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Abstract—Data-intensive Web applications usually require integrating data from Web sources at query time. The sources may refer to the same real-world entity in different ways and some may even provide outdated or erroneous data. An important task is to recognize and merge the records that refer to the same real world entity at query time. Most existing duplicate detection and fusion techniques work in the off-line setting and do not meet the online constraint. There are at least two aspects that differentiate online duplicate detection and fusion from its off-line counterpart. (i) The latter assumes that the entire data is available, while the former cannot make such an assumption. (ii) Several query submissions may be required to compute the “ideal” representation of an entity in the online setting. This paper presents a general framework for the online setting based on an iterative record-based caching technique. A set of frequently requested records is deduplicated off-line and cached for future reference. Newly arriving records in response to a query are deduplicated jointly with the records in the cache, presented to the user and appended to the cache. Experiments with real and synthetic data show the benefit of our solution over traditional record linkage techniques applied to an online setting.

I. INTRODUCTION

A key task in integrating data from multiple Web sources is to recognize records referring to the same real world entity—the record linkage problem [1]. This task is known to be difficult since the attribute values of an entity may be represented in different ways or even conflict with each other, e.g., different addresses for the same business. Conflicting data may also occur because of multiple correct values for the same real world entity, incomplete data, out-of-date data or erroneous data. Thus, another important task is to identify the correct attribute values of an entity—the data fusion problem [2].

In a virtual integration system (VIS), such as a vertical search engine, all of the above tasks must be performed at query time. Given that the data integration step is just one part of the process of getting data to users (which includes network communication, ranking, etc.), it needs to be performed very fast. Fusing all data upfront is obviously not an option in a VIS. The goal of this work is to provide efficient solutions to the record linkage and fusion (RL&F) problems at query-time.

An example will help illustrate the challenges tackled in this paper. Consider a VIS that integrates data from the following Web databases: Metromix.com, DexKnows.com, Yelp.com and Menuism.com. The following query is submitted to the VIS: $Q1 = (\text{Name} = \text{"Pizz\%"}; \text{Cuisine} = \text{"Pizza"}; \text{Price} = \text{"Affordable"}; \text{Neighborhood} = \text{"Downtown, Chicago"})$. (% is used as a wildcard character). Among all the returned records, we look at those associated with the restaurant “Pizzeria Uno” (Table I). Metromix does not return any record, while the records returned by the other Web databases do not agree on the address and phone number. At this time, the best we can do is to flip a coin to decide on the address of the restaurant and to take a majority voting to decide on the correct phone number. Suppose now that at a later time a new query is posted: $Q2 = (\text{Name} = \text{"Pizz\%"}; \text{Cuisine} = \text{"Pizza"}; \text{Price} = \text{"%"}; \text{Neighborhood} = \text{"\%"})$. Table I shows the list of records of the two queries gives us the opportunity to see, although at different time intervals, multiple records about the entity “Pizzeria Uno”. Thus, if we stored the answer to query $Q1$, then, using the answer to $Q2$ together with that to $Q1$, we could make a more informed decision about the correct address and phone number of “Pizzeria Uno”. For example, the list of results of Zagat and DexKnows did not share any record for 721 queries. As shown in Table II,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Engine</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Query Q1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metromix</td>
<td>Pizzeria Uno</td>
<td>49 E. Ontario St.</td>
<td>312-280-5115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menuism</td>
<td>Pizzeria Uno</td>
<td>49 E. Ontario St.</td>
<td>312-280-5115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DexKnows</td>
<td>Pizza Uno</td>
<td>49 E. Ontario St.</td>
<td>312-280-5115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yelp</td>
<td>Pizzeria Uno</td>
<td>49 E. Ontario St.</td>
<td>312-280-5115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Query Q2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metromix</td>
<td>Pizzeria Uno</td>
<td>49 E. Ontario St.</td>
<td>312-280-5115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menuism</td>
<td>Pizzeria Uno</td>
<td>49 E. Ontario St.</td>
<td>312-280-5115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DexKnows</td>
<td>Pizza Uno</td>
<td>49 E. Ontario St.</td>
<td>312-280-5115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yelp</td>
<td>Pizzeria Uno</td>
<td>49 E. Ontario St.</td>
<td>312-280-5115</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE I: An example of inconsistent data on the Web.
this was not a rare occurrence. The table shows the number of queries for which Zagat and each of the Web databases have zero records in common. We observe that, on average, in the merged list of results of a query, about 70% of the records appear in one or two sources (out of 10) and only about 15% of them appear in more than 5 sources. These observations clearly suggest that effective record linkage cannot in general be undertaken query by query in isolation, because there is not sufficient “cleaning evidence” from the records returned by a single query.

We can alleviate the lack of “cleaning evidence” by collecting “evidence” from queries as we process them. We approach the online RL&F problems from an iterative caching perspective (see Fig. 1). Specifically, the set of records corresponding to frequently posted queries is deduplicated off-line and cached for future references. Newly arriving records in response to a user query are deduplicated jointly with the records in the cache, presented to users and appended to the cache. The framework of the problem addressed in this paper is as follows:

**The Setting:** Let $D$ be a set of Web databases. Let $E$ be a set of real-world entities in the same application domain (e.g., real estate, book). Each entity has a set of attributes (e.g., name, address, phone for a business entity) and an attribute may have zero or several values. Different sources may supply different values for an attribute of an entity and the same value may be represented differently. A subset of the entities in $E$ are frequently requested and a fraction of the volume of queries occurs frequently. Thus, RL&F in this environment faces unique challenges (e.g., time) and opportunities (e.g., temporal locality in queries) compared to a traditional setting.

**The Problem:** Let $Q$ be a query. From the lists of records returned by the $D$ Web databases in response to $Q$, we need to identify the set of records $R$ referring to the same real-world entity in $E$ and fuse the records in $R$ into a single and “clean” representation. That is, solve the RL&F problems for $Q$.

**The Proposed Solution:** A solution for the above problem must achieve a trade-off between efficiency and effectiveness. Nevertheless, it needs to do so without significantly deteriorating effectiveness. We seek to improve efficiency by (1) avoiding repetitions of data cleaning steps such as unnecessary fusion, and (2) identifying the duplicates of a record in a constant time that is independent of the number of database records by using an index. Concretely, we propose an online record linkage and fusion framework (ORLF, for short) based on iterative caching. ORLF stores fused records as plain records together with information about how they were created, i.e., provenance. A non-trivial problem in the proposed RL&F framework is that of quickly finding the candidate matching records in the cache of a record in the query answer. We cannot afford to go through all the records in the cache to match them against the query records. In Section IV-A, we give a novel indexing data structure for fast similarity record lookup based on the $B^{ed}$-tree data structure [4].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Web Database</th>
<th>ChicagoReader</th>
<th>YellowPages</th>
<th>Metromix</th>
<th>MenuPages</th>
<th>Yelp</th>
<th>Yahoo</th>
<th>CitySearch</th>
<th>Menusim</th>
<th>DexKnows</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># occurrences</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>649</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>676</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>721</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The paper is organized as follows. Section II describes ORLF. Section III discusses caching. Section IV describes the query-time answering. Section V describes ORLF in action with a comprehensive example. Section VI describes the experiments. Related work is in Section VII. Section VIII concludes the paper.

II. THE ORLF SYSTEM

We describe in this section the workflow of the proposed iterative caching approach for online RL&F. In a nutshell, newly arriving records in response to a user query are cleaned jointly with the records in the cache, presented to users and appended to the cache. The workflow is drawn in Fig. 2.

There are two processing paths: the hit and the miss paths. Both start by looking up the records returned by each source in response to a query in the cache. The lookup process is a two-step process. First, for each incoming record \( r \) we use an indexing data structure to retrieve the matching record of \( r \) in the cache. We employ a string-based similarity search (see Section IV). We collect the top-k most similar records to \( r \) in the cache. These entities are derived from the records frequently accessed entities and load their corresponding records into the cache content determined off-line, there can be cached updates on these records. A cache record is updated by fusing it with incoming matching records from sources which have not yet contributed to the cache record. We keep track of the provenance of each cache record for that purpose.

A cache record is updated based on the adopted cache policy (Section III). We will show that there are substantial differences between traditional caching and caching for online RL&F. Iterative caching allows a “fast” response to the current query and an “improved” data quality for subsequent queries.

III. CACHING MECHANISMS

The decision of what to cache can be taken either off-line (static) or online (dynamic) in general. A static cache is based on historical information. A dynamic cache has a limited number of entries and stores items according to the sequence of requests. Upon a new request, the cache system decides whether to evict some entries in the case of a cache miss. Online decisions are based on the cache policy. Two common policies are: evicting the least recently used (LRU) or the least frequently used (LFU) items from the cache [9]. We analyze the suitability of these strategies to online RL&F. We also introduce locking of cached items and record provenance to improve efficiency when interacting with the cache.

A. Static Cache

With a static cache we need to identify the most frequently accessed entities and load their corresponding records in the cache. These entities are derived from the records corresponding to the most frequent queries gathered from the Web databases. Results of the frequent queries are processed off-line using off-line RL&F algorithms. We used FRIL [5] for RL and majority voting for fusion in our prototype. More sophisticated fusion techniques can be used [10].

We introduce a variation of static caching where records in the cache are allowed to be updated, called static cache with in-place updates (SCU). The reason is that even though the cache content is determined off-line, there can be cached records for which the number of pieces of evidence is not enough to decide whether they are correct (see example in Section I). Hence, it is of practical importance to allow online updates on these records. A cache record is updated by fusing it with incoming matching records from sources which have not yet contributed to the cache record. We keep track of the provenance of each cache record for that purpose.

B. Dynamic Cache

The semantics of a miss is different in our caching from the traditional one. In the latter, upon receiving a request for an item \( v \), the cache is probed for \( v \). If \( v \) is not found, \( v \) is brought into the cache from the disk. If the cache is full, then a cached item is evicted to make space for \( v \). In our caching
setting there is no disk: all the known records are those in the cache and the ones in response to a query. Thus, on a miss, i.e., the match of an incoming record $r \notin$ in the cache, $r$ itself is brought into the cache after RL&F. Each cache record has a cache tag that stores the information needed for accomplishing dynamic caching, e.g., the number of times (or the last time) the fused record was output to users.

C. Locking

Avoiding unnecessary cleaning operations is key to improving online efficiency. We use a locking mechanism to avoid unnecessary invocations of the fusion step. Specifically, a cache record is locked if our confidence in its quality is “high”. Determining when “high” is reached for a unlocked record is orthogonal to our system. It can, for example, be probabilistic [10]. In our prototype, we implemented a voting strategy for this purpose: a record is locked if the value of each of its attributes is obtained by fusing the records from $p \in$ of the sources. We empirically set $p = \frac{|D|}{2} – 1$. Note also that locking provides a means for implementing online cache refreshing: certain locked records are unlocked at certain time intervals and are refreshed via fusion. A thorough treatment of refreshing is left for future work.

D. Record Provenance

If a cached record was previously constructed using a record from a source $S$ and, for a new query, $S$ returns a record $r$ that matches the fused record, then we may decide to discard $r$ as it is very likely that $r$ has been previously seen from source $S$ or is a duplicate record. If the record was updated in the source, then the next refresh of the cache will reflect this change. We encode provenance using a bit string of length $|D|$, such that the $i^{th}$ bit is turned on if a record from the $i^{th}$ source was involved in the construction of the fused record.

IV. QUERY-TIME ANSWERING

In ORLF, the cache contains fused records. Specifically, if $fr_i$ is a record in the cache at time $t_i$ then at time $t_{i+1}$ the new version of $fr_i$ is either $fr_i$ itself or a new record $fr_{i+1}$ that is constructed out of $fr_i$ and a set of incoming records not in the cache, which were linked to $fr_i$.

Algorithm 1 describes the query answering algorithm. A key novelty in our approach is that the merging is not only performed between the incoming lists of records, but the relevant records in the cache are also involved. As explained earlier, there are two processing paths: the hit and the miss paths. Each list of responses is processed by Procedure RecordLookupBySource (Algorithm 2) which updates the IMI (inverted match index) data structure, which will contain the set of cache records matching records in $R_i$ and outputs $Y$, the set of records in $R_i$ without a match in the cache. $Y$ is appended to the set of unmatched records $\mathcal{MR}$ (Line 7, Algorithm 1). The matching records from all the incoming lists $R_i$ and cache are fused (Line 9). The unmatched records are linked among themselves and then fused (procedure HierarchicalRLF, Line 10). The resulting fused records that do not already exist in the cache are appended to the cache (Line 11). This step is only executed for dynamic caching. Those that already exist in the cache are updated (Line 10). This step is executed when either SCU or dynamic cache are used. The union of the fused records, from both the matched and unmatched records, are then returned to the user (Line 13).

HierarchicalRLF performs pairwise RL. For example, if $\mathcal{R}_1, \mathcal{R}_2, \mathcal{R}_3$ and $\mathcal{R}_4$ are the four lists of records, then it performs RL on $\mathcal{R}_1$ and $\mathcal{R}_2$, and on $\mathcal{R}_3$ and $\mathcal{R}_4$. RL is performed again on their outputs to obtain the final list of linked records. This scheme is captured as a full binary tree, where a leaf node is the list of unmatched records from a source and an internal node represents the RL outcome on its children. While HierarchicalRLF is not as effective as a RL procedure that exhaustively compares the records of the $m$ sources across each other, it is more amenable to a parallel implementation. Nevertheless, it is significantly more efficient and very effective within our overall framework (Section VI).

A. Record Look Up and Record Linkage

Let $r$ be an incoming record and $fr$ the record in the cache most similar to $r$. The problem is how to find $fr$ in an online caching setting — $fr$ may be substantially different from $r$, because $fr$ has been subject to several fusion iterations. Hence, $fr$ can only be found using similarity search. And operationally, how to check if $fr$ indeed exists in the cache? An exhaustive search of the cache to look for $fr$ is clearly prohibitive. We propose a two-step process: (1) fast approximate nearest-neighbor search and (2) exhaustive record matching, where we compare $r$ with the (smaller) set of nearest neighbors (records). In the light of (1), our proposed cache is an instance of similarity caching [11].

1) Nearest Neighbor Search: Given an incoming record $r$, we need to obtain the cached record $fr$ such that $\text{sim}(r, fr)$ is maximized, where the similarity function is defined on the space of the “keys” of the records. A subset of the attributes of entities in $\mathcal{E}$ is a “key” if it can serve as entity identifier, i.e., the attributes uniquely identify an entity. For example, when matching business listings the subsets \{Name, Address\} and \{Name, Phone\} are such attributes. That is, if two business records have very similar names and addresses

---

**Algorithm 1: Query Processing in the ORLF system**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Input</th>
<th>Query $Q$ and Cache</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Output</td>
<td>The set of fused records $FR$ in response to $Q$ and an updated cache</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Let \{\(R_1, \ldots, R_m\)\} be the lists of records from $m$ Web databases in response to $Q$;
2. Initialize $\text{IMI} \leftarrow \emptyset$; // the inverted match index
3. $MR \leftarrow \emptyset$; // matched records in the cache
4. $\mathcal{MR} \leftarrow \emptyset$; // unmatched incoming records
5. for $i = 1$ to $m$ do
   6. $\mathcal{Y} \leftarrow \text{RecordLookupBySource}(R_i, S_i, \text{IMI});$
   7. $\mathcal{MR} \leftarrow \mathcal{MR} \cup \mathcal{Y};$
   8. $\text{MR} \leftarrow \text{Transitive closure of \text{IMI}};$
   9. $FR_i \leftarrow \text{fuse}($\text{IMI}$);$;
10. $\text{addToCache}(FR_2);$; // only in dynamic caching
11. $\text{updateCache}(FR_1);$; // only in dynamic caching and SCU
12. return $FR_1 \cup FR_2;$;
or very similar names and the same phone number, then the records are very likely to refer to the same business entity. Many indexing strategies can be used with static caching: e.g., locality sensitive hashing (LSH) [12]. For dynamic caching however, we need an indexing structure that supports efficient live updates. Since in many practical cases the entity identifier attributes are strings, we choose the $B^d$-tree index [4], a string similarity indexing. $B^d$-tree is a $B^+$-tree based index structure, which has a number of properties that suit our environment very well. $B^d$-tree: (i) efficiently answers selection queries, (ii) can handle arbitrary edit distance thresholds, (iii) supports normalized edit distance for all query types, in particular, top-k queries, (iv) has good performance for long strings and large datasets, and (v) supports incremental updates efficiently.

2) Modifying the $B^d$-tree index for use in similarity record search: $B^d$-tree index was developed for string similarity search and hence cannot directly be used in our setting. For us, it all boils down to finding a suitable record representation such that records can be indexed with this data structure and carrying the good performance of the index on strings to records. We index a set of records using their “key” (matching) attributes $Key_0 = \{A_1, A_2, \ldots, A_n\}$.

$B^d$-tree index overview. $B^d$-tree [4] is an index for string similarity search based on (normalized) edit distance built on top of a $B^+$-tree. To index the strings with a $B^+$-tree index, it is necessary to construct a mapping from the string domain to an ordered domain (e.g., the integer space). Since we are interested in top-k searches, the mapping must give an ordering that satisfies two properties when used with the edit distance: comparability and lower bounding. The former property requires linear time to verify if a string is ahead of another in the given string order, whereas the latter requires that it is efficient to find the minimal edit distance between a string $q$ and any string in an interval $[s, s']$. The latter property is needed to efficiently prune out the intervals with no strings within the given edit distance from the query string during search. Three orderings are given in [4]: (1) dictionary, (2) gram counting, and (3) gram location. Gram counting is superior to the other two for top-k queries for relatively large (2)-gram counting, and (3)-gram location. Gram counting is 11011011.

Adapting $B^d$-tree to Record Linkage. We now describe our solution using $B^d$-tree with the gram counting order for top-k record similarity search. A naive approach to represent $Key_r$ is to simply concatenate the key attribute values of a record to form a string. The index key is then generated by taking the z-order representation for the obtained string. One issue with this scheme is that we may end up comparing q-grams of different attributes; e.g., if we compare two business records whose names are not of the same length, then, we will compare the q-grams of the longer name to the q-grams of the address attribute of the other record.

To avoid this problem we need to treat the attribute values as first-class citizens. We analyzed two z-order representations of record keys: $z$-order concatenation and $z$-order interleaving. In both representation schemes, we first obtain the z-order representation of each attribute. Then, in the z-order concatenation scheme the index key is obtained by concatenating the resulting bit-strings of each attribute, whereas in the latter z-order interleaving scheme, we interleave the bits from all attributes in a round robin fashion.

These representation schemes are bounded by the size of $L$. First, $L$ cannot be arbitrarily large. For example, efficiency-wise $L = 4$ gives the best results in [4]. This is too small to adequately represent an index key with multiple attributes. As shown in Fig. 3c (Section VI), increasing $L$ increases the time it takes to retrieve top-k. Second, for each of the $n$ attributes we need to allocate a contiguous number of buckets. However, each attribute may require a different number of buckets. For instance, the attribute name may require more buckets than the attribute phone. Third, we experimentally noticed that the $z$-order concatenation scheme is influenced by the order of the attributes, while the $z$-order interleaving scheme is not. So, in general we need to find a solution to the following linear equation. If we denote by $L_i$ the number of buckets required by attribute $A_i$, then we have

$$L_1 + \cdots + L_n = L, \text{ where } L_i \in [b_1, B_1], b_1, B_1 \in \mathbb{N}^*.$$ (1)

$b_i$ and $B_i$ denote the minimum and respectively maximum (ideal) number of buckets required by the $i^{th}$ attribute. This equation may not have solutions, i.e., $b_1 + \cdots + b_n > L$. Thus, there may be application domains where $B^d$-tree index is not suitable. Alternatively, it may have multiple solutions (this is a linear Diophantine equation). Ideally, all solutions need to be tested out and one that fits the best the application at hand is chosen. Enumerating all possible solutions in search for the ideal one is an overkill for some application domains because for each solution to Equation 1 we need to construct the corresponding $B^d$-tree and carry out the empirical evaluation. We give here a heuristic procedure to locate a suitable solution.

We first order in descending order the attributes based on their selectivity property (selectivity of an attribute A is the ratio between the number of distinct values in A and the total number of records). This can be given by a domain expert or estimated by sampling. Intuitively, the more selective an attribute is the more useful is to distinguish between records about different entities and thus more buckets should be allocated to it. Let $A_1, \ldots, A_n$ be the desired ordering. We make $L_{ij} = b_{ij}, 1 \leq j \leq n$. Then we apply a greedy strategy as follows. Let $L' = L - \sum_{j=1}^{n} b_j$. As long as $L' > 0$ we proceed as follows. For each 1 \leq j \leq n, if $B_{ij} - b_{ij} \leq L'$ then $L_{ij} = B_{ij}$, else $L_{ij} = b_{ij} + L'$ and stop. For instance, suppose the attributes are name, address and phone. Suppose that this is the desired ordering and that for each of them $b = 4$ and $B = 6$. Let $L = 15$. Applying the greedy strategy, we allocate 6 buckets to name, 5 to address, and 4 to phone.
**Algorithm 2: RecordLookupBySource**

Input: \((R, S, IMI)\) - the list of incoming records \(R\) from a source \(S\) and \(IMI\) - the inverted match index

Output: \(M\) - the records in \(R\) without a match in the cache.

updated \(IMI\).

foreach \(r \in R\) do

   hasMatch ← false;

   TK ← getCashK(r);

   foreach \(fr \in TK\) do

      if RecordMatch(r, fr) then

         if \(S \notin fr.Provenance\) then

            update(IMI, fr, r);

            hasMatch ← true;

            break;

      end if

   end foreach

   if hasMatch = false then

      add\((r, M)\);

   end if

end foreach

**B^d\text{-}tree Setup.** Due to space constraints, we cannot give the entire set of experiments for setting up the index. We summarize the key points here. We empirically determine that beyond \(L = 12\) the performance of \(B^d\text{-}tree\) deteriorates considerably. We set \(b_i = 4\) and \(B_i = 6\). For the matching of business listings with the attributes name, address and phone, the best configuration is to allocate each attribute 4 buckets. Also, z-order concatenation gives better retrieval times on average than z-order interleaving scheme. The order of the attributes in the z-order concatenation is name, address, phone. We further evaluate the z-order concatenation scheme in Section VI-A under different parameters of the \(B^d\text{-}tree\).

3) Record Matching: The custom record matching function must predict with high confidence if the records \(r\) and \(fr\) refer to the same entity. Otherwise, duplicates may be inserted in both the cache and query answer. The actual function is application-dependent and, thus, orthogonal to the current work. For our proof of concept, we developed such a function as follows. We obtained a training sample by posting a number of random queries to the component search engines, then we manually labeled the pairs of matching records and learnt a binary classifier: match or not match. We constructed a decision tree from the labeled data. Once we had the decision tree we transformed it into a procedure with IF-THEN rules [13] that was plugged into our system.

4) Look up Algorithm: Algorithm 2 describes the procedure to look up an incoming record in the cache. We first post a top-k query to the \(B^d\text{-}tree\) to get the k most similar records to \(r\) in the cache. We then perform pairwise comparisons between \(r\) and the top-k records to determine \(fr\). In our implementation, we empirically set \(k = 5\) (Section VI). Each new record is compared against its top-k matches from the index (Lines 4-10). Our reasoning assume: (1) cache records are distinct and (2) a cache record can match at most one record in a given source. (1) can be seen as a cache invariant and its consequence is that a new record can match at most one record in the cache. (2) may seem restrictive, but note that our goal is not to clean the individual sources, but rather to return relevant and clean records. Thus, if \(r\) matches a cache record \(fr\), then \(r\) is retained to be later fused with \(fr\) only if a record from \(S\) has not previously contributed to the construction of \(fr\) (Lines 6-7).

**TABLE III: An example cache.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Provenance</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>cr1</td>
<td>(1, 2, 3, 5)</td>
<td>Pizzeria Uno</td>
<td>49 E. Ontario St.</td>
<td>312-280-5115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cr2</td>
<td>(1, 3)</td>
<td>Pizzeria Uno</td>
<td>40 E. Ontario St.</td>
<td>312-280-3344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cr3</td>
<td>(1, 3)</td>
<td>Pizza Uno</td>
<td>39 N. Ontario St.</td>
<td>312-280-2355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cr4</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>Pizzeria Uno</td>
<td>51 E. Ontario St.</td>
<td>312-280-5115</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE IV: \(Q_1\)’s answer set**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(R_i)</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(R_1)</td>
<td>cr1</td>
<td>Pizzeria Uno</td>
<td>49 E. Ontario St.</td>
<td>312-280-5115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(R_2)</td>
<td>cr2</td>
<td>Pizza Uno</td>
<td>51 E. Ontario St.</td>
<td>312-280-5115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(R_3)</td>
<td>cr3</td>
<td>Pizza King</td>
<td>11 W. Ontario St.</td>
<td>312-443-7844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(R_4)</td>
<td>cr4</td>
<td>Giordano’s pizza</td>
<td>33 N. Ontario St.</td>
<td>312-544-9033</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If \(r\) has no match in the cache, it is appended to the list of unmatched records (Lines 10-11).

**B. Fusion Procedure**

For each set of records representing the same entity, we need to compute the fusion. For each cache attribute, the value representations that have a similarity of at least some threshold (current implementation 0.9) are considered to be “identical”. Among a set of representations for a value, we choose the one provided by the largest number of sources. When a cache record \(fr\) is fused with a list of new records, the value representation of an attribute from \(fr\) receives \(\left\lfloor \frac{m}{2} \right\rfloor\) votes, where \(m\) is the number of sources from which \(fr\) was previously derived. Other fusion schemes (e.g., [14], [10]) can easily be plugged into our framework.

**C. Algorithm Complexity**

The non-parallel worst-case time complexity of Algorithm 1 is \(O((m-2)(m-2)cR^2)\), where \(m\) is the number of databases, each returning \(R\) records; \(c\) is the cache miss rate; \(\delta \approx 1 - \text{or}\), where \(\text{or}\) is the overlap rate of the \(m\) sources. This occurs when most of the records have no match in the cache, i.e., \(c\) is close to 1. In this case ORLF is simply as good as traditional RL. The best case occurs when \(c\) is close to 0. On average however, the algorithm is near linear in \(mR\).

**V. A WALKTHROUGH EXAMPLE**

We give a step-by-step illustration of Algorithms 1 and 2 through an example in this section. Consider the following query: \(Q_1 = \{\text{Address} = “%Ontario%”, \text{Cuisine} = “Pizza”\}\). Table III shows the cache content. We assume four sources. \(Q_1\) is posted to all the sources. The list of records returned from a source \(i\) is stored in a list \(R_i\). The lists are shown in Table IV. For the sake of simplicity, we assume that each source returns one record in response to \(Q_1\). For each record \(r\) in list \(R_i\), the system finds its top-k similar records according to the string edit distance in the cache. We assume \(k = 2\) in this example. Note that there is no guarantee that the returned records are indeed real matches. Hence, we next find which ones among the \(k\) records are valid matches of \(r\). Table V shows the incoming records after the “filtering” process is applied to the top-k set. The “edit” column in the table shows the sum of the string edit distance between \(r_i\) and \(cr_i\) on attributes \{
\text{name, address, phone}\}. 


TABLE V: $Q_1$’s Top-2 records and their matching status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MR</th>
<th>cr</th>
<th>Matching incoming records</th>
<th>$\text{edit}(r_1, cr)$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>cr1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR</td>
<td>cr2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cr3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cr4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cr5</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cr6</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cr7</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cr8</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE VI: $Q_1$’s Inverted Index (IMI)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>cr</th>
<th>Matching incoming records</th>
<th>Matching incoming records (after transitive closure)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>cr1</td>
<td>${r_1, r_2}$</td>
<td>${r_1, r_2}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cr4</td>
<td>${r_2}$</td>
<td>${r_1, r_2}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE VII: Updated cache after processing $Q_1$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Provenance</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>cr1</td>
<td>(1, 2, 3, 5)</td>
<td>Pizzeria Uno</td>
<td>40 E. Ontario St.</td>
<td>312-280-3115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cr2</td>
<td>(1, 3)</td>
<td>Pizzeria</td>
<td>40 E. Ontario St.</td>
<td>312-280-3344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cr3</td>
<td>(1, 3)</td>
<td>Pizza Uno</td>
<td>39 N. Ontario St.</td>
<td>312-280-2355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cr4</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>Pizza King</td>
<td>11 W. Ontario St.</td>
<td>312-443-7844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cr5</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>Giordano’s pizza</td>
<td>33 N. Ontario St.</td>
<td>312-544-8033</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$r_1$ and $r_2$ match $cr_1$ and $cr_4$, respectively, in the cache. $r_3$ and $r_4$ have no match in the cache. The records $r_1$ and $r_2$ along with their matches $cr_1$ and $cr_2$ are processed in the “Hit path” (as shown in Fig. 2), whereas $r_3$ and $cr_3$ are processed in the “Miss path”.

Table VI illustrates the usage of IMI: $cr_1$ matches $\{r_1, r_2\}$ and $cr_4$ matches $\{r_2\}$. We are assuming that the matching relation is transitive, so, by transitivity, $cr_4$ also matches $\{r_1, r_2\}$ after computing the transitive closure on IMI. Then, the system fuses the records $cr_1, cr_4, r_1$ and $r_2$ into $cr_1$. The records $r_3$ and $r_4$ do not have matches in the cache and are appended to the cache. Table VII shows the new version of the cache after $Q_1$ is processed. The records that were either added or updated are highlighted. Finally, the system returns to the user the records: $cr_1, cr_4$ and $cr_5$.

The example shows that a cache record may also be fused, such as $cr_1$ and $cr_4$. The iterative (and incremental) process gives us the opportunity to clean the cache itself of duplicates, should there be any, as more and more new queries are seen. Duplicates may sneak into the cache because there is no perfect record linkage procedure and true positives may be missed in early iterations, but discovered in later iterations.

VI. EXPERIMENTS

The goal of our experiments is to show that ORLF is feasible in practice; its effectiveness and efficiency significantly exceeds those of off-line solutions, such as Febrel [6], when applied to the online setting. We also evaluate the main components of ORLF to demonstrate its robustness. All of the experiments are conducted on a machine that runs Linux, has eight Intel Xeon E5450 3.0 GHz cores and 32 GB of physical memory. We implemented the framework in C++ and used MySQL to manage the data in the sources and the cache.

A. B$^{ed}$-tree Index Experiments

We assess the effectiveness of the modified B$^{ed}$-tree index in the record linkage task. The effectiveness of B$^{ed}$-tree is not analyzed in [4].

We define the sensitivity of the modified B$^{ed}$-tree index as its ability to return a record $r$ in response to the top-k query $r$ given that $r$ is present in the index. If the index has a low sensitivity, then ORLF does not benefit from caching because it cannot locate the matching records of the incoming records even when they are in the cache. We assess the sensitivity of the B$^{ed}$-tree index with the two strategies of representing the matching key, naive and z-order concatenation.

The sensitivity experiment requires a set $T$ of $N$ distinct records w.r.t the record matching function discussed in Section IV. We randomly generated over 1M records for the attributes (name, address, phone) with an approximate error rate of 20%, i.e., around 20% of the records have duplicates in the set. This does not bias the experiments as we are interested in measuring the sensitivity of the B$^{ed}$-tree when most of the records are distinct—Recall that the cache is assumed to be duplicate-free in general. We have also conducted an experiment where we indexed a set $T_D$ of 1K records that are guaranteed to be 100% distinct from each other.

The experiment runs as follows: (1) records in the set $T$ are indexed using the modified B$^{ed}$-tree index ; (2) a sample set of records, $ST$, of size 100 is taken from $T$; (3) a top-k query to the B$^{ed}$-tree with every record $r$ in $ST$ is posted; and (4) if $r \in T_r$, where $T_r$ is the set of returned records for $r$, then it is a match; otherwise, it is a miss.

When the indexing key of a record is obtained by mere concatenation of its attribute values, B$^{ed}$-tree exhibits a poor quality as illustrated in Fig. 3b. The main reason is that attribute values have different lengths, thus different parts of these attribute values are compared when computing the lower-bound of the edit distance.

Fig. 3a shows the matching ratios when the indexing key is the z-order concatenation of the attribute values, B$^{ed}$-tree exhibits a poor quality as illustrated in Fig. 3b. The main reason is that attribute values have different lengths, thus different parts of these attribute values are compared when computing the lower-bound of the edit distance.

The matching ratios are reported for different values of $k$ and $L$ (the bucket size). The matching ratios are reasonable and comparable to those for the original B$^{ed}$-tree index. This z-order concatenation strategy is used in our implementation and all the subsequent experiments. In another set of experiments, we indexed $T_D$ and then queried the index with all of the records in $T_D$. We obtained the average matching ratios 0.97, 0.98, 0.99, 0.99 for $k = 5, 10, 15$ and 20, respectively. This shows that the z-order concatenation scheme is very effective and suitable for indexing records with the B$^{ed}$-tree index.

While increasing $L$ and $k$ has a clear positive impact on the match ratio as shown in Fig. 3a, Fig. 3c shows a negative impact on efficiency. As a reasonable trade-off between quality and performance, we set the overall bucket size $L = 12$ with 4 buckets per attribute, and $k = 5$.

1) B$^{ed}$-tree Effectiveness for Plain Strings: We also need to have a sense of the effectiveness of the B$^{ed}$-tree index in general. We use the original implementation of the B$^{ed}$-tree\(^1\). We employ a set of 12K distinct strings corresponding

\(^1\)We thank the authors of [4] for sharing their source code.
to business names and post top-k queries. On average, we obtained a 0.99 matching ratio for $k = 5, 10, 15$ and 20. Larger $k$ values are not used in practical systems in the online setting. The $B^{ed}$-tree index is indeed effective when applied to plain strings. This will serve as the baseline behavior for the modified version of $B^{ed}$-tree.

B. ORLF Experiments

We implemented an in-house metasearch engine to create a controlled experimental environment, we used two datasets: (1) Real Web data, to show how the system behaves in the wild; (2) Synthetic data, to show that the system is not sensitive to the data domain being used, and to better evaluate the RL quality since we know the set of duplicates for all the records. To obtain the Web dataset, we crawled the data of 9 Web databases that provide information about restaurant listings in the metropolitan Chicago, US. We also compared ORLF’s fusion with Solaris [14] on a book dataset.

Table VIII gives a general picture of the “dirtiness” of the data crawled from the 9 Web databases. The part titled “Number of records with distinct” includes four of the cache attributes, “City” and “State” are omitted as most records are from Chicago, IL. We show the number of distinct values in each of the cache attributes, e.g., there are 8,200 distinct names in Yelp. A “0” in the column of an attribute means that there are no values for the attribute in the corresponding crawled data, e.g., no record has a zip code in the crawled data from MenuPages. The part of the table titled “Number of records without” looks at the missing values in all the attributes. If we analyze the two tables jointly, we note that all the records have a name value, but not all of them have a phone number, e.g., in Yelp there are 8,744 distinct phone numbers and 367 records have no phone number.

A key question is whether the content of real Web databases overlaps significantly. We use overlap rate to measure the degree of overlap among a group of databases [15]:

$$\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{m} |D_i| - |D_u|}{(n-1)|D_u|},$$

where $m$ is the number of databases, $|D_i|$ is the number of records in database $D_i$ and $|D_u|$ is the total number of distinct records in the union of the $n$ databases. The overlap rate for our metasearch engine is 0.38. This is a global score; pairwise, the databases have higher rates. Consequently, the likelihood of at least two records referring to the same entity to occur in a query is very high. This emphasizes the practical importance of addressing the problem of online RL&F.

Matching Function Thresholds: We use the dataset 12Q$^2$ for learning and the Restaurant dataset from the RIDDLE$^3$ repository for testing. We obtain 12Q by posting queries to the 9 component search engines. The thresholds to match restaurant entities have been learned and applied by the ORLF system custom function to match restaurant pairs from the real-world data crawled from the Web.

Cache Warmup: A well-known result from information retrieval is that query frequencies follow a power-law distribution for text search engines [16], [17]. Thus, a few queries have very high frequencies and the rest appears very infrequently. To our knowledge, there is no similar study for the queries posted over search engines for (semi)structured data. It is however known that the sales of books, music recordings and almost every other branded commodity follow a power law distribution [18], [19]. Hence, we can “deduce” that the queries used to find them also follow a power law distribution. To warm up the cache, we generate a stream of structured queries following a power law distribution. We select the top 20% most frequent queries, post them, and download their results. We then apply an off-line RL&F algorithm, namely FRIL [5], on their results.

Generating Simulated Queries: To empirically analyze the behavior of ORLF we need to generate queries that simulate the influx of queries faced by a search engine. To our knowledge, there is no published method for simulating a stream of structured queries to a search engine. We give a method here. First, suppose that we know the set of query fields, say $F$. For example, $F = \{\text{Cuisine}, \text{Price}, \text{Location}\}$ are common fields in restaurant search engines. We assume that each field $f$ has a predefined list of values $D_f$. This is quite common on the Web. Otherwise, we can draw values from some sample datasets. We then generate the entire query space by taking the cross-product of the domains of the fields, $\prod_{f \in F} D_f$. We also insert a null value in the domain of $f$ in order to account for the queries when $f$ is not mentioned. For instance, the query (Cuisine = “Mexican”; Neighborhood = “Loop,

---

2 www.cis.temple.edu/~edragut/research.htm
3 www.cs.utexas.edu/users/ml/riddle/data.html
Chicago” does not mention the price. We draw a stream of queries from the set of all queries according to a power law distribution, i.e., \( p(x) = C x^{-\beta} \), \( C = \frac{1}{\beta - 1} \). \( Q \) is the total number of distinct queries. We set \( \beta \) to values observed in literature (e.g., \([17]\)) for keyword queries, e.g., \( \beta \in \{0.83, 1.06\} \). We denote the generated stream of queries by \( Q \).

Obtaining the Gold Standard: Since no automatic RL tool can guarantee perfect results, we manually construct a subset of matching records. We randomly select a subset \( R_M \) of 100 records from the crawled data. Then, we apply the record linkage tool Febrl to \( R_M \) and the entire crawled data and obtain a set of candidate matches for the records in \( R_M \). We manually investigate the generated pairs to keep only the correct matching pairs \( P_{GS} \). \( P_{GS} \) contains 420 pairs. We use \( P_{GS} \) to measure the effectiveness of \( ORLF \).

Dynamic Cache with Infinite Size: In these experiments, \( ORLF \) is set up with a dynamic cache of infinite size, and \( k=5 \), \( L=12 \) for the \( B^{ed} \)-tree index. In the first part, we evaluate the quality of \( ORLF \) in the task of RL against \( P_{GS} \). We simply count correct matching pairs that \( ORLF \) returns as it goes through the stream of queries. The experiment is conducted in the following manner:

1) Let \( Q \) be a stream of queries and \( Q_M \subset Q \) a sub-stream of queries with the property that the list of results of each query contains exactly one record in \( R_M \) and each record in \( R_M \) appears in the list of results of some query.

2) We execute 1,000 queries from \( Q - Q_M \). Then, we execute all queries in \( Q_M \) randomly.

3) For each query \( q \in Q_M \), \( ORLF \) yields a set of duplicate record pairs \( P_q \) corresponding to \( q \).

4) We collect all matching pairs \( P_{ORLF} \) generated by \( ORLF \) (Eq. 2) over the entire stream \( Q_M \). Then, we extract the set of correct matching pairs from \( P_{ORLF} \) (Eq. 3).

\[
P_{ORLF} = \bigcup_{q \in Q_M} P_q \tag{2}
\]

\[
Correctness_{ORLF} = |P_{ORLF} \cap P_{GS}| \tag{3}
\]

5) We repeat 2-4 until \( ORLF \) processes 100,000 queries. The goal is to show that \( ORLF \) incrementally benefits from past queries and yields significantly improved RL results.

In general, both \( P_q \) and \( P_{ORLF} \) are different at subsequent iterations because more and more records are appended to the cache. \( Correctness_{ORLF} \) is independent of the number of processed records when performing RL. Hence, it is a good indicator of \( ORLF \) effectiveness since it provides a uniform way to measure effectiveness across iterations. The goal is to show that \( ORLF \) converges to \( P_{GS} \) as the system processes more queries. Note that in this and in the following experiment, to increase the randomness of the testing, we tested \( ORLF \) with three different query streams, corresponding to different values for the parameter \( \beta \in \{0.64, 0.7, 1.3\} \) of the power law distribution, and reported the average number of correct pairs across the three runs.

Fig. 4a shows that the overall quality of \( ORLF \) improves sharply as the system sees more queries, then it remains relatively stable. More importantly, it does not deteriorate; \( ORLF \) benefits from previously processed queries and improves the quality of the current and future queries.

The second part of the experiment compares our system to simply applying an off-the-shelf off-line RL tool. We choose Febrl [6] because its source code is readily available online. Febrl takes two sets of records \( S_1 \) and \( S_2 \) as input and outputs the set \( P_{Febrl} \) of duplicate pairs from these two sets. We employ the same setting described above. Febrl is used as follows. For each query \( q \in Q_M \) let \( D_i(q), 1 \leq i \leq 9 \) be the set of results returned by the \( i^{th} \) Web database in response to \( q \). Febrl is then applied to every pair \( D_i(q) \) and \( D_j(q) \) of result sets, \( 1 \leq i < j \leq 9 \). Febrl is applied to 36 pairs of result sets per query. (This experiment is the most time consuming and it took several days to complete). We then union the pairs of matching records obtained from the 36 runs of Febrl, we call this set \( P_{Febrl}(q) \). The set of pairs of record matchings produced by Febrl for all the queries in \( Q_M \) is given by \( P_{Febrl} = \bigcup_{q \in Q_M} P_{Febrl}(q) \). \( P_{Febrl} \) is computed every 1,000 queries as is \( P_{ORLF} \). The set of correct pairs of matching records for Febrl is given by \( Correctness_{Febrl} = |P_{Febrl} \cap P_{GS}| \).

Fig. 4b plots \( Correctness_{Febrl} \) and \( Correctness_{ORLF} \) side by side. The graph clearly shows that for the initial set of queries, Febrl outperforms \( ORLF \). However, as more queries are processed, \( ORLF \) starts to gradually catch up with Febrl and eventually outperforms it. Fig. 4b approximately mirrors the trend presented in Fig. 1. Observe that Febrl’s effectiveness remains about the same across the query stream.
Dynamic Cache with Eviction and Static Cache: We evaluated two caching strategies: dynamic caching with three eviction policies (LRU, MRU and LFU) and static caching. We use Febrl to clean all the crawled data from the 9 databases offline; the resulting clusters (or entities) are loaded increasingly by fraction into the cache. We report the number of returned correct pairs (Eq. 3) computed from randomly selected queries from \( Q \). We report the numbers for each of the considered cache sizes.

Overall, LRU has the best results and MRU has the poorest as shown in Fig. 4f—MRU evicts the most recently used entity from the cache, which is likely to be needed for future queries. The static cache performs worse than the dynamic cache, but it becomes almost as good as the dynamic cache as the cache size approaches 100% of the total entities. LRU and LFU dynamic caches show better performance than the static cache since a dynamic cache continues to update the content of the cache over time, while a static cache does not. Increasing the cache capacity allows ORLF to evict less records (and thus, to keep more “useful data”); this decreases the likelihood to miss an incoming record.

We report experiments that assess ORLF’s performance. First, we evaluate the average query response time by varying the number of returned records per source, we used a total of 10 sources in this experiment. Fig. 4h shows the average query response time when using different values for the maximum number of returned records per source, we can see that ORLF is very efficient, even when processing 20 records from each source, the average query response time does not exceed 0.4 second. We also evaluate the scalability of ORLF by computing the average query response time for a set of 200 randomly selected queries, while increasing the number of sources to which we submit the queries. The response time is the time between querying the cache for top-k matches and producing the query’s output. We do not take the database querying time into account as it depends on factors (e.g., access method, internet bandwidth) that are outside the scope of this work. We start with 9 distinct sources. We gradually increase the number of sources up to 100 by duplicating the original sources. Fig. 4e shows the scalability results. We observe that the increase in the query response time is linear in the number of sources. We have observed that the query response time is primarily dominated by the top-k query time, this is expected because the top-k queries in the \( B^{cf} \)-tree index require computing edit distance for each string in the tree leaves to find the possible matches to the querying record. In addition, the similarity search algorithms based on \( B \)-tree indices explore many branches (in the worst case all of them) in the tree that may contain candidate matches [20].

C. Synthetic Dataset

In this experimental study, we compare ORLF against an ideal system that has a perfect RL algorithm. That is, the ideal system does not miss a pair of matches in the list of returned records of a query. We want to showcase that because the system is stateless (does not keep information from previous queries), it cannot deliver a “clean” representation of an entity in most cases, while ORLF does. The experiment is set up as follows. For an entity \( e \), let \( L_e \) be the set of records from all sources that need to be known for a fusion algorithm to compute the correct representation of \( e \). \( L_e \) is computed by RL (over time). Missing any portion of \( L_e \) would render an imperfect version of \( e \) regardless of the fusion algorithm being used. The “cleanliness” of \( e \) is measured as the ratio \( |L|/|L_e| \), where \( L \) is the set of records discovered by one of the two systems. For ORLF, \( L \) is the union of the pairs discovered across processed queries, while for the perfect off-line RL system, it is the set of matching record pairs for a given query.

We use synthetically generated data to check the duplicates of all the records in the dataset, and hence, to accurately measure the effectiveness of the two systems. We generated a
synthetic dataset of 1M records that contains made-up personal information such as first name, last name, and social security number. We used the tool ds gen which is part of Febri l to generate this dataset. We generated 200K records along with 800K duplicates. The maximum number of duplicates per record was set to 10. The tool introduces different types of noise to the original records to generate duplicates. In order to simulate the setup of a VIS, we randomly split the set of synthetic data into 10 sources, each containing 100K records.

The matching function checks if two records have a similar SSN, surname and phone. The string edit distance threshold for the three attributes is empirically set to 0.8.

Fig. 4c shows the results obtained for a query stream of 1K queries posted to 10 sources; we can see that ORLF greatly improves the quality of the returned results to the posted queries over the ideal tool. Such improvement comes from the proposed caching system which makes ORLF benefit from previously processed queries.

D. Comparison with Solaris

We compare ORLF to Solaris [14], which performs online fusion of records returned by a query with copying and accuracy constraints on the sources. Solaris has two methods: ACCU and PRAGMATIC. As reported in [14], PRAGMATIC has a slightly better precision than ACCU, but it is slower. We only implemented ACCU for the comparison.

Dataset: We use the dataset Books [14] since Solaris requires the accuracy information of the Web sources. Books has book records (ISBN, title and authors) from 894 sources. It comes with a gold standard set of 100 books for which we know the correct authors.

Query stream: We generate a set \( Q_{books} \) of 3000 queries that ask for the books in the gold data. For a book entity \( B_i \) that has a set of records \( R_i = \{ r_{i1}, r_{i2}, ..., r_{in} \} \) across the sources, there exists a set of queries that have different coverage ratios on \( R_i \); ORLF is expected to do well even when the query coverage ratio is low (thanks to the cache), whereas Solaris, due to its stateless nature, performs well when the query has a high coverage ratio. We consider queries of different coverage ratios to be fair to both systems.

We post the queries in \( Q_{books} \) to ORLF and Solaris to assess the accuracy of their fusion results. We measure this accuracy by assessing their ability to return the correct value for the authors of the books in the gold data. We consider only the sources that contain books in the gold data. There are 238 such sources. As we see in Fig. 4d, the two systems perform quite similarly. However, unlike Solaris, ORLF performs RL (besides data fusion). ORLF is thus exposed to RL mistakes (which may lead to low-quality fusion). Data fusion in the current implementation of ORLF is naive and only considers majority voting among conflicting values. We observe that in the beginning, Solaris slightly outperforms ORLF. As ORLF processes more queries, it starts outperforming Solaris as it benefits from the cached fused results.

Using the same dataset, we compare the average response time for both systems, excluding the data sources querying time. We use a query stream of 100 randomly chosen queries from \( Q_{books} \). Fig. 4g shows that ORLF slightly outperforms Solaris since it does not perform any preprocessing for the conflicting values to be fused, it just takes the majority value. As the number of data sources increases, Solaris’s average time becomes closer to ORLF’s; this is because Solaris does not necessarily query all the data sources, and hence it is not as sensitive to the number of sources as ORLF.

VII. Related Work

Our work is related to four areas: metasearch engines for structured data, data fusion, record linkage and caching. It also builds upon existing off-line RL&F techniques, most of them comprehensively summarized in [1] and [21]. We are not aware of any caching method for metasearch engines over structured data. Caching nonetheless has received substantial consideration in text Web search engines [22].

To our knowledge, an RL&F system for online settings as presented in this paper, i.e., for metasearch, has not been proposed before. We are aware of three other recent works that propose online solutions [23], [14], [10]. In [23], the term “online” denotes an entirely different setting than ours, namely, a set of distributed databases whose records need to be matched over a network. The goal is to minimize the communication overhead, i.e., to minimize the number of records transferred over the network.

The approach proposed in [14] (referred to as Solaris) performs online fusion with copying and accuracy constraints on the data sources. The key idea is to stop probing additional sources, in response to a query, once the system is confident enough that data from the remaining sources are unlikely to change the answer computed from the probed sources. The main differences between Solaris and our system are:

1. Solaris does not perform RL (in the reported experiments, ISBN is assumed clean and used as key for RL purposes) and
2. Solaris is stateless, thus its fusion accuracy for an attribute value is as good as the number of records having that value or related values in the query result set. Our experiments on the same dataset show similar accuracy for both systems.

A Bayesian approach for fusing records is also described in [10]. It infers the quality of a data source for different attribute types without any supervision and incorporates this quality in the fusion process. While both works present interesting frameworks for online fusion, there are at least two issues with these solutions. First, as illustrated in Section I, the lists of returned records for a query do not have a high degree of overlap. Second, as shown in these works, a large number of sources may need to be probed to reach the desired quality level at query-time. For example, in [14] the authors show experimentally that 73 out of 100 (book) records reach a stable version after 14 sources are probed and all 100 are stable after over 90 sources are probed. Although a metasearch engine may connect to hundreds of component search engines, in practice and for efficiency reasons, it submits a query to a very small number of them: a few tens of them [24]. The databases are selected based on the query at hand and the profile of each database [25], [3]. The above two observations suggest that the proposed fusion approach may not be suitable for metasearch engines. Data from past queries, i.e., caching, is needed for accurate online data cleaning.

---

Footnote:
1. We thank the authors for sharing with us the dataset, the accuracy of the sources, and the gold standard.
While iterative caching was not used to efficiently perform data quality, efficient (off-line) RL nonetheless is a major topic. Methods to speed up the performance of RL include iterative blocking [7], size filtering [26], order filtering [27], suffix filtering [28], iterative hashing [8] or “hints” as in the pay-as-you-go technique proposed in [29]. Three type of hints are proposed: sorted lists of record pairs, partition hierarchy, and sorted list of records.

Incremental record linkage is also a related topic [30], [31], [32]. An incremental clustering technique is proposed in [30]. For a new record, it estimates its likely cluster through a voting scheme and then it recursively updates the clusters. The algorithm is not suitable for online settings because the recursion may pass through the entire database. The solution in [31] is a heuristic incremental clustering algorithm that ignores the propagation step. The neighboring objects are never analyzed, the clusters never merge or split: a new record is either added to a cluster or forms a new cluster. [32] proposes two graph incremental clustering algorithms for RL. The proposed algorithms are intractable in general and the proposed solutions are not suitable for the online setting.

[33] reports a probabilistic approach to online RL. The aim is to return alternative linkage assignments with assigned probabilities in a response to a query, whereas we return duplicate-free query results along with fused attribute values.

VIII. CONCLUSIONS

We proposed a novel approach for record linkage and fusion in an online setting. Our approach is based on iterative caching: a set of frequently requested records (obtained from the different Web databases through sampling) is cleaned off-line and cached for future references. Newly arriving records in response to a query are cleaned jointly with the records in the cache, presented to users and appropriately appended to the cache. Our solution allows a “fast” response to the current query and an “improved” data quality for subsequent queries.

There are at least two items for future work: (1) Devises a measure of degradation of the cache, which would trigger a cache refresh. (2) Incorporate better fusion algorithms in ORLF. The solution presented in [10] seems to be better amenable to our framework due to its incremental nature.
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