
STDiff: A STATE TRANSITION DIFFUSION FRAMEWORK FOR TIME SERIES IMPUTATION IN INDUSTRIAL SYSTEMS

A PREPRINT

 **Gary Simethy**
 Department of Energy Technology
 Aalborg University
 Esbjerg, Denmark 6700
 gasi@energy.aau.dk

 **Daniel Ortiz-Arroyo**
 Department of Energy Technology
 Aalborg University
 Esbjerg, Denmark 6700
 doa@energy.aau.dk

 **Petar Durdevic**
 Department of Energy Technology
 Aalborg University
 Esbjerg, Denmark 6700
 pdl@energy.aau.dk

ABSTRACT

Most deep learning methods for imputing missing values treat the task as completing patterns within a fixed time window. This assumption often fails in industrial systems, where dynamics are driven by control actions, are highly non-stationary, and can experience long, uninterrupted gaps. We propose **STDiff**, which reframes imputation as learning how the system evolves from one state to the next. STDiff uses a conditional denoising diffusion model with a causal bias aligned to control theory, generating missing values step-by-step based on the most recent known state and relevant control or environmental inputs. On a public wastewater treatment dataset with simulated missing blocks, STDiff consistently achieves the lowest errors, with its advantage increasing for longer gaps. On a raw industrial dataset with substantial real gaps, it produces trajectories that remain dynamically plausible, in contrast to window-based models that tend to flatten or over-smooth. These results support dynamics-aware, explicitly conditioned imputation as a robust approach for industrial time series, and we discuss computational trade-offs and extensions to broader domains.

Keywords Time series imputation · Diffusion models · State-space modeling · Industrial cyber-physical systems · Wastewater treatment plants · Missing data

1 Introduction

Multivariate time series are central to decision-making in finance, healthcare, and industrial process control. Missing values - caused by sensor faults, network outages, or maintenance - jeopardize forecasting, anomaly detection, and closed-loop control [1]. Much recent progress is driven by models that excel on public benchmarks (Electricity, Traffic, ETT, Exchange, M4) [2, 3, 4, 5]. Yet simple linear baselines can match or outperform sophisticated Transformers on some datasets [6], calling into question their robustness.

Wastewater Treatment Plants (WWTPs) are cyber-physical systems governed by nonlinear biochemical processes, influenced by non-stationary disturbances, and manipulated by discrete control actions [7, 8, 9, 10]. Measurements are often indirect and noisy [10]. Missingness frequently occurs in long, contiguous chunks - conditions under which window-based imputers become brittle [11, 12].

A unifying limitation of many state-of-the-art methods is their *window-based* design: the model infers missing values from a fixed-size slice of past/future data. When the gap exceeds the window, usable context becomes sparse or absent. We argue that, for dynamical systems, imputation should model how the system evolves, i.e., a probabilistic “world model” of state transitions [13, 14].

We introduce **STDiff**, which learns a discrete-time conditional transition model using a denoising diffusion approach. This design embeds a causal bias, integrates control and external inputs, and enables robust recursive imputation across extended gaps. We evaluate STDiff against RNN-, attention-, Transformer-, diffusion-, LLM-, and dynamics-based baselines on WWTP datasets, showing consistent gains and analyzing failure modes of window-based approaches.

Our main contributions are:

- **Formulation of imputation as probabilistic state transition modeling** - reframing the task to explicitly capture how system states evolve over time, rather than relying solely on fixed-window context.
- **STDiff framework** - a conditional diffusion model aligned with discrete-time, control-driven industrial systems, incorporating both control inputs and exogenous variables.
- **Comprehensive validation** - extensive experiments on wastewater treatment plant (WWTP) datasets, showing robustness to long contiguous gaps and improved accuracy over strong baselines, including Latent ODE.

We next review each category in turn and discuss how they motivate the design of STDiff.

2 Related Work

Research in multivariate time series imputation spans a spectrum from simple statistical heuristics to deep generative and dynamics-aware models. We group the literature into three major categories:

- **Window-based pattern completion** - methods that rely on fixed-size local context to fill gaps, including classical statistics, matrix factorization, recurrent networks, attention-based transformers, and generative models.
- **Dynamics-based system modeling** - approaches that model temporal evolution explicitly, often in continuous time, using neural ODEs, SDEs, or controlled differential equations to capture system dynamics.
- **Hybrid approaches** - models that combine short-term feature extraction with long-term dynamics modeling, sometimes incorporating domain-specific physics or constraints.

2.1 Window-based pattern completion

Classical statistical techniques such as mean/median substitution, last observation carried forward, and linear interpolation remain widely used due to their speed and simplicity [1]. However, these methods fail to model nonlinear dependencies or variable-specific temporal patterns, often introducing bias when the missing segments are long or structured. Matrix factorization and low-rank tensor completion methods improve upon simple statistics by exploiting correlations across time and features [15, 16], but they are still fundamentally limited to linear relationships.

With the rise of deep learning, recurrent models have become prominent. BRITS [17] integrates imputation directly into recurrent updates, using temporal decay to weight older observations [18]. Attention-based models such as SAITS [19] extend this by capturing temporal and feature-wise dependencies jointly, improving flexibility over purely sequential RNNs. Transformer variants - including Informer [3], Autoformer [4], and iTransformer [20] - push scalability and periodicity modeling further, with iTransformer treating variates as tokens for improved feature interactions.

Generative approaches represent another branch of window-based methods. GAN-based imputation (GAIN) [21] frames the task as a minimax game between a generator and a discriminator, producing diverse but sometimes unstable results. More recently, diffusion models such as CSDI [22] have shown strong performance in structured missingness scenarios, benefiting from denoising objectives [23, 24, 25]. Despite their strengths, all of these window-based methods rely heavily on the availability of recent local context. When long, contiguous gaps occur, performance degrades sharply because no mechanism enforces physically plausible long-horizon evolution.

2.2 Dynamics-based system modeling

An alternative to fixed-window approaches is to model the temporal evolution of the system explicitly. Neural ordinary differential equations (Neural ODEs) [26, 27] parameterize continuous-time dynamics, naturally handling irregular sampling. Probabilistic extensions, such as Neural stochastic differential equations (Neural SDEs) [28, 29] and controlled differential equations (CDEs) [30], further account for uncertainty and exogenous influences. These methods are conceptually elegant and can capture fine-grained temporal continuity, but their application to high-frequency SCADA-like datasets can be computationally demanding. Injecting discrete control actions into continuous solvers remains challenging, often requiring expensive event handling [31, 32]. Furthermore, over-smoothing is a common issue, particularly when models prioritize stability over reproducing high-frequency transients.

2.3 Hybrid approaches

Several recent works have sought to combine the strengths of window-based feature extraction with the robustness of dynamics-aware modeling. For instance, short-term convolutional encoders fused with latent ODE dynamics to capture both local variability and long-term structure [33]. Others use physics-informed neural networks (PINNs)

[34] to embed domain-specific constraints into data-driven models, improving extrapolation beyond the observed horizon. These hybrids, however, often require domain-specific priors or carefully engineered architectures, limiting their general applicability.

2.4 Motivation for STDiff

There remains a clear gap between strong local pattern recognizers and models that encode causal, control-driven evolution over long horizons. STDiff addresses this by learning a discrete-time conditional transition kernel with a denoising diffusion model. This design combines the robustness of dynamics modeling with explicit conditioning on control inputs and exogenous variables, enabling plausible imputation even in extended gaps where purely local-context models fail.

3 The State Transition Diffusion (STDiff) Framework

This section introduces STDiff, a framework for robust imputation in control-driven industrial systems. We frame imputation as probabilistic state transition modeling, instantiate the transition kernel via conditional diffusion, present the model architecture and algorithms, and conclude with a discussion of advantages.

3.1 Problem formulation: imputation as state transition modeling

Let $x_t \in \mathbb{R}^{D_x}$ denote the system state at time t , influenced by control inputs $u_t \in \mathbb{R}^{D_u}$ and exogenous variables $w_t \in \mathbb{R}^{D_w}$. Under a first-order Markov assumption [13], the conditional transition distribution is given by

$$p_\theta(x_t \mid x_{t-1}, u_t, w_t).$$

Imputation across a gap of length H becomes recursive conditional generation:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{x}_{k+h} &\sim p_\theta(\cdot \mid \hat{x}_{k+h-1}, u_{k+h}, w_{k+h}), \\ h &= 1, \dots, H, \quad \hat{x}_k = x_k, \end{aligned}$$

which depends only on the most recent state and known inputs, avoiding the context starvation of fixed windows.

Notation. $x_t \in \mathbb{R}^{D_x}$ is the system state; $u_t \in \mathbb{R}^{D_u}$ control inputs; $w_t \in \mathbb{R}^{D_w}$ exogenous variables. Let k be the index of the last observed state before a gap and H the gap length; \hat{x}_t denotes imputed states. Diffusion uses T steps with index $\tau \in \{1, \dots, T\}$ and noise schedule β_τ ; we write $\alpha_\tau = 1 - \beta_\tau$ and $\bar{\alpha}_\tau = \prod_{s=1}^\tau \alpha_s$. The forward noising is constructed with *Gaussian* noise $\epsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I)$ via $x_{t,\tau} = \sqrt{\bar{\alpha}_\tau} x_t + \sqrt{1 - \bar{\alpha}_\tau} \epsilon$. The reverse model predicts that noise as $\hat{\epsilon} = \epsilon_\theta(x_{t,\tau}, \tau, c)$, where $c = \{x_{t-1}, u_t, w_t\}$. During reverse sampling we also inject fresh noise $z \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I)$ when $\tau > 1$, scaled by $\sigma_\tau = \sqrt{\beta_\tau}$. Unless stated otherwise, scalar–vector operations act elementwise across state dimensions; we also use $a_\tau = (1 - \alpha_\tau)/\sqrt{1 - \bar{\alpha}_\tau}$ for brevity in the algorithms.

3.2 Realizing the kernel with conditional diffusion

We use a denoising diffusion probabilistic model (DDPM) [23]. The forward process is:

$$q(x_{t,\tau} \mid x_{t,\tau-1}) = \mathcal{N}\left(\sqrt{1 - \beta_\tau} x_{t,\tau-1}, \beta_\tau I\right),$$

$$q(x_{t,\tau} \mid x_{t,0}) = \mathcal{N}\left(\sqrt{\bar{\alpha}_\tau} x_{t,0}, (1 - \bar{\alpha}_\tau) I\right),$$

where

$$\alpha_\tau = 1 - \beta_\tau, \quad \bar{\alpha}_\tau = \prod_{s=1}^\tau \alpha_s.$$

The reverse model predicts the added noise via:

$$L(\theta) = \mathbb{E}\left[\|\epsilon - \epsilon_\theta(x_{t,\tau}, \tau, c)\|^2\right], \quad c = \{x_{t-1}, u_t, w_t\}.$$




Figure 1: Training architecture of STDiff. A 1D U-Net predicts the Gaussian noise term ϵ added to the true next state, conditioned on diffusion timestep and an embedding of (x_{t-1}, u_t, w_t) .

Algorithm 1 STDiff Training [adapted from 23]

- 1: **repeat**
 - 2: Sample (x_{t-1}, u_t, w_t, x_t) from data
 - 3: Draw $\tau \sim \text{Uniform}\{1, \dots, T\}$, $\epsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I)$
 - 4: $x_{t,\tau} \leftarrow \sqrt{\bar{\alpha}_\tau} x_t + \sqrt{1 - \bar{\alpha}_\tau} \epsilon$
 - 5: $c \leftarrow \{x_{t-1}, u_t, w_t\}$
 - 6: Update θ to minimize $\|\epsilon - \epsilon_\theta(x_{t,\tau}, \tau, c)\|^2$
 - 7: **until** converged
-

3.3 Model architecture

The STDiff framework employs a conditional denoising diffusion model that explicitly integrates the most recent valid system state along with known control and exogenous inputs. A lightweight multi-layer perceptron (MLP) encodes the tuple (x_{t-1}, u_t, w_t) into a fixed-dimensional embedding vector c_{emb} , which serves as the conditioning signal throughout the reverse diffusion process.

The noise predictor ϵ_θ is parameterized as a 1D U-Net [35], chosen for its ability to capture both local temporal correlations and multi-scale dependencies in industrial time-series data. The U-Net operates on the noisy state $x_{t,\tau}$ and receives two conditioning inputs:

1. The encoded control/exogenous context c_{emb} (added to intermediate feature maps via channel-wise concatenation), and
2. A sinusoidal timestep embedding of τ , allowing the network to learn time-dependent denoising behaviours across the diffusion trajectory.

This design enables the model to adapt the reverse process to the specific operational regime and control context at each step. Figure 1 illustrates the overall training architecture, highlighting how the conditioning signal is injected into the network layers.




Figure 2: Recursive imputation in STDiff. Each missing step is generated via reverse diffusion conditioned on the previously generated state and the corresponding inputs (u_t, w_t) .

Algorithm 2 STDiff Imputation (Recursive Sampling)

Require: Last observed x_k ; inputs $\{u_{k+h}, w_{k+h}\}_{h=1}^H$

- 1: $\hat{x}_k \leftarrow x_k$
 - 2: **for** $h = 1$ **to** H **do**
 - 3: $c \leftarrow \{\hat{x}_{k+h-1}, u_{k+h}, w_{k+h}\}$
 - 4: $x_{k+h,T} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I)$
 - 5: **for** $\tau = T$ **to** 1 **do**
 - 6: $\hat{\epsilon} \leftarrow \epsilon_\theta(x_{k+h,\tau}, \tau, c)$
 - 7: $a \leftarrow \frac{1-\alpha_\tau}{\sqrt{1-\alpha_\tau}}$ ▷ precompute coefficient
 - 8: $x_{k+h,\tau-1} \leftarrow \alpha_\tau^{-1/2}(x_{k+h,\tau} - a\hat{\epsilon})$
 - 9: **if** $\tau > 1$ **then**
 - 10: $z \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I)$
 - 11: $x_{k+h,\tau-1} \leftarrow x_{k+h,\tau-1} + \sqrt{\beta_\tau} z$
 - 12: $\hat{x}_{k+h} \leftarrow x_{k+h,0}$
 - 13: **return** $\{\hat{x}_{k+1}, \dots, \hat{x}_{k+H}\}$
-

3.4 Algorithms

The STDiff framework consists of two core procedures: (1) a *training phase* (**Algorithm 1**), adapted from the DDPM objective [23] with explicit state-transition conditioning; and (2) a *recursive imputation phase* (**Algorithm 2**), which performs conditional reverse sampling for each missing time step in sequence.

3.5 Imputation (recursive sampling)

Building on the conditional reverse diffusion kernel, the imputation process starts from the last available valid state x_k and generates $\hat{x}_{k+1}, \dots, \hat{x}_{k+H}$ one step at a time, executing a complete reverse diffusion process for each missing time step.

At step h , the model conditions on the previously imputed state \hat{x}_{k+h-1} along with the known future control inputs u_{k+h} and exogenous variables w_{k+h} . This conditioning ensures that each imputed point is dynamically consistent with both the evolving system trajectory and the planned or observed external influences.

The reverse process is initialized from Gaussian noise and proceeds through T denoising steps, progressively refining the state estimate until a clean sample is obtained. This sample becomes \hat{x}_{k+h} and is fed into the next step, allowing information to propagate sequentially across the imputation horizon.

By recomputing the context embedding at each step, the model maintains sensitivity to both the evolving state and the sequence of inputs. Figure 2 visualizes this recursive sampling procedure, and the precise algorithmic steps are given in **Algorithm 2**.

Table 1: Effective per-variable missingness (%) in Agrtrup under four synthetic block-missingness scenarios.

Variable	20%	30%	40%	50%
<i>State Variables</i>				
T1_NH ₄	11.54	17.25	22.66	28.10
T1_PO ₄	11.61	17.20	22.69	28.46
<i>Control/Exogenous</i>				
IN_METAL_Q	5.47	8.36	11.13	13.75
T1_O ₂	5.59	8.28	11.07	13.75
TEMPERATURE	5.55	8.38	11.12	13.65
IN_Q	5.56	8.28	11.12	13.71

3.6 Theoretical advantages

This formulation offers several benefits for industrial time-series imputation:

1. **Robustness to long gaps:** Dependence on the last valid state and known inputs mitigates context starvation.
2. **Causal inductive bias:** Modeling the transition $p(x_t \mid x_{t-1}, u_t, w_t)$ aligns with the causal direction of control-driven systems - effects follow from the previous state and inputs - so the model responds correctly to interventions in u_t and avoids spurious window-based correlations [36, 37].
3. **Explicit control/exogenous handling:** Directly models how external drivers influence state evolution.
4. **Probabilistic regularization:** Sampling from learned conditionals reduces runaway error accumulation across recursive steps.

We have introduced STDiff and motivated its advantages for dynamics-aware imputation. Next, we empirically test these claims on wastewater datasets, detailing datasets, baselines and metrics.

4 Experimental Setup

We evaluate STDiff on synthetic and real industrial datasets to test performance under controlled missingness and raw operational conditions. We describe datasets, baselines and implementation.

4.1 Datasets

Agrtrup (BlueKolding). We use the public, pre-processed WWTP dataset [38]. T1_NH₄ and T1_PO₄ are treated as *state* variables to be imputed, while IN_METAL_Q, T1_O₂, TEMPERATURE, and IN_Q act as *control/exogenous* conditioning inputs. To assess robustness under structured missingness, we introduce *contiguous block* masks at four target levels (20–50%). Blocks are sampled over calendar time and applied primarily to the two state channels; to mimic realistic co-failures (e.g., short sensor/communication outages), a smaller fraction of the control/exogenous channels inside the same blocks is also dropped. This yields the *realized* per-variable rates reported in Table 1 (approximately 11.5–28.5% on the states and 5.5–13.8% on the conditioning channels across scenarios). Evaluation is performed only on the masked entries of the state variables (T1_NH₄, T1_PO₄). Control/exogenous channels (IN_METAL_Q, T1_O₂, TEMPERATURE, IN_Q) are treated purely as covariates: their observed values are used to condition the model when present, but they are not targets of imputation and are therefore excluded from MAE/RMSE. For time steps where a covariate entry is missing, we pass a binary mask and a zero value in z -score space.

Avedøre. We also analyze a raw, operational WWTP dataset [7] with substantial naturally occurring gaps across sensors (Table 2). No synthetic corruption is added. This dataset is used to study *dynamic plausibility*: we visualize long-horizon imputations for representative measurements (e.g., N₂O and NH₄) in the presence of real gaps. Where inputs are missing, each method handles them according to its design; STDiff conditions on whatever control/exogenous signals are available at each time step.

Table 2: Percentage of missing data for selected variables in the raw Avedøre dataset.

Variable	Missing (%)
Q	45.79
Q.AIRFLOW	45.10
LINE 3 TANK 1 VALVE 1,PCT	42.30
O ₂	41.80
TEMPERATURE	41.00
PROCESSPHASE	40.70
NO ₃	39.50
BLOWERSTATION 1.O.AIRFLOW	39.40
NH ₄	39.10
SS	38.90
N ₂ O	38.80
PO ₄	37.50
O2.SETPOINT	36.70

Table 3: Agtrup: MAE and RMSE for NH₄ under 20 - 50% missingness. Lower is better.

Model	20%	30%	40%	50%
MAE				
STDiff	0.1502	0.1671	0.1906	0.2144
LatentODE	0.5002	0.4607	0.4346	0.4581
BRITS	0.6601	1.0304	1.6056	2.0505
SAITS	0.6873	1.0666	1.6979	2.2462
iTransformer	0.9361	1.6094	2.4726	2.8170
CSDI	1.1110	1.4894	3.1720	2.8888
TimeLLM	1.2317	2.0639	3.1668	3.6922
RMSE				
STDiff	0.4492	0.4444	0.5225	0.5694
LatentODE	0.7268	0.6542	0.6298	0.6701
BRITS	11.7938	15.4246	19.9027	23.7285
SAITS	11.9291	15.7040	22.0079	24.5096
iTransformer	14.2668	19.2816	27.9116	27.8301
CSDI	19.0929	21.8841	48.3049	32.7235
TimeLLM	17.2826	23.2829	32.2013	32.8111

4.2 Baselines and implementation details

We compare against BRITS [17], SAITS [19], iTransformer [20], CSDI [22], TimeLLM [39], and Latent ODE [27]. Window-based baselines are run with PyPOTS [40]; Latent ODE uses the authors’ implementation. STDiff is implemented in PyTorch and all experiments run on an NVIDIA RTX 4090 (24 GB).

5 Results and Discussion

We report quantitative and qualitative results. First, we assess numerical performance on Agtrup with controlled block missingness. Then we analyze dynamic plausibility on raw Avedøre data for two representative variables. Finally, we discuss computational aspects.

5.1 Quantitative analysis: dynamics-based robustness

Table 3 and Fig. 3 (top) show MAE and RMSE for NH₄ under 20–50% corruption. STDiff achieves the lowest errors across all missingness levels, with its advantage increasing as gap length grows. Dynamics-based approaches,

Table 4: Agtrup: MAE and RMSE for PO_4 under 20 - 50% missingness. Lower is better.

Model	20%	30%	40%	50%
MAE				
STDiff	0.1060	0.1222	0.1462	0.1697
LatentODE	0.3276	0.3164	0.3179	0.3179
BRITS	0.6266	1.0845	1.6595	2.1134
SAITS	0.6429	1.1334	1.7652	2.3017
iTransformer	0.9336	1.6090	2.3467	2.8841
CSDI	0.9901	1.5705	2.7737	2.9190
TimeLLM	1.1685	2.0657	2.9867	3.7353
RMSE				
STDiff	0.2883	0.3076	0.3811	0.4309
LatentODE	0.4911	0.4599	0.4756	0.5119
BRITS	11.3561	16.0112	20.7296	24.0780
SAITS	11.4032	16.5676	23.1434	24.8839
iTransformer	14.7720	19.4940	26.2288	28.3911
CSDI	17.0092	22.1234	37.6717	32.6795
TimeLLM	17.2249	23.3118	30.1431	32.9272

including Latent ODE, degrade more slowly than window-based baselines; however, Latent ODE still trails STDiff, likely due to smoother reconstructions that under-represent sharp variations.

Table 4 and Fig. 3 (bottom) present results for PO_4 . The pattern mirrors NH_4 : STDiff remains consistently superior, especially under severe corruption, while Latent ODE performs second-best among dynamics-aware models. Window-based methods show rapid performance degradation as gap length increases, confirming their sensitivity to extended context loss.

5.2 Qualitative analysis: dynamics fidelity and gap robustness

To complement the quantitative results, we inspect example sequences from the raw Avedøre dataset with naturally occurring gaps. We compare side-by-side imputations for two contrasting variables - N_2O (fast, spiky) and NH_4 (slow, drifting) - in Figs. 4 and 5.

5.2.1 N_2O - spiky, high-variance signal

Figure 4 compares imputed and observed N_2O across winter/spring (Jan–May) and summer/fall (Jun–Nov). The signal shows intermittent high-amplitude transients tied to rapid process perturbations.

- **STDiff** preserves both spike timing and amplitude without overshoot or excessive smoothing, indicating that recursive state-transition conditioning anchors bursts even in high-variance intervals.
- **CSDI** retains spikes but attenuates peak amplitudes during volatile periods.
- **SAITS, BRITS, iTransformer** heavily smooth the series, removing operationally significant transients.
- **Latent ODE** produces occasional bursts but its baseline drifts during long gaps, suggesting long-horizon predictions are not well anchored.

Preserving such perturbations is critical: they often signal process instability or control interventions; suppressing them risks operationally misleading imputations.

5.2.2 NH_4 - extended gaps, slow drift

Figure 5 focuses on NH_4 , a slow-moving water-quality parameter that drifts seasonally and occasionally exhibits sharp transients. During extended gaps there is no ground truth, so structure that appears within a gap cannot be ruled out a priori. Our qualitative assessment therefore asks whether imputations (i) carry the underlying drift across the gap, (ii) allow occasional bursts consistent with the surrounding context, and (iii) reconnect smoothly at the gap boundaries.




Figure 3: Agrtrup quantitative results: MAE versus block-missingness (20 - 50%). **Top:** T1_NH₄; **Bottom:** T1_PO₄. Dynamics-based methods degrade more slowly than window-based methods, with STDiff consistently achieving the lowest errors across all corruption levels.

- **STDiff** maintains slow drift while allowing intermittent high-amplitude deviations consistent with pre- and post-gap behavior.
- **Latent ODE** generates lower-amplitude spikes with smoother transitions, which may underrepresent genuine rapid changes.
- **CSDI** flatlines mid-gap (e.g., early September), symptomatic of context starvation; variability resumes abruptly at observed-data boundaries.

Avoiding both excessive smoothing and unrealistic temporal stationarity is crucial for slow-varying variables like NH₄, where gradual drift informs early warnings.

5.3 Computational considerations and limitations

STDiff requires T reverse-diffusion steps for each missing time step, so inference scales as $\mathcal{O}(HT)$ with the gap length H (i.e., $\mathcal{O}(T)$ per step). In our experiments we set $T=1000$; using fewer steps or accelerated samplers/distillation can reduce latency at a small loss in fidelity, whereas larger T improves accuracy at higher cost.

Because the model conditions on control/exogenous inputs (u_t, w_t) , its performance depends on their quality. We pass binary masks alongside values and apply random input dropouts during training to make the model tolerant to occasional corruption. When long stretches of these inputs are missing, two practical fallbacks are: (i) imputing the




Figure 4: Avedøre N_2O in 2023 (winter/spring left, summer/fall right). **Top:** STDiff preserves bursts and baseline variability. **Middle:** CSDI underestimates amplitudes; SAITS/BRITS/iTransformer over-smooth. **Bottom:** Latent ODE captures some bursts but shows baseline drift in extended gaps.

covariates with a *simple* method (e.g., forward-fill/back-fill with decay, linear interpolation, or a low-order Kalman filter fitted on past data), and (ii) running a history-only variant that conditions only on the last valid state together with the input masks.

The present kernel assumes first-order Markov dynamics. This keeps sampling simple but can miss higher-order effects such as actuator delays or slow seasonal components. A short history encoder (e.g., a small TCN/RNN over a few past steps) can be added to the conditioning path to capture these dependencies without changing the diffusion objective; we leave this as a straightforward extension.




Figure 5: Avedøre NH_4 over a full year (2023) with a zoomed September gap. **Top:** STDiff preserves gradual drift and plausible intra-gap variability. **Middle:** Latent ODE is smoother with lower-amplitude spikes. **Bottom:** CSDI shows flatlining inside long gaps.

Finally, deployment in industrial streams must account for concept drift [41]. We recommend rolling, time-based validation; lightweight drift monitoring on summary statistics; versioned checkpoints; and periodic retraining or scheduled refreshes when monitored drift or evaluation metrics indicate degradation.

6 Conclusion

In this work, we reframed time series imputation for industrial systems as the task of learning a conditional state transition model, rather than relying solely on fixed-window pattern completion. Our proposed method, STDiff, uses

a denoising diffusion approach to generate missing values across long and irregular gaps, explicitly modelling how the system evolves over time rather than simply inferring values from short local context.

By conditioning on the last observed state and known control or external inputs, STDiff embeds a causal bias aligned with the physical and control-driven nature of industrial processes. This design avoids the context starvation that plagues fixed-window models, maintains robustness under severe block-missingness, and preserves important dynamic behaviours in both high-variance and slow-drift variables.

We validated STDiff on two wastewater treatment plant datasets - one with controlled synthetic gaps and one with naturally occurring operational gaps. In both settings, STDiff consistently outperformed strong window-based baselines and a continuous-time dynamics model, demonstrating that explicitly modelling system transitions yields more accurate and operationally plausible imputations. These results suggest that dynamics-aware, conditionally driven imputation is a principled and practical solution for cyber-physical systems, where the temporal coherence of reconstructed signals can be as critical as numerical error reduction.

The broader implication of this work is that industrial time series imputation benefits greatly from models that respect the causal structure of the system being modelled. By combining data-driven learning with explicit conditioning on system inputs, it is possible to achieve reconstructions that not only score well on error metrics but also align with the physical realities of the process - supporting better forecasting, monitoring, and decision-making.

7 Future Work

While this study establishes the potential of STDiff, further development could make it more powerful, efficient, and broadly applicable. The experiments revealed areas where the method’s strengths such as preserving dynamics under scarce context - could be extended, and where current limitations, like handling concept drift or scaling to extremely long gaps, could be addressed. Improvements in these directions would not only enhance accuracy but also strengthen deployment readiness in real-world industrial settings.

Promising directions for future research include:

- **Richer conditioning:** Incorporate short historical encoders, such as recurrent or temporal convolutional networks, alongside step-wise transitions to capture higher-order dependencies without sacrificing interpretability.
- **Cross-domain validation:** Apply STDiff to other control-driven domains such as manufacturing, HVAC, and power grid operations to assess portability and generalisability.
- **Downstream impact:** Quantify the benefits of improved imputation on forecasting accuracy, anomaly detection, and control performance, including integration with model-based reinforcement learning.
- **Adaptive retraining:** Develop strategies for handling concept drift in evolving industrial environments through periodic or online model updates.
- **Computational optimisation:** Explore faster reverse-diffusion sampling methods to reduce inference time for very long gaps while maintaining accuracy.

Acknowledgment

This research was supported by Aalborg University & Helix Lab in Denmark under the Novo Nordisk Fonden through project grant number 224611.

Declaration of competing interest

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

References

- [1] Wei-Chao Lin and Chih-Fong Tsai. A comprehensive survey on imputation of missing data in time series. *IEEE Access*, 8:204513–204527, 2020.
- [2] Dheeru Dua and Casey Graff. Uci machine learning repository. <http://archive.ics.uci.edu/ml>, 2019.

- [3] Haoyi Zhou, Shanghang Zhang, Jieqi Peng, Shuai Zhang, Jianxin Li, Hui Xiong, and Wancai Zhang. Informer: Beyond efficient transformer for long sequence time-series forecasting. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 35, pages 11106–11115, 2021.
- [4] Haixu Wu, Jiehui Xu, Jianmin Wang, and Mingsheng Long. Autoformer: Decomposition transformers with auto-correlation for long-term series forecasting. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 34, pages 22419–22430, 2021.
- [5] Spyros Makridakis, Evangelos Spiliotis, and Vassilios Assimakopoulos. The m4 competition: Results, findings and conclusion. *International Journal of Forecasting*, 34(4):802–808, 2018.
- [6] Ailing Zeng, Muxi Chen, Lei Zhang, and Qiang Xu. Are transformers effective for time series forecasting? In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 37, pages 11121–11128, 2023.
- [7] J. Alex et al. Benchmark for evaluating control strategies in wastewater treatment plants. Technical report, IWA Task Group on Benchmarking of Control Strategies for WWTPs, 2008.
- [8] J. B. Copp. *The COST Simulation Benchmark: Description and Simulator Manual*. Office for Official Publications of the European Communities, 2002.
- [9] Xiao He, Zhiwen Wang, and Avdhesh Gani. Fault detection and diagnosis in a wastewater treatment plant. In *2012 IEEE International Conference on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics (SMC)*, pages 1649–1653. IEEE, 2012.
- [10] Petr Kadlec, Bogdan Gabrys, and Sybille Strandt. Data-based soft sensors in the process industry. *Computers & Chemical Engineering*, 33(4):795–814, 2009.
- [11] Qingsong Wen, Linxiao Yang, Tian Zhou, et al. A survey on time series data augmentation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.02213*, 2022.
- [12] Ziyi Zhang, Weichao Lin, and Chih-Fong Tsai. A survey on domain adaptation for time series analysis. *IEEE Access*, 11:39071–39089, 2023.
- [13] Richard S. Sutton and Andrew G. Barto. *Reinforcement Learning: An Introduction*. MIT Press, 2018.
- [14] Bernt Oksendal. *Stochastic Differential Equations*. Springer, 2003.
- [15] Mohammad Taha Bahadori and Qi Yu. Fast multivariate spatio-temporal analysis via low rank tensor learning. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 27, pages 3491–3499, 2014.
- [16] Rose Yu, Nikhil Rao, and Inderjit S Dhillon. Temporal regularized matrix factorization for high-dimensional time series prediction. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 29, pages 847–855, 2016.
- [17] Wei Cao, Dong Wang, Jian Li, Hao Zhou, Lei Wang, and Yitan Li. Brits: Bidirectional recurrent imputation for time series. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 31, 2018.
- [18] Razvan Pascanu, Tomas Mikolov, and Yoshua Bengio. On the difficulty of training recurrent neural networks. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1310–1318. PMLR, 2013.
- [19] Wenjie Du, Fabian Falck, Liyuan Sun, George Zerveas, and Sebastian Vollmer. Saits: Self-attention-based imputation for time series. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 219:119619, 2023.
- [20] Yong Liu, Tengge Hu, Haoran Zhang, Haixu Wu, Shiyu Wang, Linyuan Ma, and Mingsheng Long. itransformer: Inverted transformers are effective for time series forecasting. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024.
- [21] Jinsung Yoon, James Jordon, and Mihaela van der Schaar. Gain: Missing data imputation using generative adversarial nets. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 5689–5698. PMLR, 2018.
- [22] Yusuke Tashiro, Jiaming Song, Yang Song, and Stefano Ermon. Csd: Conditional score-based diffusion models for probabilistic time series imputation. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 34, pages 24804–24816, 2021.
- [23] Jonathan Ho, Ajay Jain, and Pieter Abbeel. Denoising diffusion probabilistic models. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 33, pages 6840–6851, 2020.
- [24] Yang Song and Stefano Ermon. Generative modeling by estimating gradients of the data distribution. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 32, 2019.
- [25] Prafulla Dhariwal and Alex Nichol. Diffusion models beat gans on image synthesis. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 34, pages 8780–8794, 2021.
- [26] Tian Qi Chen, Yulia Rubanova, Jesse Bettencourt, and David Duvenaud. Neural ordinary differential equations. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 31, 2018.

- [27] Yulia Rubanova, Ricky TQ Chen, and David K Duvenaud. Latent ordinary differential equations for irregularly-sampled time series. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 32, 2019.
- [28] Xuechen Li, Ting-Kam Leonard Wong, Ricky TQ Chen, and David Duvenaud. Scalable gradients for stochastic differential equations. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 3870–3882. PMLR, 2020.
- [29] Belinda Tzen and Maxim Raginsky. Neural stochastic differential equations: Deep latent gaussian models in the diffusion limit. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1905.09883*, 2019.
- [30] Patrick Kidger, James Morrill, and Terry Lyons. Neural controlled differential equations for irregular time series. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 33, pages 6696–6707, 2020.
- [31] Samuel Ainsworth, Guy Blelloch, Ayca Elibol, Gregory R. Ganger, Giorgio Gori, Luke Kovarik, Matt J. Kusner, J. Zico Lee, Andrew Li, Jia Lu, Benjamin Miller, Martin O’Connor, Jeffrey Sacks, Patrick So, Peter Stone, Lyle Ungar, Petar Veličković, Sean Welleck, and Shunan Zhao. On the practicality of continuous-time policy gradient for robot control. In *Proceedings of the 5th Conference on Robot Learning (CoRL)*, pages 1–14, 2021. Accessed: 2025-08-12.
- [32] Ming Li, Han Zhao, Yu Wang, and Rakesh Kumar. Neural ordinary differential equations for control: Challenges and opportunities. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2508.01833*, 2025. Accessed: 2025-08-12.
- [33] Edward De Brouwer, Jaak Simm, Yves Moreau, and Dieter Vercauteren. Latent neural ordinary differential equations for multivariate time series forecasting. *Pattern Recognition*, 135:109156, 2023.
- [34] Maziar Raissi, Paris Perdikaris, and George E Karniadakis. Physics-informed neural networks: A deep learning framework for solving forward and inverse problems involving nonlinear partial differential equations. *Journal of Computational Physics*, 378:686–707, 2019.
- [35] Olaf Ronneberger, Philipp Fischer, and Thomas Brox. U-net: Convolutional networks for biomedical image segmentation. In *Medical Image Computing and Computer-Assisted Intervention – MICCAI 2015*, volume 9351 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 234–241. Springer, 2015.
- [36] Peter W. Battaglia et al. Relational inductive biases, deep learning, and graph networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1806.01261*, 2018.
- [37] Jonas Peters, Dominik Janzing, and Bernhard Schölkopf. *Elements of Causal Inference: Foundations and Learning Algorithms*. MIT Press, 2017.
- [38] Lise L. Hansen, Morten B. Johansen, Kristoffer Vad, Malte Christensen, Pedram Ramin, and Ulf M. Nielsen. Time series imputation on wastewater data: A case study. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.09413*, 2024.
- [39] Minge Jin, Yutong Wang, Qinkai Ma, Yishuo Zheng, Chen Li, Ruyi Chen, Haoyun Zhang, Shiliang Zhou, Zhiguang Yang, Weiqing Chen, et al. Time-llm: Time series forecasting by reprogramming large language models. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024.
- [40] Wenjie Du, Guanchu Wang, Zepu Zhao, Fabian Falck, Liyuan Sun, George Zerveas, Chang-wei Li, Sebastian Vollmer, and Xuan Li. Pypots: A python toolbox for data mining on partially-observed time series. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.18811*, 2023.
- [41] João Gama, Indrė Žliobaitė, Albert Bifet, Mykola Pechenizkiy, and Abdelhamid Bouchachia. A survey on concept drift adaptation. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 46(4):1–37, 2014.