

---

# BOARDING FOR ISS: IMBALANCED SELF-SUPERVISED DISCOVERY OF A SCALED AUTOENCODER FOR MIXED TABULAR DATASETS

---

**Samuel Stocksieker**  
Université Claude Bernard Lyon 1  
UR SAF  
Lyon, France

**Denys Pommeret**  
Aix Marseille Université  
CNRS, Centrale Marseille, I2M  
Marseille, France

**Arthur Charpentier**  
Université du Québec à Montréal  
Département de Mathématique  
Montréal, Canada

## ABSTRACT

The field of imbalanced self-supervised learning, especially in the context of tabular data, has not been extensively studied. Existing research has predominantly focused on image datasets. This paper aims to fill this gap by examining the specific challenges posed by data imbalance in self-supervised learning in the domain of tabular data, with a primary focus on autoencoders. Autoencoders are widely employed for learning and constructing a new representation of a dataset, particularly for dimensionality reduction. They are also often used for generative model learning, as seen in variational autoencoders. When dealing with mixed tabular data, qualitative variables are often encoded using a one-hot encoder with a standard loss function (MSE or Cross Entropy). In this paper, we analyze the drawbacks of this approach, especially when categorical variables are imbalanced. We propose a novel metric to balance learning: a Multi-Supervised Balanced MSE. This approach reduces the reconstruction error by balancing the influence of variables. Finally, we empirically demonstrate that this new metric, compared to the standard MSE: i) outperforms when the dataset is imbalanced, especially when the learning process is insufficient, and ii) provides similar results in the opposite case.

**Keywords** Autoencoder, Imbalanced, Mixed Tabular Data, Self-Supervised Learning

## 1 Introduction

Self-supervised learning (SSL) is an approach in machine learning where a model is trained to understand and represent the underlying structure of data without relying on externally provided labels. Unlike supervised learning, which requires labeled examples for training, self-supervised learning leverages the inherent information within the data itself to create meaningful representations. Advancements in SSL frameworks have greatly improved the training of machine learning models when faced with a scarcity of labeled data, particularly in image and language domains. These approaches leverage the distinctive structures present in domain-specific datasets, such as spatial relationships in images or semantic relationships in language. However, their adaptability to general tabular data remains limited. A specific category of SSL is Autoassociative self-supervised learning where a model, often a neural network, is trained to reproduce its own input data. This task is often accomplished using autoencoders. This powerful technique learns to encode and decode data, involving the transformation of data into a latent space through the encoder (i.e., changing the representation space). Subsequently, through decoding, it aims to faithfully reconstruct the inputs from this new representation. To do this, it must learn to identify the most important features of the data and the relationships. These features can then be used for supervised learning tasks such as classification or regression. Autoencoders can be used in a variety of applications such as Computer Vision or Natural Language Processing and for multiple tasks such as data compression, dimensionality reduction, detecting anomalies, denoising data, or generating data.

On the other hand, Imbalanced Learning can be defined as learning from a dataset with an imbalanced distribution. Learning from imbalanced data concerns many problems with numerous applications in different fields ((Krawczyk, 2016), (Fernández et al., 2018a)): supervised framework (binary classification, multi-class classification, multi-

label/multi-instance classification and regression), unsupervised framework (especially clustering) and big data/data streams.

We consider here a novel issue: the Imbalanced Self-Supervised (ISS) for tabular datasets and especially the autoencoder learning with mixed data. Indeed, it is important to emphasize that while neural networks have demonstrated effectiveness in handling images or text, the same level of success has not yet been achieved for tabular data, despite its prevalence in many applications (Shwartz-Ziv and Armon, 2022). Our main contributions can be summarized as follows: i) understanding and analyzing the drawbacks of using MSE as a loss function; ii) proposing a balanced multi-supervised MSE adapting for mixed tabular data, especially when data are imbalanced; iii) illustrating the differences between these two loss functions through a simple simulation and across multiple real datasets in various supervised, unsupervised and generative contexts. The paper is organized as follows: in Section 3 we analyze the autoencoder and MSE loss function with tabular mixed data. In Section 3.2 we propose a balanced MSE dealing with mixed data and imbalance. Numerical results on simulations are presented in Section 4 and several experiments in supervised and unsupervised learning are presented in Sections 5 and 6. Finally, a comparative study in a generative context, using VAEs, is described in Section 7.

**This paper does not delve into the advantages of autoencoders (e.g., comparison of results obtained with an autoencoder versus those obtained from the sample) but rather compares the use of a standard loss function versus our proposed loss function.**

## 2 Related Works

### 2.1 Imbalance Learning

Initially, research in imbalanced learning focused mainly on supervised classification (often binary classification), i.e., learning to explain or predict a binary target variable with very few occurrences of the positive class (see for instance (Buda et al., 2018), (Cao et al., 2019), (Cui et al., 2019), (Huang et al., 2016), (Yang and Xu, 2020a), (Branco et al., 2016) or (Fernández et al., 2018b)). Some works are relative to the Imbalanced learning in the regression framework ((Torgo and Ribeiro, 2007), (Torgo et al., 2013), (Branco et al., 2017), (Branco et al., 2019), (Ribeiro and Moniz, 2020), (Song et al., 2022), (Camacho et al., 2022)). More recently, a new issue extending the imbalanced regression to images has been proposed: the Deep Imbalanced Regression ((Yang et al., 2021)). Several works have then focused on data imbalance in this context (such as (Sen et al., 2023), (Ding et al., 2022), or (Gong et al., 2022)). Finally, a new problem has also been proposed by (Stocksieker et al., 2023) which focuses more on the features imbalance rather than the target variable. ISS can be related to the work of (Ren et al., 2022), which proposes a weighted MSE based on a continuous multivariate target variable  $Y$ . Unlike this work, here we consider the context of autoencoders i.e. seeking to predict the inputs from the inputs.

### 2.2 Imbalance SSL

Self-Supervised Learning is nowadays used for improving learning performance or representation learning (e.g in a generative and/or contrastive framework ((Liu et al., 2021b), (Jaiswal et al., 2020)). Despite its success in handling images or text data, SSL is less suited for tabular data and requires specific adaptations (e.g (Ucar et al., 2021), (Hajiramezanali et al., 2022), (Darabi et al., 2021)). As observed in (Yoon et al., 2020), who introduced a novel "pretext" task for tabular data: SSL is often not effective for tabular data. Very few works investigated the behavior of the SSL in the face of imbalanced datasets. (Liu et al., 2021a) compare the SSL performance to the supervised framework, but they only focused on images rather than tabular datasets, and autoencoders were not considered. Another work addresses the challenge of representations using SSL (without autoencoders) on Imbalance data, but still with images (Li et al., 2021). (Yang and Xu, 2020b) proposes to deal with imbalanced supervised classification by using SSL but it also handles only images. Some works propose to use SSL to handle imbalanced image datasets ((Hou et al., 2022), (Timofeev et al., 2021), (Elbatel et al., 2023) and (Chen and Li, 2021)). To the best of our knowledge, no work deals with Imbalanced SSL for mixed tabular datasets.

### 2.3 Autoencoder for Mixed Tabular Dataset

Autoencoders are often used to extract relevant patterns/features, for features reduction e.g used for improving imbalanced binary classification ((Tomescu et al., 2021), (Arafa et al., 2023)), and to detect anomalies (e.g. (Yamanaka et al., 2019), (Chen et al., 2018) or (Eduardo et al., 2020)). However, mixed tabular data poses challenges for training neural networks and requires a specific approach. The first one is handling categorical data by converting them because neural networks only accept real number vectors as inputs. Several works propose specific architectures (e.g. (Delong and Kozak, 2023)) or embedding to enhance supervised learning tasks. (Hancock and Khoshgoftaar, 2020) offers a

survey and comparison of existing categorical data encoding and deep learning architecture. They state "The most common determined technique we find in this review is One-hot encoding.". Other works present the same comparison (e.g Potdar et al., 2017). (Borisov et al., 2022) provides an overview of the state-of-the-art main approaches: data transformations, specific architectures, and regularization models. (Zhang and Bom, 2021) propose a combined loss function for multi-class classification, based on a weighted cross-entropy loss for the target variable and MSE for reconstruction error of inputs (with one-hot encoded categorical features). Some works handle the outlier detection using VAE (Eduardo et al., 2020). (Xu et al., 2019) adapted a Variational AutoEncoder for mixed tabular data generation (TVAE) and proposed a conditional GAN for synthetic data generation for generating synthetic data: CTGAN. (Ma et al., 2020) proposes also an extension of Variational AutoEncoder called VAEM to handle mixed tabular data. Other works propose another approach to generate tabular data using a deep model (e.g (Vardhan and Kok, 2020), (Zhang et al., 2023)).

### 3 A First Imbalanced Self-Supervised Case: Autoencoders

Let  $X = (X_{ij})_{i=1,\dots,n;j=1,\dots,p}$  be a dataset composed of  $n$  observations and  $p$  variables where  $X_{ij}$  is the variable  $j$  for the observation  $i$ . Consider an autoencoder consisting of an encoder, denoted as  $\phi$ , and a decoder, denoted as  $\psi$ . A metric commonly used for training autoencoders is the Mean Squared Error (MSE), defined as follows:

$$MSE(X, \hat{X}) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n d(X_i, \psi(\phi(X_i))) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n d(X_i, \hat{X}_i).$$

where  $\hat{X}$  denotes the vector of prediction. The distance often used is the Euclidean distance (referred to as the L2 loss function) with an encoding for categorical variables. To avoid confusion, we use  $\epsilon_{ik} = X_{ik} - \hat{X}_{ik}$  to designate the error for the quantitative variable  $k$ , and  $\epsilon_{iq} = X_{iq} - \hat{X}_{iq}$  the error for the categorical variable  $q$ . Then the MSE can be rewritten as:

$$MSE(X, \hat{X}) = \frac{1}{n} \frac{1}{p} \left( \sum_{k \in K_n} \sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon_{ik}^2 + \sum_{q \in Q} \sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon_{iq}^2 \right) = \frac{1}{np} SSE \quad (1)$$

where  $K_n$  (resp.  $Q$ ) denotes the subset of numerical (resp. categorical) variables. Hence, minimizing the MSE is equivalent to minimizing the Sum Squared Error (SSE).

#### 3.1 Standard MSE: a First Intuition

As demonstrated for imbalanced regression by (Ren et al., 2022), "a regressor trained with standard MSE will underestimate on rare labels". This result can be extended to the context of autoencoders with mixed variables (without distinction between features and target variables, in other words: all variables are features and target variables). Mechanically, the MSE tends to favor the learning of majority values as it allows for a more substantial reduction in the loss function. More precisely, for a mixed tabular dataset, we write  $K_q$  the set of modalities of a categorical variable  $q$ , and  $f_{k_q}^n := \frac{n_{k_q}}{n}$  the frequency associated to the modality  $k_q$ . The categorical variables are frequently transformed using a one-hot encoder i.e.  $X_{ik_q} = \mathbb{1}_{\{X_{iq}=k_q\}}$ . We also write  $p_{K_c}$  the total number of modalities in  $Q$ , and  $p_{K_n}$  the number of numerical variables.

Let's start by analyzing the contribution of a modality to the global MSE. We have :

$$\begin{aligned} MSE(X, \hat{X}) &= \frac{1}{n(p_{K_n} + p_{K_c})} \left( \sum_{k \in K_n} \sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon_{ik}^2 + \sum_{q \in Q} \sum_{k_q \in K_q} \sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon_{ik_q}^2 \right) \\ &:= \frac{1}{p_{K_n} + p_{K_c}} \left( \sum_{k \in K_n} MSE(X_k, \hat{X}_k) + \sum_{q \in Q} \sum_{k_q \in K_q} MSE(X_{k_q}, \hat{X}_{k_q}) \right) \end{aligned}$$

with

$$MSE(X_{k_q}, \hat{X}_{k_q}) = f_{k_q}^n MSE(1, \hat{X}_{k_q}) + (1 - f_{k_q}^n) MSE(0, \hat{X}_{k_q}),$$

where the first quantity is the MSE on 1, i.e. when  $\{X_{iq} = k_q\}$ . Then the variation due to  $MSE(1, \hat{X}_{k_q})$  is proportional to  $f_{k_q}^n$ : the lower the frequency  $f_{k_q}^n$ , the lower its contribution to the global MSE will be. This phenomenon is similar to what is observed in Imbalanced Learning. For example, in the case of binary supervised classification, if the target variable is imbalanced, with very few instances of 1, then standard algorithms may face challenges. If the algorithm always predicts 0, precision will increase with imbalance: the rarer the 1 is, the stronger the precision will be. More

generally, it is known that in the imbalanced binary classification framework, accuracy is a poor indicator (see e.g (Branco et al., 2016)) because it falsely indicates good performances due to the imbalance: an algorithm that always predicts 0 for a sample with many 0s will have high accuracy. We show that such a weakness is inherent to the MSE by the following relation:

**PROPOSITION 1** (MSE - Accuracy optimizing Equivalence). *For a binary variable  $X_{k_q}$ , we have the following relation:*

$$MSE(X_{k_q}, \hat{X}_{k_q}) \equiv 1 - accuracy(X_{k_q}, \hat{X}_{k_q})$$

*In other words, minimizing the MSE for binary classification is equivalent to maximizing the accuracy.*

*Proof.*

$$\begin{aligned} MSE(X_{k_q}, \hat{X}_{k_q}) &= \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\epsilon_{ik_q}^2}{n} = \sum_{\substack{i=1 \\ x_{ik_q}=1}}^n \frac{\epsilon_{ik_q}^2}{n} + \sum_{\substack{i=1 \\ x_{ik_q}=0}}^n \frac{\epsilon_{ik_q}^2}{n} \cdot 1 \equiv \frac{FP + FN}{n} = \frac{n - (TP + TN)}{n} \\ &\equiv 1 - \frac{TP + TN}{TP + TN + FP + FN} = 1 - Accuracy(X_{k_q}, \hat{X}_{k_q}) \end{aligned}$$

□

The first conclusion is that the standard autoencoder on mixed tabular data, that is, using a one-hot encoder and the MSE loss function, could be not suitable for imbalanced categorical variables. This issue extends the classical issue in the framework of univariate classification imbalanced learning to the multi-supervised/self-supervised case. In addition, two other challenges can further complicate the complexity of this imbalance learning: i) the imbalance influence between categorical variables; ii) the imbalance influence between categorical variables versus quantitative variables. An alternative approach to analyze the standard MSE, using a min-max comparison, is provided in Appendix .1.

We also examined the cross-entropy loss function and a combination of MSE and cross-entropy. The supplementary study in Appendix .4.2 empirically shows that cross-entropy exhibits the same drawback: it favors majority categories. In our illustration, cross-entropy performs less effectively than MSE, which is why we focus on an analysis of MSE. Moreover, working with a single loss function avoids combining loss functions, making it simpler to balance the influence between quantitative and qualitative variables.

### 3.2 A Balanced Multi-Supervised MSE

An intuitive first solution to address imbalanced binary variables, in supervised classification, is to perform oversampling which is equivalent to weighting the loss function. This leads to penalizing more strongly the errors made on the 1 to rebalance the learning process. Typically, for logistic regression, it is equivalent to using a weighted likelihood ((King and Zeng, 2001)). In this way, we propose to define a weighted MSE for training autoencoder with mixed tabular data. This proposition generalizes the case of imbalanced binary variables to the context of multiple mixed variables.

Here, we propose to introduce a new type of autoencoder for handling mixed data: the Scaled Autoencoder for Mixed tabular datasets (SAM). The reconstruction of rare values is sometimes very important because they can have a significant impact on the studied phenomenon. For example, a significant influence on the target variable in a supervised framework or a strong impact on clustering, etc. This is also the case, when, due to a sampling bias, some values are observed infrequently. In this context, it may be important to reconstruct all categories, regardless of their frequency. Therefore, it would be relevant to give them equal weight in the SSE and, consequently, an equal influence in the learning process. Undoubtedly, with ample complexity and large iterations, autoencoders relying on a standard MSE and a one-hot encoder will converge, signifying their ability to perfectly reconstruct  $X$ . But here, we are concerned with the quality of reconstruction if it is not complete, for instance when a too large number of iterations is needed to converge. Furthermore, in a dimensionality reduction context (independently of the number of iterations), the latent space will be defined to reconstruct the variables: the information loss could thus be unequal, favoring majority categories and penalizing minority ones.

To avoid an imbalanced influence of categories in the learning process, we propose to weigh the errors of each modality depending on their frequency. We first introduce a rebalanced SSE as follows:

$$SSE^* := \sum_{k \in K_n} \sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon_{ik}^2 + \sum_{q \in Q} \sum_{k_q \in K_q} \frac{n}{2n_{k_q}} \times \sum_{\substack{i=1 \\ x_{ik_q}=1}}^n \epsilon_{ik_q}^2 + \frac{n}{2(n - n_{k_q})} \times \sum_{\substack{i=1 \\ x_{ik_q}=0}}^n \epsilon_{ik_q}^2$$

Such an encoding is very similar to that of the Factorial Analysis of Mixed Data (Pagès, 2004).

**REMARK 1.** *The metric  $SSE^*$  rebalances the influence of categories for each variable. Indeed, for any modality  $k_q \in K_q$  we have*

$$0 \leq \frac{n}{2n_{k_q}} \times \sum_{\substack{i=1 \\ x_{ik_q}=1}}^n \epsilon_{ik_q}^2 \leq n/2 \text{ and } 0 \leq \frac{n}{2(n-n_{k_q})} \times \sum_{\substack{i=1 \\ x_{ik_q}=0}}^n \epsilon_{ik_q}^2 \leq n/2 \implies 0 \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon_{ik_q}^2 \leq n.$$

**PROPOSITION 2.** *Minimizing the  $MSE^*$  for a modality is equivalent to maximizing its balanced accuracy defined as ((Mosley, 2013))*

$$BalAcc(X_{k_q}, \hat{X}_{k_q}) := \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{TP}{TP + FN} + \frac{TN}{TN + FP} \right). \quad (2)$$

*Proof.*

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n_{k_q}} \sum_{\substack{i=1 \\ x_{ik_q}=1}}^n \epsilon_{ik_q}^2 &= \frac{FP}{TN + FP} = 1 - \frac{TN}{TN + FP} \\ \frac{1}{n - n_{k_q}} \sum_{\substack{i=1 \\ x_{ik_q}=0}}^n \epsilon_{ik_q}^2 &= \frac{FN}{TP + FN} = 1 - \frac{TP}{TP + FN} \end{aligned}$$

□

Finally, to avoid an imbalanced influence of the categorical variables in the learning process, we propose to normalize their error by their cardinals, yielding to a last modification of the  $SSE^*$  that we shall call *balanced SSE*.

**Definition 1.** The balanced SSE for categorical data is given by

$$BalSSE := \sum_{k \in K_n} \sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon_{ik}^2 + \sum_{q \in Q} \sum_{k_q \in K_q} \frac{n}{2p_q n_{k_q}} \times \sum_{\substack{i=1 \\ x_{ik_q}=1}}^n \epsilon_{ik_q}^2 + \frac{n}{2p_q(n-n_{k_q})} \times \sum_{\substack{i=1 \\ x_{ik_q}=0}}^n \epsilon_{ik_q}^2,$$

where  $p_q$  is the number of categories of the categorical variable  $q$ . Its associated balanced MSE is deduced from 1

**REMARK 2.** *The metric  $BalSSE$  rebalances the influence of the categorical variables. Indeed for all  $q \in Q$  and for all  $k_q \in K_q$ , we have*

$$0 \leq \frac{n}{2p_q n_{k_q}} \times \sum_{\substack{i=1 \\ x_{ik_q}=1}}^n \epsilon_{ik_q}^2 \leq n/2 \text{ and } 0 \leq \frac{n}{2p_q(n-n_{k_q})} \times \sum_{\substack{i=1 \\ x_{ik_q}=0}}^n \epsilon_{ik_q}^2 \leq n/2 \implies 0 \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon_{ik_q}^2 \leq np_q \implies 0 \leq \sum_{k_q \in K_q} \sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon_{ik_q}^2 \leq n.$$

**PROPOSITION 3.** *Under the assumption  $\epsilon_{ik}^2 \leq 1$ , the previous  $BalSSE$  allows balancing influence between numerical and categorical variables.*

*Proof.* For all  $q \in Q$  and for all  $k_q \in K_q$ , we have

$$0 \leq \sum_{k_q \in K_q} \sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon_{ik_q}^2 \leq n \text{ and } 0 \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon_{ik}^2 \leq n$$

□

## 4 Numerical Illustration

To illustrate the previous section, we propose analyzing the shortcomings of the standard MSE using a simple example where we empirically demonstrate and compare the benefits of using the balanced MSE in different scenarios. Other loss functions and encodings were tested, but they yielded poor results (details are given in Appendix .4.2). We first define the various metrics used to compare the two loss functions. Next, we describe the simulated data used for illustration, and finally, we analyze the results.

## 4.1 Quality Metrics

We analyze the balanced MSE in a regression framework on the following measures:

- Quality of the reconstruction:
  - MSE for Mixed data with standard MSE on numerical data and balanced accuracy (defined by (2)) on categorical data:

$$MSEM(X, \hat{X}) = \frac{1}{p} \left( \sum_{k \in K_n} MSE(X_k, \hat{X}_k) + \sum_{q \in Q} (1 - BalAcc(X_q, \hat{X}_q)) \right)$$

with

$$BalAcc(X_q, \hat{X}_q) = \frac{1}{p_q} \sum_{k_q} BalAcc(X_{k_q}, \hat{X}_{k_q})$$

- $Y$  test prediction from the reconstructed data as train dataset:

$$MSE(Y, \hat{Y}) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_i (Y_i - \hat{Y}_i)^2$$

- Quality of the dimensionality reduction:  $Y$  test prediction from the latent space, as train set:  $MSE(Y, \hat{Y})$ .
- Quality of the correlation reconstruction: differences between the mixed correlation matrix in the initial sample (inputs of autoencoder) and the mixed correlation matrix in the reconstructed sample (outputs of autoencoder):

$$\begin{aligned} MC(X, \hat{X}) &= \sum_{k, l \in K_n} |\rho(X_k, X_l) - \rho(\hat{X}_k, \hat{X}_l)| \\ &+ \sum_{k, l \in Q} |V(X_k, X_l) - V(\hat{X}_k, \hat{X}_l)| \\ &+ \sum_{k \in K_n, l \in Q} |\eta^2(X_k, X_l) - \eta^2(\hat{X}_k, \hat{X}_l)| \end{aligned}$$

The correlation metric is mixed i.e. defined with Spearman correlation  $\rho$  for quantitative-quantitative variables, correlation coefficient  $\eta^2$  for quantitative-categorical variables, and Cramer's  $V$  for categorical-categorical variables.

To effectively measure the impact of the loss function, the autoencoder is applied only to the features  $X$  and not to  $Y$ . This way, for the supervised analysis ( $Y$  test prediction), the same  $y$  is used in all training sets.

## 4.2 Dataset Design

We consider a uncorrelated sample of size  $n = 2000$  composed of 3 quantitative, Gaussian, features ( $X_1, X_2, X_3$ ) and 5 categorical, Multinomial, features ( $Q_1, Q_2, Q_3, Q_4, Q_5$ ) (described in the Appendix .2.1). We define a target variable  $Y$  as a Linear Model:  $Y \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma_\epsilon := 0.5)$  with  $\mu$  defined as a linear combination of the features according to a specific context (described in the Appendix .2.2):

- Imbalanced: the target variable  $Y$  is explained by quantitative variables and minority categories.
- Balanced: the target variable  $Y$  is explained by quantitative variables and majority categories.
- Majority: the target variable  $Y$  is explained by majority categories.

The autoencoder architecture and parameters are described in Appendix .3.1. The test sample is constructed by random sampling from the initial sample and represents 40% of the observations.

## 4.3 Illustration Results

To avoid sampling effects and obtain a distribution of prediction errors we ran 20 train-test datasets (k-fold analysis) for 1000, 2000, and 3000 epochs. In the same way, to avoid getting results dependent on some learning algorithms we use 10 models from the *autoML of the H2O package* (LeDell and Poirier, 2020) among the following algorithms: Distributed Random Forest, Extremely Randomized Trees, Generalized Linear Model with regularization, Gradient Boosting Model, Extreme Gradient Boosting and a Fully-connected multi-layer artificial neural network.

### 4.3.1 Quality of the reconstruction

Figure 1 presents the reconstruction error ( $MSEM$ ) for the three contexts. The input data  $X$  are better reconstructed using balanced MSE when epochs are insufficient (1000 or 2000). With 3000 epochs being sufficient, the results are similar. The differences are very high for 1000 epochs. We can observe the learning difference with Figure 2 that presents the  $MSEM$  during the learning process for both loss functions.




Figure 1:  $MSEM(\hat{X})$  with 1000 (up), 2000, and 3000 (down) epochs. Comparison of the balanced MSE (green) vs standard MSE (orange) and inputs (blue) at different scales

As described in the Appendix .4.1 and .4.1, these results can be explained by the learning process of the autoencoder with standard MSE (which focuses on the majority variables), differing from those of the SAM (which aims to learn from all variables through the balanced MSE). We can see from Figure 2 that the balanced MSE provides a better  $MSEM$  than the standard MSE, even though both converge. A focus on the learning process of the autoencoder on a categorical variable is provided in the appendix 14. We can see that both the standard MSE and Cross Entropy initially focus on the majority categories and overlook minority data.




Figure 2: Learning curves ( $MSEM$ )

As shown in Figure 3, training with balanced MSE is better (at 1000 and 2000 epochs) or equally good (at 3000 epochs) as standard MSE, whatever the context.

The results for the imbalanced context are not very surprising, given that the standard MSE overlooks minority categories, even though they explain  $Y$ . For the balanced context, the results are quite understandable: the standard MSE does not prioritize quantitative variables, while the balanced MSE reconstructs them better. Since these variables explain  $Y$ , and the majority categories are well represented, the prediction error is lower with the balanced MSE. Finally, for the majority context, the results are somewhat surprising but interesting. A closer analysis reveals that the standard MSE, by assigning too much importance to majority values, completely neglects the reconstruction of minority categories and quantitative variables. This leads to spurious correlations, thus disrupting learning algorithms.




Figure 3:  $MSE(Y, \hat{Y})$  with 1000 (up), 2000, and 3000 (down) epochs from reconstructed data. Comparison of the balanced MSE (green) vs standard MSE (orange) and inputs (blue) at different scales

### 4.3.2 Quality of the dimensionality reduction

Figure 4 presents  $MSE(Y, \hat{Y})$  when  $\hat{Y}$  is reconstructed from the latent space. We can observe that training with balanced MSE is better than with standard MSE, regardless of the context or epochs.




Figure 4:  $MSE(Y, \hat{Y})$  with 1000 (up), 2000 and 3000 (down) epochs from latent space. Comparison of the balanced MSE (green) vs standard MSE (orange) and inputs (blue) at different scales

### 4.3.3 Quality of the correlation reconstruction

As shown in Figure 5, training with balanced MSE provides a better reconstruction of correlation than with standard MSE for 1000 and 2000 epochs, regardless of the context or epochs. The correlation is similar for 3000 epochs. Since the data are not correlated, this confirms that the standard MSE creates spurious correlations. By focusing on majority categories to significantly reduce MSE, the neurons in the latent space poorly reconstruct numerical features and minority data.

## 5 Experiments in Supervised Learning

We propose to compare the two loss functions on real datasets in the context of supervised learning. We thus work with multiple datasets presented in the appendix .5. As for the illustration, to avoid sampling effects and obtain a distribution of prediction errors we ran 10 train-test datasets (k-fold analysis). The autoencoders are trained with 1000 epochs. In






Figure 5:  $MC(\hat{X})$  with 1000 (up), 2000, and 3000 (down) epochs. Comparison of the balanced MSE (green) vs standard MSE (orange) and inputs (blue) at different scales

the same way, to avoid getting results dependent on some learning algorithms we use 10 models from the *autoML of the H2O package*.

## 5.1 Binary Classification

We test our approach on the well-known "Adults" dataset i.e., in a binary classification framework. As for the illustration, we suggest to predict the test from the reconstructed data. We analyze below the following metrics on the prediction of  $Y$  (which is binary): F1-Score and Balanced Accuracy. The boxplots of these metrics, Correlation Matrix, and Area Under the Curve (AUC) are presented in the Appendix .5.2. As for illustration, the results below are related to an imbalanced context: by making explanatory categories minority (obtained through variable importance with a random forest). We also construct a "balanced" context where the training sets are randomly drawn from the dataset. More results are provided in Appendix .5.2.

We test also our approach on a second dataset: Breast Cancer. More results for Breast Cancer are available in Appendix .5.2. The results presented below are obtained with 500 epochs. We presented the results with 1000 epochs in the Appendix. The baseline represents the initial train.

Train	F1Score (mean)	F1Score (std)	BalAcc (mean)	BalAcc (std)
Baseline	79.2	2.6	73.8	4.6
MSE	78.2	2.5	72.8	4.6
bMSE	<b>80.1</b>	1.9	<b>73.8</b>	3.7

Table 1: Adults Results:  $Y$  test prediction metrics

Train	F1Score (mean)	F1Score (std)	BalAcc (mean)	BalAcc (std)
Baseline	88.3	1.2	76.1	2.3
MSE	77.2	5.6	75.7	1.8
bMSE	<b>87.0</b>	2.2	<b>76.5</b>	2.7

Table 2: BreastCancer Results:  $Y$  test prediction metrics

In Tables 1, evaluated on the imbalanced context, and 2, we observe that, for both datasets, the reconstructed data from the SAM (balanced MSE) provides better prediction than the autoencoder with standard MSE. The results in a "balanced" context with the "Adults" dataset are similar for both loss functions, as previously observed in our illustration.

## 5.2 Multi-class Classification

We test our approach on the "Obesity" dataset where the goal is to predict a category of diabetes i.e., in a multi-class classification framework. As for the illustration, we suggest to predict the test from the reconstructed data. We analyze here the global accuracy on the test set i.e. the proportion of good prediction (from the confusion matrix diagonal).




Figure 6: Multi-Class Accuracy

As shown in figure 6, the reconstructed data from an autoencoder with the balanced MSE provides a better prediction than the autoencoder with the standard MSE (higher is better).

## 5.3 Regression

We test our approach on four datasets with a continuous target variable  $Y$  i.e., in a regression framework. Three datasets are from insurance: "Pricing game", "Telematics" and "freMTPL" and another is more classical: "Student". We measure the Mean Absolute Error (MAE) indicator (below) and MSE/RMSE (in Appendix .5) on the  $Y$  test prediction from the reconstructed data. We analyze also the correlation, MC indicator, in the reconstructed data, as an illustration. More results for each dataset are available in Appendix .5.3.

Train	MAE (mean)	MAE (std)	MC (mean)	MC (std)
Baseline	108557.2	28115.3	0.0	0.0
MSE	111314.0	27555.0	8041.3	237.3
bMSE	<b>109072.2</b>	28161.8	<b>7356.8</b>	172.7

Table 3: freMTPL Results:  $Y$  test prediction metrics

Train	MAE (mean)	MAE (std)	MC (mean)	MC (std)
Baseline	50885.6	2111.1	0.0	0.0
MSE	59061.5	6496.5	911.2	112.2
bMSE	<b>54145.3</b>	3774.4	<b>596.4</b>	59.6

Table 4: Pricing game Results:  $Y$  test prediction metrics

Train	MAE (mean)	MAE (std)	MC (mean)	MC (std)
Baseline	170134.1	10108.7	0.0	0.0
MSE	226013.2	26731.7	25134.4	633.1
bMSE	<b>206478.3</b>	14219.0	<b>24090.9</b>	534.5

Table 5: Telematics Results:  $Y$  test prediction metrics

As observed in Tables 3, 4, 5, 6, we observe that the metrics are better for balanced MSE: MAE (smaller is better) and correlation difference (smaller is better).

## 6 Experiments in Unsupervised Learning

We propose to compare the two loss functions on real datasets in the context of unsupervised learning. We thus work with two previous datasets, "Telematics" and "Obesity", presented in the appendix .5. To avoid sampling effects and

Train	MAE (mean)	MAE (std)	MC (mean)	MC (std)
Baseline	202.3	32.6	0.0	0.0
MSE	212.3	28.1	3925.4	99.3
bMSE	<b>203.6</b>	22.1	<b>3876.5</b>	79.6

Table 6: Student Results:  $Y$  test prediction metrics

obtain a distribution of errors we ran 10 train-test datasets (k-fold analysis). The autoencoders are trained with 1000 epochs.

### 6.1 Dimensionality Reduction

We test the balanced MSE for dimensionality reduction with the "Telematics" dataset. To compare the performances, we use MSE and MAE measures on the prediction of  $Y$  from a test set obtained from the latent space. To avoid getting results dependent on some learning algorithms we use 10 models from the *autoML* of the *H2O* package.




(a) MAE

Figure 7:  $Y$  test set Prediction from latent space. Comparison of the balanced MSE (green) vs standard MSE (orange)

In Figure 7, we observe that the prediction realized from the latent space of the autoencoder with the balanced MSE is better than with the standard MSE.

### 6.2 Clustering

We test the balanced MSE for clustering with the "Obesity" dataset. To measure the performance of clustering, we use the silhouette coefficient, a classical metric to evaluate clustering. We use two clustering approaches on the latent space: A K-Means algorithm and a Gaussian Mixture Model algorithm.



(a) K-Means

(b) GMM

Figure 8: Silhouette score for K-Means and GMM clustering. Comparison of the balanced MSE (green) vs standard MSE (orange)

In Figure 8, we observe that the clustering realized from the latent space of the autoencoder with the balanced MSE is better than with the standard MSE (a higher silhouette coefficient is better).

## 7 Experiments in Generative context

Finally, the balanced MSE can also be compared in a generative context through Variational Autoencoders (VAE). Variational Autoencoders (VAEs) are a type of generative model designed to learn latent representations of data in a probabilistic framework, allowing for an efficient generation of new samples. As VAEs are a type of autoencoder, we

can compare a VAE constructed using the balanced MSE instead of the standard MSE. To conduct this experiment, we suggest building a single VAE, training it with standard MSE, and then with balanced MSE. Subsequently, we generate a synthetic sample from the VAEs. Finally, similar to comparing AEs, we will use the generated samples to train multiple models (autoML) for predicting on a test set. Unlike the illustration where only features were generated, here we generate both features and the target variable  $Y$ . The variational autoencoder architecture is described in Appendix .3.2. We compared the results in the same "imbalanced" context for numerical illustration. To avoid random outcomes, we perform 20 runs to compare the results. The autoencoders are trained with 1000 epochs.

As observed in Figure 9, the VAE constructed using balanced MSE better reconstructs the data (the MSEM metric is lower). As a result, the generated data will be closer to the real data, improving the prediction on the test set since the MSE metric is lower. Note that we do not compare the VAE with balanced MSE to other generative models because our objective is to compare loss functions and not models.




Figure 9: Illustration Results:  $Y$  test prediction metrics. Comparison of the balanced MSE (green) vs standard MSE (orange) and inputs (blue)

## 8 Discussion

This paper illustrates the issue associated with using the MSE loss function in an autoencoder trained to reconstruct data in an imbalanced context. We demonstrated that, unlike images, self-supervised learning on imbalanced datasets introduces a learning bias due to the unequal influence of variables and categories in a classical loss function.

To overcome this problem we introduce a novel loss function designed to rebalance the influence of categories and variables, optimizing the learning process. This new loss function shows better results when the learning process is insufficient (either due to complexity or iterations) and shows similar results otherwise.

As shown in imbalanced regression works, where optimizing MSE is not effective, we could extend this work to quantitative variables. Finally, as the balanced MSE has the particularity of making the different modalities equitable, there might be cases where this is not judicious due to too many modalities or the presence of anomalies. A user could then combine the balanced MSE with the standard MSE such as:

$$\mathcal{L} := \alpha MSE + (1 - \alpha) BalMSE$$

with  $\alpha$  being a hyperparameter corresponding to the weight he wants to assign to the rebalancing.

## References

- Arafa, A., El-Fishawy, N., Badawy, M., and Radad, M. (2023). Rn-autoencoder: Reduced noise autoencoder for classifying imbalanced cancer genomic data. *Journal of Biological Engineering*, 17(1):7.
- Borisov, V., Leemann, T., Seßler, K., Haug, J., Pawelczyk, M., and Kasneci, G. (2022). Deep neural networks and tabular data: A survey. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*.
- Branco, P., Torgo, L., and Ribeiro, R. P. (2016). A survey of predictive modeling on imbalanced domains. *ACM computing surveys (CSUR)*, 49(2):1–50.
- Branco, P., Torgo, L., and Ribeiro, R. P. (2017). Smogn: a pre-processing approach for imbalanced regression. In *First international workshop on learning with imbalanced domains: Theory and applications*, pages 36–50. PMLR.
- Branco, P., Torgo, L., and Ribeiro, R. P. (2019). Pre-processing approaches for imbalanced distributions in regression. *Neurocomputing*, 343:76–99.
- Buda, M., Maki, A., and Mazurowski, M. A. (2018). A systematic study of the class imbalance problem in convolutional neural networks. *Neural Networks*, 106:249–259.
- Camacho, L., Douzas, G., and Bacao, F. (2022). Geometric smote for regression. *Expert Systems with Applications*, page 116387.
- Cao, K., Wei, C., Gaidon, A., Arechiga, N., and Ma, T. (2019). Learning imbalanced datasets with label-distribution-aware margin loss. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 32.
- Chen, W. and Li, K. (2021). Self-supervised learning for medical image classification using imbalanced training data. In *International Symposium on Intelligence Computation and Applications*, pages 242–252. Springer.
- Chen, Z., Yeo, C. K., Lee, B. S., and Lau, C. T. (2018). Autoencoder-based network anomaly detection. In *2018 Wireless telecommunications symposium (WTS)*, pages 1–5. IEEE.
- Cortez, P. and Silva, A. M. G. (2008). Using data mining to predict secondary school student performance.
- Cui, Y., Jia, M., Lin, T.-Y., Song, Y., and Belongie, S. (2019). Class-balanced loss based on effective number of samples. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 9268–9277.
- Darabi, S., Fazeli, S., Pazoki, A., Sankararaman, S., and Sarrafzadeh, M. (2021). Contrastive mixup: Self and semi-supervised learning for tabular domain. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.12296*.
- Delong, L. and Kozak, A. (2023). The use of autoencoders for training neural networks with mixed categorical and numerical features. *ASTIN Bulletin: The Journal of the IAA*, 53(2):213–232.
- Ding, Y., Jia, M., Zhuang, J., and Ding, P. (2022). Deep imbalanced regression using cost-sensitive learning and deep feature transfer for bearing remaining useful life estimation. *Applied Soft Computing*, 127:109271.
- Eduardo, S., Nazábal, A., Williams, C. K., and Sutton, C. (2020). Robust variational autoencoders for outlier detection and repair of mixed-type data. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 4056–4066. PMLR.
- Elbatel, M., Wang, H., Mart, R., Fu, H., and Li, X. (2023). Federated model aggregation via self-supervised priors for highly imbalanced medical image classification. In *International Conference on Medical Image Computing and Computer-Assisted Intervention*, pages 334–346. Springer.
- Fernández, A., García, S., Galar, M., Prati, R. C., Krawczyk, B., and Herrera, F. (2018a). *Learning from imbalanced data sets*, volume 10. Springer.
- Fernández, A., García, S., Herrera, F., and Chawla, N. V. (2018b). Smote for learning from imbalanced data: progress and challenges, marking the 15-year anniversary. *Journal of artificial intelligence research*, 61:863–905.
- Gong, Y., Mori, G., and Tung, F. (2022). Ranksim: Ranking similarity regularization for deep imbalanced regression. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.15236*.
- Hajiramezanali, E., Diamant, N. L., Scalia, G., and Shen, M. W. (2022). Stab: Self-supervised learning for tabular data. In *NeurIPS 2022 First Table Representation Workshop*.
- Hancock, J. T. and Khoshgoftaar, T. M. (2020). Survey on categorical data for neural networks. *Journal of Big Data*, 7(1):1–41.
- Hou, R., Chen, J., Feng, Y., Liu, S., He, S., and Zhou, Z. (2022). Contrastive-weighted self-supervised model for long-tailed data classification with vision transformer augmented. *Mechanical Systems and Signal Processing*, 177:109174.
- Huang, C., Li, Y., Loy, C. C., and Tang, X. (2016). Learning deep representation for imbalanced classification. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 5375–5384.

- Jaiswal, A., Babu, A. R., Zadeh, M. Z., Banerjee, D., and Makedon, F. (2020). A survey on contrastive self-supervised learning. *Technologies*, 9(1):2.
- King, G. and Zeng, L. (2001). Logistic regression in rare events data. *Political analysis*, 9(2):137–163.
- Krawczyk, B. (2016). Learning from imbalanced data: open challenges and future directions. *Progress in Artificial Intelligence*, 5(4):221–232.
- LeDell, E. and Poirier, S. (2020). H2O AutoML: Scalable automatic machine learning. *7th ICML Workshop on Automated Machine Learning (AutoML)*.
- Li, H., Xue, F.-F., Chaitanya, K., Luo, S., Ezhov, I., Wiestler, B., Zhang, J., and Menze, B. (2021). Imbalance-aware self-supervised learning for 3d radiomic representations. In *Medical Image Computing and Computer Assisted Intervention—MICCAI 2021: 24th International Conference, Strasbourg, France, September 27–October 1, 2021, Proceedings, Part II 24*, pages 36–46. Springer.
- Liu, H., HaoChen, J. Z., Gaidon, A., and Ma, T. (2021a). Self-supervised learning is more robust to dataset imbalance. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.05025*.
- Liu, X., Zhang, F., Hou, Z., Mian, L., Wang, Z., Zhang, J., and Tang, J. (2021b). Self-supervised learning: Generative or contrastive. *IEEE transactions on knowledge and data engineering*, 35(1):857–876.
- Ma, C., Tschitschek, S., Turner, R., Hernández-Lobato, J. M., and Zhang, C. (2020). Vaem: a deep generative model for heterogeneous mixed type data. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:11237–11247.
- Mosley, L. S. D. (2013). *A balanced approach to the multi-class imbalance problem*. PhD thesis, Iowa State University.
- Pagès, J. (2004). Analyse factorielle de données mixtes: principe et exemple d’application. *Revue de statistique appliquée*, 52(4):93–111.
- Palechor, F. M. and de la Hoz Manotas, A. (2019). Dataset for estimation of obesity levels based on eating habits and physical condition in individuals from colombia, peru and mexico. *Data in brief*, 25:104344.
- Potdar, K., Pardawala, T. S., and Pai, C. D. (2017). A comparative study of categorical variable encoding techniques for neural network classifiers. *International journal of computer applications*, 175(4):7–9.
- Ren, J., Zhang, M., Yu, C., and Liu, Z. (2022). Balanced mse for imbalanced visual regression. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 7926–7935.
- Ribeiro, R. P. and Moniz, N. (2020). Imbalanced regression and extreme value prediction. *Machine Learning*, 109:1803–1835.
- Sen, S., Singh, K. P., and Chakraborty, P. (2023). Dealing with imbalanced regression problem for large dataset using scalable artificial neural network. *New Astronomy*, 99:101959.
- Shwartz-Ziv, R. and Armon, A. (2022). Tabular data: Deep learning is not all you need. *Information Fusion*, 81:84–90.
- So, B., Boucher, J.-P., and Valdez, E. A. (2021). Synthetic dataset generation of driver telematics. *Risks*, 9(4):58.
- Song, X. Y., Dao, N., and Branco, P. (2022). DistSmogn: Distributed smogn for imbalanced regression problems. In *Fourth International Workshop on Learning with Imbalanced Domains: Theory and Applications*, pages 38–52. PMLR.
- Stocksiekler, S., Pommeret, D., and Charpentier, A. (2023). Data augmentation for imbalanced regression. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 7774–7799. PMLR.
- Timofeev, A., Chrysos, G. G., and Cevher, V. (2021). Self-supervised neural architecture search for imbalanced datasets. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.08580*.
- Tomescu, V.-I., Czibula, G., and Nițică, Ș. (2021). A study on using deep autoencoders for imbalanced binary classification. *Procedia Computer Science*, 192:119–128.
- Torgo, L. and Ribeiro, R. (2007). Utility-based regression. In *Knowledge Discovery in Databases: PKDD 2007: 11th European Conference on Principles and Practice of Knowledge Discovery in Databases, Warsaw, Poland, September 17-21, 2007. Proceedings 11*, pages 597–604. Springer.
- Torgo, L., Ribeiro, R. P., Pfahringer, B., and Branco, P. (2013). Smote for regression. In *Portuguese conference on artificial intelligence*, pages 378–389. Springer.
- Ucar, T., Hajiramezanali, E., and Edwards, L. (2021). Subtab: Subsetting features of tabular data for self-supervised representation learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:18853–18865.
- Vardhan, L. V. H. and Kok, S. (2020). Synthetic tabular data generation with oblivious variational autoencoders: alleviating the paucity of personal tabular data for open research. In *Proceedings of the 37th International conference on machine learning, ICML HSYS Workshop 2020*.

- Xu, L., Skoularidou, M., Cuesta-Infante, A., and Veeramachaneni, K. (2019). Modeling tabular data using conditional gan. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 32.
- Yamanaka, Y., Iwata, T., Takahashi, H., Yamada, M., and Kanai, S. (2019). Autoencoding binary classifiers for supervised anomaly detection. In *PRICAI 2019: Trends in Artificial Intelligence: 16th Pacific Rim International Conference on Artificial Intelligence, Cuvu, Yanuca Island, Fiji, August 26–30, 2019, Proceedings, Part II 16*, pages 647–659. Springer.
- Yang, Y. and Xu, Z. (2020a). Rethinking the value of labels for improving class-imbalanced learning. *NeurIPS*.
- Yang, Y. and Xu, Z. (2020b). Rethinking the value of labels for improving class-imbalanced learning. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:19290–19301.
- Yang, Y., Zha, K., Chen, Y., Wang, H., and Katabi, D. (2021). Delving into deep imbalanced regression. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 11842–11851. PMLR.
- Yoon, J., Zhang, Y., Jordon, J., and van der Schaar, M. (2020). Vime: Extending the success of self-and semi-supervised learning to tabular domain. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:11033–11043.
- Zhang, C. and Bom, S. (2021). Auto-encoder based model for high-dimensional imbalanced industrial data. In *International Conference on Neural Information Processing*, pages 265–273. Springer.
- Zhang, H., Zhang, J., Srinivasan, B., Shen, Z., Qin, X., Faloutsos, C., Rangwala, H., and Karypis, G. (2023). Mixed-type tabular data synthesis with score-based diffusion in latent space. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.09656*.

### .1 Standard MSE: a First Intuition

**REMARK 3** (Imbalanced contribution of categories). *Mechanically, the standard MSE favors the reconstruction of majority values rather than rare values. Indeed, the contribution to the decrease in error, SSE (or MSE), is an increasing function of the number of observations.*

*Proof.* Determine the contribution to the error reduction of each category. Let  $k_q$  be a category of a categorical variable  $q$  with a size of  $n_{k_q}$ . We have:

$$0 \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon_{ik_q} = \sum_{\substack{i=1 \\ x_{ik_q}=1}}^n \epsilon_{ik_q} + \sum_{\substack{i=1 \\ x_{ik_q}=0}}^n \epsilon_{ik_q} \leq n$$

with:

$$0 \leq \sum_{\substack{i=1 \\ x_{ik_q}=1}}^n \epsilon_{ik_q} \leq n_{k_q}; \quad 0 \leq \sum_{\substack{i=1 \\ x_{ik_q}=0}}^n \epsilon_{ik_q} \leq n - n_{k_q}$$

Typically, if the  $\hat{x}_{ik_q}$  are initially zero, then finding the correct values of  $k_q$  (for  $x_{ik_q} = 1$ ) will decrease the SSE by  $n_{k_q}$ .  $\square$

**REMARK 4** (Imbalanced contribution of categorical variables). *The contribution to the decrease in error is increasing with the number of categories. By using an OHE, each category of a categorical variable becomes a separate indicator variable. A variable with many categories will consequently generate a large number of indicator variables. As each encoded variable has the same weight in SSE, a categorical variable with many values will have more influence.*

*Proof.*

$$0 \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon_{iq}^2 = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{k_q \in K_q} \epsilon_{ik_q}^2 \leq \sum_{k_q \in K_q} n = p_q \times n$$

with  $p_q$  the number of categories of the categorical variable  $q$ .  $\square$

**REMARK 5** (Imbalanced contribution of categorical variables versus numerical variables). *The contribution to the reduction of error for a categorical variable, as a function of the number of categories, is generally more substantial than the contribution for a numeric variable.*

*Proof.* Given that numeric variables have a variance or range of 1, we can assume that:

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq \epsilon_{ik}^2 \leq 1 \\ 0 &\leq \epsilon_{ik_q}^2 \leq 1 \end{aligned}$$

Then we have:

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq \sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon_{ik}^2 \leq n \\ 0 &\leq \sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon_{iq}^2 \leq p_q \times n \end{aligned}$$

$\square$

**REMARK 6** (Double error on categorical variable). *Another observation can be made regarding an autoencoder based on a one-hot encoder: the double counting of errors made on categories. We suppose (i)  $\sum_{j_q \in J_q} x_{ij_q} = 1$  and (ii)*

$$\sum_{j_q \in J_q} \hat{x}_{ij_q} = 1.$$

*Let  $k_q$  be a modality of a categorical variable  $x_q$ . If  $\epsilon_{ik_q} = 1$  then it exists  $l_q$  such as  $\epsilon_{il_q} = 1$  and thus  $\sum_{j_q \in J_q} \epsilon_{ij_q}^2 \in \{0; 2\}$*



*Proof.*  $\epsilon_{ik_q} = 1 \Leftrightarrow$  case 1:  $\hat{x}_{ik_q} = 1, x_{ik_q} = 0$  or case 2:  $\hat{x}_{ik_q} = 0, x_{ik_q} = 1$

Considering case 1, the demonstration is analogous for case 2. From assumption (i) and (ii), we have:  $\sum_{\substack{j_q \in J_q \\ j_q \neq k_q}} \hat{x}_{ij_q} = 0$

$$\text{and } \sum_{\substack{j_q \in J_q \\ j_q \neq k_q}} x_{ij_q} = 1 \text{ so } \sum_{\substack{j_q \in J_q \\ j_q \neq k_q}} (x_{ij_q} - \hat{x}_{ij_q})^2 = \sum_{\substack{j_q \in J_q \\ j_q \neq k_q}} \epsilon_{ij_q}^2 = 1$$

$$\sum_{j_q \in J_q} \epsilon_{ij_q}^2 = \sum_{\substack{j_q \in J_q \\ j_q \neq k_q}} \epsilon_{ij_q}^2 + \epsilon_{ik_q}^2 = 2 \quad \square$$

## .2 Illustration

### .2.1 Dataset Design

We consider a sample of size  $n = 2000$  composed of 3 quantitative, Gaussian ( $\mathcal{N}()$  below), features ( $X_1, X_2, X_3$ ) and 5 categorical, Multinomial ( $\mathcal{M}()$  below), features ( $Q_1, Q_2, Q_3, Q_4, Q_5$ ) defined as follows:

- $X_1 \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$
- $X_2 \sim \mathcal{N}(10, 2)$
- $X_3 \sim \mathcal{N}(10, 2)$
- $Q_1 : (Q_{1.70}, Q_{1.30}) \sim \mathcal{M}(70\%, 30\%)$
- $Q_2 : (Q_{2.10}, Q_{2.20}, Q_{2.29}, Q_{2.31}, Q_{2.02}, Q_{2.08}) \sim \mathcal{M}(10\%, 20\%, 29\%, 31\%, 10\%, 02\%, 08\%)$
- $Q_3 : (Q_{3.60}, Q_{3.20}, Q_{3.17}, Q_{3.03}) \sim \mathcal{M}(60\%, 20\%, 17\%, 03\%)$
- $Q_4 : (Q_{4.10}, Q_{4.10}, Q_{4.10}, Q_{4.10}, Q_{4.10}, Q_{4.15}, Q_{4.05}, Q_{4.30}) \sim \mathcal{M}(10\%, 10\%, 10\%, 10\%, 10\%, 15\%, 05\%, 30\%)$
- $Q_5 : (Q_{5.25}, Q_{5.25}, Q_{5.10}, Q_{5.10}, Q_{5.05}, Q_{5.05}, Q_{5.05}, Q_{5.05}, Q_{5.05}, Q_{5.09}, Q_{5.01}) \sim \mathcal{M}(25\%, 25\%, 10\%, 10\%, 05\%, 05\%, 05\%, 05\%, 09\%, 01\%)$

### .2.2 Context Design

**Imbalanced context** In this context, the target variable is explained by quantitative variables and minority modalities.

$$\begin{aligned} \mu = \mathbb{E}(Y|X) = & \alpha_1 X_1 + \alpha_2 X_2 + \alpha_3 X_3 + \alpha_4 Q_{1.30} + \alpha_5 Q_{2.02} \\ & + \alpha_6 Q_{3.03} + \alpha_7 Q_{4.05} + \alpha_8 Q_{5.01} + \alpha_9 Q_{5.05} \end{aligned}$$

**Balanced context** In this context, the target variable is explained by quantitative variables and majority categories:

$$\begin{aligned} \mu = \mathbb{E}(Y|X) = & \alpha_1 X_1 + \alpha_2 X_2 + \alpha_3 X_3 + \alpha_4 Q_{1.70} + \alpha_5 Q_{2.29} \\ & + \alpha_6 Q_{3.60} + \alpha_7 Q_{4.30} + \alpha_8 Q_{5.25} + \alpha_9 Q_{5.10} \end{aligned}$$

**Majority context** In this context, the target variable is explained by majority categories:

$$\begin{aligned} \mu = \mathbb{E}(Y|X) = & \alpha_4 Q_{1.70} + \alpha_5 Q_{2.29} + \alpha_6 Q_{3.60} \\ & + \alpha_7 Q_{4.30} + \alpha_8 Q_{5.25} + \alpha_9 Q_{5.10} \end{aligned}$$

## .3 Architecture

### .3.1 Autoencoder

Let  $p$  be the number of features of inputs (one hot encoded). Let  $q$  defined as  $\text{int}(p/10)$ . Let  $\text{dim}_z$  be the dimension of the latent space (hyperparameter).

The "vanilla" autoencoder is constructed as follows:

- an encoder  $\phi$  consisting of:
  - $\text{Tanh}(\text{Linear}(p, p - q))$
  - $\text{Tanh}(\text{Linear}(p - q, p - 2q))$
  - $\text{Tanh}(\text{Linear}(p - 2q, p - 3q))$
  - $\text{Tanh}(\text{Linear}(p - 3q, \text{dim}_z))$
- a decoder  $\psi$  consisting of:

- $Tanh(Linear(dim_z, p - 3q))$
- $Tanh(Linear(p - 3q, p - 2q))$
- $Tanh(Linear(p - 2q, p - q))$
- $Tanh(Linear(p - q, p))$

The parameters used are as follows:

- $BatchSize = 128$
- $LearningRate = 10^{-4}$
- $Epochs = 1000, 2000, 3000$
- $dim_z = 10$

### .3.2 Variational Autoencoder

In contrast to the "vanilla" autoencoder where  $y$  is not reconstructed, the VAE is trained to reconstruct both the features  $X$  and the target variable  $y$ . Let  $p$  be the number of features of inputs (one hot encoded). Let  $dim_{HL}$  and  $dim_z$  be the dimension of the latent space and hidden layers respectively (hyperparameter).

The "vanilla" variational autoencoder is constructed as follows:

- an encoder  $\phi$  consisting of:
  - $HL21(H1), HL22(H1)$  with:
  - $H1 = Tanh(HL1(.,.))$  with:
  - $HL1 = Linear(p, dim_{HL})$
  - $HL21 = Linear(dim_{HL}, dim_z)$
  - $HL22 = Linear(dim_{HL}, dim_z)$
- a decoder  $\psi$  consisting of:
  - $HL41(H3), HL42(H3)$  with:
  - $H3 = Tanh(HL3(.,.))$  with:
  - $HL3 = Linear(dim_z, dim_{HL})$
  - $HL41 = Linear(dim_{HL}, p)$
  - $HL42 = Linear(dim_{HL}, 1)$
- a reparametrization consisting of:
  - inputs: the mean  $mu$ , the log-variance  $logvar$
  - a standard deviation  $std = exp(0.5 \times logvar)$
  - an epsilon  $eps$  defined as random standard Gaussian for  $std$
  - outputs:  $mu + eps * std$


The parameters used are as follows:

- $BatchSize = 256$
- $LearningRate = 10^{-3}$
- $Epochs = 1000$
- $dim_z = 10$
- $dim_{HL} = 20$


## .4 Numerical Illustration

### .4.1 Learning Analysis


**Learning error graph** Below are the learning graphs: error (MSE) per feature every  $epochs/10$ .



(a) 1000 epochs




(b) 2000 epochs




(c) 3000 epochs


Figure 10: Plot of errors by features during learning with the standard MSE



(a) 1000 epochs




(b) 2000 epochs



(c) 3000 epochs

Figure 11: Plot of errors by features during learning with the balanced MSE

**Learning error heatmap** Below are the learning heatmaps:  $\text{error}/(\max(\text{error}))$  per feature every  $\text{epochs}/10$ .



(a) 1000 epochs




(b) 2000 epochs




(c) 3000 epochs

(d) Standard MSE

Figure 12: Heatmap of errors by features during learning with the standard MSE



(a) 1000 epochs



(b) 2000 epochs



(c) 3000 epochs

(d) Balanced MSE

Figure 13: Heatmap of errors by features during learning with the balanced MSE




Figure 14: Plot of errors by features during learning with the standard MSE on 1 categorical feature. Comparison between the Binary Cross Entropy (BCE) and the standard MSE

## .4.2 Other benchmark

We naively compared our approach with different encodings (using the python package "category-encoders") combined with the loss function MSE, as well as the cross-entropy loss function - with a softmax activation function applied to each variable (as used in e.g (Xu et al., 2019) or (Delong and Kozak, 2023)), and a combination of MSE-CrossEntropy. As the results were not satisfactory, we preferred to present them in the annex and leave the comparison with only the standard MSE. Below we present the MSEM for different encodings and loss functions. As observed below in our illustration, the different encodings and loss functions do not seem relevant (with 1000 epochs).

LossFunction with Encoding	MSEM
Balanced MSE with OHE	2,55
MSE with BinaryEncoder	9,08
MSE with CatBoostEncoder	10,99
MSE with OHE	12,52
MSE with SumEncoder	12,69
CrossEntropy(+Softmax/features) + MSE with OHE	42,97
MSE with OrdinalEncoder	152,55
CrossEntropy (+Softmax) with OHE	185,18
MSE with HelmertEncoder	207,44

Figure 15: Comparison of different loss functions and encoding

## .5 Experiments

### .5.1 Datasets Details

**Adults** The dataset contains 14 variables: 11 categorical and 3 numerical. It comes from the following source: <https://archive.ics.uci.edu/dataset/2/adult>

Variable	Type	count	unique	top	freq	mean	std	min	25%	50%	75%	max
age	int64	48 842				2	1	0	1	2	3	4
workclass	object	46 043	8	Private	33 906							
fnlwt	int64	48 842				189 664	105 604	12 285	117 551	178 145	237 642	1 490 400
education	object	48 842	16	HS-grad	15 784							
marital-status	object	48 842	7	Married-civ-spouse	22 379							
occupation	object	46 033	14	Prof-specialty	6 172							
relationship	object	48 842	6	Husband	19 716							
race	object	48 842	5	White	41 762							
sex	object	48 842	2	Male	32 650							
capitalgain	object	48 842				0	1	0	0	0	0	4
capitalloss	object	48 842				0	1	0	0	0	0	4
hoursperweek	int64	48 842				2	1	0	2	2	2	4
native-country	object	47 985	41	United-States	43 832							
class	object	48 842	2	<=50K	37 155							

Figure 16: Adults dataset details

**BreastCancer** The dataset contains 16 variables: 11 categorical and 5 numerical. It comes from the following source: <https://www.kaggle.com/datasets/reihanenamdari/breast-cancer>

Variable	Type	count	unique	top	freq	mean	std	min	25%	50%	75%	max
Age	int64	4 024				54	9	30	47	54	61	69
Race	object	4 024	3	White	3 413							
Marital Status	object	4 024	5	Married	2 643							
T Stage	object	4 024	4	T2	1 786							
N Stage	object	4 024	3	N1	2 732							
6th Stage	object	4 024	5	IIA	1 305							
differentiate	object	4 024	4	Moderately differentiated	2 351							
Grade	object	4 024	4	2	2 351							
A Stage	object	4 024	2	Regional	3 932							
Tumor Size	int64	4 024				30	21	1	16	25	38	140
Estrogen Status	object	4 024	2	Positive	3 755							
Progesterone Status	object	4 024	2	Positive	3 326							
Regional Node Examined	int64	4 024				14	8	1	9	14	19	61
Reginof Node Positive	int64	4 024				4	5	1	1	2	5	46
Survival Months	int64	4 024				71	23	1	56	73	90	107
Status	object	4 024	2	Alive	3 408							

Figure 17: BreastCancer dataset details

**Obesity** The dataset contains 17 variables: 9 categorical and 8 numerical. It comes from the following source: <https://archive.ics.uci.edu/dataset/544/estimation+of+obesity+levels+based+on+eating+habits+and+physical+condition>. It is associated with the paper (Palechor and de la Hoz Manotas, 2019).

Variable	Type	count	unique	top	freq	mean	std	min	25%	50%	75%	max
Gender	object	2 111	2	Male	1 068							
Age	float64	2 111				24	6	14	20	23	26	61
Height	float64	2 111				2	0	1	2	2	2	2
Weight	float64	2 111				87	26	39	65	83	107	173
family_history_with_overweight	object	2 111	2	yes	1 726							
FAVC	object	2 111	2	yes	1 866							
FCVC	float64	2 111				2	1	1	2	2	3	3
NCP	float64	2 111				3	1	1	3	3	3	4
CAEC	object	2 111	4	Sometimes	1 765							
SMOKE	object	2 111	2	no	2 067							
CH2O	float64	2 111				2	1	1	2	2	2	3
SCC	object	2 111	2	no	2 015							
FAF	float64	2 111				1	1	0	0	1	2	3
TUE	float64	2 111				1	1	0	0	1	1	2
CALC	object	2 111	4	Sometimes	1 401							
MTRANS	object	2 111	5	Public_Transportation	1 580							
NObesydad	object	2 111	7	Obesity_Type_I	351							

Figure 18: Obesity dataset details

**freMTPL** The dataset contains 26 variables: 11 categorical and 15 numerical. It comes from the following source: <http://cas.uqam.ca/>



Variable	Type	count	unique	top	freq	mean	std	min	25%	50%	75%	max
IDpol	object	51 949	32 117	1000111,100a	2							
Year	int64	51 949				2 003	0	2 003	2 003	2 003	2 004	2 004
DrivAge	int64	51 949				40	12	18	31	38	47	97
DrivGender	object	51 949	2	M	34 155							
MaritalStatus	object	17 001	5	Cohabiting	10 680							
BonusMalus	int64	51 949				63	15	50	50	57	72	156
LicenceNb	int64	51 949				2	1	1	1	2	2	7
PayFreq	object	51 949	4	Half-yearly	28 978							
JobCode	object	17 001	7	Private employee	9 147							
VehAge	int64	51 949				8	5	0	4	7	10	89
VehClass	object	51 949	9	Cheapest	17 894							
VehPower	object	51 949	15	P10	9 148							
VehGas	object	51 949	2	Regular	31 334							
VehUsage	object	51 949	3	Private trip to office	50 435							
Garage	object	51 949	4	Closed zbox	26 318							
Area	object	51 949	10	A5	15 108							
Region	object	51 949	4	Center	27 486							
Channel	object	51 949	3	A	30 220							
Marketing	object	51 949	4	M1	26 318							
PremWindscreen	int64	51 949				26	20	0	13	22	35	264
PremDamAll	int64	51 949				83	106	0	0	0	144	1 429
PremFire	int64	51 949				4	4	0	0	4	7	50
PremAcc1	int64	51 949				13	17	0	0	0	32	77
PremAcc2	int64	51 949				15	24	0	0	0	45	198
PremLegal	int64	51 949				10	4	0	8	10	12	50
PremTPLM	float64	51 949				168	97	39	103	142	205	1 433
PremTPLV	int64	51 949				9	5	0	5	7	11	68
PremServ	int64	51 949				54	5	0	51	53	57	237
PremTheft	int64	51 949				47	49	0	0	38	68	642
PremTot	float64	51 949				429	225	91	270	381	530	3 163
Claim	int64	51 949				180	3 097	0	0	0	0	633 790

Figure 19: freMTPL dataset details

**Pricing Game** The dataset contains 20 variables: 6 categorical and 14 numerical. It comes from the following source: <http://cas.uqam.ca/>

Variable	Type	count	unique	top	freq	mean	std	min	25%	50%	75%	max
PolNum	int64	100 021				200 200 320	62 172	200 114 871	200 139 855	200 164 860	200 260 800	200 285 805
CalYear	int64	100 021				2 009	1	2 009	2 009	2 009	2 010	2 010
Gender	object	100 021	2	Male	63 443							
Type	object	100 021	6	A	27 760							
Category	object	100 021	3	Medium	36 644							
Occupation	object	100 021	5	Employed	31 150							
Age	int64	100 021				41	14	18	30	40	51	75
Group1	int64	100 021				11	5	1	7	11	14	20
Bonus	int64	100 021				-7	49	-50	-40	-30	10	350
Poldur	int64	100 021				5	5	0	1	4	9	15
Value	int64	100 021				16 455	10 507	1 000	8 380	14 610	22 575	49 995
Adind	int64	100 021				1	0	0	0	1	1	1
SubGroup2	object	100 021	471	Q29	431							
Group2	object	100 021	10	L	23 733							
Density	float64	100 021				117	80	14	51	94	175	297
Expdays	int64	100 021				328	74	91	340	365	365	365
Numtppd	int64	100 021				0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Numtpbi	int64	100 021				0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Indtppd	float64	100 021				106	445	0	0	0	0	12 878
Indtpbi	float64	100 021				223	1 859	0	0	0	0	69 068

Figure 20: Pricing Game dataset details

**Telematics** The dataset contains 52 variables: 48 categorical and 4 numerical. It comes from the following source: <https://www2.math.uconn.edu/~valdez/data.html>. It is associated with the paper (So et al., 2021).

Variable	Type	count	unique	top	freq	mean	std	min	25%	50%	75%	max
Duration	int64	100 000				314	80	27	200	365	366	366
Insured,age	int64	100 000				51	15	16	39	51	63	103
Insured,sex	object	100 000	2	Male	53 943							
Car,age	int64	100 000				6	4	-2	2	5	8	20
Marital	object	100 000	2	Married	69 930							
Car,use	object	100 000	4	Commute	49 815							
Credit,score	float64	100 000				801	83	422	766	825	856	900
Region	object	100 000	2	Urban	78 141							
Annual,miles,drive	float64	100 000				9 124	3 826	0	6 214	7 456	12 427	56 731
Years,noclaims	int64	100 000				29	16	0	15	29	41	79
Territory	int64	100 000				57	24	11	35	62	78	91
Annual,pct,driven	float64	100 000				1	0	0	0	0	1	1
Total,miles,driven	float64	100 000				4 834	4 546	0	1 530	3 468	6 780	47 283
Pct,drive,mon	float64	100 000				0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Pct,drive,tue	float64	100 000				0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Pct,drive,wed	float64	100 000				0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Pct,drive,thr	float64	100 000				0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Pct,drive,fri	float64	100 000				0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Pct,drive,sat	float64	100 000				0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Pct,drive,sun	float64	100 000				0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Pct,drive,2hrs	float64	100 000				0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pct,drive,3hrs	float64	100 000				0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pct,drive,4hrs	float64	100 000				0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pct,drive,wkday	float64	100 000				1	0	0	1	1	1	1
Pct,drive,wkend	float64	100 000				0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Pct,drive,rush am	float64	100 000				0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Pct,drive,rush pm	float64	100 000				0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Avgdays,week	float64	100 000				6	1	0	5	6	6	7
Accel,06miles	float64	100 000				43	62	0	9	24	52	621
Accel,08miles	float64	100 000				5	20	0	0	1	3	621
Accel,09miles	float64	100 000				2	15	0	0	0	1	621
Accel,11miles	float64	100 000				1	12	0	0	0	0	621
Accel,12miles	float64	100 000				1	10	0	0	0	0	621
Accel,14miles	float64	100 000				0	8	0	0	0	0	621
Brake,06miles	float64	100 000				84	80	0	33	60	107	621
Brake,08miles	float64	100 000				10	18	0	3	6	11	621
Brake,09miles	float64	100 000				3	13	0	1	2	3	621
Brake,11miles	float64	100 000				1	11	0	0	1	1	621
Brake,12miles	float64	100 000				1	9	0	0	0	0	621
Brake,14miles	float64	100 000				0	8	0	0	0	0	621
Left,turn,intensity08	float64	100 000				916	16 331	0	7	66	361	794 740
Left,turn,intensity09	float64	100 000				718	15 666	0	2	22	146	794 676
Left,turn,intensity10	float64	100 000				552	14 688	0	0	3	30	794 380
Left,turn,intensity11	float64	100 000				487	14 198	0	0	1	9	793 926
Left,turn,intensity12	float64	100 000				448	13 720	0	0	0	2	793 170
Right,turn,intensity08	float64	100 000				843	11 630	0	11	122	680	841 210
Right,turn,intensity09	float64	100 000				565	10 657	0	3	43	321	841 207
Right,turn,intensity10	float64	100 000				327	9 460	0	0	7	81	841 200
Right,turn,intensity11	float64	100 000				247	8 978	0	0	2	27	841 176
Right,turn,intensity12	float64	100 000				199	8 585	0	0	0	9	841 144
NB_Claim	int64	100 000				0	0	0	0	0	0	3
AMT_Claim	float64	100 000				138	1 264	0	0	0	0	104 075

Figure 21: Telematics dataset details


**Student** The dataset contains 33 variables: 17 categorical and 16 numerical. It comes from the following source: <https://archive.ics.uci.edu/dataset/320/student+performance>. It is associated with the paper (Cortez and Silva, 2008).

Variable	Type	count	unique	top	freq	mean	std	min	25%	50%	75%	max
school	object	395	2	GP	349							
sex	object	395	2	F	208							
age	int64	395				17	1	15	16	17	18	22
address	object	395	2	U	307							
famsize	object	395	2	GT3	281							
Pstatus	object	395	2	T	354							
Medu	int64	395				3	1	0	2	3	4	4
Fedu	int64	395				3	1	0	2	2	3	4
Mjob	object	395	5	other	141							
Fjob	object	395	5	other	217							
reason	object	395	4	course	145							
guardian	object	395	3	mother	273							
traveltime	int64	395				1	1	1	1	1	2	4
studytime	int64	395				2	1	1	1	2	2	4
failures	int64	395				0	1	0	0	0	0	3
schoolsup	object	395	2	no	344							
famsup	object	395	2	yes	242							
paid	object	395	2	no	214							
activities	object	395	2	yes	201							
nursery	object	395	2	yes	314							
higher	object	395	2	yes	375							
internet	object	395	2	yes	329							
romantic	object	395	2	no	263							
famrel	int64	395				4	1	1	4	4	5	5
freetime	int64	395				3	1	1	3	3	4	5
goout	int64	395				3	1	1	2	3	4	5
Dalc	int64	395				1	1	1	1	1	2	5
Walc	int64	395				2	1	1	1	2	3	5
health	int64	395				4	1	1	3	4	5	5
absences	int64	395				6	8	0	0	4	8	75
G1	int64	395				11	3	3	8	11	13	19
G2	int64	395				11	4	0	9	11	13	19
G3	int64	395				10	5	0	8	11	14	20


Figure 22: Student dataset details

### 5.2 Complementary Results for Supervised Classification


**Adults Results** Below different metrics for  $Y$  prediction.




(a) Correlation Matrix Difference with the initial train




(b) Area Under the Curve (AUC)




(c) F1-Score




(d) Balanced Accuracy




(e) Correlation Matrix Difference with the initial train



(f) Area Under the Curve (AUC)




(g) F1-Score




(h) Balanced Accuracy

Figure 23: Prediction from reconstructed features. Comparison between an Imbalanced context (left) and a Balanced context (right). Comparison between the initial train (blue), standard MSE (orange) and balanced MSE (green)


**Breast Cancer Results** Below different metrics for  $Y$  prediction.




(a) Correlation Matrix Difference with the initial train




(b) Area Under the Curve (AUC)




(c) F1-Score




(d) Balanced Accuracy




(e) Correlation Matrix Difference with the initial train



(f) Area Under the Curve (AUC)



(g) F1-Score




(h) Balanced Accuracy


Figure 24: Prediction from reconstructed features. Comparison between a learning with 500 epochs (left) and a learning with 1000 epochs (right). Comparison between the initial train (blue), standard MSE (orange) and balanced MSE (green)

### 5.3 Complementary Results for Regression


**freMTPL** Below different metrics for  $Y$  prediction.



(a) Correlation Matrix Difference with the initial train




(b) MAE




(c) RMSE

Figure 25: Prediction from reconstructed features. Comparison between the initial train (blue), standard MSE (orange) and balanced MSE (green)


**Pricing Game** Below different metrics for  $Y$  prediction.



(a) Correlation Matrix Difference with the initial train




(b) MAE




(c) MSE

Figure 26: Prediction from reconstructed features. Comparison between the initial train (blue), standard MSE (orange) and balanced MSE (green)


**Telematics** Below different metrics for  $Y$  prediction.



(a) Correlation Matrix Difference with the initial train



(b) MAE




(c) MSE


Figure 27: Prediction from reconstructed features. Comparison between the initial train (blue), standard MSE (orange) and balanced MSE (green)




**Student** Below different metrics for  $Y$  prediction.



(a) Correlation Matrix Difference with the initial train



(b) MAE



(c) MSE

Figure 28: Prediction from reconstructed features. Comparison between the initial train (blue), standard MSE (orange) and balanced MSE (green)