

Table Pre-training: A Survey on Model Architectures, Pre-training Objectives, and Downstream Tasks

Haoyu Dong
Microsoft Research
hadong@microsoft.com

Zhoujun Cheng
Shanghai Jiaotong University
blankcheng@sjtu.edu.cn

Xinyi He
Xi'an Jiaotong University
hxyhxy@stu.xjtu.edu.cn

Mengyu Zhou
Microsoft Research
mezho@microsoft.com

Anda Zhou*[†]
University of Edinburgh
A.D.Zhou@sms.ed.ac.uk

Fan Zhou[†]
Shanghai Jiaotong University
zhoufan98@sjtu.edu.cn

Ao Liu[†]
Tokyo Institute of Technology
zeitmond@gmail.com

Shi Han
Microsoft Research
shihan@microsoft.com

Dongmei Zhang
Microsoft Research
dongmeiz@microsoft.com

ABSTRACT

Since a vast number of tables can be easily collected from web pages, spreadsheets, PDFs, and various other document types, a flurry of table pre-training frameworks have been proposed following the success of text and images, and they have achieved new state-of-the-arts on various tasks such as table question answering, table type recognition, column relation classification, table search, formula prediction, etc. To fully use the supervision signals in unlabeled tables, a variety of pre-training objectives have been designed and evaluated, for example, denoising cell values, predicting numerical relationships, and implicitly executing SQLs. And to best leverage the characteristics of (semi-)structured tables, various tabular language models, particularly with specially-designed attention mechanisms, have been explored. Since tables usually appear and interact with free-form text, table pre-training usually takes the form of table-text joint pre-training, which attracts significant research interests from multiple domains. This survey aims to provide a comprehensive review of different model designs, pre-training objectives, and downstream tasks for table pre-training, and we further share our thoughts and vision on existing challenges and future opportunities.

CCS CONCEPTS

• **Information systems** → **Information retrieval**.

KEYWORDS

Semi-structured table; Representation learning; pre-training

*The contributions by Anda Zhou, Fan Zhou, and Ao Liu have been conducted and completed during their internships at Microsoft Research Asia, Beijing, China.

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than ACM must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from permissions@acm.org.

Conference'17, July 2017, Washington, DC, USA

© 2022 Association for Computing Machinery.

ACM Reference Format:

Haoyu Dong, Zhoujun Cheng, Xinyi He, Mengyu Zhou, Anda Zhou, Fan Zhou, Ao Liu, Shi Han, and Dongmei Zhang. 2022. Table Pre-training: A Survey on Model Architectures, Pre-training Objectives, and Downstream Tasks. In . ACM, New York, NY, USA, 14 pages.

1 INTRODUCTION

Tables are widely used to organize and present data in various document types and database systems such as webpages, spreadsheets, PDFs, presentation slides, and MySQL, and gain increasing attention from the research community. Following the success of large-scale pre-training in natural language (NL) and computer vision domains, a flurry of research works have been proposed to leverage unlabeled tables for self-supervised pre-training and achieve promising results in table type classification [92], cell type classification [45, 92], table question answering (QA) [51, 101], table search [94], entity linking [28], column type identification [15, 47], table augmentation [28, 55], formula prediction [23], etc. On the one hand, similar to NL that has already proved the success of large-scale pre-training, tables have dense semantics stored in textual headers, captions, and notes. On the other hand, different from NL, tables have distinct information (e.g., intuitive formats, well-organised numerical values, formulas, etc.) and various structures (relational tables, entity tables, matrix tables, forms, etc.), and thus desire table-specific model designs and pre-training objectives to achieve optimal results. To best leverage table characteristics while maintaining capabilities to understand text in/out tables, various Tabular Language Models (TaLMs) are proposed, e.g., TaBERT [101] encoded tables and text by concatenating a row-wise transformer and a column-wise transformer, pre-trained with Masked Language Models (MLM) and Masked Column Prediction (MCP), and achieved SOTA results on benchmarks of table question answering. TaPas [51] pioneeredly proposed an end-to-end table-text joint reasoning framework using transformers without explicitly generating logical forms for table QA, and TaPas trained row and column embeddings together with token embeddings. TURL is the first work to learn entity representations from relational tables to enhance table knowledge matching and table augmentation [28], and it restricts each cell to aggregate information from the located row and column via masked attention. TUTA [92] then extended the success of table pre-training to

generally structured tables by devising a unified bi-dimensional coordinate tree, to describe both the spatial and hierarchical information, and it further proposed tree-based attention, tree-based positional encoding, and progressive token-cell-table pre-training objectives based on the unified bi-tree structure. TUTA constructed a distinct vocabulary based on large table corpora and was the first model to be pre-trained on both web and spreadsheet tables to achieve better generalities. TaPEX explored to learn a neural SQL executor via pre-training and demonstrated surprising effectiveness on table-text joint reasoning [69]. This survey aims to provide a comprehensive review of different model designs, pre-training objectives, and downstream tasks for table pre-training.

We believe that the table, as a distinct (semi-)structured data form far away from NL text and images, is valuable for studying the effectiveness of frontier neural architectures and inspiring new research directions. Since the table often interacts with programming languages such as SQLs and spreadsheet formulas, it additionally spawns cross-domain applications such as semantic parsing [104], logic-to-text [20], and formula prediction [21]. In this survey, we first introduce some preliminaries of table types, table structures, cell information, and table corpora in Section 2. Then we give a comprehensive review of table modeling architectures, table pre-training objectives, and downstream tasks in Sections 3,4,5. At last, we provide our thoughts and vision on existing challenges and future opportunities in Section 6.

2 PRELIMINARIES

2.1 Structured, Semi-structured, and Unstructured (Image) Tables

Tables can be categorized into three primary forms: well-structured tables, semi-structured tables, and unstructured tables. Database tables are **well structured** due to the ordinarily defined relational schema: a model of vertical columns (identifiable by column names with a specific number) and horizontal rows (with an unrestricted number), the primary key that uniquely identifies each row in the table and facilitates the joins between multiple tables, the number unit to augment information of quantities, etc. so that machines are able to retrieve information from database tables precisely through formal languages such as SQL, R, and Python’s Pandas. Whereas document tables such as web tables, Latex tables, spreadsheet tables, and Word tables are **semi-structured**, and they are usually human-crafted with end-user tools or markup languages such as Word documents, spreadsheets, Latex code, HTML code, etc. As shown in Figure 1, they arrange cells in bi-dimensional matrices, lack sufficient meta-information to record high-level table structures and data types, and thus challenge precise and automatic information retrieval. In addition to well-structured and semi-structured tables, there is large amount of **unstructured image tables** only with raw RGB information, such as scanned tables from books, pictures of receipts, and handwritten drafts. They need to be firstly digitized through OCR and cell segmentation before any higher-level information retrieval. Note that, since a large proportion of PDF tables do not provide any structural information, PDF tables are simply treated as image tables in many research works [82, 82].

In this paper, we mainly focus on semi-structured and well-structured tables. **While image tables are also widely used, we**

neglect them in this paper, because they have distinct challenges from a vision perspective, and it is desirable to discuss them separately in another paper.

2.2 Table Structure

Tables are flexible with various structures, including relational tables, entity tables, matrix tables, layout tables, forms, etc. Tables also have different orientations (horizontal/vertical) and hierarchies (flat/hierarchical). As shown in Figure 1, the structure of a flat relational table is definite and straightforward in a database-like form, wherein each row is a record, each column is a field and there is no hierarchy. Matrix tables have both horizontal and vertical orientations. In fact, there are various definitions on table structure categorization, which are summarized in detail by [109].

2.3 Cell Information

Typically a cell is the intersection of one row and one column in a table. Sometimes multiple cells can be merged into a larger cell that occupies multiple rows and columns. Cells are basic units in bi-dimensional tables to record text, numerical values, formats, formulas, etc.

1) Text. Text is a critical component in the table to record meta information in headers, notes, and captions. It is also an important part of the data region, e.g., textual columns such as team names in Figure 1 (a). Texts in tables are basically in NL but often have short lengths and concise meanings to meet the space restriction in documents.

2) Numerical values. Besides texts, a large proportion of table cells also store numerical values, as shown in Figure 1. Unlike text, numerical values could have arithmetical relationships, such as sum and proportion, and statistical characteristics, such as distribution and trend.

3) Visual formats. Tables have various intuitive formats to highlight the table structure or content, such as border, alignment, background color, font, merging, formatting string (e.g., "yyyy/m/d"), etc. [33].

4) Formulas. In several popular end-user tools such as Excel, Google Sheet, and Notion¹, spreadsheet formulas or other kinds of formal formulas are used to store the logical and numerical cell relationships in tables explicitly.

5) Other elements such as hyperlinks, images, and icons can also be inserted into a cell. A table can even be nested in Word documents by inserting one or more tables into individual cells.

2.4 Relationships Between Tables and Text

Tables and text are usually complementary in modern documents, e.g., statistical reports and research papers. Text is general and consequential for diverse objectives, e.g., storytelling, detailed descriptions, and in-depth analyses, while tables efficiently organize and present data in a more structured way. We present our understandings as follows.

2.4.1 Similarities. (1) Many cell values in the table are text. Although texts in cells tend to be much more concise, most of them

¹<https://www.notion.so/>

Team Statistic Leaders.

Category	Team	Statistic
Points per game	Milwaukee Bucks	118.7
Rebounds per game	Milwaukee Bucks	51.7
Assists per game	Phoenix Suns	27.2
Steals per game	Chicago Bulls	10.0
Blocks per game	Los Angeles Lakers	6.6
Turnovers per game	San Antonio Spurs	12.6
FG%	Los Angeles Lakers	48.0%
FT%	Phoenix Suns	83.4%
3FG%	Utah Jazz	38.0%
+/-	Milwaukee Bucks	+10.1

(a) A relational web table

Named Entity Recognition Results.

System	Dev F1	Test F1
ELMo (Peters et al., 2018a)	95.7	92.2
CVT (Clark et al., 2018)	-	92.6
CSE (Akbik et al., 2018)	-	93.1
Fine-tuning approach		
BERT _{LARGE}	96.6	92.8
BERT _{BASE}	96.4	92.4
Feature-based approach (BERT _{BASE})		
Embeddings	91.0	-
Second-to-Last Hidden	95.6	-
Last Hidden	94.9	-
Weighted Sum Last Four Hidden	95.9	-
Concat Last Four Hidden	96.1	-
Weighted Sum All 12 Layers	95.5	-

(b) A matrix PDF table

	A	B	C	D	E
1	Cancer statistics in 2018	Incidence		Mortality	
2		Males	Females	Males	Females
3	Skin				
4	Melanoma of skin	150,698	137,025	34,831	25,881
5	Non-melanoma skin cancer	637,733	404,323	38,345	26,810
6	Urinary tract				
7	Kidney and renal pelvis	254,507	148,755	113,822	61,276
8	Bladder	424,082	125,311	148,270	51,652
9	Respiratory system				
10	Larynx	154,977	22,445	81,806	12,965
11	Trachea, bronchus and lung	1,368,524	725,352	1,184,947	576,060
12	Mesothelioma	21,662	8,781	18,332	7,244
13	Digestive organs				
14	Colorectum and anus	1,026,215	823,303	484,224	396,568
15	Oesophagus	399,699	172,335	357,190	151,395
22	Pancreas	243,033	215,885	226,910	205,332

(c) A matrix spreadsheet table

Figure 1: Examples of real-world tables. (a) shows a relational web table with a flat top header. (b) shows a matrix PDF table (produced by latex code) with a flat top header and a hierarchical left header. (c) shows a spreadsheet table that has hierarchical top and left headers.

can be treated similarly to text in NL, such as entity names, short descriptions, measure names, etc. (2) A table usually has surrounding textual captions, titles, and notes, conveying a wealth of information and critical components of tables.

2.4.2 Differences. (1) Structures. Unlike sequential NL text, tables have two-dimensional structures with optional top and left headers. (2) Visual Formats. Unlike plain NL text, tables usually use intuitive formats for a better presentation of table structures and data highlights, e.g., color, alignment, font. (3) Numerical values. Tables often contain rich numerical values such as currencies and dates for easy-lookup, comparison, and analysis, and there are various calculation relationships between numerical values, which can be recorded in spreadsheet formulas.

2.5 Relationships Between Tables and Images

2.5.1 Similarities. (1) Both tables and images are two-dimensional. An image can be seen as a matrix of pixels, and a table can be seen as a matrix of cells [32]. (2) Tables have visual formats such as color, alignment, and font, making them more visually intuitive.

2.5.2 Differences. (1) Compared with a pixel in an image, a cell in a table contains much richer information (with dense meanings), e.g., cell text, hyperlinks, and formulas. (2) Beyond the surface form of a matrix of cells, a table is often created with the hierarchical structure.

2.6 Existing Large Table Corpus

2.6.1 Web Tables. Large corpus of web tables include WDC Web Table Corpus² (233M tables), Dresden Web Tables Corpus [37] (174M tables), WebTables [11] (154M tables), and WikiTables (1.6M tables). More details are summarized by [109].

2.6.2 Spreadsheet Tables. Barik et al. [8] includes web-crawled 249,376 unique spreadsheets called FUSE. Chen and Cafarella [12] obtained 410,554 Microsoft Excel files from 51,252 distinct Internet domains through Web crawling. TUTA [92] collected 13.5 million

public spreadsheet files from 1.75 million web sites. However, only FUSE has been made publicly available till now.

2.6.3 Arxiv Scientific Tables. TableArXiv³ contains 341,573 tables extracted from scientific publications on arxiv.org.

2.6.4 Others. There is also a large volume of tables in other document types such as Word documents, presentation slides., but public datasets are scarce in previous works. Although data models behind tables from different document types are different, key cell information such as cell values, formats, and merging are universal. Therefore, it is desirable to pre-train a model to represent tables from various document types in a unified architecture.

3 MODEL

In this section, we provide a review of previous works on input featurization and embedding, model architectures, and model efficiency.

3.1 Input Featurization and Embedding

3.1.1 Word Encoding. As mentioned in Section 2.4, due to the similarity between tables and text, it makes sense to leverage frontier language models, e.g., BERT [30] and T5 [80]. However, as tabular data is distributed in a semi-structured way, we have to first obtain linearized tabular sequences before feeding them into language models, and more details about linearization will be introduced in section 3.2.1. Word encoding for tables can be divided into static and dynamic types similar to the NLP. Table2Vec [110] learns static word embedding inspired from word2vec [70]. However, following the weakness of static embedding in NLP, neither of them can handle with polysemy problem, and features are limited by the pre-set window size. On the other hand, methods built on dynamic contextual embedding have also been explored. Many of them are tokenized using WordPiece, encoded via the token vocabulary, and initialized by BERT [30], such as TaBERT [101], TaPas [51], MATE [39], StruG [29], TableFormer [6], TUTA [95], ForTaP [23], and

²<http://webdatacommons.org/framework/>

³<http://boston.lti.cs.cmu.edu/eager/table-arxiv/>

TABBIE [55]. TURL [28] was initialized by TinyBERT [56] and additionally used an entity vocabulary. TUTA [95] constructed a table-specific vocabulary using WordPiece and merged it with BERT’s original vocabulary. Other works also explored to use other kinds of encoding, e.g., GraPPa [105] and TaPEX [69] were initialized by Roberta [68] and BART [64], respectively, based on the BPE tokenization.

3.1.2 Sequential Positional Encoding. Since word orders and positions in a 1D text sequence are crucial for natural language understanding as they contain both rule-based lower levels such as syntax and regularity-governed higher levels such as semantics and general knowledge, transformer-based architectures introduced extra positional encoding to utilize the sequential information. Sequential positional information also plays an important role in tabular data and can be classified into global and local types.

By default, based on BERT, some works used global positional encoding in the flattened tabular sequences such as TaBERT [101], TaPas [51], MATE [39], StruG [29], GraPPa [105], TaPEX [69]. Other works divided the global sequence into multiple pieces and counted positions in each piece separately: TUTA [95] treated each cell as an independent piece and locally encoded positional information of tokens inside a cell; TURL [28] regarded the table caption and the header as two separate pieces, therefore it used two local positional encodings for the caption and the header.

3.1.3 Structural Positional Encoding. However, in addition to 1D sequential positions, tables have structured rows and columns that contain critical two-dimensional and hierarchical information, and they are also desirable to be explicitly or implicitly encoded.

Works such as Tapas [51], MATE [39], TABBIE [55], and TUTA [95], learn column and row encodings based on column/row IDs. Both of them show increased performance. However, considering hierarchical structures, as Figure 1 (c) shows, column/row encoding results in limited representation capability. TUTA [95] further devised a bi-dimensional coordinate tree structure to jointly encode the spatial and hierarchical positions and designed explicit/implicit tree-based positional embeddings.

3.1.4 Numerical Encoding. A large amount of numerical values are distributed in tables and challenge BERT-based models to learn optimal representations since these methods simply tokenize and encode numerical values like NL text using the WordPiece tokenizer. It corrupts the original recording structure of numbers into fragments and introduces difficulties on number representation [89]. However, understanding numerical values and their relationships are crucial for table content understanding, especially for tables in financial reports and scientific papers that involve a variety of numerical reasoning, such as aggregation, division, sorting, change ratio, etc. Explorations on learning better number representations have surged in the NLP field recently [89] while only few works attempted in tabular data.

Tapas [51] and MATE [39] devised a unique rank embedding for number comparison in one column, bringing improvements on answering comparatives or superlative questions. FLAP [5] added an extra feature encoding to indicate whether the value was mentioned in the text summary. TUTA [95] proposed a number embedding method that distinguished numerical values from a text string via

embedding over four discrete numerical features, magnitude, precision, the first digit, and the last digit.

3.1.5 Format Encoding. Tables also contain stylistic formats such as cell merging, background color, font bold, etc. Since formatting contains valuable hints about table structures, such information is of great significance for table type classification or cell type classification. However, only a few works made explorations on it. TUTA [95] learned a unique format embedding together with the transformer backbone to distinguish whether a cell has merge, border, formula, font bold, non-white background color, and non-black font color. In addition to transformer-based architecture, Ghasemi Gol *et al.* [44] explored to learn format embedding by converting stylistic features to the integer vector from categorical types and feeding them into autoencoders.

3.1.6 Others. Apart from the typical encoding listed above, Tapas [51] designed "Previous Answer Embedding" for the conversational scenario, marking whether a tabular cell answered the last question.

3.2 Model Architecture

Since both semantic and spatial information is crucial to understanding semi-structured tables, many neural architectures have been proposed to capture spatial and semantic information jointly. CNNs [15, 31] are adopted to capture spatial information for web and spreadsheet tables. Dong *et al.* [34] use CNN-based GANs to recommend good-looking formats for tables and Park *et al.* [75] use GANs for data synthesis. Bidirectional RNNs and LSTMs are widely adopted in web tables to capture the order of rows and columns [40, 45, 59, 72]. Later work proposed a hybrid neural network by combining bidirectional RNNs and CNNs in the task of column type prediction [14]. Graph neural networks have been explored for table understanding and question answering [60, 106, 111]. [36] proposed a hybrid neural network by combining RNNs and GNNs in the task of cell type classification. While there are various architectures for table modeling, few use unlabeled data for pre-training.

Recently, a flurry of works explored transformer-based language models in table pre-training, we call them Tabular Language Models (TaLMs). Table-BERT linearizes tables as sentences so that tables can be directly processed by the pre-trained BERT model [16]. TAPAS and TaBERT target question answering over relational tables via joint pre-training of tables and their text [51, 101]. TURL learns representations from relational tables to enhance table knowledge matching and table augmentation [28], and in TURL, each cell aggregates information from the located row and column via masked attention. TUTA [92] is a transformer-based method for general table structure understanding with tree-based positional encoding and tree-based sparse attention to capture cell positions and hierarchies, and it is pre-trained on both web and spreadsheet tables. Tabnet [4] uses a separate transformer for feature selection to choose which features to reason from at each decision step. KGPT [94] and GTR [94] combines GNN with transformers to better encode table structures.

Since using transformer-base TaLMs is a common choice for existing table pertaining methods, many variants of TaLMs are proposed. **In the following subsections, we dig deeper into**

Table 1: Model architectures of Transformers for table pre-training.

Encoder	TAPAS, TaBERT, TURL, TUTA, StruG, GraPPa, MATE, FORTAP, TabFormer, TABBIE, etc.
Encoder+Decoder	KGPT, RPT, TaPEX, STTP, FLAP, etc.
Decoder	TableGPT, etc.

various TaLMs architectures: first introducing how tables are linearized to fit the transformer architecture, and then categorizing existing methods by encoder-decoder architectures and attention mechanisms.

3.2.1 Tabular Sequence Serialization. A common serialization method is to linearize raw tables row by row. Most works such as Tapas [51], MATE [39], TableFormer [6], TUTA [95] and TURL [28] performs in this way. TABBIE [55] linearizes tables by rows and columns separately. TableGPT [46] distinctly adapts a template-based table serialization way on relatively simple tables. Experiments conducted by UnifiedSKG [97] show that putting external text (like questions) ahead of tables helps T5 to generalise better on tabular tasks. [66] directly encodes markup languages like NL. Some works linearize a specific part of a table, e.g., TaBERT [101] only linearizes most relevant rows to the input utterance, and StruG [29] and GraPPa [105] only take headers as input without data cells.

3.2.2 Encoder-decoder. Existing table pre-training models mainly inherit the architectures from language models such as BERT [30], GPT-2 [79] and BART [64]. Depending on the focused downstream tasks, these models adopt different components, i.e., encoders or decoders, as summarized in Table 1. Most of them adopt the encoder part of transformers similar to BERT [30], including TURL [28], StruG [29], TAPAS [38, 51], GraPPa [29], MATE [39], TUTA [95], ForTap [23], and TableFormer [6]. Typically, a single encoder is applied on the sequential inputs constructed from tables and associated texts, if any, to learn the contextual representations of the inputs. Additional modules such as classification layers are applied upon the encoder to perform downstream tasks. Some works also employ more than one encoder to capture the structural information of tables. TaBERT [101] stacks column-wise self-attention layers on the row-wise encoder. TABBIE [55] employs double encoders to encode the table row-wise and column-wise separately, then aggregates the representations obtained from both encoders. DoT [62] also uses double encoders, one acting as a pruning model to select most relevant tokens from the input and the other one used for performing specific tasks, e.g. a TAPAS model for QA. Another branch of approaches build their pre-training models with an encoder-decoder architecture to better enable sequence generation tasks such as table-to-text. KGPT [18] uses two alternative encoders, a GNN-based graph encoder and a transformer-based sequential encoder, each can be combined with a transformer decoder. RPT [87] also adopts the encoder-decoder model, similar to a BERT [30] model combined with a GPT-3 [10] model. TaPEX [69] and UnifiedSKG [97] implements the encoder-decoder (text-to-text) model based on BART [64] and T5 [80], respectively, for downstream

tasks such as text-to-SQL parsing, table-based QA, and table fact verification. STTP focus on table-to-text generation by fine-tuning BART on table-structure-aware self-supervised tasks. Instead of pre-training, TableGPT [46] directly fine-tunes pre-trained GPT-2 decoder to take advantage of its contextual knowledge learned from linguistic corpora.

3.2.3 Structure-based Attention. TaLMs highly depend on the self-attention mechanism to compute contextual representations [90]. Besides a large proportion of models which directly adopt self-attention, e.g. TAPAS [51], StruG [29], GRAPPA [105], and TaPEX [69], a series of structure-based attention mechanisms have been proposed to better leverage the tabular structure, as summarized in Table 2.

However, self attention may introduce a lot of irrelevant and even noisy contexts, and have lots of unnecessary computations [95], while table structures can be leveraged towards precise and efficient attention. TaBERT [101] generates tabular representations serially by first producing row-wise encoding with a transformer and then column representation with vertical attention layers using row-wise encodings as inputs. TABBIE [55] generates cell representations in parallel by applying two separate transformers. Each cell’s representation is an average of its row and column embeddings, where row/column embeddings are separately calculated by row/column transformers. MATE [39] uses different types of attention heads, i.e. row attention head and column attention head, which are restricted to attending tokens in the same row/column (query tokens can attend to all tokens). TURL [28] also designs a restricted attention mechanism, in which each token/entity attends to tokens in the same row/column. TUTA [95] uses joint bi-tree-based attention, which takes in both spatial and hierarchical information from tables. More specifically, for a structured table, TUTA defines cell coordinates and cell-to-cell distance from a bi-dimensional tree generated from the table. The bi-tree-based attention is restricted to attending tokens within the tree-based distance threshold. GTR [94], which focuses mainly on table retrieval, transforms a table into a tabular graph and uses joint layout-based graph attention similar to graph transformer to capture structural information. KGPT [18] applies the encoder-decoder model architecture. The graph encoder of KGPT uses a graph transformer. It enforces the structure as a hard constraint to explicitly encode the structure information, e.g. in the first encoder layer, each node is restricted to attend to tokens in the same knowledge triple. Tabnet [4] applies a sequential attention mechanism to generate an interpretable feature selection mask during each decision step. Rather than hard masking on the tokens, TableFormer [6] proposed to use soft attention biases when computing attention scores to indicate the structural relations within table-text pairs, which are learnable scalars.

3.3 Model Efficiency

Typical TaLMs are inefficient at dealing with long sequences due to the quadratic complexity of self-attention [88, 90]. Unfortunately, large tables from webs, documents, and spreadsheets contain dozens of rows or columns, posing a significant challenge to the memory and computational efficiency [39]. A naive way [51, 69] to deal with large tables is truncating the input tokens by a maximum sequence

Table 2: Attention mechanisms of transformers for table pre-training.

Global	Self attention	TAPAS, StruG, GraPPa, TaPEX, etc
	Serial row/column attention layers	TaBERT
	Parallel row/column attention layers	TABBIE
Sparse	Parallel row/column attention heads	MATE
	Joint row/column attention	TURL
	Joint bi-tree-based attention	TUTA
	Joint layout-based graph attention	GTR
	Joint knowledge-triple-based graph attention	KGPT

length. This section discusses some other strategies that existed TaLMs apply to mitigate the memory and computation issue.

3.3.1 Input Selection. One intuitive way is to reduce input size by selecting the important contents of the table as inputs. TaBERT [101] extracts *content snapshot*, the most relevant table rows to the NL sentence(s) regarding n-gram overlap ratio, as table input. Similarly, TaPas with intermediate pre-training [38] ranks columns by Jaccard coefficient between the NL and each column tokens. The model is twice as fast to train as TaPas [51] while achieving similar performance. TUTA [95] randomly samples out 50% text cells and 90% numeric cells in pre-training, since spreadsheets are usually large while limited semantics are introduced by similar data cells. Instead of using heuristics to prune inputs, DoT [62] presents a double transformer model: a pruning transformer selects top- K tokens, and a task-specific transformer takes them as inputs. The architecture is two times faster to train, while the memory bottleneck depends on the size of the pruning transformer. A small or medium-size pruning transformer is usually enough to achieve comparative performance with large-size TaPas, but falls behind on more challenging datasets like WTQ [76]. While input selection is effective for tasks with table-text joint input like table QA and fact verification, it may fail for tasks that (1) full table contents are required as input, e.g., cell type classification; (2) table is the only input, where table-text relevance can not be measured with heuristics, e.g., table formatting and formula prediction.

3.3.2 Input Splitting. An alternative way is to split a large table into multiple chunks and input chunks separately into the model. For cell type classification [31], TUTA [95] splits the table into chunks containing the same header row(s) and non-overlapped data rows. For formula prediction, SpreadsheetCoder [21], which is not a pre-training method but a typical case, splits the target table range in a spreadsheet by chunks with $N = 3$ adjacent table rows/columns. The chunks are encoded by a BERT [30] encoder and then aggregated by convolutional layers. Splitting the input table allows encoding all table cells, while it costs more time due to multiple inferences of the encoder and is thus not used by most table pre-training methods.

3.3.3 Sparse Attention. On the model side, MATE [39] leverages the sparse attention of table encoding by an efficient implementation to reduce memory cost. In MATE, row and column attentions are designed for different attention heads, which are implemented following ETC [1] by dividing the input into a global part G attending to and from everything and a local part attending to G and

tokens within a radius R . With this efficient attention implementation, the model scales linearly concerning memory (8,000 tokens at most) and speed. Note that though sparse attention based on table structure is widely adopted in table pre-training, they mainly aim at performance improvement instead of efficiency. Replacing these sparse attentions with efficient implementations can largely mitigate the memory issue. ForTaP [23] used the TVM⁴ framework to compile a CUDA kernel to implement sparse tree-attention in TUTA, and the maximum input sequence length has been extended to 8,000 tokens.

4 PRE-TRAINING OBJECTIVES

Most pre-training objectives of TaLMs generally follow the Masked Language Modeling (MLM) [30], while a variety of other pre-training objectives mimic downstream tasks. We divide objectives into denoising autoencoder and task-specific objectives. The former apply self-supervised learning and denoise the table itself, and the latter build supervision according to specific tasks.

4.1 Denoising Autoencoder Objectives

Denoising autoencoder objectives take partially corrupted inputs and recover the original ones. Most TaLMs apply token MLM on tables following the way on NL sequences [30]. However, unlike NL, the cell and the column are unique and essential components for tabular data, so some works also took them into consideration when designing denoising objectives.

4.1.1 Token-level. Most pre-training models use token MLM [30] by masking some percentage of the input tokens at random and then predicting those masked tokens. Standard MLM used in Tapas [51], MATE [39] and TableFormer [6], uses a masking rate of 15% tokens. Some methods use a slightly larger masked ratio to make the pre-training more challenging, e.g., MLM used in TURL [28] masks 20% of the token positions at random. Some models not only utilize tables but also utilize NL context around tables. In addition, Some methods have certain restrictions on selected masked tokens, e.g., MLM used in TaBERT [101] only masks tokens in an NL context, and MLM used in TURL [28] and GraPPa [29] masks both NL sentences and table headers.

In addition to MLM, the Masked Entity Recovery (MER) objective used in TURL [28] masks a certain percentage of input entity cells and then recovers the linked entity based on surrounding entity cells and table metadata. It helps the model capture the factual

⁴<https://github.com/apache/tvm>

knowledge embedded in the table content and the associations between table metadata and table content.

4.1.2 Cell-level. We list three kinds of cell-level objectives as follows.

- **Masking and recovery:** Since a cell could have multiple value tokens, cell-level objectives slightly differ from the standard MLM. TUTA [92] uses a whole-cell masking strategy to capture relationships of neighboring cells. Cell Value Recovery (CVR) objective used in TaBERT [101] applies the span-based prediction objective to deal with multiple value tokens. In TCN [93], each token represents each cell, so they randomly mask 10% of table cells beforehand for recovery from the set of all cell values.
- **Cloze:** Cell-level cloze used in TUTA [92] samples cell strings based on the bi-tree structure as candidate choices, and at each blanked position, encourages the model to retrieve its corresponding cell string.
- **Classifying cell corruption:** TABBIE [55] corrupts cells and predicts each cell either is the original cell or has been corrupted. They use two different corruption strategies, frequency-based cell sampling and intra-table cell swapping.

4.1.3 Column-level. The Masked Column Prediction (MCP) objective used in TaBERT [101] encourages the model to recover the names and data types of masked columns, and it depends on a premise of the relational schema.

4.2 Task-specific Objectives

When there are sufficient supervision labels from real downstream data or synthetic data, some methods are proposed to directly use the downstream task or downstream-task-like objectives for from-scratch pre-training or intermediate pre-training. We will discuss those objectives from the downstream task perspective and the data source perspective. Towards cross-task representations, it's highly desirable to validate the effectiveness of existing pre-training objectives across multiple diverse downstream tasks in tabular domain, as introduced by Section 5 in details.

4.2.1 Objectives by downstream tasks. In this subsection, we neglect details of downstream tasks, which are described in detail in Sec 5 and mainly focus on the relationships between pre-training objectives and downstream tasks.

Table QA There are a variety of works on this topic. We only list some representative ones. A critical technical component of text-to-SQL is the alignment between text and tabular data. GraPPa [29] designed an objective: given an NL sentence and table headers, predicting whether a column appears in the SQL query and what operation is triggered. StruG [29] uses several grounding tasks of text-to-SQL as objectives, including selecting columns mentioned in sentences, finding cell values from sentences, and mapping column-value. TaPEX [69] proposed to learn a novel neural SQL executor. Given a table and an executable SQL query, TaPEX uses the query's execution result (obtained through an off-the-shelf SQL executor, e.g., MySQL) to supervise the TaLM as a neural executor. Yoran *et al.* [103] generate at scale question-paragraph pairs that require different reasoning skills to enhance the numerical reasoning abilities in table QA.

Table Fact Verification Eisenschlos *et al.* [38] use an intermediate pre-training objective of table entailment verification targeting both table entailment verification and table QA. TaPEX [69], described above, also has benefits for this task.

Entity Linking TURL [28] proposed a novel Masked Entity Recovery (MER) objective for pre-training to capture the semantics and knowledge in large-scale unlabeled data.

Table Type Classification and Table Search Table context retrieval objective used in TUTA [92] provides each table with text segments and retrieves the corresponding tables using text segments.

Numerical Reasoning (Formula-driven) ForTaP [23] devised numerical-reasoning-aware table pre-training by predicting numerical reference prediction and numerical calculation prediction, and aims to benefit all related tasks involving table numerical reasoning, e.g., table QA, formula prediction, cell type classification, and table-to-text.

4.2.2 Objectives by data sources. Sufficient data and supervision labels are critical to task-specific objectives, and different data and labels are needed by different downstream tasks. Existing works get them from two sources – human created and machine synthesis.

Human created Human created data can be post-labeled, e.g., ToTTo, a well-labeled dataset for table-to-text with NL descriptions and corresponding web tables, is used by StruG for pre-training. And human created data can also be crawled and extracted with trivial efforts, e.g., FORTAP extracts formulas from a large web-crawled spreadsheet corpus, analyzes them with XLParse[2], and extracts numerical reference and calculation relationships from them. Human created datasets are usually meaningful, and web-crawled ones may be large, diverse, and noisy, which need careful preprocessing.

Machine GraPPa [29] proposed SCFG (synchronous context-free grammar) and applied it to synthesized sentence-SQL pairs on a large number of tables. Eisenschlos *et al.* [38] created synthetic and counterfactual statements for existing Wikipedia tables. The former got table and sentences from Wikipedia as positive examples and created minimally differing refuted examples. The latter built a table-dependent statement, defined the (probabilistic) context-free grammar, and synthesized statements from the CFG. TaPEX randomly selected tables from the training set of WIKITQ [76] and instantiated SQL templates to synthesize table-SQL pairs. Synthesized datasets are more targeted and controllable, but also need careful designation to ensure the meaningfulness and diversity.

5 DOWNSTREAM TASKS AND DATASETS

As shown in Figure 2, tasks of table understanding often have intersections with domains like NL, programming language, and computer vision. For example, table question answering is a popular cross-domain task that requires models to understand tables and NL questions jointly, and to enable robust reasoning over tables, semantic parsing becomes a widely-studied task of parsing NL questions to programming languages such as SQLs, logical forms, or python code. Question answering over visual documents is a cross-domain task of computer vision, tabular data, and NL. We think that classifying tasks by domains presents a fresh perspective to future works on multi-modal modeling, but it is not an absolutely strict or

Table 3: Downstream task evaluation for table pre-training. In this table, we try to cluster some similar tasks, e.g., column type&relation classification and a series of tasks of data preparation. We also merge sub-tasks like logic-to-text, into main tasks like table-to-text.

	Table question answering Sec 5.2.1	Table fact verification Sec 5.2.3	Table -to-text Sec 5.2.2	Table type classification Sec 5.1.1	Cell type classification Sec 5.1.2	Column type & relation classification Sec 5.5.1	Table augmentation Sec 5.5.2	Formula prediction Sec 5.3.2	Entity linking Sec 5.5.1	Table search Sec 5.2.4	Data preparation Sec 5.7	Machine learning applications Sec 5.8
TAPAS	yes											
TaBERT	yes											
TURL						yes	yes		yes			
TUTA				yes								
Tabnet												Yes
VIME												Yes
KGPT			yes									
RPT											yes	
StruG	yes											
TabTransformer												Yes
GraPPa	yes											
TABBIE						yes	yes					
TaPEX	yes											
FORTAP	yes				yes			yes				
MATE	yes	yes										
TableGPT			yes									
GTR										yes		
TableFormer	yes	yes										
FLAP			yes									
UnifiedSKG	yes	yes	yes									




Figure 2: Task categorization by domains.

static cauterization, e.g., table QA can involve programming languages via semantic parsing [101], while it can also use end-to-end prediction [51] without explicitly using a programming language. In addition to categorizing tasks by domains, some tasks are more suitable to be categorized by their applications, e.g., data preparation represents a range of tasks for data preparation. The machine learning application covers various machine learning benchmarks or competitions where features and labels are stored in a tabular form. In the following sections, we introduce tasks by domains and objectives jointly.

5.1 Table Structure Understanding

Understanding the structure of tables is the premise of many other downstream tasks, e.g., question answering, table-to-text, and formula suggestion. Even the pre-training stage relies on the table type and header regions, e.g., in the data pre-processing stage of pre-training, TaBERT filters relational tables and "flattens" top headers if they cross multiple rows, and TUTA extracts tree-based positions based on header hierarchies. This section introduces two representative tasks of table structure understanding, table type classification and cell type classification.

5.1.1 Table Type Classification. This task is to classify tables into different structural types [37, 43, 72]. However, most datasets are not publicly available, except the *July 2015 Common Crawl (WCC)* in [43] where tables are categorized into five types: relational, entity, matrix, list, and non-data. To enable table-level classification, TUTA extends its pre-training backbone with a simple multi-layer classification head upon the special global [CLS] token of the table. [92]

5.1.2 Cell Type Classification. Cell type classification is to identify cell types in the table [31, 45, 61]. Existing public datasets include deexcelerator (DeEx) [61], SAUS [45], and CIUS [45], where cells are categorized into metadata, notes, data, top attribute, left attribute, and derived. WebSheet [31] provides a fine-grained taxonomy of headers, including index, index name, and value name, but is not publicly available now. To better leverage cell-level information, Ghasemi Gol *et al.* [44] encodes contextual (cell text) and stylistic (cell formats) features to embeddings via unsupervised training, and then trains an LSTM-based model for supervised cell classification. TUTA [92] optimizes cell embedding layers, attention layers, and the cell classification head jointly via a transformer-based framework.

5.2 Table and Natural Language

5.2.1 Question Answering over Tables. A general problem formulation of Table QA is defined as follows: given a table and a question in NL, output an answer, and the question-answer pair should be fully supported by the table. Table QA has many benchmark datasets, mainly focusing on DB tables [91, 104, 113] and relational web tables [76, 85]. Recently, it has been extended to QA [24] over complex statistical report tables (questions are revised from real sentences that are meaningful, diverse, and natural rather than written from scratch), QA [22, 117] over financial tables, and jointly QA over tables and text [19, 22, 117]. In general, applying pre-training models to this task has three kinds of approaches: (1) TaBERT [101] feeds the embeddings outputted by the encoder to a logical forms generator and uses the generated logical forms to return answers by executing on tables; (2) TAPAS [51] does not generate logical forms, and simply extends the encoder with classification heads for cell selection and operator selection; (3) TaPEX [69] uses an encoder-decoder architecture that decodes answers in a way like a sequence generation.

5.2.2 Table-to-Text. Table-to-text, i.e., generating textual descriptions from (semi-) structured tables, is another prevalent task that can benefit from table pre-training. There are many existing datasets for table-to-text [7, 13, 63, 67, 73, 96]. Recently, a large-scale controlled table-to-text dataset (ToTTo) is proposed for text generation over Wikipedia tables with annotated highlighted cells as conditions [74]. NumericNLG [84] and SciGen [71] are proposed to generate reasoning-aware paragraph-level descriptions for tables in scientific papers. LogicNLG [17] is built for generating logical textual descriptions from Wikipedia tables. Logic2Text [20] shares the same idea with LogicNLG to incorporate logical inference in table-to-text but contains annotated logical forms to enhance the generation fidelity. HiTab [24] is the first to introduce hierarchical tables as the generation context, posing new challenges compared with previous datasets. Many prior approaches [17, 24, 46, 58] on these datasets directly utilize pre-trained language models by first transforming the table into a textual sequence. A recent branch of works [78, 98] has focused on better table understanding by pre-training the transformer model on structure-aware self-supervised tasks.

5.2.3 Table Fact Verification. This is a binary entailment task to verify whether a textual hypothesis holds based on the given table. TabFact [16] is a big human-labeled dataset for table fact verification to evaluate the effectiveness of table-text joint modeling. Methods like TAPAS [38] and TaPEX [69] encode table and text together and outputs the truth value of entailment via a simple MLP-based binary classifier over the [CLS] token embeddings and a transformer-based decoder, respectively.

5.2.4 Table Search by Natural Language. Table search by NL seeks to retrieve semantically relevant tables based on NL queries. Wikitables [108] is a benchmark dataset containing 60 queries and 3,120 candidate tables. WebQueryTable [86] contains 21,113 queries collected from search logs of a commercial search engine and 273,816 candidate tables. GTR [94] encodes tables with a tabular graph transformer, contexts with a BERT-based model [30], and queries with a FastText method [57], and calculates the relevance score of the

query-table and query-context matching by multi-layer perceptron (MLP).

5.3 Table and Programming Language

5.3.1 Semantic Parsing Towards Table Question Answering. Semantic parsing, usually seen as an important intermediate task of table question answering, is to parse natural language queries to SQLs (text-to-SQL), logical forms, or other kinds of programming languages that can return answers through executing on one or more target tables. Public datasets includes Spider [104], WikiSQL [113], etc. For example, StruG [29], GraPPa [105], GAP [81] promote semantic parsing through pre-training on synthetic or human-labeled table-text data.

5.3.2 Formula Prediction. Formula prediction is to predict a formula for the target cell in a table [21]. Since writing formulas from scratch could be time-consuming and error-prone, it facilitates spreadsheet end-users by recommending formulas based on corresponding headers and other useful contexts. Enron [50] is a large and public dataset of Excel Spreadsheets containing over 17K spreadsheets with rich table structures and formula types. In FORTAP [23], based on the contextual embeddings of the target cell outputted by the pre-trained encoder, an LSTM-based decoder is adopted for formula generation.

5.3.3 Formula Error Detection. Formula error detection refers to the task of detecting spreadsheet formula errors. This task has real critical usage in the financial domain since formula errors can greatly degrade the quality of spreadsheets and cause financial losses [77]. Public datasets include CACheck [35] and CUSTODES [25].

5.4 Table and Vision

5.4.1 Image-based Table Detection and Cell Recognition. Since image tables are not the main focus of this paper as claimed in Section 2.1, we only list two most representative tasks for image tables here, image-based table detection and cell recognition. Image-based table detection is a task of detecting table regions in visual documents, and cell recognition further decomposes a whole table region into individual cell regions. Recent public datasets include ICDAR 2019 [41], TableBank [65], PubTabNet [114], SciTSR [26], and FinTabNet [112]. pre-training works on visual documents like LayoutLM [99], DocFormer [3], and LAMBERT [42] can be potentially applied to these datasets. We will not expand this part due to the focus of this paper as stated in 2.1.

5.4.2 Table Format Generation. Good-looking formatting is desirable for modern tables. Format generation refers to the task of generating formatting to better exhibit table structures and data relationships in a visual perspective. Dong *et al.* [34] provides three web-crawled datasets, SAUS, NCSE, and NSF, containing a total of 7,541 tables with high-quality table formatting.

5.5 Table and Knowledge Graph

5.5.1 Table Interpretation. Table interpretation is the task of converting Web tables into machine-understandable knowledge, including entity linking, column type identification, and relation extraction [9]. *Entity linking* is the task of finding phrases of text,

called mentions, in cells and associating each with its referent entity. *Column type classification* is the task of associating a column in a table with the KB type of entities it contains. *Relation extraction* is the task of associating a pair of columns in a table with the KB relation that holds between each pair of entities in a given row of the columns.

T2Dv2 Gold Standard⁵ contains 779 tables from various websites with manual annotations. SemTab challenge⁶ provides automatically generated tables with annotations from knowledge graph[27]. WikiTable corpus [9] contains entity linking annotation from hyperlinks, and TURL [28] extends WikiTable corpus to the other tasks.

5.5.2 Table Augmentation. Table augmentation is the task of expanding a table with additional data [107]. Three sub-tasks are proposed for augmenting relational tables, including row population that suggests entity filings for table columns, cell filling that fills the cell values, and schema augmentation that recommends top headers to columns. Since this task can be self-supervised, one can also adopt it as a pre-training objective using unlabeled data.

Knowledge graph augmentation is a task opposite to table augmentation. It enriches knowledge graphs with knowledge extracted from tabular data. Existing table pre-training works have not focused on this task.

5.6 Table and Data Analysis

Tabular data is one of the important data formats in data analysis for business intelligence. There are two table analysis tasks – table transformation and visualization generation. Table transformation aims at transforming tables with operators like group by, pivot, aggregation, and so on [100]. Besides, some works [115] focus on creating analysis with transformation. Visualization generation aims at recommendation visualization to make tabular data human-friendly and expressive. VizML [52] and Table2Chart [116] provide corresponding corpus.

5.7 Table and Data Preparation

Data preparation consists of a series of tasks. Hameed and Naumann [48] classify them into six broader categories: data discovery, data validation, data structuring, data enrichment, data filtering, and data cleaning. RPT [87] improves a range of data preparation tasks through large pre-training with a transformer-based denoising autoencoder. Here, we only introduce a representative data discovery task, spreadsheet table detection.

5.7.1 Spreadsheet Table Detection. Spreadsheets are flexible to use, but most tables on spreadsheets are not explicitly inserted by authors (by selecting the bounding box and clicking the "Insert Table" button in Excel), so spreadsheet table detection is essential to recognize table layouts and detect table boundaries. TableSense [32] gives a public dataset containing 2,615 table regions from 1,645 spreadsheets⁷.

⁵<http://webdatacommons.org/webtables/goldstandardV2.html>

⁶<http://www.cs.ox.ac.uk/isg/challenges/sem-tab/>

⁷<https://github.com/microsoft/TableSense>

5.8 Table and Machine Learning Application

Since tabular data are often used to record categorical or continuous features and corresponding labels in machine learning applications (e.g., competitions held by Kaggle and KDD Cup such as product recommending and online advertising), this distinct scenario attracts research work such as VIME [102], SAINT [83], TabTransformer [54], and Tabnet [4], to pre-train on unlabeled tabular data towards better featurization, feature selection, and contextual representation learning to achieve higher prediction accuracy in machine learning applications. Since there are pretty diverse machine learning applications, and most prediction tasks need complex reasoning over a specific set of domain-specific features, pre-training a general model has distinct challenges to handle those task diversity and reasoning complexity.

5.9 Other Tasks

There are still many related tasks and datasets that have not been evaluated by table existing pre-training methods, but they are also helpful to evaluate the effectiveness of pre-training models, such as table title generation [49], pairwise table relation classification [40], tabular data synthesis [75], table error detection [53], etc.

6 FUTURE VISION

Although the "pre-training and fine-tuning" paradigm has demonstrated its success on various table understanding and reasoning tasks, there are still some key challenges (opportunities) that are highly desirable to be solved (explored) in future research. We provide our thoughts and vision in this section.

6.1 Universal Framework for General Downstream tasks

Almost all table pre-training works only focus on one or two specific downstream tasks so that they have sufficient flexibility on model designs to achieve the best performance, but it is desirable to explore a general table pre-training method to support various downstream tasks simultaneously like what BERT and GPT are doing in NL domain. But the diversity of downstream tasks presents a significant challenge, for example, formula prediction and entity linking may need different feature sets and sampling mechanisms. Recently, UnifiedSKG explored to fine-tune the T5-based text-to-text model on 21 datasets across 6 task families and achieved promising results. It's desirable to include more tasks such as entity linking [28], formula prediction [23], table structure recognition [95], etc.

6.2 Combining Diverse Cell Features Effectively

Tables are arranged in two-dimension, including not only text but also quantities, visual formats, hyperlinks, and even spreadsheet formulas, it is non-trivial to learn high-level representations from such diverse and raw information. It particularly challenges existing language models that directly consume a flat sequence. How to combine and embed information effectively is a challenge.

6.3 Efficient Transformers for Big Tables

Due to the limitation of the input length of existing large-scale pre-trained language models, they usually need to split tables into several parts [92] to be input to the model or only feed a specific part of a table (sometimes called "content snapshot") to the model according to the requirement of a specific task [51, 101]. ForTaP and MATE are great trials but still have a limited maximum length (around 8,000 tokens) constraint that is not applicable to larger tables, such as a large proportion of spreadsheet tables. We wonder if there exists a general sampling method that is effective and general for various downstream tasks, and if there does not exist one, what we can do better in the pre-training stage.

6.4 Universal Framework for General Document Tables

Most works only focus on a specific type of table, e.g., web tables. However, we believe that although data models behind different document types are different, key cell information such as cell value, formats, and merging are universal. In the future, it is highly desirable to pre-train a universal model to represent them in a unified architecture so that each type of document can leverage a large pre-trained model for the universal table type. TUTA [95] took the first step towards this direction by pre-training and evaluating the model on web and spreadsheet tables together.

7 CONCLUSION

We believe that the table, as a distinct (semi-)structured data form far away from natural language and images, deserves sufficient research explorations. In this survey of table pre-training, a comprehensive review of existing model architectures, pre-training objectives, and downstream tasks is presented. We hope that this survey can provide some insightful perspectives to inspire more directions of future works.

REFERENCES

- [1] Joshua Ainslie, Santiago Ontanon, Chris Alberti, Vaclav Cvicek, Zachary Fisher, Philip Pham, Anirudh Ravula, Sumit Sanghai, Qifan Wang, and Li Yang. Etc: Encoding long and structured inputs in transformers. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 268–284, 2020.
- [2] Efthimia Aivaloglou, David Hoepelman, and Felienne Hermans. A grammar for spreadsheet formulas evaluated on two large datasets. In *2015 IEEE 15th International Working Conference on Source Code Analysis and Manipulation (SCAM)*, pages 121–130. IEEE, 2015.
- [3] Srikar Appalaraju, Bhavan Jasani, Bhargava Urala Kota, Yusheng Xie, and R Manmatha. Docformer: End-to-end transformer for document understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.11539*, 2021.
- [4] Sercan Ö Arik and Tomas Pfister. Tabnet: Attentive interpretable tabular learning. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 35, pages 6679–6687, 2021.
- [5] Anonymous Authors. Flap: Table-to-text generation with feature indication and numerical reasoning pretraining. *ACL Rolling Review Nov.*, 2021.
- [6] Anonymous Authors. Tableformer: Robust transformer modeling for table-text encoding. *ACL Rolling Review Nov.*, 2021.
- [7] Eva Banik, Claire Gardent, and Eric Kow. The kbgen challenge. In *the 14th European Workshop on Natural Language Generation (ENLG)*, pages 94–97, 2013.
- [8] Titus Barik, Kevin Lubich, Justin Smith, John Slankas, and Emerson Murphy-Hill. Fuse: a reproducible, extendable, internet-scale corpus of spreadsheets. In *2015 IEEE/ACM 12th Working Conference on Mining Software Repositories*, pages 486–489. IEEE, 2015.
- [9] Chandra Sekhar Bhagavatula, Thanapon Noraset, and Doug Downey. Tabel: entity linking in web tables. In *International Semantic Web Conference*. Springer, 2015.
- [10] Tom B Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, et al. Language models are few-shot learners. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.14165*, 2020.
- [11] Michael J Cafarella, Alon Y Halevy, Yang Zhang, Daisy Zhe Wang, and Eugene Wu. Uncovering the relational web. In *WebDB*, 2008.
- [12] Zhe Chen and Michael Cafarella. Automatic web spreadsheet data extraction. In *Proceedings of the 3rd International Workshop on Semantic Search over the Web*, pages 1–8, 2013.
- [13] David L Chen and Raymond J Mooney. Learning to sportscast: a test of grounded language acquisition. In *Proceedings of the 25th international conference on Machine learning*, pages 128–135, 2008.
- [14] J Chen, I Horrocks, E Jimenez-Ruiz, and C Sutton. Learning semantic annotations for tabular data. *IJCAI 2019*, pages 2088–2094, 2019.
- [15] Jiaoyan Chen, Ernesto Jiménez-Ruiz, Ian Horrocks, and Charles Sutton. Colnet: Embedding the semantics of web tables for column type prediction. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 33, pages 29–36, 2019.
- [16] Wenhui Chen, Hongmin Wang, Jianshu Chen, Yunkai Zhang, Hong Wang, Shiyang Li, Xiyu Zhou, and William Yang Wang. Tabfact: A large-scale dataset for table-based fact verification. *arXiv preprint:1909.02164*, 2019.
- [17] Wenhui Chen, Jianshu Chen, Yu Su, Zhiyu Chen, and William Yang Wang. Logical natural language generation from open-domain tables. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 7929–7942, 2020.
- [18] Wenhui Chen, Yu Su, Xifeng Yan, and William Yang Wang. Kgpt: Knowledge-grounded pre-training for data-to-text generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.02307*, 2020.
- [19] Wenhui Chen, Hanwen Zha, Zhiyu Chen, Wenhan Xiong, Hong Wang, and William Wang. Hybridqa: A dataset of multi-hop question answering over tabular and textual data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.07347*, 2020.
- [20] Zhiyu Chen, Wenhui Chen, Hanwen Zha, Xiyu Zhou, Yunkai Zhang, Sairam Sundaresan, and William Yang Wang. Logic2text: High-fidelity natural language generation from logical forms. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing: Findings*, pages 2096–2111, 2020.
- [21] Xinyun Chen, Petros Maniatis, Rishabh Singh, Charles Sutton, Hanjun Dai, Max Lin, and Denny Zhou. Spreadsheetcoder: Formula prediction from semi-structured context. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1661–1672. PMLR, 2021.
- [22] Zhiyu Chen, Wenhui Chen, Charese Smiley, Sameena Shah, Iana Borova, Dylan Langdon, Reema Moussa, Matt Beane, Ting-Hao Huang, Bryan Routledge, et al. Finqa: A dataset of numerical reasoning over financial data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.00122*, 2021.
- [23] Zhoujun Cheng, Haoyu Dong, Fan Cheng, Ran Jia, Pengfei Wu, Shi Han, and Dongmei Zhang. Fortap: Using formulae for numerical-reasoning-aware table pre-training. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.07323*, 2021.
- [24] Zhoujun Cheng, Haoyu Dong, Zhiruo Wang, Ran Jia, Jiaqi Guo, Yan Gao, Shi Han, Jian-Guang Lou, and Dongmei Zhang. Hitab: A hierarchical table dataset for question answering and natural language generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.06712*, 2021.
- [25] Shing-Chi Cheung, Wanjuan Chen, Yeping Liu, and Chang Xu. Custodes: automatic spreadsheet cell clustering and smell detection using strong and weak features. In *Proceedings of the 38th International Conference on Software Engineering*, pages 464–475, 2016.
- [26] Zewen Chi, Heyan Huang, Heng-Da Xu, Houjin Yu, Wanxuan Yin, and Xian-Ling Mao. Complicated table structure recognition. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1908.04729*, 2019.
- [27] Vincenzo Cutrona, Federico Bianchi, Ernesto Jiménez-Ruiz, and Matteo Palmonari. Tough tables: Carefully evaluating entity linking for tabular data. In *International Semantic Web Conference*, pages 328–343. Springer, 2020.
- [28] Xiang Deng, Huan Sun, Alyssa Lees, You Wu, and Cong Yu. Turl: table understanding through representation learning. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment*, 14(3):307–319, 2020.
- [29] Xiang Deng, Ahmed Hassan, Christopher Meek, Oleksandr Polozov, Huan Sun, and Matthew Richardson. Structure-grounded pretraining for text-to-sql. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 1337–1350, 2021.
- [30] Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.04805*, 2018.
- [31] Haoyu Dong, Shijie Liu, Zhouyu Fu, Shi Han, and Dongmei Zhang. Semantic structure extraction for spreadsheet tables with a multi-task learning architecture. In *Workshop on Document Intelligence at NeurIPS 2019*, 2019.
- [32] Haoyu Dong, Shijie Liu, Shi Han, Zhouyu Fu, and Dongmei Zhang. Tablesense: Spreadsheet table detection with convolutional neural networks. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 33, pages 69–76, 2019.
- [33] Haoyu Dong, Jiong Yang, Shi Han, and Dongmei Zhang. Learning formatting style transfer and structure extraction for spreadsheet tables with a hybrid neural network architecture. In *Proceedings of the 29th ACM International Conference on Information & Knowledge Management*, pages 2389–2396, 2020.
- [34] Haoyu Dong, Jinyu Wang, Zhouyu Fu, Shi Han, and Dongmei Zhang. Neural formatting for spreadsheet tables. In *Proceedings of the 29th ACM International Conference on Information & Knowledge Management*, pages 305–314, 2020.
- [35] Wensheng Dou, Chang Xu, Shing-Chi Cheung, and Jun Wei. Cacheck: detecting and repairing cell arrays in spreadsheets. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, 43(3):226–251, 2016.
- [36] Lun Du, Fei Gao, Xu Chen, Ran Jia, Junshan Wang, Jiang Zhang, Shi Han, and Dongmei Zhang. Tabulernet: A neural network architecture for understanding semantic structures of tabular data. In *Proceedings of the 27th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining*, pages 322–331, 2021.
- [37] Julian Eberius, Katrin Braunschweig, and Others. Building the dresden web table corpus: A classification approach. In *2015 IEEE/ACM 2nd International Symposium on Big Data Computing (BDC)*, pages 41–50. IEEE, 2015.
- [38] Julian Eisenschlos, Syrine Krichene, and Thomas Mueller. Understanding tables with intermediate pre-training. In *Proceedings of the 27th Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing: Findings*, pages 281–296, 2020.
- [39] Julian Eisenschlos, Maharshi Gor, Thomas Mueller, and William Cohen. Mate: Multi-view attention for table transformer efficiency. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 7606–7619, 2021.
- [40] Besnik Fetahu, Avishek Anand, and Maria Koutraki. Tablenet: An approach for determining fine-grained relations for wikipedia tables. In *The World Wide Web Conference*, pages 2736–2742, 2019.
- [41] Liangcai Gao, Yilun Huang, Hervé Déjean, Jean-Luc Meunier, Qinqin Yan, Yu Fang, Florian Kleber, and Eva Lang. Icdar 2019 competition on table detection and recognition (ctdar). In *2019 International Conference on Document Analysis and Recognition (ICDAR)*, pages 1510–1515. IEEE, 2019.
- [42] Łukasz Gmarniec, Rafał Powalski, Tomasz Stanisławek, Bartosz Topolski, Piotr Halama, Michał Turski, and Filip Graliński. Lambert: Layout-aware (language) modeling for information extraction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.08087*, 2020.
- [43] Majid Ghasemi-Gol and Pedro Szekely. Tabvec: Table vectors for classification of web tables. *arXiv preprint:1802.06290*, 2018.
- [44] Majid Ghasemi Gol, Jay Pujara, and Pedro Szekely. Tabular cell classification using pre-trained cell embeddings. In *2019 IEEE International Conference on Data Mining (ICDM)*, pages 230–239, 2019.
- [45] Majid Ghasemi Gol, Jay Pujara, and Pedro Szekely. Tabular cell classification using pre-trained cell embeddings. In *2019 IEEE International Conference on Data Mining (ICDM)*, pages 230–239. IEEE, 2019.
- [46] Heng Gong, Yawei Sun, Xiaocheng Feng, Bing Qin, Wei Bi, Xiaojiang Liu, and Ting Liu. Tablegpt: Few-shot table-to-text generation with table structure reconstruction and content matching. In *Proceedings of the 28th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, pages 1978–1988, 2020.
- [47] Tong Guo, Derong Shen, Tiezheng Nie, and Yue Kou. Web table column type detection using deep learning and probability graph model. In *International Conference on Web Information Systems and Applications*, pages 401–414. Springer, 2020.
- [48] Mazhar Hameed and Felix Naumann. Data preparation: A survey of commercial tools. *ACM SIGMOD Record*, 49(3):18–29, 2020.
- [49] Braden Hancock, Hongrae Lee, and Cong Yu. Generating titles for web tables. In *The World Wide Web Conference*, pages 638–647, 2019.
- [50] Felienne Hermans and Emerson Murphy-Hill. Enron’s spreadsheets and related emails: A dataset and analysis. In *2015 IEEE/ACM 37th IEEE International Conference*

- on Software Engineering.
- [51] Jonathan Herzig, Paweł Krzysztof Nowak, Thomas Mueller, Francesco Piccinno, and Julian Eisenschlos. Tapas: Weakly supervised table parsing via pre-training. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 4320–4333, 2020.
- [52] Kevin Hu, Michiel A Bakker, Stephen Li, Tim Kraska, and César Hidalgo. Vizml: A machine learning approach to visualization recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 2019 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, pages 1–12, 2019.
- [53] Zhipeng Huang and Yeye He. Auto-detect: Data-driven error detection in tables. In *Proceedings of the 2018 International Conference on Management of Data*, pages 1377–1392, 2018.
- [54] Xin Huang, Ashish Khetan, Milan Cvitkovic, and Zohar Karnin. Tabtransformer: Tabular data modeling using contextual embeddings. *arXiv preprint:2012.06678*, 2020.
- [55] Hiroshi Iida, Dung Thai, Varun Manjunatha, and Mohit Iyyer. Tabbie: Pretrained representations of tabular data. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 3446–3456, 2021.
- [56] Xiaoqi Jiao, Yichun Yin, Lifeng Shang, Xin Jiang, Xiao Chen, Linlin Li, Fang Wang, and Qun Liu. TinyBERT: Distilling BERT for natural language understanding. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2020*, pages 4163–4174, Online, November 2020. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [57] Armand Joulin, Edouard Grave, Piotr Bojanowski, and Tomas Mikolov. Bag of tricks for efficient text classification. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1607.01759*, 2016.
- [58] Mihir Kale and Abhinav Rastogi. Text-to-text pre-training for data-to-text tasks. In *Proceedings of the 13th International Conference on Natural Language Generation*, pages 97–102, 2020.
- [59] Marcin Kardas, Piotr Czapla, Pontus Stenetorp, Sebastian Ruder, Sebastian Riedel, Ross Taylor, and Robert Stojnic. Axccl: Automatic extraction of results from machine learning papers. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 8580–8594, 2020.
- [60] Elvis Koci, Maik Thiele, Wolfgang Lehner, and Oscar Romero. Table recognition in spreadsheets via a graph representation. In *2018 13th IAPR International Workshop on Document Analysis Systems (DAS)*, pages 139–144. IEEE, 2018.
- [61] Elvis Koci, Maik Thiele, Josephine Rehak, Oscar Romero, and Wolfgang Lehner. Deco: A dataset of annotated spreadsheets for layout and table recognition. In *International Conference on Document Analysis and Recognition*. IEEE, 2019.
- [62] Syrine Krichene, Thomas Müller, and Julian Martin Eisenschlos. Dot: An efficient double transformer for nlp tasks with tables. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.00479*, 2021.
- [63] Rémi Lebrete, David Grangier, and Michael Auli. Neural text generation from structured data with application to the biography domain. In *Proceedings of the 2016 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 1203–1213, 2016.
- [64] 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 *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 7871–7880, 2020.
- [65] Minghao Li, Lei Cui, Shaohan Huang, Furu Wei, Ming Zhou, and Zhoujun Li. Tablebank: Table benchmark for image-based table detection and recognition. In *Proceedings of the 12th Language Resources and Evaluation Conference*, pages 1918–1925, 2020.
- [66] Junlong Li, Yiheng Xu, Lei Cui, and Furu Wei. Markuplm: Pre-training of text and markup language for visually-rich document understanding. 2021.
- [67] Percy Liang, Michael I Jordan, and Dan Klein. Learning semantic correspondences with less supervision. In *Proceedings of the Joint Conference of the 47th Annual Meeting of the ACL and the 4th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing of the AFNLP*, pages 91–99, 2009.
- [68] 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, 2019.
- [69] Qian Liu, Bei Chen, Jiaqi Guo, Zeqi Lin, and Jian-guang Lou. Tapex: Table pre-training via learning a neural sql executor. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.07653*, 2021.
- [70] Tomás Mikolov, Kai Chen, Greg Corrado, and Jeffrey Dean. Efficient estimation of word representations in vector space. In Yoshua Bengio and Yann LeCun, editors, *1st International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2013, Scottsdale, Arizona, USA, May 2-4, 2013, Workshop Track Proceedings*, 2013.
- [71] Nafise Sadat Moosavi, Andreas Rücklé, Dan Roth, and Iryna Gurevych. Learning to reason for text generation from scientific tables. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.08296*, 2021.
- [72] Kyosuke Nishida, Kugatsu Sadamitsu, Ryuichiro Higashinaka, and Yoshihiro Matsuo. Understanding the semantic structures of tables with a hybrid deep neural network architecture. In *Thirty-First AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2017.
- [73] Jekaterina Novikova, Oliver Lemon, and Verena Rieser. Crowd-sourcing nlg data: Pictures elicit better data. In *Proceedings of the 9th International Natural Language Generation conference*, pages 265–273, 2016.
- [74] Ankur Parikh, Xuezhi Wang, Sebastian Gehrmann, Manaal Faruqi, Bhuvan Dhingra, Diyi Yang, and Dipanjan Das. Totto: A controlled table-to-text generation dataset. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 1173–1186, 2020.
- [75] Noseong Park, Mahmoud Mohammadi, Kshitij Gorde, Sushil Jajodia, Hongkyu Park, and Youngmin Kim. Data synthesis based on generative adversarial networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1806.03384*, 2018.
- [76] 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)*, pages 1470–1480, 2015.
- [77] Stephen G Powell, Kenneth R Baker, and Barry Lawson. A critical review of the literature on spreadsheet errors. *Decision Support Systems*, 46(1):128–138, 2008.
- [78] Numerical Reasoning Pretraining. Flap: Table-to-text generation with feature indication and numerical reasoning pretraining.
- [79] Alec Radford, Jeff Wu, Rewon Child, David Luan, Dario Amodei, and Ilya Sutskever. Language models are unsupervised multitask learners. 2019.
- [80] 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. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 21(40):1–67, 2020.
- [81] Peng Shi, Patrick Ng, Zhiguo Wang, Henghui Zhu, Alexander Hanbo Li, Jun Wang, Cicero Nogueira dos Santos, and Bing Xiang. Learning contextual representations for semantic parsing with generation-augmented pre-training. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2012.10309*, 2020.
- [82] Alexey Shigarov, Andrey Mikhailov, and Andrey Altaev. Configurable table structure recognition in untagged pdf documents. In *Proceedings of the 2016 ACM Symposium on Document Engineering*, pages 119–122, 2016.
- [83] Gowthami Somepalli, Micah Goldblum, Avi Schwarzschild, C Bayan Bruss, and Tom Goldstein. Saint: Improved neural networks for tabular data via row attention and contrastive pre-training. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.01342*, 2021.
- [84] Lya Hulliyayatus Suadaa, Hidetaka Kamigaito, Kotaro Funakoshi, Manabu Okumura, and Hiroya Takamura. Towards table-to-text generation with numerical reasoning. 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 1451–1465, 2021.
- [85] Huan Sun, Hao Ma, Xiaodong He, Wen-tau Yih, Yu Su, and Xifeng Yan. Table cell search for question answering. In *Proceedings of the 25th International Conference on World Wide Web*, pages 771–782, 2016.
- [86] Yibo Sun, Zhao Yan, Duyu Tang, Nan Duan, and Bing Qin. Content-based table retrieval for web queries. *Neurocomputing*, 349:183–189, 2019.
- [87] Nan Tang, Ju Fan, Fangyi Li, Jianhong Tu, Xiaoyong Du, Guoliang Li, Sam Madden, and Mourad Ouzzani. Rpt: relational pre-trained transformer is almost all you need towards democratizing data preparation. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment*, 14(8):1254–1261, 2021.
- [88] Yi Tay, Mostafa Dehghani, Dara Bahri, and Donald Metzler. Efficient transformers: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.06732*, 2020.
- [89] Avijit Thawani, Jay Pujara, Filip Ilievski, and Pedro Szekely. Representing numbers in nlp: a survey and a vision. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 644–656, 2021.
- [90] Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. Attention is all you need. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pages 5998–6008, 2017.
- [91] Yushi Wang, Jonathan Berant, and Percy Liang. Building a semantic parser overnight. 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)*, pages 1332–1342, 2015.
- [92] Zhiruo Wang, Haoyu Dong, Ran Jia, Jia Li, Zhiyi Fu, Shi Han, and Dongmei Zhang. Structure-aware pre-training for table understanding with tree-based transformers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.12537*, 2020.
- [93] Daheng Wang, Prashant Shiralkar, Colin Lockard, Binxuan Huang, Xin Luna Dong, and Meng Jiang. Tcn: Table convolutional network for web table interpretation. In *Proceedings of the Web Conference 2021*, pages 4020–4032, 2021.
- [94] Fei Wang, Kexuan Sun, Muhao Chen, Jay Pujara, and Pedro Szekely. Retrieving complex tables with multi-granular graph representation learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.01736*, 2021.
- [95] Zhiruo Wang, Haoyu Dong, Ran Jia, Jia Li, Zhiyi Fu, Shi Han, and Dongmei Zhang. Tuta: Tree-based transformers for generally structured table pre-training. In *Proceedings of the 27th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining*, pages 1780–1790, 2021.
- [96] Sam Wiseman, Stuart M Shieber, and Alexander M Rush. Challenges in data-to-document generation. In *Proceedings of the 2017 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 2253–2263, 2017.
- [97] Tianbao Xie, Chen Henry Wu, Peng Shi, Ruiqi Zhong, Torsten Scholak, Michihiro Yasunaga, Chien-Sheng Wu, Ming Zhong, Pengcheng Yin, Sida I Wang, et al. Unified-skg: Unifying and multi-tasking structured knowledge grounding with text-to-text language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.05966*, 2022.
- [98] Xinyu Xing and Xiaojun Wan. Structure-aware pre-training for table-to-text generation. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL-IJCNLP 2021*, pages 2273–2278, 2021.

- [99] Yiheng Xu, Minghao Li, Lei Cui, Shaohan Huang, Furu Wei, and Ming Zhou. Layoutlm: Pre-training of text and layout for document image understanding. In *Proceedings of the 26th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining*, pages 1192–1200, 2020.
- [100] Cong Yan and Yeye He. Auto-suggest: Learning-to-recommend data preparation steps using data science notebooks. In *Proceedings of the 2020 ACM SIGMOD International Conference on Management of Data*, pages 1539–1554, 2020.
- [101] 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*, pages 8413–8426, 2020.
- [102] Jinsung Yoon, Yao Zhang, James Jordon, and Mihaela van der Schaar. Vime: Extending the success of self-and semi-supervised learning to tabular domain. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33, 2020.
- [103] Ori Yoran, Alon Talmor, and Jonathan Berant. Turning tables: Generating examples from semi-structured tables for endowing language models with reasoning skills. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.07261*, 2021.
- [104] 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*, pages 3911–3921, 2018.
- [105] 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.
- [106] Vicky Zayats, Kristina Toutanova, and Mari Ostendorf. Representations for question answering from documents with tables and text. In *Proceedings of the 16th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Main Volume*, pages 2895–2906, 2021.
- [107] Shuo Zhang and Krisztian Balog. Entitables: Smart assistance for entity-focused tables. In *Proceedings of the 40th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*, pages 255–264, 2017.
- [108] Shuo Zhang and Krisztian Balog. Ad hoc table retrieval using semantic similarity. In *Proceedings of the 2018 world wide web conference*, pages 1553–1562, 2018.
- [109] Shuo Zhang and Krisztian Balog. Web table extraction, retrieval, and augmentation: A survey. *ACM Transactions on Intelligent Systems and Technology (TIST)*, 11(2):1–35, 2020.
- [110] Li Zhang, Shuo Zhang, and Krisztian Balog. Table2vec: Neural word and entity embeddings for table population and retrieval. In *Proceedings of International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*, 2019.
- [111] Xingyao Zhang, Linjun Shou, Jian Pei, Ming Gong, Lijie Wen, and Daxin Jiang. A graph representation of semi-structured data for web question answering. In *Proceedings of the 28th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, pages 51–61, 2020.
- [112] Xinyi Zheng, Douglas Burdick, Lucian Popa, Xu Zhong, and Nancy Xin Ru Wang. Global table extractor (gte): A framework for joint table identification and cell structure recognition using visual context. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision*, pages 697–706, 2021.
- [113] Victor Zhong, Caiming Xiong, and Richard Socher. Seq2sql: Generating structured queries from natural language using reinforcement learning. *arXiv:1709.00103*, 2017.
- [114] Xu Zhong, Jianbin Tang, and Antonio Jimeno Yepes. Publaynet: largest dataset ever for document layout analysis. In *2019 International Conference on Document Analysis and Recognition (ICDAR)*, pages 1015–1022. IEEE, 2019.
- [115] Mengyu Zhou, Wang Tao, Ji Pengxin, Han Shi, and Zhang Dongmei. Table2analysis: Modeling and recommendation of common analysis patterns for multi-dimensional data. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 34(01):320–328, Apr. 2020.
- [116] Mengyu Zhou, Qingtao Li, Xinyi He, Yuejiang Li, Yibo Liu, Wei Ji, Shi Han, Yining Chen, Daxin Jiang, and Dongmei Zhang. Table2charts: Recommending charts by learning shared table representations. In *Proceedings of the 27th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining, KDD '21*, page 2389–2399, New York, NY, USA, 2021. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [117] Fengbin Zhu, Wenqiang Lei, Youcheng Huang, Chao Wang, Shuo Zhang, Jiancheng Lv, Fuli Feng, and Tat-Seng Chua. Tat-qa: A question answering benchmark on a hybrid of tabular and textual content in finance. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.07624*, 2021.