Reflection Results

Ibrahim Ozkan Lamin O. Touray Mahdi Ouchrahou

Task 1.3 - Our Query

• Experience:

- O Took database courses during bachelor's degree.
- Use of ORMs over time led to a decline in SQL construction skills.

Development Duration & Steps:

- O Query construction in Task 1.1 took one day.
- o Involved analyzing the database schema, reading PostgreSQL documentation, fixing SQL errors, and execution.

Quality of Implementation:

- Results from Task 1.1 were less accurate compared to the LLM-generated version.
- Query execution was slower, indicating inefficiency.

Automation Tool:

None used.

Task 1.3 - LLMs Query

• Experience:

- Familiar with using ChatGPT and adept at crafting prompts to achieve desired results.
- O Gained familiarity with PostgreSQL before using ChatGPT effectively.

Duration & Steps:

- Achieved the final result in a 20-minute session with ChatGPT, including query executions.
- O Tested every guery given to us by ChatGPT and did some error fixing
- O Also, did some result analysing to interpret the correctness of SQL queries

Quality:

ChatGPT's implementation outperformed ours in terms of both accuracy and performance.

Misunderstandings:

- o Initially, ChatGPT used the **post** table in its query, which caused execution errors.
- O Proper prompts directed it to use the correct tables.
- O The initial query was inefficient; prompting for optimization resulted in a more efficient version.

Automation Tools:

None used.

Task 2.3

Query Development Process:

O The query development process in sub-tasks 1 and 2 was not straightforward and required iterations to optimize the query and achieve the desired result.

Role of LLM Automation:

O The LLM can integrate into an interactive query development process, acting as a source of ground truth to compare and refine human-generated queries for better optimization.

• Efficiency Through LLM:

O With accurate and concise prompts, the LLM can leverage its vast knowledge to create accurate and efficient queries, speeding up the development process through automation.

Task 3.2

• Result:

- The LLM made a good effort in creating the execution plan.
- However, it gave a hypothetical execution plan, which looks like the structure of a real PostgreSQL execution plan but is not a real one.
- O The output was more like a template, so it is not fully usable for real-world tasks.

Explanatory Value:

- The LLM's explanation was helpful for understanding execution plans.
- O It showed a template of how an execution plan should look and explained its parts.
- O It also explained the query the plan was based on, which added clarity.
- Query execution plan help in further optimization, query debugging and index optimization.
 - Fundamental difference.

