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Spatial Data

- Beginning statistics: Data are assumed to be independent and identically distributed (‘i.i.d.’) Inference is based on theory that relies on this assumption.
- **Spatial data** contain information about both the attribute of interest as well as its location.
- There is a need for more realistic models that account for the fact that data are spatially dependent. What’s more, the dependence may be present in all directions and the relationships may be highly complex.
- Typical modeling assumption: observations that are further apart are less dependent than observations that are located close to each other.
The importance of dependence

- Model will be a poor fit to the data, hence ignoring dependence can lead to poor estimates and poor prediction based on the estimated model.

- Not only do we have poor estimates and predictions, we will underestimate the variability of our estimates. (Variability of estimates is higher due to dependence.)

- Toy example: Consider the following simulated realization from a dependent process. For easy visualization, we consider a simple 1-D scenario:
  
  - Simulate $Y(s_i) = \beta s_i + \epsilon_i$ where $s_i \in (0, 1)$ and $i = 1, \ldots, N$.
  - $(\epsilon_1, \ldots, \epsilon_N)^T \sim$ zero mean dependent process.
When ‘true model’ has dependent errors

Independent error model (blue, dotted): Poor fit though mean trend ($\beta$) is estimated reasonably well.

Dependent error model (red, solid), $\epsilon$ from a Gaussian process: much better fit.
When ‘true model’ has complicated mean

Truth: \( Y(s_i) = \sin(s_i) + \epsilon(s_i) \), with \( \epsilon(s_i) \) independent.

Linear model with independent errors (blue, dotted): Poor fit.
Linear model with dependent (Gaussian process) errors (red, solid): much better fit even though it is the ‘wrong’ model!
Some reasons to use spatial models

- Can lead to superior estimators (e.g. low mean squared error).
- Spatial dependence can protect against misspecification of mean structure (hence, gaussian process are often used in machine learning, emulating output from complex computer models etc.)
- Statistically sound framework for interpolation.
- Ignoring dependence may underestimate variability.
- Sometimes learning about spatial dependence is of interest in its own right, e.g. finding clusters, regions of influence/dependence.
Useful ideas for non-spatial data

Although we will be talking about methods/models in the context of spatial data, some methods discussed here may be useful in non-spatial scenarios, for instance:

- Gaussian processes: Useful for modeling complex relationships of various kinds — particularly in machine learning (including classification), emulation of complex computer experiments (nonparametric curve fitting).

- Markov random fields: Time series, Graphical models, Semiparametric regression, Varying coefficient models etc.

- Notion of distance may arise in non-spatial data.
Some goals of spatial modeling

Scientists are often interested in one or more of the following goals:

- Modeling of trends and correlation structures, finding clusters.
- Estimation of the model parameters.
- Hypothesis Testing (or comparison of competing models).
- Prediction of observations at unobserved times or locations.
- Experimental design: Location of experimental units for optimal inference.
Types of Spatial Data

There are three main categories of spatial data (though it is not always obvious how to classify data into these categories):

- **Geostatistical data**: When a spatial process that varies continuously is observed only at points.
- **Lattice (areal) data**: When a spatial process is observed at countably many (often finitely many) locations. Usually this arises due to aggregation of some sort, e.g. averages over a pixel.
- **Spatial point processes**: When a spatial process is observed at points and the locations themselves are of interest. Typical research questions are: Is the pattern random or does it exhibit clustering?
(1) Concentrations of PM2.5 (pollutants) across the U.S.
(2) Wheat flowering dates by location (below):

Courtesy Plant Pathology, PSU and North Dakota State.
Areal/Lattice Data: Examples

(1) Pixel values from remote sensing e.g. forest cover in PA.
(2) Event rates by county (e.g. below).

Courtesy MN Cancer Surveillance System, Dept. of Health
Although geostatistical models and areal/lattice data models are usually talked about separately, they can be viewed in a unified framework.

- **Spatial process at location** \( s \) is \( Z(s) = \mu(s) + w(s) \) where:
  - \( \mu(s) \) is the mean. Often \( \mu(s) = X(s)\beta \), \( X(s) \) are covariates at \( s \) and \( \beta \) is a vector of coefficients.

- **Model dependence among spatial random variables** by imposing it on the errors (the \( w(s) \)’s).

- **For** \( n \) locations, \( s_1, \ldots, s_n \), \( w = (w(s_1), \ldots, w(s_n))^T \) can be jointly modeled via a zero mean Gaussian process (GP), for geostatistics, or Gaussian Markov random field (GMRF), for areal/lattice data.
Gaussian Processes

- Gaussian Process (GP): Let $\Theta$ be the parameters for covariance matrix $\Sigma(\Theta)$. Then:
  \[
  w | \Theta \sim N(0, \Sigma(\Theta)).
  \]
  This implies:
  \[
  Z | \Theta, \beta \sim N(X\beta, \Sigma(\Theta))
  \]
- We have used the simplest multivariate distribution (the multivariate normal). We will specify $\Sigma(\Theta)$ so it reflects spatial dependence.
- Need to ensure that $\Sigma(\Theta)$ is positive definite for this distribution to be valid, so we assume some valid parametric forms for specifying the covariance.
Consider the popular **exponential** covariance function.

Let $\Sigma(\Theta) = \kappa I + \psi H(\phi)$ where $I$ is the $N \times N$ identify matrix. Note that $\Theta = (\kappa, \psi, \phi)$ and $\kappa, \psi, \phi > 0$.

The $i, j$th element of the matrix $H$,

$$H(\|s_i - s_j\|; \phi)_{ij} = \exp(-\phi\|s_i - s_j\|).$$

Note: covariance between $i, j$th random variables depends only on distance between $s_i$ and $s_j$, and does not depend on the locations themselves (implying *stationarity*) and only depends on the magnitude of the distance, not on direction (implying *isotropy*).

Extremely flexible models, relaxing these conditions, can be easily obtained though fitting them can be more difficult.
The model completely specifies the likelihood, $\mathcal{L}(Z|\Theta, \beta)$. This means we can do likelihood-based inference:

- If we observe $Z$, can find maximum likelihood estimates of $\Theta, \beta$ by maximizing $\mathcal{L}(Z; \Theta, \beta)$ with respect to $\Theta, \beta$.
- Using the MLEs of $\Theta, \beta$, and conditioning on the observed values $Z$, we can easily estimate the value of this process at other locations (‘kriging’ with Gaussian processes.)

If we place priors on $\Theta, \beta$, we can do Bayesian inference:

- Simulate from the posterior distribution, $\pi(\Theta, \beta \mid Z)$ via Markov chain Monte Carlo (tutorial tomorrow!)
- Using sampled values of $\Theta, \beta$, conditioning on $Z$, can easily simulate value of this process at other locations.
- Bayesian version incorporates variability due to uncertainty about $\Theta, \beta$. 
Gaussian Processes: Computing

- **For likelihood based inference:** R’s `geoR` package by Ribeiro and Diggle.
- **For Bayesian inference:**
  - R’s `spBayes` package by Finley, Banerjee and Carlin.
  - `WINBUGS` software by Spiegelhalter, Thomas and Best.
- **Very flexible packages:** can fit many versions of the linear Gaussian spatial model. Also reasonably well documented.
- **Warning:** With large datasets (>1000 data points), matrix operations (of order $O(N^3)$) become very slow. Either need to be clever with coding or modeling. Above software will not work.
Recall that we are specifying dependence on the spatial data $Z$ via $w$ where $Z(s) = \mu(s) + w(s)$.

We could stick to geostatistical modeling (using, say, distances between centroids of subregions.)

This is often not reasonable. For e.g. centroids of subregions may lie outside the subregion.

Modeling the process through its adjacencies may make more sense.

Adjacent (neighboring) regions/pixels are thought to be more strongly related than those further away so, again, concerned with incorporating dependence into modeling.
Dependence in such cases can be imposed by a **conditionally specified modeled**. Idea is as follows: What is the distribution of the random variable at this location *given* that I know the values of the random variable at neighboring locations?

**Caution:** Need to ensure that conditional specification of distribution results in valid joint distribution. Theory relies on Hammersley-Clifford theorem and Gibbs distributions (cf. Besag, 1974).

**Best to use well studied conditionally specified models.** For example, we could use Gaussian Markov random field models.
We model the conditional distribution of \( Z(s_i) \mid Z(s_{-i}) \)
where \( Z(s_{-i}) \) denotes all \( Z(s_j) \) except \( Z(s_i) \).

Markov property: \( Z(s_i) \mid Z(s_{-i}) \) is the same as
\( Z(s_i) \mid Z(s_{j \sim i}) \) where \( j \sim i \) indicates that \( s_j \) is a neighbor of \( s_i \). The distribution of \( Z(s_i) \) is *conditionally independent* of all the other values, *given* its neighboring values.

This is therefore a local specification, although the model indirectly implies a global specification, i.e., a joint distribution (all the \( Z(s) \)’s will still be dependent on one another.)
If we assume all conditional distributions are Normal (with appropriate conditions on variance parameters), resulting distribution is a multivariate normal.

See any standard references on GMRFs for (slightly messy) details.

If we let $\Theta$ be the parameters for the precision matrix $Q(\Theta)$. Then:

$$Z|\Theta, \beta \sim N(X\beta, Q^{-1}(\Theta))$$

Since we have a likelihood, we can (as before) find an MLE or place priors on the parameters and do Bayesian inference and estimation.
GMRF models (and more generally, conditionally specified models) have an important advantage: The matrices involved tend to be quite sparse and hence can yield considerable computational advantages over a Gaussian Process specification.

GeoDa package at
https://www.geoda.uiuc.edu/ (free) by Luc Anselin

R’s spdep package by Roger Bivand et al.

Bayesian inference: WINBUGS includes GeoBUGS which is useful for fitting such models.
Spatial Point Processes: Introduction

Have so far discussed the first two major categories of spatial data. The third category is also equally important and perhaps of particular interest to astronomers.

- **Spatial point process**: The *locations* where the process is observed are random variables, process itself may not be defined; if defined, it is a marked spatial point process.

- **Observation window**: the area where points of the pattern can possibly be observed. The observation window specification is vitally important since absence of points in a region where they could potentially occur is also valuable information whereas absence of points outside of an observation window does not tell us anything.
Many problems can be formulated as spatial point process problems. Consider a study of tree species biodiversity (from Møller and Waagepetersen):

- **Information available:**
  - Locations of (potentially hundreds of thousands) of trees belonging to potentially thousands of species.
  - Covariate information such as altitude, norm of altitude gradient etc.

- **Some questions of interest:**
  - Is the pattern completely random?
  - If not completely random, can an explanatory point process model be fit to it?
  - How is the point pattern related to the covariates?
Locations of pine saplings in a Swedish forest.
Location and diameter of Longleaf pines (marked point process).

Are they randomly scattered or are they clustered?

(from Baddeley and Turner R package, 2006)
Questions related to spatial randomness of process

Some examples:

- Is there regular spacing between locations where process was observed or do locations show a tendency to cluster together? Need to fit clustering models and perhaps do some hypothesis testing.

- Does the probability of observing the event vary according to some factors? (Need to relate predictors to observations in a regression type setting.)

- Can we estimate the overall count from only partial observations? Need to fit a model to observations and make estimates/predictions based on fitted model.
Questions related to spatial randomness (contd)

Assume multiple (sometimes competing) models for the process. For instance, when studying point patterns of observations:

- Perhaps non-homogenous environmental conditions (associated with locations) are related to the presence/absence.
- Maybe the pattern arose by virtue of how the process spreads (e.g. clustering of ‘offspring’ near ‘parents’)?
- Note that hypothesis testing alone is inadequate for most of these questions. Can try to resolve these by fitting appropriate models where intensity of the process is modeled according to one of the models above.
There appear to be many important problems where spatial point process modeling may be the most appropriate approach.

However, the complexity of the theory along with computational difficulties have made it much less ‘friendly’ to applications than geostatistical models or areal models.

Recent methodological developments and software such as the R library `spatstat` (A.Baddeley and Turner) are slowly opening up greater possibilities for practical modeling and analyses.
Classical Approaches

- Relatively small spatial point patterns.
- Assumption of stationarity is central and non-parametric methods based on summary statistics play a major role.
- Lack of software that works for classes of problems (software has been tailored to specific problems).
- In recent years, fast computing resources and better algorithms have allowed for analyses of larger point pattern data sets.
Some definitions for spatial point processes

- A spatial point process is a stochastic process, a realization of which consists of a countable set of points \( \{s_1, \ldots, s_n\} \) in a bounded region \( S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2 \).
- The points \( s_i \) are called events.
- For a region \( A \subseteq S \), \( N(A) = \#(s_i \in A) \).
- The intensity measure \( \Lambda(A) = E(N(A)) \) for any \( A \subseteq S \).
- If measure \( \Lambda(A) \) has a density with respect to Lebesgue measure (we will typically assume this holds), then it can be written as:

\[
\Lambda(A) = \int_A \lambda(s)ds \quad \text{for all } A \subseteq S.
\]

\( \lambda(s) \) is called the intensity function.
The process is **stationary** if for any integer $k$ and regions $A_i$, $i = 1, \ldots, k$, the joint distribution of $N(A_1), \ldots, N(A_k)$ is translation-invariant, i.e., the joint distribution of $N(A_1), \ldots, N(A_k) = \text{joint distribution of } N(A_1 + y), \ldots, N(A_k + y)$ for arbitrary $y$.

The process is **isotropic** if for any integer $k$ and regions $A_i$, $i = 1, \ldots, k$, the joint distribution of $N(A_1), \ldots, N(A_k)$ is invariant to rotation through an arbitrary angle, i.e., there is no directional effect.
Spatial point process modeling

Spatial point process models can be specified by:

- A deterministic intensity function (analogous to generalized linear model framework)
- A random intensity function (analogous to random effects models).

Two classes of models:

- Poisson Processes \( \approx \) provide models for no interaction patterns.
- Cox processes \( \approx \) provide models for aggregated point patterns.

Poisson process: Fundamental point process model — basis for exploratory tools and constructing more advanced point process models.
Homogeneous Poisson Process

Poisson process on $X$ defined on $S$ with intensity measure $\Lambda$ and intensity function $\lambda$, satisfies for any bounded region $B \in S$ with $\Lambda(B) > 0$:

1. $N(B) \sim \text{Poisson}(\Lambda(B))$.
2. Conditional on $N(B)$, the points (event locations) $X_B = \{X_1, \ldots, X_{N(B)}\}$ in the bounded region are (i.i.d.) and each uniformly distributed in the region $B$.

- **Homogeneous Poisson process**: The intensity function, $\lambda(s)$ is constant for all $s \in S$.
- Poisson process is a model for complete spatial randomness since $X_A$ and $X_B$ are independent for all $A, B \in S$ that are disjoint.
The intensity $\lambda(s)$ specifies the mean number of events per unit area as a function of location $s$.

Intensity is sometimes called the ‘density’ in other fields such as ecology (this term would be confused with a probability density, which is why it is not used in statistics).

It is important as a null model and as a simple model from which to build other models.

Homogeneous Poisson process is model for complete spatial randomness against which spatial point patterns are compared.
Some notes:

1. **Stationarity** ⇒ $\lambda(s)$ is constant ⇒ $X$ is isotropic.
2. **Random thinning** of a point process is obtained by deleting the events in series of mutually independent Bernoulli trials. Random thinning of Poisson process results in another Poisson process.

- Independence properties of Poisson process makes it unrealistic for most applications. However, it is mathematically tractable and hence easy to use/study.
- For modeling, usually consider log model of intensity function (to preserve non-negativity of intensity):
  \[ \log \lambda(s) = z(s)\beta^T \]
Let $ds$ denote a small region containing location $s$.

**First-order intensity function of a spatial point process:**

$$
\lambda(s) = \lim_{ds \to 0} \frac{E(N(ds))}{|ds|}.
$$

**Second-order intensity function of a spatial point process:**

$$
\lambda^{(2)}(s_1, s_2) = \lim_{ds_1 \to 0} \lim_{ds_2 \to 0} \frac{E\{N(ds_1)N(ds_2)\}}{|ds_1||ds_2|}.
$$

**Covariance density of a spatial point process**

$$
\gamma(s_1, s_2) = \lambda^{(2)}(s_1, s_2) - \lambda(s_1)\lambda(s_2).
$$
Assuming stationarity and isotropy:

- **Constant intensity:** If \( s \in A \), \( \lambda(s) = \lambda = E(N(A))/|A| \), constant for all \( A \).

- **Second order intensity** depends only on distance between locations \( s_1, s_2 \): \( \lambda^{(2)}(s_1, s_2) = \lambda^{(2)}(\|s_1 - s_2\|) \).

- \( \gamma(d) = \lambda^{(2)}(d) - \lambda^2 \), where \( d = \|s_1 - s_2\| \).

Hard to interpret \( \lambda^{(2)} \). Instead, consider the *reduced second moment function*, the K-function:

\[
K(d) = 2\pi \frac{1}{\lambda^2} \int_0^d \lambda^{(2)}(r)dr.
\]
Still assuming stationarity and isotropy:

\[ K(d) = \frac{1}{\lambda} E(\text{number of events within distance } d \text{ of an arbitrary event}). \]

- Easier to interpret than second-order intensity and by dividing by \( \lambda \), eliminate dependence on the intensity.
  - If process is clustered: Each event is likely to be surrounded by more events from the same cluster. \( K(d) \) will therefore be \textit{relatively large} for small values of \( d \).
  - If process is randomly distributed in space: Each event is likely to be surrounded by empty space. For small values of \( d \), \( K(d) \) will be \textit{relatively small}.
- Can obtain an intuitive estimator for \( K(d) \) for a given data set.
Let $\lambda$ be the intensity of the process.

- Effective method for seeing whether the process is completely random in space.

$$ K(d) = \frac{\text{Mean number of events within distance } d \text{ of an event}}{\lambda} $$

- This can be estimated by

$$ \hat{K}(d) = \frac{\sum_{i \neq j} w_{ij} I(d_{ij} \leq d)}{\hat{\lambda}} $$

where $\hat{\lambda} = N/|A|$ with $|A|$ as the total area of the observation window and $N$ is the observed count.

- Note: $K$ can also be viewed as an integral of the two point correlation function as used by astronomers (cf. Martinez and Saar, 2002).
Estimating Ripley’s $K$ Function

Three circles of radius $d = 0.2$ each have been drawn with centers located at 3 locations where the process was observed. Note that they may overlap and also part of the circle may be outside the obervation window. Circles are drawn for every point, number of points within each circle is counted.
What are the weights ($w_{ij}$s)?

Just a way to account for edge effects: For events close to the edge of the observation window, we cannot observe the events within radius $d$.

When we are estimating the $K(d)$ corresponding to a circle centered at location of an event at $s_i$, and we are looking at an event at location $s_j$, the weight $w_{ij}$ is the reciprocal of the portion of the circle of radius $d$ that is inside the region. If circle is completely contained in the region, $w_{ij}$ is 1; the smaller the portion contained in the region, the larger the weight $w_{ij}$ assigned (to ‘correct’ for the fact that the count was only for an area smaller than $\pi d^2$).
Ripley’s $K$ Function (contd.)

- Under complete spatial randomness (homogeneous spatial Poisson point process):

$$E(K(d)) = \pi d^2.$$ 

- Easy to see why (simple proof):
  1. Location of events in a Poisson process are independent so occurrence of one event does not affect other events.
  2. Since $E($number of events in a unit area$)=\lambda$, $E($number of events in area within radius $d)=\lambda \pi d^2$.
  3. $E(K(d)) = \frac{1}{\lambda} \lambda \pi d^2 = \pi d^2$.

- Once we have obtained $\hat{K}(d)$, we can plot $\hat{K}(d)$ versus $d$.
- Compare it to the plot we would have obtained under complete spatial randomness.
Inhomogeneous Poisson processes

Useful for modeling spatial process that varies in intensity over space. An inhomogeneous Poisson process with intensity $\lambda$ satisfies:

- Number of events $N(A)$ in an observation window $A$ is Poisson with mean
  \[ \Lambda(A) = \int_A \lambda(s) ds, \]
  equivalently, \[ P(N(A) = N) = \frac{1}{N!} e^{-\Lambda(A)}(\Lambda(A))^N. \]
- Conditional on $N(A)$, event locations are independently sampled from a probability density function proportional to $\lambda(s)$. 

Ripley’s $K$ for homogeneous Poisson Process

Process was simulated with intensity function $\lambda(x, y) = 100$. homogeneous Poisson Process

**Ripley’s K**

**blue**=K function under complete spatial randomness
black (and red and green) are various versions of estimates of the K function
Ripley’s $K$ for inhomogeneous Poisson Process (Eq.1)

Process was simulated with intensity function

$$\lambda(x, y) = 100 \exp(3x).$$

Inhomogeneous Poisson Process

Ripley’s $K$

- blue = $K$ function under complete spatial randomness
- black (and red and green) are various versions of estimates of the $K$ function
Ripley’s $K$ for inhomogeneous Poisson Process (Eg.2)

Process was simulated with intensity function

$$\lambda(x, y) = 100 \exp(y).$$

Inhomogeneous Poisson Process

Ripley’s $K$

\[ \text{blue} = \text{K function under complete spatial randomness} \]

black (and red and green) are various versions of estimates of

the K function
Example: Galaxy clustering (Sloan Digital Sky Survey)

Distribution of 67,676 galaxies in two slices of the sky showing strong anisotropic clustering (Tegmark et al. 2004).

Bottom: Two-point correlation function showing the faint feature around 100 megaparsec scales revealing cosmological Baryonic Acoustic Oscillations (Eisenstein et al. 2005).
As can be seen from Eq.2, even for strong departures from complete spatial randomness, difference between Ripley’s K and its expectation under complete spatial randomness can be small.

Plot of K function may not suffice. Instead, consider a linearizing transformation:

\[ L(d) = \sqrt{K(d)/\pi} - d. \]

- Complete spatial randomness: \( E(L(d)) = 0 \).
- Clustering: \( E(L(d)) > 0 \).
- Regular spacing: \( E(L(d)) < 0 \).
Ripley’s $K$ function: robustness to thinning

- As pointed out before, random thinning of a Poisson process results in a Poisson process.
- Also, random thinning reduces the intensity and the number of events within a distance $d$ of a location by the same multiplicative factor.
- Since $K(d)$ is the ratio of the number of events within a distance $d$ and the intensity of the process, it is robust to incomplete ascertainment (random thinning).
- Hence, $K(d)$ does not change as long as missing cases are missing at random (missingness does not depend on location).
Inference for Poisson process

We would like to be able to perform statistical inference for a point process. By definition, Poisson process on $\mathbf{X}$ defined on $S$ with intensity measure $\Lambda$ and intensity function $\lambda$ satisfies for any bounded region $B \in S$ with $\Lambda(B) > 0$:

- $N(B) \sim \text{Poisson}(\Lambda(B))$, i.e.
  \[
  f(N(B)|\Lambda(B)) = \frac{\exp(-\Lambda(B))\Lambda(B)^{N(B)}}{N(B)!}
  \]

- Conditional on $N(B)$, the points (event locations) $\mathbf{X}_B = \{X_1, \ldots, X_{N(B)}\}$ in the bounded region are (i.i.d.) and each uniformly distributed in the region $B$:
  \[
  f(X_1, \ldots, X_{N(B)}|N(B)) = \prod_{i=1}^{N(B)} f(X_i|N(B)) = \prod_{i=1}^{N(B)} \frac{\lambda(X_i)}{\int_B \lambda(s) ds}
  \]
The joint distribution is then:

\[ f(X_1, \ldots, X_{N(B)}, N(B)) = \exp(-\Lambda(B))\Lambda(B)^{N(B)} \frac{\prod_{i=1}^{N(B)} \lambda(X_i)}{N(B)!} \int_B \lambda(s)ds \]

\[ = \exp(-\Lambda(B))\Lambda(B)^{N(B)} \frac{\prod_{i=1}^{N(B)} \lambda(X_i)}{N(B)!} \exp(-\Lambda(B)) \frac{\prod_{i=1}^{N(B)} \lambda(X_i)}{N(B)!} \]

For instance, this means that for a region \( F \in S \) and a point process \( X \):

\[ P(X \in F, N = n) = \int_S 1(X \in F) \frac{\exp(-\Lambda(B))}{n!} \prod_{i=1}^{n} \lambda(X_i) dX \]

and \( P(X \in F) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} P(X \in F, N = n) \).
As before, denote covariates at a location $s$ by $X(s)$. Impact of spatially varying covariates on a spatial point pattern may be modeled through the intensity function

$$\lambda(s) = \exp(\beta X(s))$$

Inhomogeneous Poisson process with this intensity is a modulated Poisson process.

Examples of $X(s)$: spatially varying environmental variables such as elevation, precipitation etc., known functions of the spatial coordinates or distances to known environmental features (e.g. distance to nearest road).

Important question: How is $X$ related to the spatial point process intensity, i.e., what is $\beta$?
Parameter estimation for modulated Poisson process

Maximum likelihood estimation using observed \( X \) on a region \( S \):

- The likelihood for the simple linear model is (from before):

\[
\mathcal{L}(X, N; \beta) = \frac{\exp(\Lambda(S))}{N(B)!} \prod_{i=1}^{N(B)} \lambda(X_i).
\]

- MLE for \( \beta \): Find \( \hat{\beta} \) that maximizes likelihood. This may be difficult, need to use Newton-Raphson or other optimization algorithm.

- Note that an assumption above is that covariates are available everywhere.
Impractical to assume covariates are observed for every observed event and all locations in observation window.

Need to turn to other approaches. Natural approach is to estimate covariate information based on observed covariate information (cf. Rathbun, 1996).

Use kriging (a form of spatial interpolation, falling under ‘Geostatistics’) to predict the values of the covariates at locations of observed events and at unsampled locations.

Substitute predicted values of the covariates into the likelihood.

Maximize this approximate likelihood to obtain coefficient estimates, $\hat{\beta}$. 
The Cox process or the *doubly stochastic Poisson process* (Cox, 1955) is a more flexible and realistic class of models than the Poisson process model.

- Natural extension of a Poisson process: Consider the intensity function of the Poisson process as a realization of a random field. We assume $\Lambda(A) = \int_A \lambda(s) ds$.
  - Stage 1: $N(A|\Lambda) \sim \text{Poisson}(\Lambda(A))$.
  - Stage 2: $\lambda(s)|\Theta \sim f(\cdot; \Theta)$ so that $\lambda$ is stochastic, a nonnegative random field parametrized by $\Theta$.

- Simple case: If $\lambda(s)$ is deterministic, $X$ is a Poisson process with intensity $\lambda(s)$. 

---
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Point patterns may require a flexible description that allows for the points to interact.

Markov point processes are models for point processes with interacting points (attractive or repulsive behavior can be modeled).

‘Markovian’ in that intensity of an event at some location $s$, given the realization of the process in the remainder of the region, depends only on information about events within some distance of $s$.

Origins in statistical physics, used for modeling large interacting particle systems.
Inference for spatial point process models

- Maximum likelihood for all but the simplest spatial point process model is analytically intractable. Maximum pseudolikelihood (MPL) is a useful approximation to maximum likelihood.
- For some models, can use Newton-Raphson or some variant but often need (Markov chain) Monte Carlo maximum likelihood (MCML), also referred to as simulated maximum likelihood (SML).
- No ‘automatic’ methods exist for fitting such models.
- Simulating from a point process model is often easy but inference (estimating a point process model based on observations) is usually more difficult. Challenging to fit flexible new models.
Spatial point processes: computing

- **R command:** `spatstat` function `ppm` fits models that include spatial trend, interpoint interaction, and dependence on covariates, generally using MPL.

- MPL often works well in practice (Baddeley, 2005). Caveat: MPL can work very poorly in some cases, particularly when there is strong dependence.

- MPLE can be used to get a guess for MLE before doing something more elaborate like Markov chain Maximum Likelihood (cf. C.J.Geyer’s chapter in “MCMC in Practice”, 1996 for a gentle introduction.)

- There is not much in the way of computing resources for fitting Bayesian models, even though they are becoming increasingly common.
Summary: spatial data types and associated models

General spatial process: \( \{ Z(\mathbf{s}) : \mathbf{s} \in D \} \), \( D \) is set of locations.

- **Geostatistics:** \( D \) is a fixed subset of \( \mathbb{R}^2 \) (or \( \mathbb{R}^3 \) in 3D case).
  \( Z(\mathbf{s}) \) is a random variable at each location \( \mathbf{s} \in D \).
  Usual (basic) model: **Gaussian process**.

- **Areal/lattice data:** \( D = \{ \mathbf{s}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{s}_N \} \) is a fixed regular or irregular lattice, on \( \mathbb{R}^2 \) (or \( \mathbb{R}^3 \)).
  \( Z(\mathbf{s}) \) is a random variable at each location \( \mathbf{s} \in D \).
  Usual (basic) model: **Gaussian Markov random field**.

- **Spatial point process:** \( D = \{ \mathbf{s}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{s}_N \} \) is a random collection of points on the plane.
  Ordinary point process: \( Z(\mathbf{s}) \) does not exist. For marked point process, \( Z(\mathbf{s}) \) is a random variable as well. Usual (basic) models: **Poisson process**, **Cox process**.
References: Geostatistics and Lattice Processes

Geostatistics and Lattice/Areal Data:


- Cressie (1994) "Statistics for Spatial Data". This is a comprehensive guide to classical spatial statistics, but it is considerably more technical than the other two references listed here.

- S. Banerjee, B.P. Carlin and A.E. Gelfand “Hierarchical Modeling and Analysis for Spatial Data”. This is a textbook on Bayesian models for spatial data.
References: Spatial Point Processes

Spatial Point Processes:

- Baddeley and Turner’s R \texttt{spatstat} package.
- P.J.Diggle’s online lecture notes:
  
  \url{http://www.maths.lancs.ac.uk/~diggle/spatialepi/notes.ps}
References: Spatial Point Processes


Notes about the references:

1. Several of these references also cover spatiotemporal (space-time) process, that may also be of significant interest.

2. Acknowledgement: A lot of the material and examples in this tutorial were drawn from several of the listed references.