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Abstract

Large collections of time series data are commonly organized into cross-sectional structures with different levels of aggregation; examples include product and geographical groupings. A necessary condition for “coherent” decision-making and planning, with such data sets, is for the dis-aggregated series’ forecasts to add up exactly to the aggregated series forecasts, which motivates the creation of novel hierarchical forecasting algorithms. The growing interest of the Machine Learning community in cross-sectional hierarchical forecasting systems states that we are in a propitious moment to ensure that scientific endeavors are grounded on sound baselines. For this reason, we put forward the HierarchicalForecast library, which contains preprocessed publicly available datasets, evaluation metrics, and a compiled set of statistical baseline models. Our Python-based framework aims to bridge the gap between statistical, econometric modeling, and Machine Learning forecasting research.
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1. Introduction

Large collections of time series organized into structures at different aggregation levels often require their forecasts to follow their aggregation constraints, which poses the challenge of creating novel algorithms capable of coherent forecasts. A fundamental component in developing practical methods is extensive empirical evaluations and comparing newly proposed forecasting methods with state-of-the-art and well-established baselines; regarding this, Machine Learning research on hierarchical forecasting faces two obstacles:

(i) **Statistical Baseline’s Absence**: Eventually Python continues to grow in popularity among the Machine Learning community (Piatetsky, 2018), it lacks a lot of statistical and econometric model packages, for which its forecasting research struggles with access to these baselines. This problem exacerbates by the most recent advancements in the hierarchical forecasting literature.

(ii) **Statistical Baseline’s Computational Efficiency**: The Python global interpreter lock limits its programs to use a single thread, which translates into a lost opportunity to speed up algorithms by leveraging the available CPU resources. When implemented naively, statistical baselines in Python take an excessively long execution, even surpassing those of more complex methods, which discourages their use.

To address these problems, we put forward HierarchicalForecast, an open-source benchmark for hierarchical forecasting tasks. Our work aims to improve the availability of hierarchical forecasting baselines and provide with utilities for evaluation and forecast of hierarchical time series systems.

1.1 Cross-Sectional Hierarchical Forecasting Notation

We denote a cross-sectional hierarchical time series by the vector $y_{[a,b],\tau} = [y_{[a],\tau}^\top, y_{[b],\tau}^\top]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{N_a + N_b}$, for the time step $\tau$, where $[a], [b]$ denote respectively the aggregate and bottom level indices. The total number of series in the hierarchy is $|[a,b]| = (N_a + N_b)$. We distinguish between the time indices $[t]$ and the $h$ steps ahead indices $[t + 1 : t + h]$, and bottom and aggregate indexes $\beta \in [b], \alpha \in [a]$. At any time $\tau \in [t]$, a hierarchical time series is defined by the following aggregation constraints in matrix representation:

$$y_{[a,b],\tau} = Sy_{[b],\tau} \iff \begin{bmatrix} y_{[a],\tau} \\ y_{[b],\tau} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} A_{[a][b]} \\ I_{[b][b]} \end{bmatrix} y_{[b],\tau}$$ (1)

Under this notation the summing matrix $S \in \mathbb{R}^{(N_a + N_b) \times N_b}$ controls the aggregation of the bottom series to the upper levels, and it is composed of an aggregate matrix $A_{[a][b]} \in \mathbb{R}^{N_a \times N_b}$ and the identity matrix $I_{[b][b]} \in \mathbb{R}^{N_b \times N_b}$. In Figure 1 example $N_a = 3$, $N_b = 4$, and

$$y_{Total,\tau} = y_{\beta_1,\tau} + y_{\beta_2,\tau} + y_{\beta_3,\tau} + y_{\beta_4,\tau}$$

$$y_{[a],\tau} = [y_{Total,\tau}, y_{\beta_1,\tau} + y_{\beta_2,\tau}, y_{\beta_3,\tau} + y_{\beta_4,\tau}]^\top$$

$$y_{[b],\tau} = [y_{\beta_1,\tau}, y_{\beta_2,\tau}, y_{\beta_3,\tau}, y_{\beta_4,\tau}]^\top$$ (2)

The constraints matrix associated to Figure 1 and Equations (2) is:

\[
S = \begin{bmatrix}
A_{[a][b]} \\
I_{[b][b]}
\end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix}
1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\
1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\
1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 1
\end{bmatrix}
\]

1.2 Hierarchical Forecasting Baselines

The classic approach to hierarchical forecasting has been a two-stage process where base level forecasts are produced \(\hat{y}_{[a,b],\tau}\) and later reconciled into coherent forecasts \(\tilde{y}_{[a,b],\tau}\) (Hyndman and Athanasopoulos, 2018). Reconciliation can be represented in the following notation:

\[
\tilde{y}_{[a,b],\tau} = SP\hat{y}_{[a,b],\tau}.
\] (3)

Where \(S \in \mathbb{R}^{(N_a+N_b) \times N_b}\) is the hierarchical constraints matrix, \(P \in \mathbb{R}^{N_b \times (N_a+N_b)}\) is a matrix that maps base forecasts into bottom level, specified by the reconciliation strategies.

1. **Bottom-Up**: This method constrains the base-level predictions to the bottom-level series, which are usually treated as independent (Orcutt et al., 1968). The reconciliation of the method is a simple addition to the upper levels. Its \(P\) matrix is defined \(P_{BU} = [0_{[b][a]} \mid I_{[b][b]}]\), where the first columns collapses the aggregate level predictions and the identity picks only the bottom-level forecasts.

2. **Top-Down**: The second method constrains the base-level predictions to the top-most aggregate-level series and then distributes it to the disaggregate series through the use of proportions \(p_{[b]}\). Its \(P\) matrix is defined \(P_{TD} = [p_{[b]} \mid 0_{[b][a+b-1]}]\), the rest of the columns zero-out the base forecast below the highest aggregation. Several variants of the methods emerge depending on the strategy for the computation of \(p_{[b]}\) (Gross and Sohl, 1990; Fliedner, 1999).

3. **Alternative**: Recent hierarchical reconciliation strategies, transcend the base forecasts’ single level origin, and define the \(P\) optimally under reasonable assumptions.

   • **Middle Out**: This method is only available for strictly hierarchical structures. It anchors the base predictions in a middle level. The levels above the base predictions use the bottom-up approach, while the levels below use a top-down.

   • **Minimum Trace**: Wickramasuriya et al. (2019) computed the reconciliation matrix \(P\) to minimize the total forecast variance of the space of coherent forecasts, with the **Minimum Trace** reconciliation. Under unbiasedness assumptions for the base forecasts, in this method, \(P_{\text{MinT}} = (S^T W_{\tau}^{-1} S)^{-1} S^T W_{\tau}^{-1}\) and \(W_{\tau} = \text{Var}[\langle y_{[a,b],\tau} - \hat{y}_{[a,b],\tau}\rangle]\) is the base predictions’ variance-covariance matrix.

   • **Empirical Risk Minimization**: The **ERM** approach relaxes the unbiasedness assumption and optimizes the reconciliation matrix minimizing an L1 regularized
HierarchicalForecast: A Python Benchmarking Framework for Hierarchical Forecasting

The method also has a closed-form solution considering only the reconciliation quadratic errors.

\[ \mathbf{P}_{\text{ERM}} = \arg\min_{\mathbf{P}} \| \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{SPy} \|_2^2 + \lambda \| \mathbf{P} - \mathbf{P}_{\text{BU}} \|_1 \]

The HierarchicalForecast package contains a curated collection of reference hierarchical forecasting algorithms through the BottomUp, TopDown, MiddleOut, MinTrace, and ERM model classes. Currently, the collection is restricted to point and mean forecasting methods, but we are working on implementing coherent probabilistic algorithms.

2. HierarchicalForecast Package

2.1 Dependencies

The HierarchicalForecast library is built with minimal dependencies using NumPy for linear algebra and array operations (Harris et al., 2020), Pandas for data manipulation (McKinney, 2010) and Scikit-Learn (Pedregosa et al., 2011) for data processing. Additionally, the auto-ARIMA and auto-ETS (Hyndman and Khandakar, 2008) base forecast models depend on NumBa and open-source just-in-time compiler that translates Python and NumPy code into C++ currently these are Python’s fastest implementations.

2.2 Evaluation Metrics

For the evaluation of the forecasting algorithms we provide access to the following initial prediction accuracy metrics that have been used in past hierarchical forecasting literature.

Mean/Point Forecasting Accuracy: To measure the point forecasts accuracy, we summarize the forecast errors into the mean absolute scaled error (MASE), and the mean squared scaled error (MSSE), using \( \hat{y}_{i,\tau} \), the Naive1’s in the denominator errors, their definition is inspired by Hyndman and Koehler (2006):

\[
\text{MASE}(\mathbf{y}_i, \hat{\mathbf{y}}_i, \tilde{\mathbf{y}}_i) = \frac{\sum_{\tau=t+1}^{t+H} |y_{i,\tau} - \hat{y}_{i,\tau}|}{\sum_{\tau=t+1}^{t+H} |y_{i,\tau} - \tilde{y}_{i,\tau}|} \quad \text{MSSE}(\mathbf{y}_i, \hat{\mathbf{y}}_i, \tilde{\mathbf{y}}_i) = \frac{\sum_{\tau=t+1}^{t+H} (y_{i,\tau} - \hat{y}_{i,\tau})^2}{\sum_{\tau=t+1}^{t+H} (y_{i,\tau} - \tilde{y}_{i,\tau})^2} \quad (4)
\]

Quantile Forecasting Accuracy: Transitioning from point predictions, towards probabilistic predictions we measure the accuracy of individual quantiles \( \hat{y}_{i,\tau}^{(q)} = \hat{F}_{i,\tau}^{-1}(q) \) of a predictive distribution \( \hat{F}_{i,\tau} \) using the quantile loss (QL) defined as:

\[
\text{QL}(\hat{y}_{i,\tau}^{(q)}, y_{i,\tau}) = \text{QL}(\hat{F}_{i,\tau}^{-1}(q), y_{i,\tau}) = 2 \left( \mathbb{1}\{y_{i,\tau} \leq \hat{y}_{i,\tau}^{(q)}\} - q \right) \left( \hat{y}_{i,\tau}^{(q)} - y_{i,\tau} \right) \quad (5)
\]

Probabilistic Forecasting Accuracy: For a fully probabilistic prediction, we use the continuous ranked probability score (CRPS) (Matheson and Winkler, 1976)\(^2\), that summarizes the accuracy of the entire predictive distribution \( \hat{F}_{i,\tau} \), the CRPS definition is:

\[
\text{CRPS}(\hat{F}_{i,\tau}, y_{i,\tau}) = \int_0^1 \text{QL}(\hat{F}_{i,\tau}^{-1}(q), y_{i,\tau}) dq \quad (6)
\]

\(^2\) The CRPS uses a left Riemann numeric approximation of the integral and averages a discrete set of uniformly distanced quantile losses.
HierarchicalForecast: A Python Benchmarking Framework for Hierarchical Forecasting

Table 1: Summary of available hierarchical datasets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dataset</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Aggregated</th>
<th>Bottom</th>
<th>Levels</th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>Daily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labour</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiki2</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>Daily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism-S</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism-L</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>76 / 304</td>
<td>4 / 5</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3 Datasets

We are making the following preprocessed seven publicly available hierarchical datasets easily accessible through the Pandas and NumPy libraries. Each dataset is accompanied by metadata capturing its seasonality/frequency, the forecast horizon used in previous hierarchical forecast publications, its corresponding hierarchical aggregation constraints matrix, and the names of its levels. Hierarchical forecasting studies have used these datasets in the past. We briefly describe the datasets in Table 1. In more detail, the available datasets are:

1. **Traffic** measures the occupancy of 963 traffic lanes in the Bay Area, the data is grouped into a year of daily observations and organized into a 207 hierarchical structure (Dua and Graff, 2017).

2. **Tourism-S** consists of 89 Australian location quarterly visits series; it covers from 1998 to 2006. Several hierarchical forecasting studies have used this dataset in the past (Tourism Australia, Canberra, 2005).

3. **Tourism-L** summarizes an Australian visitor survey managed by the Tourism Research Australia agency, the dataset contains 555 monthly series from 1998 to 2016, and it is organized into geographic and purpose of travel (Tourism Australia, Canberra, 2019).


5. **Wiki2** contains the daily views of 145,000 Wikipedia articles from July 2015 to December 2016. The dataset is filtered and processed into 150 bottom series and 49 aggregate series (Anava et al., 2018; Ben Taieb and Koo, 2019).

2.4 Dataset Class

Each dataset class contains load and preprocessing methods that output readily available hierarchical time series as well as its aggregation’s constraints matrix, and hierarchical indexes for each level. Additionally, each dataset contains metadata that includes the frequency and seasonality of the data, hierarchical indexes for the convenient evaluation across the levels of the hierarchical or grouped structures, and the dates.
3. HierarchicalForecast Example

3.1 Base Predictions and Reconciliation

In this subsection, we demonstrate the use of the `HierarchicalForecast` library to predict twelve months of the 555 series of the `Tourism-L` dataset using auto-ARIMA base model and later reconcile using the `BottomUp`, `MinTrace`, and `ERM` classes. The complete hierarchical forecasting pipeline example is available in this jupyter notebook, we report its results in Appendix A.

```python
from datasetsforecast.hierarchical import HierarchicalData
from hierarchicalforecast.core import HierarchicalReconciliation
from hierarchicalforecast.methods import BottomUp, MinTrace, ERM
from statsforecast.core import StatsForecast
from statsforecast.models import auto_arima

# Load TourismL dataset
Y_df, S, tags = HierarchicalData.load('./data', 'TourismLarge')
Y_df = Y_df.set_index('unique_id')

# Compute base auto-ARIMA predictions
fcst = StatsForecast(df=Y_df, models=[(auto_arima,12)], freq='M', n_jobs=-1)
Y_hat_df = fcst.forecast(h=12)

# Reconcile the base predictions
reconcilers = [
    BottomUp(),
    MinTrace(method='ols'),
    MinTrace(method='wls_struct'),
    MinTrace(method='wls_var'),
    MinTrace(method='mint_shrink'),
    ERM(method='lasso'),
]

hrec = HierarchicalReconciliation(reconcilers=reconcilers)
Y_rec_df = hrec.reconcile(Y_hat_df, Y_df, S, tags)
```

3.2 Hierarchical Forecast Evaluation

Our library facilitates a complete evaluation across the levels of the hierarchical structure. We evaluate the reconciliation strategies' predictions using the MASE metric in this example. In Appendix A we perform a thorough evaluation with a rolling window cross-validation hyperparameter selection on the available hierarchical forecasting methods for the `Traffic`, `Labour`, `Wiki2`, `Tourism-S`, and `Tourism-L` datasets.

```python
from hierarchicalforecast.evaluation import HierarchicalEvaluation, mase
evaluator = HierarchicalEvaluation(evaluators=[mase])
evaluator.evaluate(Y_h=Y_hat_df, Y_test=Y_test,
            tags=tags, benchmark='naive')
```
4. Conclusion

We presented HierarchicalForecast, an open-source python library dedicated to hierarchical time series forecasting. The library integrates publicly available processed datasets, evaluation metrics, and a curated set of statistical baselines. We provide usage examples and references to extensive experiments where we showcase the baseline’s use and evaluate the accuracy of their predictions. With this work, we hope to contribute to Machine Learning forecasting by bridging the gap to statistical and econometric modeling, as well as providing tools for the development of novel hierarchical forecasting algorithms rooted in a thorough comparison of these well-established models. We intend to continue maintaining and increasing the repository, promoting collaboration across the forecasting community.
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Appendix A. Appendix

A.1 Hierarchical Forecasting Evaluation

To complement the examples from Section 3. Here we perform a thorough hierarchical forecasting experiment on the Labour, Tourism-L, Tourism-S, Traffic, and Wiki2 datasets, comparing the predictions accuracy of BottomUp, MiddleOut, MinTrace, and ERM methods using the mean absolute scaled error (MASE) using $\hat{y}_{i,t}'$, the Naive1 forecast in the denominator.

$$\text{MASE}(y_i, \hat{y}_i, \hat{y}_i') = \frac{\sum_{t=1}^{t+H} |y_{i,t} - \hat{y}_{i,t}|}{\sum_{t=1}^{t+H} |y_{i,t} - \hat{y}_{i,t}'|}$$  (7)

We use two settings for the experiments; one uses a rolling window approach where we fit and predict a horizon of length defined in Table 1, using the last 25% of the dataset as the test set. For the second experiment, we restrict the evaluation to the last window of the forecast’s horizon length. Table 2 reports the rolling window evaluation, and Table 3 reports the single window evaluation.

Table 2: Empirical evaluation of hierarchically coherent forecasts. Mean absolute scaled error (MASE). These experiments use a rolling window evaluation where we use the last 25% of the available observations to test.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dataset</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>ARIMA</th>
<th>BottomUp</th>
<th>TopDown (fast prop)</th>
<th>MiddleOut (level 2)</th>
<th>MiddleOut (level 3)</th>
<th>MiddleOut (level 4)</th>
<th>MinTrace (ols)</th>
<th>MinTrace (wls struct)</th>
<th>MinTrace (wls var)</th>
<th>MinTrace (shrink)</th>
<th>ERM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Labour</td>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>0.8763</td>
<td>0.9099</td>
<td>0.8817</td>
<td>0.9149</td>
<td>0.8838</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.8849</td>
<td>0.8616</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.8751</td>
<td>0.8769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 (geo.)</td>
<td>0.6042</td>
<td>0.8284</td>
<td>0.6042</td>
<td>0.7268</td>
<td>0.6953</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.5991</td>
<td>0.6641</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.7434</td>
<td>0.7550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 (geo.)</td>
<td>0.9303</td>
<td>0.9019</td>
<td>0.8914</td>
<td>0.9303</td>
<td>0.8744</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.9217</td>
<td>0.8621</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.8647</td>
<td>0.8697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 (geo.)</td>
<td>0.9422</td>
<td>0.9442</td>
<td>0.9619</td>
<td>0.9802</td>
<td>0.9422</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.9633</td>
<td>0.9004</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.9097</td>
<td>0.9136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 (geo.)</td>
<td>0.9304</td>
<td>0.9304</td>
<td>0.9539</td>
<td>0.9524</td>
<td>0.9391</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.9470</td>
<td>0.9222</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.9197</td>
<td>0.9209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism-L</td>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>0.5077</td>
<td>0.6026</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.5036</td>
<td>0.5102</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.5335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 (geo.)</td>
<td>0.3582</td>
<td>0.7028</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.3425</td>
<td>0.4228</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.4980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 (geo.)</td>
<td>0.8360</td>
<td>0.5992</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.3788</td>
<td>0.4183</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.4613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 (geo.)</td>
<td>0.5150</td>
<td>0.5926</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.4827</td>
<td>0.4868</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.5105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 (geo.)</td>
<td>0.5650</td>
<td>0.6045</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.5659</td>
<td>0.5547</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.5777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 (prp.)</td>
<td>0.3274</td>
<td>0.5730</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.3596</td>
<td>0.4030</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.4585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 (prp.)</td>
<td>0.4631</td>
<td>0.5506</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.4508</td>
<td>0.4575</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.4851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 (prp.)</td>
<td>0.5657</td>
<td>0.5905</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.5654</td>
<td>0.5544</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.5607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 (prp.)</td>
<td>0.6282</td>
<td>0.6282</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.6471</td>
<td>0.6236</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.6207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>0.6026</td>
<td>0.5736</td>
<td>0.5868</td>
<td>0.6861</td>
<td>0.5671</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.6021</td>
<td>0.5831</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.5615</td>
<td>0.5615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 (geo.)</td>
<td>0.5183</td>
<td>0.5035</td>
<td>0.5183</td>
<td>0.7871</td>
<td>0.5324</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.5507</td>
<td>0.5591</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.5437</td>
<td>0.5376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 (geo.)</td>
<td>0.6888</td>
<td>0.5089</td>
<td>0.5654</td>
<td>0.6888</td>
<td>0.5158</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.5942</td>
<td>0.5505</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.5235</td>
<td>0.5235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 (geo.)</td>
<td>0.5449</td>
<td>0.5809</td>
<td>0.5659</td>
<td>0.6263</td>
<td>0.5449</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.5828</td>
<td>0.5650</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.5478</td>
<td>0.5478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 (geo.)</td>
<td>0.6538</td>
<td>0.6358</td>
<td>0.6464</td>
<td>0.6964</td>
<td>0.6321</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.6452</td>
<td>0.6287</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.6066</td>
<td>0.6066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiki2</td>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>0.6241</td>
<td>0.6676</td>
<td>0.6399</td>
<td>0.6290</td>
<td>0.6249</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.6273</td>
<td>0.6180</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.6529</td>
<td>0.6690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 (geo.)</td>
<td>0.4937</td>
<td>0.5694</td>
<td>0.4937</td>
<td>0.4907</td>
<td>0.4864</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.4911</td>
<td>0.4846</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.5473</td>
<td>0.5724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 (geo.)</td>
<td>0.5105</td>
<td>0.5735</td>
<td>0.5129</td>
<td>0.5165</td>
<td>0.5044</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.5100</td>
<td>0.5013</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.5529</td>
<td>0.5762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 (geo.)</td>
<td>0.5198</td>
<td>0.5768</td>
<td>0.5278</td>
<td>0.5258</td>
<td>0.5198</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.5247</td>
<td>0.5133</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.5581</td>
<td>0.5796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 (geo.)</td>
<td>0.8570</td>
<td>0.8570</td>
<td>0.8703</td>
<td>0.8696</td>
<td>0.8683</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.8652</td>
<td>0.8553</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.8538</td>
<td>0.8554</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 3: Empirical evaluation of hierarchically coherent forecasts. Mean absolute scaled error (MASE). These experiments use a single window evaluation where we use the last available observations to test.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dataset</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>ARIMA</th>
<th>BottomUp</th>
<th>TopDown</th>
<th>MiddleOut (level 2)</th>
<th>MiddleOut (level 3)</th>
<th>MinTrace (ols)</th>
<th>MinTrace (wls struct)</th>
<th>MinTrace (wls var)</th>
<th>MinTrace (shrink)</th>
<th>ERM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Labour</td>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>1.1519</td>
<td>1.1231</td>
<td>1.2132</td>
<td>1.1214</td>
<td>1.1512</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.1892</td>
<td>1.1470</td>
<td>1.1342</td>
<td>1.1254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2309</td>
<td>1.1334</td>
<td>1.2309</td>
<td>1.1220</td>
<td>1.1654</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.2139</td>
<td>1.1629</td>
<td>1.1463</td>
<td>1.1357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1217</td>
<td>1.1241</td>
<td>1.2175</td>
<td>1.1217</td>
<td>1.1533</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.1966</td>
<td>1.1497</td>
<td>1.1350</td>
<td>1.1256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.1490</td>
<td>1.1235</td>
<td>1.2174</td>
<td>1.1266</td>
<td>1.1490</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.1885</td>
<td>1.1461</td>
<td>1.1334</td>
<td>1.1245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.1132</td>
<td>1.1132</td>
<td>1.1905</td>
<td>1.1160</td>
<td>1.1392</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.1624</td>
<td>1.1319</td>
<td>1.1237</td>
<td>1.1241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>0.6112</td>
<td>0.7333</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.5961</td>
<td>0.6162</td>
<td>0.6550</td>
<td>0.6550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 (geo.)</td>
<td>0.3107</td>
<td>1.2293</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.3040</td>
<td>0.6838</td>
<td>0.8996</td>
<td>0.8996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 (geo.)</td>
<td>0.5285</td>
<td>0.8485</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.4430</td>
<td>0.5628</td>
<td>0.6706</td>
<td>0.6706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 (geo.)</td>
<td>0.7125</td>
<td>0.8232</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.6482</td>
<td>0.6725</td>
<td>0.7242</td>
<td>0.7242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 (geo.)</td>
<td>0.7830</td>
<td>0.7563</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.7331</td>
<td>0.7045</td>
<td>0.7078</td>
<td>0.7078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 (prp.)</td>
<td>0.4463</td>
<td>0.7030</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.4241</td>
<td>0.4627</td>
<td>0.5362</td>
<td>0.5362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 (prp.)</td>
<td>0.5213</td>
<td>0.6152</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.5099</td>
<td>0.5147</td>
<td>0.5462</td>
<td>0.5462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 (prp.)</td>
<td>0.6187</td>
<td>0.6396</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.6139</td>
<td>0.5955</td>
<td>0.6122</td>
<td>0.6122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 (prp.)</td>
<td>0.6776</td>
<td>0.6776</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.7223</td>
<td>0.6809</td>
<td>0.6761</td>
<td>0.6761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiki2</td>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>1.5259</td>
<td>1.7460</td>
<td>2.9061</td>
<td>2.5611</td>
<td>2.2417</td>
<td>2.2339</td>
<td>1.7593</td>
<td>1.4153</td>
<td>1.4889</td>
<td>1.4889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.4317</td>
<td>34.5394</td>
<td>16.4317</td>
<td>1.5588</td>
<td>0.8263</td>
<td>0.7546</td>
<td>13.0176</td>
<td>2.9936</td>
<td>3.7734</td>
<td>3.7734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6932</td>
<td>2.1472</td>
<td>2.0661</td>
<td>1.6932</td>
<td>1.1936</td>
<td>1.1668</td>
<td>1.6256</td>
<td>0.9642</td>
<td>1.1518</td>
<td>1.1518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.3780</td>
<td>1.5570</td>
<td>1.7037</td>
<td>1.5396</td>
<td>1.3760</td>
<td>1.3719</td>
<td>1.4984</td>
<td>1.2730</td>
<td>1.3488</td>
<td>1.3488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.3271</td>
<td>1.3417</td>
<td>1.6015</td>
<td>1.4683</td>
<td>1.3212</td>
<td>1.3271</td>
<td>1.3815</td>
<td>1.1447</td>
<td>1.3047</td>
<td>1.3047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.4539</td>
<td>1.4539</td>
<td>4.6322</td>
<td>4.2796</td>
<td>3.8015</td>
<td>3.7961</td>
<td>2.0483</td>
<td>1.8275</td>
<td>1.6528</td>
<td>1.6528</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>