Dominant Shuffle: A Simple Yet Powerful Data Augmentation for Time-series Prediction

Kai Zhao¹ Zuojie He² Alex Hung¹ Dan Zeng² ¹UCLA ² Shanghai University kz@kaizhao.net

Abstract

Recent studies have suggested frequency-domain Data augmentation (DA) is effective for time series prediction. Existing frequency-domain augmentations disturb the original data with various full-spectrum noises, leading to excess domain gap between augmented and original data. Although impressive performance has been achieved in certain cases, frequency-domain DA has yet to be generalized to time series prediction datasets. In this paper, we found that frequency-domain augmentations can be significantly improved by two modifications that limit the perturbations. First, we found that limiting the perturbation to only dominant frequencies significantly outperforms full-spectrum perturbations. Dominant frequencies represent the main periodicity and trends of the signal and are more important than other frequencies. Second, we found that simply shuffling the dominant frequency components is superior over sophisticated designed random perturbations. Shuffle rearranges the original components (magnitudes and phases) and limits the external noise. With these two modifications, we proposed *dominant shuffle*, a simple yet effective data augmentation for time series prediction. Our method is very simple yet powerful and can be implemented with just a few lines of code. Extensive experiments with eight datasets and six popular time series models demonstrate that our method consistently improves the baseline performance under various settings and significantly outperforms other DA methods. Code can be accessed at https://kaizhao.net/time-series.

1 Introduction

Time-series prediction aims to forecast multivariate future values based on historical observations. It is a long-standing problem with various applications in electricity pricing, weather forecast, traffic prediction [10, 35]. Recently, impressive results have been achieved by using various deep learning architectures, e.g. recurrent neural networks (RNNs) [21, 22, 14], Transformers [35, 31, 37, 13], and temporal convolutional networks (TCNs) [27, 12, 30]. Neural networks require a large volume of training data to effectively fit their numerous parameters. Unfortunately, time-series data acquired from real-world sensors are often limited in many time-series applications. The patterns of the time series heavily depend on specific dynamic system that generates the data and other data sources are not applicable [3, 23].

To mitigate the impact of insufficient data in time series analysis, several data augmentation techniques have been explored [28, 7, 1, 23, 3, 33, 4, 8, 34, 20, 26, 9, 24, 11, 16, 10]. Most of these data augmentation techniques in time series analysis focus on classification [20, 26, 9, 24, 16, 10, 33, 4] and anomaly detection [11, 10, 8]. These augmentations alter the time series sequences while preserving the class labels. However, the prediction task requires more fine-grained temporal information to accurately estimate future dynamics [34, 3]. These perturbations designed for classification can disrupt the data-label coherence and lead to performance degradation [34, 3].

Preprint. Under review.



Figure 1: Relative improvements (%) of various data augmentations over the baseline on eight datasets using the state-of-the-art iTransformer [13] model. Zero corresponds to the original model without any data augmentation. Our method consistently improves the baseline on all the datasets and outperforms other augmentations in most cases. The improvements are based on the average performance of four prediction lengths: 96, 192, 336, and 720.

Coherence is a key factor to effective data augmentation [28, 34, 25]. It measures the semantic connection between the augmented data and the label. These augmentations designed for classification often struggle with prediction tasks, due to unilateral perturbations that disrupt the data-label coherence. Recently, to mitigate the data-label coherence, Chen et. al [3] proposed to simultaneously perturb the data (historical sequence) and labels (future sequences) in the frequency domain. Unlike common data augmentations that introduce slight perturbations only to the data while keeping the labels unchanged, this approach enables more radical perturbations, such as frequency mix (FreqMix) and frequency mask (FreqMask), to be applied without severely disrupting the data-label coherence. And the method indeed generates new data-label pairs that are significantly different from the originals.

However, the full-spectrum perturbations in FreqMask and FreqMix introduce external randomization and reduce the domain gap between the augmented and original data. This can lead to unstable and suboptimal results on some benchmarks, especially with a larger amount of augmented samples. As shown in Fig. 5, the performance of FrAug [3] degrades significantly with the rising number of augmented samples, which demonstrates that the augmented samples are out-of-distribution with the original samples.

In this paper, to reduce the domain gap between the augmented and original data, we propose to limit the perturbation and randomization in data augmentation. First, we limit the perturbation to specific frequencies instead of full-spectrum perturbation. Several recent studies have pointed out that a few frequency components are dominating the periodicity and main trends of the time series. And other Frequencies correspond to minor trends or noise [30, 37, 36]. Following [30], we perturb top-*k* frequencies with highest magnitudes. Second, to avoid excess external noise, we use random shuffle for perturbation. Shuffle rearranges existing components without introducing any external randomness.

Extensive comparisons were made among nine different data augmentation methods on eight public datasets using six state-of-the-art time-series prediction network architectures. These comparisons demonstrate that, despite its simplicity, our method significantly outperforms other competitors by a substantial margin. As shown in Fig. 1, our method consistently improves the performance across various datasets, and outperforms other augmentations in most cases.

Comprehensive ablation studies demonstrate that perturbing dominant frequencies yields significantly better performance than various full-spectrum perturbations. And shuffle is proven to be superior to other randomization techniques. Besides, our augmentation demonstrates improved augmented-original gap over other augmentations, as indicated by higher performance with an increased number of augmented samples (Fig. 5).

2 Related Work

In the last decade, deep learning has emerged as a powerful tool in time-series prediction and has shown superior performance over traditional statistical methods such as ARIMA and Exponential Smoothing [15]. A rich line of studies has introduced various deep-learning architectures, including

recurrent neural networks (RNNs) [21, 22, 14], temporal convolution neural networks (TCNs) [27, 12, 30], and Transformers [31, 17, 18, 13, 37]. These models learn to predict the future from large volumes of historical data.

Various data augmentations have been proposed for time series data and many of these techniques were proposed for the classification tasks [28, 20, 26, 9, 24, 16, 10, 33, 4]. Many of these methods regard time series data as one-dimensional image and borrowed data augmentations, e.g. cropping [9, 5] flipping [28], and noise injection [29], from computer vision. Window warping [28] is a time series-specific data augmentation that upsamples (or downsamples) a random range of the time series while keeping other time ranges unchanged.

In addition to time-domain augmentations, there are also methods that perturb the original data in the frequency domain. Gao [8] proposed to add noise on both magnitude and phase in the frequency domain. Zhang [33] proposed to add single or multiple frequency components in the first half of the frequency spectrum. Chen [4] proposed to perform pooling or smoothing operations in the frequency domain.

While most of the augmentations focus on the classification tasks, a few methods for forecasting task have also been explored. Bandara [1] introduces two DA methods for forecasting : (i) Average selected with distance (ASD), which generates augmented time series using the weighted sum of multiple time series, and the weights are determined by the dynamic time warping (DTW) distance[7]; (ii) Moving block bootstrapping (MBB) generates augmented data by manipulating the residual part of the time series after STL Decomposition [23] and recombining it with the other series. Zhang [34] proposed to simultaneously augment in frequency and time domains. Recently, Chen et. al. [3] proposed to augment both the data (historical sequence) and the label (future sequence) in the frequency domain to improve the data-label coherence. Although this method generally achieves decent results, full-spectrum randomization imposes a large domain gap between the augmented and the original data, sometimes leading to degraded performance.

3 Dominant Frequency Shuffle for Time-series

3.1 Time-series Prediction and Frequency Domain Augmentation

Time-series prediction is a sequence-to-sequence problem where the model estimates a future multivariate sequence based on a sequence of historical measurements. Let $x = \{x^1, x^2, ..., x^L\}_{t=1}^L \in \mathbb{R}^{L \times D}$ be the historical sequence, and $y = \{x^{L+1}, x^{L+2}, ..., x^{L+T}\}_{t=L+1}^{L+T} \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times D}$ is the future sequence to be estimated. x^t is the measurement at timestep t and D is the number of variates. Next, we will use $x \in R^{L \times D}$ and $y \in R^{T \times D}$ to denote the historical and future sequences. x and y are the input and output of deep learning models, respectively.

3.2 Dominant Frequency Shuffle

Deep neural networks learn the $x \to y$ mapping from large volume of (x, y) pairs, and data augmentation is an efficient way of expanding the training data. Frequency-domain augmentation is a family of augmentation methods that perturb time series in the frequency domain. These methods initially convert time series to the frequency domain, apply perturbations there, and then convert the modified data back to the time domain.

Following FrAug [3], we augmented the concatenation of data and label to preserve the data-label consistency. Let $F(\omega) = \mathcal{F}([x, y])$ be the discrete Fourier transform $(DFT)^1$ of the time-series where [x, y] denotes the concatenation of data and label. $F(\omega)$ is the discrete Fourier transform of [x, y]. We shuffle only the dominant frequencies with highest magnitudes $(|F(\omega)|)$. Let $\hat{F}(\omega)$ be the frequency-domain data with dominant frequencies shuffled, $\hat{F}(\omega)$ is then converted back to time domain using inverse DFT (iDFT): $[\hat{x}, \hat{y}] = iDFT(\hat{F}(\omega))$. Where \hat{x}, \hat{y} is the augmented data-label pair. Fig. 2 illustrates an example of the process of dominant shuffle with k = 3. The prediction models were trained on a combined training set with both augmented and original data.

¹We used the torch.fft.rfft() and torch.fft.irfft() for time-to-frequency and inverse conversions.



Figure 2: Illustration of shuffling three dominant frequencies. (a) The original time-series x^t . (b) and (c) Frequency-domain representations before and after dominant shuffle. Color dots represent the shuffle of dominant frequencies. (d) Augmented time series with original time series as reference.

4 Experiments

In this section, we first introduce the implementation details in Sec. 4.1, and then compared the performance of various SOTA models with and without dominant shuffle in Sec. 4.2. In Sec. 4.3, we thoroughly compared dominant shuffle with various data augmentation methods. Finally, we conducted ablation studies to verify hyperparameter sensitivity and justify design choices in Sec. 4.4.

4.1 Experimental Setups

Implementation details All the experiments were conducted with the PyTorch [19] framework on a single NVIDIA RTX 3090 GPU. Some of the experimental results were from respective original papers, and some were reproduced using official code with default configurations. We only changed the data augmentation for fair comparisons. Please refer to appendix A.2 for the details about our reimplementations. Following the practice of [3], we performed data augmentations to double the size of the original training dataset unless otherwise specified.

Evaluation protocols We tested our method with short-term and long-term prediction protocols. In the long-term protocol, the prediction period T ranges from 96 to 720, with variations at 96, 192, 336, and 720. In contrast, the short-term protocol has prediction periods ranging from 12 to 48, with variations at 12, 24, 36, and 48. Following the common practice of previous works [35, 31, 37, 13, 27, 30], we quantified the performance of the prediction using the mean-squared error (MSE) between the ground-truth and the prediction.

Datasets For long-term prediction, we experimented on eight well-established benchmarks: the ETT datasets (ETTh1, ETTh2, ETTm1, ETTm2) [35], and the Weather, Electricity, Exchange, and Traffic datasets [31]. For short-term prediction, following iTransformer [13], we used four public traffic network datasets (PEMS03, PEMS04, PEMS07, PEMS08) from PEMS [2].

Each dataset is divided into training, testing, and evaluation subsets in specific ratios. The training, testing, and evaluation ratio is 6:2:2 for ETT and PEMS datasets, and the ratio is 7:1:2 for Electricity, Traffic, Weather, and Exchange-rate datasets. Detailed statistics of these datasets are summarized in appendix A.1. For each setting (dataset+prediction length T), we tuned the optimal number of dominant frequencies k on the evaluation set. The optimal k on various datasets can be found in appendix B.3.

Baseline Models We selected diverse models as the baseline in our experiments, including two Transformer-based (iTransformer [13], Autoformer [31]), two MLP-based methods (TiDE [6], Lightts [32]), and two temporal convolutional network (TCN) based methods (MICN [27], SCINet [12]). iTransformer (Liu et al., 2024) is the state-of-the-art in Transformer-based models, TiDE (Das et al., 2023) is the state-of-the-art MLP-based model, and MICN (Wang et al., 2023) is the state-of-the-art TCN-based model. For short-term prediction, we used the SOTA iTransformer [13] model on PEMS [2] dataset as the baseline model.

Other data augmentation methods We compared the proposed method with nine existing data augmentation methods, including three time-domain augmentations (ASD [7], MSB [1] Upsample [23]), five frequency-domain methods (FreqMix [3], FreqMask [3], FreqAdd [33], FreqPool [4], Robusttad [8]), and a temporal-frequency method STAug [34].

4.2 Comparison With State-of-the-arts

We first compared our method with other state-of-the-art time series prediction models published in top-tier venues. We compared the performance of recent models (iTransformer [13] (ICLR2024), SCINet [12] (NIPS2022) AutoFormer [31] (NIPS2021)) with and without dominant shuffle. The averaged mean squared errors (MSE) across various prediction lengths (96, 192, 336, 720) is calculated for each dataset. The results in Fig. 3 clearly demonstrate that our method consistently



Figure 3: Performance of different models with (right striped bars) and without (left color bars) dominant shuffle. The horizontal dotted lines demonstrate how dominant shuffle helps one model outperforms a more advanced model.

reduces the prediction error for all the cases. In some cases, dominant shuffle surpasses even a highly sophisticated model. For example, on the ETTh1 dataset, our approach significantly improves the performance of AutoFormer [31] and MICN [27], and helps them outperform the latest iTransformer [13] model. On the Exchange and Weather dataset, our approach enables AutoFormer to outperform SCINet [12] and assists MICN [27] in surpassing iTransformer [13]. The results in Fig. 3 clearly demonstrate the significant improvements achieved by our method.

4.3 Comparisons With Other Data Augmentations

We compared different data augmentation methods on various datasets and baseline models under short-term and long-term protocols. Fig. 1 demonstrates the relative improvements (%) of various augmentation methods over the baseline. Tab. 1 to 3 summarize the average performance of 5 runs with distinct random seeds, and the standard deviations of different runs can be found in appendix B.4. The best values in each colume are highlighted with color. Example predictions can be found in Fig. 6 in the appendix B.

We first compared different data augmentation methods for long-term prediction. Tab. 1 summarizes the mean squared errors (MSE) on ETT datasets and Tab. 2 summarizes the MSE on Weather, Electricity, and Exchange-rate datasets. Limited by the space, we only reported the results of six subsets (ETTh1, ETTh2, ETTm1, Electricity, Weather, and Exchange rate) in Tab. 1 and 2, and the results of the other two subsets (ETTm2 and Traffic) can be found in appendix B. We also merged the results of FreqMix and FreqMask by selecting the superior one in each case. The merged results are denoted as 'MixMask'.

As demonstrated in Tab. 1 and 2, our method consistently improves the baseline on 96% of the cases, while other augmentation methods, e.g. FreqMix, outperform the baseline for around 87% of the cases. Our method also outperforms other augmentation methods on more than 77% of the cases. Moreover, our method achieves larger relative improvements as the prediction length T increased, highlighting its strong capacity in long-term predictions. Tab. 3 summarizes the MSE of short-term prediction using the iTransformer [13] model on the PEMS datasets [2]. The prediction errors are generally lower than the errors in long-term prediction. Our method outperforms other augmentations in most cases, although the improvements are marginal compared to long-term prediction. This is because short-term prediction is relatively easy, and the performance has already reached saturation.

4.4 Ablation Study

Our method includes a hyper-parameter k and two unique designs: 1) perturb the dominant frequencies and 2) shuffle the dominant frequency components. We conducted ablation studies to investigate the impact of hyperparameters and to justify our design choices.

Method 96 192 336 720 96 192 336 720 96 192 336 720 944 734 734 734 734 734 734 734 734 735 736 730 MSB 11 0.397 0.446 0.475 0.380 0.447 0.433 0.380 0.446 0.475 0.510 0.300 0.384 0.446 0.475 0.470 0.385 0.412 0.449 0.351 0.390 0.385 0.446 0.475 0.470 0.510 0.320 0.449 0.331 0.390 0.445 0.470 0.510 0.320 0.448 0.330 0.385 0.446 0.437 0.420 0.438 0.331 0.331 0.331 0.331 0.331 0.331 0.331 0.331 0.331 0.331 0.331 0.341 0.441 0.433 0.331 0.331 0.341 0.431 0.431 0.431 0.431 0.431 0.431		N 4 1		ET	Th1			ET	Th2			ET	Tm1	
Baseline 0.392 0.447 0.448 0.512 0.310 0.388 0.432 0.442 0.382 0.432 0.440 0.382 0.432 0.440 0.382 0.432 0.440 0.382 0.442 0.440 0.381 0.419 0.381 0.419 0.430 0.381 0.419 0.430 0.381 0.419 0.430 0.381 0.419 0.430 0.351 0.381 0.419 0.352 0.432 0.430 0.351 0.381 0.419 0.332 0.413 0.390 0.445 0.489 0.332 0.421 0.430 0.417 0.445 0.489 0.331 0.331 0.333 0.417 0.442 0.432 0.421 0.485 0.422 0.440 0.331 0.332 0.333 0.333 0.417 0.442 0.332 0.333 0.333 0.417 0.443 0.430 0.433 0.430 0.433 0.433 0.433 0.433 0.433 0.433 0.433 0.433 0.433		Method	96	192	336	720	96	192	336	720	96	192	336	720
ASD [7] 0.398 0.442 0.310 0.388 0.442 0.430 0.339 0.386 0.447 0.433 0.339 0.386 0.447 0.433 0.339 0.386 0.447 0.433 0.339 0.386 0.447 0.433 0.339 0.386 0.446 0.475 0.386 0.416 0.435 0.335 0.381 0.416 0.433 0.339 0.386 0.416 0.433 0.339 0.448 0.330 0.331 0.332 0.447 0.332 0.441 0.433 0.339 0.341 0.410 0.335 0.441 0.433 0.339 0.331 0.331 0.331 0.332 0.341 0.443 0.333 0.331 0.333 0.331 0.339 0.331 0.339 0.331 <		Baseline	0 392	0 447	0.483	0.516	0 303	0.381	0.412	0.434	0 344	0.383	0.421	0 4 9 4
 MSB 111 0.387 0.460 0.494 0.531 0.309 0.382 0.447 0.430 0.331 0.380 0.467 0.551 0.381 0.419 0.430 0.351 0.381 0.432 0.489 mrcqAod [31] 0.389 0.446 0.475 0.510 0.300 0.381 0.419 0.430 0.351 0.381 0.432 0.499 grrcqAod [41] 0.433 0.456 0.497 0.552 0.313 0.392 0.415 0.450 0.347 0.392 0.448 0.499 Robustad [81] 0.390 0.445 0.497 0.510 0.312 0.388 0.412 0.499 0.353 0.382 0.421 0.498 STAug [34] 0.390 0.445 0.497 0.504 0.301 0.380 0.414 0.424 0.332 0.375 0.421 0.485 0.380 0.440 0.475 0.504 0.301 0.438 0.411 0.425 0.356 0.422 0.499 Baseline 0.420 0.440 0.495 0.498 0.381 0.443 0.471 0.475 0.466 0.610 0.522 0.773 ASD 0.450 0.488 0.523 0.556 0.370 0.445 0.476 0.503 0.480 0.620 0.202 0.633 0.212 0.676 MSB 0.462 0.477 0.522 0.357 0.434 0.423 0.471 0.475 0.466 0.610 0.523 0.576 0.421 0.492 0.492 Baseline 0.420 0.480 0.487 0.497 0.525 0.367 0.443 0.471 0.475 0.466 0.610 0.523 0.576 0.421 0.493 0.480 0.512 0.667 FreqAol 0.460 0.487 0.497 0.525 0.357 0.434 0.430 0.590 0.449 0.534 0.541 0.518 0.564 0.599 MixMask 0.420 0.478 0.505 0.506 0.334 0.443 0.470 0.433 0.470 0.523 0.105 0.554 0.420 0.499 0.535 0.516 0.564 MixMask 0.420 0.478 0.574 0.538 0.421 0.470 0.476 0.415 0.510 0.491 0.558 0.543 MixMask 0.420 0.445 0.467 0.457 0.559 0.402 0.423 0.590 0.427 0.336 0.328 0.401 0.580 0.491 0.559 Baseline 0.384 0.430 0.472 0.529 0.559 0.506 0.530 0.623 0.797 0.136 0.360 0.387 0.470 0.388 0.443 0.340 0.430 0.437 0.437 0.438 0.430 0.358 0.402 0.459 0.445 0.446 0.457 0.500 0.541 0.459 0.330 0.357 0.337 0.342 0.445 0.440 0.449 0.440 0.449 0.459 0.346 0.337 0.470 0.331 0.360 0.337 0.470 0.378 0.443 0.346 0.430 0.447 0.450 0.559 0.402 0.457 0.331 0.360 0.338 0.437 0.337 0.341 0.340 0.439 0.451 0.340 0.430 0.347 0.450 0.337 0.342 0.340 0.349 0.441 0.344 0.359 0.350 0.347 0.331 0.	_	Δ SD [7]	0.398	0.456	0.483	0.512	0.310	0.388	0.432	0.452	0.340	0.382	0.454	0.492
Link Link <thlink< th=""> Link Link <thl< td=""><td>13</td><td>MSB [1]</td><td>0.397</td><td>0.450</td><td>0.403</td><td>0.512</td><td>0.310</td><td>0.300</td><td>0.432</td><td>0.432</td><td>0.340</td><td>0.302</td><td>0.467</td><td>0.472</td></thl<></thlink<>	13	MSB [1]	0.397	0.450	0.403	0.512	0.310	0.300	0.432	0.432	0.340	0.302	0.467	0.472
2 0.5341 0.530 0.542 0.530 0.531 0.530 0.531 0.532 0.531 0.530 0.535 0.432 0.531 0.530 0.535 0.532 0.433 0.532 0.433 0.532 0.433 0.532 0.433 0.532 0.433 0.533 0.532 0.433 0.533 0.532 0.433 0.533 0.532 0.433 0.533 0.533 0.432 0.433 0.533 0.533 0.432 0.433 0.533 0.533 0.432 0.534 0.533 0.532 0.441 0.442 0.433 0.535 0.422 0.433 0.534 0.535 0.533 0.446 0.445 0.443 0.443 0.533 0.446 0.445 0.445 0.446 0.445 0.446 0.		Uncomple [22]	0.307	0.400	0.494	0.551	0.309	0.362	0.447 0.410	0.433	0.339	0.380	0.407	0.310
$ \begin{array}{c} \begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	ы	Erog A dd [22]	0.391	0.445	0.401	0.519	0.303	0.301	0.419	0.430	0.331	0.301	0.432	0.409
2 FreqPool 0.435 0.449 0.232 0.213 0.332 0.441 0.433 0.334 0.332 0.432 0.433 0.332 0.432 0.433 0.332 0.432 0.433 0.333 0.332 0.432 0.433 0.333 0.332 0.433 0.333 0.332 0.433 0.333 0.432 0.431 0.434 0.332 0.334 0.375 0.421 0.442 0.442 0.442 0.442 0.442 0.442 0.442 0.442 0.442 0.444 0.444 0.444 0.523 0.556 0.462 0.455 0.570 0.771 0.747 0.535 0.530 0.446 0.533 0.446 0.556 0.462 0.553 0.572 0.576 0.566 0.571 0.612 0.677 0.576 0.566 0.445 0.467 0.477 0.538 0.510 0.479 0.535 0.533 0.538 0.538 0.538 0.538 0.538 0.538 0.538 0.510 <th< td=""><td>E</td><td>FreqAdd [55]</td><td>0.309</td><td>0.440</td><td>0.473</td><td>0.510</td><td>0.500</td><td>0.304</td><td>0.410</td><td>0.450</td><td>0.550</td><td>0.303</td><td>0.422</td><td>0.490</td></th<>	E	FreqAdd [55]	0.309	0.440	0.473	0.510	0.500	0.304	0.410	0.450	0.550	0.303	0.422	0.490
22 Robustad [8] 0.390 0.445 0.489 0.510 0.332 0.339 0.383 0.417 0.439 E MixMask [3] 0.388 0.441 0.439 0.339 0.382 0.417 0.485 Ours 0.383 0.441 0.431 0.317 0.424 0.420 Baseline 0.429 0.440 0.492 0.480 0.510 0.532 0.556 0.370 0.442 0.453 0.512 0.566 0.442 0.446 0.523 0.512 0.367 0.439 0.450 0.442 0.451 0.510 0.521 0.510 0.521 0.510 0.521 0.510 0.521 0.510 0.521 0.510 0.521 0.510 0.521 0.510 0.551 0.523 0.5	fo	FreqPool [4]	0.433	0.430	0.497	0.332	0.313	0.392	0.413	0.450	0.347	0.392	0.430	0.499
E SiAug [34] 0.390 0.480 0.489 0.51 0.530 0.482 0.486 0.483 0.334 0.375 0.421 0.485 Durs 0.383 0.486 0.471 0.504 0.301 0.380 0.411 0.428 0.332 0.374 0.427 0.420 0.425 0.773 ASD 0.450 0.440 0.520 0.570 0.436 0.552 0.773 0.420 0.502 0.573 0.713 0.467 0.410 0.521 0.512 0.512 0.512 0.512 0.512 0.512 0.566 0.521 0.512 0.566 0.550 0.556 0.446 0.450 0.512 0.566 0.551 0.566 0.551 0.566 0.551 0.566 0.551 0.566 0.521 0.510 0.510 0.510 0.551 0.553 0.560 0.510 0.551 0.551 0.551 0.551 0.551 0.551 0.551 0.551 0.551 0.551 0.551 <td>SUI</td> <td>Robustiad [8]</td> <td>0.390</td> <td>0.445</td> <td>0.497</td> <td>0.510</td> <td>0.312</td> <td>0.388</td> <td>0.412</td> <td>0.439</td> <td>0.353</td> <td>0.382</td> <td>0.421</td> <td>0.498</td>	SUI	Robustiad [8]	0.390	0.445	0.497	0.510	0.312	0.388	0.412	0.439	0.353	0.382	0.421	0.498
E MixMask [3] 0.388 0.440 0.477 0.304 0.301 0.380 0.411 0.428 0.375 0.421 0.442 0.422 Baseline 0.420 0.440 0.495 0.498 0.331 0.411 0.428 0.332 0.376 0.424 0.424 0.424 0.424 0.424 0.424 0.424 0.424 0.424 0.427 0.375 0.424 0.426 0.520 0.533 0.460 0.487 0.502 0.533 0.460 0.455 0.509 0.448 0.455 0.509 0.448 0.450 0.540 0.445 0.551 0.561 0.551 0.562 0.527 0.432 0.510 0.554 0.510 0.554 0.521 0.551 0.580 0.521 0.477 0.530 0.421 0.425 0.429 0.430 0.430 0.420 0.520 0.527 0.432 0.510 0.554 0.521 0.571 0.530 0.521 0.527 0.330 0.529 <t< td=""><td>La</td><td>STAug [34]</td><td>0.390</td><td>0.445</td><td>0.489</td><td>0.511</td><td>0.323</td><td>0.428</td><td>0.486</td><td>0.483</td><td>0.339</td><td>0.383</td><td>0.41/</td><td>0.485</td></t<>	La	STAug [34]	0.390	0.445	0.489	0.511	0.323	0.428	0.486	0.483	0.339	0.383	0.41/	0.485
		MixMask [3]	0.388	0.440	0.477	0.504	0.301	0.380	0.414	0.434	0.334	0.375	0.421	0.485
Baseline 0.429 0.449 0.449 0.443 0.474 0.475 0.0410 0.529 0.773 MSB 0.462 0.517 0.612 0.579 0.434 0.523 0.460 0.440 0.502 0.633 0.640 0.645 0.550 0.445 0.550 0.445 0.550 0.445 0.540 0.445 0.540 0.445 0.540 0.445 0.540 0.445 0.540 0.443 0.447 0.523 0.512 0.647 0.520 0.527 0.432 0.510 0.554 0.546 0.554 0.546 0.554 0.546 0.559 0.550 0.502 0.527 0.520 0.527 0.422 0.442 0.445 0.443 0.443 0.443 0.443 0.443 0.443 0.443 0.443 0.443 0.443 0.443 0.444 0.444 0.444 0.444 0.444 0.444 0.444 0.444 0.444 0.444 0.446 0.445 0.450 0.452 0		Ours	0.383	0.438	0.473	0.492	0.298	0.382	0.411	0.428	0.332	0.374	0.424	0.492
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		Baseline	0.429	0.440	0.495	0.498	0.381	0.443	0.471	0.475	0.467	0.610	0.529	0.773
MSB 0.462 0.517 0.612 0.579 0.434 0.523 0.556 0.462 0.499 0.643 0.533 0.720 FreqAdd 0.460 0.487 0.480 0.533 0.460 0.455 0.509 0.498 0.530 0.512 0.566 0.555 0.567 0.432 0.510 0.553 0.521 0.512 0.523 0.512 0.432 0.510 0.553 0.563 0.527 0.432 0.510 0.538 0.621 0.470 0.451 0.510 0.538 0.623 0.441 0.470 0.538 0.421 0.470 0.458 0.638 0.432 0.440 0.544 0.540 0.447 0.450 0.433 0.452 0.320 0.558 0.518 0.560 0.521 0.521 0.533 0.520 0.533 0.530 0.538 0.402 0.435 0.431 0.560 0.533 0.520 0.533 0.530 0.533 0.520 0.533 0.520 0.533 0.5		ASD	0.450	0.485	0.523	0.556	0.370	0.465	0.476	0.503	0.480	0.620	0.502	0.633
	31	MSB	0.462	0.517	0.612	0.579	0.434	0.523	0.556	0.462	0.499	0.645	0.553	0.721
E FreqAdd 0.460 0.487 0.497 0.525 0.367 0.439 0.449 0.524 0.541 0.554 0.546 0.553 0.523 0.512 0.392 0.442 0.479 0.523 0.512 0.392 0.443 0.490 0.553 0.623 MixMask 0.420 0.4478 0.505 0.506 0.354 0.447 0.447 0.445 0.446 0.446 0.447 0.446 0.446 0.446 0.446 0.446 0.446 0.446 0.446 0.442 0.478 0.518 0.518 0.518 0.518 0.521 0.321 0.310 0.432 0.399 0.457 MSB 0.423 0.423 0.521 0.523 0.521 0.620 0.831 0.752 0.339 0.377 0.402 0.4459 Upsample 0.390 0.433 0.453 0.550 0.533 0.529 0.553 0.590 0.336 0.377 0.402 0.4479 Upsample <td></td> <td>Upsample</td> <td>0.416</td> <td>0.523</td> <td>0.480</td> <td>0.482</td> <td>0.353</td> <td>0.460</td> <td>0.455</td> <td>0.509</td> <td>0.498</td> <td>0.630</td> <td>0.512</td> <td>0.667</td>		Upsample	0.416	0.523	0.480	0.482	0.353	0.460	0.455	0.509	0.498	0.630	0.512	0.667
E FreqPool 0.446 0.457 0.523 0.512 0.392 0.442 0.470 0.493 0.479 0.623 0.510 0.553 G STAug 0.420 0.477 0.367 0.497 0.502 0.527 0.432 0.510 0.558 0.623 Ours 0.409 0.436 0.448 0.486 0.486 0.452 0.432 0.510 0.588 0.660 MXMask 0.430 0.443 0.447 0.538 0.410 0.433 0.420 0.443 0.450 0.438 0.430 0.431 0.315 0.360 0.439 0.447 0.538 0.518 0.566 0.827 0.313 0.316 0.360 0.433 0.422 0.339 0.423 0.337 0.539 0.420 0.339 0.423 0.422 0.339 0.430 0.370 0.521 0.526 0.339 0.339 0.339 0.339 0.339 0.339 0.339 0.339 0.339 0.339	ne	FregAdd	0.460	0.487	0.497	0.525	0.367	0.439	0.480	0.504	0.419	0.554	0.546	0.569
E Rohistidad 0.437 0.452 0.492 0.477 0.367 0.497 0.502 0.527 0.432 0.510 0.553 0.6623 MixMask 0.420 0.448 0.456 0.435 0.447 0.358 0.449 0.445 0.451 0.510 0.491 0.558 0.6633 Baseline 0.348 0.420 0.446 0.345 0.419 0.453 0.452 0.332 0.506 0.491 0.558 Baseline 0.348 0.420 0.446 0.547 0.539 0.620 0.847 0.315 0.360 0.491 0.578 Upsample 0.396 0.433 0.463 0.550 0.366 0.500 0.821 0.331 0.372 0.339 0.440 0.440 0.441 0.430 0.447 0.553 0.550 0.312 0.336 0.437 0.422 0.445 Upsample 0.330 0.432 0.443 0.446 0.552 0.372 0.370 0.	Ю	FreqPool	0.446	0.457	0.523	0.512	0.392	0.442	0.470	0.493	0.479	0.623	0.510	0.754
▼ STAug MixMask Ours 0.429 0.478 0.505 0.534 0.443 0.496 0.445 0.415 0.588 0.691 Ours 0.409 0.445 0.446 0.335 0.419 0.4538 0.452 0.329 0.506 0.415 0.581 0.588 Baseline 0.384 0.425 0.446 0.335 0.518 0.556 0.827 0.339 0.370 0.520 0.843 0.315 0.362 0.399 0.447 0.533 0.370 0.521 0.826 0.831 0.752 0.339 0.377 0.402 0.423 Upsample 0.396 0.433 0.550 0.366 0.521 0.550 0.810 0.772 0.316 0.336 0.372 0.407 0.448 Robustad 0.378 0.423 0.461 0.521 0.330 0.350 0.356 0.414 0.356 0.337 0.321 0.351 0.336 0.337 0.421 0.441 0.356 0.331	ц	Robusttad	0.437	0.452	0.492	0.477	0.367	0.497	0.502	0.527	0.432	0.510	0.553	0.623
✓ MixMask 0.420 0.445 0.476 0.338 0.421 0.470 0.446 0.510 0.491 0.589 Baseline 0.384 0.425 0.464 0.335 0.419 0.433 0.452 0.313 0.360 0.389 0.461 ASD 0.380 0.430 0.472 0.538 0.620 0.821 0.315 0.360 0.389 0.420 MSB 0.423 0.430 0.470 0.559 0.420 0.620 0.821 0.316 0.360 0.420 0.445 Upsample 0.390 0.430 0.477 0.550 0.366 0.500 0.812 0.336 0.372 0.377 0.402 0.4475 Treq Pool 0.399 0.465 0.470 0.551 0.550 0.510 0.310 0.327 0.370 0.316 0.360 0.418 0.430 0.461 0.521 0.339 0.529 0.351 0.357 0.377 0.4420 0.430 0.461	Itc	STAug	0.429	0.478	0.505	0.506	0.354	0.443	0.496	0.495	0.415	0.581	0.588	0.693
Ours 0.409 0.436 0.438 0.448 0.335 0.419 0.433 0.432 0.330 0.559 Baseline 0.384 0.425 0.464 0.574 0.538 0.518 0.566 0.827 0.313 0.360 0.389 0.457 MSB 0.423 0.423 0.510 0.559 0.402 0.623 0.790 1.126 0.330 0.388 0.402 0.447 FreqAdd 0.390 0.443 0.471 0.643 0.570 0.316 0.370 0.420 0.423 0.380 0.472 0.521 0.626 0.975 0.316 0.370 0.420 0.472 Robustad 0.392 0.445 0.445 0.550 0.550 0.521 0.520 0.530 0.330 0.336 0.372 0.310 0.350 0.360 0.472 STAug 0.373 0.421 0.452 0.510 0.310 0.422 0.430 0.330 0.330 0.330 0.330	Ā	MixMask	0 4 2 0	0 4 4 5	0.467	0 474	0.358	0.421	0 470	0.467	0.415	0.510	0.491	0 588
Baseline 0.384 0.425 0.464 0.374 0.338 0.318 0.360 0.325 0.313 0.360 0.389 0.445 ASD 0.380 0.430 0.472 0.523 0.377 0.539 0.620 0.843 0.315 0.362 0.399 0.457 MSB 0.423 0.423 0.423 0.523 0.790 1.126 0.330 0.377 0.402 0.442 0.442 0.442 0.442 0.442 0.442 0.442 0.442 0.442 0.442 0.442 0.442 0.442 0.442 0.442 0.442 0.442 0.441 0.445 MixMask 0.378 0.421 0.441 0.521 0.321 0.310 0.322 0.401 0.442 0.310 0.358 0.472 MixMask 0.378 0.423 0.461 0.521 0.320 0.523 0.301 0.352 0.410 0.442 0.341 0.363 0.472 MixMask 0.378		Ours	0.409	0.436	0.458	0.486	0.335	0.419	0.453	0.452	0.392	0.506	0.491	0.559
ASD 0.380 0.412 0.213 0.213 0.213 0.213 0.213 0.213 0.213 0.213 0.214 0.214 0.214 0.214 0.214 0.214 0.214 0.213 0.213 0.213 0.213 0.213 0.213 0.213 0.214 0.236 0.237 0.214 0.236 0.237 0.237 0.214 0.236 0.237 0.237 0.231 0.235 0.237 0.236 0.237 0.237 0		Baseline	0.10	0.425	0.464	0.574	0.358	0.518	0.566	0.827	0.313	0.360	0.389	0.461
ABB 0.423 0.423 0.529 0.470 0.623 0.790 0.613 0			0.380	0.430	0.472	0.574	0.377	0.510	0.500	0.027	0.315	0.362	0.300	0.457
		MSD	0.300	0.432	0.472	0.525	0.377	0.557	0.020	1 1 26	0.313	0.302	0.377	0.450
Circuit Opsample 0.5390 0.433 0.433 0.530 0.530 0.531 0.531 0.532 0.533 0.537 0.440 0.447 Zi FreqPool 0.390 0.436 0.473 0.572 0.355 0.550 0.521 0.526 0.539 0.339 0.359 0.339 0.359 0.339 0.359 0.339 0.359 0.339 0.359 0.339 0.359 0.339 0.359 0.339 0.359 0.339 0.359 0.339 0.359 0.339 0.359 0.339 0.352 0.418 0.440 0.442 0.442 0.442 0.442 0.442 0.442 0.442 0.442 0.442 0.442 0.442 0.442 0.442 0.442 0.442 0.442 0.443 0.471 0.457 0.430 0.432 0.447 0.330 0.362 0.4416 0.331 0.362 0.331 0.362 0.331 0.362 0.331 0.362 0.331 0.342 0.331	[Uncomple	0.423	0.425	0.301	0.559	0.402	0.023	0.790	1.120	0.330	0.330	0.402	0.439
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	5	Upsample Enca A dd	0.390	0.455	0.405	0.550	0.500	0.500	0.631	0.752	0.339	0.377	0.402	0.475
E FreqProof 0.399 0.443 0.373 0.323 0.330 0.320 0.339 0.342 0.339 0.330 0.430 0.440 0.453 0.470 0.311 0.360 0.437 0.473 0.470 0.311 0.360 0.432 0.441 0.310 0.320 0.331 0.362 0.331 <th< td=""><td>\mathbf{z}</td><td>FreqAdd</td><td>0.390</td><td>0.450</td><td>0.477</td><td>0.045</td><td>0.570</td><td>0.521</td><td>0.020</td><td>0.973</td><td>0.510</td><td>0.300</td><td>0.407</td><td>0.476</td></th<>	\mathbf{z}	FreqAdd	0.390	0.450	0.477	0.045	0.570	0.521	0.020	0.973	0.510	0.300	0.407	0.476
Kobusttad 0.392 0.436 0.491 0.556 0.339 0.529 0.539 0.398 0.339 0.390 0.390 0.491 0.481 MixMask 0.374 0.429 0.481 0.608 0.413 0.760 0.313 0.360 0.418 0.483 Ours 0.373 0.421 0.452 0.510 0.310 0.427 0.507 0.731 0.314 0.360 0.387 0.431 ASD 0.494 0.480 0.491 0.552 0.372 0.416 0.422 0.470 0.331 0.367 0.387 0.431 MSB 0.489 0.466 0.502 0.571 0.352 0.432 0.447 0.342 0.342 0.388 0.373 0.421 FreqAdd 0.442 0.4452 0.469 0.332 0.332 0.333 0.342 0.338 0.370 0.331 0.351 0.399 0.442 Jpsingle 0.447 0.452 0.465 0.438	Ū	FreqPool	0.399	0.465	0.4/3	0.572	0.305	0.553	0.550	0.812	0.330	0.372	0.397	0.466
Are STAug 0.378 0.429 0.489 0.608 0.413 0.70 1.330 0.2608 0.313 0.350 0.448 0.352 0.401 0.454 Ours 0.378 0.423 0.461 0.521 0.339 0.488 0.544 0.735 0.301 0.352 0.401 0.454 ASD 0.494 0.488 0.559 0.362 0.402 0.422 0.499 0.331 0.367 0.388 0.438 MSB 0.448 0.466 0.550 0.559 0.362 0.402 0.442 0.330 0.367 0.389 0.443 Upsample 0.471 0.457 0.479 0.551 0.379 0.407 0.403 0.442 0.342 0.376 0.338 0.377 0.431 0.362 0.379 0.443 Upsample 0.471 0.445 0.559 0.362 0.433 0.447 0.331 0.327 0.331 0.379 0.331 0.379 0.331 <	Ŧ	Robusttad	0.392	0.436	0.491	0.556	0.339	0.529	0.553	0.998	0.339	0.359	0.396	0.472
MixMask 0.378 0.423 0.461 0.539 0.488 0.544 0.735 0.301 0.352 0.470 Baseline 0.485 0.506 0.519 0.552 0.372 0.416 0.429 0.470 0.316 0.353 0.387 0.471 ASD 0.494 0.480 0.491 0.552 0.372 0.416 0.429 0.470 0.331 0.367 0.387 0.431 MSB 0.489 0.466 0.502 0.547 0.379 0.407 0.442 0.342 0.351 0.396 0.442 0.342 0.348 0.362 0.431 0.442 0.342 0.342 0.342 0.342 0.342 0.342 0.342 0.342 0.342 0.331 0.362 0.431 0.417 0.434 0.421 0.443 0.451 0.433 0.327 0.432 0.331 0.326 0.331 0.327 0.320 0.321 0.320 0.321 0.320 0.321 0.320 0.331	-	STAug	0.374	0.429	0.489	0.608	0.413	0.760	1.330	2.608	0.313	0.360	0.418	0.483
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		MixMask	0.378	0.423	0.461	0.521	0.339	0.488	0.544	0.735	0.301	0.352	0.401	0.454
Baseline 0.485 0.506 0.512 0.372 0.416 0.429 0.470 0.316 0.333 0.337 0.431 ASD 0.494 0.480 0.491 0.559 0.362 0.402 0.432 0.4470 0.331 0.367 0.389 0.443 MSB 0.489 0.466 0.502 0.541 0.379 0.407 0.403 0.482 0.342 0.386 0.399 0.442 FreqAdd 0.442 0.452 0.452 0.452 0.331 0.342 0.338 0.373 0.421 Robustad 0.442 0.452 0.559 0.362 0.431 0.417 0.433 0.461 0.432 0.447 0.304 0.331 0.361 0.311 0.346 0.379 0.431 WiXMask 0.427 0.452 0.558 0.336 0.377 0.400 0.438 0.302 0.331 0.366 0.422 Ours 0.417 0.441 0.510 0.521		Ours	0.373	0.421	0.452	0.510	0.310	0.427	0.507	0.731	0.314	0.360	0.387	0.470
ASD 0.494 0.480 0.451 0.559 0.362 0.402 0.432 0.432 0.432 0.331 0.367 0.339 0.473 MSB 0.489 0.466 0.502 0.547 0.359 0.396 0.442 0.336 0.390 0.442 Upsample 0.411 0.457 0.479 0.541 0.379 0.442 0.342 0.338 0.373 0.421 FreqPool 0.499 0.510 0.557 0.549 0.410 0.453 0.442 0.342 0.331 0.351 0.357 0.438 0.442 Robusttad 0.462 0.501 0.498 0.559 0.362 0.431 0.419 0.496 0.331 0.357 0.389 0.442 MixMask 0.427 0.452 0.465 0.538 0.362 0.371 0.400 0.438 0.322 0.331 0.377 0.380 0.311 0.340 0.331 0.372 0.331 0.322 0.331 0.322		Baseline	0.485	0.506	0.519	0.552	0.372	0.416	0.429	0.470	0.316	0.353	0.387	0.431
MSB 0.489 0.466 0.502 0.547 0.359 0.396 0.448 0.4476 0.320 0.351 0.399 0.442 Upsample 0.471 0.457 0.479 0.541 0.379 0.407 0.403 0.442 0.342 0.386 0.399 0.442 FreqAdd 0.428 0.452 0.459 0.557 0.549 0.410 0.453 0.442 0.342 0.331 0.362 0.379 0.442 Robusttad 0.462 0.501 0.557 0.549 0.410 0.453 0.442 0.311 0.362 0.379 0.443 MixMask 0.427 0.500 0.524 0.534 0.357 0.392 0.421 0.302 0.338 0.436 0.320 0.331 0.329 0.331 0.329 0.421 0.302 0.338 0.442 MixMask 0.427 0.453 0.426 0.331 0.357 0.331 0.329 0.321 0.334 0.302 0.336 </td <td></td> <td>ASD</td> <td>0.494</td> <td>0.480</td> <td>0.491</td> <td>0.559</td> <td>0.362</td> <td>0.402</td> <td>0.432</td> <td>0.499</td> <td>0.331</td> <td>0.367</td> <td>0.389</td> <td>0.453</td>		ASD	0.494	0.480	0.491	0.559	0.362	0.402	0.432	0.499	0.331	0.367	0.389	0.453
Upsample 0.471 0.457 0.479 0.541 0.379 0.403 0.482 0.342 0.386 0.399 0.442 FreqAdd 0.428 0.452 0.469 0.532 0.335 0.385 0.443 0.344 0.338 0.373 0.421 Z FreqPool 0.499 0.510 0.557 0.549 0.410 0.453 0.432 0.447 0.331 0.351 0.379 0.432 MixMask 0.427 0.452 0.465 0.548 0.335 0.377 0.400 0.438 0.302 0.341 0.376 0.423 Ours 0.417 0.443 0.521 0.558 0.304 0.350 0.331 0.302 0.331 0.377 0.400 0.332 0.372 0.422 MSB 0.422 0.476 0.529 0.579 0.331 0.377 0.334 0.401 0.320 0.331 0.372 0.334 0.401 0.320 0.337 0.464 0.324		MSB	0.489	0.466	0.502	0.547	0.359	0.396	0.458	0.476	0.320	0.351	0.396	0.478
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	12	Upsample	0.471	0.457	0.479	0.541	0.379	0.407	0.403	0.482	0.342	0.386	0.399	0.442
PredPool Robustad 0.499 0.510 0.557 0.549 0.410 0.453 0.432 0.475 0.331 0.362 0.379 0.432 STAug MixMask 0.457 0.501 0.498 0.559 0.362 0.431 0.419 0.446 0.331 0.351 0.394 0.438 MixMask 0.427 0.452 0.465 0.538 0.636 0.648 0.319 0.357 0.389 0.443 Ours 0.417 0.443 0.521 0.355 0.375 0.392 0.421 0.302 0.338 0.372 0.420 Baseline 0.401 0.443 0.521 0.558 0.304 0.350 0.331 0.399 0.311 0.340 0.366 0.422 MSB 0.422 0.476 0.529 0.579 0.331 0.379 0.334 0.401 0.302 0.356 0.324 0.339 0.339 0.339 0.339 0.339 0.339 0.339 0.339 0.339 <	Ļ	FregAdd	0.428	0.452	0.469	0.532	0.335	0.385	0.403	0.447	0.304	0.338	0.373	0.421
Eg Robusttad STAug 0.462 0.501 0.498 0.559 0.362 0.431 0.419 0.496 0.331 0.351 0.394 0.438 MixMask 0.457 0.500 0.524 0.534 0.538 0.636 0.681 0.648 0.319 0.357 0.389 0.443 Ours 0.417 0.443 0.461 0.527 0.335 0.375 0.392 0.421 0.302 0.338 0.372 0.420 Baseline 0.401 0.444 0.521 0.558 0.304 0.350 0.331 0.399 0.311 0.340 0.366 0.420 ASD 0.417 0.441 0.513 0.556 0.320 0.351 0.367 0.422 0.311 0.341 0.399 0.341 0.399 0.432 MSB 0.422 0.476 0.529 0.579 0.331 0.372 0.350 0.324 0.339 0.378 0.463 FreqAdd 0.385 0.420	Ne Se	FreqPool	0.499	0.510	0.557	0.549	0.410	0.453	0.432	0.475	0.331	0.362	0.379	0.432
STAug MixMask 0.457 0.500 0.524 0.538 0.636 0.648 0.319 0.357 0.389 0.445 MixMask Ours 0.417 0.443 0.465 0.548 0.335 0.377 0.400 0.438 0.302 0.341 0.376 0.423 Baseline 0.401 0.443 0.521 0.558 0.304 0.392 0.421 0.302 0.338 0.372 0.420 ASD 0.417 0.443 0.521 0.558 0.304 0.351 0.367 0.422 0.311 0.340 0.366 0.420 MSB 0.422 0.476 0.529 0.579 0.331 0.379 0.311 0.340 0.365 0.420 0.351 0.367 0.421 0.310 0.322 0.351 0.367 0.422 0.316 0.322 0.310 0.322 0.351 0.364 0.390 0.339 0.320 0.320 0.322 0.365 0.417 FreqAdd 0.385 0.4	B	Robusttad	0.462	0.501	0.498	0.559	0.362	0.431	0.419	0.496	0.331	0.351	0.394	0.438
MixMask Ours 0.427 0.452 0.465 0.548 0.335 0.377 0.400 0.438 0.302 0.341 0.376 0.423 Ours 0.417 0.443 0.461 0.527 0.335 0.375 0.392 0.421 0.302 0.338 0.372 0.420 Baseline 0.401 0.443 0.521 0.558 0.304 0.350 0.331 0.399 0.311 0.340 0.366 0.420 ASD 0.417 0.441 0.513 0.556 0.320 0.351 0.367 0.422 0.311 0.340 0.366 0.420 MSB 0.422 0.476 0.529 0.579 0.331 0.379 0.334 0.401 0.302 0.356 0.320 0.356 0.420 MSB 0.422 0.437 0.505 0.289 0.336 0.330 0.390 0.309 0.339 0.339 0.339 0.331 0.322 0.337 0.463 0.463 <	Š	STAug	0.457	0.500	0.524	0.534	0.538	0.636	0.681	0.648	0.319	0.357	0.389	0.445
Ministri 0.117 0.142 0.161 0.127 0.135 0.135 0.132 0.142 0.142 0.142 Baseline 0.401 0.434 0.521 0.558 0.304 0.350 0.331 0.399 0.311 0.340 0.366 0.420 ASD 0.417 0.441 0.513 0.556 0.320 0.351 0.367 0.422 0.319 0.341 0.399 0.411 0.399 0.432 MSB 0.422 0.476 0.529 0.579 0.331 0.379 0.334 0.401 0.302 0.356 0.322 0.356 0.322 0.356 0.322 0.356 0.420 Upsample 0.431 0.452 0.533 0.604 0.346 0.372 0.330 0.390 0.339 0.339 0.366 0.342 0.312 376 0.339 0.397 0.319 0.352 0.397 0.453 FreqPool 0.432 0.521 0.557 0.331 0.352		MixMask	0.427	0.452	0.465	0 548	0.335	0 377	0.400	0.438	0.302	0.341	0.376	0.423
Baseline 0.417 0.413 0.558 0.304 0.355 0.317 0.312 0.311 0.340 0.312 0.311 0.340 0.340 0.326 0.417 0.414 0.558 0.304 0.355 0.331 0.340 0.341 0.340 0.341 0.340 0.341 0.340 0.341 0.399 0.432 MSB 0.422 0.476 0.529 0.579 0.331 0.379 0.334 0.401 0.302 0.356 0.382 0.451 Upsample 0.431 0.452 0.533 0.604 0.346 0.372 0.350 0.334 0.401 0.302 0.336 0.339 0.331 0.352 0.431 0.342 0.453 Upsample 0.431 0.452 0.533 0.604 0.346 0.332 0.330 0.330 0.330 0.330 0.330 0.330 0.330 0.330 0.331 0.352 0.330 0.331 0.352 0.331 0.350 0.331 0.35		Ours	0.417	0.443	0.461	0.527	0.335	0.375	0.392	0.421	0.302	0.338	0.372	0.420
ASD 0.401 0.404 0.511 0.504 0.301 0.401 0.341 0.399 0.432 MSB 0.422 0.476 0.529 0.579 0.331 0.379 0.334 0.401 0.302 0.334 0.401 0.302 0.334 0.401 0.302 0.334 0.401 0.302 0.335 0.305 0.334 0.401 0.302 0.335 0.432 MSB 0.422 0.476 0.529 0.579 0.331 0.379 0.334 0.401 0.302 0.324 0.339 0.325 0.431 FreqAdd 0.385 0.420 0.477 0.505 0.289 0.336 0.330 0.390 0.339 0.339 0.331 0.352 0.397 0.319 0.352 0.397 0.453 MixMask 0.396 0.432 0.521 0.537 0.331 0.352 0.337 0.336 0.413 0.463 0.447 MixMask 0.410 0.446 0.447		Baseline	0.401	0.434	0.521	0.558	0.304	0.350	0.331	0.300	0.302	0.340	0.366	0.420
MSB 0.417 0.513 0.539 0.331 0.337 0.420 0.451 0.451 0.451 0.451 0.451 0.451 0.451 0.451 0.451 0.451 0.451 0.451 0.451 0.451 0.451 0.451 0.451 0.451 0.451 0.452 0.451 0.452 0.451 0.452 0.451 0.463 0.463 0.451 0.324 0.331 0.352 0.330 0.302 0.339 0.335 0.463 FreqAdd 0.423 0.455 0.510 0.592 0.312 .376 0.339 0.390 0.399 0.391 0.493 0.463 0.417 MixMask 0.515 0.535 0.521 0.558<			0.417	0.441	0.513	0.556	0.320	0.351	0.367	0.377	0.310	0.341	0.300	0.420
M3B 0.422 0.476 0.329 0.379 0.337 0.341 0.431 0.324 0.431 0.324 0.431 0.324 0.441 0.324 0.441 0.324 0.441 0.324 0.442 0.337 0.041 0.324 0.324 0.324 0.339 0.331 0.352 0.337 0.443 MixMask 0.515 0.535 0.521 0.558 0.339 0.330 0.3		MSB	0.422	0.476	0.510	0.550	0.320	0.370	0.307	0.422	0.317	0.341	0.397	0.451
G Obsample 0.431 0.432 0.432 0.333 0.044 0.346 0.342 0.343 0.441 0.436 0.342 0.343 0.441 0.346 0.342 0.343 0.346 0.346 0.346 0.346 0.349 0.346 0.349 0.347 0.430 0.349 0.347 0.430 0.349 0.341 0.445 0.441 0.467 0.448 0.448 <th0< td=""><td>_</td><td>Uncomplo</td><td>0.422</td><td>0.470</td><td>0.529</td><td>0.579</td><td>0.331</td><td>0.379</td><td>0.354</td><td>0.401</td><td>0.302</td><td>0.330</td><td>0.362</td><td>0.451</td></th0<>	_	Uncomplo	0.422	0.470	0.529	0.579	0.331	0.379	0.354	0.401	0.302	0.330	0.362	0.451
HetqAdd 0.383 0.420 0.477 0.330 0.289 0.350 0.350 0.350 0.530 <	9	Erog A dd	0.431	0.432	0.555	0.004	0.340	0.372	0.330	0.450	0.324	0.339	0.370	0.403
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Щ	FreqAud	0.303	0.420	0.4//	0.505	0.209	276	0.330	0.390	0.309	0.339	0.303	0.417
F Robustiad 0.396 0.432 0.521 0.537 0.331 0.352 0.337 0.337 0.346 0.437 STAug 0.515 0.535 0.521 0.558 0.390 0.437 0.403 0.508 0.310 0.337 0.364 0.417 MixMask 0.385 0.420 0.478 0.507 0.289 0.339 0.330 0.391 0.299 0.332 0.367 0.416 Ours 0.385 0.414 0.467 0.498 0.283 0.332 0.321 0.323 0.347 0.428 0.412 Baseline 0.448 0.444 0.663 0.706 0.369 0.476 0.738 1.165 0.323 0.347 0.428 0.447 ASD 0.451 0.476 0.633 0.681 0.392 0.469 0.701 0.998 0.356 0.352 0.441 0.478 MSB 0.467 0.463 0.627 0.652 0.378 0.472 0.652 1.123 0.371 0.349 0.430 0.479 0.463 0.447	Ð	Delegroof	0.425	0.433	0.510	0.592	0.512	.570	0.339	0.397	0.519	0.552	0.397	0.433
STAug 0.515 0.535 0.521 0.588 0.390 0.437 0.403 0.508 0.310 0.337 0.364 0.417 MixMask 0.385 0.420 0.478 0.507 0.289 0.330 0.391 0.299 0.332 0.367 0.416 Ours 0.385 0.414 0.467 0.498 0.283 0.332 0.324 0.388 0.297 0.328 0.365 0.412 Baseline 0.448 0.447 0.498 0.283 0.332 0.324 0.388 0.297 0.328 0.365 0.412 Baseline 0.448 0.447 0.663 0.706 0.369 0.476 0.738 1.165 0.323 0.347 0.448 0.447 MSB 0.467 0.463 0.627 0.652 0.378 0.472 0.652 1.123 0.371 0.349 0.430 0.479 Upsample 0.449 0.472 0.610 0.637 0.401 0.487 0.714 1.245 0.322 0.356 0.452 0.492 FreqA	Η	Robustiad	0.396	0.432	0.521	0.537	0.331	0.352	0.337	0.398	0.321	0.340	0.382	0.437
MixMask 0.385 0.420 0.478 0.507 0.289 0.330 0.391 0.299 0.332 0.367 0.416 Ours 0.385 0.440 0.467 0.498 0.283 0.332 0.330 0.391 0.299 0.332 0.367 0.416 Baseline 0.448 0.4467 0.498 0.283 0.332 0.324 0.388 0.297 0.328 0.365 0.412 Baseline 0.444 0.663 0.706 0.369 0.476 0.738 1.165 0.323 0.337 0.428 0.447 MSB 0.451 0.476 0.633 0.681 0.392 0.469 0.701 0.988 0.356 0.352 0.441 0.478 MSB 0.467 0.463 0.627 0.652 0.378 0.472 0.652 1.23 0.371 0.349 0.430 0.479 Upsample 0.447 0.430 0.578 0.622 0.351 0.445 0.322		STAug	0.515	0.535	0.521	0.558	0.390	0.437	0.403	0.508	0.310	0.337	0.364	0.417
Ours 0.385 0.414 0.467 0.498 0.283 0.332 0.324 0.388 0.297 0.328 0.365 0.412 Baseline 0.448 0.444 0.663 0.706 0.369 0.476 0.738 1.165 0.323 0.347 0.428 0.476 ASD 0.451 0.476 0.633 0.681 0.392 0.469 0.701 0.998 0.356 0.347 0.428 0.476 MSB 0.467 0.463 0.627 0.652 0.378 0.472 0.522 1.123 0.371 0.349 0.430 0.479 Upsample 0.449 0.472 0.652 0.378 0.472 0.522 0.329 0.366 0.453 0.492 FreqAdd 0.417 0.430 0.578 0.622 0.351 0.453 0.322 0.322 0.322 0.352 0.400 0.445 KereqPool 0.463 0.471 0.652 0.690 0.369 0.512		MixMask	0.385	0.420	0.478	0.507	0.289	0.339	0.330	0.391	0.299	0.332	0.367	0.416
Baseline ASD 0.448 0.444 0.663 0.706 0.369 0.476 0.738 1.165 0.323 0.347 0.428 0.476 ASD 0.451 0.476 0.633 0.681 0.392 0.469 0.701 0.998 0.356 0.352 0.441 0.478 MSB 0.467 0.463 0.627 0.652 0.378 0.472 0.652 1.123 0.371 0.349 0.430 0.479 Upsample 0.449 0.472 0.610 0.637 0.401 0.487 0.714 1.245 0.322 0.352 0.440 0.479 StreqPool 0.449 0.472 0.610 0.637 0.401 0.487 0.714 1.245 0.322 0.352 0.400 0.450 Kobusttad 0.445 0.442 0.590 0.369 0.512 0.723 1.264 0.336 0.352 0.441 0.462 StAug 0.445 0.442 0.590 0.520 0.807 <td></td> <td>Ours</td> <td>0.385</td> <td>0.414</td> <td>0.467</td> <td>0.498</td> <td>0.283</td> <td>0.332</td> <td>0.324</td> <td>0.388</td> <td>0.297</td> <td>0.328</td> <td>0.365</td> <td>0.412</td>		Ours	0.385	0.414	0.467	0.498	0.283	0.332	0.324	0.388	0.297	0.328	0.365	0.412
ASD MSB 0.451 0.476 0.633 0.681 0.392 0.469 0.701 0.998 0.356 0.352 0.441 0.478 MSB Upsample 0.467 0.463 0.627 0.652 0.378 0.472 0.652 1.123 0.371 0.349 0.430 0.479 Vpsample FreqAdd 0.449 0.472 0.610 0.637 0.401 0.487 0.714 1.245 0.329 0.366 0.453 0.492 FreqAdd FreqPool 0.417 0.430 0.578 0.622 0.351 0.453 0.689 1.125 0.322 0.352 0.400 0.450 Kobusttad 0.445 0.442 0.590 0.654 0.372 0.468 0.699 0.982 0.331 0.352 0.441 0.462 STAug 0.445 0.441 0.669 0.714 0.520 0.807 2.101 2.467 0.320 0.343 0.427 0.476 MixMask 0.417 0.423 0.565 0.603 0.335 0.395 0.575 0.827		Baseline	0.448	0.444	0.663	0.706	0.369	0.476	0.738	1.165	0.323	0.347	0.428	0.476
MSB 0.467 0.463 0.627 0.652 0.378 0.472 0.652 1.123 0.371 0.349 0.430 0.479 MSB Upsample 0.449 0.472 0.610 0.637 0.401 0.487 0.714 1.245 0.329 0.366 0.453 0.492 FreqAdd FreqPool 0.417 0.430 0.578 0.622 0.351 0.443 0.689 1.125 0.322 0.352 0.400 0.450 Go Robusttad 0.445 0.441 0.652 0.690 0.369 0.512 0.723 1.264 0.336 0.351 0.442 0.497 Go STAug 0.445 0.442 0.590 0.654 0.372 0.468 0.699 0.982 0.331 0.352 0.441 0.462 MixMask 0.417 0.429 0.575 0.620 0.337 0.426 0.643 0.993 0.316 0.340 0.388 0.447 Ours <		ASD	0.451	0.476	0.633	0.681	0.392	0.469	0.701	0.998	0.356	0.352	0.441	0.478
C Upsample 0.449 0.472 0.610 0.637 0.401 0.487 0.714 1.245 0.329 0.366 0.453 0.492 FreqAdd FreqAdd 0.417 0.430 0.578 0.622 0.351 0.453 0.689 1.125 0.322 0.325 0.400 0.450 FreqPool 0.463 0.471 0.652 0.690 0.369 0.512 0.723 1.264 0.336 0.351 0.442 0.497 Nobustad 0.445 0.442 0.590 0.654 0.372 0.468 0.699 0.982 0.331 0.352 0.441 0.462 STAug 0.445 0.441 0.669 0.714 0.520 0.807 2.101 2.467 0.320 0.343 0.427 0.476 MixMask 0.417 0.423 0.565 0.603 0.335 0.395 0.575 0.827 0.322 0.340 0.398 0.447 Ours 0.405 0.423		MSB	0.467	0.463	0.627	0.652	0.378	0.472	0.652	1.123	0.371	0.349	0.430	0.479
FreqAdd FreqPool 0.417 0.430 0.578 0.622 0.351 0.453 0.689 1.125 0.322 0.352 0.400 0.450 FreqPool Robusttad 0.463 0.471 0.652 0.690 0.369 0.512 0.723 1.264 0.336 0.351 0.442 0.497 STAug 0.445 0.442 0.590 0.654 0.372 0.468 0.699 0.982 0.331 0.352 0.441 0.462 MixMask 0.445 0.441 0.669 0.714 0.520 0.807 2.101 2.467 0.320 0.343 0.427 0.476 MixMask 0.417 0.429 0.575 0.620 0.337 0.426 0.643 0.993 0.316 0.340 0.398 0.447 Ours 0.405 0.423 0.565 0.603 0.335 0.395 0.575 0.827 0.322 0.340 0.391 0.440	3	Upsample	0.449	0.472	0.610	0.637	0.401	0.487	0.714	1.245	0.329	0.366	0.453	0.492
E FreqPool 0.463 0.471 0.652 0.690 0.369 0.512 0.723 1.264 0.336 0.351 0.442 0.497 E Robustad 0.445 0.442 0.590 0.654 0.372 0.468 0.699 0.982 0.331 0.352 0.441 0.462 STAug MixMask 0.445 0.441 0.669 0.714 0.520 0.807 2.101 2.467 0.320 0.343 0.427 0.476 MixMask 0.417 0.429 0.575 0.620 0.337 0.426 0.643 0.993 0.316 0.340 0.398 0.447 Ours 0.405 0.423 0.565 0.603 0.335 0.395 0.575 0.827 0.322 0.340 0.391 0.440	$\overline{\mathbf{s}}$	FreqAdd	0.417	0.430	0.578	0.622	0.351	0.453	0.689	1.125	0.322	0.352	0.400	0.450
50 Robusttad 0.445 0.442 0.590 0.654 0.372 0.468 0.699 0.982 0.331 0.352 0.441 0.462 II STAug MixMask Ours 0.445 0.442 0.590 0.654 0.372 0.468 0.699 0.982 0.331 0.352 0.441 0.462 MixMask Ours 0.445 0.441 0.669 0.714 0.520 0.807 2.101 2.467 0.320 0.343 0.427 0.476 0.417 0.429 0.575 0.620 0.337 0.426 0.643 0.993 0.316 0.340 0.398 0.447 0.405 0.423 0.565 0.603 0.335 0.395 0.575 0.827 0.322 0.340 0.391 0.440	Ĥ	FreqPool	0.463	0.471	0.652	0.690	0.369	0.512	0.723	1.264	0.336	0.351	0.442	0.497
STAug MixMask Ours 0.445 0.441 0.669 0.714 0.520 0.807 2.101 2.467 0.320 0.343 0.427 0.476 MixMask Ours 0.417 0.429 0.575 0.620 0.337 0.426 0.643 0.993 0.316 0.340 0.398 0.447 0.405 0.423 0.565 0.603 0.335 0.395 0.575 0.827 0.322 0.340 0.391 0.440	gh	Robusttad	0.445	0.442	0.590	0.654	0.372	0.468	0.699	0.982	0.331	0.352	0.441	0.462
MixMask Ours 0.417 0.429 0.575 0.620 0.337 0.426 0.643 0.993 0.316 0.340 0.398 0.447 Ours 0.405 0.423 0.565 0.603 0.335 0.395 0.575 0.827 0.322 0.340 0.391 0.440	Ē	STAug	0.445	0.441	0.669	0.714	0.520	0.807	2.101	2.467	0.320	0.343	0.427	0.476
Ours 0.405 0.423 0.565 0.603 0.335 0.395 0.575 0.827 0.322 0.340 0.391 0.440	. –	MixMask	0.417	0.429	0.575	0.620	0.337	0.426	0.643	0.993	0.316	0.340	0.398	0.447
		Ours	0.405	0.423	0.565	0.603	0.335	0.395	0.575	0.827	0.322	0.340	0.391	0.440

Table 1: MSE of the long-term prediction on the ETT [35] datasets. The best values are marked with colors.

4.4.1 Number of Dominant Frequencies

The only hyper-parameter in our method is the number of dominant frequencies k. We evaluated the performance using various k values with iTransformer [13]. The results in Fig. 4 reveal that our method is stable against different k values.

			Elect	ricity			Wea	ather			Exchar	ige Rate	
	Method	96	192	336	720	96	192	336	720	96	192	336	720
	Baseline	0 152	0.150	0.170	0.230	0 175	0.224	0.281	0.362	0.086	0.180	0.335	0.856
_		0.173	0.139	0.179	0.230	0.101	0.224	0.201	0.364	0.000	0.183	0.333	0.872
ίΩ,	ASD [7]	0.175	0.179	0.201	0.234	0.191	0.225	0.200	0.304	0.000	0.105	0.343	0.072
		0.162	0.102	0.194	0.207	0.103	0.255	0.204	0.339	0.009	0.109	0.339	0.907
er	Upsample [25]	0.100	0.168	0.210	0.221	0.204	0.237	0.291	0.373	0.080	0.180	0.338	0.834
E	FreqAdd [33]	0.150	0.15/	0.172	0.204	0.181	0.230	0.285	0.362	0.087	0.181	0.333	0.837
foi	FreqPool [4]	0.169	0.170	0.194	0.237	0.184	0.223	0.279	0.378	0.088	0.183	0.330	0.832
ns	Robusttad [8]	0.150	0.157	0.176	0.210	0.172	0.225	0.281	0.357	0.087	0.179	0.329	0.833
ra	STAug [34]	0.160	0.173	0.218	0.372	0.206	0.264	0.319	0.385	0.086	0.178	0.335	0.866
Ë	MixMask [3]	0.151	0.158	0.173	0.205	0.175	0.224	0.279	0.354	0.089	0.178	0.328	0.845
	Ours	0.150	0.156	0.171	0.199	0.171	0.221	0.276	0.351	0.086	0.176	0.313	0.821
	Baseline	0.203	0.208	0.231	0.239	0.241	0.314	0.341	0.425	0.143	0.305	0.470	1.056
_	ASD	0.247	0.216	0.221	0.235	0.652	0.392	0.416	0.513	0.141	0.280	0.579	1.240
3	MSB	0.237	0.256	0.295	0.236	0.256	0 379	0.402	0.468	0 156	0.254	0.513	1 339
<u> </u>	Unsample	0.201	0.200	0.232	0.250	0.281	0.294	0.329	0.385	0.150	0.291	0.513	1 295
E	Erea A dd	0.201	0.207	0.232	0.200	0.251	0.224	0.320	0.303	0.141 0.143	0.272	0.555	1 173
Ξ	FragPool	0.195	0.197	0.212 0.224	0.223	0.233	0.323	0.370	0.419	0.143 0.142	0.309	0.710	1.175
Ö	Debuetted	0.215	0.224	0.234	0.237	0.257	0.339	0.572	0.440	0.142	0.330	0.352	1.014
<u>l</u> o	KODUSIIAU	0.230	0.242	0.201	0.231	0.27	0.334	0.331	0.429	0.142	0.309	0.402	1.123
Ē	STAug	0.191	0.206	0.217	0.234	0.250	0.300	0.347	0.418	0.140	0.326	0.594	1.1/0
₹,	MixMask	0.177	0.194	0.206	0.224	0.240	0.302	0.330	0.422	0.141	0.284	0.453	0.778
	Ours	0.171	0.191	0.203	0.219	0.214	0.273	0.327	0.383	0.136	0.243	0.418	0.695
	Baseline	0.171	0.183	0.198	0.224	0.188	0.241	0.278	0.350	0.091	0.185	0.355	0.941
	ASD	0.165	0.174	0.190	0.237	0.189	0.242	0.276	0.354	0.087	0.175	0.337	1.203
	MSB	0.179	0.182	0.201	0.225	0.201	0.250	0.291	0.365	0.088	0.176	0.360	0.995
E	Upsample	0.182	0.180	0.203	0.220	0.193	0.249	0.279	0.372	0.084	0.171	0.313	0.702
2	FreqAdd	0 160	0 169	0 182	0 199	0 180	0.234	0.282	0.350	0.087	0 174	0 349	0.923
\mathbf{Z}	FreqPool	0 182	0.203	0.102	0.256	0.192	0.257	0.278	0.351	0.089	0 1 7 9	0.394	0.923
Ŋ	Pobusttad	0.102	0.205	0.241	0.200	0.102	0.237	0.270	0.331	0.007	0.170	0.324	0.020
Σ	KUUUSIIAU STAna	0.179	0.220	0.234	0.227	0.192	0.239	0.292	0.545	0.000	0.179	0.330	0.932
	STAUg	0.150	0.195	0.210	0.224	0.272	0.550	0.433	0.339	0.092	0.105	0.313	0.790
	MIXIMASK	0.159	0.103	0.170	0.195	0.183	0.239	0.281	0.344	0.080	0.174	0.337	0.790
	Ours	0.157	0.168	0.178	0.211	0.179	0.232	0.275	0.342	0.084	0.169	0.303	0.750
	Baseline	0.212	0.237	0.255	0.286	0.229	0.282	0.334	0.402	0.099	0.191	0.356	0.916
	ASD	0.229	0.241	0.239	0.282	0.254	0.276	0.356	0.462	0.095	0.204	0.379	1.230
	MSB	0.232	0.237	0.228	0.274	0.279	0.265	0.374	0.454	0.093	0.267	0.402	0.965
12	Upsample	0.250	0.232	0.271	0.309	0.243	0.299	0.361	0.431	0.092	0.196	0.311	0.932
t t	FreaAdd	0.176	0.195	0.212	0.237	0.208	0.258	0.309	0.385	0.092	0.186	0.343	0.920
4e	FreqPool	0.230	0.221	0.242	0.339	0.261	0.290	0.337	0.456	0.096	0.183	0.551	0.938
Ħ	Robusttad	0 189	0.202	0.210	0 243	0.229	0.281	0.331	0 4 1 0	0.093	0 186	0 334	0.957
S	STAng	0.10	0.202	0.210	0.411	0.227	0.329	0.372	0.435	0.098	0.100	0.342	0.931
• 1	MixMack	0.210	0.237	0.202	0.711	0.277	0.529	0.372	0.433	0.000	0.170	0.342	0.028
	Our	0.171	0.100	0.204	0.230	0.203	0.230	0.310	0.374	0.095	0.175	0.330	0.920
	Durs	0.172	0.100	0.200	0.223	0.197	0.240	0.299	0.379	0.091	0.175	0.342	0.890
	Baseline	0.207	0.197	0.211	0.238	0.1//	0.220	0.203	0.323	0.093	0.184	0.330	0.860
	ASD	0.232	0.220	0.231	0.265	0.189	0.221	0.297	0.332	0.095	0.206	0.351	0.962
	MSB	0.210	0.219	0.253	0.261	0.199	0.254	0.273	0.339	0.092	0.179	0.358	0.941
9	Upsample	0.206	0.199	0.223	0.274	0.203	0.267	0.331	0.355	0.091	0.182	0.331	0.852
(T)	FreqAdd	0.150	0.163	0.177	0.209	0.173	0.216	0.263	0.322	0.088	0.180	0.330	0.848
Ö	FreqPool	0.224	0.238	0.233	0.270	0.189	0.224	0.292	0.334	0.092	0.334	0.521	1.124
Ξ	Robusttad	0.176	0.166	0.182	0.229	0.182	0.231	0.279	0.330	0.099	0.232	0.331	0.924
	STAug	0.230	0.210	0.192	0.225	0.205	0.247	0.292	0.364	0.092	0.184	0.330	0.859
	MixMask	0.143	0.155	0.164	0.210	0.173	0.216	0.263	0.323	0.089	0.180	0.329	0.861
	Ours	0 143	0.150	0.165	0.202	0 177	0.219	0.261	0.322	0.088	0 179	0.324	0.847
	Baseline	0.115	0.150	0.182	0.202	0.177	0.217	0.201	0.320	0.000	0.252	0.321	0.840
		0.210	0.109	0.102	0.212	0.170	0.210	0.200	0.320	0.139	0.232	0.412	1 026
	ASD	0.223	0.179	0.190	0.232	0.179	0.210	0.271	0.321	0.132	0.520	0.450	1.050
2	M2R	0.233	0.182	0.204	0.228	0.1/0	0.214	0.239	0.332	0.11/	0.294	0.302	0.904
$\overline{\mathbf{c}}$	Upsample	0.246	0.179	0.211	0.254	0.182	0.223	0.25/	0.330	0.099	0.251	0.369	0.702
\mathbf{S}	FreqAdd	0.213	0.159	0.177	0.210	0.164	0.207	0.258	0.317	0.098	0.522	0.565	1.583
μŢ	FreqPool	0.219	0.174	0.197	0.236	0.193	0.254	0.267	0.339	0.099	0.275	0.394	0.793
5	Robusttad	0.212	0.169	0.181	0.223	0.172	0.223	0.259	0.324	0.092	0.279	0.451	0.796
Ľ	STAug	0.224	0.267	0.294	0.351	0.214	0.263	0.382	0.371	0.096	0.212	0.380	0.690
	MixMask	0.192	0.158	0.175	0.211	0.163	0.206	0.257	0.318	0.099	0.384	0.518	0.774
	Ours	0.210	0.156	0.173	0.206	0.165	0.205	0.249	0.312	0.088	0.243	0.361	0.676

 Table 2:
 MSE of the long-term prediction on the Weather, Electricity, and Exchange Rate[31]

 datasets. The best values are marked with colors.

4.4.2 Shuffle the Dominant Frequencies

In this experiment, we compared the combination of different perturbation strategies and operations.

We first compared perturbing different frequency proportions including dominant frequencies, minor frequencies, and the full spectrum. The results in Tab. 4 clearly indicate that perturbing the dominant

Mathada		PEN	1S03			PEN	IS04			PEN	4S07	
Methods	12	24	36	48	12	24	36	48	12	24	36	48
Baseline	0.070	0.097	0.134	0.164	0.088	0.124	0.160	0.196	0.067	0.097	0.128	0.156
ASD [7]	0.072	0.096	0.152	0.239	0.098	0.132	0.156	0.190	0.069	0.099	0.154	0.181
MSB [1]	0.096	0.131	0.129	0.214	0.087	0.134	0.167	0.219	0.098	0.096	0.137	0.165
Upsample [23]	0.069	0.096	0.128	0.179	0.087	0.124	0.158	0.199	0.072	0.099	0.127	0.155
FreqAdd [33]	1.036	0.104	0.251	0.362	0.088	0.125	0.159	0.201	0.067	0.097	0.127	0.155
FreqPool [4]	1.234	0.178	0.296	0.451	0.099	0.145	0.178	0.226	0.079	0.104	0.152	0.172
Robusttad [8]	0.082	0.098	0.132	1.520	0.089	0.123	0.161	0.195	0.067	0.097	0.129	0.157
STAug [34]	0.079	0.112	0.195	0.456	0.087	0.120	0.162	0.304	0.066	0.096	0.132	0.165
Mask [3]	0.443	1.205	0.233	1.510	0.086	0.119	0.158	0.346	0.065	0.095	0.125	0.156
Mix [3]	1.018	0.097	0.877	1.501	0.085	0.119	0.154	0.205	0.065	0.094	0.134	0.152
Ours	0.067	0.095	0.126	0.235	0.085	0.118	0.149	0.182	0.065	0.094	0.123	0.148

Table 3: Short-term prediction using the iTransformer [13] on the PEMS datasets [2].



Figure 4: Mean-squared errors with various k values on four datasets under the predict-96 setting. Our method is stable against k, and the performance varies slightly.

frequencies significantly outperforms other options, while perturbing the minor frequencies yields the worst performance. Tab. 5 compares different perturbation operations including masking [3], adding noise [8, 10], randomization, and shuffling (ours). Shuffle consistently surpasses other operations in most of the cases.

				ET	Th1			ET	Гm2			Wea	ather	
			96	192	336	720	96	192	336	720	96	192	336	720
	fle	full	0.391	0.447	0.486	0.509	0.182	0.247	0.311	0.403	0.175	0.223	0.278	0.355
3	սղ	min	0.389	0.445	0.494	0.505	0.181	0.251	0.310	0.413	0.174	0.225	0.282	0.355
s	S	dom	0.383	0.438	0.473	0.492	0.178	0.246	0.309	0.409	0.171	0.221	0.276	0.351
ran	¥	full	0.390	0.442	0.475	0.503	0.179	0.251	0.311	0.411	$\overline{0.178}$	0.228	0.284	0.359
Ē	Лas	min	0.389	0.444	0.487	0.499	0.183	0.252	0.311	0.412	0.180	0.226	0.282	0.361
	4	dom	0.388	0.442	0.486	0.505	0.180	0.251	0.309	0.410	0.173	0.224	0.280	0.356
	fle	full	0.385	0.427	0.466	0.604	0.184	0.293	0.375	0.594	0.182	0.239	0.280	0.348
E	սղ	min	0.390	0.430	0.480	0.565	0.191	0.281	0.365	0.580	0.197	0.236	0.283	0.349
	S	dom	0.373	0.421	0.452	0.510	0.174	0.263	0.348	0.502	0.179	0.232	0.275	0.342
Ð	×	full	0.381	0.424	$\overline{0.460}$	0.543	0.184	0.265	0.353	0.510	$\overline{0.190}$	0.236	0.281	0.345
Σ	Лas	min	0.385	0.426	0.472	0.553	0.187	0.276	0.359	0.542	0.179	0.240	0.281	0.344
	4	dom	0.377	0.421	0.454	0.543	0.175	0.268	0.337	0.505	0.178	0.239	0.283	0.342
	fle	full	0.415	0.426	0.577	0.621	0.202	0.235	0.325	0.445	0.163	0.205	0.251	0.317
32]	սղ	min	0.418	0.432	0.577	0.619	0.206	0.239	0.326	0.444	0.164	0.212	0.259	0.317
S	S	dom	0.405	0.423	0.565	0.603	0.195	0.245	0.312	0.422	0.165	0.205	0.249	0.312
ghti	4	full	0.418	0.432	0.573	0.621	0.204	0.238	0.321	0.435	0.163	0.206	0.258	0.317
Ľi	Aas	min	0.419	0.433	0.578	0.621	0.205	0.233	0.324	0.452	0.163	0.208	0.260	0.317
	2	dom	0.418	0.424	0.579	0.618	0.198	0.240	0.312	0.430	0.162	0.201	0.250	0.317

Table 4: Comparison of perturbing different spectrum (full, minor, and dominant) using shuffle and random mask. Perturbing the dominant frequencies performs significantly better than perturbing other frequencies. And shuffle is also more effective than random mask.

The results in Tab. 4 and 5 justified the design decisions in *dominant shuffle* and confirm that both perturbing dominant frequencies and the shuffle operation is superior to other alternatives. More details about the experiments, including how we defined minor frequencies and we implemented mask, noise, and randomization perturbations can be found in appendix A.2.

			ET	Th1			ET	Гm2			Wea	ather	
		96	192	336	720	96	192	336	720	96	192	336	720
[]	Mask	0.388	0.442	0.486	0.505	0.180	0.251	0.309	0.410	0.173	0.224	0.280	0.356
s	Noise	0.387	0.445	0.482	0.510	0.180	0.256	0.312	0.409	0.177	0.222	0.281	0.359
ran	Random	0.386	0.440	0.479	0.499	0.183	0.254	0.311	0.407	0.171	0.222	0.280	0.358
Ē	Shuffle	0.383	0.438	0.473	0.492	0.178	0.246	0.309	0.409	0.171	0.221	0.276	0.351
[13	Mask	0.377	0.421	0.454	0.543	0.175	0.268	0.337	0.505	0.178	0.239	0.283	0.342
	Noise	0.393	0.430	0.479	0.531	0.201	0.331	0.366	0.561	0.201	0.236	0.281	0.351
Ð	Random	0.381	0.423	0.476	0.670	0.183	0.284	0.367	0.614	0.182	0.233	0.282	0.349
Σ	Shuffle	0.373	0.421	0.452	0.510	0.174	0.263	0.348	0.502	0.179	0.232	0.275	0.342
32]	Mask	0.418	0.424	0.579	0.618	0.198	0.240	0.312	0.430	0.162	0.201	0.250	0.317
s	Noise	0.432	0.451	0.566	0.636	0.221	0.236	0.351	0.433	0.169	0.219	0.259	0.321
shtt	Random	0.414	0.431	0.570	0.610	0.206	0.244	0.324	0.442	0.171	0.213	0.263	0.323
Lig	Shuffle	0.405	0.423	0.565	0.603	0.195	0.245	0.312	0.422	0.165	0.205	0.249	0.312

Table 5: Comparison of different dominant frequency perturbations. Shuffle outperforms other alternatives with clear margins.

4.4.3 Different Augmentation Sizes

In prior experiments, we explored data augmentation that doubled the original datasets. In this experiment, we assessed the performance of various augmentation sizes. The performance with a larger augmentation size reflects the domain gap between augmented and original data. A larger augmentation size indicates more augmented samples in the training set. If these augmented samples are out of distribution compared to the original data, larger augmentation sizes could lead to degraded performance due to a training/test gap.



Figure 5: MSE with different augmentation sizes using iTransformer [13]. An augmentation size of two, which was used in previous experiments, achieves the best results in most cases. Our method is more resistant to larger augmentation sizes, indicating the improved augmented-original gap.

As shown in Fig. 5, the performance of FreqMix and FreqMask declines significantly after an augmentation size of two. This is due to the domain gap between augmented and original data. Our method is slightly impacted by augmentation size, and even benefits from larger augmentation sizes on the Weather dataset. The results in Fig. 5 reveal a smaller augmented-original gap of our method.

5 Conclusion

We proposed the *dominant shuffle*, a simple yet highly effective data augmentation technique for time series prediction. Our method mitigates the domain gap between augmented and original data by limiting the perturbation to dominant frequencies, and uses shuffles to avoid external noises. Although being simple and effective, our method is proposed primarily based on heuristics and lacks theoretical explainability. Instead of theoretical justifications, we conducted extensive experiments using a wide range of datasets, baseline models, and augmentation methods to validate its consistent improvements across various configurations. Since dominant shuffle introduces significant perturbation to the original data and therefore disrupts the sample-wise class labels, our method is limited to prediction tasks and cannot be extended to classification tasks. Exploring theoretical justifications and principles of the proposed method would be a promising future direction that helps better understand it.

References

- Kasun Bandara, Hansika Hewamalage, Yuan-Hao Liu, Yanfei Kang, and Christoph Bergmeir. Improving the accuracy of global forecasting models using time series data augmentation. *Pattern Recognition*, 120:108148, 2021.
- [2] Chao Chen, Karl Petty, Alexander Skabardonis, Pravin Varaiya, and Zhanfeng Jia. Freeway performance measurement system: mining loop detector data. *Transportation research record*, 1748(1):96–102, 2001.
- [3] Muxi Chen, Zhijian Xu, Ailing Zeng, and Qiang Xu. Fraug: Frequency domain augmentation for time series forecasting. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.09292*, 2023.
- [4] Xi Chen, Cheng Ge, Ming Wang, and Jin Wang. Supervised contrastive few-shot learning for high-frequency time series. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 37, pages 7069–7077, 2023.
- [5] Zhicheng Cui, Wenlin Chen, and Yixin Chen. Multi-scale convolutional neural networks for time series classification. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1603.06995*, 2016.
- [6] Abhimanyu Das, Weihao Kong, Andrew Leach, Shaan K Mathur, Rajat Sen, and Rose Yu. Longterm forecasting with tiDE: Time-series dense encoder. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*, 2023.
- [7] Germain Forestier, François Petitjean, Hoang Anh Dau, Geoffrey I Webb, and Eamonn Keogh. Generating synthetic time series to augment sparse datasets. In 2017 IEEE international conference on data mining (ICDM), pages 865–870. IEEE, 2017.
- [8] Jingkun Gao, Xiaomin Song, Qingsong Wen, Pichao Wang, Liang Sun, and Huan Xu. Robusttad: Robust time series anomaly detection via decomposition and convolutional neural networks. In *MileTS'20: 6th KDD Workshop on Mining and Learning from Time Series*, pages 1–6, 2020.
- [9] Arthur Le Guennec, Simon Malinowski, and Romain Tavenard. Data augmentation for time series classification using convolutional neural networks. In *ECML/PKDD workshop on advanced analytics and learning on temporal data*, 2016.
- [10] Bryan Lim and Stefan Zohren. Time-series forecasting with deep learning: a survey. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A*, 379(2194):20200209, 2021.
- [11] Swee Kiat Lim, Yi Loo, Ngoc-Trung Tran, Ngai-Man Cheung, Gemma Roig, and Yuval Elovici. Doping: Generative data augmentation for unsupervised anomaly detection with gan. In 2018 IEEE international conference on data mining (ICDM), pages 1122–1127. IEEE, 2018.
- [12] Minhao Liu, Ailing Zeng, Muxi Chen, Zhijian Xu, Qiuxia Lai, Lingna Ma, and Qiang Xu. Scinet: Time series modeling and forecasting with sample convolution and interaction. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, 35:5816–5828, 2022.
- [13] Yong Liu, Tengge Hu, Haoran Zhang, Haixu Wu, Shiyu Wang, Lintao Ma, and Mingsheng Long. itransformer: Inverted transformers are effective for time series forecasting. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024.
- [14] Yunshan Ma, Yujuan Ding, Xun Yang, Lizi Liao, Wai Keung Wong, and Tat-Seng Chua. Knowledge enhanced neural fashion trend forecasting. In *Proceedings of the 2020 international conference on multimedia retrieval*, pages 82–90, 2020.
- [15] ED McKenzie. General exponential smoothing and the equivalent arma process. *Journal of Forecasting*, 3(3):333–344, 1984.
- [16] Gue-Hwan Nam, Seok-Jun Bu, Na-Mu Park, Jae-Yong Seo, Hyeon-Cheol Jo, and Won-Tae Jeong. Data augmentation using empirical mode decomposition on neural networks to classify impact noise in vehicle. In *ICASSP 2020-2020 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics*, *Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pages 731–735. IEEE, 2020.
- [17] Zelin Ni, Hang Yu, Shizhan Liu, Jianguo Li, and Weiyao Lin. Basisformer: Attention-based time series forecasting with learnable and interpretable basis. In *Thirty-seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2023.
- [18] Yuqi Nie, Nam H Nguyen, Phanwadee Sinthong, and Jayant Kalagnanam. A time series is worth 64 words: Long-term forecasting with transformers. In *The Eleventh International Conference* on Learning Representations, 2023.

- [19] Adam Paszke, Sam Gross, Francisco Massa, Adam Lerer, James Bradbury, Gregory Chanan, Trevor Killeen, Zeming Lin, Natalia Gimelshein, Luca Antiga, et al. Pytorch: An imperative style, high-performance deep learning library. *Advances in neural information processing* systems, 32, 2019.
- [20] Hangwei Qian, Tian Tian, and Chunyan Miao. What makes good contrastive learning on small-scale wearable-based tasks? In *Proceedings of the 28th ACM SIGKDD conference on knowledge discovery and data mining*, pages 3761–3771, 2022.
- [21] Syama Sundar Rangapuram, Matthias W Seeger, Jan Gasthaus, Lorenzo Stella, Yuyang Wang, and Tim Januschowski. Deep state space models for time series forecasting. Advances in neural information processing systems, 31, 2018.
- [22] David Salinas, Valentin Flunkert, Jan Gasthaus, and Tim Januschowski. Deepar: Probabilistic forecasting with autoregressive recurrent networks. *International journal of forecasting*, 36(3):1181–1191, 2020.
- [23] Artemios-Anargyros Semenoglou, Evangelos Spiliotis, and Vassilios Assimakopoulos. Data augmentation for univariate time series forecasting with neural networks. *Pattern Recognition*, 134:109132, 2023.
- [24] Odongo Steven Eyobu and Dong Seog Han. Feature representation and data augmentation for human activity classification based on wearable imu sensor data using a deep lstm neural network. *Sensors*, 18(9):2892, 2018.
- [25] Jianhua Sun, Hao-Shu Fang, Yuxuan Li, Runzhong Wang, Minghao Gou, and Cewu Lu. Instaboost++: Visual coherence principles for unified 2d/3d instance level data augmentation. *International Journal of Computer Vision*, 131(10):2665–2681, 2023.
- [26] Terry T Um, Franz MJ Pfister, Daniel Pichler, Satoshi Endo, Muriel Lang, Sandra Hirche, Urban Fietzek, and Dana Kulić. Data augmentation of wearable sensor data for parkinson's disease monitoring using convolutional neural networks. In *Proceedings of the 19th ACM international conference on multimodal interaction*, pages 216–220, 2017.
- [27] Huiqiang Wang, Jian Peng, Feihu Huang, Jince Wang, Junhui Chen, and Yifei Xiao. MICN: Multi-scale local and global context modeling for long-term series forecasting. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023.
- [28] Qingsong Wen, Liang Sun, Fan Yang, Xiaomin Song, Jingkun Gao, Xue Wang, and Huan Xu. Time series data augmentation for deep learning: A survey. In *Proceedings of the Thirtieth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI-21*, pages 4653–4660. International Joint Conferences on Artificial Intelligence Organization, 8 2021. Survey Track.
- [29] Tailai Wen and Roy Keyes. Time series anomaly detection using convolutional neural networks and transfer learning. In *IJCAI Workshop on AI4IoT*, 2019.
- [30] Haixu Wu, Tengge Hu, Yong Liu, Hang Zhou, Jianmin Wang, and Mingsheng Long. Timesnet: Temporal 2d-variation modeling for general time series analysis. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023.
- [31] Haixu Wu, Jiehui Xu, Jianmin Wang, and Mingsheng Long. Autoformer: Decomposition transformers with auto-correlation for long-term series forecasting. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 34:22419–22430, 2021.
- [32] Tianping Zhang, Yizhuo Zhang, Wei Cao, Jiang Bian, Xiaohan Yi, Shun Zheng, and Jian Li. Less is more: Fast multivariate time series forecasting with light sampling-oriented mlp structures. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2207.01186*, 2022.
- [33] Xiang Zhang, Ziyuan Zhao, Theodoros Tsiligkaridis, and Marinka Zitnik. Self-supervised contrastive pre-training for time series via time-frequency consistency. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:3988–4003, 2022.
- [34] Xiyuan Zhang, Ranak Roy Chowdhury, Jingbo Shang, Rajesh Gupta, and Dezhi Hong. Towards diverse and coherent augmentation for time-series forecasting. In *ICASSP 2023-2023 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pages 1–5. IEEE, 2023.
- [35] Haoyi Zhou, Shanghang Zhang, Jieqi Peng, Shuai Zhang, Jianxin Li, Hui Xiong, and Wancai Zhang. Informer: Beyond efficient transformer for long sequence time-series forecasting. In

Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence, volume 35, pages 11106–11115, 2021.

- [36] Tian Zhou, Ziqing Ma, Qingsong Wen, Liang Sun, Tao Yao, Wotao Yin, Rong Jin, et al. Film: Frequency improved legendre memory model for long-term time series forecasting. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, 35:12677–12690, 2022.
- [37] Tian Zhou, Ziqing Ma, Qingsong Wen, Xue Wang, Liang Sun, and Rong Jin. Fedformer: Frequency enhanced decomposed transformer for long-term series forecasting. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 27268–27286. PMLR, 2022.

Appendices

A More Details

A.1 Datasets

We evaluate the performance of different models and different augmentations for long-term forecasting on 8 well-established datasets, including Weather, Traffic, Electricity, Exchange Rate [31], and ETT datasets (ETTh1, ETTh2, ETTm1, ETTm2) [35]. Furthermore, we adopt PEMS [2] datasets for short-term forecasting. We detail the descriptions of the dataset in Tab. 6.

Dataset	Variates	Prediction length (T)	Total Length (Train:Validation:Test)	Frequency	Information
ETTh1,ETTh2	7	{96,192,336,720}	(8545, 2,881, 2,881)	Hourly	Temperature
ETTm1,ETTm2	7	{96, 192, 336, 720}	(34465, 11521, 11521)	15min	Temperature
Exchange	8	{96, 192, 336, 720}	(5120, 665, 1422)	Daily	Economy
Weather	21	{96,192,336,720}	(36792, 5271, 10540)	10min	Weather
ECL	321	{96,192, 336, 720}	(18317, 2633, 5261)	Hourly	Electricity
Traffic	862	{96, 192, 336, 720}	(12185, 1757, 3509)	Hourly	Transportation
PEMS03	358	{12, 24, 36, 48}	(15617, 5135, 5135)	5min	Traffic network
PEMS04	307	{12, 24, 36, 48}	(10172, 3375, 3375)	5min	Traffic network
PEMS07	883	{12, 24, 36, 48}	(16911, 5622, 5622)	5min	Traffic network
PEMS08	170	{12, 24, 36, 48}	(10690, 3548, 3548)	5min	Traffic network

Table 6: Statistics of the eight datasets used in our experiments.

A.2 Implementation Details

A.2.1 Reimplementation other methods

For ASD, MSB, and upsample, we reproduce them based on the descriptions in their original paper [1, 7, 23]. For STAug [34] and MixMask [3], we use their official code. For Robusttad [8], we reproduce it by adding Gaussian noise to the frequency components of a time series. For FreqAdd [33], we perturb a single low-frequency component by setting its magnitude to half of the maximum magnitude. For FreqPool [4], we apply it by maximum pooling of the entire spectrum with size=4. For a fair comparison, all frequency-domain methods target both the data-label pair.

A.2.2 Different perturbations

In our ablation study, we define minor frequencies as other components except for the frequency components with the top 10 magnitudes. In Tab. 4, Mask on the full spectrum is similar to FrAug [3]. Mask on dominant frequencies means mask within frequency components with the top 10 magnitudes, Mask on minor frequencies is the opposite. In Tab. 5, Noise means adding Gaussian noise to the selected frequency components. For Random, we first get the maximum and minimum magnitude of the selected frequency components and then randomly assigned magnitude within the max-min range.

B More Results

B.1 Full forecasting results

Tab. 7 to 9 show the full results of the forecasting task. Specifically, our method improves the performance of iTransformer by 13% in Electricity when the predicted length is 720, and it improves the performance of Autoformer by 28% in ETTm1 when the predicted length is 720. Our method also improves the performance of MICN by 18% in ETTh2 when the predicted length is 192 and the performance of SCINet by 21% in Electricity when the predicted length is 720. Similarly, our method improves the performance of Lights by 29% in ETTh2 when the predicted length is 720.

and the performance of TiDE by 24% in Electricity when the predicted length is 192. It is worth noting that the strong baseline MixMask falls short in Exchange rate, whose main goal is to predict trends. But our method improves the performance of Autoformer by 34% in Exchange rate when the predicted length is 720, and it improves the performance of Lightts by 37% in Exchange rate when the predicted length is 96. These results demonstrate the effectiveness of our method for long-term prediction, as it consistently improves the performance of SOTA methods in different datasets.

	16.4.1		ET	Th1			ET	Th2			ET	ſm1			ET	Tm2	
	Method	96	192	336	720	96	192	336	720	96	192	336	720	96	192	336	720
	Baseline	0 392	0 447	0.483	0.516	0 303	0.381	0.412	0.434	0 344	0.383	0.421	0 494	0 183	0.251	0.311	0.412
_	ASD [7]	0.398	0.456	0.483	0.512	0.310	0.388	0.432	0.452	0.340	0.382	0.454	0.492	0 100	0.254	0.341	0.423
2	MSP [1]	0.397	0.450	0.404	0.512	0.310	0.300	0.432	0.432	0.340	0.302	0.467	0.472	0.197	0.254	0.341	0.452
÷.	Uncomple [22]	0.367	0.400	0.494	0.551	0.309	0.362	0.447	0.433	0.339	0.380	0.407	0.310	0.107	0.207	0.332	0.452
er	Cpsample [23]	0.391	0.445	0.401	0.519	0.505	0.301	0.419	0.430	0.551	0.301	0.452	0.469	0.190	0.279	0.520	0.411
Ε	FreqAdd [55]	0.389	0.440	0.475	0.510	0.300	0.384	0.410	0.438	0.330	0.385	0.422	0.490	0.187	0.255	0.511	0.415
Ð	FreqPool [4]	0.433	0.456	0.497	0.532	0.313	0.392	0.415	0.450	0.347	0.392	0.430	0.499	0.18/	0.256	0.324	0.449
ns	Robusttad [8]	0.390	0.445	0.497	0.510	0.312	0.388	0.412	0.439	0.353	0.382	0.421	0.498	0.189	0.255	0.309	0.428
Ľa	STAug [34]	0.390	0.445	0.489	0.511	0.323	0.428	0.486	0.483	0.339	0.383	0.417	0.485	0.196	0.267	0.339	0.449
E	MixMask [3]	0.388	0.440	0.477	0.504	0.301	0.380	0.414	0.434	0.334	0.375	0.421	0.485	0.178	0.248	0.311	0.407
	Ours	0.383	0.438	0.473	0.492	0.298	0.382	0.411	0.428	0.332	0.374	0.424	0.492	0.178	0.246	0.309	0.409
	Baseline	0.429	0.440	0.495	0.498	0.381	0.443	0.471	0.475	0.467	0.610	0.529	0.773	0.233	0.278	0.383	0.488
_	ASD	0.450	0.485	0.523	0.556	0.370	0.465	0.476	0.503	0.480	0.620	0.502	0.633	0.231	0.282	0.379	0.499
31	MSB	0.462	0.517	0.612	0.579	0.434	0.523	0.556	0.462	0.499	0.645	0.553	0.721	0.232	0.285	0.389	0.487
<u> </u>	Unsample	0.416	0.523	0.480	0.482	0 353	0.460	0.455	0 509	0.498	0.630	0.512	0.667	0 234	0.291	0.382	0 521
EI I	Erea A dd	0.460	0.487	0.100	0.525	0.367	0.100	0.155	0.504	0.110	0.554	0.546	0.560	0.223	0.268	0.330	0.458
E	FragPool	0.400	0.457	0.522	0.525	0.307	0.439	0.470	0.304	0.419	0.534	0.540	0.309	0.225	0.200	0.330	0.492
0	Debustted	0.440	0.457	0.323	0.312	0.392	0.442	0.470	0.495	0.479	0.023	0.510	0.734	0.230	0.291	0.394	0.462
2	KODUSIIAU	0.457	0.432	0.492	0.477	0.507	0.497	0.302	0.327	0.452	0.510	0.555	0.025	0.255	0.291	0.575	0.470
Ē.	STAug	0.429	0.4/8	0.505	0.506	0.354	0.443	0.496	0.495	0.415	0.581	0.588	0.693	0.224	0.291	0.338	0.431
<.	MixMask	0.420	0.445	0.467	0.474	0.358	0.421	0.470	0.467	0.415	0.510	0.491	0.588	0.211	0.267	0.340	0.451
	Ours	0.409	0.436	0.458	0.486	0.335	0.419	0.453	0.452	0.392	0.506	0.491	0.559	0.210	0.266	0.329	0.429
	Baseline	0.384	0.425	0.464	0.574	0.358	0.518	0.566	0.827	0.313	0.360	0.389	0.461	0.200	0.282	0.375	0.606
	ASD	0.380	0.430	0.472	0.523	0.377	0.539	0.620	0.843	0.315	0.362	0.399	0.457	0.189	0.331	0.399	0.617
_	MSB	0.423	0.423	0.501	0.559	0.402	0.623	0.790	1.126	0.330	0.358	0.402	0.459	0.192	0.279	0.376	0.651
E	Upsample	0.396	0.435	0.463	0.550	0.366	0.500	0.831	0.752	0.339	0.377	0.402	0.475	0.203	0.291	0.372	0.595
	FreqAdd	0 390	0.430	0477	0.643	0 370	0.521	0.626	0.975	0.316	0.360	0 4 0 7	0 478	0 176	0 273	0 378	0.614
Z	FreqPool	0.399	0.465	0.473	0.572	0.365	0.553	0.550	0.812	0.336	0.372	0 397	0.466	0.212	0.287	0.390	0.623
ß	Robusttad	0.392	0.436	0.491	0.556	0.339	0.529	0.553	0.012	0.330	0.359	0.396	0.472	0.200	0.207	0.356	0.617
Σ	STAng	0.374	0.420	0.491	0.550	0.337	0.760	1 2 2 0	2 608	0.337	0.357	0.370	0.472	0.200	0.250	0.330	0.670
	MirMash	0.374	0.429	0.467	0.008	0.415	0.700	0.544	2.008	0.313	0.300	0.410	0.465	0.100	0.204	0.323	0.070
	WIIXWASK	0.578	0.425	0.401	0.521	0.339	0.400	0.544	0.755	0.301	0.552	0.401	0.434	0.105	0.278	0.550	0.528
	Ours	0.373	0.421	0.452	0.510	0.310	0.427	0.507	0.731	0.314	0.360	0.387	0.470	0.174	0.263	0.346	0.502
	Baseline	0.485	0.506	0.519	0.552	0.372	0.416	0.429	0.470	0.316	0.353	0.387	0.431	0.184	0.240	0.295	0.385
	ASD	0.494	0.480	0.491	0.559	0.362	0.402	0.432	0.499	0.331	0.367	0.389	0.453	0.197	0.238	0.296	0.432
~	MSB	0.489	0.466	0.502	0.547	0.359	0.396	0.458	0.476	0.320	0.351	0.396	0.478	0.182	0.237	0.289	0.449
1	Upsample	0.471	0.457	0.479	0.541	0.379	0.407	0.403	0.482	0.342	0.386	0.399	0.442	0.179	0.254	0.292	0.401
÷	FreqAdd	0.428	0.452	0.469	0.532	0.335	0.385	0.403	0.447	0.304	0.338	0.373	0.421	0.174	0.228	0.286	0.380
ž	FreqPool	0.499	0.510	0.557	0.549	0.410	0.453	0.432	0.475	0.331	0.362	0.379	0.432	0.185	0.239	0.302	0.399
8	Robûsttad	0.462	0.501	0.498	0.559	0.362	0.431	0.419	0.496	0.331	0.351	0.394	0.438	0.182	0.247	0.299	0.402
š	STAng	0.457	0.500	0.524	0.534	0.538	0.636	0.681	0.648	0 319	0.357	0 389	0 445	0 323	0.407	0.514	0.668
	MixMask	0 427	0.452	0.465	0.548	0.335	0.377	0.400	0.438	0.302	0 341	0.376	0.423	0 174	0.230	0.289	0.368
	Ours	0.417	0.443	0.461	0.527	0.335	0.375	0.302	0.421	0.302	0.338	0.372	0.420	0.174	0.228	0.283	0.372
	Pasalina	0.401	0.434	0.521	0.527	0.333	0.375	0.372	0.421	0.302	0.330	0.372	0.420	0.174	0.220	0.203	0.372
	ASD	0.401	0.434	0.521	0.556	0.304	0.350	0.331	0.399	0.311	0.340	0.300	0.420	0.100	0.220	0.275	0.330
	ASD	0.417	0.441	0.515	0.550	0.520	0.331	0.307	0.422	0.519	0.341	0.399	0.452	0.177	0.241	0.291	0.571
	MSB	0.422	0.470	0.529	0.579	0.331	0.379	0.334	0.401	0.302	0.330	0.382	0.451	0.182	0.232	0.287	0.339
9	Upsample	0.431	0.452	0.533	0.604	0.346	0.372	0.350	0.456	0.324	0.339	0.378	0.463	0.203	0.246	0.306	0.366
m	FreqAdd	0.385	0.420	0.477	0.505	0.289	0.336	0.330	0.390	0.309	0.339	0.365	0.417	0.164	0.219	0.273	0.355
ā	FreqPool	0.423	0.455	0.510	0.592	0.312	.376	0.339	0.397	0.319	0.352	0.397	0.453	0.179	0.231	0.299	0.371
H	Robusttad	0.396	0.432	0.521	0.537	0.331	0.352	0.337	0.398	0.321	0.346	0.382	0.437	0.180	0.225	0.282	0.371
	STAug	0.515	0.535	0.521	0.558	0.390	0.437	0.403	0.508	0.310	0.337	0.364	0.417	0.222	0.343	0.515	0.847
	MixMask	0.385	0.420	0.478	0.507	0.289	0.339	0.330	0.391	0.299	0.332	0.367	0.416	0.165	0.219	0.271	0.347
	Ours	0.385	0414	0.467	0 4 9 8	0.283	0.332	0.324	0.388	0 297	0.328	0.365	0.412	0.165	0.218	0 271	0.350
	Baseline	0.448	0 444	0.663	0.706	0.369	0.476	0.738	1 165	0.323	0.347	0.428	0.476	0.212	0.237	0.350	0.473
		0.451	0.476	0.633	0.681	0.302	0.460	0.701	0.008	0.356	0.352	0.441	0.478	0.212	0.251	0.351	0.483
_	MSD	0.451	0.462	0.055	0.652	0.392	0.409	0.701	1 1 2 2	0.350	0.332	0.420	0.470	0.256	0.231	0.351	0.403
2	MSB	0.40/	0.403	0.610	0.032	0.378	0.472	0.032	1.123	0.3/1	0.349	0.450	0.479	0.230	0.242	0.339	0.4/1
<u></u>	Upsample	0.449	0.472	0.610	0.037	0.401	0.48/	0./14	1.245	0.329	0.300	0.455	0.492	0.241	0.255	0.306	0.492
\sim	FreqAdd	0.417	0.430	0.578	0.622	0.351	0.453	0.689	1.125	0.322	0.352	0.400	0.450	0.206	0.237	0.327	0.455
Ę	FreqPool	0.463	0.471	0.652	0.690	0.369	0.512	0.723	1.264	0.336	0.351	0.442	0.497	0.233	0.259	0.372	0.453
50	Robusttad	0.445	0.442	0.590	0.654	0.372	0.468	0.699	0.982	0.331	0.352	0.441	0.462	0.232	0.227	0.342	0.446
Ξ	STAug	0.445	0.441	0.669	0.714	0.520	0.807	2.101	2.467	0.320	0.343	0.427	0.476	0.230	0.266	0.372	0.475
	MixMask	0.417	0.429	0.575	0.620	0.337	0.426	0.643	0.993	0.316	0.340	0.398	0.447	0.199	0.233	0.322	0.440
	Ours	0.405	0.423	0.565	0.603	0.335	0.395	0.575	0.827	0.322	0.340	0.391	0.440	0.195	0.245	0.312	0.422

Table 7: MSE of the long-term prediction on the ETT [35] datasets.

B.2 Example predictions

We provided example prediction results on different datasets in Fig. 6

B.3 Optimal k

We provide the optimal k for all long-term prediction datasets using iTranformer [13] in Tab. 10 and 11. As can be seen from the table, our method does not need too much effort to find the optimal parameters.

			Elet	ricity			Wea	ther			Exchan	ge Rate	e		Tra	affic	
	Method	96	192	336	720	96	192	336	720	96	192	336	720	96	192	336	720
	Baseline	0 152	0 1 5 9	0.179	0.230	0 175	0.224	0.281	0.362	0.086	0 180	0.335	0.856	0 399	0.418	0.428	0.463
_	ASD [7]	0 173	0 179	0.201	0.234	0 101	0.223	0.280	0.364	0.088	0.183	0.343	0.872	0.431	0.428	0.430	0.478
13	MSB [1]	0 182	0 182	0 194	0.267	0 185	0.225	0.284	0.359	0.000	0 189	0.359	0.907	0.417	0.416	0.422	0.471
	Uncomple [22]	0.166	0.102	0.174	0.207	0.105	0.257	0.204	0.337	0.005	0.100	0.337	0.907	0.422	0.410	0.422	0.476
ы	Erog Add [22]	0.100	0.100	0.210	0.221	0.204	0.237	0.291	0.373	0.080	0.100	0.338	0.034	0.455	0.419	0.455	0.470
Ξ	FreqAdd [55]	0.150	0.157	0.172	0.204	0.181	0.230	0.285	0.302	0.087	0.181	0.333	0.837	0.480	0.441	0.450	0.301
g	FreqPool [4]	0.109	0.170	0.194	0.237	0.184	0.223	0.279	0.378	0.088	0.185	0.330	0.832	0.410	0.429	0.433	0.470
ns	Robusttad [8]	0.150	0.157	0.176	0.210	0.172	0.225	0.281	0.357	0.087	0.179	0.329	0.833	0.406	0.417	0.429	0.458
Ľa	STAug [34]	0.160	0.173	0.218	0.372	0.206	0.264	0.319	0.385	0.086	0.178	0.335	0.866	0.413	0.432	0.449	0.481
Ë	MixMask [3]	0.151	0.158	0.173	0.205	0.175	0.224	0.279	0.354	0.089	0.178	0.328	0.845	0.395	0.401	0.418	0.450
	Ours	0.150	0.156	0.171	0.199	0.171	0.221	0.276	0.351	0.086	0.176	0.313	0.821	0.394	0.412	0.423	0.448
	Baseline	0.203	0.208	0.231	0.239	0.241	0.314	0.341	0.425	0.143	0.305	0.470	1.056	0.640	0.645	0.611	0.658
_	ASD	0 247	0.216	0.221	0 2 3 5	0.652	0 392	0.416	0 513	0 1 4 1	0.280	0 579	1 240	0.631	0.602	0.607	0.643
1	MSB	0 237	0.256	0.295	0.236	0.256	0 379	0.402	0.468	0 156	0 254	0.513	1 3 3 9	0.652	0.665	0.643	0.65
	Unsample	0.201	0.200	0.232	0.268	0.281	0.294	0.329	0.385	0 141	0.292	0.553	1 295	0.653	0.676	0.702	0.694
er	Erog Add	0.102	0.107	0.232	0.200	0.201	0.227	0.320	0.303	0.141	0.252	0.555	1 172	0.612	0.508	0.617	0.630
Ξ	FreqAud	0.195	0.197	0.212	0.223	0.233	0.323	0.370	0.419	0.143	0.309	0.710	1.175	0.015	0.570	0.017	0.039
Ģ,	FreqPool	0.213	0.224	0.234	0.257	0.237	0.339	0.372	0.440	0.142	0.330	0.552	1.014	0.03	0.598	0.003	0.039
Ю	Robusttad	0.230	0.242	0.261	0.231	0.27	0.334	0.351	0.429	0.142	0.309	0.462	1.123	0.621	0.614	0.612	0.646
Ę	STAug	0.191	0.206	0.217	0.234	0.250	0.300	0.347	0.418	0.140	0.326	0.594	1.176	0.632	0.619	0.632	0.640
\triangleleft	MixMask	0.177	0.194	0.206	0.224	0.240	0.302	0.330	0.422	0.141	0.284	0.453	0.778	0.560	0.584	0.594	0.635
	Ours	0.171	0.191	0.203	0.219	0.214	0.273	0.327	0.383	0.136	0.243	0.418	0.695	0.577	0.581	0.592	0.638
	Baseline	0.171	0.183	0.198	0.224	0.188	0.241	0.278	0.350	0.091	0.185	0.355	0.941	0.522	0.540	0.553	0.573
	ASD	0 165	0 174	0 1 9 0	0 2 3 7	0 189	0 2 4 2	0 276	0 3 5 4	0.087	0 175	0 3 3 7	1 203	0 505	0 534	0 541	0 539
	MSB	0 179	0 182	0 201	0.225	0.201	0.250	0.291	0.365	0.088	0 176	0.360	0.995	0.513	0.532	0.528	0.556
	Uncomplo	0.192	0.102	0.201	0.225	0.201	0.230	0.270	0.303	0.000	0.171	0.212	0.702	0.513	0.550	0.526	0.500
<u>`</u> 2	Upsample	0.162	0.160	0.203	0.220	0.195	0.249	0.279	0.372	0.004	0.171	0.313	0.702	0.555	0.559	0.550	0.590
7	FreqAdd	0.160	0.169	0.182	0.199	0.180	0.234	0.282	0.350	0.087	0.174	0.349	0.923	0.503	0.527	0.520	0.5/1
5	FreqPool	0.182	0.203	0.241	0.256	0.192	0.257	0.278	0.351	0.089	0.179	0.394	0.923	0.531	0.539	0.556	0.592
É	Robusttad	0.179	0.220	0.234	0.227	0.192	0.239	0.292	0.343	0.085	0.179	0.336	0.932	0.510	0.532	0.547	0.597
4	STAug	0.180	0.195	0.210	0.224	0.272	0.356	0.433	0.559	0.092	0.183	0.313	0.790	0.512	0.533	0.529	0.585
	MixMask	0.159	0.165	0.178	0.195	0.185	0.239	0.281	0.344	0.086	0.174	0.337	0.796	0.490	0.512	0.519	0.538
	Ours	0 1 57	0.168	0 1 7 8	0.211	0 1 7 9	0 2 3 2	0 275	0.342	0.084	0.169	0 3 0 3	0 7 5 0	0.501	0 507	0 518	0.556
	Baseline	0.212	0.237	0.255	0.286	0.229	0.282	0.334	0.402	0.000	0.101	0.356	0.916	0.550	0.526	0.545	0.596
	ASD	0.220	0.241	0.230	0.282	0.254	0.276	0.356	0.462	0.005	0.204	0.370	1 230	0.537	0.521	0.541	0.570
	MSD	0.229	0.241	0.239	0.202	0.234	0.270	0.330	0.454	0.095	0.204	0.379	0.065	0.557	0.521	0.541	0.570
2	INISD 1	0.252	0.257	0.220	0.274	0.279	0.203	0.374	0.434	0.095	0.207	0.402	0.905	0.520	0.510	0.557	0.505
- E	Upsample	0.250	0.232	0.2/1	0.309	0.243	0.299	0.361	0.431	0.092	0.196	0.311	0.932	0.519	0.536	0.528	0.576
đ	FreqAdd	0.176	0.195	0.212	0.237	0.208	0.258	0.309	0.385	0.092	0.186	0.343	0.920	0.492	0.497	0.512	0.550
ž	FreqPool	0.230	0.221	0.242	0.339	0.261	0.290	0.337	0.456	0.096	0.183	0.551	0.938	0.557	0.519	0.533	0.562
5	Robusttad	0.189	0.202	0.210	0.243	0.229	0.281	0.331	0.410	0.093	0.186	0.334	0.957	0.523	0.519	0.522	0.569
š	STAug	0.210	0.239	0.282	0.411	0.277	0.329	0.372	0.435	0.098	0.191	0.342	0.931	0.560	0.517	0.521	0.566
	MixMask	0 171	0.188	0.204	0.230	0.205	0.250	0.310	0 374	0.093	0 179	0.336	0.928	0 4 9 5	0.492	0.511	0.551
	Ours	0 172	0 188	0.200	0.225	0 197	0.246	0.299	0.379	0.091	0.175	0.342	0.890	0 500	0.495	0.509	0 544
	Pasalina	0.172	0.107	0.211	0.220	0.177	0.220	0.265	0.372	0.001	0.194	0.320	0.860	0.300	0.450	0.307	0.470
	ASD	0.207	0.197	0.211	0.256	0.177	0.220	0.203	0.323	0.095	0.104	0.350	0.060	0.432	0.462	0.450	0.479
	ASD	0.252	0.220	0.251	0.205	0.109	0.221	0.297	0.332	0.095	0.200	0.551	0.902	0.4//	0.402	0.450	0.500
	MSB	0.210	0.219	0.253	0.261	0.199	0.254	0.273	0.339	0.092	0.179	0.358	0.941	0.461	0.451	0.455	0.510
9	Upsample	0.206	0.199	0.223	0.274	0.203	0.267	0.331	0.355	0.091	0.182	0.331	0.852	0.490	0.466	0.472	0.493
(T1)	FreqAdd	0.150	0.163	0.177	0.209	0.173	0.216	0.263	0.322	0.088	0.180	0.330	0.848	0.429	0.441	0.440	0.471
ä	FreqPool	0.224	0.238	0.233	0.270	0.189	0.224	0.292	0.334	0.092	0.334	0.521	1.124	0.453	0.466	0.479	0.503
Ξ	Robûsttad	0.176	0.166	0.182	0.229	0.182	0.231	0.279	0.330	0.099	0.232	0.331	0.924	0.449	0.430	0.438	0.482
r .	STAng	0 2 3 0	0.210	0.192	0 225	0 205	0 2 4 7	0 292	0 364	0.092	0 184	0 3 3 0	0.859	0 4 6 6	0.455	0 471	0.480
	MixMask	0 143	0 155	0 164	0.210	0 173	0.216	0.263	0.323	0.089	0 180	0.329	0.861	0.421	0 427	0 4 3 4	0.466
	Ouro	0 1/2	0.150	0.165	0.202	0.177	0.210	0.261	0.323	0.009	0.170	0.324	0.847	0.121	0.426	0.422	0.166
	Develop	0.145	0.150	0.103	0.202	0.177	0.219	0.201	0.322	0.000	0.179	0.324	0.047	0.423	0.420	0.433	0.400
	Basenne	0.210	0.109	0.182	0.212	0.108	0.210	0.200	0.320	0.139	0.232	0.412	0.840	0.505	0.515	0.539	0.587
	ASD	0.225	0.179	0.198	0.232	0.179	0.21	0.271	0.321	0.132	0.320	0.436	1.036	0.510	0.514	0.534	0.5/9
2	MSB	0.233	0.182	0.204	0.228	0.170	0.214	0.259	0.332	0.117	0.294	0.502	0.964	0.532	0.510	0.539	0.584
<u>6</u>	Upsample	0.246	0.179	0.211	0.254	0.182	0.223	0.257	0.336	0.099	0.251	0.369	0.702	0.522	0.547	0.532	0.597
S	FreqAdd	0.213	0.159	0.177	0.210	0.164	0.207	0.258	0.317	0.098	0.522	0.565	1.583	0.492	0.500	0.530	0.572
E	FreqPool	0.219	0.174	0.197	0.236	0.193	0.254	0.267	0.339	0.099	0.275	0.394	0.793	0.501	0.519	0.533	0.592
, hi	Robusttad	0.212	0.169	0.181	0.223	0.172	0.223	0.259	0.324	0.092	0.279	0.451	0.796	0.499	0.502	0.521	0.572
	STAng	0 224	0 267	0 294	0 351	0 214	0.263	0 382	0 371	0.096	0.212	0 380	0.690	0 520	0 534	0 520	0 596
П	MixMach	0 102	0.159	0 175	0 211	0.163	0.205	0.257	0.319	0.000	0.384	0.519	0.774	0.486	0.400	0.517	0.555
	Ouro	0.192	0.156	0.172	0.211	0.105	0.200	0.237	0.310	0.099	0.364	0.241	0.774	0.400	0.499	0.517	0.555
	Ours	0.210	0.150	0.173	0.200	0.105	0.205	0.249	0.512	0.008	0.243	0.501	0.076	0.465	0.497	0.515	0.307

 Table 8: MSE of the long-term prediction on the Electricity, traffic, Weather, and Exchange Rate [31] datasets.

Mathada		PEN	1S03			PEN	1S04			PEN	IS07			PEN	1S08	
wiethous	12	24	36	48	12	24	36	48	12	24	36	48	12	24	36	48
Baseline	0.070	0.097	0.134	0.164	0.088	0.124	0.160	0.196	0.067	0.097	0.128	0.156	0.088	0.136	0.191	0.248
ASD [7]	0.072	0.096	0.152	0.239	0.098	0.132	0.156	0.190	0.069	0.099	0.154	0.181	0.089	0.138	0.196	0.247
MSB [1]	0.096	0.131	0.129	0.214	0.087	0.134	0.167	0.219	0.098	0.096	0.137	0.165	0.096	0.137	0.210	0.256
Upsample [23]	0.069	0.096	0.128	0.179	0.087	0.124	0.158	0.199	0.072	0.099	0.127	0.155	0.088	0.140	0.192	0.245
FreqAdd [33]	1.036	0.104	0.251	0.362	0.088	0.125	0.159	0.201	0.067	0.097	0.127	0.155	0.089	0.135	0.192	0.253
FreqPool [4]	1.234	0.178	0.296	0.451	0.099	0.145	0.178	0.226	0.079	0.104	0.152	0.172	0.099	0.155	0.203	0.264
Robusttad [8]	0.082	0.098	0.132	1.520	0.089	0.123	0.161	0.195	0.067	0.097	0.129	0.157	0.092	0.135	0.189	0.26
STAug [34]	0.079	0.112	0.195	0.456	0.087	0.120	0.162	0.304	0.066	0.096	0.132	0.165	0.092	0.147	0.192	0.276
Mask [3]	0.443	1.205	0.233	1.510	0.086	0.119	0.158	0.346	0.065	0.095	0.125	0.156	0.089	0.131	0.186	0.239
Mix [3]	1.018	0.097	0.877	1.501	0.085	0.119	0.154	0.205	0.065	0.094	0.134	0.152	0.089	0.131	0.184	0.234
Ours	0.067	0.095	0.126	0.235	0.085	0.118	0.149	0.182	0.065	0.094	0.123	0.148	0.087	0.134	0.184	0.240

Table 9: MSE of the Short-term prediction using the iTransformer [13] on the PEMS datasets [2].

B.4 Standard deviations

Tab. 12 to 15 shows the standard deviations of different runs, indicating the performance of our method is stable.

Figure 6: Example predictions of different methods under long-term (top) and short-term (bottom) protocols.

Uran anna at an		ET	Th1			ET	Th2			ET	Tm1			ET	Tm2	
Hypermeter	96	192	336	720	96	192	336	720	96	192	336	720	96	192	336	720
Optimal k	4	4	4	4	2	2	2	4	3	3	2	2	4	4	2	4
Tabl	e 10	: The	e opti	mal k	on l	ETT o	latase	ets usi	ing t	he iTi	ransfo	ormer	[13]	mod	el.	

ab	le	10	The	optimal	k on	ETT	datasets	using	the i	Trans	former	[1:	3]	mod	el.
----	----	----	-----	---------	------	-----	----------	-------	-------	-------	--------	-----	----	-----	-----

Unin anna atau		Elec	tricity			Tr	affic			We	ather			Exchar	ige Ra	te
Hypermeter	96	192	336	720	96	192	336	720	96	192	336	720	96	192	336	720
Optimal k	2	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	2	4	2	2	8	8
1.11. 701		41	1	F1		T		337	1	1 1	C . 1.		Ditt	1.4.		

Table 11: The optimal k on Electricity, Traffic, Weather, and Exchange Rate datasets using the iTransformer [13] model.

ETTh1				ETTh2			
96	192	336	720	96	192	336	720
$0.392 {\pm} 0.001$	0.447 ± 0.002	0.483 ± 0.003	0.516 ± 0.003	$0.303 {\pm} 0.001$	$0.381 {\pm} 0.000$	0.412 ± 0.001	0.434 ± 0.002
$0.390 {\pm} 0.001$	$0.442 {\pm} 0.002$	$0.475 {\pm} 0.001$	$0.503 {\pm} 0.003$	$0.301{\pm}0.001$	$0.385 {\pm} 0.003$	$0.414{\pm}0.001$	$0.438 {\pm} 0.005$
$0.388 {\pm} 0.002$	$0.440 {\pm} 0.002$	$0.477 {\pm} 0.000$	$0.504{\pm}0.004$	$0.301 {\pm} 0.001$	$0.380{\pm}0.001$	$0.414{\pm}0.001$	$0.434{\pm}0.003$
$0.383{\pm}0.001$	$0.438 {\pm} 0.001$	$0.473 {\pm} 0.002$	$0.492 {\pm} 0.002$	$0.298 {\pm} 0.002$	$0.382{\pm}0.003$	$0.411 {\pm} 0.004$	$0.428 {\pm} 0.001$
	96 0.392±0.001 0.390±0.001 0.388±0.002 0.383±0.001	$\begin{array}{c c} & & & & & & & & & & \\ \hline 96 & 192 \\ \hline 0.392 {\pm} 0.001 & 0.447 {\pm} 0.002 \\ 0.390 {\pm} 0.001 & 0.442 {\pm} 0.002 \\ 0.388 {\pm} 0.002 & 0.440 {\pm} 0.002 \\ \hline 0.383 {\pm} 0.001 & 0.438 {\pm} 0.001 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $

Table 12: Error bars on ETTh1 and ETTh2 datasets.

Model	ETTm1				ETTm2			
	96	192	336	720	96	192	336	720
Baseline	0.344 ± 0.002	$0.383 {\pm} 0.003$	0.421 ± 0.001	0.494 ± 0.003	0.183 ± 0.001	0.251 ± 0.002	$0.311 {\pm} 0.001$	0.412 ± 0.001
iTrans Mask [3]	0.347±0.002	$0.383 {\pm} 0.005$	$0.420 {\pm} 0.001$	$0.494{\pm}0.004$	0.179 ± 0.003	$0.251 {\pm} 0.001$	$0.311 {\pm} 0.001$	0.411±0.002
former Mix [3]	0.334 ± 0.005	$0.375 {\pm} 0.002$	$0.421 {\pm} 0.000$	$0.485 {\pm} 0.002$	$0.178 {\pm} 0.002$	$0.248 {\pm} 0.001$	$0.311 {\pm} 0.000$	0.407 ± 0.002
Ours	$0.332{\pm}0.001$	$0.374{\pm}0.001$	$0.424 {\pm} 0.001$	$0.492{\pm}0.002$	$0.178{\pm}0.002$	$0.246 {\pm} 0.001$	$0.309 {\pm} 0.001$	$0.409{\pm}0.000$
Table 12, Error have an ETTml and ETTm2 datasets								

Table 13: Error bars on ETTm1 and ETTm2 datasets.

Model	Electricity				Traffic			
	96	192	336	720	96	192	336	720
Baseline	0.152 ± 0.000	$0.159 {\pm} 0.001$	0.179 ± 0.003	0.230 ± 0.013	0.399 ± 0.001	$0.418 {\pm} 0.000$	0.428 ± 0.000	0.463 ± 0.000
iTrans Mask [3]	0.153 ± 0.001	$0.157 {\pm} 0.001$	$0.173 {\pm} 0.001$	$0.208 {\pm} 0.005$	0.395 ± 0.001	$0.401 {\pm} 0.005$	$0.418 {\pm} 0.001$	0.450 ± 0.002
former Mix [3]	0.151 ± 0.000	$0.158 {\pm} 0.001$	$0.173 {\pm} 0.000$	$0.205 {\pm} 0.003$	0.400 ± 0.003	$0.414{\pm}0.004$	$0.424 {\pm} 0.002$	0.453 ± 0.003
Ours	$0.150{\pm}0.000$	$0.156{\pm}0.001$	$0.171 {\pm} 0.000$	$0.199{\pm}0.002$	$0.394{\pm}0.000$	$0.412{\pm}0.002$	$0.423 {\pm} 0.002$	$0.448 {\pm} 0.001$
Table 14: Error bars on Electricity and Traffic datasets.								

Model	Weather				Exchange Rate			
	96	192	336	720	96	192	336	720
Baseline	0.175 ± 0.001	0.224 ± 0.001	0.281 ± 0.000	0.362 ± 0.003	0.086 ± 0.000	$0.180 {\pm} 0.000$	$0.335 {\pm} 0.002$	0.856 ± 0.004
iTrans Mask [3]	0.178 ± 0.001	$0.228 {\pm} 0.002$	$0.284{\pm}0.002$	$0.359{\pm}0.001$	0.090 ± 0.002	$0.178 {\pm} 0.001$	$0.329 {\pm} 0.006$	$0.845 {\pm} 0.008$
former Mix [3]	0.175 ± 0.001	$0.224 {\pm} 0.000$	$0.279 {\pm} 0.000$	$0.354{\pm}0.000$	0.089 ± 0.001	$0.178 {\pm} 0.001$	$0.328 {\pm} 0.006$	$0.868 {\pm} 0.008$
Ours	$0.171 {\pm} 0.001$	$0.221 {\pm} 0.000$	$0.276 {\pm} 0.000$	$0.351 {\pm} 0.002$	0.086 ± 0.001	$0.176 {\pm} 0.001$	$0.313 {\pm} 0.006$	$0.821 {\pm} 0.003$

Table 15: Error bars on Weather and Exchange Rate datasets.