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ABSTRACT

Entity Matching (EM), which aims to identify whether two entity records from two relational tables refer to the same real-world entity, is one of the fundamental problems in data management. Traditional EM assumes that two tables are homogeneous with the aligned schema, while it is common that entity records of different formats (e.g., relational, semi-structured, or textual types) involve in practical scenarios. It is not practical to unify their schemas due to the different formats. To support EM on format-different entity records, Generalized Entity Matching (GEM) has been proposed and gained much attention recently. To do GEM, existing methods typically perform in a supervised learning way, which relies on a large amount of high-quality labeled examples. However, the labeling process is extremely labor-intensive, and frustrates the use of GEM. Low-resource GEM, i.e., GEM that only requires a small number of labeled examples, becomes an urgent need. To this end, this paper, for the first time, focuses on the low-resource GEM and proposes a novel low-resource GEM method, termed as PromptEM. PromptEM has addressed three challenging issues (i.e., designing GEM-specific prompt-tuning, improving pseudo-labels quality, and running efficient self-training) in low-resource GEM. Extensive experimental results on eight real benchmarks demonstrate the superiority of PromptEM in terms of effectiveness and efficiency.
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1 INTRODUCTION

Entity Matching (EM) aims to identify whether two entity records from two relational tables refer to the same real-world entity, which is one of the fundamental and significant tasks in data management. Most existing solutions [22, 29, 30] assume that two tables are homogeneous with the aligned schema. However, there is an urgent need to generalize the entity matching problem for more practical scenarios. Taking paper matching as an example, as shown in Figure 1, paper metadata is usually stored in relational tables or semi-structured JSON objects, while paper description (e.g., abstract) is textual data. It is not practical to unify their schemas since we need a potentially expensive schema matching in the pre-processing step [27], which is even not applicable when matching data of different formats (e.g., matching paper metadata stored in tabular format with their textual abstracts). Therefore, traditional EM is unable to support those practical scenarios like paper matching [49]. Recently, TDmatch [1] first attempts to match structured data and textual data while having extremely poor scalability, which will be analyzed in Section 5.4. To support more practical application scenarios, following [49], we focus on a new research problem, Generalized Entity Matching (GEM), which allows matching entity records of relational, semi-structured, or textual types.

Existing methods designed for GEM typically perform in a supervised learning way, which relies on a large amount of labeled training data, and thus, is extremely labor-intensive in reality. Recent studies [22, 29] have achieved considerable performance by leveraging the power of pre-trained language models (LMs) and the fine-tuning paradigm. Nonetheless, the fine-tuning paradigm still requires a non-trivial amount of high-quality labeled examples (e.g., thousands of labels for a typical GEM application [49]). TDmatch [1] performs in an unsupervised learning way via graph creation and random walk. However, two drawbacks restrict its real-world applications as confirmed in Section 5: (i) it has unstable performance due to the absence of labeled samples; and (ii) random walk is not scalable on large datasets [43], incurring enormous execution time and memory usage (e.g., more than 120 hours and 130 gigabytes for once training of the SEMI-REL). To satisfy real-life applications, a low-resource (i.e., using only a small number of labeled examples) but an effective and efficient solution is required. To the best of our knowledge, low-resource GEM remains unexplored.

To overcome the low-resource dilemma, semi-supervised learning techniques (e.g., self-training [45]) are good choice. Self-training has recently been shown to obtain state-of-the-art performance
for low-resource tasks like sequence generation [19] and speech recognition [51]. In self-training, a teacher model is trained on some labeled data, and is used to produce pseudo-labels on unlabeled data. Furthermore, the original labeled data is augmented with the pseudo-label data, and is employed to train a student model. Thus, a large amount of unlabeled data can be utilized effectively and the requirement of labeled data is correspondingly reduced. Although self-training has achieved promising performance in a wide range of applications, it has not been explored in GEM.

Motivated by the above considerations, we study the problem of learning high-quality models for low-resource GEM by means of self-training. Our goal is to develop an effective and efficient low-resource GEM solution based on pre-trained LMs along with leveraging self-training to boost performance, which is a challenging endeavor. The challenges are mainly three-folds:

**Challenge I: How to tune pre-trained LMs for GEM better?** Despite the success of fine-tuning LMs for the matching problem, some recent studies [17, 23, 24] find that there is a significant gap between objective forms in pre-training and fine-tuning, which restricts taking full advantage of knowledge in LMs. Pre-training is usually formalized as a cloze-style task to predict target words (e.g., masked language models). However, the approaches based on fine-tuning add additional layers to do different objective forms (e.g., classification and generation) as illustrated in Figure 2. To do GEM, existing approaches treat it as a classification problem. This gap hinders the transfer and adaptation of knowledge in LMs for GEM tasks.

**Challenge II: How to select high-quality pseudo-labels?** The quality of pseudo-labels determines whether self-training can improve performance. Thus, the pseudo-label selection strategy is extremely important. A common strategy is using confidence to select pseudo-labels. However, this strategy has some serious drawbacks [31, 36]. On the one hand, incorrect predictions can have high confidence scores in poorly calibrated networks. On the other hand, if we only aim at the pseudo-labels with high confidence produced by the teacher, there is little to gain for the student model.

**Challenge III: How to avoid expensive self-training?** Traditional self-training can be costly. To be more specific, the labeled data is augmented by the pseudo-labels produced by the teacher model, which may be beneficial to performance but result in a longer training time. Intuitively, maybe not all training data contribute to boosting the performance of the student model. Nevertheless, how to quantify the importance of training data to avoid expensive self-training is still challenging.

To tackle the above three challenges, we propose a novel low-resource GEM solution PromptEM. Prompt-tuning is a new promising paradigm in natural language processing, and is able to bridge the gap of objective forms between pre-training and fine-tuning [23, 38]. To address the gap between pre-training and fine-tuning (CI), we cast GEM as a cloze-style task via designing the GEM-specific prompt-tuning, which has the same objective form as pre-training. Thus, we can stimulate the rich knowledge distributed in LMs through prompt-tuning. To select high-quality pseudo-labels (CH), we develop a lightweight uncertainty-aware self-training method to boost performance. High-quality pseudo-labels are a prerequisite for boosting performance of self-training. To this end, we employ recent advances in Bayesian deep learning [13] to obtain uncertainty estimates of the teacher model for pseudo-labeling and boosting the self-training process. To avoid expensive self-training (CIII), we prune useless training data dynamically using our proposed MC-EL2N, making the self-training process more lightweight and efficient. Our contributions are summarized as follows:

- **Low-resource GEM.** This is the first work formally studying the problem of low-resource generalized entity matching. We articulate the importance of this problem in more practical scenarios.
- **Prompt-tuning for GEM.** We present PromptEM, a novel GEM solution based on prompt-tuning, which casts GEM as a cloze-style task. To the best of our knowledge, PromptEM is the first GEM (EM) solution that stimulates the rich knowledge distributed in LMs via prompt-tuning.
- **Lightweight Self-training.** To further improve the performance in low-resource settings, we develop a lightweight self-training method, which selects pseudo-labels using uncertainty to boost performance. Meanwhile, we make self-training more lightweight and efficient by dynamic data pruning.
- **Extensive Experiments.** We conduct comprehensive experimental evaluation on GEM tasks compared against state-of-the-art approaches, using eight real-world datasets from various domains. Extensive experimental results demonstrate the superiority of our proposed PromptEM in terms of effectiveness and efficiency.

**Outline.** Section 2 presents the problem definition and overviews preliminaries. We introduce prompt-tuning for GEM in Section 3. We further improve the performance by lightweight self-training in Section 4. Section 5 presents the experimental results. Finally, we discuss related work in Section 6 and conclude in Section 7.

## 2 PRELIMINARIES

In this section, we first present the problem definition of generalized entity matching (GEM). Next, we introduce the serialization method for GEM, followed by an introduction of conventional vanilla fine-tuning and prompt-based tuning with LMs.

### 2.1 Problem Formulation

Given two collections of data entries, entity matching (EM) is to identify pairs of data entries that refer to the same real-world entity. A classic EM workflow [21] has two main steps: blocking and matching. The blocking [41] typically uses simple heuristics or deep learning techniques to reduce the quadratic number of candidates. The matching identifies whether each candidate pair is a real match or not. In this paper, we focus on the matching. Formally, given two tables $E_A$ and $E_B$, we assign a binary label $y \in \{0, 1\}$ for each candidate pair $(e_a, e_b) \in E_A \times E_B$. Here, $y = 1$ denotes a truly matched pair, while $y = 0$ represents a mismatched pair.

To generalize the classic setting to more practical application scenarios, Machamp [49] comes up with the new research problem, generalized entity matching (GEM). GEM can support a variety of matching tasks with practical applications by allowing matching entity records of relational, semi-structural, or textual types.

**Problem 1. Generalized Entity Matching (GEM).** Given two structured, semi-structured, or unstructured entity tables $E_A$ and $E_B$ with homogeneous or heterogeneous schema, GEM is to assign a binary label $y \in \{0, 1\}$ for each candidate $(e_a, e_b) \in E_A \times E_B$.

### 2.2 Serializing

The matching problem can be effectively solved by formulating it as a sequence classification task [14, 22, 49]. First, entity pairs
are serialized to sequences, and then, a pre-trained LM is fine-tuned to solve the task. Existing methods are designed for EM over structured data with homogeneous data, which are not suitable for GEM. Following [49], we extend the serialization method presented in Ditto [22] and introduce a reasonable way to fulfill this task.

**Structured tables.** For structured tables, an entity with $n$ attributes can be denoted as $e = (\text{attr}_i, \text{val}_i)_{i \in [1, n]}$, where attr$_i$ is the attribute name and val$_i$ is the corresponding attribute value. Then the serialization is denoted as:

$$\text{serialize}(e) := [\text{COL}] \text{attr}_1 [\text{VAL}] \text{val}_1 \ldots [\text{COL}] \text{attr}_n [\text{VAL}] \text{val}_n$$

where [COL] and [VAL] are two special tags indicating the start of attribute names and values respectively. Taking the relational entity in Figure 1 as an example, we serialize it as:

$$[\text{COL}] \text{title} [\text{VAL}] \text{ efficient similarity } \ldots [\text{COL}] \text{ authors} [\text{VAL}] \text{ ronald fagin ravi kumar d. sivakumar}$$

**Unstructured tables.** Unstructured textual entities are sequences originally, and hence, there does not need to serialize the unstructured tables.

### 2.3 Vanilla Fine-tuning

Pre-trained language models (LMs) (e.g., BERT [7] and RoBERTa [25]) have demonstrated powerful semantic expression abilities, which can support lots of downstream tasks (e.g., classification and question answering). Formally, GEM can be treated as a sequence pair classification task denoted as $T = \{X, Y\}$, where $X$ is a candidate pair set and $Y$ is a class set. For each instance $x \in X$, it is serialized by $x := [\text{CLS}] \text{serialize}(e)[\text{SEP}] \text{serialize}(e')[\text{SEP}]$ and is annotated with a label $y \in Y$. Here, $[\text{CLS}]$ and $[\text{SEP}]$ are special tokens used to mark the beginning and end of a sequence.

Given a LM $M$, vanilla fine-tuning first converts $x$ to the input sequence $\{[\text{CLS}], w_1, \ldots, w_m, [\text{SEP}], w'_1, \ldots, w'_m, [\text{SEP}]\}$, and then, it uses $M$ to encode all tokens of the input sequence into corresponding vectors $[h_{\text{CLS}}, h_{w_1}, \ldots, h_{w_m}, h_{\text{SEP}}, h_{w'_1}, \ldots, h_{w'_m}, h_{\text{SEP}}]$, where $w_i$ is the token and $h_{w_i}$ is the corresponding embedding. For a downstream classification task (e.g., GEM), a task-specific head is trained to predict the probability distribution over the label set $Y$ with the softmax function $p(y | x) = \text{Softmax}\left(W \times h_{[\text{CLS}]} + b\right)$. Here, $h_{[\text{CLS}]}$ is the embedding of special classification token [CLS], $b$ is the bias for the layer, and $W$ is a learnable matrix randomly initialized before fine-tuning. The parameters of $M$, $b$, and $W$ are tuned to maximize $\frac{1}{|\mathcal{N}|} \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \log p (y | x)$.

### 2.4 Prompt-based Tuning

Prompt-based tuning has been proposed to apply cloze-style tasks to tune LMs. Formally, we define a label word set $\mathcal{V}_y = \{w_1, \ldots, w_m\}$. $\mathcal{V}_y$ is a subset of the vocabulary $\mathcal{V}$ of the LM $M$, i.e., $\mathcal{V}_y \subseteq \mathcal{V}$. We get an overall dictionary $\mathcal{V}^*$ by taking the union of the dictionary corresponding to each label. Another primary component of prompt-tuning is a prompt template $T(\cdot)$, which modifies the original input $x$ into a prompt input $T(x)$ by adding a set of additional tokens in $x$. Generally, a token [MASK] is added for LMs to predict the missing label word $w \in \mathcal{V}^*$. Thus, in prompt-tuning, a classification problem is transferred into a masked language modeling problem $p(y \in \mathcal{Y} | x) = p([\text{MASK}] = w \in \mathcal{V}_y | T(x))$.

### 3 PROMPT TUNING FOR GEM

In this section, we detail how to utilize prompt-tuning to deal with GEM. We first present the construction of templates, and then, we describe the training and inference of prompt-tuning.

#### 3.1 Prompt Templates

The goal of generalized entity matching is to predict if two heterogeneous or homogeneous entities are matching, and the answers can be “yes” or “no”. Thus, we can construct templates based on the task definition. We design hard-encoding templates with natural language and continuous templates in our work.

**Hard-encoding templates.** For the choice of hard-encoding templates, we do not use automatic searching methods for discrete prompts since the GEM task is clearly defined and the prompts are easily purposeful. Given each candidate pair $x = (e, e')$, we construct the following templates:

$$T_1(x) = \text{serialize}(e) \text{ serialize}(e')$$

They are [MASK]

$$T_2(x) = \text{serialize}(e) \text{ is } [\text{MASK}] \text{ to serialize}(e')$$

**Continuous templates.** As prompt construction is to find a method that allows a LM to effectively perform a task, rather than being for human consumption, it is not necessary to limit the prompt to human-interpretable natural language [23]. Thus, continuous prompts are proposed to perform prompting directly in the embedding space of the model. Here, we employ P-tuning [24], where
continuous prompt tokens are learned by inserting trainable variables into the embedding input. Specifically, trainable prompt tokens are initialized, and then, BiLSTM [16] is utilized to account for interaction between prompt tokens. This enables the model to find better continuous prompts beyond the original vocabulary $V$ of $M$ could express. We give an illustrative example in Figure 2.

**Label words set.** After constructing templates, another primary component is defining the label words set. Note that, traditional EM tasks seek for finding pairs of entities that are identical [49]. However, GEM might require searching for entity pairs satisfying a general binary relation. Taking paper matching as an example, our goal is to find pairs between paper metadata and abstracts. Indeed, the relation between them is whether they are relevant, which is more general beyond matching. Considering general binary relations, we map the label $y$ = yes into a set $V_y = \{\text{matched, similar, relevant}\}$. Similarly, the label set for label $y$ = no is $V_y = \{\text{mismatched, different, irrelevant}\}$.

**Summarizing long entries.** When the textual data is an extremely long string, it is harder for the LM to understand (e.g., the input to BERT can have at most 512 sub-word tokens). A common practice is to truncate the sequences. Nevertheless, the truncation strategy is not a wise choice because the important information for matching is usually not at the beginning of the sequences. Inspired by Ditto [22], we apply a TF-IDF based summarization technique for textual data in our implementation, which retains non-stopword tokens with high TF-IDF scores.

3.2 Training and Inference

A classification problem is transferred into a masked language modeling problem via prompt-tuning. In masked language modeling, we use confidence scores of all the words in $V_y$ to construct the final score of the particular class $y$. Given a candidate pair $x$ (which is mapped to $T(x)$) and its class $y$ (which is mapped to $V_y = \{w_1, \ldots, w_m\}$), the conditional probability is computed as:

$$P(y \mid x) = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} P([\text{MASK}] = w_i \mid T(x))$$  \hspace{1cm} (1)

**Training.** The continuous prompt tokens can be parameterized by $\phi$ and optimized along with $M$ during training. We tune the pre-trained model $M$ (parameterized by $\theta$) along with the additional prompt embeddings by using the cross-entropy loss function $L = -\sum \log P(y \mid x; \theta, \phi)$. Here, we prompt-tune a pre-trained LM for the GEM task as follows:

1. Design task-specific prompt templates and label words set.
2. Initialize the network with parameters from the pre-trained LM and continuous prompt tokens.
3. Train the network on the training set until convergence.

**Inference.** For inference, we aim to assign a label for the input, which can directly use Eq. 1 to predict the class of the current input instance based on predicted words of the [MASK] position.

4 LIGHTWEIGHT SELF-TRAINING

With prompt-tuning, we can stimulate the rich knowledge distributed in LMs, which achieves considerable performance under low-resource settings. To further improve the performance and avoid expensive self-training, we develop a lightweight self-training method. We first overview the lightweight self-training in this section, and then, we present two key modules: uncertainty-aware pseudo-label selection and dynamic data pruning.

4.1 Overview

Let $D_L = \{x(i), y(i)\}_{i=1}^{N_L}$ and $D_U = \{x(i)\}_{i=1}^{N_U}$ be a labeled dataset with $N_L$ samples and an unlabeled dataset with $N_U$ samples, respectively. Our lightweight self-training aims to boost the performance using the unlabeled dataset while avoiding expensive traditional self-training. We describe the lightweight self-training procedure, with its pseudo code presented in Algorithm 1. Given a labeled dataset $D_L$, a teacher model $M_t$ is initialized and trained on $D_L$ until convergence (Lines 2-4). Then the teacher model $M_t$ produces pseudo-labels on $D_U$. After that, we introduce an uncertainty-aware pseudo-label selection strategy to select high-quality pseudo-labels $D_P$ (Lines 5-6). Meanwhile, $D_U$ and $D_L$ are updated (Lines 7-8). Next, a student model $M_s$ is initialized and trained on the updated $D_L$ (Lines 9-11). To make self-training more lightweight and efficient, we present a dynamic data pruning strategy, which can prune useless samples and their labels in $D_L$ every fixed number of epochs (Lines 12-15). Finally, we choose the best student model with the best performance on the validation set (Line 16). Noted that, the above steps can repeat iteratively.

4.2 Uncertainty-aware Pseudo-label Selection

Selecting high-quality pseudo-labels is a prerequisite for boosting self-training performance. Therefore, we aim at reducing the noise present in the selected samples to improve the overall performance. A straightforward way to select pseudo-labels is by selecting samples with high-confidence predictions. However, incorrect predictions can have high confidence scores in poorly calibrated networks [36]. Besides, if the teacher model already predicts some

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Algorithm 1: Lightweight Self-training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Input:</strong> the number iter of iterations, a labeled train set $D_L$, an unlabeled train set $D_U$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output:</strong> a student model $M_{\theta,\phi}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 for $i \leftarrow 1$ to iter do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Initialize a new teacher model $M_{t,\theta,\phi,i}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 for epoch $\leftarrow 1$ to Epochs of teacher do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 \hspace{1cm} Train $M_{t,\theta,\phi,i}$ using the train set $D_L$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 \hspace{1cm} \hspace{1cm} Uncertainty-aware Pseudo-label Selection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 \hspace{1cm} \hspace{1cm} Select pseudo-labels from $D_U$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 \hspace{1cm} $D_P \leftarrow D_U - D_P$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 \hspace{1cm} $D_L \leftarrow D_L \cup D_P$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Initialize a new student model $M_{s,\theta,\phi,i}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 for epoch $\leftarrow 1$ to Epochs of student do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 \hspace{1cm} Train $M_{s,\theta,\phi,i}$ using the train set $D_L$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 \hspace{1cm} \hspace{1cm} Dynamic Data Pruning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 \hspace{1cm} \hspace{1cm} if $(epoch \mod \text{frequency of pruning}) = 0$ then</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 \hspace{1cm} \hspace{1cm} \hspace{1cm} $D_D \leftarrow$ Select useless samples from $D_L$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 \hspace{1cm} \hspace{1cm} \hspace{1cm} $D_L \leftarrow D_L - D_D$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 return the best student model $M_{\theta,\phi}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
samples with high confidence, then these is little to gain for student model with these samples [31]. Based on the observation that prediction uncertainties can be leveraged to negate the effect of poor calibration [36], we employ an uncertainty-aware pseudo-label selection strategy. Formally, uncertainty can be divided into epistemic uncertainty and aleatoric uncertainty [45]. The former comes from uncertainty in the parameters of the model, and the latter is uncertainty inherent in the data (e.g., two samples of different classes are similar). We focus on quantifying epistemic uncertainty. Inspired by [31, 36], we use MC-Dropout [13] to obtain an uncertainty measure by calculating the standard deviation of a fixed number (e.g., 10 in our experiments) of stochastic forward passes. To avoid carefully chosen thresholds, we choose \( N_P \) samples with the least uncertainty after calculating the uncertainties of \( D_U \):

\[
D_P = \left\{ \left( x^{(i)}, y^{(i)} \right) \right\}_{i=1}^{N_P} = \text{Top} \cdot N_P (D_U | - u^{(i)})
\]

Here, \( N_P = \text{Top} \cdot u_r, u^{(i)} \) is the uncertainty of the sample, \( y^{(i)} \) is the pseudo-label produced by the teacher model, and \( u_r \) is the proportion of the unlabeled samples. The time complexity of the uncertainty estimation is \( O(|N_P| \times \log(|N_U|)) \).

4.3 Dynamic Data Pruning

Traditional self-training can be expensive as the training set grows, via experimental study, to be presented in Section 5.4.

5 EXPERIMENTS

In this section, we experimentally evaluate the proposed PromptEM on eight real-world datasets. We aim at answering the following research questions:

- **RQ1**: How does PromptEM perform compared with the state-of-the-art methods under low-resource settings?
- **RQ2**: How does each module affect the overall performance of the model?
- **RQ3**: How does PromptEM perform compared with state-of-the-art approaches in terms of efficiency?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Datasets</th>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Left Table</th>
<th>Right Table</th>
<th>Labeled Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REL-HETER</td>
<td>restaurant</td>
<td>534 6.00</td>
<td>332 7.00</td>
<td>567 10% 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEMI-HOMO</td>
<td>citation</td>
<td>2,616 1.00</td>
<td>2,295 6.00</td>
<td>4,269 5.00 4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEMI-HETER</td>
<td>book</td>
<td>22,133 12.28</td>
<td>23,264 12.03</td>
<td>1,240 10% 124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEMI-REL</td>
<td>movie</td>
<td>29,180 8.00</td>
<td>32,823 13.81</td>
<td>1,309 10% 151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEMI-TEXT-w</td>
<td>product</td>
<td>9,234 10.00</td>
<td>9,234 10.00</td>
<td>12,583 5% 627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEMI-TEXT-c</td>
<td>product</td>
<td>20,897 10.00</td>
<td>20,897 1.00</td>
<td>64,263 7.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL-TEXT</td>
<td>citation</td>
<td>2,500 10% 250</td>
<td>2,500 10% 250</td>
<td>57 10% 742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEO-HETER</td>
<td>geo-spatial</td>
<td>2,616 8.65</td>
<td>6,426 7.34</td>
<td>2,616 8.65 64,263 7.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **RQ4**: Why do we choose these key modules (i.e., continuous templates and uncertainty-aware pseudo-label selection)?

5.1 Experimental Setup

**Dataset**: We use seven real-world benchmark datasets with different structures from Machamp [49] and one real geospatial dataset from [2]. Datasets are from various domains, e.g., a specific domain geo-spatial. The statistics of datasets are summarized in Table 1. Each dataset consists of the left and right tables of entities with possibly different formats (i.e., relational (REL), semi-structured (SEMI), or textual (TEXT)). When they are of the same format, they can have a homogeneous (HOMO) or heterogeneous (HETER) schema. Following [49], we construct GEO-HETER using the dataset OSM-FSQ-Pittsburgh from [2]. We focus on low-resource GEM settings and use rate% of labeled data as training set (e.g., 57 labeled data for REL-HETER). We use the same train/valid/test splits as Machamp.

**Baselines**: We compare PromptEM with eight SOTA EM methods, among which three (i.e., Ditto, DADER, and Rotom) have made efforts to low-resource EM, and TDmatch* is an unsupervised matching method for structural and textual data.

- **DeepMatcher** [30] is an entity matching framework that uses RNN architecture to aggregate the attribute values and then align the aggregated representations of the attributes.
- **BERT** [7] is fine-tuned to treat GEM as a sequence pair classification task.
- **SentenceBERT** [35] proposes a siamese architecture for pre-trained LMs for sentence matching, and could also be applied to the task of GEM.
- **Ditto** [22] is the SOTA EM approach that fine-tunes a pre-trained LM with three optimizations (i.e., domain knowledge, TF-IDF summarization, and data augmentation).
- **DADER** [44] presents a transfer learning-based EM framework via domain adaptation.
- **Rotom** [29] proposes a meta-learning framework that selects and weights the augmented data to better fine-tune the LMs.
- **TDmatch** [1] is an unsupervised approach to match textual and structured data using graph creation and random walk. Furthermore, we build an MLP classifier on top of its embeddings to perform in the supervised setting, namely, TDmatch+.

**Implementation details**: We implement PromptEM in PyTorch [33], the Transformers library [50] and the OpenPrompt library [9]. We use RoBERTa-base [25] as the backbone structure of our model in all the experiments. Unless particularly specified, the experimental results are conducted under the low-resource setting shown in
with an Intel Xeon Silver 4216 CPU, an NVIDIA A100 GPU and (P), recall (R), F1-score (F).

Table 1. We further apply the half-precision floating-point (fp16) advances in pre-trained LMs. Existing low-resource EM approaches the worst performance, since it does not leverage the recent ad-

Table 2: Results of all the methods under the default low-resource setting.

Table 3: Results of all the methods under the extremely challenging low-resource setting.

Table 1. We further apply the half-precision floating-point (fp16) optimization to save the GPU memory usage and running time. In all the experiments, the max sequence length is set to 512; the learning rate is set to 2e-5; the batch size is set to 32; the number of iterations for self-training is set to 1; and the number of passes for MC-Dropout is set to 10. We use AdamW as the optimizer for training, fix the epochs of training the teacher model to 20, and set the epochs of training the student model to 30. We prune the train set for every 8 epochs. We tune the hyper-parameters by doing a grid search and selecting the one with the best performance. Specifically, the continuous template is selected from \{T1(·), T2(·), \ldots\}, \tau is selected from \{0.05, 0.10, 0.15, 0.20, 0.25\}, and \epsilon is selected from \{0.1, 0.2, 0.3, 0.4, 0.5\}. We select the epoch with the highest F1-score on the validation set, and report the values of precision, recall, and F1-score on all the test set. All the experiments are conducted on a machine with an Intel Xeon Silver 4216 CPU, an NVIDIA A100 GPU and 512GB memory. We use the same serialization method as PromptEM to implement each baseline method and report the performance under their optimal settings.

Evaluation metrics. Following related studies [14, 22, 44], we employ three widely-used classification metrics, namely, precision (P), recall (R), F1-score (F).

5.2 Main Results (RQ1)

Results under the default low-resource setting. We first verify the performance under low-resource setting of PromptEM using the above eight baselines. The benchmark results of all methods across the datasets are reported in Table 2. DeepMatcher achieves the worst performance, since it does not leverage the recent advances in pre-trained LMs. Existing low-resource EM approaches (i.e., Ditto, DADER, and Rotom) achieve relatively poor performance, because the GEM problem is more intractable than EM (e.g., heterogeneous tables). In particular, TDmatch is not stable across different datasets due to the absence of label guidance, which can achieve the best F1-score on SEMI-HETER but only 18.0 F1-score on SEMI-TEXT-c. TDmatch outperform other LM-based approaches on SEMI-HETER. The reason is that SEMI-HETER has lots of numeric attributes, i.e., 53% attribute values are digits. It is well known that LMs are not good at understanding digits [46]. Also, we find that the scalability of TDmatch is extremely poor, which will be confirmed in Section 5.4.

Effectiveness to different low-resource settings. We reduce the training rate from 25% to 5% to see the performance under different low-resource settings. Experimental results are depicted in Figure 3. We observe that PromptEM achieves SOTA performance in most cases, while TDmatch and DADER achieve unstable results across different datasets due to lacking the guidance of labels and the heterogeneity of datasets. We also evaluate methods in a more challenging setting, i.e., the number of available data for training is only 80 for all datasets. This setting is extremely challenging for supervised methods, e.g., only using 0.46% labeled examples on SEMI-HOMO. As shown in Table 3, PromptEM achieves SOTA performance on most datasets, which demonstrates the great robustness of PromptEM compared to baselines.

Overall, our PromptEM is superior to all the baselines in almost all the cases under various low-resource settings. This justifies the effectiveness of PromptEM against competitive baselines. Our results suggest that the prompt-tuning paradigm has the potential to outperform the fine-tuning paradigm in data management tasks, much as it has revolutionized NLP.
5.3 Ablation Study (RQ2)

Next, we study the effectiveness of each module in PromptEM (i.e., prompt-tuning (PT), lightweight self-training (LST), dynamic data pruning (DDP)) by comparing PromptEM with its variants without the key module. The results are listed in Tables 2. **PromptEM vs. PromptEM w/o PT.** PromptEM w/o PT denotes that we fine-tune the LM instead of prompt-tuning. It is observed that the use of prompt-tuning contributes to a large portion of the performance gain. The F1-score drops 15.7% on average under the low-resource setting. This confirms that prompt-tuning greatly helps to stimulate the rich knowledge distributed in the LM.

**PromptEM vs. PromptEM w/o LST.** We use LST to boost the performance under low-resource settings. We can observe that LST can bring performance improvement in most cases. For example, LST brings 6.8% improvement on SEMI-TEXT-c. Also notice that LST brings relatively low improvement on some datasets. This is attributed to the nature of the datasets, as it is relatively much easier for PromptEM to achieve the extremely high performance, e.g., 100% F1-score on REL-HETER. Since LST is general enough to incorporate with other approaches, it is possible to be widely used in practical low-resource GEM applications.

**PromptEM vs. PromptEM w/o DDP.** We can observe that DDP can prune useless training data without sacrificing test accuracy. It is worth noting that DDP can prune training data while slightly improving test accuracy in some datasets. This is because DDP makes the model focus on important and useful training data.

5.4 Efficiency Analysis (RQ3)

We further explore the efficiency of our proposed PromptEM in terms of training time and memory usage, and the results are presented in Table 4. Since it is common for methods to use a similar strategy for evaluating the GEM results in the test set, we do not report the test time of every evaluated approach. SBERT denotes SentenceBERT, and PromptEM- represents PromptEM without dynamic data pruning.

5.5 Model Variants (RQ4)

Finally, we investigate the performance of PromptEM using alternative modules by conducting the following experiments. **PromptEM vs. best baselines.** Due to the limitation of space, we report PromptEM with the other evaluated approaches that achieve the best quality of GEM results in the corresponding categories, i.e., the normal EM method SBERT, the low-resource EM approach Rotom, and the unsupervised matching method TDmatch. We report the GPU memory for the methods running on GPU and the CPU memory for the method (i.e., TDmatch) running on CPU, respectively. As observed, PromptEM needs more training time than SBERT to obtain the SOTA results. This demonstrates a trade-off between the effectiveness and efficiency of the GEM problem. To sum up, it is significant that spending a relatively longer time in achieving better matching results. Rotom requires two-stage training, incurring a long training process. SBERT, Rotom, and PromptEM need similar memory usage since they are all based on LMs. We would like to emphasize that TDmatch needs too much training time and memory usage, especially on relatively large datasets (e.g., 120.3 hours and 131.5 Gigabytes on SEMI-REL), which is very costly in real-world applications.

**PromptEM vs. PromptEM-.** We also compare PromptEM with PromptEM- to evaluate the efficiency of dynamic data pruning. It is observed that DDP greatly helps to reduce the training time, i.e., reduce 26.1% time on average. This is because the proposed MC-EL2N is able to quantify useless training data effectively. Meanwhile, DDP does not bring extra memory usage as it does not require any new model parameters. As analyzed in Section 5.3, DDP does not hurt the performance. This further demonstrates that PromptEM is effective and efficient in solving the GEM problem.
datasets are 74.4, 67.8, 77.0, and 74.5, respectively. Continuous templates achieve better performance than hard-encoding templates. This further validates the effectiveness of the proposed continuous templates, which can find better continuous prompts beyond the original vocabulary ‘V of M could express.

Effect of label words choices. We compare our designed label words with the simple one (i.e., matched and mismatched). Using continuous T1 and T2, our designed label words achieve +5.2% and +9.4% average F1-score improvements over the simple one, respectively. This confirms the effectiveness of our label words.

Pseudo-label selection strategies. We consider several pseudo-label selection strategies, including uncertainty [36], confidence, and clustering [10]. We fix α to 0.1 on all datasets. Similarly, confidence and clustering both select the samples whose scores are in the top 10%. Following [14], we use true-positive rate (TPR) and true-negative rate (TNR) to evaluate the quality of the pseudo-labels generated by different strategies. Formally, TPR represents the proportion of matched entity pairs that are correctly labeled, denoted as \( \frac{TP}{TP+FP} \); TNR represents the proportion of mismatched pairs that are correctly labeled, denoted as \( \frac{TN}{TN+FP} \). The results are reported in Table 5. As expected, uncertainty can achieve state-of-the-art performance when generating pseudo-labels, e.g., TPR and TNR are 0.88 and 0.99 on average, respectively. It confirms the effectiveness of the uncertainty-aware pseudo-label selection strategy.

### 6 RELATED WORK

#### 6.1 Entity Matching

Entity Matching (EM) is one of the fundamental and significant tasks in data management. Many efforts have devoted to develop effective approaches for EM, including rule-based methods [6, 12, 40, 48], crowdsourcing-based methods [15, 28, 47], and traditional ML-based methods [3, 5, 21, 37]. Recently, deep learning has been used widely in EM, and achieved promising results. DeepER [11] uses deep neural networks to extract features of entity pairs, and then models EM as a binary classification task. DeepMatcher [30] systematically describes a DL architecture, and designs a space of DL solutions for EM. However, a lot of labeled training data are still needed for those DL-based approaches, which is extremely expensive in practice. To decrease the demand for high-quality training data, Ditto [22] applies pre-trained language models to EM, performing well with the help of some data augmentation (DA) techniques. Rotom [29] effectively improves the performance of EM tasks via combining multiple DA operators. DADER [44] develops a framework that significantly advances EM by applying domain adaptation. Some other attempts have also been made to enhance the performance via information fusion [52], active learning [20, 32], and transfer learning [26, 42, 53]. Nonetheless, these methods only focus on EM tasks in low-resource scenarios but perform poorly on GEM tasks. Tmatch [1] first attempts to match textual content and structured data under an unsupervised setting. However, it has one serious shortcoming: it is not scalable on large-scale datasets, which makes it hard to be used in practical scenarios.

#### 6.2 Prompt-tuning

Despite the success of fine-tuning pre-trained LMs [7, 25], the huge objective form gap between pre-training and fine-tuning still hinders the full use of pre-trained knowledge for downstream tasks [23, 24]. The birth of GPT-3 [4] is the seminal work that stimulates the development of prompt-tuning, which applies hand-encoding prompts for tuning and achieves impressive performance on various tasks, especially under the low-resource settings. Following GPT-3, lots of hand-encoding prompts [8, 24] have been widely explored. Recently, automatic prompt search [39] and continuous prompts [18, 24] have been proposed to avoid labor-intensive prompt design and enhance the expressiveness of the prompt. The burst of prompt-tuning has led to significant advancement in many areas such as natural language inference [24] and entity typing [8]. However, it is the first time to introduce prompt-tuning in EM for the better usage of pre-trained LMs. PromptEM provides a good connection to recent NLP advancements with application to data management.

#### 7 CONCLUSIONS

In this paper, we study the problem of low-resource generalized entity matching via our presented PromptEM solution. PromptEM introduces prompt-tuning to cast GEM as a cloze-style task for the first time. To this end, we design templates (i.e., hard-encoding templates and continuous templates) and label words set for the GEM problem. To further improve the performance in low-resource settings, we develop a lightweight self-training method using uncertainty, which is a nice combination of existing methods and can be efficient by dynamic data pruning. Extensive experimental results on eight real-world datasets with different structures demonstrate the superiority of PromptEM compared with the state-of-the-art approaches. In the future, we plan to explore a general prompt-tuning method to support more data management tasks (e.g., data cleaning), advancing the usage of LMs in the database community.
As shown in Table 6, we observe that PromptEM achieves the best F1-score for all datasets. PromptEM achieves an average 88.9% F1-score, which is 8.0% relatively over the best baseline Rotom. This attributes to the power of prompt-tuning. As mentioned in Section 1, prompt-based tuning is able to bridge the gap of objective forms between pre-training and fine-tuning, which is good at stimulating the rich knowledge distributed in LMs. PromptEM w/o PT denotes that we fine-tune the LM instead of prompt-tuning. It is observed that the use of prompt-tuning contributes to a large portion of the performance gain. The F1-score drops 5.2% on average under the sufficient setting. The results of label words choices

Effect of template choices. The results of label words choices are depicted in Figure 5. We compare our designed label words with the simple one, i.e., matched for "yes" and mismatched for "no". Both $T_1$ and $T_2$ use the continuous versions. We can observe that the F1-score is significantly dropped using the simple label words. This demonstrates the effectiveness of our designed label words. In other words, considering the more general relation between entities is beneficial to the predictions.

C ERROR ANALYSIS

We conduct an error analysis to verify the limitations of our proposed PromptEM. Figure 6 plots the erroneous predictions, including a false positive (FP) and a false negative (FN). For the FP case, two entities have very similar titles and the same authors. Indeed, we can find that they are different entities based on the publication date and the ISBN. For the FN case, two entities have the same titles but different authors and publishers. However, we can judge they are the same based on the publication date and the ISBN. We can find that some digital attributes are vital to making correct predictions. Nonetheless, PromptEM and other LM-based methods are not good at understanding digits, so they cannot find the importance of those digital attributes. Therefore, it is necessary to improve the ability of LMs to understand and focus on important digital attributes.

D IMPLEMENTATION DETAILS OF BASELINES

We implement each baseline method as follows and report its performance under its optimal settings.

- DeepMatcher [30]: We implement DeepMatcher following the original paper and public code\(^1\). As DeepMatcher only accepts input with the same schema on two tables, we just make the schemas of both tables have only one attribute, whose value is a sentence consisting of all attribute values. And we use the default setting of the hybrid model.
- BERT [7], SentenceBERT [35], Ditto [22] and Rotom [29]: These methods are based on LMs. We implement these methods according to the original papers, public code\(^2\) and public code\(^3\). Following [49], we tune the hyper-parameters by doing a grid search and select the one with the best performance. Specifically, the learning rate is selected from \{10^{-5}, 3.0 \times 10^{-5}, 5.0 \times 10^{-5}\}. The maximum sequence length for LMs is selected from \{128, 256, 384, 512\}. The batch size and epoch are set to 32 and 40, respectively.
- DADER [44]: We implement DADER following the original paper and public code\(^4\). For the source dataset, we use all the training samples. For the target dataset, we use the same low-resource training samples as other supervised methods. Specially, we select the source and target datasets from a similar domain for DADER. We use the same hyper-parameters setting according to the paper. And we use the InvGAN+KD model.
- TDmatch [1]: We implement TDmatch according to the original paper and public code\(^5\). All hyper-parameters are the same as the original paper. To perform in the supervised setting, we extract the embeddings from TDmatch. Then we build a classification layer (i.e., MLP) upon the embeddings, whose name is TDmatch*. Following the original paper and public code\(^5\), we use $(u, v, [u - v], u + v)$ as input for the classifier. The batch size is set to 64; the number of epoch is set to 100; and the learning rate is set to $5 \times 10^{-3}$.

\(^{1}\)https://github.com/anhaidgroup/deepmatcher
\(^{2}\)https://github.com/megagonlabs/ditto
\(^{3}\)https://github.com/megagonlabs/rotom
\(^{4}\)https://github.com/ruc-datalab/DADER
\(^{5}\)https://github.com/naserahmadi/TDmatch
Table 6: Results of all the methods under sufficient resource setting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>REL-HETER</th>
<th>SEMI-HOMO</th>
<th>SEMI-HETER</th>
<th>SEMI-REL</th>
<th>SEMI-TEXT-c</th>
<th>SEMI-TEXT-w</th>
<th>REL-TEXT</th>
<th>GEO-HETER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeepMatcher</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>87.9</td>
<td>93.6</td>
<td>89.0</td>
<td>83.2</td>
<td>86.1</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BERT</td>
<td>95.5</td>
<td>95.5</td>
<td>95.5</td>
<td>93.8</td>
<td>93.9</td>
<td>93.8</td>
<td>90.7</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SentenceBERT</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>69.6</td>
<td>85.6</td>
<td>89.3</td>
<td>87.4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>53.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>94.7</td>
<td>91.6</td>
<td>93.1</td>
<td>84.6</td>
<td>48.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DADER</td>
<td>87.0</td>
<td>90.9</td>
<td>88.9</td>
<td>87.4</td>
<td>87.4</td>
<td>87.4</td>
<td>98.5</td>
<td>40.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotom</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>94.4</td>
<td>95.1</td>
<td>94.7</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>32.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDMATCH</td>
<td>56.4</td>
<td>70.1</td>
<td>72.1</td>
<td>93.7</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>97.2</td>
<td>88.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDMATCH*</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>86.5</td>
<td>91.2</td>
<td>88.8</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td>41.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PromptEM</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>96.3</td>
<td>96.0</td>
<td>96.3</td>
<td>99.3</td>
<td>87.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PromptEM w/PT</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>94.3</td>
<td>97.1</td>
<td>95.7</td>
<td>76.2</td>
<td>52.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional details of experimental datasets

We use all seven real-world datasets from Machamp [49]. The two tables of each dataset may have different formats (i.e., relational (REL), semi-structured (SEMI), or textual (TEXT)) and different schemas (i.e., homogeneous (HOMO), or heterogeneous (HETER)). Additionally, we use one real geospatial dataset GEO-HETER, which is derived from OSM-FSQ-Pittsburgh [2]. For each entity, there are textual attributes and the geographical position. Following [49], the "latitude" and "longitude" of the right table are combined into a single 'position' attribute to convert the dataset into a case of heterogeneous schema.