments with SQL Query Compilation

5.4.1 Experimental Setup

The experiments were based on LangChain SQLQueryChain¹¹, which automatically extracts metadata from the database, creates a prompt with the metadata and passes it to the LLM. This chain greatly simplifies creating prompts to access databases through views since it passes a view specification as if it were a table specification.

The experiments executed the 100 questions introduced in Section 5.1.2 in nine alternatives:

1. (*Relational Schema*): SQLQueryChain executed over the relational schema of the benchmark database.
2. (*Partially Extended Views*): SQLQueryChain executed over the partially extended views of the benchmark database.

3. (*Partially Extended Views and DFE*): SQLQueryChain executed over the partially extended views using only the DFE technique.
4. (*Partially Extended Views, DFE, and Question Decomposition*): SQLQueryChain executed over the partially extended views, using Question Decomposition and the DFE technique.
5. (*The Proposed Text-to-SQL Strategy – GPT-4*): The proposed Text-to-SQL Strategy, using GPT-4-32K.
6. (*The Proposed Text-to-SQL Strategy – GPT-4o*): The proposed Text-to-SQL Strategy, using GPT-4o.
7. (*The Proposed Text-to-SQL Strategy – LLaMA 3.1-405B-Instruct*): The proposed Text-to-SQL Strategy, using LLaMA 3.1-405B-Instruct.
8. (*The Proposed Text-to-SQL Strategy – Mistral Large*): The proposed Text-to-SQL Strategy, using Mistral Large.
9. (*The Proposed Text-to-SQL Strategy – Claude 3.5-Sonnet*): The proposed Text-to-SQL Strategy, using Claude 3.5-Sonnet.

Alternatives 1–6 ran on the OpenAI platform, and Alternatives 7–9 on the AWS Bedrock platform.

Also, recall that:

- GPT-4-32K has a context window of 32K tokens.
- GPT-4o has a context window of 128K tokens.
- Llama 3.1-405B Instruct has 405B parameters and a context window of 128K tokens.
- Mistral Large has 123B parameters and a context window of 32K tokens.
- Claude 3.5 Sonnet has 175B parameters and a context window of 200K tokens.

5.4.2 Results

Table 3 summarizes the results for the various alternatives. Columns under “**#Correct Predicted Questions**” show the number of NL questions per type correctly translated to SQL (recall that there are 33 simple, 33 medium, and 34 complex NL questions, with a total of 100); columns under “**Accuracy**” indicate the accuracy results per NL question type and the overall accuracy; the last column shows the total elapsed time to run all 100 NL questions.

The results for Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 were reported in (Nascimento et al., 2024a; Nascimento et al., 2024b; Coelho et al., 2024), respectively. They are repeated in Table 3 for comparison with the results of this paper.

¹¹<https://docs.langchain.com>

Table 3: Summary of the results.

#Line	Alternatives / Model	#Samples	#Correct Predicted Questions				Accuracy				Total Elapsed Time
			Simple	Medium	Complex	Total	Simple	Medium	Complex	Total	
1	<i>Relational Schema</i>										
	GPT-4	-	22	11	8	41	0,67	0,33	0,23	0,41	23min
2	<i>Partially Extended Views</i>										
	GPT-4	-	30	25	19	74	0,91	0,76	0,56	0,74	N/A
3	<i>Partially Extended Views and DFE</i>										
	GPT-4-32K	Top 8	32	24	23	79	0,97	0,73	0,68	0,79	11min
4	<i>Partially Extended Views, DFE, and Question Decomposition</i>										
	GPT-4-32K	Top 8	32	28	24	84	0,97	0,85	0,71	0,84	31min
5	<i>The Proposed Text-to-SQL Strategy</i>										
	GPT-4-32K	Top 8	31	32	30	93	0,94	0,97	0,98	0,93	17min
6	<i>The Proposed Text-to-SQL Strategy</i>										
	GPT-4o	Top 8	30	30	30	90	0,91	0,91	0,88	0,90	7min
7	<i>The Proposed Text-to-SQL Strategy</i>										
	LLaMA 3.1-405B-Instruct	Top 8	25	28	28	81	0,76	0,85	0,82	0,81	19min
8	<i>The Proposed Text-to-SQL Strategy</i>										
	Mistral Large	Top 8	26	27	24	77	0,79	0,82	0,71	0,77	16min
9	<i>The Proposed Text-to-SQL Strategy</i>										
	Claude 3.5-Sonnet	Top 8	24	24	26	74	0,73	0,73	0,76	0,74	17min

The results for Alternative 4 show that Question Decomposition produced an improvement in total accuracy from 0.79 to 0.84. This reflects the diversity of examples passed to the LLM when they are retrieved for each sub-question, as already pointed out in (Oliveira et al., 2025).

The results for Alternative 5 show that the key contribution of this paper, the text-to-SQL strategy described in Section 4, indeed leads to a significant improvement in the total accuracy for the case study database, as well as the accuracies for the medium and complex NL questions.

The results for Alternative 6 indicate a slight decrease in the total accuracy to 0.90 when GPT-4o is adopted, possibly due to the non-deterministic behavior of the models. However, while GPT-4-32K took 17 minutes to run all 100 questions, GPT-4o took only 7 minutes.

The results for Alternatives 7–9 show a decrease in the total accuracy to 0.81%, 0.77%, and 0.74%, respectively, with a much higher total elapsed time when compared with GPT-4o, but comparable to that of GPT-4-32K.

5.4.3 Discussion

In all alternatives that did not resort to DANKE, the LLM had all the Schema Linking burden, and had to synthesize all the joins required to process the NL question correctly. By contrast, the strategy of Section 4, by using DANKE, alleviated these burdens.

DANKE also helped the LLM with ambiguous questions both during the Schema Linking and the

SQL Query Compilation processes.

In a few cases, Schema Linking returned more tables than required. But, in most of these cases, the SQL Query Compilation process was not jeopardized; in only one case, the extra tables and consequently the extra columns in the view led the LLM to confuse the choice of columns, and synthesize an incorrect WHERE clause.

The results in Table 3 show that the proposed strategy (Line 5) correctly processed four more medium NL questions and six more NL complex questions than the previous best strategy (Line 4). However, these results hide the fact that the proposed strategy processed four complex NL questions that none of the strategies previously tested on the same database and set of questions have correctly handled, including C3 and DIN. Table 6 shows three such NL questions. For example, in Question 29, the previous strategies did not correctly synthesize the required join, whereas the view created in Step 1 of the SQL Query compilation process (see Section 4.4) indeed includes such join, making it easier for the LLM to compile the required SQL query. In Question 93, all previous strategies failed to remap the installation name “E176” in the user question to the installation name “E-176” stored in the database; the proposed strategy used DANKE’s matches to correct this problem.

Similar observations are valid for the medium NL questions. For example, the previous strategies did not correctly process Question 24 in Table 5, whereas the proposed strategy did, using DANKE’s matches.

An analysis of the NL questions compiled into incorrect SQL queries uncovered that the proposed

strategy failed for two basic reasons: (1) the semantics of a term of the NL question was mapped into an incorrect SQL filter (i.e., due to a *semantic mismatch*); and (2) a term of the NL question was associated with an incorrect column name.

As for the other models – Llama 3.1-405B Instruct, Mistral Large, and Claude 3.5 Sonnet – the most common source of error was the use of the CONTAINS function, which requires the target column to be indexed, but this was not always the case; the correct filter would have to use LIKE.

6 CONCLUSIONS

This paper proposed a strategy to compile NL questions into SQL queries, especially questions that require complex filters and joins, that leverages the services provided by DANKE, a database keyword search platform.

The paper detailed how the schema-linking process can be improved with the help of the keyword extraction service that DANKE provides. Then, it showed how DANKE can be used to synthesize a view that captures the joins required to process an input NL question and thereby simplify the SQL query compilation step.

Both the schema-linking and the SQL query compilation processes use a dynamic few-shot technique, based on a synthetic dataset constructed from the database. Section 4.2 described a technique for constructing the synthetic dataset that improves the technique introduced in (Coelho et al., 2024).

The paper included experiments with a real-world relational database to assess the performance of the proposed strategy. The results in Section 5.3 showed that the precision and recall of the schema-linking process indeed improved with the help of the keyword extraction service that DANKE provides. The discussion in Section 5.4 suggested that creating a view with the help of DANKE also helped with the SQL query compilation process. In conjunction, these results indicated that the proposed strategy achieved a total accuracy in excess of 90% over a benchmark built upon a relational database with a challenging schema and a set of 100 questions carefully defined to reflect the questions users submit and to cover a wide range of SQL constructs. The total accuracy was much higher than that achieved by SQLCoder, LangChain SQL-QueryChain, C3, and DIN+SQL on the same benchmark, as reported in (Nascimento et al., 2024a).

As future work, the proposed strategy should be tested and compared against other strategies using additional databases and test questions. This ef-

fort depends, however, on working with real-world databases that are available, populated, and with good documentation. As a first step, the strategy has already been applied to other databases that are in production and to the openly available Mondial database, with positive results.

A second demand is to address the problem that Natural Language questions are intrinsically ambiguous. The use of DANKE’s matching process helps, but it should be complemented with a different approach, perhaps incorporating the user in a disambiguation loop.

Finally, it should also be stressed that the proposed strategy and the synthetic dataset construction process are generic, but costly to set up. They should be considered when it is worth investing in an NL interface for a serious database where accuracy is at stake.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work was partly funded by FAPERJ under grant E-26/204.322/2024; by CNPq under grant 302303/2017-0; and by Petrobras, under research agreement 2022/00032-9 between CENPES and PUC-Rio.

REFERENCES

- Affolter, K., Stockinger, K., and Bernstein, A. (2019). A comparative survey of recent natural language interfaces for databases. *The VLDB Journal*, 28:793–819.
- Coelho, G., Nascimento, E. S., Izquierdo, Y., García, G., Feijó, L., Lemos, M., Garcia, R., de Oliveira, A., Pinheiro, J., and Casanova, M. (2024). Improving the accuracy of text-to-sql tools based on large language models for real-world relational databases. In Strauss, C., Amagasa, T., Manco, G., Kotsis, G., Tjoa, A., and Khalil, I., editors, *Database and Expert Systems Applications*, pages 93–107, Cham. Springer Nature Switzerland.
- Dong, X., Zhang, C., Ge, Y., Mao, Y., Gao, Y., Chen, L., Lin, J., and Lou, D. (2023). C3: Zero-shot text-to-sql with chatgpt. *arXiv preprint*. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2307.07306>.
- Floratou, A. et al. (2024). Nl2sql is a solved problem... not! In *Conference on Innovative Data Systems Research*.
- Gan, Y., Chen, X., Huang, Q., Purver, M., Woodward, J., Xie, J., and Huang, P. (2021a). Towards robustness of text-to-sql models against synonym substitution. In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing*, page 2505–2515. Association for Computational Linguistics.

- Gan, Y., Chen, X., and Purver, M. (2021b). Exploring underexplored limitations of cross-domain text-to-sql generalization. In Moens, M.-F., Huang, X., Specia, L., and Yih, S., editors, *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, page 8926–8931. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Gao, Y., Xiong, Y., Gao, X., Jia, K., Pan, J., Bi, Y., Dai, Y., Sun, J., Guo, Q., Wang, M., and Wang, H. (2024). Retrieval-augmented generation for large language models: A survey. *arXiv preprint*. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2312.10997>.
- García, G., Izquierdo, Y., Menendez, E., Dartayre, F., and Casanova, M. (2017). Rdf keyword-based query technology meets a real-world dataset. In *Proceedings of the 20th International Conference on Extending Database Technology (EDBT)*, pages 656–667, Venice, Italy. OpenProceedings.org.
- Guo, C., Tian, Z., Tang, J., Li, S., Wen, Z., Wang, K., and Wang, T. (2024). Retrieval-augmented gpt-3.5-based text-to-sql framework with sample-aware prompting and dynamic revision chain. In *Neural Information Processing*, pages 341–356, Singapore. Springer Nature Singapore.
- Izquierdo, Y., García, G., Lemos, M., Novello, A., Novelli, B., Damasceno, C., Leme, L., and Casanova, M. (2021). A platform for keyword search and its application for covid-19 pandemic data. *Journal of Information and Data Management*, 12(5):521–535.
- Izquierdo, Y., Lemos, M., Oliveira, C., Novelli, B., García, G., Coelho, G., Feijó, L., Coutinho, B., Santana, T., García, R., and Casanova, M. (2024). Busca360: A search application in the context of top-side asset integrity management in the oil & gas industry. In *Anais do XXXIX Simpósio Brasileiro de Bancos de Dados*, pages 104–116, Porto Alegre, RS, Brasil. SBC.
- Katsogiannis-Meimarakis, G. and Koutrika, G. (2023). A survey on deep learning approaches for text-to-sql. *The VLDB Journal*, 32(4):905–936.
- Kim, H., So, B.-H., Han, W.-S., and Lee, H. (2020). Natural language to sql: Where are we today? *Proc. VLDB Endow.*, 13(10):1737–1750.
- Lei, F. et al. (2024). Spider 2.0: Evaluating language models on real-world enterprise text-to-sql workflows. *arXiv preprint*. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2411.07763>.
- Lewis, P., Perez, E., Piktus, A., Petroni, F., Karpukhin, V., Goyal, N., Küttler, H., Lewis, M., Yih, W.-t., Rocktäschel, T., Riedel, S., and Kiela, D. (2020). Retrieval-augmented generation for knowledge-intensive nlp tasks. In Larochelle, H., Ranzato, M., Hadsell, R., Balcan, M., and Lin, H., editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 33, pages 9459–9474, Red Hook, NY, USA. Curran Associates, Inc.
- Li, J., Hui, B., Qu, G., Yang, J., Li, B., Li, B., Wang, B., Qin, B., Geng, R., Huo, N., Zhou, X., Ma, C., Li, G., Chang, K., Huang, F., Cheng, R., and Li, Y. (2024). Can llm already serve as a database interface? a big bench for large-scale database grounded text-to-sqls. In *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems, NIPS '23*, Red Hook, NY, USA. Curran Associates Inc.
- Nascimento, E.R. Avila, C., Izquierdo, Y., García, G., Feijó, L., Facina, M., M., L., and Casanova, M. (2025). On the text-to-sql task supported by database keyword search. In *(Accepted to the 27th International Conference on Enterprise Information Systems)*, Porto, Portugal.
- Nascimento, E., García, G., Feijó, L., Victorio, W., Izquierdo, Y., Oliveira, A., Coelho, G., M., L., Garcia, R., Leme, L., and Casanova, M. (2024a). Text-to-sql meets the real-world. In *Proceedings of the 26th International Conference on Enterprise Information Systems - Volume 1: ICEIS*, pages 61–72, Setúbal, Portugal. INSTICC, SciTePress.
- Nascimento, E., Izquierdo, Y., García, G., Coelho, G., Feijó, L., Lemos, M., Leme, L., and M.A., C. (2024b). My database user is a large language model. In *Proceedings of the 26th International Conference on Enterprise Information Systems - Volume 1: ICEIS*, pages 800–806, Setúbal, Portugal. INSTICC, SciTePress.
- Oliveira, A., Nascimento, E., Pinheiro, J., Avila, C., Coelho, G., Feijó, L., Izquierdo, Y., García, G., Leme, L., Lemos, M., and Casanova, M. (2025). Small, medium, and large language models for text-to-sql. In Maass, W., Han, H., Yasar, H., and Multari, N., editors, *Conceptual Modeling*, pages 276–294, Cham. Springer Nature Switzerland.
- Panda, S. and Gozluklu, B. (28 Feb 2024). Build a robust text-to-sql solution generating complex queries, self-correcting, and querying diverse data sources. *AWS Machine Learning Blog*.
- Pourreza, M. and Rafiei, D. (2024). Din-sql: decomposed in-context learning of text-to-sql with self-correction. In *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems, NIPS '23*, Red Hook, NY, USA. Curran Associates Inc.
- Shi, L., Tang, Z., Zhang, N., Zhang, X., and Yang, Z. (2024). A survey on employing large language models for text-to-sql tasks. *arXiv preprint*. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2407.15186>.
- Yu, T., Zhang, R., Yang, K., Yasunaga, M., Wang, D., Li, Z., Ma, J., Li, I., Yao, Q., Roman, S., Zhang, Z., and Radev, D. (2018). Spider: A large-scale human-labeled dataset for complex and cross-domain semantic parsing and text-to-sql task. In Riloff, E., Chiang, D., Hockenmaier, J., and Tsujii, J., editors, *Proc. 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 3911–3921, Brussels, Belgium. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Table 4: Sample NL simple questions and their SQL golden standard (anonymized).

id	NL Question	SQL Ground-truth	SQL Predicted Query
5	<i>Which maintenance recommendations were created from 2021 on?</i>	SELECT id FROM Recommendation WHERE creation_date >= TO_DATE('2021-01-01', 'YYYY-MM-DD')	SELECT Recommendation_id, Recommendation_creation_date FROM Recommendation WHERE Recommendation_creation_date >= TO_DATE('2021-01-01', 'YYYY-MM-DD')
7	<i>Which RTIs are due in the second semester of 2022 for E-176?</i>	SELECT id FROM Recommendation WHERE installation_name = 'E-176' AND due_date BETWEEN TO_DATE('2022-07-01', 'YYYY-MM-DD') AND TO_DATE('2022-12-31', 'YYYY-MM-DD')	SELECT Recommendation_id, Recommendation_due_date FROM Recommendation WHERE Recommendation_installation_name = 'E-176' AND Recommendation_due_date BETWEEN TO_DATE('2022-07-01', 'YYYY-MM-DD') AND TO_DATE('2022-12-31', 'YYYY-MM-DD')
20	<i>How many maintenance requests are there for each installation?</i>	SELECT installation_name, COUNT(id) FROM Request GROUP BY installation_name	SELECT Request_installation_name , COUNT(Request_id) AS Total_Requests FROM Request GROUP BY Request_installation_name

Table 5: Sample NL medium questions and their SQL golden standard (anonymized).

id	NL Question	SQL Ground-truth	SQL Predicted Query / View
14	<i>How many orders have already been closed in each center responsible for installation 30100H?</i>	SELECT responsible_planning_center, COUNT(id) AS total_orders_closed FROM Order WHERE installation_name = '30100H' AND LOWER(status) = LOWER('Closed') GROUP BY responsible_planning_center	SELECT Order_responsible_planning_center, COUNT(Order_id) AS Total_Orders FROM Order WHERE LOWER(Order_status) LIKE LOWER('%Closed%') AND Order_installation_name = '30100H' GROUP BY Order_responsible_planning_center
18	<i>Which is the installation with the largest number of maintenance recommendations with criticality B?</i>	SELECT installation_name, COUNT(*) AS quantity_maintenance_recommendation FROM Recommendation WHERE criticality = 'B' GROUP BY installation_name ORDER BY quantity_maintenance_recommendation DESC FETCH FIRST 1 ROWS ONLY	SELECT Recommendation_installation_name, COUNT(Recommendation_id) AS count_recommendation FROM Recommendation WHERE LOWER(Recommendation_criticality) LIKE LOWER('%B%') GROUP BY Recommendation_installation_name ORDER BY count_recommendation DESC FETCH FIRST 1 ROWS ONLY
24	<i>Which recommendations from BU Catalina are released?</i>	SELECT r.id FROM Recommendation r JOIN Installation p ON r.installation_name = p.name WHERE r.situation LIKE '%Released%' AND p.business_unit LIKE '%CATALINA%'	SELECT Recommendation_id, Recommendation_situation FROM Recommendation_Installation WHERE Installation_business_Unit='CATALINA' AND LOWER(Recommendation_situation) LIKE LOWER('%Released%') CREATE VIEW Recommendation_Installation AS SELECT r.id AS Recommendation_id, r.situation AS Recommendation_situation, ... FROM Recommendation r JOIN Installation p ON r.installation_name = p.name

Table 6: Sample complex NL questions and their SQL golden standard (anonymized).

id	NL Question	SQL Ground-truth	SQL Predicted Query / View
21	<i>Which is the failure impact score of objects of class valve that are active at E-151 ?</i>	<pre>SELECT E.id, E.failure_impact_score FROM Equipment E, Installation P WHERE E.installation_name = P.name AND E.class_description LIKE '%valve%' AND E.status = 'Active' AND P.name = 'E-151'</pre>	<pre>SELECT Equipment_failure_impact_score FROM Equipment_Installation WHERE Installation_name='E-151' AND LOWER(Equipment_status) LIKE LOWER('%Active%') AND LOWER(Equipment_class_description) LIKE LOWER('%valve%')</pre> <pre>CREATE VIEW Equipment_Installation AS SELECT e.id, e.failure_impact_score AS Equipment_failure_impact_score, p.name AS Installation_name, e.status AS Equipment_status, E.class_description AS Equipment_class_description, ... FROM Equipment e JOIN Installation p ON e.installation_name = p.name</pre>
29	<i>Tags with the largest number of open orders of type MZ01.</i>	<pre>SELECT et.tag_id FROM Maintenance_Order o JOIN Equipment e ON e.id = o.equipment_id JOIN Equipment_Tag et ON e.id = et.equipment_id WHERE o.type = 'MZ01' AND o.status = 'Open' GROUP BY et.tag_id ORDER BY COUNT(o.id) DESC</pre>	<pre>SELECT Tag_id, COUNT(Order_id) AS total_orders FROM Order_Tag WHERE LOWER(Order_status) LIKE LOWER('%Open%') AND LOWER(Order_type) LIKE LOWER('%MZ01%') GROUP BY Tag_id ORDER BY total_orders DESC</pre> <pre>CREATE VIEW Order_Tag AS SELECT et.tag_id AS Tag_id, o.id AS Order_id, o.type AS Order_type o.status AS Order_status, ... FROM Maintenance_Order o JOIN Equipment e ON e.id = o.equipment_id JOIN Equipment_Tag et ON e.id = et.equipment_id</pre>
93	<i>Which are the ZR notes, the related RTIs and the orders corresponding to the RTIS of Platform E176 where the criticality of the measure is not B, and the situation of the order is released?</i>	<pre>SELECT m.id, r.id, o.id FROM Maintenance_request m JOIN Maintenance_recommendation r ON m.id = r.note_id JOIN Maintenance_Order o ON r.order_id = o.id WHERE m.installation_name = 'E-176' AND o.status = 'Released' AND r.criticality != 'B' AND m.type = 'ZR'</pre>	<pre>SELECT Request_id, Recommendation_id, Order_id FROM Request_Recommendation_Order WHERE Request_installation_name = 'E-176' AND Request_type='ZR' AND LOWER(Recommendation_criticality) NOT LIKE LOWER('%B%') AND LOWER(Order_status) LIKE LOWER('%Released%')</pre> <pre>CREATE VIEW Request_Recommendation_Order AS SELECT m.id AS Request_id, r.id AS Recommendation_id, o.id AS Order_id, ... FROM Maintenance_request m JOIN Maintenance_recommendation r ON m.id = r.note_id JOIN Maintenance_order o ON r.order_id = o.id</pre>