

☑ novartis_datathon_2025-Arman – Improvement TODO for Copilot Agent

You are Copilot in VS Code, working inside the `novartis_datathon_2025-Arman` repo.

Goal: Turn the project from “complex and good” into “sharp, reliable, and leaderboard-dangerous.”

1. Config, Metrics & Validation Plumbing

1.1 Make Config the Single Source of Truth

- ☐ Find all places where scenario, model, sample weights, or feature choices are **hard-coded** in Python (especially in `train.py`, `inference.py`, `models/*.py`).
- ☐ Move those settings into YAML (e.g. `configs/run_defaults.yaml`, `configs/model_*.yaml`).
- ☐ Ensure all entry points load config via a shared function (e.g. `load_run_config()`), and do **not** silently override YAML settings in code.
- ☐ Add comments in YAML explaining each important flag (scenario, sample weights, model type).

1.2 Centralize Official Metric Usage

- ☐ Create or clean up a single module, e.g. `src/metrics/official.py`, that:
 - ☐ Wraps `compute_metric1` (Scenario 1) and `compute_metric2` (Scenario 2).
 - ☐ Provides helper functions:
 - ☐ `evaluate_on_train(df_train, df_pred_s1, df_pred_s2, df_aux)`
 - ☐ `evaluate_cv_fold(...)` (if needed).
- ☐ Ensure **every training script** calls these wrappers for final scoring (no custom MAE/RMSE-only selection without also logging the official metrics).
- ☐ Add a simple unit test in `tests/` that:
 - ☐ Builds tiny fake `df_actual`, `df_pred`, `df_aux`.
 - ☐ Calls `compute_metric1`, `compute_metric2`.
 - ☐ Asserts basic properties (e.g., perfect prediction → metric = 0).

1.3 Standardize Cross-Validation Strategy

- ☐ In `src/validation.py`, confirm there is a single function, e.g. `create_group_kfold_by_brand(bucket_stratified=True)`.
 - ☐ Ensure **all models** (CatBoost, LGBM, XGB, etc.) use that function to get splits.
 - ☐ Add a test that verifies:
 - ☐ All months of a given brand go to the same fold.
 - ☐ Bucket 1 and Bucket 2 are reasonably balanced across folds.
-

2. Strong & Stable Single-Model Baselines

2.1 Re-run Core Models on a Shared Setup

- ☐ For **Scenario 1**, run:

- ☐ CatBoost
- ☐ LightGBM
- ☐ XGBoost
- ☐ Linear / Ridge / ElasticNet (if implemented)
- ☐ Hybrid physics-ML
- ☐ ARIHOW
- ☐ For **Scenario 2**, run the same family of models.
- ☐ Ensure all runs:
 - ☐ Use the same CV split function.
 - ☐ Use the same feature config for that scenario.
 - ☐ Log official metrics via the centralized metric module.

2.2 Build a Model Leaderboard

- ☐ Parse `training_all_models.log` and any per-run JSON/CSV metrics to create:
 - ☐ `artifacts/model_leaderboard.csv` with columns:
 - ☐ `scenario` , `model_name` , `seed` , `cv_metric_s1` , `cv_metric_s2` , `config_path` , `timestamp` .
- ☐ Add a small script (e.g. `tools/aggregate_model_scores.py`) that regenerates the leaderboard from logs.
- ☐ Sort models by the relevant scenario metric and mark **top N** models for each scenario.

2.3 Declare "Hero" Models per Scenario

- ☐ In `docs/planning/approach.md` , document:
 - ☐ The **best single model** for Scenario 1.
 - ☐ The **best single model** for Scenario 2.
- ☐ Record:
 - ☐ Config file used.
 - ☐ Official metrics.
 - ☐ Notes on stability (e.g., variance across folds / seeds).

3. Time & Bucket Weighting Improvements

3.1 Review and Refine Sample Weights

- ☐ Open the sample weight section in `run_defaults.yaml` (or relevant config).
- ☐ Confirm current behavior:
 - ☐ Months 0–5, 6–11, 12–23 have different weights.
 - ☐ Bucket 1 rows have higher weight than Bucket 2 (e.g. $\times 2$).
- ☐ Propose a **small set** of alternative weighting schemes, such as:
 - ☐ Slightly higher weight on months 0–5 (Scenario 1) and 6–11 (both scenarios).
 - ☐ Slightly higher weight on Bucket 1 (but not extreme).

3.2 Controlled Weighting Experiments

- ☐ For each candidate weight scheme:
 - ☐ Run the **hero** model for Scenario 1 and Scenario 2 with the modified weights.

- ☐ Log official metrics and store configs separately (e.g. `configs/experiments/weights_v1.yaml`).
 - ☐ Compare metrics to the baseline scheme and keep the best-performing version.
 - ☐ Update `run_defaults.yaml` only if the improvement is consistent across seeds/folds.
-

4. Targeted Hyperparameter Optimization (HPO)

4.1 Define Tight Search Spaces

- ☐ For CatBoost, LGBM, and XGBoost configs:
 - ☐ Add HPO ranges for:
 - ☐ `learning_rate`
 - ☐ `depth` / `max_depth`
 - ☐ `n_estimators` (if using early stopping, allow higher max)
 - ☐ `l2_leaf_reg` / regularization parameters.
 - ☐ Keep ranges **narrow, sane, and tabular-TS-friendly**.
- ☐ Document the search spaces in comments within `model_*.yaml` .

4.2 Enable and Run Small HPO Sweeps

- ☐ Ensure `train.py` supports an HPO mode (`--hpo` or similar).
- ☐ For each scenario:
 - ☐ Run a **small** sweep for CatBoost (and optionally one GBM alternative).
 - ☐ Use the **official metric** as the optimization objective.
- ☐ Save best hyperparameters in a separate config file (e.g. `configs/model_catboost_s1_best.yaml`).

4.3 Freeze and Document Best Hyperparams

- ☐ Update the main configs to use the HPO results (or reference them).
 - ☐ Keep the original defaults as commented blocks or separate "baseline" configs.
 - ☐ Note in `docs/planning/approach.md` which hyperparameters came from HPO.
-

5. Smarter Ensembles

5.1 Prepare Base Models for Ensembling

- ☐ Make sure all base models used in ensembles:
 - ☐ Share the same CV splits.
 - ☐ Use the same target scaling (if any).
 - ☐ Produce predictions for the same set of brands and months.
- ☐ Add a helper in `src/models/ensemble_utils.py` to align predictions by:
 - ☐ `country` , `brand_name` , `months_postgx` keys.

5.2 Build and Evaluate Simple Ensembles

- ☐ Implement or reuse simple ensemble classes:
 - ☐ Plain average (equal weights).

- ☐ Weighted average (weights learned on validation).
 - ☐ Simple stacking (meta-model over base predictions).
- ☐ Test ensembles like:
 - ☐ CatBoost + LightGBM.
 - ☐ CatBoost + Hybrid + ARIHOW.
- ☐ For each ensemble:
 - ☐ Compute Scenario 1 & Scenario 2 metrics.
 - ☐ Save ensemble composition and weights in JSON/YAML under `artifacts/ensembles/`.

5.3 Add Guardrails to Ensemble Predictions

- ☐ Implement a `sanitize_predictions(df_pred)` function that:
 - ☐ Clips negative volumes to 0.
 - ☐ Optionally clips very extreme values (e.g. $> 5 \times$ pre-entry avg) or at least flags them.
 - ☐ Call `sanitize_predictions()` before generating submission files.
 - ☐ Add a small test to ensure sanitization behaves as expected.
-

6. Inference & Submission Robustness

6.1 Scenario Detection & Fallbacks

- ☐ Inspect `inference.py` logic for detecting Scenario 1 vs Scenario 2 test series.
- ☐ Add tests for:
 - ☐ Proper scenario classification given different combinations of available months.
 - ☐ Edge cases (e.g. missing some early months).
- ☐ Verify fallback strategies (e.g. exponential decay) are triggered when:
 - ☐ A model does not produce a prediction for a series/month.
 - ☐ The prediction is NaN or obviously invalid.

6.2 Submission Sanity Checks

- ☐ Implement a small script (`tools/check_submission.py`) that:
 - ☐ Reads a submission CSV.
 - ☐ Verifies:
 - ☐ Correct column names and types.
 - ☐ No negative volumes.
 - ☐ Reasonable range vs pre-entry `avg_vol` from train data.
 - ☐ Prints summary stats per scenario and bucket.
 - ☐ Run this script for every candidate submission before uploading.
-

7. Experiment Tracking & Presentation Story

7.1 Experiment Tracking

- ☐ Ensure each training run:
 - ☐ Logs model name, scenario, config path, seed, official metrics to a centralized log (e.g. `training_all_models.log` + CSV).

- ☐ Add or improve a small `ExperimentTracker` utility that:
 - ☐ Appends entries to a structured file (`experiments.csv` or similar).
 - ☐ Can be queried (e.g. via a notebook) to list best runs.

7.2 Presentation Outline

- ☐ Create `docs/presentation_outline.md` with sections:
 - ☐ Problem framing (LOE, generic erosion, scenarios 1 & 2).
 - ☐ Data understanding (brands, buckets, erosion behavior).
 - ☐ Modeling approach (features, validation, models, ensembles).
 - ☐ Results and insights (official metrics, bucket-wise performance).
 - ☐ Business interpretation (why early months and Bucket 1 matter).
-

8. How Copilot Should Behave in This Repo

- ☐ Favor **small, incremental edits** over large refactors.
 - ☐ Suggest moving parameters into config rather than duplicating logic.
 - ☐ Auto-complete patterns based on existing code:
 - ☐ New model classes should mimic current `BaseModel` subclasses.
 - ☐ New tests follow patterns from `tests/test_smoke.py`.
 - ☐ Frequently remind the user (via comments or docstrings) to:
 - ☐ Re-run `pytest` after non-trivial changes.
 - ☐ Re-run a known baseline config to check no performance regression.
 - ☐ Update docs and experiment tracker when a new "hero" result is found.
-

End goal:

A **clean, well-documented, and reproducible** Arman project with:

- Strong baselines per scenario,
- Thoughtful weighting and HPO,
- Smart ensembles,
- Robust inference/submission code,
- And a clear evidence trail for why your final submissions deserve to top the leaderboard.