ECB Workshop on Forecasting Techniques

"The Anatomy of Out-of-Sample Forecasting Accuracy" by Borup, Coulombe, Rapach, Schütte and Schwenk-Nebbe

Discussion by Michel van der Wel

Erasmus U Rotterdam

June 13, 2023

A lot of interest in machine learning



- A lot of interest in machine learning
- \blacksquare Subject to "black-box" criticism \rightarrow Limits use for policymaking



- A lot of interest in machine learning
- \blacksquare Subject to "black-box" criticism \rightarrow Limits use for policymaking
- Paper develops Shapley-based metrics for interpreting models
 - Two metrics for importance of individual predictors for predicted target values
 - New metric (PBSV) for contribution of individual predictors for loss in sequence of fitted models



- A lot of interest in machine learning
- \blacksquare Subject to "black-box" criticism \rightarrow Limits use for policymaking
- Paper develops Shapley-based metrics for interpreting models
 - Two metrics for importance of individual predictors for predicted target values
 - New metric (PBSV) for contribution of individual predictors for loss in sequence of fitted models
- Empirical study of forecasting US inflation provides sensible leading predictors (oil, components of CPI) and discrepancies between in-sample and out-of-sample importance



Shapley values

■ Model: $y_{t+1} = f(x_t) + \varepsilon_{t+1}$, with x_t dimension P; Collect all predictor indices in set $S = \{1, 2, ..., P\}$



Shapley values

■ Model: $y_{t+1} = f(x_t) + \varepsilon_{t+1}$, with x_t dimension P; Collect all predictor indices in set $S = \{1, 2, ..., P\}$

Shapley value of *p*-th predictor is comparison of all possible models including *p* to all without *p*; in my sloppy notation:

$$\phi_{p} = \sum_{Q \subseteq S \setminus \{p\}} \frac{|Q|!(P-|Q|-1)!}{P!} \left(E[f|Q \cup \{p\}] - E[f|Q] \right)$$



Shapley values

■ Model: $y_{t+1} = f(x_t) + \varepsilon_{t+1}$, with x_t dimension P; Collect all predictor indices in set $S = \{1, 2, ..., P\}$

Shapley value of *p*-th predictor is comparison of all possible models including *p* to all without *p*; in my sloppy notation:

$$\phi_{p} = \sum_{Q \subseteq S \setminus \{p\}} \frac{|Q|!(P-|Q|-1)!}{P!} \left(E[f|Q \cup \{p\}] - E[f|Q] \right)$$

- Paper cleverly adjusts setting for
 - Dealing with large number of predictors (use sampling)
 - Expanding samples (not one value; take average)
 - Retraining of the samples \rightarrow (i/o)Shapley-VI_p
 - Loss-function effects rather than predicted values → PBSV_p



1. Empirical findings (Figure 1)



- Stability of findings (pcepi least to 2nd most important h = 1 to h = 6)?
- Why not more correlated results (similar series in FRED-MD)?



2. Empirical application

Curious to robustness regarding

- Forecasting y_{t+h} rather than $\frac{1}{h} \sum_{k=1}^{h} y_{t+k}$
- Including predictors and moving average of predictors
- Selection of *L* (AR-lag) and *q* (MA-order)



2. Empirical application

- Curious to robustness regarding
 - Forecasting y_{t+h} rather than $\frac{1}{h} \sum_{k=1}^{h} y_{t+k}$
 - Including predictors and moving average of predictors
 - Selection of *L* (AR-lag) and *q* (MA-order)
- Main benchmark is AR(k) model. Consider smaller/more targeted model with explanatory variables, survey data, etc? Particularly given somewhat modest (short-horizon) improvement of ML approaches (7% for h = 1; 19% for h = 12)



2. Empirical application

Curious to robustness regarding

- Forecasting y_{t+h} rather than $\frac{1}{h} \sum_{k=1}^{h} y_{t+k}$
- Including predictors and moving average of predictors
- Selection of *L* (AR-lag) and *q* (MA-order)
- Main benchmark is AR(k) model. Consider smaller/more targeted model with explanatory variables, survey data, etc? Particularly given somewhat modest (short-horizon) improvement of ML approaches (7% for h = 1; 19% for h = 12)
- For PCA, possible to compare with significance?



Overes and Van der Wel (Computational Economics; 2023) also use Shapley values (for driving factors of sovereign credit ratings). From referee process:

■ Is iteratively omitting variables possible/useful?



- Is iteratively omitting variables possible/useful?
- Can you extend the results with more machine learning techniques? [Ensembles mentioned; Included in your work!]



- Is iteratively omitting variables possible/useful?
- Can you extend the results with more machine learning techniques? [Ensembles mentioned; Included in your work!]
- Can you take the panel nature into account? [You do!]



- Is iteratively omitting variables possible/useful?
- Can you extend the results with more machine learning techniques? [Ensembles mentioned; Included in your work!]
- Can you take the panel nature into account? [You do!]
- Compare to scikit-learn package (which also provides feature importance estimates)



- Is iteratively omitting variables possible/useful?
- Can you extend the results with more machine learning techniques? [Ensembles mentioned; Included in your work!]
- Can you take the panel nature into account? [You do!]
- Compare to scikit-learn package (which also provides feature importance estimates)
- Closer comparison of findings with existing literature and evaluation also of signs



Final point and conclusion

Final point: What audience do you see for this paper?

■ In-between ML and econometrics, currently



Final point and conclusion

Final point: What audience do you see for this paper?

- In-between ML and econometrics, currently
- If more econometric, perhaps some (small-scale!) simulation study is possible? And further breakdown/analysis/comparison with existing models/metrics for linear model?



Final point and conclusion

Final point: What audience do you see for this paper?

- In-between ML and econometrics, currently
- If more econometric, perhaps some (small-scale!) simulation study is possible? And further breakdown/analysis/comparison with existing models/metrics for linear model?

In conclusion:

Opens the black box with clever adaptations to time series setting

Great work!



ECB Workshop on Forecasting Techniques

"The Anatomy of Out-of-Sample Forecasting Accuracy" by Borup, Coulombe, Rapach, Schütte and Schwenk-Nebbe

Discussion by Michel van der Wel

Erasmus U Rotterdam

June 13, 2023