

# Ensembling LLM-Induced Decision Trees for Explainable and Robust Error Detection

Mengqi Wang  
UNSW Sydney

Jianwei Wang\*  
UNSW Sydney

Qing Liu  
Data61, CSIRO

Xiwei Xu  
Data61, CSIRO

Zhenchang Xing  
Data61, CSIRO

Liming Zhu  
Data61, CSIRO

Wenjie Zhang  
UNSW Sydney

## ABSTRACT

Error detection (ED), which aims to identify incorrect or inconsistent cell values in tabular data, is important for ensuring data quality. Recent state-of-the-art ED methods leverage the pre-trained knowledge and semantic capability embedded in large language models (LLMs) to directly label whether a cell is erroneous. However, this *LLM-as-a-labeler* pipeline (1) relies on the black box, implicit decision process, thus failing to provide explainability for the detection results, and (2) is highly sensitive to prompts, yielding inconsistent outputs due to inherent model stochasticity, therefore lacking robustness. To address these limitations, we propose an *LLM-as-an-inducer* framework that adopts LLM to induce the decision tree for ED (termed TreeED) and further ensembles multiple such trees for consensus detection (termed ForestED), thereby improving explainability and robustness. Specifically, based on prompts derived from data context, decision tree specifications and output requirements, TreeED queries the LLM to induce the decision tree skeleton, whose root-to-leaf decision paths specify the stepwise procedure for evaluating a given sample. Each tree contains three types of nodes: (1) rule nodes that perform simple validation checks (e.g., format or range), (2) Graph Neural Network (GNN) nodes that capture complex patterns (e.g., functional dependencies), and (3) leaf nodes that output the final decision types (error or clean). Furthermore, ForestED employs uncertainty-based sampling to obtain multiple row subsets, constructing a decision tree for each subset using TreeED. It then leverages an Expectation-Maximization-based algorithm that jointly estimates tree reliability and optimizes the consensus ED prediction. Extensive experiments demonstrate that our methods are accurate, explainable and robust, achieving an average F1-score improvement of 16.1% over the best baseline.

## PVLDB Artifact Availability:

The source code, data, and/or other artifacts have been made available at <https://github.com/T-Lab/ForestED>.

## 1 INTRODUCTION

Data quality is crucial for supporting reliable data analytics and data-driven decision-making. Poor data quality can distort analytical results, hinder operational processes, and ultimately lead to negative downstream impact [12, 40, 47, 51]. Unfortunately, real-world datasets often suffer from low quality due to issues like inconsistent data collection and sensor failures, leading to errors such as missing values, outliers, typos, and rule violations [6, 9, 11]. To address this issue, data cleaning [22, 24, 44] is widely studied to substantially improve data quality through a two-phase process: (1)

Customer ID	Email	Age	Order Date
C11000	alice@email.com	-5	2024-03-15
C11000		20	2025-05-13
C11001	bob@emaix.com	45	15/06/2024
...	...	...	...

Figure 1: An illustrated example of common data errors.

error detection (ED), which identifies incorrect or inconsistent cell values in tabular data, and (2) data repair, which corrects the identified errors. In this paper, we study ED, a critical step for effective data repair and downstream data preparation.

**EXAMPLE 1.** Common data error patterns are illustrated in Figure 1, including 1) The missing value error occurs where the Email field is blank; 2) The outlier error appears in the Age column where a negative value ( $-5$ ) is invalid for a person’s age; 3) A pattern violation is shown in the second row’s Order Date, which uses the non-standard format “15/06/2024” instead of the expected “YYYY-MM-DD”; 4) A typo occurs in the malformed email “bob@emaix.com”, where the domain contains a misspelling; 5) A rule violation is demonstrated in the rows with CustomerID C11000, where the functional dependency CustomerID  $\rightarrow$  Email is violated because the same customer identifier is associated with two different email values.

Given the importance and practical value of ED, a set of methods has been developed [14, 16, 33]. Traditional ED methods for tabular data are mainly statistical-based [19, 34] and rule-based [8, 14, 25]. Statistical-based approaches detect potentially erroneous values by modeling value distributions or correlations and identifying entries that deviate from expected patterns, but they can be sensitive to distributional variability and may incorrectly flag rare but legitimate values. On the other hand, rule-based approaches rely on rules, such as integrity constraints, patterns, functional dependencies (FDs), or external knowledge bases, to identify violations. However, they require substantial domain expertise and effort to construct and maintain such rules.

Recently, with the development of large language models (LLMs), LLM-based ED methods are emerging. They exploit the pre-trained knowledge and semantic understanding capabilities of LLMs to directly label all the data cells or portions of them as either clean or erroneous. The first line of work, with FM\_ED [27] as a representative (illustrated in Figure 2(a)), constructs a dedicated prompt

\*Jianwei Wang is the corresponding author. Email: [jianwei.wang1@unsw.edu.au](mailto:jianwei.wang1@unsw.edu.au)




Figure 2: Framework comparisons of LLM-based ED methods.

for each cell in the table and uses the LLM to classify it. The second line of work, with ZeroED [29] as a representative (illustrated in Figure 2(b)), first employs the LLM to label a selected subset of cells. A multi-layer perceptron (MLP) classifier is then trained using these labels, and the trained classifier is subsequently applied to determine whether each cell is clean or erroneous.

**Motivations.** Although FM\_ED and ZeroED, which follow the *LLM-as-a-labeler* pipeline, achieve state-of-the-art performance for ED, they still face two notable limitations.

Firstly, their detection results lack explainability. They rely on black-box components: the LLM behaves as an opaque function that directly outputs their decision, lacking explicit justification, and the trained MLP classifier in ZeroED is similarly a neural-based model. As a result, users cannot pinpoint the reasons that derive the predicted outcomes [32]. This lack of explainability makes it difficult for experts to verify detected errors, impedes root cause diagnosis and undermines trust in automated data systems.

Secondly, their detection results lack robustness. They rely on LLMs, which are inherently stochastic due to factors such as probabilistic decoding strategies and GPU-level variations. Consequently, even identical prompts may produce different labeling outcomes [17]. Moreover, the MLP classifier in ZeroED is also highly sensitive to the quality of the labels it is trained on, including their correctness, diversity, and coverage. Furthermore, ED is performed on low-quality input data, which makes it more difficult for the output to maintain robustness. The lack of robustness leads to an unstable error detection process, which limits its practical applicability.

**Challenges.** To design an accurate, explainable and robust ED method, two challenges exist below:

*Challenge I: How to design an accurate and explainable ED method for noisy tabular data with complex relationships?* The existence of diverse error patterns and complex table dependencies complicates the problem. A direct approach is to prompt LLMs to produce natural-language reasoning traces, such as Chain-of-Thought (CoT) [43], thereby providing an explanation for each error judgment. However, such self-generated explanations are often unfaithful or post-hoc rationalizations of the model decisions [26, 36], limiting their reliability. Another promising approach is to use LLMs to generate explicit logic rules extracted from sampled data for ED, offering a more structured form of explainability. Nevertheless, simple rules struggle to represent diverse error patterns and capture complex relational structures among tables.

*Challenge II: How to design a robust ED method for large-scale tabular data?* The limited context windows of LLMs and the complex distributions of large real-world tabular data make robust error detection particularly challenging. A naive approach is to prompt

the LLM with the entire table, which can enhance robustness by leveraging global context. However, real-world datasets may contain tens or hundreds of thousands of tuples, far exceeding the input limits of most current LLMs. A more practical alternative, as in ZeroED, is to label a subset of the table and train a downstream classifier on these partial labels. Nevertheless, a single detector struggles to characterize the intricate distributions and suffers from the stochasticity of LLM-based labeling. Another line of work, exemplified by methods such as Raha [25], combines the outputs of multiple detectors and trains a classifier to aggregate outputs. Yet these aggregation strategies rely on ground-truth labels, which are hard to obtain in real-world scenarios.

**Our approach.** Driven by the aforementioned challenges, we propose an *LLM-as-an-inducer* framework (see Figure 2(c)) that leverages LLMs to induce decision trees composed of different node types to handle diverse error patterns and errors of varying complexity (termed TreeED). We further ensemble multiple such trees by applying an Expectation–Maximization (EM)–based procedure to obtain consensus detection results (termed ForestED). In this way, we enhance the accuracy, explainability and robustness of ED.

In TreeED, we use LLM to induce a decision tree for ED (see case study in Figure 8 for detailed illustration). Specifically, we provide the LLM with data context, decision tree specification, and output requirements, which ground the LLM in the structure of the table and guide it toward producing meaningful decision logic. To capture diverse error patterns and errors of varying complexity, we guide the LLM to induce a decision tree skeleton comprising three different nodes, including rule nodes, Graph Neural Network (GNN) nodes, and leaf nodes (representing error or clean states). This design effectively combines neural models and symbolic rules for enhanced performance. Rule nodes encode simple symbolic checks such as format, range, and domain validation. In GNN nodes, we model the table as a bipartite graph and approach ED as a link classification task that leverages global context for superior performance under complex relational error patterns, such as cross-attribute correlations and functional dependencies. It can effectively capture constraints that simple rules cannot express. Moreover, each GNN node is dedicated to a specialized function, such as verifying the dependencies of a specific attribute, thereby ensuring the explainability. During prediction, each cell is evaluated through the tree starting from the root. At every node of the tree, the corresponding rule or GNN check determines the next branch to follow, and the process continues until a leaf node is reached. This results in an explainable decision path.

To further enhance the robustness of the framework, ForestED is proposed. It consists of two components: (1) generating multiple

**Table 1: Symbols and descriptions.**

Notation	Description
$\mathbf{D}$	Dirty dataset of size $N \times M$ .
$\mathbf{D}^*$	Clean (ground-truth) version of $\mathbf{D}$ .
$\mathbf{T}_i / t_i$	$i$ -th tuple / its index in $\mathbf{D}$ , $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ .
$A_j / a_j$	$j$ -th attribute / its index in $\mathbf{D}$ , $j \in \{1, \dots, M\}$ .
$\hat{\mathbf{Y}}$	Estimated error matrix $\hat{\mathbf{Y}} \in \{0, 1\}^{N \times M}$ .
$f_{\text{LLM}}(\cdot)$	LLM inference function.
$\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}_t \cup \mathcal{V}_a, \mathcal{E})$	Bipartite graph over tuples and attributes.
$\mathcal{T}$	A decision tree.
$\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{T}) := \{u_1, \dots, u_K\}$	Node set of tree $\mathcal{T}$ .
$\pi(i, j)$	Root-to-leaf decision path of $\mathbf{D}[i, j]$ in $\mathcal{T}$ .
$\mathcal{S}; \mathcal{S}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathcal{S}^{(R)}$	Sample of $\mathbf{D}$ and its $R$ partitions.
$\Theta^{(r)}$	Confusion matrix at the $r$ -th tree.
$\hat{\mathbf{Y}}_{i,j}^{(r)}$	Cell-level prediction by the $r$ -th tree.

decision trees and (2) ensembling their ED results. We generate multiple decision trees by providing TreeED with distinct subsets of representative rows, selected via our uncertainty-based sampling strategy. To aggregate the consensus results of these trees without labeled data, we propose an EM-based algorithm. Instead of manually assigning weights to each tree, the algorithm models both the unknown consensus predictions and the tree-specific reliabilities (i.e., error rates) as latent variables, which are iteratively estimated through EM. Specifically, in the E-step, given the current tree reliability matrix and the prediction prior (i.e., the probability of each cell being erroneous), the algorithm updates the posterior consensus predictions. In the M-step, it updates the tree reliability matrix and the prediction prior via maximum likelihood estimation based on the estimated consensus predictions. This iterative refinement continues until convergence, producing a consensus error detection result that is more robust than a single tree.

**Contributions.** The main contributions are summarized as:

- We propose an *LLM-as-an-inducer* framework for error detection in tabular data, consisting of TreeED and ForestED.
- We introduce TreeED, which leverages an LLM to induce a decision tree whose different node types capture both simple rules and complex relational patterns, enabling accurate and explainable error detection.
- We introduce ForestED, which ensembles multiple TreeED-derived predictions using an EM-based consensus procedure to obtain reliable and robust error detection results.
- We conduct extensive experiments across diverse datasets and evaluation settings. The results show that our framework achieves state-of-the-art performance while substantially improving explainability and robustness over existing LLM-based ED methods, yielding an average F1 improvement of approximately 16.1% over the strongest baseline.

## 2 PRELIMINARIES

We begin by defining tabular data and the common types of errors that occur within it, followed by a formal definition of the error detection problem. We then introduce LLM and two previous state-of-the-art LLM-based ED methods: FM\_ED and ZeroED.

### 2.1 Problem Statement

Let  $\mathbf{D} = \{\mathbf{T}_1, \dots, \mathbf{T}_N\}$  be a dirty tabular dataset with  $N$  tuples. The dataset contains  $M$  attributes, denoted by  $A_1, \dots, A_M$ . For each tuple  $\mathbf{T}_i$ , we use  $\mathbf{D}[i, j]$  to represent the value of attribute  $A_j$  in that tuple. Let  $\mathbf{D}^*$  denote the corresponding clean (ground-truth) dataset. Tabular data can contain a wide variety of errors arising during data collection, entry, or integration. Common error types include missing values, typos, pattern violations, outliers, and rule violations [1, 5, 25, 28, 29]. Missing values occur when certain fields are left empty, while typos result from manual entry mistakes such as misspellings or extra characters, both of which can often be identified from individual cell contents. Pattern violations occur when values deviate from expected syntactic formats (e.g., inconsistent date formats), whereas outliers refer to values outside the typical statistical or semantic range of an attribute. Rule violations capture cross-attribute inconsistencies, such as mismatched hierarchical relationships or logically impossible combinations, and often require understanding dependencies across multiple attributes or tuples. Here, we give a formal definition of tabular error detection.

**DEFINITION 1 (TABULAR ERROR DETECTION).** *Given a dirty tabular dataset  $\mathbf{D}$  with  $N$  tuples and  $M$  attributes, and the corresponding clean dataset  $\mathbf{D}^*$ , the ground-truth error matrix  $\mathbf{Y} \in \{0, 1\}^{N \times M}$  is defined as*

$$\mathbf{Y}[i, j] = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } \mathbf{D}[i, j] \neq \mathbf{D}^*[i, j], \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

*The task of tabular error detection is to estimate a predicted error matrix  $\hat{\mathbf{Y}} \in \{0, 1\}^{N \times M}$  that approximates  $\mathbf{Y}$ .*

### 2.2 LLM and LLM-based Error Detection

**LLM.** LLMs demonstrate strong zero-shot generalization across diverse tasks [36, 37] due to the broad semantic abilities acquired through large-scale pretraining and instruction tuning, enabling them to interpret contextual information and perform complex context-dependent operations. Recent studies further show that these capabilities make LLMs promising tools for data quality improvement [15, 23, 35, 38, 42]. In general, LLM-based data processing can be formalized as conditioning on a structured context  $C$  to produce a task-specific output  $y$ :

$$y = f_{\text{LLM}}(C),$$

where  $C$  may include textual descriptions, attribute values, or retrieved records, and  $y$  may correspond to a label, a rewritten value, or a generated decision. For error detection, LLMs use contextual signals surrounding a cell to determine whether the value is erroneous. For a cell  $(i, j)$ , this can be written as:

$$y_{i,j} = f_{\text{LLM}}(C_{i,j}), \quad y_{i,j} \in \{0, 1\},$$

where  $C_{i,j}$  may encode row-level, column-level, or table-level cues. Existing state-of-the-art LLM-based ED methods (i.e., FM\_ED and ZeroED) differ primarily in how they construct  $C_{i,j}$  and how they invoke  $f_{\text{LLM}}$  during inference.

**FM\_ED** [27] directly prompts the LLM with the full row  $\mathbf{T}_i$  and the target attribute  $A_j$  to classify whether  $\mathbf{D}[i, j]$  is erroneous:

$$y_{i,j} = f_{\text{LLM}}(\mathbf{T}_i, A_j).$$




Figure 3: Framework overview of TreeED and ForestED.

**ZeroED** [29] reduces LLM inference cost by applying the LLM only to a sampled subset of cells. The sampled set  $\mathcal{S}$  is labeled by the LLM as:

$$Y_S = f_{LLM}(S),$$

where  $Y_S$  contains the LLM-assigned error labels for  $\mathcal{S}$ . A light-weight classifier  $h$  is then trained on these labeled examples:

$$\nu = \text{Train}(S, Y_S).$$

Once trained, the classifier is applied to the full dataset to produce the predicted error matrix:

$$\hat{Y} = \nu(D).$$

This strategy leverages the LLM to generate labels at a small scale while performing large-scale ED efficiently by the learned classifier.

However, the decision processes of these LLM-based methods are not traceable, limiting their explainability, and their outputs vary with prompt choices, sampled data, or distributional shifts, undermining robustness. Hence, in this paper, we introduce an *LLM-as-an-inducer* framework comprising TreeED and ForestED for accurate, explainable, and robust ED.

### 3 OVERVIEW

In Figure 3, we provide an overview of our proposed error detection framework, consisting of TreeED and ForestED. TreeED induces an LLM to construct a decision tree for error detection, while ForestED further ensembles multiple such trees using an EM-based consensus procedure to achieve reliable and robust detection.

Specifically, in TreeED, given a structured prompt that includes (i) data context, including a data profile and a set of sample rows, (ii) decision tree specification (e.g., node types and structural constraints), and (iii) output requirements (label requirements and output format), the LLM induces a decision tree skeleton that specifies how a single table cell should be evaluated for error detection. Each tree comprises three node types: (i) rule nodes; (ii) GNN nodes;

and (iii) leaf nodes. For each cell, inference proceeds along a root-to-leaf path in the decision tree. At each internal node, the model either executes the prescribed rule check or invokes the GNN-based prediction, and the terminal leaf returns the final ED label. ForestED aggregates decisions from multiple trees via EM-based consensus. It first applies uncertainty-based sampling to select representative subsets of the original table and partitions them into several subsets. For each sampled subset, TreeED induces a decision tree and applies it to the entire table to produce a full cell-level prediction matrix. ForestED then collects these prediction matrices and applies an EM-based consensus procedure that iteratively estimates the latent true labels in the E-step and updates each tree’s reliability matrix in the M-step, repeating until convergence to produce the final consensus result.

### 4 TREEED METHOD

The objective of TreeED is to prompt an LLM to generate an explainable, executable error detector in the form of a decision tree for tabular data and use it to perform error prediction. The workflow of TreeED consists of three stages: (1) **prompt construction**, where an LLM is guided with structured context to generate a decision tree skeleton; (2) **decision tree construction**, where the decision tree skeleton is induced as an executable tree; and (3) **error prediction via decision tree**, where the constructed decision tree is executed on the original table to identify erroneous cells.

#### 4.1 Prompt Construction

The prompt for constructing a decision tree in TreeED consists of three key components: data context, decision tree specification, and output requirements. An example of prompt is given in the Box 4.1. **Data context.** The data context provides essential background information for the LLM, consisting of two parts: (i) a data profile helping the LLM understand its structure and semantics without populating all tuples; and (ii) a set of representative sample rows illustrating diverse data patterns (selected by uncertainty sampling



detailed in Section 5.1). The data profile is generated from the original dataset to provide dataset-level information that helps the LLM formulate relevant rules, following the idea of [10]. For each attribute  $A_j$  in the schema, the profile records:

- (1) its *data type* (e.g., numeric, categorical, date, inferred from the value domain).
- (2) its *distinctness* (the ratio of unique values to the total number of non-missing entries).
- (3) its *missing ratio* (the fraction of tuples for which  $A_j$  is empty).
- (4) its *inclusion dependencies* (whether the values of  $A_j$  are contained within those of another attribute).
- (5) its *inter-column similarity* (computed by measuring the cosine similarity between 300-dimensional column embedding, where each embedding encodes the column’s value distribution using histograms, summary statistics, and hashed buckets for numeric attributes, and a hashed bag-of-tokens representation for non-numeric attributes).
- (6) its *correlation scores* (e.g., Pearson or mutual information for numeric or categorical pairs).
- (7) its *representative values* (a small set of frequent samples).
- (8) its *summary statistics*, including mean, median, standard deviation, and min–max for numeric attributes.

**Decision tree specification.** The decision tree specification defines both the structure and the functional roles of different node types. Since real-world tabular datasets exhibit error patterns of varying complexity, from simple syntactic errors to multi-attribute relational violations, the tree includes three complementary node types: symbolic rule nodes for simple local checks, learning-based GNN nodes for complex global reasoning, and leaf nodes for final classification. By modeling the table as a bipartite graph and propagating information over the bipartite graph, GNNs aggregate contextual signals from related rows and attributes, enabling the detection of inconsistencies that arise only from global structure. Finally, leaf nodes act as terminal decision points that output whether the examined cell is erroneous or clean.

**REMARK 1.** *The GNN nodes in our framework remain explainable because: (1) each node has a LLM-induced descriptive message indicating its intended function (e.g., checking an FD, as shown in Figure 8); (2) the tree also specifies the attributes involved in each relational dependency and is dedicated to the specific checking function.*

**Output requirements.** To induce a valid and executable decision tree from the LLM, we restrict the output format to two core components: a decision tree structure and a set of labeled sample records. These two components jointly specify how the tree is constructed and how it behaves on example inputs, ensuring that both the structure and semantics of the induced tree are unambiguous.

The first component, "tree\_structure", defines the decision tree skeleton as a list of node objects. Each node includes a `node_id` (unique identifier), a `type` (node type), and a `name` (semantic label). Rule nodes contain an executable code field specifying a Python function for simple checks, along with `true_child` and `false_child` pointers that determine branching behavior. GNN nodes represent relational checks and include only skeleton descriptions without explicit code. Leaf nodes specify a `leaf_value` indicating whether the final decision is true (error) or false (clean).

The second component, "labels", contains labeled examples showing how the induced tree evaluates sampled cells. Each record includes a `row_id` and an attribute name to identify the cell, an `is_error` Boolean indicating the predicted label, and a `path` field recording the ordered sequence of nodes taken from the root to the leaf. These paths provide explicit supervision for GNN node behaviors, and make the resulting decision logic traceable.

A concrete example of an induced decision tree is provided in the case study in Section 6.4 (see Figure 8).

### Prompt Design

**1. Data context:** data profile, sample rows

**2. Decision tree specification:** The decision tree should be shallow (4–8 levels). Each node should be specialized, not overloaded with unrelated checks. There should be at least one gnn node whose children are not leaf nodes.

- **rule:** must provide executable Python code that performs simple rule checks, formatted as:

```
def rule_fn(tuple, attr) -> bool:
    # return True if the cell is erroneous,
    # False otherwise
```

Each rule node should handle **only one type of check** (e.g., numeric range, format, or cross-column consistency).

- **gnn:** for complex relational checks (e.g., functional dependencies, conditional FDs, denial constraints), where the node name reflect the purpose (e.g., `gnn_fd_check`, `gnn_cfd_check`).
- **leaf:** must have a `leaf_value` of true or false.

**3. Labeling requirements:**

- For every sampled row and every column, output one entry in labels. Each entry must contain the **row\_id**, **column\_name**, **is\_error (bool)**, and the **full path of node\_ids from root to leaf**.
- The overall output must be a single JSON object with two fields:
  - "tree\_structure": list of NodeSpec objects.
  - "labels": list of entries with `row_id`, `column`, `is_error`, and `path`.
- Example error types and output format.

## 4.2 Decision Tree Construction

Given the two LLM outputs, the `tree_structure` component and the `labels` component, TreeED constructs an executable decision tree  $\mathcal{T}$  with a set of nodes  $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{T})$  that integrates both rule nodes  $\mathcal{U}_{rule}$  and GNN nodes  $\mathcal{U}_{gnn}$ . Since the rule nodes directly incorporate the LLM-generated code without further processing, we next detail the training process for the learning-based GNN nodes.

**Label preparation.** To train GNN nodes, we extract supervision labels from the labels component, which records the decision paths that sampled cells follow from the root to a leaf in the decision tree. For each sampled cell  $D[i, j]$ , its root-to-leaf decision path in the tree  $\mathcal{T}$  is represented as

$$\pi(i, j) = [(u_0, b_0), (u_1, b_1), \dots, (u_K, b_K)],$$

---

**Algorithm 1:** The algorithm for decision tree construction

---

**Input:** Dirty table  $\mathbf{D}$ , LLM model  $f_{LLM}$ , samples  $\mathcal{S}$   
**Output:** Executable decision tree  $\hat{\mathcal{T}}$

```

1  $pmt \leftarrow$  prompt construction with  $\mathcal{S}$  &  $\mathbf{D}$ ;  $\mathcal{U}, \hat{\mathcal{S}} \leftarrow f_{llm}(pmt)$ 
  // Step 1: Tree skeleton construction
2 foreach  $u \in \mathcal{U}$  do
3   if  $u \in \mathcal{U}_{rule}$  then
4      $n \leftarrow \{\text{type: rule, } u.\text{code, } u.\text{t\_child, } u.\text{f\_child}\}$ 
5   else if  $u \in \mathcal{U}_{gnn}$  then
6      $n \leftarrow \{\text{type: gnn, } u.\text{t\_child, } u.\text{f\_child}\}$ 
7   else
8      $n \leftarrow \{\text{type: leaf, value: } \{0, 1\}\}$ 
9    $\mathcal{T}_{skeleton} \leftarrow \mathcal{T}_{skeleton} \cup \{n\}$ 
  // Step 2: Label preparation
10 foreach  $u_k \in \mathcal{U}_{gnn}$  do
11   foreach  $s_{i,j} \in \hat{\mathcal{S}}$  do
12      $\pi(i, j) \leftarrow \text{Flow}(\mathcal{T}_{skeleton}, s_{i,j})$ 
13     if  $(u_k, b_k) \in \pi(i, j)$  then
14        $\mathcal{L}_{u_k} \leftarrow \mathcal{L}_{u_k} \cup \{(\mathbf{D}[i, j], l_{i,j,k} = b_k)\}$ 
  // Step 3: Graph construction
15 foreach  $u_k \in \mathcal{U}_{gnn}$  do
16   foreach  $i = 1..N, j = 1..M$  do
17      $\mathbf{h}_{e_{v_t, v_a}} \leftarrow \phi(\mathbf{D}[i, j]); \mathcal{E} \leftarrow \mathcal{E} \cup e_{v_t, v_a}$ 
18    $u_k.\text{graph} = (\mathcal{V}_t \cup \mathcal{V}_a, \mathcal{E}), u_k.\text{train\_labels} = \mathcal{L}_{u_k}$ 
  // Step 4: GNN training
19 foreach  $u_k \in \mathcal{U}_{gnn}$  do
20   foreach  $i = 1..N, j = 1..M$  do
21      $\hat{q}_{i,j,k} \leftarrow \text{MLP}\left(\mathbf{h}_{v_t^i}^{(2)} \parallel \mathbf{h}_{v_a^j}^{(2)}\right),$ 
22     Optimize  $Loss_k \leftarrow$ 
       $-\sum_{(i,j)} [l_{i,j,k} \log \hat{q}_{i,j,k} + (1 - l_{i,j,k}) \log(1 - \hat{q}_{i,j,k})]$ 
23 return  $\hat{\mathcal{T}}$ 

```

---

where  $u_k$  denotes the  $k$ -th node encountered along the path, and  $b_k \in \{0, 1\}$  indicates which outgoing branch is taken at that node (0 for the false branch and 1 for the true branch). The values of  $b_k$  only denote which branch is chosen at each decision point and do not directly indicate whether the cell is an error or not.

**EXAMPLE 2.** Consider the decision path for cell  $\mathbf{D}[i, j]$ :  $\pi(i, j) = [(\text{check\_country\_code\_format}, 0), (\text{gnn\_fd\_location}, 1), (\text{check\_location\_gdp\_range}, 0), (\text{leaf\_ok}, 0)]$ . This means the cell first reaches the rule node `check\_country\_code\_format` and selects the false branch (e.g., the format check does not trigger), then reaches the GNN node `gnn\_fd\_location` and selects the true branch (e.g., the relational pattern is satisfied), then selects the false branch at `check\_location\_gdp\_range`, and ultimately arrives at `leaf\_ok`, indicating that the cell is labeled as clean.

From these decision paths, we derive supervision labels for training the GNN nodes. For each GNN node  $u_k$  that appears in the path  $\pi(i, j)$ , where  $(u_k, b_k) \in \pi(i, j)$ , the corresponding cell  $\mathbf{D}[i, j]$  is assigned a supervision label  $l_{i,j,k} = b_k$ , indicating which branch the

cell follows at node  $u_k$ . By collecting all cells whose root-to-leaf path includes node  $u_k$  and pairing them with their associated labels, we obtain the training set  $\mathcal{L}_{u_k}$  for that GNN node.

**Graph construction.** We employ a graph-based representation to support relational reasoning, as many tabular errors arise from dependencies that span multiple rows or multiple attributes and therefore cannot be captured by local, cell-level checks alone. To model these interactions, we represent the table as a bipartite graph motivated by [46]. In the constructed bipartite graph, tuple nodes and attribute nodes form two disjoint sets, and each cell corresponds to an edge connecting its associated tuple and attribute. This bipartite design naturally reflects the two-dimensional structure of tabular data and allows information to propagate across both tuple and attribute dimensions, making it particularly suitable for capturing error patterns driven by cross-row relationships (e.g., functional dependencies) or cross-column constraints (e.g., type or domain consistency). Formally, each GNN node operates on a bipartite graph:

$$\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}_t \cup \mathcal{V}_a, \mathcal{E}),$$

where  $\mathcal{V}_t$  and  $\mathcal{V}_a$  denote tuple and attribute nodes, respectively. Tuple node  $v_t^i \in \mathcal{V}_t$  corresponds to the  $i$ -th row in the original table, while attribute node  $v_a^j \in \mathcal{V}_a$  corresponds to the  $j$ -th column. An edge  $e_{v_t^i, v_a^j} \in \mathcal{E}$  between node  $v_t^i$  and node  $v_a^j$  represents a table cell  $\mathbf{D}[i, j]$  and is associated with a feature vector:

$$\mathbf{h}_{e_{v_t^i, v_a^j}} = \phi(\mathbf{D}[i, j]),$$

where  $\phi(\cdot)$  is a hash-based embedding function that encodes the cell value into a numerical vector.

**GNN training.** For each GNN node  $u_k$  in the induced decision tree, we train an independent GNN on its constructed bipartite graph  $\mathcal{G}_{u_k}$  with supervision labels  $\mathcal{L}_{u_k}$ . Following GRAPE [46], we extend the GraphSAGE architecture [13] by incorporating explicit edge embeddings. For node initialization, tuple nodes are assigned an  $m$ -dimensional constant vector, whereas attribute nodes are given an  $m$ -dimensional one-hot vector that uniquely identifies each attribute:

$$\mathbf{h}_v^{(0)} = \begin{cases} \mathbf{1}, & v \in \mathcal{V}_t, \\ \text{ONEHOT}(v), & v \in \mathcal{V}_a. \end{cases}$$

At each GNN layer  $p$ , the neighborhood representation of a node  $v$  is obtained by forming a message for every neighbor  $v' \in \mathcal{N}(v)$  via concatenating the neighbor's previous-layer embedding  $\mathbf{h}_{v'}^{(p-1)}$  with the corresponding edge embedding  $\mathbf{h}_{e_{v', v}}$ , passing it through a nonlinear transformation, and aggregating all such messages:

$$\mathbf{h}_{\mathcal{N}(v)}^{(p)} = \text{AGG}\left\{\sigma\left(\text{CONCAT}\left(\mathbf{h}_{v'}^{(p-1)}, \mathbf{h}_{e_{v', v}}\right)\right) \mid v' \in \mathcal{N}(v)\right\}.$$

Finally, the node embedding is updated by combining its previous-layer embedding of  $\mathbf{h}_v^{(p-1)}$  with its aggregated neighborhood representation  $\mathbf{h}_{\mathcal{N}(v)}^{(p)}$ :

$$\mathbf{h}_v^{(p)} = \sigma\left(\mathbf{W}^{(p)} \cdot \text{CONCAT}\left(\mathbf{h}_v^{(p-1)}, \mathbf{h}_{\mathcal{N}(v)}^{(p)}\right)\right).$$

Here,  $\text{AGG}(\cdot)$  denotes a permutation-invariant mean aggregator,  $\mathbf{W}^{(p)}$  is the trainable weight matrix at propagation layer  $p$ , and  $\sigma(\cdot)$  is a nonlinear activation function RELU. After two propagation layers, we obtain the final embeddings for all tuple and attribute

nodes. For each cell  $\mathbf{D}[i, j]$ , we perform binary error detection by feeding the concatenated tuple node and attribute node embeddings into a two-layer MLP:

$$\hat{q}_{i,j,k} = \text{MLP}\left(\mathbf{h}_{v_t^i}^{(2)} \parallel \mathbf{h}_{v_a^j}^{(2)}\right),$$

which outputs the probability of routing the cell to the true or false branch at GNN node  $u_k$ . The model is trained using binary cross-entropy loss:

$$\text{Loss}_k = - \sum_{(i,j)} \left[ l_{i,j,k} \log \hat{q}_{i,j,k} + (1 - l_{i,j,k}) \log(1 - \hat{q}_{i,j,k}) \right].$$

where  $l_{i,j,k} \in \{0, 1\}$  is the ground-truth error label. After training, each GNN node predicts error labels for cells by applying its learned GNN embeddings to the optimized MLP classifier.

**Tree construction process.** The overall workflow of decision tree construction process, summarized in Algorithm 1, follows a four-stage process. First, *tree skeleton construction* creates a decision tree skeleton by defining node types and linking parent-child relationships according to the LLM-generated structure (lines 2-9). Next, *label preparation* extracts supervision signals from the decision paths in labeled samples, assigning corresponding training labels to each GNN node (lines 10-14). Then, *graph construction* represents the table as a bipartite graph connecting tuples and attributes, serving as the structural input for GNN training (lines 15-18). Finally, in *GNN training and integration*, each GNN node is independently optimized and reattached to the tree, forming the final executable decision tree  $\hat{\mathcal{T}}$  (lines 19-23).

### 4.3 Error Prediction via Decision Tree

Once the decision tree  $\hat{\mathcal{T}}$  is constructed, it can be directly applied to perform cell-level error detection on a given table  $\mathbf{D}$ . As shown in Algorithm 2, each cell is evaluated by following a root-to-leaf decision path: starting from the root (line 3), the model applies either a rule check or a GNN-based relational check at the current internal node. The Boolean outcome selects the next child node, and this process continues until a leaf is reached (lines 4-9). For each cell  $\mathbf{D}[i, j]$ , let  $\pi(i, j)$  denote this root-to-leaf decision path, and let  $u_K$  denote the leaf node at the end of the path; the value stored in  $u_K$  becomes the final prediction for the cell (line 10). Iterating this procedure over all rows and columns (line 2) yields the binary prediction matrix  $\hat{\mathbf{Y}} \in \{0, 1\}^{N \times M}$  (line 11), where  $\hat{\mathbf{Y}}[i, j] = 1$  indicates that  $\mathbf{D}[i, j]$  is predicted as erroneous and 0 otherwise.

## 5 FORESTED METHOD

While TreeED demonstrates that an LLM can effectively serve as a decision tree inducer for error detection, its performance may vary due to the stochastic nature of LLMs. To address this, ForestED applies uncertainty-based sampling to select an informative subset of rows and partitions it into smaller segments, with each segment inducing its own decision tree to form a diverse forest of detectors. We then ensemble their predictions using an EM-based consensus procedure inspired by [7, 39], which jointly infers the latent true labels and each tree-specific reliability to achieve a consensus result.

---

### Algorithm 2: TreeED for error detection

---

**Input:** Dirty table  $\mathbf{D}$ , LLM model  $f_{LLM}$ , samples  $\mathcal{S}$

**Output:** Prediction matrix  $\hat{\mathbf{Y}} \in \{0, 1\}^{N \times M}$

```

1  $\hat{\mathcal{T}} \leftarrow \text{Algorithm 1}(\mathbf{D}, f_{LLM}, \mathcal{S})$ 
2 for  $i = 1 \dots N, j = 1 \dots M$  do
3    $\text{node} \leftarrow \hat{\mathcal{T}}.\text{root}$ 
4   while  $\text{node.type} \neq \text{leaf}$  do
5     if  $\text{node.type} = \text{rule}$  then
6        $\text{child} \leftarrow f_{\text{rule}}(\mathbf{D}[i, j])$ 
7     if  $\text{node.type} = \text{gnn}$  then
8        $\text{child} \leftarrow f_{\text{gnn}}(i, j)$ 
9      $\text{node} \leftarrow \text{child}$ 
10   $\hat{\mathbf{Y}}[i, j] \leftarrow \text{node.value}$ 
11 return  $\hat{\mathbf{Y}}$ 
```

---

### 5.1 Sampling and Partitioning

**Motivation.** Annotating every cell in a large dataset with an LLM is prohibitively expensive, so we focus on labeling only a small but highly informative subset of rows. Rather than relying on random sampling, we target tuples that lie in irregular, ambiguous, or boundary-case regions of the data distribution, as these are more likely to reveal informative error patterns. Prioritizing such uncertain regions reduces annotation cost and exposes the LLM to diverse hard cases, improving generalization.

To identify informative tuples, we adopt a Gaussian Process (GP)-based uncertainty sampling strategy [50]. For each tuple  $i$ , we construct a feature vector  $\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$  by standardizing numeric attributes, one-hot encoding categorical attributes, and applying PCA to reduce dimension. A GP places a prior over a latent function  $g(\cdot)$  that models similarity between tuples, using an RBF kernel

$$\mathcal{K}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') = \exp\left(-\frac{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'\|_2^2}{2\chi^2}\right),$$

where  $\chi$  is the kernel length-scale controlling how quickly similarity decays with distance. Fitting the GP on a small subset with a dummy target yields a posterior distribution, from which we obtain a predictive variance for each tuple  $\text{Var}[g(\mathbf{x}_i)]$  where larger variance indicates greater uncertainty [20]. We then select the top- $s$  tuples with the highest variances, where  $s = \min(100, \lceil \rho N \rceil)$  and  $\rho$  is the sampling ratio.

Specifically, the selected samples  $\mathcal{S}$  are divided into  $R$  disjoint partitions  $\{S^{(1)}, S^{(2)}, \dots, S^{(R)}\}$ , each serving as the input sample for LLM to induce a decision tree  $\hat{\mathcal{T}}^{(r)}$ . By construction,  $\hat{\mathcal{T}}^{(r)}$  models error patterns from its corresponding partition  $S^{(r)}$ , while the full collection  $\{\hat{\mathcal{T}}^{(r)}\}_{r=1}^R$  forms a decision forest, and the corresponding prediction set  $\{\hat{\mathbf{Y}}^{(r)}\}_{r=1}^R$  is later aggregated by EM into a unified consensus result.

### 5.2 Ensemble Consensus via EM Algorithm

**Motivation.** When ensembling predictions from multiple decision trees, simple strategies such as majority voting ignore that different trees may have very different reliability due to variations in sampled rows, LLM behavior, and induced structures. To overcome this, we adopt an EM-based consensus procedure that treats both the

---

**Algorithm 3: ForestED: EM-Based Ensemble Consensus for Error Detection**


---

**Input:** Dirty table  $D$ , LLM model  $f_{LLM}$

**Output:** Final consensus matrix  $\hat{Y} \in \{0, 1\}^{N \times M}$

// **Step 1: Sampling and Partitioning**

1  $S \leftarrow \text{Sampling}(D)$

2  $S^{(1)}, \dots, S^{(R)} \leftarrow \text{Partition}(S)$

// **Step 2: Tree-Level Predictions**

3 **for**  $r = 1 \dots R$  **do**

4    $\hat{Y}^{(r)} \leftarrow \text{TreeED}(D, f_{LLM}, S^{(r)})$

// **Step 3: EM-Based Ensemble Consensus**

5 Initialize posterior  $\gamma_{i,j}(y)$  and confusion matrix  $\Theta^{(r)}$

6 **repeat**

    // **E-step: update posteriors**

7   **for each cell**  $(i, j); y \in \{0, 1\}$  **do**

8      $\gamma_{i,j}(y) \leftarrow \frac{\eta_y \prod_{r=1}^R \theta_{y, \hat{Y}_{i,j}^{(r)}}^{(r)}}{\sum_{y' \in \{0,1\}} \eta_{y'} \prod_{r=1}^R \theta_{y', \hat{Y}_{i,j}^{(r)}}^{(r)}}$

    // **M-step: update reliability matrices**

9   **for**  $r = 1 \dots R; y, \hat{y} \in \{0, 1\}$  **do**

10      $\Theta_{y, \hat{y}}^{(r)} \leftarrow \frac{\sum_{i,j: \hat{Y}_{i,j}^{(r)} = \hat{y}} \gamma_{i,j}(y)}{\sum_{i,j} \gamma_{i,j}(y)}$

11    $\eta_y \leftarrow \frac{1}{NM} \sum_{i,j} \gamma_{i,j}(y)$

12 **until convergence**

    // **Final consensus prediction**

13 **for each cell**  $(i, j)$  **do**

14    $\hat{Y}_{i,j} \leftarrow \arg \max_{y \in \{0,1\}} \gamma_{i,j}(y)$

15 **return**  $\hat{Y}$

---

true cell labels and tree-specific reliabilities as latent variables. By iteratively estimating these reliabilities and updating the consensus labels to approximate true cell labels, EM down-weights unreliable trees, reinforces consistent signals, and produces a principled, stable ensemble that outperforms naive methods.

**Latent variables and model parameters.** For each cell  $D[i, j]$ , we model its unknown ground-truth error label as a latent random variable  $Y_{i,j} \in \{0, 1\}$ . Each induced decision tree  $\hat{T}^{(r)}$  provides an observed prediction  $\hat{Y}_{i,j}^{(r)} \in \{0, 1\}$ . The probability that the latent label is  $y$  given all tree predictions is denoted by the posterior:

$$\gamma_{i,j}(y) = p(Y_{i,j} = y \mid \hat{Y}_{i,j}^{(1)}, \dots, \hat{Y}_{i,j}^{(R)}),$$

and the prior distribution over error labels is written as:

$$\eta_y = p(Y_{i,j} = y), \quad y \in \{0, 1\}.$$

To capture the reliability of each tree, we associate  $\hat{T}^{(r)}$  with a  $2 \times 2$  latent confusion matrix

$$\Theta^{(r)} = \begin{pmatrix} \theta_{00}^{(r)} & \theta_{01}^{(r)} \\ \theta_{10}^{(r)} & \theta_{11}^{(r)} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \theta_{y, \hat{y}}^{(r)} = p(\hat{Y}^{(r)} = \hat{y} \mid Y = y),$$

where each  $\theta_{y, \hat{y}}^{(r)}$  in  $\theta_{y, \hat{y}}^{(r)}$  characterizes how likely tree  $\hat{T}^{(r)}$  is to output  $\hat{y}$  when the true label is  $y$ .

**E-step.** The E-step updates the posterior of the true cell labels given the reliability matrix of each tree and the prior distribution computed in the M-step. Specifically, it applies Bayes' rule to compute the posterior responsibility:

$$\gamma_{i,j}(y) = \frac{\eta_y \prod_{r=1}^R \theta_{y, \hat{Y}_{i,j}^{(r)}}^{(r)}}{\sum_{y' \in \{0,1\}} \eta_{y'} \prod_{r=1}^R \theta_{y', \hat{Y}_{i,j}^{(r)}}^{(r)}}.$$

The likelihood term reflects how each tree tends to behave when the true label is  $y$ , while the prior  $\eta_y$  accounts for the overall error rate in the dataset. Multiplying them captures how strongly the tree predictions support label  $y$  in the context of expected error frequency. Normalizing over both labels yields a valid posterior distribution that reflects how likely each cell is to be erroneous.

*Initialization in the first iteration.* The first E-step initializes the posterior responsibilities directly from the TreeED predictions. For each cell, the initial posterior is obtained by normalizing the aggregated predictions from all trees, yielding a data-driven estimate of how likely the cell is to be clean or erroneous:

$$\gamma_{i,j}^{(0)}(y) = \frac{\sum_r \mathbf{1}\{\hat{Y}_{i,j}^{(r)} = y\}}{\sum_{y' \in \{0,1\}} \sum_r \mathbf{1}\{\hat{Y}_{i,j}^{(r)} = y'\}}.$$

**M-step.** In the M-step, given the posterior of true cell labels, we compute the reliability matrix of each tree and the prior distribution over error labels. For each tree  $\hat{T}^{(r)}$ , the  $(y, \hat{y})$  entry of its confusion matrix is computed as

$$\theta_{y, \hat{y}}^{(r)} = \frac{\sum_{i,j: \hat{Y}_{i,j}^{(r)} = \hat{y}} \gamma_{i,j}(y)}{\sum_{i,j} \gamma_{i,j}(y)}, \quad y, \hat{y} \in \{0, 1\},$$

where the numerator is the expected number of cells with true label  $y$  that tree  $\hat{T}^{(r)}$  predicts as  $\hat{y}$ , and the denominator is the expected number of cells with true label  $y$ . The prior distribution is computed using the empirical mean of the posteriors across all cells:

$$\eta_y = \frac{1}{NM} \sum_{i,j} \gamma_{i,j}(y).$$

As established in Lemma 1 and its proof in Section 5.3, the update rules in both the E-step and M-step monotonically improve the consensus quality of the ensemble.

**LEMMA 1 (MONOTONICITY OF EM UPDATES).** *Let  $o_{i,j}(y)$  be any variational distribution over the latent label  $Y_{i,j}$ , and define the evidence lower bound (ELBO) as*

$$\mathcal{F}(o, \Theta) = \sum_{i,j} \sum_y o_{i,j}(y) \left[ \log \eta_y + \sum_{r=1}^R \log \theta_{y, \hat{Y}_{i,j}^{(r)}}^{(r)} - \log o_{i,j}(y) \right].$$

*For an ensemble of  $R$  decision trees producing predictions  $\hat{Y}_{i,j}^{(r)}$ , maximizing  $\mathcal{F}$  with respect to either the variational posteriors  $o$  (E-step) or the reliability matrices  $\Theta$  (M-step) yields a monotonic increase in the marginal log-likelihood  $\log p(\hat{Y} \mid \Theta)$ . Consequently, each EM update improves the consensus quality of ensemble.*

**Consensus prediction.** After convergence, the posterior matrix  $\Gamma = [\gamma_{i,j}(y)]$  encodes the final consensus estimate for all cells. The unified ED result is obtained by taking the MAP label:

$$\hat{Y}_{i,j} = \arg \max_{y \in \{0,1\}} \gamma_{i,j}(y).$$



**Overall algorithm.** Algorithm 3 summarizes the complete EM-based ensemble consensus procedure in ForestED. Lines 1-2 perform sampling and partitioning, extracting a subset of informative rows from the original table. Lines 3-4 generate  $R$  tree-specific prediction matrices. Lines 5-17 implement the EM algorithm: the E-step (lines 7-8) refines the posterior distribution about each cell’s true label, while the M-step (lines 9-11) updates each tree’s reliability matrix and the overall prior distribution of error labels based on the inferred posteriors. This iterative refinement continues until the posterior distribution converges (line 12). Finally, it converts the posterior matrix into a binary consensus prediction via MAP inference, yielding the final ED result (lines 13–15).

### 5.3 Discussion and Analysis

**Explainability.** The ForestED maintains explainability at two complementary levels. At the tree level, each decision tree provides a root-to-leaf decision path for every cell prediction. At the ensemble level, the confusion matrix quantifies how much each tree contributes to the final decision, effectively revealing which reasoning patterns are considered trustworthy. Consequently, the posterior probability for each cell can be decomposed into weighted evidence from individual trees, allowing analysts to trace not only whether a cell is erroneous but also why, by inspecting which factors most influenced the consensus.

**Time complexity analysis.** The table contains  $N \times M$  cells. For a single decision tree in TreeED, the main computation consists of LLM-based rule generation, GNN training, and cell-level inference. The LLM component is invoked once per tree and is treated as a constant cost  $C_{\text{LLM}}$ . Training each GNN node on the bipartite graph requires  $O(NMd)$  time, where  $d$  is the embedding dimension, while applying the constructed tree to all cells costs  $O(NMk)$  for tree depth  $k$ . Thus, the overall time complexity of TreeED is  $O(NM(d+k) + C_{\text{LLM}})$ . With  $R$  independently constructed trees, the pre-consensus cost of ForestED becomes  $O(R(NM(d+k) + C_{\text{LLM}}))$ . During the EM-based consensus stage, each iteration evaluates posterior updates for all  $NM$  cells using predictions from all  $R$  trees, resulting in a per-iteration cost of  $O(NMR)$ . The overall time complexity of ForestED is  $O(R(NM(d+k) + C_{\text{LLM}}) + INMR)$ , where  $I$  is the number of iterations.

**Proof of Lemma 1.** Using Jensen’s inequality,

$$\log p(\hat{Y} \mid \Theta) \geq \mathcal{F}(o, \Theta),$$

so  $\mathcal{F}$  is a lower bound on the marginal log-likelihood. Fixing  $\Theta$ , maximizing  $\mathcal{F}$  over  $w$  yields

$$o_{i,j}(y) = p(Y_{i,j} = y \mid \hat{Y}, \Theta),$$

which uniquely maximizes the bound and increases  $\mathcal{F}$  unless already optimal. Fixing  $o$ , maximizing  $\mathcal{F}$  over each  $\Theta^{(r)}$  under the constraint  $\sum_{\hat{y}} \theta_{y,\hat{y}}^{(r)} = 1$  gives

$$\theta_{y,\hat{y}}^{(r)} = \frac{\sum_{i,j: \hat{Y}_{i,j} = \hat{y}} o_{i,j}(y)}{\sum_{i,j} o_{i,j}(y)}.$$

Thus each E-step and M-step maximizes the ELBO, ensuring

$$\mathcal{F}(o^{(t+1)}, \Theta^{(t+1)}) \geq \mathcal{F}(o^{(t)}, \Theta^{(t)}),$$

**Table 2: Dataset statistics used for evaluation.**

Dataset	Tuples	Attributes	Errors(%)	Error Types
Rayyan	1,000	11	29.19	PV, T, O, RV
Hospital	1,000	17	4.82	MV, PV, T, O, RV
Flights	2,376	6	34.51	MV, PV, T, O, RV
Beers	2,410	9	12.98	MV, PV, T, O, RV
Billionaire	2,614	22	9.16	MV, PV, T, O, RV
Movies	7,390	17	4.97	MV, PV, T, O
Tax	200,000	15	4.05	MV, PV, T, O, RV

which implies a monotonic increase in  $\log p(\hat{Y} \mid \Theta)$ . Since  $o$  determines posterior consensus and  $\Theta$  encodes tree reliability, improving the ELBO directly improves ensemble consensus.

## 6 EXPERIMENTAL EVALUATION

### 6.1 Experimental Setup

**Datasets.** We evaluate our approach on seven datasets following existing ED methods [25, 27, 29]. The datasets contain diverse error types, including missing values (MV), pattern violations (PV), typos (T), outliers (O), and rule violations (RV) as shown in Table 2.

**Baselines.** We evaluate ForestED against a range of state-of-the-art error detection (ED) methods for tabular data, including statistics-based approaches (dBoost [34]), rule-based systems (Raha [25]), and LLM-based methods (FM\_ED [27], ZeroED [29]). In addition, we report the performance of our TreeED, which corresponds to using one LLM-induced decision tree for error detection.

**Metrics:** In this paper, we primarily use *Precision*, *Recall*, and *F1-score*, which are widely adopted by existing error detection studies [25, 29]. For all three metrics, higher values indicate better error detection performance.

**Implementation details.** We use gpt-5 as the default LLM for all experiments, accessed through the OpenAI API with temperature fixed to 1.0. For uncertainty-driven sampling, we set the sampling ratio to  $\rho = 0.05$  with at most 100 sampled tuples, and each partition contains 10 tuples for decision-tree induction. For ZeroED, we use the same ratio without a cap, following the original paper. Induced decision trees have 4–8 levels, and each GNN node uses a two-layer GraphSAGE encoder (hidden dimension 64, learning rate  $10^{-2}$ ) trained for 2000 epochs. For EM-based consensus, EM iterates up to 100 rounds or until convergence threshold  $\Delta < 10^{-4}$ . As ForestED does not rely on manually defined constraints or domain knowledge, we provide only 2 labeled tuples per dataset for baselines that require manual supervision following [29]. Due to the high token usage of LLM-based baselines, we randomly sample 50 rows for FM\_ED and 500 rows for ZeroED for evaluation. All experiments run on a workstation with an Intel(R) Xeon(R) Silver 4314 CPU @ 2.40 GHz, an NVIDIA RTX A5000 GPU, and 512 GB RAM.

### 6.2 Overall Evaluation

**Exp-1: Overall detection performance.** Table 3 summarizes the performance across seven datasets. Traditional baselines such as dBoost and Raha perform poorly, consistently yielding much lower F1-scores than other methods, particularly on challenging datasets such as *Hospital*, *Billionaire*, *Movies*, and *Tax*, where the error rate is below 10%. LLM-based baselines improve performance but still show limitations: FM\_ED is highly unstable across datasets and sometimes underperforms traditional methods, whereas ZeroED is

Table 3: Overall Precision (Prec), Recall (Rec), and F1-score (F1).

Methods	Rayyan			Hospital			Flights			Beers			Billionaire			Movies			Tax		
	Prec	Rec	F1	Prec	Rec	F1	Prec	Rec	F1	Prec	Rec	F1	Prec	Rec	F1	Prec	Rec	F1	Prec	Rec	F1
dBoost	0.343	0.361	0.352	0.227	0.074	0.112	0.524	0.388	0.446	0.363	0.147	0.210	0.484	0.142	0.220	0.145	0.092	0.112	0.577	0.274	0.371
Raha	0.610	0.540	0.570	0.460	0.090	0.140	0.660	0.320	0.430	0.760	0.640	0.680	0.170	0.100	0.130	0.230	0.270	0.250	0.400	0.640	0.487
FM_ED	0.500	0.500	0.500	0.132	<b>0.844</b>	0.224	0.537	0.302	0.325	0.192	0.246	0.195	0.432	0.498	0.459	0.108	0.639	0.138	0.027	0.115	0.006
ZeroED	0.751	<b>0.631</b>	0.686	0.449	0.650	0.531	0.493	<b>0.720</b>	0.585	0.548	<b>0.957</b>	0.678	0.384	<b>0.746</b>	0.455	0.700	<b>0.696</b>	0.698	0.399	0.689	0.505
TreeED (avg)	0.995	0.550	<b>0.709</b>	0.638	0.416	0.472	<b>1.000</b>	0.535	0.697	0.741	0.928	0.782	0.644	0.369	0.358	0.700	0.576	0.583	<b>1.000</b>	<b>0.721</b>	<b>0.838</b>
ForestED	<b>0.998</b>	0.544	0.704	<b>0.844</b>	0.685	<b>0.756</b>	<b>1.000</b>	0.562	<b>0.720</b>	<b>0.974</b>	0.922	<b>0.947</b>	<b>0.698</b>	0.560	<b>0.566</b>	<b>0.934</b>	0.606	<b>0.735</b>	<b>1.000</b>	<b>0.721</b>	<b>0.838</b>

Table 4: Ablation study on components of ForestED across datasets.

Ablation	Rayyan			Hospital			Flights			Beers			Billionaire			Movies			Tax		
	Prec	Rec	F1	Prec	Rec	F1	Prec	Rec	F1	Prec	Rec	F1	Prec	Rec	F1	Prec	Rec	F1	Prec	Rec	F1
ForestED (wo gnn)	0.476	<b>0.919</b>	0.627	<b>1.000</b>	0.398	0.569	<b>1.000</b>	0.470	0.639	0.975	0.706	0.819	0.212	<b>0.806</b>	0.336	0.104	<b>0.720</b>	0.182	<b>1.000</b>	<b>0.724</b>	<b>0.840</b>
ForestED (wo ens.)	<b>0.998</b>	0.544	<b>0.704</b>	0.818	0.390	0.529	<b>1.000</b>	<b>0.593</b>	<b>0.737</b>	<b>0.989</b>	<b>0.951</b>	<b>0.970</b>	<b>0.817</b>	0.303	0.442	0.932	0.598	0.721	<b>1.000</b>	0.721	0.838
<b>ForestED (Full)</b>	<b>0.998</b>	0.544	<b>0.704</b>	0.844	<b>0.685</b>	<b>0.756</b>	<b>1.000</b>	<b>0.593</b>	<b>0.737</b>	0.974	0.922	0.947	0.698	0.560	<b>0.566</b>	<b>0.934</b>	0.606	<b>0.735</b>	<b>1.000</b>	0.721	0.838

more consistent and generally strong. TreeED performs strongly on many datasets, though its effectiveness varies with the induced tree structure and attribute characteristics. ForestED further improves consistency and achieves the best performance on nearly all datasets, offering greater robustness than TreeED. In terms of F1-score, it achieves average absolute gains of 49.2% over dBoost, 36.8% over Raha, 48.8% over FM\_ED, 16.1% over ZeroED, and 11.8% over TreeED, demonstrating the effectiveness of reliability-aware EM consensus for robust and accurate error detection.

**Exp-2: Ablation study.** Table 4 evaluates the contributions of the two key components in ForestED: GNN-based relational reasoning and EM-based ensemble consensus. Removing GNN nodes (*wo gnn*) from the decision tree consistently lowers recall and results in an average F1-score drop of about 18.2%, indicating that rule nodes alone cannot capture relational dependencies. Removing EM consensus (*wo ens.*) also degrades performance, with an average F1-score reduction of roughly 4.9%, reflecting that individual trees induced from different partitions may be biased or unstable when used alone. While the full ForestED model is not always the top performer on every metric for every dataset, it generally achieves the most balanced and stable results overall. This demonstrates that GNNs broaden structural coverage and EM consensus calibrates tree reliability, and that integrating both components yields more robust error-detection performance across datasets.

**Exp-3: Efficiency evaluation.** This experiment compares the token consumption and runtime efficiency of ForestED, FM\_ED, and ZeroED across multiple datasets. As shown in Figure 4(a), ForestED requires significantly fewer tokens than both ZeroED and FM\_ED. In terms of runtime, as shown in Figure 4(b), ForestED is slightly slower on small datasets but becomes more efficient as the dataset size increases, whereas ZeroED exhibits the opposite pattern. Both methods, however, run substantially faster than FM\_ED. Overall, ForestED achieves the best balance of token efficiency and time efficiency among state-of-the-art LLM-based ED approaches.

### 6.3 Robustness Evaluation

**Exp-4: Mean and standard deviation over 3 trials.** Table 5 reports the mean and standard deviation of precision, recall, and F1-score over three runs. Both FM\_ED and ZeroED show high instability, reflecting strong sensitivity to fluctuations in LLM-generated labels and classifier stochasticity. In contrast, ForestED achieves




Figure 4: Runtime and token cost across datasets.

Table 5: Mean and standard deviation of the metrics for FM\_ED, ZeroED, and ForestED over three trials.

Methods	Beers			Billionaire		
	Prec(std)	Rec(std)	F1(std)	Prec(std)	Rec(std)	F1(std)
FM_ED	0.192 (0.147)	0.246 (0.215)	0.195 (0.141)	0.432 (0.131)	0.498 (0.195)	0.459 (0.160)
ZeroED	0.548 (0.232)	<b>0.957</b> (0.007)	0.678 (0.178)	0.384 (0.257)	<b>0.746</b> (0.106)	0.455 (0.245)
ForestED	<b>0.974</b> (0.006)	0.922 (0.027)	<b>0.947</b> (0.016)	<b>0.698</b> (0.238)	0.560 (0.219)	<b>0.566</b> (0.027)

both the highest accuracy and the smallest standard deviation in F1-score. Its average F1-score standard deviation is consistently the lowest across datasets, representing a  $7\times$  reduction compared with FM\_ED and a  $10\times$  reduction compared with ZeroED. This substantial decrease demonstrates that the EM-based algorithm enhances robustness by calibrating tree reliabilities and aggregating multiple decision trees. As a result, ForestED provides the most robust and consistent error-detection performance across trials.

**Exp-5: Varying numbers of labels.** We vary the number of labeled records from 40 to 100 while keeping all other settings fixed. Figure 5 shows that additional supervision generally improves accuracy and stabilizes performance, though the magnitude of improvement differs across datasets. For *Flights*, the model remains highly stable with only 40 labeled tuples, indicating strong generalization under minimal supervision. For *Movies*, increasing the labels from 40 to 60 yields a substantial gain of roughly 25% in F1-score, while the performance from 60 to 100 labels becomes largely stable. Based on this observation, we use 100 labeled tuples as the upper bound in our experiments, ensuring stable performance without requiring excessive annotation effort.

**Exp-6: Varying LLMs.** Table 6 shows that the choice of LLM backbone influences ZeroED far more than ForestED. ZeroED’s F1-score varies substantially across models (with an average drop of about 25.5% between its best and worst backbone), reflecting its sensitivity to LLM-generated attribute-level classifiers. In contrast, ForestED exhibits much smaller fluctuations (average F1-score spread of only




Figure 5: Effect of varying the number of labeled records on model performance across different datasets.

Table 6: Performance comparison of ForestED and ZeroED using different LLM models on different datasets.

LLM Models	Rayyan			Flights		
	Prec	Rec	F1	Prec	Rec	F1
<b>ForestED</b>						
GPT-5	<b>0.998</b>	0.544	0.704	<b>1.000</b>	<b>0.562</b>	<b>0.720</b>
DeepSeek-V3	0.992	<b>0.575</b>	<b>0.728</b>	0.993	0.531	0.692
Qwen3	<b>0.998</b>	0.543	0.704	<b>1.000</b>	0.470	0.639
<b>ZeroED</b>						
GPT-5	<b>0.751</b>	0.631	<b>0.686</b>	<b>0.493</b>	<b>0.720</b>	<b>0.585</b>
DeepSeek-V3	0.270	0.646	0.375	0.174	0.603	0.387
Qwen3	0.365	<b>0.698</b>	0.479	0.430	0.687	0.529




Figure 6: Effect of varying error rates on model performance.

5.25% across backbones) and consistently outperforms the corresponding ZeroED variant under every LLM. This demonstrates that ForestED’s multi-tree design and EM-based consensus effectively buffer backbone-induced noise, providing more stable and reliable performance regardless of the underlying LLM.

**Exp-7: Varying error rates.** We evaluate the robustness of the three ED methods, ForestED, ZeroED, and FM\_ED, under increasing error rate ranging from 1% to 30%. As shown in Figure 6, ForestED consistently achieves the highest F1-scores across all error-rate settings on both *Rayyan* and *Flights*. Its performance remains largely stable as error number increases, exhibiting only minor fluctuations between the 1% and 30% settings. In contrast, ZeroED and FM\_ED perform substantially worse at low error rates, although both methods improve as more error cells become available for learning. This behavior highlights their reliance on higher error rate to establish reliable decision boundaries. Overall, the results demonstrate that ForestED is markedly more resilient to varying degrees of errors, maintaining strong detection accuracy where ZeroED and FM\_ED degrade, especially in low-error conditions.

**Exp-8: Varying tree numbers.** This experiment investigates how the number of decision trees affects the performance of ForestED. As shown in Table 7, using a small ensemble (2 or 5 trees) leads to suboptimal performance because of limited coverage of different error patterns. When the number increases to 10, both datasets achieve their best overall results, indicating that a moderate ensemble size balances diversity and stability in error reasoning. Further

Table 7: Performance of ForestED under different numbers of trees. “-” indicates that the LLM timed out.

Tree Number	Flights			Movies		
	Prec	Rec	F1	Prec	Rec	F1
2	1.000	0.470	0.639	-	-	-
5	1.000	0.556	0.715	-	-	-
10	<b>1.000</b>	<b>0.562</b>	<b>0.720</b>	<b>0.934</b>	<b>0.606</b>	<b>0.735</b>
20	1.000	0.562	0.720	0.182	0.698	0.289

Table 8: Performance of ForestED under different tree depths.

Tree Depth	Hospital			Beers		
	Prec	Rec	F1	Prec	Rec	F1
2~6	0.769	0.159	0.263	0.917	0.951	0.934
4~8	<b>0.844</b>	0.685	<b>0.756</b>	<b>0.974</b>	0.922	<b>0.947</b>
6~10	0.482	<b>0.700</b>	0.571	0.881	<b>0.953</b>	0.916




Figure 7: Correlation between F1 and ensemble reliability.

increasing the number of trees (e.g., 20) slightly degrades performance due to overfitting and increased label noise propagation. For some configurations, denoted by “-”, the LLM failed to generate valid responses within the default time window, highlighting the inefficiency of LLMs when required to process too many tuples. Overall, ForestED achieves the most stable and effective performance with approximately 10 trees per dataset.

**Exp-9: Varying tree depths.** We further study how the depth of individual decision trees influences the detection performance of ForestED. Table 8 reports results across two representative datasets. Shallow trees (depth 2–6) show limited capacity, leading to underfitting and low recall, while overly deep trees (depth 6–10) tend to overfit noisy records. The optimal performance is achieved when the tree depth ranges from 4–8, balancing interpretability and expressiveness, and yielding the highest F1-scores across both datasets.

## 6.4 Explainability Evaluation

**Exp-10: F1-score vs. ensemble reliability.** We assess whether the EM-estimated reliability scores meaningfully reflect the predictive quality of individual partitions. As shown in Figure 7, F1-scores and reliability values exhibit a clear positive linear trend across datasets, with Pearson correlations above 0.7. This indicates that partitions assigned higher reliability by the EM algorithm consistently achieve higher F1-scores, demonstrating that the consensus procedure accurately captures variations in partition quality. Overall, these results show that EM reliability serves as an explainable and trustworthy indicator of prediction consistency within ForestED.

**Exp-11: Case study.** We present a representative example to illustrate how the decision tree identifies errors in tabular data. Specifically, we choose an erroneous cell from the *Hospital* dataset at row




Figure 8: An example of decision tree.

690 and column *City*, where the tuple contains the value “birminxham” and the correct value is “birmingham”. One of the decision trees induced for this dataset is shown in Figure 8. Since the inspected column is not *PhoneNumber*, the decision path bypasses the root rule and moves to the GNN node `gnn_fd_provider_identity`. This node evaluates whether the tuple is consistent with functional dependency patterns learned between *ProviderNumber* and other identity-related attributes such as *HospitalName* and *PhoneNumber*. As the typo error in the *City* field does not violate the FD relational structure, the GNN node allows the execution to continue. The decision path next reaches `check_measurement_spacing`, a rule designed to detect formatting or spacing inconsistencies across textual attributes. This rule returns False, forwarding the tuple to `check_canonical_categories`. This rule validates whether a textual field matches the canonical spellings learned from the dataset. Here, the token “birminxham” deviates from the canonical category “birmingham”, causing the rule to return True and route the tuple to `leaf_error`. This example reflects the decision procedure of a single decision tree, while the dataset is partitioned into five subsets, each producing its own tree. Among these five predictions, three trees classify the value as erroneous while two classify it as clean. Our ensemble method aggregates these outputs and assigns a final error probability of 99.99%, resulting in a consensus judgment that the value is indeed erroneous.

## 7 RELATED WORK

**Error detection.** Error detection in relational data has progressed through four major paradigms. Early systems relied on integrity constraints, for instance denial constraints, to identify logical inconsistencies, with substantial work on scalable discovery (e.g., Hydra [3]) and efficient violation detection (e.g., FACET [31]). Beyond logic-based rules, statistical approaches such as Auto-Detect [16] introduced a corpus-driven notion of value compatibility, enabling the detection of anomalies that break global co-occurrence patterns rather than explicit constraints. A third paradigm, grounded in data-centric learning, reframed detection as a weakly supervised machine learning task. Representative systems include Raha [25], which builds ensemble feature vectors and trains a classifier with few-shot labels, and HoloDetect [14], which uses weak supervision

and augmentation from a small clean seed. The latest paradigm leverages foundation models, such as FM\_ED [27] and ZeroED [29], to enable zero-shot detection by prompting over serialized tuples. These LLM-based approaches exploit broad world knowledge to detect contextual inconsistencies, such as semantically mismatched but individually valid values, which earlier logic-based and statistical methods cannot capture.

**LLM for data quality management.** LLMs have recently been adopted across the data quality pipeline to move from syntactic checks toward semantic, context-aware reasoning. In data integration, prompt engineering has become central: schema matching and entity resolution increasingly rely on 1-to-N “selection” prompts that enable holistic comparison and allow the model to infer attribute importance and relational plausibility [30, 41]. In data cleaning, LLMs demonstrate strong capability in identifying single-row contextual errors by leveraging rich world knowledge, semantic cues, and intra-row dependencies [2]. Program-synthesis systems such as Cocoon [49] use the LLM as a high-level planner that reasons over statistical profiles and synthesizes executable validation or repair programs. Meanwhile, cost-driven hybrid frameworks such as Magneto [21] and Jellyfish [48] employ LLMs offline as teachers to generate training signals for smaller, secure student models that handle online inference, enabling scalable, efficient, and privacy-preserving deployment in practical data quality systems.

**LLM-based decision trees generation.** Recent efforts toward explainable LLMs have increasingly leveraged decision tree-based reasoning as a means to enhance interpretability and transparency. Methods such as [4, 45] demonstrate that tree structures can serve as an intermediate reasoning form, translating complex model behaviors into modular, human-understandable rules. These approaches highlight that decision trees not only provide a faithful post-hoc explanation of LLM predictions but can also be directly induced by the LLM to externalize its internal reasoning process. Complementary frameworks such as CORTEX [18] further emphasize structured rule extraction and cost-sensitive tree modeling, reinforcing the role of hierarchical logic as an interpretable abstraction layer for large models. Overall, this line of work establishes decision tree reasoning as a promising direction for bridging the gap between the opaque reasoning of LLMs and the explainable structure required for trustworthy AI systems.

## 8 CONCLUSION

In this paper, we presented an interpretable and robust LLM-based framework for tabular error detection under the paradigm of *LLM-as-an-inducer*. Unlike prior methods that treat LLMs as black-box annotators or rely solely on attribute-level classifiers, our approach integrates explicit reasoning structures with ensemble consensus to achieve both explainability and stability. TreeED leverages LLMs to induce hybrid decision trees composed of rule-based and GNN-based nodes, transforming implicit model reasoning into transparent, verifiable logic. Building on this foundation, ForestED enhances robustness by aggregating multiple induced trees through an EM-based consensus, effectively consolidating consistent predictions and mitigating variance across runs. Extensive experiments on seven diverse datasets demonstrate the superiority of our methods.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Mohamed Abdelaal, Tim Ktitarev, Daniel Städtler, and Harald Schöning. 2024. SAGED: Few-Shot Meta Learning for Tabular Data Error Detection.. In *EDBT*. 386–398.
- [2] Tommaso Bendinelli, Artur Dox, and Christian Holz. 2025. Exploring llm agents for cleaning tabular machine learning datasets. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.06664* (2025).
- [3] Tobias Bleifuß, Sebastian Kruse, and Felix Naumann. 2017. Efficient denial constraint discovery with hydra. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment* 11, 3 (2017), 311–323.
- [4] Lucas Carrasco, Felipe Urrutia, and Andr  s Abeliuk. 2025. Zero-shot decision tree construction via large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.16247* (2025).
- [5] Jiahui Chen, Yu Sun, Shaoxu Song, Haiwei Zhang, and Xiaojie Yuan. 2025. Minimum Change   Best Cleaning: Parallel and Incremental Error Detection under Integrity Constraints. *Proceedings of the ACM on Management of Data* 3, 4 (2025), 1–26.
- [6] Xu Chu, Ihab F Ilyas, Sanjay Krishnan, and Jiannan Wang. 2016. Data cleaning: Overview and emerging challenges. In *Proceedings of the 2016 international conference on management of data*. 2201–2206.
- [7] Alexander Philip Dawid and Allan M Skene. 1979. Maximum likelihood estimation of observer error-rates using the EM algorithm. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series C (Applied Statistics)* 28, 1 (1979), 20–28.
- [8] Amr Ebad, Ahmed Elmagarmid, Ihab F Ilyas, Mourad Ouzzani, Jorge-Arnulfo Quiane-Ruiz, Nan Tang, and Si Yin. 2013. NADEEF: A generalized data cleaning system. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment* 6, 12 (2013), 1218–1221.
- [9] Wenfei Fan, Floris Geerts, Xibei Jia, and Anastasios Kementsietsidis. 2008. Conditional functional dependencies for capturing data inconsistencies. *ACM Transactions on Database Systems (TODS)* 33, 2 (2008), 1–48.
- [10] Saeed Fathollahzadeh, Essam Mansour, and Matthias Boehm. 2025. CatDB: Data-catalog-guided, LLM-based Generation of Data-centric ML Pipelines. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment* 18, 8 (2025), 2639–2652.
- [11] Congcong Ge, Yunjun Gao, Xiaoye Miao, Bin Yao, and Haobo Wang. 2022. A Hybrid Data Cleaning Framework Using Markov Logic Networks. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering* 34, 5 (2022), 2048–2062. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TKDE.2020.3012472>
- [12] Nitin Gupta, Shashank Mujumdar, Hima Patel, Satoshi Masuda, Naveen Panwar, Sambaran Bandyopadhyay, Sameep Mehta, Shanmukha Guttula, Shazia Afzal, Ruhi Sharma Mittal, et al. 2021. Data quality for machine learning tasks. In *Proceedings of the 27th ACM SIGKDD conference on knowledge discovery & data mining*. 4040–4041.
- [13] Will Hamilton, Zhitaoying, and Jure Leskovec. 2017. Inductive representation learning on large graphs. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 30 (2017).
- [14] Alireza Heidari, Joshua McGrath, Ihab F Ilyas, and Theodoros Rekatsinas. 2019. Holodetect: Few-shot learning for error detection. In *Proceedings of the 2019 International Conference on Management of Data*. 829–846.
- [15] Tzu-Heng Huang, Catherine Cao, Vaishnavi Bhargava, and Frederic Sala. 2024. The alchemist: Automated labeling 500x cheaper than llm data annotators. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 37 (2024), 62648–62672.
- [16] Zhipeng Huang and Yeye He. 2018. Auto-detect: Data-driven error detection in tables. In *Proceedings of the 2018 International Conference on Management of Data*. 1377–1392.
- [17] Dongjun Jang, Youngchae Ahn, and Hyopil Shin. 2025. RCScore: Quantifying Response Consistency in Large Language Models. In *Proceedings of the 2025 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. 5701–5719.
- [18] M Kopanja, M Savi  , and L Longo. [n.d.]. CORTEX: A Cost-Sensitive Rule and Tree Extraction Method. 2025. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2502.03200> [n.d.].
- [19] Sanjay Krishnan, Jiannan Wang, Eugene Wu, Michael J Franklin, and Ken Goldberg. 2016. Activeclean: Interactive data cleaning for statistical modeling. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment* 9, 12 (2016), 948–959.
- [20] David D Lewis and Jason Catlett. 1994. Heterogeneous uncertainty sampling for supervised learning. In *Machine learning proceedings 1994*. Elsevier, 148–156.
- [21] Guoliang Li, Xuanhe Zhou, and Xinyang Zhao. 2024. Llm for data management. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment* 17, 12 (2024), 4213–4216.
- [22] Peng Li, Xi Rao, Jennifer Blase, Yue Zhang, Xu Chu, and Ce Zhang. 2021. Cleanml: A study for evaluating the impact of data cleaning on ml classification tasks. In *2021 IEEE 37th International Conference on Data Engineering (ICDE)*. IEEE, 13–24.
- [23] Lin Long, Rui Wang, Ruixuan Xiao, Junbo Zhao, Xiao Ding, Gang Chen, and Haobo Wang. 2024. On llms-driven synthetic data generation, curation, and evaluation: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.15126* (2024).
- [24] Mohammad Mahdavi and Ziawash Abedjan. 2021. Semi-Supervised Data Cleaning with Raha and Baran.. In *CIDR*.
- [25] Mohammad Mahdavi, Ziawash Abedjan, Raul Castro Fernandez, Samuel Madden, Mourad Ouzzani, Michael Stonebraker, and Nan Tang. 2019. Raha: A configuration-free error detection system. In *Proceedings of the 2019 International Conference on Management of Data*. 865–882.
- [26] Katie Matton, Robert Osazuwa Ness, John Gutttag, and Emre Kicman. 2025. Walk the talk? Measuring the faithfulness of large language model explanations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.14150* (2025).
- [27] Avnika Narayan, Ines Chami, Laurel Orr, Simran Arora, and Christopher R  . 2022. Can foundation models wrangle your data? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.09911* (2022).
- [28] Mona Nashaat, Aindrila Ghosh, James Miller, and Shaikh Quader. 2021. TabReformer: Unsupervised representation learning for erroneous data detection. *ACM/IMS Transactions on Data Science* 2, 3 (2021), 1–29.
- [29] Wei Ni, Kaihang Zhang, Xiaoye Miao, Xiangyu Zhao, Yangyang Wu, Yaoshu Wang, and Jianwei Yin. 2025. ZeroED: Hybrid Zero-shot Error Detection through Large Language Model Reasoning. In *2025 IEEE 41st International Conference on Data Engineering (ICDE)*. IEEE Computer Society, 3126–3139.
- [30] Marcel Parciak, Brecht Vandevoort, Frank Neven, Liesbet M Peeters, and Stijn Vansummen. 2024. Schema matching with large language models: an experimental study. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.11852* (2024).
- [31] Eduardo HM Pena, Eduardo C de Almeida, and Felix Naumann. 2021. Fast detection of denial constraint violations. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment* 15, 4 (2021), 859–871.
- [32] Jeremy Petch, Shuang Di, and Walter Nelson. 2022. Opening the black box: the promise and limitations of explainable machine learning in cardiology. *Canadian Journal of Cardiology* 38, 2 (2022), 204–213.
- [33] Minh Pham, Craig A Knoblock, Muhao Chen, Binh Vu, and Jay Pujara. 2021. SPADE: A Semi-supervised Probabilistic Approach for Detecting Errors in Tables.. In *IJCAI*. 3543–3551.
- [34] Clement Pit-Claudel, Zeld Mariet, Rachael Harding, and Sam Madden. 2016. Outlier detection in heterogeneous datasets using automatic tuple expansion. (2016).
- [35] Jiyuan Ren, Zhaocheng Du, Zhihao Wen, Qinglin Jia, Sunhao Dai, Chuhan Wu, and Zhenhua Dong. 2025. Few-shot LLM Synthetic Data with Distribution Matching. In *Companion Proceedings of the ACM on Web Conference 2025*. 432–441.
- [36] Xingyu Tan, Xiaoyang Wang, Qing Liu, Xiwei Xu, Xin Yuan, and Wenjie Zhang. 2025. Paths-over-graph: Knowledge graph empowered large language model reasoning. In *Proceedings of the ACM on Web Conference 2025*. 3505–3522.
- [37] Xingyu Tan, Xiaoyang Wang, Qing Liu, Xiwei Xu, Xin Yuan, Liming Zhu, and Wenjie Zhang. 2025. HydraRAG: Structured Cross-Source Enhanced Large Language Model Reasoning. In *Proceedings of the 2025 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. 14442–14470.
- [38] Jianwei Wang, Kai Wang, Ying Zhang, Wenjie Zhang, Xiwei Xu, and Xuemin Lin. 2025. On LLM-Enhanced Mixed-Type Data Imputation with High-Order Message Passing. *Proc. VLDB Endow.* 18, 10 (Sept. 2025), 3421–3434. <https://doi.org/10.14778/3748191.3748205>
- [39] Jianwei Wang, Yuehai Wang, Kai Wang, Xuemin Lin, Wenjie Zhang, and Ying Zhang. 2025. Ensemble-based Deep Multilayer Community Search. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.02194* (2025).
- [40] Jianwei Wang, Ying Zhang, Kai Wang, Xuemin Lin, and Wenjie Zhang. 2024. Missing data imputation with uncertainty-driven network. *Proceedings of the ACM on Management of Data* 2, 3 (2024), 1–25.
- [41] Tianshu Wang, Xiaoyang Chen, Hongyu Lin, Xuanang Chen, Xianpei Han, Le Sun, Hao Wang, and Zhenyu Zeng. 2025. Match, compare, or select? an investigation of large language models for entity matching. In *Proceedings of the 31st International Conference on Computational Linguistics*. 96–109.
- [42] Xinru Wang, Hannah Kim, Sajjadur Rahman, Kushan Mitra, and Zhongjie Miao. 2024. Human-llm collaborative annotation through effective verification of llm labels. In *Proceedings of the 2024 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. 1–21.
- [43] Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Fei Xia, Ed Chi, Quoc V Le, Denny Zhou, et al. 2022. Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 35 (2022), 24824–24837.
- [44] Yangyang Wu, Chen Yang, Mengying Zhu, Xiaoye Miao, Wei Ni, Meng Xi, Xinkui Zhao, and Jianwei Yin. 2025. A Zero-Training Error Correction System with Large Language Models. In *2025 IEEE 41st International Conference on Data Engineering (ICDE)*. 2949–2962. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICDE65448.2025.00221>
- [45] Sichao Xiong, Yigit Ihlamur, Fuat Alican, and Aaron Ontoyin Yin. 2024. Gptree: Towards explainable decision-making via llm-powered decision trees. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.08257* (2024).
- [46] Jiaxuan You, Xiaobai Ma, Yi Ding, Mykel J Kochenderfer, and Jure Leskovec. 2020. Handling missing data with graph representation learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 33 (2020), 19075–19087.
- [47] Xiao Yu, Zexian Zhang, Feifei Niu, Xing Hu, Xin Xia, and John Grundy. 2024. What Makes a High-Quality Training Dataset for Large Language Models: A Practitioners’ Perspective. In *Proceedings of the 39th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering*. 656–668.
- [48] Haochen Zhang, Yuyang Dong, Chuan Xiao, and Masafumi Oyamada. 2023. Jellyfish: A large language model for data preprocessing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.01678* (2023).

- [49] Shuo Zhang, Zezhou Huang, and Eugene Wu. 2025. Data cleaning using large language models. In *2025 IEEE 41st International Conference on Data Engineering Workshops (ICDEW)*. IEEE, 28–32.
- [50] Kangfei Zhao, Jeffrey Xu Yu, Hao Zhang, Qiyan Li, and Yu Rong. 2021. A learned sketch for subgraph counting. In *Proceedings of the 2021 International Conference on Management of Data*. 2142–2155.
- [51] Junhao Zhu, Tao Wang, Danlei Hu, Ziquan Fang, Lu Chen, Yunjun Gao, Tianyi Li, and Christian S. Jensen. 2024. T-Assess: An Efficient Data Quality Assessment System Tailored for Trajectory Data. *Proc. VLDB Endow.* 18, 3 (Nov. 2024), 666–674. <https://doi.org/10.14778/3712221.3712233>