

Preserving correlations: A statistical method for generating synthetic data

Nicklas Jävergård, Rainey Lyons, Adrian Muntean¹ and Jonas Forsman²

¹Department of Mathematics and Computer Science, Karlstad University, Sweden

²CGI, Data Advantage, Karlstad, Sweden

Abstract

We propose a method to generate statistically representative synthetic data. The main goal is to be able to maintain in the synthetic dataset the correlations of the features present in the original one, while offering a comfortable privacy level that can be eventually tailored on specific customer demands.

We describe in detail our algorithm used both for the analysis of the original dataset and for the generation of the synthetic data points. The approach is tested using a large energy-related dataset. We obtain good results both qualitatively (e.g. via visualizing correlation maps) and quantitatively (in terms of suitable ℓ^1 -type error norms used as evaluation metrics).

The proposed methodology is general in the sense that it does not rely on the used test dataset. We expect it to be applicable in a much broader context than indicated here.

Keywords: synthetic data generation, computational statistics

1 Introduction

Computational science and engineering is constantly meeting new data-related challenges. Some of these challenges involve contradictory requests. For instance, in the presence of complex projects such as the creation of digital twins of manufacturing processes, the development of realistic smart cities, or the reliable prediction of trends in the evolution of energy consumption or financial markets in the presence of uncertainties, researchers need access to large high quality datasets for data-driven modeling; see, e.g., the recent review article [1]. On the other hand, data owners are often hesitant to share detailed information due to various concerns. One common example of such concerns is with respect to privacy, particularly regarding sensitive

data such as, medical records, survey responses, or household level electrical consumption; the latter of which being of increasing importance in the context of system monitoring and load prediction. Additionally, companies storing extensive datasets are concerned about disclosing information that could affect their competitiveness on a given market. Such developments make the generation of high utility synthetic data critical. In this context, “high utility” suggests that some analysis conducted on the synthetic dataset produce similar results as the same analysis performed on the original dataset. At the same time, it is crucial to minimize the risk of disclosing sensitive information to an affordable level. Keeping the right balance between “utility” and “disclosure” is essential for a successful methodology. This is precisely the our goal here: to explore a simple method of synthetic data generation which preserves a tunable quality of statistic information and allows for a controllable level of privacy.

Many different approaches for synthetic data generation exist and all have both advantages and drawbacks. Two of the most prominent categories of methods are machine learning techniques like those based on Generative-Adversarial Networks (GANs) [2] and statistical methods such as Bayesian Networks (BNs) [3], [4]. While the usage of GANs is flexible it, like most machine learning methods, requires significant training time, the tuning of hyperparameters and a internal process that is hard to inspect; see e.g. [5] and references cited therein, where the authors highlight critical challenges and innovations in outsourcing machine learning confidentially. Meanwhile, BNs postulate relationships between dataset features, assuming prior conditional distributions, and are particularly useful when the analysis on the synthetic dataset is predefined.

The approach proposed within the frame of this article is different from GANs and BNs. In particular, we do not assume any *a priori* structure on the dataset and nor on conditional distributions between its features. Furthermore, our process is inspect-able, relatively fast and has few tunable parameters. Our method aims to keep a good representation of the original data and in terms of controlling (in suitable error norms) the distributions of the features as well as of preserving inter-feature correlations. We introduce a tunable parameter that balances, to a certain extent, how closely the obtained synthetic dataset resembles the original. Keeping such balance is paramount to persuade data owners to share their data. The proposed approach is data-driven¹ and, by the way it is designed, can be extended to handle time series and can be combined with other alternative methodologies for producing synthetic data that are process-driven, i.e, we have in mind here agents-based/econometrics models and/or stochastic differential

¹We do not change the method for different data sets. Data-driven production of synthetic data refers within this context to computable metrics based on operations with the original data, aiming the synthesis of the output. The terminology *data-driven* is borrowed from [6].

equations describing physical or economic systems; see, for instance, [6], [7]. We will explore such options elsewhere.

This paper is structured in the following way. In section 2, we give a brief description of our chosen dataset. In section 3, we present in simple mathematical terms how our method works and what it must deliver, while the corresponding algorithm and a few implementation details are the subject of section 4. Using a particular large dataset collected from the energy sector, referred in section 2 as the original dataset, we focus our attention in section 5 on qualitative and quantitative results obtained when comparing our synthetically generated datasets with the original dataset. Finally, in section 6 we discuss the obtained results and anticipate as well further potential developments of our method for synthetic data generation.

2 Data acquisition

The data was downloaded from, *SustData: A Public dataset for ICT4S Electric Energy Research* <https://osf.io/2ac8q/>. The dataset contains over 35 million individual records of electric energy related data, among which you can find consumption and demographic information from 50 monitored homes, electric energy production in Madeira Island and supporting environmental data. *SustData* have been used in the research on Non-Intrusive Load Monitoring (NILM)[8] and particularly in event based approaches for NILM as discussed in [9]. The subset we work on is consumption in homes containing 15 features (columns) representing the minimum, maximum and average of current (I), voltage (V), real power (P), power factor (PF), and reactive power (Q). The dataset has a temporal resolution of one minute. Description of the dataset is available in [10]. From this dataset we extracted a random sample with circa 10 million individual records. This subset was then cleaned, removing any rows of observations that contained invalid values. Also any categorical columns was removed, since our approach, for now, only deals with floating point numbers. Any row that contains invalid entries or zeros were also removed. From this cleaned version of the dataset, we sample randomly 5 million observations. In this paper, we refer to the reduced (clean) dataset as \mathcal{O} . Its features, will be denoted by $f^i (i \in \{1, \dots, 15\})$. What concerns the dataset used within this framework, we identify the features as follows:

Notation	Physical meaning	Symbol
f_1	Minimum Current	} I
f_2	Maximum Current	
f_3	Average Current	
f_4	Minimum Voltage	} V
f_5	Maximum Voltage	
f_6	Average Voltage	
f_7	Minimum Power	} P
f_8	Maximum Power	
f_9	Average Power	
f_{10}	Minimum Power Factor	} PF
f_{11}	Maximum Power Factor	
f_{12}	Average Power Factor	
f_{13}	Minimum Reactive Power	} Q
f_{14}	Maximum Reactive Power	
f_{15}	Average Reactive Power	

Table 1: Description of the notation and physical meaning of each feature of the dataset \mathcal{O} . The maximum, minimum and average are taken over the course of one minute.

3 Description of the method

The raw data was obtained in `csv`-format and each file was read using the `pandas` library in the `Python` programming language. Then the different sections were concatenated and cleaned by looking for invalid entries in the dataset.

3.1 Statistical map

We want to generate representative synthetic data from an original dataset, \mathcal{O} . Consider \mathcal{O} to be a large table of values where each column is a feature, f_i for $i = 1, 2, \dots, N_f$, with M rows. (i.e., we have M data points). Additionally, we assume all features can be represented by real numbers, and so, $\mathcal{O} = [f_1, f_2, \dots, f_{N_f}] \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times N_f}$. We take the maximum and minimum value of a feature and we discretize the range of values in a homogeneous way. Choose a natural number, say N , to be the number of intervals that subdivides the range of each feature and calculate the interval length, Δx_i , according to

$$\Delta x_i = \frac{\max\{f_i\} - \min\{f_i\}}{N}. \quad (1)$$

In (1), the parameter N can be thought of as an indicator of resolution and is taken to be the same for all features. We may express the grid point of

our discretization as,

$$x_i^n := \min\{f_i\} + \Delta x_i \cdot n \text{ for } n \in 0, 1, \dots, N. \quad (2)$$

From the expression above we define the intervals $A_i^k := [x_i^{k-1}, x_i^k]$ for $k = 0, 1, \dots, N-1$ and $A_i^N := [x_i^{N-1}, x_i^N]$, for each feature f_i . We assume that each feature has a underlying distribution $\rho_i(x)$ we also assume that any two-way combination of the features, f_i , has an underlying conditional distribution $\rho_{ij}(y|x)$. Using the above discretization we approximate the probability of observing a value, $x \in A_k^i$, of feature f_i as,

$$p_i(A_k^i) = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{x \in f^i} \chi_{A_k^i}(x), \quad (3)$$

where $\chi_A(\cdot)$ is the indicator function of event A defined by

$$\chi_A(x) := \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x \in A, \\ 0 & \text{if } x \notin A. \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

We can approximate the probability of a set $A \in \{\bigcup_{k=0} A_i^k \cup A_i^N\}$ by means of the following expression:

$$\int_A \rho_i(x) dx \approx \sum_{\{k: A_i^k \cap A \neq \emptyset\}} p_i(A_i^k) \Delta x_i. \quad (5)$$

To be able to construct a synthetic dataset that retains the correlations between features, we compute the conditional probability of observing a value $y \in A_j^m$ of f_j given a value $x \in A_i^n$ of f_i denoted, $p(A_j^m | A_i^n)$.

$$p(A_j^m | A_i^n) = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{\vec{x} \in \text{rows}(\mathcal{O})} \frac{\chi_{A_i^n}(x_i) \chi_{A_j^m}(x_j)}{p_i(A_i^n)} \quad (6)$$

In equation (6), we are approximating the probability of an event A given B based on the standard definition of conditional probability,

$$P(A|B) := \frac{P(A \cap B)}{P(B)}. \quad (7)$$

Similarly as in (5) we can sum up $p(A_j^m | A_i^n)$ to obtain the approximate probability of a set $A \in \{\bigcup_{k=0} A_i^k \cup A_i^N\}$, for a fixed A_i^n using equation (8).

$$\int_A \rho_{ij}(y | A_i^n) dy \approx \sum_{\{m: A_j^m \cap A \neq \emptyset\}} p(A_j^m | A_i^n) \Delta x_j. \quad (8)$$

With our empirical estimations in equation (5) and (8) we can construct empirical distributions approximating $\rho_i(x)$ and $\rho_{ij}(y|x)$ denoted $\tilde{\rho}_i(x)$ and

$\tilde{\rho}_{ij}(y|x)$, respectively. This is done using the function `rv_histogram` in SciPy, description here [11], which, given a histogram, returns a linear interpolation of the histogram using the center points of the bins. This is done for convenience in drawing values randomly from this approximate distribution.

Using $\tilde{\rho}_i(x)$ and $\tilde{\rho}_{ij}(y|x)$ to construct the synthetic dataset is now rather straightforward. Draw a value, x from $\tilde{\rho}_i(x)$ and use the interval A_i^k that x belongs to as condition in $\tilde{\rho}_{ij}(y|x)$ to draw the values for remaining features f_j .

4 Implementation

In this section, we wish to indicate the workflow of our way to create our statistical map. For the convenience of the reader, we present in Algorithm 1 the pseudo code describing our approach for generating a statistical map of the original dataset, \mathcal{O} , for a given choice of N .

Algorithm 1 Implementation for the statistical map

```

1: for each feature  $f_i$  do
2:   Discretize the range of feature  $f_i$ , forming intervals  $A_i^k$ 
3:   for each  $A_i^k$  do
4:     Compute the probability of a value  $x \in f_i$  to belong in
        $A_i^k$ 
5:   end for
6: end for
7: for each feature  $f_i$  do
8:   for each feature  $f_j \neq f_i$  do
9:     for each  $A_i^k$  do
10:      Select values  $y \in f_j$  such that  $x \in A_i^k$ , denoted  $Y$ 
11:      Use the discretization of  $f_j$ , meaning  $A_j^n$ 
12:      for each  $A_j^n$  do
13:        Compute the conditional probability of  $y \in Y$  to
          be in  $A_j^n$ 
14:      end for
15:    end for
16:  end for
17: end for

```

When generating synthetic data with our empirical distribution functions there are a lot of choices one could make. For instance, one could use the correlations of the original dataset and select the root features as being the set of features that are highly correlated with each other. One could perform principal component analysis and construct the joint distribution for the n most important features and draw the allowed root feature from

those. Then use conditional probabilities to fill out the values of remaining features. Our approach was to select a feature f_i uniformly and draw a value x from the corresponding empirical probability distribution function $\tilde{\rho}_i(x)$, and subsequent values y from the conditional distributions $\tilde{\rho}_{ij}(y|x)$ given the drawn value x from $\tilde{\rho}_i(x)$, such that each feature $f_j \neq f_i$ attains a generated value. Once this is done we have generated a new observation in our synthetic dataset. The conditional feature f_i is rotated between the features such that each feature is used as the root feature for the conditional distribution approximately the same number of times. This is done to avoid unfair bias in the resulting dataset.

5 Results - comparisons between original and synthetic datasets

When trying to assess the utility of a synthetic dataset there are two broad categories one can consider. When analysis to be performed on the synthetic dataset is predefined, one can employ specific utility measures. The measure of utility would be the "distance" between the analysis result performed on the original and synthetic dataset alike. When the intended analysis is not known one could consider more general measures of utility. For a more in depth discussion on measures of utility, both general and specific, we recommend [12]. For specific examples on general utility measures based on permutation entropy or Principal Component Analysis, see [13] or [14], respectively. We are considering general measures of utility in this paper, focusing on comparing the different datasets in a distributional sense.

5.1 Comparison of first-order distributions

In Figure 1, we plot the first order distributions ($\tilde{\rho}_i$) of the features from the original and the synthetic dataset. By first order distributions we simply mean that no conditions are made on the distributions. This is done to illustrate that the distributions of each feature of the synthetic dataset (\mathcal{S}) and original dataset (\mathcal{O}) are similar but not identical.




Figure 1: Comparison between the first order distributions, $(\tilde{\rho}_i)$, of \mathcal{O} (blue) and \mathcal{S} (red) plotted over the range of each feature in \mathcal{O} . \mathcal{S} was generated using 750 bins for the approximation of the distributions of the original dataset, \mathcal{O} . Qualitatively the distributions of \mathcal{O} and \mathcal{S} seems very similar but not identical.

5.2 Comparison of second-order distributions

To illustrate the retention of correlations between features of \mathcal{S} compared to \mathcal{O} , we select one feature, f_i , and one set in the range of f_i , called A . We plot the conditional distributions (also referred here as second-order distributions) $\tilde{\rho}_{ij}(y|x \in A)$. We show in Figure 2 one example of such a plot. In this example, the particular set A was chosen to illustrate different characteristics of our method. If the correlations between \mathcal{O} and \mathcal{S} were identical, then we would expect the corresponding distributions to be identical as well.




Figure 2: Comparison between the conditional distributions of features 3, 6, 10 and 15 given all values in the union of the first 250 bins of feature 5 between \mathcal{O} (blue) and \mathcal{S} (red). Generation was done using 1000 bins in total.

Note that it is expected that the difference between the datasets \mathcal{S} and \mathcal{O} depends on both the order of correlation and on the choice of discretization used during generation. Our current implementation includes information only up to the second order in distributions. Conceptually, we can adapt our construction of synthetic datasets to benefit of a higher hierarchy of distributions, e.g. including 3rd, 4th, or higher-order distributions. We notice this effect while looking at $\tilde{\rho}_{5,6}$ in Figure 2. Here we see that the synthetic version displays a bi-modal structure not seen in the original correlation. This is due to only using second-order distributions during generation and choosing the conditional root feature randomly for each data point. Such a process leads to the possibility of generating data points using a root feature independent of feature f_6 , which would be equivalent to generating from the first order distribution.




Figure 4: Pearson correlation matrix calculated on \mathcal{O} .

From Figure 3 it would be reasonable to conclude that the number of bins used in constructing the statistical map does not strongly influence how well the correlations are kept as we generate synthetic data. However, when looking closer at both Figure 3 and Figure 4, we observe that the relative correlations between features are similar in \mathcal{S} when compared to \mathcal{O} even though the strength of correlation seems to be weaker in our synthetic dataset \mathcal{S} as compared with the original \mathcal{O} .

5.3 Computational error estimates

When computing the errors herein we focus on the five features of the dataset \mathcal{O} which contain most interesting information. The chosen features represent the one minute averages of I , V , P , PF , and respectively, of Q . We want to compute a *cumulative* error between \mathcal{O} and \mathcal{S} for the conditional distributions, hereafter known as error. We do this by fixing the same two features in the different datasets, \mathcal{O} and \mathcal{S} , and summing the difference in their histograms over all sets A_i^k and A_j^m , presented in (9). Since we work with a cumulative type of error (without any attempt of normalization), the reported absolute values are not particularly meaningful. Instead, we focus on their relative changes with respect to varying N .

$$\mathcal{E}_{ij} = \sum_{\substack{k=0 \\ \overset{\mathcal{O}}{p}_i(A_k^i) > 0}}^N \sum_{\substack{m=0 \\ \overset{\mathcal{S}}{p}_i(A_k^i) > 0}}^N |p_{ij}^{\mathcal{O}}(A_j^m | A_i^k) - p_{ij}^{\mathcal{S}}(A_j^m | A_i^k)| \Delta x_j \Delta x_i. \quad (9)$$

The role of the conditions $\overset{\mathcal{O}}{p}_i(A_k^i) > 0$ and $\overset{\mathcal{S}}{p}_i(A_k^i) > 0$ is to ensure that the quantity $p_{ij}(\cdot | A_j^k)$ is well-defined for both datasets. We want to investigate how the chosen discretization in the data generation affects the errors. Therefore, we get one matrix \mathcal{E}_{ij} from (9) for each choice of N in equation (2). The result of these calculations is visualized in Figure 5.




Figure 5: \mathcal{E}^{ij} calculated according to (9) for 5 features with $N \in \{1, \dots, 100\} \cup \{150, 200, 250, \dots, 2000\}$.

In Figure 5, we point out the cumulative error collected between the datasets \mathcal{O} and \mathcal{S} for values of N that satisfy the condition

$$N \in \{1, \dots, 100\} \cup \{150, 200, 250, \dots, 2000\}.$$

We see in Figure 5 that the amount of error varies with N . Moreover, the error strongly depends on which feature is represented. Particularly, feature

15 and 9 seem more prone to error. A common aspect for all features is that the corresponding localized error tends to decline as N increases.

To show the aggregate behavior of our synthetic datasets we use the following representation of the error

$$\mathcal{E}_j := \frac{1}{5} \sum_{i=1}^5 \mathcal{E}_{ij}. \quad (10)$$

Equation (10) can be thought of as the average error made when using different features i as the condition on feature j . The result of this computation is illustrated in Figure 6.




Figure 6: Aggregate behavior seen via average (cumulative) errors of type (10) on the conditional distribution of the synthetic data compared to the original data. The features showed are 3, 6, 9, 12, and 15.

Considering Figure 6, we can see that after the initial increase of the error for small values of N the average error \mathcal{E}_j either declines gradually or finds some sort of plateau. Finding of such a plateau seems to be connected to the order of distributions used during the generation of synthetic data. In this spirit, we do not expect that approximation mismatches such as those discussed about $\tilde{\rho}_{ij}$ in Figure 2 would disappear as N increases. Their damping seems to be possible either by using higher order distributions or smarter choices of root features.

6 Discussion

Looking at a specific original large dataset, referred as \mathcal{O} and taken from [10], we create many synthetic versions. To be more precise, we produced another dataset, referred to as \mathcal{S} , which has the same size and features and with different entries. We preserved in the synthetic dataset \mathcal{S} the low-order correlations between features of the original dataset \mathcal{O} . Our method for generating synthetic data exhibits interesting aspects, which can be pointed out for the current dataset under investigation.

When comparing the first-order distributions (ρ_i) of both \mathcal{O} and \mathcal{S} , the corresponding datasets appear to be very similar. The degree of similarity is, in fact, so high that one may think that they are essentially the same dataset. However, when comparing the conditional distributions of each dataset, a less clear cut story emerges. The plots of the correlation matrix show that the relative correlation remains but the strength of the correlations in the synthetic data have decreased. The errors arising in these distributions decrease for larger values of N for some features, while the errors of other features tend to a plateau. These type of comparisons can be found in Figure 3 – Figure 6. We believe that the strength of correlations could be better preserved if one would make use of higher-order distributions. Herewith we mean that one first calculates the distribution of each feature, then the conditional distribution of each feature becomes dependent on all the other features. What is then to be added is the calculation of the distribution of each feature given any combination of two other features in the dataset, i.e. one considers a third-order distribution. Doing this might prove to be computationally expensive. What value of N to use for a concrete study case depends on the feature that is to be represented. It is interesting to note that one has the option to select different values of N corresponding to each feature and then chose such an N to weigh utility *versus* risk of disclosure (a particularly critical aspect when handling sensitive information). It is however possible that the range of error one can tune by means of varying N depends itself on the order of distributions used for the production of the statistical mapping of the original dataset. This aspect is yet to be investigated for more choices of target datasets than the set \mathcal{O} taken here in the focus. More insight in this direction would give hints on what we should expect to prove theoretically for our algorithm if one thinks of error bounds for the control of disclosure.

Quite interestingly, a few innovative ideas for quantifying rigorously privacy (either differential, metric, or something else) in terms of error bounds exist; see e.g. [15] and references cited therein. We plan to explore in the near future to which extent such ideas are applicable to our context.

Acknowledgments

We thank Grigor Nika (Karlstad) for fruitful initial discussions on the synthetic data topic. N.J, J.F, and A.M. are involved in Swedish Energy Agency’s project Solar Electricity Research Centre (SOLVE) with grant number 52693-1. R.L. and A.M. are grateful to Carl Tryggers Stiftelse for their financial support via the grant CTS 21:1656.

References

- [1] G. Gogoshin, S. Branciamore, and A. S. Rodin. “Enhancing manufacturing operations with synthetic data: a systematic framework for data generation, accuracy, and utility”. In: *Front. Manuf. Technol.* 4 (2024), p. 1320166.
- [2] A. Figueira and B. Vaz. “Survey on synthetic data generation, evaluation methods and GANs”. In: *Mathematics* 10.15 (2022). ISSN: 2227-7390. DOI: [10.3390/math10152733](https://doi.org/10.3390/math10152733). URL: <https://www.mdpi.com/2227-7390/10/15/2733>.
- [3] J. Young, P. Graham, and R. Penny. “Using Bayesian networks to create synthetic data”. In: *Journal of Official Statistics* 25.4 (2009), pp. 549–567.
- [4] G. Gogoshin, S. Branciamore, and A. S. Rodin. “Synthetic data generation with probabilistic Bayesian Networks”. In: *Mathematical Biosciences and Engineering: MBE* 18.6 (2021), p. 8603.
- [5] S. Sagar and C. Keke. “Confidential machine learning on untrusted platforms: a survey”. In: *Cybersecurity* 4.30 (2021).
- [6] J. Jordon, L. Szpruch, F. Houssiau, et al. *Synthetic Data – what, why and how?* 2022. URL: https://royalsociety.org/-/media/policy/projects/privacy-enhancing-technologies/Synthetic_Data_Survey-24.pdf.
- [7] R. Carmona and F. Delarue. “Probabilistic Theory of Mean Field Games with Applications I Mean Field FBSDEs, Control, and Games”. English (US). In: *Probability Theory and Stochastic Modelling*. Probability Theory and Stochastic Modelling. United States: Springer Nature, 2018, pp. 1–695.
- [8] D. P. B. Renaux, F. Pottker, H. C. Ancelmo, et al. “A dataset for non-intrusive load monitoring: Design and implementation”. In: *Energies* 13.20 (2020). ISSN: 1996-1073. DOI: [10.3390/en13205371](https://doi.org/10.3390/en13205371). URL: <https://www.mdpi.com/1996-1073/13/20/5371>.

- [9] A. E. Ruano, A. Hernández, J. Ureña, et al. “NILM techniques for intelligent home energy management and ambient assisted living: A review”. In: *Energies* (2019). URL: <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:195061785>.
- [10] L. Pereira, F. Quintal, R. Gonçalves, et al. “SustData: A Public Dataset for ICT4S Electric Energy Research”. In: *Proceedings of the 2014 conference ICT for Sustainability*. Atlantis Press, 2014, pp. 359–368. ISBN: 978-94-62520-22-6. DOI: [10.2991/ict4s-14.2014.44](https://doi.org/10.2991/ict4s-14.2014.44). URL: <https://doi.org/10.2991/ict4s-14.2014.44>.
- [11] P. Virtanen, Ralf Gommers, Travis E. Oliphant, et al. “SciPy 1.0: Fundamental algorithms for scientific computing in Python”. In: *Nature Methods* 17 (2020), pp. 261–272. DOI: [10.1038/s41592-019-0686-2](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41592-019-0686-2).
- [12] J. Snoke, G. M. Raab, B. Nowok, et al. “General and specific utility measures for synthetic data”. In: *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series A: Statistics in Society* 181.3 (Mar. 2018), pp. 663–688. ISSN: 0964-1998. DOI: [10.1111/rssa.12358](https://doi.org/10.1111/rssa.12358). eprint: https://academic.oup.com/jrsssa/article-pdf/181/3/663/49449431/jrsssa_181_3_663.pdf. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1111/rssa.12358>.
- [13] R. Yuan. “A synthetic dataset of Danish residential electricity consumers”. In: *Scientific Data* 10.371 (2023). URL: <https://rdcu.be/dkbsE>.
- [14] F. Dankar and M. Ibrahim. “A new PCA-based utility measure for synthetic data evaluation”. In: (Nov. 2022). DOI: [10.48550/arXiv.2212.05595](https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2212.05595).
- [15] M. Boedihardjo, T. Strohmer, and R. Vershynin. “Private sampling: a noiseless approach for generating differentially private synthetic data”. In: *SIAM Journal on Mathematics of Data Science* 4 (2022), pp. 1082–1115.