Forecasting with Model Uncertainty: Representations and Risk Reduction

Keisuke Hirano and Jonathan H. Wright

University of Arizona and Johns Hopkins University

ECB, June 13 2014

- Introduction

Introduction

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ □ のQ@

- Controversy between in-sample and OOS
- Considers forecasting with weak predictors
- Present paper highlights important effect of bagging
- Without bagging ordering is approximately:
 - In-sample + AIC
 - Out-of-sample
 - 3 Split sample

- Introduction

Introduction

- Controversy between in-sample and OOS
- Considers forecasting with weak predictors
- Present paper highlights important effect of bagging
- Without bagging ordering is approximately:
 - 1 In-sample + AIC
 - Out-of-sample
 - Split sample
- With bagging, it's generally reversed
- With alternate form of bagging, can prove that OOS and SS are dominated by bagging counterparts

Setup

Regression Model:

$$y_t = \beta' x_t + u_t$$

k regressors (k fixed)

$$E[x_t x_t'] = \Sigma_{xx} = I_k$$

- *u_t* IID, independent of *x*
- Solution: $\beta = T^{-1/2}b$ (Inoue & Kilian (2006))

Forecast Assessment

Forecast: $\tilde{y}_{T+1} = \tilde{\beta}' x_{T+1}$.

Unconditional MSPE

$$\mathsf{E}[(y_{T+1} - \tilde{\beta}' x_{T+1})^2] = \sigma^2 + \mathsf{E}\left[(\tilde{\beta} - \beta)'(\tilde{\beta} - \beta)\right] + \mathsf{o}_{\mathsf{P}}(T^{-1})$$

Sirst term is O(1) and same for all methods

- Second term is $O(T^{-1})$
- Normalized MSPE:

$$\mathsf{NMSPE} = \mathsf{T}(\mathsf{MSPE} - \sigma^2) = \mathsf{E}\left[\mathsf{T}(ilde{eta} - eta)'(ilde{eta} - eta)
ight]$$

Forecasting Procedures

With k regressors, there are 2^k possible subsets.

- Big Model (OLS with all predictors)
- Small Model: $\tilde{\beta} = 0$.
- Positive-part James-Stein (shrinkage)
- Select model using AIC
- Out-of-sample forecasting
- Split-sample forecasting
- All methods with bagging

Bagging

Bagging = Bootstrap Aggregation (Breiman, 1996)

- Solution Draw a bootstrap sample $\{x_t^*(i), y_t^*(i)\}$ from the original data $\{x_t, y_t\}$.
- Solution Recompute estimator $\tilde{\beta}^*(i)$.
- Repeat for many bootstrap samples (i = 1, ..., L), average and generate the forecast
- Bühlmann and Yu (2002): bagging smooths hard-threshold estimators
- Inoue and Kilian (2008): application to forecasting CPI

Theorem 2: Limiting Distributions of Estimators

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 のへぐ

• OLS:
$$T^{1/2}\tilde{\beta} \rightarrow_d Y = N(b, \sigma^2)$$

• JS: $T^{1/2}\tilde{\beta} \rightarrow_d S_1(Y) = Yw_1(Y)$
• AIC: $T^{1/2}\tilde{\beta} \rightarrow_d S_2(Y) = Yw_2(Y)$

Theorem 2: Limiting Distributions of Estimators

• OLS:
$$T^{1/2}\tilde{\beta} \rightarrow_d Y = N(b, \sigma^2)$$

• JS:
$$T^{1/2}\tilde{\beta} \rightarrow_d S_1(Y) = Yw_1(Y)$$

• AIC:
$$T^{1/2}\tilde{\beta} \rightarrow_d S_2(Y) = Yw_2(Y)$$

• OOS:
$$T^{1/2}\hat{\beta} \rightarrow_d S_3(Y, U_B)$$

where U_B is a Brownian bridge independent of Y and b

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 のへぐ

• SS:
$$T^{1/2}\tilde{\beta} \rightarrow_d S_4(Y, U_B)$$

....

Representation of Partial Sums

All of the procedures we consider depend crucially on the partial sum process ($r \in [0, 1]$): $T^{-1/2} \sum_{t=1}^{[Tr]} x_t y_t$

Theorem 1:

$$T^{-1/2}\sum_{t=1}^{[Tr]} x_t y_t \to_d rY + \sigma U_B(r)$$

where $Y \sim N(b, \sigma^2)$ and U_B is a Brownian bridge independent of Y and b

Adding Bagging Step

Theorem 3: In the *i*th bootstrap step

$$T^{-1/2}\Sigma_{t=1}^{[Tr]}x_t^*(i)y_t^*(i) \rightarrow_d rY + \sigma V_i(r)$$

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへぐ

where V_i are independent Brownian *motions* (Park, 2002).

Limiting Distributions of Estimators with Bagging

$$\bigcirc$$
 OLS $T^{1/2}\tilde{eta}_i
ightarrow_d Y + V_i$

• JS: $T^{1/2}\tilde{\beta}_i \rightarrow_d S_1(Y, V_i)$

• AIC:
$$T^{1/2}\tilde{\beta}_i \rightarrow_d S_2(Y, V_i)$$

• OOS:
$$T^{1/2}\tilde{\beta}_i \rightarrow_d S_3(Y, V_i)$$

where V_i is a Brownian motion independent of Y and b

• SS:
$$T^{1/2}\tilde{\beta}_i \rightarrow_d S_4(Y, V_i)$$

Repeating across different *i* and averaging means that all estimators eliminate V_i and are generalized shrinkage estimators.

Bagging Comments

- For OOS and SS, bagging replaces U_B with V_i and then eliminates by integration.
- Intuition: for SS, bagging randomizes over partitions of the data ⇒ uses all obs for both model selection and estimation

Simpler Representations with k = 1

- AIC without bagging: $T^{1/2}\tilde{eta} \rightarrow_d Y \mathbf{1}(Y > \sqrt{2}\sigma)$
- SS without bagging: $Z_1 \mathbf{1}(|Z_2| > \sqrt{2/\pi}\sigma)$

where
$$Z_1 \sim \textit{N}(b, rac{\sigma^2}{1-\pi}) \perp \ Z_2 \sim \textit{N}(b, rac{\sigma^2}{\pi})$$

• AIC with bagging: $Y - Y\Phi(\frac{\sqrt{2}\sigma - Y}{\sigma}) + \sigma\phi(\frac{\sqrt{2}\sigma - Y}{\sigma}) + Y\Phi(\frac{-\sqrt{2}\sigma - Y}{\sigma}) - \sigma\phi(\frac{-\sqrt{2}\sigma - Y}{\sigma})$

SS with bagging:
$$Y - Y\Phi(\frac{\sqrt{2}\sigma - \sqrt{\pi}Y}{\sigma}) + Y\Phi(\frac{-\sqrt{2}\sigma - \sqrt{\pi}Y}{\sigma})$$

Risk Reduction

- In the limit, OOS and SS are functionals of both Y = Y(1)and $U = U_B$.
- But Y is sufficient.
- Marginalize out the random noise term U:

$$\tilde{S}(Y) = E\left[S(Y, U) \mid Y\right].$$

By the Rao-Blackwell theorem,

 $MSPE(\tilde{S}, b) \leq MSPE(S, b) \quad \forall b$

Calculations indicate strict risk reduction for at least some b.

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 の�?

Hence OOS and SS are asymptotically inadmissible.

- Second contract of the strict risk reduction for at least some b.
- Hence OOS and SS are asymptotically inadmissible.
- Bagging is like Rao-Blackwellization wrt V instead of U.
- Might want to do Rao-Blackwellization or an alternative form of bagging that achieves this.

Alternative Form of Bagging

• All estimators are functions of $x_t x'_t$ and $x_t y_t$ alone.

🕒 Let

$$z_t = x_t y_t = x_t x_t^{'} \hat{\beta} + x_t e_t$$

and define the *i*th bootstrap draw of z_t as:

$$z_t^*(i) = x_t x_t^{'} \hat{\beta} + \theta_t(i) x_t e_t - T^{-1} \Sigma_{s=1}^T \theta_s(i) x_s e_s$$

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへぐ

where $\theta_t(i)$ is the "wild" term.

Alternative Form of Bagging

• All estimators are functions of $x_t x'_t$ and $x_t y_t$ alone.

Let

$$z_t = x_t y_t = x_t x_t^{'} \hat{\beta} + x_t e_t$$

and define the *i*th bootstrap draw of z_t as:

$$z_t^*(i) = x_t x_t^{'} \hat{\beta} + \theta_t(i) x_t e_t - T^{-1} \Sigma_{s=1}^T \theta_s(i) x_s e_s$$

where $\theta_t(i)$ is the "wild" term.

• Theorem 4: Limiting distributions same as Theorem 2 but with $Y(r) = rY + \sigma U_B(r)$ replaced by $rY + \sigma U_B^i(r)$

Asymptotic Root NMSPE (k=1)



- nac

Asymptotic Root NMSPE (k=3)



E 990

Dominance Relations (1 nonzero coefficient)								
k	1	2	3	4	5	6		
AIC v OOS								
AIC v SS								
AIC v AICB								
AIC v OOSB	OOSB	OOSB	OOSB	OOSB	OOSB	OOSB		
AIC v SSB				SSB	SSB	SSB		
OOS v SS								
OOS v AICB								
OOS v OOSB	OOSB	OOSB	OOSB	OOSB	OOSB	OOSB		
OOS v SSB	SSB	SSB	SSB	SSB	SSB	SSB		
SS v AICB								
SS v OOSB								
SS v SSB	SSB	SSB	SSB	SSB	SSB	SSB		
AICB v OOSB		OOSB	OOSB	OOSB	OOSB	OOSB		
AICB v SSB			SSB	SSB	SSB	SSB		
OOSB v SSB								

Dominance Relations (2 nonzero coefficients)									
k	1	2	3	4	5	6			
AIC v OOS									
AIC v SS									
AIC v AICB									
AIC v OOSB									
AIC v SSB									
OOS v SS									
OOS v AICB									
OOS v OOSB	OOSB	OOSB	OOSB	OOSB	OOSB	OOSB			
OOS v SSB	SSB	SSB	SSB	SSB	SSB	SSB			
SS v AICB									
SS v OOSB									
SS v SSB	SSB	SSB	SSB	SSB	SSB	SSB			
AICB v OOSB					OOSB	OOSB			
AICB v SSB					SSB	SSB			
OOSB v SSB									

◆□ ▶ < 圖 ▶ < 圖 ▶ < 圖 ▶ < 圖 • 의 Q @</p>

Comparison of Bayes Risk



- Each regressor is included in the model with probability *p*.
- Conditional on inclusion, prior for that element of b is $N(0, \phi)$.

Can work out local asymptotic Bayes risk: limit of

$$E[(T^{1/2}\tilde{\beta}-b)'(T^{1/2}\tilde{\beta}-b)]$$

Comparison of Bayes Risk



- Each regressor is included in the model with probability *p*.
- Conditional on inclusion, prior for that element of b is $N(0, \phi)$.
- Can work out local asymptotic Bayes risk: limit of

$$E[(T^{1/2}\tilde{\beta}-b)'(T^{1/2}\tilde{\beta}-b)]$$

- OOS/SS with bagging do well
- But BMA always does better, and can do much better

- Extensions

h-step ahead forecasting

Setup:

$$y_{t+h} = \beta' x_t + u_t$$

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへぐ

Serial correlation in u_t could be exploited but isn't.

- Extensions

h-step ahead forecasting



$$y_{t+h} = \beta' x_t + u_t$$

Serial correlation in *u*_t could be exploited but isn't.

Without bagging

$$\mathcal{T}^{-1/2}\Sigma_{t=1}^{[Tr]}x_t(i)y_t(i)
ightarrow_d r \mathcal{N}(b,\omega^2 I) + \omega U_B(r)$$

With bagging

$$T^{-1/2} \Sigma_{t=1}^{[Tr]} x_t^*(i) y_t^*(i) \rightarrow_d r \mathcal{N}(b, \omega^2 I) + \sigma V_i(r)$$

– Extensions

h-step ahead forecasting

Could get bagging to "mimic" serial dependence in the data.

Draw blocks of data of length that goes to infinity slowly.

– Extensions

h-step ahead forecasting

Could get bagging to "mimic" serial dependence in the data.

Draw blocks of data of length that goes to infinity slowly.

Easy to do Rao-Blackwellization with serial correlation

- Extensions

Forecasting in a VAR

A p-variable stationary VAR with k lags and intercept:

$$y_t = Bx_t + \varepsilon_t$$

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

Suppose that $B = CT^{-1/2}$.

Each model consists of a set of zero restrictions on *B*.

– Extensions

Forecasting in a VAR

A p-variable stationary VAR with k lags and intercept:

$$y_t = Bx_t + \varepsilon_t$$

• Suppose that $B = CT^{-1/2}$.

Each model consists of a set of zero restrictions on *B*.

All estimators depend on:

$$T^{-1} \Sigma_{t=1}^{[Tr]} x_t x'_t \rightarrow_r r \Omega_{xx} \text{ where } \Omega_{xx} = E(x_t x'_t)$$

$$T^{-1/2} \Sigma_{t=1}^{[Tr]} y_t x'_t \rightarrow_d [rC + B(r)] \Omega_{xx}$$

- Estimators other than OOS or SS are functions of Y = C + B(1) alone
- OOS and SS are functions of Y and $U_B(r)$.

- Extensions

Extension to general likelihood framework

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへぐ

Solution Parameter θ and likelihood $I(\theta) = \sum_{t=1}^{T} I_t(\theta)$

$$igsquirin$$
 True value is $heta_0=cT^{-1/2}$

igsim Model selection amounts to imposing zeros on heta

Solution Need
$$T^{-1/2} \Sigma_{t=1}^{[Tr]} I'_t(\theta_0) \rightarrow B(r)$$

Monte-Carlo Simulation

Monte-Carlo simulation with Gaussian shocks and T = 100

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

Evaluated normalized root mean square prediction error $\sqrt{T * (MSPE - 1)}$

└─ Monte Carlos

Monte-Carlo Root NMSPE (k=1)



) D Q C

└─ Monte Carlos

Monte-Carlo Root NMSPE (k=3)



🛯 ୬ବ୍ଚ

- Conclusions

Conclusion

Representation highlights dependence of OOS and SS "noise"

This can be eliminated by bagging

- Or by Rao-Blackwellization (alternative bagging)
- Standard and alternative bagging on OOS/SS compares favorably with existing methods

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

Conclusions

Recap (in haiku)

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへぐ

Out of sample is Inadmissible, but the Future's in the bag.