TREB: A BERT ATTEMPT FOR IMPUTING TABULAR DATA IMPUTATION

Shuyue Wang Shanghai A&I Co., Ltd. Shanghai henri_w_91@hotmail.com Wenjun Zhou Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd. Shanghai 2260882790@qq.com

Han drk-m-s Jiang M3, Autoslide Inc.,Talent Mediocre Holdings Group, Paris, Grenoble, Talinn john.jianghan@gmail.com

Shuo Wang

Digital Medicial Research Center, School of Basic Medical Sciences, Fudan University Shanghai shuowang@fudan.edu.cn

> Ren Zheng Shanghai A&I Co., Ltd. Shanghai zhengren@jingzhi-sh.com

ABSTRACT

TREB, a novel tabular imputation framework utilizing BERT, introduces a groundbreaking approach for handling missing values in tabular data. Unlike traditional methods that often overlook the specific demands of imputation, TREB leverages the robust capabilities of BERT to address this critical task. While many BERT-based approaches for tabular data have emerged, they frequently under-utilize the language model's full potential. To rectify this, TREB employs a BERT-based model fine-tuned specifically for the task of imputing real-valued continuous numbers in tabular datasets. The paper comprehensively addresses the unique challenges posed by tabular data imputation, emphasizing the importance of context-based interconnections. The effectiveness of TREB is validated through rigorous evaluation using the California Housing dataset. The results demonstrate its ability to preserve feature interrelationships and accurately impute missing values. Moreover, the authors shed light on the computational efficiency and environmental impact of TREB, quantifying the floating-point operations (FLOPs) and carbon footprint associated with its training and deployment.

Keywords tabular imputing · BERT · tokenizer · RoBERTa · TREB

1 Introduction

Data in the real world often manifests in a form incorporating tabular elements. Tabular data, a stalwart of structured information for decades, is organized into mazes of rows and columns. This ubiquitous format has found applications in a multitude of fields, ranging from finance and medicine to business, agriculture, education, and beyond. These attributes can depend on one another and have different data types (i.e., categorical and numerical data). Fang et al.[1] summarizes characteristics of tabular data, the last three of which constitutes the driving force of the proposed approach in this paper: heterogeneity, sparsity, lack of prior knowledge, dependency on pre-processing, context-based

interconnection, and order invariant. Traditionally, tabular data has been used for simply organizing and reporting information. Over the past decade, its usage has evolved significantly due to machine learning competitions and open-source contributions.[2];

A significant obstacle for general tabular data problems is the relatively limited size of available datasets. This contrasts sharply with domains like vision and NLP, where vast amounts of "extra" data can be readily sourced from the internet. For instance, learning to recognize an image of a cat involves studying a seemingly endless collection of feline images. This task is ubiquitous in computer vision, explicitly manifested in input (e.g., user prompts), processing (e.g., attention-based heatmaps), or output (e.g., generated cat images or captions). The universality of the concept of a 'cat' further underscores its prevalence. Similar observation can also be made in the field of NLP problem in that every task is explicit and universal, whilst tabular data is independent from table to table because they represent different observation of different things in the real world, let alone the discrepancy and biases in observation. In this case, titles of tables seems to be of help; however, they lack in the universality compared against the above examples, which enhances the difficulty in finding a proper solution. This aligns with the notion of a "lack of prior knowledge" (cf. 1). In contrast, models like CLIP, BLIP, or GLIP can effectively assist diffusion models in computer vision tasks.

Before the rise of AI, people relied on traditional table perception platforms, such as manual spreadsheets, SQL databases, statistical software, programming libraries, and visualization tools. Even simple techniques like SMOTE interpolation ([3]) can outperform complex tabular GANs ([4]) for minority class oversampling.[5] Tree-based ensemble methods, especially gradient-boosted decision trees, remain the state-of-the-art for tabular data predictions ([6], [7]). Efforts to integrate neural networks with tabular data for management tasks are ongoing ([1]). Additionally, borrowing approaches from other domains, such as leveraging tree-based structural knowledge ([8]) or topological information via directed graphs ([9]), are common techniques. GBDT is one such strong and lightweight technique in modelling tabular data, which powers some implementations of non-deep-learning neural network in leveraging expressive feature combinations.[8]

Artificial intelligence is often considered to be essentially equivalent to modern statistics, albeit with a different terminology $([10])^1$. While statistics draw inspiration from various fields like physics, biology, and economics, it remains a valuable tool, especially when reasoning fails. In fact, statistics can be viewed as a last resort ([11]) in many situations.² Consider a table where relationships between columns are known. Some columns may be directly influenced by others, while others exhibit more complex, non-linear relationships. Traditional statistics often rely on correlation metrics to quantify these relationships, but they may not provide an explicable metrics of correlation. It is in such cases that generative AI is sought to offer the potential to delve deeper into the underlying dynamics of tabular data manipulation.

Generative AI, or GenAI, reached a significant milestone with the emergence of ChatGPT in late 2022. The successful implementation of attention mechanisms demonstrated that 'thinking' could be achieved by strategically accumulating and utilizing information for program execution, challenging traditional research paradigms. Despite significant advancements in the past three years, it's clear that foundation models are not a direct representation of the real world. They are intelligent understanding machines. Tabular data researchers rarely expect to simply call a foundation model's API for direct table imputation. Even when prompt engineering ([12]) and increased input token capacity ([13]) are considered, the results are often unsatisfactory. This highlights the need for further research to bridge the gap between foundation models and specific tabular data tasks.

Based on a preliminary investigation, this paper tentatively categorizes generative AI approaches in the realm of tabular data manipulation into three primary paradigms, as illustrated in fig.1. The first approach is based on intuitive understanding. Assuming underlying mechanisms are beyond human perception, we can leverage the laws of large numbers and the central limit theorem to obtain macro-scale observations. By distilling knowledge from these observations, we can sample the data. A recent trend of such genre in this area involves extending generative AI models and their variants to general tabular problems. TabDDPM ([14]) demonstrates the effectiveness of diffusion models for tabular data with heterogeneous features. CTGAN ([15]) uses a conditional generator to address the challenges of modeling row probability distributions and generating realistic synthetic data. These diffusion model approaches often require transforming heterogeneous tabular input into homogeneous data ([1]). The second approach involves language model, transforming tabular data into a language-like format, reflecting the idea that language is a primary carrier of knowledge: *The limits of my knowlede mean the limits of my world*.

citewittgenstein2023tractatus. Recent advancements in large language models have enabled various tasks related to tabular data modeling, including table understanding and data generation ([16], [17]). The approach usually relies on the semantic knowledge of LMs to transfer feature patterns from pre-training feature names to downstream ones,

¹Thomas J. Sargent, laureate of Nobel Economics Prize in 2011, said Artificial intelligence is just statistics., on August 11th, 2018, in Global Science and Technology Innovation Forum (GSTIF)

²Thanks to Baojun He for identifying the quotation source.

implicitly requiring meaningful and clear feature semantics.[18] Borisov et al. proposed a comprehensive linguistic description approach, transforming tabular data while considering data types, ranges, continuous/categorical attributes, and collation methods ([19]). Another less intrusive method involves prompt engineering ([12]), chain-of-thought agents ([20]), and retrieval-augmented generation ([21]) to leverage the power of language models for tabular data problems. The third approach is what the proposed approach in this paper belongs to. It is classified as 'attention-based methods' by Fang et al.[1], where basically BERT (Bidirectional Encoder Representations from Transformers) is dominating the role.[22] The application of BERT in tabular data generation processes. As matter of fact, TREB is a *verlan* of BERT, indicating the method's nature amongst all tabular data tools. Detailed description will be in sections2 and 3.



Figure 1: The three major types summarized in GenAI approaches in tabular data manipulation: 1. using diffusion model; 2 .using pretrained language model (e.g. GPT2); 3. using BERT (to which this paper belongs).

In the realm of generative AI research concerning tabular data, the term 'data manipulation' often encapsulates the process of 'sampling,' although 'imputation' is also occasionally included. While synthesizing tabular data entails the creation of an artificial table (or multiple relational tables) based on an original dataset, imputation represents a form of 'conditional sampling'. Broadly speaking, sampling adopts a macro-scale perspective, while imputation is a more focused approach. Imputation serves as a valuable tool for data augmentation, particularly effective in addressing class imbalances. Its primary objective is to preserve and leverage the interrelationships between features represented by columns, thereby accurately and precisely filling missing values. In contrast, sampling seeks to simulate a broad-scale representation of data distribution patterns within a limited number of rows. This paper concentrates on developing a BERT-based approach for imputing tables containing real continuous numbers, thereby introducing the TREB (TabluaR imputatEr using Bert) method.

In this paper, section 2 reviews the past literature of Bert architecture in tabular data studies; section 3 provides the mathematical description of the proposed approach and illustrates the fundamental steps it takes to accomplish the task in discussion, where subsection 3.3 demonstrates the performance in imputing based on California Housing data set[23], where accuracy is the priority in the evaluation. The cost of computation in terms of flops and carbon footprint is also shown there. The appendix includes some figures. The code repository is made public for your convenience³.

2 Related works

BERT and tabular data BERT (Bidirectional Encoder Representations from Transformers) is a deep learning model designed to pre-train representations from unlabeled text data [24]. Like all transformer-related approaches, BERT is tailored for problems where both the input and output information are sequences. A sequence is an arbitrary set of contiguous text tokens [25]. BERT addresses a fundamental challenge in Natural Language Processing (NLP): text representation. Text representation involves transforming natural language data into a format interpretable by machines. While simple encodings exist, effective NLP tasks require representations that capture the inherent meaning and structure of the text [26]. BERT's innovation lies in its unique text representation methodology and training paradigm. Its training comprises two distinct phases: unsupervised pre-training on a large corpus of unlabeled text and subsequent fine-tuning on a labeled dataset tailored to a specific downstream task [27]. While the fine-tuning process and architectural modifications may vary depending on the task, the underlying model and parameter set remain consistent. Although BERT's autoencoder architecture eliminates the need for task-specific adaptation, it introduces artificial tokens like [SEP] and [MASK] during pre-training. This discrepancy between the pre-training and fine-tuning environments can potentially hinder the model's performance on downstream tasks [22]. Moreover, BERT's initial training on general-purpose text may not perfectly align with the data distribution of target application domains. To address this, fine-tuning or even retraining can be conducted on different tasks, subjects, and datasets, contingent upon the nature of the text data and available resources[28].

TABERT While numerous BERT-based studies have explored various aspects of tabular data, investigations specifically targeting imputation tasks remain notably scarce. To provide a contextual understanding of how BERT is applied to tabular data, here we present a brief overview of the TABERT model.[29] As one application of BERT in tabular data, it is trained on a substantial corpus of 26 million tables and their corresponding English contexts. Built upon the BERT architecture, TABERT effectively acquires contextual representations for both utterance tokens (individual words or phrases) and the structured schema of database tables. To ensure compatibility with the Transformer-based BERT model, TABERT linearizes the tabular structure. This essentially transforms the table into a sequence of elements. By utilizing the special token [SEP], TABERT is able to learn representations of utterances and table schemas effectively. An illustrative example from the WIKITABLE-QUESTIONS dataset⁴ demonstrates this capability.

3 TREB: TabluaR imputatEr using Bert.

Some authors of BERT studies in tabular data refer schema as the set of columns in a table, and its representation as the list of vectors that represent its columns.[29] This paper is stick to column-row-value nomenclature, inheriting what is done by Borisov et al.[19] Fig.2 shows the workflow of the proposed approach.

3.1 Data and tokenization

To evaluate the effectiveness of our proposed tabular imputation method, we selected the California Housing dataset from Pace et al.[23] This dataset, characterized by its rich feature set and substantial sample size, aligns well with the requirements of our research. Its numerical nature, devoid of categorical variables, presents an ideal test case for assessing the performance of algorithms specifically designed for tabular data imputation. To ensure a representative training and validation split, we randomly shuffled the dataset while maintaining stratified sampling to preserve the original distribution across both subsets. Consequently, 18,000 rows were allocated to the training set, with the remaining data designated for validation. Using the newly defined tokenizer, we established a maximum sequence length of 512. This resulted in a tensor of dimensions (18,000, 512). To simulate real-world scenarios, we randomly masked 15The modified tensor was then integrated into a PyTorch Dataset. Given the computational capabilities of the GPU, we set the batch size to 64 and enabled shuffling for enhanced generalization.

First, we need to convert a row from a table into a string, with the columns names. For instance, a row is like the one shown in table1. We do a zero-one normalization, which is basically put every value in a column as: $x_{norm} = \frac{x - \min}{\max - \min}$,

³https://github.com/shuyueW1991/TREB

⁴stanford.io/38iZ8Pf

MedInc	HouseAge	AveRooms	AveBedrms	Population	AveOccup	Latitude	Longitude	MedHouseVal
 3.8462	 52.0	 6.281853	 1.081081	 565.0	 2.181467	 37.85	-122.25	 3.422
	•••		•••					

Table 1: A sampled row from vanilla California Housing Dataset

Table 2: A sampled text transformed from a row

index	text
 314	 Column 0: 0.123, Column 1: 0.4321,
	•••

where integer part will be no longer a concern. Then round it with 4 digits in decimal part, since we would like a game that is only participated by 4-digit tokens, treating the numerical bins as new words.[18] We would like the transformer to be the 'interpolator' among limited tokens that has profound numerical meanings. This is our way of possessing the sensitivity to numeric features seen in other BERT mission in tabular data problems.[18] Consequently, it may appear counter-intuitive to employ a vocabulary composed solely of fixed-length digits for these embeddings. However, this approach is adopted to facilitate a transition from implicit mathematical reasoning among tabular data towards a token-based game representing numbers, rather than the mathematical deduction based on numbers.⁵

Next, we make each row a text string in form shown in table2. Permutation from feature to feature[19] is not necessary because we're not dealing with auto-regressive model [30] Since it is now a problem in the realm of language, tools like language model is now available to us. We lift feature name thus canceling the nuanced manipulation of feature-wise and intra-feature troubles, like the cobbling of 'intra feature attention'[18]. In our case, it is BERT tabular imputer, i.e. TREB, evidently.

For that purpose, we also need a token that tokenize a string. Within the BERT architecture, embeddings of plain text, encompassing both numerical and textual elements, encapsulate the semantic properties of words. By transforming a discrete set of tokens into a continuous space, information pertaining to words is compressed, and the extensive vocabulary is represented within a lower-dimensional space. Faced with 4-digit number in a sentence that is just transformed into a text string:

'column 0: 0.2349, column 1: ..., 0.3788']

, a regular tokenizer will give you result like this:

```
['column', '0', ':', '0', '.', '234', '##9',',',
'column', '1', ':', ...,
...,
..., '0', ',', '37', '##8', '##8']
```

where the decimal part is tore up, hindering the game of 4-digit tokens (which is exactly why we set the digit occupation being 4). It is also observed the pattern shown in all tokenization result does not involve fixed length in terms of decimal parts of a float point number. The BERT model employs a base tokenizer 'bert-base-uncased' to preprocess textual data. This tokenizer serves as a foundational component within the BERT architecture, responsible for transforming raw text into a numerical representation that the model can comprehend and process effectively. The tokenizer achieves this by segmenting the text into individual units, known as tokens, which can be either words or subwords. Each distinct token is assigned a unique numerical identifier, constructing a vocabulary that enables the model to represent text as a sequence of numbers. To facilitate the training process, we establish the 'vocab_file' as a vocabulary book consisting solely of four-digit numbers, including those prefixed with zeros.⁶ Within this vocabulary, the token '103' is specifically

⁵The decimal part reminds us of the myth question of 'Is 9.9 bigger than 9.11' where many LLM fails to give correct answer. The first author believes it is related to the prior impact given by the tokenization stuff.

⁶The 'bert-base-uncase' belongs to AutoTokenizer family that is a little too old that it only accepts add_tokens for extra addition of vocabulary.

reserved to represent the '[mask]' token, a crucial element for future training. The new tokenizer will give us a tokens series like this:

in triple forms input_ids, attention_masks and labels.



Figure 2: Workflow of TREB.

3.2 Training paradigm

We proceeded to the training phase, employing a Roberta model configured with the following parameters: a vocabulary size of 51,100, a maximum sequence length of 514, a hidden size of 768, 12 attention heads, 6 hidden layers, and a type vocabulary size of 1. Like many BERT projects in tabular data problems, this paper is built on the basis of RoBERT.[31] This model was initialized for masked language modeling, tasked with predicting missing words in a given sequence. Its architecture can be seen in fig.3 in Appendix. An initial learning rate of 1e-4 was adopted. A random (15%) sample of the tokens in the input sequence is selected and replaced with the special token [MASK]. To leverage GPU acceleration, the model and batch were transferred to a GPU device. Input IDs, attention masks, and labels were provided to the model, and the outputs were evaluated in terms of token differences to compute the loss. Position encoding is lifted as attempts in many other literature[32], but we reserve it here because the column, though incoherent, is inherent in tabular information. Training was terminated after 500 epochs, at which point the loss converged to approximately 5e-7.

3.3 Evaluation

3.4 Hardware

We use A800 SXM4 80 GB, which is a professional graphics card by NVIDIA, launched on August 11th, 2022⁷. The GPU is operating at a frequency of 1155 MHz, which can be boosted up to 1410 MHz, memory is running at 1593 MHz. The system utilized in this analysis is equipped with a CUDA Driver Version 12.1, specifically driver version 525.60.13. The programming language employed is Python, version 3.11.8.final.0 (64-bit). The CPU is an Intel Xeon Platinum 8358P with a base clock speed of 2.6000 GHz.

3.5 Performance

3.5.1 Errors

To evaluate the model's performance to missing data, we conducted a series of ablation experiments of tabular imputing. For each column in the validation dataset, we systematically removed the column's values, thereby simulating scenarios with missing information. This process was repeated for all nine columns, resulting in nine distinct ablation tests.

⁷https://www.techpowerup.com/gpu-specs/a800-sxm4-80-gb.c3966

To visualize the impact of missing data on the model's performance, we generated a colormap depicting the evolution of loss over epochs, which is listed in appendix. The x-axis represented the row index, while the y-axis indicated the epoch number. The intensity of the color at each grid point corresponded to the magnitude of the loss, with darker hues signifying lower loss values. The loss is measured simply by getting the absolute number from reducing the correct value from the imputed one. With the iteration of epochs of trained models (from top to bottom, only selecting last 35 epochs), the loss is majorly decreasing along all rows (sampled every 25 rows in the figures). The converging situation is quantitatively different among different columns. Except for comparatively bad case in column 3, most of the column imputing has attained good effect.

3.5.2 Flops consumption and carbon footprint

Flops We deploy the toolkit *calflops* to compute the theoretical amount of FLOPs floating-point operations MACs (Multiply-ACcumulate operations) and Parameters in our network.[33] By adding up flops consumption layer by layer, we get to know that, the proposed model exhibited a total of 1.16 million trainable parameters, demonstrating a moderate complexity. In terms of computational efficiency, the forward pass required approximately 201 billion MACs and 402 TFLOPs. For both forward and backward passes, the computational demands increased to 603 billion MACs and 1.2 TFLOPs.

Carbon footprint We deploy CarbonTracker[34] to calculate the carbon generation issued by the project. CarbonTracker employs a default average carbon intensity of 541.33 grams of CO_2 per kilowatt-hour for Shanghai, China, in 2021. Based on this metric, a predicted consumption of 6.17 kilowatt-hours during 50 s epoch would result in 3,339.37 grams of CO_2 equivalent emissions. This quantity is comparable to the emissions produced by a car traveling 31.06 kilometers. While the project utilizes 50 epochs for the primary task, the actual computational demands are significantly higher. Due to various adjustments and experimental iterations, we anticipate a threefold increase in computational requirements. Plus, assuming an average of 50 grams of CO2 per kWh, the carbon footprint for using the laptop and monitor for one hour would be 0.075kWh * 50grams/kWh = 3.75grams of CO_2 . So, with approximately 30 hours of working, the total carbon footprint would 13,469 grams of CO_2 .

4 Conclusion

This paper centers its methodological approach on three key characteristics of tabular data, as outlined by Fang et al. (cf. 1). Regarding the dependence on pre-processing, we acknowledge its critical role and application-specific nature. Beyond the standard normalization of numerical values, this work employs case-oriented tokenizers to optimize the data for the Bert architecture. Recognizing the significance of context-based interconnections, we have fully integrated this effective approach into our methodology. Finally, the order-invariant property of tabular data has guided our decisions regarding row shuffling and the training/validation split of the dataset.

A cornerstone of TREB is the explicit incorporation of designed tokens through the use of pre-processed tokenizers. If, By tailoring the tokenization process to specific data types — such as categorical integers within a defined range, Boolean variables, or natural language words from a large corpus — we will effectively introduce informative seeds into the (partial) transformer architecture. The authors posit that TREB's imputation mechanism can rival the expertise of a domain-specific expert who has acquired a deep understanding of data patterns through instinct or accumulated experience.

Another thing to be noted is that, the BERT mask process in the paper involves batches already, which guarantees its potential capability in such scenario where the information entanglement is not only columnwise, but also row-wise. For example, there might be group of 4 rows describing the housing prices in the same county, whilst another group of 5 rows in another county, in the context of California Housing Dataset. This sort of problem is named as VRUOC (Variable Row-numbers Under One Cluster) that is illustrated in a Github repository⁸. Apart from combining related rows into one, TREB obviously provides another solution in that it is possible for it to learn the row-wise information within a batch during training.

Ma et al. pointed out the the challenges of tabular problems lies in the mismatch in structure between models' *generativity* vs. *discriminativity* in tabular data.[35] Upon further examination, TREB's methodology reveals a strategic balance between the generative capabilities of the transformer architecture (specifically, RoBERTa) and the discriminative nature of tokenization with case-oriented constraints. This hybrid approach allows TREB to effectively leverage the strengths of both paradigms.

In short, this work is basically yet another testament of attention mechanism 's power in tabular data.

⁸https://github.com/shuyueW1991/be_great-

Acknowledgments

The paper, as always, dedicate this paper to Gemini, Visual Studio Code and GitHub community. It gains inspiration from an educational blog⁹ and the great work of GReaT model[19]. While this research, conducted on a modest MacBook Pro and scaled up on a server, may seem underwhelming to those who fetishize GPU clusters, it demonstrates that computational efficiency, measured in FLOPS and carbon footprint, is a far more meaningful metric for evaluating performance. As evidenced by the misguided priorities of interviewers like one Tang at Intsig Information Co., Ltd., overreliance on hardware-centric metrics is a hallmark of superficial understanding.

References

- [1] Xi Fang, Weijie Xu, Fiona Anting Tan, Jiani Zhang, Ziqing Hu, Yanjun Jane Qi, Scott Nickleach, Diego Socolinsky, Srinivasan Sengamedu, Christos Faloutsos, et al. Large language models (llms) on tabular data: Prediction, generation, and understanding-a survey. 2024.
- [2] Towardsai.net. The evolution of tabular data: From analysis to ai. towardsai.net.
- [3] Nitesh V Chawla, Kevin W Bowyer, Lawrence O Hall, and W Philip Kegelmeyer. Smote: synthetic minority over-sampling technique. *Journal of artificial intelligence research*, 16:321–357, 2002.
- [4] Ramiro D Camino, Christian A Hammerschmidt, et al. Oversampling tabular data with deep generative models: Is it worth the effort? 2020.
- [5] Léo Grinsztajn, Edouard Oyallon, and Gaël Varoquaux. Why do tree-based models still outperform deep learning on typical tabular data? *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:507–520, 2022.
- [6] Yury Gorishniy, Ivan Rubachev, Valentin Khrulkov, and Artem Babenko. Revisiting deep learning models for tabular data. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:18932–18943, 2021.
- [7] Tianqi Chen and Carlos Guestrin. Xgboost: A scalable tree boosting system. In *Proceedings of the 22nd acm sigkdd international conference on knowledge discovery and data mining*, pages 785–794, 2016.
- [8] Guolin Ke, Jia Zhang, Zhenhui Xu, Jiang Bian, and Tie-Yan Liu. Tabnn: A universal neural network solution for tabular data. 2018.
- [9] Sergei Ivanov and Liudmila Prokhorenkova. Boost then convolve: Gradient boosting meets graph neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2101.08543*, 2021.
- [10] Thomas J. Sargent. Sources of artificial intelligence. www.tomsargent.com.
- [11] Xiru Chen. Math of chances (in Chinese). People's Posts and Telecommunications Press, 12 2021.
- [12] Shuyue Wang and P Jin. A brief summary of prompting in using gpt models. *Qeios*, 2023.
- [13] Ruoyu Qin, Zheming Li, Weiran He, Mingxing Zhang, Yongwei Wu, Weimin Zheng, and Xinran Xu. Mooncake: Kimi's kvcache-centric architecture for llm serving. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.00079*, 2024.
- [14] Akim Kotelnikov, Dmitry Baranchuk, Ivan Rubachev, and Artem Babenko. Tabddpm: Modelling tabular data with diffusion models. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 17564–17579. PMLR, 2023.
- [15] Lei Xu, Maria Skoularidou, Alfredo Cuesta-Infante, and Kalyan Veeramachaneni. Modeling tabular data using conditional gan. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 32, 2019.
- [16] Stefan Hegselmann, Alejandro Buendia, Hunter Lang, Monica Agrawal, Xiaoyi Jiang, and David Sontag. Tabllm: Few-shot classification of tabular data with large language models. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 5549–5581. PMLR, 2023.
- [17] Yuan Sui, Jiaru Zou, Mengyu Zhou, Xinyi He, Lun Du, Shi Han, and Dongmei Zhang. Tap4llm: Table provider on sampling, augmenting, and packing semi-structured data for large language model reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.09039*, 2023.
- [18] Jiahuan Yan, Bo Zheng, Hongxia Xu, Yiheng Zhu, Danny Chen, Jimeng Sun, Jian Wu, and Jintai Chen. Making pre-trained language models great on tabular prediction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.01841*, 2024.
- [19] Vadim Borisov, Kathrin Seßler, Tobias Leemann, Martin Pawelczyk, and Gjergji Kasneci. Language models are realistic tabular data generators. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.06280*, 2022.
- [20] Bohao Yang, Chen Tang, Kun Zhao, Chenghao Xiao, and Chenghua Lin. Effective distillation of table-based reasoning ability from llms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.13182*, 2023.

⁹https://medium.com/@henri_w_91/build-a-transformer-from-scratch-my-version-of-how-cf1ad8ff47c1

- [21] Anirudh S Sundar and Larry Heck. ctbls: Augmenting large language models with conversational tables. *arXiv* preprint arXiv:2303.12024, 2023.
- [22] Mikhail V Koroteev. Bert: a review of applications in natural language processing and understanding. *arXiv* preprint arXiv:2103.11943, 2021.
- [23] R Kelley Pace and Ronald Barry. Sparse spatial autoregressions. *Statistics & Probability Letters*, 33(3):291–297, 1997.
- [24] Jacob Devlin Ming-Wei Chang Kenton and Lee Kristina Toutanova. Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. In *Proceedings of naacL-HLT*, volume 1, page 2, 2019.
- [25] Alex Graves. Sequence transduction with recurrent neural networks. arXiv preprint arXiv:1211.3711, 2012.
- [26] Amirsina Torfi, Rouzbeh A Shirvani, Yaser Keneshloo, Nader Tavaf, and Edward A Fox. Natural language processing advancements by deep learning: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2003.01200*, 2020.
- [27] A Vaswani. Attention is all you need. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, 2017.
- [28] Chi Sun, Xipeng Qiu, Yige Xu, and Xuanjing Huang. How to fine-tune bert for text classification? In Chinese computational linguistics: 18th China national conference, CCL 2019, Kunming, China, October 18–20, 2019, proceedings 18, pages 194–206. Springer, 2019.
- [29] Pengcheng Yin, Graham Neubig, Wen-tau Yih, and Sebastian Riedel. Tabert: Pretraining for joint understanding of textual and tabular data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.08314*, 2020.
- [30] Shengzhe Xu, Cho-Ting Lee, Mandar Sharma, Raquib Bin Yousuf, Nikhil Muralidhar, and Naren Ramakrishnan. Are llms naturally good at synthetic tabular data generation? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.14541*, 2024.
- [31] Yinhan Liu. Roberta: A robustly optimized bert pretraining approach. arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.11692, 2019.
- [32] Chao Ye, Guoshan Lu, Haobo Wang, Liyao Li, Sai Wu, Gang Chen, and Junbo Zhao. Towards cross-table masked pretraining for web data mining. In *Proceedings of the ACM on Web Conference 2024*, pages 4449–4459, 2024.
- [33] xiaoju ye. calflops: a flops and params calculate tool for neural networks in pytorch framework, 2023.
- [34] Lasse F. Wolff Anthony, Benjamin Kanding, and Raghavendra Selvan. Carbontracker: Tracking and predicting the carbon footprint of training deep learning models. ICML Workshop on Challenges in Deploying and monitoring Machine Learning Systems, July 2020. arXiv:2007.03051.
- [35] Junwei Ma, Apoorv Dankar, George Stein, Guangwei Yu, and Anthony Caterini. Tabpfgen–tabular data generation with tabpfn. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.05216*, 2024.

Appendix



Figure 3: Training paradigm.



Figure 4: Imputation on column 0.



Figure 5: Imputation on column 1.



Figure 6: Imputation on column 2.



Figure 7: Imputation on column 3.