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ABSTRACT

Software systems that learn from data with machine learning (ML) are used in critical decision-making processes. Unfortunately, real-world experience shows that the pipelines for data preparation, feature encoding and model training in ML systems are often brittle with respect to their input data. As a consequence, data scientists have to run different kinds of data centric what-if analyses to evaluate the robustness and reliability of such pipelines, e.g., with respect to data errors or preprocessing techniques. These what-if analyses follow a common pattern: they take an existing ML pipeline, create a pipeline variant by introducing a small change, and execute this variant to see how the change impacts the pipeline’s output score.

We recently proposed mlwhatif, a library that enables data scientists to declaratively specify what-if analyses for an ML pipeline, and to automatically generate, optimize and execute the required pipeline variants. We demonstrate how data scientists can leverage mlwhatif for a variety of pipelines and three different what-if analyses focusing on the robustness of a pipeline against data errors, the impact of data cleaning operations, and the impact of data preprocessing operations on fairness. In particular, we demonstrate step-by-step how mlwhatif generates and optimizes the required execution plans for the pipeline analyses. Our library is publicly available at https://github.com/stefan-grafberger/mlwhatif.
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PVLDB Artifact Availability:
The source code, data, and/or other artifacts have been made available at https://github.com/shubhaguha/mlwhatif-demo.

1 INTRODUCTION

Software systems that learn from data with machine learning (ML) are used in critical decision-making processes [14]. Unfortunately, real-world experience shows that the pipelines for data preparation, feature encoding and model training in ML systems are often brittle with respect to issues in the data they process [9, 10, 14].

Data centric what-if analysis with mlwhatif. Data scientists play a critical role in ensuring the robustness and fairness of these pipelines by performing data-centric what-if analyses. These analyses focus on understanding the sensitivity of the pipelines to small changes to their input data or pipeline operators [2]. Such analyses, for example, focus on (i) the robustness against data errors [13], asking what-if the input data to a pipeline had certain errors like missing values or outliers?, (ii) the impact of preprocessing operators on the pipeline’s fairness [1], asking what-if the pipeline filtered or featurized the training data differently?, and (iii) the impact of data cleaning operations [7], asking what-if the pipeline applied a particular error detection and cleaning technique?

Performing what-if analyses on ML pipelines poses several technical challenges. Many analysis techniques are designed for single input datasets and are not easily integrated with existing pipeline code. Additionally, the repeated execution of pipeline variants incurs significant overhead, making it difficult for data scientists to iterate quickly during development.

We recently proposed mlwhatif [2] in response to these problems. mlwhatif enables data scientists to declaratively specify what-if analyses for an ML pipeline, and to automatically generate, optimize and execute the required pipeline variants. Our approach builds on dataflow representations for ML pipelines from previous work [3, 4, 11, 12].

Demonstration Details. We showcase mlwhatif in three scenarios, each highlighting a different what-if analysis, which mlwhatif can automatically apply to existing pipeline code. Attendees will be able to experiment with these analyses on pipelines from different domains, implemented using popular data science libraries like scikit-learn and pandas. We provide a web-based user interface for the attendees to experience mlwhatif from the perspective of a data scientist. In particular, they can experiment with what-if analyses focusing on the robustness of a pipeline against data errors, the impact of preprocessing operators on the pipeline’s fairness, and the impact of data cleaning operations.

Our web-based user interface additionally allows attendees to explore the inner workings of mlwhatif: we show how mlwhatif extracts a dataflow plan from the original pipeline, and how it leverages so-called “pipeline patches” to create pipeline variants, according to the attendee’s configuration of the what-if analyses.

Furthermore, we visualize mlwhatif’s multi-query optimization process step-by-step, as it applies different optimization rules and merges all optimized pipeline variants into one joint execution plan.

We provide the fully working web-based user interface for our demonstration, along with all example pipelines and datasets, at https://github.com/shubhaguha/mlwhatif-demo.
2 SYSTEM OVERVIEW

In the following, we provide a brief overview of mlwhatif and refer to the original publication [2] for further details.

Core ideas. Figure 1 provides an overview of how mlwhatif works internally. mlwhatif only requires the user to provide the source code of their pipeline and declaratively specified what-if analyses to run. mlwhatif starts by extracting the logical plan of the original pipeline. It then extracts the plan of the original pipeline. Internally, mlwhatif generates different pipeline variants with “pipeline patches”, and merges the variants into a single joint dataflow plan. mlwhatif applies various multi-query optimization rules to re-use shared intermediates (illustrated as black operators) between variants. Finally, mlwhatif executes the optimized plan, and generates a report per analysis, which details the variants and their output scores.

3 DEMONSTRATION DETAILS

We demonstrate mlwhatif with a web-based interface (illustrated in Figure 2), which allows attendees to configure three what-if analyses [1, 6–8, 13], and automatically apply them to existing pipeline code from different domains (healthcare, product reviews, census data). Attendees will analyze the source code of the pipelines, and inspect reports about the results of the analyses. Furthermore, they can leverage mlwhatif’s runtime estimation to tailor the analysis configuration to their time budget. Additionally, the interface visualizes the internal multi-query optimization steps that mlwhatif applies to reduce the runtime of the analyses.

We make the web interface, datasets and pipeline code publicly available at https://github.com/shubha/guha/mlwhatif-demo.

In particular, we demonstrate each what-if analysis as follows:

1. Attendees choose one of our provided ML pipelines, and we briefly introduce them to the ML pipeline code and the what-if analysis.
2. Attendees use mlwhatif’s runtime estimation feature to estimate the runtime of different analysis configurations.
3. Attendees select an analysis configuration and execute the pipeline analysis. Afterwards, they inspect and discuss the resulting reports with us and other attendees.
(4) To provide attendees with a deeper understanding of how \texttt{mlwhatif} generates, optimizes, and executes analyses internally, our web-based frontend provides step-by-step visualizations of the execution and optimization process. Attendees can freely explore those visualizations. First, they will observe how the dataflow plan is extracted from the original pipeline and how the what-if analyses use pipeline patches to create the pipeline variants for their configured what-if analysis.

(5) Then, they can follow how the generated pipeline variants get optimized and merged into one joint execution plan. Attendees will interactively explore the execution plans in different stages of our multi-query optimizer.

In detail, we demonstrate the following three scenarios:

\textbf{What-If Analysis 1: Robustness against data errors.} This analysis allows attendees to test the robustness of ML pipelines against data errors [13], asking \emph{what-if the input data to a pipeline had certain errors like missing values or outliers?} Before deploying an ML pipeline in production, it is important to analyze how robust it is against potential data quality problems. For example, in healthcare an ML model might make predictions based on patient data and notes from a doctor. \emph{What-if} a doctor makes a lot of typos in a stressful period? \emph{What-if} patients enter their weight via a web-form and mix up the separator symbol for decimals, resulting in a sudden change of scale?

\textit{Interactivity.} Our web-interface allows attendees to select which columns to corrupt and how to corrupt them (e.g., with missing values, categorical shifts, random scaling of numerical attributes, and introducing broken characters to text columns). Additionally, it allows attendees to specify different fractions of rows to corrupt to test the level of robustness of the pipelines. Optionally, attendees can introduce these corruptions not just to the test data, but also to the train data, to see if encountering similar errors at training time already helps the pipeline deal with particular errors better.

\textit{Analysis results.} After running the what-if analysis, attendees are presented with a report, which describes the type and magnitude of the introduced data corruptions, as well as the corresponding pipeline output scores on the test set. Optionally, \texttt{mlwhatif} also reports the change to the output score if both the train and test set were corrupted. Based on this report, attendees explore how robust the respective pipeline is against different data errors at inference.
time. These findings give them indications on ways to increase the robustness of their pipeline, e.g., by augmenting the training data with corrupted examples for a particular error type.

**Optimization opportunities.** Additionally, attendees can get a close look under the hood of mlwhatif’s multi-query optimizer. As the robustness analysis corrupts only the test side of a pipeline, our optimizer reuses large portions of work between the variants, e.g., all operations on the train side, including featurization and model training. For the test side, mlwhatif can push up the corruption operations below the featurization, and optimize the repeated application of expensive UDFs.

**What-If Analysis 2: Impact of data cleaning operations.** This analysis allows attendees to test the impact of data cleaning operations [6–8], asking *what-if the pipeline applied a particular error detection and cleaning technique?* Data quality problems like outliers are easy to miss but can significantly impact the performance of an ML model consuming the data. There are many data cleaning techniques to choose from for particular error types. E.g., outliers can be detected with, e.g., standard deviations, percentiles, or isolation forests. Potential outliers can be imputed with methods like replacing them with the median, the mean, or the most frequent value. Unfortunately, it is often unclear in advance which data cleaning techniques are likely to help most. Thus, practitioners often have to experiment with many different methods [5]. mlwhatif automates this tedious and time-consuming repetitive process for existing pipelines.

**Interactivity.** The what-if analysis for this only requires attendees to specify which data quality problem they expect in which parts of the data. The analysis will automatically try a pre-defined list of cleaning methods for each data quality problem, e.g., identifying and cleaning label errors with cleanlab [8] or kNN-Shapley [6].

**Analysis results.** mlwhatif generates a report on how particular cleaning methods affect the output scores of all variants of the pipeline code. For each variant, the report details how a data quality problem in a column was addressed, which cleaning method was applied, and how this impacts the output score.

**Optimization opportunities.** Attendees can again explore how much work is re-useable between different pipeline variants thanks to our optimization rules. The data cleaning analysis always patches both the train and test side of the pipeline, and requires a model re-training per variant. Therefore, the optimizer focuses on preprocessing optimizations here, such as projection push-up and filter push-up optimizations.

**What-If Analysis 3: Impact of preprocessing on fairness.** The third analysis allows attendees to measure the impact of preprocessing operators on the output scores of a pipeline, e.g., fairness metrics [1], asking *what-if the pipeline filtered or featurized the training data differently?* Sometimes, even inconspicuous preprocessing operations like removing rows with missing values via dropna in pandas introduce technical bias in ML pipelines [3]. Biswas et al. [1] proposed measuring the fairness impact of data transformers in ML pipelines by removing them or replacing them with a reference operation. mlwhatif can apply such analyses automatically to existing pipelines.

**Interactivity.** Attendees only need to specify which kind of preprocessing operators they want to analyze; they can select both filters and featurizers. Next, mlwhatif will generate a variant for each preprocessing operator to analyze, where the operator is dropped or replaced with a reference operation. The resulting pipeline scores are then compared to the original pipeline scores, to measure the impact of a particular preprocessing choice.

**Analysis results.** Attendees are presented with a report, describing each measured operator, its reference operation (e.g., the removal of the operator), and the resulting change in the pipeline output scores. The report allows attendees to discover particular operations that introduce technical bias, and to remove or change them accordingly in the original pipeline. One such example for a potentially problematic operation is the aforementioned dropna function.

**Optimization opportunities.** Repeatedly dropping or replacing preprocessing operations such as filters presents interesting optimization opportunities. Optimization rules like filter-removal push-up help mlwhatif to optimize across multiple different variants, which systematically remove or replace one operator at a time. Attendees will again be able to follow step-by-step how our multi-query optimizer leverages such optimization opportunities.
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