

ReMatch: Retrieval Enhanced Schema Matching with LLMs

Eitam Sheetrit*

Microsoft
Israel

eitams@microsoft.com

Moshik Mishaeli*

Microsoft
Israel

mmishaeli@microsoft.com

Menachem Brief*

Microsoft
Israel

menibrief@microsoft.com

Oren Elisha

Microsoft
Israel

oren.elisha@microsoft.com

ABSTRACT

Schema matching is a crucial task in data integration, involving the alignment of a source schema with a target schema to establish correspondence between their elements. This task is challenging due to textual and semantic heterogeneity, as well as differences in schema sizes. Although machine-learning-based solutions have been explored in numerous studies, they often suffer from low accuracy, require manual mapping of the schemas for model training, or need access to source schema data which might be unavailable due to privacy concerns. In this paper we present a novel method, named ReMatch, for matching schemas using retrieval-enhanced Large Language Models (LLMs). Our method avoids the need for predefined mapping, any model training, or access to data in the source database. Our experimental results on large real-world schemas demonstrate that ReMatch is an effective matcher. By eliminating the requirement for training data, ReMatch becomes a viable solution for real-world scenarios.

CCS CONCEPTS

• **Information systems** → **Mediators and data integration**; • **Computing methodologies** → **Natural language processing**.

KEYWORDS

Schema Matching, Large Language Models (LLMs), RAG, Machine Learning, Ranking, Data Integration

1 INTRODUCTION

Schema matching is a fundamental task in data management and integration, involving the identification of semantic correspondences between elements of two or more database schemas [13], regardless of differences in naming, structure, or data type. The matching task is challenging since schemas are designed using different perspectives and terminologies. This semantic heterogeneity can lead to ambiguous mappings where schema elements have the same name but different meanings, or different names but the same meaning.

Human schema matching, a manual and time-consuming process, requires significant effort from skilled individuals. This can be expensive and impractical, particularly in large-scale projects. Furthermore, human matchers are prone to errors and inconsistencies due to cognitive biases and fatigue [23]. As a result, the automation of schema matching has become a major focus within the AI and database-oriented research community over the years.

*Equal contribution.

In recent years, LLMs have achieved significant advancements across many challenging tasks that require a deep understanding of semantics. These models have shown an impressive ability to generalize to new tasks without any task-specific fine-tuning, even in areas significantly divergent from the ones they were originally trained on, including various data related tasks [17, 27].

In this paper, we present a new approach that unlike previously proposed machine learning (ML) methods, circumvents the need for predefined mapping, model training, or access to data in the source database. Our approach, which we call ReMatch, improves the task of schema matching by using retrieval-enhanced LLMs. Fig. 1 illustrates our proposed approach.

Our contributions in this study are as follows: (1) Introducing a new method for the task of schema matching, which allows for scalable and accurate matching results, without any model training or access to labeled data. (2) Proposing a mechanism to reduce the search space of the target schema for efficient candidate generation. (3) Exploiting the generative abilities of LLMs to perform semantic ranking between two schemas, in alignment with human matchers. (4) Providing a complete mapping between two important healthcare schemas, aiming to address the lack of real-world evaluation datasets in the field. To the best of our knowledge, this is currently the largest publicly available schema matching dataset.

2 BACKGROUND AND RELATED WORK

Large Language Models (LLMs) Generative language models are trained to generate human-like text and can be fine-tuned for a variety of tasks, but also can be reused for a variety of tasks, with no additional training [2, 12, 15, 21]. Embedding models like BERT or Ada [18] provide contextual embeddings that have significantly improved performance on a wide range of NLP tasks [14, 25]. Moreover, the representation of text via embeddings allows for efficient and accurate passage retrieval, using semantic similarity [10, 18].

LLMs have been applied to various data preprocessing tasks, including error detection, data imputation, entity matching, as well as schema matching [15, 17]. These models have shown promising results, however, these approaches still faced challenges related to computational expense and inefficiency, as well as lacking evaluation on data that represents real-world schema matching challenges.

Schema Matching Schema matching involves identifying correspondences between different data schemas. Traditionally, schema matching was done manually, however, this approach strongly




Figure 1: Overview of the ReMatch method.

relies on the expertise of human matchers [5]. This has led to development of automated schema matching, primarily using ML algorithms [1, 4, 13]. Much of the work on ML-based schema matching was limited to basic schemas, with most works dealing only with toy datasets [4, 6, 11, 16, 24], or focused primarily on entity matching only. This stemmed from a combination of lack of high-quality datasets [9], as well as relatively poor results of past methods.

Recent work, such as SMAT [28] and LSM [29], leverages advancements in natural language processing to achieve semantic mappings between source and target schemas. While these methods improve previous results, they still require extensive data tagging, limiting their practicality in real-world applications.

Finally, the majority of previous methods dealt with schema-matching as a binary classification task over $\mathcal{A}_1 \times \mathcal{A}_2$. While simplifying training and evaluation, in normalized schemas positive labels scale by $O(n)$, whereas negative labels scale by $O(n^2)$, which is problematic when inference is expensive, as in the case of LLMs.

3 ReMATCH

Problem Statement Given a source schema \mathcal{S}_1 and a target schema \mathcal{S}_2 , with sets of tables \mathcal{T}_1 and \mathcal{T}_2 and sets of attributes \mathcal{A}_1 and \mathcal{A}_2 , respectively, the schema matching task involves finding a mapping between $(\mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{T}_1) \in \mathcal{S}_1$ to $(\mathcal{A}_2, \mathcal{T}_2) \in \mathcal{S}_2$. The matches between their attributes are captured by a relation *match*: $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A}_1) \times \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A}_2)$. An element $(A_1, A_2) \in \text{match}$ defines a matching pair possibly representing the same information in the schemas. If $|A_1| = 1$ and $|A_2| = 1$, we call the match an *elementary match* or 1:1 match. Otherwise, we refer to it as a *complex match* or m:n match.

Formally, we want to find a function $\Psi : \mathcal{A}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A}_2)$, such that $\forall a \in \mathcal{A}_1, \forall a' \in \Psi(a), (a, a') \in \text{match}$. In other words, $\Psi(a) = A' \subseteq \mathcal{A}_2$, should contain all relevant matches for a .

A possible simplification of this problem can be made by limiting Ψ to be a $N \times K$, $N = |\mathcal{A}_1|, K \in \mathbb{N}$, matrix of elements from \mathcal{A}_2 , denoted as Ψ_K . In the case of elementary matches, or m:1 complex matches, the goal from above now becomes to maximize the *accuracy@K* metric, i.e., to maximize:

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{1}_{\{\exists a', (a, a') \in \text{match}, a' \in \Psi_K(a)\}} \quad (1)$$

Method Description Algorithm 1 shows the pseudocode for our method. Given a source schema \mathcal{S}_1 with a set of tables \mathcal{T}_1 and a set of attributes \mathcal{A}_1 , and a target schema \mathcal{S}_2 with a set of tables \mathcal{T}_2 and a set of attributes \mathcal{A}_2 :

(1) Target schema *tables* and source schema *attributes* are transformed into two corpora of structured documents, C_t and C_s , respectively. Each target schema table and source schema attribute is represented as a structured document consisting of descriptive paragraphs. The title of the document is the table’s name, and the opening paragraph provides an overview of the table’s purpose and characteristics. The subsequent paragraphs detail the set of attributes serving as the table’s primary key, the set of attributes referring to other tables (foreign keys), and the rest of the attributes belonging to this table, respectively. Each attribute is followed by its data type and a textual description. In the case of attribute documents, the specific attribute is highlighted above the title.

(2) For each attribute in the source schema, we search for the top J documents that represent candidate tables from the target schema. This step ensures that only the most relevant documents are considered for matching. To facilitate the retrieval of candidate tables, we utilize a text embedding model to encode each source attribute’s document, and the corpus of target table documents. These embeddings serve as a basis for measuring semantic similarity, enabling the retrieval of candidate tables. Finally, for every source table $t_i \in \mathcal{T}_1$, we create a set of all top J candidate tables \mathcal{T}_c retrieved.

(3) In the last step, the LLM is tasked with selecting the top K most similar target attributes from the set of retrieved tables \mathcal{T}_c identified earlier. The model assesses the context provided by the document representations, and yields a ranked list of K potential matches for each attribute in the source schema.

4 EVALUATION

4.1 Dataset Creation

To evaluate our method we used two primary datasets, both involving mappings between healthcare database schemas.

MIMIC-III to OMOP For the first dataset, we created a mapping between the schema of MIMIC-III [8], a public database containing deidentified records from the Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center, and The Observational Medical Outcomes Partnership

Algorithm 1: ReMatch

Inputs : a source schema $\mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{A}_1$, with all its textual descriptions; a target schema $\mathcal{S}_2, \mathcal{T}_2, \mathcal{A}_2$ with all its textual descriptions; $K, J \in \mathbb{N}$; an embedding model Φ ; a generative LLM \mathcal{F} .

Outputs : a $N \times K$ matrix of attribute candidates from \mathcal{A}_2 , denoted as Ψ_K .

- 1: $C_S \leftarrow \emptyset, C_t \leftarrow \emptyset, \Psi_K \leftarrow \{\}$
- /* lines 2-4 are performed once, as a pre-processing step. */
- 2: $C_t \leftarrow \text{TableToDoc}(\mathcal{S}_2, \mathcal{T}_2, \mathcal{A}_2)$
- 3: $C_S \leftarrow \text{AttributeToDoc}(\mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{A}_1)$
- 4: $\tilde{C}_t \leftarrow \Phi(C_t)$
- 5: **foreach** $t_i \in \mathcal{T}_1$ **do**
- 6: $\mathcal{T}_c \leftarrow \{\}$
- 7: **foreach** $a_k \in \mathcal{A}_1[t_i]$ **do**
- 8: $\tilde{a}_{emb} \leftarrow \Phi(C_S[t_i; a_k])$
- 9: $\text{scores} \leftarrow \text{Similarity}(\tilde{a}_{emb}, \tilde{C}_t)$
- 10: $\text{top}_j \leftarrow \text{argmaxes}(\{\text{scores}_1, \dots, \text{scores}_n\})[1:j]$
- 11: $\mathcal{T}_c \leftarrow \mathcal{T}_c \cup C_t[\text{top}_j]$
- 12: **end**
- 13: $\Psi_K \leftarrow \text{CreateTopkMapping}(t_i, C_S[t_i], \mathcal{T}_c, C_t[\mathcal{T}_c], \mathcal{F})$
- 14: **end**

Common Data Model (OMOP)¹, an open-source data standard. The mapping was created manually by a domain expert, aided by the mapping created in [20]. If no matching attribute in OMOP could be found, the attribute was assigned *NA*. For convenience we will refer to this dataset as MIMIC.

OMAP Benchmark Synthea Dataset Following [17] we used the *Synthea* [26] to *OMOP* dataset from the OMAP benchmark [28]. The dataset contains a partial mapping of the schema for Synthea (the source), a synthetic healthcare dataset, to a partial subset of relevant OMOP attributes (the target). For convenience we will refer to this dataset as Synthea.

It is important to note that although both datasets are similar, the first maps the entire MIMIC-III schema to OMOP, while Synthea contains only *partial* mappings. To the best of our knowledge, the MIMIC dataset is the largest single-schema to single-schema dataset published. Table 1 contains statistics detailing both datasets. The full MIMIC dataset is publicly available at https://github.com/meniData1/MIMIC_2_OMOP.

4.2 Experiments

We established the performance of ReMatch and SMAT [28], the previous state-of-the-art (SOTA) method, on MIMIC and Synthea.

As our method treats schema matching as a retrieval problem, the most appropriate metric is $\text{accuracy}@K$, as defined in Eq. (1). Unlike the F1-score, standard $\text{accuracy}@K$ is not well defined for m:n matches. To deal with this, we limited ourselves to evaluating 1:1 or m:1 relations.²

¹<https://www.ohdsi.org/data-standardization/>

²It is worth noting that for a dataset with only 1:1 and m:1 mappings, $\text{accuracy}@1$ is equivalent to F1-score when using *argmax*, instead of a threshold, for prediction (since it trivially reflects both the precision and the recall simultaneously).

Table 1: Dataset statistics for MIMIC and Synthea. #Columns and #Tables refer to the number of columns and tables used in the dataset. #Mapped Columns refers to the number of unique columns mapped. #Null Mappings refers to source columns without a mapping (mapped to *NA*).

Dataset	#Columns	#Tables	#Mapped Columns	#Null Mappings
MIMIC	268	25	156	112
OMOP (MIMIC)	425	38	95	-
Synthea	38	8	105	-
OMOP (Synthea)	67	8	67	-

There are multiple dimensions we would like to optimize. The first is maximizing $\text{accuracy}@K$. We also seek lower values of K , as our aim is to assist human schema matching, and minimize cognitive overload [1, 3]. Finally, we would like to minimize the number of target tables, reducing prompt size and costs.

Evaluating ReMatch For all experiments we used GPT-4 [19], specifically GPT-4-1106, and Ada2 [7, 18] as our embedding model.

We performed a grid search over various values of J and K , also allowing us to select hyperparameters for further evaluations. As an ablation study, we evaluated the performance on MIMIC when only the *names* of the tables and attributes are used for retrieval and generation. We also evaluated a version with no retrieval stage, i.e., for each table in the source schema we used the entire target schema. Finally, we ran ReMatch multiple times on each of the setups in the ablation study, to verify stability across generations.

Evaluating ReMatch with Guidance A human matcher may determine that the suggestions are not good enough, or decide to provide information they already have. In our evaluation we investigated a mechanism, inspired by the relevance feedback technique [22]. To do so, we selected a mapping of the form $(T_1, a_1) \rightarrow (T_2, a_2)$ for a single attribute from each table. Specifically, we used the *SUBJECT_ID* attribute where available (19/25 tables), and an attribute containing unique identifiers otherwise. We then automatically included T_2 in the set of retrieved tables, \mathcal{T}_c , and provided the LLM with this mapping in the prompt.

Evaluating SMAT Our method’s performance was evaluated against SMAT [28], a previously SOTA non-LLM model. For SMAT’s training we used the default hyperparameters: {Learning Rate: 0.8, Batch Size: 64, Epochs: 30}, with early stopping, and 10% of the training data was used as a validation set to avoid overfitting. Models were trained on a single Nvidia A-100 GPU.

We tried two setups, 80% training and 20% testing, and vice versa. The splits were stratified across table names. We also extended the evaluation to include $\text{accuracy}@K$. We calculated the $\text{accuracy}@K$ by determining whether the correct match received one of the K highest classification scores. Binary predictions were given by using the optimal threshold for the validation set.

4.3 Results

ReMatch Results The results of the grid search for MIMIC can be found in Table 2. We found $\{(J = 1, K = 1), (J = 2, K = 5)\}$ to be the best balance points between the three optimization dimensions for the MIMIC dataset. Interestingly, $\text{accuracy}@K$ seems to perform

Table 2: Grid search results on MIMIC.

Retrieved Documents	Acc@1	Acc@2	Acc@3	Acc@5	Acc@7	Avg #T
$J = 1$	0.424	0.589	0.644	0.709	0.697	2.44
$J = 2$	0.425	0.541	0.638	0.729	0.758	4.68
$J = 3$	0.321	0.477	0.533	0.657	0.733	6.64
$J = 5$	0.336	0.425	0.504	0.657	0.754	9.88
$J = 7$	0.317	0.399	0.414	0.616	0.71	12.84

Table 3: Grid search results on Synthea. $J = \infty$ means skipping the retrieval step.

Retrieved Documents	Acc@1	Acc@3	Acc@5	Avg #T
$J = 1$	0.562	0.6	0.6	1.125
$J = 2$	0.505	0.581	0.743	2.625
$J = \infty$	0.438	-	0.924	8

Table 4: Results on MIMIC for ablation study with standard deviations across runs. Baseline is the full ReMatch method, names-only refers to skipping the document creation step, and $J = \infty$ means skipping the retrieval step.

Variation	Acc@1	Acc@5	Avg #T
$J = 1$ baseline	0.424 ± 0.017	-	2.44
$J = 2$ baseline	-	0.729 ± 0.023	4.68
$J = 1$ names-only	0.396 ± 0.005	-	1.48
$J = 2$ names-only	-	0.503 ± 0.008	3.28
$J = \infty$	0.311 ± 0.0157	0.518 ± 0.03	38

Table 5: Results for MIMIC with guidance provided. Relative improvement over baseline (in percentage) in bold.


Variation	Acc@1	Acc@5	Avg #T
$J = 1$	0.539/ 20.38%	0.783/ 10.41%	2.84
$J = 2$	0.459/ 7.89%	0.765/ 4.86%	4.92

best for $J \leq 2$. This may imply that the retrieval is efficient, and additional tables only add ‘noise’ to the matching prompt.

The results for the grid search for Synthea are presented in Table 3. While $\{(J = 1, K = 1), (J = 2, K = 5)\}$ still appear to work well, for Synthea we found that not using retrieval yielded optimal results for accuracy@5. This may be explained by the small size of the dataset, with only 8 tables in the target.

The results of the ablation study are shown in Table 4. We found that skipping the retrieval step yields inferior results, in alignment with the results from the grid search. We also found that using only the names of the tables and attributes, with no descriptions, results in a significant decrease. Additionally, Table 4 demonstrates that the method’s outputs are stable.

Adding guidance to ReMatch indeed improves performance, as can be seen in Table 5. The largest improvements are for $J = 1$, achieving the highest overall scores for MIMIC. This is consistent with the rest of the results, with more efficient retrieval being correlated with better matching accuracy.

**Figure 2: Comparison of the different models’ performance. SMAT was trained and evaluated on 20%, 80% of the data, after removing all null mappings. ReMatch was evaluated on the entire dataset, with no guidance, and with nulls. Optimal setup from grid search is shown for ReMatch.****Table 6: Results for SMAT on both datasets.**

(a) MIMIC				(b) Synthea			
Variation	Acc@1	Acc@5	F1	Variation	Acc@1	Acc@5	F1
SMAT 80-20	0.454	1.0	0.102	SMAT 80-20	0.875	1.0	0.483
SMAT 20-80	0.077	0.361	0.084	SMAT 20-80	0.271	0.694	0.241

SMAT Results SMAT’s performance was validated using the F1-score, with an F1-score of 0.48276 for the 80-20 train-test split on the Synthea dataset, indicating successful model training when compared to the original values reported by Zhang et al.

When using 80% of the data for training, SMAT achieved a perfect accuracy@5 score (accuracy@5 = 100%) on the remaining 20% of the attributes. Unfortunately, in real-world scenarios only a small portion of mappings can be available, since mapping 80% manually removes the need for automatic mapping. In the much more realistic split, with only 20% of the data, SMAT achieved significantly lower results than ReMatch on both datasets, as is emphasized in Fig. 2. Unlike ReMatch, the results were significantly higher on Synthea, when compared to MIMIC dataset, for both splits. This finding is aligned with our expectations about the difficulty of MIMIC, and demonstrates the robustness of ReMatch.

5 CONCLUSIONS

In this work we introduced ReMatch, a scalable and effective method for matching schemas using retrieval-enhanced LLMs, designed to complement and aid human matchers throughout their work. ReMatch avoids the need for predefined mapping, any model training, or access to data in the source database. Instead, it exploits the generative abilities of LLMs to perform semantic ranking between two schemas, in alignment with a human matching process. We also provided a new large dataset that will hopefully aid further research.

In future work, we plan to include the explicit use of type constraints, foreign keys, and primary keys, as well as enhanced guidance mechanisms and enrichment of table and column descriptions using the source schema data, where accessible without privacy or security constraints.

REFERENCES

- [1] Philip A. Bernstein, Jayant Madhavan, and Erhard Rahm. 2011. Generic schema matching, ten years later. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment* 4 (2011), 695 – 701. <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:6302654>
- [2] Tom B. Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Sandhini Agarwal, Ariel Herbert-Voss, Gretchen Krueger, T. J. Henighan, Rewon Child, Aditya Ramesh, Daniel M. Ziegler, Jeff Wu, Clemens Winter, Christopher Hesse, Mark Chen, Eric Sigler, Mateusz Litwin, Scott Gray, Benjamin Chess, Jack Clark, Christopher Berner, Sam McCandlish, Alec Radford, Ilya Sutskever, and Dario Amodei. 2020. Language Models are Few-Shot Learners. *ArXiv abs/2005.14165* (2020). <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:218971783>
- [3] Alexander Chernev, Ulf Böckenholt, and Joseph K. Goodman. 2015. Choice overload: A conceptual review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Consumer Psychology* 25 (2015), 333–358. <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:46655935>
- [4] Hong Hai Do and Erhard Rahm. 2002. COMA - A System for Flexible Combination of Schema Matching Approaches. In *Very Large Data Bases Conference*. <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:9318211>
- [5] Zlatan Dragisic, Valentina Ivanova, Patrick Lambrix, Daniel Faria, Ernesto Jiménez-Ruiz, and Catia Pesquita. 2016. User Validation in Ontology Alignment. In *International Workshop on the Semantic Web*. <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:1578751>
- [6] Avigdor Gal, Haggai Roitman, and Roece Shraga. 2021. Learning to Rerank Schema Matches. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering* 33 (2021), 3104–3116. <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:143427155>
- [7] Ryan Greene, Ted Sanders, Lilian Weng, and Arvind Neelakantan. 2022. New and improved embedding model. <https://openai.com/blog/new-and-improved-embedding-model>
- [8] Alistair E W Johnson, Tom J Pollard, Lu Shen, Li-Wei H Lehman, Mengling Feng, Mohammad Ghassemi, Benjamin Moody, Peter Szolovits, Leo Anthony Celi, and Roger G Mark. 2016. MIMIC-III, a freely accessible critical care database. *Scientific data* 3, 1 (2016), 1–9.
- [9] Christos Koutras, George Siachamis, Andra Ionescu, Kyriakos Psarakis, Jerry Brons, Marios Fragkoulis, Christoph Lofi, Angela Bonifati, and Asterios Katsifodimos. 2020. Valentine: Evaluating Matching Techniques for Dataset Discovery. *2021 IEEE 37th International Conference on Data Engineering (ICDE)* (2020), 468–479. <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:222378204>
- [10] Patrick Lewis, Ethan Perez, Aleksandra Piktus, Fabio Petroni, Vladimir Karpukhin, Naman Goyal, Heinrich Küttler, Mike Lewis, Wen-tau Yih, Tim Rocktäschel, et al. 2020. Retrieval-augmented generation for knowledge-intensive nlp tasks. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 33 (2020), 9459–9474.
- [11] Yuliang Li, Jimfeng Li, Yoshihiko Suhara, AnHai Doan, and Wang Chiew Tan. 2020. Deep entity matching with pre-trained language models. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment* 14 (2020), 50 – 60. <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:214743579>
- [12] Yi-Hsien Liu, Tianle Han, Siyuan Ma, Jia-Yu Zhang, Yuanyu Yang, Jiaming Tian, Haoyang He, Antong Li, Mengshen He, Zheng Liu, Zihao Wu, Dajiang Zhu, Xiang Li, Ning Qiang, Dingang Shen, Tianming Liu, and Bao Ge. 2023. Summary of ChatGPT-Related Research and Perspective Towards the Future of Large Language Models. *Meta-Radiology* (2023). <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:257921533>
- [13] Jayant Madhavan, Philip A. Bernstein, and Erhard Rahm. 2001. Generic Schema Matching with Cupid. In *Very Large Data Bases Conference*. <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:1456533>
- [14] Shervin Minaee, E. Cambria, and Jianfeng Gao. 2021. Deep Learning Based Text Classification: A Comprehensive Review. <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:235386502>
- [15] Suvir Mirchandani, F. Xia, Peter R. Florence, Brian Ichter, Danny Driess, Montse Gonzalez Arenas, Kanishka Rao, Dorsa Sadigh, and Andy Zeng. 2023. Large Language Models as General Pattern Machines. *ArXiv abs/2307.04721* (2023). <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:259501163>
- [16] Sidharth Mudgal, Han Li, Theodoros Rekatsinas, AnHai Doan, Youngchoon Park, Ganesh Krishnan, Rohit Deep, Esteban Arcaute, and Vijay Raghavendra. 2018. Deep Learning for Entity Matching: A Design Space Exploration. *Proceedings of the 2018 International Conference on Management of Data* (2018). <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:44063437>
- [17] Avanika Narayan, Ines Chami, Laurel J. Orr, and Christopher R’e. 2022. Can Foundation Models Wrangle Your Data? *Proc. VLDB Endow.* 16 (2022), 738–746. <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:248965029>
- [18] Arvind Neelakantan, Tao Xu, Raul Puri, Alec Radford, Jesse Michael Han, Jerry Tworek, Qiming Yuan, Nikolas A. Tezak, Jong Wook Kim, Chris Hallacy, Johannes Heidecke, Pranav Shyam, Boris Power, Tyna Eloundou Nekoul, Girish Sastry, Gretchen Krueger, David P. Schnurr, Felipe Petroski Such, Kenny Sai-Kin Hsu, Madeleine Thompson, Tabarak Khan, Toki Sherbakov, Joanne Jang, Peter Welinder, and Lilian Weng. 2022. Text and Code Embeddings by Contrastive Pre-Training. *ArXiv abs/2201.10005* (2022). <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:246275593>
- [19] OpenAI. 2023. GPT-4 Technical Report. *ArXiv abs/2303.08774* (2023). <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:257532815>
- [20] Nicolas Paris, Antoine Lamer, and Adrien Parrot. 2021. Transformation and Evaluation of the MIMIC Database in the OMOP Common Data Model: Development and Usability Study. *JMIR Medical Informatics* 9 (2021). <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:244194789>
- [21] Alec Radford, Karthik Narasimhan, Tim Salimans, and Ilya Sutskever. 2018. Improving Language Understanding by Generative Pre-Training. <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:49313245>
- [22] J. J. Rocchio. 1971. Relevance feedback in information retrieval. <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:61859400>
- [23] Roece Shraga, Ofra Amir, and Avigdor Gal. 2021. Learning to Characterize Matching Experts. In *2021 IEEE 37th International Conference on Data Engineering (ICDE)*. 1236–1247. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICDE51399.2021.00111>
- [24] Roece Shraga, Avigdor Gal, and Haggai Roitman. 2020. ADnEV: Cross-Domain Schema Matching using Deep Similarity Matrix Adjustment and Evaluation. *Proc. VLDB Endow.* 13 (2020), 1401–1415. <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:214588544>
- [25] Chi Sun, Xipeng Qiu, Yige Xu, and Xuanjing Huang. 2019. How to Fine-Tune BERT for Text Classification?. In *China National Conference on Chinese Computational Linguistics*. <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:153312532>
- [26] Jason Walonoski, Mark Kramer, Joseph Nichols, Andre Quina, Chris Moesel, Dylan Hall, Carlton Duffett, Kudakwashe Dube, Thomas Gallagher, and Scott McLachlan. 2018. Synthesia: An approach, method, and software mechanism for generating synthetic patients and the synthetic electronic health care record. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association* 25, 3 (2018), 230–238.
- [27] Haochen Zhang, Yuyang Dong, Chuan Xiao, and M. Oyamada. 2023. Large Language Models as Data Preprocessors. *ArXiv abs/2308.16361* (2023). <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:261397017>
- [28] Jing Zhang, Bonggun Shin, Jinho D. Choi, and Joyce Ho. 2021. SMAT: An Attention-Based Deep Learning Solution to the Automation of Schema Matching. *Advances in databases and information systems. ADBIS* 12843 (2021), 260–274. <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:237207055>
- [29] Yunjia Zhang, Avriella Floratou, Joyce Cahoon, Subru Krishnan, Andreas C. Müller, Dalitso Banda, Fotis Psallidas, and Jignesh M. Patel. 2023. Schema Matching using Pre-Trained Language Models. *2023 IEEE 39th International Conference on Data Engineering (ICDE)* (2023), 1558–1571. <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:255188911>