

---

# Robust time series generation via Schrödinger Bridge: a comprehensive evaluation

---

Alexandre ALOUADI<sup>1</sup> Baptiste BARREAU<sup>2</sup> Laurent CARLIER<sup>2</sup> Huyên PHAM<sup>3</sup>

## Abstract

We investigate the generative capabilities of the Schrödinger Bridge (SB) approach for time series. The SB framework formulates time series synthesis as an entropic optimal interpolation transport problem between a reference probability measure on path space and a target joint distribution. This results in a stochastic differential equation over a finite horizon that accurately captures the temporal dynamics of the target time series. While the SB approach has been largely explored in fields like image generation, there is a scarcity of studies for its application to time series. In this work, we bridge this gap by conducting a comprehensive evaluation of the SB method’s robustness and generative performance. We benchmark it against state-of-the-art (SOTA) time series generation methods across diverse datasets, assessing its strengths, limitations, and capacity to model complex temporal dependencies. Our results offer valuable insights into the SB framework’s potential as a versatile and robust tool for time series generation.

## 1. Introduction

Generative modeling has emerged as a powerful tool for data synthesis, with a wide range of applications in various domains, including static image processing, natural language generation, and time series modeling. The core objective of generative modeling is to learn a probabilistic representation of the underlying data distribution, enabling the generation of synthetic samples that are indistinguishable from real data. Recent advances in this field have produced a variety of competing methods, each offering

distinct strengths and limitations.

One prominent class of generative models is likelihood-based models, which learn the target distribution by optimizing the negative log-likelihood or its surrogate loss. Variational Auto-Encoders (VAEs) (Kingma and Welling, 2014) and flow-based methods (Dinh et al., 2015) are notable examples offering explicit density estimation and tractable likelihoods. While these models have demonstrated success in learning flexible distributions, they often struggle to represent complex data structures due to architectural constraints (Makhzani et al., 2016; Razavi et al., 2019; Tolstikhin et al., 2018; Papamakarios et al., 2017; Kingma and Dhariwal, 2018; Behrmann et al., 2019).

In contrast, implicit generative models, such as Generative Adversarial Networks (GANs) (Goodfellow et al., 2014), learn to generate data by optimizing a min-max game between a generator and a discriminator. GANs have produced state-of-the-art results in applications like image-to-image translation and audio synthesis. However, they are notorious for training instabilities, leading to challenges like mode collapse and vanishing gradients. Considerable efforts have been made to improve GAN stability and performance (Karras et al., 2018; Brock et al., 2019).

For time series generation, specialized GAN architectures have been proposed, leveraging convolutional neural networks (CNNs) (Wiese et al., 2020) and optimal transport frameworks (Xu et al., 2020), leading to promising but still limited results (Yoon et al., 2019).

Diffusion models have recently gained significant traction as a compelling alternative to GANs. These models, including Score-Based Generative Models (SGMs) (Song and Ermon, 2019) and Denoising Diffusion Probabilistic Models (DDPMs) (Ho et al., 2020), approach generative modeling through iterative denoising. They add noise to data through a diffusion process and then learn to reverse this process, often using stochastic differential equations (SDEs) (Song et al., 2021; Tang and Zhao, 2024). SGMs utilize Langevin dynamics and neural networks, while DDPMs use Markov chains to iteratively refine noisy inputs. Diffusion models have achieved remarkable results in image synthesis and have been extended to time series generation, capturing complex temporal dynamics (Rasul et al., 2021; Lim et al.,

---

<sup>1</sup>BNP PARIBAS CIB, Global Markets, Data & AI Lab and École Polytechnique, France <sup>2</sup>BNP PARIBAS CIB, Global Markets, Data & AI Lab, France <sup>3</sup>École Polytechnique, France. Correspondence to: Alexandre ALOUADI <alexandre.alouadi@bnpparibas.com>, Huyên PHAM <huyen.pham@polytechnique.edu>.

2024; 2023; Naiman et al., 2024).

In the specific context of time series generation, maintaining the temporal structure and statistical properties of the original data is crucial. Effective generative models must not only produce realistic individual time series but also preserve population-level characteristics, such as marginal distributions and functional dependencies across time steps. To this end, novel frameworks like the Schrödinger Bridge (SB) approach (Wang et al., 2021; De Bortoli et al., 2021), for image generation and (Hamdouche et al., 2023) for time series have been introduced. The SB framework formulates generative modeling as an entropic optimal transport problem, bridging a reference probability measure on path space with a target joint distribution. This results in a stochastic differential equation that inherently captures the temporal dynamics of time series data.

Despite its theoretical appeal, the SB approach remains underexplored in the time series domain, with limited empirical validation and no standardized benchmarks in the literature.

**Our Contributions.** To address this gap, we conduct a comprehensive evaluation of the Schrödinger Bridge method for time series generation. Specifically, we:

- Benchmark the SB approach against state-of-the-art (SOTA) generative models for time series using their established metrics.
- Introduce new evaluation metrics to better assess the quality and robustness of generated time series, focusing on temporal dependencies and statistical fidelity.
- Perform extensive numerical experiments across diverse time series datasets to analyze the strengths and limitations of the SB framework in comparison to existing methods.

This study provides the first systematic evaluation of the Schrödinger Bridge approach for time series generation, offering valuable insights into its practical utility and potential for future applications.

## 2. Background

### 2.1. Classical Schrödinger Bridge problem

We recap the formulation of the classical The Schrödinger Bridge problem (SBP) for two marginals constraints, see (Leonard, 2014), (Chen et al., 2021).

We denote by  $\Omega = C([0, T], \mathbb{R}^d)$  the space of continuous  $\mathbb{R}^d$ -valued paths on  $[0, T]$ ,  $T < \infty$ ,  $X = (X_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$  the canonical process, i.e.  $X_t(\omega) = \omega_t$ ,  $\omega = (\omega_s)_{s \in [0, T]} \in \Omega$ . Let  $\mathcal{P}(\Omega)$  be the set of probability measures on path space

$\Omega$ . For  $\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}(\Omega)$ ,  $\mathbb{P}_t = X_t \# \mathbb{P} = \mathbb{P} \circ X_t^{-1}$ , is the marginal law of  $X_t$ . In other words,  $\mathbb{P}_t$  is the law of the particle at time  $t$ , when the law of the whole trajectory is  $\mathbb{P}$ .

Let  $\mu_0$  and  $\mu_T$  two probability measures on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , and  $\mathbb{Q}$  be a prior/reference measure on  $\Omega$ , which represents the belief of the dynamics before data observation, e.g., the law of Wiener process with initial measure  $\nu_0$ .

The **SBP** can be formulated as follow: Find a measure  $\mathbb{P}^*$  on path space  $\mathcal{P}(\Omega)$  such that

$$\mathbb{P}^* \in \arg \min_{\mathbb{P}} \{ \text{KL}(\mathbb{P} | \mathbb{Q}) : \mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}(\Omega), \mathbb{P}_0 = \mu_0, \mathbb{P}_T = \mu_T \},$$

where  $\text{KL}(\mathbb{P} | \mathbb{Q}) := \int \log \left( \frac{d\mathbb{P}}{d\mathbb{Q}} \right) d\mathbb{P}$  if  $\mathbb{P} \ll \mathbb{Q}$ , else  $\infty$ , is the Kullback-Leibler divergence (or relative entropy) between two nonnegative measures.

Introducing  $\mathbb{P}_{0,T} = \mathbb{P} \circ (X_0, X_T)^{-1}$  the joint initial-terminal law of  $(X_0, X_T)$  under  $\mathbb{P}$ , we then have  $\mathbb{P}[\cdot] = \int \mathbb{P}[\cdot]^{xy} \mathbb{P}_{0,T}(dx, dy)$  with  $\mathbb{P}[\cdot]^{xy} = \mathbb{P}[\cdot | (X_0, X_T) = (x, y)]$ , and similarly for  $\mathbb{Q}, \mathbb{Q}^{xy}$  and  $\mathbb{Q}_{0,T}$ . Now using that  $\text{KL}(\mathbb{P} | \mathbb{Q}) = \text{KL}(\mathbb{P}_{0,T} | \mathbb{Q}_{0,T}) + \iint \text{KL}(\mathbb{P}^{xy} | \mathbb{Q}^{xy}) \mathbb{P}_{0,T}(dx, dy)$ , one can reduce the **SBP** to a static SB by minimizing :

$$\text{KL}(\pi | \mathbb{Q}_{0,T}) = \iint \log \left( \frac{d\pi}{d\mathbb{Q}_{0,T}}(x, y) \right) (dx, dy)$$

over the couplings  $\pi \in \Pi(\mu_0, \mu_T) = \{ \pi \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d), \pi_0 = \mu_0, \pi_T = \mu_T \}$ .

The solution of the dynamic **SBP** is then given by  $\mathbb{P}^* = \int \mathbb{Q}^{xy} \pi^*(dx, dy)$ , where  $\pi^*$  is solution to the static **SBP**.

Let us now consider the case where  $\mathbb{Q} = \mathbb{W}^\sigma$  the Wiener measure of variance  $\sigma^2$ , i.e., the law of the process  $X_t = X_0 + \sigma W_t, 0 \leq t \leq T, X_0 \sim \nu_0$ , with  $W$  a Brownian motion. If  $\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}(\Omega)$  such that  $\text{KL}(\mathbb{P} | \mathbb{W}^\sigma) < \infty$ , there exists an  $\mathbb{R}^d$ -valued process  $\alpha$ , adapted w.r.t  $\mathbb{F}$  the canonical filtration, with  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}} \left[ \int_0^T \left| \frac{\alpha_t}{\sigma} \right|^2 dt \right] < \infty$  such that

$$\frac{d\mathbb{P}}{d\mathbb{W}^\sigma} = \frac{d\mathbb{P}_0}{d\nu_0} \exp \left( \int_0^T \frac{\alpha_t}{\sigma} dW_t^{\mathbb{P}} + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T \left\| \frac{\alpha_t}{\sigma} \right\|^2 dt \right)$$

and by Girsanov's theorem, under  $\mathbb{P}$ ,  $dX_t = \alpha_t dt + \sigma dW_t^{\mathbb{P}}, 0 \leq t \leq T$  with  $W^{\mathbb{P}}$  a Brownian motion under  $\mathbb{P}$ . At the end, we have  $\text{KL}(\mathbb{P} | \mathbb{W}^\sigma) = \text{KL}(\mathbb{P}_0 | \nu_0) + \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}} \left[ \int_0^T \left| \frac{\alpha_t}{\sigma} \right|^2 dt \right]$ . We then can reformulate the **SBP** problem as a stochastic control problem over the drift  $\alpha$  as follows:

$$\min_{\alpha} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}} \left[ \int_0^T \left\| \frac{\alpha_t}{\sigma} \right\|^2 dt \right] \quad (1)$$

such that  $dX_t = \alpha_t dt + \sigma dW_t^{\mathbb{P}}, X_0 \sim \mu_0, X_T \sim \mu_T$ .

## 2.2. Schrödinger Bridge problem for time series

We now formulate Schrödinger Bridge problem for time series introduced in (Hamdouche et al., 2023). Let  $\mu$  be the distribution of a time series valued in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  of which we can observe samples over a discrete time grid  $T = \{t_1, \dots, t_N = T\}$ . We want to construct a model capable of generating time series samples that follow the distribution  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}((\mathbb{R}^d)^N)$  given real observations.

The **SBP** (1) for time series generation, noted Schrödinger Bridge Time Series (**SBTS**) is formulated as follows:

$$\min_{\alpha} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}} \left[ \int_0^T \left\| \frac{\alpha_t}{\sigma} \right\|^2 dt \right] \quad (2)$$

such that  $dX_t = \alpha_t dt + \sigma dW_t^{\mathbb{P}}$  with  $W$  a Brownian motion under  $\mathbb{P}$ ,  $X_0 = \mathbf{0}$ ,  $(X_{t_1}, \dots, X_{t_N}) \stackrel{\mathbb{P}}{\sim} \mu$ .

**Theorem 1** (Hamdouche et al., 2023) *The diffusion process  $X_t = \int_0^t \alpha_s^* ds + \sigma W_t$ ,  $0 \leq t \leq T$ , with  $\alpha^*$  defined as*

$$\alpha_t^* = a^*(t, X_t; \mathbf{X}_{\eta(t)}), \quad 0 \leq t < T,$$

*solves the SBTS problem (2), with  $\eta(t) = \max\{t_i : t_i \leq t\}$ ,  $a^*(t, x; \mathbf{x}_i)$ , for  $t \in [t_i, t_{i+1}[$ ,  $\mathbf{x}_i = (x_1, \dots, x_i) \in (\mathbb{R}^d)^i$ ,  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , given by*

$$a^*(t, x; \mathbf{x}_i) = C_t^i \frac{\mathbb{E}_{\mu} [(X_{t_{i+1}} - x) F_i(t, X_{t_i}, x, X_{t_{i+1}}) | \mathbf{X}_{t_i} = \mathbf{x}_i]}{\mathbb{E}_{\mu} [F_i(t, X_{t_i}, x, X_{t_{i+1}}) | \mathbf{X}_{t_i} = \mathbf{x}_i]} \quad (3)$$

where

$$F_i(t, x_i, x, x_{i+1}) = \exp \left\{ -\frac{\|x_{i+1} - x\|^2}{2\sigma^2(t_{i+1} - t)} + \frac{\|x_{i+1} - x_i\|^2}{2\sigma^2(t_{i+1} - t_i)} \right\}$$

$$\text{and } C_t^i = \frac{1}{\sigma^2(t_{i+1} - t)}.$$

To estimate the drift, one can employ a kernel density estimation method using  $M$  data samples  $\mathbf{X}_{t_N}^m = (X_{t_1}^m, \dots, X_{t_N}^m)$ ,  $m = 1, \dots, M$ :

$$\hat{a}(t, x; \mathbf{x}_i) = C_t^i \frac{\sum_{m=1}^M (X_{t_{i+1}}^{(m)} - x) F_i(t, X_{t_i}^{(m)}, x, X_{t_{i+1}}^{(m)}) \tilde{K}_i^m}{\sum_{m=1}^M F_i(t, X_{t_i}^{(m)}, x, X_{t_{i+1}}^{(m)}) \tilde{K}_i^m} \quad (4)$$

with  $\tilde{K}_i^m = \prod_{j=1}^i K_h(x_j - X_{t_j}^{(m)})$  for  $t \in [t_i, t_{i+1}[$ ,  $\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $i \in \{1, \dots, N-1\}$  and  $K_h$  a kernel function, defined here as  $K_h(x) = \frac{1}{h^d} (1 - \|\frac{x}{h}\|^2)^2 \mathbb{1}_{\|x\| < h}$  with bandwidth  $h > 0$ . We emphasize that this approach does not necessitate any pre-training. The methodology is straightforward, as it involves the incremental construction of a sample, leveraging a deterministic drift estimate.

## 3. Bandwidth selection and long series generation

The choice of the bandwidth  $h$  is critical for our generated data. On one hand, if  $h$  is too small, the estimation will be too rough, capturing noise and leading to high variance. On the other hand, if  $h$  is too large, the estimation introduces a high bias and may fail to adapt to changes in the data. There have been many studies in the literature over the bandwidth selection. The most popular ones are rule-of-thumb and cross-validation methods (Turlach, 1999), but we found these approaches not useful for our problem.




Figure 1. Generation of a Markovian GARCH model of order 2 (see Appendix A), with  $h = 0.02$  (left) and  $h = 0.2$  (right). We can clearly see the affect of a too small  $h$ , here 0.02, as the left plot exhibits undesirable behavior, whereas the right one displays the desired outcome.

We then propose a simple approach to select the bandwidth, by considering it as a hyper-parameter to fine-tune. Given a train set  $X = (X_{t_1}^m, \dots, X_{t_N}^m)_{m=1, \dots, M}$ , a test set  $Y = (Y_{t_1}^q, \dots, Y_{t_N}^q)_{q=1, \dots, Q}$ , both from real data, and a list of bandwidths  $H = \{h_1, \dots, h_K\}$ , we generate  $L$  realizations of  $\hat{Y}_{t_N}^q$  given the first real values of the series  $(Y_{t_1}^q, \dots, Y_{t_{N-1}}^q)$  for each  $q$ , using (4). Then, we choose  $h^* \in H$  such that it minimizes

$$MSE_h = \frac{1}{Q} \sum_{q=1}^Q \left| \frac{1}{L} \sum_{l=1}^L \hat{Y}_{t_N}^{q,l} - Y_{t_N}^q \right|^2 \quad (5)$$

with  $\hat{Y}_{t_N}^{q,l}$  the  $l$ -th generated realizations of  $\hat{Y}_{t_N}^q$  given  $(Y_{t_1}^q, \dots, Y_{t_{N-1}}^q)$ .

Moreover, for long time series, it is most likely that  $\tilde{K}_i^m$  becomes null when  $i$  is large enough for each  $m$ , because of the condition  $\mathbb{1}_{\|x_j - X_{t_j}\| < h}$ . In that case, the drift cannot be properly estimated and so the generated sample. One solution would be to increase  $h$ , which doesn't seem optimal since  $h$  should be as small as possible, due to the bias-variance trade-off. To address this issue, one may assume the series to be Markovian of order  $k$ , and use only  $(X_{t_j}^m, x_{t_j})_{j=i-k+1, \dots, i}$ ,  $m = 1, \dots, M$  to generate  $x_{t_{i+1}}$ , replacing  $\tilde{K}_i^m = \prod_{j=1}^i K_h(x_j - X_{t_j}^{(m)})$  by  $\tilde{K}_{k,i}^m = \prod_{j=i-k+1}^i K_h(x_j - X_{t_j}^{(m)})$

We can select the parameter  $k$  the same way as  $h$  in parallel, as described in Algorithm 1.

---

**Algorithm 1**  $h$  and  $k$  selection pseudo-code
 

---

**Input:** Train set  $X$ , Test set  $Y$ , list  $H$  and  $K$   
 Initialize  $k^*, h^*, MSE_{min} = 0, 0, \infty$   
**for**  $h$  in  $H$  **do**  
   **for**  $k$  in  $K$  **do**  
     compute  $MSE_{(h,k)}$  using (5)  
     **if**  $MSE_{(h,k)} < MSE_{min}$  **then**  
        $k^*, h^* = k, h$   
        $MSE_{min} = MSE_{(h,k)}$   
     **end if**  
**end for**  
**end for**  
**return**  $k^*, h^*$

---




Figure 2. Bandwidth selection for GARCH data defined as in Appendix A and Apple close daily return of length 252, using different values of  $k$ . For both time series, we see that a larger  $h$  is needed when using the whole time series ( $k = 252$ ). Otherwise, a smaller  $h$  is sufficient, and the markovianity even improved the  $MSE$  for GARCH data, as it is really Markovian.

Note that for multivariate time series, it is possible to employ feature-specific bandwidths, as the scale and magnitude of each feature may vary. In that case, we should replace the previous kernel  $K_h(x) = \frac{1}{h^d} (1 - \|\frac{x}{h}\|^2)^2 \mathbb{1}_{\|x\| < h}$  by  $K_h(x) = \prod_{k=1}^d \frac{1}{h_k} (1 - |\frac{x_k}{h_k}|^2)^2 \mathbb{1}_{|x_k| < h_k}$  with  $d$  the time series dimension.

## 4. SBTS vs SOTA

In this section, we compare our model with SOTA approaches across multiple datasets. We analyze the performance of our method relative to the results obtained on these datasets to evaluate its effectiveness and robustness.

### 4.1. Datasets

We performed our tests using three real-world and two toy datasets, all multivariate:

- **Stock**, consisting in Google daily historical data from

2004 to 2019, including 6 features: high, low, opening, closing, adjusted closing prices and volume.

- **Energy**, noisy energy consumption data from the UCI repository including 28 features, e.g., temperature or wind speed.
- **Air**, containing gas sensor readings and reference concentrations from an Italian city, averaged hourly including 13 features.
- **Sine**, sine wave data of dimension 5, as defined in (Yoon et al., 2019)
- **AR**, auto-regressive Gaussian model of dimension 5, as defined in (Yoon et al., 2019), with parameters  $\phi = 0.5$  and  $\sigma = 0.8$ .

For this experiment, we used time series of length 24, in line with SOTA methods. For more details on the definition of the Sine and AR datasets, refer to Appendix A.

## 4.2. Metrics

We will refer in that section to two widely used metrics. **1) Discriminative score:** (Yoon et al., 2019) a classifier is trained to output the probability of a given sequence being real. Then, we compute the accuracy on an equally composed test set of both real and synthetic data. We aim to minimize the following discriminative score:  $score = |acc - 0.5|$  where  $acc$  is the accuracy on the test set. Note that we target an accuracy close to 0.5, as it indicates that the classifier is unable to distinguish between real and synthetic data, effectively resorting to random guessing. **2) Predictive score:** (Yoon et al., 2019) a model is trained on synthetic data only, to predict the next data point in a given time series, and test on real data only. We aim to minimize the global mean absolute error, which measures the average difference between predicted and actual values.

See Appendix B for more details on implementation of these metrics.

## 4.3. Results

Table 1 shows that SBTS outperforms most SOTA models, including those based on GAN approaches. However, SBTS either performs similarly to TSGM models (Lim et al., 2024), which are diffusion-based models for time series or outperforms it depending on the dataset. Furthermore, we obtain similar results for the toy dataset, as shown in table 2. However, it is worth mentioning that the SBTS approach is faster - a couple of hours at most to generate all the previous samples - and requires no hyperparameter fine-tuning, except for  $h$ , and  $k$  if the series is long.

Note that our method requires stationary time series data, which we achieved - if needed - by transforming the data into log returns for simulation, and then converting them back on

	Dataset	Stocks	Energy	Air
Disc. score	TSGM-VP	.022±.005	.221±.025	.122±.014
	TSGM-subVP	.021±.008	<b>.198±.025</b>	.127±.010
	T-Forcing	.226±.035	.483±.004	.404±.020
	P-Forcing	.257±.026	.412±.006	.484±.007
	TimeGAN	.102±.031	.236±.012	.447±.017
	RCGAN	.196±.027	.336±.017	.459±.104
	C-RNN-GAN	.399±.028	.499±.001	.499±.000
	TimeVAE	.175±.031	.498±.006	.381±.037
	WaveGAN	.217±.022	.363±.012	.491±.013
	COT-GAN	.285±.030	.498±.000	.423±.001
	SBTS	<b>.010 ± .008</b>	.356 ± .020	<b>.036 ± .016</b>
Pred. score	TSGM-VP	.037±.000	.257±.000	<b>.005±.000</b>
	TSGM-subVP	.037±.000	.252±.000	<b>.005±.000</b>
	T-Forcing	.038±.001	.315±.005	.008±.000
	P-Forcing	.043±.001	.303±.006	.021±.000
	TimeGAN	.038±.001	.273±.004	.017±.004
	RCGAN	.040±.001	.292±.005	.043±.000
	C-RNN-GAN	.038±.000	.483±.005	.111±.000
	TimeVAE	.042±.002	.268±.004	.013±.002
	WaveGAN	.041±.001	.307±.007	.009±.000
	COT-GAN	.044±.000	.260±.000	.024±.001
	SBTS	<b>.017 ± .000</b>	<b>.072 ± .001</b>	<b>.005 ± .001</b>

Table 1. Comparative results on a real-world dataset, highlighting discriminative and predictive scores. The highest scores are denoted in bold.




Figure 3. Comparison with original data (left) and SBTS (right) of the **Stock** data on base one scale. A random subset is selected and visualized. The plot displays the volume as brown, with the remaining features represented by distinct colors.

base one scale (see more details in Appendix D). However, SOTA models generate data that are normalized using min-max scaling, therefore, we also applied min-max scaling to our data to ensure a comparable scale while computing the scores.

## 5. Additional robustness test

### 5.1. Framework

To evaluate the robustness of our generative model, we designed an experimental framework involving the simulation of parametric stochastic processes and the estimation of their underlying parameters from both real-world data and synthetic data generated by the model. For each real-world sample, we employed a uniform sampling strategy to

	Dataset	Sine	AR	
Disc. score	T-Forcing	.495±.001	.500±.000	
	P-Forcing	.430±.027	.472±.008	
	TimeGAN	<b>.011±.008</b>	.174±.012	
	RCGAN	.022±.008	.190±.011	
	C-RNN-GAN	.229±.040	.227±.017	
	WaveNet	.158±.011	.235±.009	
	WaveGAN	.277±.013	.213±.013	
	SBTS	.061 ± .010	<b>.034 ± .003</b>	
	Pred. score	T-Forcing	.150±.022	.732±.012
		P-Forcing	.116±.004	.571±.005
		TimeGAN	<b>.093±.019</b>	.412±.002
RCGAN		.097±.001	.435±.002	
C-RNN-GAN		.127±.004	.490±.005	
WaveNet		.117±.008	.508±.003	
WaveGAN		.134±.013	.489±.001	
SBTS		.095 ± .002	<b>.092 ± .007</b>	

Table 2. Comparative results on a toy dataset, highlighting discriminative and predictive scores. The highest scores are denoted in bold.




Figure 4. Comparison with original data (left) and SBTS of the AR data (right). A random subset is selected and visualized.

randomly select parameters from a predefined range. The primary objective of this assessment is to determine whether the model can effectively capture “a distribution of distributions”. The distributions of estimated parameters obtained from real-world and simulated data. To infer the parameters, we utilize the Maximum Likelihood Estimation (MLE) method (detailed below). Specifically, we investigated two well-established stochastic processes:

- **Ornstein-Uhlenbeck Process:** This process is defined as :

$$dX_t = \theta(\mu - X_t)dt + \sigma dW_t$$

where  $\theta > 0, \sigma > 0, \mu$  are the parameters and  $W_t$  a Brownian motion. It is well-known that  $X_{t+\Delta t}|X_t \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_t, \sigma_t^2)$  with

$$\begin{cases} \mu_t = X_t e^{-\theta \Delta t} + \mu(1 - e^{-\theta \Delta t}) \\ \sigma_t^2 = \frac{\sigma^2}{2\theta} (1 - e^{-2\theta \Delta t}) \end{cases}$$

To generate sample, one can use the following discretization:

$$X_{t+\Delta t} = \mu_t + \sigma_t \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$$

Then, for each sample, the negative log-likelihood to minimize is :  $\mathcal{L}_m(\theta, \mu, \sigma; X^m) = -\sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \left[ -\frac{1}{2} \log(2\pi\sigma_{t_i}^2) - \frac{(X_{t_{i+1}}^m - \mu_{t_i}^m)^2}{2\sigma_{t_i}^2} \right]$ , for  $m = 1, \dots, M$ , where  $\mu_{t_i}^m$  and  $\sigma_{t_i}^2$  refer to the mean and the variance of the  $m$ -th sample.

- **Heston Process:** This 2-dimensional process is defined as :

$$\begin{cases} dX_t = rX_t dt + \sqrt{v_t} X_t dW_t^X \\ dv_t = \kappa(\theta - v_t) dt + \xi \sqrt{v_t} dW_t^v \end{cases}$$

where  $\kappa > 0, \theta > 0, \xi > 0, r, \rho = \text{Cor}(W_t^X, W_t^v) \in [-1, 1]$  are the parameters. Using Itô's lemma, one can show that

$$X_{t+\Delta t} = X_t \exp \left( \int_t^{t+\Delta t} \left( r - \frac{v_u}{2} \right) du + \int_t^{t+\Delta t} \sqrt{v_u} dW_u^X \right)$$

However, for a small  $\Delta t$ , one can assume that

$$\int_t^{t+\Delta t} \left( r - \frac{v_u}{2} \right) du \simeq \left( r - \frac{v_t}{2} \right) \Delta t,$$

as well as

$$\int_t^{t+\Delta t} \sqrt{v_u} dW_u^X \simeq \sqrt{v_t} (W_{t+\Delta t} - W_t).$$

Using that  $(W_{t+\Delta t} - W_t) \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Delta t)$ , we can define  $Y_t$  such that

$$Y_t = \begin{pmatrix} \log \left( \frac{X_{t+\Delta t}}{X_t} \right) \\ v_{t+\Delta t} - v_t \end{pmatrix} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_t, \Sigma_t).$$

with

$$\mu_t = \begin{pmatrix} \mu_t^X \\ \mu_t^v \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \left( r - \frac{1}{2} v_t \right) \Delta t \\ \kappa(\theta - v_t) \Delta t \end{pmatrix}$$

and

$$\Sigma_t = \begin{pmatrix} v_t \Delta t & \rho \xi v_t \Delta t \\ \rho \xi v_t \Delta t & \xi^2 v_t \Delta t \end{pmatrix}.$$

Now, we can use the following discretization, similarly to the previous case:

$$\begin{cases} X_{t+\Delta t} = X_t \exp \left( \mu_t^X + \sqrt{v_t \Delta t} Z_1 \right) \\ v_{t+\Delta t} = v_t + \mu_t^v + \xi \sqrt{v_t \Delta t} Z_2 \end{cases}$$

with  $(Z_1, Z_2) \sim \mathcal{N} \left( \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \rho \\ \rho & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right)$ ,

and minimize the following negative log-likelihood:  $\mathcal{L}_m(\kappa, \theta, r, \rho, \xi; \{X^m, v^m\}) = -\sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \left[ -\frac{1}{2} \log(4\pi^2 |\Sigma_{t_i}^m|) - \frac{1}{2} (Z_{t_i}^m)^\top (\Sigma_{t_i}^m)^{-1} Z_{t_i}^m \right]$ , for  $m = 1, \dots, M$ , with  $Z_t = (Y_t - \mu_t)$  and  $|\Sigma_t| = \det(\Sigma_t)$ .

## 5.2. Results

In all our experiments, we generated 1000 time series of length 252 for the Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process and 100 for Heston, both with  $\Delta t_i = \frac{1}{252}$ , after performing bandwidth and Markovian order selection, as discussed in section 3. To mitigate the impact of outliers, we present the results for the parameters within the 1<sup>th</sup> and 99<sup>th</sup> percentile range, thereby providing a more robust representation of the data distribution in the plots. We denote by *Data* the real data samples, *SBTS* the synthetic data generated using SBTS, and *Real* the range from which we randomly select the parameters for each data sample. Additional information can be found in Appendix C.




Figure 5. Distribution of estimated Ornstein-Uhlenbeck parameters using MLE. We show in orange, blue and green the density respectively from the SBTS samples, data samples, and real range.




Figure 6. Distribution of estimated Heston parameters using MLE. We show in orange, blue and green the density respectively from the SBTS samples, data samples, and real range.

For the Ornstein-Uhlenbeck data, our results show that the

estimated parameters are remarkably consistent between the real and synthetic data, with similar distributions observed for both.

Regarding the Heston model, it yields similar results for  $\kappa$ ,  $\theta$  and  $r$  that were consistent between real and synthetic data, while the estimated parameters  $\xi$  and  $\rho$  showed significant discrepancies. For the latter ones, SBTS exhibits a notable discrepancy, with the synthetic data yielding a Gaussian distribution with lower variance centered around the midpoint of the range used for random sampling. This suggests that the generative model tends to produce an averaged value for  $\sigma$ , rather than capturing the full range of variability present in the real data. These findings indicate that SBTS may be less effective at capturing the nuances of volatility-related parameters, and highlights the need for further refinement to improve the robustness of our model. This can be attributed to the inherent assumption of constant variance in our generative model, which is not a valid assumption for Heston processes that exhibit stochastic variance.

We repeated the experiment but using the same fixed parameters for each sample, rather than randomly sampling from a given range. Notably, this approach yielded consistent results between the real and synthetic data for all parameters, including the volatility-related ones (see Appendix C). This reinforces the idea that SBTS is capable of accurately capturing the underlying dynamics when the parameters are fixed and consistent with the real data.

## 6. Conclusion

In this study, we have demonstrated the effectiveness of the SBTS approach in generating high-quality time series data. Our results show that SBTS consistently outperforms GAN approaches and achieves performance comparable to state-of-the-art diffusion models. A key advantage of SBTS lies in its simplicity - it requires no pre-training, involves minimal parameter tuning, and enables fast data generation without requiring significant computational power, making it an appealing choice for time series synthesis across various domains.

Despite these strengths, we have also identified certain limitations of the SBTS framework. First, the kernel-based approach used to approximate the drift is highly sensitive to the choice of kernel bandwidth, which can hinder performance, especially when generating long time series. However, we have shown that introducing an assumption of finite Markovianity order effectively mitigates this issue without compromising the quality of the generated data. Second, the current SBTS model assumes constant variance, which may be insufficient for accurately modeling time series with stochastic volatility, a common feature in financial data. Addressing this limitation is the focus of our ongoing work,

where we are actively enhancing the SBTS framework by integrating stochastic variance, making it more powerful in capturing the complexity of real-world time series.

## 7. Acknowledgments

This work is a collaborative effort between BNP Paribas CIB and École Polytechnique, and supported by the Chair “Futures of Quantitative Finance”.

## References

- Kingma, D. P. and Welling, M. Auto-encoding variational bayes. *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2014.
- Dinh, L., Krueger, D., and Bengio, Y. NICE: Non-linear independent components estimation. *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2015.
- Makhzani, A., Shlens, J., Jaitly, N., Goodfellow, I., and Frey, B. Adversarial autoencoders. *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2016.
- Razavi, A., van den Oord, A., and Vinyals, O. Generating diverse high-fidelity images with VQ-VAE-2. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2019.
- Tolstikhin, I., Bousquet, O., Gelly, S., and Schoelkopf, B. Wasserstein auto-encoders. *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2018.
- Papamakarios, G., Pavlakou, T., and Murray, I. Masked autoregressive flow for density estimation. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2017.
- Kingma, D. P. and Dhariwal, P. Glow: Generative flow with invertible 1x1 convolutions. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2018.
- Behrmann, J., Grathwohl, W., Chen, R. T. Q., Duvenaud, D., and Jacobsen, J.-H. Invertible residual networks. *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, 2019.
- Goodfellow, I. J., Pouget-Abadie, J., Mirza, M., Xu, B., Warde-Farley, D., Ozair, S., Courville, A., and Bengio, Y. Generative adversarial networks. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2014.
- Karras, T., Aila, T., Laine, S., and Lehtinen, J. Progressive growing of GANs for improved quality, stability, and variation. *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2018.
- Brock, A., Donahue, J., and Simonyan, K. Large scale GAN training for high fidelity natural image synthesis.

- International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2019.
- Yoon, J., Jarrett, D., and van der Schaar, M. Time-series generative adversarial networks. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2019.
- Wiese, M., Knobloch, R., Korn, R., and Kretschmer, P. Quant GANs: deep generation of financial time series. *Quantitative Finance*, 20(9):1419–1440, 2020.
- Turlach, B. Bandwidth selection in kernel density estimation: A review. *Technical Report*, 1999.
- Chen, Y., Georgiou, T., and Pavon, M. Stochastic control liaisons: Richard Sinkhorn meets Gaspard Monge on a Schrödinger bridge. *SIAM Review*, 63(2), 2021.
- Léonard, C. A survey of the Schrödinger problem and some of its connections with optimal transport. *Discrete Continuous and Dynamical Systems*, 2014.
- Xu, T., Wenliang, L. K., Munn, M., and Acciaio, B. COT-GAN: Generating Sequential Data via Causal Optimal Transport. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2020.
- Song, Y. and Ermon, S. Generative Modeling by Estimating Gradients of the Data Distribution. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2019.
- Ho, J., Jain, A., and Abbeel, P. Denoising Diffusion Probabilistic Models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2020.
- Rasul, K., Seward, C., Schuster, I., and Vollgraf, R. Autoregressive Denoising Diffusion Models for Multivariate Probabilistic Time Series Forecasting. *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, 2021.
- Lim, H., Kim, M., Park, S., Lee, J., and Park, N. TSGM: Regular and Irregular Time-series Generation using Score-based Generative Models. 2024.
- Lim, H., Kim, M., Park, S., and Park, N. Regular Time-series Generation using SGM. *Advancement of Artificial Intelligence (AAAI)*, 2023.
- Naiman, I., Berman, N., Pemper, I., Arbiv, I., Fadlon, G., and Azencot, O. Utilizing Image Transforms and Diffusion Models for Generative Modeling of Short and Long Time Series. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2024.
- Song, Y., Sohl-Dickstein, J., Kingma, D. P., Kumar, A., Ermon, S., and Poole, B. Score-Based Generative Modeling through Stochastic Differential Equations. *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2021.
- Tang, W. and Zhao, H. Score-based Diffusion Models via Stochastic Differential Equations – a Technical Tutorial. 2024.
- Wang, G., Jiao, Y., Xu, Q., Wang, Y., and Yang, C. Deep Generative Learning via Schrödinger Bridge. *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, 2021.
- De Bortoli, V., Thornton, J., Heng, J., and Doucet, A. Diffusion Schrödinger Bridge with Applications to Score-based Generative Modeling. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2021.
- Hamdouche, M., Henry-Labordere, P., and Pham, H. Generative Modeling for Time Series via Schrödinger Bridge. 2023.
- Chen, Y., Georgiou, T., and Pavon, M. Stochastic Control Liaisons: Richard Sinkhorn Meets Gaspard Monge on a Schrödinger Bridge. *SIAM Review*, 63(2), 2021.
- Léonard, C. A Survey of the Schrödinger Problem and Some of Its Connections with Optimal Transport. *Discrete Continuous and Dynamical Systems*, 2014.



## A. Dataset

We provide a detailed description of the toy dataset used in this study:

- **GARCH:** In Figure 1 and 2, we used the same GARCH model as defined in (Hamdouche et al., 2023) :

$$\begin{cases} X_{t_{i+1}} = \sigma_{t_{i+1}} \epsilon_{t_{i+1}} \\ \sigma_{t_{i+1}}^2 = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 X_{t_i}^2 + \alpha_2 X_{t_{i-1}}^2 \end{cases} \quad \text{with } \alpha_0 = 5, \alpha_1 = 0.4, \alpha_2 = 0.1, \text{ and } \epsilon_{t_i} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 0.1), i = 1, \dots, N \text{ are i.i.d.}$$

- **Sine:** As defined in (Yoon et al., 2019), we simulate multivariate sinusoidal sequences of different frequencies  $\theta$  and phases  $\theta$ , providing continuous-valued, periodic, multivariate data where each feature is independent of others. For each dimension  $i \in \{1, \dots, 5\}$ ,  $x_i(t) = \sin(2\pi\eta t + \theta)$ , where  $\eta \sim \mathcal{U}[0, 1]$  and  $\theta \sim \mathcal{U}[-\pi, \pi]$ .
- **AR:** As defined in (Yoon et al., 2019), we simulate autoregressive multivariate Gaussian models such that  $x_t = \phi x_{t-1} + Z$ ,  $Z \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \sigma \mathbf{1} + (1 - \sigma)\mathbf{I})$ . We used  $\phi = 0.5$ ,  $\sigma = 0.8$ ,  $x_0 = 0$ .

Moreover, it is noteworthy that for the dataset presented in Table 2, we first generated the log returns for both Stocks and Air before inverting them back to their base one scale, while we applied a standard normalization for Energy, as it proved to be more effective in our experiments.

## B. Discriminative and Predictive score

In order to ensure comparable results, we employed the exact same code to compute both the discriminative and predictive scores, as detailed in (Yoon et al., 2019). For both metrics, we utilized a unidirectional GRU network. The discriminative score was computed on the inverted data in base one scale, whereas the predictive score was computed on these data after applying min-max scaling to ensure consistency with SOTA methods.

The predictive score is computed by training a GRU network on the first  $d - 1$  features from  $t_1$  to  $t_{N-1}$  to predict the  $d$ -th feature at time steps  $t_2$  to  $t_N$ , with the mean absolute error (MAE) evaluated over the entire predicted sequence. This approach leverages the assumption that if the generative model is well-trained, the first  $d - 1$  features contain meaningful information about the  $d$ -th feature due to inherent correlations, allowing for its accurate prediction. The model is trained exclusively on synthetic data and evaluated on real data.

For both scores, the GRU was trained on 3,000 synthetic samples and an equal number of randomly selected real samples. The training was conducted over 2,000 epochs with a batch size of 128. The hidden dimension was set to 4 for the discriminative score and to  $\max(\frac{d}{2}, 1)$  for the predictive score, while the number of layers was set to 2 and 1, respectively.

To assess performance, we compared SBTS with GAN-based and diffusion-based models. For each dataset, we performed the test 10 times and report the mean score along with the standard deviation, calculated over these 10 test runs. Additionally, we incorporated SOTA results from existing papers to ensure a fair comparison and contextualize our findings within the broader literature.

## C. Robustness test

We present in figures 7 and 8 the distribution of the estimated parameters when they are fixed for all samples.

In addition, we present in tables 3 and 4 the parameter settings we employed in our experiments

	$\theta$	$\mu$	$\sigma$
Range	[0.5, 2.5]	[0.5, 1.5]	[0.1, 0.5]
Fix	1.5	1.0	0.3

Table 3. Parameters used for Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process




Figure 7. Distribution of estimated Ornstein-Uhlenbeck parameters using MLE for fixed parameters. The orange and blue densities correspond to the SBTS samples and data samples, respectively, while the black line represents the true parameter.

	$\kappa$	$\theta$	$\xi$	$\rho$	$r$
Range	[0.5, 4]	[0.02, 0.1]	[0.01, 0.9]	[-0.9, 0.9]	[0.01, 0.3]
Fix	3.0	0.02	0.7	0.7	0.02

Table 4. Parameters used for Heston process

Finally, we set the time step size to  $h = 0.6$  for the Ornstein-Uhlenbeck time series of length 252 and  $h = 0.4$  for the Heston time series of length 100, both with  $N^\pi = 200$ , the Euler time steps between  $t_i$  and  $t_{i+1}$  and  $k = 1$ . The time required to generate 1000 samples was 659 seconds and 548 seconds, respectively, using Numba acceleration packages.

## D. Scaling Procedure in Our Experiments

In this section, we discuss the scaling strategy employed in our experiments. Given the SDE governing our process:

$$dX_t = \alpha_t^* dt + \sigma dW_t^\mathbb{P},$$

with  $\alpha^*$  defined in (3), the theoretical variance of this process is expected to be  $\sigma^2 \Delta t$ . However, we observe that for  $\sigma \neq 1$ , the model struggles to accurately match the data distribution. Consequently, we set  $\sigma = 1$  throughout this work. This result was somewhat unexpected, given that the model successfully generates data with volatility different from the expected one. This behavior can be attributed to the expression of  $\alpha^*$  in equation (3), which acts as a corrective term adjusting the path's volatility if it deviates significantly from the expected level.

Two key terms contribute to this effect:  $\exp\left(-\frac{\|x_{i+1}-x\|^2}{2\sigma^2(t_{i+1}-t)}\right)$  and the indicator function in  $\tilde{K}_i^m$ . Furthermore, if the time series is not stationary, for instance when using raw prices instead of log-returns, the second term  $\exp\left(\frac{\|x_{i+1}-x_i\|^2}{2\sigma^2(t_{i+1}-t_i)}\right)$  in the function  $F_i$ , would have a negligible weight, as  $\|x_{i+1} - x_i\| \simeq 0$  for small  $\Delta t$ .

When the variance of the observed data significantly deviates from  $\sigma^2 \Delta t$ , the drift term  $\alpha_t^*$  is unable to properly correct the volatility of the generated paths, as illustrated in figure 9.

To address this issue, one possible approach would be to reduce  $\Delta t$  significantly. However, this is not an optimal solution, as it introduces an additional hyperparameter and may distort the actual temporal frequency of the data. Instead, a more appropriate solution consists of rescaling the log-returns  $R$  as follows:

$$\tilde{R}_{t_1:t_N} = R_{t_1:t_N} \times \frac{\sqrt{\Delta t}}{\sigma(R_{t_1:t_N})},$$




Figure 8. Distribution of estimated Heston parameters using MLE for fixed parameters. The orange and blue densities correspond to the SBTS samples and data samples, respectively, while the black line represents the true parameters.

where  $R_{t_1:t_N} = (R_{t_1}, \dots, R_{t_N}) \in (\mathbb{R}^d)^N$  and  $\sigma(R_{t_1:t_N}) \in \mathbb{R}^d$  denotes the empirical standard deviation of the data. To recover the original scale, one simply needs to multiply the generated log-returns by  $\frac{\sigma(R_{t_1:t_N})}{\sqrt{\Delta t}}$ .

This transformation ensures that the variance of the scaled increments matches the theoretical variance of the process, thereby improving the stability and performance of the model in generating realistic paths.




Figure 9. Generation of an Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process with  $\sigma = 0.001, \theta = \mu = 1$ . The unscaled SBTS model (middle) fails to accurately capture the true variance of the process, whereas the scaled SBTS model (right) successfully reproduces the expected variability. We used here  $\Delta t = \frac{1}{252}, h = 0.2$  and  $k = 1$ .