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Abstract. Learning to predict ahead of time events in open time series is challenging. While Early Classification of Time Series (ECTS) tackles the problem of balancing online the accuracy of the prediction with the cost of delaying the decision when the individuals are time series of finite length with a unique label for the whole time series. Surprisingly, this trade-off has never been investigated for open time series with undetermined length and with different classes for each subsequence of the same time series. In this paper, we propose a principled method to adapt any technique for ECTS to the Early Classification in Open Time Series (ECOTS). We show how the classifiers must be constructed and what the decision triggering system becomes in this new scenario. We address the challenge of decision making in the predictive maintenance field. We illustrate our methodology by transforming two state-of-the-art ECTS algorithms for the ECOTS scenario and report numerical experiments on a real dataset for predictive maintenance that demonstrate the practicality of the novel approach.
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1 Introduction

In intensive care units [13], in control rooms of electrical power grids [3], in government councils assessing emergency situations, in many kinds of contexts therefore, it is essential to make timely decisions in absence of complete knowledge of the true outcome. The issue facing the decision-makers is that, usually, the longer the decision is delayed, the clearer is the likely outcome (e.g. whether the patient is critical or not) but, also, the higher the cost that will be incurred if only because earlier decisions allow one to be better prepared. Formally, this problem translates into optimizing online the trade-off between the earliness and the accuracy of the decision. Early Classification of Time Series (ECTS) deals with time series of finite length, and a single decision per time series. This paper proposes a principled way to adapt the ECTS approaches to deal with the early classification in open time series (i.e. with no time bounds).

Our contribution opens the path to a wealth of new applications. Ones for which online decisions have to be made about upcoming events, optimizing both
In particular, in the experimental part, we address in a novel way the challenge of decision making in the field of predictive maintenance, raised in a recent survey [15]. As another example, an autonomous car must interpret online the scene in front of it. It cannot brake every time there is a slight indication of an obstacle, but neither can it afford to wait too long and break too late in order to avoid what increasingly appears as a reckless pedestrian ahead.

In the classical setting, the Early Classification of Time Series (ECTS) problem assumes that measurements, possibly multivariate, become available over time in a time series which, at time $t$, is $x_t = \langle x_1, \ldots, x_t \rangle \in \mathcal{X}^t$ where $x_t$ is the current measurement and each $x_i(1 \leq i \leq t)$ belongs to some input domain $\mathcal{X}$ (e.g. the temperature and the blood pressure of a patient at time step $i$). It is further supposed that each time series can be ascribed to a class $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ (e.g. patient who needs a surgical operation or not). The task is to predict the class of an incoming time series by optimizing the trade-off between the expected accuracy of the prediction and the increasing cost of delaying the decision.

What makes the problem possible to tackle is the availability of a training set $\mathcal{S} = \{(x_i^T, y_i)\}_{1 \leq i \leq m}$ of complete time series, with their associated labels. For each time step $t$, $t \in \{1, \ldots, T\}$, using $\mathcal{S}$, a classifier $h_t$ can be learned $h_t : \mathcal{X}^t \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$, with $\mathcal{X}^t$ being the space of truncated time series at time step $t$.

Moreover, for each of these classifiers $h_t$, it is possible to estimate its expected accuracy on time series $x_t$ using a test set. Two different approaches can then be used. In the myopic one, at each successive time step $t$, the accuracy (or confidence) of the current classifier $h_t$ on its prediction can be assessed and it is possible to decide whether the time seems right to make a prediction. In a non-myopic approach, given the current incoming time series $x_t$, the expected accuracy of all future classifiers $h_\tau$ ($t \leq \tau \leq T$) given the current input can be computed and the best decision time be estimated taking into account the delay cost. Only if $t$ coincides with this best instant, the prediction is performed.

Overall, the ECTS problem can be seen as involving two components: (i) the set of classifiers $h_t$ ($1 \leq t \leq T$) and (ii) a trigger system which decides whether to make the prediction at the current time $t$ or to wait for at least one more measurement $x_{t+1}$ (see Figure 1). In a non-myopic approach, the trigger system may even predict what will be the best time in the future to make the classification of the incoming time series.

While the ECTS framework is well suited to many real world problems, it is limited by the fact that (i) the time series all have a finite length and (ii) it is assumed that there is a single class associated with each of them. Applications abound where the measurements come in an open time series with no time bounds and where different events arise, possibly of different lengths, each with its own class (see Figure 2). In this setting, the Early Classification of these events

---

3 This can be seen as an instance of the LUPI (Learning Under Privileged Information) framework ([14]): during the learning phase, the learner has access to the full knowledge about the training time series $\mathcal{S} = \{(x_i^T, y_i)\}_{1 \leq i \leq m}$, while at testing time, only a subsequence $x_t$ ($t < T$) is known.
in an Open Time Series (ECOTS) raises three issues if one wants to adapt the ECTS approach. First, what should be the form of the classifiers that, in the ECTS framework, take incomplete time series $x_t$ as input to make a prediction about the class of the associated complete, but still unknown, time series $x_T$ now that the notion of completeness or incompleteness of time series makes no sense? Second, how to solve online the accuracy-earliness trade-off in the new setting and how to adapt the strategy of the trigger system which now seeks to predict as early as possible the class of an incoming event (or time chunk) in the open time series? And, third, how training sets should be constructed in the ECOTS setting where open time series labeled by experts are available?

The goal of this paper is, first, to define properly the ECOTS problem and, second, to present a methodology to adapt any ECTS approach to this problem by answering the three questions raised above. As a result, we show how the classifiers must be constructed and how the earliness-accuracy trade-off translates to the new scenario and what the decision triggering system becomes. We illustrate our methodology by transforming two state-of-the-art ECTS algorithms for the ECOTS scenario and we demonstrate the practicality of the novel approach by applying it to a real world scenario which is predictive maintenance.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we formally draw a parallel between the ECTS problem and the ECOTS one. We then review the main approaches to ECTS, and outline two competitive methods: one described in
and the other, the ECONOMY method presented in [1]. We then show, in Section 4, how to adapt these methods to the ECOTS problem, before comparing their performances on experiments in Section 5. The conclusion, in Section 6, underlines what has been performed in this work, and provides directions for future research.

2 ECOTS in the perspective of ECTS

This section defines the problem of ECTS and ECOTS, and presents our proposed methodology to adapt any ECTS approach to solve the ECOTS problem.

2.1 The ECTS problem

In the ECTS setting, each classifier $h_t$ ($1 \leq t \leq T$) is learned from the truncated training time series up to time $t$: $\{(x_j, y_j)\}_{1 \leq j \leq m}$ (see Figure 3). It is expected that the accuracy of the classifiers grows as $t$ increases from the first time step $t = 1$ to the last one $t = T$.

![Fig. 3: In the ECTS setting, the classifier $h_t$ sees the incoming time series $x_t$ and predicts a label $\hat{y}$ of the time series of true class $y$.](image)

The problem, given an incoming time series, is to choose a time $t$ for which the expected cost of misclassification $C_m(\hat{y}|y)$, where $\hat{y} = h_t(x_t)$ and $y$ is the true class, plus the delay cost $C_d(t)$, is minimal. Formally, the combined expected cost is given by:

$$f(x_t) = \mathbb{E}_t^{(\hat{y}, y) \in \mathbb{Y}^2} [C_m(\hat{y}|y)|x_t] + C_d(t)$$

$$= \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Y}} P_t(y|x_t) \sum_{\hat{y} \in \mathbb{Y}} P_t(\hat{y}|y, x_t) C_m(\hat{y}|y) + C_d(t)$$

(1)

where $\mathbb{E}_t^{(\hat{y}, y) \in \mathbb{Y}^2} []$ is the expectancy at time $t$, over the variables $y$ and $\hat{y}$. $P_t(y|x_t)$ is the probability of the class $y$ given an incomplete time series $x_t$, and $P_t(\hat{y}|y, x_t)$ is the probability that the classifier $h_t$ makes the prediction $\hat{y}$ given $x_t$ as input while $y$ would be its true label.

The objective of the trigger function is to identify the best time $t^*$ for triggering the decision while receiving online the measurements of the time series, the one that minimizes Equation 1. Section 3 provides a state of the art of the existing approaches to solve this problem, from very heuristic ones to more formally grounded.
2.2 The ECOTS problem

In the ECOTS scenario, we suppose that we have a training data set of \(m\) open time series \(\{x^j, y^j\}_{1 \leq j \leq m}\), where \(x^j\) has length \(l_{x^j}\), and where \(y^j = \langle y^j_1, \ldots, y^j_{l_{x^j}} \rangle\) is the corresponding sequence of \(l_{x^j}\) labels, one for each time step. In this paper, contiguous labels \(y^j_t\) of the same class are called chunks or events (see Figure 2). The task is to predict, if possible, or to detect, if not, these events. The assumption is that, in favorable cases, events can be preceded by premises that allow one to anticipate them. When such premises do not exist or are not detected, then it is hoped that classifiers can detect events of which measurements are part of the observation window. In both cases, the sooner these telltale signs are detected and interpreted in order to make a prediction, the better.

2.3 Proposed transposition of ECTS approaches into ECOTS ones

In this section, we propose a methodology to adapt ECTS approaches in order to address the ECOTS problem. It enables the triggering of a decision to predict the class associated with each incoming time stamp of the open time series at a moment that optimizes the accuracy-earliness trade-off.

Let us first introduce some notations. A target \(t_p\) is a fixed time stamp that the triggering system, at time \(t\), is looking at in order to decide whether this is the best time for the prediction of the class label associated with \(t_p\) or to postpone this decision to the next time step \(t+1\) which will bring new measurements. The horizon \(\eta \in \mathbb{Z}\) is an integer representing a time lag \(t_p - t\). We define premises as any pattern available in the sliding window \(x(t-w, t)\) which provides useful information for predicting the class \(y_{t_p}\) of a target \(t_p\) in the future (\(\eta > 0\)). For example, the water pressure in the pipes of an underfloor heating system decreases before the heating system fails or shuts down.

We now turn to the three questions raised in the introduction.

1- In the classical ECTS problem (see Section 2.1 and Figure 3), each classifier \(h_t\) observes a time series \(x_t\) that is increasingly large as \(t\) approaches the time limit \(T\). In the ECOTS setting, by contrast, each classifier \(h_{\eta}\) observes a sliding window of the same number \(w\) of observations \(x_{(t-w, t)}\). And each one makes a prediction about the class of a time at \(\eta\) (positive or negative) time steps of \(t\) (see Figure 4). Given a maximal horizon \(\eta_M > 0\), the first classifier that can make a prediction about a time \(t_p\) is \(h_{\eta_M}\) viewing the window \(x_{(t_p-w, t_p)}\). And the last classifier is \(h_{\eta_m}\) viewing the window \(x_{(t_p-w, t_p)}\).

Thus, instead of having a set of classifiers \(h_t\) (\(1 \leq t \leq T\)) as in the ECTS setting, we now have a set of classifiers \(h_{\eta}\) (\(\eta_m \leq \eta \leq \eta_M\)). This answers the first question about how to “translate” the classifiers in the ECTS setting, into classifiers for the ECOTS problem.

2- The second question to solve is to adapt the earliness-accuracy trade-off to the ECOTS problem. On one hand, it is expected that the accuracy of the predictions of the classifiers \(\{h_{\eta}\}_{\eta_m \leq \eta \leq \eta_M}\) increases as \(\eta\) goes from \(\eta_M\) (maximum horizon)
Fig. 4: The point in time where to make a prediction is $t_p$, of true label $y_{t_p}$. As the measurements become available from $t_p - \eta_M$ to $t_p - \eta_m$, different classifiers $h_\eta$ come into play with an advancing sliding window and a diminishing horizon. The triggering system selects the best time to make a prediction $\hat{y}_{t_p}$.

3- In this new setting, the values of the window size $w$, and of the bounds $\eta_m$ and $\eta_M$ have to be chosen from a training set. But which training set?

Here, it is important to emphasize that there is a strong distinction between open time series and data streams. In the latter, all kinds of shifts can occur, including concept shifts. For instance, the tastes or the expectations of the consumers may change over time. Not so in open time series where the concepts, i.e. the relationship between recently observed measurements and the events to be predicted, are assumed to stay the same over time (e.g. a given malfunction of a machine keeps the same telltale signs and the same characteristics whenever its appearance).

From this property, it is possible to use subsequences of the open time series, as long as they are independent, in order to build training datasets and train the classifiers $h_\eta$ (see Section 5.1).
3 Related work on trigger systems

While most of the proposed ECTS approaches rely on learning classifiers for different time steps in the time series, they differ in the way they trigger the decision to make a prediction.

The earliest works on ECTS were heuristics in nature. They did not try to explicitly optimize the cost defined in equation (1) but instead relied on the concept of an estimated confidence in the current prediction. If this estimate was above a threshold, then the decision was triggered. For instance, [10] describes a method where the accuracy of a set of probabilistic classifiers is monitored over time, which allows the identification of time steps from whence it seems safe to make predictions. In [12,8,6], various stopping rules are defined, some on them relying on a confidence level threshold. And in [16], the best time step to trigger the decision is estimated by determining the earliest time step for which the predicted label does not change, based on a 1-NN classifier.

More recently, approaches have been proposed that attempt to explicitly optimize the trade-off between the earliness and the accuracy. A notable example is [9] where a single objective optimization criterion is defined. In [11], the authors put forward the idea of a multi-objective criterion with an associated Pareto front with multiple dominating trade-offs. However, whereas these methods are myopic in nature, the ECONomy approach described in [1,4] goes one step further by (i) directly optimizing the combined cost defined in equation 1 and (ii) giving a way to estimate the combined cost for future time steps, thus leading to a non-myopic approach that outperforms the best methods known to date.

For a complete and recent survey the interested reader can refer to [7].

4 Application to state-of-the art ECTS approaches

In Section 2.3, we have shown how to translate an ECTS problem into an ECOTS one by modifying the definition and purpose of the classifiers. In the following, we demonstrate how the triggering strategy used in ECTS can be adapted to deal with ECOTS. For this, we consider one of the best performing myopic strategies known to date, described in [9] and the best non-myopic approach in the literature: the ECONomy-γ strategy described in [1]. The first one relies ultimately on confidence criteria, while the second one explicitly optimizes the accuracy versus delay cost trade-off.

4.1 The SR approach

The SR approach [9] uses a trigger-model which involves 3 parameters ($\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_3$) in order to decide if the current prediction is reliable (output 1) or if it is preferable to wait for more data (output 0):

\[
Trigger^\gamma (h_\eta(x_t)) = \begin{cases} 
0 & \text{if } \gamma_1 p_1 + \gamma_2 p_2 + \gamma_3 t \leq 0 \\
1 & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases}
\]  

(2)
where \( p_1 \) is the largest posterior probability estimated by the classifier \( h_\eta \), \( p_2 \) is the difference between the two largest posterior probabilities, and the last term \( \frac{1}{T} \) represents the proportion of the incoming time series that is visible at time \( t \). The parameters \( \gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_3 \) are real values in \([-1, 1]\) to be optimized using training data.

In the ECOTS problem, the trigger function for a target at horizon \( \eta = t_p - t \) becomes:

\[
\text{Trigger}^\gamma(h_\eta(x_{t-w,t})) = \begin{cases} 
0 & \text{if } \gamma_1 p_1 + \gamma_2 p_2 + \gamma_3 \frac{\eta M - \eta}{\eta M - \eta_m} \leq 0 \\
1 & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases}
\]

The last term of Equation (2) is replaced by \( \frac{\eta M - \eta}{\eta M - \eta_m} \), which represents the relative position of the current horizon \( \eta \) in the considered range of horizons \([\eta_m, \eta_M]\).

### 4.2 The ECONOMY-\( \gamma \) approach

ECONOMY-\( \gamma \) is a non-myopic cost-based approach [2], which is capable of estimating the expected cost of making a prediction for any time \( t+\tau \) \((1 \leq \tau \leq T-t)\) in the future, defined as:

\[
f_\tau(x_t) = \mathbb{E}_{(\hat{y}, y) \in Y^2} \left[ C_m(\hat{y}|y)|x_t] + C_d(t + \tau) \right] \\
= \sum_{y \in Y} P_{t+\tau}(\hat{y}|y) \sum_{\hat{y} \in Y} P_{t+\tau}(\hat{y}|x_t, y) C_m(\hat{y}|y) + C_d(t + \tau) \tag{3}
\]

In practice, the terms \( P_{t+\tau}(\hat{y}|y, x_t) \) and \( P_{t+\tau}(y|x_t) \) are not tractable. A partitioning of the training data into \( K \) groups is required to make them computable, yielding the following approximation:

\[
f_\tau(x_t) \approx \sum_{g_k \in G} \sum_{y \in Y} P_{t+\tau}(g_k|x_t) \sum_{\hat{y} \in Y} P_{t+\tau}(\hat{y}|g_k) \sum_{\hat{y} \in Y} P_{t+\tau}(\hat{y}|y, g_k) C_m(\hat{y}|y) + C_d(t + \tau)
\]

The optimal decision time, at time \( t \), is thus estimated to be:

\[
\tau^* = \operatorname{ArgMin}_{\tau \in \{0, \ldots, T-t\}} f_\tau(x_t) \tag{4}
\]

The idea is to estimate the cost of a decision for all future time steps, up until \( t = T \), based on the current knowledge about the incoming time series \( x_t \). The decision is postponed unless \( \tau^* = 0 \), that is when it is expected that there will be no better trade-off in the future. If so, the prediction \( h_t(x_t) \) is returned and the classification process is terminated. Otherwise, the decision is postponed to the next time step, and Eq. (4) is computed again, this time with \( x_{t+1} \) as input. The process goes on until a decision is made or \( t = T \) at which point a prediction is forced.

In ECOTS, as time \( t \) increases, the task is to label each time step \( t_p \) as it appears in the span of the horizon: \([t + \eta_m, t + \eta_M]\) (see Figure 4). While in
Equation (3), the term $E^{t+\tau}_{(\hat{y},y)\in\mathcal{Y}^2} [C_m(\hat{y}|y)]$ involves the calculation of the confusion matrices for future time steps $t + \tau$ knowing the current incoming time series $x_t$, the adaptation to ECOTS requires that the confusion matrices are now computed for the various horizons from $\eta_m$ to $\eta_M$ and then used to estimate the cost of decision for each horizon $\eta$:

$$f_\eta(x_{(t-w,t)}) = E^\eta_{(\hat{y},y)\in\mathcal{Y}^2} [C_m(\hat{y}|y)|x_{(t-w,t)}] + C_d(\eta)$$

and the best horizon:

$$\eta^* = \text{ArgMin}_{\eta_m \leq \eta \leq \eta_M} f_\eta(x_{(t-w,t)})$$

The decision to classify the data point $t_p$ is triggered at time $t$ either because $t + \eta^* = t_p$ (i.e. corresponding to the optimal cost) or when $t_p = t + \eta_m$ (i.e. it is not possible to wait any longer).

The cost of delay $C_d(t)$, which is an increasing function of $t$ in ECTS is a decreasing function $C_d(\eta)$ of the horizon $\eta$ in ECOTS. Indeed, as the target that we want to label approaches ($\eta$ decreasing), the cost of the decision increases.

Note that the time and space complexities of the ECONOMY-$\gamma$ approach adapted to ECOTS are the same than in the original approach.

5 Experiments

We have proposed a principled method to adapt any ECTS approach into an ECOTS one (see Sections 2 and 4). The aim of the experiments is to validate that the adaptation of the SR and ECONOMY-$\gamma$ approaches is efficient in the ECOTS setting. In addition, we illustrate the applicability of the proposed approaches on a real data from the industrial domain to solve the problem of predictive maintenance.

This section aims at answering the following questions:

1. How efficient is the proposed framework for adapting any ECTS approach to the ECOTS problem compared to baseline algorithms designed for the ECOTS problem?
2. How do these approaches behave when the delay cost increases, and when the misclassification cost becomes very imbalanced?
3. How these approaches adapt their decision time to the observed data?

Our source code is shared for full reproducibility of the experiments in the supplementary material. This also allows interested researchers to extend the experiments to other open time series datasets.

5.1 Experimental protocol

Data description: We use an open real dataset [5] from one of the Schwan’s factories. It contains 100 multivariate time series corresponding to 100 machines
monitored over time for a period of 1 year (January 2015 to January 2016) with measurements collected every hour. Each time series is a multi-dimensional data table whose rows indicate the temporal domain and columns include telemetry features (pressure, rotation, voltage and vibration), 5 Boolean columns encoding different types of device errors which are premises correlated with a future failure and a last column which indicates the presence or absence of a failure (the variable to be predicted). This makes 8761 rows and 10 columns for each machine. The whole dataset contains 3919 errors and 761 failures for a total number 876,100 of timestamps. This dataset is extremely imbalanced with 0.08% of timestamps associated with the abnormal class (i.e. failure). There is on average 7 failures per time series, with a minimum of 0 and a maximum of 19 failures per machine during the observed year.

**Problem statement:** Traditionally, the problem of predictive maintenance is solved by fixing a horizon for predictions (e.g. if a technician needs at least 12 hours to take preventive actions before the machine fails actually, then a fixed horizon would be chosen as \( \eta = 12 \) hours). Our goal is to use the ECOTS approaches to make this horizon adaptive to the observable part of the time series at hand.

**Evaluation criterion:** Ultimately, the value of using an early classification method is defined by the average cost incurred using it, as in [1]. Given an open time series \( S \) (e.g. a machine monitored over a year), observed on a finite time interval of sufficient length \( N \). This time period is composed of time stamps \( t \in [1,N] \), labeled by the class \( y_t \). As time increases from 1 to \( N \), the ECOTS system makes predictions for each time step \( t: \hat{y}_t \) while the true class is \( y_t \). In addition, for each \( t \in [1,N] \), the prediction is made using a classifier \( h_{\eta^*} \) corresponding to the triggering horizon \( \eta^* \), thus incurring a delay cost \( C_d(\eta^*) \). Hence, the formula:

\[
\text{AvgCost}(S) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{t=1}^{N} \left( C_m(\hat{y}_t|y_t) + C_d(\eta^*) \right)
\]  

(5)

The average cost over a dataset \( D \) is defined as:

\[
\text{AvgCost}(D) = \frac{1}{|D|} \sum_{S \in D} \text{AvgCost}(S)
\]  

(6)

**The costs in the experiments:** In real applications, the decision costs would be provided by domain experts. In order to study the behavior of the different ECOTS algorithms, a large range of values has been considered for the misclassification and the delay costs.

*The cost of misclassification:* Since we deal with a predictive maintenance problem, we make the assumption that the cost of missing a failure is much higher
than the cost of sending the technical team. We thus consider four different misclassification costs $C_m = \begin{bmatrix} TN & FN \\ FP & TP \end{bmatrix}$, by varying the importance of false negatives such that:

$C_m^{(1)} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, C_m^{(2)} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 10 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, C_m^{(3)} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 100 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, C_m^{(4)} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1000 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$.

The cost of delaying decision: The delay cost $C_d(t)$ is provided by the domain experts for an actual use case, and could be of any form. In our experiments, we set it as a linear function of horizon, with coefficient, or slope, $\alpha$: $C_d(\eta) = \alpha \times \frac{\eta_M - \eta}{\eta_M - \eta_m}$. The larger $\alpha$, the higher the cost of postponing the decision and thus reducing the prediction horizon $\eta$. When $\alpha$ is very high, the gain in misclassification cost by waiting to be closer to the target cannot compensate for the increase of the delay cost, and it is better to make a decision early on, that is for large horizons, close to $\eta_M$. If, on the contrary, $\alpha$ is very low compared to the misclassification cost, it does not hurt to wait until the target $t_p$ is close to the sliding window $x_{(t_p-\eta-w,t_p-\eta)}$. Our experiments were run over a large range of values of $\alpha \in [10^{-0.04}, 10^{-0.03}, 10^{-0.02}, 1, 10, 100, 1000]$.

Training the collection of classifiers and ECOTS algorithms

Data split and extraction: We splitted the set of time series into four parts: 50% for training classifiers, 20% for testing ECOTS algorithms, 15% for validating ECOTS algorithms and 15% for estimating confusion matrices. This split is inspired from the original paper of ECONOMY [1]. Subsequences of size $w$ were extracted from the training open time series by doing the following steps: (i) time stamps $t_p$, aka targets, were set within the time series, spaced with $w + \eta_M$ time units in order to avoid overlaps between samples; (ii) $\eta_M - \eta_m$ subsequences were extracted around each target, each one dedicated to the training of the classifier $h_\eta$ (see Figure 4).

Choice of the parameters $w, \eta_m, \eta_M$: These parameters depend on the problem that is being solved and the data associated with it. One of the key ingredients of early classification methods is the information gain measured by the AUC, the expected cost of misclassification decreases as the target being scored gets closer to the sliding window. A window size of $w = 10$ has been chosen to study the behavior of the ECOTS problems, since it shows a significant information gain over horizons, as measured in Figure 5 using AUC. We refer the reader to the supplementary material for other sliding window sizes. They highlight equivalent information gain curves, this dataset is not very sensitive to the choice of $w$. The parameter $\eta_M$ can be chosen according to the AUC, for our experiments we have chosen $\eta_M = 50$ as the AUC reaches 0.5 which corresponds to the random model, while, for $\eta_m$, we chose the end of the sliding window: $\eta_m = -w$.

Training the collection of classifiers: As mentioned in Section 2.2, a set of classifiers $h_\eta$ for different horizons $\eta$ such that ($\eta_m \leq \eta \leq \eta_M$) has to be trained. Ex-
Evolution of the AUC over various horizons when $w = 10$, $\eta_m = -w$ and $\eta_M = 50$. Three regions can be noticed: (i) $\eta \in [14, 23]$ where the AUC is at its maximum, this is where most premises lie which explains the high AUC; (ii) $\eta \in [-2, 13] \cup [24, 40]$ is a region with reasonable AUC values; and (iii) $\eta \in [-10, -3] \cup [41, 50]$ is the region where it is very difficult to predict the class “failure”, since the premises are either past the window (negative horizons) or not yet available (large positive ones).

Extracted features from sliding windows include simple statistics: $\min$, $\max$, $\text{mean}$, $\text{median}$ and the count of each type of errors. For our experiments, we trained XGboost models by fine tuning parameters within the following grid of values:

- $\text{minchlidweight} \in [1, 5, 10]$
- $\text{gamma} \in [0.5, 1, 1.5, 2, 5]$
- $\text{subsample} \in [0.6, 0.8, 1]$
- $\text{colsamplebytree} \in [0.6, 0.8, 1]$
- $\text{maxdepth} \in [3, 4, 5, 10]$

The parameter $\text{scalePosWeight}$ is set to the ratio of positive examples over negative ones in order to take into account the fact that the dataset is imbalanced. The combination of parameters that minimize the total cost is chosen on a validation set (20% of the set used for training the classifiers), then the model is learned on the whole training set. For a fair comparison, the same collection of classifiers is used for all ECOTS algorithms.

ECOTS algorithms: The competing approaches considered in this paper are described below as well as their optimized hyper-parameters.

- **Late baseline**: the last classifier in the collection $\tilde{h}_{\eta_m}$ is used. This is the last time that a prediction can be made.
- **Early baseline**: the first classifier in the collection $\tilde{h}_{\eta_M}$ is used. This corresponds to the earliest possible prediction with the largest horizon in the future.
- **Confidence-based Classifiers (CC)**: for a fixed target $t_p$, this method takes a decision as soon as the confidence of the classifier regarding the class

---

4 Reproducible using our source code available in the supplementary material.
5 The interested reader can refer to the official documentation for more details: https://xgboost.readthedocs.io/en/stable/
6 Given the cost of false positives and false negatives, the total cost is computed on a validation set as the sum over wrongly predicted samples weighted by the corresponding cost.
of interest exceeds a given threshold, optimized as a meta-parameter for each value of $\alpha$ using validation set. If this never happens, then $t_p = t + \eta_m$ and the prediction is forced using $\tilde{h}_{\eta_m}$.

- **Economy-$\gamma$** (see Section 4.2): for each value of $\alpha$, the number of groups $K$ used in the method is optimized in the range $[1,5]$ using a validation set.
- **SR** (see Section 4.1): for each value of $\alpha$, the parameters $\gamma_1, \gamma_2$ and $\gamma_3$ were optimized in the range $[-1, -0.5, 0, 0.5, 1]^3$ using a validation set.

### 5.2 Results and analysis

In this section, detailed answers to the questions raised in the introduction of Section 5 are given, supported by numerical results.
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**Fig. 6:** *AvgCost* of ECOTS algorithms computed on the test set for different values of the $\alpha$ parameter of the delay cost (x-axis), and for different values of misclassification cost. The maximum value of *alpha* on the x-axis is chosen in each subfigure according to the maximum value in the misclassification cost matrix $C_m$. Figures with all values of alpha are given in the supplementary material.
Efficiency of the proposed framework: The experiments show that the proposed framework to adapt ECTS approaches to ECOTS ones is efficient and leads to algorithms that outperform baseline methods as well as the CC approach for most classification and delay costs (see Figure 6). ECONOMY-$\gamma$ performs worse than the two baselines in two cases: (i) with highly imbalanced misclassification costs namely for $C^m_m^{(4)}$; (ii) with very high delay costs. In the following, we provide an interpretation for these two results:

A possible explanation for i) can be that the original method uses by default $0.5$ as the prediction threshold in order to estimate its confusion matrices, however this threshold seems to be important when we deal with highly imbalanced misclassification costs, this direction should be explored in future work.

The second result ii) can be explained by the fact that when delay costs are very high, ECONOMY-$\gamma$ tends to wait more time steps before triggering a prediction, because it expects to compensate the increase of delay cost by the decrease of the expected misclassification cost. This seems to not be the case for the used data set, and it is due to a bad estimation of this expectation. However, the original paper [1] showed that this approximation performed by ECONOMY-$\gamma$ significantly improves the performance over 34 datasets using statistical testing.

The SR approach seems to be more robust to the two points raised above, one potential interpretation is that the classifier’s output is taken into consideration explicitly in the decision criterion 4.1, which gives the SR approach an advantage over ECONOMY-$\gamma$ to be less or more conservative according to the misclassification cost. the same reason could explain that CC is better for high imbalanced misclassification costs. In addition SR is myopic (i.e it only decides if the current moment is the decision moment or not, without giving information about when the decision moment will happen in the future), consequently it does not suffer from the bad estimation of the expected cost of misclassification.

Effect of the delay and misclassification costs: In all sub-figures of Figure 6 which represent different misclassification costs, all curves exhibit increases with respect to growing values of $\alpha$, the slope of the delay cost function. In addition, when the delay cost is very high and the misclassification cost is non symmetric, as expected, the early baseline is always the best one.

Ability to adapt the triggering moment according to observed data: In order to better understand the superiority of the SR approach, we show in Figure 7 the distribution of the decision moments of the three methods ECONOMY-$\gamma$, CC and SR. We have chosen the scenario $C_m = C_m^{(2)}$ (The method behaves similarly for other values of $C_m = C_m^{(4)}$, additional figures are given in the supplementary material). When $\alpha = 0.001$, ECONOMY-$\gamma$ outperforms SR and CC since it decides earlier that SR, and CC takes mostly very late decisions as shown in Figure 6b. However, when $\alpha = 0.1$, the distribution of decision moments of ECONOMY-$\gamma$ is shifted towards earlier horizons which is expected since the parameter $\alpha$ of the delay cost is higher, the same phenomenon is noticed for CC and SR, but in addition, the distribution of SR became more skewed, in other words, it adapts its decision horizon to observed data, and this explains the performance superiority over the competing approaches in Figure 6b.
ECOTS: Early Classification in Open Time Series

Fig. 7: Horizon distribution for ECONOMY-γ, SR and CC algorithms, for \( \alpha = 0.001 \) and \( \alpha = 0.1 \) both for \( C_m^{(2)} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 10 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \).

6 Conclusion

In this paper, we formally defined for the first time in the literature the problem of early classification in open time series (ECOTS). We have provided a recipe that allows the adaptation of early classification of time series (ECTS) approaches to the ECOTS problem. This recipe specifies how to translate the earliness-accuracy trade-off, how to modify the decision triggering system and what the classifiers become in the new setting.

We have illustrated our methodology by adapting two state-of-the-art ECTS algorithms to the ECOTS scenario and demonstrated the value of the resulting algorithms by applying them to a real world dataset related to predictive maintenance. Experiments attest to the ability of the new ECOTS algorithms to seek the best trade-off between the earliness and the accuracy of the decisions when events unfold over open time series.

Our work paves the way for a wealth of applications where measurements are made over long periods of time, and decisions about upcoming events need to be triggered as early, but also as accurately, as possible. This includes applications in healthcare, predictive maintenance, autonomous driving, decision aid in agriculture, to name but a few.

For future work, it would be interesting for the scientific community to build a reference benchmark, composed of a large collection of datasets from various application domains. This would allow to compare ECOTS approaches in a more meaningful way, using statistical tests to compare competing approaches. Moreover, the development of a library including the adaptation of other ECTS approaches to the ECOTS problem would allow a wider diffusion of this type of approaches.
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