

Table 1. More comparison results on two benchmarks demonstrate the SOTA performance of GDformer.

Dataset	NIPS_TS_GECCO[1]			ASD[2]		
Metric	P	R	F1	P	R	F1
AnomalyTrans	28.42	45.48	34.98	73.7	99.74	84.76
DCdetector	32.23	45.21	37.63	91.83	99.81	95.66
GDformer	63.10	55.80	59.20	97.18	99.85	98.50

Table 2. Comparison results on additional metrics (affiliation precision/recall[3] and VUS[4]).

Dataset	Method	Aff-P[3]	Aff-R[3]	R_AUC_ROC[4]	R_AUC_PR[4]	VUS_ROC[4]	VUS_PR[4]
MSL	AnomalyTrans	84.51	98.82	90.17	87.96	88.57	86.54
	DCdetector	83.49	98.45	89.98	87.87	88.2	86.31
	GDformer	88.24	99.14	90.89	89.33	90.22	88.78
SMAP	AnomalyTrans	80.66	97.7	85.76	85.76	85.8	85.8
	DCdetector	82.68	99.51	95.87	93.99	94.78	93.03
	GDformer	84.00	99.73	96.81	94.51	96.23	94.01
SWaT	AnomalyTrans	78.56	90.27	84.42	79.91	84.37	79.87
	DCdetector	89.32	99.85	96.61	94.03	96.81	94.21
	GDformer	93.97	99.92	98.37	96.96	98.09	96.72
PSM	AnomalyTrans	75.16	75.21	89.38	92.2	87.81	91.07
	DCdetector	63.49	80.93	86.66	89.36	82.38	86.14
	GDformer	69.86	84.79	92.90	94.17	89.81	91.95

Table 3. Error bars.

Method	MSL	SMAP	SWaT	PSM
AnomalyTrans	93.83±0.32	95.75±0.07	93.14±1.07	97.46±0.1
DCdetector	94.7±0.76	95.94±0.39	96.4±0.06	97.42±0.45
GDformer	95.7±0.14	96.47±0.04	97.69±0.31	98.43±0.44

Table 4. Comparison with SOTA baselines.

Dataset	MSL			SMAP			SWaT			PSM			AVG
Metric	P	R	F1	P	R	F1	P	R	F1	P	R	F1	F1
GDformer	93.70	98.07	95.83	95.55	97.52	96.52	96.28	99.82	98.02	97.97	99.52	98.74	97.28
MEMTO[5]	92.07	96.76	94.36	93.76	99.63	96.61	94.18	97.54	95.83	97.46	99.23	98.34	96.28
DiffAD[6]	92.97	95.44	94.19	96.52	97.38	96.95	98.44	96.9	97.66	97.00	98.92	97.95	96.69
EH-GAM-EGAN[7]	89.49	94.29	91.83	8.34	1.00	9.10	4.51	1.00	8.63	94.66	98.45	96.51	51.52

Table 5. Ablation study on SMD dataset.

Variants	A.1	A.2	A.3	A.4	A.5	GDformer	B.1	B.2	C.1	C.2
P	83.86	83.34	81.53	83.07	83.9	86.33	84.47	84.32	81.58	85.54
R	82.52	88.31	77.56	88.01	93.26	94.89	86.82	83.43	70.07	89.7
F1	83.18	85.75	79.5	85.47	88.34	90.41	85.63	83.88	75.39	87.57

Reference:

- [1] DCdetector: Dual Attention Contrastive Representation Learning for Time Series Anomaly Detection
- [2] Multivariate Time Series Anomaly Detection and Interpretation using Hierarchical Inter-Metric and Temporal Embedding
- [3] Local Evaluation of Time Series Anomaly Detection Algorithms
- [4] Volume under the surface: a new accuracy evaluation measure for time-series anomaly detection
- [5] Memto: Memory-guided transformer for multivariate time series anomaly detection, 2023
- [6] Imputation-based Time-Series Anomaly Detection with Conditional Weight-Incremental Diffusion Models, 2023
- [7] Graph-enhanced anomaly detection framework in multivariate time series using Graph Attention and Enhanced Generative Adversarial Networks, 2025