Enhancing Time Series Forecasting via Logic-Inspired Regularization

Jianqi Zhang^{*1} Jingyao Wang^{*1} Xingchen Shen¹ Wenwen Qiang¹

Abstract

Time series forecasting (TSF) plays a crucial role in many applications. Transformer-based methods are one of the mainstream techniques for TSF. Existing methods treat all token dependencies equally. However, we find that the effectiveness of token dependencies varies across different forecasting scenarios, and existing methods ignore these differences, which affects their performance. This raises two issues: (1) What are effective token dependencies? (2) How can we learn effective dependencies? From a logical perspective, we align Transformer-based TSF methods with the logical framework and define effective token dependencies as those that ensure the tokens as atomic formulas (Issue 1). We then align the learning process of Transformer methods with the process of obtaining atomic formulas in logic, which inspires us to design a method for learning these effective dependencies (Issue 2). Specifically, we propose Attention Logic Regularization (Attn-L-Reg), a plug-and-play method that guides the model to use fewer but more effective dependencies by making the attention map sparse, thereby ensuring the tokens as atomic formulas and improving prediction performance. Extensive experiments and theoretical analysis confirm the effectiveness of Attn-L-Reg.

1. Introduction

Time series forecasting (TSF) plays a crucial role in various real-world applications, such as weather prediction (Abhishek et al., 2012; Karevan & Suykens, 2020; Kratzenberg et al., 2008), energy planning (Boussif et al., 2024; Novo et al., 2022; Riva et al., 2018), and traffic flow forecasting (Fang et al., 2023; Li et al., 2022; Ma et al., 2021). Re-

Preprint

cently, Transformer-based methods (Wu et al., 2020; Lim et al., 2021; Liu et al., 2023) have emerged as a dominant approach for TSF with strong predictive performance. Typically, these methods first divide the input series into "tokens". Each token represents the feature of a segment within the input series. Then, they employ attention mechanisms to capture token dependencies, which correspond to temporal patterns like peaks, periods, and trends (Dong et al., 2023). Finally, the methods make predictions based on the extracted token dependencies.

Generally, existing Transformer-based TSF methods leverage all token dependencies for prediction (Liu et al., 2023; Nie et al., 2023). However, we observe that the effectiveness of these dependencies varies significantly across different prediction scenarios. Specifically, we conduct a toy experiment using iTransformer (Liu et al., 2023) and PatchTST (Nie et al., 2023) on ECL, Weather, and Traffic datasets (Subsection 3.2). It evaluates the impact of removing each token dependency on the predictions at different time points. The results, shown in Fig.2, reveal that removing certain token dependencies improves predictions at the first time point but may decrease predictions for the last time point, indicating significant differences in the effectiveness of token dependencies for these two prediction scenarios. One possible explanation is that the effectiveness of token dependencies depends on the state of the time point being predicted (Lim et al., 2021). For instance, when predicting the first time point (yellow points in Fig.1), which does not span a cycle, the token dependencies related to periodic features are redundant and may harm performance. In contrast, for the last time point (red points in Fig.1), where the prediction spans a cycle, the token dependencies related to periodic features are effective. Existing Transformer-based methods treat all token dependencies equally (Vaswani et al., 2017; Liu et al., 2023; Nie et al., 2023; Wu et al., 2021), ignoring their varying effectiveness and affecting performance.

To address this issue, we need to differentiate between effective and redundant token dependencies and then learn from the effective token dependencies for prediction. Therefore, in this paper, we aim to solve two issues: (1) what are effective token dependencies, and (2) how to learn effective token dependencies. Specifically, we begin by defining what constitutes an effective token dependency. Intuitively, effective token dependencies should enhance the logical reasoning

^{*}Equal contribution ¹Institute of Software, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, China. Correspondence to: Jianqi Zhang <jluzhangjianqi@163.com>, Jingyao Wang <wangjingyao2023@iscas.ac.cn>, Xingchen Shen <xingchen@iscas.ac.cn>, Wenwen Qiang <a01114115@163.com>.



Figure 1. Example of time series forecasting. The yellow point represents the first time point to be predicted, which does not need to span a cycle. The red point represents the last point to be predicted, which requires spanning approximately four cycles.

ability of the TSF models, thereby improving prediction performance. Drawing inspiration from the concept of effective features in logic-based reasoning methods (Boix-Adsera et al., 2023; Li et al., 2024; Barbiero et al., 2022), we define effective dependencies from a logical reasoning perspective. Specifically, we integrate Transformer-based TSF methods with the logical framework in (Andréka et al., 2017), leading to the logical framework for TSF (Section 4.1). When token representations form atomic formulas, the reasoning ability is significantly strengthened (see Section 4.1 and Appendix D for details). An atomic formula, in logic, is an indivisible unit (Andréka et al., 2017; Shoenfield, 2018). For token representations in TSF, this indivisibility means that the token's semantic information cannot be further reduced without negatively affecting prediction performance. Therefore, we define effective token dependencies as those that preserve the indivisibility of token representations (Definition 4.4).

After defining effective token dependencies, next, we aim to address the second question: how to learn these dependencies. Building on the previous analysis, our goal is to guide the model in learning token dependencies that form an atomic formula, thereby enhancing predictive performance. Inspired by the logical methodology in (Andréka et al., 2017; Margaris, 1990), we draw an analogy between the learning process of the model and the decomposition of a composite formula into atomic formulas. This process occurs in three steps: First, in logic, a composite formula is decomposed into predicates and objects, corresponding to splitting the input series into tokens in TSF. Second, the predicates and objects are recombined into new formulas, which in TSF corresponds to generating new tokens using input tokens and their dependencies. Third, the components forming a new formula must be minimal to retain clear meaning, ensuring its indivisibility as an atomic formula. However, in Transformer-based TSF methods, the model generates new tokens by utilizing all dependencies without applying such a constraint, which can negatively impact performance. To address this, we propose a method that mimics this logical constraint, ensuring that the minimality and effectiveness of the extracted token dependencies for accurate predictions. The minimality guarantees the indivisibility of the new tokens (also the properties of the atomic formula), while the effectiveness ensures that the extracted token dependencies

are the most important ones for TSF.

Based on the above insight, we propose Attn-L-Reg, a plugand-play method that encourages the model to focus on fewer but more effective token dependencies for accurate TSF. The design of this regularization term takes into account: (1) minimality, by constraining the attention map of the models to be as sparse as possible, encouraging the model to focus on the fewest token dependencies; and (2) effectiveness, by ensuring that the model's performance based on the sparse attention map is similar to or even better than that of the original model, thereby guaranteeing the effectiveness of the attended token dependencies. Attn-L-Reg can be easily embedded into the optimization objective of any Transformer-based TSF method without introducing a new network structure, thus improving model performance. Extensive experiments prove the effectiveness of the proposed method. Theoretical analyses demonstrate that introducing Attn-L-Reg can obtain a tighter generalization bound.

The main contributions include: (1) Through empirical analysis, we find two interesting observations: (i) the effectiveness of token dependencies for prediction varies in different TSF scenarios; (ii) the existing Transformer-based TSF methods ignore this difference, affecting model performance. (2) We rethink the learning process of Transformerbased TSF methods from a logical perspective. We propose a definition of effective token dependencies based on the atomic formula of logic and align logical reasoning with Transformer-based TSF to learn these effective dependencies. Building on this, we introduce Attn-L-Reg, a plug-andplay method that guides the model to use these effective dependencies for prediction, thereby improving TSF performance. (3) Extensive theoretical and empirical results demonstrate the effectiveness and versatility of Attn-L-Reg.

2. Related Work

Transformer-based TSF Methods: Transformer-based methods have become a mainstream approach in TSF. Recent advancements have focused on optimizing token processing mechanisms for time series data. Informer (Li et al., 2021) embeds all variable values at a time point into a token and uses attention to extract temporal patterns like seasonality, trends, valleys, and peaks for predictions. Autoformer (Wu et al., 2021) and Fedformer (Zhou et al., 2022) employ a similar approach but use an auto-correlation mechanism instead of attention, allowing them to capture dependencies between token subsequences for improved forecasting. PatchTST (Nie et al., 2023) groups adjacent data points along the temporal dimension into a single token, enhancing token semantics and enabling better modeling of token dependencies. Crossformer (Zhang & Yan, 2023) extends PatchTST by incorporating variable dependency calculations, yielding superior performance on certain datasets. iTransformer (Liu et al., 2023) takes a step further by creating a token from the entire input sequence of a single variable, further enriching token semantics. However, these methods treat all token dependencies equally (Vaswani et al., 2017), overlooking their varying effectiveness in different contexts, which can lead to reduced predictive performance. Different from these works, we explore the different effects of token dependencies on TSF and build a theoretically supported approach to learn the effective token dependencies, thus improving model performance.

Applications of Logical Experience in Deep Learning: Logical experience refers to the process of gaining insights or understanding through structured reasoning, deduction, and the application of logical principles. Logical experience is first applied in deep learning for symbolic reasoning. (Boix-Adsera et al., 2023; Li et al., 2024) use logic-based templates to enhance the ability of the model to perform logical reasoning with abstract symbols. These studies relate to natural language processes, such as generating longer response sequences in large language models or solving mathematical problems. Subsequently, (Barbiero et al., 2022; Tan et al., 2024) applies logical rules to image classification models, enabling the model to infer image labels by reasoning with fewer but key regions, thereby improving performance. However, despite the widespread application of logical experience in deep learning, current Transformerbased TSF methods overlook this aspect of research. In this paper, to distinguish between different types of token dependency, we explore the characteristics of Transformerbased TSF methods from a logical perspective and propose an actionable approach that improves TSF performance.

3. Problem Analysis and Motivation

3.1. Problem Settings

TSF task: In TSF, given historical observations $X = {\mathbf{x}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_T} \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times N}$ with T timestamps and N variables, we predict the future S timestamps $Y = {\mathbf{x}_{T+1}, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_{T+S}} \in \mathbb{R}^{S \times N}$. Here, T denotes the lookback length, while S denotes the prediction length. **Transformer-based TSF methods:** Transformer-based methods have made significant progress in TSF. These methods leverage the attention mechanism to extract token dependencies for accurate prediction. Specifically, given the input series X, these methods first divide it into subsequences. Then an embedding function f_{emb} is used to convert each subsequence into a basic unit called "token". For example, the iTransformer (Liu et al., 2023) treats all input time points of each variable as a subsequence, thus the converted input token is as follows:

$$Tok_n = f_{emb}(X_{:,n}), \quad n = 1...N,$$
 (1)

where $X_{:,n}$ is the entire input series of each variable indexed by *n*. After obtaining all the input tokens $Tok = \{Tok_1, Tok_2, ...\}$, the model uses three linear layers to transform Tok into Query (Q), Key (K), and Value (V). Query (Q) and Key (K) are used to compute the attention map (Ξ). The attention map is a two-dimensional matrix whose elements are called attention scores, which represent the **token dependencies**. The calculation method for the attention map (Ξ) is as follows:

$$\Xi = QK^{\top} / \sqrt{D}, \qquad (2)$$

where D is the dimension of tokens. Afterward, the model performs matrix multiplication on V and the normalized Ξ . The result of this operation then passes through a layer of FFN (Feed-Forward Network), producing the new tokens:

$$Tok^{new} = FFN(softmax(\Xi)V), \tag{3}$$

where softmax is the normalization function. This process (Eq.2, 3) is repeated multiple times to generate the final token representation $Tok^f = \{Tok_1^f, ..., Tok_N^f\}$. The final prediction is obtained by decoding Tok^f with a decoder h.

3.2. Empirical Evidence

As shown in Eq.3, Transformer-based TSF methods treat the token dependencies equally. However, these methods overlook that the effectiveness of these dependencies varies significantly across different prediction scenarios, which may lead to a decline in model performance. In this subsection, we conduct a set of toy experiments to evaluate the impact of token dependencies in TSF. We evaluate the impact of removing each token dependency at different time points to demonstrate the existence of this difference and assess the effects of neglecting it.

Specifically, we use the weather, ECL, and traffic datasets from (Liu et al., 2023), which contain 21, 321, and 862 variables, respectively. These datasets represent scenarios with few, medium, and many variables, providing a comprehensive coverage of real-world applications. We select two Transformer-based TSF methods, iTransformer (Liu et al., 2023) and PatchTST (Nie et al., 2023), which are known for their strong predictive performance and broad applicability, with numerous subsequent methods (Zhang & Yan, 2023; Jiang et al., 2023; Yu et al., 2023; Yuan et al., 2024; Liu et al., 2024) building upon them. As a result, our experimental conclusions are easily generalizable to other models based on these methods. The look-back and prediction lengths are set to 96, with all other settings adhering to the original methods. We first train the selected models on the three datasets. Then, during testing, we systematically removed each token dependency by setting each element in the normalized Ξ of the final encoder layer to 0. Finally, we record the changes in the predictions of the model for



Figure 2. The results of the empirical analysis. The used algorithm, dataset, and predicted point position (first or last) are shown at the top of each image. The x and y axes represent token indices. The color in the *i*-th row and *j*-th column indicates the change in model performance after removing the dependency between the *i*-th and *j*-th tokens: purple for improvement, and beige for decline. Due to space limitations, only the dependencies between a maximum of 50 tokens are shown in the figure.

the first and last predicted points across 100 samples, both before and after removing each token dependency.

The results are shown in Fig.2. The horizontal and vertical axes represent token indices. Each cell at row i and column j shows the change in model performance after removing the dependency between token i and token j. Purple indicates an improvement(indicating redundant dependencies), while beige signifies a decrease in performance. From the results, we can observe that: (1) removing a dependency that improves the prediction of the first point may degrade the prediction of the last point; (2) in predicting the first and last points, the used token dependencies include both effective (beige area) and redundant (purple area) parts. These results indicate that (1) there are significant differences in the effectiveness of token dependencies across these two prediction scenarios; (2) existing methods ignore the above differences causing the model to rely heavily on redundant dependencies for prediction, affecting model performance.

3.3. Motivation Analysis

Based on the above conclusions, we can improve the performance of the model by restricting its use to only effective token dependencies. An intuitive approach is to identify all effective token dependencies. However, this approach is impractical. For example, on the Traffic dataset, the estimated time for the machine to compute all dependencies' types is 2.69e+11 hours. To address this issue, this paper distinguishes between effective and redundant dependencies at an abstract definition level, then constrains the model to predict based on the defined effective dependencies, thereby improving its predictive performance. To this end, this paper focuses on two key issues: (1) what are the effective token dependencies, and (2) how to ensure that effective token dependencies are learned. Inspired by relevant concepts in logical reasoning, we apply logic to solve these two issues.

4. Rethinking from the Logical Lens

In this section, we rethink the Transformer-based TSF methods from a logical lens to address the two issues in Section 3.3. In Section 4.1, we define effective token dependencies based on our logical framework for TSF to address the first issue. In Section 4.2, we analogize the reasoning process of the Transformer to the process of decomposing a composite formula into atomic formulas, and based on this analogy, propose a method for learning the effective token dependencies to address the second issue.

4.1. What are Effective Token Dependencies

In this subsection, we first propose our logical framework for TSF based on the definition of logic. Building on this framework, we then define effective token dependencies. Specifically, the definition of logic is as follows:

Definition 4.1 (Logic (Andréka et al., 2017)). A logic \mathcal{L} is a four-tuple in the form:

$$\mathcal{L} = \langle \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{L}}, M_{\mathcal{L}}, mng_{\mathcal{L}}, \models_{\mathcal{L}} \rangle, \tag{4}$$

where:(1) $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{L}}$ is the set of all formulas of \mathcal{L} . (2) $M_{\mathcal{L}}$ is the class of possible situations. (3) $mng_{\mathcal{L}}$ is the meaning function, whose domain of definition is $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{L}} \times M_{\mathcal{L}}$. It is used to explain the meaning of a formula of $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{L}}$ in a given context. (4) $\models_{\mathcal{L}}$ is a binary relation, relating the truth of whether the formulas are true or false.

For more details, see Appendix D. Based on the definition of logic, we give the logical framework in TSF:

Definition 4.2 (Logic in TSF). A logic \mathcal{L} in TSF (especially for Transformer-based TSF) is a four-tuple in the form:

$$\mathcal{L}^{TSF} = \langle Tok^f, \mathcal{D}, h, \models_{\mathcal{L}^{TSF}} \rangle, \tag{5}$$

where:(1) $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{L}}$ is the final token representation (Tok^f) obtained by the models' encoder. (2) $M_{\mathcal{L}}$ is considered as different domains \mathcal{D} of input series X. (3) $mng_{\mathcal{L}}$ is the decoder of Transformer-based TSF methods, named h. (4) $\models_{\mathcal{L}}$ is a binary relation that $\langle \mathcal{D}_s, (g(X_s), Y_s) \rangle \in \models_{\mathcal{L}}$, where s indicates the visible variable, and g is the encoder.

Based on the logical framework for TSF, we further analyze the effective token dependencies. Intuitively, the effective token dependencies should enhance the reasoning ability of the models, thereby improving their predictive performance on the test set. According to (Andréka et al., 2017), when all formulas in the set $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{L}}$ are atomic formulas, the logic \mathcal{L} can be more flexibly extended to other scenarios, tasks, or contexts, meaning it has stronger reasoning ability (See Appendix D for details). An atomic formula is a fundamental unit in logic, and its key characteristic is indivisibility-it represents a simple formula that cannot be further decomposed (Andréka et al., 2017) (See Definition D.2 for details.). Therefore, to ensure the stronger reasoning ability of the model (\mathcal{L}^{TSF}), Tok_i^f (i = 1..N) should be an atomic formula (i.e., possess indivisibility). An atomic formula cannot be further decomposed because doing so would change its intended meaning (Andréka et al., 2017). Similarly, the indivisibility of Tok_i^f can be understood as the inability to reduce its semantics without affecting its ability to predict future series. Based on the above discussion, we formally define "Atomic Formula in Transformer-based TSF".

Definition 4.3 (Atomic Formula in Transformer-based TSF). Let the prediction function be f_p , which maps Tok_i^f to a predicted series. Let the ground truth of the output series be Y, MSE(.,.) be the mean squared error between two series, sem_j is the *i*-th semantic information of Tok_i^f . Then, $Tok_i^f (i = 1..N) = \{sem_1, sem_2, ...\}$ is an atomic formula if and only if the following inequality holds:

 $MSE(f_p(Tok_i^f/sem_j), Y) > MSE(f_p(Tok_i^f), Y), j = 1, 2, ...,,$ (6) where Tok_i^f/sem_j denotes Tok_i^f without sem_j .

The definition ensures that any semantic in Tok_i^f is effective, thereby guaranteeing its indivisibility and making it an atomic formula. Since Tok_i^f is generated from the input tokens and their dependencies (Vaswani et al., 2017), the effective token dependencies should ensure that the generated Tok_i^f is an atomic formula, thereby enhancing the reasoning ability of the models. Based on this, we get:

Definition 4.4 (Effective Token Dependencies). Token dependencies are effective only if the generated Tok_i^f (i = 1..N) using these dependencies forms an atomic formula.

The above definition requires that effective token dependencies ensure the generated Tok_i^f is an atomic formula as defined in Definition 4.3, guaranteeing its indivisibility and thereby enhancing the reasoning ability of the model.

4.2. How to Learn Effective Token Dependencies

After defining the effective token dependencies in Definition 4.4, we answer the second question in this subsection, i.e., how to learn effective token dependencies.

Specifically, we aim to guide the model in learning effective token dependencies that form atomic formulas, thereby enhancing predictive performance. Inspired by the logical methodology (Andréka et al., 2017), we analogize the learning process of the TSF model to decomposing a composite formula into atomic formulas and then seek effective learning methods. The composite formula is a formula formed by multiple atomic formulas. Its definition can be found in Definition D.2. Specifically, we treat the input series X as a composite formula, with the Transformer's extraction of Tok_i^f (i = 1..N) analogous to the decomposition of the composite formula into atomic formulas. This process of decomposition occurs in three steps as following:

Step I: Decomposition. In logic, a composite formula is first decomposed into predicates and objects. Predicates describe the relationships, properties, or actions between objects, while objects represent the targets of these predicates (Andréka et al., 2017). **In Transformer-based TSF methods**, this process can be likened to splitting the input series into tokens (Eq.1). This tokenization allows the model to process the input in a structured manner, akin to how predicates and objects are treated in logical formulas.

Step II: Combination. In logic, the obtained predicates and objects need to be recombined into new formulas. **In the Transformer-based TSF methods**, it can be considered as the process of generating new tokens using input tokens and the dependencies between them (Eq.3).

Step III: Constraint. In logic, the components used to form a new formula should be minimal, while ensuring that the formula retains clear meaning. This constraint ensures the indivisibility of the new formula, making it an atomic formula (Andréka et al., 2017). However, in **Transformerbased TSF methods**, the model generates new tokens by leveraging all dependencies, but without applying any corresponding constraint, affecting model performance.

To address this issue, we propose to design a constraint that corresponds to the logic constraint to ensure the learning of effective token dependencies in TSF. Inspired by **Step III**, effective token dependencies can be viewed as the minimal set of dependencies that ensure accurate prediction. This minimality guarantees the indivisibility of the new tokens. Based on this understanding, we propose to constrain the model to generate new tokens using the fewest token dependencies while ensuring accurate predictions. This constraint enforces the indivisibility of the new tokens, thereby ensuring the effectiveness of the used token dependencies.



Figure 3. The overall framework of the proposed method.

5. Method

Inspired by Section 4, we propose the Attention Logical Regularization (Attn-L-Reg) and combine it with Transformerbased TSF methods. The overall framework of the proposed method is shown in Fig.3. Based on the discussion in Section 4.1, Attn-L-Reg constrains the model to minimize the used token dependencies when generating new tokens. This minimization, together with the minimization of the prediction MSE loss, ensures that Tok_i^f (i = 1..N) becomes an atomic formula, thereby enhancing TSF performance.

Specifically, the design of this regularization term addresses two key considerations: (1) minimality, by constraining the attention map to be as sparse as possible using L1 regularization, encouraging the model to focus on a minimal set of token dependencies, and (2) effectiveness, by ensuring that the model's performance with the sparse attention map matches or exceeds that of the original model, thereby confirming the relevance of the attended token dependencies. The effectiveness can be achieved through the original MSE loss of the method, so the term ensuring effectiveness is omitted in Attn-L-Reg. Note that we directly constrain the attention map, where each element emphasizes the importance of the corresponding token dependency. Compared to introducing a learnable matrix on the attention map, this mechanism makes the model more efficient while considering the importance of token dependencies, and the experiments in Table 9 demonstrate its better performance. To this end, we add an L1 regularization term to each attention layer of the encoder to constrain the attention map. Thus, Attn-L-Reg can be expressed as:

$$\ell_{reg}(\Xi_i) = \sum_{q=1}^{N} \sum_{p=1}^{N} |m_{p,q}|, m_{p,q} \in \Xi_i, i = 1, 2, \dots L, \quad (7)$$

where N is the number of input tokens, L is the number of encoder layers, Ξ_i is the attention map in the *i*-th encoder layer. $m_{p,q}$ is the element of Ξ_i . The sparse attention map allows the model to predict using fewer token dependencies. It is important to note that deeper features tend to have less noise than shallow features (Zhang et al., 2021), then, the deeper the layer, the lower the degree of suppression of token dependencies. The proposed Attn-L-Reg can be embedded into any Transformer-based TSF methods. By combining the Eq.7 with the commonly used MSE loss, we obtain the learning objective:

$$arg\min_{a} \ell_{pred}(f_{\theta}(X), Y) + \sum_{i=1}^{L} \alpha_i \ell_{reg}(\Xi_i),$$
 (8)

where θ is the parameters of our model, α_i is the hyperparameter to adjust the sparsity of the token dependencies in the *i*-th encoder layer, ℓ_{pred} is used to constrain the predictions to be as accurate as possible, and it is specifically implemented using the MSE loss, ℓ_{reg} is used to constrain the attention map to be as sparse as possible, and it is specifically implemented using the L1 norm. X is the input series, Y is the ground truth. In Section 6 and 7, we show the effectiveness of our method theoretically and empirically.

6. Theoretical Analysis

In this section, we provide a theoretical analysis to demonstrate the effectiveness of our method. First, we present Theorem 6.1 to give the generalization error upper bound for Transformer-based TSF methods. Then, we use Theorem 6.2 to show that for Transformer-based TSF methods, applying L1 regularization to constrain the attention map results in a smaller generalization upper bound.

According to the generalization upper bound for regression tasks (Eq.13) and Lemma E.4 in the appendix, assuming the loss function is l-Lipschitz (Definition E.3), then we can obtain the upper bound of the generalization error for TSF methods represented by iTransformer and PatchTSF:

Theorem 6.1 (Generalization Bound for Transformer-based TSF). Assuming that the encoder of the Transformer-based TSF method has only one layer, the decoder uses a fully connected layer, and the Feed-Forward Neural Network (FFN) and the fully connected layer of the decoder are l_1 -Lipschitz and l_2 -Lipschitz, respectively, let x_i be the *i*-th input series. Then, the upper bound of the generalization error for this method is:

$$R_{gen}(f) \leq R_{emp}(f) + 2l_1 l_2 \hat{\mathfrak{R}}(\mathcal{F}_1) + 3M \sqrt{\frac{\ln(2/\delta)}{2m}}, \quad (9)$$

where $f_1 \in \mathcal{F}_1$ and $f_1(x_i) = \left[softmax \left[QK^{\top}/\sqrt{D}\right]V\right]_{R_{gen}}$
 $R_{gen}(f)$ and $R_{emp}(f)$ are the generalization error and

Table 1. Full results for the TSF task. The look-back length for all baseline models is 96, and the prediction lengths include either $\{96, 192, 336, 720\}$ or $\{12, 24, 48, 96\}$. Among the 9 baseline methods, except for DSfomer, the data are sourced from the paper of iTransformer. The data for DSfomer is obtained by conducting experiments on our dataset using the source code and optimal parameters released by the paper. iTransformer+Attn-L-Reg and PatchTST+Attn-L-Reg are our methods. The results of our methods are the average outcomes from running five different random seeds, with the corresponding standard deviations provided in Appendix F.

Mo	odels	iTrans (+Attn	sformer -L-Reg)	Patc (+Attn	hTST -L-Reg)	PatchTS (2023)	T iTra	nsformer 2024)	Cross (20	former)23)	Times (202	sNet 23)	DLinear (2023)	DSfo (202	rmer 23)	FEDfe (20)	ormer 22)	SCIN (202	let 2)	TID (2023	E 3)
M	etric	MSE	MAE	MSE	MAE	MSE M.	AE MS	E MAE	MSE	MAE	MSE 1	MAE	MSE MAE	MSE	MAE	MSE	MAE	MSE N	MAE	MSE N	ЛАE
ETTh2	96 192 336 720	0.292 0.377 0.424 0.425	0.340 0.391 0.432 0.443	0.301 0.385 0.425 0.426	0.346 0.402 0.435 0.445	0.302 0.3 0.388 0.4 0.426 0.4 0.431 0.4	49 0.29 00 0.38 33 0.42 46 0.42	7 0.347 0 0.400 8 0.432 7 0.445	0.745 0.877 1.043 1.104	0.584 0.656 0.731 0.763	0.340 (0.402 (0.452 (0.462 ().374).414).452).468	0.333 0.387 0.477 0.476 0.594 0.541 0.831 0.657	0.319 0.400 0.462 0.457	0.359 0.410 0.451 0.463	0.358 0.429 0.496 0.463	0.397 0.439 0.487 0.474	0.707 (0.860 (1.000 (1.249 ().621).689).744).838	0.400 0 0.528 0 0.643 0 0.874 0	.440 .509 .571 .679
	Avg	0.380	0.402	0.384	0.407	0.387 <mark>0.</mark> 4	07 0.38	3 0.407	0.942	0.684	0.414 ().427	0.559 0.515	0.410	0.421	0.437	0.449	0.954 (0.723	0.611 0	.550
ECL	96 192 336 720	0.133 0.151 0.165 0.194	0.228 0.245 0.261 0.290	0.191 0.197 0.211 0.259	0.284 0.287 0.307 0.341	0.195 0.2 0.199 0.2 0.215 0.3 0.256 0.3	85 0.14 89 0.16 05 0.17 37 0.22	8 0.240 2 0.253 8 0.269 5 0.317	0.219 0.231 0.246 0.280	0.314 0.322 0.337 0.363	0.168 (0.184 (0.198 (0.220 ().272).289).300).320	0.197 0.282 0.196 0.285 0.209 0.301 0.245 0.333	0.173 0.183 0.203 0.259	0.269 0.280 0.297 0.340	0.193 0.201 0.214 0.246	0.308 0.315 0.329 0.355	0.247 (0.257 (0.269 (0.299 (0.345 0.355 0.369 0.390	0.237 0 0.236 0 0.249 0 0.284 0	.329 .330 .344 .373
	Avg	0.161	0.256	0.214	0.305	0.216 0.3	04 <mark> 0.17</mark>	8 0.270	0.244	0.334	0.192 ().295	0.212 0.300	0.205	0.297	0.214	0.327	0.268 (.365	0.251 0	.344
Traffic	96 192 336 720	0.380 0.401 0.410 0.440	0.259 0.269 0.275 0.290	0.534 0.532 0.547 0.582	0.355 0.351 0.360 0.372	0.544 0.3 0.540 0.3 0.551 0.3 0.586 0.3	59 0.39 54 0.41 58 0.43 75 0.46	5 0.268 7 0.276 3 0.283 7 0.302	0.522 0.530 0.558 0.589	0.290 0.293 0.305 0.328	0.593 (0.617 (0.629 (0.640 ().321).336).336).350	0.650 0.396 0.598 0.370 0.605 0.373 0.645 0.394	0.529 0.533 0.545 0.583	0.370 0.366 0.370 0.386	0.587 0.604 0.621 0.629	0.366 0.373 0.383 0.382	0.788 (0.789 (0.797 (0.841 (0.499 0.505 0.508 0.523	0.805 0 0.756 0 0.762 0 0.719 0	.493 .474 .477 .449
	Avg	0.408	0.273	0.549	0.360	0.555 0.3	62 <mark> 0.42</mark>	8 0.282	0.550	0.304	0.620 ().336	0.625 0.383	0.548	0.373	0.610	0.376	0.804 (.509	0.760 0	.473
Weather	96 192 336 720	0.158 0.208 0.266 0.346	0.202 0.250 0.291 0.346	0.175 0.222 0.275 0.356	0.216 0.255 0.294 0.346	0.177 0.2 0.225 0.2 0.278 0.2 0.354 0.3	18 0.17 59 0.22 97 0.27 48 0.35	4 0.214 1 0.254 8 0.296 8 0.349	0.158 0.206 0.272 0.398	0.230 0.277 0.335 0.418	0.172 (0.219 (0.280 (0.365 ().220).261).306).359	0.196 0.255 0.237 0.296 0.283 0.335 0.345 0.381	0.162 0.211 0.267 0.343	0.207 0.252 0.294 0.343	0.217 0.276 0.339 0.403	0.296 0.336 0.380 0.428	0.221 (0.261 (0.309 (0.377 (0.306 0.340 0.378 0.427	0.202 0 0.242 0 0.287 0 0.351 0	.261 .298 .335 .386
	Avg	0.244	0.272	0.257	0.278	0.259 0.2	81 0.25	8 0.279	0.259	0.315	0.259 ().287	0.265 0.317	0.246	0.274	0.309	0.360	0.292 (0.363	0.271 0	.320
lar-Energy	96 192 336 720	0.196 0.226 0.244 0.247	0.226 0.254 0.269 0.274	0.231 0.264 0.287 0.286	0.283 0.308 0.311 0.321	0.234 0.2 0.267 0.3 0.290 0.3 0.289 0.3	86 0.20 10 0.23 15 0.24 17 0.24	3 0.237 3 0.261 8 0.273 9 0.275	0.310 0.734 0.750 0.769	0.331 0.725 0.735 0.765	0.250 (0.296 (0.319 (0.338 ().292).318).330).337	0.290 0.378 0.320 0.398 0.353 0.415 0.356 0.413	0.247 0.288 0.329 0.341	0.292 0.320 0.344 0.352	0.242 0.285 0.282 0.357	0.342 0.380 0.376 0.427	0.237 (0.280 (0.304 (0.308 (0.344 0.380 0.389 0.388	0.312 0 0.339 0 0.368 0 0.370 0	.399 .416 .430 .425
Sol	Avg	0.228	0.256	0.268	0.306	0.270 0.3	07 <mark>0.23</mark>	3 0.262	0.641	0.639	0.301 ().319	0.330 0.401	0.301	0.327	0.291	0.381	0.282 0	.375	0.347 0	.417
PEMS03	12 24 48 96	0.066 0.085 0.119 0.155	0.170 0.191 0.231 0.264	0.097 0.141 0.208 0.267	0.214 0.257 0.317 0.367	0.099 0.2 0.142 0.2 0.211 0.3 0.269 0.3	16 0.07 59 0.09 19 0.12 70 0.16	1 0.174 3 0.201 5 0.236 0 0.270	0.090 0.121 0.202 0.262	0.203 0.240 0.317 0.367	0.085 (0.118 (0.155 (0.228 ().192).223).260).317	0.122 0.243 0.201 0.317 0.333 0.425 0.457 0.515	0.078 0.119 0.216 0.357	0.190 0.236 0.329 0.431	0.126 0.149 0.227 0.348	0.251 0.275 0.348 0.434	0.066 (0.085 (0.127 (0.178 (.172 .198 .238 .287	0.178 0 0.257 0 0.379 0 0.490 0	.305 .371 .463 .539
	Avg	0.106	0.214	0.178	0.289	0.180 0.2	91 <mark>0.11</mark>	3 0.221	0.169	0.281	0.147 ().248	0.278 0.375	0.193	0.297	0.213	0.327	0.114 (0.224	0.326 0	.419

empirical error, \Re is Rademacher complexities. *M* is the maximum value of the loss function. *m* is the total number of training examples. δ is the confidence level.

This theorem provides a generalization bound for Transformer-based TSF methods, assuming a one-layer encoder and certain Lipschitz properties for FFN and the decoder. It establishes that the generalization error can be bounded by the empirical error, a term involving Rademacher complexities, and an additional complexity term dependent on the training size and confidence level. According to Theorem 6.1, we can further deduce that:

Theorem 6.2 (Better Generalization Error Upper Bound). Let $\overline{R_{gen}}(f)$, $\overline{R_{gen}^{l1}}(f)$ denote the upper bounds of the generalization error for the models without and with L1 regularization on the attention map, respectively. Then for any hypothesis of f, f' in finite set \mathcal{F} , it holds that:

$$\overline{R_{gen}^{l1}}(f) \le \overline{R_{gen}}(f). \tag{10}$$

Theorem 6.2 shows that L1 regularization tightens the generalization upper bound of Transformer-based TSF by constraining the attention map. See Appendix E for proof.

7. Experiments

This section validates our method through experiments, detailing the setup (Section 7.1), results on six benchmarks (Section 7.2), and visual analysis (Section 7.3). Prediction visualizations and ablation studies are in Appendices G, H.

7.1. Experimental Settings

Datasets: We use six real-world datasets, including ECL, ETTh2, Traffic, Weather in (Liu et al., 2023), Solar-Energy dataset in (Lai et al., 2018), and PEMS03 in (Liu et al., 2022). We use the same train-validation-test split as in (Liu et al., 2023). See Appendix B for details.

Baselines: We compare with nine classic TSF methods, including transformer-based approaches (*FEDformer* (Zhou et al., 2022), *PatchTST* (Nie et al., 2023), *iTransformer* (Liu et al., 2023), *Crossformer* (Zhang & Yan, 2023), *DSformer* (Yu et al., 2023)), CNN-based methods (*TimesNet* (Wu et al., 2023) and *SCINet* (Liu et al., 2022)) and MLP-based methods (*DLinear* and *TIDE* (Das et al., 2023)).

Implementation Details: We apply the proposed Attn-L-Reg to two representative Transformer-based TSF methods (iTransformer (Liu et al., 2023) and PatchTST (Nie et al., 2023)). The reasons for choosing these two methods are twofold: first, both methods have simple structures that easily integrate with Attn-L-Reg; second, they are highly versatile, and many other methods (Zhang & Yan, 2023; Jiang et al., 2023; Yu et al., 2023) are built upon these two approaches. The successful application of Attn-L-Reg on these two methods suggests that it can be utilized in more models based on these two methods. The proposed models are trained using an NVIDIA 4090 GPU. MSE and MAE are employed as evaluation metrics. Due to space limitations, the value of $\alpha_i (i = 1...L)$ in Eq.8 is shown in Appendix C. The other hyperparameters and training methods are consistent with iTransformer and PatchTST.

7.2. Comparative Experimental Results

Table 1 shows the prediction results. The best results are in red, and the second-best in blue. Lower MSE/MAE values indicate more accurate predictions. "iTransformer+Attn-L-Reg" and "PatchTST+Attn-L-Reg" are our methods. Compared to other TSF models, "iTransformer+Attn-L-Reg" achieves the best average performance on each benchmark dataset. The improvement of "PatchTST+Attn-L-Reg" over PatchTST is limited due to PatchTST merging multiple time points into a single token, reducing the number of input tokens. However, more input tokens allow for more redundant token dependencies, making our method more suitable for such cases. For example, in the Traffic dataset, "iTransformer+Attn-L-Reg" uses over 800 input tokens, showing a significant performance boost over iTransformer.

Table 2. The sparsity and MSE comparison of iTransformer and iTransformer+Attn-L-Reg on different datasets.

Dataset	iTransformer's Sparsity / MSE	iTransformer+Attn-L-Reg's Sparsity / MSE				
ECL	1.2% / 0.148	54.0% / 0.133				
Traffic	19.5% / 0.395	51.4% / 0.380				

7.3. Visualization Analysis

In the first visualization experiment, we compare the sparsity of attention maps between "iTransformer+Attn-L-Reg" and the original iTransformer on the ECL and Traffic datasets. Sparsity is defined as the proportion of elements less than 1e-05 in the normalized attention map, with higher sparsity indicating fewer token dependencies used for prediction.



Figure 4. The visualized redundant dependencies. The method, dataset, and MSE are shown at the top of each image. The colors follow Fig.2. Due to the space limitations, only dependencies among 50 tokens are displayed in this figure.

We calculate the sparsity for the encoder's first layer attention maps with a look-back and prediction length of 96. The results shown in Table 2 indicate that our method uses fewer token dependencies and outperforms iTransformer, suggesting that iTransformer's reliance on excessive token dependencies harms its prediction performance.

In the second experiment, we visualize the proportion of redundant dependencies, which improve model performance when removed (purple area in Fig.2 and Fig.4). Using the same datasets and algorithms as the first experiment, we focus on the attention map of the encoder's final layer. By removing each token dependency from a trained model and evaluating its performance on 100 data points, we find that our method significantly reduces redundant dependencies (purple area) compared to iTransformer, resulting in a lower MSE and demonstrating its superiority.

8. Conclusion

Through empirical analysis, this paper identifies a commonly overlooked issue in existing Transformer-based TSF methods: the effectiveness of token dependencies varies across different forecasting scenarios. Ignoring this fact can lead to a decline in prediction performance. To address this issue, we define effective token dependencies from a logical perspective and design a plug-and-play method, Attn-L-Reg, to constrain the model and focus on fewer but more effective dependencies. Both theoretical and experimental results confirm the effectiveness of the proposed method.

Impact Statement

This paper presents work whose goal is to advance the field of Machine Learning and Time Series Forecasting. There are many potential societal consequences of our work, none of which we feel must be specifically highlighted here.

References

- Abhishek, K., Singh, M., Ghosh, S., and Anand, A. Weather forecasting model using artificial neural network. *Procedia Technology*, 4:311–318, 2012.
- Andréka, H., Németi, I., and Sain, I. Universal algebraic logic. Studies in Logic, Springer, due to, 2017.
- Barbiero, P., Ciravegna, G., Giannini, F., Lió, P., Gori, M., and Melacci, S. Entropy-based logic explanations of neural networks. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference* on Artificial Intelligence, volume 36, pp. 6046–6054, 2022.
- Boix-Adsera, E., Saremi, O., Abbe, E., Bengio, S., Littwin, E., and Susskind, J. When can transformers reason with abstract symbols? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.09753*, 2023.
- Boussif, O., Boukachab, G., Assouline, D., Massaroli, S., Yuan, T., Benabbou, L., and Bengio, Y. Improving* day-ahead* solar irradiance time series forecasting by leveraging spatio-temporal context. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.
- Das, A., Kong, W., Leach, A., Sen, R., and Yu, R. Longterm forecasting with tide: Time-series dense encoder. arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.08424, 2023.
- Dong, J., Wu, H., Zhang, H., Zhang, L., Wang, J., and Long, M. Simmtm: A simple pre-training framework for masked time-series modeling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.00861*, 2023.
- Fang, Y., Qin, Y., Luo, H., Zhao, F., and Zheng, K. Stwave+: A multi-scale efficient spectral graph attention network with long-term trends for disentangled traffic flow forecasting. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, 2023.
- Jiang, J., Han, C., Zhao, W. X., and Wang, J. Pdformer: Propagation delay-aware dynamic long-range transformer for traffic flow prediction. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, volume 37, pp. 4365– 4373, 2023.
- Karevan, Z. and Suykens, J. A. Transductive lstm for timeseries prediction: An application to weather forecasting. *Neural Networks*, 125:1–9, 2020.

- Kratzenberg, M., Colle, S., and Beyer, H. Solar radiation prediction based on the combination of a numerical weather prediction model and a time series prediction model. In *Proc. First Int. Congress on Heating, Cooling, and Buildings: EuroSun 2008.* Citeseer, 2008.
- Lai, G., Chang, W.-C., Yang, Y., and Liu, H. Modeling long-and short-term temporal patterns with deep neural networks. *SIGIR*, 2018.
- Li, J., Hui, X., and Zhang, W. Informer: Beyond efficient transformer for long sequence time-series forecasting. *arXiv:* 2012.07436, 2021.
- Li, R., Zhang, F., Li, T., Zhang, N., and Zhang, T. Dmgan: Dynamic multi-hop graph attention network for traffic forecasting. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, 2022.
- Li, Z., Huang, Y., Li, Z., Yao, Y., Xu, J., Chen, T., Ma, X., and Lu, J. Neuro-symbolic learning yielding logical constraints. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.
- Lim, B., Arık, S. Ö., Loeff, N., and Pfister, T. Temporal fusion transformers for interpretable multi-horizon time series forecasting. *International Journal of Forecasting*, 37(4):1748–1764, 2021.
- Liu, L., Wang, X., Dong, X., Chen, K., Chen, Q., and Li, B. Interpretable feature-temporal transformer for shortterm wind power forecasting with multivariate time series. *Applied Energy*, 374:124035, 2024.
- 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, 2022.
- Liu, Y., Hu, T., Zhang, H., Wu, H., Wang, S., Ma, L., and Long, M. itransformer: Inverted transformers are effective for time series forecasting. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.06625*, 2023.
- Ma, C., Dai, G., and Zhou, J. Short-term traffic flow prediction for urban road sections based on time series analysis and lstm_bilstm method. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, 23(6):5615–5624, 2021.
- Margaris, A. First order mathematical logic. Courier Corporation, 1990.
- Mohri, M. Foundations of machine learning, 2018.
- Nie, Y., Nguyen, N. H., Sinthong, P., and Kalagnanam, J. A time series is worth 64 words: Long-term forecasting with transformers. *ICLR*, 2023.

- Novo, R., Marocco, P., Giorgi, G., Lanzini, A., Santarelli, M., and Mattiazzo, G. Planning the decarbonisation of energy systems: The importance of applying time series clustering to long-term models. *Energy Conversion and Management: X*, 15:100274, 2022.
- Riva, F., Tognollo, A., Gardumi, F., and Colombo, E. Longterm energy planning and demand forecast in remote areas of developing countries: Classification of case studies and insights from a modelling perspective. *Energy strategy reviews*, 20:71–89, 2018.
- Shoenfield, J. R. *Mathematical logic*. AK Peters/CRC Press, 2018.
- Tan, Z., Yang, X., Wang, Q., Nguyen, A., and Huang, K. Interpret your decision: Logical reasoning regularization for generalization in visual classification. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.04492*, 2024.
- Vaswani, A., Shazeer, N., Parmar, N., Uszkoreit, J., Jones, L., Gomez, A. N., Kaiser, L., and Polosukhin, I. Attention is all you need. *NeurIPS*, 2017.
- Wu, H., Xu, J., Wang, J., and Long, M. Autoformer: Decomposition transformers with Auto-Correlation for longterm series forecasting. *NeurIPS*, 2021.
- Wu, H., Hu, T., Liu, Y., Zhou, H., Wang, J., and Long, M. Timesnet: Temporal 2d-variation modeling for general time series analysis. *ICLR*, 2023.
- Wu, N., Green, B., Ben, X., and O'Banion, S. Deep transformer models for time series forecasting: The influenza prevalence case. arXiv preprint arXiv:2001.08317, 2020.
- Yu, C., Wang, F., Shao, Z., Sun, T., Wu, L., and Xu, Y. Dsformer: a double sampling transformer for multivariate time series long-term prediction. In *Proceedings of the* 32nd ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management, pp. 3062–3072, 2023.
- Yuan, Y., Ding, J., Feng, J., Jin, D., and Li, Y. Unist: A prompt-empowered universal model for urban spatiotemporal prediction. In *Proceedings of the 30th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, pp. 4095–4106, 2024.
- Zhang, C., Bengio, S., Hardt, M., Recht, B., and Vinyals, O. Understanding deep learning (still) requires rethinking generalization. *Communications of the ACM*, 64(3):107– 115, 2021.
- Zhang, Y. and Yan, J. Crossformer: Transformer utilizing cross-dimension dependency for multivariate time series forecasting. *ICLR*, 2023.
- Zhou, T., Ma, Z., Wen, Q., Wang, X., Sun, L., and Jin, R. FEDformer: Frequency enhanced decomposed transformer for long-term series forecasting. *ICML*, 2022.

Appendix

The appendix provides supplemental information and additional details to support the main findings and the method presented in this paper.

A. Table of Notations

We list the definitions of all notations from the main text in Table 3.

Table 3. The definitions of notations.										
Notations	Definition									
	Notations of Data									
$X = \{\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_T\} \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times N}$	The input series									
$Y = \{\mathbf{x}_{T+1}, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{T+S}\} \in \mathbb{R}^{S \times N}$	The output series									
T	The look-back length									
N	The number of variables in the input/output series									
S	The prediction length									
$X_{\cdot n}$	The entire input time series of each variable indexed by n									
$\mathcal{D}^{i,i,i}$	The data domain									
Notations of Model										
θ	The parameters of the model									
f_{emb}	The embedding function									
$Tok_n, n = 1, 2,$	The input token									
$Tok = \{Tok_1, Tok_2, \ldots\}$	All the input tokens									
Q	The Query of the attention module									
K	The Key of the attention module									
V	The Value of the attention module									
Ξ	The attention map									
$m_{p,q}$	The element in the <i>p</i> -th row and q -th column of Ξ .									
softmax	The softmax function									
FFN	The feed-forward network									
Tok^{new}	The new generated tokens									
$Tok^{f} = \{Tok_{1}^{f}, Tok_{2}^{f},\}$	The final tokens									
semi	The <i>i</i> -th semantic information of Tok_i^f									
h	The decoder of the model									
D	The dimension of tokens									
	Notations of Logic									
L	The logic									
$\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{L}}$	The set of all formulas of \mathcal{L}									
$M_{\mathcal{L}}$	The class of possible situations									
$mng_{\mathcal{L}}$	The meaning function									
$\models_{\mathcal{L}}$	The validity relation of \mathcal{L}									
\mathcal{L}	The logic									
	Notations of Theory									
$R_{gen}(f)$	The generalization error									
$R_{emp}(f)$	The empirical error									
Ĥ	The Rademacher complexities									
M	The maximum value of the loss function									
m	The total number of training examples									
δ	The confidence level									
$\overline{R_{aen}^{l1}}(f)$	The upper bounds of the generalization error for the models with L1 regularization on the attention map									
$\overline{R_{gen}^{gen}}(f)$	The upper bounds of the generalization error for the models without L1 regularization on the attention map									
	Other									
MSE(.,.)	The mean squared error between two series									

B. Dataset Descriptions

In this paper, we performed tests using six real-world datasets. These include: (1) ETTh2 (Li et al., 2021), which encompasses seven variables related to electricity transformers, gathered hourly from July 2016 to July 2018. (2) Weather (Wu et al., 2021), covering 21 meteorological variables, was recorded at 10-minute intervals in 2020 by the Max Planck Institute for Biogeochemistry's Weather Station. (3) ECL (Wu et al., 2021), detailing the hourly electrical usage of 321 customers. (4) Traffic (Wu et al., 2021), which compiles data on the hourly occupancy rates of roads, monitored by 862 sensors in the San Francisco Bay area's freeways, spanning from January 2015 to December 2016. (5) Solar-Energy (Lai et al., 2018), documenting the solar energy output from 137 photovoltaic (PV) plants in 2006, with data points every 10 minutes. (6) PEMS03 (Liu et al., 2022), which includes data on California's public traffic network, collected in 5-minute intervals.

We follow the same data processing and train-validation-test set split protocol used in iTransformer (Liu et al., 2023), where the train, validation, and test datasets are strictly divided according to chronological order to make sure there are no data leakage issues. As for the forecasting settings, the lookback length for datasets ETTh2, Weather, ECL, Solar-Energy, and Traffic is set to 96, while their prediction length varies in $\{96, 192, 336, 720\}$. For PEMS03, the lookback length is set to 96, and their prediction length varies in $\{12, 24, 36, 48\}$ which is the same as SCINet (Liu et al., 2022). The details of the datasets are provided in Table 4.

Table 4. Detailed Dataset Descriptions. Dim Denotes the Variate Number of Each Dataset. Dataset Size Denotes the Total Number of Time Points in (Train, Validation, Test) Split Respectively. Prediction Length Denotes the Future Time Points to be Predicted and Four Prediction Settings are Included in Each Dataset. Frequency Denotes the Sampling Interval of Time Points.

Dataset	Dim	Prediction Length	Dataset Size	Frequency	Information
ETTh2	7	{96, 192, 336, 720}	(8545, 2881, 2881)	Hourly	Electricity
Weather	21	{96, 192, 336, 720}	(36792, 5271, 10540)	10min	Weather
ECL	321	{96, 192, 336, 720}	(18317, 2633, 5261)	Hourly	Electricity
Traffic	862	{96, 192, 336, 720}	(12185, 1757, 3509)	Hourly	Transportation
Solar-Energy	137	{96, 192, 336, 720}	(36601, 5161, 10417)	10min	Energy
PEMS03	358	{12, 24, 48, 96}	(15617,5135,5135)	5min	Transportation

C. Implementation Details

This section provides the values of α_i (i=1...L) for both "iTransformer+Attn-L-Reg" and "PatchTST+Attn-L-Reg" on different datasets (Table 5). The values are presented as a list, where the *i*-th entry corresponds to the value of α_i for the model.

D. Details of the Logical Framework for Time Series Forecasting

This section first strictly aligns the definition of logic with Transformer-based TSF methods. It then discusses the conditions under which logic exhibits better generalization ability. Following that, an example is provided to intuitively explain these conditions. Finally, based on these conditions, it presents the design concept of the proposed method.

Defining logic is similar to defining a language (Andréka et al., 2017). For example, to define English, three key elements must be specified: (1) the syntax, which explains which strings of symbols are English sentences and which are not (for instance, "Nice to meet you" is an English sentence, whereas "Der Tisch ist rot" is not); (2) a class of possible situations M, or in other words, "possible world" in which our English sentences are interpreted; (3) the meaning function $mng(\varphi, M)$ which assigns meanings to symbol strings φ in M.

Logic is a language equipped with a validity relation and a provability relation (Andréka et al., 2017). Introducing a validity relation to a language means designating certain texts as true in specific situations. The provability relation allows us to evaluate which texts are true or false based on the validity relation and inference rules. For the sake of simplicity, the definition of logic in (Andréka et al., 2017) typically omits the provability relation. Specifically, the definition of logic in (Andréka et al., 2017) is as follows:

Dataset	Prediction Length	iTransformer+Attn-L-Reg	PatchTST+Attn-L-Reg
ECL	96	[0.01, 0.007, 0.0049]	[0.01, 0.003, 0.009]
	192	[0.01, 0.008, 0.0064]	[0.01, 0.003, 0.009]
	336	[0.01, 0.009, 0.0081]	[0.01, 0.003, 0.009]
	720	[0.01, 0.004, 0.0016]	[0.01, 0.003, 0.009]
ETTh2	96	[0.8, 0.4]	[0.007, 0.0042, 2e-4]
	192	[0.07, 0.056]	[0.007, 0.0032, 2e-4]
	336	[0.1, 0.03]	[0.007, 0.0031, 1e-4]
	720	[0.001, 3e-5]	[0.004, 0.0032, 2e-4]
solar	96	[5e-4, 3e-4]	[0.02, 0.01, 2e-4]
	192	[0.1, 0.03]	[0.02, 0.005, 0.001]
	336	[0.1, 0.09]	[0.02, 0.008, 0.001]
	720	[0.1, 0.04]	[0.02, 0.008, 0.002]
traffic	96	[0.01, 0.03, 0.009, 2.7e-4]	[0.01, 0.003, 9e-4, 2.7e-4]
	192	[0.01, 0.003, 9e-4, 2.7e-4]	[0.01, 0.003, 9e-4, 2.7e-4]
	336	[0.01, 0.003, 9e-4, 2.7e-4]	[0.01, 0.003, 9e-4, 2.7e-4]
	720	[0.01, 0.003, 9e-4, 2.7e-4]	[0.01, 0.003, 9e-4, 2.7e-4]
Weather	96	[0.007, 0.0021, 6.3e-4]	[0.01, 0.003, 9e-4]
	192	[0.007, 0.0021, 6.3e-4]	[0.01, 0.003, 9e-4]
	336	[0.007, 0.0021, 6.3e-4]	[0.01, 0.003, 9e-4]
	720	[0.006, 0.0018, 5.4e-4]	[0.001, 0.003, 9e-5]
PEMS03	96	[0.003, 0.0021, 0.00147, 0.001029]	[0.01, 0.003, 9e-4]
	192	[0.003, 0.0021, 0.00147, 0.001029]	[0.01, 0.003, 9e-4]
	336	[0.003, 0.0021, 0.0017, 0.0012]	[0.01, 0.003, 9e-4]
	720	[0.003, 0.0021, 0.0016, 0.001]	[0.01, 0.001, 9e-4]

Table 5. The values of α_i (i=1...L).

Definition D.1 (Logic). Following (Andréka et al., 2017), a logic \mathcal{L} is a four-tuple in the form:

$$\mathcal{L} = \langle \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{L}}, M_{\mathcal{L}}, mng_{\mathcal{L}}, \models_{\mathcal{L}} \rangle, \tag{11}$$

where:

- $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{L}}$ is the set of all formulas of \mathcal{L} . In the language domain, $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{L}}$ represents the finite set of sentences that can be expressed in the language \mathcal{L} . In the Transformer-based TSF method, $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{L}}$ is the token representation set obtained through the encoder of the model.
- $M_{\mathcal{L}}$ is the class of possible situations. In the language domain, $M_{\mathcal{L}}$ represents the possible scenarios in which the sentences can be interpreted. In TSF, $M_{\mathcal{L}}$ is considered as different domains \mathcal{D} of input series X.
- mng_L is the meaning function, whose domain of definition is F_L × M_L. For any φ ∈ F_L, M ∈ M_L, mng_L(φ, M) represents the meaning of formula φ in the context of M. In the language domain, mng_L is used to interpret the meaning of sentences. In the Transformer-based TSF method, mng_L represents the decoder of the model, which decodes the token sequence representation φ into the final output.
- |=_L is a binary relation, |=_L⊆ M_L × F_L, called the validity relation of L. Intuitively, |=_L is used to indicate which formulas in the language L are true in the situation M_L. In TSF, assuming the visible data distribution is D_s, the visible input sequence is X_s, the encoder is g and the visible output sequence is Y_s, it is evident that ⟨D_s, (g(X_s), Y_s)⟩ ∈ |=_L.

According to (Andréka et al., 2017), when all the formulas in the set $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{L}}$ are atomic formulas, the logic \mathcal{L} exhibits better generalization, meaning the logic can be flexibly extended to other scenarios, tasks, or contexts. An atomic formula is a basic unit in logic, representing a simple statement that cannot be further decomposed. An atomic formula does not contain any logical connectives (e.g., \land , \lor , etc.), and its truth value is clear. The counterpart to an atomic formula is a composite formula, meaning that if a formula is not an atomic formula, it must be a composite formula. According to **??**, the specific definition of the atomic formula and composite formula is as follows:

Definition D.2 (Atomic Formula and Composite Formula). An **atomic formula** is a basic formula with a definite truth value that cannot be further decomposed into smaller formulas. Specifically, if any element (such as logical connectives, predicates, or objects) is removed from an atomic formula, it will no longer be a valid formula, or its truth value will become indeterminate. In other words, an atomic formula is the simplest indivisible unit of a formula, serving as the foundation for constructing composite formulas. If a formula is not an **atomic formula**, it must be a **composite formula**.

To intuitively understand why the logic exhibits better generalization when all the formulas in $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{L}}$ are atomic formulas, let us consider an intuitive example. Suppose in the logic \mathcal{L}_1 , $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{L}_1} = \{P_1, P_2, P_3\}$, and in the logic \mathcal{L}_2 , $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{L}_2} = \{P_1, P_2 \land P_3\}$, where P_1 , P_2 , and P_3 are atomic formulas. Clearly, \mathcal{L}_1 and \mathcal{L}_2 contain the same formulas P_1 , P_2 , and P_3 , but all the formulas in $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{L}_1}$ are atomic, whereas in $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{L}_2}$, this is not the case. Suppose the meaning function $mng_{\mathcal{L}}$ outputs the truth value of a formula. Then, we need these two logics to infer the truth value of a new formula $P_4 = P_1 \land P_2$. Clearly, for \mathcal{L}_1 , the truth value of P_4 can be easily obtained through the following formula:

$$mng_{\mathcal{L}_1}(P_4) = mng_{\mathcal{L}_1}(P_1 \wedge P_2) = mng_{\mathcal{L}_1}(P_1) \wedge mng_{\mathcal{L}_1}(P_2).$$
⁽¹²⁾

However, for \mathcal{L}_2 , the truth value of P_4 can only be estimated through $mng_{\mathcal{L}_2}(P_1 \wedge P_2 \wedge P_3) = mng_{\mathcal{L}_2}(P_4 \wedge P_3)$, and there is redundancy (P_3) in the reasoning equation. Therefore, the reasoning for the truth value of P_4 in \mathcal{L}_1 is more accurate than in \mathcal{L}_2 . From this example, we can intuitively see that when all elements in $F_{\mathcal{L}}$ are atomic formulas, the logic is better able to handle unseen formulas like P_4 , offering better generalization.

The goal of this paper is to constrain Transformer-based TSF methods such that the tokens (elements in $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{L}}$) obtained by its encoder are as atomic formulas as possible, thereby enhancing its generalization ability.

E. Details of Theoretical Analysis

E.1. Related Definitions

This subsection provides the relevant definitions required for the theoretical analysis. Since we need to analyze the upper bound of the generalization error in regression tasks and the generalization error upper bound is related to the empirical error, we first present the definitions of generalization error and empirical error in the regression problems: **Definition E.1** (Generalization Error in Regression Problem). The *generalization error* in a regression problem is the expected loss between the predicted outputs and the true outputs over the distribution of all possible input-output pairs. Mathematically, it is defined as:

$$\mathcal{R}_{\text{gen}}(f) = \mathbb{E}_{(\mathbf{x},y)\sim P} \left[L(f(\mathbf{x}), y) \right],$$

where:

- f is the regression function or model,
- L is a loss function (e.g., mean squared error),
- x represents input variables,
- y is the true output variable,
- P denotes the true but unknown joint distribution of (\mathbf{x}, y) .

Definition E.2 (Empirical Error in Regression Problem). The *empirical error* (also known as the training error) in a regression problem is the average loss calculated over the training dataset. It measures how well the model fits the observed data. Mathematically, it is defined as:

$$\mathcal{R}_{emp}(f) = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} L(f(\mathbf{x}_i), y_i),$$

where:

- \mathbf{x}_i represents the input variables of the *i*-th training example,
- y_i is the true output variable of the *i*-th training example,
- *m* is the total number of training examples.

In analyzing the upper bound of the generalization error, we need to assume that the loss function is a Lipschitz function for the theorem derivation. Therefore, we define the Lipschitz function here:

Definition E.3 (Lipschitz Function). A function $f : \mathbb{R}^{n_1} \to \mathbb{R}^{n_2}$ is said to be *l*-Lipschitz or a Lipschitz function if there exists a constant $l \ge 0$ such that for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1}$, the following holds:

$$|f(x) - f(y)| \le l|x - y|,$$

where $|\cdot|$ denotes the L1 norm.

E.2. Upper Bound of Generalization Error Analysis

According to (Mohri, 2018), in regression tasks, the upper bound of the generalization error $\mathcal{R}_{gen}(f)$ is given by:

$$R_{gen}(f) \le R_{emp}(f) + 2\hat{\mathfrak{R}}_n(\mathcal{L} \circ \mathcal{F}) + 3M\sqrt{\frac{\ln(2/\delta)}{2m}}.$$
(13)

M is the maximum value of the loss function \mathcal{L} . \mathcal{F} is the class of functions for the prediction function *f*. *m* is the total number of training examples. δ is the confidence level. The upper bound in Eq.13 holds with a probability of $1 - \delta$. $\hat{\mathfrak{R}}_n(\mathcal{L} \circ \mathcal{F})$ is the Rademacher complexities, expressed as:

$$\hat{\mathfrak{R}}_{n}(\mathcal{L}\circ\mathcal{F}) = \frac{1}{m}\mathbb{E}_{\sigma}\left[\sup_{f\in\mathcal{F}}\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\sigma_{i}\mathcal{L}(f(x_{i}))\right],\tag{14}$$

where $\sigma_1, \sigma_2, ..., \sigma_n$ is the Rademacher random variables. The first and third terms of the generalization upper bound in Eq.13 are generally fixed, and we primarily analyze the second term. To simplify the second term, we introduce Talagrand's Lemma in (Mohri, 2018):

Lemma E.4 (Talagrand's Lemma). Let Φ_1, \ldots, Φ_m be *l*-Lipschitz functions and $\sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_m$ be Rademacher random variables. Then, for any hypothesis set \mathcal{H} of real-valued functions, the following inequality holds:

$$\frac{1}{m} \mathbb{E}_{\sigma} \left[\sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \sum_{i=1}^{m} \sigma_{i} (\Phi_{i} \circ h)(x_{i}) \right] \leq \frac{1}{m} \mathbb{E}_{\sigma} \left[\sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \sum_{i=1}^{m} \sigma_{i} h(x_{i}) \right] = l \hat{\Re}(\mathcal{H}).$$
(15)

In particular, if $\Phi_i = \Phi$ for all $i \in [m]$, then the following holds:

$$\hat{\mathfrak{R}}(\Phi \circ \mathcal{H}) \le l\hat{\mathfrak{R}}(\mathcal{H}).$$
(16)

According to Lemma E.4, assuming the loss function is *l*-Lipschitz, then we can obtain the upper bound of the generalization error for TSF methods represented by iTransformer and PatchTSF (Theorem 6.1). A detailed proof of Theorem 6.1 can be found in Appendix E.4. According to Theorem 6.1, we can further deduce Theorem 6.2. A detailed proof can be found in Appendix E.5.

E.3. Proof of Lemma E.4

Proof. First we fix a sample $S = (x_1, \ldots, x_m)$, then, by definition,

$$\frac{1}{m} \mathbb{E}_{\sigma} \left[\sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \sum_{i=1}^{m} \sigma_{i}(\Phi_{m} \circ h)(x_{i}) \right] = \frac{1}{m} \mathbb{E}_{\sigma_{1},...,\sigma_{m-1}} \left[\mathbb{E}_{\sigma_{m}} \left[\sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}} u_{m-1}(h) + \sigma_{m}(\Phi_{m} \circ h)(x_{m}) \right] \right],$$
(17)

where $u_{m-1}(h) = \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \sigma_i(\Phi_i \circ h)(x_i)$. By definition of the supremum, for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exist $h_1, h_2 \in \mathcal{H}$ such that

$$u_{m-1}(h_1) + (\Phi_m \circ h_1)(x_m) \ge$$

$$(1-\epsilon) \sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}} u_{m-1}(h) + (\Phi_m \circ h)(x_m)$$
(18)

and

$$u_{m-1}(h_2) - (\Phi_m \circ h_2)(x_m) \ge$$

$$(1-\epsilon) \sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}} u_{m-1}(h) - (\Phi_m \circ h)(x_m).$$

$$(19)$$

Thus, for any $\epsilon > 0$, by definition of \mathbb{E}_{σ_m} ,

$$(1 - \epsilon) \mathbb{E}_{\sigma_m} \left[\sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}} u_{m-1}(h) + \sigma_m (\Phi_m \circ h)(x_m) \right]$$

= $(1 - \epsilon) \left[\frac{1}{2} \sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}} (u_{m-1}(h) + (\Phi_m \circ h)(x_m)) + \frac{1}{2} \left[\sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}} u_{m-1}(h) - (\Phi_m \circ h)(x_m) \right] \right]$
$$\leq \frac{1}{2} (u_{m-1}(h_1) + (\Phi_m \circ h_1)(x_m)) + \frac{1}{2} (u_{m-1}(h_2) - (\Phi_m \circ h_2)(x_m)).$$
(20)

Let $s = sgn(h_1(x_m) - h_2(x_m))$. Then, the previous inequality implies

$$(1 - \epsilon) \mathbb{E}_{\sigma_m} \left[\sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}} u_{m-1}(h) + \sigma_m (\Phi_m \circ h)(x_m) \right]$$
(Lipschitz property)

$$\leq \frac{1}{2} \left[u_{m-1}(h_1) + u_{m-1}(h_2) + sl(h_1(x_m) - h_2(x_m)) \right]$$
(rearranging)

$$= \frac{1}{2} \left[u_{m-1}(h_1) + slh_1(x_m) \right] + \frac{1}{2} \left[u_{m-1}(h_2) - slh_2(x_m) \right]$$
(definition of sup)

$$\leq \frac{1}{2} \sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \left[u_{m-1}(h) + slh(x_m) \right] + \frac{1}{2} \sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \left[u_{m-1}(h) - slh(x_m) \right]$$
(21)

$$\leq \frac{1}{2} \sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \left[u_{m-1}(h) - slh(x_m) \right]$$
(definition of \mathbb{E}_{σ_m})

$$= \mathbb{E}_{\sigma_m} \left[\sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}} u_{m-1}(h) + \sigma_m lh(x_m) \right].$$

Since the inequality holds for all $\epsilon > 0$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{\sigma_m} \left[\sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}} u_{m-1}(h) + \sigma_m (\Phi_m \circ h)(x_m) \right] \\\leq \mathbb{E}_{\sigma_m} \left[\sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}} u_{m-1}(h) + \sigma_m lh(x_m) \right].$$
(22)

Proceeding in the same way for all other σ_i $(i \neq m)$ proves the lemma.

E.4. Proof of Theorem 6.1

Proof. According to Lemma E.4, assuming the loss function is *l*-Lipschitz, then:

$$\hat{\mathfrak{R}}_n(\mathcal{L}\circ\mathcal{F}) \le l\hat{\mathfrak{R}}(\mathcal{F}).$$
(23)

Assuming the number of encoding layers in the Transformer is 1 and its decoder is a fully connected layer, $f(x_i)$ can be expressed as:

$$f(x_i) = FC_{out}FFN \\ \left[softmax \left[FC_Q(x_i)FC_K(x_i)^\top / \sqrt{d} \right] FC_V(x_i) \right],$$
(24)

where $f \in \mathcal{F}$, $FC_{out}/FC_Q/FC_K/FC_V$ stand for the fully connected layer to generate the output/Query/Key/Value, FFN is the Feed-Forward Neural Network in Transformer. Assuming FC_{out} and FNN are l_1 -Lipschitz and l_2 -Lipschitz, respectively, then:

$$\Re(\mathcal{F}) \le l_1 l_2 \Re(\mathcal{F}_1). \tag{25}$$

where $f_1 \in \mathcal{F}_1$ and

$$f_1(x_i) = \left[softmax \left[FC_Q(x_i)FC_K(x_i)^\top / \sqrt{d}\right]FC_V(x_i)\right].$$
(26)

By substituting Eq.25 into Eq.13, we can obtain:

$$R_{gen}(f) \le R_{emp}(f) + 2l_1 l_2 \hat{\mathfrak{R}}(\mathcal{F}_1) + 3M \sqrt{\frac{\ln(2/\delta)}{2m}},\tag{27}$$

E.5. Proof of Theorem 6.2

Proof. According to Theorem 6.1, the generalization error upper bounds for the models with and without L1 regularization on the attention map are as follows:

$$\overline{R_{gen}^{l_1}}(f) = R_{emp}(f) + 2l_1 l_2 \hat{\Re}(\mathcal{F}'_1) + 3M \sqrt{\frac{\ln(2/\delta)}{2m}},
\overline{R_{gen}}(f) = R_{emp}(f) + 2l_1 l_2 \hat{\Re}(\mathcal{F}_1) + 3M \sqrt{\frac{\ln(2/\delta)}{2m}}.$$
(28)

Let:

$$A^{norm} = softmax \left[FC_Q(x_i) FC_K(x_i)^\top / \sqrt{d} \right].$$
⁽²⁹⁾

Then:

$$f_1(x_i) = A^{norm} FC_V(x_i). \tag{30}$$

We can regard A^{norm} as a weight matrix, but this weight matrix depends on the input x_i . When we apply L1 regularization to constrain $FC_Q(x_i)FC_K(x_i)^{\top}/\sqrt{d}$, it is equivalent to applying L1 regularization on A. After L1 regularization, a new model class \mathcal{F}'_1 is formed. According to (Mohri, 2018), due to the impact of the regularization, the new \mathcal{F}'_1 only contains a subset of the functions from the original model class \mathcal{F}_1 . This means that:

$$\mathcal{F}_1' \subseteq \mathcal{F}_1. \tag{31}$$

Since \mathcal{F}'_1 is a subset of \mathcal{F}_1 , according to the properties of Rademacher complexity:

$$\hat{\mathfrak{R}}(\mathcal{F}_1') \le \hat{\mathfrak{R}}(\mathcal{F}_1). \tag{32}$$

Therefore:

$$\overline{R_{gen}^{l1}}(f) \le \overline{R_{gen}}(f). \tag{33}$$

F. Robustness of Our Method

We report the standard deviation of our method's performance under five runs with different random seeds in Table 6 and 7, which exhibits that the performance of our method is stable.

	Table	6.	The mean and	standard	deviation of	the result	ts from t	five rand	om seed e	xperiments of	'iTransformer-	-Attn-L-R	leg"	'.
--	-------	----	--------------	----------	--------------	------------	-----------	-----------	-----------	---------------	----------------	-----------	------	----

Prediction Length	ETTh2		Weather		ECL		Traffic		Solar-Energy		PEMS03	
r realetion Bengui	MSE	MAE	MSE	MAE	MSE	MAE	MSE	MAE	MSE	MAE	MSE	MAE
96	$0.292 {\pm} 0.003$	$0.340{\pm}0.001$	0.158 ± 0.000	$0.202{\pm}0.002$	0.133±0.001	$0.228{\pm}0.002$	$0.380 {\pm} 0.002$	$0.259 {\pm} 0.003$	0.196 ± 0.003	$0.226 {\pm} 0.001$	0.066 ± 0.002	$0.170 {\pm} 0.001$
192	0.377 ± 0.002	$0.391 {\pm} 0.002$	0.208 ± 0.003	$0.250 {\pm} 0.002$	0.151 ± 0.001	$0.245 {\pm} 0.002$	0.401 ± 0.003	$0.269 {\pm} 0.002$	0.226 ± 0.004	$0.254 {\pm} 0.001$	0.085 ± 0.003	$0.191 {\pm} 0.001$
336	$0.424 {\pm} 0.000$	$0.432 {\pm} 0.003$	0.266 ± 0.002	$0.291 {\pm} 0.001$	0.165 ± 0.002	0.261 ± 0.001	0.410 ± 0.003	$0.275 {\pm} 0.004$	0.244 ± 0.001	$0.269 {\pm} 0.003$	0.119 ± 0.002	$0.231 {\pm} 0.003$
720	$0.425 {\pm} 0.002$	$0.443{\pm}0.004$	0.346±0.003	$0.346{\pm}0.003$	0.194±0.004	$0.290{\pm}0.005$	0.440 ± 0.003	$0.290{\pm}0.004$	0.247 ± 0.002	$0.274 {\pm} 0.003$	0.155 ± 0.001	$0.264{\pm}0.004$

Table 7. The mean a	nd standard devi	iation of the resu	Its from five rand	dom seed experiment	s of "PatchTST+Attn-L-Reg"
Incle // Including	na standara av				or ratemportion brited

Prediction Length	ETTh2		Weather		ECL		Traffic		Solar-Energy		PEMS03	
	MSE	MAE	MSE	MAE	MSE	MAE	MSE	MAE	MSE	MAE	MSE	MAE
96	$0.301 {\pm} 0.002$	$0.346 {\pm} 0.002$	0.175±0.003	$0.216 {\pm} 0.001$	0.191±0.002	$0.284{\pm}0.001$	0.534 ± 0.002	$0.355 {\pm} 0.003$	0.231±0.001	$0.283{\pm}0.002$	0.097±0.002	$0.214 {\pm} 0.003$
192	$0.385 {\pm} 0.002$	$0.402 {\pm} 0.003$	0.222 ± 0.002	$0.255 {\pm} 0.001$	0.197±0.003	$0.287 {\pm} 0.004$	$0.532 {\pm} 0.001$	$0.351 {\pm} 0.002$	0.264 ± 0.003	$0.308 {\pm} 0.002$	0.141 ± 0.001	$0.257 {\pm} 0.003$
336	$0.425 {\pm} 0.002$	$0.435 {\pm} 0.003$	0.275 ± 0.003	$0.294 {\pm} 0.002$	0.211 ± 0.002	$0.307 {\pm} 0.003$	0.547 ± 0.004	$0.360 {\pm} 0.002$	0.287 ± 0.002	$0.311 {\pm} 0.003$	0.208 ± 0.001	$0.317 {\pm} 0.004$
720	$0.426 {\pm} 0.005$	$0.445{\pm}0.002$	0.356±0.004	$0.346{\pm}0.003$	0.259±0.004	$0.341 {\pm} 0.005$	$0.582{\pm}0.003$	$0.372{\pm}0.004$	0.286 ± 0.003	$0.321 {\pm} 0.001$	0.267±0.004	$0.367 {\pm} 0.002$

G. Visualization of Prediction

To provide a clear comparison among different models, we list the prediction showcases of three representative datasets in Fig.5, 6 and 7, which are given by the following methods: Our method ("iTransformer+Attn-L-Reg"), iTransformer (Liu et al., 2023), PatchTST (Nie et al., 2023). Among the various models, our method predicts the most precise future series variations and exhibits superior performance.

Submission and Formatting Instructions for ICML 2025



Figure 5. Visualization of input-96-predict-96 results on the Traffic dataset.



Figure 6. Visualization of input-96-predict-96 results on the Weather dataset.

H. Ablation Study

In this section, we analyze the rationale behind the design of the proposed method through ablation experiments. In the first experiment, we validate the necessity of using a gradually decreasing α in Eq.8. We train and evaluate the model on multiple datasets, comparing it with a setting that does not decrease α . The results, shown in Table 8, demonstrate that gradually decreasing α significantly improves the predictive performance of the model. In the second experiment, we show that directly applying L1 regularization to enforce sparsity in the attention map outperforms using a sparse learnable matrix to element-wise multiply the attention map for sparsity. The results, presented in Table 9, confirm that L1 regularization is more effective.

I. Discussion: Equal Dependency Handling in Transformer

The Transformer model treats all token dependencies equally through its self-attention mechanism (Vaswani et al., 2017). Specifically, the Transformer uses a global self-attention mechanism, allowing each token to interact with all other tokens in the sequence, regardless of their positions or order. The Transformer achieves this interaction by computing the relevance (i.e., attention score) between each token and the other tokens. This means that when calculating its representation, each token can equally consider the information from other tokens in the sequence, without giving more weight or importance to tokens that are closer to the current position (Vaswani et al., 2017).

This mechanism gives the Transformer an advantage in capturing long-range dependencies and modeling complex relationships, as it is not limited by the local dependencies in traditional sequence models (such as RNNs or LSTMs), allowing it to more comprehensively handle the relationships between all tokens (Vaswani et al., 2017). However, current methods overlook that this mechanism also leads to the introduction of excessive redundant token dependencies during prediction, which negatively impacts the model's performance. In this paper, we first demonstrate this issue experimentally (as shown in Fig.2), and then address it from a logical perspective, thereby improving the model's predictive performance.

Dataset	Prediction Length	$ \begin{array}{c c} \alpha & \textbf{Not Decreasing} \\ MSE/MAE \end{array} $	$\begin{array}{c c} \alpha & \textbf{Decreasing} \\ \text{MSE/MAE} \end{array}$
ECL	96	0.133 / 0.228	0.156 / 0.242
	192	0.151 / 0.245	0.167 / 0.259
	336	0.165 / 0.261	0.179 / 0.274
	720	0.194 / 0.290	0.215 / 0.314
Traffic	96	0.380 / 0.259	0.397 / 0.269
	192	0.401 / 0.269	0.421 / 0.282
	336	0.410 / 0.275	0.431 / 0.288
	720	0.440 / 0.290	0.462 / 0.301

Table 8. Ablation Experiments for α

Dataset	Prediction Length	Using L1 MSE/MAE	Using Sparse Learnable Matrix MSE/MAE
ECL	96	0.133 / 0.228	0.146 / 0.236
	192	0.151 / 0.245	0.161 / 0.253
	336	0.165 / 0.261	0.172 / 0.267
	720	0.194 / 0.290	0.207 / 0.307
Traffic	96	0.380 / 0.259	0.387 / 0.261
	192	0.401 / 0.269	0.415 / 0.276
	336	0.410/0.275	0.421 / 0.282
	720	0.440 / 0.290	0.452 / 0.296

Table 9. Ablation Experiment for Sparsification Methods.



Figure 7. Visualization of input-96-predict-96 results on the ECL dataset.