
DeepIFSA: Deep Imputation of Missing Values Using Feature and Sample Attention

Ibna Kowsar, Shourav B. Rabbani, Yina Hou, Manar D. Samad
Department of Computer Science
Tennessee State University
Nashville, TN, USA
msamad@tnstate.edu

January 22, 2025

ABSTRACT

Missing values of varying patterns and rates in real-world tabular data pose a significant challenge in developing reliable data-driven models. Existing missing value imputation methods use statistical and traditional machine learning, which are ineffective when the missing rate is high and not at random. This paper explores row and column attention in tabular data to address the shortcomings of existing methods by introducing a new method for imputing missing values. The method combines between-feature and between-sample attention learning in a deep data reconstruction framework. The proposed data reconstruction uses CutMix data augmentation within a contrastive learning framework to improve the uncertainty of missing value estimation. The performance and generalizability of trained imputation models are evaluated on set-aside test data folds with missing values. The proposed joint attention learning outperforms nine state-of-the-art imputation methods across several missing value types and rates (10%-50%) on twelve data sets. Real electronic health records data with missing values yield the best classification accuracy when imputed using the proposed attention learning compared to other statistical, machine learning, and deep imputation methods. This paper highlights the heterogeneity of tabular data sets to recommend imputation methods based on missing value types and data characteristics.

Keywords attention, missing values, imputation, tabular data, contrastive learning, CutMix.

1 Introduction

In the era of big-data-driven intelligence, meaningful insights from large data sets are crucial in advancing science, economy, and industries. The effectiveness of data is often questioned due to the presence of missing data values at different rates and patterns in practical applications. The missing value problem is found in many tabular data applications, including electronic health records (EHR), banking, biology, and cybersecurity [1, 2, 3, 4]. Tabular data and missing value problems are studied in statistics, whereas state-of-the-art deep learning methods in artificial intelligence (AI) are proposed for image and text data. Recent studies have reported surprising under-performance of deep learning methods on tabular data compared to traditional machine learning [4, 2, 5]. The underperformance of modern AI underscores the need to investigate deep learning methods for tabular data.

Deep learning methods are often benchmarked using clean and curated data sets, which are far from unprocessed real-world data marred by missing values. For instance, EHR data inevitably contain missing values because physicians never recommend all tests for every patient or the same test in all medical follow-ups. A data set with missing values is unfit for machine learning, whereas imputing missing values alters the data quality. Furthermore, most studies train imputation models on the entire data set to evaluate the imputation accuracy alone. Train and test folds created on an imputed data set for downstream classification cannot escape information leaks. Some methods [6] even leverage classification labels for imputation, which biases data with the target variable and inflates classification accuracy.

The goal of imputation methods should be to prepare high-quality and unbiased data sets for downstream predictive modeling.

One of the most effective imputation strategies builds regression models for individual features. Missing values of a feature are estimated from other features using a linear model, ensemble of decision trees, and neural networks [7]. Regression models can overfit a large number of features in capturing between-feature relationships. We hypothesize that missing values in a data table can be better estimated by learning between-row and between-column attentions instead of regression modeling. A deep learning framework that combines row and column attention learning can optimally the tabular data structure. While attention learning has been proposed for tabular data classification, the concept is rarely considered for missing value imputation. This paper investigates deep imputations by combining feature and sample attentions (DeepIFSA) corresponding to columns and rows of tabular data, respectively. A data augmentation strategy of contrastive learning is used to improve the joint attention learning framework for missing value estimation. The source code of the proposed algorithm implementation has been shared publicly¹. To the best of our knowledge, this paper is the first to use contrastive learning in a joint attention learning framework for imputing missing values in tabular data.

The structure of the paper is organized in the following order. Section 2 provides an overview of state-of-the-art methods for imputing missing values. The methodology and experiments of our proposed algorithm are detailed in Section 3. Section 4 discusses the imputation performance of our method, comparing it to other leading baseline MVI methods. Finally, Section 5 summarizes the principal conclusions, provides insights into the outcomes, and outlines possible avenues for future investigation.

2 Background

The presence of missing values in tabular data demands significant efforts to prepare data for machine learning and predictive analytics. While missing values make machine learning models inoperable, the imputation strategy is left at the discretion of the data end user. In reality, missing values can be of varying statistical types and rates. Most imputation methods assume values missing completely at random (MCAR), which may not be effective on data with missing values that are not at random.

Recent studies have used machine learning and statistical approaches to impute missing values in tabular data. Multiple imputations (MI) is one of the most successful statistical approaches, contributing to state-of-the-art methods, including multiple imputations using chained equations (MICE) [8], missForest [9], and deep MICE [7]. MICE employs an iterative process of updating missing value estimates using a set of linear regression equations for individual variables. Replacing linear regression with nonlinear machine learning regressors (e.g., random forest and gradient-boosting trees) has demonstrated notable improvements in imputation accuracy [9, 10]. However, regression models can produce out-of-range values, and nonlinear models are known to overfit data with limited samples but a large number of features [11]. Mera et al. [12] argue that MICE is computationally expensive in complex data scenarios. The number and complexity of regression equations increase with the number of features.

Similar statistical and traditional machine learning methods remain the primary techniques for analyzing tabular data despite impressive accomplishments of deep learning in other data domains. Deep learning solutions [4, 3, 13, 5, 14] proposed for tabular data have not seen major success compared to their machine learning counterparts. Kadra et al. [4] refer to tabular data as the “last unconquered castle” for deep learning.

The limited success of deep learning on tabular data has inspired recent research on deep imputation methods. In [7], deep regression within the MICE framework has shown promising performance in imputing data with up to 80% missing values. The study shows that deep regression within MICE is superior to its machine-learning counterparts for imputing the most challenging type of missing values, missing not at random (MNAR). In contrast, generative deep learning has inspired several missing value imputation models. The diffusion-based framework (MissDiff) is trained to generate values for missing data entries [15]. Multiple imputation (MI) based denoising autoencoder (DA) method, MIDASpy [16] replaces a random subset of training data with zeros during each mini-batch processing. However, zero value imputation can substantially alter the original data distribution, which may affect the model performance [17]. The performance of MIDASpy is also unknown against similar other denoising autoencoder-based imputation methods [18, 19, 20, 21].

Novel imputation algorithms can take inspiration from state-of-the-art deep learning methods proposed for tabular data classification. A recent benchmarking article [22] suggests that combining deep contrastive and attention learning, for example, Self-Attention and Intersample Attention Transformer (SAINT) [23], significantly outperforms most baseline classifier methods on a wide selection of tabular data. Multiple attention and transformer-based algorithms proposed

¹github link would be shared in the final version for anonymity during the peer-review process




Figure 1: Proposed missing value imputation framework by jointly learning between-feature and between-sample attentions within a contrastive learning framework. MHSA stands for multi-head self-attention.

for tabular data, such as the Feature Tokenizer Transformer (FT-Transformer) [5] and the Non-parametric Transformer (NPT) [24], have shown promising classification performance. Similar deep representation learning methods are yet to be repurposed to perform missing value imputation.

Attention between-features (aka self-attention) can be an effective learning strategy when missing values of a feature depend on other feature values. A denoising self-attentional network (DSAN) [25] has been proposed for missing value imputation. Similar to [16], a random subset of the training data is replaced with zeroes during the mini-batch training of the network. DSAN shows limited performance on data sets with only numeric features or small sample sizes and is evaluated only on data with completely random missing values. A similar attention-based imputation network (AimNet) learns between-feature attention only [26]. AimNet randomly replaces values with zeros for up to 20% missing values before attention learning. Overall, current imputation methods use autoencoders or between-feature attentions on data with up to 30% missing rates. In reality, the missing rate of the second most important predictor of mortality in [27] is around 50%, which would otherwise be discarded without imputing.

This paper takes several steps to propose a novel deep imputation method that jointly attends between-features and between-samples and leverages a data augmentation method within a contrastive learning framework to address the limitations of current methods. A rigorous analysis of attention-based imputation methods on various missing value types, rates, and data sets demonstrates the effectiveness of proposed imputation methods against the state-of-the-art. The contributions of this paper are as follows.

- The proposed deep imputation method combines and complements between-feature attention with between-sample attention to attend between rows and between columns of tabular data.
- The data representation obtained from joint attention learning is enhanced by contrastive learning to reconstruct the missing values.
- The robustness of imputation is enhanced by the CutMix data augmentation [28] of contrastive learning during model training instead of using zero or median values [16, 25].
- Unlike existing studies, imputation methods are trained and tested on separate data folds for better generalization. No class labels are used in the imputation process.
- We benchmark all methods on twelve tabular data sets from OpenML [29] for three missing value types across 10%, 30%, and 50% missing rates. The quality of imputed data is evaluated using real electronic health records data in classifying patients with heart failure.

3 Methods

This section presents some background on missing value types, computational steps of the proposed imputation method, and evaluation methods.

3.1 Statistical types of missing values

A data matrix X with observed (X_{obs}) and missing (X_{mis}) values can use a binary matrix M of the same size to identify the position of missing values, where 1 corresponds to observed and 0 corresponds to missing values. The




Figure 2: Data processing pipeline for validating imputation model and quality of imputed data in classification tasks.

binary matrix can be simulated for one of the three statistical missing value types: missing completely at random (MCAR), missing at random (MAR), and missing not at random (MNAR). First, MCAR occurs when the probability of a value M_j^i being missing is independent of both observed X_{obs} and missing data X_{mis} , as shown in Equation 1.

$$P(M = 0) = P(M = 0 | X_{obs}, X_{mis}) \quad (1)$$

MCAR happens when someone forgets to enter data or data collection is interrupted due to sensor failure. Second, the MAR type occurs when missing values of a variable depend on the observed values of another variable in Equation 2.

$$P(M = 0 | X_{obs}) = P(M = 0 | X_{obs}, X_{mis}) \quad (2)$$

For example, certain medical lab values can be missing or not recommended by a physician because the patient’s age is below eighteen. Third, MNAR occurs when the missing probability depends on the missing values in Equation 3.

$$P(M = 0 | X_{mis}) = P(M = 0 | X_{obs}, X_{mis}) \quad (3)$$

For example, the body weight of an obese person may not be recorded during a survey because of personal preference. Therefore, the weight value can be missing because the value is too high. We hypothesize that the same imputation method may not be the best choice for all missing value types, which necessitates benchmarking across different missing value types.

3.2 Data augmentation

The data augmentation step uses a mask matrix (I) to alter randomly selected values during mini-batch training. The masking and filling steps in data augmentation are intended to improve the uncertainty of missing value estimations and enhance model robustness to varying missing patterns. Current studies perform this step by replacing randomly selected values with zeros [25, 16]. Instead, we use the CutMix [28] method to achieve data randomization and augmentation for subsequent contrastive learning. The CutMix method replaces a feature value of one sample (x^i) with the same feature value from another random sample (x^j), as shown in Equation 4.

$$\tilde{X}^i = X^i \odot I^i + X^j \odot (1 - I^i) \quad (4)$$

The corrupted samples (\tilde{X}) and their uncorrupted versions (X) are taken to subsequent attention learning in Figure 1.

3.3 Data reconstruction from attention embedding

The Transformer architecture [30], integrated with residual learning [31] and dot-scaled attention, has been tailored for tabular data classification in recent studies [23, 24, 5, 32]. These state-of-the-art transformer architectures inspire the proposed imputation method. Unlike supervised classification, missing value imputation is a self-supervised learning process on the data set to reconstruct the missing values. The proposed data reconstruction through attention learning has the following steps.

3.3.1 Deep feature embeddings

A tabular data set with b samples and n features are transformed into a new feature space. Each feature j is transformed into a d -dimensional embedding using a linear layer characterized by learnable weight parameters W_j and bias parameters B_j , as below.

$$f_j^i = W_j x_j + B_j \quad (5)$$

Algorithm 1: Proposed DeepIFSA Algorithm

Input: Data $X = \{X_{obs}, X_{mis}\}$ with missing values
Output: Imputed data matrix, $X = \{X_{obs}, X_{imputed}\}$
for $t = 1 \rightarrow n_epochs$ **do**
 Corrupted data via CutMix, $\tilde{X} = \{X, I\}$, Equation 4
 Feature Embeddings, $\{F, \tilde{F}\} \leftarrow \{X, \tilde{X}\}$, Equation 5,6
 $\{Q_h, K_h, V_h\} \leftarrow F, \{\tilde{Q}_h, \tilde{K}_h, \tilde{V}_h\} \leftarrow \tilde{F}$, Equation 7
 Attention scores for each head h :
 $\{head_h, head_h\} \leftarrow \{\{Q_h, K_h, V_h\}, \{\tilde{Q}_h, \tilde{K}_h, \tilde{V}_h\}\}$, Equation 8
 Between-feature attention:
 $\{G, \tilde{G}\} \leftarrow \text{MHSA}(\{F, \tilde{F}\})$, Equation 9
 Between-sample attention:
 $G' \leftarrow \text{Reshape } G \in \mathbb{R}^{b \times n, d}$, MHSA between-samples
 $S' \leftarrow \text{MHSA}(G')$, Equation 10
 $S \leftarrow \text{Reshape } S' \in \mathbb{R}^{b, n, d}$ shape for reconstruction
 Feature reconstruction, $\hat{X} \leftarrow S$
 $\mathcal{L}_{recon} = \{\hat{X}_{obs}, X_{obs}\}$, Equation 11
 Projected embedding, $\{Z, \tilde{Z}\} \leftarrow \{S, \tilde{S}\}$
 $\mathcal{L}_{contrastive} = \{Z, \tilde{Z}\}$, Equation 13
 $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_{recon} + \mathcal{L}_{contrastive}$
end for

Subsequently, the d -dimensional embeddings of the i -th sample are stacked to create a feature embedding matrix F^i with dimensions (n, d) . The feature embedding stacking is repeated for all b samples, resulting in the feature embedding tensor F with dimensions (b, n, d) , as in Equation 6.

$$F(X) = [F^1, F^2, \dots, F^b] \quad (6)$$

where $F^i = \text{stack}[f_1^i, f_2^i, \dots, f_j^i]$

The uncorrupted input data X and CutMix corrupted samples \tilde{X} are used to obtain the corresponding feature embedding tensors, F and \tilde{F} , as shown in Figure 1.

3.3.2 Attention between features

The feature embedding F is transformed into G feature space to capture attention between-features using the dot-scaled attention mechanism [30]. Specifically, the feature embedding F is used to compute the queries (Q), keys (K), and values (V), as defined in Equation 7.

$$Q_h = F^i W_h^Q, \quad K_h = F^i W_h^K, \quad V_h = F^i W_h^V \quad (7)$$

Here, Q represents the feature of the current token. K encodes all positions as keys for comparison. The attention scores are obtained from the QK^T product. Next, V stores the feature values, which are weighted by the attention scores to yield outputs of an attention head. A head in a dot-scaled attention framework results in a between-feature attention embedding $head$ in Equation 8.

$$head = \text{softmax}\left(\frac{Q(K)^T}{\sqrt{d_H}}\right)V \quad (8)$$

The output of each attention head has (n, d_H) dimensions. In multi-head self-attention (MHSA), outputs of H attention heads are concatenated to create a tensor of shape (n, d) . This tensor is then projected to a learnable weight matrix W^C with shape (d, d) to obtain the between-feature embedding (G^i) in Equation 9.

$$G^i = \text{MHSA}(F^i) = \text{concat}(head_1, \dots, head_H)W^C \quad (9)$$

Similarly, another view \tilde{G}^i is obtained from embedding \tilde{F}^i . Here, H attention heads are concatenated, each with an embedding of dimension $d_H = \frac{d}{H}$. The learnable weight parameters for the h -th attention head, denoted as W_h^Q, W_h^K , and W_h^V , have shapes of (d, d_H) .

Table 1: Tabular data sets used to evaluate the baseline and proposed imputation methods. Data sets obtained from OpenML are with ID numbers. Electronic health records (EHR) data set of heart failure patients are obtained from All of Us [34]. The difficulty based on the contrast between linear and non-linear classifier performances [2]

ID	Data set Name	Samples	Features	Classes	Difficulty
11	Balance-scale	625	4	3	Easy
37	Diabetes	768	8	2	Easy
54	Vehicle	846	18	4	Easy
187	Wine	178	13	3	Easy
458	Analcatdata	841	70	4	Easy
1464	Blood-transfusion	748	5	2	Easy
1049	pc4	1458	37	2	Hard
1050	pc3	1563	37	2	Hard
1067	Kc1	2109	21	2	Hard
1068	Pc1	1109	21	2	Hard
1497	Wall-robot-navigation	5456	24	4	Hard
40982	Steel-plates-fault	1941	27	7	Hard
EHR	Heart failure	2000	54	2	-

3.3.3 Attention between samples

The G embedding is reshaped to G' with dimensions $(b \times n, d)$ to achieve between-sample attention. Each $b \times n$ row in G' with a d -dimensional embedding is then input to the MHSA (Equation 9) to obtain embedding S' with between-sample attentions. The $(b \times n, d)$ embedding is reshaped back to (b, n, d) , as S before feature reconstruction in the next step in Equation 10. Similarly, feature embedding \tilde{G} is used to obtain a corresponding between-sample attention embedding \tilde{S} .

$$S \leftarrow \text{reshape}(\cdot) \leftarrow S' \leftarrow \text{MHSA}(G') \leftarrow \text{reshape}(G) \quad (10)$$

3.3.4 Feature reconstruction

A stack of multi-layer perceptron (MLP) heads $R(\cdot)$ reconstruct the original feature values (X) from embeddings infused with either between-feature attentions (\tilde{G}) only or between-sample attentions only (\tilde{S}). Apart from individual attention embeddings, joint attention learning obtains between-sample attention (\tilde{S}) after between-feature attention (\tilde{G}), as shown in Figure 1. The reconstruction loss (\mathcal{L}_{recon}) is obtained using mean squared error (\mathcal{L}_{num}) between the observed values of original (X_j^{obs}) and their reconstructed (\hat{X}_j^{obs}) counterparts, as follows.

$$\mathcal{L}_{num}(\hat{X}_j^{obs}, X_j^{obs}) = \frac{1}{b} \sum_{i=1}^b M_j^i (x_j^i - \hat{x}_j^i)^2 \quad (11)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{recon} = \sum_{j=1}^n \mathcal{L}_{num}(\hat{X}_j^{obs}, X_j^{obs}) \quad (12)$$

Here, \hat{X}_j^{obs} and X_j^{obs} are the reconstructed and original values of the j -th feature, respectively.

3.4 Contrastive representation learning

Contrastive learning yields a new embedding by moving the corrupted and uncorrupted versions of the same sample (Z_i and \tilde{Z}_i) closer and pulling different samples (Z_i and $Z_k, i \neq k$) far apart [33]. Here, the new embeddings Z and \tilde{Z} are obtained through two MLP subnetworks, $z^i = C_1(S^i)$ and $\tilde{z}^i = C_2(\tilde{S}^i)$ from corresponding attention embeddings, S and \tilde{S} . The infoNCE loss on S and \tilde{S} is optimized in Equation 13.

$$\mathcal{L}_{Contrastive} = - \sum_{i=1}^b \log \frac{\exp(\text{sim}(z^i, \tilde{z}^i)/\tau)}{\sum_k \exp(\text{sim}(z^i, \tilde{z}^k)/\tau)} \quad (13)$$

Here, $\text{sim}(\cdot)$ represents the cosine similarity between two embeddings. b is the sample size for each batch. The proposed attention learning algorithm for data imputation is presented in Algorithm 1.

3.5 Experimental setup

This section provides the experimental setup, including data preparation, model selection, and evaluation. Figure 2 shows the experimental and performance evaluation pipeline.

Table 2: Performance rank ordering of imputation methods on OpenML MCAR type data sets with 10%, 30%, and 50% missing rates.

Model	Median			KNN			MICE [8]			missForest [9]			DSAN [25]			MIDASpy [16]			Between-feature [35]			Between-sample [35]			Between-feature-sample			DeepIFSA (Proposed)			
	% Miss	10	30	50	10	30	50	10	30	50	10	30	50	10	30	50	10	30	50	10	30	50	10	30	50	10	30	50			
11	5	5	5	9	8	7	5	5	8	10	9	9	8	5	6	7	10	10	10	1	1	2	1	1	2	1	1	2	1	1	1
37	9	6	6	6	9	7	5	7	8	6	7	9	10	5	5	6	10	10	10	2	1	1	2	3	4	2	3	3	1	1	1
54	9	9	9	7	5	7	5	7	6	5	5	5	8	8	8	10	10	10	4	4	4	2	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	3
187	6	5	4	3	1	1	2	5	4	4	3	3	5	2	1	1	4	6	10	8	7	7	7	9	9	8	7	8	8	10	
458	9	8	9	6	5	5	5	9	7	7	6	7	8	7	6	10	10	10	2	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	3	2	2	3	
1464	10	10	9	7	8	7	6	6	6	5	5	8	9	7	5	8	9	10	1	2	4	1	2	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	
1049	9	9	9	2	2	4	2	6	7	1	1	1	5	8	4	10	10	10	5	4	4	7	4	8	8	3	2	4	6	3	
1050	9	9	9	3	2	3	1	4	3	2	1	1	5	5	5	10	10	10	4	2	2	7	8	7	7	6	8	6	7	6	
1067	9	9	9	4	5	8	6	8	6	6	5	5	8	7	6	10	10	10	3	3	3	4	4	1	2	2	1	1	1	3	
1068	9	8	9	6	5	6	5	9	7	7	5	5	8	7	8	10	10	10	3	3	2	4	4	3	2	2	1	1	1	4	
1497	10	9	9	5	4	4	6	8	7	4	5	6	8	7	7	9	10	10	7	6	5	3	1	2	1	1	2	1	1	1	
40982	6	5	5	2	2	3	3	4	2	1	1	1	4	3	4	10	10	10	8	8	6	7	9	9	5	7	8	9	6	7	
Avg.	8.3	7.7	7.7	5.0	4.7	5.2	4.2	6.5	5.9	4.8	4.4	5.0	7.2	5.9	5.4	8.4	9.4	9.7	4.2	3.7	3.4	3.9	3.8	4.1	3.4	3.2	3.2	3.0	3.0	3.6	
Std.	1.7	1.9	2.0	2.2	2.6	2.2	1.8	1.8	1.9	2.7	2.5	3.0	1.9	1.9	1.9	2.7	1.7	1.2	2.9	2.5	1.9	2.5	2.9	3.2	3.0	2.4	2.8	3.0	2.8	2.8	

Table 3: Performance rank ordering of imputation methods on OpenML MAR type data sets with 10%, 30%, and 50% missing rates.

Model	Median			KNN			MICE [8]			missForest [9]			DSAN [25]			MIDASpy [16]			Between-feature [35]			Between-sample [35]			Between-feature-sample			DeepIFSA (Proposed)		
	% Miss	10	30	50	10	30	50	10	30	50	10	30	50	10	30	50	10	30	50	10	30	50	10	30	50	10	30	50		
11	5	5	5	9	8	7	5	5	8	10	9	9	8	7	6	7	10	10	2	2	1	2	4	1	2	2	4	1	1	1
37	8	6	6	7	9	7	5	6	9	6	6	7	10	5	5	8	10	10	1	4	2	4	2	1	3	3	2	2	1	2
54	9	9	9	6	6	7	5	7	6	6	5	5	8	8	8	10	10	10	4	4	4	1	1	1	2	2	1	2	2	1
187	6	5	4	2	1	2	1	6	4	5	3	3	2	1	1	2	4	6	10	9	7	8	8	8	7	7	9	9	10	10
458	9	8	9	6	5	5	5	9	7	6	5	7	8	7	6	10	10	10	2	1	1	2	4	2	1	1	3	2	1	3
1464	10	10	9	8	9	7	5	5	5	6	7	8	9	6	6	8	10	10	1	1	3	1	1	3	1	1	1	1	1	1
1049	9	9	9	5	3	4	4	8	6	1	1	1	6	6	7	10	10	10	8	6	5	6	5	8	3	2	2	1	3	3
1050	9	9	9	3	2	3	1	4	8	1	1	1	6	5	4	10	10	10	4	3	2	6	6	7	6	8	5	5	6	5
1067	9	9	9	5	6	8	5	8	7	3	5	5	8	7	6	10	10	10	4	3	4	2	3	3	5	1	1	1	1	2
1068	9	9	9	7	6	7	5	8	8	5	5	5	8	7	6	10	10	10	2	3	1	4	4	1	2	1	4	1	1	1
1497	10	9	9	4	4	4	6	8	7	5	5	6	8	7	7	9	10	10	7	6	5	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	1
40982	6	4	5	2	2	3	3	5	2	1	1	1	4	3	4	10	10	10	8	8	7	7	9	9	5	7	6	9	6	8
Avg.	8.2	7.7	7.7	5.3	5.1	5.3	4.2	6.6	6.4	4.6	4.4	4.8	7.1	5.8	5.5	8.5	9.3	9.7	4.4	4.2	3.5	3.8	4.1	3.8	3.2	3.1	3.3	2.9	2.8	3.2
Std.	1.7	2.1	2.0	2.3	2.7	2.1	1.6	1.6	2.0	2.7	2.5	2.8	2.2	2.0	1.8	2.5	1.8	1.2	3.1	2.6	2.2	2.5	2.6	3.2	2.0	2.6	2.4	3.1	2.9	3.0

3.5.1 System environment

All experiments related to public tabular data sets are conducted on an Ubuntu 22.04 machine featuring an Intel(R) Xeon(R) W-2265 CPU @ 3.70GHz, 64GB RAM, and a Quadro RTX A4000 16GB GPU. The processor has 24 logical cores. We use deep learning methods and modules from the PyTorch package, which automatically uses multiple CPUs for parallel processing. All experiments involving All of Us health records data must be conducted within a secure cloud workbench to comply with data sharing and privacy policy. We maintain a uniform system environment by provisioning cloud instances with specifications similar to those of our Ubuntu machine.

3.5.2 Data preparation

Many studies report imputation accuracy on the same data samples used to train the imputation model. Instead, we split a data set into five folds to train the imputation model with four data folds and test the trained model in imputing the left-out data fold. The average imputation score is obtained across five left-out folds. A fixed random seed ensures the same train-test splits in all experiments. The five-fold cross-validation ensures the generalizability and reproducibility of the results.

Missing values of each of the three types are simulated in data sets sourced from OpenML [29]. Three missing value types, MCAR, MNAR, and MAR, are simulated at 10%, 30%, and 50% missing rates. Missing values are not simulated in All of Us health records data, which have 35% values missing. Missing values are initially imputed with median values in our proposed method. Next, the numerical features are standardized, and categorical features are one-hot encoded on the training data folds. The standardization is then applied to both the training and test data folds.

3.5.3 Model training

All deep learning models are trained with a batch size of 128 samples using Adam optimizer after setting $\beta_1 = 0.9$, $\beta_2 = 0.999$, a decay rate of 0.01, and a 0.0001 learning rate. The attention-based models have an embedding size of 32, eight attention heads (H), and six sequential MHSA blocks (L). Additionally, we apply a dropout rate of 0.1.

We train each model for 1000 epochs on training data samples and use the trained model to reconstruct and impute missing values on the test data fold.

3.5.4 Baselines

The imputation performance of the proposed attention network is compared against several state-of-the-art baseline imputation methods, including single-value median imputation, statistical methods like KNN, MICE [8], a competitive machine learning method missForest [9], recent deep imputation methods, DSAN [25], MIDASpy [16], and several variants of the proposed transformer-based imputation method. These variants include imputation by between-feature learning [35] and between-sample learning [35]. In this paper, we introduce a joint attention learning that combines between-feature and between-sample attention as between-feature-sample attention for imputing missing values. The between-feature-sample attention is without contrastive learning, whereas the proposed DeepIFSA uses joint attention within contrastive learning. Several other imputation methods, including AimNet [26], do not share source code publicly. Hence, these methods are excluded from baselines.

3.5.5 Model evaluation

The difference between the model imputed and ground truth values on the test data fold is measured using the normalized root mean squared error (NRMSE), as shown in Equation 14.

$$NRMSE = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \sqrt{\frac{\mathbb{E}[(X_j - \hat{X}_j)^2]}{\text{Var}(X_j)}} \quad (14)$$

Here, N is the number of features. $\text{Var}(X_j)$ is the variance of the j -th feature, and $\mathbb{E}(\cdot)$ obtains the mean of squared errors. The mean RMSE score across all the features is the normalized RMSE used to report the imputation error. The All of Us electronic records data of heart failure patients have missing values without ground truths. We evaluate the quality of the imputed data in the supervised classification of heart failure patients, similar to [1, 7] using mean F1 scores across the test data folds.

4 Results

This section presents the performance of our proposed missing value imputation method compared to nine baseline methods on twelve publicly available data sets and a real EHR data set.

4.1 Tabular data sets

A summary of the diverse tabular data sets used in this paper is provided in Table 1. Unlike image data sets, the heterogeneity and complexity of tabular data sets can significantly affect the performance of a learning algorithm. Hence, the model performance can be specific to the data type and characteristics [22]. Tabular data sets are grouped as hard and easy based on the performance gap between linear and non-linear classifiers [2]. Accordingly, we select twelve diverse data sets from the OpenML [29] repository, ensuring a balanced mix of hard and easy data sets. Additionally, we evaluate the imputed data quality on a real EHR data set with missing values in classifying patients with heart failure (HF) and without any cardiovascular diseases.

4.2 Effects of missing value types

We present the rank ordering of individual models based on NRMSE scores because no model can perform the best on all tabular data domains. Results specific to three different missing value types are discussed below.

4.2.1 MCAR missing type

Table 2 presents the rank orderings of the imputation methods on MCAR-type data sets sourced from OpenML. The single imputation method, median, ranks the worst, as expected. KNN shows promising results for 30% and 50% missing rates by outperforming MICE on overall rank. MICE outperforms missForest on eight data sets when the missing rate is 10%. Conversely, missForest outperforms MICE and KNN on ten and eight data sets with 30% missing values, respectively. When the missing rate is 50%, missForest outperforms MICE and KNN on eight and seven data sets, respectively. Therefore, missForest is generally superior to MICE and KNN-based imputation methods. Among the deep learning methods (DSAN, MIDASpy, between-feature, between-sample, between-feature-sample,

Table 4: Performance rank ordering of imputation methods on OpenML MNAR type data sets with 10%, 30%, and 50% missing rates.

Model	Median			KNN			MICE [8]			missForest [9]			DSAN [25]			MIDASpy [16]			Between-feature [35]			Between-sample [35]			Between-feature-sample			DeepIFSA (Proposed)			
	% Miss	10	30	50	10	30	50	10	30	50	10	30	50	10	30	50	10	30	50	10	30	50	10	30	50	10	30	50			
11	7	6	6	6	8	9	8	10	9	8	8	7	10	7	8	1	1	1	4	5	4	4	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	4
37	9	9	6	7	9	9	5	6	6	6	8	9	10	7	6	8	5	5	4	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	1	1	1	
54	10	10	10	7	8	9	6	6	7	9	9	8	8	6	6	1	1	1	5	5	5	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	
187	5	5	4	2	3	4	1	4	1	3	2	3	3	1	2	10	6	6	9	10	7	6	7	10	8	8	8	7	9	8	
458	10	10	7	6	8	8	6	6	9	8	7	6	9	9	10	1	1	1	5	2	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	3
1464	10	9	8	6	6	6	7	6	8	8	10	8	9	8	7	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
1049	9	8	9	5	7	8	7	9	6	8	6	7	3	4	3	10	10	10	4	5	5	5	3	1	1	2	3	2	1	1	1
1050	9	9	9	7	8	8	5	6	6	8	7	7	5	5	5	10	10	10	4	4	4	1	3	1	3	2	3	1	1	1	1
1067	9	9	9	6	6	6	8	8	8	7	7	6	5	5	5	10	10	10	4	4	4	3	2	2	2	3	2	1	1	1	1
1068	9	9	9	6	8	8	7	6	6	7	6	6	5	5	5	10	10	10	3	4	3	1	2	1	4	2	3	1	1	1	1
1497	10	10	9	6	8	9	8	8	6	5	7	6	9	6	6	3	1	1	7	5	5	3	4	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	2
40982	5	5	3	1	3	5	1	2	2	4	4	3	1	1	1	10	10	10	9	9	8	8	8	9	7	6	6	6	7	7	7
Avg.	8.5	8.2	7.4	5.4	6.8	7.4	5.8	6.4	6.2	6.8	6.8	6.3	6.4	5.3	5.3	6.2	5.5	5.5	5.0	4.8	4.2	3.2	3.2	2.9	3.0	3.0	3.2	2.3	2.6	2.8	
Std.	1.8	1.9	2.2	1.9	2.0	1.7	2.5	2.2	2.5	1.9	2.1	1.8	3.1	2.5	2.5	4.4	4.3	4.3	2.2	2.4	2.0	2.2	2.2	3.1	2.3	2.0	1.9	2.0	2.6	2.4	

Table 5: Mean F1 scores in classifying imputed All of Us [34] heart failure patient data.

Median	KNN	MICE [8]	missForest [9]	DSAN [25]	MIDASpy [16]	Between-feature [35]	Between-sample [35]	Between feature-sample	DeepIFSA (Proposed)
76.15 (9.26)	83.59 (1.04)	85.10 (1.48)	80.30 (3.03)	82.29 (2.12)	86.04 (0.6)	86.59 (1.44)	87.24 (1.24)	87.29 (1.29)	87.49 (1.35)

DeepIFSA), the proposed DeepIFSA achieves the best NRMSE scores on six of twelve data sets. DeepIFSA, on average, ranks better than all methods for 10% and 30% missing rates. A closer look reveals that DeepIFSA outperforms the between-feature attention method on seven and six of twelve data sets for 10% and 30% missing rates, respectively. Overall, DeepIFSA ranks second to its simplified between-feature-sample attention without contrastive learning when the missing rate is 50%. The overall performance of attention-based imputation methods, including DeepIFSA, is quite negatively impacted by data sets with ID 187 and 40982. Average rank ordering presented in Table 2 shows that DeepIFSA is the best imputation method for 10% (avg. rank 3.0 (3.0)) and 30% (3.0(2.8)) missing rates whereas its between-feature-sample version without contrastive learning ranks the best (avg. rank 3.2 (2.8)) on 50% missing values.

4.2.2 MAR missing type

Table 3 presents the rank ordering of imputation methods based on NRMSE scores for twelve data sets with MAR-type values. As expected, median single-value imputation performs the worst. KNN outperforms MICE on 30% and 50% missing rates on overall rank ordering. However, MICE outperforms missForest and KNN on seven and nine data sets with 10% missing values. Conversely, missForest outperforms MICE and KNN on eight and seven data sets with 50% values. Therefore, the non-linear missForest method is superior to its linear counterpart (MICE) at higher missing rates. Our proposed DeepIFSA ranks the best among all imputation methods across all three missing rates for the MAR type. The between-feature-sample attention without contrastive learning method ranks second at 10% and 30% missing rates. However, attention-based methods perform poorly on data sets with ID 187, 1050, and 40982. Conversely, missForest outperforms all attention-based methods on data sets with ID 1049, 1050, and 40982.

4.2.3 MNAR missing type

Table 4 presents the rank ordering of nine imputation methods on the twelve MNAR-type data sets. Median imputation ranks worse than KNN, MICE, and missForest across all missing rates. KNN shows promising results by outperforming MICE and missForest on six and ten data sets with 10% missing values, respectively. However, MICE and missForest perform equally well on six data sets each when the missing rate is 50%. Among the deep learning methods, the proposed DeepIFSA ranks the best and outperforms all baseline methods on five data sets regardless of the missing rate. The baseline deep imputation methods (DSAN, MIDASpy) perform better than their statistical and machine learning counterparts (MICE, missForest). The between-sample attention shows substantial improvement over its between-feature counterpart on all missing value rates. The combination of between-feature and between-sample attention as between-feature-sample outperforms between-sample attention on 10% and 30% missing values. However, between-sample attention outperforms the combined attention when 50% values are missing. Conversely, the proposed DeepIFSA method outperforms all other deep and attention-based solutions regardless of the missing value rate.

4.3 Effects of data types and missing rates

Twelve tabular data sets from OpenML are evenly grouped into easy and hard categories based on the contrast between linear and non-linear classifier performance. Eighteen experimental scenarios, constituting six data sets and three missing value types, are investigated for each data category. In the easy category, the proposed DeepIFSA method ranks the best in seven of eighteen scenarios with 10% missing rates. The between-feature-sample attention method jointly ranks the best with DeepIFSA in five scenarios. At a 50% missing rate, DeepIFSA outperforms all other imputation methods in eight experimental scenarios, whereas missForest ranks the best in six. In the hard data set category, DeepIFSA ranks the best in eleven out of eighteen scenarios with 10% missing values. At a 50% missing rate, DeepIFSA outperforms all other methods in eight experimental scenarios, while missForest ranks the best in six.

4.4 Imputation of health records data

Missing values are inevitable in real health records data where ground truth values are unknown. NRMSE scores cannot be obtained without ground truth values. However, the efficacy of imputation methods can be evaluated by classifying patient diagnoses on imputed data. A data set is curated from the All of Us health records by selecting two patient cohorts based on International Classification of Diseases (ICD-10) diagnostic codes: one with a heart failure diagnosis and the other without cardiovascular disease events. Figure 5 the F1 scores of a gradient boosting tree (GBT) classifier after performing five-fold cross-validation on imputed data. The MICE method appears superior to median value imputation, KNN, missForest, and one of the deep learning imputation methods (DSAN). Notably, MICE is the most popular method in biostatistics for imputing health records data [27]. All four attention learning methods, including the proposed DeepIFSA, yield better classification accuracy than other imputation methods. Notably, a 1% improvement in classification accuracy accounts for correctly predicting heart failure diagnosis of an additional 20 patients in 2000, which has a significant value in practice.

5 Discussion of the results

This paper uses between-feature and between-sample attentions within a contrastive learning framework to improve data reconstruction for missing value imputation. Experimental results in the previous section reveal several key findings. First, the proposed DeepIFSA method yields the best overall performance in imputing data with MAR and MNAR-type missing values across all missing value rates. Second, the proposed CutMix method is superior to randomly masking values and filling with zeros [18, 25, 16, 26] in improving missing value estimations. Third, combining between-feature and between-sample attentions as between-feature-sample attention improves the imputation accuracy of all individual attention learning, except between-sample attention on MNAR data with 50% missing values. Between-sample attention is superior for imputing MNAR-type data when missing values do not rely on between-features. Fourth, contrastive representation learning improves the imputation accuracy of between-feature-sample attention learning in the proposed DeepIFSA method, except for MCAR data with 50% missing values.

5.1 Explanation of missing value types

Most studies benchmark imputation algorithms on MCAR-type data without recognizing the impact of missing value types on imputation performance. Our results reveal similar model performance on MCAR and MAR type data where missForest is superior to KNN and MICE imputations. missForest and MICE between-feature regression models similar to the notion of MAR type. In MAR, missing values of a feature depend on the values of other features. Therefore, between-feature attention generally performs better on MAR-type data than other methods. In contrast, missForest performs worse than KNN and MICE on MNAR-type data. The performance drop of missForest can be explained by the missing values of a feature in MNAR, which are independent of other features. Therefore, between-feature attention is ineffective for imputing MNAR-type data, which is a limitation overcome by between-sample attention learning. Between-sample attention shows superior performance in imputing MNAR-type data, which even outperforms the joint between-feature-sample attention on MNAR data with 50% missing values.

5.2 Data set specific trends

Tabular data sets are highly heterogeneous in feature space, unlike the pixel space in images. Therefore, no single method is expected to perform the best across all tabular data sets consistently. Previous studies reveal that machine and deep learning classification performance significantly varies across tabular data structures and statistics [22]. Similarly, data-specific performance patterns are observed with imputation methods. Despite superior performance, attention learning yields worse imputation accuracy on several data sets than traditional imputation methods. These data sets are with IDs 187, 1049, 1050, and 40982.

Traditional imputation methods, including KNN and MICE, are the most accurate in imputing the data set with ID 187. DSAN also shares several of the best imputation scenarios for the data set with ID 187. This data set has the lowest sample size (178) among the twelve data sets used in this study. Deep learning generally expects large sample sizes, which may perform worse on limited sample data than traditional learning methods. On the other hand, the missForest method is the best for MCAR and MAR data sets with IDs 1049 and 1050 when attention learning methods underperform substantially. However, the proposed attention learning ranks the best on these data sets with MNAR values. Both data sets are hard to classify and have similar sample sizes and feature dimensionality. One aspect of these two data sets is the presence of features with large values and very high standard deviations, unlike other data sets. The data set with ID 40982 is best imputed by missForest when data are of MCAR or MAR types. However, the same data set with the MNAR type is best imputed by DSAN. Attention-based learning performs worse on these three hard-to-classify data sets with IDs 1049, 1050, and 40982. These three have the highest number of features among the hard-to-classify data sets. Therefore, imputing tabular data with a large number of features can pose a challenge in computing between-feature attention.

5.3 Resilience to high missing rates

Deep imputation methods often use benchmark data with low to moderate missing rates, up to 30% [25, 26]. The benefit of imputing missing values may diminish at low missing rates. Moreover, real data sets like electronic health records (EHR) can have very high missing rates for potentially important predictor variables. For example, the second most important predictor of all-cause mortality in [27] has values missing for more than 50% samples. Therefore, imputation resilient to high missing rates is valuable in optimizing data quality and utility. Our post-analysis reveals mixed effects of increasing missing rates from 10% to 50% on NRMSE scores. The median value imputation appears to be the least sensitive to the increase in missing values despite being one of the worst imputation approaches. Among the competitive methods, DSAN is the least sensitive to high missing rates for MCAR and MAR-type data, followed by proposed attention-based imputation methods. For MNAR-type data, MIDASpy is the least sensitive overall, possibly because of its superior performance on easy data sets with MNAR.

5.4 Attention and deep learning in imputation

The DeepIFSA method combines between-feature and between-sample attention in a contrastive learning framework. Including contrastive learning has improved the overall performance compared to between-feature-sample attention without contrastive learning. Contrastive learning may have improved data representation and reconstruction through its data augmentation mechanism. The CutMix [28] data augmentation in contrastive learning also aids in randomizing missing values during model training to yield robust imputation on set-aside test data. A previous study [35] uses both CutMix [28] and MixUp [36] methods to randomize missing values without contrastive learning. However, the CutMix method alone in the DeepIFSA method, within its native contrastive learning, most effectively benefits from missing value randomization and contrastive data representation. Therefore, CutMix is proven to be an effective step in missing value estimation instead of masking and filling with zeros [16, 25].

On the other hand, deep denoising autoencoder (DDA) is a data reconstruction strategy commonly used in missing value imputations. MIDASpy has used DDA within the multiple imputations and shown imputation performance worse than median value imputation in this paper. The MIDASpy method is an improved version of MIDA [18], which has been reported to yield exploding NRMSE scores on specific data sets in [26] similar to our findings. The MIDASpy authors report the model performance on the training data set without using a set-aside test data fold. Therefore, separate train and test data folds are imperative to demonstrate the generalizability of imputation methods similar to classification algorithms.

5.5 Limitations

Despite superior performance against state-of-the-art methods, the proposed attention-learning method has some limitations. The model is not designed to impute missing values of categorical features; hence, its performance is limited to numeric features only. It is well known that deep learning methods require large sample sizes. The proposed deep-IFSA underperforms when the sample size is limited (< 200) when traditional imputation methods are better choices. The effectiveness of between-feature attention can be challenged by data sets with many features of highly variable scales.

6 Conclusions

This paper combines between-feature and between-sample attention to attend to rows and columns of tabular data for imputing missing values in tabular data. The CutMix data augmentation method within its native contrastive learning improves the imputation accuracy of the combined between-feature-sample attention learning. The proposed imputation algorithm is effective across varying missing value types and rates and against state-of-the-art methods. The superiority of the proposed imputation method is also reflected in the classification performance of imputed data from real electronic health records. Despite superior performance rank, a data-set-specific consideration is still needed to identify the most effective imputation method considering the heterogeneity of tabular data sets.

References

- [1] M. Kazijevs, M. D. Samad, Deep imputation of missing values in time series health data: A review with benchmarking, *Journal of biomedical informatics* 144 (2023) 104440. doi:10.1016/j.jbi.2023.104440.
- [2] L. Grinsztajn, E. Oyallon, G. Varoquaux, Why do tree-based models still outperform deep learning on typical tabular data?, in: *Thirty-sixth Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems Datasets and Benchmarks Track*, 2022.
URL https://openreview.net/forum?id=Fp7__phQszn
- [3] V. Borisov, T. Leemann, K. Seßler, J. Haug, M. Pawelczyk, G. Kasneci, Deep neural networks and tabular data: A survey, *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems* (2022).
- [4] A. Kadra, M. Lindauer, F. Hutter, J. Grabocka, Well-tuned simple nets excel on tabular datasets, *Advances in neural information processing systems* 34 (2021) 23928–23941.
- [5] Y. Gorishniy, I. Rubachev, V. Khruikov, A. Babenko, Revisiting deep learning models for tabular data, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 23 (2021) 18932–18943.
- [6] Y.-L. He, J.-Y. Yu, X. Li, P. Fournier-Viger, J. Z. Huang, A novel and efficient risk minimisation-based missing value imputation algorithm, *Knowledge-Based Systems* 304 (2024) 112435. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.knosys.2024.112435>.
URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0950705124010694>
- [7] M. D. Samad, S. Abrar, N. Diawara, Missing value estimation using clustering and deep learning within multiple imputation framework, *Knowledge-based systems* 249 (2022) 108968.
- [8] M. Resche-Rigon, I. R. White, Multiple imputation by chained equations for systematically and sporadically missing multilevel data, *Statistical methods in medical research* 27 (6) (2018) 1634.
- [9] D. J. Stekhoven, P. Bühlmann, Missforest—non-parametric missing value imputation for mixed-type data, *Bioinformatics* 28 (2012) 112–118.
- [10] D. Bertsimas, C. Pawlowski, Y. D. Zhuo, From predictive methods to missing data imputation: an optimization approach, *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 18 (196) (2018) 1–39.
- [11] T. Emmanuel, T. Maupong, D. Mpoeleng, T. Semong, B. Mphago, O. Tabona, A survey on missing data in machine learning, *Journal of Big data* 8 (2021) 1–37.
- [12] M. Mera-Gaona, U. Neumann, R. Vargas-Canas, D. M. López, Evaluating the impact of multivariate imputation by mice in feature selection, *Plos one* 16 (7) (2021) e0254720.
- [13] S. O. Arik, T. Pfister, Tabnet: Attentive interpretable tabular learning, *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence* (2021) 6679–6687.
URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1908.07442>
- [14] J. Chen, J. Yan, D. Z. Chen, J. Wu, Excelformer: A neural network surpassing gbdt on tabular data, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.02819* (1 2023).
URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2301.02819>
- [15] Y. Ouyang, L. Xie, C. Li, G. Cheng, Missdiff: Training diffusion models on tabular data with missing values, in: *ICML 2023 Workshop on Structured Probabilistic Inference & Generative Modeling*, 2023.
URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=S435pkeAdT>

- [16] R. Lall, T. Robinson, The midas touch: Accurate and scalable missing-data imputation with deep learning, *Political Analysis* 30 (2) (2022) 179–196. doi:10.1017/pan.2020.49.
- [17] A. Liguori, R. Markovic, M. Ferrando, J. Frisch, F. Causone, C. van Treeck, Augmenting energy time-series for data-efficient imputation of missing values, *Applied Energy* 334 (2023) 120701.
- [18] L. Gondara, K. Wang, MIDA: Multiple imputation using denoising autoencoders, in: *Lecture Notes in Computer Science (including subseries Lecture Notes in Artificial Intelligence and Lecture Notes in Bioinformatics)*, Vol. 10939 LNAI, Springer Verlag, 2018, pp. 260–272. arXiv:1705.02737, doi:10.1007/978-3-319-93040-4_21.
- [19] L. Zhao, Z. Chen, Z. Yang, Y. Hu, M. S. Obaidat, Local similarity imputation based on fast clustering for incomplete data in cyber-physical systems, *IEEE Systems Journal* 12 (2018) 1610–1620.
- [20] N. Jaques, S. Taylor, A. Sano, R. W. Picard, Multimodal autoencoder: A deep learning approach to filling in missing sensor data and enabling better mood prediction, 2017 Seventh International Conference on Affective Computing and Intelligent Interaction (ACII) (2017) 202–208.
URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:1551101>
- [21] A. Nazábal, P. M. Olmos, Z. Ghahramani, I. Valera, Handling incomplete heterogeneous data using vaes, *ArXiv abs/1807.03653* (2018).
URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:49671188>
- [22] S. B. Rabbani, I. V. Medri, M. D. Samad, Attention versus contrastive learning of tabular data – a data-centric benchmarking, *International Journal of Data Science and Analytics*In press (2024). arXiv:2401.04266.
- [23] G. Somepalli, A. Schwarzschild, M. Goldblum, C. B. Bruss, T. Goldstein, Saint: Improved neural networks for tabular data via row attention and contrastive pre-training, in: *NeurIPS 2022 First Table Representation Workshop*, 2022.
- [24] J. Kossen, N. Band, C. Lyle, A. N. Gomez, T. Rainforth, Y. Gal, Self-attention between datapoints: Going beyond individual input-output pairs in deep learning, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 34 (2021) 28742–28756.
- [25] D.-H. Lee, H.-j. Kim, A self-attention-based imputation technique for enhancing tabular data quality, *Data* 8 (6) (2023) 102.
- [26] R. Wu, A. Zhang, I. Ilyas, T. Rekatsinas, Attention-based learning for missing data imputation in holoclean, *Proceedings of Machine Learning and Systems* 2 (2020) 307–325.
- [27] M. D. Samad, A. Ulloa, G. J. Wehner, L. Jing, D. Hartzel, C. W. Good, B. A. Williams, C. M. Haggerty, B. K. Fornwalt, Predicting survival from large echocardiography and electronic health record datasets: Optimization with machine learning, *JACC: Cardiovascular Imaging* 12 (2019) 681–689. doi:10.1016/j.jcmg.2018.04.026.
- [28] S. Yun, D. Han, S. J. Oh, S. Chun, J. Choe, Y. Yoo, Cutmix: Regularization strategy to train strong classifiers with localizable features, in: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*, 2019, pp. 6023–6032.
- [29] J. Vanschoren, J. N. van Rijn, B. Bischl, L. Torgo, Openml: networked science in machine learning, *SIGKDD Explorations* 15 (2) (2013) 49–60. doi:10.1145/2641190.2641198.
- [30] A. Vaswani, N. Shazeer, N. Parmar, J. Uszkoreit, L. Jones, A. N. Gomez, Ł. Kaiser, I. Polosukhin, Attention is all you need, *Advances in neural information processing systems* 30 (2017).
- [31] K. He, X. Zhang, S. Ren, J. Sun, Deep residual learning for image recognition, in: *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2016, pp. 770–778.
- [32] X. Huang, A. Khetan, M. Cvitkovic, Z. Karnin, Tabtransformer: Tabular data modeling using contextual embeddings, In: *Workshop on weakly supervised learning (WeaSuL 2021)*. ICLR (2021).
URL <https://weasul.github.io/papers/7.pdf>

- [33] T. Chen, S. Kornblith, M. Norouzi, G. Hinton, A simple framework for contrastive learning of visual representations, in: H. D. III, A. Singh (Eds.), Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Machine Learning, Vol. 119 of Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, PMLR, 2020, pp. 1597–1607.
URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v119/chen20j.html>
- [34] A. of Us Research Program Investigators, J. C. Denny, J. L. Rutter, D. B. Goldstein, A. Philippakis, J. W. Smoller, G. Jenkins, E. Dishman, The "all of us" research program, *New England Journal of Medicine* 381 (2019) 668–676. doi:10.1056/NEJMs1809937.
- [35] I. Kowsar, S. B. Rabbani, M. D. Samad, Attention-based imputation of missing values in electronic health records tabular data, in: The 12th IEEE International Conference on Healthcare Informatics (ICHI), 2024.
- [36] H. Zhang, M. Cisse, Y. N. Dauphin, D. Lopez-Paz, mixup: Beyond empirical risk minimization, in: International Conference on Learning Representations, 2018.
URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=r1Ddp1-Rb>