## Statistics 222, Spatial Statistics.

## Outline for the day:

1. Superthinning.
2. Exercises.
3. van Lieshout, Kriging, CAR, SAR, and ch3 examples.

No class Mon Nov6!

## With 2 models, can compare loglikelihoods across pixels or Voronoi cells.



Fig. 3. (a) Estimated rates under the Shen, Jackson and Kagan (2007) model, with epicentral locations of observed earthquakes with $M \geq 4.0$ in Southern California between January 1, 2006 and January 1, 2011 overlaid. (b) Pixel deviance plot with blue favoring model A, Helmstetter, Kagan and Jackson (2007), versus model B, Shen, Jackson and Kagan (2007). Coloration is on a linear scale. (c) Voronoi deviance plot with blue favoring model A, Helmstetter, Kagan and Jackson (2007), versus model B, Shen, Jackson and Kagan (2007). Coloration is on a linear scale.

1. Superthinning. (Clements et al., 2012)

Choose some number $\mathrm{c} \sim \operatorname{mean}(\hat{\lambda})$.
Superpose: where $\hat{\lambda}(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{x}, \mathrm{y})<\mathrm{c}$, add in points of a simulated Poisson process of rate $\mathrm{c}-\hat{\lambda}(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{x}, \mathrm{y})$.
Thin: where $\hat{\lambda}\left(\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{i}}, \mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{i}}, \mathrm{y}_{\mathrm{i}}\right)>\mathrm{c}$, keep each point $\left(\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{i}}, \mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{i}}, \mathrm{y}_{\mathrm{i}}\right)$ with prob. $\mathrm{c} / \hat{\lambda}\left(\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{i}}, \mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{i}}, \mathrm{y}_{\mathrm{i}}\right)$.


Fig. 11. One realization of super-thinned residuals for the five models considered (circles $=$ observed earthquakes; plus signs $=$ simulated points). Top-left panel $(\mathrm{a}):$ model $A$ ( $k=2.76$ ). Top-center panel (b): model $B(k=2.95)$. Top-right panel (c): model $C(k=2.73)$. Bottom-left panel (d): ETAS $(k=1.35)$. Bottom-right panel $(\mathrm{e})$ : STEP $(k=0.75)$.

1. Superthinning. (Clements et al., 2013)

Choose some number $\mathrm{c} . \operatorname{mean}(\hat{\lambda})$ at the points is a suggested default.
Superpose: where $\hat{\lambda}(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{x}, \mathrm{y})<\mathrm{c}$, add in points of a simulated Poisson process of rate $\mathrm{c}-\hat{\lambda}(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{x}, \mathrm{y})$.
Thin: where $\hat{\lambda}\left(\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{i}}, \mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{i}}, \mathrm{y}_{\mathrm{i}}\right)>\mathrm{c}$, keep each point $\left(\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{i}}, \mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{i}}, \mathrm{y}_{\mathrm{i}}\right)$ with prob. $\mathrm{c} / \hat{\lambda}\left(\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{i}}, \mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{i}}, \mathrm{y}_{\mathrm{i}}\right)$.
Result is Poisson with rate c , if the model for $\lambda$ is correct.

(a) Super-thinned residuals Model A.

(b) Super-thinned residuals Model B.

(c) Super-thinned residuals Model C.

Exercises. Superposition.
Suppose $\mathrm{N}_{1}$ is a Poisson process with rate 3 , and $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ is a Poisson process with rate $2+\mathrm{x}+4 \mathrm{t}$, independent of $\mathrm{N}_{1}$, and both are on $[0,10] \times[0,1] \times[0,1]$. $\mathrm{t} \quad \mathrm{x} \quad \mathrm{y}$.
Let $\mathrm{M}=\mathrm{N}_{1}+\mathrm{N}_{2}$. Is M a Poisson process? What is its intensity?
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Suppose $\mathrm{N}_{1}$ is a Poisson process with rate 3 , and $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ is a Poisson process with rate $2+\mathrm{x}+4 \mathrm{t}$, independent of $\mathrm{N}_{1}$, and both are on $[0,10] \times[0,1] \times[0,1]$. $t \quad x \quad y$.
Let $\mathrm{M}=\mathrm{N}_{1}+\mathrm{N}_{2}$. Is M a Poisson process? What is its intensity?
For any disjoint measurable sets $\mathrm{B}_{1}, \mathrm{~B}_{2}, \ldots$, $\mathrm{M}\left(\mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{i}}\right)=\mathrm{N}_{1}\left(\mathrm{~B}_{\mathrm{i}}\right)+\mathrm{N}_{2}\left(\mathrm{~B}_{\mathrm{i}}\right)$ is independent of $\left\{\mathrm{N}_{1}\left(\mathrm{~B}_{\mathrm{j}}\right), \mathrm{j} \neq \mathrm{i}\right\}$ and $\left\{\mathrm{N}_{2}\left(\mathrm{~B}_{\mathrm{j}}\right), \mathrm{j} \neq \mathrm{i}\right\}$ and thus is independent of $\left\{\mathrm{N}_{1}\left(\mathrm{~B}_{\mathrm{j}}\right)+\mathrm{N}_{2}\left(\mathrm{~B}_{\mathrm{j}}\right), \mathrm{j} \neq \mathrm{i}\right\}$.

So yes, M is a Poisson process and since $\mathrm{EM}(\mathrm{B})=\mathrm{EN}_{1}(\mathrm{~B})+$ $\mathrm{EN}_{2}(\mathrm{~B}), \mathrm{M}$ has rate $5+\mathrm{x}+4 \mathrm{t}$.

Exercises.
Suppose N is homogeneous Poisson process with rate 1, and M is a clustered Hawkes process.

Both M and N have 40 points on $\mathrm{B}=[0,10] \times[0,1] \times[0,1]$
$t \quad x \quad y$.
Let $\mathrm{v} 1=$ the average size of a Voronoi cell in a Voronoi tessellation of N , and $\mathrm{v} 2=$ the average size of a Voronoi cell in a Voronoi tesselation of M . Which is bigger, v1 or v 2 , or will they be the same?
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Suppose N is homogeneous Poisson process with rate 1, and M is a clustered Hawkes process.

Both M and N have 40 points on $\mathrm{B}=[0,10] \times[0,1] \times[0,1]$
$t \quad x \quad y$.
Let $\mathrm{v} 1=$ the average size of a Voronoi cell in a Voronoi tessellation of N , and $\mathrm{v} 2=$ the average size of a Voronoi cell in a Voronoi tesselation of M .

Which is bigger, v1 or v2, or will they be the same?

The same, since $\mathrm{v} 1=\mathrm{v} 2=1 / 4$. Each cell has one point, and the 40 cells occupy an area of size 10 .

