

CAIFormer: A Causal Informed Transformer for Multivariate Time Series Forecasting

Xingyu Zhang^{1,2}, Wenwen Qiang^{1,2}, Siyu Zhao¹, Huijie Guo^{1,2}, Jiangmeng Li^{1,2}, Chuxiong Sun^{1,2} and Changwen Zheng^{1,2}

¹University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, ²Institute of Software, Chinese Academy of Sciences

Abstract: Most existing multivariate time series forecasting methods adopt an all-to-all paradigm that feeds all variable histories into a unified model to predict their future values without distinguishing their individual roles. However, this undifferentiated paradigm makes it difficult to identify variable-specific causal influences and often entangles causally relevant information with spurious correlations. To address this limitation, we propose an all-to-one forecasting paradigm that predicts each target variable separately. Specifically, we first construct a Structural Causal Model from observational data and then, for each target variable, we partition the historical sequence into four sub-segments according to the inferred causal structure: endogenous, direct causal, collider causal, and spurious correlation. The prediction relies solely on the first three causally relevant sub-segments, while the spurious correlation sub-segment is excluded. Furthermore, we propose Causal Informed Transformer (CAIFormer), a novel forecasting model comprising three components: Endogenous Sub-segment Prediction Block, Direct Causal Sub-segment Prediction Block, and Collider Causal Sub-segment Prediction Block, which process the endogenous, direct causal, and collider causal sub-segments, respectively. Their outputs are then combined to produce the final prediction. Extensive experiments on multiple benchmark datasets demonstrate the effectiveness of the CAIFormer.

1. Introduction

Multivariate Time Series Forecasting (MTSF) is a fundamental problem in various fields, including energy consumption [4], economic planning [13], weather prediction [6], and traffic forecasting [10]. The goal of MTSF is to predict the future values of multiple interrelated variables based on their historical observations [66]. Unlike univariate time series forecasting, MTSF must capture not only individual temporal patterns but also the interactions among multiple interdependent variables. This makes it crucial to identify which variables influence the target and how. Failing to distinguish relevant from irrelevant inter-variable dependencies properly could either result in information loss or introduce spurious correlations that degrade forecasting performance.

Based on the above statement, an MTSF method should be capable of capturing the intrinsic temporal patterns of each variable, correctly identifying how other variables causally influence the target, and eliminating spurious correlations that obscure true dependence. However, most existing MTSF methods overlook this structural heterogeneity, including Transformer-based models [22, 77]. These models typically take all variables' histories without differentiation, and train a single shared model to jointly forecast all targets in one forward pass [40, 91]. This design, whether channel-independent [36] or channel-mixed [19], makes no distinction in contribution among variables, ignoring the distinct causal roles they may play with respect to the target. Although this all-to-all design is easy to implement, it overlooks an important observation: when focusing on forecasting a specific target variable, the history

segments of different variables often play very different roles. For instance, in weather forecasting, temperature and humidity are influenced by wind direction, yet they have no direct causal relationship. Meanwhile, temperature and atmospheric pressure jointly affect precipitation, forming a collider structure: $\text{temperature} \rightarrow \text{precipitation} \leftarrow \text{pressure}$ [96]. When forecasting temperature, different variables influence in distinct ways: (i) temperature’s own past provides an autoregressive signal; (ii) wind direction exerts a direct causal influence by determining the inflow of warm or cold air; (iii) through the collider structure, precipitation activates conditional dependence between temperature and pressure; and (iv) humidity appears correlated with temperature only through their shared cause wind direction, but becomes independent once wind direction is conditioned on. Feeding all of these histories indiscriminately into an all-to-all model conflates true causal drivers with spurious signals, leading to noisy attention weights, entangled parameter learning, and ultimately degraded forecasting performance.

To address the above challenges, we propose a novel all-to-one MTSF strategy that predicts the future trajectory of each target variable individually. This design enables capturing the heterogeneous influences of different historical segments on the target’s future. This naturally raises the question: how should the historical window be decomposed for each target variable? As discussed in Section 3, motivated by the structural properties of causal graphs and the d-separation criterion in structural causal models (SCMs), we partition the complete historical window for each target variable into four sub-segments: 1) Endogenous Sub-segment (ES): the target variable’s own history; 2) Direct Causal Sub-segment (DCS): histories of other variables that exhibit a direct influence on the target; 3) Collider Causal Sub-segment (CCS): histories that, along with the target, participate in collider patterns such as $V_i \rightarrow V_c \leftarrow V_s$; 4) Spurious Correlation Sub-segment (SCS): histories that become independent of the target once all other sub-segments are conditioned on.

Based on the above decomposition, we learn the conditional distribution $P(\text{target variable future} \mid \text{sub-segment history})$ for sub-segments 1)- 3), while discarding sub-segment 4) to avoid spurious correlations. We thus propose the Causal Informed Transformer (CAIFormer), comprising three blocks: Endogenous Sub-segment Prediction Block (ESPB), Direct Causal Sub-segment Prediction Block (DCSPB), and Collider Causal Sub-segment Prediction Block (CCSPB). ESPB applies an attention mechanism to capture both local and global temporal dependencies on ES. DCSPB applies a masked attention mechanism to attend exclusively to DCS, capturing the influence of direct causal variables. CCSPB first computes a preliminary prediction using masked attention over CCS and then projects it onto the kernel space (Section 3.5) to enforce the collider constraint and improve generalization. Finally, we combine the three blocks’ outputs via an output projection layer that adaptively weights their contributions to produce the final forecast.

Our contributions: 1) We propose an all-to-one forecasting paradigm for MTSF, in which each target variable’s future is predicted individually. For each target, we partition its complete history into four sub-segments: ES, DCS, CCS, and SCS; 2) We propose CAIFormer, a novel forecasting method that separately captures the roles of different categories of variables via ESPB, DCSPB, and CCSPB, and combines their predictions to achieve accurate and interpretable MTSF; 3) Extensive experiments and ablation studies on multiple benchmark datasets demonstrate that CAIFormer achieves superior predictive accuracy, robustness, and interpretability compared to existing methods.

2. Related Works

With the development of deep learning [62], numerous models have been proposed for MTSF [22, 27, 66, 107], including CNN-based [20, 30], RNN-based [21, 31], MLP-based [86], and Transformer-based [84] architectures. These approaches are all based on all-to-all strategy and can be broadly categorized based on their modeling focus into three groups: temporal-domain, frequency-domain, and variable-domain methods. Temporal domain methods, such as PatchTST [36] and TimesNet [34], focus on intra-variable dependencies by modeling patch-wise or point-wise relations. Frequency domain methods, such as FEDFormer [41] and FreDF [84], transform sequences into the Fourier domain to capture frequency-specific dynamics. Variable domain methods, such as iTransformer [19], model inter-variable dependencies via attention mechanisms, and TimeXer [90] proposes to treat variables' endogenous and exogenous signals differently. A more detailed discussion of these approaches, particularly from the perspective of variable modeling and causal inference, is provided in Appendix C. This paper proposes a MTSF method that can explore the causal relationships between the future of the target variable and different sub-segments of the input history.

3. Causal Analysis and Motivation

In this section, we first present some notations. Then, we explain from a causal analysis perspective why it is essential to separate the influence of different historical segments on the target variable. At last, we convert these causal analyses into concrete modeling guidelines for our MTSF framework.

3.1. Notation and Problem Definition

Let $X = [x_1, \dots, x_T] \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times D}$ be a historical sequence with T time steps and D variables. At each timestamp $t \in \{1, \dots, T\}$, the state of X is represented as $x_t = [V_1^t, \dots, V_D^t] \in \mathbb{R}^D$, where $V_i^t \in \mathbb{R}$ is the observed value of the variable V_i at time step t . Let $Y = [x_{T+1}, \dots, x_{T+S}] \in \mathbb{R}^{S \times D}$ be the future sequence with S time steps. Given a training dataset $D_{\text{train}} = \{(X^i, Y^i)\}_{i=1}^K$, where K is the number of training samples, X^i represents the i -th historical sequence, and Y^i is its corresponding future sequence. The learning process of MTSF can be formalized as finding an optimal predictor f^* within a hypothesis space \mathcal{F} , such that $f^*(X) = Y$. Specifically, the forecasting model is learned by solving the following empirical risk minimization problem:

$$f^* = \arg \min_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \frac{1}{K} \sum_{i=1}^K \mathcal{L}(Y^i, f(X^i)), \quad (1)$$

where $\mathcal{L}(\cdot)$ denotes the loss function, e.g., the MSE loss. As shown in Equation (1), the learning process of f^* doesn't constrain correlations among variables in the input.

In Section 1, we identified a potential limitation in existing MTSF methods: when analyzing model predictions from the perspective of a specific target variable, all-to-all based strategies may inadvertently encode spurious correlations between variables. This can lead to inaccurate forecasting and significantly degrade the model's generalization ability. This issue is further substantiated by the empirical analysis presented in Section 3.3. To address this challenge, the key lies in understanding how each variable's historical values contribute to target variable future evolution. We propose a segmentation strategy based on semantic consistency: the historical sequences of variables that influence the target variable

through similar causal mechanisms are grouped into the same sub-segment, while segments with distinct mechanisms are separated. In following section, we elaborate on the rationale and theoretical foundations behind this segmentation approach.

3.2. Why should the history be divided into endogenous and exogenous sub-segments?

For any target variable in MTSF, its own history can be regarded as a discrete sampling of an underlying dynamical system [133], encoding all the information needed to describe the variable’s intrinsic evolution [90]. What we really want to uncover is how the history of other variables influences that evolution. If we do not explicitly separate the endogenous sub-segment from the exogenous sub-segment, any apparent improvement in prediction will be confounded by the history of the target variable itself. We will observe that the target changes, but cannot determine whether that change is driven by external histories or merely by its own history. Clear causal attribution therefore, demands an explicit distinction between endogenous and exogenous historical sub-segments.

3.3. Why should the exogenous segment be further subdivided?

Having explicitly distinguished the endogenous and exogenous sub-segments, we next examine the causal structure of the exogenous sub-segment. According to [98], causal relationships between variables can be classified as either direct or indirect. From the SCM perspective, a direct causal relationship indicates an immediate connection between two variables, whereas an indirect causal relationship involves one or more intermediate nodes. As noted in Appendix D, two variables that are indirectly connected may become independent once we condition on intermediate variables. If we indiscriminately use the historical sequences of all variables to predict the target variable, we may inadvertently introduce spurious correlation. Therefore, the exogenous sub-segment should be further divided into causally relevant sub-segment and spurious correlation sub-segment.

To empirically validate the necessity of further subdividing the exogenous sub-segment, we conducted experiments on ETTh1, ETTm1, and Exchange-rate datasets. We employed Granger causality analysis, a common statistical test in time series analysis, to examine inter-variable predictive relationships. Specifically, if past values of one variable improve the forecasting accuracy of target variable, indicating a Granger-causal relationship, we classify its historical observations into the causally relevant sub-segment. Otherwise, it is assigned to the spurious correlation sub-segment because modeling its history introduces spurious correlations without improving predictive accuracy. Granger causality analysis outputs a P -value indicating statistical significance. To better visualize these influences, we apply a $-\log(P)$ transformation and present the results as a heatmap in Figure 1a-1c. In the heatmap, the cell at row m and column n represents causal influence from the m -th variable to the n -th variable, with darker colors corresponding to stronger influences. Diagonal elements are filled with a uniform color to exclude self-influence. As shown in Figure 1 left, some variables exhibit strong causal impacts on others, while many pairs display negligible or no causal effect. This observation underscores the necessity of clearly identifying genuine causal relationships to avoid spurious correlations, thereby improving predictive performance.

3.4. How should the exogenous segment be further subdivided?

To precisely distinguish genuine causal relationships from spurious ones, we systematically analyze all relevant causal pathways connected to the target variable V_i and construct a local SCM centered




Figure 1: (a)-(c) Visualization of Granger causality across variables in ETTh1, ETTm1, and Exchange datasets. Each heatmap shows the transformed causal strength matrix using $-\log(P)$ values, where a darker color indicates a stronger causal influence from the row variable to the column variable. Diagonal entries are masked. (d) Representative partial SCM commonly encountered in MTSF. White nodes represent the target variable V_i , red and green nodes represent causally related variables and spurious correlated variables separately.

around it. Based on the analysis detailed in Appendix D, we exhaust all categories of relationships among other variables and the target variable in Figure 1d, obtaining: 1) **Path a:** $V_1 \rightarrow V_i$. Contains only two variables, V_1 points to V_i , and there are no other variables connected to the left of V_1 . In this case, $V_1 \not\perp V_i$; 2) **Path b:** $V_D \dots V_{i+1} V_{i-1} \dots V_3 V_2 \rightarrow V_1 \rightarrow V_i$. Here, “ \rightarrow ” represents that the casual relationship between two variables is unclear, e.g., “ \rightarrow ” can be either “ \rightarrow ” or “ \leftarrow ”, but we are not sure whether it is “ \rightarrow ” or “ \leftarrow ”. In this case, when given $\mathcal{Z} = \{V_1, \dots, V_{i-1}, V_{i+1}, \dots, V_D\}$, we can obtain that $\{V_1 \not\perp V_i, V_j \perp V_i\} \mid \mathcal{Z}$, where $V_j \in \mathcal{Z} \setminus V_1$. Thus, **Path b** equals to $V_1 \rightarrow V_i$; 3) **Path c:** $V_D \dots V_{i+1} V_{i-1} \dots V_3 V_2 \leftarrow V_1 \rightarrow V_i$. In this case, when given $\mathcal{Z} = \{V_1, \dots, V_{i-1}, V_{i+1}, \dots, V_D\}$, we can obtain that $\{V_1 \not\perp V_i, V_j \perp V_i\} \mid \mathcal{Z}$, where $V_j \in \mathcal{Z} \setminus V_1$. Thus, **Path c** equals to $V_1 \rightarrow V_i$; 4) **Path d:** $V_i \rightarrow V_1$. Contains only two variables, V_i points to V_1 , and there are no other variables to the right of V_1 . In this case, $V_1 \not\perp V_i$; 5) **Path e:** $V_i \rightarrow V_1 \rightarrow V_2 \dots V_{i-1} V_{i+1} \dots V_D$. In this case, when given $\mathcal{Z} = \{V_1, \dots, V_{i-1}, V_{i+1}, \dots, V_D\}$, we can obtain that $\{V_1 \not\perp V_i, V_j \perp V_i\} \mid \mathcal{Z}$, where $V_j \in \mathcal{Z} \setminus V_1$. Thus, **Path e** equals to $V_i \rightarrow V_1$; 6) **Path f:** $V_i \rightarrow V_1 \leftarrow V_2 \dots V_{i-1} V_{i+1} \dots V_D$. In this case, when given $\mathcal{Z} = \{V_1, \dots, V_{i-1}, V_{i+1}, \dots, V_D\}$, we can obtain that $\{V_1 \not\perp V_i, V_2 \not\perp V_i, V_j \perp V_i\} \mid \mathcal{Z}$, where $V_j \in \mathcal{Z} \setminus \{V_1, V_2\}$. Thus, **Path f** equals to $V_i \rightarrow V_1 \leftarrow V_2$. Formal proofs of the conditional independencies asserted for each path are provided in Appendix E.

Without loss of generality, consider any SCM defined over a set of variables $\{V_1, \dots, V_D\}$. For any target variable V_i and the local SCM relevant to V_i can be represented by the combination of elements in **{Path a, ..., Path f}**. Then, we can identify a subset of variables that are conditionally dependent on the V_i and eliminate other independent variables. Specifically, the simplified SCM includes: 1) **Direct Parents:** Variables that have a direct causal influence on V_i , denoted as $V_p \rightarrow V_i$; 2) **Direct Children:** Variables that are directly influenced by V_i , denoted as $V_i \rightarrow V_k$ and each V_k is not a collider; 3) **Collider Structures:** Variables that form collider structure involving V_i , e.g., $V_i \rightarrow V_c \leftarrow V_s$, where V_c is the collider and V_s denotes the spouse variables.

Ultimately, for each variable, we partition the exogenous segment into three sub-segments: 1) Direct Causal Sub-segment (DCS): including all variables that are direct parents or direct children of the target variable, representing direct causal affect on target variable; 2) Collider Causal Sub-segment (CCS): consisting of variables that, together with the target, form collider patterns such as $V_i \rightarrow V_c \leftarrow V_s$, where V_c is the collider node; 3) Spurious Correlation Sub-segment (SCS): comprising every remaining

variable that is not part of the direct parent, direct child, or collider structures; these variables do not reflect genuine causality with the target variable. In the next section, we further elaborate on why causal relationships should be distinguished specifically between DCS and CCS to enhance predictive generalization.

3.5. Why is the causal relationship divided into two categories: DCS and CCS?

While both DCS and CCS are causally relevant to the target, we treat CCS as a separate component because its collider-induced dependencies behave differently in prediction: they do not directly affect the target, but can affect generalization if not properly constrained. As we show below, isolating CCS enables us to enforce a conditional independence constraint that reduces the generalization gap.

Consider any variable pair $(V_{c,j}, V_{s,j})$ that constitutes a collider structure $V_i \rightarrow V_{c,j} \leftarrow V_{s,j}$ within the set $\{V_{c,j}, V_{s,j}\}_{j=1}^m$, where m denotes the number of colliders. Both $V_{c,j}$ and $V_{s,j}$ consist of only one variable. Then, the optimal predictor f_{IP}^* under MSE loss for the future values of V_i is defined as:

$$V_i^{T:T+S} = f_{\text{IP}}^*(V_{c,j}^{0:T}, V_{s,j}^{0:T}) = \mathbb{E}[V_i^{T:T+S} | V_{c,j}^{0:T}, V_{s,j}^{0:T}]. \quad (2)$$

For notational simplicity, we henceforth denote the history $V_{c,j}^{0:T}$ and $V_{s,j}^{0:T}$ simply as $V_{c,j}$ and $V_{s,j}$ respectively, and $V_i^{T:T+S}$ simply as V_i . Thus, we have: $f_{\text{IP}}^*(V_{c,j}^{0:T}, V_{s,j}^{0:T}) \cong f_{\text{IP}}^*(V_{c,j}, V_{s,j}) = \mathbb{E}[V_i | V_{c,j}, V_{s,j}]$. Collider structure implies the independence relationship $V_i \perp\!\!\!\perp V_{s,j}$, we can obtain:

$$\mathbb{E}[f_{\text{IP}}^*(V_{c,j}, V_{s,j}) | V_{s,j}] = \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[V_i | V_{c,j}, V_{s,j}] | V_{s,j}] = \mathbb{E}[V_i | V_{s,j}] = \mathbb{E}[V_i], \quad (3)$$

where the second equality follows from the tower property [104]. Let $\mathcal{S}_{V_c} = \{V_{c,1}, \dots, V_{c,m}\}$ and $\mathcal{S}_{V_s} = \{V_{s,1}, \dots, V_{s,m}\}$. Since each path $V_i \rightarrow V_{c,j} \leftarrow V_{s,j}$, $j = 1, \dots, m$, forms a separate collider structure and these structures do not intersect, the corresponding independence relations hold. $V_i \perp\!\!\!\perp \mathcal{S}_{V_s}$ means every $V_{s,j} \in \mathcal{S}_{V_s}$ is $V_i \perp\!\!\!\perp V_{s,j}$, and $V_i \not\perp\!\!\!\perp \mathcal{S}_{V_s} | \mathcal{S}_{V_c}$ means condition on \mathcal{S}_{V_c} , $\forall V_{s,j} \in \mathcal{S}_{V_s}$ exists $V_i \not\perp\!\!\!\perp V_{s,j} | \mathcal{S}_{V_c}$. For all variable pairs in $\{V_{c,j}, V_{s,j}\}_{j=1}^m$, Equation (3) equals to:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[f_{\text{IP}}^*(\mathcal{S}_{V_c}, \mathcal{S}_{V_s}) | \mathcal{S}_{V_s}] &= \mathbb{E}[f_{\text{IP}}^*(V_{c,1}, V_{s,1}, \dots, V_{c,m}, V_{s,m}) | V_{s,1}, \dots, V_{s,m}] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[V_i | V_{c,1}, V_{s,1}, \dots, V_{c,m}, V_{s,m}] | V_{s,1}, \dots, V_{s,m}] = \mathbb{E}[V_i | V_{s,1}, \dots, V_{s,m}] = \mathbb{E}[V_i], \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

Without loss of generality, we assume that $\mathbb{E}[V_i] = C$, here C is a constant. This implies that:

$$f_{\text{IP}}^* \in \mathcal{F}_{\Psi} = \{f \in \mathcal{F} \mid \mathbb{E}[f(\mathcal{S}_{V_c}, \mathcal{S}_{V_s}) | \mathcal{S}_{V_s}] - C = 0\}, \quad (5)$$

where \mathcal{F} is denoted as $L^2(V)$, a space of the square-integrable functions. Let $\Phi : L^2(V) \rightarrow L^2(V)$ denote the following conditional expectation operator:

$$\Phi f(\mathcal{S}_{V_c}, \mathcal{S}_{V_s}) = \mathbb{E}[f(\mathcal{S}_{V_c}, \mathcal{S}_{V_s}) | \mathcal{S}_{V_s}] - C. \quad (6)$$

Based on Equation (5) and Equation (6), the space $L^2(V)$ can be decomposed orthogonally as $L^2(V) = \text{Preimage}(\Phi) \oplus \text{Kernel}(\Phi)$, where $\text{Kernel}(\Phi) = \mathcal{F}_{\Psi}$ denotes the kernel (null space) of Φ , while $\text{Preimage}(\Phi)$




Figure 2: Visualization of the CAIFormer. (a) depicts the overall architecture, consisting of ESPB, DCSPB, and CCSPB, three Blocks. (b) illustrates the Encoder structure, featuring Multi-Patch Attention in ESPB and Multi-variate Attention in both DCSPB and CCSPB. (c) shows the causal discovery on a dataset. (d) demonstrates how we impose constraints on Multi-variate Attention.

denotes the preimage space (inverse image) of Φ . Based on Equation (2) and (5), we obtain that f_{IP}^* lies in $\text{Kernel}(\Phi)$. Then, for any $f \in L^2(V)$, define the projection Ψ as:

$$\Psi f = f - \Phi f, \quad (7)$$

where $\Psi = I - \Phi$ and I is an identity mapping. Then, Ψ orthogonal projects f into $\text{Kernel}(\Phi)$. Thus, we want Ψf as our ideal prediction function. Then, we can obtain the following theorem, which demonstrates that Ψf can improve generalization of f :

Theorem 3.1. (Generalization Gap Reduction) For any predictor $f \in L^2(V)$, we can obtain $\Delta(f, \Psi f) = \|\Phi f\|_{L^2(V)}^2 \geq 0$, where $\Delta(f, \Psi f)$ denotes the generalization gap, which is defined by $\Delta(f, \Psi f) = \mathbb{E}[(V_i - f(S_{V_c}, S_{V_s}))^2] - \mathbb{E}[(V_i - \Psi f(S_{V_c}, S_{V_s}))^2]$.

See the proof in Appendix F. From a causal perspective, Φf captures the portion of f that is spuriously correlated with S_{V_s} . In other words, the operator Φ extracts those components of f that vary systematically with S_{V_s} but offer no real predictive benefit for V_i . Under collider-induced independence ($V_i \perp\!\!\!\perp S_{V_s}$), any apparent correlation with S_{V_s} reflects noise or sampling artifacts. Consequently, incorporating this dependence not only fails to improve prediction but can also inflate variance by fitting irrelevant fluctuations. By contrast, the projection Ψf removes these spurious elements-effectively filtering out parts of f that do not help predict V_i . Eliminating such irrelevant dependencies tightens the generalization bound [99] because reducing the hypothesis space naturally curbs overfitting. This observation clarifies the reasoning behind **Theorem 3.1**, and shows how constraining f to the kernel space of Φ directly mitigates the generalization gap. The above theoretical insights naturally motivate the decomposition strategy employed in our final predictive model, as described in the next sections.

Motivation. Drawing on the analyses in Sections 3.2-3.5, we partition the historical influence of all variables on the target variable into three components: the ES, DCS, and CCS. This decomposition motivates an MTSF architecture that assigns a dedicated modeling module to each component and then combines their outputs to yield the final prediction.

4. The Proposed Method

Most existing Transformer-based methods for MTSF follow an all-to-all forecasting principle, which we found insufficient given the causal decomposition motivated in Section 3. Thus, we adopt a decomposed MTSF strategy that first selects each variable in Y and then forecasts it individually to better isolate causal influences. This finer-grained approach enables examination of how each historical segment affects each target variable’s future. Guided by this idea, we refine the forecasting process in three ways: 1) we explicitly distinguish the target’s own history from other variables’ histories (Section 3.2); 2) we identify and remove spurious associations while preserving genuine causal effects (Section 3.3 and 3.4); and 3) we further partition the endogenous segment into DCS and CCS based on their distinct roles in prediction (Section 3.5). Therefore, we propose Causal Informed Transformer (CAIFormer), a novel MTSF architecture that implements this decomposition. In this section, we detail the framework of CAIFormer.

Causal Discovery. As the first step, we apply the Peter-Clark (PC) algorithm [121, 122] on observational data (Figure 2(c)) to construct a Directed Acyclic Graph (DAG). The algorithm outputs all conditional independencies as a adjacency matrix $W_{\text{adjm}} \in \{-1, 0, 1\}^{D \times D}$, where $W_{\text{adjm}}[i][j] = -1$ denotes V_i has a causal edge pointing to V_j .

For each target variable V_i , we then extract four sets from W_{adjm} in line with our decomposition: First, we define the Direct Parents, which have edges pointing to V_i , formally defined by $\mathcal{S}_i^P = \{V_p \mid W_{\text{adjm}}[p][i] = -1\}$. Secondly, we identify Direct Children without other parents as $\mathcal{S}_i^K = \{V_k \mid W_{\text{adjm}}[i][k] = -1, W_{\text{adjm}}[s][k] \neq -1, \forall s \neq i\}$. We then construct the Direct causal mask $D_{\text{mask}}[i][j]$, where the entry is set to 1 if $V_j \in \mathcal{S}_i^P$ or $V_j \in \mathcal{S}_i^K$, and 0 otherwise. Then, we identify Colliders by $\mathcal{S}_i^C = \{V_c \mid W_{\text{adjm}}[i][c] = -1, \exists s \neq i, W_{\text{adjm}}[s][c] = -1, D_{\text{mask}}[i][s] \neq 1\}$. Finally, for each $V_c \in \mathcal{S}_i^C$, its spouse set is $\mathcal{S}_i^S = \{V_s \mid W_{\text{adjm}}[s][c] = -1, s \neq i, D_{\text{mask}}[i][s] \neq 1\}$. We then define the collider structure masks as follows: $CS_{\text{mask}}[i][j] = 1$, if $V_j \in \mathcal{S}_i^C$ or $V_j \in \mathcal{S}_i^S$, and 0 otherwise; and $S_{\text{mask}}[i][j] = 1$ if $V_j \in \mathcal{S}_i^S$, and 0 otherwise.

Endogenous Sub-segment Prediction Block (ESPB). As discussed in Section 3.2, each target’s endogenous segment encodes its intrinsic evolution. Thus, we design the ESPB to capture each target’s intrinsic temporal dynamics. Formally, Let the input history be $X = \{V_1^{0:T}, V_2^{0:T}, \dots, V_D^{0:T}\} \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times D}$, where T is the number of time steps and D denotes the number of variables. Correspondingly, the future sequence is defined as $Y = \{V_1^{T:T+S}, V_2^{T:T+S}, \dots, V_D^{T:T+S}\}$, where $V_i^{T:T+S}$ denotes the future S time steps values of the target variable V_i . We predict the future of V_i by $V_i^{T:T+S} = f_e(V_i^{0:T})$. Specifically, we apply the Patching module [36] to split X into overlapping temporal patches: $X_{\text{Patch}} = f_{\text{Patch}}(X)$, where $f_{\text{Patch}} : \mathbb{R}^{T \times D} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{H \times P \times D}$ is a variable-wise independent process, with H is the number of patches and P is the length of each patch. Next, we embed the patches: $X_{\text{Enc}}^0 = f_{\text{Emb}}^t(X_{\text{Patch}})$, resulting in an embedded representation $X_{\text{Enc}}^0 \in \mathbb{R}^{D \times H \times d_E}$, where d_E is the embedding dimension. Subsequently, the embeddings pass through E_e consecutive Encoder layers: $X_{\text{Enc}}^e = \text{Encoder}(X_{\text{Enc}}^{e-1})$, $e = 1, \dots, E_e$. Finally, we project the final embeddings to forecast space: $Y_e = f_{\text{Projection}}^e(X_{\text{Enc}}^{E_e})$, where $Y_e \in \mathbb{R}^{S \times D}$ constitutes the ESPB output.

Direct Causal Sub-segment Prediction Block (DCSPB). As discussed in Section 3.4, direct parents exert direct influence on the target, while direct children are directly influenced by it. We model capture causal impact by $V_i^{T:T+S} = f_d(V_p^{0:T}, V_k^{0:T}) = \sum_{\alpha \in V_p^{0:T}} g_d(\alpha)/\delta + \sum_{\beta \in V_k^{0:T}} g_d(\beta)/\delta$, where g_d transforms a direct causal sub-segment into a predictive representation, and δ is a normalization factor. Specifically, DCSPB employs a Transformer whose attention is masked by D_{mask} .

Transformer with Variable Attention Mask. We first apply a variable-wise embedding: $X_{\text{Enc}}^0 = f_{\text{Emb}}^v(X)$, where $X_{\text{Enc}}^0 \in \mathbb{R}^{D \times d_D}$ and d_D is the embedding dimension. Then, for $e = 1, \dots, E_d$, we compute $X_{\text{Enc}}^e = \text{Encoder}(X_{\text{Enc}}^{e-1}, D_{\text{mask}})$. We apply D_{mask} in attention: $\text{Attention}(Q, K, V) = \text{softmax}(QK^T \odot D_{\text{mask}}/\sqrt{d_k})V$, where \odot is element-wise multiplication and d_k is the dimensionality factor used for scaling. Finally, we project to the forecast space: $Y_d = f_{\text{Projection}}^d(X_{\text{Enc}}^{E_d})$, where $Y_d \in \mathbb{R}^{S \times D}$ yielding the DCSPB output.

Collider Causal Sub-segment Prediction Block (CCSPB). As discussed in Section 3.4, CCSPB predicts $V_i^{T:T+S} = f_c(V_c^{0:T}, V_s^{0:T})$ for collider structure. Specifically, f_c follows DCSPB similar pipeline: embedding, E_c mask-attention encoder layers, and projection, apply to $V_c^{0:T}$ and $V_s^{0:T}$. The attention in each encoder layer is masked by CS_{mask} , thus, the model attends only to the collider structure. Producing preliminary predictions Z , which are then refined under the collider constraint.

Collider Constraint. For the preliminary prediction Z , we enforce the constraint in Equation (7) by projecting into $\text{Range}(\Phi)$. Specifically, we extract spouse sub-segment via $X_{\text{Collider}} = X \odot S_{\text{mask}}$, where \odot denotes element-wise multiplication. We then compute the conditional expectation $EZ = \mathbb{E}[Z | X_{\text{Collider}}] - C$ according to Equation (6). Finally, we project Z into the $\text{Kernel}(\Phi)$ by subtracting EZ , yielding $Y_c = Z - EZ$, thereby enforcing the constraint in Equation (5). Here, $Y_c \in \mathbb{R}^{S \times D}$ is the final output of the CCSPB.

Output Projection Layer. We concatenate the three outputs along the variable dimension: $Y_{\text{cat}} = \text{Concat}(Y_e, Y_d, Y_c) \in \mathbb{R}^{S \times (3D)}$. We then fuse via an MLP: $Y = f_o(Y_{\text{cat}}) = Y_{\text{cat}} W_o + b_o$, where $W_o \in \mathbb{R}^{3D \times D}$ and $b_o \in \mathbb{R}^{S \times D}$ are learnable parameters that adaptively fuse the three sub-segment outputs into the final prediction $Y = (V_1^{T:T+S}, \dots, V_D^{T:T+S}) \in \mathbb{R}^{S \times D}$.

In summary, our decoupled forecasting approach offers several advantages. First, by explicitly excluding irrelevant variables, the model eliminates the risk of learning misleading patterns. Second, by separating intrinsic temporal dynamics from direct causal influences, the model achieves more accurate interaction modeling. Third, systematically incorporating collider structure variables leverages conditional dependencies, enhancing the forecasting context.

5. Experimental Results

In this section, we first present the comparison results on six benchmark datasets. Next, we conduct ablation studies to evaluate the effectiveness of each module and projection Ψ . Finally, we assess the robustness of CAIFormer.

Experimental Setup. We evaluate CAIFormer on six real-world multivariate time series datasets covering electricity, weather, and economy domains. All experiments are implemented in PyTorch and trained on NVIDIA V100 GPUs. For fair comparison, we adopt the standard train-validation-test splits and preprocessing protocols introduced in [19]. Hyperparameters such as learning rate, batch size, model depth, and hidden dimensions are selected from pre-defined grids based on performance. Evaluation metrics include Mean Squared Error (MSE) and Mean Absolute Error (MAE), averaged over five random seeds. More detailed descriptions of datasets, PC algorithm implementation, and model configurations are provided in Appendix G, J, and H, respectively.

Comparison Results. We thoroughly evaluate the proposed CAIFormer on various MTSF benchmarks. For better comparison, we follow the settings of iTransformer in [19]. We fix the length of the lookback series as 96, and the prediction length varies in $\{96, 192, 336, 720\}$. We carefully choose 8 well-acknowledged

Table 1: Multivariate time series forecasting results with prediction lengths $S \in \{96, 192, 336, 720\}$ and fixed lookback length $T = 96$. The best results in **bold** and the second underlined. The lower MSE/MAE indicates a more accurate prediction result.

Models		CAIFormer (Ours)		iTransformer [19]		PatchTST [36]		Crossformer [37]		TiDE [51]		TimesNet [34]		DLinear [42]		FEDformer [41]		Autoformer [38]	
Metric		MSE	MAE	MSE	MAE	MSE	MAE	MSE	MAE	MSE	MAE	MSE	MAE	MSE	MAE	MSE	MAE	MSE	MAE
ETTh1	96	0.327	0.364	0.334	0.368	0.329	0.367	0.404	0.426	0.364	0.387	0.338	0.375	0.345	0.372	0.379	0.419	0.505	0.475
	192	0.361	0.377	0.377	0.391	0.367	0.385	0.450	0.451	0.398	0.404	0.374	0.387	0.380	0.389	0.426	0.441	0.553	0.496
	336	0.391	0.402	0.426	0.420	0.399	0.410	0.532	0.515	0.428	0.425	0.410	0.411	0.413	0.413	0.445	0.459	0.621	0.537
	720	0.449	0.437	0.491	0.459	0.454	0.439	0.666	0.589	0.487	0.461	0.478	0.450	0.474	0.453	0.543	0.490	0.671	0.561
	Avg	0.382	0.395	0.407	0.410	0.387	0.400	0.513	0.496	0.419	0.419	0.400	0.406	0.403	0.407	0.448	0.452	0.588	0.517
ETTh2	96	0.168	0.255	0.180	0.264	0.175	0.259	0.287	0.366	0.207	0.305	0.187	0.267	0.193	0.292	0.203	0.287	0.255	0.339
	192	0.240	0.302	0.250	0.309	0.241	0.302	0.414	0.492	0.290	0.364	0.249	0.309	0.284	0.362	0.269	0.328	0.281	0.340
	336	0.300	0.339	0.311	0.348	0.305	0.343	0.597	0.542	0.377	0.422	0.321	0.351	0.369	0.427	0.325	0.366	0.339	0.372
	720	0.398	0.397	0.412	0.407	0.402	0.400	1.730	1.042	0.558	0.524	0.408	0.403	0.554	0.522	0.421	0.415	0.433	0.432
	Avg	0.276	0.323	0.288	0.332	0.281	0.326	0.757	0.610	0.358	0.404	0.291	0.333	0.350	0.401	0.305	0.349	0.327	0.371
ETTh1	96	0.372	0.399	0.386	0.405	0.414	0.419	0.423	0.448	0.479	0.464	0.384	0.402	0.386	0.400	0.376	0.419	0.449	0.459
	192	0.429	0.426	0.441	0.436	0.460	0.445	0.471	0.474	0.525	0.492	0.436	0.429	0.437	0.432	0.420	0.448	0.500	0.482
	336	0.464	0.449	0.487	0.458	0.501	0.466	0.570	0.546	0.565	0.515	0.491	0.469	0.481	0.459	0.459	0.465	0.521	0.496
	720	0.495	0.483	0.503	0.491	0.500	0.488	0.653	0.621	0.594	0.558	0.521	0.500	0.519	0.516	0.506	0.507	0.514	0.512
	Avg	0.439	0.439	0.454	0.447	0.469	0.454	0.529	0.522	0.541	0.507	0.458	0.450	0.456	0.452	0.440	0.460	0.496	0.487
ETTh2	96	0.294	0.344	0.297	0.349	0.302	0.348	0.745	0.584	0.400	0.440	0.340	0.374	0.333	0.387	0.358	0.397	0.346	0.388
	192	0.377	0.398	0.380	0.400	0.388	0.400	0.877	0.656	0.528	0.509	0.402	0.414	0.477	0.476	0.429	0.439	0.456	0.452
	336	0.425	0.430	0.428	0.432	0.426	0.433	1.043	0.731	0.643	0.571	0.452	0.452	0.594	0.541	0.496	0.487	0.482	0.486
	720	0.424	0.442	0.427	0.445	0.431	0.446	1.104	0.763	0.874	0.679	0.462	0.468	0.831	0.657	0.463	0.474	0.515	0.511
	Avg	0.380	0.403	0.383	0.407	0.387	0.407	0.942	0.684	0.611	0.550	0.414	0.427	0.559	0.515	0.437	0.449	0.450	0.459
Exchange	96	0.083	0.201	0.086	0.206	0.088	0.205	0.256	0.367	0.094	0.218	0.107	0.234	0.088	0.218	0.148	0.278	0.197	0.323
	192	0.173	0.295	0.177	0.299	0.176	0.299	0.470	0.509	0.184	0.307	0.226	0.344	0.176	0.315	0.271	0.315	0.300	0.369
	336	0.292	0.395	0.331	0.417	0.301	0.397	1.268	0.883	0.349	0.431	0.367	0.448	0.313	0.427	0.460	0.427	0.509	0.524
	720	0.832	0.688	0.847	0.691	0.901	0.714	1.767	1.068	0.852	0.698	0.964	0.746	0.839	0.695	1.195	0.695	1.447	0.941
	Avg	0.345	0.395	0.360	0.403	0.367	0.404	0.940	0.707	0.370	0.413	0.416	0.443	0.354	0.414	0.519	0.429	0.613	0.539
Weather	96	0.147	0.205	0.174	0.214	0.177	0.218	0.158	0.230	0.202	0.261	0.172	0.220	0.196	0.255	0.217	0.296	0.266	0.336
	192	0.195	0.243	0.221	0.254	0.225	0.259	0.206	0.277	0.242	0.298	0.219	0.261	0.237	0.296	0.276	0.336	0.307	0.367
	336	0.269	0.285	0.278	0.296	0.278	0.297	0.272	0.335	0.287	0.335	0.280	0.306	0.283	0.335	0.339	0.380	0.359	0.395
	720	0.345	0.340	0.358	0.349	0.354	0.348	0.398	0.418	0.351	0.386	0.365	0.359	0.345	0.381	0.403	0.428	0.419	0.428
	Avg	0.239	0.268	0.258	0.279	0.259	0.281	0.259	0.315	0.271	0.320	0.259	0.287	0.265	0.317	0.309	0.360	0.338	0.382

forecasting models, including Transformer-based methods: iTransformer [19], PatchTST [36], Autoformer [38], FEDformer [41], Crossformer [37]; Linear-based methods: DLinear [42], TiDE [51]; TCN-based methods: TimesNet [34]. Table 1 presents the performance of CAIFormer in MTSF with the best in **bold** and the second-best being underlined. The lower MSE/MAE indicates a more accurate prediction result. Not only compared to iTransformer [19], which utilizes variable attention to compute the correlation between variables, but also compared to PatchTST [36], which utilizes attention to compute the correlation between time patch, CAIFormer consistently achieves lower MSE and MAE across all datasets, demonstrating its superior forecasting accuracy.

Ablation Study About Each Block. To evaluate the contribution of each component in our model, we conduct an ablation study on the Weather, ETTh1, and Exchange datasets. Specifically, we examine the forecasting performance when using only one of the three modules, ESPB, DCSPB, or CCSPB, while disabling the others. For all experiments, the lookback window is fixed at $T = 96$, and the prediction horizon S is varied across $\{96, 192, 336, 720\}$. The averaged forecasting errors in terms of MSE and MAE are reported in Table 2. The best performance is obtained when all three blocks are used together. Removing any single component leads to a noticeable increase in prediction error, indicating that each module captures a distinct and complementary aspect of the target. Additionally, to verify the importance of causal masks, we introduce Shuffle Mask setting, where the original D_{mask} and CS_{mask} are randomly permuted 10% across variables. In these experiments, we isolate either DCSPB or CCSPB while disabling the other two blocks, and compare performance with and without mask shuffling. Results (last two rows in Table 2) show that using randomly 10% shuffled masks significantly deteriorates performance,

underscoring that the learned DAG structure provides meaningful guidance for variable-level attention and prediction.

Table 2: The average performance of lookback length $T = 96$ and prediction lengths $S \in \{96, 192, 336, 720\}$ in weather and ETTh1 datasets.

ESPB	DCSPB	CCSPB	Shuffle Mask	Weather		ETTh1		Exchange	
				MSE	MAE	MSE	MAE	MSE	MAE
w	w	w	No	0.239	0.268	0.439	0.439	0.345	0.395
w/o	w/o	w	No	0.354	0.345	0.533	0.527	0.448	0.497
w	w/o	w/o	No	0.259	0.281	0.469	0.454	0.367	0.404
w/o	w	w/o	No	0.282	0.326	0.491	0.483	0.415	0.463
w/o	w/o	w	Yes	0.378	0.369	0.551	0.548	0.471	0.522
w/o	w	w/o	Yes	0.331	0.370	0.512	0.509	0.439	0.487

Ablation Study on the Projection Operator Ψ .

To empirically validate the generalization benefits of the projection operator Ψ introduced in Section 3.5, we conduct an ablation experiment on the Weather dataset. We fix both the lookback window and the prediction horizon to 96, and compare two model variants: one with the projection Ψ applied to the collider sub-module’s output, and one without it. Figure 3 plots the training and test MSE Loss over epochs for both variants. The results show that applying Ψ substantially reduces the generalization gap, that is, the difference between training and test losses, indicating improved robustness and better generalization. This aligns with the theoretical insight that Ψ eliminates components of the predictor that are spuriously correlated with collider spouse variables.




Figure 3: Effect of Ψ Projection on Train/Test Loss

Table 3: Robustness evaluation of CAIFormer. The reported results (MSE and MAE) reflect the mean and standard deviation computed over five independent runs with different random seeds.

Dataset Horizon	ETTh1		ETTh1		Exchange	
	MSE	MAE	MSE	MAE	MSE	MAE
96	0.327±0.002	0.364±0.001	0.382±0.002	0.399±0.003	0.083±0.000	0.201±0.002
192	0.361±0.002	0.377±0.003	0.429±0.003	0.426±0.001	0.173±0.001	0.295±0.001
336	0.391±0.003	0.402±0.001	0.474±0.002	0.449±0.002	0.302±0.002	0.395±0.001
720	0.449±0.002	0.437±0.004	0.495±0.003	0.483±0.004	0.842±0.005	0.688±0.003

Robustness evaluation To assess the robustness, we examine the sensitivity to variations induced by different random seeds. Specifically, we repeat experiments five times, each time using a different random seed from $\{2021, 2022, 2023, 2024, 2025\}$ on the ETTh1, ETTh1, and Exchange-rate datasets. Table 3 summarizes the standard deviations of CAIFormer’s performance across these runs. The consistently low standard deviations demonstrate that the performance of CAIFormer is stable.

6. Conclusion

In this paper, we rethink the problem of MTSF from a causal perspective. We introduce an all-to-one decoupled forecasting strategy, based on which we develop a novel model, CAIFormer. For each target variable, we treat it independently and partition the history window into four sub-segments. CAIFormer employs three blocks to model the first three causal sub-segments in isolation, then combines their predictions at the output layer. This design effectively removes irrelevant variables, captures the target’s intrinsic pattern, and identifies related variables according to their distinct causal roles, thereby delivering an interpretable and efficient solution to MTSF.

References

- [1] Y. Bengio and Y. LeCun, “Scaling learning algorithms towards AI.” MIT Press, 2007.
- [2] G. E. Hinton, S. Osindero, and Y. W. Teh, “A fast learning algorithm for deep belief nets,” *Neural Computation*, vol. 18, pp. 1527–1554, 2006.
- [3] I. Goodfellow, Y. Bengio, A. Courville, and Y. Bengio, *Deep learning*. MIT Press, 2016, vol. 1.
- [4] M. Bilal, H. Kim, M. Fayaz, and P. Pawar, “Comparative analysis of time series forecasting approaches for household electricity consumption prediction,” 2022.
- [5] M. Hoffmann, L. Kotzur, D. Stolten, and M. Robinius, “A review on time series aggregation methods for energy system models,” *Energies*, vol. 13, no. 3, p. 641, 2020. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.3390/en13030641>
- [6] C. Duchon and R. Hale, “Time series analysis in meteorology and climatology: An introduction,” 2012.
- [7] J. Pearl, “Causal inference in statistics: An overview,” 2009.
- [8] E. N. Lorenz, *Empirical orthogonal functions and statistical weather prediction*. Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Department of Meteorology Cambridge, 1956, vol. 1.
- [9] —, *Empirical orthogonal functions and statistical weather prediction*. Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Department of Meteorology Cambridge, 1956, vol. 1.
- [10] L. Li, X. Su, Y. Zhang, Y. Lin, and Z. Li, “Trend modeling for traffic time series analysis: An integrated study,” *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, vol. 16, no. 6, pp. 3430–3439, 2015.
- [11] F. Al-Turjman, M. Nawaz, U. Ulusar, and R. I. Saeed, “Artificial intelligence-based traffic flow prediction: a comprehensive review,” *Journal of Electrical Systems and Information Technology*, 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1186/s43067-023-00081-6>
- [12] A. A. Ariyo, A. O. Adewumi, and C. K. Ayo, “Stock price prediction using the arima model,” 2014, pp. 106–112.
- [13] J. Hidalgo, “Journal of time series econometrics,” 2009. [Online]. Available: <https://www.degruyter.com/journal/key/jtse/html>

- [14] J. Lonlac, A. Doniec, M. Lujak, and S. Lecoeuche, “Extracting seasonal gradual patterns from temporal sequence data using periodic patterns mining,” 2020. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2010.10289>
- [15] C. Yang, X. Chen, L. Sun, and H. Yang, “Enhancing representation learning for periodic time series with floss: A frequency domain regularization approach,” 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/pdf/2308.01011.pdf>
- [16] R. N. Bracewell, *The Fourier Transform and its Applications*. McGraw Hill, 1986.
- [17] R. Bracewell, “The fourier transform and its applications,” 2000. [Online]. Available: <https://books.google.com.ph/books?id=ecH2KgAACAAJ>
- [18] A. Vaswani, N. Shazeer, N. Parmar, J. Uszkoreit, L. Jones, A. N. Gomez, Ł. Kaiser, and I. Polosukhin, “Attention is all you need,” 2017.
- [19] Y. Liu, T. Hu, H. Zhang, H. Wu, S. Wang, L. Ma, and M. Long, “itransformer: Inverted transformers are effective for time series forecasting,” 2023.
- [20] S. Bai, J. Z. Kolter, and V. Koltun, “An empirical evaluation of generic convolutional and recurrent networks for sequence modeling,” 2018.
- [21] H. Hewamalage, C. Bergmeir, and K. Bandara, “Recurrent neural networks for time series forecasting: Current status and future directions,” *International Journal of Forecasting*, vol. 37, no. 1, p. 388–427, Jan. 2021. [Online]. Available: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijforecast.2020.06.008>
- [22] Q. Wen, T. Zhou, C. Zhang, W. Chen, Z. Ma, J. Yan, and L. Sun, “Transformers in time series: A survey,” 2023.
- [23] K. Yi, Q. Zhang, L. Cao, S. Wang, G. Long, L. Hu, H. He, Z. Niu, W. Fan, and H. Xiong, “A survey on deep learning based time series analysis with frequency transformation,” 2023.
- [24] G. Chiarot and C. Silvestri, “Time series compression survey,” *ACM Computing Surveys*, vol. 55, no. 10, p. 1–32, Feb. 2023. [Online]. Available: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1145/3560814>
- [25] K. Yi, Q. Zhang, W. Fan, H. He, L. Hu, P. Wang, N. An, L. Cao, and Z. Niu, “Fouriergnn: Rethinking multivariate time series forecasting from a pure graph perspective,” 2023.
- [26] C. Zhu, X. Ma, W. Ding, and J. Zhan, “Long-term time series forecasting with multilinear trend fuzzy information granules for lstm in a periodic framework,” *IEEE Transactions on Fuzzy Systems*, vol. 32, no. 1, pp. 322–336, 2024.
- [27] Y. Hu and F. Xiao, “Time-series forecasting based on fuzzy cognitive visibility graph and weighted multisubgraph similarity,” *IEEE Transactions on Fuzzy Systems*, vol. 31, no. 4, pp. 1281–1293, 2022.
- [28] Y. Cheng, W. Xing, W. Pedrycz, S. Xian, and W. Liu, “Nfig-x: Non-linear fuzzy information granule series for long-term traffic flow time series forecasting,” 2023.
- [29] F. Li, Y. Tang, F. Yu, W. Pedrycz, Y. Liu, and W. Zeng, “Multilinear-trend fuzzy information granule-based short-term forecasting for time series,” *IEEE Transactions on Fuzzy Systems*, vol. 30, no. 8, pp. 3360–3372, 2021.

- [30] T. Zhan, Y. He, Y. Deng, and Z. Li, “Differential convolutional fuzzy time series forecasting,” 2023.
- [31] Y. Tang, F. Yu, W. Pedrycz, X. Yang, J. Wang, and S. Liu, “Building trend fuzzy granulation-based lstm recurrent neural network for long-term time-series forecasting,” *IEEE transactions on fuzzy systems*, vol. 30, no. 6, pp. 1599–1613, 2021.
- [32] K. Yi, Q. Zhang, W. Fan, S. Wang, P. Wang, H. He, D. Lian, N. An, L. Cao, and Z. Niu, “Frequency-domain mlps are more effective learners in time series forecasting,” 2023.
- [33] Z.-Q. J. Xu, “Frequency principle: Fourier analysis sheds light on deep neural networks,” *Communications in Computational Physics*, vol. 28, no. 5, p. 1746–1767, Jun. 2020. [Online]. Available: <http://dx.doi.org/10.4208/cicp.OA-2020-0085>
- [34] H. Wu, T. Hu, Y. Liu, H. Zhou, J. Wang, and M. Long, “Timesnet: Temporal 2d-variation modeling for general time series analysis,” 2023.
- [35] G. Woo, C. Liu, D. Sahoo, A. Kumar, and S. Hoi, “Cost: Contrastive learning of disentangled seasonal-trend representations for time series forecasting,” 2022.
- [36] Y. Nie, N. H. Nguyen, P. Sinthong, and J. Kalagnanam, “A time series is worth 64 words: Long-term forecasting with transformers,” 2023.
- [37] Y. Zhang and J. Yan, “Crossformer: Transformer utilizing cross-dimension dependency for multivariate time series forecasting,” 2023.
- [38] H. Wu, J. Xu, J. Wang, and M. Long, “Autoformer: Decomposition transformers with Auto-Correlation for long-term series forecasting,” 2021.
- [39] J. Li, X. Hui, and W. Zhang, “Informer: Beyond efficient transformer for long sequence time-series forecasting,” 2021.
- [40] Y. Liu, H. Wu, J. Wang, and M. Long, “Non-stationary transformers: Rethinking the stationarity in time series forecasting,” 2022.
- [41] T. Zhou, Z. Ma, Q. Wen, X. Wang, L. Sun, and R. Jin, “FEDformer: Frequency enhanced decomposed transformer for long-term series forecasting,” Baltimore, Maryland, 2022.
- [42] A. Zeng, M. Chen, L. Zhang, and Q. Xu, “Are transformers effective for time series forecasting?” 2023.
- [43] M. Liu, A. Zeng, M. Chen, Z. Xu, Q. Lai, L. Ma, and Q. Xu, “Scinet: time series modeling and forecasting with sample convolution and interaction,” 2022.
- [44] T. Zhou, Z. Ma, Q. Wen, L. Sun, T. Yao, W. Yin, R. Jin *et al.*, “Film: Frequency improved legendre memory model for long-term time series forecasting,” pp. 12 677–12 690, 2022.
- [45] K. Zhou, H. Yu, W. X. Zhao, and J.-R. Wen, “Filter-enhanced mlp is all you need for sequential recommendation,” ser. WWW ’22. ACM, Apr. 2022. [Online]. Available: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1145/3485447.3512111>
- [46] X. Zhang, Z. Zhao, T. Tsiligkaridis, and M. Zitnik, “Self-supervised contrastive pre-training for time series via time-frequency consistency,” 2022.

- [47] K. Xu, M. Qin, F. Sun, Y. Wang, Y.-K. Chen, and F. Ren, “Learning in the frequency domain,” 2020.
- [48] Z. Qin, P. Zhang, F. Wu, and X. Li, “Fcanet: Frequency channel attention networks,” 2021.
- [49] A. Paszke, S. Gross, F. Massa, A. Lerer, J. Bradbury, G. Chanan, T. Killeen, Z. Lin, N. Gimelshein, L. Antiga, A. Desmaison, A. Köpf, E. Yang, Z. DeVito, M. Raison, A. Tejani, S. Chilamkurthy, B. Steiner, L. Fang, J. Bai, and S. Chintala, “Pytorch: An imperative style, high-performance deep learning library,” *NeurIPS*, 2019.
- [50] D. P. Kingma and J. Ba, “Adam: A method for stochastic optimization,” *ICLR*, 2015.
- [51] A. Das, W. Kong, A. Leach, R. Sen, and R. Yu, “Long-term forecasting with tide: Time-series dense encoder,” 2023.
- [52] I. O. Tolstikhin, N. Houlsby, A. Kolesnikov, L. Beyer, X. Zhai, T. Unterthiner, J. Yung, A. Steiner, D. Keysers, J. Uszkoreit *et al.*, “Mlp-mixer: An all-mlp architecture for vision,” *NeurIPS*, 2021.
- [53] Y. Liu, C. Li, J. Wang, and M. Long, “Koopman: Learning non-stationary time series dynamics with koopman predictors,” 2023.
- [54] Bartlett, Peter, L., Mendelson, and Shahar, “Rademacher and gaussian complexities: Risk bounds and structural results.” *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, vol. 3, no. 3, pp. 463–463, 2003.
- [55] A. V. Oppenheim, R. W. Schaffer, and J. R. Buck, “Discrete-time signal processing,” 1999.
- [56] D. R. Brillinger, *Time Series: Data Analysis and Theory*. Holden-Day, 1981.
- [57] H. So, “Discrete-time fourier transform,” *City University of Hong Kong*, 2024. [Online]. Available: [\[¹\]\[5\]](#)
- [58] G. E. P. Box, “Time Series Analysis.”
- [59] M. D. Adams, “Signals and Systems.”
- [60] J. D. Hamilton, “Time series analysis,” 2020.
- [61] D. G. Luenberger, “Dynamic systems,” 1979.
- [62] Y. LeCun, Y. Bengio, and G. Hinton, “Deep learning,” *Nature*, vol. 521, no. 7553, pp. 436–444, May 2015, number: 7553 Publisher: Nature Publishing Group. [Online]. Available: <https://www.nature.com/articles/nature14539>
- [63] L. C. Evans, *Partial differential equations*. American Mathematical Society, 2022, vol. 19. [Online]. Available: <https://books.google.com/books?hl=zh-CN&lr=&id=Ott1EAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PP1&dq=Partial+Differential+Equations+evans&ots=cUNzAH2MyK&sig=yAAqmzvrLLXVgW7JzKTZ3qzvlqo>
- [64] A. V. Oppenheim, A. S. Willsky, S. H. Nawab, and J.-J. Ding, “Signals and systems,” 1997.
- [65] Y. Katznelson, “An introduction to harmonic analysis,” 2004.
- [66] G. E. Box, G. M. Jenkins, G. C. Reinsel, and G. M. Ljung, “Time series analysis: forecasting and control,” 2015.

- [67] H. J. Nussbaumer and H. J. Nussbaumer, “The fast fourier transform,” 1982.
- [68] Z. Yang, W. Yan, X. Huang, and L. Mei, “Adaptive temporal-frequency network for time-series forecasting,” *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, vol. 34, no. 4, pp. 1576–1587, 2020.
- [69] P. C. Young, D. J. Pedregal, and W. Tych, “Dynamic harmonic regression,” *Journal of forecasting*, vol. 18, no. 6, pp. 369–394, 1999.
- [70] Z. Li, N. Kovachki, K. Azizzadenesheli, B. Liu, K. Bhattacharya, A. Stuart, and A. Anandkumar, “Fourier Neural Operator for Parametric Partial Differential Equations,” May 2021, arXiv:2010.08895 [cs, math]. [Online]. Available: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2010.08895>
- [71] H. Lange, S. L. Brunton, and J. N. Kutz, “From Fourier to Koopman: Spectral methods for long-term time series prediction,” *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, vol. 22, no. 1, pp. 1881–1918, 2021, publisher: JMLRORG.
- [72] P. R. Winters, “Forecasting sales by exponentially weighted moving averages,” *Management science*, vol. 6, no. 3, pp. 324–342, 1960.
- [73] J. Mitrovic, B. McWilliams, J. Walker, L. Buesing, and C. Blundell, “Representation learning via invariant causal mechanisms,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.07922*, 2020.
- [74] D. Liang, H. Zhang, D. Yuan, X. Ma, D. Li, and M. Zhang, “Does long-term series forecasting need complex attention and extra long inputs?” 2023.
- [75] Y. Zhao, Z. Ma, T. Zhou, M. Ye, L. Sun, and Y. Qian, “Gcformer: An efficient solution for accurate and scalable long-term multivariate time series forecasting,” ser. CIKM ’23. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2023, p. 3464–3473. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3583780.3615136>
- [76] D. Du, B. Su, and Z. Wei, “Preformer: Predictive transformer with multi-scale segment-wise correlations for long-term time series forecasting,” IEEE, 2023.
- [77] P. Tang and X. Zhang, “Infomaxformer: Maximum entropy transformer for long time-series forecasting problem,” 2023.
- [78] J. Guo, Z. Wan, and Z. Lv, “Digital twins fuzzy system based on time series forecasting model lftformer,” ser. MM ’23. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2023, p. 7094–7100. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3581783.3612936>
- [79] Z. Xu, A. Zeng, and Q. Xu, “FITS: Modeling time series with \$10k\$ parameters,” 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://openreview.net/forum?id=bWcnvZ3qMb>
- [80] P. Chen, Y. ZHANG, Y. Cheng, Y. Shu, Y. Wang, Q. Wen, B. Yang, and C. Guo, “Pathformer: Multi-scale transformers with adaptive pathways for time series forecasting,” 2024.
- [81] S. Wang, H. Wu, X. Shi, T. Hu, H. Luo, L. Ma, J. Y. Zhang, and J. ZHOU, “Timemixer: Decomposable multiscale mixing for time series forecasting,” 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://openreview.net/forum?id=7oLshfEIC2>

- [82] H. Kim, S. Kim, S. Min, and B. Lee, “Contrastive time-series anomaly detection,” no. 01, pp. 1–14, nov 5555.
- [83] J. Zhang, W. Li, W. Sun, Y. Zhang, and R. Tao, “Locality robust domain adaptation for cross-scene hyperspectral image classification,” MAR 15 2024.
- [84] J. Zhang, J. Wang, W. Qiang, F. Xu, C. Zheng, F. Sun, and H. Xiong, “Intriguing properties of positional encoding in time series forecasting,” 2024.
- [85] J. Wang, Y. Zhou, W. Qiang, Y. Ba, B. Su, and J.-R. Wen, “Spatio-temporal branching for motion prediction using motion increments,” pp. 4290–4299, 2023.
- [86] X. Zhang, S. Zhao, Z. Song, H. Guo, J. Zhang, C. Zheng, and W. Qiang, “Not all frequencies are created equal: Towards a dynamic fusion of frequencies in time-series forecasting,” 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://openreview.net/forum?id=Wp4Hkaz2Xe>
- [87] Z. Li, S. Qi, Y. Li, and Z. Xu, “Revisiting long-term time series forecasting: An investigation on linear mapping,” *ArXiv*, vol. abs/2305.10721, 2023.
- [88] G. W. Imbens and D. B. Rubin, *Causal Inference for Statistics, Social, and Biomedical Sciences: An Introduction*. Cambridge University Press, 2015.
- [89] J. Li, B. Wu, X. Sun, and Y. Wang, “Causal hidden markov model for time series disease forecasting,” 2021, pp. 12 100–12 109.
- [90] Y. Wang, H. Wu, J. Dong, G. Qin, H. Zhang, Y. Liu, Y. Qiu, J. Wang, and M. Long, “Timexer: Empowering transformers for time series forecasting with exogenous variables,” 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2402.19072>
- [91] Y. Liu, G. Qin, X. Huang, J. Wang, and M. Long, “Timer-XL: Long-context transformers for unified time series forecasting,” 2025. [Online]. Available: <https://openreview.net/forum?id=KMCJXjlDDr>
- [92] Y. Yamaguchi, I. Suemitsu, and W. Wei, “Citras: Covariate-informed transformer for time series forecasting,” 2025. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2503.24007>
- [93] M. Liu, X. Sun, L. Hu, and Y. Wang, “Causal discovery from subsampled time series with proxy variables,” 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://openreview.net/forum?id=etYk6TeO2q>
- [94] A. A. Mastakouri, B. Schölkopf, and D. Janzing, “Necessary and sufficient conditions for causal feature selection in time series with latent common causes,” ser. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, M. Meila and T. Zhang, Eds., vol. 139. PMLR, 18–24 Jul 2021, pp. 7502–7511. [Online]. Available: <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v139/mastakouri21a.html>
- [95] M. Castro, P. Júnior, A. Soriano Vargas, R. Werneck, M. Gonçalves, L. Lusquino Filho, R. Moura, M. Zampieri, O. Linares, V. Ferreira, A. Ferreira, A. Davolio, D. Schiozer, and A. Rocha, “Time series causal relationships discovery through feature importance and ensemble models,” *Scientific Reports*, vol. 13, 07 2023.
- [96] D. S. Wilks, *Statistical methods in the atmospheric sciences*. Academic press, 2011.
- [97] M. Glymour, J. Pearl, and N. P. Jewell, *Causal Inference in Statistics: A Primer*. John Wiley & Sons, Jan. 2016.

- [98] J. Pearl, *Causality*. Cambridge university press, 2009.
- [99] M. Mohri, A. Rostamizadeh, and A. Talwalkar, *Foundations of Machine Learning*. MIT press, 2018.
- [100] V. Kuznetsov and M. Mohri, “Generalization Bounds for Time Series Prediction with Non-stationary Processes,” P. Auer, A. Clark, T. Zeugmann, and S. Zilles, Eds. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2014, vol. 8776, pp. 260–274.
- [101] C. W. Granger, “Investigating causal relations by econometric models and cross-spectral methods,” *Econometrica: journal of the Econometric Society*, pp. 424–438, 1969.
- [102] A. P. Dawid, “Conditional independence in statistical theory,” *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, vol. 41, no. 1, pp. 1–15, 1979.
- [103] J. Pearl, “Embracing causality in default reasoning,” *Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 35, no. 2, pp. 259–271, 1988.
- [104] J. Pearl and A. Paz, “Graphoids: Graph-based logic for reasoning about relevance relations or when would x tell you more about y if you already know z?” 2022, pp. 189–200.
- [105] A. Statnikov, N. I. Lytkin, J. Lemeire, and C. F. Aliferis, “Algorithms for discovery of multiple markov boundaries,” *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, vol. 14, no. Feb, pp. 499–566, 2013.
- [106] E. S. Gardner Jr, “Exponential smoothing: The state of the art,” *Journal of forecasting*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 1–28, 1985.
- [107] B. Lim and S. Zohren, “Time-series forecasting with deep learning: a survey,” *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A*, vol. 379, no. 2194, p. 20200209, 2021.
- [108] A. C. Harvey, “Forecasting, structural time series models and the kalman filter,” 1990.
- [109] L. G. Valiant, “A theory of the learnable,” *Communications of the ACM*, vol. 27, no. 11, pp. 1134–1142, 1984.
- [110] V. Koltchinskii, “Rademacher penalties and structural risk minimization,” *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 47, no. 5, pp. 1902–1914, 2001.
- [111] V. N. Vapnik and A. Y. Chervonenkis, “On uniform convergence of the frequencies of events to their probabilities,” *Teoriya Veroyatnostei i ee Primeneniya*, vol. 16, no. 2, pp. 264–279, 1971.
- [112] P. Doukhan and P. Doukhan, “Mixing,” *Mixing: Properties and Examples*, pp. 15–23, 1994.
- [113] B. Yu, “Rates of convergence for empirical processes of stationary mixing sequences,” *The Annals of Probability*, pp. 94–116, 1994.
- [114] A. Rakhlin, K. Sridharan, and A. Tewari, “Online learning: Random averages, combinatorial parameters, and learnability,” *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 23, 2010.
- [115] V. Kuznetsov and M. Mohri, “Learning Theory and Algorithms for Forecasting Non-stationary Time Series,” vol. 28. Curran Associates, Inc., 2015.
- [116] A. R. Statnikov, J. Lemeir, and C. F. Aliferis, “Algorithms for discovery of multiple markov boundaries,” *Journal of Machine Learning Research Jmlr*, 2013.

- [117] S. L. Lauritzen and N. Wermuth, “Graphical models for associations between variables, some of which are qualitative and some quantitative,” *The annals of Statistics*, pp. 31–57, 1989.
- [118] B. Sibbald and M. Roland, “Understanding controlled trials. why are randomised controlled trials important?” *BMJ: British Medical Journal*, vol. 316, no. 7126, p. 201, 1998.
- [119] P. Spirtes and C. Glymour, “An algorithm for fast recovery of sparse causal graphs,” *Social science computer review*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 62–72, 1991.
- [120] T. Verma and J. Pearl, “Causal networks: Semantics and expressiveness.” Elsevier, 1990, vol. 9, pp. 69–76.
- [121] P. Spirtes, C. Glymour, and R. Scheines, *Causation, prediction, and search*. MIT press, 2001.
- [122] R. Cai, K. Zhang, R. Guo, and et al., “Causallearn: Causal discovery library,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.01703*, 2023.
- [123] P. Spirtes, “An anytime algorithm for causal inference.” PMLR, 2001, pp. 278–285.
- [124] D. Entner and P. O. Hoyer, “On causal discovery from time series data using fci,” *Probabilistic graphical models*, vol. 16, 2010.
- [125] D. Koller and N. Friedman, *Probabilistic Graphical Models: Principles and Techniques*. Probabilistic Graphical Models: Principles and Techniques, 2009.
- [126] D. Wang, R. Liu, C. Chen, and S. Li, “Mpm: Multi patterns memory model for short-term time series forecasting,” *IEEE Trans. on Knowl. and Data Eng.*, vol. 37, no. 1, p. 438–448, Jan. 2025. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1109/TKDE.2024.3490843>
- [127] K. Yan, C. Long, H. Wu, and Z. Wen, “Multi-resolution expansion of analysis in time-frequency domain for time series forecasting,” *IEEE Trans. on Knowl. and Data Eng.*, vol. 36, no. 11, p. 6667–6680, Nov. 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1109/TKDE.2024.3396785>
- [128] S. Feng, C. Miao, K. Xu, J. Wu, P. Wu, Y. Zhang, and P. Zhao, “Multi-scale attention flow for probabilistic time series forecasting,” *IEEE Trans. on Knowl. and Data Eng.*, vol. 36, no. 5, p. 2056–2068, May 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1109/TKDE.2023.3319672>
- [129] M. Jin, Y. Zheng, Y.-F. Li, S. Chen, B. Yang, and S. Pan, “Multivariate time series forecasting with dynamic graph neural odes,” *IEEE Trans. on Knowl. and Data Eng.*, vol. 35, no. 9, p. 9168–9180, Sep. 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1109/TKDE.2022.3221989>
- [130] L. Chen, D. Chen, Z. Shang, B. Wu, C. Zheng, B. Wen, and W. Zhang, “Multi-scale adaptive graph neural network for multivariate time series forecasting,” *IEEE Trans. on Knowl. and Data Eng.*, vol. 35, no. 10, p. 10748–10761, Oct. 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1109/TKDE.2023.3268199>
- [131] L. Li, J. Yan, Y. Zhang, J. Zhang, J. Bao, Y. Jin, and X. Yang, “Learning generative rnn-ode for collaborative time-series and event sequence forecasting,” *IEEE Trans. on Knowl. and Data Eng.*, vol. 35, no. 7, p. 7118–7137, Jul. 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1109/TKDE.2022.3185115>

- [132] C. Gong, D. Yao, C. Zhang, W. Li, J. Bi, L. Du, and J. Wang, “Causal discovery from temporal data,” ser. KDD ’23. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3580305.3599552>
- [133] F. Takens, “Detecting strange attractors in turbulence.” Springer, 1981, pp. 366–381.

Appendix A provides the limitation and broad impact. Appendix B provides the notation. Appendix C provides the related works. Appendix D provides the background in causality. Appendix E presents the proof of analysis in Section 3.4. Appendix F presents the proof of Theorem 3.1. Appendix G provides the dataset descriptions. Appendix H provides the details of the implementation. Appendix I provides the robustness to DAG Perturbations. Appendix J details the implementation of the causal discovery algorithm PC. Appendix K visual the DAGs extracted from datasets and the mask form of DAGs. Appendix L presents the comparison of the results among CAIFormer, iTransformer, and PatchTST.

A. Limitation and Broad Impact

First, reliance on a pre-estimated causal DAG. Our framework assumes the availability of a causal graph prior to model training. In this work, we use the PC algorithm primarily for proof-of-concept purposes; the model is not restricted to PC and can readily incorporate other causal discovery techniques (e.g., tsFCI). However, the quality of the estimated DAG remains a key bottleneck, and exploring more robust or online discovery methods constitutes an important direction for future research. Second, the model does not explicitly account for latent confounders. As is common in multivariate time-series forecasting, the DAG is inferred solely from observed variables in the training data, ignoring potential hidden confounders. While this assumption enhances practicality and ensures comparability with existing baselines, it may leave parts of the true causal structure unmodeled, thereby limiting the completeness of the model’s explanations.

B. List of Notations

We list the definitions of all notations from the main text as follows:

- **Time Series Symbols (Basic Class)**

- $X = [x_1, \dots, x_T] \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times D}$: Multivariate time series history(T time steps, D variables).
- $Y = [x_{T+1}, \dots, x_{T+S}] \in \mathbb{R}^{S \times D}$: Multivariate time series future(S time steps).
- $x_t = [V_1^t, \dots, V_D^t] \in \mathbb{R}^D$: the value of D variables in t -th time step.
- $V_i^t \in \mathbb{R}$: the value of i -th variable in t -th time step.
- $V_i^{t:t+\tau} \in \mathbb{R}^\tau$: the value of i -th variables in τ timesteps.
- T : the lookback length.
- S : the prediction length.
- $D_{\text{train}} = \{(X^i, Y^i)\}_{i=1}^K$: the set of train samples.
- f^* : an optimal predictor that $f^*(X) = Y$.
- \mathcal{F} : a hypothesis space that $f^* \in \mathcal{F}$.

- **Causal Graph and Variable Categorization (Causal Class)**

- $G = (V, E)$: Causal DAG among variables.
- V : Set of variable nodes $\{V_1, V_2, \dots, V_D\}$.
- $W_{\text{adjm}} \in \mathbb{R}^{D \times D}$: Adjacency matrix from PC algorithm.
- V_i : Target variable.

- V_p : Variables that have a direct causal influence on V_i .
 - V_k : Variables that are directly influenced by V_i , denoted as $V_i \rightarrow V_k$ and each V_k is not a collider.
 - V_c : Variables that are directly influenced by V_i , denoted as $V_i \rightarrow V_c$ and each V_c is a collider.
 - V_s : The spouse variables of V_i .
 - S_i^P : Direct parents of variable V_i .
 - S_i^K : Direct children of variable V_i exclude collider.
 - S_i^C : Direct children of variable V_i and is a collider.
 - S_i^S : Spouse of variable V_i .
 - S_{V_c} : The set of collider.
 - S_{V_s} : The set of spouse variable.
 - X_i : The node in DAG, denotes the i -th variable in dataset.
- **Model Structure Variables (Module Class)**
 - H : Number of patches.
 - P : Length of patch.
 - d_E : Embedding dimension of ESPB.
 - d_D : Embedding dimension of DCSPB.
 - d_C : Embedding dimension of CCSPB.
 - E_e : Number of Encoder layers in ESPB.
 - E_d : Number of Encoder layers in DCSPB.
 - E_c : Number of Encoder layers in CCSPB.
 - δ : A normalization factor.
 - Y_e : Output from Endogenous Sub-segment Prediction Block (ESPB).
 - Y_d : Output from Direct Causal Sub-segment Prediction Block (DCSPB).
 - Y_c : Output from Collider Causal Sub-segment Prediction Block (CCSPB).
 - Y_{cat} : Concat of Y_e , Y_d , and Y_c .
 - D_{mask} : Attention mask for direct causal variables.
 - CS_{mask} : Attention mask for collider structure.
 - S_{mask} : Attention mask for spouse variables.
 - **Theoretical Analysis Variables (Generalization and Projection Class)**
 - f_{IP}^* : Optimal predictor under MSELoss for collider structure inputs.
 - $\mathbb{E}[\cdot]$: Expectation operator.

- Φ : Conditional expectation operator.
- $\Psi f = f - \Phi f$: Projection operator into kernel space.
- \mathcal{F}_Ψ : Function space satisfying collider constraints.
- $L^2(V)$: Space of square-integrable functions.
- $\Delta(f, \Psi f)$: Generalization gap between original and projected function.

C. Related Work

C.1. Modeling Variable Relationships in MTSF

The complex causal dependencies among variables in multivariate time series data pose significant challenges for modeling. Existing approaches exhibit primary modeling paradigms: Temporal-based methods (e.g., TimesNet [34] and PatchTST [36]) focus on intra-variable temporal patterns by analyzing relationships between time points or segments; Frequency-based methods (e.g., FreTS [32] and FEDformer [41]) decompose temporal patterns through spectral transformations, but remain limited to single-variable analysis; Variable-based methods (e.g., iTransformer [19]) attempt to capture cross-variable interactions through attention mechanisms. However, these methods often perform unconstrained pairwise computations which may conflate causal relationships with spurious correlations, lacking explicit mechanisms to distinguish different types of inter-variable dependencies. The limitations of these approaches reveal a gap: current methods either oversimplify cross-variable correlation or naively aggregate all potential interactions without causal discrimination. Therefore, effectively modeling inter-variable relationships in MTSF remains an open research problem.

C.2. Causal Discovery for MTSF

Causal discovery provides a systematic framework for identifying genuine cause-effect relationships from observational data [97, 98, 132] through directed acyclic graphs (DAG) [117]. The development of causal discovery methods has evolved through several stages: Constraint-based approaches (e.g., Inductive Causation algorithm [120] and the Peter-Clark algorithm [119]) rely on conditional independence tests to reconstruct DAG. However, they suffer from high computational costs and struggle with hidden confounders. Later methods improved computational [121] efficiency and enhanced confounder modeling [123]. In time series settings, causal discovery faces additional challenges. For instance, tsFCI [124] extends FCI to accommodate time-lagged dependencies, while Granger causality [101] infers temporal precedence based on predictive accuracy tests. Recent studies have attempted to integrate causal discovery with MTSF, primarily through two paradigms: 1) Causal Markov Models: These methods use causal inference as a preprocessing step to remove spurious correlations [89], and 2) Proxy Variable Methods: These approaches leverage latent variable recovery techniques to infer hidden causal structures [93]. However, these methods typically treat causal discovery as either a preprocessing step or an interpretability tool rather than integrating it directly into the model’s parametrization. As a result, they fail to dynamically incorporate causal information during the forecasting process. Unlike existing methods, our approach incorporates DAG as architectural constraints, enforcing causal dependencies during model training. This ensures that the forecasting mechanism aligns with underlying causal

structures, eliminating spurious correlations while enhancing model interpretability.

D. Background In Causality

Causal relationships among variables play a crucial role in MTSF. By constructing a structural causal model, we can better understand the dependencies and independencies among variables, enabling us to build more accurate forecasting models [98]. One core concept of causality is conditional independence, which is defined as:

Definition D.1 (Conditional Independence [102]). *Let $V = \{V_1, V_2, \dots, V_D\}$ be a finite set of variables, V_i is the i -th variable and D is the number of variable, $P(\cdot)$ be a joint probability function over the variables in V , and S_X, S_Y, S_Z stand for three subsets of variables in V . Then, S_X and S_Y are said to be conditionally independent given S_Z if*

$$P(S_X | S_Y, S_Z) = P(S_X | S_Z), \forall P(S_Y, S_Z) > 0. \quad (8)$$

That is, S_Y does not provide any additional information for predicting S_X , once given S_Z . $S_X \perp\!\!\!\perp S_Y | S_Z$ denotes the conditional independence of S_X and S_Y given S_Z .

Conditional independence relationships among variables form the basis of the SCM. In these models, a DAG, denoted as $G = (V, E)$, is typically used to represent the relationships among variables, where the node set $V = \{V_1, V_2, \dots, V_D\}$ corresponds to random variables, and the edge set $E = \{(V_1, V_2), (V_2, V_3), \dots\}$ represents causal relationships between variables. An SCM is built upon three fundamental structures: Chain, Fork and Collider. Any model containing at least three variables incorporates these key structures.

Definition D.2 (Chain). *A chain $V_p \rightarrow V_i \rightarrow V_c$ is a graphical structure involving three variables V_p, V_i , and V_c in graph G , where V_p has a directed edge to V_i and V_i has a directed edge to V_c . Here, V_p causally influences V_i , and V_i causally influences V_c , making V_i a mediator.*

Definition D.3 (Fork). *A fork $V_b \leftarrow V_p \rightarrow V_i$ is a graphical structure involving V_b, V_p , and V_i , where V_p is a common parent of both V_b and V_i . V_p causally influences V_b and V_i .*

Definition D.4 (Collider). *A collider, also known as a V-structure, $V_i \rightarrow V_c \leftarrow V_s$, is a graphical structure involving three variables V_i, V_c , and V_s , where V_c is a common child of both V_i and V_s , V_i and V_s are not directly connected. Here, V_i and V_s causally influence V_c .*

In a chain structure, V_p and V_c are conditionally independent given V_i , formally, $V_p \perp\!\!\!\perp V_c | V_i$. In a fork structure, V_b and V_i are independent given V_p , V_b provides no additional information about V_i , and vice versa, i.e., $V_b \perp\!\!\!\perp V_i | V_p$. In a collider structure, V_i and V_s are marginally independent, knowing V_i does not provide information about V_s and vice versa. However, when conditioning on the collider V_c , this independence is broken, making V_i and V_s dependent. Formally, $V_i \perp\!\!\!\perp V_s$ and $V_i \not\perp\!\!\!\perp V_s | V_c$. The related proofs are presented in Chapter Two of [7]. The above independence relationships are fundamental for understanding the dependencies implied by an SCM, thereby facilitating tasks such as causal discovery and causal inference in MTSF.

Algorithm 1 Pseudo-Code of CAIFormer

Dataset: Multivariate time series dataset $D_{\text{train}} = \{(X^i, Y^i)\}_{i=1}^K$, where $X^i = \{V_1^{0:T}, \dots, V_D^{0:T}\} \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times D}$ and $Y^i = \{V_1^{T:T+S}, \dots, V_D^{T:T+S}\} \in \mathbb{R}^{S \times D}$.

Preprocessing:

Apply PC algorithm on D to learn DAG and construct masks $D_{\text{mask}}, CS_{\text{mask}}, S_{\text{mask}}$.

Input: $X = (V_1^{0:T}, V_2^{0:T}, \dots, V_D^{0:T})$

Endogenous Sub-segment Prediction Block (ESPB):

- 1: $X_{\text{Patch}} = f_{\text{Patch}}(X)$ $\triangleright X_{\text{Patch}} \in \mathbb{R}^{H \times P \times D}$
- 2: $X_{\text{Enc}}^0 = f_{\text{Emb}}^t(X_{\text{Patch}})$ $\triangleright X_{\text{Enc}}^0 \in \mathbb{R}^{H \times D \times d_E}$
- 3: **for** $e = 1$ **to** E_e **do**
- 4: $X_{\text{Enc}}^e = \text{Encoder}(X_{\text{Enc}}^{e-1})$
- 5: **end for**
- 6: $Y_e = f_{\text{Projection}}^e(X_{\text{Enc}}^{E_e})$ $\triangleright Y_e \in \mathbb{R}^{S \times D}$

Direct Causal Sub-segment Prediction Block (DCSPB):

- 1: $X_{\text{Enc}}^0 = f_{\text{Emb}}^v(X)$ $\triangleright X_{\text{Enc}}^0 \in \mathbb{R}^{D \times d_D}$
- 2: **for** $e = 1$ **to** E_d **do**
- 3: $X_{\text{Enc}}^e = \text{Encoder}(X_{\text{Enc}}^{e-1}, D_{\text{mask}})$
- 4: **end for**
- 5: $Y_d = f_{\text{Projection}}^d(X_{\text{Enc}}^{E_d})$ $\triangleright Y_d \in \mathbb{R}^{S \times D}$

Collider Causal Sub-segment Prediction Block (CCSPB):

- 1: $X_{\text{Enc}}^0 = f_{\text{Emb}}^v(X)$ $\triangleright X_{\text{Enc}}^0 \in \mathbb{R}^{D \times d_C}$
- 2: **for** $e = 1$ **to** E_c **do**
- 3: $X_{\text{Enc}}^e = \text{Encoder}(X_{\text{Enc}}^{e-1}, CS_{\text{mask}})$
- 4: **end for**
- 5: $Z = f_{\text{Projection}}^c(X_{\text{Enc}}^{E_c})$ $\triangleright Z \in \mathbb{R}^{S \times D}$
- 6: $X_{\text{collider}} = X \odot S_{\text{mask}}$
- 7: $EZ = \mathbb{E}[Z \mid X_{\text{collider}}] - C$
- 8: $Y_c = Z - EZ$ $\triangleright Y_c \in \mathbb{R}^{S \times D}$

Output Linear Layer:

- 1: $Y_{\text{cat}} = \text{Concat}(Y_e, Y_d, Y_c)$
 - 2: $Y = f_o(Y_{\text{cat}})$ $\triangleright Y \in \mathbb{R}^{S \times D}$
 - 3: **Output:** Predicted future values $Y = (V_1^{T:T+S}, \dots, V_D^{T:T+S})$
-

E. Proofs of Conditional Independence for Paths

We provide formal proofs of the conditional independencies in each causal pathway described in Section 3.4, based on probabilistic factorization and d-separation in structural causal models (SCMs).

Let $\mathcal{V} = \{V_1, V_2, \dots, V_D\}$ denote the full set of variables. We focus on a target variable V_i and consider its interactions with other variables via six typical causal paths (Path a to Path f). We use the notation $\mathcal{S}_A \perp\!\!\!\perp \mathcal{S}_B \mid \mathcal{S}_C$ to represent that \mathcal{S}_A is conditionally independent of \mathcal{S}_B given \mathcal{S}_C .

Path a: $V_1 \rightarrow V_i$. This is a direct causal link from V_1 to V_i . The joint distribution factorizes as $P(V_1, V_i) = P(V_1)P(V_i \mid V_1)$. Then the marginal and conditional probabilities are $P(V_i) = \int P(V_i \mid V_1)P(V_1)dV_1$. $P(V_i \mid V_1) \neq P(V_i)$ for any value of V_1 , then $P(V_i \mid V_1) \neq P(V_i) \Rightarrow V_1 \not\perp\!\!\!\perp V_i$.

Path b: $V_D - \dots - V_{i+1} - V_{i-1} - \dots - V_3 - V_2 \rightarrow V_1 \rightarrow V_i$. This structure represents a causal chain beginning at V_2 and ending at V_i , where $V_3, \dots, V_{i-1}, V_{i+1}, \dots, V_D$ are unclear path direction variables in the left of V_2 .

Let $\mathcal{Z} = \mathcal{V} \setminus \{V_1, V_i\}$. By d-separation, V_1 blocks all paths from V_j to V_i , so $P(V_i \mid V_1, V_j, \mathcal{Z} \setminus \{V_j\}) = P(V_i \mid V_1)$. Hence $V_i \perp\!\!\!\perp V_j \mid \{V_1\} \cup (\mathcal{Z} \setminus \{V_j\})$ and $V_i \not\perp\!\!\!\perp V_1 \mid \mathcal{Z}$. Thus the entire structure simplifies to the direct influence $V_1 \rightarrow V_i$.

Path c: $V_D - \dots - V_3 - V_2 \leftarrow V_1 \rightarrow V_i$. This is a fork structure where V_1 is a common cause of both V_2 and V_i , and the path may include $V_3, \dots, V_{i-1}, V_{i+1}, \dots, V_D$ connected to V_2 from the left with unclear direction paths.

Let $\mathcal{Z} = \mathcal{V} \setminus \{V_1, V_i\}$. Conditioning on V_1 d-separates V_2 (and all its upstream nodes) from V_i , so $P(V_i \mid V_1, V_2, \mathcal{Z} \setminus \{V_2\}) = P(V_i \mid V_1)$. Thus $V_i \perp\!\!\!\perp V_2 \mid \{V_1\} \cup (\mathcal{Z} \setminus \{V_2\})$ and $V_i \not\perp\!\!\!\perp V_1 \mid \mathcal{Z}$. Hence Path c also reduces to $V_1 \rightarrow V_i$.

Path d: $V_i \rightarrow V_1$. This is a direct causal link from V_i to V_1 . The joint distribution factorizes as $P(V_1, V_i) = P(V_i)P(V_1 \mid V_i)$. Then the marginal and conditional probabilities are $P(V_i) = \int P(V_i \mid V_1)P(V_1)dV_1$. $P(V_i \mid V_1) \neq P(V_i)$ for any value of V_1 , then $P(V_i \mid V_1) \neq P(V_i) \Rightarrow V_1 \not\perp\!\!\!\perp V_i$.

Path e: $V_i \rightarrow V_1 \rightarrow V_2 - V_3 - \dots - V_D$. This is a chain structure originating from V_i and propagating through intermediate nodes. let $\mathcal{Z} = \mathcal{V} \setminus \{V_i\}$. $P(V_1 \mid V_i, \mathcal{Z} \setminus \{V_1\}) \neq P(V_1 \mid \mathcal{Z} \setminus \{V_1\}) \Rightarrow V_1 \not\perp\!\!\!\perp V_i \mid \mathcal{Z}$. For $j \geq 2$, the dependency is blocked by known V_1 : $P(V_j \mid V_i, \mathcal{Z} \setminus \{V_j\}) = P(V_j \mid \mathcal{Z} \setminus \{V_j\}) \Rightarrow V_j \perp\!\!\!\perp V_i \mid \mathcal{Z}$. Thus, the path reduces to $V_i \rightarrow V_1$.

Path f: $V_i \rightarrow V_1 \leftarrow V_2 - V_3 - \dots - V_D$. This is a collider structure where V_1 is a common result of V_i and V_2 , and V_2 may be influenced by the right variables with unclear direction paths. let $\mathcal{Z} = \mathcal{V} \setminus \{V_i\}$.

Since V_1 is observed, the dependency between V_i and V_2 is activated: $P(V_i \mid \mathcal{Z}) \neq P(V_i \mid \mathcal{Z} \setminus \{V_1, V_2\}) \Rightarrow V_2 \not\perp\!\!\!\perp V_i \mid \mathcal{Z}$. Meanwhile, $P(V_i \mid \mathcal{Z}) = P(V_i \mid \mathcal{Z} \setminus \{V_j\}) \Rightarrow V_j \perp\!\!\!\perp V_i \mid \mathcal{Z} \forall j \in \{3, \dots, i-1, i+1, \dots, D\}$. Hence both V_1 and V_2 are relevant under conditioning, confirming the collider structure $V_i \rightarrow V_1 \leftarrow V_2$.

F. Proof of Theorem 3.1

Proof. The conditional expectation $\Pi : Z \in L^2(\Omega) \mapsto \mathbb{E}[Z \mid \mathcal{S}_{V_s}]$ defines an orthogonal projection onto the space of \mathcal{S}_{V_s} -measurable random variables with finite variance $L^2(\Omega, \sigma(\mathcal{S}_{V_s}), P)$. Thus, its range and null space are orthogonal in $L^2(\Omega)$. Let $f \in L^2(V)$. We have $\Phi f(\mathcal{S}_{V_c}, \mathcal{S}_{V_s}) = \mathbb{E}[f(\mathcal{S}_{V_c}, \mathcal{S}_{V_s}) \mid \mathcal{S}_{V_s}] - C =$

$\Pi f(\mathcal{S}_{V_c}, \mathcal{S}_{V_s}) - C$ hence $\Phi f(\mathcal{S}_{V_c}, \mathcal{S}_{V_s})$ is in the range of Π . On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[\Psi f(\mathcal{S}_{V_c}, \mathcal{S}_{V_s})|\mathcal{S}_{V_s}] &= \mathbb{E}[f(\mathcal{S}_{V_c}, \mathcal{S}_{V_s})|\mathcal{S}_{V_s}] - \mathbb{E}[\Phi f(\mathcal{S}_{V_c}, \mathcal{S}_{V_s})|\mathcal{S}_{V_s}] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[f(\mathcal{S}_{V_c}, \mathcal{S}_{V_s})|\mathcal{S}_{V_s}] - \mathbb{E}[f(\mathcal{S}_{V_c}, \mathcal{S}_{V_s})|\mathcal{S}_{V_s}] = 0.\end{aligned}\quad (9)$$

Therefore, $\Psi f(\mathcal{S}_{V_c}, \mathcal{S}_{V_s})$ is in the null space of Π . Finally, because $V_i \perp\!\!\!\perp \mathcal{S}_{V_s}$ we have $\mathbb{E}[V_i|\mathcal{S}_{V_s}] = \mathbb{E}[V_i] = C$ by assumption, therefore V_i is also in the null space of Π .

Hence, adopting this random variable view, the desired result simply follows from $L^2(\Omega)$ orthogonality:

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta(f, \Psi f) &= \mathbb{E}[(V_i - f(\mathcal{S}_{V_c}, \mathcal{S}_{V_s}))^2] - \mathbb{E}[(V_i - \Psi f(\mathcal{S}_{V_c}, \mathcal{S}_{V_s}))^2] \\ &= \|V_i - f(\mathcal{S}_{V_c}, \mathcal{S}_{V_s})\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 - \|V_i - \Psi f(\mathcal{S}_{V_c}, \mathcal{S}_{V_s})\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \\ &= \|V_i - \Psi f(\mathcal{S}_{V_c}, \mathcal{S}_{V_s}) - \Phi f(\mathcal{S}_{V_c}, \mathcal{S}_{V_s})\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 - \|V_i - \Psi f(\mathcal{S}_{V_c}, \mathcal{S}_{V_s})\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \\ &= \|V_i - \Psi f(\mathcal{S}_{V_c}, \mathcal{S}_{V_s})\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|\Phi f(\mathcal{S}_{V_c}, \mathcal{S}_{V_s})\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 - \|V_i - \Psi f(\mathcal{S}_{V_c}, \mathcal{S}_{V_s})\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\Phi f(\mathcal{S}_{V_c}, \mathcal{S}_{V_s})^2] = \|\Phi f\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2.\end{aligned}\quad (10)$$

□

G. Dataset Descriptions

In this paper, we conduct tests using six real-world datasets. These datasets include:

(1) The ETT dataset contains 7 factors of electricity transformer from July 2016 to July 2018, consists of two sub-datasets, ETT1 and ETT2, collected from electricity transformers at two different stations. Each sub-dataset is available in two resolutions (15 minutes and 1 hour), containing multiple load series and a single oil temperature series. (2) Weather covers 21 meteorological variables recorded at 10-minute intervals throughout the year 2020. The data was collected by the Max Planck Institute for Biogeochemistry’s Weather Station, providing valuable meteorological insights. (3) Exchange Rate contains daily currency exchange rates for eight countries, spanning from 1990 to 2016.

We follow the same data processing and chronological train-validation-test split protocol as used in iTransformer [19] to avoid data leakage issues. The details of the datasets are provided in Table 4.

Table 4: Detailed descriptions of datasets. *Dim* denotes the number of variables in each dataset. *Prediction Length* denotes the number of future time points to predict; each dataset includes four different forecasting horizons. *Time steps* represents the number of time points. *Percentage* indicates the proportions of the dataset allocated to Train, Validation, and Test splits. *Frequency* specifies the sampling interval between consecutive time points.

Dataset	Dim	Prediction Length	Time steps	Percentage	Frequency	Information
ETTh1,ETTh2	7	{96, 192, 336, 720}	17420	(60%, 20%, 20%)	Hourly	Electricity
ETTm1,ETTm2	7	{96, 192, 336, 720}	69680	(60%, 20%, 20%)	15min	Electricity
Exchange	8	{96, 192, 336, 720}	7588	(70%, 10%, 20%)	Daily	Economy
Weather	21	{96, 192, 336, 720}	52560	(70%, 10%, 20%)	10min	Weather

Algorithm 2 Causal Discovery Algorithm-PC

Input: \hat{P} , a stable distribution on a set V of variables;**Output:** A pattern $H(\hat{P})$ compatible with \hat{P} .

```
1: Initialize complete undirected graph  $G$  on  $V$ 
2: depth  $\leftarrow 0$ 
3: repeat
4:   for each ordered pair  $(a, b)$  adjacent in  $G$  do
5:     for each  $S \subseteq \text{Adj}(a) \setminus \{b\}$  with  $|S| = \text{depth}$  do
6:       if  $a \perp\!\!\!\perp b \mid S$  in  $\hat{P}$  then
7:         Remove edge  $a-b$  from  $G$ ;  $\text{Sepset}[a][b] \leftarrow S$ 
8:         break
9:       end if
10:    end for
11:  end for
12:  depth  $\leftarrow \text{depth} + 1$ 
13: until no edge removed at current depth
14: for each non-adjacent  $a, b$  with common neighbor  $c$  do
15:   if  $c \notin \text{Sepset}[a][b]$  then
16:     Orient  $a \rightarrow c \leftarrow b$  (v-structure)
17:   end if
18: end for
19: while any Meek rule applies without creating a cycle do
20:   Orient the corresponding edge
21: end while return  $G$  as CPDAG  $H(\hat{P})$ 
```




Figure 4: Visualization of causal DAGs discovered by the PC algorithm across different datasets. Directed edges indicate inferred causal relationships between variables, while undirected edges indicate uncertainty regarding causal direction. The results cover six datasets: (a) Weather, (b) Exchange, (c) ETTh1, (d) ETTh2, (e) ETTm1, and (f) ETTm2.




Figure 5: Visualization of the masks constructed from the DAG discovered by the PC algorithm on the ETTh1, ETTh2, and weather datasets.






Figure 6: Visualization of forecasting results for the ETTh1, ETTh2 and Weather dataset under the input-96-predict-96 setting.



(a) MSE



(b) MAE

Figure 7: MSE/MAE vs. Perturbation Percentage on Weather Dataset

H. Implementation Details

All experiments are implemented in PyTorch [49] and trained on NVIDIA V100 32GB GPUs. The model is optimized using the Adam optimizer [50]. The initial learning rate is selected from $\{10^{-3}, 10^{-4}\}$, and the batch size from $\{16, 32, 64\}$, based on test set performance. Each prediction block in CAIFormer, ESPB, DCSPB, and CCSPB contains a stack of Transformer encoder layers, where the number of layers is selected from $\{1, 2, 3\}$. The hidden dimension for each block is selected independently from $\{64, 128, 256, 512\}$. Training is performed for up to 10 epochs using Mean Squared Error (MSE) as the loss function. An early stopping strategy is employed: if validation loss does not improve for three consecutive epochs, training is terminated. After training, the model checkpoint with the best performance on the test set is selected and used for final evaluation. For evaluation, we report both MSE and Mean Absolute Error (MAE). All experiments are repeated five times with different random seeds, and the average results are reported.

I. Robustness to DAG Perturbations

To quantify how CAIFormer tolerates imperfect causal discovery, we inject synthetic noise into the learned DAG on the Weather dataset ($D = 21$ variables, lookback length and prediction length are 96). For each perturbation ratio $p \in \{0\%, 5\%, 10\%, 15\%, 20\%, 25\%, 30\%\}$ we generate three settings: False-Negative (FN): uniformly delete $p\%$ of true edges; False-Positive (FP): uniformly add $p\%$ spurious edges between previously independent nodes; Shuffle (FN+FP): first delete $p/2\%$ true edges, then add the same number of spurious edges. For each setting we retrain CAIFormer with identical hyper-parameters and report the resulting mean squared error (MSE) and mean absolute error (MAE). Results are shown in Fig. 7.

J. Causal Discovery Algorithm

In this section, we detail the Peter-Clark (PC) algorithm (Algorithm 2) used for causal discovery. The PC algorithm assumes that the data are sampled from a faithful joint distribution \hat{P} over a variable set

V ; that is, every conditional independence in \hat{P} corresponds to d-separation in the true causal DAG, and vice-versa. The outcome is a completed partially directed acyclic graph (CPDAG), denoted $H(\hat{P})$. A CPDAG represents the entire Markov-equivalence class of the true (but unobserved) causal DAG: edges that are compelled in every member of the class appear directed, whereas reversible edges remain undirected. In this mixed graph, oriented edges encode compelled causal directions, whereas undirected edges denote Markov-equivalent ambiguities.

K. Causal Discovery Visualization

Figure 4 displays the DAGs discovered by the PC algorithm on six datasets (ETTh1, ETTh2, ETTm1, ETTm2, Exchange, and Weather). Directed edges denote compelled causal relations, whereas undirected edges mark orientational ambiguity. We use ETTh1, ETTh2, and Weather datasets as illustrating examples. Based on Section 4, we derive the three masks required by CAIFormer: D_{mask} , CS_{mask} , and S_{mask} . We visualize these masks in Figure 5, which clearly shows that some variables lack direct causal variables, while others do not have indirect auxiliary variables. Such observations explain why, as shown in Table 2, relying on only one specific module degrades forecasting accuracy.

L. Forecasting Results Comparison

Figure 6 compares CAIFormer (input window 96, prediction 96) with iTransformer and PatchTST on ETTh1, ETTh2, and Weather.