

Jellyfish: A Large Language Model for Data Preprocessing

¹Haochen Zhang, ²Yuyang Dong, ^{1,3}Chuan Xiao, ²Masafumi Oyamada

¹Osaka University, ²NEC Corporation, ³Nagoya University

{chou.koushin, chuanx}@ist.osaka-u.ac.jp, dongyuyang, oyamada@nec.com

Abstract

As a crucial step in the data mining pipeline, data preprocessing (DP) is the process of transforming raw data into a clean format conducive to easy processing. While a variety of DP tasks exist, such as error detection and entity matching, most current DP solutions are limited to one or two specific tasks. The emergence of large language models (LLMs), particularly those responsive to natural language prompts, has sparked interest in developing generic solutions applicable to a broad range of DP tasks. However, existing approaches in this domain typically rely on OpenAI’s GPT APIs, raising inevitable data breach concerns.

In this paper, we present Jellyfish, *an open-source LLM as a universal task solver for DP*. Built on the Llama 2-13B model, Jellyfish is instruction-tuned with the datasets of several typical DP tasks including error detection, data imputation, schema matching, and entity matching, and delivers generalizability to other tasks.

Remarkably, Jellyfish can operate on a local, single, and low-priced GPU with its 13 billion parameters, ensuring data security and enabling further tuning. Its proficiency in understanding natural language allows users to manually craft instructions for DP tasks. Unlike many existing methods that heavily rely on prior knowledge, Jellyfish acquires domain knowledge during its tuning process and integrates optional knowledge injection during inference. A distinctive feature of Jellyfish is its interpreter, which elucidates its output decisions.

To construct Jellyfish, we develop a series of pre-tuning and DP-tuning techniques. Jellyfish is equipped with an instance serializer, which automatically translates raw data into model prompts, and a knowledge injector, which optionally introduces task- and dataset-specific knowledge to enhance DP performance. Our evaluation of Jellyfish, using a range of real datasets, shows its competitiveness compared to state-of-the-art methods and its strong generalizability to unseen tasks. Jellyfish’s performance rivals that of GPT series models, and its interpreter offers enhanced reasoning capabilities compared to GPT-3.5. Furthermore, our evaluation highlights the effectiveness of the techniques employed in constructing Jellyfish.

Our model is available at Hugging Face: <https://huggingface.co/NECOUDBFM/Jellyfish>.

1 Introduction

Data preprocessing (DP) plays a pivotal role in the data mining pipeline, transforming raw data into a manageable and processable format ready for use. Over the past decades, significant strides have been made in various DP tasks. Until 2021, most efforts were concentrated on one or two specific tasks such as error detection (ED) [22, 56], data imputation (DI) [71, 55, 57], schema matching (SM) [94], and entity matching (EM) [34, 46]. A key challenge in developing generic solutions to DP is that these tasks differ in nature: they deal with errors, anomalies, matches, etc. and require different actions such as detection, repairing, and alignment.

With the advent of large language models (LLMs) * like GPT-3 and subsequent versions, researchers

*Haochen Zhang and Yuyang Dong contributed equally to this work. Yuyang Dong is the corresponding author.

*We focus on prompted LLMs, i.e., those receiving natural language instructions, in this paper. BERT [15] and its variants, though considered as LLMs in some literature [89], are not built to be prompted, hence not belonging to the category of LLMs we target.

have found a key to address this challenge, spurring the development of generic solutions for a wider array of DP tasks [61, 93]. The application of LLMs in DP has the following strengths:

- The primary strengths of using LLMs in DP lie in their ability to process natural language. Most LLMs provide a prompting interface with which users can interact and assign tasks in natural language, contrasting with existing DP solutions that require computer programming or specific tools (e.g., HoloClean [71] and Magellan [34]).
- With the knowledge acquired through training on vast amounts of data, LLMs are universal problem solvers capable of identifying errors, anomalies, and matches in data (and particularly unseen datasets in unseen tasks), aligning with the aims of DP tasks without needing human-engineered rules [70].
- LLMs are excellent reasoners [33], enabling them to not only return DP results but also provide the reasons for these results. In this sense, their answers are more interpretable than those of other deep learning approaches.
- LLMs can be conditioned by few- [5] or zero-shot [33] prompting. As such, we can condition the criteria for DP tasks (e.g., the degree of matching) using few-shot examples or zero-shot prompts, contrasting with traditional solutions based on a threshold [73, 34] or a time-consuming training process to fit to the data [57].

Despite these strengths, existing LLM-based solutions to DP [61, 93, 35], with reliance on GPT APIs, have raised concerns about data breaches, as evidenced by OpenAI’s first confirmed data breach involving ChatGPT [64]. Another limitation is the difficulty in domain specification [61]. When dealing with data from highly specialized domains, training the LLMs used in these solutions can be costly (e.g., GPT-3.5) and even unavailable due to frozen parameters (e.g., GPT-4), posing difficulty in customizing the model.

In response to the aforementioned challenges, we propose Jellyfish, an open-source LLM tailored to various DP tasks. Jellyfish distinguishes itself with several key features:

- Based on Meta’s Llama 2-13B model, Jellyfish is universal DP task solver by instruction-tuning [95] for DP tasks: ED and DI for data cleaning, and SM and EM for data integration.
- Its 13 billion parameters enable operation on a local, single, and low-priced GPU, ensuring data security and allowing further tuning.
- Capable of understanding natural language, it allows users to manually craft instructions for DP tasks and apply prompt engineering techniques to tailor it to specific tasks and datasets.
- Unlike many existing methods that rely heavily on prior knowledge [71, 69], Jellyfish acquires domain knowledge during its tuning process and uses optional knowledge injection during inference.
- It includes a model interpreter for providing natural language explanations of its outputs.

Our development of Jellyfish involves selecting the Llama 2-13B as the base model and applying pre-tuning and DP-tuning techniques. The pre-tuning phase selects two datasets: one for enhancing reasoning trace and the other for improving STEM and logic skills. They are essential for the model to comprehend the meanings of entities and data entry formats, aligning with expertise in data mining, which encompasses DP. The DP-tuning phase utilizes an instance serializer to prepare instruction data by serializing training datasets – which consist of several public datasets widely used for DP – into the prompts input to the model. With a knowledge injector, task- and dataset-specific knowledge – particularly domain knowledge that can be extended to unseen datasets – is infused to the model. Moreover, it resorts to GPT-4 to generate reasoning data used to tune Jellyfish’s interpreter. As such, the interpreter distills GPT-4’s knowledge in reasoning DP results.

For DP task solving, Jellyfish’s instance serializer automatically translates raw data into prompts, while the knowledge injector allows for optional knowledge specification. The prompts support feature engineering, and the model incorporates few-shot prompting for conditioning, especially beneficial for unseen datasets.

Our evaluation of Jellyfish, using a range of publicly available real datasets used for DP tasks, compares with two categories of methods: non-LLM methods – typically solutions based on machine learning (ML) or pre-trained language models (PLMs) prior to the prevalence of LLMs – and LLM methods – typically GPT series methods. The results show that Jellyfish consistently outperforms non-LLM methods on its seen datasets. Its effectiveness on unseen datasets is comparable to that of non-LLM methods on their respective seen datasets. Jellyfish also delivers strong performance in two case studies of unseen tasks, demonstrating its generalizability to a wider range of DP tasks beyond the four tasks used for instruction tuning. Its performance rivals that of GPT series models, and its interpreter offers enhanced reasoning capabilities compared to GPT-3.5. Furthermore, our evaluation highlights the effectiveness of the techniques employed in building Jellyfish.

Our contributions are summarized as follows.

- We develop Jellyfish, an open-source LLM as a universal DP task solver.
- Jellyfish showcases several notable features: a universal model design, moderate size, assurance of data security, feasibility for further tuning, natural language instruction handling, optional specification of prior knowledge, and model interpretability.
- We elaborate on the techniques employed for the selection of pre-tuning datasets and the preparation of instruction and reasoning data for DP.
- Our experiments demonstrate Jellyfish’s effectiveness in DP task solving, its generalizability to new tasks beyond what it is tuned for, and its superior reasoning abilities.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows: Section 2 introduces the DP tasks targeted by our model and briefly reviews LLMs as well as their strengths and limitations when used for DP. Section 3 presents the framework of the Jellyfish model. Sections 4 and 5 jointly describe the construction of Jellyfish by delving into the selection of base model, pre-tuning, and instruction-tuning for DP tasks. Section 6 introduces how to use Jellyfish for solving DP tasks. Section 7 discusses the extensions to unseen tasks. Section 8 reports experimental results and analysis. Section 9 reviews related works on DP. Section 10 concludes this paper.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Data Preprocessing

In data management and mining, DP is a crucial step that deals with noise, missing values, inconsistencies, and heterogeneity in data. Major DP procedures include data cleaning, data integration, data transformation, and data reduction [20]. In this initial exploration of LLMs for DP, we concentrate on tabular data, one of the most common data types. Our data model operates on relational tables specified by schemas. We assume all attributes are either numerical values (including binary values) or textual values (including categorical values). Diverging from the traditional definition that presents the entire dataset and finds or fixes all the errors (or matches, etc.) within, we define the problem by handling one record (or a pair, depending on the task) at a time, so the prompt (i.e., the input text to an LLM) can be easily written. Next, we outline the DP tasks involved in this paper:

Error Detection (ED). Given a tuple and an attribute, our task is to detect whether there is an error in the cell value of this attribute.

Data Imputation (DI). Given a tuple and an attribute such that cell value for this attribute is missing, our task is to infer its correct value.

Schema Matching (SM). Given a pair of attributes represented in the form of (name, description), our task is to find whether they refer to the same attribute.

Entity Matching (EM). Given a pair of tuples of the same schema, our task is to infer whether they refer to the same entity.

Column Type Annotation (CTA). Given a table with no header, our task is to infer the type of each column from a set of predefined semantic types (e.g., name, time, location).

Attribute Value Extraction (AVE). Given a text description of an entity and a set of predefined attributes, extract corresponding attribute values from the text description.

We term each input object an *instance*, i.e., a tuple for ED and DI, a pair of attributes for SM, a pair of tuples for EM, a table or a column for CTA, and a text description for AVE.

2.2 Large Language Models

With advancements in the field of natural language processing, LLMs have become one of the hottest topics in the AI research community. Representative LLMs include OpenAI’s GPT series (in particular, GPT-3, 3.5, and 4), Anthropic’s Claude, Meta’s Llama [80], and Llama 2 [81], a more advanced version Llama, as well as their variants that can be found at Hugging Face [27]. We refer readers to [98] for a survey on LLMs. Some LLMs are open-source (e.g., Llama and Llama 2), and they can be fine-tuned with additional tasks to improve their abilities in logical reasoning, question answering, and so on. Among these fine-tuning approaches, instruction tuning [95] has become a prevalent one which further trains LLMs on a dataset consisting of (instruction, output) pairs in a supervised fashion, hence bridging the gap between the next-word prediction objective of LLMs and the users’ objective of having LLMs adhere to human instructions. For efficiency of fine-tuning, parameter-efficient fine-tuning (PEFT) approaches enable adaptation of LLMs to downstream applications without fine-tuning all the parameters. Notable methods are adapter tuning [24], prefix-tuning [45], and low-rank adaptation (LoRA) [25]. In particular, LoRA achieves significantly fewer trainable parameters and no additional inference latency, and has become a prevalent PEFT approach.

In addition to the strengths outlined in Section 1, we discuss the limitations of LLMs in the context of DP:

- LLMs often require substantial computational resources, thereby increasing the cost of use and compromising the efficiency and scalability of DP on large-scale data.
- Due to token limitation (the maximum input length, e.g., 4k tokens for GPT-3.5) and lack of memory for keeping historical information, the input to the LLM is often instance-by-instance, and the DP results may exhibit inconsistency across different instances. Simply raising the token limitation (e.g., 128k tokens for GPT-4-turbo) does not solve the problem, because performance may degrade due to increased lengths of input [48].
- LLMs sometimes exhibit hallucination [97], i.e., they generate text that is plausible-sounding but factually incorrect or non-sensical, as they lack a fundamental understanding of the world and rely solely on the patterns they learned during training.

3 Framework of Jellyfish

Figure 1 illustrates the overview of the Jellyfish model. This framework comprises two parts: tuning and DP, the details of which are introduced in the subsequent sections.

In the tuning part, we select an LLM as the base model and tune it for DP. The tuning consists of two stages: a pre-tuning stage – which enhances the base model for logical reasoning ability in a data analysis pipeline – and a DP-tuning stage – which instruction-tunes the resultant model in the first stage with a subset of the DP tasks outlined in Section 2.1: ED, DI, SM, and EM. Here, we only tune




Figure 1: Overview of the Jellyfish model. Jellyfish components are marked in purple.

for four typical DP tasks and evaluate if the capability of tackling these tasks obtained through DP-tuning can be translated to new tasks, thereby creating a universal DP task solver. DP-tuning results in two models: Jellyfish-13B, for addressing DP tasks, and Jellyfish-13B-interpreter, for analyzing the DP results. The reason for the order of the two stages is due to catastrophic forgetting [53] that may erase or distort the model’s understanding of previously acquired knowledge. As our focus is solving DP tasks, we place DP-tuning to a later stage.

To tune Jellyfish-13B, given a set of tabular datasets commonly utilized in DP, we prepare the instruction data, with instances and the ground truth labels in the form of natural language instructions. Specifically, we infuse knowledge pertinent to DP tasks into these instructions. This approach enables the model to adhere to fundamental DP rules and to discern which aspects of the data need particular attention. To tune Jellyfish-13B-interpreter, we prepare reasoning data by feeding Jellyfish-13B’s instruction data to GPT-4 API. In this sense, Jellyfish-13B-interpreter can be regarded as the outcome of distilling GPT-4’s knowledge of DP tasks. The Jellyfish framework also allows for free selection of the base model and the modeled to be distilled for interpretation. That is, we expect that with the progress in AI technology, more advanced models are be selected to improve the performance.

In the DP part, Jellyfish-13B addresses DP tasks. It employs an instance serializer, which takes the data to be preprocessed and constructs the text sequences, namely the “prompts”, input to the tuned LLM. Note that the input data do not have to be among the datasets used in its instruction tuning. Moreover, it has an optional knowledge injector with which users can specify prior knowledge such as constraints on formats or values. Jellyfish-13B-interpreter, on the other hand, processes the Jellyfish’s output and delivers the reasons behind such outcomes. The necessity of two models stems

from the challenges in tuning a single 13B model to adequately perform both tasks. Nonetheless, since we employ the LoRA technique [25] for DP-tuning, users can efficiently switch from DP task-solving to model interpretation by replacing Jellyfish’s decomposition matrices with Jellyfish-13B-interpreter’s. The details of this approach will be elaborated in Section 5. We anticipate that future advancements in AI technology will enable a single model to handle both roles.

4 Base Model Selection and Pre-tuning

Considering the motivations behind designing Jellyfish, we establish the following criteria for selecting the base model: (1) The model should be open-source to allow for further fine-tuning. (2) It should be of moderate size. A models that is too small struggles with handling multiple DP tasks, while an overly large model is inefficient and requires substantial hardware resources. Llama 2, developed by Meta AI, is a recent advanced model that meets the first criterion. As an open-source LLM optimized for dialogue use cases, Llama 2 offers three model sizes: 7B, 13B, and 70B. For DP, the 13B model aligns well with our second criterion. For this reason, we choose Llama 2-13B as our base model.

However, Llama 2-13B is limited in reasoning capabilities, and its human evaluation did not encompass reasoning-related prompts [81]. Because DP tasks fundamentally involve reasoning about errors, matches, and other data aspects, it is necessary to condition the base model to enhance its reasoning ability. Besides reasoning ability, another concern is domain knowledge in data analysis, because DP is a crucial component in the data mining pipeline. However, such domain knowledge is missing in the base model.

To overcome these limitations, we pre-tune base model with a series of carefully selected datasets prior to tuning it for DP. First, we select the FLAN dataset [52], which features a mix of few-shot [5], zero-shot [33], and chain-of-thought [87] (reasoning-eliciting) prompt settings with a focus on reasoning trace. Second, we select the Open-Platypus dataset [40], which aims to enhance the model’s STEM and logic proficiency. Both datasets include tasks that are crucial for the model to understand the meanings of entities and the format of data entries, aligning perfectly with the domain knowledge in data mining. For example, in the FLAN dataset, there are questions like

Here is some data: Ariane 5, finalFlight, 2009-12-18; Ariane 5, launchSite, Guiana Space Centre; Ariane 5, manufacturer, "ESA and Arianespace". Write a sentence that describes this data.

This question is essentially testing the model’s ability in understanding entities. Besides, there are questions regarding the relation of entities and attributes, e.g.,

Given the question: Information: - "Don't Think I Can't Love You" is a song co-written and recorded by American country music artist Jake Owen ... Startin' with Me is the debut album of country music artist Jake Owen, released in July 2006 (see 2006 in country music) on RCA Records Nashville... Given the information, choose the subject and object entities that have the relation of 'record label'. The answer is:

In the Open-Platypus dataset, there are questions regarding data formats, e.g.,

*Given two version numbers, 'version1' and 'version2', compare them. Version numbers consist of **one or more revisions** joined by a dot '.'. Each revision consists of **digits** and may contain leading **zeros**...*

With the inclusion of such training data, it is anticipated that the pre-tuning of the base model will significantly enhance the performance in DP.

Due to the large size of the two datasets, it tends to be very time-consuming to pre-tune the base model. In this version of Jellyfish, we address this issue by adopting an existing Llama 2 variant, OpenOrca-Platypus2-13B [41]. It is a merge of two models: a Llama 2-13B fine-tuned with

Table 1: DP-tuning dataset statistics (Jellyfish-13B). #Positives indicates the number of positive instances, i.e., there is an error (for ED) or the two objects match (for SM and EM).

Task	Dataset	#Instances	#Positives
ED	Adult	550×2	35×2
	Hospital	1710×2	44×2
DI	Buy	586	N/A
	Restaurant	778	N/A
SM	MIMIC-III	7000	11
	Synthea	5000	18
EM	Amazon-Google	6874	699
	Beer	359	54
	DBLP-ACM	5000	885
	DBLP-GoogleScholar	5000	924
	Fodors-Zagats	757	88
	iTunes-Amazon	430	105

OpenOrca [47] – an augmented FLAN collection by sampling from the collection to form a diverse mixture of tasks and integrating GPT-3.5 and GPT-4 responses – and a Llama 2-13B fine-tuned with Open-Platypus. As such, we do not have to repeatedly pre-tune the model. Future investigations may tailor the pre-tuning process by drilling down to FLAN and Open-Platypus and finding a subset of data that is most relevant to DP.

5 DP-tuning

5.1 DP-tuning Datasets

For the four tasks involved in DP-tuning, we choose a series of datasets that have been widely used in previous studies and cover a variety of application domains.

- ED: Adult and Hospital, used in [22];
- DI: Buy and Restaurant, used in [57];
- SM: MIMIC-III and Synthea, used in [94];
- EM: Amamazon-Google, Beer, DBLP-ACM, DBLP-GoogleScholar, Fodors-Zagats, and iTunes-Amazon from the Magellan data repository [13].

We use the publicly available version of these datasets [61], where errors and missing values are already injected to the datasets for ED and DI, respectively. The statistics of these datasets are provided in Table 1. For determining the number of instances in each dataset, a rationale is that the dataset across different tasks should be balanced and there is no dataset dominating the entire corpus. Moreover, since missing values can be regarded as errors or non-errors, depending on the application, we duplicate its instances in tuning, one copy for missing values as errors and the other as non-errors (specified by inject knowledge, to be introduced in this section). We split each dataset into training and validation with a ratio of 80:20. Next, we introduce how we transform raw data to the instructions used for tuning Jellyfish-13B and Jellyfish-13B-interpreter.

5.2 Jellyfish-13B

To prepare the training data for an LLM, we need to serialize (a.k.a. contextualize) each instance in the raw data to a prompt. The prompt contains the task description, the instance content, and any injected knowledge. To describe our techniques for constructing the instruction data for training, we

use an example for an instance in the Beer dataset used for EM, as shown below *. Note that the boldface part indicates comments that are not prompted to the model.

Instruction Data

(system message) *You are an AI assistant that follows instruction extremely well. User will give you a question. Your task is to answer as faithfully as you can.*

(task description) *You are tasked with determining whether two Products listed below are the same based on the information provided. Carefully compare all the attributes before making your decision.*

(injected knowledge) *Note that missing values (N/A or "nan") should not be used as a basis for your decision.*

(instance content) *Product A: [name: "Sequoia American Amber Ale", factory: "Wig And Pen"]*

Product B: [name: "Aarhus Cains Triple A American Amber Ale", factory: "Aarhus Bryghus"]

(question) *Are Product A and Product B the same Product?*

(output format) *Choose your answer from: [Yes, No]*

At the beginning, there is a system message guiding the model behavior. Here, we instruct the model to act as an AI assistant to answer the user's question, and its response should always respect this constraint [81]. In the second line, we describe the DP task, i.e., EM in this example. The third line refers to injected knowledge. There are two types of injected knowledge: (1) general knowledge that applies to many datasets, and (2) specific knowledge that only applies to the given dataset. In this example, the knowledge belongs to general knowledge and concerns with missing values. Such knowledge injection may prevent the model incorrectly handling certain values in the dataset, especially when training data is noisy. The fourth and fifth lines pertain to the instance content. Finally, there is a question presented to the model, and the output format is specified afterwards.

Whereas in the above example we specify knowledge on missing values, there are other forms of general knowledge used in DP-tuning, including error types and terminology. For example, for ED, we inform the model of the fact that errors can include, but are not limited to, spelling errors, inconsistencies, or values that do not make sense for that attribute; for EM, we instruct the model to consider the full name of an attribute and its acronym to determine if the two values are the same. Specific knowledge highly depends on the application domain, mainly including constraints or rules that pertain to the dataset. For example, in publication datasets, authors' names may occur in different forms and different orders even for the same article. Additionally, the model can be configured to assign greater importance to certain attributes. In the context of product data, for example, the model is directed to prioritize the comparison of product numbers. Specific knowledge can be applicable to datasets within the same domain, thereby enhancing the model's performance on unseen datasets, particularly in scenarios where prior knowledge about these datasets is absent. Overall, the knowledge injected through instruction tuning becomes the built-in knowledge of Jellyfish and can be used even without user-specification during inference.

5.3 Jellyfish-13B-interpreter

Jellyfish-13B-interpreter uses the same set of datasets for instruction tuning as Jellyfish-13B, except that we use roughly smaller numbers of instances to save training time: 2500 for SM and 360 for EM, with detailed statistics given in Appendix A *. This smaller set of training data is also used for initial experiments on selecting models, and thus the tuning process using this set of data is dubbed DP-tuning-preview. The reasoning data for training the interpreter is similar to the instruction data

*The prompts used for constructing and evaluating Jellyfish are provided in Appendix D.

*Appendix is available at <https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1bnkNEACsccMuTFfLgxMyv2VBaoon879E?usp=sharing>.

introduced above. The only difference is the reasoning instructions. For the above example, there are two reasoning instructions, one appended to the system message and one specified in the output format, as shown below.

Reasoning Data

(system message) [same as Instruction Data] While answering, provide detailed explanation and justify your answer.

(task description – question) [same as Instruction Data]

(output format) After your reasoning, finish your response in a separate line with and ONLY with your final answer. Choose your final answer from [Yes, No].

As such, the model needs to give a reason before presenting the final answer. Despite an interpreter, it is also requested to answer yes or no at the end. We choose this design for keeping the possibility of enabling a single model to handle both roles (solving DP tasks and making interpretation) in the future.

Unlike the ground truth of yes/no for the instruction data, the ground truth of the reasoning data is more complicated. We resort to GPT-4 for reasonable answers. Such practice is also used in constructing training data for various Llama and Llama 2 variants such as Alpaca [77] and Orca [60]. For the above example, we use the following prompt to obtain ground truth reasons from GPT-4.

Reasoning Ground Truth Collection

(system message – output format) [same as Reasoning Data]

(injected knowledge) Note that different factories can belong to the same parent company. The company name of Product B may occur in its product name.

(answer hint) You can use the "Hint" below, but your response cannot contain any information from it.

Hint: the final answer is "No"

In the above prompt, we inject a piece of knowledge specific to the dataset. With this additional knowledge, GPT-4 can produce high-quality reasoning result. Note that such knowledge is not prompted to Jellyfish-13B or Jellyfish-13B-interpreter, as for unseen datasets such knowledge is not always available. In addition to the injected knowledge, GPT-4 also receives a hint to the answer of yes or no. As such, we can guarantee that the output reason always points to the correct direction. A sample answer from GPT-4 is given below.

The two products listed are not the same. Product A is named "Sequoia American Amber Ale" and is produced by "Wig And Pen". In contrast, Product B is "Aarhus Cains Triple A American Amber Ale" and is produced by "Aarhus Bryghus". Despite both being types of American Amber Ale, the names and manufacturers of the two products are different, indicating that they are distinct products.

No

Jellyfish-13B and Jellyfish-13B-interpreter are both trained as autoregressive models, in line with other Llama 2 variants. To speed up the training process, we employ LoRA [25], which exploits the low intrinsic rank in the change of weights during fine-tuning. We apply LoRA in fine-tuning the W_q and W_o matrices in the Transformer architecture [83], with detailed setup reported in Appendix A. Utilizing LoRA also enables quick switch of models from Jellyfish-13B to Jellyfish-13B-interpreter when users want to interpret the DP results. This is because the two models share most of parameters, only differing in LoRA decomposition matrices. Thus, we can unload the LoRA matrices from Jellyfish-13B-interpreter and load the LoRA matrices for Jellyfish-13B-interpreter. Such operation can be done much faster than loading the entire Jellyfish-13B-interpreter model into graphics memory.

6 Data Preprocessing with Jellyfish

Given a dataset in CSV format, Jellyfish uses an instance serializer that iterates through all the instances and transforms each instance to a prompt. The prompt is same as the instruction and reasoning data for tuning Jellyfish-13B and Jellyfish-13B-interpreter, respectively. We apply general knowledge for DP tasks, e.g., missing values in matching tasks and error types in ED. Jellyfish-13B also provides a knowledge injector with which users can input dataset-specific knowledge, such as the domain knowledge (e.g., constraints) outlined in Section 5.2. Such user-specified knowledge is optional and not indispensable, and is not used in our experiments.

Feature Engineering. Users can optionally select a subset of features to improve performance. For instance, for EM in the Beer dataset, **name** and **factory** are more relevant features, while **style** and **ABV** are less relevant. Hence users may choose to use only **name** and **factory** as attributes. Such feature engineering can be also implemented in the prompt as specific knowledge, e.g., *you should only consider name and factory and ignore other attributes.*

Prompt Engineering. Prompt engineering [88] is the process of structuring text to enhance the model performance. We introduce few-shot prompting [5] in Jellyfish-13B, which conditions the model to learn from a small selection of examples drawn from the dataset. We apply few-shot prompting by manually selecting a subset of data instances from the dataset and labeling them. For instance, a few-shot example for the Beer dataset is presented as follows:

Few-Shot Prompting

(system message – injected knowledge) [same as Instruction Data]
(1st example’s instance content) ### Instruction: Product A: [name: "Shirt Tail Amber", factory: "Iron Hill Brewery & Restaurant"]
Product B: [name: "Iron Hill Shirt Tail Amber", factory: "Iron Hill Maple Shade"]
(1st example’s question) Are Product A and Product B the same Product?
(1st example’s output format) Choose your answer from: [Yes, No]
(1st example’s answer) ### Response: Yes
(other examples) ...
(instance content – output format) [same as Instruction Data] ### Response:

The example follows the same format of instance content, question, and output format as in the instruction data. It also provides the answer indicated by *### Response: Yes*. Whereas we only show an positive example here, it is suggested to include both positive and negative examples. After the final example, the instance to be processed is presented in the prompt, and the model follows the same output format as demonstrated in the examples.

Since ground truths are usually not available in real applications, users can handcraft few-shot examples for inference. On the other hand, few-shot examples can be automatically generated by randomly injecting errors for ED and DI, such as missing values, typographical/formatting errors, and randomly swapping values for two columns in a tuple or two tuples in a column. For SM and EM, we can employ rule-based methods (e.g., blocking rules [34]) to quickly find a few matches and use them as few-shot examples.

Batch prompting [8] is a prompt engineering technique designed to enable models to perform inference in batches, rather than processing single instances individually. This approach involves presenting multiple instances within a single prompt, with the model instructed to respond to all of them concurrently. Though proven effective for GPT-3.5 and GPT-4 in reducing token consumption and execution time [93], we have opted not to employ this method in the current version of Jellyfish. Our concern is that overburdening the 13B model with an excessive number of tokens, even when staying within its 4k token limit, could lead to diminished attention. This might significantly impair performance, potentially resulting in the model overlooking responses to some instances. We anticipate that future research, utilizing larger models or increasing the token input capacity, could effectively

address this limitation.

7 Extensions to Unseen Tasks

In Section 6, we introduce DP task solving and focus on seen tasks. For unseen tasks, we consider two case studies: CTA and AVE, as outlined in Section 2.1. We will show that Jellyfish can be easily extended to support them by employing the prompt engineering techniques in existing LLM-based solutions, hence simplifying its use in unseen tasks.

Column Type Annotation. As a task in the realm of table understanding, CTA is an essentially DP step for data search [7], knowledge base completion [72], and data integration a data lake [19]. We follow the two-stage pipeline proposed in [35], which was designed for ChatGPT and based on chain-of-thought [87], a technique that enables complex reasoning capabilities through intermediate reasoning steps.

Given a table to be annotated, in the first stage, the model predicts the domain of the table. In the second stage, given a set of predefined types, the model determines the type of column based on sample values extracted from it. The chain-of-thought prompt instructs the model in a step-by-step manner. For example, to predict the domain of the table, there are four steps: (1) look at the input and make a table out of it, (2) look at the cell values in detail, (3) decide if the table describes domain A, domain B ... and (4) answer with the domain. Then, the model follows this prompt to cope with the task. The column type selection in the second stage works in the same way, except that table is replaced by column and domains are replaced by candidate types.

Attribute Value Extraction. Given a text description, AVE is an information extraction task that discovers missing values of attributes and reconstructs a table. For this task, we follow the prompt in [4] designed for GPT-4. The prompt is simple, beginning with the task description. Then, the instance content follows, with the description of the entity and the attribute to be extracted. Finally, an exception rule is mentioned: if the attribute cannot be extracted, the model should answer “N/A”.

In addition to the above unseen tasks, we also would like to mention that Jellyfish enables further fine-tuning. Users may choose to condition the model for specific DP tasks or domains to seek better performance. Moreover, Jellyfish can be utilized for multiple tasks in a DP pipeline, e.g., data cleaning followed by data integration on the same sets of data. It is likely that the DP tasks within this pipeline belong to the same domain. In this case, Jellyfish may deliver consistency in handling the data in different tasks due to the built-in domain knowledge acquired through DP-tuning.

8 Experiments

8.1 Experimental Setup

Datasets. Apart from the seen datasets for DP-tuning (Section 5), we use following datasets as unseen data. CTA and AVE are used for case studies on unseen tasks.

- ED: Flights and Rayyan, used in [56];
- DI: Flipkart [68] and Phone [67] from Kaggle;
- SM: CMS, used in [94];
- EM: Abt-Buy and Walmart-Amazon* from the Magellan data repository [13];
- CTA: SOTAB, used in [35];

*Despite the same domain as the Amazon dataset used in DP-tuning, the entities belong to a different category of products.

Table 2: Testing dataset statistics. #Train and #Valid numbers only apply to GPT-3.5 on AVE and non-LLM methods on other tasks.

Task	Type	Dataset	#Train	#Valid	#Test	#Total
ED	Seen	Adult	550	550	9900	11000
		Hospital	1710	190	17101	19001
	Unseen	Flights	715	714	12832	14261
		Rayyan	501	502	8997	10000
DI	Seen	Buy	469	117	65	651
		Restaurant	622	156	86	864
	Unseen	Flipkart	6240	0	2675	8915
		Phone	2537	0	1194	3731
SM	Seen	MIMIC-III	51264	6408	6408	64080
		Synthea	23709	2964	2964	29637
	Unseen	CMS	22784	2848	2564	28196
EM	Seen	Amazon-Google	6874	2293	2293	11460
		Beer	268	91	91	450
		DBLP-ACM	6417	2473	2473	11363
		DBLP-GoogleScholar	17223	5742	5742	28707
		Fodors-Zagats	567	190	189	946
		iTunes-Amazon	321	109	109	539
	Unseen	Abt-Buy	5743	1916	1946	9575
		Walmart-Amazon	6144	2049	2049	10242
CTA	Unseen	SOTAB	356	0	250	606
AVE	Unseen	AE-110K	4360	0	1482	5842
		OA-Mine	7360	0	2451	9811

- AVE: AE-110k and OA-Mine, used in [4].

The statistics of the datasets are reported in Table 2. We generate train/valid/test splits following the protocol in [22] for Adult and Hospital, [57] for Flipkart and Phone, and [94] for MIMIC-III and CMS. The other datasets have already been provided with splits [61, 35, 4]. A subset of the train/valid splits is used for tuning Jellyfish, as reported in Table 1.

Methods. We categorize existing methods into non-LLM methods and LLM methods. For non-LLM methods, we select the following baselines, in line with [61]:

- ED: HoloDetect [22] and Raha [56];
- DI: IPM [57];
- SM: SMAT [94];
- EM: Ditto [46];
- CTA: RoBERTa [51].

For their performance, we follow the best numbers reported in prior works [61, 35]. Other methods such as Baran [55], HoloClean [71], and DODUO [76], have been shown to be outperformed by the above competitors [57, 61, 35], and hence are not compared here.

LLM methods include Jellyfish, GPT-3 (`text-davinci-002`), GPT-3.5 (`gpt-3.5-turbo-0301`), GPT-4 (`gpt-4-0314`), Stable Beluga 2 70B [54], and SOLAR 70B [82]. We follow the best numbers reported in [61, 93, 4] for their performance. To show the effect of DP-tuning, we also report the results of OpenOrca-Platypus2-13B [41] (dubbed “OOP2”), the model prior to DP-tuning.

The hyperparameter setup for Jellyfish’s DP-tuning is provided in Appendix A. Knowledge injected to Jellyfish is reported in Appendix B, where knowledge specific to datasets are **not** injected to the prompts during inference. When few-shot prompting is enabled, we equip Jellyfish with three examples for each dataset, as reported in Appendix C. They cover both positive and negative examples, using the automatic generation method mentioned in Section 6.

Metrics. For DP task solving, we measure accuracy for DI, F1 score for ED, DI, EM, and AVE, and micro-F1 for CTA, all reported on a 100-scale. We also report precision and recall for SM because all the competitors report low F1 scores. For model interpretation, we request GPT-4 to compare the outputs of Jellyfish-13B-interpreter and GPT-3.5 and decide the winner.

Environment. Experiments are conducted on a server with an Intel(R) Xeon(R) E5-2640 v4 @2.10GHz 8-core CPU and 256 GB RAM, running Ubuntu 18.04.6 LTS. Jellyfish is accelerated with an NVIDIA RTX A6000 GPU with 48GB graphics memory for inference and two GPUs for DP-tuning. DP-tuning is implemented in Python 3.10.9. Besides LoRA [25], we use FlashAttention-2 [12] to speed up tuning and vLLM with PageAttention [38] to speed up inference.

8.2 Performance on Seen Tasks

We first evaluate the performance on the seen tasks that are used for DP-tuning. Table 3 reports the accuracy for DI and F1 score for the other three tasks. For Jellyfish-13B, few-shot prompting is disabled on seen datasets and enabled for unseen datasets. Among all the competitors, GPT-4 generally performs the best. This is expected, as it is the most advanced model with the largest number of parameters. However, its performance on SM is mediocre. Jellyfish-13B is generally the runner-up model and significantly outperforms GPT-4 on SM. Its accuracy or F1 score on the unseen datasets are over 80%, except on SM. In addition, Jellyfish-13B outperforms non-LLM methods on all but one seen datasets, and on all unseen datasets. Note that for non-LLM methods, because they need training on the input dataset, all the datasets are seen for them. This means that even without training on these datasets, Jellyfish-13B’s performance still surpasses the performance of non-LLM methods with training. Comparing Jellyfish-13B with GPT-3 and GPT-3.5, Jellyfish-13B wins in more cases. Another observation is that the strong performance of Jellyfish-13B can be attributed to its DP-tuning, because OOP2, the model without DP-tuning, delivers inferior results. In particular, OOP2 fails to report reasonable answers on Flipkart and Phone for DI. Meanwhile, Jellyfish-13B achieves 81% and 87% accuracy on them.

Among the four tasks, SM is the hardest task, and all the competitors report relatively low F1 score. Looking into the datasets, we find that even humans have difficulties in telling whether the two attributes match, given only name and description. To compare the methods in more detail, we report precision and recall in Table 4. The non-LLM method, SMAT, reports the highest recall, yet with a very low precision. Among its results, only 1 out of 3 – 9 is true positive. This is because many SM-tailored methods seek high recall, in order to find more candidates for further verification. Jellyfish-13B exhibits relatively high precision (41% – 57%), and is close to GPT-4 on the unseen dataset of CMS. This suggests that Jellyfish-13B can be used as a verification method (1 out of 2 is true positive) on top of a filtering approach (e.g., SMAT).

8.3 Performance on Unseen Tasks

Next, we extend the use of Jellyfish-13B to unseen tasks and investigate the two case studies mentioned in Section 7, both following the prompts in existing studies without using any few-shot examples.

Table 3: Performance on seen tasks, with winner in boldface and runner-up underlined. Few-shot is disabled for Jellyfish-13B on seen datasets and enabled on unseen datasets. For ED, non-LLM refers to (1) HoloDetect on Adult and Hospital and (2) Raha on Flights and Rayyan. “–” indicates numbers not reported in the prior works. “INV” indicates no valid response is obtained.

Task	Type	Dataset	Model					
			Non-LLM	GPT-3	GPT-3.5	GPT-4	OOP2	Jellyfish-13B
ED	Seen	Adult	<u>99.10</u>	<u>99.10</u>	92.01	92.01	42.77	99.33
		Hospital	94.40	97.80	90.74	90.74	63.24	<u>95.59</u>
	Unseen	Flights	81.00	–	–	83.48	65.74	<u>82.52</u>
		Rayyan	79.00	–	–	<u>81.95</u>	74.30	90.65
DI	Seen	Buy	96.50	98.50	98.46	100	89.23	100
		Restaurant	77.20	88.40	<u>94.19</u>	97.67	81.40	89.53
	Unseen	Flipkart	68.00	–	–	89.94	INV	<u>81.68</u>
		Phone	86.70	–	–	90.79	INV	<u>87.21</u>
SM	Seen	MIMIC-III	20.00	–	–	40.00	36.36	40.00
		Synthea	38.50	45.20	<u>57.14</u>	66.67	22.22	56.00
	Unseen	CMS	<u>50.00</u>	–	–	19.35	13.33	59.29
EM	Seen	Amazon-Google	<u>75.58</u>	63.50	66.50	74.21	36.70	81.34
		Beer	94.37	100	96.30	100	85.71	96.77
		DBLP-ACM	98.99	96.60	96.99	97.44	78.86	<u>98.98</u>
		DBLP-GoogleScholar	<u>95.60</u>	83.80	76.12	91.87	59.48	98.51
		Fodors-Zagats	100	100	100	100	92.68	100
		iTunes-Amazon	97.06	<u>98.20</u>	96.40	100	57.45	98.11
	Unseen	Abt-Buy	89.33	–	–	92.77	61.78	<u>89.58</u>
		Walmart-Amazon	86.76	87.00	86.17	90.27	67.29	<u>89.42</u>

Table 4: Precision (P), recall (R), and F1 score on SM.

Type	Dataset	Model								
		SMAT			GPT-4			Jellyfish-13B		
		P	R	F1	P	R	F1	P	R	F1
Seen	MIMIC-III	11.5	84.6	20.2	33.33	50.0	40.0	45.45	35.71	40.0
	Synthea	24.4	90.9	38.5	71.42	62.5	66.67	41.18	87.50	56.00
Unseen	CMS	33.9	95.0	50.0	60.0	11.5	19.35	57.14	61.54	59.26

Table 5: Micro-F1 score on the unseen task of CTA, few-shot disabled for Jellyfish-13B.

RoBERTa (159 shots)	RoBERTa (356 shots)	GPT-3.5	GPT-4	OOP2	Jellyfish-13B
79.20	89.73	89.47	91.55	56.40	82.00

Table 5 reports the performance comparison on CTA. RoBERTa needs fine-tuning for this task. We report its results with two options, one for 159 shots of training data, the other for 356 shots of training data, following the numbers in [35]. GPT-4 still performs the best. Even without any tuning for this task, Jellyfish-13B still outperforms than RoBERTa fine-tuned with 159 shots. It is also significantly better than OOP2, suggesting that DP-tuning successfully translates the capability of handling the four seen tasks to this unseen task.

For AVE, we report results in Table 6. GPT-3.5 is the winner on the AE-110k dataset, and GPT-4 is the winner on the OA-Mine dataset. Jellyfish-13B is the runner-up on AE-110k and the third on OA-Mine. It is also interesting to see that even with 13B parameters, Jellyfish-13B surpasses the two 70B models on both datasets, and even beats GPT-4 on AE-110k.

To drill down to the impact of DP-tuning on unseen tasks, we investigate CTA as an example. Table 7 helps us find out which task contributes the most to this unseen task. When tuning with only one task, the model reports a micro-F1 in the range of 71% – 79%, with DI being the highest.

Table 6: F1 score on the unseen task of AVE, few-shot disabled for Jellyfish-13B.

Dataset	Model					
	Stable Beluga 2 70B	SOLAR 70B	GPT-3.5	GPT-4	OOP2	Jellyfish-13B
AE-110k	52.10	49.20	61.30	55.50	49.28	58.12
OA-Mine	50.80	55.20	62.70	68.90	43.48	55.96

Table 7: Impact of DP-tuning on the unseen task of CTA. “+ task” denotes the model tuned for the task.

OOP2	+ ED	+ DI	+ SM	+ EM	Jellyfish-13B
56.40	74.20	79.20	76.70	71.50	82.00

Table 8: Impact of prompts on the unseen task of CTA, varying options in stages and chain-of-thought (CoT).

One-stage, w/o CoT	One-stage, w/ CoT	Two-stage, w/o CoT	Two-stage, w/ CoT
51.50	58.00	67.00	82.00

Table 9: Head-to-head comparison of GPT-3.5 and Jellyfish-13B on interpretation, judged by GPT-4.

Task	Dataset	Model	
		GPT-3.5	Jellyfish-13B- interpreter
ED	Adult	3	17
	Hospital	3	17
DI	Buy	2	18
	Restaurant	3	17
SM	Synthea	7	13
EM	Amazon-Google	5	15
	Beer	6	14
	DBLP-ACM	4	16
	DBLP-GoogleScholar	4	16
	Fodors-Zagats	2	18
	iTunes-Amazon	9	11
Total		48	172
Winning Rate		21.82%	78.18%

We suppose this is because DI is exactly the inverse operation of CTA, i.e., DI fills the value of an attribute, and meanwhile CTA infers the type of an attribute given a set of sample values. Moreover, the four tasks jointly contributes to an overall micro-F1 of 82% and it surpasses the performance of tuning with only DI, showcasing the usefulness of other tasks as well.

Further, we conduct an ablation study to study the impact of prompting and report the results in Table 8. The two-stage pipeline performs better than the one-stage pipeline, and chain-of-thought, which splits the inference of column types into four steps, is also useful, in line with the observation in [35]. This demonstrates that the prompt engineering techniques developed for existing LLM-based solutions can be also used for Jellyfish-13B to take effect. In doing so, the design of prompts for Jellyfish-13B on unseen tasks is rendered much easier, as users may directly follow those used in existing works.

Overall, the two case studies, with Jellyfish-13B’s competitive performance observed, collectively demonstrate its generalizability to a wider range of DP tasks than what is tuned for.

8.4 Evaluation of Interpretation

We evaluate the performance of Jellyfish-13B-interpreter and compare it with GPT-3.5 (gpt-3.5-turbo-0613). Given an answer output by Jellyfish-13B, we generate reasons using both Jellyfish-13B-interpreter and GPT-3.5, and request GPT-4 to decide which one is better. Note that GPT-4 is unaware of the correct answer to the question in DP. As such, it needs to judge by its own analysis of the question as well. Table 9 reports the head-to-head comparison of the two models. Jellyfish-13B-interpreter defeats GPT-3.5 across all the datasets, achieving an overall winning rate of 78% across 220 tests. To delve into detailed comparison, we show an example on the Amazon-Google dataset in EM. The prompt for this instance is as follows.

Head-to-Head Instance

You are an AI assistant that follows instruction extremely well. The user will give you a question. Your task is to answer as faithfully as you can. While answering, provide detailed explanation and justify your answer.

Answer your reason first, then finish your response in a separate line with and ONLY with your final answer.

Product A: [name: "adobe dreamweaver cs3 [mac]", manufacturer: "adobe", price: "399.0"]

Product B: [name: "adobe cs3 web premium", price: "1659.99"]

Are Product A and Product B the same Product?

The reason given by Jellyfish-13B-interpreter is as follows.

The two products are not the same. Product A is "adobe dreamweaver cs3 [mac]" and Product B is "adobe cs3 web premium". Even though they are both Adobe products and part of the CS3 suite, they are different software tools with different functionalities. Adobe Dreamweaver is a web development tool while Adobe CS3 Web Premium is a suite that includes multiple software tools. The price difference also indicates that they are not the same product, as Product B is significantly more expensive than Product A. No

The reason given by GPT-3.5 is as follows.

*No, Product A and Product B are not the same product. The reason is that although both products are from Adobe and are part of the CS3 suite, they have different names and prices. Product A is specifically named "Adobe Dreamweaver CS3 [Mac]" and is priced at \$399.0, while Product B is named "Adobe CS3 Web Premium" and is priced at \$1659.99. The difference in names and prices indicates that they are different products within the CS3 suite, likely with different features and functionalities. Therefore, Product A and Product B are not the same product.
Final answer: No.*

GPT-4 compares the outputs of both models in four aspects (we summarize GPT-4’s response due to its length):

- Structure: Both models effectively follow the instruction to provide a detailed explanation before the final answer.
- Focus: Jellyfish-13B-interpreter emphasizes the different functionalities of the software, while GPT-3.5 focuses more on the difference in names and prices.
- Adherence to Instruction: GPT-3.5 includes an unnecessary repetition of the conclusion before the final answer, which is not strictly in line with the instruction to finish the response with the final answer only.
- Clarity: Jellyfish-13B-interpreter presents a more concise and focused response by avoiding repetition and sticking to the instruction more closely.

Table 10: Effect of pre-tuning. “+ DP(P)” denotes the model with DP-tuning-preview. Knowledge injection is disabled.

Task	Dataset	Model							
		Llama-2-13B-Chat	OpenOrcaxOpenChat-Preview2-13B (Llama 2 + OpenOrca)	Platypus2-13B (Llama 2 + Open-Platypus)	OOP2 (Llama 2 + OpenOrca + Open-Platypus)	Llama-2-13B-Chat + DP(P)	OpenOrcaxOpenChat-Preview2-13B + DP(P)	Platypus2-13B + DP(P)	OOP2 + DP(P)
ED	Adult	5.92	33.67	7.73	42.77	93.62	93.49	93.49	96.62
	Hospital	8.78	64.05	6.29	63.24	81.55	89.67	90.58	92.01
DI	Buy	95.38	75.38	41.54	89.23	92.31	90.77	87.69	100
	Restaurant	90.70	88.37	86.05	81.40	89.53	90.70	88.37	89.53
SM	Synthea	0.97	0.00	0.68	22.22	22.22	22.22	28.57	36.36
EM	Amazon-Google	14.58	25.62	25.64	36.70	40.00	49.77	42.35	48.20
	Beer	39.13	81.48	11.76	85.71	95.55	93.33	93.33	96.55
	DBLP-ACM	45.95	78.84	0.00	78.86	97.45	97.66	97.35	97.35
	DBLP-GoogleScholar	35.71	56.07	40.73	59.48	92.27	92.22	92.87	92.83
	Fodors-Zagats	42.86	84.21	39.56	92.68	97.67	100	100	100
iTunes-Amazon	30.43	63.53	0.00	57.45	96.15	96.15	96.15	96.15	96.30

Based on the analysis, GPT-4 decides that Jellyfish-13B-interpreter performed better because it adhered more strictly to the original instruction by providing a clear, concise response without unnecessary repetition. In addition, with its built-in knowledge, Jellyfish-13B-interpreter pointed out the difference in functionalities, whereas GPT-3.5 merely described the difference on the surface.

Furthermore, we find out that when reasoning, GPT-3.5 even fails to respond with a correct answer of matching or not for EM, as shown in its mediocre performance on datasets like Amazon-Google and DBLP-GoogleScholar in Table 3. In contrast to the above example of Jellyfish-13B-interpreter’s landslide win, GPT-3.5 only has a slight edge when it wins. For instance, in an example of the Amazon-Google dataset, GPT-4 points out that GPT-3.5 has more focused justification and additional insights into the implications of the differences between the products, yet it also mentioned that GPT-3.5’s repetition of the final answer is a minor deviation from the instruction’s format.

8.5 Evaluation of Pre-tuning

To evaluate the impact of pre-tuning, particularly the two chosen datasets (FLAN and Open-Platypus), we conduct an ablation study by comparing four models:

- Llama-2-13B-Chat, our base model;
- OpenOrcaxOpenChat-Preview2-13B, Llama 2-13B fine-tuned with OpenOrca [47] – an augmented FLAN collection [52] – organized in the OpenChat [84] prompting style;
- Platypus2-13B, Llama 2-13B fine-tuned with Open-Platypus [40];
- OOP2.

We apply DP-tuning-preview, a small set of training data for initial experiments of model selection, as mentioned in Section 5.3, to all the four competitors.

Table 10 report the results. Comparing the base model with those with pre-tuning, it can be seen that OpenOrcaxOpenChat-Preview2-13B, pre-tuned with augmented FLAN, roughly performs better. Platypus2-13B, pre-tuned with Open-Platypus, though not delivering better overall performance than the base model, jointly contributes to the superiority of OOP2. This advantage is also observed when DP-tuning-preview is applied, with OOP2 + DP(P) being the winner on a majority of datasets. Moreover, with DP-tuning-preview, we also observe the advantage of Platypus2-13B over the base model, showcasing its usefulness not only jointly but also individually. Overall, this evaluation justifies the effectiveness of pre-tuning in Jellyfish.

Table 11: Impact of knowledge injection on EM. “+ EM(P)” denotes the model tuned for DP-tuning-preview with EM datasets only. Few-shot is disabled.

Type	Dataset	Model		
		OOP2	+ EM(P) w/o knowledge	+ EM(P) w/ knowledge
Seen	Amazon-Google	36.70	47.54	50.53
	Beer	85.71	85.71	92.86
	DBLP-ACM	78.86	85.33	90.26
	DBLP-GoogleScholar	59.48	90.46	91.54
	Fodors-Zagats	92.68	100	100
Unseen	iTunes-Amazon	57.45	98.11	98.18
	Abt-Buy	61.78	83.35	84.44
	Walmart-Amazon	67.29	71.71	73.18

8.6 Evaluation of Knowledge Injection

To evaluate the impact of knowledge injection, we consider the case of EM as an example and compare the models with DP-tuning-preview using the datasets for EM only. Table 11 reports the results for OOP2 and its tuned version with knowledge either injected or not. Comparing OOP2 and the one without injected knowledge, as expected, the performance on EM is significantly raised. When we turn on knowledge injection, the performance further improves and the improvement is consistent. Furthermore, the improvement is also observed on unseen datasets, because like seen datasets of Amazon-Google and Beer, they are also product data. This observation suggests that the domain knowledge learned through tuning indeed enhances the model’s generalizability to unseen datasets.

8.7 Evaluation of Efficiency

DP-tuning spends around 5 hours for Jellyfish-13B and 10 hours for Jellyfish-13B-interpreter. For inference, Jellyfish-13B spends 0.08 – 0.15 seconds on average to process an instance. As a reference, GPT-4 spends an average of 1 – 8 seconds per instance. Despite the efficiency limitation of LLMs mentioned in Section 2.2, some non-LLM methods, such as RoBERTa and those built upon it (e.g., IPM), need fine-tuning when applied to unseen datasets. This fine-tuning time should be counted towards total time expense for fair comparison. Moreover, advanced learning techniques enables Jellyfish to be quantized [49] or distilled to improve efficiency, which will be considered in the future.

9 Related Works

Since works on LLMs have been introduced in Section 2.2, we briefly review related works on DP here. *Seen Tasks.* The tasks targeted in this paper collectively form the most critical part of DP, and they have been extensively studied.

- **ED:** Traditional methods mainly depend on hand-crafted rules [10], pattern discovery [11], outlier detection [66], or statistical modeling [26, 85]. Recent works employ more advanced ML techniques such as few-shot learning based on a noisy channel model (HoloDetect) [22], or resort to a series of ML pipelines (Raha) [56], including feature engineering, clustering, and classification.
- **DI:** While rule-based solutions [71, 75] remain one of the prevalent approaches, another stream of works develops ML models for this task, including variational autoencoders [63], generative adversarial networks [92], and attention mechanisms [90, 79]. To seek better imputation performance, recent progress utilizes PLMs to capture semantics [57].

- **SM:** The use of similarity matrices is a traditional way [73]. More advanced methods utilize ML techniques [18], including deep learning models [74]. SMAT [94] is a recent approach leveraging attention-based deep learning.
- **EM** The procedure is divided into blocking and in-block pairwise matching for the sake of efficiency. Blocking groups pairs of entities that potentially match into the same block, and then pairwise matching is performed within each block to find matching entities. Traditional solutions for blocking mostly rely on attribute equivalence, hashes, or similarities [65]. Recently, the feasibility of using DL methods for blocking has also been examined [78], following the use of DL for pairwise matching [59]. In addition, there are tools that handle both steps such as Megallan [34] and Ditto [46].
- **Generic Solution** Whereas the above solutions are specialized for a task, recent progress developed generic solutions to DP based on GPT-3 [61], or GPT-3.5 and GPT-4 [93], basically employing various prompt engineering techniques on frozen LLMs. Fine-tuning GPT-3.5 and ChatGPT for a variety of table-related tasks has also been investigated [43], and several DP tasks are covered.

Unseen Tasks. We review the related studies on CTA and AVE.

- **CTA** As a typical table understanding task, it often appears in the studies on table representation learning [28, 14, 76]. These approaches fine-tune PLMs, typically BERT [15] and its variants [29, 51]. Recently, ChatGPT has been utilized to solve this task [35].
- **AVE** Early approaches employ LSTM-CRF [37, 100]. With the prevalence of PLMs, like CTA, many solutions to AVE resort to using BERT [91, 86, 101]. A recent work [4] considered fine-tuning GPT-3.5 and prompting GPT-4, and compared with open-source LLMs like Stable Beluga 2 [54] and SOLAR [82].

Other DP Tasks. Besides the ones covered by this paper, there are many other DP tasks. We name a few examples.

- Data repairing corrects erroneous values in a dataset. Typical solutions are HoloClean [71] and Baran [55]. HoloClean can detect errors and perform repairing subsequently. Baran only repair errors and resort to Raha to detect errors. Recent advancements [42, 69] utilized Bayesian inference to capture dependencies between attributes.
- Data fusion is the process of integrating multiple data sources that contain information about the same set of entities, with possibly conflicting attribute values. Surveys of early attempts are available [44, 6], with a detailed comparison of various fusion methods on deep web data [44]. More recent endeavors targeted multi-truth data fusion [2] and golden record [23].
- Data transformation is the process of converting data from one format into another format. Notable approaches are transformation by user-specified examples [21] and learning from large collections of paired table columns [30]. In addition, the aforementioned generic DP solution also covers this task [61].

Data Preparation. DP is also studied in the name of data preparation, which manipulates raw data into a form that can be readily analyzed. A notable Python library is DataPrep [39]. In addition to the DP tasks listed above, data augmentation [9, 58, 50, 99] is another key operation in data preparation. Another line of work studies dataset discovery [3, 36, 17, 62], particularly for integrating data lake tables [32] where joinable [16], unionable [31], and related table search [96] are often used for identifying candidates. Despite search speed being a key concern, LLMs are anticipated to be used on top of their outcomes for automated integration in a data lake [1].

10 Conclusions

We introduced Jellyfish, an LLM specifically designed for DP. Built upon Llama 2-13B and instruction-tuned for four tasks, Jellyfish generalizes as a universal DP task solver. With its 13 billion parameters that can be further tuned, it can operate on a local GPU without compromising data security. It is adept at understanding natural language, enabling users to craft instructions manually for processing DP tasks. In contrast to many existing methods that depend heavily on prior knowledge, Jellyfish acquires domain knowledge during its tuning process and employs optional knowledge injection during inference. A notable feature is its interpreter, which provides explanations for its outputs. We evaluated Jellyfish using a collection of public datasets commonly employed for DP tasks and demonstrated its competitiveness against existing solutions, impressive generalizability to new tasks, and superior reasoning abilities. The evaluation also justified the usefulness of our techniques of building Jellyfish such as pre-tuning and knowledge injection.

Future research directions include enriching Jellyfish’s DP-tuning with data from a wider range of domains and expanding Jellyfish to encompass more DP tasks, such as data repairing and data transformation. Another area of interest is integrating the DP task-solving model with the interpreter model. Furthermore, we are considering the development of a quantized or distilled model to enhance processing speed, as well as a multi-agent system for adaptable, conversational, code-free DP pipeline.

Acknowledgements

This work is supported by NEC Corporation and JSPS Kakenhi 22H03903, 23H03406, 23K17456, and CREST JPMJCR22M2. We thank Prof. Makoto Onizuka, Yuki Arase, and Yuya Sasaki for providing equipment support for completing this research.

References

- [1] S. Arora, B. Yang, S. Eyuboglu, A. Narayan, A. Hojel, I. Trummer, and C. Ré. Language models enable simple systems for generating structured views of heterogeneous data lakes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.09433*, 2023.
- [2] F. Azzalini, D. Piantella, E. Rabosio, and L. Tanca. Enhancing domain-aware multi-truth data fusion using copy-based source authority and value similarity. *The VLDB Journal*, 32(3):475–500, 2023.
- [3] A. Bogatu, A. A. Fernandes, N. W. Paton, and N. Konstantinou. Dataset discovery in data lakes. In *ICDE*, pages 709–720. IEEE, 2020.
- [4] A. Brinkmann, R. Shraga, and C. Bizer. Product attribute value extraction using large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.12537*, 2023.
- [5] T. Brown, B. Mann, N. Ryder, M. Subbiah, J. D. Kaplan, P. Dhariwal, A. Neelakantan, P. Shyam, G. Sastry, A. Askell, et al. Language models are few-shot learners. *NeurIPS*, 33:1877–1901, 2020.
- [6] G. K. Canalle, A. C. Salgado, and B. F. Loscio. A survey on data fusion: what for? in what form? what is next? *Journal of Intelligent Information Systems*, 57:25–50, 2021.
- [7] A. Chapman, E. Simperl, L. Koesten, G. Konstantinidis, L.-D. Ibáñez, E. Kacprzak, and P. Groth. Dataset search: a survey. *The VLDB Journal*, 29(1):251–272, 2020.
- [8] Z. Cheng, J. Kasai, and T. Yu. Batch prompting: Efficient inference with large language model APIs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.08721*, 2023.
- [9] N. Chepurko, R. Marcus, E. Zraggen, R. C. Fernandez, T. Kraska, and D. Karger. ARDA: automatic relational data augmentation for machine learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2003.09758*, 2020.
- [10] X. Chu, I. F. Ilyas, and P. Papotti. Holistic data cleaning: Putting violations into context. In *ICDE*, pages 458–469. IEEE, 2013.
- [11] X. Chu, J. Morcos, I. F. Ilyas, M. Ouzzani, P. Papotti, N. Tang, and Y. Ye. Katara: A data cleaning system powered by knowledge bases and crowdsourcing. In *SIGMOD*, pages 1247–1261, 2015.
- [12] T. Dao. FlashAttention-2: Faster attention with better parallelism and work partitioning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.08691*, 2023.
- [13] S. Das, A. Doan, P. S. G. C., C. Gokhale, P. Konda, Y. Govind, and D. Paulsen. The magellan data repository. <https://sites.google.com/site/anhaidgroup/useful-stuff/the-magellan-data-repository>.
- [14] X. Deng, H. Sun, A. Lees, Y. Wu, and C. Yu. TURL: Table understanding through representation learning. *ACM SIGMOD Record*, 51(1):33–40, 2022.
- [15] J. Devlin, M.-W. Chang, K. Lee, and K. Toutanova. BERT: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.04805*, 2018.
- [16] Y. Dong, C. Xiao, T. Nozawa, M. Enomoto, and M. Oyamada. DeepJoin: Joinable table discovery with pre-trained language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.07588*, 2022.
- [17] G. Fan, J. Wang, Y. Li, D. Zhang, and R. Miller. Semantics-aware dataset discovery from data lakes with contextualized column-based representation learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.01922*, 2022.

- [18] A. Gal, H. Roitman, and R. Shraga. Learning to rerank schema matches. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, 33(8):3104–3116, 2019.
- [19] R. Hai, C. Koutras, C. Quix, and M. Jarke. Data lakes: A survey of functions and systems. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, 2023.
- [20] J. Han, J. Pei, and H. Tong. *Data mining: concepts and techniques*. Morgan kaufmann, 2022.
- [21] Y. He, X. Chu, K. Ganjam, Y. Zheng, V. Narasayya, and S. Chaudhuri. Transform-data-by-example (TDE) an extensible search engine for data transformations. *PVLDB*, 11(10):1165–1177, 2018.
- [22] A. Heidari, J. McGrath, I. F. Ilyas, and T. Rekatsinas. HoloDetect: Few-shot learning for error detection. In *SIGMOD*, pages 829–846, 2019.
- [23] A. Heidari, G. Michalopoulos, I. F. Ilyas, and T. Rekatsinas. Record fusion via inference and data augmentation. *ACM/JMS Journal of Data Science*, 2023.
- [24] N. Houlsby, A. Giurgiu, S. Jastrzebski, B. Morrone, Q. De Laroussilhe, A. Gesmundo, M. Attariyan, and S. Gelly. Parameter-efficient transfer learning for NLP. In *ICML*, pages 2790–2799. PMLR, 2019.
- [25] E. J. Hu, Y. Shen, P. Wallis, Z. Allen-Zhu, Y. Li, S. Wang, L. Wang, and W. Chen. LoRA: Low-rank adaptation of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.09685*, 2021.
- [26] Z. Huang and Y. He. Auto-detect: Data-driven error detection in tables. In *SIGMOD*, pages 1377–1392, 2018.
- [27] Hugging Face. Llama and llama 2 variants. <https://huggingface.co/models?other=llama>, 2023.
- [28] H. Iida, D. Thai, V. Manjunatha, and M. Iyyer. Tabbie: Pretrained representations of tabular data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.02584*, 2021.
- [29] X. Jiao, Y. Yin, L. Shang, X. Jiang, X. Chen, L. Li, F. Wang, and Q. Liu. TinyBERT: Distilling BERT for natural language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.10351*, 2019.
- [30] Z. Jin, Y. He, and S. Chaudhuri. Auto-transform: learning-to-transform by patterns. *PVLDB*, 13(12):2368–2381, 2020.
- [31] A. Khatiwada, G. Fan, R. Shraga, Z. Chen, W. Gatterbauer, R. J. Miller, and M. Riedewald. SANTOS: Relationship-based semantic table union search. *SIGMOD*, 1(1):1–25, 2023.
- [32] A. Khatiwada, R. Shraga, W. Gatterbauer, and R. J. Miller. Integrating data lake tables. *PVLDB*, 16(4):932–945, 2022.
- [33] T. Kojima, S. S. Gu, M. Reid, Y. Matsuo, and Y. Iwasawa. Large language models are zero-shot reasoners. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.11916*, 2022.
- [34] P. Konda, S. Das, A. Doan, A. Ardalan, J. R. Ballard, H. Li, F. Panahi, H. Zhang, J. Naughton, S. Prasad, et al. Magellan: toward building entity matching management systems over data science stacks. *PVLDB*, 9(13):1581–1584, 2016.
- [35] K. Korini and C. Bizer. Column type annotation using ChatGPT. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.00745*, 2023.
- [36] C. Koutras, G. Siachamis, A. Ionescu, K. Psarakis, J. Brons, M. Frangkoulis, C. Lofi, A. Bonifati, and A. Katsifodimos. Valentine: Evaluating matching techniques for dataset discovery. In *ICDE*, pages 468–479. IEEE, 2021.

- [37] Z. Kozareva, Q. Li, K. Zhai, and W. Guo. Recognizing salient entities in shopping queries. In *ACL*, pages 107–111, 2016.
- [38] W. Kwon, Z. Li, S. Zhuang, Y. Sheng, L. Zheng, C. H. Yu, J. E. Gonzalez, H. Zhang, and I. Stoica. Efficient memory management for large language model serving with pagedattention. In *SOSP*, 2023.
- [39] S. F. U. D. S. Lab. DataPrep. <https://dataprep.ai/>.
- [40] A. N. Lee, C. J. Hunter, and N. Ruiz. Platypus: Quick, cheap, and powerful refinement of LLMs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.07317*, 2023.
- [41] A. N. Lee, C. J. Hunter, N. Ruiz, B. Goodson, W. Lian, G. Wang, E. Pentland, A. Cook, C. Vong, and "Teknium". OpenOrcaPlatypus: Llama2-13B model instruct-tuned on filtered OpenOrcaV1 GPT-4 dataset and merged with divergent STEM and logic dataset model. <https://huggingface.co/Open-Orca/OpenOrca-Platypus2-13B>, 2023.
- [42] A. Lew, M. Agrawal, D. Sontag, and V. Mansinghka. PClean: Bayesian data cleaning at scale with domain-specific probabilistic programming. In *AISTATS*, pages 1927–1935. PMLR, 2021.
- [43] P. Li, Y. He, D. Yashar, W. Cui, S. Ge, H. Zhang, D. R. Fainman, D. Zhang, and S. Chaudhuri. Table-GPT: Table-tuned GPT for diverse table tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.09263*, 2023.
- [44] X. Li, X. L. Dong, K. Lyons, W. Meng, and D. Srivastava. Truth finding on the deep web: Is the problem solved? *arXiv preprint arXiv:1503.00303*, 2015.
- [45] X. L. Li and P. Liang. Prefix-tuning: Optimizing continuous prompts for generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2101.00190*, 2021.
- [46] Y. Li, J. Li, Y. Suhara, A. Doan, and W.-C. Tan. Deep entity matching with pre-trained language models. *PVLDB*, 14(1):50–60, 2020.
- [47] W. Lian, B. Goodson, E. Pentland, A. Cook, C. Vong, and "Teknium". OpenOrca: An open dataset of GPT augmented FLAN reasoning traces. <https://huggingface.co/Open-Orca/OpenOrca>, 2023.
- [48] N. F. Liu, K. Lin, J. Hewitt, A. Paranjape, M. Bevilacqua, F. Petroni, and P. Liang. Lost in the middle: How language models use long contexts. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.03172*, 2023.
- [49] S.-y. Liu, Z. Liu, X. Huang, P. Dong, and K.-T. Cheng. LLM-FP4: 4-bit floating-point quantized transformers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.16836*, 2023.
- [50] T. Liu, J. Fan, Y. Luo, N. Tang, G. Li, and X. Du. Adaptive data augmentation for supervised learning over missing data. *PVLDB*, 14(7):1202–1214, 2021.
- [51] Y. Liu, M. Ott, N. Goyal, J. Du, M. Joshi, D. Chen, O. Levy, M. Lewis, L. Zettlemoyer, and V. Stoyanov. RoBERTa: A robustly optimized BERT pretraining approach. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.11692*, 2019.
- [52] S. Longpre, L. Hou, T. Vu, A. Webson, H. W. Chung, Y. Tay, D. Zhou, Q. V. Le, B. Zoph, J. Wei, et al. The FLAN collection: Designing data and methods for effective instruction tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.13688*, 2023.
- [53] Y. Luo, Z. Yang, F. Meng, Y. Li, J. Zhou, and Y. Zhang. An empirical study of catastrophic forgetting in large language models during continual fine-tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.08747*, 2023.

- [54] D. Mahan, R. Carlow, L. Castricato, N. Cooper, and C. Laforte. Stable beluga 2. <https://huggingface.co/stabilityai/StableBeluga2>, 2023.
- [55] M. Mahdavi and Z. Abedjan. Baran: Effective error correction via a unified context representation and transfer learning. *PVLDB*, 13(12):1948–1961, 2020.
- [56] M. Mahdavi, Z. Abedjan, R. Castro Fernandez, S. Madden, M. Ouzzani, M. Stonebraker, and N. Tang. Raha: A configuration-free error detection system. In *SIGMOD*, pages 865–882, 2019.
- [57] Y. Mei, S. Song, C. Fang, H. Yang, J. Fang, and J. Long. Capturing semantics for imputation with pre-trained language models. In *ICDE*, pages 61–72. IEEE, 2021.
- [58] Z. Miao, Y. Li, and X. Wang. Rotom: A meta-learned data augmentation framework for entity matching, data cleaning, text classification, and beyond. In *SIGMOD*, pages 1303–1316, 2021.
- [59] S. Mudgal, H. Li, T. Rekatsinas, A. Doan, Y. Park, G. Krishnan, R. Deep, E. Arcaute, and V. Raghavendra. Deep learning for entity matching: A design space exploration. In *SIGMOD*, pages 19–34, 2018.
- [60] S. Mukherjee, A. Mitra, G. Jawahar, S. Agarwal, H. Palangi, and A. Awadallah. Orca: Progressive learning from complex explanation traces of GPT-4. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.02707*, 2023.
- [61] A. Narayan, I. Chami, L. Orr, and C. Ré. Can foundation models wrangle your data? *PVLDB*, 16(4):738–746, 2022.
- [62] F. Nargesian, K. Pu, B. Ghadiri-Bashardoost, E. Zhu, and R. J. Miller. Data lake organization. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, 35(1):237–250, 2022.
- [63] A. Nazabal, P. M. Olmos, Z. Ghahramani, and I. Valera. Handling incomplete heterogeneous data using VAEs. *Pattern Recognition*, 107:107501, 2020.
- [64] OpenAI. March 20 ChatGPT outage: Here’s what happened, 2023.
- [65] G. Papadakis, D. Skoutas, E. Thanos, and T. Palpanas. Blocking and filtering techniques for entity resolution: A survey. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 53(2):1–42, 2020.
- [66] N. Prokoshyna, J. Szlichta, F. Chiang, R. J. Miller, and D. Srivastava. Combining quantitative and logical data cleaning. *PVLDB*, 9(4):300–311, 2015.
- [67] PromptCloud. Amazon reviews: Unlocked mobile phones. <https://www.kaggle.com/datasets/PromptCloudHQ/amazon-reviews-unlocked-mobile-phones>.
- [68] PromptCloud. Flipkart products. <https://www.kaggle.com/datasets/PromptCloudHQ/flipkart-products>.
- [69] J. Qin, S. Huang, Y. Wang, J. Zhu, Y. Zhang, Y. Miao, R. Mao, M. Onizuka, and C. Xiao. BClean: A bayesian data cleaning system. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.06517*, 2023.
- [70] S. Razniewski, A. Yates, N. Kassner, and G. Weikum. Language models as or for knowledge bases. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.04888*, 2021.
- [71] T. Rekatsinas, X. Chu, I. F. Ilyas, and C. Ré. HoloClean: Holistic data repairs with probabilistic inference. *PVLDB*, 10(10):1190–1201, 2017.
- [72] D. Ritze, O. Lehmborg, Y. Oulabi, and C. Bizer. Profiling the potential of web tables for augmenting cross-domain knowledge bases. In *WWW*, pages 251–261, 2016.

- [73] T. Sagi and A. Gal. Schema matching prediction with applications to data source discovery and dynamic ensembling. *The VLDB Journal*, 22:689–710, 2013.
- [74] R. Shraga, A. Gal, and H. Roitman. Adnev: Cross-domain schema matching using deep similarity matrix adjustment and evaluation. *PVLDB*, 13(9):1401–1415, 2020.
- [75] S. Song, Y. Sun, A. Zhang, L. Chen, and J. Wang. Enriching data imputation under similarity rule constraints. *IEEE transactions on knowledge and data engineering*, 32(2):275–287, 2018.
- [76] Y. Suhara, J. Li, Y. Li, D. Zhang, Ç. Demiralp, C. Chen, and W.-C. Tan. Annotating columns with pre-trained language models. In *SIGMOD*, pages 1493–1503, 2022.
- [77] R. Taori, I. Gulrajani, T. Zhang, Y. Dubois, X. Li, C. Guestrin, P. Liang, and T. B. Hashimoto. Alpaca: A strong, replicable instruction-following model. *Stanford Center for Research on Foundation Models*, 3(6):7, 2023.
- [78] S. Thirumuruganathan, H. Li, N. Tang, M. Ouzzani, Y. Govind, D. Paulsen, G. Fung, and A. Doan. Deep learning for blocking in entity matching: a design space exploration. *PVLDB*, 14(11):2459–2472, 2021.
- [79] S. Tihon, M. U. Javaid, D. Fourure, N. Posocco, and T. Peel. DAEMA: Denoising autoencoder with mask attention. In *ICANN*, pages 229–240, 2021.
- [80] H. Touvron, T. Lavril, G. Izacard, X. Martinet, M.-A. Lachaux, T. Lacroix, B. Rozière, N. Goyal, E. Hambro, F. Azhar, et al. LLaMA: Open and efficient foundation language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.13971*, 2023.
- [81] H. Touvron, L. Martin, K. Stone, P. Albert, A. Almahairi, Y. Babaei, N. Bashlykov, S. Batra, P. Bhargava, S. Bhosale, et al. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09288*, 2023.
- [82] Upstage. Solar-0-70b-16bit. <https://huggingface.co/upstage/SOLAR-0-70b-16bit>, 2023.
- [83] A. Vaswani, N. Shazeer, N. Parmar, J. Uszkoreit, L. Jones, A. N. Gomez, L. Kaiser, and I. Polosukhin. Attention is all you need. *NIPS*, 30, 2017.
- [84] G. Wang, S. Cheng, X. Zhan, X. Li, S. Song, and Y. Liu. OpenChat: Advancing open-source language models with mixed-quality data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.11235*, 2023.
- [85] P. Wang and Y. He. Uni-detect: A unified approach to automated error detection in tables. In *SIGMOD*, pages 811–828, 2019.
- [86] Q. Wang, L. Yang, B. Kanagal, S. Sanghai, D. Sivakumar, B. Shu, Z. Yu, and J. Elsas. Learning to extract attribute value from product via question answering: A multi-task approach. In *KDD*, pages 47–55, 2020.
- [87] J. Wei, X. Wang, D. Schuurmans, M. Bosma, E. Chi, Q. Le, and D. Zhou. Chain of thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.11903*, 2022.
- [88] L. Weng. Prompt engineering. <https://lilianweng.github.io/posts/2023-03-15-prompt-engineering/>, 2023.
- [89] Wikipedia. Large language model. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Large_language_model, 2023.
- [90] R. Wu, A. Zhang, I. Ilyas, and T. Rekatsinas. Attention-based learning for missing data imputation in HoloClean. *MLSys*, 2:307–325, 2020.

- [91] H. Xu, W. Wang, X. Mao, X. Jiang, and M. Lan. Scaling up open tagging from tens to thousands: Comprehension empowered attribute value extraction from product title. In *ACL*, pages 5214–5223, 2019.
- [92] J. Yoon, J. Jordon, and M. Schaar. GAIN: Missing data imputation using generative adversarial nets. In *ICML*, pages 5689–5698, 2018.
- [93] H. Zhang, Y. Dong, C. Xiao, and M. Oyamada. Large language models as data preprocessors. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.16361*, 2023.
- [94] J. Zhang, B. Shin, J. D. Choi, and J. C. Ho. SMAT: An attention-based deep learning solution to the automation of schema matching. In *ADBIS*, pages 260–274. Springer, 2021.
- [95] S. Zhang, L. Dong, X. Li, S. Zhang, X. Sun, S. Wang, J. Li, R. Hu, T. Zhang, F. Wu, et al. Instruction tuning for large language models: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.10792*, 2023.
- [96] Y. Zhang and Z. G. Ives. Finding related tables in data lakes for interactive data science. In *SIGMOD*, pages 1951–1966, 2020.
- [97] Y. Zhang, Y. Li, L. Cui, D. Cai, L. Liu, T. Fu, X. Huang, E. Zhao, Y. Zhang, Y. Chen, et al. Siren’s song in the ai ocean: A survey on hallucination in large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.01219*, 2023.
- [98] W. X. Zhao, K. Zhou, J. Li, T. Tang, X. Wang, Y. Hou, Y. Min, B. Zhang, J. Zhang, Z. Dong, et al. A survey of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.18223*, 2023.
- [99] Z. Zhao and R. Castro Fernandez. Leva: Boosting machine learning performance with relational embedding data augmentation. In *SIGMOD*, pages 1504–1517, 2022.
- [100] G. Zheng, S. Mukherjee, X. L. Dong, and F. Li. Opentag: Open attribute value extraction from product profiles. In *KDD*, pages 1049–1058, 2018.
- [101] T. Zhu, Y. Wang, H. Li, Y. Wu, X. He, and B. Zhou. Multimodal joint attribute prediction and value extraction for e-commerce product. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.07162*, 2020.

A Model Setup

The hyperparameter setup for tuning Jellyfish-13B is:

- `lora_target`: q-proj, v-proj;
- `per_device_train_batch_size`: 4;
- `gradient_accumulation_steps`: 4;
- `learning_rate`: 3e-5;
- `num_train_epochs`: 5.0;
- `lora_rank`: 16;
- `lora_alpha`: 16.

The hyperparameter setup for tuning Jellyfish-13B-interpreter is:

- `lora_target`: q-proj, v-proj;
- `per_device_train_batch_size`: 2;
- `gradient_accumulation_steps`: 2;
- `learning_rate`: 3e-5;
- `num_train_epochs`: 8.0;
- `lora_rank`: 16;
- `lora_alpha`: 16.

The dataset statistics for tuning Jellyfish-13B-interpreter are shown in Table 12.

Table 12: DP-tuning-preview dataset statistics (Jellyfish-13B-interpreter and initial experiments on model selection). #Positives indicates the number of positive instances, i.e., there is an error (for ED) or the two objects match (for SM and EM).

Task	Dataset	#Instances	#Positives
ED	Adult	550	35
	Hospital	1250	40
DI	Buy	586	N/A
	Restaurant	600	N/A
SM	Synthea	2500	15
EM	Amazon-Google	359	31
	Beer	359	54
	DBLP-ACM	359	71
	DBLP-GoogleScholar	359	69
	Fodors-Zagats	359	41
	iTunes-Amazon	360	92

The following hyperparameters are used for inference:

- `temperature`: 0.35;
- `top_p`: 0.9;
- `top_k`: 10.

B Injected Knowledge

Table 13: General knowledge.

Prompt
Missing values (N/A or "nan") should not be used as a basis for your decision.
If there are missing values, you should make inferences based only on the information that is available.

Table 14: Task-specific knowledge.

Task	Prompt
ED	Errors may include, but are not limited to, spelling errors, inconsistencies, or values that don't make sense given the context of the whole record. (Used when showing the whole record)
	Errors can include, but are not limited to, spelling errors, inconsistencies, or values that don't make sense for that attribute. (Used when showing only one attribute)
	Capitalization should not be a factor in deciding whether there is an error or not.
DI	Note that values such as 'nan' and 'N/A' mean missing values, and they are not considered as errors. (used when we decide not to treat missing values as errors)
	Note that values such as 'nan' and 'N/A' mean missing values, and they ARE errors. (used when we decide to treat missing values as errors)
EM	To determine if two values are identical, you need to examine both their full names and corresponding acronyms.

Table 15: Dataset-specific knowledge.

Task	Dataset	Prompt
ED	Adult	Both the 'age' attribute and the 'hoursperweek' attribute can represent a range of integer values.
		Verify the consistency of target attribute with related attributes to identify any errors.
	Hospital	The value of attribute "score" can be a percentage number.
DI	Restaurant	The city can often be deduced from the area code of the phone number and the specific street name.
EM	Amazon-Google	Different editions, versions, or operating systems for the same software are all considered as different products. You should compare the two product numbers first.
	Beer	Note that different factories can belong to the same parent company. Beverages that undergo different production processes, such as the use of various types of wood in the barrelling process, may be considered distinct products.
	Fodors-Zagats	The type of a specific restaurant might vary between different datasets.
	iTunes-Amazon	The length of the same song might vary slightly across different datasets due to rounding or data entry discrepancies.
	DBLP-ACM	The names of authors might be presented in various formats or sequences, even when referring to the same article.
	DBLP-GoogleScholar	The names of authors might be presented in various formats or sequences, even when referring to the same article.

C Few-Shot Examples

C.0.1 Error Detection

The few-shot examples for the Flights and Rayyan datasets are given as follows.

Flights – 1st Example

Instruction:
Record [datasource: "flightview", flight: "AA-3063-SLC-LAX", scheduled departure time: "nan", actual departure time: "8:40 p.m.", scheduled arrival time: "nan", actual arrival time: "9:11 p.m."]
Attribute for Verification: [scheduled departure time: "nan"]
Question: Is there an error in the value of the "scheduled departure time" attribute?
Choose your answer from: [Yes, No]
Response:
Yes

Flights – 2st Example

Instruction:
Record [datasource: "aa", flight: "AA-3823-LAX-DEN", scheduled departure time: "9:00 p.m.", actual departure time: "nan", scheduled arrival time: "12/02/2011 12:15 a.m.", actual arrival time: "nan"]
Attribute for Verification: [scheduled arrival time: "12/02/2011 12:15 a.m."]
Question: Is there an error in the value of the "scheduled arrival time" attribute?
Choose your answer from: [Yes, No]
Response:
Yes

Flights – 3rd Example

Instruction:
Record [datasource: "flightview", flight: "AA-616-DFW-DTW", scheduled departure time: "9:05 a.m.", actual departure time: "10:11 a.m.", scheduled arrival time: "12:35 p.m.", actual arrival time: "1:18 p.m."]
Attribute for Verification: [datasource: "flightview"]
Question: Is there an error in the value of the "datasource" attribute?
Choose your answer from: [Yes, No]
Response:
No

Rayyan – 1st Example

Instruction:

Record [article_title: "A re-appraisal of screening for colour vision impairments", article_language: "nan", journal_title: "Child: Care, Health & Development", journal_abbreviation: "nan", journal_issn: "0305-1862", article_jvolumn: "23", article_jissue: "5", article_jcreated_at: "1/1/97", article_pagination: "391-398", author_list: "D. M. B. Hall", "E. Holroyd"]

Attribute for Verification: [journal_abbreviation: "nan"]

Question: Is there an error in the value of the "journal_abbreviation" attribute?

Choose your answer from: [Yes, No]

Response:

Yes

Rayyan – 2nd Example

Instruction:

Record [article_title: "Nurturing students' interest in primary care research through summer training in meta-analysis.", article_language: "eng", journal_title: "Academic Medicine: Journal Of The Association Of American Medical Colleges", journal_abbreviation: "nan", journal_issn: "1040-2446", article_jvolumn: "76", article_jissue: "5", article_jcreated_at: "5/1/01", article_pagination: "526", author_list: "L N Meurer"]

Attribute for Verification: [article_jissue: "5"]

Question: Is there an error in the value of the "article_jissue" attribute?

Choose your answer from: [Yes, No]

Response:

No

Rayyan – 3rd Example

Instruction:

Record [article_title: "Different renal toxicity profiles in the association of cyclosporine and tacrolimus with sirolimus in rats.", article_language: "eng", journal_title: "Nephrology, dialysis, transplantation : official publication of the European Dialysis and Transplant Association - European Renal Association", journal_abbreviation: "Nephrol. Dial. Transplant.", journal_issn: "1460-2385", article_jvolumn: "23", article_jissue: "10", article_jcreated_at: "10/1/08", article_pagination: "3111-9", author_list: "N\u033cria Lloberas", "Marcel la Franquesa", "Josep M Cruzado", "Josep M Griny\u033d", "In\u0329s Rama", "Gabriela Alperovich", "Immaculada Herrero-Fresneda", "Joan Torras", "Pepita Gim\u0329nez-Bonaf\u0329"]

Attribute for Verification: [article_pagination: "3111-9"]

Question: Is there an error in the value of the "article_pagination" attribute?

Choose your answer from: [Yes, No]

Response:

Yes

C.0.2 Data Imputation

The few-shot examples for the Flikpkart and Phone datasets are given as follows.

Flipkart – 1st Example

Instruction:

Record: [Product Name: "Himmlisch ST381 Magnetic Sun Shade For Maruti Alto", description: "Himmlisch ST381 Magnetic Sun Shade For Maruti Alto (Side Window) Price: Rs. 1,899 Beat the heat this summer and feel like a VIP with Himmlisch Car Window Magnetic Sunshades. These magnetic sunshades create a mesh layer to stops the heat. Magnet border gets easily stick to your car window door edges (No need of Suction cups) Features: Block UV Rays Keeps Car Cool Easy to install and remove Durable and Exact Fit Provides Complete privacy Resists Heat Mesh Type Sunshade Package Contents: 1 x Set Of 4 Magnetic Sunshades, Specifications of Himmlisch ST381 Magnetic Sun Shade For Maruti Alto (Side Window) General Brand Himmlisch Model Number ST381 Magnetic Placement Position Side Window Color Black Dimensions Weight 4000 g Depth 1.1 cm In the Box Sales Package 4 Sun Shade Pack of 4"]
Based on the provided product record, what would you infer is the value for the missing attribute "brand"?

Answer the name of the brand.

Response:
Himmlisch

Flipkart – 2nd Example

Instruction:

Record: [Product Name: "dilli bazaaar Bellies, Corporate Casuals, Casuals", description: "Key Features of dilli bazaaar Bellies, Corporate Casuals, Casuals Material: Fabric Occasion: Ethnic, Casual, Party, Formal Color: Pink Heel Height: 0, Specifications of dilli bazaaar Bellies, Corporate Casuals, Casuals General Occasion Ethnic, Casual, Party, Formal Ideal For Women Shoe Details Weight 200 g (per single Shoe) - Weight of the product may vary depending on size. Heel Height 0 inch Outer Material Fabric Color Pink"]
Based on the provided product record, what would you infer is the value for the missing attribute "brand"?

Answer the name of the brand.

Response:
dilli bazaaar

Flipkart – 3rd Example

Instruction:

Record: [Product Name: "Shining Diva Alloy Yellow Gold Bangle Set", description: "Shining Diva Alloy Yellow Gold Bangle Set (Pack of 2) Price: Rs. 499 Accentuate Your Feminine Charm Wearing This Beautiful Bangle From The House Of Shining Diva. Made From Premium Quality Material, It Will Retain Its Quality And Lustre For Years To Come. This Bangle Is Lightweight And Skin Friendly. Featuring A Stylish Design And Great Finish, It Will Definitely Give Your Overall Look An Ethereal Dimension. This Bangle Will Surely Catch Your Fancy At Once. It Is Worth Investing In And Will Definitely Get You Noticed. This Bangle Comes In A Set Of Two. Accentuate Your Feminine Charm Wearing This Beautiful Bangle From The House Of Shining Diva. Made From Premium Quality Material, It Will Retain Its Quality And Lustre For Years To Come. This Bangle Is Lightweight And Skin Friendly. Featuring A Stylish Design And Great Finish, It Will Definitely Give Your Overall Look An Ethereal Dimension. This Bangle Will Surely Catch Your Fancy At Once. It Is Worth Investing In And Will Definitely Get You Noticed. This angle Comes In A Set Of Two."]

Based on the provided product record, what would you infer is the value for the missing attribute "brand"?

Answer the name of the brand.

Response:

Shining Diva

Phone – 1st Example

Instruction:

Record: Record: [Product Name: "UNLOCKED RIM BlackBerry Pearl Flip 8220 Smart Cell Phone - Red"]

Based on the provided cellphone record, what would you infer is the value for the missing attribute "brand"?

Answer the name of the brand.

Response:

BlackBerry

Phone – 2nd Example

Instruction:

Record: [Product Name: "OtterBox Apple iPhone 4 & 4S Protective ION Defender Series Case (Retail Packaging) Black"]

Based on the provided cellphone record, what would you infer is the value for the missing attribute "brand"?

Answer the name of the brand.

Response:

OtterBox

Phone – 3rd Example

Instruction:

Record: [Product Name: "DTECH @ 2 PECES! Universal Ring Grip/Stand Holder for any Smart Device, Universal Black Bunker Ring Stand Holder for Apple iPhone 4 4s iphone 5 Samsung Galaxy s3 SIII Samsung GALAXY S6,S6 EDGE.Note II iPad 2 3 ipad mini iPod Nokia LG HTC One X etc,RING Essentials " Cell Phone and Tablets Anti Drop Ring for iPhone 6 plus iPad mini iPad2 iPad iPod Samsung GALAXY NOTE S5 Universal Mobile Devices"]

Based on the provided cellphone record, what would you infer is the value for the missing attribute "brand"?

Answer the name of the brand.

Response:

DTECH

C.0.3 Schema Matching

The few-shot examples for the CMS dataset are given as follows.

CMS – 1st Example

Instruction:

Attribute A is [name: "condition_occurrence-condition_source_value", description: "the source code for the condition as it appears in the source data. this code is mapped to a standard condition concept in the standardized vocabularies and the original code is stored here for reference."]

Attribute B is [name: "inpatientclaims-admtng.icd9_dgns_cd", description: "claim admitting diagnosis code"]

Are Attribute A and Attribute B semantically equivalent?

Choose your answer from: [Yes, No]

Response:

Yes

CMS – 2nd Example

Instruction:

Attribute A is [name: "provider-npi", description: "the national provider identifier (npi) of the provider."]

Attribute B is [name: "outpatientclaims-op_physn_npi", description: "operating physician – national provider identifier number"]

Are Attribute A and Attribute B semantically equivalent?

Choose your answer from: [Yes, No]

Response:

Yes

CMS – 3rd Example

Instruction:

Attribute A is [name: "visit_detail-visit_detail_start_datetime", description: "the date and time of the visit started."]

Attribute B is [name: "outpatientclaims-desynpuf_id", description: "beneficiary code"]

Are Attribute A and Attribute B semantically equivalent?

Choose your answer from: [Yes, No]

Response:

No

C.0.4 Entity Matching

The few-shot examples for the Abt-Buy and Walmart-Amazon datasets are given as follows.

Abt-Buy – 1st Example

Instruction:

Product A: [name: "samsung s3 black multimedia player yps3jab", description: "samsung s3 black multimedia player yps3jab 4 gb internal flash memory 1.8 ' tft lcd display touch-sensitive led controls multi-formats support dnse 2.0 sound engine fm tuner and recorder with presets up to 25 hours audio playback up to 4 hours video playback black finish"]

Product B: [name: "samsung 4gb portable mltimdia plyr blk yps-s3jab / xaa", description: "nan"]

Are Product A and Product B the same Product?

Choose your answer from: [Yes, No]

Response:

Yes

Abt-Buy – 2nd Example

Instruction:

Product A: [name: "sony white 8 ' portable dvd player dvpfx820w", description: "sony dvp-fx820 white 8 ' portable dvd player dvpfx820w swivel & flip screen with dual sensor for remote control control buttons on screen bezel 12 bit video dac with 108 mhz processing removable , rechargeable battery & car adapter included white finish"]

Product B: [name: "toshiba sd-p71s portable dvd player", description: "toshiba sd-p71s 7 ' portable dvd player"]

Are Product A and Product B the same Product?

Choose your answer from: [Yes, No]

Response:

No

Abt-Buy – 3rd Example

Instruction:

Product A: [name: "sony xplod 10-disc add-on cd/mp3 changer cdx565mærf", description: "sony xplod 10-disc add-on cd/mp3 changer cdx565mærf cd/cd-r/cd-rw and mp3 playback mp3 decoding d-bass 12-second advanced electronic shock protection fm modulator 9 modulation frequencies wireless remote"]

Product B: [name: "sony cdx-565mærf 10-disc cd/mp3 changer", description: "nan"]

Are Product A and Product B the same Product?

Choose your answer from: [Yes, No] ### Response:

Yes

Walmart-Amazon – 1st Example

Instruction:

Product A: [name: "d-link dgs-1005g 5-port gigabit desktop switch", modelno: "dgs1005g"]

Product B: [name: "d-link dgs-1005g 5-port gigabit desktop switch", modelno: "dgs-1005g"]

Are Product A and Product B the same Product?

Choose your answer from: [Yes, No]

Response:

Yes

Walmart-Amazon – 2nd Example

Instruction:

Product A: [name: "nzxt phantom crafted series atx full tower steel chassis black", modelno: "nzxt phantom"]

Product B: [name: "nzxt crafted series atx full tower steel chassis - phantom white", modelno: "phantom white"]

Are Product A and Product B the same Product?

Choose your answer from: [Yes, No]

Response:

No

Walmart-Amazon – 3rd Example

Instruction:

Product A: [name: "at t prepaid gophone samsung a187 with bluetooth blue", modelno: "a187"]

Product B: [name: "samsung a107 prepaid gophone at t", modelno: "a107"]

Are Product A and Product B the same Product?

Choose your answer from: [Yes, No]

Response:

No

D Prompts

For instruction data, we show the prompt for each task, using one dataset as an example. Then, we show the prompt for reasoning data, which slightly differs from instruction data. The prompts for inference are the same as DP-tuning, except that dataset-specific knowledge is optional. The prompts for reasoning ground truth collection and head-to-head judge are used for GPT-4.

Instruction Data – ED (Adult)

(system message) You are an AI assistant that follows instruction extremely well. User will give you a question. Your task is to answer as faithfully as you can.

(task description) Your task is to determine if there is an error in the value of a specific attribute within the whole record provided. The attributes may include age, workclass, education, marital status, occupation, relationship, race, sex, hours per week, country, and income.

(injected knowledge) Errors may include, but are not limited to, spelling errors, inconsistencies, or values that don't make sense given the context of the whole record.

(instance content) Record [age: "18-21", workclass: "Private", education: "Some-college", maritalstatus: "Never-married", occupation: "Other-service", relationship: "Own-child", race: "White", sex: "Male", hoursperweek: "30", country: "United-States", income: "eLssThan50K"]

Attribute for Verification: [income: "eLssThan50K"]

(question) Is there an error in the value of the "income" attribute?

(output format) Choose your answer from: [Yes, No]

Instruction Data – DI (Restaurant)

(system message) You are an AI assistant that follows instruction extremely well. User will give you a question. Your task is to answer as faithfully as you can.

(task description) You are presented with a restaurant record that is missing a specific attribute: the city. Your task is to deduce or infer the city of the restaurant using the available information in the record. You may be provided with fields like 'Name', 'Address', 'Phone', and 'Type' to help you in the inference.

(instance content) Record: [name: "darbar", addr: "44 w. 56th st.", phone: "212-432-7227", type: "indian"].

(question) Based on the provided restaurant record, what would you infer is the value for the missing attribute "City"?

(output format) Answer the name of the city.

Instruction Data – SM (MIMIC-III)

(system message) You are an AI assistant that follows instruction extremely well. User will give you a question. Your task is to answer as faithfully as you can.

(task description) Your task is to determine if the two attributes (columns) are semantically equivalent in the context of merging two tables. Each attribute will be described by its name and a brief description. Your goal is to assess if they refer to the same information based on these names and descriptions provided.

(instance content) Attribute A is [name: "visit_occurrence-visit_end_date", description: "the end date of the visit. if this is a one-day visit the end date should match the start date."].

Attribute B is [name: "admissions-dischtime", description: "dischtime provides the date and time the patient was discharged from the hospital."].

(question) Are Attribute A and Attribute B semantically equivalent?

(output format) Choose your answer from: [Yes, No]

Instruction Data – EM (Beer)

(system message) You are an AI assistant that follows instruction extremely well. User will give you a question. Your task is to answer as faithfully as you can.

(task description) You are tasked with determining whether two Products listed below are the same based on the information provided. Carefully compare all the attributes before making your decision.

(injected knowledge) Note that missing values (N/A or "nan") should not be used as a basis for your decision.

(instance content) Product A: [name: "Sequoia American Amber Ale", factory: "Wig And Pen"]

Product B: [name: "Aarhus Cains Triple A American Amber Ale", factory: "Aarhus Bryghus"]

(question) Are Product A and Product B the same Product?

(output format) Choose your answer from: [Yes, No]

Reasoning Data

(system message) [same as Instruction Data] While answering, provide detailed explanation and justify your answer.

(task description – question) [same as Instruction Data]

(output format) After your reasoning, finish your response in a separate line with and ONLY with your final answer. Choose your final answer from [Yes, No].

Reasoning Ground Truth Collection

(system message – output format) [same as Reasoning Data]

(injected knowledge) Note that different factories can belong to the same parent company. The company name of Product B may occur in its product name.

(answer hint) You can use the "Hint" below, but your response cannot contain any information from it.

Hint: the final answer is "No"

Head-to-Head Judge

(task description) You will evaluate the responses from two different AI models to determine which one is better.

Along with the responses, you will be provided with the original instruction that was given to both models.

Provide your analysis to compare and contrast the responses based on the original instruction. Based on your analysis, decide which model performed better. Conclude your evaluation by clearly stating the winner's name on a separate line at the end of your response.

(DP task) Original instruction: [original task instruction]

(models' responses) Model 1: [response from Model 1]

Model 2: [response from Model 2]