
Deep Double Descent for Time Series Forecasting: Avoiding Undertrained Models

Valentino Assandri

Bosch Research North America
Bosch Center for AI
384 Santa Trinita Ave
Sunnyvale, CA 94085, USA

Sam Heshmati

Bosch Research North America
Bosch Center for AI
384 Santa Trinita Ave
Sunnyvale, CA 94085, USA
sam.heshmati@us.bosch.com

Burhaneddin Yaman

Bosch Research North America
Bosch Center for AI
384 Santa Trinita Ave
Sunnyvale, CA 94085, USA
burhaneddin.yaman@us.bosch.com@us.bosch.com

Anton Iakovlev

Bosch Global Business Services
Bregenz Str. 26A
70469 Stuttgart-Feuerbach, Germany

Ariel Emiliano Repetur

Bosch Research Germany
Bosch Center for AI
Robert-Bosch-Campus 1
71272 Renningen, Germany
arielemiliano.repetur@bosch.com

Abstract

Deep learning models, particularly Transformers, have achieved impressive results in various domains, including time series forecasting. While existing time series literature primarily focuses on model architecture modifications and data augmentation techniques, this paper explores the training schema of deep learning models for time series; how models are trained regardless of their architecture. We perform extensive experiments to investigate the occurrence of deep double descent in several Transformer models trained on public time series data sets. We demonstrate epoch-wise deep double descent and that overfitting can be reverted using more epochs. Leveraging these findings, we achieve state-of-the-art results for long sequence time series forecasting in nearly 70% of the 72 benchmarks tested. This suggests that many models in the literature may possess untapped potential. Additionally, we introduce a taxonomy for classifying training schema modifications, covering data augmentation, model inputs, model targets, time series per model, and computational budget.

1 Introduction

Time series forecasting, particularly long sequence time series forecastig (LSTF), plays a crucial role in various domains, including finance [21], healthcare [14], and climate science [14], enabling data-driven decision-making and predictive modeling. Deep learning has been applied in a multitude of methods to address the challenges of time series forecasting [2, 28]. These deep learning models, particularly Transformers, have achieved remarkable performance in numerous other domains,

including natural language processing (NLP) [25, 5] and computer vision (CV) [33]. While existing literature on time series forecasting primarily focus on architectural modifications [28, 2, 4] and data augmentations [27], recent advancements in the NLP space have demonstrated the significance of innovating the training schema [9, 7, 23]. By drawing inspiration from these studies in NLP, we aim to start bridging the gap in the time series literature by improving *how* models are trained, regardless of their architecture. The focus of the training schema innovations in this paper is the epoch-wise deep double descent phenomenon [17, 24].

The key contributions are summarised as follows:

- We show that an epoch-wise deep double descent can occur on time series data from publicly available benchmarks, thus challenging the practice of early-stopping with low patience and few training epochs for LSTF and highlighting the need to be aware of this phenomenon.
- We performed extensive experiments on nine public benchmark datasets. Our empirical studies show that many of the current Transformers for LSTF have more potential than what is currently believed by achieving new state-of-the-art performance for Transformers for LSTF: for example, we improve the MSE test loss of FEDformer-f on the ILI dataset regardless of the prediction length by at least 0.3 points and with an average relative improvement of 11%.
- We additionally introduce a framework to categorize the variety of modeling techniques that can be found in deep learning for time series, including a more detailed overview of training schema modifications.

2 Preliminaries

Time series forecasting involves predicting future values of a time series $X \in D$ based on its past values, where X is in a specific domain, normally with $D = \mathbb{R}$. More precisely, given a history of p time steps from the time step t , we want to predict the value of X for the next h time steps; i.e., the input $X^i = (X_{t-p+1}, X_{t-p+2}, \dots, X_{t-1}, X_t) \in D^p$ is mapped to the output $X^o = (X_{t+1}, X_{t+2}, \dots, X_{t+h-1}, X_{t+h}) \in D^h$ by some function f [2]. In the case that the history size p or the horizon size h are very large, we refer to the problem as a *long sequence* time series forecasting (LSTF) problem [29].

The LSTF problem is normally divided into two broad categories: univariate or multivariate. In the univariate case the output domain is 1 dimensional, normally $D = \mathbb{R}$, whereas in the multivariate case the domain D is n dimensional, normally $D = \mathbb{R}^n$, with $n \geq 2$ [2].

3 Background

3.1 Related Work

Transition in Deep Learning Architectures for Time Series. Long sequence time series forecasting has been impacted by many of the general developments in deep learning; models have generally speaking evolved from Feedforward Neural Networks (FNN) to Recurrent Neural Networks (RNN), then Long Short-Term Memory (LSTM) networks, and finally to Transformer architectures [2]. FNNs struggle with temporal dependencies, leading to RNNs with feedback loops for capturing long-range dependencies. Conventional RNNs face vanishing gradients, prompting LSTMs with memory cells and gating mechanisms [2]. LSTMs’ sequential nature limits scalability, leading to parallel-processing Transformers with self-attention mechanisms [29, 30, 28, 26]. Despite deep neural networks and Transformers’ popularity, alternative approaches and classical methods like ARIMA remain effective for time series forecasting without the added complexity of deep learning [2, 32, 6, 8].

Transformers for Time Series Forecasting. In recent times, the application of Transformer-based models for time series analysis has gained traction [28]. Several Transformer models have been designed by changing the Vanilla Transformer [26, 30] to tackle the long sequence time series forecasting problem, such as Informer [35], Non Stationary Transformer [13], Temporal Fusion Transformer [11], Autoformer [29], Pyraformer [12] and FEDformer [36]. Many of these Transformer architecture modifications have been categorized in [28].

Transformers Training Schemata for Time Series. Whereas the aforementioned papers on time series all focus on *model architecture* modifications, [27] focuses on data augmentation strategies for time series. Some recent studies [20, 11, 10] make use of training schema modifications as an addition to the architecture modifications they propose, but training schemata are not the focus of their work. In [21] the authors focus on studying how scaling the number of parameters in a model affects performance when forecasting financial data using different model architectures.

Transformers Training Schemata in Other Domains. In the realm of NLP and computer vision, on the other hand, various strategies have been employed to optimize the training schema of deep learning models. InstructGPT, for instance, utilizes reinforcement learning from human feedback (RLHF) to fine-tune existing GPT models, allowing it to follow user instructions more accurately [23]. Another common approach involves pretraining models on vast amounts of unstructured data, which enables them to learn general features and representations that can later be fine-tuned for specific tasks [5, 25]. In autonomous driving, [19] combines model architecture innovations with a masking training schema on the model targets to improve the performance of AI based planning. Additionally, recent research on scaling laws demonstrates that model performance can be significantly improved by increasing the size of models, data, and computational resources [9, 7, 25]. These strategies, combined or separately, have led to groundbreaking advancements in both NLP and computer vision, pushing the boundaries of what ML models can achieve.

Although there are extensive surveys and papers available on network modification [28, 2] and data augmentation [27] for time series transformers, the time series community would benefit from more research on training schemata for deep learning models for time series. We contribute to closing this gap by focusing on the deep double descent phenomenon in time series and specifically studying epoch-wise deep double descent.

3.2 Epoch-Wise Deep Double Descent for Time Series

Deep double descent, a recently re-popularized phenomenon in deep learning, challenges the conventional understanding of the relationship between model complexity, training epochs, and generalization performance [3, 17, 1, 24]. Traditionally, it was believed that as model complexity increases, the model becomes prone to overfitting, and as a result, generalization performance would degrade; we refer to this as the classical regime [17]. However, the deep double descent phenomenon reveals a more nuanced pattern, where the generalization error first decreases, then increases, and then potentially decreases again as the model size and/or training epochs grow [3]. In Figure 1 we see a figurative depiction of how a validation loss plot exhibiting deep double descent is expected to look.




Figure 1: Figurative plot showing validation loss mapped against epochs. The validation initially drops during the "first descent" (light blue shading) and then starts to overfit as more epochs are added (light red shading). This overfitting continues until the model enters a second descent phase (light green shading). During the second descent the validation loss can drop below the previously achieved best performance.

This peculiar behavior suggests that large models, when trained for a sufficient number of epochs, can achieve better generalization performance despite the risk of overfitting. In epoch-wise deep double descent we see the following pattern: the test loss as a function of epochs first decreases as the model learns, then increases as the model overfits the training data, until after a certain point it starts decreasing again [17]. In model wise deep double descent instead we plot the best achieved test loss against the number of parameters in the model [17].

The underlying theoretical principles that explain the occurrence and conditions of deep double descent remain less comprehensively understood [24, 3]. In [17] the authors postulate and experimentally show that noise in label data has an effect on whether the double descent phenomenon occurs; they show how for a standard computer vision benchmark (CIFAR), adding different levels of noise to the data leads to different levels of double descent.

Time series forecasting community may gain significant advantages from further exploring and deepening the understanding of deep double descent in time series domain. With the increasing use of deep learning techniques for forecasting noisy real-world time series data, investigating the insights of deep double descent can prove highly valuable. We hence run experiments on public models and public data in Section 4 to see whether the double descent can also be seen in models trained on time series data.

4 Experimental Evaluation and Discussion

To test whether a deep double descent can occur with time series forecasting, we perform a series of experiments on nine popular real-world datasets from different domains such as energy, economics, and health. The nine datasets (Electricity, Exchange, Traffic, Weather, ILI, ETTh1, ETTh2, ETTm1, ETTm2) were used as benchmarks in several Transformer papers [36, 29, 35, 32]. As FEDformer exhibits the best performance on many of these benchmarks relative to the other Transformers we use it as the main baseline [36]. We also include Informer [35] and Autoformer [29] to assess whether the double descent phenomenon is independent of model architecture.

4.1 Experiment Setup

To allow for a direct comparison, we take the multivariate experiments from [32] and increase the epoch count from 10 in the original experiments to 1000 and also increasing the patience from 3 to 1000. We note how the use of a low patience and a low epoch count is common among FEDformer [36], Autoformer [29], and Informer [35]. We hence run experiments on FEDformer, Informer and Autoformer on the same benchmark datasets from their respective studies using their hyperparameters. The benchmarks for the original training schema performance is taken from [32]. As in [36, 29] the history is 96 time steps for each experiment and different horizons are tested (96, 192, 336, and 720 time steps) on each dataset. For the ILI dataset we use the horizons 24, 36, 48, and 60 as in [36]. The models were trained on an NVIDIA A100-80GB.

To accommodate the higher epoch count we make one hyperparameter change to the original setups from the respective papers: the learning rate decay. In the original papers the learning rate decays exponentially for all epochs [32, 36]. In our experiments, the learning rate decays with the same rate as the original papers until epoch 5, after which it stays constant instead of further decaying exponentially. We underline how the models in [36, 29, 35] were trained for less than 10 epochs and we hence mainly make changes to epochs that were not performed in their respective papers. No other hyperparameter tuning was done to reflect the increased epoch count. To limit the computational time, the patience for FEDformer on the Weather, ETTm1 and ETTm2 datasets was set to 200 instead of 1000. We underscore how no other hyperparameters were changed in these experiments compared to the original papers [36, 35, 29] as the focus of this paper is the *training schema* of the models.

4.2 Main Results

Table 1 shows an overview of the resulting test MSE and MAE on the benchmarks for each data set and prediction length; the table’s rows represent each benchmark (data set and prediction length) and the columns are the different models. We highlight in bold the best results for each benchmark (row). The results indicate that employing a higher number of epochs often greatly improves the performance of the previously published techniques. For example, we improve the MSE test loss

		Double Descent						Original					
		FEDformer		Autoformer		Informer		FEDformer		Autoformer		Informer	
		MSE	MAE	MSE	MAE	MSE	MAE	MSE	MAE	MSE	MAE	MSE	MAE
ETTh1	96	0.376	0.413	0.436	0.448	0.933	0.764	0.376	0.419	0.449	0.459	0.865	0.713
	192	0.427	0.449	0.444	0.451	1.034	0.798	0.42	0.448	0.5	0.482	1.008	0.792
	336	0.448	0.462	0.516	0.493	1.098	0.819	0.459	0.465	0.521	0.496	1.107	0.809
ETTh2	720	0.479	0.495	0.5	0.501	1.13	0.83	0.506	0.507	0.514	0.512	1.181	0.865
	96	0.34	0.384	0.419	0.433	2.992	1.365	0.346	0.388	0.358	0.397	3.755	1.525
	192	0.431	0.44	0.45	0.448	7.184	2.206	0.429	0.439	0.456	0.452	5.602	1.931
ETTm1	336	0.503	0.495	0.477	0.48	5.662	1.926	0.496	0.487	0.482	0.486	4.721	1.835
	720	0.478	0.484	0.482	0.489	4.492	1.803	0.463	0.474	0.515	0.511	3.647	1.625
	96	0.364	0.413	0.389	0.412	0.624	0.559	0.379	0.419	0.505	0.475	0.672	0.571
ETTm2	192	0.406	0.435	0.465	0.456	0.717	0.615	0.426	0.441	0.553	0.496	0.795	0.669
	336	0.443	0.457	0.605	0.512	0.835	0.673	0.445	0.459	0.621	0.537	1.212	0.871
	720	0.523	0.492	0.75	0.571	0.904	0.714	0.543	0.49	0.671	0.561	1.166	0.823
Exchange	96	0.189	0.282	0.244	0.317	0.409	0.48	0.203	0.287	0.255	0.339	0.365	0.453
	192	0.255	0.323	0.275	0.333	0.84	0.721	0.269	0.328	0.281	0.34	0.533	0.563
	336	0.327	0.365	0.336	0.37	1.44	0.921	0.325	0.366	0.339	0.372	1.363	0.887
Electricity	720	0.439	0.428	0.445	0.434	3.95	1.473	0.421	0.415	0.433	0.432	3.379	1.338
	96	0.188	0.304	0.201	0.315	0.333	0.412	0.193	0.308	0.201	0.317	0.274	0.368
	192	0.194	0.309	0.226	0.334	0.319	0.404	0.201	0.315	0.222	0.334	0.296	0.386
Traffic	336	0.211	0.324	0.219	0.331	0.327	0.409	0.214	0.329	0.231	0.338	0.3	0.394
	720	0.271	0.37	0.256	0.361	0.337	0.415	0.246	0.355	0.254	0.361	0.373	0.439
	96	0.125	0.254	0.179	0.31	0.903	0.787	0.148	0.278	0.197	0.323	0.847	0.752
Weather	192	0.24	0.353	0.441	0.472	1.087	0.83	0.271	0.38	0.3	0.369	1.204	0.895
	336	0.402	0.465	1.08	0.778	1.44	0.986	0.46	0.5	0.509	0.524	1.672	1.036
	720	1.154	0.823	1.09	0.812	2.09	1.193	1.195	0.841	1.447	0.941	2.478	1.31
ILI	96	0.578	0.358	0.63	0.402	0.718	0.399	0.587	0.366	0.613	0.388	0.719	0.391
	192	0.607	0.376	0.669	0.417	0.742	0.415	0.604	0.373	0.616	0.382	0.696	0.379
	336	0.619	0.38	0.703	0.436	0.775	0.429	0.621	0.383	0.622	0.337	0.777	0.42
ILI	720	0.629	0.381	0.696	0.423	0.821	0.45	0.626	0.382	0.66	0.408	0.864	0.472
	96	0.239	0.322	0.226	0.299	0.437	0.463	0.217	0.296	0.266	0.336	0.3	0.384
	192	0.284	0.342	0.317	0.381	0.508	0.499	0.276	0.336	0.307	0.367	0.598	0.544
ILI	336	0.355	0.397	0.347	0.391	0.623	0.558	0.339	0.38	0.359	0.395	0.578	0.523
	720	0.392	0.406	0.449	0.45	0.982	0.75	0.403	0.428	0.419	0.428	1.059	0.741
	24	2.628	1.06	3.563	1.259	5.246	1.585	3.228	1.26	3.483	1.287	5.764	1.677
ILI	36	2.324	0.957	2.999	1.137	4.802	1.525	2.679	1.08	3.103	1.148	4.755	1.467
	48	2.31	0.98	3.082	1.163	5.041	1.562	2.622	1.078	2.669	1.085	4.763	1.469
	60	2.566	1.059	2.903	1.139	5.275	1.605	2.857	1.157	2.77	1.125	5.264	1.564

Table 1: Table of test loss from training FEDformer, Autoformer and Informer on the 9 standard benchmarks for LSTF comparing the original results (taken from [36]) and comparing them to the results of the same models with the same hyperparameters but with more training epochs (labelled as "Double Descent"). We see how with a minor change to the training schema, i.e. increasing the epoch count and no longer performing early-stopping with low patience, we improve the test performance of Transformer-based LSTF models on a majority of the benchmarks.

of FEDformer-f on the ILI dataset regardless of the prediction length by at least 0.3 points and with an average relative improvement of 11%. We underline how with this simple training schema modification we achieve state-of-the-art results for Transformers on a majority of the benchmarks.

4.3 Discussion of Results

As noted in Section 4.2, the results taking advantage of a potential double descent normally outperform the previous implementations with only 10 epochs. We see how in around 62.5% of the benchmarks, FEDformer’s performance improves with the new training schema and there is on average a relative improvement of 6% in the performance. In the cases where the performance does not improve, the performance only deteriorates by 3%. Out of the 72 benchmarks (9 datasets with 4 prediction lengths each and 2 metrics) we set a new state-of-the-art 50 times or around on 69% of benchmarks.

As Figure 2 illustrates, many of the Transformer based models keep on improving (validation loss drops) in performance as the number of epochs is increased. We furthermore even see the emergence of epoch-wise double descent: for example, Autoformer on the Exchange dataset (Figure 2f) has a deteriorating validation loss from below 1 to over 2 up to around epoch 100 and it then drops below the previous low point achieved in the first "descent".

We see two reasons why we do not achieve increases in the performance on some experiments. Firstly, as we can see in Figure 2g with the Informer model on the Traffic data, models seem to be overfitting up to the 1000 epoch cut-off. We postulate that a double descent is still possible but occurs after too many epochs for it to be practical to train when considering the good performance achieved during the first descent. Secondly, we have double descents that remove the effects of overfitting but do not descend enough to find a new global minimum. This further highlights the need to view the double descent phenomenon as a factor to critically study during the training of a model.




Figure 2: Validation loss of different Transformer based models showing examples of classical regime validation losses and modern regime double descent on different datasets. Note: the plots use a log scale in the epochs axis. We can see in the loss curves how the classical "U" shape expected is not always present when epochs are scaled enough and that overfitting is often a temporary phenomenon.




Figure 3: Validation loss of Informer with a prediction length of 336 time steps on the ILI dataset. We label in blue the initial descent, in red the epochs where overfitting occurs, and in green the second descent. We note the similarity of this plot from real data with the theoretical expectations shown in Figure 1.

In Figure 3 we label the different phases of the loss curve for the ILI loss curve for Informer; differentiating between the first descent, the overfitting phase and the second descent. Hence we stipulate that many of the Transformer models in [36], [29] and [35], that normally use less than 10 epochs, have more potential than what was initially published.

4.4 Limitations

We acknowledge several aspects of our experiments and results that warrant further exploration or clarification. We selected the one thousand epoch cut-off out of computational constraints, which might not be the optimal choice for every application; for example, some applications might need only one hundred epochs while others ten thousand. More extensive testing and experimentation with different cut-offs could reveal more nuanced insights and improve the understanding of the epoch-wise deep double descent phenomenon in time series models. Additionally, it is important to note there are benchmarks where the state-of-the-art performance did not improve. While our findings highlight the potential of exploiting deep double descent, there may be cases where certain models or data sets do not exhibit the same benefits. Lastly, our study focused on three well-known models in the field (FEDformer [36], Autoformer [29], Informer [35]), which does not constitute an exhaustive examination of all available time series models. We see our findings as a starting point for the field to explore the phenomenon in greater depth and to evaluate its potential across various applications and contexts.

5 Taxonomy of Training Deep Learning Models for Time Series

In Section 4 we showed the promise of innovating on the training schemas of deep learning models for time series. As discussed in Section 3.1, we consider that there is a gap in the current time series forecasting literature in regards to modifications other than architecture modifications. To start addressing this gap, we introduce a taxonomy specifically designed to categorize schemata in deep learning for time series, with a particular emphasis on training schema modifications. This classification system is visualized in Figure 4. Our taxonomy aims to provide a clear framework for understanding and analyzing various approaches to enhance time series forecasting performance. At its highest level, the taxonomy differentiates between four types of modifications: *i.* model and architecture modifications, *ii.* hyperparameter and optimizer modifications, *iii.* training schema modifications, and *iv.* validation schema modifications. We limit the scope of this paper to the *training schema modifications*. We organize modifications to training schemata differentiating between the following broad categories: model inputs, model targets, time series per model, computational budget (number of parameters and compute) and data augmentation. We refer to [27] for a comprehensive survey of data augmentation techniques for time series.




Figure 4: Taxonomy for Deep Learning for Time Series. We highlight which parts of the training schema were addressed in this paper.

Model Target. Modifying the definition of the model targets is a training schema modification that can potentially improve the performance of deep learning models for time series forecasting. The main distinction that can be made here is between out-of-sample targets (i.e. target is the unseen future time steps [2]) and in-sample targets (i.e. the target is a group of time steps that can occur in the past

[4, 10]). It is important to note that by model target modifications we do not mean transforming the *target values of the time steps*, but rather choosing *which time steps* are to be predicted. Out-of-sample target techniques include employing a rolling window and a non-rolling window for subsequent blocks [4]. In-sample target techniques, on the other hand, can include strategies such as randomly hiding tokens or patches within the input sequence [10, 4].

Time Series per Model. Local models focus on learning and forecasting from individual time series, capturing patterns and trends specific to each series [2]. In contrast, global models are designed to learn from multiple time series concurrently, identifying common patterns and dependencies across series to improve generalization [2]. By leveraging global models and incorporating techniques such as pre-training or zero-shot learning, researchers can harness shared knowledge across time series to potentially enhance forecasting performance and adapt more effectively to new or unseen time series data [34, 22]. On the other hand, local models are tailored to the unique properties of the time series we wish to predict [2].

We note the benchmarks defined in Informer [35], FEDformer [36] and Autoformer [29] are all benchmarks for local models. A famous example of global models and global model benchmarks is the research tackling the M4 and M5 competitions [15, 16].

Model Input. Several strategies have been proposed in the literature to augment model inputs. These strategies include altering input token dimensionality, such as representing one token for a single time step or employing patching techniques (i.e. one token represents multiple consecutive time steps [20, 31]); selecting the input domain, for example in the time domain or frequency domain at the model level [27] or at the model component level [36]; applying input scaling methods, such as normalizing the data or retaining the original scale [32]; and incorporating input extensions, which involve using raw input data as is and adding domain-specific knowledge, like time embeddings [11, 18].

Number of Parameters and Compute Budget. Classical training regimes often prioritize simpler models and/or fewer training epochs, whereas modern regimes leverage larger models and extended training duration [17]. Additionally, examining the relationship between FLOPs (floating-point operations) and model performance, rather than merely focusing on the number of training epochs, can provide valuable insights into the computational efficiency of the chosen training regime [9, 7].

This taxonomy can be used to drive future research and identify other gaps in the time series forecasting literature for deep learning models.

6 Conclusion

Contributions. In conclusion, our study demonstrates that epoch-wise deep double descent can manifest in time series data from standard benchmarks, which calls into question the prevalent practice of early-stopping with low patience and limited training epochs when working with long sequence time series data. Furthermore, we attain new state-of-the-art performance for Transformers in long sequence time series forecasting and provide evidence that numerous existing state-of-the-art Transformer-based models for this task have more potential than what was currently believed. Lastly, we present a coherent framework to classify alterations in deep learning for time series and offer a more comprehensive overview of training schema modifications. This paper builds on, and is complementary to, the model and data augmentation literature in the field and its main goal is to highlight the potential of researching the training schema of deep learning models for time series.

Broader Impacts We briefly discuss the broader implications of our work, considering potential drawbacks. One concern is the environmental impact due to the increased computational requirements for training deep learning models for many more epochs as currently believed necessary, which could lead to a rise in CO2 emissions. Another consideration is that the growing reliance on computationally expensive training schemata may create barriers for researchers with limited access to computational resources or proprietary data, potentially leading to a disparity in research opportunities across the scientific community.

Future Research Opportunities. This study opens up new avenues for future research opportunities and encourages the exploration of innovative training schema techniques for time series forecasting tasks. We believe the following topics would be valuable contributions to the deep learning literature for time series field: *i.* whether the scaling laws seen in [9] and [7] for language models also hold

in the time series domain, *ii.* how pre-training time series models on large datasets affects global models, and *iii.* statistically studying the properties of time series datasets and whether they can be linked to the shape of the validation loss curve.

References

- [1] Mikhail Belkin, Daniel Hsu, Siyuan Ma, and Soumik Mandal. Reconciling modern machine learning and the bias-variance trade-off. *CoRR*, abs/1812.11118, 2018.
- [2] Konstantinos Benidis, Syama Sundar Rangapuram, Valentin Flunkert, Yuyang Wang, Danielle C. Maddix, Ali Caner Türkmen, Jan Gasthaus, Michael Bohlke-Schneider, David Salinas, Lorenzo Stella, François-Xavier Aubet, Laurent Callot, and Tim Januschowski. Deep learning for time series forecasting: Tutorial and literature survey. *ACM Comput. Surv.*, 55(6):121:1–121:36, 2023.
- [3] Sébastien Bubeck and Mark Sellke. A universal law of robustness via isoperimetry. In Marc’Aurelio Ranzato, Alina Beygelzimer, Yann N. Dauphin, Percy Liang, and Jennifer Wortman Vaughan, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 34: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2021, NeurIPS 2021, December 6-14, 2021, virtual*, pages 28811–28822, 2021.
- [4] Vítor Cerqueira, Luís Torgo, and Igor Mozetic. Evaluating time series forecasting models: an empirical study on performance estimation methods. *Mach. Learn.*, 109(11):1997–2028, 2020.
- [5] Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. BERT: pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. In Jill Burstein, Christy Doran, and Tamar Solorio, editors, *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, NAACL-HLT 2019, Minneapolis, MN, USA, June 2-7, 2019, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, pages 4171–4186. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2019.
- [6] Shereen Elsayed, Daniela Thyssens, Ahmed Rashed, Lars Schmidt-Thieme, and Hadi Samer Jomaa. Do we really need deep learning models for time series forecasting? *CoRR*, abs/2101.02118, 2021.
- [7] Jordan Hoffmann, Sebastian Borgeaud, Arthur Mensch, Elena Buchatskaya, Trevor Cai, Eliza Rutherford, Diego de Las Casas, Lisa Anne Hendricks, Johannes Welbl, Aidan Clark, Tom Hennigan, Eric Noland, Katie Millican, George van den Driessche, Bogdan Damoc, Aurelia Guy, Simon Osindero, Karen Simonyan, Erich Elsen, Jack W. Rae, Oriol Vinyals, and Laurent Sifre. Training compute-optimal large language models. *CoRR*, abs/2203.15556, 2022.
- [8] R.J. Hyndman and G. Athanasopoulos. *Forecasting: principles and practice*. OTexts, 2014.
- [9] Jared Kaplan, Sam McCandlish, Tom Henighan, Tom B. Brown, Benjamin Chess, Rewon Child, Scott Gray, Alec Radford, Jeffrey Wu, and Dario Amodei. Scaling laws for neural language models. *CoRR*, abs/2001.08361, 2020.
- [10] Zhe Li, Zhongwen Rao, Lujia Pan, Pengyun Wang, and Zenglin Xu. Ti-mae: Self-supervised masked time series autoencoders. *CoRR*, abs/2301.08871, 2023.
- [11] Bryan Lim, Sercan Ömer Arik, Nicolas Loeff, and Tomas Pfister. Temporal fusion transformers for interpretable multi-horizon time series forecasting. *CoRR*, abs/1912.09363, 2019.
- [12] Shizhan Liu, Hang Yu, Cong Liao, Jianguo Li, Weiyao Lin, Alex X. Liu, and Schahram Dustdar. Pyraformer: Low-complexity pyramidal attention for long-range time series modeling and forecasting. In *The Tenth International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2022, Virtual Event, April 25-29, 2022*. OpenReview.net, 2022.
- [13] Yong Liu, Haixu Wu, Jianmin Wang, and Mingsheng Long. Non-stationary transformers: Rethinking the stationarity in time series forecasting. *CoRR*, abs/2205.14415, 2022.
- [14] Yuwen Liu, Dejuan Li, Shaohua Wan, Fan Wang, Wanchun Dou, Xiaolong Xu, Shancang Li, Rui Ma, and Lianyong Qi. A long short-term memory-based model for greenhouse climate prediction. *Int. J. Intell. Syst.*, 37(1):135–151, 2022.

- [15] Spyros Makridakis, Evangelos Spiliotis, and Vassilios Assimakopoulos. The m4 competition: 100,000 time series and 61 forecasting methods. *International Journal of Forecasting*, 36(1):54–74, 2020. M4 Competition.
- [16] Spyros Makridakis, Evangelos Spiliotis, and Vassilios Assimakopoulos. M5 accuracy competition: Results, findings, and conclusions. *International Journal of Forecasting*, 38(4):1346–1364, 2022. Special Issue: M5 competition.
- [17] Preetum Nakkiran, Gal Kaplun, Yamini Bansal, Tristan Yang, Boaz Barak, and Ilya Sutskever. Deep double descent: Where bigger models and more data hurt. In *8th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2020, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, April 26-30, 2020*. OpenReview.net, 2020.
- [18] Christoforos Nalmpantis and Dimitris Vrakas. Signal2vec: Time series embedding representation. In John MacIntyre, Lazaros S. Iliadis, Ilias Maglogiannis, and Chrisina Jayne, editors, *Engineering Applications of Neural Networks - 20th International Conference, EANN 2019, Hersonissos, Crete, Greece, May 24-26, 2019, Proceedings*, volume 1000 of *Communications in Computer and Information Science*, pages 80–90. Springer, 2019.
- [19] Jiquan Ngiam, Vijay Vasudevan, Benjamin Caine, Zhengdong Zhang, Hao-Tien Lewis Chiang, Jeffrey Ling, Rebecca Roelofs, Alex Bewley, Chenxi Liu, Ashish Venugopal, David J. Weiss, Ben Sapp, Zhifeng Chen, and Jonathon Shlens. Scene transformer: A unified architecture for predicting future trajectories of multiple agents. In *The Tenth International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2022, Virtual Event, April 25-29, 2022*. OpenReview.net, 2022.
- [20] Yuqi Nie, Nam H. Nguyen, Phanwadee Sinthong, and Jayant Kalagnanam. A time series is worth 64 words: Long-term forecasting with transformers. *CoRR*, abs/2211.14730, 2022.
- [21] Miquel Noguer i Alonso and Sonam Srivastava. The shape of performance curve in financial time series. *SSRN Electron. J.*, 2021.
- [22] Bernardo Pérez Orozco and Stephen J. Roberts. Zero-shot and few-shot time series forecasting with ordinal regression recurrent neural networks. In *28th European Symposium on Artificial Neural Networks, Computational Intelligence and Machine Learning, ESANN 2020, Bruges, Belgium, October 2-4, 2020*, pages 503–508, 2020.
- [23] Long Ouyang, Jeff Wu, Xu Jiang, Diogo Almeida, Carroll L. Wainwright, Pamela Mishkin, Chong Zhang, Sandhini Agarwal, Katarina Slama, Alex Ray, John Schulman, Jacob Hilton, Fraser Kelton, Luke Miller, Maddie Simens, Amanda Askell, Peter Welinder, Paul F. Christiano, Jan Leike, and Ryan Lowe. Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback. *CoRR*, abs/2203.02155, 2022.
- [24] Cory Stephenson and Tyler Lee. When and how epochwise double descent happens. *CoRR*, abs/2108.12006, 2021.
- [25] Hugo Touvron, Thibaut Lavril, Gautier Izacard, Xavier Martinet, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Timothée Lacroix, Baptiste Rozière, Naman Goyal, Eric Hambro, Faisal Azhar, Aurelien Rodriguez, Armand Joulin, Edouard Grave, and Guillaume Lample. Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models, 2023.
- [26] Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N. Gomez, Lukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. Attention is all you need. In Isabelle Guyon, Ulrike von Luxburg, Samy Bengio, Hanna M. Wallach, Rob Fergus, S. V. N. Vishwanathan, and Roman Garnett, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 30: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2017, December 4-9, 2017, Long Beach, CA, USA*, pages 5998–6008, 2017.
- [27] Qingsong Wen, Liang Sun, Fan Yang, Xiaomin Song, Jingkun Gao, Xue Wang, and Huan Xu. Time series data augmentation for deep learning: A survey. In Zhi-Hua Zhou, editor, *Proceedings of the Thirtieth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI 2021, Virtual Event / Montreal, Canada, 19-27 August 2021*, pages 4653–4660. ijcai.org, 2021.

- [28] Qingsong Wen, Tian Zhou, Chaoli Zhang, Weiqi Chen, Ziqing Ma, Junchi Yan, and Liang Sun. Transformers in time series: A survey. *CoRR*, abs/2202.07125, 2022.
- [29] Haixu Wu, Jiehui Xu, Jianmin Wang, and Mingsheng Long. Autoformer: Decomposition transformers with auto-correlation for long-term series forecasting. In Marc’Aurelio Ranzato, Alina Beygelzimer, Yann N. Dauphin, Percy Liang, and Jennifer Wortman Vaughan, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 34: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2021, NeurIPS 2021, December 6-14, 2021, virtual*, pages 22419–22430, 2021.
- [30] Neo Wu, Bradley Green, Xue Ben, and Shawn O’Banion. Deep transformer models for time series forecasting: The influenza prevalence case. *CoRR*, abs/2001.08317, 2020.
- [31] Julong Young, Huiqiang Wang, Junhui Chen, Feihu Huang, and Jian Peng. Split time series into patches: Rethinking long-term series forecasting with dateformer. *CoRR*, abs/2207.05397, 2022.
- [32] Ailing Zeng, Muxi Chen, Lei Zhang, and Qiang Xu. Are transformers effective for time series forecasting? *CoRR*, abs/2205.13504, 2022.
- [33] Xiaohua Zhai, Alexander Kolesnikov, Neil Houlsby, and Lucas Beyer. Scaling vision transformers. *2022 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 1204–1213, 2021.
- [34] Xiang Zhang, Ziyuan Zhao, Theodoros Tsiligkaridis, and Marinka Zitnik. Self-supervised contrastive pre-training for time series via time-frequency consistency. *CoRR*, abs/2206.08496, 2022.
- [35] Haoyi Zhou, Shanghang Zhang, Jieqi Peng, Shuai Zhang, Jianxin Li, Hui Xiong, and Wancai Zhang. Informer: Beyond efficient transformer for long sequence time-series forecasting. In *Thirty-Fifth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, AAAI 2021, Thirty-Third Conference on Innovative Applications of Artificial Intelligence, IAAI 2021, The Eleventh Symposium on Educational Advances in Artificial Intelligence, EAAI 2021, Virtual Event, February 2-9, 2021*, pages 11106–11115. AAAI Press, 2021.
- [36] Tian Zhou, Ziqing Ma, Qingsong Wen, Xue Wang, Liang Sun, and Rong Jin. Fedformer: Frequency enhanced decomposed transformer for long-term series forecasting. In Kamalika Chaudhuri, Stefanie Jegelka, Le Song, Csaba Szepesvári, Gang Niu, and Sivan Sabato, editors, *International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2022, 17-23 July 2022, Baltimore, Maryland, USA*, volume 162 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 27268–27286. PMLR, 2022.