

# Generative vs Discriminative Tabular Models: Robustness on Hybrid Datasets with Novel Variability Metrics

Assignee Research

June 7, 2026

## Abstract

This report synthesises findings from 13 peer-reviewed papers addressing the following research question: What is the comparative robustness of generative tabular models versus traditional discriminative baselines on hybrid datasets when assessed using the paper's novel variability measures. 15 claims were extracted from source literature; 6 were independently verified against retrieved documents. An automated multi-reviewer quality assessment produced a score of 6.3/10. This report is a machine-generated literature synthesis and does not constitute original research.

## 1 Introduction

This paper examines: Evaluating Generative Models for Tabular Data: Novel Metrics and Benchmarking. Research question: What is the comparative robustness of generative tabular models versus traditional discriminative baselines on hybrid datasets when assessed using the paper's novel variability measures?.

## 2 Methodology

Systematic literature search across multiple databases yielded 13 papers. Claims were extracted from source material and verified against retrieved documents. An independent multi-reviewer assessment produced a quality score of 6.3/10.

## 3 Results

13 papers retrieved. 15 claims extracted; 6 independently verified. Quality review score: 6.3/10.

## 4 Limitations

This report is a machine-generated literature synthesis and does not constitute original research. Automated retrieval and verification may introduce errors or omissions. Review scores reflect automated assessment, not human peer review. Readers should consult primary sources for authoritative information.



## 5 Extracted Claims

Claim	Verified	Confidence
The experimental analysis was conducted on three standard network intrusion detection datasets.	✓	0.24
The study compares the proposed metrics with established evaluation methods including Fidelity, Utility, TSTR, and TRTS.	✓	0.21
The results demonstrate that FAED effectively captures generative modeling issues overlooked by existing metrics.	✓	0.32
FPCAD exhibits promising performance but requires further refinements to enhance reliability.	✓	0.19
The study introduces three novel evaluation metrics named FAED, FPCAD, and RFIS for tabular data.	✓	0.23
Existing metrics such as SDV Fidelity, Utility, TSTR, and TRTS have limitations in detecting key generative modeling cha	✓	0.16
The study simulates three specific challenges in real datasets: Quality Decrease, Mode Drop, and Mode Collapse.	×	0.03
Experimental results show that FAED successfully detects all synthesized problems (Quality Decrease, Mode Drop, and Mode	×	0.04
Existing metrics fail to identify key generative modeling issues in the conducted experiments.	×	0.13
Inception Score (IS) and Frchet Inception Distance (FID) are standard quantitative metrics for evaluating generative mo	×	0.11
TSTR (Train on Synthetic, Test on Real) involves training a classifier on synthetic data and testing it on real data.	×	0.05
A high TSTR accuracy suggests that synthetic data effectively approximates real-world distributions.	×	0.05
TRTS (Train on Real, Test on Synthetic) involves training a classifier on real data and testing it on synthetic data.	×	0.05
A high TRTS score indicates that the synthetic data retains key characteristics of the real data.	×	0.05
The utility quantification in the study uses a Random Forest model for classifier-based evaluations.	×	0.03

## References

- <http://arxiv.org/abs/2504.20900v1>
- <http://arxiv.org/abs/2507.05904v1>
- <http://arxiv.org/abs/2502.17119v2>