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Abstract

Realistic synthetic time series data of sufficient length enables practical applications in time series modeling tasks, such as forecasting, but remains a challenge. In this paper, we present PSA-GAN, a generative adversarial network (GAN) that generates long time series samples of high quality using progressive growing of GANs and self-attention. We show that PSA-GAN can be used to reduce the error in two downstream forecasting tasks over baselines that only use real data. We also introduce a Frechet-Inception Distance-like score, Context-FID, assessing the quality of synthetic time series samples. In our downstream tasks, we find that the lowest scoring models correspond to the best-performing ones. Therefore, Context-FID could be a useful tool to develop time series GAN models.

1. Introduction

In the past years, methods such as [29, 9, 15, 5, 23, 25, 4, 34] have consistently showcased their effectiveness of deep learning in time series analysis tasks. Although these deep learning-based methods are effective when sufficient clean data is available, this assumption is not always met in practice. For example, sensor outages can cause gaps in IoT data, which might render the data unusable for machine learning applications [39]. An additional problem is that time series panels often have insufficient size for forecasting tasks, leading to research in meta-learning for forecasting [24]. Thus, designing flexible and task-independent models that generate synthetic, but realistic time series for arbitrary tasks poses an important challenge. Generative adversarial network (GAN) is a flexible model family that has had success in other domains. However, for their success to carry over to time series, synthetic time series data must be of realistic length, which current state-of-the-art synthetic time series models struggle to generate because they often rely on recurrent networks to capture temporal dynamics [8, 37].

In this work, we make three contributions: i) We propose PSA-GAN, a progressively growing, convolutional time series GAN model augmented with self-attention [13, 33]. PSA-GAN can be scaled to long time series because the progressive growing architecture starts modeling the coarse-grained time series features and moves towards modeling fine-grained details during training. The self-attention mechanism captures long-range dependencies in the data [38]. ii) We show empirically that PSA-GAN samples are of sufficient quality and length to boost downstream forecasting tasks via data augmentation and data imputation in far-forecasting experiments. iii) Finally, we propose a Frechet Inception distance (FID)-like score [27], Context-FID, leveraging unsupervised time series embeddings [9]. We show that the lowest scoring models correspond to the best-performing models in our downstream tasks and therefore could be a useful general-purpose tool to select GAN models for downstream applications.

Related Work. GANs [11] are an active area of research [14, 37, 7, 18, 8] that have recently been applied to the time series domain [8, 37] to synthesize data [31, 8], and to forecasting tasks [35]. Many time series GAN architectures use recurrent networks to model temporal dynamics [22, 8, 37]. Modeling long-range dependencies and scaling recurrent networks to higher lengths is inherently difficult and limits the application of time series GANs to short sequence lengths (less than 100 time steps) [37, 8]. One way to achieve longer realistic synthetic time series is by employing convolutional [32, 3, 10] and self-attention architectures [33]. Convolutional architectures are able to learn relevant features from the raw time series data [32, 3, 10], but are ultimately limited to local receptive fields and can only capture long-range dependencies via many stacks of convolutional layers. Self-attention can bridge this gap and allow for modeling long-range dependencies from convolutional feature maps, which has been a successful approach in the image [38] and time series forecasting domain [17]. Another technique to achieve long sample sizes is progressive growing, which successively increases the resolution by adding layers to generator and discriminator during training [13]. Our proposal, PSA-GAN, synthesizes progressive...
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growing with convolutions and self-attention into a novel architecture particularly geared towards time series.

Another challenge is the evaluation of synthetic data. While the computer vision domain uses standard scores like the Inception Score and the Frechet Inception Distance (FID) [27, 12], such universally accepted scores do not exist in the time series field. Thus, researchers rely on a Train on Synthetic—Test on Real setup and assess the quality of the synthetic time series in a downstream classification and/or prediction task [8, 37]. In this work, we build on this idea and assess the GAN models through downstream forecasting tasks. Additionally, we suggest a Frechet Inception Distance-like score that is based on unsupervised time series embeddings [10]. Critically, we want to be able to score the fit of our fixed length synthetic samples into their context of (often much longer) true time series, which is taken into account by the contrastive training procedure in [10]. As we will later show, the lowest scoring models correspond to the best performing models in downstream tasks.

2. Model

Problem formulation We denote the values of a time series dataset by \( z_{i,t} \in \mathbb{R} \) (or \( \mathbb{N} \)), where \( i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, N\} \) is the index of the individual time series and \( t \in \{1, 2, \ldots, T\} \) is the time index. Additionally, we consider an associated matrix of time feature vectors \( X_{i,T} = (x_1, \ldots, x_T) \) in \( \mathbb{R}^{D \times T} \), where \( D \) is the number of time features. Our goal is to model a time series of fixed length \( \tau \), \( \hat{Z}_{i,t,\tau} = (\hat{z}_{i,t}, \ldots, \hat{z}_{i,t+\tau}) \), from this dataset using a conditional generator function \( G \) and a fixed time point \( t \). Thus, we aim to model \( \hat{Z}_{i,t,\tau} = G(n, \phi(i), X_{i,t+\tau}) \), where \( n \) is a noise vector drawn from a standard Gaussian and \( \phi \) is an embedding function that maps the index of a time series to a vector representation.

Spectral Normalised Residual Self Attention with Convolution The generator and discriminator use a main function \( m \) that is a composition of convolution, self attention and spectral normalisation:

\[
m : \mathbb{R}^{n_f \times l} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n_f \times l}
\]

\[
x \mapsto \gamma \text{SA}(f(x)) + f(x)
\]

\[
f(x) = \text{SN}(\text{LR}(c(x)))
\]

where \( c \) is the one dimensional convolution operator, LR the LeakyReLU operator [36], SN the Spectral Normalisation operator [21] and SA the Self Attention module. The variable \( n_f \) is the number of in-features, \( n_f' \) is the number of out-features and \( l \) is the length of the sequence. Following the work of [38], the parameter \( \gamma \) is learnable. This is initialized to zero to allow the network to learn local features directly from the building block \( f \), and is later enriched with distant features as the absolute value of gamma increases, hereby more heavily factoring the self-attention term \( SA \circ f \).

Downscaling and Upscaling The following sections mention upscaling (UP) and downsampling (DOWN) operators that double and halve, respectively, the length of the time series. In this work, the upscaling operator is a linear interpolation and the downsampling operator is the average pooling.

PSA-GAN PSA-GAN is a progressively growing GAN [13]; thus, trainable modules are added during training. Hereby, we model the generator and discriminator as a composition of functions: \( G = g_{L+1} \circ \ldots \circ g_{1} \) and \( D = d_{1} \circ \ldots \circ d_{L+1} \) where each function \( g_{i} \) and \( d_{i} \) for \( i \in [1, L+1] \) corresponds to a module of the generator and discriminator.

Generator As a preprocessing step, we first map the input features from a sequence of length \( \tau \) to a sequence of length 8, denoted by \( \hat{Z}_{0} \), using average pooling. Then, the first layer of the generator \( g_{1} \) applies the main function \( m \):

\[
g_{1} : \mathbb{R}^{n_f \times 2^2} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n_f \times 2^3}
\]

\[
\hat{Z}_{0} \mapsto \hat{Z}_{1} = m(\hat{Z}_{0})
\]

For \( i \in [2, L] \), \( g_{i} \) maps an input sequence \( \hat{Z}_{i-1} \) to an output sequence \( \hat{Z}_{i} \) by applying an upscaling of the input sequence and the function \( m \):

\[
g_{i} : \mathbb{R}^{n_f \times 2^{i+2}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n_f \times 2^{i+3}}
\]

\[
\hat{Z}_{i-1} \mapsto \hat{Z}_{i} = m(\text{UP}(\hat{Z}_{i-1}))
\]

Lastly the final layer of the generator \( g_{L+1} \) reshapes the multivariate sequence \( \hat{Z}_{L} \) to a univariate time series \( \tilde{Z}_{i,t,\tau} \) of length \( \tau = 2^{L+3} \) using a one dimensional convolution.

Discriminator The architecture of the discriminator mirrors the architecture of the generator. It maps the generator’s output \( \hat{Z}_{i,t,\tau} \) and the time features \( X_{i,t+\tau} \) to a score \( d \). The first module of the discriminator \( d_{L+1} \) uses a one dimensional convolution \( c_{1} \) and a LeakyReLU activation function:

\[
d_{L+1} : \mathbb{R}^{1+D \times T} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n_f \times \tau}
\]

\[
(\hat{Z}_{L+1}, X_{i,t+\tau}) \mapsto \hat{Z}_{L} = \text{LR}(c_{1}(\hat{Z}_{L+1}, X_{i,t+\tau}))
\]

For \( i \in [L, 2] \), the module \( d_{i} \) applies a downscale operator and the main function \( m \):

\[
d_{i} : \mathbb{R}^{n_f \times 2^{i+3}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n_f \times 2^{i+2}}
\]

\[
Y_{i} \mapsto Y_{i-1} = \text{DOWN}(m(Y_{i}))
\]

The last module \( d_{1} \) turns its input sequence into a score:

\[
d_{1} : \mathbb{R}^{n_f \times 2^2} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}
\]

\[
Y_{1} \mapsto Y_{0} = \text{SN}(\text{FC}(\text{LR}(\text{SN}(c(Y_{1}))))))
\]

where FC is a fully connected layer.
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2.1. Loss functions

PSA-GAN can be trained both via a Wasserstein loss [2] and via least squares [20]. We use an auxiliary moment loss to the generator to match the first and second order moment between a batch of synthetic samples and real samples.

2.2. Training procedures

GANs are notoriously difficult to training, have hard-to-interpret learning curves, and are susceptible to mode collapse. PSA-GAN uses spectral normalization and progressive fade-in of new layers to stabilize training. We provide implementation details in the Supplement.

3. Experiments

3.1. Context-FID Score on Time Series Embeddings

The Frechet Inception Distance [12] assesses the performance of a GAN by measuring the similarity between the synthetic samples and the real samples. Here, we replace InceptionV3 [30] with the encoder $E$ of Franceschi et al. [9], trained separately for each dataset.

Our proposed Context-FID score is computed as follows: we first select a time range $[t, t + \tau]$. We then sample a batch of synthetic time series $Z_{t,\tau} = [\hat{Z}_{1,t,\tau}, \ldots, \hat{Z}_{N,t,\tau}]$ and a batch of real time series $Z_{t,\tau} = [Z_{1,t,\tau}, \ldots, Z_{N,t,\tau}]$ that we encode with $E$ into $\hat{Z}_{t,\tau}$ and $Z_{t,\tau}$ respectively. Finally, we compute the FID score of the embeddings.

3.2. Datasets and Baselines

We use the following public, standard benchmark datasets in the time series domain: M4, hourly time series competition data (414 time series) [19]; Solar, hourly solar energy collection data in Alabama State (137 stations) [16]; Electricity, hourly electricity consumption data (370 customers) [6]; Traffic: hourly occupancy rate of lanes in San Francisco (963 lanes) [6].

We split all data into a training/test set with a fixed date and use all data before that date for training. For testing, we use a rolling window evaluation with a window size of 32 and seven windows. We minmax scale each dataset to be within $[0, 1]$ for all experiments in this paper (we scale the data back before evaluating the forecasting experiments). We compare PSA-GAN with different GAN models from the literature (TIMEGAN [37] and EBGAN [40]). In what follows PSA-GAN and PSA-GAN$_W$ denote our proposed PSA-GAN with least squares and Wasserstein loss, respectively. In the data augmentation and far-forecasting experiments, we use the GluonTS [1] implementation of DeepAR which is a well-performing forecasting model and established baseline [28].

3.3. Evaluation Results

Direct Evaluation with Context-FID Scores: Table 1 shows the Context-FID scores for PSA-GAN, baselines, and ablations. For all sequence length, we find that PSA-GAN consistently produces the lowest Context-FID scores. PSA-GAN also scores lower Context-FID scores than its ablation models without moment loss and self-attention (see Table 1, last two columns) For a sequence length of 256 time steps, TIMEGAN is the second best performing model for all datasets, except for Electricity. We show example plots of the samples generated by all models in the Supplement. We find that low Context-FID scores correlate well with samples that qualitatively look realistic. As we show later, low Context-FID score models also correspond to the best-performing models in our downstream tasks. In the next two paragraphs, we will show the performance of PSA-GAN on downstream tasks: data augmentation and far-forecasting.

Data Augmentation: In this experiment, we train DeepAR by randomly sampling time windows of length 256 from the dataset. We average the real data and GAN samples to augment the data during training. 1 During inference, DeepAR is conditioned on real data only to generate forecasts. We evaluate the forecasts with the normalized root mean squared error (NRMSE), normalized by the absolute mean of the target in the forecasting window. We give more details on the forecasting setup in the Supplement. Using PSA-GAN for data augmentation results into the lowest NRMSE for three out of four datasets (M4, Solar, Traffic) (see Table 2). Although using synthetic samples from PSA-GAN improves over using real data only, we notice that our improvements are small and more research is required to explore the use of synthetic data for forecasting via data augmentation.

Far-forecasting: In this experiment, we forecast far into the future by assuming that the data points between the training end time and the rolling evaluation window are not observed (in other words, we are increasing the lead time). For example, the last evaluation window would have $32 \times 6$ unobserved values between the training end time and the forecast start date. Because DeepAR conditions on this data during inference, we need to impute these missing observations. We use the GAN models during inference to fill the missing observations with synthetic data. As a baseline, we use DeepAR and impute the missing observations with a moving average during inference. Here, we find that using the synthetic data from GAN models drastically

---

1We also tried using only the GAN generated data for training and experimented with ratios of mixing synthetic and real samples, similar to the work in [26], but we were not able to obtain consistent improvements in this way.
Table 1. Context FID-scores (lower is better) of PSA-GAN, baselines, and ablations. We score 1600 randomly selected windows and report the mean and standard deviation. The first four result columns correspond to the different models that we tested. The last two columns are ablations of PSA-GAN without self-attention and moment loss.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dataset</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>EBGAN</th>
<th>TIMEGAN</th>
<th>PSA-GANW</th>
<th>PSA-GAN (ours)</th>
<th>without SA</th>
<th>without ML</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>2.07±0.30</td>
<td>0.77±0.12</td>
<td>0.95±0.07</td>
<td><strong>0.03±0.01</strong></td>
<td>0.11±0.02</td>
<td>0.24±0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>128</td>
<td>1.93±0.28</td>
<td>1.03±0.13</td>
<td>4.08±0.24</td>
<td><strong>0.04±0.01</strong></td>
<td>1.65±0.12</td>
<td>0.16±0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>256</td>
<td>3.02±0.25</td>
<td>1.58±0.08</td>
<td>1.10±0.10</td>
<td><strong>0.08±0.03</strong></td>
<td>0.44±0.05</td>
<td><strong>0.08±0.03</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M4</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>0.93±0.15</td>
<td>0.93±0.10</td>
<td>0.80±0.08</td>
<td><strong>0.14±0.05</strong></td>
<td>0.14±0.05</td>
<td><strong>0.09±0.03</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>128</td>
<td>2.53±0.27</td>
<td>0.60±0.07</td>
<td>1.15±0.10</td>
<td><strong>0.45±0.09</strong></td>
<td>0.59±0.19</td>
<td><strong>0.28±0.09</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>256</td>
<td>2.08±0.13</td>
<td>0.89±0.13</td>
<td>1.97±0.64</td>
<td><strong>0.52±0.07</strong></td>
<td>1.46±0.22</td>
<td>1.12±0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solar-Energy</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>0.48±0.11</td>
<td>0.13±0.02</td>
<td>1.89±0.40</td>
<td><strong>0.03±0.01</strong></td>
<td>0.17±0.05</td>
<td>0.17±0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>128</td>
<td>1.87±0.43</td>
<td>0.22±0.05</td>
<td>0.15±0.04</td>
<td><strong>0.02±0.01</strong></td>
<td>0.05±0.01</td>
<td>0.60±0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>256</td>
<td>2.38±0.43</td>
<td>0.09±0.02</td>
<td>2.62±0.24</td>
<td><strong>0.06±0.01</strong></td>
<td>1.46±0.22</td>
<td>1.12±0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>2.65±0.15</td>
<td>0.59±0.06</td>
<td>0.92±0.08</td>
<td><strong>0.23±0.04</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.16±0.03</strong></td>
<td>0.38±0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>128</td>
<td>2.09±0.26</td>
<td>2.13±0.12</td>
<td>2.08±0.10</td>
<td><strong>0.42±0.08</strong></td>
<td>0.55±0.06</td>
<td>0.51±0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>256</td>
<td>1.86±0.14</td>
<td>1.82±0.12</td>
<td>2.76±0.20</td>
<td><strong>0.56±0.10</strong></td>
<td>1.74±0.06</td>
<td>1.21±0.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. NRMSE accuracy comparison of data augmentation experiments (lower is better, best method in bold). Mean and 95% confidence intervals are obtained by re-running each method five times. DeepAR is only run on the real time series data. The other models correspond to DeepAR and one of the GAN models for data augmentation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dataset</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Electricity</th>
<th>M4</th>
<th>Solar-Energy</th>
<th>Traffic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DeepAR</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>0.49±0.03</strong></td>
<td>0.26±0.02</td>
<td>1.07±0.01</td>
<td>0.45±0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBGAN</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.64±0.05</td>
<td>0.32±0.09</td>
<td>1.18±0.03</td>
<td>0.50±0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIMEGAN</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.56±0.05</td>
<td>0.28±0.02</td>
<td>1.06±0.02</td>
<td>0.47±0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSA-GANW</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.50±0.01</td>
<td>0.26±0.07</td>
<td>1.08±0.03</td>
<td>0.64±0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSA-GAN</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.53±0.07</td>
<td><strong>0.23±0.03</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.04±0.01</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.43±0.003</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. NRMSE accuracy comparison of far-forecasting experiments (lower is better, best method in bold). Mean and 95% confidence intervals are obtained by re-running each method five times. DeepAR is only run on the real time series data. The other models correspond to DeepAR and one of the GAN models for filling missing observations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dataset</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Electricity</th>
<th>M4</th>
<th>Solar-Energy</th>
<th>Traffic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DeepAR</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.01±0.18</td>
<td>1.0±0.14</td>
<td>1.64±0.01</td>
<td>0.95±0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBGAN</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.8±0.41</td>
<td>1.44±0.12</td>
<td>2.5±0.05</td>
<td>0.88±0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIMEGAN</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.1±0.18</td>
<td>1.67±0.03</td>
<td><strong>1.15±0.02</strong></td>
<td>0.85±0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSA-GANW</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.17±0.05</td>
<td>1.13±0.05</td>
<td>1.49±0.04</td>
<td>1.0±0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSA-GAN</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1.72±0.05</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.47±0.03</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.19±0.02</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.56±0.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Low Context-FID Score Models Correspond to Best-performing Forecasting Models: One other observation is that the lowest Context-FID score models correspond to the best models in the data augmentation and far-forecasting experiments. For each experiment, the model with lowest Context-FID is also the model that produces the lowest NRMSE in three out of four cases, for both the data augmentation and far-forecasting experiment. At least one of the models with the lowest two Context-FID scores performs best in the forecasting experiments. This suggests that the Context-FID score could be a useful score to develop time series GAN models for downstream use.

4. Conclusion

In this paper, we have presented PSA-GAN, a progressive growing time series GAN, augmented with self-attention, that produces long realistic time series and improves downstream forecasting tasks. Furthermore, we introduced the Context-FID score to assess the quality of synthetic time series samples produced by GAN models. We found that the lowest Context-FID scoring models correspond to the best-performing models in downstream tasks. We believe that time series GANs that scale to long sequences combined with a reliable metric to assess their performance might lead to their routine use in time series modeling.
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A. Time Series Features

We use time series features to represent the time dimension for the GAN models and also for DeepAR. For our hourly datasets, we use HourOfDay, DayOfWeek, DayOfMonth and DayOfYear features. Each feature is encoded using a single index number (for example, between [0, 365] for DayOfYear) and normalized to be within [−0.5, 0.5]. We also use an age feature to represent the age of the time series to be log(2.0 + t) where t is the time index.

B. Compute details

PSA-GAN (and its variants) has been trained on ml.p2.xlarge Amazon instances. The table 1 summarizes the training time for each variant and each length of time series:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSA-GAN(-W) w/o self attention</th>
<th>PSA-GAN(-W)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>4h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>5h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>7h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>256</td>
<td>9h</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Training time for PSA-GAN and PSA-GAN-W with and without self attention

C. Model Details

C.1. Loss Function

PSA-GAN can be trained both via a Wasserstein loss [2] and via least squares [5].

We also introduce a auxiliary moment loss to the generator to match the first and second order moment between a batch of synthetic samples and a batch of real samples denoted \( \hat{Z}_r \) and \( Z_r \) respectively:

\[
ML(\hat{Z}_r, Z_r) = \left| \sigma(\hat{Z}_r) - \sigma(Z_r) \right| + \left| \mu(\hat{Z}_r) - \mu(Z_r) \right|
\]

where \( \mu \) is the mean and \( \sigma \) the standard deviation operator.

C.2. Training Procedures

GANs’ training is notoriously difficult. They are prone to unstable training, do not necessarily have meaningful learning curves and can exhibit mode collapse. PSA-GAN addresses these issues as follows:

Spectral Normalisation Both the generator and the discriminator benefit from using spectral normalisation layers. In the discriminator, Spectral Normalisation stabilizes training [6]. It also constrains the Lipschitz constant of the discriminator to be bounded by one, thus respecting the condition of the Wasserstein GAN optimisation problem. In the generator, according to [8] the spectral normalisation stabilises the training and avoids escalation of the gradient magnitude.

Progressive fade in of new layers As training progresses, new layers are added to double the length of time series. However, simply adding new untrained layers drastically changes the number of parameters and the loss landscape, which destabilizes training. To mitigate this effect, we updated the model to progressively fade in new layers \( g_i \) for \( i \in [2, L] \) [3], as follows:

\[
g_i : \mathbb{R}^{n_f \times 2^{i+2}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n_f \times 2^{i+3}}
\]

\[
\tilde{Z}_{i-1} \mapsto \tilde{Z}_i = \alpha m(\text{UP}(\tilde{Z}_{i-1})) + (1 - \alpha) \text{UP}(\tilde{Z}_{i-1})
\]

(1)

where \( \alpha \) is a scalar initialized to be zero and grows linearly to one over the given number of epochs.

The same procedure is also applied to \( d_i \) for \( i \in [2, L] \):
\[
d_i : \mathbb{R}^{n_f \times 2^{i+3}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n_f \times 2^{i+2}}
\]
\[
Y_i \mapsto Y_{i-1} = \alpha \text{DOWN}(m(Y_i)) + (1 - \alpha) \text{DOWN}(Y_i)
\]  
(2)

### D. Training details

Both the generator and the discriminator has been trained using the ADAM optimizer [4] with a learning of 0.0005 and betas of (0.9, 0.999).

A new module is added to the discriminator and generator for each 1000 epochs passed. Each module is faded in over 200 epochs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Epoch number</th>
<th>Batch size</th>
<th>Number of batches per epoch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2500</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>3500</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>4500</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>5500</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>256</td>
<td>6500</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 2. Number of epochs used to train PSA-GAN(-W) and batch size.*

### E. Architecture details

The number of features \( n_f \) in the generator and discriminator equals 32. The kernel size of the convolutional layer \( c \) equals 3 and the kernel size of the convolutional layer \( c_1 \) equals 1.

### F. Forecasting Experiment Details

We use the DeepAR [7] implementation in GluonTS [1] for the forecasting experiments. We used the default hyperparameters of DeepAR with the following exceptions: epochs=100, num_batches_per_epoch=100, dropout_rate=0.01, scaling=False, prediction_length=32, context_length=64, use_feat_static_cat=True. We use the Adam optimizer with a learning rate of \( 1e^{-3} \) and weight decay of \( 1e^{-8} \). Additionally, we clip the gradient to 10.0 and reduce the learning rate by a factor of 2 for every 10 consecutive updates without improvement, up to a minimum learning rate of \( 5e^{-5} \). DeepAR also uses lagged values from previous time steps that are used as input to the LSTM at each time step \( t \). We set the time series window size that DeepAR samples to 256 and truncate the default hourly lags to fit the context window, the prediction window, and the longest lag into the window size 256. We use the following lags: [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 23, 24, 25, 47, 48, 49, 71, 72, 73, 95, 96, 97, 119, 120, 121, 143, 144, 145]

For the far-forecasting experiment, we additionally impute the missing observations during inference with a moving average. For the moving average, we tried short and long window sizes (3 and 24) but they essentially resulted into the same performance.

### G. Plots of time series

Below we plot time series generated by all the models presented in the paper.
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Figure 1. Time Series - Solar-Energy: On the left we plot four synthetic time series at the same time range. On the right we plot between two vertical red line a real time series at the same time range. On the left and right of the red lines is the context of the real time series, 30 time points before and after. We also show the FID score for each model.
Figure 2. Time Series - M4 Hourly: On the left we plot four synthetic time series at the same time range. On the right we plot between two vertical red line a real time series at the same time range. On the left and right of the red lines is the context of the real time series, 30 time points before and after. We also show the FID score for each model.
Figure 3. Time Series - Traffic: On the left we plot four synthetic time series at the same time range. On the right we plot between two vertical red lines a real time series at the same time range. On the left and right of the red lines is the context of the real time series, 30 time points before and after. We also show the FID score for each model.
Figure 4. Time Series - Electricity: On the left we plot four synthetic time series at the same time range. On the right we plot between two vertical red lines a real time series at the same time range. On the left and right of the red lines is the context of the real time series, 30 time points before and after. We also show the FID score for each model.