

Entity Matching using Large Language Models

Ralph Peeters
Data and Web Science Group
University of Mannheim
Mannheim, Germany
ralph.peeters@uni-mannheim.de

Christian Bizer
Data and Web Science Group
University of Mannheim
Mannheim, Germany
christian.bizer@uni-mannheim.de

ABSTRACT

Entity Matching is the task of deciding whether two entity descriptions refer to the same real-world entity and is a central step in most data integration pipelines. Many state-of-the-art entity matching methods rely on pre-trained language models (PLMs) such as BERT or RoBERTa. Two major drawbacks of these models for entity matching are that (i) the models require significant amounts of task-specific training data and (ii) the fine-tuned models are not robust concerning out-of-distribution entities. This paper investigates using generative large language models (LLMs) as a less task-specific training data-dependent and more robust alternative to PLM-based matchers. Our study covers hosted and open-source LLMs, which can be run locally. We evaluate these models in a zero-shot scenario and a scenario where task-specific training data is available. We compare different prompt designs and the prompt sensitivity of the models and show that there is no single best prompt but needs to be tuned for each model/dataset combination. We further investigate (i) the selection of in-context demonstrations, (ii) the generation of matching rules, as well as (iii) fine-tuning a hosted LLM using the same pool of training data. Our experiments show that the best LLMs require no or only a few training examples to perform similarly to PLMs that were fine-tuned using thousands of examples. LLM-based matchers further exhibit higher robustness to unseen entities. We show that GPT4 can generate structured explanations for matching decisions. The model can automatically identify potential causes of matching errors by analyzing explanations of wrong decisions. We demonstrate that the model can generate meaningful textual descriptions of the identified error classes, which can help data engineers improve entity matching pipelines.

KEYWORDS

Entity Matching, Large Language Models, Explainability

1 INTRODUCTION

Entity matching [3, 7, 11] is the task of discovering entity descriptions in different data sources that refer to the same real-world entity. Entity matching is a central step in data integration pipelines [8] and forms the foundation of interlinking data on the Web [27]. Application domains of entity matching include e-commerce, where offers from different vendors are matched for example for price tracking, and financial data integration, where information about companies from different sources is combined. While early matching systems relied on manually defined matching rules, supervised machine learning methods have become the foundation of entity matching systems [8] today. This trend was reinforced by the success of neural networks [3] and today most state-of-the-art matching systems rely on pre-trained language

models (PLMs), such as BERT or RoBERTa [18, 30, 32, 42]. The major drawbacks of using PLMs for entity matching are that (i) PLMs need a lot of task-specific training examples for fine-tuning and (ii) they are not very robust concerning unseen entities that were not part of the training data [1, 32].




Figure 1: Process of combining two entity descriptions into a prompt which is afterwards passed to the LLM.

Generative large language models (LLMs) [44] such as GPT, Llama, Gemini, and Mixtral have the potential to address both of these shortcomings. Due to being pre-trained on large amounts of textual data as well as due to emergent effects resulting from the model size [40], LLMs often show a better zero-shot performance compared to PLMs and are more robust concerning unseen examples [4, 44].

In this paper, we investigate using LLMs for entity matching as a less task-specific training data dependent and more robust alternative to PLM-based matchers. We evaluate the models in a zero-shot scenario as well as a scenario where task-specific training data is available and can be used for selecting demonstrations, generating matching rules, or fine-tuning the LLM. Our study covers hosted LLMs as well as open-source LLMs which can be run locally. Figure 1 shows an example of how LLMs are used for entity matching. The two entity descriptions at the bottom of the figure are combined with the question whether they refer to the same real-world entity into a prompt. The prompt is passed to the LLM, which generates the answer shown at the top of Figure 1.

Contributions: This paper makes the following contributions:

- (1) **Range of prompts:** We experiment with a wider range of zero-shot and few-shot prompts compared to the related work [12, 26, 31, 43]. This allows us to present a more nuanced picture of the strengths and weaknesses of the different approaches.

- (2) **No single best prompt:** We show that there is no single best prompt per model or per dataset but that the best prompt depends on the model/dataset combination.
- (3) **Prompt sensitivity:** We are first to investigate the sensitivity of LLMs concerning variations of entity matching prompts. Our experiments show that the matching performance of many LLMs is strongly influenced by prompt variations while the performance of other models is rather stable.
- (4) **LLMs versus PLMs:** We show that GPT4 without any task-specific training data outperforms fully fine-tuned PLMs on 3 out of 4 e-commerce datasets and achieves a comparable performance for bibliographic data. We are the first to compare the generalization performance of LLM- and PLM-based matchers for unseen entities. PLM-based matchers perform poor on entities that are not part of any pair in the training set [1, 32]. LLMs do not have this problem as they perform well without task-specific training data.
- (5) **Hosted versus open-source LLMs:** We perform a cost analysis of hosted LLMs and show that open-source LLMs can reach a similar F1 performance as hosted LLMs given that a small amount of task-specific training data or matching knowledge in the form of rules is available.
- (6) **Fine-tuning:** We are the first to experiment with fine-tuning a hosted LLM for entity matching. Our results show that fine-tuning significantly improves the performance of the LLM without harming its ability to generalize across datasets.
- (7) **Explanations and automated error analysis:** We are first to use a LLM for generating structured explanations of matching decisions. We further demonstrate that the model can automatically identify potential causes of matching errors by analyzing explanations of wrong decisions.

Structure: Section 2 introduces our experimental setup. Section 3 compares prompt designs and LLMs in the zero-shot setting, while Section 4.1 investigates whether the model performance can be improved by providing demonstrations for in-context learning. In Section 4.2, we experiment with adding matching knowledge in the form of natural language rules. Section 4.3 compares fine-tuning an LLM to the previous experiments. Section 5 presents a cost analysis of the hosted LLMs. In Section 6, we use GPT4 to create structured explanations to gain insights into the model and in Section 7 we demonstrate how to automatically discover error classes using explanations of errors. Section 8 presents related work, while Section 9 concludes the paper and summarizes the implications of our findings.

Replicability: All data and code used for the experiments presented in this paper is made publicly available¹ so that all experiments can be replicated.

2 EXPERIMENTAL SETUP

This section provides details about the large language models, the benchmark datasets, the serialization of entity descriptions, and the evaluation metrics that are used in the experiments.

¹<https://github.com/wbbsg-uni-mannheim/MatchGPT/tree/main/LLMForEM>

Large Language Models: We compare three hosted LLMs from OpenAI and three open-source LLMs that can be run on local GPUs:

- **gpt3.5-turbo-0301 (Turbo03):** This hosted LLM was used by OpenAI as the model behind ChatGPT in March 2023.
- **gpt3.5-turbo-0613 (Turbo06):** This model was released by OpenAI in June 2023. It is an updated version of the March model also available on the OpenAI API.
- **gpt4-0613 (GPT4):** The largest LLM in this study is OpenAI’s GPT4. We use the June 2023 version of the model which is accessible via the OpenAI API.
- **SOLAR-0-70b-16bit (SOLAR):** SOLAR is an open source LLM developed by upstage² and based on the 70B parameter version of Llama2 [34] as backbone model. The authors state that this model is fine-tuned on Orca- [24] and Alpaca-style³ datasets, which are not further disclosed.
- **StableBeluga2 (Beluga2):** Beluga2 is another open source LLM based on the 70B version of Llama2. It is developed by StabilityAI⁴. The model is fine-tuned using an undisclosed Orca-style dataset.
- **Mixtral-8x7B-Instruct-v0.1 (Mixtral):** Mixtral is an open-source model that consists of 8 smaller models fine-tuned for chat applications that together form a sparse mixture of experts. It is developed by Mistral AI⁵.

The following sections and tables use the model naming scheme introduced in the brackets above. We use the langchain⁶ library for interaction with the OpenAI API as well as for template-based prompt generation. We set the temperature parameter to 0 for all LLMs to reduce randomness. For the open-source LLMs, we use a local machine with an AMD EPYC 7413 processor, 1024GB RAM, and four nVidia RTX6000 GPUs.

PLM Baselines: We compare the performance of the LLMs to two PLM-based matching baselines:

- **RoBERTa:** The RoBERTa-base [21] model is the first baseline representing a PLM-based language model which has been shown to reach high performance on the entity matching task [18, 29, 42]. We fine-tune the RoBERTa model for entity matching on the respective development sets.
- **Ditto:** The Ditto [18] matching system is one of the first dedicated entity matching systems using PLMs. Ditto introduces various data augmentation and domain knowledge injection modules that can be added for model training. For our experiments, we use a RoBERTa-base language model and activate the data augmentation modules as proposed in the original paper where available.

Benchmark Datasets: We use the following benchmark datasets for our experiments [17, 32]:

- **WDC Products:** The WDC Products benchmark contains product offers spanning various product categories like electronics, clothing and tools for home improvement from thousands of different e-shops from the Web. We use the

²<https://en.upstage.ai/>

³https://github.com/tatsu-lab/stanford_alpaca

⁴<https://stability.ai/>

⁵<https://mistral.ai/>

⁶<https://www.langchain.com/>

Table 1: Statistics for the development sets and test sets for all datasets. In-context example selection and fine-tuning is performed on the training part of the development split while prompts are evaluated on the test splits.

Dataset	Development Set			Test Set		
	# Pairs	# Pos	# Neg	# Pairs	# Pos	# Neg
(WDC) - WDC Products	5,000	1,000	4,000	1,239	259	989
(A-B) - Abt-Buy	7,659	822	6,837	1,206	206	1,000
(W-A) - Walmart-Amazon	8,193	769	7,424	1,193	193	1,000
(A-G) - Amazon-Google	9,167	933	8,234	1,234	234	1,000
(D-S) - DBLP-Scholar	22,965	4,277	18,688	1,250	250	1,000
(D-A) - DBLP-ACM	9,890	1,776	8,114	1,250	250	1,000

most difficult version of the benchmark including 80% corner-cases (hard positives and hard negatives). The benchmark was released after the training data cutoff date of the LLMs.

- **Abt-Buy:** This benchmark dataset contains product offers that need to be matched. The products are from similar categories as those in WDC Products. It represents a less structured dataset as most attributes are highly textual.
- **Walmart-Amazon:** The Walmart-Amazon benchmark represents a structured matching task in the product domain. The types of products in this dataset are similar to WDC Products and Abt-Buy.
- **Amazon-Google:** The Amazon-Google dataset contains mainly offers for software products, e.g. different versions of the Windows operating system or image/video editing applications.
- **DBLP-Scholar:** The task of this benchmark dataset is to match bibliographic entries from DBLP and Google Scholar.
- **DBLP-ACM:** Similar to DBLP-Scholar, the task of DBLP-ACM is to match bibliographic entries between two sources.

Splits: For WDC Products, we use the training/validation/test split of size small [32]. For the other benchmark datasets, we use the splits established in the DeepMatcher paper [23]. Measuring the performance of entity matching methods on benchmarks which contain only small number of matches can lead to unstable results. Thus, we selected the subset of the benchmark tasks used in the DeepMatcher paper that contain at least 150 matches. As we perform a large number of experiments against the OpenAI API and as these experiments, especially for long prompts and for using the GPT4 model, result in relevant API usage fees, we down-sample all test sets to approximately 1250 entity pairs. Table 1 provides statistics about the numbers of positive (matches) and negative (non-matches) pairs in the development and test sets of all benchmarks used in the experiments.

Serialization: For the serialization of pairs of entity description into prompts, we serialize each entity description as a string by concatenating attribute values. Figure 1 shows an example of this serialization practice for a pair of product offers. We apply the same serialization method for the bibliographic data.

Evaluation: The responses gathered from the models are natural language text. In order to decide if a response refers to a positive matching decision regarding a pair of product offers, we apply simple pre-processing to the answer and subsequently parse for the

Table 2: Mean results for the zero-shot experiments.

Prompt	All Datasets (Mean F1)					
	Turbo03	Turbo06	GPT4	SOLAR	Beluga2	Mixtral
domain-complex-force	74.77	73.62	88.91	72.59	71.55	68.29
domain-complex-free	68.06	63.74	89.46	79.25	69.52	62.13
domain-simple-force	79.41	65.88	86.10	47.28	66.98	41.65
domain-simple-free	73.40	76.20	87.92	70.38	63.02	43.20
general-complex-force	73.48	71.21	87.94	61.09	68.18	59.51
general-complex-free	62.93	65.16	87.85	77.02	67.27	61.50
general-simple-force	76.92	47.53	81.12	25.97	60.18	33.59
general-simple-free	75.41	74.19	85.07	48.58	54.78	36.12
Narayan-complex	67.88	60.22	86.70	74.42	64.68	32.04
Narayan-simple	72.23	55.65	86.92	66.60	55.76	30.94
Mean	72.45	65.34	86.80	62.32	64.19	46.90
Standard deviation	4.64	8.60	2.26	16.05	5.41	13.68

word *yes*. In any other case we assume the model decides on not matching. This rather simple approach turns out to be surprisingly effective as shown by Narayan et al. [26].

3 SCENARIO 1: ZERO-SHOT PROMPTING

In the first scenario, we analyze the impact of different prompt designs on the LLMs’ entity matching performance. We further investigate the prompt sensitivity of the different models for the entity matching task and finally compare the LLMs’ performance to the PLM baselines.

Prompt Building Blocks: We construct prompts as a combination of smaller building blocks to allow the systematic evaluation of different prompt designs. Each prompt consists at least of a task description and the serialization of the pair of entity descriptions to be matched. In addition, the prompts may contain a specification of the output format. We evaluate for alternative task descriptions which formulate the task as a question using simple or complex wording combined with domain-specific or general terms. The alternative task descriptions are listed below:

- **domain-simple:** "Do the two product descriptions match?" / "Do the two publications match?"
- **domain-complex:** "Do the two product descriptions refer to the same real-world product?" / "Do the two publications refer to the same real-world publication?"
- **general-simple:** "Do the two entity descriptions match?"
- **general-complex:** "Do the two entity descriptions refer to the same real-world entity?"

A specification of the output format may follow the task description. We evaluate two formats: *free* which does not restrict the answer of the LLM and *force* which instructs the LLM to "Answer with 'Yes' if they do and 'No' if they do not". The prompt continues with the entity pair to be matched, serialized as discussed in Section 2. Figure 1 contains an example of a complete prompt implementing the prompt design *general-complex-free*. Examples of all prompt designs are found in the accompanying repository. In addition to the prompts we generate using these building blocks, we also evaluate the prompt designs proposed by Narayan et al. [26]. The main difference of these designs is that they put the serialization of the entities before the task description, while we order the task description and the serialization the other way around.

Table 3: Results (F1) of the zero-shot experiments for all LLMs and datasets. Best results are set bold, second best are underlined.

Prompt	WDC Products						Abt-Buy						Walmart-Amazon					
	Turbo03	Turbo06	GPT4	SOLAR	Beluga2	Mixtral	Turbo03	Turbo06	GPT4	SOLAR	Beluga2	Mixtral	Turbo03	Turbo06	GPT4	SOLAR	Beluga2	Mixtral
domain-complex-force	75.55	74.96	<u>88.35</u>	67.93	63.61	53.37	76.48	67.11	<u>95.15</u>	87.56	<u>84.10</u>	82.20	67.88	60.26	89.00	74.92	<u>69.64</u>	70.44
domain-complex-free	68.66	64.93	89.61	72.95	<u>54.97</u>	51.98	66.34	50.56	95.78	<u>88.42</u>	85.79	78.07	52.80	42.59	89.33	<u>81.61</u>	74.47	<u>54.42</u>
domain-simple-force	<u>79.17</u>	38.24	83.72	26.71	44.19	8.43	86.03	81.11	93.56	66.45	79.36	51.96	<u>74.38</u>	57.52	88.78	44.36	63.32	27.56
domain-simple-free	75.17	<u>72.52</u>	84.50	53.44	43.79	14.81	73.66	81.82	94.38	79.22	75.90	52.30	<u>60.24</u>	69.12	88.67	75.00	61.79	24.43
general-complex-force	76.51	60.62	85.83	56.52	54.97	42.04	74.32	<u>82.30</u>	94.40	85.04	83.51	79.02	64.26	<u>68.77</u>	89.67	65.32	63.46	50.56
general-complex-free	65.87	67.83	86.72	<u>71.98</u>	51.38	<u>52.22</u>	61.47	55.86	94.87	89.20	84.07	<u>81.27</u>	44.42	45.82	<u>89.45</u>	83.11	66.46	53.82
general-simple-force	78.33	14.02	77.39	11.28	40.00	9.89	87.39	69.07	93.23	52.30	77.47	54.04	74.81	31.03	86.41	26.79	59.59	21.20
general-simple-free	79.70	69.71	83.41	31.02	30.16	12.03	83.30	83.83	92.77	72.73	73.41	58.86	68.63	65.19	88.60	58.25	51.47	19.63
Narayan-complex	72.73	51.16	81.23	65.24	46.99	21.05	81.98	78.99	92.13	80.90	73.60	40.00	52.67	40.16	83.37	71.93	62.82	15.17
Narayan-simple	73.02	50.29	81.91	57.22	45.73	15.33	<u>86.39</u>	78.61	92.42	75.28	68.66	37.8	68.42	42.45	84.72	62.30	49.81	11.65
Mean	74.47	56.43	84.27	51.43	47.58	28.12	77.74	72.93	93.87	77.71	78.59	61.55	62.85	52.29	87.80	64.36	62.28	34.89
Standard deviation	4.28	17.87	3.42	20.13	8.78	18.31	8.43	11.23	1.17	11.01	5.44	16.32	9.59	12.82	2.08	16.69	7.09	19.39

Prompt	Amazon-Google						DBLP-Scholar						DBLP-ACM					
	Turbo03	Turbo06	GPT4	SOLAR	Beluga2	Mixtral	Turbo03	Turbo06	GPT4	SOLAR	Beluga2	Mixtral	Turbo03	Turbo06	GPT4	SOLAR	Beluga2	Mixtral
domain-complex-force	60.37	<u>61.25</u>	75.61	43.75	49.59	40.98	80.46	83.04	88.44	72.32	<u>74.58</u>	<u>75.40</u>	87.86	95.11	96.90	89.08	87.77	87.33
domain-complex-free	55.61	49.53	75.57	52.03	45.56	24.91	79.06	82.28	89.78	84.91	71.03	77.75	85.91	92.54	96.71	95.60	85.27	85.66
domain-simple-force	<u>63.64</u>	44.38	75.32	14.67	<u>47.54</u>	13.39	84.13	80.45	77.21	56.50	75.53	60.39	<u>89.10</u>	<u>93.59</u>	<u>98.03</u>	75.00	91.93	<u>88.15</u>
domain-simple-free	63.72	63.50	74.51	41.64	35.26	17.69	<u>82.25</u>	79.39	88.20	78.04	68.88	59.67	<u>85.37</u>	<u>90.84</u>	<u>97.28</u>	<u>94.95</u>	92.47	90.32
general-complex-force	57.91	44.06	74.91	19.01	42.01	<u>31.65</u>	<u>79.15</u>	78.22	87.22	52.05	72.68	66.15	88.73	93.28	95.60	88.60	92.43	87.63
general-complex-free	45.88	51.91	74.38	44.31	40.50	29.45	76.47	83.03	87.50	<u>79.91</u>	68.18	68.01	83.47	86.51	94.16	<u>93.62</u>	<u>93.00</u>	84.23
general-simple-force	49.56	15.73	53.60	5.79	31.02	11.24	81.89	67.18	78.26	12.69	64.78	31.65	89.56	88.12	97.85	46.95	88.21	73.50
general-simple-free	57.63	52.31	66.67	14.12	28.77	12.70	<u>77.53</u>	80.81	81.47	41.38	54.49	38.59	85.66	93.28	97.47	73.95	90.36	74.88
Narayan-complex	43.35	33.33	76.38	54.69	45.97	3.36	68.67	70.67	89.82	78.82	65.62	27.40	87.86	87.03	97.27	94.91	93.05	85.26
Narayan-simple	56.35	29.61	<u>75.70</u>	39.62	34.34	2.51	67.52	56.90	88.37	74.40	54.02	35.06	81.67	76.05	98.41	90.75	81.97	83.30
Mean	55.40	44.56	72.27	32.96	40.06	18.79	77.71	76.20	85.63	63.10	66.98	54.01	86.52	89.64	96.97	84.34	89.65	84.03
Standard deviation	6.66	13.99	6.76	16.80	6.93	11.99	5.27	8.18	4.53	21.49	7.18	18.01	2.44	5.34	1.19	14.53	3.58	5.29

Effectiveness: Table 2 shows the averaged results of our zero-shot experiments across all datasets. Table 3 shows the results for each dataset separately. With regards to overall performance, the GPT4 model outperforms all other LLMs on all datasets by at least 3% F1 achieving an absolute performance of 89% or higher on 5 of 6 datasets without requiring any task-specific training data. When comparing the GPT3.5 versions, the best prompt of the more recent version (Turbo06) performs 5% F1 worse than the best prompt of the earlier version across 3 of the 6 datasets, indicating that the changes made to the model in the newer version have degraded the performance on the domain of tangible products. The performance on the other 3 datasets is comparable with the newer version even achieving a 5% higher score on the DBLP-ACM dataset. Comparing the open source LLMs, the SOLAR model achieves 2-10% higher F1 scores than Beluga2 across all datasets. SOLAR can surpass the best GPT3.5 result by 2% and 9% F1 on two datasets, while achieving a similar result on the publication datasets and falling behind by 7% and 9% on the remaining two datasets. The Mixtral model does not perform as well on the task trailing the other open-source models by 3-10% on 5 datasets. In summary, the results indicate that locally run open-source LLMs can perform similarly to OpenAI’s GPT3.5 models given that the right prompt is selected. If maximum performance is desired, none of the other LLMs can reach the performance of GPT4 in the zero-shot setting. Due to space reasons, we provide precision and recall results for the experiments in the accompanying repository.

Sensitivity: Small variations in prompts can have a large impact on the overall task performance [20, 26, 45]. We measure this prompt sensitivity as the standard deviation (SD) of the F1 scores of a model over all 10 prompt designs. We list this standard deviation in the lower section of Tables 2 and 3. Comparing the prompt

sensitivity of the models, the GPT4 model is most invariant to the wording of the prompt (mean-SD 2.26) while also achieving high results with most of the prompt designs. Comparing the sensitivity of GPT4 to the GPT3.5 models shows that the later models have a significantly higher prompt sensitivity. For the open source LLMs, the better performing SOLAR has the highest prompt sensitivity among all models tested (mean-SD 16.05), making prompt search a must. Mixtral is slightly less sensitive (mean-SD 13.68) while the Beluga2 model is least sensitive among the open-source models.

Prompt to Model Fit: The best result for each model is set bold in Table 3, the second best result is underlined. This highlighting shows that there is no prompt design that performs best for most models. Taking the mean F1 scores in Table 2 as basis, the prompt design *domain-complex* performs best for the GPT4, SOLAR, Beluga2 and Mixtral models, while the prompt design *domain-simple* works best for the GPT-Turbo models. When looking at the best performing prompts per dataset in Table 3, the highlighting of best and second best results clearly shows that there is no prompt that works best for a specific model or dataset. As a result, a prompt search is necessary for each model/dataset combination.

Comparison to PLM Baselines: We compare the zero-shot performance of the LLMs to the performance of two PLM-based matchers: a fine-tuned RoBERTa model [21] and Ditto [18], an entity matching system which also relies on domain-specific training data. Table 4 shows the overall best results for each LLM in comparison to the two PLM-based matchers on all datasets. For three out of the six datasets, GPT4 achieves higher performance than the best PLM baseline (2.65-4.71% F1), while the performance for the other three datasets is 3.69, 4.49 and 0.73% F1 lower. This shows that GPT4 without using any task-specific training data is able to reach comparable results or even outperform PLMs that were fine-tuned

Table 4: Comparison of F1 scores of the best zero-shot prompt per model with fine-tuned baselines. Best result is bold, second best is underlined. The "Unseen" rows correspond to training on the respective dataset named in the column and applying the model to the WDC Products test set.

	WDC	A-B	W-A	A-G	D-S	D-A
Turbo03	79.70	87.39	74.81	63.72	84.13	89.56
Turbo06	74.96	83.83	69.25	63.50	83.04	95.11
GPT4	89.61	95.78	89.67	76.38	89.82	98.41
SOLAR	72.95	89.20	83.11	54.69	84.91	95.60
Beluga2	63.61	85.79	74.47	49.59	75.53	93.05
Mixtral	53.37	82.20	70.44	40.98	77.75	90.32
RoBERTa	77.53	91.21	<u>87.02</u>	<u>79.27</u>	93.88	99.14
Ditto	<u>84.90</u>	<u>91.31</u>	86.39	80.07	94.31	<u>99.00</u>
Δ best LLM/PLM	4.71	4.47	2.65	-3.69	-4.49	-0.73
RoBERTa Unseen	-	55.52	36.46	31.00	29.64	16.25
Ditto Unseen	-	48.74	31.55	33.12	32.82	29.00
Δ RoBERTa Unseen	-	-22.01	-41.07	-46.53	-47.89	-61.28
Δ Ditto Unseen	-	-36.16	-53.35	-51.78	-52.08	-55.90

using thousands of training pairs (see Table 1). The reliance on large amounts of task-specific training data to achieve good performance is one of the main shortcomings of fine-tuned PLMs. Thus, LLMs could be the preferred choice if task-specific training data is not available or costly to obtain.

Generalization: Another shortcoming of PLM-based matchers is their low robustness to out-of-distribution entities, e.g. entities that are not part of any training pair [1, 32]. In another set of experiments, we apply each of the previously fine-tuned RoBERTa and Ditto models, apart from the one fine-tuned on WDC Products, to the WDC Products test set, which contains a different set of products which are thus unseen to these fine-tuned models. We report the results of these experiments in the "RoBERTa Unseen" and "Ditto Unseen" rows at the bottom of Table 4. Compared to fine-tuning directly on the WDC Products development set (84.90% F1 for Ditto), the transfer of fine-tuned models leads to large drops in performance ranging from 36 to 56% F1 for Ditto and 22 to 61% F1 for RoBERTa. All LLMs apart from Mixtral achieve at least 8% F1 higher performance than the best transferred PLM while GPT4 outperforms it by 34%. These results indicate that LLMs have a general capability to perform entity matching while PLM-based matchers are fitted closely to entities of specific datasets after fine-tuning.

4 SCENARIO 2: WITH TRAINING DATA

Task-specific training data in the form of matching and non-matching entity pairs can be used to (i) add demonstrations to the prompts, (ii) learn textual matching rules, and (iii) fine-tune the LLMs. In this section, we explore whether and how our zero-shot results can be improved by using task-specific training data. In order to make the results comparable, we use the same development sets (see Table 1)

that we already used for fine-tuning the PLM-based matchers for all experiments.

4.1 In-Context Learning

For the in-context learning experiments, we provide each LLM with a set of task demonstrations [19] as part of the prompt to help guide the models decisions. The provided demonstrations are then followed by the specific entity description pair for which the model should generate an answer. Figure 2 shows an example of an in-context learning prompt with a single positive and a single negative demonstration. We vary the amount of demonstrations in each prompt from 6 to 10 with an equal amount of positive and negative examples. For the selection of the demonstrations, we compare three different heuristics:

Task Desc.	Do the following two product descriptions match?
Demonstrations	Product 1: 'Title: DYMO D1 19 mm x 7 m' Product 2: 'Title: Dymo D1 (19mm x 7m – BoW)'
Answer	Yes.
Task Desc.	Do the following two product descriptions match?
Demonstrations	Product 1: 'Title: DYMO D1 Tape 24mm' Product 2: 'Title: Dymo D1 19mm x 7m'
Answer	No.
Task Desc.	Do the following two product descriptions match?
Task Input	Product 1: 'Title: DYMO D1 – Roll (1.9cm x 7m)' Product 2: 'Title: DYMO D1 Tape 12mm x 7m'

Figure 2: Example of a prompt containing a positive and a negative demonstration before asking for a decision.

- **Hand-picked:** Hand-picked demonstrations are a set of entity description pairs which were hand-selected by a human domain expert with the aim to cover potentially helpful corner cases. For the four datasets of the product domain, these examples are selected from the training set of the WDC Products benchmark. For the two datasets from the publication domain, the examples are selected from the pool of training examples of DBLP-Scholar.
- **Random:** For this heuristic, task demonstrations are drawn randomly from the labeled training set of the corresponding benchmark.
- **Related:** Related demonstrations are selected from the training set of the corresponding benchmark by calculating the Jaccard similarity between the string representation of the pair to be matched and all positive and negative pairs in the training set. The resulting similarity lists are sorted and the most similar examples are selected. Due to this process, related examples can be considered highly similar to the specific task at hand.

Effectiveness: Table 5 shows the averaged results of the in-context experiments in comparison to the best zero-shot baselines.

Table 5: Mean results for the in-context learning.

Prompt	All Datasets (Mean F1)						
	Shots	Turbo03	Turbo06	GPT4	SOLAR	Beluga2	Mixtral
Fewshot-related	6	80.47	77.40	90.24	72.36	81.10	50.51
	10	79.58	77.98	90.80	51.45	79.40	53.25
Fewshot-random	6	84.52	80.95	89.44	69.40	83.17	57.37
	10	84.59	81.94	89.05	63.09	83.52	53.94
Fewshot-handpicked	6	84.55	78.39	88.61	75.21	83.75	57.76
	10	84.84	80.64	88.76	72.07	82.97	51.03
Hand-written rules	0	81.42	74.97	87.65	80.47	78.54	79.03
Learned rules	0	80.29	71.48	86.64	77.84	80.06	<u>74.53</u>
Mean	-	82.53	77.97	88.90	70.24	81.56	59.68
Standard deviation	-	2.15	3.23	1.25	8.66	1.92	10.23
Best zero-shot	0	79.89	78.26	89.95	<u>80.08</u>	73.67	69.18
Δ Few-shot/zero-shot	-	4.95	3.67	0.85	-4.86	10.08	-11.42
Δ Rules/zero-shot	-	1.53	-3.29	-2.29	0.39	6.39	9.86

Table 6 shows the results for each dataset independently. Depending on the model/dataset combination the usefulness of in-context learning differs. The GPT4 model, which is the best performing model in the zero-shot scenario, only improves significantly on Amazon-Google (9%) with marginal improvements on two datasets (0.6-1.5%) when supplying related demonstrations and an improvement of 2% on DBLP-Scholar with handpicked demonstrations. GPT4’s performance on WDC Products and Abt-Buy drops irrespective of the demonstration selection method meaning that the model does not need the additional guidance in these cases. For all other LLMs providing in-context examples usually leads to larger performance improvements, while the size of the improvements varies widely in the range of 0.5% to 25% F1. Interestingly, the largest improvements for all models with in-context learning are observable on the Amazon-Google dataset. As stated in Section 2, this dataset contains software products which are somewhat different to the products in the other three product datasets that mainly contain tangible products like for example electronics, tools, or clothing items. Demonstrations seems to be more helpful for this specific category of products. In summary, in-context learning can generally improve the performance of an LLM on the entity matching task for most model/dataset combinations with the exception of GPT4 which does not need the additional guidance on two datasets as well as Mixtral which suffers large performance drops on many datasets. As a result, the usefulness of in-context learning cannot be assumed and needs to be determined experimentally for each model/dataset combination. As for the zero-shot scenario, we provide the precision and recall values in the accompanying repository.

Comparison of Selection Methods: While providing demonstrations generally improves results for most LLMs and datasets, the demonstration selection method that works best varies depending on the dataset. The open-source LLMs generally reach the best performance when random or handpicked demonstrations are provided. GPT4 on the other hand, achieves the highest scores using related demonstrations apart from DBLP-Scholar, which points towards the model being able to better understand and transfer the specific patterns of such closely related examples to the current matching decision. The handpicked demonstrations are helpful for the Turbo models and Beluga2 on WDC Products but interestingly also lead to improvements on the other product datasets.

We observe a similar generalization effect on a larger scale during fine-tuning in Section 4.3.

4.2 Learning Matching Rules

In this set of experiments, instead of providing the models with in-context examples, we provide a set of textual matching rules in the prompt in order to guide the model to find the correct solution. We differentiate between two kinds of rules (i) handwritten and (ii) learned rules. Handwritten rules are a simple set of rules provided by a domain expert and are depicted in Figure 3 for the product domain. For the learned rules, we pass the handpicked examples that were used for the in-context experiments to GPT4 and ask the model to generate matching rules from these examples. A subset of these rules for the product domain is depicted in Figure 3. For the full list of learned rules, please refer to the project repository.

Task Desc.	The following rules regarding product features need to be observed:
Hand-Written Rules	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The brand of matching products must be the same if available. 2. Model names of matching products must be the same if available. 3. Model numbers of matching products must be the same if available. 4. Additional features of matching products must be the same if available. 5. Matching attributes may not have the exact same surface form due to different case, typos, value formats. 6. If an attribute is missing for one description, it is likely still a match if the existing attributes match.
Task Desc.	Do the following two product descriptions match? Answer with ‘Yes’ if they do and ‘No’ if they do not.
Task Input	Product 1: ‘Title: DYMO D1 – Roll (1.9cm x 7m)’ Product 2: ‘Title: DYMO D1 Tape 12mm x 7m’
Learned Rules	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The product titles match if they both refer to the same core product, which means they have the same primary brand and product model ... Order of words and usage of separators (like hyphen, comma, slash, parentheses) does not matter ... 3. The product titles match if they both contain the same key information, even if one product title contains additional details ... 4. Exact matching of all specifications is not necessary. Titles match as long as the critical specs like model number, series, and brand are the same ... 5. The product titles do not match if they refer to different models of the same brand ... 6. ...

Figure 3: Example of a prompt containing handwritten matching rules for the product domain. A subset of the learned rules is depicted below. Each learned rule is usually accompanied by an example which we omit for brevity.

Effectiveness: Table 6 shows the results of providing matching rules in comparison to the best zero-shot prompt and the in-context experiments. The results show that GPT4 with matching rules does not improve over its best zero-shot performance and instead loses 1% to 3% F1 on all datasets. All other models see improvements of 0.5% to 17% F1 over zero-shot depending on model and dataset. Interestingly, the Mixtral LLM, which has comparatively low performance compared to all other LLMs in the zero-shot and few-shot settings, significantly improves with the provision of rules on all datasets, gaining from 3 to 17% F1 closing the gap to all other LLMs. This indicates that the provision of matching rules can be helpful, especially for the open-source LLMs with Mixtral achieving its highest scores on all datasets using rules. In summary, providing task demonstrations generally leads to higher performance gains than providing matching rules for all models with the exception

Table 6: Results (F1) of the few-shot and rule-based experiments in comparison to the best zero-shot prompt for all LLMs and datasets. Best result is bold, second best is underlined.

Prompt	Shots	WDC Products						Abt-Buy						Walmart-Amazon					
		Turbo03	Turbo06	GPT4	SOLAR	Beluga2	Mixtral	Turbo03	Turbo06	GPT4	SOLAR	Beluga2	Mixtral	Turbo03	Turbo06	GPT4	SOLAR	Beluga2	Mixtral
Fewshot-related	6	61.70	43.29	85.71	59.45	67.35	37.45	<u>91.93</u>	93.14	93.83	87.92	90.20	49.77	84.73	78.70	91.19	77.92	77.69	50.78
	10	57.46	42.94	86.45	48.11	61.58	41.93	91.48	<u>92.98</u>	<u>94.35</u>	62.61	89.38	52.44	83.90	80.27	91.24	54.92	80.21	54.70
Fewshot-random	6	<u>84.09</u>	80.93	86.55	74.76	73.48	53.8	90.78	83.51	94.12	75.38	85.65	55.75	87.62	75.26	88.89	78.96	83.25	53.68
	10	83.27	<u>79.43</u>	86.37	69.51	<u>73.64</u>	50.22	90.25	84.39	93.21	70.55	86.52	49.80	<u>86.70</u>	78.30	89.00	69.60	<u>84.11</u>	46.94
Fewshot-handpicked	6	85.44	78.65	<u>87.23</u>	61.19	74.2	48.12	92.52	81.89	93.36	86.09	90.65	47.79	83.84	67.86	88.84	80.00	84.18	50.64
	10	83.33	79.31	86.72	64.94	73.33	44.86	93.36	86.65	93.62	82.07	89.36	42.02	84.47	73.96	87.89	77.29	82.47	45.56
Hand-written rules	0	79.85	68.93	85.71	<u>73.26</u>	70.35	<u>69.81</u>	86.70	74.81	94.15	86.44	85.93	<u>86.18</u>	74.90	61.97	89.16	83.02	81.82	83.08
Learned rules	0	71.81	59.63	87.06	72.96	72.45	70.25	87.50	83.09	93.40	84.11	87.08	88.83	82.81	71.68	86.21	83.37	79.40	<u>80.11</u>
Mean	-	75.87	66.64	86.48	65.52	70.80	52.06	90.57	85.06	93.76	79.40	88.10	59.07	83.62	73.50	89.05	75.64	81.64	58.19
Standard deviation	-	10.26	15.14	0.52	8.48	4.08	11.38	2.20	5.62	0.39	8.46	1.88	16.83	3.61	5.78	1.54	8.79	2.19	13.83
Best zero-shot	0	79.70	74.96	89.61	72.95	63.61	53.37	87.39	83.83	95.78	89.20	85.79	82.20	74.81	69.12	89.67	<u>83.11</u>	74.47	70.44
Δ Few-shot/zero-shot	-	<u>5.74</u>	<u>5.97</u>	<u>-2.38</u>	<u>1.81</u>	<u>10.59</u>	<u>0.43</u>	<u>5.97</u>	<u>9.31</u>	<u>-1.43</u>	<u>-1.28</u>	<u>4.86</u>	<u>-26.45</u>	<u>12.81</u>	<u>11.15</u>	<u>1.57</u>	<u>-3.11</u>	<u>9.71</u>	<u>-15.74</u>
Δ Rules/zero-shot	-	<u>0.15</u>	<u>-6.03</u>	<u>-2.55</u>	<u>0.31</u>	<u>8.84</u>	<u>16.88</u>	<u>0.11</u>	<u>-0.74</u>	<u>-1.63</u>	<u>-2.76</u>	<u>1.29</u>	<u>6.63</u>	<u>8.00</u>	<u>2.56</u>	<u>-0.51</u>	<u>0.26</u>	<u>7.35</u>	<u>12.64</u>

Prompt	Shots	Amazon-Google						DBLP-Scholar						DBLP-ACM					
		Turbo03	Turbo06	GPT4	SOLAR	Beluga2	Mixtral	Turbo03	Turbo06	GPT4	SOLAR	Beluga2	Mixtral	Turbo03	Turbo06	GPT4	SOLAR	Beluga2	Mixtral
Fewshot-related	6	<u>78.15</u>	<u>80.16</u>	<u>84.27</u>	60.92	72.48	39.11	68.90	71.25	88.00	61.67	82.43	53.82	<u>97.41</u>	97.83	98.41	86.29	96.44	72.12
	10	78.42	82.58	85.21	41.35	68.53	47.89	68.80	71.29	88.52	43.81	81.53	55.57	<u>97.42</u>	<u>97.82</u>	99.01	57.91	95.18	66.95
Fewshot-random	6	75.27	69.68	78.08	47.69	<u>73.76</u>	48.99	76.25	80.09	90.21	49.22	87.26	55.80	93.10	96.24	<u>98.81</u>	90.41	95.60	76.21
	10	75.85	73.27	78.76	43.57	74.59	46.17	77.41	79.91	89.30	45.84	87.80	56.13	94.05	96.31	97.66	79.48	94.43	74.39
Fewshot-handpicked	6	73.11	67.85	76.92	<u>62.72</u>	71.52	45.92	78.52	79.20	<u>90.98</u>	64.78	86.00	67.70	93.87	94.86	94.34	96.50	<u>95.95</u>	86.36
	10	73.37	68.01	76.57	62.31	70.64	<u>49.18</u>	80.86	80.44	91.81	48.74	<u>87.55</u>	55.61	93.64	95.48	95.97	97.06	94.48	68.97
Hand-written rules	0	68.81	66.11	72.47	64.53	62.33	58.31	<u>82.70</u>	<u>82.92</u>	87.34	78.97	77.00	83.55	95.53	95.06	97.09	96.57	93.78	93.26
Learned rules	0	65.73	54.92	73.50	62.32	62.21	48.55	82.97	77.98	89.42	77.02	85.88	78.38	90.91	81.57	90.25	87.26	93.36	81.04
Mean	-	73.59	70.32	78.22	55.68	69.51	48.02	77.05	77.89	89.45	58.76	84.43	63.32	94.49	94.40	96.44	86.44	94.90	77.41
Standard deviation	-	4.14	8.08	4.27	9.08	4.53	4.95	5.23	4.03	1.41	13.08	3.56	11.03	2.07	4.96	2.76	12.22	1.00	8.39
Best zero-shot	0	63.72	63.50	76.38	54.69	49.59	40.98	84.13	83.04	89.82	84.91	75.53	<u>77.75</u>	89.56	95.11	98.41	<u>95.60</u>	93.05	<u>90.32</u>
Δ Few-shot/zero-shot	-	<u>14.70</u>	<u>19.08</u>	<u>8.83</u>	<u>8.03</u>	<u>25.00</u>	<u>8.20</u>	<u>-3.27</u>	<u>-2.60</u>	<u>1.99</u>	<u>-20.13</u>	<u>12.27</u>	<u>-10.05</u>	<u>7.86</u>	<u>2.72</u>	<u>0.60</u>	<u>1.46</u>	<u>3.39</u>	<u>-3.96</u>
Δ Rules/zero-shot	-	<u>5.09</u>	<u>2.61</u>	<u>-2.88</u>	<u>9.84</u>	<u>12.74</u>	<u>17.33</u>	<u>-1.43</u>	<u>-0.12</u>	<u>-0.40</u>	<u>-5.94</u>	<u>10.35</u>	<u>5.80</u>	<u>5.97</u>	<u>-0.05</u>	<u>-1.32</u>	<u>0.97</u>	<u>0.73</u>	<u>2.94</u>

of Mixtral, which struggles with demonstrations but significantly improves with provided rules.

Sensitivity: Similarly to the zero-shot scenario, we measure the prompt sensitivity of each LLM across all few-shot and rule experiments. We list this standard deviation in the lower section of Tables 5 and 6. Comparing the prompt sensitivity of the models to the zero-shot deviations across different prompt formulations, the average deviation from the mean has decreased for all models, suggesting that the additional guidance in the form of demonstrations and rules leads to more robust results overall.

4.3 Fine-Tuning

In the next set of experiments, we fine-tune the Turbo06 model via the OpenAI API, which is the only recent LLM offered for fine-tuning by OpenAI at the time of writing. Specifically, we use the development splits of each dataset to train a fine-tuned Turbo06 model and subsequently apply the fine-tuned models to all other datasets. We run fine-tuning for 3 epochs using the default parameters suggested by OpenAI.

Effectiveness: The results of the fine-tuned LLMs are shown in Table 7. When comparing the results to the best zero-shot performance of the same model (Turbo06), there is a substantial improvement of 4% to 20% F1 depending on the dataset. These improvements allow the fine-tuned Turbo06 model to nearly reach the performance of the best GPT4 zero-shot prompt on two datasets, missing only a single F1 point. On the remaining four datasets, the fine-tuned Turbo06 exceeds the performance of zero-shot GPT4 by

Table 7: Results for fine-tuning Turbo06 and transfer to all datasets. Left-most column shows the dataset used for fine-tuning. Best result is bold, second best is underlined.

	WDC	A-B	W-A	A-G	D-S	D-A
WDC Products	<u>88.34</u>	<u>94.69</u>	<u>90.55</u>	77.82	88.97	95.60
Abt-Buy	62.53	94.18	90.19	<u>79.84</u>	89.36	96.15
Walmart-Amazon	52.33	92.80	92.76	<u>78.80</u>	87.93	97.42
Amazon-Google	48.66	89.97	87.26	79.81	91.01	96.15
DBLP-Scholar	11.32	57.24	57.55	35.33	92.49	98.02
DBLP-ACM	20.00	79.20	65.37	42.46	88.93	99.40
Best ZS Turbo06	74.96	83.83	69.12	63.50	83.04	95.11
Best FS/R Turbo06	80.93	93.14	80.27	82.58	82.92	97.83
Best ZS GPT4	89.61	95.78	89.67	76.38	89.82	98.41
Δ GPT4/FT	<u>-1.27</u>	<u>-1.09</u>	<u>3.09</u>	<u>3.46</u>	<u>2.67</u>	<u>0.99</u>

1 to 3% F1. When compared to the best Turbo06 model leveraging in-context learning or rules, fine-tuning leads to improvements of 1% to 12% F1 on 4 of 5 datasets while the best results on Amazon-Google are achieved with in-context learning. In summary, fine-tuning the model leads to improved results compared to the zero-shot version of the model rivaling the performance of the best GPT4 prompts with a much cheaper model.

Generalization: We observe a generalization effect of Turbo06 models fine-tuned on one dataset to datasets from related domains

Table 8: Costs for hosted LLMs on WDC Products. The best performing prompt was selected for the analysis for each scenario.

	Zeroshot		6-Shot		10-Shot		Rules (written)		Rules (learned)		Fine-tune	
	Turbo03	GPT4	Turbo03	GPT4	Turbo03	GPT4	Turbo03	GPT4	Turbo03	GPT4	Train	Inference
F1 (Best prompt)	79.70	89.61	85.44	87.23	83.33	86.72	79.85	85.71	71.81	87.06	-	88.34
Mean # Tokens prompt	71	77	639	639	942	942	214	214	817	817	97	88
Mean # Tokens completion	49	40	2	2	2	2	1	1	2	1	1	1
Mean # Tokens combined	120	117	641	641	944	944	215	215	819	818	98	89
Token incr. to ZS	-	-	5.3x	5.5x	7.9x	8.1x	1.8x	1.8x	6.8x	7x	0.8x	0.8x
Cost per prompt	0.02¢	0.47¢	0.10¢	2.06¢	0.15¢	3.04¢	0.03¢	0.65¢	0.12¢	2.46¢	0.23¢	0.11¢
Cost incr. to ZS (Turbo03)	-	23x	5x	102x	7.5x	151x	1.5x	32x	6x	122x	11.5x	5.5x
Cost incr. per Δ F1 to ZS	-	2.4x	0.87x	43x	2x	52x	10x	8x	0.8x	48x	-	0.6x

Table 9: Runtime in seconds per prompt (request) for three LLMs using the best prompts from the previous sections on the WDC Products dataset.

Model	Zeroshot	6-Shot	10-Shot	Rules (written)	Rules (learned)	Fine-Tune (Inference)
Turbo03/06	0.73 s	0.34 s	0.37 s	0.32 s	0.37 s	0.31 s
GPT4	2.19 s	0.75 s	0.78 s	0.68 s	0.76 s	-
SOLAR	27.98 s	5.78 s	17.39 s	0.97 s	1.98 s	-

and even across domains. Transferring models between the product domains in general leads to improved performance of 6-18% F1 over the best zero-shot prompts for all models unless transferred to WDC Products where all models experience a drop of at least 12% F1 in performance compared to zero-shot. This suggests, that many of the patterns found in WDC Products are transferable to the other product datasets while the patterns of the other datasets may be too simple to be helpful for WDC Products which contains 80% corner cases [32]. Furthermore, all models fine-tuned on the datasets from the product domain exhibit good generalization to the publication domain, resulting in improvements of 5-8% F1 over the best zero-shot prompt on DBLP-Scholar and 0.5-2.5% on DBLP-ACM. Conversely, transferring fine-tuned models among the publication domain shows the same effect. Interestingly, the transfer does not work in the other direction as transferring a model from the arguably easier publication domain leads to lower performance on the product domain datasets. The transfer of fine-tuned models to unseen benchmarks has received quite some research attention in the context of PLM-based matchers [35, 36] but often results in a significant loss of performance as we saw in Table 4. As we have shown in Section 3, LLM-based matchers perform within 4% F1 of PLMs in the zero-shot scenario which essentially constitutes an unseen scenario for the LLMs. The fine-tuning experiments show that tuning a model on a related training set can even further improve performance over the zero-shot results for the Turbo06 model. In how far this effect is present across other LLMs is an interesting avenue for future work.

5 COST ANALYSIS

Apart from pure matching performance there are additional considerations such as data privacy requirements and the cost of using hosted LLMs which may result in the decision to use a less performant but cheaper hosted LLM or to run an open-source LLM on local hardware. Table 8 contains an analysis of the costs associated with the hosted LLMs across both experimental scenarios for the WDC Products dataset. The cost of using a hosted LLMs is dependent on the length of the respective prompts, measured by the amount of tokens, and the current prices of the respective model. Thus, the results we present here are only a snapshot as of April 2024 as the prices are subject to change at any time. We compare the models GPT4 and Turbo03. The pricing of the models at experimentation time is 1.5\$/2\$ and 30\$/60\$ for 1M prompt/completion tokens for Turbo03 and GPT4 respectively. Thus, the GPT4 model is twenty times more expensive for prompt tokens and thirty times more expensive for completion (output) tokens, than the Turbo03 model. Table 8 shows that all prompting approaches from Scenario 2 in Section 4 with the exception of fine-tuning require between 1.5 and 8.1 times the amount of tokens per prompt compared to basic zeroshot prompting. For all of them this is due to longer prompts, either because of the inclusion of fewshot demonstrations or rules. The fine-tuning approach on the other hand has lesser token requirements than zeroshot as the prompt we chose for fine-tuning leverages the restricted output format *force* (see Section 3) whereas the best zeroshot prompts for Turbo03 and GPT4 use the *free* format which allows the model to answer more verbosely. From a cost perspective, all methods from Scenario 2 incur an increase in cost of 1.5 to 151 times the cost of the zero-shot Turbo03 model. The relative increase in matching performance across these methods thus comes at high price of at least 0.6 times the zero-shot cost per gained F1 compared to Turbo03.

Table 9 presents an analysis of the time performance per prompt for the Turbo, GPT4 and SOLAR models. The selected prompts and the used numbers of tokens are the same as in Table 8. Prompting GPT4 generally takes double the amount of time as prompting the Turbo models if we restrict the answering of the model using the *force* output format. If we do not restrict the answer and let the model freely generate (zeroshot prompts), GPT4 requires three times the time compared to the Turbo models as token generation seems to be more time-intensive compared to processing prompt

input tokens for this model. The locally hosted open-source LLM SOLAR requires the largest amount of time for all scenarios on our hardware (see Section 2), especially when generating freely in the zeroshot case where the runtime is nearly fourteen times higher than for GPT4.

6 EXPLAINING MATCHING DECISIONS

Understanding the decisions of a matching model is important for users to build trust towards the systems. Explanations of model decisions can further be used for debugging matching pipelines. The size and structure of deep learning models makes explaining the models decisions a difficult endeavour that has spawned its own direction of research in the field of entity matching [2, 10, 28, 29]. Instead of relying on external explainability methods, LLMs can directly be queried for explanations of their matching decisions. In this Section we use GPT4 to generate structured explanations for its decisions and show how to aggregate these explanations to derive global insights about matching decisions.

6.1 Generating Explanations

For the generation of explanations, we first prompt the LLM to match a pair of entities and subsequently ask the model for an explanation of its decision using a second prompt. If we do not pose any restrictions on the format of the explanation, the model would answer with natural language text describing the different aspects that influenced its decision [25]. Instead of allowing free-text explanations, we ask the model to organize its explanations into a fixed structure which will later allow us to parse and aggregate the explanations. Figure 4 shows examples of complete conversations for generating structured explanations for pairs from the Walmart-Amazon and DBLP-Scholar datasets. After prompting for and receiving a decision in the first exchange with the model, we continue the conversation by passing a second prompt (the second user prompt in Figure 4). Specifically, we ask for a structured format of the explanation that includes all attributes of both product offers that were used for the matching decision. Each attribute should be accompanied by an importance value as well as a similarity value for the compared attributes. The sign of the importance values should be negative if the attribute comparison contributed to a non-match decision and vice versa. We subsequently query one explanation for each pair in the test sets of both datasets for the best performing zeroshot prompt.

The first structured explanation of the product pair from Walmart-Amazon in Figure 4 shows that the model is very capable of extracting various attributes from the serialized strings. The highest positive importance is assigned to the *model* followed by the *brand* and the *price*. Although none of these strings perfectly match, they are very similar and the model correctly assigns them a high similarity and positive importance value and considers them indications for matching product offers. Interestingly, the model extracted the hard drive size from the first offer which is missing in the description of the second offer and assigned this circumstance a low negative importance score. As the size of the hard drive is an important piece of information for matching, the model may be accounting for this uncertainty by reducing its confidence in this specific case. In the explanation for the DBLP-Scholar pair the *authors* match perfectly,

Actor	Prompt (Walmart-Amazon)
User	"Do the two entity descriptions refer to the same real-world entity? Answer with 'Yes' if they do and 'No' if they do not. Entity 1: night owl night owl zeus-810 16-channel h. 264 dvr kit with 1tb hard drive 773.82 Entity 2: night owl optics security zeus-810 16-channel 8-camera h. 264 dvr surveillance kit with d1 recording and hdmi output zeus-810 676.63"
AI	Yes.
User	Now explain your decision in a structured format , listing the attributes that you compared for reaching your decision. Each attribute should be accompanied by the attribute values and a score between -1 and 1 that shows the importance of the attribute for the decision. If the attribute influenced the decision towards non-match the importance score should be negative. If the attribute pointed towards a match, the importance score should be positive. Also provide a similarity score for the attribute values . If an attribute only occurs in one item, specify the value of that attribute for the other item as "missing". An example output is the following: attribute=brand - importance=0.05 - values=Logitech###Logitech - similarity=1.00 attribute=model - importance=-0.95 - values=MX G500###MX Master 3S - similarity=0.20 attribute=color - importance=0.00 - values=missing###Graphite - similarity=0.00'
AI	attribute=brand - importance=0.30 - values=Night Owl###Night Owl Optics - similarity=0.90 attribute=model - importance=0.40 - values=Zeus-810 16-channel H. 264 DVR kit###Zeus-810 16-channel 8-camera H. 264 DVR surveillance kit - similarity=0.85 attribute=price - importance=0.20 - values=773.82###676.63 - similarity=0.80 attribute=hard drive - importance=-0.10 - values=1TB###missing - similarity=0.00
Actor	Prompt (DBLP-Scholar)
User	"Do the two entity descriptions refer to the same real-world entity? Answer with 'Yes' if they do and 'No' if they do not. Entity 1: b george , j haritsa secure bufering in firm real-time database systems vldb j. 2000 Entity 2: b george , j haritsa secure transaction processing in firm real-time database systems sigmod conference , 1997.0"
AI	No.
User	Now explain your decision ... (same as in example above)
AI	attribute=authors - importance=0.30 - values=b george , j haritsa###b george , j haritsa - similarity=1.00 attribute=title - importance=-0.70 - values=secure bufering in firm real-time database systems###secure transaction processing in firm real-time database systems - similarity=0.60 attribute=year - importance=-0.50 - values=2000###1997.0 - similarity=0.00 attribute=conference - importance=-0.50 - values=vldb j.###sigmod conference - similarity=0.00

Figure 4: Conversation instructing the model to match an entity pair and subsequently asking for a structured explanation of the matching decision. Top: Walmart-Amazon, bottom: DBLP-Scholar.

which the model also sees as important evidence for a match by assigning a positive importance of 0.3. The model further correctly assigns a high negative importance to *year* and *conference* which are reasonably different to support a non-match decision. Here it is interesting that while the *title* overlaps in all but two words, the model still uses this as the most important evidence for predicting

Table 10: Aggregated structured explanations for Non-Matches and Matches on the DBLP-Scholar and Walmart-Amazon datasets.

Attribute	Matches			Non-Matches		
	Freq.	Mean Import.	St.Dev.	Freq.	Mean Import.	St.Dev.
DBLP-Scholar						
title	0.96	0.59	0.40	0.95	-0.40	0.38
authors	0.78	0.65	0.40	0.68	-0.66	0.34
conference	0.50	0.35	0.37	0.29	-0.11	0.29
year	0.46	0.26	0.37	0.43	-0.16	0.25
journal	0.14	0.40	0.43	0.05	-0.15	0.25
Walmart-Amazon						
brand	0.98	0.78	0.34	0.99	-0.04	0.34
price	0.92	-0.03	0.27	0.86	-0.16	0.25
model	0.81	0.63	0.51	0.82	-0.77	0.37
color	0.24	0.23	0.31	0.35	-0.06	0.23
product type	0.12	0.64	0.48	0.11	-0.42	0.50

non-match. This is likely an example of the inherent domain knowledge the model possesses about the publication matching domain where titles of matching publications should match exactly.

To evaluate the meaningfulness of the similarity values created by the model in the structured explanations, we calculate their Pearson correlation with the well known string similarity metrics Cosine and Generalized Jaccard. We apply the latter metrics to each of the extracted attributes found in the explanations and calculate the correlation between them and the generated similarities. We find that the model generated similarities have a strong positive correlation between 0.75-0.85 and 0.73-0.83 with Cosine and Generalized Jaccard respectively across all datasets. These results point to the general meaningfulness of the GPT4 created similarity values.

6.2 Aggregating Explanations

The structured explanations can easily be parsed to extract the attributes, importance scores, and similarity values. We can then aggregate the extracted values by attribute and calculate average importance scores for all attributes deemed relevant by the model for its decision. An example of five of these aggregated average importances can be seen in Table 10 for both datasets. We can see that the model very frequently assigned a high importance to brand and model for the matches while the price was not deemed relevant for the decisions on average. For non-matches instead, the model seems to focus mainly on the model attribute with a more neutral importance of the brand attribute. For DBLP-Scholar GPT4s focus is mainly on differences and similarities of the title and author attributes of the publications for both matches and non-matches, while conference and year information only contributes to a lesser extent to the matching decisions. After the aggregation there are in total 81 attributes for DBLP-Scholar with seven of them being used in at least 10% of decisions while the remaining 76 make up the long-tail. 28 of 81 attributes have a mean importance, positive or negative, of at least 30%. For Walmart-Amazon there are 181

Actor	Prompt
User	<p>The following list contains false positive and false negative product pairs from the output of a product matching classification system. Given the product pairs and the associated explanations, come up with a set of error classes, separately for both false positives and false negatives, that explain why the classification systems fails on these examples.</p> <p>False Negatives:</p> <p>FN1 {Entity 1} {Entity 2} {Explanation}</p> <p>{additional FNs}</p> <p>False Positives:</p> <p>FP1 {Entity 1} {Entity 2} {Explanation}</p> <p>{additional FPs}</p>
AI	<p>Based on the provided examples of false negatives (FN) and false positives (FP), we can identify several error classes that explain why the classification system fails on these examples.</p> <p>### Error Classes for False Negatives:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Model Number Mismatch: The system fails when there are slight differences in model numbers or product codes, even when other attributes match closely. {additional error classes} <p>### Error Classes for False Positives:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Overemphasis on Matching Attributes: The system might give too much weight to matching attributes like brand or model number, leading to false positives even when other important attributes differ. {additional error classes}

Figure 5: Prompt used for the automatic generation of error classes given false positives and false negatives.

attributes with seven of them used in at least 10% of decisions. 64 of 181 have a mean importance of at least 30% towards the decision.

7 AUTOMATED ERROR ANALYSIS

The analysis of wrongly matched entity pairs may lead to insights on how to improve the matching pipeline. The analysis of matching errors requires a decent understanding of the application domain, e.g. products or publications, and profound knowledge about the entity matching task. Error analysis usually involves manually inspecting the errors made by matching systems and subsequently deriving a set of error classes for categorizing these errors. The task of deriving the error classes is not mechanical but rather a creative task requiring reasoning capabilities. This Section demonstrates that GPT4-turbo can automate this creative task and derive meaningful error classes from the errors and associated explanations that were created in Section 6. The machine-generated error classes can be helpful for data engineers as they widen the scope of their analysis.

7.1 Discovery of Error Classes

For the automatic discovery of error classes, we first select all erroneous decisions together with the structured explanations of these decisions for the zeroshot prompts and explanations we used in Section 6. In the second step we pass a prompt to the GPT4-turbo model that asks for the synthesis of error classes for both false positive and false negatives cases separately. Subsequently we pass the collected erroneous pairs together with their GPT4 created explanation. These are 26 false positives and 26 false negatives for the DBLP-Scholar test set and 26 false positive and 15 false

Table 11: GPT4-turbo generated error classes for the DBLP-Scholar dataset and manually annotated number of errors falling into each class.

False Negatives (26 overall)	# errors
1. Year Discrepancy: Differences in publication years lead to false negatives, even when other attributes match closely.	8
2. Venue Variability: Variations in how the publication venue is listed (e.g., abbreviations, full names) cause mismatches.	14
3. Author Name Variations: Differences in author names, including initials, order of names, or inclusion of middle names, lead to false negatives.	9
4. Title Variations: Minor differences in titles, such as missing words or different word order, can cause false negatives.	11
5. Author List Incompleteness: Differences in the completeness of the author list, where one entry has more authors listed than the other.	11
False Positives (26 overall)	# errors
1. Overemphasis on Title Similarity: High similarity in titles leading to false positives, despite differences in other critical attributes.	15
2. Author Name Similarity Overreach: False positives due to high similarity in author names, ignoring discrepancies in other attributes.	16
3. Year and Venue Ignored: Cases where the year and venue match or are close, but other discrepancies are overlooked.	5
4. Partial Information Match: Matching based on partial information, such as incomplete author lists or titles, leading to false positives.	19
5. Misinterpretation of Publication Types: Confusing different types of publications (e.g., conference vs. journal) when other attributes match.	9

negatives for the Walmart-Amazon test set. An example of this prompt and part of the answer of the LLM is presented in Figure 5.

Table 11 and Table 12 show the generated error classes for both datasets and for each class the number of errors that fall into these classes. The latter are manually annotated by three domain experts. For DBLP-Scholar, three additional error classes were created but for the sake of presentation are not listed in the table. The full set of created error classes, as well as the false positives and false negatives used to create them are found in the accompanying repository. The numbers show that the automatically created error classes are relevant and cover not only frequent errors but also rarer errors. For example, for the DBLP-Scholar dataset, the first error class of the false positives references putting too much emphasis on the similarity of publication titles which is deemed correct by a human annotator for 15 of the 26 errors, while the third error class is relevant only for 5 of the errors, namely those where the model seemed to put too much emphasis on matching year and venue information in the pairs while ignoring crucial difference in the other attributes. After manual inspection, all of the created error classes are relevant for the errors being made and support a deeper understanding of what causes these errors and can lead to actions to improve the matching pipeline. For example, the general heterogeneity of the venues in the DBLP-Scholar dataset could prompt the user to improve the normalization of these values. Additionally, many of the discovered reasons for errors could be directly incorporated into the prompts asking for a matching decision to steer the model to avoid these errors.

7.2 Assignment of Errors to Error Classes

In this final experiment, we investigate whether GPT4-turbo is capable of explicitly categorizing the errors into the created error classes. Such a categorization allows data engineers to drill down from the error classes to concrete example errors which might give them hints on how to address the problem. For categorizing errors,

Table 12: GPT4-turbo generated error classes for the Walmart-Amazon dataset and manually annotated number of errors falling into each class.

False Negatives (15 overall)	# errors
1. Model Number Mismatch: The system fails when there are slight differences in model numbers or product codes, even when other attributes match closely.	9
2. Attribute Missing or Incomplete: When one product listing includes an attribute that the other does not, the system may fail to recognize them as a match.	9
3. Minor Differences in Descriptions: Small differences in product descriptions or titles can lead to false negatives, such as slightly different wording or the inclusion/exclusion of certain features.	11
4. Price Differences: Even when products are very similar, significant price differences can lead to false negatives, as the system might weigh price too heavily.	12
5. Variant or Accessory Differences: Differences in product variants or accessories included can cause false negatives, especially if the system does not adequately account for these variations being minor.	7
False Positives (26 overall)	# errors
1. Overemphasis on Matching Attributes: The system might give too much weight to matching attributes like brand or model number, leading to false positives even when other important attributes differ.	23
2. Ignoring Minor but Significant Differences: The system fails to recognize important differences in product types, models, or features that are significant to the product identity.	21
3. Misinterpretation of Accessory or Variant Information: Including or excluding accessories or variants in the product description can lead to false positives if the system does not correctly interpret these differences.	8
4. Price Discrepancy Overlooked: The system might overlook significant price differences, assuming products are the same when they are not, particularly if other attributes match closely.	14
5. Condition or Quality Differences: Differences in the condition or quality of products (e.g., original vs. compatible, new vs. refurbished) are not adequately accounted for, leading to false positives.	2

Actor	Prompt
User	<p>Given the following error classes for a product matching classification system, please classify the following product pair into all error classes by their number if they are relevant for this pair and its explanation. Please give a short explanation of every decision as a list first. Finally, also provide a confidence score for each classification adhering to the JSON format of the following example: {"2": "90", "4": "30", "5": "75"}</p> <p>Error classes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Model Number Mismatch: The system fails when there are slight differences in model numbers or product codes, even when other attributes match closely (e.g., FN2, FN7, FN8). 2. {remaining error classes} <p>Now classify this pair: Original Label: Match Predicted Label: Non-Match {Entity 1} {Entity 2} {Explanation}</p>
AI	<p>Based on the provided information and the error classes, here's the classification for the product pair:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Model Number Mismatch: This error class is relevant because ... 2. {additional classifications} <p>{ "1": "95", "2": "60", "3": "50", "4": "70" }</p>

Figure 6: Prompt used for the classification of errors into the generated error classes.

we use the prompt shown in Figure 6. Each prompt presents the error classes and subsequently the correct as well as predicted label and finally one entity pair with its GPT4 created explanation. The

Table 13: Accuracy of GPT4 for classifying errors into the created error classes.

Error class	Walmart-Amazon		DBLP-Scholar	
	FP	FN	FP	FN
1	34.62	86.67	92.31	96.15
2	84.62	73.33	76.92	92.31
3	84.62	73.33	76.92	73.08
4	76.92	100	100	88.46
5	84.62	86.67	92.31	88.46
Mean	73.08	84.00	87.69	87.69

model is asked to pick all error classes that apply to the pair and provide a confidence value for each of its predictions.

Table 13 shows the accuracy values the GPT4-turbo model reaches on this task. From these values we can see that the model on average achieves a mean accuracy of over 80% for most error types. Only the mean accuracy on Walmart-Amazon’s false positives is lower which is caused by the low accuracy of the first error class *Overemphasis on Matching Attributes* as the domain experts did not agree with the model’s classification in the first error class, more specifically the model rarely assigned this class while the domain experts considered it relevant in 23 out of 26 cases. Apart from this disagreement, the model is capable of correctly categorizing the errors with a high accuracy.

8 RELATED WORK

Entity Matching: Entity matching [3, 7, 11] has been researched for over 50 years [13]. Early approaches involved domain experts hand-crafting matching rules [13]. Over time, advancements were made with unsupervised and supervised machine learning techniques resulting in improved matching performance [8]. By the late 2010s, the success of deep learning in areas such as natural language processing and computer vision paved the way for early applications in entity matching [23, 33]. The Transformer architecture [37] and pre-trained models like BERT [9] and RoBERTa [21] revolutionized natural language processing, which has led the data integration community to also turn to these language models for entity matching [5, 18, 29, 38, 41, 42]. More recent work delved into the application of self-supervised and supervised contrastive losses [6, 14, 16] in combination with PLM encoder networks for entity matching [30, 39]. Other studies have explored graph-based methods [15, 41] and the application of domain adaptation techniques for entity matching [1, 22, 35, 36].

LLM-based Entity Matching: Narayan et al. [26] were the first to experiment with using an LLM (GPT3) for entity matching as part of a wider study also covering data engineering tasks such as schema matching and missing value imputation. In our recent work [31], we employed ChatGPT for entity matching which was tested using different prompt designs on a single benchmark dataset. Zhang et al. [43] experimented with fine-tuning a Llama2 model for several data preparation tasks at once and include entity matching as one of their fine-tuning tasks. Fan et al. [12] experiment with batching multiple entity matching decisions together with

in-context demonstrations to reduce the cost of in-context learning. Compared to these papers, we evaluate a wider range of LLM models using a larger set of prompt designs. We present a deeper analysis of the prompt sensitivity of the models and the prompt to model fit. We also investigate the utility of additional methods such as rule learning and LLM fine-tuning specifically for entity matching which were not covered in the existing work.

Explaining Entity Matching: The prevalence of PLMs over recent years in the field of entity matching has led to research into the explainability of these matching systems [2, 10, 28, 29]. Most methods [10, 29] for explaining the matching decisions of PLMs provide local explanations for single entity pairs, e.g. as importance score of single tokens. Paganelli et al. [28] present an approach for explaining matching decisions by analyzing the attention scores of PLM-based matchers. The WYM [2] system is an example of an intrinsically interpretable system that was recently proposed based on the idea of finding important decision units among entity descriptions for PLM-based matchers. To the best of our knowledge, none of the existing methods automates the discovery error classes and generates human-interpretable descriptions of these error classes like the ones we presented in Section 7.

9 CONCLUSION

This paper has investigated using LLMs as a more robust and less task-specific training data dependent alternative to PLM-based matchers. We can summarize the high-level implications of our findings concerning the selection of matching techniques in the following rules of thumb: For use cases that do not involve many unseen entities and for which a decent amount of training data is available, PLM-based matchers are a suitable option which does not require much compute due to the smaller size of the models. For use cases that involve a relevant amount of unseen entities and for which it is costly to gather and maintain a decent size training set, LLM-based matchers should be preferred due to their high zero-shot performance and ability to generalize to unseen entities. If using the best performing hosted LLMs is not an option due to their high usage costs, fine-tuning a cheaper hosted model is an alternative that can deliver a similar F1 performance. If using hosted models is no option due to privacy concerns, using an open-source LLM on local hardware can be an alternative providing a slightly lower F1 performance given that some task-specific training data or domain-specific matching rules are available. We demonstrated that GPT4 can generate structured explanations of matching decisions and that we can automatically aggregate these explanations to gain global insights into the models’ decisions. Finally, we have shown that GPT4-turbo can perform the creative task of automatically deriving error classes from the explanations. This automation of the error analysis might save data engineers time and can point them at issues that they would have otherwise overlooked.

REFERENCES

- [1] Mehdi Akbarian Rastaghi, Ehsan Kamaloo, and Davood Rafiei. 2022. Probing the Robustness of Pre-trained Language Models for Entity Matching. In *Proceedings of the 31st ACM International Conference on Information & Knowledge Management*. 3786–3790.
- [2] Andrea Baraldi, Francesco Del Buono, Francesco Guerra, Matteo Paganelli, and Maurizio Vincini. 2023. An Intrinsically Interpretable Entity Matching System. In *Proceedings 26th International Conference on Extending Database Technology, Ioannina, Greece, March 28-31, 2023*. 645–657.

- [3] Nils Barlaug and Jon Atle Gulla. 2021. Neural Networks for Entity Matching: A Survey. *ACM Transactions on Knowledge Discovery from Data* 15, 3 (2021), 52:1–52:37.
- [4] Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, et al. 2020. Language Models are Few-Shot Learners. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 33 (2020), 1877–1901.
- [5] Ursin Brunner and Kurt Stockinger. 2020. Entity Matching with Transformer Architectures - a Step Forward in Data Integration. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Extending Database Technology*. 463–473.
- [6] Ting Chen, Simon Kornblith, Mohammad Norouzi, and Geoffrey Hinton. 2020. A Simple Framework for Contrastive Learning of Visual Representations. In *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Machine Learning*. 1597–1607.
- [7] Peter Christen. 2012. *Data Matching: Concepts and Techniques for Record Linkage, Entity Resolution, and Duplicate Detection*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin Heidelberg.
- [8] Vassilis Christophides, Vasilis Efthymiou, Themis Palpanas, George Papadakis, and Kostas Stefanidis. 2020. An Overview of End-to-End Entity Resolution for Big Data. *Comput. Surveys* 53, 6 (2020), 127:1–127:42.
- [9] Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2019. BERT: Pre-Training of Deep Bidirectional Transformers for Language Understanding. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1*. 4171–4186.
- [10] Vincenzo Di Cicco, Donatella Firmani, Nick Koudas, Paolo Merialdo, and Divesh Srivastava. 2019. Interpreting Deep Learning Models for Entity Resolution: An Experience Report Using LIME. In *Proceedings of the Second International Workshop on Exploiting Artificial Intelligence Techniques for Data Management*. 8:1–8:4.
- [11] Ahmed K. Elmagarmid, Panagiotis G. Ipeirotis, and Vassilios S. Verykios. 2007. Duplicate Record Detection: A Survey. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering* 19, 1 (2007), 1–16.
- [12] Meihao Fan, Xiaoyue Han, Ju Fan, Chengliang Chai, Nan Tang, et al. 2023. Cost-Effective In-Context Learning for Entity Resolution: A Design Space Exploration. *arXiv:2312.03987 [cs]*
- [13] Ivan P. Fellegi and Alan B. Sunter. 1969. A Theory for Record Linkage. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.* 64, 328 (1969), 1183–1210.
- [14] Tianyu Gao, Xingcheng Yao, and Danqi Chen. 2021. SimCSE: Simple Contrastive Learning of Sentence Embeddings. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. 6894–6910.
- [15] Congcong Ge, Pengfei Wang, Lu Chen, Xiaoze Liu, Baihua Zheng, and Yunjun Gao. 2021. CollaborER: A Self-supervised Entity Resolution Framework Using Multi-features Collaboration. *arXiv:2108.08090 [cs]* (Sept. 2021).
- [16] Prannay Khosla, Piotr Teterwak, Chen Wang, Aaron Sarna, Yonglong Tian, et al. 2020. Supervised Contrastive Learning. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, Vol. 33. 18661–18673.
- [17] Hanna Köpcke, Andreas Thor, and Erhard Rahm. 2010. Evaluation of Entity Resolution Approaches on Real-World Match Problems. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment* 3, 1-2 (Sept. 2010), 484–493.
- [18] Yuliang Li, Jinfeng Li, Yoshihiko Suhara, AnHai Doan, and Wang-Chiew Tan. 2020. Deep Entity Matching with Pre-Trained Language Models. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment* 14, 1 (2020), 50–60.
- [19] Jiachang Liu, Dinghan Shen, Yizhe Zhang, Bill Dolan, Lawrence Carin, et al. 2022. What Makes Good In-Context Examples for GPT-3?. In *Proceedings of Deep Learning Inside Out: The 3rd Workshop on Knowledge Extraction and Integration for Deep Learning Architectures*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 100–114.
- [20] Pengfei Liu, Weizhe Yuan, Jinlan Fu, Zhengbao Jiang, Hiroaki Hayashi, et al. 2023. Pre-Train, Prompt, and Predict: A Systematic Survey of Prompting Methods in Natural Language Processing. *Comput. Surveys* 55, 9, Article 195 (2023), 35 pages.
- [21] Yinhan Liu, Myle Ott, Naman Goyal, Jingfei Du, Mandar Joshi, et al. 2019. RoBERTa: A Robustly Optimized BERT Pretraining Approach. *arXiv:1907.11692 [cs]* (2019).
- [22] Michael Loster, Ioannis Koumarelas, and Felix Naumann. 2021. Knowledge Transfer for Entity Resolution with Siamese Neural Networks. *Journal of Data and Information Quality* 13, 1 (Jan. 2021), 2:1–2:25.
- [23] Sidharth Mudgal, Han Li, Theodoros Rekatsinas, AnHai Doan, Youngchoon Park, et al. 2018. Deep Learning for Entity Matching: A Design Space Exploration. In *Proceedings of the 2018 International Conference on Management of Data*. 19–34.
- [24] Subhabrata Mukherjee, Arindam Mitra, Ganesh Jawahar, Sahaj Agarwal, Hamid Palangi, et al. 2023. Orca: Progressive Learning from Complex Explanation Traces of GPT-4. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.02707* (2023).
- [25] Navapat Nananukul, Khanin Sisaengsuwanchai, and Mayank Kejriwal. 2024. Cost-Efficient Prompt Engineering for Unsupervised Entity Resolution. *arXiv:2310.06174 [cs.AI]*
- [26] Avaniika Narayan, Ines Chami, Laurel Orr, and Christopher Ré. 2022. Can Foundation Models Wrangle Your Data? *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment* 16, 4 (2022), 738–746.
- [27] Markus Nentwig, Michael Hartung, Axel-Cyrille Ngonga Ngomo, and Erhard Rahm. 2017. A Survey of Current Link Discovery Frameworks. *Semantic Web* 8, 3 (jan 2017), 419–436.
- [28] Matteo Paganelli, Francesco Del Buono, Andrea Baraldi, and Francesco Guerra. 2022. Analyzing How BERT Performs Entity Matching. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment* 15, 8 (June 2022), 1726–1738.
- [29] Ralph Peeters and Christian Bizer. 2021. Dual-Objective Fine-Tuning of BERT for Entity Matching. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment* 14, 10 (2021), 1913–1921.
- [30] Ralph Peeters and Christian Bizer. 2022. Supervised Contrastive Learning for Product Matching. In *Companion Proceedings of the Web Conference 2022*. 248–251.
- [31] Ralph Peeters and Christian Bizer. 2023. Using ChatGPT for Entity Matching. In *New Trends in Database and Information Systems (Communications in Computer and Information Science)*. Springer Nature Switzerland, Cham, 221–230.
- [32] Ralph Peeters, Reng Chiz Der, and Christian Bizer. 2024. WDC Products: A Multi-Dimensional Entity Matching Benchmark. In *Proceedings of the 27th International Conference on Extending Database Technology, Paestum, Italy, March 25 - March 28, 2024*. 22–33.
- [33] Kashif Shah, Selcuk Kopru, and Jean David Ruvini. 2018. Neural Network Based Extreme Classification and Similarity Models for Product Matching. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference of the Association for Computational Linguistics, Volume 3*. 8–15.
- [34] Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, et al. 2023. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09288* (2023).
- [35] Mohamed Trabelsi, Jeff Hefflin, and Jin Cao. 2022. DAME: Domain Adaptation for Matching Entities. In *Proceedings of the Fifteenth ACM International Conference on Web Search and Data Mining*. 1016–1024.
- [36] Jianhong Tu, Ju Fan, Nan Tang, Peng Wang, Chengliang Chai, et al. 2022. Domain Adaptation for Deep Entity Resolution. In *Proceedings of the 2022 International Conference on Management of Data*. 443–457.
- [37] Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, et al. 2017. Attention Is All You Need. In *Proceedings of the 31st International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*. 6000–6010.
- [38] Jin Wang, Yuliang Li, and Wataru Hirota. 2021. Machamp: A Generalized Entity Matching Benchmark. In *Proceedings of the 30th ACM International Conference on Information & Knowledge Management*. 4633–4642.
- [39] Runhui Wang, Yuliang Li, and Jin Wang. 2023. Sudowoodo: Contrastive Self-supervised Learning for Multi-purpose Data Integration and Preparation. In *2023 IEEE 39th International Conference on Data Engineering*. 1502–1515.
- [40] Jason Wei, Yi Tay, Rishi Bommasani, Colin Raffel, Barret Zoph, et al. 2022. Emergent Abilities of Large Language Models. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research* (2022).
- [41] Dezhong Yao, Yuhong Gu, Gao Cong, Hai Jin, and Xinqiao Lv. 2022. Entity Resolution with Hierarchical Graph Attention Networks. In *Proceedings of the 2022 International Conference on Management of Data*. 429–442.
- [42] Alexandros Zeakis, George Papadakis, Dimitrios Skoutas, and Manolis Koubarakis. 2023. Pre-trained embeddings for entity resolution: An experimental analysis. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment* 16, 9 (2023), 2225–2238.
- [43] Haochen Zhang, Yuyang Dong, Chuan Xiao, and Masafumi Oyamada. 2023. Jellyfish: A Large Language Model for Data Preprocessing. *arXiv:2312.01678 [cs]*
- [44] Wayne Xin Zhao, Kun Zhou, Junyi Li, Tianyi Tang, Xiaolei Wang, et al. 2023. A Survey of Large Language Models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.18223* (2023).
- [45] Zihao Zhao, Eric Wallace, Shi Feng, Dan Klein, and Sameer Singh. 2021. Calibrate Before Use: Improving Few-Shot Performance of Language Models. In *Proceedings of the 38th International Conference on Machine Learning*. 12697–12706.