
SQLENS: An End-to-End Framework for Error Detection and Correction in Text-to-SQL

Yue Gong^{◦,△} **Chuan Lei[◦]** **Xiao Qin[◦]** **Kapil Vaidya[◦]**
 Balakrishnan Narayanaswamy[◦] Tim Kraska^{◦,□}

[◦]Amazon Web Services [△]The University of Chicago [□]Massachusetts Institute of Technology
 yuegong@uchicago.edu, {chuanlei,drxqin,kapivaid,muralibn,timkraska}@amazon.com

Abstract

Text-to-SQL systems translate natural language (NL) questions into SQL queries, enabling non-technical users to interact with structured data. While large language models (LLMs) have shown promising results on the text-to-SQL task, they often produce semantically incorrect yet syntactically valid queries, with limited insight into their reliability. We propose SQLENS, an end-to-end framework for fine-grained detection and correction of semantic errors in LLM-generated SQL. SQLENS integrates error signals from both the underlying database and the LLM to identify potential semantic errors within SQL clauses. It further leverages these signals to guide query correction. Empirical results on two public benchmarks show that SQLENS outperforms the best LLM-based self-evaluation method by 25.78% in F1 for error detection, and improves execution accuracy of out-of-the-box text-to-SQL systems by up to 20%. Our code with full documentation is available at <https://anonymous.4open.science/r/sqlens-7DE6/>.

1 Introduction

Text-to-SQL systems translate natural language (NL) questions into a SQL query, enabling non-technical users to query relational databases and extract insights [28]. Large Language Models (LLMs) have significantly advanced this task, with recent methods [39, 30, 25, 13] achieving promising results on public benchmarks such as BIRD [21] and Spider [50]. Such LLM-based text-to-SQL solutions have been adopted by data platforms like AWS [3], Databricks [9], Snowflake [36], etc.

Despite these advances, LLM-generated queries remain error-prone [11]. The best-performing method on the BIRD leaderboard [4] only achieves an execution accuracy of around 75% on the dev set, still producing more than 400 incorrect SQL queries out of 1534 NL questions. While considerable effort has been devoted to improving the retrieval and generation stages in LLM-based text-to-SQL systems [39, 30, 25], such as schema linking, Chain-of-Thought (CoT) prompting, task decomposition, and the inclusion of cell values, these approaches are still insufficient to eliminate errors entirely, as LLMs do not always adhere to the provided instructions.

A major gap in text-to-SQL systems is the lack of fine-grained, explainable error detection—especially for semantic errors, where queries execute but return incorrect results. Detecting such errors requires understanding both query logic and database structure, which most existing methods fail to capture [29, 43, 20]. They generate SQL queries without estimating quality or confidence, making it difficult for users to debug [37]. In this paper, we address three challenges in error detection and correction:

Challenge 1: identify semantic errors at the clause level. Semantic errors often arise from various causes, from inconsistencies with external knowledge to the LLM’s misunderstanding of the database




Figure 1: An overview of SQLLENS.

schema. Identifying them is challenging due to NL ambiguity and the complexity of SQL queries, data, and schema [42, 15], and requires joint reasoning over all these sources.

Challenge 2: predict the correctness of a SQL query with noisy error signals. Error signals are noisy proxies for true semantic errors. Each signal evaluates the semantic correctness of the generated SQL from a specific perspective, potentially missing the full context. The challenge is to aggregate the decisions from multiple noisy signals to determine whether a SQL query is semantically incorrect.

Challenge 3: fix SQL queries without correctness oracle. Correcting SQL queries is difficult because it must be done cautiously to avoid breaking queries that may already be correct, as no correctness oracle is assumed. Additionally, the order in which errors are fixed is crucial, as errors can be interdependent, and addressing the root cause can resolve many related issues.

State-of-the-art approaches. Existing text-to-SQL methods often rely on LLM self-reflection for error detection and correction [29, 20, 30], but suffers from self-preference bias [27, 47], resulting in low recall. RL-based approaches are emerging, using rewards based on execution accuracy, syntactic correctness, or LLM evaluations [32, 23], but still lack the granularity needed for precise error identification. These methods typically offer only a single confidence score for the full SQL query, without pinpointing specific erroneous clauses or explaining the cause—limiting debuggability and reducing trust in text-to-SQL assistants [5].

SQLLENS overview. We introduce SQLLENS, an end-to-end framework that leverages diverse error signals from both the database and LLM to detect and correct semantic SQL errors. As shown in Figure 1, SQLLENS parses the SQL query into an Abstract Syntax Tree (AST) and uses its Error Detector to collect noisy signals for identifying potential errors (*Challenge 1*). To handle noisy signals, SQLLENS uses weak supervision to combine them into probabilistic labels—without needing ground truth—and trains a classifier to predict semantic correctness and generate detailed error reports (*Challenge 2*). SQLLENS’s Error Selector then decomposes the SQL correction task and guides the LLM through iterative fixes (Error Fixer) based on prioritized errors (*Challenge 3*), and the SQL Auditor selects the better query between the original and revised versions.

Contributions. Our contributions can be summarized as follows: (1) we present SQLLENS that holistically exploits fine-grained error signals for predicting the semantic correctness of SQL queries and correcting erroneous queries using these signals; (2) SQLLENS leverages both LLM and database signals to diagnose SQL queries and employs a weak supervision framework to aggregates noisy error signals for estimating semantic correctness; (3) we design a sequential error correction strategy that guides the LLM to fix SQL queries step-by-step, prioritizing the most critical errors to minimize cascading mistakes; and (4) experimental results on BIRD [21] and Spider [50] show that SQLLENS improves semantic error detection by 25.78% in F1 score over the best LLM self-evaluation method and boosts execution execution accuracy by an average of 3% over existing text-to-SQL solutions.

2 Related Work

Text-to-SQL. Large language models (LLMs) have demonstrated significant capabilities in natural language understanding as the model scale increases. LLM-based text-to-SQL systems, such as DIN-SQL [29] and MAC-SQL [43], decompose the task into sub-tasks using multi-agent frameworks




Figure 2: A running example from BIRD, where each client is guaranteed to have an account.

for effective execution. Other approaches like MCS-SQL [20], CHESS [39] and Chase-SQL [30] follow similar workflows—retrieving relevant context, selecting schema, and synthesizes SQL queries. Recently RL-based reasoning models for text-to-SQL have been explored, where rewards are typically based on execution accuracy, syntactic correctness, or LLM-based self-evaluation [32, 23]. Our proposed error detection can be naturally integrated into this framework as reward functions, providing more semantically meaningful supervision to guide and enhance model reasoning.

Error detection and correction in text-to-SQL. Early approaches [6, 48, 49, 51] focus primarily on binary correctness classification, offering limited insight into the nature of the errors. LLM-based text-to-SQL systems [29, 43, 31, 20] often rely on either SQL execution feedback or LLM self-reflection to judge correctness. In contrast, SQUELDS produces interpretable, clause-level error signals that can guide both user debugging and downstream learning frameworks. LLM self-evaluation techniques [17, 14] assess response quality, while Tian et al. [40] and Self-RAG [1] improve confidence estimation and factual accuracy through fine-tuning and retrieval-based self-critique. However, these are built for general tasks and do not tackle text-to-SQL’s specific challenges.

3 Methodology

3.1 Problem Formulation

In this paper, a table T consists of a set of columns $\mathcal{C} = \{C_1, C_2, \dots, C_n\}$. A join relationship J between two tables T_i and T_j is based on common attributes (i.e., joinable columns $T_i.C_m$ and $T_j.C_n$, respectively). A database instance $\mathcal{D} = \{(T_1, T_2, \dots, T_n), \mathcal{J}\}$ comprises a set of tables and a set of join relationships \mathcal{J} between these tables.

Definition 1 (Text-to-SQL Algorithm) A text-to-SQL algorithm f takes as input a natural language question Q , a database instance \mathcal{D} , and optionally external knowledge \mathcal{K} , and generates a SQL query $q = f(Q, \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{K})$.

Figure 2 presents an example using a question from the BIRD benchmark, asking for the number of female clients who opened accounts at the Jesenik branch. The benchmark also provides external knowledge, such as annotations on a column name and a cell value. The predicted SQL query is generated by a text-to-SQL algorithm to answer the question.

Definition 2 (Semantic Error) A semantic error e results in the SQL query q failing to correctly answer the natural language query Q . Formally,

$$do(e) \Rightarrow \mathcal{O}(q, \mathcal{D}) \neq \mathcal{O}(Q, \mathcal{D})$$

The operation $do(e)$ denotes an intervention in the generation of q due to e , causing a mismatch between the observed output $\mathcal{O}(q, \mathcal{D})$ and the expected correct output $\mathcal{O}(Q, \mathcal{D})$, thereby identifying e as the semantic error.

For example, the generated SQL query in Figure 2 is semantically incorrect with an output of 0, whereas the correct output is 26 based on the ground truth SQL query. First, the query incorrectly uses `jesenik` in the predicate, leading to the empty result. Secondly, the query violates the evidence




Figure 3: The causal graph of semantic errors and signals

specified in the external knowledge, using `gender='Female'` instead of `gender='F'`. Even with the correct predicates, the SQL query would still produce an incorrect result of 23 due to an incorrect join predicate and a suboptimal join path. Specifically, there is no valid join path between the `client` and `account` tables, indicating the join predicate `client.client_id = account.account_id` in the query is hallucinated. Moreover, the `account` table involved in the join path is redundant as the `client` and `district` tables can be directly joined based on the database.

Problem 3.1 (Semantic Error Detection) *Given a natural language question \mathcal{Q} , a database instance \mathcal{D} , optionally external knowledge \mathcal{K} , and the output SQL query $q = f(\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{K})$ generated by a text-to-SQL algorithm f , the task is to determine if q is semantically correct and, if not, identify a set of potential semantic errors \mathcal{E} in q .*

For a semantically incorrect SQL query, our goal is to fix it to correctly answer the given NL question.

Problem 3.2 (Semantic Error Correction) *Given a semantically incorrect SQL query q , the task is to correct q such that the corrected query q' , accurately answers the natural language question \mathcal{Q} , such that $\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{D}) = \mathcal{O}(q', \mathcal{D})$.*

3.2 SQLENS Error Detection

Accurately identifying semantic errors can be inherently difficult due to the complexity of SQL queries, as well as the ambiguities present in natural language (NL) queries, data, and database schemas. Our insight is that many semantic errors in LLM-generated queries exhibit common patterns that can be detected through carefully crafted signals. Building on observations and insights from recent text-to-SQL studies [43, 20, 31], we categorize common semantic errors as follows.

1. **Question ambiguity.** The user’s questions may inherently contain ambiguities and be interpreted in multiple ways. For example, if a user asks “*What were the total sales last quarter?*” in a database where the `sales` table includes both `gross_sales` and `net_sales` columns, either column could be chosen to answer the question.
2. **Data ambiguity.** In real-world databases, multiple tables or columns with similar or identical names can arise due to data integration, versioning, table transformations, and other factors, leading to ambiguities. For example, if a user asks “*What are the average salaries by department?*”, but the database contains both a `dept` table and a `department` table, selecting the wrong table would result in incorrect query results.
3. **Semantic misalignment.** Even when NL questions and databases are unambiguous, a semantic gap can still cause mismatches between the generated SQL and the NL question. For example, as shown in Figure 2, an incorrect join predicate (`client.client_id = account.account_id`) occurs due to the LLM misinterpreting join relationships in the financial database.

An *error signal* acts as a proxy for detecting semantic errors in SQL queries. SQLENS’s Error Detector combines signals from both the database and LLM to detect these errors. Figure 3 illustrates how each signal in SQLENS corresponds to common types of semantic errors.

Database-based error signals. Database-based signals are designed to identify semantic misalignment and inherent ambiguity within the data. These signals draw inspiration from diverse SQL workloads including real-life scenarios and benchmarks such as TPC-DS [26], Redset [41], BIRD [21], etc. These signals can be reliably and efficiently obtained without LLMs by: (1) extracting information from the query plan (e.g., *Empty Predicate*), (2) checking (meta-)data information from




Figure 4: Signal aggregation using weak supervision.

the underlying database (e.g., *Suboptimal Join Tree*, *Value Ambiguity*), or (3) leveraging general heuristics derived from the above query workloads (e.g., *Unnecessary Subquery*). In Appendix B, we present examples of incorrect and correct SQL query pairs based on NL questions from real-world applications, highlighting the specific SQL clauses each signal targets.

LLM-based error signals. For semantic errors due to insufficient evidence or LLM hallucination, we need to consider both the NL question and the SQL query simultaneously and understand the LLM’s reasoning process. Therefore, SQLENS introduces LLM-based error signals that dig into question ambiguity and the LLM’s reasoning process [45]. All LLM-based signals are obtained from a single LLM call, significantly reducing the cost and latency compared to multiple individual calls. Detailed descriptions of the error signals, along with illustrative examples, are provided in Appendix C. The corresponding prompts used to collect these signals are included in Appendix D.

Effective error detection in text-to-SQL requires integrating both database and LLM-based signals: the former excel at identifying structural or value errors, while the latter capture logical inconsistencies requiring nuanced interpretation of the NL question and query. Since these signals are inherently noisy, SQLENS avoids relying on any single source. Instead, it employs a learning-based approach (Section 3.3) to aggregate complementary signals, combining database analysis with LLM reasoning. This makes SQLENS a general and extensible framework for robust error detection and correction.

3.3 Aggregating All Signals Using Weak Supervision

The signals that we collect are inherently noisy—each may incorrectly flag correct SQL clauses or overlook actual errors. To mitigate this, we adopt a weak supervision framework (shown in Figure 4) that aggregates these diverse signals, treating each as a labeling function (LF) that provides partial and noisy supervision. Inspired by prior work [34, 12], this approach not only combines the signals but also learns their accuracies and correlations to better approximate ground truth. In SQLENS, each error signal s acts as a LF, identifying potential issues in a SQL query q . Formally,

$$\mathcal{I} = \lambda_s(q) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } |s(q)| > 0 \\ -1 & \text{if } |s(q)| = 0 \end{cases}$$

where $\mathcal{I} = 1$ indicates that the error signal s has detected at least one problematic SQL clause (i.e., likely incorrect), and $\mathcal{I} = -1$ indicates that no issues are found. However, relying solely on negative signals limits coverage. To improve recall, we introduce three positive labelers that assign $\mathcal{I} = 0$ (i.e., likely correct) when no issues are detected by: (1) λ_{all} labels a SQL query as correct if no error signals are detected; (2) λ_{db} labels a SQL query as correct if no database-based signals are detected; and (3) λ_{llm} labels a SQL query as correct if no LLM-based signals are detected.

Each query q is thus represented by a decision vector $\Lambda_q = \langle \lambda_{s_1}(q), \dots, \lambda_{s_n}(q), \lambda_{all}(q), \lambda_{db}(q), \lambda_{llm}(q) \rangle$. We use a generative model to estimate the joint distribution $p(\Lambda, Y)$, where Y is the unobserved true label, by optimizing:

$$\theta_{opt} = \arg \min_{\theta} -\log \sum_Y p_{\theta}(\Lambda, Y)$$

The resulting probabilistic labels $p(\Lambda, Y)$ reflect the estimated correctness of each SQL query, which we use to train a classifier for downstream semantic error detection.

3.4 SQLENS Error Correction

As discussed in Section 1, LLM-based text-to-SQL methods [29, 7] often rely on self-reflection without grounding their corrections. This leads to two issues: (1) hallucinations due to generation

```

{
  "signal description": "The SQL query uses more tables than necessary in the join
  ↵ clauses, which may lead to potential errors.",
  "correction instruction": "Review and revise the SQL query to include only the
  ↵ essential tables in the join clauses.",
  "problematic clauses": {
    "tables used in the JOIN clauses": ["client", "account", "district"],
    "optimal set of tables to join": ["client", "district"]
  },
  "confidence": "high"
}

```

Figure 5: Example error report for *Suboptimal Join Tree*

bias [27, 47] and limited factual grounding [35], and (2) degradation of originally correct queries when relying on a single, unreliable correctness estimate. Other methods similarly assume that all SQL queries are incorrect [8, 2], ignoring the risk of over-correction.

SQLENS error report. In SQLENS, an error signal is associated with SQL clauses and provides a detailed error report. An error report consists of (1) *signal description* which explains the error signal and the conditions that trigger it; (2) *example(s)* (optional) to clarify the meaning of the signal; (3) *correction instruction* for correcting the SQL query; (4) *problematic clauses* identified as potential sources of error. Such error report offers rich context for the identified errors in SQL queries; and (5) *confidence* bucketized into high, medium, and low based on the weight assigned to each labeler in error detection. Figure 5 presents an example of an error report generated by the *Suboptimal Join Tree* signal for the SQL query shown in Figure 2.

SQLENS correction strategy. A straightforward approach of using error signals for SQL query correction is to concatenate all the detected error information and ask the LLM to fix all errors at once. However, providing too much information can overwhelm the LLM, causing it to lose focus [22]. To address this, SQLENS decomposes the SQL correction task, guiding the LLM to fix the query step-by-step. SQLENS prioritizes fixing the most critical error in each iteration, allowing the LLM to focus on resolving one issue at a time, reducing the risk of distraction [18, 44, 46]. By addressing the most critical error first, the total number of errors can also be reduced more quickly, as dependent errors can be automatically resolved if the root cause is fixed. This iterative process continues until no error signals remain or the maximum number of iterations is reached. Algorithm 1 in Appendix E presents the pseudocode for the error correction. The correction prompt is provided in Appendix D.8.

- **Error Selector.** Given a SQL query, schema, and a ranked list of error reports, the Error Selector uses an LLM to prioritize which error to fix first, refining the ranking based on relevance to the original query [38, 24, 33]. The highest-priority error is then passed to the Error Fixer.
- **Error Fixer.** The Error Fixer takes the query and a selected error report, applies a targeted correction using contextual signals (Algorithm 1), and validates the revised query using a SQL parser. If syntax issues arise, the fixer uses the parser feedback to iteratively resolve them. Corrected queries are re-evaluated by the Error Detector; the process repeats until no errors remain or a maximum number of iterations is reached. Fixed signals are removed to prevent redundant corrections.
- **SQL Auditor.** To avoid overlooking persistent errors, a high-precision signal can be designated as a guardrail to trigger final adjustments. To prevent degradation of originally correct queries, the final revised query and the original are both evaluated by an LLM-based SQL Auditor, which selects the version that best aligns with the input question.

4 Experimental Evaluation

4.1 Experimental Setup

Datasets. We evaluate on the dev sets of two standard text-to-SQL benchmarks: BIRD [21] and Spider [50]. SQL queries for evaluation were generated using four state-of-the-art text-to-SQL systems with Claude 3.5 Sonnet as the backbone LLM: (1) a basic schema-aware prompt (Vanilla) listed in Appendix D.1, (2) DIN-SQL [29], (3) MAC-SQL [43], and (4) CHESS [39]. Semantic correctness was determined by comparing generated queries against gold SQL queries.

Table 1: End-to-end accuracy improvement on BIRD.

	Method	$\Delta \text{Acc.}(N_{\text{net}})$	$\Delta \text{Acc.}(N_{\text{fix}})$	N_{net}	N_{fix}	N_{break}
Vanilla	Self-Reflection	59.07 (+0.00%)	60.6(+1.53%)	1	22	21
	SQLLENS w. Fix-ALL	61.15 (+2.08%)	62.34 (+3.27%)	30	47	17
	SQLLENS	62.54 (+3.47%)	63.66(+4.59%)	50	66	16
DIN-SQL	Self-Reflection	54.63 (+15.14%)	56.37(+16.88%)	209	233	24
	SQLLENS w. Fix-ALL	58.11 (+18.62%)	59.71(+20.22%)	257	279	22
	SQLLENS	59.99 (+20.50%)	61.45 (+21.96%)	283	303	20
MAC-SQL	Self-Reflection	60.12 (+0.80%)	62.63(+2.59%)	12	39	27
	SQLLENS w. Fix-ALL	62.43 (+2.39%)	63.84(+3.80%)	36	57	21
	SQLLENS	64.03 (+3.99%)	65.23 (+5.19%)	60	78	18
CHESS	Self-Reflection	67.99 (+0.08%)	69.42 (+1.51%)	12	23	11
	SQLLENS w. Fix-ALL	68.96 (+1.05%)	70.21(+2.30%)	16	35	19
	SQLLENS	69.74 (+1.83%)	70.53(+2.62%)	28	40	12

Evaluation metrics. We evaluate SQLLENS on two tasks: (1) *end-to-end correction*, measuring execution accuracy gains on benchmarks; and (2) *semantic error detection*, framed as binary classification. For correction, in addition to the execution accuracy gain $\Delta \text{Acc.}$, we also report N_{fix} (incorrect \rightarrow correct), N_{break} (correct \rightarrow incorrect), and the net improvement $N_{\text{net}} = N_{\text{fix}} - N_{\text{break}}$. For error detection, we treat semantically incorrect queries as the positive class and report accuracy, AUC, and precision/recall/F1, over 5-fold cross-validation.

End-to-end correction baselines. (1) **Self-Reflection**: A standard LLM prompt [29] where the model is given the schema, sample values, and original SQL query, and asked to debug without any explicit error information. (2) **SQLLENS + Fix-ALL**: Provides the LLM with all error signals detected by SQLLENS simultaneously, prompting it to correct the query based on the full set of error reports.

Semantic error detection baselines. (1) **LLM Self-Eval (Bool)**: Following Kadavath et al. [17], the LLM is asked whether the SQL query correctly answers the question (yes/no). (2) **LLM Self-Eval (Prob)**: Based on Tian et al. [40], the LLM outputs a confidence score (0–1) for query correctness; scores above 0.5 are treated as correct. (3) **Supervised SQLLENS**: A classifier trained on error signal outputs as features and gold correctness labels derived by comparing the generated SQL against the ground truth. We use AutoGluon [10] to automatically select the best-performing model.

All methods, including SQLLENS, use Claude 3.5 Sonnet as the backbone LLM. Our code is available at <https://anonymous.4open.science/r/sqlens-7DE6/>, which includes the full implementation of our method and all baselines.

4.2 Main Results

As shown in Table 1, SQLLENS consistently improves end-to-end accuracy across all out-of-the-box text-to-SQL systems and outperforms both Self-Reflection and Fix-ALL on BIRD. In this realistic setting—where inputs include both correct and incorrect queries—SQLLENS achieves the highest net improvement (N_{net}), fixing more queries and introducing fewer regressions. For example, with queries generated by the vanilla prompt, SQLLENS corrects 49 and 20 more queries than Self-Reflection and Fix-ALL, respectively, yielding 3.47% and 2.08% higher accuracy. It improves DIN-SQL’s performance by 20.5% and boosts CHESS from 67.91% to 69.74%. When assuming all inputs are incorrect—as done by other methods—SQLLENS achieves an average gain of 4.13%. Notably, LLM self-reflection breaks the most correct queries, highlighting the need for grounded, signal-driven correction. The results on Spider are in Appendix F.1.

4.3 Ablation Studies

Error detection performance analysis. We evaluate SQLLENS’s effectiveness in predicting semantic correctness. Results on BIRD are shown in Table 2, with additional results on Spider provided in Appendix F.2.

Table 2: Effectiveness of SQLLENS error detection on BIRD.

	Method	Acc.	AUC	Precision	Recall	F1
Vanilla	LLM Self-Eval. (Bool)	60.53 (± 2.30)	\times	57.70 (± 18.90)	10.02 (± 4.54)	16.97 (± 7.35)
	LLM Self-Eval. (Prob)	59.76 (± 1.10)	64.23 (± 2.98)	64.22 (± 22.97)	2.72 (± 1.89)	5.17 (± 3.49)
	Supervised SQLLENS	66.58[†] (± 2.56)	65.12[†] (± 3.88)	71.83[†] (± 9.55)	31.77 (± 7.38)	43.32 (± 6.47)
	SQLLENS	64.63 (± 1.97)	61.90 (± 2.18)	58.11 (± 2.80)	48.74[†] (± 4.31)	52.94[†] (± 3.24)
DIN-SQL	LLM Self-Eval. (Bool)	61.52 (± 1.20)	\times	86.83 (± 2.18)	42.99 (± 2.72)	57.43 (± 2.20)
	LLM Self-Eval. (Prob)	49.57 (± 1.56)	73.01 (± 0.86)	92.27[†] (± 5.05)	17.84 (± 2.19)	29.83 (± 3.09)
	Supervised SQLLENS	76.96[†] (± 2.10)	83.55[†] (± 2.33)	85.90 (± 2.14)	74.13 (± 3.27)	79.53[†] (± 2.14)
	SQLLENS	75.29 (± 2.33)	81.49 (± 1.74)	81.64 (± 2.17)	76.41[†] (± 3.50)	78.88 (± 2.19)
MAC-SQL	LLM Self-Eval. (Bool)	61.50 (± 1.47)	\times	65.51 (± 14.72)	7.83 (± 2.16)	13.94 (± 3.69)
	LLM Self-Eval. (Prob)	61.37 (± 0.81)	64.60 (± 2.19)	72.69[†] (± 12.19)	5.16 (± 1.53)	9.61 (± 2.76)
	Supervised SQLLENS	67.09 (± 3.56)	65.07[†] (± 4.30)	66.19 (± 10.83)	38.11 (± 2.90)	48.16 (± 4.29)
	SQLLENS	67.43[†] (± 4.38)	64.27 (± 4.42)	63.27 (± 8.64)	45.10[†] (± 3.90)	52.63[†] (± 5.62)
CHESS	LLM Self-Eval. (Bool)	67.98 (± 1.95)	\times	50.89 (± 10.76)	15.71 (± 3.96)	23.81 (± 5.22)
	LLM Self-Eval. (Prob)	68.50 (± 0.82)	64.23[†] (± 1.65)	61.87 (± 13.09)	4.90 (± 1.63)	9.03 (± 2.87)
	Supervised SQLLENS	72.10[†] (± 1.27)	62.95 (± 3.23)	72.43[†] (± 8.93)	23.06 (± 7.23)	33.96 (± 8.04)
	SQLLENS	69.35 (± 1.60)	63.34 (± 2.90)	52.54 (± 2.91)	44.69[†] (± 6.03)	48.17[†] (± 4.33)

\times indicates that the classification is not threshold-based. \dagger Top result; top two are bolded.

On BIRD, SQLLENS outperforms all baselines in Accuracy, Recall, and F1, demonstrating superior ability to identify erroneous SQL queries. For DIN-SQL, SQLLENS achieves an F1 of 78.88—21.45 points higher than the best LLM self-evaluation baseline (57.43). Although LLM Self-Eval. (Prob) attains the highest precision on MAC-SQL, it suffers from the lowest recall.

When aggregating signals, the supervised version of SQLLENS achieves higher accuracy, AUC, and precision, benefiting from access to gold labels during training to better assess signal reliability. In contrast, the weak supervision variant yields higher recall and F1 by leveraging agreement among signals without relying on ground truth. While this leads to slightly lower precision and accuracy, it enables broader error coverage by capturing diverse aspects of SQL errors.

We further analyze the impact of SQL Auditor and the guardrail signal on SQLLENS error correction through an ablation study on BIRD, as shown in Table 3.

Impact of SQL Auditor. SQL Auditor helps reduce the number of SQL queries broken during the correction process. However, this comes at the expense of fixing fewer queries overall. The decision to enable SQL Auditor depends on the desired objective: whether to prioritize conservative corrections with minimal regressions or more aggressive corrections aimed at maximizing the total number of fixed queries.

Impact of guardrail signal. To isolate the effect of the guardrail signal, we compare the results with and without it before running SQL Auditor. As shown in Table 3, the use of the guardrail signal increases the net improvements by raising the total number of fixes while reducing the total number of regressions.

4.4 Effectiveness of Individual Signals

We conduct a microbenchmark on BIRD to evaluate the effectiveness of each individual signal in both error detection and correction.

Table 3: Effectiveness of SQL Auditor and guardrail signal on BIRD.

	Method	N_{net}	N_{fix}	N_{break}
Vanilla	SQLLENS	50	66	16
	w/o SQLAuditor	53	72	19
	w/o Guardrail+Auditor	48	69	21
DIN-SQL	SQLLENS	283	303	20
	w/o SQLAuditor	288	308	20
	w/o Guardrail+Auditor	281	304	23
MAC-SQL	SQLLENS	60	78	18
	w/o SQLAuditor	57	78	21
	w/o Guardrail+Auditor	46	69	23
CHESS	SQLLENS	28	40	12
	w/o SQLAuditor	26	40	14
	w/o Guardrail+Auditor	24	38	14

Table 4: Error detection using individual error signal.

Signal Name	DIN-SQL			MAC-SQL			CHESS		
	Precision	Recall	N_w	Precision	Recall	N_w	Precision	Recall	N_w
Abnormal Result	99.68	37.01	309	100	6.66	40	98.48	13.27	65
Empty Predicate	96.07	46.83	391	75.81	7.82	47	81.25	10.61	52
Incorrect Filter in Subquery	No queries detected	76	3.16	19	No queries detected				
Incorrect GROUP BY	68.75	5.27	44	66.67	3.0	18	50	0.2	1
Incorrect Join Predicate	100	0.12	1	92.86	2.16	13	100	0.41	2
Suboptimal Join Tree	73.86	15.57	130	62.24	10.15	61	55.13	8.78	43
Table Similarity	73.08	4.55	38	67.31	5.82	35	63.27	6.33	31
Unnecessary Subquery	92.31	1.44	12	62.77	10.15	61	100	0.2	1
Value Ambiguity	66.22	5.87	49	58.49	5.16	31	38.89	5.71	28
LLM-based Error Signals	Precision	Recall	N_w	Precision	Recall	N_w	Precision	Recall	N_w
Column Ambiguity	88.69	17.84	149	75.0	3.49	21	50	4.69	23
Evidence Violation	91.24	14.97	125	87.1	4.49	27	42.86	1.22	6
Insufficient Evidence	82.4	12.34	103	62.07	3.0	18	41.03	3.27	16
LLM Self-Check	86.71	43.0	359	65.28	7.82	47	50.33	15.71	77
Question Clause Linking	87	12.34	103	60.71	5.66	34	53.49	4.69	23

Table 5: Error correction via each error signal on MAC-SQL.

Signal Name	N_{fix}	N_{break}	N_{net}	DB-based Signals		
				Precision	Recall	N_w
Abnormal Result	4	0	4			
Empty Predicate	8	1	7			
Incorrect Filter in Subquery	9	3	6			
Incorrect GROUP BY	5	2	3			
Incorrect Join Predicate	5	1	4			
Suboptimal Join Tree	16	7	9			
Table Ambiguity	2	1	1			
Unnecessary Subquery	6	4	2			
Value Ambiguity	4	1	3			
LLM-based Signals						
Column Ambiguity	4	1	3			
Evidence Violation	9	1	8			
LLM Self-Check	10	3	7			

Individual signal in error detection. Table 4 presents the performance of individual error signals on SQL queries generated by MAC-SQL, DIN-SQL, and CHESS on BIRD. For MAC-SQL, 13 of 14 signals exceed 60% precision. Notably, *Abnormal Result* achieves 100% precision in identifying 40 errors, and *Suboptimal Join Tree* detects the most errors, though at 62% precision. Signals like *Empty Predicate* and *Incorrect Join Predicate* perform consistently well across all systems.

In contrast, signals such as *Unnecessary Subquery* and *Insufficient Evidence* show lower precision and limited impact due to low coverage on the queries generated by MAC-SQL and CHESS. Among LLM-based signals, LLM Self-Check is the most reliable, consistent with results in Table 2.

The lower precision of *Suboptimal Join Tree* with MAC-SQL and CHESS stems from redundant joins that do not affect query results, though the suggested optimal trees often align with the gold query. While such joins may not cause semantic errors, they can harm execution efficiency. *Incorrect Join Predicate* consistently achieves over 90% precision. Overall, database-based signals provide better coverage and precision than LLM-based ones.

Individual signal in error correction. We evaluate the correction effectiveness of individual error signals using SQL queries generated by MAC-SQL. For each signal, we pass all flagged queries and their corresponding error reports to the relevant Signal Fixer. Results are shown in Table 5. Among database-based signals, *Suboptimal Join Tree* achieves the strongest impact with $N_{fix} = 16$ and a net gain of 9 corrected queries. *Empty Predicate* also performs well, fixing 8 and breaking only 1. For LLM-based signals, *Evidence Violation* yields the highest net gain, correcting 8 queries. All signals produce a positive net correction, highlighting the usefulness of SQLLENS’s error signals.

5 Conclusion

We present SQLLENS, a novel framework to leverage both database- and LLM-based error signals for clause-level semantic error detection and correction in text-to-SQL. SQLLENS uses weak supervision to aggregate noisy signals, predicts query correctness, and applies LLM-guided iterative correction. It outperforms LLM self-evaluation in error detection and improves execution accuracy of out-of-the-box text-to-SQL systems by up to 20% without relying on a correctness oracle.

6 Limitations

SQLLENS leverages LLMs in SQL error detection and correction. Hence it inherits certain limitations from the underlying LLM. For example, context window constraints may restrict how much error information can be passed at once, and some corrections may exceed the LLM’s current reasoning capabilities. In our analysis of unfixed SQL queries (Appendix F.3), we observe cases where SQLLENS correctly identifies semantic errors and provides appropriate guidance, but the LLM fails to apply the correction. SQLLENS also incurs computational overhead from aggregating multiple signals and performing iterative corrections, which may introduce high latency in real-time settings. However, SQLLENS is intended as an offline, general-purpose SQL debugging tool, designed to refine and validate generated queries asynchronously—rather than being deployed in latency-sensitive pipelines.

References

- [1] Akari Asai, Zeqiu Wu, Yizhong Wang, Avirup Sil, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. Self-rag: Learning to retrieve, generate, and critique through self-reflection. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2024, Vienna, Austria, May 7-11, 2024*. OpenReview.net, 2024. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=hSyW5go0v8>.
- [2] Arian Askari, Christian Poelitz, and Xinye Tang. Magic: Generating self-correction guideline for in-context text-to-sql, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.12692>.
- [3] AWS. Amazon q generative sql. <https://tinyurl.com/yjwcfwm>, 2024. Accessed: 2024-10-17.
- [4] BIRD-bench. Bird leaderboard. <https://bird-bench.github.io/>, 2023. Accessed: May 2025.
- [5] Nik Bear Brown. Enhancing trust in llms: Algorithms for comparing and interpreting llms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.01943*, 2024.
- [6] Shijie Chen, Ziru Chen, Huan Sun, and Yu Su. Error detection for text-to-sql semantic parsing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.13683*, 2023.
- [7] Xinyun Chen, Maxwell Lin, Nathanael Schärli, and Denny Zhou. Teaching large language models to self-debug, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2304.05128>.
- [8] Ziru Chen, Shijie Chen, Michael White, Raymond Mooney, Ali Payani, Jayanth Srinivasa, Yu Su, and Huan Sun. Text-to-sql error correction with language models of code, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2305.13073>.
- [9] Databricks. Databricks assistant. <https://tinyurl.com/cdva2bjx>, 2023. Accessed: 2024-10-17.
- [10] Nick Erickson, Jonas Mueller, Alexander Shirkov, Hang Zhang, Pedro Larroy, Mu Li, and Alexander Smola. AutoGluon-Tabular: Robust and Accurate AutoML for Structured Data, March 2020. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2003.06505>. arXiv:2003.06505 [cs, stat].
- [11] Avrilia Floratou, Fotis Psallidas, Fuheng Zhao, Shaleen Deep, Gunther Hagleither, Wangda Tan, Joyce Cahoon, Rana Alotaibi, Jordan Henkel, Abhik Singla, Alex Van Grootel, Brandon Chow, Kai Deng, Katherine Lin, Marcos Campos, K. Venkatesh Emani, Vivek Pandit, Victor Shnayder, Wenjing Wang, and Carlo Curino. NL2SQL is a solved problem... not! In *14th Conference on Innovative Data Systems Research, CIDR 2024, Chaminade, HI, USA, January 14-17, 2024*. www.cidrdb.org, 2024. URL <https://www.cidrdb.org/cidr2024/papers/p74-floratou.pdf>.
- [12] Daniel Fu, Mayee Chen, Frederic Sala, Sarah Hooper, Kayvon Fatahalian, and Christopher Re. Fast and three-rious: Speeding up weak supervision with triplet methods. In Hal Daumé III and Aarti Singh, editors, *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 119 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 3280–3291. PMLR, 13–18 Jul 2020. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v119/fu20a.html>.
- [13] Dawei Gao, Haibin Wang, Yaliang Li, Xiuyu Sun, Yichen Qian, Bolin Ding, and Jingren Zhou. Text-to-sql empowered by large language models: A benchmark evaluation, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2308.15363>.
- [14] Jiahui Geng, Fengyu Cai, Yuxia Wang, Heinz Koepll, Preslav Nakov, and Iryna Gurevych. A survey of confidence estimation and calibration in large language models. In Kevin Duh, Helena Gomez, and Steven Bethard, editors, *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 6577–6595, Mexico City, Mexico, June 2024. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2024.nacl-long.366. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2024.nacl-long.366>.

- [15] Zezhou Huang, Pavan Kalyan Damalapati, and Eugene Wu. Data ambiguity strikes back: How documentation improves gpt’s text-to-sql, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2310.18742>.
- [16] Pallavi Jayawant and Kerry Glavin. Minimum spanning trees. *Involve, a Journal of Mathematics*, 2(4):439–450, 2009.
- [17] Saurav Kadavath, Tom Conerly, Amanda Askell, Tom Henighan, Dawn Drain, Ethan Perez, Nicholas Schiefer, Zac Hatfield-Dodds, Nova DasSarma, Eli Tran-Johnson, Scott Johnston, Sheer El-Showk, Andy Jones, Nelson Elhage, Tristan Hume, Anna Chen, Yuntao Bai, Sam Bowman, Stanislav Fort, Deep Ganguli, Danny Hernandez, Josh Jacobson, Jackson Kernion, Shauna Kravec, Liane Lovitt, Kamal Ndousse, Catherine Olsson, Sam Ringer, Dario Amodei, Tom Brown, Jack Clark, Nicholas Joseph, Ben Mann, Sam McCandlish, Chris Olah, and Jared Kaplan. Language Models (Mostly) Know What They Know, November 2022. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2207.05221>. arXiv:2207.05221 [cs].
- [18] Tushar Khot, Harsh Trivedi, Matthew Finlayson, Yao Fu, Kyle Richardson, Peter Clark, and Ashish Sabharwal. Decomposed prompting: A modular approach for solving complex tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.02406*, 2022.
- [19] Joseph B Kruskal. On the shortest spanning subtree of a graph and the traveling salesman problem. *Proceedings of the American Mathematical society*, 7(1):48–50, 1956.
- [20] Dongjun Lee, Choongwon Park, Jaehyuk Kim, and Heesoo Park. MCS-SQL: Leveraging Multiple Prompts and Multiple-Choice Selection For Text-to-SQL Generation, May 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2405.07467v1>.
- [21] Jinyang Li, Binyuan Hui, Ge Qu, Jiaxi Yang, Binhua Li, Bowen Li, Bailin Wang, Bowen Qin, Rongyu Cao, Ruiying Geng, Nan Huo, Xuanhe Zhou, Chenhao Ma, Guoliang Li, Kevin C. C. Chang, Fei Huang, Reynold Cheng, and Yongbin Li. Can LLM Already Serve as A Database Interface? A BIG Bench for Large-Scale Database Grounded Text-to-SQLs, November 2023. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2305.03111>. arXiv:2305.03111 [cs].
- [22] Nelson F. Liu, Kevin Lin, John Hewitt, Ashwin Paranjape, Michele Bevilacqua, Fabio Petroni, and Percy Liang. Lost in the middle: How language models use long contexts, 2023. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2307.03172>.
- [23] Peixian Ma, Xialie Zhuang, Chengjin Xu, Xuhui Jiang, Ran Chen, and Jian Guo. Sql-r1: Training natural language to sql reasoning model by reinforcement learning, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2504.08600>.
- [24] Xueguang Ma, Xinyu Zhang, Ronak Pradeep, and Jimmy Lin. Zero-shot listwise document reranking with a large language model, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2305.02156>.
- [25] Karime Maamari, Fadhl Abubaker, Daniel Jaroslawicz, and Amine Mhedhbi. The death of schema linking? text-to-sql in the age of well-reasoned language models, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2408.07702>.
- [26] Raghunath Othayoth Nambiar and Meikel Poess. The making of tpc-ds. In *VLDB*, volume 6, pages 1049–1058, 2006.
- [27] Arjun Panickssery, Samuel R. Bowman, and Shi Feng. Llm evaluators recognize and favor their own generations, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2404.13076>.
- [28] Liana Patel, Siddharth Jha, Carlos Guestrin, and Matei Zaharia. Lotus: Enabling semantic queries with llms over tables of unstructured and structured data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.11418*, 2024.
- [29] Mohammadreza Pourreza and Davood Rafiei. DIN-SQL: Decomposed In-Context Learning of Text-to-SQL with Self-Correction, April 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2304.11015v3>.

- [30] Mohammadreza Pourreza, Hailong Li, Ruoxi Sun, Yeounoh Chung, Shayan Talaei, Gaurav Tarlok Kakkar, Yu Gan, Amin Saberi, Fatma Ozcan, and Sercan O. Arik. Chase-sql: Multi-path reasoning and preference optimized candidate selection in text-to-sql, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2410.01943>.
- [31] Mohammadreza Pourreza, Hailong Li, Ruoxi Sun, Yeounoh Chung, Shayan Talaei, Gaurav Tarlok Kakkar, Yu Gan, Amin Saberi, Fatma Ozcan, and Sercan O Arik. Chase-sql: Multi-path reasoning and preference optimized candidate selection in text-to-sql. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.01943*, 2024.
- [32] Mohammadreza Pourreza, Shayan Talaei, Ruoxi Sun, Xingchen Wan, Hailong Li, Azalia Mirhoseini, Amin Saberi, and Sercan "O. Arik. Reasoning-sql: Reinforcement learning with sql tailored partial rewards for reasoning-enhanced text-to-sql, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2503.23157>.
- [33] Ronak Pradeep, Sahel Sharifmoghaddam, and Jimmy Lin. Rankvicuna: Zero-shot listwise document reranking with open-source large language models, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2309.15088>.
- [34] Alexander Ratner, Stephen H. Bach, Henry Ehrenberg, Jason Fries, Sen Wu, and Christopher Ré. Snorkel: rapid training data creation with weak supervision. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment*, 11(3):269–282, November 2017. ISSN 2150-8097. doi: 10.14778/3157794.3157797. URL <https://dl.acm.org/doi/10.14778/3157794.3157797>.
- [35] Kurt Shuster, Spencer Poff, Moya Chen, Douwe Kiela, and Jason Weston. Retrieval augmentation reduces hallucination in conversation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.07567*, 2021.
- [36] Snowflake. Snowflake copilot. <https://tinyurl.com/mtry8z7p>, 2024. Accessed: 2024-10-17.
- [37] Claudio Spiess, David Gros, Kunal Suresh Pai, Michael Pradel, Md Rafiqul Islam Rabin, Amin Alipour, Susmit Jha, Prem Devanbu, and Toufique Ahmed. Calibration and correctness of language models for code, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2402.02047>.
- [38] Weiwei Sun, Lingyong Yan, Xinyu Ma, Shuaiqiang Wang, Pengjie Ren, Zhumin Chen, Dawei Yin, and Zhaochun Ren. Is chatgpt good at search? investigating large language models as re-ranking agents, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2304.09542>.
- [39] Shayan Talaei, Mohammadreza Pourreza, Yu-Chen Chang, Azalia Mirhoseini, and Amin Saberi. CHESS: Contextual Harnessing for Efficient SQL Synthesis, June 2024. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2405.16755>. arXiv:2405.16755 [cs].
- [40] Katherine Tian, Eric Mitchell, Allan Zhou, Archit Sharma, Rafael Rafailov, Huaxiu Yao, Chelsea Finn, and Christopher D. Manning. Just Ask for Calibration: Strategies for Eliciting Calibrated Confidence Scores from Language Models Fine-Tuned with Human Feedback, October 2023. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2305.14975>. arXiv:2305.14975 [cs].
- [41] Alexander van Renen, Dominik Horn, Pascal Pfeil, Kapil Eknath Vaidya, Wenzian Dong, Murali Narayanaswamy, Zhengchun Liu, Gaurav Saxena, Andreas Kipf, and Tim Kraska. Why tpc is not enough: An analysis of the amazon redshift fleet. In *VLDB 2024*, 2024. URL <https://www.amazon.science/publications/why-tpc-is-not-enough-an-analysis-of-the-amazon-redshift-fleet>.
- [42] Bing Wang, Yan Gao, Zhoujun Li, and Jian-Guang Lou. Know what I don't know: Handling ambiguous and unknown questions for text-to-SQL. In Anna Rogers, Jordan Boyd-Graber, and Naoaki Okazaki, editors, *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2023*, pages 5701–5714, Toronto, Canada, July 2023. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2023.findings-acl.352. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2023.findings-acl.352>.
- [43] Bing Wang, Changyu Ren, Jian Yang, Xinnian Liang, Jiaqi Bai, Linzheng Chai, Zhao Yan, Qian-Wen Zhang, Di Yin, Xing Sun, and Zhoujun Li. MAC-SQL: A Multi-Agent Collaborative Framework for Text-to-SQL, June 2024. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2312.11242>. arXiv:2312.11242 [cs].

- [44] Lei Wang, Chen Ma, Xueyang Feng, Zeyu Zhang, Hao Yang, Jingsen Zhang, Zhiyuan Chen, Jiakai Tang, Xu Chen, Yankai Lin, et al. A survey on large language model based autonomous agents. *Frontiers of Computer Science*, 18(6):186345, 2024.
- [45] Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Fei Xia, Ed Chi, Quoc V Le, Denny Zhou, et al. Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:24824–24837, 2022.
- [46] Zhuofeng Wu, He Bai, Aonan Zhang, Jiatao Gu, VG Vinod Vydiswaran, Navdeep Jaitly, and Yizhe Zhang. Divide-or-conquer? which part should you distill your lilm?, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2402.15000>.
- [47] Wenda Xu, Guanglei Zhu, Xuandong Zhao, Liangming Pan, Lei Li, and William Wang. Pride and prejudice: LLM amplifies self-bias in self-refinement. In Lun-Wei Ku, Andre Martins, and Vivek Srikumar, editors, *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 15474–15492, Bangkok, Thailand, August 2024. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2024.acl-long.826. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2024.acl-long.826>.
- [48] Ziyu Yao, Yu Su, Huan Sun, and Wen-tau Yih. Model-based interactive semantic parsing: A unified formulation and a text-to-sql case study. In *2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP’19)*, 2019.
- [49] Ziyu Yao, Yiqi Tang, Wen-tau Yih, Huan Sun, and Yu Su. An imitation game for learning semantic parsers from user interaction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.00689*, 2020.
- [50] Tao Yu, Rui Zhang, Kai Yang, Michihiro Yasunaga, Dongxu Wang, Zifan Li, James Ma, Irene Li, Qingning Yao, Shanelle Roman, Zilin Zhang, and Dragomir Radev. Spider: A Large-Scale Human-Labeled Dataset for Complex and Cross-Domain Semantic Parsing and Text-to-SQL Task. In Ellen Riloff, David Chiang, Julia Hockenmaier, and Jun’ichi Tsujii, editors, *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 3911–3921, Brussels, Belgium, October 2018. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/D18-1425. URL <https://aclanthology.org/D18-1425>.
- [51] Jichuan Zeng, Xi Victoria Lin, Caiming Xiong, Richard Socher, Michael R Lyu, Irwin King, and Steven CH Hoi. Photon: A robust cross-domain text-to-sql system. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.15280*, 2020.

A SQLENS Use Case

Figure 6 shows a text-to-SQL solution that generates a SQL query for a given NL question. Although the generated query has no syntax errors, the user executes the query and finds that it produces empty results, indicating the query is incorrect. Under the status quo in text-to-SQL assistants [3, 9, 36], users must invest significant time manually debugging semantic errors in queries. Our goal is to provide users with a Debug SQL functionality, which automatically performs a deep semantic analysis of the query, identifying errors such as incorrect join predicates in the FROM clause or incorrect usage of the provided external knowledge in the WHERE clause. This is followed by an automated correction process that generates an updated SQL query for the user to validate. Using Debug SQL, users’ manual efforts in query troubleshooting are significantly reduced, consequently building trust in the text-to-SQL assistant.

```

1 SELECT COUNT(DISTINCT client.client_id) Sub-optimal Join Tree
2 FROM client
3 INNER JOIN account ON
4 client.client_id = account.account_id Incorrect Join Predicate
5 INNER JOIN district ON
6 account.district_id = district.district_id
7 WHERE
8 client.gender = 'Female' Evidence Violation
9 AND district.A2 = 'jesenik';

```

Figure 6: Text-to-SQL debugging use case.

B DB-based Error Signals

The following signals detect semantic misalignment, which occurs when the LLM misinterprets the question or misuses the data.

- **Suboptimal join tree** signal targets the `FROM` and `JOIN` clauses, checking if the SQL query uses the optimal join tree to connect the required tables for answering the NL question. While query optimizers can eliminate redundant tables that do not affect the query results, LLMs may generate unnecessarily complex join trees, potentially leading to incorrect outcomes. Let $\mathcal{D}_{\text{req}} \subseteq \mathcal{D}$ denote the tables needed to answer the question. The optimal join tree is the minimum Steiner tree T^* [16] spanning \mathcal{D}_{req} . If the query includes extra tables beyond \mathcal{D}_{req} , the *Suboptimal Join Tree* signal is flagged. For example, Figure 7 (right) shows an optimal join tree connecting tables *A* and *C*. SQUELNS identifies columns not involved in `JOIN` clauses as \mathcal{D}_{req} and uses Kruskal's algorithm [19] to find the minimum Steiner Tree on the pre-built join graph. If the query involves more tables than necessary, the signal is raised. False positives may occur when multiple valid join trees exist.




Figure 7: Steiner Trees spanning *A* and *C*

To implement this signal, SQUELNS first identifies the columns in a SQL query that are not involved in the `JOIN` clauses. Based on these columns, SQUELNS searches for the minimum Steiner Tree on the join graph built offline to connect the relevant tables. If the SQL query involves more tables in the join than necessary, compared to the minimum Steiner Tree, SQUELNS raises *Suboptimal Join Tree* flag. This signal can produce false positives when a suboptimal join strategy does not impact the correctness of the SQL query. For instance, if a query asks for the total sales from a specific store, it can directly select the `sales` column from the `store_sales` table. However, if the query unnecessarily joins the `store_sales` table with a `store_location` table, even though the `store_location` table is not needed to get the correct sales data, the result would still be correct but the join is suboptimal.

- **Incorrect join predicate** signal checks whether a SQL query uses an invalid join predicate. For example, in Figure 2, the predicted SQL incorrectly joins `client_id` with `account_id`, which does not exist in the corresponding schema graph. To implement this signal, SQUELNS first extracts all the join predicates from the SQL query. It then identifies two types of correct join predicates: (1) using a primary key-foreign key (PK/FK) join explicitly defined in the database schema, and (2) derived from PK/FK joins. Specifically, if two columns C_i and C_j both reference the same primary key C_k (i.e., they refer to the same entity), C_i and C_j can be used in a join predicate. This signal may generate false positives when the PK/FK relationships are not fully documented in the database.

- **Empty predicate** signal detects if there is a predicate within a SQL query that yields an empty result. This signal is useful to detect semantic misalignment errors, including wrong column selection, wrong value usage or wrong comparison operator. SQUELNS extracts all comparisons between a column and a literal from a given SQL, executes each of them individually and records the output size. If there is a predicate that yields empty rows, this signal is flagged. This signal may lead to false positives when an empty predicate is intentional.

- **Abnormal result** signal detects whether a SQL outputs an abnormal result that does not provide much information. SQUELNS executes the SQL and records its output. The output is considered abnormal if (1) it is empty, (2) it contains a column full of zeros, or (3) it contains a column full of NULLs. This signal extends beyond the empty predicate to evaluate the entire SQL output. In addition to detecting empty predicates, it can identify empty intermediate execution results, making it effective for catching semantic misalignment in the intermediate steps of a SQL query. This signal may incorrectly flag a SQL query when the abnormal result is intentional, though this scenario is rare in practice.

- **Incorrect filter in subquery** signal detects the problematic filtering in a subquery. Filters in a subquery often follow the pattern `column = (SELECT...)`. When the subquery returns multiple rows,

Table 6: DB-based Error Signals.

Signal Name	Incorrect SQL Query	Correct SQL Query	SQL Clause
Abnormal Result	SELECT c.id FROM cards c WHERE c.cardKingdomFoilId = c.cardKingdomId AND c.cardKingdomId IS NOT NULL AND c.hasFoil = 1 AND c.isFullArt = 0 AND c.isOversized = 0 AND c.isPromo = 0; <i>Output Size: 0</i>	SELECT id FROM cards WHERE cardKingdomFoilId IS NOT NULL AND cardKingdomId IS NOT NULL; <i>Output Size: 25061</i>	WHERE
Empty Predicate	SELECT c.atom_id, c.atom_id2 FROM connected c JOIN bond b ON c.bond_id = b.bond_id WHERE b.bond_id = 'TR_000_2_5';	SELECT T.atom_id FROM connected AS T WHERE T.bond_id = 'TR_000_2_5';	WHERE
Incorrect Filter in Subquery	SELECT Name FROM badges WHERE UserId = (SELECT Id FROM users WHERE DisplayName = 'Pierre');	SELECT Name FROM badges WHERE UserId IN (SELECT Id FROM users WHERE DisplayName = 'Pierre');	SUBQUERY
Incorrect GROUP BY	SELECT s.City, f.Enrollment (K-12) FROM frpm f JOIN schools s ON f.CDSCode = s.CDSCode GROUP BY s.City, f.'Enrollment (K-12)' ORDER BY SUM(f.'Enrollment (K-12)') ASC LIMIT 5;	SELECT T2.City FROM frpm AS T1 INNER JOIN schools AS T2 ON T1.CDSCode = T2.CDSCode GROUP BY T2.City ORDER BY SUM(T1.'Enrollment (K-12)') ASC LIMIT 5;	GROUP BY
Incorrect Join Predicate	SELECT (SELECT COUNT(DISTINCT client.client_id) FROM client INNER JOIN account ON client.client_id = account.account_id INNER JOIN district ON account.district_id = district.district_id WHERE district.a2 = 'Jesenik' AND client.gender = 'F') AS num_female_clients;	SELECT COUNT(T1.client_id) FROM client AS T1 INNER JOIN district AS T2 ON T1.district_id = T2.district_id WHERE T1.gender = 'F' AND T2.A2 = 'Jesenik';	JOIN
Suboptimal Join Tree	SELECT a.a3 FROM client c JOIN disp di ON c.client_id = di.client_id JOIN account a ON di.account_id = a.account_id JOIN district d ON a.district_id = d.district_id WHERE c.client_id = 3541 LIMIT 1;	SELECT T1.a3 FROM district T1 INNER JOIN client T2 ON T1.district_id = T2.district_id WHERE T2.client_id = 3541;	FROM JOIN
Table Similarity	SELECT AVG(r.points) AS avg_score FROM results r JOIN drivers d ON r.driverId = d.driverId JOIN races ra ON r.raceId = ra.raceId WHERE d.forename = 'Lewis' AND d.surname = 'Hamilton' AND ra.raceId IN (SELECT raceId FROM races WHERE name LIKE '%Turkish Grand Prix');	SELECT AVG(T2.points) FROM drivers AS T1 INNER JOIN driverStandings AS T2 ON T1.driverId = T2.driverId INNER JOIN races AS T3 ON T3.raceId = T2.raceId WHERE T1.forename = 'Lewis' AND T1.surname = 'Hamilton' AND T3.name = 'Turkish Grand Prix'	SELECT FROM
Unnecessary Subquery	SELECT (SELECT c.name FROM cards c WHERE c.uuid = (SELECT uuid FROM rulings)) AS card_name, (SELECT c.artist FROM cards c WHERE c.uuid = (SELECT uuid FROM rulings)) AS artist, (SELECT c.ispromo FROM cards c WHERE c.uuid = (SELECT uuid FROM rulings)) AS is_promo;	SELECT T1.name, T1.artist, T1.isPromo FROM cards AS T1 INNER JOIN rulings AS T2 ON T1.uuid = T2.uuid WHERE T1.isPromo = 1 GROUP BY T1.artist ORDER BY COUNT(DISTINCT T1.uuid) DESC LIMIT 1	SUBQUERY
Value Ambiguity	SELECT c.'artist' FROM 'cards' c JOIN 'foreign_data' f ON c.'uuid'=f.'uuid' WHERE c.'watermark'='phyrexian' AND c.'artist' IS NOT NULL GROUP BY c.'artist';	SELECT T1.artist FROM cards AS T1 INNER JOIN foreign_data AS T2 ON T1.uuid = T2.uuid WHERE T2.language = 'Phyrexian';	SELECT WHERE

the filter condition becomes ambiguous (e.g., IN or ‘=’), potentially leading to errors. SQUELNS uses regular expressions to match this pattern and executes the extracted subquery separately. If it returns more than one row, the signal is flagged. Additionally, SQLite is lenient with SQL semantics, allowing *column* = *(SELECT...)* to match only the first value returned by the subquery. While the query might still be correct if the first value happens to be the desired one, relying on this behavior is generally considered poor practice in SQL writing.

- **Incorrect GROUP BY** signal detects any standalone GROUP BY clause without accompanying aggregate functions such as MAX, COUNT. A misused GROUP BY clause can change the SQL semantics and lead to an incorrect result. In SQLite, a standalone GROUP BY behaves the same as the DISTINCT operator. While the query may still be correct when using GROUP BY as a substitute for DISTINCT, this approach is generally considered poor practice.

- **Unnecessary subquery** signal indicates if there is an excessive use of subqueries in a SQL query, which leads to inefficiencies, increased complexity, and a higher likelihood of errors. This signal counts the number of subqueries in a SQL query and flags it as problematic if the count exceeds a specified threshold. In our evaluation, this threshold is set to 3. False positives may arise when the subqueries are necessary for performance optimization or specific logic, even though they exceed the threshold.

The following signals are designed to capture the inherent ambiguity within the data.

- **Value ambiguity** signal detects incorrect column selections when a value used in an NL question appears in multiple columns. For example, “New York” can appear in both “state” and “city” columns. To identify ambiguous value, this signal extracts all values used in the SQL and finds columns that contain a used value via an inverted index built offline. If there is an alternative column that is closer to the question semantically, the signal flags the corresponding value as ambiguous. It is possible

Table 7: LLM-based Error Signals.

Signal Name	Incorrect SQL Query	Correct SQL Query	SQL Clause
Column Ambiguity	<code>SELECT s.School, s.StreetAbv FROM satscores sat JOIN schools s ON sat.cds = s.CDSCode ORDER BY sat.AvgScrMath DESC LIMIT 1 OFFSET 5;</code>	<code>SELECT T2.MailStreet, T2.School FROM satscores AS T1 INNER JOIN schools AS T2 ON T1.cds = T2.CDSCode ORDER BY T1.AvgScrMath DESC LIMIT 5, 1;</code>	<code>SELECT</code>
Evidence Violation	<p>Evidence: set of cards with “Angel of Mercy” in it refers to <code>name = ‘Angel of Mercy’</code></p> <pre><code>SELECT COUNT(*) FROM set_translations WHERE setCode = ‘UNH’;</code></pre>	<pre><code>SELECT COUNT(DISTINCT translation) FROM set_translations WHERE setCode IN (SELECT setCode FROM cards WHERE name = ‘Angel of Mercy’) AND translation IS NOT NULL;</code></pre>	Any clause identified by LLM
Insufficient Evidence	<p>Q: How many atoms with iodine and sulfur type elements are there in <code>single bond molecules</code>? Evidence: with iodine element refer to element = ‘i’; with sulfur element refers to element = ‘s’; <code>single type bond</code> refers to bond_type = ‘-’; <i>It is not clear what “single bond molecules” refers to.</i></p>	<pre><code>SELECT COUNT(DISTINCT CASE WHEN T1.element = ‘i’ THEN T1.atom_id ELSE NULL END) AS iodine_nums, COUNT(DISTINCT CASE WHEN T1.element = ‘s’ THEN T1.atom_id ELSE NULL END) AS sulfur_nums FROM atom AS T1 INNER JOIN connected AS T2 ON T1.atom_id = T2.atom_id INNER JOIN bond AS T3 ON T2.bond_id = T3.bond_id WHERE T3.bond_type = ‘-’;</code></pre>	Any clause identified by LLM
Incorrect Question Clause Linking	<p>Q: List the top 10 players’ names whose heights are above 180 in <code>descending order of average heading accuracy</code>.</p> <pre><code>SELECT p.player_name FROM Player p JOIN Player_Attributes pa ON p.player_api_id = pa.player_api_id WHERE p.height > 180 ORDER BY pa.heading_accuracy DESC LIMIT 10;</code></pre>	<pre><code>SELECT t1.player_name FROM Player AS t1 INNER JOIN Player_Attributes AS t2 ON t1.player_api_id = t2.player_api_id WHERE t1.height > 180 GROUP BY t1.id ORDER BY CAST(SUM(t2.heading_accuracy) AS REAL) / COUNT(t2.player_fifa_api_id) DESC LIMIT 10;</code></pre>	Any clause identified by LLM
LLM Self-Check	<code>SELECT p.Paragraph_Text FROM Paragraphs p JOIN Documents d ON p.Document_ID = d.Document_ID WHERE d.Document_Name = ‘Welcome to NY’;</code>	<code>SELECT T1.paragraph_text FROM Paragraphs AS T1 JOIN Documents AS T2 ON T1.document_id = T2.document_id WHERE T2.document_name = ‘Customer reviews’;</code>	Any clause identified by LLM

that the originally selected column in the SQL is correct, as the semantic distance may not always accurately determine which column containing the value is the best candidate to answer the question.

- **Table similarity** signal detects potential errors in table selection by identifying alternative tables with similar structures. It extracts all columns used in the SQL, groups columns by their tables, and searches for other tables that contain the same groups of columns. If such a table is found, it suggests that the alternative table could have been used, indicating a potential mistake in the original chosen table. False positives can occur when the chosen table is actually correct, but another table with a similar structure exists, leading the system to incorrectly flag a possible error.

In Table 6, we present examples of incorrect and correct SQL query pairs based on NL questions from real-world applications, highlighting the specific SQL clauses each signal targets.

C LLM-based Error Signals

- **Evidence violation** signal identifies cases where the generated SQL query contradicts the evidence provided in the question or external knowledge. For example, if the question specifies retrieving rows only about *active employees*, but the SQL query does not include a condition to filter out inactive employees, this would trigger an evidence violation. The prompt used by SQUEL can be found in Appendix D.2.

- **Insufficient evidence** signal assesses whether the available evidence is adequate to confirm that the SQL query correctly answers the user’s question. For example, if the question lacks a clear explanation of a domain-specific concept, the LLM is prone to hallucination. This signal essentially verifies that the LLM has enough information and context to provide a correct response. The prompt is shown in Appendix D.3.

- **Incorrect question clause linking** signal evaluates the LLM’s confidence in the generated SQL clauses. This signal first prompts the LLM to map the concepts, entities, and expressions in the user question to the corresponding clauses in the SQL query. For each identified link, the LLM is then asked to indicate its confidence in the generated clause by responding with a simple *yes* or *no*. This signal is flagged when there is at least one clause with low confidence. The prompt can be found in Appendix D.4.

- **Column ambiguity** signal identifies whether there are columns in the database that are very similar to those used in the SQL query and could also be used to answer the user’s question. This signal suggests that a SQL is prone to wrong column selection. The prompt for this signal is shared in Appendix D.5.

The above signals provide specific error causes for the LLM to detect. Given that studies have shown LLMs possess the ability to validate their own answers [17, 40], we also incorporate a signal that prompts the LLM to provide an overall assessment of its own output.

- **LLM self-check** asks an LLM to determine whether the proposed SQL correctly answers the user question considering the database and any available external knowledge. The prompt can be found in Appendix D.6 and D.7.

The signal examples are listed in Table 7. False positives can occur for the LLM-based signals when the LLM misinterprets the question, has limited understanding of the specified knowledge, experiences hallucination, or exhibits bias when evaluating its own output.

D Prompts

D.1 Prompt for Vanilla Text-to-SQL

```
Role: You are an expert SQL database administrator responsible for crafting
→ precise SQL queries to address user questions.

Context: You are provided with the following information:
1. A SQLite database schema
2. A user question
3. Relevant evidence pertaining to the user's question

Database Schema:
- Consists of table descriptions
- Each table contains multiple column descriptions
- Frequent values for each column are provided

Your Task:
1. Carefully analyze the user question, evidence and the database schema.
2. Write a SQL query that correctly answers the user question

Format your SQL query using the following markdown:
```sql
YOUR SQL QUERY HERE
```

[Question]
{question}

[Evidence]
{evidence}

[Database Info]
{db_desc_str}

[Answer]
```

D.2 Prompt for Evidence Violation

```
You are provided with a user question and a proposed SQL query that solves the
→ user question. Your task is to determine whether the proposed SQL query
→ reflects all the evidence specified in the question.
```

Here is a typical example:

```
==== Example ====

[Question] How many users are awarded with more than 5 badges? more than 5 badges
→ refers to Count (Name) > 5; user refers to UserId
```

```
[SQL query] SELECT UserId FROM ( SELECT UserId, COUNT(DISTINCT Name) AS num FROM
→ badges GROUP BY UserId ) T WHERE T.num > 6;

[Answer] :

```json
{
 "violates_evidence": true
 "explanation": "This SQL query violates the evidence in the question because it
 → counts the number of users with more than 6 badges, not more than 5 badges.
 → Additionally, it uses COUNT(DISTINCT Name) instead of COUNT(Name) as
 → specified in the question.
}
```
Question Solved. Make sure you generate a valid json response.
=====

Here is new example, please start answering:

[Question] {question}. {evidence}

[SQL query] {sql_query}

[Answer]
```

D.3 Prompt for Insufficient Evidence

```
You are provided with sqlite database schema, a user question, and a proposed SQL
→ query that solves the user question. Your task is to determine whether you
→ have sufficient evidence to determine whether the SQL answers the user
→ question correctly.

Output a JSON object in the following format. Make sure you generate a valid json
→ response.
[Answer]
```json
{
 "insufficient_evidence": true/false
 "explanation": "why the evidence is not sufficient"
}
```
Question Solved.
=====

Here is new example, please start answering:

[Question] {question}. {evidence}

{db_desc_str}

[SQL query]

{sql_query}

[Answer]
```

D.4 Prompt for Question-Clause Linking

```
You are given a SQLite database schema, a user question, and a proposed SQL query
→ intended to address the user's question. Please follow these steps:

1. Link the concepts, entities, and expressions in the user question to the
→ corresponding clauses in the SQL query.
```

```

2. For each link you have identified, indicate whether you are confident in the
→ generated clause by answering "yes" or "no."
Output a JSON object in the following format. Make sure you generate a valid json
→ response.
[Answer]
```json
{{<(entity in the question, the corresponding SQL clause)>: "<yes/no>"}
}}
```
Please start answering the following question:
[Question] {question}. {evidence}.

{db_desc_str}

[SQL query] {sql_query}

[Answer]

```

D.5 Prompt for Column Ambiguity

As an experienced and professional database administrator, you are provided with a
→ SQLite database schema, a user question, and a proposed SQL query intended to
→ solve the user question. The database schema consists of table descriptions,
→ each containing multiple column descriptions.
Your task is to determine whether there are columns in the database that are very
→ similar to the ones used in the SQL query and could also be used to answer the
→ user's question.

Here is a typical example:

```

===== Example =====

[Question] Which state special schools have the highest number of enrollees from
→ grades 1 through 12? State Special Schools refers to DOC = 31; Grades 1
→ through 12 means K-12

[DB_ID]california_schools
[Database Schema]
# Table: frpm
[
  (CDSCode, CDSCode.),
  (Enrollment (K-12), Enrollment (K-12).),
]
# Table: satscores
[
  (cds, cds. Column Description: California Department Schools),
  (sname, school name. Value examples: [None, 'Middle College High', 'John F.
  → Kennedy High', 'Independence High', 'Foothill High', 'Washington High',
  → 'Redwood High'].),
  (enroll12, enrollment (1st-12nd grade).),
]
# Table: schools
[
  (CDSCode, CDSCode.),
  (DOC, District Ownership Code. Value examples: ['54', '52', '00', '56', '98',
  → '02'].),
]
```

```

[SQL query] <SQL> SELECT T2.sname FROM schools AS T1 INNER JOIN satscores AS T2 ON
→   T1.CDSCode = T2.cds WHERE T1.DOC = '31' AND T2.enroll12 IS NOT NULL ORDER BY
→   T2.enroll12 DESC LIMIT 1; </SQL>

[Answer]
```json
){}
 "alternative_column": true
 "explanation": "frpm.Enrollment (K-12) can also be used to determine the number
 → of enrollees from grades 1 through 12. This column is very similar to
 → satscores.enroll12 used in the proposed SQL."
}
```
Question Solved. Make sure you generate a valid json response.
=====

Please start answering the following question.
[Question] {question}. {evidence}

{db_desc_str}

[SQL query] {sql_query}

[Answer]

```

D.6 Prompt for LLM Self-Check (True/False)

```

You are provided with a SQLite database schema, a user question, and a proposed
→   SQL query intended to solve the user question. Your task is to determine
→   whether the proposed SQL correctly answers the user question. Your answer
→   should be in the form of a JSON object with two keys: "correct" and
→   "explanation". Provide an explanation only if the SQL is incorrect.

You need to generate the answer in the following format:

[Answer]:
```json
){}
 "correct": false,
 "explanation": "your explanation of why the SQL is incorrect"
}
```
Make sure you generate a valid json response.
=====

Please start answering the following question.
[Question]
{question}. {evidence}

[Database Info]
{db_desc_str}

[SQL query]
{sql_query}

[Answer]

```

D.7 Prompt for LLM Self-Check (Probability)

```

You are provided with a user question, a SQLite database schema and a proposed SQL
→   query intended to solve the user question.

```

Your task is to evaluate the proposed SQL query and provide the probability that
 ↳ it correctly answers the user question.

Provide this probability as a decimal number between 0 and 1.

You need to generate the answer in the following format:

```
[Answer]:  
```json  
{
 "probability": <the probability between 0.0 and 1.0 that the SQL correctly
 ↳ answers the question>
}

Make sure you generate a valid json response.
=====
```

Please start answering the following question:

[Question]  
 {question}. {evidence}

[Database Info]  
 {db\_desc\_str}

[SQL query]  
 {sql\_query}

[Answer]

## D.8 Prompt for SQL Query Correction

Role: You are an experienced and professional database administrator tasked with  
 ↳ analyzing and correcting SQL queries that are potentially wrong.

Context: You are provided with the following information:

1. A SQLite database schema
2. A user question
3. A proposed SQL query intended to answer the user question
4. An error report for the proposed SQL query. The error report suggests potential  
 ↳ errors in the SQL.

Database Schema:

- Consists of table descriptions
- Each table contains multiple column descriptions
- Frequent values for each column are provided

Your Task:

1. Analyze the error report
2. Determine if the SQL query needs to be fixed. You can choose not to modify the  
 ↳ SQL if it is correct.
3. If the proposed SQL is incorrect, generate a correct SQL query to answer the  
 ↳ user question

Instructions:

1. Review the provided information carefully
2. Use SQL format in code blocks for any SQL queries
3. Explain your reasoning and any changes made to the query
4. Avoid using overly complex queries. For example, ... EXISTS (SELECT 1 FROM  
 ↳ table WHERE condition) can be substituted with JOIN.

[Question]  
 {question}

[Evidence]

```

{evidence}

[Database Info]
{db_desc}

[Old SQL]
```sql
{old_sql}
```

[Error Report]
{error_report}

Now, please analyze the error report, decide whether the SQL needs to be fixed and
→ generate a correct SQL to answer the user question if you think the proposed
→ SQL is indeed wrong.

[Correct SQL]

```

## E SQLENS Error Correction Pseudo Code

---

**Algorithm 1:** SQLENS Error Correction

---

**Input:**  $ctx$ : Correction context, including the database, external knowledge, and the natural language question;  $q$ : Original SQL query;  $\mathcal{S}$ : Set of error signals;  $max\_iter$ : Maximum number of iterations;  $e_g$ : Guardrail signal

**Output:** Corrected SQL query,  $q'$

```

1 $\mathcal{E} \leftarrow ErrorDetector(ctx, q, \mathcal{S})$
2 $i \leftarrow 0$
3 $q' \leftarrow q$
4 while $|\mathcal{E}| > 0$ or $i < max_iter$ do
 /* select the current most critical error */
 5 $e \leftarrow ErrorSelector(ctx, \mathcal{E})$
 6 $q' \leftarrow ErrorFixer(ctx, e, q')$
 /* remove error signal that has been fixed before */
 7 $\mathcal{S} \leftarrow \mathcal{S} \setminus \{e\}$
 8 $\mathcal{E} \leftarrow ErrorDetector(ctx, q', \mathcal{S})$
 9 $i \leftarrow i + 1$
10 end
 /* fix guardrail signal if detected */
11 if $|ErrorDetector(ctx, \{e_g\})| = 1$ then
12 | $q' \leftarrow ErrroFixer(ctx, e_g, q')$
13 end
14 $q' \leftarrow SQLAuditor(ctx, q', q)$
15 return q'

```

---

Algorithm 1 presents the pseudocode for the error correction. In essence, SQLENS’s error correction is a greedy, sequential algorithm. The original SQL query is first processed by SQLENS’s Error Detector, which evaluates a given set of signals on the input query and generates a list of error reports for the detected signals (Line 1). In practice, users can select a subset of signals to fix queries based on their precision in detecting errors on a development dataset. These reports are then sent to the Error Selector, which identifies the most critical error to address for the current iteration (Line 5).

The Error Selector component takes as inputs the original SQL query, database schema, and a list of error reports ranked by their confidence, and then determines the most critical error to address first using an LLM. Essentially, the LLM adjusts the ranking of these error reports based on its understanding of their relevance to the original SQL [38, 24, 33]. Once the most critical error is identified, the next step is to correct the query using the error information provided by that signal, handled by the Error Fixer (Line 6).

Table 8: Statistics of SQL queries generated by out-of-the-box text-to-SQL systems.

| Approach | Dataset | Acc. 1 <sup>1</sup> | Acc. 2 <sup>2</sup> | # SQLs | # Incorrect | # Semantic Err. |
|----------|---------|---------------------|---------------------|--------|-------------|-----------------|
| Vanilla  | BIRD    | 55.41               | 59.07               | 1534   | 684         | 589             |
| DINSQL   | BIRD    | 35.53               | 39.49               | 1534   | 989         | 835             |
| MACSQL   | BIRD    | 58.87               | 60.04               | 1534   | 631         | 601             |
| CHESS    | BIRD    | 67.60               | 67.91               | 1534   | 497         | 490             |
| Vanilla  | Spider  | 79.11               | 79.65               | 1034   | 216         | 209             |
| DINSQL   | Spider  | 76.31               | 77.66               | 1034   | 245         | 227             |
| MACSQL   | Spider  | 78.92               | 79.69               | 1034   | 218         | 208             |

<sup>1</sup> Accuracy over all queries <sup>2</sup>Accuracy over queries without syntax errors

The `Error Fixer` component takes the original SQL query, and a specific error report along with the correction context (specified in Algorithm 1) as input. It analyzes the error, determines how to fix the query, and generates a new query. To avoid syntax errors introduced in the revision process, we include a `Syntax Checker` in the `Error Fixer`, which uses a SQL parser to validate the syntax. If there is any syntax error, the `Error Fixer` uses the parser’s error message to iteratively revise the SQL query until it is valid. Note that SQLENS avoids fixing the same error repeatedly by removing the error signal from the signal collection after it has been used for correction (Line 7). Once the current error is fixed, we run `Error Detector` on the revised SQL query. If it contains no further errors, the corrected SQL query is returned. Otherwise, the correction process iterates until all errors are resolved or the maximum number of iterations is reached (Lines 4-10).

The above process generates a revised SQL query, but it may still contain some errors that need to be fixed. To ensure the most critical error is corrected, we introduce a final check to identify if any further adjustments are needed. The signal with the highest precision in detecting incorrect SQL queries can be configured as a “*guardrail signal*” to catch and fix remaining errors (Lines 11-13). As mentioned earlier, the revision process may break an originally correct SQL query. To address this issue, the original SQL and the final revised SQL are passed to an LLM-based `SQL Auditor` for the final evaluation (Line 14).

## F Additional Experimental Evaluation

Table 8 presents the text-to-SQL performance of the base SQL generators on BIRD and Spider.

### F.1 End-to-End Evaluation on Spider

Table 9 shows the end-to-end evaluation results on Spider benchmark. In terms of net improvement, SQLENS outperforms Self-Reflection by 10, 20, and 9 SQL queries on MAC-SQL, DIN-SQL, and Vanilla prompt, respectively. SQLENS consistently fixes more SQL queries compared to the baselines ( $N_{fix}$ ). Its performance is similar to its variant, Fix-ALL, with SQLENS fixing 2 more SQL queries on MACSQL and nearly the same number on the other two methods. However, SQLENS produces more regressions than Fix-ALL. This is because error signals have lower accuracy on Spider than on BIRD, causing SQLENS to trigger more corrections, which results in a higher number of regressions.

### F.2 Error Detection on Spider

On Spider benchmark, we observe similar results, with SQLENS outperforming LLM self-evaluation methods in terms of both recall and F1 score (Table 10). A notable observation is that LLM self-evaluation tends to be overly confident in the generated SQL queries, leading to low recall in identifying incorrect queries. For instance, LLM Self-Eval. (Prob) only identifies 5.16% of the incorrect SQL queries on those generated by MAC-SQL. The overall F1 score on Spider is lower than on BIRD because the text-to-SQL algorithms already achieve around 80% accuracy on Spider, which is significantly higher than on BIRD. This creates a more challenging scenario, as most remaining errors fall within the long-tail distribution.

Table 9: End-to-end accuracy improvement on Spider.

| Method                                                  | $\Delta \text{Acc.}(N_{\text{net}})$ | $\Delta \text{Acc.}(N_{\text{fix}})$ | $N_{\text{net}}$ | $N_{\text{fix}}$ | $N_{\text{break}}$ |
|---------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------|------------------|--------------------|
| <b>Vanilla</b> (Initial Acc.=79.65%); # input SQLs=1027 |                                      |                                      |                  |                  |                    |
| Self-Reflection                                         | 80.14 (+0.49%)                       | 80.72 (+1.07%)                       | 5                | 11               | 6                  |
| SQLENS w. Fix-ALL                                       | <b>81.11 (+1.46%)</b>                | 81.4 (+1.75%)                        | <b>15</b>        | 18               | <b>3</b>           |
| SQLENS                                                  | <b>81.11 (+1.46%)</b>                | <b>81.5 (+1.85%)</b>                 | <b>15</b>        | <b>19</b>        | 4                  |
| <b>DIN-SQL</b> (Initial Acc.=77.66%); # input SQLs=1016 |                                      |                                      |                  |                  |                    |
| Self-Reflection                                         | 80.51 (+2.85%)                       | 81.1 (+3.44%)                        | 29               | 35               | 6                  |
| SQLENS w. Fix-ALL                                       | <b>82.58 (+4.92%)</b>                | 82.88 (+5.22%)                       | <b>50</b>        | 53               | <b>3</b>           |
| SQLENS                                                  | 82.48 (+4.82%)                       | <b>83.27 (+5.61%)</b>                | 49               | <b>57</b>        | 8                  |
| <b>MAC-SQL</b> (Initial Acc.=79.69%); # input SQLs=1024 |                                      |                                      |                  |                  |                    |
| Self-Reflection                                         | 81.06 (+1.37%)                       | 81.45 (+1.76%)                       | 14               | 18               | 4                  |
| SQLENS w. Fix-ALL                                       | 81.74 (+2.05%)                       | 82.03 (+2.34%)                       | 21               | 24               | <b>3</b>           |
| SQLENS                                                  | <b>81.93 (+2.24%)</b>                | <b>82.23 (+2.54%)</b>                | <b>23</b>        | <b>26</b>        | <b>3</b>           |

Table 10: Effectiveness of SQLENS error detection on Spider.

| Method                | Acc.                                    | AUC                                     | Precision                                | Recall                                   | F1                                       |
|-----------------------|-----------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|
| Vanilla               |                                         |                                         |                                          |                                          |                                          |
| LLM Self-Eval. (Bool) | 74.39 ( $\pm 3.12$ )                    | <b>X</b>                                | 21.59 ( $\pm 13.00$ )                    | 9.13 ( $\pm 5.21$ )                      | 12.77 ( $\pm 7.42$ )                     |
| LLM Self-Eval. (Prob) | <b>77.41</b> ( $\pm 1.43$ )             | 57.42 ( $\pm 1.30$ )                    | 13.33 ( $\pm 17.78$ )                    | 2.90 ( $\pm 3.89$ )                      | 4.77 ( $\pm 6.38$ )                      |
| Supervised SQLENS     | <b>80.72<sup>†</sup></b> ( $\pm 1.06$ ) | <b>61.02<sup>†</sup></b> ( $\pm 3.28$ ) | <b>75.79<sup>†</sup></b> ( $\pm 17.24$ ) | <b>10.56</b> ( $\pm 4.53$ )              | <b>17.79</b> ( $\pm 6.62$ )              |
| SQLENS                | 74.49 ( $\pm 4.86$ )                    | <b>59.49</b> ( $\pm 5.91$ )             | <b>34.91</b> ( $\pm 14.18$ )             | <b>29.22<sup>†</sup></b> ( $\pm 11.61$ ) | <b>31.76<sup>†</sup></b> ( $\pm 12.75$ ) |
| DIN-SQL               |                                         |                                         |                                          |                                          |                                          |
| LLM Self-Eval. (Bool) | 75.69 ( $\pm 2.46$ )                    | <b>X</b>                                | 40.38 ( $\pm 11.33$ )                    | 16.78 ( $\pm 4.24$ )                     | 23.64 ( $\pm 6.01$ )                     |
| LLM Self-Eval. (Prob) | <b>76.58</b> ( $\pm 1.23$ )             | 58.60 ( $\pm 1.78$ )                    | 41.07 ( $\pm 17.97$ )                    | 5.73 ( $\pm 2.23$ )                      | 9.90 ( $\pm 3.72$ )                      |
| Supervised SQLENS     | <b>82.48<sup>†</sup></b> ( $\pm 2.27$ ) | <b>67.89<sup>†</sup></b> ( $\pm 3.66$ ) | <b>73.68<sup>†</sup></b> ( $\pm 7.45$ )  | <b>33.57</b> ( $\pm 9.14$ )              | <b>45.51</b> ( $\pm 9.91$ )              |
| SQLENS                | 76.38 ( $\pm 2.75$ )                    | <b>67.14</b> ( $\pm 4.30$ )             | <b>47.18</b> ( $\pm 5.76$ )              | <b>48.09<sup>†</sup></b> ( $\pm 6.91$ )  | <b>47.59<sup>†</sup></b> ( $\pm 6.17$ )  |
| MAC-SQL               |                                         |                                         |                                          |                                          |                                          |
| LLM Self-Eval. (Bool) | 76.85 ( $\pm 1.60$ )                    | <b>X</b>                                | 31.20 ( $\pm 11.26$ )                    | <b>11.52</b> ( $\pm 4.11$ )              | <b>16.81</b> ( $\pm 5.98$ )              |
| LLM Self-Eval. (Prob) | <b>78.51</b> ( $\pm 1.21$ )             | 57.81 ( $\pm 4.42$ )                    | <b>42.52</b> ( $\pm 30.00$ )             | 5.31 ( $\pm 2.41$ )                      | 9.07 ( $\pm 3.74$ )                      |
| Supervised SQLENS     | <b>79.98<sup>†</sup></b> ( $\pm 1.39$ ) | <b>61.59<sup>†</sup></b> ( $\pm 3.11$ ) | <b>54.83<sup>†</sup></b> ( $\pm 21.06$ ) | 9.65 ( $\pm 8.11$ )                      | 15.10 ( $\pm 11.29$ )                    |
| SQLENS                | 74.41 ( $\pm 2.24$ )                    | <b>58.99</b> ( $\pm 3.19$ )             | 35.88 ( $\pm 5.22$ )                     | <b>32.23<sup>†</sup></b> ( $\pm 4.33$ )  | <b>33.88<sup>†</sup></b> ( $\pm 4.49$ )  |

<sup>X</sup> indicates that the classification is not threshold-based.

<sup>†</sup> Top result. Top two results are highlighted in bold.

### F.3 Analysis of Unfixed SQL Queries

Some SQL queries are indeed incorrect but remain unfixed. We investigated the reasons and identified three main causes:

- The SQL query is corrected but does not exactly match the ground truth execution result. For instance, the fixed SQL may be semantically equivalent to the ground truth but projects a different set of columns or represents a column differently. This is the inherent limitation of the exact match metric.
- The semantic errors are correctly identified, and our error reports provide the right instructions to the LLM. However, the LLM fails to follow the guidance provided by SQLENS and cannot correct the query. This stems from the limitations of the LLM itself.
- The detected semantic errors do not fully capture the root cause, and even after the identified errors are fixed, some errors remain in the SQL query.

#### F.4 Discussion

As confirmed by our experimental results, SQLENS is highly effective in error detection and correction, particularly benefiting non-technical users with limited SQL knowledge. However, like many other LLM-based text-to-SQL solutions, our method incurs some costs and latency. On average, SQLENS makes approximately 5 LLM calls with an end-to-end latency of less than 30 seconds. To further reduce costs and latency, users can configure cheaper error signals, provide ground truth labels for SQL correctness, or limit the number of iterations in SQLENS’s error correction process. As noted in the motivating example in Section 1, SQLENS is not designed for real-time, interactive SQL query correction. Instead, it functions as a debugging tool, detecting and correcting errors in SQL queries asynchronously.

#### F.5 Effectiveness of Individual Error Signals on BIRD and Spider

Table 11: Individual error signal performance (Vanilla+BIRD).

| Signal Name                  | Precision           | Recall | $N_w$ |
|------------------------------|---------------------|--------|-------|
| <b>DB-based Signals</b>      |                     |        |       |
| Abnormal Result              | 98.96               | 16.13  | 95    |
| Empty Predicate              | 85.34               | 11.88  | 70    |
| Incorrect Filter in Subquery | No Queries Detected |        |       |
| Incorrect GROUP BY           | 40.0                | 2.38   | 14    |
| Incorrect Join Predicate     | 100                 | 1.87   | 11    |
| Suboptimal Join Tree         | 45.9                | 14.26  | 84    |
| Table Similarity             | 67.35               | 5.6    | 33    |
| Unnecessary Subquery         | 33.33               | 0.34   | 2     |
| Value Ambiguity              | 53.85               | 7.13   | 42    |
| <b>LLM-based Signals</b>     |                     |        |       |
| Column Ambiguity             | 68.75               | 1.87   | 11    |
| Evidence Violation           | 61.11               | 1.87   | 11    |
| Insufficient Evidence        | 29.03               | 1.53   | 9     |
| LLM Self Check               | 60.82               | 10.02  | 59    |
| Question Clause Linking      | 53.49               | 3.9    | 23    |

Table 12: Individual error signal performance (Vanilla+Spider).

| Signal Name                  | Precision           | Recall | $N_w$ |
|------------------------------|---------------------|--------|-------|
| <b>DB-based Signals</b>      |                     |        |       |
| Abnormal Result              | 60.0                | 14.35  | 30    |
| Empty Predicate              | 50.0                | 2.39   | 5     |
| Incorrect Filter in Subquery | 100.0               | 0.48   | 1     |
| Incorrect GROUP BY           | 64.29               | 4.31   | 9     |
| Incorrect Join Predicate     | 100.0               | 5.26   | 11    |
| Suboptimal Join Tree         | 42.86               | 5.74   | 12    |
| Table Similarity             | No Queries Detected |        |       |
| Unnecessary Subquery         | 100.0               | 0.48   | 1     |
| Value Ambiguity              | 33.33               | 1.44   | 3     |
| <b>LLM-based Signals</b>     |                     |        |       |
| Column Ambiguity             | 33.33               | 0.48   | 1     |
| Evidence Violation           | 100                 | 1.44   | 3     |
| Insufficient Evidence        | 7.14                | 1.44   | 3     |
| LLM Self Check               | 20.65               | 9.09   | 19    |
| Question Clause Linking      | 70.0                | 3.35   | 7     |

Table 13: Individual error signal performance (DIN-SQL+Spider).

| Signal Name                  | Precision           | Recall | $N_w$ |
|------------------------------|---------------------|--------|-------|
| <b>DB-based Signals</b>      |                     |        |       |
| Abnormal Result              | 73.61               | 23.35  | 53    |
| Empty Predicate              | 82.98               | 17.18  | 39    |
| Incorrect Filter in Subquery | No Queries Detected |        |       |
| Incorrect GROUP BY           | 43.33               | 5.73   | 13    |
| Incorrect Join Predicate     | 92.86               | 11.45  | 26    |
| Suboptimal Join Tree         | 33.33               | 5.73   | 13    |
| Table Similarity             | No Queries Detected |        |       |
| Unnecessary Subquery         | 0                   | 0      | 0     |
| Value Ambiguity              | 25.0                | 1.32   | 3     |
| <b>LLM-based Signals</b>     |                     |        |       |
| Column Ambiguity             | 80                  | 1.76   | 4     |
| Evidence Violation           | 80                  | 1.76   | 4     |
| Insufficient Evidence        | 40                  | 7.93   | 18    |
| Question Clause Linking      | 53.33               | 3.52   | 8     |
| LLM Self Check               | 39.58               | 16.74  | 38    |

Table 14: Individual error signal performance (MAC-SQL+Spider).

| Signal Name                  | Precision           | Recall | $N_w$ |
|------------------------------|---------------------|--------|-------|
| <b>DB-based Signals</b>      |                     |        |       |
| Abnormal Result              | 58.82               | 14.42  | 30    |
| Empty Predicate              | 52.94               | 4.33   | 9     |
| Incorrect Filter in Subquery | 100                 | 1.44   | 3     |
| Incorrect GROUP BY           | 50                  | 3.37   | 7     |
| Incorrect Join Predicate     | 100                 | 3.85   | 8     |
| Suboptimal Join Tree         | 38.71               | 5.77   | 12    |
| Table Similarity             | No Queries Detected |        |       |
| Unnecessary Subquery         | 33.33               | 0.48   | 1     |
| Value Ambiguity              | 25.0                | 1.44   | 3     |
| <b>LLM-based Signals</b>     |                     |        |       |
| Column Ambiguity             | 0                   | 0      | 0     |
| Evidence Violation           | 58.33               | 3.37   | 7     |
| Insufficient Evidence        | 18.92               | 3.37   | 7     |
| LLM Self Check               | 31.17               | 11.54  | 24    |
| Question Clause Linking      | 40                  | 2.88   | 6     |