

---

# AnnotatedTables: A Large Tabular Dataset with Language Model Annotations

---

**Yaojie Hu**

Department of Computer Science  
Iowa State University  
jhu@iastate.edu

**Ilias Fountalis**

RelationalAI  
ilias.fountalis@relational.ai

**Jin Tian**

Department of Computer Science  
Iowa State University  
jtian@iastate.edu

**Nikolaos Vasiloglou**

RelationalAI  
nik.vasiloglou@relational.ai

## Abstract

Tabular data is ubiquitous in real-world applications and abundant on the web, yet its annotation has traditionally required human labor, posing a significant scalability bottleneck for tabular machine learning. In this paper, we introduce methods that leverage Large Language Models (LLMs) to understand and annotate tabular data. Our methodology can successfully annotate a large amount of tabular data and can be flexibly steered to generate various types of annotations based on specific research objectives, as we demonstrate with SQL annotation and input-target column annotation as examples. As a result, we release AnnotatedTables, a collection of 32,119 databases with LLM-generated annotations. The dataset includes 405,616 valid SQL programs, making it the largest SQL dataset with associated tabular data that supports query execution. To further demonstrate the value of our methodology and dataset, we perform two follow-up research studies. 1) We investigate whether LLMs can translate SQL programs to Rel programs, a database language previously unknown to LLMs, while obtaining the same execution results. Using our Incremental Prompt Engineering methods based on execution feedback, we show that LLMs can produce adequate translations with few-shot learning. 2) We evaluate the performance of TabPFN, a recent neural tabular classifier trained on Bayesian priors, on 2,720 tables with input-target columns identified and annotated by LLMs. On average, TabPFN performs on par with the baseline AutoML method, though the relative performance can vary significantly from one data table to another, making both models viable for practical applications depending on the situation. Our findings underscore the potential of LLMs in automating the annotation of large volumes of diverse tabular data.

## 1 Introduction

Tabular data is one of the most common data types with pervasive real-world applications such as finance, healthcare management, and marketing analytics (Shwartz-Ziv & Armon, 2022; Borisov et al., 2022; Chui et al., 2018). The tabular format can organize structured data as relational databases. Machine learning models are able to understand and generate SQL queries against the relational databases (Zhong et al., 2017; Yan et al., 2020), and large language models (LLMs) have emerged as a prominent method in this field (Liu et al., 2023a; Li et al., 2023a). Recent studies show that LLMs can achieve state-of-the-art SQL generation with carefully engineered prompts (Gao et al., 2023),

owing thanks to the massive amount of open-source SQL code in their training set (Li et al., 2023b). Although valuable for training LLMs, SQL code alone is not enough for other tabular machine learning problems. For example, to evaluate the text-to-SQL ability where the model generates SQL code based on a description, both tabular data and SQL code would be required to calculate the execution accuracy (Zhong et al., 2017; Xu et al., 2017; Chang & Fosler-Lussier, 2023). While either SQL code or tabular data can be abundant, obtaining both at the same time can be far more difficult. Not limited to SQL code, annotations for tabular datasets can be generally difficult to collect, which we call *tabular dataset annotation problem* in this paper. We use executable SQL code as a lens to explore this tabular dataset annotation problem in detail and propose our machine learning solutions.

WikiSQL (Zhong et al., 2017) and Spider (Yu et al., 2018b) are two popular datasets with both SQL code and tabular data suitable for execution. However, their sizes are limited, mainly because their annotation methodologies do not scale up to make full use of either the tabular data or the SQL code on the web. WikiSQL gathers its tabular data from Wikipedia pages, which is a limited source and does not reflect the complications of real-world tabular data. Also, its SQL programs are annotated manually by a crowd-sourcing service called Amazon Mechanical Turk. Every crowd-sourced SQL program in WikiSQL only queries one table at a time, without table-join operations. Spider, on the other hand, does include relatively more complex queries on multiple tables in a database, but it also relies on human annotations from 11 college students to collectively write the SQL programs. Human annotation is common in all tabular datasets with executable SQL code prior to our work (Table 1), an expensive methodology to reproduce and expand upon (Hsueh et al., 2009). However, recent work shows that LLMs are able to synthesize SQL code robustly given instructions (Liu et al., 2023a), which motivates us to explore the potential to use LLMs to synthesize the SQL code for the abundant, unannotated tabular data. Our work focuses on SQL code, but SQL code is not the only type of annotation that tabular machine learning systems may need. Can LLMs create other types of annotations and generally replace expensive human annotations for tabular datasets? Inspired by the multi-tasking (Srivastava et al., 2022) and emergent abilities (Wei et al., 2022; Schaeffer et al., 2024) of LLMs, we see both value and potential in tackling the tabular dataset annotation problem.

In this paper, we introduce AnnotatedTables, a large scale tabular dataset with large language model annotations. To overcome the bottleneck of labor-intensive human annotations, we use LLMs to understand tabular data and generate synthetic annotations. Our dataset construction starts with diverse cross-domain tabular data encountered in real-world data science practices, while maintaining general applicability to other tabular data sources. With careful prompt design, we instruct LLMs to synthesize SQL code with zero-shot learning, which, despite its large scale, proves to be a quick and cost-effective method to create a rich dataset without expensive human labor. To ensure the quality of LLM-generated SQL code,

we verify them with execution on the tabular data, and we report the validity of generated SQL queries for analysis. To date, AnnotatedTables is the largest collection of SQL code that can be executed on the associated tabular data (Table 1). SQL programs are not the only annotations LLMs can produce. Some columns in a table may serve as model input to predict others, and such input-target columns are usually identified by people manually. The LLM annotation methodology can be extended to annotate input-target columns for our tables, making them suitable for tabular classification. Our work shows that LLMs can simplify and automate the process of tabular dataset construction.

To validate the soundness and value of our dataset, we conduct two follow-up studies. 1) We study LLM’s ability to learn a new programming language in-context. 2) We scale up the evaluation of a recent tabular classification model and test its performance on diverse real-world data. Both studies demonstrate how LLM annotation can flexibly adapt our dataset to target specific research problems. Our code and data will be released publicly.

The contributions of our paper are summarized as follows.

- We introduce in-context learning methods of LLMs to understand and annotate a large amount of real-world tabular data, addressing the scaling bottleneck of traditional human annotation.

Table 1: The sizes of the executable SQL datasets in the literature compared to ours.

Dataset	SQL	DB
WikiSQL (Zhong et al., 2017)	80654	26251
Spider (Yu et al., 2018b)	9693	200
Cspider (Min et al., 2019)	9691	166
IMDB (Yaghmazadeh et al., 2017)	111	1
Yelp (Yaghmazadeh et al., 2017)	68	1
SparC (Yu et al., 2019)	15598	200
TableQA (Sun et al., 2020)	49974	5291
DuSQL (Wang et al., 2020)	23797	200
KaggleDBQA (Lee et al., 2021)	272	8
Chase (Guo et al., 2021)	17940	280
BIRD (Li et al., 2023a)	12751	95
AnnotatedTables (Ours)	405616	32119

- We use a LLM to annotate public data tables and construct a cross-domain dataset named AnnotatedTables, currently the largest SQL dataset with tabular data that supports query execution.
- We extensively assess the quality of the LLM-generated annotations throughout the study. We demonstrate the research value of AnnotatedTables dataset through two follow-up studies.
- We introduce Incremental Prompt Engineering to teach LLMs to translate SQL programs to Rel programs with adequate accuracy, where Rel is a new language not previously learned by LLMs.
- We use the input-target columns annotated by LLMs to study TabPFN’s performance on a wide variety of tabular classification problems. We find that TabPFN performs overall on par with the baseline method, with each model potentially performing better depending on the tables.

## 2 Related Work

**Database management systems and deep learning** For text-to-SQL, language models can be trained or fine-tuned to synthesize SQL queries given natural language descriptions (Yavuz et al., 2018; Hwang et al., 2019; Yu et al., 2018a). For cardinality estimation, neural networks can predict the number of rows returned by an intermediate operation for query optimization (Liu et al., 2015; Negi et al., 2020; Woltmann et al., 2019; Yang et al., 2019, 2020), and end-to-end neural query optimizers can be built (Fischer et al., 2019; Gupta et al., 2020; Marcus et al., 2019, 2021). Other deep learning for database problems include query answering (Hilprecht et al., 2019), anomaly detection (Pang et al., 2021), ontology matching (Bento et al., 2020), relational data modeling (Fan et al., 2020; Liu, 2022), and database indexing (Kraska et al., 2018). All these problems could potentially benefit from a large-scale multi-domain dataset like AnnotatedTables. LLM annotation can also be applied to these problems to acquire a large amount of tabular training data. Moreover, our dataset supports query execution, which is required for text-to-SQL and cardinality estimation to collect ground truth.

**SQL datasets with tabular data.** SQL annotation is a focus of our paper. AnnotatedTables is the largest SQL dataset with associated tabular data that supports query execution. Currently, the most commonly used SQL datasets with tabular data are listed in Table 1, surveyed in (Deng et al., 2022; Qin et al., 2022; Li et al., 2023a). All of them are annotated by humans, and our work is the first tabular dataset annotated by LLMs. Our LLM methods can cheaply generate a large amount of annotations that match the volume of tabular data available on the web. Existing SQL datasets with tabular data often include English descriptions for text-to-SQL evaluation. While we collect these descriptions, we do not assess or ensure their quality. Unlike SQL programs, which can be validated through execution (Yu et al., 2019), English descriptions cannot be executed.

**Large Language Models for data annotation.** LLMs have been used for data annotation on text domains (Mao et al., 2024) and can outperform human annoators (Gilardi et al., 2023). LLMs can detect implicit hate speech and provide natural language explanations as annotations (Huang et al., 2023). LLMs are also used for natural language generation evaluation, showing a high alignment with human evaluation (Liu et al., 2023b). Texts can be directly understood and annotated by LLMs, while tabular data requires additional annotation methods, which we introduce.

## 3 AnnotatedTables

### 3.1 Dataset Construction

**Collection of public data tables** The construction of AnnotatedTables starts by collecting public tabular data. Our goal is to tap into the large quantity of un-annotated tabular data that exist on the web, with a preference for curated tables encountered in real-world data science applications. Kaggle, a data science platform, meets our requirements (Risdal & Bozsolik, 2022; Quaranta et al., 2021; Wang et al., 2021). Kaggle hosts data tables that are crowd sourced by a community of data enthusiasts and professionals. Users can share and analyze datasets on a wide variety of real-world topics, including football players, U.S airline flights, renewable energy output, weather forecasting, and e-commerce product reviews. Users may rate, improve, and analyze the datasets on Kaggle, contributing to the curation of useable and reliable data. Although individual Kaggle datasets have been studied in prior works (Bojer & Meldgaard, 2021; Taieb & Hyndman, 2014; Yang et al., 2018;




Figure 1: An illustration of the SQL code annotation process with a large language model.

Tolkachev et al., 2020; Yang & Ding, 2020), our research aggregates and examines the data tables en masse, uncovering an previously overlooked goldmine of diverse and high-quality data tables.

We use Kaggle’s public API to search for datasets with sizes ranging from 10 megabytes to 1 gigabyte for faster data collection and processing. We also require every dataset’s “usability rating” to be higher than 0.1. The “usability rating” is a quality score given by Kaggle users and helps us filter out low-quality datasets and datasets with no usages. We collect 70,000 Kaggle datasets before stopping for further processing. Our LLM annotation methodology is flexible and automated. The rest of our methods can be applied to other data sources and is not limited to Kaggle datasets alone.

**Describing databases to LLMs with schema and example rows** In order for LLMs to understand and annotate tabular data, we need to design a textual description for each database as a part of the prompt. Using entire tables in the prompt could exceed the maximum input length of LLMs, and we use a much shorter description instead that contains a basic schema and example rows.

Table schema is a summary description of its structure, commonly used to define the table during its creation (Uschold, 2015). For our annotation purposes, we use a basic schema that includes the table name, the table’s column names, and the data type of each column (Figure 1). We find tabular data stored as CSV files in the Kaggle datasets and automate schema extraction. As CSV files do not include table names in their content, we opt to use the file names as table names. Column names are included in the CSV files as the header row. Upon inspection, we find that the column names and file names are typically well-labeled and descriptive enough for LLMs to infer the information in the table. Lastly, we use an existing data analysis software (pandas) to load the tables and infer the column data types. Our schema extraction method is practical and effective.

A Kaggle dataset may contain multiple tables and therefore multiple table schemas. The set of table schemas describe the database structure: how many tables there are, what the columns and types are, and whether a column appears in multiple tables that could potentially be a JOIN key.

Example rows contain content from the table, and they are necessary for LLMs to write many common SQL queries, such as WHERE statements that filter the table based on a condition. For a concrete example, in `SELECT * FROM CUSTOMERS WHERE COUNTRY='MEXICO'`, the table name CUSTOMERS and column name COUNTRY can be found in the database schemas, while ‘MEXICO’ is a value that can only be found in a table row. Providing row examples in addition to the schema is necessary for LLMs to synthesize WHERE statements in SQL. For the example row, we use the first row of each table, converted to text through JSON formatting. Our schema and example row descriptions are generic and allow almost all tabular data to be annotated by LLMs.

**SQL annotations with zero-shot synthesis by LLMs** Through zero-shot learning, we instruct LLMs to synthesize SQL code that queries the data tables we collected as one type of annotation. Currently, OpenAI’s ChatGPT (Ouyang et al., 2022) is one of the best performing LLMs on various benchmarks (Hendrycks et al., 2021; Zellers et al., 2019; Sakaguchi et al., 2021). For our paper, we use ChatGPT with GPT-3.5 backbone as our annotation LLM, referred to as “the LLM” from now on.

To perform zero-shot SQL annotation for each database, we create a prompt that contains the instruction, the database schema, and the example row of every table, illustrated in Figure 1. The instruction asks the LLM to write SQL queries from “typical users who access this database”. In addition, the instruction asks for queries “with relatively high complexity”, which steers the synthesis results to more complicated SQL code and makes the dataset more challenging. Lastly, the instruction

Table 2: Examples of LLM-generated English and SQL annotations for Kaggle tabular data. LLMs can generate SQL programs that cannot be executed, and we mark the incorrect parts in red.

English Annotation	SQL Annotation	Execution
1 Get the average humidity for each location in the morning and afternoon:	SELECT Location, AVG(Humidity9am) AS AverageHumidity9am, AVG(Humidity3pm) AS AverageHumidity3pm FROM WeatherAus GROUP BY Location;	Valid
2 Retrieve rows where the tempo is greater than the average tempo:	SELECT * FROM LikedsongsGV WHERE Tempo > (SELECT AVG(Tempo) FROM LikedsongsGV);	Valid
3 Retrieve records from a table that meet a certain condition:	SELECT * FROM <b>table_name</b> WHERE <b>condition</b> ;	Error
4 Retrieve rows where column 2 is less than 0.1 and column 5 is greater than 0.2:	SELECT * FROM Preds001 WHERE 2 < 0.1 AND 5 > 0.2;	Error
5 Get the total number of matches played in a specific season	SELECT COUNT(*) FROM IPLMatches WHERE Season = 2019;	Empty Result

asks the language model to create more JOIN queries when multiple tables are present, as JOIN queries are especially valuable data points when studying problems including cardinality estimation and query optimization (Yang et al., 2020; Marcus et al., 2021). For every Kaggle dataset with tabular data, we prompt the LLM to generate 15 SQL program annotations with natural language annotations.

**Execution-based validation** Some of the LLM-generated SQL programs could be incorrect, and it is important to examine and ensure the quality of the LLM annotations. As AnnotatedTables has tabular data available for execution, we verify the validity of the SQL programs by executing them (Yu et al., 2019). If a SQL program can be executed and returns non-empty results, then we classify it as a valid SQL annotation. Executable queries with empty results are marked. In our follow-up study of SQL-to-Rel translation, a pair of SQL and Rel queries with empty results cannot be compared by execution accuracy, and SQL queries with empty results will not be used. We do not validate the English descriptions. All intermediate data artifacts are released as a part of AnnotatedTables.

### 3.2 Features, Statistics, and Examples of AnnotatedTables

**Human-like annotation** We find that the LLM can write SQL programs with human-like intent and usage. Examples of the LLM-annotated SQL programs are provided in Table 2. Instructed by our prompt to play the role of a typical user of a database, the LLM writes meaningful queries to look for useful data analytics.

**Correctness and complexity** Given a high percentage (82.25%) of valid SQL programs, the annotation quality is good. The LLM can write complex programs with a variety of SQL components (Table 3). The percentages of valid queries in all SQL component categories except JOIN exceed 50%. 49.47% of JOIN queries are valid, possibly reflecting a higher level of data understanding and programming skills required to combine multiple tables.

Table 3: SQL code synthesized by LLM categorized by the types of SQL components.

Component	Total	Valid	% Valid	% Error	% Empty
Total	493134	405616	82.25	9.96	7.79
FROM	493093	405612	82.26	7.78	9.96
WHERE	276710	209393	75.67	8.07	16.26
AND	88182	61814	70.10	10.81	19.09
GROUP BY	77004	66061	85.79	9.74	4.47
AVG	65797	58238	88.51	8.83	2.66
COUNT	58586	53486	91.29	6.41	2.29
ORDER BY	52677	45941	87.21	8.98	3.81
LIKE	38865	28189	72.53	5.90	21.57
JOIN	30079	14879	49.47	23.00	27.53
MAX	29693	26188	88.20	9.29	2.52
SUM	24801	21324	85.98	10.14	3.87
LIMIT	24241	21573	88.99	8.23	2.77
NOT	19180	15111	78.79	7.22	13.99
IN	16011	9656	60.31	23.76	15.93
MIN	12368	10938	88.44	9.38	2.18
OR	11199	8346	74.52	11.09	14.39
UNION	10408	7375	70.86	24.95	4.19
HAVING	2507	1427	56.92	15.96	27.12
INTERSECT	184	101	54.89	10.33	34.78
EXCEPT	37	26	70.27	13.51	16.22

For limitations, we note that some simple SQL statements appear often, in the form of SELECT \* FROM table, reflected by a high percentage (48.4% among valid SQL programs) of FROM statements without other SQL components. Although valid, they may not be as valuable as the more complicated SQL programs for downstream learning and analysis. In the prompt, we steer the LLM to generate SQL programs “with relative high complexity” and see success to some extent (Appendix B). However, the dual objectives to generate complex queries and correct queries may inherently conflict with each other, and LLMs could be inclined to generate simple ones to prioritize correctness over complexity.

**Invalid SQL annotations** As shown in Table 2, some LLM-annotated SQL programs may be invalid for different reasons. At times, the LLM hallucinates non-existing table names such as “table\_name” (Example 3) or leaves a place holder text “condition” instead of the exact selection condition (Example 3). In some CSV files, the column names may be numerical, which are invalid column names in a SQL statement, and the LLM is unable to annotate (Example 4). Lastly, as execution result needs to be non-empty so that execution accuracy can be computed for downstream tasks, some syntactically correct SQL programs that return empty results are labeled (Example 5).

Table 4: Examples of the SQL-to-Rel translations produced, categorized by “correct translations”, “execution errors”, and “different results”.

SQL	Rel Translated	Ex. Acc.
1 SELECT Departments, MAX(AverageMonthlyHours) AS MaxMonthlyHours FROM Attrition GROUP BY Departments;	def output[departments] = max[row_id, avg_monthly_hours: Attrition:AverageMonthlyHours(row_id, avg_monthly_hours) and Attrition:Departments[row_id, departments]]	Correct
2 SELECT (SELECT COUNT(*) FROM Oof) + (SELECT COUNT(*) FROM Submission) as TotalCount;	def count_oof_rows = count[row_id: Oof[, row_id, _]] def count_submission_rows = count[row_id: Submission[, row_id, _]] def output = count_oof_rows + count_submission_rows	Correct
3 SELECT COUNT(*) FROM DgemFormatValidation;	def count_rows = count[row_id: DgemFormatValidation[, row_id, _]] def output = count_rows	Correct
4 SELECT Education, AVG(Age) AS avg_age FROM MLPdata GROUP BY Education;	def output[education] = average[row_id, age: MLPdata:Education[row_id, education] and MLPdata:Age[row_id, age]] groupby education	Error
5 SELECT COUNT(*) FROM Dict;	def output = count[row, _ : Dict[, row, _]]	Error
6 SELECT * FROM V9d3 ORDER BY Labels DESC;	def output[col, row_id, val] = V9d3[col, row_id, val] orderby V9d3:Labels[row_id] desc	Error
7 SELECT MAX(LENGTH(Description)) FROM Cryptosentiment;	def output = max[row_id, length: Cryptosentiment:Description[row_id, length]]	Diff. Results
8 SELECT * FROM Comments20200605 WHERE ReplyCount >= 5;	def output[col, row_id, val] = Comments20200605[col, row_id, val] and Comments20200605:ReplyCount[row_id] >= 5	Diff. Results
9 SELECT AVG(MonthlyRevenue) FROM Cell2celltrain;	def output = average[idx, monthly_revenue: Cell2celltrain:MonthlyRevenue [idx, monthly_revenue]]	Diff. Results

## 4 AnnotatedTables for In-Context Translation from SQL to Rel

We use AnnotatedTables to study large language models’ ability to learn to code in Rel, a new database language (RelationalAI, 2021). For new programming languages, there is not much open-source code available to train machine learning models with gradient-descent methods, and, with few training examples, few-shot in-context learning (ICL) becomes a natural candidate instead (Min et al., 2022). ICL has been studied, but ICL of a new programming language is a novel research problem. New programming languages are rare, and the lens of this study is unique and timely.

All SQL programs in AnnotatedTables are executable, which is necessary in order to evaluate the correctness of the translations with execution accuracy. AnnotatedTables contains many SQL programs and data tables, which can measure the general performance of our SQL-to-Rel translation method. SQL programs in AnnotatedTables emulate the usage and intent of typical database users, and, by translating these queries, we indirectly synthesize a large dataset of non-trivial Rel programs that is valuable for downstream analysis and machine learning of the new programming language.

Machine learning of a new programming language may seem challenging with limited training data, but as our results show, our translation accuracy increases steadily as more in-context examples are included, and with 45 translation pairs in the prompt, the translation accuracy can reach around 40%.

### 4.1 Task Formulation of SQL-to-Rel Translation

Given a SQL program  $S$  that can be executed on table  $T$ , the task is to build a model  $\mathcal{M}$  that learns to translate  $S$  into a Rel program  $R$ , such that  $S$  and  $R$  return the same query results when executed on table  $T$ . In our case, the model  $\mathcal{M}$  is a LLM parameterized by an instruction prompt that contains few-shot examples. Execution accuracy is the percentage of queries  $S, R$  that return the same non-empty results. Execution accuracy is a common metric for SQL generation (Zhong et al., 2017; Xu et al., 2017; Chang & Fosler-Lussier, 2023). Program equivalence is generally undecidable (Rice, 1953; Strichman, 2018), and it is not possible to directly compare SQL and Rel programs.

### 4.2 Extending AnnotatedTables with Few-shot SQL-to-Rel Translation Pairs

While LLMs have already learned to program in SQL from comprehensive pre-training (Brown et al., 2020; OpenAI, 2023), they do not know how to write programs in Rel. To enable ICL, one idea is to use the Rel language specification and documentation as the prompt. However, language models such as ChatGPT have limited context span up to 16,000 tokens (around 12,000 English words) (Tay et al., 2020; Beltagy et al., 2020), and it is currently infeasible for the prompt to contain the complete Rel specification and documentation (estimated 500,000 words). Instead, we use SQL-to-Rel translation examples to teach the LLM to code in Rel, which is simple and effective. Rel is a declarative language similar to Datalog and Prolog. LLMs may transfer their background knowledge in related languages to learn Rel. ICL through translation examples cannot comprehensively cover all the edge cases of the Rel language, but, as our results show, around 40% of our SQL code can be successfully translated.

**Incremental Prompt Engineering of translation examples** To develop SQL-to-Rel translation examples to teach LLMs to code in Rel, we introduce a technique called *Incremental Prompt Engineering* (IPE). For step  $i = 1, 2, \dots, k$ , we start with some manually annotated SQL-to-Rel translation examples  $E_i$  and instruct the language model to translate some unseen SQL programs  $S_i$  to Rel programs  $R_i$ . We then calculate the execution accuracy by comparing the query results of  $S_i$  and  $R_i$  at every step  $i$ . The execution accuracy is used as a feedback, and for the SQL code in  $S_i$  that the LLM fails to translate, we manually annotate the ones that represent common failure patterns to add to  $E_i$  as the few-shot examples  $E_{i+1}$  at the next step. In practice, we start with 5 translation examples and add multiple manual annotations at a time until the execution accuracy converges with around 45 translation examples (Figure 2). All examples used in the prompt are in Appendix A.

### 4.3 Results

**The LLM can learn a new programming language adequately from dozens of examples**

Table 4 shows examples of SQL programs and their Rel translations produced by the LLM. As seen in the examples, the two languages differ greatly, and it is not an easy task to translate them, even for experienced programmers. For example, SQL aggregators such as MAX have their counterpart max function in Rel, but the syntax differs greatly (Example 1). Nevertheless, the LLM is able to perform adequate translations by learning a new programming language from just 45 examples in-context. Aggregators including MAX, MIN, and COUNT have higher-than-average translation accuracy. This is an impressive result for a challenging problem. Notably, no manual examples illustrate how to translate MIN queries, and LLM has inferred its usage from MAX examples.

Execution accuracy measures the translation correctness, where every SQL and Rel pair are executed on the same database and compare their results. Table 5 shows that the overall execution accuracy is 40.8%, showing that the LLM can generate adequate translations from SQL to Rel. Machine learning of new programming languages is challenging and valuable. Since the best text-to-SQL models have 60%-80% accuracy (Liu et al., 2023a; Li et al., 2023a), 40% SQL-to-Rel is a promising first step, which could be sufficient for applications such as coding suggestions and automatic test generation.

**Translation errors and limitations** 53.6% of the Rel translations have errors before returning results, while 5.6% of the Rel translations finish execution but have different results (Table 5). This suggests that most of the failed translations have syntactical problems and cannot be executed. Examples of inaccurate translations are in Table 4. LLMs may use SQL language constructs such as “groupby”, “orderby”, and “desc” directly in Rel programs (Example 4, 6), causing syntactically incorrect programs. In Example 5, the first underscore “\_” caused a syntax error. In Example 7, the SQL method “LENGTH” is not demonstrated in-context, and the LLM used “length” as a variable name instead, causing a change in semantics and different execution results. Examples 8 and 9 show different execution results, but the translations are correct by our inspection. Rel is a language based on the Sixth-Normal-Form (6NF) (Date et al., 2004; Knowles, 2012), which represents all data as sets of tuples with only one value column, without null values or empty rows. Rel’s data representation is not the same as SQL’s data representation, and we make conservative conversions when comparing the results to prioritize precision over recall by allowing some false negatives in execution accuracy. Therefore, some correct Rel translations may have different results due to the conversion, though such cases are rare, as the percentage of Rel errors is 10x higher than different results. Discounting this limitation, the SQL-to-Rel translation accuracy may be even higher than that reported in Table 5.

**Performance convergence of Incremental Prompt Engineering** To study the effectiveness of IPE, we vary the number of few-shot examples incrementally added and measure the translation

Table 5: The LLM’s few-shot SQL-to-Rel translation execution results, by the types of SQL components.

SQL Comp.	# Ex.	Translated	Correct	% Correct	% Error	% Diff.
Total	45	285140	116327	40.80	53.60	5.60
FROM	45	285136	116327	40.80	53.60	5.60
WHERE	28	141893	49576	34.94	59.02	6.04
GROUP BY	9	40254	7737	19.22	78.36	2.42
AND	7	37963	13086	34.47	59.72	5.81
AVG	5	37318	12601	33.77	60.08	6.16
COUNT	6	36769	17542	47.71	48.90	3.39
ORDER BY	2	28618	434	1.52	97.74	0.75
LIKE	1	18399	2037	11.07	82.67	6.26
MAX	2	17984	7698	42.80	52.46	4.74
SUM	5	14107	4077	28.90	69.69	1.41
LIMIT	0	13696	73	0.53	98.53	0.94
NOT	0	8754	326	3.72	93.24	3.04
JOIN	8	8358	526	6.29	88.32	5.38
MIN	0	7344	3043	41.44	55.51	3.05
IN	2	5365	1045	19.48	76.07	4.45
UNION	0	4530	263	5.81	88.92	5.28
OR	1	4071	1292	31.74	60.21	8.06
HAVING	0	677	1	0.15	99.26	0.59
INTERSECT	0	56	2	3.57	92.86	3.57
EXCEPT	0	11	1	9.09	81.82	9.09



accuracy on a randomly selected subset of 2,000 SQL programs. We plot the execution accuracy versus the number of translation examples in Figure 2.

Conceptually, Incremental Prompt Engineering adds demonstrations for the failed translations in the previous step and integrates execution feedback into prompt engineering. It is an effective way to improve translation accuracy, as we see a clear increase in the percentage of correctly translated Rel programs as more examples are added. When the number of few-shot examples increases above 30, we see a diminishing return on the accuracy improvements. At 45 examples, the accuracy converges around 40%. Due to the convergence, more examples may not improve the accuracy beyond 40%, and additional prompt engineering or LLM techniques may be required.




Figure 2: With Incremental Prompt Engineering, translation accuracy gradually improves and converges as more examples are added.

## 5 AnnotatedTables for an Extended Evaluation of TabPFN

In this section, we use AnnotatedTables to comprehensively evaluate TabPFN’s tabular classification performance on diverse, real-world data tables. TabPFN (Hollmann et al., 2023) is a Prior-Data Fitted Network (PFN), a new type of neural networks trained on synthetic data drawn from a Bayesian prior. Once trained, it takes the entire test set as the input and produces all predictions in a single forward pass. TabPFN represents a novel approach to tabular classification, a domain dominated by traditional methods and largely uncontested by deep learning methods (Shwartz-Ziv & Armon, 2022). Inspired by its state-of-the-art results on a small curated benchmark (Hollmann et al., 2023), we wonder if TabPFN will perform robustly against the complications of real-world tabular data.

**TabPFN evaluation and ours** TabPFN was evaluated on the OpenML-CC18 benchmark suite (Bischl et al., 2017). The benchmark has 30 datasets in total, and 18 of them have only numerical features with no missing values, the same as the Bayesian prior that TabPFN is trained on. The authors choose five standard ML methods and two state-of-the-art AutoML methods as baselines to compare with TabPFN. The ML methods include K-nearest-neighbors (KNN), logistic regression, and three gradient boosting methods – XGBoost (Chen & Guestrin, 2016), CatBoost (Prokhorenkova et al., 2018), LightGBM (Ke et al., 2017). The AutoML baseline methods are AutoGluon (Erickson et al., 2020; Shi et al., 2021) and AutoSkLearn (Feurer et al., 2022). On the 18 numerical datasets, TabPFN outperformed all baselines, and AutoGluon was the best performing baseline (see Table 1 of (Hollmann et al., 2023)), which we will use as the baseline in our study. In this section, we follow TabPFN authors’ experimental settings and use AnnotatedTables to vastly scale up the evaluation, with a focus on assessing its real-world performance. We evaluate TabPFN on 2,720 tabular classification problems, a 90x increase over OpenML-CC18. Moreover, in comparison to the OpenML-CC18 benchmark, AnnotatedTables contains diverse tabular data gathered from a public platform, which would be a more comprehensive evaluation of TabPFN’s robustness in real world problems.

### 5.1 Task Formulation of Tabular Classification

For tabular classification, a table  $T$  has rows  $\{R_1, R_2, \dots\}$ . A row  $R_i$  has one or more column values  $x_i$  and a categorical column value  $y_i$ . A tabular classification model  $f$  aims to use  $x_i$  to predict  $y_i$ .

Our experimental settings follow the TabPFN authors’ settings. We train AutoGluon with a time budget of one minute and five minutes per table, and we split the training and test set once per table. To reduce the total training time as we have many more tables than OpenML-CC18, we do not repeat training on every table with a five-fold training-test set split. We use AutoGluon as our baseline, because it is the best performing baseline model in the original evaluation (Hollmann et al., 2023). Our work does not alter the TabPFN model architecture, and we use the authors’ publicly released pre-trained checkpoint. For more model details, we refer readers to the paper (Hollmann et al., 2023).



Table 6: The AUROC (one-versus-one), cross entropy, and time statistics for TabPFN and the AutoGluon baseline on the tabular classification problems in AnnotatedTables.

		1 Min (2725 problems)			5 Mins (2720 problems)		
		TabPFN	AutoGluon	Paired Diff.	TabPFN	AutoGluon	Paired Diff.
AUROC	Mean	0.760 ± 0.173	0.723 ± 0.214	0.036 ± 0.152	0.760 ± 0.174	0.755 ± 0.187	0.005 ± 0.095
	Median	0.794	0.767	0.004	0.793	0.794	-0.000
CE	Mean	0.753 ± 0.550	0.886 ± 2.129	-0.133 ± 1.944	0.753 ± 0.550	0.807 ± 1.929	-0.054 ± 1.726
	Median	0.655	0.693	-0.011	0.656	0.659	0.001
Time (sec.)	Mean	2.002	73.654	-71.652	2.342	315.038	-312.696

## 5.2 Extending AnnotatedTables with LLM-Annotated Input-Target Columns

The Kaggle data tables collected in AnnotatedTables could be used for tabular classification task, if LLMs can identify the potential input and target columns. We give the schema description from Sec 3.1 to the LLM to identify potential input and target columns in the tables. TabPFN requires that the input columns are numeric and the target column is categorical for classification. LLM annotation is flexible, and we instruct the LLM to find columns that satisfy this data type requirement (for complete prompt, see Appendix A). We use the input-target columns annotated to train TabPFN and AutoGluon, and if the models cannot be trained, the annotations are discarded (Appendix E).

## 5.3 Results

### TabPFN performs robustly on diverse tabular data

We fit TabPFN and AutoGluon on 2,720 tabular classification problems in AnnotatedTables, and we compute the AUROC (one-versus-one) and cross entropy for every one of them, shown in Table 6. WilCoxon signed-rank test shows that all the paired differences between TabPFN and AutoGluon for both AUROC and cross entropy and for both 1 minute and 5 minutes are non-zero with statistical significance (p-values and discussions in Appendix D). AnnotatedTables allows us to conduct a large number of experiments to draw statistically significant conclusions, but the paired differences are small and may not be informative for model selection, an issue known generally as “statistical significance versus practical significance” (Kirk, 1996; Peeters, 2016; McShane & Gelman, 2022). Overall, TabPFN performs on par with the AutoGluon baseline.

The classification problems in AnnotatedTables are diverse and have lots of inherent variations, which is reflected by the standard deviation of both models’ performance. Between the two, TabPFN has a lower standard deviation for both AUROC and cross entropy, showing a more consistent performance.

The inherent diversity of AnnotatedTables can be seen from the dot plots in Figure 3, where we plot the AUROC of both models versus each other. Given a relatively high spread of AUROC and overall on-par performance, it is not possible to pre-determine which model will perform better, and either model could be better on a specific table. Practitioners may fit both models and select the better performing one in practice. Given that AutoGluon is a widely used AutoML framework, we believe that the newly introduced TabPFN is a welcome addition that would raise the state-of-the-art performance on many real-world tabular classification problems, especially as it takes only a fraction of the time budget per table (2 seconds) compared to AutoGluon (1 or 5 minutes in our experiments).

**LLM annotation quality** Running TabPFN and AutoGluon on LLM-generated annotation proves that LLMs can successfully identify potential input and target columns in a table and annotate them, given only a prompt that describes each table’s name, column names and data types. As seen in Figure 3, most of the tabular classification problems annotated by LLMs have an AUROC over 0.5 for both TabPFN and AutoGluon. This means, for most tables, the target columns identified by LLMs do have non-trivial relationships with the input columns and can be predicted to some extent, and the LLM successfully found the suitable tables for the tabular classification task.




Figure 3: The AUROC (OVO) of TabPFN versus baseline AutoGluon with 1-minute time budget on the tabular classification problems in AnnotatedTables.

## 6 Conclusions and Discussions

Prior to this work, human labor had been necessary to acquire tabular dataset annotations. Large language models can bring a radical change to how machine learning datasets are constructed, and AnnotatedTables is the first to pioneer tabular dataset annotation with LLMs. LLMs can be steered to generate annotations based on detailed instructions, and tabular machine learning researchers could easily acquire tailored annotations that fit their research directions. With the human annotation bottleneck opened, our methodology could enable more studies with reduced costs and automation.

## References

- Iz Beltagy, Matthew E Peters, and Arman Cohan. Longformer: The long-document transformer. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.05150*, 2020.
- Alexandre Bento, Amal Zouaq, and Michel Gagnon. Ontology matching using convolutional neural networks. In *Proceedings of the Twelfth Language Resources and Evaluation Conference*, pp. 5648–5653, 2020.
- Bernd Bischl, Giuseppe Casalicchio, Matthias Feurer, Pieter Gijsbers, Frank Hutter, Michel Lang, Rafael G Mantovani, Jan N van Rijn, and Joaquin Vanschoren. Openml benchmarking suites. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1708.03731*, 2017.
- Casper Solheim Bojer and Jens Peder Meldgaard. Kaggle forecasting competitions: An overlooked learning opportunity. *International Journal of Forecasting*, 37(2):587–603, 2021.
- Vadim Borisov, Tobias Leemann, Kathrin Seßler, Johannes Haug, Martin Pawelczyk, and Gjergji Kasneci. Deep neural networks and tabular data: A survey. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, 2022.
- Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, et al. Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:1877–1901, 2020.
- Shuaichen Chang and Eric Fosler-Lussier. How to prompt LLMs for text-to-SQL: A study in zero-shot, single-domain, and cross-domain settings. In *NeurIPS 2023 Second Table Representation Learning Workshop*, 2023. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=5s0ZNkkKh3>.
- Tianqi Chen and Carlos Guestrin. Xgboost: A scalable tree boosting system. In *Proceedings of the 22nd acm sigkdd international conference on knowledge discovery and data mining*, pp. 785–794, 2016.
- Michael Chui, James Manyika, Mehdi Miremadi, Nicolaus Henke, Rita Chung, Pieter Nel, and Sankalp Malhotra. Notes from the ai frontier: Insights from hundreds of use cases. *McKinsey Global Institute*, 2:267, 2018.
- CJ Date, Hugh Darwen, and Nikos A Lorentzos. A detailed investigation into the application of interval and relation theory to the problem of temporal database management, 2004.
- Naihao Deng, Yulong Chen, and Yue Zhang. Recent advances in text-to-SQL: A survey of what we have and what we expect. In Nicoletta Calzolari, Chu-Ren Huang, Hansaem Kim, James Pustejovsky, Leo Wanner, Key-Sun Choi, Pum-Mo Ryu, Hsin-Hsi Chen, Lucia Donatelli, Heng Ji, Sadao Kurohashi, Patrizia Paggio, Nianwen Xue, Seokhwan Kim, Younggyun Hahm, Zhong He, Tony Kyungil Lee, Enrico Santus, Francis Bond, and Seung-Hoon Na (eds.), *Proceedings of the 29th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, pp. 2166–2187, Gyeongju, Republic of Korea, October 2022. International Committee on Computational Linguistics. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2022.coling-1.190>.
- Nick Erickson, Jonas Mueller, Alexander Shirkov, Hang Zhang, Pedro Larroy, Mu Li, and Alexander Smola. Autogluon-tabular: Robust and accurate automl for structured data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2003.06505*, 2020.

- Ju Fan, Tongyu Liu, Guoliang Li, Junyou Chen, Yuwei Shen, and Xiaoyong Du. Relational data synthesis using generative adversarial networks: A design space exploration. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2008.12763*, 2020.
- Matthias Feurer, Katharina Eggenberger, Stefan Falkner, Marius Lindauer, and Frank Hutter. Auto-sklearn 2.0: Hands-free automl via meta-learning. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 23(261):1–61, 2022.
- Marc Fischer, Mislav Balunovic, Dana Drachler-Cohen, Timon Gehr, Ce Zhang, and Martin Vechev. D12: training and querying neural networks with logic. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 1931–1941. PMLR, 2019.
- 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. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.15363*, 2023.
- Fabrizio Gilardi, Meysam Alizadeh, and Maël Kubli. Chatgpt outperforms crowd workers for text-annotation tasks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 120(30):e2305016120, 2023.
- Jiaqi Guo, Ziliang Si, Yu Wang, Qian Liu, Ming Fan, Jian-Guang Lou, Zijiang Yang, and Ting Liu. Chase: A large-scale and pragmatic chinese dataset for cross-database context-dependent text-to-sql. In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pp. 2316–2331, 2021.
- Udit Gupta, Samuel Hsia, Vikram Saraph, Xiaodong Wang, Brandon Reagen, Gu-Yeon Wei, Hsien-Hsin S Lee, David Brooks, and Carole-Jean Wu. Deeprecsys: A system for optimizing end-to-end at-scale neural recommendation inference. In *2020 ACM/IEEE 47th Annual International Symposium on Computer Architecture (ISCA)*, pp. 982–995. IEEE, 2020.
- Dan Hendrycks, Collin Burns, Steven Basart, Andy Zou, Mantas Mazeika, Dawn Song, and Jacob Steinhardt. Measuring massive multitask language understanding. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=d7KBjmI3GmQ>.
- Benjamin Hilprecht, Andreas Schmidt, Moritz Kulesa, Alejandro Molina, Kristian Kersting, and Carsten Binnig. Deepdb: Learn from data, not from queries! *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.00607*, 2019.
- Noah Hollmann, Samuel Müller, Katharina Eggenberger, and Frank Hutter. TabPFN: A transformer that solves small tabular classification problems in a second. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023. URL [https://openreview.net/forum?id=cp5PvcI6w8\\_](https://openreview.net/forum?id=cp5PvcI6w8_).
- Pei-Yun Hsueh, Prem Melville, and Vikas Sindhwani. Data quality from crowdsourcing: a study of annotation selection criteria. In *Proceedings of the NAACL HLT 2009 workshop on active learning for natural language processing*, pp. 27–35, 2009.
- Fan Huang, Haewoon Kwak, and Jisun An. Is chatgpt better than human annotators? potential and limitations of chatgpt in explaining implicit hate speech. In *Companion proceedings of the ACM web conference 2023*, pp. 294–297, 2023.
- Wonseok Hwang, Jinyeong Yim, Seunghyun Park, and Minjoon Seo. A comprehensive exploration on wikisql with table-aware word contextualization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1902.01069*, 2019.
- Guolin Ke, Qi Meng, Thomas Finley, Taifeng Wang, Wei Chen, Weidong Ma, Qiwei Ye, and Tie-Yan Liu. Lightgbm: A highly efficient gradient boosting decision tree. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30, 2017.
- Roger E. Kirk. Practical significance: A concept whose time has come. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 56(5):746–759, 1996. doi: 10.1177/0013164496056005002. URL <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164496056005002>.
- Curtis Knowles. 6nf conceptual models and data warehousing 2.0. 2012.

- Tim Kraska, Alex Beutel, Ed H Chi, Jeffrey Dean, and Neoklis Polyzotis. The case for learned index structures. In *Proceedings of the 2018 international conference on management of data*, pp. 489–504, 2018.
- Chia-Hsuan Lee, Oleksandr Polozov, and Matthew Richardson. KaggleDBQA: Realistic evaluation of text-to-SQL parsers. In Chengqing Zong, Fei Xia, Wenjie Li, and Roberto Navigli (eds.), *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pp. 2261–2273, Online, August 2021. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2021.acl-long.176. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2021.acl-long.176>.
- Jinyang Li, Binyuan Hui, Ge Qu, Jiayi Yang, Binhua Li, Bowen Li, Bailin Wang, Bowen Qin, Ruiying Geng, Nan Huo, et al. Can llm already serve as a database interface? a big bench for large-scale database grounded text-to-sqls. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2023a.
- Raymond Li, Loubna Ben Allal, Yangtian Zi, Niklas Muennighoff, Denis Kocetkov, Chenghao Mou, Marc Marone, Christopher Akiki, Jia Li, Jenny Chim, et al. Starcoder: may the source be with you! *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.06161*, 2023b.
- Aiwei Liu, Xuming Hu, Lijie Wen, and Philip S Yu. A comprehensive evaluation of chatgpt’s zero-shot text-to-sql capability. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.13547*, 2023a.
- Henry Liu, Mingbin Xu, Ziting Yu, Vincent Corvinelli, and Calisto Zuzarte. Cardinality estimation using neural networks. In *Proceedings of the 25th Annual International Conference on Computer Science and Software Engineering*, pp. 53–59, 2015.
- Linfeng Liu. *Learning from Relational Data via Graph Neural Networks*. PhD thesis, Tufts University, 2022.
- Yang Liu, Dan Iter, Yichong Xu, Shuohang Wang, Ruochen Xu, and Chenguang Zhu. G-eval: NLG evaluation using gpt-4 with better human alignment. In Houda Bouamor, Juan Pino, and Kalika Bali (eds.), *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pp. 2511–2522, Singapore, December 2023b. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2023.emnlp-main.153. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2023.emnlp-main.153>.
- Rui Mao, Guanyi Chen, Xulang Zhang, Frank Guerin, and Erik Cambria. GPTEval: A survey on assessments of ChatGPT and GPT-4. In Nicoletta Calzolari, Min-Yen Kan, Veronique Hoste, Alessandro Lenci, Sakriani Sakti, and Nianwen Xue (eds.), *Proceedings of the 2024 Joint International Conference on Computational Linguistics, Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC-COLING 2024)*, pp. 7844–7866, Torino, Italia, May 2024. ELRA and ICCL. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2024.lrec-main.693>.
- Ryan Marcus, Parimarjan Negi, Hongzi Mao, Chi Zhang, Mohammad Alizadeh, Tim Kraska, Olga Papaemmanouil, and Nesime Tatbul. Neo: A learned query optimizer. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.03711*, 2019.
- Ryan Marcus, Parimarjan Negi, Hongzi Mao, Nesime Tatbul, Mohammad Alizadeh, and Tim Kraska. Bao: Making learned query optimization practical. In *Proceedings of the 2021 International Conference on Management of Data*, pp. 1275–1288, 2021.
- Blakeley B McShane and Andrew Gelman. Selecting on statistical significance and practical importance is wrong. *Journal of Information Technology*, 37(3):312–315, 2022.
- Qingkai Min, Yuefeng Shi, and Yue Zhang. A pilot study for Chinese SQL semantic parsing. In Kentaro Inui, Jing Jiang, Vincent Ng, and Xiaojun Wan (eds.), *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*, pp. 3652–3658, Hong Kong, China, November 2019. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/D19-1377. URL <https://aclanthology.org/D19-1377>.
- Sewon Min, Xinxi Lyu, Ari Holtzman, Mikel Artetxe, Mike Lewis, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, and Luke Zettlemoyer. Rethinking the role of demonstrations: What makes in-context learning work? In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pp. 11048–11064, 2022.

- Parimarjan Negi, Ryan Marcus, Hongzi Mao, Nesime Tatbul, Tim Kraska, and Mohammad Alizadeh. Cost-guided cardinality estimation: Focus where it matters. In *2020 IEEE 36th International Conference on Data Engineering Workshops (ICDEW)*, pp. 154–157. IEEE, 2020.
- OpenAI. Gpt-4 technical report, 2023.
- Long Ouyang, Jeffrey Wu, Xu Jiang, Diogo Almeida, Carroll Wainwright, Pamela Mishkin, Chong Zhang, Sandhini Agarwal, Katarina Slama, Alex Ray, et al. Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:27730–27744, 2022.
- Guansong Pang, Chunhua Shen, Longbing Cao, and Anton Van Den Hengel. Deep learning for anomaly detection: A review. *ACM computing surveys (CSUR)*, 54(2):1–38, 2021.
- PapersWithCode. Table annotation, 2024. URL <https://paperswithcode.com/task/table-annotation>.
- Michael J Peeters. Practical significance: Moving beyond statistical significance. *Currents in Pharmacy Teaching and Learning*, 8(1):83–89, 2016.
- Liudmila Prokhorenkova, Gleb Gusev, Aleksandr Vorobev, Anna Veronika Dorogush, and Andrey Gulin. Catboost: unbiased boosting with categorical features. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 31, 2018.
- Bowen Qin, Binyuan Hui, Lihan Wang, Min Yang, Jinyang Li, Binhua Li, Ruiying Geng, Rongyu Cao, Jian Sun, Luo Si, et al. A survey on text-to-sql parsing: Concepts, methods, and future directions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2208.13629*, 2022.
- Luigi Quaranta, Fabio Calefato, and Filippo Lanubile. Kgtorrent: A dataset of python jupyter notebooks from kaggle. In *2021 IEEE/ACM 18th International Conference on Mining Software Repositories (MSR)*, pp. 550–554. IEEE, 2021.
- RelationalAI. The rel language, Jan 2021. URL <https://docs.relational.ai/rel>.
- Henry Gordon Rice. Classes of recursively enumerable sets and their decision problems. *Transactions of the American Mathematical society*, 74(2):358–366, 1953.
- Megan Risdal and Timo Bozsolik. Meta kaggle, 2022. URL <https://www.kaggle.com/ds/9>.
- Keisuke Sakaguchi, Ronan Le Bras, Chandra Bhagavatula, and Yejin Choi. Winogrande: An adversarial winograd schema challenge at scale. *Communications of the ACM*, 64(9):99–106, 2021.
- Rylan Schaeffer, Brando Miranda, and Sanmi Koyejo. Are emergent abilities of large language models a mirage? *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.
- Xingjian Shi, Jonas Mueller, Nick Erickson, Mu Li, and Alex Smola. Multimodal autoML on structured tables with text fields. In *8th ICML Workshop on Automated Machine Learning (AutoML)*, 2021. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=OHAIV0017V1>.
- Ravid Shwartz-Ziv and Amitai Armon. Tabular data: Deep learning is not all you need. *Information Fusion*, 81:84–90, 2022.
- Aarohi Srivastava, Abhinav Rastogi, Abhishek Rao, Abu Awal Md Shoeb, Abubakar Abid, Adam Fisch, Adam R Brown, Adam Santoro, Aditya Gupta, Adrià Garriga-Alonso, et al. Beyond the imitation game: Quantifying and extrapolating the capabilities of language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.04615*, 2022.
- Ofer Strichman. program equivalence. *Formal Methods in System Design*, 52:227–228, 2018.
- Ningyuan Sun, Xuefeng Yang, and Yunfeng Liu. Tableqa: a large-scale chinese text-to-sql dataset for table-aware sql generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.06434*, 2020.
- Souhaib Ben Taieb and Rob J Hyndman. A gradient boosting approach to the kaggle load forecasting competition. *International journal of forecasting*, 30(2):382–394, 2014.

- Yi Tay, Mostafa Dehghani, Samira Abnar, Yikang Shen, Dara Bahri, Philip Pham, Jinfeng Rao, Liu Yang, Sebastian Ruder, and Donald Metzler. Long range arena: A benchmark for efficient transformers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2011.04006*, 2020.
- Alexey Tolkachev, Ilyas Sirazitdinov, Maksym Kholiavchenko, Tamerlan Mustafaev, and Bulat Ibragimov. Deep learning for diagnosis and segmentation of pneumothorax: The results on the kaggle competition and validation against radiologists. *IEEE Journal of Biomedical and Health Informatics*, 25(5):1660–1672, 2020.
- Michael Uschold. Ontology and database schema: What’s the difference? *Applied Ontology*, 10(3-4): 243–258, 2015.
- April Yi Wang, Dakuo Wang, Jaimie Drozdal, Xuye Liu, Soya Park, Steve Oney, and Christopher Brooks. What makes a well-documented notebook? a case study of data scientists’ documentation practices in kaggle. In *Extended Abstracts of the 2021 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, pp. 1–7, 2021.
- Lijie Wang, Ao Zhang, Kun Wu, Ke Sun, Zhenghua Li, Hua Wu, Min Zhang, and Haifeng Wang. DuSQL: A large-scale and pragmatic Chinese text-to-SQL dataset. In Bonnie Webber, Trevor Cohn, Yulan He, and Yang Liu (eds.), *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pp. 6923–6935, Online, November 2020. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2020.emnlp-main.562. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2020.emnlp-main.562>.
- Jason Wei, Yi Tay, Rishi Bommasani, Colin Raffel, Barret Zoph, Sebastian Borgeaud, Dani Yogatama, Maarten Bosma, Denny Zhou, Donald Metzler, et al. Emergent abilities of large language models. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*, 2022.
- Frank Wilcoxon. Individual comparisons by ranking methods. *Biometrics Bulletin*, 1(6):80–83, 1945. ISSN 00994987. URL <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3001968>.
- Lucas Woltmann, Claudio Hartmann, Maik Thiele, Dirk Habich, and Wolfgang Lehner. Cardinality estimation with local deep learning models. In *Proceedings of the second international workshop on exploiting artificial intelligence techniques for data management*, pp. 1–8, 2019.
- Xiaojun Xu, Chang Liu, and Dawn Song. Sqlnet: Generating structured queries from natural language without reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1711.04436*, 2017.
- Navid Yaghmazadeh, Yuepeng Wang, Isil Dillig, and Thomas Dillig. Sqlizer: query synthesis from natural language. *Proceedings of the ACM on Programming Languages*, 1(OOPSLA):1–26, 2017.
- Zeyu Yan, Jianqiang Ma, Yang Zhang, and Jianping Shen. Sql generation via machine reading comprehension. In *Proceedings of the 28th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, pp. 350–356, 2020.
- Xulei Yang and Jie Ding. A computational framework for iceberg and ship discrimination: Case study on kaggle competition. *IEEE Access*, 8:82320–82327, 2020.
- Xulei Yang, Zeng Zeng, Sin G Teo, Li Wang, Vijay Chandrasekhar, and Steven Hoi. Deep learning for practical image recognition: Case study on kaggle competitions. In *Proceedings of the 24th ACM SIGKDD international conference on knowledge discovery & data mining*, pp. 923–931, 2018.
- Zongheng Yang, Eric Liang, Amog Kamsetty, Chenggang Wu, Yan Duan, Xi Chen, Pieter Abbeel, Joseph M Hellerstein, Sanjay Krishnan, and Ion Stoica. Deep unsupervised cardinality estimation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1905.04278*, 2019.
- Zongheng Yang, Amog Kamsetty, Sifei Luan, Eric Liang, Yan Duan, Xi Chen, and Ion Stoica. Neurocard: one cardinality estimator for all tables. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.08109*, 2020.
- Semih Yavuz, Izzeddin Gür, Yu Su, and Xifeng Yan. What it takes to achieve 100% condition accuracy on wikisql. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pp. 1702–1711, 2018.

Tao Yu, Zifan Li, Zilin Zhang, Rui Zhang, and Dragomir Radev. Typesql: Knowledge-based type-aware neural text-to-sql generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1804.09769*, 2018a.

Tao Yu, Rui Zhang, Kai Yang, Michihiro Yasunaga, Dongxu Wang, Zifan Li, James Ma, Irene Li, Qingning Yao, Shanelle Roman, et al. Spider: A large-scale human-labeled dataset for complex and cross-domain semantic parsing and text-to-sql task. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1809.08887*, 2018b.

Tao Yu, Rui Zhang, Michihiro Yasunaga, Yi Chern Tan, Xi Victoria Lin, Suyi Li, Heyang Er, Irene Li, Bo Pang, Tao Chen, Emily Ji, Shreya Dixit, David Proctor, Sungrok Shim, Jonathan Kraft, Vincent Zhang, Caiming Xiong, Richard Socher, and Dragomir Radev. SPaC: Cross-domain semantic parsing in context. In Anna Korhonen, David Traum, and Lluís Màrquez (eds.), *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pp. 4511–4523, Florence, Italy, July 2019. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/P19-1443. URL <https://aclanthology.org/P19-1443>.

Rowan Zellers, Ari Holtzman, Yonatan Bisk, Ali Farhadi, and Yejin Choi. HellaSwag: Can a machine really finish your sentence? In Anna Korhonen, David Traum, and Lluís Màrquez (eds.), *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pp. 4791–4800, Florence, Italy, July 2019. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/P19-1472. URL <https://aclanthology.org/P19-1472>.

Victor Zhong, Caiming Xiong, and Richard Socher. Seq2sql: Generating structured queries from natural language using reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1709.00103*, 2017.

## A Example Prompts for Large Language Models Annotation

An example of the prompt for the zero-shot synthesis of SQL code is shown below.

```
1 We have a SQL database with 2 tables. For each table, here is the schema and
2 a sample row data.
3 Schema for table 0:
4 CREATE TABLE MaLga12345(
5     Saledate TEXT,
6     MA BIGINT,
7     Type TEXT,
8     Bedrooms BIGINT
9 );
10 A sample row data from table 0:
11 {"Saledate": "30/09/2007", "MA": 441854, "Type": "house", "Bedrooms": 2}
12 Schema for table 1:
13 CREATE TABLE RawSales(
14     Datesold TEXT,
15     Postcode BIGINT,
16     Price BIGINT,
17     PropertyType TEXT,
18     Bedrooms BIGINT
19 );
20 A sample row data from table 1:
21 {"Datesold": "2007-02-07 00:00:00", "Postcode": 2607, "Price": 525000,
22 "PropertyType": "house", "Bedrooms": 4}
23 Consider the typical users who access this database. What kind of SQLite
24 SELECT queries would they write? List 15 examples SQL code that are
25 directly executable with relatively high complexity, each following a
26 description. If possible, use joins. Reply in the format of a description
27 and the SQL code for each example.
```

An example of the prompt for SQL to Rel translation is shown below.

```
1 REL is a database management system language that is similar to datalog. REL is
2 based on the sixth normal form (6NF),
3 where every variable represents a relation, i.e. a set of tuples.
4 In REL, from-variables will not appear in the output, and for-variables will appear
5 in the output.
```



```

4 Strings in REL use double quotes.
5 Below are few examples of SQL code and REL code pairs that perform the same query.
6 Examples:
7
8 1.SQL:
9 '''
10 SELECT L.JobTitle, L.ExperienceLevel, V3.JobTitle, V3.ExperienceLevel FROM
    LatestDataScienceSalaries AS L INNER JOIN V3LatestDataScienceSalaries AS V3 ON
    L.CompanyLocation = V3.CompanyLocation WHERE L.CompanyLocation = "United States
    ";
11 '''
12 1.REL:
13 '''
14 def temp[x,y] = LatestDataScienceSalaries:CompanyLocation[x, company_location] and
    V3LatestDataScienceSalaries:CompanyLocation[y, company_location] and
    company_location = "United States" from company_location
15 def output[x_job_title, x_experience_level, y_job_title, y_experience_level] =
    LatestDataScienceSalaries:JobTitle[x, x_job_title], LatestDataScienceSalaries:
    ExperienceLevel[x, x_experience_level], V3LatestDataScienceSalaries:JobTitle[y,
    y_job_title], V3LatestDataScienceSalaries:ExperienceLevel[y,
    y_experience_level] and temp[x,y] for x, y
16 '''
17 2.SQL:
18 '''
19 SELECT p.ImageLink FROM Photos p JOIN Likes l ON p.Id = l.Photo JOIN Users u ON l.
    User = u.Id LEFT JOIN Follows f ON u.Id = f.Follower AND f.Followee = p.UserID
    WHERE f.Follower IS NULL;
20 '''
21 2.REL:
22 '''
23 def UserPhoto(user_id, photo_id) = Photos:UserID[l,user_id] and Photos:Id[l,
    photo_id] from l
24 def UserLikesPhoto(user_id, photo_id) = Likes:User[l,user_id] and Likes:Photo[l,
    photo_id] from l
25 def UserID(user_id) = Users:Id(l, user_id) from l
26 def UserFollowsUser(follower_id, followee_id) = Follows:Follower[l,follower_id] and
    Follows:Followee[l, followee_id] from l
27 def PhotoIDHasImageLink(photo_id, image_link) =
28 Photos:Id(p, photo_id) and Photos:ImageLink(p, image_link) from p
29 def photos_liked_by_not_a_follower(photo) =
30 UserPhoto.poster, photo
31 and UserLikesPhoto.liker, photo)
32 and not UserFollowsUser.liker, poster)
33 from poster, liker
34 def output = PhotoIDHasImageLink[photos_liked_by_not_a_follower]
35 '''
36 3.SQL:
37 '''
38 SELECT MainTable.StateB, MainTable.Name FROM MainTable JOIN CaseUniverse ON
    MainTable.StateB = CaseUniverse.TargetState AND MainTable.StateBCode =
    CaseUniverse.TargetCOWID WHERE TargetState = "FRN" AND TargetCOWID = "220";
39 '''
40 3.REL:
41 '''
42 def join[mt, cu] = MainTable:StateB[mt, sb] and CaseUniverse:TargetState[cu, sb] and
    MainTable:StateBCode[mt, sbc] and CaseUniverse:TargetCOWID[cu, sbc] and sb="
    FRN" and sbc="220" from sb, sbc
43 def output = MainTable:StateB[mt], MainTable:Name[mt] for mt, cu where join[mt, cu]
44 '''
45 4.SQL:
46 '''
47 SELECT LD.Regions, SUM(DT.Punjab + DT.Haryana + DT.Rajasthan + DT.Delhi + DT.UP + DT
    .Uttarakhand) AS Total_Usage FROM DatasetTk DT INNER JOIN LongData LD ON DT.
    Punjab = LD.Usage AND LD.States = 'Punjab' GROUP BY LD.Regions;
48 '''

```

```

49 4.REL:
50 '''
51 def join1[dt,ld]= DatasetTk:Punjab[dt, punjab] and LongData:Usage[ld, punjab] from
    punjab
52 def sum_usage = DatasetTk:Punjab[dt] + DatasetTk:Haryana[dt] +
53 DatasetTk:Rajasthan[dt] + DatasetTk:Delhi[dt] +
54 DatasetTk:UP[dt] + DatasetTk:Uttarakhand[dt] for dt
55 def output[region] = sum[dt, usage:
56 LongData:Regions[ld, region]
57 and sum_usage[dt, usage]
58 and join1[dt,ld] and LongData:States[ld] = "Punjab" for ld]
59
60 '''
61 5.SQL:
62 '''
63 SELECT Test.ID, Test.Age, Train.SpendingScore FROM Test INNER JOIN Train ON Test.ID
    = Train.ID WHERE Test.Age >= 40 OR Train.Age >= 40;
64 '''
65 5.REL:
66 '''
67 def output[id, age, spending_score] = Test:ID[test_idx, id], Test:Age[test_idx, age
    ], Train:SpendingScore[train_idx, spending_score] and Test:ID[test_idx, id]
    and Train:ID[train_idx, id] and (Test:Age[test_idx]>=40 or Train:Age[train_idx]
    >= 40) from test_idx, train_idx
68 '''
69 6.SQL:
70 '''
71 SELECT bb.PlayerOut, m.WinningTeam FROM IPLBallByBall2022 bb JOIN IPLMatches2022 m
    ON bb.ID = m.ID WHERE bb.ID = 1312200 AND bb.IsWicketDelivery = 1;
72 '''
73 6.REL:
74 '''
75 def join[bb, m] = IPLBallByBall2022:ID[bb, id] and IPLMatches2022:ID[m, id] and
    IPLBallByBall2022:ID[bb]=1312200 and IPLBallByBall2022:IsWicketDelivery[bb]=1
    from id
76 def output = IPLBallByBall2022:PlayerOut[bb], IPLMatches2022:WinningTeam[m] from bb,
    m where join[bb,m]
77 '''
78 7.SQL:
79 '''
80 SELECT il.AccountName, il.Ismarketplace FROM InstAccLabeled AS il JOIN InstAcc AS ia
    ON il.AccountName = ia.Username WHERE ia.IsBusinessAccount = 1;
81 '''
82 7.REL:
83 '''
84 def join[il, ia] = InstAccLabeled:AccountName[il, account_name] and InstAcc:Username
    [ia, account_name] and InstAcc:IsBusinessAccount[ia]=boolean_true from
    account_name
85 def output = InstAccLabeled:AccountName[il], InstAccLabeled:Ismarketplace[il] for
    il, ia where join[il, ia]
86 '''
87 8.SQL:
88 '''
89 SELECT table0.Area, table0.AveragePrice, table1.MedianSalary FROM
    HousingInLondonMonthlyVariables AS table0 JOIN HousingInLondonYearlyVariables
    AS table1 ON table0.Code = table1.Code WHERE table0.BoroughFlag = 1;
90 '''
91 8.REL:
92 '''
93 def join[row_id_0, row_id_1] = HousingInLondonMonthlyVariables:Code[row_id_0, code]
    and HousingInLondonYearlyVariables:Code[row_id_1, code] and
    HousingInLondonMonthlyVariables:BoroughFlag[row_id_0]=1 from code
94 def output[area, average_price, median_salary] = HousingInLondonMonthlyVariables:
    Area[row_id_0, area] and HousingInLondonMonthlyVariables:AveragePrice[row_id_0,

```

```

    average_price] and HousingInLondonYearlyVariables:MedianSalary[row_id_1,
median_salary] and join[row_id_0, row_id_1] for row_id_0, row_id_1
95  '''
96  9.SQL:
97  '''
98  SELECT Gender, Segmentation, COUNT(*) FROM Test WHERE Segmentation IN ('B', 'C')
    GROUP BY Gender, Segmentation;
99  '''
100  9.REL:
101  '''
102  def output[gender, seg] = count[row_id: Test:Gender(row_id, gender) and Test:
    Segmentation(row_id,seg) and {"B"; "C"}(seg)]
103  '''
104  10.SQL:
105  '''
106  SELECT DISTINCT State FROM NCHSLeadingCausesOfDeathUnitedStates;
107  '''
108  10.REL:
109  '''
110  def output[state] = NCHSLeadingCausesOfDeathUnitedStates:State[x,state] from x
111  '''
112  11.SQL:
113  '''
114  SELECT * FROM HRCommaSep;
115  '''
116  11.REL:
117  '''
118  def output[col, row, val] = HRCommaSep[col, row, val]
119  '''
120  12.SQL:
121  '''
122  SELECT Title, Year FROM TvShows;
123  '''
124  12.REL:
125  '''
126  def output[title, year] = TvShows:Title[idx, title], TvShows:Year[idx, year] for idx
127  '''
128  13.SQL:
129  '''
130  SELECT AverageMontlyHours FROM HRCommaSep WHERE Department = 'sales';
131  '''
132  13.REL:
133  '''
134  def output[average_monthly_hours] = HRCommaSep:Department(row_idx, "sales") and
    HRCommaSep:AverageMontlyHours(row_idx, average_monthly_hours) for row_idx
135  '''
136  14.SQL:
137  '''
138  SELECT Location, Age FROM User WHERE UserId = 1;
139  '''
140  14.REL:
141  '''
142  def output[location, age] = User:Location[idx, location], User:Age[idx, age], User:
    UserId[idx, 1] for idx
143  '''
144  15.SQL:
145  '''
146  SELECT * FROM GMPlayersStatistics WHERE isstreamer = 1 AND bulletwin > 70;
147  '''
148  15.REL:
149  '''
150  def output[col, row, val] = GMPlayersStatistics[col, row, val] and
    GMPlayersStatistics:IsStreamer[row] = boolean_true and GMPlayersStatistics:
    BulletWin[row] > 70
151  '''

```

```

152 16.SQL:
153 '''
154 SELECT AVG(Visibilitykm), MAX(WindSpeedkmh) FROM WeatherData WHERE Weather = "Rain";
155 '''
156 16.REL:
157 '''
158 def all_row_ids_with_rain[row_id] = WeatherData:Weather[row_id]="Rain"
159 def output = average[row_id, value_vis: all_row_ids_with_rain(row_id) and
    WeatherData:VisibilityKm(row_id, value_vis)], max[row_id, value_wind_speed :
    all_row_ids_with_rain(row_id) and WeatherData:WindSpeedKmh(row_id,
    value_wind_speed)]
160 '''
161 17.SQL:
162 '''
163 SELECT * FROM Data WHERE Danceability > 0.8;
164 '''
165 17.REL:
166 '''
167 def output[col, idx, val] = Data[col, idx, val] and Data:Danceability[idx] > 0.8
168 '''
169 18.SQL:
170 '''
171 SELECT * FROM SpaceCorrected WHERE StatusMission IN ('Success', 'Failure');
172 '''
173 18.REL:
174 '''
175 def output[col, row_id, val] = SpaceCorrected[col, row_id, val] and {"Success"; "
    Failure"}(SpaceCorrected:StatusMission[row_id])
176 '''
177 19.SQL:
178 '''
179 SELECT * FROM SpaceCorrected WHERE Location LIKE '%
180 '''
181 19.REL:
182 '''
183 def output[col, row_id, val] = SpaceCorrected[col, row_id, val] and like_match("%
    Florida%", SpaceCorrected:Location[row_id])
184 '''
185 20.SQL:
186 '''
187 SELECT * FROM Cars24Combined WHERE Fuel = 'PETROL';
188 '''
189 20.REL:
190 '''
191 def output[colname, row_idx, val] = Cars24Combined[colname, row_idx, val] and
    Cars24Combined[:Fuel, row_idx, "PETROL"]
192 '''
193 21.SQL:
194 '''
195 SELECT DISTINCT Name FROM UCIDatasets;
196 '''
197 21.REL:
198 '''
199 def output[name] = UCIDatasets:Name[idx, name] from idx
200 '''
201 22.SQL:
202 '''
203 SELECT COUNT(*) FROM SupermarketSalesSheet1;
204 '''
205 22.REL:
206 '''
207 def count_rows = count[row_id: SupermarketSalesSheet1[_ , row_id, _]]
208 def output = count_rows
209 '''
210 23.SQL:

```

```

211  """
212 SELECT * FROM Jobs WHERE ActivelyHiring = 1.0;
213  """
214 23.REL:
215  """
216 def output[col, idx, val] = Jobs[col, idx, val] and Jobs:ActivelyHiring[idx] = 1.0
217  """
218 24.SQL:
219  """
220 SELECT marvelcomiccharactername, comicappearance1 FROM MarvelComicsLegacy WHERE
    marvelcomiccharactername = 'Wolverine';
221  """
222 24.REL:
223  """
224 def output[mavel_character_name, comic_appearance_1] = MarvelComicsLegacy:
    MarvelComicCharacterName[idx, mavel_character_name], MarvelComicsLegacy:
    ComicAppearance1[idx, comic_appearance_1] and mavel_character_name = "
    Wolverine" for idx
225  """
226 25.SQL:
227  """
228 SELECT * FROM WAFnUseCTelcoCustomerChurn WHERE Churn = "Yes";
229  """
230 25.REL:
231  """
232 def output[col, row_idx, val] = WAFnUseCTelcoCustomerChurn[col, row_idx, val] and
    WAFnUseCTelcoCustomerChurn:Churn[row_idx] = "Yes"
233  """
234 26.SQL:
235  """
236 SELECT AVG(Charges) FROM Insurance WHERE Age > 40;
237  """
238 26.REL:
239  """
240 def output = average[idx, charges: Insurance:Charges[idx, charges] and Insurance:Age
    [idx] > 40]
241  """
242 27.SQL:
243  """
244 SELECT * FROM CommentsCleaned WHERE EmojiUsed = "yes";
245  """
246 27.REL:
247  """
248 def output[col, row_id, val] = CommentsCleaned[col, row_id, val] and CommentsCleaned
    :EmojiUsed[row_id] = "yes"
249  """
250 28.SQL:
251  """
252 SELECT * FROM Cars24Combined WHERE Fuel = "PETROL" AND Location = "HR-98";
253  """
254 28.REL:
255  """
256 def output[col, idx, val] = Cars24Combined[col, idx, val] and Cars24Combined:Fuel[
    idx, "PETROL"] and Cars24Combined:Location[idx, "HR-98"]
257  """
258 29.SQL:
259  """
260 SELECT StateUT, AVG(NumberOfHouseholdsSurveyed) as AverageHouseholds FROM Datafile
    GROUP BY StateUT;
261  """
262 29.REL:
263  """
264 def output[state] = average[idx, num: Datafile:NumberOfHouseholdsSurveyed[idx, num]
    and Datafile:StateUT[idx, state]]
265  """

```

```

266 30.SQL:
267 '''
268 SELECT * FROM Cars24Combined WHERE Fuel = 'PETROL' AND Location = 'HR-98';
269 '''
270 30.REL:
271 '''
272 def output[col, idx, val] = Cars24Combined[col, idx, val] and Cars24Combined:Fuel[
    idx, "PETROL"] and Cars24Combined:Location[idx, "HR-98"]
273 '''
274 31.SQL:
275 '''
276 SELECT Gender, COUNT(*) FROM Diabetes GROUP BY Gender;
277 '''
278 31.REL:
279 '''
280 def output[gender] = count[row_id: Diabetes:Gender[row_id, gender]]
281 '''
282 32.SQL:
283 '''
284 SELECT JobTitle, AVG(Salary) AS AverageSalary
285 FROM PartiallyCleanedSalaryDataset
286 GROUP BY JobTitle;
287 '''
288 32.REL:
289 '''
290 def output[job_title] = average[idx, salary: PartiallyCleanedSalaryDataset:Salary[
    idx, salary] and PartiallyCleanedSalaryDataset:JobTitle[idx, job_title]]
291 '''
292 33.SQL:
293 '''
294 SELECT Race, COUNT(*) AS TotalPitstops
295 FROM Pitstops
296 GROUP BY Race;
297 '''
298 33.REL:
299 '''
300 def output[race] = count[row_id: Pitstops:Race[row_id, race]]
301 '''
302 34.SQL:
303 '''
304 SELECT Title, Rating FROM TopAnime WHERE Rating = (SELECT MAX(Rating) FROM TopAnime)
    ;
305 '''
306 34.REL:
307 '''
308 def max_rating = max[x, rating : TopAnime:Rating[x, rating]]
309 def output[title, rating] = TopAnime:Title[idx, title], TopAnime:Rating[idx, rating]
    and TopAnime:Rating[idx, max_rating] for idx
310 '''
311 35.SQL:
312 '''
313 SELECT Category, SUM(Sales) AS TotalSales, SUM(Profit) AS TotalProfit
314 FROM SampleSuperstore
315 GROUP BY Category;
316 '''
317 35.REL:
318 '''
319 def output[category] = sum[row_id, sales: SampleSuperstore:Category(row_id, category
    ) and SampleSuperstore:Sales(row_id, sales)], sum[row_id, profit:
    SampleSuperstore:Category(row_id, category) and SampleSuperstore:Profit(row_id,
    profit)]
320 '''
321 36.SQL:
322 '''
323 SELECT SUM(CustomerCareCalls)

```

```

324 FROM Train
325 WHERE DiscountOffered >= 50;
326 '''
327 36.REL:
328 '''
329 def output = sum[row_id,calls: Train:CustomerCareCalls[row_id, calls] and Train:
    DiscountOffered[row_id] >= 50]
330 '''
331 37.SQL:
332 '''
333 SELECT AVG(MonthlyCharges) FROM CustomerChurn WHERE Churn = 'Yes';
334 '''
335 37.REL:
336 '''
337 def output = average[row_id, monthly_charges: CustomerChurn:MonthlyCharges(row_id,
    monthly_charges) and CustomerChurn:Churn[row_id] = "Yes"]
338 '''
339 38.SQL:
340 '''
341 SELECT COUNT(DISTINCT StatusType) AS UniqueStatusTypes
342 FROM Live;
343 '''
344 38.REL:
345 '''
346 def output = count[status_type: Live:StatusType(row_id, status_type) from row_id]
347 '''
348 39.SQL:
349 '''
350 SELECT * FROM PCOSInfertility ORDER BY S1No DESC;
351 '''
352 39.REL:
353 '''
354 def output[col, row_idx, val] = PCOSInfertility[col, row_idx, val]
355 '''
356 40.SQL:
357 '''
358 SELECT SUM(WeeklySales) AS TotalWeeklySales FROM WalmartStoreSales;
359 '''
360 40.REL:
361 '''
362 def output = sum[row_idx, weekly_sales : WalmartStoreSales:WeeklySales[row_idx,
    weekly_sales]]
363 '''
364 41.SQL:
365 '''
366 SELECT * FROM WeatherData ORDER BY RelativeHumidity ASC;
367 '''
368 41.REL:
369 '''
370 def output[col, row_id, val] = WeatherData[col, row_id, val]
371 '''
372 42.SQL:
373 '''
374 SELECT ShipMode, SUM(Sales) AS TotalSales FROM SampleSuperstore GROUP BY ShipMode;
375 '''
376 42.REL:
377 '''
378 def output[shipmode] = sum[row_id, value_sales: SampleSuperstore:Sales[row_id,
    value_sales] and SampleSuperstore:ShipMode[row_id, shipmode]]
379 '''
380 43.SQL:
381 '''
382 SELECT PlayerOfMatch, WinningTeam
383 FROM IPLMatches2022
384 WHERE WinningTeam = "Rajasthan Royals";

```



```

385  """
386 43.REL:
387  """
388 def output[player_of_match, winning_team] = IPLMatches2022:PlayerOfMatch[idx,
    player_of_match], IPLMatches2022:WinningTeam[idx, winning_team] and
    IPLMatches2022:WinningTeam[idx, winning_team] and winning_team = "Rajasthan
    Royals" for idx
389  """
390 44.SQL:
391  """
392 SELECT Title, Desc FROM MegaGymDataset WHERE Type = "Strength";
393  """
394 44.REL:
395  """
396 def output[title, desc] = MegaGymDataset:Title[idx, title], MegaGymDataset:Desc[idx,
    desc] and MegaGymDataset:Type[idx, "Strength"] for idx
397  """
398 45.SQL:
399  """
400 SELECT TypeOfInternship, COUNT(*) as Count FROM Internship GROUP BY TypeOfInternship
    ;
401  """
402 45.REL:
403  """
404 def output[type_of_internship] = count[row_id: Internship:TypeOfInternship[row_id,
    type_of_internship]]
405  """
406 Given examples above, translate the following SQL queries to REL programs. No
    explanation is needed.
407 Output only the REL code one by one numbered with '1.REL:', '2.REL:', for example.
408
409 1.SQL:
410  """
411 SELECT * FROM BookingSaudiArabia ORDER BY Score DESC LIMIT 5;
412  """
413 2.SQL:
414  """
415 SELECT *
416 FROM VsrrProvisionalDrugOverdoseDeathCounts
417 WHERE DataValue > 5000;
418  """
419 3.SQL:
420  """
421 SELECT COUNT(*) FROM Tweets;
422  """
423 4.SQL:
424  """
425 SELECT AVG(PredSvr) FROM PredSvr INNER JOIN PredXgb ON PredSvr.PredSvr = PredXgb.
    XgCost;
426  """
427 5.SQL:
428  """
429 SELECT * FROM ChurnTrainTransformed WHERE CreditPerProduct < 400 OR EstSalaryScaled
    IS NULL
430 UNION
431 SELECT * FROM TestDfTransformed WHERE CreditPerProduct < 400 OR EstSalaryScaled IS
    NULL;
432  """
433 6.SQL:
434  """
435 SELECT * FROM Leads WHERE LastNotableActivity = 'Modified';
436  """
437 7.SQL:
438  """

```

```

439 SELECT CentralPressure, MaximumSustainedWindSpeed FROM TyphoonData WHERE
      IndicatorOfLandfallOrPassage = 'Landfall';
440 ' ' '
441 8.SQL:
442 ' ' '
443 SELECT SUM(A28) FROM Texture WHERE A17 < (SELECT AVG(A17) FROM Texture);
444 ' ' '
445 9.SQL:
446 ' ' '
447 SELECT FlatModel, MAX(ResalePrice) AS MaxResalePrice
448     FROM ResaleFlatPricesBasedOnApprovalDate2000Feb2012
449     GROUP BY FlatModel;
450 ' ' '
451 10.SQL:
452 ' ' '
453 SELECT COUNT(*) FROM TestFile;
454 ' ' '

```

An example of the prompt for input-target column annotation is shown below.

```

1 Consider a machine learning model that takes a few numeric input columns
2 and predict a single classification target column. Given the following
3 schema of a data table, suggest the input columns and target column, such
4 that the target may be predicted from the inputs non-trivially.
5 Schema: CREATE TABLE PartiallyCleanedSalaryDataset(
6     CompanyName TEXT,
7     JobTitle TEXT,
8     SalariesReported BIGINT,
9     Location TEXT,
10    Salary FLOAT
11 );
12 Respond in JSON format with 'input_columns' and 'output_column'.

```

## B Steering LLMs to Generate More Complex SQL Programs

During prototyping, we refined the instructions to create the best annotation results. One of our goals was to increase the complexity of SQL programs generated by the LLM. We experimented with different prompts, and we found that instructing the LLM to generate SQL programs “with relatively high complexity” can increase the complexity and reduce the number of simple queries generated by the LLM. An example is given here to illustrate the effect of including the steering phrase and without the steering phrase.

The following is a prompt for the zero-shot synthesis of SQL code without the steering phrase “with relatively high complexity”.

```

1 We have a SQL database with 2 tables. For each table, here is the schema and
2 a sample row data.
3 Schema for table 0:
4 CREATE TABLE MaLga12345(
5     Saledate TEXT,
6     MA BIGINT,
7     Type TEXT,
8     Bedrooms BIGINT
9 );
10 A sample row data from table 0:
11 {"Saledate": "30/09/2007", "MA": 441854, "Type": "house", "Bedrooms": 2}
12 Schema for table 1:
13 CREATE TABLE RawSales(
14     Datesold TEXT,
15     Postcode BIGINT,
16     Price BIGINT,
17     PropertyType TEXT,
18     Bedrooms BIGINT

```

```
19 );
20 A sample row data from table 1:
21 {"Datesold": "2007-02-07 00:00:00", "Postcode": 2607, "Price": 525000,
22 "PropertyType": "house", "Bedrooms": 4}
23 Consider the typical users who access this database. What kind of SQLite
24 SELECT queries would they write? List 15 examples SQL code that are
25 directly executable, each following a description. If possible, use joins.
26 Reply in the format of a description and the SQL code for each example.
```

Here is the annotation generated by the LLM when the steering phrase is not used.

```
1 1. Get all rows from MaLga12345 table:
2   ``sql
3 SELECT * FROM MaLga12345;
4   ``
5
6 2. Get all rows from RawSales table:
7   ``sql
8 SELECT * FROM RawSales;
9   ``
10
11 3. Find the average price of properties sold by postcode:
12   ``sql
13 SELECT Postcode, AVG(Price) as AveragePrice
14 FROM RawSales
15 GROUP BY Postcode;
16   ``
17
18 4. List all house sales from MaLga12345:
19   ``sql
20 SELECT * FROM MaLga12345
21 WHERE Type = 'house';
22   ``
23
24 5. List all properties sold on a specific date from RawSales:
25   ``sql
26 SELECT * FROM RawSales
27 WHERE Datesold = '2007-02-07 00:00:00';
28   ``
29
30 6. Find the total number of bedrooms sold in RawSales:
31   ``sql
32 SELECT SUM(Bedrooms) as TotalBedrooms
33 FROM RawSales;
34   ``
35
36 7. Get the maximum MA value from MaLga12345:
37   ``sql
38 SELECT MAX(MA) as MaxMA
39 FROM MaLga12345;
40   ``
41
42 8. List properties sold in a specific postcode with more than 3 bedrooms from
    RawSales:
43   ``sql
44 SELECT * FROM RawSales
45 WHERE Postcode = 2607 AND Bedrooms > 3;
46   ``
47
48 9. Count the number of sales by property type from RawSales:
49   ``sql
50 SELECT PropertyType, COUNT(*) as SalesCount
51 FROM RawSales
52 GROUP BY PropertyType;
53   ``
```

```

54
55 10. Get all properties sold in a specific year from RawSales:
56   ```sql
57 SELECT * FROM RawSales
58 WHERE Datesold LIKE '2007%'
59   ```
60
61 11. Find the sum of prices for all house sales from RawSales:
62   ```sql
63 SELECT SUM(Price) as TotalHouseSales
64 FROM RawSales
65 WHERE PropertyType = 'house';
66   ```
67
68 12. Join MaLga12345 and RawSales tables on bedrooms and list matching records:
69   ```sql
70 SELECT a.*, b.*
71 FROM MaLga12345 a
72 JOIN RawSales b ON a.Bedrooms = b.Bedrooms;
73   ```
74
75 13. Find properties with the same sale date and date sold from both tables:
76   ```sql
77 SELECT a.*, b.*
78 FROM MaLga12345 a
79 JOIN RawSales b ON a.Saledate = b.Datesold;
80   ```
81
82 14. Get the count of properties sold for each MA value from MaLga12345:
83   ```sql
84 SELECT MA, COUNT(*) as CountOfSales
85 FROM MaLga12345
86 GROUP BY MA;
87   ```
88
89 15. List all properties from MaLga12345 and their corresponding prices from RawSales
90     if they have the same number of bedrooms:
91   ```sql
92 SELECT a.*, b.Price
93 FROM MaLga12345 a
94 JOIN RawSales b ON a.Bedrooms = b.Bedrooms;
95   ```

```

The following is a prompt for the zero-shot synthesis of SQL code that has the steering phrase “with relatively high complexity”.

```

1 We have a SQL database with 2 tables. For each table, here is the schema and
2 a sample row data.
3 Schema for table 0:
4 CREATE TABLE MaLga12345(
5     Saledate TEXT,
6     MA BIGINT,
7     Type TEXT,
8     Bedrooms BIGINT
9 );
10 A sample row data from table 0:
11 {"Saledate": "30/09/2007", "MA": 441854, "Type": "house", "Bedrooms": 2}
12 Schema for table 1:
13 CREATE TABLE RawSales(
14     Datesold TEXT,
15     Postcode BIGINT,
16     Price BIGINT,
17     PropertyType TEXT,
18     Bedrooms BIGINT
19 );

```

```
20 A sample row data from table 1:
21 {"Datesold": "2007-02-07 00:00:00", "Postcode": 2607, "Price": 525000,
22 "PropertyType": "house", "Bedrooms": 4}
23 Consider the typical users who access this database. What kind of SQLite
24 SELECT queries would they write? List 15 examples SQL code that are
25 directly executable with relatively high complexity, each following a
26 description. If possible, use joins. Reply in the format of a description
27 and the SQL code for each example.
```

The following is the annotation generated by the LLM when the steering phrase is used. Clearly, the SQL programs generated have a higher complexity, and they are more valuable as SQL annotations for our data tables.

```
1 1. Select all sales records from both tables where the property type is a "house":
2   ```sql
3 SELECT * FROM MaLga12345 WHERE Type = 'house'
4 UNION
5 SELECT * FROM RawSales WHERE PropertyType = 'house';
6   ```
7
8 2. Retrieve the total price for houses sold in table 1:
9   ```sql
10 SELECT SUM(Price) as total_price FROM RawSales WHERE PropertyType = 'house';
11   ```
12
13 3. List the average number of bedrooms for properties sold in each table:
14   ```sql
15 SELECT AVG(Bedrooms) as avg_bedrooms_table0 FROM MaLga12345;
16 SELECT AVG(Bedrooms) as avg_bedrooms_table1 FROM RawSales;
17   ```
18
19 4. Find the number of sales made in each table in the year 2007:
20   ```sql
21 SELECT COUNT(*) as sales_count_table0 FROM MaLga12345 WHERE Saledate LIKE '%
22 SELECT COUNT(*) as sales_count_table1 FROM RawSales WHERE Datesold LIKE '%
23   ```
24
25 5. Retrieve the sales records where the postcode is 2607 from table 1:
26   ```sql
27 SELECT * FROM RawSales WHERE Postcode = 2607;
28   ```
29
30 6. Identify the latest sale date recorded from both tables:
31   ```sql
32 SELECT MAX(Saledate) as latest_sale_date_table0 FROM MaLga12345;
33 SELECT MAX(Datesold) as latest_sale_date_table1 FROM RawSales;
34   ```
35
36 7. Display the details for sales records with a price greater than $500,000 in table
37 1:
38   ```sql
39 SELECT * FROM RawSales WHERE Price > 500000;
40   ```
41
42 8. Retrieve the number of bedrooms for properties sold in table 0, grouped by
43 property type:
44   ```sql
45 SELECT Type, AVG(Bedrooms) as avg_bedrooms FROM MaLga12345 GROUP BY Type;
46   ```
47
48 9. List the sales records from both tables where the number of bedrooms is greater
49 than 3:
50   ```sql
51 SELECT * FROM MaLga12345 WHERE Bedrooms > 3
```

```

49 UNION
50 SELECT * FROM RawSales WHERE Bedrooms > 3;
51 '''
52
53 10. Calculate the average price of properties sold in table 1 with 4 bedrooms:
54 '''sql
55 SELECT AVG(Price) as avg_price FROM RawSales WHERE Bedrooms = 4;
56 '''
57
58 11. Count the number of distinct postcodes present in table 1:
59 '''sql
60 SELECT COUNT(DISTINCT Postcode) as unique_postcodes FROM RawSales;
61 '''
62
63 12. Retrieve the sales records from table 1 where the price is greater than the
64     average price:
65 '''sql
66 SELECT * FROM RawSales
67 WHERE Price > (SELECT AVG(Price) FROM RawSales);
68 '''
69
70 13. Join tables based on matching postal codes and display the combined dataset:
71 '''sql
72 SELECT * FROM MaLga12345
73 JOIN RawSales ON MaLga12345.MA = RawSales.Postcode;
74 '''
75
76 14. Identify the property types present in the two tables without duplication:
77 '''sql
78 SELECT DISTINCT Type FROM MaLga12345
79 UNION
80 SELECT DISTINCT PropertyType FROM RawSales;
81 '''
82
83 15. Show the top 5 highest-priced sales records from both tables:
84 '''sql
85 SELECT * FROM (SELECT * FROM MaLga12345
86 UNION
87 SELECT * FROM RawSales)
88 ORDER BY Price DESC
89 LIMIT 5;
90 '''

```

SQL queries with higher complexity reflect better annotation quality. Thus we include the steering phrase “with relatively high complexity” in our prompt.

## C Costs of LLM Annotation


We use the public service from OpenAI to access ChatGPT with the GPT-3.5 large language model. To support our claim that LLM annotations are cheap and accessible, we provide an estimate of our annotation cost.

1. Generating SQL programs costs less than 400 U.S. dollars.
2. Generating Rel translations for SQL programs costs less than 2000 U.S. dollars. The prompt for SQL-to-Rel translation is very long, as seen in Appendix A.
3. Generating input-output column annotations for the data tables costs less than 100 U.S. dollars.

The time spent on annotation depends on the account limitations. OpenAI API calls can be made asynchronously to paralyze the annotation process. All annotation processes combined can be completed within 2 days.

Table 7: The alternative hypotheses and p-values of paired Wilcoxon signed-rank test for TabPFN and AutoGluon performance on the tabular classification problems in AnnotatedTables. All alternative hypotheses are accepted with high statistical significance.

		1 Min (2725 problems)	5 Mins (2720 problems)
AUROC	Alternative hypothesis p-value	TabPFN > Autogluon 3.798882e-20	TabPFN < Autogluon 6.643113e-11
Cross entropy	Alternative hypothesis p-value	TabPFN < Autogluon 4.25193e-63	TabPFN > Autogluon 2.44812e-06



(a) AUROC with 1 minute time budget. (b) Cross entropy with 1 minute time budget. (c) AUROC with 5 minutes time budget. (d) Cross entropy with 5 minutes time budget.

Figure 4: Bar plots for the performance metrics of TabPFN and AutoGluon. The outliers are not plotted as they are far from the quantile bars.

## D Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Test for TabPFN and AutoGluon Tabular Classification Performance Difference

Wilcoxon signed-rank test (Wilcoxon, 1945) is a non-parametric statistical test for paired data. We use the test to determine if there is a statistically significant performance difference between TabPFN and AutoGluon on the tabular classification problems from AnnotatedTables. For every tabular classification problem among the 2,720 problems, for every specific time budget (either 1 min or 5 mins), the performance metrics (either AUROC or cross entropy) of TabPFN and AutoGluon form a paired data. The tests show that the median difference between the pairs is nonzero with statistical significance for all settings. The p-value of Wilcoxon signed-rank test is shown in Table 7. The paired bar plots are in Figure 4.

Judging by the results of the Wilcoxon signed-rank test, TabPFN performs better than AutoGluon with 1 minute time budget, and AutoGluon with 5 minutes time budget performs better than TabPFN. However, the difference of medians is small, and the standard deviation of performances are high. Based solely on the general results of Wilcoxon signed-rank test, we cannot predict if one model will outperform the other for a particular tabular classification problem. The issue of “statistical significance versus practical significance” (Kirk, 1996) is reflected here: even if a result is statistically significant, it may not be practically significant if the effect size is very small.



## E Data Retention Rate During Dataset Construction

During the dataset construction, we discard the data point if data processing fails at any step in order to maintain high quality results. In this section, we list the main data processing steps and the number of data points remaining at every step.

All intermediate data artifacts will be released as a part of the AnnotatedTables dataset. We hope future researchers can study the quality of LLM annotations and introduce methods for improvements.

**SQL Annotation** SQL annotation starts with 70,000 Kaggle datasets and create 405,616 SQL programs with 32,119 databases, in the following data processing steps.

1. 70,000 Kaggle datasets are collected.
2. 42,776 Kaggle datasets have CSV files to load as databases, representing 61.11% of the datasets collected from the last step.
3. 34,460 SQL databases can be loaded, for which the schema and example row descriptions can be extracted, representing 80.56% of the datasets with CSV files from the last step.
4. 32,926 SQL databases have SQL annotations generated by the Large Language Model, representing 95.54% of the datasets from the last step. The total number of SQL programs synthesized is 493,495.
5. We execute 493,134 SQL programs from 32,902 SQL databases within a time out of 120 seconds per query to collect execution results, representing 99.93% of the SQL programs and 99.93% of the databases from the last step. Every table in the database is truncated to a maximum of 1,000 rows before execution of SQL programs.
6. 405,616 SQL programs from 32,119 databases have execution results that are not empty, labeled as “Valid” in Table 3, representing 82.25% of the SQL programs executed.

**SQL-to-Rel translation** SQL-to-Rel translation uses the SQL annotations in AnnotatedTables to translate to Rel programs.

1. 405,616 SQL programs from 32,119 databases are valid.
2. 28,514 databases have at least 10 SQL programs each, forming 285,140 SQL programs to be translated, reported in Table 5, representing 70.30% of the valid SQL programs from the last step.
3. 116,327 Rel programs are translated correctly, with the same execution results as the SQL queries, representing 40.80% of the source SQL programs from the last step.

**Input-output column annotation** The input-output columns are annotated for the evaluation of TabPFN. For a given table, numeric input columns and a categorical output column need to be identified for the tabular classification task. For this annotation, we start with the 70,000 Kaggle datasets and evaluate TabPFN and AutoGluon on 2,720 tabular classification problems.

1. 70,000 Kaggle datasets are collected.
2. 42,776 Kaggle datasets have CSV files to load as databases, representing 61.11% of the datasets collected from the last step.
3. 34,009 tables are annotated with input-output columns by the LLM. One table is taken from each database to avoid re-using similar or related tables from the same database. 79.50% of the tables from the previous step have input-output columns annotated from the LLM.
4. 10,529 tables have numeric input columns and a categorical output column, to satisfy TabPFN’s requirements. The LLM may still generate an annotation when the table does not have columns that satisfy the requirement. We do not remove missing values from the tables or tables with missing values.
5. We run both TabPFN and AutoGluon on every table from the last step. Data is processed using TabPFN authors’ code, with data truncated to at most 1,000 training samples, 100 numerical features, and 10 classes. 2,725 problems can be run and finish running within 1 minute time budget for both models, and 2,720 problems within 5 minute time budget.

## **F Tabular Dataset Annotation and Semantic Annotation of Tabular Data**

Our paper studies the “tabular dataset annotation problem”, that is the problem of dataset annotation limited to the tabular data domain. Based on the common concept of dataset annotation, tabular dataset annotation is the process of labeling tabular data for machine learning. Currently, tabular dataset annotation is done through expert annotators or crowd-sourced human workers.

The “tabular dataset annotation problem” should not be confused with “semantic annotation of tabular data”, which is also called “tabular data annotation” in some context (PapersWithCode, 2024). “Semantic annotation of tabular data” aims to match tabular data with knowledge graph entities.

## NeurIPS Paper Checklist

### 1. Claims

Question: Do the main claims made in the abstract and introduction accurately reflect the paper's contributions and scope?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: The abstract and introductions made claims that are accurate and supported by the results in the paper. Our dataset is the largest SQL dataset with tabular data that support execution in the literature. Our paper is also the first to use large language models to annotate tabular datasets, to the best of our knowledge.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the abstract and introduction do not include the claims made in the paper.
- The abstract and/or introduction should clearly state the claims made, including the contributions made in the paper and important assumptions and limitations. A No or NA answer to this question will not be perceived well by the reviewers.
- The claims made should match theoretical and experimental results, and reflect how much the results can be expected to generalize to other settings.
- It is fine to include aspirational goals as motivation as long as it is clear that these goals are not attained by the paper.

### 2. Limitations

Question: Does the paper discuss the limitations of the work performed by the authors?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: We measure and report the performance of LLM annotations, including statistics and analysis on the erroneous annotations throughout this paper. We have paragraphs in the paper devoted to discussing the limitations of our results.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper has no limitation while the answer No means that the paper has limitations, but those are not discussed in the paper.
- The authors are encouraged to create a separate "Limitations" section in their paper.
- The paper should point out any strong assumptions and how robust the results are to violations of these assumptions (e.g., independence assumptions, noiseless settings, model well-specification, asymptotic approximations only holding locally). The authors should reflect on how these assumptions might be violated in practice and what the implications would be.
- The authors should reflect on the scope of the claims made, e.g., if the approach was only tested on a few datasets or with a few runs. In general, empirical results often depend on implicit assumptions, which should be articulated.
- The authors should reflect on the factors that influence the performance of the approach. For example, a facial recognition algorithm may perform poorly when image resolution is low or images are taken in low lighting. Or a speech-to-text system might not be used reliably to provide closed captions for online lectures because it fails to handle technical jargon.
- The authors should discuss the computational efficiency of the proposed algorithms and how they scale with dataset size.
- If applicable, the authors should discuss possible limitations of their approach to address problems of privacy and fairness.
- While the authors might fear that complete honesty about limitations might be used by reviewers as grounds for rejection, a worse outcome might be that reviewers discover limitations that aren't acknowledged in the paper. The authors should use their best judgment and recognize that individual actions in favor of transparency play an important role in developing norms that preserve the integrity of the community. Reviewers will be specifically instructed to not penalize honesty concerning limitations.

### 3. Theory Assumptions and Proofs

Question: For each theoretical result, does the paper provide the full set of assumptions and a complete (and correct) proof?

Answer: [NA]

Justification: We have no theoretical results.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not include theoretical results.
- All the theorems, formulas, and proofs in the paper should be numbered and cross-referenced.
- All assumptions should be clearly stated or referenced in the statement of any theorems.
- The proofs can either appear in the main paper or the supplemental material, but if they appear in the supplemental material, the authors are encouraged to provide a short proof sketch to provide intuition.
- Inversely, any informal proof provided in the core of the paper should be complemented by formal proofs provided in appendix or supplemental material.
- Theorems and Lemmas that the proof relies upon should be properly referenced.

#### 4. **Experimental Result Reproducibility**

Question: Does the paper fully disclose all the information needed to reproduce the main experimental results of the paper to the extent that it affects the main claims and/or conclusions of the paper (regardless of whether the code and data are provided or not)?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: We publicly release our code and data.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not include experiments.
- If the paper includes experiments, a No answer to this question will not be perceived well by the reviewers: Making the paper reproducible is important, regardless of whether the code and data are provided or not.
- If the contribution is a dataset and/or model, the authors should describe the steps taken to make their results reproducible or verifiable.
- Depending on the contribution, reproducibility can be accomplished in various ways. For example, if the contribution is a novel architecture, describing the architecture fully might suffice, or if the contribution is a specific model and empirical evaluation, it may be necessary to either make it possible for others to replicate the model with the same dataset, or provide access to the model. In general, releasing code and data is often one good way to accomplish this, but reproducibility can also be provided via detailed instructions for how to replicate the results, access to a hosted model (e.g., in the case of a large language model), releasing of a model checkpoint, or other means that are appropriate to the research performed.
- While NeurIPS does not require releasing code, the conference does require all submissions to provide some reasonable avenue for reproducibility, which may depend on the nature of the contribution. For example
  - (a) If the contribution is primarily a new algorithm, the paper should make it clear how to reproduce that algorithm.
  - (b) If the contribution is primarily a new model architecture, the paper should describe the architecture clearly and fully.
  - (c) If the contribution is a new model (e.g., a large language model), then there should either be a way to access this model for reproducing the results or a way to reproduce the model (e.g., with an open-source dataset or instructions for how to construct the dataset).
  - (d) We recognize that reproducibility may be tricky in some cases, in which case authors are welcome to describe the particular way they provide for reproducibility. In the case of closed-source models, it may be that access to the model is limited in some way (e.g., to registered users), but it should be possible for other researchers to have some path to reproducing or verifying the results.

#### 5. **Open access to data and code**

Question: Does the paper provide open access to the data and code, with sufficient instructions to faithfully reproduce the main experimental results, as described in supplemental material?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: We publicly release our code and data. The access instructions are in the supplementary material. The source Kaggle datasets can be accessed publicly.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that paper does not include experiments requiring code.
- Please see the NeurIPS code and data submission guidelines (<https://nips.cc/public/guides/CodeSubmissionPolicy>) for more details.

- While we encourage the release of code and data, we understand that this might not be possible, so “No” is an acceptable answer. Papers cannot be rejected simply for not including code, unless this is central to the contribution (e.g., for a new open-source benchmark).
- The instructions should contain the exact command and environment needed to run to reproduce the results. See the NeurIPS code and data submission guidelines (<https://nips.cc/public/guides/CodeSubmissionPolicy>) for more details.
- The authors should provide instructions on data access and preparation, including how to access the raw data, preprocessed data, intermediate data, and generated data, etc.
- The authors should provide scripts to reproduce all experimental results for the new proposed method and baselines. If only a subset of experiments are reproducible, they should state which ones are omitted from the script and why.
- At submission time, to preserve anonymity, the authors should release anonymized versions (if applicable).
- Providing as much information as possible in supplemental material (appended to the paper) is recommended, but including URLs to data and code is permitted.

#### 6. **Experimental Setting/Details**

Question: Does the paper specify all the training and test details (e.g., data splits, hyper-parameters, how they were chosen, type of optimizer, etc.) necessary to understand the results?

Answer: [\[Yes\]](#)

Justification: Our experimental settings are discussed in the paper with great details. We also release our code as the supplemental material.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not include experiments.
- The experimental setting should be presented in the core of the paper to a level of detail that is necessary to appreciate the results and make sense of them.
- The full details can be provided either with the code, in appendix, or as supplemental material.

#### 7. **Experiment Statistical Significance**

Question: Does the paper report error bars suitably and correctly defined or other appropriate information about the statistical significance of the experiments?

Answer: [\[Yes\]](#)

Justification: For experiments, p-values and bar plots are included in the paper and the appendix.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not include experiments.
- The authors should answer "Yes" if the results are accompanied by error bars, confidence intervals, or statistical significance tests, at least for the experiments that support the main claims of the paper.
- The factors of variability that the error bars are capturing should be clearly stated (for example, train/test split, initialization, random drawing of some parameter, or overall run with given experimental conditions).
- The method for calculating the error bars should be explained (closed form formula, call to a library function, bootstrap, etc.)
- The assumptions made should be given (e.g., Normally distributed errors).
- It should be clear whether the error bar is the standard deviation or the standard error of the mean.
- It is OK to report 1-sigma error bars, but one should state it. The authors should preferably report a 2-sigma error bar than state that they have a 96% CI, if the hypothesis of Normality of errors is not verified.
- For asymmetric distributions, the authors should be careful not to show in tables or figures symmetric error bars that would yield results that are out of range (e.g. negative error rates).
- If error bars are reported in tables or plots, The authors should explain in the text how they were calculated and reference the corresponding figures or tables in the text.

#### 8. **Experiments Compute Resources**

Question: For each experiment, does the paper provide sufficient information on the computer resources (type of compute workers, memory, time of execution) needed to reproduce the experiments?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: Our LLM annotation methods aim to reduce the costs of dataset annotation, and the estimated costs are in the Appendix.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not include experiments.
- The paper should indicate the type of compute workers CPU or GPU, internal cluster, or cloud provider, including relevant memory and storage.
- The paper should provide the amount of compute required for each of the individual experimental runs as well as estimate the total compute.
- The paper should disclose whether the full research project required more compute than the experiments reported in the paper (e.g., preliminary or failed experiments that didn't make it into the paper).

#### 9. Code Of Ethics

Question: Does the research conducted in the paper conform, in every respect, with the NeurIPS Code of Ethics <https://neurips.cc/public/EthicsGuidelines>?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: We have reviewed the NeurIPS Code of Ethics and confirm that our research conforms to it.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the authors have not reviewed the NeurIPS Code of Ethics.
- If the authors answer No, they should explain the special circumstances that require a deviation from the Code of Ethics.
- The authors should make sure to preserve anonymity (e.g., if there is a special consideration due to laws or regulations in their jurisdiction).

#### 10. Broader Impacts

Question: Does the paper discuss both potential positive societal impacts and negative societal impacts of the work performed?

Answer: [NA]

Justification: Dataset annotation is a standard component in all machine learning projects, and improvements on the dataset annotation process should bring no risks of negative societal impacts.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that there is no societal impact of the work performed.
- If the authors answer NA or No, they should explain why their work has no societal impact or why the paper does not address societal impact.
- Examples of negative societal impacts include potential malicious or unintended uses (e.g., disinformation, generating fake profiles, surveillance), fairness considerations (e.g., deployment of technologies that could make decisions that unfairly impact specific groups), privacy considerations, and security considerations.
- The conference expects that many papers will be foundational research and not tied to particular applications, let alone deployments. However, if there is a direct path to any negative applications, the authors should point it out. For example, it is legitimate to point out that an improvement in the quality of generative models could be used to generate deepfakes for disinformation. On the other hand, it is not needed to point out that a generic algorithm for optimizing neural networks could enable people to train models that generate Deepfakes faster.
- The authors should consider possible harms that could arise when the technology is being used as intended and functioning correctly, harms that could arise when the technology is being used as intended but gives incorrect results, and harms following from (intentional or unintentional) misuse of the technology.
- If there are negative societal impacts, the authors could also discuss possible mitigation strategies (e.g., gated release of models, providing defenses in addition to attacks, mechanisms for monitoring misuse, mechanisms to monitor how a system learns from feedback over time, improving the efficiency and accessibility of ML).

#### 11. Safeguards

Question: Does the paper describe safeguards that have been put in place for responsible release of data or models that have a high risk for misuse (e.g., pretrained language models, image generators, or scraped datasets)?

Answer: [NA]

Justification: Dataset annotation is a standard component in all machine learning projects and our work poses no risks of misuse.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper poses no such risks.
- Released models that have a high risk for misuse or dual-use should be released with necessary safeguards to allow for controlled use of the model, for example by requiring that users adhere to usage guidelines or restrictions to access the model or implementing safety filters.
- Datasets that have been scraped from the Internet could pose safety risks. The authors should describe how they avoided releasing unsafe images.
- We recognize that providing effective safeguards is challenging, and many papers do not require this, but we encourage authors to take this into account and make a best faith effort.

#### 12. Licenses for existing assets

Question: Are the creators or original owners of assets (e.g., code, data, models), used in the paper, properly credited and are the license and terms of use explicitly mentioned and properly respected?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: The assets we created are released with public licenses. The original licenses of the Kaggle datasets can be found on the dataset webpages, and we do not re-release their data or modify their licenses to conform to Kaggle's terms of use. Users may download the Kaggle datasets on their own through public Kaggle API access, following our process or using our tools. Kaggle datasets have licenses that permit data analysis usages.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not use existing assets.
- The authors should cite the original paper that produced the code package or dataset.
- The authors should state which version of the asset is used and, if possible, include a URL.
- The name of the license (e.g., CC-BY 4.0) should be included for each asset.
- For scraped data from a particular source (e.g., website), the copyright and terms of service of that source should be provided.
- If assets are released, the license, copyright information, and terms of use in the package should be provided. For popular datasets, [paperswithcode.com/datasets](https://paperswithcode.com/datasets) has curated licenses for some datasets. Their licensing guide can help determine the license of a dataset.
- For existing datasets that are re-packaged, both the original license and the license of the derived asset (if it has changed) should be provided.
- If this information is not available online, the authors are encouraged to reach out to the asset's creators.

#### 13. New Assets

Question: Are new assets introduced in the paper well documented and is the documentation provided alongside the assets?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: Our model and dataset are well documented and released publicly.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not release new assets.
- Researchers should communicate the details of the dataset/code/model as part of their submissions via structured templates. This includes details about training, license, limitations, etc.
- The paper should discuss whether and how consent was obtained from people whose asset is used.
- At submission time, remember to anonymize your assets (if applicable). You can either create an anonymized URL or include an anonymized zip file.

#### 14. Crowdsourcing and Research with Human Subjects



Question: For crowdsourcing experiments and research with human subjects, does the paper include the full text of instructions given to participants and screenshots, if applicable, as well as details about compensation (if any)?

Answer: [NA]

Justification: The paper does not involve crowdsourcing nor research with human subjects.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not involve crowdsourcing nor research with human subjects.
- Including this information in the supplemental material is fine, but if the main contribution of the paper involves human subjects, then as much detail as possible should be included in the main paper.
- According to the NeurIPS Code of Ethics, workers involved in data collection, curation, or other labor should be paid at least the minimum wage in the country of the data collector.

**15. Institutional Review Board (IRB) Approvals or Equivalent for Research with Human Subjects**

Question: Does the paper describe potential risks incurred by study participants, whether such risks were disclosed to the subjects, and whether Institutional Review Board (IRB) approvals (or an equivalent approval/review based on the requirements of your country or institution) were obtained?

Answer: [NA]

Justification: The paper does not involve crowdsourcing nor research with human subjects.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not involve crowdsourcing nor research with human subjects.
- Depending on the country in which research is conducted, IRB approval (or equivalent) may be required for any human subjects research. If you obtained IRB approval, you should clearly state this in the paper.
- We recognize that the procedures for this may vary significantly between institutions and locations, and we expect authors to adhere to the NeurIPS Code of Ethics and the guidelines for their institution.
- For initial submissions, do not include any information that would break anonymity (if applicable), such as the institution conducting the review.