arXiv:1911.01010v1 [stat.ML] 4 Nov 2019

Seasonally-Adjusted Auto-Regression of Vector Time Series

Enzo Busseti

Department of Management Science and Engineering

Stanford University

February 5, 2022

Abstract

We present a simple algorithm to forecast vector time series, that is robust against missing data, in both training and inference. It models seasonal annual, weekly, and daily baselines, and a Gaussian process for the seasonally-adjusted residuals. We develop a custom truncated eigendecomposition to fit a low-rank plus block-diagonal Gaussian kernel. Inference is performed with the Schur complement, using Tikhonov regularization to prevent overfit, and the Woodbury formula to invert sub-matrices of the kernel efficiently. Inference requires an amount of memory and computation linear in the dimension of the time series, and so the model can scale to very large datasets. We also propose a simple "greedy" grid search for automatic hyper-parameter tuning. The paper is accompanied by `tsar` (*i.e.*, time series auto-regressor), a Python library that implements the algorithm.

1 Introduction

We present a model, accompanied by a software implementation, for a time series. This can be used to forecast future unknown values of the series.

Note for the reader. The present paper is a draft that still lacks references, examples, and applications of the model.

Notation. We use some simple notational conventions. Whenever a variable has a subscript "t" it is a time series and t indexes time, for example, $b_t \in \mathbf{R}^M$ for $t \in \mathbf{Z}$, is a (real) vector time series. Each value of t corresponds to a point in time, and the time interval between t and $t+1$ is the same for each value of t. For example, in a *hourly* time series each value of t typically corresponds to the start of each hour. The choice of the origin for the time index is arbitrary. Whenever we write a variable with a "hat" on top we mean it

is a statistical inference of the variable without it. In addition, if we are inferring a variable in a time series, by the notation $\hat{x}_{\tau|t}$ we mean the inferred value of variable x_τ using the data available at time t. If $t < \tau$ then $\hat{x}_{\tau|t}$ is a *forecast* or prediction, if $t \geq \tau$ then $\hat{x}_{\tau|t}$ is called a *nowcast* or *imputation* (of missing values). Finally, we denote by `nan` a missing value of a scalar variable (literally, "not a number"). Typically, a scalar variable in a raw dataset takes value in $\mathbf{R} \cup \{\texttt{nan}\}$, meaning that it is either a real number or is missing. We use the simple algebraic convention that $a + \texttt{nan} = a - \texttt{nan} = a \times \texttt{nan} = a/\texttt{nan} = \texttt{nan}$ for any $a \in \mathbf{R} \cup \{\texttt{nan}\}$. We treat the problems of forecasting future values and of guessing or nowcasting missing values as the same.

Our objective. We consider a vector time series $x_t \in (\mathbf{R} \cup \{\texttt{nan}\})^M$ for $t \in \mathbf{Z}$ and $M \geq 1$. We use the notation $x_{t,i} \in \mathbf{R} \cup \{\texttt{nan}\}$, for any $i = 1, \ldots M$, to mean the i-th element of the t-th observation of the series. We are given data for a certain period,

$$x_{t_s}, \ldots, x_{t_e},$$

where $t_e > t_s$ are its end and start times. The provided data can have any number of missing values, and the time series is equal to $M-$vectors of missing values outside of the interval

$$x_\tau = (\texttt{nan}, \ldots, \texttt{nan}) \text{ if } \tau < t_s \text{ or } \tau > t_e.$$

Our objective is to fill the missing values of the time series. The machinery we build can be used to fill any missing value: we can guess the time series at times before t_s, impute the missing entries in the data provided, and forecast the future values after t_e. In the rest of the paper, for ease of explanation, we focus on the case of producing forecasts of the future values

$$\hat{x}_{\tau|t_e} \in \mathbf{R}^M, \quad \tau > t_e.$$

The model. We model the time series as

$$x_t = b_t + r_t,$$

the sum of a seasonal *baseline* $b_t \in \mathbf{R}^M$ and an auto-regressive *residual* $r_t \in (\mathbf{R} \cup \{\texttt{nan}\})^M$, for all $t \in \mathbf{Z}$. The baseline has always real values, the residual instead has a missing value wherever the time series has one. The baseline explains periodic patterns with daily, weekly, and annual seasonalities, and an optional linear trend. (Other periodicities such as quarterly or lunar could be also included, but in this work we only focus on those three.) The baseline separates across the components of the time series, *i.e.*, it is composed of M separate scalar baseline functions. We show our proposed baseline function in §2. The residual represents instead a mean-reverting deviation from the baseline. We propose to model it as a partially observed zero-meaned Gaussian process with a finite memory. The missing values are simply the unobserved values of the process, and we fill them by computing their Gaussian conditional expectations, given the observed values. We propose various computational optimizations to achieve better performance in practical usage, such as a

low-rank approximation of the Gaussian kernel that ensures that the computational cost of inferring the missing values is linear, as opposed to cubic, in M. We detail the Gaussian process model in §3. Both components of the model contain various *hyper-parameters* that an expert user may control to achieve better performance. We propose a simple heuristic to choose automatically good values for these, a *greedy* grid search, where "greedy" has the meaning given to it in computer science: it iteratively tries small changes in the hyper-parameters, myopically selecting the ones giving better improvements. We explain it in §4.

Train-test split. Throughout the paper we detail procedures to fit models using *train* data $x_{t_s^{\text{tr}}}, \dots, x_{t_e^{\text{tr}}}$, and to evaluate models using *test* data $x_{t_s^{\text{te}}}, \dots, x_{t_e^{\text{te}}}$. These are two subsets of the initial dataset $x_{t_s}, \dots, x_{t_e}$, split by a simple rule: With a user-defined ratio $r \in (0, 1)$, by default $r = 2/3$, we choose $t_s^{\text{tr}} = t_s$, $t_s^{\text{te}} = t_e^{\text{tr}} + 1$, $t_e^{\text{te}} = t_e$, and $(t_e^{\text{tr}} - t_s^{\text{tr}}) \approx r(t_e^{\text{te}} - t_s^{\text{te}})$, where the last equation is valid to the closest approximation possible. That is, we use approximately the first r fraction of the data as train data, and the rest as test data. For simplicity, the train and test datasets have values all equal to `nan` outside of their boundaries. The test data is used to select the values of the hyper-parameters. Once these have been chosen, each model is re-fit on the complete original dataset.

Organization of the paper. We divide the paper in sections that correspond to sub-modules of the `tsar` library , so that each section can in principle be thought of as a separate document. However, the order in which we present them matters, since each section depends on concepts from, or is motivated by, the preceding ones. The last section is an exception (as is this introduction): it describes the software implementation and exemplifies its use.

Originality. None of the material presented in this paper is completely new. For example, the predictive model explained in [MBBW19, Appendix A] is a special case of the present model, for a scalar time series with no missing values, and no logic to automatically select the hyper-parameter values. The idea of separating a time series in a seasonal and an auto-regressive component is very old, it is sometimes called seasonal auto-regression (SAR). Projecting a periodic function on sines and cosines up to a certain frequency is a very common basis expansion, and is at the core of Fourier analysis. Using Gaussian processes to generalize auto-regressive models is also not a new idea, and low-rank approximations, such as principal component analysis (PCA), are widely used in practice. Tikhonov regularization, which we use to control overfit of the Gaussian kernel, is also a classic idea. Lastly, the grid search of hyper-parameters is a typical procedure and greedy searches are explained in any introductory computer science course. To our knowledge, however, no published material models time series as sums of truncated Fourier expansions and Gaussian processes, the low-rank plus block-diagonal Gaussian kernel we propose has not appeared before, nor has the greedy grid search idea. In addition, we wrote all the software implementation, with a focus on simplicity and usability.

2 Seasonal baseline

Here we develop a model for the baseline $b_t \in \mathbf{R}^M$ for any $t \in \mathbf{Z}$, that separates on the M components of the time series. So, for simplicity of notation, and without loss of generality, in this section we fix $M = 1$, so $x_t \in \mathbf{R} \cup \{\texttt{nan}\}$ and $b_t \in \mathbf{R}$ for any $t \in \mathbf{Z}$.

We propose, as in [MBBW19], to represent the baseline as a sum of sine and cosine basis functions, so as to capture variations with periodically repeating patterns. Other strategies can be used, as long as they are robust against missing data. For example, we include in our software library the non-parametric baseline of [BB19] as an option. We model the baseline as the sum

$$\begin{aligned} b_t = K^{\text{trend}}\alpha_0 t + \beta_0 \\ + \sum_{k=1}^{K^{\text{day}}} \alpha_k^{\text{day}} \sin(2\pi tk/P^{\text{day}}) + \beta_k^{\text{day}} \cos(2\pi tk/P^{\text{day}}) \\ + \sum_{k=1}^{K^{\text{week}}} \alpha_k^{\text{week}} \sin(2\pi tk/P^{\text{week}}) + \beta_k^{\text{week}} \cos(2\pi tk/P^{\text{week}}) \\ + \sum_{k=1}^{K^{\text{year}}} \alpha_k^{\text{year}} \sin(2\pi tk/P^{\text{year}}) + \beta_k^{\text{year}} \cos(2\pi tk/P^{\text{year}}) \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where $P^{\text{day}} \in \mathbf{R}$, $P^{\text{week}} \in \mathbf{R}$, and $P^{\text{year}} \in \mathbf{R}$ are the lenghts of a day, week, and year, in the time interval spacing of the time series (*e.g.*, if the series is hourly, $P^{\text{day}} = 24$, $P^{\text{week}} = 168$, and $P^{\text{year}} = 8766$), and $K^{\text{trend}} \in \{0, 1\}$, $K^{\text{day}} \in \{0, \ldots\}$, $K^{\text{week}} \in \{0, \ldots, 6\}$, $K^{\text{year}} \in \{0, \ldots, 51\}$ are hyper-parameters with a range chosen so that the periodicities of the terms in the baseline are unique, and α_0, β_0, α_k^{day}, β_k^{day}, α_k^{week}, β_k^{week}, α_k^{year}, β_k^{year}, for any k, are the coefficients or parameters of the model, and they are all real numbers. In the following we use the shorthand notation

$$b_t(\alpha, \beta; K),$$

where α, β, and K, are the vectors of parameters and hyper-parameters for all subscripts and superscripts. So, we use as periods the fundamental periods of one day, one week, one year, and their first few harmonics, *i.e.*, half of each period, a third of, and so on. The numbers of harmonics used, or whether a fundamental period is used at all, are chosen by fixing the values of hyper-parameters, which thus control the complexity of the model. In addition, we have a constant term β_0 and a linear trend $\alpha_0 t$ which is only active if $K^{\text{trend}} = 1$. The number of effective coefficients of the model is $2(K^{\text{day}} + K^{\text{week}} + K^{\text{year}}) + K^{\text{trend}} + 1$ (since α_0 is irrelevant when $K^{\text{trend}} = 0$).

Fit. We detail an ad-hoc procedure to fit the baseline model, *i.e.*, to obtain the values of the coefficients α and β, given a sequence $x_{t_s}^{\text{tr}}, \ldots, x_{t_e}^{\text{tr}}$ of *train* data, and chosen values of

the hyper-parameters K. We use simple least-squares optimization, minimizing the total squared deviation between the baseline model and the given data. The coefficients are the solution of the following least-squares optimization problem

$$\text{minimize} \quad \sum_{t\in\{t_s^{\text{tr}},\ldots,t_e^{\text{tr}}|x_t\neq\texttt{nan}\}} \|x_t - b_t(\alpha,\beta;K)\|_2^2 + \gamma\left(\|\alpha\|_2^2 + \|\beta\|_2^2 - \beta_0^2\right) \tag{2}$$

where the optimization variables are α and β, for all subscripts and superscripts, and $\gamma > 0$ is a regularization constant used to ensure uniqueness of the solution, unless all data is missing in the train dataset, in which case we also fix $\beta_0 = 0$. We subtract β_0 from the regularization term to ensure that the deviation between the baseline and the train data has mean zero. We fix the value of γ to a small constant, by default 10^{-8} in the software package.

Infer. Given values of the hyper-parameters K, and the coefficients α and β, to infer the value of the baseline at any time $t \in \mathbf{Z}$ we simply evaluate it

$$\hat{b}_t = b_t(\alpha,\beta;K).$$

Thus inference can be performed at any time, also, *e.g.*, in the distant future. For time series whose long-term dynamics is not expected to change much in time, such as the energy production of a renewable power plant which depends only on weather, the baseline model by itself can be used as a (rough) estimate of the far future.

Evaluate. It is easy to evaluate the goodness of a baseline model, *i.e.*, its set of parameters α and β and hyper-parameters K, over some *test* data $x_s^{\text{te}},\ldots,x_e^{\text{te}}$, by the squared deviation

$$\sum_{t\in\{t_s^{\text{te}},\ldots,t_e^{\text{te}}|x_t\neq\texttt{nan}\}} \|x_t - \hat{b}_t\|_2^2, \tag{3}$$

skipping missing data. The smaller the value of (3), the better. The greedy grid search we use to choose the values of the hyper-parameters K relies on empirically minimizing (3), with the original data $x_s,\ldots,x_e$ split between train and test datasets.

3 Gaussian process of the residuals

Once a baseline model has been fitted, we subtract it from the original data to get a time series of residuals

$$r_t = x_t - b_t$$

where $r_t \in (\mathbf{R}\cup\{\texttt{nan}\})^M$, for any $t \in \mathbf{Z}$. In particular, for any $t \in \mathbf{Z}$ and $i = 1,\ldots,M$, if $x_{t,i} = \texttt{nan}$ then $r_{t,i} = \texttt{nan}$.

Normalization. We divide the residuals by their empirical norm. Let $\sigma \in \mathbf{R}^M$ be defined as

$$\sigma_i = \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{t \in \{t=t_s^{\mathrm{tr}},\ldots,t_e^{\mathrm{tr}} | r_{t,i} \neq \mathtt{nan}\}} r_{t,i}^2}{\sum_{t \in \{t=t_s^{\mathrm{tr}},\ldots,t_e^{\mathrm{tr}} | r_{t,i} \neq \mathtt{nan}\}} 1}}$$

for $i = 1, \ldots, M$, and $\sigma_i = 1$ if all $r_{t_s^{\mathrm{tr}},i}, \ldots, r_{t_e^{\mathrm{tr}},i} = \mathtt{nan}$. Then the normalized residuals are

$$\tilde{r}_{t,i} = r_{t,i}/\sigma_i \tag{4}$$

for any $t \in \mathbf{Z}$ and $i = 1, \ldots, M$. We model $\tilde{r}_t$ as a Gaussian process with a kernel size defined by the user. This model generalizes the classic auto-regression of a time series, which is a special case when there are no missing data.

Gaussian kernel. Let $P \in \mathbf{N}$ be the lenght of the *past*, or *memory*, of the kernel, and $F \in \mathbf{N}$ be the lenght of the *future*, or forecast *horizon*. These are specified by the user, based on the requirements of the application of the model. For example, if the time series is comprised of hourly data, one could choose $P = F = 24$, or $P = F = 48$. We model the normalized residual as a partially observed Gaussian process with mean zero, so that for any $t \in \mathbf{Z}$

$$(\tilde{r}_{t-P+1,1}, \ldots, \tilde{r}_{t+F,1}, \ldots \tilde{r}_{t-P+1,M}, \ldots, \tilde{r}_{t+F,M}) \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma) \tag{5}$$

where $\Sigma \in \mathbf{S}_{++}^{(P+F)M}$ is the Gaussian *kernel* or covariance, a real positive definite matrix, and the $\sim$ operator is overloaded to mean that the variables on the left are distributed according to the multivariate Gaussian distribution on the right, but are only partially observed, *i.e.*, can have missing values.

Fit. We fit an approximate Gaussian kernel $\hat{\Sigma} \in \mathbf{S}^{(P+F)M}$ as follows. The kernel is divided in submatrices

$$\hat{\Sigma} = \begin{pmatrix} C_{(1,1)} & \cdots & C_{(1,M)} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ C_{(M,1)} & \cdots & C_{(M,M)} \end{pmatrix}. \tag{6}$$

where, for any $i, j = 1, \ldots, M$, the matrix $C_{(i,j)} \in \mathbf{R}^{(P+F)\times(P+F)}$ is Toeplitz

$$C_{(i,j)} = \begin{pmatrix} c_0^{(i,j)} & c_1^{(i,j)} & \cdots & c_{P+F-1}^{(i,j)} \\ c_{-1}^{(i,j)} & \ddots & & \vdots \\ \vdots & & & c_1^{(i,j)} \\ c_{1-P-F}^{(i,j)} & \cdots & c_{-1}^{(i,j)} & c_0^{(i,j)} \end{pmatrix}.$$

The approximate *correlation* coefficients $c_\tau^{(i,j)} \in \mathbf{R}$, for $\tau = 1 - P - F, \ldots, P + F - 1$, are defined as

$$c_\tau^{(i,j)} = \frac{\sum_{t \in \{t=t_s^{\mathrm{tr}},\ldots,t_e^{\mathrm{tr}} | r_{t,i} \neq \mathtt{nan}, r_{t+\tau,j} \neq \mathtt{nan}\}} \tilde{r}_{t,i} \tilde{r}_{t+\tau,j}}{\sum_{t \in \{t=t_s^{\mathrm{tr}},\ldots,t_e^{\mathrm{tr}} | r_{t,i} \neq \mathtt{nan}, r_{t+\tau,j} \neq \mathtt{nan}\}} 1}, \tag{7}$$

or $c_\tau^{(i,j)} = 0$ if the denominator in (7) is equal to 0, and we remind that the train dataset has values all equal to `nan` when $t < t_s^{\text{tr}}$ and $t > t_e^{\text{tr}}$. The approximate kernel so constructed is symmetric but is not in general positive definite, unless there are no missing data, in which case $\hat{\Sigma}$ is at least positive semi-definite (indeed, an empirical correlation matrix). We use Tikhonov regularization during inference to correct the non-positive-definiteness of $\hat{\Sigma}$. We show an example estimated kernel, as visualized by a heatmap of the kernel matrix values, in Figure 1.

Infer. We infer the missing values of the normalized residual, and hence of the residual, by computing their Gaussian conditional expectations. For a given time index $t \in \mathbf{Z}$ we concatenate the normalized residuals as in (5) to obtain

$$\tilde{\rho} = (\tilde{r}_{t-P+1,1}, \dots, \tilde{r}_{t+F,1}, \dots, \tilde{r}_{t-P+1,M}, \dots, \tilde{r}_{t+F,M}) \in (\mathbf{R} \cup \{\texttt{nan}\})^{M(P+F)}.$$

We form two sets of indexes of $\tilde{\rho}$. Let $\mathcal{O}$ be the set of indexes of *observed* values, and $\mathcal{U}$ the set of indexes of *unobserved* values. Together they are a partition of the set $\{1, \dots, M(P+F)\}$ of indexes of $\tilde{\rho}$. For any $i \in \mathcal{O}$ we have $\tilde{\rho}_i \in \mathbf{R}$, and for any $i \in \mathcal{U}$, $\tilde{\rho}_i = \texttt{nan}$. Then, given an estimated kernel $\hat{\Sigma} \in \mathbf{S}^{M(P+F)}$ and a Tikhonov regularization parameter $\lambda \geq 0$, inference is performed via the regularized Schur complement

$$\hat{\tilde{\rho}}_{\mathcal{U}} = \hat{\Sigma}_{\mathcal{U},\mathcal{O}} (\hat{\Sigma}_{\mathcal{O},\mathcal{O}} + \lambda I)^{-1} \tilde{\rho}_{\mathcal{O}}, \tag{8}$$

where I is an identity matrix of appropriate size and λ is chosen large enough so that the inverse matrix above exists and is real. For simplicity, we define $\hat{\tilde{\rho}}_{\mathcal{O}} = \tilde{\rho}_{\mathcal{O}}$, so the vector $\hat{\tilde{\rho}} \in \mathbf{R}^{M(P+F)}$ is well defined. We deconcatenate it, obtaining $\hat{\tilde{r}}_{t-P+1}, \dots, \hat{\tilde{r}}_{t+F}$, and finally we get the inferred unnormalized residuals by inverting (4)

$$\hat{r}_{\tau,i} = \sigma_i \hat{\tilde{r}}_{\tau,i}$$

for any $i = 1, \dots, M$ and $\tau = t-P+1, \dots, t+F$. The regularization coefficient λ is thus an hyper-parameter of the model, and for simplicity we give it a range $\lambda \in \{M(P+F), M(P+F)/\alpha, M(P+F)/\alpha^2, \dots\}$, where α is a constant (by default $\alpha = \sqrt[3]{10}$ in the software).

Auto-regression. If the kernel is estimated on data without any missing value, the inference is exclusively performed on data such that $r_{t-P+1}, \dots, r_t \in \mathbf{R}^M$, and $r_{t+1}, \dots, r_{t+F} \in (\{\texttt{nan}\})^M$, and finally $\lambda = 0$, then the procedure explained above is equivalent to a classic vector auto-regression with memory P and prediction horizon F, see for example [MBBW19, Appendix A]. (Some authors define the auto-regression only with $F = 1$.) That is in turn equivalent to a linear regression of the observations of $\tilde{r}$ at times $t+1, \dots, t+F$ on the observations at times $t-P+1, \dots, t$ for every t, with no intercept, because their mean is zero. If $\lambda > 0$, then the procedure is equivalent to a *ridge* regression. Our approach is more flexible than a classic auto-regression since it does not assume a fixed pattern of observed data, and hence can handle any past missing, or future present, value.

Evaluate. We evaluate the performance of a fitted model by the sum of the squared deviations between the model predictions of the future, and the real values, on a test dataset. First, given the test dataset $r_{t_s^{\text{te}}}, \ldots, r_{t_e^{\text{te}}}$, we normalize by the σ computed on the train dataset to obtain the normalized residuals $\tilde{r}_{t_s^{\text{te}}}, \ldots, \tilde{r}_{t_e^{\text{te}}}$. Then, for every $t = t_s^{\text{te}}, \ldots, t_e^{\text{te}}$, and $\tau = t+1, \ldots, t+F$, we use the notation $\hat{\tilde{r}}_{\tau|t}$, to mean the inferred value of $\tilde{r}_\tau$ computed according to (8) with all normalized residuals at times after t set equal to `nan`, *i.e.*, $\tilde{r}_{t+1} = \ldots = \tilde{r}_{t+F} = (\texttt{nan}, \ldots, \texttt{nan})$. Finally, we measure the performance by

$$\sum_{t=t_s^{\text{te}}}^{t_e^{\text{te}}} \sum_{i=1}^{M} \sum_{\tau \in \{t+1,\ldots,t+F | r_{\tau,i} \neq \texttt{nan}\}} (\hat{\tilde{r}}_{\tau|t,i} - \tilde{r}_{\tau,i})^2.$$

Memory and computational cost. The memory cost of storing $\hat{\Sigma}$ is $O(M^2(P+F))$, quadratic in M and linear in $P+F$ (because each sub-matrix is Toeplitz). The computational cost of fitting $\hat{\Sigma}$ is approximately $O(M^2(P+F)T)$, where T is the number of observations in the dataset, so quadratic in M, linear in $P+F$, and linear in the size of the dataset. The cost of inference, in the worst case, is $O(M^3(P+F)^3)$, the matrix inverse computation, so it is cubic in M and $(P+F)$. We can however cache the matrix $\hat{\Sigma}_{\mathcal{U},\mathcal{O}}(\hat{\Sigma}_{\mathcal{O},\mathcal{O}} + \lambda I)^{-1}$ and re-use it if we need to predict with the same pattern of observed and unobserved data. In that case, the cost of re-use would only be quadratic in M and $P+F$, as would be the cost of storing the matrix.

3.1 Low-rank plus block diagonal kernel

We now develop an approximation of the estimated Gaussian kernel $\hat{\Sigma}$ defined in (6) that gives a great computational speedup, so that the computation cost of inference is linear, rather than cubic, in M. The main idea is to obtain a small number $R \geq 0$ of *principal directions* $v_1, \ldots, v_R \in \mathbf{R}^M$, with $R < M$, that explain most of the changes in $\tilde{r}_t$, model the auto-regression along such directions, and neglect the other joint variations of the residual series. We retain however the (scalar) auto-regressive model of each of the M components of $\tilde{r}_t$. So, R is the second hyper-parameter of the Gaussian process, and has range $R \in \{0, \ldots, M\}$.

Principal directions. We consider the eigendecomposition of the matrix of approximate correlation coefficients of the variables in the normalized residual, defined in (7)

$$\begin{pmatrix} c_0^{(1,1)} & \cdots & c_0^{(1,M)} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ c_0^{(M,1)} & \cdots & c_0^{(M,M)} \end{pmatrix} = \sum_{k=1}^{M} \lambda_k v_k v_k^T,$$

where $\lambda_k \in \mathbf{R}$ and $v_k \in \mathbf{R}^M$ for $k = 1, \ldots, M$. We choose as principal directions the eigenvectors v_k associated with the R largest eigenvalues.

Fit. We now describe how to fit the low-rank plus block diagonal kernel, starting from an approximate kernel $\hat{\Sigma}$ fitted as explained in (6). The kernel has the form

$$\hat{\Sigma}^{\text{lr+bd}} = V^T \hat{\Sigma}^{\text{lr}} V + D, \quad D = \begin{pmatrix} \bar{C}_1 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & \cdots & \bar{C}_M \end{pmatrix}, \tag{9}$$

where $V \in \mathbf{R}^{R(P+F)\times M(P+F)}$, $\hat{\Sigma}^{\text{lr}} \in \mathbf{S}^{R(P+F)}$, and each $\bar{C}_i \in \mathbf{S}^{(P+F)}$, for $i = 1, \ldots, M$. The sparse matrix V is defined as

$$V = \begin{pmatrix} v_{1,1} & \cdots & 0 & \cdots & v_{1,M} & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \cdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & \cdots & v_{1,1} & \cdots & 0 & \cdots & v_{1,M} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ v_{R,1} & \cdots & 0 & \cdots & v_{R,M} & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \cdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & \cdots & v_{R,1} & \cdots & 0 & \cdots & v_{R,M} \end{pmatrix},$$

that is, it projects the normalized residual, concatenated in time according to (5), along the R principal directions, concatenated in time in the same way. Then, the low-rank approximation of the kernel $\hat{\Sigma}^{\text{lr}}$ is given by

$$\hat{\Sigma}^{\text{lr}} = V \hat{\Sigma} V^T.$$

Finally, the block diagonal elements $\bar{C}_i$, for $i = 1, \ldots, M$, are chosen so that the block diagonal components of $\hat{\Sigma}$ and $\hat{\Sigma}^{\text{lr+bd}}$ are equal. That is,

$$(\bar{C}_m)_{i,j} = (\hat{\Sigma} - V^T \hat{\Sigma}^{\text{lr}} V)_{i+(m-1)(P+F),j+(m-1)(P+F)}$$

for all $i = 1, \ldots, (P+F)$, $j = 1, \ldots, (P+F)$, and $m = 1, \ldots, M$. We note that both the $\hat{\Sigma}^{\text{lr}}$ matrix and all the $\bar{C}_m$ matrices are Toeplitz. Clearly, the low-rank plus block diagonal kernel so constructed is symmetric, but is not guaranteed to be positive definite. Again we rely on Tikhonov regularization during inference to correct any non-positive definiteness.

Infer. To infer missing values of the normalized residual we again solve equation (8), where $\hat{\Sigma}$ is replaced by $\hat{\Sigma}^{\text{lr+bd}}$. We note here an efficient way to obtain the inverse matrix

$$(\hat{\Sigma}^{\text{lr+bd}}_{\mathcal{O},\mathcal{O}} + \lambda I)^{-1}.$$

We apply the well-known Woodbury formula, where $A = D_{\mathcal{O},\mathcal{O}} + \lambda I$ is the initial matrix and $V^T_{\mathcal{O},\mathcal{O}} \hat{\Sigma}^{\text{lr}} V_{\mathcal{O},\mathcal{O}}$ is the low-rank correction. The inverse is given by

$$(V^T_{\mathcal{O},\mathcal{O}} \hat{\Sigma}^{\text{lr}} V_{\mathcal{O},\mathcal{O}} + A)^{-1} = A^{-1} - A^{-1} V^T_{\mathcal{O},\mathcal{O}} \Big((\hat{\Sigma}^{\text{lr}})^{-1} + V_{\mathcal{O},\mathcal{O}} A^{-1} V^T_{\mathcal{O},\mathcal{O}} \Big)^{-1} V_{\mathcal{O},\mathcal{O}} A^{-1}.$$

We discuss below how this computational procedure helps to reduce the cost of inference.

Memory and computational cost. Using the low-rank plus block diagonal approximate kernel allows to reduce both the memory usage and the computational cost of inference from the model. The memory required to store $\hat{\Sigma}^{\text{lr+bd}}$ is $O(MR)$ for V, $O(K^2(P+F))$ for $\hat{\Sigma}^{lr}$, and $O(M(P+F))$ for D, so it is linear in M, quadratic in R, and linear in $P+F$. The computational cost of fitting the low-rank plus block diagonal does not change significantly from the cost of fitting $\hat{\Sigma}$, which is still the costlier part. The cost of inference, again in the worst case, is $O((P+F)^3M)$ to compute A^{-1}, $O((P+F)^3R^3)$ to compute the other inverses, and of lower order for all the matrix multiplications, since also $\hat{\Sigma}^{\text{lr+bd}}_{\mathcal{U},\mathcal{O}}$ is low-rank plus sparse. So, the computational cost of inference is linear in M and cubic in R and $P+F$, a great advantage with respect to the original kernel. Again, in practice, caching can dramatically reduce the execution time.

4 Greedy grid search

We now explain the simple algorithm we use to select values of the hyper-parameters in the various components of our model. The algorithm consists in fitting the model on some train data and measuring the model performance on some test data for different choices of the hyper-parameters, starting from the first ones in their provided ranges, ordered by increasing complexity, and trying iteratively the next ones. The algorithm stops when it finds a local optimum of the evaluated performance of the model on the test data, up to a user-defined *search width* of possible changes in the hyper-parameter choices.

Fit and evaluate. Consider a model with $H > 0$ hyper-parameters, which we call $h = (h_1, \dots, h_H)$. Each has a range of possible values, $h_1 \in \mathcal{H}_1 = \{h_1^{(1)}, \dots, h_1^{(V_1)}\}$, $\dots$, $h_H \in \mathcal{H}_H = \{h_H^{(1)}, \dots, h_H^{(V_H)}\}$, so $h \in \mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_1 \times \cdots \times \mathcal{H}_H$. A fit procedure, for given train data, is a mapping

$$\mathcal{F} : \mathcal{H} \to \mathcal{M}$$

to a certain, typically very large dimensional, *model space* $\mathcal{M}$. The procedure to evaluate a model, for given test data, is a function

$$\mathcal{E} : \mathcal{M} \to \mathbf{R}$$

from the model space to the real numbers, so that the lowest the value, the more accurate the model on the given test data. In this section we look at ways to approximately minimize the function

$$(\mathcal{E} \circ \mathcal{F}) : \mathcal{H} \to \mathbf{R},$$

i.e., to find the combination of hyper-parameter values so that the model fitted with that choice is the approximate minimizer of the model evalution function.




Figure 1: The heatmap plot of an example low-rank plus block diagonal kernel. The data used to estimate it involve a few hundred measured and forecasted quantities related to a portfolio management problem. The brigher the color, the stronger the correlation between a pair of variables. The diagonal blocks modeling the auto-correlation of each separate variable are clearly visible. All estimation and inference procedures with this kernel take, respectively, a few seconds and about one, on a consumer laptop.

Hyper-parameters. We rely on three basic features of the hyper-parameters. First, for each one we need a discrete range of possible values. Second, the spacing among such values must be such that choosing the next or previous value changes the model complexity by approximately the same amount. (Here we do not define "model complexity" formally. In information theory it would be, roughly speaking, the bit size of an efficiently compressed representation of the model.) Last, the ranges are ordered by increasing complexity of the resulting model, so the first values give rise to the simpler models. Typically, simpler models are either more regularized, so some regularization hyper-parameter has a higher value, or more parsimonious, *i.e.*, have fewer parameters to fit.

Iterative search. So, given a sequence of $H > 0$ hyper-parameters $h = (h_1, \ldots, h_H)$ and for each one a range of possible values, $h_1 \in \{h_1^{(1)}, \ldots, h_1^{(V_1)}\}$, $\ldots$, $h_H \in \{h_H^{(1)}, \ldots, h_H^{(V_H)}\}$, a search width $W \geq 1$, and a hyper-parameter evaluation function $(\mathcal{E} \circ \mathcal{F}) : \mathcal{H} \to \mathbf{R}$, the greedy grid search algorithm is as follows.

- We define a cursor vector $(c_1, \ldots, c_H)$ where $c_i \in \{1, \ldots, V_i\}$ for every $i = 1, \ldots, H$, and initially $(c_1, \ldots, c_H) = (1, \ldots, 1)$.
- We repeat until convergence:
    1. For any combination of cursor values c' such that $\|c - c'\|_1 \leq W$, we compute $\xi(c') = (\mathcal{E} \circ \mathcal{F})(h_1^{(c'_1)}, \ldots, h_H^{(c'_H)})$ For example, if $W = 1$, we vary each c_i by summing or subtracting 1, unless we are at the boundary of a range, in which case we only subtract or add. If $W = 2$, we sum and subtract 2 to each variable, and also sum and/or subtract 1 to any pair of variables, and so on.
    2. Let $c^\star$ be the cursor value such that $\xi(c^\star)$ is smaller than all other $\xi(c')$ tried. If it is not unique, we pick the one such that $\|c^\star\|_1$ is smaller than all $\|c'\|_1$, and if still not unique, we pick the one that is alphanumerically smaller. It $c^\star = c$ we exit, and return the hyper-parameters $h_1 = h_1^{c_1}$, $\ldots$, $h_H = h_H^{c_H}$. Otherwise, we set the new value of c to the value of $c^\star$.

A simple caching mechanism allows the algorithm just described to not re-evaluate the same set of hyper-parameters twice. The returned sequence of hyperparameters gives the lowest model evaluation on the test set among all its neighbors, up to an ℓ_1 distance of W.

Re-fit. After having chosen the hyper-parameters $h^\star$ with the procedure just described, with the provided data divided into train and test sets, we re-fit the model on the whole dataset.

Computational cost. The algorithm described has only one parameter, the search width W, which can be provided by the user. By default it has value $W = 1$. The larger the search width, the more combinations of hyper-parameters will be tried, and eventually (for large enough W) the whole grid will be tested, so the algorithm becomes a full grid search.

This has a cost exponential in H. If instead the user chooses a small value of W the computational cost may be dramatically lower. In fact, the cost of each iteration of the algorithm is approximately $O(H^W)$. The number of iterations is random, but is likely to not depend significantly on H, and instead on the spacing of the hyper-parameter ranges. So, we may think of this algorithm as a way to turn a search exponential in H into one that is linear (if $W = 1$), quadratic (if $W = 2$), and so on. The returned choice of hyper-parameters is not guaranteed to be the same that would be returned by the full grid search, but is likely to err on the side of caution, *i.e.*, to be more regularized and/or parsimonious (since we start the search from the most conservative point).

Example: seasonal baseline. As an example, the procedure just described can be used (as is in our software package) to choose the values of the hyper-parameters K^{trend}, K^{day}, K^{week}, K^{year}, whose ranges are given in §2. The initial values are $K^{\text{trend}} = K^{\text{day}} = K^{\text{week}} = K^{\text{year}} = 0$, corresponding to a constant baseline $b_t = \beta_0$. Then we iteratively increase the number of harmonics for each periodicity, daily, weekly, and annual, and either turn on or turn off the trend term. We return the combination whose evaluated loss on the test set is lowest. We note that this simple strategy can be superior to human tuning in many practical cases. For example, one might not expect the power production of a wind turbine to have any weekly seasonality, and hence might be tempted to hard-code $K^{\text{week}} = 0$, but maybe maintenance of the turbine is typically done on Sundays (because power is less expensive), and so, statistically, the turbine produces less power on that day. The greedy search would presumably notice that, set some $K^{\text{week}} > 0$, and thus capture this effect in the baseline model, at a very low computational cost.

5 Software library

The software implementation of the algorithm is available online at

`https://github.com/enzobusseti/tsar`.

It is written in Python and depends on the standard scientific libraries `numpy`, `scipy`, `pandas`, and `numba`, which is used to compile certain operations in machine code, to speed them up.

Fit. The fit procedure of the model is performed by the model constructor function. In the simplest case, the syntax is as follows

```
from tsar import tsar
model = tsar(data=data, past=P, future=F)
```

where `data` is a dataframe indexed by a datetime column, with M columns of floating point numbers, or missing values, and `P` and `F` are integers, for the P and F constants. The model constructor divides the data into train and test datasets, performs greedy grid searches for all of the baseline models, and for the residual Gaussian process, and then refits the model

on the whole data with the hyper-parameter values obtained. The resulting `model` object can be efficiently serialized.

Infer. Once a model has been fitted, inference is performed as follows

```
prediction = model.predict(data=new_data, prediction_time=t)
```

where `new_data` is a dataframe indexed by a datetime column and with the same columns as the dataframe `data`, and `t` is a datetime variable describing time t. The returned `prediction` dataframe has a datetime index with datetime values described by $t - P + 1, \ldots, t + F$, the same columns as the dataframe `data`, and no missing values: All the values that were already present in `new_data` are copied over and the others are filled in with the procedure of equation (8), plus the computed baseline value.

Hyper-parameters. For any hyper-parameter explained above the user can provide a value to the constructor function, or none. In that case the hyper-parameter is flagged for greedy grid search optimization, and finally set to the result of the search. That is what happens with the syntax we showed above. So the user can specify, or leave unexpressed, any number of hyper-parameters. For example, the user can set $K^{\text{trend}} = 0$ for certain components, but let the greedy grid search find the values of K^{day}, and so on. If no hyper-parameter is left unexpressed no greedy grid search is performed, and the model is trained only once, without splitting the data into train and test sets.

Acknowledgments

The author thanks Stephen Boyd, Emmanuel Candes, Trevor Hastie, Michael Kochenderfer, Nicholas Moehle, Robert Tibshirani, and his other former colleagues, for interesting discussions.

References

[BB19] E. Busseti and S. Boyd. A non-parametric multi-period model for time-stamped data. *To appear*, 2019.

[MBBW19] N. Moehle, E. Busseti, S. Boyd, and M. Wytock. *Large Scale Optimization in Supply Chains and Smart Manufacturing*, chapter Dynamic energy management. Springer, 2019.