

A Comprehensive Survey on Data Augmentation

ZAITIAN WANG* and PENGFEI WANG*, Computer Network Information Center, Chinese Academy of Sciences; University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Chinese Academy of Sciences, China

KUNPENG LIU, Portland State University, USA

PENGYANG WANG, University of Macau, China

YANJIE FU, Arizona State University, USA

CHANG-TIEN LU, Virginia Tech, USA

CHARU C. AGGARWAL, IBM T. J. Watson Research Center, USA

JIAN PEI, Duke University, USA

YUANCHUN ZHOU[†], Computer Network Information Center, Chinese Academy of Sciences; University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Chinese Academy of Sciences, China

Data augmentation is a series of techniques that generate high-quality artificial data by manipulating existing data samples. By leveraging data augmentation techniques, AI models can achieve significantly improved applicability in tasks involving scarce or imbalanced datasets, thereby substantially enhancing AI models' generalization capabilities. Existing literature surveys only focus on a certain type of specific modality data, and categorize these methods from modality-specific and operation-centric perspectives, which lacks a consistent summary of data augmentation methods across multiple modalities and limits the comprehension of how existing data samples serve the data augmentation process. To bridge this gap, we propose a more enlightening taxonomy that encompasses data augmentation techniques for different common data modalities. Specifically, from a data-centric perspective, this survey proposes a modality-independent taxonomy by investigating how to take advantage of the intrinsic relationship between data samples, including single-wise, pair-wise, and population-wise sample data augmentation methods. Additionally, we categorize data augmentation methods across five data modalities through a unified inductive approach.

Additional Key Words and Phrases: Data augmentation, Data-centric taxonomy, Multi-modality

ACM Reference Format:

Zaitian Wang, Pengfei Wang, Kunpeng Liu, Pengyang Wang, Yanjie Fu, Chang-Tien Lu, Charu C. Aggarwal, Jian Pei, and Yuanchun Zhou. 2024. A Comprehensive Survey on Data Augmentation. 1, 1 (May 2024), 36 pages. <https://doi.org/XXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>

*Both authors contributed equally to this research.

[†]Contact Author.

Authors' addresses: Zaitian Wang, wangzaitian23@mails.ucas.ac.cn; Pengfei Wang, pfwang@cnic.cn, Computer Network Information Center, Chinese Academy of Sciences; University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, China, 100083; Kunpeng Liu, kunpeng@pdx.edu, Portland State University, Portland, OR, USA, 97201; Pengyang Wang, pywang@um.edu.mo, University of Macau, Macau, China, 999078; Yanjie Fu, yanjie.fu@asu.edu, Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ, USA, 85281; Chang-Tien Lu, ctlu@vt.edu, Virginia Tech, Falls Church, VA, USA, 22043; Charu C. Aggarwal, CharuCAggarwal@gmail.com, IBM T. J. Watson Research Center, Yorktown, NY, USA, 10598; Jian Pei, jpei@duke.edu, Duke University, Durham, NC, USA, 27708; Yuanchun Zhou, zyc@cnic.cn, Computer Network Information Center, Chinese Academy of Sciences; University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, China, 100083.

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than the author(s) must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from permissions@acm.org.

© 2024 Copyright held by the owner/author(s). Publication rights licensed to ACM.

ACM XXXX-XXXX/2024/5-ART

<https://doi.org/XXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>

1 INTRODUCTION

With the rapid development of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in the past decades, AI methods have shown their superiority over human beings and other traditional approaches across most tasks, from universal tasks in our daily lives such as image recognition [74] and text translation [7] to complicated scientific research tasks such as protein structure prediction [93] and weather forecasting [12]. Recently, powered by Latent Diffusion Models [158] and Transformer [187], Stable Diffusion [158] and ChatGPT [147] have greatly changed human beings' working, living, and entertainment. The success of AI products is usually attributed to AI models' in-depth understanding of the accumulated data, thereby intrinsically uncovering data patterns and learning data-task correlations. The performances of AI models will be affected by the quantity and quality of training data, e.g. models trained with limited data suffer from over-fitting with significantly degenerative performance on testing datasets, and models trained with unbalanced samples will lead to poor generalization ability. In most situations, researchers have to overcome difficulties caused by limited data sample amounts and imbalanced distribution of data samples. An intuitive solution to these problems is to acquire more data, but data are scarce or difficult to collect in many cases, and labeling the data is yet another labor-intensive work.

To solve these problems, data augmentation has been extensively applied and proven to be effective and efficient [218]. The core idea of data augmentation is to artificially enlarge the training dataset by creating modified copies of existing data. It also introduces more diversity and fills the gap between training datasets and real-world applications. As technology continues to evolve, a variety of techniques are applied to augment data samples. Some simple approaches only randomly mask part of the data [42, 199, 227], while more sophisticated augmentation schemes involve generative adversarial networks [15] or reinforcement learning agents [34].

An ideal survey on data augmentation should be modality-independent, because only in this way can it focus on the intrinsic mechanisms of data augmentation, regardless of the data type, and thus provide insight into the nature of data augmentation. Existing literature surveys summarize data augmentation methods from different perspectives [11, 14, 43, 53, 55, 82, 85, 100, 137, 141, 162, 168, 169, 201, 225, 228]. As summarized in Table. 1, each of them concentrates on a certain data modality. Most of them categorize data augmentation methods with modality-specific (e.g. image modality and text modality), or operation-centric (e.g. feature scaling operation, data perturbation operation) taxonomies. These surveys reflect the development of data augmentation and its application in different learning scenarios. However, they fail to cover data augmentation methods across data types, uncover their common patterns despite different modalities, and thus limit readers' understanding of the essence of data augmentation. To fill this gap, we investigate data augmentation methods comprehensively, across five most popular data modalities. We analyze how data augmentation methods utilize different sample numbers and how they leverage different components of the data information. Then, we propose a unified taxonomy that focuses on the way data augmentation derives new data samples. Finally, we investigate up-to-date literature and categorize them by our proposed taxonomy.

The main contributions of this survey can be summarized as follows:

- We propose a novel modality-independent taxonomy from a data-centric perspective that accommodates data augmentation techniques for all modalities consistently and inductively;
- To the best of our knowledge, this is the first survey that covers data augmentation techniques across five data modalities, i.e. image, text, graph, tabular, and time-series modalities;
- We investigate how information is consistently contained in each of these data modalities and can be utilized for data augmentation.
- We include and categorize up-to-date literature in data augmentation.

Table 1. A comparison of data modalities and taxonomies discussed by existing surveys and ours.

	Data Modality					Taxonomies				
	Image	Text	Graph	Tabular	Time-series	Modality	Technical	Procedural	Sample amount	Information type
IIPhDW 2018 [137]	✓					✓	✓			
J Big Data 2019 [168]	✓						✓	✓		
Artif Intell Rev 2022 [100]	✓						✓			
Array 2022 [141]	✓					✓	✓	✓		
IJCNLP 2021 [53]		✓					✓			
J Big Data 2021 [169]		✓					✓	✓		
Comput Surv 2022 [11]		✓				✓		✓		
KDD 2022 [43]			✓			✓				
arXiv 2022 [225]			✓				✓			
arXiv 2022 [228]			✓			✓				
TNNLS 2022 [14]				✓						
J Big Data 2022 [162]				✓						
J Big Data 2023 [55]				✓			✓	✓		
IJCAI 2021 [201]					✓	✓	✓	✓		
Neural Comput Appl 2023 [82]					✓		✓			
Plos one 2021 [85]					✓	✓	✓			
Ours	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓				✓	✓

2 BACKGROUND

2.1 Early Evolution

Despite the fact that data augmentation only became popular in no more than a decade, some of its embryonic forms were proposed quite early. The concept of data augmentation was conceived at the very beginning of Deep Learning. For example, the use of random distortion can be found in LeNet [109], where ninefold the distorted images are added to the dataset to verify that increasing the size of the training set can effectively reduce test error. Since then, data augmentation has gradually been recognized as a best practice for training Convolutional Neural Networks (CNNs) [30, 31, 170]. AlexNet [105] explicitly employs several data augmentation techniques to reduce overfitting. It augments the datasets by extracting patches from images and altering the color intensity. It also applies dropout, which randomly sets the output of some neurons to zero to prevent their co-adaption. Although dropout is often regarded as an approach to regularization, it has a similar idea to data augmentation and indeed inspires a set of augmentation methods [42]. These applications of data augmentation mainly focus on increasing the size of the training dataset and introducing diversity to it. SMOTE [18] is another early and representative work on data augmentation but from a different perspective. Focusing on addressing the class imbalance problem, it suggests that oversampling the minority class can achieve better classification performance when categories are not equally represented in the dataset.

2.2 Existing Surveys

Given the rapid development of CNNs and their wide application in image-related tasks, most early data augmentation methods are proposed for image data. Also, it is natural to augment image data because many data augmentation methods suit the traits of CNNs very well, such as translation invariance. Published in 2018, [137] is one of the first surveys on data augmentation. It gives a brief discussion of the effect of traditional and neural-based augmentation methods. In 2019, the use of data augmentation on image data is thoroughly studied in [168], which is up to now the most extensive work on this track. It categorizes image data augmentation methods into basic image manipulation and deep learning approaches, with a wide coverage. It also introduces how meta-learning is used to wisely choose and combine various basic operations for data augmentation.

[100] is a recent survey on image data augmentation published in 2022. It formalizes commonly used operations for image data augmentation with equations and illustrates their effects with examples. In the same year, [141] also elaborates on image data augmentation with plenty of examples. It adopts taxonomies similar to those of [168] but includes more modern approaches and evaluates the improvements in model performance when these augmentation methods are used.

Data augmentation on text data is not thoroughly researched as early as image data, possibly due to the discrete and correlated nature of text components. Still, several augmentation methods are proposed for or transplanted to text data. [53] is among the first surveys on text data augmentation. It adopts a simple taxonomy but gives more emphasis on the applications. Built on previous work on image data augmentation, [169] continues to investigate how data augmentation is used to enrich text datasets, and methods are classified as symbolic augmentation and neural augmentation. [11] categorizes text data augmentation methods by identifying whether they are used on the data space or feature space. It also presents the performance improvements of different methods.

Following the success of data augmentation methods for image and text data, there is a growing trend in augmenting graph data, too. Since the graph represents data in a relatively complex form compared with image and text, there are more opportunities for data augmentation. This also leads to more possible ways to categorize graph data augmentation methods. For example, [43] views graph data augmentation from the employed techniques and application scenarios, while [225] discusses graph data augmentation in terms of its data modality, task level, and whether the augmentation operation is rule-based or learned. [228] tries to elaborate on all feasible taxonomies for graph data augmentation and uses detailed schematic illustrations to explain the overview framework as well as the idea of some typical methods.

Tabular data is common in reality, but there is not as much room for data augmentation as other data types because tabular data lacks some features for augmentation to utilize. Some surveys only discuss augmentation techniques in the context of deep learning on tabular data [14], and others mainly focus on how to generate tabular data [55, 162].

With its growing application in scenarios such as speech recognition and IoT, time-series data is attracting more attention. [201] discusses basic and advanced augmentation methods. [82] focuses on generative approaches. [85] gives more discussion on mixing time-series data.

Till now, data augmentation techniques for different data types have been exhaustively discussed; however, there has not been a comprehensive survey that summarizes data augmentation for all types of data. Such a survey can be profitable because data augmentation techniques for different modalities share some common methodologies when leveraging information from existing data, such as altering some features of a sample or mixing values between multiple samples. Summarizing these similarities can help reveal the common pattern of data augmentation. A comprehensive survey does mean simply combining existing surveys because the proposed taxonomies in these surveys view data augmentation from different angles and are incompatible with each other. Some taxonomies contrast basic operations to advanced approaches; some categorize methods by their application scenarios. Besides, these taxonomies provide limited insight into what happens to the information. Indeed, huge gaps lie between operations for data modalities due to their distinctive nature; these operation-based or application-based taxonomies reflect the development of data augmentation techniques. However, from such taxonomies, we cannot grasp the essence of data augmentation and lack perception of the big picture of data augmentation. Hence there is a need for a comprehensive survey that covers data augmentation techniques for all data modalities with an all-embracing and information-centric taxonomy.

3 TAXONOMY

Before presenting the taxonomy, we formalize data augmentation as follows. Given a labeled dataset $\mathcal{D}_L = \{\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y}\}$, where $\mathbf{X}$ stands for the data, and $\mathbf{y}$ stands for the labels, data augmentation can be represented by a certain function f_θ , such that the augmented dataset $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_L = \{\tilde{\mathbf{X}}, \tilde{\mathbf{y}}\}$ is derived by:

$$f_\theta : \mathcal{D}_L = \{\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y}\} \rightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{D}}_L = \{\tilde{\mathbf{X}}, \tilde{\mathbf{y}}\} \quad (1)$$

This representation also applies to an unlabeled dataset $\mathcal{D}_U = \{\mathbf{X}\}$ or a partially labeled dataset $\mathcal{D} = \{\mathbf{X}_L \cup \mathbf{X}_U, \mathbf{y}_L\}$, but for simplicity, in this section, we only use a labeled dataset to explain the taxonomy. Some data augmentation approaches are used in the input data space, while others are used in the latent feature space. This section uses $\mathbf{X}$ as a space-agnostic representation.

In this comprehensive survey, we try to propose a two-tier taxonomy from an information-centric perspective that can be applied to all data modalities. The main consideration of our taxonomy is whence the information in the augmented data comes. It differentiates data augmentation techniques by asking two research questions: **RQ1: How many samples are used to generate each new sample?** **RQ2: Which part of the information is used to generate new data?** The answers to these questions constitute the taxonomy hierarchy which we present below.

By answering **RQ1**, we can divide data augmentation approaches into **Individual**, **Multiple**, and **Populational Augmentation**, which build the first tier of the taxonomy in our survey.

Individual Augmentation. This type of data augmentation method transforms one data sample without referring to others to create new data. It introduces a certain perturbation to the data, such as masking and noise addition. The information of new data comes from exactly one sample in the original dataset, and each new sample often lies around its original sample in the feature space. We formalize Individual Augmentation as follows, where $\epsilon(\mathbf{x}_i)$ stands for a certain perturbation that is related to the original data $\mathbf{x}_i$:

$$\tilde{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{x}_i + \epsilon(\mathbf{x}_i), \quad \tilde{y} = y_i \quad (2)$$

We further answer **RQ2** to build the second tier of the taxonomy. To answer this question, we must consider how the information is contained in the data. Typically, data is made up of a certain type of element that carries unit information with a value, such as the coloring of a pixel or the wording in a sentence. For most data, there is also some structural information that connects these elements in a certain way, such as the positional relationship of pixels or the syntax of a sentence. The key to designing data augmentation methods is to think of how to properly leverage the two types of information. So, we can categorize Individual Augmentation according to which part of the information is used for data augmentation:

- **Value-based Transformation**, which perturbs the value that an element carries.
- **Structure-based Transformation**, which perturbs elements' structural relationships.

Multiple Augmentation. This type of data augmentation method makes use of multiple data to acquire new ones. Information from different data samples is combined by operations such as interpolation and concatenation. New samples derived from these methods often lie between the source data in the feature space. We formalize Multiple Augmentation as follows, where i and j are two data samples from the original dataset, and λ is a scalar factor that often lies between $[0, 1]$:

$$\tilde{\mathbf{x}} = \lambda \cdot \mathbf{x}_i + (1 - \lambda) \cdot \mathbf{x}_j, \quad \tilde{y} = \lambda \cdot y_i + (1 - \lambda) \cdot y_j \quad (3)$$

Now we answer **RQ2** for Multiple Augmentation. Similarly to Individual Augmentation, this type of data augmentation is also conducted utilizing either value of structure information, and the detailed classification is as follows:

- **Value-based Mixture**, which arithmetically mixes the values of multiple data.
- **Structure-based Combination**, which pieces multiple data (or parts of them) together.




Fig. 1. A taxonomy for data augmentation (left) and how information in each data modality is utilized (right).

Populational Augmentation. This type of data augmentation method does not explicitly make use of one or multiple data but rather uses the population of the data. It comprehensively learns the features and abstractions of the entire dataset and samples completely new data from a learned distribution of the data. The generated data should also fall into this distribution. We formalize Populational Augmentation as follows, where $P(\cdot)$ stands for a probability distribution learned from the original dataset $\mathcal{D}_L = \{X, y\}$:

$$\tilde{x} \sim P(X), \quad \tilde{y} \sim P(y|\tilde{x}) \quad (4)$$

The answer to **RQ2** for Populational Augmentation is different from the two categories mentioned above. When generating new data based on population distributions, most methods simultaneously consider value and structural information. Some methods also introduce external knowledge when learning from the data population. So, we have the following classification:

- **Vanilla Generation**, where the generation process only resorts to the existing dataset.
- **Exogenous Generation**, where the generation process refers to external resources such as other datasets or expert knowledge.

We have presented a general taxonomy for data augmentation, whereas the category is at a high level, and each data modality has its specific data augmentation techniques depending on the nature of that modality. In addition, the equations that we use as a general formalization are only abstract and conceptual. They do not literally represent all specific data augmentation techniques in these categories. From paragraph 4 to paragraph 8, we will elaborate on how this taxonomy applies to each data modality and review some typical data augmentation methods.

4 DATA AUGMENTATION FOR IMAGE DATA

The elemental components of an image are pixels. A pixel carries unit information that uses a numerical value to represent the color. Each pixel also has spatial relationships with other pixels, so, images are well-structured. Data augmentation for image data revolves around the manipulation of the colors and spatial relationships of image pixels.

4.1 Individual Image Augmentation

4.1.1 Value-based Image Transformation. Two kinds of methods are used to perturb the value a pixel carries, and thus change the color it displays. One is called **Pixel Erasing**, which completely masks out the color information in an area of the data; another is called **Photometric Transformation**, which only imposes a soft adjustment to change the appearance of the image, but the essential information remains visible.

Pixel Erasing. Pixel Erasing is one of the simplest yet effective types of method in data augmentation. The idea is to mask some information from the original input space or the feature space. Typical work like Cutout [42] and random erasing [227] first selects a rectangle region and erases all pixels in that region. The erased region is then filled with a certain color or Gaussian noises.

If erasing is performed by randomly selecting an area in the image, it is called Image-aware Random Erasing (IRE) [227]. In some tasks, the location of the target in the image is known, so random erasing can be restricted in the object’s bounding box, known as Object-aware random erasing (ORE) [227]. Further argued in [210], the erased area within the bounding box should be limited to a manageable size and a part of the less informative background should also be erased. [210] proposed Region-aware Random Erasing (RRE), which first introduces ORE with upper bounds for width and height in the bounding boxes, and then randomly erases the background.

Random Erasing typically adds one or two big rectangular masks to the image, and some other methods deploy more flexible implementations. Hide-And-Seek [106] proposes to randomly remove multiple parts of the image so that the model has to learn from multiple parts of the image other than the most discriminating part. Similarly, the Grid-Mask method [24] generates a set of squared masks under the grid layout. It can prevent excessive deletion and reservation and achieve a reasonable balance between deleted and reserved regional information.

In most research, random erasing is used in the spatial domain, while REF [81] extends the use of random erasing to the frequency domain. It uses the discrete Fourier transform to process the image, applies random erasing on the image’s frequency domain, and uses the inverse discrete Fourier transform to recover the image to the spatial domain.

Photometric Transformation. In contrast to Pixel Erasing, which put masks on an area of the image, Photometric Transformation changes the overall color and style of the image.

Some methods alter the value of each pixel without considering other pixels. The simplest way is to adjust the brightness of the image. Color inversion replaces the pixels with their “opposite” color. Color casting applies different operations in different channels. For example, red color casting increases the image’s red channel while keeping the green channel and blue channel untouched. Noise injection adds Gaussian or other types of noises to the images. It helps the model learn from various distorted features and become robust. In addition, this method can produce a large amount of augmented data with low cost and complexity.

Some other methods decide how to adjust the value of pixels according to other pixels. Histogram equalization [1, 27], for example, enhances the image by enhancing its contrast, and white balancing simulates alternative light cast on the object. Kernel filters are matrices that slide across and are convoluted with original the image to generate new images. Depending on the value of the matrix, a kernel filter can be used to sharpen or blur the image, or make other changes. A sharpening filter helps extract the features, and a blurring filter can improve the robustness of the model. [157], for instance, uses kernel filters to improve edge detection performance.

Greyscaling transforms a colored picture into black-and-white by combining channels for different colors. This change forces the model to focus on the shapes or edges of target objects instead of their colors. Apart from this, greyscaling would be especially useful in compressing data and improving the model’s efficiency. A counter-operation of grey-scaling is Grayscale-to-Color Conversion (GCC) [71]. Since most pre-trained models for image-related tasks are trained on colored images, single-channeled greyscale images should be colored to fit the models.

4.1.2 Structure-based Image Transformation. This type of Individual Image Augmentation manipulates the spatial relationship between pixels. **Image Cropping** breaks the original image into pieces, and **Geometric Transformation** perturbs the structure within the original data.

Table 2. Region selection strategy for Pixel Erasing methods

Name	Ref	Augmentation Strategy	Random Location-based
Cutout	[42]	✓	
Image-aware Random Erasing	[227]	✓	
Object-aware Random Erasing	[227]		✓
Region-aware Random Erasing	[210]	✓	✓
Hide-and-seek	[106]	✓	
Grid-Mask	[24]	✓	
Random Erasing in the frequency domain	[81]	✓	

Image Cropping. Image Cropping refers to selecting an area from the original image and removing other parts of the image. Some cropping techniques are discussed in the context of reducing the cost of image storage and transmission, improving image quality, and reducing computation complexity and cost when training artificial intelligence models. However, it can also be used as a data augmentation technique, in that image cropping can produce multiple samples by selecting different regions from the original image, and prevent the models from being affected by irrelevant background information in the images. Primitive cropping methods make use of manual selection or random cropping, while some methods employ more advanced techniques to perform this task, including attention-based approaches and aesthetics-based approaches [22].

Attention-based approaches use certain attention scores to evaluate a subimage. Regions that contain the main topic or other types of information often have high attention scores. [132] proposes a general solution, which uses the entropy, area ratio, and center distance of the image to evaluate the performance of the image segmentation and accordingly adjust the cropping parameters. [29] uses an adaptive cropping method that applies different processes depending classification result of the image. These studies discuss the way to evaluate the importance of each part of the image, while they overlook how to search for the optimal cropping rectangle. Formulations of this problem and algorithms with low computational complexity are given by [22]. Apart from these automatic methods, there are also some interactive image cropping methods. [161], a gaze-based image cropping approach, uses eye tracking techniques to capture human fixations and thus infer the location of important contents on the image. Unlike fully hand-crafted image cropping, the implicit interaction applied in eye tracking is less burdensome and less time-consuming.

Aesthetics-based approaches [26, 145, 221] are similar to quality evaluation. For example, [145] detects several subject regions and one background region, extracts features from the regions, estimates and combines posterior probabilities, and determines the quality score according to these probabilities. A2-RL [112] integrates image cropping into a sequential decision-making process and an aesthetics-aware reinforcement learning model to solve the best cropping problem.

Beyond attention-based and aesthetic-based cropping, [207] proposed a change-based approach. It takes into account the content that is removed and extracts two sets of specially designed features to model what is changed after cropping.

Geometric Transformation. As one of the most classical image data augmentation methods, Geometric Transformation changes the spatial relationship of pixels within an image while keeping the value of each pixel untouched to create more data without extra sampling or labeling. It increases the number of training samples, extends the input space, and better represents the real world by deriving more possible views from the original images. For example, flipping the image of a cat can be understood as taking another picture of the cat from a different orientation.

Affine transformations like flipping, shearing, rotation, and translation manipulate the image while preserving the colinearity and ratios of distances. Image flipping reflects the image around its vertical axis, horizontal axis, or both axes, rotation turns the image by an angle about a fixed point. Image shearing fixes all pixels along a given line, and other pixels are shifted parallel to that line by a distance proportional to their perpendicular distance from the line. Translation means moving an image in a certain direction. It can introduce more variance in the position of target objects in the image.

In non-affine transformation, the spatial relationship between pixels is further changed compared with affine transformations because the colinearity and ratio of distances are broken. One example of non-affine transformation is perspective transformation [194], which mimics images taken from other views of the object. Image stretching [197] is a kind of content-aware image resizing. It preserves or even enlarges the prominent contents in the image and compresses the background or unimportant foreground information. For example, if there is a person in the middle of an image, the

middle part of the image is made wider, and the left and right parts are made narrower. Distortion [86, 170] also stretches the pixels but often focuses on a certain region. It aims at fixing distortion in the original images and is especially useful in digit classification tasks where the handwriting is poor or when the images are distorted by a camera lens (e.g. wide-angle lens) when collecting them. PatchShuffle [94] divides an image into block matrices and shuffles the pixels within each block under a certain probability. This transformation introduces more variance in the image and extends the input space or feature space of the training data.

4.1.3 Image Value-structure Transformation. *Automatic Data Augmentation* methods search for the optimized augmentation policy. The policy is derived from a search space that includes both value-based transformations and structure-based transformations. When implementing the augmentation, both pixels' coloring and the positions are changed.

Automatic Data Augmentation. AutoAugment [34] is among the most significant achievements in Automatic Data Augmentation. It represents data augmentation as a decision-making process and uses reinforcement learning to search for the best operations. In AutoAugment, an operation can be any basic value-based transformation like shearing, or structure-based transformation like histogram equalization. A sub-policy consists of two operations along with their probabilities and magnitudes with which the operations are applied. A policy consists of many sub-policies. All sub-policies and their parameters form the search space (action space), and a controller RNN (agent) picks the sub-policies from the search space and gets a policy (action). Images are processed under the policy, which produces several augmented images. The augmented images are fed to downstream networks (environment) and then AutoAugment uses the network's performance (reward) to update the controller. As a result, the controller is trained to pick the policies and parameters that can yield the best network performance. This optimal policy will be used on all images and is also transferable so that it can be used on other datasets, too. Fast AutoAugment [114] proposes a more efficient searching algorithm for augmentation policies, which works significantly faster than AutoAugment and thus allows a larger number of sub-policies, which should benefit the generalization performance. Similarly, RandAugment [35] removes the need for a separate search phase on a proxy task, and makes the training process less complicated and less expensive. Population Based Augmentation (PBA) [76] learns a augmentation schedule rather than a fixed policy as in AutoAugment to improve efficiency. These methods combine the benefits of both value-based transformations and structure-based transformations and further discover the potential of data augmentation with individual image data.

4.2 Multiple Image Augmentation

4.2.1 Value-based Image Mixture. This type of Multiple Image Augmentation computes an arithmetical mixture (e.g. interpolation) of the color from different images.

Image MixUp. Image mixup is a category of data augmentation methods that combine two images pixel-wise. Each pixel of the augmented image is produced by interpolating the pixels from the original images. Mixup [219] mixes two random images on the input layer. Pixels from two original images each contribute a portion to the new image:

$$\tilde{\mathbf{x}} = \lambda \mathbf{x}_i + (1 - \lambda) \mathbf{x}_j, \quad \tilde{\mathbf{y}} = \lambda \mathbf{y}_i + (1 - \lambda) \mathbf{y}_j \quad (5)$$

where $(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{y}_i)$ and $(\mathbf{x}_j, \mathbf{y}_j)$ are two labeled images from the dataset, and $\lambda \in [0, 1]$. As a variant, manifold mixup [188] is operated on the hidden layers of the neural network. Most mixup methods combine two different images, while AugMix [75] applies three augmentation operations to one source image, and combines the three augmented images to generate a new sample.

In the above-mentioned mixup approaches, the mixing factor is even across the entire image, so they are region-consistent. In region-variant mixup approaches, the mixing operation varies in strength across regions. For example, SmoothMix [110] applies a soft-edged mask when mixing.

Two more sophisticated methods are Co-mixup [103] and Puzzle mix [104], which both use saliency to decide the mixing strength of different regions, potentially leading to better mixing performances.

Most mixup methods create new samples with soft labels, as in Eq.5, while there are some exceptions. Sample Paring [83], for example, uses the label of one of the original images, and that of the other image is left unused. ReMix [28] is designed to address the class imbalance problem, and the label of the augmented data is assigned with the label from the minority class.

Neural Blending. In mixup, we explicitly and arithmetically blend different images. However, this process can benefit from the use of neural networks.

AutoMix [128], for example, integrates a Mix Block in the training process. It builds a bridge between the selection of mixup policy and the optimization of the model. In AutoMix, the augmentation module is optimized along with the classification feature map, and the mixup functions and mixing ratio will updated according to the classification loss. Another image blending technique is proposed as Smart Augmentation [111]. At the input end of Smart Augmentation, two random samples are fed into the network through two channels, and a CNN sub-network yields a one-channel output with the same shape as the input, which means one new image is generated based on the information of the two input images. The augmented image is then used for downstream tasks, and the augmentation sub-network adjusts to the task performance accordingly.

4.2.2 Structure-based Image Combination. Methods that combine images based on the position of pixels and image substructure are called **Image Patching**. It refers to putting together small fragments of many images or putting a part of an image over a second image.

Image Patching. RICAP [181] randomly crops four images, and patches them to construct a new image. CutMix [217] makes use of two images. It is developed based on Cutout [42], but the removed region is replaced by a patch from another image. Attentive CutMix [191] further enhances the CutMix method by adding a feature extraction module that selects an important or representative region, and pastes this attentive patch onto the other image. Image patching is not limited to rectangular shapes. CowMask [58], for example, introduces patching with irregular shape rather than rectangular.




Fig. 2. A conceptual demonstration of (a) Value-based Individual Image Transformation, (b) Structure-based Individual Image Transformation, (c) Value-based Multiple Image Mixture, and (d) Structure-based Multiple Image Combination.

4.3 Populational Image Augmentation

4.3.1 Vanilla Image Generation. Generative Adversarial Networks. The rise of Generative Adversarial Networks (GAN) [65] makes it possible for humans to generate new images on a large scale using computers. This nature also leads to a new path of data augmentation: creating new images instead of modifying or combining old ones.

GANs have now been widely used as a data augmentation technique [15], especially in the medical field [59, 97], where data is to some extent scarce. Apart from simply enlarging the dataset, GAN can be used in other way such as removing background noise and cleaning the dataset [6, 107, 166]. It can also generate different views or poses of the object based on the original image [220], and thus add more variation to the dataset.

4.3.2 Exogenous Image Generation. *Neural Style Transfer* introduces style information from external dataset when augmenting an entire dataset. *Computer Graphic Modelling* is to leverage expert knowledge on how objects in the existing dataset looks like and the power of computer software to generate new image samples.

Neural Style Transfer. Neural Style Transfer [63] learns the artistic style from a group of image data and uses this artistic style to depict the topic of images from another dataset.

As is [63], Neural Style Transfer can be used to mimic the drawing styles of particular artists. Such an augmentation process can help the model learn a more general representation of the topics. [113] proposes a more realistic use of neural style transfer. It transfers the weather or illumination from reference images to the target dataset. This is particularly useful because it is hard to collect sufficient images under certain weather.

Computer Graphics Modelling. Computer Graphics Modelling refers to artificially creating images by computer software, and it can be used to produce datasets for model training [10, 60, 136]. These datasets have several advantages over ordinary image datasets. First, it requires little human efforts to collect data. Second, by applying different aspects, poses, and lighting condition, computer graphics modelling can generate images with high diversity. Third, these images are all fully labelled with accurate ground truth.

Table 3. A summary for image data augmentation

Tier 1: Quantity of source data	Tier 2: Information type	Augmentation method	Typical literature
Individual Image Augmentation	Value-based Transformation	Pixel Erasing	Cutout [42] (arXiv 2017), Random Erasing [227] (AAAI 2020), Region-aware Random Erasing [210] (ICCT 2019), Hide-and-seek [106] (ICCV 2017), Grid-Mask [24] (arXiv 2020), REF [81] (ICEIC 2023)
		Photometric Transformation	multi-peak GHE [27] (Digital Signal Processing 2024), DHE [1] (TCE 2007), [157] (ICPR 1990), GCC [71] (JDI 2020)
	Structure-based Transformation	Image Cropping	[132] (CCNC 2004), Self-adaptive Image Cropping [29] (TCE 2007), Automatic Image Cropping [22] (CVPR 2016), Gaze-based Cropping [161] (CHI 2006), Sensation-based Cropping [145] (MM 2009), [26] (MM 2010), [221] (TIP 2012), Change-based Image Cropping [207] (CVPR 2013), A2-RL [112] (CVPR 2018)
		Geometric Transformation	Perspective Transformation [194] (IEEE Access 2019), Stretching [197] (SIGGRAPH 2008), Distortion [170] (ICDAR 2003), STN [86] (NeurIPS 2015), PatchShuffle [94] (arXiv 2017)
	Value-structure Transformation	Automatic Augmentation	AutoAugment [34] (CVPR 2019), Fast AutoAugment [114] (NeurIPS 2019), RandAugment [35] (CVPR 2020), PBA [76] (ICML 2019)
Multiple Image Augmentation	Value-based Mixture	Image Mixup	Mixup [219] (arXiv 2017), Manifold Mixup [188] (ICML 2019), AugMix [75] (arXiv 2019), SmoothMix [110] (CVPR 2020), Co-Mixup [103] (arXiv 2021), Puzzle Mix [104] (ICML 2020), ReMix [28] (ECCV 2020), Sample Paring [83] (arXiv 2018)
		Neural Blending	AutoMix [128] (ECCV 2022), Smart Augmentation [111] (IEEE Access 2017)
	Structure-based Combination	Image Patching	RICAP [181] (TCSVT 2019), CutMix [217] (ICCV 2019), Attentive CutMix [191] (ICASSP 2020), CowMask [58] (arXiv 2020)
Populational Image Augmentation	Vanilla Generation	Generative Adversarial Networks	GAN Augmentation [15] (arXiv 2018), [59] (Neurocomputing 2018), [97] (ICAIA 2021), De-blurGAN [107] (CVPR 2018), [166] (ACCV 2019), [6] (IEEE Access 2021), Re-ID [220] (Neural Computing and Applications 2022)
	Exogenous Generation	Neural Style Transfer	Neural Style Transfer [63] (CVPR 2016), Photorealistic Image Stylization [113] (ECCV 2018)
		Computer Graphics Modelling	Virtual KITTI [60] (CVPR 2016), SceneNet RGB-D [136] (CVPR 2017), SOMAnet [10] (CVIU 2018)

5 DATA AUGMENTATION FOR TEXT DATA

The elemental components of text data are words, and sometimes the words are processed in the form of tokens for later convenience. Words are organized into sentences following syntactic rules. The sentence is a sequential representation since one word comes after another, but there is also a tree-structured grammatical dependency behind the sentence. Data augmentation for text data often changes the wording or reshapes the structure of a sentence.

5.1 Individual Text Augmentation

5.1.1 Value-based Text Transformation. Text data augmentation of this type uses word-level manipulation. It applies changes to the choice of words or adds or removes some words.

Invariant Replacement. Invariant Replacement refers to those augmentations that try to use alternative wording in a given sentence but convey the same meaning.

EDA [199], for example, proposes a set of text augmentations, including synonym replacement. It randomly selects several words from a sentence, substituting them with their synonyms, i.e. words that mean exactly or nearly the same.

There are several ways to implement Synonym Replacement. [135] uses WordNet [139], a lexical database to find synonyms for verbs and nouns in sentences and thus make replacements. Apart from WordNet, [135] also derives word embeddings by Word2Vec [138] and replaces a word with others who have high cosine similarity. Another possibility is to use a knowledge graph. A knowledge graph describes the relationships of entities, and by utilizing the “is equivalent” relation, we can easily find a series of synonyms for a given word.

A special case of synonym replacement is discussed in [118]. Non-standard tokens are frequently used in people’s daily lives, especially for text messages and social network websites, posing challenges to language processing tasks. [118] models the process of generating non-standard tokens from standard dictionary words by letter removal or substitution and proposes a letter transformation approach to handle non-standard tokens. Although used as a normalization method, this technique could also be applied in data augmentation tasks to transform non-standard tokens to standard form, or vice versa.

Token Addition. Token Addition refers to adding extra tokens to the original text, either introducing junk tokens as noise or enriching the sentences and making them more informative.

The random insertion, proposed in EDA [199], inserts a random synonym of a random word at a random position in the sentence. The words added in the EDA play the role of data noising and may carry either little or harmful information. As a variant of EDA, the technique of AEDA [96] only inserts punctuation marks. It only adds limited noise and avoids the potentially negative effect of random insertion. INSNET [130] is an insertion-based text generation model that can sequentially insert new tokens into an incomplete sentence, and with consecutive insertion steps, the sentence is enriched and contains more information. LeCA [19] introduces lexical constraints to improve the performance of neural machine translation. In LeCA, a set of words is supposed to appear in the translation result. These words are called constraints whose embeddings are appended to those of the original tokens. The embeddings are then fed to the transformers’ encoding layer, and these constraint words are very likely to be included in the output text. A very similar research is [78], which also uses lexical constraints. The difference is that in LeCA, the constraints are given a soft suggestion, rather than being forced to appear as in [78].

Token Deletion. Random deletion [199] randomly removes some words from a sentence. In [204], noising techniques are used to avoid overfitting, and the randomly selected word is replaced by a blank placeholder token “_”, rather than simply being removed. In [46], apart from word dropout which is similar to random deletion, it also uses word blanking to replace a word with a special “<BLANK>” placeholder.

On Word Selection. Most methods randomly select the word to be replaced, added, and deleted. But some method considers the role a word plays in the sentence when deciding whether to impose perturbation. For example, TEXTFOOLER [90] ranks words by their importance and replaces the important words with their synonyms.

Syntax-aware data augmentation [46] argues that most previous text data augmentation approaches are only computation-motivated and cannot assure the good quality of the generated text.

Instead of simply modifying words with the same probability, Syntax-aware data augmentation calculates the probability of being modified for each word based on its syntactic role in the sentence. Specifically, it utilizes a dependency tree to calculate the importance of each word, i.e. the depth in the tree. A word far from the root is considered less important syntactically and is more likely to be removed (by means of dropout and blanking) or replaced during the augmentation process.

Instead of using a syntax tree to assess word importance, Selective Text Augmentation (STA) [66] focuses more on the statistical and semantic features of words to describe the role of words. It proposes two perspectives to view words in text classification tasks, namely, statistical correlation, which means how frequently a word co-occurs with a certain category, and semantic similarity, which measures the semantic overlap of the given words and the category label. Using the metrics as axes, STA divides the roles of words into four quadrants: gold, venture, bonus, and trivial. Words with different roles are treated differently when imposing augmentation operations on the sentence. For example, gold words will be kept in selective deletion and synonyms of gold words are added in selective insertion.

Table 4. Word selection strategy

Name	Ref	Augmentation Strategy		
		Random	Role-based	Learned
EDA	[199]	✓		
-	[135]	✓		
TEXTFOOLER	[90]		✓	
LetterTran	[118]			✓
AEDA	[96]	✓		
INSNET	[130]			✓
LeCA	[19]		✓	
GBS	[78]		✓	
-	[204]	✓		
STA	[66]		✓	

5.1.2 Structure-based Text Transformation. We categorize transformation that perturbs sentence structure into two types: **Sentence Cropping** that splits a sentence into many pieces, and **Sentence Morphing** that swaps the location of words or grammatical components.

Sentence Cropping. Borrowing the idea of image cropping, which selects segments from the images, Sentence Cropping [160] divides sentences into several small pieces. It often uses dependency trees to extract the relationships between subjects and objects of the sentence and produces multiple smaller sentences that focus on different parts of the original sentence. This operation breaks the syntactic solidity and semantic comprehensiveness of the entire sentence but preserves local syntactic tags and shallow semantic labels.

Sentence Morphing. These methods manipulate sentence structure by altering the position of words or terms and thus changing the syntax of the sentence.

Random swap [5, 199] randomly chooses two words in a sentence and swaps their position. This perturbs the structure and adds noise to the text data across paragraphs. [140] studies two types of syntactic augmentations: inversion and passivization. Inversion swaps the subject and object in a sentence, and the semantics might be different in most cases. Passivization converts a sentence to its passive form, and the meaning of the new sentence is typically consistent with the original one. Sentence rotation [160] borrows the idea of image rotation, where the image is rotated around its center. In sentence rotation, the root of the sentence is chosen as the center of the sentence, and other sentence fragments are connected to their center via the dependency tree. For some languages, such an operation is semantic-preserving, while for other languages the sentence’s meaning is subject to change. The DRNNs model [206] also utilizes the dependency tree and subject-object knowledge for data augmentation. It samples the shortest dependency path from a sentence’s dependency parse tree and then extracts two sub-paths, i.e. the subject-predicate path and the object-predicate path. Augmentation is done by changing the order of the two paths.

5.1.3 Text Value-structure Manipulation. This type of method perturbs both value and structure information of a sentence. And two typical methods are **Back-translation Augmentation** and **Hierarchical Data Augmentation**.

Back-translation Augmentation. Back-translation [165] means translating text data from one language to another, or a sequence of other languages, and finally translating back to the original

Table 5. Demonstration of some elementary operations for text data augmentation

Operation	Sentence
Original	I am an art student and I paint a lot of pictures. Many people pretend that they understand modern art.
Synonym Replacement [199]	I am an art student and I <i>draw</i> a lot of pictures. Many people pretend that they understand <i>contemporary</i> art.
Similarity Replacement [135]	I am an art student and I paint a lot of <i>photos</i> . Many people pretend that they understand modern <i>literature</i> .
Random Insertion [199]	I am an art student and <i>picture</i> I paint a lot of pictures. Many <i>appreciate</i> people pretend that they understand modern art.
Punctuation Insertion [96]	I am an, art student and: I paint a lot of pictures. Many people? pretend that they. understand modern art.
Random Swap [199]	I am an <i>of</i> student and I paint a lot <i>art</i> pictures. Many people <i>they</i> that <i>pretend</i> understand modern art.
Random Deletion [199]	I am an art <i>student</i> and I paint a lot of pictures. Many <i>people</i> pretend that they understand modern art.
Placeholder Replacement [204]	I am an art _ and I paint a lot of pictures. Many _ pretend that they understand modern art.
Inversion [140]	I am an art student and <i>a lot of pictures paint me</i> . Many people pretend that they understand modern art.
Passivization [140]	I am an art student and I paint a lot of pictures. Many people pretend that <i>modern art are understood by them</i> .

language. The semantic information is preserved during the translation process, but the process can introduce some variance in syntax and wording. Such transformation can help the model learn more flexible expressions that convey the same meaning.

Hierarchical Data Augmentation. Hierarchical Data Augmentation (HDA) [215] augments text data at both word and sentence levels. It evaluates the roles of words and sentences by training a hierarchical attention network to obtain the attention values of the text data at both levels. The attention value is used to help decide the importance of components and augment the data by cropping and concatenating these components.

5.2 Multiple Text Augmentation

5.2.1 Value-based Text Mixture. Mixup [219] has been a widely used data augmentation approach especially used for image data. However, unlike image data, whose coloring information is expressed by numerical values and can be interpolated at the input layer, it is hard to calculate an interpolation for the words. So, text data are usually interpolated at embedding layers.

Text Mixup. The adaptation of Mixup in sentence classification is studied in [69], which proposes wordMixup and senMixup. WordMixup interpolates a pair of word embeddings and then feeds the interpolation to the sentence encoder. SenMixup, on the other hand, interpolates a pair of sentence embeddings. The embedding vector produced by WordMixup or SenMixup is then passed to the softmax layer to produce the target distribution of the classification task. The use of mixup in text data augmentation has also been extensively studied in many research, such as nonlinear Mixup [67] and DoubleMix [20]. A special example is GPT3Mix [211], which makes use of the latest large language model to mix sentences. By inserting two source sentences in a prompt template that describes the instruction to the model, we can get a mixed sentence of high quality with a soft label.

5.2.2 Structure-based Text Combination. Some methods combine text data by merging text fragments from one sentence into another.

Text Fragment Merging. Substructure Substitution [167] and Subtree Swapping [39] both use tree structures to analyze the part of speech or role in the sentences and thus make reasonable swaps. Some simpler method like GECA [3] aims to remove a fragment from a sentence and populate it with another fragment that occurs in some common environment.

5.3 Populational Text Augmentation

5.3.1 Vanilla Text Generation. We have discussed how augmented text data samples can be produced based on existing text materials. While modifying existing data is not the only solution to data augmentation. By leveraging various generative models, we can easily acquire high-quality text data on a large scale, and such abundance in data availability could greatly improve the performance of language models especially in terms of their generalization and robustness. Data augmentation

by text generation previously relied on *Traditional Models*, while *Large Language Models* have now become the dominant technique.

Traditional Models. The use in data augmentation of some early generative language models, such as seq2seq [152], VAE [16], and CVAE [229] has been investigated in [134], which shows improvement in the accuracy of an extrinsic low resource classification task.

Large Language Models. Recent advances in large language models (LLM) and generative pre-training (GPT) [155] models have demonstrated unprecedented power in text understanding, classification, and generation tasks. Apart from supporting intelligent chat-bots that help people in their daily lives, the capacity of these state-of-the-art language generation models establishes a new paradigm of text data augmentation.

LAMBADA [2] is among the first attempts to use a state-of-the-art language generator to synthesize new text data for data augmentation, and its procedure is as follows. LAMBADA first trains a baseline classifier from a small dataset, and then it fine-tunes the GPT-2 [156] model. A set of labels is thereafter fed to the fine-tuned language model, which generates a large dataset of labeled sentences. These sentences are evaluated by the classifier trained prior according to its confidence score, and top-ranked sentences are retained to compose the synthesized dataset. Similarly, [154] integrates GPT-2 in its text data augmentation process and improves the performance of active learning on tiny datasets. It uses the language model to generate a tree of tokens as candidates and construct a sentence from them. The set of new sentences is repeatedly refined by active learning, and the outcome is an augmented text dataset.

Some other research also applies GPT-2 to effectively augment low-resource text datasets, such as [209] and [47]. Despite their success, both of them point out the need for more sophisticated methods to generate text data. [209] for example, argues that human-in-the-loop for relabeling might be rewarding. [47] adopts human-in-the-loop for seed selection and further discusses the potential benefits of injecting expert knowledge for specialized domains. Notably, Data Boost [124] proposes a reinforcement learning framework to guide the process of text data augmentation with GPT-2 and succeeds in generating data of high quality and high similarity to the original data.

The rise of GPT-3 [17] and later LLMs is now providing more possibilities for text generative augmentation. Their use and improvements are studied in the latest research such as [9] and [33].

Table 6. A summary for text data augmentation

Tier 1: Quantity of source data	Tier 2: Information type	Augmentation method	Typical literature
Individual Text Augmentation	Value-based Transformation	Invariant Replacement	EDA [199] (EMNLP-IJCNLP 2019), [135] (CD-MAKE 2020), TEXTFOOLER [90] (AAAI 2020), LetterTran [118] (ACL 2011), [46] (TASLP 2023), STA [66] (arXiv 2022)
		Token Addition	EDA [199] (EMNLP-IJCNLP 2019), AEDA [96] (EMNLP 2021), INSNET [130] (NeurIPS 2022), LeCA [19] (IJCAI 2021), GBS [78] (ACL 2017), STA [66] (arXiv 2022)
		Token Deletion	EDA [199] (EMNLP-IJCNLP 2019), [204] (ICLR 2017), [46] (TASLP 2023), STA [66] (arXiv 2022)
	Structure-based Transformation	Sentence Cropping	Sentence cropping [160] (EMNLP 2018), STA [66] (arXiv 2022)
		Sentence Morphing	EDA [199] (EMNLP-IJCNLP 2019), [5] (ICLR 2018), Sentence Rotation [160] (EMNLP 2018), Inversion & Passivization [140] (ACL 2020), DRNNs [206] (COLING 2016)
	Value-structure Transformation	Back-translation	Back-translation [165] (ACL 2016)
		Hierarchical	HDA [215] (IEEE Access 2019)
Multiple Text Augmentation	Value-based Mixture	Text Mixup	wordMixup & senMixup [69] (arXiv 2019), Nonlinear Mixup [67] (AAAI 2020), DoubleMix [20] (COLING 2022), GPT3Mix [211] (EMNLP 2021)
	Structure-based Combination	Text Fragment Merging	Substructure Substitution [167] (IJCNLP 2021), GECA [3] (arXiv 2019), Subtree Swapping [39] (COLING 2020)
Populational Text Augmentation	Vanilla Generation	Traditional Models	[134] (EMNLP-IJCNLP 2019)
		LLMs	LAMBADA [2] (AAAI 2020), [154] (EMNLP 2020), [209] (EMNLP 2020), [47] (DaSH 2021), Data Boost [124] (EMNLP 2020), [9] (Natural Language Engineering 2022), [33] (ICAIE 2023)

6 DATA AUGMENTATION FOR GRAPH DATA

A graph is represented by $G = \{\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}\}$, where $\mathcal{V}$ stands for the vertex set, and $\mathcal{E}$ stands for the edge set. The topology structure can be alternatively represented by an adjacency matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{V}| \times |\mathcal{V}|}$, where A_{ij} is 1 if there is an edge connecting vertex i and vertex j , and is 0 otherwise. In a deep graph learning scenario, the graph also contains a feature matrix $X \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{V}| \times d}$ that represents the attributes of the nodes. Hence another representation for a graph is $G = \{A, X\}$. Graph data augmentation is to perturb the values in the feature matrix X of nodes or the topology structure represented by the adjacency matrix A .

6.1 Individual Graph Augmentation

6.1.1 Value-based Graph Transformation. Graph nodes often contain rich attributes in the feature matrix. This matrix is generally similar to tabular data, so augmenting node attributes does not need to consider the specialty of graph data.

Node Attributes Augmentation. Various typical augmentation approaches on node attributes from random masking [54, 182, 214] to perturbing attributes with random noises [208] can be applied, as we do for common tabular data. These methods are unified in Eq. 6, where $M \in \{0, 1\}^{N \times N}$ is a binary mask, $\odot$ denotes the Hadamard product, and $N_W \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma)$ is the Gaussian white noise.

$$\tilde{X} = X \odot M + N_W \quad (6)$$

Some other methods are more sophisticated. For example, [173] first learns the topology information of the graph by random walk, and uses the topology embedding together with the original features as inputs to a dual graph neural network. Similarly, LA-GNN [125] applies a local augmentation mechanism. It samples features from nodes' neighborhoods as additional information when augmenting the attributes. A different approach is proposed in DropMessage [52]. Instead of directly modifying the attributes on the nodes, it applies random dropping in the message-passing phase.

6.1.2 Structure-based Graph Transformation. Graph topology structure has immense information representation capacity. Many augmentation methods designed for graph data focus on modifying the topology structure. **Naive Topology Perturbation** methods modify a single node or edge component or consider a set of nodes as a whole and modify the substructure. There is also **Sub-graphing** that extracts subgraphs from the complete graph. **Graph Diffusion**, **Graph Rewiring** and **Graph Structure Learning** are more sophisticated techniques that focus on adjusting the edges to obtain a better graph.

Naive Topology Perturbation. Due to its straightforward idea and easy implementation, node dropping and addition are among the first applied augmentation approaches in graph learning tasks. As given in Eq. 7, Node dropping [214] randomly discards some nodes from the graph. Such an operation will also remove the attributes that these nodes carry and the edges on these nodes.

$$\tilde{\mathcal{V}} = \text{Drop}(\mathcal{V}), \quad \tilde{G} = \{\tilde{A}, \tilde{X}\} = \{A[\tilde{\mathcal{V}}, \tilde{\mathcal{V}}], X[\tilde{\mathcal{V}}, :]\} \quad (7)$$

In some special cases where node dropping is adopted, the edges on the removed nodes are not simply dropped. For example, in MoCL [177], when dropping a general carbon, the two sides of the carbon atom are connected to ensure the completeness of the molecule. So, in MoCL, rather than being removed, the node is more of being "skipped". As for node addition, an example is MPNN [64]. It introduces a latent master node that is connected to all other nodes, which helps messages pass through the graph network.

An edge describes the relationship between two nodes, and by perturbing the edges, we also introduce diversity to the structural information of a graph. DropEdge [159] perturbs the edge set by randomly setting a portion of the adjacency matrix to zero. It first produces a sparse matrix

from a random subset of the original edges, then derives the augmented edge set by subtracting the sparse matrix from the original adjacency matrix. Edge masking in [182] constructs a Bernoulli distribution, and randomly masks edges under that probability. FairDrop [174] computes a mask according to the network's homophily, and use this mask to guide the edge dropping process to remove unfair connections. AD-GCL [180] applies a GNN-augmenter to learn how to drop edges so that the mutual information of the augmented graph and that of the original graph is minimized.

Graph substructure perturbation is beneficial for molecular graphs. A molecule graph represents atoms with nodes and chemical bonds with edges. Functional groups, which often decide the chemical characteristics of molecules, can be represented by substructures. So, by wisely sampling substructures, the global semantics of a molecule graph can be well contained. MoCL [177], for example, utilizes substructure information as one of its augmentation scheme. It performs graph augmentation by replacing functional groups, effectively introducing reasonable noises to the graph. GEAR [119] also employs such technique. It augment molecule graphs by so-called environment replacement, which introduces noise from the environment subgraphs.

Subgraphing. Subgraphing is based on the idea that graph semantics are partially represented in local structures [214], and some subgraphing methods, such as those used in GCC [153] and SUGAR [179] use random walk to sample a subgraph from the original graph. GrpahCrop [195] applies a node-centric strategy to crop connectivity-preserved subgraphs and expand the dataset with these augmented subgraphs. For each subgraph, the rest of the graph is removed, but compared with edge dropping and node dropping methods, GraphCrop [195] better maintains the topology characteristics of the original graph. Similarly, SUBG-CON [89] uses the Personalized PageRank algorithm to select the important nodes. NeuralSparse [226] proposes to obtain the subgraph by learning. It uses a sparsification network to generate sparsified subgraphs.

Graph Diffusion. Traditional message passing in graph neural networks only leverages one-hop connections, while the edges of a real graph are often noisy or arbitrarily defined, and many relationships in the networks are indirectly contained in higher-order neighborhoods. To address this issue, GDC [62], as in Eq. $\tilde{\mathbf{A}} = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \theta_k \mathbf{T}^k$, proposes to calculate a series of transition matrices $\mathbf{T}^k$ by means such as random walk and combines these transition matrices with weights θ_k to obtain a new adjacency matrix $\tilde{\mathbf{A}}$ and thus generate a new graph that directly contains some node connection hidden in the original graph. The new graph can also be understood as being processed by a denoising filter because graph diffusion smooths out the neighborhood over the graph [62]. This technique is widely used by self-supervised approaches to transform the graph and generate different views for contrastive learning, such as MVGRL [73], SelfGNN [98], and MERIT [91].

Graph Rewiring. The topology structure has significant influences on the performance of GNN models. Message passing plays an indispensable role in GNN models. Still, this process suffers from the over-squashing problem when information is spreading over long distances in a graph with the bottleneck [183]. Also, the over-smoothing problem leads to GNNs' performance degeneration on heterophilous graphs [70]. Moreover, the graph's robustness to perturbations poses the stability problem to GNN models [99]. To address these issues, a series of methods referred to as Graph Rewiring is proposed, which adjust the structure of the graphs to help models learn better graph representations and yield better inference in downstream tasks [70].

Graph rewiring, as presented in Eq. 8, is initially proposed as randomly swapping edges [163] to improve a network's robustness and mitigate malicious attacks. Some later research such as smart rewiring [129] takes the degrees of chosen nodes when swapping their edges. Stochastic Discrete Ricci Flow [183] is a curvature-based graph rewiring method, which in each step adds an edge that can improve the most negatively curved edge, and then removes the edge with the

most positive curvature. Its results demonstrate the ability of graph rewiring to alleviate the over-squashing problem. DiffWire [4] introduces the CT-LAYER and GAP-LAYER in a GNN model, which respectively learns the commute times and spectral gap of the graph. It rewires the adjacency graph so that the graph's spectral gap is minimized, and by doing so tries to predict the optimal graph structure for the downstream task. DHGR [13] first learns a similarity matrix from the original graph. Then it rewires the graph by adding edges between high-similarity node pairs and removing edges from low-similarity ones. Such an operation can effectively improve the homophily of the graph and thus improve GNN performance. HDHGR [70] is a method that follows DHGR [13]. It computes multiple similarity matrices under different meta-paths and thus generates several rewired meta-path subgraphs.

$$\tilde{\mathbf{A}} = \overbrace{\mathbf{A} \odot (\mathbf{1} - \mathbb{1}_r)}^{\text{edge removal}} + \overbrace{(\mathbf{1} - \mathbf{A}) \odot \mathbb{1}_r}^{\text{edge addition}} \quad (8)$$

Graph Structure Learning. Graph Neural Networks are subject to noisy, wrong, or incomplete graph structures. Similar to graph rewiring, graph structure learning (GSL) also aims at simultaneously optimizing graph structure and its corresponding representations [231] to deal with the above-mentioned problem, however, GSL is often implemented in a more complicated manner and discussed in a broader context than graph rewiring. GSL applies various techniques to learn and model graph structures, and it is often depicted with a pipeline that includes iterative learning and updating [231]. Also, unlike graph rewiring, which only rewires a graph, GSL can be used to learn and construct a graph structure from non-graph datasets [231], so that many models specific to graph datasets, e.g. GNNs can be trained on these data. Based on how the graph structure is modeled, GSL can be categorized into three classes: metric-based, neural, and direct modeling [231].

Metric-based modeling evaluates the similarity between node pairs through some kernel functions, and in the new graph, the weights of the edges are decided by the similarities of the node pairs. Many early GSL methods fall into this group. For example, IDGL [25] and HGSL [224] both use cosine function for similarity learning to evaluate the optimal adjacency of nodes.

Neural approaches use neural networks for both graph learning and graph convolution tasks, as presented in the work of GLCN [88], which introduces a simple single-layer neural network to learn a new graph from the original node attributes before the graph data is learned by the graph convolution module. PTDNet [131] focuses on dropping noisy, task-irrelevant edges from the graph structure. VIB-GSL [178] learns graph structure from an information theory perspective. SUBLIME [127] proposes an unsupervised learning paradigm for GSL that benefits more types of downstream task.

Direct GSL approaches do not involve estimating edge weights from the vertex or generating a graph by training neural networks. Pro-GNN [92] for example, directly updates the learned adjacency matrix itself during the training process. To avoid sub-optimal results, it jointly learns the graph structure and downstream GNN model. The learned graph and model parameters are updated sequentially in each training epoch. LDS-GNN [57] treats graph learning as a probabilistic distribution problem. When learning from the objectives, it updates the parameter of a Bernoulli distribution, and samples the learned graph from this distribution.

6.2 Multiple Graph Augmentation

6.2.1 Value-based Graph Mixture. Feature or label information from different nodes can be mixed by **Graph Propagation**, which is often used for tasks such as node classification.

Graph Propagation. Propagation refers to spreading information from one node to other nodes along the graph. This type of method can be divided into feature propagation and label propagation.

Feature propagation shares node features with other nodes. After feature vectors of some nodes are masked out, GRAND [54] further augments the node features by randomly propagating them

through edges. MV-GCN [216] first creates three different views from the original graph and propagates the features of the three views respectively before their representations are combined.

Label propagation algorithm (LPA) [230] propagates labels from labeled nodes to all unlabeled nodes according to their proximity through areas with dense unlabeled nodes. AutoGRL [176] applies LPA in their semi-supervised framework to label more nodes utilizing a few ground truth nodes. [80] performs two types of label propagation, correcting the base predictions and smoothing the final prediction, respectively. Though not in a typical graph-based scenario, [84] constructs a nearest neighbor graph on the classifier's manifolds. The affinity matrix, which is the analogy to the adjacency matrix in this case, is constructed based on the k nearest neighbors of each node's embeddings, and this matrix decides how labels propagate.

6.2.2 Graph Value-structure Mixutre. **Graph Mixup** refers to mixing graph nodes or graph instances. This often involves both node attribute values and the topology structure information.

Graph Mixup. The technique of mixup has been extensively applied in various augmentation approaches for image and text tasks. By interpolating feature vectors and labels, mixup expands the feature space of training data and effectively improves the model's robustness and generalization ability. However, the application of mixup in graph data augmentation is challenged by the special structure of graph datasets. Due to the irregular connectivity and various topological structures of graph data, it is hard to directly combine nodes or graphs, as we do when combining two images.

For node-level mixup, one solution to this problem is temporarily ignoring the edges and mixing node features in latent space. For example, GraphMix [189] interpolates the hidden states and labels of input nodes to train a better FCN layer, whose parameters are shared with the GNN layer. A topology-involved node mixup method is proposed in [196]. It randomly pairs nodes and includes the nodes' local topology representations when interpolating them. Notwithstanding the topology information's involvement in [196], it does not mention the construction of edges for the new node. S-Mixup (Structural Mixup) [102] also considers neighboring edges when pairing nodes but works in the input space and discusses how to connect the node with the original graph with edges. It matches nodes based on their classification confidence of a GNN classifier and selects edges with high gradients to connect with the mixed node.

[196] also proposes a method for graph-level mixup. It uses GNNs to embed the complex and irregular graph structures and conduct mixup in the embedding space. However, this method cannot mix graphs in the input layer. To directly mix two inputs at the graph level, ifMixup [68] adds dummy nodes so that two graphs have the same number of nodes. These dummy nodes have all-zero feature vectors and are not connected to any other nodes, or in other words, the weights of edges on dummy nodes are zeros. When mixing the graph, the interpolation of a normal, one-hot labeled edge and a zero-weighted edge yields an edge with a soft label. Similarly, S-Mixup (Graph Mixup with Soft Alignments) [115] also aligns graphs first before mixing them. It obtains an assignment matrix by a soft assignment and uses the assignment matrix to transform a graph so that every node corresponds with a node in the other graph. Another approach that mixes graph-structured datasets at the graph level and input space is Graph Transplant [149]. It extracts a salient subgraph from the source graph and a random subgraph from the destination graph. The augmented graph is produced by transplanting the source subgraph to the destination subgraph and adaptively interpolating the labels of the original graphs. Compared with the above-mentioned approaches, G-Mixup [72] proposes a more sophisticated way to interpolate graph data. It first uses graphs within the same class to estimate a graphon, i.e. graph generator:

$$\mathcal{G} \rightarrow W_{\mathcal{G}}, \mathcal{H} \rightarrow W_{\mathcal{H}} \quad (9)$$

The graphon $W : [0, 1]^2 \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is a matrix, where $W(i, j)$ describes the probability of an edge between nodes i and j , and graphs of the same class are considered to be generated from the same

graphon. Graphons of two classes of graphs are then interpolated to produce a mixed graphon:

$$W_I = \lambda W_{\mathcal{G}} + (1 - \lambda) W_{\mathcal{H}} \quad (10)$$

By sampling from the graphon mixup W_I , we acquire a series of graphs with the same soft labels:

$$\mathbf{y}_I = \lambda \mathbf{y}_{\mathcal{G}} + (1 - \lambda) \mathbf{y}_{\mathcal{H}} \quad (11)$$

At the graphon estimation phase, G-Mixup aligns the original node features and obtains the graphon node features average pooling, which are used as node features of the generated graphs. DAGAD [117] mixes graph representations by performing random permutations and it shows that data augmentation is very helpful in scenarios such as graph anomaly detection.

6.3 Populational Graph Augmentation

6.3.1 Vanilla Graph Generation. Despite that Variational Autoencoders (VAEs) and Generative Adversarial Networks (GANs) can all be used to generate graph data, they face many problems in practice. VAE models require things like a massive graph-matching process, and GANs on graphs easily fall into mode collapse [116]. So, graph data augmentation resort to another recently proposed technique, namely, **Generative Diffusion Models**.

Generative Diffusion Models. The denoising diffusion model [77] is a generative paradigm that has become popular in recent years. Though not yet widely applied as an approach to graph data augmentation, the Generative Diffusion Model boasts enormous potential in graph generation and can possibly be adopted as a promising data augmentation technique. To implement diffusion models on graph data, some properties of the graph data must be properly treated. For example, diffusion models often rely on a continuous Gaussian noise process, but the graph structures are discrete [222]. DiGress [190] designs a discrete denoising diffusion model for graph generation and achieves state-of-the-art performance on molecular and non-molecular datasets. The use of Generative Diffusion Models for data augmentation especially benefits studies on molecules, proteins, and materials, whose data are often in the form of graph instances.

Table 7. A summary for graph data augmentation

Tier 1: Quantity of source data	Tier 2: Information type	Augmentation method	Typical literature
Individual Graph Augmentation	Value-based Transformation	Node Attributes Augmentation	Attribute Masking [214] (NeurIPS 2020), GRAND [54] (NeurIPS 2020), BGRL [182] (ICLR 2021), GASSL [208] (NeurIPS 2021), Topological Regularization [173] (arXiv 2021), LA-GNN [125] (ICML 2022), DropMessage [52] (AAAI 2023)
		Naive Topology Perturbation	Node Dropping & Edge perturbation [214] (NeurIPS 2020), MPNN [64] (ICML 2017), BGRL [182] (ICLR 2021), DropEdge [159] (ICLR 2019), AD-GCL [180] (NeurIPS 2021), FairDrop [174] (TAI 2021)
	Structure-based Transformation	Subgraphing	Subgraph [214] (NeurIPS 2020), GCC [153] (KDD 2020), SUGAR [179] (WWW 2021), GraphCrop [195] (arXiv 2020), SUBG-CON [89] (ICDM 2020), NeuralSparse [226] (ICML 2020), MoCL [177] (KDD 2021), GEAR [119] (KDD 2021)
		Graph Diffusion	GDC [62] (NeurIPS 2019), MVGRL [73] (ICML 2020), SelfGNN [98] (arXiv 2021), MERIT [91] (arXiv 2021)
		Graph Rewiring	[163] (PNAS 2011), Smart Rewiring [129] (J. Complex Netw. 2013), SDRF [183] (ICLR 2021), DiffWire [4] (LoG 2022), DHGR [13] (arXiv 2022), HDHGR [70] (WWW 2023)
		Graph Structure Learning	IDGL [25] (NeurIPS 2020), HGSL [224] (AAAI 2021), GLCN [88] (CVPR 2019), PTDNet [131] (WSDM 2021), VIB-GSL [178] (AAAI 2022), SUBLIME [127] (WWW 2022), Pro-GNN [92] (KDD 2020), LDS-GNN [57] (ICML 2019)
Multiple Graph Augmentation	Value-based Mixture	Propagation	Label propagation [230] (2002), GRAND [54] (NeurIPS 2020), MV-GCN [216] (CIKM 2021), AutoGRL [176] (IJCNN 2021), C&S [80] (ICLR 2020), [84] (CVPR 2019)
	Value-structure Mixture	Graph Mixup	GraphMix [189] (AAAI 2021), [196] (WWW 2021), Structural Mixup [102] (CIKM 2023), ifMixup [68] (arXiv 2021), Graph Mixup with Soft Alignments [115] (arXiv 2023), Graph Transplant [149] (AAAI 2022), G-Mixup [72] (ICML 2022), DAGAD [117] (ICDM 2022)
Populational Graph Augmentation	Vanilla Generation	Diffusion Models	DiGress [190] (ICLR 2023)

7 DATA AUGMENTATION FOR TABULAR DATA

A table is made up of cells, which store numerical or categorical values that represent attributes of the described entities. Cells are organized into columns and rows, but this structural information is trivial, and switching the sequence of the columns and rows does not affect the information conveyed by the table. So, most data augmentation methods leverage the value information.

7.1 Individual Tabular Augmentation

7.1.1 Value-based Table Transformation. Tabular data is much simpler compared with other modalities, so it is hard to design complex augmentation methods that make use of spatial or sequential relationships within a data sample as we do for image or text data, and most data augmentation for tabular data perturbs the value stored in the table cells. **Table Masking** is a simple technique often applied for tabular data augmentation. These corrupted data are often used with the original data under a self-supervised learning framework to learn stronger representations of the dataset. Another approach to tabular data augmentation borrows ideas from **Feature Engineering**. Some work on Feature Engineering design automatic feature selection and transformation frameworks to generate optimal feature space, and the operations can also be used to augment tabular datasets.

Table Masking. VIME [213] uses a mask generator to corrupt features. In a self-supervised scenario, two pretext tasks respectively reconstruct the original data and estimate the mask vector. The model updates its weights based on the reconstruction loss and the mask vector estimation loss of the two pretext tasks. VIME also considers a semi-supervised scenario. In that case, multiple masks are generated and applied to the feature of the unlabeled samples. Despite not being labeled, the model predictions on these corrupted samples should be similar, and thus a consistency loss is calculated. For labeled samples, a supervised loss is calculated based on the prediction. The two losses jointly contribute to the back-propagation phase. SCARF [8] applies data augmentation in a contrastive learning framework. Its corruption process is similar to that of VIME but it uses InfoNCE loss to evaluate the similarity between the embeddings of the corrupted and original views and then update the model accordingly. MET [133] works in a pattern similar to VIME and SCARF, which calculates the reconstruction loss of a partially masked sample. MTR [146] randomly replaces part of the tokenized embeddings, instead of working directly in the input space.

Feature Engineering. [101] continuously generates new features and records them in a transformation graph. It uses reinforcement learning to select the feature set with best cross-validation performance. Some methods formulate the feature selection problem into a multi-agent reinforcement learning task [50, 120, 121]. They assign each feature to an agent, and the agents learn from the reward whether to select or unselect the features. However, the use of multi-agent reinforcement learning increases the computational burden and hardware cost, and some single-agent frameworks are further proposed for this problem [122, 123]. In these methods, only one agent is employed to traverse the whole feature set using the Monte Carlo algorithm and early stopping. Compared to the above-mentioned automatic feature selection methods, RAFT [192] and GRFG [202] emphasize feature transformation and generation. Unlike latent representation learning methods, they use arithmetic operations to generate new features, providing better traceability and explainability. GAINS [203] and MOAT [193] extend feature selection and transformation to continuous space. In GAINS [203], the selected feature subset is encoded into a continuous embedding space. It searches for better embeddings in the learned space and uses the decoder to generate an optimal selection of the dataset. MOAT [193] adapts this process to a feature transformation scenario, where features go through arithmetic operations transformation before the continuous embedding and searching stage, and the decoded features are also processed by a series of transformations. TFWT [223] computes weights for samples and features, and the weights are combined with the data for later

tasks. Although these studies focus on feature engineering, their way of thinking and application of reinforcement learning is very enlightening for data augmentation tasks.

7.1.2 Structure-based Table Transformation.

Table Subsetting. Inspired by image cropping [22, 207], SubTab [185] divides a table into multiple subsets by splitting its columns. Each subset contains only a percentage of all features. The model is forced to learn the representation of the samples by these features and is required to reconstruct all the features from the subset.

7.2 Multiple Tabular Augmentation

7.2.1 Value-based Tabular Mixture. Mixup is the technique to interpolate samples to produce new data. Tabular data, due to its well-aligned structure, is suitable for this augmentation approach.

Table Mixup. SMOTE [18] is among the first works to study data interpolation, even before the proposal of Mixup [219]. It addresses the problem of class imbalance by oversampling from the minority class. The samples are selected within the k nearest neighbors in the feature space and new synthetic data are produced by a random interpolation operation. Since tabular features are often nominal, two variants, namely SMOTE-NC and SMOTE-N, are also proposed along with the initial version of SMOTE [18]. As argued in [37], SMOTE is subject to unrealistic samples when interpolating in a sparse feature space. To solve this problem, TAEI [37] first encodes the sparse data into a dense latent space, interpolates the new data, and then decodes them to obtain the original data plus the augmented data. Contrastive Mixup [38] applies mixup for tabular data in a self- and semi-supervised learning framework. SAINT [172] combines CutMix [217] with contrastive learning to learn from tabular data. ExcelFormer [23] proposes two schemes, namely Feat-Mix and Hidden-Mix. They interpolate data in the input layer and the hidden layer, respectively.

7.2.2 Structure-based Tabular Combination. Contrary to Individual Tabular Augmentation, which lacks structural information to use, Multiple Tabular Augmentation suffers from strict and fixed table structure. Columns differ in their nomenclatures and representations, so it is hard to combine and learn from multiple distinct tables. If these restrictions are relaxed, models can learn across different tables, be more transferable, and better predict unseen tables.

Structure Relaxation. TransTab [198] suggests that multiple tables could share partially overlapped columns in the real world, but traditional methods often fail to fully utilize the data due to the removal of non-overlapping columns and mismatched samples when cleaning the data. TransTab first divides the table into three parts, each containing categorical, binary, and numerical data. These three types of data undergo different operations, are all converted to embeddings, and are again integrated into a new and encoded table. The processed tables can be joined in many ways, depending on the application scenarios. The augmented table contains information from many original tables and helps the model learn across them.

7.3 Populational Tabular Augmentation

7.3.1 Vanilla Tabular Generation. An **Autoencoder** (AE) learns from the dataset and extracts the essential structure, which can be used to generate a more robust dataset. **Generative Adversarial Network** (GAN) is another powerful method that can produce more augmented data and is especially useful for oversampling and alleviating the problem of class imbalance.

Autoencoder. [40] tries out four types of autoencoder, concluding that all of these autoencoders can generate data sets that produce better task performance, while the variational autoencoder (VAE) provides the most robust result. Some other works [51, 184] also use VAE as their data generation approach. SDAT [51] adds extra noise to the latent space of its VAE to obtain augmented samples. These samples, along with the original ones, are then trained under a semi-supervised

framework. [184] combines VAE with active learning. The samples are iteratively selected by active learning, labeled by an oracle, reconstructed by the VAE, and discriminated and classified.

Generative Adversarial Networks. Table-GAN [150] mainly considers the privacy issue, and experiments show that the augmented table given by GAN is compatible with downstream machine learning models and produces similar performance. CTGAN [205] focuses on the class imbalance problem and proposes a conditional generator that accounts for the imbalance in categorical columns. [48] shares similar goal and method with CTGAN [205] but employs a more sophisticated loss function that better incorporates the discriminator and the auxiliary classifier. ITS-GAN [21] proposes a framework that aims to preserve functional dependencies in tables. It models functional dependencies with autoencoders and includes a term to characterize the set of functional dependency constraints in the generator loss function. Arguing that GANs are difficult to train on small datasets, ConvGeN [164] designed a new mechanism that requires the GAN’s generator and discriminator to cooperate with each other, that the generator generates batches of convex combination of minority neighborhood samples and the discriminator classifies these augmented minority samples against majority batches.

7.3.2 Exogenous Tabular Generation. The potential of tabular data is limited by its simple nature compared with data from other modalities. Due to the lack of spatial or relational relationships, many popular augmentation approaches and network configurations are not suitable for tabular datasets. A solution is to construct and introduce relational structure based on the tabular dataset.

Relational Structure Construction. GOGGLE [126] proposes a solution to this problem. It learns the relational structure and corresponding functional relationships from tabular datasets and uses this basis to generate new samples. In other words, it learns a graph from the features in the table and obtains augmented data from that graph. PET [45] depicts multiple tabular data instances as a hyper graph and use the labels to help construct hyper edges. These methods are based on external assumptions and introduces extra structural information beyond the tabular dataset.

Table 8. A summary for tabular data augmentation

Tier 1: Quantity of source data	Tier 2: Information type	Augmentation method	Typical literature
Individual Tabular Augmentation	Value-based Transformation	Table Masking	VIME [213] (NeurIPS 2020), SCARF [8] (ICLR 2021), MET [133] (arXiv 2022), MTR [146] (arXiv 2023)
		Feature Engineering	RL₁ [101] (AAAI 2018), MARFS [120] (KDD 2019), AutoFS [50] (ICDM 2020), MCRFS [123] (ICDM 2021), RAFT [202] (SDM 2023), GRFG [192] (KDD 2022), GAINS [203] (ICDM 2023), MOAT [193] (NeurIPS 2023), TFWT [223] (IJCAI 2024)
	Structure-based Transformation	Table Subsetting	SubTab [185] (NeurIPS 2021)
Multiple Tabular Augmentation	Value-based Mixture	Tabular Mixup	SMOTE [18] (JAIR 2002), TAEI [37] (arXiv 2021), Contrastive Mixup [38] (arXiv 2021), SAINT [172] (arXiv 2021), ExcelFormer [23] (arXiv 2023)
	Structure-based Combination	Structure Relaxation	TransTab [198] (NeurIPS 2022)
Populational Tabular Augmentation	Vanilla Generation	Autoencoder	[40] (Applied Soft Computing 2021), SDAT [51] (CIKM 2022), [184] (ICML 2019)
		Generative Adversarial Networks	Table-GAN [150] (arXiv 2018), CTGAN [205] (NeurIPS 2019), [48] (Expert Systems with Applications 2021), ITS-GAN [21] (IJCAI 2019), ConvGeN [164] (Pattern Recognition 2023)
	Exogenous Generation	Relational Structure Construction	GOGGLE [126] (ICLR 2022), PET [45] (NeurIPS 2022)

8 DATA AUGMENTATION FOR TIME-SERIES DATA

Time-series data represent sequential values within a period, and each timestamp is considered as an elemental component. Data augmentation methods for time-series data either perturb the value at each timestamp or perturb the sequence of timestamps.

8.1 Individual Time-series Augmentation

8.1.1 Value-based Time-series Transformation. A type of simple and straightforward value-based method is **Value Perturbation**, which changes the value represented by a sequence. There is also another type of method called **Decomposition**, which decomposes the value of a sequence into different parts that express the sequential values from different aspects.

Value Perturbation. Value Perturbation augments time-series data by altering the value on the Y-axis. It often perturbs the amplitude at a certain timestamp or in a certain frequency channel.

One of the most simple but popular augmentation methods is to add random noise to the value at each timestamp. For time-series data, this is referred to as jittering. In [186], jittering is used to simulated additive noise ϵ of wearable sensors:

$$\tilde{x}(\epsilon) = \{x_1 + \epsilon_1, \dots, x_t + \epsilon_t, \dots, x_T + \epsilon_T\} \quad (12)$$

Scaling [186] alters the data by multiplying the magnitude of the entire sequence with a scalar α .

$$\tilde{x}(\alpha) = \{\alpha x_1, \dots, \alpha x_t, \dots, \alpha x_T\} \quad (13)$$

Magnitude warping [186] is similar to scaling, but it uses a smooth curve to warp the sequence so that magnitude at different timestamps is scaled with different parameters.

$$\tilde{x}(\alpha) = \{\alpha_1 x_1, \dots, \alpha_t x_t, \dots, \alpha_T x_T\} \quad (14)$$

Rotation [186], or flipping, assumes the data is symmetric with respect to the X-axis, and makes the data upside down by applying a rotation matrix R .

$$\tilde{x}(R) = \{Rx_1, \dots, Rx_t, \dots, Rx_T\} \quad (15)$$

Apart from the amplitude, the phase spectrum provides another option for data augmentation. RobustTAD [61] converts the time-series data from the time domain to the frequency domain, as shown in Eq. 16, and then increases all phases $\theta(\omega_k)$ by a small perturbation.

$$F(\omega_k) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{t=0}^{N-1} x_t e^{-j\omega_k t} = A(\omega_k) \exp[j\theta(\omega_k)] \quad (16)$$

Decomposition. Empirical Mode Decomposition (EMD) [79] is used to produce a set of intrinsic mode functions (IMFs). This decomposition relies on extracting the energy linked to different time scales that are inherent to the data. EMD has been utilized as a method of data augmentation in [143] for the purpose of categorizing impact noise in vehicles. Another way to decompose time-series data is STL [32], which decomposes signals into seasonal, trend, and remainder:

$$y_t = \tau_t + s_t + r_t, \quad t = 1, 2, \dots, N \quad (17)$$

Other works such as [200] and [61] focus on improving robustness with the help of STL components.

8.1.2 Structure-based Time-series Transformation. Unlike Value Perturbation, sequence perturbation is implemented on the X-axis, either on the time domain or the frequency domain. **Window Slicing** splits the time-series data into pieces. It is also the basis of many **Sequence Morphing** methods because they apply varied operations on these slices.

Window Slicing. Inspired by image cropping, which is widely used for image data augmentation, MCNN [36] proposes window slicing. It extracts slices from the entire sequence as new training samples. Each slice is assigned with the label of the original sequence.

Sequence Morphing. Based on Window Slicing, [108] extends or compresses the generated spans, which is called window wrapping. This is equivalent to speeding up or slowing down a span of the sequence. Vowel stretching [142] is a special kind of window wrapping technique. It only perturbs the sequence by prolonging the vowels. This is meant to be consistent with how children

speak. [186] propose to randomly permeate these slices and concatenate them as a long sequence. Similar processing is also called Random Shuffling and is used in [175]. VTLP [87] applies window wrapping in the frequency domain. It adds a small distortion to the central frequency. SpecAugment [148] also proposes to augment the frequency domain. It generates masks of length sampled from a uniform distribution and uses each of them to mask consecutive frequency channels.

8.2 Multiple Time-series Augmentation

8.2.1 Value-based Sequence Mixing. Most methods that combine information from different sequences only use the values, and they are referred to as sequence averaging or sequence mixing.

For example, DTW Barycenter Averaging (DBA) [151] revolves around the averaging problem for Dynamic Time Warping. It develops a global technique for computing the average of a set of sequences and avoids using iterative pairwise averaging. In Weighted-DBA [56], instead of each time series contributing equally to the final average, some can contribute more than others, so that an infinite number of new examples from any set of given time series can be generated. [41] applies both interpolation and extrapolation in the feature space to augment time-series data. It first uses a sequence autoencoder to learn a feature space from unlabeled data. The data is then encoded and augmented with additive noises, interpolation, and extrapolation. Finally, the data in feature spaces is decoded and classified. Extending sequence mixing to the frequency domain, [144] applies the Equalized Mixture Data Augmentation (EMDA) to create new data. It computes the weighted average of two randomly chosen spectrograms with the same label.

8.3 Populational Time-series Augmentation

8.3.1 Vanilla Time-series Generation. GANs are widely used to generate virtual time-series data.

Generative Adversarial Networks. [49] uses an RGAN and an RCGAN to produce realistic medical time-series data. TimeGAN [212] combines supervised and unsupervised losses to train its autoencoding components and adversarial components. [44] propose WaveGAN and SpecGAN to generate time-series data. WaveGAN is used on waveform, while SpecGAN is used on spectrogram. SpecGAN demonstrates how GAN is applied to generate time-series data on the frequency domain

8.3.2 Exogenous Time-series Generation. Some methods view time-series data outside the existing data and from a statistical perspective. They are based on human knowledge on statistics and can predict how the value changes in future timestamps.

Statistical Generation. [171] uses a statistical algorithm called LGT (Local and Global Trend) to forecast paths of the time-series data and samples from them to get extra data. GRATIS [95] employs mixture autoregressive (MAR) models to generate collections of time series and examine the variety and extent of the produced time series within a feature space for time series.

9 DISCUSSION

Influence of Data Augmentation Operations. Some data augmentation methods aim to produce noisy or even “wrong” data to improve the AI models’ robustness by learning those low-quality or adversarial samples; in contrast, some are designed to improve data quality by removing noise or error from the data, so that the models can learn a clean representation of the data; some other methods do not intend to affect data quality, and they only make some semantic-preserving perturbation to the data, enlarge the dataset size, and cover more area in the feature space.

Evaluation Metrics Specific to Data Augmentation. Most research on data augmentation uses the models’ performance on downstream tasks to evaluate the effect of data augmentation methods. However, this criterion depends on too many extraneous factors and may fail to reflect the influence of data augmentation methods on the data. So, there is need for a set of evaluation metrics that can assess specific considerations of data augmentation, such as how much diversity is introduced and data distribution in the feature space changes.

Table 9. A summary for time-series data augmentation

Tier 1: Quantity of source data	Tier 2: Information type	Augmentation method	Typical literature
Individual Time-series Data Augmentation	Value-based Transformation	Value Perturbation	Jittering, Scaling, Magnitude Wrapping, and Rotation [186] (ICMI 2017), Phase Perturbation [61] (arXiv 2020)
		Decomposition	EMD [143] (ICASSP 2020), STL [32] (J. Off. Stat 1990), RobustSTL [200] (AAAI 2019), RobustTAD [61] (arXiv 2020)
	Structure-based Transformation	Window Slicing	Window Slicing [36] (arXiv 2016)
Multiple Time-series Data Augmentation	Value-based Mixture	Sequence Morphing	Window Wrapping [108] (ECML-PKDD 2016), Vowel Stretching [142] (ICASSP 2019), Permutation [186] (ICMI 2017), Random Shuffling [175] (Sensors 2018), VTLP [87] (ICML 2013), SpecAugment [148] (arXiv 2019)
		Sequence Mixing	DTW Barycenter Averaging [151] (Pattern Recognition 2011), Weighted-DBA [56] (ICDM 2017), [41] (arXiv 2017), EMDA [144] (Ecological Informatics 2020)
	Vanilla Generation	GAN	[49] (arXiv 2017), TimeGAN [212] (NeurIPS 2019), WaveGAN & SpecGAN [44] (ICLR 2018)
Populational Time-series Data Augmentation	Exogenous Generation	Statistical Generation	Local and Global Trend [171] (ISF 2016), MAR [95] (Statistical Analysis and Data Mining 2020)

Harnessing Latest Techniques. Large language models possess outstanding ability in manipulating text data, but up to now, most text data augmentation methods relies on symbolic analysis and rules. The question of how to utilize advanced techniques, such as LLM, to perform data augmentation tasks remains open and is rewarding to discover.

10 CONCLUSION

This survey presents a comprehensive summary of data augmentation techniques across five data modalities and proposes a modality-independent taxonomy from a data-centric perspective, which focuses on where the augmented data is derived from. It further enumerates related research papers on these data augmentation methods and annotates them with descriptive information in detail.

REFERENCES

- [1] Mohammad Abdullah-Al-Wadud, Md Hasanul Kabir, M Ali Akber Dewan, and Oksam Chae. 2007. A dynamic histogram equalization for image contrast enhancement. *IEEE transactions on consumer electronics* 53, 2 (2007), 593–600.
- [2] Ateret Anaby-Tavor, Boaz Carmeli, Esther Goldbraich, Amir Kantor, George Kour, Segev Shlomov, Naama Tepper, and Naama Zwerdling. 2020. Do not have enough data? Deep learning to the rescue!. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, Vol. 34. 7383–7390.
- [3] Jacob Andreas. 2019. Good-enough compositional data augmentation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.09545* (2019).
- [4] Adrián Arnaiz-Rodríguez, Ahmed Begga, Francisco Escolano, and Nuria Oliver. 2022. DiffWire: Inductive Graph Rewiring via the Lovász Bound. In *Learning on Graphs Conference*. PMLR, 15–1.
- [5] Mikel Artetxe, Gorka Labaka, Eneko Agirre, and Kyunghyun Cho. 2018. Unsupervised neural machine translation. In *6th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2018*.
- [6] Hina Ashraf, Yoonsang Jeong, and Chong Hyun Lee. 2021. Underwater Ambient-Noise Removing GAN Based on Magnitude and Phase Spectra. *IEEE Access* 9 (2021), 24513–24530.
- [7] Dzmitry Bahdanau, Kyung Hyun Cho, and Yoshua Bengio. 2015. Neural machine translation by jointly learning to align and translate. In *3rd International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2015*.
- [8] Dara Bahri, Heinrich Jiang, Yi Tay, and Donald Metzler. 2021. Scarf: Self-Supervised Contrastive Learning using Random Feature Corruption. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- [9] Salvador V Balkus and Donghui Yan. 2022. Improving short text classification with augmented data using GPT-3. *Natural Language Engineering* (2022), 1–30.
- [10] Igor Barros Barbosa, Marco Cristani, Barbara Caputo, Aleksander Rognhaugen, and Theoharis Theoharis. 2018. Looking beyond appearances: Synthetic training data for deep cnns in re-identification. *Computer Vision and Image Understanding* 167 (2018), 50–62.
- [11] Markus Bayer, Marc-André Kaufhold, and Christian Reuter. 2022. A survey on data augmentation for text classification. *Comput. Surveys* 55, 7 (2022), 1–39.
- [12] Kaifeng Bi, Lingxi Xie, Hengheng Zhang, Xin Chen, Xiaotao Gu, and Qi Tian. 2023. Accurate medium-range global weather forecasting with 3D neural networks. *Nature* 619, 7970 (2023), 533–538.

- [13] Wendong Bi, Lun Du, Qiang Fu, Yanlin Wang, Shi Han, and Dongmei Zhang. 2022. Make heterophily graphs better fit gnn: A graph rewiring approach. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.08264* (2022).
- [14] Vadim Borisov, Tobias Leemann, Kathrin Seßler, Johannes Haug, Martin Pawelczyk, and Gjergji Kasneci. 2022. Deep neural networks and tabular data: A survey. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems* (2022).
- [15] Christopher Bowles, Liang Chen, Ricardo Guerrero, Paul Bentley, Roger Gunn, Alexander Hammers, David Alexander Dickie, Maria Valdés Hernández, Joanna Wardlaw, and Daniel Rueckert. 2018. Gan augmentation: Augmenting training data using generative adversarial networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.10863* (2018).
- [16] Samuel R Bowman, Luke Vilnis, Oriol Vinyals, Andrew M Dai, Rafal Jozefowicz, and Samy Bengio. 2015. Generating sentences from a continuous space. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1511.06349* (2015).
- [17] Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, et al. 2020. Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 33 (2020), 1877–1901.
- [18] Nitesh V Chawla, Kevin W Bowyer, Lawrence O Hall, and W Philip Kegelmeyer. 2002. SMOTE: synthetic minority over-sampling technique. *Journal of artificial intelligence research* 16 (2002), 321–357.
- [19] Guanhua Chen, Yun Chen, Yong Wang, and Victor OK Li. 2021. Lexical-constraint-aware neural machine translation via data augmentation. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Ninth International Conference on International Joint Conferences on Artificial Intelligence*. 3587–3593.
- [20] Hui Chen, Wei Han, Diyi Yang, and Soujanya Poria. 2022. DoubleMix: Simple Interpolation-Based Data Augmentation for Text Classification. In *Proceedings of the 29th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*. 4622–4632.
- [21] Haipeng Chen, Sushil Jajodia, Jing Liu, Noseong Park, Vadim Sokolov, and VS Subrahmanian. 2019. FakeTables: Using GANs to Generate Functional Dependency Preserving Tables with Bounded Real Data.. In *IJCAI*. 2074–2080.
- [22] Jiansheng Chen, Gaocheng Bai, Shaoheng Liang, and Zhengqin Li. 2016. Automatic image cropping: A computational complexity study. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*. 507–515.
- [23] Jintai Chen, Jiahuan Yan, Danny Ziyi Chen, and Jian Wu. 2023. ExcelFormer: A Neural Network Surpassing GBDTs on Tabular Data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.02819* (2023).
- [24] Pengguang Chen, Shu Liu, Hengshuang Zhao, and Jiaya Jia. 2020. Gridmask data augmentation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2001.04086* (2020).
- [25] Yu Chen, Lingfei Wu, and Mohammed Zaki. 2020. Iterative deep graph learning for graph neural networks: Better and robust node embeddings. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 33 (2020), 19314–19326.
- [26] Bin Cheng, Bingbing Ni, Shuicheng Yan, and Qi Tian. 2010. Learning to photograph. In *Proceedings of the 18th ACM international conference on Multimedia*. 291–300.
- [27] Heng-Da Cheng and XJ Shi. 2004. A simple and effective histogram equalization approach to image enhancement. *Digital signal processing* 14, 2 (2004), 158–170.
- [28] Hsin-Ping Chou, Shih-Chieh Chang, Jia-Yu Pan, Wei Wei, and Da-Cheng Juan. 2020. Remix: rebalanced mixup. In *Computer Vision—ECCV 2020 Workshops: Glasgow, UK, August 23–28, 2020, Proceedings, Part VI* 16. Springer, 95–110.
- [29] Gianluigi Ciocca, Claudio Cusano, Francesca Gasparini, and Raimondo Schettini. 2007. Self-adaptive image cropping for small displays. *IEEE Transactions on Consumer Electronics* 53, 4 (2007), 1622–1627.
- [30] Dan Ciregan, Ueli Meier, and Jürgen Schmidhuber. 2012. Multi-column deep neural networks for image classification. In *2012 IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*. IEEE, 3642–3649.
- [31] Dan C Cireşan, Ueli Meier, Jonathan Masci, Luca M Gambardella, and Jürgen Schmidhuber. 2011. High-performance neural networks for visual object classification. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1102.0183* (2011).
- [32] Robert B Cleveland, William S Cleveland, Jean E McRae, and Irma Terpenning. 1990. STL: A seasonal-trend decomposition. *J. Off. Stat* 6, 1 (1990), 3–73.
- [33] Keith Cochran, Clayton Cohn, Jean Francois Rouet, and Peter Hastings. 2023. Improving Automated Evaluation of Student Text Responses Using GPT-3.5 for Text Data Augmentation. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence in Education*. Springer, 217–228.
- [34] Ekin D Cubuk, Barret Zoph, Dandelion Mane, Vijay Vasudevan, and Quoc V Le. 2019. Autoaugment: Learning augmentation strategies from data. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*. 113–123.
- [35] Ekin D Cubuk, Barret Zoph, Jonathon Shlens, and Quoc V Le. 2020. Randaugment: Practical automated data augmentation with a reduced search space. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition workshops*. 702–703.
- [36] Zhicheng Cui, Wenlin Chen, and Yixin Chen. 2016. Multi-scale convolutional neural networks for time series classification. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1603.06995* (2016).
- [37] Sajad Darabi and Yotam Elor. 2021. Synthesising multi-modal minority samples for tabular data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.08204* (2021).

- [38] Sajad Darabi, Shayan Fazeli, Ali Pazoki, Sriram Sankararaman, and Majid Sarrafzadeh. 2021. Contrastive mixup: Self-and semi-supervised learning for tabular domain. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.12296* (2021).
- [39] Mathieu Dehouck and Carlos Gómez-Rodríguez. 2020. Data augmentation via subtree swapping for dependency parsing of low-resource languages. In *28th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*. International Committee on Computational Linguistics; International ..., 3818–3830.
- [40] Juan Manuel Davila Delgado and Lukumon Oyedele. 2021. Deep learning with small datasets: using autoencoders to address limited datasets in construction management. *Applied Soft Computing* 112 (2021), 107836.
- [41] Terrance DeVries and Graham W Taylor. 2017. Dataset augmentation in feature space. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1702.05538* (2017).
- [42] Terrance DeVries and Graham W Taylor. 2017. Improved regularization of convolutional neural networks with cutout. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1708.04552* (2017).
- [43] Kaize Ding, Zhe Xu, Hanghang Tong, and Huan Liu. 2022. Data augmentation for deep graph learning: A survey. *ACM SIGKDD Explorations Newsletter* 24, 2 (2022), 61–77.
- [44] Chris Donahue, Julian McAuley, and Miller Puckette. 2018. Adversarial Audio Synthesis. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- [45] Kounianhua Du, Weinan Zhang, Ruiwen Zhou, Yangkun Wang, Xilong Zhao, Jiarui Jin, Quan Gan, Zheng Zhang, and David P Wipf. 2022. Learning Enhanced Representation for Tabular Data via Neighborhood Propagation. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 35 (2022), 16373–16384.
- [46] Sufeng Duan, Hai Zhao, and Dongdong Zhang. 2023. Syntax-aware data augmentation for neural machine translation. *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Audio, Speech, and Language Processing* (2023).
- [47] Aleksandra Edwards, Asahi Ushio, Jose Camacho-Collados, Helene Ribaupierre, and Alun Preece. 2022. Guiding Generative Language Models for Data Augmentation in Few-Shot Text Classification. In *Proceedings of the Fourth Workshop on Data Science with Human-in-the-Loop (Language Advances)*. 51–63.
- [48] Justin Engelmann and Stefan Lessmann. 2021. Conditional Wasserstein GAN-based oversampling of tabular data for imbalanced learning. *Expert Systems with Applications* 174 (2021), 114582.
- [49] Cristóbal Esteban, Stephanie L Hyland, and Gunnar Rätsch. 2017. Real-valued (medical) time series generation with recurrent conditional gans. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1706.02633* (2017).
- [50] Wei Fan, Kunpeng Liu, Hao Liu, Pengyang Wang, Yong Ge, and Yanjie Fu. 2020. Autofs: Automated feature selection via diversity-aware interactive reinforcement learning. In *2020 IEEE International Conference on Data Mining (ICDM)*. IEEE, 1008–1013.
- [51] Junpeng Fang, Caizhi Tang, Qing Cui, Feng Zhu, Longfei Li, Jun Zhou, and Wei Zhu. 2022. Semi-Supervised Learning with Data Augmentation for Tabular Data. In *Proceedings of the 31st ACM International Conference on Information & Knowledge Management*. 3928–3932.
- [52] Taoran Fang, Zhiqing Xiao, Chunping Wang, Jiarong Xu, Xuan Yang, and Yang Yang. 2023. Dropmessage: Unifying random dropping for graph neural networks. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, Vol. 37. 4267–4275.
- [53] Steven Y Feng, Varun Gangal, Jason Wei, Sarath Chandar, Soroush Vosoughi, Teruko Mitamura, and Eduard Hovy. 2021. A Survey of Data Augmentation Approaches for NLP. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL-IJCNLP 2021*. 968–988.
- [54] Wenzheng Feng, Jie Zhang, Yuxiao Dong, Yu Han, Huanbo Luan, Qian Xu, Qiang Yang, Evgeny Kharlamov, and Jie Tang. 2020. Graph random neural networks for semi-supervised learning on graphs. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 33 (2020), 22092–22103.
- [55] Joao Fonseca and Fernando Bacao. 2023. Tabular and latent space synthetic data generation: a literature review. *Journal of Big Data* 10, 1 (2023), 115.
- [56] Germain Forestier, François Petitjean, Hoang Anh Dau, Geoffrey I Webb, and Eamonn Keogh. 2017. Generating synthetic time series to augment sparse datasets. In *2017 IEEE international conference on data mining (ICDM)*. IEEE, 865–870.
- [57] Luca Franceschi, Mathias Niepert, Massimiliano Pontil, and Xiao He. 2019. Learning discrete structures for graph neural networks. In *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 1972–1982.
- [58] Geoff French, Avital Oliver, and Tim Salimans. 2020. Milking cowmask for semi-supervised image classification. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2003.12022* (2020).
- [59] Maayan Frid-Adar, Idit Diamant, Eyal Klang, Michal Amitai, Jacob Goldberger, and Hayit Greenspan. 2018. GAN-based synthetic medical image augmentation for increased CNN performance in liver lesion classification. *Neurocomputing* 321 (2018), 321–331.
- [60] Adrien Gaidon, Qiao Wang, Yohann Cabon, and Eleonora Vig. 2016. Virtual worlds as proxy for multi-object tracking analysis. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*. 4340–4349.

- [61] Jingkun Gao, Xiaomin Song, Qingsong Wen, Pichao Wang, Liang Sun, and Huan Xu. 2020. Robusttad: Robust time series anomaly detection via decomposition and convolutional neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.09545* (2020).
- [62] Johannes Gasteiger, Stefan Weißenberger, and Stephan Günnemann. 2019. Diffusion improves graph learning. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 32 (2019).
- [63] Leon A Gatys, Alexander S Ecker, and Matthias Bethge. 2016. Image style transfer using convolutional neural networks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*. 2414–2423.
- [64] Justin Gilmer, Samuel S Schoenholz, Patrick F Riley, Oriol Vinyals, and George E Dahl. 2017. Neural message passing for quantum chemistry. In *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 1263–1272.
- [65] Ian Goodfellow, Jean Pouget-Abadie, Mehdi Mirza, Bing Xu, David Warde-Farley, Sherjil Ozair, Aaron Courville, and Yoshua Bengio. 2014. Generative adversarial nets. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 27 (2014).
- [66] Biyang Guo, Songqiao Han, and Hailiang Huang. 2022. Selective text augmentation with word roles for low-resource text classification. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.01560* (2022).
- [67] Hongyu Guo. 2020. Nonlinear mixup: Out-of-manifold data augmentation for text classification. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, Vol. 34. 4044–4051.
- [68] Hongyu Guo and Yongyi Mao. 2021. ifMixup: Interpolating Graph Pair to Regularize Graph Classification. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.09344* (2021).
- [69] Hongyu Guo, Yongyi Mao, and Richong Zhang. 2019. Augmenting data with mixup for sentence classification: An empirical study. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1905.08941* (2019).
- [70] Jiayan Guo, Lun Du, Wendong Bi, Qiang Fu, Xiaojun Ma, Xu Chen, Shi Han, Dongmei Zhang, and Yan Zhang. 2023. Homophily-oriented Heterogeneous Graph Rewiring. In *Proceedings of the ACM Web Conference 2023*. 511–522.
- [71] Vikash Gupta, Mutlu Demirel, Matthew Bigelow, Kevin J Little, Sema Candemir, Luciano M Prevedello, Richard D White, Thomas P O'Donnell, Michael Wels, and Barbaros S Erdal. 2020. Performance of a deep neural network algorithm based on a small medical image dataset: incremental impact of 3D-to-2D reformation combined with novel data augmentation, photometric conversion, or transfer learning. *Journal of digital imaging* 33 (2020), 431–438.
- [72] Xiaotian Han, Zhimeng Jiang, Ninghao Liu, and Xia Hu. 2022. G-mixup: Graph data augmentation for graph classification. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 8230–8248.
- [73] Kaveh Hassani and Amir Hosein Khasahmadi. 2020. Contrastive multi-view representation learning on graphs. In *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 4116–4126.
- [74] Kaiming He, Xiangyu Zhang, Shaoqing Ren, and Jian Sun. 2016. Deep residual learning for image recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*. 770–778.
- [75] Dan Hendrycks, Norman Mu, Ekin D Cubuk, Barret Zoph, Justin Gilmer, and Balaji Lakshminarayanan. 2019. Augmix: A simple data processing method to improve robustness and uncertainty. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1912.02781* (2019).
- [76] Daniel Ho, Eric Liang, Xi Chen, Ion Stoica, and Pieter Abbeel. 2019. Population based augmentation: Efficient learning of augmentation policy schedules. In *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 2731–2741.
- [77] Jonathan Ho, Ajay Jain, and Pieter Abbeel. 2020. Denoising diffusion probabilistic models. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 33 (2020), 6840–6851.
- [78] Chris Hokamp and Qun Liu. 2017. Lexically Constrained Decoding for Sequence Generation Using Grid Beam Search. In *Proceedings of the 55th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*. 1535–1546.
- [79] Norden E Huang, Zheng Shen, Steven R Long, Manli C Wu, Hsing H Shih, Quanan Zheng, Nai-Chyuan Yen, Chi Chao Tung, and Henry H Liu. 1998. The empirical mode decomposition and the Hilbert spectrum for nonlinear and non-stationary time series analysis. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series A: mathematical, physical and engineering sciences* 454, 1971 (1998), 903–995.
- [80] Qian Huang, Horace He, Abhay Singh, Ser-Nam Lim, and Austin Benson. 2020. Combining Label Propagation and Simple Models out-performs Graph Neural Networks. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- [81] Hyunha Hwang, Kyujoong Lee, and Hyuk-Jae Lee. 2023. Improving Corruption Robustness with Random Erasing in the Frequency Domain. In *2023 International Conference on Electronics, Information, and Communication (ICEIC)*. IEEE, 1–3.
- [82] Guillermo Iglesias, Edgar Talavera, Ángel González-Prieto, Alberto Mozo, and Sandra Gómez-Canaval. 2023. Data Augmentation techniques in time series domain: a survey and taxonomy. *Neural Computing and Applications* 35, 14 (2023), 10123–10145.
- [83] Hiroshi Inoue. 2018. Data augmentation by pairing samples for images classification. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1801.02929* (2018).
- [84] Ahmet Iscen, Giorgos Tolias, Yannis Avrithis, and Ondrej Chum. 2019. Label propagation for deep semi-supervised learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*. 5070–5079.

- [85] Brian Kenji Iwana and Seiichi Uchida. 2021. An empirical survey of data augmentation for time series classification with neural networks. *Plos one* 16, 7 (2021), e0254841.
- [86] Max Jaderberg, Karen Simonyan, Andrew Zisserman, et al. 2015. Spatial transformer networks. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 28 (2015).
- [87] Navdeep Jaitly and Geoffrey E Hinton. 2013. Vocal tract length perturbation (VTLP) improves speech recognition. In *Proc. ICML Workshop on Deep Learning for Audio, Speech and Language*, Vol. 117. 21.
- [88] Bo Jiang, Ziyang Zhang, Doudou Lin, Jin Tang, and Bin Luo. 2019. Semi-supervised learning with graph learning-convolutional networks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*. 11313–11320.
- [89] Yizhu Jiao, Yun Xiong, Jiawei Zhang, Yao Zhang, Tianqi Zhang, and Yangyong Zhu. 2020. Sub-graph contrast for scalable self-supervised graph representation learning. In *2020 IEEE international conference on data mining (ICDM)*. IEEE, 222–231.
- [90] Di Jin, Zhijing Jin, Joey Tianyi Zhou, and Peter Szolovits. 2020. Is bert really robust? a strong baseline for natural language attack on text classification and entailment. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, Vol. 34. 8018–8025.
- [91] Ming Jin, Yizhen Zheng, Yuan-Fang Li, Chen Gong, Chuan Zhou, and Shirui Pan. 2021. Multi-scale contrastive siamese networks for self-supervised graph representation learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.05682* (2021).
- [92] Wei Jin, Yao Ma, Xiaorui Liu, Xianfeng Tang, Suhang Wang, and Jiliang Tang. 2020. Graph structure learning for robust graph neural networks. In *Proceedings of the 26th ACM SIGKDD international conference on knowledge discovery & data mining*. 66–74.
- [93] John Jumper, Richard Evans, Alexander Pritzel, Tim Green, Michael Figurnov, Olaf Ronneberger, Kathryn Tunyasuvunakool, Russ Bates, Augustin Židek, Anna Potapenko, et al. 2021. Highly accurate protein structure prediction with AlphaFold. *Nature* 596, 7873 (2021), 583–589.
- [94] Guoliang Kang, Xuanyi Dong, Liang Zheng, and Yi Yang. 2017. Patchshuffle regularization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1707.07103* (2017).
- [95] Yanfei Kang, Rob J Hyndman, and Feng Li. 2020. GRATIS: GeneRAting Time Series with diverse and controllable characteristics. *Statistical Analysis and Data Mining: The ASA Data Science Journal* 13, 4 (2020), 354–376.
- [96] Akbar Karimi, Leonardo Rossi, and Andrea Prati. 2021. AEDA: An Easier Data Augmentation Technique for Text Classification. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2021*. 2748–2754.
- [97] Sukhpal Kaur, Himanshu Aggarwal, and Rinkle Rani. 2021. MR image synthesis using generative adversarial networks for Parkinson’s disease classification. In *Proceedings of International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Applications: ICAIA 2020*. Springer, 317–327.
- [98] Zekarias T Kefato and Sarunas Girdzijauskas. 2021. Self-supervised graph neural networks without explicit negative sampling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.14958* (2021).
- [99] Henry Kenlay, Dorina Thano, and Xiaowen Dong. 2021. On the stability of graph convolutional neural networks under edge rewiring. In *ICASSP 2021-2021 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*. IEEE, 8513–8517.
- [100] Nour Eldeen Khalifa, Mohamed Loey, and Seyedali Mirjalili. 2022. A comprehensive survey of recent trends in deep learning for digital images augmentation. *Artificial Intelligence Review* (2022), 1–27.
- [101] Udayan Khurana, Horst Samulowitz, and Deepak Turaga. 2018. Feature engineering for predictive modeling using reinforcement learning. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, Vol. 32.
- [102] Junghun Kim, Sukwon Yun, and Chanyoung Park. 2023. S-Mixup: Structural Mixup for Graph Neural Networks. In *Proceedings of the 32nd ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management*. 4003–4007.
- [103] Jang-Hyun Kim, Wonho Choo, Hosan Jeong, and Hyun Oh Song. 2021. Co-mixup: Saliency guided joint mixup with supermodular diversity. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2102.03065* (2021).
- [104] Jang-Hyun Kim, Wonho Choo, and Hyun Oh Song. 2020. Puzzle mix: Exploiting saliency and local statistics for optimal mixup. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 5275–5285.
- [105] Alex Krizhevsky, Ilya Sutskever, and Geoffrey E Hinton. 2012. Imagenet classification with deep convolutional neural networks. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 25 (2012).
- [106] Krishna Kumar Singh and Yong Jae Lee. 2017. Hide-and-seek: Forcing a network to be meticulous for weakly-supervised object and action localization. In *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision*. 3524–3533.
- [107] Orest Kupyn, Volodymyr Budzan, Mykola Mykhailych, Dmytro Mishkin, and Jiří Matas. 2018. Deblurgan: Blind motion deblurring using conditional adversarial networks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*. 8183–8192.
- [108] Arthur Le Guennec, Simon Malinowski, and Romain Tavenard. 2016. Data augmentation for time series classification using convolutional neural networks. In *ECML/PKDD workshop on advanced analytics and learning on temporal data*.

- [109] Yann LeCun, Léon Bottou, Yoshua Bengio, and Patrick Haffner. 1998. Gradient-based learning applied to document recognition. *Proc. IEEE* 86, 11 (1998), 2278–2324.
- [110] Jin-Ha Lee, Muhammad Zaigham Zaheer, Marcella Astrid, and Seung-Ik Lee. 2020. Smoothmix: a simple yet effective data augmentation to train robust classifiers. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition workshops*. 756–757.
- [111] Joseph Lemley, Shabab Bazrafkan, and Peter Corcoran. 2017. Smart augmentation learning an optimal data augmentation strategy. *Ieee Access* 5 (2017), 5858–5869.
- [112] Debang Li, Huikai Wu, Junge Zhang, and Kaiqi Huang. 2018. A2-RL: Aesthetics aware reinforcement learning for image cropping. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*. 8193–8201.
- [113] Yijun Li, Ming-Yu Liu, Xueting Li, Ming-Hsuan Yang, and Jan Kautz. 2018. A closed-form solution to photorealistic image stylization. In *Proceedings of the European conference on computer vision (ECCV)*. 453–468.
- [114] Sungbin Lim, Ildoo Kim, Taesup Kim, Chiheon Kim, and Sungwoong Kim. 2019. Fast autoaugment. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 32 (2019).
- [115] Hongyi Ling, Zhimeng Jiang, Meng Liu, Shuiwang Ji, and Na Zou. 2023. Graph Mixup with Soft Alignments. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.06788* (2023).
- [116] Chengyi Liu, Wenqi Fan, Yunqing Liu, Jiatong Li, Hang Li, Hui Liu, Jiliang Tang, and Qing Li. 2023. Generative diffusion models on graphs: Methods and applications. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.02591* (2023).
- [117] Fanzhen Liu, Xiaoxiao Ma, Jia Wu, Jian Yang, Shan Xue, Amin Beheshti, Chuan Zhou, Hao Peng, Quan Z Sheng, and Charu C Aggarwal. 2022. Dagad: Data augmentation for graph anomaly detection. In *2022 IEEE International Conference on Data Mining (ICDM)*. IEEE, 259–268.
- [118] Fei Liu, Fuliang Weng, Bingqing Wang, and Yang Liu. 2011. Insertion, deletion, or substitution? Normalizing text messages without pre-categorization nor supervision. In *Proceedings of the 49th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*. 71–76.
- [119] Gang Liu, Tong Zhao, Jiaxin Xu, Tengfei Luo, and Meng Jiang. 2022. Graph rationalization with environment-based augmentations. In *Proceedings of the 28th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*. 1069–1078.
- [120] Kunpeng Liu, Yanjie Fu, Pengfei Wang, Le Wu, Rui Bo, and Xiaolin Li. 2019. Automating feature subspace exploration via multi-agent reinforcement learning. In *Proceedings of the 25th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining*. 207–215.
- [121] Kunpeng Liu, Yanjie Fu, Le Wu, Xiaolin Li, Charu Aggarwal, and Hui Xiong. 2021. Automated feature selection: A reinforcement learning perspective. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering* (2021).
- [122] Kunpeng Liu, Dongjie Wang, Wan Du, Dapeng Oliver Wu, and Yanjie Fu. 2023. Interactive reinforced feature selection with traverse strategy. *Knowledge and Information Systems* 65, 5 (2023), 1935–1962.
- [123] Kunpeng Liu, Pengfei Wang, Dongjie Wang, Wan Du, Dapeng Oliver Wu, and Yanjie Fu. 2021. Efficient reinforced feature selection via early stopping traverse strategy. In *2021 IEEE International Conference on Data Mining (ICDM)*. IEEE, 399–408.
- [124] Ruibo Liu, Guangxuan Xu, Chenyan Jia, Weicheng Ma, Lili Wang, and Soroush Vosoughi. 2020. Data Boost: Text Data Augmentation Through Reinforcement Learning Guided Conditional Generation. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*. 9031–9041.
- [125] Songtao Liu, Rex Ying, Hanze Dong, Lanqing Li, Tingyang Xu, Yu Rong, Peilin Zhao, Junzhou Huang, and Dinghao Wu. 2022. Local augmentation for graph neural networks. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 14054–14072.
- [126] Tennison Liu, Zhaozhi Qian, Jeroen Berrevoets, and Mihaela van der Schaar. 2022. GOGGLE: Generative modelling for tabular data by learning relational structure. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- [127] Yixin Liu, Yu Zheng, Daokun Zhang, Hongxu Chen, Hao Peng, and Shirui Pan. 2022. Towards unsupervised deep graph structure learning. In *Proceedings of the ACM Web Conference 2022*. 1392–1403.
- [128] Zicheng Liu, Siyuan Li, Di Wu, Zihan Liu, Zhiyuan Chen, Lirong Wu, and Stan Z Li. 2022. Automix: Unveiling the power of mixup for stronger classifiers. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*. Springer, 441–458.
- [129] Vitor HP Louzada, Fabio Daolio, Hans J Herrmann, and Marco Tomassini. 2013. Smart rewiring for network robustness. *Journal of Complex networks* 1, 2 (2013), 150–159.
- [130] Sidi Lu, Tao Meng, and Nanyun Peng. 2022. Insnet: An efficient, flexible, and performant insertion-based text generation model. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 35 (2022), 7011–7023.
- [131] Dongsheng Luo, Wei Cheng, Wenchao Yu, Bo Zong, Jingchao Ni, Haifeng Chen, and Xiang Zhang. 2021. Learning to drop: Robust graph neural network via topological denoising. In *Proceedings of the 14th ACM international conference on web search and data mining*. 779–787.
- [132] Matthew Ma and Jinhong K Guo. 2004. Automatic image cropping for mobile device with built-in camera. In *First IEEE Consumer Communications and Networking Conference, 2004. CCNC 2004*. IEEE, 710–711.

- [133] Kushal Majmundar, Sachin Goyal, Praneeth Netrapalli, and Prateek Jain. 2022. Met: Masked encoding for tabular data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.08564* (2022).
- [134] Nikolaos Malandrakis, Minmin Shen, Anuj Goyal, Shuyang Gao, Abhishek Sethi, Angeliki Metallinou, and Amazon Alexa AI. 2019. Controlled Text Generation for Data Augmentation in Intelligent Artificial Agents. *EMNLP-IJCNLP 2019* (2019), 90.
- [135] Vukosi Marivate and Tshephisho Sefara. 2020. Improving short text classification through global augmentation methods. In *Machine Learning and Knowledge Extraction: 4th IFIP TC 5, TC 12, WG 8.4, WG 8.9, WG 12.9 International Cross-Domain Conference, CD-MAKE 2020, Dublin, Ireland, August 25–28, 2020, Proceedings 4*. Springer, 385–399.
- [136] John McCormac, Ankur Handa, Stefan Leutenegger, and Andrew J Davison. 2017. Scenenet rgb-d: Can 5m synthetic images beat generic imagenet pre-training on indoor segmentation?. In *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision*. 2678–2687.
- [137] Agnieszka Mikołajczyk and Michał Grochowski. 2018. Data augmentation for improving deep learning in image classification problem. In *2018 international interdisciplinary PhD workshop (IIPhDW)*. IEEE, 117–122.
- [138] Tomas Mikolov, Kai Chen, Greg Corrado, and Jeffrey Dean. 2013. Efficient estimation of word representations in vector space. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1301.3781* (2013).
- [139] George A Miller. 1995. WordNet: a lexical database for English. *Commun. ACM* 38, 11 (1995), 39–41.
- [140] Junghyun Min, R Thomas McCoy, Dipanjan Das, Emily Pitler, and Tal Linzen. 2020. Syntactic data augmentation increases robustness to inference heuristics. In *58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics, ACL 2020*. Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL), 2339–2352.
- [141] Alhassan Mumuni and Fuseini Mumuni. 2022. Data augmentation: A comprehensive survey of modern approaches. *Array* (2022), 100258.
- [142] Tohru Nagano, Takashi Fukuda, Masayuki Suzuki, and Gakuto Kurata. 2019. Data augmentation based on vowel stretch for improving children’s speech recognition. In *2019 IEEE Automatic Speech Recognition and Understanding Workshop (ASRU)*. IEEE, 502–508.
- [143] Gue-Hwan Nam, Seok-Jun Bu, Na-Mu Park, Jae-Yong Seo, Hyeon-Cheol Jo, and Won-Tae Jeong. 2020. Data augmentation using empirical mode decomposition on neural networks to classify impact noise in vehicle. In *ICASSP 2020-2020 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*. IEEE, 731–735.
- [144] Loris Nanni, Gianluca Maguolo, and Michelangelo Paci. 2020. Data augmentation approaches for improving animal audio classification. *Ecological Informatics* 57 (2020), 101084.
- [145] Masashi Nishiyama, Takahiro Okabe, Yoichi Sato, and Imari Sato. 2009. Sensation-based photo cropping. In *Proceedings of the 17th ACM international conference on Multimedia*. 669–672.
- [146] Soma Onishi and Shoya Meguro. 2023. Rethinking Data Augmentation for Tabular Data in Deep Learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.10308* (2023).
- [147] R OpenAI. 2023. Gpt-4 technical report. arxiv 2303.08774. *View in Article* 2 (2023), 13.
- [148] Daniel S Park, William Chan, Yu Zhang, Chung-Cheng Chiu, Barret Zoph, Ekin D Cubuk, and Quoc V Le. 2019. SpecAugment: A simple data augmentation method for automatic speech recognition. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.08779* (2019).
- [149] Joonhyung Park, Hajin Shim, and Eunho Yang. 2022. Graph transplant: Node saliency-guided graph mixup with local structure preservation. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, Vol. 36. 7966–7974.
- [150] Noseong Park, Mahmoud Mohammadi, Kshitij Gorde, Sushil Jajodia, Hongkyu Park, and Youngmin Kim. 2018. Data synthesis based on generative adversarial networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1806.03384* (2018).
- [151] François Petitjean, Alain Ketterlin, and Pierre Gançarski. 2011. A global averaging method for dynamic time warping, with applications to clustering. *Pattern recognition* 44, 3 (2011), 678–693.
- [152] Aaditya Prakash, Sadid A Hasan, Kathy Lee, Vivek Datla, Ashequl Qadir, Joey Liu, and Oladimeji Farri. 2016. Neural paraphrase generation with stacked residual LSTM networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1610.03098* (2016).
- [153] Jiezhong Qiu, Qibin Chen, Yuxiao Dong, Jing Zhang, Hongxia Yang, Ming Ding, Kuansan Wang, and Jie Tang. 2020. Gcc: Graph contrastive coding for graph neural network pre-training. In *Proceedings of the 26th ACM SIGKDD international conference on knowledge discovery & data mining*. 1150–1160.
- [154] Husam Quteineh, Spyridon Samothrakis, and Richard Sutcliffe. 2020. Textual data augmentation for efficient active learning on tiny datasets. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*. 7400–7410.
- [155] Alec Radford, Karthik Narasimhan, Tim Salimans, Ilya Sutskever, et al. 2018. Improving language understanding by generative pre-training. (2018).
- [156] Alec Radford, Jeffrey Wu, Rewon Child, David Luan, Dario Amodei, Ilya Sutskever, et al. 2019. Language models are unsupervised multitask learners. *OpenAI blog* 1, 8 (2019), 9.
- [157] Stephen E Reichenbach, Stephen K Park, and Rachel Alter-Gartenberg. 1990. Optimal small kernels for edge detection. In *[1990] Proceedings. 10th International Conference on Pattern Recognition*, Vol. 2. IEEE, 57–63.

- [158] Robin Rombach, Andreas Blattmann, Dominik Lorenz, Patrick Esser, and Björn Ommer. 2022. High-resolution image synthesis with latent diffusion models. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*. 10684–10695.
- [159] Yu Rong, Wenbing Huang, Tingyang Xu, and Junzhou Huang. 2019. DropEdge: Towards Deep Graph Convolutional Networks on Node Classification. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- [160] Gözde Gül Şahin and Mark Steedman. 2018. Data Augmentation via Dependency Tree Morphing for Low-Resource Languages. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. 5004–5009.
- [161] Anthony Santella, Maneesh Agrawala, Doug DeCarlo, David Salesin, and Michael Cohen. 2006. Gaze-based interaction for semi-automatic photo cropping. In *Proceedings of the SIGCHI conference on Human Factors in computing systems*. 771–780.
- [162] Rick Sauber-Cole and Taghi M Khoshgoftaar. 2022. The use of generative adversarial networks to alleviate class imbalance in tabular data: a survey. *Journal of Big Data* 9, 1 (2022), 98.
- [163] Christian M Schneider, André A Moreira, José S Andrade Jr, Shlomo Havlin, and Hans J Herrmann. 2011. Mitigation of malicious attacks on networks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 108, 10 (2011), 3838–3841.
- [164] Kristian Schultz, Saptarshi Bej, Waldemar Hahn, Markus Wolfien, Prashant Srivastava, and Olaf Wolkenhauer. 2023. ConvGeN: A convex space learning approach for deep-generative oversampling and imbalanced classification of small tabular datasets. *Pattern Recognition* (2023), 110138.
- [165] Rico Sennrich, Barry Haddow, and Alexandra Birch. 2016. Improving Neural Machine Translation Models with Monolingual Data. In *Proceedings of the 54th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*. 86–96.
- [166] Monika Sharma, Abhishek Verma, and Lovekesh Vig. 2019. Learning to clean: A GAN perspective. In *Computer Vision—ACCV 2018 Workshops: 14th Asian Conference on Computer Vision, Perth, Australia, December 2–6, 2018, Revised Selected Papers 14*. Springer, 174–185.
- [167] Haoyue Shi, Karen Livescu, and Kevin Gimpel. 2021. Substructure Substitution: Structured Data Augmentation for NLP. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL-IJCNLP 2021*. 3494–3508.
- [168] Connor Shorten and Taghi M Khoshgoftaar. 2019. A survey on image data augmentation for deep learning. *Journal of big data* 6, 1 (2019), 1–48.
- [169] Connor Shorten, Taghi M Khoshgoftaar, and Borko Furht. 2021. Text data augmentation for deep learning. *Journal of big Data* 8 (2021), 1–34.
- [170] Patrice Y Simard, David Steinkraus, John C Platt, et al. 2003. Best practices for convolutional neural networks applied to visual document analysis.. In *Icdar*, Vol. 3. Edinburgh.
- [171] Slawek Smyl and Karthik Kuber. 2016. Data preprocessing and augmentation for multiple short time series forecasting with recurrent neural networks. In *36th international symposium on forecasting*.
- [172] Gowthami Somepalli, Micah Goldblum, Avi Schwarzschild, C Bayan Bruss, and Tom Goldstein. 2021. Saint: Improved neural networks for tabular data via row attention and contrastive pre-training. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.01342* (2021).
- [173] Rui Song, Fausto Giunchiglia, Ke Zhao, and Hao Xu. 2021. Topological regularization for graph neural networks augmentation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.02478* (2021).
- [174] Indro Spinelli, Simone Scardapane, Amir Hussain, and Aurelio Uncini. 2021. Fairdrop: Biased edge dropout for enhancing fairness in graph representation learning. *IEEE Transactions on Artificial Intelligence* 3, 3 (2021), 344–354.
- [175] Odongo Steven Eyobu and Dong Seog Han. 2018. Feature representation and data augmentation for human activity classification based on wearable IMU sensor data using a deep LSTM neural network. *Sensors* 18, 9 (2018), 2892.
- [176] Junwei Sun, Bai Wang, and Bin Wu. 2021. Automated graph representation learning for node classification. In *2021 International Joint Conference on Neural Networks (IJCNN)*. IEEE, 1–7.
- [177] Mengying Sun, Jing Xing, Huijun Wang, Bin Chen, and Jiayu Zhou. 2021. MoCL: data-driven molecular fingerprint via knowledge-aware contrastive learning from molecular graph. In *Proceedings of the 27th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining*. 3585–3594.
- [178] Qingyun Sun, Jianxin Li, Hao Peng, Jia Wu, Xingcheng Fu, Cheng Ji, and S Yu Philip. 2022. Graph structure learning with variational information bottleneck. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, Vol. 36. 4165–4174.
- [179] Qingyun Sun, Jianxin Li, Hao Peng, Jia Wu, Yuanxing Ning, Philip S Yu, and Lifang He. 2021. Sugar: Subgraph neural network with reinforcement pooling and self-supervised mutual information mechanism. In *Proceedings of the Web Conference 2021*. 2081–2091.
- [180] Susheel Suresh, Pan Li, Cong Hao, and Jennifer Neville. 2021. Adversarial graph augmentation to improve graph contrastive learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 34 (2021), 15920–15933.
- [181] Ryo Takahashi, Takashi Matsubara, and Kuniaki Uehara. 2019. Data augmentation using random image cropping and patching for deep CNNs. *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems for Video Technology* 30, 9 (2019), 2917–2931.

- [182] Shantanu Thakoor, Corentin Tallec, Mohammad Gheshlaghi Azar, Mehdi Azabou, Eva L Dyer, Remi Munos, Petar Veličković, and Michal Valko. 2021. Large-Scale Representation Learning on Graphs via Bootstrapping. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- [183] Jake Topping, Francesco Di Giovanni, Benjamin Paul Chamberlain, Xiaowen Dong, and Michael M Bronstein. 2021. Understanding over-squashing and bottlenecks on graphs via curvature. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- [184] Toan Tran, Thanh-Toan Do, Ian Reid, and Gustavo Carneiro. 2019. Bayesian generative active deep learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 6295–6304.
- [185] Talip Ucar, Ehsan Hajiramezanali, and Lindsay Edwards. 2021. Subtab: Subsetting features of tabular data for self-supervised representation learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 34 (2021), 18853–18865.
- [186] Terry T Um, Franz MJ Pfister, Daniel Pichler, Satoshi Endo, Muriel Lang, Sandra Hirche, Urban Fietzek, and Dana Kulić. 2017. Data augmentation of wearable sensor data for parkinson’s disease monitoring using convolutional neural networks. In *Proceedings of the 19th ACM international conference on multimodal interaction*. 216–220.
- [187] Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. 2017. Attention is all you need. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 30 (2017).
- [188] Vikas Verma, Alex Lamb, Christopher Beckham, Amir Najafi, Ioannis Mitliagkas, David Lopez-Paz, and Yoshua Bengio. 2019. Manifold mixup: Better representations by interpolating hidden states. In *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 6438–6447.
- [189] Vikas Verma, Meng Qu, Kenji Kawaguchi, Alex Lamb, Yoshua Bengio, Juho Kannala, and Jian Tang. 2021. Graphmix: Improved training of gnns for semi-supervised learning. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, Vol. 35. 10024–10032.
- [190] Clément Vignac, Igor Krawczuk, Antoine Siraudin, Bohan Wang, Volkan Cevher, and Pascal Frossard. 2023. DiGress: Discrete Denoising diffusion for graph generation. In *Proceedings of the 11th International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- [191] Devesh Walawalkar, Zhiqiang Shen, Zechun Liu, and Marios Savvides. 2020. Attentive Cutmix: An Enhanced Data Augmentation Approach for Deep Learning Based Image Classification. In *ICASSP 2020-2020 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*. IEEE, 3642–3646.
- [192] Dongjie Wang, Yanjie Fu, Kunpeng Liu, Xiaolin Li, and Yan Solihin. 2022. Group-wise reinforcement feature generation for optimal and explainable representation space reconstruction. In *Proceedings of the 28th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*. 1826–1834.
- [193] Dongjie Wang, Meng Xiao, Min Wu, Yuanchun Zhou, Yanjie Fu, et al. 2023. Reinforcement-Enhanced Autoregressive Feature Transformation: Gradient-steered Search in Continuous Space for Postfix Expressions. In *Thirty-seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- [194] Ke Wang, Bin Fang, Jiye Qian, Su Yang, Xin Zhou, and Jie Zhou. 2019. Perspective transformation data augmentation for object detection. *IEEE Access* 8 (2019), 4935–4943.
- [195] Yiwei Wang, Wei Wang, Yuxuan Liang, Yujun Cai, and Bryan Hooi. 2020. Graphcrop: Subgraph cropping for graph classification. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.10564* (2020).
- [196] Yiwei Wang, Wei Wang, Yuxuan Liang, Yujun Cai, and Bryan Hooi. 2021. Mixup for node and graph classification. In *Proceedings of the Web Conference 2021*. 3663–3674.
- [197] Yu-Shuen Wang, Chiew-Lan Tai, Olga Sorkine, and Tong-Yee Lee. 2008. Optimized scale-and-stretch for image resizing. In *ACM SIGGRAPH Asia 2008 papers*. 1–8.
- [198] Zifeng Wang and Jimeng Sun. 2022. Transtab: Learning transferable tabular transformers across tables. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 35 (2022), 2902–2915.
- [199] Jason Wei and Kai Zou. 2019. EDA: Easy Data Augmentation Techniques for Boosting Performance on Text Classification Tasks. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*. 6382–6388.
- [200] Qingsong Wen, Jingkun Gao, Xiaomin Song, Liang Sun, Huan Xu, and Shenghuo Zhu. 2019. RobustSTL: A robust seasonal-trend decomposition algorithm for long time series. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, Vol. 33. 5409–5416.
- [201] Qingsong Wen, Liang Sun, Fan Yang, Xiaomin Song, Jingkun Gao, Xue Wang, and Huan Xu. 2021. Time Series Data Augmentation for Deep Learning: A Survey. In *Proceedings of the Thirtieth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*. International Joint Conferences on Artificial Intelligence Organization.
- [202] Meng Xiao, Dongjie Wang, Min Wu, Ziyue Qiao, Pengfei Wang, Kunpeng Liu, Yuanchun Zhou, and Yanjie Fu. 2023. Traceable Automatic Feature Transformation via Cascading Actor-Critic Agents. In *Proceedings of the 2023 SIAM International Conference on Data Mining (SDM)*. SIAM, 775–783.
- [203] Meng Xiao, Dongjie Wang, Min Wu, Pengfei Wang, Yuanchun Zhou, and Yanjie Fu. 2023. Beyond Discrete Selection: Continuous Embedding Space Optimization for Generative Feature Selection. In *2023 IEEE International Conference*

- on Data Mining (ICDM). IEEE Computer Society, 688–697.
- [204] Ziang Xie, Sida I Wang, Jiwei Li, Daniel Lévy, Aiming Nie, Dan Jurafsky, and Andrew Y Ng. 2017. Data noising as smoothing in neural network language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1703.02573* (2017).
 - [205] Lei Xu, Maria Skoularidou, Alfredo Cuesta-Infante, and Kalyan Veeramachaneni. 2019. Modeling tabular data using conditional gan. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 32 (2019).
 - [206] Yan Xu, Ran Jia, Lili Mou, Ge Li, Yunchuan Chen, Yangyang Lu, and Zhi Jin. 2016. Improved relation classification by deep recurrent neural networks with data augmentation. In *Proceedings of COLING 2016, the 26th International Conference on Computational Linguistics: Technical Papers*. 1461–1470.
 - [207] Jianzhou Yan, Stephen Lin, Sing Bing Kang, and Xiaoou Tang. 2013. Learning the change for automatic image cropping. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*. 971–978.
 - [208] Longqi Yang, Liangliang Zhang, and Wenjing Yang. 2021. Graph adversarial self-supervised learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 34 (2021), 14887–14899.
 - [209] Yiben Yang, Chaitanya Malaviya, Jared Fernandez, Swabha Swayamdipta, Ronan Le Bras, Ji-Ping Wang, Chandra Bhagavatula, Yejin Choi, and Doug Downey. 2020. Generative Data Augmentation for Commonsense Reasoning. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2020*. 1008–1025.
 - [210] Zhen Yang, Zhipeng Wang, Wenshan Xu, Xiuying He, Zhichao Wang, and Zhijian Yin. 2019. Region-aware random erasing. In *2019 IEEE 19th International Conference on Communication Technology (ICCT)*. IEEE, 1699–1703.
 - [211] Kang Min Yoo, Dongju Park, Jaewook Kang, Sang-Woo Lee, and Woomyoung Park. 2021. GPT3Mix: Leveraging Large-scale Language Models for Text Augmentation. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2021*. 2225–2239.
 - [212] Jinsung Yoon, Daniel Jarrett, and Mihaela Van der Schaar. 2019. Time-series generative adversarial networks. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 32 (2019).
 - [213] Jinsung Yoon, Yao Zhang, James Jordon, and Mihaela van der Schaar. 2020. Vime: Extending the success of self- and semi-supervised learning to tabular domain. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 33 (2020), 11033–11043.
 - [214] Yuning You, Tianlong Chen, Yongduo Sui, Ting Chen, Zhangyang Wang, and Yang Shen. 2020. Graph contrastive learning with augmentations. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 33 (2020), 5812–5823.
 - [215] Shujuan Yu, Jie Yang, Danlei Liu, Runqi Li, Yun Zhang, and Shengmei Zhao. 2019. Hierarchical data augmentation and the application in text classification. *IEEE Access* 7 (2019), 185476–185485.
 - [216] Jinliang Yuan, Hualie Yu, Meng Cao, Ming Xu, Junyuan Xie, and Chongjun Wang. 2021. Semi-supervised and self-supervised classification with multi-view graph neural networks. In *Proceedings of the 30th ACM international conference on information & knowledge management*. 2466–2476.
 - [217] Sangdoo Yun, Dongyoon Han, Seong Joon Oh, Sanghyuk Chun, Junsuk Choe, and Youngjoon Yoo. 2019. Cutmix: Regularization strategy to train strong classifiers with localizable features. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*. 6023–6032.
 - [218] Daochen Zha, Zaid Pervaiz Bhat, Kwei-Herng Lai, Fan Yang, Zhimeng Jiang, Shaochen Zhong, and Xia Hu. 2023. Data-centric artificial intelligence: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.10158* (2023).
 - [219] Hongyi Zhang, Moustapha Cisse, Yann N Dauphin, and David Lopez-Paz. 2017. mixup: Beyond empirical risk minimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1710.09412* (2017).
 - [220] Lei Zhang, Na Jiang, Qishuai Diao, Zhong Zhou, and Wei Wu. 2022. Person Re-identification with pose variation aware data augmentation. *Neural computing and applications* 34, 14 (2022), 11817–11830.
 - [221] Luming Zhang, Mingli Song, Qi Zhao, Xiao Liu, Jiajun Bu, and Chun Chen. 2012. Probabilistic graphlet transfer for photo cropping. *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing* 22, 2 (2012), 802–815.
 - [222] Mengchun Zhang, Maryam Qamar, Taegoo Kang, Yuna Jung, Chenshuang Zhang, Sung-Ho Bae, and Chaoning Zhang. 2023. A survey on graph diffusion models: Generative ai in science for molecule, protein and material. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.01565* (2023).
 - [223] Xinhao Zhang, Zaitian Wang, Lu Jiang, Wanfu Gao, Pengfei Wang, and Kunpeng Liu. 2024. TFWT: Tabular Feature Weighting with Transformer. *arXiv:2405.08403 [cs.LG]*
 - [224] Jianan Zhao, Xiao Wang, Chuan Shi, Binbin Hu, Guojie Song, and Yanfang Ye. 2021. Heterogeneous graph structure learning for graph neural networks. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, Vol. 35. 4697–4705.
 - [225] Tong Zhao, Wei Jin, Yozen Liu, Yingheng Wang, Gang Liu, Stephan Günnemann, Neil Shah, and Meng Jiang. 2022. Graph data augmentation for graph machine learning: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.08871* (2022).
 - [226] Cheng Zheng, Bo Zong, Wei Cheng, Dongjin Song, Jingchao Ni, Wenchao Yu, Haifeng Chen, and Wei Wang. 2020. Robust graph representation learning via neural sparsification. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 11458–11468.
 - [227] Zhun Zhong, Liang Zheng, Guoliang Kang, Shaozi Li, and Yi Yang. 2020. Random erasing data augmentation. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, Vol. 34. 13001–13008.

- [228] Jiajun Zhou, Chenxuan Xie, Zhenyu Wen, Xiangyu Zhao, and Qi Xuan. 2022. Data Augmentation on Graphs: A Survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.09970* (2022).
- [229] Xianda Zhou and William Yang Wang. 2017. Mojitalk: Generating emotional responses at scale. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1711.04090* (2017).
- [230] Xiaojin Zhu and Zoubin Ghahramani. 2002. Learning from labeled and unlabeled data with label propagation. *ProQuest Number: INFORMATION TO ALL USERS* (2002).
- [231] Yanqiao Zhu, Weizhi Xu, Jinghao Zhang, Yuanqi Du, Jieyu Zhang, Qiang Liu, Carl Yang, and Shu Wu. 2021. A survey on graph structure learning: Progress and opportunities. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.03036* (2021).