# Calibration assumptions

* Removing 2023 diagnosis data: the trend is not in line with previous years in most cities
* Using similar likelihoods for all targets for now:
  + In some cities (e.g., Baltimore), we are missing late diagnosis data for 2000-2019 and the model has a hard time catching up with the most recent estiamtes. But this is not the case everywhere. Need to come up with a generalizable solution

# Calibration workflow:

**During the run:** if ration of accepted runs fall below 20%: the chain is not mixing. Can end the run

**After the run completes:**

1. Check the mixing statistics: Did the chain mix well?
   1. No, dismiss
   2. Yes: look at each outcome: total, stratified, ….
2. If some outcomes don’t fit well:
   1. it is moving in the right direction?
      1. Yes? It may need more time
      2. No? Moving in the bad direction
         1. Is it scoring the likelihood worse?
            1. yes: If it's moving in a bad direction and its scoring worse, then there is a conflict between different outcomes : then maybe find a manual fit
            2. no, If it's moving in a bad direction and its scoring it better, then there is an issue with the likelihood