

OPEN IA

En un análisis de series de tiempo interrumpidas sobre la medición del efecto causal se obtiene la siguiente información:

Tipo de intervención: "**Evento adverso crisis energética**",

Tipo de datos: "**Sector Agricultura**",

Fecha de intervención: "**01/03/2020**",

definidos en el pre-periodo: "**01/03/2000**" a "**01/03/2020**",

y el post-periodo: "**01/06/2020**" a "**01/12/2023**".

En formato markdown y en español devuélveme una explicación del siguiente reporte el cual debe tener como título: "**Informe sobre el impacto de la intervención**" seguido de un párrafo de no más de 10 líneas, en forma sencilla, clara y precisa para usuarios que no saben nada.

Luego, si el **valor promedio actual** es mayor que el **valor promedio predicho** escribe el título "**Estrategias para potenciar el éxito del impacto**" seguido de una lista ordenada con 3 subtítulos con un párrafo cada uno que no supere más de 5 líneas sobre las estrategias para potenciar el éxito del impacto.

Por lo contrario, si el **valor promedio actual** es menor que el **valor promedio predicho** escribe el título "**Estrategias de acción del fracaso del impacto**" seguido de una lista ordenada con 5 subtítulos con un párrafo cada uno que no supere más de 10 líneas de texto, escribiendo sobre estrategias de acción para no volver a caer en el impacto negativo de forma específica y clara.

Reporte dado en dólares:

Analysis report {CausalImpact}

During the post-intervention period, the response variable had an average value of approx. 30.08. By contrast, in the absence of an intervention, we would have expected an average response of 40.03. The 95% interval of this counterfactual prediction is [37.81, 42.41]. Subtracting this prediction from the observed response yields an estimate of the causal effect the intervention had on the response variable. This effect is -9.94 with a 95% interval of [-12.33, -7.72]. For a discussion of the significance of this effect, see below.

Summing up the individual data points during the post-intervention

period (which can only sometimes be meaningfully interpreted), the response variable had an overall value of 6016.92.

By contrast, had the intervention not taken place, we would have expected a sum of 8005.59. The 95% interval of this prediction is [7561.42, 8482.55].

The above results are given in terms of absolute numbers. In relative terms, the response variable showed a decrease of -24.84%. The 95% interval of this percentage is [-30.8%, -19.29%].

This means that the negative effect observed during the intervention period is statistically significant.

If the experimenter had expected a positive effect, it is recommended to double-check whether anomalies in the control variables may have caused an overly optimistic expectation of what should have happened in the response variable in the absence of the intervention.

The probability of obtaining this effect by chance is very small (Bayesian one-sided tail-area probability $p = 0.0$).

This means the causal effect can be considered statistically significant.

GROQ

En un análisis de series de tiempo interrumpidas sobre la medición del efecto causal se obtiene la siguiente información: Tipo de intervención: "**Evento adverso covid 19**", Tipo de datos: "**Sector Comercio en ecuador**", Fecha de intervención: "**01/03/2020**", definidos en el pre-periodo: "**01/03/2000**" a "**01/03/2020**", y el post-periodo: "**01/06/2020**" a "**01/12/2023**".

En formato markdown y en español devuélveme una explicación del siguiente reporte el cual debe tener como título: "**Informe sobre el impacto de la intervención**" seguido de un párrafo de no más de 5 líneas, en forma sencilla, clara y precisa para usuarios que no saben nada, sin incluir más palabras. Luego en un título: "**Explicación**" seguido de un párrafo de no más de 5 líneas, en forma sencilla, clara y precisa para usuarios que no saben nada explica las posibles causas de esos resultados, sin incluir más palabras.

Reporte dado en dólares:

Analysis report {CausalImpact}

During the post-intervention period, the response variable had an average value of approx. 10.08. By contrast, in the absence of an intervention, we would have expected an average response of 150.03.

The 95% interval of this counterfactual prediction is [37.81, 42.41].

Subtracting this prediction from the observed response yields an estimate of the causal effect the intervention had on the response variable. This effect is -9.94 with a 95% interval of [-12.33, -7.72]. For a discussion of the significance of this effect, see below.

Summing up the individual data points during the post-intervention period (which can only sometimes be meaningfully interpreted), the response variable had an overall value of 6016.92.

By contrast, had the intervention not taken place, we would have expected a sum of 8005.59. The 95% interval of this prediction is [7561.42, 8482.55].

The above results are given in terms of absolute numbers. In relative terms, the response variable showed a decrease of -24.84%. The 95% interval of this percentage is [-30.8%, -19.29%].

This means that the negative effect observed during the intervention period is statistically significant.

If the experimenter had expected a positive effect, it is recommended to double-check whether anomalies in the control variables may have

caused an overly optimistic expectation of what should have happened in the response variable in the absence of the intervention.

The probability of obtaining this effect by chance is very small (Bayesian one-sided tail-area probability $p = 0.0$).

This means the causal effect can be considered statistically significant.