

Coherent forecast combination for linearly constrained multiple time series

Daniele Girolimetto*, Tommaso Di Fonzo

Department of Statistical Sciences, University of Padua, Padova 35121, Italy

Abstract

Linearly constrained multiple time series may be encountered in many practical contexts, such as the National Accounts (e.g., GDP disaggregated by Income, Expenditure and Output), and multilevel frameworks where the variables are organized according to hierarchies or groupings, like the total energy consumption of a country disaggregated by region and energy sources. In these cases, when multiple incoherent base forecasts for each individual variable are available, a forecast combination-and-reconciliation approach, that we call *coherent forecast combination*, may be used to improve the accuracy of the base forecasts and achieve coherence in the final result. In this paper, we develop an optimization-based technique that combines multiple unbiased base forecasts while assuring the constraints valid for the series. We present closed form expressions for the coherent combined forecast vector and its error covariance matrix in the general case where a different number of forecasts is available for each variable. We also discuss practical issues related to the covariance matrix that is part of the optimal solution. Through simulations and a forecasting experiment on the daily Australian electricity generation hierarchical time series, we show that the proposed methodology, in addition to adhering to sound statistical principles, may yield in significant improvement on base forecasts, single-task combination and single-expert reconciliation approaches as well.

Keywords: Forecasting; Linearly constrained multiple time series; Coherent forecasts; Forecast combination; Forecast reconciliation; Australian electricity generation

*Corresponding author

Email address: daniele.girolimetto@unipd.it (Daniele Girolimetto)

1. Introduction

Forecasting is a critical and important component of effective and informed decision-making in various domains, from business and economics to public policy and environmental management. However, selecting an appropriate forecasting approach is often a complex and time-consuming challenge, requiring significant resources to implement techniques that slightly improve accuracy. Despite these efforts, the intrinsic uncertainty associated with forecasting means that no method can guarantee the most accurate predictions for all scenarios. The challenge is particularly pronounced in contexts where multiple variables are interrelated through specific constraints, linear but not limited to. These relationships offer valuable supplementary information that can improve the accuracy, but they also introduce additional complexity into the forecasting process.

Many real-world forecasting scenarios involve data structures with multiple variables linked by constraints (Athanasopoulos et al., 2024). This is common in National Accounts systems, where aggregates like GDP are broken down into components from Income, Expenditure and Output sides (Di Fonzo and Girolimetto, 2023), or in hierarchical frameworks like the total electricity demand and power generation of a country, which is disaggregated by regions and energy sources (Ben Taieb et al., 2021, Panagiotelis et al., 2023). In these cases, when multiple forecasts of the individual variables are available, a forecast combination-and-reconciliation approach, that we call *coherent forecast combination*, may be used to improve the accuracy of individual forecasts while ensuring that the final forecasts satisfy the constraints. For instance, when base, i.e., possibly incoherent multiple forecasts, are available for various components of a constrained time series, these forecasts can be combined and reconciled to produce coherent and more accurate predictions. This paper investigates the problem of combining forecasts for multiple time series linked by linear constraints, focusing on deriving a coherent forecast combination. Specifically, the study examines how to optimally assign combination weights to base forecasts such that the final combined forecast is both coherent (i.e., consistent with the underlying constraints) and exhibits improved accuracy. It is important to note that the generation of the initial base forecasts is outside the scope of this study, as these forecasts may be produced through various methodologies.

The classical univariate forecast combination approach (Bates and Granger, 1969, Clemen, 1989, Timmermann, 2006, Wang et al., 2024) considers each time series separately, by using only forecasts of that variable, according to a local approach. In contrast, global forecast combination techniques consider multiple time series simultaneously, using information across series and common patterns available in the forecast errors to improve accuracy (Thompson et al., 2024). Although standard (univariate) forecast combination approaches focus on using local information to fit the weights, i.e., information that only concerns the target forecast, by its nature forecast reconciliation (Hyndman

et al., 2011) is a ‘global’ approach, insofar it derives the forecast of a single variable belonging to a constrained structure, by using information coming from the forecasts of all variables. The literature on forecast reconciliation has extensively explored this idea, methodologically formalizing the problem and demonstrating its significant empirical benefits across various applications (see Wickramasuriya et al., 2019, Ben Taieb et al., 2021, Girolimetto et al., 2024, among many others).

Some authors have investigated whether combining forecasts generated from different models can improve the forecast accuracy of hierarchical time series rather than individual models (Spiliotis et al., 2019, Yang and Zhang, 2019, Goehry et al., 2020, Mohamed, 2023, Rostami-Tabar and Hyndman, 2024, Zhang et al., 2024), and similar research questions, related to general linearly constrained multiple time series, have been addressed in engineering (Porrill, 1988, Sun and Deng, 2004). Notably, Hollyman et al. (2021) and Di Fonzo and Girolimetto (2024) propose a reconciliation approach that focuses on combining forecasts across sub-hierarchical structures. However, they do not address the integration of different forecasting models within a unified combination framework, limiting the scope of their reconciliation efforts to sub-hierarchical models without considering the potential of broader model combinations.

In this paper, we follow up on an insight of Bates and Granger (1969), who wrote: “*Work by Stone et al. (1942) has made use of ideas rather similar to these, though their work related only to making improved estimates of past national income figures for the U.K. and did not tackle forecasting problems*”. We show that integrating their linear forecast combination approach with the constrained multivariate least-squares adjustment setting developed by Stone et al. (1942), results in a closed-form expression that provides optimal combined and coherent forecasts for multiple linearly constrained time series. This new result unifies linear forecast reconciliation and combination in a simultaneous and statistically justified way, ensuring that the forecasts are both accurate and coherent, which is particularly valuable in applications where the integrity of the forecast structure is crucial.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we set the notation and consider different representations of the problem. Section 3 describes the model linking the multiple base forecasts to the target linearly constrained forecast vector. The methodological analysis, including the closed-form solution for optimal coherent forecast combination and its covariance matrix, is presented in Section 4. Section 5 discusses practical issues related to the estimation of the covariance matrix. Insights into the empirical performance of the newly proposed methodology are presented in Section 6, that describes a Monte-Carlo experiment, and in Section 7, where an application on forecasting the daily time series of the Australian electricity generation is discussed. Finally, Section 8 presents conclusions and indications for future research. Appendices A-G contain supplementary theoretical materials, as well as tables and graphs related to the empirical applications.

2. Notation and preliminaries

We use lower case bold letters to denote column vectors, e.g., $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N$, and upper case bold letters to denote matrices, e.g., $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times K}$. An all-one vector of dimension N is denoted as $\mathbf{1}_N$. We use \mathbf{I}_N to denote the $(N \times N)$ identity matrix, and $\mathbf{0}_{(N \times K)}$ to denote the $(N \times K)$ zero matrix. To specify that a vector \mathbf{x} is non-negative for all its elements, we write $\mathbf{x} \succeq \mathbf{0}_{(N \times 1)}$. For matrices \mathbf{A} , $\mathbf{A} \succeq \mathbf{0}$ means that \mathbf{A} is positive semi-definite. Table 1 summarizes the notation used throughout the paper.

Table 1: List of symbols used in the paper.

Symbol	Description
$n_u, n_b,$ n, p	Scalars denoting the number of constrained (upper), free (bottom), total variables, respectively, and the number of forecast experts.
i, k	Indices running on the variables, $i, k = 1, \dots, n$.
j, l	Indices running on the forecast experts, $j, l = 1, \dots, p$.
n_j	Scalar denoting the number of variables for which forecasts produced by the j -th expert are available, $1 \leq n_j \leq n$.
p_i	Scalar denoting the number of forecast experts available for the i -th variable, $1 \leq p_i \leq p$, with $p = \max_{i=1, \dots, n} p_i$.
m	Scalar denoting the total number of available forecasts produced by p experts for n variables: $m = \sum_{j=1}^p n_j = \sum_{i=1}^n p_i$, $n \leq m \leq np$. When $n_j = n \forall j$, i.e., $p_i = p \forall i$, $m = np$ ('balanced' case).
y_i	Target forecast for the i -th variable.
\mathbf{u}	$(n_u \times 1)$ vector of constrained (upper) variables.
\mathbf{b}	$(n_b \times 1)$ vector of free (bottom) variables.
\mathbf{A}	$(n_u \times n_b)$ linear combination matrix mapping \mathbf{b} into \mathbf{u} : $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{b}$.
\mathbf{C}	$(n_u \times n)$ zero-constraints matrix: $\mathbf{C} = [\mathbf{I}_{n_u} \quad -\mathbf{A}]$.
\mathbf{y}	$(n \times 1)$ target forecast vector: $\mathbf{y} = [\mathbf{u}^\top \quad \mathbf{b}^\top]^\top$, by definition coherent ($\mathbf{C}\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{0}_{(n_u \times 1)}$).
\mathbf{S}	$(n \times n_b)$ structural-like matrix: $\mathbf{S} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{A} \\ \mathbf{I}_{n_b} \end{bmatrix}$, such that $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{S}\mathbf{b}$.
\hat{y}_i^j	Unbiased base forecast of the i -th variable produced by the j -th expert.
$\hat{\mathbf{y}}^j$	$(n_j \times 1)$ vector of the base forecasts produced by the j -th expert.
$\hat{\mathbf{y}}_i$	$(p_i \times 1)$ vector of the base forecasts of the i -th variable.
$\hat{\mathbf{y}} \equiv \hat{\mathbf{y}}_{\text{be}}$	$[\hat{\mathbf{y}}^{1\top} \dots \hat{\mathbf{y}}^{j\top} \dots \hat{\mathbf{y}}^{p\top}]^\top$: $(m \times 1)$ vector of the base forecasts stacked <i>by-expert</i> (be).
$\hat{\mathbf{y}}_{\text{bv}}$	$[\hat{\mathbf{y}}_1^\top \dots \hat{\mathbf{y}}_i^\top \dots \hat{\mathbf{y}}_n^\top]^\top$: $(m \times 1)$ vector of the base forecasts stacked <i>by-variable</i> (bv).
$\hat{\mathbf{Y}}$	$[\hat{\mathbf{y}}^1 \dots \hat{\mathbf{y}}^j \dots \hat{\mathbf{y}}^p]$. If $n_j = n \forall j$ (i.e., 'balanced' case): $(n \times p)$ matrix containing the base forecasts produced by p different experts for the target vector \mathbf{y} . Each column denotes an expert $j = 1, \dots, p$, while each row denotes a variable $i = 1, \dots, n$. In this case, $\hat{\mathbf{y}} = \text{vec}(\hat{\mathbf{Y}})$.
$\hat{\mathbf{Y}}^\top$	$[\hat{\mathbf{y}}_1 \dots \hat{\mathbf{y}}_i \dots \hat{\mathbf{y}}_n]$. If $n_j = n \forall j$ (i.e., 'balanced' case): $(p \times n)$ matrix containing the base forecasts produced by p different experts for the target vector \mathbf{y} . Each column denotes a variable $i = 1, \dots, n$, while each row denotes an expert $j = 1, \dots, p$. In this case, $\hat{\mathbf{y}}_{\text{bv}} = \text{vec}(\hat{\mathbf{Y}}^\top)$.
\mathbf{P}	$(m \times m)$ permutation matrix such that $\mathbf{P}\hat{\mathbf{y}} = \hat{\mathbf{y}}_{\text{bv}}$. As $\mathbf{P}^{-1} = \mathbf{P}^\top$, $\hat{\mathbf{y}} = \mathbf{P}^\top \hat{\mathbf{y}}_{\text{bv}}$. If $n_j = n \forall j$ (i.e., 'balanced' case): $(np \times np)$ commutation matrix such that $\mathbf{P}\text{vec}(\hat{\mathbf{Y}}) = \text{vec}(\hat{\mathbf{Y}}^\top)$.
\mathbf{L}_j	$(n_j \times n)$ zero-one matrix selecting the entries of \mathbf{y} for which forecasts of expert j are available.
\mathbf{L}	$\text{Diag}(\mathbf{L}_1, \dots, \mathbf{L}_j, \dots, \mathbf{L}_p) \in \{0, 1\}^{m \times np}$. If $n_j = n \forall j$ (i.e., 'balanced' case): $\mathbf{L} = \mathbf{I}_{np}$.

Continued on next page

Table 1 – continued from previous page

Symbol	Description
\mathbf{K}	$\mathbf{L}(\mathbf{1}_p \otimes \mathbf{I}_n) = [\mathbf{L}_1^\top \dots \mathbf{L}_j^\top \dots \mathbf{L}_p^\top]^\top \in \{0, 1\}^{m \times n}$. If $n_j = n \forall j$ (i.e., ‘balanced’ case): $\mathbf{K} = \mathbf{1}_p \otimes \mathbf{I}_n$, $(np \times n)$ matrix such that $\mathbf{K}\mathbf{y} = \underbrace{[\mathbf{y}^\top \dots \mathbf{y}^\top]^\top}_{p \text{ times}} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{y} \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{y} \end{bmatrix}$.
\mathbf{J}	$\mathbf{PK} = \mathbf{PL}(\mathbf{1}_p \otimes \mathbf{I}_n) \in \{0, 1\}^{m \times n}$, such that $\mathbf{J}\mathbf{y} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{1}_{p_1} y_1 \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{1}_{p_n} y_n \end{bmatrix}$. If $n_j = n \forall j$ (i.e., ‘balanced’ case): $\mathbf{J} = \mathbf{I}_n \otimes \mathbf{1}_p$: $(np \times n)$ matrix such that $\mathbf{J}\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{y} \otimes \mathbf{1}_p$.
\mathbf{W}	$(m \times m)$ error covariance matrix of $\hat{\mathbf{y}}$.
\mathbf{W}_{jl}	$(n_j \times n_l)$ error cross-covariance matrix of $\hat{\mathbf{y}}^j$ and $\hat{\mathbf{y}}^l$.
$\mathbf{\Sigma}$	$(m \times m)$ error covariance matrix of $\hat{\mathbf{y}}_{\text{bv}}$. $\mathbf{\Sigma} = \mathbf{P}\mathbf{W}\mathbf{P}^\top$ and $\mathbf{W} = \mathbf{P}^\top \mathbf{\Sigma} \mathbf{P}$.
$\mathbf{\Sigma}_{ik}$	$(p_i \times p_k)$ error cross-covariance matrix of $\hat{\mathbf{y}}_i$ and $\hat{\mathbf{y}}_k$.
$\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^c$	$(n \times 1)$ vector of the multi-task combined forecasts. In general, these forecasts are incoherent: $\mathbf{C}\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^c \neq \mathbf{0}_{(n_u \times 1)}$.
$\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^j$	If $n_j = n$, $(n \times 1)$ vector of reconciled forecasts using the base forecasts produced by the j -th expert. $\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^j$ is by construction coherent: $\mathbf{C}\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^j = \mathbf{0}_{(n_u \times 1)}$.
$\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^c$	$(n \times 1)$ vector of the optimal coherent combined forecasts, by construction coherent: $\mathbf{C}\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^c = \mathbf{0}_{(n_u \times 1)}$.
$\mathbf{\Omega}$	$[\mathbf{\Omega}_1 \dots \mathbf{\Omega}_j \dots \mathbf{\Omega}_p]^\top$: $(m \times n)$ matrix given by the concatenation of the matrix combination weights $\mathbf{\Omega}_j \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n_j}$ of the multi-task forecast combination $\hat{\mathbf{y}}^c = \mathbf{\Omega}^\top \hat{\mathbf{y}} = \sum_{j=1}^p \mathbf{\Omega}_j \hat{\mathbf{y}}^j$ (by-expert formulation).
$\mathbf{\Gamma}$	$[\mathbf{\Gamma}_1 \dots \mathbf{\Gamma}_i \dots \mathbf{\Gamma}_n]^\top$: $(m \times n)$ matrix given by the concatenation of the matrix combination weights $\mathbf{\Gamma}_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p_i}$ of the multi-task forecast combination $\hat{\mathbf{y}}^c = \mathbf{\Gamma}^\top \hat{\mathbf{y}}_{\text{bv}} = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{\Gamma}_i \hat{\mathbf{y}}_i$ (by-variable formulation).
$\mathbf{\Psi}$	$[\mathbf{\Psi}_1 \dots \mathbf{\Psi}_j \dots \mathbf{\Psi}_p]^\top$: $(m \times n)$ matrix given by the concatenation of the matrix reconciliation weights $\mathbf{\Psi}_j \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n_j}$ of the coherent multi-task forecast combination $\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^c = \mathbf{\Psi}^\top \hat{\mathbf{y}} = \sum_{j=1}^p \mathbf{\Psi}_j \hat{\mathbf{y}}^j$ (by-expert formulation).
$\mathbf{\Phi}$	$[\mathbf{\Phi}_1 \dots \mathbf{\Phi}_i \dots \mathbf{\Phi}_n]^\top$: $(m \times n)$ matrix given by the concatenation of the matrix reconciliation weights $\mathbf{\Phi}_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p_i}$ of the coherent multi-task forecast combination $\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^c = \mathbf{\Phi}^\top \hat{\mathbf{y}}_{\text{bv}} = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{\Phi}_i \hat{\mathbf{y}}_i$ (by-variable formulation).
src	Sequential first-reconciliation-then-combination.
scr	Sequential first-combination-then-reconciliation.
occ	Optimal (minimum mean square error, MMSE) coherent linear combination.

2.1. Zero-constrained and structural representations of a general linearly constrained time series

Let $\mathbf{y}_t = [y_{1,t} \dots y_{i,t} \dots y_{n,t}]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be a vector of observed time series we are interested in forecasting, and assume that the time series is linearly constrained, in the sense that at every time t the n individual variables of \mathbf{y}_t must satisfy $n_u < n$ independent linear constraints. Without loss of generality, we assume that the n_u constraints are expressed in *zero-constrained form*, according to the homogeneous linear system:

$$\mathbf{C}\mathbf{y}_t = \mathbf{0}_{(n_u \times 1)}, \quad (1)$$

where $\mathbf{C} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_u \times n}$ is a zero-constraints matrix with full row rank¹.

Girolimetto and Di Fonzo (2024c) show that every general linearly constrained time series \mathbf{y}_t may be expressed as $\mathbf{y}_t = [\mathbf{u}_t^\top \ \mathbf{b}_t^\top]^\top$, i.e., stacking an ‘upper’ vector $\mathbf{u}_t \in \mathbb{R}^{n_u}$ and a ‘bottom’ vector $\mathbf{b}_t \in \mathbb{R}^{n_b}$, with $n = n_u + n_b$, where \mathbf{u}_t is a linear combination of the bottom time series \mathbf{b}_t : $\mathbf{u}_t = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{b}_t$. $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_u \times n_b}$ is the *linear combination matrix* mapping n_b free variables \mathbf{b}_t into n_u constrained variables \mathbf{u}_t . Then, denoting $\mathbf{C} = [\mathbf{I}_{n_u} \ -\mathbf{A}] \in \mathbb{R}^{n_u \times n}$ the zero-constraints matrix, and $\mathbf{S} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{A} \\ \mathbf{I}_{n_b} \end{bmatrix}$ the *structural-like matrix* (Girolimetto and Di Fonzo, 2024c), the constraints on \mathbf{y}_t may be equivalently expressed either as expression (1) or in *structural form*:

$$\mathbf{y}_t = \mathbf{S}\mathbf{b}_t. \quad (2)$$

For example, the left panel of Figure 1 shows a three-level hierarchical time series ($n = 7$, $n_u = 3$) $\mathbf{y}_t = [\mathbf{X}_t \ \mathbf{A}_t \ \mathbf{B}_t \ \mathbf{AA}_t \ \mathbf{AB}_t \ \mathbf{BA}_t \ \mathbf{BB}_t]^\top$, with

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{X} = \mathbf{AA} + \mathbf{AB} + \mathbf{BA} + \mathbf{BB} \\ \mathbf{A} = \mathbf{AA} + \mathbf{AB} \\ \mathbf{B} = \mathbf{BA} + \mathbf{BB} \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{C} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & -1 & -1 & -1 & -1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & -1 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & -1 & -1 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (3)$$

In this case, $\mathbf{u}_t = [\mathbf{X}_t \ \mathbf{A}_t \ \mathbf{B}_t]^\top$, $\mathbf{b}_t = [\mathbf{AA}_t \ \mathbf{AB}_t \ \mathbf{BA}_t \ \mathbf{BB}_t \ \mathbf{BC}_t]^\top$, and matrices \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{S} are easily deduced from (3):

$$\mathbf{A} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{S} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ \mathbf{I}_4 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (4)$$

This is not the case for the general linearly constrained structure shown in the right panel of Figure 1, consisting of two simple hierarchies that share the same top-level series, but with different bottom series. Denoting now $\mathbf{y}_t = [\mathbf{X}_t \ \mathbf{A}_t \ \mathbf{AA}_t \ \mathbf{AB}_t \ \mathbf{B}_t \ \mathbf{C}_t \ \mathbf{D}_t]^\top$, we may write:

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{X} = \mathbf{C} + \mathbf{D} \\ \mathbf{X} = \mathbf{AA} + \mathbf{AB} + \mathbf{B} \\ \mathbf{A} = \mathbf{AA} + \mathbf{AB} \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 & -1 & -1 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & -1 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{y}_t = \mathbf{0}_{(3 \times 1)}, \quad (5)$$

where the zero-constraints matrix has not the requested $[\mathbf{I}_{n_u} \ -\mathbf{A}]$ form. However, \mathbf{A} (and \mathbf{C}) may be obtained after simple operations on (5), shown in Girolimetto and Di Fonzo (2024c), resulting in:

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{X} = \mathbf{C} + \mathbf{D} \\ \mathbf{A} = -\mathbf{B} + \mathbf{AA} + \mathbf{AB} \\ \mathbf{AA} = -\mathbf{AB} - \mathbf{B} + \mathbf{C} + \mathbf{D} \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{A} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & -1 & 1 & 1 \\ -1 & -1 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (6)$$

¹We assume that these constraints are well defined throughout this paper, i.e., they are not in conflict with each other and there are no repeated constraints.




Figure 1: Two examples of linearly constrained time series. Left: a three-level genuine hierarchical structure. Right: a general linearly constrained multiple time series consisting of two simple hierarchies sharing the same top-level series.

with $n_u = 3$, $n_b = 4$, $\mathbf{u}_t = [\mathbf{X}_t \ A_t \ \mathbf{AA}_t]^\top$ and $\mathbf{b}_t = [\mathbf{AB}_t \ B_t \ C_t \ D_t]^\top$.

Starting with Athanasopoulos et al. (2009) and Hyndman et al. (2011), the *structural form* (2) is widely used in the literature on forecast reconciliation for genuine hierarchical/grouped time series (for a recent review, see Athanasopoulos et al., 2024). In fact, expression (2) has the merit of describing the relationships linking the free (bottom) and the constrained (upper) time series in a way that visually recalls a genuine hierarchical or grouped structure, by placing the aggregated series at higher levels than the bottom one, where the most disaggregated series take place. Moreover, this formulation allows the forecast reconciliation results to be developed through an unconstrained regression model, very simple to be dealt with. For this reason, although the zero-constrained form is more general², as the two formulations are perfectly equivalent, i.e., both bring to the same final results, this paper will also present expressions derived from the structural representation to provide a comprehensive overview of the different but equivalent approaches to the problem.

2.2. Base forecasts' organization: 'by-expert' and 'by-variable'

Suppose we have base forecasts of the individual n variables of the target vector $\mathbf{y}_{t+h} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, where $h \geq 1$ is the forecast horizon, produced by $p \geq 2$ experts³. In general, we admit that the forecasts provided by each expert might refer to different sets of individual variables, and denote them by the vectors $\hat{\mathbf{y}}_{t+h}^1 \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1}$, \dots , $\hat{\mathbf{y}}_{t+h}^p \in \mathbb{R}^{n_p}$, with $1 \leq n_j \leq n$, $j = 1, \dots, p$. In analogy to the literature on panel data models (Baltagi, 2021), we will refer to this situation as the 'unbalanced case'. To simplify the notation, in the following we consider a single prediction horizon, say $h = 1$, and omit the subscript $t + 1$. In other terms, $y_i \equiv y_{i,t+1}$, $\hat{y}_i^j \equiv \hat{y}_{i,t+1}^j$, $\mathbf{y} \equiv \mathbf{y}_{t+1}$ and $\hat{\mathbf{y}}^j \equiv \hat{\mathbf{y}}_{t+1}^j$. Let $\hat{\mathbf{y}}_i \in \mathbb{R}^{p_i}$ be the vector of the base forecasts available for the i -th variable, where $1 \leq p_i \leq p$, with $p = \max_{i=1, \dots, n} p_i$,

²Whereas the structural representation of a genuine hierarchical/grouped time series can be transformed into a zero-constrained form in a straightforward way, for a general linearly constrained time series, with a complex and not genuine hierarchical or grouped structure, finding the structural-like representation may be a complex task. On this point, see Girolimetto and Di Fonzo (2024c).

³We use the term 'expert' as a synonym for 'agent' or 'model'.

and denote $m = \sum_{j=1}^p n_j = \sum_{i=1}^n p_i$ the total number of available forecasts (i.e., produced by p experts for n individual variables). All the available base forecasts may be grouped into a single $(m \times 1)$ vector, obtained by concatenation of either $\hat{\mathbf{y}}^j$, $j = 1, \dots, p$, or $\hat{\mathbf{y}}_i$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, vectors. In the former case, the base forecasts are said to be organized *by-expert*, in the latter *by-variable* (bv):

$$\hat{\mathbf{y}} \equiv \hat{\mathbf{y}}_{\text{be}} = \begin{bmatrix} \hat{\mathbf{y}}^1 \\ \vdots \\ \hat{\mathbf{y}}^j \\ \vdots \\ \hat{\mathbf{y}}^p \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^m, \quad \hat{\mathbf{y}}_{\text{bv}} = \begin{bmatrix} \hat{\mathbf{y}}_1 \\ \vdots \\ \hat{\mathbf{y}}_i \\ \vdots \\ \hat{\mathbf{y}}_n \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^m. \quad (7)$$

As in the rest of the paper we mainly refer to the by-expert data organization, we omit the subscript ‘be’ and use $\hat{\mathbf{y}}$ instead of $\hat{\mathbf{y}}_{\text{be}}$. Passing from a by-expert to a by-variable data organization can be achieved through a permutation matrix (Magnus and Neudecker, 2019), i.e., a square matrix $\mathbf{P} \in \{0, 1\}^{m \times m}$ obtained from the same size identity matrix by a permutation of rows, such that $\mathbf{P}\hat{\mathbf{y}} = \hat{\mathbf{y}}_{\text{bv}}$. In addition, as $\mathbf{P}^{-1} = \mathbf{P}^\top$, it is $\hat{\mathbf{y}} = \mathbf{P}^\top \hat{\mathbf{y}}_{\text{bv}}$.

Balanced case

It is worth mentioning that this notation encompasses the complete case where $n_j = n \forall j$ (i.e., $p_i = p \forall i$, $m = np$). In this case, that we call ‘balanced’, the available base forecasts may be organized as a $(n \times p)$ matrix $\hat{\mathbf{Y}}$, whose j -th column contains the n forecasts provided by the j -th individual expert (by-expert organization):

$$\hat{\mathbf{Y}} = \begin{bmatrix} \hat{\mathbf{y}}_1^1 & \dots & \hat{\mathbf{y}}_1^j & \dots & \hat{\mathbf{y}}_1^p \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \hat{\mathbf{y}}_i^1 & \dots & \hat{\mathbf{y}}_i^j & \dots & \hat{\mathbf{y}}_i^p \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \hat{\mathbf{y}}_n^1 & \dots & \hat{\mathbf{y}}_n^j & \dots & \hat{\mathbf{y}}_n^p \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \hat{\mathbf{y}}^1 & \dots & \hat{\mathbf{y}}^j & \dots & \hat{\mathbf{y}}^p \end{bmatrix}. \quad (8)$$

An equivalent by-variable organization of the available base forecasts is obtained by considering the transpose of matrix $\hat{\mathbf{Y}}$:

$$\hat{\mathbf{Y}}^\top = \begin{bmatrix} \hat{\mathbf{y}}_1 & \dots & \hat{\mathbf{y}}_i & \dots & \hat{\mathbf{y}}_n \end{bmatrix}, \quad (9)$$

where $\hat{\mathbf{y}}_i \in \mathbb{R}^p$ contains the base forecasts of the i -th individual variable provided by the p experts. In this case, moving from a by-expert to a by-variable data organization can be achieved through a commutation matrix $\mathbf{P} \in \{0, 1\}^{np \times np}$ (Magnus and Neudecker, 2019), such that $\mathbf{P}\text{vec}(\hat{\mathbf{Y}}) = \text{vec}(\hat{\mathbf{Y}}^\top)$.

3. Method and theoretical properties

Coherent multi-task forecast combination for a linearly constrained multivariate time series, or specific cases thereof, like hierarchical or grouped time series, is the process of combining multiple experts' base forecasts with the information on the relationships linking the individual variables of the series.

If only the i -th scalar variable is considered (i.e., $n = 1$ and $p \geq 2$), and a linear solution \hat{y}_i^c is looked for, we face a classical problem of single-task linear forecast combination (Bates and Granger, 1969), without any coherence issue. In this case, the combined forecasts \hat{y}_i^c is the result of a *local* (Thompson et al., 2024) linear combination across the p experts of the same variable:

$$\hat{y}_i^c = \boldsymbol{\omega}_i^\top \hat{\mathbf{y}}_i = \sum_{j=1}^p \omega_{ij} \hat{y}_i^j, \quad (10)$$

where $\hat{\mathbf{y}}_i \in \mathbb{R}^p$ and $\boldsymbol{\omega}_i \in \mathbb{R}^p$ is a vector of combination weights⁴.

On the other hand, if only the base forecasts of the j -th single expert are available (i.e., $p = 1$) for all the $n > 1$ individual variables of \mathbf{y} , we face a classical problem of single-expert forecast reconciliation. When looking for a linear solution, the reconciled (i.e., coherent) forecast vector may be expressed as

$$\tilde{\mathbf{y}} = \mathbf{M} \hat{\mathbf{y}}^j \quad \rightarrow \quad \tilde{y}_i = m_{ii} \hat{y}_i^j + \sum_{\substack{k=1 \\ k \neq i}}^n m_{ik} \hat{y}_k^j, \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \quad (11)$$

where $\hat{\mathbf{y}}^j \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and $\mathbf{M} = \{m_{ik}\} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is a projection matrix depending on the base forecast errors' covariance matrix and the zero constraints matrix \mathbf{C} (Panagiotelis et al., 2021, Di Fonzo and Girolimetto, 2023). The single-variable formulation on the rhs of expression (11) makes it clear the *global* nature (Thompson et al., 2024) of the forecast combination resulting in the single-expert linear reconciliation, in the sense that the reconciled forecast of the i -th individual variable is given by the linear combination of the base forecasts of the same variable, \hat{y}_i^j , **and** of all the remaining $n - 1$ individual variables.

Continuing along this line of reasoning, we might consider the extension to the multi-task framework of the single-task linear forecast combination approach in expression (10). Useful references are Sun and Deng (2004), who deal with data assimilation problems, Keller and Olkin (2004) and Lavancier and Rochet (2016), extending the statistical theory on the combination of multiple estimators of the same vector of parameters. The results found by Sun and Deng (2004) and Lavancier and Rochet (2016) may be used to express a global multi-task combined forecast $\hat{\mathbf{y}}^c$ which

⁴For a comprehensive review of the many weighting schemes proposed in the forecasting literature, see Timmermann (2006) and Wang et al. (2024).

Table 2: Combination approaches for single- and multi-task forecast combination, single-expert forecast reconciliation, and coherent forecast combination. The term **local** denotes the combination of multiple base forecasts of one individual variable, while **global** refers to the combination of either single or multiple experts base forecasts of all n individual variables.

Combination approaches	Forecast	Coherence	Nature of the combined forecast
Single-task forecast combination	\hat{y}_i^c	NO	→ Local, multiple experts
Forecast reconciliation	\tilde{y}	YES	→ Global, single expert
Multi-task forecast combination	\hat{y}^c	NO	} → Global, multiple experts
Sequential combination-reconciliation	\tilde{y}_{scr}^c	YES	
Sequential reconciliation-combination	\tilde{y}_{src}^c	YES	
Optimal coherent combination	\tilde{y}^c	YES	

exploits all the base forecasts of all variables, and is more accurate than any individual or multiple base forecasts. Surprisingly, these papers appear to have had a limited impact on research on forecast combination and we aim to address this gap.

However, it should be noted that, if the variable to be forecast is linearly constrained, there is no guarantee that the outcome obtained following the approaches so far is coherent. In other terms, in general it is $C\hat{y}^c \neq \mathbf{0}_{(n_u \times 1)}$. A possible, practical solution to obtain coherent forecasts is adopting a two-step procedure (*sequential combination-first-then-reconciliation*, scr), consisting of performing the reconciliation of \hat{y}^c in order to finalize the coherent combination forecasting process (see Rostami-Tabar and Hyndman, 2024). Another simple two-step procedure, *sequential reconciliation-first-then-simple-average-combination*, src, may be developed as well. However, it is worth mentioning that the src approach is limited to the balanced case and does not apply to more general situations.

In this paper we address the problem of finding the optimal (in least squares sense) coherent-and-combined forecast vector $\tilde{y}^c \in \mathbb{R}^n$ of a linearly constrained time series, where the coherence condition is expressed as $C\tilde{y}^c = \mathbf{0}_{(n_u \times 1)}$. Table 2 schematically shows conceivable combination and reconciliation approaches in relation to the forecast coherence property and to the local/global nature of the final result.

3.1. Model and number of experts for each individual variable: The unbalanced case

To discuss the optimal coherent forecast combination methodology, we slightly abstract the problem and consider a data-fitting issue with equality constraints. As in the classical frameworks of Stone et al. (1942) and Bates and Granger (1969), we assume that each individual base forecast is unbiased, i.e., $E(\hat{y}_i^j) = E(y_i)$ $i = 1, \dots, n_j$, $j = 1, \dots, p_i$. Following Stone et al. (1942) (see also Byron, 1978, 1979), we state that the base forecast of the i -th variable produced by the j -th expert,

is the sum of the ‘true’, unknown target forecast and a zero-mean forecast error ε_i^j :

$$\widehat{y}_i^j = y_i + \varepsilon_i^j, \quad i = 1, \dots, n_j, \quad i = 1, \dots, p_i. \quad (12)$$

In the following, we discuss the unbalanced case⁵, occurring when for at least one index j , it is $n_j < n$, which means that the p experts do not produce base forecasts for each of the n variables. Denote \mathbf{L} the $(m \times np)$ selection matrix $\mathbf{L} = \text{Diag}(\mathbf{L}_1, \dots, \mathbf{L}_j, \dots, \mathbf{L}_p)$, where $\mathbf{L}_j \in \{0, 1\}^{n_j \times n}$, $j = 1, \dots, p$, selects the $n_j \leq n$ entries of \mathbf{y} for which base forecasts of the j -th expert are available⁶. Model (12) may now be grouped into the p linear models

$$\widehat{\mathbf{y}}^j = \mathbf{L}_j \mathbf{y} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^j, \quad j = 1, \dots, p, \quad (13)$$

where $\widehat{\mathbf{y}}^j \in \mathbb{R}^{n_j}$, and the base forecast errors $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^j \in \mathbb{R}^{n_j}$ are $(n_j \times 1)$ zero-mean random vectors, with $(n_j \times n_l)$ variance-covariance matrices $\mathbf{W}_{jl} = E[\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^j (\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^l)^\top] \in \mathbb{R}^{n_j \times n_l}$, $j, l = 1, \dots, p$. Denoting then

$$\widehat{\mathbf{y}} = \begin{bmatrix} \widehat{\mathbf{y}}^1 \\ \vdots \\ \widehat{\mathbf{y}}^j \\ \vdots \\ \widehat{\mathbf{y}}^p \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^m, \quad \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} = \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^1 \\ \vdots \\ \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^j \\ \vdots \\ \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^p \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^m, \quad (14)$$

the linear relationship linking all the available base forecasts $\widehat{\mathbf{y}}$ and the unknown target forecast vector \mathbf{y} can be expressed through the multiple regression model:

$$\widehat{\mathbf{y}} = \mathbf{K} \mathbf{y} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}, \quad (15)$$

where $\mathbf{K} = \mathbf{L} (\mathbf{1}_p \otimes \mathbf{I}_n) \in \{0, 1\}^{m \times np}$, and $\mathbf{W} = E(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^\top) \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ is a p.d. block-matrix

$$\mathbf{W} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{W}_1 & \cdots & \mathbf{W}_{1j} & \cdots & \mathbf{W}_{1p} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \mathbf{W}_{j1} & \cdots & \mathbf{W}_j & \cdots & \mathbf{W}_{jp} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \mathbf{W}_{p1} & \cdots & \mathbf{W}_{pj} & \cdots & \mathbf{W}_p \end{bmatrix}, \quad (16)$$

where $\mathbf{W}_j \equiv \mathbf{W}_{jj}$, $j = 1, \dots, p$. A simple numerical example is shown in Appendix C.

⁵The ‘balanced’ case (i.e., $n_j = n \forall j$, $p_i = p \forall i$) is presented in Appendix B.

⁶Clearly, if $n_j = n \forall j$, it is $\mathbf{L}_j = \mathbf{I}_n \forall j$, and $\mathbf{L} = \mathbf{I}_{np}$.

4. Optimal coherent forecast combination

Let $\mathbf{y} = [y_1 \dots y_i \dots y_n]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be the target forecast vector of a linearly constrained time series \mathbf{y}_t such that $\mathbf{C}\mathbf{y}_t = \mathbf{0}_{(n_u \times 1)}$. We are looking for a coherent forecast vector $\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^c$, i.e., $\mathbf{C}\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^c = \mathbf{0}_{(n_u \times 1)}$, which exploits all the available base forecasts and improves their accuracy. Forecast combination and reconciliation can be simultaneously dealt with through an optimization-based technique that combines the base forecasts of multiple individual experts $\hat{\mathbf{y}}^j$. By extending the well known procedure of least squares adjustment for a single vector of preliminary incoherent estimates (i.e., base forecasts) (Stone et al., 1942, Byron, 1978, 1979, Di Fonzo and Girolimetto, 2023) to the case of $p \geq 2$ vectors, the coherent combined forecast vector $\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^c$ can be expressed as a weighted sum of base forecasts from individual experts. This interesting result is shown by Theorem 1.

Theorem 1. Optimal linear coherent forecast combination $\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^c$

The minimum mean square error (MMSE) linear coherent combined forecast vector $\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^c$, obtained as solution to the linearly constrained quadratic program

$$\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^c = \arg \min_{\mathbf{y}} (\hat{\mathbf{y}} - \mathbf{K}\mathbf{y})^\top \mathbf{W}^{-1} (\hat{\mathbf{y}} - \mathbf{K}\mathbf{y}) \quad \text{s.t. } \mathbf{C}\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{0}_{(n_u \times 1)}, \quad (17)$$

is given by

$$\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^c = \Psi^\top \hat{\mathbf{y}} = \mathbf{M}\Omega^\top \hat{\mathbf{y}}, \quad (18)$$

with weight matrix $\Psi^\top = \mathbf{M}\Omega^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$, where

$$\mathbf{M} = \left[\mathbf{I}_n - \mathbf{W}_c \mathbf{C}^\top (\mathbf{C}\mathbf{W}_c \mathbf{C}^\top)^{-1} \mathbf{C} \right], \quad (19)$$

$$\Omega = \mathbf{W}^{-1} \mathbf{K} \mathbf{W}_c, \quad (20)$$

$$\mathbf{W}_c = \left(\mathbf{K}^\top \mathbf{W}^{-1} \mathbf{K} \right)^{-1}. \quad (21)$$

Proof. See Appendix A

The unbiasedness of $\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^c$ and an important property of its error covariance matrix are discussed in the following Corollary.

Corollary 1. Unbiasedness of $\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^c$ and a property of its error covariance matrix

Denoting $\boldsymbol{\mu} = E(\mathbf{y})$, the MMSE linear coherent combined forecast vector $\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^c$ is unbiased, i.e., $E(\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^c) = \boldsymbol{\mu}$, with error covariance matrix equal to:

$$\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_c = E \left[(\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^c - \mathbf{y})(\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^c - \mathbf{y})^\top \right] = \mathbf{M}\mathbf{W}_c. \quad (22)$$

In addition,

$$\mathbf{L}_j \widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_c \mathbf{L}_j^\top \preceq \mathbf{L}_j \mathbf{W}_c \mathbf{L}_j^\top \preceq \mathbf{W}_j, \quad j = 1, \dots, p. \quad (23)$$

Proof. See Appendix A

Remark 1. The coherency property of $\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^c$ can be easily verified by observing that $\mathbf{C}\mathbf{M} = \mathbf{0}_{(n_u \times n)}$. Then it follows $\mathbf{C}\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^c = \mathbf{C}\mathbf{M}\mathbf{\Omega}^\top \hat{\mathbf{y}} = \mathbf{0}_{(n_u \times 1)}$.

Remark 2. Denoting $\mathbf{\Psi} = [\mathbf{\Psi}_1 \dots \mathbf{\Psi}_j \dots \mathbf{\Psi}_p]^\top$, with $\mathbf{\Psi}_j \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n_j}$, $j = 1, \dots, p$, the MMSE linear coherent combined forecast vector can be expressed as

$$\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^c = \mathbf{\Psi}_1 \hat{\mathbf{y}}^1 + \dots + \mathbf{\Psi}_j \hat{\mathbf{y}}^j + \dots + \mathbf{\Psi}_p \hat{\mathbf{y}}^p = \sum_{j=1}^p \mathbf{\Psi}_j \hat{\mathbf{y}}^j. \quad (24)$$

It is worth noting that, due to the unbiasedness of the base forecasts, the weight matrices $\mathbf{\Psi}_j$'s have the following interesting property⁷:

$$\sum_{j=1}^p \mathbf{\Psi}_j \mathbf{L}_j = \mathbf{I}_n. \quad (25)$$

In the balanced case, i.e. $n_j = n \forall j$ and $p_i = p \forall i$, expression (25) simplifies to $\sum_{j=1}^p \mathbf{\Psi}_j = \mathbf{I}_n$. Again in this case, looking at the entries of the square weight matrices $\mathbf{\Psi}_j$ as

$$\mathbf{\Psi}_j = \begin{bmatrix} \psi_{11,j} & \dots & \psi_{1i,j} & \dots & \psi_{1n,j} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \psi_{i1,j} & \dots & \psi_{ii,j} & \dots & \psi_{in,j} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \psi_{n1,j} & \dots & \psi_{ni,j} & \dots & \psi_{nn,j} \end{bmatrix}, \quad j = 1, \dots, p,$$

the reconciled forecast of the i -th variable may be expressed as

$$\tilde{y}_i^c = \sum_{j=1}^p \sum_{k=1}^n \psi_{ik,j} \hat{y}_k^j = \sum_{j=1}^p \psi_{ii,j} \hat{y}_i^j + \sum_{j=1}^p \sum_{\substack{k=1 \\ k \neq i}}^n \psi_{ik,j} \hat{y}_k^j, \quad i = 1, \dots, n. \quad (26)$$

According to expression (26), the multi-task coherent combined forecast \tilde{y}_i^c is the sum of a ‘local’ forecast combination (Thompson et al., 2024), $\sum_{j=1}^p \psi_{ii,j} \hat{y}_i^j$, computed by using only the base forecasts of the i -th variable, plus an adjustment term that takes into account the base forecasts of all the remaining variables. This suggests that \tilde{y}_i^c can be interpreted as the result of a simple ‘global’ linear forecast combination method (Thompson et al., 2024).

Remark 3. Another interesting interpretation of $\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^c$ is obtained noting that expression (18) may be re-stated as $\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^c = \mathbf{M}\hat{\mathbf{y}}^c$, where

$$\hat{\mathbf{y}}^c = \mathbf{\Omega}^\top \hat{\mathbf{y}}. \quad (27)$$

⁷In fact, since $E(\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^c) = \mathbf{\Psi}^\top E(\hat{\mathbf{y}}) = \mathbf{\Psi}^\top \mathbf{K}E(\mathbf{y}) = E(\mathbf{y})$, it follows $\mathbf{\Psi}^\top \mathbf{K} = \mathbf{I}_n$, that corresponds to expression (25).

In line with the results found by Sun and Deng (2004) and Lavancier and Rochet (2016), we deduce that $\hat{\mathbf{y}}^c$ is the unbiased MMSE linear multi-task combination forecast of \mathbf{y} , with error covariance matrix given by expression (21), i.e.,

$$\mathbf{W}_c = E \left[(\hat{\mathbf{y}}^c - \mathbf{y})(\hat{\mathbf{y}}^c - \mathbf{y})^\top \right] = \left(\mathbf{K}^\top \mathbf{W}^{-1} \mathbf{K} \right)^{-1}.$$

In addition, it should be noted that $\hat{\mathbf{y}}^c$ is in general incoherent, i.e., $\mathbf{C}\hat{\mathbf{y}}^c \neq \mathbf{0}_{(n_u \times 1)}$, and matrix $\mathbf{M} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is an oblique projector from \mathbb{R}^n into the linear sub-space $\mathcal{S} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ spanned by the relationship $\mathbf{C}\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{0}_{(n_u \times 1)}$. Vector $\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^c$ can thus be seen as the projection of the incoherent forecast vector $\hat{\mathbf{y}}^c$ into $\mathcal{S} = \{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \mathbf{C}\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{0}_{(n_u \times 1)}\}$ (Panagiotelis et al., 2021). More precisely, $\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^c$ is the result of two successive transformations, the first mapping $\hat{\mathbf{y}}$ from the base forecasts space \mathbb{R}^m to the combined forecasts subspace $\mathcal{S}_c = \{\hat{\mathbf{y}}^c \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \hat{\mathbf{y}}^c = \mathbf{\Omega}^\top \hat{\mathbf{y}}\}$, the second projecting $\hat{\mathbf{y}}^c$ into the coherent subspace \mathcal{S} . The keypoint is that the error covariance matrix used in the latter projection is related to the error covariance matrix used in the former transformation, i.e., $\mathbf{W}_c = \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{W})$, where for any non-singular matrix $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$, $\mathbf{F} : \mathbb{R}^{m \times m} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is the matrix function $\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{X}) = (\mathbf{K}^\top \mathbf{X}^{-1} \mathbf{K})^{-1}$.

Remark 4. Theorem 1 was proved by adopting a constrained data fitting approach with base forecasts organized by-expert. Indeed, the same result may be obtained in other ways, depending on the base forecasts' organization (by-expert or by-variable), and the problem formulation (constrained data fitting problem or unconstrained structural form). In these equivalent proofs, summarized in Table 3 and developed in Appendix D, the choice of the forecast organization gives a different emphasis to the 'objects' that are combined in the final formula, i.e., base forecasts either from the j -th expert, $\hat{\mathbf{y}}^j$, collected into $\hat{\mathbf{y}}$, or of the i -th variable $\hat{\mathbf{y}}_i$, concatenated into vector $\hat{\mathbf{y}}_{\text{bv}}$.

The difference between constrained projection and structural approaches is more interesting from an interpretative point of view. Each approach has, in fact, some distinctive interesting features.

- The structural approach is based on a linear model that directly incorporates the constraints on the final forecasts, whose solution is found by minimizing the trace of the error covariance matrix $\tilde{\mathbf{W}}_c$. For a similar result in the cross-sectional forecast reconciliation, see Wickramasuriya et al. (2019) and Ando and Narita (2024). The coherent combined forecasts, either $\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^c = \mathbf{S}\mathbf{G}\hat{\mathbf{y}}$ or $\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^c = \mathbf{S}\mathbf{G}_{\text{bv}}\hat{\mathbf{y}}_{\text{bv}}$, depend on the organization of the adopted base forecasts. In both cases, first the combination forecast for a set of 'free' variables is computed, i.e., $\tilde{\mathbf{b}}^c = \mathbf{G}\hat{\mathbf{y}} = \mathbf{G}_{\text{bv}}\hat{\mathbf{y}}_{\text{bv}}$, and then the whole vector of coherent forecasts is obtained in a bottom-up fashion, through pre-multiplication by the structural matrix \mathbf{S} : $\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^c = \mathbf{S}\tilde{\mathbf{b}}^c$.
- As shown in Remark 3, the zero-constrained approach "splits" the coherent forecast combination methodology into two strictly linked steps: in the former, the MMSE combination of multiple forecast vectors is computed, i.e., $\hat{\mathbf{y}}^c$, in the latter this incoherent forecast vector is reconciled

Table 3: Equivalent formulations of Theorem 1 distinct by model representation and organization of base forecasts. The symbols are fully described in Table 1. The proof for the zero-constrained representation with by-expert formulation is in Appendix A. The remaining proofs are in Appendix D.

		Model representation	
		<i>zero-constrained</i>	<i>structural</i>
Base forecasts' organization	<i>by-expert</i>	$\hat{\mathbf{y}} = \mathbf{K}\mathbf{y} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}, \text{ s.t. } \mathbf{C}\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{0}$ $\begin{cases} \tilde{\mathbf{y}}^c = \arg \min_{\mathbf{y}} (\hat{\mathbf{y}} - \mathbf{K}\mathbf{y})^\top \mathbf{W}^{-1} (\hat{\mathbf{y}} - \mathbf{K}\mathbf{y}) \\ \text{s.t. } \mathbf{C}\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{0} \end{cases}$ $\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^c = \mathbf{M}\hat{\mathbf{y}} = \mathbf{M}\boldsymbol{\Omega}^\top \hat{\mathbf{y}}$ $\mathbf{M} = [\mathbf{I}_n - \mathbf{W}_c \mathbf{C}^\top (\mathbf{C}\mathbf{W}_c \mathbf{C}^\top)^{-1} \mathbf{C}]$ $\boldsymbol{\Omega} = \mathbf{W}^{-1} \mathbf{K} \mathbf{W}_c$ $\mathbf{W}_c = (\mathbf{K}^\top \mathbf{W}^{-1} \mathbf{K})^{-1},$ $\tilde{\mathbf{W}}_c = \mathbf{M} \mathbf{W}_c$ $\mathbf{L}_j \tilde{\mathbf{W}}_c \mathbf{L}_j^\top \preceq \mathbf{L}_j \mathbf{W}_c \mathbf{L}_j^\top \preceq \mathbf{W}_j, \quad j = 1, \dots, p$	$\hat{\mathbf{y}} = \mathbf{K}\mathbf{S}\mathbf{b} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$ $\begin{cases} \mathbf{G} = \arg \min_{\mathbf{G}} \text{tr} (\mathbf{S}\mathbf{G}\mathbf{W}\mathbf{G}^\top \mathbf{S}^\top) \\ \text{s.t. } \mathbf{G}\mathbf{K}\mathbf{S} = \mathbf{I}_{n_b} \end{cases}$ $\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^c = \mathbf{S}\mathbf{G}\hat{\mathbf{y}} = \tilde{\mathbf{S}}\mathbf{b},$ $\tilde{\mathbf{b}} = \mathbf{G}\hat{\mathbf{y}}$ $\mathbf{G} = (\mathbf{S}^\top \mathbf{W}_c^{-1} \mathbf{S})^{-1} \mathbf{S}^\top \mathbf{K}^\top \mathbf{W}^{-1}$ $\mathbf{W}_c = (\mathbf{K}^\top \mathbf{W}^{-1} \mathbf{K})^{-1}$ $\tilde{\mathbf{W}}_c = \mathbf{S} (\mathbf{S}^\top \mathbf{W}_c^{-1} \mathbf{S})^{-1} \mathbf{S}^\top$ $\mathbf{L}_j \tilde{\mathbf{W}}_c \mathbf{L}_j^\top \preceq \mathbf{W}_j, \quad j = 1, \dots, p$
	<i>by-variable</i>	$\hat{\mathbf{y}}_{\text{bv}} = \mathbf{J}\mathbf{y} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{\text{bv}}, \text{ s.t. } \mathbf{C}\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{0}$ $\begin{cases} \tilde{\mathbf{y}}^c = \arg \min_{\mathbf{y}} (\hat{\mathbf{y}} - \mathbf{J}\mathbf{y})^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} (\hat{\mathbf{y}} - \mathbf{J}\mathbf{y}) \\ \text{s.t. } \mathbf{C}\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{0} \end{cases}$ $\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^c = \mathbf{M}_{\text{bv}} \hat{\mathbf{y}}_{\text{bv}} = \mathbf{M}\boldsymbol{\Gamma}^\top \hat{\mathbf{y}}$ $\mathbf{M} = [\mathbf{I}_n - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_c \mathbf{C}^\top (\mathbf{C}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_c \mathbf{C}^\top)^{-1} \mathbf{C}]$ $\boldsymbol{\Gamma} = \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \mathbf{J} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_c$ $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_c = (\mathbf{J}^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \mathbf{J})^{-1},$ $\tilde{\mathbf{W}}_c = \mathbf{M} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_c$ $\mathbf{L}_j \tilde{\mathbf{W}}_c \mathbf{L}_j^\top \preceq \mathbf{L}_j \mathbf{W}_c \mathbf{L}_j^\top \preceq \mathbf{W}_j, \quad j = 1, \dots, p$	$\hat{\mathbf{y}}_{\text{bv}} = \mathbf{J}\mathbf{S}\mathbf{b} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{\text{bv}}$ $\begin{cases} \mathbf{G}_{\text{bv}} = \arg \min_{\mathbf{G}} \text{tr} (\mathbf{S}\mathbf{G}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}\mathbf{G}^\top \mathbf{S}^\top) \\ \text{s.t. } \mathbf{G}\mathbf{J}\mathbf{S} = \mathbf{I}_{n_b} \end{cases}$ $\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^c = \mathbf{S}\mathbf{G}_{\text{bv}} \hat{\mathbf{y}}_{\text{bv}} = \tilde{\mathbf{S}}\mathbf{b},$ $\tilde{\mathbf{b}} = \mathbf{G}_{\text{bv}} \hat{\mathbf{y}}_{\text{bv}}$ $\mathbf{G}_{\text{bv}} = (\mathbf{S}^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_c^{-1} \mathbf{S})^{-1} \mathbf{S}^\top \mathbf{J}^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1}$ $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_c = (\mathbf{J}^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \mathbf{J})^{-1}$ $\tilde{\mathbf{W}}_c = \mathbf{S} (\mathbf{S}^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_c^{-1} \mathbf{S})^{-1} \mathbf{S}^\top$ $\mathbf{L}_j \tilde{\mathbf{W}}_c \mathbf{L}_j^\top \preceq \mathbf{W}_j, \quad j = 1, \dots, p$

through an oblique projection onto a coherent subspace of \mathbb{R}^n , making use of \mathbf{W}_c , the error covariance matrix of $\hat{\mathbf{y}}^c$.

Remark 5. Expression (23) states that the base forecasts produced by a single expert ($\hat{\mathbf{y}}^j$) are always not better (i.e., the error covariance matrix is not ‘smaller’) than the corresponding multi-task combined forecast vector $\mathbf{L}_j \hat{\mathbf{y}}^c$, which in turn is not better than the corresponding subset of $\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^c$, i.e., $\mathbf{L}_j \tilde{\mathbf{y}}^c$. Moreover, since $\mathbf{L}_j = \mathbf{I}_n$ when $n_j = n$, then in the balanced case we have $\tilde{\mathbf{W}}_c \preceq \mathbf{W}_c \preceq \mathbf{W}_j$. In other terms - assuming that the base forecasts are unbiased and the error covariance matrix \mathbf{W} is known - simultaneously considering multiple incoherent forecasts and the constraints operating on the component of a multivariate time series, does not worsen (and in fact, hopefully improves on) the precision of both original (base) and combined (incoherent) forecasts.

In summary, according to Theorem 1 and Corollary 1, the problem of coherently combining the forecasts, produced by $p \geq 2$ experts, of the components of a linearly constrained multiple time series, is specified as that of determining the best estimator within the class of all unbiased estimators of the

mean of \mathbf{y} obtainable *via* linearly combining all the available base forecasts, the term “best” being used in the usual sense of the nonnegative definite partial ordering between the dispersion matrices of the forecast errors. Furthermore, the results have been obtained under the commonly assumed hypotheses that the base forecasts are unbiased, and that the joint dispersion matrix of the p forecast experts is known.

5. On the covariance matrix used by the coherent combination method

The choice of the forecast errors’ covariance matrix \mathbf{W} greatly influences the combination and reconciliation processes, as its properties determine how the base forecasts are combined, and then the nature of the final coherent forecasts. In the following, we first consider two notable patterns of this matrix, where the base forecasts’ error are assumed uncorrelated either across experts or across variables. Then, we deal with practical estimation issues, following an approach widely used in the context of forecast reconciliation, which makes use of the in-sample base forecasts’ errors, when available, to estimate matrix \mathbf{W} .

5.1. Uncorrelated forecast errors: block-diagonal \mathbf{W} and Σ

If the forecast errors are uncorrelated across the p experts, the covariance matrix \mathbf{W} has a block-diagonal form: $\mathbf{W} = \text{Diag}(\mathbf{W}_1, \dots, \mathbf{W}_j, \dots, \mathbf{W}_p)$. In this case, $\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^c$ is found as the solution to the linearly constrained quadratic program

$$\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^c = \arg \min_{\mathbf{y}} \sum_{j=1}^p (\hat{\mathbf{y}}^j - \mathbf{y})^\top \mathbf{W}_j^{-1} (\hat{\mathbf{y}}^j - \mathbf{y}) \quad \text{s.t. } \mathbf{C}\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{0}_{(n_u \times 1)}, \quad (28)$$

where the global loss function in expression (17) simplifies to the sum of p quadratic loss functions.

According to the traditional single-task forecast combination approach (Bates and Granger, 1969, Thompson et al., 2024), for each single variable i the combination weights are obtained by exploiting the relationships between \hat{y}_i^j and \hat{y}_i^l , with $\{j, l\} \in \{(j, l) \mid 1 \leq j, l \leq p, j \neq l\}$. We will show that this is a particular case of our general framework. To this end, it is convenient to adopt an organization ‘by-variable’ of the base forecasts (see Section 2.2), that is $\hat{\mathbf{y}}_{\text{bv}} = [\hat{\mathbf{y}}_1^\top \dots \hat{\mathbf{y}}_i^\top \dots \hat{\mathbf{y}}_n^\top]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^m$, where $\hat{\mathbf{y}}_i \in \mathbb{R}^{p_i}$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, is the vector of the base forecasts available for the i -th variable.

Denote $\Sigma = E[\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{\text{bv}} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{\text{bv}}^\top] \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ the covariance matrix of the forecast errors organized by-variable $\hat{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}}_{\text{bv}} = [\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_1^\top \dots \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i^\top \dots \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_n^\top]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^m$, and $\mathbf{J} = \mathbf{PK} \in \{0, 1\}^{m \times n}$. Noting that $\Sigma = \mathbf{P}\mathbf{W}\mathbf{P}^\top$, equivalent by-variable formulations of $\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^c$ in expression (18) are presented in Table 3. If we assume uncorrelated errors across the variables, the covariance matrix has a block-diagonal structure, i.e., $\Sigma = \text{Diag}(\Sigma_1, \dots, \Sigma_i, \dots, \Sigma_n)$, where Σ_i , $i = 1, \dots, n$, is the $(p_i \times p_i)$ forecast error covariance matrix for the i -th variable. In this case, after some simple calculations, we obtain $\hat{y}_i^c = \frac{\mathbf{1}_{p_i}^\top \Sigma_i^{-1}}{\mathbf{1}_{p_i}^\top \Sigma_i^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{p_i}} \hat{\mathbf{y}}_i$,

$i = 1, \dots, n$. In summary, if the forecast errors are uncorrelated across variables, each entry of the global combined forecast vector $\widehat{\mathbf{y}}^c$ corresponds to the single-variable optimally combined forecast: $\widehat{y}_i^c = \gamma_i^\top \widehat{\mathbf{y}}_i$, where $\gamma_i = \frac{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{p_i}}{\mathbf{1}_{p_i}^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{p_i}}$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, a well-known result dating back to Newbold and Granger (1974). However, when $\widehat{\mathbf{y}}^c$ is computed through the projection of the incoherent combined forecast vector $\widehat{\mathbf{y}}^c$ onto the linear space spanned by the constraints, i.e., when $\widehat{\mathbf{y}}^c$ is pre-multiplied by the projection matrix \mathbf{M} , the coherent combined forecast for each **single** variable is computed by combining the base forecasts of **all** variables, not only those of the variable in hand. Put in other terms, whereas \widehat{y}_i^c is the result of a local forecast combination, its coherent counterpart \widehat{y}_i^c is obtained as a global forecast combination.

5.2. Feasible estimates of the covariance matrix

In the previous sections we have always considered the covariance matrix as known, but in practice this rarely happens, and this matrix must be estimated somehow. For a forecast horizon $h = 1$, it seems sensible to exploit (if available) the in-sample forecast errors (residuals), given by⁸:

$$\widehat{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}}_t^j = \mathbf{L}_j \mathbf{y}_t - \widehat{\mathbf{y}}_t^j \in \mathbb{R}^{n_j}, \quad j = 1, \dots, p,$$

where $t = 1, \dots, T$, is the time index running on the training set used to estimate the base forecasts. This is a rather common practice in forecast reconciliation (Hyndman et al., 2016, Wickramasuriya et al., 2019), particularly when the available observations of the time series to be forecast are not long, and splitting the dataset into training, validation and test may result in a too short validation set. As for the classical combination, the use of an in-sample fit to determine the weights of the combination is not uncommon (Kapetanios et al., 2008, Bańbura et al., 2010).

Denoting $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}}_t = \left[\widehat{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}}_t^1 \top \quad \dots \quad \widehat{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}}_t^j \top \quad \dots \quad \widehat{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}}_t^p \top \right]^\top$, $t = 1, \dots, T$, the $(m \times 1)$ vector containing the in-sample forecast errors, a natural estimator of \mathbf{W} (and $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$) is the sample forecast MSE matrix: $\widehat{\mathbf{W}} = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \widehat{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}}_t \widehat{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}}_t^\top$ (and $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}} = \mathbf{P} \widehat{\mathbf{W}} \mathbf{P}^\top$). When dealing with $h > 1$, $\widehat{\mathbf{W}}_h$ is challenging to estimate (e.g., multi-step-ahead errors will not be independent) and we assume that $\widehat{\mathbf{W}}_h \propto \widehat{\mathbf{W}}$ as proposed in Wickramasuriya et al. (2019) and Ben Taieb et al. (2021). Moreover, when $m \gg T$, $\widehat{\mathbf{W}}$ and $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}$ are not well defined, and some regularization has to be adopted in order to recover a stable, non-singular covariance matrix. The natural choice is to consider the shrunk versions of the sample covariance matrices $\widehat{\mathbf{W}}$ and $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}$ towards their diagonal versions, that is:

$$\widehat{\mathbf{W}}_{\text{shr}} = \widehat{\lambda} \left(\mathbf{I}_n \odot \widehat{\mathbf{W}} \right) + \left(1 - \widehat{\lambda} \right) \widehat{\mathbf{W}} \rightarrow \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{\text{shr}} = \mathbf{P} \widehat{\mathbf{W}}_{\text{shr}} \mathbf{P}^\top, \quad (29)$$

⁸Equivalently, one may use the by-variable version of the in sample residuals, i.e., $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}}_{i,t} = y_{it} \mathbf{1}_{p_j} - \widehat{\mathbf{y}}_{i,t} \in \mathbb{R}^{p_j}$, $i = 1, \dots, n$.

where \odot denotes the Hadamard product and $\hat{\lambda}$ is an estimate of the coefficient of shrinkage intensity λ , $0 \leq \lambda \leq 1$ (Schäfer and Strimmer, 2005).

An alternative approach involves assuming uncorrelated errors across either experts or variables, which results in block-diagonal covariance matrices (see Section 5.1): in the former case $\widehat{\mathbf{W}}_{\text{bd}} = \text{Diag}(\widehat{\mathbf{W}}_1, \dots, \widehat{\mathbf{W}}_j, \dots, \widehat{\mathbf{W}}_p)$, with $\widehat{\mathbf{W}}_j = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \widehat{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}}_t^j \widehat{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}}_t^{j\top} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_j \times n_j}$, $j = 1, \dots, p$. In the latter case, $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{\text{bd}} = \text{Diag}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_1, \dots, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_i, \dots, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_n)$, with $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_i = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \widehat{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}}_{i,t} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}}_{i,t}^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{p_i \times p_i}$, $i = 1, \dots, n$. When $n_j > T$ for some expert j , or $p_i > T$ for some variable y_i , the estimates $\widehat{\mathbf{W}}_j$ and $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_i$ are not well defined. In this case, as usual, we can resort to the shrunk versions of these two matrices given by, respectively:

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\mathbf{W}}_{j,\text{shr}} &= \hat{\lambda}_j \left(\mathbf{I}_n \odot \widehat{\mathbf{W}}_j \right) + (1 - \hat{\lambda}_j) \widehat{\mathbf{W}}_j, & j = 1, \dots, p \\ \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{i,\text{shr}} &= \hat{\nu}_i \left(\mathbf{I}_n \odot \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_i \right) + (1 - \hat{\nu}_i) \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_i, & i = 1, \dots, n \end{aligned}$$

where $\hat{\lambda}_j$ and $\hat{\nu}_i$ are estimates of the coefficients of shrinkage intensity, respectively, λ_j and ν_i , $0 \leq \lambda_j \leq 1$ and $0 \leq \nu_i \leq 1$. Then, other two estimators can be considered: $\widehat{\mathbf{W}}_{\text{bd-shr}} = \text{Diag}(\widehat{\mathbf{W}}_{1,\text{shr}}, \dots, \widehat{\mathbf{W}}_{p,\text{shr}})$ and $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{\text{bd-shr}} = \text{Diag}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{1,\text{shr}}, \dots, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{n,\text{shr}})$.

6. A simulation experiment

In order to assess the performance of the proposed approach, a simulation experiment is run. The simulation framework, designed for a hierarchical multivariate time series, extends the univariate simulation experiment of Capistrán and Timmermann (2009) to a multivariate setting that accommodates for cross-sectional dependencies and linear constraints across series. The hierarchical structure of the series is the one on the left panel of Figure 1, including a total of $n = 7$ variables, with $n_b = 4$ bottom series, with aggregation and structural matrices \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{S} , respectively, given by (4).

Denote $t = 0, \dots, (T - 1)$, and $i = 1, \dots, n_b$, the indices running on, respectively, time periods and bottom series. The observed bottom time series are simulated from a simple two-factor model⁹: $b_{i,t+1} = F_{1,i,t+1} + F_{2,i,t+1} + \eta_{i,t+1}$, $i = 1, \dots, n_b$, where factors $F_{1,i}$ and $F_{2,i}$ come from a Vector AutoRegressive model of order 1, $\mathbf{F}_{i,t+1} = \boldsymbol{\Phi}_F \mathbf{F}_{i,t} + \boldsymbol{\xi}_{i,t+1}$, characterized by a diagonal coefficients' matrix $\boldsymbol{\Phi}_F$ and independent innovations $\boldsymbol{\xi}_{i,t+1} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}_{(2 \times 1)}, \mathbf{I}_2)$. In addition, $\boldsymbol{\eta}_{t+1} = \begin{bmatrix} \eta_{1,t+1} & \dots & \eta_{n_b,t+1} \end{bmatrix}^\top \sim \mathcal{N}_{n_b}(\mathbf{0}_{n_b \times 1}, \sigma_\eta^2 \mathbf{R})$, where $\sigma_\eta^2 = 1$ and \mathbf{R} is the correlation matrix of the bottom series obtained as the closest positive definite matrix to $\check{\mathbf{R}}$, with $\check{\rho}_{i,k} = U(-1, 1)$, $i \neq k$, with $U(-1, 1)$ denoting a Uniform distribution in $(-1, 1)$, and $\check{\rho}_{i,i} = 1$, $i, k = 1, \dots, n_b$. The n -variate

⁹This formulation is equivalent to expression (9) in Capistrán and Timmermann (2009), where $\mu_y = 0$ and $\beta_{y1} = \beta_{y2} = 1$ in all settings. We have chosen to omit these parameters to simplify the notation.

Table 4: Each setting specifies values for the parameters in the multivariate forecast model, including mean terms μ_j , factor loadings β_i , errors' variance σ_i^2 , autoregressive matrix Φ_F , and correlation $\rho_{i,k}$, $i \neq k$, for the bottom time series. Settings vary systematically to assess model performance under different assumptions, including uniform (U), beta (B), inverse gamma (IG), and normal (\mathcal{N}) distributions. Settings 1–5 replicate Capistrán and Timmermann (2009), while Setting 6 includes a bias component $\mu_j \neq 0$ for each expert.

Setting	μ_j	β_j	σ_j^2	Φ_F
1	0	$\mathbf{1}_2$	1	$\mathbf{0}_{2 \times 2}$
2	0	$0.5 \cdot \mathbf{1}_2$	1	$\mathbf{0}_{2 \times 2}$
3	0	$0.5 \cdot \mathbf{1}_2$	1	$0.9 \cdot \mathbf{I}_2$
4	0	$\begin{bmatrix} B(1,1) \\ B(1,1) \end{bmatrix}$	1	$\mathbf{0}_{2 \times 2}$
5	0	$0.5 \cdot \mathbf{1}_2$	$IG(5,5)$	$\mathbf{0}_{2 \times 2}$
6	$\mathcal{N}(0,1)$	$0.5 \cdot \mathbf{1}_2$	1	$\mathbf{0}_{2 \times 2}$

linearly constrained time series \mathbf{y}_{t+1} is given by $\mathbf{y}_{t+1} = \mathbf{S}\mathbf{b}_{t+1}$, where $\mathbf{b}_{t+1} = [b_{1,t+1} \ \dots \ b_{n_b,t+1}]^\top$.

To generate the base forecasts from different experts, the systematic part of the forecast from the j -th expert for the i -th bottom variable at time $t+1$ is obtained as $\check{b}_{i,t+1}^j = \mu_j + \beta_{j,1}F_{1,i,t+1} + \beta_{j,2}F_{2,i,t+1}$, $i = 1, \dots, n_b$, $j = 1, \dots, p$, where $\beta_j = [\beta_{j,1} \ \beta_{j,2}]^\top$ is the vector of factor loadings for the series' components. The base forecast vector $\hat{\mathbf{y}}_{t+1}^j$ produced by the j -th expert for the complete set of n variables (i.e., balanced case), is

$$\hat{\mathbf{y}}_{t+1}^j = \mathbf{S}\check{\mathbf{b}}_{t+1}^j + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{t+1}^j, \quad (30)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{t+1}^j = [\varepsilon_{1,t+1}^j \ \dots \ \varepsilon_{n,t+1}^j]^\top \sim \mathcal{N}_n(\mathbf{0}_{(n \times 1)}, \Gamma_\varepsilon)$ and $\Gamma_\varepsilon = \mathbf{D}^{-1/2}\boldsymbol{\Theta}\mathbf{D}^{-1/2}$, with variance proportional to the number of bottom variables involved in the aggregation defining the nodes at each hierarchy level, i.e., $\mathbf{D} = \text{Diag}(\sigma_j^2 \mathbf{S}\mathbf{1}_{n_b})$, that in our setting is equal to

$$\mathbf{D} = \sigma_j^2 \begin{bmatrix} 4 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad j = 1, \dots, p,$$

and two covariance structures: either uncorrelated errors¹⁰, i.e., $\boldsymbol{\Theta} = \mathbf{I}_n$, or $\boldsymbol{\Theta}$ equal to the closest positive definite matrix $\check{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}$ with entries $\check{\theta}_{i,k} = U(-1,1)$, $i \neq k$, and $\check{\theta}_{i,i} = 1$, $i, k = 1, \dots, n_b$.

Following Capistrán and Timmermann (2009), we assume that $E[\varepsilon_{i,t+1}^j \varepsilon_{k,t+1}^l] = 0$ for $j \neq l$, and that $E[\varepsilon_{n_u+i,t+1}^j \eta_{i,t+1}] = 0$, $j = 1, \dots, p$ and $i = 1, \dots, n_b$. This setup represents a scenario where, at

¹⁰Due to space constraints, the results with uncorrelated errors are provided in Appendix E. The main conclusions drawn do not differ substantially from those valid for the correlated case.

time t , forecasters receive noisy signals that are imperfectly correlated with future realizations of the factors $F_{1,i,t+1}$ and $F_{2,i,t+1}$. For the calculation of covariance matrices in both reconciliation and combination processes, we utilize N observations, with $T = N + 100$, where the last 100 observations are reserved as test set. In each experimental configuration (see Table 4), we examine different values for the number of observations, $N \in \{50, 100, 200\}$, and the number of experts, $p \in \{4, 10, 20\}$, running 500 replications per setting to ensure robustness in results. In addition, we consider two different frameworks as Capistrán and Timmermann (2009):

- **Balanced panel of forecasts:** no missing values, allowing for consistent forecasts across all variables and experts.
- **Unbalanced panel of forecasts:** we classify experts according to their participation frequency, distinguishing between frequent (40%) and infrequent participants. Using the transition probabilities proposed in Capistrán and Timmermann (2009), we generate a binary participation matrix for each variable¹¹, that is applied to the fully populated matrix of forecasts simulated by expression (30). This results in a realistic, unbalanced panel structure that allows us to examine the impact of varying participation frequencies on the accuracy and robustness of different coherent combination forecast approaches.

These frameworks provide a comprehensive environment for testing forecast performance under different data conditions, allowing us to assess robustness across scenarios. The forecast accuracy is evaluated using the Average Relative Mean Absolute (*AvgRelMAE*)¹², given by

$$AvgRelMAE^{app} = \left(\prod_{s=1}^{500} \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{MAE_{s,i}^{app}}{MAE_{s,i}^{ew}} \right)^{\frac{1}{500n}} \quad \text{with} \quad MAE_{s,i}^{app} = \frac{1}{100} \sum_{q=1}^{100} |y_{i,s,q} - \bar{y}_{i,s,q}^{app}|,$$

where $i = 1, \dots, n$ denotes the variable, *app* is the approach used, $y_{i,s,q}$ is the observed value and $\bar{y}_{i,s,q}^{app}$ is the forecast value using the *app* approach (either coherent or incoherent, see Table 5).

Table 6 presents several critical aspects that influence the performance of forecasting methods under different conditions. It clearly appears that as the number of residuals used to estimate the error covariance matrices grows, the quality of forecast improves in terms of accuracy. This finding highlighted the critical role of robust statistical techniques to estimate the covariances, particularly in high-dimensional settings where estimation errors can propagate and affect the results negatively. In relation to this problem, we observe that the *AvgRelMAE* decreases as the number of experts p increases. Developing criteria for identifying the most relevant experts for combining and reconciling

¹¹In the optimal coherent combination approach utilizing a block-diagonal shrunk error covariance matrix, the different number of residuals across experts and variables is addressed through the covariance shrinkage parameters λ_j , $j = 1, \dots, p$, as detailed in Section 3.

¹²Detailed results, including a forecast evaluation using the Average Relative Mean Squared Error, are presented in Appendix E. Notably, the use of the squared error metric does not change the main conclusions.

Table 5: Summary of forecasting approaches used in the simulation (Section 6) and in the forecasting experiment on the Australian daily electricity generation time series (Section 7). For single-model reconciliation and coherent combination sequential approaches, the shrunk in-sample MSE matrix is used for the reconciliation.

Approach & description		Approach & description	
<i>Base (incoherent forecasts)</i>		<i>Single-task combination (incoherent forecasts, Sections 6 and 7)</i>	
base*	Best base forecasts (Section 6)	ew	Equal-weighted average
tbats	Exponential smoothing state space model with Box-Cox transformation, ARMA errors, Trend and Seasonal components (Section 7)	ow _{var}	Weighted average, optimal weights inversely proportional to the MSE's
		ow _{cov}	Weighted average, optimal weights in the unit simplex (Conflitti et al., 2015) computed using the MSE matrix
<i>Single model reconciliation</i>		<i>Coherent combination (Sections 6 and 7)</i>	
base* _{shr}	Cross-sectional reconciliation of the best base forecasts (Section 6)	src	Sequential reconciliation-then-combination with ew
base _{shr}	Best cross-sectional reconciliation of base forecasts (Section 6)	scr _{ew}	Sequential ew combination-then-reconciliation
		scr _{var}	Sequential ow _{var} combination-then-reconciliation
tbats _{shr}	Cross-sectional reconciliation of tbats base (Section 7)	scr _{cov}	Sequential ow _{cov} combination-then-reconciliation
		occ _{be}	Optimal coherent combination using a <i>by-expert</i> block-diagonal shrunk error covariance matrix

forecasts is an important aspect which lies beyond the scope of this paper.

Looking at the different forecasting procedures, the coherent approaches src (for balanced cases), scr_{ew}, scr_{var}, and occ_{be} consistently outperform the benchmark equal-weighted (ew) average, as indicated by indices uniformly below 1. Among these, occ_{be} is the most effective overall, ranking first in the majority of cases for both balanced panels (51 out of 54 cases) and unbalanced panels (50 out of 54 cases) for any setting. The scr_{ew} method also demonstrates strong performance, particularly in unbalanced panel, where it frequently ranks among the top-performing methods (first 4 times and second 50 times). Similarly, the src method shows excellent results in balanced cases, ranking second in 37 out of 54 cases. However, a major drawback of this approach is that it cannot be used in the unbalanced case, which limits its applicability in real-world scenarios where data availability is often irregular. In conclusion, among the evaluated approaches, occ_{be} stands out as the most effective and accurate, highlighting the advantages of simultaneously combining and reconciling forecasts for different variables and from multiple experts.

7. Forecasting Australian daily electricity generation

To illustrate the effectiveness of the coherent forecast combination methodology for real-life data, we perform a forecasting experiment on the daily electricity generation from various energy sources in Australia (Panagiotelis et al., 2023). Daily time series data were obtained from opennem.org.au, which compiles publicly available data from the Australian Energy Market Operator (AEMO). Accurate day-ahead forecasts are crucial for operational planning and ensuring the efficiency and stability of the power network, particularly as the growth of intermittent renewable energy sources, such as wind and solar, introduces significant variability and complexity into the power system.

Figure 2 shows the source generation hierarchy and the corresponding linear combination matrix

Table 6: AvgRelMAE for the simulation experiment. Benchmark approach: equal-weighted average (ew). Bold entries identify the best performing approaches, italic entries identify the second best and red color denotes forecasts worse than the benchmark.

Sett.	p	N	Balanced panel of forecasts										Unbalanced panel of forecasts								
			base*	base* _{hr}	base _s _{hr}	ew	OW _{var}	OW _{cov}	SFC	SCF _{ew}	SCF _{var}	SCF _{cov}	OCC _{be}	ew	OW _{var}	OW _{cov}	SCF _{ew}	SCF _{var}	SCF _{cov}	OCC _{be}	
1	4	50	1.308	1.063	1.058	1.000	1.002	1.027	0.921	0.949	0.951	0.969	0.905	1.000	1.031	1.479	0.903	1.053	1.122	0.892	
		100	1.307	1.038	1.037	1.000	1.000	1.014	0.915	0.946	0.946	0.955	0.894	1.000	1.024	1.341	0.903	1.032	1.114	0.885	
		200	1.305	1.026	1.025	1.000	1.000	1.007	0.912	0.943	0.942	0.946	0.890	1.000	1.010	1.191	0.902	1.002	1.090	0.880	
	10	50	1.417	1.152	1.146	1.000	1.001	1.053	0.962	0.980	0.981	1.020	0.953	1.000	1.220	2.999	0.943	1.276	1.492	0.941	
		100	1.417	1.125	1.123	1.000	1.000	1.033	0.959	0.979	0.979	1.003	0.947	1.000	1.216	2.924	0.940	1.250	1.488	0.928	
		200	1.412	1.111	1.110	1.000	1.000	1.019	0.958	0.976	0.976	0.989	0.946	1.000	1.183	2.688	0.940	1.190	1.464	0.923	
	20	50	1.461	1.188	1.181	1.000	1.001	1.063	0.979	0.990	0.991	1.040	0.974	1.000	1.351	4.250	0.973	1.426	1.797	0.981	
		100	1.463	1.162	1.159	1.000	1.000	1.044	0.978	0.990	0.990	1.023	0.972	1.000	1.335	4.405	0.974	1.385	1.814	0.968	
		200	1.455	1.147	1.145	1.000	1.000	1.028	0.978	0.989	0.988	1.008	0.971	1.000	1.287	4.077	0.973	1.302	1.709	0.958	
	2	4	50	1.226	1.054	1.052	1.000	1.001	1.026	0.949	0.967	0.968	0.986	0.942	1.000	1.022	1.396	0.928	1.031	1.076	0.919
			100	1.226	1.037	1.036	1.000	1.000	1.014	0.945	0.965	0.966	0.975	0.936	1.000	1.020	1.314	0.929	1.022	1.077	0.914
			200	1.225	1.026	1.026	1.000	1.000	1.007	0.943	0.963	0.963	0.967	0.932	1.000	1.013	1.191	0.927	1.008	1.067	0.910
10		50	1.294	1.113	1.110	1.000	1.001	1.045	0.977	0.988	0.989	1.023	0.974	1.000	1.147	2.536	0.963	1.173	1.316	0.960	
		100	1.295	1.095	1.093	1.000	1.000	1.030	0.976	0.988	0.988	1.009	0.972	1.000	1.145	2.470	0.962	1.161	1.317	0.952	
		200	1.293	1.083	1.083	1.000	1.000	1.018	0.975	0.987	0.987	0.999	0.970	1.000	1.129	2.088	0.961	1.133	1.260	0.947	
20		50	1.319	1.135	1.132	1.000	1.000	1.050	0.988	0.994	0.994	1.032	0.986	1.000	1.226	3.433	0.985	1.259	1.518	0.989	
		100	1.319	1.117	1.114	1.000	1.000	1.036	0.988	0.994	0.994	1.021	0.986	1.000	1.221	3.561	0.986	1.245	1.537	0.981	
		200	1.318	1.105	1.103	1.000	1.000	1.023	0.987	0.994	0.994	1.009	0.984	1.000	1.199	3.475	0.986	1.206	1.512	0.974	
3		4	50	1.110	1.034	1.034	1.000	1.000	1.020	0.979	0.988	0.988	1.003	0.978	1.000	1.321	1.824	0.969	1.377	1.459	0.961
			100	1.112	1.025	1.025	1.000	1.000	1.013	0.977	0.986	0.987	0.995	0.975	1.000	1.325	1.862	0.969	1.360	1.479	0.958
			200	1.111	1.016	1.016	1.000	1.000	1.007	0.974	0.984	0.984	0.989	0.971	1.000	1.313	1.852	0.966	1.328	1.498	0.957
	10	50	1.137	1.059	1.059	1.000	1.000	1.029	0.992	0.995	0.995	1.017	0.991	1.000	1.462	2.819	0.988	1.523	1.647	0.984	
		100	1.139	1.050	1.049	1.000	1.000	1.021	0.990	0.995	0.995	1.011	0.989	1.000	1.462	2.712	0.986	1.503	1.619	0.979	
		200	1.138	1.044	1.041	1.000	1.000	1.013	0.989	0.995	0.995	1.004	0.988	1.000	1.437	2.256	0.988	1.455	1.506	0.977	
	20	50	1.147	1.069	1.067	1.000	1.000	1.031	0.996	0.997	0.998	1.021	0.995	1.000	1.527	3.547	0.997	1.594	1.801	0.997	
		100	1.148	1.058	1.057	1.000	1.000	1.023	0.995	0.997	0.997	1.015	0.994	1.000	1.514	3.682	0.998	1.563	1.798	0.992	
		200	1.148	1.053	1.051	1.000	1.000	1.016	0.995	0.998	0.998	1.010	0.994	1.000	1.482	3.599	0.999	1.504	1.755	0.990	
	4	4	50	1.243	1.074	1.074	1.000	0.991	1.001	0.950	0.968	0.957	0.950	0.922	1.000	0.999	1.343	0.922	1.008	1.049	0.909
			100	1.241	1.056	1.056	1.000	0.989	0.988	0.946	0.966	0.953	0.936	0.915	1.000	1.001	1.277	0.922	1.004	1.049	0.904
			200	1.242	1.042	1.042	1.000	0.989	0.982	0.942	0.963	0.950	0.929	0.909	1.000	0.993	1.130	0.921	0.988	1.032	0.900
10		50	1.317	1.134	1.134	1.000	0.986	0.987	0.978	0.988	0.973	0.955	0.948	1.000	1.129	2.507	0.956	1.155	1.290	0.947	
		100	1.313	1.117	1.117	1.000	0.985	0.968	0.976	0.987	0.972	0.936	0.942	1.000	1.126	2.388	0.956	1.141	1.283	0.938	
		200	1.317	1.107	1.107	1.000	0.985	0.959	0.975	0.986	0.971	0.926	0.939	1.000	1.114	2.072	0.955	1.119	1.240	0.933	
20		50	1.336	1.150	1.150	1.000	0.983	0.973	0.989	0.994	0.977	0.948	0.958	1.000	1.214	3.456	0.982	1.248	1.500	0.975	
		100	1.339	1.138	1.138	1.000	0.983	0.952	0.988	0.994	0.977	0.928	0.954	1.000	1.206	3.482	0.981	1.230	1.519	0.964	
		200	1.334	1.123	1.123	1.000	0.983	0.937	0.987	0.994	0.976	0.913	0.950	1.000	1.186	3.329	0.981	1.193	1.452	0.957	
5		4	50	1.241	1.049	1.049	1.000	0.989	1.010	0.939	0.959	0.955	0.969	0.926	1.000	0.989	1.346	0.916	0.998	1.040	0.901
			100	1.245	1.038	1.034	1.000	0.989	0.998	0.934	0.957	0.952	0.958	0.919	1.000	0.986	1.251	0.915	0.988	1.038	0.895
			200	1.243	1.023	1.023	1.000	0.988	0.991	0.930	0.954	0.949	0.951	0.915	1.000	0.982	1.136	0.915	0.977	1.030	0.892
	10	50	1.322	1.122	1.122	1.000	0.994	1.036	0.972	0.985	0.981	1.012	0.966	1.000	1.120	2.421	0.953	1.145	1.292	0.945	
		100	1.320	1.103	1.103	1.000	0.994	1.021	0.971	0.985	0.981	1.000	0.964	1.000	1.118	2.349	0.953	1.134	1.280	0.936	
		200	1.320	1.087	1.087	1.000	0.993	1.009	0.968	0.983	0.979	0.990	0.960	1.000	1.105	2.083	0.950	1.109	1.248	0.930	
	20	50	1.353	1.151	1.149	1.000	0.997	1.049	0.986	0.993	0.991	1.030	0.983	1.000	1.212	3.480	0.979	1.246	1.514	0.980	
		100	1.352	1.132	1.128	1.000	0.996	1.031	0.984	0.992	0.990	1.015	0.980	1.000	1.204	3.568	0.980	1.228	1.533	0.969	
		200	1.356	1.116	1.113	1.000	0.996	1.020	0.984	0.992	0.990	1.007	0.979	1.000	1.186	3.461	0.980	1.193	1.496	0.963	
	6	4	50	1.370	1.240	1.240	1.000	0.966	0.962	0.961	0.975	0.928	0.919	0.898	1.000	0.871	1.212	0.848	0.870	0.904	0.840
			100	1.367	1.224	1.224	1.000	0.964	0.950	0.956	0.972	0.923	0.906	0.891	1.000	0.869	1.099	0.847	0.864	0.899	0.830
			200	1.366	1.212	1.212	1.000	0.964	0.944	0.952	0.970	0.921	0.899	0.886	1.000	0.863	0.997	0.844	0.853	0.884	0.826
10		50	1.508	1.363	1.363	1.000	0.980	1.003	0.981	0.990	0.964	0.980	0.946	1.000	1.016	2.396	0.893	1.036	1.180	0.891	
		100	1.507	1.349	1.349	1.000	0.978	0.986	0.979	0.990	0.962	0.965	0.942	1.000	1.013	2.297	0.891	1.025	1.176	0.878	
		200	1.499	1.331	1.331	1.000	0.979	0.975	0.977	0.988	0.961	0.956	0.940	1.000	1.005	2.055	0.893	1.007	1.163	0.875	
20		50	1.554	1.410	1.408	1.000	0.990	1.031	0.989	0.994	0.982	1.014	0.973	1.000	1.143	3.443	0.945	1.175	1.459	0.952	
		100	1.552	1.389	1.389	1.000	0.988	1.012	0.989	0.994	0.980	0.998	0.969	1.000	1.135	3.527	0.942	1.155	1.469		




Figure 2: Australian daily electricity generation hierarchy (left) and the corresponding linear combination matrix (right), mapping 15 bottom variables into 8 upper variables. Red color denotes bottom variables that - when aggregated - are subtracted instead of added.

$\mathbf{A} \in \{-1, 0, 1\}^{8 \times 15}$ for the whole dataset of 23 time series (Figure 3), with 15 of these being bottom-level series, representing the specific sources of generation. Detailed descriptions of the aggregation levels, including the components of each source, are available in Panagiotelis et al. (2023)¹³.

In order to assess the forecast accuracy of the various approaches, we perform a rolling forecast experiment with an expanding window. The first training window consists of 140 days (20 weeks) of data. One- to seven- step- ahead forecasts were generated leading to $Q_1 = 226$ one-, ..., and $Q_7 = 220$ seven- step- ahead daily forecasts for evaluation. Each series was independently modeled using three different approaches: stlf (Seasonal and Trend decomposition using Loess, Cleveland, 1990), arima (AutoRegressive Integrated Moving Average, Box and Jenkins, 1976), tbats (Exponential smoothing state space model with Box-Cox transformation, ARMA errors, Trend and Seasonal components, De Livera et al., 2011). Starting from the base forecasts produced by these models, we consider three single-task combination procedures, resulting in incoherent forecasts, three single model reconciliation

¹³The original dataset, available at <https://github.com/PuwasalaG/Probabilistic-Forecast-Reconciliation>, underwent a cleaning process. Specifically, 2 out of the 15 original bottom time series (Distillate and Biomass) contained some negative values (from -0.06 to -0.01), which affected 26% and 0.9% of their data, respectively. To address this issue, these negative values were replaced by zero




Figure 3: Australian daily electricity generation time series.

approaches and five coherent combination procedures (see Table 5)¹⁴:

1. *Single-task combination*: equal weights (ew) and two classical optimal weighting schemes proposed by Bates and Granger (1969) and Newbold and Granger (1974), called respectively ow_{var} , based on the diagonal elements of the in-sample MSE matrix, and ow_{cov} , based on the whole MSE matrix, with optimized weights constrained to be non-negative and sum to unity (Conflitti et al., 2015).
2. *Single model reconciliation*: for each base forecasting model, the reconciled forecasts are obtained through the MinT approach by Wickramasuriya et al. (2019), with a shrunk in-sample error covariance matrix ($stlf_{shr}$, $arima_{shr}$, $tbats_{shr}$).
3. *Coherent combination*: we consider four sequential approaches, namely (i) sequential reconciliation-then-equal-weight-combination (src), (ii)-(iv) sequential combination-then-reconciliation: (scr_{ew} , scr_{var} , scr_{cov}), and finally occ, the optimal coherent combination approach with *by-expert* block-diagonal shrunk in-sample covariance matrix (see section 5.2).

The forecast accuracy is evaluated using the Average Relative Mean Absolute (*AvgRelMAE*) and Squared (*AvgRelMSE*) Error (Fleming and Wallace, 1986, Davydenko and Fildes, 2013) computed

¹⁴The base forecasting models were implemented using the automatic forecasting procedure of the R package `forecast` (Hyndman and Khandakar, 2008, Hyndman et al., 2023). The combined and reconciled forecasts were computed using the R packages `FoReco` (Girolimetto and Di Fonzo, 2024a) and `FoCo2` (Girolimetto and Di Fonzo, 2024b). A complete set of results is available at the GitHub repository <https://github.com/danigirotto/cfc-project>.

as, respectively,

$$AvgRelMAE^{app} = \left(\prod_{h=1}^H AvgRelMAE_h^{app} \right)^{\frac{1}{H}} \quad \text{and} \quad AvgRelMSE^{app} = \left(\prod_{h=1}^H AvgRelMSE_h^{app} \right)^{\frac{1}{H}}.$$

The $AvgRelMAE$ and $AvgRelMSE$ for a fixed forecast horizon h are defined as

$$AvgRelMAE_h^{app} = \left(\prod_{i=1}^n \frac{MAE_{h,i}^{app}}{MAE_{h,i}^{ew}} \right)^{\frac{1}{n}} \quad \text{and} \quad AvgRelMSE_h^{app} = \left(\prod_{i=1}^n \frac{MSE_{h,i}^{app}}{MSE_{h,i}^{ew}} \right)^{\frac{1}{n}},$$

with the Mean Squared Error (MSE) and Mean Absolute Error (MAE) for each forecast horizon and variable are computed as

$$MSE_{h,i}^{app} = \frac{1}{Q_h} \sum_{q=1}^{Q_h} \left(y_{i,h,q} - \bar{y}_{i,h,q}^{app} \right)^2 \quad \text{and} \quad MAE_{h,i}^{app} = \frac{1}{Q_h} \sum_{q=1}^{Q_h} \left| y_{i,h,q} - \bar{y}_{i,h,q}^{app} \right|,$$

where $h = 1, \dots, H$ is the forecast horizon, $i = 1, \dots, n$ denotes the variable, Q_h is the dimension of the test set, app is the approach used, $y_{i,h,q}$ is the observed value and $\bar{y}_{i,h,q}^{app}$ is the forecast value using the app approach (coherent or incoherent).

Finally, we evaluate the forecasting performances of different approaches by first applying the pairwise Diebold and Mariano (1995) test to investigate the null hypothesis of Equal Predictive Accuracy (EPA) across models and, then, we use the Model Confidence Set (MCS) approach developed by Hansen et al. (2011), which identifies approaches with statistically superior performance. In addition, in Appendix F, we present the results for the non-parametric Friedman test along with the post hoc multiple-comparison-with-the-best (MCB) Nemenyi test (Koning et al., 2005, Kourentzes and Athanasopoulos, 2019, Makridakis et al., 2022), both of which are well-established tools for evaluating multiple forecast approaches.

7.1. Results

Forecast accuracy indices $AvgRelMAE$ and $AvgRelMSE$ for all 23 time series¹⁵ are reported in Table 7, while Figure 4 and Table 8 show the pairwise DM-test test and the MCS approach, respectively. The forecasting approaches are evaluated for each forecast horizon (1 through 7 days), and across all horizons (denoted 1:7).

We begin by analyzing incoherent forecasting approaches, focusing on both base and single-task combinations. Among the three base forecasting models, tbats demonstrates the highest performance (Appendix G) and single-task combination strategies consistently lead to improvements in forecasting accuracy over the base models. Furthermore, we observe that equal weight (ew) and variance-weighted

¹⁵A detailed analysis, distinct between upper and bottom time series, also using a wider set of coherent combination procedures, is available in Appendix G.

Table 7: AvgRelMAE (top panel) and AvgRelMSE (bottom panel) of daily forecasts for the Australian electricity generation dataset. Benchmark approach: equal-weighted average (ew). Bold entries identify the best performing approaches, italic entries identify the second best, and red color denotes forecasts worse than the benchmark.

Approach	Forecast horizon							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1:7
AvgRelMAE - All 23 time series								
<i>Base (incoherent forecasts) and single model reconciliation</i>								
tbats	1.0447	1.0515	1.0348	1.0266	1.0305	1.0288	1.0201	1.0331
tbats _{shr}	1.0320	1.0413	1.0231	1.0134	1.0212	1.0208	1.0188	1.0235
<i>Combination (incoherent forecasts)</i>								
ew	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
ow _{var}	0.9927	0.9921	0.9982	0.9983	0.9967	0.9967	0.9990	0.9965
ow _{cov}	1.0216	1.0208	1.0390	1.0423	1.0307	1.0250	1.0325	1.0309
<i>Coherent combination</i>								
src	0.9939	0.9941	0.9919	0.9895	0.9887	0.9908	0.9933	0.9915
scr _{ew}	0.9952	0.9959	0.9911	0.9908	0.9908	0.9932	0.9961	0.9930
scr _{var}	0.9819	0.9803	0.9869	0.9895	0.9887	0.9913	0.9972	0.9882
scr _{cov}	1.0081	1.0081	1.0270	1.0327	1.0245	1.0197	1.0250	1.0215
occ _{be}	0.9779	0.9745	0.9843	0.9852	0.9851	0.9880	0.9926	0.9843
AvgRelMSE - All 23 time series								
<i>Base (incoherent forecasts) and single model reconciliation</i>								
tbats	1.0796	1.0780	1.0445	1.0270	1.0322	1.0288	1.0142	1.0393
tbats _{shr}	1.0478	1.0577	1.0304	1.0108	1.0219	1.0213	1.0116	1.0257
<i>Combination (incoherent forecasts)</i>								
ew	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
ow _{var}	0.9840	0.9881	0.9995	1.0032	1.0020	1.0028	1.0054	0.9995
ow _{cov}	1.0279	1.0494	1.0972	1.1103	1.1009	1.0993	1.1055	1.0908
<i>Coherent combination</i>								
src	0.9827	0.9855	0.9863	0.9833	0.9852	0.9873	0.9911	0.9859
scr _{ew}	0.9875	0.9898	0.9859	0.9859	0.9885	0.9905	0.9962	0.9890
scr _{var}	0.9586	0.9683	0.9838	0.9942	0.9982	1.0017	1.0114	0.9910
scr _{cov}	1.0026	1.0287	1.0795	1.0972	1.0942	1.0913	1.0981	1.0773
occ _{be}	0.9481	0.9560	0.9754	0.9831	0.9891	0.9939	0.9993	0.9808

(ow_{var}) combinations outperform the covariance-weighted (ow_{cov}) approach in terms of both MSE and MAE. Among these, ow_{var} performs better than ew in all cases when considering MAE, and in three out of seven forecast horizons when evaluated by MSE.

However, further analysis in Figure 4 and Table 8, using the Diebold-Mariano and MCS tests (along with the MCB test in Appendix F), suggests that these differences are not statistically significant. This result is not surprising, and somehow confirms the robustness of the equal weight combination scheme, an issue well-known in the forecasting literature as ‘forecast combination puzzle’ (Smith and Wallis, 2009, Claeskens et al., 2016, Qian et al., 2019, Frazier et al., 2023, Liu et al., 2024).

When we focus on coherent forecasting methods, single-expert reconciliation approaches generally improve on the forecasting accuracy of the base forecasts, but perform worse when compared to the single-task combination approaches. Coherent combination approaches, on the other hand,




Figure 4: Pairwise DM-test results for the Australian electricity generation dataset, evaluated using absolute loss (top panels) and quadratic loss (bottom panel) across different forecast horizons. The left panel corresponds to forecast horizon $h = 1$, while the right panel is for $h = 1, \dots, 7$. Each cell reports the percentage of series for which the p -value of the DM-test is below 0.05: e.g., the value 83 in the top-left cell means that occ resulted more accurate (p -value < 0.05) than stlf for $h = 1$ and in terms of absolute error in the 83% of the series.

consistently outperform base models, single-task combinations, and single-expert reconciliation. Moreover, these coherent methods produce forecasts that satisfy all the necessary constraints, which is a critical advantage in many applied contexts. In detail, while the differences between the various coherent methods may not always be statistically significant, overall Figure 4 and Table 8 suggest that the optimal coherent combination approach occ_{be} delivers the best results in terms of both MSE and MAE, and looks particularly effective in balancing forecast accuracy and coherence. In addition, scr_{var} , the variance-weighted combination followed by MinT reconciliation, is the most effective sequential coherent combination procedure.

Table 8: Model Confidence Set results (10^4 bootstrap sample) for the Australian electricity generation dataset, evaluated using absolute loss (top panels) and quadratic loss (bottom panel) across different forecast horizons ($h = 1$ and $h = 1, \dots, 7$). Each cell reports the percentage of series for which that approach is in the Model Confidence Set across different thresholds ($\delta \in \{95\%, 90\%, 80\%\}$).

Approach	$h = 1$			$h = 1 : 7$		
	$\delta = 95\%$	$\delta = 90\%$	$\delta = 80\%$	$\delta = 95\%$	$\delta = 90\%$	$\delta = 80\%$
Absolute loss - All 23 time series						
<i>Base (incoherent forecasts) and single model reconciliation</i>						
tbats	56.5	56.5	52.2	78.3	69.6	56.5
tbats _{shr}	78.3	73.9	60.9	87.0	82.6	69.6
<i>Combination (incoherent forecasts)</i>						
ew	87.0	87.0	78.3	95.7	91.3	78.3
ow _{var}	95.7	95.7	82.6	95.7	91.3	82.6
ow _{cov}	73.9	69.6	60.9	73.9	65.2	43.5
<i>Coherent combination</i>						
src	91.3	91.3	87.0	95.7	95.7	87.0
scr _{ew}	91.3	91.3	87.0	95.7	91.3	78.3
scr _{var}	100.0	100.0	91.3	91.3	91.3	87.0
scr _{cov}	82.6	78.3	73.9	78.3	69.6	65.2
occ _{be}	100.0	100.0	95.7	95.7	95.7	87.0
Quadratic loss - All 23 time series						
<i>Base (incoherent forecasts) and single model reconciliation</i>						
tbats	65.2	65.2	60.9	91.3	73.9	73.9
tbats _{shr}	73.9	69.6	65.2	95.7	82.6	69.6
<i>Combination (incoherent forecasts)</i>						
ew	87.0	78.3	60.9	95.7	87.0	82.6
ow _{var}	100.0	82.6	78.3	91.3	87.0	82.6
ow _{cov}	78.3	69.6	52.2	78.3	60.9	34.8
<i>Coherent combination</i>						
src	95.7	91.3	82.6	91.3	91.3	91.3
scr _{ew}	95.7	87.0	73.9	91.3	91.3	91.3
scr _{var}	95.7	95.7	95.7	91.3	91.3	91.3
scr _{cov}	82.6	82.6	73.9	73.9	60.9	56.5
occ _{be}	100.0	95.7	95.7	91.3	91.3	91.3

8. Conclusions, limitations and future work

In this paper, we have introduced several coherent multi-task forecast combination procedures designed for linearly constrained time series, with a focus on an approach involving an optimization-based technique to combine multiple unbiased, possibly incoherent base forecasts, while ensuring coherence across the variables. Our solution has nice theoretical properties, including unbiasedness and minimum forecast error variance, making it a powerful tool balancing forecast accuracy and coherence in different scenarios.

However, the theoretical solution relies on two key assumptions: the base forecasts are unbiased, and the error covariance matrix is known. As for the former issue, it is left to the user the task of removing any bias from the base forecasts. Addressing the second challenge, we have outlined practical approaches for the estimation of the covariance matrix, such as using in-sample residuals, which consider techniques from both forecast combination and reconciliation literature. These

approaches provide a feasible path forward for practitioners dealing with multiple base forecasts in real-world settings, where there is not perfect knowledge of the covariance matrix.

From a practical perspective, the new methodology has been empirically validated through a simulation experiment and in a real-world application, demonstrating its effectiveness and robustness. The results show that the coherent multi-task forecast combination consistently outperforms individual base forecasts, single-task combinations, forecasts reconciled by single experts and sequential coherent combination approaches. This performance highlights the method's ability to integrate multiple sources of information while maintaining coherence.

Future research offers several directions for further developing of the coherent multi-task forecast combination methodology. One key area involves exploring more advanced and flexible methods for estimating the error covariance matrix. While we have proposed practical solutions using in-sample residuals, more sophisticated techniques could be devised to improve the covariance estimates, particularly in high-dimensional settings where data limitations are common. Another promising direction is the extension of the framework from point to probabilistic forecasting, which is crucial for decision-making in fields like energy, finance, and economics. We aim to pursue these topics in our ongoing research, with the goal of further improving the accuracy and flexibility of this methodology.

Appendix A. Proofs of Theorem 1 and Corollary 1

Proof of Theorem 1: Optimal linear coherent forecast combination $\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^c$.

Consider the augmented (lagrangean) objective function

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{y}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}) &= (\hat{\mathbf{y}} - \mathbf{K}\mathbf{y})^\top \mathbf{W}^{-1} (\hat{\mathbf{y}} - \mathbf{K}\mathbf{y}) + 2\boldsymbol{\lambda}^\top \mathbf{C}\mathbf{y} \\ &= \mathbf{y}^\top \mathbf{K}^\top \mathbf{W}^{-1} \mathbf{K}\mathbf{y} - 2\hat{\mathbf{y}}^\top \mathbf{W}^{-1} \mathbf{K}\mathbf{y} + \hat{\mathbf{y}}^\top \mathbf{W}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{y}} + 2\boldsymbol{\lambda}^\top \mathbf{C}\mathbf{y}.\end{aligned}$$

The first order condition, obtained by equating to zero the partial derivatives of $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{y}, \boldsymbol{\lambda})$ wrt \mathbf{y} and $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$, respectively, results in:

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{K}^\top \mathbf{W}^{-1} \mathbf{K} & \mathbf{C}^\top \\ \mathbf{C} & \mathbf{0}_{(n_u \times 1)} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{y} \\ \boldsymbol{\lambda} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{K}^\top \mathbf{W}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{y}} \\ \mathbf{0}_{(n_u \times 1)} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

The optimal coherent combination forecast vector $\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^c$ is thus obtained by solving equation (A.1):

$$\begin{bmatrix} \tilde{\mathbf{y}}^c \\ \tilde{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{K}^\top \mathbf{W}^{-1} \mathbf{K} & \mathbf{C}^\top \\ \mathbf{C} & \mathbf{0}_{(n_u \times 1)} \end{bmatrix}^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{K}^\top \mathbf{W}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{y}} \\ \mathbf{0}_{(n_u \times 1)} \end{bmatrix}.$$

As $\mathbf{K}^\top \mathbf{W}^{-1} \mathbf{K}$ has full rank, define $\mathbf{W}_c = (\mathbf{K}^\top \mathbf{W}^{-1} \mathbf{K})^{-1}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^c &= \left[\mathbf{W}_c - \mathbf{W}_c \mathbf{C}^\top (\mathbf{C} \mathbf{W}_c \mathbf{C}^\top)^{-1} \mathbf{C} \mathbf{W}_c \right] \mathbf{K}^\top \mathbf{W}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{y}} \\ &= \left[\mathbf{I}_n - \mathbf{W}_c \mathbf{C}^\top (\mathbf{C} \mathbf{W}_c \mathbf{C}^\top)^{-1} \mathbf{C} \right] \mathbf{W}_c \mathbf{K}^\top \mathbf{W}^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{y}} \\ &= \left[\mathbf{I}_n - \mathbf{W}_c \mathbf{C}^\top (\mathbf{C} \mathbf{W}_c \mathbf{C}^\top)^{-1} \mathbf{C} \right] \boldsymbol{\Omega}^\top \hat{\mathbf{y}} \\ &= \mathbf{M} \boldsymbol{\Omega}^\top \hat{\mathbf{y}} = \boldsymbol{\Psi}^\top \hat{\mathbf{y}},\end{aligned}$$

where $\boldsymbol{\Psi}^\top = \mathbf{M} \boldsymbol{\Omega}^\top$, $\boldsymbol{\Omega} = \mathbf{W}^{-1} \mathbf{K} \mathbf{W}_c$, and $\mathbf{M} = \left[\mathbf{I}_n - \mathbf{W}_c \mathbf{C}^\top (\mathbf{C} \mathbf{W}_c \mathbf{C}^\top)^{-1} \mathbf{C} \right]$. \square

Proof of Corollary 1: Unbiasedness of $\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^c$ and an important property of its error covariance matrix.

The unbiasedness of the p base forecasts $\hat{\mathbf{y}}^j$ can be expressed in compact form as

$$E(\hat{\mathbf{y}}) = \mathbf{K} E(\mathbf{y}) = \mathbf{K} \boldsymbol{\mu}.$$

Then, noting that $\boldsymbol{\Omega}^\top \mathbf{K} = \mathbf{W}_c \mathbf{K}^\top \mathbf{W}^{-1} \mathbf{K} = \mathbf{I}_n$ and $\mathbf{C} \boldsymbol{\mu} = \mathbf{0}_{(n_u \times 1)}$, it is

$$\begin{aligned}E(\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^c) &= \mathbf{M} \boldsymbol{\Omega}^\top E(\hat{\mathbf{y}}) = \mathbf{M} \boldsymbol{\Omega}^\top \mathbf{K} \boldsymbol{\mu} = \mathbf{M} \boldsymbol{\mu} \\ &= \boldsymbol{\mu} - \mathbf{W}_c \mathbf{C}^\top (\mathbf{C} \mathbf{W}_c \mathbf{C}^\top)^{-1} \mathbf{C} \boldsymbol{\mu} = \boldsymbol{\mu}.\end{aligned}$$

To compute $\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_c$, we start by noting that $\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^c - \mathbf{y} = \mathbf{M} \boldsymbol{\Omega}^\top \hat{\mathbf{y}} - \mathbf{y} = \mathbf{M} \boldsymbol{\Omega}^\top \mathbf{K} \mathbf{y} + \mathbf{M} \boldsymbol{\Omega}^\top \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} - \mathbf{y} = \mathbf{M} \boldsymbol{\Omega}^\top \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$.

The error covariance matrix of $\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^c$ is thus given by

$$\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_c = E\left(\mathbf{M} \boldsymbol{\Omega}^\top \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^\top \boldsymbol{\Omega} \mathbf{M}^\top\right) = \mathbf{M} \boldsymbol{\Omega}^\top \mathbf{W} \boldsymbol{\Omega} \mathbf{M}^\top = \mathbf{M} \mathbf{W}_c \mathbf{M}^\top,$$

where the last expression is obtained by noting that

$$\boldsymbol{\Omega}^\top \mathbf{W} \boldsymbol{\Omega} = \mathbf{W}_c \underbrace{\mathbf{K}^\top \mathbf{W}^{-1} \mathbf{W} \mathbf{W}^{-1} \mathbf{K}}_{\mathbf{W}_c^{-1}} \mathbf{W}_c = \mathbf{W}_c.$$

Proceeding further in the calculations gives:

$$\begin{aligned}\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_c &= \mathbf{M} \mathbf{W}_c \mathbf{M}^\top \\ &= \mathbf{W}_c - \mathbf{W}_c \mathbf{C}^\top (\mathbf{C} \mathbf{W}_c \mathbf{C}^\top)^{-1} \mathbf{C} \mathbf{W}_c - \mathbf{W}_c \mathbf{C}^\top (\mathbf{C} \mathbf{W}_c \mathbf{C}^\top)^{-1} \mathbf{C} \mathbf{W}_c \\ &\quad + \mathbf{W}_c \mathbf{C}^\top (\mathbf{C} \mathbf{W}_c \mathbf{C}^\top)^{-1} \overbrace{\mathbf{C} \mathbf{W}_c \mathbf{C}^\top (\mathbf{C} \mathbf{W}_c \mathbf{C}^\top)^{-1}}^{\mathbf{I}_{n_u}} \mathbf{C} \mathbf{W}_c \\ &= \mathbf{W}_c - \mathbf{W}_c \mathbf{C}^\top (\mathbf{C} \mathbf{W}_c \mathbf{C}^\top)^{-1} \mathbf{C} \mathbf{W}_c = \mathbf{M} \mathbf{W}_c.\end{aligned}$$

Finally, in order to derive (23), we prove¹⁶ first the inequality

$$\mathbf{L}_j \mathbf{W}_c \mathbf{L}_j^\top \preceq \mathbf{W}_j. \quad (\text{A.2})$$

Let $\mathbf{K}_j = [\mathbf{0}_{(n_1 \times n)} \dots \mathbf{L}_j \dots \mathbf{0}_{(n_p \times n)}]^\top \in \{0, 1\}^{m \times n}$ be a matrix whose j -th block place is \mathbf{L}_j and other blocks are $(n_l \times n)$ zero matrices, $l = 1, \dots, p$, with $l \neq j$. Observing that $\mathbf{K}_j \mathbf{L}_j^\top = [\mathbf{0}_{(n_1 \times n_j)} \dots \mathbf{I}_{n_j} \dots \mathbf{0}_{(n_p \times n_j)}]^\top$ is a $(m \times n_j)$ matrix such that $(\mathbf{L}_j \mathbf{K}_j^\top)(\mathbf{K}_j \mathbf{L}_j^\top) = \mathbf{I}_{n_j}$, and $\mathbf{K}^\top \mathbf{K}_j \mathbf{L}_j^\top = \mathbf{L}_j^\top$, it easy to check that $\mathbf{L}_j \mathbf{K}_j^\top \mathbf{W} \mathbf{K}_j \mathbf{L}_j^\top = \mathbf{W}_j$. Therefore, applying Schwarz matrix inequality¹⁷, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{L}_j \mathbf{W}_c \mathbf{L}_j^\top &= \mathbf{L}_j \left(\mathbf{K}^\top \mathbf{W}^{-1} \mathbf{K} \right)^{-1} \mathbf{L}_j^\top \\ &= \left[\left(\mathbf{W}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{K} \right)^\top \left(\mathbf{W}^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{K}_j \mathbf{L}_j^\top \right) \right]^\top \left[\left(\mathbf{W}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{K} \right)^\top \left(\mathbf{W}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{K} \right) \right]^{-1} \left[\left(\mathbf{W}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{K} \right)^\top \left(\mathbf{W}^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{K}_j \mathbf{L}_j^\top \right) \right] \\ &\preceq \left(\mathbf{W}^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{K}_j \mathbf{L}_j^\top \right)^\top \left(\mathbf{W}^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{K}_j \mathbf{L}_j^\top \right) = \mathbf{L}_j \mathbf{K}_j^\top \mathbf{W} \mathbf{K}_j \mathbf{L}_j^\top = \mathbf{W}_j, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.4})$$

which proves $\mathbf{L}_j \mathbf{W}_c \mathbf{L}_j^\top \preceq \mathbf{W}_j$.

Consider now the inequality $\mathbf{L}_j \widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_c \mathbf{L}_j^\top \preceq \mathbf{L}_j \mathbf{W}_c \mathbf{L}_j^\top$. In Remark 3 we have shown that $\widehat{\mathbf{y}}^c$ may be interpreted as a single-expert optimal combination reconciled forecast of the multi-task forecast combination vector $\widehat{\mathbf{y}}^c$. It follows that $\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_c \preceq \mathbf{W}_c$ (Panagiotelis et al., 2021). In addition, since $\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_c = \mathbf{M} \mathbf{W}_c$, we can write

$$\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_c = \mathbf{W}_c - \mathbf{\Delta}, \quad (\text{A.5})$$

where $\mathbf{\Delta} = \mathbf{W}_c \mathbf{C}^\top (\mathbf{C} \mathbf{W}_c \mathbf{C}^\top)^{-1} \mathbf{C} \mathbf{W}_c$ is a symmetric positive semidefinite matrix. Since pre-multiplying and post-multiplying a positive semidefinite matrix by the same matrix always gives a positive semidefinite matrix, pre- and post- multiplying expression (A.5) by \mathbf{L}_j gives:

$$\mathbf{L}_j \widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_c \mathbf{L}_j^\top = \mathbf{L}_j \mathbf{W}_c \mathbf{L}_j^\top - \mathbf{\Delta}_j \preceq \mathbf{L}_j \mathbf{W}_c \mathbf{L}_j^\top, \quad (\text{A.6})$$

where $\mathbf{\Delta}_j = \mathbf{L}_j \mathbf{\Delta} \mathbf{L}_j^\top$ is a positive semidefinite matrix. Finally, from (A.2) and (A.6) it results:

$$\mathbf{L}_j \widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_c \mathbf{L}_j^\top \preceq \mathbf{L}_j \mathbf{W}_c \mathbf{L}_j^\top \preceq \mathbf{W}_j. \quad \square$$

¹⁶This proof extends a result by Sun and Deng (2004) about the covariance matrix of the multi-task combined forecast vector $\widehat{\mathbf{y}}^c$ in the balanced case.

¹⁷Corollary (2.4) in Rao (2000) (p. 311) says that, for matrices \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{B} having the same number of columns, it is:

$$\mathbf{A} \mathbf{A}^\top \succeq \mathbf{A} \mathbf{B}^\top \left(\mathbf{B} \mathbf{B}^\top \right)^{-} \mathbf{B} \mathbf{A}^\top, \quad (\text{A.3})$$

where the symbol $^{-}$ denotes the generalized inverse. In this case, it is:

$$\underbrace{\mathbf{L}_j \mathbf{K}_j^\top \mathbf{W}^{\frac{1}{2}}}_{\mathbf{A}} \underbrace{\mathbf{W}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{K}}_{\mathbf{B}^\top} \left[\underbrace{\mathbf{K}^\top \mathbf{W}^{-\frac{1}{2}}}_{\mathbf{B}} \underbrace{\mathbf{W}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{K}}_{\mathbf{B}^\top} \right]^{-1} \underbrace{\mathbf{K}^\top \mathbf{W}^{-\frac{1}{2}}}_{\mathbf{B}} \underbrace{\mathbf{W}^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{K}_j \mathbf{L}_j^\top}_{\mathbf{A}^\top}.$$

Appendix B. Balanced case: $n_j = n \forall j$ and $p_i = p \forall i$

In the balanced case, expression (12) may be grouped as p linear models relating the (unbiased) base forecast $\hat{\mathbf{y}}^j$ to the target vector \mathbf{y} :

$$\hat{\mathbf{y}}^j = \mathbf{y} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^j, \quad j = 1, \dots, p, \quad (\text{B.1})$$

where the base forecast errors $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^j$, $j = 1, \dots, p$, are $(n \times 1)$ zero-mean random vectors, with $(n \times n)$ covariance matrices $\mathbf{W}_{jl} = E[\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^j(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^l)^\top]$, $j, l = 1, \dots, p$. The p relationships in expression (B.1) can be written in compact form as a simplified multivariate multiple linear model (Seber, 1984):

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mathbf{Y}} &= \left[\overbrace{\mathbf{y} \quad \dots \quad \mathbf{y}}^{p \text{ times}} \right] + \mathbf{E} \\ &= \mathbf{y} \mathbf{1}_p^\top + \mathbf{E}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.2})$$

where $\hat{\mathbf{Y}}$ is the $(n \times p)$ matrix defined in (8), containing the base forecasts of the target vector \mathbf{y} produced by p different experts, and the $(n \times p)$ matrix $\mathbf{E} = [\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^1 \dots \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^j \dots \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^p]$ contains the base forecast errors $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^j = \hat{\mathbf{y}}^j - \mathbf{y}$, $j = 1, \dots, p$, across all models and variables. In both matrices $\hat{\mathbf{Y}}$ and \mathbf{E} , each column denotes a single expert $j = 1, \dots, p$, and each row denotes an individual variable $i = 1, \dots, n$. Applying the $\text{vec}(\cdot)$ operator to expression (B.2), noting that $\text{vec}(\mathbf{y} \mathbf{1}_p^\top) = (\mathbf{1}_p \otimes \mathbf{I}_n) \mathbf{y}$, yields the multiple regression model

$$\hat{\mathbf{y}} = \mathbf{K} \mathbf{y} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}, \quad (\text{B.3})$$

where $\hat{\mathbf{y}} = \text{vec}(\hat{\mathbf{Y}})$ is a $(np \times 1)$ vector containing the base forecasts stacked by-expert, $\mathbf{K} = \mathbf{1}_p \otimes \mathbf{I}_n$ is a $(np \times n)$ matrix, and $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} = \text{vec}(\mathbf{E})$ is a $(np \times 1)$ vector of errors with zero average and $(np \times np)$, known and positive definite covariance matrix \mathbf{W} :

$$\mathbf{W} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{W}_1 & \cdots & \mathbf{W}_{1j} & \cdots & \mathbf{W}_{1p} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \mathbf{W}_{j1} & \cdots & \mathbf{W}_j & \cdots & \mathbf{W}_{jp} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \mathbf{W}_{p1} & \cdots & \mathbf{W}_{pj} & \cdots & \mathbf{W}_p \end{bmatrix} \quad (\text{B.4})$$

where $\mathbf{W}_j \equiv \mathbf{W}_{jj}$, $j = 1, \dots, p$.

Appendix C. A simple numerical example

Consider the case $n = 3$, i.e., $\mathbf{y} = [y_1 \ y_2 \ y_3]^\top$, $p_1 = 2, p_2 = 1$ and $p_3 = 4$, with

$$\hat{\mathbf{Y}} = \begin{bmatrix} \hat{y}_1^1 & \bullet & \hat{y}_1^3 & \bullet \\ \bullet & \hat{y}_2^2 & \bullet & \bullet \\ \hat{y}_3^1 & \hat{y}_3^2 & \hat{y}_3^3 & \hat{y}_3^4 \end{bmatrix},$$

where the symbol \bullet denotes an empty entry of $\hat{\mathbf{Y}}$. In this case, it is $p = 4$ and $m = 7$. The vector containing all the available base forecasts is given by

$$\hat{\mathbf{y}} = \begin{bmatrix} \hat{y}^1 \\ \hat{y}^2 \\ \hat{y}^3 \\ \hat{y}^4 \end{bmatrix} = [\hat{y}_1^1 \ \hat{y}_3^1 \ \hat{y}_2^2 \ \hat{y}_3^2 \ \hat{y}_1^3 \ \hat{y}_3^3 \ \hat{y}_3^4]^\top,$$

and the selection matrices

$$\mathbf{L}_1 = \mathbf{L}_3 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{L}_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{L}_4 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix},$$

are such that

$$\mathbf{L}_1 \mathbf{y} = \mathbf{L}_3 \mathbf{y} = \begin{bmatrix} y_1 \\ y_3 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{L}_2 \mathbf{y} = \begin{bmatrix} y_2 \\ y_3 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{L}_4 \mathbf{y} = y_3.$$

Finally, it is

$$\mathbf{L} = \text{Diag}(\mathbf{L}_1, \mathbf{L}_2, \mathbf{L}_3, \mathbf{L}_4) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Appendix D. Equivalent derivations of the optimal coherent linear forecast combination

Let us first prove that the solution found with the zero-constrained approach is the same as the one obtained with the structural approach. At this end, consider the model and the linear constraints of the zero-constrained approach according to the ‘by-expert’ representation¹⁸:

$$\hat{\mathbf{y}} = \mathbf{K} \mathbf{y} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}, \text{ s.t. } \mathbf{C} \mathbf{y} = \mathbf{0}. \tag{D.1}$$

¹⁸An analogous reasoning may be followed if the ‘by-variable’ representation is adopted.

The constraint $\mathbf{C}\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{0}$ is equivalent to¹⁹ $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{S}\mathbf{b}$, that can be explicitly incorporated into expression (D.1). Since it is $\mathbf{C}\mathbf{S} = \mathbf{0}_{(n_u \times n_b)}$, this operation results in an unrestricted linear model:

$$\widehat{\mathbf{y}} = \mathbf{K}\mathbf{S}\mathbf{b} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}, \text{ s.t. } \mathbf{C}\mathbf{S}\mathbf{b} = \mathbf{0} \quad \Rightarrow \quad \widehat{\mathbf{y}} = \mathbf{K}\mathbf{S}\mathbf{b} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}, \quad (\text{D.2})$$

and the rhs of expression (D.2) corresponds to the linear model of the structural approach according to the ‘by-expert’ base forecasts’ representation. Then, computing the MMSE coherent forecast combination of \mathbf{y} through either model (D.1) or (D.2) gives the same result, the only difference being the closed-form expressions of $\widehat{\mathbf{y}}^c$ and its error covariance matrix $\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_c$ according to either approaches (see Table 3). This establishes the equivalence between zero-constrained and structural approaches in the optimal coherent linear forecast combination method²⁰.

D.1. Zero-constrained approach and by-expert base forecasts’ organization

See the proofs of Theorem 1 and Corollary 1 in Appendix A.

D.2. Zero-constrained approach and by-variable base forecasts’ organization

Pre-multiplication of model (15) by the permutation matrix $\mathbf{P} \in \{0, 1\}^{m \times m}$ (see section 2.2) gives the equivalent, re-parameterized model according to a by-variable data organization:

$$\widehat{\mathbf{y}}_{\text{bv}} = \mathbf{J}\mathbf{y} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{\text{bv}}, \quad (\text{D.3})$$

where $\widehat{\mathbf{y}}_{\text{bv}} = \mathbf{P}\widehat{\mathbf{y}}$, $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{\text{bv}} = \mathbf{P}\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$,

$$\mathbf{J} = \mathbf{P}\mathbf{K} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{1}_{p_1} & \cdots & \mathbf{0}_{(p_1 \times 1)} & \cdots & \mathbf{0}_{(p_1 \times 1)} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \mathbf{0}_{(p_i \times 1)} & \cdots & \mathbf{1}_{p_i} & \cdots & \mathbf{0}_{(p_i \times 1)} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \mathbf{0}_{(p_n \times 1)} & \cdots & \mathbf{0}_{p_n \times 1} & \cdots & \mathbf{1}_{p_n} \end{bmatrix} \in \{0, 1\}^{m \times n}, \quad (\text{D.4})$$

and $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{\text{bv}} \in \mathbb{R}^m$ is a zero-mean random vector, with covariance matrix $\boldsymbol{\Sigma} = E(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{\text{bv}}\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{\text{bv}}^\top) = \mathbf{P}\mathbf{W}\mathbf{P}^\top$. In this case, the solution to the linearly constrained quadratic program

$$\widehat{\mathbf{y}}^c = \arg \min_{\mathbf{y}} (\widehat{\mathbf{y}}_{\text{bv}} - \mathbf{J}\mathbf{y})^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} (\widehat{\mathbf{y}}_{\text{bv}} - \mathbf{J}\mathbf{y}) \quad \text{s.t. } \mathbf{C}\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{0}_{(n_u \times 1)} \quad (\text{D.5})$$

can be obtained as for the case of by-expert data organization (see Appendix A):

$$\widehat{\mathbf{y}}^c = \boldsymbol{\Phi}^\top \widehat{\mathbf{y}}_{\text{bv}} = \mathbf{M}\boldsymbol{\Gamma}^\top \widehat{\mathbf{y}}_{\text{bv}}, \quad (\text{D.6})$$

¹⁹ $\mathbf{C}\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{0}$ means $\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{A}\mathbf{b} = \mathbf{0}$, i.e., $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{b}$, while $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{S}\mathbf{b}$ corresponds to $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{b}$ and $\mathbf{b} = \mathbf{b}$, this last expression being trivially true.

²⁰In passing, this way of operating also establishes the equivalence between zero-constrained and structural approaches when $p = 1$, which corresponds to the optimal linear cross-sectional forecast reconciliation, complementing in a sense the result shown by Wickramasuriya et al. (2019) in their online appendix, where this simple step is missing.

with weight matrix $\Phi^\top = \mathbf{M}\Gamma^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$, where

$$\mathbf{M} = \left[\mathbf{I}_n - \Sigma_c \mathbf{C}^\top \left(\mathbf{C} \Sigma_c \mathbf{C}^\top \right)^{-1} \mathbf{C} \right], \quad (\text{D.7})$$

$$\Gamma = \Sigma^{-1} \mathbf{J} \Sigma_c, \quad (\text{D.8})$$

$$\Sigma_c = \left(\mathbf{J}^\top \Sigma^{-1} \mathbf{J} \right)^{-1}. \quad (\text{D.9})$$

In order to establish the equivalence between expressions (D.6) and (18), it will suffice to show that $\mathbf{W}_c = \Sigma_c$. For, noting that $\mathbf{K} = \mathbf{P}^\top \mathbf{J}$ and $\mathbf{W} = \mathbf{P}^\top \Sigma \mathbf{P}$, we have:

$$\mathbf{W}_c = \left(\mathbf{K}^\top \mathbf{W}^{-1} \mathbf{K} \right)^{-1} = \left(\mathbf{J}^\top \mathbf{P} \mathbf{P}^\top \Sigma^{-1} \mathbf{P} \mathbf{P}^\top \mathbf{J} \right)^{-1} = \left(\mathbf{J}^\top \Sigma^{-1} \mathbf{J} \right)^{-1} = \Sigma_c.$$

It follows that:

- $\left[\mathbf{I}_n - \mathbf{W}_c \mathbf{C}^\top \left(\mathbf{C} \mathbf{W}_c \mathbf{C}^\top \right)^{-1} \mathbf{C} \right] = \left[\mathbf{I}_n - \Sigma_c \mathbf{C}^\top \left(\mathbf{C} \Sigma_c \mathbf{C}^\top \right)^{-1} \mathbf{C} \right] = \mathbf{M}$;
- $\Omega = \mathbf{P}^\top \Gamma$ and $\Gamma = \mathbf{P} \Omega$;
- $\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^c = \mathbf{M} \Omega^\top \hat{\mathbf{y}} = \mathbf{M} \Gamma^\top \hat{\mathbf{y}}_{\text{bv}}$.

In addition, denoting $\Gamma = \left[\Gamma_1 \ \dots \ \Gamma_i \ \dots \ \Gamma_n \right]^\top$ and $\Phi = \left[\Phi_1 \ \dots \ \Phi_i \ \dots \ \Phi_n \right]^\top$, we can express the MMSE multi-task combination forecast $\hat{\mathbf{y}}^c$ and the MMSE multi-task coherent combination forecast $\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^c$ as, respectively,

$$\hat{\mathbf{y}}^c = \Gamma^\top \hat{\mathbf{y}}_{\text{bv}} = \sum_{i=1}^n \Gamma_i \hat{\mathbf{y}}_i \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\mathbf{y}}^c = \Phi^\top \hat{\mathbf{y}}_{\text{bv}} = \sum_{i=1}^n \Phi_i \hat{\mathbf{y}}_i,$$

with $\Phi_i = \mathbf{M} \Gamma_i$, $i = 1, \dots, n$.

D.3. Structural approach and by-expert base forecasts' organization

Deriving the MMSE multi-task coherent combination forecast according to the structural approach can be seen as a multi-task extension of the optimal combination forecast reconciliation approach proposed by Athanasopoulos et al. (2009) and Hyndman et al. (2011). This approach, originally developed to reconcile the incoherent base forecasts of a genuine hierarchical/grouped time series, has been extended by Girolimetto and Di Fonzo (2024c) to deal with also general linearly constrained multiple series not having a natural hierarchical/grouped structure. In particular, Girolimetto and Di Fonzo (2024c) have shown how a general linearly constrained time series can be represented in a structural-like form, as in expression (2), i.e., $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{S}\mathbf{b}$. Building on this, in the following we derive the same results as Theorem 1 and Corollary 1.

Let us consider the p linear models

$$\hat{\mathbf{y}}^j = \mathbf{L}_j \mathbf{S} \mathbf{b} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^j, \quad j = 1, \dots, p, \quad (\text{D.10})$$

where \mathbf{L}_j is the selection matrix defined in Section 3.1. Expression (D.10) can be written in compact

form as

$$\hat{\mathbf{y}} = \mathbf{K}\mathbf{S}\mathbf{b} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}, \quad (\text{D.11})$$

with $E(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^\top) = \mathbf{W}$. Coherent multi-task forecast combination can be achieved through model (D.11), by extending to the case of $p \geq 2$ vectors of base forecasts the minimum trace (MinT) solution proposed by Wickramasuriya et al. (2019) as for cross-sectional forecast reconciliation. This result is shown by the following Theorem.

Theorem 2. Optimal linear coherent forecast combination $\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^c$ (structural approach)

Let \hat{y}_i^j , $1 \leq n_j \leq n$, $1 \leq j \leq p_i$, be the unbiased forecasts of the scalar variable y_i , which is part of an n -dimensional target forecast vector \mathbf{y} , and denote $\hat{\mathbf{y}}^j \in \mathbb{R}^{n_j}$ the vector of the base forecasts produced by the j -th expert. Let the zero-mean base forecast errors be $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^j = \hat{\mathbf{y}}^j - \mathbf{y}$, $j = 1, \dots, p$, and assume that $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^j$ and $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^l$ ($j \neq l$) are correlated, with variance and cross-covariance matrices denoted by $\mathbf{W}_j \in \mathbb{R}^{n_j \times n_j}$ and $\mathbf{W}_{jl} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_j \times n_l}$, respectively. Denoting $\mathbf{W} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ the p.d. error covariance matrix as in (16), the MMSE coherent linear forecast combination is given by:

$$\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^c = \mathbf{S}\mathbf{G}\hat{\mathbf{y}}, \quad (\text{D.12})$$

where

$$\mathbf{G} = \left(\mathbf{S}^\top \mathbf{W}_c^{-1} \mathbf{S} \right)^{-1} \mathbf{S}^\top \mathbf{K}^\top \mathbf{W}^{-1}. \quad (\text{D.13})$$

Proof. From the proof of Corollary 1, we know that the unbiasedness of the base forecasts may be expressed in compact form as $E(\hat{\mathbf{y}}) = \mathbf{K}E(\mathbf{y})$. In addition, it is worth noting that $E(\mathbf{y}) = \mathbf{S}E(\mathbf{b})$, and thus $E(\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^c) = \mathbf{S}\mathbf{G}E(\hat{\mathbf{y}}) = \mathbf{S}\mathbf{G}\mathbf{K}E(\mathbf{y}) = \mathbf{S}\mathbf{G}\mathbf{K}\mathbf{S}E(\mathbf{b})$. Then, for $\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^c$ to be unbiased, i.e., $E(\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^c) = E(\mathbf{y}) = \mathbf{S}E(\mathbf{b})$, it must be $\mathbf{S}\mathbf{G}\mathbf{K}\mathbf{S} = \mathbf{S}$, that is:

$$\mathbf{G}\mathbf{K}\mathbf{S} = \mathbf{I}_{n_b}. \quad (\text{D.14})$$

The $(n \times 1)$ vector of the coherent combined forecast error $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}} = \tilde{\mathbf{y}}^c - \mathbf{y}$, may be expressed as

$$\tilde{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}} = \mathbf{S}\mathbf{G}\hat{\mathbf{y}} - \mathbf{y} = \mathbf{S}\mathbf{G}(\hat{\mathbf{y}} - \mathbf{K}\mathbf{y}).$$

Noting that $\mathbf{W} = E[(\hat{\mathbf{y}} - \mathbf{K}\mathbf{y})(\hat{\mathbf{y}} - \mathbf{K}\mathbf{y})^\top]$, the covariance matrix of $\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^c$ is given by $\tilde{\mathbf{W}}_c = E[\tilde{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}}\tilde{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}}^\top] = \mathbf{S}\mathbf{G}\mathbf{W}\mathbf{G}^\top\mathbf{S}^\top$. We want to find the optimal combination weight matrix \mathbf{G} under restriction (D.14) that minimizes the trace of $\tilde{\mathbf{W}}_c$, i.e., $\text{tr}(\mathbf{S}\mathbf{G}\mathbf{W}\mathbf{G}^\top\mathbf{S}^\top)$. At this end, consider the lagrangean function

$$\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{G}, \boldsymbol{\Lambda}) = \text{tr}(\mathbf{S}\mathbf{G}\mathbf{W}\mathbf{G}^\top\mathbf{S}^\top) - 2\text{tr}[\boldsymbol{\Lambda}^\top(\mathbf{G}\mathbf{K}\mathbf{S} - \mathbf{I}_{n_b})],$$

where $\mathbf{\Lambda} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_b \times n_b}$ is a matrix of Lagrange multipliers. Solving the first-order conditions system

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{W}\mathbf{G}^\top \mathbf{S}^\top \mathbf{S} - \mathbf{K}\mathbf{S}\mathbf{\Lambda} &= \mathbf{0}_{m \times n_b} \\ \mathbf{G}\mathbf{S} - \mathbf{I}_{n_b} &= \mathbf{0}_{(n_b \times n_b)} \end{aligned}$$

results in the following expressions:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{K}\mathbf{S}\mathbf{\Lambda} &= \mathbf{W}\mathbf{G}^\top \mathbf{S}^\top \mathbf{S} \\ \mathbf{W}^{-1}\mathbf{K}\mathbf{S}\mathbf{\Lambda} &= \mathbf{G}^\top \mathbf{S}^\top \mathbf{S} && \text{pre-multiplying by } \mathbf{W}^{-1} \text{ on both sides} \\ \mathbf{S}^\top \mathbf{K}^\top \mathbf{W}^{-1}\mathbf{K}\mathbf{S}\mathbf{\Lambda} &= \mathbf{S}^\top \mathbf{K}^\top \mathbf{G}^\top \mathbf{S}^\top \mathbf{S} && \text{pre-multiplying by } \mathbf{S}^\top \mathbf{K}^\top \text{ on both sides} \\ \mathbf{S}^\top \mathbf{W}_c^{-1}\mathbf{S}\mathbf{\Lambda} &= \mathbf{S}^\top \mathbf{K}^\top \mathbf{G}^\top \mathbf{S}^\top \mathbf{S} && \mathbf{W}_c^{-1} = \mathbf{K}^\top \mathbf{W}^{-1}\mathbf{K} \\ \mathbf{S}^\top \mathbf{W}_c^{-1}\mathbf{S}\mathbf{\Lambda} &= \mathbf{S}^\top \mathbf{S} && \text{according to (D.14), } \mathbf{S}^\top \mathbf{K}^\top \mathbf{G}^\top = \mathbf{I}_{n_b} \\ \mathbf{\Lambda} &= \left(\mathbf{S}^\top \mathbf{W}_c^{-1}\mathbf{S} \right)^{-1} \mathbf{S}^\top \mathbf{S}. \end{aligned}$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{W}\mathbf{G}^\top \mathbf{S}^\top \mathbf{S} - \mathbf{K}\mathbf{S}\mathbf{\Lambda} &= \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{W}\mathbf{G}^\top \mathbf{S}^\top \mathbf{S} &= \mathbf{K}\mathbf{S}\mathbf{\Lambda} \\ \mathbf{W}\mathbf{G}^\top \mathbf{S}^\top \mathbf{S} &= \mathbf{K}\mathbf{S} \left(\mathbf{S}^\top \mathbf{W}_c^{-1}\mathbf{S} \right)^{-1} \mathbf{S}^\top \mathbf{S} \\ \mathbf{W}\mathbf{G}^\top &= \mathbf{K}\mathbf{S} \left(\mathbf{S}^\top \mathbf{W}_c^{-1}\mathbf{S} \right)^{-1} && \text{post-multiplying by } \left(\mathbf{S}^\top \mathbf{S} \right)^{-1} \text{ on both sides} \\ \mathbf{G}^\top &= \mathbf{W}^{-1}\mathbf{K}\mathbf{S} \left(\mathbf{S}^\top \mathbf{W}_c^{-1}\mathbf{S} \right)^{-1} && \text{pre-multiplying by } \mathbf{W}^{-1} \text{ on both sides} \\ \mathbf{G} &= \left(\mathbf{S}^\top \mathbf{W}_c^{-1}\mathbf{S} \right)^{-1} \mathbf{S}^\top \mathbf{K}^\top \mathbf{W}^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Remark 6. Since $\mathbf{C}\mathbf{S} = \mathbf{0}_{(n_u \times n_b)}$, the combined forecast vector (D.12) is also coherent, i.e., $\mathbf{C}\hat{\mathbf{y}}^c = \mathbf{0}_{(n_u \times 1)}$. The unbiasedness property may be checked by noting that $E(\mathbf{S}\mathbf{G}\hat{\mathbf{y}}) = \mathbf{S}\mathbf{G}E(\hat{\mathbf{y}}) = \mathbf{S}\mathbf{G}\mathbf{K}E(\mathbf{y})$. Then,

$$E(\mathbf{S}\mathbf{G}\hat{\mathbf{y}}) = \mathbf{S} \overbrace{\mathbf{G}\mathbf{K}\mathbf{S}}^{\mathbf{I}_{n_b}} E(\mathbf{b}) = \mathbf{S}E(\mathbf{b}) = E(\mathbf{y}).$$

Remark 7. A straightforward interpretation of expressions (D.12) and (D.13) is obtained by considering the GLS estimator of \mathbf{b} in model (D.11):

$$\tilde{\mathbf{b}}^c = \left(\mathbf{S}^\top \mathbf{W}_c^{-1}\mathbf{S} \right)^{-1} \mathbf{S}^\top \mathbf{K}^\top \mathbf{W}^{-1}\hat{\mathbf{y}} = \mathbf{G}\hat{\mathbf{y}},$$

where \mathbf{G} is the $(n_b \times m)$ optimal combination weight matrix mapping all the m available forecasts into the n_b reconciled forecasts of the free (bottom) variables of series \mathbf{y}_t . This result is then used to compute the complete vector of coherent combined forecasts according to the structural representation link-

ing the target vectors \mathbf{b} and \mathbf{y} , that is, $\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^c = \mathbf{S}\tilde{\mathbf{b}}^c = \mathbf{S}\mathbf{G}\hat{\mathbf{y}}$. In addition, since $E \left[\left(\tilde{\mathbf{b}}^c - \mathbf{b} \right) \left(\tilde{\mathbf{b}}^c - \mathbf{b} \right)^\top \right] = \left(\mathbf{S}^\top \mathbf{W}_c^{-1} \mathbf{S} \right)^{-1}$, it follows $E \left[\left(\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^c - \mathbf{y} \right) \left(\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^c - \mathbf{y} \right)^\top \right] = \mathbf{S} \left(\mathbf{S}^\top \mathbf{W}_c^{-1} \mathbf{S} \right)^{-1} \mathbf{S}^\top = \tilde{\mathbf{W}}_c$ (see Corollary 2).

Corollary 2. Property of the error covariance matrix (structural approach)

The error covariance matrix of $\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^c$ in expression (D.12) is given by

$$\tilde{\mathbf{W}}_c = \mathbf{S} \left(\mathbf{S}^\top \mathbf{W}_c^{-1} \mathbf{S} \right)^{-1} \mathbf{S}^\top. \quad (\text{D.15})$$

Furthermore, it is

$$\mathbf{L}_j \tilde{\mathbf{W}}_c \mathbf{L}_j^\top \preceq \mathbf{W}_j, \quad j = 1, \dots, p.$$

Proof. In the proof of Theorem 2 it was noted that the error covariance matrix of $\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^c$ is equal to $\tilde{\mathbf{W}}_c = \mathbf{S}\mathbf{G}\mathbf{W}\mathbf{G}^\top \mathbf{S}^\top$. Replacing \mathbf{G} with expression (D.13) gives:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathbf{W}}_c &= \mathbf{S} \left(\mathbf{S}^\top \mathbf{W}_c^{-1} \mathbf{S} \right)^{-1} \underbrace{\mathbf{S}^\top \mathbf{K}^\top \mathbf{W}^{-1} \mathbf{W} \mathbf{W}^{-1} \mathbf{K} \mathbf{S}}_{\mathbf{I}_{n_b}} \left(\mathbf{S}^\top \mathbf{W}_c^{-1} \mathbf{S} \right)^{-1} \mathbf{S}^\top \\ &= \mathbf{S} \left(\mathbf{S}^\top \mathbf{W}_c^{-1} \mathbf{S} \right)^{-1} \mathbf{S}^\top. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.16})$$

As for the derivation of $\mathbf{L}_j \tilde{\mathbf{W}}_c \mathbf{L}_j^\top \preceq \mathbf{W}_j$, $j = 1, \dots, p$, by applying Schwarz matrix inequality, we have^{21,22}

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{L}_j \tilde{\mathbf{W}}_c \mathbf{L}_j^\top &= \mathbf{L}_j \mathbf{S} \left(\mathbf{S}^\top \mathbf{W}_c^{-1} \mathbf{S} \right)^{-1} \mathbf{S}^\top \mathbf{L}_j^\top = \mathbf{L}_j \mathbf{S} \left(\mathbf{S}^\top \mathbf{K}^\top \mathbf{W}^{-1} \mathbf{K} \mathbf{S} \right)^{-1} \mathbf{S}^\top \mathbf{L}_j^\top \\ &= \left[\left(\mathbf{W}^{-1/2} \mathbf{K} \mathbf{S} \right)^\top \left(\mathbf{W}^{1/2} \mathbf{K}_j \mathbf{L}_j^\top \right) \right]^\top \left[\left(\mathbf{W}^{-1/2} \mathbf{K} \mathbf{S} \right)^\top \left(\mathbf{W}^{-1/2} \mathbf{K} \mathbf{S} \right) \right]^{-1} \\ &\quad \left[\left(\mathbf{W}^{-1/2} \mathbf{K} \mathbf{S} \right)^\top \left(\mathbf{W}^{1/2} \mathbf{K}_j \mathbf{L}_j^\top \right) \right] \\ &\preceq \left(\mathbf{W}^{1/2} \mathbf{K}_j \mathbf{L}_j^\top \right)^\top \left(\mathbf{W}^{1/2} \mathbf{K}_j \mathbf{L}_j^\top \right) = \mathbf{W}_j, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.17})$$

where $\mathbf{K}_j = [\mathbf{0} \dots \mathbf{L}_j \dots \mathbf{0}]^\top$ is a $(m \times n)$ matrix whose j -th block place is the selection matrix \mathbf{L}_j , and other blocks are $(n_l \times n)$ zero matrices, $l = 1, \dots, p$, $l \neq j$. \square

²¹It is worth noting that $\left(\mathbf{W}^{-1/2} \mathbf{K} \mathbf{S} \right)^\top \left(\mathbf{W}^{1/2} \mathbf{K}_j \right) = \mathbf{S}^\top \mathbf{K}^\top \mathbf{K}_j = \mathbf{S}^\top \mathbf{L}_j^\top$.

²²According to footnote 17, in this case it is:

$$\underbrace{\left[\underbrace{\mathbf{K}_j^\top \mathbf{W}^{1/2}}_A \underbrace{\mathbf{W}^{-1/2} \mathbf{K} \mathbf{S}}_{B^\top} \right]}_S \underbrace{\left[\underbrace{\mathbf{S}^\top \mathbf{K}^\top \mathbf{W}^{-1/2}}_B \underbrace{\mathbf{W}^{-1/2} \mathbf{K} \mathbf{S}}_{B^\top} \right]^{-1}}_{[\mathbf{S}^\top \mathbf{K}^\top \mathbf{W}^{-1} \mathbf{K} \mathbf{S}]^{-1}} \underbrace{\left[\underbrace{\mathbf{S}^\top \mathbf{K}^\top \mathbf{W}^{-1/2}}_B \underbrace{\mathbf{W}^{1/2} \mathbf{K}_j}_A \right]}_{S^\top}.$$

D.4. Structural approach and by-variable base forecasts' organization

Pre-multiplication of model (D.11) by the permutation matrix \mathbf{P} gives the equivalent, re-parameterized structural model according to a by-variable data organization:

$$\hat{\mathbf{y}}_{\text{bv}} = \mathbf{J}\mathbf{S}\mathbf{b} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{\text{bv}}, \quad (\text{D.18})$$

where $\mathbf{J} = \mathbf{P}\mathbf{K} \in \{0, 1\}^{m \times n}$ is defined by (D.4). In this case, the MMSE coherent linear forecast combination using the by-variable base forecasts' organization is given by:

$$\tilde{\mathbf{y}}^c = \mathbf{S}\mathbf{G}_{\text{bv}}\hat{\mathbf{y}}_{\text{bv}}, \quad (\text{D.19})$$

where $\mathbf{G}_{\text{bv}} = (\mathbf{S}^\top \mathbf{J}^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \mathbf{J} \mathbf{S})^{-1} \mathbf{S}^\top \mathbf{J}^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1}$. Since $\mathbf{J}^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \mathbf{J} = \mathbf{K}^\top \mathbf{P}^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \mathbf{P} = \mathbf{K}^\top \mathbf{W}^{-1} \mathbf{K} = \mathbf{W}_c^{-1}$, it is $\mathbf{G}_{\text{bv}} = (\mathbf{S}^\top \mathbf{W}_c^{-1} \mathbf{S})^{-1} \mathbf{S}^\top \mathbf{K}^\top \mathbf{W}^{-1} = \mathbf{G}$, and $(\mathbf{S}^\top \mathbf{W}_c^{-1} \mathbf{S}) = (\mathbf{S}^\top \mathbf{J}^\top \mathbf{P} \mathbf{P}^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \mathbf{P} \mathbf{P}^\top \mathbf{J} \mathbf{S}) = (\mathbf{S}^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_c^{-1} \mathbf{S})$. In addition, $\mathbf{G}_{\text{bv}} = \mathbf{G}\mathbf{P}^\top$, $\mathbf{G} = \mathbf{G}_{\text{bv}}\mathbf{P}$, and $\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_c = \mathbf{S}\mathbf{G}\hat{\mathbf{y}} = \mathbf{S}\mathbf{G}_{\text{bv}}\hat{\mathbf{y}}_{\text{bv}}$.

Appendix E. Simulation: extended figures and tables

The forecast accuracy is evaluated also using the Average Relative Mean Squared (*AvgRelMSE*) as

$$AvgRelMSE^{app} = \left(\prod_{s=1}^{500} \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{MSE_{s,i}^{app}}{MSE_{s,i}^{ew}} \right)^{\frac{1}{500n}} \quad \text{with} \quad MSE_{s,i}^{app} = \frac{1}{100} \sum_{q=1}^{100} \left(y_{i,s,q} - \bar{y}_{i,s,q}^{app} \right)^2,$$

where $i = 1, \dots, n$ denotes the variable, *app* is the approach used, $y_{i,s,q}$ is the observed value and $\bar{y}_{i,s,q}^{app}$ is the forecast value using the *app* approach (coherent or incoherent, Table E.9).

Table E.9: Summary of forecasting approaches used in the simulation and the forecasting experiment on the Australian daily electricity generation time series. For single-model reconciliation and coherent combination sequential approaches, the shrunk in-sample MSE matrix is used for the reconciliation.

Approach & description	Approach & description
<i>Base (incoherent forecasts)</i>	<i>Coherent combination</i>
base* Best base forecasts (simulations)	src Sequential reconciliation-then-combination with equal weights
tbats Exponential smoothing state space model with Box-Cox transformation, ARMA errors, Trend and Seasonal components (application)	scr _{ew} Sequential ew combination-then-reconciliation
	scr _{var} Sequential ow _{var} combination-then-reconciliation
	scr _{cov} Sequential ow _{cov} combination-then-reconciliation
<i>Single model reconciliation</i>	occ _{bv} Optimal coherent combination using a <i>by-variable</i> block-diagonal shrunk error covariance matrix
base* _{shr} Cross-sectional reconciliation of the best base forecasts (simulations)	occ _{shr} Optimal coherent combination using a full shrunk error covariance matrix
base _{shr} Best cross-sectional reconciliation of base forecasts (simulations)	occ _{wls} Optimal coherent combination using a diagonal error covariance matrix
tbats _{shr} Cross-sectional reconciliation of tbats base (application)	occ _{be} Optimal coherent combination using a <i>by-expert</i> block-diagonal shrunk error covariance matrix
<i>Single-task combination (incoherent forecasts)</i>	
ew Equal-weighted average	
ow _{var} Weighted average, optimal weights inversely proportional to the MSE's	
ow _{cov} Weighted average, optimal weights in the unit simplex (Conflitti et al., 2015) computed using the MSE matrix	

Table E.10: AvgRelMSE for the simulation experiment. Benchmark approach: ew. Bold entries identify the best performing approaches, italic entries identify the second best and red color denotes forecasts worse than the benchmark.

Sett.	p	N	Balanced panel of forecasts										Unbalanced panel of forecasts							
			base*	base ^{shr}	base ^{shr}	ew	OW _{var}	OW _{cov}	SrC	SrC _{ew}	SrC _{var}	SrC _{cov}	OCC _{be}	ew	OW _{var}	OW _{cov}	SrC _{ew}	SrC _{var}	SrC _{cov}	OCC _{be}
1	4	50	1.712	1.130	1.120	1.000	1.004	1.056	0.847	0.901	0.905	0.939	0.818	1.000	1.063	3.884	0.811	1.108	1.272	0.792
		100	1.708	1.078	1.074	1.000	1.001	1.029	0.837	0.895	0.896	0.913	0.801	1.000	1.046	2.532	0.811	1.060	1.246	0.779
		200	1.702	1.052	1.049	1.000	1.000	1.013	0.832	0.888	0.888	0.895	0.791	1.000	1.020	1.638	0.810	1.001	1.190	0.771
	10	50	2.010	1.327	1.315	1.000	1.002	1.108	0.925	0.960	0.963	1.040	0.908	1.000	1.494	34.050	0.885	1.630	2.414	0.883
		100	2.007	1.267	1.262	1.000	1.001	1.068	0.920	0.958	0.959	1.005	0.899	1.000	1.480	28.860	0.882	1.563	2.393	0.861
		200	1.996	1.236	1.232	1.000	1.000	1.039	0.918	0.953	0.953	0.979	0.895	1.000	1.404	18.107	0.880	1.416	2.302	0.849
	20	50	2.136	1.411	1.398	1.000	1.001	1.129	0.958	0.980	0.982	1.081	0.949	1.000	1.836	84.355	0.946	2.045	3.705	0.966
		100	2.139	1.351	1.345	1.000	1.001	1.090	0.956	0.980	0.981	1.046	0.945	1.000	1.787	89.608	0.946	1.922	3.820	0.937
		200	2.118	1.314	1.309	1.000	1.000	1.055	0.955	0.977	0.977	1.015	0.942	1.000	1.662	69.338	0.946	1.699	3.380	0.918
2	4	50	1.502	1.111	1.108	1.000	1.003	1.054	0.901	0.936	0.939	0.973	0.888	1.000	1.042	3.352	0.859	1.061	1.164	0.842
		100	1.503	1.077	1.074	1.000	1.001	1.029	0.893	0.933	0.933	0.951	0.876	1.000	1.036	2.474	0.860	1.041	1.163	0.833
		200	1.500	1.052	1.051	1.000	1.000	1.013	0.888	0.928	0.927	0.935	0.868	1.000	1.025	1.690	0.858	1.013	1.140	0.826
	10	50	1.674	1.238	1.235	1.000	1.001	1.092	0.955	0.975	0.977	1.044	0.949	1.000	1.313	22.856	0.925	1.372	1.840	0.920
		100	1.675	1.200	1.195	1.000	1.000	1.060	0.953	0.976	0.976	1.018	0.944	1.000	1.307	19.212	0.924	1.344	1.822	0.904
		200	1.670	1.171	1.170	1.000	1.000	1.036	0.950	0.973	0.973	0.997	0.940	1.000	1.276	9.649	0.922	1.282	1.647	0.895
	20	50	1.739	1.287	1.281	1.000	1.001	1.103	0.976	0.987	0.988	1.065	0.973	1.000	1.506	52.634	0.970	1.590	2.555	0.981
		100	1.740	1.247	1.242	1.000	1.000	1.074	0.976	0.988	0.988	1.042	0.971	1.000	1.490	55.401	0.971	1.549	2.608	0.962
		200	1.736	1.217	1.216	1.000	1.000	1.046	0.974	0.988	0.988	1.019	0.968	1.000	1.438	48.233	0.973	1.456	2.559	0.949
3	4	50	1.240	1.073	1.071	1.000	1.001	1.043	0.957	0.975	0.976	1.006	0.954	1.000	1.738	5.907	0.936	1.881	2.137	0.920
		100	1.241	1.052	1.052	1.000	1.000	1.027	0.953	0.972	0.972	0.990	0.948	1.000	1.742	5.729	0.937	1.831	2.192	0.916
		200	1.242	1.036	1.035	1.000	1.000	1.015	0.948	0.968	0.969	0.979	0.943	1.000	1.712	5.168	0.932	1.745	2.243	0.912
	10	50	1.301	1.124	1.124	1.000	1.000	1.061	0.983	0.990	0.990	1.037	0.981	1.000	2.125	25.490	0.974	2.301	2.850	0.966
		100	1.305	1.105	1.102	1.000	1.000	1.044	0.980	0.990	0.990	1.022	0.978	1.000	2.121	21.027	0.972	2.237	2.747	0.956
		200	1.305	1.092	1.087	1.000	1.000	1.028	0.978	0.989	0.989	1.009	0.975	1.000	2.051	10.766	0.975	2.101	2.349	0.952
	20	50	1.324	1.144	1.143	1.000	1.000	1.064	0.991	0.995	0.995	1.044	0.990	1.000	2.324	49.384	0.994	2.526	3.512	0.993
		100	1.327	1.124	1.121	1.000	1.000	1.048	0.990	0.994	0.994	1.031	0.988	1.000	2.280	55.099	0.995	2.425	3.561	0.983
		200	1.328	1.112	1.106	1.000	1.000	1.035	0.989	0.995	0.995	1.021	0.987	1.000	2.181	48.296	0.997	2.245	3.429	0.979
4	4	50	1.546	1.152	1.152	1.000	0.981	1.001	0.901	0.937	0.915	0.902	0.849	1.000	0.994	2.993	0.847	1.010	1.102	0.822
		100	1.542	1.114	1.114	1.000	0.978	0.977	0.895	0.933	0.909	0.877	0.836	1.000	0.995	2.329	0.847	0.999	1.098	0.813
		200	1.543	1.087	1.087	1.000	0.977	0.965	0.889	0.928	0.904	0.864	0.826	1.000	0.983	1.474	0.846	0.971	1.062	0.806
	10	50	1.734	1.287	1.287	1.000	0.971	0.975	0.956	0.976	0.947	0.913	0.899	1.000	1.272	22.092	0.910	1.331	1.751	0.894
		100	1.730	1.253	1.253	1.000	0.970	0.939	0.953	0.975	0.945	0.878	0.889	1.000	1.264	17.674	0.911	1.298	1.731	0.877
		200	1.731	1.221	1.221	1.000	0.970	0.919	0.951	0.974	0.943	0.857	0.882	1.000	1.239	9.583	0.909	1.248	1.599	0.868
	20	50	1.785	1.325	1.325	1.000	0.967	0.948	0.978	0.988	0.954	0.900	0.918	1.000	1.475	54.937	0.963	1.561	2.493	0.951
		100	1.789	1.293	1.293	1.000	0.967	0.906	0.976	0.988	0.954	0.862	0.910	1.000	1.453	52.381	0.962	1.510	2.580	0.930
		200	1.778	1.261	1.261	1.000	0.966	0.877	0.974	0.988	0.954	0.832	0.903	1.000	1.406	43.904	0.961	1.422	2.324	0.916
5	4	50	1.539	1.099	1.099	1.000	0.978	1.019	0.881	0.920	0.911	0.939	0.857	1.000	0.970	3.043	0.833	0.987	1.081	0.806
		100	1.547	1.077	1.069	1.000	0.977	0.996	0.871	0.916	0.905	0.916	0.844	1.000	0.963	2.197	0.833	0.968	1.074	0.795
		200	1.545	1.049	1.046	1.000	0.976	0.983	0.867	0.910	0.900	0.904	0.838	1.000	0.958	1.509	0.832	0.946	1.055	0.789
	10	50	1.750	1.260	1.260	1.000	0.988	1.075	0.946	0.970	0.963	1.025	0.934	1.000	1.251	19.939	0.904	1.307	1.778	0.890
		100	1.744	1.216	1.216	1.000	0.987	1.041	0.944	0.970	0.962	1.000	0.929	1.000	1.244	16.563	0.904	1.278	1.719	0.873
		200	1.744	1.181	1.181	1.000	0.986	1.018	0.937	0.966	0.958	0.979	0.921	1.000	1.216	9.717	0.899	1.224	1.625	0.861
	20	50	1.830	1.325	1.321	1.000	0.994	1.102	0.971	0.984	0.981	1.060	0.965	1.000	1.472	54.645	0.960	1.554	2.538	0.962
		100	1.829	1.283	1.272	1.000	0.993	1.064	0.969	0.985	0.980	1.031	0.961	1.000	1.449	56.087	0.960	1.507	2.644	0.941
		200	1.838	1.245	1.238	1.000	0.993	1.040	0.968	0.984	0.979	1.013	0.959	1.000	1.407	48.361	0.959	1.424	2.483	0.927
6	4	50	1.836	1.488	1.488	1.000	0.940	0.935	0.922	0.949	0.868	0.854	0.813	1.000	0.765	2.523	0.726	0.763	0.831	0.708
		100	1.824	1.443	1.443	1.000	0.936	0.912	0.912	0.945	0.859	0.830	0.800	1.000	0.760	1.705	0.724	0.751	0.818	0.693
		200	1.821	1.414	1.414	1.000	0.936	0.901	0.905	0.941	0.855	0.817	0.792	1.000	0.751	1.171	0.719	0.733	0.790	0.683
	10	50	2.202	1.782	1.782	1.000	0.963	1.011	0.962	0.978	0.932	0.964	0.897	1.000	1.034	20.803	0.799	1.074	1.478	0.795
		100	2.198	1.740	1.740	1.000	0.961	0.976	0.959	0.979	0.930	0.936	0.890	1.000	1.027	17.133	0.795	1.050	1.462	0.773
		200	2.179	1.698	1.698	1.000	0.961	0.956	0.955	0.976	0.927	0.917	0.887	1.000	1.010	10.024	0.796	1.013	1.416	0.763
	20	50	2.348	1.903	1.903	1.000	0.981	1.065	0.979	0.988	0.966	1.030	0.947	1.000	1.312	55.538	0.894	1.387	2.407	0.910
		100	2.343	1.849	1.849	1.000	0.978	1.027	0.978	0.989	0.963	0.998	0.940	1.000	1.292	57.402	0.889	1.338		

E.1. Simulation with uncorrelated forecast errors

Table E.11: AvgRelMAE for the simulation experiment (balanced panel of forecasts). Benchmark approach: ew. Bold entries identify the best performing approaches, italic entries identify the second best and red color denotes forecasts worse than the benchmark.

Sett.	p	N	Approach													
			base*	base* _{shr}	base _{shr}	ew	OW _{var}	OW _{cov}	SFC	SCT _{ew}	SCT _{var}	SCT _{cov}	OCC _{wls}	OCC _{hw}	OCC _{s-hr}	OCC _{be}
1	4	50	1.269	1.132	1.132	1.000	1.003	1.028	<i>0.955</i>	0.962	0.965	0.982	0.953	0.969	1.053	0.959
		100	1.267	1.127	1.126	1.000	1.001	1.015	<i>0.953</i>	0.959	0.959	0.968	0.951	0.962	1.031	0.955
		200	1.265	1.121	1.121	1.000	1.001	1.008	<i>0.953</i>	0.956	0.957	0.961	0.952	0.959	1.000	0.954
	10	50	1.358	1.213	1.213	1.000	1.002	1.050	<i>0.979</i>	0.984	0.986	1.021	0.978	1.019	1.165	0.981
		100	1.358	1.208	1.207	1.000	1.001	1.032	<i>0.978</i>	0.982	0.983	1.005	0.977	1.002	1.197	0.979
		200	1.352	1.199	1.199	1.000	1.000	1.019	<i>0.977</i>	0.981	0.981	0.994	0.977	0.992	1.125	0.978
	20	50	1.395	1.246	1.246	1.000	1.001	1.059	<i>0.988</i>	0.992	0.993	1.037	0.988	1.070	1.143	0.989
		100	1.394	1.240	1.239	1.000	1.000	1.040	<i>0.988</i>	0.991	0.991	1.021	0.987	1.039	1.283	0.988
		200	1.385	1.229	1.229	1.000	1.000	1.026	0.987	0.990	0.991	1.009	<i>0.987</i>	1.016	1.324	0.988
2	4	50	1.195	1.099	1.098	1.000	1.001	1.026	<i>0.972</i>	0.976	0.977	0.994	0.969	0.983	1.065	0.974
		100	1.192	1.094	1.094	1.000	1.001	1.015	<i>0.971</i>	0.975	0.975	0.984	0.969	0.977	1.048	0.972
		200	1.192	1.089	1.089	1.000	1.000	1.008	<i>0.970</i>	0.973	0.973	0.978	0.969	0.974	1.018	0.971
	10	50	1.249	1.149	1.149	1.000	1.001	1.042	<i>0.988</i>	0.990	0.991	1.020	0.987	1.028	1.165	0.989
		100	1.247	1.145	1.144	1.000	1.000	1.028	<i>0.987</i>	0.990	0.990	1.009	0.986	1.010	1.202	0.988
		200	1.245	1.138	1.138	1.000	1.000	1.018	<i>0.987</i>	0.990	0.990	1.001	0.986	0.999	1.137	0.987
	20	50	1.268	1.165	1.165	1.000	1.001	1.046	<i>0.994</i>	0.995	0.995	1.028	0.993	1.079	1.145	0.995
		100	1.267	1.163	1.162	1.000	1.000	1.032	<i>0.993</i>	0.995	0.995	1.018	0.993	1.044	1.281	0.994
		200	1.264	1.155	1.155	1.000	1.000	1.023	<i>0.993</i>	0.995	0.995	1.010	0.993	1.020	1.323	0.993
3	4	50	1.092	1.052	1.050	1.000	1.000	1.020	<i>0.989</i>	0.990	0.991	1.005	0.986	0.999	1.076	0.990
		100	1.093	1.049	1.049	1.000	1.000	1.012	<i>0.988</i>	0.990	0.990	0.999	0.986	0.993	1.059	0.989
		200	1.093	1.047	1.046	1.000	1.000	1.008	<i>0.987</i>	0.989	0.989	0.994	0.986	0.990	1.034	0.988
	10	50	1.114	1.072	1.071	1.000	1.000	1.027	<i>0.995</i>	0.996	0.996	1.016	0.994	1.030	1.161	0.996
		100	1.115	1.068	1.068	1.000	1.000	1.018	<i>0.995</i>	0.996	0.996	1.009	0.994	1.016	1.185	0.995
		200	1.115	1.067	1.067	1.000	1.000	1.013	<i>0.995</i>	0.996	0.996	1.005	0.994	1.006	1.136	0.995
	20	50	1.122	1.080	1.079	1.000	1.000	1.028	<i>0.998</i>	0.998	0.998	1.018	0.997	1.073	1.142	0.998
		100	1.122	1.076	1.076	1.000	1.000	1.020	<i>0.997</i>	0.998	0.998	1.012	0.997	1.045	1.258	0.997
		200	1.123	1.074	1.074	1.000	1.000	1.014	<i>0.997</i>	0.998	0.998	1.008	0.997	1.023	1.297	0.997
4	4	50	1.213	1.117	1.117	1.000	0.989	0.994	0.972	0.976	0.964	<i>0.955</i>	0.955	0.946	1.012	0.956
		100	1.212	1.113	1.113	1.000	0.988	0.983	0.971	0.975	0.961	<i>0.943</i>	0.954	0.937	0.990	0.952
		200	1.211	1.110	1.110	1.000	0.988	0.978	0.969	0.972	0.958	<i>0.937</i>	0.954	0.934	0.964	0.951
	10	50	1.272	1.175	1.174	1.000	0.984	0.978	0.988	0.991	0.974	<i>0.949</i>	0.970	0.945	1.064	0.966
		100	1.269	1.167	1.167	1.000	0.983	0.960	0.988	0.991	0.973	<i>0.933</i>	0.969	0.924	1.076	0.964
		200	1.272	1.166	1.166	1.000	0.984	0.952	0.987	0.990	0.973	<i>0.923</i>	0.969	0.915	1.020	0.963
	20	50	1.288	1.187	1.187	1.000	0.982	0.962	0.994	0.995	0.976	0.940	0.974	<i>0.952</i>	1.022	0.969
		100	1.288	1.183	1.183	1.000	0.981	0.942	0.993	0.995	0.976	<i>0.920</i>	0.974	0.917	1.112	0.967
		200	1.285	1.178	1.178	1.000	0.981	0.927	0.993	0.995	0.976	<i>0.906</i>	0.974	0.894	1.132	0.967
5	4	50	1.209	1.103	1.103	1.000	0.992	1.012	0.966	0.971	0.966	0.979	0.957	0.968	1.047	<i>0.963</i>
		100	1.209	1.098	1.098	1.000	0.991	1.001	0.964	0.968	0.963	0.970	0.957	0.963	1.030	<i>0.961</i>
		200	1.209	1.096	1.096	1.000	0.991	0.994	0.963	0.967	0.961	0.964	0.957	<i>0.959</i>	1.003	0.959
	10	50	1.275	1.164	1.164	1.000	0.996	1.035	0.985	0.988	0.985	1.013	0.981	1.019	1.156	<i>0.983</i>
		100	1.273	1.159	1.159	1.000	0.995	1.021	0.985	0.988	0.985	1.002	0.981	1.002	1.186	<i>0.983</i>
		200	1.273	1.155	1.155	1.000	0.995	1.010	0.983	0.987	0.983	0.992	0.980	0.991	1.122	<i>0.981</i>
	20	50	1.301	1.187	1.187	1.000	0.998	1.045	0.992	0.994	0.992	1.027	0.990	1.073	1.144	<i>0.991</i>
		100	1.300	1.182	1.182	1.000	0.997	1.029	0.992	0.994	0.992	1.014	0.989	1.038	1.269	<i>0.990</i>
		200	1.301	1.179	1.179	1.000	0.997	1.020	0.991	0.994	0.992	1.008	0.990	1.017	1.310	<i>0.990</i>
6	4	50	1.346	1.281	1.281	1.000	0.965	0.959	0.982	0.983	0.938	<i>0.928</i>	0.934	0.915	0.984	0.930
		100	1.344	1.274	1.274	1.000	0.962	0.947	0.979	0.981	0.933	<i>0.915</i>	0.931	0.906	0.961	0.925
		200	1.341	1.266	1.266	1.000	0.961	0.940	0.976	0.978	0.929	<i>0.907</i>	0.930	0.901	0.931	0.921
	10	50	1.468	1.396	1.396	1.000	0.979	1.000	0.991	0.991	0.966	0.978	<i>0.964</i>	0.979	1.113	0.961
		100	1.467	1.391	1.391	1.000	0.978	0.984	0.989	0.991	0.964	0.965	<i>0.962</i>	0.964	1.134	0.958
		200	1.460	1.379	1.379	1.000	0.978	0.974	0.989	0.991	0.963	0.957	0.963	0.955	1.074	<i>0.957</i>
	20	50	1.511	1.440	1.440	1.000	0.989	1.026	0.996	0.995	0.983	1.010	<i>0.981</i>	1.043	1.128	0.981
		100	1.513	1.436	1.436	1.000	0.988	1.009	0.995	0.995	0.981	0.996	<i>0.980</i>	1.015	1.241	0.978
		200	1.511	1.428	1.428	1.000	0.986	0.997	0.994	0.996	0.980	0.985	<i>0.979</i>	0.993	1.264	0.975

Table E.12: AvgRelMSE for the simulation experiment (balanced panel of forecasts). Benchmark approach: ew. Bold entries identify the best performing approaches, italic entries identify the second best and red color denotes forecasts worse than the benchmark.

Sett.	p	N	Approach													
			base*	base* _{shr}	base _{shr}	ew	OW _{var}	OW _{cov}	sfc	scr _{ew}	scr _{var}	scr _{cov}	OCC _{wls}	OCC _{by}	OCC _{shr}	OCC _{be}
1	4	50	1.611	1.283	1.283	1.000	1.005	1.058	<i>0.912</i>	0.926	0.930	0.965	0.908	0.939	1.108	0.919
		100	1.606	1.269	1.269	1.000	1.002	1.031	<i>0.909</i>	0.919	0.921	0.939	0.906	0.926	1.063	0.913
		200	1.603	1.257	1.257	1.000	1.001	1.015	<i>0.908</i>	0.914	0.915	0.924	0.907	0.919	0.999	0.910
	10	50	1.847	1.474	1.472	1.000	1.004	1.104	<i>0.957</i>	0.968	0.971	1.043	0.956	1.039	1.355	0.962
		100	1.843	1.457	1.457	1.000	1.002	1.065	<i>0.956</i>	0.965	0.966	1.010	0.954	1.004	1.432	0.958
		200	1.830	1.439	1.439	1.000	1.001	1.039	0.955	0.962	0.963	0.988	<i>0.955</i>	0.984	1.265	0.956
	20	50	1.947	1.552	1.551	1.000	1.002	1.121	<i>0.976</i>	0.983	0.985	1.074	0.976	1.146	1.305	0.979
		100	1.943	1.536	1.536	1.000	1.001	1.082	<i>0.975</i>	0.982	0.983	1.042	0.974	1.079	1.646	0.976
		200	1.922	1.511	1.511	1.000	1.001	1.054	0.975	0.981	0.982	1.018	<i>0.975</i>	1.032	1.753	0.976
2	4	50	1.428	1.206	1.206	1.000	1.003	1.053	<i>0.944</i>	0.953	0.955	0.988	0.939	0.966	1.135	0.948
		100	1.421	1.195	1.195	1.000	1.001	1.030	<i>0.942</i>	0.950	0.951	0.969	0.938	0.954	1.098	0.945
		200	1.421	1.185	1.185	1.000	1.001	1.016	<i>0.941</i>	0.947	0.947	0.956	0.938	0.947	1.036	0.942
	10	50	1.561	1.321	1.321	1.000	1.002	1.086	<i>0.976</i>	0.980	0.982	1.041	0.974	1.057	1.354	0.978
		100	1.556	1.308	1.308	1.000	1.001	1.056	<i>0.975</i>	0.980	0.981	1.018	0.973	1.019	1.443	0.976
		200	1.551	1.294	1.294	1.000	1.001	1.036	<i>0.974</i>	0.979	0.980	1.002	0.973	0.998	1.290	0.974
	20	50	1.610	1.362	1.361	1.000	1.001	1.095	<i>0.987</i>	0.990	0.991	1.058	0.986	1.165	1.308	0.989
		100	1.607	1.351	1.351	1.000	1.000	1.066	<i>0.987</i>	0.989	0.990	1.037	0.986	1.091	1.641	0.987
		200	1.599	1.334	1.334	1.000	1.000	1.046	<i>0.986</i>	0.991	0.991	1.021	0.986	1.042	1.749	0.987
3	4	50	1.198	1.109	1.107	1.000	1.001	1.042	<i>0.977</i>	0.981	0.982	1.011	0.973	0.998	1.164	0.979
		100	1.201	1.103	1.103	1.000	1.000	1.026	<i>0.976</i>	0.980	0.980	0.997	0.972	0.987	1.125	0.976
		200	1.201	1.098	1.097	1.000	1.000	1.016	<i>0.974</i>	0.978	0.978	0.988	0.972	0.980	1.070	0.974
	10	50	1.249	1.155	1.154	1.000	1.001	1.056	<i>0.991</i>	0.991	0.992	1.033	0.989	1.064	1.362	0.992
		100	1.249	1.147	1.147	1.000	1.000	1.039	<i>0.990</i>	0.991	0.992	1.020	0.988	1.034	1.418	0.990
		200	1.250	1.142	1.142	1.000	1.000	1.027	<i>0.989</i>	0.992	0.992	1.010	0.988	1.012	1.299	0.989
	20	50	1.266	1.172	1.170	1.000	1.000	1.058	<i>0.995</i>	0.995	0.996	1.039	0.994	1.159	1.315	0.996
		100	1.268	1.164	1.164	1.000	1.000	1.042	<i>0.995</i>	0.995	0.996	1.025	0.994	1.096	1.599	0.995
		200	1.268	1.158	1.158	1.000	1.000	1.030	<i>0.994</i>	0.995	0.995	1.016	0.994	1.049	1.700	0.994
4	4	50	1.472	1.249	1.249	1.000	0.978	0.990	0.944	0.954	0.929	<i>0.912</i>	0.913	0.894	1.025	0.914
		100	1.468	1.239	1.239	1.000	0.976	0.967	0.942	0.950	0.924	<i>0.890</i>	0.911	0.878	0.983	0.907
		200	1.469	1.231	1.231	1.000	0.975	0.956	0.940	0.946	0.919	<i>0.878</i>	0.911	0.872	0.929	0.904
	10	50	1.619	1.379	1.379	1.000	0.969	0.956	0.976	0.981	0.949	<i>0.901</i>	0.940	0.892	1.131	0.934
		100	1.613	1.366	1.364	1.000	0.967	0.922	0.975	0.981	0.947	<i>0.870</i>	0.939	0.854	1.161	0.929
		200	1.612	1.356	1.356	1.000	0.967	0.904	0.974	0.979	0.946	<i>0.852</i>	0.939	0.836	1.040	0.927
	20	50	1.661	1.412	1.412	1.000	0.964	0.927	0.988	0.990	0.953	0.883	0.949	<i>0.905</i>	1.042	0.939
		100	1.655	1.398	1.398	1.000	0.963	0.888	0.987	0.990	0.953	<i>0.847</i>	0.949	0.843	1.238	0.936
		200	1.650	1.383	1.383	1.000	0.963	0.860	0.987	0.991	0.953	<i>0.822</i>	0.949	0.798	1.283	0.935
5	4	50	1.462	1.219	1.219	1.000	0.983	1.024	0.932	0.943	0.933	0.958	0.916	0.937	1.097	<i>0.927</i>
		100	1.460	1.205	1.205	1.000	0.982	1.002	0.930	0.937	0.928	0.941	0.915	0.926	1.061	<i>0.923</i>
		200	1.461	1.202	1.202	1.000	0.981	0.988	0.928	0.934	0.924	0.928	0.915	<i>0.920</i>	1.005	0.920
	10	50	1.627	1.358	1.358	1.000	0.991	1.072	0.970	0.976	0.970	1.026	0.962	1.038	1.337	<i>0.967</i>
		100	1.619	1.343	1.343	1.000	0.990	1.042	0.969	0.976	0.970	1.004	0.961	1.004	1.407	<i>0.965</i>
		200	1.624	1.338	1.338	1.000	0.990	1.020	0.967	0.974	0.968	0.986	0.961	0.983	1.261	<i>0.963</i>
	20	50	1.692	1.408	1.408	1.000	0.995	1.094	0.984	0.987	0.985	1.055	0.980	1.151	1.305	<i>0.983</i>
		100	1.691	1.401	1.399	1.000	0.994	1.060	0.983	0.987	0.984	1.029	0.979	1.078	1.613	<i>0.981</i>
		200	1.692	1.391	1.391	1.000	0.995	1.040	0.983	0.988	0.984	1.015	0.979	1.034	1.714	<i>0.981</i>
6	4	50	1.765	1.591	1.591	1.000	0.938	0.930	0.963	0.964	0.886	<i>0.869</i>	0.877	0.846	0.978	0.872
		100	1.755	1.570	1.570	1.000	0.933	0.906	0.957	0.961	0.877	<i>0.847</i>	0.873	0.830	0.933	0.862
		200	1.751	1.550	1.550	1.000	0.932	0.894	0.953	0.957	0.871	<i>0.833</i>	0.872	0.822	0.879	0.857
	10	50	2.084	1.877	1.877	1.000	0.962	1.003	0.982	0.983	0.936	0.962	<i>0.932</i>	0.963	1.245	0.927
		100	2.080	1.860	1.860	1.000	0.959	0.971	0.979	0.983	0.933	0.936	<i>0.930</i>	0.933	1.289	0.922
		200	2.064	1.826	1.826	1.000	0.959	0.952	0.977	0.982	0.931	0.920	0.930	0.915	1.158	<i>0.919</i>
	20	50	2.211	2.000	2.000	1.000	0.980	1.055	0.991	0.990	0.967	1.021	<i>0.964</i>	1.089	1.274	0.964
		100	2.218	1.986	1.986	1.000	0.977	1.020	0.989	0.991	0.964	0.992	<i>0.961</i>	1.031	1.544	0.957
		200	2.202	1.952	1.952	1.000	0.975	0.996	0.988	0.991	0.961	0.973	<i>0.959</i>	0.989	1.599	0.953

Table E.13: AvgRelMAE for the simulation experiment (unbalanced panel of forecasts). Benchmark approach: ew. Bold entries identify the best performing approaches, italic entries identify the second best and red color denotes forecasts worse than the benchmark.

Sett.	p	N	Approach									
			ew	OWvar	OWcov	SCTew	SCTvar	SCTcov	OCCewls	OCCbv	OCCshr	OCCbpe
1	4	50	1.000	1.067	1.561	0.920	1.096	1.176	0.908	0.941	0.911	<i>0.911</i>
		100	1.000	1.065	1.452	0.920	1.078	1.177	0.903	0.937	0.906	<i>0.906</i>
		200	1.000	1.048	1.279	0.919	1.043	1.149	0.902	0.937	<i>0.904</i>	0.905
	10	50	1.000	1.250	3.037	0.952	1.312	1.525	0.950	0.976	0.950	0.951
		100	1.000	1.249	2.933	0.950	1.285	1.525	0.942	0.970	<i>0.942</i>	0.944
		200	1.000	1.216	2.624	0.951	1.224	1.475	<i>0.938</i>	0.968	0.938	0.940
	20	50	1.000	1.369	4.231	0.979	1.448	1.815	<i>0.985</i>	0.998	<i>0.985</i>	0.985
		100	1.000	1.355	4.456	0.978	1.407	1.832	0.973	0.987	0.973	0.974
		200	1.000	1.304	4.098	0.979	1.320	1.734	0.967	0.983	0.967	0.968
2	4	50	1.000	1.051	1.441	0.943	1.065	1.115	0.932	0.959	0.935	<i>0.934</i>
		100	1.000	1.052	1.378	0.943	1.059	1.121	0.928	0.958	0.933	<i>0.931</i>
		200	1.000	1.043	1.276	0.942	1.040	1.111	0.927	0.956	0.929	<i>0.929</i>
	10	50	1.000	1.167	2.514	0.970	1.195	1.333	0.967	0.988	0.967	0.968
		100	1.000	1.167	2.452	0.969	1.183	1.329	<i>0.961</i>	0.983	0.961	0.962
		200	1.000	1.153	1.986	0.970	1.157	1.253	<i>0.957</i>	0.982	0.957	0.959
	20	50	1.000	1.239	3.429	0.989	1.273	1.526	<i>0.992</i>	1.001	<i>0.992</i>	0.992
		100	1.000	1.233	3.564	0.989	1.256	1.544	0.984	0.994	0.984	0.984
		200	1.000	1.211	3.451	0.991	1.218	1.508	0.980	0.992	0.980	0.981
3	4	50	1.000	1.343	1.865	0.976	1.404	1.492	0.967	0.984	0.972	<i>0.968</i>
		100	1.000	1.348	1.882	0.975	1.387	1.512	0.964	0.984	0.967	<i>0.967</i>
		200	1.000	1.338	1.927	0.975	1.356	1.537	0.964	0.982	0.968	<i>0.966</i>
	10	50	1.000	1.477	2.810	0.990	1.540	1.660	0.986	0.998	<i>0.986</i>	0.987
		100	1.000	1.475	2.688	0.990	1.517	1.625	<i>0.982</i>	0.997	0.982	0.983
		200	1.000	1.453	2.302	0.990	1.474	1.521	0.981	0.995	<i>0.981</i>	0.982
	20	50	1.000	1.533	3.541	0.998	1.599	1.801	0.997	1.003	0.997	0.997
		100	1.000	1.523	3.545	0.999	1.572	1.794	0.993	1.000	0.993	0.994
		200	1.000	1.491	3.682	0.999	1.514	1.754	0.992	0.998	0.992	0.992
4	4	50	1.000	1.026	1.381	0.934	1.039	1.079	0.921	0.957	0.923	<i>0.922</i>
		100	1.000	1.025	1.318	0.935	1.032	1.080	0.917	0.954	0.919	<i>0.919</i>
		200	1.000	1.021	1.215	0.934	1.019	1.072	0.914	0.953	<i>0.915</i>	0.915
	10	50	1.000	1.151	2.446	0.964	1.180	1.307	0.954	0.988	0.954	0.955
		100	1.000	1.150	2.384	0.962	1.167	1.308	0.947	0.983	<i>0.947</i>	0.947
		200	1.000	1.135	2.051	0.962	1.140	1.242	<i>0.943</i>	0.980	0.943	0.943
	20	50	1.000	1.224	3.380	0.984	1.260	1.492	0.976	1.003	0.976	0.976
		100	1.000	1.216	3.604	0.984	1.242	1.513	<i>0.967</i>	0.996	<i>0.967</i>	0.967
		200	1.000	1.198	3.399	0.984	1.207	1.482	0.962	0.991	<i>0.962</i>	0.962
5	4	50	1.000	1.021	1.374	0.932	1.033	1.080	0.916	0.956	0.919	<i>0.918</i>
		100	1.000	1.021	1.329	0.932	1.026	1.083	0.913	0.954	<i>0.915</i>	0.915
		200	1.000	1.015	1.222	0.931	1.013	1.075	0.910	0.952	0.912	<i>0.912</i>
	10	50	1.000	1.143	2.481	0.962	1.169	1.309	<i>0.954</i>	0.986	0.954	0.955
		100	1.000	1.141	2.363	0.961	1.157	1.300	0.947	0.982	<i>0.947</i>	0.948
		200	1.000	1.129	2.029	0.961	1.133	1.239	<i>0.944</i>	0.981	0.944	0.945
	20	50	1.000	1.226	3.427	0.984	1.260	1.514	<i>0.984</i>	1.001	<i>0.984</i>	0.985
		100	1.000	1.218	3.583	0.986	1.242	1.534	0.975	0.996	0.975	0.976
		200	1.000	1.201	3.407	0.985	1.209	1.502	0.971	0.992	0.971	0.971
6	4	50	1.000	0.891	1.228	<i>0.855</i>	0.892	0.929	0.855	0.976	0.858	0.848
		100	1.000	0.891	1.158	0.854	0.889	0.926	0.851	0.969	<i>0.849</i>	0.841
		200	1.000	0.879	1.032	0.849	0.872	0.906	0.847	0.970	<i>0.841</i>	0.833
	10	50	1.000	1.032	2.405	0.899	1.053	1.199	<i>0.899</i>	1.017	<i>0.899</i>	0.895
		100	1.000	1.027	2.322	0.894	1.040	1.192	<i>0.889</i>	1.012	0.889	0.884
		200	1.000	1.020	2.097	0.894	1.024	1.170	<i>0.887</i>	1.006	0.887	0.881
	20	50	1.000	1.151	3.467	0.946	1.182	1.464	0.953	1.028	0.953	<i>0.952</i>
		100	1.000	1.144	3.503	0.944	1.165	1.466	<i>0.941</i>	1.015	<i>0.941</i>	0.939
		200	1.000	1.128	3.381	0.942	1.135	1.422	<i>0.935</i>	1.010	<i>0.935</i>	0.931

Table E.14: AvgRelMAE for the simulation experiment (unbalanced panel of forecasts). Benchmark approach: ew. Bold entries identify the best performing approaches, italic entries identify the second best and red color denotes forecasts worse than the benchmark.

Sett.	p	N	Approach										
			ew	OWvar	OWcov	SCTew	SCTvar	SCTcov	OCCwls	OCCbv	OCCshr	OCCpe	
1	4	50	1.000	1.142	4.445	0.843	1.204	1.414	0.821	0.882	0.827	<i>0.825</i>	
		100	1.000	1.135	3.129	0.844	1.158	1.394	0.811	0.875	0.818	<i>0.816</i>	
		200	1.000	1.100	1.959	0.841	1.086	1.324	0.808	0.874	<i>0.812</i>	0.814	
	10	50	1.000	1.574	34.142	0.903	1.727	2.534	0.901	0.952	0.901	0.904	
		100	1.000	1.561	27.893	0.900	1.648	2.530	0.885	0.939	<i>0.885</i>	0.888	
		200	1.000	1.483	16.711	0.901	1.501	2.349	<i>0.878</i>	0.935	0.878	0.881	
	20	50	1.000	1.888	84.260	0.959	2.110	3.768	<i>0.973</i>	1.000	<i>0.973</i>	0.974	
		100	1.000	1.840	92.476	0.956	1.981	3.905	0.947	0.974	0.947	0.949	
		200	1.000	1.711	71.014	0.957	1.749	3.532	0.935	0.967	0.935	0.937	
	2	4	50	1.000	1.103	3.558	0.887	1.132	1.252	0.866	0.918	0.873	<i>0.869</i>
			100	1.000	1.104	2.806	0.887	1.117	1.262	0.859	0.914	0.877	<i>0.863</i>
			200	1.000	1.088	2.042	0.885	1.081	1.237	0.856	0.912	0.863	<i>0.861</i>
10		50	1.000	1.363	22.230	0.939	1.426	1.877	<i>0.932</i>	0.975	0.932	0.934	
		100	1.000	1.360	18.549	0.937	1.398	1.857	<i>0.922</i>	0.966	0.922	0.924	
		200	1.000	1.330	8.240	0.940	1.339	1.621	<i>0.916</i>	0.964	0.916	0.919	
20		50	1.000	1.536	52.890	0.977	1.623	2.588	<i>0.984</i>	1.004	<i>0.984</i>	0.985	
		100	1.000	1.519	56.419	0.978	1.577	2.641	0.968	0.988	0.968	0.969	
		200	1.000	1.468	48.081	0.981	1.485	2.525	0.960	0.984	0.960	0.961	
3		4	50	1.000	1.801	6.249	0.950	1.959	2.247	0.932	0.967	0.955	<i>0.935</i>
			100	1.000	1.808	5.826	0.949	1.907	2.299	0.928	0.965	0.936	<i>0.932</i>
			200	1.000	1.780	5.758	0.948	1.823	2.366	0.926	0.964	0.940	<i>0.930</i>
	10	50	1.000	2.174	25.406	0.980	2.356	2.893	0.971	0.996	<i>0.971</i>	0.972	
		100	1.000	2.162	20.583	0.980	2.283	2.770	<i>0.963</i>	0.993	0.963	0.966	
		200	1.000	2.099	11.622	0.980	2.157	2.413	0.960	0.991	<i>0.960</i>	0.962	
	20	50	1.000	2.342	50.297	0.996	2.545	3.534	0.993	1.007	0.993	0.994	
		100	1.000	2.308	48.473	0.998	2.456	3.544	0.985	1.000	0.985	0.986	
		200	1.000	2.208	52.373	0.999	2.275	3.417	0.983	0.997	0.983	0.984	
	4	4	50	1.000	1.049	3.225	0.870	1.075	1.168	0.843	0.913	0.850	<i>0.845</i>
			100	1.000	1.048	2.518	0.870	1.058	1.167	0.836	0.907	0.841	<i>0.839</i>
			200	1.000	1.039	1.808	0.869	1.033	1.148	0.832	0.904	<i>0.834</i>	0.834
10		50	1.000	1.324	20.433	0.926	1.390	1.796	0.907	0.975	0.907	0.909	
		100	1.000	1.317	17.617	0.922	1.356	1.808	0.893	0.963	<i>0.893</i>	0.894	
		200	1.000	1.285	9.268	0.923	1.295	1.602	<i>0.887</i>	0.959	0.887	0.888	
20		50	1.000	1.502	51.565	0.967	1.590	2.450	0.954	1.007	0.954	0.954	
		100	1.000	1.478	58.675	0.968	1.542	2.556	<i>0.934</i>	0.992	<i>0.934</i>	0.934	
		200	1.000	1.435	46.748	0.968	1.454	2.460	0.926	0.982	0.926	0.926	
5		4	50	1.000	1.037	3.183	0.863	1.060	1.168	0.834	0.910	0.843	<i>0.837</i>
			100	1.000	1.037	2.585	0.865	1.047	1.175	0.829	0.907	0.833	<i>0.833</i>
			200	1.000	1.024	1.859	0.862	1.019	1.151	0.823	0.903	0.829	<i>0.827</i>
	10	50	1.000	1.304	21.252	0.923	1.365	1.812	<i>0.908</i>	0.974	0.908	0.910	
		100	1.000	1.299	16.763	0.922	1.336	1.776	0.895	0.964	<i>0.895</i>	0.898	
		200	1.000	1.270	9.024	0.920	1.279	1.584	<i>0.887</i>	0.958	0.887	0.889	
	20	50	1.000	1.504	52.836	0.966	1.589	2.527	0.970	1.003	<i>0.970</i>	0.971	
		100	1.000	1.485	57.874	0.971	1.543	2.612	0.951	0.992	0.951	0.953	
		200	1.000	1.442	47.212	0.970	1.461	2.521	<i>0.942</i>	0.983	0.942	0.943	
	6	4	50	1.000	0.800	2.593	0.735	0.802	0.879	<i>0.733</i>	0.955	0.747	0.721
			100	1.000	0.798	1.953	0.737	0.795	0.866	<i>0.727</i>	0.942	0.730	0.710
			200	1.000	0.780	1.286	0.727	0.767	0.830	0.720	0.942	<i>0.719</i>	0.697
10		50	1.000	1.070	21.273	0.809	1.114	1.531	<i>0.809</i>	1.036	<i>0.809</i>	0.803	
		100	1.000	1.058	17.496	0.801	1.085	1.507	<i>0.792</i>	1.025	<i>0.792</i>	0.783	
		200	1.000	1.044	10.631	0.799	1.050	1.432	<i>0.786</i>	1.011	0.786	0.776	
20		50	1.000	1.331	55.600	0.895	1.405	2.416	0.912	1.062	0.912	<i>0.910</i>	
		100	1.000	1.313	55.471	0.892	1.361	2.416	<i>0.889</i>	1.032	<i>0.889</i>	0.884	
		200	1.000	1.276	46.749	0.890	1.293	2.240	<i>0.875</i>	1.021	<i>0.875</i>	0.870	

E.2. Simulation with correlated forecast errors

Table E.15: AvgRelMAE for the simulation experiment (balanced panel of forecasts). Benchmark approach: ew. Bold entries identify the best performing approaches, italic entries identify the second best and red color denotes forecasts worse than the benchmark.

Sett.	p	N	Approach													
			base*	base* _{shr}	base _{shr}	ew	OW _{var}	OW _{cov}	STC	STC _{ew}	STC _{var}	STC _{cov}	OCC _{wls}	OCC _{by}	OCC _{shr}	OCC _{be}
1	4	50	1.308	1.063	1.058	1.000	1.002	1.027	<i>0.921</i>	0.949	0.951	0.969	0.945	0.961	0.976	0.905
		100	1.307	1.038	1.037	1.000	1.000	1.014	<i>0.915</i>	0.946	0.946	0.955	0.944	0.955	0.939	0.894
		200	1.305	1.026	1.025	1.000	1.000	1.007	0.912	0.943	0.942	0.946	0.944	0.951	<i>0.908</i>	0.890
	10	50	1.417	1.152	1.146	1.000	1.001	1.053	<i>0.962</i>	0.980	0.981	1.020	0.974	1.016	1.148	0.953
		100	1.417	1.125	1.123	1.000	1.000	1.033	<i>0.959</i>	0.979	0.979	1.003	0.973	1.000	1.109	0.947
		200	1.412	1.111	1.110	1.000	1.000	1.019	<i>0.958</i>	0.976	0.976	0.989	0.973	0.988	1.038	0.946
	20	50	1.461	1.188	1.181	1.000	1.001	1.063	<i>0.979</i>	0.990	0.991	1.040	0.986	1.071	1.209	0.974
		100	1.463	1.162	1.159	1.000	1.000	1.044	<i>0.978</i>	0.990	0.990	1.023	0.985	1.041	1.286	0.972
		200	1.455	1.147	1.145	1.000	1.000	1.028	<i>0.978</i>	0.989	0.988	1.008	0.985	1.015	1.189	0.971
2	4	50	1.226	1.054	1.052	1.000	1.001	1.026	<i>0.949</i>	0.967	0.968	0.986	0.963	0.978	1.012	0.942
		100	1.226	1.037	1.036	1.000	1.000	1.014	<i>0.945</i>	0.965	0.966	0.975	0.963	0.971	0.980	0.936
		200	1.225	1.026	1.026	1.000	1.000	1.007	<i>0.943</i>	0.963	0.963	0.967	0.963	0.967	0.952	0.932
	10	50	1.294	1.113	1.110	1.000	1.001	1.045	<i>0.977</i>	0.988	0.989	1.023	0.984	1.029	1.166	0.974
		100	1.295	1.095	1.093	1.000	1.000	1.030	<i>0.976</i>	0.988	0.988	1.009	0.984	1.010	1.133	0.972
		200	1.293	1.083	1.083	1.000	1.000	1.018	<i>0.975</i>	0.987	0.987	0.999	0.984	0.997	1.062	0.970
	20	50	1.319	1.135	1.132	1.000	1.000	1.050	<i>0.988</i>	0.994	0.994	1.032	0.992	1.085	1.216	0.986
		100	1.319	1.117	1.114	1.000	1.000	1.036	<i>0.988</i>	0.994	0.994	1.021	0.992	1.049	1.298	0.986
		200	1.318	1.105	1.103	1.000	1.000	1.023	<i>0.987</i>	0.994	0.994	1.009	0.992	1.020	1.204	0.984
3	4	50	1.110	1.034	1.034	1.000	1.000	1.020	<i>0.979</i>	0.988	0.988	1.003	0.984	0.997	1.048	0.978
		100	1.112	1.025	1.025	1.000	1.000	1.013	<i>0.977</i>	0.986	0.987	0.995	0.984	0.992	1.024	0.975
		200	1.111	1.016	1.016	1.000	1.000	1.007	<i>0.974</i>	0.984	0.984	0.989	0.983	0.987	0.997	0.971
	10	50	1.137	1.059	1.059	1.000	1.000	1.029	<i>0.992</i>	0.995	0.995	1.017	0.994	1.033	1.178	0.991
		100	1.139	1.050	1.049	1.000	1.000	1.021	<i>0.990</i>	0.995	0.995	1.011	0.993	1.018	1.147	0.989
		200	1.138	1.044	1.041	1.000	1.000	1.013	<i>0.989</i>	0.995	0.995	1.004	0.993	1.006	1.084	0.988
	20	50	1.147	1.069	1.067	1.000	1.000	1.031	<i>0.996</i>	0.997	0.998	1.021	0.997	1.083	1.223	0.995
		100	1.148	1.058	1.057	1.000	1.000	1.023	<i>0.995</i>	0.997	0.997	1.015	0.996	1.051	1.293	0.994
		200	1.148	1.053	1.051	1.000	1.000	1.016	<i>0.995</i>	0.998	0.998	1.010	0.996	1.026	1.215	0.994
4	4	50	1.243	1.074	1.074	1.000	0.991	1.001	0.950	0.968	0.957	0.950	0.952	<i>0.947</i>	0.954	0.922
		100	1.241	1.056	1.056	1.000	0.989	0.988	0.946	0.966	0.953	0.936	0.951	0.938	0.910	<i>0.915</i>
		200	1.242	1.042	1.042	1.000	0.989	0.982	0.942	0.963	0.950	0.929	0.950	0.934	0.872	<i>0.909</i>
	10	50	1.317	1.134	1.134	1.000	0.986	0.987	0.978	0.988	0.973	0.955	0.968	<i>0.953</i>	1.044	0.948
		100	1.313	1.117	1.117	1.000	0.985	0.968	0.976	0.987	0.972	<i>0.936</i>	0.968	0.931	0.986	0.942
		200	1.317	1.107	1.107	1.000	0.985	0.959	0.975	0.986	0.971	0.926	0.968	<i>0.923</i>	0.908	0.939
	20	50	1.336	1.150	1.150	1.000	0.983	0.973	0.989	0.994	0.977	0.948	0.975	0.964	1.069	<i>0.958</i>
		100	1.339	1.138	1.138	1.000	0.983	0.952	0.988	0.994	0.977	0.928	0.974	<i>0.930</i>	1.096	0.954
		200	1.334	1.123	1.123	1.000	0.983	0.937	0.987	0.994	0.976	<i>0.913</i>	0.974	0.905	0.997	0.950
5	4	50	1.241	1.049	1.049	1.000	0.989	1.010	<i>0.939</i>	0.959	0.955	0.969	0.950	0.962	0.993	0.926
		100	1.245	1.038	1.034	1.000	0.989	0.998	<i>0.934</i>	0.957	0.952	0.958	0.949	0.955	0.962	0.919
		200	1.243	1.023	1.023	1.000	0.988	0.991	<i>0.930</i>	0.954	0.949	0.951	0.949	0.952	0.934	0.915
	10	50	1.322	1.122	1.122	1.000	0.994	1.036	<i>0.972</i>	0.985	0.981	1.012	0.977	1.017	1.149	0.966
		100	1.320	1.103	1.103	1.000	0.994	1.021	<i>0.971</i>	0.985	0.981	1.000	0.976	1.000	1.119	0.964
		200	1.320	1.087	1.087	1.000	0.993	1.009	<i>0.968</i>	0.983	0.979	0.990	0.976	0.988	1.051	0.960
	20	50	1.353	1.151	1.149	1.000	0.997	1.049	<i>0.986</i>	0.993	0.991	1.030	0.988	1.076	1.212	0.983
		100	1.352	1.132	1.128	1.000	0.996	1.031	<i>0.984</i>	0.992	0.990	1.015	0.987	1.040	1.275	0.980
		200	1.356	1.116	1.113	1.000	0.996	1.020	<i>0.984</i>	0.992	0.990	1.007	0.987	1.016	1.196	0.979
6	4	50	1.370	1.240	1.240	1.000	0.966	0.962	0.961	0.975	0.928	0.919	0.929	<i>0.912</i>	0.934	0.898
		100	1.367	1.224	1.224	1.000	0.964	0.950	0.956	0.972	0.923	0.906	0.927	0.904	<i>0.901</i>	0.891
		200	1.366	1.212	1.212	1.000	0.964	0.944	0.952	0.970	0.921	0.899	0.928	0.900	0.872	<i>0.886</i>
	10	50	1.508	1.363	1.363	1.000	0.980	1.003	0.981	0.990	0.964	0.980	<i>0.962</i>	0.980	1.113	0.946
		100	1.507	1.349	1.349	1.000	0.978	0.986	0.979	0.990	0.962	0.965	<i>0.961</i>	0.964	1.077	0.942
		200	1.499	1.331	1.331	1.000	0.979	0.975	0.977	0.988	0.961	0.956	0.961	<i>0.954</i>	1.012	0.940
	20	50	1.554	1.410	1.408	1.000	0.990	1.031	0.989	0.994	0.982	1.014	<i>0.980</i>	1.046	1.196	0.973
		100	1.552	1.389	1.389	1.000	0.988	1.012	0.989	0.994	0.980	0.998	<i>0.979</i>	1.017	1.254	0.969
		200	1.553	1.379	1.379	1.000	0.987	0.998	0.988	0.995	0.979	0.986	<i>0.978</i>	0.994	1.170	0.966

Table E.16: AvgRelMSE for the simulation experiment (balanced panel of forecasts). Benchmark approach: ew. Bold entries identify the best performing approaches, italic entries identify the second best and red color denotes forecasts worse than the benchmark.

Sett.	p	N	Approach													
			base*	base* _{shr}	base _{shr}	ew	OW _{var}	OW _{cov}	sfc	sfc _{ew}	sfc _{var}	sfc _{cov}	OCC _{wls}	OCC _{bv}	OCC _{shr}	OCC _{be}
1	4	50	1.712	1.130	1.120	1.000	1.004	1.056	<i>0.847</i>	0.901	0.905	0.939	0.893	0.924	0.954	0.818
		100	1.708	1.078	1.074	1.000	1.001	1.029	<i>0.837</i>	0.895	0.896	0.913	0.892	0.912	0.883	0.801
		200	1.702	1.052	1.049	1.000	1.000	1.013	0.832	0.888	0.888	0.895	0.891	0.904	<i>0.825</i>	0.791
	10	50	2.010	1.327	1.315	1.000	1.002	1.108	<i>0.925</i>	0.960	0.963	1.040	0.948	1.032	1.317	0.908
		100	2.007	1.267	1.262	1.000	1.001	1.068	<i>0.920</i>	0.958	0.959	1.005	0.947	1.000	1.232	0.899
		200	1.996	1.236	1.232	1.000	1.000	1.039	<i>0.918</i>	0.953	0.953	0.979	0.946	0.977	1.077	0.895
	20	50	2.136	1.411	1.398	1.000	1.001	1.129	<i>0.958</i>	0.980	0.982	1.081	0.971	1.146	1.459	0.949
		100	2.139	1.351	1.345	1.000	1.001	1.090	<i>0.956</i>	0.980	0.981	1.046	0.971	1.084	1.657	0.945
		200	2.118	1.314	1.309	1.000	1.000	1.055	<i>0.955</i>	0.977	0.977	1.015	0.970	1.029	1.416	0.942
2	4	50	1.502	1.111	1.108	1.000	1.003	1.054	<i>0.901</i>	0.936	0.939	0.973	0.929	0.957	1.026	0.888
		100	1.503	1.077	1.074	1.000	1.001	1.029	<i>0.893</i>	0.933	0.933	0.951	0.928	0.944	0.962	0.876
		200	1.500	1.052	1.051	1.000	1.000	1.013	<i>0.888</i>	0.928	0.927	0.935	0.927	0.935	0.906	0.868
	10	50	1.674	1.238	1.235	1.000	1.001	1.092	<i>0.955</i>	0.975	0.977	1.044	0.968	1.056	1.359	0.949
		100	1.675	1.200	1.195	1.000	1.000	1.060	<i>0.953</i>	0.976	0.976	1.018	0.968	1.019	1.283	0.944
		200	1.670	1.171	1.170	1.000	1.000	1.036	<i>0.950</i>	0.973	0.973	0.997	0.967	0.994	1.129	0.940
	20	50	1.739	1.287	1.281	1.000	1.001	1.103	<i>0.976</i>	0.987	0.988	1.065	0.984	1.175	1.477	0.973
		100	1.740	1.247	1.242	1.000	1.000	1.074	<i>0.976</i>	0.988	0.988	1.042	0.983	1.100	1.686	0.971
		200	1.736	1.217	1.216	1.000	1.000	1.046	<i>0.974</i>	0.988	0.988	1.019	0.983	1.040	1.451	0.968
3	4	50	1.240	1.073	1.071	1.000	1.001	1.043	<i>0.957</i>	0.975	0.976	1.006	0.967	0.994	1.105	0.954
		100	1.241	1.052	1.052	1.000	1.000	1.027	<i>0.953</i>	0.972	0.972	0.990	0.966	0.983	1.048	0.948
		200	1.242	1.036	1.035	1.000	1.000	1.015	<i>0.948</i>	0.968	0.969	0.979	0.966	0.975	0.995	0.943
	10	50	1.301	1.124	1.124	1.000	1.000	1.061	<i>0.983</i>	0.990	0.990	1.037	0.987	1.071	1.406	0.981
		100	1.305	1.105	1.102	1.000	1.000	1.044	<i>0.980</i>	0.990	0.990	1.022	0.986	1.037	1.324	0.978
		200	1.305	1.092	1.087	1.000	1.000	1.028	<i>0.978</i>	0.989	0.989	1.009	0.985	1.012	1.181	0.975
	20	50	1.324	1.144	1.143	1.000	1.000	1.064	<i>0.991</i>	0.995	0.995	1.044	0.993	1.181	1.515	0.990
		100	1.327	1.124	1.121	1.000	1.000	1.048	<i>0.990</i>	0.994	0.994	1.031	0.993	1.107	1.691	0.988
		200	1.328	1.112	1.106	1.000	1.000	1.035	<i>0.989</i>	0.995	0.995	1.021	0.993	1.055	1.490	0.987
4	4	50	1.546	1.152	1.152	1.000	0.981	1.001	0.901	0.937	0.915	0.902	0.905	<i>0.896</i>	0.910	0.849
		100	1.542	1.114	1.114	1.000	0.978	0.977	0.895	0.933	0.909	0.877	0.905	0.881	0.829	<i>0.836</i>
		200	1.543	1.087	1.087	1.000	0.977	0.965	0.889	0.928	0.904	0.864	0.903	0.873	0.762	<i>0.826</i>
	10	50	1.734	1.287	1.287	1.000	0.971	0.975	0.956	0.976	0.947	0.913	0.938	<i>0.908</i>	1.089	0.899
		100	1.730	1.253	1.253	1.000	0.970	0.939	0.953	0.975	0.945	<i>0.878</i>	0.937	0.870	0.976	0.889
		200	1.731	1.221	1.221	1.000	0.970	0.919	0.951	0.974	0.943	0.857	0.937	<i>0.851</i>	0.824	0.882
	20	50	1.785	1.325	1.325	1.000	0.967	0.948	0.978	0.988	0.954	0.900	0.950	0.931	1.144	<i>0.918</i>
		100	1.789	1.293	1.293	1.000	0.967	0.906	0.976	0.988	0.954	0.862	0.949	<i>0.865</i>	1.202	0.910
		200	1.778	1.261	1.261	1.000	0.966	0.877	0.974	0.988	0.954	<i>0.832</i>	0.949	0.818	0.993	0.903
5	4	50	1.539	1.099	1.099	1.000	0.978	1.019	<i>0.881</i>	0.920	0.911	0.939	0.901	0.924	0.985	0.857
		100	1.547	1.077	1.069	1.000	0.977	0.996	<i>0.871</i>	0.916	0.905	0.916	0.900	0.912	0.924	0.844
		200	1.545	1.049	1.046	1.000	0.976	0.983	<i>0.867</i>	0.910	0.900	0.904	0.901	0.906	0.873	0.838
	10	50	1.750	1.260	1.260	1.000	0.988	1.075	<i>0.946</i>	0.970	0.963	1.025	0.954	1.035	1.322	0.934
		100	1.744	1.216	1.216	1.000	0.987	1.041	<i>0.944</i>	0.970	0.962	1.000	0.953	1.000	1.251	0.929
		200	1.744	1.181	1.181	1.000	0.986	1.018	<i>0.937</i>	0.966	0.958	0.979	0.952	0.977	1.105	0.921
	20	50	1.830	1.325	1.321	1.000	0.994	1.102	<i>0.971</i>	0.984	0.981	1.060	0.976	1.158	1.467	0.965
		100	1.829	1.283	1.272	1.000	0.993	1.064	<i>0.969</i>	0.985	0.980	1.031	0.975	1.082	1.626	0.961
		200	1.838	1.245	1.238	1.000	0.993	1.040	<i>0.968</i>	0.984	0.979	1.013	0.975	1.033	1.431	0.959
6	4	50	1.836	1.488	1.488	1.000	0.940	0.935	0.922	0.949	0.868	0.854	0.869	<i>0.841</i>	0.883	0.813
		100	1.824	1.443	1.443	1.000	0.936	0.912	0.912	0.945	0.859	0.830	0.866	0.826	<i>0.820</i>	0.800
		200	1.821	1.414	1.414	1.000	0.936	0.901	0.905	0.941	0.855	0.817	0.867	0.820	0.770	<i>0.792</i>
	10	50	2.202	1.782	1.782	1.000	0.963	1.011	0.962	0.978	0.932	0.964	<i>0.928</i>	0.965	1.243	0.897
		100	2.198	1.740	1.740	1.000	0.961	0.976	0.959	0.979	0.930	0.936	<i>0.927</i>	0.933	1.164	0.890
		200	2.179	1.698	1.698	1.000	0.961	0.956	0.955	0.976	0.927	0.917	0.927	<i>0.915</i>	1.030	0.887
	20	50	2.348	1.903	1.903	1.000	0.981	1.065	0.979	0.988	0.966	1.030	<i>0.962</i>	1.097	1.432	0.947
		100	2.343	1.849	1.849	1.000	0.978	1.027	0.978	0.989	0.963	0.998	<i>0.959</i>	1.039	1.581	0.940
		200	2.335	1.815	1.815	1.000	0.975	0.999	0.976	0.989	0.959	0.974	<i>0.957</i>	0.989	1.371	0.936

Table E.17: AvgRelMAE for the simulation experiment (unbalanced panel of forecasts). Benchmark approach: ew. Bold entries identify the best performing approaches, italic entries identify the second best and red color denotes forecasts worse than the benchmark.

Sett.	p	N	Approach									
			ew	OWvar	OWcov	SCTew	SCTvar	SCTcov	OCCewls	OCCbv	OCCshr	OCCbpe
1	4	50	1.000	1.031	1.479	0.903	1.053	1.122	<i>0.897</i>	0.927	0.898	0.892
		100	1.000	1.024	1.341	0.903	1.032	1.114	<i>0.893</i>	0.922	0.893	0.885
		200	1.000	1.010	1.191	0.902	1.002	1.090	0.890	0.921	<i>0.889</i>	0.880
	10	50	1.000	1.220	2.999	<i>0.943</i>	1.276	1.492	0.943	0.967	0.943	0.941
		100	1.000	1.216	2.924	0.940	1.250	1.488	<i>0.933</i>	0.959	0.933	0.928
		200	1.000	1.183	2.688	0.940	1.190	1.464	0.929	0.955	<i>0.929</i>	0.923
	20	50	1.000	1.351	4.250	0.973	1.426	1.797	0.983	0.997	0.983	<i>0.981</i>
		100	1.000	1.335	4.405	0.974	1.385	1.814	<i>0.971</i>	0.986	<i>0.971</i>	0.968
		200	1.000	1.287	4.077	0.973	1.302	1.709	<i>0.962</i>	0.979	<i>0.962</i>	0.958
2	4	50	1.000	1.022	1.396	0.928	1.031	1.076	<i>0.921</i>	0.947	0.923	0.919
		100	1.000	1.020	1.314	0.929	1.022	1.077	<i>0.918</i>	0.944	0.920	0.914
		200	1.000	1.013	1.191	0.927	1.008	1.067	0.916	0.943	<i>0.916</i>	0.910
	10	50	1.000	1.147	2.536	0.963	1.173	1.316	<i>0.961</i>	0.980	<i>0.961</i>	0.960
		100	1.000	1.145	2.470	0.962	1.161	1.317	<i>0.954</i>	0.975	0.954	0.952
		200	1.000	1.129	2.088	0.961	1.133	1.260	<i>0.950</i>	0.973	0.950	0.947
	20	50	1.000	1.226	3.433	0.985	1.259	1.518	0.989	1.000	0.989	<i>0.989</i>
		100	1.000	1.221	3.561	0.986	1.245	1.537	<i>0.982</i>	0.993	<i>0.982</i>	0.981
		200	1.000	1.199	3.475	0.986	1.206	1.512	<i>0.976</i>	0.988	<i>0.976</i>	0.974
3	4	50	1.000	1.321	1.824	0.969	1.377	1.459	0.961	0.979	0.964	<i>0.961</i>
		100	1.000	1.325	1.862	0.969	1.360	1.479	<i>0.958</i>	0.977	0.961	0.958
		200	1.000	1.313	1.852	0.966	1.328	1.498	<i>0.957</i>	0.977	0.963	0.957
	10	50	1.000	1.462	2.819	0.988	1.523	1.647	0.984	0.997	0.984	0.984
		100	1.000	1.462	2.712	0.986	1.503	1.619	<i>0.979</i>	0.994	0.979	0.979
		200	1.000	1.437	2.256	0.988	1.455	1.506	<i>0.977</i>	0.992	0.977	0.977
	20	50	1.000	1.527	3.547	0.997	1.594	1.801	<i>0.997</i>	1.004	<i>0.997</i>	0.997
		100	1.000	1.514	3.682	0.998	1.563	1.798	<i>0.992</i>	0.998	<i>0.992</i>	0.992
		200	1.000	1.482	3.599	0.999	1.504	1.755	<i>0.990</i>	0.998	<i>0.990</i>	0.990
4	4	50	1.000	0.999	1.343	0.922	1.008	1.049	<i>0.912</i>	0.944	0.914	0.909
		100	1.000	1.001	1.277	0.922	1.004	1.049	<i>0.909</i>	0.943	0.911	0.904
		200	1.000	0.993	1.130	0.921	0.988	1.032	<i>0.906</i>	0.940	0.908	0.900
	10	50	1.000	1.129	2.507	0.956	1.155	1.290	<i>0.948</i>	0.981	<i>0.948</i>	0.947
		100	1.000	1.126	2.388	0.956	1.141	1.283	<i>0.941</i>	0.977	0.941	0.938
		200	1.000	1.114	2.072	0.955	1.119	1.240	<i>0.937</i>	0.973	0.937	0.933
	20	50	1.000	1.214	3.456	0.982	1.248	1.500	<i>0.976</i>	1.002	<i>0.976</i>	0.975
		100	1.000	1.206	3.482	0.981	1.230	1.519	<i>0.966</i>	0.992	<i>0.966</i>	0.964
		200	1.000	1.186	3.329	0.981	1.193	1.452	<i>0.960</i>	0.989	<i>0.960</i>	0.957
5	4	50	1.000	0.989	1.346	0.916	0.998	1.040	<i>0.904</i>	0.943	0.906	0.901
		100	1.000	0.986	1.251	0.915	0.988	1.038	<i>0.899</i>	0.942	0.900	0.895
		200	1.000	0.982	1.136	0.915	0.977	1.030	<i>0.899</i>	0.942	0.899	0.892
	10	50	1.000	1.120	2.421	0.953	1.145	1.292	<i>0.946</i>	0.981	0.946	0.945
		100	1.000	1.118	2.349	0.953	1.134	1.280	<i>0.938</i>	0.976	<i>0.938</i>	0.936
		200	1.000	1.105	2.083	0.950	1.109	1.248	0.933	0.971	<i>0.933</i>	0.930
	20	50	1.000	1.212	3.480	0.979	1.246	1.514	0.981	1.001	0.981	<i>0.980</i>
		100	1.000	1.204	3.568	0.980	1.228	1.533	<i>0.971</i>	0.991	<i>0.971</i>	0.969
		200	1.000	1.186	3.461	0.980	1.193	1.496	<i>0.965</i>	0.988	<i>0.965</i>	0.963
6	4	50	1.000	0.871	1.212	<i>0.848</i>	0.870	0.904	0.850	0.965	0.852	0.840
		100	1.000	0.869	1.099	0.847	0.864	0.899	0.846	0.961	<i>0.842</i>	0.830
		200	1.000	0.863	0.997	0.844	0.853	0.884	0.844	0.957	<i>0.835</i>	0.826
	10	50	1.000	1.016	2.396	<i>0.893</i>	1.036	1.180	0.897	1.006	0.897	0.891
		100	1.000	1.013	2.297	0.891	1.025	1.176	<i>0.886</i>	1.000	0.886	0.878
		200	1.000	1.005	2.055	0.893	1.007	1.163	0.884	0.998	<i>0.884</i>	0.875
	20	50	1.000	1.143	3.443	0.945	1.175	1.459	0.954	1.024	0.954	<i>0.952</i>
		100	1.000	1.135	3.527	0.942	1.155	1.469	<i>0.940</i>	1.011	<i>0.940</i>	0.936
		200	1.000	1.118	3.310	0.941	1.125	1.410	<i>0.932</i>	1.005	0.932	0.927

Table E.18: AvgRelMSE for the simulation experiment (unbalanced panel of forecasts). Benchmark approach: ew. Bold entries identify the best performing approaches, italic entries identify the second best and red color denotes forecasts worse than the benchmark.

Sett.	p	N	Approach										
			ew	OWvar	OWcov	SCTew	SCTvar	SCTcov	OCCwls	OCCbv	OCCshr	OCCbe	
1	4	50	1.000	1.063	3.884	0.811	1.108	1.272	<i>0.800</i>	0.855	0.804	0.792	
		100	1.000	1.046	2.532	0.811	1.060	1.246	<i>0.792</i>	0.846	0.795	0.779	
		200	1.000	1.020	1.638	0.810	1.001	1.190	<i>0.789</i>	0.845	0.789	0.771	
	10	50	1.000	1.494	34.050	<i>0.885</i>	1.630	2.414	0.887	0.932	0.887	0.883	
		100	1.000	1.480	28.860	0.882	1.563	2.393	<i>0.870</i>	0.918	0.870	0.861	
		200	1.000	1.404	18.107	0.880	1.416	2.302	0.860	0.909	<i>0.860</i>	0.849	
	20	50	1.000	1.836	84.355	0.946	2.045	3.705	0.969	0.997	0.969	<i>0.966</i>	
		100	1.000	1.787	89.608	0.946	1.922	3.820	<i>0.943</i>	0.971	<i>0.943</i>	0.937	
		200	1.000	1.662	69.338	0.946	1.699	3.380	<i>0.926</i>	0.958	<i>0.926</i>	0.918	
	2	4	50	1.000	1.042	3.352	0.859	1.061	1.164	<i>0.846</i>	0.896	0.853	0.842
			100	1.000	1.036	2.474	0.860	1.041	1.163	<i>0.840</i>	0.889	0.846	0.833
			200	1.000	1.025	1.690	0.858	1.013	1.140	0.837	0.888	<i>0.837</i>	0.826
10		50	1.000	1.313	22.856	0.925	1.372	1.840	<i>0.922</i>	0.959	<i>0.922</i>	0.920	
		100	1.000	1.307	19.212	0.924	1.344	1.822	<i>0.908</i>	0.950	0.908	0.904	
		200	1.000	1.276	9.649	0.922	1.282	1.647	<i>0.901</i>	0.944	0.901	0.895	
20		50	1.000	1.506	52.634	0.970	1.590	2.555	0.982	1.001	0.982	<i>0.981</i>	
		100	1.000	1.490	55.401	0.971	1.549	2.608	<i>0.964</i>	0.985	0.964	0.962	
		200	1.000	1.438	48.233	0.973	1.456	2.559	<i>0.952</i>	0.977	<i>0.952</i>	0.949	
3		4	50	1.000	1.738	5.907	0.936	1.881	2.137	0.920	0.956	0.928	<i>0.920</i>
			100	1.000	1.742	5.729	0.937	1.831	2.192	<i>0.916</i>	0.953	0.922	0.916
			200	1.000	1.712	5.168	0.932	1.745	2.243	<i>0.913</i>	0.951	0.939	0.912
	10	50	1.000	2.125	25.490	0.974	2.301	2.850	0.966	0.992	0.966	0.966	
		100	1.000	2.121	21.027	0.972	2.237	2.747	<i>0.957</i>	0.987	0.957	0.956	
		200	1.000	2.051	10.766	0.975	2.101	2.349	<i>0.953</i>	0.983	0.953	0.952	
	20	50	1.000	2.324	49.384	0.994	2.526	3.512	0.993	1.012	0.993	0.993	
		100	1.000	2.280	55.099	0.995	2.425	3.561	<i>0.983</i>	0.997	<i>0.983</i>	0.983	
		200	1.000	2.181	48.296	0.997	2.245	3.429	<i>0.979</i>	0.995	<i>0.979</i>	0.979	
	4	4	50	1.000	0.994	2.993	0.847	1.010	1.102	<i>0.827</i>	0.887	0.833	0.822
			100	1.000	0.995	2.329	0.847	0.999	1.098	<i>0.823</i>	0.885	0.831	0.813
			200	1.000	0.983	1.474	0.846	0.971	1.062	<i>0.817</i>	0.880	0.830	0.806
10		50	1.000	1.272	22.092	0.910	1.331	1.751	0.898	0.960	<i>0.898</i>	0.894	
		100	1.000	1.264	17.674	0.911	1.298	1.731	<i>0.883</i>	0.952	0.883	0.877	
		200	1.000	1.239	9.583	0.909	1.248	1.599	<i>0.875</i>	0.944	0.875	0.868	
20		50	1.000	1.475	54.937	0.963	1.561	2.493	<i>0.954</i>	1.005	<i>0.954</i>	0.951	
		100	1.000	1.453	52.381	0.962	1.510	2.580	<i>0.934</i>	0.986	<i>0.934</i>	0.930	
		200	1.000	1.406	43.904	0.961	1.422	2.324	<i>0.921</i>	0.976	<i>0.921</i>	0.916	
5		4	50	1.000	0.970	3.043	0.833	0.987	1.081	<i>0.811</i>	0.886	0.817	0.806
			100	1.000	0.963	2.197	0.833	0.968	1.074	<i>0.804</i>	0.882	0.806	0.795
			200	1.000	0.958	1.509	0.832	0.946	1.055	<i>0.801</i>	0.881	0.810	0.789
	10	50	1.000	1.251	19.939	0.904	1.307	1.778	<i>0.893</i>	0.959	0.893	0.890	
		100	1.000	1.244	16.563	0.904	1.278	1.719	<i>0.877</i>	0.949	0.877	0.873	
		200	1.000	1.216	9.717	0.899	1.224	1.625	0.867	0.941	<i>0.867</i>	0.861	
	20	50	1.000	1.472	54.645	0.960	1.554	2.538	0.964	1.003	0.964	<i>0.962</i>	
		100	1.000	1.449	56.087	0.960	1.507	2.644	<i>0.943</i>	0.983	<i>0.943</i>	0.941	
		200	1.000	1.407	48.361	0.959	1.424	2.483	<i>0.931</i>	0.977	<i>0.931</i>	0.927	
	6	4	50	1.000	0.765	2.523	0.726	0.763	0.831	<i>0.726</i>	0.934	0.736	0.708
			100	1.000	0.760	1.705	0.724	0.751	0.818	0.718	0.925	<i>0.713</i>	0.693
			200	1.000	0.751	1.171	0.719	0.733	0.790	0.714	0.917	<i>0.703</i>	0.683
10		50	1.000	1.034	20.803	<i>0.799</i>	1.074	1.478	0.805	1.013	0.805	0.795	
		100	1.000	1.027	17.133	0.795	1.050	1.462	0.787	0.998	<i>0.787</i>	0.773	
		200	1.000	1.010	10.024	0.796	1.013	1.416	0.780	0.992	<i>0.780</i>	0.763	
20		50	1.000	1.312	55.538	0.894	1.387	2.407	0.915	1.053	0.915	<i>0.910</i>	
		100	1.000	1.292	57.402	0.889	1.338	2.440	0.887	1.025	<i>0.887</i>	0.878	
		200	1.000	1.256	44.016	0.888	1.270	2.207	<i>0.870</i>	1.010	<i>0.870</i>	0.862	

Appendix F. MCB Nemenyi test




Figure F.5: MCB Nemenyi test for the electricity generation dataset using the MSE (first row) and MAE (second row) at different forecast horizon ($h = 1, \dots, 7$ for the first column and $h = 1$ for the second column). In each panel, the Friedman test p-value is reported in the lower-right corner. The mean rank of each approach is shown to the right of its name. Statistically significant differences in performance are indicated if the intervals of two forecast reconciliation procedures do not overlap. Thus, approaches that do not overlap with the green interval are considered significantly worse than the best, and vice versa.

Appendix G. Extended figures and tables

Table G.19: AvgRelMAE of daily forecasts for the Australian electricity generation dataset for all, upper and bottom time series. Benchmark approach: ew. Bold entries identify the best performing approaches, italic entries identify the second best and red color denotes forecasts worse than the benchmark.

Approach	Forecast horizon							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1:7
All 23 time series								
<i>Base (incoherent forecasts)</i>								
stlf	1.0697	1.0737	1.0996	1.1029	1.0806	1.0672	1.0801	1.0830
arima	1.0561	1.0650	1.0501	1.0426	1.0459	1.0414	1.0339	1.0471
tbats	1.0447	1.0515	1.0348	1.0266	1.0305	1.0288	1.0201	1.0331
<i>Single model reconciliation</i>								
stlf _{shr}	1.0618	1.0696	1.0970	1.1001	1.0776	1.0625	1.0758	1.0788
arima _{shr}	1.0512	1.0546	1.0334	1.0241	1.0232	1.0237	1.0182	1.0311
tbats _{shr}	1.0320	1.0413	1.0231	1.0134	1.0212	1.0208	1.0188	1.0235
<i>Combination (incoherent forecasts)</i>								
ew	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
ow _{var}	0.9927	0.9921	0.9982	0.9983	0.9967	0.9967	0.9990	0.9965
ow _{cov}	1.0216	1.0208	1.0390	1.0423	1.0307	1.0250	1.0325	1.0309
<i>Coherent combination</i>								
src	0.9939	0.9941	0.9919	0.9895	0.9887	0.9908	0.9933	0.9915
sc _{ew}	0.9952	0.9959	0.9911	0.9908	0.9908	0.9932	0.9961	0.9930
sc _{rvar}	0.9819	0.9803	0.9869	0.9895	0.9887	0.9913	0.9972	0.9882
sc _{cov}	1.0081	1.0081	1.0270	1.0327	1.0245	1.0197	1.0250	1.0215
oc _{bv}	1.0157	1.0162	1.0344	1.0415	1.0289	1.0229	1.0283	1.0275
oc _{shr}	1.0061	1.0111	1.0262	1.0325	1.0342	1.0335	1.0390	1.0269
oc _{wls}	0.9885	0.9886	0.9956	0.9962	0.9945	0.9945	0.9975	0.9938
oc _{be}	0.9779	0.9745	0.9843	0.9852	0.9851	0.9880	0.9926	0.9843
8 upper time series								
<i>Base (incoherent forecasts)</i>								
stlf	1.0541	1.0736	1.1198	1.1272	1.1003	1.0785	1.0983	1.0953
arima	1.0900	1.0906	1.0664	1.0526	1.0568	1.0558	1.0439	1.0637
tbats	1.0662	1.0660	1.0423	1.0277	1.0366	1.0348	1.0219	1.0407
<i>Single model reconciliation</i>								
stlf _{shr}	1.0443	1.0654	1.1126	1.1224	1.0967	1.0753	1.0933	1.0893
arima _{shr}	1.0684	1.0694	1.0448	1.0324	1.0297	1.0300	1.0194	1.0401
tbats _{shr}	1.0379	1.0468	1.0316	1.0174	1.0299	1.0228	1.0177	1.0283
<i>Combination (incoherent forecasts)</i>								
ew	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
ow _{var}	0.9856	0.9864	0.9982	0.9988	0.9955	0.9943	0.9989	0.9945
ow _{cov}	1.0129	1.0191	1.0529	1.0588	1.0422	1.0292	1.0434	1.0385
<i>Coherent combination</i>								
src	0.9863	0.9911	0.9928	0.9918	0.9910	0.9891	0.9912	0.9904
sc _{ew}	0.9885	0.9923	0.9905	0.9913	0.9922	0.9909	0.9932	0.9912
sc _{rvar}	0.9663	0.9662	0.9841	0.9889	0.9894	0.9882	0.9986	0.9840
sc _{cov}	0.9912	0.9953	1.0316	1.0433	1.0334	1.0243	1.0345	1.0237
oc _{bv}	1.0026	1.0058	1.0410	1.0521	1.0371	1.0286	1.0372	1.0306
oc _{shr}	0.9810	0.9942	1.0256	1.0397	1.0374	1.0353	1.0454	1.0246
oc _{wls}	0.9774	0.9800	0.9967	0.9969	0.9959	0.9928	0.9959	0.9913
oc _{be}	0.9593	0.9610	0.9823	0.9849	0.9838	0.9842	0.9917	0.9791
15 bottom time series								
<i>Base (incoherent forecasts)</i>								
stlf	1.0781	1.0737	1.0890	1.0902	1.0703	1.0612	1.0704	1.0764
arima	1.0384	1.0517	1.0415	1.0372	1.0401	1.0337	1.0286	1.0384
tbats	1.0334	1.0438	1.0309	1.0260	1.0273	1.0256	1.0192	1.0290
<i>Single model reconciliation</i>								
stlf _{shr}	1.0712	1.0719	1.0888	1.0884	1.0676	1.0557	1.0666	1.0732
arima _{shr}	1.0421	1.0468	1.0273	1.0197	1.0197	1.0203	1.0175	1.0263
tbats _{shr}	1.0289	1.0384	1.0186	1.0112	1.0166	1.0197	1.0194	1.0210
<i>Combination (incoherent forecasts)</i>								
ew	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
ow _{var}	0.9965	0.9951	0.9982	0.9980	0.9973	0.9979	0.9990	0.9975
ow _{cov}	1.0263	1.0218	1.0316	1.0336	1.0246	1.0228	1.0266	1.0269
<i>Coherent combination</i>								
src	0.9979	0.9957	0.9915	0.9883	0.9875	0.9917	0.9944	0.9920
sc _{ew}	0.9988	0.9978	0.9914	0.9905	0.9900	0.9944	0.9976	0.9939
sc _{rvar}	0.9904	0.9878	0.9884	0.9898	0.9883	0.9929	0.9965	0.9905
sc _{cov}	1.0172	1.0150	1.0245	1.0271	1.0198	1.0172	1.0201	1.0204
oc _{bv}	1.0228	1.0218	1.0308	1.0358	1.0246	1.0198	1.0236	1.0258
oc _{shr}	1.0197	1.0203	1.0266	1.0288	1.0325	1.0325	1.0356	1.0282
oc _{wls}	0.9945	0.9933	0.9950	0.9958	0.9937	0.9955	0.9984	0.9952
oc _{be}	0.9879	0.9819	0.9853	0.9854	0.9859	0.9901	0.9931	0.9870

Table G.20: AvgRelMSE of daily forecasts for the Australian electricity generation dataset for all, upper and bottom time series. Benchmark approach: ew. Bold entries identify the best performing approaches, italic entries identify the second best and red color denotes forecasts worse than the benchmark.

Approach	Forecast horizon							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1:7
All 23 time series								
<i>Base (incoherent forecasts)</i>								
stlf	1.1205	1.1629	1.2351	1.2494	1.2252	1.2151	1.2280	1.2146
arima	1.1106	1.1158	1.0842	1.0701	1.0741	1.0726	1.0615	1.0808
tbats	1.0796	1.0780	1.0445	1.0270	1.0322	1.0288	1.0142	1.0393
<i>Single model reconciliation</i>								
stlf _{shr}	1.1022	1.1512	1.2258	1.2418	1.2183	1.2051	1.2204	1.2045
arima _{shr}	1.0953	1.0904	1.0592	1.0398	1.0395	1.0433	1.0370	1.0532
tbats _{shr}	1.0478	1.0577	1.0304	1.0108	1.0219	1.0213	1.0116	1.0257
<i>Combination (incoherent forecasts)</i>								
ew	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
ow _{var}	0.9840	0.9881	0.9995	1.0032	1.0020	1.0028	1.0054	0.9995
ow _{cov}	1.0279	1.0494	1.0972	1.1103	1.1009	1.0993	1.1055	1.0908
<i>Coherent combination</i>								
src	0.9827	0.9855	0.9863	0.9833	0.9852	0.9873	0.9911	0.9859
scr _{ew}	0.9875	0.9898	0.9859	0.9859	0.9885	0.9905	0.9962	0.9890
scr _{var}	0.9586	0.9683	0.9838	0.9942	0.9982	1.0017	1.0114	0.9910
scr _{cov}	1.0026	1.0287	1.0795	1.0972	1.0942	1.0913	1.0981	1.0773
occ _{bv}	1.0174	1.0420	1.0903	1.1056	1.0953	1.0915	1.0983	1.0834
occ _{shr}	0.9914	1.0201	1.0626	1.0813	1.0930	1.0972	1.1090	1.0713
occ _{wls}	0.9752	0.9810	0.9949	1.0012	1.0009	1.0015	1.0051	0.9960
occ _{be}	0.9481	0.9560	0.9754	0.9831	0.9891	0.9939	0.9993	0.9808
8 upper time series								
<i>Base (incoherent forecasts)</i>								
stlf	1.0772	1.1468	1.2474	1.2722	1.2344	1.2084	1.2267	1.2148
arima	1.1820	1.1781	1.1254	1.0947	1.0934	1.0978	1.0783	1.1143
tbats	1.1420	1.1319	1.0842	1.0533	1.0613	1.0573	1.0389	1.0744
<i>Single model reconciliation</i>								
stlf _{shr}	1.0549	1.1254	1.2294	1.2580	1.2232	1.1962	1.2165	1.1989
arima _{shr}	1.1473	1.1357	1.0925	1.0600	1.0507	1.0535	1.0415	1.0749
tbats _{shr}	1.0844	1.0924	1.0643	1.0367	1.0499	1.0417	1.0300	1.0529
<i>Combination (incoherent forecasts)</i>								
ew	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
ow _{var}	0.9668	0.9766	0.9981	1.0065	1.0037	1.0032	1.0079	0.9981
ow _{cov}	1.0004	1.0377	1.1091	1.1301	1.1107	1.0957	1.1062	1.0939
<i>Coherent combination</i>								
src	0.9730	0.9785	0.9864	0.9855	0.9862	0.9852	0.9906	0.9841
scr _{ew}	0.9800	0.9839	0.9839	0.9871	0.9898	0.9890	0.9975	0.9874
scr _{var}	0.9292	0.9466	0.9769	0.9978	1.0026	1.0033	1.0195	0.9875
scr _{cov}	0.9589	0.9974	1.0738	1.1029	1.0962	1.0825	1.0936	1.0679
occ _{bv}	0.9817	1.0163	1.0879	1.1151	1.1002	1.0878	1.0973	1.0783
occ _{shr}	0.9385	0.9883	1.0541	1.0837	1.0892	1.0861	1.1064	1.0590
occ _{wls}	0.9531	0.9618	0.9908	1.0042	1.0035	1.0015	1.0063	0.9919
occ _{be}	0.9117	0.9292	0.9664	0.9818	0.9857	0.9876	0.9971	0.9710
15 bottom time series								
<i>Base (incoherent forecasts)</i>								
stlf	1.1443	1.1716	1.2286	1.2375	1.2202	1.2186	1.2287	1.2145
arima	1.0744	1.0840	1.0628	1.0572	1.0639	1.0593	1.0526	1.0634
tbats	1.0477	1.0503	1.0240	1.0132	1.0170	1.0140	1.0013	1.0211
<i>Single model reconciliation</i>								
stlf _{shr}	1.1283	1.1652	1.2239	1.2332	1.2157	1.2099	1.2224	1.2075
arima _{shr}	1.0686	1.0670	1.0418	1.0291	1.0336	1.0379	1.0345	1.0417
tbats _{shr}	1.0287	1.0397	1.0127	0.9973	1.0073	1.0106	1.0020	1.0115
<i>Combination (incoherent forecasts)</i>								
ew	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000
ow _{var}	0.9934	0.9943	1.0003	1.0015	1.0011	1.0026	1.0041	1.0003
ow _{cov}	1.0429	1.0556	1.0910	1.0998	1.0957	1.1013	1.1051	1.0892
<i>Coherent combination</i>								
src	0.9880	0.9892	0.9863	0.9822	0.9847	0.9884	0.9913	0.9868
scr _{ew}	0.9916	0.9930	0.9870	0.9853	0.9878	0.9955	0.9955	0.9898
scr _{var}	0.9747	0.9801	0.9875	0.9923	0.9959	1.0009	1.0072	0.9928
scr _{cov}	1.0268	1.0457	1.0826	1.0942	1.0931	1.0961	1.1005	1.0824
occ _{bv}	1.0370	1.0559	1.0916	1.1006	1.0927	1.0935	1.0988	1.0862
occ _{shr}	1.0207	1.0375	1.0672	1.0801	1.0951	1.1032	1.1103	1.0779
occ _{wls}	0.9872	0.9914	0.9971	0.9996	0.9994	1.0016	1.0045	0.9982
occ _{be}	0.9682	0.9706	0.9802	0.9837	0.9909	0.9973	1.0005	0.9861




Figure G.6: Pairwise DM-test results for the Australian electricity generation dataset, evaluated using absolute loss (top panels) and quadratic loss (bottom panel) across different forecast horizons. The left panel corresponds to forecast horizon $h = 1$, while the right panel is for $h = 1, \dots, 7$. Each cell reports the percentage of series for which the p -value of the DM-test is below 0.05.

Table G.21: Model Confidence Set results for the Australian electricity generation dataset, evaluated using absolute loss across different forecast horizons ($h = 1$ and $h = 1, \dots, 7$) and aggregation level (all, upper and bottom times series). Each cell reports the percentage of series for which that approach is in the Model Confidence Set across different thresholds ($\delta \in \{95\%, 90\%, 80\%\}$).

Approach	$h = 1$			$h = 1 : 7$		
	$\delta = 95\%$	$\delta = 90\%$	$\delta = 80\%$	$\delta = 95\%$	$\delta = 90\%$	$\delta = 80\%$
All 23 time series						
<i>Base (incoherent forecasts)</i>						
stlf	47.8	39.1	26.1	47.8	43.5	34.8
arima	60.9	60.9	56.5	73.9	73.9	69.6
tbats	69.6	65.2	56.5	87.0	87.0	82.6
<i>Single model reconciliation</i>						
stlf _{shr}	60.9	52.2	43.5	47.8	47.8	34.8
arima _{shr}	65.2	56.5	52.2	87.0	87.0	82.6
tbats _{shr}	91.3	87.0	73.9	87.0	87.0	82.6
<i>Combination (incoherent forecasts)</i>						
ew	91.3	91.3	82.6	95.7	91.3	91.3
ow _{var}	95.7	95.7	91.3	95.7	91.3	91.3
ow _{cov}	82.6	69.6	65.2	82.6	65.2	60.9
<i>Coherent combination</i>						
src	95.7	91.3	87.0	100.0	95.7	95.7
scr _{ew}	91.3	91.3	87.0	100.0	95.7	91.3
scr _{var}	100.0	100.0	95.7	95.7	95.7	95.7
scr _{cov}	82.6	78.3	78.3	78.3	73.9	73.9
occ _{bv}	91.3	73.9	69.6	69.6	69.6	56.5
occ _{shr}	82.6	82.6	69.6	69.6	65.2	65.2
occ _{wls}	100.0	95.7	87.0	91.3	91.3	91.3
occ _{be}	100.0	100.0	95.7	100.0	95.7	91.3
8 upper time series						
<i>Base (incoherent forecasts)</i>						
stlf	50.0	37.5	25.0	37.5	37.5	25.0
arima	37.5	37.5	37.5	62.5	62.5	50.0
tbats	50.0	50.0	50.0	87.5	87.5	87.5
<i>Single model reconciliation</i>						
stlf _{shr}	62.5	62.5	50.0	37.5	37.5	37.5
arima _{shr}	37.5	37.5	37.5	87.5	87.5	75.0
tbats _{shr}	87.5	75.0	62.5	87.5	87.5	87.5
<i>Combination (incoherent forecasts)</i>						
ew	87.5	87.5	87.5	100.0	100.0	100.0
ow _{var}	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
ow _{cov}	75.0	75.0	62.5	75.0	62.5	62.5
<i>Coherent combination</i>						
src	87.5	87.5	87.5	100.0	100.0	100.0
scr _{ew}	87.5	87.5	87.5	100.0	100.0	100.0
scr _{var}	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
scr _{cov}	87.5	87.5	87.5	75.0	75.0	75.0
occ _{bv}	87.5	87.5	87.5	62.5	62.5	62.5
occ _{shr}	87.5	87.5	87.5	62.5	62.5	62.5
occ _{wls}	100.0	100.0	87.5	100.0	100.0	100.0
occ _{be}	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
15 bottom time series						
stlf	46.7	40.0	26.7	53.3	46.7	40.0
arima	73.3	73.3	66.7	80.0	80.0	80.0
tbats	80.0	73.3	60.0	86.7	86.7	80.0
stlf _{shr}	60.0	46.7	40.0	53.3	53.3	33.3
arima _{shr}	80.0	66.7	60.0	86.7	86.7	86.7
tbats _{shr}	93.3	93.3	80.0	86.7	86.7	80.0
ew	93.3	93.3	80.0	93.3	86.7	86.7
ow _{var}	93.3	93.3	86.7	93.3	86.7	86.7
ow _{cov}	86.7	66.7	66.7	86.7	66.7	60.0
src	100.0	93.3	86.7	100.0	93.3	93.3
scr _{ew}	93.3	93.3	86.7	100.0	93.3	86.7
scr _{var}	100.0	100.0	93.3	93.3	93.3	93.3
scr _{cov}	80.0	73.3	73.3	80.0	73.3	73.3
occ _{bv}	93.3	66.7	60.0	73.3	73.3	53.3
occ _{shr}	80.0	80.0	60.0	73.3	66.7	66.7
occ _{wls}	100.0	93.3	86.7	86.7	86.7	86.7
occ _{be}	100.0	100.0	93.3	100.0	93.3	86.7

Table G.22: Model Confidence Set results for the Australian electricity generation dataset, evaluated using quadratic loss across different forecast horizons ($h = 1$ and $h = 1, \dots, 7$) and aggregation level (all, upper and bottom times series). Each cell reports the percentage of series for which that approach is in the Model Confidence Set across different thresholds ($\delta \in \{95\%, 90\%, 80\%\}$).

Approach	$h = 1$			$h = 1 : 7$		
	$\delta = 95\%$	$\delta = 90\%$	$\delta = 80\%$	$\delta = 95\%$	$\delta = 90\%$	$\delta = 80\%$
All 23 time series						
<i>Base (incoherent forecasts)</i>						
stlf	60.9	52.2	17.4	43.5	43.5	26.1
arima	60.9	60.9	60.9	87.0	87.0	69.6
tbats	69.6	65.2	65.2	100.0	95.7	87.0
<i>Single model reconciliation</i>						
stlf _{shr}	69.6	60.9	47.8	52.2	47.8	34.8
arima _{shr}	56.5	56.5	56.5	100.0	100.0	95.7
tbats _{shr}	78.3	78.3	69.6	100.0	95.7	87.0
<i>Combination (incoherent forecasts)</i>						
ew	91.3	87.0	82.6	91.3	91.3	91.3
ow _{var}	100.0	95.7	87.0	95.7	91.3	91.3
ow _{cov}	87.0	82.6	69.6	82.6	73.9	56.5
<i>Coherent combination</i>						
src	95.7	91.3	91.3	95.7	95.7	91.3
scr _{ew}	95.7	91.3	91.3	95.7	95.7	91.3
scr _{var}	95.7	95.7	95.7	95.7	95.7	95.7
scr _{cov}	91.3	91.3	82.6	78.3	73.9	69.6
occ _{bv}	91.3	91.3	82.6	87.0	87.0	69.6
occ _{shr}	82.6	78.3	73.9	69.6	69.6	69.6
occ _{wls}	100.0	95.7	91.3	91.3	91.3	91.3
occ _{be}	100.0	95.7	95.7	95.7	95.7	91.3
8 upper time series						
<i>Base (incoherent forecasts)</i>						
stlf	62.5	62.5	12.5	50.0	50.0	37.5
arima	37.5	37.5	37.5	87.5	87.5	62.5
tbats	50.0	50.0	50.0	100.0	87.5	87.5
<i>Single model reconciliation</i>						
stlf _{shr}	75.0	75.0	50.0	62.5	50.0	37.5
arima _{shr}	37.5	37.5	37.5	100.0	100.0	100.0
tbats _{shr}	62.5	62.5	50.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
<i>Combination (incoherent forecasts)</i>						
ew	87.5	87.5	75.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
ow _{var}	100.0	100.0	87.5	100.0	100.0	100.0
ow _{cov}	87.5	75.0	62.5	87.5	87.5	62.5
<i>Coherent combination</i>						
src	87.5	87.5	87.5	100.0	100.0	100.0
scr _{ew}	87.5	87.5	87.5	100.0	100.0	100.0
scr _{var}	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
scr _{cov}	100.0	100.0	87.5	87.5	75.0	62.5
occ _{bv}	100.0	100.0	100.0	87.5	87.5	62.5
occ _{shr}	87.5	87.5	87.5	62.5	62.5	62.5
occ _{wls}	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
occ _{be}	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
15 bottom time series						
stlf	60.0	46.7	20.0	40.0	40.0	20.0
arima	73.3	73.3	73.3	86.7	86.7	73.3
tbats	80.0	73.3	73.3	100.0	100.0	86.7
stlf _{shr}	66.7	53.3	46.7	46.7	46.7	33.3
arima _{shr}	66.7	66.7	66.7	100.0	100.0	93.3
tbats _{shr}	86.7	86.7	80.0	100.0	93.3	80.0
ew	93.3	86.7	86.7	86.7	86.7	86.7
ow _{var}	100.0	93.3	86.7	93.3	86.7	86.7
ow _{cov}	86.7	86.7	73.3	80.0	66.7	53.3
src	100.0	93.3	93.3	93.3	93.3	86.7
scr _{ew}	100.0	93.3	93.3	93.3	93.3	86.7
scr _{var}	93.3	93.3	93.3	93.3	93.3	93.3
scr _{cov}	86.7	86.7	80.0	73.3	73.3	73.3
occ _{bv}	86.7	86.7	73.3	86.7	86.7	73.3
occ _{shr}	80.0	73.3	66.7	73.3	73.3	73.3
occ _{wls}	100.0	93.3	86.7	86.7	86.7	86.7
occ _{be}	100.0	93.3	93.3	93.3	93.3	86.7




Figure G.7: MCB Nemenyi test for the Australian electricity generation dataset using the MAE at different forecast horizon ($h = 1, \dots, 7$ for the first column and $h = 1$ for the second column). In each panel, the Friedman test p-value is reported in the lower-right corner. The mean rank of each approach is shown to the right of its name. Statistically significant differences in performance are indicated if the intervals of two forecast reconciliation procedures do not overlap. Thus, approaches that do not overlap with the green interval are considered significantly worse than the best, and vice versa.




Figure G.8: MCB Nemenyi test for the Australian electricity generation dataset using the MSE at different forecast horizon ($h = 1, \dots, 7$ for the first column and $h = 1$ for the second column). In each panel, the Friedman test p-value is reported in the lower-right corner. The mean rank of each approach is shown to the right of its name. Statistically significant differences in performance are indicated if the intervals of two forecast reconciliation procedures do not overlap. Thus, approaches that do not overlap with the green interval are considered significantly worse than the best, and vice versa.

References

- Ando, S. & Narita, F. (2024). An alternative proof of Minimum Trace reconciliation. *Forecasting*, 6(2), 456–461.
- Athanasopoulos, G., Ahmed, R. A., & Hyndman, R. (2009). Hierarchical forecasts for Australian domestic tourism. *International Journal of Forecasting*, 25(1), 146–166.
- Athanasopoulos, G., Hyndman, R. J., Kourentzes, N., & Panagiotelis, A. (2024). Forecast reconciliation: A review. *International Journal of Forecasting*, 40(2), 430–456.
- Baltagi, B. H. (2021). *Econometric Analysis of Panel Data*. New York: Springer.
- Bates, J. & Granger, C. W. (1969). The combination of forecasts. *Operations Research Quarterly*, 20(4), 451–468.
- Bañbura, M., Giannone, D., & Reichlin, L. (2010). Large bayesian vector auto regressions. *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, 25(1), 71–92.
- Ben Taieb, S., Taylor, J. W., & Hyndman, R. J. (2021). Hierarchical probabilistic forecasting of electricity demand with smart meter data. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 116(533), 27–43.
- Box, G. E. P. & Jenkins, G. M. (1976). *Time series analysis: Forecasting and control*. San Francisco: Holden-Day.
- Byron, R. P. (1978). The estimation of large social account matrices. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series A*, 141(3), 359–367.
- Byron, R. P. (1979). Corrigenda: The estimation of large social account matrices. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series A*, 142(3), 405.
- Capistrán, C. & Timmermann, A. (2009). Forecast combination with entry and exit of experts. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics*, 27(4), 428–440.
- Claeskens, G., Magnus, J. R., Vasnev, A. L., & Wang, W. (2016). The forecast combination puzzle: A simple theoretical explanation. *International Journal of Forecasting*, 32(3), 754–762.
- Clemen, R. T. (1989). Combining forecasts: A review and annotated bibliography. *International Journal of Forecasting*, 5(4), 559–583.
- Cleveland, R. (1990). STL : A seasonal-trend decomposition procedure based on loess. *Journal of Official Statistics*, 6(1), 3–73.
- Conflitti, C., De Mol, C., & Giannone, D. (2015). Optimal combination of survey forecasts. *International Journal of Forecasting*, 31(4), 1096–1103.
- Davydenko, A. & Fildes, R. (2013). Measuring forecasting accuracy: The case of judgmental adjustments to sku-level demand forecasts. *International Journal of Forecasting*, 29(3), 510–522.
- De Livera, A. M., Hyndman, R. J., & Snyder, R. D. (2011). Forecasting time series with complex

- seasonal patterns using exponential smoothing. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 106(496), 1513–1527.
- Di Fonzo, T. & Girolimetto, D. (2023). Cross-temporal forecast reconciliation: Optimal combination method and heuristic alternatives. *International Journal of Forecasting*, 39(1), 39–57.
- Di Fonzo, T. & Girolimetto, D. (2024). Forecast combination based forecast reconciliation. *International Journal of Forecasting*, 40(2), 490–514.
- Diebold, F. X. & Mariano, R. S. (1995). Comparing predictive accuracy. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics*, 13(3), 253–263.
- Fleming, P. J. & Wallace, J. J. (1986). How not to lie with statistics: The correct way to summarize benchmark results. *Communications of the ACM*, 29(3), 218–221.
- Frazier, D. T., Covey, R., Martin, G. M., & Poskitt, D. (2023). Solving the forecast combination puzzle. *Monash Econometrics and Business Statistics Working Papers 18/23*, Monash University, Department of Econometrics and Business Statistics.
- Girolimetto, D., Athanasopoulos, G., Di Fonzo, T., & Hyndman, R. J. (2024). Cross-temporal probabilistic forecast reconciliation: Methodological and practical issues. *International Journal of Forecasting*, 40(3), 1134–1151.
- Girolimetto, D. & Di Fonzo, T. (2024a). FoReco: Forecast reconciliation. *R package*.
- Girolimetto, D. & Di Fonzo, T. (2024b). Foco2: Coherent forecast combination. *R package*.
- Girolimetto, D. & Di Fonzo, T. (2024c). Point and probabilistic forecast reconciliation for general linearly constrained multiple time series. *Statistical Methods & Applications*, 33(2), 581–607.
- Goehry, B., Goude, Y., Massart, P., & Poggi, J.-M. (2020). Aggregation of multi-scale experts for bottom-up load forecasting. *IEEE Transactions on Smart Grid*, 11(3), 1895–1904.
- Hansen, P. R., Lunde, A., & Nason, J. M. (2011). The Model Confidence Set. *Econometrica*, 79(2), 453–497.
- Hollyman, R., Petropoulos, F., & Tipping, M. E. (2021). Understanding forecast reconciliation. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 294(1), 149–160.
- Hyndman, R. J., Ahmed, R. A., Athanasopoulos, G., & Shang, H. L. (2011). Optimal combination forecasts for hierarchical time series. *Computational Statistics and Data Analysis*, 55(9), 2579–2589.
- Hyndman, R. J., et al. (2023). forecast: Forecasting functions for time series and linear models. *R package*.
- Hyndman, R. J. & Khandakar, Y. (2008). Automatic time series forecasting: The forecast package for R. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 27, 1–22.
- Hyndman, R. J., Lee, A. J., & Wang, E. (2016). Fast computation of reconciled forecasts for hierarchical and grouped time series. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, 97, 16–32.

- Kapetanios, G., Labhard, V., & Price, S. (2008). Forecasting using bayesian and information-theoretic model averaging: An application to UK inflation. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics*, 26(1), 33–41.
- Keller, T. & Olkin, I. (2004). Combining correlated unbiased estimators of the mean of a normal distribution. *Lecture Notes - Monograph Series*, 45, 218–227.
- Koning, A. J., Franses, P. H., Hibon, M., & Stekler, H. O. (2005). The M3 competition: Statistical tests of the results. *International Journal of Forecasting*, 21(3), 397–409.
- Kourentzes, N. & Athanasopoulos, G. (2019). Cross-temporal coherent forecasts for Australian tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 75, 393–409.
- Lavancier, F. & Rochet, P. (2016). A general procedure to combine estimators. *Computational Statistics and Data Analysis*, 94, 175–192.
- Liu, L., Hao, X., & Wang, Y. (2024). Solving the forecast combination puzzle using double shrinkages. *Oxford Bulletin of Economics & Statistics*, 86(3), 714–741.
- Magnus, J. R. & Neudecker, H. (2019). *Matrix differential calculus with applications in statistics and econometrics*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley, third edition.
- Makridakis, S., Spiliotis, E., & Assimakopoulos, V. (2022). M5 accuracy competition: Results, findings, and conclusions. *International Journal of Forecasting*, 38(4), 1346–1364.
- Mohamed, R. A. (2023). Enhancing forecast accuracy using combination methods for the hierarchical time series approach. *PLoS One*, 18(7), e0287897.
- Newbold, P. & Granger, C. W. (1974). Experience with forecasting univariate time series and the combination of forecasts. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, A*, 137(2), 131–146.
- Panagiotelis, A., Gamakumara, P., Athanasopoulos, G., & Hyndman, R. J. (2021). Forecast reconciliation: A geometric view with new insights on bias correction. *International Journal of Forecasting*, 37(1), 343–359.
- Panagiotelis, A., Gamakumara, P., Athanasopoulos, G., & Hyndman, R. J. (2023). Probabilistic forecast reconciliation: Properties, evaluation and score optimisation. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 36(2), 693–706.
- Porrill, J. (1988). Optimal combination and constraints for geometrical sensor data. *The International Journal of Robotics Research*, 7(6).
- Qian, W., Rolling, C. A., Cheng, G., & Yang, Y. (2019). On the forecast combination puzzle. *Econometrics*, 7(3), 39.
- Rao, C. R. (2000). Statistical proofs of some matrix inequalities. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 321(1–3), 307–320.
- Rostami-Tabar, B. & Hyndman, R. J. (2024). Hierarchical time series forecasting in emergency

- medical services. *Journal of Service Research*, *in press*.
- Schäfer, J. & Strimmer, K. (2005). A Shrinkage Approach to Large-Scale Covariance Matrix Estimation and Implications for Functional Genomics. *Statistical Applications in Genetics and Molecular Biology*, *4*(1).
- Seber, G. (1984). *Multivariate observations*. New York: Wiley.
- Smith, J. & Wallis, K. (2009). A simple explanation of the forecast combination puzzle. *Oxford Bulletin of Economics & Statistics*, *71*(3), 331–355.
- Spiliotis, E., Petropoulos, F., & Assimakopoulos, V. (2019). Improving the forecasting performance of temporal hierarchies. *PLoS One*, *14*(10), e0223422.
- Stone, R., Champenowne, D. G., & Meade, J. E. (1942). The precision of national income estimates. *The Review of Economic Studies*, *9*(2), 111–125.
- Sun, S.-L. & Deng, Z.-L. (2004). Multi-sensor optimal information fusion Kalman filter. *Automatica*, *40*(6), 1017–1023.
- Thompson, R., Qian, Y., & Vasnev, A. L. (2024). Flexible global forecast combinations. *Omega*, *126*, 103073.
- Timmermann, A. (2006). Forecast combinations. In G. Elliott, C. C. Granger, & A. Timmermann (Eds.), *Handbook of Economic Forecasting* (pp. 135–196). New York: Elsevier.
- Wang, X., Hyndman, R. J., Li, F., & Kang, Y. (2024). Forecast combinations: an over 50-year review. *International Journal of Forecasting*, *39*(4), 1518–1547.
- Wickramasuriya, S. L., Athanasopoulos, G., & Hyndman, R. J. (2019). Optimal forecast reconciliation for hierarchical and grouped time series through trace minimization. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, *114*(526), 804–819.
- Yang, D. & Zhang, A. N. (2019). Impact of information sharing and forecast combination on fast-moving-consumer-goods demand forecast accuracy. *Information*, *10*(8), 1167–1182.
- Zhang, B., Panagiotelis, A., & Li, H. (2024). Constructing hierarchical time series through clustering: Is there an optimal way for forecasting? *International Journal of Forecasting*, *in press*.