

Weighted Ensemble of Statistical Models

Maciej Pawlikowski^{a,*}, Agata Chorowska^a

^a*ProLogistica Soft
Ostrowskiego 9
53-238 Wrocław, Poland*

Abstract

We present a detailed description of our submission for the M4 forecasting competition, in which it ranked 3rd overall. Our solution utilizes several commonly used statistical models, which are weighted according to their performance on historical data. We cluster series within each type of frequency with respect to the existence of trend and seasonality. Every class of series is assigned a different set of algorithms to combine. We conduct experiments with holdout set to manually pick pools of models that perform best for a given series type, as well as to choose the combination approaches.

Keywords: Combining forecasts, Time series, Automatic forecasting, Time series clustering, Forecasting competitions

1. Introduction

The model combination has been shown to greatly improve the forecast quality (T. Clemen, 1989). Averaging predictions produced by different algorithms usually outperforms the individual methods. Our submission for the M4 competition relies heavily on this technique. We take several commonly used statistical methods and weight their outputs according to the performance of the models on a holdout set. Most of the challenge came from choosing the optimal pool of algorithms and the way of calculating weights. We categorize M4 data with regards to the frequency (monthly, weekly, etc.), as well as the existence of trend and seasonality. For every resulting class, we pick a separate pool of models. A slightly different way of calculating weights is used for every frequency.

*Corresponding author

Email address: maciej.pawlikowski@prologistica.pl (Maciej Pawlikowski)

Section 2 contains a general description of our method. Section 3 provides more details on the parameterization. Parameter choice is explained in section 4. We give an example of calculating a forecast for a single series in section 5.

2. General method description

The process of forecasting with our method consists of four steps:

1. Choosing the model pool.
2. Estimating performance of models on historical data.
3. Determining weights for models in the pool.
4. Combining the models to calculate the final forecast.

2.1. Choosing model pool

The selection is based upon series' class, which is defined by the frequency, existence of seasonality and trend, and similarity to other time series within the same frequency. For detecting seasonality, we use 90% autocorrelation test similar to the one used in M4 benchmarks. For trend detection, we employ a Mann-Kendall test with 95% confidence.

To measure similarity, we calculate the correlation between the tail of the series and every time window in the dataset. We picked the window length to be twice the forecast horizon. If the correlation coefficient of the best fitting time frame exceeds a threshold, the class of a series is set to *correlated*. *Correlated* series are predicted by analogy. Properly scaled and shifted continuation of the most correlated time frame is used as a forecast.

In the case of daily data, we found that, on average, the most accurate single model was naïve. We thus add a heuristic to identify daily series that resemble a random walk. The sMAPE (symmetric mean absolute percentage error) of the naïve forecast of the last 48 observations (daily forecast horizon) is compared to a threshold. If the error is smaller, and the series is not *correlated*, it is classified as *random*. These series are always predicted with naïve.

2.2. Estimating performance on historical data

Using each of the picked models, create one-step-ahead forecasts for the last N prefixes of the series and measure their accuracy. The number of trials N depends only on the series' frequency. The default value is forecast horizon. Next, for each model, summarize errors from all trials. The summarization method we use is weighted mean. This produces scores that measure the performance of each model on the past observations. Section 5 presents an example of calculations described here.

In this step, we use the sMAPE. The main accuracy measure in the M4 competition was the overall weighted average (OWA) error, which is the mean of the relative sMAPE and the relative MASE (mean absolute scaled error). We tried using OWA for estimating the performance of models, but we observed no noticeable improvement in the final forecast quality. We also considered mean squared error, but the results were similar.

2.3. Determining combination weights

From the scores, create a set of weights, that will be used in the calculation of final forecasts. The method of transforming scores into weights depends only on series' frequency. Usually, the weights are squares of inverted scores.

2.4. Calculating final forecast

Calculate future forecasts of the series for all models. The final prediction is defined as a weighted mean of those forecasts, using weights described in section 2.3. Since the M4 dataset contains only positive values, the negative forecasts are replaced with zeros.

3. Method parameters

The algorithm is parameterized by the following:

- Pools of models to combine for each class of series. The list of individual algorithms we choose from is given below.
 - *Naïve models* - simple naïve forecast, naïve forecast applied to deseasonalized data
 - *Exponential Smoothing models* - simple exponential smoothing, exponential smoothing with automatic parameter choice, with or without damped trend

- *Theta models* - Theta method (Assimakopoulos & Nikolopoulos, 2000), Optimized Theta method (Fioruci, Pellegrini, Louzada & Petropoulos, 2015)
- *ARIMA models* - ARIMA with automatic parameter choice
- *Linear regression models* - linear regression of a series on various types of a trend (constant, linear, logarithmic), optionally applied to deseasonalized data

Additionally, we use two modifications of the above models: trimming of the series and setting a different frequency for the purpose of seasonality check. The former can be used for very long series to focus on the latest observations. The latter helps if a series has more than one potential seasonality period (e.g. 168 and 24 in the case of hourly data). Multiple variants of the same method in the pool are treated as separate models. For example, for weekly data, we consider two variants of the Theta method: one with cutting the series to the last five years, and one without. We also check for yearly seasonality in weekly series in Theta, but not in ARIMA, due to a very high performance impact.

- The number N of prefixes to be used in scores calculation. The default value is forecast horizon.
- Summarization function f combining historical one-step-ahead forecast errors into a single score for a model. We use a simple arithmetic mean or a weighted average with exponential weights, where the error values for the more recent observations count more. The default value of f is a simple mean.
- Weighting function g transforming scores into final weights. The function g takes one of the forms listed below. All operations are element-wise. A small epsilon is added to the denominator to avoid division by zero.

$$g_{inv}(S) = 1 / (S + \epsilon)$$

$$g_{sqr}(S) = g_{inv}^2(S)$$

$$g_{exp}(S) = \exp(g_{inv}(S))$$

S is a vector containing scores of the models. By default we use g_{sqr} .

- Thresholds t_{cor} and t_{rnd} deciding how many series is classified as *correlated* and *random*.

The choice of N , f , g , and t_{cor} was made separately for each frequency present in M4 data. Series with the same frequency share the same values of these parameters. The t_{rnd} parameter applies only to daily series.

4. Parameter tuning

4.1. Train-test split

We start the parameter tuning process by focusing on a single frequency. We perform a train-test split of the data within that frequency by cutting the tail from every series. The length of the tail is equal to the respective forecast horizon. The test set is used to measure the quality of the parameters fitted on the training part. We use the OWA error for that.

4.2. Model pool choice

In order to decide which models to combine, the dataset is divided into four groups based on the existence of seasonality and trend (at this point we ignore *correlation* and *random* classes). Each group is then tested separately. Fixing N , f , and g at their default values, we gradually shrink the default model pool while observing the changes of the forecast error on the test data. This is being done by hand. In the end, a different set of algorithms is assigned to each of the four groups. Table 1 lists the final model pools in simplified form. The remaining details can be found in the source code of our submission¹.

The trend and seasonality detection are omitted for daily series during clustering because we did not find it beneficial. We also do not use it for the frequencies with low representation in the dataset (hourly and weekly).

4.3. Selection of N , f , g

Using model pools from the previous step, we choose N , f , and g . We start with default values of f , g , and find the best N using brute force. Values up to the respective forecast horizon are considered. Table 2 shows the chosen values of N . In most cases, we were able to make it significantly lower than forecast horizon without seeing any meaningful difference in error magnitude on the test set.

¹ <https://github.com/M4Competition/M4-methods/tree/master/237%20-%20prologistica>

	yearly	yearly	quarterly	quarterly	quarterly	quarterly	monthly	monthly	monthly	monthly	weekly	daily	daily	daily	hourly	hourly
trend	T	F	T	F	T	F	T	F	T	F						
seasonality			T	T	F	F	T	T	F	F						
<i>random</i>												F	T			
<i>correlated</i>												F	F	T	F	T
Naïve		1		1		1	1	2	2			2	1		1	
Theta		1	1		1	1		1		1	2	2			1	
OTM	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1					
ETS	2	3	3	3	2	1	2	3	2	2		3				
ARIMA	1		1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1					
Linear reg.	1		2		1		3	3	5	6		7			6	
SES						1		1	1			1				
Analogy														1		1

Table 1: Final model pools for each cluster. Due to space considerations, only the numbers of variants of particular methods are shown. Used abbreviations: OTM - Optimized Theta Method, ETS - exponential smoothing with automatic parameter choice, SES - simple exponential smoothing. Noticeably low representation of computationally expensive models (ETS, ARIMA) in case of the highest frequencies is caused by time constraints on our side.

The next step is fixing N and checking all combinations of f , g . For the f function, we found a default mean to work well for most frequencies. The two exceptions were daily and yearly series, where we observed a slight improvement using exponential weights. When choosing the g function, we picked g_{inv} for hourly series and g_{exp} for weekly series. In other cases g_{sqr} seemed to perform the best.

4.4. Threshold choices

This step introduces the *random* and *correlated* classes. The former concerns only daily data. We fix the model pool, N , f , and g , and choose t_{rnd} (the naïve forecast error threshold for the *random* class) by manually testing several values in $[0.01, 0.1]$. In the end, 0.05 was picked, which resulted in about 90% of all daily series being considered *random* at this point.

Frequency	yearly	quarterly	monthly	weekly	daily	hourly
N / h	3 / 6	8 / 8	10 / 18	13 / 13	8 / 14	24 / 48

Table 2: Chosen values of N alongside respective forecast horizons h for all frequencies.

The threshold for the *correlated* class, t_{cor} , is then picked in the same fashion, choosing from values in $[0.95, 0.999]$. We decided on 0.99 for daily and 0.995 for hourly data, which resulted in 33% of daily series and 40% of hourly series being classified as *correlated*. For yearly and weekly frequency the results did not improve when using *correlated* class. We did not have enough time to test it for monthly and quarterly data.

5. Forecast calculation example

Let X be a yearly time series of length 30 with horizon 6. We chose $N = 3$, $f = mean$, $g = g_{sqr}$, and a set of models m_1, \dots, m_5 .

1. Calculate $s_{i,j}$, where $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$, $j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, and $s_{i,j}$ is the sMAPE error of the one-step-ahead forecast produced by m_i on the first $30 - j$ terms of X
2. Calculate scores for models: $w_i = ((s_{i,1} + s_{i,2} + s_{i,3}) / 3)^{-2}$
3. Calculate F_1, \dots, F_5 - 6-steps-ahead forecasts of X for m_1, \dots, m_5 respectively
4. The final forecast is a weighted average of F_1, \dots, F_5 using weights w_1, \dots, w_5

6. Conclusions and future work

During experiments, we noticed that the choice of the model pool is crucial. Averaging all methods listed in section 3 never turned out optimal. For each frequency, careful shrinking of the full list gave better performance. We also observed that simply combining several top performing models did not result in the best choice either. For example, including the naïve model in the pool often improved the estimated accuracy, even though as a single model it performed the worst.

In the case of *correlated* series class, we fixed the model pool to forecasting by analogy. It is possible that allowing regular combination with other models would yield a better result.

We decided to average the errors of many one-step-ahead forecasts to calculate the scores for models. This choice was made due to its simplicity. We also tested the method with one k -steps-ahead prediction instead of k one-step-ahead predictions, but it was significantly less accurate. There may still, however, be a more optimal way to obtain scores.

The parameter tuning has been performed by hand. We fit each of the parameters independently, in order to make it feasible given the time constraints. While manual inspection can provide intuitions about the impact of particular variables on the final performance, a proper grid search should ultimately result in a more optimal set of values. It would also enable lower-level choices, like using different values of N for different classes within the same frequency, which quickly becomes physically impossible without automation.

Finally, the test set performance difference between the full list of models and the chosen pool was the largest for frequencies with a small amount of series (hourly and weekly). This might mean that a more fine-grained clustering of data could help improve the forecast quality. Considering more time series characteristics would result in smaller and more homogeneous clusters, which should make it easier to fit specialized model pools.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank the developers of the "forecast" package for R (Hyndman & Khandakar, 2008), which has been used extensively in this research.

Funding: This work was supported by the European Regional Development Fund [grant number RPDS.01.02.01-02].

References

- Assimakopoulos, V., & Nikolopoulos, K. (2000). The theta model: A decomposition approach to forecasting. *International Journal of Forecasting*, 16, 521–530.
- Fioruci, J. A., Pellegrini, T. R., Louzada, F., & Petropoulos, F. (2015). The optimised theta method. arXiv:1503.03529.
- Hyndman, R. J., & Khandakar, Y. (2008). Automatic time series forecasting: the forecast package for R. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 26, 1–22. URL: <http://www.jstatsoft.org/article/view/v027i03>.
- T. Clemen, R. (1989). Combining forecasts: A review and annotated bibliography. *International Journal of Forecasting*, 5, 559–583.