IMPLEMENTATION DETAILS OF ENUMINER

A. Algorithm Overview

The previous work [10] introduced editing rules and studied how to determine certain fixes with editing rules Σ and master data D_m . However, editing rules discovery problem is not thoroughly studied. One way to obtain editing rules is to ask experts to design for each dataset. To avoid suffering the high cost of experts, we first propose an enumeration-based algorithm named EnuMiner that automatically mines editing rules as presented in Algorithm 5.

In general, EnuMiner discovers different editing rules φ by enumerating possible combinations of attributes (X,X_m) and pattern t_p , and returns a set of non-redundant editing rules, which maximizes the sum of utility.

Specifically, it first initializes a candidate rule set Σ_c (line 2-9). Each possible attribute pair $(A, A_m) \in \{(A, A_m) | A_m \in A_m\}$ $M(A), A \in R \setminus Y$ is considered as $LHS(\varphi)$ and the pattern t_p in φ is empty by default. In this way, we initialize the candidate rule set Σ_c whose size is $\sum_{A \in R \setminus Y} |M(A)|$. Then, for each candidate rule $\varphi_c = ((X, X_m) \to (Y, Y_m), t_p) \in \Sigma_c$, we try to specialize it to discover more specific rules (lines 11-21). There are two ways for editing rule specialization: (a) Adding a new attribute pair (A, A_m) into (X, X_m) (line 14-17). (b) Adding an attribute and a specific value from its domain (A, v) into t_n (line 18-21), where A should not be already included in $LHS_p(\varphi_c)$. The new discovered editing rules will be included in the candidate set Σ_c and the discovered rule set Σ (line 22-28). When there is no candidate editing rule in Σ_c , the enumeration process terminates and we obtain the discovered rule set Σ (line 10). Finally, we rank all editing rules Σ according to their utility measures and return the a set of non-redundant editing rules Σ_K that maximizes the sum of utility (line 30).

The Rank algorithm is presented in Algorithm 6. Given a set Σ of editing rules, we first sort editing rules φ in Σ from the largest to the smallest according to the utility measure $\mathcal{U}(\varphi)$ (line 1). An empty set Σ_K is initialized to store the top-K editing rules. Then, we obtain the rule φ by iterating the sorted rule set Σ , and add it into Σ_K if there exist no rule $\varphi' \in \Sigma_K$ dominates φ , i.e., $\nexists \varphi' \in \Sigma_K, \varphi' \lessdot \varphi$. Finally, we can obtain a set of editing rules Σ_K consisting of top-K non-redundant rules under utility measure. The general idea of the algorithm is to select the high-utility rule first, and then consider the dominant relationship between the rules. In this way, the discovered rules are expected to be high-utility and representative, which can lead to high-quality data cleaning results and is easy for users to understand the cleaning process.

B. Acceleration

To enumerate all editing rules $\varphi = ((X \cup \{A\}, X_m \cup \{A_m\}) \to (Y, Y_m), t_p)$, we do not only consider whether an attribute should be included in X or a specific value should be specified as a condition in pattern t_p . A too huge space is unacceptable to enumerate due to the expensive time cost. So we propose several optimizations to accelerate EnuMiner (Algorithm 5).

```
Algorithm 5 EnuMiner Algorithm
Input: Input Data, D; Master Data: D_m; To-Repair Attribute
     Pair: (Y, Y_m); Support Threshold: \eta_s
Output: Discovered Rule Set, \Sigma;
 1: I_D = HashMap(), I_{D_m} = HashMap() // Init Index
     Mapping
 2: \Sigma = \{\}, \Sigma_c = \{\}, R_x = R \setminus Y
 3: for A \in X do
         for A_m \in M(A) do
 4:
              \varphi = ((A, A_m) \to (Y, Y_m), ())
 5:
              \Sigma.add(\varphi)
 6:
              if C(\varphi); 1 then
 7:
                  \Sigma_c.add(\varphi)
 8:
                   I_D.put(\varphi, D.index) // Update I_{D_m} accord-
 9:
     ingly.
10: while \Sigma_c \neq \emptyset do
         for \varphi_c = ((X,X_m) \to (Y,Y_m),t_p) \in \Sigma_c do
11:
12:
              D' = D[I_D.get(\varphi_c)], D'_m = D_m[I_{D_m}.get(\varphi_c)]
13:
              for A \in R_x \setminus X_c do
                   for A_m \in M(A) do
15:
                       \varphi = ((X \cup \{A\}, X_m \cup \{A_m\})) \rightarrow
16:
     (Y,Y_m),t_p
                       \Sigma_n.add(\varphi)
17:
                  if A \notin X_p then
18:
                       for v \in dom(D'[A]) do // subspace search-
19:
    ing
                            \varphi = ((X, X_m) \to (Y, Y_m), t_p \cup
20:
     \{(A,v)\}
                            \Sigma_n.add(\varphi)
21:
         for \varphi \in \Sigma_n do
22:
              I_D.put(\varphi, cover(\varphi).index) // Update I_{D_m} accord-
23:
     ingly.
24:
              // Measure rules in the sub-space
25:
              if S(\varphi) < \eta_s or C(\varphi)=1 then
                   \Sigma_n.remove(\varphi) // pruning
26:
              if S(\varphi) \geq \eta_s then
27:
                   \Sigma.add(\varphi)
28:
         \Sigma_c = \Sigma_n
30: \Sigma_K = \operatorname{Rank}(\Sigma, K)
31: return \Sigma_K
```

Algorithm 6 Rank

```
Input: Editing Rule Set: \Sigma; Rule Number: K;

Output: Discovered Rule Set, \Sigma_K;

1: \Sigma = Sort(\Sigma) // Sorting according to rule utility \mathcal{U}(\varphi)

2: \Sigma_K = \{\}

3: for \varphi \in \Sigma do

4: if \nexists \varphi' \in \Sigma_K, \varphi' \lessdot \varphi then

5: \Sigma_K.add(\varphi)

6: if |\Sigma_K| = K then

7: break

8: return \Sigma_K
```

- 1) Pruning: Following CFD [9] and DD discovery [28], we also set a support threshold η_s and only rules such that $S(\varphi) \geq \eta_s$ will be considered as valid rules. According to Lemma 1, we can safely stop adding more attribute pairs to X or value conditions to pattern t_p to the rule whose support is smaller than η_s , and remove it from the candidate set (lines 25-26). In addition, We also stopped refining any rules that return only one candidate fix, i.e., $C(\varphi) = 1$.
- 2) Subspace Searching: It is not difficult to find that for any editing rule φ_1 and φ_2 refined on φ_1 , the space covered by φ_2 must be the subspace of covered by φ_1 , i.e., $\operatorname{cover}(\varphi_2) \subset \operatorname{cover}(\varphi_1)$ (see proof of Lemma1). Therefore, we can record the covered tuples $D' \subset D$ of each discovered rule φ . When specializing φ , we can only consider values in D' and thus avoid enumerating many useless rules (line 19). Furthermore, we do not have to process a lot of repeated queries to find D' for rule discovery and rule measure (line 13).