

Ar-Spider: Text-to-SQL in Arabic

Saleh Almohaimeed
University of Central Florida
Orlando, Florida, USA
sa247216@ucf.edu

Mansour Al Ghanim
University of Central Florida
Orlando, Florida, USA
mansour.alghanim@ucf.edu

Saad Almohaimeed
University of Central Florida
Orlando, Florida, USA
sa583575@ucf.edu

Liqiang Wang
University of Central Florida
Orlando, Florida, USA
lwang@cs.ucf.edu

ABSTRACT

In Natural Language Processing (NLP), one of the most important tasks is text-to-SQL semantic parsing, which focuses on enabling users to interact with the database in a more natural manner. In recent years, text-to-SQL has made significant progress, but most were English-centric. In this paper, we introduce Ar-Spider¹, the first Arabic cross-domain text-to-SQL dataset. Due to the unique nature of the language, two major challenges have been encountered, namely schema linguistic and SQL structural challenges. In order to handle these issues and conduct the experiments, we adopt two baseline models LGESQL [4] and S²SQL [12], both of which are tested with two cross-lingual models to alleviate the effects of schema linguistic and SQL structure linking challenges. The baselines demonstrate decent single-language performance on our Arabic text-to-SQL dataset, Ar-Spider, achieving 62.48% for S²SQL and 65.57% for LGESQL, only 8.79% below the highest results achieved by the baselines when trained in English dataset. To achieve better performance on Arabic text-to-SQL, we propose the context similarity relationship (CSR) approach, which results in a significant increase in the overall performance of about 1.52% for S²SQL and 1.06% for LGESQL and closes the gap between Arabic and English languages to 7.73%.

CCS CONCEPTS

• **Information systems** → **Structured Query Language**; • **Computing methodologies** → **Information extraction**.

ACM Reference Format:

Saleh Almohaimeed, Saad Almohaimeed, Mansour Al Ghanim, and Liqiang Wang. 2024. Ar-Spider: Text-to-SQL in Arabic. In *Proceedings of ACM SAC Conference (SAC'24)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, Article 4, 7 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3605098.3636065>

1 INTRODUCTION

The semantic parsing task aims to transform a natural language (NL) sentence into a formal representation of its meaning, which could be a logical form or structured query language (SQL). This task has various applications, including text-to-SQL [21], task-oriented

dialogue [28], and code generation [7]. In this paper, we focus on text-to-SQL, where numerous applications and benchmarks have been developed in English language. However, only a few are designed for non-English languages [17][18][13][2][10], and none are designed for Arabic speakers. Since SQL is a universal semantic representation, it is worthwhile to study it in languages other than English. However, different languages may pose different challenges to the semantic parsing models. Considering the Arabic language for example, there are two grand challenges that need to be addressed: (1) Schema linguistic challenge: the schema tables and columns of the relational databases are represented in English, which makes it more challenging to map NL words in Arabic into database entities in English. (2) SQL structural challenge: the SQL programming language increases the difficulty of mapping NL words written in Arabic letters to SQL clauses and operators.

To extend the text-to-SQL into cross-language domain and address the two aforementioned challenges, we design Ar-Spider, the first Arabic cross-domain Text-to-SQL dataset for the semantic parsing task. Specifically, we create this Arabic version by manually translating the English Spider [26] dataset into Arabic. The dataset consists of 9691 questions with corresponding SQL queries over 166 databases, translated by two qualified translators and verified by three professional graduate computer science students.

We conducted an empirical evaluation by using two state-of-the-art baseline models, LGESQL [4] and S²SQL [12]. We extend the models with two cross-lingual pre-training language encoders mBERT [8], and XLM-R [6]. The cross-lingual models mitigate the effects of schema linguistic and partially handle SQL structural challenges.

To further improve the performance, we introduce a novel approach, which establishes **Context Similarity Relationships (CSR)** to the question-schema graph encoder in such a way that words from different languages are mapped to one another based on their context similarity in the embedding space.

Regardless of whether the inputs are encoded using mBERT or XLM-R cross-lingual models, our CSR approach improves LGESQL [4] and S²SQL [12] models. Specifically, a performance of 66.63% was achieved by LGESQL + XLM-R + CSR, outperforming the highest baseline of 65.57% achieved by LGESQL + XLM-R. Furthermore, LGESQL + mBERT + CSR, S²SQL + mBERT + CSR, and S²SQL + XLM-R + CSR all produced better results than those without CSR approach by 0.10%, 2.33%, and 1.52%, respectively.

The contributions of this paper are as follows:

¹Our dataset is available at <https://github.com/sasmohaimeed/Ar-Spider>

SAC'24, April 8 –April 12, 2024, Avila, Spain

© 2024 Copyright held by the owner/author(s). Publication rights licensed to ACM. This is the author's version of the work. It is posted here for your personal use. Not for redistribution. The definitive Version of Record was published in *Proceedings of ACM SAC Conference (SAC'24)*, <https://doi.org/10.1145/3605098.3636065>.

- (1) To the best of our knowledge, our Ar-Spider is the first Arabic cross-domain text-to-SQL dataset.
- (2) A series of experiments are conducted on the Ar-Spider using two state-of-the-art models: LGESQL [4] and S²SQL [12], both evaluated with two pre-training cross-lingual language models: mBERT [8] and XLM-R [6].
- (3) We propose a Context Similarity Relationship (CSR) approach to mitigate the effect of the schema linguistic problem by injecting new relationship into the question-schema graph encoder, which increases the performance of the models LGESQL [4] and S²SQL [12].

2 RELATED WORK

The Text-to-SQL semantic parsing has been extensively studied, especially with English datasets such as WikiSQL [29] and Spider [26]. Despite Spider [26] having fewer questions than WikiSQL [29], it covers more complex SQL queries, answers longer questions, and has more tables and databases across different domains. Additionally, the training and testing set of the Spider [26] uses different domains, which ensures model generalization. As a further extension to the Spider [26] dataset, SparC [27] and CoSQL [25] have been released for dialogue-based Text-to-SQL, in which a series of interrelated questions in a single context are handled.

Several attempts have been made to repurpose Spider [26] dataset in other languages. The first attempt is CSpider [17], a Chinese version of Spider [26]. There have been two datasets used in their experiment, one where Spider [26] questions have been translated by professional human translators and the other with machine translation. Results indicate that human translation has a significant advantage over machine translation. Furthermore, the model was tested using two word embedding representations. Cross-lingual embedding is found to be more effective than monolingual embedding, possibly because schema tables and columns are not translated, thus cross-lingual embedding provides a better connection between natural language questions and database columns. Their findings show that professional translators are necessary to adapt English datasets into another language and to test different cross-lingual embedding models with the new dataset.

Three additional versions of the Spider [26] have been made, in Vietnamese [18], Portuguese [13], and Russian [2]. The Vietnamese version [18] include translated questions, database tables and columns, which help their experiment on the monolingual embedding in Vietnamese PhoBERT [19] to outperform the cross-lingual embedding XLM-R [6].

The Portuguese [13] version translates only Spider [26] questions, and demonstrates the usefulness of cross-lingual models such as the m-BART-50 [23] when dealing with languages other than English. It has also been reported that training the model with both English and Portuguese questions at the same time may improve its performance.

In the Russian [2] version, Spider questions were translated only without translating the columns and tables of the database. Similar to CSpider[17], both human translation dataset as well as machine translation dataset are provided. The results indicate that human translation is significantly superior to machine translation. Moreover, similar to the Portuguese finding, combining both Russian

Table 1: Example questions with corresponding SQL queries in Ar-Spider.

Sample 1: applying only one table in one database.

SQL Query

SELECT count(*) FROM products

English Question

Count the number of products.

Translated Arabic Question

احسب عدد المنتجات.

Sample 2: applying multiple tables in one database.

SQL Query

SELECT count(*) , T2.name FROM products AS T1
JOIN manufacturers AS T2 ON T1.Manufacturer =
T2.code GROUP BY T2.name

English Question

How many products are there for each manufacturer?

Translated Arabic Question

كم من المنتجات لكل شركة صناعية؟

and English questions during the training has improved the model performance in two baselines.

The largest attempt was done by [10] where they built a dataset that contains seven languages (English, Chinese, Vietnamese, German, French, Spanish, and Japanese). The questions for the first three languages mentioned are taken from existing datasets [26], [17], [18], respectively. Results indicate that training with all seven languages then testing in one language is more effective than training and testing in only one language.

3 DATASET

The Spider [26] dataset has 10,181 questions separated as training, development, and testing sets. Since the authors did not make the testing set publicly available, we have translated only training and development sets of 9691 questions and ensured that no databases overlap between the two sets. For a more efficient translation, we use GPT 3 [3] to translate the Spider questions into Arabic, then ask professional translators to post-edit them individually. In Section 3.2, we demonstrate how this method speeds up the translation process and increases the diversity of question words. Specifically, two native Arabic speakers specializing in English translation services were involved in such a post-editing, each of them was assigned with 83 databases. In the following step, three graduate computer science students, who are proficient in SQL, read the original English version of the questions, ensure that the post-edit Arabic translation is accurate, and then verify that the Arabic questions are consistent with the SQL query. A sample of the dataset is shown in Table 1.

Table 2: A comparison between the English Spider dataset, and the Arabic version Ar-Spider. #Q denotes the number of questions, #SQL donates the number of distinct SQL queries, #DB donates the number of databases, and #Tables/DB represents the average number of tables per database.

		#Q	#SQL	#DB	#Tables/DB
English	all	10181	5693	200	5.1
Arabic	all	9691	5277	166	5.28
	train	8657	4714	146	5.45
	test	1034	563	20	4.05

Table 3: Comparison of the time to complete the translation process with and without using GPT3 as a machine translation tool. Q refers to question. Sec refers to seconds

Translation process	Sec / Q	600 Q	9691 Q	Word diversity
With GPT3	30	5 hours	80.1 hours	✓
Without GPT3	70	11.7 hour	188 hours	X

3.1 Dataset Statistics

Multiple attempts have been made to adapt the English Spider [26] dataset to other languages [2, 10, 13, 17, 18]. Each of them consists of the same number of questions, SQL queries, and database schemas. The statistics and splitting settings of the Ar-Spider are shown in Table 2.

3.2 Using GPT3 as Translation Model

At the beginning of the translation process, 600 English questions were translated manually without the assistance of any machine translation tools. As a result of following this process, we find that there are two disadvantages. As shown in Table 3, it takes approximately 70 seconds per question to read an English question, translate it into Arabic, and ensure that it aligns with the SQL query. The completion of all 600 questions takes around 11 hours and 42 minutes. Therefore, it will need 188 hours to complete the translation process of the 9691 questions. Alternatively, we replaced the manual translation with machine translation and post-edited the questions. In this way, the process has sped up to 30 seconds per question. Based on our final estimation, it took approximately 80 hours to complete the 9691 questions.

Secondly, despite the fact that two translators have worked on these 600 questions, the questions suffer from the diversity of Arabic words. For example, when translating the sentence "show students name" into Arabic, we always translate "show" as "أعرض". However, there are several other translations that can be used, such as "أظهر", and "أوجد". For this reason, we have used the GPT3 [3] model to translate the questions into Arabic and allowed the translators to make any necessary modifications to the questions after translation. A comparison of our translation process with and without the machine translation model is presented in Table 3.

Moreover, we did not utilize Google NMT [24] for the translation process because GPT3 provides a greater range of words diversity.

In addition, it is necessary to address the question of why the Arabic questions are not simply translated into English prior to the queries being generated without the involvement of a verifiers. GPT3 is a very good translation tool, but there are some questions that it does not ask in the same manner as a native Arabic speaker and there are others for which the context of the question is not recognized. By involving a verifiers who is a native Arabic speakers, we ensure that the essence of the question is preserved and accurately represented in the SQL query. In addition, based on previous research [17] [2], we can conclude that manual translation is more effective than using a machine translation tool.

4 MODELS

When our empirical investigation was conducted, there were over 75 models in the leaderboard of Spider [26]. To select baselines, the following three criteria were considered:

- (1) Some state-of-the-art models did not publish their source code. As a result, these models were not considered during our experiments.
- (2) For better model reusability, it is important to choose models that take into account only the exact match accuracy metrics that are used in our experiment and do not consider other implementations of unrelated metrics.
- (3) It is necessary to integrate other pre-training language models without modifying the overall model structure. Therefore, baselines must be composed of partially independent encoders, architectures, and decoding processes.

Based on the aforementioned criteria, we have selected LGESQL [4] and S²SQL [12] as the most suitable Spider models for this experiment. Both the LGESQL and S²SQL models have a similar encoder-decoder architecture, which consists of three parts, namely input graph, hidden line graph, and output graph modules. S²SQL has added more implementations to the input graph modules in the English Spider [26] version, resulting in a slight increase in performance with the ELECTRA [5] pre-training language model. However, It performs less well when using cross-lingual pre-training models, such as mBERT [8] and XLM-R [6].

During the preprocessing phase, both LGESQL and S²SQL models generate relationships between the graph nodes and store them in relation embedding matrix. LGESQL handles two types of relation structures: **Linking Structure** that connects the tokens in a question to their counterparts in the database schema, and **Schema Structure** that connects the relationships between database schema items (like primary-foreign keys). On the other hand, S²SQL captures the two aforementioned relations as well as the **Question Structure**, which represents the syntactic dependencies between question tokens. In other words, it provides an indication of which words depend on which other words to form meaningful sentences.

4.1 Input Graph Module

Initial embedding of nodes and edges of the graph are provided by the input module, in which the nodes represent question tokens, schema tables, and schema columns, while the edges represent




Figure 1: An illustration of the overall model architecture. There are three types of relations between nodes in the graph. Dot-line represents question-table-cosine-matches or question-column-cosine-matches. Bold-line represents question structure relationships between the nodes of the question tokens. Straight-line indicates schema structure relationships, such as primary and foreign keys. In the figure, the top right subgraph shows how question schema relations were created before CSR.

relationships between nodes. For the LGESQL model, node embedding are represented using either word embedding Glove [20] or pre-training language models such as BERT [9] and ELECTRA [5]. Meanwhile, S²SQL uses only the best-performing pre-training language model ELECTRA. On the other side, the relation edge embedding are retrieved directly from a parameter matrix.

4.2 Hidden Line Graph Module

The hidden line graph module will capture the relational structure between the initially generated node embedding using a relational graph attention network. The node embedding are updated in iterative processes, in which nodes gather and aggregate information from their neighboring nodes based on the attention mechanism. In addition, there is an enhanced line graph that represents the edges between the nodes in the original graph, which allows the model to consider both the importance of the nodes and their edges. Due to the fact that some embedding for different edges might become too similar or coupled during optimization, S²SQL [12] introduces an orthogonality condition that will add a penalty if the embedding become too similar.

4.3 Output Graph Modules

Using a grammar-based syntactic neural decoder, they construct the abstract syntax tree (AST) of the predicted query in depth-first search order. At each decoding step, the output is either an APPLYRULE action that expands the current partially generated

AST, or 2) SELECTTABLE or SELECTCOLUMN actions that select one schema element. In addition, they performed an auxiliary task known as graph pruning, which will assist in distinguishing between relevant and irrelevant schema items.

As a brief summary of the differences between LGESQL and S²SQL, encoding S²SQL integrates syntax dependency among question tokens into the relational graph attention network and introduces a decoupling constraint for generating diverse relation embedding.

5 CSR APPROACH

Schema linking represents one of the major challenges we face in the text-to-SQL task, which involves mapping natural language words into their corresponding schema tables and columns. As shown in the Question-Schema Interaction Graph in Figure 1, the model generates an initial graph that consists of three types of nodes: questions tokens, schema tables, and schema columns. Furthermore, the model will generate many relationships, including linking structure, schema structure, and question structure relationships. For the linking structure relationships in the original English spider [26] dataset, the model will compare each question token character-by-character with each table. When they are exactly similar, as for instance the question token “customers” and the table “customers”, the LGESQL [4] creates a relationship edge between them and name it “question-table-exact-match”. In addition, if they partially match, for example, the question token “store” and the table “store name”, LGESQL will create a relationship edge between them called question-table-partial-match. Furthermore, the same

Table 4: A comparison that shows analysis of different cosine similarity functions results derived from four cross-lingual models. The Arabic words ملك = king, سفر = travel, رجل = man, رقم الهاتف = phone number, هاتف = phone

	King ملك	Travel سفر	Man سفر	Phone number رجل	Phone number رقم الهاتف	Phone number هاتف
mBERT	77.73	54.50	73.58	82.48	82.26	71.89
XLM	68.76	78.45	70.48	65.75	61.53	58.90
SBERT	83.53	85.99	62.64	25.29	91.91	69.51
LASER	86.37	88.44	65.06	61.04	85.16	84.49

procedure will be applied to each question token with each schema column.

For Ar-Spider, a new challenge arises, namely the schema linguistics challenge, in which the question tokens are written in Arabic, while the schema tables and columns are written in English. Thus, a character-by-character comparison of question tokens with schema tables or schema columns will always result in a no-match relationship. To address this issue, we propose a new matching approach called Context Similarity Relationship (CSR). Rather than comparing character by character, we will calculate the cosine similarity between the question tokens and the schema table or column in the embedding space. Those cosine similarity that exceed a certain threshold will be taken into consideration. In our case, the threshold is 78%.

To implement our CSR approach, during preprocessing, we utilized the Language-Agnostic Sentence Representations (LASER) [1] model. The reason we selected LASER over other cross-lingual models is that LASER maps a sentence in any language to a point in a high-dimensional embedding space in such a way that the same statement in any language will end up in the same neighborhood. Therefore, the vector representation of an English sentence would be similar to the vector representation of its Arabic translation. Consequently, words with the same meaning, but in different languages, will be located in the same neighborhood.

As shown in Figure 1, before the question tokens and schema tables and columns are encoded using a pre-trained language model, LASER [1] will be used to create the relation embedding matrix. This is done by comparing every Arabic question token to every table and column. It will be determined that there is a relationship if the cosine similarity is at least 78%. It can be seen from the upper right corner of Figure 1 that before the CSR approach, Arabic tokens would have no relation to schema tables and columns, despite their similar meanings.

For better insight, we conducted some analysis to determine how many relationships were established per sample, and the CSR approach showed that the relation embedding matrix showed more relationships with an average of 0.8 question-table-cosine-match and 2.8 question-column-cosine-matches. One might argue that adding these relationships would add additional complexity to the model, which could negatively affect its efficiency. However, without the CSR approach, the relationship matrix with the question tokens and schema items relationships is already built in with zeros in all of the relationships. In contrast, our approach allows the relationship matrix to carry more information, which results in better performance across all baselines.

5.1 Ablation Study: Compare LASER with Other Models

Our CSR approach was specifically designed using LASER, and we have done an ablation study to demonstrate the reasons for our decision. A comparison of LASER with three cross-lingual models is given in Table 4, including mBERT [8], XLM [15], and SBERT [22]. While mBERT and XLM were not developed with the intention of embedding sentences, LASER and SBERT have been designed for the purpose of embedding sentences. Based on the results, it can be seen that mBERT and XLM have a high cosine similarity percentage of unrelated words and a low percentage of related words. For LASER and SBERT, this is not the case. Always similar words will have a high cosine similarity percentage, while unrelated words will have a lower percentage. Even though SBERT [22] performs well, if we compare a question token with schema items where the words are partially similar as shown in the last column of Table 4, SBERT will not perform well. Due to this, we have utilized LASER in our experiment.

6 EXPERIMENTS

6.1 Experimental Setup

6.1.1 Evaluation Metric. Results are reported for all examples using the exact match accuracy metric, which is the same metric used in Spider [26]. It measures whether the SQL clauses, tables, and columns of the predicted SQL query are equivalent to the gold SQL query. Furthermore, [26] has divided the SQL queries into four difficulty levels (easy, medium, hard, and extra hard). In general, the more SQL keywords in a SQL query, the harder the query is considered to be.

6.1.2 Baselines and Pre-trained Encoder models. With LGE SQL [4] and S²SQL [12] baseline models, we selected two pre-trained cross-lingual encoders, mBERT [8] and XLM-Roberta-Large [6]. The structure of mBERT is similar to that of BERT [9]. The only difference is that mBERT has been pre-trained on concatenated Wikipedia data for 104 languages, including Arabic. As for XLM-Roberta-Large, it has also been pre-trained on text in 100 languages, including Arabic, and reported state-of-the-art results in a number of Arabic natural language processing tasks [14] [11] [16].

6.2 Experimental Results

In our experiments, we want to answer the following research questions (RQs):

Table 5: Exact match accuracy results of LGESQL and S²SQL models over the original English Spider dataset.

Dataset	Model	Encoder	Accuracy
Spider	LGESQL	mBERT	72.79
		XLM-R	74.36
	S ² SQL	mBERT	67.79
		XLM-R	70.41

Table 6: Detailed comparison of the exact match results of LGESQL and S²SQL over Ar-Spider with and without CSR.

Dataset	Model	Encoder	CSR	Accuracy
Ar-Spider	LGESQL	mBERT	-	55.32
			Yes	55.42
		XLM-R	-	65.57
			Yes	66.63
	S ² SQL	mBERT	-	52.51
			Yes	54.84
XLM-R		-	62.48	
		Yes	64	

- RQ1 What are the performance differences between models that were trained in the English Spider [26] dataset and those that were trained on the Arabic Ar-spider dataset?
- RQ2 How does the performance of different cross-language models differ?
- RQ3 Does combining the English and Arabic versions of the datasets enhance the models performance?
- RQ4 By using our CSR approach, what impact does it have on the performance of the models?

Based on three different datasets, we evaluated the performance of LGESQL [4] and S²SQL [12] models. Table 5 shows the results of the models that were trained on the original English Spider [26] dataset. The second dataset is Ar-Spider and Table 6 shows its related results. RQ3 is addressed by the third dataset, which is a combination of both Spider [26] and Ar-spider datasets, and their corresponding results are displayed in Table 7.

6.2.1 Spider Dataset. In Table 5, we tested the LGESQL and S²SQL models using the original Spider [26] dataset, without modifying the models except in one respect, which was integrating the cross-lingual models mBERT and XLM-R with the baselines. The Spider [26] dataset is available at <https://yale-lily.github.io/spider>. Despite the fact that the S²SQL model is more efficient with the ELECTRA [5] pre-trained language model, it does not perform well with any of the cross-lingual models. Compared to S²SQL + mBERT, LGESQL + mBERT has an overall performance of 71.79%, outperforming S²SQL + mBERT by 1.96%. Additionally, LGESQL with XLM-R achieved the highest results with 74.36%, outperforming S²SQL + XLM-R by 3.95%.

Table 7: Exact accuracy results of LGESQL model by combining both English Spider and Arabic Ar-Spider datasets.

Dataset	Model	Encoder	Accuracy
Spider + Ar-Spider	LGESQL	mBERT	52.03
		XLM-R	64.31

6.2.2 Ar-Spider Dataset. In Table 6, the models were trained on the Ar-spider dataset. As for the LGESQL model, we did not modify the model except for tokenizing the Arabic questions using the Stanza [11] Arabic version library and integrating encoders mBERT [8] and XLM-R [6]. As for S²SQL, we have made the same modification as to the question dependency parser to accommodate Arabic questions. According to the accuracy results Table 5, baseline models without CSR approach are ranked ascendingly. LGESQL + mBERT produces the lowest results of 52.51%, while LGESQL + XLM-R produces the highest results of 65.57%. S²SQL performs less than LGESQL because it captures dependency relationships in the question grammatical structure, requiring an encoder that is rich in vocabulary in the target language in our case Arabic. While both mBERT and XLM-R have a good amount of Arabic vocabulary, they are still not enough.

Furthermore, to answer question RQ4, through the use of our CSR context similarity approach, three of the baselines have shown significant improvements of 2.33%, 1.52%, and 1.06% for S²SQL + mbert, S²SQL + XLM-R, and LGESQL + XLM-R, respectively. However, the model has slightly improved by 0.1% for LGESQL + mBERT. This success of CSR can be attributed to the fact that prior to CSR, all linking structures relationships between question tokens and schema entities were never matched, since the question was in Arabic and the schema entities were in English. In contrast, using CSR, more than 14000 relationships have been established with a similarity threshold of 78%, leading to an increase in performance across all baselines.

For RQ1, the models are expected to perform less well with the Arabic Ar-Spider dataset. It is due to two challenges: the schema linguistic challenge and the SQL structure challenge. Nevertheless, LGESQL + XLM-R + CSR obtains good results, achieving 66.63%, only 7.73% less than the best results obtained on the English Spider [26] dataset. For RQ2, the results indicated that the use of a large cross-lingual model, such as XLM-R [6], is crucial for capturing context effectively and achieving better performance.

6.2.3 Spider and Ar-Spider. Based on [13] [2] [10], it was found that training the models both with English spider [26] dataset and their target language resulted in a significant improvement in performance. To answer RQ3, Table 7 indicates that this is not the case for our experiment. We have noticed a slight decrease in performance when we combine Spider [26] with Ar-Spider, then test the model in the Ar-Spider testing set. This could be due to the fact that Arabic has a more complex morphology, meaning its word forms undergo a variety of changes to convey different grammatical functions. In Arabic, nouns take on different forms depending on their grammatical case, number, and gender. Thus, combining Arabic with similar languages such as Persian or Urdu may enhance the performance.

7 CONCLUSIONS

This paper presents the first Arabic cross-domain text-to-SQL dataset named Ar-Spider, revised from the original English Spider dataset [26]. In order to ensure high quality, we translated Spider by two professional translators and had it verified by three computer science graduate students. Dataset was evaluated using two strong baseline models, LGE SQL [4] and S²SQL [12], demonstrating that a larger cross-lingual model will significantly improve the performance. Additionally, we identify some challenges related to the Arabic language, Scehma linguistics, and SQL structure challenges. Along with using cross-lingual models to minimize the effect of these challenges, we introduce the Context Similarity Relationships approach that has resulted in a notable improvement on performance for all baselines, where the highest performance is 66.63% achieved by LGE SQL + XLM-R + CSR. Further, we discuss the reasons for selecting LASER [1] as the model to compute the cosine similarity angle between question tokens and schema items. Additionally, we have shown that combining English and Arabic datasets during training has not improved the performance. In future work, it would be useful to develop better methods for linking Arabic questions to English schema items, such as utilizing large language models or by fine-tuning pre-trained models specifically for the arabic-english schema linking task.

REFERENCES

- [1] Mikel Artetxe and Holger Schwenk. 2019. Massively multilingual sentence embeddings for zero-shot cross-lingual transfer and beyond. In *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, Vol. 7. 597–610.
- [2] Daria Bakshandaeva, Oleg Somov, Ekaterina Dmitrieva, Vera Davydova, and Elena Tutubalina. 2022. PAUQ: Text-to-SQL in Russian. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2022*. 2355–2376.
- [3] Tom B Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, et al. 2020. Language Models are Few-Shot Learners. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 33 (2020).
- [4] Ruisheng Cao, Lu Chen, Zhi Chen, Yanbin Zhao, Su Zhu, and Kai Yu. 2021. LGE SQL: line graph enhanced text-to-SQL model with mixed local and non-local relations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.01093* (2021).
- [5] Kevin Clark, Minh-Thang Luong, Quoc V Le, and Christopher D Manning. 2020. Electra: Pre-training text encoders as discriminators rather than generators. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2003.10555* (2020).
- [6] Alexis Conneau, Kartikay Khandelwal, Naman Goyal, Vishrav Chaudhary, Guillaume Wenzek, Francisco Guzmán, Edouard Grave, Myle Ott, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Veselin Stoyanov. 2019. Unsupervised Cross-lingual Representation Learning at Scale. *CoRR* abs/1911.02116 (2019). [arXiv:1911.02116](http://arxiv.org/abs/1911.02116) <http://arxiv.org/abs/1911.02116>
- [7] Enrique Dehaerne, Bappaditya Dey, Sandip Halder, Stefan De Gendt, and Wannes Meert. 2022. Code generation using machine learning: A systematic review. *Ieee Access* (2022).
- [8] Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2018. BERT: Pre-training of Deep Bidirectional Transformers for Language Understanding. *CoRR* abs/1810.04805 (2018). [arXiv:1810.04805](http://arxiv.org/abs/1810.04805) <http://arxiv.org/abs/1810.04805>
- [9] Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2018. BERT: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.04805* (2018).
- [10] Longxu Dou, Yan Gao, Mingyang Pan, Dingzirui Wang, Wanxiang Che, Dechen Zhan, and Jian-Guang Lou. 2023. MultiSpider: towards benchmarking multilingual text-to-SQL semantic parsing. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, Vol. 37. 12745–12753.
- [11] Abdellah El Mekki, Abdelkader El Mahdaouy, Ismail Berrada, and Ahmed Khoumsi. 2022. AdaSL: an unsupervised domain adaptation framework for arabic multi-dialectal sequence labeling. *Information Processing & Management* 59, 4 (2022), 102964.
- [12] Binyuan Hui, Ruiying Geng, Lihan Wang, Bowen Qin, Bowen Li, Jian Sun, and Yongbin Li. 2022. S2SQL: Injecting Syntax to Question-Schema Interaction Graph Encoder for Text-to-SQL Parsers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.06958* (2022).
- [13] Marcelo Archanjo José and Fabio Gagliardi Cozman. 2021. mRAT-SQL+ GAP: a Portuguese text-to-SQL transformer. In *Intelligent Systems: 10th Brazilian Conference, BRACIS 2021, Virtual Event, November 29–December 3, 2021, Proceedings, Part II 10*. Springer, 511–525.
- [14] Muhammad Khalifa, Muhammad Abdul-Mageed, and Khaled Shaalan. 2021. Self-training pre-trained language models for zero-and few-shot multi-dialectal Arabic sequence labeling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2101.04758* (2021).
- [15] Guillaume Lample and Alexis Conneau. 2019. Cross-lingual Language Model Pretraining. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*.
- [16] Wuwei Lan, Yang Chen, Wei Xu, and Alan Ritter. 2020. An empirical study of pre-trained transformers for Arabic information extraction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.14519* (2020).
- [17] Qingkai Min, Yuefeng Shi, and Yue Zhang. 2019. A pilot study for Chinese SQL semantic parsing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.13293* (2019).
- [18] Anh Tuan Nguyen, Mai Hoang Dao, and Dat Quoc Nguyen. 2020. A pilot study of text-to-SQL semantic parsing for Vietnamese. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.01891* (2020).
- [19] Dat Quoc Nguyen and Anh Tuan Nguyen. 2020. PhoBERT: Pre-trained language models for Vietnamese. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2003.00744* (2020).
- [20] Jeffrey Pennington, Richard Socher, and Christopher D. Manning. 2014. GloVe: Global vectors for word representation. In *Proceedings of the 2014 conference on empirical methods in natural language processing (EMNLP)*. 1532–1543.
- [21] Bowen Qin, Binyuan Hui, Lihan Wang, Min Yang, Jinyang Li, Binhua Li, Ruiying Geng, Rongyu Cao, Jian Sun, Luo Si, et al. 2022. A survey on text-to-sql parsing: Concepts, methods, and future directions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2208.13629* (2022).
- [22] Nils Reimers and Iryna Gurevych. 2019. Sentence-BERT: Sentence Embeddings using Siamese BERT-Networks. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. 3982–3992.
- [23] Yuqing Tang, Chau Tran, Xian Li, Peng-Jen Chen, Naman Goyal, Vishrav Chaudhary, Jiatao Gu, and Angela Fan. 2020. Multilingual translation with extensible multilingual pretraining and finetuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2008.00401* (2020).
- [24] Yonghui Wu, Mike Schuster, Zhifeng Chen, Quoc V Le, Mohammad Norouzi, Wolfgang Macherey, Maxim Krikun, Yuan Cao, Qin Gao, Klaus Macherey, et al. 2016. Google’s neural machine translation system: Bridging the gap between human and machine translation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1609.08144* (2016).
- [25] Tao Yu, Rui Zhang, He Yang Er, Suyi Li, Eric Xue, Bo Pang, Xi Victoria Lin, Yi Chern Tan, Tianze Shi, Zihan Li, et al. 2019. Cosql: A conversational text-to-sql challenge towards cross-domain natural language interfaces to databases. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.05378* (2019).
- [26] Tao Yu, Rui Zhang, Kai Yang, Michihiro Yasunaga, Dongxu Wang, Zifan Li, James Ma, Irene Li, Qingning Yao, Shanelle Roman, et al. 2018. 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).
- [27] Tao Yu, Rui Zhang, Michihiro Yasunaga, Yi Chern Tan, Xi Victoria Lin, Suyi Li, Heyang Er, Irene Li, Bo Pang, Tao Chen, et al. 2019. Sparc: Cross-domain semantic parsing in context. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.02285* (2019).
- [28] Zheng Zhang, Ryuichi Takanobu, Qi Zhu, MinLie Huang, and XiaoYan Zhu. 2020. Recent advances and challenges in task-oriented dialog systems. *Science China Technological Sciences* 63, 10 (2020), 2011–2027.
- [29] Victor Zhong, Caiming Xiong, and Richard Socher. 2017. Seq2sql: Generating structured queries from natural language using reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1709.00103* (2017).