

FRASE: Structured Representations for Generalizable SPARQL Query Generation

Papa Abdou Karim Karou Diallo^{◊†*} Amal Zouaq^{◊†*}

◊LAMA-WeST †Polytechnique Montreal *Mila

{diallokarou28, amal.zouaq}@polymtl.ca

Abstract

Translating natural language questions into SPARQL queries enables Knowledge Base querying for factual and up-to-date responses. However, existing datasets for this task are predominantly template-based, leading models to learn superficial mappings between question and query templates rather than developing true generalization capabilities. As a result, models struggle when encountering naturally phrased, template-free questions. This paper introduces FRASE (FRame-based Semantic Enhancement), a novel approach that leverages Frame Semantic Role Labeling (FSRL) to address this limitation. We also present LC-QuAD 3.0, a new dataset derived from LC-QuAD 2.0, in which each question is enriched using FRASE through frame detection and the mapping of frame-elements to their argument. We evaluate the impact of this approach through extensive experiments on recent large language models (LLMs) under different fine-tuning configurations. Our results demonstrate that integrating frame-based structured representations consistently improves SPARQL generation performance, particularly in challenging generalization scenarios when test questions feature unseen templates (unknown template splits) and when they are all naturally phrased (reformulated questions).

1 Introduction

Information democratization aims to ease access to the vast amount of factual information stored in Knowledge Bases (KBs) and relational databases. A crucial step towards this goal is the translation of natural language questions into structured queries such as SPARQL, SQL or S-expression Diallo et al. (2024); Banerjee et al. (2022); Sharma et al. (2025). Recent advances in Large Language Models (LLMs), particularly decoder-only architectures, have significantly improved the semantic representation of natural language, achieving state-of-the-art results on a variety of natural language understanding tasks.

Nevertheless, despite these successes, LLMs remain sensitive to input phrasing and prompt formulation, resulting in limited robustness and generalization across diverse question formulations and unseen patterns (Leidinger et al., 2023; Zheng et al., 2023). A key limitation of current question-to-SPARQL systems lies in the datasets on which they are trained Diallo et al. (2024); Reid & Zouaq (2023). Many benchmarks rely on rigid, template-based constructions, which lead models to learn surface-level mappings between input questions and query structures. This shortcut learning hinders their ability to generalize to naturally phrased, template-free questions, especially when the input deviates from patterns seen during training.

To address these aforementioned challenges, we introduce **FRASE** (FRame-based Semantic Enhancement), a method that augments natural language questions with structured semantic information derived from Frame Semantics. These Frames have proven valuable in




Figure 1: Overview of our proposed architecture.

enhancing semantic understanding in tasks such as machine reading comprehension (Guo et al., 2020; Flanigan et al., 2022; Bonn et al., 2024) and information extraction (Su et al., 2021; Li et al., 2024b; Chanin, 2023; Su et al., 2023).

As illustrated in Figure 1, **FRASE** leverages a two-stage pipeline to detect the frames evoked by the question and identify their associated semantic roles, which are then used to enrich the question representation. A detailed presentation of the process is shown in Section 3.2. We hypothesize that integrating such structured representation into question-to-query models can improve their ability to abstract and generalize beyond rigid surface forms. To evaluate this hypothesis, we introduce LC-QuAD3.0, a new dataset derived from LC-QuAD2.0 Dubey et al. (2019), in which each question is annotated with its corresponding frame and frame-element and argument mapping using the **FRASE** pipeline. We conduct comprehensive experiments with several recent LLMs under different fine-tuning settings, assessing the impact of our semantic augmentation across various dataset splits, including out-of-distribution (OOD) settings.

Our contributions are threefold:

1. We propose **FRASE**, a new method for frame detection and arguments identification that does not rely on manually identified target spans, leveraging a RAG-based system grounded in KB relation semantics and frame definitions.
2. We demonstrate that enriching questions with frame-based structured representations improves generalization in SPARQL query generation.
3. We show that this improvement holds not only for unseen-template test sets but also for challenging, naturally phrased reformulations.

2 Related Works

2.1 SPARQL query generation

SPARQL generation from natural language has been extensively studied using both Small and Large Language Models (SLMs and LLMs) (Diallo et al., 2024; Reyd & Zouaq, 2023; Sharma et al., 2025; Banerjee et al., 2022; Emonet et al., 2024; Zahera et al., 2024). These models are typically fine-tuned end-to-end, often with enhancements such as copy mechanisms (Banerjee et al., 2022; Diallo et al., 2024) or non-parametric memory modules (Sharma et al., 2025) to reduce URI-related errors.

While many systems explicitly generate SPARQL queries, others bypass query generation altogether by having LLMs directly produce answers grounded in the knowledge base (Shavarani & Sarkar, 2024; Alawwad et al., 2024; Muennighoff, 2022). Prompt engineering has also become a prominent strategy, using few-shot examples or explicit URI context to guide generation (Luo et al., 2023; Muennighoff, 2022; Diallo et al., 2024). Models such as Code Llama v2 (Roziere et al., 2023), Mistral 7B (Jiang et al., 2023), and Mistral 7B Instruct¹ have been widely adopted for such tasks.

However, despite promising results, existing methods often under-perform when faced with naturally phrased or paraphrased questions. Studies on LC-QuAD 2.0 show a marked drop in accuracy when models are evaluated on reformulated (template-free) questions, highlighting poor generalization to unseen linguistic patterns (Diallo et al., 2024; Reyd & Zouaq, 2023).

2.2 Frame Semantic Parsing

Frame semantic parsing approaches fall into two main categories: generative sequence-to-sequence methods and representation learning techniques leveraging FrameNet’s structured knowledge.

Seq2Seq models treat frame parsing as a generation task that includes frame identification and argument extraction (Sutskever, 2014; Raffel et al., 2020; Kalyanpur et al., 2020; Chanin, 2023). Architectures such as T5 (Raffel et al., 2020), pre-trained on PropBank (Kingsbury & Palmer, 2002) and FrameNet, are often used with lexical units and data augmentation to improve robustness. Some models adopt multi-task learning with shared encoders and task-specific decoders (Kalyanpur et al., 2020).

Representation learning methods, in contrast, focus on aligning sentence-level or span-level embeddings with candidate frames (Jiang & Riloff, 2021). These approaches often use Graph Neural Networks (Wu et al., 2020) or contrastive learning (Ju et al., 2024; An et al., 2023) to integrate semantic relations among frames, elements, and lexical triggers (Su et al., 2021; Zheng et al., 2022; Tamburini, 2022).

A major limitation of both paradigms is their reliance on an explicit target lexical unit—an annotation absent in datasets like LC-QuAD 2.0. Without this, frame-based parsing becomes inapplicable, and structured semantic representations cannot be extracted or evaluated in downstream tasks such as SPARQL generation.

3 Methodology

3.1 Data

3.1.1 LC-QuAD2.0

The LC-QuAD 2.0 dataset Dubey et al. (2019) (or LCQ2 for short) is composed of natural language questions paired with their corresponding SPARQL queries. Each entry includes two semantically equivalent versions of the question: one generated from a predefined template and another reformulated manually to resemble more natural human phrasing. This dual-question format enables nuanced evaluation of model generalization to both synthetic and naturally expressed inputs. LCQ2 incorporates a wide range of SPARQL constructs, including advanced operators such as FILTER, which often require reasoning over literals—raw values in the knowledge graph such as strings, numbers, and dates.

In our experiments, we consider two distinct data splits of LCQ2, following the protocol established by Reyd & Zouaq (2023):

Original Split. This conventional split follows a standard 80-10-10 train/validation/test partitioning strategy, with no constraints on the overlap of question-query templates across

¹<https://huggingface.co/mistralai/Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.3>

Dataset variant		Statistics				
		Total	Train	Validation	Test	Unseen
Original Split	Global templates	30	30	30	30	0
	Entries	30225	21761	2418	6046	6046
	Avg Query-Length	-	17	18	18	-
Unknown Template Split	Global templates	30	24	6	6	6
	Entries	30225	24178	3023	3024	3024
	Avg Query-Length	-	16	16	36	-

Query length is measured in term of number of words in it.

Table 1: LC-QuAD 2.0 statistics in terms of global templates and entries across data splits.

sets. As a result, similar question-query structures may appear in both training and test sets, allowing models to benefit from direct pattern reuse.

Unknown Template Split. To evaluate compositional generalization by ensuring that no templates seen in the test set appear in the training set, we group question-query pairs by their global templates and select test instances exclusively from groups containing templates that are absent from the training data. This separation results in fully disjoint template sets and imposes a more rigorous evaluation setting. Statistical analysis of these two splits is shown in Table 3.1.1.

To further analyze the influence of question formulation on model performance, we exploit the dual-question structure of LCQ2 to construct three dataset variants: **Raw Questions:** Only the original, template-based questions are retained. **Reformulated Questions:** Only the human-written, naturally phrased questions are used. **Combined Questions:** Both question versions are treated as distinct entries, effectively doubling the dataset size and increasing question variety. This experimental design allows us to address the following research questions:

RQ1: How does model performance vary when trained and evaluated on template-based questions versus naturally phrased or questions with unseen templates?

RQ2: Can combining template-based and template-free questions during training improve generalization and how effective is training exclusively on one of these two types ?

RQ3: To what extent does incorporating structured semantic representations based on frames improve performance across these different training and evaluation configurations?

3.2 FRASE Main Architecture

The motivation behind incorporating structured semantic representations via Frame Semantic Role Labeling (FSRL) lies in the observation that different surface formulations of a question can often share the same underlying meaning. Regardless of phrasing, such questions typically evoke the same core event or concept, along with a consistent set of participants and their roles. This intuition aligns closely with the theory of frame semantics, where each frame represents a conceptual structure that encapsulates an event or situation, and frame elements denote the roles associated with its participants. Given an input text such as a natural language question, **FRASE** aims to extract its structured semantic representation by (1) identifying the frame(s) it evokes and (2) mapping the associated frame elements to their corresponding spans within the text.

3.2.1 Stage 1: Frame detection

In this stage, we employ a Retrieval-Augmented Generation (RAG) model to identify the frames evoked by each question in the LCQ2 dataset. Our core assumption is that, for any natural language question associated with a SPARQL query—hence linked to a set of knowledge base (KB) entities, relations and classes, we can identify a corresponding semantic frame that reflects the same conceptual structure as the KB relations/classes involved. This assumption is grounded in the observation that both FrameNet frames




Figure 2: An example of frame-based structured representation of text.

and KB relations are associated with textual descriptions that encapsulate their underlying semantics. A well-trained embedding model is thus used to produce similar representations for these two descriptions, enabling us to establish a semantic alignment between the KB relation and the frame. By leveraging this alignment through semantic similarity search, our RAG model retrieves the most relevant frames for a given question by comparing the question’s content to the descriptions of frames and KB relations/classes. This mechanism allows us to identify which frame is most likely evoked by the question, forming the first step in constructing a structured semantic representation.

Frame and KB Relation/Class Representations. To enable effective semantic alignment between FrameNet frames and knowledge base (KB) relations/classes, we represent a frame in the most expressive and discriminative method as suggested by results in from [Diallo & Zouaq \(2025\)](#). Such representation combines all three components: the frame *label*, its *definition* (or description), and the list of its *frame-elements*. This enriched representation captures both the semantic core of the frame and the structure of its participant roles, which improves retrieval performance. In contrast, representing KB relations/classes is more straightforward. For each relation/class URI in Wikidata, we concatenate the *relation label* (i.e., its name) with its *textual description* as provided by the KB. This representation succinctly captures the intended semantics of the relation/class and is well-suited for embedding-based similarity search.

Embedding Model and Semantic Retrieval. We use the english version of BGE²([Li et al., 2024a](#); [Xiao et al., 2023](#)) embedding-model to encode all frame representations into fixed-length vector embeddings, which are stored in a vector index to enable efficient retrieval. At inference time, for each question in LCQ2, we extract the textual descriptions of the relation/class URIs present in the corresponding SPARQL query. These relation/class descriptions are then embedded into the same vector space. Using these embeddings, we perform a top- k similarity search (with $k = 1$ in the case of one-to-one alignment) to retrieve the most semantically similar FrameNet frame(s) from the vector store.

3.2.2 Stage 2: Arguments identification

Once the most semantically aligned frame has been retrieved for each KB relation/class in a given LCQ2 question, the next step involves identifying the arguments—that is, mapping each frame-element associated with the evoked frame to its corresponding span of text in the question. The frame alone provides the conceptual structure of the event or situation, but a complete semantic representation requires grounding the roles (frame elements) in the actual input question. To accomplish this, we fine-tuned the model Qwen2.5-7B [Yang et al. \(2024\)](#) which was empirically identified as one of the best-performing models for frame-semantic argument extraction in our preliminary experiments. The model is trained to

²<https://huggingface.co/BAAI>




Figure 3: Overview of the process of the SPARQL query generation from a question.

generate structured outputs in a JSON format (see Figure 2), following the recommendation and setup proposed by [Devasier et al. \(2025\)](#). The fine-tuning process is carried out on the FrameNet dataset, using its fully annotated exemplars. The training split comprises 3,353 sentences, encompassing a total of 19,391 frame annotations and 34,219 frame elements. The test split includes 1,247 sentences, with 6,714 frames and 11,302 annotated frame elements. As a result of Stage 2, we obtain a model specifically trained to perform argument mapping. Given an input text and the set of frames evoked within it, identified during Stage 1 (see Section 3.2.1), the model outputs a mapping between each frame-element and its corresponding text span in the input. The Figure 2 illustrates one example of this mapping from FrameNet data used for fine-tuning.

3.2.3 Stage 3: LCQ3 Generation

By applying **FRASE** to each LCQ2 entry, we use the system as an oracle to generate structured semantic representations. The result of this process is the construction of a new dataset, LC-QuAD 3.0 (LCQ3), which extends LCQ2 with frame-based annotations. This enriched representation now available in all LCQ3 entries not only captures the overall meaning of the question through the identified frame, but also reveals the semantic role of each entity or phrase by linking it to a frame element. Interestingly, frame elements that remain unfilled (i.e., elements not mapped to any text span in the input) often correspond to the unknowns that the SPARQL query is intended to retrieve—typically, the variables bound in the SELECT clause. For example, in SELECT-type queries, the unmapped frame element is likely to represent the answer to the given question. In contrast, for ASK-type queries, all relevant frame elements tend to be explicitly mentioned in the input, and the goal is to verify the truth value of a fully grounded statement.

3.2.4 Stage 4: SPARQL Query Generation

All large language models (LLMs) are fine-tuned using an *Instruction-Input-Output* format. In this setup, the instruction indicates to the model that it needs to generate a SPARQL query corresponding to the input question and provides the required context to successfully carry it out. The input consists of the natural language question from LCQ2, optionally augmented with its corresponding structured semantic representation. The output is the SPARQL query that answers the question as show in Figure 3. For experiments involving the structured representation, the frame-based semantic information is appended to the end of the question in the input sequence. This allows the model to condition its generation on both the original question and its enriched semantic context.

4 Results and Discussion

Since LCQ2 does not include annotations for frames or frame-element to argument mappings, the evaluation of our method is performed indirectly through its impact on SPARQL query generation performance. For this evaluation, we report BLEU scores by comparing the generated SPARQL queries with the gold-standard references. Additionally, we use execution-based metrics, namely Accuracy and F1 score, which are computed by executing both the predicted and reference queries against the knowledge base and comparing their returned answers. For model selection, we focus on several recent and competitive LLMs: LLaMA 3.1 8B, LLaMA 3.2 3B ([Dubey et al., 2024](#)), Phi-4 14B ([Abdin et al. \(2024\)](#)), and DeepSeek-R1 37B ([Guo et al. \(2025\)](#)). We also include Mistral 7B GritLM ([Muennighoff et al. \(2024\)](#)), a model with a unique training objective that combines cross-entropy loss with contrastive loss, aiming to optimize both text generation and embedding quality—making it particularly suitable for this test on generalization capability.

Models	Template-based Questions			Reformulated Questions			
	BLEU	Accuracy	F1	BLEU	Accuracy	F1	
LLMs	Llama 3.1 8B	84	30	40	36	13	25
	Llama 3.2 3B	83	23	32	37	13	26
	Phi-4 14B *	86	37	46	42	21	27
	DeepSeek-R1 37B	86	30	40	41	13	26
	Mistral 7B GritLM	85	20	25	43	15	24

* The blue-colored line indicates the best overall result and serves as the baseline against which all other configurations will be compared.

Table 2: LLMs comparison in terms of performance (based on BLEU, Accuracy and F1).

To analyze the performance of these models across the different metrics, we evaluate the impact of structured semantic representations on model generalization under two levels of difficulty. The first level is the **Unknown Template Split** which assesses generalization when the questions structures or patterns encountered at inference time were not present during training—a partial compositional generalization setting. The second is the **Reformulated Questions**, which represents a more challenging case in which the test questions are naturally phrased and don’t follow any defined template.

4.1 SPARQL Query Generation - Baselines

Table 4.1 reports the performance of several recent LLMs on the task of SPARQL query generation using the **Raw Questions** version of the LCQ2 dataset for training. These LLMs constitute our baseline models. To evaluate generalization capabilities, we consider two test scenarios: (1) the **Raw Questions** test set, corresponding to template-based questions (left block of Table 4.1), and (2) the **Reformulated Questions** test set, composed of human-written paraphrases (right block). Across all models, we observe that the BLEU scores remain relatively consistent, indicating similar surface-level output quality. However, execution-based metrics such as accuracy and F1 have more variation. Notably, all models exhibit a performance drop when evaluated on the reformulated test set, suggesting limited generalization to linguistic variations not seen during training. Somewhat unexpectedly, Mistral GritLM [Muennighoff et al. \(2024\)](#) does not outperform the other models, despite its training objective that combines cross-entropy loss with a contrastive loss component designed to improve both generation and embedding quality. Among all models evaluated, Phi-4 achieves the best overall performance, particularly in execution-based metrics. Consequently, we select it for subsequent experiments that analyze the impact of structured frame-based representations on generalization. Given the relatively close performance across models in this task, we hypothesize that trends observed using Phi-4 are likely to extend to other models with comparable capacity.

4.2 Impact of the structured representations

As described in Section 3.1.1, the **Unknown Template Split** is constructed so that the test set contains only questions whose templates are not seen during training. In this experiment, both training and test data are drawn from the **Unknown Template Split**. For each, we consider two variants: (1) the original natural language questions alone, and (2) the same questions enriched with frame-based semantic annotations. Table 4.2 reports the results, from which we extract the following key observations:

Raw Questions (without structured augmentation). As shown in Table 4.2, when models are trained and evaluated using only the **Raw Questions** on the **Unknown Template Split**, we observe a substantial drop in BLEU score compared to the **Original Split** (Table 4.1). However, execution-based metrics such as accuracy and F1 score slightly improve by

Testing data ↓ \ Training data →	Raw Questions with Unknown Template Split (UTS)					
	-			with frames		
	BLEU	Accuracy	F1	BLEU	Accuracy	F1
Raw Questions	73	41	50	-	-	-
Raw Questions with frames	-	-	-	81	52	65
Gain obtained with the use of frames	BLEU: +8 — Accuracy: +11 — F1: +15					

Table 3: Phi-4 performance on the Unknown Template Split (LCQ2/LCQ3) for different configurations of training.

approximately 4%. This counterintuitive result suggests that, although the surface form of generated queries diverges more from the gold standard, the semantic intent is still preserved in many cases. This may be attributed to discrepancies in query lengths across the training, validation, and test sets in the two splits, as illustrated in Table 3.1.1 and more in detail in Figures 4 and 5 in Appendix A. In the **Original Split**, the average query length remains relatively consistent across the training, validation, and test sets. In contrast, in the **Unknown Template Split**, the average query length in the test set is significantly higher than that of the training and validation sets. As a result, the model tends to generate shorter queries at inference time, which leads to a penalty in BLEU score. However, these shorter queries often contain fewer errors, making them more likely to execute successfully and return more correct answers—thereby improving execution-based metrics such as accuracy and F1.

Frame-Augmented Questions. When the same experiment is repeated using questions augmented with frame-based structured representations, we observe a notably different behavior. The BLEU score still drops but only by 5 points, indicating improved robustness in surface-level generation. More significantly, execution-based metrics show a marked improvement: accuracy increases by 15% and F1 score by 19%. This demonstrates that the structured semantic information introduced by the frames helps the model better capture the intent of the question, even when the surface structure is unfamiliar.

4.3 Generalization to Template-Free Questions (Reformulated Questions)

We conducted a comprehensive set of experiments using the three questions variants described in Section 3.1.1: **Raw Questions**, **Reformulated Questions**, and **Combined Questions** (where both raw questions and their associated reformulated questions are treated as distinct training examples and mapped to the same SPARQL query). For each dataset variant, we considered both standard and frame-augmented versions, resulting in a total of twelve training configurations.

At inference time, we focus exclusively on the **Reformulated Questions** version of the test set, using both the original and frame-augmented forms to assess generalization. Tables 4.3 and 4.3 present the results of these experiments using the Phi-4 model. The key findings are as follows:

Impact of Frame-Based Representations. Across all dataset variants, incorporating frame-based structured representations consistently improves performance. This trend is clearly visible when comparing the diagonal results within each experimental block—i.e., when both training and testing involve frame augmentation. Models trained and tested with frame-enhanced inputs outperform those using raw questions alone or using frames only at one stage (training or inference), demonstrating the importance of having structured semantic context available throughout the pipeline.

Impact of Combined Questions. The best BLEU score is achieved when using the **Combined Questions** of the LCQ3 dataset—where both template-based and reformulated ques-

Testing ↓ \ Training →	Raw Questions		Reformulated Questions		Combined Questions	
	-	with frames	-	with frames	-	with frames
Ref Questions	42	40	65	53	67	51
Ref Questions with frames	41	54	67	70	60	73
Gain obtained with frames	-1	+14	+2	+17	-7	+22

Table 4: BLEU performance on reformulated questions for different training configurations.

Testing ↓ \ Training →	Raw Questions				Reformulated Questions				Combined Questions			
	-		with frames		-		with frames		-		with frames	
	Acc	F1	Acc	F1	Acc	F1	Acc	F1	Acc	F1	Acc	F1
Reformulated Questions	14	27	11	20	20	32	13	27	30	40	15	29
Reformulated Questions + frames	13	25	17	30	17	29	26	39	21	37	38	50
Gain obtained with frames	-1	-2	+6	+10	-3	-3	+13	+12	-9	-3	+23	+21

Table 5: Accuracy and F1 performance with reformulated questions for different training configurations.

tions are included and augmented with frame information—at both training and testing time. This setting reflects realistic usage scenarios, where some user queries follow predictable patterns while others are more complex and less structured. While data augmentation from combining question types contributes to improved performance, the addition of frame-based representations has a greater impact, as evidenced by the increase in BLEU score from 67 (combined questions without frames) to 73 (with frames). A similar trend is observed for accuracy and F1 scores computed from the execution of the generated SPARQL queries. The best results are again obtained with the **Combined Questions + Frames** configuration, reaching 38% accuracy and 50% F1, a substantial improvement compared to the same dataset without frame augmentation (30% accuracy, 40% F1).

Overall, these findings confirm that structured frame-based semantic representations significantly enhance model robustness and generalization to naturally phrased, template-free questions.

5 Conclusion

In this paper, we introduced **FRASE**, a novel approach designed to provide structured semantic representations of natural language questions in order to improve the generalization capabilities of large language models (LLMs) in the task of SPARQL query generation. **FRASE** addresses the brittleness of LLMs to lexical variation and syntactic reformulation—two key challenges in question-to-query tasks—by leveraging frame semantics as an intermediate representation. Extensive experiments conducted across multiple recent LLMs show that **FRASE** consistently improves SPARQL generation performance, especially in generalization settings involving unseen templates and naturally reformulated questions. These findings demonstrate the potential of integrating structured semantic knowledge into LLM-driven systems to enhance their robustness and abstraction capabilities. This work opens a promising avenue for research at the intersection of semantic parsing and prompt engineering. While we focused on question answering, the broader insight is that structured semantic enhancement can benefit a wide range of natural language tasks. In future work, we aim to explore the application of **FRASE** beyond question-to-query translation, treating prompts as general cases of natural language inputs that could similarly benefit from semantic structuring.

6 Limitations

While our proposed method improves the performance compared to baseline models on Wikidata, we acknowledge some limitations. First, the best obtained F1 score remain low (50 F1-score) and a further analysis should explore which cases are not well-handled by our frame-based representations. Second, although the approach is designed to be KB-agnostic in principle, we have not yet evaluated it on knowledge bases beyond Wikidata. Its effectiveness in other settings remains to be validated. Third, the success of our frame-based alignment depends heavily on the availability and quality of textual descriptions for relations and classes within the KB. In cases where such descriptions are missing, sparse, or poorly written, the semantic search used for frame detection may yield suboptimal or noisy alignments. This limitation is particularly relevant for incomplete or less curated knowledge bases, where relation descriptions may be inconsistent or unavailable. Finally, our current implementation relies exclusively on the English version of FrameNet, which limits the applicability of the method to English-language questions and KBs. Extending the approach to multilingual settings would require either high-quality multilingual FrameNet resources or robust cross-lingual mapping strategies, which are non-trivial and beyond the scope of this study.

Acknowledgments

We are grateful to the NSERC Discovery Grant Program, which has funded this research. The authors would also like to express their gratitude to Compute Canada (Calcul Quebec) for providing computational resources.

References

- Marah Abidin, Jyoti Aneja, Harkirat Behl, Sébastien Bubeck, Ronen Eldan, Suriya Gunasekar, Michael Harrison, Russell J. Hewett, Mojan Javaheripi, Piero Kauffmann, James R. Lee, Yin Tat Lee, Yuanzhi Li, Weishung Liu, Caio C. T. Mendes, Anh Nguyen, Eric Price, Gustavo de Rosa, Olli Saarikivi, Adil Salim, Shital Shah, Xin Wang, Rachel Ward, Yue Wu, Dingli Yu, Cyril Zhang, and Yi Zhang. Phi-4 technical report, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2412.08905>.
- Hessa Abdulrahman Alawwad, Areej Alhothali, Usman Naseem, Ali Alkathlan, and Amani Jamal. Enhancing textbook question answering task with large language models and retrieval augmented generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.05128*, 2024.
- Kaikai An, Ce Zheng, Bofei Gao, Haozhe Zhao, and Baobao Chang. Coarse-to-fine dual encoders are better frame identification learners. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.13316*, 2023.
- Debayan Banerjee, Pranav Ajit Nair, Jivat Neet Kaur, Ricardo Usbeck, and Chris Biemann. Modern baselines for sparql semantic parsing. In *Proceedings of the 45th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*, pp. 2260–2265, 2022.
- Julia Bonn, Jeffrey Flanigan, Jan Hajic, Ishan Jindal, Yunyao Li, and Nianwen Xue. Meaning representations for natural languages: Design, models and applications. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Joint International Conference on Computational Linguistics, Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC-COLING 2024): Tutorial Summaries*, pp. 13–18, 2024.
- David Chanin. Open-source frame semantic parsing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.12788*, 2023.
- Jacob Devasier, Rishabh Mediratta, and Chengkai Li. Can llms extract frame-semantic arguments?, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2502.12516>.
- Papa Abdou Karim Karou Diallo and Amal Zouaq. Enhancing frame detection with retrieval augmented generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.12210*, 2025.
- Papa Abdou Karim Karou Diallo, Samuel Reyd, and Amal Zouaq. A comprehensive evaluation of neural sparql query generation from natural language questions. *IEEE Access*, 2024.

- Abhimanyu Dubey, Abhinav Jauhri, Abhinav Pandey, Abhishek Kadian, Ahmad Al-Dahle, Aiesha Letman, Akhil Mathur, Alan Schelten, Amy Yang, Angela Fan, et al. The llama 3 herd of models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.21783*, 2024.
- Mohnish Dubey, Debayan Banerjee, Abdelrahman Abdelkawi, and Jens Lehmann. Lc-quad 2.0: A large dataset for complex question answering over wikidata and dbpedia. In Chiara Ghidini, Olaf Hartig, Maria Maleshkova, Vojtech Svátek, Isabel F. Cruz, Aidan Hogan, Jie Song, Maxime Lefrançois, and Fabien Gandon (eds.), *The Semantic Web - ISWC 2019 - 18th International Semantic Web Conference, Auckland, New Zealand, October 26-30, 2019, Proceedings, Part II*, volume 11779 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pp. 69–78. Springer, 2019. doi: 10.1007/978-3-030-30796-7\5. URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-30796-7.5>.
- Vincent Emonet, Jerven Bolleman, Severine Duvaud, Tarcisio Mendes de Farias, and Ana Claudia Sima. Llm-based sparql query generation from natural language over federated knowledge graphs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.06062*, 2024.
- Jeffrey Flanigan, Ishan Jindal, Yunyao Li, Tim O’Gorman, Martha Palmer, and Nianwen Xue. Meaning representations for natural languages: Design, models and applications. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing: Tutorial Abstracts*, pp. 1–8, 2022.
- Daya Guo, Dejian Yang, Haowei Zhang, Junxiao Song, Ruoyu Zhang, Runxin Xu, Qihao Zhu, Shirong Ma, Peiyi Wang, Xiao Bi, et al. Deepseek-r1: Incentivizing reasoning capability in llms via reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.12948*, 2025.
- Shaoru Guo, Yong Guan, Ru Li, Xiaoli Li, and Hongye Tan. Incorporating syntax and frame semantics in neural network for machine reading comprehension. In *Proceedings of the 28th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, pp. 2635–2641, 2020.
- Albert Q. Jiang, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Arthur Mensch, Chris Bamford, Devendra Singh Chaplot, Diego de las Casas, Florian Bressand, Gianna Lengyel, Guillaume Lample, Lucile Saulnier, L lio Renard Lavaud, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Pierre Stock, Teven Le Scao, Thibaut Lavril, Thomas Wang, Timoth e Lacroix, and William El Sayed. Mistral 7b, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2310.06825>.
- Tianyu Jiang and Ellen Riloff. Exploiting definitions for frame identification. In *Proceedings of the 16th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Main Volume*, pp. 2429–2434, 2021.
- Wei Ju, Yifan Wang, Yifang Qin, Zhengyang Mao, Zhiping Xiao, Junyu Luo, Junwei Yang, Yiyang Gu, Dongjie Wang, Qingqing Long, et al. Towards graph contrastive learning: A survey and beyond. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.11868*, 2024.
- Aditya Kalyanpur, Or Biran, Tom Breloff, Jennifer Chu-Carroll, Ariel Diertani, Owen Rambo, and Mark Sammons. Open-domain frame semantic parsing using transformers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.10998*, 2020.
- Paul R Kingsbury and Martha Palmer. From treebank to propbank. In *LREC*, pp. 1989–1993, 2002.
- Alina Leidinger, Robert Van Rooij, and Ekaterina Shutova. The language of prompting: What linguistic properties make a prompt successful? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.01967*, 2023.
- Chaofan Li, MingHao Qin, Shitao Xiao, Jianlyu Chen, Kun Luo, Yingxia Shao, Defu Lian, and Zheng Liu. Making text embedders few-shot learners, 2024a. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2409.15700>.
- Ru Li, Yunxiao Zhao, Zhiqiang Wang, Xuefeng Su, Shaoru Guo, Yong Guan, Xiaoqi Han, and Hongyan Zhao. A comprehensive overview of cfn from a commonsense perspective. *Machine Intelligence Research*, 21(2):239–256, 2024b.

- Haoran Luo, Zichen Tang, Shiyao Peng, Yikai Guo, Wentai Zhang, Chenghao Ma, Guanting Dong, Meina Song, Wei Lin, et al. Chatkbqa: A generate-then-retrieve framework for knowledge base question answering with fine-tuned large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.08975*, 2023.
- Niklas Muennighoff. Sgpt: Gpt sentence embeddings for semantic search. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.08904*, 2022.
- Niklas Muennighoff, SU Hongjin, Liang Wang, Nan Yang, Furu Wei, Tao Yu, Amanpreet Singh, and Douwe Kiela. Generative representational instruction tuning. In *ICLR 2024 Workshop: How Far Are We From AGI*, 2024.
- Colin Raffel, Noam Shazeer, Adam Roberts, Katherine Lee, Sharan Narang, Michael Matena, Yanqi Zhou, Wei Li, and Peter J Liu. Exploring the limits of transfer learning with a unified text-to-text transformer. *Journal of machine learning research*, 21(140):1–67, 2020.
- Samuel Reyd and Amal Zouaq. Assessing the generalization capabilities of neural machine translation models for sparql query generation. In *International Semantic Web Conference*, pp. 484–501. Springer, 2023.
- Baptiste Roziere, Jonas Gehring, Fabian Gloeckle, Sten Sootla, Itai Gat, Xiaoqing Ellen Tan, Yossi Adi, Jingyu Liu, Tal Remez, Jérémy Rabin, et al. Code llama: Open foundation models for code. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.12950*, 2023.
- Aditya Sharma, Luis Lara, Amal Zouaq, and Christopher J Pal. Reducing hallucinations in language model-based sparql query generation using post-generation memory retrieval. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.13369*, 2025.
- Hassan S Shavarani and Anoop Sarkar. Entity retrieval for answering entity-centric questions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.02795*, 2024.
- Xuefeng Su, Ru Li, Xiaoli Li, Jeff Z Pan, Hu Zhang, Qinghua Chai, and Xiaoqi Han. A knowledge-guided framework for frame identification. In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pp. 5230–5240, 2021.
- Xuefeng Su, Ru Li, Xiaoli Li, Baobao Chang, Zhiwei Hu, Xiaoqi Han, and Zhichao Yan. A span-based target-aware relation model for frame-semantic parsing. *ACM Transactions on Asian and Low-Resource Language Information Processing*, 22(3):1–24, 2023.
- I Sutskever. Sequence to sequence learning with neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1409.3215*, 2014.
- Fabio Tamburini. Combining electra and adaptive graph encoding for frame identification. In *Proceedings of the Thirteenth Language Resources and Evaluation Conference*, pp. 1671–1679, 2022.
- Zonghan Wu, Shirui Pan, Fengwen Chen, Guodong Long, Chengqi Zhang, and S Yu Philip. A comprehensive survey on graph neural networks. *IEEE transactions on neural networks and learning systems*, 32(1):4–24, 2020.
- Shitao Xiao, Zheng Liu, Peitian Zhang, and Niklas Muennighoff. C-pack: Packaged resources to advance general chinese embedding, 2023.
- An Yang, Baosong Yang, Beichen Zhang, Binyuan Hui, Bo Zheng, Bowen Yu, Chengyuan Li, Dayiheng Liu, Fei Huang, Haoran Wei, et al. Qwen2. 5 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.15115*, 2024.
- Hamada M Zahera, Manzoor Ali, Mohamed Ahmed Sherif, Diego Moussallem, and A-C Ngonga Ngomo. Generating sparql from natural language using chain-of-thoughts prompting, 2024.
- Ce Zheng, Xudong Chen, Runxin Xu, and Baobao Chang. A double-graph based framework for frame semantic parsing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.09158*, 2022.




Figure 4: Distribution of query length (number of words) in Original Split and Unknown Template Split.




Figure 5: AVG/Min/Max query length (number of words) in Original Split and Unknown Template Split.

Hai-Tao Zheng, Zuocong Xie, Wenqiang Liu, Dongxiao Huang, Bei Wu, and Hong-Gee Kim. Prompt learning with structured semantic knowledge makes pre-trained language models better. *Electronics*, 12(15):3281, 2023.

A Splits Statistics

Figures 4 and 5 show the distribution of question lengths (in number of words) and the corresponding statistics (minimum, mean, maximum) for the training, validation, and test sets in the two LC-QuAD 2.0 splits: the **Original Split** and the **Unknown Template Split**. In the **Original Split**, the length distributions are relatively consistent across all subsets, with similar averages, indicating structural alignment between training and test data. In contrast, the **Unknown Template Split** reveals a clear discrepancy: test questions are, on average, significantly longer than those in the training and validation sets. This shift reflects the intended challenge of the split, where models must generalize to unseen question templates, which tend to be more complex and verbose. Such distributional differences likely contribute to the performance drop observed in this setting, particularly for surface-level generation metrics like BLEU.

B FRASE additional detail

The Algorithm B shows the Stage 1 of **FRASE** that detects the frames evoked in any LCQ2 question as depicted in first part of Figure 6.

Algorithm 1 Identify Frames for LCQ2 Questions

Require: LCQ2_question (natural language question), SPARQL_query (corresponding SPARQL query), VectorDatabase (stores frame vectors), KB (Knowledge Base with ontology and descriptions)

Ensure: EvokedFrames (set of frames evoked by the question)

- 1: Initialize an empty set EvokedFrames
- 2: **Preprocess Frames:**
- 3: **for** each frame in the set of available frames **do**
- 4: Represent the frame using its name, description, and list of frame-elements
- 5: Encode the frame representation into a vector using the embedding-model
- 6: Store the frame vector in VectorDatabase
- 7: **end for**
- 8: **Extract Relevant KB Elements:**
- 9: Parse SPARQL_query to extract relevant KB element identifiers (URIs) corresponding to relation or class
- 10: **Generate KB Element Representations:**
- 11: **for** each URI in the extracted URIs **do**
- 12: Fetch the label and textual description of the corresponding KB element from KB
- 13: Encode the label and description using the embedding-model
- 14: **end for**
- 15: **Align KB Elements with Frames:**
- 16: **for** each vector representation of a KB element **do**
- 17: Perform a similarity search in VectorDatabase to find the most similar frame vector(s)
- 18: **if** a match is found (similarity score \geq threshold) **then**
- 19: Add the matched top- $k = 1$ frame(s) to EvokedFrames
- 20: **end if**
- 21: **end for**
- 22: **return** EvokedFrames

C LCQ2 Questions Annotation by FRASE

Figure 6 illustrates how our proposed **FRASE** pipeline semantically enriches a natural language question from LC-QuAD 2.0 using frame-based structured representations. In **Stage 1**, each relation URI in the associated SPARQL query is aligned with a corresponding FrameNet frame based on textual similarity. For instance, the relation ‘wdt:P1365’ (“replaces”) is aligned with the **Replacing** frame, and “wdt:P31” (“instance of”) is mapped to **Identity**. In **Stage 2**, the system identifies the relevant **Frame Elements** and links them to corresponding spans in the question text. In this example, the element “Old” is mapped to “Yuan dynasty”, and “Type” is inferred as “Dynasty”. This structured representation captures the underlying semantic roles involved in the question and provides an interpretable abstraction that can be used to improve SPARQL generation and generalization.

D Experimental details

We fine-tune all models using the QLoRA method, which combines 4-bit quantization with parameter-efficient fine-tuning. Specifically, we quantize the base model weights using NF4 quantization and bfloat16 computation via the BitsAndBytesConfig. We then apply a low-rank adaptation (LoRA) on key components of the transformer layers (e.g., q_proj, k_proj, v_proj, etc.) with rank 16, lora_alpha 16, and no dropout. The fine-tuning is performed using the adamw_8bit optimizer with a learning rate of 2×10^{-4} , and linear scheduling. We

LCQ2 Question: What is the Chinese dynasty that replaced the Yuan dynasty?
KB Relations/Classes URI: [wdt:P1365, wdt:P31]




Figure 6: An example of frame-based structured representation of text semantic.

Parameters	Values
Max Sequence Length	2048
Packing	False (for faster training)
Per Device Batch Size	8
Gradient Accumulation Steps	4
Warmup Steps	5
Number of Epochs	10 (adjustable)
Learning Rate	2e-4
Precision Mode	bfloat16
Quantization Type	4-bit (NF4)
LoRA Rank (r)	16
LoRA Alpha	16
LoRA Dropout	0
Target Modules	Attention + MLP Projections ¹
Optimizer	adamw_8bit
Weight Decay	0.01
Learning Rate Scheduler	Linear
Random Seed	1618
Evaluation Strategy	Epoch

¹ q_proj, k_proj, v_proj, o_proj, gate_proj, up_proj, down_proj

Table 6: Technical details of the fine-tuning

save and evaluate the model at the end of each epoch and report the best checkpoint based on validation loss. Further training parameters are detailed in Table D.