

# Analyzing Deviations from Monotonic Trends through Database Repair

Shunit Agmon  
Technion  
Israel  
shunit.agmon@gmail.com

Jonathan Gal  
Technion  
Israel  
jonathan.gal@campus.technion.ac.il

Amir Gilad  
Hebrew University  
Israel  
amirg@cs.huji.ac.il

Ester Livshits  
Technion  
Israel  
esterlivshits@gmail.com

Or Mutay  
Technion  
Israel  
or.mutay@campus.technion.ac.il

Brit Youngmann  
Technion  
Israel  
brity@technion.ac.il

Benny Kimelfeld  
Technion  
Israel  
bennyk@cs.technion.ac.il

## Abstract

Datasets often exhibit violations of expected monotonic trends—for example, higher education level correlating with higher average salary, newer homes being more expensive, or diabetes prevalence increasing with age. We address the problem of quantifying how far a dataset deviates from such trends. To this end, we introduce Aggregate Order Dependencies (AODs), an aggregation-centric extension of the previously studied order dependencies. An AOD specifies that the aggregated value of a target attribute (e.g., mean salary) should monotonically increase or decrease with the grouping attribute (e.g., education level).

We formulate the AOD repair problem as finding the smallest set of tuples to delete from a table so that the given AOD is satisfied. We analyze the computational complexity of this problem and propose a general algorithmic template for solving it. We instantiate the template for common aggregation functions, introduce optimization techniques that substantially improve the runtime of the template instances, and develop efficient heuristic alternatives. Our experimental study, carried out on both real-world and synthetic datasets, demonstrates the practical efficiency of the algorithms and provides insight into the performance of the heuristics. We also present case studies that uncover and explain unexpected AOD violations using our framework.

## CCS Concepts


• Information systems → Data management systems.

## Keywords

Database repair, aggregate order constraints, trend analysis

## 1 Introduction

Real-world datasets frequently violate anticipated monotonic relationships, such as the expectation that the median salary increases with the education level, that newer homes are generally more expensive, and that the prevalence of diabetes rises with age. The detection and analysis of monotonic trends in data is a fundamental



**Figure 1: Median salary versus education level in the USA, computed with the Stack Overflow dataset. “College study” refers to people who have studied in college or university without a degree. “Doctoral” includes professional doctoral degrees (e.g., MD, JD) and other doctoral degrees (e.g., PhD).**

problem in statistics [13, 56, 58], with wide-ranging applications in economics, medicine, and the social sciences. For example, monotonicity constraints incorporated into predictive models have been shown to increase predictive accuracy for housing prices, disease prediction, student success, and more [30, 52, 69]. A central task in this domain is to determine whether an underlying relationship—often modeled through noise-aware regression—is monotonic, either increasing or decreasing, with respect to an explanatory variable. The inherent challenge is distinguishing monotonic relationships from random fluctuations, especially in high-noise or sparsely sampled data; notable contributions include the work of Ghosal et al. [25] and of Hall and Heckman [31], who developed reliable tests for monotonicity. In this work, we propose a complementary database-centric view on the problem of analyzing monotonic trends and explaining their violation, namely *measuring the amount of intervention* required to exhibit monotonicity.

*Example 1.1.* The Stack Overflow dataset<sup>1</sup> consists of responses from developers to questions about their jobs, including demographics, education level, role, and salary. We focus on entries from USA (8682 tuples). One might expect that, as the education level grows, so does the median yearly salary. This, however, is not the case, as Figure 1 shows (left bars). For example, the median salary of people with some college or university studies but without a degree (\$145K) is higher than that of people with an Associate’s degree (\$125K) or Bachelor’s degree (\$140K). Additionally, the median salary of people with primary and secondary school education (\$130K each) is higher than that of people with an Associate degree (\$125K). □

To analyze the violation of monotonic trends, we propose the *aggregate order dependency* (AOD), stating a monotonic trend exhibited by an aggregate query over an ordered grouping attribute. More precisely, an AOD has the form  $G \nearrow \alpha(A)$  where  $G$  is a grouping attribute (column name) with a linearly ordered domain,  $A$  is an aggregated attribute, and  $\alpha$  is an aggregate function. The AOD  $G \nearrow \alpha(A)$  states that whenever one grouping variable is greater than another, its aggregated value cannot be lower. For example, “education  $\nearrow$  median(salary)” states that the median salary grows with the level of education. Put differently, the AOD  $G \nearrow \alpha(A)$  states that the SQL query

SELECT  $G, \alpha(A)$  FROM  $R$  GROUP BY  $G$

should return a table that defines a monotonically non-decreasing function. One can analogously define the AOD  $G \searrow \alpha(A)$  that requires a non-increasing trend.

The computational challenge we study in this paper is that of finding a *cardinality-based repair* (C-repair for short), that is, the largest subset of the table that satisfies the AOD. While C-repairs have been traditionally studied as a *prescriptive* tool in data cleaning [20, 39, 44], our work is better motivated by the *descriptive* aspect of measuring how far the table is from satisfying the AOD and, consequently, the monotonic trend that it suggests. From another angle, our work can be seen as applying the “minimal repair” measure of inconsistency [7, 45, 49]; here, consistency is with respect to the AOD. Beyond their quantitative semantics, C-repairs can also serve as an explanatory tool of a qualitative nature: analyzing the removed tuples can shed light on the nature of the trend violation, as we demonstrate through several use cases in Section 7.

*Example 1.2.* The dataset discussed in Example 1.1 violates the AOD education  $\nearrow$  median(salary). A C-repair (Figure 1, central bars), removing the minimal number of tuples, requires deleting 77 tuples, constituting 0.88% of the data (17 people with college study and no degree and 60 with Associate degrees). In contrast, repairing for a *decreasing* trend education  $\searrow$  median(salary) requires the removal of a minimum of 566 tuples, which constitute 6.52% of the dataset. This suggests that the dataset is much closer to exhibiting an increasing trend than a decreasing one. We later discuss the *heuristic* repair that is referred to in the right bars of the figure. □

Computing a C-repair is challenging, both theoretically and pragmatically, since there can be exponentially many ways of restoring the AOD through tuple deletions (as is the case for functional dependencies [39, 44]). Hence, we begin with a complexity analysis

of the problem, showing that while the general case is NP-hard, several practically relevant aggregates admit polynomial-time solutions. We present a general algorithmic template that uses dynamic programming to reduce the problem to ones that involve a single group, which are arguably simpler. We show the instantiation of the template on a list of common aggregate functions  $\alpha$ , including max, min, count, count distinct, median, sum, and average. Hence, we establish a polynomial-time bound for each of these aggregates. However, in the case of sum and average, where the number of possible aggregation values can be exponential in the number of tuples, the resulting algorithm is only weakly polynomial, that is, it runs in polynomial time if we assume that the input represents the numbers in a unary encoding; we show that this weakening is necessary, as the problem is NP-hard otherwise.

Although the algorithmic template offers a polynomial-time guaranty, in practice, this time can be very long. For example, over an hour for 10K tuples with median, or for 1K tuples with avg. The algorithm is generic and applies to various aggregation functions under mild assumptions. While useful, this also means we are not using the specific properties of the aggregation functions, which could accelerate the computation. We address this limitation through two complementary approaches. First, we develop optimization techniques tailored to the specific aggregation functions, significantly reducing execution costs. Second, we introduce a heuristic method that computes a repair satisfying the AOD by repeatedly removing the tuple with the most impact on the violation, albeit potentially with more deletions than the C-repair. This heuristic serves two key purposes: (1) providing a practical alternative when computational resources are limited, and (2) yielding an upper bound on the number of deletions required. We demonstrate how this bound can be leveraged to substantially prune the search space of the dynamic program of the exact computation.

*Example 1.3.* As we demonstrate in Section 7, the heuristic algorithm performs well for several aggregate functions. However, in certain scenarios, it may yield substantially inferior repairs. For the use case described in Example 1.1, the heuristic algorithm computed a repair for the non-decreasing trend education  $\nearrow$  median(salary) in 0.52 seconds, removing 494 tuples—5.7% of the data. While this is 30× faster than the exact algorithm (15.9 seconds), it removed 6.4 times more tuples than necessary. Notably, it eliminated the entire secondary-school group.

As for the opposite AOD, namely education  $\searrow$  median(salary), the heuristic algorithm removed 8187 tuples (94.3% of the data) in 16.7 seconds. This number provides an upper bound on the number of tuples needed to be removed, but it does not give any information about the *minimum* amount of deletion needed to fulfill the AOD; hence, it cannot support a claim as the one closing Example 1.2. □

We then describe an extensive empirical study on our implementation of the algorithms. The datasets include the German credit [32], Stack Overflow,<sup>1</sup> H&M [60], Zillow,<sup>2</sup> and Diabetes,<sup>3</sup> as well as synthetic data that we generated. The empirical study demonstrates the effectiveness of the algorithms and optimizations and shows the quality of the heuristic solution, which is often highly

<sup>1</sup><https://survey.stackoverflow.co/2022> (accessed April 2025)

<sup>2</sup><https://www.zillow.com/research/data/>

<sup>3</sup><https://www.kaggle.com/datasets/iammustafaz/diabetes-prediction-dataset>

competitive, even though it takes a small fraction of the execution time of finding a C-repair.

In summary, our contributions are as follows: (1) We introduce the notion of an AOD to express a monotonic trend in the result of an aggregate query over a table; (2) We provide a complexity analysis of C-repairs for AODs, and present a general algorithmic framework that reduces the global repair problem to local problems on individual groups; (3) We develop multiple optimization techniques to improve the practical performance of the algorithms; (4) We propose a heuristic algorithm that efficiently computes approximate repairs and supports the exact algorithm by providing an upper bound for pruning the search space; (5) We conduct an experimental study on real and synthetic datasets.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. After an overview of related work in Section 2, we present in Section 3 the formal framework and define AODs. Section 4 provides a complexity analysis of the C-repair problem. In Section 5, we describe our implementation and algorithmic optimizations, followed by heuristic repair strategies in Section 6. Section 7 reports on our empirical evaluation, and we conclude in Section 8.

## 2 Related Work

*Database constraints.* A large body of work in the data management community has studied enforcing constraints on relational data via data repair, traditionally focusing on integrity constraints [6, 20]. This includes functional dependencies [10, 14, 27, 39, 44, 48], conditional functional dependencies [9, 24], multi-valued dependencies [63], denial constraints [15, 17, 59], and inclusion dependencies [10, 16, 38, 46]. The most common repair operations include tuple deletion [14–16, 26, 44, 46, 48], tuple insertion [63], and value updates [10, 17, 24, 27, 38, 39, 59]. The AOD entails a fundamentally different repair problem, since it involves aggregation. Repairs of aggregation-centric constraints have been studied by Flesca et al. [21, 22, 23], but they have not considered monotonicity—a central aspect of our framework.

Closer to our work is the line of research on dependencies that involve ordering, specifically the *order dependencies* (ODs) [18, 19, 28, 29, 35, 40, 57], also known as *ordered functional dependencies* [50, 51]. An OD of the form  $X \rightarrow_{\succeq} Y$  asserts that  $X$  functionally determines  $Y$ , and that the relationship is monotonic with respect to a specified order  $\succeq$  over the domain. Of similar flavor are the *trend dependencies* (TD) [64], capturing changes over time (e.g., “salaries do not decrease in time”). These formalisms strengthen functional dependencies by capturing monotonic dependencies between attributes. In contrast, our AODs consider an aggregation level of the data and do not require or entail any underlying functional dependency. In addition, past work in this category focused on logical analysis (satisfiability and implication) and constraint mining, differently from the focus of this work—quantifying violation via repairs.

*Statistical perspectives on monotonicity.* Monotonic relationships between variables, such as the expectation that an outcome variable consistently increases or decreases with an explanatory factor, have been extensively studied in statistics and econometrics. Much of that work focuses on detecting violations of monotonicity using nonparametric or regression-based methods, often under linearity

assumptions [25, 31, 53]. These approaches are common in applications such as environmental trend analysis [33], economics [41, 53], and financial forecasting [53]. Other research takes a more theoretical view, using property testing to assess monotonicity over general domains, including partial orders [8]. While this field focuses on identifying monotonic models with noise, our work offers a complementary perspective: we quantify the deviation from the trend by the amount of required database intervention that creates the expected behavior. Moreover, our framework accommodates general aggregation functions and is not bound to any specific one.

*Cherry-picking.* Another relevant line of research focuses on assessing the robustness of claims based on the results of aggregate queries [2, 3, 36, 42, 66, 67]. Wu et al. [66, 67] defined parameterized queries and analyzed how perturbations in input parameters affect the resulting claims, using measures of relevance and naturalness. Closer to our work, Asudeh et al. [3, 4] investigate the robustness of trendlines to selective endpoints or item selection, aiming to expose cherry-picking. While these approaches highlight the vulnerability of trend-based claims to manipulation, our work focuses on quantifying and repairing violations of expected trends in the data. The challenge of identifying misleading trends is, again, different from the focus of this work on the repair challenge.

## 3 Formal Framework

We begin by presenting the formal framework of this work, starting with preliminary concepts on databases.

*Database concepts.* A relation schema  $S$  is a sequence  $(A_1, \dots, A_k)$  of *attributes*. We denote by  $Att(S)$  the set  $\{A_1, \dots, A_k\}$ . We assume, without loss of generality, that all attributes are numeric. In particular, a relation  $r$  over  $S = (A_1, \dots, A_k)$  is a finite set of tuples in  $\mathbb{R}^k$ . If  $t \in r$  is a tuple and  $G \in Att(S)$ , then we denote by  $t[G]$  the value of  $t$  for the attribute  $G$ . We denote by  $r[G]$  the projection of  $r$  to  $G$ , that is, the set  $\{t[G] \mid t \in r\}$ . We also write  $r[A]$  to denote the bag-semantics projection of  $r$  to  $A$ , that is, the bag of values that occur under  $A$  without removing duplicates.

In this work, an *aggregate function*  $\alpha$  maps a bag  $V$  of numbers to a single value  $\alpha(V)$ . We focus on the common aggregate functions avg, sum, count, countd, min, max, and median.

Let  $G$  and  $A$  be two attributes of  $S$ , let  $r$  be a relation, let  $\alpha$  be an aggregate function, and let  $g \in \text{dom}(G)$  be a constant. We denote by  $\alpha_r(A \mid G = g)$  the value  $\alpha(\sigma_{G=g}r[A])$ , where  $\sigma_{G=g}r$  is the relation that consists of all tuples  $t \in r$  with  $t[G] = g$ .

*Aggregate Order Dependencies.* Let  $S$  be a relation schema. An *aggregate order dependency* (AOD) is an expression of the form  $G \nearrow \alpha(A)$  where  $G$  and  $A$  are attributes in  $Att(S)$ . We refer to  $G$  as the *grouping* attribute and to  $A$  as the *aggregate* attribute. A relation  $r$  *satisfies* the AOD  $G \nearrow \alpha(A)$ , denoted  $r \models G \nearrow \alpha(A)$ , if the following holds: for all values  $g$  and  $g'$  in  $r[G]$ , if  $g \leq g'$  then  $\alpha_r(A \mid G = g) \leq \alpha_r(A \mid G = g')$ . (We focus on *increasing* trends, but all our results are applicable to *decreasing* trends as well.)

*Example 3.1.* Consider the relation  $r$  on the left of Figure 2. The tables on the right give the aggregate values  $\alpha_r(\text{income} \mid \text{edu} = a)$  for  $\alpha = \text{sum}$  (top) and  $\alpha = \text{avg}$  (bottom). We can see that  $r$  satisfies the AOD  $\text{edu} \nearrow \text{sum}(\text{income})$ , since the sum column is monotonically increasing. On the other hand,  $r$  violates the AOD

person	edu	income
Ashley	1	1
Brandon	1	2
Chloe	2	2
Daniel	2	5
Emily	2	6
Faith	2	5
Gavin	2	2
Hanna	3	8
Isaac	3	4
Jerry	3	3
Katie	3	2
Larry	3	2
Marie	3	1
Nathan	3	1

edu	sum(income)
1	3
2	20
3	21

edu	avg(income)
1	1.5
2	4
3	3

**Figure 2: Example relation  $r$  (left) and statistics grouped by the education level (edu).**

$\text{edu} \nearrow \text{avg}(\text{income})$  since the average salary for education level 2 is higher than the average salary for education level 3.  $\square$

*Cardinality-based repair.* The main problem we study is that of finding a *cardinality-based repair* (C-repair for short) for an AOD. The formal definition is as follows.

**Definition 3.2.** A *monotonic subset* of  $r$  is a subset  $r'$  of  $r$  such that  $r' \models G \nearrow \alpha(A)$ . A *C-repair* of  $r$  is a monotonic subset of maximum size. Hence,  $r'$  is obtained from  $r$  by deleting the minimum possible number of tuples needed to satisfy  $G \nearrow \alpha(A)$ .

We illustrate the definition with an example.

**Example 3.3.** Continuing Example 3.1, let us consider the AOD  $\text{edu} \nearrow \text{avg}(\text{income})$ . We can repair  $r$  by removing the tuples of Larrie, Nathan, and Marie (highlighted in green), which would result in  $\alpha_{r'}(\text{income} \mid \text{edu} = 3) = 4.25$  and, therefore, satisfy the AOD. Nevertheless, we can also repair  $r$  by removing the tuples of Daniel and Emily (highlighted in pink), which would result in  $\alpha_{r'}(\text{income} \mid \text{edu} = 2) = 3$ . In this example, removing any single tuple will not satisfy the AOD, so the repair requires removing at least two tuples. Hence, we conclude that removing the tuples of Daniel and Emily results in a C-repair of size 12.  $\square$

## 4 The Complexity of C-repairs

In this section, we investigate the computational complexity of finding a C-repair for an AOD. The main result is the following.

**THEOREM 4.1.** Let  $G \nearrow \alpha(A)$  be an AOD.

- (1) For  $\alpha \in \{\max, \min, \text{count}, \text{countd}, \text{median}\}$ , a C-repair can be found in polynomial time.
- (2) For  $\alpha \in \{\text{sum}, \text{avg}\}$ , a C-repair can be found in pseudo-polynomial time.

Recall that *pseudo-polynomial time* means that the running time is polynomial if we assume that the numbers (here, in the column  $A$ ) are integers given in a unary representation. In Section 4.3, we will show that this weakening is necessary, since the problem is NP-hard if we assume a binary representation.

To prove the theorem, we present algorithms for computing C-repairs for different aggregate functions  $\alpha$ . We begin with a general

**Algorithm 1:** Dynamic programming algorithm for C-repair: CardRepair.

**Input :** Relation  $r$ , AOD  $G \nearrow \alpha(A)$

**Output :** Maximum-size subset  $r' \subseteq r$  such that  $r' \models G \nearrow \alpha(A)$ .

```

1 for  $x \in V_\alpha(r)$  do
2    $H_0[x] \leftarrow \emptyset$ 
3 for  $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$  do
4   for  $x \in V_\alpha(r_i)$  do
5     if  $O_\alpha(r_i, x) = \emptyset$  then
6        $H_i[x] \leftarrow H_{i-1}[x]$ 
7     else
8        $H_i[x] \leftarrow O_\alpha(r_i, x) \cup H_{i-1}[\arg \max_{y \leq x} |H_{i-1}[y]|]$ 
9 return  $H_m[\max(V_\alpha(r))]$ 

```

procedure that applies to all aggregate functions (and requires some sub-procedures to be implemented) and then proceed to specific ones. Throughout this section, we assume the AOD is  $G \nearrow \alpha(A)$  and refer to the input relation as  $r$ .

### 4.1 General Procedure

We first show a dynamic programming algorithm for finding a C-repair (described in Algorithm 1). The algorithm requires specific procedures that depend on the aggregation function  $\alpha$ . In the next sections, we discuss the realization of these procedures for specific aggregation functions. The procedures are as follows.

- (1) The first procedure takes a relation  $r$  as input, and produces a set  $V_\alpha(r)$  that contains all possible values  $\alpha_{r'}(A)$  that any nonempty subset  $r' \subseteq r$  can take. For example, if  $\alpha$  is max or min, then  $V_\alpha(r)$  can be  $r[A]$ .
- (2) The second procedure takes as input a relation  $r$  with a single group (hence, it ignores the grouping attribute  $G$ ) and a value  $x \in V_\alpha(r)$ , and it computes an optimal (maximum-size) relation  $r' \subseteq r$  such that  $\alpha(r'[A]) = x$ , that is, the aggregate value is exactly  $x$ . We denote  $r'$  by  $O_\alpha(r, x)$ . If no such  $r'$  exists, then we define  $O_\alpha(r, x) = \emptyset$ . (Later on, we will refer to this problem as *aggregation packing*.)

**Example 4.2.** Consider again the relation  $r$  of Figure 2, and let  $\alpha$  be avg. Then  $V_\alpha(r)$  should include (at least) every mean of every possible bag of values from the income column. If  $r$  consists of the tuples of Daniel, Emily, and Faith, and  $\alpha$  is avg, then  $O_\alpha(r, 5)$  consists of the tuples of Daniel and Faith.  $\square$

We describe how to compute  $V_\alpha(r)$  and  $O_\alpha(r, x)$  efficiently for different aggregation functions in Section 4.2. Before we do so, we show how  $V_\alpha(r)$  and  $O_\alpha(r, x)$  can be used for computing a C-repair.

For convenience, we use the following definitions. Let  $r[G] = \{g_1, \dots, g_m\}$  where  $g_i < g_j$  whenever  $i < j$ . We denote by  $r_i$  the relation  $\{t \in r \mid t[G] = g_i\}$ , which we refer to as a *group*. For  $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ , we denote by  $r_{\leq i}$  the relation  $r_1 \cup \dots \cup r_i$ . As an example, referring to the relation  $r$  of Example 3.1, the relation  $r_2$  consists of the tuples of Chloe, Daniel, Emily, Faith, and Gavin, and the relation  $r_{\leq 2}$  includes, in addition to the five, the tuples of Ashley and Brandon.

Algorithm 1 applies dynamic programming by increasing  $i = 1, \dots, m$ . For each  $i$  and  $x \in V_\alpha(r_i)$ , the algorithm computes  $H_i[x]$ , which is a largest subset  $r' \subseteq r_{\leq i}$  such that  $r'$  satisfies the AOD and, in addition, the value of the rightmost bar is  $x$ ; that is, if  $g$  is the maximal value in  $r'[G]$ , then  $\alpha_{r'}(A \mid G = g) = x$ . For each  $i$  and  $x \in V_\alpha(r_i)$ , the algorithm considers (in lines 4–8) two cases.

- (1) In the first case,  $O_\alpha(r_i, x)$  is empty; that is, no subset of  $r_i$  has the  $\alpha$  value  $x$ . In this case,  $H_i[x]$  is simply  $H_{i-1}[x]$  (ignoring the group  $r_i$ ).
- (2) Otherwise, if  $O_\alpha(r_i, x)$  is nonempty, then  $H_i[x]$  is the union of  $O_\alpha(r_i, x)$  and the best  $H_{i-1}[y]$  over all  $y \leq x$ .

## 4.2 Instantiations

Next, we present instantiations of Algorithm 1 to specific aggregate functions  $\alpha$  by showing how to compute  $V_\alpha(r)$  and  $O_\alpha(r, x)$  in polynomial time.

**4.2.1 Polynomial-Time Instantiations.** We begin with polynomial-time instantiations that give rise to the first part of Theorem 4.1.

*Max and min.* When  $\alpha$  is max, the set  $V_\alpha(r)$  of possible values over  $r$  is simply the set of values in the column  $A$ . For  $x \in V_\alpha(r)$ , the set  $O_\alpha(r, x)$  is simply the set  $\{t \in r \mid t[A] \leq x\}$  of all tuples where the  $B$  attribute is at most  $x$ . The case of min is similar, except that  $O_\alpha(r, x)$  is the set  $\{t \in r \mid t[A] \geq x\}$ .

*Count and count-distinct.* For count, the set  $V_\alpha(r)$  is  $\{0, \dots, |r|\}$ , and  $O_\alpha(r, x)$  can be any subset of size  $x$ . For countd, the set  $V_\alpha(r)$  is  $\{0, \dots, |r[A]|\}$ ; for  $x \in V_\alpha(r)$ , the set  $O_\alpha(r, x)$  contains the tuples with the  $x$  most frequent  $A$  values in  $r$ . More precisely, for each  $a \in r[A]$ , denote  $n_a = |\{t \in r \mid t[A] = a\}|$ . Let  $a_1, \dots, a_m$  be the values of  $r[A]$  sorted by decreasing  $n_{a_i}$ . Then

$$O_{\text{countd}}(r, x) = \{t \in r \mid t[A] \in \{a_1, \dots, a_x\}\}.$$

*Median.* The set  $V_\alpha(r)$  of possible median values over  $r$  is

$$\{t[A] \mid t \in r\} \cup \{(t_1[A] + t_2[A])/2 \mid t_1, t_2 \in r\}.$$

For  $x \in V_\alpha(r)$ , we denote by  $n_x^>$ ,  $n_x^-$ , and  $n_x^<$  the number of tuples  $t \in r$  with  $t[A] > x$ ,  $t[A] = x$ , and  $t[A] < x$ , respectively. Let  $t_1, \dots, t_n$  be the tuples of  $r$  sorted by increasing  $t_i[A]$ . Then, the set  $O_\alpha(r, x)$  is the largest of the two candidate sets  $r_{\text{include}}$  and  $r_{\text{exclude}}$ . The set  $r_{\text{include}}$  is the largest subset of  $r$  where  $x$  is the median by being the single middle element. Hence, the number of values higher than and lower than  $x$  should be equal (and the size of the set is odd):

$$r_{\text{include}} = \begin{cases} \emptyset & \text{if } n_x^- = 0, \\ r & \text{if } n_x^- \neq 0 \text{ and } n_x^> = n_x^<, \\ \{t_1, \dots, t_{2n_x^- + n_x^>}\} & \text{if } n_x^- \neq 0 \text{ and } n_x^> > n_x^<, \\ \{t_{n_x^- - n_x^> + 1}, \dots, t_n\} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

The set  $r_{\text{exclude}}$  is the largest subset where  $x$  is the median because it is the average of two middle elements, which is only possible for an even-sized set. Let  $S = \{(i, j) \mid t_i[A] + t_j[A] = 2x, i < j\}$  and let  $(i^*, j^*) = \arg \max_{(i, j) \in S} \{\min\{i-1, n-j\}\}$ . Then,

$$r_{\text{exclude}} = \begin{cases} \emptyset & \text{if } S = \emptyset; \\ \{t_1, \dots, t_{i^*-1}\} \cup \{t_{j^*}, t_{j^*}\} & \text{if } i^* - 1 \leq n - j^*; \\ \cup \{t_{j^*+1}, \dots, t_{j^*+i^*-1}\} & \\ \{t_{i^*-n+j^*}, \dots, t_{i^*-1}\} \cup \{t_{i^*}, t_{j^*}\} & \text{otherwise.} \\ \cup \{t_{j^*+1}, \dots, t_n\} & \end{cases}$$

Note that the goal here is to construct the largest possible balanced subset around a pair  $(t_i, t_j)$ . The number of tuples that we can place on either side of this pair is at most  $\min\{i-1, n-j\}$ . The total size of the subset is  $2 + 2 \cdot \min\{i-1, n-j\}$ ; hence, to maximize this size, we must choose the pair maximizing the value  $\min\{i-1, n-j\}$ .

**4.2.2 Weakly polynomial-time instantiations.** For sum and average, we assume that values in  $r[A]$  are integers given in a unary representation (hence, establish pseudo-polynomial time as stated in Theorem 4.1). Throughout this section, we denote  $r = \{t_1, \dots, t_n\}$ .

*Sum.* We begin with  $\alpha = \text{sum}$ . For the set  $V_\alpha(r)$  we can use  $V_{\text{sum}}(r) = \{\text{sum}(r^-[A]), \dots, \text{sum}(r^+[A])\}$  where  $r^-$  (resp.,  $r^+$ ) is the subset of  $r$  consisting of the tuples with a negative (resp., positive) value in the  $B$  attribute.

For  $x \in V_\alpha(r)$ , the computation of  $O_\alpha(r, x)$  can be done via a standard dynamic program for the knapsack problem, as follows. The program computes the value  $M[j, s]$ , for  $j = 0, \dots, n$  and  $s \in V_\alpha(r)$ , that holds the maximal size of any subset of  $\{t_1, \dots, t_j\}$  with the sum  $s$  of  $A$  values. As an example, considering the relation  $r$  of Figure 2, the value  $M[5, 8] = 3$ , as witnessed by the subset that corresponds to Ashley, Brandon, and Daniel.

With the  $M[j, s]$  computed,  $O_\alpha(r, x)$  is simply  $M[n, x]$ . Beginning with  $j = 0$ , we set

$$M[j, s] = 0 \text{ if } s = 0, \text{ and } M[j, s] = -\infty \text{ otherwise.}$$

For  $j > 0$  and any  $s \in V_\alpha(r)$ , we check whether  $s - t_j[A] \in V_\alpha(r)$ . If so, we set

$$M[j, s] = \max(M[j-1, s], 1 + M[j-1, s - t_j[A]]) .$$

If  $s - t_j[A] \notin V_\alpha(r)$ , then we set  $M[j, s] = M[j-1, s]$ .

*Average.* Consider now  $\alpha = \text{avg}$ . For the set  $V_\alpha(r)$  we can choose

$$V_{\text{avg}}(r) = \{s/\ell \mid s \in V_{\text{sum}}(r) \wedge 1 \leq \ell \leq r\} .$$

For  $O_\alpha(r, x)$ , we construct the data structure  $M'$  that has the three arguments  $j, \ell$ , and  $s$  for  $j = 0, \dots, n$ ,  $\ell = 0, \dots, j$ , and  $s \in V_{\text{sum}}(r)$ . The value  $M'[j, \ell, s]$  is Boolean, with  $M'[j, \ell, s]$  being true if and only if  $\{t_1, \dots, t_j\}$  has a subset with precisely  $\ell$  tuples, where the  $A$  values sum up to  $s$ . As an example, in Figure 2, both  $M'[5, 8, 2]$  is true (due to Brandon and Emily) and  $M'[5, 8, 3]$  is true (due to Ashley, Brandon, and Daniel). To set  $O_\alpha(r, x)$ , we take the maximal value  $\ell$  such that  $M'[j, \ell, s]$  is true and  $s = \ell \cdot x$ . (If no such  $s$  and  $\ell$  exist, then we set  $O_\alpha(r, x) = \emptyset$  as per our convention.) We build  $M'$  as follows.

- For  $j = 0$ , we set  $M'[j, \ell, s]$  to true if  $\ell = 0$  and  $s = 0$ , and false otherwise.
- For  $\ell = 0$  and every  $j$ , we set  $M'[j, \ell, s]$  to true if  $s = 0$ , and false otherwise.

- For  $j > 0$  and  $\ell > 0$ , we check whether  $s - t_j[A] \in V_\alpha(r)$ ; if so:  

$$M'[j, \ell, s] = M'[j - 1, \ell, s] \vee M'[j - 1, \ell - 1, s - t_j[A]],$$
otherwise, if  $s - t_j[A] \notin V_\alpha(r)$ , then  $M'[j, \ell, s] = M'[j - 1, \ell, s]$ .

### 4.3 Hardness of Sum and Average

The following theorem implies that the pseudo-polynomial weakening of Theorem 4.1 is required, since finding a C-repair is intractable for  $\alpha = \text{sum}$  and  $\alpha = \text{avg}$  under the conventional binary representation of numbers. The proof is available in Section A.

**THEOREM 4.3.** *Let  $G \nearrow \alpha(A)$  be an AOD where  $\alpha$  is either sum or avg. It is NP-hard to find a C-repair (under the conventional binary representation of numbers).*

## 5 Implementation and Optimizations

Next, we discuss the implementation of CardRepair (Algorithm 1), along with its instantiations. We also discuss practical optimizations of the implementation.

The implementation uses a single data structure (dictionary)  $H$  instead of the  $m$  different  $H_i$ s of Algorithm 1. To do so, in line 4 we traverse the  $x$ s in decreasing order, thereby assuring that we do not run over values from the previous iteration (i.e., those belonging to  $H_{i-1}$ ) that are needed for computing  $H[x]$  at iteration  $i$ ; this holds because the computation of  $H_i[x]$  requires only values  $H_i[y]$  such that  $y \leq x$ . By doing so, we can restrict line 4 to iterate over only *feasible* values  $x$  of  $r_i$  (i.e., the ones satisfying  $O(r_i, x) \neq \emptyset$ ), which we compute in advance. The rest of the values are set in a previous iteration (hence, due to line 6, need not be changed). We use lazy initialization of  $H$ , so we avoid lines 1–2 altogether.

### 5.1 Pruning based on Upper Bounds

CardRepair computes a solution (subset) for every feasible aggregation value and subset size. We can prune the search space to ignore subsets that are too small. For example, consider an AOD over a database with 1K tuples, and assume we know of a monotonic subset satisfying the AOD by removing 100 tuples. CardRepair will compute a solution for every subset size, but solutions removing more than 100 tuples will never be used, as they cannot be completed into a C-repair, and therefore, can be avoided altogether.

In this work, we propose two methods of achieving a bound on the number of tuples to remove. The first is to compute an *approximate* repair using a fast algorithm that makes the best effort to build a large (but possibly not the largest) monotonic subset. Such a heuristic algorithm is described in Section 6.

We utilize this pruning for the computation of  $O(r_i, x)$  in the cases of sum and avg, which are the most computationally intensive. For that, we replace the computation of  $M[j, s]$  (or,  $M'[j, \ell, s]$  for avg) with a new (yet conceptually equivalent) data structure  $P[j, s]$  ( $P'[j, \ell, s]$  for avg), which holds the minimal number of tuples needed to be deleted from  $\{t_1, \dots, t_j\}$  in order to satisfy the AOD, starting with  $j = 0$  (i.e., no tuples are removed from  $r$ ) and  $s = \alpha_r(A)$ , where  $P[j, s] = 0$ . This allows us to ignore the entries  $P[j, s]$  and avoid their storage in the case where  $P[j, s] > h$ , where  $h$  is the number of tuples removed in a given approximate repair. We elaborate on this optimization in Section B.2.

The second method exploits a dominance relation over partial solutions saved in  $H$ : a solution is said to dominate another if it retains more tuples and induces weaker constraints on the remaining groups. Dominated solutions can be pruned from the search space without affecting optimality. We elaborate more on this in Section B.1. In general, while the pruning strategies for  $H$  we describe there substantially reduce  $H$ , their current overhead diminishes a runtime improvement.

In the next section, we show how to compute  $O(r_i, x)$  in a holistic way for all relevant  $x$ , and there we also show how the bound  $h$  can be incorporated for avg, sum, and median.

### 5.2 Holistic Packing

**5.2.1 Naive WholePack( $\alpha$ ).** Algorithm 1 requires a packing procedure to compute the set  $O_\alpha(r_i, x)$  for each value  $x \in V_\alpha(r_i)$ . This computation is costly, especially in the cases of sum, avg and median. For sum and avg, recall that we populate data structures containing the optimal subset size for each aggregation value (Section 4.2.2). In Algorithm 1, these data structures need to be populated from scratch for every  $x \in V_\alpha(r_i)$ . We can optimize the algorithm by populating these data structures once, before the iteration in line 3 and without repeating their shared computation. For median, instead of searching for a tuple (or pair) that yields a specific median  $x$  for each  $x \in V_\alpha(r_i)$ , we can iterate once over all tuples and tuple pairs and store the resulting medians.

Computing the  $O_\alpha(r_i, x)$  in a holistic manner for all  $x \in V_\alpha(r_i)$  enables further optimizations for specific aggregation functions. Next, we devise such optimizations for each of the three aggregates  $\alpha$ ; we refer to the optimized procedures uniformly as WholePack( $\alpha$ ). As we show in Section 7, the holistic computation gives considerable acceleration of the computation of a repair.

**5.2.2 Optimizing WholePack(median).** We next describe an algorithm to compute  $O_{\text{median}}(r_i, x)$  holistically for all feasible medians  $x$ . This allows us to avoid the search for the specific tuples that yield each median. Furthermore, we can also iterate over unique values in  $r_i$  instead of a costly iteration over tuples. Due to its length, the pseudocode is omitted and can be found in Section B.3.

As described in Section 4.2.1, a median  $x$  is either the  $A$  value of a single middle tuple (if the number of tuples is odd) or the average of the  $A$  values of two middle tuples (if it is even). In what follows, we refer to the middle tuple(s) as pivot(s).

The algorithm uses a histogram to keep track of the number of tuples on each side of the pivot(s). It maintains two data structures: a mapping  $M[x]$ , representing the size of the largest subset of  $r_i$  with median  $x$ , and a mapping  $D[x]$  for reconstructing this subset, containing the (one or two) pivots and the number of tuples on each side to include in the subset. It addresses three cases:

- (1) A single middle tuple: the algorithm iterates over the tuples  $t_i$  sorted by  $t_i[A]$  within a pruned range  $i \in [n/2 - h/2, n/2 + h/2]$  determined by the repair size bound  $h$ . For each tuple, it calculates the size of the largest balanced subset that can be formed around it as the single median and updates  $M$  and  $D$  if a new maximum is found.
- (2) Two adjacent middle tuples: A similar computation is performed for medians formed by pairs of consecutive tuples.
- (3) Two nonadjacent middle tuples: the algorithm iterates over pairs of unique values from the histogram that stores, for each  $A$



value, its number of appearances in  $r_i$ . For each pair  $(a_1, a_2)$ , the histogram is used to compute  $k_{\text{left}}$  (the number of tuples with  $A$  value at most  $a_1$ ) and  $k_{\text{right}}$  (the number of tuples with  $A$  value at least  $a_2$ ). The maximum size of a balanced subset around this pair is  $2 \cdot \min\{k_{\text{left}}, k_{\text{right}}\}$ . The structures  $M$  and  $D$  are updated if a new maximum is found. This method avoids the costly process of checking all pairs of nonadjacent tuples.

**5.2.3 Optimizing WholePack(sum).** We next describe an algorithm to compute  $O_{\text{sum}}(r_i, x)$  holistically for all feasible sums  $x$ , to avoid the repeated population of  $M[j, s]$  (described in Section 4.2.2). We additionally apply a strategy of iterating over unique values instead of individual tuples (as in Section 5.2.2). We next describe an additional optimization, based on existing optimized solutions for the knapsack problem [47, 55]. For the latter optimization, we assume that all  $A$  values are positive.

Let  $v_1, \dots, v_n$  denote the unique  $A$  values in ascending order and stored in the histogram. Algorithm 2 maintains two data structures: (1) an array  $M$  where an index  $s$  represent a possible sum, and  $M[s]$  is the maximum size of a subset with sum  $s$ , and (2) a matrix  $D$ , where  $D[j, s]$  represents the number of instances of the unique value  $v_j$ , used in the maximum subset for sum  $s$ .  $D$  can also be used to reconstruct the subset for a given feasible sum  $s$ .

The algorithm builds these data structures by iteratively processing each unique value  $v_j$  from the histogram in ascending order. The algorithm considers two distinct cases for each sum  $s$ :

- (1) No instances of  $v_j$  left (lines 12-17): This is the case if the solution for the sum  $s - v_j$  has already used every available copy of  $v_j$ , i.e.,  $D[j, s - v_j] = \text{Hist}[v_j]$ . The algorithm must therefore reevaluate how to form the sum  $s$  by checking different combinations involving  $v_j$  and the previous unique values.
- (2) There are available instances of  $v_j$  left (lines 19-21): This is the case if the solution for the sum  $s - v_j$  did not require all copies of  $v_j$ . Meaning,  $D[j, s - v_j] < \text{Hist}[v_j]$ . Here, we rely on an insight (stated in Lemma 5.1), that the maximum subset for a sum  $s$  can be found by comparing just two scenarios: the best solution for  $s$  without using  $v_j$ , and the best solution formed by adding  $v_j$  to the best subset for sum  $s - v_j$ .

**LEMMA 5.1.** *If  $D[j, s - v_j] \neq \text{Hist}[v_j]$ , then either  $D[j, s] = 0$  or  $D[j, s] = D[j, s - v_j] + 1$ .*

The proof of the lemma is in Section A, and a detailed running example can be found in Section B.4. As the algorithm builds the set of feasible sums from smallest to largest, it cannot be combined with the Dictionary pruning optimization from Section 5.1.

**5.2.4 Optimizing WholePack(avg).** As in the previous section, a holistic computation of  $O_{\text{avg}}(r_i, x)$  for all feasible averages  $x$  enables skipping repeated computations. In the following, we describe several additional optimizations.

First, we modify the data structure to a value-based semantic (instead of tuple-based), which greatly reduces the size of the data structure. Recall that for avg, we used a dynamic programming table  $M'[j, \ell, s]$  that stores true if there is a subset of  $\{t_1, \dots, t_j\}$  of size  $\ell$  and sum  $s$  of  $A$  values. We modify the algorithm to maintain a table  $P[s, \ell]$  of sums and sizes.

---

**Algorithm 2: WholePack(sum)**


---

**Input** : A bag of values  $r_i[A]$ .  
**Output** : Array  $M$  mapping sums to maximum subset sizes, and an array  $D$  mapping unique value ids  $j$  and sums  $s$  to the number of usages of  $v_j$  in the construction of  $s$ .

```

1 Hist  $\leftarrow$  a histogram of  $r_i[A]$ , in ascending order by values  $v_j$ 
2  $T \leftarrow \text{sum}(r_i[A])$   $M \leftarrow$  Array of size  $T + 1$  containing  $-1$  in each
   cell and 0 in  $M[0]$ 
3  $D \leftarrow$  Empty array of size  $|\text{Hist}| \times (T + 1)$ 
4  $Z \leftarrow 0$  // Maximal sum reached so far.
5 for  $v_j \in \text{Hist}$  do
6    $Z \leftarrow Z + v_j \cdot \text{Hist}[v_j]$ 
7    $M' \leftarrow M$  // Avoid changing  $M$  directly.
8   for  $s \leftarrow v_j$  to  $Z$  do
9      $u \leftarrow D[j, s - v_j]$ 
10     $s_{\text{prev}} \leftarrow s - (u + 1) \cdot v_j$ 
11    // All instances of  $v_j$  are used.
12    if  $u = \text{Hist}[v_j]$  then
13      for  $u' \leftarrow 1$  to  $\text{Hist}[v_j]$  do
14         $\text{size} \leftarrow M[s - u' \cdot v_j] + u'$ 
15        if  $M[s - u' \cdot v_j] \geq 0$  and  $\text{size} > M'[s]$  then
16           $M'[s] \leftarrow \text{size}$ 
17           $D[j, s] \leftarrow u'$ 
18    // Additional instances of  $v_j$  are available.
19    if  $u < \text{Hist}[v_j]$  and  $M[s_{\text{prev}}] \geq 0$  and
20       $M[s_{\text{prev}}] + u + 1 > M[s]$  then
21         $M'[s] \leftarrow M[s_{\text{prev}}] + u + 1$ 
22         $D[j, s] \leftarrow u + 1$ 
23    $M \leftarrow M'$ 
24 return  $(M, D)$ 
```

---

To enable the pruning optimization (described in Section 5.1), we use the semantics that  $P[s, \ell]$  stores true if there is a subset  $r' \subseteq r$  of size  $\ell$  such that the sum of  $A$  values of  $r \setminus r'$  is  $s$ .

Furthermore, we apply a similar approach to WholePack(median) and WholePack(sum), and avoid iterating on individual tuples. Instead, we iterate on unique  $r_i[A]$  values using a histogram, to find possible sums and sizes (thereby, possible averages). We store backtracking information in a separate data structure  $D[s, \ell]$ , to reconstruct the removed subset of tuples.

In Algorithm 3, we iterate over  $r_i[A]$  values  $v_j$  stored in the histogram (line 6). For each previously obtained sum  $s$  and removed subset size  $\ell$ , and each possible number  $k$  of instances of  $v_j$ , we try to remove  $k$  instances of  $v_j$  from  $s$  (lines 13-14), to obtain a new sum  $s'$  with a new removed subset size  $\ell' = \ell + k$ . If a bound  $h$  is given on the number of removed tuples and  $\ell' > h$ , we prune this option (lines 15-16). If this is indeed a new combination of sum and subset size, we update the data structures (lines 17-19). We then update the original data structures with the sums and sizes achieved using  $v_j$  (lines 20-23). Note that unlike the algorithms for WholePack(median) and WholePack(sum), the data structure used in the algorithm ( $P$ ) does not map from aggregation values (averages) to maximal subset sizes. Therefore a new mapping is built (lines 25-31), based on the sums and sizes of removed subsets.

## 6 Heuristic Algorithm

CardRepair (Algorithm 1) guarantees a C-repair, but its runtime can be prohibitively long for some aggregation functions. This is

**Algorithm 3: WholePack<avg>**


---

**Input:** A bag of values  $r_i[A]$ , and an upper bound  $h$  on the number of tuples to remove.

**Output:** An array  $F$  mapping average values to maximum subset sizes.

```

1 Hist  $\leftarrow$  a histogram of  $r_i[A]$ , in ascending order by values  $v_j$ 
2  $T \leftarrow \text{sum}(r_i[A])$ 
3  $P \leftarrow$  an empty mapping with default false
4  $P[T][0] \leftarrow \text{true}$  // Removing 0 tuples yields the sum  $T$ .
5  $D \leftarrow$  an empty mapping
6 for  $v_j \in \text{Hist}$  do
7    $P' \leftarrow$  an empty mapping with default false
8    $D' \leftarrow D$ 
9   for  $s \in P$  do
10    for  $\ell \in P[s]$  do
11      for  $k \leftarrow 0$  to  $\text{Hist}[v_j]$  do
12        // Add  $v_j$  to each previous (removed) subset.
13         $s' \leftarrow s - k \cdot v_j$ 
14         $\ell' \leftarrow \ell + k$ 
15        if  $\ell' > h$  then
16          break // Prune using bound  $h$ .
17         $P'[s'][\ell'] \leftarrow \text{true}$ 
18        if  $k > 0$  and  $(s' \notin D' \text{ or } \ell' \notin D'[s'])$  then
19           $D'[s'][\ell'] \leftarrow (s, \ell, v_j, k)$ 
20    $P \leftarrow P'$ 
21   for  $s \in D'$  do
22     for  $\ell \in D'[s]$  do
23        $D[s][\ell] \leftarrow D'[s][\ell]$ 
24 //  $F$  Maps avg values to maximal subset sizes.
25  $F \leftarrow$  an empty mapping
26 for  $s \in P$  do
27   for  $\ell \in P[s]$  do
28      $c \leftarrow |r_i| - \ell$ 
29      $x \leftarrow s/c$ 
30     if  $x \notin F$  or  $F[x] < c$  then
31        $F[x] \leftarrow c$ 
32 return  $F$ 

```

---

the case especially for sum and avg that take pseudo-polynomial time and depend on the size of  $V_\alpha(r)$  (the set of possible values that  $\alpha_{r'}(A)$  can take for any  $r' \subseteq r$ ). In this section, we present a polynomial-time greedy algorithm that serves two purposes. First, it provides a fast, inexact alternative to CardRepair. Second, it accelerates CardRepair via pruning, by providing an upper bound on the number of tuples to remove in both the generic CardRepair algorithm (as described in Section B.1.2) and the implementation of WholePack< $\alpha$ > (described in Section 5.1), without sacrificing the optimality guarantee. Using this bound, we can avoid the computations in CardRepair searching for subsets that are too small.

CardRepair iterates over each feasible aggregation value, which may correspond to every possible subset of tuples. HeurRepair avoids this heavy iteration. Instead, it greedily selects the tuple(s) with the largest impact on the violations of the AOD. This process is repeated until the violations are eliminated, and a monotonic subset is reached. We next define the notions of violation and impact.

Denote the *measure of violation* of the groups  $r_i$  and  $r_{i+1}$  by:

$$\text{MVI}(r_i, r_{i+1}) = \max(0, \alpha(r_i[A]) - \alpha(r_{i+1}[A])). \quad (1)$$

**Algorithm 4: Heuristic algorithm for repair: HeurRepair.**


---

**Input :** Relation  $r$ , AOD  $G \nearrow \alpha(A)$ .

**Output:** Subset  $r' \subseteq r$  such that  $r' \models G \nearrow \alpha(A)$ .

```

1 Function ComputeMVI( $r, A, G, \alpha$ )
2   return  $[\max(0, \alpha(r_i[A]) - \alpha(r_{i+1}[A])) \text{ for } i \in \{1, \dots, |r[G]| - 1\}]$ 
3  $\text{MVI} \leftarrow \text{ComputeMVI}(r, A, G, \alpha)$ 
4 while  $\text{sum}(\text{MVI}) > 0$  do
5   for  $t \in r$  do
6      $r' \leftarrow r \setminus \{t\}$ 
7      $\text{MVI}' \leftarrow \text{ComputeMVI}(r', A, G, \alpha)$ 
8      $\text{impacts}[t] \leftarrow \text{sum}(\text{MVI}) - \text{sum}(\text{MVI}')$ 
9    $t^* \leftarrow \arg \max_t \{\text{impacts}[t]\}$ 
10   $r' \leftarrow r \setminus \{t^*\}$ 
11   $\text{MVI} \leftarrow \text{ComputeMVI}(r', A, G, \alpha)$ 
12 return  $r'$ 

```

---

The *sum of violations* over all groups  $r_i$  is defined as  $S_{\text{MVI}}(r) = \sum_{i=1}^{|r[G]|-1} \text{MVI}(r_i, r_{i+1})$ . The *impact* of a tuple  $t$  on the sum of violations is defined as  $S_{\text{MVI}}(r) - S_{\text{MVI}}(r \setminus \{t\})$ ; this is called the “leave-one-out” influence and is inspired by causal counterfactuals [54]. That is, a tuple  $t$  has a positive impact if removing it results in a decrease in the sum of violations.

HeurRepair (Algorithm 4) iteratively removes the tuple with the highest impact, until all violations are resolved ( $S_{\text{MVI}} = 0$ ). The algorithm begins by computing the initial MVI for every pair of consecutive groups (line 3), based on Equation (1). As long as the sum of violations remains positive (line 4), the algorithm calculates the impact of each tuple (lines 5-8). The tuple with the maximum impact is selected for removal (line 9). Once this tuple is removed, the dataset is updated accordingly (line 10), and the measures of violations are recomputed (line 11). Finally, the algorithm returns the modified relation  $r'$ , which satisfies the AOD (line 12).

**Remark 1.** The algorithm may choose to remove a tuple with a non-positive impact. In such cases, it still selects the tuple with the highest impact, which would be the least negative one. Restricting the algorithm to remove only tuples with a positive impact might prevent it from guaranteeing a valid solution, as it could get stuck in a situation where no tuples with a positive impact exist, yet violations remain. This can happen if removing a tuple from  $r_i$  reduces the violation between  $r_i, r_{i+1}$  but causes another violation to increase. We next show an example of this phenomenon.  $\square$

*Example 6.1.* Consider the relation  $r(G, A)$  composed of the following tuples: (1, 3), (1, 4), (2, 2), (2, 3), (2, 4), (3, 1), (3, 2), and the AOD  $G \nearrow \max(A)$ .

The relation consists of three groups  $r_1, r_2$ , and  $r_3$ , where  $r_i = \{t \in r \mid t[G] = i\}$ . Any tuple  $t \in r_i$  with  $t[A] < \max(r_i[A])$  has impact 0, as removing it does not change the aggregation value  $\max(r_i[A])$ . As for the tuples with the maximum  $A$  value in each group: in  $r_1$ , the tuple (1, 4) has impact 0 since  $\max(r_1[A]) = \max(r_2[A])$  (hence,  $\text{MVI}(r_1, r_2) = 0$ ), and removing this tuple only decreases the value  $\max(r_1[A])$  (hence,  $\text{MVI}(r_1, r_2)$  remains 0). The tuple (2, 4) in  $r_2$  has impact 0 since removing it will decrease  $\text{MVI}(r_2, r_3)$  by 1 but increase  $\text{MVI}(r_1, r_2)$  by 1.

Finally, the tuple (3, 2) in  $r_3$  has impact  $-1$ , as removing it increases  $\text{MVI}(r_2, r_3)$  by 1. If the algorithm was restricted to removing



only tuples with a positive impact, it would stop at this point and fail to find a solution. In contrast, the algorithm will remove one of the tuples with a maximum impact (0). Following the tie-breaking rule (lowest group index, then highest value), the algorithm removes (1, 4). Now the impact of (1, 3) is 0, the tuple (2, 4) has impact 1, and the tuple (3, 2) has impact  $-1$ . The algorithm removes the tuple (2, 4). The process continues with the removal of (1, 3), followed by (2, 3), and at this point, no violations remain.  $\square$

For every aggregation function  $\alpha$ , the impact of a tuple  $t$  (computed in lines 6-8 of Algorithm 4) can be calculated by running the query “SELECT  $\alpha(A)$  GROUP BY  $G$ ” twice: once with  $t$  and once without it. Then,  $S_{MV}$  is calculated for each of the queries, and the impact is the difference between them. This process can be optimized to avoid the need to run these two queries for every tuple. We describe such optimizations in Section C.

The following proposition states that the approximation ratio of HeurRepair can be arbitrarily high.

**PROPOSITION 6.2.** *For  $\alpha \in \{\text{avg}, \text{sum}, \text{median}\}$ , there are classes of instances where the approximation ratio of HeurRepair is  $\Omega(n)$ .*

The proof is in Section A. For each of the three aggregations, we show a database with  $n$  tuples where HeurRepair removes  $\Omega(n)$  tuples while  $O(1)$  tuples suffice for a C-repair.

Despite this large worst-case approximation ratio, the use of HeurRepair to prune the search of CardRepair can still lead to a reduction in the runtime of finding a C-repair, as we show in Section 7.2. For example, pruning has improved the runtime of CardRepair by up to 426 times for avg over 1K tuples and by up to 15 times for median over 10K tuples.

## 7 Experimental Evaluation

In our experiments, we aim to answer the following questions: (1) How do the repairs perform, and what do they delete in case studies? (Section 7.4.1) (2) How do the optimizations of the DP algorithm (Section 5) affect the runtime across various aggregation functions? (Section 7.2) (3) How do the algorithms perform in terms of runtime, with varying data sizes and varying amounts of noise? (Section 7.3) (4) What is the quality of the heuristic algorithm (Section 6), compared to the C-repair? (Section 7.4) (5) Can outlier removal methods be used to find an AOD repair or to accelerate AOD repairing? (Section 7.5)

**Result summary:** We found that aggregation-specific optimizations of WholePack( $\alpha$ ) in combination with pruning by a heuristic algorithm whenever possible consistently provided the largest runtime improvement. Over all real world datasets, the largest improvement was recorded for the stack overflow dataset with avg, with a speedup of over 3 orders of magnitude. When comparing the algorithm runtimes for various aggregations, we found that in line with Theorem 4.1, the fastest aggregations were max, count and countd, and that the runtime advantage of the heuristic algorithm depends on the number of tuple removals necessary for a C-repair (an optimal repair). In terms of quality, the heuristic solution found C-repairs in all tested datasets and AODs except for Zillow (median aggregation) and Diabetes (avg aggregation). In these specific case studies, we found that the diabetes dataset deviated from the AOD

age  $\nearrow$  avg(diabetes) by 0.84% of tuples, and the Zillow dataset deviated from the AOD construction year  $\nearrow$  median(listing price) by 2.6% of the tuples.

While outlier removal as a preliminary step before CardRepair was sometimes useful in speeding up the computation, it also resulted in many unnecessary tuple removals (over 10 times more than the C-repair). This suggests that repairing for an AOD typically requires more than just applying an outlier removal algorithm.

### 7.1 Experimental Setup

The implementation is in Python 3.11 and publicly available.<sup>4</sup> The experiments were done on a 2.50GHz CPU PC with 512GB memory.

**Datasets and AODs.** We analyze several publicly available datasets that contain intuitive near-trends.

- *German credit* [32] (1K tuples): This dataset classifies people as low or high credit risks. We focused on the probability of being classified as low-risk over the time a person has been in their current job. We expect to observe an increasing trend, as longer job tenure may reflect greater financial stability, which is typically associated with a higher credit score.
- *Stack Overflow*<sup>5</sup> (31,301 tuples): This dataset consists of responses from developers worldwide to questions about their jobs, including demographics, education level, role, and salary. We focused on the average salary, grouped by the education level (from elementary school to PhD). We expect to see an increasing trend, suggesting that with higher education, the average salary increases. We binned the salary attribute using equi-width bins of size \$1000, and truncated it at \$2,250,000, which is larger than 99% of the salary values in the data.
- *H&M* [60] (1,877,674 tuples): This dataset contains transactions of customers in H&M in 2019-2020, with features like the purchased item, the price, the age of the customer, etc. When analyzing the purchase prices by customer age, we found that overall, there was a clear trend where customers aged 25 spent the most money in H&M, with a clear decrease until the age of 40, where the sum of transaction prices begins rising again. The trend is violated from May to July 2020. We focused on this time period. We experimented with the sum and max aggregations.
- *Zillow*<sup>6</sup> (629926 tuples): This dataset contains information on real estate sales in three California counties in 2016. We focus on listing prices, grouped by the year of construction, and expect listing prices to rise with construction year.
- *Diabetes*<sup>7</sup> (100K tuples): This dataset contains information about diabetes diagnosis, risk factors, and complications of individuals. We examine the trend of diabetes prevalence across age groups, anticipating higher rates among older individuals. To that end, we divided the age attribute into equal-width bins, 5 years each.

**Synthetic datasets.** The synthetic data generation process is controlled by the following parameters: number  $n$  of tuples, number of groups, fraction  $f$  of noise tuples, and the number of violating

<sup>4</sup><https://anonymous.4open.science/r/aod-C28C/>

<sup>5</sup><https://survey.stackoverflow.co/2022> (accessed April 2025)

<sup>6</sup><https://www.zillow.com/research/data/>

<sup>7</sup><https://www.kaggle.com/datasets/iammustafaz/diabetes-prediction-dataset>

groups. In our experiments, we used 10 groups in total and 4 violating groups. We first generate  $n \cdot (1 - f)$  tuples, by uniformly sampling values for the aggregated attribute between 1 and 100, and uniformly dividing them into groups. Next,  $f \cdot n$  noise tuples are generated by uniformly sampling aggregate values from (100, 120) and uniformly dividing them into the specified number of violating groups. This process means that the number of tuples that need to be removed to find a repair will be correlated with  $n \cdot f$ .

**Algorithms.** We evaluate two algorithms: CardRepair (Section 4), which is guaranteed to return a C-repair, and HeurRepair (Section 6), a heuristic algorithm that returns a monotonic subset. We also use a third alternative, that combines CardRepair with outlier removal methods. We bring this alternative to understand the role of outliers in the violation of AODs, and in particular, to understand if they capture a significant part of the violation. Specifically, since outlier removal is not guaranteed to return a monotonic subset, we first apply outlier removal methods, followed by CardRepair. We measure their effect on the size of the repair and the runtime. For the combined algorithm (*Outlier removal* + CardRepair), we experimented with three methods of outlier removal, of different types: Z-score [37], Local outlier factor [12] (a K-Nearest-Neighbors based method), and Isolation forest [43] (based on decision trees).


## 7.2 Evaluation of CardRepair Optimizations

Next, we compare the  $\text{WholePack}(\alpha)$  variations with regard to the effect of optimizations on the runtime. We evaluate the following variations: (1) Naive  $\text{WholePack}(\alpha)$ —computing  $O_\alpha(r_i, x)$  for all  $x \in V_\alpha(r_i)$  holistically, without optimizations (Section 5.2.1), (2) aggregation-specific optimization of  $\text{WholePack}(\alpha)$  (as described in Sections 5.2.2 to 5.2.4), (3) pruning  $\text{WholePack}(\alpha)$  using a bound from a heuristic algorithm (Section 5.1), and (4) a combination of pruning and aggregation-specific optimizations. Experiments with dictionary pruning (Section 5.1) can be found in Section B.1.

For each aggregation, we compare the optimizations over increasing size samples from the datasets, as well as on synthetic datasets we generated. For the scale experiments shown later, we created samples of the Stack Overflow, H&M and Zillow datasets. For Zillow and H&M we used sample sizes of different orders of magnitude. For SO, we used smaller samples (up to 1K) since the avg aggregation function used with this dataset is the hardest variation of the problem. For each sample size (and each synthetic dataset size), we performed the sampling (or generation) three times.

The most effective optimization for median was the combination of the value-based iteration and dictionary pruning (Section 5.2.2): for real world data, the optimized algorithm was up to 860× faster than the naive algorithm (which timed out at 50K tuples). This combination of optimizations, adjusted for avg (Section 5.2.4) was 2282 times faster than the naive algorithm for 1K rows of real world data. For sum, the knapsack-based optimization of Section 5.2.3 led to the greatest improvement on real world data - up to 92× faster than the naive algorithm (which timed out at 100K tuples).

**7.2.1  $\text{WholePack}(\text{sum})$  optimizations.** For sum we compare variations (1)-(3), since a combination of the two optimizations is not possible. The three variations are compared over increasing sample



**Figure 3: Comparison of runtime performance for  $\text{WholePack}(\text{sum})$  optimizations over increasing number of tuples. In Figure 3b, the timeout was 20 hours.**

sizes from the H&M dataset (Figure 3a), and increasing number of generated synthetic rows (Figure 3b).

The most effective optimization was the knapsack-based algorithm (red in Figure 3). Pruning the search by a bound on the number of removed tuples had almost no effect on the search time. This is likely because the main bottleneck of the  $\text{WholePack}(\alpha)$  procedure for sum is in combining each tuple with all of the previously reached subsets. Additionally, the C-repairs in the H&M samples required removing 30 tuples on average. Therefore, the bounds yielded by HeurRepair were not small enough to make a significant reduction to the runtime. Yet, for avg and median, we observed a runtime decrease when pruning by the HeurRepair result.

**7.2.2  $\text{WholePack}(\text{median})$  optimizations.** For median, we compare four variations: the naive  $\text{WholePack}(\text{median})$ , pruning by a bound from HeurRepair (Section 5.1), optimizing it using value-based iteration (Section 5.2.2), or combining the two optimizations. We compared them over increasing samples from the Zillow dataset (Figure 4a), and increasing number of rows generated by the synthetic dataset generator (Figure 4b).

In both real and synthetic data, the most effective optimization was the combination of pruning and value-based iteration. Iterating on unique values instead of tuples reduced the number of iterations. Additionally, pruning the search allowed us to consider fewer options per value. For the heuristic pruning in the synthetic data experiment, we saw a high variance in the runtime measurements. The runtime of this optimization greatly depends on the number of tuples removed by HeurRepair, which is farthest from optimal for the median aggregation (more on this in Section C).

**7.2.3  $\text{WholePack}(\text{avg})$  optimizations.** For avg (as for median), we compare four variations: the naive  $\text{WholePack}(\text{avg})$ , pruning the procedure by a bound from HeurRepair (Section 5.1), optimizing it using value-based iteration (Section 5.2.4), or combining the two optimizations. We compared them over increasing samples from the SO dataset (Figure 5a), and increasing number of rows generated by the synthetic dataset generator (Figure 5b). In both cases we sampled up to 1K rows, since  $\text{WholePack}(\text{avg})$  still poses a computational challenge, even with the optimizations.

For avg, the combination of both optimizations worked best. Pruning by the heuristic bound had a greater effect on real data than it did on the generated synthetic data, due to the number of tuples that need to be removed (and therefore the size of the bound):




Figure 4: Runtime performance for WholePack<median> optimizations for different numbers of tuples.

in the real dataset, removing a small number of tuples (0.1%) yields a repair. In the synthetic dataset, the repair requires removing 10% of the data (10% of the generated tuples were noise tuples).

### 7.3 Comparing Between Aggregations

We compare the runtimes CardRepair and HeurRepair on different aggregation functions. CardRepair runs substantially longer for median, sum, and avg. For each aggregation function, we chose the version of CardRepair that was fastest according to the experiments in Section 7.2. To compare all aggregations on the same dataset, we generated synthetic datasets (as described in Section 7.1) ranging from 10K to 1M tuples, with 10% being noise tuples.

To evaluate the effect of the amount of violation on the algorithm runtimes, we generated 100K-tuple datasets with varying numbers of noise tuples (1K to 15K). In both experiments, for avg we included only HeurRepair, since CardRepair with avg remains a scalability challenge. For count and countd, we included only CardRepair results; since CardRepair is fast for these aggregations, we did not implement an instantiation of HeurRepair for them.

The runtimes versus the increasing number of tuples are shown in Figure 6a (A version of Figure 6 with confidence intervals is available in Section G.) As expected, CardRepair was fastest for max, count, and countd, where the computation of  $O_\alpha(r_i, x)$  is linear in the number of tuples in  $r_i$ . CardRepair was slower for the non-linear aggregations: median, sum and avg.

Interestingly, for sum, HeurRepair was faster than CardRepair only for tables with fewer than 80K tuples, since HeurRepair removes one tuple at a time. As the number of tuples to remove increases with the size of the dataset, HeurRepair takes longer.




Figure 5: Runtime performance for WholePack<avg> optimizations over increasing number of tuples. Both axes in log-scale.




Figure 6: Run times of CardRepair and HeurRepair with various aggregations over synthetic data.

This can also be observed in Figure 6b, showing the runtimes versus the number of noise tuples: the time of HeurRepair as well as CardRepair for median that uses greedy-based pruning, increase with the number of noise tuples, while other times are not affected.

### 7.4 Evaluation of the Heuristic Algorithm

We next evaluate HeurRepair compared to CardRepair in terms of quality (number of tuples removed) and their runtime.

**Result Summary:** HeurRepair outperformed CardRepair in terms of runtime across all tested cases. For avg over Stack Overflow, it was more than 2000 times faster, while for max over H&M, the speedup was more modest at 2.5 times. In terms of solution quality, HeurRepair reached a C-repair for most cases, except median for Zillow and avg for the Diabetes dataset. For these two cases, we include an analysis of the differences in the repairs found by the two algorithms in Section 7.4.1.


We ran the best variation of CardRepair per each aggregation function as found in the previous experiments (Section 7.2). For HeurRepair, we applied the relevant optimizations described in Section C. The results can be seen in Table 1 and Figure 7.

HeurRepair was faster than CardRepair in all tested cases. The largest difference was for edu/avg(salary) in Stack Overflow—over 2000× faster; the smallest was for age\max(price) in H&M (2.5× faster). For most of the tested AODs, HeurRepair found a C-repair. For age/avg(diabetes) and year/median(value), it removed more tuples than necessary (1.37× and 1.61× more tuples than CardRepair, respectively). A possible reason could be that for avg and median we lack monotonicity—the removal of a tuple can either increase or decrease the aggregate value of the group.


Another issue is that for median, the impact of the removed tuple on the aggregate value of the group (and on the sum of violations) depends on the other tuples in the group (specifically those in proximity to the current median). In these cases, HeurRepair that

Table 1: CardRepair and HeurRepair over real datasets.

Dataset	$\alpha$	HeurRepair		CardRepair	
		time (s)	#tuples removed	time (s)	#tuples removed
Zillow	median	4912	22481	59904	16361
H&M	sum	57.53	1464	4441	1464
H&M	max	0.7522	43	1.91	43
German	avg	0.0126	16	0.19	16
SO	avg	0.61	37	1082	37
Diabetes	avg	4.95	834	306	518



**Figure 7: Runtime and number of tuples removed (log scale) by HeurRepair and CardRepair. The number near the dashed line represents the removal overhead of HeurRepair (triangles) relative to CardRepair (squares).**



**Figure 8: Diabetes prevalence by age.**


only sees a single step ahead is likely to make suboptimal choices. An example of this issue is provided in Section F.

**7.4.1 Drill Down on Removed Tuples.** We next present two in-depth analyses, for the datasets where the HeurRepair reached a different solution size than CardRepair (analyses for additional datasets are included in Section E). Our goal is to highlight the differences between CardRepair and HeurRepair in terms of the tuples they remove, and to demonstrate how our approach can help explain why a trend does not fully hold.

**Diabetes.** Result Summary: HeurRepair removed 834 (0.83%) tuples in 4.95 seconds, while CardRepair removed 316 fewer tuples (0.52% removed) but took 306.18 seconds - over 61 times more than HeurRepair, as shown in Table 1.

**Initial AOD violations.** Consider the average diabetes prevalence over age as depicted in Figure 8 (blue bars). There is a visible trend: as age increases, the prevalence of diabetes is higher. However, there are some violations to this AOD:  $\text{avg}_r(\text{diabetes}|\text{age}=15-19) = 0.009$  while  $\text{avg}_r(\text{diabetes}|\text{age}=20-24) = 0.007$ , and there is a decrease among the groups 70-74, 75-79 and 80+.

**Comparison of removed tuples.** The data is close to satisfying the AOD. HeurRepair (Figure 8, orange bars) executed in 4.95 seconds, removing 834 tuples (0.84%): 8 diabetes patients aged 15-19, to fix the first violation, as well as 60 diabetes patients aged 65-75, and 766 healthy individuals aged over 75, to fix the second violation. CardRepair (green bars) executed in 306.18 seconds and removed



**Figure 9: Property value median vs. year built on Zillow.**

518 diabetes patients (0.52%). Of these, it removed 8 patients aged 15-19, as HeurRepair did, and 510 patients aged 65-79.

The greedy nature of HeurRepair, which performs the most impactful single-tuple removal at each iteration, resulted in a sub-optimal repair; it removed 1.61 more tuples. However, it had a less drastic impact on the aggregation query result, as can be seen in Figure 8. The aggregation values of the heuristic repair remained closer to the original values compared to those of CardRepair.

**Zillow.** Result Summary: HeurRepair removed 22,481 (3.57%) tuples in 39.8 minutes. In comparison, CardRepair removed 6120 fewer tuples (2.6%), but took 16.64 hours to run (12.2 times more than HeurRepair), as shown in Table 1.

**Initial AOD violations.** We focus on the trend of house prices by the year they were built. The years were binned to 5-year terms: 1985-1989 (inclusive) until 2010-2014 (inclusive). We observed (Figure 9, blue bars) that the median of house prices, grouped by these 5-year terms, is increasing but with an outlier in the years 2005-2009 (\$487K, versus \$565K in 2000-2004). That is, the AOD year  $\nearrow$  median(price) almost holds.

**Comparison of removed tuples.** HeurRepair (Figure 9, orange bars) terminated in 39.8 minutes, removing 22,481 (3.6%) tuples, most (22,120) from the 2005-2009 group and the rest from 2000-2004. CardRepair (Figure 9, green bars) took 16.64 hours and removed 16,361 tuples (2.6% of the dataset), all from the 2005-2009 group.

Comparing the tuples removed by CardRepair with those that remained, we observed notable differences in land use distribution. Among the removed tuples, 62.7% were condominium properties and 26.91% were single-family residences. In contrast, the remaining tuples showed an almost reverse pattern: only 34.36% were condominium properties, while 57.31% were single-family residences. This suggests a connection between condominium apartments built between 2005 and 2009 and lower property values, which may be related to the housing bubble in those years. We also analyzed the geographic distribution of the removed versus remaining properties. The most significant difference was observed in Los Angeles, which accounted for 29.2% of the removed tuples but only 13.17% of the remaining ones. A possible reason for this is that the Los Angeles housing market was one of the most rapidly deflating markets at the end of the housing bubble in 2008 [5].

**Distance from trend.** As mentioned previously, a C-repair for an AOD can serve as a measure of the distance of a dataset from satisfying a trend. When applying HeurRepair to find a repair for

the opposite trend (a decrease in median house prices with increasing year), it removed 405K tuples (64.3%), 18.03 times more than for the increasing trend. Hence, the distance from the increasing trend is significantly smaller than the distance from the decreasing one. Note that HeurRepair does not provide any guarantees on the minimum number of tuples to be removed to satisfy each trend. For such guarantees, we need CardRepair.

When applying CardRepair to find a repair for the decreasing trend, the repair required removing 146.6K tuples (23.3%). Due to the optimality of the algorithm, it provides a lower bound on the number of tuples to be removed to satisfy the trend in each direction. Therefore, the dataset is 8.96 times closer to satisfying an increasing trend than to satisfying a decreasing trend.

From Figures 8 and 9, it may seem that CardRepair only equates the aggregation values of consecutive groups. Note, however, that in Figure 8, the values are close but not identical, while in Figure 9 (with median aggregation) they became equal. This behavior (making two consecutive groups have close values) is an inherent property of the problem. When each tuple has a small effect on the aggregation value of the group, a C-repair will result in close aggregation values. The heuristic algorithm HeurRepair aims to utilize this property by trying to match the value of a group with its predecessor group. Yet, as we saw in the experiments, this approach may be overly simplistic and may be considerably suboptimal (see Section 7.4.1 and Figure 7).

## 7.5 Comparison to Outlier Detection Methods

As an alternative to repairing for an AOD, we compare against methods that remove statistically identified outliers. This choice reflects a common strategy in data cleaning, where violations of expected trends are attributed to noisy or erroneous records [11, 68], rather than to fundamental structure in the data. Like our algorithms, outlier removal methods work by deleting a subset of tuples, but they rely on statistical rarity rather than explicitly targeting monotonicity violations. This comparison allows us to quantify the benefit of using AOD-aware repair algorithms over generic noise-removal approaches. Therefore, we next aim to answer our 5th research question from the beginning of Section 7: can existing outlier removal methods be used to find a repair for an AOD?

We consider three settings: the SO dataset with the AOD edu  $\nearrow$  avg(salary), and H&M with two AODs: age  $\searrow$  max(price) and age  $\searrow$  sum(price). Out of the real-world scenarios, these are most likely to be affected by outliers: for Diabetes and German credit, all values of the aggregated attribute are 0 or 1 (there are no outliers to be found); and the median function used with Zillow is less affected by outliers than avg, max and sum.

We experimented with three outlier removal methods using the scikit-learn implementations with hyper-parameter tuning. (1) *Z-score* [37] models  $r[A]$  as samples from a normal distribution, and removes points whose distance from the mean is over  $\tau$  standard deviations. We experimented with  $1 \leq \tau \leq 6$ . (2) *Local outlier factor (LOF)* [12] detects samples with substantially lower density compared to the  $k$  closest neighbors are considered outliers. We tried  $k$  values in  $\{3, 5, 8, 10\}$ . (3) *Isolation forest* [43] trains random decision

**Table 2: Outlier removal on 3 settings. For each method, the best variation is shown for global/per-group outlier removal.**

Setting	Method	Best Param	# Removed outliers	# Removed total
SO avg	Z score	6/6	369/373	369/373
SO avg	LOF	3/8	318/972	<b>356</b> /990
SO avg	Iso.Forest	0.05/0.05	1519/1556	1526/1561
H&M max	Z score	6/2	1356/83664	<b>1356</b> /84934
H&M max	Iso.Forest	0.005/0.01	8489/16657	8489/21258
H&M sum	Z score	1/1.5	462973/117349	465770/118930
H&M sum	Iso.Forest	0.2/0.01	367546/16657	369816/ <b>18083</b>

trees to isolate observations; easily isolated samples (with shorter path lengths in the decision tree) are considered outliers. A contamination parameter controls the number of expected outliers. We tried contamination values between 0.001 and 0.2. For each method, we also examined a variation where the outlier removal is done per group  $r_i$  rather than the full dataset.

For each dataset setting, we applied all combinations of outlier removal method and hyper-parameters as a preliminary step, selected the combinations that were closest to a repair according to the sum of violations after removal, and applied CardRepair after the removal to find a C-repair.

The results of the best parameters for each combination of scenario and outlier removal method are shown in Table 2 (the full tables are available in Section D). For each outlier removal method, we report the number of removed outliers and the total number of tuple removals including those removed by CardRepair. Note that due to the size of the dataset, the LOF method timed out at 2 hours for the H&M dataset (for comparison, CardRepair took under 1 minute for this dataset).

Most variations of outlier removal methods did not yield a monotonic subset (namely, a valid solution). For the sum scenario, none of the methods yielded a monotonic subset, all of them removed over 30 times more tuples than necessary, and CardRepair had to remove a similar number of tuples as without the preliminary outlier detection. For the avg and max scenarios, some of the outlier removal methods did return a monotonic subset satisfying the AOD, but they required removing 10 times more tuples than the C-repair.

Still, outlier removal can occasionally accelerate CardRepair. For example, for SO with avg, Isolation forest with 0.05 contamination (in both the group-wise and the non group-wise settings), there were only a few remaining tuples to remove. In both cases, HeurRepair yielded tight bounds, thus greatly shortening the run-times of CardRepair (60.5 seconds and 115.9 seconds, respectively).

Overall, we conclude that *repairing for an AOD typically requires more than just applying outlier detection, as the tuples that obscure the trend are not necessarily statistical outliers*. They may appear structurally standard, but still interfere with the expected trend.

## 8 Concluding Remarks

We introduced the notion of an aggregate order dependency (AOD) and investigated the problem of computing a cardinality-based repair for databases that violate an AOD. This framework serves as



a principled approach to analyzing violations of expected monotonic trends in data. We analyzed the computational complexity of the repair problem, proposed a general algorithmic framework (CardRepair), and provided tailored optimizations for common aggregate functions. We also presented a heuristic alternative (HeurRepair) that is often highly effective (that is, fast and close to optimal quality). Our experimental evaluation demonstrates the practical effectiveness of the proposed methods and highlights, through analysis of the removed tuples, the utility of our framework in quantifying and interpreting trend violations.

As for the next steps, a staggering open challenge lies in handling the *average* aggregate function, which remains computationally demanding and requires further optimization techniques; this difficulty is echoed in related contexts such as Shapley value computation [1]. Furthermore, CardRepair has theoretical guarantees but it is computationally heavy, while HeurRepair is usually faster but its quality is not guaranteed. To close this gap, it would be helpful to find effective algorithms with nontrivial guaranteed approximation.

Beyond that, several promising directions remain open for future work. First, our techniques can likely be extended to incorporate constraints on the *magnitude of change* between consecutive groups, such as requiring a minimum absolute or relative difference, thereby capturing stronger forms of monotonicity. Second, a natural generalization is to accommodate *multiple* AODs, enabling the assessment of how closely a dataset conforms to multiple monotonic trends simultaneously. Third, we can extend the framework to support a richer class of AODs, such as ones involving aggregation over joins of multiple relations, negation, and so on. Another important extension is to support intervention models beyond tuple deletion, including updates of cell values and insertion of new tuples.

Finally, as an alternative to the number of removed tuples, we can explore different *measures of intervention*, such as a weighted sum of tuples, assuming that different tuples are associated with different weights (e.g., representing confidence scores). Another measure of intervention is the complexity of the description of removed tuples; in this context, we are currently exploring a variation of the framework where we delete batches of tuples using tuple templates, thereby seeking populations of deleted tuples that are characterized by easy-to-explain database queries (e.g., people of a certain age group), in the vein of previous work on pattern-based explanations [2, 34, 61, 62, 65]; yet, while previous work has focused on *abductive* explanations (what to keep in the database), our focus is on *contrastive* explanations (what to remove).

## References

- [1] Omer Abramovich, Daniel Deutch, Nave Frost, Ahmet Kara, and Dan Olteanu. 2025. Advancing Fact Attribution for Query Answering: Aggregate Queries and Novel Algorithms. arXiv:2506.16923 [cs.DB] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2506.16923>
- [2] Shunit Agmon, Amir Gilad, Brit Youngmann, Shahar Zoarets, and Benny Kimelfeld. 2024. Finding Convincing Views to Endorse a Claim. *Proc. VLDB Endow.* 18, 2 (2024), 439–452. <https://www.vldb.org/pvldb/vol18/p439-agmon.pdf>
- [3] Abolfazl Asudeh, Hosagrahar Visvesvaraya Jagadish, You Wu, and Cong Yu. 2020. On detecting cherry-picked trendlines. *VLDB* 13, 6 (2020), 939–952.
- [4] Abolfazl Asudeh, You Will Wu, Cong Yu, and HV Jagadish. 2021. Perturbation-based Detection and Resolution of Cherry-picking. *A Quarterly bulletin of the Computer Soc. of the IEEE Technical Committee on Data Engineering* 45, 3 (2021), 39–51.
- [5] Dean Baker. 2008. The housing bubble and the financial crisis. *Real-world economics review* 46, 20 (2008), 73–81.
- [6] Leopoldo E. Bertossi. 2011. *Database Repairing and Consistent Query Answering*. Morgan & Claypool Publishers.
- [7] Leopoldo E. Bertossi. 2019. Repair-Based Degrees of Database Inconsistency. In *LPNMR (Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Vol. 11481)*. Springer, 195–209.
- [8] Arnab Bhattacharyya, Eldar Fischer, Ronitt Rubinfeld, and Paul Valiant. 2011. Testing monotonicity of distributions over general partial orders. In *ICS*. Citeseer, 239–252.
- [9] Philip Bohannon, Wenfei Fan, Floris Geerts, Xibei Jia, and Anastasios Kementsis-etsidis. 2006. Conditional functional dependencies for data cleaning. In *2007 IEEE 23rd international conference on data engineering*. IEEE, 746–755.
- [10] Philip Bohannon, Michael Flaster, Wenfei Fan, and Rajeev Rastogi. 2005. A Cost-Based Model and Effective Heuristic for Repairing Constraints by Value Modification. In *SIGMOD Conference*. ACM, 143–154.
- [11] Sanae Borrohou, Rachida Fissoune, and Hassan Badir. 2023. Data cleaning survey and challenges—improving outlier detection algorithm in machine learning. *Journal of Smart Cities and Society* 2, 3 (2023), 125–140.
- [12] Markus M Breunig, Hans-Peter Kriegel, Raymond T Ng, and Jörg Sander. 2000. LOF: identifying density-based local outliers. In *Proceedings of the 2000 ACM SIGMOD international conference on Management of data*. 93–104.
- [13] Hugh D Brunk. 1955. Maximum likelihood estimates of monotone parameters. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics* (1955), 607–616.
- [14] Nofar Carmeli, Martin Grohe, Benny Kimelfeld, Ester Livshits, and Muhammad Tibi. 2021. Database Repairing with Soft Functional Dependencies. In *24th International Conference on Database Theory, ICDT 2021, March 23–26, 2021, Nicosia, Cyprus (LIPIcs, Vol. 186)*, Ke Yi and Zhewei Wei (Eds.). Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 16:1–16:17.
- [15] Jan Chomicki and Jerzy Marcinkowski. 2005. Minimal-change integrity maintenance using tuple deletions. *Information and Computation* 197, 1–2 (2005), 90–121.
- [16] Jan Chomicki and Jerzy Marcinkowski. 2005. Minimal-change integrity maintenance using tuple deletions. *Inf. Comput.* 197, 1–2 (2005), 90–121.
- [17] Xu Chu, Ihab F. Ilyas, and Paolo Papotti. 2013. Holistic data cleaning: Putting violations into context. In *2013 IEEE 29th International Conference on Data Engineering (ICDE)*. 458–469. doi:10.1109/ICDE.2013.6544847
- [18] Cristian Consonni, Paolo Sottovia, Alberto Montresor, Yannis Velegarakis, et al. 2019. Discovering Order Dependencies through Order Compatibility. In *EDBT*. 409–420.
- [19] Jirun Dong and Richard Hull. 1982. Applying approximate order dependency to reduce indexing space. In *Proceedings of the 1982 ACM SIGMOD International Conference on Management of Data (Orlando, Florida) (SIGMOD '82)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 119–127. doi:10.1145/582353.582375
- [20] Wenfei Fan and Floris Geerts. 2012. *Foundations of Data Quality Management*. Morgan & Claypool Publishers.
- [21] Sergio Flesca, Filippo Furfaro, and Francesco Parisi. 2007. Preferred database repairs under aggregate constraints. In *Scalable Uncertainty Management: First International Conference, SUM 2007, Washington, DC, USA, October 10–12, 2007. Proceedings 1*. Springer, 215–229.
- [22] Sergio Flesca, Filippo Furfaro, and Francesco Parisi. 2010. Querying and repairing inconsistent numerical databases. *ACM Transactions on Database Systems (TODS)* 35, 2 (2010), 1–50.
- [23] Sergio Flesca, Filippo Furfaro, and Francesco Parisi. 2011. *Repairing and querying databases under aggregate constraints*. Springer Science & Business Media.
- [24] Floris Geerts, Giansalvatore Mecca, Paolo Papotti, and Donatello Santoro. 2013. The LLUNATIC data-cleaning framework. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment* 6, 9 (2013), 625–636.
- [25] Subhashis Ghosal, Arusharka Sen, and Aad W Van Der Vaart. 2000. Testing monotonicity of regression. *Annals of statistics* (2000), 1054–1082.
- [26] Amir Gilad, Daniel Deutch, and Sudeepa Roy. 2020. On Multiple Semantics for Declarative Database Repairs. In *Proceedings of the 2020 International Conference on Management of Data, SIGMOD Conference 2020, online conference [Portland, OR, USA], June 14–19, 2020*, David Maier, Rachel Pottinger, AnHai Doan, Wang-Chiew Tan, Abdussalam Alawini, and Hung Q. Ngo (Eds.). ACM, 817–831. doi:10.1145/3318464.3389721
- [27] Amir Gilad, Aviram Imber, and Benny Kimelfeld. 2023. The Consistency of Probabilistic Databases with Independent Cells. In *ICDT (LIPIcs, Vol. 255)*. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 22:1–22:19.
- [28] Seymour Ginsburg and Richard Hull. 1983. Order Dependency in the Relational Model. *Theor. Comput. Sci.* 26 (1983), 149–195.
- [29] Seymour Ginsburg and Richard Hull. 1986. Sort sets in the relational model. *J. ACM* 33, 3 (May 1986), 465–488. doi:10.1145/5925.5929
- [30] Germán González-Almagro, Pablo Sánchez-Bermejo, Juan Luis Suarez, José-Ramón Cano, and Salvador García. 2024. Semi-supervised clustering with two types of background knowledge: Fusing pairwise constraints and monotonicity constraints. *Inf. Fusion* 102, C (Feb. 2024), 15 pages. doi:10.1016/j.inffus.2023.102064
- [31] Peter Hall and Nancy E Heckman. 2000. Testing for monotonicity of a regression mean by calibrating for linear functions. *Annals of Statistics* (2000), 20–39.
- [32] Hans Hofmann. 1994. Statlog (German Credit Data). UCI Machine Learning Repository. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24432/C5NC77>



- [33] Mohamed Hussian, Anders Grimvall, Oleg Burdakov, and Oleg Sysoev. 2005. Monotonic regression for the detection of temporal trends in environmental quality data. *MATCH Commun. Math. Comput. Chem* 54 (2005), 535–550.
- [34] Ibrahim A. Ibrahim, Xue Li, Xin Zhao, Sanad Al Maskari, Abdullah M. Albarak, and Yanjun Zhang. 2018. Automated Explanations of User-Expected Trends for Aggregate Queries. In *Advances in Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, Dinh Phung, Vincent S. Tseng, Geoffrey I. Webb, Bao Ho, Mohadeseh Ganji, and Lida Rashidi (Eds.). Springer International Publishing, Cham, 602–614.
- [35] Yifeng Jin, Lin Zhu, and Zijiang Tan. 2020. Efficient Bidirectional Order Dependency Discovery. In *2020 IEEE 36th International Conference on Data Engineering (ICDE)*. 61–72. doi:10.1109/ICDE48307.2020.00013
- [36] Saehan Jo, Immanuel Trummer, Weicheng Yu, Xuezhi Wang, Cong Yu, Daniel Liu, and Niyati Mehta. 2019. Aggchecker: A fact-checking system for text summaries of relational data sets. *VLDB* 12, 12 (2019), 1938–1941.
- [37] Senthamarai Kannan Kaliyaperumal, Manoj Kuppusamy, and Arumugam Subbanna Gounder. 2015. Outlier detection and missing value in time series ozone data. *International Journal of Scientific Research in Knowledge* 3, 9 (2015), 220–226.
- [38] Youri Kaminsky, Benny Kimelfeld, Ester Livshits, Felix Naumann, and David Wajc. 2025. Repairing Databases over Metric Spaces with Coincidence Constraints. In *ICDT (LIPIcs, Vol. 328)*. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 14:1–14:18.
- [39] Solmaz Kolahi and Laks V. S. Lakshmanan. 2009. On approximating optimum repairs for functional dependency violations. In *ICDT (ACM International Conference Proceeding Series, Vol. 361)*. ACM, 53–62.
- [40] Philipp Langer and Felix Naumann. 2016. Efficient order dependency detection. *The VLDB Journal* 25 (2016), 223–241.
- [41] Sokbae Lee, Oliver Linton, and Yoon-Jae Whang. 2009. Testing for stochastic monotonicity. *Econometrica* 77, 2 (2009), 585–602.
- [42] Yin Lin, Brit Youngmann, Yuval Moskovitch, HV Jagadish, and Tova Milo. 2021. On detecting cherry-picked generalizations. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment* 15, 1 (2021), 59–71.
- [43] Fei Tony Liu, Kai Ming Ting, and Zhi-Hua Zhou. 2008. Isolation forest. In *2008 eighth IEEE international conference on data mining*. IEEE, 413–422.
- [44] Ester Livshits, Benny Kimelfeld, and Sudeepa Roy. 2020. Computing Optimal Repairs for Functional Dependencies. *ACM Trans. Database Syst.* 45, 1 (2020), 4:1–4:46.
- [45] Ester Livshits, Rina Kochirgan, Segev Tsur, Ihab F. Ilyas, Benny Kimelfeld, and Sudeepa Roy. 2021. Properties of Inconsistency Measures for Databases. In *SIGMOD Conference*. ACM, 1182–1194.
- [46] Yasir Mahmood, Jonni Virtama, Timon Barlag, and Axel-Cyrille Ngonga Ngomo. 2024. Computing Repairs Under Functional and Inclusion Dependencies via Argumentation. In *FoIKS (Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Vol. 14589)*. Springer, 23–42.
- [47] Silvano Martello and Paolo Toth. 1984. A mixture of dynamic programming and branch-and-bound for the subset-sum problem. *Management Science* 30, 6 (1984), 765–771.
- [48] Dongjing Miao, Pengfei Zhang, Jianzhong Li, Ye Wang, and Zhipeng Cai. 2023. Approximation and inapproximability results on computing optimal repairs. *VLDB J.* 32, 1 (2023), 173–197.
- [49] Shubhankar Mohapatra, Amir Gilad, Xi He, and Benny Kimelfeld. 2025. Computing Inconsistency Measures Under Differential Privacy. *Proc. ACM Manag. Data* 3, 3, Article 140 (June 2025), 27 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3725397>
- [50] Wilfred Ng. 1999. Ordered functional dependencies in relational databases. *Information Systems* 24, 7 (1999), 535–554. doi:10.1016/S0306-4379(99)00031-9
- [51] Wilfred Ng. 2001. An extension of the relational data model to incorporate ordered domains. *ACM Trans. Database Syst.* 26, 3 (Sept. 2001), 344–383. doi:10.1145/502030.502033
- [52] Sergey Ovchinnik, Fernando E. B. Otero, and Alex A. Freitas. 2019. Monotonicity Detection and Enforcement in Longitudinal Classification. In *Artificial Intelligence XXXVI*, Max Bramer and Miltos Petridis (Eds.). Springer International Publishing, Cham, 63–77.
- [53] Andrew J Patton and Allan Timmermann. 2010. Monotonicity in asset returns: New tests with applications to the term structure, the CAPM, and portfolio sorts. *Journal of Financial Economics* 98, 3 (2010), 605–625.
- [54] Judea Pearl. 2009. *Causality*. Cambridge university press.
- [55] Vincent Poirriez, Nicola Yanev, and Rumen Andonov. 2009. A hybrid algorithm for the unbounded knapsack problem. *Discrete Optimization* 6, 1 (2009), 110–124. doi:10.1016/j.disopt.2008.09.004
- [56] Prem S Puri and Harshinder Singh. 1990. On recursive formulas for isotonic regression useful for statistical inference under order restrictions. *Journal of statistical planning and inference* 24, 1 (1990), 1–11.
- [57] Yu Qiu, Zijiang Tan, Kejia Yang, Weidong Yang, Xiangdong Zhou, and Naiwang Guo. 2018. Repairing Data Violations with Order Dependencies. In *Database Systems for Advanced Applications*, Jian Pei, Yannis Manolopoulos, Shazia Sadiq, and Jianxin Li (Eds.). Springer International Publishing, Cham, 283–300.
- [58] James O Ramsay. 1998. Estimating smooth monotone functions. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)* 60, 2 (1998), 365–375.
- [59] Theodoros Rekatsinas, Xu Chu, Ihab F. Ilyas, and Christopher Ré. 2017. HoloClean: holistic data repairs with probabilistic inference. *Proc. VLDB Endow.* 10, 11 (aug 2017), 1190–1201. doi:10.14778/3137628.3137631
- [60] Joshua Robinson, Rishabh Ranjan, Weihua Hu, Kexin Huang, Jiaqi Han, Alejandro Dobles, Matthias Fey, Jan E. Lenssen, Yiwen Yuan, Zecheng Zhang, Xinwei He, and Jure Leskovec. 2024. RelBench: A Benchmark for Deep Learning on Relational Databases. arXiv:2407.20060 [cs.LG] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2407.20060>
- [61] Sudeepa Roy, Laurel Orr, and Dan Suciu. 2015. Explaining query answers with explanation-ready databases. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment* 9, 4 (2015), 348–359.
- [62] Sudeepa Roy and Dan Suciu. 2014. A formal approach to finding explanations for database queries. In *Proceedings of the 2014 ACM SIGMOD international conference on Management of data*. 1579–1590.
- [63] Babak Salimi, Luke Rodriguez, Bill Howe, and Dan Suciu. 2019. Interventional fairness: Causal database repair for algorithmic fairness. In *Proceedings of the 2019 International Conference on Management of Data*. 793–810.
- [64] Jef Wijsen. 2001. Trends in databases: Reasoning and mining. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering* 13, 3 (2001), 426–438.
- [65] Eugene Wu and Samuel Madden. 2013. Scorpion: Explaining Away Outliers in Aggregate Queries. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment* 6, 8 (2013).
- [66] You Wu, Pankaj K Agarwal, Chengkai Li, Jun Yang, and Cong Yu. 2014. Toward computational fact-checking. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment* 7, 7 (2014), 589–600.
- [67] You Wu, Pankaj K Agarwal, Chengkai Li, Jun Yang, and Cong Yu. 2017. Computational fact checking through query perturbations. *ACM Transactions on Database Systems (TODS)* 42, 1 (2017), 1–41.
- [68] Hui Xiong, Gaurav Pandey, Michael Steinbach, and Vipin Kumar. 2006. Enhancing data analysis with noise removal. *IEEE transactions on knowledge and data engineering* 18, 3 (2006), 304–319.
- [69] Yun Zhou, Norman Fenton, and Cheng Zhu. 2016. An empirical study of Bayesian network parameter learning with monotonic influence constraints. *Decision Support Systems* 87 (2016), 69–79. doi:10.1016/j.dss.2016.05.001

## A Omitted Proofs

Following are proofs of results omitted from the body of the paper.

**THEOREM 4.3.** *Let  $G \not\rightarrow \alpha(A)$  be an AOD where  $\alpha$  is either sum or avg. It is NP-hard to find a C-repair (under the conventional binary representation of numbers).*

**PROOF.** We begin with  $\alpha = \text{sum}$ . We will show a reduction from the NP-complete *Subset-Sum* problem in the variant of natural numbers. An instance of this problem consists of a set  $X = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$  of natural numbers, along with a natural number  $s$ ; the goal is to decide whether  $X$  has a subset  $Y$  with  $\sum_{x \in Y} x = s$ . Given  $X$  and  $s$ , we construct the relation  $r$  that consists of the following tuples over  $(G, A)$ :

- (1)  $(i, s)$  for  $i = 0, \dots, n - 1$ ;
- (2)  $(n, x_j)$  for  $j = 1, \dots, n$ ;
- (3)  $(\ell, s)$  for  $\ell = n + 1, \dots, 2n$ .

We claim that  $(X, s)$  is a “yes” instance (i.e., the above  $Y$  exists) if and only if  $r$  has a monotonic subset (having the aggregate value  $s$  for each group) that requires deleting fewer than  $n$  tuples:

- If the subset  $Y$  exists, then we remove from  $r$  all tuples  $(n, x_j)$  with  $x_j \in X \setminus Y$ , and obtain a monotonic subset.
- Conversely, if  $r$  has a monotonic subset achieved by deleting fewer than  $n$  tuples, then it must leave at least one tuple of each of the above three types. In particular, the tuples  $(n, x_j)$  that remain in  $r$  must have their  $x_j$ s summing up to  $s$  for the result to satisfy the AOD.

In particular, it is NP-hard to find a C-repair deleting a minimum number of tuples from  $r$ .

For  $\alpha = \text{avg}$ , we use a similar reduction, with a slightly different construction of  $r$ , which now consists of the following tuples:

- (1)  $(i, 0)$  for  $i = 0, \dots, n - 1$ ;
- (2)  $(n, -s)$  and, additionally,  $(n, x_j)$  for  $j = 1, \dots, n$ ;
- (3)  $(\ell, 0)$  for  $\ell = n + 1, \dots, 2n$ .

The same reasoning of sum shows that  $(X, s)$  is a “yes” instance if and only if  $r$  has a monotonic subset that requires deleting fewer than  $n$  tuples. In this case, the aggregate value of each group is zero.  $\square$

**LEMMA 5.1.** *If  $D[j, s - v_j] \neq \text{Hist}[V_j]$ , then either  $D[j, s] = 0$  or  $D[j, s] = D[j, s - v_j] + 1$ .*

**PROOF.** Let  $\text{OPT}$  denote the optimal solution:  $\text{OPT}[s]$  will be the size of the largest subset of  $r_i$  with sum  $s$ .

We first observe that  $\text{OPT}[s] \geq \text{OPT}[s - v_j] + 1$ , since a solution with sum  $s - v_j$  can be completed into a solution for  $s$  by adding another  $v_j$  tuple to the subset. We divide into two cases.

Case 1:  $\text{OPT}[s] > \text{OPT}[s - v_j] + 1$ . We will now show that  $v_j$  items are not used in the optimal solution for  $s$ . Assume by way of contradiction that  $D[j, s] \neq 0$ . We can remove a  $v_j$  tuple from the optimal solution for  $s$ , and get a solution with sum  $s - v_j$  with  $\text{OPT}[s] - 1$  tuples. Then  $\text{OPT}[s - v_j] \geq \text{OPT}[s] - 1$ . However, by the assumption in case 1, this means:  $\text{OPT}[s] > \text{OPT}[s - v_j] + 1 \geq \text{OPT}[s]$  (contradiction).

Case 2:  $\text{OPT}[s] = \text{OPT}[s - v_j] + 1$ . Meaning that the solution with sum  $s$  contains one more tuple than the solution for  $s - v_j$ . Adding a  $v_j$  tuple to the optimal solution for  $s - v_j$  would yield

a solution for  $s$  with  $D[j, s - v_j] + 1$  tuples of value  $v_j$ . Since the algorithm searches for an optimal solution with a minimal number of instances of the largest value, we get:

$$D[j, s] \leq D[j, s - v_j] + 1 \quad (2)$$

Assume by way of contradiction:  $D[j, s] \notin \{0, D[j, s - v_j] + 1\}$ . Then:

$$0 < D[j, s] < D[j, s - v_j] + 1 \quad (3)$$

Then removing a  $v_j$  tuple from the optimal solution with sum  $s$  would yield a solution with sum  $s - v_j$ , with  $\text{OPT}[s] - 1$  tuples in total, and with  $D[j, s] - 1$  instances of  $v_j$ . From Equation (3) we get  $D[j, s] - 1 < D[j, s - v_j]$ , in contradiction to the minimality of  $D[j, s - v_j]$ .  $\square$

**PROPOSITION 6.2.** *For  $\alpha \in \{\text{avg}, \text{sum}, \text{median}\}$ , there are classes of instances where the approximation ratio of HeurRepair is  $\Omega(n)$ .*

**PROOF.** For each case we show a database with schema  $(G, A)$ , where HeurRepair will reach a repair by removing at least  $\Omega(n)$  times more tuples than the optimal solution.

**avg.** Consider the following database with schema  $(G, A)$ , composed of the following tuples:  $\{(1, 1), (1, 3), (2, 1), (2, 3), (3, 2)\}$  and also  $n - 5$  tuples  $(3, 1)$ . Initially, the averages of the 3 groups are  $\text{avg}(r_1) = \text{avg}(r_2) = 2$  and  $\text{avg}(r_3) = (2 + n - 5)/n - 4$ , meaning  $1 < \text{avg}(r_3) < 2$ , and the AOD  $G \not\rightarrow \text{avg}(A)$  is not satisfied. A possible monotonic subset is achieved by removing the two tuples  $(1, 3)$  and  $(2, 3)$ , resulting in an average of 1 for  $r_1, r_2$ . HeurRepair would not choose to remove these tuples. Removing  $(1, 3)$  has impact 0 on the MVI, and removing  $(2, 3)$  has a negative impact. The only tuples with a positive impact are the  $n - 5$  copies of  $(3, 1)$ , which HeurRepair will remove one by one.

**sum.** Consider the following database with schema  $(G, A)$ , composed of the following tuples:  $n - 5$  copies of  $(1, 1)$ , as well as  $(2, 2n)$ , 2 copies of  $(2, n/3)$  and 2 copies of  $(3, n)$ . Initially, the sums of the 3 groups are  $\text{sum}(r_1) = n - 5$ ,  $\text{sum}(r_2) = 8n/3$  and  $\text{sum}(r_3) = 2n$ , and the AOD  $G \not\rightarrow \text{sum}(A)$  is not satisfied since  $\text{sum}(r_2) > \text{sum}(r_3)$ . Removing the two tuples  $(2, n/3)$  will yield a monotonic subset, since  $\text{sum}(r_2)$  will be  $2n$ . In the first iteration of HeurRepair, tuples from  $r_1$  have impact 0, and tuples from  $r_3$  will have a negative impact. Therefore the algorithm will remove a tuple from  $r_2$ : specifically,  $(2, 2n)$  has the maximal impact of  $2n/3 - (n - 5 - 2n/3) = 5 + n/3$  (while the other two tuples in  $r_2$  have impact  $n/3$ ). The new sums are  $n - 5, 2n/3, 2n$ , and the AOD is still not satisfied. Next, HeurRepair will remove only tuples from  $r_1$ , as the others have impact 0. Since each tuple contributes 1 to  $\text{sum}(r_1)$ ,  $n/3 - 5$  additional tuples will be removed.

**median.** Consider the following database with schema  $(A, G)$ , composed of the following tuples:  $(1, 1)$ , 3 copies of  $(1, n)$ , and  $(2, 1), (2, 2), \dots, (2, n - 4)$ . Initially, the medians are  $\text{median}(r_1) = n$ ,  $\text{median}(r_2) \in \{1, \dots, n - 4\}$ , and the AOD  $G \not\rightarrow \text{median}(A)$  is not satisfied since  $\text{median}(r_1) > \text{median}(r_2)$ . Removing the three tuples of the form  $(1, n)$  yields a monotonic subset, since  $\text{median}(r_1)$  will be 1. However, the impact of the  $(1, n)$  tuples is 0, since it does not change  $\text{median}(r_1)$ . Instead, HeurRepair will remove all  $n - 4$  tuples from  $r_2$ , starting with the lower  $A$  values, since each one will increase  $\text{median}(r_2)$  and have a positive impact.  $\square$

## B Missing Details from Section 5

In this section, we give additional details that were omitted from Section 5.

### B.1 Pruning the Intermediate Result Dictionary

A notable drawback of the CardRepair outlined in Algorithm 1 is that the size of the intermediate result dictionary,  $H_i$ , can grow to be very large. We next describe two methods of pruning that dictionary, followed by an evaluation of their effects on the size of the dictionary and on the runtime.

**B.1.1 Pruning the Intermediate Result Dictionary using Dominated Values.** Let  $F_i = \{x \mid O_\alpha(r_i, x) \neq \emptyset\}$  denote the set of feasible aggregate values of  $r_i$ . Each feasible value  $x \in F_i$  is added to  $H_i$  in line 8 of Algorithm 1. The size of  $F_i$  may be exponential in the size of  $r_i$  since, potentially, every subset of  $r_i$  may lead to a different aggregate value. However, after computing  $H_i$  (at the end of the loop of line 3), we can prune  $H_i$ , so that the number of keys saved in this dictionary is linear in the size of the dataset.


We say that a monotonic subset  $r' \subseteq r$  uses a value  $x$  for group  $i$  if it holds that  $\alpha(r'_i[A]) = x$ . An entry  $x_1$  of  $H_i$  is *dominated* by entry  $x_2$  of  $H_i$  if  $x_1 > x_2$  and for every monotonic subset  $r'$  that uses  $x_1$  for  $r_i$ , there exists another monotonic subset  $r''$  such that  $|r''| \geq |r'|$ ,  $r''$  uses  $x_2$  for  $r_i$ , and  $\forall j \neq i : \alpha(r'_j[A]) = \alpha(r''_j[A])$ . That is, it is possible to use  $x_2$  instead of  $x_1$  as the aggregate value for group  $i$ , without compromising the optimality of the solution. Recall that  $H_i[x]$  holds the largest subset  $r'$  of  $r_1 \cup \dots \cup r_i$  such that  $\alpha(r'_i[A]) = x$ .

**LEMMA B.1.** *Let  $x_1$  and  $x_2$  be two values in  $H_i$  such that  $x_1 > x_2$  and  $|H_{i-1}[x_1]| \leq |H_{i-1}[x_2]|$ . Then,  $x_1$  is dominated by  $x_2$ .*

**PROOF.** Let  $r'$  be a monotonic subset of  $r$  w.r.t. an AOD  $G \nearrow \alpha(A)$ , that uses  $x_1$  for group  $i$ . Then we have  $\alpha(r'_i[A]) = x_1$  and  $\alpha(r'_j[A]) \geq x_1$  for  $j > i$ . Since  $x_1 > x_2$ ,  $\alpha(r'_j[A]) \geq x_2$  for  $j > i$ . Let  $r'_{>i} = r'_i \cup \dots \cup r'_m$ . Then  $H_{i-1}[x_2] \cup r'_{>i}$  is a monotonic subset for the AOD, and  $|H_{i-1}[x_2] \cup r'_{>i}| \geq |H_{i-1}[x_1] \cup r'_{>i}| = |r'|$ .  $\square$

Given Lemma B.1, we can prune  $H_i$  in the following manner: we iterate over the keys  $x$  in ascending order and keep track of the largest solution size  $k$  seen so far. When considering a value of  $x$ , keep it only if  $|H[x]| > k$ . Since the solution sizes  $|H_i[x]|$  must be strictly increasing, this means that the size of  $H$  after this pruning is bounded by the size of the dataset. Consider  $r_1 = \{t \in r \mid t.edu = 1\}$  from the example in Figure 2, with  $r_1[A] = [1, 2]$ . Then  $|H_1[1]| = 1$ ,  $|H_1[2]| = 1$ ,  $|H_1[3]| = 2$ . In this case, 1 dominates 2, and we prune 2 from  $H_1$ .

**B.1.2 Pruning the Intermediate Result Dictionary using a Heuristic Upper Bound.** To accelerate the search, we can use a lower bound on the size of the C-repair (i.e., an upper bound on the number of removed tuples). Such a bound can come from a heuristic algorithm that finds a monotonic subset, and we show an example of such an algorithm (HeurRepair) in Section 6. We first run HeurRepair and reach a (possibly non-maximal) monotonic subset, that requires removing  $h$  tuples. The number of tuple removals for the C-repair is at most  $h$ . Therefore, we prune the search so as not to consider partial solutions that remove more tuples than HeurRepair.



**Figure 10: Comparison of runtime performance of different DP aggregation-agnostic optimizations, over sum, median, avg, and max across increasing number of tuples, using samples from real datasets.**

In the intermediate result dictionary  $H$ , we only keep solutions that remove up to  $m$  tuples from the entire relation  $r$ . Specifically, in line 8 of Algorithm 1, if  $|H_{i-1}[x] \cup F_i[x]| \leq |r| - m$ , then  $H_{i-1}[x] \cup F_i[x]$  cannot be completed into an optimal solution, and therefore we can avoid saving  $x$  in  $H_i$ .

**B.1.3 Experimental Evaluation.** We next compare the runtimes of variations of CardRepair, over various aggregation functions (sum, median, avg, max). The compared variations are: (1) Naive DP - the naive version described in Algorithm 1. (2) Pruning the intermediate result dictionary by dominating values (Section B.1.1). (3) Pruning the intermediate result dictionary by a heuristic bound (Section B.1.2). (4) Both pruning methods combined. For each aggregation function we use the setting that achieved the fastest runtimes according to Section 7.2: for WholePack(sum), we apply the knapsack optimization (Section 5.2.3). For WholePack(median) and WholePack(avg), we used the combination of WholePack( $\alpha$ ) pruning by a heuristic bound and optimizing WholePack( $\alpha$ ) with value-based iteration.

From Figure 10, we can see that both methods of pruning the intermediate result dictionary caused an increase in runtimes. This is due to the overhead of this optimization: pruning requires an additional iteration over the keys in the dictionary. However, these optimizations are useful for reducing memory overhead. Figure 11 shows the number of keys stored in  $H$  over the number of processed groups, for avg and sum, the two harder cases of the problem. For avg, pruning dominated values reduced the number of stored keys by 4 orders of magnitude (6,112,712 versus 164 for the last group). For sum, pruning dominated values resulted in 4 times less stored keys for the last group (1.4M vs 5.4M). The difference in the size of improvement is related to the number of possible distinct

aggregation values of subsets of  $r[A]$ . For avg, every different sum and size of a subset possibly lead to a new average, while for sum, the size of the subset does not matter.

We conclude that the pruning optimizations for the intermediate result dictionary substantially reduce  $H$ , their current overhead diminishes a runtime improvement. An interesting future work direction is to develop the algorithm further to reduce the pruning overhead.

## B.2 Pruning Holistic Packing using a Heuristic Bound

**B.2.1 sum.** Recall that the dynamic program in Section 4.2.2 used a data structure  $M[j, s]$ , that holds the maximal subset of the first  $j$  tuples  $t_1, \dots, t_j$  with sum  $s$  of  $A$  values. To be able to prune the computation based on a bound  $h$  on the number of tuples to remove, we first replace the structure  $M$  with a similar structure  $P[j, s]$  with a different meaning.  $P[j, s]$  holds the minimal subset  $r'$  of  $t_1, \dots, t_j$  that when removed from  $r$ , the sum of  $A$  values is  $s$ . I.e.,  $\text{sum}((r \setminus r')[A]) = s$ .

Let  $T = \text{sum}(r[A])$ . To populate the table  $P[j, s]$ , we start by setting  $P[j, s] = 0$  for  $j = 0, s = T$  and  $\infty$  otherwise (when removing 0 tuples, the sum of the remaining tuples is  $T$ ).

For  $j > 0$  and any  $s \in V_\alpha(r)$ , if  $s + t_j[A] \in V_\alpha(r)$ ,

$$P[j, s] = \min(P[j-1, s], 1 + P[j-1, s + t_j[A]]) .$$

If  $s - t_j[A] \notin V_\alpha(r)$ , then we set  $P[j, s] = P[j-1, s]$ .

To prune the computation based on a bound  $h$  on the number of tuples to remove, we add another condition to the update of  $P[j, s]$ : if  $1 + P[j-1, s + t_j[A]] > h$  (there are already too many tuples in the removed subset), we set  $P[j, s] = P[j-1, s]$ .

**B.2.2 avg.** As for sum, to be able to prune the search for a maximum size subset with an avg value of  $x$ , we modify the dynamic programming table described in Section 4.2.2 as follows. Recall that the data structure  $M'[j, \ell, s]$  was used to hold a boolean value, being true when  $\{t_1, \dots, t_j\}$  has a subset with precisely  $\ell$  tuples, where the  $A$  values sum up to  $s$ .

The modified table  $P'[j, \ell, s]$  holds true when  $\{t_1, \dots, t_j\}$  has a subset  $r'$  of  $\ell$  tuples such that  $\text{sum}((r \setminus r')[A]) = s$ .

To populate  $P'$ , we initialize  $P'[j, \ell, s]$  to true for  $\ell = 0, s = T$ , and every  $j$ , and false otherwise.




Figure 11: Number of keys stored in the intermediate result dictionary  $H$  with and without pruning.

For  $j > 0$  and  $\ell > 0$ , we check whether  $s + t_j[A] \in V_\alpha(r)$ ; if so:

$$P'[j, \ell, s] = P'[j-1, \ell, s] \vee P'[j-1, \ell-1, s + t_j[A]] ,$$

otherwise, if  $s + t_j[A] \notin V_\alpha(r)$ , then:

$$P'[j, \ell, s] = P'[j-1, \ell, s] .$$

Again, as for sum, if a bound  $h$  on the number of tuples to remove is given, we can limit the update only to cells of  $P'$  that have  $\ell \leq h$ .

## B.3 Holistic Packing for Median: Pseudo-code

Algorithm 5 gives the pseudo-code of the algorithm of holistic packing for median.

## B.4 Example for Holistic Sum Packing

Consider the group  $r_2$  defined by  $\text{edu}=2$  from Figure 2. The values of the aggregate attribute are 2, 2, 5, 5, 6, creating the input histogram  $\text{Hist} = [(2, 2), (5, 2), (6, 1)]$ . The keys are sorted in ascending  $\text{edu}$  order, so  $v_1 = 2, v_2 = 5, v_3 = 6$ . The sum of all  $r_2[A]$  values is  $T = 20$ ; hence, the size of  $M, M'$ , and each row of  $D$  is 21. The cell  $M[0]$  is initialized to 0, and all other cells to  $-1$ .

Figure 12 shows the point in the algorithm where we have already performed the first two iterations of the loop in line 5 of Algorithm 2. That is, we have processed  $v_1 = 2$  (green cells) and  $v_2 = 5$  (orange cells). For example, using two instances of  $v_2 = 5$  we reached  $s = 10$ , so  $M[10] = 2$  and  $D[2, 10] = 2$ . Using one instance of 5 and two instances of 2 we have reached  $s = 9$ , so  $M[9] = 3, D[2, 9] = 1$ , and  $D[1, 9-5]$  has already been set to 2 in the first iteration. At this point,  $Z = 2 \cdot 2 + 5 \cdot 2 = 14$ . The last pair in the histogram is  $(v_j, c_j) = (v_3, c_3) = (6, 1)$ . We increase  $Z$  to 20 (line 6). Then,  $M$  is copied into  $M'$ , which is shown in Figure 12 in the non-colored cells of  $M'$ .

We iterate over  $s$  values from  $v_j = 6$  to  $Z = 20$  (line 8). For example, consider  $s = 10$ . In the previous iteration, we had  $M[10] = 2$  using two instances of 5, and no instances of 6, so  $u = D[3, 10-6] = 0$ . We now consider  $M[s_{\text{prev}}] = M[s - (u+1) \cdot v_j] = M[10-6] = M[4] = 2$ , update  $M'[10] = 2 + 0 + 1$  (line 18), and  $D[3, 10] = 1$  (line 19).

As another example, consider  $s = 16$ . We have  $u = D[j, s - v_j] = D[3, 10] = 1$  since the instance of 6 was already used to construct a maximum-sized subset with sum 10. The condition in line 12 holds, and we cannot use  $u + 1$  instances of 6. Therefore we iterate over possible usages of 6 (combined with the previous values) for a way to construct 16. In line 15 we have  $M[s - u' \cdot v_j] = M[16-6] = M[10] = 2$ . Note that  $M[10]$  still holds the solution made up of two instances of 5 (the best solution without using the current  $v_j$ ), since the  $M$  data structure only changes in the end of the iteration on  $v_j$ . In lines 16-17, we update  $M'[16] = 2 + 1 = 3$  and  $D[3, 16] = 1$ .

## C Optimizations of the Heuristic Algorithm

We next describe optimizations to HeurRepair, the heuristic algorithm described in Section 6. As explained before, for every aggregation function  $\alpha$ , the impact of a tuple  $t$  (computed in lines 6-8 of Algorithm 4) can be calculated by running the query “SELECT  $\alpha(A)$  GROUP BY  $G$ ” twice: once with  $t$  and once without it. Then,  $S_{\text{MVI}}$  is calculated for each of the queries, and the impact is the difference between them. We next describe several optimizations of this process. We begin with general optimizations that apply to all

s	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
M	0	-1	1	-1	2	1	-1	2	-1	3	2	-1	3	-1	4	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1
temp M	0	-1	1	-1	2	1	1	2	2	3	2	3	3	3	4	4	3	-1	4	-1	5
D[1] : v <sub>1</sub> = 2			1		2																
D[2] : v <sub>2</sub> = 5					1		1		1	2		2		2							
D[3] : v <sub>3</sub> = 6						1		1		1	1		1		1	1		1		1	

Figure 12: Example for Algorithm 2. Empty cells in  $D_j$  contain the default value 0.

aggregations functions  $\alpha$ , and then describe aggregation-specific optimizations.

*Iteration on a reduced set of tuples.* We optimize the algorithm by calculating tuple impacts only for those within violating groups, i.e., any group  $r_i$  where  $\text{MVI}(r_i, r_{i+1}) > 0$  or  $\text{MVI}(r_{i-1}, r_i) > 0$ . Note that this optimization may alter the algorithm's outcome. While the original algorithm could select for removal a zero-impact tuple from anywhere in the relation (if zero is the highest impact, as shown in Example 6.1), the optimization will only consider such a tuple if it belongs to a violating group. This heuristic logically focuses the repair effort on tuples that are active participants in a violation.

We can further optimize the process for max, count, countd and sum. These functions are *monotonic* in the sense that a tuple removal from group  $r_i$  can only reduce (or preserve) the value  $\alpha(r_i[A])$ . Therefore, if  $\text{MVI}(r_i, r_{i+1}) > 0$ , every removal of a tuple from  $r_{i+1}$  would only increase  $\text{MVI}(r_i, r_{i+1})$ . Hence, when selecting a tuple to remove, we iterate over (and compute the impact for) tuples in  $r_i$ , not those in  $r_{i+1}$ . In other words,  $r_i$  is considered a violating group only if  $\text{MVI}(r_i, r_{i+1}) > 0$ .

The next optimizations are based on specific properties of each aggregation function.

*Optimization for max and min.* A key observation for max is that when there are multiple tuples with the maximum  $A$  value in a group  $r_i$ , removing any single one of them will have no impact on  $\alpha(r_i[A])$  (and consequently on the sum of violations). Similarly, removing any other tuple from  $r_i$  will have zero impact on  $\alpha(r_i[A])$ . The only operation that reduces the value of  $\alpha(r_i[A])$  is the removal of all the maximum-value tuples together. Therefore, we optimize the algorithm by computing the impact of removing all maximum-value tuples in each violating group together, instead of removing tuples one at a time. A similar observation applies to min.

*Optimization for count and countd.* For count, all tuples of a given group have the same impact. If  $r_i$  is a violating group, any tuple removed from  $r_i$  will reduce  $\alpha(r_i[A])$  by one; therefore, all tuples from  $r_i$  have the same impact on the sum of violations, and it is sufficient to calculate the impact of one of these tuples.

For countd, similarly to max, removing any proper subset of tuples with the same  $A$  value from  $r_i$  has no impact on  $\text{countd}(r_i[A])$ . Therefore, instead of removing a single tuple at each iteration, we remove all the tuples of  $r_i$  that share the least common  $A$  value in this group together.

*Optimizations for sum and avg.* In the case of sum, to compute the impact of a tuple  $t \in r_i$ , we compute the modified aggregate value based on the stored value  $\text{sum}(r_i[A])$ . That is,  $\text{sum}((r_i \setminus \{t\})[A]) = \text{sum}(r_i[A]) - t[A]$ .

For avg, we track the sum and the count of tuples for each group. Then instead of computing  $\text{avg}((r_i \setminus \{t\})[A])$  from scratch, we can compute it as  $(\text{sum}(r_i[A]) - t[A]) / (\text{count}(r_i[A]) - 1)$ .

*Optimization for median.* We maintain the count of the tuples in each group  $r_i$ , and a sorted list  $L$  of  $r_i[A]$  values and their corresponding indices. The list is sorted by  $A$  values in ascending order. Instead of removing each tuple and calculating  $\text{median}((r_i \setminus \{t_j\})[A])$ , we can compute it in three batches: for all tuples such that  $j < m$ , all tuples where  $j > m$ , and the median tuple  $j = m$ . For each of these batches, every tuple removed will result in the same median. If the count of tuples after removal  $(|L| - 1)$  is odd, the new median is given by:

$$\text{median}(r_i \setminus \{t_j\}) = \begin{cases} L[m] & \text{if } j < m, \\ L[m-1] & \text{if } j \geq m \end{cases}$$

If  $|L| - 1$  is even, the new median is the average of two values:

$$\text{median}(r_i \setminus \{t_j\}) = \begin{cases} (L[m] + L[m+1])/2 & \text{if } j < m, \\ (L[m-1] + L[m+1])/2 & \text{if } j = m, \\ (L[m-1] + L[m])/2 & \text{if } j > m. \end{cases}$$

## D Omitted Results from Comparison to Outlier Detection Methods

We bring here the full set of results from three combinations of dataset and AOD. For each such combination, we performed hyper parameter search for the three outlier removal methods described in Section 7.5.

For each method, we performed hyper parameter tuning on the parameters described next.

- (1) *Z-score* [37] with threshold parameter  $\tau$ : models  $r[A]$  as samples from a normal distribution and removes points whose distance from the mean is over  $\tau$  standard deviations. We experimented with  $1 \leq \tau \leq 6$ .
- (2) *Local outlier factor* [12]: samples with substantially lower density compared to the  $k$  closest neighbors are considered outliers. We tried  $k$  values in  $\{3, 5, 8, 10\}$ .
- (3) *Isolation forest* [43]: random decision trees are trained to isolate observations; easily isolated samples (with shorter path lengths in the decision tree) are considered outliers. A contamination



**Algorithm 5: WholePack⟨median⟩**


---

**Input** : A bag of values  $r_i \llbracket A \rrbracket$ , and an upper bound  $h$  on the number of tuples to remove.

**Output**: A mapping  $M$  from a median value  $x$  to maximum subset size, and an array  $D$  mapping  $x$  to the  $A$  values composing it and the number of tuples on each side to include.

```

1  $T \leftarrow$  a sorted array of  $r_i \llbracket A \rrbracket$  values
2  $\text{Hist} \leftarrow$  a histogram of  $T$ , in ascending order by values  $v_j$ 
3  $M \leftarrow$  a mapping from each median  $x$  to  $-1$ 
4  $D \leftarrow$  a mapping from median to (empty list, 0)
5  $n \leftarrow |T|$ 
6 // Define the range of pivot candidates with pruning.
7  $\text{start} \leftarrow \max(0, \lfloor n/2 - h/2 - 1 \rfloor)$ 
8  $\text{end} \leftarrow \min(n, \lfloor n/2 + h/2 + 1 \rfloor)$ 
9 // Single pivot medians.
10 for  $i \leftarrow \text{start}$  to  $\text{end} - 1$  do
11    $k \leftarrow \min(i, n - i - 1)$ 
12    $\text{count} \leftarrow 2 \cdot k + 1$ 
13   if  $M[T[i]] < \text{count}$  then
14      $M[T[i]] \leftarrow \text{count}$ 
15      $D[T[i]] \leftarrow ([T[i]], k)$ 
16 // Two adjacent pivot medians.
17 for  $i \leftarrow \text{start}$  to  $\min(\text{end}, n - 1) - 1$  do
18    $k \leftarrow \min(i, n - i - 2)$ 
19    $\text{count} \leftarrow 2 \cdot k + 2$ 
20    $x \leftarrow (T[i] + T[i + 1]) / 2$ 
21   if  $M[x] < \text{count}$  then
22      $M[x] \leftarrow \text{count}$ 
23      $D[x] \leftarrow ([T[i], T[i + 1]], k)$ 
24 // Two nonadjacent pivot medians.
25  $k_{\text{left}} \leftarrow 0$ 
26 for  $i \leftarrow 0$  to  $|\text{Hist}| - 1$  do
27    $k_{\text{left}} \leftarrow k_{\text{left}} + \text{Hist}[i]$ 
28    $k_{\text{right}} \leftarrow n - k_{\text{left}}$ 
29   // Pruning - too far to the left
30   if  $2 \cdot k_{\text{left}} \leq n - h$  then
31     continue
32   for  $j \leftarrow i + 1$  to  $|\text{Hist}| - 1$  do
33     // Pruning - too far to the right
34     if  $2 \cdot k_{\text{right}} \leq n - h$  then
35       continue
36      $x \leftarrow (\text{Hist}[i] + \text{Hist}[j]) / 2$ 
37      $\text{count} \leftarrow 2 \cdot \min(k_{\text{left}}, k_{\text{right}})$ 
38     if  $M[x] < \text{count}$  then
39        $M[x] \leftarrow \text{count}$ 
40        $D[x] \leftarrow ([\text{Hist}[i], \text{Hist}[j]], \min(k_{\text{left}}, k_{\text{right}} - 1))$ 
41      $k_{\text{right}} \leftarrow k_{\text{right}} - \text{Hist}[j]$ 
42 return  $(M, D)$ 

```

---

parameter controls the number of expected outliers in the data. We tried contamination values between 0.001 and 0.2.

For each method, we also examined a variation where the outlier removal is done per group  $r_i$  versus on the full dataset.

**Table 3: Outlier removal results for stack overflow with  $\alpha = \text{avg}$ . For each method, the variation with the minimal sum of violations (and minimal number of removed tuples) is in bold. Removed+ is the number of additional tuple removals required to reach a monotonic subset after outlier removal.**

Method	Param.	Groupwise	# Removed	$S_{\text{MVI}}$	Removed+
Z score	1	No	1480	6304	
Z score	1.5	No	1235	3680	
Z score	2	No	1037	0	
Z score	2.5	No	865	0	
Z score	3	No	724	0	
Z score	3.5	No	630	0	
Z score	4	No	544	0	
Z score	5	No	425	0	
Z score	6	No	<b>369</b>	<b>0</b>	0
LOF	3	No	318	<b>25667</b>	38
LOF	5	No	412	32736	
LOF	8	No	417	35204	
LOF	10	No	465	31542	
Iso.Forest	0.001	No	23	17182	
Iso.Forest	0.005	No	23	17182	
Iso.Forest	0.01	No	23	17182	
Iso.Forest	0.05	No	1519	<b>6515</b>	7
Iso.Forest	0.1	No	3125	8542	
Iso.Forest	0.2	No	6252	10569	
Z score	1	Yes	1509	11200	
Z score	1.5	Yes	1244	7073	
Z score	2	Yes	1062	2787	
Z score	2.5	Yes	888	6252	
Z score	3	Yes	733	2166	
Z score	3.5	Yes	638	4229	
Z score	4	Yes	558	2119	
Z score	5	Yes	441	3764	
Z score	6	Yes	373	<b>0</b>	0
LOF	3	Yes	600	29850	
LOF	5	Yes	766	23598	
LOF	8	Yes	972	<b>2142</b>	18
LOF	10	Yes	1055	3609	
Iso.Forest	0.001	Yes	23	17182	
Iso.Forest	0.005	Yes	83	15653	
Iso.Forest	0.01	Yes	179	36211	
Iso.Forest	0.05	Yes	1556	<b>4424</b>	5
Iso.Forest	0.1	Yes	3112	5053	
Iso.Forest	0.2	Yes	6126	9060	

All methods (with the various parameters) were applied on the datasets as a preliminary step. We then selected the ones that were closest to a repair - i.e., the ones with the minimal sum of violations after removal. On the resulting subset of the dataset for those method variations, we applied CardRepair to find a cardinality repair.

The results are shown in Tables 3 to 5. For each outlier removal method, we report the number of removed tuples, and the sum of violations after removal. For each set of variations of a method, we highlight (in bold) the variation that was closest to a repair (the minimal  $S_{\text{MVI}}$ , and minimal number of removed tuples in the case of a tie). For the variations that were closest to satisfying the AOD, we also report the number of additional tuple removals required to reach a monotonic subset.

Most variations of outlier removal methods did not yield a monotonic subset (namely, a valid solution). For the sum scenario, none of the methods yielded a monotonic subset, all of them removed over 30 times more tuples than necessary, and CardRepair had to remove a similar number of tuples as without the preliminary outlier detection. For the avg and max scenarios, some of the outlier



**Table 4: Outlier removal results for H&M with  $\alpha = \max$ . For each method, the variation with the minimal sum of violations (and minimal number of removed tuples) is in bold.**

Method	Param.	Groupwise	# Removed	$S_{MVI}$	Removed+
Z score	1	No	462973	0	
Z score	1.5	No	179157	0	
Z score	2	No	84041	0	
Z score	2.5	No	54412	0	
Z score	3	No	21512	0	
Z score	3.5	No	18258	1	
Z score	4	No	8378	4	
Z score	5	No	3158	4	
Z score	6	No	<b>1356</b>	<b>0</b>	0
Iso.Forest	0.001	No	1262	4	
Iso.Forest	0.005	No	<b>8489</b>	<b>0</b>	0
Iso.Forest	0.01	No	18540	0	
Iso.Forest	0.05	No	92774	0	
Iso.Forest	0.1	No	181400	0	
Iso.Forest	0.2	No	367546	0	
Z score	1	Yes	117349	458	
Z score	1.5	Yes	117349	577	
Z score	2	Yes	83664	<b>4</b>	1270
Z score	2.5	Yes	54489	5	
Z score	3	Yes	21335	6	
Z score	3.5	Yes	18105	7	
Z score	4	Yes	9019	10	
Z score	5	Yes	3970	17	
Z score	6	Yes	1712	13	
Iso.Forest	0.001	Yes	1385	47	
Iso.Forest	0.005	Yes	8348	26	
Iso.Forest	0.01	Yes	16657	<b>13</b>	4601
Iso.Forest	0.05	Yes	83907	16	
Iso.Forest	0.1	Yes	117349	577	
Iso.Forest	0.2	Yes	117349	458	

**Table 5: Outlier removal results for H&M with  $\alpha = \text{sum}$ . For each method, the variation with the minimal sum of violations (and minimal number of removed tuples) is in bold.**

Method	Param.	Groupwise	# Removed	$S_{MVI}$	Removed+
Z score	1	No	462973	<b>88112</b>	2797
Z score	1.5	No	179157	94748	
Z score	2	No	84041	106035	
Z score	2.5	No	54412	106576	
Z score	3	No	21512	106172	
Z score	3.5	No	18258	105808	
Z score	4	No	8378	106379	
Z score	5	No	3158	105009	
Z score	6	No	1356	105355	
Iso.Forest	0.001	No	1262	105841	
Iso.Forest	0.005	No	8489	105950	
Iso.Forest	0.01	No	18540	106113	
Iso.Forest	0.05	No	92774	107011	
Iso.Forest	0.1	No	181400	107873	
Iso.Forest	0.2	No	367546	<b>99800</b>	2270
Z score	1	Yes	117349	94262	
Z score	1.5	Yes	117349	<b>89214</b>	236279
Z score	2	Yes	83664	105083	
Z score	2.5	Yes	54489	104848	
Z score	3	Yes	21335	105236	
Z score	3.5	Yes	18105	105568	
Z score	4	Yes	9019	113748	
Z score	5	Yes	3970	105007	
Z score	6	Yes	1712	105355	
Iso.Forest	0.001	Yes	1385	105355	
Iso.Forest	0.005	Yes	8348	105950	
Iso.Forest	0.01	Yes	16657	<b>83644</b>	1426
Iso.Forest	0.05	Yes	83907	111784	
Iso.Forest	0.1	Yes	117349	95054	
Iso.Forest	0.2	Yes	117349	151932	

removal methods did return a monotonic subset satisfying the AOD, but they required removing 10 times more tuples than the C-repair.

Still, outlier removal can occasionally accelerate CardRepair. For example, for SO with avg, Isolation forest with 0.05 contamination (in both the group-wise and the non group-wise settings), there were only a few remaining tuples to remove. In both cases, HeurRepair yielded tight bounds, thus greatly shortening the run-times of CardRepair (60.5 seconds and 115.9 seconds, respectively, versus 1082 seconds).


Overall, we conclude that *repairing for an AOD typically requires more than just applying outlier detection, as the tuples that obscure the trend are not necessarily statistical outliers*. They may appear structurally standard, but still interfere with the expected trend.

## E Additional Case Studies

*H&M*. For H&M we considered the sum of purchases grouped by age between the ages of 25 and 40, which exhibited an almost perfect decrease. Both the heuristic and the exact algorithm found a C-repair for the AOD  $\text{age} \searrow \text{sum}(\text{price})$  by removing 1464 tuples (0.07%). A C-repair for the reversed AOD  $\text{age} \nearrow \text{sum}(\text{price})$  would require removing 741,302 tuples (39%), meaning that indeed the dataset is much closer to supporting  $\text{age} \searrow \text{sum}(\text{price})$ .

*German credit*. We focused on the average credit risk score over time that a person has been employed in their place of work. We would expect that as the employment time is longer, the person is more likely to be labeled as a good credit risk. However, the rate for unemployed (63%) was higher than for people employed under 1 year (59%), and the rate for people with over 7 years of employment in their place of work (75%) was lower than for people with 4-7 years of employment (78%). Both HeurRepair and CardRepair found a C-repair by removing 16 (1.6%) tuples, removing people with over 7 years of employment, and unemployed individuals. A C-repair for the opposite direction AOD required removing 90 (9%) tuples.

*Stack Overflow*. For the AOD  $\text{edu} \nearrow \text{avg}(\text{income})$  (Figure 13), we considered the categories primary school, secondary school, Bachelor’s degree, Master’s degree, and PhD (excluding professional degrees like MD, JD). The original dataset does not satisfy the AOD, as the average salary for primary school is too high (\$131.6K versus \$110.9K for secondary school) and the salary for Bachelor’s degree (\$138.4K) is higher than for Master’s (\$134.4K). CardRepair and HeurRepair removed the exact same subset of 37 tuples (0.12%

**Figure 13: Average yearly salary over education level, according to the Stack Overflow dataset.**

$r_1$	$r_2$
11	10
10	5
9	5
8	5
7	1

**Figure 14: Heuristic algorithm example for median aggregation.**

of the data), but HeurRepair’s runtime was much faster (0.61 seconds versus 1082.42 seconds for the most optimized version of CardRepair). For the opposite AOD, the HeurRepair removed 403 tuples (1.3% of the dataset), but we were unable to run CardRepair, since even with pruning to keep only repairs that remove up to 403 tuples, the algorithm would take days to run.

## F Pitfalls of the Heuristic Algorithm for Median

One of the key challenges with HeurRepair for median is its inefficiency in removing tuples. The main issue is that for median, the impact of the removed tuple depends on the other tuples in the group (specifically those in proximity of the current median). In these cases, the greedy approach that only sees a single step ahead is likely to make suboptimal choices.

*Example F.1.* Consider a relation  $r$  consisting of two groups,  $r_1$  with  $G$  value 1 and  $r_2$  with  $G$  value 2. The two columns  $r_1, r_2$  in Table 14 represent the bag of values in each group (e.g., the value 11 in  $r_1$  represents the tuple (1, 11)). We consider the AOD:  $G \nearrow \text{median}(A)$ . Initially,  $\text{median}(r_1[A]) = 9$  and  $\text{median}(r_2[A]) = 5$ . The impact of removing each single tuple from  $r_2$  is 0, since there are multiple instances of the median value. The algorithm then


chooses to remove the tuple (1, 11) that has impact 0.5 on  $S_{\text{MVI}}$ , as after the removal,  $\text{median}(r_1[A]) = 9$ . The situation is repeated in each iteration of the algorithm until all five tuples in  $r_1$  are removed (marked in red), where an optimal solution is to remove the three lowest-value tuples from  $r_2$  (marked in green).  $\square$

A possible improvement to HeurRepair could consider one group  $r_i$  at a time (instead of one tuple at a time) and try to reduce the violations of this group to 0. For median, given  $\text{LB} = \text{median}(r_{i-1}[A])$  and  $\text{UB} = \text{median}(r_{i+1}[A])$ , it is possible to devise a closed formula to find the maximum-sized subset  $r'_i \subseteq r_i$  such that  $\text{LB} \leq \text{median}(r_i[A]) \leq \text{UB}$ .

## G Graphs with Additional Information

In Section 7 we have omitted the confidence intervals from Figure 6, to make them more accessible. We include them here in Figure 15.

For the comparison between aggregations (Figure 6) we have included Figure 15.



**Figure 15: Run times of CardRepair and HeurRepair with various aggregations over synthetic data, with 95% confidence intervals. This is a fuller version of Figure 6.**