

AI-Assisted SQL Authoring at Industry Scale

Chandra Maddila
Meta Platforms Inc.
USA

Negar Ghorbani
Meta Platforms Inc.
USA

Kosay Jabre
Meta Platforms Inc.
USA

Vijayaraghavan Murali
Meta Platforms Inc.
USA

Edwin Kim
Meta Platforms Inc.
USA

Parth Thakkar
Meta Platforms Inc.
USA

Nikolay Pavlovich Laptev
Meta Platforms Inc.
USA

Olivia Harman
Meta Platforms Inc.
USA

Diana Hsu
Meta Platforms Inc.
USA

Rui Abreu
Meta Platforms Inc.
USA

Peter C. Rigby*
Meta Platforms Inc.
USA

ABSTRACT

SqlCompose brings generative AI into the data analytics domain. SQL is declarative, has formal table schemas, and is often written in a non-linear manner. We address each of these challenges and develop a set of models that shows the importance of each problem. We first develop an internal SQL benchmark to perform offline tests at Meta. We evaluate how well the Public Llama model performs. We attain a BLEU score of 53% and 24% for single- and multi-line predictions, respectively. This performance is consistent with prior works on imperative languages. We then fine-tune Llama on our internal data and database schemas. SqlComposeSA substantially outperforms Llama by 16 percentage points on BLEU score. SQL is often written with multiple sub queries and in a non-sequential manner. We develop SqlComposeFIM which is aware of the context before and after the line(s) that need to be completed. This fill-in-the-middle model outperform SqlComposeFIM by 35 percentage points. We also measure how often the models get the correct table names, and SqlComposeFIM is able to do this 75% of the time a major improvement over the other two models. Aside from our scientific research, we also roll out SqlComposeFIM at Meta. SqlCompose has is used on a weekly basis by over 10k users including data scientists and software engineers, less than 1% of users have disabled SqlCompose. We use the feedback from users to improve SqlCompose. Interesting positive themes include completing tedious or repetitive SQL clauses, suggesting boilerplate coding, and help in eliminate the need to remember difficult SQL syntax. The most significant negative themes was table and column name hallucinations, which has been reduced with the release of SqlComposeFIM. The SqlCompose models consistently outperform public and internal LLMs despite their smaller size (7 bn and 13 bn), which provides early indications that smaller specialist models can outperform larger general purpose models.

*Rigby is also a professor at Concordia University in Montreal, QC, Canada.

1 INTRODUCTION

While Large Language Models (LLMs) have been used extensively on general coding problems [1, 2], previous work on LLMs for SQL is very limited. Related work has been concerned with the generation of SQL code from natural language specifications [3–5], but, to the best of our knowledge, no work exists on autocompleting SQL queries.

While it can be tempting to cast SQL as just another programming language for existing LLM autocompletion systems, there are three main challenges that warrant special treatment for SQL.

- (i) SQL is declarative in nature, and thus represents a different paradigm from the general mix of languages used in code LLM training data. SQL is intimately tied to a data warehouse (often proprietary), which severely limits the LLM’s ability for knowledge transfer across training stages and programming languages.
- (ii) SQL exacerbates the hallucination problem often seen in LLMs. For example, it is easy for an LLM to conjure up a non-existent table name, which then corrupts the remaining context for suggesting column names, joins, etc., quickly making the entire query invalid. While code LLMs also hallucinate, the impact of a single incorrect generation is more cascading for SQL. We conjecture that the data/db structure can help in mitigating hallucinations.
- (iii) SQL queries are often written ad-hoc, from scratch, as one-off queries. There is no repository of queries as there is code, so LLMs have to work with very little context. Developers tend to write short queries often starting with the FROM clause and working back to the final columns and aggregations. Developers will often have complex subqueries, *i.e.* the WITH clause, which makes the context before and after the current line even more important than in procedural programming languages.

In this work, we provide evidence to four research questions that deal with these specific SQL challenges. Our first three research questions revolve around three candidate models and their efficacy for SQL autocompletion. For RQ 1, the pyramid in Figure 1 is built upon the public Llama [6] model. For RQ 2, we then use first-party data at Meta, *i.e.* internal code and SQL code as well as schema information including table names and columns to create SqlComposeSA. For RQ 3, we observe that when engineers write SQL, they

often do not write in a sequential top-to-bottom manner. For example, they might fill in a `WHERE` clause before fully indicating the columns to be selected. As a result, we develop a fill-in-the-middle model, `SqlComposeFIM`, that has context before and after the line(s) of code to be completed. Our final research question, describes the rollout to `SqlCompose` to thousands of engineers and examines their feedback.

RQ 1. Public Llama: How well does the a public model generate SQL code?

While LLMs have been used extensively on general coding problems [1, 7, 8], our goal is to understand how well they work on SQL, which is declarative. To establish a baseline model at Meta, we evaluate how well the public Llama [6] model performs on our internal benchmarks. The Llama model is trained on publicly available code including natural language datasets related to code. Llama is also the base of our pyramid in Figure 1.

Results summary. For Llama we see an exact match, BLEU, containment, and table match of 29%, 53%, 66%, and 12% for single line. The corresponding values for multi-line are 0%, 12%, 57%, and 26%, respectively. These results are comparable with prior work examining imperative languages like python [1].

RQ 2. SqlComposeSA: How important is fine-tuning on table schemas?

We train `SqlComposeSA` on first-party data and code at Meta. Since LLMs notoriously hallucinate, we also fine-tune on internal table schema including table names and columns. We expect to see fewer incorrect column names and invalid table names. Figure 2 illustrates how important it is to have knowledge of the schema. The Llama model hallucinates table names and suggests infrequently used tables. In contrast, once the table names are known, the columns are correct.

Results summary. For `SqlComposeSA` we see an exact match, BLEU, containment, and table match of 48%, 69%, 78%, 13% for single line. The corresponding values for multi-line are 0%, 24%, 77%, and 62%, respectively. These results represent a substantial 11 to 48 percentage point improvement over the public Llama model.

RQ 3. SqlComposeFIM: How well does a fill-in-the-middle (FIM) model perform? SQL authoring is usually not linear and sequential. When authoring long queries, it is common for developers to jump around nested subqueries and common table expressions (CTEs), such that information in the suffix becomes just as important as information in the prefix. See the nested query in Figure 2. The Fill-In-the-Middle (FIM) paradigm [9, 10] helps widen the context aperture. With FIM, we provide both the prefix and the suffix to the model.

`SqlComposeFIM` benefits from not only knowing the schema but also knowing how common the use of a particular column or table is. In Figure 2, we see that although `SqlComposeSA` has correct column names given the table, `SqlComposeFIM` has more context about which columns make the most amount of sense given the context of the query.

Results summary. For `SqlComposeFIM` we see an exact match, BLEU, containment, and table match of 50%, 69%, 78%, 23% for single line. The corresponding values for multi-line are 20%, 59%, 82%, and 75%, respectively. The improvement in single line is mostly contained to better table match percentages over `SqlComposeSA`, the multi-line improvement is dramatic, increasing from 0% exact




Figure 1: Data pyramid

matches to 20%. Furthermore, `SqlComposeFIM` suggests the correct table 75% of the time.

RQ 4. Adoption and Feedback: How is SqlCompose used in practice? At Meta, we incrementally rolled out the models. We did not rollout all models, instead, those that performed the best in the offline historical tests were rolled out.

We describe the rollout methodology and results. While we do not conduct a controlled experiment, we allow developers to provide feedback on `SqlCompose`. Since there is no requirement to provide feedback, we also report the opt-out rate for `SqlCompose` to ensure that developers who did not enjoy `SqlCompose` but did not comment are captured.

Results summary. `SqlCompose` has is used on a weekly basis by over 10k users including data scientists and software engineers, less than 1% of users have disabled `SqlCompose`. We use the feedback from users to improve `SqlCompose`. Interesting positive themes include completing tedious or repetitive SQL clauses, suggesting boilerplate coding, and help in eliminate the need to remember difficult SQL syntax. The most significant negative themes was table and column name hallucinations, which has been reduced with the release of `SqlComposeFIM`. Other negative themes include interfering with traditional auto-complete system and changes in the keyboard shortcuts and the stylistic aspects.

2 BACKGROUND AND MODEL

Before we provide the technical details, we introduce our running example. Figure 2 shows three screenshots of a suggestion generated by plugging in three different models into the `Daiquery` UI while providing the same context.

The first screenshot shows the suggestion generated by the public Llama model. It hallucinates column names, suggests a function that is nonexistent in the first-party data warehouse (`octet_length`), and hallucinates the table name as well (`session_info`). As a result, the generated query does not even compile and user rejects the suggestion.

The second screenshot shows a suggestion generated by the `SqlComposeSA` model that is fine tuned on the first-party data warehouse. The model is already doing a good job with respect to predicting the correct function names (`length` as opposed to

curated and automated techniques for improving data quality. The main components of our data quality pipeline include query quality filtering, query diversity filtering and deduplication of similar or repetitive queries.

For example for the SQL completion learning task, we have leveraged simple heuristics to enhance the quality of our SqlCompose training dataset. The heuristics that we have used include keeping SQL queries with a certain minimum or maximum length, deduping queries and keeping queries that have been run successfully. For instance deduping resulted in filtering of over 5% of queries (leaving 10 million queries for training after filtering).

Finally, to improve the dataset diversity we have ensured that we have a representative queries from different table schemas and query complexity levels (e.g., easy, medium, hard) defined by the number of SQL components, selections, and conditions. More specifically we defined the complexity levels defined based on the Spider [11]. Using the data quality filtering steps above, we ended with about 10M queries for SQL completion task fine-tuning.

2.3 Llama model development

We use a checkpoint of the Llama model that is trained heavily on code as our base model [6]. They come in four model sizes: 7B, 13B, 34B and 70B parameters. We take the 7B model as our base model as it helps us strike the right balance between prediction accuracy and end-to-end inference latency requirements of a code completion system (~200 milliseconds). At the time this work began, we were only able to use the Llama 2 model weights [12] and trained on 500B tokens from a code-heavy data set.

The Llama model is trained predominantly on a near-deduplicated data set of publicly available code. It was trained to support infilling tasks. Infilling is the task of predicting the missing part of a program given a surrounding context. Applications include code completion at the cursor’s position in code IDEs, type inference and generation of in-code documentation (e.g., docstrings). Infilling models were trained following the concept of causal masking [10], where parts of a training sequence are moved to the end, and the reordered sequence is predicted autoregressively.

2.4 SqlComposeSA model development

SqlComposeSA models are trained on top of the Llama models. This model is initialized with Llama model weights [6] and trained on first-party code data. This data includes code from other programming languages such as Python, C++, React, etc. as mentioned in Section 2.1.2. This helps the model learn the basics of coding patterns, frameworks, nomenclature used in the company.

After a checkpoint is produced, we continue to pre-train this checkpoint using the first-party SQL data and SQL schema information to specialize or align the model further on SQL completion and prediction tasks. As the base model has seen SQL queries as part of the pre-training (Llama training), the model already understands how to write SQL queries. However, it does not understand the dialects used at Meta *i.e.* Presto SQL [13].

Therefore, we continued pre-training on first-party SQL queries and schema. This serves two purposes: it teaches the model about the nuances of the SQL used internally, and it equips the model with the knowledge of the first-party data warehouse, which is

very important to prevent the model from hallucinating table and column names while synthesizing SQL queries.

2.5 SqlComposeFIM model development

While training the model on the first-party coding data and SQL artifacts, we leverage a training objective named Language Causal Masking (LCM) [1]. This helps the model consume context bidirectionally (code before and code after), which is important for any code completion system. Moreover, LCM overcomes the limitations imposed by regular CM objective with respect to tokenization. We list the modifications we performed to the CM objective to produce LCM objective below:

- CM implements the masking after the text has been tokenized into token IDs, which limits the model during training to only seeing mask spans with edges at common tokenizer tokens. LCM lifts the masking step to the language level and avoids this, similar to the fill-in-the-middle (FIM) task [14]. Also, LCM only masks at certain trigger characters – that is, characters where the model will be queried during inference such as (, ., =, SELECT, WHERE, FROM, etc.
- We prefix certain metadata to the input in LCM, such as the programming language, full path to the file, and the kernel name for notebooks.
- Through model-level ablations, we found an optimal 70-30 split of the model’s input length between code before and code after the cursor.
- Specialized for our use case, LCM has only one mask in any input.

A step-by-step overview of constructing an input in LCM is shown in Figure 3, along with an example SQL query. Once an input is constructed, during training, we maximize the log probability of the language-masked input:

$$\log \mathcal{P}([\text{Metadata}; \text{Before}; \langle \text{mask} \rangle; \text{After}; \langle \text{mask} \rangle; \text{Target}]) \quad (1)$$

where Metadata, Before and After are the tokens in the metadata, code before, and code after the cursor, respectively, Target is the code that was masked, and $\langle \text{mask} \rangle$ is a special token. During inference, we sample tokens in an auto-regressive manner from the distribution:

$$\mathcal{P}(\cdot | [\text{Metadata}; \text{Before}; \langle \text{mask} \rangle; \text{After}; \langle \text{mask} \rangle]) \quad (2)$$

As we are suggesting lines of code, we stop the generation early once a newline token has been generated. Due to the real-time nature of our application and the inline suggestion user experience (UX), we only return one sequence of generated tokens.

3 CONTEXTUAL INFORMATION ABOUT META

This section offers an overview of the technology stack used by data engineers at Meta. This is important to provide context on our dataset and experimental setup.

Meta’s data warehouse is the main data repository that is used for analytics. It is a collection of millions of tables, physically stored using an internal fork of ORC¹ Meta’s exabyte-scale data warehouse

¹Apache ORC, <https://orc.apache.org/>




Figure 3: Converting a query to fill-in-the-middle (FIM) format with SqlComposeFIM’s processor

is so large that it cannot physically be stored in one single datacenter. Instead, data is spread across different geographical locations.

The warehouse, due to its non-centralized nature, is divided into ‘namespaces.’ These namespaces represent both a geographical and logical segmentation of the warehouse: tables that share a common “theme” are grouped into the same namespace. This allows for efficient querying as data does not need to be transferred across different locations. However, if a query requires tables from two distinct namespaces (for example, table1 in namespace A and table2 in namespace B), data replication becomes necessary. Either table2 can be replicated to namespace A, or table1 to namespace B, allowing the query to be run in the namespace where both tables are present. Data engineers have the ability to create these cross-namespace replicas swiftly using a web-based tool, and these replicas are automatically synchronized.

Data is typically introduced into the warehouse in three primary ways:

- Through data workflows and pipelines, such as data inserted by a Dataswarm pipeline. This data is usually sourced by querying other tables within the warehouse.
- Via logs, which are data produced from either server-side or client-side logging frameworks.
- Through daily snapshots of entities present in the production graph database.

The warehouse can be queried by many different entry points, but data engineers at Meta generally use Presto and Spark. While both are open-source (Presto was originally developed at Meta and was open-sourced in 2019), Meta uses and maintains its own internal forks – but frequently rebases from the open-source repository so that we are kept up-to-date, and contributes features back into the open-source projects.

With our focus primarily on business impact, design and optimization, most of our pipelines and queries are written in SQL in one of two dialects, Spark SQL or Presto SQL. This approach

provides a consistent understanding of the data and business logic and enables any data engineer, data scientist, or software engineer comfortable with SQL to understand all of our pipelines and even write their own queries.

The choice of Presto or Spark depends mostly on the workload: Presto is typically more efficient and is used for most queries while Spark is employed for heavy workloads that require higher amounts of memory or expensive joins. Presto clusters are sized in a way that most day-to-day adhoc queries (that scan, generally, a few billions rows – which is considered a light query at Meta scale) produce results in a few seconds (or minutes, if there’s complex joins or aggregations involved).

3.1 Real-time Querying

Scuba is Meta’s real-time data analytics framework. It is frequently used by data engineers and software engineers to analyze trends on logging data in real time. It is also extensively used for debugging purposes by software and production engineers.

Scuba tables can be queried either through the Scuba web UI (which is comparable to tools like Kibana), or via a dialect of SQL. In the Scuba web UI, engineers can quickly visualize trends on a log table without having to write any queries, with data that was generated in the past few minutes.

3.2 Bento and Daiquery

Daiquery is one of the tools data engineers use on a daily basis at Meta. It is a web-based notebooks experience which acts as a single endpoint to query any data source: the warehouse (either through Presto or Spark), Scuba, and plenty of others. It includes a notebook interface with multiple query cells, and users can quickly run and iterate on queries against our data warehouse. Results appear as tables by default, but built-in visualization tools allow the creation of many different types of plots.

Daiquery is optimized for rapid query development, but does not support more complex post-query analysis. For this, users can promote their Daiquery notebooks into Bento notebooks. Bento is Meta’s implementation of managed Jupyter notebooks, and in addition to queries also enables python or R code (with a range of custom kernels for different use cases) and access to a wide range of visualization libraries. In addition to its use by data engineers, Bento is also used extensively by data scientists for analytics and machine learning engineers for running experiments and managing workflows.

4 DATA, EVALUATION METHODOLOGY, AND MEASURES

4.1 Internal Benchmark

Benchmarking and evaluation which are essential tools for guiding model improvements through better training data selection, prompt engineering and supervised fine-tuning. Internal benchmarking is especially vital for understanding the performance of the current models, comparing different models (large versus small, catch-all models versus expert models), and even catching future regressions in production deployments of models. While external data sets such as Spider [11], Geo Query [15] exist for benchmarking general SQL completion, Spider [11] contains annotations from 11 college students. For problems like SQL completion, State-Of-The-Art (SOTA) benchmarking does not even exist, which makes it more difficult to benchmark these applications. Typically, a benchmarking exercise constitutes two primary components: ground truth data, metrics.

Benchmarking comprises two primary components: ground truth data and metrics. Ground truth data can be human curated or can be generated programmatically. In both cases, the dataset quality is of utmost importance. To obtain human-generated dataset, we employ human annotators (preferably, domain experts) to curate and annotate datasets with the appropriate labels, responses, etc. While this is of higher quality, it is also resource-intensive. To programmatically obtain ground truth data, we apply heuristics as well as simple machine learning models to curate data sets. Programmatic datasets are of lower quality compared to human-generated datasets, however, scalable and less resource consuming.

To curate our benchmark, named SeqComp, we started with a partial held-out dataset from the SqlComposeSA fine tuning data, and randomly cut-off a part of the queries (both consisting of a single line and multi lines) starting from specific trigger characters (e.g., whitespaces, comma, parenthesis). We also categorized each data point by the length of the queries, *i.e.* Small, Medium, and Large, and the complexity of the queries. To classify the queries we defined query complexity levels inspired by Spider [11] where we classify SQL keywords such as "SELECT", "FROM", and "WHERE" into *easy*, keywords such as "JOIN", "GROUP BY", "HAVING", and "ORDER BY" into *medium*, keywords such as "UNION", "EXCEPT", "INTERSECT", and "LIMIT" into *hard*, and keywords such as "WITH", "CASE", "IF", and "COALESCE" into *extra hard* complexity levels. Regarding the length of the queries, we defined *Small*, *Medium*, and *Large* based on the third quantiles of the dataset. Then, we randomly selected a subset of the dataset which forms a uniform distribution of all query lengths and complexity levels resulting in a balanced SeqComp dataset of 15,256 data points.

Metrics help us track the performance of various solutions against the ground truth data. There exist a plethora of offline metrics such as Exact Match (EM), BLEU score, Levenshtein edit distance, ROUGE score that evaluate the performance of translation systems. Further, they can be extended to measure any system that generates text. While the conservative metrics are standard for translation and other text and code generation applications, accomplishing a data task using SQL can be done in an infinite number of ways by querying different tables and columns. Therefore, there is a compelling need for domain-specific metrics such as “containment” or “Table Match” to better understand the usefulness of generated SQL query. To evaluate SqlComposeSA, we created our SeqComp SQL completion benchmark, and measured a series of standard text and code generation metrics as well as defining SQL-specific metrics.

4.2 Evaluation Method

To evaluate SqlComposeSA, SqlComposeFIM, and Llama capabilities in predicting SQL completions, we ran them against the SeqComp benchmark. More specifically, we ask the models to predict the masked part of a given SQL query, such as the “target” in Figure 3, having the query texts before and after the masked target as their input. We evaluate each model in two modes of single-line, where the model is expected to only complete the query until the end of the first line of the masked target, and multi-line, where the model is expected to complete the whole masked target. We then measure the following metrics:

- Exact Match (EM) is a simple but strict metric that evaluates how often the generated SQL is exactly the same as the masked portion.
- BLEU Score is a ratio measuring the average number of n-grams between the masked portion and the generated SQL.
- Containment Score (CS) measures to what extent the predicted completion contains the same SQL keywords as the masked target, such as WHERE clauses, predicates, joins, group, orderby.
- Table Match Score (TMS) is a binary score that measures whether the predicted completion contains the same table names as the masked target. This is important to understand how often the models hallucinate table information.

4.3 Evaluation methodology for use in production

We used a mixed methods approach [16] to evaluate SqlCompose in production, collecting usage data and feedback comments.

Our rollout strategy for SqlCompose consists of gradual deployment in waves of randomly selected user cohorts. Within each wave, we rolled it out to increments of 25% of the developer population until we enable it for 100% of developers. The rollout was completed after four weeks in the fall of 2023.

We report how many suggestions are accepted by engineers and what proportion of SQL code is written by SqlCompose. We instrumented telemetry to track various events in the SQL authoring tool such as displaying a suggestion inline, accepting or rejecting a suggestion, and the length of accepted suggestions. In total, our large-scale deployment resulted in SqlCompose making 4.5 million

suggestions. 16 thousand distinct developers have seen at least one SqlCompose suggestion. We only count suggestions that were displayed for at least 750 milliseconds to ensure that developers were exposed to a suggestion and had a chance to see and comprehend it [1].

Our outcome measures are the acceptance rate of suggestions and the percentage of code typed using SqlCompose. These measures have been used in prior work, with, for example, Google reporting that 3% of the code typed by engineers was from their AI [17].

While we do not use a formal thematic or grounded theory research methodology to understand user feedback, we provide examples of both negative and positive feedback. We have used this feedback to incrementally improve SqlCompose. We also extract overarching themes from the feedback. Future work is necessary to systematically understand the user experience of AI-assisted SQL editing.

5 RESULTS

5.1 RQ 1. Public Llama

How well does the a public model generate SQL code?

Our goal is to understand how well LLMs work on SQL, which is a declarative language. To establish a baseline model at Meta, we evaluate how well the public Llama [6] performs at autocompleting SQL queries.

Llama is an open-sourced model trained on publicly available data. We evaluated it against our internal benchmark, described in Section 4.1, for both single-line and multi-line SQL completion tasks. For more details on the evaluation methodology and execution refer to Section 4.2.

In Table 1, we see Llama’s performance in both single-line and multi-line SQL completion tasks. For Llama we see an exact match, BLEU, containment, and table match of 29%, 53%, 66%, and 12% for single line. The corresponding values for multi-line are 0%, 12%, 57%, and 26%, respectively. These results are comparable with prior work examining imperative languages [1].

As shown in Table 1, Llama is able to accurately predict the single-line completion of a small portion of the SQL queries in our internal benchmark. For multi-line, Llama was not able to correctly predict any of the SQL queries in our benchmark, as multi-line completion is a more challenging task which requires accurate table and column names beyond SQL keywords. Additionally, it is not able to predict the table names in many SQL queries of our internal benchmark, *i.e.* only 12% in single-line and 26% in multi-line completions. Note that, single-line completions in our benchmark contain less number of completions with a table name in them. more specifically, since the model is asked to complete only a partial line of a SQL query, that specific line might not be the line containing the table name in the SQL query. Therefore, in multi-line completions the model is presented with more opportunity to predict the table names.

The results for Llama represent a baseline performance for a model as it has not been trained on our internal data, and hence, it is not familiar with the internal SQL queries, coding styles, and table names.

5.2 RQ 2. SqlComposeSA

How important is fine-tuning on table schemas?

To evaluate the impact of fine-tuning in SQL completion task, we fine-tuned SqlComposeSA on first-party data and code at Meta. LLMs notoriously hallucinate, and in this case, they especially hallucinate table and column names. Therefore, we also fine-tune SqlComposeSA on internal table schema including table and column names. We evaluate the fine-tuned model, *i.e.* SqlComposeSA, against our internal benchmark, described in Section 4.1, and measure the same set of metrics as described in Section 4.2.

In Table 1, we see the detailed results of SqlComposeSA’s performance in single-line and multi-line SQL completion tasks compared to those of Llama, in terms of percentage points (pp) difference. For SqlComposeSA we see an exact match, BLEU, containment, and table match of 48%, 69%, 78%, 13% for single line. The corresponding values for multi-line are 0%, 24%, 77%, and 62%, respectively, representing a substantial pp increase over public Llama.

SqlComposeSA outperforms Llama in both single-line and multi-line SQL completions, except for EM in multi-line which shows that SqlComposeSA is not able to correctly predict any of the multi-line SQL completions either. However, SqlComposeSA’s accuracy in predicting the correct table name has significantly improved with a fine-tuning on table schemas, *i.e.* 36 percentage points increased in multi-line. As a result, fine-tuning the model on the first-party data and code significantly improves the performance of SQL completion in our internal benchmark.

5.3 RQ 3. SqlComposeFIM

How well does a fill-in-the-middle (FIM) model perform?

SQL authoring is often not linear or sequential. When authoring long queries, it is common for developers to jump around nested sub-queries and common table expressions (CTEs), such that information in the suffix becomes just as important as information in the prefix, *i.e.* they Fill In the Middle (FIM).

SqlComposeFIM is trained on the first-party data and code with FIM objective where the model consumes bidirectional contexts of the code and is asked to fill in the middle. See Section 2.5 for more details of the SqlComposeFIM’s development. To evaluate the impact of the FIM training we evaluated SqlComposeFIM against our internal benchmark and compared its results with SqlComposeSA.

In Table 1, we see the detailed results of SqlComposeFIM’s performance in SQL completion in both single-line and multi-line modes compared to those of SqlComposeSA in terms of percentage points (pp) difference. For SqlComposeFIM we see an exact match, BLEU, containment, and table match of 50%, 69%, 78%, 23% for single line. The corresponding values for multi-line are 20%, 59%, 82%, and 75%, respectively. The improvement in single line is mostly contained to better table match percentages over SqlComposeSA, the multi-line improvement is dramatic, increasing from 0% exact matches to 20%. Furthermore, SqlComposeFIM suggests the correct table 75% of the time.

Table 1: Outcome metrics for each model and the percentage point (pp) change among models. SqlComposeSA performs well on single-line completions. On single-line SqlComposeFIM performs similar to SqlComposeSA only making significant improvement on TMS. However, for multi-line predictions, only SqlComposeFIM is capable of making high quality suggestions.

Single line	Llama	SqlComposeSA	vs Llama	SqlComposeFIM	vs Llama	vs SqlComposeSA
EM	29 %	48 %	19 pp	50 %	21 pp	1 pp
BLEU	53 %	69 %	16 pp	69 %	17 pp	1 pp
CS	66 %	78 %	12 pp	78 %	12 pp	0 pp
TMS	12 %	13 %	1 pp	23 %	11 pp	10 pp
Multi-line	Llama	SqlComposeSA	vs Llama	SqlComposeFIM	vs Llama	vs SqlComposeSA
EM	0 %	0 %	0 pp	20 %	20 pp	20 pp
BLEU	12 %	24 %	12 pp	59 %	47 pp	35 pp
CS	57 %	77 %	19 pp	82 %	25 pp	6 pp
TMS	26 %	62 %	36 pp	75 %	48 pp	13 pp

Table 2: SqlCompose Weekly Active Users by Job Family

Job Family	Weekly Active Users
Software Engineering	9,120
Data Science	1,690
Data Engineering	1,260
Production Engineering	560
Other	3,060

SqlComposeFIM outperforms SqlComposeSA in both single-line and multi-line SQL completion tasks. More specifically, we see a significant lift in multi-line completions, *i.e.* an increase of 20 pp in EM from 0% in SqlComposeSA. Note that EM is the most restrictive metric and it is exceedingly difficult to achieve in multi-line completions, as they include longer responses and more chance of failure.

(continued from above) Additionally, SqlComposeFIM is able to predict correct table names in 75% of the multi-line completions which highlights the necessity of consuming the bidirectional context, *i.e.* the suffix as well as the prefix in a SQL query.

5.4 RQ 4. Adoption and Feedback

How is SqlCompose used in practice?

SqlCompose has enjoyed a wide and consistent adoption among employees at Meta. It peaks at approximately 8,100 Daily Active Users (DAU) and 15,700 Weekly Active Users (WAU), where active users are those that accept suggestions consistently.

In the first quarter of 2024, the system made over 8 million suggestions at a rate of approximately 680,000 suggestions per week. On average, users accepted 21% of the suggestions that were shown for more than 750 milliseconds. This makes up over 50 million characters of SQL and represents almost 6% of all the SQL authored at Meta.

While acceptance rate helps us understand the likeability of SqlCompose and can serve as a proxy to suggestion accuracy, it can be gamed easily. We propose a new metric named Characters accepted Per Opportunity (CPO) [18]. An opportunity is any editing action in the editor that could trigger a suggestion. CPO allows us to track the throughput of accepted suggestions in a normalized way. It is more robust than simple acceptance rate because it also takes into account the length of accepted suggestions and cannot be affected by simply showing less and/or trivial suggestions. The system records a CPO of 2.2.

Week-over-week product retention, which is the fraction of weekly active users who were also active in the previous week, for SqlCompose is 80%. Opt-out rate, which is the number of users that disabled SqlCompose voluntarily. The opt-out rate of SqlCompose currently ranges around 0.3%.

5.5 User sentiment and feedback

At Meta, developers are encouraged to post their feedback in a tool-specific feedback group. The developers are generally vocal and provide feedback despite the feedback being publicly visible to others, including the developers of SqlCompose. We use the user feedback to keep track of sentiment, learn about UX and suggestion accuracy issues, and identify bugs.

5.5.1 Favorable scenarios for SqlCompose. The scenarios for which SqlCompose was able to add the biggest value includes (but is not limited to), completing tedious or repetitive SQL clauses, boilerplate coding, helping eliminate the need to remember difficult SQL syntax. We also noticed auxiliary benefits reported by the developers that SqlCompose helped them in filling out the natural language parts of the query (e.g., column alias names or inline comments).

Many developers highlighted the fact that the suggestions are accurate. Also, we received feedback about how nicely SqlCompose navigates the precision versus recall problem by not showing suggestions too often, which is reflected in the metrics we shared in Section 5.4. Also, we noticed that SqlCompose is being received by occasional and experienced SQL developers alike. We list some anecdotes below.

“The other day it literally wrote the exact query I wanted, which was one with a window function which I always

forget the syntax for. For me as a PM, who only digs into data every now and then, it really makes it more efficient as I don't have to pull up the Presto SQL documentation to see how functions are working all the time."

This summarizes the productive experience a product manager who does not author SQL frequently.

"I just wanted to give a quick shout out that inline completions has been getting really good and I've personally seen the improvements as someone who writes a lot of queries. Today, I was writing a comment, and I literally only wrote one word and it somehow telepathically knew exactly what I wanted to say, and auto complete was great. Also, queries auto completion has been getting noticeably better with picking up patterns, assigning date stamps, writing filters, etc."

Here, the feedback summarizes the delightful and productive experience a data engineer who authors SQL regularly had with SqlCompose.

Another fascinating trend we noticed in these feedback items is, developers tend to be fine with reworking the suggested queries per their needs as long as SqlCompose helps them get started. As SQL development is iterative, the biggest time savings and productivity boost comes from the fact that SqlCompose helps developers bootstrap and iterate on complex SQL queries without needing to navigate clunky SQL syntax, semantics, and documentation.

"SqlCompose saved me hours of SQL iteration today: I feel like in its current state, the value of SqlCompose to me is already there. The answers in here aren't exactly right, but they are close enough to have saved me a lot of smashing my face into daiquery which is what usually happens when I start doing some new data analysis. SqlCompose instantly got me from 0 to 10 to about 90%, and I was able to do the rest on my own."

Additionally, many developers provided unsolicited feedback about how helpful SqlCompose has been with respect to saving several hours of their time and contributing towards bringing a positive developer experience at Meta.

"I just wanted to drop a line and say, I got to use this feature today. The auto-complete and suggestions are a fantastic use of generative AI."

"This query would have taken me several hours, but with SqlCompose, it saved me a significant amount of time. This is awesome!"

5.5.2 Unfavorable scenarios. After analyzing negative feedback, we found that common problems themed around hallucinating table names, issues related to UX such as SqlCompose competing with traditional inline completions, etc.

A developer passed the following feedback about SqlCompose:

"I was playing around to see if it could write queries for me in SQL and it looks like it is hallucinating columns that don't exist on the tables."

"I attempted to use SqlCompose to help with writing a daiquery query since I am bad at SQL, but it seems to have no knowledge of any of the tables"

While we reduced hallucinations significantly (as reported in Table 1), it is hard to solve it completely as tables keep getting moved, renamed, deleted, and created continuously. The scale at which these operations happen at Meta amplifies the complexity further. Our offline tests shows that table names are correct around 75% of the time.

Additionally, SQL is a language where SELECT (and the column list) is authored before writing the table names many times. This makes the problem even more difficult. To alleviate that, we train the models on schema information and the model tend to perform significantly better in its ability to pass subsequent suggestions once the developer writes the FROM clause and the table names.

Another developer expressed their negative experience about overloading of the tab key for both indentation and accepting suggestions:

"I have a distinct style of formatting my SQL queries that I've been using for 5+ years and will likely never change, as it makes SQL much more readable for me. As part of this I utilize the tab key extensively for indenting + spacing. As you can probably imagine, this makes tab-autocomplete a frustrating experience for me, especially when it triggers really quickly."

Coexisting with the traditional auto complete system is a challenge faced by many AI-assisted code authoring solutions [1]. Developers tend to have strong preferences around UX, keyboard shortcuts, and the stylistic aspects. It takes time, great amount of user education, and novel and innovative ways if presenting AI suggestions to make the experience enjoyable for everyone.

SqlCompose has is used on a weekly basis by over 10k users including data scientists and software engineers, less than 1% of users have disabled SqlCompose. We use the feedback from users to improve SqlCompose. Interesting positive themes include completing tedious or repetitive SQL clauses, suggesting boilerplate coding, and help in eliminate the need to remember difficult SQL syntax. The most significant negative themes was table and column name hallucinations, which has been reduced with the release of SqlComposeFIM. Other negative themes include interfering with traditional auto-complete system and changes in the keyboard shortcuts and the stylistic aspects.

6 THREATS TO VALIDITY

6.1 Generalizability

Drawing general conclusions from empirical studies in software engineering is difficult because any process depends on a potentially large number of relevant context variables. The analyses in the present paper were performed at Meta, and it is possible that results might not hold true elsewhere. However, our study does cover a very wide swath of software engineering. The software systems covers millions of lines of code and 10's of thousands of developers who are both collocated and working at multiple locations across the world. We also cover a wide range of domains from user facing social network products and virtual and augmented reality projects

to software engineering infrastructure, such as calendar, task, and release engineering tooling.

In Sections 2 and 4 we provide detailed steps and descriptions of the types of data we used in our model. We look forward to reading how other researchers use LLMs to assist in SQL composition.

6.2 Construct Validity

To evaluate our models in offline tests, we used standard metrics such as exact match and BLEU scores. However, given that SQL is declarative and is often not written in a sequential manner, we introduced two new metrics (see Section 4). The Containment Score (CM), which determines how many SQL clauses are correct. We also introduced the Table Match Score. A hallucinated table name will drastically reduce the quality of the SQL and impact column names. These metrics need further validation and we hope that other researchers will build upon our SQL specific measures.

6.3 Internal Validity

Unlike a traditional experiment, we also have to produce and release a running product. While our offline experimental results and benchmark are on consistent dataset, our rollout is an ongoing process without a constrained timeframe. Instead of a traditional research method, we monitor the feedback and usage results on a daily basis. New features are gradually rolled-out to avoid any regressions using an A/B test methodology [19].

7 LITERATURE AND DISCUSSION

To the best of our knowledge, almost all published work in the domain of authoring SQL using LLMs is focused on the problem of converting natural language to SQL queries (Text2SQL) [3–5, 20], whereas the focus of this work is on autocompleting SQL queries as authors type them out. While related, the problems are different and need different approaches. For instance, (a) for autocompleting SQL queries, the LLM must be trained on a large number of SQL queries instead of text-sql pairs, (b) the latency constraints are much tighter for an autocompletion tool compared to natural language querying, and (c) the model must be able to pick up context from after the cursor unlike the relatively straight-forward left-to-right generation in the typical Text2SQL setting.

Text2SQL: Early works did not handle generalization to unseen databases well, later works such as RAT-SQL did attempt to generalize to unseen database schemas but assumed the schemas are small enough that they can be encoded at query time, and furthermore assumed that the system knows which database to look at [21].

Most works assume small database schema or the schema is known at runtime, which is not the case for us [21]. text2sql assumes the model is aware of the intent of the author, whereas in completion even the intent is not clear in most of the cases. makes things like encoding schema in the query, or using PICARD (constrained decoding) hard. Even if these were known in a subset of cases, latency constraints make it hard to use them. Some works also use the DB content which cannot work for us due to the sheer number of dbs/tables and size of the data, and the latency constraints. Further complication in our setting is there may be multiple tables that may answer the user’s question which makes evaluation also challenging.

Code completion: While there is a large body of work around code autocompletion with LLMs[22–26], there has been limited deployment of these in large industrial environments [2, 17, 27–29]. These works have been effective at generating code in programming languages. For example, Nguyen et al. [30] used 33 LeetCode questions to create queries for Copilot in four different programming languages. They found that Copilot’s Java suggestions have the highest correctness score (57%) while JavaScript is the lowest (27%).

Although there are blog posts explaining to developers how to use GitHub Copilot with SQL [31, 32], there is no description of the model and no evaluation of how well it performs on SQL. Our paper illustrates three main challenges that warrant special treatment for SQL autocompletion: (i) its declarative nature coupled with its ties to a data warehouse, (ii) exacerbated impact of LLM hallucinations, and (iii) atypical coding styles (CTEs, non-linear authoring) when developers write SQL queries. In this light, our work is the first to develop specialized models for AI-assisted SQL authoring at scale with comprehensive evaluation.

8 CONCLUSION AND CONTRIBUTIONS

Our major contribution is to show how well LLMs can work in the context of SQL. Our specific contributions that provide answer to our research questions are the following:

- (1) RQ 1. Public Llama: We see an exact match, BLEU, containment, and table match of 29%, 53%, 66%, and 12% for single line. The corresponding values for multi-line are 0%, 12%, 57%, and 26%, respectively. These results are comparable with prior work examining imperative languages like python [1].
- (2) RQ 2. SqlComposeSA: We see an exact match, BLEU, containment, and table match of 48%, 69%, 78%, 13% for single line. The corresponding values for multi-line are 0%, 24%, 77%, and 62%, respectively. These results represent a substantial improvement over the public Llama model.
- (3) RQ 3. SqlComposeFIM: We see an exact match, BLEU, containment, and table match of 50%, 69%, 78%, 23% for single line. The corresponding values for multi-line are 20%, 59%, 82%, and 75%, respectively. The improvement in single line is mostly contained to better table match percentages over SqlComposeSA, the multi-line improvement is dramatic, increasing from 0% exact matches to 20%. Furthermore, SqlComposeFIM suggests the correct table 75% of the time.
- (4) RQ 4. Rollout and Feedback: SqlCompose has is used on a weekly basis by over 10k users including data scientists and software engineers, less than 1% of users have disabled SqlCompose. We use the feedback from users to improve SqlCompose. Interesting positive themes include completing tedious or repetitive SQL clauses, suggesting boilerplate coding, and help in eliminate the need to remember difficult SQL syntax. The most significant negative themes was table and column name hallucinations, which has been reduced with the release of SqlComposeFIM. Other negative themes include interfering with traditional auto-complete system and changes in the keyboard shortcuts and the stylistic aspects.

We anticipate that other researchers will build upon our techniques, models, and evaluation metrics to ensure LLMs continue to accelerate and assist in writing SQL.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We would like to thank Charlie Regan, Kristian Kristensen, Daniel Cheng, Kelly Hirano, Bhaskar Mehta, Barak Yagour, Killian Murphy, Aparna Ramani, Dinkar Pataballa, Shahin Sefati, Michael Jiang, Emily Yeh, Kamran Asif, Peyton Foucht, Mariel Carter, Imad Ahmad, Gabriel Synnaeve, Baptiste Rozière, Jeremy Reizenstein, Sten Sootla, Maria Lomeli, and Michael Bolin for their help and support with this work.

REFERENCES

- [1] V. Murali, C. Maddila, I. Ahmad, M. Bolin, D. Cheng, N. Ghorbani, R. Fernandez, and N. Nagappan, "Codecompose: A large-scale industrial deployment of ai-assisted code authoring," 2023.
- [2] (Accessed 2023) Amazon codewhisperer. Amazon. [Online]. Available: <https://aws.amazon.com/codewhisperer>
- [3] X. Zhang, F. Yin, G. Ma, B. Ge, and W. Xiao, "M-SQL: Multi-task representation learning for single-table text2sql generation," *IEEE Access*, vol. 8, pp. 43 156–43 167, 2020.
- [4] Z. Li, X. Wang, J. Zhao, S. Yang, G. Du, X. Hu, B. Zhang, Y. Ye, Z. Li, R. Zhao *et al.*, "PET-SQL: A prompt-enhanced two-stage text-to-sql framework with cross-consistency," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.09732*, 2024.
- [5] B. Zhang, Y. Ye, G. Du, X. Hu, Z. Li, S. Yang, C. H. Liu, R. Zhao, Z. Li, and H. Mao, "Benchmarking the text-to-sql capability of large language models: A comprehensive evaluation," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.02951*, 2024.
- [6] B. Rozière, J. Gehring, F. Gloeckle, S. Sootla, I. Gat, X. E. Tan, Y. Adi, J. Liu, T. Remez, J. Rapin, A. Kozhevnikov, I. Evtimov, J. Bitton, M. Bhatt, C. C. Ferrer, A. Grattafiori, W. Xiong, A. Défossez, J. Copet, F. Azhar, H. Touvron, L. Martin, N. Usunier, T. Scialom, and G. Synnaeve, "Code llama: Open foundation models for code," 2023.
- [7] A. Ziegler, E. Kalliamvakou, X. A. Li, A. Rice, D. Rifkin, S. Simister, G. Sittampalam, and E. Aftandilian, "Productivity assessment of neural code completion," in *Proceedings of the 6th ACM SIGPLAN International Symposium on Machine Programming*, ser. MAPS 2022. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2022, p. 21–29. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3520312.3534864>
- [8] R. Li, L. B. Allal, Y. Zi, N. Muennighoff, D. Kocetkov, C. Mou, M. Marone, C. Akiki, J. Li, J. Chim, Q. Liu, E. Zheltonozhskii, T. Y. Zhuo, T. Wang, O. Dehaene, M. Davaadorj, J. Lamy-Poirier, J. Monteiro, O. Shliazhko, N. Gontier, N. Meade, A. Zebaze, M.-H. Yee, L. K. Umapathi, J. Zhu, B. Lipkin, M. Oblukolov, Z. Wang, R. Murthy, J. Stillerman, S. S. Patel, D. Abulkhanov, M. Zocca, M. Dey, Z. Zhang, N. Fahmy, U. Bhattacharyya, W. Yu, S. Singh, S. Luccioni, P. Villegas, M. Kunakov, F. Zhdanov, M. Romero, T. Lee, N. Timor, J. Ding, C. Schlesinger, H. Schoelkopf, J. Ebert, T. Dao, M. Mishra, A. Gu, J. Robinson, C. J. Anderson, B. Dolan-Gavitt, D. Contractor, S. Reddy, D. Fried, D. Bahdanau, Y. Jernite, C. M. Ferrandis, S. Hughes, T. Wolf, A. Guha, L. von Werra, and H. de Vries, "StarCoder: may the source be with you!" 2023.
- [9] D. Fried, A. Aghajanyan, J. Lin, S. Wang, E. Wallace, F. Shi, R. Zhong, W. tau Yih, L. Zettlemoyer, and M. Lewis, "InCoder: A generative model for code infilling and synthesis," 2023.
- [10] A. Aghajanyan, B. Huang, C. Ross, V. Karpukhin, H. Xu, N. Goyal, D. Okhonko, M. Joshi, G. Ghosh, M. Lewis, and L. Zettlemoyer, "CM3: A causal masked multi-modal model of the internet," 2022.
- [11] T. Yu, R. Zhang, K. Yang, M. Yasunaga, D. Wang, Z. Li, J. Ma, I. Li, Q. Yao, S. 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*, 2018.
- [12] H. Touvron, L. Martin, K. Stone, P. Albert, A. Almahairi, Y. Babaei, N. Bashlykov, S. Batra, P. Bhargava, S. Bhosale, D. Bikel, L. Blecher, C. C. Ferrer, M. Chen, G. Cucurull, D. Esiobu, J. Fernandes, J. Fu, W. Fu, B. Fuller, C. Gao, V. Goswami, N. Goyal, A. Hartshorn, S. Hosseini, R. Hou, H. Inan, M. Kardas, V. Kerkez, M. Khabsa, I. Kloumann, A. Korenev, P. S. Koura, M.-A. Lachaux, T. Lavril, J. Lee, D. Liskovich, Y. Lu, Y. Mao, X. Martinet, T. Mihaylov, P. Mishra, I. Molybog, Y. Nie, A. Poulton, J. Reizenstein, R. Rungta, K. Saladi, A. Schelten, R. Silva, E. M. Smith, R. Subramanian, X. E. Tan, B. Tang, R. Taylor, A. Williams, J. X. Kuan, P. Xu, Z. Yan, I. Zarov, Y. Zhang, A. Fan, M. Kambadur, S. Narang, A. Rodriguez, R. Stojnic, S. Edunov, and T. Scialom, "Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models," 2023.
- [13] (Accessed 2024) Presto. [Online]. Available: <https://prestodb.io/>
- [14] M. Bavarian, H. Jun, N. Tezak, J. Schulman, C. McLeavey, J. Twarek, and M. Chen, "Efficient training of language models to fill in the middle," 2022.
- [15] "GeoQuery Benchmark," 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://paperswithcode.com/sota/sql-parsing-on-geoquery>
- [16] J. W. Creswell and V. L. P. Clark, *Designing and conducting mixed methods research*. Sage publications, 2017.
- [17] (Accessed 2021) Ml enhanced code completion. Google. [Online]. Available: <https://ai.googleblog.com/2022/07/ml-enhanced-code-completion-improves.html>
- [18] (Accessed 2024) The golden metrics: Characters per opportunity and percentage code written. [Online]. Available: <https://codeium.com/blog/golden-metrics-characters-per-opportunity-percentage-code-written>
- [19] Q. Shan, D. Sukhdeo, Q. Huang, S. Rogers, L. Chen, E. Paradi, P. C. Rigby, and N. Nagappan, "Using nudges to accelerate code reviews at scale," ser. ESEC/FSE 2022. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2022, p. 472–482. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3540250.3549104>
- [20] V. Zhong, C. Xiong, and R. Socher, "Seq2sql: Generating structured queries from natural language using reinforcement learning," 2017.
- [21] B. Wang, R. Shin, X. Liu, O. Polozov, and M. Richardson, "RAT-SQL: Relation-aware schema encoding and linking for text-to-sql parsers," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1911.04942*, 2019.
- [22] M. Bruch, M. Monperrus, and M. Mezini, "Learning from examples to improve code completion systems," in *Proceedings of the 7th joint meeting of the European software engineering conference and the ACM SIGSOFT symposium on The foundations of software engineering (ESEC/FSE '09)*, 2009.
- [23] R. Robles and M. Lanza, "How program history can improve code completion," in *2008 23rd IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering*, 2008, pp. 317–326.
- [24] S. Proksch, J. Lerch, and M. Mezini, "Intelligent code completion with bayesian networks," *ACM Transactions on Software Engineering and Methodology (TOSEM)*, vol. 25, no. 1, 12 2015.
- [25] W. Zhou, S. Kim, V. Murali, and G. A. Aye, "Improving code autocompletion with transfer learning," in *2022 IEEE/ACM 44th International Conference on Software Engineering: Software Engineering in Practice (ICSE-SEIP)*, 2022, pp. 161–162.
- [26] S. Kim, J. Zhao, Y. Tian, and S. Chandra, "Code prediction by feeding trees to transformers," in *2021 IEEE/ACM 43rd International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE)*, 2021, pp. 150–162.
- [27] (Accessed 2021) Microsoft intelliCode. Microsoft. [Online]. Available: <https://visualstudio.microsoft.com/services/intellicode>
- [28] (Accessed 2021) Github copilot. Github. [Online]. Available: <https://github.com/features/copilot>
- [29] O. Dunay, D. Cheng, A. Tait, P. Thakkar, P. C. Rigby, A. Chiu, I. Ahmad, A. Ganesan, C. Maddila, V. Murali, A. Tayyebi, and N. Nagappan, "Multi-line ai-assisted code authoring," 2024.
- [30] N. Nguyen and S. Nadi, "An empirical evaluation of github copilot's code suggestions," in *Proceedings of the 19th International Conference on Mining Software Repositories (MSR '22)*, 2022.
- [31] S. Basak. (2023) Github copilot for sql developers: Turbocharge your sql development workflow. Microsoft. [Online]. Available: <https://techcommunity.microsoft.com/t5/azure-sql-blog/github-copilot-for-sql-developers-turbocharge-your-sql/ba-p/3875915>
- [32] D. Skwiers-Koballa. (2023) Introducing github copilot for azure data studio. Microsoft. [Online]. Available: <https://techcommunity.microsoft.com/t5/azure-sql-blog/introducing-github-copilot-for-azure-data-studio/ba-p/3829511>