

# Some recap and hopefully useful points

Alan Gelfand<sup>1</sup> and Andrew O. Finley<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of Statistical Science, Duke University, Durham, North Carolina.

<sup>2</sup> Department of Forestry, Michigan State University, Lansing, Michigan.

September 9, 2014

## Some hopefully useful points

- More on covariance functions
- Kriging
- Priors and identifiability
- Last remarks

## The exponential model

- The sill is only reached asymptotically, meaning that strictly speaking, the range is infinite.
- To define an "effective range", for  $t > 0$ , we see that as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $\gamma(t) \rightarrow \tau^2 + \sigma^2$  which would become  $C(0)$ .

- Again,

$$C(t) = \begin{cases} \tau^2 + \sigma^2 & \text{if } t = 0 \\ \sigma^2 \exp(-\phi t) & \text{if } t > 0 \end{cases} .$$

- Then the correlation between two points distance  $t$  apart is  $\exp(-\phi t)$ ;
- We define the *effective range*,  $t_0$ , as the distance at which this correlation = 0.05. Setting  $\exp(-\phi t_0)$  equal to this value we obtain  $t_0 \approx 3/\phi$ , since  $\log(0.05) \approx -3$ .

## The Matèrn correlation function

- The Matèrn is a very flexible isotropic family:

$$C(t) = \begin{cases} \frac{\sigma^2}{2^{\nu-1}\Gamma(\nu)} (2\sqrt{\nu}t\phi)^\nu K_\nu(2\sqrt{(\nu)}t\phi) & \text{if } t > 0 \\ \tau^2 + \sigma^2 & \text{if } t = 0 \end{cases}$$

$K_\nu$  is the modified Bessel function of order  $\nu$

- $\nu$  is a smoothness parameter:
  - $\nu = 1/2 \Rightarrow$  exponential;  $\nu \rightarrow \infty \Rightarrow$  Gaussian;  $\nu = 3/2 \Rightarrow$  convenient closed form for  $C(t), \gamma(t)$
  - in two-dimensions, the greatest integer in  $\nu$  indicates the number of times process realizations will be mean-square differentiable.

## A bit more on covariance functions

- To be a valid covariance function the function must be positive definite
- Whether a function is positive definite or not can depend upon dimension
- $c$  is a valid covariance functions if and only if it is the characteristic function of a symmetric about 0 random variable (Bochner's Theorem), i.e.,  
$$c(\mathbf{h}) = \int \cos(\mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{h}) G(d\mathbf{w})$$
- Fourier transform, spectral distribution, spectral density
- In principle, the inversion formula could be used to *check* if  $c(\mathbf{h})$  is valid

## Constructing valid covariance functions

Construct valid covariance functions by using properties of characteristic functions

- multiply valid covariance functions (corresponds to summing independent random variables)
- mixing covariance functions (corresponds to mixing distributions)
- convolving covariance functions (if  $c_1$  and  $c_2$  are valid then  $c_{12}(\mathbf{s}) = \int c_1(\mathbf{s} - \mathbf{u})c_2(\mathbf{u})d\mathbf{u}$  is valid).
- There are conditions for valid variograms but difficult and not of interest for us.

## Classical spatial prediction or “Kriging”

- Named by Matheron (1963) in honor of D.G. Krige, a South African mining engineer whose seminal work on empirical methods for geostatistical data inspired the general approach.
- Optimal spatial prediction: given observations of a random field  $\mathbf{y} = (y(\mathbf{s}_1), \dots, y(\mathbf{s}_n))'$ , predict the variable  $y$  at a site  $\mathbf{s}_0$  where it has not been observed
- Under squared error loss, the best linear prediction minimizes  $E[y(\mathbf{s}_0) - (\sum \ell_i y(\mathbf{s}_i) + \delta_0)]^2$  over  $\delta_0$  and the  $\ell_i$ .
- With an estimate of  $\gamma$ , one immediately obtains the ordinary kriging estimate.
- Other than intrinsic stationarity, no distributional assumptions are required for the  $y(\mathbf{s}_i)$ .

## Kriging with Gaussian processes

- Given covariate values  $\mathbf{x}(\mathbf{s}_i)$ ,  $i = 0, 1, \dots, n$ , suppose

$$\mathbf{y} = X\boldsymbol{\beta} + \boldsymbol{\epsilon}, \text{ where } \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \sim N(\mathbf{0}, \Sigma) .$$

- For a spatial covariance structure having no nugget effect, we specify  $\Sigma$  as

$$\Sigma = \sigma^2 H(\phi) \text{ where } (H(\phi))_{ij} = \rho(\phi; d_{ij}) ,$$

where  $d_{ij} = \|\mathbf{s}_i - \mathbf{s}_j\|$ .

- For a model having nugget effect, we instead set

$$\Sigma = \sigma^2 H(\phi) + \tau^2 I.$$



## Gaussian kriging cont.

- We seek the function  $g(\mathbf{y})$  that minimizes the mean-squared prediction error,  $E \left[ (y(\mathbf{s}_0) - g(\mathbf{y}))^2 \mid \mathbf{y} \right]$ .
- $g(\mathbf{y}) = E[y(\mathbf{s}_0) \mid \mathbf{y}]$ .
- Intuitive from a Bayesian point of view, since this  $g(\mathbf{y})$  is just the *posterior mean* of  $y(\mathbf{s}_0)$ !
- Using standard conditional normal distribution calculations, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} E[y(\mathbf{s}_0) \mid \mathbf{y}] &= \mathbf{x}_0^T \boldsymbol{\beta} + \boldsymbol{\gamma}^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} (\mathbf{y} - X\boldsymbol{\beta}), \\ \text{and } Var[Y(\mathbf{s}_0) \mid \mathbf{y}] &= \sigma^2 + \tau^2 - \boldsymbol{\gamma}^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\gamma}. \end{aligned}$$

## Issues

- These are not estimators; They are really  $E[y(\mathbf{s}_0)|\mathbf{y}, \boldsymbol{\theta}]$  and  $Var[y(\mathbf{s}_0)|\mathbf{y}, \boldsymbol{\theta}]$ . Parameters are unknown
- Plug in estimates of the parameter?
- Estimators are no longer linear, no longer unbiased, don't account for the uncertainty in the parameter estimates
- Can we do satisfying inference with these estimators?
- A cleaner way: the posterior predictive distribution of  $y(\mathbf{s}_0)|\mathbf{y}$

## Priors

- Again, basic geostatistical model:

$$y(\mathbf{s}) = \mathbf{x}^T \boldsymbol{\beta} + \omega(\mathbf{s}) + \epsilon(\mathbf{s})$$

- The likelihood is given by:

$$\mathbf{y}|\boldsymbol{\theta} \sim N(X\boldsymbol{\beta}, \sigma^2 H(\phi) + \tau^2 I)$$

- Typically, independent priors are chosen for the parameters:  $p(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = p(\boldsymbol{\beta})p(\sigma^2)p(\tau^2)p(\phi)$  Useful candidates are multivariate normal for  $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ , and inverse gamma for  $\sigma^2$  and  $\tau^2$ .
- Specification of  $p(\phi)$  depends upon choice of  $\rho$  function; a uniform or discrete prior is usually selected.

## Priors cont.

- Informativeness:  $p(\beta)$  can be “flat” (improper)
- Without nugget ( $\tau^2$ ), can't *identify* both  $\sigma^2$  and  $\phi$  (Zhang, 2004). With Matérn, can identify the product  $(\sigma^2\phi)^\nu$ . So an informative prior on at least one of these parameters
- With  $\tau^2$ ,  $\phi$  and at least one of  $\sigma^2$  and  $\tau^2$  require informative priors.
- If the prior on  $\beta, \sigma^2, \phi$  is of the form  $\frac{p(\phi)}{\sigma^2}^{a+1}$  with  $\pi(\cdot)$  proper, then, improper posterior if  $a < 2$
- Shows the problem with using  $IG(\epsilon, \epsilon)$  priors for  $\sigma^2$  - “nearly” improper. Safer is  $IG(a, b)$  with  $a \geq 1$

## Last remarks

- We are modeling with spatial random effects
- Introducing these in the **transformed mean** encourages means of spatial variables at proximate locations to be close to each other
- Marginal spatial dependence is induced between, say,  $y(\mathbf{s})$  and  $y(\mathbf{s}')$ , but observed  $y(\mathbf{s})$  and  $y(\mathbf{s}')$  need not be *close* to each other
- Second stage spatial modeling is attractive for spatial explanation in the *mean*
- First stage spatial modeling more appropriate to encourage proximate observations to be similar.