# **Model Comparison Report**

## **Economic Data**

## Model 1: XGBoost & LightGBM

- **Model Type:** Tree-based Ensemble Models
- **Dataset:** US Unemployment Rate (UNRATE)
- Feature Engineering:
  - Lag features (1, 2, 3 months, etc.)
  - o Rolling mean & std (window sizes: 3, 6, 12)
  - Train/test split (no future forecasting)
- Interpretability: SHAP values used for feature importance
- Performance Metrics:

Metric	XGBoost	t LightGBI	
MAE	0.303	0.302	
RMSE	0.403	0.401	
R²	0.940	0.941	

Strengths:

- High accuracy
- o Strong interpretability with SHAP

o Good for short-term forecasting and feature analysis

## Model 2: Explainable Boosting Machine (EBM)

- **Model Type:** Generalized Additive Model (interpretable ML)
- Dataset: US Retail Sales (RSAFS)
- Feature Engineering:
  - Extracted time components (year, month, weekday)
  - Lag features
- Interpretability:
  - Built-in EBM feature plots
  - SHAP for additional insights
- Performance Metrics:

Metric EBM

MAE **5.59** 

RMSE **6.55** 

R<sup>2</sup> **0.973** 

•

## Strengths:

- Best overall accuracy
- Extremely interpretable
- Clear view of how features affect predictions
- Limitations:

- Not suitable for multi-step forecasting or seasonality
- No external indicators used

## Model 3: Prophet

- Model Type: Additive Time Series Model by Meta (Facebook)
- Dataset: US Retail Sales (RSAFS) with external indicators (CPI, UNRATE, FEDFUNDS)
- Feature Engineering:
  - Lag features, rolling stats
  - Built-in seasonality modeling (yearly, monthly)
- Interpretability:
  - Prophet components (trend, seasonality, holidays)
- Performance Metrics:

## Metric Prophet

MAE 5.85

RMSE 7.12

R<sup>2</sup> 0.968

MAPE 4.7%

•

## Strengths:

- Strong at modeling seasonality and trend
- Supports long-term forecasting
- Easy to visualize components

#### • Limitations:

- Slightly lower accuracy than EBM
- Less interpretable at the feature level

## Model 4: Temporal Fusion Transformer (TFT)

- **Model Type:** Deep Learning (Sequence-to-Sequence Transformer)
- Dataset: Bank Marketing Data (Binary Classification subscription)
- Feature Engineering:
  - Categorical encoding
  - Time index creation
  - Grouped by campaign ID
  - Rolling time windows with encoder length = 30

## • Interpretability:

- TFT's built-in feature importance tools
- Heatmaps of attention weights and variable relevance

#### Performance Metrics:

• Not explicitly reported (no MAE/RMSE/R<sup>2</sup> shown)

## Strengths:

- Powerful deep learning for complex time series
- Good for handling multiple variables and non-linear dynamics

#### Limitations:

- o High complexity
- o No performance numbers shown (hard to compare directly)
- o Requires more resources to train

# **Overall Model Comparison**

Criteria	XGBoost/LightGBM	EBM	Prophet	Temporal Fusion Transformer (TFT)
Model Type	Tree Ensemble	Additive GAM	Additive Time Series	Deep Learning Transformer
Forecasting Capability	×	×	<b>V</b>	<b>V</b>
Interpretability	SHAP	Very High	Medium (components)	Medium-High (attention-based)
External Indicators	No	No	Yes	No
R <sup>2</sup> Score (Best)	0.941 (LightGBM)	<b>0.973</b>	0.968	X Not available
MAE (Best)	0.302	5.59 (different scale)	5.85	X Not available
Use Case Suitability	Short-term prediction	Feature analysis	Forecasting with trends	Long-term, complex time series

# Conclusion: Best Model by Use Case

- **Most Accurate Model:** 
  - ➤ EBM Best R² and strong MAE performance. Great for interpretable business insights.

- Best for Long-Term Forecasting:
  - ➤ **Prophet** Handles trend/seasonality and supports future predictions.
- Best for Complex Temporal Modeling:
  - ➤ TFT Excellent architecture for deep time series tasks, but needs metrics to confirm.
- Balanced Performance + Interpretability:
  - ➤ **LightGBM** Very good accuracy and SHAP-based feature importance.