

Methods for generating and evaluating synthetic longitudinal patient data: a systematic review

Katariina Perkonoja¹, Kari Auranen¹, Joni Virta¹

Abstract

Background: The increase in data volume in recent years has advanced the utilization of various statistical and machine learning techniques, thus expediting research and development activities. Not all industries, however, have benefited equally from the surge in data availability, partly due to legal restrictions on data usage and privacy regulations, with medicine being a prominent example. To address this issue, various statistical disclosure and privacy-preserving methods have been proposed, including the use of synthetic data generation. Synthetic data are generated based on some existing data, with the aim of replicating them as closely as possible and acting as a proxy for real sensitive data. Patient data are often longitudinal in nature, yet this aspect remains underrepresented in the existing reviews concerning synthetic data generation in the medical field.

Objective: The objective of this paper is to map and describe existing methods for generating and evaluating synthetic longitudinal patient data in real-life settings.

Methods: We conducted a systematic review following the PRISMA guidelines, incorporating data from five databases until the end of 2022.

Results: Seventeen distinct methods were identified, ranging from traditional simulation techniques to modern deep learning methods. Fourteen studies (82%) compared resemblance and ten studies (59%) assessed utility between the synthetic and original data. Privacy was addressed in eight studies (47%). Six studies (35%) evaluated all three aspects.

Conclusions: None of the 17 methods were found to address all challenges related to longitudinal data generation simultaneously, underscoring the need for ongoing methodological research. The heterogeneity in evaluation approaches observed across the studies poses a significant challenge to meaningful comparisons between methods and their real-world applicability. While standardized evaluation criteria could enhance method assessment, it is crucial to acknowledge the importance of tailored approaches for different applications and datasets. Additionally, transparent documentation and source code accessibility are essential for method dissemination. Lastly, addressing privacy concerns in synthetic data requires collaboration among method developers, medical practitioners, and legislators, with empirical support and practical feasibility in mind.

Keywords: Data privacy, Longitudinal patient data, Statistical disclosure control, Synthetic data generation, Privacy-preserving data publishing

¹ University of Turku, Department of Mathematics and Statistics

Corresponding author:

Katariina Perkonoja, Department of Mathematics and Statistics, 20014 University of Turku, Finland

1 Introduction

The recent surge in data volumes has greatly facilitated research, development, and innovation (RDI) activities. Yet, some sectors, particularly medicine, still face challenges in harnessing existing data sources due to stringent data protection regulations. Sensitive and confidential medical records fall under various international and national legislations, such as the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR)[1] or the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA)[2]. Compliance with these policies typically leads to prolonged data processing times and, in certain cases, restricted access. For instance, while the national regulation in Finland permits using identifiable individual-level data for research, their use in development and innovation activities remain prohibited [3].

If patient data are deemed sufficiently anonymous, they fall outside the rules of personal data protection, streamlining data access and sharing. Synthetic data generation (SDG) offers a promising approach to achieve such anonymity. The goal of SDG is to produce artificial data that resemble real-world observations, referred to as original or input data, while maintaining adequate utility and resemblance with the input. Here, resemblance refers to the level of equivalence between synthetic and original data distributions, while utility pertains to the extent the analyses and predictions based on the synthesized data align with those from the original data. The two concepts are partially overlapping as good resemblance typically implies high utility. However, while synthetic data often maintain high utility through resembling the original data, a perfect match is not required. For instance, a classification model may perform well in synthetic data even when the two distributions do not fully agree, as long as specific data structures are preserved.

In the context of statistical disclosure control (SDC) [4] and privacy-preserving data publishing (PPDP) [5], the third goal of SDG is to achieve privacy, i.e., to avoid releasing personal information. Originally proposed by Rubin [6] in 1993, SDG has gained prominence in enhancing data protection and expediting RDI activities. However, concerns regarding the sufficiency of mere random data generation for privacy preservation have prompted exploration of more effective privacy-preserving techniques [7–9]. Beyond privacy, SDG offers value in model testing and data augmentation, where privacy concerns might be less pertinent and the emphasis is on providing sufficiently realistic data.

1.1 Rationale

Previous reviews [9–14] on synthetic data generation in healthcare have primarily focused on Generative Adversarial Networks (GANs) [15] or have not explored the specific challenges posed by generation of longitudinal data although this gap has been acknowledged [13]. Yet, longitudinal data (LD) which accumulate over time during patient treatment and follow-up, are a common form of health data. LD contain at least one variable measured for each subject at two or more time points [16]. These measurements can be collected at the same time points for all subjects, constituting *balanced* data. Alternatively, the time points or the numbers of measurements may vary across subjects, resulting in *unbalanced* data. These subject-specific repeated measurements create a distinct dependency structure, absent in standard cross-

sectional data at a single time point [16]. At the same time, LD pose specific requirements for data modeling and analysis. Typically, repeatedly measured variables are regarded as response variables (outputs), while other variables are treated as covariates (inputs), with the goal of modeling the relationship between the covariates and the evolution of the response in time. Figure 1 depicts the defining characteristics of longitudinal data.




Figure 1. Illustration of key characteristics and different forms of longitudinal data. Subfigure (a) shows balanced (subjects have identical visit sequences), and subfigure (b) shows unbalanced (differing visit sequences) longitudinal data in long format (multiple rows per subject). The third subfigure (c) illustrates the same data as in (a) but in wide format (single row per subject). The main difference to another common tabular data type, cross-sectional data, are precisely these repeatedly measured variables from the same subjects over time. These repeated measurements create a unique temporal structure that is essential to preserve when generating synthetic data. Moreover, missing data (NA), measurement errors (176 in (a)), and dropouts (second row in (b)) are common issues encountered in longitudinal data and can impede synthetic data generation.

In this review, we categorize longitudinal datasets into three categories. If the data takes the form presented in Figure 1, wherein the variables naturally divide into covariates (e.g., sex, age) and responses (e.g., albumin, QoL), we call them “standard longitudinal data”. Alternatively, when the data solely comprise repeated measurements without static covariates, we call them “trajectory data”. As an example, a trajectory dataset may encompass a series of diagnostic codes per visit, alongside additional repeated measurements linked to each visit. Finally, if there is only one repeatedly measured variable type, such as disease codes, we call the data “sequence data”. This trichotomy is later used when categorizing different methods of longitudinal SD based on their input data type.

Longitudinal data are not the only type of time-dependent data. Other data types akin to LD are time series and survival data. Unlike time series, characterized by frequent equi-spaced repeated measurements [17], LD consist of numerous independent realizations of relatively short subject-specific series of observations [16]. The key difference between longitudinal and

survival (time-to-event) data lies in their distinct conceptualizations of time. In LD, time is treated as fixed index [16], whereas in survival data time is random and inherently of interest [18].

Another related data type, electronic health records (EHRs), integrates unbalanced longitudinal data alongside other data types such as imaging, time series (signals), survival, and omics data, making them multimodal. As the focus in this review is on longitudinal data, we categorize EHRs based on the characteristics of their longitudinal component, employing the previously outlined trichotomy.

When generating synthetic LD, neglecting the longitudinal aspects of data may lead to flawed generative models characterized by logical inconsistencies, such as treating repeated within-subject measurements as independent entities. Consequently, additional research is warranted to identify appropriate techniques for generating synthetic longitudinal patient data that are reliable and of sufficient quality to be used in real-life settings. Such methods could be directly offered to data controllers to facilitate the use of patient data in different RDI activities while safeguarding patient privacy. This systematic literature review aims to address this need and complies with the PRISMA [19] guidelines as applicable.

1.2 Objectives

The primary objective of this systematic review is to map and describe existing methods for generating synthetic longitudinal patient data in real-life settings.

The research questions under the primary objective are:

- RQ1. What methods are currently available for generating synthetic longitudinal patient data?
- RQ2. How do these methods address the key characteristics of longitudinal data, including temporal structure, balance, different variable types, and missing values?
- RQ3. How were these methods evaluated in terms of resemblance, utility, and privacy preservation?

The secondary objective is to evaluate the comprehensiveness of reporting in the identified literature to provide insights to method developers about areas requiring further research. Comparing the identified methods in practice is beyond the scope of this review but presents an intriguing prospect for future research.

The rest of the article is organized as follows: Section 2 outlines the review's methodology, Section 3 presents the findings of individual studies and their synthesis. Section 4 concludes the article by offering general interpretations of the results, addressing limitations and discussing practical implications.

2 Materials and methods

2.1 Eligibility criteria

Table 1 presents the eligibility criteria used to select the pertinent literature to address the research questions RQ1–3.

Table 1. Eligibility criteria. The following criteria were used to select relevant literature from the search results.

Criterion	Description	Examples of exclusions
Includes synthetic data generation	Synthetic data are generated via a randomized algorithm using an existing dataset (i.e., original or input dataset) with the goal of closely mimicking the original data distribution and with the ability to generate unlimited number of synthetic samples.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Deterministic algorithm, e.g., rule-based• Algorithm based naively on standard probability distributions• Data simulation, i.e., data are generated from theoretical models
Longitudinal input data	The input dataset includes at least one repeatedly measured variable and the authors address this longitudinal aspect.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Not longitudinal data• Longitudinal data altered so that the temporal structure is lost, e.g., through aggregation• Variables included “incidentally” without explicitly considering repeated measurements or temporal correlation
Data comparability	In case the input data are not patient data, variables in the original dataset should be comparable to those found generally in longitudinal patient data.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Data not comparable to longitudinal patient data
Data sharing capability	Method should support data sharing and generate fully synthetic data which is void of the original confidential data.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Publication focuses on data augmentation
Privacy-preserving techniques	Consideration for privacy-preserving techniques in SDG is optional.	
Non-open-source and commercial methods	Literature involving non-open-source and commercially licensed methods are included.	
Language	English	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Language other than English
Publication types	Peer-reviewed journals and proceedings as well as pre-prints, books, book chapters and reviews.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Other than listed in Description

2.2 Information sources

We searched EMBASE (1947 to Nov 22, 2022), MEDLINE (Ovid interface, 1946 to Nov 22, 2022), Web of Science (1900 to Nov 22, 2022) and Google Scholar (Publish or Perish software [20], first 1000 hits on June 18, 2021), and arXiv (open-source metadata [21] on Nov 22, 2022). These databases were chosen because they have been found to provide the best coverage [22]. To discover the latest, yet unpublished methods, we included arXiv.

2.3 Search strategy

Literature search strategies (Supplemental Material A) were developed using topic (title, abstract, keywords) and text words related to synthetic longitudinal patient data. The strategy was reviewed by a review team member who was not involved in its development, using the PRESS standard [23]. To ensure that the review was up to date, the search was conducted twice (Jun/2021, Nov/2022).

2.4 Selection process

After removing duplicates using EndNote Online [24], the results were uploaded to Rayyan [25]. Subsequently, the review authors (KP and JV) independently screened the titles and abstracts against the eligibility criteria using a specific screening chart (Supplemental Material B.1). Any remaining duplicates were removed by KP. Full texts, referred to as studies or publications, were procured for records that met the eligibility criteria or exhibited any uncertainty in eligibility. Inaccessible publications were excluded.

Subsequently, the potential publications were independently screened by KP and JV against the eligibility criteria using a specific full-text screening chart (Supplemental Material B.2). Disagreements were resolved through discussion and, if necessary, a third-party arbitration (KA) was consulted. The reasons for exclusion were documented.

2.5 Data items and collection

KP collected and managed data from the eligible publications using a structured form (Supplemental Material C) within the REDCap electronic data capturing tools hosted at the University of Turku [26,27]. In unclear situations, KP consulted the authors and their webpages to make sure that all relevant data were captured. For quality control, JV and KA conducted spot checks on the data collection process. Unavailable or unclear information was recorded as missing, and in cases of uncertainty, KP consulted JV and KA.

2.6 Risk of bias and reporting quality assessment

In adherence to the PRISMA guidelines [19], a systematic review is expected to consider and assess potential biases present in the studies that are included. Due to the absence of a specific evaluation framework in our context of a methodological review, we applied the existing guidelines from the Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions [28]. We considered events such as favoring data subsets for better results (selection bias), omission of results (reporting bias), and ambiguity in model performance assessment (performance bias). The detailed assessment framework is presented in Supplemental Material D.1.

Reporting quality was assessed by examining inconsistency, imprecision, or indirectness of reporting, drawing inspiration from the Grading of Recommendations, Assessment, Development and Evaluations (GRADE) framework [29]. Furthermore, KP collected data related to disclosed conflicts of interest, peer-review status, and the comprehensiveness of detailing the training process employed in SDG.

KP assessed the risk of bias and the reporting quality, sharing the findings with JV and KA to obtain mutual agreement. Nevertheless, it should be noted that despite the utilization of a structured framework, the assessment of bias risk and reporting quality inherently encompasses subjectivity, a recognized characteristic even within the established frameworks [30].

2.7 Methods to address research questions

To address RQ1, we compiled a concise overview encompassing all SDG methods that were predominantly applied in the eligible publications, subsequently referred to as the primary methods (Section 3.4). This summary lists the fundamental operational principles, approaches for modeling longitudinal data and potential limitations for all primary methods. In addition, we recorded all SDG methods that were utilized for comparing and benchmarking against the primary methods, later referred to as the reference methods.

To address RQ2, we generated a comprehensive table delineating the capabilities of the primary methods in processing and generating unbalanced data or mixed-type variables, handling missing observations, and the necessity of expert knowledge (Section 3.4). Here, expert knowledge refers to highly context-specific information, necessary to be able to use the method, such as choosing realistic generation sequences or variable distributions, and goes beyond the basic functionalities, such as training a neural network or a machine learning model.

To address RQ3, we constructed summary figures and tables that outline the utilized datasets, measures of resemblance, assessments of utility, and considerations of privacy (Section 3.5). In addition, to gain insight into the broader evaluation framework, we examined whether each evaluation task was conducted using a single or multiple independently generated synthetic datasets, and whether the evaluation of the quality of synthetic data was conducted in relation to the original data or in comparison to other datasets or methods.

In accordance with the secondary objective, we categorized the research objectives of the eligible publications (Section 3.2), classified utilized methods and LD types (Section 3.4) and assessed bias and reporting quality (Section 3.3). Finally, we discussed our findings in relation to the existing literature to identify prospective areas for future research (Section 4).

3 Results

3.1 Study selection

The search initially identified 8 943 publications. After removing 2 027 duplicates, 6 916 studies underwent title and abstract screening, leading to selection of 377 publications for full-text screening. Nine studies were unattainable, leaving 368 studies for evaluation against the eligibility criteria (Section 2.1). Altogether 15 of the 368 studies met our criteria and were included at this stage.

To augment the search, KP examined all references in the 15 included studies. This process identified 22 potential publications, of which two were deemed eligible and incorporated in the review. Ultimately, 17 eligible studies were included in the review. Figure 2 illustrates the study selection process according to the PRISMA guidelines [19]. Examples of each exclusion category are provided in Supplemental Material E.




Figure 2. PRISMA flow diagram. The diagram illustrates the study selection process according to the PRISMA guidelines; pds: probability distributions.

3.2 Study characteristics

The 17 included studies (Table 1) were published between 2016 and 2022, with seven studies in 2022. The predominant research objective in the studies was privacy-preserving data publishing (41%). Additionally, five (29%) of the studies emphasized data publishing but did not employ privacy-preserving techniques or privacy evaluation for synthetic data. As per the SCImago Journal & Country Rank [31], the most common publication fields were medicine (35%) and computer science (35%).

Table 2. Summary of the included publications. The table provides a summary of the 17 publications included in the systematic literature review. The publications are presented in descending order of publication year and sorted alphabetically by author name. The table includes information about the type of report, the field based on SCImago Journal & Country Rank, and the objective of each publication as interpreted by the review authors.

Authors	Journal	Type	Field	Objective	Year
Li et al. [32]	arXiv	Preprint	Multidisciplinary	PPDP	2023*
Bhanot et al. [33]	Neurocomputing	Journal article	Computer science Neuroscience	Resemblance quantification	2022
Kuo et al. [34]	Scientific Data	Journal article	Computer science Decision science Mathematics Social Sciences	PPDP	2022
Lu et al. [35]	arXiv	Preprint	Multidisciplinary	(PP)DP	2022
Wang et al. [36]	BMC Medical Informatics and Decision Making	Journal article	Computer science Medicine	Modeling	2022
Wendland et al. [37]	npj Digital Medicine	Journal article	Computer science Health professions Medicine	(PP)DP	2022
Yu, He & Raghunathan [38]	Journal of Survey Statistics and Methodology	Journal article	Decision sciences Mathematics Social sciences	PPDP	2022
Zhang, Yan & Malin [39]	Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association	Journal article	Medicine	Framework development	2022
Biswal et al. [40]	Proceedings of Machine Learning Research: Machine Learning for Healthcare	Conference paper	Computer science and technology Computing Data processing	PPDP	2021
Zhang et al. [41]	Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association	Journal article	Medicine	PPDP	2021
Goofjes-Dreesbach et al. [42]	Frontiers in Big Data	Journal article	Computer science	PPDP	2020
Sood et al. [43]	Scientific Reports	Journal article	Multidisciplinary	(PP)DP	2020
Beaulieu-Jones et al. [44]	Circulation: Cardiovascular Quality and Outcomes	Journal article	Medicine	PPDP	2019

Fisher et al. [45]	Scientific Reports	Journal article	Multidisciplinary	Modeling	2019
Barrientos et al. [46]	The Annals of Applied Statistics	Journal article	Decision sciences Mathematics	PPDP	2018
Walonoski et al. [47]	Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association	Journal article	Medicine	(PP)DP	2018
Raab, Nowok & Dibben [48]	Journal of Privacy and Confidentiality	Journal article	Computer science Mathematics	(PP)DP	2016

PPDP: privacy-preserving data publishing; (PP)DP: data publishing without considering data privacy; *The initial arXiv pre-print (Dec 22, 2021) was found during the search, but a newer version discovered during data collection was included in the review.

3.3 Risk of bias and reporting quality

There was no indication of selection bias in the included studies. However, five (29%) studies had potential risk of performance bias, and a risk of reporting bias was observed in nine publications (53%). Details regarding these assessments are available in Supplemental Material D.2.

Inconsistency of reporting was observed in one study, imprecision in six (35%) publications, and three studies (18%) showed evidence of indirect reporting (see details in Supplemental Material D.3).

In three studies (18%) the documentation of the training processes was only partially provided and seven (41%) publications lacked such descriptions altogether. Among the included publications, only two (12%) were not peer reviewed. Conflict of interest was declared in four (24%) publications, whereas this information was absent in six (35%) publications.

3.4 SDG methods for longitudinal patient data

We identified a total of 33 SDG methods, comprising 17 primary and 16 reference methods. Detailed descriptions of each primary method are provided in Supplemental Material F and a summary of the reference methods is provided in Supplemental Material G. Figure 3 illustrates our classification of all identified methods according to their key operating principles while Table 3 details the key characteristics of the primary methods.




Figure 3 Classification of the identified SDG methods. The identified 17 primary methods (black) and 16 reference methods (grey) were classified into five different groups: autoencoders (AEs), Bayesian Networks (BNs), Ensembles (methods that combine three or more machine or deep learning models to generate SD), Generative Adversarial Networks (GANs) and Other methods (those not fitting into the aforementioned categories).

Information of the method's ability to generate unbalanced data was available for four primary methods (24%), two of which were capable of the task. Two primary methods (12%) demonstrated proficiency in generating missing observations by learning their distribution from the input data. In contrast, five methods (29%) imputed missing observations in the original data before generating SD.

All primary methods could generate categorical variables, but some methods required encoding of these variables into indicator variables prior to SDG. Additionally, some methods were restricted in that they generate specific categorical variables, e.g., sequences of diagnosis codes. Of the 17 primary methods, 11 (65%) could generate numerical, often continuous, variables. The implementation of six (35%) primary methods required expert knowledge.

Source codes were available for 11 primary methods (65%), with two (12%) available in another publication and two upon request. Pseudocodes were given for three methods (18%), one of which was provided in a cited publication. Both the source and pseudocodes were inaccessible for four methods (24%). Python was the most common programming language (47%), followed by R (35%), and the programming language for four primary methods (24%) was unverifiable. System requirements were detailed in four studies (24%).

Table 3. Summary of the 17 identified primary synthetic longitudinal data generation methods. The table presents each method and its type, the type of longitudinal SD generated, the ability to generate unbalanced and missing data, and categorical and continuous variables (✓ Yes, X No, ? Missing). In addition, the table indicates whether the method requires expert knowledge, the availability of source and pseudocode (reference in parenthesis if not the original publication), as well as the programming language employed. The last column lists all the publications included in this review, including the original publication, where the method was applied.

Method	Type	Data type	Unbalanced data	Missing data	Categorical variables	Numerical variables	Expert knowledge	Source / pseudocode	Programming language	Applied in
AC-GAN	GAN	Standard	?	X	✓	✓	X	✓ / X	Python	[44]
EHR-M-GAN	GAN	Trajectory	?	X	✓	✓	X	✓ / ✓	Python	[32]
HealthGAN	GAN	Standard	?	X	✓	✓	X	✓ [49] / X	Python	[33]
Health Gym GAN	GAN	Standard	?	X	✓	✓	X	✓ / X	Python	[34]
MTGAN	GAN	Sequence	?	X	✓	X	X	✓ / ✓	Python	[35]
EVA	AE	Sequence	✓	X	✓	X	X	X / X	?	[40]
MBN	AE + BN	Standard	X	X*	✓	✓	✓	✓** / X	R	[43]
VAMBN	AE + BN	Standard	?	X*	✓	✓	✓	✓ / X	Python + R	[37,42]
GMB model	BN	Sequence	✓	X	✓	X	✓	X / ✓ [50]	Python	[36]
LS-EHR	Ensemble	Sequence	?	X	✓	X	X	X / X	?	[39]
MultiNODEs	Ensemble	Standard	?	X*	✓	✓	X	✓ / X	Python + R	[37]
SynTEG	Ensemble	Sequence	?	X	✓	X	X	X / X	?	[32,41]
CRBM	Other	Standard	X	X*	✓	✓	X	X / X	?	[45]
SCM	Other	Standard	?	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓ / X	R	[46]
SPMI	Other	Standard	?	X*	✓	✓	X	✓** / X	R	[38]
Synthea	Other	Standard	?	X	✓	✓	✓	✓ / X	Java	[47]
Synthpop	Other	Standard	?	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓ / X	R	[38,48]

GAN: generative adversarial network; AE: autoencoder; BN: Bayesian Network; Ensemble: utilizes three or more machine or deep learning models; * Imputed as part of the method; ** Upon request

3.5 Evaluation approaches for synthetic data quality

All 17 studies implemented both qualitative and quantitative approaches to evaluate synthetic data quality. Most studies (76%) generated a single synthetic dataset, while four studies (24%) created multiple (< 50) datasets. Fifteen studies (88%) compared SD against the original data in some way. The remaining two studies pursued alternative approaches: one compared prevalence statistics in the synthetic data against empirical population data [47], while the other focused solely on describing the characteristics of the synthetic dataset [36]. Additionally, one study augmented its assessment with simulated data [37].

Seven studies (41%) explored the impact of adjusting tuning parameters or altering the method's structural configuration on the quality of synthetic data. An equivalent number of studies (41%) conducted comparisons between the primary method and reference methods. In the following subsections, we expound the approaches employed to assess resemblance, utility, and privacy. Supplemental Material H gives details about the datasets utilized for these purposes within the studies.

3.5.1 Resemblance

Fourteen studies (82%) compared resemblance between the synthetic and original data. We discerned four different domains of resemblance: the similarity of univariate distributions, bivariate distributions, multivariate distributions, and temporal structure. In each domain, we further classified the approaches into qualitative, quantitative, model-based, and statistical test-based paradigms (Figure 4). Each approach was then further classified under its respective paradigm (x-axis of Figure 4), with those not aligning with commonly used applications labeled as "Other."




Figure 4. Approaches used to evaluate synthetic and original data resemblance. The figure illustrates the utilization of various approaches (on the x-axis, indicated in blue) in assessing the resemblance between synthetic and original data in each included study. The evaluation of resemblance encompasses four domains: univariate distributions, bivariate distributions, multivariate distributions, and similarity of temporal structure. Furthermore, the approaches used for this assessment were categorized into qualitative, quantitative, model-based, and statistical test-based paradigms. It should be noted that a study may encompass multiple assessments that belong to the same approach. The approach “Histogram” also includes density plots, and the approach “Boxplot” includes violin plots. The approaches labeled as “Other” are discussed in detail in the main text. SD: standard deviation; Reg: regression; RF: random forests; LSTM: long short-term memory; NA: not applicable, did not compare SD against original data.

Among the 17 studies, two studies (12%) evaluated all four domains using at least one paradigm per domain. Similarly, five studies (29%) evaluated three domains, five studies evaluated two domains and two studies (12%) evaluated one domain. One study did not evaluate resemblance in any domain. Twelve of the studies (71%) assessed univariate resemblance, eight studies (47%) examined resemblance of bivariate distributions, six studies (35%) evaluated multivariate distribution resemblance, and nine studies (53%) investigated temporal structure resemblance.

The assessment of resemblance of univariate distributions involved comparing marginal distributions of a single variable in the synthetic data and the original data. Qualitative and quantitative paradigms were applied in nine studies (53%), and statistical tests were employed in five studies (29%). The “Other” approaches to quantitative comparisons included methods such as root mean square error (RMSE) and Jensen-Shannon divergence (JSD).

Comparisons of bivariate distributions focused on contrasting the association between pairs of variables in the synthetic data with the corresponding association in the original data. Both quantitative and qualitative paradigms were used at an equal rate (47%), and statistical tests were employed in one study (6%). The “Other” quantitative approach consisted mainly of the Frobenius norm of correlation matrices and study-specific measurements.

The multivariate distribution domain included models aimed at differentiating synthetic observations from real observations, validation by medical experts, and principal component and factor analyses. Four studies (24%) applied quantitative and three studies (18%) qualitative paradigms to evaluate multivariate resemblance. Model-based paradigms were used in four studies (24%) and one study (6%) utilized statistical tests. The quantitative “Other” approach included scores given by clinicians, discriminative area under curve (AUC) and discriminative score. The “Other” model-based approach included factor analysis and naïve-, transfer learning-, and finetuning-based discriminators.

The assessment of temporal structure involved inspection of temporal relationships among the synthetic and original variables using autocorrelation or data visualization. Temporal structures were evaluated qualitatively in eight (47%) and quantitatively in three (18%) studies. A visualization of the underlying Bayesian Network was considered as an “Other” qualitative approach, and the computation of the RMSE of an autocorrelation function and a latent temporal statistic derived from singular value decomposition were included in “Other” quantitative approaches.

3.5.2 Utility

Utility was evaluated in ten studies (59%), with the focus on statistical inference and prediction performance. These domains were divided in the same four-class paradigm classification as for resemblance. Figure 5 summarizes the approaches adopted for utility assessment.

Three studies (18%) evaluated the similarity of statistical inference, all of them using both qualitative and model-based paradigms. One study also used a quantitative paradigm that

consisted of ratios of standard errors based on the fitted logistic regression model (labeled as “Other” in Figure 5).

Seven studies (41%) assessed predictive performance and applied model-based paradigms. In addition, four studies (24%) used qualitative, two (12%) quantitative, and one (6%) statistical test-based paradigms. The quantitative paradigms included the mean absolute relative difference of AUC, and weighted F1-score. The “Other” model-based category included support vector machines (SVM), RNN, batch-constrained Q-learning and an unspecified model.




Figure 4. Approaches used to evaluate synthetic data utility in comparison to the original data. The figure illustrates the utilization of various approaches (on the x-axis, indicated in blue) in assessing the utility of synthetic data in each included study. The evaluation of utility encompasses two domains: similarity of statistical inference and prediction performance. Furthermore, the approaches used for this assessment were categorized into qualitative, quantitative, model-based, and statistical test-based paradigms. It should be noted that a study may encompass multiple assessments that belong to the same approach. The approach “Histogram” also includes density plots, and the approach “Boxplot” includes violin plots. The approaches labeled as “Other” are discussed in detail in the main text. SD: standard deviation; Reg.: regression; RF: random forests; LSTM: long short-term memory; NA: not applicable, did not compare synthetic and original data.

3.5.3 Privacy

Privacy was addressed in eight studies (47%) to varying degrees. Three studies (18%) [32,42,44] implemented differential privacy (DP) [51]. However, one of them [42] used DP only partially without generating fully synthetic differentially private data.

Membership disclosure, i.e., unintentional or unauthorized disclosure of an individual's inclusion in the original data, was evaluated in four studies (24%) [32,34,40,41] with various techniques. Attribute disclosure, i.e., inadvertent or unauthorized exposure of specific attributes or characteristics of an individual, was assessed in two studies (18%) [38,41].

One study [34] evaluated identity disclosure, i.e., unintended revelation of an individual's identity or personally identifiable information. Another study [46] assessed inferential disclosure, involving the derivation of sensitive information through statistical analysis.

4 Discussion

We identified 17 studies presenting methods able to generate synthetic longitudinal patient data, with the majority published in 2022. This contrasts with earlier medical SDG reviews, which primarily examined literature predating 2022 [9,10,14]. A further inspection revealed that the earlier reviews focused mainly on “simple” forms of data such as cross-sectional and time series data, and methods for generating synthetic longitudinal data, which exhibit elements of both of the previous data types, have mostly emerged more recently. Nevertheless, our findings align with prior literature reviews to the extent that research on this topic has predominantly emerged from approximately 2016 onwards.

Most of the identified methods were deep learning (DL) models (GANs, AEs, Ensembles), aligning with the previous reviews [9,10,14]. These models enable capturing complex patterns and learning from data without requiring strict distributional assumptions, making them versatile across diverse datasets. However, they do possess limitations. DL models typically entail numerous training parameters and demand substantial sample sizes, which limits their use on small datasets. Dealing with data containing multiple variable types is challenging and often necessitates variable encoding and normalization, which may reduce information and increase dimensionality. Moreover, the effectiveness of DL models in generating longitudinal data relies heavily on their ability to discern relevant patterns within the input data, yet they typically struggle with generating unbalanced observations or handling missing data. In the context of synthetic longitudinal data generation, a progressive step forward would involve developing and integrating components specifically designed to preserve temporal structures and generate unbalanced data.

In addition to the characteristics listed in Section 3.2. (Table 3), we identified two prevalent modeling choices that were used often in the 17 methods: (a) the Markov assumption that the present depends on the past only through the previous time point, and (b) the ordered generation of each subsequent variable, including the non-temporal variables, conditionally on all previously generated variables (instead of just the most recent one). Of these, the former might be too much of a simplification to capture the full complexity of LD, but the latter appears promising as the repeated measurements in LD carry a natural ordering. It is noteworthy that five of the 17 methods exclusively concentrated on generating diagnostic code sequences. As such, these methods may not be deemed suitable for synthesizing standard longitudinal data, which typically comprise a combination of categorical and numerical variables. Furthermore, Table 5 reveals that only two methods of the 17 could be confirmed to generate unbalanced data and both of these methods were restricted to sequence data (single type of variable, such as medical codes, observed repeatedly in time). This, too, indicates the pressing need for developing methodology specifically targeted to generate LD.

When evaluating the SD quality, only 35% of the studies assessed all three aspects (resemblance, utility, and privacy), with diverse approaches. The absence of a standardized evaluation framework has also been addressed in previous reviews [9,10,13,14]. Only initial attempts have been undertaken to formulate one [52]. However, this framework, grounded in

cross-sectional data, lacks specific evaluations for other tabular data types, including LD. Evaluating the preservation of temporal structures is essential to assess any given method's suitability for LD and the fact that only half of the included studies evaluated temporal resemblance is concerning. Moreover, the evaluations notably overlooked standard longitudinal statistical models commonly employed in medical research, introducing uncertainty regarding the reliability of statistical inferences drawn from SD generated by the identified methods.

The classification employed in this review to characterize resemblance and utility aspects provides a foundation for advancing the development of an evaluation framework. While certain approaches are applicable to generic tabular data (e.g., univariate and bivariate resemblance evaluation), the categorization allows for the integration of data-specific (e.g., temporal structure) and task-specific utility metrics, accommodating both statistical and machine learning considerations. Objective quantitative metrics (such as numerical comparisons of means and correlations) provide a foundation, while qualitative assessments (such as visual comparisons) offer a more interpretable understanding of synthetic data. As stated earlier, when dealing with LD, it is essential to assess the preservation of temporal structures. This could be accomplished through, e.g., comparing autocorrelations of repeated measurements or the statistical inferences obtained from mixed-effect models. However, the detailed specification of metrics and approaches for evaluating resemblance and utility is deferred for future research. Finally, regardless of the actual metrics, a crucial part of any evaluation framework is the use of independent replications and averaging of the metrics across them. If the evaluation metrics are computed only for a single synthetic dataset, any observed outcome is possible to have occurred by chance alone. For reliable conclusions, the number of replicates should be measured in tens, if not hundreds. Surprisingly, only four out of the 17 studies employed more than one independent replication.

While the incorporation of privacy-preserving techniques within SDG has garnered increasing attention in recent years, we did not observe such a trend, with only half of the studies addressing privacy in some manner. A similar observation was made by Murtaza et al. [13]. The lack of explicit emphasis on privacy is likely attributed to beliefs that random generation of data is adequate to preserve privacy, and to the challenging nature of implementing and evaluating effective privacy protection. Despite the introduction of various privacy-preserving methods, including integrated approaches like differential privacy [51] and post-hoc evaluations [53–55], achieving satisfactory privacy protection remains a formidable task. To maintain the integrity of scientific research to uphold trust with research subjects, it is crucial to assess SD for potential risks of identity disclosure. This holds true even when employing privacy-preserving methods like DP, as recent studies suggest that certain DP implementations may not consistently adhere to theoretical privacy bounds [56]. Moreover, the practical interpretation of the privacy budget parameter regarding to what it means to any particular individual and their associated disclosure risks is not straightforward [57], and choosing the correct privacy budget especially in the case of SDG can be challenging. Additionally, the examination of attribute and membership disclosure risks is strongly recommended. The evaluation of inferential disclosure risk holds uncertain significance, given that data publication

primarily aims to facilitate inference. Concealing features in synthetic data constrains its utility for various purposes. Nevertheless, an inherent tradeoff persists between privacy and utility, necessitating the delineation of a precise balance between these two factors.

Lastly, none of the previous reviews [9,10,14] systematically assessed risk of bias or reporting quality, although Hernandez et al. [14] recognized the potential for biases. Thus, our review appears to be the first in this regard. Despite employing a structured framework and receiving validation from all review authors, these assessments remain somewhat subjective. Nevertheless, we found no indication of selection bias, aligning with our initial expectations regarding the difficulty of its assessment (Supplemental Material D.1). Conversely, approximately every third publication lacked a transparent description of comparison procedures (performance bias), and selective reporting (reporting bias) was present in half of the reviewed studies. Furthermore, like Ghosheh, Li and Zhu [10], we identified inadequacies in the training process descriptions and source code availability. We stress that our findings are not meant to criticize any single study. Indeed, given an individual study, we find that any shortcomings are more likely to be oversights than consequences of any deliberate action. Therefore, the review's findings should be regarded as overarching recommendations for improving the transparency of SDG research and the accessibility of proposed methods.

4.1 Limitations

Although our review, as far as we are aware, is the first systematic literature review concentrating on SDG that adheres to the PRISMA guidelines throughout the entire review process, it is important to acknowledge its inherent constraints.

First, due to the lack of unambiguous definitions of synthetic and longitudinal data and the dispersal of SDG evolution across diverse fields, formulating a definitive search algorithm was challenging. Despite our efforts to encompass recognized synonyms and accommodate different permutations, omitting relevant publications remains possible. Nevertheless, given the large number of screened publications and exhaustive citation searching, coupled with our accurate identification of intersecting publications observed in the prior reviews, we hold assurance in the comprehensiveness of literature.

Second, longitudinal data analysis has mainly been used in medical statistics, while SDG methods derive predominantly from computer science and associated applications. This discrepancy poses challenges in assessing the applicability and characteristics of SDG methods for LD generation. For instance, the notion of unbalanced data, though well-established in medical statistics, appears to receive limited attention in computer science, resulting in its underrepresentation and oversight in SDG research. This likely explains our inability to collect the respective information from the included studies. Additionally, the inherent opaque nature of DL models further complicates their evaluation.

Third, it is crucial to note that scientific advancements continue, and this review is confined to data accessible until November 2022. Consequently, the review does not encompass eligible methods, such as the novel language model-based HALO [58], published in 2023. Nonetheless,

we anticipate that this review will contribute to easing future research endeavors in the realm of SDG methods for longitudinal data.

4.2 Conclusion

Ultimately, while we identified 17 methods which generate synthetic longitudinal patient data (RQ1) and address various challenges related to LD (RQ2), none of the identified methods tackled all challenges concurrently. This emphasizes the need for continued methodological research. Due to the many different forms of longitudinal data, no single method is likely to be sufficient for all of them and more focused approaches are advised. For example, for the type of longitudinal data we termed as standard (covariates and time-varying responses), it could be feasible to consider a hybrid approach where the static covariates are generated using a suitable assumption-free generative model, while the unbalanced time-varying responses are modelled conditionally on the covariates using hierarchical statistical models that properly take into account the missingness and time-dependence of the measurements.

Any one method rarely accommodates all objectives and comprehending each method's inherent limitations and advantages remains essential. This requires meticulous documentation and transparent presentation of the method in question, including its evaluation. Moreover, publishing a method which is accessible only to its developers is seldom pragmatic. Therefore, including the source code as part of the publication is important and aligns with today's standards.

The observed heterogeneity in the evaluation approaches across the studies (RQ3) presents a significant challenge in conducting meaningful comparisons between various methods and their applicability in practice. While creating standardized evaluation criteria would enhance method assessment, it is crucial to recognize the importance of tailored approaches for various applications and datasets. Establishing a standardized evaluation framework offers a chance for interdisciplinary collaboration among medicine, statistics, and computer science. The categorization employed in this review to delineate different evaluation approaches for assessing resemblance, utility and privacy provides a robust basis for subsequent research.

Lastly, further research is necessary to address privacy concerns related to synthetic data, along with clear directives from data protection agencies to guide SDG implementation and progress. There is a pressing need for official guidelines delineating criteria for determining privacy and safety thresholds for publishing data. Currently, there appears to be a shortage in the availability of synthetic patient data and platforms facilitating their use in comparison to the progress made in SDG method development. This task requires increased collaboration between method developers, medical practitioners and legislators, as the directives will require empirical support and new methods should be developed with practical feasibility in mind.

CRedit authorship contribution statement

Katariina Perkonaja: Conceptualization, Methodology, Formal analysis, Investigation, Resources, Data curation, Writing – original draft, Visualization, Project administration, Funding acquisition. **Kari Auranen:** Conceptualization, Methodology, Supervision, Writing – review & editing. **Joni Virta:** Conceptualization, Methodology, Investigation, Writing – review & editing, Supervision, Funding acquisition.

Acknowledgements

We thank Antti Airola, Martin Closter Jespersen, Henning Langberg and Arho Virkki for their roles in the systematic review team.

Declaration of competing interests

The authors declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Funding

This work was supported by the Novo Nordisk Foundation (grant number NNF19SA0059129), the Finnish Cultural Foundation (grant number 00220801) and the Research Council of Finland (grant numbers 335077, 347501 and 353769). The funding agencies were not involved in study design; the collection, analysis and interpretation of data; the writing of the report; nor in the decision to submit the article for publication.

Registration and protocol

The review protocol was registered with PROSPERO (registration number CRD42021259232) on July 5, 2021. Subsequently, the protocol was amended twice, on January 25, 2022, and March 9, 2023, respectively. The rationale for each modification is detailed in the corresponding section of the amended protocol, which is available at https://www.crd.york.ac.uk/prospero/display_record.php?ID=CRD42021259232.

Availability of data

The data used to derive the results and conclusions of this systematic review are available upon request.

Supplemental Material

The supplemental material of this manuscript is available at https://users.utu.fi/kakype/wp-content/uploads/sites/1396/2024/03/supplemental_material_syst_review_v3.pdf

References

- [1] EU General Data Protection Regulation (EU-GDPR), European Union, 2018. <https://gdpr.eu/> (accessed June 22, 2023).
- [2] Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 (HIPAA), United States, 1996. <https://www.hhs.gov/hipaa/index.html> (accessed June 22, 2023).
- [3] Finnish Ministry of Social Affairs and Health, Act 552/2019 on the Secondary Use of Health and Social Data, Finland, 2019. <https://stm.fi/en/secondary-use-of-health-and-social-data> (accessed June 22, 2023).
- [4] A. Hundepool, J. Domingo-Ferrer, L. Franconi, S. Giessing, E.S. Nordholt, K. Spicer, P. de Wolf, Synthetic and Hybrid Data, in: *Statistical Disclosure Control*, Wiley, 2012: pp. 78–99. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118348239>.
- [5] B.C.M. Fung, K. Wang, A.W.-C. Fu, P.S. Yu, Anonymization Operations, in: *Introduction to Privacy-Preserving Data Publishing: Concepts and Techniques*, Chapman and Hall/CRC, 2010: pp. 35–42. <https://doi.org/10.1201/9781420091502>.
- [6] D.B. Rubin, Statistical Disclosure Limitation, *J Off Stat* 9 (1993) 461–468.
- [7] T. Stadler, B. Oprisanu, C. Troncoso, Synthetic Data – Anonymisation Groundhog Day, in: *Proceedings of the 31st USENIX Security Symposium*, Boston, 2022. <https://www.usenix.org/conference/usenixsecurity22/presentation/stadler>.
- [8] T.E. Raghunathan, Synthetic Data, *Annu Rev Stat Appl* 8 (2021) 129–140. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-statistics-040720-031848>.
- [9] J. Georges-Filteau, E. Cirillo, Synthetic Observational Health Data with GANs: from slow adoption to a boom in medical research and ultimately digital twins?, *ArXiv Preprint* (2020). <http://arxiv.org/abs/2005.13510>.
- [10] G. Ghosheh, J. Li, T. Zhu, A review of Generative Adversarial Networks for Electronic Health Records: applications, evaluation measures and data sources, *ArXiv Preprint* (2022). <http://arxiv.org/abs/2203.07018>.
- [11] J.J. Jeong, A. Tariq, T. Adejumo, H. Trivedi, J.W. Gichoya, I. Banerjee, Systematic Review of Generative Adversarial Networks (GANs) for Medical Image Classification and Segmentation, *J Digit Imaging* 35 (2022) 137–152. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10278-021-00556-w>.
- [12] D. Zhang, M. Ma, L. Xia, A comprehensive review on GANs for time-series signals, *Neural Comput Appl* 34 (2022) 3551–3571. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00521-022-06888-0>.

- [13] H. Murtaza, M. Ahmed, N.F. Khan, G. Murtaza, S. Zafar, A. Bano, Synthetic data generation: State of the art in health care domain, *Comput Sci Rev* 48 (2023) 100546. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cosrev.2023.100546>.
- [14] M. Hernandez, G. Epelde, A. Alberdi, R. Cilla, D. Rankin, Synthetic data generation for tabular health records: A systematic review, *Neurocomputing* 493 (2022) 28–45. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neucom.2022.04.053>.
- [15] I. Goodfellow, J. Pouget-Abadie, M. Mirza, B. Xu, D. Warde-Farley, S. Ozair, A. Courville, Y. Bengio, Generative adversarial networks, *Commun ACM* 63 (2020) 139–144. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3422622>.
- [16] G. Van Belle, L.D. Fisher, P.J. Heagerty, T. Lumley, Longitudinal Data Analysis, in: *Biostatistics: A Methodology for the Health Sciences*, 2nd ed., John Wiley & Sons, Inc., Hoboken, NJ, USA, 2004: pp. 728–765. <https://doi.org/10.1002/0471602396>.
- [17] R.H. Shumway, D.S. Stoffer, Characteristics of Time Series, in: G. Casella, S. Fienberg, I. Olkin (Eds.), *Time Series Analysis and Its Applications: With R Examples*, 2nd ed., Springer, New York, 2006: pp. 1–40.
- [18] Shenyang. Guo, Introduction, in: *Survival Analysis*, Oxford University Press, New York, 2010: pp. 3–25.
- [19] M.J. Page, J.E. McKenzie, P.M. Bossuyt, I. Boutron, T.C. Hoffmann, C.D. Mulrow, L. Shamseer, J.M. Tetzlaff, E.A. Akl, S.E. Brennan, R. Chou, J. Glanville, J.M. Grimshaw, A. Hróbjartsson, M.M. Lalu, T. Li, E.W. Loder, E. Mayo-Wilson, S. McDonald, L.A. McGuinness, L.A. Stewart, J. Thomas, A.C. Tricco, V.A. Welch, P. Whiting, D. Moher, The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews, *Syst Rev* 10 (2021) 89. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13643-021-01626-4>.
- [20] Harzing Anne-Wil, Publish or Perish, (2007). <https://harzing.com/resources/publish-or-perish> (accessed June 18, 2021).
- [21] Cornell University, arXiv Dataset, (2022). <https://www.kaggle.com/datasets/Cornell-University/arxiv> (accessed November 22, 2022).
- [22] W.M. Bramer, M.L. Rethlefsen, J. Kleijnen, O.H. Franco, Optimal database combinations for literature searches in systematic reviews: a prospective exploratory study, *Syst Rev* 6 (2017) 245. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13643-017-0644-y>.
- [23] J. McGowan, M. Sampson, D.M. Salzwedel, E. Cogo, V. Foerster, C. Lefebvre, PRESS Peer Review of Electronic Search Strategies: 2015 Guideline Statement, *J Clin Epidemiol* 75 (2016) 40–46. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.JCLINEPI.2016.01.021>.

- [24] The EndNote Team, EndNote 20, (2013).
- [25] M. Ouzzani, H. Hammady, Z. Fedorowicz, A. Elmagarmid, Rayyan—a web and mobile app for systematic reviews, *Syst Rev* 5 (2016) 210. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13643-016-0384-4>.
- [26] P.A. Harris, R. Taylor, R. Thielke, J. Payne, N. Gonzalez, J.G. Conde, Research electronic data capture (REDCap)—A metadata-driven methodology and workflow process for providing translational research informatics support, *J Biomed Inform* 42 (2009) 377–381. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbi.2008.08.010>.
- [27] P.A. Harris, R. Taylor, B.L. Minor, V. Elliott, M. Fernandez, L. O’Neal, L. McLeod, G. Delacqua, F. Delacqua, J. Kirby, S.N. Duda, The REDCap consortium: Building an international community of software platform partners, *J Biomed Inform* 95 (2019) 103208. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbi.2019.103208>.
- [28] I. Boutron, M. Page, J. Higgins, D. Altman, A. Lundh, A. Hróbjartsson, Chapter 7: Considering bias and conflicts of interest among the included studies, in: J. Higgins, J. Thomas, J. Chandler, M. Cumpston, T. Li, M. Page, V. Welch (Eds.), *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions Version 6.1*, Cochrane, 2020.
- [29] G.H. Guyatt, A.D. Oxman, G.E. Vist, R. Kunz, Y. Falck-Ytter, P. Alonso-Coello, H.J. Schünemann, GRADE: an emerging consensus on rating quality of evidence and strength of recommendations, *BMJ* 336 (2008) 924–926. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.39489.470347.AD>.
- [30] R. Siemieniuk, G. Gordon, What is GRADE?, *BMJ Best Practice* (2017). <https://bestpractice.bmj.com/info/us/toolkit/learn-ebm/what-is-grade/> (accessed January 22, 2024).
- [31] SCImago, SJR — SCImago Journal & Country Rank [Portal], (n.d.). <http://www.scimagojr.com> (accessed July 15, 2023).
- [32] J. Li, B.J. Cairns, J. Li, T. Zhu, Generating Synthetic Mixed-type Longitudinal Electronic Health Records for Artificial Intelligent Applications, *ArXiv Preprint* (2023). <https://arxiv.org/abs/2112.12047v2>.
- [33] K. Bhanot, J. Pedersen, I. Guyon, K.P. Bennett, Investigating synthetic medical time-series resemblance, *Neurocomputing* 494 (2022) 368–378. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neucom.2022.04.097>.
- [34] N.I.-H. Kuo, M.N. Polizzotto, S. Finfer, F. Garcia, A. Sönnnerborg, M. Zazzi, M. Böhm, R. Kaiser, L. Jorm, S. Barbieri, The Health Gym: synthetic health-related datasets for the development of reinforcement learning algorithms, *Sci Data* 9 (2022) 693. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41597-022-01784-7>.

- [35] C. Lu, C.K. Reddy, P. Wang, D. Nie, Y. Ning, Multi-Label Clinical Time-Series Generation via Conditional GAN, ArXiv Preprint (2022). <http://arxiv.org/abs/2204.04797>.
- [36] X. Wang, Y. Lin, Y. Xiong, S. Zhang, Y. He, Y. He, Z. Zhang, J.M. Plasek, L. Zhou, D.W. Bates, C. Tang, Using an optimized generative model to infer the progression of complications in type 2 diabetes patients, *BMC Med Inform Decis Mak* 22 (2022) 174. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12911-022-01915-5>.
- [37] P. Wendland, C. Birkenbihl, M. Gomez-Freixa, M. Sood, M. Kschischo, H. Fröhlich, Generation of realistic synthetic data using Multimodal Neural Ordinary Differential Equations, *NPJ Digit Med* 5 (2022) 122. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41746-022-00666-x>.
- [38] M. Yu, Y. He, T.E. Raghunathan, A Semiparametric Multiple Imputation Approach to Fully Synthetic Data for Complex Surveys, *J Surv Stat Methodol* 10 (2022) 618–641. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jssam/smac016>.
- [39] Z. Zhang, C. Yan, B.A. Malin, Keeping synthetic patients on track: feedback mechanisms to mitigate performance drift in longitudinal health data simulation, *J Am Med Inform Assoc* 29 (2022) 1890–1898. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jamia/ocac131>.
- [40] S. Biswal, S. Ghosh, J. Duke, B. Malin, W. Stewart, J. Sun, EVA: Generating Longitudinal Electronic Health Records Using Conditional Variational Autoencoders, in: K. Jung, S. Yeung, M. Sendak, M. Sjoding, R. Ranganath (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 6th Machine Learning for Healthcare Conference*, PMLR, 2021: pp. 260–282. <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v149/biswal21a.html>.
- [41] Z. Zhang, C. Yan, T.A. Lasko, J. Sun, B.A. Malin, SynTEG: a framework for temporal structured electronic health data simulation, *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association* 28 (2021) 596–604. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jamia/ocaa262>.
- [42] L. Gootjes-Dreesbach, M. Sood, A. Sahay, M. Hofmann-Apitius, H. Fröhlich, Variational Autoencoder Modular Bayesian Networks for Simulation of Heterogeneous Clinical Study Data, *Front Big Data* 3 (2020).
- [43] M. Sood, A. Sahay, R. Karki, M.A. Emon, H. Vrooman, M. Hofmann-Apitius, H. Fröhlich, Realistic simulation of virtual multi-scale, multi-modal patient trajectories using Bayesian networks and sparse auto-encoders, *Sci Rep* 10 (2020) 10971. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-020-67398-4>.
- [44] B.K. Beaulieu-Jones, Z.S. Wu, C. Williams, R. Lee, S.P. Bhavnani, J.B. Byrd, C.S. Greene, Privacy-Preserving Generative Deep Neural Networks Support Clinical Data Sharing, *Circ Cardiovasc Qual Outcomes* 12 (2019) e005122. <https://doi.org/10.1161/CIRCOUTCOMES.118.005122>.

- [45] C.K. Fisher, A.M. Smith, J.R. Walsh, A.J. Simon, C. Edgar, C.R. Jack, D. Holtzman, D. Russell, D. Hill, D. Grosset, F. Wood, H. Vanderstichele, J. Morris, K. Blennow, K. Marek, L.M. Shaw, M. Albert, M. Weiner, N. Fox, P. Aisen, P.E. Cole, R. Petersen, T. Sherer, W. Kubick, Machine learning for comprehensive forecasting of Alzheimer’s Disease progression, *Sci Rep* 9 (2019) 13622. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-019-49656-2>.
- [46] A.F. Barrientos, A. Bolton, T. Balmat, J.P. Reiter, J.M. de Figueiredo, A. Machanavajjhala, Y. Chen, C. Kneifel, M. DeLong, Providing access to confidential research data through synthesis and verification: An application to data on employees of the U.S. federal government, *Annals of Applied Statistics* 12 (2018) 1124–1156. <https://doi.org/10.1214/18-AOAS1194>.
- [47] J. Walonoski, M. Kramer, J. Nichols, A. Quina, C. Moesel, D. Hall, C. Duffett, K. Dube, T. Gallagher, S. McLachlan, Synthea: An approach, method, and software mechanism for generating synthetic patients and the synthetic electronic health care record, *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association* 25 (2018) 230–238. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jamia/ocx079>.
- [48] G.M. Raab, B. Nowok, C. Dibben, Practical Data Synthesis for Large Samples, *Journal of Privacy and Confidentiality* 7 (2018) 67–97. <https://doi.org/10.29012/jpc.v7i3.407>.
- [49] A. Yale, S. Dash, R. Dutta, I. Guyon, A. Pavao, K.P. Bennett, Generation and evaluation of privacy preserving synthetic health data, *Neurocomputing* 416 (2020) 244–255. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neucom.2019.12.136>.
- [50] X. Wang, D. Sontag, F. Wang, Unsupervised learning of disease progression models, in: *Proceedings of the 20th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, ACM, New York, NY, USA, 2014: pp. 85–94. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2623330.2623754>.
- [51] C. Dwork, Differential Privacy, in: M. Bugliesi, B. Preneel, V. Sassone, I. Wegener (Eds.), *Automata, Languages and Programming*, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2006: pp. 1–12. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1007/1178700>.
- [52] M. Hernandez, G. Epelde, A. Alberdi, R. Cilla, D. Rankin, Synthetic Tabular Data Evaluation in the Health Domain Covering Resemblance, Utility, and Privacy Dimensions, *Methods Inf Med* 62 (2023) e19–e38. <https://doi.org/10.1055/s-0042-1760247>.
- [53] B. van Breugel, H. Sun, Z. Qian, M. van der Schaar, Membership Inference Attacks against Synthetic Data through Overfitting Detection, (2023). <http://arxiv.org/abs/2302.12580>.

- [54] K. El Emam, L. Mosquera, J. Bass, Evaluating Identity Disclosure Risk in Fully Synthetic Health Data: Model Development and Validation, *J Med Internet Res* 22 (2020) e23139. <https://doi.org/10.2196/23139>.
- [55] M.S.M.S. Annamalai, A. Gadotti, L. Rocher, A Linear Reconstruction Approach for Attribute Inference Attacks against Synthetic Data, *ArXiv Preprint* (2023). <http://arxiv.org/abs/2301.10053>.
- [56] T. Stadler, B. Oprisanu, C. Troncoso, Synthetic Data – Anonymisation Groundhog Day, in: *31st USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 22)*, Boston, MA, 2022: pp. 1451–1468. <https://www.usenix.org/conference/usenixsecurity22/presentation/stadler>.
- [57] J. Lee, C. Clifton, How much is enough? Choosing ϵ for differential privacy, in: *Lecture Notes in Computer Science (Including Subseries Lecture Notes in Artificial Intelligence and Lecture Notes in Bioinformatics)*, 2011. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-24861-0_22.
- [58] B. Theodorou, C. Xiao, J. Sun, Synthesize high-dimensional longitudinal electronic health records via hierarchical autoregressive language model, *Nat Commun* 14 (2023) 5305. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-023-41093-0>.