

TableBench: A Comprehensive and Complex Benchmark for Table Question Answering

Xianjie Wu¹, Jian Yang^{1*}, Linzheng Chai¹, Ge Zhang², Jiaheng Liu¹, Xinrun Du¹,
Di Liang³, Daixin Shu¹, Xianfu Cheng¹, Tianzhen Sun¹,
Guanglin Niu¹, Tongliang Li⁴, Zhoujun Li¹

¹CCSE, Beihang University, ²University of Waterloo, ³Fudan University

⁴Beijing Information Science and Technology University

wuxianjie@buaa.edu.cn

Abstract

Recent advancements in large language models (LLMs) have markedly enhanced the interpretation and processing of tabular data, introducing previously unimaginable capabilities. Despite these achievements, LLMs still encounter significant challenges when applied in industrial scenarios, particularly due to the increased complexity of reasoning required with real-world tabular data, underscoring a notable disparity between academic benchmarks and practical applications. To address this discrepancy, we conduct a detailed investigation into the application of tabular data in industrial scenarios and propose a comprehensive and complex benchmark TableBench, including 18 fields within four major categories of table question answering (TableQA) capabilities. Furthermore, we introduce TABLELLM, trained on our meticulously constructed training set TableInstruct, achieving comparable performance with GPT-3.5. Massive experiments conducted on TableBench indicate that both open-source and proprietary LLMs still have significant room for improvement to meet real-world demands, where the most advanced model, GPT-4, achieves only a modest score compared to humans.¹

1 Introduction

Recent studies have shown the potential of large language models (LLMs) on tabular tasks such as table question answering (TableQA) (Zhu et al., 2021; Zhao et al., 2023; Heggelmann et al., 2023; Li et al., 2023b; Zhang et al., 2024b; Lu et al., 2024) by adopting in-context learning and structure-aware prompts (Singha et al., 2023), suggesting that a well-organized representation of tables improves the interpretation of tabular. Tai et al. (2023) notes that eliciting a step-by-step reasoning process from LLMs enhances their ability to

*Corresponding author.

¹The instruction data, benchmark, and leaderboard are available at <https://tablebench.github.io/>.

Year	Gallons Consumed (in millions)	Fuel Expense (in millions)	Average Price Per Gallon	Percentage of Total Operating Expense	Available Seat Miles per Fuel Gallon
2018	4,137	\$9,307	\$2.25	24%	67
2017	3,978	\$6,913	\$1.74	20%	66
2016	3,904	\$5,813	\$1.49	18%	65




Figure 1: Typical challenges in TableBench: 1) Multi-hop fact-checking involves multiple steps to establish the relationship between facts across different years. 2) Multi-hop numerical reasoning requires calculating total operating expenses not directly provided in the table for specific years. 3) Trend forecasting involves estimating future data trends based on historical data analysis. 4) Chart generation necessitates executing program commands to create charts.

comprehend and respond to tabular data queries. Furthermore, Zha et al. (2023) investigates the use of external interfaces for improved understanding of tabular data.

Traditionally, adapting language models for tabular data processing entailed modifying their architectures with specialized features such as position embeddings and attention mechanisms to grasp tables' structural nuances. However, the introduction of LLMs like GPT-4, GPT-3.5 (Brown et al., 2020; OpenAI, 2023), and PaLM2 (Anil et al., 2023) has heralded a new approach focused on the art of crafting precise, information-rich prompts that seamlessly integrate table data, coupled with leveraging external programming languages like SQL, Python,

or other languages (Wang et al., 2023; Chai et al., 2024a), which facilitates more sophisticated chain-of-thought (Wei et al., 2022; Chai et al., 2024b) (CoT) reasoning processes across both proprietary and open-source LLM platforms, including Llama. Such advancements have propelled the fine-tuning of models for tabular data-specific tasks, showcased by initiatives like StructLM (Zhuang et al., 2024), enhancing capabilities in table structure recognition, fact verification, column type annotation, and beyond. However, the existing benchmark might not entirely resonate with the practical challenges, especially complex reasoning requirements encountered by professionals routinely navigating tabular data in real-world settings. *Therefore, there is a huge need for creating a benchmark to bridge the gap between the industrial scenarios and the academic benchmark.*

To better evaluate the capability of LLMs in Table QA, we introduce TableBench, a comprehensive and complex benchmark covering 18 subcategories within four major categories of TableQA abilities. First, We systematically analyze real-world challenges related to table applications and define task complexity based on the required number of reasoning steps. Based on the analysis, we introduce a rigorous annotation workflow, integrating manual and automated methods, to construct TableBench. Subsequently, We create a massively TableQA instruction corpora TableInstruct, covering three distinct reasoning methods. Textual chain-of-thought (TCoT) utilizes a textual reasoning approach, employing a series of inferential steps to deduce the final answer. Symbolic chain-of-thought (SCoT) adopts symbolic reasoning steps, leveraging programming commands to iteratively simulate and refine results through a *Think then Code* process. Conversely, program-of-thought (PoT) generates executable code, using lines of code as reasoning steps within a programming environment to derive the final result. Based on open-source models and TableInstruct, we propose TABLELLM as a strong baseline to explore the reasoning abilities of LLMs among tabular data, yielding comparable performance with GPT-3.5. Furthermore, we evaluate the performance of over 30 LLMs across these reasoning methods on TableBench, highlighting that both open-source and proprietary LLMs require substantial improvements to meet real-world demands. Notably, even the most advanced model, GPT-4, achieves only a modest score when com-

pared to human performance.

The contributions are summarized as follows:

- We propose TableBench, a human-annotated comprehensive and complex TableQA benchmark comprising 886 samples across 18 fields, designed to facilitate fact-checking, numerical reasoning, data analysis, and visualization tasks.
- We introduce TableInstruct, a massive TableQA instruction corpus covering three distinct reasoning methods. TABLELLM, trained on TableInstruct, serves as a robust baseline for TableBench.
- We systematically evaluate the interpretation and processing capabilities of 30+ models on our crafted TableBench and create a leaderboard to evaluate them on four main tasks. Notably, extensive experiments suggest that comprehensive and complex TableQA evaluation can realistically measure the gap between leading language models and human capabilities in real-world scenarios.

2 Construction of TableBench

To bridge the gap between academic benchmarks and industrial scenarios, we comprehensively analyze tabular data applications in real-world contexts, categorizing these problems into four major categories and 18 specific subcategories. We define the complexity of these tasks based on the reasoning steps required for problem-solving and provide detailed guidelines for defining and decomposing these steps, which are rigorously followed during the annotation process. Additionally, we introduce an annotation framework that combines manual and automated methods to enhance annotation efficiency, as illustrated in Figure 2. Finally, we propose two high-quality corpora: TableBench, a comprehensive and complex benchmark consisting of 886 samples, and TableInstruct (20K samples in total), massive instruction corpora designed to instruct LLMs with various reasoning methods.

2.1 Tabular Data Collection

We collect raw tabular data from existing datasets, including typical datasets such as WTQ (Pasupat and Liang, 2015), SQA (Iyyer et al., 2017), TabFact (Nan et al., 2022), FeTaQA (Nan et al., 2022), FinQA (Chen et al., 2021b), AIT-QA (Katsis et al.,




Figure 2: A comprehensive overview of the annotation framework.

2022), etc. We select tables based on topics and size, ensuring each contains at least 8 rows and 5 columns. We focus on tables with significant numerical values to emphasize numerical reasoning, thereby ensuring the complexity of the tabular data. Ultimately, we collect 3681 tables covering 20 major topics: finance, competition, sports, science, etc.

2.2 Question Annotation

We opt to manually construct a more complex set of questions to mitigate the data leak risk in LLMs rather than modifying existing datasets. We introduce a self-inspiration question generation mechanism to construct questions across different categories. Firstly, We meticulously craft one seed question and a detailed definition for each category, forming the initial question seed corpus. Subsequently, we incorporate these initial seed questions as examples into a meticulously designed prompt to guide GPT4-based agents in generating questions that adhere to specific category constraints. We limit the output to five questions in the initial rounds. These questions are manually annotated to identify new patterns and added to the seed corpus. We continuously select representative questions into the question seed corpus to promote benchmark qualities, eventually maintained at 50 questions, serving as the test set questions for TableBench. Upon reaching 50 questions per category, we conduct manual annotations on a sample basis (30%), with the remaining questions validated

by another GPT-4 agent through a question verification process, eventually serving as the questions for TableInstruct.

2.3 Answer Annotation

We design a self-consistency mechanism for annotating answers based on a given table and question. During the answer generation phase, we utilize three LLM agents, each employing a distinct reasoning method (TCoT, SCoT, and PoT) to generate responses. We introduce a voting mechanism to assess the answers generated by the different agents. We preliminarily reserve the results if the voting system identifies a valid consistency among all agents. These preliminary results are then subjected to manual review and modification to produce the final answer and its associated reasoning details. Additionally, to minimize bias in answers generated by LLMs, we enforce a strict format for all answers, retaining only the essential and accurate content, thereby avoiding any preference for model-specific answer styles. For answers excluded due to inconsistencies, particularly those stemming from questions deemed too complex for LLMs to generate an adequate response, we randomly select 30% of the filtered data for manual annotation and subsequently incorporate them into the dataset. Notably, We manually annotate all answers in the TableBench with no omissions and carefully scrutinize each.

2.4 Human Annotation

We paid all the annotators the equivalent of \$6 per question and provided them with a comfortable working environment, free meals, and souvenirs. We also provided the computer equipment and GPT-4 interface required for labeling. We labeled about 2,000 questions in total and employed them to check the quality of the questions/answers, and the total cost was about \$12,000 in US dollars. The annotators checked the derived tasks, including multilingual code explanation and code completion.

2.5 Quality Control

Iterative Annotation We requested feedback from annotators on the task instructions and the website’s user experience, making iterative modifications to the annotation guidelines and website design based on this feedback.

Double-Blind Annotation We employed a double-blind mechanism by assigning two independent annotators to each generated question or answer during the annotation process. These annotators worked independently, without any prior discussion. Following this, we conducted checks for annotation consistency. In cases of discrepancies, experts were invited to review the differing annotations, serving as guidelines to further refine our annotation standards, ensuring a comprehensive understanding of the constraints for specific categories of questions and the validity of computational results.

Quality Assessment	Average Score	Human Agreement(%)	Randolph’s Kappa(%) / 95% CI
Table Complexity	3.94	79%	78% / [76%, 80%]
Question Complexity	4.12	88%	86% / [84%, 88%]
Objectivity of Answers	4.53	93%	92% / [89%, 94%]
Reasoning Steps	6.43	81%	78% / [74%, 82%]

Table 1: Quality assessment over 100 samples showcase the high consistency and complexity of TableBench

Quality Assessment We invited five internal annotators to assess the quality of TableBench across four dimensions. Given the subjective nature of evaluating complexity and objectivity, annotators were asked to score based on their personal judgment. We designed a scoring system ranging from 1 to 5, providing reference examples and criteria for different scores. Reasoning steps follow the definition in 2.6. Additionally, we also reported an agreement percentage and Randolph’s Kappa (Randolph, 2005) (with 95% CI) in Table 1. The

quantitative and qualitative analyses of the benchmark not only demonstrated its complexity but also highlighted the consistency of data annotations.

2.6 Dataset Statistic

Properties	Value
<i>Basic Insight</i>	
Unique Tables	3681
Question Length(Avg)	20.30
Answer Length (Avg)	8.52
Columns Per Table	6.68
Rows Per Table	16.71
Ratio of Numerical Cells	65.74%
Average Reasoning Steps	6.26
<i>Question Categories</i>	
Fact Checking	Match-Based Fact Checking Multi-hop Fact Checking
Numerical Reasoning	Arithmetic Calculation Comparison Aggregation Ranking Counting Time-based Calculation Multi-hop Numerical Reasoning
Data Analysis	Domain-Specific Descriptive Analysis Anomaly Detection Statistical Analysis Correlation Analysis Causal Analysis Trend Forecasting Impact Analysis
Visualization	ChartGeneration
TableBench Size	886
TableInstruct Size	19,661

Table 2: Data statistics of TableBench

Topics As illustrated in Figure 3, TableBench primarily comprises numerical tables, with the largest proportions being financial reports and data from competitive events.




Figure 3: Table Topic distribution

Question Categories Drawing from real-world scenarios and user demands for tabular data, we devise four primary question categories: fact-checking, numerical reasoning, data analysis, and

visualization, encompassing 18 subcategories, thoroughly illustrating the various challenges encountered in TableQA scenarios. Compared with existing datasets, TableBench encompasses a broader spectrum of question categories as presented in Table 3, with a particular emphasis on data analysis and chart generation capabilities that are notably scarce in prior datasets.

Dataset	Test Set Examples	Fact Checking	Numerical Reasoning	Data Analysis	Visualization
WTQ	4,344	✓	✗	✗	✗
SQA	3,012	✓	✗	✗	✗
TabFact	12,779	✓	✗	✗	✗
FeTaQA	2,000	✓	✗	✗	✗
FinQA	1,147	✗	✓	✗	✗
AIT-QA	515	✗	✓	✗	✗
WikiSQL	15,878	✓	✓	✗	✗
Spider	1,034	✓	✓	✗	✗
Bird	1,534	✗	✓	✓	✗
Text2Analysis	2,249	✗	✗	✓	✓
TableBench	886	✓	✓	✓	✓

Table 3: Comparison with existing datasets in categories.



Figure 4: Comparison with existing datasets in complexity

Reasoning Steps We define the complexity of the dataset by calculating the number of reasoning steps required to solve the problem. Figure 4 demonstrates that the overall complexity of TableBench is significantly higher than that of existing datasets, particularly in questions about data analysis and visualization.

3 TABLELLM

3.1 Problem Definition

Table question answering (Table QA) can be formulated as follows: Given a semi-structured table \mathcal{T} , comprised of \mathcal{R} rows and \mathcal{C} columns, the objective is to generate an answer \mathcal{A} to a question \mathcal{Q} utilizing the information contained within \mathcal{T} , where \mathcal{A} is a set of values or entities denoted as $\{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k\}$, where $k \in \mathbb{N}^+$.

3.2 Reasoning Methods

In-context learning (Dong et al., 2022) (ICL) refers to strategies that optimize input for LLMs (\mathcal{M}) to generate practical outputs with a task-specific instruction (\mathcal{I}) and a few output examples (\mathcal{E}). We introduce distinct reasoning methods to fully assess the reasoning capabilities of LLMs.

Textual Chain-of-Thought (TCoT) TCoT (Wei et al., 2022) refers to a reasoning process in which LLMs incrementally derive a series of intermediate steps or sub-goals through textual prompts before generating the final answer. These intermediate steps constitute a "thought chain" that ultimately leads the model to the correct outcome. Formally, the method is:

$$\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{E}) \rightarrow \{r_1, r_2, \dots, r_k, \mathcal{A}\} \quad (1)$$

where r_k represents the k -th reasoning step.

Symbolic Chain-of-Thought (SCoT) SCoT implements a methodology that utilizes Python-based instruction to facilitate logical reasoning, comprising three primary steps repeated until a definitive conclusion is derived: STEP-1: Analyzing the available information to determine the next move. STEP-2: Generating instructions using Python programming language commands. STEP-3: Simulating the outcomes by executing the instructions and analyzing the results. The entire steps can be formally framed as follows:

$$\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{E}) \rightarrow \{(r_{a_1}, r_{p_1}, r_{s_1}), \dots, (r_{a_k}, r_{p_k}, r_{s_k}), \mathcal{A}\} \quad (2)$$

where r_{a_k} is the analyzing step, r_{p_k} is the program commands generating step, and r_{s_k} is the result simulation step.

Program-of-Thoughts (PoT) PoT (Chen et al., 2022) offers a novel approach to numerical reasoning tasks by distinctly delineating computation from reasoning. PoT decomposes the problem into programming commands \mathcal{P} and utilizes a language interpreter, like Python, to compile and execute the resultant code. In contrast to SCoT, PoT enhances reasoning capabilities by actually executing generated code (\mathcal{P}) within a programming environment to output results, thereby implementing reasoning through structured code steps. The method can be formulated as:

$$\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{E}) \rightarrow \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathcal{A} \quad (3)$$

	Fact Checking		Num-Reasoning			Data Analysis			Visualization			Overall								
	DP	TCoT	SCoT	PoT@1	DP	TCoT	SCoT	PoT@1	DP	TCoT	SCoT	PoT@1	DP	TCoT	SCoT	PoT@1				
Human Performance	94.3			87.1			82.1			86.3			85.91							
<i>Open-source In Context Learning Methods</i>																				
Llama2-7B-Chat	41.14	34.99	27.47	3.61	7.43	6.7	4.63	3.95	23.78	14.31	12.49	1.56	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.98	12.36	9.95	2.76
CodeLlama-7B-Instruct	42.5	33.06	12.34	19.44	6.1	5.43	2.99	13.31	24.88	16.16	17.06	1.79	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	17.01	12.3	9.28	8.85
Gemini-7B-Instruct	29.69	27.63	10.07	21.62	6.44	6.78	2.91	10.45	22.21	20.33	11.76	6.74	2.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	14.82	13.96	6.97	9.81
Mistral-7B-Instruct	50.15	50.45	40.56	6.25	9.32	8.73	5.77	2.6	24.55	21.99	21.12	1.19	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	19.15	17.86	15.11	2.35
Deepseek-Coder-7B-Instruct	21.6	22.92	27.48	48.98	4.75	6.45	5.61	34.66	22.17	18.73	20.72	18.17	14.0	8.0	18.0	18.0	13.82	13.1	14.58	28.89
CodeQwen1.5-7B-Chat	32.01	30.56	32.94	0.0	7.08	6.24	5.68	0.0	25.86	27.04	22.47	0.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	16.76	16.8	14.85	0.0
Qwen1.5-7B-Chat	26.47	56.08	53.53	39.23	8.04	11.3	10.99	20.4	24.13	24.77	22.96	7.66	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	15.84	20.7	19.65	16.29
Qwen2-7B-Instruct	53.76	57.7	57.52	0.0	15.75	16.09	16.65	0.76	21.51	24.02	21.5	0.38	0.0	0.0	4.0	2.0	21.23	22.77	22.26	0.6
StructLM-7B	34.64	47.72	64.06	13.54	5.79	9.55	19.97	11.48	14.37	19.59	23.83	4.38	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.06	17.06	25.21	8.3
MAP-Neo-7B-Instruct	22.43	32.7	33.22	0.0	7.17	7.23	6.46	0.0	18.21	21.85	14.38	0.44	0.0	0.0	4.0	4.0	12.66	15.26	12.03	0.4
Llama3-8B-Chat	70.79	38.32	72.53	13.94	18.55	22.02	17.33	19.5	28.93	30.15	30.75	9.31	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	27.28	25.71	27.59	14.43
Llama3.1-8B-Instruct	64.13	47.89	36.29	30.38	13.28	11.26	13.77	17.24	27.15	15.78	14.82	8.86	2.0	8.0	0.0	8.0	23.47	16.76	15.81	14.88
Llama2-13B-Chat	46.49	48.47	32.69	3.03	9.72	15.83	6.79	4.48	23.25	22.04	17.16	3.19	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	18.58	20.86	13.25	3.61
StructLM-13B	27.76	26.28	64.49	1.04	6.74	12.3	17.38	0.0	14.3	20.7	18.41	0.28	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.52	16.35	21.94	0.21
WizardLM-13B	52.35	53.93	46.01	8.33	11.48	13.79	16.52	14.79	25.5	22.61	20.16	3.73	0.0	0.0	4.0	4.0	20.8	20.75	20.23	9.12
Qwen1.5-14B-Chat	34.8	40.83	61.92	44.38	11.08	10.29	15.01	28.2	22.9	22.99	29.24	10.33	2.0	2.0	8.0	2.0	17.76	18.03	25.14	21.48
Qwen1.5-32B-Chat	42.32	64.99	67.86	49.01	15.6	19.13	21.15	34.01	21.46	24.27	28.29	17.43	4.0	4.0	8.0	8.0	20.21	25.38	28.3	27.79
Deepseek-Coder-33B-Instruct	28.38	48.27	54.34	33.12	5.09	9.41	12.69	32.6	10.13	9.09	21.7	19.97	8.0	0.0	0.0	24.0	9.74	13.01	19.92	27.2
CodeLlama-34B-Instruct	58.97	64.39	58.28	5.9	12.24	13.1	13.3	4.2	24.83	19.23	15.28	0.53	2.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	21.6	20.24	18.19	2.88
StructLM-34B	0.0	19.1	30.21	27.74	0.5	15.36	9.03	14.45	0.99	20.74	17.92	5.38	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	0.6	16.93	14.37	11.61
Mixtral-8x7B-Instruct	66.24	54.54	56.01	35.86	15.81	16.8	16.05	26.23	25.99	24.69	25.67	13.96	10.0	2.0	0.0	6.0	24.98	23.14	23.24	21.32
Qwen1.5-72B-Chat	75.34	71.27	67.03	33.16	21.1	19.01	16.68	20.85	28.02	26.63	27.33	13.03	0.0	2.0	8.0	14.0	28.45	26.66	25.8	18.65
Qwen2-72B-Instruct	71.11	72.5	71.13	56.37	27.32	36.97	31.81	41.33	30.9	32.2	31.85	22.36	10.0	20.0	14.0	12.0	32.52	38.13	35.14	33.91
Qwen1.5-110B-Chat	72.37	74.87	69.8	53.55	22.28	29.81	22.33	36.83	28.28	27.34	29.32	18.38	18.0	14.29	12.0	24.0	29.72	32.81	30.1	30.77
Llama3-70B-Chat	72.24	73.88	75.44	60.64	23.09	37.64	28.87	36.59	31.58	37.47	34.06	26.11	12.0	4.0	6.0	10.0	30.91	39.59	34.48	33.59
Llama3.1-70B-Instruct	72.31	76.32	77.65	59.05	27.6	44.89	38.93	34.04	31.14	35.88	33.87	23.15	22.0	26.0	6.0	34.0	33.63	43.85	39.22	32.52
<i>Close-source In Context Learning Methods</i>																				
GPT-3.5-Turbo	56.5	59.95	75.68	60.92	20.52	23.45	23.16	42.09	31.84	34.4	32.54	30.25	0.0	10.0	4.0	38.0	27.75	30.85	31.41	39.34
Qwen-Max	67.01	70.48	68.21	50.42	22.28	32.83	25.06	32.8	28.55	27.87	30.98	19.41	22.92	18.0	8.0	30.0	29.63	34.26	31.04	29.39
Yi-Large	70.26	71.41	66.08	13.19	25.01	40.18	23.2	15.25	29.74	29.22	22.59	5.97	37.5	26.0	26.0	6.0	32.43	38.57	27.82	10.9
GLM-4	70.37	67.93	73.59	31.49	24.99	34.01	26.18	25.46	31.19	30.47	31.54	25.34	6.0	8.0	14.0	22.0	31.23	34.8	32.76	25.92
Deepseek-Chat-V2	68.82	72.41	69.89	57.48	40.87	50.07	38.96	45.96	35.71	38.07	34.44	30.37	20.0	40.0	24.0	46.0	40.65	47.22	39.63	41.07
Deepseek-Coder-V2	70.25	74.58	34.9	62.91	31.48	48.46	18.23	47.08	31.07	33.52	13.09	31.62	26.0	40.0	26.0	44.0	35.21	45.02	18.5	42.67
GPT-4-Turbo	72.97	75.92	77.62	70.08	40.17	53.01	44.31	49.31	32.34	41.03	36.52	34.63	34.0	62.0	32.0	48.0	40.38	51.32	44.26	45.69
GPT-4o	74.29	72.63	71.01	62.31	42.73	54.46	42.2	47.83	34.36	38.9	34.65	30.03	38.0	56.0	38.0	54.0	42.73	50.39	42.22	42.92
<i>Open-Source Fine-Tuning Methods</i>																				
TableLLM-CodeQwen-7B	65.02	62.9	66.94	4.86	13.48	24.86	14.9	12.04	29.82	31.49	30.52	16.08	26.0	36.0	26.0	36.0	26.08	32.16	27.13	14.21
TableLLM-Deepseek-Coder-7B	67.32	69.23	63.15	7.12	17.14	35.87	21.2	14.61	29.86	31.75	29.62	21.04	26.0	36.0	18.0	30.0	27.98	37.76	28.8	17.19
TableLLM-Llama3.1-8B	63.68	68.15	65.17	25.67	18.01	30.51	17.86	28.64	28.32	33.47	30.2	19.77	24.0	24.0	18.0	44.0	27.19	35.29	27.7	25.76
TableLLM-Llama3-8B	66.03	62.13	64.46	15.07	16.59	29.42	16.73	12.68	28.02	30.21	29.45	17.53	28.0	26.0	20.0	28.0	26.93	32.89	26.97	15.83
TableLLM-Qwen2-7B	65.25	71.05	62.34	10.59	16.7	37.25	19.95	10.34	28.94	32.6	31.95	18.76	24.0	24.0	20.0	26.0	27.14	38.32	29.09	14.54

Table 4: The main results of advanced LLMs on TableBench are presented alongside human performance. Direct Prompting (DP) is a method that provides solutions directly without intermediate reasoning steps. PoT@1 refers to conducting code execution only once to derive the final answer. In the task of chart generation, all methods are required to generate code that is executed only once, evaluated with pass@1 as well.

3.3 Supervised Fine-Tuning

The TABLELLM training objective \mathcal{L}_{all} of the Table QA instruction fine-tuning on TableInstruct can be described as:

$$\mathcal{L}_{all} = - \sum_{n=1}^N \mathbb{E}_{q^{R_n}, a^{R_n} \sim \{D^{R_n}\}_{n=1}^N} \left[\log P(a^{R_n} | q^{R_n}; \mathcal{M}) \right] \quad (4)$$

where q^{R_n} and a^{R_n} are the table-related question and answer from the dataset D^{R_n} of reasoning method R_n , respectively. N is the number of reasoning methods.

4 Experiments

4.1 Implementation Details

We meticulously design uniform style prompt templates to implement distinct reasoning methods to ensure the fairness of the evaluation. Furthermore, we impose formatting constraints on the outputs of LLMs and parse the final answers from the outputs to prevent any extraneous information from affecting the evaluation results. For open-source models, we operate within the *transformer* environment on multiple A100 GPUs. For proprietary models, we employ official APIs to interact with

exclusive LLMs. We conduct supervised finetuning of various open-source LLMs on the designated training set (TableInstruct). We utilize a cosine annealing scheduler, setting the initial learning rate at $2e^{-5}$, and conduct training over three epochs. Optimization is performed using the Adam optimizer, with a batch size of 512 and a maximum sequence length of 4096.

4.2 LLMs

We evaluate 34 models with sizes ranging from 7B to 110B parameters, including general/code LLMs, open-source/proprietary models, and SFT (Ouyang et al., 2022) models. For open-source LLMs, we evaluate on Llama2s (Touvron et al., 2023), Llama3s (Dubey et al., 2024), Llama3.1s, CodeLlamas (Roziere et al., 2023), CodeQwen1.5-7B-Chat, Qwen1.5s (Bai et al., 2023), Qwen2s (Yang et al., 2024a), Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2 (Jiang et al., 2023), Deepseek-Coders (Guo et al., 2024), StructLMs (Zhuang et al., 2024), MAP-Neo-7B-Instruct (Zhang et al., 2024a), WizardLM-13B-V1.2 (Xu et al., 2023). For proprietary LLMs, we perform evaluation on GPTs (Brown et al., 2020; OpenAI, 2023) (GPT-3.5-Turbo, GPT4-Turbo, GPT4-o), Qwen-Max (Yang et al., 2024b), GLM-4 (GLM et al., 2024), Yi-Large (AI et al., 2024) and




Figure 5: The fine-grained categorical evaluation of proprietary models on TableBench with various reasoning methods.

Deepseek models (Bi et al., 2024) (Chat-V2, Coder-V2). Furthermore, we finetune TABLELLM based on CodeQwen-7B, DeepSeekCoder-7B, Llama3-8B, Llama3.1-8B, and Qwen2-7B to further explore the Table QA capabilities of LLMs.

4.3 Automatic Evaluation Metrics

we adopt Rouge-L (Lin, 2004) to assess the quality of the generated answers by measuring the n-gram overlap with reference answers. In the PoT method, we enforce a specific format for the executable code outputs and evaluate the final answer with the ROUGE-L metric, ensuring alignment with other reasoning methodologies. Specifically, in the task of chart generation, we parse and execute code derived from LLM responses and establish rigorous test cases to assess the accuracy of the generated charts, with a particular focus on the precision of y-axis fields, employing the pass@1 metric (Chen et al., 2021a) for evaluation.

4.4 Main Results

Table 4 showcases the main results of over 30 advanced advanced LLMs on the TableBench. GPT-4 outperforms other models in numerous tasks, demonstrating superior performance across complex reasoning scenarios. Particularly in numerical computation and analytical tasks, GPT-4 maintains a commendable level of performance. TABLELLM finetuned on the open-source models with TableInstruct achieves a performance level comparable to GPT-3.5, significantly validating the effectiveness of our training data. Despite these advancements, humans still surpass all LLMs in these tasks. Nevertheless, certain advanced LLMs, especially those employing proprietary approaches, demonstrate potential in these scenarios.

Category Analysis Coarse-grained (Table 4) and fine-grained (Figure 5) experimental results reveal that most models perform commendably in fact-based reasoning tasks, indicating their proficiency in this area. However, challenges arise in numerical reasoning tasks due to the complexity of mathematical computations, especially complex calculations such as aggregation, which require multiple intermediate steps to reach the final answer. Data analysis tasks necessitate more intricate and comprehensive analytical skills, such as using correlation coefficients to analyze model relationships and employing linear regression functions to predict future trends, thereby imposing higher demands on the overall reasoning abilities of LLMs. The task of chart generation poses the greatest challenge, requiring significant coding skills and strict adherence to instructions. Notably, smaller-sized models exhibit significant deficiencies in chart generation tasks, highlighting their limitations in utilizing code to handle complex tasks.

Reasoning Methods Analysis As illustrated in Table 4, those methods incorporating reasoning steps demonstrate a clear advantage on TableBench compared to methods that derive conclusions directly. The TCoT method exhibits stable and superior performance across various dimensions. The PoT method delivers commendable results in purely numerical computations, particularly in chart generation, but falls short in textual reasoning. We investigate the factors contributing to the suboptimal performance of the PoT method and find that the code execution success rate constrains the performance, as we only conduct a single generation and execute the code without employing any strategy for code correction. Even for the best-performing GPT4-Turbo, the executable code ratio

is only 78.67%. This indicates that the PoT method requires LLMs with significant code-generation capabilities and instruction-following ability. However, it also underscores the substantial potential of the PoT method. Conversely, the SCoT method adapts effectively in scenarios requiring a combination of numerical and textual reasoning, such as analytical tasks, achieving a balanced yet modest overall performance. The performance of SCoT falls short of expectations due to its reliance on simulated outcomes rather than executing actual code, consequently amplifying the error margin.

	Auto Metric	GPT-4 Eval	Human Eval
GPT-3.5-Turbo	30.87	32.84	34.12
Qwen-Max	34.29	36.12	37.12
Yi-Large	38.56	43.12	41.23
GLM-4	34.82	38.60	39.21
Deepseek-Chat-V2	47.24	48.31	50.12
Deepseek-Coder-V2	44.92	44.92	46.13
GPT-4-Turbo	51.30	52.82	54.02
GPT-4o	50.53	54.18	53.19
PCC with Auto Metric	1	0.981	0.995

Table 5: We performed a consistency test of evaluation methods for advanced LLMs on TCoT performance

4.5 Consistency of Evaluation Methods

Despite constraints imposed on the output format and the standardization of ground truth annotations, the ROUGE-L metric may not fully capture the real performance due to the inherent flexibility in the outputs of LLMs. Both GPT-4 and human judgment are conducted, as shown in Table 5, to assess this potential bias. The Pearson Correlation Coefficient (Cohen et al., 2009) (PCC) is adopted to analyze the consistency across different evaluation methods. The results, as presented in the table, indicate a high level of agreement among these evaluating methods, demonstrating that the constraints are effective and our metric accurately reflects the real performance of LLMs on the TableBench.

5 Further Analysis

5.1 Instruct Following Analysis

We observe that the performance trends of small-size LLMs across different reasoning methods differ from those observed in large-size models in Table 4. We find that the non-reasoning method (DP) performs better on small-size LLMs than reasoning-based methods. As shown in Figure 6, most models exhibit good instruction-following capabilities with the DP method due to the simpler instructions to follow. Conversely, small-size LLMs perform significantly worse with the PoT method, mainly due




Figure 6: The impact of the parsing ratio on the overall score, where the parsing ratio is defined as the proportion of responses generated by the LLM that can be successfully parsed according to predetermined instructions.

to their insufficient code generation capabilities, resulting in a lower rate of executable code generation. Additionally, the iterative symbolic reasoning steps required by the SCoT method pose considerable challenges for small-scale models.

In comparison to the DP, SCoT, and TCoT methods in Figure 6, the data points on the left side of the quadratic curve show that at low parsing ratios, the overall score increases as the parsing ratio decreases, suggesting that certain models (e.g., StructLLM), possess strong table understanding capabilities but exhibit weaker instruction-following abilities. This may be attributed to differences in the instruction format during instruction tuning compared to the format we employ. The right side of the quadratic curve reveals that despite the strong instruction-following performance of the DP method, the non-reasoning DP method faces a clear performance ceiling. In contrast, reasoning-based methods show significant potential for improvement. The curve of the PoT highlights the substantial potential of the PoT to enhance the overall score by increasing the parsing rate.




Figure 7: Data efficient of TableInstruct

5.2 Data Efficiency of TableInstruct

In this section, we discuss the data efficiency of TableInstruct on the SFT process. We construct datasets of varying sizes by sampling from TableInstruct with sampling rates ranging from 0.2 to 0.6. Figure 7 visually depicts the relative performance at different sampling rates. Surprisingly, with only 60% of the samples, the model retains over 90% of the performance of the complete dataset. The full data provides the highest knowledge coverage, enabling the model to achieve optimal overall performance, comparable to GPT-3.5, with inference costs being only a fraction, indicating the high efficiency of TableInstruct.

6 Related Work

Table QA (Mueller et al., 2019; Jin et al., 2022) has grown substantially, driven by the development of robust datasets that engage advanced algorithms in the tasks of semantic comprehension (Huang et al., 2024; Yang et al., 2020, 2022b,a; Li et al., 2023c, 2024; Bai et al., 2023; Yang et al., 2024b). These datasets function as significant milestones for enhancing table-centric semantic understanding. WTQ (Pasupat and Liang, 2015), SQA (Iyyer et al., 2017), and TabFact (Chen et al., 2019) set the cornerstone for Table QA research. They furnish benchmarks founded on question-answer pairs predicated on HTML tables sourced from Wikipedia. However, these datasets rely heavily on specific cell content from the table to formulate answers, which can not fully represent the multi-dimensional queries posed in real-world scenarios.

Acknowledging this incongruity, some datasets have been introduced to bridge the gap. ToTTo (Parikh et al., 2020), OTTQA (Chen et al., 2020), and FeTaQA (Nan et al., 2022) step into the fore by providing free-form QA datasets. These datasets challenge models to generate answers that go beyond the table’s explicit content, thereby enhancing model performance to align with the free-form nature of real-world questions. FinQA (Chen et al., 2021b) and AIT-QA (Katsis et al., 2022) lay emphasis on numeric-focused queries. These datasets predominantly target financial tables, suggesting complex reasoning challenges that necessitate models to not only interpret but also to compute and extract nuanced information precisely. Further diversifying the landscape, datasets such as WikiSQL (Zhong et al., 2017), Spider (Yu et al., 2018), and Bird (Li

et al., 2023a) introduce logical expressions as supervisory signals to train Table QA models, discretizing reasoning capabilities through logic-based problem-solving. Despite the significant advancements made by LLMs in TableQA (Li et al., 2022; Singha et al., 2023; Li et al., 2023b; Lei et al., 2023), there is still a critical need for benchmarks that reflect the reasoning complexity encountered in real-world tabular data scenarios. TableBench, a comprehensive and complex benchmark, incorporates real-world complexities into its evaluation scenarios, effectively addressing the limitations of existing benchmarks

7 Conclusion

In this work, we introduce TableBench, a comprehensive and complex benchmark designed to evaluate a broad spectrum of tabular skills. It encompasses 886 question-answer pairs across 18 distinct capabilities, significantly contributing to bridging the gap between academic benchmarks and real-world applications. We evaluate 30+ models with various reasoning methods on TableBench and provide a training set TableInstruct that enables TABLELLM to achieve performance comparable to ChatGPT. Despite these advancements, even the most advanced model, GPT-4, still lags significantly behind human performance on TableBench, underscoring the challenges of tabular tasks in real-world applications.

Limitations

We acknowledge the following limitations of this study: (1) This paper primarily focuses on the reasoning complexity of table questions. It does not extensively explore the inherent complexities of the tables themselves, such as large-size tables and hierarchical tabulation. (2) Tabular data in image formats, which are also prevalent in real-world applications, are not discussed in this paper.

Ethics Statement

This research adheres to ethical guidelines for AI development. We aim to enhance the capabilities of LLMs while acknowledging potential risks such as bias, misuse, and privacy concerns. To mitigate these, we advocate for transparency, rigorous bias testing, robust security measures, and human oversight in AI applications. Our goal is to contribute positively to the field and encourage responsible AI development and deployment.

References

01. AI, :, Alex Young, Bei Chen, Chao Li, Chengen Huang, Ge Zhang, Guanwei Zhang, Heng Li, Jiangcheng Zhu, Jianqun Chen, Jing Chang, Kaidong Yu, Peng Liu, Qiang Liu, Shawn Yue, Senbin Yang, Shiming Yang, Tao Yu, Wen Xie, Wenhao Huang, Xiaohui Hu, Xiaoyi Ren, Xinyao Niu, Pengcheng Nie, Yuchi Xu, Yudong Liu, Yue Wang, Yuxuan Cai, Zhenyu Gu, Zhiyuan Liu, and Zonghong Dai. 2024. [Yi: Open foundation models by 01.ai](#).
- Rohan Anil, Andrew M Dai, Orhan Firat, Melvin Johnson, Dmitry Lepikhin, Alexandre Passos, Siamak Shakeri, Emanuel Taropa, Paige Bailey, Zhifeng Chen, et al. 2023. Palm 2 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.10403*.
- Jinze Bai, Shuai Bai, Yunfei Chu, Zeyu Cui, Kai Dang, Xiaodong Deng, Yang Fan, Wenbin Ge, Yu Han, Fei Huang, Binyuan Hui, Luo Ji, Mei Li, Junyang Lin, Runji Lin, Dayiheng Liu, Gao Liu, Chengqiang Lu, Keming Lu, Jianxin Ma, Rui Men, Xingzhang Ren, Xuancheng Ren, Chuanqi Tan, Sinan Tan, Jianhong Tu, Peng Wang, Shijie Wang, Wei Wang, Sheng-guang Wu, Benfeng Xu, Jin Xu, An Yang, Hao Yang, Jian Yang, Shusheng Yang, Yang Yao, Bowen Yu, Hongyi Yuan, Zheng Yuan, Jianwei Zhang, Xingxuan Zhang, Yichang Zhang, Zhenru Zhang, Chang Zhou, Jingren Zhou, Xiaohuan Zhou, and Tianhang Zhu. 2023. Qwen technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.16609*.
- Xiao Bi, Deli Chen, Guanting Chen, Shanhuang Chen, Damai Dai, Chengqi Deng, Honghui Ding, Kai Dong, Qiusi Du, Zhe Fu, et al. 2024. Deepseek llm: Scaling open-source language models with longtermism. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.02954*.
- Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D 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*, 33:1877–1901.
- Linzheng Chai, Shukai Liu, Jian Yang, Yuwei Yin, Ke Jin, Jiaheng Liu, Tao Sun, Ge Zhang, Changyu Ren, Hongcheng Guo, et al. 2024a. Mceval: Massively multilingual code evaluation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.07436*.
- Linzheng Chai, Jian Yang, Tao Sun, Hongcheng Guo, Jiaheng Liu, Bing Wang, Xinnian Liang, Jiaqi Bai, Tongliang Li, Qiyao Peng, and Zhoujun Li. 2024b. [xcot: Cross-lingual instruction tuning for cross-lingual chain-of-thought reasoning](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.07037*, abs/2401.07037.
- 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. 2021a. Evaluating large language models trained on code. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.03374*.
- Wenhu Chen, Ming-Wei Chang, Eva Schlinger, William Wang, and William W Cohen. 2020. Open question answering over tables and text. *CoRR*.
- Wenhu Chen, Xueguang Ma, Xinyi Wang, and William W Cohen. 2022. Program of thoughts prompting: Disentangling computation from reasoning for numerical reasoning tasks. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*.
- Wenhu Chen, Hongmin Wang, Jianshu Chen, Yunkai Zhang, Hong Wang, Shiyang Li, Xiyu Zhou, and William Yang Wang. 2019. Tabfact: A large-scale dataset for table-based fact verification. *CoRR*.
- Zhiyu Chen, Wenhu Chen, Charese Smiley, Sameena Shah, Iana Borova, Dylan Langdon, Reema Moussa, Matt Beane, Ting-Hao Huang, Bryan R Routledge, et al. 2021b. Finqa: A dataset of numerical reasoning over financial data. In *EMNLP 2021*, pages 3697–3711.
- Israel Cohen, Yiteng Huang, Jingdong Chen, Jacob Benesty, Jacob Benesty, Jingdong Chen, Yiteng Huang, and Israel Cohen. 2009. Pearson correlation coefficient. *Noise reduction in speech processing*, pages 1–4.
- Qingxiu Dong, Lei Li, Damai Dai, Ce Zheng, Zhiyong Wu, Baobao Chang, Xu Sun, Jingjing Xu, and Zhifang Sui. 2022. A survey for in-context learning. *CORR*.
- Abhimanyu Dubey, Abhinav Jauhri, Abhinav Pandey, Abhishek Kadian, Ahmad Al-Dahle, Aiesha Letman, Akhil Mathur, Alan Schelten, Amy Yang, Angela Fan, et al. 2024. The llama 3 herd of models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.21783*.
- Team GLM, Aohan Zeng, Bin Xu, Bowen Wang, Chenhui Zhang, Da Yin, Diego Rojas, Guanyu Feng, Hanlin Zhao, Hanyu Lai, et al. 2024. Chatglm: A family of large language models from glm-130b to glm-4 all tools. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.12793*.
- Daya Guo, Qihao Zhu, Dejian Yang, Zhenda Xie, Kai Dong, Wentao Zhang, Guanting Chen, Xiao Bi, Y. Wu, Y. K. Li, Fuli Luo, Yingfei Xiong, and Wenfeng Liang. 2024. [Deepseek-coder: When the large language model meets programming – the rise of code intelligence](#).
- Stefan Hegselmann, Alejandro Buendia, Hunter Lang, Monica Agrawal, Xiaoyi Jiang, and David Sonntag. 2023. Tabllm: Few-shot classification of tabular data with large language models. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 5549–5581. PMLR.
- Shulin Huang, Shirong Ma, Yinghui Li, Mengzuo Huang, Wuhe Zou, Weidong Zhang, and Haitao Zheng. 2024. [Lateval: An interactive llms evaluation benchmark with incomplete information from lateral thinking puzzles](#). In *Proceedings of the 2024 Joint International Conference on Computational Linguistics, Language Resources and Evaluation*,

- LREC/COLING 2024, 20-25 May, 2024, Torino, Italy*, pages 10186–10197. ELRA and ICCL.
- Mohit Iyyer, Wen-tau Yih, and Ming-Wei Chang. 2017. Search-based neural structured learning for sequential question answering. In *ACL 2017*, pages 1821–1831.
- Albert Q Jiang, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Arthur Mensch, Chris Bamford, Devendra Singh Chaplot, Diego de las Casas, Florian Bressand, Gianna Lengyel, Guillaume Lample, Lucile Saulnier, et al. 2023. Mistral 7b. *CoRR*.
- Nengzheng Jin, Joanna Siebert, Dongfang Li, and Qingcai Chen. 2022. A survey on table question answering: recent advances. In *China Conference on Knowledge Graph and Semantic Computing*, pages 174–186. Springer.
- Yannis Katsis, Saneem Chemmengath, Vishwajeet Kumar, Samarth Bharadwaj, Mustafa Canim, Michael Glass, Alfio Gliozzo, Feifei Pan, Jaydeep Sen, Karthik Sankaranarayanan, et al. 2022. Ait-qa: Question answering dataset over complex tables in the airline industry. In *NAACL 2022*, pages 305–314.
- Fangyu Lei, Tongxu Luo, Pengqi Yang, Weihao Liu, Hanwen Liu, Jiahe Lei, Yiming Huang, Yifan Wei, Shizhu He, Jun Zhao, et al. 2023. Tableqakit: A comprehensive and practical toolkit for table-based question answering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.15075*.
- Jinyang Li, Binyuan Hui, Ge Qu, Binhua Li, Jiayi Yang, Bowen Li, Bailin Wang, Bowen Qin, Rongyu Cao, Ruiying Geng, et al. 2023a. Can llm already serve as a database interface? a big bench for large-scale database grounded text-to-sqls. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.03111*.
- Peng Li, Yeye He, Dror Yashar, Weiwei Cui, Song Ge, Haidong Zhang, Danielle Rifinski Fainman, Dongmei Zhang, and Surajit Chaudhuri. 2023b. Table-gpt: Table-tuned gpt for diverse table tasks. *CORR*.
- Yinghui Li, Zishan Xu, Shaoshen Chen, Haojing Huang, Yangning Li, Yong Jiang, Zhongli Li, Qingyu Zhou, Hai-Tao Zheng, and Ying Shen. 2023c. Towards real-world writing assistance: A chinese character checking benchmark with faked and misspelled characters. *CoRR*, abs/2311.11268.
- Yinghui Li, Qingyu Zhou, Yangning Li, Zhongli Li, Ruiyang Liu, Rongyi Sun, Zizhen Wang, Chao Li, Yunbo Cao, and Hai-Tao Zheng. 2022. The past mistake is the future wisdom: Error-driven contrastive probability optimization for chinese spell checking. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2022, Dublin, Ireland, May 22-27, 2022*, pages 3202–3213. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Yinghui Li, Qingyu Zhou, Yuanzhen Luo, Shirong Ma, Yangning Li, Hai-Tao Zheng, Xuming Hu, and Philip S. Yu. 2024. When llms meet cunning questions: A fallacy understanding benchmark for large language models. *CoRR*, abs/2402.11100.
- Chin-Yew Lin. 2004. ROUGE: A package for automatic evaluation of summaries. In *Text Summarization Branches Out*, pages 74–81, Barcelona, Spain. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Weizheng Lu, Jiaming Zhang, Jing Zhang, and Yueguo Chen. 2024. Large language model for table processing: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.05121*.
- Thomas Mueller, Francesco Piccinno, Peter Shaw, Massimo Nicosia, and Yasemin Altun. 2019. Answering conversational questions on structured data without logical forms. In *EMNLP-IJCNLP 2019*, pages 5902–5910.
- Linyong Nan, Chiachun Hsieh, Ziming Mao, Xi Victoria Lin, Neha Verma, Rui Zhang, Wojciech Kryściński, Hailey Schoelkopf, Riley Kong, Xiangru Tang, et al. 2022. Fetaqa: Free-form table question answering. *TACL 2022*, 10:35–49.
- OpenAI. 2023. Gpt-4 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774*.
- Long Ouyang, Jeffrey Wu, Xu Jiang, Diogo Almeida, Carroll Wainwright, Pamela Mishkin, Chong Zhang, Sandhini Agarwal, Katarina Slama, Alex Ray, et al. 2022. Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:27730–27744.
- Ankur Parikh, Xuezhi Wang, Sebastian Gehrmann, Manaal Faruqi, Bhuwan Dhingra, Diyi Yang, and Dipanjan Das. 2020. Totto: A controlled table-to-text generation dataset. In *EMNLP 2020*, pages 1173–1186.
- Panupong Pasupat and Percy Liang. 2015. Compositional semantic parsing on semi-structured tables. In *ACL 2015*, pages 1470–1480.
- Justus J Randolph. 2005. Free-marginal multirater kappa (multirater k [free]): An alternative to fleiss’ fixed-marginal multirater kappa. *Online submission*.
- Baptiste Roziere, Jonas Gehring, Fabian Gloeckle, Sten Sootla, Itai Gat, Xiaoqing Ellen Tan, Yossi Adi, Jingyu Liu, Tal Remez, Jérémy Rapin, et al. 2023. Code llama: Open foundation models for code. *CORR*.
- Ananya Singha, José Cambronero, Sumit Gulwani, Vu Le, and Chris Parnin. 2023. Tabular representation, noisy operators, and impacts on table structure understanding tasks in llms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.10358*.
- Chang-Yu Tai, Ziru Chen, Tianshu Zhang, Xiang Deng, and Huan Sun. 2023. Exploring chain of thought style prompting for text-to-sql. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 5376–5393.
- Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajjwal Bhargava, Shrutli Bhosale, et al. 2023. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models. *CoRR*.

- Bing Wang, Changyu Ren, Jian Yang, Xinnian Liang, Jiaqi Bai, Qian-Wen Zhang, Zhao Yan, and Zhoujun Li. 2023. Mac-sql: Multi-agent collaboration for text-to-sql. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.11242*.
- Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Fei Xia, Ed Chi, Quoc V Le, Denny Zhou, et al. 2022. Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:24824–24837.
- Can Xu, Qingfeng Sun, Kai Zheng, Xiubo Geng, Pu Zhao, Jiazhan Feng, Chongyang Tao, and Daxin Jiang. 2023. Wizardlm: Empowering large language models to follow complex instructions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.12244*.
- An Yang, Baosong Yang, Binyuan Hui, Bo Zheng, Bowen Yu, Chang Zhou, Chengpeng Li, Chengyuan Li, Dayiheng Liu, Fei Huang, et al. 2024a. Qwen2 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.10671*.
- An Yang, Baosong Yang, Binyuan Hui, Bo Zheng, Bowen Yu, Chang Zhou, Chengpeng Li, Chengyuan Li, Dayiheng Liu, Fei Huang, et al. 2024b. Qwen2 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.10671*.
- Jian Yang, Shuming Ma, Dongdong Zhang, Zhoujun Li, and Ming Zhou. 2020. [Improving neural machine translation with soft template prediction](#). In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics, ACL 2020, Online, July 5-10, 2020*, pages 5979–5989. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jian Yang, Yuwei Yin, Shuming Ma, Dongdong Zhang, Zhoujun Li, and Furu Wei. 2022a. [High-resource language-specific training for multilingual neural machine translation](#). In *Proceedings of the Thirty-First International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI 2022, Vienna, Austria, 23-29 July 2022*, pages 4461–4467. ijcai.org.
- Jian Yang, Yuwei Yin, Shuming Ma, Dongdong Zhang, Shuangzhi Wu, Hongcheng Guo, Zhoujun Li, and Furu Wei. 2022b. [UM4: unified multilingual multiple teacher-student model for zero-resource neural machine translation](#). In *Proceedings of the Thirty-First International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI 2022, Vienna, Austria, 23-29 July 2022*, pages 4454–4460. ijcai.org.
- 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. In *EMNLP 2018*, pages 3911–3921.
- Liangyu Zha, Junlin Zhou, Liyao Li, Rui Wang, Qingyi Huang, Saisai Yang, Jing Yuan, Changbao Su, Xiang Li, Aofeng Su, et al. 2023. Tablegpt: Towards unifying tables, nature language and commands into one gpt. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.08674*.
- Ge Zhang, Scott Qu, Jiaheng Liu, Chenchen Zhang, Chenghua Lin, Chou Leuang Yu, Danny Pan, Esther Cheng, Jie Liu, Qunshu Lin, et al. 2024a. Map-neo: Highly capable and transparent bilingual large language model series. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.19327*.
- Xiaokang Zhang, Jing Zhang, Zeyao Ma, Yang Li, Bohan Zhang, Guanlin Li, Zijun Yao, Kangli Xu, Jinchang Zhou, Daniel Zhang-Li, et al. 2024b. Tablellm: Enabling tabular data manipulation by llms in real office usage scenarios. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.19318*.
- Bowen Zhao, Changkai Ji, Yuejie Zhang, Wen He, Yingwen Wang, Qing Wang, Rui Feng, and Xiaobo Zhang. 2023. Large language models are complex table parsers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.11521*.
- Victor Zhong, Caiming Xiong, and Richard Socher. 2017. Seq2sql: Generating structured queries from natural language using reinforcement learning. *CoRR*.
- Fengbin Zhu, Wenqiang Lei, Youcheng Huang, Chao Wang, Shuo Zhang, Jiancheng Lv, Fuli Feng, and Tat-Seng Chua. 2021. Tat-qa: A question answering benchmark on a hybrid of tabular and textual content in finance. 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)*, pages 3277–3287.
- Alex Zhuang, Ge Zhang, Tianyu Zheng, Xinrun Du, Junjie Wang, Weiming Ren, Stephen W. Huang, Jie Fu, Xiang Yue, and Wenhu Chen. 2024. [Structlm: Towards building generalist models for structured knowledge grounding](#).