BINDING LANGUAGE MODELS IN SYMBOLIC LANGUAGES

Anonymous authors
Paper under double-blind review

ABSTRACT

Though end-to-end neural approaches have recently been dominating NLP tasks in both performance and ease-of-use, they lack interpretability and robustness. We propose BINDER, a training-free neural-symbolic framework that maps the task input to a program, which (1) allows binding a unified API of language model (LM) functionalities to a programming language (*e.g.*, SQL, Python) to extend its grammar coverage and thus tackle more diverse questions, (2) adopts an LM as both the program parser and the underlying model called by the API during execution, and (3) requires only a few in-context exemplar annotations. Specifically, we employ GPT-3 Codex as the LM. In the parsing stage, with only a few in-context exemplars, Codex is able to identify the part of the task input that cannot be answerable by the original programming language, correctly generate API calls to prompt Codex to solve the unanswerable part, and identify where to place the API calls while being compatible with the original grammar. In the execution stage, Codex can perform versatile functionalities (*e.g.*, commonsense QA, information extraction) given proper prompts in the API calls. BINDER achieves state-of-the-art results on WIKITABLEQUESTIONS and TABFACT datasets, with explicit output programs that benefit human debugging. Note that previous best systems are all finetuned on tens of thousands of task-specific samples, while BINDER only uses dozens of annotations as in-context exemplars without any training. Our code is available at `anonymized`.

1 INTRODUCTION

Performance on natural language processing tasks is dominated by neural *end-to-end* systems that directly map inputs to outputs (Devlin et al., 2019; Liu et al., 2019; Lewis et al., 2020; Raffel et al., 2020, *i.a.*). These end-to-end approaches are flexible and easy-to-use while lacking interpretability and robustness. This stands in contrast to *symbolic* approaches that produce explicit intermediate representations such as logical forms, reasoning paths, or program code, which might then be executed to derive a final output (Zettlemoyer & Collins, 2005; Gulwani et al., 2017; Chen et al., 2019b, *i.a.*). The intermediate form produced by these symbolic methods is *interpretable*, and the resulting execution makes them more robust to input changes. However, their semantic coverage is limited by the affordances of the grammar of the selected symbolic language (*e.g.*, not being able to handle *"North America?"* in Fig. 1), leading to failures on real-world diverse questions, and the intermediate form annotations require expert knowledge and researcher labour.

A few works (Andreas et al., 2016; Gupta et al., 2019; Khot et al., 2021; Zhu et al., 2022, *i.a.*) have been proposed to combine neural modules and symbolic languages (*neural-symbolic*) to leverage advantages of both approaches. However, they require the elaborate human design of the symbolic language and the calibration of corresponding neural modules to tackle problems in a specific domain with large training data. More specifically, most of these works propose a task-specific symbolic language and corresponding modules that cover only limited semantic phenomena in a specific task and domain. Therefore, new languages and neural modules have to be introduced when adapting them to new tasks and domains. Their coverage is still restricted by the customized symbolic language and neural modules. Moreover, they call for various and large training data to ensure all modules are well trained. Therefore, we expect a neural-symbolic system that supports *flexible* neural module calls that will enable *higher coverage* for the symbolic language, while only requiring *few annotations*.

We propose BINDER, a training-free neural-symbolic framework that maps task inputs to an executable program in a programming language (e.g., SQL, Python) bound with a unified API to call language



Figure 1: An overview of the BINDER pipeline of two stages: *parsing* and *execution*. (1) In the *parsing* stage, the language model (LM) maps the input to a BINDER program given the question and (optional) knowledge sources. The expressions with blue background in the program are API calls to acquire external results. (2) In the *execution* stage, an LM serves to realize the API calls given the prompt and the return values feed back into the original programming language. A deterministic program interpreter executes the program without API calls to derive the final answer.

models (LMs; Brown et al., 2020; Chen et al., 2021) to perform versatile functionalities, *i.e.* a BINDER program(*e.g.*, *Binder-SQL, Binder-Python* in Fig. 1), with only a few input-BINDER program annotations as in-context exemplars. More specifically, BINDER first prompts Codex, a code-pretrained of GPT-3, to parse a question input into a BINDER program, in which Codex has to decide (1) which parts in the input can be converted to the target programming language (question parts highlighted in grey in Fig. 1), (2) the corresponding task API calls (*e.g.*, f(*"North America?"; Made_in*)) to prompt Codex to resolve the other parts, and (3) where to insert the API calls in the BINDER program. Next, BINDER prompts Codex again to generate answers to the task API calls (given the generated task prompts), integrates the generated results back to the programming language. Specifically as in Fig. 1, the prompt (*e.g.*, "North America?") and data (*e.g.*, column $Made_in$) in API calls are fed into Codex, and the output is a new column answering the prompt based on the input data (*i.e.*, yes/no of whether a country in $Made_in$ column is from North America). Finally, the program with standard programming languages is executed the derive the final answer. In summary, BINDER enables flexible functionality integration to the programming language to improve its coverage and requires only a few annotations. The BINDER program replaces custom neural modules and task-specific languages with a unified prompting API call to Codex and general programming languages respectively, which enables it to handle much more diverse task inputs in open domains without complex language and neural module design. BINDER is built on the advances of in-context learning with language models and does not require any training and large-scale annotations.

We demonstrate the effectiveness of the BINDER framework on WIKITABLEQUESTIONS (WIKITQ; Pasupat & Liang, 2015) TABFACT (Chen et al., 2019a), two structured knowledge grounding datasets that require complex reasoning on the tables. Using Codex (Chen et al., 2021) as the LM, BINDER achieves state-of-the-art results on WIKITQ and TABFACT. Note that the previous state-of-the-art methods all require fine-tuning on more than 10K annotated training examples or even massive amounts of task-related pretraining data, while our method requires only a dozen or so annotations without training. In further analysis, we find that BINDER provides the greatest performance gain on the questions that the original language grammar (SQL and Python) cannot support, indicating that BINDER effectively improves programming language coverage. We also demonstrate BINDER can be applied on multi-modal knowledge sources (text, table, images, and combined) with MULTIMODALQA dataset (Talmor et al., 2021). Moreover, we show that BINDER, compared with end-to-end approaches, is more interpretable when debugging the model, more scalable to very large inputs, and more robust to noisy inputs.

2 APPROACH

Task Definition Given an NLP task that accepts a natural language question/statement Q and optional context(s) D (*e.g.*, passages, tables, images, or a combination of the above) as inputs, the

goal is to output an answer A based on the inputs to respond to Q correctly. For example, in passage question answering, Q is a question about the passage(s) D; in table fact verification, Q is a statement about the table(s) D.

2.1 BINDER FRAMEWORK

Overview The BINDER framework to solve NLP tasks is defined as follows: given a natural language input Q and optional context(s) D as the input, an *executable* BINDER program Z is generated. Finally, the output answer A is derived by executing Z with a BINDER interpreter.

BINDER Parsing In the parsing stage, the input natural language Q is parsed into a BINDER program Z. A BINDER program is an expression in a symbolic language that optionally includes API calls where the core symbolic language fails to provide a desired functionality. We define the API call in the program as function $f(\hat{Q}\ ;\hat{D})$ that accepts a question $\hat{Q}$ to be answered, and the context $\hat{D}$ to be queried on. Here $\hat{Q}$ is the unanswerable part of Q with the programming language only and $\hat{D}$ is the relevant contexts in D to answer $\hat{Q}$. For example, *"North America?"* in Fig 1 is a $\hat{Q}$, and its corresponding contexts $\hat{D}$ to answer $\hat{Q}$ is the column *Made_in*. Note $\hat{Q} = Q$ or $\hat{D} = D$ is also valid (if $\hat{Q} = Q$ and $\hat{D} = D$, the program is equivalent to solving the problem with an LM in end-to-end manner). The output of an API call $f(\hat{Q}\ ;\hat{D})$ is the answer to $\hat{Q}$, and it is represented as *a variable* compatible with the symbolic language grammar so that the program can be executed.

BINDER Execution In the execution stage, the program Z is executed by a BINDER interpreter to derive the answer A. The BINDER interpreter consists of a standard symbolic language interpreter and the model(s) realizing the API calls. The execution phase includes lexical analysis, syntax analysis, and program evaluation. In lexical and syntax analysis, $f(\hat{Q}\ ;\hat{D})$ is added as a new identifier in the grammar, and the program is parsed as an abstract syntax tree (AST) based on this extended grammar. In program evaluation, the API calls are evaluated by calling the underlying neural models. The API call output is saved as *a variable* compatible with the standard symbolic language grammar, and thus the program can be finally executed by an off-the-shelf symbolic language interpreter to derive the output. Specifically, BINDER extends the symbolic language production rules to facilitate parsing the BINDER program's AST. The AST is evaluated in bottom-up order so that nested API calls are also supported, which allows different degrees of decomposition and free combination of language models for the complex question. We provide more details about the grammar extension and a BINDER program AST in Appendix A.4.

2.2 IN-CONTEXT LEARNING FOR BINDER

Much recent work uses large language models for in-context learning (Brown et al., 2020; Chen et al., 2021; Chowdhery et al., 2022b). Compared with fine-tuning, in-context learning (1) only takes a few annotations/demonstrations as a prompt, and (2) performs inference without training the model parameters, which are both longstanding issues of conventional semantic parsing. We base our experiments for BINDER on Codex, a code-pretrained version of GPT-3, which has been shown to perform proficiently on code generation tasks (Rajkumar et al., 2022; Chen et al., 2022) and even some weakly-related tasks like dialogue state tracking (Hu et al., 2022). We use Codex as both the semantic parser and the model to perform API call functionalities.

In the parsing stage, it is challenging to generate BINDER programs because their grammar is different from the original programming language grammar due to the inserted API calls. Thus, we take advantage of the few-shot generalization ability of Codex and find that it can learn the modified grammar effectively with only a small number of in-context examples. In the execution stage, Codex as the underlying LM serves to give the output to the API calls by concatenating the API call input, $\hat{Q}$ and $\hat{D}$ as the language model prompt (the prompt style is described in Section 3.1). The Codex output result(s) are stored as *variables* in the standard programming language so that a programming language interpreter can execute on the combination of these variables and the rest part of the program.

Specifically, we apply in-context learning for BINDER in the following manner: the inputs are k in-context exemplars of $\{(Q_i, D_i, Z_i)\}_{i=1}^{k}$ and the inference example (Q, D). The k examples should

balance the trade-off between the diversity of question types and the model's maximum input capacity, which can either be manually selected (fixed) or automatically retrieved (dynamic) according to the inference example. The model outputs are n candidate BINDER programs $\mathcal{Z} = \{Z_1, ..., Z_n\}$ that aim to solve the inference question Q. Next, the programs $\mathcal{Z}$ are executed by the BINDER interpreter producing n answers $\mathcal{A} = \{A_1, ..., A_n\}$. Finally, the output answer A is derived via a majority voting strategy over the set of produced answers $\mathcal{A}$ (the voting method is similar to the one used by MBR-EXEC (Shi et al., 2022), which we elaborate on in Appendix A.3). The values of k and n are hyperparameters in the process above.

2.3 BINDER IMPLEMENTATION

In this section, we describe our implementation of BINDER with SQL and Python over structured knowledge as a demonstration. As BINDER is designed to be extensible to various programming languages and API call functionalities, we introduce a pipeline for users to quickly adapt BINDER to a new domain in Appendix D.

We implement two APIs — $f_{col}(\hat{Q}\ ; \hat{D})$ and $f_{val}(\hat{Q}\ ; \hat{D})$, where $\hat{D} = \{c_1, ..., c_{|\hat{D}|}\}$ is a (sub-)table of a set of table columns, and $c = \{v_i, ..., v_{|c|}\}$ is a column filled with cell values. Based on $\hat{Q}$, f_{col} maps $\hat{D}$ into *a column*, and f_{val} maps $\hat{D}$ into *a value*. Since both return types, i.e., column and value, are compatible with the grammars of SQL and Python (with the Pandas package), f_{col} and f_{val} APIs are inserted to replace the columns and values to form a valid BINDER program.

Take the question "*which is the best-selling shirt made in North America and with no chemicals?*" in Fig 1 as an example. The country names in the *Made_in* column do not provide enough information on their own to indicate what their continents are, and thus pure SQL cannot solve it (with this table's data). However, it is easy for a (large) language model to answer whether a country is from North America, which is represented by the f_{col}*("North America?";Made_in)* expression in the position of a column name in standard SQL. Similarly, the expression f_{col}*("No chemicals?";Shirt)* calls a (large) language model to identify whether the shirts consist of no chemicals (*i.e.*, pure cotton in this case) based on the textual details in the *Shirt* column.

When a (sub-)question is too complex or infeasible to be solved by creating an intermediate new column with f_{col}, we turn to f_{val} to directly derive the answer. For example, given the question "*which shirt is the most suitable for a formal event?*" on the table in Fig 1, it is hard to map *Shirt* to a new column of "formality value" followed by a SQL "ORDER BY" clause. Thus, the expression will be f_{val}*("The most formal?";Shirt)*, that outputs a value as the answer. f_{val} looks more like end-to-end QA, with two important differences: (1) it can be integrated into more compositional SQL queries using its result as a value, (2) it inputs the sub-table instead of the whole table which can mitigate the challenge of input capacity.

3 EXPERIMENTS

3.1 EXPERIMENT SETUP

Datasets We evaluate our method on three knowledge grounding datasets which were all previously dominated by *end-to-end* methods: WIKITQ (Pasupat & Liang, 2015) and TABFACT (Chen et al., 2019a). WIKITQ requires complex table reasoning skills to answer the questions. Furthermore, according to SQUALL (Shi et al., 2020b), about 20% of WIKITQ questions are not answerable by pure SQL, either because of the need for extra knowledge or the limited coverage of the SQL grammar, both of which are issues that BINDER is designed to address. TABFACT is a binary fact verification benchmark over small tables, on which end-to-end methods have a large advantage but offer no interpretability.

Evaluation The evaluation metrics are execution accuracy (EA) for WIKITQ and TABFACT following common practice for these datasets. Program executions are likely to be semantically correct but fail to match the gold answer exactly – for example, SQL outputs 1/0 for yes/no questions. Though this is considered correct according to human evaluation, it is regarded as incorrect by the exact match evaluator. Thus, we add a pre-matching check for these semantically correct cases in WIKITQ to the official evaluator. For a fair comparison, we compute the outputs of all baseline

Method	Dev.	Test
Finetuned		
T5-3B (Xie et al., 2022)	51.9	50.6
Tapex (Liu et al., 2021)	60.4	59.1
TaCube (Zhou et al., 2022)	61.1	61.3
OmniTab (Jiang et al., 2022)	-	63.3
Without Finetuning		
Codex end-to-end QA	50.5	48.7
Codex SQL†	60.2	61.1
Codex BINDER † (Ours)	**65.0**	**64.6**

Table 1: WIKITQ execution accuracy on development and test sets. † denotes a symbolic method that outputs intermediate languages.

Method	Test
Finetuned	
SASP† (Ou & Liu, 2022)	77.0
BART-Large (Lewis et al., 2020)	82.5
T5-3B (Xie et al., 2022)	85.4
Tapex (Liu et al., 2021)	**85.9**
Without Finetuning	
Codex end-to-end QA	72.6
Codex SQL†	80.7
Codex BINDER †(Ours)	**85.1**
with few-shot retriever	**86.0**

Table 2: TABFACT accuracy on the official small test set. † denotes a symbolic method that outputs intermediate languages.

methods and re-evaluate them using the same evaluator. We provide more details on the evaluator in Appendix A.5, and list the results with the official evaluator for all baselines and our method in C.2.

Baselines We compare our method to a series of strong published methods on these datasets, including Tapex (Liu et al., 2021), OmniTab (Jiang et al., 2022), TaCube (Zhou et al., 2022), T5-3B (Xie et al., 2022; Raffel et al., 2020), and SASP (Ou & Liu, 2022). These baselines are fine-tuned on the full-size training set, and many of them (Liu et al., 2021; Zhou et al., 2022) are even further pretrained on a domain-relevant corpus of extra data which is specific to the target domain and task, while BINDER is training-free and only requires a few in-context exemplar annotations.

To further demonstrate the effectiveness of BINDER, we also evaluate Codex with additional inference modes including: (1) end-to-end QA, i.e., directly outputting the answer based on the input question and table; and (2) semantic parsing with the standard SQL language. Due to page limits, we refer readers interested in these baselines to their respective papers for details (Liu et al., 2021; Jiang et al., 2022; Zhou et al., 2022; Xie et al., 2022; Raffel et al., 2020; Ou & Liu, 2022), and we present a complete list and evaluation results of more previous systems on these datasets in Appendix C.1.

Implementation Details We use the OpenAI Codex (code-davinci-002) API[1] model in our experiments as both the parser to generate programs and as the underlying model for API calls during the execution of each program. We annotate 14 in-context exemplars with BINDER programs for each dataset, which are selected considering the diversity of question types in demonstrations and the maximum token limit for Codex ($8,000$ tokens). The prompt format mainly follows (Rajkumar et al., 2022), which inputs the table schema and the first three table rows. The detailed prompt templates we use for each dataset are listed in Appendix A.1. On TABFACT, we further annotate a pool of 200 examples with BINDER programs from the training set using vote-*k* selective annotation (Su et al., 2022), and use them by retrieving relevant few-shot examples for each inference example via maximum inner-product similarity of the SentenceBert (Clark et al., 2019) embeddings of the questions. The Codex hyperparameters for parsing and execution are provided in Appendix A.2. Empirically, it takes about 6 hours on average to evaluate $1,000$ examples (i.e., generate and execute 20 programs per example) given that Codex allows 200 queries per minute. We evaluate on the official small test set ($2,000$ samples) of TABFACT considering the time cost.

3.2 MAIN RESULTS

WIKITQ All results on the WIKITQ dataset are shown in Table 1. Our Codex BINDER outperforms listed strong baseline systems by a large margin, surpassing the previous state-of-the-art by absolute 1.3%. Note that all baseline methods require access to the full training dataset and further fine-tuning, while our method can achieve state-of-the-art performance with only 14 example annotations. Codex BINDER improves over semantic parsing with standard SQL by 3.5% on the test set, indicating BINDER indeed mitigates the coverage limitations of the original language. Furthermore, both Codex BINDER and Codex SQL deliver dramatic advantages (15.9% and 12.4%) over end-to-end QA,

[1] https://beta.openai.com/

Method	Program-unsolvable	Program-solvable	Overall
T5-3B (Xie et al., 2022)	37.6	56.0	51.9
Tapex (Liu et al., 2021)	33.6	68.0	60.4
TaCube (Zhou et al., 2022)	34.9	68.5	61.1
Codex end-to-end QA	40.3	53.4	50.5
w/o table inputs	14.2	11.9	12.4
Codex SQL	31.2	68.4	60.2
Codex BINDER (Ours)	**41.3**	**71.8**	**65.0**

Table 3: Decomposition of execution accuracy on WIKITQ development set. The questions annotated with SQL by SQUALL (Shi et al., 2020b) dataset are denoted *program-solvable*, and the rest are *program-unsolvable*. OmniTab (Jiang et al., 2022) didn't provide its result on the development set.

showing that semantic parsing with Codex is a better default choice when it comes to structured knowledge grounding and code-related tasks. A fine-grained analysis on why BINDER outperforms end-to-end QA and pure SQL is provided in Section 4.1.

TABFACT Table 2 presents the results on TABFACT's official small test set. Codex BINDER substantially surpasses the previous best symbolic method SASP by 8.1%. Note symbolic methods usually fall behind end-to-end manners in fact verification (binary classification) since the answer space is small. When retrieving a few relevant questions from the annotated pool of 200 examples, our method achieves new state-of-the-art results, outperforming the previous best fine-tuned method. However, the improvement provided by retrieving a few similar examples is comparatively small (0.9%). Effective sample selection methods for in-context learning remain an open challenge. Within the Codex few-shot setting (no few-shot retriever), BINDER shows a large advantage over standard SQL (4.4%) and end-to-end QA (12.5%), indicating the necessity of BINDER framework.

Besides the performance gain, BINDER has the additional advantages of (1) interpretability that benefits human debugging and (2) robustness that makes it stable to large or noisy inputs. We elaborate on these in Sections 4.2 and 4.3.

4 ANALYSIS

4.1 ABLATION STUDY

Binding neural module API calls into a programming language can help solve queries that are unsolvable in that language alone. Therefore, we are particularly interested in the performance of BINDER on the unsolvable questions. According to SQUALL (Shi et al., 2020b), about 20% of WIKITQ questions cannot be annotated in SQL; we call these *program-unsolvable*, and refer to the annotated ones as *program-solvable*. As presented in Table 3, Codex BINDER significantly outperforms Codex SQL by 10.1% on *program-unsolvable* questions, aligned with the motivation of our design. Our method even performs better than all end-to-end QA methods on the *program-unsolvable* part, which are supposed to be more robust to this subset of the examples. We note that while SQL performs well on about 31.2% of unsolvable questions, many are spurious programs that derive the correct answer by accident. BINDER largely mitigates this phenomenon. We randomly pick 100 correct predictions in *program-unsolvable* set shared by SQL and BINDER and find that BINDER has a much lower spurious rate than SQL (12% vs. 33%). One thing to note is that BINDER also achieves a higher score than SQL on *program-solvable*. We find that this is because some tables are manually cleaned (*e.g.*, extracting numerical parts from the text) to run the annotated SQLs by SQUALL, which means there also exist unsolvable questions even in the *program-solvable* subset. We elaborate on our manual statistics about the proportion of WIKITQ that can be solved with SQL in Appendix C.4. We also present to what extent Codex itself can answer the question only using its internal knowledge. Codex can only answer a few WIKITQ questions (12.4%) correctly, indicating it is not pretrained to overfit to the downstream dataset questions.

Error Type	Description	Proportion(%)
Syntax error	Incorrect program syntax (invalid grammar)	**5%**
Semantic error	Incorrect program semantics	**64%**
Token	Incorrect or missing column/value/operator	10%
Structure	Incorrect program structure (valid grammar)	22%
BINDER usage	Missing BINDER API usage	32%
Incorrect execution	Incorrect execution answer with the correct program	**15%**
False negative	Incorrect annotations or misjudge in evaluator	**16%**

Table 4: Error types of 100 samples from WIKITQ development set of BINDER (SQL).

System	Program	Answer
End-to-end QA	–	*1967*
SQL	`SELECT year FROM t WHERE win_team='kansas state' AND win_team - los_team > 10`	*<empty>*
BINDER	`SELECT year FROM t WHERE win_team='kansas state' AND f("Points?";win_team) - f("Points?";los_team) > 10`	*<empty>*

Table 5: An example from WIKITQ development set. The query is "*When was the first game that kansas state won by double digits?*" and the gold answer is 1926. The incorrect segment(s) of each output are marked in red. See Appendix E for full context of this example.

4.2 INTERPRETABILITY

An important advantage BINDER provides is the improvement in interpretability over the end-to-end approaches, where the explicit program can assist human debugging and error analysis. We sample 100 error cases from WIKITQ dev set (approximately 10% of all incorrect examples) of the Codex BINDER (on SQL) for error analysis. We classify errors into syntax error, semantic error, incorrect execution, and false negative, as listed in Table 4. More details about the classification and example demonstrations are listed in Appendix E. For WIKITQ, the errors mainly lie in the BINDER usage (32%) and structure errors (22%) of semantic errors, and incorrect execution (15%). This indicates that 32% of incorrect examples can be further corrected if BINDER is used and 15% can be corrected through better execution, *e.g.*, by leveraging more powerful LMs, using better in-context learning methods, and annotating more exemplars.

We also use an example to show the advantages of using BINDER for debugging and interpreting results. As shown in the example in Table 5, the result from the end-to-end system is *1967*, which is incorrect but provides no clue to the reason behind this prediction. The result from BINDER is incorrect, since the program uses the incorrect value and operator regarding the *win_team* column from the table (should be "LIKE "%kansas state%""), and it can be potentially fixed in the future by adding similar in-context exemplars or fuzzy match postprocessing. For standard SQL, though we find the direct subtraction of *win_team* − *los_team* is incorrect (contain non-numerical text), it cannot be fixed for its limited grammar coverage. Thus, in this example, BINDER enables finding the source of the error (an advantage over the end-to-end approach) while also being expressive enough for users to find a way to fix it (an advantage over a pure symbolic system), making BINDER fit for debugging and enabling interpretability of a system that uses it. We leave it to future work to develop more systematic evaluation methods that consider ease of debugging by estimating human effort to correct system errors.

4.3 ROBUSTNESS

4.3.1 SCALABILITY

A great advantage of BINDER over end-to-end QA is the scalability, *i.e.*, parsing and executing the symbolic language is always practical even when the knowledge source is too large (*e.g.*, company databases, domain knowledge graphs) to fit into the model input capacity or memory, while end-to-end QA fails or degrades since it requires the whole table as input to predict the answer. We expand tables with 100, 200, and 500 rows from a WIKITQ development subset (random 150 samples) by prompting Codex to populate the original table with content-consistent rows, and then have two annotators annotate question-answer pairs manually. When the table is too large for Codex's maximum token limit ($8,000$ tokens), we truncate table rows until it fits. As shown in Figure 2, Codex



Figure 2: Execution accuracy on WIKITQ with very large tables (original, 100, 200, 500 rows).



Figure 3: Execution accuracy on WIKITQ with noisy content in tables.

Method	Program-unsolvable
Codex Python	30.7
Codex BINDER (Ours)	**34.4**

Table 6: WIKITQ accuracy on program-unsolvable subset using Python as the programming language.

Method	F1	EM
Finetuned		
Implicit-Decomp (Talmor et al., 2021)	55.5	48.8
PReasM-Large (Yoran et al., 2022)	**65.5**	**59.0**
Without Finetuning		
Codex end-to-end QA	55.4	48.0
Codex BINDER (Ours)	57.1	51.0
with oracle retriever	**64.5**	**58.1**

Table 7: MMQA F1/EM on development set.

end-to-end QA performance drops dramatically as table size increases, while BINDER consistently outperforms it with only slight performance decreases. Note that the input of BINDER is only *three table rows* for all table sizes.

4.3.2 NOISY CONTENT

End-to-end methods are more brittle to noisy inputs, especially when there exists *distractors* that are similar to the question-relevant (gold) contents. We build a noisy WIKITQ development subset (random 150 samples) with distractors in three steps: (1) the gold table cells and columns are found using a heuristic fuzzy match, (2) replace 15% cells in gold columns with either *text* that has the smallest edit distance to the gold cell string in the WordNet corpus or *number* that equals to the gold cell value ± 1, (3) have one annotator check that question-answer pairs are valid after content disturbance. As shown in Figure 3, BINDER is stable confronting distractors (1.3% $\downarrow$), while end-to-end QA is more likely to be confused by similar text and numbers (6.7% $\downarrow$).

4.4 BINDER EXTENSION

BINDER with Python We design BINDER to be easily extensible to various programming languages. Thus, we explore using Python (with the Pandas package) as the BINDER language on WIKITQ. Similar to SQL, BINDER with Python is implemented by incorporating the $f(\cdot\,;\cdot)$ neural API into it. Since the neural API also calls language models with Python, we just use the original Python interpreter to execute our BINDER with Python. We evaluated it on the program-unsolvable subset of WIKITQ to test whether our method improves Python's capability. Though this subset is split based on SQL, Python shares some similar weaknesses with SQL, such as in cases with external knowledge requirements and unsupported functionality. As shown in Table 6, BINDER with Python effectively improves the Python coverage on the difficult subset. The gap between Python and SQL performance on WIKITQ may lie in the properties of each programming language, as suggested by Guo et al. (2020). We conjecture that Codex is more familiar with semantic parsing to SQL for tabular data, while Python is not as commonly used in this context.

MultiModal Application We further explore applying BINDER on the multi-modal dataset MULTIMODALQA (MMQA) across text, tables, and images. To input images into the LM program generation, images are converted into textual image captions with a vision-text pretrained model OFA (Wang et al., 2022) in advance. For table-related questions, the BINDER program is based

on SQL. For non-table questions, a program with f_{val} is generated with the targeted passage or image title(s). We follow Yoran et al. (2022) to retrieve the question-relevant passages and images in preprocessing. As far as we know, we are the first to demonstrate that multi-modal QA across text, tables, and images can be handled with interpretable and executable programs. As listed in Table 7, under the Codex few-shot setting, BINDER achieves better performance than end-to-end QA and the fine-tuned baseline Implicit-Decomp, showing the feasibility of BINDER on multi-modal knowledge sources. With the oracle retriever that assumes gold passages and images are given for each question, BINDER can achieve comparable performance with the state-of-the-art, showing the potential of BINDER approach in the future.

5 RELATED WORK

Semantic Parsing Semantic parsing (Zelle & Mooney, 1996; Zettlemoyer & Collins, 2005) has been a mainstay of symbolic methods that produce an executable program given natural language input, generate intermediate structures that assist problem-solving, and improve interpretability over the neural methods which generate solution directly that came later. Structured knowledge grounding tasks mainly adopt semantic parsing since symbolic languages like SQL, SPARQL can be executed on them (Berant et al., 2013; Liang et al., 2017; Yin & Neubig, 2017; Zhong et al., 2018; Yu et al., 2018; Shaw et al., 2021; Scholak et al., 2021). Beyond structured knowledge, Chen et al. (2019b) and Thorne et al. (2021) design domain-specific languages executable on text. Recently, Chen et al. (2021) propose a generative pre-trained language model for code generation that require no additional human annotation. Many works propose methods based on this model and achieve great success (Rajkumar et al., 2022; Shi et al., 2022). However, the semantic parsing method is restricted by its grammar coverage, unable to solve problems requiring external knowledge or functions.

Neural-Symbolic Methods Some works integrate neural modules with symbolic languages for the advantage of both approaches, *i.e.*, good performance and interpretability. Andreas et al. (2016); Hu et al. (2017); Das et al. (2018) and Gupta et al. (2019) generate programs that are further softly executed by the corresponding neural modules. Khot et al. (2021) propose text module networks to solve complex tasks by decomposing them into simpler ones solvable by existing QA models and a symbolic calculator. BREAK (Wolfson et al., 2020) proposes a meaningful representation, QDMR, that decomposes the question into multiple steps. However, they require the elaborate design of functions to be used in corresponding task and the calibration of corresponding neural modules which require complicated training steps and large training data (normally tens of thousands) to tackle problems in a specific domain.

Compared with these methods, BINDER is expressive and flexible to handle real-world diverse questions since it is able to make proper API calls to enhance its functionalities. Moreover, BINDER is training-free and requires only dozens of annotations based on certain symbolic language to perform on a domain specific task while maintaining: excellent performance, ability in scaling on input, interpretabilityand robustness over noisy content.

6 CONCLUSION

We propose BINDER, a training-free neural-symbolic framework that maps the task input to a program that allows binding a unified LM API for additional functionalities. BINDER aims to combine the strengths of end-to-end approaches (high coverage) and symbolic approaches (high interpretability). Using Codex as the LM, BINDER achieves state-of-the-art performance on WIKITQ and TABFACT with only dozens of in-context demonstrations and no additional training. In contrast, the best existing systems are finetuned on thousands of task-specific training samples and may require further domain-specific pretraining. We also perform a series of analyses of BINDER, decomposing performance gains, examining robustness to large or noisy inputs, applying it to multi-modal knowledge sources, and extending it to the Python language. We regard BINDER as a new, language model-focused attempt to integrate two widely-adopted paradigms in NLP: end-to-end and symbolic approaches. With the recent powerful large language models, it has become feasible that BINDER programs are generated and executed correctly in a training-free manner. In the future, we believe BINDER can be extended to many more scenarios with the appropriate programming language and functionalities, and we hope it can inspire more creative ideas on balancing model capability and interpretability.

7 REPRODUCIBILITY

BINDER experiments are mainly based on OpenAI Codex (code-davinci-002) API[2]. We provide (1) the input prompt templates we use in Appendix A.1, (2) Codex hyper-parameters for each dataset we adopt in Appendix A.2, (3) more implementation details in Appendix A. Besides, we also upload our source code in the materials making our results easy to be reproduced.

[2] https://beta.openai.com/

REFERENCES

Rishabh Agarwal, Chen Liang, Dale Schuurmans, and Mohammad Norouzi. Learning to generalize from sparse and underspecified rewards. In *International conference on machine learning*, pp. 130–140. PMLR, 2019.

Jacob Andreas, Marcus Rohrbach, Trevor Darrell, and Dan Klein. Neural module networks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pp. 39–48, 2016.

Jonathan Berant, Andrew Chou, Roy Frostig, and Percy Liang. Semantic parsing on Freebase from question-answer pairs. In *Proc. of EMNLP*, 2013. URL https://aclanthology.org/D13-1160.

Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Sandhini Agarwal, Ariel Herbert-Voss, Gretchen Krueger, Tom Henighan, Rewon Child, Aditya Ramesh, Daniel Ziegler, Jeffrey Wu, Clemens Winter, Chris Hesse, Mark Chen, Eric Sigler, Mateusz Litwin, Scott Gray, Benjamin Chess, Jack Clark, Christopher Berner, Sam McCandlish, Alec Radford, Ilya Sutskever, and Dario Amodei. Language models are few-shot learners. In *Proc. of NeurIPS*, 2020. URL https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2020/file/1457c0d6bfcb4967418bfb8ac142f64a-Paper.pdf.

Bei Chen, Fengji Zhang, Anh Nguyen, Daoguang Zan, Zeqi Lin, Jian-Guang Lou, and Weizhu Chen. Codet: Code generation with generated tests. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2207.10397*, 2022.

Mark Chen, Jerry Tworek, Heewoo Jun, Qiming Yuan, Henrique Ponde de Oliveira Pinto, Jared Kaplan, Harri Edwards, Yuri Burda, Nicholas Joseph, Greg Brockman, et al. Evaluating large language models trained on code. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.03374*, 2021.

Wenhu Chen, Hongmin Wang, Jianshu Chen, Yunkai Zhang, Hong Wang, Shiyang Li, Xiyou Zhou, and William Yang Wang. Tabfact: A large-scale dataset for table-based fact verification. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.02164*, 2019a.

Xinyun Chen, Chen Liang, Adams Wei Yu, Denny Zhou, Dawn Song, and Quoc V Le. Neural symbolic reader: Scalable integration of distributed and symbolic representations for reading comprehension. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2019b.

Aakanksha Chowdhery, Sharan Narang, Jacob Devlin, Maarten Bosma, Gaurav Mishra, Adam Roberts, Paul Barham, Hyung Won Chung, Charles Sutton, Sebastian Gehrmann, et al. Palm: Scaling language modeling with pathways. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.02311*, 2022a.

Aakanksha Chowdhery, Sharan Narang, Jacob Devlin, Maarten Bosma, Gaurav Mishra, Adam Roberts, Paul Barham, Hyung Won Chung, Charles Sutton, Sebastian Gehrmann, et al. Palm: Scaling language modeling with pathways. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.02311*, 2022b.

Hyung Won Chung, Le Hou, Shayne Longpre, Barret Zoph, Yi Tay, William Fedus, Eric Li, Xuezhi Wang, Mostafa Dehghani, Siddhartha Brahma, et al. Scaling instruction-finetuned language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.11416*, 2022.

Elizabeth Clark, Asli Celikyilmaz, and Noah A. Smith. Sentence mover's similarity: Automatic evaluation for multi-sentence texts. In *Proc. of ACL*, July 2019. URL https://aclanthology.org/P19-1264/.

Abhishek Das, Georgia Gkioxari, Stefan Lee, Devi Parikh, and Dhruv Batra. Neural modular control for embodied question answering. In *Conference on Robot Learning*, pp. 53–62. PMLR, 2018.

Pradeep Dasigi, Matt Gardner, Shikhar Murty, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Eduard Hovy. Iterative search for weakly supervised semantic parsing. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, pp. 2669–2680, 2019.

Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. BERT: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. In *Proc. of NAACL*, 2019. URL https://arxiv.org/abs/810.04805.

Julian Eisenschlos, Syrine Krichene, and Thomas Mueller. Understanding tables with intermediate pre-training. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2020*, pp. 281–296, 2020.

Sumit Gulwani, Oleksandr Polozov, Rishabh Singh, et al. Program synthesis. *Foundations and Trends® in Programming Languages*, 4(1-2):1–119, 2017.

Jiaqi Guo, Qian Liu, Jian-Guang Lou, Zhenwen Li, Xueqing Liu, Tao Xie, and Ting Liu. Benchmarking meaning representations in neural semantic parsing. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pp. 1520–1540, 2020.

Jiaqi Guo, Jian-Guang Lou, Ting Liu, and Dongmei Zhang. Weakly supervised semantic parsing by learning from mistakes. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2021*, pp. 2603–2617, Punta Cana, Dominican Republic, November 2021. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2021.findings-emnlp.222. URL https://aclanthology.org/2021.findings-emnlp.222.

Nitish Gupta, Kevin Lin, Dan Roth, Sameer Singh, and Matt Gardner. Neural module networks for reasoning over text. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1912.04971*, 2019.

Jonathan Herzig, P. Nowak, Thomas Müller, Francesco Piccinno, and Julian Martin Eisenschlos. Tapas: Weakly supervised table parsing via pre-training. In *Proceedings of ACL*, 2020.

Jordan Hoffmann, Sebastian Borgeaud, Arthur Mensch, Elena Buchatskaya, Trevor Cai, Eliza Rutherford, Diego de Las Casas, Lisa Anne Hendricks, Johannes Welbl, Aidan Clark, et al. Training compute-optimal large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.15556*, 2022.

Ronghang Hu, Jacob Andreas, Marcus Rohrbach, Trevor Darrell, and Kate Saenko. Learning to reason: End-to-end module networks for visual question answering. In *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision*, pp. 804–813, 2017.

Yushi Hu, Chia-Hsuan Lee, Tianbao Xie, Tao Yu, Noah A Smith, and Mari Ostendorf. In-context learning for few-shot dialogue state tracking. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.08568*, 2022.

Zhengbao Jiang, Yi Mao, Pengcheng He, Graham Neubig, and Weizhu Chen. Omnitab: Pretraining with natural and synthetic data for few-shot table-based question answering. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pp. 932–942, 2022.

Tushar Khot, Daniel Khashabi, Kyle Richardson, Peter Clark, and Ashish Sabharwal. Text modular networks: Learning to decompose tasks in the language of existing models. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pp. 1264–1279, 2021.

Takeshi Kojima, Shixiang Shane Gu, Machel Reid, Yutaka Matsuo, and Yusuke Iwasawa. Large language models are zero-shot reasoners. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.11916*, 2022.

Mike Lewis, Yinhan Liu, Naman Goyal, Marjan Ghazvininejad, Abdelrahman Mohamed, Omer Levy, Veselin Stoyanov, and Luke Zettlemoyer. BART: Denoising sequence-to-sequence pre-training for natural language generation, translation, and comprehension. In *Proc. of ACL*, July 2020. URL https://arxiv.org/abs/1910.13461.

Chen Liang, Jonathan Berant, Quoc Le, Kenneth D. Forbus, and Ni Lao. Neural symbolic machines: Learning semantic parsers on Freebase with weak supervision. In *Proceedings of the 55th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pp. 23–33, Vancouver, Canada, July 2017. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/P17-1003. URL https://aclanthology.org/P17-1003.

Chen Liang, Mohammad Norouzi, Jonathan Berant, Quoc V Le, and Ni Lao. Memory augmented policy optimization for program synthesis and semantic parsing. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 31, 2018.

Qian Liu, Bei Chen, Jiaqi Guo, Zeqi Lin, and Jian guang Lou. Tapex: Table pre-training via learning a neural sql executor, 2021.

Yinhan Liu, Myle Ott, Naman Goyal, Jingfei Du, Mandar Joshi, Danqi Chen, Omer Levy, Mike Lewis, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Veselin Stoyanov. Roberta: A robustly optimized bert pretraining approach. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.11692*, 2019.

Arvind Neelakantan, Quoc V Le, and Ilya Sutskever. Neural programmer: Inducing latent programs with gradient descent. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1511.04834*, 2015.

Suixin Ou and Yongmei Liu. Learning to generate programs for table fact verification via structure-aware semantic parsing. In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pp. 7624–7638, Dublin, Ireland, May 2022. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2022.acl-long.525. URL https://aclanthology.org/2022.acl-long.525.

Panupong Pasupat and Percy Liang. Compositional semantic parsing on semi-structured tables. In *Proceedings of the 53rd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 7th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pp. 1470–1480, Beijing, China, July 2015. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.3115/v1/P15-1142. URL https://aclanthology.org/P15-1142.

Colin Raffel, Noam Shazeer, Adam Roberts, Katherine Lee, Sharan Narang, Michael Matena, Yanqi Zhou, Wei Li, and Peter J. Liu. Exploring the limits of transfer learning with a unified text-to-text transformer. *JLMR*, 21, 2020. URL http://jmlr.org/papers/v21/20-074.html.

Nitarshan Rajkumar, Raymond Li, and Dzmitry Bahdanau. Evaluating the text-to-sql capabilities of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.00498*, 2022.

Torsten Scholak, Nathan Schucher, and Dzmitry Bahdanau. PICARD: Parsing incrementally for constrained auto-regressive decoding from language models. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pp. 9895–9901, Online and Punta Cana, Dominican Republic, November 2021. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2021.emnlp-main.779. URL https://aclanthology.org/2021.emnlp-main.779.

Peter Shaw, Ming-Wei Chang, Panupong Pasupat, and Kristina Toutanova. Compositional generalization and natural language variation: Can a semantic parsing approach handle both? In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, Online, August 2021. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Freda Shi, Daniel Fried, Marjan Ghazvininejad, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Sida I Wang. Natural language to code translation with execution. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.11454*, 2022.

Qi Shi, Yu Zhang, Qingyu Yin, and Ting Liu. Learn to combine linguistic and symbolic information for table-based fact verification. In *Proceedings of the 28th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, pp. 5335–5346, 2020a.

Tianze Shi, Chen Zhao, Jordan Boyd-Graber, Hal Daumé III, and Lillian Lee. On the potential of lexico-logical alignments for semantic parsing to sql queries. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2020*, pp. 1849–1864, 2020b.

Hongjin Su, Jungo Kasai, Chen Henry Wu, Weijia Shi, Tianlu Wang, Jiayi Xin, Rui Zhang, Mari Ostendorf, Luke Zettlemoyer, Noah A Smith, et al. Selective annotation makes language models better few-shot learners. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.01975*, 2022.

Alon Talmor, Ori Yoran, Amnon Catav, Dan Lahav, Yizhong Wang, Akari Asai, Gabriel Ilharco, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, and Jonathan Berant. Multimodalqa: Complex question answering over text, tables and images. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.06039*, 2021.

James Thorne, Majid Yazdani, Marzieh Saeidi, Fabrizio Silvestri, Sebastian Riedel, and Alon Halevy. Database reasoning over text. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.01074*, 2021.

Bailin Wang, Ivan Titov, and Mirella Lapata. Learning semantic parsers from denotations with latent structured alignments and abstract programs. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*, pp. 3774–3785, 2019.

Peng Wang, An Yang, Rui Men, Junyang Lin, Shuai Bai, Zhikang Li, Jianxin Ma, Chang Zhou, Jingren Zhou, and Hongxia Yang. Unifying architectures, tasks, and modalities through a simple sequence-to-sequence learning framework. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.03052*, 2022.

Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Ed Chi, Quoc Le, and Denny Zhou. Chain of thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.11903*, 2022.

Tomer Wolfson, Mor Geva, Ankit Gupta, Matt Gardner, Yoav Goldberg, Daniel Deutch, and Jonathan Berant. Break it down: A question understanding benchmark. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 2020.

Tianbao Xie, Chen Henry Wu, Peng Shi, Ruiqi Zhong, Torsten Scholak, Michihiro Yasunaga, Chien-Sheng Wu, Ming Zhong, Pengcheng Yin, Sida I. Wang, Victor Zhong, Bailin Wang, Chengzu Li, Connor Boyle, Ansong Ni, Ziyu Yao, Dragomir Radev, Caiming Xiong, Lingpeng Kong, Rui Zhang, Noah A. Smith, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Tao Yu. Unifiedskg: Unifying and multi-tasking structured knowledge grounding with text-to-text language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.05966*, 2022.

Xiaoyu Yang, Feng Nie, Yufei Feng, Quan Liu, Zhigang Chen, and Xiaodan Zhu. Program enhanced fact verification with verbalization and graph attention network. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pp. 7810–7825, 2020.

Pengcheng Yin and Graham Neubig. A syntactic neural model for general-purpose code generation. In *Proceedings of the 55th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pp. 440–450, Vancouver, Canada, July 2017. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/P17-1041. URL https://aclanthology.org/P17-1041.

Pengcheng Yin, Graham Neubig, Wen-tau Yih, and Sebastian Riedel. TaBERT: Pretraining for joint understanding of textual and tabular data. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*. Association for Computational Linguistics, July 2020.

Ori Yoran, Alon Talmor, and Jonathan Berant. Turning tables: Generating examples from semi-structured tables for endowing language models with reasoning skills. In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pp. 6016–6031, Dublin, Ireland, May 2022. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2022.acl-long.416. URL https://aclanthology.org/2022.acl-long.416.

Tao Yu, Rui Zhang, Kai Yang, Michihiro Yasunaga, Dongxu Wang, Zifan Li, James Ma, Irene Li, Qingning Yao, Shanelle Roman, et al. Spider: A large-scale human-labeled dataset for complex and cross-domain semantic parsing and text-to-sql task. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pp. 3911–3921, 2018.

Tao Yu, Chien-Sheng Wu, Xi Victoria Lin, Yi Chern Tan, Xinyi Yang, Dragomir Radev, Caiming Xiong, et al. Grappa: Grammar-augmented pre-training for table semantic parsing. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2020.

John M. Zelle and Raymond J. Mooney. Learning to parse database queries using inductive logic programming. In *AAAI 1996*, pp. 1050–1055, 1996.

Luke S. Zettlemoyer and Michael Collins. Learning to map sentences to logical form: Structured classification with probabilistic categorial grammars. *UAI*, 2005.

Yuchen Zhang, Panupong Pasupat, and Percy Liang. Macro grammars and holistic triggering for efficient semantic parsing. In *Proceedings of the 2017 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pp. 1214–1223, 2017.

Victor Zhong, Caiming Xiong, and Richard Socher. Seq2sql: Generating structured queries from natural language using reinforcement learning. 2018.

Wanjun Zhong, Duyu Tang, Zhangyin Feng, Nan Duan, Ming Zhou, Ming Gong, Linjun Shou, Daxin Jiang, Jiahai Wang, and Jian Yin. Logicalfactchecker: Leveraging logical operations for fact checking with graph module network. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pp. 6053–6065, 2020.

Fan Zhou, Mengkang Hu, Haoyu Dong, Zhoujun Cheng, Shi Han, and Dongmei Zhang. Tacube: Pre-computing data cubes for answering numerical-reasoning questions over tabular data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.12682*, 2022.

Zhaocheng Zhu, Mikhail Galkin, Zuobai Zhang, and Jian Tang. Neural-symbolic models for logical queries on knowledge graphs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.10128*, 2022.

Appendices

A MORE IMPLEMENTATION DETAILS

We present more details in our implementation of Codex BINDER for interested readers.

A.1 CODEX INPUT PROMPTS

We list prompts we use in main experiments for BINDER for each dataset. As shown, the prompt starts with an instruction describing the task, followed by a few examples for in-context learning. We follow Rajkumar et al. (2022) table prompt format: (1) "CREATE TABLE" schema; (2) the first three rows of the table; (3) the question Q and parsed logic form BINDER program. Besides, we also add *row_id* and lower case all table contents, which we find will improve the Codex parsing performance. For the sample to be inferenced, we empty the BINDER program to let Codex generate it, and input the full table to provide more information. If the full table is too large, we will shrink number of in-context shots until the table fits within the Codex max token limits.

```
## WikiTQ
Generate SQL given the question and table to answer
the question correctly.
...

CREATE TABLE Electoral district of Lachlan(
    row_id int,
    member text,
    party text,
    term text)
/*
3 example rows:
SELECT * FROM w LIMIT 3;
row_id member party term
0 john ryan none 1859-1864
1 james martin none 1864-1869
2 james watson none 1869-1880
*/
Q: of the members of the third incarnation of the lachlan,
    who served the longest?
Binder: SELECT member FROM w ORDER BY
    f("How long does it last?"; term) DESC LIMIT 1


## TabFact
Generate SQL given the statement and table to verify
the statement correctly.
...
CREATE TABLE british records in athletics(
    row_id int,
    event text,
    data text,
    athlete text,
    date text,
    place text)
/*
3 example rows:
SELECT * FROM w LIMIT 3;
row_id event data athlete date place
0 5 km t19:29 andi drake 1990-05-27 00:00:00 søfteland , norway
```

```
1 5 miles 32:38 + ian mccombie 1985-03-23 00:00:00
york , united kingdom
2 10 km 40:17 chris maddocks 1989-04-30 00:00:00
burrator , united kingdom
*/
Q: there be 8 different event that take place within
    the united kingdom
Binder: SELECT (SELECT COUNT(place) FROM w WHERE
    f("Is it in united kingdom?"; place) = 'yes') = 8


## MMQA
Generate SQL given the question, table, passages, image captions
to answer the question correctly.
...
CREATE TABLE 2018 Warrington Wolves season(
    row_id int,
    player text,
    signed from text,
    contract length text,
    announced text)
/*
3 example rows:
SELECT * FROM w LIMIT 3;
row_id player signed from contract length announced
0 sitaleki akauola penrith panthers 2 2017-08-01
1 bryson goodwin south sydney rabbitohs 2 2017-10-01
2 tyrone roberts gold coast titans 3 2017-10-01
*/
CREATE TABLE Images(
    row_id int,
    gold coast titans text)
/*
All rows of the table:
SELECT * FROM w;
row_id gold coast titans
0 a logo for the golden knights is painted on the beach.
*/
Q: What player was transferred from the team that has crossed
    swords on its logo to the Warrington Wolves in the 2018 season?
Binder: SELECT player FROM w WHERE
    f("Has crossed swords on its logo?"; `signed from`) = 'yes'
```

In end-to-end QA setting, the prompt is almost the same, except the full table contents are used in all the in-context examples to since in most cases QA must see the complete table to answer the question correctly. We empirically find that full table input to Codex is a necessity for end-to-end QA, but only a small bonus for semantic parsing.

In the ablation study experiments, the prompt is also almost the same, except that under the very large table *scalability* setting, we truncate number of table rows instead of in-context shots to fit in Codex max token limits, in order to simulate a realistic situation where only parts of the table can be input into the model.

A.2 CODEX HYPER-PARAMETERS

In both two phases of our Codex BINDER pipeline, parsing and execution, the Codex api is called. We set the Codex in-context learning hyper-parameters as shown in Table 8.

Hyper-parameter	Parsing			Execution		
	WIKITQ	TABFACT	MMQA	WIKITQ	TABFACT	MMQA
temperature	0.4	0.6	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
top_p	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
max_output_tokens	512	512	512	1024	1024	1024
sampling_n	20	50	20	1	1	1
stop_tokens	\n\n	\n\n	\n\n	\n\n	\n\n	\n\n
num_shots	14	14	18	8	8	8

Table 8: Codex hyper-parameters we set in main experiments. Codex is used in two phases: *Parsing* and *Execution*.

Parsing In parsing phase, *i.e.* parsing questions into programming languages, we annotate a dozens or so examples from training set or modified examples from development set as in-context demonstrations for each dataset. $temperature$ is to control randomness of generations. We find 0.4 is a suitable trade-off between fidelity and diversity of generated programs in most cases. $sampling_n$ is number of generations (programs) per sample. We heuristically set $sampling_n$ as 20 in WIKITQ and MMQA to balance the time cost in execution and the potential performance gain over majority voting. For TABFACT, we increase $temperature$ to 0.6 and 50, as we empirically find that for binary classification tasks (or tasks with a small output space), more generations with more diversity can better determine the final answer.

Execution As mentioned in Section 2, the executor will call model(s) with various functionalities. In experiments, we use Codex as the underlining model for all the neural modules since Codex itself is a very powerful large language model which can realize most functions on texts and codes. For images, they are preprocessed into text via image captioning by OFA (Wang et al., 2022). Note that on MMQA, replacing Codex (with image captions) with a specific VQA model is likely to improve the performance on images because image captioning is question-agnostic while VQA model can predict the answer based on the question.

We let Codex output only one answer with $temperature$ 0.0 per input instead of multiple answers followed by a majority vote considering the time cost. An interesting thing is that even when $temperature$ is 0.0, the Codex outputs may be different in two inferences. OpenAI team said the randomness inherent to GPU computations, and generally the outputs will be the consistent in most cases, which is aligned with our observations.

We also find it better to give Codex some in-context demonstrations for the neural module functionality. 50 samples are annotated as a small retrieve pool (shared across datasets) for mapping a column to a new one according to the question, $i.e.$, f_m API in BINDER grammar. A simple BLEU score retriever will retrieve 8 similar items from the pool as in-context demonstrations for each coming sample. Below are several examples demonstrating the formats of neural module functionality prompt. The output (sub-)table contains a new mapped column named after the query, which will be further merged into the original table. Note it is important to formulate the output also as a (sub-)table, otherwise if Codex outputs a list of answers, it will be confused which row it is generating answer for and perform very poorly.

```
## 1
Give a database as shown below:
Table: Highest mountain peaks of California
/*
row_id  prominence
0       10080 ft; 3072 m
1       1677 ft; 511 m
2       7196 ft; 2193 m
3       2894 ft; 882 m
4       9832 ft; 2997 m
5       2563 ft; 781 m
*/
Q: Answer question "What is the value of in feet?" row by row.
QA map@ output:
```

```
/*
row_id  prominence          What is the value of in feet?
0       10080 ft; 3072 m    10080
1       1677 ft; 511 m      1677
2       7196 ft; 2193 m     7196
3       2894 ft; 882 m      2894
4       9832 ft; 2997 m     9832
5       2563 ft; 781 m      2563
*/


## 2
Give a database as shown below:
Table: 2010-11 UAB Blazers men’s basketball team
/*
row_id  hometown
0       chicago, il, u.s.
1       oklahoma city, ok, u.s.
2       montgomery, al, u.s.
3       greenville, ms, u.s.
4       birmingham, al, u.s.
*/
Q: Answer question "Is it from alabama?" row by row.
QA map@ output:
/*
row_id  hometown                Is it from alabama?
0       chicago, il, u.s.       no
1       oklahoma city, ok, u.s. no
2       montgomery, al, u.s.    yes
3       greenville, ms, u.s.    no
4.      birmingham, al, u.s.    yes
*/


## 3
Give a database as shown below:
Table: 1963 International Gold Cup
/*
row_id  driver
0       jim clark
1       richie ginther
2       graham hill
3       jack brabham
4       tony maggs
*/
Q: Answer question "What is his/her country?" row by row.
QA map@ output:
/*
row_id  driver           What is his/her country?
0       jim clark        scotland
1       richie ginther   united states
2       graham hill      england
3       jack brabham     australia
4       tony maggs       south africa
*/
```

A.3 MAJORITY VOTE STRATEGY

Majority vote is widely used to ensemble multiple candidate answers. A simple implementation of majority vote is to select the answer that appears most often in candidates as the final answer. For example, given a candidate answer pool C with n answers, the output answer a_{out} is derived by:

$$a_{out} = \arg\max_{a}(count(a)), a \in set(C) \quad (1)$$

where $count(\cdot)$ function counts the number of occurrences of the input answer in C, and $set(\cdot)$ function de-duplicates the input list. In our case, n programs are generated per sample, and their execution results compose the candidate answer pool.

In experiments, we adopt two variants of majority vote strategies. The first one we call *answer-biased*. In TABFACT, we conjecture that it is difficult to validate a statement of multiple sub-statements as *entailed* (*i.e.*, answer 1) with SQL program, since a minor error in program will cause the execution to output *refuted* (*i.e.*, answer 0). In other words, we value it when an answer 1 occurs because it indicates the statement has a high probability of being *entailed*. Thus, we re-weight answers by assigning four votes for an answer 1, and one vote for an answer 0. The second is *program-biased*. We assign larger weights to BINDER language when it occurs in the generated programs because BINDER consists of small portion in few-shot prompt, and thus more generations will be in standard programming language. Specifically, we re-weight BINDER program with ten votes, and the others with one vote in WIKITQ and MMQA.

A.4 BINDER GRAMMAR ADAPTION TO SQL



Figure 4: An illustration of BINDER program AST and extension to SQL grammar. The blue types in the production rule are extended by BINDER.

BINDER extends the production rules of the programming language to ensure the return values of API calls can be compatible with its original grammar. Take SQL as an example, in Figure 4, two APIs f_{col} and f_{val} are added as identifiers in the production rules to fit in as a *column* and a *value* in SQL. The AST of the shown BINDER program is quite similar to standard SQL's AST, except that API calls are placed in the column position.

A.5 EVALUATOR

Program executions are naturally more difficult to match gold answers exactly when the answer is not a span in the input knowledge source, while end-to-end models may match this pattern by finetuning or infer phrases from the question. However, we find that in WIKITQ, some error cases of program execution outputs are correct according to humans. These cases mainly fall into two types. The first is *A or B* choice question, *e.g.*,, "Are there at least 13 different components on the chart?" in Table 9. The SQL program `SELECT COUNT(component) > 13`, returns 1 to indicate "yes" and 0 for "no". Generally in *A or B* problem, we match 1 with *A* and 0 with *B*. The second is *number with unit* question, *e.g.*,, "what is the difference in years between constituency 1 and 2" in Table 9, where the gold answer contains unit *years* in it, while it is almost impossible for programs to derive *years*, and 4 is also a reasonable correct answer in this case. Therefore, we add pre-matching logics upon WIKITQ official evaluator for these two problems. Besides, we also normalize the dates with $Recognizers$ package in Python. Table 9 gives some examples to show the differences of three WIKITQ evaluators. For fair comparison, all previous baselines are re-evaluated with the *semantic-match* evaluator in experiments.

Example	EM(TaPEx string match)	EM(WIKITQ official)	EM(Semantic match)
(Normalization) *Question:* What was the same problem that Bernard Collomb had as Innes Ireland? *Gold Answer:* oil pressure *Pred Answer:* oil pressure (56 laps)	×	✓	✓
(Float Precision) *Question:* What is the difference between the qualifying time in 1967 and 1965? *Gold Answer:* 7.45 *Pred Answer:* 7.449999999999989	×	✓	✓
(A or B Choice) *Question:* Are there at least 13 different components on the chart? *Gold Answer:* Yes *Pred Answer:* 1	×	×	✓
(Number with Units) *Question:* What is the difference in years between constiuency 1 and 2? *Gold Answer:* 4 years *Pred Answer:* 4	×	×	✓

Table 9: Examples to illustrate differences among three exact match evaluators on WIKITQ. In experiments, we evaluate all baselines and our method with semantic-match evaluator.



Figure 5: Comparison of the BINDER method(ours) with other large language model usage paradigms: End-to-End, Chain-of-Thought, and Semantic Parsing/Code Generation.

B COMPARISON WITH OTHER LARGE LANGUAGE MODEL USAGE PARADIGMS

Besides our work, some other works also focus on how to leverage large language models in creative ways to achieve better performance on downstream tasks and see improvements with proper designs. We compare our Binder method with the three previous paradigms of large language model usage: End-End, Chain-of-Thought, and Semantic Parsing/Code Generation.

End-to-End End-to-End method (Brown et al., 2020; Hoffmann et al., 2022, *i.a.*) aims to use large language models to generate final answers directly, often done by providing a task description and/or a few examples for in-context learning. Despite being effective enough to reach state-of-the-art or comparable performance in a large number of benchmarks, it suffers from being uninterpretable and lacking in robustness.

Chain-of-thought Chain-of-thought methods (Wei et al., 2022; Chowdhery et al., 2022a; Kojima et al., 2022; Chung et al., 2022, *i.a.*) improve the ability of large language models to perform complex reasoning by generating a series of intermediate reasoning steps. While achieving great success in various benchmarks, as a model-generated natural language, chain-of-thought suffers from unreliability and uncontrollability.

Semantic Parsing/Code Generation Semantic Parsing/Code Generation methods (Chen et al., 2021; Rajkumar et al., 2022; Shi et al., 2022) aim to parse the question into a pre-defined program(SQL, Python, etc.), then execute it through the corresponding interpreter. It gains advantages in interpretability and robustness compared with End-to-End and Chain-of-Thought methods, but still suffers from the fixed grammar of the pre-defined programming language, making it inherently limited in coverage (Shi et al., 2020b).

BINDER BINDER is a neural-symbolic paradigm that aims at mapping the question to a program that allows binding a unified LM API for additional functionalities. This keeps the interpretability and robustness of the semantic parsing method while unlocking the grammar's limitations on its coverage.

C MORE EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS

C.1 RESULTS OF MORE PREVIOUS SYSTEMS

Due to page limits, we didn't list the complete previous systems in main results of WIKITQ and TABFACT. In this section, we present comparisons between more previous methods and ours, as shown in Table 10 and Table 11.

Method	Dev	Test
Finetuned		
Pasupat & Liang (2015)	37.0	37.1
Neelakantan et al. (2015)	34.1	34.2
Zhang et al. (2017)	40.6	43.7
Liang et al. (2018)	42.7	43.8
Dasigi et al. (2019)	43.1	44.3
Agarwal et al. (2019)	43.2	44.1
Wang et al. (2019)	43.7	44.5
Herzig et al. (2020)	-	48.8
Xie et al. (2022)¶	51.9	50.6
Yin et al. (2020)	53.0	52.3
Yu et al. (2020)	51.9	52.7
Guo et al. (2021)	53.6	52.3
Liu et al. (2021)¶	60.4	59.1
Zhou et al. (2022)¶	61.1	61.3
Jiang et al. (2022)¶	-	63.3
Without Finetuning		
Codex end-to-end QA¶	50.5	48.7
Codex SQL¶†	60.2	61.1
Codex BINDER † (Ours)	**65.3**	**65.2**

Table 10: WIKITQ execution accuracy of more previous systems. ¶ means the result has been re-evaluated by the semantic-match evaluator in Table 9. † means symbolic method that outputs intermediate languages.

Method	Small Test
Finetuned	
Chen et al. (2019a)†	68.1
Zhong et al. (2020)†	74.3
Shi et al. (2020a)†	74.2
Yang et al. (2020)†	76.2
Ou & Liu (2022)†	77.0
Liu et al. (2021) (BART-Large)	82.5
Eisenschlos et al. (2020)	83.9
Xie et al. (2022)	85.4
Liu et al. (2021) (Tapex)	**85.9**
Without Finetuning	
Codex end-to-end QA	72.6
Codex SQL†	80.7
Codex BINDER † (Ours)	**85.1**
with few-shot retriever	**86.0**

Table 11: TABFACT accuracy on small test set of more previous systems. † means symbolic method that outputs intermediate languages.

Method	Dev	Test
Finetuned		
T5-3B (Xie et al., 2022)	51.6	50.3
Tapex (Liu et al., 2021)	60.1	58.5
TaCube (Zhou et al., 2022)	60.9	60.8
OmniTab (Jiang et al., 2022)	-	**62.9**
Without Finetuning		
Codex end-to-end QA	49.3	47.6
Codex SQL†	57.6	55.1
Codex BINDER † (Ours)	**62.6**	**61.9**

Table 12: WIKITQ execution accuracy using its official evaluator, with a normalizer to recognize date.

C.2 RESULTS WITH WIKITQ OFFICIAL EVALUATORS

We list BINDER performance evaluated under WIKITQ official evaluator in Table 12. As shown, there exist performance drops compared with semantic-match evaluator. The symbolic methods with SQL and BINDER see larger drops (about 2.5%) than end-to-end methods (about 1%) because the *A or B choice* questions and *number with units* answers (illustrated in Table 9) are judged as incorrect.

C.3 ABLATION STUDY OF #MAJORITY VOTE CANDIDATES

In this section, we give an empirical study of how number of generations (*i.e.*, candidate BINDER programs) affects majority voting performance. As shown in Figure 6 and Figure 7, increasing the #candidates of majority vote effectively improves the performance on WIKITQ and TABFACT. Empirically, TABFACT requires more candidates to determine *entailed* or *refuted*. We haven't conducted experiments on WIKITQ with more than 20 candidate programs now, which may potentially lift the current best performance a bit.



Figure 6: WIKITQ execution accuracy on dev set with different numbers of generations (x-axis) used in majority vote.



Figure 7: TABFACT execution accuracy on small test set with different numbers of generations (x-axis) used in majority vote.

C.4 WIKITQ SQL UNSOLVABLE PROPORTION BY OUR STATISTICS

In Table 3, the decomposition of execution accuracy on WIKITQ development set, we can see the BINDER method also gain advantage on Program-solvable subset (and pure SQL method still able to have a certain performance on Program-unsolvable part). It is surprisingly since this part could already be solved by SQL (according to notation from SQUALL dataset), and thus our approach does not theoretically improve the performance of this part. Further, we found this is because in SQUALL, authors normalized part of the table before doing the SQL annotation, and they also missed some samples that could be solved after normalizing the table. In turn, there is a significant portion of the data marked by SQUALL, and when we use the original table rather than the table modified by the authors, we find that it belongs to the part that cannot be resolved by the program, so that BINDER could gain some advantage on it. The same is true for the part that is not marked by

SQUALL. We re-executed the SQL annotation of the SQUALL dataset on the tables we normalized for each sample, check and re-judged whether the sample was a Program-solvable sample by whether the execution result matched the previous one, and obtained the new split of 1251 (44.19%) and 1580 (55.81%) for Program-unsolvable and Program-solvable set, respectively.(Previous split according to SQUALL is of 625 (22.08%) and 2206 (77.92%) examples. This reduces table content noise by artificially cleaning the table, but also underestimates the challenges posed by in-the-wild data.) The new split will be released in our code for future more fine-grained analysis or exploration.

D PIPELINE TO EXTEND BINDER



Figure 8: A pipeline to extend BINDER to a new domain.

In this section, we introduce a pipeline with Codex to extend BINDER to a new domain with new the programming language and neural modules. Figure 8 illustrates the pipeline:

(1) A programming language is selected as the intermediate representation according to the domain. For example, SQL fits table domain, SPARQL, Cypher fit knowledge graph domain, and general-purpose languages like Python, Lisp, and Java are more likely to be adapted to various domains.

(2) Before parsing the text into BINDER programs in-context examples are required to help Codex learn this task and the grammar adaption (inserted neural modules) from the original language. Empirically, since Codex has been heavily pretrained on code, a dozen of BINDER program annotations are enough. Besides, annotating a pool of more examples (*e.g.*, 100) and retrieving in-context examples for each inference sample has been proved to be a effective way to improve parsing accuracy, as we applied in TABFACT.

(3) Generate the BINDER programs with Codex given the in-context examples and the inference query. Codex hyper-parameters can be adjusted based on the task.

(4) Bind models with the neural module functionalities in BINDER program. In this paper, we set Codex as the only underlying model for all functionalities like commonsense QA, information extraction because large language models (LLM) are powerful and easy-to-use. If a single LLM is not enough to realize the required functionalities, *e.g.,* VQA, bind the API with a specialized VQA model given the inputs are images.

(5) Execute the BINDER programs with the deterministic language executor and neural models.

E ERROR ANALYSIS

E.1 ERROR TYPES

We divide the error type into:

(1) **Syntax error**: prediction not satisfied with the syntax of BINDER program.

(2) **Semantic error**:

- *Column*: choose the wrong column, or miss the restriction from certain column.
- *Value*: use the wrong value, or obfuscate the fuzzy match with the exact match.
- *Operator*: use wrong operator or miss the restriction of operators.
- *Structure*: The query produced an overall structural error. Either the overall meaning of the query is misinterpreted; or the query only considers the question and is not applicable to this table at all.

row_id	year	site	winning team	losing team	series
0	1902	lawrence	kansas 16	kansas state 0	ku 1–0
1	1903	lawrence	kansas 34	kansas state 0	ku 2–0
2	1904	manhattan	kansas 41	kansas state 4	ku 3–0
3	1905	lawrence	kansas 28	kansas state 0	ku 4–0
4	1906	manhattan	kansas state 6	kansas 4	ku 4–1
5	1907	lawrence	kansas 29	kansas state 10	ku 5–1
...					
21	1924	manhattan	kansas state 6	kansas 0	ku 17–2–3
22	1925	lawrence	kansas state 14	kansas 7	ku 17–3–3
23	1926	manhattan	kansas state 27	kansas 0	ku 17–4–3
24	1927	lawrence	kansas state 13	kansas 2	ku 17–5–3
25	1928	manhattan	kansas 7	kansas state 0	ku 18–5–3
...					

Table 13: The table of WIKITQ nt-1239 with title "Kansas–Kansas State football rivalry". We use it for demonstration of interpretibility. Removed rows unimportant to get the answer. The query is *When was the first game that kansas state won by double digits?* and the gold answer is *1926*.

- BINDER *usage*: missing the usage of BINDER when needed, or the command inside the BINDER cell is improper or ambiguous to execute.

(3) **Incorrect execution**: The predicted program is correct, but the final result are wrong because some wrong mid-term answers are predicted in the execution process(error in information extraction, error in handling the corner cases value etc.).

(4) **False negative**: the annotation of the gold answer is wrong; or the prediction is actually right while the executor misjudges it as wrong due to limited ability.

E.2 ERROR EXAMPLE

The context(table, query, answer) of WIKITQ nt-1239 is shown in Table 13.

F ANNOTATION INTERFACE

We build an annotation interface allowing real-time executions with huggingface spaces[3]. Currently, SQL and BINDER with SQL are supported. We will release the source code which hopefully may benefit annotations of tasks requiring symbolic languages in the community, *e.g.*, semantic parsing and code generation. Figure 9 and 10 demonstrate our interface.

[3]https://huggingface.co/spaces

Question: when was the last time kansas state lost with 0 points in manhattan?

Title: Kansas–Kansas State football rivalry

	row_id	year	site	winning team	losing team	series
0	0	1902	lawrence	kansas 16	kansas state 0	ku 1–0
1	1	1903	lawrence	kansas 34	kansas state 0	ku 2–0
2	2	1904	manhattan	kansas 41	kansas state 4	ku 3–0
3	3	1905	lawrence	kansas 28	kansas state 0	ku 4–0
4	4	1906	manhattan	kansas state 6	kansas 4	ku 4–1
5	5	1907	lawrence	kansas 29	kansas state 10	ku 5–1
6	6	1908	lawrence	kansas 12	kansas state 6	ku 6–1
7	7	1909	manhattan	kansas 5	kansas state 3	ku 7–1
8	8	1911	manhattan	kansas 6	kansas state 0	ku 8–1
9	9	1912	lawrence	kansas 19	kansas state 6	ku 9–1

Answer: ['1964']

Full info for this dataset item(if you need)

{...}

Neural SQL

```
SELECT MAX(Year) FROM w WHERE QA("map@Did Kansas State lost with 0 points?"; `losing team`)="
```

Execution Answer: [1964]

Submit

Download annotations

Figure 9: An example from WIKITQ annotation interface.

Statement: the album powerhouse be release in 1968

Table:

caption

none

	row_id	year	title	from album	label
0	0	1962	2022-8-29tni / sinnin' sam	lookin' ahead	pacific jazz
1	1	1962	the young rabbits / song …	lookin' ahead	pacific jazz
2	2	1962	congolese sermon / weat…	(only on 45)	pacific jazz
3	3	1963	no name samba / tough talk	tough talk	world pacific
4	4	1963	turkish black / boopie	tough talk	world pacific
5	5	1963	spanish castles / bluesette	jazz waltz (w les mccann)	world pacific
6	6	1964	heat wave / on broadway	heat wave	world pacific
7	7	1964	i remember 2022-8-30 / lo…	stretchin' out	world pacific
8	8	1965	tough talk / the thing	the thing	world pacific
9	9	1965	aqua dulce / soul bourge	chile con soul	world pacific

Answer: 1

1 means entailed, 0 means refuted.

Full info for this dataset item(if you need)

{...}

Neural SQL

SELECT (SELECT year FROM w WHERE `from album` = "lighthouse '68") = 1968

Execution Answer: [1]

Submit

Download annotations

Figure 10: An example from TABFACT annotation interface.