

TTVAE: Transformer-based Generative Modeling for Tabular Data Generation

Alex X. Wang, Binh P. Nguyen

School of Mathematics and Statistics, Victoria University of Wellington, Wellington, New Zealand

{alex.wang, binh.p.nguyen}@vuw.ac.nz

Abstract

Tabular data synthesis presents unique challenges, with Transformer models remaining underexplored despite the application of Variational Autoencoders and Generative Adversarial Networks. To address this gap, we propose the Transformer-based Tabular Variational AutoEncoder (TTVAE), leveraging the attention mechanism for capturing complex data distributions. The inclusion of the attention mechanism enables our model to understand complex relationships among heterogeneous features, a task often difficult for traditional methods. TTVAE facilitates the integration of interpolation within the latent space during the data generation process. Specifically, TTVAE is trained once, establishing a low-dimensional representation of real data, and then various latent interpolation methods can efficiently generate synthetic latent points. Through extensive experiments on diverse datasets, TTVAE consistently achieves state-of-the-art performance, highlighting its adaptability across different feature types and data sizes. This innovative approach, empowered by the attention mechanism and the integration of interpolation, addresses the complex challenges of tabular data synthesis, establishing TTVAE as a powerful solution.

1 Introduction

Synthetic data proves valuable for tasks like data augmentation, class balancing, and ensuring data privacy in real datasets [Borisov *et al.*, 2022]. It has wide applications, including face recognition, text classification, graph analysis, disease prediction, anomaly detection, and statistical disclosure [Venugopal *et al.*, 2022; Hernandez *et al.*, 2022; Liu *et al.*, 2022a]. A comprehensive exploration of synthetic data use cases is available in [James *et al.*, 2021].

Tabular data synthesis (TDS) is challenging, as tabular datasets often contain heterogeneous data and lack inherent structure. Moreover, defining a well-structured evaluation framework for synthetic tabular data remains unclear. While traditional machine learning (ML) methods are recognized for their superiority over deep learning (DL) techniques in handling such data [Shwartz-Ziv and Armon, 2022], there is a

need to develop a robust deep representation for tabular data, which remains an open problem [Rabbani and Samad, 2023]. Several adapted models, including Variational Autoencoders (VAEs), Generative Adversarial Networks (GANs), and Diffusion models, have gained prevalence [Xu *et al.*, 2019; Zhao *et al.*, 2022; Kotelnikov *et al.*, 2023]. However, many adaptations heavily rely on conventional Multilayer Perceptrons (MLPs), potentially lacking the explicit capture of high-level contextual relationships during training [Borisov *et al.*, 2022]. Moreover, these models often employ stochastically generated latent variables in data generation, limiting control over the generated data. Although limited comparative studies have been conducted with the Synthetic Minority Over-sampling Technique (SMOTE), the results consistently indicate that SMOTE outperforms these models. [Kim *et al.*, 2022; Kotelnikov *et al.*, 2023].

To bridge these gaps, we propose a Transformer-based tabular Variational Autoencoder (TTVAE) designed to harness the Transformer architecture for model training and employ latent space interpolation for data generation. Firstly, our approach incorporates a Transformer with an attention mechanism to effectively capture contextual relationships among heterogeneous features [Badaro *et al.*, 2023]. Secondly, recognizing the efficacy of the shallow interpolation mechanism of SMOTE in the tabular data domain [Dablain *et al.*, 2022], we integrate it into our data generation process through latent space interpolation. The main contributions of our work are summarized below:

1. We conduct a comprehensive evaluation of key tabular data generation models, assessing their relative performance across various tasks and datasets.
2. We present TTVAE, a streamlined tabular data generation algorithm capable of synthesizing mixed data types, including numerical and categorical features.
3. We demonstrate TTVAE’s superior performance over alternative TDS models, including statistical, traditional ML, and recent DL models. Our analysis identifies key factors contributing to its success.
4. Building on previous research, we recognize the efficacy of SMOTE in generating competitive synthetic data. However, our study consistently demonstrates the superior performance of TTVAE compared to SMOTE, particularly when dealing with large datasets.

2 Related Work

Data Generation is the process of creating synthetic data resembling real data [Raghunathan, 2021]. It serves wide applications, including data augmentation, data balancing, enhancing privacy, and training/testing ML models [Wang *et al.*, 2024]. Tabular data generation, among other modalities, has emerged as a significant topic due to its widespread usage in daily activities and across diverse industries [Assefa *et al.*, 2020]. However, generating synthetic tabular data is non-trivial due to its inherent complexities. Firstly, tabular data collection can be diverse and manual. It can also originate from various systems, leading to arbitrary dataset lengths and inconsistent features with missing values. Secondly, the heterogeneous nature of tabular data, which includes both categorical and numerical features, presents challenges in both model training and evaluation. The encoding of categorical variables into a numeric format adds complexity, especially when features are derived from unrelated sources. Moreover, traditional metrics borrowed from other domains, like the “Inception Score”, tailored for evaluating 2D image data, may not be suitable for measuring the quality of synthetic tabular data [Gorishniy *et al.*, 2021; Chong and Forsyth, 2020]. Finally, the generation of tabular synthetic data is often driven by specific business questions, requiring different preprocessing and postprocessing steps. For example, it is crucial to recognize that synthetic data created to enhance ML models differs significantly from data created for privacy preservation; each represents a distinct trade-off between data accuracy and privacy [Wang *et al.*, 2023; Lampis *et al.*, 2023].

The Variational Autoencoder (VAE) is a probabilistic generative model designed for learning latent representations of data [Kingma and Welling, 2014]. It consists of two primary components: an encoder network and a decoder network. Let \mathbf{X} represent the observed data and \mathbf{Z} the latent variable. The encoder function $q_\phi(\mathbf{Z}|\mathbf{X})$ estimates the posterior distribution of the latent variable given the data, while the decoder function $p_\theta(\mathbf{X}|\mathbf{Z})$ models the conditional distribution of the data given the latent variable. Both q_ϕ and p_θ are parametrized by neural networks with parameters ϕ and θ , respectively. The objective of the VAE is to maximize the Evidence Lower Bound (ELBO) on the log-likelihood of the observed data, where the ELBO is expressed as:

$$\log p_\theta(\mathbf{X}) \geq \mathbb{E}_{q_\phi(\mathbf{Z}|\mathbf{X})}[\log p_\theta(\mathbf{X}|\mathbf{Z})] - \text{KL}[q_\phi(\mathbf{Z}|\mathbf{X})||p(\mathbf{Z})] \quad (1)$$

Here, the first term on the right-hand side is the reconstruction term, representing the log-likelihood of the data given the latent variable. The second term, $\text{KL}[q_\phi(\mathbf{Z}|\mathbf{X})||p(\mathbf{Z})]$, is the Kullback-Leibler (KL) divergence between the approximate posterior $q_\phi(\mathbf{Z}|\mathbf{X})$ and the prior distribution $p(\mathbf{Z})$, which is typically chosen as a multivariate standard normal distribution. To enable differentiability during training, the VAE employs the reparameterization trick. This trick involves sampling a latent variable \mathbf{z} from the approximate posterior in a way that allows backpropagation. For a standard normal prior, the reparameterization trick can be expressed as:

$$\mathbf{Z} = \mu + \sigma \odot \epsilon \quad (2)$$

where μ and σ represent the mean and standard deviation predicted by the encoder, and ϵ is sampled from a standard normal distribution. In summary, VAEs are trained to learn a probabilistic mapping from the data space to a lower-dimensional latent space. This learned mapping enables both efficient data compression and data generation.

The Transformer proposed by Vaswani *et al.* in 2017 [Vaswani *et al.*, 2017], has played a pivotal role in natural language processing (NLP). Its fundamental strength lies in the utilization of the self-attention mechanism, which enables parallel processing and efficient capture of dependencies within sequences. This capability to model relationships and learn long-range dependencies has contributed significantly to its widespread success. Given a sequence of input vectors, typically denoted as $\mathbf{X} = [\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n]$, where $\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ represents the i -th element in the sequence with a d -dimensional vector, the self-attention mechanism calculates a weighted sum of these vectors to capture dependencies between elements. This process is defined as follows:

$$\text{Attention}(\mathbf{K}, \mathbf{Q}, \mathbf{V}) = \text{softmax}\left(\frac{\mathbf{Q} \cdot \mathbf{K}^T}{\sqrt{d_k}}\right) \cdot \mathbf{V}. \quad (3)$$

Here, \mathbf{Q} , \mathbf{K} , and \mathbf{V} are linear transformations of the input vectors. The softmax operation normalizes the attention scores across all elements, effectively computing a weighted sum of the values \mathbf{V} with the attention weights determined by the compatibility between queries \mathbf{Q} and keys \mathbf{K} . The Transformer architecture applies this self-attention mechanism across multiple layers and utilizes position encodings to handle sequential data, making it a versatile architecture for capturing long-range dependencies in sequences.

In the tabular data domain, Transformers offer compelling advantages, including the ability to capture complex feature interactions and learn meaningful representations in a latent space [Badaro *et al.*, 2023]. Transformers have demonstrated efficacy in supervised learning tasks [Song *et al.*, 2019; Huang *et al.*, 2020; Gorishniy *et al.*, 2021; Zhang *et al.*, 2023; Yan *et al.*, 2023]. AutoInt, introduced by Song *et al.* [Song *et al.*, 2019], emphasizes the importance of self-attention mechanisms and automatically learns high-order feature interactions for subsequent predictive tasks. TabTransformer [Huang *et al.*, 2020] employs a transformer encoder to derive contextual embeddings for categorical features, while FT-Transformer [Gorishniy *et al.*, 2021] extends a similar mechanism to both categorical and numerical features. These approaches have further been extended to time series data and integrated with advanced DL algorithms. FATA-Trans [Zhang *et al.*, 2023], introduces a field- and time-aware Transformer model for sequential tabular data, enhancing its ability to model temporal patterns. Yan *et al.* propose T2G-FORMER, incorporating a Graph Estimator to automatically estimate relations among tabular features, guiding Transformer-based tabular learning [Yan *et al.*, 2023]. However, despite the proven effectiveness of Transformers in supervised learning tasks for tabular data, their potential in tabular data generation remains unexplored. In response, we introduce TTVAE—a simple adaptation of the Transformer architecture tailored for TDS.




Figure 1: Illustration of TTVAE with latent space interpolation: During training, each data sample x undergoes a transformation, mapping it to contextual embeddings h and a latent space z via column-wise preprocessing and a Transformer-based encoder. These embeddings h and z are used as inputs for a Transformer-based decoder, incorporating reconstruction and a penalty loss. In the generation phase, a synthetic latent space \hat{z} is generated through latent space interpolation on the encoded latent space z . This, along with contextual embeddings h , is fed into the trained decoder to generate synthetic data, followed by reverse processing to return the data to its original format, \hat{x} .

3 TTVAE: Transformer-based Tabular Variational AutoEncoder

This section introduces our proposed tabular data generation model, TTVAE, which leverages Transformer-based neural networks. TTVAE comprises two key stages: (1) fine-tuning a Transformer-based VAE to capture feature interactions in the latent space; and (2) sampling from latent space interpolations derived from the fine-tuned VAE to generate synthetic tabular data. The complete architectural overview is provided in Figure 1. We then elaborate on each component, covering fine-tuning and sampling procedures, and conclude with a brief summary of our approach.

Problem Definition of TDS. For a dataset of $\{x_i | x_i \in R, i = 1, \dots, N\}$ as samples from a true data distribution $q(x)$, the goal of a DGM is to build deep neural networks with parameters $\theta \in R$, to describe a distribution $p_\theta(x)$ so that the parameters θ can be trained to ensure $p_\theta(x)$ match $q(x)$ the best [Wang *et al.*, 2024].

Preprocessing. For continuous variables, a variational Gaussian mixture model (VGM) is used to overcome the non-Gaussian and multimodal distribution. Initially, it estimates the number of modes m and fits a Gaussian mixture, normalizing values within each mode. Mode is represented as one-hot vector $\beta_{i,j} = [0, 0, \dots, 1]$, while $\alpha_{i,j}$ is the normalized value, where i is the i th column and j is the j th row. So the original continuous variables can be represented as $\alpha_{1,j} \oplus \beta_{1,j} \oplus \dots \oplus \alpha_{n_c,j} \oplus \beta_{n_c,j}$ for row j , where \oplus means concatenation. For each of the categorical features, one-hot encoding is used to convert each unique categorical element into its own binary vector column. So all the discrete columns D_1, \dots, D_{n_d} end up as one-hot vectors d_1, \dots, d_{n_d} such that the i th one-hot vector is $d_i = [d_i^{(k)}]$ for $k = 1, \dots, C_i$ (categories in the i th column). Therefore, the original categorical variables can be represented as $d_{1,j} \oplus \dots \oplus d_{n_d,j}$ for row j . As a result, the initial j th row, r_j can be represented as the concatenation of processed numerical and categorical variables:

$$r_j = \alpha_{1,j} \oplus \beta_{1,j} \oplus \dots \oplus \alpha_{n_c,j} \oplus \beta_{n_c,j} + d_{1,j} \oplus \dots \oplus d_{n_d,j} \quad (4)$$

Transformer Variational AutoEncoder. To extend the VAE with the power of the Transformer architecture, we introduce a novel architecture that leverages both components. The Transformer encoder-decoder architecture is well-known for its sequence-to-sequence modeling capabilities [Badaro *et al.*, 2023], and it can be adapted to the VAE framework for structured data generation. Consider the observed data \mathbf{X} and the latent variable \mathbf{Z} . The encoder function $q_\phi(\mathbf{Z}|\mathbf{X})$ now utilizes a Transformer-based mechanism to capture dependencies within the data. It processes the input data \mathbf{X} by attending to different parts of the input and creates contextual embeddings h that represent the relationships between features [Huang *et al.*, 2020]. The decoder function $p_\theta(\mathbf{X}|\mathbf{Z})$, which maps from latent space to data space, also employs a Transformer architecture. This decoder can take advantage of the self-attention mechanism in the Transformer to capture dependencies in the data generation process. It generates synthetic data samples by considering the relationships and dependencies learned during training.

Given X has n features: $X = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n\}$, where each x_i represents a feature. The self-attention mechanism computes three linear projections for each feature:

$$Q_i = x_i \cdot W_{Qi},$$

$$K_i = x_i \cdot W_{Ki},$$

$$V_i = x_i \cdot W_{Vi},$$

Here, W_{Qi} , W_{Ki} , and W_{Vi} are learnable weight matrices specific to the i -th feature. Q_i , K_i , and V_i represent the query, key, and value representations of the i -th feature, respectively. Then the self-attention mechanism operates on each feature x_i and calculates attention score A_{ij} by considering the interactions with all other features x_j in the dataset, using the scaled dot-product attention mechanism:

$$A_{ij} = \text{softmax} \left(\frac{Q_i \cdot K_j}{\sqrt{d_k}} \right),$$

where d_k is the dimension of the query and key vectors. The attention scores determine the importance of each element in the feature sequence when processing the i -th feature. In this sense, the output of the self-attention mechanism for the i -th feature is then computed as a weighted sum of the values:

$$\text{Attention}(x_i) = \sum_j A_{ij} \cdot V_j.$$

here $\text{Attention}(x_i)$ represents the attended representation of the i -th feature in the input sequence, taking into account the contributions of all other features based on their attention scores. This process is repeated for each feature in the tabular dataset, allowing the Transformer to capture both local and global dependencies between features. The self-attention mechanism inherently adapts to the diverse data types, making it suitable for tabular datasets with a mix of categorical and numerical features. In summary, the mathematical formulation of self-attention in the Transformer enables the model to effectively capture contextual relationships between different features, addressing the challenges posed by mixed data types in tabular datasets.

Loss Function. In a standard VAE, the loss function is typically expressed as the negative ELBO shown in Equation 1. Here are two main components: the reconstruction term $\mathbb{E}_{q(z|x)}[\log p(x|z)]$ and the KL divergence term $\text{KL}[q(z|x)||p(z)]$, which encourages the model's latent space distribution to approximate a prior distribution. Here we use β -VAE that one can modify the relative significance of these two components by adjusting β .

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{TTVAE}} = -\mathbb{E}_{q(z|x)}[\log p(x|z)] + \beta \text{KL}[q(z|x)||p(z)] \quad (5)$$

A higher β value emphasizes the importance of the KL-divergence loss, promoting a more disentangled latent space. Conversely, a lower β value promotes the reconstruction loss, potentially leading to better data reconstruction. The β -VAE loss, maximizing the ELBO, is now computed with a Transformer-based encoder and decoder. The reparameterization trick allows differentiable sampling from the latent space, enabling the generation of structured data capturing complex feature interactions and relationships with the Transformer's self-attention mechanism.

Latent Space Interpolation for Data Generation. Latent space interpolation, a well-explored concept in generative modeling, holds particular value in computer vision applications [Struski *et al.*, 2023]. In the context of VAEs, it enables smooth and controlled data generation, facilitating gradual transitions between data samples [Mukherjee *et al.*, 2019; Struski *et al.*, 2023]. Specifically, it supports an exploration of learned representations within the encoded latent space, contributing to a deeper understanding of the underlying data structure. Moreover, the interpolation process ensures the continuity of data generation, seamlessly transitioning between actual data points while preserving essential data characteristics and semantics. In summary, employing latent variables derived from learned data representations, in contrast to randomly generated latent variables, enhances the meaningfulness and realism of data generation [Dablain *et al.*, 2022]. In our study, we employ three distinct interpolation approaches to introduce noise into the latent space [Fonseca and Bacao, 2023], as illustrated in Figure 2. These methods constitute a subset of diverse interpolation techniques, with the first aligning with SMOTE and generating synthetic latent variables along the path between a randomly selected point and one of its neighbors. The second, the triangular mechanism, involves selecting n observations z to generate $\hat{z} = \lambda_1 z_1 + \dots + (1 - \lambda_1 - \dots - \lambda_{n-1}) z_n$, where $\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \lambda_i = 1$. The third, the hyper-rectangle mechanism, adopts a balanced approach similar to the first two, using two latent variables to generate a new latent variable within a rectangle area.




Figure 2: Illustration of latent interpolation used in this study. **a** Within-class interpolation, **b** triangular interpolation, **c** hyper-rectangle interpolation

4 Experiments

In this section, we experimentally assess TTVAE’s performance using diverse data quality metrics, aiming to establish a unified and comprehensive framework for evaluating TDS techniques. Our code is made publicly available in our GitHub repository¹.

Datasets. To systematically assess tabular generative models, we chose a diverse set of 16 real-world public datasets with variations in size, characteristics, features, and distributions. These datasets, previously used in evaluating tabular models, are detailed in Table 1.

Table 1: Statistics of datasets used in this study. #S, #N and #C stand for the number of samples, numerical and categorical columns.

Abbr	Name	#S	#N	#C	Task type
CR	credit-g	1000	3	18	Classification
SI	sick	3103	5	18	Classification
AB	abalone	4177	7	2	Regression
NA	wine-quality	4898	11	1	Regression
PA	parkinsons-telemonitoring	5875	18	2	Regression
NC	NewspaperChurn	15855	3	14	Classification
CO	compass	16644	5	13	Classification
LA	law-school-admission	20800	2	9	Classification
KI	King	21613	13	6	Regression
NO	nomao	34465	56	63	Classification
NW	news	39644	40	18	Regression
MV	mv	40768	6	4	Classification
BE	Beijing	43824	7	5	Regression
BM	Bank-Marketing	45211	7	10	Classification
AD	adult	48842	5	10	Classification
CI	Census-Income	299285	9	33	Classification

Baselines. A variety of methods exist for generating synthetic tabular data, each with its own unique strengths and limitations [Fonseca and Bacao, 2023]. Statistical distribution-based approaches simulate data based on known distributions, capturing statistical properties but often assuming feature independence. Distance-based methods, typified by SMOTE, are effective for oversampling minority classes, with variants like ADASYN and SMOTENC addressing categorical data. DGMs are versatile in generating diverse data types but encounter difficulties when handling discrete and categorical data. Recent research has produced numerous models, including tabular VAEs, GAN-based models, and Diffusion-based models, such as TVAE and TabDDPM. In this study, we conduct a comprehensive comparison against state-of-the-art tabular synthetic data models from statistical, ML, and DL models, including Copula [Sun *et al.*, 2019], Synthpop [Nowok *et al.*, 2016], SMOTE [Zhang *et al.*, 2022], and its variants: ADASYN [He *et al.*, 2008], SMOTENC [Mukherjee and Khushi, 2021], along with TVAE, CTGAN [Xu *et al.*, 2019], CTABGAN+ [Zhao *et al.*, 2022], and TabDDPM [Kotelnikov *et al.*, 2023].

Evaluation Measures. In alignment with prior studies [Raghunathan, 2021; Alaa *et al.*, 2022; Zhao *et al.*, 2023],

we assess the quality of synthetic data across three dimensions: ML utility, statistical similarity, and privacy. We also include visualization aids for each evaluation aspect.

For ML utility, we employ various supervised learning algorithms to train classification or regression models, evaluating their performance on a separate holdout test dataset to prevent information leakage. To ensure a fair comparison, default hyperparameters are utilized [Zhao *et al.*, 2022; Kotelnikov *et al.*, 2023]. The objective is to demonstrate that models trained on high-quality synthetic data can be as competitive as, or even outperform, those trained on real data. We calculate an average efficiency across a diverse set of ML models, including logistic regression, decision trees, and others, following common practices in the literature.

For statistical similarity, we employed three groups of metrics commonly used in previous studies: column-wise metrics (univariate), pair-wise column correlation (bivariate), and table-level metrics (multivariate) [Zhao *et al.*, 2021; Chundawat *et al.*, 2022; Kotelnikov *et al.*, 2023]. To assess synthetic data from a univariate distribution perspective, we utilized Kullback-Leibler divergence (KLD), Jensen-Shannon divergence (JSD), and Wasserstein distance (WD) [Theis *et al.*, 2016; Zhao *et al.*, 2022]. Additionally, to determine if the synthetic data captures the expected interrelationships in the ground truth, a correlation analysis is performed. Finally, we adopted the metrics proposed in [Naem *et al.*, 2020] to evaluate data fidelity (realism) using density and data diversity (variability) using coverage. While coverage is bounded between 0 and 1, density has no upper limit, with higher values indicating better performance in both cases.

In privacy evaluation, we initially use the mean Distance to Closest Record (DCR), calculating the average minimum L2 distances from each synthetic sample to real records. Low DCR values suggest that synthetic samples closely emulate real data points, raising potential privacy concerns. However, it is important to note that this might also indicate a close resemblance between synthetic and real data. To further aid privacy assessment, we employed ML detectability as a propensity score for each record to measure the risk of a black-box privacy attack, which aims to infer whether a record belongs to the real training data [Lee *et al.*, 2021; Kotelnikov *et al.*, 2023]. This involves training an ML classification model to assess the difficulty of distinguishing synthetic data from real data. The process includes shuffling real and synthetic data, assigning flags indicating their origin, and cross-validating a binary classifier predicting these flags [Hediger *et al.*, 2022]. As shown in the equation below, we use the propensityMSE (pMSE) score, which is the mean squared difference of the probability (propensity score) from 0.5. We normalize it to a range of [0,1] by dividing by 0.25. A score of 0 implies indistinguishability between synthetic and real data, while a score of 1 indicates complete distinguishability. Ideally, high-quality synthetic data should show a low DCR and a high pMSD, reflecting proximity to real data without mere replication, thus minimizing privacy risks.

$$pMSE = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{(p_i - 0.5)^2}{0.25}, \quad (6)$$

¹The Github link was removed for double-blind review, and it will be made publicly available upon acceptance of the paper.

Table 2: The values of ML utility computed w.r.t. classification/regression models. — denotes that SMOTENC cannot handle large datasets. **Bold** represents the best score on each dataset. For classification, higher F1 \uparrow means better while for regression, lower RMSE \downarrow means better.

	CR (F1 \uparrow)	SI (F1 \uparrow)	AB (RMSE \downarrow)	NA (RMSE \downarrow)	PA (RMSE \downarrow)	NC (F1 \uparrow)	CO (F1 \uparrow)	LA (F1 \uparrow)
SMOTE	0.5819 \pm 0.17	0.0923 \pm 0.07	0.3138 \pm 0.11	0.4261 \pm 0.14	0.5264 \pm 0.20	0.1067 \pm 0.09	0.6782 \pm 0.04	0.7399 \pm 0.03
ADASYN	0.5988 \pm 0.13	0.0747 \pm 0.08	0.3172 \pm 0.11	0.4238 \pm 0.14	0.5262 \pm 0.20	0.0997 \pm 0.08	0.6726 \pm 0.05	0.7442 \pm 0.03
SMOTENC	0.7998 \pm 0.03	0.2599 \pm 0.07	0.3301 \pm 0.12	0.5038 \pm 0.19	0.5295 \pm 0.20	0.2572 \pm 0.16	0.6894 \pm 0.03	0.7784 \pm 0.03
Synthpop	0.4985 \pm 0.31	0.1608 \pm 0.11	0.3605 \pm 0.13	0.3941 \pm 0.14	1.1919 \pm 0.44	0.1056 \pm 0.10	0.3601 \pm 0.14	0.6888 \pm 0.08
Copula	0.7677 \pm 0.12	0.0169 \pm 0.03	0.3495 \pm 0.12	0.3968 \pm 0.13	0.5509 \pm 0.16	0.0623 \pm 0.09	0.2696 \pm 0.16	0.6865 \pm 0.24
TVAE	0.7750 \pm 0.06	0.1429 \pm 0.10	0.4314 \pm 0.17	0.6004 \pm 0.23	0.6233 \pm 0.18	0.3172 \pm 0.13	0.6422 \pm 0.03	0.7497 \pm 0.04
CTGAN	0.7686 \pm 0.06	0.0149 \pm 0.03	0.3175 \pm 0.11	0.4465 \pm 0.14	0.5020 \pm 0.15	0.2221 \pm 0.13	0.6017 \pm 0.07	0.7535 \pm 0.04
CTABGAN+	0.7475 \pm 0.10	0.0104 \pm 0.03	0.3874 \pm 0.13	0.4797 \pm 0.14	0.5583 \pm 0.15	0.2558 \pm 0.10	0.6755 \pm 0.03	0.6567 \pm 0.27
TabDDPM	0.7538 \pm 0.12	0.1928 \pm 0.10	0.4336 \pm 0.15	0.6254 \pm 0.23	0.5200 \pm 0.18	0.3129 \pm 0.17	0.6758 \pm 0.04	0.7852 \pm 0.03
TTVAE	0.7669 \pm 0.09	0.2284 \pm 0.11	0.4069 \pm 0.14	0.5924 \pm 0.23	0.4981 \pm 0.17	0.3372 \pm 0.17	0.6872 \pm 0.04	0.7857 \pm 0.03
Real	0.7987 \pm 0.05	0.2539 \pm 0.11	0.3001 \pm 0.11	0.3912 \pm 0.14	0.5251 \pm 0.21	0.3109 \pm 0.21	0.7032 \pm 0.05	0.7857 \pm 0.03
	KI (RMSE \downarrow)	NO (F1 \uparrow)	NW (RMSE \downarrow)	MV (F1 \uparrow)	BE (RMSE \downarrow)	BM (F1 \uparrow)	AD (F1 \uparrow)	CI (F1 \uparrow)
SMOTE	0.0841 \pm 0.03	0.8697 \pm 0.16	0.0098 \pm 0.01	0.9553 \pm 0.07	0.5862 \pm 0.01	0.1682 \pm 0.09	0.4333 \pm 0.12	0.2844 \pm 0.08
ADASYN	0.0794 \pm 0.03	0.8587 \pm 0.14	0.0075 \pm 0	0.9537 \pm 0.07	0.5765 \pm 0.01	0.1836 \pm 0.09	0.4484 \pm 0.09	0.2989 \pm 0.08
SMOTENC	0.0840 \pm 0.03	-	0.0101 \pm 0.01	0.9412 \pm 0.06	0.5844 \pm 0.01	0.3419 \pm 0.07	0.4970 \pm 0.10	-
Synthpop	0.2123 \pm 0.05	0.7450 \pm 0.26	0.0113 \pm 0.01	0.9166 \pm 0.08	1.1957 \pm 0.01	0.2821 \pm 0.05	0.2828 \pm 0.09	0.0573 \pm 0.05
Copula	0.1720 \pm 0.05	0.8303 \pm 0.16	0.1186 \pm 0.05	0.8796 \pm 0.08	0.6857 \pm 0.01	0.0719 \pm 0.09	0.0957 \pm 0.12	0.0195 \pm 0.04
TVAE	0.1505 \pm 0.05	0.9382 \pm 0.02	0.1341 \pm 0.14	0.9267 \pm 0.10	0.6253 \pm 0.01	0.4125 \pm 0.05	0.4636 \pm 0.12	0.2204 \pm 0.06
CTGAN	0.1319 \pm 0.04	0.8313 \pm 0.14	0.0663 \pm 0.03	0.9126 \pm 0.06	0.6253 \pm 0.01	0.3955 \pm 0.05	0.4463 \pm 0.08	0.3563 \pm 0.09
CTABGAN+	0.1200 \pm 0.04	0.8795 \pm 0.04	0.0643 \pm 0.03	0.9296 \pm 0.07	0.5601 \pm 0.01	0.2909 \pm 0.14	0.4606 \pm 0.17	0.3955 \pm 0.06
TabDDPM	0.1085 \pm 0.04	0.9366 \pm 0.01	0.0112 \pm 0.54	0.9576 \pm 0.06	0.5688 \pm 0.01	0.3711 \pm 0.11	0.5128 \pm 0.16	0.3793 \pm 0.06
TTVAE	0.1064 \pm 0.03	0.9407 \pm 0.01	0.0073 \pm 0.01	0.9605 \pm 0.06	0.5265 \pm 0.01	0.4311 \pm 0.08	0.5206 \pm 0.14	0.4170 \pm 0.08
Real	0.0711 \pm 0.03	0.9685 \pm 0.01	0.0068 \pm 0.01	0.9683 \pm 0.06	0.4564 \pm 0.01	0.4264 \pm 0.10	0.5228 \pm 0.17	0.4679 \pm 0.09

where N is the sample size, and p_i represents predicted probabilities (propensity scores) from chosen classification algorithms, such as logistic regression and decision trees.

5 Results and Discussion

ML Utility. The results of the ML utility evaluation are presented in Table 2, aiming to assess the performance of synthetic datasets in predictive tasks compared to real data. A superior synthetic dataset should demonstrate performance in ML utility that is comparable to real data. Our extensive evaluations across diverse public benchmark datasets reveal the remarkable performance of TTVAE, surpassing baseline models and even outperforming the widely recognized and challenging-to-beat shallow SMOTE model [Shwartz-Ziv and Armon, 2022; Kotelnikov *et al.*, 2023]. Specifically, TTVAE exhibits superiority over other state-of-the-art (SOTA) methods across a majority of datasets, particularly for larger datasets. However, for smaller datasets, SMOTE-based algorithms remain competitive. This is expected given that DL typically benefits from larger datasets for optimal performance. This robust performance of TTVAE underscores its effectiveness in generating synthetic tabular data that retains utility comparable to real-world datasets across various scales. The enhancement observed in comparison to TVAE highlights the positive impact of the Transformer-based architecture, the introduction of a new loss function, and the incorporation of latent space interpolation. These elements collectively contribute to the improved learning of inter-feature correlations and the overall training effectiveness of VAE.

Statistical Similarity. We qualitatively evaluate TTVAE’s ability to model individual and joint feature distributions compared to baseline methods. Synthetic datasets are gener-

Table 3: Average ranks (smaller is better), are computed across all datasets for eight metrics, each representing distinct measurement aspects, to evaluate the resemblance between real and synthetic data.

	KLD	JSD	WD	Corr	Density	Coverage	DCR	pMSE
SMOTE	4.4	4.8	4.9	3.6	4.7	4.9	4.9	4.3
ADASYN	4.1	4.5	4.7	3.6	4.8	3.8	4.1	3.2
SMOTENC	3.4	3.5	4.4	3.6	3.1	3.1	3.7	3.1
Copula	6.5	6.4	6.8	5.2	8.3	7.5	7.8	7.2
Synthpop	7.1	7.7	7.8	4.6	7.4	7.5	8.3	7.2
TVAE	8.1	6.8	5.5	4.3	4.2	6.1	6.3	6.5
CTGAN	4.4	5.5	6.3	5.2	6.8	6.3	6.5	6.5
CTABGAN+	6.4	6.0	6.0	4.4	6.9	7.1	7.1	6.8
TabDDPM	3.9	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.7	3.4	3.4	3.8
TTVAE	2.4	2.1	1.9	2.1	2.4	2.3	2.2	2.8

ated for each dataset using various data synthesis algorithms, matching the size of the real training set and employing stratified sampling for classification datasets. Statistical similarity metrics are then calculated. The results are summarized in Table 3, which consistently highlights TTVAE’s superior performance over baselines across all selected metrics, with notable excellence in accuracy and privacy.

At the univariate level, synthetic data generated by TTVAE exhibits the closest resemblance based on different distance metrics, including Kullback-Leibler divergence (KLD=2.4), Jensen-Shannon divergence (JSD=2.3), and Wasserstein Distance (WD=1.9). For the bivariate relationship, We employ diverse correlation measures for measuring bivariate relationships, following a previous study [Wang *et al.*, 2024]. We then compute differences between correlation matrices on real and synthetic data for each dataset. We use Pearson correlation coefficients when both are continuous variables, Eta coefficients for one nominal and one continuous variable, and point biserial correlation coefficients for one dichotomous





Figure 3: Heatmaps of the pair-wise column correlation of synthetic data v.s. the real data. The value represents the absolute divergence between the real and estimated correlations (the lighter, the better). TTVAE gives the most accurate column correlation estimation on *BE* (Upper) and *AD* (Lower) datasets.

Figure 4: t-SNE projection on the *AD* dataset.



and one continuous variable. When both variables are nominal (including dichotomous), Cramer’s V is applied. Based on correlation metrics, TTVAE outperforms all other baselines in generating synthetic datasets with more realistic pair-wise correlations (Corr=2.1). The results for the largest regression dataset (BE) and classification dataset (AD) are presented in Figure 3, showcasing TTVAE’s similar superior performance to assist this evaluation. At the table level, TTVAE still ranks at the top based on Density (2.4) and Coverage (2.3). We also present t-SNE projections on real and synthetic datasets in Figure 4 for dataset AD to qualitatively investigate quality and examine the learned joint distribution [Liu *et al.*, 2022b]. We observe that the synthetic data generated by TTVAE exhibits significantly better overlap with the original dataset compared to other benchmarks when using t-SNE for visualization.

Privacy. From a privacy perspective, TTVAE takes the lead in the DCR (2.2), indicating that the synthetic data generated by TTVAE closely resembles the real dataset, enabling its exceptional ML utility. On the other hand, TTVAE ranks in the top position in pMSE (2.8), suggesting that simple ML algorithms can effectively distinguish between real and synthetic data. This finding implies that our synthetic data exhibits suf-

ficient dissimilarity to prevent a straightforward replication of the real data. Overall, these evaluations demonstrate that TTVAE is a more flexible and effective solution than other baselines, producing synthetic data with superior quality and resilience to privacy attacks.

6 Conclusions

In this study, we investigate the potential of Transformer architectures in the domain of TDS, introducing the TTVAE design adept at handling mixed data types, including both numerical and categorical features. The integration of latent space interpolation enhances the controllability and interpretability of synthetic data generation. Across various benchmark datasets, TTVAE consistently outperforms existing models, including statistical, ML, and DL algorithms. Notably, our proposed model exceeds the performance of SMOTE and its variants, traditionally considered effective baselines. In contrast to the shallow interpolation models of SMOTE, TTVAE combines latent space interpolation with the Transformer, capturing intricate feature relationships and significantly improving the quality of synthetic data generation.

References

- [Alaa *et al.*, 2022] Ahmed Alaa, Boris Van Breugel, Evgeny S Saveliev, and Mihaela van der Schaar. How faithful is your synthetic data? Sample-level metrics for evaluating and auditing generative models. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 290–306. PMLR, 2022.
- [Assefa *et al.*, 2020] Samuel A Assefa, Danial Dervovic, Mahmoud Mahfouz, Robert E Tillman, Prashant Reddy, and Manuela Veloso. Generating synthetic data in finance: opportunities, challenges and pitfalls. In *Proceedings of the First ACM International Conference on AI in Finance*, pages 1–8, 2020.
- [Badaro *et al.*, 2023] Gilbert Badaro, Mohammed Saeed, and Paolo Papotti. Transformers for tabular data representation: A survey of models and applications. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 11:227–249, 2023.
- [Borisov *et al.*, 2022] Vadim Borisov, Tobias Leemann, Kathrin Seßler, Johannes Haug, Martin Pawelczyk, and Gjergji Kasneci. Deep neural networks and tabular data: A survey. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, 2022.
- [Chong and Forsyth, 2020] Min Jin Chong and David Forsyth. Effectively unbiased FID and inception score and where to find them. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 6070–6079, 2020.
- [Chundawat *et al.*, 2022] Vikram S Chundawat, Ayush K Tarun, Murari Mandal, Mukund Lahoti, and Pratik Narang. A universal metric for robust evaluation of synthetic tabular data. *IEEE Transactions on Artificial Intelligence*, 2022.
- [Dablain *et al.*, 2022] Damien Dablain, Bartosz Krawczyk, and Nitesh V. Chawla. DeepSMOTE: Fusing deep learning and SMOTE for imbalanced data. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, pages 1–15, 2022.
- [Fonseca and Bacao, 2023] Joao Fonseca and Fernando Bacao. Tabular and latent space synthetic data generation: a literature review. *Journal of Big Data*, 10(1):115, 2023.
- [Gorishniy *et al.*, 2021] Yury Gorishniy, Ivan Rubachev, Valentin Khrulkov, and Artem Babenko. Revisiting deep learning models for tabular data. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34, 2021.
- [He *et al.*, 2008] Haibo He, Yang Bai, Edwardo A Garcia, and Shutao Li. ADASYN: Adaptive synthetic sampling approach for imbalanced learning. In *IEEE International Joint Conference on Neural Networks (IEEE World Congress on Computational Intelligence)*, pages 1322–1328. IEEE, 2008.
- [Hediger *et al.*, 2022] Simon Hediger, Loris Michel, and Jeffrey Näf. On the use of random forest for two-sample testing. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, 170:107435, 2022.
- [Hernandez *et al.*, 2022] Mikel Hernandez, Gorka Epelde, Ane Alberdi, Rodrigo Cilla, and Debbie Rankin. Synthetic data generation for tabular health records: A systematic review. *Neurocomputing*, 493:28–45, 2022.
- [Huang *et al.*, 2020] Xin Huang, Ashish Khetan, Milan Cvitkovic, and Zohar Karnin. Tabtransformer: Tabular data modeling using contextual embeddings. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2012.06678*, 2020.
- [James *et al.*, 2021] Stefanie James, Chris Harbron, Janice Branson, and Mimmi Sundler. Synthetic data use: exploring use cases to optimise data utility. *Discover Artificial Intelligence*, 1(1):15, 2021.
- [Kim *et al.*, 2022] Jayoung Kim, Chaejeong Lee, Yehjin Shin, Sewon Park, Minjung Kim, Noseong Park, and Jihoon Cho. SOS: Score-based oversampling for tabular data. In *Proceedings of the 28th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, pages 762–772, 2022.
- [Kingma and Welling, 2014] D. P. Kingma and M. Welling. Auto-encoding variational Bayes. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2014.
- [Kotelnikov *et al.*, 2023] Akim Kotelnikov, Dmitry Baranchuk, Ivan Rubachev, and Artem Babenko. TABDDPM: Modelling tabular data with diffusion models. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 17564–17579. PMLR, 2023.
- [Lampis *et al.*, 2023] Andrea Lampis, Eugenio Lomurno, and Matteo Matteucci. Bridging the gap: Enhancing the utility of synthetic data via post-processing techniques. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.10118*, 2023.
- [Lee *et al.*, 2021] Jaehoon Lee, Jihyeon Hyeong, Jinsung Jeon, Noseong Park, and Jihoon Cho. Invertible tabular GANs: Killing two birds with one stone for tabular data synthesis. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:4263–4273, 2021.
- [Liu *et al.*, 2022a] Fan Liu, Zhiyong Cheng, Huilin Chen, Yinwei Wei, Liqiang Nie, and Mohan Kankanhalli. Privacy-preserving synthetic data generation for recommendation systems. In *Proceedings of the 45th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*, pages 1379–1389, 2022.
- [Liu *et al.*, 2022b] Tennison Liu, Zhaozhi Qian, Jeroen Berrevoets, and Mihaela van der Schaar. GOGGLE: Generative modelling for tabular data by learning relational structure. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022.
- [Mukherjee and Khushi, 2021] Mimi Mukherjee and Matloob Khushi. SMOTE-ENC: A novel SMOTE-based method to generate synthetic data for nominal and continuous features. *Applied System Innovation*, 4(1):18, 2021.
- [Mukherjee *et al.*, 2019] Sudipto Mukherjee, Himanshu Asnani, Eugene Lin, and Sreeram Kannan. ClusterGAN: Latent space clustering in generative adversarial networks. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 33, pages 4610–4617, 2019.

- [Naeem *et al.*, 2020] Muhammad Ferjad Naeem, Seong Joon Oh, Youngjung Uh, Yunjey Choi, and Jaesun Yoo. Reliable fidelity and diversity metrics for generative models. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 7176–7185. PMLR, 2020.
- [Nowok *et al.*, 2016] Beata Nowok, Gillian M Raab, Chris Dibben, et al. synthpop: Bespoke creation of synthetic data in R. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 74(11):1–26, 2016.
- [Rabbani and Samad, 2023] Shourav B Rabbani and Manar D Samad. Between-sample relationship in learning tabular data using graph and attention networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.06772*, 2023.
- [Raghunathan, 2021] Trivellore E Raghunathan. Synthetic data. *Annual Review of Statistics and Its Application*, 8, 2021.
- [Shwartz-Ziv and Armon, 2022] Ravid Shwartz-Ziv and Amitai Armon. Tabular data: Deep learning is not all you need. *Information Fusion*, 81:84–90, 2022.
- [Song *et al.*, 2019] Weiping Song, Chence Shi, Zhiping Xiao, Zhijian Duan, Yewen Xu, Ming Zhang, and Jian Tang. AutoInt: Automatic feature interaction learning via self-attentive neural networks. In *Proceedings of the 28th ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management*, pages 1161–1170, 2019.
- [Struski *et al.*, 2023] Łukasz Struski, Michał Sadowski, Tomasz Danel, Jacek Tabor, and Igor T Podolak. Feature-based interpolation and geodesics in the latent spaces of generative models. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, 2023.
- [Sun *et al.*, 2019] Yi Sun, Alfredo Cuesta-Infante, and Kalyan Veeramachaneni. Learning vine copula models for synthetic data generation. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 33, pages 5049–5057, 2019.
- [Theis *et al.*, 2016] L Theis, A van den Oord, and M Bethge. A note on the evaluation of generative models. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR 2016)*, pages 1–10, 2016.
- [Vaswani *et al.*, 2017] Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. Attention is all you need. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 30, 2017.
- [Venugopal *et al.*, 2022] Rohit Venugopal, Noman Shafqat, Ishwar Venugopal, Benjamin Mark John Tillbury, Harry Demetrios Stafford, and Aikaterini Bourazeri. Privacy preserving generative adversarial networks to model electronic health records. *Neural Networks*, 153:339–348, 2022.
- [Wang *et al.*, 2023] Alex X Wang, Stefanka S Chukova, and Binh P Nguyen. Synthetic minority oversampling using edited displacement-based k-nearest neighbors. *Applied Soft Computing*, 148:110895, 2023.
- [Wang *et al.*, 2024] Alex X Wang, Stefanka S Chukova, Andrew Sporle, Barry J Milne, Colin R Simpson, and Binh P Nguyen. Enhancing public research on citizen data: An empirical investigation of data synthesis using Statistics New Zealand’s integrated data infrastructure. *Information Processing & Management*, 61(1):103558, 2024.
- [Xu *et al.*, 2019] Lei Xu, Maria Skoularidou, Alfredo Cuesta-Infante, and Kalyan Veeramachaneni. Modeling tabular data using conditional GAN. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 7335–7345, 2019.
- [Yan *et al.*, 2023] Jiahuan Yan, Jintai Chen, Yixuan Wu, Danny Z Chen, and Jian Wu. T2G-FORMER: organizing tabular features into relation graphs promotes heterogeneous feature interaction. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 37, pages 10720–10728, 2023.
- [Zhang *et al.*, 2022] Aimin Zhang, Hualong Yu, Zhangjun Huan, Xibei Yang, Shang Zheng, and Shang Gao. SMOTE-RkNN: A hybrid re-sampling method based on SMOTE and reverse k-nearest neighbors. *Information Sciences*, 595:70–88, 2022.
- [Zhang *et al.*, 2023] Dongyu Zhang, Liang Wang, Xin Dai, Shubham Jain, Junpeng Wang, Yujie Fan, Chin-Chia Michael Yeh, Yan Zheng, Zhongfang Zhuang, and Wei Zhang. FATA-Trans: Field and time-aware transformer for sequential tabular data. In *Proceedings of the 32nd ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management*, pages 3247–3256, 2023.
- [Zhao *et al.*, 2021] Zilong Zhao, Aditya Kunar, Robert Birke, and Lydia Y Chen. CTAB-GAN: Effective table data synthesizing. In *Asian Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 97–112. PMLR, 2021.
- [Zhao *et al.*, 2022] Zilong Zhao, Aditya Kunar, Robert Birke, and Lydia Y Chen. CTAB-GAN+: Enhancing tabular data synthesis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.00401*, 2022.
- [Zhao *et al.*, 2023] Zilong Zhao, Robert Birke, and Lydia Y Chen. FCT-GAN: Enhancing global correlation of table synthesis via Fourier transform. In *Proceedings of the 32nd ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management*, pages 4450–4454, 2023.