

# Towards Scalable Generation of Realistic Test Data for Duplicate Detection

Fabian Panse  
Hasso Plattner Institute  
Hamburg, Germany  
fabian.panse@hpi.de

Wolfram Wingerath  
University of Oldenburg  
Oldenburg, Germany  
wolfram.wingerath@uol.de

Benjamin Wollmer  
University of Hamburg  
Hamburg, Germany  
benjamin.wollmer@uni-hamburg.de

## ABSTRACT

Due to the increasing volume, volatility, and diversity of data in virtually all areas of our lives, the ability to detect duplicates in potentially linked data sources is more important than ever before. However, while research is already intensively engaged in adapting duplicate detection algorithms to the changing circumstances, existing test data generators are still designed for small – mostly relational – datasets and can thus fulfill their intended task only to a limited extent. In this report, we present our ongoing research on a novel approach for test data generation that – in contrast to existing solutions – is able to produce large test datasets with complex schemas and more realistic error patterns while being easy to use for inexperienced users.

## 1 INTRODUCTION

The detection of duplicate records is a critical task in data cleaning [27, 34, 55], data integration [18, 22], and data linkage [15]. It has been extensively studied during the last decades [47, 49, 60] and is still subject of many research projects today [26, 28, 37–39, 46, 64].

Quality evaluation using appropriate test data is an essential aspect in developing new duplicate detection algorithms and adjusting existing ones to specific use cases. The most adaptable and flexible approach is to use a test data generator, such as DBGen [31], GeCo [16], or EMBench<sup>++</sup> [35]. The goal of these generators is to create test data that resembles the required real-world properties (e.g., sparsity or textuality [53]) as well as possible.

However, according to Gardners’ 4 „V“s, datasets are becoming bigger (volume), more heterogeneous (variety), and are changing faster (velocity) than ever before while often being incomplete and error-prone (veracity). Thus, while the ever-increasing number of data sources makes the integration of data more and more valuable, the size, velocity, diversity, and error-proneness of the individual sources make this task more and more challenging [49]. In conclusion, duplicate detection will remain an important task in data management. But while there is already plenty of research on developing new algorithms adapted to these circumstances (e.g., [23, 41, 57]), there is little to no work addressing the generation of appropriate test data (cf. Section 3). Therefore, we strive in our research for a novel approach for test data generation that in contrast to existing solutions

- c<sub>1</sub>**: scales vertically as well as horizontally and thus well enough to generate datasets with millions of records,
- c<sub>2</sub>**: supports NoSQL data models (e.g., JSON or property graphs),
- c<sub>3</sub>**: provides an automatic preconfiguration to aid novice users,
- c<sub>4</sub>**: supports the generation of complex scenarios with multiple data sources, each defined on a complex data schema, and

- c<sub>5</sub>**: utilizes an event-based error model to realistically simulate temporal errors and complex error patterns as they result, e.g., from outdated values and copying processes.

The remainder of this paper is structured as follows. First, we describe three different contexts with their individual characteristics in which duplicate detection is applied. Then, we discuss existing test data generators and their limitations in Section 3. Thereafter, we present the idea of our new generation approach in Section 4 and discuss challenges as well as our ongoing research in Section 5. Finally, we conclude the paper in Section 6.

## 2 APPLICATION CONTEXTS

Since the detection and elimination of duplicates is needed in various contexts, the requirements for corresponding algorithms can be very different. Roughly speaking, these contexts can be divided into three categories:

- **Data Cleaning:** If we want to clean a single data source from intra-source duplicates, all records conform to the same schema and most of them are defined using the same formats, units and language. Thus, the degree of heterogeneity is rather low and divergences between duplicate records primarily result from data errors and outdated values.
- **Data Integration:** If we want to remove inter-source duplicates from an integration result, all records conform to the same (target) schema, but many of them are defined in different formats, languages, vocabularies and units of measurements. Thus, the degree of heterogeneity is much higher than in a data cleaning scenario. Depending on the quality of the integration process this can also include differences on the schema level (e.g., values have been mapped to wrong attributes).
- **Data Linkage:** If we want to link inter-source duplicates that have not been integrated into a common target schema so far, these records are not only defined in different formats, units, etc., but also conform to different schemas. Thus, the given records are much more heterogeneous than in the previous two categories.

In the case of duplicate detection, the gold standard corresponds to a duplicate clustering (one cluster per real-world entity) [42]. In the case of duplicate elimination, we additionally need the correct values for every cluster, the so-called *golden record* [17].

## 3 STATE OF THE ART & RELATED WORK

Static test datasets (e.g., Magellan project [19]) are very useful when it comes to getting a rough impression of an algorithm’s quality, but cannot be used to systematically evaluate the algorithm’s behavior with respect to changing conditions such as the data’s volume,

quality, or complexity. Instead, this requires a test data generator that allows to control the number of records, duplicates, and data errors. Test data generators can be divided into two classes. *Data synthesis* tools create a whole dataset including duplicates and errors from scratch. In contrast, *data pollution* tools inject duplicates, errors, and heterogeneities into an already existing dataset.

**Existing Tools.** Existing data synthesis tools, such as DBGen [31] or the Febrl dataset Generator [14], are very efficient so that large datasets can be generated in short time. However, since all values are fictional and based on handmade generation rules, they struggle to generate realistic data and are limited to a single domain. To overcome this drawback, current approaches for general-purpose data synthesis [25, 51] (data without duplicates and errors) use Deep-Learning-techniques (e.g., GANs), but this comes with longer runtimes. Data pollution tools, such as DirtyXML [54], GeCo [16], TDGen [6], EMBench<sup>++</sup> [35], BART [5], or Lance [58], are designed to generate test data with realistic value patterns because real-world data can be used as input. Moreover, if a broad spectrum of error classes is supported, they are nearly domain-independent.

**Limitations.** Existing generators have several limitations:

- **Data Size (cf. c<sub>1</sub>):** Existing data pollution tools are strongly limited with respect to their scalability (runtime as well as memory) making a generation of large datasets either impossible or too time-consuming [32]. However, in times of big data, many algorithms focus on scalability (e.g., [13, 30, 56, 57]) so that an evaluation of their key functionalities requires large test datasets with millions or even billions of records.
- **Model Diversity (cf. c<sub>2</sub>):** They are limited to relational (e.g., DBGen, TDGen), XML (e.g., DirtyXML), and/or RDF data (e.g., Lance) although the database landscape became extremely diverse in recent years and different kinds of NoSQL systems, such as document stores or graph databases find increased use in practice [29]. In addition, a matching of records across individual data models is extremely relevant if we want to integrate or link data in highly diverse environments.
- **Number of Sources (cf. c<sub>4</sub>):** Most of them generate a single dataset, although the evaluation of duplicate detection algorithms for data integration and data linkage requires the existence of multiple data sources having different schemas.
- **Schema Complexity (cf. c<sub>4</sub>):** Most of them generate a single table, although in the last decades a lot of research (e.g., [8, 11, 20, 24, 56]) focused on a detection of duplicates in complex datasets where records are connected via different kinds of relationships (e.g., modeled by using foreign keys or RDF triples). To the best of our knowledge, there is currently no study which compares the quality of these algorithms with respect to datasets of varying schema complexity.
- **Automatic Configuration (cf. c<sub>3</sub>):** Almost none of them provides any mechanism to compute parameter settings automatically, although it is essential to enable a proper usage of the generator by inexperienced users.
- **Copying Patterns (cf. c<sub>5</sub>):** There are several works (e.g., [21, 52]) that use copying relationships between data sources to increase the quality of their duplicate elimination results. Existing generators, however, inject errors into datasets by using simple




Figure 1: Basic architecture of DaPo<sup>+</sup>

mechanisms and thus do not support the generation of complex error patterns as they result from those copying processes.

- **Outdated Values (cf. c<sub>5</sub>):** With increasing velocity, outdated data become a major quality issue [43]. However, existing generators are very bad at simulating a consistent appearance of outdated values across individual records or data sources.

## 4 TEST DATA GENERATION IN SIX PHASES

In our previous work [32], we proposed the data polluter DaPo that scales horizontally by using Apache Spark. The implementation of this prototype, however, focused on the scalability aspect and did not address the other shortcomings listed in Section 3. With DaPo<sup>+</sup>, we are extending this prototype to support non-relational data models, more complex data schemas, and more realistic error patterns.

As shown in Figure 1, DaPo<sup>+</sup> gets a single clean dataset (real-world or synthesized) as input and produces either a *cleaning*, *integration*, or *linkage scenario* as output. In the cleaning scenario, we generate a single dataset with intra-source duplicates. In the latter two scenarios, we generate a predefined number of datasets with intra- and inter-source duplicates and integrate these datasets into a single target schema in case of the integration scenario. All three scenarios also contain a so-called *gold standard* modeling the true duplicate relationships between their records. To properly reflect the variety, veracity, and velocity of many real-world use cases, the output datasets contain a user-controlled degree of data errors and may vary in their schemas. Since these datasets serve as *data sources* in the individual scenarios, we also refer to them as such.

The architecture of DaPo<sup>+</sup> includes six phases (see Figure 1). In the first four phases, the input dataset is analyzed, prepared, and enriched. In addition, a proper configuration of the actual generation process is calculated based on the user’s specifications. In the final two phases, the actual test data is generated.

**1. Profiling.** First, the input dataset is analyzed. The results are a data profile and an enriched data schema. The profile contains statistics about the individual attributes (e.g., length and number of tokens) and relationships between records (e.g., frequency and

type). The enriched schema contains important metadata such as integrity constraints (e.g., functional dependencies), semantic column types, and temporal characteristics (e.g., update frequencies and dependencies).

**2. Preparation of Input Dataset.** The transformation of the input data to the data models and schemas of the generated data sources as well as the injection of errors are usually much easier to handle if these sources are modeled on a lower level of detail than the input dataset (e.g., it is easier to merge two attributes than to split one). Therefore, the profiling results are used to prepare the input dataset and the enriched data schema. Among others, this includes transforming it into a structured data model, normalizing its schema, and splitting its attributes into several subattributes if a clear separation between the corresponding values is possible.

**3. Automatic Preconfiguration.** Since DaPo<sup>+</sup> is a complex system and one of our goals is to support inexperienced users, a preconfiguration is automatically derived from the enriched data schema. This configuration contains a *source profile history* (i.e., a sequence of *source profiles* where every profile has a validity period) for each of the data sources that have to be created in the current generation task. Each of the source profiles in turn consists of a *representation profile* and an *error profile*. A representation profile determines in which way which data is modeled within the described source. This includes the source’s data model and schema as well as its scope (i.e., the relevant parts of the real-world). An error profile determines in which way the source’s data is corrupted by errors, including the amount of duplicates and the probabilities of certain error classes. In addition to the source profile histories, a *copying history* is generated. It determines which sources copy which data from which other sources during which period of time. This includes a program that transforms data from the copied to the copying source (including possible transformation errors). In case of an integration scenario, an additional integration process is required whose configuration is called *integration profile* in Figure 1.


**4. Generation of Data History.** To enable the simulation of outdated values and data copying as defined in the corresponding configuration files, a data history is generated based on the given input data, the data profile, and the enriched data schema.

**5. Source Creation & Pollution.** The required number of data sources is created based on the data history, the source profile histories, and the copying history. To create these sources and inject duplicates as well as errors into their data, we use our novel event-based error model (see Section 5.4).

**6. Result Generation.** The final output (including the gold standard) is generated based on the previously generated data sources. If an integration scenario is requested, these sources are integrated into a single target schema by using the integration profile. To increase the value of the costly generated data sources without much additional effort, we use more than one target schema to generate several integration scenarios in a single run.

## 5 CHALLENGES & ONGOING RESEARCH

In this section, we describe the various challenges we face in our project and present the current status of our research in the development of suitable solutions. Since our current prototype has already



**Figure 2: Sample hierarchy of error parameters. Automated mappings from the few abstract high-level parameters to the many low-level parameters support inexperienced users in configuring the actual error probabilities.**

proven to scale very well [32], we limit the following discussions to the remaining challenges.

### 5.1 Data Profiling

The more metadata we have about the input dataset, the more realistic are the data history, the schemas as well as the errors generated in the subsequent phases [48]. Therefore, we are developing a data profiling component which is able to extract useful metadata from the given input data. In case of NoSQL input data even whole schema versions may have to be extracted [36].

As surveyed by Abedjan et al. [2], there is already a lot of research on collecting database statistics, identifying semantic domains [33, 65], and detecting dependencies (exact, conditional, or approximate) [7, 9, 12, 40, 50, 59, 62]. Most of these projects, however, focus on relational data and only a few of them consider XML [63], RDF [3], or JSON [44, 45] data. In addition, only few projects [1, 10, 43] address the detection of temporal data characteristics. However, to generate realistic data histories, we need to identify:

- **Changes:** when, how often, and how (what are allowed and typical updates?) records change,
- **Dependencies:** intra-record (e.g., phone landline number ↔ residence) and inter-record (e.g., residence of family members or pay raise of co-workers) dependencies, and
- **Integrity:** constraints that are not allowed to be violated at any point in time (e.g., a key has always to be unique) or over all points in time (e.g., an old key value is never reused).

Our main focus is on the adaptation of existing profiling algorithms to non-relational data models and the development of profiling algorithms to detect temporal data characteristics. For instance, intra-record dependencies can be modeled as association rules, e.g., *update of A* → *update of B*. Thus, our current solution to identify those dependencies is to leverage existing techniques for frequent-itemset mining (FIM) [61]. The identification, however, is more difficult when there is a small time lag between the two updates so that they are assigned to different FIM-transactions. To address this problem, we calculate support values by using a sliding window over the time-ordered list of transactions (i.e., all transactions within the same window are treated as one).

## 5.2 Automatic Preconfiguration

DaPo<sup>+</sup>'s large number of parameters will allow users to configure the generation process in a flexible and detailed way and thus helps them to generate test data that meet their requirements best. Setting these parameters to proper values, however, requires a lot of domain knowledge and experience in using this generator.

Since it is almost impossible to reduce the number of parameters without reducing functionality, we intend to relieve users by introducing a few abstract high-level parameters which are set by them and then serve as a basis to calculate proper settings for the actual (low-level) parameters by the system itself (before and/or during runtime). To allow experienced users to invest more effort in the configuration process, we introduce a hierarchy of abstract high-level parameters so that they can enter the configuration at a granularity level of their choice. We illustrate such a potential hierarchy for the degree of pollution in Figure 2 where a single degree of pollution for the whole dataset is at the top and the probabilities of the actual error classes are at the bottom.

Our current efforts are aimed at identifying

- **High-level Parameters** that are intuitive, simple to understand, and easy to map to the actual low-level parameters.
- **Efficient Measures** to calculate high-level parameters (e.g., the current degree of pollution), so that we are able to adapt the corresponding low-level parameters dynamically at runtime.


A special challenge is the reasoning of the low-level parameters that address the representation profile (data model, schema, etc.) of the individual data sources. Here we are reusing concepts of existing schema generators, such as iBench [4].

## 5.3 Generation and Reuse of Data Histories

A major goal of DaPo<sup>+</sup> is to enable the generation of realistic outdated values and the simulation of copying processes between data sources by using a data history. This history is either part of the input or needs to be generated based on the profiling results.

**Generation & Realism.** We aim to generate a data history by modifying the given input dataset, which is either a single snapshot or already a data history. This includes the update or deletion of existing records and the insertion of new records. In complex data schemas, such modifications also address relationships between records. To make these modifications as realistic as possible every intermediate state of the generated data history has to comply with the integrity constraints of the enriched data schema. This poses a major challenge to the scalability of the generation process if we consider constraints, such as uniqueness, that take large parts of the dataset into account. To further increase the realism of the resulting history, we build on the latest achievements in data synthesis [25] and extend them by a proper handling of temporal aspects.

**Reusability.** If the input dataset comes without any history, we want to adopt temporal data characteristics from a similar dataset because having non-perfect training data is often still better than having no training data at all. Therefore, we maintain a repository of datasets and the update models (e.g., a set of rules) learned from them. This requires appropriate measures to capture similarities between datasets (e.g., based on summaries as they are calculated



**Figure 3: Event-based error model with three data sources. Events are inserts, updates, and deletes of records, copying processes, and changes in the schema and error profiles.**

by DataSynthesizer [51]) and methods to adapt update models from one dataset to another.

## 5.4 Source Creation & Pollution

The error model defines in which way the different histories (data, source profile, and copying) are used to generate the individual sources and to pollute their data. The error models typically used by data pollution tools (including DaPo) take the input dataset as basis and then subsequently replace single values (or whole records) with copies modified by using a specific error class [35]. If we stick to this approach, we can simulate outdated values in a consistent fashion by using the data history as a kind of look-up table. Every time we want to set a value to an old instance, we compute a past point in time randomly and then replace the value's current instance with the corresponding instance from the data history.

These error models can be executed efficiently because they pollute most parts of the dataset independently. However, they have several limitations when it comes to temporal aspects. One of them concerns the integration of time-variant copying patterns because all data records are treated individually so that a time-based consistency across these records is hard to achieve. Similar problems apply to temporally triggered changes within the error or representation profiles, such as an evolving data schema.

**Event-Based Error Model.** To address these problems, we developed an event-based error model (see Figure 3). The basic idea of this model is to simulate the whole time-span from the beginning to the end of the data history by processing events, which originate from the different input histories and the reactions of the data sources to these events. Those events include:

- changes of real-world conditions (modeled by the data history) provoking inserts, updates, and deletes in the data sources,
- copying processes triggered either periodically or by an insert, update, or delete in one of the data sources, and
- changes of the representation profile (e.g., data model, schema, or scope) or error profile (errors are fixed or new ones arise) of an individual data source.

By doing so, the copying pattern can be incorporated easily by considering every copying process as an event. Outdated values are simply created when a data source misses to update its data

according to a changing real-world condition. Errors can be introduced into the data in different ways and at a very fine level of granularity. Typos, formatting, or phonetic errors are immediately inserted into the values when a data source reacts to an event (e.g., insert, update, or copying) or can be inserted afterwards to simulate errors in data maintenance. Dependencies between errors, as they result when different values/records are affected by the same faulty hardware (e.g., an infrared sensor) or software (e.g., an ETL library) component, can be modeled and incorporated into the data pollution process very smoothly. The same holds for time-variant changes of such error sources (e.g., it can be simulated that after some time a data source detected a damaged sensor and replaced it). In summary, the event-based error model allows to model the different aspects of a dynamic world in a very detailed manner.

**Error Classes & Patterns.** Due to the structural differences of NoSQL data models and the different behavior of NoSQL data stores, NoSQL datasets can contain other types of errors than relational ones (e.g., an incorrectly sorted list in a JSON document). Therefore, we are developing new error classes and mechanisms to integrate them into the error model. An integration into the event-based error model is quite simple, because we are able to mimic typical processes that lead to errors in real life one-to-one.

## 6 CONCLUSION

In both research and practice, benchmarking is an important instrument to ensure algorithms of high quality. In this paper, we discussed the limitations of existing test data generators for duplicate detection including the lack of support for complex error patterns, temporal errors, and inexperienced users. We then presented our approach for a novel test data generator called DaPo<sup>+</sup> and described how it addresses these issues. This approach introduces a new set of challenges, such as the generation of a data history, which we described along with our ongoing research to solve them.

## REFERENCES

- Ziawasch Abedjan, Cuneyt Gurcan Akcora, Mourad Ouzzani, Paolo Papotti, and Michael Stonebraker. 2015. Temporal Rules Discovery for Web Data Cleaning. *Proc. VLDB Endow.* 9, 4 (2015), 336–347. <https://doi.org/10.14778/2856318.2856328>
- Ziawasch Abedjan, Lukasz Golab, and Felix Naumann. 2015. Profiling Relational Data: a Survey. *VLDB J.* 24, 4 (2015), 557–581. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00778-015-0389-y>
- Ziawasch Abedjan, Toni Grütze, Anja Jentzsch, and Felix Naumann. 2014. Profiling and mining RDF data with ProLOD++. In *IEEE 30th International Conference on Data Engineering, Chicago, ICDE*. IEEE Computer Society, 1198–1201. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICDE.2014.6816740>
- Patricia C. Arocena, Boris Glavic, Radu Ciucanu, and Renée J. Miller. 2015. The iBench Integration Metadata Generator. *PVLDB* 9, 3 (2015), 108–119. <https://doi.org/10.14778/2850583.2850586>
- Patricia C. Arocena, Boris Glavic, Giansalvatore Mecca, Renée J. Miller, Paolo Papotti, and Donatello Santoro. 2015. Messing Up with BART: Error Generation for Evaluating Data-Cleaning Algorithms. *PVLDB* 9, 2 (2015), 36–47. <https://doi.org/10.14778/2850578.2850579>
- Tobias Bachteler and Jörg Reiher. 2012. *Tdgen: A test data generator for evaluating record linkage methods*. Technical Report wp-grlc-2012-01. German Record Linkage Center.
- Laure Berti-Équille, Hazar Harmouch, Felix Naumann, Noël Novelli, and Saravan Thirumuruganathan. 2019. Discovery of Genuine Functional Dependencies from Relational Data with Missing Values. In *Actes du XXXVIIème Congrès INFORSID*. 287–288. [http://inforsid.fr/actes/2019/INFORSID\\_2019\\_p287-288.pdf](http://inforsid.fr/actes/2019/INFORSID_2019_p287-288.pdf)
- Indrajit Bhattacharya and Lise Getoor. 2007. Collective entity resolution in relational data. *ACM Trans. Knowl. Discov. Data* 1, 1 (2007), 5. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1217299.1217304>
- Johann Birnick, Thomas Bläsius, Tobias Friedrich, Felix Naumann, Thorsten Papenbrock, and Martin Schirneck. 2020. Hitting Set Enumeration with Partial Information for Unique Column Combination Discovery. *Proc. VLDB Endow.* 13, 11 (2020), 2270–2283. <http://www.vldb.org/pvldb/vol13/p2270-birnick.pdf>
- Tobias Bleifuß, Leon Bornemann, Theodore Johnson, Dmitri V. Kalashnikov, Felix Naumann, and Divesh Srivastava. 2018. Exploring Change - A New Dimension of Data Analytics. *PVLDB* 12, 2 (2018), 85–98. <http://www.vldb.org/pvldb/vol12/p85-bleifuss.pdf>
- Antoon Bronselaer, Daan Van Britsom, and Guy De Tré. 2015. Propagation of Data Fusion. *IEEE Trans. Knowl. Data Eng.* 27, 5 (2015), 1330–1342. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TKDE.2014.2365807>
- Loredana Caruccio, Vincenzo Deufemia, Felix Naumann, and Giuseppe Polese. 2021. Discovering Relaxed Functional Dependencies Based on Multi-Attribute Dominance. *IEEE Trans. Knowl. Data Eng.* 33, 9 (2021), 3212–3228. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TKDE.2020.2967722>
- Xiao Chen, Eike Schallehn, and Gunter Saake. 2018. Cloud-Scale Entity Resolution: Current State and Open Challenges. *Open J. Big Data* 4, 1 (2018), 30–51. [https://www.ronpub.com/ojbd/OJBD\\_2018v4i1n03\\_Chen.html](https://www.ronpub.com/ojbd/OJBD_2018v4i1n03_Chen.html)
- Peter Christen. 2009. Development and user experiences of an open source data cleaning, deduplication and record linkage system. *SIGKDD Explorations* 11, 1 (2009), 39–48. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1656274.1656282>
- Peter Christen. 2012. *Data Matching: Concepts and Techniques for Record Linkage, Entity Resolution, and Duplicate Detection*. Springer.
- Peter Christen and Dinusha Vatsalan. 2013. Flexible and extensible generation and corruption of personal data. In *22nd ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management, CIKM*. 1165–1168. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2505515.2507815>
- Dong Deng, Wenbo Tao, Ziawasch Abedjan, Ahmed K. Elmagarmid, Ihab F. Ilyas, Samuel Madden, Mourad Ouzzani, Michael Stonebraker, and Nan Tang. 2017. Entity Consolidation: The Golden Record Problem. *CoRR* abs/1709.10436 (2017). arXiv:1709.10436 <http://arxiv.org/abs/1709.10436>
- AnHai Doan, Alon Halevy, and Zachary G. Ives. 2012. *Principles of Data Integration*. Morgan Kaufmann.
- AnHai Doan, Pradap Konda, Paul Suganthan G. C., Yash Govind, Derek Paulsen, Kaushik Chandrasekhar, Philip Martinkus, and Matthew Christie. 2020. Magellan: toward building ecosystems of entity matching solutions. *Commun. ACM* 63, 8 (2020), 83–91. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3405476>
- Xin Dong, Alon Y. Halevy, and Jayant Madhavan. 2005. Reference Reconciliation in Complex Information Spaces. In *Proceedings of the ACM SIGMOD International Conference on Management of Data*. ACM, 85–96. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1066157.1066168>
- Xin Luna Dong, Laure Berti-Equille, Yifan Hu, and Divesh Srivastava. 2010. Global Detection of Complex Copying Relationships Between Sources. *PVLDB* 3, 1 (2010), 1358–1369. <http://www.comp.nus.edu.sg/~vldb2010/proceedings/files/papers/R120.pdf>
- Xin Luna Dong and Divesh Srivastava. 2015. *Big Data Integration*. Morgan & Claypool Publishers. <https://doi.org/10.2200/S00578ED1V01Y201404DTM040>
- Sourav Dutta, Ankur Narang, and Suman K. Bera. 2013. Streaming Quotient Filter: A Near Optimal Approximate Duplicate Detection Approach for Data Streams. *Proc. VLDB Endow.* 6, 8 (2013), 589–600. <https://doi.org/10.14778/2536354.2536359>
- Vasilis Efthymiou, George Papadakis, Kostas Stefanidis, and Vassilis Christophides. 2019. MinoanER: Schema-Agnostic, Non-Iterative, Massively Parallel Resolution of Web Entities. In *22nd International Conference on Extending Database Technology, EDBT*. 373–384. <https://doi.org/10.5441/002/edbt.2019.33>
- Khaled El Emam, Lucy Mosquera, and Richard Hoptroff. 2020. *Practical Synthetic Data Generation - Balancing Privacy and the Broad Availability of Data*. O'Reilly.
- Martin Franke, Ziad Sehili, Florens Rohde, and Erhard Rahm. 2021. Evaluation of Hardening Techniques for Privacy-Preserving Record Linkage. In *Proceedings of the 24th International Conference on Extending Database Technology, EDBT*. 289–300. <https://doi.org/10.5441/002/edbt.2021.26>
- Venkatesh Ganti and Anish Das Sarma. 2013. *Data Cleaning: A Practical Perspective*. Morgan & Claypool Publishers.
- Leonardo Gazzari and Melanie Herschel. 2021. End-to-end Task Based Parallelization for Entity Resolution on Dynamic Data. In *37th IEEE International Conference on Data Engineering, ICDE*. IEEE, 1248–1259. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICDE51399.2021.00112>
- Felix Gessert, Wolfram Wingerath, Steffen Friedrich, and Norbert Ritter. 2017. NoSQL database systems: a survey and decision guidance. *Computer Science - R&D* 32, 3-4 (2017), 353–365. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00450-016-0334-3>
- Lise Getoor and Ashwin Machanavajjhala. 2013. Entity resolution for big data. In *The 19th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining, KDD*. ACM, 1527. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2487575.2506179>
- Mauricio A. Hernández and Salvatore J. Stolfo. 1998. Real-world Data is Dirty: Data Cleansing and The Merge/Purge Problem. *Data Min. Knowl. Discov.* 2, 1 (1998), 9–37.
- Kai Hildebrandt, Fabian Panse, Niklas Wilcke, and Norbert Ritter. 2020. Large-Scale Data Pollution with Apache Spark. *IEEE Trans. Big Data* 6, 2 (2020), 396–411. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TBDDATA.2016.2637378>

- [33] Madelon Hulsebos, Kevin Zeng Hu, Michiel A. Bakker, Emanuel Zraggen, Arvind Satyanarayan, Tim Kraska, Çağatay Demiralp, and César A. Hidalgo. 2019. Sherlock: A Deep Learning Approach to Semantic Data Type Detection. In *Proceedings of the 25th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining, KDD*. ACM, 1500–1508. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3292500.3330993>
- [34] Ihab F. Ilyas and Xu Chu. 2019. *Data Cleaning*. ACM. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3310205>
- [35] Ekaterini Ioannou and Yannis Velegarakis. 2019. EMBench<sup>++</sup>: Data for a thorough benchmarking of matching-related methods. *Semantic Web* 10, 2 (2019), 435–450. <https://doi.org/10.3233/SW-180331>
- [36] Meike Klettke, Uta Störl, and Stefanie Scherzinger. 2015. Schema Extraction and Structural Outlier Detection for JSON-based NoSQL Data Stores. In *BTW*. 425–444. <https://dl.gi.de/20.500.12116/2420>
- [37] Ioannis K. Koumarelas, Thorsten Papenbrock, and Felix Naumann. 2020. MDedup: Duplicate Detection with Matching Dependencies. *Proc. VLDB Endow.* 13, 5 (2020), 712–725. <http://www.vldb.org/pvldb/vol13/p712-koumarelas.pdf>
- [38] Shrinu Kushagra, Hemant Saxena, Ihab F. Ilyas, and Shai Ben-David. 2019. A Semi-Supervised Framework of Clustering Selection for De-Duplication. In *35th IEEE International Conference on Data Engineering, ICDE*. IEEE, 208–219. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICDE.2019.00027>
- [39] Yuliang Li, Jinfeng Li, Yoshihiko Suhara, AnHai Doan, and Wang-Chiew Tan. 2020. Deep Entity Matching with Pre-Trained Language Models. *Proc. VLDB Endow.* 14, 1 (2020), 50–60. <https://doi.org/10.14778/3421424.3421431>
- [40] Ester Livshits, Alireza Heidari, Ihab F. Ilyas, and Benny Kimelfeld. 2020. Approximate Denial Constraints. *Proc. VLDB Endow.* 13, 10 (2020), 1682–1695. <https://doi.org/10.14778/3401960.3401966>
- [41] Hanchao Ma, Morteza Alipour Langouri, Yinghui Wu, Fei Chiang, and Jiaxing Pi. 2019. Ontology-based Entity Matching in Attributed Graphs. *Proc. VLDB Endow.* 12, 10 (2019), 1195–1207. <https://doi.org/10.14778/3339490.3339501>
- [42] David Menestrina, Steven Whang, and Hector Garcia-Molina. 2010. Evaluating Entity Resolution Results. *PVLDB* 3, 1 (2010), 208–219.
- [43] Mostafa Milani, Zheng Zheng, and Fei Chiang. 2019. CurrentClean: Spatio-Temporal Cleaning of Stale Data. In *ICDE*. IEEE, 172–183. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICDE.2019.00024>
- [44] Michael J. Mior. 2021. Fast Discovery of Nested Dependencies on JSON Data. *CoRR* abs/2111.10398 (2021). arXiv:2111.10398 <https://arxiv.org/abs/2111.10398>
- [45] Mark Lukas Möller, Nicolas Berton, Meike Klettke, Stefanie Scherzinger, and Uta Störl. 2019. jHound: Large-Scale Profiling of Open JSON Data. In *BTW*. 555–558. <https://doi.org/10.18420/btw2019-44>
- [46] Sidharth Mudgal, Han Li, Theodoros Rekatsinas, AnHai Doan, Youngchoon Park, Ganesh Krishnan, Rohit Deep, Esteban Arcaute, and Vijay Raghavendra. 2018. Deep Learning for Entity Matching: A Design Space Exploration. In *Proceedings of the 2018 International Conference on Management of Data, SIGMOD Conference*. ACM, 19–34. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3183713.3196926>
- [47] Felix Naumann and Melanie Herschel. 2010. *An Introduction to Duplicate Detection*. Morgan & Claypool Publishers.
- [48] Fabian Panse and Felix Naumann. 2021. Evaluation of Duplicate Detection Algorithms: From Quality Measures to Test Data Generation. In *37th IEEE International Conference on Data Engineering, ICDE*. IEEE, 2373–2376. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICDE51399.2021.00269>
- [49] George Papadakis, Ekaterini Ioannou, Emanouil Thanos, and Themis Palpanas. 2021. *The Four Generations of Entity Resolution*. Morgan & Claypool Publishers. <https://doi.org/10.2200/S01067ED1V01Y202012DTM064>
- [50] Eduardo H. M. Pena, Eduardo Cunha de Almeida, and Felix Naumann. 2019. Discovery of Approximate (and Exact) Denial Constraints. *Proc. VLDB Endow.* 13, 3 (2019), 266–278. <https://doi.org/10.14778/3368289.3368293>
- [51] Haoyue Ping, Julia Stoyanovich, and Bill Howe. 2017. DataSynthesizer: Privacy-Preserving Synthetic Datasets. In *Proceedings of the 29th International Conference on Scientific and Statistical Database Management*. ACM, 42:1–42:5. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3085504.3091117>
- [52] Ravali Pochampally, Anish Das Sarma, Xin Luna Dong, Alexandra Meliou, and Divesh Srivastava. 2014. Fusing data with correlations. In *SIGMOD Conference*. 433–444. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2588555.2593674>
- [53] Anna Primpeli and Christian Bizer. 2020. Profiling Entity Matching Benchmark Tasks. In *The 29th ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management, CIKM*. ACM, 3101–3108. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3340531.3412781>
- [54] Sven Puhlmann. 2004. *Fehlerklassen in XML Daten und Erzeugung schmutziger XML Daten*. Technical Report. Humboldt Universität Berlin.
- [55] Erhard Rahm and Hong Hai Do. 2000. Data Cleaning: Problems and Current Approaches. *IEEE Data Eng. Bull.* 23, 4 (2000), 3–13. <http://sites.computer.org/debull/A00DEC-CD.pdf>
- [56] Vibhor Rastogi, Nilesh N. Dalvi, and Minos N. Garofalakis. 2011. Large-Scale Collective Entity Matching. *Proc. VLDB Endow.* 4, 4 (2011), 208–218. <https://doi.org/10.14778/1938545.1938546>
- [57] Alieh Saeedi, Markus Nentwig, Eric Peukert, and Erhard Rahm. 2018. Scalable Matching and Clustering of Entities with FAMER. *CSIMQ* 16 (2018), 61–83. <https://doi.org/10.7250/csimq.2018-16.04>
- [58] Tzanina Saveta, Evangelia Daskalaki, Giorgos Flouris, Irimi Fundulaki, and Axel-Cyrille Ngonga Ngomo. 2015. LANCE: A Generic Benchmark Generator for Linked Data. In *ISWC*. [http://ceur-ws.org/Vol-1486/paper\\_43.pdf](http://ceur-ws.org/Vol-1486/paper_43.pdf)
- [59] Philipp Schirmer, Thorsten Papenbrock, Sebastian Kruse, Felix Naumann, Dennis Hempfing, Torben Mayer, and Daniel Neuschäfer-Rube. 2019. DynFD: Functional Dependency Discovery in Dynamic Datasets. In *Advances in Database Technology - 22nd International Conference on Extending Database Technology, EDBT*. 253–264. <https://doi.org/10.5441/002/edbt.2019.23>
- [60] John R. Talburt. 2011. *Entity Resolution and Information Quality*. Morgan Kaufman Publ. Inc.
- [61] Pang-Ning Tan, Michael S. Steinbach, and Vipin Kumar. 2005. *Introduction to Data Mining*. Addison-Wesley. <http://www-users.cs.umn.edu/%7Ekumar/dmbook/>
- [62] Fabian Tschirschnitz, Thorsten Papenbrock, and Felix Naumann. 2017. Detecting Inclusion Dependencies on Very Many Tables. *ACM Trans. Database Syst.* 42, 3 (2017), 18:1–18:29. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3105959>
- [63] Millist W. Vincent, Jixue Liu, and Chengfei Liu. 2004. Strong functional dependencies and their application to normal forms in XML. *ACM Trans. Database Syst.* 29, 3 (2004), 445–462. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1016028.1016029>
- [64] Renzhi Wu, Sanya Chaba, Saurabh Sawlani, Xu Chu, and Saravanan Thirumuruganathan. 2020. ZeroER: Entity Resolution using Zero Labeled Examples. In *Proceedings of the 2020 International Conference on Management of Data, SIGMOD Conference*. ACM, 1149–1164. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3318464.3389743>
- [65] Dan Zhang, Yoshihiko Suhara, Jinfeng Li, Madelon Hulsebos, Çağatay Demiralp, and Wang-Chiew Tan. 2020. Sato: Contextual Semantic Type Detection in Tables. *Proc. VLDB Endow.* 13, 11 (2020), 1835–1848. <http://www.vldb.org/pvldb/vol13/p1835-zhang.pdf>