

Electricity price forecasting with Smoothing Quantile Regression Averaging: Quantifying economic benefits of probabilistic forecasts

Bartosz Uniejewski^a

^a*Department of Operations Research and Business Intelligence, Wrocław University of Science and Technology,
50-370 Wrocław, Poland*

Abstract

In the world of the complex power market, accurate electricity price forecasting is essential for strategic bidding and affects both daily operations and long-term investments. This article introduces a new method dubbed Smoothing Quantile Regression (SQR) Averaging, that improves on well-performing schemes for probabilistic forecasting. To showcase its utility, a comprehensive study is conducted across four power markets, including recent data encompassing the COVID-19 pandemic and the Russian invasion on Ukraine. The performance of SQR Averaging is evaluated and compared to state-of-the-art benchmark methods in terms of the reliability and sharpness measures. Additionally, an evaluation scheme is introduced to quantify the economic benefits derived from SQR Averaging predictions. This scheme can be applied in any day-ahead electricity market and is based on a trading strategy that leverages battery storage and sets limit orders using selected quantiles of the predictive distribution. The results reveal that, compared to the benchmark strategy, utilizing SQR Averaging leads to average profit increases of up to 14%. These findings provide strong evidence for the effectiveness of SQR Averaging in improving forecast accuracy and the practical value of utilizing probabilistic forecasts in day-ahead electricity trading, even in the face of challenging events such as the COVID-19 pandemic and geopolitical disruptions.

Keywords: probabilistic electricity price forecasting, power market, economic evaluation, trading strategy, energy storage system, energy management

1. Introduction

In the realm of power grids, stringent quality standards are the foundation for ensuring a stable and reliable supply of energy that meets the evolving needs of consumers. The intricate challenges posed by factors such as the optimization of distributed generators, the refinement of transmission and distribution systems, and the advancement of energy storage technologies are driving the continuous improvement of smart grid technologies (Mohseni et al., 2022). As a result, operating within a complex electricity market is highly reliant on electricity price forecasts. These forecasts enable strategic bidding by market participants and influence daily operations and long-term investments (Pourdaryaei et al., 2024).

Email address: bartosz.uniejewski@pwr.edu.pl (Bartosz Uniejewski)

Recent events such as the COVID-19 pandemic and geopolitical changes in Europe and the Middle East have added instability to an already volatile market. As a result, it has become more important than ever to have an accurate short-term forecast of electricity prices to support risk management and decision-making. Day-ahead forecasts of electricity prices are crucial for the short-term transactions that take place in the day-ahead, intraday or balancing markets and play a central role in the day-to-day operations of the market (Mayer and Trück, 2018; Kath and Ziel, 2018). They not only allow the adjustment of long-term positions, but also provide a reference point for OTC trading and settlement.

Considering that electricity price forecasting is a very practical problem, the real value of the forecast should be evaluated with its economic value. The primary goal of a forecast is to support the decision-making process and to reduce the risk associated with this process. That is why, for a long time, some researchers have expressed negative views on the exclusive use of statistical measures of the error to evaluate and compare forecasts (Maciejowska et al., 2022). Over the past decade, only few authors have attempted to quantify the economic benefits of price forecasting (e.g., Zareipour et al., 2010; Hong, 2015; Magalhães et al., 2023), and a standardized methodology for evaluating it has not yet been established (Hong et al., 2020). What is more, all of them have been limited to point forecasts. Recently, a different approach was presented by Uniejewski and Weron (2021), who introduced a trading strategy that utilizes probabilistic predictions to compare the performance of probabilistic forecasting models. The proposed solution has some serious limitations as it requires trading on the balancing market, which is associated with high risk.

In this paper, another trading strategy is proposed that can be applied to day-ahead markets and allows market participants to make profits. The strategy requires access to an energy storage system, which has become more prevalent due to the growth of production from renewable energy sources (Meade and Islam, 2015; Gianfreda et al., 2020). Optimal storage system performance is becoming increasingly important in light of the decarbonization goals set by European countries. According to Wesseh and Lin (2021), energy storage can be crucial to decarbonizing the energy sector, as it can play an important role in integrating variable renewable energy into power systems. Proposed trading strategy is inspired by the Uniejewski and Weron (2021), but here each transaction is made in the day-ahead market without requiring participation in the balancing market.

The general rule claims that more accurate forecasts can directly lead to better financial results (Maciejowska et al., 2022). To improve the accuracy of the predictions, in this paper, a novel approach to obtain probabilistic forecasts, called Smoothing Quantile Regression (SQR) Averaging is introduced. The approach is inspired by Fernandes et al. (2021) where the fundamentals of the smoothing quantile regression, as well as its statistical details, are described. In this article, the SQR method is used for the first time to average predictions. The new approach is proposed in three variants, which can be considered as smoothed equivalents to Quantile Regression Averaging (QRA) by Nowotarski and Weron (2015), Quantile Regression Machine (QRM) by Marcjasz et al. (2020) and a probability (F) average of Quantile Regression (QRF) by Uniejewski et al. (2019), and are denoted as SQRA, SQRM and SQRF, respectively.

During the past decades, most EPF studies have focused only on point predictions. However, the Global Energy Forecasting Competition 2014 (GEFCom2014) has ended the point forecasting

hegemony. Instead of focusing on point forecasts, organizers have advocated computing quantile predictions (Hong et al., 2016). The development of probabilistic forecasting methods in the EPF has been beyond necessary. Increased market penetration of renewable energy sources and active demand response, along with sudden changes in generation levels, unpredictable consumer behavior, and significant deviations in temperature from mean levels, contribute to the increased probability of extreme values or price spikes (Huisman, 2008; Grossi and Nan, 2019). As a result, the gap between production and consumption is widening and short-term electricity prices have become even more volatile (Gianfreda et al., 2018; Kowalska-Pyzalska, 2018). All this has driven the research in the direction of probabilistic price (Nowotarski and Weron, 2018) and load (Hong and Fan, 2016) forecasting.

In comparison to point predictions, the probabilistic ones provide a full picture of the future price distribution. They allow for a better adjustment of the offering process to avoid the costs induced by a range of unexpected generation or consumption volumes (Morales et al., 2014). Probabilistic EPF is a concept closely related to risk management. In general, good quality probabilistic price forecasts can help producers, retailers, and speculators to determine optimal strategies for short-term operations (Uniejewski and Weron, 2021), as well as derivative pricing, Value-at-Risk calculations, hedging, and trading (Bunn et al., 2016).

Formally introduced by Nowotarski and Weron (2015), Quantile Regression Averaging (QRA) sparked interest in the EPF community after its astonishing success in the GEFCom2014 competition. The variants of the method were then used by two winning teams in the price track (Gaillard et al., 2016; Maciejowska and Nowotarski, 2016). Despite more than successful performance in a dozen EPF papers, a recent study of Marcjasz et al. (2020) has revealed some important deficiencies of the method. Firstly, the quality of the forecasts decreases significantly when the set of regressors is greater than just two or three. Secondly, the interval predictions obtained with QRA are too narrow, making the electricity price forecast less reliable (Maciejowska et al., 2016). To address the first issue, Uniejewski and Weron (2021) proposed a novel approach by applying ℓ^1 regularization to correctly select individual point forecasts for QRA. In fact, the proposed solution significantly outperformed the standard approach in terms of pinball loss for the rich pool of point forecasts, but it did not fully solve the problem of too narrow prediction intervals.

It is important to clarify the terminology used in this paper regarding quantile regression averaging. The term *quantile regression averaging* encompasses the general concept of combining quantile regression with forecast averaging techniques. However, it is also specifically used to refer to the quantile regression averaging model introduced by Nowotarski and Weron (2015). To avoid confusion, throughout the remainder of this paper, the general concept will be denoted as QR Averaging, while the specific model proposed by Nowotarski and Weron (2015) will be referred to as QRA. Similarly SQR Averaging refers to an idea of using the smoothing quantile regression technique to average forecasts, while SQRA refers to a specific model.

This article introduces a new class of models called smoothing quantile regression averaging and assesses its performance using datasets from four electricity markets and five distinct point forecasts obtained through various data transformations. Empirical results demonstrate the superior predictive performance of the new method compared to well-established benchmarks in terms of Kupiec (1995) test, the pinball score as well as the conditional predictive accuracy test.

The remainder of this paper is structured as follows. Section 2 offers a brief description of the

datasets. Section 3 discusses the construction of point forecasts, introduces the idea of smoothing quantile regression, along with a description of the probabilistic forecasting benchmarks, and presents the trading strategy. In Section 4, the predictive performance of point forecasts is evaluated, followed by the discussion of the coverage and sharpness of probabilistic forecasts. Additionally, a range of trading strategies is evaluated in terms of the profits obtained with different probabilistic predictions. Finally, in Section 5, the results are summarized and the conclusions are drawn.

2. Datasets

This empirical study has utilized datasets from four distinct markets, spanning eight years each. The first one, German EPEX spot market, has recently experienced a great increase in the share of renewable generation and some major structural changes, which makes it very interesting for analysis. Data was collected from the transparency platform (<https://transparency.entsoe.eu>) and comprise two time series, each at an hourly resolution (see Figure 1a):

- day-ahead electricity prices for the DE-AT-LU bid zone until 30.9.2018 and DE-LU afterwards,
- day-ahead total load forecasts for Germany.

The second dataset represents another major European power market. The data comes from the Scandinavian Nord Pool (NP) exchange. The main feature that distinguishes the market is its high dependence on renewable sources such as hydro and wind, which for some days cover the entire demand. Data is taken from the official Nord Pool website (<https://www.nordpoolgroup.com>) and the transparency platform (load forecasts) and, like the previous set, consists of two time series at an hourly resolution (see Figure 1b):




- day-ahead system prices for the entire Nordic region,
- day-ahead load forecasts (consumption prognosis) for Norway.

The third European market included in the research is the Spanish OMIE market. The Iberian market, unlike other European markets, still does not allow the price to drop below zero. This feature, along with the rapid development of the market, makes it very interesting to analyze. Data was collected from the transparency platform and comprise two time series at an hourly resolution (see Figure 1c):

- day-ahead marginal electricity prices for Spain,
- day-ahead total load forecasts for Spain.

The last dataset represents the American PJM market. PJM was the world's largest electricity market until the development of the European Integrated Energy Market in the 2000s. The data is taken from the PJM data miner (<https://dataminer2.pjm.com>) and includes two time series at an hourly resolution (see Figure 1d):

- day-ahead marginal electricity prices for the COMED zone,



(c) OMIE system prices (*top*), day-ahead load prognosis (*bottom*)

Figure 1: Day-ahead prices and day-ahead load forecast time series from 1.1.2015 to 31.12.2022. The vertical dashed lines mark respectively the beginning of the out-of-sample test period for point forecasts (29.12.2016; also the beginning of the initial 182-day calibration window for probabilistic forecasts) and the beginning of the out-of-sample test period for probabilistic forecasts (29.6.2017). The first 728 days constitute the initial calibration window for point forecasts. (Continued on next page)




Figure 1: (cont.) Day-ahead prices and day-ahead load forecast time series from 1.1.2015 to 31.12.2022. The vertical dashed lines mark respectively the beginning of the out-of-sample test period for point forecasts (29.12.2016; also the beginning of the initial 182-day calibration window for probabilistic forecasts) and the beginning of the out-of-sample test period for probabilistic forecasts (29.6.2017). The first 728 days constitute the initial calibration window for point forecasts.

- day-ahead RTO load forecasts evaluated at 9:45 AM.

All time series span 2922 days, ranging from 1.1.2015 to 31.12.2022. The missing or doubled values (corresponding to the time change) were replaced by the average of the closest observations for the missing hours and the arithmetic mean of the two values for doubled hours.

Four datasets from major energy markets were chosen to demonstrate the robustness of the proposed method and its ability to fit into various time series. The price series structure of all, but especially the three European markets, showed significant changes over the eight-year period considered, as shown in Figure 1. The beginning of 2020 and the emergence of the COVID-19 pandemic, followed by the 2022 Russian invasion of Ukraine, brought about significant changes in the dynamics of electricity prices. The price volatility increased significantly in the years 2020-2022 due to COVID-19 and unstable political situations in Eastern Europe. To enable a better analysis of the performance of the proposed forecasting models the prediction accuracy was tested on two sub-periods lasting respectively till the end of 2019 and from the beginning of 2020.

3. Methodology

The price forecasting task is implemented separately for each hour, leading to 24 different sets of parameters for every forecasted day. This multivariate framework is the most common approach in the EPF literature (see Ziel and Weron (2018) for a discussion of the uni- and multivariate frameworks). Although the 24 individual models are independent, they are estimated using the same set of information. The day-ahead price forecasts for day d are computed before the price auction (i.e., around noon of day $d - 1$). It means that at the time the predictions are made, the day-ahead load forecasts are already available (from around 9 AM) and the prices for all hours of day $d - 1$ are established (around 1 PM of day $d - 2$).

Point forecasts are determined with a rolling calibration window scheme, using data from the most recent 728 days (approximately 2 years). At first, the models described in the following Section 3.1 are calibrated to data from 1.1.2015 to 28.12.2016 and forecasts for all 24 hours of 29th December are determined. Then the window is moved forward by one day (meaning 1.1.2015 is removed and 29.12.2016 is added), and the forecasts for all 24 hours of 30th December are computed. This procedure is repeated until the predictions for the last day in the dataset (31.12.2022) are made, giving a total number of 2194 forecasted days.

Once the point forecasts are obtained, they are used as a basis to construct probabilistic predictions. All the approaches considered (see Section 3.2) require a subsample of point prediction. Therefore, a rolling calibration window of 182 days (26 weeks) is used to estimate the quantiles of the future price distribution. As a result, probabilistic forecasts are obtained and then evaluated over the 2012-day period, from 29.6.2017 to 31.12.2022 (see Figure 1).

The remainder of this section describes the forecasting scheme composed of two stages is described. Firstly, Section 3.1 introduces the point forecasting models. Secondly, Section 3.2, presents probabilistic forecasting benchmarks and introduces the smoothing quantile regression averaging models. Finally, Section 3.3, proposes and describes a probabilistic forecast-based trading strategy.

3.1. Point forecasts

For each day in the out-of-sample test period for point forecasts, i.e., $d = 1, 2, \dots, 2012$, each hour of the day, i.e., $h = 1, 2, \dots, 24$, and each of the considered Variance Stabilizing Transformation (VST), the same multi-step procedure is followed:

$$P_{d,h} \xrightarrow{\text{standardize}} p_{d,h} \xrightarrow{\text{VST}} Y_{d,h} \xrightarrow{\text{predict}} \hat{Y}_{d,h} \xrightarrow{\text{inverse VST}} \hat{p}_{d,h} \xrightarrow{\text{inverse standardization}} \hat{P}_{d,h}. \quad (1)$$

First, prices are standardized in the 728-days-long calibration window. Next, one of the transformation functions described in the following section (see Section 3.1.1) is applied. Then the parameters of the expert model (see Eq. (2)) are estimated using ordinary least squares and day-ahead point predictions are computed. Finally, the inverse of the transformation used in the second step and the inverse of standardization are applied to obtain the final price forecasts. The same standardization and VST are also applied to the load forecast series before fitting the expert model in the prediction step. As a result of this routine, for each day d and hour h , five various point forecasts of the same expert model (see Section 3.1.2) estimated with different VST are obtained.

3.1.1. Variance Stabilizing Transformations

The spiky behavior of the electricity prices makes the model estimation hampered by extreme values. The outliers pull the model coefficients towards values that fit better to the spikes and increase the in-sample errors for the non-spiky periods. The general idea of the variance stabilizing transformation is to reduce the variation in the data (Uniejewski et al., 2018). A lower variation or less spiky behavior of the input data usually allows the forecasting model to produce more accurate predictions (Janczura et al., 2013)

Following Uniejewski et al. (2018), before applying a proper VST, each time series (prices and load) is first standardized by subtracting the sample median and dividing by the mean absolute

deviation (MAD) of the sample. Finally, the transformation is applied and the transformed price is denoted by $Y_{d,h}$, i.e., $Y_{d,h} = f(p_{d,h})$, where $f(\cdot)$ is a given VST. After computing the forecasts, the inverse transformation and standardization are applied to obtain the final electricity price forecasts: $\hat{P}_{d,h} = bf^{-1}(\hat{Y}_{d,h}) + a$.

In this study, motivated by the results of Uniejewski et al. (2018), five VST classes have been used that performed best in the EPF context: *Area hyperbolic sine* (asinh), *Box-Cox* (boxcox), *Mirror log* (mlog), *Polynomial* (poly), *Normal-distribution Probability Integral Transform* (N-PIT). A detailed description of each transformation can be found in the original paper (Uniejewski et al., 2018).

3.1.2. The expert model

The choice of the point forecasting model is motivated by two factors. Firstly, recent studies on the variable selection (Ziel and Weron, 2018; Uniejewski et al., 2016) allow to build a well-designed structure and motivate the choice of model regressors. Secondly, due to the computational complexity required to produce probabilistic forecasts within a rolling calibration window scheme, the computational burden needed to obtain point forecasts has to be limited. Therefore, the sophisticated techniques, such as CNN (Amjady and Daraeepour, 2009) or RNN-based models (Kaya et al., 2023) are replaced with a parsimonious autoregressive structure. The model for the transformed price on day d and hour h was inspired by a number of EPF studies (Ziel and Weron, 2018; Uniejewski and Maciejowska, 2022) and is given by:

$$\begin{aligned}
Y_{d,h} = & \underbrace{\beta_1 Y_{d-1,h} + \beta_2 Y_{d-2,h} + \beta_3 Y_{d-7,h}}_{\text{autoregressive effects}} + \underbrace{\beta_4 Y_{d-1,24}}_{\text{end-of-day}} + \underbrace{\beta_5 Y_{d-1}^{\max} + \beta_6 Y_{d-1}^{\min}}_{\text{non-linear effects}} \\
& + \underbrace{\beta_7 L_{d,h}}_{\text{load}} + \underbrace{\sum_{j=1}^7 \beta_{h,j+7} D_j}_{\text{weekday dummies}} + \varepsilon_{d,h}, \tag{2}
\end{aligned}$$

where $Y_{d-1,h}$, $Y_{d-2,h}$ and $Y_{d-7,h}$ account for the autoregressive terms and refer to the prices from the same hour of the previous day, two days before and a week before, respectively. $Y_{d-1,24}$ is the midnight price of electricity for the previous day and is the last known price at the time the prediction is made. Y_{d-1}^{\max} and Y_{d-1}^{\min} represent the maximum and minimum prices of the previous day. $L_{d,h}$ is the transformed day-ahead load forecast for a given hour of a day, finally D_1, \dots, D_7 are weekday dummies and $\varepsilon_{d,h}$ is the noise term assumed to be independent and identically distributed normal variables. Note that although recent studies indicate that using more exogenous variables such as wind and solar generation (Huisman and Stet, 2022), air temperature (Jasiński, 2020), or fossil fuels prices (Billé et al., 2023) can significantly improve forecast accuracy, they are not included in the model due to missing observations or lack of availability.

3.2. Probabilistic forecasts

The most common way to go from point to probabilistic forecasts is to construct quantile forecasts or prediction intervals (PIs). Instead of forecasting the expected value of the future price, we predict the price range in which the future price will fall with a given probability (α). If we continue with this idea and extend it to construct multiple PIs, the final outcome will be a set

of quantiles of many different levels. In this research, the objective is to forecast 99 percentiles ($q = 1\%, 2\%, \dots, 99\%$), which is a reasonably accurate approximation of a full distribution.

In the econometric literature, there are many different methods that can be used to obtain a quantile forecast, with the easiest and probably the most common method being the so-called historical simulation. However, in the case of electricity price forecasting, the QRA model plays a crucial role and can be treated as a gold standard in probabilistic EPF. In this paper, historical simulation and QRA are used as benchmarks, and a novel approach to construct prediction intervals with smoothing quantile regression is proposed.

3.2.1. Historical simulation (HS)

The most popular method for obtaining a quantile forecast takes into account both the point forecast and the corresponding error (Maciejowska et al., 2016). The center of the prediction interval (PI) is set at $\hat{P}_{d,h}$ (point forecast), while its limits are defined by the quantiles of the forecast error distribution $\varepsilon_{d,h}$ (Nowotarski and Weron, 2018). In this research, the historical simulation method utilizes the average of five point forecasts (each corresponding to different VSTs) to construct probabilistic predictions.

3.2.2. Quantile Regression (QR) Averaging

Quantile Regression Averaging was introduced by Nowotarski and Weron (2015) and was widely acknowledged in the literature on electricity price forecasting. QR Averaging is a special case of Quantile Regression (QR) of Koenker (2005) where the independent variables (regressors) are point forecasts of the dependent variable, i.e., $\hat{P}_{d,h}^{(i)}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. To obtain parameter estimates, the sum of the so-called check functions is minimized (Koenker, 2005):

$$\hat{\beta}_q = \underset{\beta_q}{\operatorname{argmin}} \left\{ \sum_{d,h} \underbrace{\left(q - \mathbb{1}_{P_{d,h} < X_{d,h}\beta_q} \right)}_{\text{check function}} (P_{d,h} - X_{d,h}\beta_q) \right\}. \quad (3)$$

3.2.3. Smoothing Quantile Regression (SQR) Averaging

In this paper, a completely new approach to obtaining probabilistic electricity price forecasts is proposed. The method is based on the very fresh idea presented by Fernandes et al. (2021). The authors suggest modifying the function minimized in quantile regression (see Eq. (3)) by smoothing the objective function using kernel estimation. They showed that not only does the proposed solution yield a lower mean squared error compared to the standard QR estimator, but it is also asymptotically differentiable. In addition, the asymptotic theory holds uniformly with respect to the quantile level and bandwidth.

In the proposed approach, the smoothing quantile regression of Fernandes et al. (2021) is used to average a pool of point forecasts. Therefore, the only (but crucial) change compared to the QRA model is the estimator of β_q that takes the following form (Fernandes et al., 2021):

$$\hat{\beta}_q = \underset{\beta_q}{\operatorname{argmin}} \left\{ \sum_{d,h} H \times \phi \left(\frac{P_{d,h} - X_{d,h}\beta_q}{H} \right) + \left(q - \Phi \left(\frac{P_{d,h} - X_{d,h}\beta_q}{H} \right) \right) (P_{d,h} - X_{d,h}\beta_q) \right\}, \quad (4)$$

where the independent variable matrix $X_{d,h}$ is the matrix of n point forecasts $\hat{P}_{d,h}^{(i)}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. $\Phi(\cdot)$ and $\phi(\cdot)$ are the cumulative distribution function (cdf) and the density function (pdf)

of the standard normal distribution, respectively, while H is a bandwidth. The method is proposed in three different variants, denoted by SQRA, SQRM, and SQRF (for details, see Section 3.2.5).

The literature reviews and analyses of smoothing procedure integrated with quantile regression can be found in Fernandes et al. (2021). However, to better illustrate the difference between smoothing and standard QR, the objective functions for different quantile levels are plotted in Figure 2. It can be observed that for any quantile (except median $q = 50\%$) the minimum of the SQR objective function does not lie on the Y-axis. As a consequence, to forecast one of the lower quantiles, the favorable situation is when the prediction is smaller than the actual price. On the contrary, the lowest value of the objective function for the upper quantiles is shifted to the left from the Y-axis. This means that the SQR expects the upper quantile to be above the actual price and gives a higher penalty if the prediction of the upper quantile hits the actual price, which is the perfect scenario for the standard QR. The size of the shift, as well as the slope of the objective function, depends on the bandwidth H . Note that the SQR is, in fact, a generalization of the standard QR. The limit of the objective function of SQR, when H tends to 0, is equivalent to the standard quantile regression.

When comparing the prediction intervals (PIs) obtained with the QR and SQR estimators, the latter are usually significantly wider. Recall that probabilistic forecasts of electricity prices most often suffer from too narrow PIs, that is why the SQR solution seems to fit perfectly to the electricity data.

3.2.4. Bandwidth selection

As in many applications of kernel estimation, the performance of the smoothing quantile regression strongly depends on the bandwidth choice. Following the recommendation of Fernandes et al. (2021) a simple approach was used to select an optimal bandwidth. The bandwidth value is computed according to the Rule-of-Thumb (RoT) method by Scott (1992):

$$H = 1.06 \frac{\sigma_\varepsilon}{N^{\frac{1}{3}}}, \quad (5)$$

where $\sigma_\varepsilon = \min\{\text{std}, \text{IQR}\}$ is a minimum of standard deviation and interquartile range of in-sample residuals of standard quantile regression, while N is the number of observations in the sample (here $N = 182$).

In fact, limited tests consisting of several different approaches were conducted. In particular, the plug-in method (Hall et al., 1991), Silverman (1986) rule-of-thumb, or cross-validation of maximum likelihood (Duin, 1976) were tested on limited data. Preliminary testing indicates that none of them significantly outperformed a very fast RoT method. However, the issue remains unsolved and requires more extensive studies. Note that the bandwidth is reselected at each hour separately for each percentile, and thus the computational efficiency of bandwidth selection is very important for practical usage.

3.2.5. Models

To compute probabilistic forecasts of the day-ahead price, five different point forecasts obtained with one model structure but various data transformation functions (see Section 3.1) are used. In a recent article, Marcjasz et al. (2020) discussed whether it is better to combine point or

probabilistic forecasts, and proposed to use the QRA model in several variants that outperform the original model. Based on that, in this research, three variants of QR and SQR-based methods are considered (see also Figure 3):

- The standard approach is to apply one of the described methods to all available point forecasts (with the intercept). This solution is denoted by QRA and SQRA consecutively for QR- and SQR-based methods.
- The second approach is to use single point forecasts to obtain a single probabilistic prediction. As a result, five various probabilistic forecasts are obtained, each based on a different point forecast. Next, motivated by the results of Uniejewski et al. (2019), a probability (F) averaging of the probabilistic forecasts is computed (for details see Section 3.3.2 in the cited article). Described models are denoted by QRF for the quantile regression-based model and, by analogy, SQRF for the smoothing quantile regression equivalent.
- Finally, according to Marcjasz et al. (2020), in some applications it may be beneficial to first average point forecasts and then construct a probabilistic forecast based on the single prediction of a better accuracy. In such models, denoted by QRM or SQRM (respectively, for quantile regression and smoothing quantile regression), all available point forecasts are first combined with arithmetic mean and the averaged prediction (with the intercept) is used as the input for a QR or SQR.

To better understand the difference between the described variants, a graph that compares the models is presented in Figure 3. Finally, note that the forecasts for all 99 percentiles are computed separately. In such a setup, it is possible to obtain a nonmonotonic quantile function. Therefore, after obtaining the predictions of the 99 percentiles, the results are sorted independently for each day and hour.

3.3. Trading strategy

Despite the fact that the primary purpose of forecasting is to support decision-making and maximize profits, most EPF studies use only statistical measures to assess forecast accuracy




Figure 2: Comparison of the objective function shape for standard Quantile Regression and Smoothing Quantile Regression estimators across different quantile levels. Note that for clarity reasons, the SQR objective function was shifted downwards as its minimum does not reach X-axis.




Figure 3: Visualization of the (S)QRA, (S)QRM, and (S)QRF concepts of computing probabilistic forecasts. The point forecasts (corresponding to different VSTs) are depicted by white circles, while the gray circles represent probabilistic predictions. Solid arrows represent the process of constructing probabilistic forecasts out of point forecasts, dotted arrows refer to averaging probabilistic forecasts, while dashed arrows represent the process of averaging point forecasts.

(Hong et al., 2020; Maciejowska et al., 2022) with only a few articles considering the economic value of the forecasts. Among them, we can distinguish two basic approaches: the first takes into account a one-sided (supply or demand) perspective (Maciejowska et al., 2021; Janczura and Wójcik, 2022), and the second evaluates the quality of the forecasts based on the trading strategy (Magalhães et al., 2023).

In this paper, following the latter approach, a trading strategy for the day-ahead market is proposed. It utilizes probabilistic forecasts to support the decision-making process. The strategy is suitable for a company with an access to an energy storage system, such as the virtual power plant. Let us assume that the company owns a 2.5 MWh battery. For both economic and technical reasons, it cannot be discharged below 0.5 MWh (20% of the nominal capacity), and its efficiency is 90% for each charge and discharge process. The company aims to buy energy and charge the battery when the price is low and to discharge and sell energy at high prices. In order to trade only on the day-ahead market, the company limits the volume of a single transaction (charge or discharge) to 1 MWh. The proposed strategy aims to leave 1 MWh of energy in the energy storage system at the end of each day. However, depending on whether the submitted bid or offer are accepted or rejected, three battery states are possible at the beginning of the next day:

- $B_d = 0$ refers to the situation in which, at the beginning of day d , the lower technical limit is

reached and there is no more energy to be sold. On day d^* when $B_{d^*} = 0$ the company will additionally place a price-taker offer to buy energy and charge the battery.

- $B_d = 1$ refers to the desirable situation in which a day starts with a half-full storage. In that state, the battery can be both charged and discharged. On day d^* when $B_{d^*} = 1$, the battery owner follows the basic steps described in Section 3.3.1.
- $B_d = 2$ refers to the situation in which the capacity limit is reached and there is no space left in the battery at the beginning of day d . On day d^* when $B_{d^*} = 2$, the company will make an additional unlimited offer to discharge the battery and sell energy.

3.3.1. Quantile-based trading strategies

The proposed quantile-based trading strategies consist of three steps that are performed each day. In Step (1), based on the median forecast ($\hat{P}^{50\%}$), the trader selects two hours – one with the lowest price on a given day denoted by h_1 and one with the highest price indicated by h_2 . However, if on day d^* the battery is fully discharged ($B_{d^*} = 0$), the additional unlimited bid is placed at hour h^* . In such a case, the trader has to ensure that the additional transaction will take place before hour h_1 . It requires selecting not only two hours, in which the minimum and the maximum prices are most likely to be observed, but also the third hour corresponding to the additional bid, which is no longer a trivial task. To address this issue, the linear optimization solver should be used to select the optimal (that is, the most profitable) hours to place offers. The maximized function will be equivalent to the following problem (fractions 0.9 and $\frac{1}{0.9}$ correspond to the battery efficiency):

$$\max_{h_1, h_2, h^*} \left(0.9 \hat{P}_{d, h_2}^{50\%} - \frac{1}{0.9} \hat{P}_{d, h_1}^{50\%} - \frac{1}{0.9} \hat{P}_{d, h^*}^{50\%} \right), \quad \text{when: } h^* < h_2. \quad (6)$$

By analogy, if $B_{d^*} = 2$, the company will place an additional unlimited offer to sell energy before hour h_2 . To select the transaction hours, the following problem has to be solved:

$$\max_{h_1, h_2, h^*} \left(0.9 \hat{P}_{d, h_2}^{50\%} - \frac{1}{0.9} \hat{P}_{d, h_1}^{50\%} + 0.9 \hat{P}_{d, h^*}^{50\%} \right), \quad \text{when: } h^* < h_1. \quad (7)$$

In Step (2), having selected the optimal hours to place the offers, the company has to make the decision on the levels of the bid and the offer. First, the trader arbitrarily selects the level α of the prediction interval (PI). The bid price is equal to the upper bound of the PI at hour h_1 and equals $\hat{U}_{d, h_1}^\alpha = \hat{P}_{d, h_1}^{\frac{1+\alpha}{2}}$, while the offer price is set equal to the lower bound of the PI at hour h_2 and equals $\hat{L}_{d, h_2}^\alpha = \hat{P}_{d, h_2}^{\frac{1-\alpha}{2}}$. The prices which the trader bids and offers are indicated with black dots in Figure 4. The additional unlimited bid or offer submitted on day d^* are the price-taker transactions. Therefore, it is not necessary to establish the price level for the hour h^* .

Finally, in Step (3) the profit obtained for day d is calculated depending on the acceptance of the bid and the offer:

- If both the bid and the offer are accepted, the company buys $\frac{1}{0.9}$ MWh of energy at hour h_1 and sells 0.9 MWh of energy at hour h_2 at market price P_{d, h_1} and P_{d, h_2} , respectively. The daily profit is equal to $0.9 P_{d, h_2} - \frac{1}{0.9} P_{d, h_1}$ and, since the battery was charged and discharged once, its state remains unchanged ($B_{d+1} = B_d$).




Figure 4: Illustration of the quantile-based trading strategies when bidding for 17.1.2019 for EPEX dataset, based on the 80% PIs available a day earlier. Red line indicates the median forecast ($\hat{P}_{d,h}^{50\%}$). The grey space depicts the 80% prediction interval and the dots at the PI limits represent the offer $\hat{P}_{d,h_2}^{10\%}$ and bid $\hat{P}_{d,h_1}^{90\%}$ price (see step (2) in quantile-based trading strategies).

- If $B_d = 0$, the trader additionally buys $\frac{1}{0.9}$ MWh of energy at hour h^* , so the daily profit decreases and equals $0.9P_{d,h_2} - \frac{1}{0.9}P_{d,h_1} - \frac{1}{0.9}P_{d,h^*}$ while the battery state is upgraded ($B_{d+1} = B_d + 1$).
- If $B_d = 2$, the battery owner additionally sells 0.9 MWh of energy at hour h^* , so the daily profit increases and equals $0.9P_{d,h_2} - \frac{1}{0.9}P_{d,h_1} + 0.9P_{d,h^*}$ while the battery state is downgraded ($B_{d+1} = B_d - 1$).
- If both the bid and the offer are rejected, the daily profit is equal to 0.
 - If $B_d = 0$, the company buys $\frac{1}{0.9}$ MWh of energy at hour h^* with an unlimited offer, so the daily profit decreases and equals $-\frac{1}{0.9}P_{d,h^*}$ while the battery state is upgraded ($B_{d+1} = B_d + 1$).
 - If $B_d = 2$, the trader sells 0.9 MWh of energy at hour h^* , so the daily profit increases and equals $0.9P_{d,h^*}$ while the battery state is downgraded ($B_{d+1} = B_d - 1$).
- If only the offer is accepted, at hour h_2 the battery is discharged and 0.9 MWh of energy is sold in the day-ahead market. The daily profit is equal to $0.9P_{d,h_2}$, and the state of the battery is reduced ($B_{d+1} = B_d - 1$).
 - If $B_d = 0$, the trader additionally buys $\frac{1}{0.9}$ MWh of energy at hour h^* , so the daily profit decreases and equals $0.9P_{d,h_2} - \frac{1}{0.9}P_{d,h^*}$ while the battery stays unchanged.

- If $B_d = 2$, the trader additionally sells 0.9 MWh of energy at hour h^* , so the daily profit increases and equals $0.9P_{d,h_2} + 0.9P_{d,h^*}$ while the battery state is reduced ($B_{d+1} = B_d - 2$).
- By analogy, if only the bid is accepted, at hour h_1 the company buys $\frac{1}{0.9}$ MWh of energy in the day-ahead market and charges the battery. The daily loss is equal to $\frac{1}{0.9}P_{d,h_1}$, but the state of the battery is upgraded ($B_{d+1} = B_d + 1$).
 - If $B_d = 0$, the company additionally buys $\frac{1}{0.9}$ MWh of energy at hour h^* , so the daily profit decreases and equals $-\frac{1}{0.9}P_{d,h_1} - \frac{1}{0.9}P_{d,h^*}$ while the battery state is upgraded ($B_{d+1} = B_d + 2$).
 - If $B_d = 2$, the company additionally sells 0.9 MWh of energy at hour h^* , so the daily profit increases and equals $-\frac{1}{0.9}P_{d,h_1} + 0.9P_{d,h^*}$ while the battery status remains unchanged.

In this research, a set of trading strategies is considered, which are based on prediction intervals ranging from 50% to 98%. The proposed strategies are evaluated using data from four different day-ahead energy markets. In order to evaluate the performance of the models, the averaged profits obtained with a single 1 MWh transaction have been reported as a measure of their economic value. The results obtained from the proposed SQR-based models are compared with those obtained from the benchmarks. By utilizing the proposed trading strategies, the performance of each model is evaluated in terms of its ability to optimize the bidding decision.

3.3.2. Unlimited-bids benchmark

Having only the point forecast available, one can propose a similar strategy that does not require any knowledge about price distribution. In this case, the trader selects the hours with the lowest (h_1) and highest (h_2) predicted prices (according to the point forecasts) each day. Unlimited (price taker) offers to sell energy at the highest price and buy energy at the lowest price are then submitted. The daily profit is calculated taking into account the efficiency of the battery and is equal to $0.9P_{d,h_2} - \frac{1}{0.9}P_{d,h_1}$.

4. Results

In this section, the day-ahead forecasting results for all considered datasets will be presented. The section will be structured as follows. First, in Section 4.1, the results for point forecasts based on a 2194-day out-of-sample test period will be analyzed, and the predictive accuracy will be compared depending on VST used. Next, in Section 4.2, the performance of smoothing quantile regression averaging models will be compared against the benchmarks based on probabilistic forecasts over a 2012-day out-of-sample period. Finally, in Section 3.3, the financial profits of the proposed trading strategies will be presented, and the economic value of probabilistic forecasts will be assessed depending on the forecasting model.

The beginning of 2020 and the emergence of the COVID-19 pandemic, followed by the 2022 Russian invasion of Ukraine, brought about significant changes in the dynamics and volatility of electricity prices. To enable a better analysis of predictive models' performance and to facilitate

comparisons of forecasting accuracy among models during this exceptional period, the following time intervals were selected:

- The period between 29.12.2016 and 31.12.2019 (denoted by 2017-2019), which was analyzed for point forecasts related to the time before COVID-19.
- The period between 29.6.2017 and 31.12.2019 (denoted by 2017Q3-2019), which was analyzed for probabilistic forecasts relating to the time before COVID-19.
- The period between 1.1.2020 and 31.1.2022 (denoted by 2020-2022), which was analyzed for both point and probabilistic forecasts during the COVID-19 pandemic and the 2022 Russian invasion of Ukraine.
- The period between 29.12.2016 and 31.12.2022 (denoted by 2017-2022), which was analyzed for point forecasts related to the entire out-of-sample period.
- The period between 29.6.2017 and 31.12.2022 (denoted by 2017Q3-2022), which was analyzed for probabilistic forecasts related to the entire out-of-sample period.

4.1. Point forecasts

In this paper, the point forecast will be evaluated using Mean Absolute Error (MAE), which is the most commonly used measures to test the accuracy of point forecasts (Weron, 2014):

$$\text{MAE} = \frac{1}{24D} \sum_{d=1}^D \sum_{h=1}^{24} |P_{d,h} - \hat{P}_{d,h}|, \quad (8)$$

where $P_{d,h}$ is the observed real price (at day d and hour h) and $\hat{P}_{d,h}$ is the corresponding forecast and $D = 1098, 1096, 2194$ is the number of days taken for forecast evaluation for periods 2017-2019, 2020-2022, and 2017-2022, respectively.

Table 1 shows the results, which show a strong variation in prediction accuracy depending on the time period considered. In particular, the average forecast error for the years 2020-2022 is significantly higher compared to the pre-COVID period. This difference is pronounced for Nordpool data, where the MAE increases by about 8 times, while for all European markets the error is at least 3 times higher. In contrast, the American PJM market shows a less drastic increase, with the MAE being on average 75% higher for 2020-2022 compared to 2017-2019. Among the transformations considered, the asinh transformation suffers the greatest performance loss. Despite its good performance in the pre-COVID period, which was always only slightly worse than the best transformation, the asinh transformation was on average 4.6% worse than the optimal transformation for the years 2020-2022.

No clear winner emerges among the considered VSTs. The boxcox transformation is optimal for OMIE and PJM, while for EPEX and NP, the best transformations are poly and N-PIT, respectively. The performance of different VSTs exhibits significant variability across datasets and test periods. For instance, N-PIT is the best-performing VST for NP in the years 2020-2022, but the worst for OMIE and PJM in the same period, and the worst for NP in the pre-COVID period.

Table 1: Mean absolute errors (MAE) of point forecast in four markets and five variance stabilizing transformations (in rows). Results are divided into three sub-tables, for three test periods: 2017-2019 (29.12.2016-31.12.2019), 2020-2022 (1.1.2020-31.12.2022), and 2017-2022 (29.12.2016-31.12.2022). The lowest error in each column is marked in bold.

MAE	2017-2019				2020-2022				2017-2022			
	EPEX	NP	OMIE	PJM	EPEX	NP	OMIE	PJM	EPEX	NP	OMIE	PJM
asinh	6.37	2.16	3.76	3.32	22.64	17.67	13.69	5.94	14.50	9.91	8.72	4.63
boxcox	6.39	2.09	3.71	3.33	21.71	16.96	12.88	5.79	14.04	9.52	8.29	4.56
mlog	6.37	2.09	3.70	3.32	21.74	17.03	12.96	5.80	14.05	9.55	8.33	4.56
poly	6.37	2.08	3.70	3.32	21.72	16.98	12.91	5.80	14.04	9.52	8.30	4.56
N-PIT	6.45	2.17	3.71	3.29	22.12	16.75	13.71	5.98	14.28	9.45	8.71	4.63

4.2. Probabilistic forecasts

According to Gneiting and Raftery (2007), the objective of evaluating probabilistic predictions should be to maximize sharpness subject to reliability. The term reliability refers to coverage, i.e., the percentage of real prices that fall within the prediction interval. Sharpness, on the other hand, describes the width of the interval. Therefore, the prediction intervals should be as narrow as possible, but first, they have to provide reliable coverage.

4.2.1. Reliability measures

Following this idea, the first step of probabilistic forecasts evaluation is to assess the reliability of the predictions. This can be accomplished by defining a function that assigns a value of one whenever the actual price falls within the prediction interval (PI) and zero otherwise.

$$I_{d,h}^{\alpha} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{for } P_{d,h} \in [\hat{L}_{d,h}^{\alpha}, \hat{U}_{d,h}^{\alpha}], \\ 0, & \text{for } P_{d,h} \notin [\hat{L}_{d,h}^{\alpha}, \hat{U}_{d,h}^{\alpha}], \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

where $\hat{L}_{d,h}^{\alpha}$ is the lower and $\hat{U}_{d,h}^{\alpha}$ is the upper bound of the α prediction interval. In this paper, the PI Coverage Probability (PICP; Nowotarski and Weron, 2018) will be reported. For nominal coverage α , the measure is defined as the percentage of times the real price is found within the α PI and is averaged over all hours:

$$\text{PICP}^{\alpha} = \frac{1}{24} \sum_{h=1}^{24} \frac{\#(I_{d,h}^{\alpha} = 1 : d = 1, 2, \dots, D)}{D} \times 100\%, \quad (10)$$

where $D = 916, 1096, 2012$ is the total number of days in the out-of-sample period respectively for 2017Q3-2019, 2020-2022, and 2017Q3-2022 test periods. In order to assess the accuracy of the forecasts, a comparison can be made with the nominal coverage, α , also known as the PI Nominal Coverage (PINC). Close PICP and α indicates high accuracy in terms of reliability of the predictions. In this study, the PINC measure is reported for three levels of nominal coverage ($\alpha = 50\%$, 70% , and 90%).

Table 2 presents the prediction interval coverage probability for three test periods: 2017Q3-2019 (29.6.2017-31.12.2019; top panels), 2020-2022 (1.1.2020-31.12.2022; middle panels), and

Table 2: The prediction interval coverage probability (PICP) for $\alpha = 50\%$, 70% , and 90% (consecutively from left to right) and three test periods: 2017Q3-2019 (29.6.2017-31.12.2019; top panels), 2020-2022 (1.1.2020-31.12.2022; middle panels), and 2017Q3-2022 (29.6.2017-31.12.2022; bottom panels). The values that are within a range of 2.5% of the nominal coverage are marked with green color, while the ones that deviate beyond 5% from the nominal coverage are marked with red color. The value of PICP closest to nominal coverage is marked with bold separately in each period and market.

PICP		50%				70%				90%			
		EPEX	NP	OMIE	PJM	EPEX	NP	OMIE	PJM	EPEX	NP	OMIE	PJM
2017Q3-2019	HS	48.5	48.6	49.0	49.4	67.3	68.6	68.5	68.9	87.5	88.4	88.2	88.6
	QRA	45.1	45.1	46.6	47.2	63.8	64.5	65.5	65.9	84.8	84.5	85.4	85.3
	QRM	46.2	47.5	48.0	48.3	65.2	66.6	67.4	67.1	85.9	86.3	87.1	86.6
	QRF	46.6	48.7	48.3	48.7	65.6	67.9	67.8	67.5	86.3	87.3	87.3	87.1
	SQRA	48.5	48.8	50.1	50.9	68.5	68.7	69.9	70.1	87.4	87.4	88.5	88.4
	SQRM	49.9	51.2	51.4	52.0	69.0	70.4	71.0	70.8	88.3	88.6	89.3	89.4
	SQRF	50.2	52.1	51.8	52.3	69.3	71.4	71.3	71.1	88.5	89.4	89.5	89.6
2020-2022	HS	43.5	40.1	43.5	45.6	62.4	58.3	62.6	65.3	84.7	81.4	84.7	86.3
	QRA	42.3	42.3	42.0	46.4	60.6	60.5	60.3	65.4	81.7	81.4	81.2	84.7
	QRM	43.0	42.8	43.6	48.7	61.8	61.8	62.2	68.2	83.3	82.8	83.4	87.2
	QRF	44.2	45.1	44.7	49.5	62.7	64.1	63.6	68.9	84.2	84.4	84.7	87.9
	SQRA	45.4	45.9	45.0	50.0	64.1	64.5	64.4	69.3	84.3	84.2	84.2	87.2
	SQRM	46.4	45.8	46.7	52.0	64.8	65.1	65.4	71.3	85.3	85.3	85.6	89.0
	SQRF	47.6	48.0	47.7	52.6	65.9	67.2	66.9	71.9	86.0	86.5	86.6	89.5
Q32017-2022	HS	45.8	44.0	46.0	47.4	64.6	63.0	65.3	66.9	86.0	84.6	86.3	87.3
	QRA	43.6	43.6	44.1	46.8	62.1	62.3	62.7	65.6	83.1	82.8	83.1	85.0
	QRM	44.5	45.0	45.6	48.5	63.3	64.0	64.5	67.7	84.5	84.4	85.1	87.0
	QRF	45.3	46.7	46.3	49.1	64.0	65.8	65.5	68.3	85.1	85.7	85.9	87.5
	SQRA	46.8	47.2	47.3	50.4	66.1	66.4	66.9	69.6	85.7	85.6	86.2	87.8
	SQRM	48.0	48.3	48.8	52.0	66.7	67.5	67.9	71.1	86.6	86.8	87.3	89.2
	SQRF	48.8	49.9	49.6	52.4	67.5	69.1	68.9	71.6	87.2	87.8	87.9	89.5

2017Q3-2022 (29.6.2017-31.12.2022; bottom panels). Additionally, the empirical coverage measure is presented for the prediction intervals with significance level $\alpha = 50\%$, 70% , and 90% , in the left, center, and right panels of Table 2, respectively. Several conclusions can be drawn from the presented results:

- The reliability of the forecasts is highly dependent on the test period. During the pre-COVID period (2017Q3-2019), most models were able to produce prediction intervals with coverage probabilities close to nominal coverage. However, during the 2020-2022 period, only a few models, and only for the PJM market, were able to produce PIs with coverage probabilities within a 2% range of nominal coverage.
- In the 2017Q3-2019 test period, the new smoothing quantile regression method appeared to be the most reliable. Specifically, the SQRA model performed best on average for both 50% and 70% prediction intervals, with the most reliable results for two out of four datasets. Meanwhile, for the 90% prediction interval, the SQRF model was the clear winner for all datasets.
- For 2020-2022 test period SQRF outperformed any other model for all considered prediction

Table 3: The number of hours of the day (out of 24) for which the null hypothesis of the Kupiec test is not rejected at the 1% significance levels for $\alpha = 50\%$, 70%, and 90% prediction intervals. The green color is used to indicate forecasts that pass the test for at least 12 hours. The highest value in each column is marked with bold.

Kupiec	50%				70%				90%			
	EPEX	NP	OMIE	PJM	EPEX	NP	OMIE	PJM	EPEX	NP	OMIE	PJM
HS	1	0	2	16	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0
QRA	1	0	0	8	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0
QRM	0	2	0	24	0	0	0	15	0	0	0	1
QRF	4	10	7	24	1	2	0	16	0	0	0	8
SQRA	9	12	14	24	5	2	6	21	0	0	0	6
SQRM	18	18	24	20	6	13	18	19	0	0	0	16
SQRF	24	22	24	14	11	23	23	14	2	7	9	17

intervals, yielding the most reliable forecasts for three out of four markets for 50% and 70% prediction intervals, and for all markets for the 90% prediction interval.

- Throughout the entire out-of-sample period (2017Q3-2022), the SQRF produced the most reliable prediction intervals. Overall, besides the PJM market, SQRF and SQRM were the only methods that produced prediction intervals with coverage probabilities in a 2.5% range from nominal coverage.
- For all markets, prediction interval levels, and test periods, the majority of the most accurate forecasts were obtained with one of the SQR Averaging variants in 35 out of 36 instances. The only exception was the 50% prediction interval in 2017Q3-2019 for the PJM market, where the historical simulation method outperformed the others.
- In a pairwise comparison between QRA and SQRA, QRM and SQRM, and QRF and SQRF, the latter ones produced more reliable prediction intervals in 100 out of 108 cases. The only exceptions appear for 50% prediction intervals, where SQRF and SQRM produced PIs that were too wide.
- For the historical simulation and all QR variants, all prediction intervals were too narrow. In some cases, in particular, HS and QRA produced prediction intervals with empirical coverage lower than α by a significant margin of almost 10%. Meanwhile, SQR Averaging-based variants sometimes exceeded the nominal coverage for 50% and 70% prediction intervals.

To formally examine of the reliability of the obtained prediction intervals (PIs), the Kupiec (1995) test has been employed. It has been performed for each of the 24 hourly series in the entire out-of-sample period (2017Q3-2022). The results of the test for 50%, 70%, and 90% PIs are presented in Table 3, which displays the number of daily hours (out of 24) for which the p-value of the Kupiec test exceeds 1%.

Table 3 provides additional statistical evidence to support the findings presented in Table 2. Note that in Table 3 the results are presented only for the whole out-of-sample (2017Q3-2022) period without the distinction between two sub-periods as they reflect the results already illustrated in Table 2. Table 3 allows for more in-depth conclusions to be drawn:

- SQR Averaging-based approaches are the only models that provide reliable forecasts for the 50% PI in European markets. For the PJM market, most models pass the test for the majority of hours.
- For 70% PI, the Kupiec test indicates that only SQRM and SQRF fulfill the coverage test criterion for the majority of hours for the European markets. In particular, SQRF outperforms all other models for all markets from Europe. For PJM, most models, except for HS and QRA, pass the test for the majority of hours.
- The vast majority of methods struggle to provide reliable forecasts even for a single hour for the 90% PI. Only the SQRF passes the test for a few hours in any of the European markets. The situation changes for PJM where SQRF and SQRM produce reliable predictions for the majority of hours.
- SQRF provides the most reliable forecast on average, yielding the most reliable prediction intervals for 10 out of 12 cases.
- QRA-based approaches and HS do not provide reliable forecasts for most of the prediction intervals considered, and QRA does not pass the Kupiec test for the majority of hours in any of the considered cases.

In summary, it was found that SQR Averaging-based methods, particularly the SQRF model, provided the most reliable prediction intervals in most cases, except for the 50% and 70% PIs in the PJM market, which sometimes produced PIs wider than expected. Conversely, QR-based models performed poorly compared to their SQR-based equivalents. The accuracy of the prediction intervals varied depending on the test period, with better results observed before the COVID-19 pandemic and the Russia-Ukraine conflict. The PJM market, which experienced less disruption from these events, showed more reliable results. As a result, it can be concluded that the reliability condition is met for SQR Averaging-based methods and the sharpness of the forecasts can now be evaluated.

4.2.2. Sharpness measures

The Pinball Score (PS) is used to compare the performance of the models and evaluate the sharpness of the forecasts in this study. The measure, which is a proper scoring rule (Gneiting and Katzfuss, 2014) widely used in EPF literature (for instance, Muniain and Ziel, 2020) and is equivalent to computing the quantile representation of the Continuous Rank Probability Score (CRPS; Laio and Tamea, 2007). The measure is defined as follows:

$$\text{PS}(\hat{P}_{d,h}^q, P_{d,h}, q) = \begin{cases} (1 - q)(\hat{P}_{d,h}^q - P_{d,h}) & \text{for } P_{d,h} < \hat{P}_{d,h}^q, \\ q(P_{d,h} - \hat{P}_{d,h}^q) & \text{for } P_{d,h} \geq \hat{P}_{d,h}^q, \end{cases} \quad (11)$$

where $\hat{P}_{d,h}^q$ is the forecast of the price quantile of order $q \in (0, 1)$ and $P_{d,h}$ is the observed price for day d and hour h .

Table 4: The Aggregate Pinball Score (APS) for three test periods: 2017Q3-2019 (29.6.2017-31.12.2019), 2020-2022 (1.1.2020-31.12.2022), and 2017Q3-2022 (29.6.2017-31.12.2022). for four considered electricity markets. The best result is marked with bold independently for each market.

APS	2017-2019				2020-2022				2017-2022			
	EPEX	NP	OMIE	PJM	EPEX	NP	OMIE	PJM	EPEX	NP	OMIE	PJM
HS	2.436	0.843	1.375	1.294	8.130	6.471	4.912	2.184	5.537	3.909	3.302	1.779
QRA	2.462	0.825	1.385	1.313	8.222	6.473	4.944	2.269	5.600	3.902	3.324	1.834
QRM	2.426	0.831	1.374	1.279	8.083	6.428	4.895	2.169	5.508	3.880	3.292	1.764
QRF	2.420	0.827	1.371	1.276	8.051	6.391	4.857	2.161	5.488	3.858	3.270	1.758
SQRA	2.455	0.823	1.382	1.311	8.166	6.457	4.917	2.265	5.566	3.892	3.307	1.831
SQRM	2.421	0.830	1.371	1.278	8.048	6.402	4.873	2.167	5.486	3.865	3.279	1.762
SQRF	2.417	0.827	1.370	1.276	8.031	6.377	4.846	2.160	5.475	3.850	3.263	1.758

For the purpose of aggregating the measure, the pinball score can be averaged across all percentiles and for all hours during the entire test period. To compare the performance of the models and evaluate the sharpness in Table 4, Aggregate Pinball Score (APS) is reported. Based on the results presented in Table 4, certain conclusions can be drawn:

- Forecast accuracy differs significantly depending on the period considered. The average forecasting error for 2020-2022 is much higher compared to pre-COVID times, especially for all European markets (APS is at least three times higher, eight for Nordpool).
- SQR Averaging-based approaches outperformed all other methods in terms of pinball score for all datasets and test periods, with SQRF being the best-performing model in 11 out of 12 cases.
- Among the three variants considered for both QR- and SQR-based models, QRA and SQRA variants performed the worst in 11 out of 12 cases, with the exception of NP data in pre-COVID times where they provided the most accurate forecasts.
- Pairwise comparisons between QRA and SQRA, QRM and SQRM, and QRF and SQRF showed that the latter models yielded more accurate forecasts in all markets and test periods.
- Forecasts obtained with historical simulation were not competitive compared to QRF or SQRF in terms of pinball score.

Many financial and risk measures, such as Value at Risk (VaR) or Excess Return (ER) are based (mainly or purely) on some extreme quantiles. To pay more attention to these quantiles, in Table 5, the pinball score is presented for the aggregation of the 5 lowest and 5 highest percentiles (10 in total). The presented results clearly indicate that the most accurate forecasts in terms of extreme quantiles are obtained with SQRF model. Moreover, for all markets and test periods, SQRA is outperformed by both SQRF and SQRM, and QRA is outperformed by QRF and QRM. Finally, again in a pairwise comparison, the SQR-based variants always perform better than the corresponding QRA-based equivalent.

Table 5: The Pinball Score aggregated across 10 extreme quantiles for three test periods: 2017Q3-2019 (29.6.2017-31.12.2019), 2020-2022 (1.1.2020-31.12.2022), and 2017Q3-2022 (29.6.2017-31.12.2022) for four considered electricity markets. The best result is marked with bold independently for each market.

PS	2017-2019				2020-2022				2017-2022			
	EPEX	NP	OMIE	PJM	EPEX	NP	OMIE	PJM	EPEX	NP	OMIE	PJM
HS	0.812	0.312	0.420	0.441	2.421	2.055	1.597	0.766	1.689	1.261	1.061	0.618
QRA	0.819	0.298	0.423	0.424	2.548	2.096	1.700	0.756	1.761	1.277	1.119	0.605
QRM	0.783	0.298	0.400	0.399	2.375	1.983	1.611	0.698	1.651	1.216	1.060	0.562
QRF	0.775	0.293	0.396	0.394	2.334	1.955	1.557	0.684	1.625	1.198	1.028	0.552
SQRA	0.805	0.294	0.417	0.422	2.473	2.074	1.659	0.753	1.713	1.263	1.093	0.602
SQRM	0.772	0.294	0.394	0.395	2.328	1.931	1.574	0.691	1.619	1.186	1.037	0.556
SQRF	0.767	0.290	0.391	0.392	2.299	1.915	1.528	0.680	1.602	1.176	1.010	0.549

To draw statistically significant conclusions, the Giacomini and White (2006) test for Conditional Predictive Ability (CPA) is proposed. The Giacomini and White (2006) test is considered an extension of the Diebold and Mariano (1995) test for unconditional predictive ability, which is commonly used in the literature (e.g., Weron, 2014). For each pair of models, the statistic is computed based on the 24-dimensional vector of pinball scores for each day.

$$\Delta_{X,Y,d} = \|\text{APS}_{X,d}\| - \|\text{APS}_{Y,d}\|,$$

where $\|\text{APS}_{X,d}\| = \sum_{h=1}^{24} \sum_{q=0.01}^{0.99} \text{PS}(\hat{P}_{d,h}^q, P_{d,h}, \alpha)$ for model X . In CPA test the null hypothesis $H_0 : \phi = 0$ in the regression: $\Delta_{X,Y,d} = \phi' \mathbb{X}_{d-1} + \varepsilon_d$, where \mathbb{X}_{d-1} contains information of day $d - 1$ is tested.

Figure 5 displays the obtained p -values, illustrated with chessboards. The significance of the difference between the forecast of the model on the X-axis (better) and the forecast of the model on the Y-axis (worse) is indicated by the p -values closest to zero (\rightarrow dark green). Note that the test was performed for the whole out-of-sample period (2017Q3-2022) without distinction between two sub-periods. The results reveal that SQRF significantly outperforms any other competitor in terms of the sharpness for three out of four datasets, as shown in the plots. Although in the case of




Figure 5: Results of the CPA test of Giacomini and White (2006) for forecasts of in 2017Q3-2022 test period (29.6.2017-31.12.2022) for all considered datasets – from the left – EPEX, Nord Pool, OMIE and PJM. The heat map is used to illustrate the range of the p -values – the smaller they are (\rightarrow dark green) the more significant difference is reported between the two forecasts (the model on the X-axis outperforms the model on the Y-axis).

the NP market, the SQRF does not outperform QRA and SQRA, the Giacomini and White (2006) test suggests that SQRF is also not worse than those models.

To sum up, the SQRF model consistently provided the most accurate probabilistic forecasts in terms of the pinball score for all markets and test periods. Pairwise comparisons showed that the kernel smoothing improves the performance of the quantile regression averaging procedure in all considered variants, particularly for extreme quantile.

4.3. Economic value

No matter how accurate the forecasts are in terms of reliability or sharpness measures, their value is limited unless the accuracy gain can be translated into financial profits. In this section, the economic value of probabilistic forecasts is presented. The results of the trading strategies described in Section 3.3 are evaluated with financial profits. The reported measure indicates the average amount of money that the company can gain from a single 1MWh transaction. Therefore, the profit is defined as the total profit obtained during the entire out-of-sample period divided by the sum of the total traded volume. Note that the reported profits do not include transaction or investment costs.

In Figure 6, the profits (in EUR/MWh) obtained when using the benchmark and quantile-based strategies for all considered prediction intervals (50% to 98%) are reported. The plots illustrate the average score for the whole out-of-sample period (2017Q3-2022). Based on the results, different forecasting models can be compared in terms of the economic value of the forecasts and some interesting conclusions can be drawn:

- The proposed quantile-based trading strategy for the best-performing models using optimal PI level outperforms the unlimited bids strategy, with the improvement varying from 0.9% (for PJM) up to 14.3% (for OMIE), depending on the market.
- The highest profits for the proposed trading strategies, up to 21 EUR per 1MWh transaction, are yielded for EPEX market, while the lowest profits are obtained for OMIE, with the best-performing model yielding profits slightly above 8 EUR/MWh.
- On average, the SQRF model generates the highest profits, except for the EPEX market, where the QRF and SQRM slightly outperform other competitors.
- The performance of the forecasting models changes across quantiles. Although SQRF dominates other methods for nearly all quantiles in the Nord Pool and OMIE markets, the results in the other two markets do not indicate a clear winner.
- QRA and SQRA are the worst-performing forecasting models in terms of economic value for all markets.
- The choice of optimal PI level in the quantile-based trading strategy varies across markets, with the highest profit per transaction obtained using 50% PI for EPEX and 68%, 54%, and 60% PIs for Nord Pool, OMIE, and PJM, respectively.




Figure 6: The profits per 1 MW traded for EPEX (upper left), NP (upper right), OMIE (lower left), and PJM (lower right) markets obtained using benchmark and quantile-based strategies at different PI levels and all considered probabilistic forecasting models for the 2017Q3-2022 test period. The grey line refers to the profits for HS method, the blue ones represent the class of QRA-based models and the red ones depict the profits of the SQR Averaging-based class of method. The result of the unlimited bids strategy is plotted with solid black lines.

It can be observed from the results presented in Figure 6 that the performance of the trading strategy is consistent with the performance of the probabilistic models based on their statistical measures. The top two models with the lowest pinball loss scores, SQRF and QRF, also perform the best in terms of average profits.

5. Conclusions

The contribution of this paper is twofold. First, it introduces a new probabilistic forecasting technique called Smoothing Quantile Regression Averaging, which combines a well-performing load and price forecasting approach with kernel estimation to improve the reliability of the estimates. This approach produces probabilistic forecasts that significantly outperform a range of well-performing benchmarks. Second, the manuscript is one of the first in the literature to bridge the gap between computing probabilistic forecasts and trading based on such forecasts. More specifically, it introduces a trading strategy using probabilistic price forecasts and battery storage

that can be effectively implemented in a day-ahead electricity market.

In this study, the forecasting methods were evaluated across four distinct datasets from the German, Nordic, Iberian, and American power markets. The proposed method is compared against several well-established benchmarks, including historical simulation and variants of Quantile Regression Averaging. The performance of probabilistic forecasting models was compared using the Kupiec test, the pinball score, and the conditional predictive accuracy test. The results of the empirical tests reveal that SQRM and SQRF, the variants of SQR Averaging outperform the comparison methods in terms of both reliability and sharpness.

The robustness of the proposed method was further demonstrated by presenting results for two separate test periods, namely 2017-2019 (pre-COVID) and 2020-2022 associated with the COVID-19 pandemic and the unstable political situation in Europe. Although the accuracy of the forecasts is clearly lower for the latter one, the overall conclusion remains the same for both periods. This highlights the remarkable consistency and robustness of the proposed methods to market changes, which is a highly desirable feature in electricity price forecasting and other applications.

In addition, this study introduces a trading strategy that utilizes only day-ahead market prices and is suitable for companies with access to energy storage systems, such as virtual power plants. The proposed strategy provides evidence of the economic value of probabilistic forecasts, with the highest profits obtained using the newly proposed SQRF model.

Overall, the proposed SQR Averaging-based methods offer significant potential for improving forecast accuracy, thus enhancing risk management and supporting the decision-making process in electricity markets. The demonstrated reliability and robustness of the method suggest that it can be successfully applied to other markets and forecasting applications, which can be further investigated in future research.

Future research should address the issue of bandwidth selection for the SQR Averaging method. In this paper, a simple rule-of-thumb method is used to select the bandwidth for the SQR estimator. However, there are many other methods for selecting the optimal bandwidth, such as maximum likelihood cross-validation or the plug-in method. Despite the popularity of these alternative methods in the literature, their performance in this application remains an open research question. Therefore, further research is needed to determine the most appropriate bandwidth selection method for SQR-based models.

Acknowledgments

I am grateful to Katarzyna Maciejowska and Rafał Weron for inspiring discussions on probabilistic forecasting of electricity prices and Karolina Uniejewska for inspiring discussions on energy trading strategy. This paper has also benefited from conversations with the participants of the International Ruhr Energy Conference (INREC 2021), the Energy Finance Italia (EFI 2022), and the International Symposium on Forecasting (ISF 2022).

This work was partially supported by the National Science Center (NCN, Poland) through MAESTRO grant No. 2018/30/A/HS4/00444.

References

- S. Mohseni, A. C. Brent, S. Kelly, and W. N. Browne. Demand response-integrated investment and operational planning of renewable and sustainable energy systems considering forecast uncertainties: A systematic review. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 158:112095, 2022.
- A. Pourdaryaei, M. Mohammadi, H. Mubarak, A. Abdellatif, M. Karimi, E. Gryazina, and V. Terzija. A new framework for electricity price forecasting via multi-head self-attention and cnn-based techniques in the competitive electricity market. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 235:121207, 2024.
- K. Mayer and S. Trück. Electricity markets around the world. *Journal of Commodity Markets*, 9:77–100, 2018.
- C. Kath and F. Ziel. The value of forecasts: Quantifying the economic gains of accurate quarter-hourly electricity price forecasts. *Energy Economics*, 76:411–423, 2018.
- K. Maciejowska, B. Uniejewski, and R. Weron. Forecasting electricity prices. *Oxford research encyclopedia of economics and finance*, 2022. doi: (arXiv)10.48550/arXiv.2204.11735.
- H. Zareipour, C. A. Canizares, and K. Bhattacharya. Economic impact of electricity market price forecasting errors: A demand-side analysis. *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, 25(1):254–262, 2010.
- T. Hong. Crystal ball lessons in predictive analytics. *EnergyBiz, Spring*, pages 35–37, 2015.
- B. G. Magalhães, P. M. Bento, J. A. Pombo, M. R. Calado, and S. J. Mariano. Spot price forecasting for best trading strategy decision support in the iberian electricity market. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 224:120059, 2023.
- T. Hong, P. Pinson, Y. Wang, R. Weron, D. Yang, and H. Zareipour. Energy forecasting: A review and outlook. *IEEE Open Access Journal of Power and Energy*, 7:376–388, 2020.
- B. Uniejewski and R. Weron. Regularized quantile regression averaging for probabilistic electricity price forecasting. *Energy Economics*, 95:105121, 2021.
- N. Meade and T. Islam. Modelling european usage of renewable energy technologies for electricity generation. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 90(PB):497 – 509, 2015.
- A. Gianfreda, F. Ravazzolo, and L. Rossini. Comparing the forecasting performances of linear models for electricity prices with high res penetration. *International Journal of Forecasting*, 36(3):974–986, 2020.
- P. K. Wesseh and B. Lin. Bulk storage technologies in imperfect electricity markets under time-of-use pricing: Implications for the environment and social welfare. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 171, 2021.
- M. Fernandes, E. Guerre, and E. Horta. Smoothing quantile regressions. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics*, 39(1):338–357, 2021.
- J. Nowotarski and R. Weron. Computing electricity spot price prediction intervals using quantile regression and forecast averaging. *Computational Statistics*, 30(3):791–803, 2015.
- G. Marcjasz, B. Uniejewski, and R. Weron. Probabilistic electricity price forecasting with NARX networks: Combine point or probabilistic forecasts? *International Journal of Forecasting*, 36:466–479, 2020.
- B. Uniejewski, G. Marcjasz, and R. Weron. On the importance of the long-term seasonal component in day-ahead electricity price forecasting: Part II – Probabilistic forecasting. *Energy Economics*, 79:171–182, 2019.
- T. Hong, P. Pinson, S. Fan, H. Zareipour, A. Troccoli, and R. J. Hyndman. Probabilistic energy forecasting: Global Energy Forecasting Competition 2014 and beyond. *International Journal of Forecasting*, 32(3):896–913, 2016.
- R. Huisman. The influence of temperature on spike probability in day-ahead power prices. *Energy Economics*, 30: 2697–2704, 2008.
- L. Grossi and F. Nan. Robust forecasting of electricity prices: Simulations, models and the impact of renewable sources. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 141:305 – 318, 2019.
- A. Gianfreda, L. Parisio, and M. Pelagatti. A review of balancing costs in Italy before and after RES introduction. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 91:549–563, 2018.
- A. Kowalska-Pyzalska. What makes consumers adopt to innovative energy services in the energy market? A review of incentives and barriers. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 82:3570–3581, 2018.
- J. Nowotarski and R. Weron. Recent advances in electricity price forecasting: A review of probabilistic forecasting. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 81:1548–1568, 2018.
- T. Hong and S. Fan. Probabilistic electric load forecasting: A tutorial review. *International Journal of Forecasting*, 32:914–938, 2016.
- J. M. Morales, A. J. Conejo, H. Madsen, P. Pinson, and M. Zugno. *Integrating Renewables in Electricity Markets: Operational Problems*. Springer, 2014.

- D. Bunn, A. Andresen, D. Chen, and S. Westgaard. Analysis and forecasting of electricity price risks with quantile factor models. *Energy Journal*, 37(1):101–122, 2016.
- P. Gaillard, Y. Goude, and R. Nedellec. Additive models and robust aggregation for GEFCom2014 probabilistic electric load and electricity price forecasting. *International Journal of Forecasting*, 32(3):1038–1050, 2016.
- K. Maciejowska and J. Nowotarski. A hybrid model for GEFCom2014 probabilistic electricity price forecasting. *International Journal of Forecasting*, 32(3):1051–1056, 2016.
- K. Maciejowska, J. Nowotarski, and R. Weron. Probabilistic forecasting of electricity spot prices using Factor Quantile Regression Averaging. *International Journal of Forecasting*, 32(3):957–965, 2016.
- P. H. Kupiec. Techniques for verifying the accuracy of risk measurement models. *The Journal of Derivatives*, 3(2): 73–84, 1995.
- F. Ziel and R. Weron. Day-ahead electricity price forecasting with high-dimensional structures: Univariate vs. multivariate modeling frameworks. *Energy Economics*, 70:396–420, 2018.
- B. Uniejewski, R. Weron, and F. Ziel. Variance stabilizing transformations for electricity spot price forecasting. *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, 33:2219–2229, 2018.
- J. Janczura, S. Trück, R. Weron, and R. Wolff. Identifying spikes and seasonal components in electricity spot price data: A guide to robust modeling. *Energy Economics*, 38:96–110, 2013.
- B. Uniejewski, J. Nowotarski, and R. Weron. Automated variable selection and shrinkage for day-ahead electricity price forecasting. *Energies*, 9:621, 2016.
- N. Amjady and A. Daraeepour. Design of input vector for day-ahead price forecasting of electricity markets. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 36(10):12281–12294, 2009.
- M. Kaya, M. B. Karan, and E. Telatar. Electricity price estimation using deep learning approaches: An empirical study on turkish markets in normal and covid-19 periods. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 224:120026, 2023.
- B. Uniejewski and K. Maciejowska. Lasso principal component averaging – a fully automated approach for point forecast pooling. *International Journal of Forecasting*, 2022. available online.
- R. Huisman and C. Stet. The dependence of quantile power prices on supply from renewables. *Energy Economics*, 105:105685, 2022.
- T. Jasiński. Use of new variables based on air temperature for forecasting day-ahead spot electricity prices using deep neural networks: A new approach. *Energy*, 213:118784, 2020.
- A. G. Billé, A. Gianfreda, F. Del Grosso, and F. Ravazzolo. Forecasting electricity prices with expert, linear, and nonlinear models. *International Journal of Forecasting*, 39(2):570–586, 2023.
- R. W. Koenker. *Quantile Regression*. Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- D. W. Scott. *Kernel Density Estimators*, chapter 6, pages 125–193. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, 1992.
- P. Hall, S. J. Sheather, M. C. Jones, and J. S. Marron. On optimal data-based bandwidth selection in kernel density estimation. *Biometrika*, 78(2):263–269, 1991.
- B. Silverman. Density estimation for statistocs and data analysis. *Monographs on Statistics and Applied Probability*, 1986.
- R. P. W. Duin. On the choice of smoothing parameters for parzen estimators of probability density functions. *IEEE Transactions on Computers*, C-25(11):1175–1179, 1976.
- K. Maciejowska, W. Nitka, and T. Weron. Enhancing load, wind and solar generation for day-ahead forecasting of electricity prices. *Energy Economics*, 99:105273, 2021.
- J. Janczura and E. Wójcik. Dynamic short-term risk management strategies for the choice of electricity market based on probabilistic forecasts of profit and risk measures. the german and the polish market case study. *Energy Economics*, 110:106015, 2022.
- R. Weron. Electricity price forecasting: A review of the state-of-the-art with a look into the future. *International Journal of Forecasting*, 30(4):1030–1081, 2014.
- T. Gneiting and A. Raftery. Strictly proper scoring rules, prediction, and estimation. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 102(477):359–378, 2007.
- T. Gneiting and M. Katzfuss. Probabilistic forecasting. *Annual Review of Statistics and Its Application*, 1:125–151, 2014.
- P. Muniain and F. Ziel. Probabilistic forecasting in day-ahead electricity markets: Simulating peak and off-peak prices. *International Journal of Forecasting*, 36(4):1193–1210, 2020.

- F. Laio and S. Tamea. Verification tools for probabilistic forecasts of continuous hydrological variables. *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences Discussions*, 11(4):1267–1277, 2007.
- R. Giacomini and H. White. Tests of conditional predictive ability. *Econometrica*, 74(6):1545–1578, 2006.
- F. X. Diebold and R. S. Mariano. Comparing predictive accuracy. *Journal of Business and Economic Statistics*, 13: 253–263, 1995.