Table 1: Comparative Performance of Data Augmentation Methods on CIFAR10

Gen	Model	Acc	Prec	Rec	$\mathbf{F1}$	Gen	Model	Acc	Prec	Rec	<b>F</b> 1
	Baseline	38.55	38.48	38.55	38.41		Baseline	38.18	38.44	38.18	38.02
	Wass	42.34	42.47	42.34	42.07		Wass	43.88	43.67	43.88	43.55
<b>2</b>	MMD	42.14	41.71	42.14	41.63	12	MMD	43.43	42.95	43.43	43.02
	$\mathrm{TV}$	39.93	40.20	39.93	39.85		$\mathrm{TV}$	42.70	42.24	42.70	42.27
	Baseline	39.21	39.31	39.21	38.95		Baseline	37.85	37.72	37.85	37.50
	Wass	42.37	42.44	42.37	42.24		Wass	42.28	42.34	42.28	42.01
4	MMD	42.90	42.86	42.90	42.67	14	MMD	42.74	42.31	42.74	42.33
	$\mathrm{TV}$	42.27	42.26	42.27	42.09		$\mathrm{TV}$	44.10	43.69	44.10	43.76
	Baseline	38.86	38.96	38.86	38.76		Baseline	39.65	40.11	39.65	39.45
	Wass	41.97	42.12	41.97	41.79		Wass	44.51	44.28	44.51	44.27
6	MMD	44.65	$\bf 44.52$	44.65	44.32	16	MMD	43.80	43.27	43.80	43.29
	$\mathrm{TV}$	42.75	43.29	42.75	42.73		$\mathrm{TV}$	43.74	43.16	43.74	43.27
	Baseline	39.12	38.87	39.12	38.59		Baseline	38.85	39.03	38.85	38.85
8	Wass	43.82	43.63	43.82	43.42	18	Wass	43.79	43.53	43.79	43.56
	MMD	44.42	44.24	44.42	44.22		MMD	43.06	42.99	43.06	42.79
	$\mathrm{TV}$	42.84	42.66	42.84	42.35		$\mathrm{TV}$	44.22	43.93	<b>44.22</b>	43.74
	Baseline	38.14	38.00	38.14	37.90		Baseline	38.92	38.93	38.92	38.67
	Wass	43.93	43.79	43.93	43.63		Wass	43.52	43.15	43.52	43.15
10	MMD	43.79	44.00	43.79	43.67	20	MMD	43.97	43.45	43.97	43.27
	$\mathrm{TV}$	42.89	42.53	42.89	42.53		TV	42.59	42.41	42.59	42.30

Performance metrics (%) on CIFAR-10 with 1,000 training samples and varying numbers of generated images (Gen) from SD-XL at strength=0.3. Data augmentation uses Wass (Wasserstein), MMD (Maximum Mean Discrepancy), and TV (Total Variation) metrics, retaining the top 60% of images. Baseline: original samples (averaged across Gen); Augmented: unfiltered generated data; Wass, MMD, TV: filtered by respective metrics. Metrics: Acc (Accuracy), Prec (Precision), Rec (Recall), F1 (F1-Score). Augmentation improves over the baseline, with Wass, MMD, and TV showing comparable performance.