
Ister: Inverted Seasonal-Trend Decomposition Transformer for Explainable Multivariate Time Series Forecasting

Fanpu Cao¹ Shu Yang² Zhengjian Chen³ Ye Liu¹ Laizhong Cui²

Abstract

In long-term time series forecasting, Transformer-based models have achieved great success, due to its ability to capture long-range dependencies. However, existing transformer-based methods face challenges in accurately identifying which variables play a pivotal role in the prediction process and tend to overemphasize noisy channels, thereby limiting the interpretability and practical effectiveness of the models. Besides, it faces scalability issues due to quadratic computational complexity of self-attention. In this paper, we propose a new model named *Inverted Seasonal-Trend Decomposition Transformer (Ister)*, which addresses these challenges in long-term multivariate time series forecasting by designing an improved Transformer-based structure. *Ister* firstly decomposes original time series into seasonal and trend components. Then we propose a new *Dot-attention* mechanism to process the seasonal component, which improves both accuracy, computation complexity and interpretability. Upon completion of the training phase, it allows users to intuitively visualize the significance of each feature in the overall prediction. We conduct comprehensive experiments, and the results show that *Ister* achieves state-of-the-art (SOTA) performance on multiple datasets, surpassing existing models in long-term prediction tasks.

1. Introduction

Multivariate Long-term time series forecasting (LTSF) is widely applied in energy, transportation, economic planning, weather prediction, and disease propagation, and accurate

¹South China University of Technology ²ShenZhen University ³Shenzhen Energy Group Co., Ltd.. Correspondence to: Fanpu Cao <202164690237@mail.scut.edu.cn>, Shu Yang <yangshu@szu.edu.com>, Zhengjian Chen <chenzhengjian@163.com>, Ye Liu <yliu03@scut.edu.cn>, Laizhong Cui <cuilz@szu.edu.cn>.

Preprint.

prediction is crucial for them (Wen et al., 2023).

Over the past decades, many researches have proposed many statistical models and machine learning based models. Statistical time series prediction models, such as Auto Regressive Integrated Moving Average (ARIMA) and its variants (Shumway et al., 2017), exhibit poor prediction performance on nonlinear time series datasets. To improve accuracy, many Machine Learning (ML) based algorithms have been proposed, e.g., Support Vector Regression (SVR) (Platt, 1998), Multi-Layer Perceptron (MLP), Temporal Convolutional Network (TCN) (Hewage et al., 2020), Recurrent Neural Network (RNN) (Grossberg, 2013) and Long Short-Term Memory (LSTM) (Hochreiter & Schmidhuber, 1997), etc. However, these models perform poorly when predicting extremely long sequences, and some even suffer from accumulated errors (Zhou et al., 2021).

Due to the significant success of Transformer (Vaswani et al., 2017) in Natural Language Processing (NLP), many studies are trying to use it in other fields (Liu et al., 2021; Arnab et al., 2021). Among these fields, Transformer has made great progress recently in LTSF (Wen et al., 2023). Because of the self-attention mechanism, Transformers can capture long-range dependencies in sequences, thereby improving prediction accuracy.

However, the vanilla Transformer faces significant challenges in both accuracy and scalability when applied to LTSF. The permutation-invariant nature of self-attention, along with its insensitivity to sequence order, contributes to inaccuracies. Additionally, the quadratic computational complexity of self-attention causes scalability issues.

Recently, many works have been devoted to improve its efficiency and accuracy. Informer (Zhou et al., 2021) and Reformer (Kitaev et al., 2020) focus on reducing computation complexity. Autoformer (Wu et al., 2021) and FEDformer (Zhou et al., 2022) take periodic nature of time series into considerations, and apply Seasonal-Trend decomposition or fourier transform to improve prediction accuracy on long sequence with seasonal characteristics. PatchTST (Nie et al., 2023) divides the time series into several segments and applies segmentation-level attention. Inverted Transformer (iTransformer) (Liu et al., 2024a) improves accuracy

of multivariate forecasting by embedding series into variate tokens rather than temporal tokens, becoming a milestone in the field. Transformer-based models continue to achieve state-of-the-art time series forecasting performance.

However, transformer-based predictors still encounter challenges such as *computational inefficiency*, *difficulty in identifying key variables*, and *inadequate modeling of noisy channels*, which hinder both interpretability and practical effectiveness. We examine the state-of-the-art iTransformer (Liu et al., 2024a) and find that many channels provide limited information and are excessively noisy, preventing accurate prediction. For example, Figure 1 shows that the attention heat map learned by iTransformer on two well-known datasets (Wu et al., 2021) displays a sparse stripe, suggesting that only a few channels are strongly correlated with the target, while many others play a minimal role in multivariate global prediction. iTransformer uses attention to compute the relationships between every pair of channels. This approach incurs significant computational cost and may introduce noise, which could degrade performance. Therefore, we argue that not every channel justifies the allocation of computational resources for precise modeling during channel alignment. Instead, we propose selecting channels that contribute more effectively to global prediction, while discarding low-quality channels that are noisy and lack clear semantic information. We also need to quantify the contribution of each channel to the global prediction, thereby providing interpretability for the model’s decision.

Thus, to better address the previously mentioned issues, we propose a new model named the **Inverted seasonal-trend decomposition Transformer** (*Ister*). Particularly, *Ister* firstly decomposes the time series into seasonal and trend components, and we believe different components need different techniques. Secondly, we propose a new *Dot-attention* mechanism to capture dependencies within seasonal component, where *Dot-attention* can improve accuracy and reduce computation complexity. Finally, *Ister* uses MLP network to forecast the trend component. Above all, *Ister* can achieve the best of two worlds, effectively modeling channel alignment while allowing the user to intuitively assess the importance of each feature to the overall prediction after training, providing interpretability to the prediction results.

To evaluate the performance of *Ister*, we conduct comprehensive simulations on different datasets. The results show that *Ister* achieves state-of-the-art performance on real-world benchmarks and outperforms existing Transformer-based forecasters on long-term multivariate forecasting.

To sum up, the main contributions of this work include:

- We propose *Ister*, a transformer model that efficiently models channel alignment for multivariate long-term time series forecasting.

- We find that seasonal features can effectively enhance the performance of channel modeling. Periodic alignment is the key to channel alignment.
- We propose *Dot-attention*, an efficient attention mechanism with linear complexity and interpretability.
- We conduct extensive experiments on predicting long multivariate sequences on several real-world benchmarks, and prove that *Ister* outperforms previous methods. We also try various combinations of techniques on different components, and prove *Ister* win others.

2. Related Work

Traditional Time Series Prediction Methods: Many time series prediction methods were proposed during the past years, such as ARIMA (Shumway et al., 2017), Holt-Winters (Chatfield, 1978), and Prophet (Gibran & Bushrui, 2012). These methods attempt to compute hidden time series patterns and use them to forecast. However, real-world temporal changes contain complex non-linear relationships and hard to find patterns, limiting the scope of these methods. STL (Seasonal and Trend decomposition using Loess) (Cleveland et al., 1990) is one of the earliest algorithms that decomposes time series data into seasonal and trend components for prediction. We borrow the idea from STL, as different components adapts to different processing algorithms.

Neural Network based Method: Many deep neural network based methods have emerged for time series forecasting, including RNN (Grossberg, 2013), LSTM (Hochreiter & Schmidhuber, 1997), TCN (Hewage et al., 2020). They captures local patterns through convolutional operations and addresses, and employ recurrent neural network to reduce memory usage of neural networks. These methods perform well in finding non-linear relationships in series. However, they face great challenges like error accumulation. In this paper, we use MLP (Das et al., 2023) for trend prediction, and we find that a simple static feed-forward structure performs better in learning intricate patterns in trending components.

Transformer based Methods: Transformer (Vaswani et al., 2017) has achieved remarkable successes in NLP, and gained significant attentions for time series prediction, due to its ability to capture long-range dependencies. After that, numerous improved Transformer based architecture have been proposed. Many of them are devoted to reduce quadratic computational complexity in both computation and memory of vanilla Transformer (Kitaev et al., 2020; Zhou et al., 2021), while most of the others are devoted to improve its prediction accuracy (Wu et al., 2021; Zhou et al., 2022). Although many researchers are trying to push




Figure 1. Attention heatmap visualization results of a 3&4-layer iTransformer after 10 epochs of training on ECL and traffic dataset

this direction forward, (Zeng et al., 2023) found that a simple one-layer linear model outperforms all previous Transformer based models in all cases. However, our proposed methods still adopts the architecture of the Transformer model, because we find it performs better when processing the seasonal components in time series.

Modeling Seasonality with Transformer: We are not the first to model seasonality with Transformer. In recent years, Autoformer (Wu et al., 2021) uses auto-correlation to identify sub-series similarities within time series data, FEDformer (Zhou et al., 2022) develops a frequency enhanced Transformer using fourier transform and seasonal-trend decomposition. TimesNet (Wu et al., 2022) unravels intricate frequency patterns using FFT (Fast Fourier Transform) (Brigham & Morrow, 1967) method for the first time. However, these methods often overlook hidden noise and face instability after introducing frequency domain (Liu et al., 2022b). In this paper, we learn lessons from them by just using seasonal-trend decomposition.

Inverted Transformer Structure: The most recent Transformer-based methods (Nie et al., 2023; Liu et al., 2024a) recognize that point-wise representation performs poor in capturing local semantics in temporal variations. To improve it, PatchTST (Nie et al., 2023) divides time series data into subseries-level patches and use self-attention to capture dependencies between these patches. What is more, iTransformer (Liu et al., 2024a) build upon the inverted transformer structure and tries to capture dependencies between multiple variables. They have been proved to perform better in most scenarios. In this paper, we also adopt this

inverted structure when predicting the seasonal components.




Figure 2. Existing time-series forecasting modeling methods. The methods used by *Ister* are in the solid boxes.

3. Preliminary

Problem definition In multivariate time series forecasting, given historical observations $\mathbf{X} = \{x_1, \dots, x_T\} \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times N}$, where T represents the number of time steps and N represents the number of variables, our target is predicting the future S time steps $\mathbf{Y} = \{x_{T+1}, \dots, x_{T+S}\} \in \mathbb{R}^{S \times N}$.

Integrated representation The Kolmogorov-Arnold representation theory (Liu et al., 2024b) (KA-theorem) provides a framework for representing multivariate functions as compositions of simpler univariate functions. Specifically, it asserts that any continuous multivariate function can be expressed as a finite composition of continuous functions of a single variable. Formally, for a continuous function $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, the Kolmogorov-Arnold representation is

given by:

$$f(x_1, \dots, x_M) = \rho\left(\sum_{m=1}^M \lambda_m \phi(x_m)\right)$$

where ϕ are the univariate continuous functions, λ are the weighting parameters and ρ is a nonlinear continuous function. This decomposition allows for the representation of complex high-dimensional functions in terms of simpler, lower-dimensional components, making it a powerful tool in approximation theory and machine learning.

As previously mentioned, most channels lacking semantic meaning or containing noise have a minimal impact on multivariate global prediction, while a small set of core variables play a crucial role. Our goal is to design an efficient algorithm that automatically learns to extract these core information. The fusion representation concept in the KA-theorem has inspired the design of our dot-attention module.

4. Methodology

We propose the *Inverted seasonal-trend decomposition Transformer (Ister)*, *Ister* firstly employs a seasonal-trend decomposition algorithm to decompose original time series into two parts, including seasonal and trend components. Transformer with *Dot-attention* based encoder is proposed to analyze sequential seasonal patterns, meanwhile an MLP based network is applied on the trend component. The backbone structure is shown in Figure 3.

Series Decomposition Time series can be decomposed into seasonal and trend components using time series decomposition algorithm. Seasonal components preserve the periodic features, while trend components depict the overall fluctuations.

To decompose the series into seasonal and trend components, we use a moving average technique to smooth periodic fluctuations and emphasize long-term trends. For an input series $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times N}$ with T time steps, the decomposition process is as follows:

$$\mathbf{X}_t = F(\mathbf{X}), \mathbf{X}_s = \mathbf{X} - \mathbf{X}_t \quad (1)$$

where $F(\cdot)$ is an average pooling filters, \mathbf{X}_s and $\mathbf{X}_t \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times N}$ represent the seasonal and extracted trend-cyclical components of \mathbf{X} , respectively. This process is encapsulated by $\mathbf{X}_s, \mathbf{X}_t = \text{SeriesDecomp}(\mathbf{X})$, which serves as an integral component within the model architecture.

After seasonal-trend decomposition, *Ister* outputs the seasonal and trend components. Then we process different components along different branches, i.e., attention for seasonal component and MLP for trend component.

Backbone Structure After decomposition, we apply different algorithms on seasonal and trend components, because they have different characteristics. For seasonal component, we use Transformer encoder to capture correlations among the high-dimensional representations of seasonal information embedded in different features. For trend component, we just use a simple MLP with residual connections and layer normalization.

Ister adopts the channel-independent method, which has been proved to outperform channel-mixing method on multivariate time series (Nie et al., 2023). The backbone structure includes two channel-independent modules: both Transformer encoder for seasonal component and MLP network for trend component.

The latest Transformer-based structure (Liu et al., 2024a) begin to use inverted embedding and encode each variant as a single token, expanding the receptive field along the time dimension. Thus, we also use the inverted structure, encoding each input seasonal and trend component feature as a token.

For convenience, we denote $\mathbf{X}_{s,n}$ as the seasonal component and $\mathbf{X}_{t,n}$ as the trend component of whole time series of each variable indexed by n .

4.1. Transformer based Module

We found that seasonal component, which encompasses the most significant features of time-series, can effectively enhance the performance of channel modeling. Thus, we use Transformer to predict seasonal component.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{h}_{s,n}^0 &= \text{Embedding}_s(\mathbf{X}_{s,n}), \\ \mathbf{H}_s^{l+1} &= \text{Encoder}_s(\mathbf{H}_s^l), \quad l = 0, \dots, L-1, \\ \hat{\mathbf{Y}}_{s,n} &= \text{Projection}_s(\mathbf{h}_{s,n}^L), \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where $\mathbf{H} = \{\mathbf{h}_1, \dots, \mathbf{h}_N\} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times D}$ contains N embedded tokens of dimension D and the superscript denotes the layer. We implement Embedding_s and Projection_s using MLP network. The obtained seasonal variate tokens are independently processed by a shared feed-forward network. Specifically, as the order of sequence is implicitly stored in the neuron permutation of the feed-forward network, the position embedding in the vanilla Transformer is no longer needed here.

Dot-attention Mechanism The vanilla Transformer (Vaswani et al., 2017) faces quadratic computational complexity, which is unacceptable when processing long sequences.

Multivariate time series can be considered as multichannel data. Previous work (Zeng et al., 2023) has demonstrated




Figure 3. Overall structure of *Ister*. The original sequence is decomposed into seasonal and trend components using the *SeriesDecomp*(.). After obtaining the embedded representations of the seasonal and trend components, the seasonal component is fed into the Transformer, while the trend component is fed into the MLP layer with residual connections and layer normalization, resulting in the corresponding seasonal and trend outputs. The seasonal and trend outputs are added together to obtain the final result.

that a simple linear architecture with channel independence can outperform most transformer-based models, highlighting the importance of this architecture. Existing models often adopt a channel independence framework. However, they either lack the ability to model channel alignment or treat all channels equally. In practical applications the data typically involve a large number of channels, many of which contain significant noise or lack semantic meaning, making it challenging to manually distinguish the semantic information of each channel. Discarding such channels directly leads to information loss, but excessive modeling may introduce noise, which poses a challenge for accurate prediction. In light of this, it becomes crucial to develop an attention mechanism that can automatically learn and extract core information.

In order to solve the bottleneck just mentioned, while improving both efficiency and accuracy, inspired by the KA-theorem, we propose *Dot-attention* mechanism. Dot-attention eliminates the multi-head architecture and replaces the matrix multiplication in self-attention with element-wise multiplication. The formula for Dot-attention is as follows:

$$Dot.(Q, K, V) = \left(\sum_{i=1}^L \text{Softmax}(Q_i) \odot K_i \right)^T \mathbf{1}_L^T \odot V, \quad (3)$$

where $Q, K, V \in \mathbb{R}^{L \times D}$

The Dot-attention mechanism, similar to the original multi-head attention mechanism, consists of three learnable weight

matrices: 1. Query (**Q**): Models the importance of different channels and assigns weights to channel information. 2. Key (**K**): Aggregates the weighted representations of all features into a global predictive representation. 3. Value (**V**): Utilizes the global predictive representation to guide the predictions for all channels. We adopt a representation approach inspired by the KA-theorem. Specifically, the input tokens are first multiplied by the **Q**, **K**, and **V** matrices to obtain the corresponding weight representations, global representations, and guiding representations. A *softmax* operation is then applied to the weight representations, converting each channel’s weight values into a probability distribution. These weights are used to scale each channel’s contribution. The weight representation is then multiplied with the global representation via a dot product to extract the core representation of the sequence. Finally, this core representation is multiplied by the guiding vector **V**, serving as guidance for each channel’s prediction.

Dot-attention enables all tokens to interact and learn weights through the summation operation. Due to the gradient update characteristics of the summation operation during back-propagation, tokens with higher weights will have their gradients updated more significantly, contribute more and exert greater influence in the summation process. Finally, element-wise multiplication of the score matrix with the Value matrix guides all channels.

All computational operations of Dot-attention consist of element-wise multiplications. This not only reduces the original quadratic computational complexity of self-attention to $O(L)$ but also eliminates the interference from noisy chan-

nels, further enhancing accuracy. Table 1 lists the time complexities of the existing Transformers. The Dot-attention used by Ister achieves optimal computational efficiency and has the lowest complexity.

After training the Dot-Attention mechanism, users can input test data into the model for forward propagation and examine the learned weight representations output by the Query matrix. These representations, presented in the form of a probability distribution, quantitatively and transparently measure the contribution of each channel to the global prediction.

Model	Attention Algorithm	Complexity
Ister	Dot-attention	$O(L)$
Transformer	Multi-head attention	$O(L^2)$
Reformer	LSH attention	$O(L \cdot \log L)$
Informer	ProbSparse	$O(L \cdot \ln L)$
Autoformer	Auto-Correlation	$O(L \cdot \log L)$
FEDformer	FEA-f	$O(L)$

Table 1. Computational complexities of various attention algorithms.

4.2. MLP-Layer based Module

While Transformer is good at predicting seasonal component, it fails to accurately predict the trend component. It should avoid capturing excessive long-range details to prevent performance degradation. To predict trend component, we use a simple MLP network with residual connections and layer normalization.

For $\mathbf{X}_t \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times T}$:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbf{H}_t^0 &= \text{Embedding}_t(\mathbf{X}_t) && (\mathbb{R}^T \mapsto \mathbb{R}^D) \\
 \mathbf{h}_1 &= \mathbf{W}_1 \mathbf{H}_t^0 + \mathbf{b}_1 && (\text{first hidden layer}) \\
 \mathbf{h}_2 &= \mathbf{W}_2 \mathbf{h}_1 + \mathbf{b}_2 && (\text{second hidden layer}) \\
 \mathbf{h}_3 &= \mathbf{W}_3 \mathbf{H}_t^0 + \mathbf{b}_3 && (\text{shortcut connection}) \\
 \mathbf{H}_t^1 &= \mathbf{H}_t^0 + \text{LayerNorm}(\mathbf{h}_2 + \mathbf{h}_3) && (\text{Add\&Norm}) \\
 \hat{\mathbf{Y}}_t &= \text{Projection}_t(\mathbf{H}_t^1) && (\mathbb{R}^D \mapsto \mathbb{R}^S)
 \end{aligned}$$

5. Experiment

Our proposed model framework aims to improve performance in LTSF, and we specifically assessed its ability to generalize for these prediction tasks.

Datasets We extensively include 6 real-world datasets in our experiments, including ECL, ETT (4 subsets), Exchange, Traffic, Weather used by Autoformer (Wu et al., 2021) and PEMS (4 subsets) used by SCINet (Liu et al., 2022a). Here

is a description of the experiment datasets: (1) ETT dataset contains the data collected from electricity transformers, including load and oil temperature that are recorded every 15 minutes between July 2016 and July 2018. (2) Electricity dataset contains the hourly electricity consumption of 321 customers from 2012 to 2014. (3) Exchange records the daily exchange rates of eight different countries ranging from 1990 to 2016. (4) Traffic collects hourly road occupancy rates measured by 862 sensors of San Francisco Bay area freeways from January 2015 to December 2016. (5) Weather is recorded every 10 minutes for 2020 whole year, which contains 21 meteorological indicators, such as air temperature, humidity, etc. (6) PEMS contains the public traffic network data in California collected by 5-minute windows. We use the same four public subsets (PEMS03, PEMS04, PEMS07, PEMS08) adopted in SCINet.

Implementation details Our method is trained with L2 loss, using the ADAM optimizer (Kingma & Ba, 2015). For the rest of the parameter settings, we strictly follow the settings of iTransformer (Liu et al., 2024a) for each of the models We explore the number of Transformer blocks N within the set $\{1, 2, 3, 4\}$, and the dimension of series d within $\{128, 256, 512\}$. All experiments are repeated three times, implemented in PyTorch (Paszke et al., 2019) and conducted on NVIDIA RTX 3090 24GB GPUs.

Forecasting Results In this section, we conduct extensive experiments to evaluate the forecasting performance of our proposed model together with advanced deep forecasters.

Baselines We carefully choose competitive forecasting models in Long-term Forecasting task until 2024 March as our benchmark, including iTransformer (Liu et al., 2024a), DLinear (Zeng et al., 2023), TimesNet (Wu et al., 2022), PatchTST (Nie et al., 2023), Crossformer (Zhang & Yan, 2022), TiDE (Das et al., 2023), SCINet (Liu et al., 2022a) and Non-Stationary (Liu et al., 2022b).

Main results Comprehensive forecasting results are listed in Table 2 and Table 3 with best in **bold** and the second underlined. The lower MSE/MAE indicates the more accurate prediction result. Ister has achieved the best performance across multiple datasets, particularly at the longest forecasting horizon (720 steps). Ister is particularly good at forecasting high-dimensional time series, such as the Traffic dataset (862 variables) and the PEMS dataset (170 to 883 variables). Moreover, our model demonstrates the most significant improvements over iTransformer (Liu et al., 2024a) at most forecasting lengths, with some datasets even showing enhanced predictive performance as the forecast horizon increases. This indicates that our model effectively utilizes the cyclical information in time series, thereby playing a

Methods	Ister		iTransformer		DLinear		TimesNet		PatchTST		Crossformer		TiDE		SCINet		Stationary		
Metric	MSE	MAE	MSE	MAE	MSE	MAE	MSE	MAE	MSE	MAE	MSE	MAE	MSE	MAE	MSE	MAE	MSE	MAE	
Traffic	96	0.374	0.259	0.393	0.268	0.648	0.396	0.599	0.314	0.485	0.318	0.511	0.266	0.805	0.493	0.788	0.499	0.612	0.338
	192	0.386	0.265	0.411	0.276	0.598	0.370	0.622	0.323	0.487	0.315	0.530	0.293	0.756	0.474	0.789	0.505	0.613	0.340
	336	0.405	0.273	0.424	0.282	0.605	0.373	0.632	0.332	0.501	0.321	0.558	0.305	0.762	0.477	0.797	0.508	0.618	0.328
	720	0.432	0.285	0.459	0.301	0.645	0.395	0.648	0.344	0.536	0.338	0.589	0.328	0.719	0.449	0.841	0.523	0.653	0.355
ETTh1	96	0.377	0.401	0.394	0.409	0.382	0.395	0.452	0.453	0.386	0.398	0.420	0.439	0.479	0.464	0.654	0.599	0.513	0.491
	192	0.436	0.429	0.448	0.440	0.432	0.425	0.498	0.477	0.435	0.426	0.540	0.519	0.525	0.492	0.719	0.631	0.534	0.504
	336	0.460	0.449	0.492	0.465	0.491	0.467	0.536	0.494	0.479	0.450	0.720	0.646	0.565	0.515	0.778	0.659	0.588	0.535
	720	0.481	0.475	0.520	0.503	0.526	0.517	0.555	0.516	0.491	0.475	0.808	0.690	0.594	0.558	0.836	0.699	0.643	0.616
ETTh2	96	0.284	0.341	0.299	0.349	0.339	0.393	0.331	0.369	0.290	0.338	0.846	0.634	0.400	0.440	0.707	0.621	0.476	0.458
	192	0.355	0.385	0.381	0.399	0.481	0.479	0.396	0.410	0.382	0.405	1.783	1.022	0.528	0.509	0.860	0.689	0.512	0.493
	336	0.345	0.387	0.423	0.432	0.590	0.540	0.252	0.450	0.411	0.425	2.650	1.405	0.643	0.571	1.000	0.744	0.552	0.551
	720	0.412	0.436	0.430	0.446	0.839	0.660	0.438	0.450	0.422	0.443	3.061	1.472	0.874	0.679	1.249	0.838	0.562	0.560
ETTm1	96	0.323	0.361	0.345	0.375	0.346	0.373	0.334	0.376	0.329	0.365	0.360	0.401	0.364	0.387	0.418	0.438	0.386	0.398
	192	0.366	0.385	0.391	0.399	0.381	0.391	0.404	0.410	0.368	0.386	0.402	0.440	0.398	0.404	0.439	0.450	0.459	0.444
	336	0.399	0.410	0.436	0.426	0.415	0.414	0.416	0.423	0.400	0.410	0.543	0.528	0.428	0.425	0.490	0.485	0.495	0.464
	720	0.457	0.443	0.504	0.465	0.473	0.451	0.497	0.466	0.463	0.446	1.073	0.794	0.487	0.461	0.595	0.550	0.585	0.516
ETTm2	96	0.177	0.261	0.183	0.265	0.193	0.292	0.189	0.266	0.184	0.264	0.270	0.356	0.207	0.305	0.286	0.377	0.192	0.274
	192	0.243	0.304	0.253	0.311	0.284	0.361	0.252	0.306	0.246	0.306	0.470	0.522	0.290	0.364	0.399	0.445	0.280	0.339
	336	0.300	0.340	0.312	0.350	0.382	0.429	0.322	0.349	0.308	0.346	1.165	0.759	0.377	0.422	0.637	0.591	0.334	0.361
	720	0.396	0.395	0.417	0.409	0.557	0.524	0.422	0.407	0.404	0.409	6.048	1.693	0.558	0.524	0.960	0.735	0.417	0.413
ECL	96	0.146	0.240	0.148	0.240	0.297	0.394	0.168	0.271	0.181	0.270	0.150	0.253	0.237	0.329	0.247	0.345	0.169	0.273
	192	0.165	0.260	0.165	0.256	0.299	0.397	0.190	0.292	0.187	0.275	0.166	0.267	0.236	0.330	0.257	0.355	0.182	0.286
	336	0.177	0.273	0.177	0.270	0.310	0.407	0.204	0.306	0.203	0.291	0.189	0.287	0.249	0.344	0.269	0.369	0.200	0.304
	720	0.207	0.301	0.228	0.313	0.343	0.432	0.272	0.353	0.245	0.325	0.231	0.318	0.284	0.373	0.299	0.390	0.222	0.321
Weather	96	0.170	0.210	0.173	0.212	0.195	0.254	0.169	0.219	0.180	0.220	0.174	0.239	0.202	0.261	0.221	0.306	0.173	0.223
	192	0.220	0.257	0.224	0.256	0.237	0.295	0.226	0.265	0.221	0.257	0.232	0.302	0.242	0.298	0.261	0.340	0.245	0.285
	336	0.278	0.298	0.280	0.299	0.281	0.331	0.281	0.303	0.279	0.296	0.276	0.340	0.287	0.335	0.309	0.378	0.321	0.338
	720	0.354	0.348	0.360	0.351	0.345	0.381	0.359	0.354	0.357	0.350	0.371	0.410	0.351	0.386	0.377	0.427	0.414	0.410
Exchange	96	0.080	0.199	0.088	0.209	0.098	0.232	0.105	0.235	0.087	0.204	0.256	0.367	0.106	0.232	0.267	0.396	0.131	0.257
	192	0.173	0.296	0.180	0.302	0.186	0.325	0.237	0.354	0.176	0.298	0.469	0.508	0.201	0.323	0.351	0.459	0.235	0.351
	336	0.318	0.407	0.362	0.440	0.340	0.446	0.362	0.437	0.300	0.397	1.267	0.882	0.380	0.446	1.324	0.853	0.393	0.456
	720	0.837	0.689	0.907	0.724	0.746	0.662	0.940	0.738	0.886	0.707	1.766	1.068	1.104	0.793	1.058	0.797	1.448	0.881
1 st Count	49		6		6		1		6		1		0		0		0		

Table 2. Full results of the Long-term Forecasting Task. We compare competitive models in Long-term Forecasting Task until 2024 March under different prediction lengths following the setting of original papers. The input sequence length is set to 96 for all baselines.

crucial role in predicting long-term future data and tackle real-world time series forecasting scenarios.

5.1. Model Analysis

Increasing lookback length Previous works have shown that the forecasting performance does not improve with the increase in lookback length on Transformers (Zeng et al., 2023). After decomposing time series into seasonal-trend components, as historical information expands, our model can better learn the periodic relationships in temporal data, achieving MSE improvement across multiple prediction steps with increasing lookback window size. The results of the visualization are presented in Figure 4, which proves that Ister can benefit from the extended lookback window for more precise predictions. As can be seen from the figure, the MSE monotonically decreases with increasing length of the lookback window at any prediction length.




Figure 4. Forecasting performance with the look-back length varying from {48, 96, 192, 336, 720} and prediction length varying from {96, 192, 336, 720}. Different styles of lines represent different prediction lengths. Ister’s forecasting performance benefits from the increase of look-back length.

Methods	Ister	iTransformer	DLinear	TimesNet	PatchTST	Crossformer	TiDE	SCINet	Stationary	
Metric	MSE MAE	MSE MAE	MSE MAE	MSE MAE	MSE MAE	MSE MAE	MSE MAE	MSE MAE	MSE MAE	
PEMS03	12	0.065 0.170	0.071 0.174	0.122 0.243	0.085 0.192	0.099 0.216	0.090 0.203	0.178 0.305	<u>0.066 0.172</u>	0.081 0.188
	24	0.085 0.195	0.093 0.201	0.201 0.317	0.118 0.223	0.142 0.259	0.121 0.240	0.257 0.371	0.085 0.198	0.105 0.214
	48	0.119 0.232	<u>0.125 0.236</u>	0.333 0.425	0.155 0.260	0.211 0.319	0.202 0.317	0.379 0.463	0.127 0.238	0.154 0.257
	96	0.164 0.274	<u>0.165 0.275</u>	0.457 0.515	0.228 0.317	0.269 0.370	0.262 0.367	0.490 0.539	0.178 0.287	0.247 0.336
PEMS04	12	<u>0.076 0.178</u>	0.078 0.183	0.148 0.272	0.087 0.195	0.105 0.224	0.098 0.218	0.219 0.340	0.073 0.177	0.088 0.196
	24	<u>0.091 0.198</u>	0.095 0.205	0.224 0.340	0.103 0.215	0.153 0.275	0.131 0.256	0.292 0.398	0.084 0.193	0.104 0.216
	48	<u>0.115 0.224</u>	0.120 0.233	0.355 0.437	0.136 0.250	0.229 0.339	0.205 0.326	0.409 0.478	0.099 0.211	0.137 0.251
	96	<u>0.143 0.252</u>	0.150 0.262	0.452 0.504	0.190 0.303	0.291 0.389	0.402 0.457	0.492 0.532	0.114 0.227	0.186 0.297
PEMS07	12	0.059 0.156	0.067 0.165	0.115 0.242	0.082 0.181	0.095 0.207	0.094 0.200	0.173 0.304	0.068 0.171	0.083 0.185
	24	0.077 0.179	<u>0.088 0.190</u>	0.210 0.329	0.101 0.204	0.150 0.262	0.139 0.247	0.271 0.383	0.119 0.225	0.102 0.207
	48	0.102 0.206	<u>0.110 0.215</u>	0.398 0.458	0.134 0.238	0.253 0.340	0.311 0.369	0.446 0.495	0.149 0.237	0.136 0.240
	96	0.130 0.231	<u>0.139 0.245</u>	0.594 0.553	0.181 0.279	0.346 0.404	0.396 0.442	0.628 0.577	0.141 0.234	0.187 0.287
PEMS08	12	0.076 0.176	0.079 0.182	0.154 0.276	0.112 0.212	0.168 0.232	0.165 0.214	0.227 0.343	0.087 0.184	0.109 0.207
	24	0.107 0.208	<u>0.115 0.219</u>	0.248 0.353	0.141 0.238	0.224 0.281	0.215 0.260	0.318 0.409	0.122 0.221	0.140 0.236
	48	0.168 0.258	<u>0.186 0.235</u>	0.440 0.470	0.198 0.283	0.321 0.354	0.315 0.355	0.497 0.510	0.189 0.270	0.211 0.294
	96	0.195 0.264	<u>0.221 0.267</u>	0.674 0.565	0.320 0.351	0.408 0.417	0.377 0.397	0.721 0.592	0.236 0.300	0.345 0.367
1 st Count	23	1	0	0	0	0	0	<u>9</u>	0	

Table 3. Full results of the Short-term Forecasting Task (PEMS). The results from other models are taken from iTransformer (Liu et al., 2024a). The input length is set to 96 for all baselines. The best results are in **bold** and the second best results are underlined.

Model efficiency The Ister architecture consists of two main components: Transformer encoder and MLP. Since MLP and Dot-attention mechanism have linear time complexity, the model’s overall complexity is $O(L)$. For memory complexity, we embed the whole series of dimension T as the tokens of dimension D . This makes our model’s memory usage less dependent on the prediction horizon compared to other Transformer-based methods, where memory usage increases linearly with the prediction horizon. We compare the running memory and training time among other Transformer-based methods during the training phase. Consequently, as shown in the Table 4, the proposed Ister achieves better efficiency for long-term sequence predictions.

Method	Parameter	Time	Memory
Ister	7.670M	0.098s	3924MiB
Informer	14.39M	0.154s	4107MiB
FEDformer	21.21M	0.332s	4720MiB
PatchTST	9.170M	0.125s	6761MiB
Crossformer	72.37M	0.393s	11430MiB

Table 4. Comparison of practical efficiency of LTSF-Transformers under input length=96 and predict length=720 on the Traffic. The training time averages 5 runs.

Ablation study We conducted ablation studies on multiple variants of the *Ister* model architecture, including *Ister-S*, *Ister-T*, *i-Ister*, *iMLP*, *i-Ister-S* and *i-Ister-T*. *Ister-S* retains only the seasonal portion of the *Ister*. *Ister-T* retains only the trend portion. *i-Ister* uses the Transformer architecture for the trend component and the MLP architecture for the seasonal component. *iMLP* feeds the original time series di-

Variants	ETT		ECL		Traffic	
Metric	MSE	MAE	MSE	MAE	MSE	MAE
Ister	0.363	0.387	0.174	0.268	0.400	0.270
<i>Ister-S</i>	0.386	0.400	0.175	0.268	0.414	0.280
<i>Ister-T</i>	0.389	0.402	0.213	0.288	0.535	0.345
<i>i-Ister</i>	0.392	0.401	0.191	0.279	0.499	0.325
<i>iMLP</i>	0.371	0.386	0.199	0.281	0.499	0.319
<i>i-Ister-S</i>	0.375	0.391	0.203	0.284	0.502	0.324
<i>i-Ister-T</i>	0.402	0.411	0.178	0.271	0.419	0.287

Table 5. Ablations on Ister. We conducted evaluations of a series of variants of the *Ister* model across multiple datasets. The input sequence length is set to 96 for all baselines. Results are averaged from all prediction length. For ETT dataset, the results are averaged from four datasets {ETTm1, ETTm2, ETTh1, ETTh2}. The best MSE results are in **bold**.

rectly into the MLP without decomposition. *i-Ister-S* retains only the seasonal portion of *i-Ister*. *i-Ister-T* retains only the trend portion of *i-Ister*. All variants of *Ister* are trained with the same hyperparameter settings as *Ister*. The ablation results are listed in Table 5. Experimental results demonstrate that *Ister* exhibits superior performance in terms of MSE and MAE across multiple datasets. This validates the effectiveness of using a attention mechanism for seasonal components and an MLP for capturing macro trends in the *Ister* architecture. Extracting periodic components allows the attention mechanism to more effectively capture relationships between features. Notably, the *iMLP* slightly improved over both iTransformer (Liu et al., 2024a) and the original *Ister* in certain datasets. This suggests that the

multi-head self-attention mechanism may have negligible effects on datasets with limited variables, which questions whether we really need to focus on two-by-two connections between variables in multivariate prediction tasks.

Interpretability of Dot-attention To evaluate whether Dot-Attention can effectively extract core information from multichannel data and understand the importance of different channels, we conducted experiments on two datasets with a large number of channels: ECL (321 channels) and Traffic (862 channels). Under the setting of an input length of 96 and output length of 96, we trained the Ister model for 10 epochs using the hyperparameters described in the experimental section and selected the weights that performed best on the validation set for testing. Figure 5 presents the visualization of feature representations learned by the Query matrix of Dot-Attention.




Figure 5. We used a 3-layer Ister trained on ECL and Traffic for 10 epochs and demonstrated the importance of each channel learned by Dot-attention to the overall prediction on the corresponding test set.

From the Figure 5, it can be observed that both the Traffic and ECL datasets exhibit conclusions consistent with the attention heatmap: a small number of core variables contribute significantly to global prediction. This demonstrates that the Dot-Attention mechanism effectively mitigates the influence of noise channels lacking semantic meaning and accurately identifies the key variables that play a dominant role in the prediction process. Moreover, the specific values of the probability distribution provide an intuitive measure of the percentage contribution of each feature to the global prediction. This contributes to the interpretability of predictions in practical applications.

Generalization performance We evaluated the generalization performance of *Dot-attention* on other models by selecting three different types of models utilizing self-

attention: *iTransformer* (Channel-wise), *PatchTST* (Patch-wise), and *Transformer* (Point-wise). Experiments were conducted on three multivariate datasets: ECL (321 variables), Traffic (862 variables), and PEMS08 (170 variables). Table 6 presents the experimental results and the corresponding percentage improvements. Our findings indicate that *Dot-attention*, which is designed for inter-channel attention, performs well in other tasks as well. It not only retains most of the performance but also achieves improvements in predictive accuracy on certain datasets. The Dot-Attention module can be seamlessly integrated into any channel independence-based model, enhancing its predictive performance through channel alignment and providing interpretability for the prediction results.

	Models	iTransformer		PatchTST		Transformer	
		MSE	MAE	MSE	MAE	MSE	MAE
ECL	<i>Ori.</i>	0.179	0.269	0.204	0.290	0.414	0.476
	+Dot.	0.172	0.264	0.194	0.288	0.269	0.360
	<i>Promotion</i>	4.0%	2.0%	5.0%	1.0%	35%	25%
Traffic	<i>Ori.</i>	0.412	0.281	0.502	0.323	0.660	0.361
	+Dot.	0.404	0.272	0.450	0.291	0.645	0.359
	<i>Promotion</i>	4.1%	4.3%	11%	10%	2.3%	0.6%
PEMS08	<i>Ori.</i>	0.175	0.254	0.280	0.321	0.252	0.274
	+Dot.	0.169	0.250	0.194	0.263	0.241	0.263
	<i>Promotion</i>	3.5%	1.6%	31%	19%	4.5%	4.0%

Table 6. We compared the performance of original *Multi-head self-attention* and *Dot-attention* for several different types (Channel-wise, Patch-wise and Point-wise) of Transformer models. The experimental results show that dot attention not only outperforms full attention in terms of time complexity, but also retains accuracy and even able to improve on some datasets.

6. Conclusion and future work

In this paper, we investigate the task of long-term multivariate forecasting of time series, which is a pressing need for real-world applications. We propose *Ister*, which decomposes the time series into seasonal and trend components and uses different methods to efficiently capture the intrinsic temporal patterns of each component. We propose to use efficient channel-independent modules with Dot-attention to capture inter-channel relationships, which reduces the secondary computational complexity, improves the prediction accuracy, and solving the bottleneck problem of lack of interpretability of prediction results and difficulty in locating core variables in previous methods. We conducted experiments on real-world datasets and showed that *Ister* achieves state-of-the-art performance on almost all datasets. Future research will explore *Ister*'s potential capabilities in estimation, classification, and anomaly detection tasks.

References

- Arnab, A., Dehghani, M., Heigold, G., Sun, C., Lučić, M., and Schmid, C. Vivit: A video vision transformer. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*, pp. 6836–6846, 2021.
- Brigham, E. O. and Morrow, R. E. The fast fourier transform. *IEEE Spectrum*, 4(12):63–70, 1967. doi: 10.1109/MSPEC.1967.5217220.
- Chatfield, C. The holt-winters forecasting procedure. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series C (Applied Statistics)*, 27(3):264–279, 1978.
- Cleveland, R. B., Cleveland, W. S., McRae, J. E., Terpenning, I., et al. Stl: A seasonal-trend decomposition. *J. Off. Stat*, 6(1):3–73, 1990.
- Das, A., Kong, W., Leach, A., Mathur, S. K., Sen, R., and Yu, R. Long-term forecasting with tiDE: Time-series dense encoder. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*, 2023. ISSN 2835-8856. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=pCbC3aQB5W>.
- Gibran, K. and Bushrui, S. B. *The prophet: A new annotated edition*. Simon and Schuster, 2012.
- Grossberg, S. Recurrent neural networks. *Scholarpedia*, 8(2):1888, 2013.
- Hewage, P., Behera, A., Trovati, M., Pereira, E., Ghahremani, M., Palmieri, F., and Liu, Y. Temporal convolutional neural (tcn) network for an effective weather forecasting using time-series data from the local weather station. *Soft Computing*, 24:16453–16482, 2020.
- Hochreiter, S. and Schmidhuber, J. Long short-term memory. *Neural computation*, 9(8):1735–1780, 1997.
- Kingma, D. and Ba, J. Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, San Diego, CA, USA, 2015.
- Kitaev, N., Kaiser, L., and Levskaya, A. Reformer: The efficient transformer. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2020. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=rkgNKkHtvB>.
- Liu, M., Zeng, A., Chen, M., Xu, Z., Lai, Q., Ma, L., and Xu, Q. Scinet: Time series modeling and forecasting with sample convolution and interaction. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:5816–5828, 2022a.
- Liu, Y., Wu, H., Wang, J., and Long, M. Non-stationary transformers: Exploring the stationarity in time series forecasting. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:9881–9893, 2022b.
- Liu, Y., Hu, T., Zhang, H., Wu, H., Wang, S., Ma, L., and Long, M. itransformer: Inverted transformers are effective for time series forecasting. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024a. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=JePfAI8fah>.
- Liu, Z., Lin, Y., Cao, Y., Hu, H., Wei, Y., Zhang, Z., Lin, S., and Guo, B. Swin transformer: Hierarchical vision transformer using shifted windows. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*, pp. 10012–10022, 2021.
- Liu, Z., Wang, Y., Vaidya, S., Ruehle, F., Halverson, J., Soljačić, M., Hou, T. Y., and Tegmark, M. Kan: Kolmogorov-arnold networks, 2024b. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2404.19756>.
- Nie, Y., Nguyen, N. H., Sinthong, P., and Kalagnanam, J. A time series is worth 64 words: Long-term forecasting with transformers. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=Jbdc0vTOcol>.
- Paszke, A., Gross, S., Massa, F., Lerer, A., Bradbury, J., Chanan, G., Killeen, T., Lin, Z., Gimelshein, N., Antiga, L., et al. Pytorch: An imperative style, high-performance deep learning library. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 32, 2019.
- Platt, J. Sequential minimal optimization: A fast algorithm for training support vector machines. 1998.
- Shumway, R. H., Stoffer, D. S., Shumway, R. H., and Stoffer, D. S. Arima models. *Time series analysis and its applications: with R examples*, pp. 75–163, 2017.
- Vaswani, A., Shazeer, N., Parmar, N., Uszkoreit, J., Jones, L., Gomez, A. N., Kaiser, L., and Polosukhin, I. Attention is all you need. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30, 2017.
- Wen, Q., Zhou, T., Zhang, C., Chen, W., Ma, Z., Yan, J., and Sun, L. Transformers in time series: A survey. In Elkind, E. (ed.), *Proceedings of the Thirty-Second International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI-23*, pp. 6778–6786, 8 2023. doi: 10.24963/ijcai.2023/759. URL <https://doi.org/10.24963/ijcai.2023/759>. Survey Track.
- Wu, H., Xu, J., Wang, J., and Long, M. Autoformer: Decomposition transformers with auto-correlation for long-term series forecasting. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 34:22419–22430, 2021.
- Wu, H., Hu, T., Liu, Y., Zhou, H., Wang, J., and Long, M. Timesnet: Temporal 2d-variation modeling for general time series analysis. In *The eleventh international conference on learning representations*, 2022.

Zeng, A., Chen, M., Zhang, L., and Xu, Q. Are transformers effective for time series forecasting? In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, volume 37, pp. 11121–11128, 2023.

Zhang, Y. and Yan, J. Crossformer: Transformer utilizing cross-dimension dependency for multivariate time series forecasting. In *The eleventh international conference on learning representations*, 2022.

Zhou, H., Zhang, S., Peng, J., Zhang, S., Li, J., Xiong, H., and Zhang, W. Informer: Beyond efficient transformer for long sequence time-series forecasting. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, volume 35, pp. 11106–11115, 2021.

Zhou, T., Ma, Z., Wen, Q., Wang, X., Sun, L., and Jin, R. Fedformer: Frequency enhanced decomposed transformer for long-term series forecasting. In *International conference on machine learning*, pp. 27268–27286. PMLR, 2022.