

How to reduce the search space of Entity Resolution: with Blocking or Nearest Neighbor search? [Experiment, Analysis & Benchmark Papers]

George Papadakis¹, Marco Fisichella², Franziska Schoger², George Mandilaras¹,
Nikolaus Augsten³, Wolfgang Nejdl²

¹National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Greece {gpapadis, gmandi}@di.uoa.gr

²L3S Research Center, Germany {mfisichella, schoger, nejdl}@l3s.de

³University of Salzburg, Austria nikolaus.augsten@sbg.ac.at

ABSTRACT

Entity Resolution suffers from quadratic time complexity. To increase its time efficiency, three kinds of filtering techniques are typically used for restricting its search space: (i) *blocking workflows*, which group together entity profiles with identical or similar signatures, (ii) *string similarity join algorithms*, which quickly detect entities more similar than a threshold, and (iii) *nearest-neighbor methods*, which convert every entity profile into a vector and quickly detect the closest entities according to the specified distance function. Numerous methods have been proposed for each type, but the literature lacks a comparative analysis of their relative performance. As we show in this work, this is a non-trivial task, due to the significant impact of configuration parameters on the performance of each filtering technique. We perform the first systematic experimental study that investigates the relative performance of the main methods per type over 10 real-world datasets. For each method, we consider a plethora of parameter configurations, optimizing it with respect to recall and precision. For each dataset, we consider both schema-agnostic and schema-based settings. The experimental results provide novel insights into the effectiveness and time efficiency of the considered techniques, demonstrating the superiority of blocking workflows and string similarity joins.

PVLDB Reference Format: George Papadakis, Marco Fisichella, Franziska Schoger, George Mandilaras, Nikolaus Augsten, Wolfgang Nejdl. How to reduce the search space of Entity Resolution? With Blocking or Nearest Neighbor search? PVLDB, 14(1): XXX-XXX, 2020. doi:XX.XX/XXX.XX

1 INTRODUCTION

Entity Resolution (ER) is a well-studied problem that aims to identify so-called *duplicates* or *matches*, i.e., different entity profiles that describe the same real-world object [26]. ER constitutes a crucial task in a number of data integration tasks, which range from Link Discovery for interlinking the sources of the Linked Open Data Cloud to data analytics, query answering, object-oriented searching and data evolution [13, 18, 21].

This work is licensed under the Creative Commons BY-NC-ND 4.0 International License. Visit <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/> to view a copy of this license. For any use beyond those covered by this license, obtain permission by emailing info@vldb.org. Copyright is held by the owner/author(s). Publication rights licensed to the VLDB Endowment.

Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment, Vol. 14, No. 1 ISSN 2150-8097.
doi:XX.XX/XXX.XX

Due to its quadratic time complexity, ER typically scales to large data through the Filtering-Verification framework [13, 26]. The first step (*filtering*) constitutes a coarse-grained, rapid phase that restricts the computational cost to the most promising matches, a.k.a. *candidate pairs*. This is followed by the *verification* step, which analytically examines every candidate pair in order to decide whether its constituent entity profiles are duplicates or not.

Verification is called *matching* in the ER literature [13, 15, 18]. Numerous matching methods have been proposed, with their majority relying on similarity functions that compare the textual values of entity profiles [13, 15, 18, 51]. Early attempts were rule-based, comparing similarity values with thresholds, but more recent techniques rely on learning, i.e., they usually model matching as a binary classification task (match, non-match) [51]. Using a labelled training dataset, (semi-)supervised, active, and deep learning techniques are adapted to ER [5]. In some cases, a clustering step is subsequently applied on the resulting similarity scores in order to refine the output [29].

In this work, we are interested in filtering methods, which significantly reduce the search space of ER. The performance of a filtering technique is assessed along three dimensions: recall, precision, and runtime efficiency. A good filter stands out by:

- (1) High recall. The candidate pairs involve as many duplicates as possible, thus limiting the impact on verification's recall.
- (2) High precision. The candidate pairs involve as few false positives (i.e., non-matching pairs) as possible. The higher precision is, the higher is the reduction in the search space.
- (3) High time efficiency, so that the overhead of filtering on the overall run-time of ER is limited.

Ideally, filtering should also be directly applicable to the input data. For this reason, we exclusively consider methods that require no labelled training instances, which often are not available or expensive to produce [59].

The filtering methods can be organized in three main types [54]:

- (1) The *blocking methods* extract one or more signatures from every entity profile and form clusters of profiles with identical or similar signatures [13, 14, 55].
- (2) The *string similarity join* methods identify quickly pairs of profiles that exceed a specific similarity threshold [31, 42].
- (3) The *nearest neighbor (NN) methods* index part or all of the input data and treat every entity profile as a query, to which they return the most similar candidates [4].

Although the three types of filtering techniques in part follow very different approaches, they all receive the same input (the entity profiles) and produce the same kind of output (candidate pairs).

To the best of our knowledge, no previous work systematically examines the relative performance of these three different kinds of methods. Previous works examine each type independently: the main blocking methods are empirically evaluated in [14, 49, 55], the string similarity joins in [23, 31, 42], and the NN methods in [4]. Note that all studies on string similarity joins and NN methods are independent of ER, as explained in Section 2. Note also that in some of the previous works, a representative blocking method is used as baseline method for an NN method, e.g., Standard/Token Blocking is compared to DeepBlocker in [59]. Typically, though, the blocking method is treated as an independent approach, instead of a part of a blocking workflow, as is common in the literature [55].

Most importantly, comparing techniques from different categories is a challenging, non-trivial task, because of their fundamentally different functionality, which involves a diversity of configuration parameters that significantly affect their performance. Yet, there is *no* systematic fine-tuning approach that is generic enough to apply to all filter methods. For example, the step-by-step configuration optimization proposed in [55] applies to blocking pipelines, but not to the single-stage similarity joins and NN methods.

In this work, we perform the first thorough and systematic experimental study that covers all three types of filtering methods. To ensure a fair comparison, every approach is represented by its best performance per dataset, as it is determined after an exhaustive fine-tuning with respect to a common performance target that considers several thousand different parameter configurations. This approach is applied to 5 blocking workflows, 3 string similarity join algorithms and 6 NN methods over 10 real-world datasets. For each type of methods, we also consider at least one baseline method with default parameter configuration. In each dataset, we consider both *schema-agnostic* and *schema-based settings*: the former take into account all information within an entity, essentially treating it as a long textual value, while the latter focus exclusively on the values of the most informative attribute.

Overall, we make the following contributions:

- We propose a configuration optimization task as a means of comparing all types of filtering methods on an equal basis.
- We present a qualitative analysis of the filtering methods for ER.
- We perform a thorough experimental analysis that systematically compares 14 state-of-the-art, fine-tuned filtering approaches and 4 baseline methods with default configurations over 10 real-world datasets and 2 schema settings – two methods, SCANN and kNN-Join, are applied to ER for the first time. The end results provide interesting insights into the behaviour of the considered techniques, with blocking workflows and string similarity joins consistently achieving the top performance. Among them, kNN-Join is the most usable, due to its intuitive configuration parameters.
- We have publicly released all our code and data¹.

The main part of the paper is structured as follows: Section 2 discusses the related works, while Section 3 provides background

knowledge on filtering and defines formally the configuration optimization task. We elaborate on the filtering methods in Section 4 and present their qualitative and quantitative analyses in Sections 5 and 6, respectively. Section 7 concludes with the main findings of our experimental analysis along with directions for future research.

2 RELATED WORK

There has been a plethora of works examining the relative performance of blocking methods. The earliest systematic studies were presented in [13, 14]. They focus exclusively on schema-based settings in combination with several user-defined parameter configurations. Most importantly, they solely consider the first step of blocking workflows, namely block building.

These studies were extended in [49], which examines the same block building methods and configurations, but applies them to schema-agnostic settings, too. The experimental outcomes suggest that recall raises significantly, when compared to the schema-based settings, while requiring no background knowledge about the given data and the quality of its schema. They also suggest that the sensitivity to parameter configuration is significantly reduced.

Building on these works, the experimental analysis in [55] examines the relative performance of the blocking workflows in schema-agnostic settings. In particular, it considers blocking workflows formed by exactly three steps: block building, block filtering and comparison cleaning. In our work, we extend this pipeline by adding block purging as a second step that further reduces the candidate pairs. We also treat block purging and filtering as optional steps, reporting the best performance among four different pipelines.

Another major difference is that [55] optimizes the configuration parameters in a step-by-step manner: first, the performance of block building is optimized and then, block filtering is fine-tuned by receiving as input the output of optimized block building as so on for comparison cleaning. In contrast, we consider a holistic approach to configuration optimization, fine-tuning all steps in a blocking workflow simultaneously. As explained in [53, 56], this approach consistently outperforms the step-by-step fine-tuning, because it considers a significantly larger set of possible configurations and because it is not confined to local maxima per workflow step.

We also go beyond [13, 14, 55, 55] in two more ways: (i) we systematically fine-tune blocking workflows in the context schema-based settings, and (ii) we compare blocking workflows with similarity joins and NN methods. Based on the results of [13, 14, 55, 55], we select the following top-performing methods for block building: Standard, (Extended) Q-Grams and (Extended) Suffix Arrays Blocking. For their configuration, we use the same parameters as in [55].

The relative performance of similarity join methods is examined in [23, 31, 42]. These analyses, though, exclusively evaluate the runtime performance of the main methods. Recall and precision are not considered, because they are identical across all approaches, i.e., all methods retrieve the same pairs of entities that exceed a similarity threshold. These pairs, which are not necessarily matching, have not been evaluated with respect to the recall and precision of ER. As a result, these studies are not useful in assessing the performance of string similarity joins for ER.

The state-of-the-art NN methods are experimentally compared in [4], but the evaluation measures are restricted to throughput,

¹See <https://github.com/scify/JedAIToolkit> for more details.

i.e., executed queries per second, and to recall, i.e., the portion of retrieved vectors that are indeed the nearest ones with respect to a specific distance function (e.g., the Euclidean one). This is different from ER recall, as the closest vectors are not necessarily matching. Based on this analysis, we select the following top-performing NN methods: Cross-polytope and Hyperplane LSH, FAISS and SCANN.

3 PRELIMINARIES

We define an entity profile e_i as the set of textual name-value pairs, i.e., $e_i = \{\langle n_j, v_j \rangle\}$, that describes a real-world object [49, 55]. This model covers most established data formats, such as the structured records in relational databases and the semi-structured instance descriptions in RDF data. Two entities, e_i and e_j , that pertain to the same real-world object ($e_i \equiv e_j$) are called *duplicates* or *matches*.

Entity Resolution is distinguished into two main tasks [13, 15]:

- (1) *Clean-Clean ER* or *Record Linkage*, which receives as input two sets of entity profiles, \mathcal{E}_1 and \mathcal{E}_2 that are individually duplicate-free, but overlapping, and
- (2) *Dirty ER* or *Deduplication*, whose input comprises a single set of entity profiles, \mathcal{E} , with duplicates in itself.

In both cases, the output consists of the detected duplicate profiles. Following [36, 45, 59], we exclusively consider Clean-Clean ER in the following, which also fits naturally to the index-query scheme of nearest neighbor search algorithms, as shown in Figure 2.

In this work, we focus on filtering methods, which receive as input \mathcal{E}_1 and \mathcal{E}_2 and produce a set of candidate pairs C , which are highly likely to be duplicates and should be analytically examined during the verification step. To measure the **effectiveness** of filtering, the following measures are typically used [14, 15, 20, 49, 55]:

- (1) *Pair Completeness (PC)* expresses *recall*, estimating the portion of the duplicate pairs in C with respect to those in the groundtruth: $PC(C, \mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2) = |\mathcal{D}(C)|/|\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{E}_1 \times \mathcal{E}_2)|$, where $\mathcal{D}(x)$ denotes the set of duplicates in set x .
- (2) *Pairs Quality (PQ)* captures *precision*, estimating the portion of comparisons in C that correspond to real duplicates: $PQ(C) = |\mathcal{D}(C)|/|C|$.

All measures result in values in the range $[0, 1]$, with higher values indicating higher effectiveness. Note that there is a trade-off between *PC* and *PQ*: the larger C is, the higher *PC* gets at the cost of lower *PQ*, and vice versa for a smaller set of candidates. The goal of filtering is to achieve a good balance between these measures.

In this context, we formalize the following configuration optimization task, which enables the comparison of fundamentally different filtering techniques on an equal basis:

PROBLEM 1 (CONFIGURATION OPTIMIZATION). *Given two sets of entity profiles, \mathcal{E}_1 and \mathcal{E}_2 , a filter method, and a threshold τ on the pair completeness (PC), configuration optimization fine-tunes the parameters of the filtering method such that the resulting set of candidates C on \mathcal{E}_1 and \mathcal{E}_2 maximizes PQ for $PC \geq \tau$.*

In this study, we chose $\tau = 0.9$ for the threshold on pair completeness. The reason we require high filtering recall is that it determines the final recall ER; the duplicate pairs that are not included in the set of candidates C cannot be detected by most matching methods, as they typically consider local information, e.g., the (deep) learning-based methods that treat matching as a binary classification task

[36, 45]. We could set a different limit for *PC*, e.g., 0.85 or 0.95, but we deem 0.9 as a good balance between those ER applications that focus on recall and those focusing on precision.

Regarding **time efficiency**, the *overall run-time (RT)* measures the time that intervenes between receiving the set(s) of entity profiles as input and producing the set of candidate pairs as output. *RT* should be minimized to restrict the overhead of filtering on ER.

4 FILTERING METHODS

4.1 The two paradigms of filtering

Blocking methods operate as follows: first, they associate every input entity with one or (usually) more signatures and then, they cluster together entities with identical or similar signatures into blocks. Every pair of entities that appears in at least one block is considered a matching candidate. The resulting blocks contain two unnecessary types of candidates in the sense that verifying them lowers precision, without any benefit for recall:

- (1) The *redundant* candidates are repeated across different blocks, because every entity typically participates in multiple ones and, thus, the blocks are overlapping.
- (2) The *superfluous* candidates consist of non-matching entities.

To eliminate the former and reduce the latter, Block and comparison cleaning are applied to the initial blocks, restructuring them based on global patterns. Figure 1 depicts the complete workflow for blocking [54]. Initially, a set of blocks is created by at least one Block Building method. The initial block collection is then processed by two coarse-grained block cleaning techniques, Block Purging and Block Filtering. Both produce a new, smaller block collection, B' and B'' , respectively, but are optional and can be omitted, e.g., in the case of schema-based blocks with low levels of redundant and/or superfluous comparisons. Finally, a comparison cleaning technique is applied, whose fine-grained functionality decides for individual comparisons whether they should be retained or discarded; in this step, redundant and superfluous candidates are subject to removal. This is a mandatory step, as at least the redundant comparisons should be removed.

A fundamentally different approach is followed by string similarity joins and NN methods. Instead of extracting signatures from the input entity profiles, they organize the input set \mathcal{E}_1 into an index I (e.g., an inverted index) and use the other dataset as a query set, as shown in Figure 2. This means that the set of candidate pairs C is formed by probing the index I for every entity profile $e_2 \in \mathcal{E}_2$ and aggregating all query results. To restrict the noise in this process, the textual attribute values are typically cleaned from stop-words and reduced them to their base/root form through lemmatization or stemming (e.g., “blocks” becomes “block”) [43]. The attribute values may also be transformed into (pre-trained) embeddings, i.e., into fixed-length, dense and distributed representations that give rise to semantic similarities [60]. These optional, preprocessing steps apply to both input sets of entity profiles. After cleaning, we get \mathcal{E}'_1 and \mathcal{E}'_2 , which remain in textual form, but after embedding, we get two sets of dense numeric vectors, $\mathcal{V}\mathcal{E}_1$ and $\mathcal{V}\mathcal{E}_2$, respectively.

Note that the blocking workflows produce redundant comparisons as intermediate results of block building, which are eliminated during comparison cleaning. In contrast, the other filtering methods




Figure 1: The complete blocking workflow. Dotted contours indicate optional steps.

do not produce redundant comparisons, as every query entity from \mathcal{E}_2 is associated with a set of indexed entities from \mathcal{E}_1 .

4.2 Blocking workflows

Block building. Based on the results of the past experimental studies [14, 49, 55], we consider the following established techniques:

1) *Standard Blocking.* Given an entity, it tokenizes the considered attribute values on whitespace and uses the resulting tokens as signatures. Hence, every block corresponds to a distinct token, involving all entities that contain it in the selected attribute value(s).

2) *Q-Grams Blocking.* To accommodate character-level errors, it defines as signatures the set of q -grams that are extracted from the tokens of Standard Blocking. In other words, every block corresponds to a distinct q -gram, encompassing all entities with that q -gram in any of the considered values.

3) *Extended Q-Grams Blocking.* Instead of individual q -grams, the signatures of this approach are constructed by concatenating at least L q -grams, where $L = \max(1, \lfloor k \cdot T \rfloor)$, k is the number of q -grams extracted from the original key/token and $T \in [0, 1)$ is a threshold that reduces the number of combinations as its value increases. Compared to Q-Grams Blocking, the resulting blocks are smaller, but contain candidate pairs that share more content.

4) *Suffix Arrays Blocking.* Another way of accommodating character-level errors in the signatures of Standard Blocking is to consider their suffixes, as long as they comprise a minimum number of characters l_{min} . In fact, every block corresponds to a token suffix that is longer than l_{min} and appears in less than b_{max} entities.

5) *Extended Suffix Arrays Blocking.* This approach generalizes the previous one by converting the signatures of Standard Blocking in all substrings longer than l_{min} and less frequent than b_{max} entities.

Example. To illustrate the difference between these blocking methods, consider as an example the attribute value “Joe Biden”. Standard Blocking produces 2 blocking keys: {Joe, Biden}. With $q = 3$, Q-Grams Blocking produces 4 keys: {Joe, Bid, ide, den}. For $T=0.9$, Extended Q-Grams Blocking combines at least two q -grams from each token, defining the following 5 blocking keys: {Joe, Bid_ide_den, Bid_ide, Bid_den, ide_den}. Using $l_{min}=3$ and a large enough b_{max} , Suffix Arrays Blocking yields 4 keys: {Joe, Biden, iden, den}, while Extended Suffix Arrays extracts 7 keys: {Joe, Biden, Bide, iden, Bid, ide, den}.

Note that we exclude Attribute Clustering Blocking [50], because it is incompatible with the schema-based settings we are considering in this work. Note also that we experimented with Sorted Neighborhood [13, 14, 49], but do not report its performance, since it consistently underperforms the above methods. The reason is that this method is incompatible with block and comparison cleaning techniques that could reduce its superfluous comparisons [54, 55].

Block cleaning. We consider two complementary methods:

1) *Block Purging* [50]. This parameter-free approach assumes that the larger a block is, the less likely it is to convey matching pairs




Figure 2: The complete workflow of similarity joins and NN methods. Dotted contours indicate optional steps.

that share no other block. Such blocks emanate from signatures that are stop-words. Therefore, it removes the largest blocks (e.g., those containing more than half the input entities) in order to significantly increase precision at a negligible (if any) cost in recall.

2) *Block Filtering* [49]. It assumes that for a particular entity e , its largest blocks are less likely to associate e with its matching entity. For every entity e , it orders its blocks in increasing size and retains it in $r\%$ of the top (smaller) ones – r is called filtering ratio. This increases precision to a significant extent for slightly lower recall.

Comparison cleaning. We consider two established methods, but only one of them can be applied in a blocking workflow, as in [55]:

1) *Comparison Propagation* [50]. This parameter-free approach removes all redundant pairs from any block collection without missing any matches, i.e., it increases precision at no cost in recall. In essence, it associates every entity with the list of its block ids and retains every candidate pair only in the block with least common id.

2) *Meta-blocking* [52]. It targets both redundant and superfluous comparisons using (i) a *weighting scheme*, which associates every candidate pair with a numerical score proportional to the matching likelihood that is extracted from the blocks shared by its constituent entities, and (ii) a *pruning algorithm*, which leverages these scores to decide which candidate pairs will be retained in the restructured block collection that is returned as output.

The rationale behind weighting schemes is that the more and smaller blocks two entities share (i.e., the more and less frequent signatures they share), the more likely they are to be matching. In this context, the following schemes have been proposed [52, 54, 58]: ARCS promotes pairs that share smaller blocks; CBS counts the blocks the two entities have in common; ECBS extends CBS by discounting the contribution of entities participating in many blocks; JS computes the Jaccard coefficient of the block ids associated with the two entities; EJS extends JS by discounting the contribution of entities participating in many non-redundant pairs; χ^2 estimates to which degree the two entities appear independently in blocks.

The following pruning algorithms have been proposed in the literature [52, 58]: BLAST retains a pair if its weight exceeds the average maximum weight of its constituent entities; CEP and CNP retain the overall top-K pairs and the top-k pairs per entity, respectively (K and k are automatically configured according to input blocks characteristics); Reciprocal CNP (RCNP) requires that every retained pair is ranked in the top-k positions of both constituent entities; WEP discards all pairs with a weight lower than the overall average one; WNP keeps only pairs with a weight higher than the average one of at least one of their entities; Reciprocal WNP (RWNP) requires a weight higher than the average of both entities.

4.3 String similarity joins

Set- or token-based similarity joins. This family of approaches represents each input entity by a set of so-called *tokens*; the similarity of two entities is assessed as the similarity of their token sets. The similarity between two sets A and B may be computed using

one of the following normalized measures [42] (value range $[0, 1]$):

- (1) Cosine similarity $C(A, B) = |A \cap B| / \sqrt{|A| \cdot |B|}$.
- (2) Dice similarity $D(A, B) = 2 \cdot |A \cap B| / (|A| + |B|)$.
- (3) Jaccard coefficient $J(A, B) = |A \cap B| / |A \cup B|$.

The tokens are extracted from string attributes (the concatenation of all attribute values in the schema-agnostic settings) by considering the character n -grams [27] (as in Q-Grams Blocking) or by splitting the strings on whitespace (as in Standard Blocking). Duplicate tokens within one string are either ignored or de-duplicated by attaching a counter to each token [3] (e.g., $\{a, a, b\} \rightarrow \{a_1, a_2, b_1\}$).

Candidate pairs are formed based on the similarity of two entities according to some *matching principles* [2]. The matching principle defines the policy for forming candidate pairs. We consider two well-known matching principles in combination with all the aforementioned similarity measures and tokenization schemes [57]:

1) *Range join (ϵ -Join)* [57]. It pairs all entities that have a similarity no smaller than a user-defined threshold ϵ . Numerous efficient algorithms for ϵ -Join between two collections of token sets have been proposed [6, 9, 12, 16, 17, 42, 62, 68]. All of these techniques produce the exact same set of candidates, but most of them are crafted for high similarity thresholds (above 0.5), which is not the case in ER, as shown in Table 9. For this reason, we employ *ScanCount* [39], which is suitable for low similarity thresholds. In essence, it builds an inverted list on all tokens in token set collection B and for lookup of a query token set $a \in A$, it performs merge-counts on the posting lists of all tokens in a . Then, it returns all sets that exceed the similarity threshold ϵ .

2) *k -nearest-neighbor join (k NN-Join)* [57]. Given two collections, A and B , it pairs each element in $a \in A$ with the k most similar elements in B that have distinct similarity values, i.e., a may be paired with more than k elements if some of these elements are equidistant from a . The k NN-Join is not commutative, i.e., the order of the join partners matters. An efficient technique that leverages an inverted list on tokens that are partitioned into size stripes is the *Cone* algorithm [35], which is crafted for label sets in the context of top- k subtree similarity queries. To increase the limited scope of the original algorithm, we adapted it to leverage ScanCount.

Note that the so-called top- k set similarity joins [61, 63] compute the k token set pairs between A and B with the highest similarities among all possible pairs. This means that they perform a global join that returns the k top-weighted pairs. In principle, this is equivalent to ϵ -Join, if the k^{th} has a similarity equal to ϵ . Instead, the k NN-Join performs a local join that returns at least k pairs per element $a \in A$.
Edit-based similarity joins. A well-known similarity measure between strings is the *edit distance* [47] (also known as Levenshtein distance), which is the minimum number of character insertions, deletions, or renames that transforms one string into the other. Computing the edit distance has quadratic runtime in the length of the strings. Join techniques for the edit distance strive to avoid edit distance computations by leveraging indices and filters [65]. In our experiments, we use *PassJoin* [40], which is the state-of-the-art [31].

4.4 Nearest-neighbor (NN) methods

LSH. Locality Sensitive Hashing [24, 30] constitutes an established solution to the approximate nearest neighbor problem in high-dimensional spaces. Its goal is to find entities/vectors that are within

$c \cdot R$ distance from a query vector, where $c > 1$ is a real number that represents a user-specified approximation ratio, while R is the maximum distance of any nearest neighbor vector from the query. LSH is commonly used as a filtering technique for ER [19, 33, 34, 67] because of its sub-linear query performance, which is coupled with a fast and small index maintenance, and its mathematical guarantee on the query accuracy. We consider three popular versions:

1) *Hyperplane LSH (HP-LSH)* [11]. The vectors are assumed to lie on a unit hypersphere divided by a random hyperplane at the center, formed from a random direction r and the positioning of the hypersphere with a line perpendicular to the direction r and through the center. This creates two equal parts of the hypersphere with $+1$ on the one side and -1 on the other. A vector v is hashed into $h(v) = \text{sgn} \langle r, v \rangle$. For two vectors v_1 and v_2 with angle α between them, the probability of collision is $\Pr[h(v_1) = h(v_2)] = 1 - \frac{\alpha}{\pi}$.

2) *Cross-Polytope LSH (CP-LSH)* [22]. It is a generalization of HP-LSH. At their core, both HP- and CP-LSH are random spatial partitions of a d -dimensional unit sphere centered at the origin. The two hash families differ in how granular these partitions are. The cross-polytope is also known as an l_1 -unit ball, where all vectors on the surface of the cross-polytope have the l_1 -norm. In CP-LSH, the hash value is the vertex of the cross-polytope closest to the (randomly) rotated vector. Thus, a cross-polytope hash function partitions the unit sphere according to the Voronoi cells of the vertices of a randomly rotated cross-polytope. In the 1-dimensional case, the cross-polytope hash becomes the hyperplane LSH family.

3) *MinHash LSH (MH-LSH)* [10, 38]. Given two token sets, this approach approximates their Jaccard coefficient by representing each set as a minhash, i.e., a sequence of hash values that are derived from the minimum values of random permutations. The minhashes are decomposed into a series of bands consisting of an equal number of rows. This decomposition has a direct impact on performance: if there are few bands with many rows, there will be collisions between pairs of objects with a very high Jaccard similarity; in contrast, when there are many bands with few rows, collisions occur between pairs of objects with very low similarity. The selected number of bands ($\#bands$) and rows ($\#rows$) approximates a step function, i.e., a high-pass filter, which indicates the probability that two objects share the same hash value: $(1/\#bands)^{(\#rows)}$.

kNN-Search. We consider three popular frameworks:

1) *FAISS* [32]. This framework provides methods for k NN searches². Given two sets of (embedding) vectors, it associates every entry q from the query set with the k entries from the indexed set that have the smallest distance to q . Two approximate methods are provided: a hierarchical, navigable small world graph method and a cell probing method with Voronoi cells, possibly in combination with product quantization. We experimented with both of them, but they do not outperform the exhaustive search (Flat index) with respect to Problem 1. The Flat index is also recommended by [32], as most of our datasets involve less than 20,000 entities. For these reasons, we exclude the approximate methods in the following.

2) *SCANN* [28]. This is another versatile framework with very high throughput. Two are the main similarity measures it supports: dot product and Euclidean distance. It also supports two types

²FAISS also supports range, i.e., similarity, search. However, our experiments showed that it consistently underperforms k NN search. For this reason, we exclude it from our analysis.

Table 1: The scope per type of filtering methods.

Scope		Blocking	Similarity Joins		NN methods	
			Set-based	Edit-based	Sparse vectors	Dense vectors
Syntactic Representation	Schema-based	✓	✓	✓	✓	-
	Schema-agnostic	✓	✓	-	✓	-
Semantic Representation	Schema-based	-	-	-	-	✓
	Schema-agnostic	-	-	-	-	✓

of scoring: brute-force, which performs exact computations, and asymmetric hashing, which performs approximate computations, trading higher efficiency for slightly lower accuracy. In all cases, SCANN leverages partitioning, splitting the indexed dataset into disjoint sets during training so that every query is answered by applying scoring to the most relevant partitions.

3) *DeepBlocker* [59]. It is the most recent method based on deep learning, consistently outperforms all others, e.g., *AutoBlock* [67] and *DeepER* [19]. It converts attribute values into embedding vectors using *fastText* and performs indexing and querying with *FAISS*. Its novelty lies in the tuple embedding module, which converts the set of embeddings associated with an individual entity into a representative vector. Several different modules are supported, with the Autoencoder constituting the most effective one under the schema-based settings. In the schema-agnostic settings, the top-performing is the Hybrid module, which couples Autoencoder with cross-tuple training, with the Autoencoder lying in close distance.

5 QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS

Taxonomies. To facilitate the use and understanding of the above techniques, we organize them into two novel taxonomies.

The first one pertains to *scope*, i.e., the entity representation that lies at the core of every filtering method. There are two types:

- (1) The *syntactic or symbolic representations* consider the actual text in an entity profile, leveraging the co-occurrences of tokens or characters.
- (2) The *semantic representations* consider the embedding vectors that encapsulate a textual value, leveraging word-, character- or transformer-based models. In this work, we exclusively consider the unsupervised, pre-trained embeddings of *fastText* [8] that have been experimentally verified to effectively address the out-of-vocabulary cases in ER tasks, which abound in domain-specific terminology [25, 46, 59, 64, 66].

These types can be combined with both schema-based and schema-agnostic settings, yielding four fields of scope, as shown in Table 1.

The distinctions introduced by this taxonomy are crucial for two reasons: (i) the syntactic representations have the advantage of producing intelligible and interpretable models. That is, it is straightforward to justify a candidate pair, unlike the semantic representations, whose interpretation is obscure to non-experts. (ii) the semantic representations involve a considerable overhead for transforming the textual values into embeddings, even when using pre-trained models. They also require external resources, which are typically loaded in main memory, thus increasing the space complexity. Instead, the methods using syntactic representations are directly applicable to the input data.

We observe that the NN methods have the broadest scope, being compatible with all four combinations. The syntactic representations are covered by the sparse numeric vectors of *MinHash LSH*;

Table 2: The functionality per non-blocking filtering method.

Operation	Similarity Threshold	Cardinality Threshold
Deterministic	ϵ -Join, edit-based Join	kNN-Join, <i>FAISS</i> , <i>SCANN</i>
Stochastic	MH-, HP-, CP-LSH	<i>DeepBlocker</i>

its dimensions correspond to character k -grams, called *k-shingles*, and are weighted according to their term frequency [38]. All other NN methods employ semantic representations in the form of the dense numeric vectors that are derived from *fastText*.

In contrast, the edit-based similarity joins have the most narrow scope, as they are compatible only with schema-based syntactic representations. They cannot be applied to the schema-agnostic ones, because of the arbitrary order of words: the attribute values are concatenated into a long text in no particular order and, thus, two consecutive words might originate from different attributes, having no semantic relation. This violates the core assumption of edit-based joins, because they are sensitive to the order of tokens and characters. For example, the distance of “John Smith” from “Smith John” is the same (10 edits) as that from the random string “xYXS1.fklt”. Further, the length difference of the strings has a major impact on the edit distance, because missing characters must be inserted. For example, “John” is more similar to “Mike” (4 edits) than to “John Smith” (6 edits). Therefore, edit-based techniques are not effective in schema-agnostic settings, where the length of strings that should be similar may vary to a great extent. Instead, they are more suitable for comparing short textual values that correspond to a specific attribute, e.g., to detect typos.

In the middle of these two extremes lie the blocking methods and the set-based similarity joins, which cover both settings of syntactic similarities, being agnostic to the word order in attribute values.

The second taxonomy pertains to the internal functionality of filtering methods. The blocking techniques are already distinguished into *lazy* and *proactive* ones [55]. The former impose no restrictions on the blocks resulting from their signatures and rely on generic block and comparison cleaning techniques in order to refine their candidates. To this category belong *Standard* and *(Extended) Q-Grams Blocking*. In contrast, the proactive methods impose restrictions on their blocks so as to produce a better set of candidates already from the block building phase. This is the case with *(Extended) Suffix Arrays Blocking*, which sets an upper bound on the size of blocks (b_{max}). In general, the lazy methods are simpler than the proactive ones, which require fine-tuning more parameters.

For the rest of the filtering methods, we define the taxonomy in Table 2, which comprises two dimensions:

- (1) The *type of operation*, which can be deterministic, lacking any randomness, or stochastic, relying on randomness.
- (2) The *type of threshold*, which can be similarity- or cardinality- based. The former specifies the minimum similarity of candidate pairs, while the latter determines the maximum number of candidates per query entity.

The distinctions introduced by this taxonomy are important for two reasons: (i) The stochastic methods yield slightly different results in each run, unlike the deterministic ones, which yield a stable performance. This is crucial in the context of Problem 1, which sets a specific limit on a particular evaluation measure. For this reason, we set the performance of stochastic methods as the average one after 10 repetitions. (ii) The configuration of cardinality-based

Table 3: The configuration space per blocking workflow.

	Parameter	Domain
Common	Block Purging (<i>BP</i>)	{-, ✓}
	Block Filtering ratio (<i>BFR</i>)	[0.025, 1.00] with a step of 0.025
	Weighting Scheme (<i>WS</i>)	{ARCS, CBS, ECBS, JS, EJS, χ^2 }
	Pruning Algorithm (<i>PA</i>)	CP or {BLAST, CEP, CNP, RCNP, RWNP, WEP, WNP}
Standard Blocking	Block Building	parameter-free
	Maximum Configurations	3,440
Q-Grams Blocking	<i>q</i>	[2, 6] with a step of 1
	Maximum Configurations	17,200
Extended Q-Grams Blocking	<i>q</i>	[2, 6] with a step of 1
	<i>t</i>	[0.8, 1.0] with a step of 0.05
(Ex.) Suffix Arrays Blocking	Maximum Configurations	68,800
	<i>l_{min}</i>	[2, 6] with a step of 1
	<i>b_{max}</i>	[2, 100] with a step of 1
	Maximum Configurations	1,702,800

methods is straightforward and can be performed a-priori, because it merely depends on the number of input entities. In contrast, the similarity-based methods depend on data characteristics – the distribution of similarities, in particular.

Overall, the deterministic, cardinality-based methods offer the highest usability. To this category belong kNN-Join, FAISS and SCANN. DeepBlocker uses a cardinality threshold, too, but its tuple embedding model employs neural networks with random initialization that are trained on automatically generated random synthetic data, which renders it a stochastic approach. Among the similarity-based methods, ϵ -Join and edit-based Join involve a deterministic operation, unlike the three LSH methods, which are stochastic by definition: MinHash LSH involves random permutations of the input token sets, while Hyperplane and CrossPolytope LSH constitute random spatial partitions of a d-dimensional unit sphere.

Configuration space. As explained in Section 1, a major aspect of filtering techniques is the fine-tuning of their configuration parameters, which has a decisive impact on their performance. For this reason, we combine every method with a wide range of values for each parameter through grid search. The domains we considered per parameter and method are reported in Tables 3, 4 and 5.

Starting with Table 3, the common parameters of the blocking workflows include the presence or absence of Block Purging and the ratio used by Block Filtering. For the latter, we examined at most 40 values in [0, 1], with 1 indicating the absence of Block Filtering. Given that these two steps determine the upper bound of recall for the subsequent steps, we terminate their grid search as soon as the resulting *PC* drops below the target one (0.9) – in these cases, the number of tested configurations is lower than the maximum possible one. For comparison cleaning, all methods are coupled with the parameter-free Comparison Propagation (CP) or one of the 42 Meta-blocking configurations, which stem from the 6 weighting schemes and the 7 pruning algorithms.

Standard Blocking involves only the common parameters, unlike the rest of the block building methods. For their fine-tuning, we experiment with the same settings as in [55]. Hence, Standard Blocking yields the lowest maximum configurations, with the proactive (Extended) Suffix Arrays Blocking yielding by far the highest ones.

In Table 4, we notice that the common parameters of set-based similarity joins include the absence or presence of cleaning (i.e., stop-word removal and stemming), the similarity measure as well as the representation model. For the last two parameters, we consider

Table 4: The configuration space per set-based similarity join.

	Parameter	Domain
Common	Cleaning (<i>CL</i>)	{-, ✓}
	Similarity Measure (<i>SM</i>)	{Cosine, Dice, Jaccard}
	Representation Model (<i>RM</i>)	{T1G, T1GM, C2G, C2GM, C3G, C3GM, C4G, C4GM, C5G, C5GM}
ϵ -Join	Similarity threshold (<i>t</i>)	[0.00, 1.00] with a step of 0.01
	Maximum Configurations	6,000
kNN-Join	Candidates per query (<i>K</i>)	[1, 100] with a step of 1
	Reverse Datasets (<i>RVS</i>)	{-, ✓}
	Maximum Configurations	12,000

Table 5: The configuration space per NN method.

	Parameter	Domain
Common	Cleaning (<i>CL</i>)	{-, ✓}
MH-LSH	#bands	#bands $\in P(2)$, #rows $\in P(2)$:
	#rows	#bands \times #rows $\in \{128, 256, 512\}$
	<i>k</i>	[2, 5] with a step of 1
	Configurations	168
HP- & CP-LSH	#tables	$2^n : n \in \{0, 9\}$
	#hashes	[1, 20] with a step of 1
	cp dimension	$2^n : n \in \{0, 9\}$
	Configurations	400 (HP), 2,000 (CP)
(a) Threshold-based algorithms		
Common	Rev. Datasets (<i>RVS</i>)	{-, ✓}
	<i>K</i>	[1, 5000] with an increasing step
FAISS	Max. Configurations	2,720
SCANN	index	{AH, BF}
	similarity	{DP, LP ² }
	Max. Configurations	10,880
DeepBlocker	Max. Configurations	2,720
(b) Cardinality-based algorithms		

all options discussed in Section 4.3, i.e., three similarity measures in combination with 10 models: whitespace tokenization (T1G) or character *n*-grams (CnG), with $n \in \{2, 3, 4, 5\}$; for each model, we consider both the set and the multiset of its tokens, with the latter denoted by appending *M* at the end of its name (e.g., T1GM).

In addition to these common settings, ϵ -Join is combined with up to 100 similarity thresholds. We start with the largest one and terminate the grid search as soon *PC* drops below target recall. kNN-Join is coupled with at most 100 cardinality thresholds, starting from the smallest one and terminating the grid search as soon *PC* exceeds the target recall. Another crucial parameter for kNN-Join is *RVS*, which is true (✓) if \mathcal{E}_2 should be indexed and \mathcal{E}_1 should be used as the query set, instead of the opposite. In theory, kNN-Join involves double as many configurations as ϵ -Join, but in practice its cardinality threshold does not exceed 26 (see Table 9 in [1]), thus reducing significantly the maximum number of its configurations.

Note that the edit-based join is excluded from Table 4, because its only parameter is the absence or presence of cleaning. There is no threshold associated with its distances, since their values depend on the length of the compared strings. For this reason, we employ a dynamic threshold that considers as matches the strings whose distance is less than half the length of the shortest one.

The parameters of NN methods are listed in Table 5. The common parameter is the absence or presence of cleaning. In MinHash LSH, we configured the number of bands and rows, restricting both of them to powers of two such that their product is also a power of two, i.e., 2^n with $n \in \{7, 8, 9\}$. For *k*-shingles, we considered four common values for *k*, i.e., [2, 5].

Hyperplane and CrossPolytope LSH two parameters: the number of hash tables (#tables), i.e., cross-polytopes and hyperplanes, respectively, and the number of hash functions (#hashes). We tested

the values reported in Table 5, because higher ones increased the query time, without increasing precision. The number of probes for multi-probe was automatically set to achieve the target recall.³ A parameter applying only to CrossPolytope LSH is the cp dimensionality, which is chosen between 1 and the smallest power of two larger than the dimension of the embeddings vector (here 512) [1].

Among the kNN-search NN methods, there are two more common parameters: RVS , which has the same meaning as in kNN-Join, and the cardinality-threshold, K . For the latter, we consider all values in [1, 100] with a step of 1, as in kNN-Join. Given, though, that this is not sufficient in some datasets, we additionally consider all values in [105, 1000] with a step of 5 and all values in [1010, 5000] with a step of 10. In each case, the grid search starts from the lowest values and terminates as soon as PC reaches the target recall.

FAISS does not use any other parameter apart from the common ones. It uses the Flat index in all cases, due to the small size of the input datasets (<20,000 vectors in most cases) [32]. Our experiments also demonstrated that the embedding vectors should always be normalized and combined with the Euclidean distance.

SCANN adds to the common parameters the type of index – asymmetri – hashing (AH) or brute-force (BF) – and the similarity measure – dot product or Euclidean distance. There is no clear winner among these options, as shown in Table 10 (cf. []).

Finally, DeepBlocker adds to the common parameters the tuple embedding model. We experimented with both top-performing modules, namely AutoEncoder and Hybrid. In most cases, though, the latter, raised out-of-memory exceptions, while being a whole order of magnitude slower than the former, as documented in [59]. For this reason, we exclusively consider AutoEncoder in the following.

6 QUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS

Setup. All experiments were performed on a laptop with an Intel i7-4710MQ @ 2.50GHz with 16GB of RAM, running Ubuntu 18.04.3 LTS. The available memory should suffice, given that all datasets occupy few MBs on the disk in their original form. For each time measurement, we performed 10 repetitions and report the average value. These measurements do not include the time required to load the input data into main memory.

For the implementation of blocking workflows and similarity join methods, we employed JedAI’s latest version, 3.2.1⁴. All experiments were run on Java 15. For MH-LSH, we used java-LSH, version 0.12⁵. For HP- and CP-LSH, we used the Python wrapper of FALCONN [1], version 1.3.1⁶. For FAISS, we used the Python wrapper of version 1.7.2 provided by Facebook Research⁷. For SCANN, we used the Python implementation of version 1.2.5 provided by Google Research⁸. For DeepBlocker, we used the implementation provided by the authors⁹. FAISS, SCANN and DeepBlocker can exploit GPU optimizations, but all methods were run on a single CPU to ensure a fair comparison.

³We used the approach in <https://github.com/FALCONN-LIB/FALCONN/blob/master/src/examples/glove/glove.py>.

⁴<https://github.com/scify/JedAIToolkit>

⁵<https://github.com/tdebatty/java-LSH>

⁶<https://github.com/FALCONN-LIB/FALCONN>

⁷<https://github.com/facebookresearch/faiss>

⁸<https://github.com/google-research/google-research/tree/master/scann>

⁹<https://github.com/saravanan-thirumuruganathan/DeepBlocker>

Datasets. We use 10 real-world datasets for Clean-Clean ER that are popular in the literature [37, 45, 55, 59]. Their technical characteristics are reported in Table 6. D_1 , which was first used in OAEI 2010¹⁰, contains restaurant descriptions. D_2 encompasses duplicate products from the online retailers Abt.com and Buy.com [37]. D_3 matches product descriptions from Amazon.com and the Google Base data API (GB) [37]. D_4 entails bibliographic data from DBLP and ACM [37]. $D_5 - D_7$ involve descriptions of television shows from TheTVDB.com (TVDB) and of movies from IMDb and the-moviedb.org (TMDb) [48]. D_8 matches product descriptions from Walmart and Amazon [45]. D_9 involves bibliographic data from publications in DBLP and Google Scholar (GS) [37]. D_{10} interlinks movie descriptions from IMDb and DBpedia [53], with the former corresponding to a different snapshot of IMDb than D_5 and D_6 . All datasets are publicly available through the JedAI data repository (<https://github.com/scify/JedAIToolkit/tree/master/data>).

Schema settings. In each dataset, we consider both *schema-agnostic* and *schema-based settings*. The former takes into account the content of all attributes, regardless of their attribute names, while the latter focuses on the values of the most suitable attribute in terms of coverage and distinctiveness. We define *coverage* of attribute a as the portion of entities that contain a non-empty value for a , while *distinctiveness* expresses the portion of different values among these entities (e.g., an attribute like year for publications or movies has very low distinctiveness in contrast to their titles). Based on these criteria, we selected the attributes at the bottom of Table 6 for the schema-based settings.

The actual coverage of these attributes per dataset is reported in Figure 3(a) along with their *groundtruth coverage*, i.e., the portion of duplicate profiles that have at least one non-empty value for the respective attribute. We observe that for half the datasets ($D_2 - D_4$, D_8 , D_9), the selected attribute has perfect (groundtruth) coverage. In $D_5 - D_7$, though, the overall coverage fluctuates between 55% and 75%, dropping to 30%-53% for duplicates, even though we have selected the most frequent attribute in each case. For these datasets, no filtering technique can satisfy the target recall specified in Section 3. As a result, we exclude the schema-based settings of $D_5 - D_7$ from our analysis. The same applies to D_{10} , even though the inadequate coverage pertains only to one of its constituent datasets. An interesting exception is D_1 , where the selected attribute covers just 2/3 of all profiles, but all of duplicate ones.

Note that the low coverage for distinctive attributes like “Name” and “Title” does not mean that there are entities missing the corresponding values. In most cases, these values are misplaced, being associated with a different attribute, due to extraction errors or other forms of noise [45, 59]. The schema-agnostic settings inherently tackle this form of noise, unlike the schema-based ones.

For the datasets that have both settings, it is worth comparing their computational cost in terms of *vocabulary size* (i.e., total number of distinct tokens) and *overall character length* (i.e., total number of characters). These measures appear in Figures 3(b) and (c), respectively. In each case, we also consider the values of these measures after *cleaning*, i.e., after removing the stop-words and stemming all tokens, as required by the workflow in Figure 2. We used nltk [7] for this purpose.

¹⁰<http://oaei.ontologymatching.org/2010/im>

Table 6: Technical characteristics of the real datasets for Clean-Clean ER in increasing computational cost.

	D _{c1}	D _{c2}	D _{c3}	D _{c4}	D _{c5}	D _{c6}	D _{c7}	D _{c8}	D _{c9}	D _{c10}
E_1 / E_2	Rest. 1 / Rest. 2	Abt / Buy	Amazon / GB	DBLP / ACM	IMDb / TMDb	IMDb / TVDB	TMDb / TVDB	Walmart / Amazon	DBLP / GS	IMDb / DBpedia
E_1 / E_2 entities	339 / 2,256	1,076 / 1,076	1,354 / 3,039	2,616 / 2,294	5,118 / 6,056	5,118 / 7,810	6,056 / 7,810	2,554 / 22,074	2,516 / 61,353	27,615 / 23,182
Duplicates	89	1,076	1,104	2,224	1,968	1,072	1,095	853	2,308	22,863
Cartesian Product	$7.65 \cdot 10^5$	$1.16 \cdot 10^6$	$4.11 \cdot 10^6$	$6.00 \cdot 10^6$	$3.10 \cdot 10^7$	$4.00 \cdot 10^7$	$4.73 \cdot 10^7$	$5.64 \cdot 10^7$	$1.54 \cdot 10^8$	$6.40 \cdot 10^8$
E_1 / E_2 n-v pairs	1,130 / 7,519	2,568 / 2,308	5,302 / 9,110	10,464 / 9,162	21,294 / 23,761	21,294 / 20,902	23,761 / 20,902	14,143 / $1.14 \cdot 10^5$	10,064 / $1.98 \cdot 10^5$	$1.6 \cdot 10^5$ / $8.2 \cdot 10^5$
E_1 / E_2 attributes	7 / 7	3 / 3	4 / 4	4 / 4	13 / 30	13 / 9	30 / 9	6 / 6	4 / 4	4 / 7
E_1 / E_2 av. profile	3.33 / 3.33	2.39 / 2.14	3.92 / 3.00	4.00 / 3.99	4.16 / 3.92	4.16 / 2.68	3.92 / 2.68	5.54 / 5.18	4.00 / 3.24	5.63 / 35.20
Best Attribute	Name	Name	Title	Title	Title	Name	Name	Title	Title	Title




Figure 3: (a) The coverage of the best attribute per each dataset, (b) the vocabulary size in schema-agnostic and schema-based settings, and (c) the overall character length in the textual content of the datasets for both schema settings.

We observe that on average, the schema-based settings reduce the vocabulary size and the character length by 66.0% and 67.7%, respectively. The reason is that in most cases, the schema-agnostic settings include 3-4 name-value pairs, on average, as indicated in Table 6 (av. profile). The more attributes and the more name value (n-v) pairs a dataset includes, the larger is the difference between the two settings. Cleaning further reduces the vocabulary size by 11.9% and the character length by 13.5%, on average. As a result, *the schema-based settings are expected to significantly reduce the runtime of filtering methods, especially when combined with cleaning.*

Baseline methods. To highlight the impact of fine-tuning, our analysis includes at least one baseline per type of methods that requires no parameter configuration. Instead, it employs default parameters that are common across all datasets.

In more detail, we consider two baseline blocking workflows:

(i) *Parameter-free BW (PBW)*. It combines three methods that involve no configuration parameter: Standard Blocking, Block Purging and Comparison Propagation (see Section 4.2 for more details). It constitutes a Standard Blocking pipeline with no configuration.

(ii) *Default BW (DBW)*. We experimented with the default configurations specified in [55] for the five blocking workflows discussed in Section 4.2 and opted for the one achieving the best performance, on average, across all settings. This configuration is Q-Grams Blocking with $q = 6$ for block building, Block Filtering with ratio=0.5 for block cleaning and *WEP + ECBS* for comparison cleaning.

For similarity joins, we use the *Default kNN-Join* as a baseline. The reason is that kNN-Join outperforms the other algorithms of this type in most cases, while being easy to configure, since it constitutes a deterministic, cardinality-based approach. Table 9 shows that its best performance is usually achieved when it is combined with cosine similarity, pre-processing to clean the attribute values and a very low number of nearest neighbors per query entity K . We used the smallest input dataset as the query set, minimizing the candidate pairs, set $K=5$ and selected *C5GM* as the default representation model, because it achieves the best average performance.

Among the NN methods, we selected DeepBlocker as the baseline approach, given that it typically outperforms all others in terms of

effectiveness (cf. Table 7). Table 10 shows that it typically works best when cleaning the attribute values with stemming and stop-word removal, when using the smallest input dataset as the query set and when using a small number of candidates per query. We set $K=5$ so that the *Default DeepBlocker (DDB)* is directly comparable with Default kNN-Join.

Schema-agnostic Settings. The experimental results are reported in Table 7.¹¹ For the schema-agnostic settings, we observe that all fine-tuned methods consistently exceed the target recall ($PC \geq 0.9$), regardless of their type. Only Default kNN-Join (DkNN-Join) and (DDB) violate the desired recall level in few cases. For this reason, the relative effectiveness of the considered methods is primarily determined by their precision (PQ).

The best precision per dataset and schema settings is underlined, while the overall best across all filtering methods is marked in bold. We notice that the precision of all methods is highly correlated. In fact, the Pearson correlation coefficient between any pair of method exceeds **0.5**. This means that the performance of filtering depends heavily on the dataset characteristics. For example, datasets like D_{a3} yield very low precision for all methods, because their duplicate entities share only generic/noisy content that appears in many non-matching profiles, too (e.g., stop words). In contrast, datasets like D_{a4} entail duplicates that have very distinguishing content in common, yielding an almost perfect performance in most cases.

Regarding the blocking workflows, the Standard Blocking workflow (SBW) outperforms all others in the eight largest datasets. Compared to its parameter-free counterpart, i.e., PBW, its PQ is substantially higher, with their difference increasing for larger datasets: it raises from 1 order of magnitude over D_{a2} to more than 3 orders over D_{a10} . This highlights the benefits of fine-tuning. Among the remaining methods, the Q-Grams Blocking workflow (QBW) lies very close to the top performing on in most datasets. On average, its precision is lower than the best one by 27.7%, as in many cases it ranks second (e.g., in D_{a8}). Compared to its default configuration, DBW, PQ gets higher by a whole order of magnitude, which also verifies the benefits of parameter fine-tuning. The Extended

¹¹See [] for more detailed results and diagrams.

On average, ϵ -Join underperforms kNN-Join by 57.8%, which suggests that *the cardinality thresholds are significantly more effective in reducing the search space of ER than the similarity ones*. The reason is that the latter apply a global condition, unlike the former, which operate locally, selecting the best candidates per query entity. Comparing kNN-Join with its baseline method, DkNN-Join, the former consistently outperforms the latter, as expected. However, the difference between the two in terms of precision is 68.3%, on average, across all datasets where DkNN-Join achieves the target recall. This verifies the benefits of parameter fine-tuning, but also highlights the robustness of kNN-Join, given that their difference is much lower than that between the blocking workflows and the corresponding baseline approaches. In fact, DkNN-Join outperforms ϵ -Join over D_{a2} and D_{a6} with respect to both precision and run-time.

Regarding the NN methods, we observe that the similarity-based ones consistently achieve the lowest by far precision among all fine-tuned techniques. CP-LSH typically outperforms MH- and HP-LSH, but underperforms all baseline methods (i.e., PBW, DBW and DkNN-Join) in most of the cases, especially over the largest datasets. The reason is that *the similarity-based methods achieve high recall for both sparse syntactic and dense embedding vectors only by producing an excessively large number of candidate pairs* – their precision raises to high levels only for $PC \ll 0.9$. As a result, MH-LSH runs out of memory when processing D_{a10} .

Significantly better performance is achieved by the cardinality-based NN methods. FAISS and SCANN exhibit practically identical performance across all datasets, because they perform an exhaustive search of the nearest neighbors. They differ only in D_{a3} , D_{a8} and D_{a7} , where SCANN outperforms FAISS by using approximate scoring (AH). The two algorithms outperform all others in four datasets, with DeepBlocker being the top performer in the remaining six cases. DeepBlocker actually lies closer to the highest precision than FAISS/SCANN in cases where it is ranked second: their average distance from the maximum PQ is 19.8% and 63.6%, respectively. This means that *the learning-based tuple embedding module raises significantly the precision of NN methods*. However, it does not scale to D_{a10} with the available memory resources, unlike FAISS/SCANN, due to the extremely large set of candidate pairs.

The same applies to its default configuration, DDB, which also fails to achieve the target recall in four datasets. For the remaining five datasets, its average distance from the maximum PQ is 82.6%. This means that *fine-tuning is necessary for DeepBlocker*.

Comparing the top performing methods from each category in terms of precision, we notice that SBW takes a clear lead, followed in close distance by kNN-Join and DeepBlocker in the last place. SBW achieves the maximum PQ in four datasets, kNN-Join in three and DeepBlocker in none of them. Most importantly, SBW’s PQ is lower than the highest one by 23.1%, on average, kNN-Join’s by 29.8% and DeepBlocker’s by 82.7%. However, *kNN-Join constitutes a more robust approach that is easier to configure and apply in practice*. Its default configuration, DkNN-Join, exhibits a precision that is lower than the best one by 78.7%, on average, whereas all other baseline methods underperform it by more than a whole order of magnitude: 94.2% for PBW, 94.7% for DBW and 92.4% for DDB (we considered only the cases where $PC \geq 0.9$).

Regarding time efficiency, we observe that the blocking workflows excel in run-time. Most of them require less than a second to

process all datasets up to D_{a8} , few seconds for D_{a9} and less than a minute for D_{a10} . In most cases, the fastest workflow is PBW, due to its simple comparison cleaning, which merely applies Comparison Propagation to eliminate the redundant candidate pairs. All other workflows are always coupled with a Meta-blocking approach that assigns a weight to every candidate pair and prunes the lowest-weighted ones in an effort to reduce the superfluous pairs, too¹². Comparison cleaning actually dominates the run-time of blocking workflows, with RT being proportional to the number of candidate pairs resulting from block cleaning. For this reason, EQBW and ESABW are typically slower than QBW and SABW, respectively.

Among the similarity join algorithms, kNN-Join is much faster than ϵ -Join in half the datasets, D_{a5} - D_{a9} in particular. This is counter-intuitive, given that the former approach involves a more complex functionality, sorting the candidate pairs per query entity. For these datasets, though, $k=1$ (2 in D_{a8} – cf. Table 9 in []), thus minimizing its overhead. This also explains why DkNN-Join, which uses $k=5$, is slower than both other techniques in D_{a5} - D_{a7} ; for D_{a8} - D_{a10} , DkNN-Join is faster than kNN-Join, because the latter uses shorter q -grams, thus generating more candidate pairs. Overall, the run-time of similarity join algorithms is dominated by the querying time, which consistently accounts for more than half of RT . In contrast, indexing time accounts for less than 10% in practically all cases, with the rest corresponding to cleaning.

Regarding the NN-methods, they are all implemented in Python and, thus, a direct comparison with the Java-based blocking workflows and the similarity join algorithms might lead to wrong conclusions. For this reason, we exclusively compare the RT of NN methods between them. Among the similarity-based NN-methods, we observe that MH-LSH is by far the slowest one for D_{a5} on, even though it is implemented in Java and does not apply cleaning (i.e., stop-word removal and stemming) in most cases, thus saving its overhead. This should be attributed to the very large number of candidates it generates during the querying phase, which prevents it from scaling to D_{a10} . The lowest run-time corresponds to CP-LSH, because it exhibits the highest PQ among the three methods.

Among the cardinality-based NN methods, we observe that FAISS is consistently the fastest one. It is significantly faster than SCANN in all cases, even though they have an almost identical effectiveness, because FAISS saves the overhead of data partitioning. Most importantly, both versions of *DeepBlocker are slower than the other NN methods by a whole order of magnitude in most cases*. This should be attributed to the cost of automatically creating a labelled dataset and using it for training the tuple embedding module – the number of candidates per query entity plays a minor role, which can be inferred from the relative run-time of DDB and DeepBlocker and its configuration in Table 10 in []. Therefore, we can conclude that DeepBlocker emphasizes effectiveness at the cost of very low time efficiency. Note also that the Hybrid tuple embedding module is a whole order of magnitude slower than Autoencoder [59].

Schema-based settings. Starting with PC , we observe that all fine-tuned methods achieve the target recall, but the baseline methods fail in two datasets – except for DkNN-Join, which fails only

¹²See the configurations of Table 8 in [] for more details.

once. Taking into account the four datasets with insufficient coverage, this means that *without fine-tuning, the schema-based settings fall short of high recall in half the cases.*

Regarding precision, we observe that SBW and QBW outperform all blocking workflows in two datasets each, but the latter has a better performance, on average: its PQ is lower than the top one by just 11.6%, leaving SBW in the second place with 14.9%. EQBW ranks third (30.4%) and SABW fourth (40.1%), even though each method is the top performer in one dataset. ESABW exhibits the largest average distance from the top (42.3%).

As regards the similarity join algorithms, we observe a balance between ϵ - and kNN-Join, as each method achieves the top precision in half the datasets. Yet, the kNN-Join lies very close to ϵ -Join in the cases where the latter is the top performer, but not vice versa: the average deviation from the maximum PQ amounts to 49.7% and 9.3% for the ϵ - and the kNN-Join, respectively. DkNN-Join exhibits a robust, high performance that remains very close to kNN-Join in all datasets, but D_{b8} (where it fails to reach the target recall), outperforming ϵ -Join over D_{b2} and D_{b3} . These settings verify that *the cardinality thresholds are superior to the similarity ones.*

Note that the schema-based settings also include the edit-based join. For brevity, though, we do not report its performance in Table 7. The reason is that its recall is extremely low, fluctuating between 0.011 (D_{b1}) and 0.382 (D_{b8}). The only exceptions are D_{b4} and D_{b9} , where its PC raises up to 0.978 and 0.933, respectively. This should be attributed to the almost identical values shared by the duplicate entities for the selected attribute names, unlike the rest of the datasets, where duplicate entities have significant differences, typically at the level of entire tokens. The corresponding precision is very high, but significantly lower than that of ϵ - and kNN-Join, amounting to 0.728 and 0.331. This means that *the edit-based join consistently underperforms the other forms of joins and given its limited scope, is inappropriate for filtering.*

Regarding the NN methods, we observe that similarity-based methods, i.e., the LSH variants, consistently outperform the rest of the fine-tuned methods, which leverage cardinality thresholds. MH-LSH actually does not scale to D_{b9} , due to very large set of candidates it produces, which do not fit into the available memory. We also notice that FAISS and SCANN, which exhibit practically identical performance, outperform DeepBlocker in four datasets. Their average distance from the maximum PQ amounts to 21%, while for DeepBlocker raises to 25.1%. Its default configuration, DDB, exhibits low precision, merely outperforming MH-LSH.

With respect to the run-time, we observe the same patterns as in the schema-agnostic settings. RT has significantly improved in most cases, especially for the largest datasets, due to the lower vocabulary size and character length. Thus, all methods are capable of processing all datasets in less than 1 second (few seconds for D_{b9}). Yet, DeepBlocker and DDB typically remain a whole order of magnitude slower than all other methods, due to the inelastic computational cost of creating a labelled dataset and using it to train the neural-based tuple embedding module.

Among the top performing fine-tuned methods per category, *kNN-Join exhibits the best and most robust performance.* It achieves the overall best PQ in two datasets and the lowest deviation from maximum PQ , on average: 26%. This deviation raises to 38.8% for

QBW and to 54% for FAISS/SCANN. Its default configuration also outperforms all other baseline methods in most cases.

7 CONCLUSIONS

Our experimental results lead to the following conclusions:

1) Fine-tuning vs default parameters. For all types of methods, optimizing the internal parameters with respect to a performance goal (i.e., Problem 1) raises significantly the performance of filtering. This field has been overlooked in the literature [54], and the few relevant methods require the involvement of experts [41, 44]. Instead, *more emphasis should be placed on a-priori fine-tuning the configuration parameters of filtering methods through an automatic, data-driven approach that requires no labelled set.*

2) Schema-based vs schema-agnostic settings. The former improve significantly the time efficiency at the cost of unstable effectiveness, whereas the latter offer robust effectiveness, as they inherently address the misplaced and missing values that are common in ER settings [45, 59]. Even when the schema-based settings exhibit high recall, their maximum PQ outperforms the schema-agnostic settings only in half the cases (D_1 – D_3). The schema-agnostic settings also exceed the target recall even in combination with default configurations, i.e., the baseline blocking workflows, unlike the schema-based settings, where all baseline methods fall short of the target recall at least once. For these reasons, *the schema-agnostic settings should be preferred to the schema-based ones.*

3) Similarity vs cardinality thresholds. The edit-based join exceeds the target recall only in datasets with very high attribute similarity between duplicates. The LSH variants achieve high recall only by producing an excessively large number of candidates: compared to the brute-force approach, MH-, CP- and HP-LSH reduce the candidate pairs by 48%, 91% and 89%, respectively, on average, across all datasets in Table 7. This might seem high (a whole order of magnitude for CP-/HP-LSH), but depends quadratically on the total size of the input, while being inferior to the cardinality-based filtering methods. This applies even to ϵ -Join, which reduces the Cartesian product by 99% (i.e., multiple orders of magnitude), but underperforms kNN-Join in 9 out of 16 cases. For the cardinality-based methods, the number of candidates depends linearly on the size of the indexed dataset, which is usually the smallest one, i.e., $|C| = k \cdot \min\{|E_1|, |E_2|\}$; in almost all cases, $k \ll 100$ for all cardinality-based methods, especially kNN-Join. Therefore, *cardinality thresholds should be preferred to similarity ones.*

4) Syntactic vs semantic representations. The blocking workflows and the similarity join algorithms assume that the pairs of duplicates share textual content; the rarer this content is, the more likely are two entities to be matching. In contrast, most NN methods assume that the duplicate entities share syntactically different, but semantically similar content that can be captured by pre-trained character-level embeddings. The latter assumption is true for the matching step of ER [59], but our experiments advocate that filtering violates this assumption: semantic-based representations outperform the syntactic ones only in two cases (D_{b4} and D_{b9}). Comparing kNN-Join with cardinality-based NN methods, we observe that the former consistently uses a lower threshold (see Tables

9 and 10 in []). This means that the semantic representations introduce more false positives than the syntactic ones, probably due to the out-of-vocabulary domain-specific terms in ER datasets. Hence, the *syntactic representations should be preferred to the semantic ones.*

5) Best overall filtering method. The only method that combines a cardinality threshold with a syntactic representation is kNN-Join. In the schema-agnostic settings, its performance is slightly lower than the Standard Blocking workflow, but offers two qualitative advantages: (i) its number of candidates depends linearly on the input size, unlike SBW, and (ii) its configuration is rather easy, as verified by the performance of DkNN-Join. Even though its recall fluctuates in [0.8, 0.9] in three datasets, it outperforms the default configuration of SBW, PBW, in almost all other cases.

In the future, we will examine methods for automatically configuring the kNN-Join.

REFERENCES

- [1] Alexandr Andoni, Piotr Indyk, Thijs Laarhoven, Ilya P. Razenshteyn, and Ludwig Schmidt. 2015. Practical and Optimal LSH for Angular Distance. In *NIPS*. 1225–1233.
- [2] Nikolaus Augsten. 2018. A Roadmap towards Declarative Similarity Queries. In *EDBT*. 509–512.
- [3] Nikolaus Augsten and Michael H. Böhlen. 2013. *Similarity Joins in Relational Database Systems*. Morgan & Claypool Publishers.
- [4] Martin Aumüller, Erik Bernhardsson, and Alexander John Faithfull. 2020. ANN-Benchmarks: A benchmarking tool for approximate nearest neighbor algorithms. *Inf. Syst.* 87 (2020).
- [5] Nils Barlaug and Jon Atle Gulla. 2021. Neural Networks for Entity Matching: A Survey. *ACM Trans. Knowl. Discov. Data* 15, 3 (2021), 52:1–52:37.
- [6] Roberto J. Bayardo, Yiming Ma, and Ramakrishnan Srikant. 2007. Scaling up all pairs similarity search. In *WWW*. 131–140.
- [7] Steven Bird, Ewan Klein, and Edward Loper. 2009. *Natural language processing with Python: analyzing text with the natural language toolkit*. O’Reilly Media, Inc.
- [8] Piotr Bojanowski, Edouard Grave, Armand Joulin, and Tomáš Mikolov. 2017. Enriching Word Vectors with Subword Information. *Trans. Assoc. Comput. Linguistics* 5 (2017), 135–146.
- [9] Panagiotis Bouros, Shen Ge, and Nikos Mamoulis. 2012. Spatio-textual similarity joins. *Proc. VLDB Endow.* 6, 1 (2012), 1–12.
- [10] Andrei Z. Broder. 1997. On the resemblance and containment of documents. In *SEQUENCES*. 21–29.
- [11] Moses S. Charikar. 2002. Similarity estimation techniques from rounding algorithms. In *STOC*. 380–388.
- [12] Surajit Chaudhuri, Venkatesh Ganti, and Raghav Kaushik. 2006. A Primitive Operator for Similarity Joins in Data Cleaning. In *ICDE*. 5.
- [13] Peter Christen. 2012. *Data Matching - Concepts and Techniques for Record Linkage, Entity Resolution, and Duplicate Detection*. Springer.
- [14] Peter Christen. 2012. A Survey of Indexing Techniques for Scalable Record Linkage and Deduplication. *IEEE Trans. Knowl. Data Eng.* 24, 9 (2012), 1537–1555.
- [15] Vassilis Christophides, Vasilis Efthymiou, and Kostas Stefanidis. 2015. *Entity Resolution in the Web of Data*. Morgan & Claypool Publishers.
- [16] Dong Deng, Guoliang Li, He Wen, and Jianhua Feng. 2015. An Efficient Partition Based Method for Exact Set Similarity Joins. *Proc. VLDB Endow.* 9, 4 (2015), 360–371.
- [17] Dong Deng, Yufei Tao, and Guoliang Li. 2018. Overlap Set Similarity Joins with Theoretical Guarantees. In *Proceedings of the 2018 International Conference on Management of Data, SIGMOD Conference 2018, Houston, TX, USA, June 10-15, 2018*, Gautam Das, Christopher M. Jermaine, and Philip A. Bernstein (Eds.). ACM, 905–920. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3183713.3183748>
- [18] Xin Luna Dong and Divesh Srivastava. 2015. *Big Data Integration*. Morgan & Claypool Publishers.
- [19] Muhammad Ebraheem, Saravanan Thirumuruganathan, Shafiq R. Joty, Mourad Ouzzani, and Nan Tang. 2018. Distributed Representations of Tuples for Entity Resolution. *Proc. VLDB Endow.* 11, 11 (2018), 1454–1467.
- [20] Mohamed G. Elfeky, Ahmed K. Elmagarmid, and Vassilios S. Verykios. 2002. TAILOR: A Record Linkage Tool Box. In *ICDE*. 17–28.
- [21] Ahmed K. Elmagarmid, Panagiotis G. Ipeirotis, and Vassilios S. Verykios. 2007. Duplicate Record Detection: A Survey. *IEEE Trans. Knowl. Data Eng.* 19, 1 (2007), 1–16.
- [22] Benjamin Nelson et al. 2018. MultiProbe-LSH. <https://github.com/gopalmenon/Multi-Probe-LSH>.
- [23] Fabian Fier, Nikolaus Augsten, Panagiotis Bouros, Ulf Leser, and Johann-Christoph Freytag. 2018. Set Similarity Joins on MapReduce: An Experimental Survey. *Proc. VLDB Endow.* 11, 10 (2018), 1110–1122.
- [24] Marco Fisichella, Andrea Ceroni, Fan Deng, and Wolfgang Nejdl. 2014. Predicting Pair Similarities for Near-Duplicate Detection in High Dimensional Spaces. In *DEXA*. 59–73.
- [25] Cheng Fu, Xianpei Han, Jiaming He, and Le Sun. 2020. Hierarchical Matching Network for Heterogeneous Entity Resolution. In *IJCAI*. 3665–3671.
- [26] Lise Getoor and Ashwin Machanavajjhala. 2012. Entity Resolution: Theory, Practice & Open Challenges. *Proc. VLDB Endow.* 5, 12 (2012), 2018–2019.
- [27] Luis Gravano, Panagiotis G. Ipeirotis, H. V. Jagadish, Nick Koudas, S. Muthukrishnan, and Divesh Srivastava. 2001. Approximate String Joins in a Database (Almost) for Free. In *VLDB*. 491–500.
- [28] Ruiqi Guo, Philip Sun, Erik Lindgren, Quan Geng, David Simcha, Felix Chern, and Sanjiv Kumar. 2020. Accelerating Large-Scale Inference with Anisotropic Vector Quantization. In *ICML*. 3887–3896.
- [29] Otkie Hassanzadeh, Fei Chiang, Renée J. Miller, and Hyun Chul Lee. 2009. Framework for Evaluating Clustering Algorithms in Duplicate Detection. *Proc. VLDB Endow.* 2, 1 (2009), 1282–1293.
- [30] Piotr Indyk and Rajeev Motwani. 1998. Approximate Nearest Neighbors: Towards Removing the Curse of Dimensionality. In *STOC*. 604–613.
- [31] Yu Jiang, Guoliang Li, Jianhua Feng, and Wen-Syan Li. 2014. String Similarity Joins: An Experimental Evaluation. *Proc. VLDB Endow.* 7, 8 (2014), 625–636.
- [32] Jeff Johnson, Matthijs Douze, and Hervé Jégou. 2021. Billion-Scale Similarity Search with GPUs. *IEEE Trans. Big Data* 7, 3 (2021), 535–547.
- [33] Dimitrios Karapiperis, Dinusha Vatsalan, Vassilios S. Verykios, and Peter Christen. 2016. Efficient Record Linkage Using a Compact Hamming Space. In *EDBT*. 209–220.
- [34] Hung-sik Kim and Dongwon Lee. 2010. HARRA: fast iterative hashed record linkage for large-scale data collections. In *EDBT*. 525–536.
- [35] Daniel Kocher and Nikolaus Augsten. 2019. A Scalable Index for Top-k Subtree Similarity Queries. In *SIGMOD*. 1624–1641.
- [36] Pradap Konda, Sanjib Das, Paul Suganthan G. C., AnHai Doan, Adel Ardalan, Jeffrey R. Ballard, Han Li, Fatemah Panahi, Haojun Zhang, Jeffrey F. Naughton, Shishir Prasad, Ganesh Krishnan, Rohit Deep, and Vijay Raghavendra. 2016. Magellan: Toward Building Entity Matching Management Systems. *Proc. VLDB Endow.* 9, 12 (2016), 1197–1208.
- [37] Hanna Köpcke, Andreas Thor, and Erhard Rahm. 2010. Evaluation of entity resolution approaches on real-world match problems. *Proc. VLDB Endow.* 3, 1 (2010), 484–493.
- [38] Jure Leskovec, Anand Rajaraman, and Jeffrey David Ullman. 2020. *Mining of massive data sets*. Cambridge university press.
- [39] Chen Li, Jiaheng Lu, and Yiming Lu. 2008. Efficient Merging and Filtering Algorithms for Approximate String Searches. In *ICDE*. 257–266.
- [40] Guoliang Li, Dong Deng, Jiannan Wang, and Jianhua Feng. 2011. PASS-JOIN: A Partition-based Method for Similarity Joins. *Proc. VLDB Endow.* 5, 3 (2011), 253–264.
- [41] Han Li, Pradap Konda, Paul Suganthan G. C., AnHai Doan, Benjamin Snyder, Youngchoon Park, Ganesh Krishnan, Rohit Deep, and Vijay Raghavendra. 2018. MatchCatcher: A Debugger for Blocking in Entity Matching. In *EDBT*. 193–204.
- [42] Willi Mann, Nikolaus Augsten, and Panagiotis Bouros. 2016. An Empirical Evaluation of Set Similarity Join Techniques. *Proc. VLDB Endow.* 9, 9 (2016), 636–647.
- [43] Christopher D. Manning, Prabhakar Raghavan, and Hinrich Schütze. 2008. *Introduction to information retrieval*. Cambridge University Press.
- [44] Ruhaila Maskat, Norman W. Paton, and Suzanne M. Embury. 2016. Pay-as-you-go Configuration of Entity Resolution. *Trans. Large Scale Data Knowl. Centered Syst.* 29 (2016), 40–65.
- [45] Sidharth Mudgal, Han Li, Theodoros Rekatsinas, AnHai Doan, Youngchoon Park, Ganesh Krishnan, Rohit Deep, Esteban Arcaute, and Vijay Raghavendra. 2018. Deep Learning for Entity Matching: A Design Space Exploration. In *SIGMOD*. ACM, 19–34.
- [46] Sidharth Mudgal, Han Li, Theodoros Rekatsinas, AnHai Doan, Youngchoon Park, Ganesh Krishnan, Rohit Deep, Esteban Arcaute, and Vijay Raghavendra. 2018. Deep Learning for Entity Matching: A Design Space Exploration. In *SIGMOD*. 19–34.
- [47] Gonzalo Navarro. 2001. A guided tour to approximate string matching. *ACM Comput. Surv.* 33, 1 (2001), 31–88.
- [48] Daniel Obraczka, Jonathan Schuchart, and Erhard Rahm. 2021. Embedding-Assisted Entity Resolution for Knowledge Graphs. In *ESWC*, Vol. 2873.
- [49] George Papadakis, George Alexiou, George Papastefanatos, and Georgia Koutrika. 2015. Schema-agnostic vs Schema-based Configurations for Blocking Methods on Homogeneous Data. *Proc. VLDB Endow.* 9, 4 (2015), 312–323.
- [50] George Papadakis, Ekaterini Ioannou, Themis Palpanas, Claudia Niederée, and Wolfgang Nejdl. 2013. A Blocking Framework for Entity Resolution in Highly Heterogeneous Information Spaces. *IEEE Trans. Knowl. Data Eng.* 25, 12 (2013), 2665–2682.

- [51] George Papadakis, Ekaterini Ioannou, Emmanouil Thanos, and Themis Palpanas. 2021. *The Four Generations of Entity Resolution*. Morgan & Claypool Publishers.
- [52] George Papadakis, Georgia Koutrika, Themis Palpanas, and Wolfgang Nejdl. 2014. Meta-Blocking: Taking Entity Resolution to the Next Level. *IEEE Trans. Knowl. Data Eng.* 26, 8 (2014), 1946–1960.
- [53] George Papadakis, Georgios M. Mandilaras, Luca Gagliardelli, Giovanni Simonini, Emmanouil Thanos, George Giannakopoulos, Sonia Bergamaschi, Themis Palpanas, and Manolis Koubarakis. 2020. Three-dimensional Entity Resolution with JedAI. *Inf. Syst.* 93 (2020), 101565.
- [54] George Papadakis, Dimitrios Skoutas, Emmanouil Thanos, and Themis Palpanas. 2020. Blocking and Filtering Techniques for Entity Resolution: A Survey. *ACM Comput. Surv.* 53, 2 (2020), 31:1–31:42.
- [55] George Papadakis, Jonathan Svirsky, Avigdor Gal, and Themis Palpanas. 2016. Comparative Analysis of Approximate Blocking Techniques for Entity Resolution. *Proc. VLDB Endow.* 9, 9 (2016), 684–695.
- [56] George Papadakis, Leonidas Tsekouras, Emmanouil Thanos, George Giannakopoulos, Themis Palpanas, and Manolis Koubarakis. 2019. Domain- and Structure-Agnostic End-to-End Entity Resolution with JedAI. *SIGMOD Rec.* 48, 4 (2019), 30–36.
- [57] Yasin N. Silva, Walid G. Aref, Per-Åke Larson, Spencer Pearson, and Mohamed H. Ali. 2013. Similarity queries: their conceptual evaluation, transformations, and processing. *VLDB J.* 22, 3 (2013), 395–420.
- [58] Giovanni Simonini, Sonia Bergamaschi, and H. V. Jagadish. 2016. BLAST: a Loosely Schema-aware Meta-blocking Approach for Entity Resolution. *Proc. VLDB Endow.* 9, 12 (2016), 1173–1184.
- [59] Saravanan Thirumuruganathan, Han Li, Nan Tang, Mourad Ouzzani, Yash Govind, Derek Paulsen, Glenn Fung, and AnHai Doan. 2021. Deep Learning for Blocking in Entity Matching: A Design Space Exploration. *Proc. VLDB Endow.* 14, 11 (2021), 2459–2472.
- [60] Shirui Wang, Wen'an Zhou, and Chao Jiang. 2020. A survey of word embeddings based on deep learning. *Computing* 102, 3 (2020), 717–740.
- [61] Chuan Xiao, Wei Wang, Xuemin Lin, and Haichuan Shang. 2009. Top-k Set Similarity Joins. In *ICDE*. 916–927.
- [62] Chuan Xiao, Wei Wang, Xuemin Lin, Jeffrey Xu Yu, and Guoren Wang. 2011. Efficient similarity joins for near-duplicate detection. *ACM Trans. Database Syst.* 36, 3 (2011), 15:1–15:41.
- [63] Zhong Yang, Bolong Zheng, GuoHui Li, Xi Zhao, Xiaofang Zhou, and Christian S. Jensen. 2020. Adaptive Top-k Overlap Set Similarity Joins. In *ICDE*. 1081–1092.
- [64] Zijun Yao, Chengjiang Li, Tiansi Dong, Xin Lv, Jifan Yu, Lei Hou, Juanzi Li, Yichi Zhang, and Zelin Dai. 2021. Interpretable and Low-Resource Entity Matching via Decoupling Feature Learning from Decision Making. In *ACL/IJCNLP*. 2770–2781.
- [65] Minghe Yu, Guoliang Li, Dong Deng, and Jianhua Feng. 2016. String similarity search and join: a survey. *Frontiers Comput. Sci.* 10, 3 (2016), 399–417.
- [66] Dongxiang Zhang, Yuyang Nie, Sai Wu, Yanyan Shen, and Kian-Lee Tan. 2020. Multi-Context Attention for Entity Matching. In *WWW*. 2634–2640.
- [67] Wei Zhang, Hao Wei, Bunyamin Sisman, Xin Luna Dong, Christos Faloutsos, and David Page. 2020. AutoBlock: A Hands-off Blocking Framework for Entity Matching. In *WSDM*. 744–752.
- [68] Erkang Zhu, Dong Deng, Fatemeh Nargesian, and Renée J. Miller. 2019. JOSIE: Overlap Set Similarity Search for Finding Joinable Tables in Data Lakes. In *SIGMOD*. 847–864.

APPENDIX

A. Detailed Configuration.

In this section, we present the detailed configuration of every filtering method that corresponds to its performance in Table 7.

B. RUN-TIME ANALYSIS

The overall run-time of blocking workflows is broken into the run-times of the four steps:

- (1) block building time (t_b),
- (2) block purging time (t_p),
- (3) block filtering time (t_f), and
- (4) comparison cleaning time (t_c).

The overall run-time for the rest of the filtering methods is divided into:

- (1) pre-processing time (t_r),
- (2) indexing time (t_i), and
- (3) querying time (t_q).




Figure 4: Portion of run-time per step in blocking workflows in (a) schema-agnostic and (b) schema-based settings.

Table 8: The best configuration of each blocking workflow across all datasets, both in schema-agnostic and schema-based settings. *BP* stands for the use of Block Purging or not (it is a parameter-free approach), *BFr* indicates the filtering ratio used by Block Filtering, *PA* denotes the pruning algorithm that is used by the Meta-blocking step and *WS* stands for the corresponding weighting scheme. Table 3 reports the domain of each parameter.

		Schema-agnostic										Schema-based					
		D _{a1}	D _{a2}	D _{a3}	D _{a4}	D _{a5}	D _{a6}	D _{a7}	D _{a8}	D _{a9}	D _{a10}	D _{b1}	D _{b2}	D _{b3}	D _{b4}	D _{b8}	D _{b9}
Standard Blocking	<i>BP</i>	-	-	✓	✓	✓	-	-	-	✓	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	<i>BFr</i>	0.050	0.875	0.925	0.225	1.000	0.975	0.350	0.225	0.625	0.800	0.900	0.875	0.800	0.250	0.650	0.525
	<i>PA</i>	WEP	BLAST	RCNP	RCNP	RCNP	RCNP	RCNP	RCNP	RCNP	BLAST	RCNP	BLAST	BLAST	RWNP	BLAST	RCNP
	<i>WS</i>	ARCS	χ^2	χ^2	EJS	CBS	CBS	CBS	ARCS	JS	χ^2	CBS	χ^2	χ^2	ECBS	χ^2	CBS
Q-Grams Blocking	<i>q</i>	4	4	6	6	6	6	6	5	3	4	6	4	3	6	3	6
	<i>BP</i>	✓	-	✓	✓	-	-	-	✓	-	✓	-	-	-	-	✓	-
	<i>BFr</i>	0.325	0.325	0.875	0.100	0.425	0.875	0.225	0.275	0.525	0.950	0.950	0.475	0.450	0.100	0.675	0.325
	<i>PA</i>	RCNP	BLAST	CEP	WEP	RCNP	RCNP	RCNP	RCNP	BLAST	BLAST	RCNP	BLAST	BLAST	WEP	RCNP	RCNP
Extended Q-Grams Blocking	<i>q</i>	4	4	3	2	6	6	6	6	6	3	3	3	4	3	3	6
	<i>t</i>	0.80	0.90	0.90	0.85	0.90	0.90	0.80	0.80	0.90	0.90	0.90	0.80	0.90	0.85	0.90	0.90
	<i>BP</i>	-	-	-	✓	✓	-	-	-	✓	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	<i>BFr</i>	0.025	0.900	0.500	0.025	0.775	0.675	0.175	0.175	0.475	0.750	0.975	0.325	0.750	0.025	0.750	0.400
Suffix Arrays Blocking	<i>l_{min}</i>	4	2	3	2	6	6	6	5	6	6	6	2	2	2	3	6
	<i>b_{max}</i>	2	46	65	16	35	79	20	52	100	96	10	35	46	97	92	100
	<i>PA</i>	WEP	BLAST	RCNP	BLAST	RWNP	RWNP	BLAST	RCNP	RCNP	WNP	RCNP	BLAST	BLAST	BLAST	WEP	WNP
	<i>WS</i>	ECBS	χ^2	χ^2	χ^2	ARCS	ARCS	ARCS	ARCS	χ^2	χ^2	CBS	χ^2	χ^2	χ^2	χ^2	CBS
Extended Suffix Arrays Blocking	<i>l_{min}</i>	2	3	6	2	6	6	6	6	6	5	6	2	2	6	6	6
	<i>b_{max}</i>	3	10	84	8	39	86	23	24	84	100	100	18	98	20	91	100
	<i>PA</i>	RWNP	BLAST	WNP	BLAST	RWNP	RWNP	BLAST	RWNP	RCNP	CNP	RCNP	BLAST	BLAST	BLAST	WNP	CEP
	<i>WS</i>	ARCS	ARCS	ARCS	χ^2	ARCS	ARCS	ARCS	ARCS	χ^2	χ^2	CBS	ARCS	JS	ARCS	ARCS	ECBS

Table 9: The best configuration per token-based similarity join across all datasets. *CL* stands for the use of pre-processing for cleaning an attribute value, *SM* for the similarity measure, *RM* for the representation model that is used, *t* for the similarity threshold and *K* for the number of nearest neighbors, while *RVS* indicates whether \mathcal{E}_2 is indexed and \mathcal{E}_1 is used as the query set, instead of the opposite. Table 4 reports the domain of each parameter.

		Schema-agnostic										Schema-based					
		D _{a1}	D _{a2}	D _{a3}	D _{a4}	D _{a5}	D _{a6}	D _{a7}	D _{a8}	D _{a9}	D _{a10}	D _{b1}	D _{b2}	D _{b3}	D _{b4}	D _{b8}	D _{b9}
ϵ -Join	<i>CL</i>	✓	✓	✓	-	✓	-	✓	✓	✓	-	✓	✓	-	-	✓	-
	<i>RM</i>	T1G	C3G	C5G	T1G	C5GM	C2G	T1GM	C3GM	C3GM	T1G	C4G	C3GM	C3G	T1G	C3G	C3GM
	<i>SM</i>	Cosine	Cosine	Cosine	Jaccard	Cosine	Cosine	Cosine	Jaccard	Jaccard	Cosine	Cosine	Cosine	Cosine	Cosine	Cosine	Cosine
	<i>t</i>	0.82	0.26	0.08	0.58	0.16	0.34	0.49	0.28	0.35	0.15	0.63	0.38	0.39	1.00	0.41	0.81
kNN-Join	<i>CL</i>	✓	✓	✓	-	-	-	-	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	-	✓	✓
	<i>RVS</i>	✓	-	-	-	-	-	-	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	-	✓	✓
	<i>RM</i>	C4GM	C3GM	G5GM	C2GM	C5G	C5G	C5G	C4GM	C4G	C4G	C5G	C2G	C3G	C3G	C2G	C2GM
	<i>SM</i>	Dice	Cosine	Cosine	Cosine	Cosine	Cosine	Cosine	Cosine	Cosine	Cosine	Cosine	Cosine	Cosine	Cosine	Cosine	Cosine
<i>K</i>	<i>K</i>	1	4	26	1	1	1	1	2	1	5	1	3	3	1	6	1

Table 10: The best configuration of each vector-based NN method across all datasets. *CL* denotes the use of pre-processing for cleaning an attribute value, *t* the corresponding Jaccard similarity threshold, *k* the size of the k-shingles that are used as representation model and *RVS* whether the indexed and the query dataset should be reversed or not. Table 5 reports the domain of each parameter.

		Schema-agnostic										Schema-based					
		D _{a1}	D _{a2}	D _{a3}	D _{a4}	D _{a5}	D _{a6}	D _{a7}	D _{a8}	D _{a9}	D _{a10}	D _{b1}	D _{b2}	D _{b3}	D _{b4}	D _{b8}	D _{b9}
MinHash LSH	<i>CL</i>	-	-	-	✓	-	✓	-	-	-	-	✓	✓	-	✓	✓	-
	<i>#bands</i>	4	32	16	4	32	32	16	32	16	16	4	32	32	2	32	-
	<i>#buckets</i>	64	8	8	128	16	8	16	16	16	16	128	16	16	256	16	-
Cross-Polytope LSH	<i>CL</i>	-	✓	✓	✓	-	-	✓	-	✓	-	✓	✓	✓	-	✓	-
	<i>#tables</i>	16	60	20	5	10	50	8	50	50	100	24	43	65	1	500	5
	<i>#hashes</i>	2	1	1	2	1	1	2	2	1	1	2	1	1	3	2	1
	<i>cp dimension</i>	32	256	256	256	512	256	128	128	512	128	128	256	512	16	128	512
Hyperplane LSH	<i>CL</i>	-	✓	✓	✓	-	✓	✓	✓	✓	-	-	-	✓	✓	✓	-
	<i>#tables</i>	13	50	19	28	17	200	200	150	100	200	13	100	19	2	150	100
	<i>#hashes</i>	15	11	9	18	12	14	16	15	13	12	14	11	12	20	14	19
	<i>#probes</i>	297	385	275	602	461	1450	226	878	643	1961	33	181	577	2	360	111
FAISS	<i>CL</i>	-	✓	✓	✓	-	-	-	✓	✓	✓	✓	-	✓	✓	✓	✓
	<i>RVS</i>	✓	-	-	-	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	-	✓	-	✓	-	✓	✓
	<i>K</i>	3	28	545	1	30	40	4	24	71	4,860	1	18	31	1	78	1
SCANN	<i>CL</i>	-	✓	✓	✓	-	-	-	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	<i>RVS</i>	✓	-	-	-	✓	✓	✓	-	✓	-	✓	-	✓	-	✓	✓
	<i>K</i>	3	28	475	1	30	40	4	19	63	4,860	1	18	31	1	60	1
	<i>index similarity</i>	BF	BF	AH	BF	BF	BF	BF	AH	AH	BF	AH	BF	BF	BF	AH	BF
DeepBlocker	<i>CL</i>	-	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	-	-	-	-	✓
	<i>RVS</i>	-	✓	✓	✓	-	-	✓	-	-	-	-	✓	-	✓	-	-
	<i>K</i>	1	35	180	1	31	63	1	17	5	-	1	31	10	1	25	4