

1 Analysis Tools

Data Analysis is inherently build upon two fundamental components: High Quality Data that allows to gain insight into the underlying data generating process and a structured and reproducible way to extract information out of the collected data.

Section 1.1 introduces the two data sets we worked with whereas Section 1.2 provides an overview about the `postforecasts` package, a unified framework to apply and analyze various post-processing techniques.

1.1 Data & Methodology

This section first describes the two data sources that all of our analysis is based on. The final paragraphs explain our evaluation procedure from a theoretical point of view.

1.1.1 UK Covid-19 Crowd Forecasting Challenge

As part of an ongoing research project by the EpiForecasts¹ group at the London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine, the *UK Covid-19 Crowd Forecasting Challenge* (Team 2021b) consisted of submitting weekly predictions of Covid-19 Cases and Deaths in the United Kingdom in 2021. The challenge was not restricted to experienced researchers in the field but rather intended to collect quantile predictions for the upcoming four weeks by non-expert individuals.

One of the main motivations was to gather evidence for or against the hypothesis that humans are highly capable of precise *point forecasts*. Yet, at the same time, they tend to be too confident in their beliefs such that prediction *intervals* are chosen too narrow. In fact, this tendency presents one motivation for post-processing: Extract valuable information from point forecasts and adjust the corresponding prediction intervals with a systematic correction procedure.

In case of individuals that are unfamiliar with statistical methodology, specifying forecasts for very specific quantiles of the predictive distribution might lead to inconsistencies. Therefore all participants could determine an uncertainty parameter around their median prediction via an interactive web application such that all quantile predictions could be concluded in an automatic fashion. Note that this procedure inherently leads to *symmetric* forecast intervals. The results of the 12-week challenge are publicly available².

1.1.2 European Covid-19 Forecast Hub

According to their webpage the *European Covid-19 Forecast Hub* (Team 2021a) collects “short-term forecasts of Covid-19 cases and deaths across Europe, created by a multitude of infectious disease modelling teams”.

In contrast to the compact UK data described above, the European Forecast Hub data contains almost two million observations for over 20 European countries. Further, the forecasters are knowledgeable research groups that submit their weekly predictions based on statistical models. Although the data collection continues in regular frequency up to this day, our data set is limited to a 32-week span from March 2021 until October 2021.

The overall structure of the two data sets introduced above is very similar. Since we will refer to some particularly important columns by name frequently throughout the next chapters, they are briefly described here:

- **location:** The country for which the forecasts were submitted. Equals **GB** for the UK data. Our analysis for the European Forecast Hub data selects 18 different European countries.
- **model:** The forecaster (group). Mostly (non-expert) individuals for the UK data and international research groups for the European Forecast Hub.
- **target_type:** Either Covid-19 Cases or Covid-19 Deaths.

¹<https://epiforecasts.io/>

²<https://epiforecasts.io/uk-challenge/>

- **horizon:** The time horizon how far in advance the predictions were submitted. Ranges from 1 week-ahead to 4 weeks-ahead.
- **forecast_date:** The exact date when the forecasts were submitted.
- **target_end_date:** The exact date for which the forecasts were submitted.
- **quantile:** One of 23 different quantile values ranging from 0.01 to 0.99.
- **prediction:** The predicted value for one specific combination of the variables above.
- **true_value:** The actual, observed number of Covid-19 Cases or Deaths. This value is repeated 23 times, once for each quantile value.

1.1.3 Weighted Interval Score

In order to quantify if the post-processed prediction intervals improve the original forecasts we chose the *Weighted Interval Score* (WIS) (Bracher et al. 2021) as our evaluation metric. The WIS is a so-called *Proper Scoring Rule* (Gneiting and Raftery 2007): It incentivizes the forecaster to state their true best belief and cannot be manipulated in favour of own interests. It combines measures for interval *sharpness* as well as *overprediction* and *underprediction* and can thus be understood as a trade-off between interval *coverage* and *precision*.

More specifically, for a given quantile level α , true observed value y as well as lower bound l and upper bound u of the corresponding $(1 - \alpha) \cdot 100\%$ prediction interval, the *Interval Score* according to Bracher et al. (2021) is computed as

$$IS_{\alpha}(y) = (u - l) + \frac{2}{\alpha} \cdot (l - y) \cdot \mathbb{1}(y \leq l) + \frac{2}{\alpha} \cdot (y - u) \cdot \mathbb{1}(y \geq u).$$

The penalties $\frac{2}{\alpha} \cdot (l - y)$ and $\frac{2}{\alpha} \cdot (y - u)$ for over- and underprediction are thus influenced by two components:

- The penalty gets larger for increasing distance of the true value y to the lower or upper bound, given that y is not contained in the interval.
- The penalty gets larger for smaller values of α , i.e. for higher nominal coverage levels $(1 - \alpha)$.

A set of K Interval Scores with different quantile levels $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_K$ can be aggregated to a single number, the *Weighted Interval Score*, via the formula

$$WIS(y) = \frac{1}{K + 0.5} \cdot (w_0 \cdot |y - m| + \sum_{k=1}^K w_k \cdot IS_{\alpha_k}(y)),$$

where m represents the predicted median.

Thus, as the name suggests, the Weighted Interval Score is a weighted sum of the individual Interval Scores. The weights w_k are typically chosen as $w_k = \frac{\alpha_k}{2}$ and the weight w_0 for the deviation of the median is usually set to 0.5.

1.1.4 Time Series Cross Validation

Just like any statistical model the post-processing methods must be evaluated on *out-of-sample* data. Rather than starting from the raw data, i.e. the observed Covid-19 Cases and Deaths, our data sets already consist of existing quantile predictions. As a consequence, no part of our data set must be dedicated to fitting the quantile regression models in the first place.

Our evaluation procedure can be split into two steps:

1. Use a *training set* to learn parameters of the post-processing procedure in consideration.
2. Use a *validation set* to evaluate how the learned parameters generalize to unseen data.

Instead of a hard cut-off between the splits we used *Time Series Cross Validation* to leverage a higher fraction of the data set for training. In contrast to classical Cross Validation for independent and identically distributed data, Time Series Cross Validation iterates through the data set along the time dimension one step at a time.




Figure 1: Time Series Cross Validation

The process is nicely illustrated in Figure 1³. At each iteration the validation set is composed of the one step ahead prediction based on all observations prior to and including the current time point. The algorithm typically starts with a minimum number of observations as the initial training set, which can be considered a hyperparameter that has to be specified at the beginning of training.

1.2 The postforecasts Package

One core aspect of our project was the development of a fully functional package in the statistical programming language R (R Core Team 2021) that unites a collection of different post-processing algorithms into a well-designed and user friendly interface. This section can be understood as a compact guide how to use our package effectively and explains parts of the thought process that went into the implementation. It is worth noting that the **postforecasts** package adheres to all formal requirements for an R package and can be installed from our GitHub⁴ repository, where the source code is publicly available.

1.2.1 Overview

The **postforecasts** functions exported to the end-user can be grouped into three categories:

1. Exploratory

The `plot_quantiles()`, `plot_intervals()` and `plot_intervals_grid()` functions visualize the development of true Covid-19 Cases and Deaths over time as well as corresponding original and adjusted quantile predictions.

2. Model Fitting

The `update_predictions()` function is the workhorse of the entire **postforecasts** package. It specifies both the raw data and the post-processing method(s) that should be applied to the data set. The function returns a list of $k + 1$ equally shaped data frames for k selected post-processing methods where the first element is given by the original, possibly filtered, data frame.

All list elements can be analyzed separately or collectively by stacking them into one large data frame with the `collect_predictions()` function. The combined data frame is designed to work well with analysis functions of the `scoringutils`⁵ package (Bosse, Sam Abbott, and Gruson 2022). If multiple post-processing methods are applied, an ensemble model of all selected methods can be added via the

³Image Source: <https://otexts.com/fpp3/tscv.html> (Hyndman and Athanasopoulos 2021).

⁴<https://github.com/nikosbosse/post-processing-forecasts>

⁵<https://epiforecasts.io/scoringutils/>

`add_ensemble()` function, which lets the user access both the weighted ensemble predictions and a data frame with the corresponding weights.

3. Evaluation

As noted in Section 1.1 the Weighted Interval Score is our primary metric to evaluate the *quality* of prediction intervals. The `score()` function of the `scoringutils` package computes this quantity for each observation in the data set which can then be aggregated by the related `summarise_scores()` function.

Depending on the *granularity* of the aggregation the output might contain many interval scores of vastly different magnitudes. To simplify interpretation the `eval_methods()` function computes *relative* or *percentage* changes in the Weighted Interval Score for each selected method compared to the original quantile predictions. Further, these relative changes can be visualized by the `plot_eval()` function.

The following section demonstrates the complete workflow described above to give an impression of the *interaction* between the functions.

1.2.2 Workflow

We use the Covid-19 data for Germany in 2021 that is provided by the European Forecast Hub.

Figure 2 illustrates the 5%, 20% 80% and 95% quantile predictions of the `EuroCOVIDhub-ensemble` forecasting model during the summer months of 2021 in Germany.

```
plot_quantiles(
  hub_germany,
  model = "EuroCOVIDhub-ensemble", quantiles = c(0.05, 0.2, 0.8, 0.95)
)
```




Figure 2: Original Quantile Predictions for Covid-19 Cases and Deaths in Germany 2021

The original predictions look quite noisy overall with the clear trend that uncertainty and, hence, the interval

Table 1: Comparison of the Weighted Interval Score after CQR Adjustments

method	target type	interval score	dispersion
cqr	Cases	13.40	5.07
original	Cases	13.78	3.81
cqr	Deaths	0.06	0.01
original	Deaths	0.05	0.03

width increases with growing forecast horizons. We want to analyze if one particular post-processing method, *Conformalized Quantile Regression* which is properly introduced in ??, improves the predictive performance for this model on a validation set by computing the Weighted Interval Scores for Covid-19 Cases and Covid-19 Deaths separately:

```
df_updated <- update_predictions(
  hub_germany,
  methods = "cqr", models = "EuroCOVIDhub-ensemble", cv_init_training = 0.5
)
df_combined <- collect_predictions(df_updated)

df_combined |>
  extract_validation_set() |>
  scoringutils::score() |>
  scoringutils::summarise_scores(by = c("method", "target_type"))
```

Table 1 shows that CQR improved the WIS for Covid-19 Cases, whereas the predictive performance for Covid-19 Deaths dropped slightly.

The `update_predictions()` and `collect_predictions()` combination immediately generalize to multiple post-processing methods. The only syntax change is a vector input of strings for the `methods` argument instead of a single string. Hence, if not desired, the user does not have to learn separate interfaces for each method nor be familiar with the precise implementation. This design allows for maximum syntactic consistency by masking the internal functionality.

Further, the `update_predictions()` function automatically takes care of *quantile crossing* (Bassett and Koenker 1982) by reordering the output predictions in increasing quantile order. The `cv_init_training` parameter specifies the fraction of observations that is used for the pure training set before the Time Series Cross Validation process starts.

As seen in Table 1 CQR increases the *dispersion* of the predictions for Cases significantly. One example of these wider intervals is visualized in Figure 3.

```
plot_intervals(df_combined, target_type = "Cases", horizon = 2, quantile = 0.05)
```

Indeed, the 2 weeks-ahead 90% prediction intervals for Covid Cases in Germany are widened by CQR. The grey dashed line indicates the end of the training set within the Cross Validation as specified by the `cv_init_training` parameter.

Recall from Figure 2 that prediction uncertainty increases with larger forecast horizons. Similarly, CQR *corrections* also increase in size for forecasts that are submitted further in advance, which can be seen in Figure 4 along the horizontal dimension. Interestingly, CQR expands the intervals only for Cases whereas the forecasts for Deaths are narrowed!

```
plot_intervals_grid(df_combined, facet_by = "horizon", quantiles = 0.05)
```

Besides the target type (Cases or Deaths), it is also useful to compare CQR effects across forecast horizons or quantiles. Quite intuitively, CQR generally has a stronger *relative* benefit for large time horizons and extreme




Figure 3: Original and CQR-adjusted Prediction Intervals for Covid-19 Cases in Germany

quantiles, where the original forecaster faced a greater uncertainty. Figure 5 illustrates how, in special cases like this one, the effect on the validation set can show rather mixed trends due to disadvantageous adjustments for the two and three weeks-ahead 98% prediction intervals.

```
df_eval <- eval_methods(df_combined, summarise_by = c("quantile", "horizon"))
plot_eval(df_eval)
```

Bassett, Gilbert, and Roger Koenker. 1982. “An Empirical Quantile Function for Linear Models with | Operatornameiid Errors.” *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 77 (378): 407. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2287261>.

Bosse, Nikos, Sam Abbott, and Hugo Gruson. 2022. *Scoringutils: Utilities for Scoring and Assessing Predictions*.

Bracher, Johannes, Evan L. Ray, Tilmann Gneiting, and Nicholas G. Reich. 2021. “Evaluating Epidemic Forecasts in an Interval Format.” *PLOS Computational Biology* 17 (2): e1008618. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pcbi.1008618>.

Gneiting, Tilmann, and Adrian E Raftery. 2007. “Strictly Proper Scoring Rules, Prediction, and Estimation.” *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 102 (477): 359–78. <https://doi.org/10.1198/016214506000001437>.

Hyndman, Rob, and George Athanasopoulos. 2021. *Forecasting: Principles and Practice*. Third. OTexts. <https://otexts.com/fpp3/>.

R Core Team. 2021. *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*. Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing. <https://www.R-project.org/>.

Team, EpiForecasts. 2021a. “European Covid-19 Forecast Hub.” London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, European Centre for Disease Control and Prevention (ECDC). <https://covid19forecasthub.eu/index.html>.

———. 2021b. “UK Covid-19 Crowd Forecasting Challenge.” London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine, European Centre for Disease Control and Prevention (ECDC). <https://www.crowdforecastr.org/2021/05/11/uk-challenge/>.

Predicted Incidences (per 100k) in Germany model: EuroCOVIDhub-ensemble | quantile: 0.05




Figure 4: Original and CQR-adjusted Prediction Intervals for different Forecast Horizons




Figure 5: Relative Changes in the WIS through CQR for all Quantile-Horizon combinations