

DTMamba : Dual Twin Mamba for Time Series Forecasting

Zexue Wu*

Yifeng Gong*

zexue.wu@bit.edu.cn

yifeng.gong@bit.edu.cn

Beijing Institute of Technology
Beijing, China

Aoqian Zhang

Beijing Institute of Technology

China

zexue.wu@bit.edu.cn

ABSTRACT

This is abstract.

ACM Reference Format:

Zexue Wu, Yifeng Gong, and Aoqian Zhang. 2024. DTMamba : Dual Twin Mamba for Time Series Forecasting. In *Proceedings of Make sure to enter the correct conference title from your rights confirmation email (Conference acronym 'XX)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 9 pages. <https://doi.org/XXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>

1 INTRODUCTION

Long-term time series forecasting (LTSF) is of paramount importance in various domains, enabling accurate predictions of future trends and patterns based on historical data. It empowers decision-makers to optimize resource allocation, make informed choices, and proactively respond to changing conditions. Accurate time series forecasting significantly benefits various domains, including finance [35], supply chain management [28], healthcare [26], and weather forecasting [13].

In the past, many traditional methods such as statistic-based method [2] have exhibited limited performance in capturing the complex and non-linear relationships between data. With the advancements in deep learning, time series forecasting has made significant progress. RNN-based [25] and TCN-based [11] methods, utilizing deep neural networks, have been employed to capture the underlying correlations among data, thereby enhancing the performance of predictions. However, RNN-based methods are often hindered by the issue of vanishing gradients, making it challenging to capture long-term dependencies in time series data. Additionally, RNN-based methods cannot be parallelized effectively, leading to lower computational efficiency. Furthermore, TCN-based methods primarily model the variations among adjacent time points, and they may have limited modeling capabilities for long-term dependencies [33]. Especially with the advent of Transformers [31], time series forecasting based on deep learning methods has reached new heights. Transformer-based methods, such as iTransformer

[22], PatchTST [27], and Crossformer [38], have successfully leveraged the self-attention mechanisms of Transformers to capture the long-term dependencies in time series data, achieving SOTA performance. While Transformer-based methods have benefited from the advantages of Transformers, they also inherit the drawback of quadratic complexity, resulting in a significant increase in computational requirements for long input sequences. To overcome the issue of quadratic complexity in Transformer-based methods, some researchers have found that simple linear models such as DLinear [37] and TiDE [4] can outperform complex Transformer-based methods in terms of both performance and efficiency. However, when compared to the top-performing Transformer-based methods, these linear models still fall slightly short in terms of performance.

Recently, Mamba [7] has emerged as an innovative linear time series modeling approach that cleverly combines the characteristics of both Recurrent Neural Networks (RNN) [6] and Convolutional Neural Networks (CNN) [15], effectively addressing the computational efficiency challenges when dealing with long sequences. By leveraging the framework of State Space Models (SSM) [8], Mamba achieves a fusion of RNN's sequential processing capability and CNN's global information processing capability. Mamba introduces a selection mechanism within the SSM framework. With this selective mechanism, Mamba can choose to focus on essential information while filtering out irrelevant details. Consequently, Mamba incorporates a summary of all preceding information, enabling efficient training and inference processes. Therefore, Mamba successfully tackles the computational efficiency issue faced by Transformer models when handling long sequence data. Moreover, Mamba has demonstrated considerable potential in various domains, including graph [1], images [24], and language [20].

Given the remarkable success of Mamba in sequence data, it is natural to consider applying Mamba to LTSF. In this paper, we propose a novel model based on Mamba called Dual Twin Mamba (DTMamba). First, the input is passed through the RevIN normalization layer, which has been proven to be highly effective for tasks related to time series data [14]. Next is a Channel Independence layer, where PatchTST is the first model to utilize Channel Independence. In our experiments, we observed that Channel Independence has significant advantages over Channel Mixing. The model then consists of two TMamba blocks, proposed by us, which demonstrate exceptional capability in capturing long-term dependencies in the data. Residual networks [9] are incorporated in the two TMamba blocks to effectively prevent gradient vanishing. Following that is a projection layer, which maps the output to the desired dimensions. Finally, a reversed Channel Independence layer and a reverse RevIN normalization layer are applied to adjust the output data format and

*Both authors contributed equally to this research.

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than ACM must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from permissions@acm.org.

Conference acronym 'XX, June 03–05, 2018, Woodstock, NY

© 2024 Association for Computing Machinery.

ACM ISBN 978-1-4503-XXXX-X/18/06...\$15.00

<https://doi.org/XXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>

scale to match the input data. Compared to previous SOTA models, DTMamba outperforms previous them in terms of performance.

In summary, we make the following five contributions in this paper:

- We propose DTMamba, which mainly consists of two TMamba blocks. By utilizing two TMamba blocks, DTMamba effectively captures long-term dependencies in temporal data.
- We evaluate the performance of DTMamba and demonstrate its superiority over the previous SOTA models.
- We conduct ablation experiments to validate the effectiveness of channel independence and residual networks in DTMamba.
- We perform parameter sensitivity experiments to demonstrate the robustness of DTMamba to different parameter settings.
- We conducted several experiments to validate the scalability of our DTMamba.

2 RELATED WORK

Traditional methods. Traditional methods, i.e. [2], such methods generally fail to capture the long-term dependencies present in time series data, resulting in poor modeling performance.

RNN-based methods. RNN-based methods, i.e. LSTNet [17], struggle with vanishing gradients, hampering their capacity to capture long-term dependencies in time series data. Moreover, they have limited parallelization capabilities, resulting in decreased computational efficiency.

Transformer-based methods. Transformer-based methods, such as Autoformer [34], FEDformer [39], Stationary [23], Crossformer [38], PatchTST [27], and iTransformer [22], leverage the self-attention mechanism of Transformers to discover dependencies between arbitrary time steps. This makes them particularly suitable for modeling long-term time series data and capturing long-term dependencies. However, these methods are often affected by the quadratic complexity of Transformers, resulting in significant time consumption.

Linear-based methods. Linear-based methods, i.e. Dlinear [37], TiDE [4], Rlinear [19], exhibit higher time and memory efficiency compared to Transformer-based methods. Nevertheless, when confronted with scenarios marked by high volatility and non-periodic, non-smooth patterns, Linear-based models that solely rely on past observed temporal patterns fail to deliver satisfactory performance [3].

TCN-based methods. TCN-based methods, i.e. SCINet [21], TimesNet [33], have made modifications to one-dimensional convolutions by employing dilated convolutions to achieve a larger receptive field. However, they still exhibit limited modeling capabilities for long-term dependencies.

Applications of Mamba. Mamba is a novel architecture that stands apart from any existing frameworks, addressing the limitations of the previously mentioned methods. Currently, there are variations based on Mamba, such as U-Mamba [24], which has been applied to biomedical image segmentation and achieved SOTA results in related tasks. Another variant is Vim [40], which enables efficient visual representation learning, demonstrating significantly

improved inference speed and memory usage compared to previous Transformer-based models. Additionally, VideoMamba [18] has been developed for efficient video understanding and exhibits notable advantages in long video understanding tasks.

3 PROPOSED METHOD

In this section, we will provide a detailed introduction to the proposed DTMamba. Figure 1 illustrates the overall structure of DTMamba, which mainly consists of three layers. Before entering the network structure, we first normalize the time series data. The first layer is the Channel Independence Layer, where each channel of the time series data is independently processed by our model, and channel independence is restored at the end to obtain data of the correct dimensionality. The third layer is the TMamba Block, which includes Embedding, an FC layer for residual transformation, Dropout, and a pair of twin Mambas, to capture information about the variables. The third layer is the Projection Layer, where the hidden information obtained from the preceding layers of the model is projected through FC layer to obtain the predicted values of the data.

3.1 Problem Statement

Definition 3.1 (Multivariate Time Series). Consider a multivariate time series of L observations, $X = \{x_1, \dots, x_L\}$. The i -th observation (data point) $X_i \in \mathbb{R}^N$ consists of N dimensions $\{x_i^1, \dots, x_i^N\}$ and is observed at time t_i .

The problem of multivariate time series data forecasting involves predicting future data of length S given historical observations of length T . The predicted results should ideally be as close to the true values as possible. Generally, the predicted length S of long-term time series forecasting will be greater than or equal to the historical length T .

PROBLEM 1. Given a historical multivariate time series $X = \{x_1, \dots, x_T\} \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times N}$, the long-term multivariate time series forecasting problem is to find a prediction $\hat{X} = \{\hat{x}_{T+1}, \dots, \hat{x}_{T+S}\} \in \mathbb{R}^{S \times N}$ that is close to the true value $X = \{x_{T+1}, \dots, x_{T+S}\}$, where $T \leq S$.

3.2 Normalization

Before multivariate time series data $X \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times N}$ enters the model, we normalize it into $X^0 = \{x_1^0, \dots, x_T^0\} \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times N}$, via $X^0 = \text{RevIN}(X)$. Here, $\text{RevIN}(\cdot)$ represents the normalization method, with the input being the raw data and the output being the normalized data, and $\text{RevIN}^{-1}(\cdot)$ represents the reverse normalization method. The normalization operation used in this paper is the reversible instance normalization (RevIN) [14]. RevIN is a normalization method aimed at improving the accuracy of time series forecasting and has also been applied in PatchTST.

3.3 Channel Independence & Reversed Channel Independence

Channel Independence in time series data prediction can prevent model overfitting [27]. Therefore, before time series data enters the model, we also need to reshape it so that the data of each channel can be processed independently. Assuming the input is $\text{Batch}(X^0)$, its shape is (Batch_Size, Lookback length, Dimension




Figure 1: Overall structure of DTMamba.




Figure 2: Details of TMamba Block.

number) $= (B, T, N)$. We will reshape $Batch(X^0)$ into $Batch(X^I)$, via $Batch(X^I) = ChannelIndependence(Batch(X^0))$. The shape of $Batch(X^I)$ is $(B \times N, 1, T)$.

Since we need to obtain the time series data $\hat{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{S \times N}$ at the end, we need to perform the operation of reverse channel independence, which involves reshaping the data in the same manner. Reshaping $Batch(X^P) : (B \times N, 1, S)$ into $Batch(\hat{X}) : (B, S, N)$, via $Batch(\hat{X}) = ChannelIndependence^{-1}(Batch(X^P))$, as the line 13 of Algorithm 1.

3.4 Twin Mamba

As shown in Figure 2, upon entering the DMamba Block, there is first an Embedding layer, followed by a residual. Then, it passes through a Dropout layer before entering the twin Mambas (with the same model parameter settings). The DMamba Block outputs the hidden information learned by the twin Mambas and the residual.

3.4.1 Embedding Layers. Linear models exhibit unique advantages in time series prediction [30], so we chose to use linear layer as the Embedding layer. Additionally, we embed the complete lookback length of the time series to obtain the global feature representation of the time series.

As the line 5 of Algorithm 1, we will embed the X^I into $X^E : (B \times N, 1, ni)$. As shown in Figure 1, DTMamba consists of two TMamba Block in total. The Embedding layer will embed the time series data into different dimensions, namely $n1$ and $n2$. The sensitivity of $n1$ and $n2$ will be discussed in Section 4.3.5. Additionally, in the subsequent discussion, we will refer to the Embedding in the first

TMamba Block as Embedding 1, and the Embedding in the second TMamba Block as Embedding 2.

3.4.2 Residual. The residual connection was first proposed by ResNet [9], and so far, it has been demonstrated in numerous studies to prevent overfitting, enable more stable training, and achieve better fitting [10]. Therefore, we add a residual term after the Embedding, and to meet the dimensional requirements of the second TMamba Block ($n2$), we use a FC layer to change the dimensionality of the residual, as the line 6 of Algorithm 1.

3.4.3 Dropout. To prevent overfitting of the Mamba model to the time series data and enhance its generalization ability [12], Dropout is added before entering the Mamba. As the line 7 of Algorithm 1, we will change the X^E into $X^D : (B \times N, 1, ni)$.

3.4.4 Mamba. Mamba's architecture is based primarily on S4, a recent state space model (SSM) architecture [7]. At a high level, S4 learns how to map an input $x(t)$ to an output $y(t)$ through an intermediate state $h(t)$. Here, x , y and h are functions of t because SSMs are designed to work well with continuous data such as audio, sensor data, and images. S4 relates these to each other with three continuous parameter matrices A , B and C . These are all tied together through the following two equations:

$$h'(t) = Ah(t) + Bx(t) \quad (1)$$

$$y(t) = Ch(t) \quad (2)$$

In practice, we always deal with discrete data, such as text. This requires us to discretize the SSM, transforming our continuous parameters A , B and C into discrete parameters \bar{A} , \bar{B} and \bar{C} by using a special fourth parameter Δ :

$$\bar{A} = \exp(\Delta A) \quad (3)$$

$$\bar{B} = (\Delta A)^{-1}(\exp(\Delta A) - I)\Delta B \quad (4)$$

Once discretized, we can instead represent the SSM through these two equations:

$$h_t = \bar{A}h_{t-1} + \bar{B}x_t \quad (5)$$

$$y_t = \bar{C}h_t \quad (6)$$

These equations form a recurrence, similar to what you would see in a recurrent neural network (RNN) [36]. At each step t , we combine the hidden state from the previous timestep h_{t-1} with the current input x_t to create the new hidden state h_t .

In the TMamba Block, we utilize two parallel Mamba. Each Mamba model can be seen as a feature extractor, and through parallel connections, multi-level feature learning can be achieved. One Mamba model can learn low-level temporal features, while the other Mamba model can learn high-level temporal patterns or relationships, thus enhancing the model's understanding and representation capability of time series data.

3.5 Projection Layer

After obtaining the hidden information learned by the two pairs of TMamba Block and R^1 and R^2 , the first step is to perform an addition operation, as indicated in line 11 of Algorithm 1. Then, we need to extract the time series data for the next length S . We also use a linear layer to complete the projection task. Finally, we will get $X^P : (B \times N, 1, S)$, which needs to undergo the reverse channel independence operation as discussed in Section 3.3 to obtain the data of the correct shape, i.e. $\hat{X} : (B, S, N)$.

Algorithm 1: The Forecasting Procedure of TDMamba

Input: $Batch(X) = [x_1, \dots, x_T] : (B, T, N)$
Output: $Batch(\hat{X}) = [\hat{x}_{T+1}, \dots, \hat{x}_{T+S}] : (B, S, N)$

- 1 $X^0 : (B, T, N) \leftarrow RevIN(X)$ {Normalization};
- 2 $X^I : (B \times N, 1, T) \leftarrow ChannelIndependence(X^0)$;
- 3 **Mamba Block;**
- 4 **for** $MambaBlock_i \leftarrow MambaBlocks$ **do**
- 5 $X^E : (B \times N, 1, ni) \leftarrow Embedding(X^I)$;
- 6 $R^i : (B \times N, 1, n2) \leftarrow FC(X^E)$ {Residual};
- 7 $X^D : (B \times N, 1, ni) \leftarrow Dropout(X^E)$;
- 8 $X^{M1} : (B \times N, 1, ni) \leftarrow Mamba(X^D)$ {low-level};
- 9 $X^{M2} : (B \times N, 1, ni) \leftarrow Mamba(X^D)$ {high-level};
- 10 $X^I : (B \times N, 1, ni) \leftarrow X^{M1} + X^{M2}$
- 11 $X^A : (B \times N, 1, n2) \leftarrow X^I + R^1 + R^2$ {Residual Connection};
- 12 $X^P : (B \times N, 1, S) \leftarrow Projection(X^A)$ {Projection};
- 13 $\hat{X} : (B, S, N) \leftarrow ChannelIndependence^{-1}(X^P)$;
- 14 $\hat{X} : (B, S, N) \leftarrow RevIN^{-1}(\hat{X})$;
- 15 **return** $Batch(\hat{X})$;

4 EXPERIMENT

In this section, we conduct various time series forecasting experiments on widely recognized benchmark datasets to comprehensively evaluate the performance of our proposed model with well-acknowledged forecasting models. The code and data of this work are available online¹.

4.1 Settings

All experiments were conducted using NVIDIA 2X3090 GPUs (24GB each) within the PyTorch framework [29], with the Ubuntu 20.04 operating system. The model was optimized using the ADAM algorithm [16] with L2 regularization. Due to the limitations of GPU memory, the batch size will be adjusted based on different datasets. However, the training for each dataset was set to 10 epochs.

¹<https://anonymous.4open.science/r/mtcsc-E4CC>

Table 1: Detailed dataset descriptions.

Dataset	#Dim	Time Points	Frequency	Information
Weather [34]	21	52696	10min	Weather
Traffic [34]	862	17544	Hourly	Transportation
Electricity [34]	321	26304	Hourly	Electricity
Exchange [34]	8	7588	Daily	Economy
ETTh1 [34]	7	17420	Hourly	Electricity
ETTh2 [34]	7	17420	Hourly	Electricity
ETTm1 [34]	7	69680	15min	Electricity
ETTm2 [34]	7	69680	15min	Electricity

4.1.1 Datasets. We conduct experiments on six real-world datasets widely used in the LTSF domain, including Weather, Traffic, Electricity, Exchange, four ETT (ETTh1, ETTh2, ETTm1, ETTm2) and Solar-Energy. The detailed descriptions of the datasets are provided in Table 1.

4.1.2 Metrics. The evaluation metrics used are Mean Squared Error (MSE) [5] and Mean Absolute Error (MAE) [32].

$$MSE = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n |X_t - \hat{X}_t|^2 \quad (7)$$

$$MAE = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n |X_t - \hat{X}_t| \quad (8)$$

Here \hat{X}_t represents the predicted value at time t . Lower values of MSE and MAE indicate more accurate prediction results.

4.1.3 Baselines. We compare our model DTMamba with 11 state-of-the-art models, including (1) Transformer-based methods: Autoformer [34], FEDformer [39], Stationary [23], Crossformer [38], PatchTST [27], iTransformer [22]; (2) Linear-based methods: DLinear [37], TiDE [4], RLinear [19]; and (3) TCN-based methods: SCINet [21], TimesNet [33].

4.1.4 Model hyperparameters. All experimental results of the model proposed in this paper were obtained under fixed hyperparameter settings. Specifically, the settings were as follows: *Dropout* = 0.05 (except Electricity, where it was set to 0.5), *Embedding* 1=256, *Embedding* 2=128, and the three parameters of Mamba: *Dimension Expansion Factor*=1; *State Expansion Factor*=256; *Local Convolutional Width*=2.

4.2 Long-term Forecasting

We conduct comprehensive time series forecasting experiments on various datasets.

4.2.1 Comparison among our proposals. Table 2 presents comprehensive prediction results, with the lookback length and forecast length settings consistent with mainstream LTSF. Overall, our model demonstrates the best experimental results. Additionally, iTransformer exhibits the second-best performance, showing clear advantages in the Traffic and Electricity datasets. It is evident that our approach performs well on datasets with fewer dimensions and ranks just below iTransformer on datasets with higher dimensions, i.e. Traffic and Electricity.

To provide a more intuitive representation of DTMamba's prediction capability, we visualize the prediction results of DTMamba and the second-place iTransformer. We select four datasets, namely

Table 2: The prediction results of DTMamba and the benchmark models for various time series forecasting. The lookback length T is fixed at 96, and the forecast length $S \in \{96, 192, 336, 720\}$. The best result is highlighted in bold black, and the second-best result is underlined. Avg represent the average results across all forecast lengths.

Models		DTMamba		iTransformer		RLinear		PatchTST		Crossformer		TiDE		TimesNet		DLinear		SCINet		FEDformer		Stationary		Autoformer	
Metric		MSE	MAE	MSE	MAE	MSE	MAE	MSE	MAE	MSE	MAE	MSE	MAE	MSE	MAE	MSE	MAE	MSE	MAE	MSE	MAE	MSE	MAE	MSE	MAE
Weather	96	<u>0.171</u>	0.218	0.174	0.214	0.192	0.232	0.177	<u>0.218</u>	0.158	0.23	0.202	0.261	0.172	0.22	0.196	0.255	0.221	0.306	0.217	0.296	0.173	0.223	0.266	0.336
	192	0.22	<u>0.257</u>	0.221	0.254	0.24	0.271	0.225	0.259	0.206	0.277	0.242	0.298	0.219	0.261	0.237	0.296	0.261	0.34	0.276	0.336	0.245	0.285	0.307	0.367
	336	<u>0.274</u>	0.296	0.278	0.296	0.292	0.307	0.278	<u>0.297</u>	0.272	0.335	0.287	0.335	0.28	0.306	0.283	0.335	0.309	0.378	0.339	0.38	0.321	0.338	0.359	0.395
	720	<u>0.349</u>	0.346	0.358	0.349	0.364	0.353	0.354	<u>0.348</u>	0.398	0.418	0.351	0.386	0.365	0.359	0.345	0.381	0.377	0.427	0.403	0.428	0.414	0.41	0.419	0.428
	Avg	0.254	0.279	<u>0.258</u>	0.278	0.272	0.291	0.259	0.281	0.259	0.315	0.271	0.32	0.259	0.287	0.265	0.317	0.292	0.363	0.309	0.36	0.288	0.314	0.338	0.382
Traffic	96	<u>0.487</u>	0.317	0.395	0.268	0.649	0.389	0.544	0.359	0.522	<u>0.29</u>	0.805	0.493	0.593	0.321	0.65	0.396	0.788	0.499	0.587	0.366	0.612	0.338	0.613	0.388
	192	<u>0.498</u>	0.325	0.417	0.276	0.601	0.366	0.54	0.354	0.53	0.293	0.756	0.474	0.617	0.336	0.598	0.37	0.789	0.505	0.604	0.373	0.613	0.34	0.616	0.382
	336	<u>0.511</u>	0.334	0.433	0.283	0.609	0.369	0.551	0.358	0.558	<u>0.305</u>	0.762	0.477	0.629	0.336	0.605	0.373	0.797	0.508	0.621	0.383	0.618	0.328	0.622	0.337
	720	<u>0.533</u>	0.326	0.467	0.302	0.647	0.387	0.586	0.375	0.589	0.328	0.719	0.449	0.64	0.35	0.645	0.394	0.841	0.523	0.626	0.382	0.653	0.355	0.66	0.408
	Avg	0.507	0.326	0.428	0.282	0.626	0.378	0.481	0.304	0.55	<u>0.304</u>	0.76	0.473	0.62	0.336	0.625	0.383	0.804	0.509	0.61	0.376	0.624	0.34	0.628	0.379
Exchange	96	0.083	0.201	<u>0.086</u>	0.206	0.093	0.217	0.088	0.205	0.256	0.367	0.094	0.218	0.107	0.234	0.088	0.218	0.267	0.396	0.148	0.278	0.111	0.237	0.197	0.323
	192	0.173	0.295	<u>0.177</u>	0.299	0.184	0.307	0.176	0.299	0.47	0.509	0.184	0.307	0.226	0.344	<u>0.176</u>	0.315	0.351	0.459	0.271	0.315	0.219	0.335	0.3	0.482
	336	0.346	0.427	0.331	<u>0.417</u>	0.351	0.432	0.301	0.397	1.268	0.883	0.349	0.431	0.367	0.448	<u>0.313</u>	0.427	1.324	0.853	0.46	0.427	0.421	0.476	0.509	0.524
	720	0.868	0.698	<u>0.847</u>	0.691	0.886	0.714	0.901	0.714	1.767	1.068	0.852	0.698	0.964	0.746	0.839	<u>0.695</u>	1.058	0.797	1.195	0.695	1.092	0.769	1.447	0.941
	Avg	0.368	0.405	<u>0.36</u>	0.403	0.378	0.417	0.367	0.404	0.94	0.707	0.37	0.413	0.416	0.443	0.354	<u>0.414</u>	0.75	0.626	0.519	0.429	0.461	0.454	0.613	0.539
Electricity	96	<u>0.166</u>	<u>0.256</u>	0.148	0.24	0.201	0.281	0.195	0.285	0.219	0.314	0.237	0.329	0.168	0.272	0.197	0.282	0.247	0.345	0.193	0.308	0.169	0.273	0.201	0.317
	192	<u>0.178</u>	<u>0.268</u>	0.162	0.253	0.201	0.283	0.199	0.289	0.231	0.322	0.236	0.33	0.184	0.289	0.196	0.285	0.257	0.355	0.201	0.315	0.182	0.286	0.222	0.334
	336	<u>0.197</u>	<u>0.289</u>	0.178	0.269	0.215	0.298	0.215	0.305	0.246	0.337	0.249	0.344	0.198	0.3	0.209	0.301	0.269	0.369	0.214	0.329	0.2	0.304	0.231	0.338
	720	0.243	<u>0.326</u>	0.225	0.317	0.257	0.331	0.256	0.337	0.226	0.363	0.284	0.373	0.22	<u>0.32</u>	0.245	0.333	0.299	0.39	0.246	0.355	<u>0.22</u>	0.321	0.254	0.361
	Avg	0.196	<u>0.285</u>	0.178	0.27	0.219	0.298	0.205	0.29	0.244	0.334	0.251	0.344	0.192	0.295	0.212	0.3	0.268	0.365	0.214	0.327	0.193	0.296	0.227	0.338
ETTh1	96	0.386	<u>0.399</u>	0.386	0.405	0.386	0.395	0.414	0.419	0.423	0.448	0.479	0.464	0.384	0.402	0.386	0.4	0.654	0.599	0.376	0.419	0.513	0.491	0.449	0.459
	192	<u>0.426</u>	0.424	0.441	0.436	0.437	0.424	0.46	0.445	0.471	0.474	0.525	0.492	0.436	0.429	0.437	0.432	0.719	0.631	0.42	0.448	0.534	0.504	0.5	0.482
	336	0.48	<u>0.45</u>	0.487	0.458	<u>0.479</u>	0.446	0.501	0.466	0.57	0.546	0.565	0.515	0.491	0.469	0.481	0.459	0.778	0.659	0.459	0.465	0.588	0.535	0.521	0.496
	720	<u>0.484</u>	0.47	0.503	0.491	0.481	0.47	0.5	0.488	0.653	0.621	0.594	0.558	0.521	0.5	0.519	0.516	0.836	0.699	0.506	0.507	0.643	0.616	0.514	0.512
	Avg	<u>0.444</u>	0.435	0.454	<u>0.447</u>	0.446	0.434	0.469	0.454	0.529	0.522	0.541	0.507	0.458	0.45	0.456	0.452	0.747	0.647	0.44	0.46	0.57	0.537	0.496	0.487
ETTh2	96	<u>0.29</u>	<u>0.34</u>	0.297	0.349	0.288	0.338	0.302	0.348	0.745	0.584	0.4	0.44	0.34	0.374	0.333	0.387	0.707	0.621	0.358	0.397	0.476	0.458	0.346	0.388
	192	0.366	<u>0.392</u>	0.38	0.4	<u>0.374</u>	0.39	0.388	0.4	0.877	0.656	0.528	0.509	0.402	0.414	0.477	0.476	0.86	0.689	0.429	0.439	0.512	0.493	0.456	0.452
	336	0.38	0.409	0.428	0.432	<u>0.415</u>	<u>0.426</u>	0.426	0.433	1.043	0.731	0.643	0.571	0.452	0.452	0.594	0.541	1.000	0.744	0.496	0.487	0.552	0.551	0.482	0.486
	720	0.416	0.437	0.427	0.445	<u>0.42</u>	<u>0.44</u>	0.431	0.446	1.104	0.763	0.874	0.679	0.462	0.468	0.831	0.657	1.249	0.838	0.463	0.474	0.562	0.56	0.515	0.511
	Avg	0.363	0.395	0.383	0.407	<u>0.374</u>	<u>0.398</u>	0.387	0.407	0.942	0.684	0.611	0.55	0.414	0.427	0.559	0.515	0.954	0.723	0.437	0.449	0.526	0.516	0.45	0.459
ETTM1	96	0.325	0.36	0.334	0.368	0.355	0.376	<u>0.329</u>	<u>0.367</u>	0.404	0.426	0.364	0.387	0.338	0.375	0.345	0.372	0.418	0.438	0.379	0.419	0.386	0.398	0.505	0.475
	192	0.375	<u>0.386</u>	0.377	0.391	0.391	0.392	0.367	0.385	0.45	0.451	0.398	0.404	0.374	0.387	0.38	0.389	0.439	0.45	0.426	0.441	0.459	0.444	0.553	0.496
	336	0.396	0.405	0.426	0.42	0.424	0.415	<u>0.399</u>	<u>0.41</u>	0.532	0.515	0.428	0.425	0.41	0.411	0.413	0.413	0.49	0.485	0.445	0.459	0.495	0.464	0.621	0.537
	720	<u>0.454</u>	<u>0.442</u>	0.491	0.459	0.487	0.45	0.454	0.439	0.666	0.589	0.487	0.461	0.478	0.45	0.474	0.453	0.595	0.55	0.543	0.49	0.585	0.516	0.671	0.561
	Avg	<u>0.388</u>	0.399	0.407	0.41	0.414	0.407	0.387	<u>0.4</u>	0.513	0.496	0.419	0.419	0.4	0.406	0.403	0.407	0.485	0.481	0.448	0.452	0.481	0.456	0.588	0.517
ETTM2	96	<u>0.177</u>	0.259	0.18	<u>0.264</u>	0.182	0.265	0.175	0.259	0.287	0.366	0.207	0.305	0.187	0.267	0.193	0.292	0.286	0.377	0.203	0.287	0.192	0.274	0.255	0.339
	192	0.24	0.3	0.25	0.309	0.246	0.304	<u>0.241</u>	<u>0.302</u>	0.414	0.492	0.29	0.364	0.249	0.309	0.284	0.362	0.399	0.445	0.269	0.328	0.28	0.339	0.281	0.34
	336	<u>0.31</u>	0.345	0.311	0.348	0.307	0.342	0.305	0.343	0.597	0.542	0.377	0.422	0.321	0.351	0.369	0.427	0.637	0.591	0.325	0.366	0.334	0.361	0.339	0.372
	720	0.395	0.394	0.412	0.407	0.407	0.398	<u>0.402</u>	<u>0.4</u>	1.73	1.042	0.558	0.524	0.408	0.403	0.554	0.522	0.96	0.735	0.421	0.415	0.417	0.413	0.433	0.342
	Avg	0.281	0.325	0.288	0.332	<u>0.286</u>	<u>0.327</u>	0.281	0.326	0.757	0.61	0.358	0.404	0.291	0.333	0.35	0.401	0.571	0.537	0.305	0.349	0.306	0.347	0.327	0.371
1 st Count		13	16	9	16	2	7	7	4	3	0	0	0	1	0	3	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0

ETTh1, ETTh2, Exchange, and Weather, with a lookback length and forecast length both set to 96 (under these datasets and settings, DTMamba's predictions outperform iTransformer). For each dataset, we select data from one dimension. As shown in Figure 3, the yellow line represents the groundtruth, and the blue line represents the prediction results. It is evident that DTMamba's prediction results are closer to the groundtruth, although sometimes the performance of all models is unsatisfactory.

4.2.2 Varying Lookback Length T . In addition to the mainstream lookback length of 96, we also conduct experiments on our DTMamba with lookback lengths of 192, 336, and 720. As shown in Table 3, MSE and MAE do not necessarily decrease with the increase in the lookback length at various forecasting lengths. Similar observations were also made in Transformer-based models [27] [37].

4.3 Hyperparameter Sensitivity Analysis and Ablation Study




Figure 3: The Visualization of DTMamba and iTransformer on ETTh1/ETTh2/ETTm1/ETTm2 datasets when the lookback length $T = 96$ and the forecast length $S = 96$.

Table 4: Residual connection and Channel Independence ablation experiment with an lookback length $T = 96$

Residual	Channel Independence	Forecast length S	ETTh1		ETTh2		ETTm1		ETTm2	
			MSE	MAE	MSE	MAE	MSE	MAE	MSE	MAE
Residual	Channel Independence	96	0.386	0.399	0.290	0.340	0.325	0.360	0.177	0.259
		192	0.426	0.424	0.366	0.392	0.375	0.386	0.240	0.300
		336	0.480	0.450	0.380	0.409	0.396	0.405	0.310	0.345
		720	0.484	0.470	0.416	0.437	0.454	0.442	0.395	0.394
		Avg	0.444	0.435	0.363	0.395	0.388	0.399	0.281	0.325
w/o	Channel Independence	96	0.384	0.408	0.294	0.345	0.329	0.367	0.181	0.263
		192	0.438	0.437	0.373	0.396	0.379	0.393	0.243	0.304
		336	0.482	0.455	0.396	0.418	0.402	0.411	0.307	0.345
		720	0.506	0.485	0.420	0.439	0.467	0.451	0.394	0.395
		Avg	0.453	0.446	0.371	0.400	0.394	0.406	0.281	0.327
Residual	w/o	96	0.396	0.408	0.290	0.343	0.376	0.395	0.180	0.262
		192	0.428	0.426	0.387	0.400	0.373	0.413	0.241	0.304
		336	0.487	0.457	0.382	0.409	0.416	0.411	0.302	0.342
		720	0.495	0.482	0.426	0.441	0.543	0.485	0.402	0.399
		Avg	0.452	0.443	0.371	0.398	0.426	0.421	0.281	0.327

on residual connections. In the “Residual” column, “w/o” indicates the removal of residual connections, while “Residual” indicates the presence of residual connections. As shown in Table 4, networks with residual connections demonstrate a noticeable improvement in experimental results.


4.3.2 Ablation of Channel Independence. To verify the effectiveness of channel independence in the model structure of this paper, ablation experiments were conducted on the Channel Independence module and the Reversed Channel Independence module in Figure 1. As shown in Table 4, in the “Channel Independence” column, “w/o”

indicates the removal of the Channel Independence/Reversed Channel Independence module, while “Channel Independence” indicates the presence of the corresponding module. From the results, it can be seen that networks with the Channel Independence/Reversed Channel Independence module demonstrate a noticeable improvement in experimental results.

4.3.3 Scalability of DTMamba. To evaluate the effectiveness and scalability of the proposed TMamba Block, we conduct module replacement experiments on the ETTh1, ETTh2, ETTm1, and ETTm2 datasets. As shown in Table 5, in the “Design” column, “DTMamba” represents the two TMamba blocks used in this paper, “Mamba”


Table 5: Scalability of DTMamba

Design	Forecast length S	ETTh1		ETTh2		ETTh1		ETTh2		Weather		Exchange	
		MSE	MAE	MSE	MAE	MSE	MAE	MSE	MAE	MSE	MAE	MSE	MAE
DTMamba	96	0.386	0.399	0.290	0.340	0.325	0.360	0.177	0.259	0.171	0.218	0.083	0.201
	192	0.426	0.424	0.366	0.392	0.375	0.386	0.240	0.300	0.220	0.257	0.173	0.295
	336	0.480	0.450	0.380	0.409	0.396	0.405	0.310	0.345	0.274	0.296	0.346	0.427
	720	0.484	0.470	0.416	0.437	0.454	0.442	0.395	0.394	0.349	0.346	0.868	0.698
	Avg	0.444	0.435	0.363	0.395	0.388	0.399	0.281	0.325	0.254	0.279	0.368	0.405
Mamba	96	0.379	0.398	0.295	0.347	0.320	0.357	0.176	0.258	0.164	0.208	0.085	0.202
	192	0.440	0.426	0.364	0.390	0.373	0.388	0.241	0.301	0.208	0.249	0.172	0.295
	336	0.474	0.444	0.414	0.425	0.398	0.407	0.295	0.336	0.267	0.290	0.333	0.417
	720	0.494	0.479	0.432	0.447	0.462	0.446	0.397	0.395	0.346	0.342	0.882	0.703
	Avg	0.447	0.437	0.376	0.409	0.388	0.400	0.277	0.323	0.246	0.272	0.368	0.404
DMamba	96	0.377	0.396	0.292	0.343	0.326	0.363	0.180	0.258	0.179	0.224	0.084	0.201
	192	0.433	0.426	0.367	0.391	0.373	0.386	0.239	0.299	0.222	0.259	0.174	0.296
	336	0.490	0.456	0.415	0.428	0.442	0.408	0.297	0.338	0.278	0.299	0.345	0.424
	720	0.524	0.492	0.426	0.443	0.460	0.443	0.397	0.395	0.349	0.345	0.844	0.689
	Avg	0.455	0.443	0.375	0.401	0.400	0.400	0.278	0.323	0.257	0.282	0.362	0.403
TMamba	96	0.380	0.396	0.289	0.342	0.318	0.356	0.178	0.259	0.165	0.212	0.084	0.200
	192	0.441	0.430	0.373	0.392	0.369	0.385	0.242	0.303	0.212	0.253	0.176	0.297
	336	0.483	0.449	0.411	0.425	0.405	0.409	0.303	0.341	0.267	0.291	0.347	0.425
	720	0.490	0.475	0.423	0.441	0.463	0.444	0.399	0.398	0.345	0.343	0.940	0.714
	Avg	0.449	0.438	0.374	0.400	0.389	0.399	0.281	0.325	0.247	0.275	0.387	0.409

**Figure 4: Sensitivity of Dropouts**

represents the use of a single Mamba model to replace two TMamba blocks, “DMamba” represents the use of two TMamba blocks, but each TMamba block only uses one Mamba, and “TMamba” represents the use of only one TMamba block proposed in this paper. From the experimental results, it can be observed that the proposed DTMamba has the best performance. This structure is capable of better learning relevant features and temporal patterns in the time series data.

4.3.4 Sensitivity of Dropouts. As shown in Figure 4, except for the cases with $Dropout = 0.2/0.4/0.5$ for a prediction length of $S = 720$ in Figure 4(a)(b), and $Dropout = 0.9$ in Figure 4(c)(d), the overall experimental results did not show significant fluctuations with changes in Dropout. Additionally, in most cases, results with

**Figure 5: Sensitivity of Linear's Parameters**

$Dropout > 0$ outperform $Dropout = 0$ (i.e., adding Dropout). However, increasing Dropout leads to higher computational costs during training. Therefore, for the majority of experiments, we chose $Dropout = 0.05$, which offer a good balance between effectiveness and computational efficiency.

4.3.5 Sensitivity of Linear's Parameters. As shown in Figure 1, our proposed network structure includes two linear layers serving as Embedding layers, namely Embedding 1 and Embedding 2. Since the baseline models, DLinear and RLinear, have demonstrated the crucial role of linear mapping in previous long-term time series prediction works, to understand the performance impact of MLP on our network, we consider different combinations of linear dimensions. As depicted in Figure 5, under different combinations of linear dimensions, the performance of DTMamba on ETTh1




Figure 6: Sensitive of Mamba Dimension Expansion Factor




Figure 7: Sensitive of State Expansion Factor of Mambas

and ETTm1 does not depend on the choice of MLP. Additionally, for multidimensional time series data with smaller dimensions, selecting smaller combinations of linear dimensions yields better results.

4.3.6 Sensitive of Mamba Dimension Expansion Factor. We conduct sensitivity experiments on the dimension expansion factor parameter (e_fact) of Mamba. As shown in Figure 6, increasing the dimension expansion factor sometimes leads to a deterioration in experimental results, along with significant time and memory consumption. Therefore, we chose $e_fact = 1$ (the default value for Mamba) for all experiments, as it offer better performance with lower memory and time costs.

4.3.7 Sensitive of State Expansion Factor of Mambas. Similarly, we conduct sensitivity experiments on another key parameter of Mamba, the state expansion factor of the SSM (d_state). As shown in Figure 7, except for the case of $d_state = 64$ for a prediction length of $S = 720$ in Figure 7(a)(b), the experimental results did not show significant fluctuations with changes in d_state . Overall, with $d_state = 256$, the experimental results were stable and effective.




Figure 8: Sensitive of Mambas' Local Convolutional Width

Therefore, we set $d_state = 256$ (the default value for Mamba) for all experiments.

4.3.8 Sensitive of Mambas' Local Convolutional Width. Finally, we conduct sensitivity experiments on the width parameter of the local convolutional kernel in Mamba (d_conv). As shown in Figure 8, the experimental results did not exhibit significant fluctuations with changes in d_conv . Moreover, increasing the width of the local convolution kernel did not lead to improvements in experimental results. Therefore, we set $d_conv = 2$ (the default value for Mamba) for all experiments.

5 CONCLUSION

This is conclusion.

REFERENCES

- [1] Ali Behrouz and Farnoosh Hashemi. 2024. Graph Mamba: Towards Learning on Graphs with State Space Models. *CoRR* abs/2402.08678 (2024).
- [2] George EP Box and Gwilym M Jenkins. 1968. Some recent advances in forecasting and control. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series C (Applied Statistics)* 17, 2 (1968), 91–109.
- [3] Si-An Chen, Chun-Liang Li, Nate Yoder, Sercan Ö. Arik, and Tomas Pfister. 2023. TSMixer: An all-MLP Architecture for Time Series Forecasting. *CoRR* abs/2303.06053 (2023).
- [4] Abhimanyu Das, Weihao Kong, Andrew Leach, Shaan Mathur, Rajat Sen, and Rose Yu. 2023. Long-term Forecasting with TiDE: Time-series Dense Encoder. *CoRR* abs/2304.08424 (2023).
- [5] Kalyan Das, Jiming Jiang, and JNK Rao. 2004. Mean squared error of empirical predictor. (2004).
- [6] Jeffrey L. Elman. 1990. Finding Structure in Time. *Cogn. Sci.* 14, 2 (1990), 179–211.
- [7] Albert Gu and Tri Dao. 2023. Mamba: Linear-Time Sequence Modeling with Selective State Spaces. *CoRR* abs/2312.00752 (2023).
- [8] Albert Gu, Karan Goel, and Christopher Ré. 2022. Efficiently Modeling Long Sequences with Structured State Spaces. In *ICLR*. OpenReview.net.
- [9] Kaiming He, Xiangyu Zhang, Shaoqing Ren, and Jian Sun. 2016. Deep Residual Learning for Image Recognition. In *CVPR*. IEEE Computer Society, 770–778.
- [10] Kaiming He, Xiangyu Zhang, Shaoqing Ren, and Jian Sun. 2016. Identity Mappings in Deep Residual Networks. In *ECCV (4) (Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Vol. 9908)*. Springer, 630–645.
- [11] Pradeep Hewage, Ardhendu Behera, Marcello Trovati, Ella Pereira, Morteza Ghahremani, Francesco Palmieri, and Yonghuai Liu. 2020. Temporal convolutional neural (TCN) network for an effective weather forecasting using time-series data from the local weather station. *Soft Comput.* 24, 21 (2020), 16453–16482.
- [12] Geoffrey E. Hinton, Nitish Srivastava, Alex Krizhevsky, Ilya Sutskever, and Ruslan Salakhutdinov. 2012. Improving neural networks by preventing co-adaptation of feature detectors. *CoRR* abs/1207.0580 (2012).

- [13] Zahra Karevan and Johan A. K. Suykens. 2020. Transductive LSTM for time-series prediction: An application to weather forecasting. *Neural Networks* 125 (2020), 1–9.
- [14] Taesung Kim, Jinhee Kim, Yunwon Tae, Cheonbok Park, Jang-Ho Choi, and Jaegul Choo. 2022. Reversible Instance Normalization for Accurate Time-Series Forecasting against Distribution Shift. In *ICLR*. OpenReview.net.
- [15] Yoon Kim. 2014. Convolutional Neural Networks for Sentence Classification. In *EMNLP. ACL*, 1746–1751.
- [16] Diederik P. Kingma and Jimmy Ba. 2015. Adam: A Method for Stochastic Optimization. In *ICLR (Poster)*.
- [17] Guokun Lai, Wei-Cheng Chang, Yiming Yang, and Hanxiao Liu. 2018. Modeling Long- and Short-Term Temporal Patterns with Deep Neural Networks. In *SIGIR*. ACM, 95–104.
- [18] Kunchang Li, Xinhao Li, Yi Wang, Yinan He, Yali Wang, Limin Wang, and Yu Qiao. 2024. VideoMamba: State Space Model for Efficient Video Understanding. *CoRR* abs/2403.06977 (2024).
- [19] Zhe Li, Shiyi Qi, Yiduo Li, and Zenglin Xu. 2023. Revisiting Long-term Time Series Forecasting: An Investigation on Linear Mapping. *CoRR* abs/2305.10721 (2023).
- [20] Opher Lieber, Barak Lenz, Hofit Bata, Gal Cohen, Jhonathan Osin, Itay Dalmedigos, Erez Safahi, Shaked Meir, Yonatan Belinkov, Shai Shalev-Shwartz, Omri Abend, Raz Alon, Tomer Asida, Amir Bergman, Roman Glozman, Michael Gokhman, Avshalom Manevich, Nir Ratner, Noam Rozen, Erez Shwartz, Mor Zusman, and Yoav Shoham. 2024. Jamba: A Hybrid Transformer-Mamba Language Model. *CoRR* abs/2403.19887 (2024).
- [21] Minhao Liu, Ailing Zeng, Muxi Chen, Zhijian Xu, Qiuxia Lai, Lingna Ma, and Qiang Xu. 2022. SCINet: Time Series Modeling and Forecasting with Sample Convolution and Interaction. In *NeurIPS*.
- [22] Yong Liu, Tengge Hu, Haoran Zhang, Haixu Wu, Shiyu Wang, Lintao Ma, and Mingsheng Long. 2023. iTransformer: Inverted Transformers Are Effective for Time Series Forecasting. *CoRR* abs/2310.06625 (2023).
- [23] Yong Liu, Haixu Wu, Jianmin Wang, and Mingsheng Long. 2022. Non-stationary transformers: Exploring the stationarity in time series forecasting. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 35 (2022), 9881–9893.
- [24] Jun Ma, Feifei Li, and Bo Wang. 2024. U-Mamba: Enhancing Long-range Dependency for Biomedical Image Segmentation. *CoRR* abs/2401.04722 (2024).
- [25] Rishabh Madan and Mangipudi Partha Sarathi. 2018. Predicting Computer Network Traffic: A Time Series Forecasting Approach Using DWT, ARIMA and RNN. In *IC3*. IEEE Computer Society, 1–5.
- [26] Mohammad Amin Morid, Olivia R. Liu Sheng, and Joseph Dunbar. 2023. Time Series Prediction Using Deep Learning Methods in Healthcare. *ACM Trans. Manag. Inf. Syst.* 14, 1 (2023), 2:1–2:29.
- [27] Yuqi Nie, Nam H. Nguyen, Phanwadee Sinthong, and Jayant Kalagnanam. 2023. A Time Series is Worth 64 Words: Long-term Forecasting with Transformers. In *ICLR*. OpenReview.net.
- [28] Massimo Pacella and Gabriele Papadia. 2021. Evaluation of deep learning with long short-term memory networks for time series forecasting in supply chain management. *Procedia CIRP* 99 (2021), 604–609.
- [29] Adam Paszke, Sam Gross, Francisco Massa, Adam Lerer, James Bradbury, Gregory Chanan, Trevor Killeen, Zeming Lin, Natalia Gimelshein, Luca Antiga, Alban Desmaison, Andreas Köpf, Edward Z. Yang, Zachary DeVito, Martin Raison, Alykhan Tejani, Sasank Chilamkurthy, Benoit Steiner, Lu Fang, Junjie Bai, and Soumith Chintala. 2019. PyTorch: An Imperative Style, High-Performance Deep Learning Library. In *NeurIPS*. 8024–8035.
- [30] William Toner and Luke Darlow. 2024. An Analysis of Linear Time Series Forecasting Models. *CoRR* abs/2403.14587 (2024).
- [31] Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N. Gomez, Lukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. 2017. Attention is All you Need. In *NIPS*. 5998–6008.
- [32] David J Wright, G Capon, R Page, J Quiroga, Arshad A Taseen, and F Tomasini. 1986. Evaluation of forecasting methods for decision support. *International journal of forecasting* 2, 2 (1986), 139–152.
- [33] Haixu Wu, Tengge Hu, Yong Liu, Hang Zhou, Jianmin Wang, and Mingsheng Long. 2023. TimesNet: Temporal 2D-Variation Modeling for General Time Series Analysis. In *ICLR*. OpenReview.net.
- [34] Haixu Wu, Jiehui Xu, Jianmin Wang, and Mingsheng Long. 2021. Autoformer: Decomposition Transformers with Auto-Correlation for Long-Term Series Forecasting. In *NeurIPS*. 22419–22430.
- [35] Hongju Yan and Hongbing Ouyang. 2018. Financial Time Series Prediction Based on Deep Learning. *Wirel. Pers. Commun.* 102, 2 (2018), 683–700.
- [36] Wojciech Zaremba, Ilya Sutskever, and Oriol Vinyals. 2014. Recurrent Neural Network Regularization. *CoRR* abs/1409.2329 (2014).
- [37] Ailing Zeng, Muxi Chen, Lei Zhang, and Qiang Xu. 2023. Are Transformers Effective for Time Series Forecasting?. In *AAAI*. AAAI Press, 11121–11128.
- [38] Yunhao Zhang and Junchi Yan. 2023. Crossformer: Transformer Utilizing Cross-Dimension Dependency for Multivariate Time Series Forecasting. In *ICLR*. OpenReview.net.
- [39] Tian Zhou, Ziqing Ma, Qingsong Wen, Xue Wang, Liang Sun, and Rong Jin. 2022. FEDformer: Frequency Enhanced Decomposed Transformer for Long-term Series Forecasting. In *ICML (Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, Vol. 162)*. PMLR, 27268–27286.
- [40] Lianghui Zhu, Bencheng Liao, Qian Zhang, Xinlong Wang, Wenyu Liu, and Xinggang Wang. 2024. Vision Mamba: Efficient Visual Representation Learning with Bidirectional State Space Model. *CoRR* abs/2401.09417 (2024).