



## **Challenge submission: AIFB**

#### Jan Wardenga and Tobias Käfer, TEXT2SPARQL@ESWC2025



#### www.kit.edu

## **Architecture Overview**









# **1. Natural Language Questions Translation**



This module translates the incoming natural language questions (NLQ's) into English, using a large language model (LLM).

- If the input is already in English, it is returned unchanged.
- English was selected as the target language for downstream processing, as it improved entity extraction performance.



# 2. Entity Extraction





This module identifies and extracts named entities from the English NLQ's.

- It constructs the LLM prompt by combining a predefined system prompt with the input NLQ.
- The returned list of entities is stripped of unneeded characters, formatted, and passed to downstream modules.



# 3. Shape Generation





- This module receives the list of extracted entities and the dataset type (DBpedia or corporate graph).
- Based on the dataset type, it decides whether to parse a local corporate RDF graph or use the DBpedia endpoint to generate the shape.
- Two libraries are used:
  - rdflib: a standard Python library for working with RDF graphs.
  - shexer: a shape generation library that supports the use of shape maps and integrates well with rdflib.
- If a corporate graph is used, the entire graph is parsed and a full ShEx shape is generated.
- If a public dataset is used, a partial ShEx shape is generated
- The resulting ShEx shape is returned for further processing.





### 4. SPARQL Query Generation



- This module builds a prompt that includes the system prompt, the natural language question (NLQ), the shape constraints, and optionally a failure reason from a previous attempt.
- The prompt is sent to the LLM API for SPARQL query generation.
- The returned output is validated:
  - If the query is valid, it is returned.
  - If invalid, the system retries up to x times, incrementally increasing the LLM's temperature to promote variation in reformulations.
- The process ensures strict syntactic compliance and attempts to creatively reformulate failed queries while respecting the shape constraints.



#### ShEx vs SHACL





A seperate study was conducted to find out which shape type yields better results for KGQA tasks

- 42 experiments conducted:
  - 30 with shape-informed setups
  - 12 baseline (no shapes)
- Each experiment:
  - 50 questions from a Wikidata, DBpedia and T2S corporate dataset
  - Unique combination of LLM, dataset, shape type, and annotation setting

Key insight:

ShEx outperforms SHACL across most KGQA configurations



## **Our Results for T2S Corporate Graph**





- Reported: F1 scores
- Configurations:
  - Shape-informed (using ShEx/SHACL constraints)
  - Baseline (no shape information)
- In the baseline setting, none of the LLMs were able to generate valid SPARQL queries for the corporate graph
- In contrast, the shape-informed configuration enabled LLMs to generate valid and executable SPARQL queries
- Datasets used in the study:
  - Wikidata  $\rightarrow$  QALD-9-plus
  - \* DBpedia  $\rightarrow$  QALD-9-plus & T2S Challenge
  - Corporate Graph  $\rightarrow$  T2S Challenge