

Point processes, spatial–temporal

Frederic Paik Schoenberg, David R. Brillinger & Peter Guttorp

Volume 3, pp 1573–1577

in

Encyclopedia of Environmetrics

(ISBN 0471 899976)

Edited by

Abdel H. El-Shaarawi and Walter W. Piegorsch

© John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, Chichester, 2002

Point processes, spatial–temporal

A spatial–temporal point process (also called space–time or spatio-temporal point process) is a random collection of points, where each point represents the time and location of an event. Examples of events include incidence of disease, sightings or births of a species, or the occurrences of fires, earthquakes, lightning strikes, tsunamis, or volcanic eruptions. Typically the spatial locations are recorded in three spatial coordinates, e.g. longitude, latitude, and height or depth, though sometimes only one or two spatial coordinates are available or of interest. Figure 1 is an illustration of a realization of a spatial–temporal point process with one spatial coordinate depicted. Figure 2 displays some point process data consisting of microearthquake origin times and epicenters in Parkfield, CA, between 1988 and 1995, recorded by the US High-Resolution Seismographic Station Network [16]. Figure 3 displays the centroids of wildfires occurring between 1876 and 1996 in Los Angeles County, CA, recorded by the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works (times of the events not shown).

Characterizations

A spatial–temporal point process N is mathematically defined as a random measure on a region $S \subseteq \mathbb{R} \times$

\mathbb{R}^3 of space–time, taking values in the non-negative integers \mathbb{Z}^+ (or infinity). In this framework the measure $N(A)$ represents the number of points falling in the subset A of S . For the set A in Figure 1, for example, the value of $N(A)$ is 2. Attention is typically restricted to points in some time interval $[T_0, T_1]$, and to processes with only a finite number of points in any compact subset of S .

Traditionally the points of a point process are thought to be indistinguishable, other than by their times and locations. Often, however, there is other important information to be stored along with each point. For example, one may wish to analyze a list of points in time and space where a member of a certain species was observed, along with the size or age of the organism, or alternatively a catalog of arrival times and locations of hurricanes along with the amounts of damage attributed to each. Such processes may be viewed as *marked* spatial–temporal point processes, i.e. random collections of points,




Figure 1 Spatial–temporal point process




Figure 2 Epicenters and times of Parkfield microearthquakes, 1988–1995



Figure 3 Centroids of recorded Los Angeles County wildfires, 1878–1996

where each point has associated with it a further random variable called a mark.

Much of the theory of spatial–temporal point processes carries over from that of spatial point processes (*see Point processes, spatial*). However, the temporal aspect enables a natural ordering of the points that does not generally exist for spatial processes. Indeed, it may often be convenient to view a spatial–temporal point process as a purely temporal point process (*see Point processes, temporal*), with spatial marks associated with each point. Sometimes investigating the purely temporal (or purely spatial) behavior of the resulting marginalized point process is of interest.

The spatial region of interest is often a rectangular portion of \mathbb{R}^2 or \mathbb{R}^3 , but not always. For the data in Figure 2, for example, the focus is on just one spatial coordinate, and in Figure 3 the region of interest is Los Angeles County, which has an irregular boundary. Cases where the points are spatially distributed in a sphere or an ellipse are investigated by Brillinger [2, 3]. When the domain of possible spatial coordinates is discrete (e.g. a lattice) rather than continuous, it may be convenient to view the spatial–temporal point process as a sequence $\{N_i\}$ of temporal point processes that may interact with one another. For example, one may view the occurrences of cars on a highway as such a collection, where N_i represents observations of cars in lane i .

Any analytical spatial–temporal point process is characterized uniquely by its associated conditional

rate process λ [6]. $\lambda(t, x, y, z)$ may be thought of as the frequency with which events are expected to occur around a particular location (t, x, y, z) in space–time, conditional on the prior history, H_t , of the point process up to time t . Note that in the statistical literature (e.g. [4] and [12]), λ is more commonly referred to as the conditional intensity rather than the conditional rate. However, the term intensity is also used in various environmental sciences, e.g. in describing the size or destructiveness of an earthquake, so to avoid confusion, the term rate may be preferred.

Formally, the conditional rate $\lambda(t, x, y, z)$ associated with a spatial–temporal point process N may be defined as a limiting conditional expectation, as follows. Fix any point $p = (t, x, y, z)$ in space–time. Let B_Δ denote the set $(t, t + \Delta t) \times (x, x + \Delta x) \times (y, y + \Delta y) \times (z, z + \Delta z)$, where Δ is the vector $(\Delta t, \Delta x, \Delta y, \Delta z)$. Then

$$\lambda(p) = \lim_{\Delta \rightarrow 0} E[N(B_\Delta)|H_t]/|\Delta| \quad (1)$$

provided the limit exists. Some authors instead define $\lambda(p)$ as

$$\lim_{\Delta \rightarrow 0} P[N(B_\Delta) > 0|H_t]/|\Delta| \quad (2)$$

For orderly point processes (processes where $\lim_{|A| \downarrow 0} \Pr\{N(A) > 1\}/|A| = 0$ for interval A), the two definitions are equivalent. λ is a predictable process whose integral C (called the compensator) is such that $N - C$ is a martingale. There are different forms of conditioning corresponding to different types of martingales; see [11], [14], or [21].

Models

The behavior of a spatial–temporal point process N is typically modeled by specifying a functional form for $\lambda(t, x, y, z)$, which represents the infinitesimal expected rate of events at time t and location (x, y, z) , given all the observations up to time t . Although λ may be estimated nonparametrically [5, 7, 24], it is more common to estimate λ via a parametric model.

In general, $\lambda(t, x, y, z)$ depends not only on t, x, y and z but also on the times and locations of preceding events. When N is a **Poisson process**, however, λ is deterministic, i.e. $\lambda(t, x, y, z)$ depends only on t, x, y and z . The simplest model is the stationary Poisson, where the conditional rate is constant:

$\lambda(t, x, y, z) = \alpha$ for all t, x, y, z . In the case of modeling environmental disturbances, this model incorporates the idea that the risk of an event is the same at all times and locations, regardless of where and how frequently such disturbances have occurred previously. Processes that display substantial spatial heterogeneity, such as earthquake epicenters, are sometimes modeled as stationary in time but not space.

Stationary spatial–temporal point processes are sometimes described by the second-order parameter measure $\rho(t', x', y', z')$, which measures the covariance between the numbers of points in spatial–temporal regions A and B , where region B is A shifted by (t', x', y', z') (see **Space–time covariance models**). For example, Kagan and Vere-Jones [10] explore models for ρ in describing spatial–temporal patterns of earthquake hypocenters and times. For a self-exciting (equivalently, clustered) point process, the function ρ is positive for small values of t', x', y' and z' ; N is self-correcting (equivalently, inhibitory) if instead the covariance is negative. Thus the occurrence of points in a self-exciting point process is associated with other points occurring nearby in space–time, whereas in a self-correcting process the points have an inhibitory effect.

Self-exciting point process models are often used in epidemiology (see **Spatial statistics in environmental epidemiology**) and seismology (see **Seismological modeling**) to model events that are clustered together in time and space. A commonly used form for such models is a spatial–temporal generalization of the Hawkes model, where $\lambda(t, x, y, z)$ may be written as

$$\mu(t, x, y, z) + \sum_i v(t - t_i, x - x_i, y - y_i, z - z_i) \quad (3)$$

where the sum is over all points (t_i, x_i, y_i, z_i) with $t_i < t$. The functions μ and v represent the deterministic background rate and clustering density, respectively. Often μ is modeled as merely a function of the spatial coordinates (x, y, z) , and may be estimated nonparametrically as in [17]. When observed marks m associated with each point are posited to affect the rate at which future points accumulate, this information is typically incorporated into the function v , i.e. the conditional rate λ is modeled as a background

rate plus

$$\sum_i v(t - t_i, x - x_i, y - y_i, z - z_i, m - m_i) \quad (4)$$

A variety of forms has been given for the clustering density v . For instance, in modeling seismological data with two spatial parameters (x and y) and a mark (m) indicating magnitude, Musmeci and Vere-Jones [15] introduced explicit forms for v , including the diffusion-type model where $v(t, x, y, m)$ is given by

$$\frac{C}{2\pi\sigma_x\sigma_y t} \exp \left[\alpha m - \beta t - \frac{\left(\frac{x^2}{\sigma_x^2} + \frac{y^2}{\sigma_y^2} \right)}{2t} \right] \quad (5)$$

Ogata [17] investigated the case where

$$v(t, x, y, m) = \frac{K_0 \exp[\alpha(m - m_0)]}{(t + c)^p (x^2 + y^2 + d)^q} \quad (6)$$

as well as a variety of other models. Several other forms for v were suggested by Rathbun [18] and Kagan [9]; see [17] for a review.

Sometimes λ is modeled as a product of marginal conditional intensities

$$\lambda(t, x, y, z) = \lambda_1(t)\lambda_2(x, y, z) \quad (7)$$

or even

$$\lambda(t, x, y, z) = \lambda_1(t)\lambda_2(x)\lambda_3(y)\lambda_4(z) \quad (8)$$

These forms embody the notion that the temporal behavior of the process is independent of the spatial behavior, and in the latter case that furthermore the behavior along each of the spatial coordinates can be seen as independent. In such cases each of the functions λ_i may be estimated individually; see, for example, [18] or [21]. Occasionally one subdivides the spatial region into a finite number of subregions and fits temporal point process models to the data within each subregion. In such a case the conditional intensity may be written

$$\lambda(t, x, y, z) = \sum_i \lambda_1(t) 1_i(x, y, z) \quad (9)$$

where the 1_i are indicator functions denoting the relevant region. An example is given in [26]. The

4 Point processes, spatial–temporal

introduction of interactions between different subregions is incorporated into this model by Lu et al. [13].

For further remarks on modeling and examples see [23] and [25].

Estimation and Inference

The parameter vector θ for a model with conditional rate $\lambda(t, x, y, z; \theta)$ is usually estimated by maximizing the log-likelihood function

$$L(\theta) = \int_{T_0}^{T_1} \int_x \int_y \int_z \log[\lambda(t, x, y, z; \theta)] dN(t, x, y, z) - \int_{T_0}^{T_1} \int_x \int_y \int_z \lambda(t, x, y, z; \theta) dz dy dx dt \quad (10)$$

Asymptotic properties of the **maximum likelihood estimator** $\hat{\theta}$ have been derived under various conditions, along with formulas for **standard errors**; see, e.g., [19]. Alternatively, simulations may be useful for obtaining approximate standard errors and for other types of inference (see **Resampling methods**).

The estimated conditional rate $\lambda(t, x, y, z; \hat{\theta})$ can be used directly for prediction and risk assessment (see **Risk assessment, seismological**). See [1] and [6], for example.

Spatial–temporal point processes may be evaluated via **residual** analysis, as described in [21]. One typically selects a spatial coordinate and rescales the point process in that direction. If the z coordinate is chosen, for example, then each point (t_i, x_i, y_i, z_i) of the observed point process is moved to a new point $(t_i, x_i, y_i, \int_{z_0}^{z_i} \lambda(t_i, x_i, y_i, z; \hat{\theta}) dz)$, where z_0 is the lower boundary in the z direction of the spatial region being considered. The resulting rescaled process is stationary Poisson if and only if the model is correctly specified [22]. Hence a useful method for assessing the fit of a point process model is to examine whether the rescaled point process looks like a Poisson process with unit rate. Several tests exist for this purpose; see, for example, [8] or [20].

References

- [1] Brillinger, D.R. (1982). Seismic risk assessment: some statistical aspects, *Earthquake Prediction Research* **1**, 183–195.
- [2] Brillinger, D.R. (1997). A particle migrating randomly on a sphere, *Journal of Theoretical Probability* **10**, 429–443.
- [3] Brillinger, D.R. (2000). Some examples of random process environmental data analysis, in *Handbook of Statistics*, Vol. 18, C.R. Rao & P.K. Sen, eds, North-Holland, Amsterdam, pp. 33–56.
- [4] Daley, D. & Vere-Jones, D. (1988). *An Introduction to the Theory of Point Processes*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin.
- [5] Diggle, P. (1985). A kernel method for smoothing point process data, *Applied Statistics* **34**, 138–147.
- [6] Fishman, P.M. & Snyder, D.L. (1976). The statistical analysis of space–time point processes, *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **IT-22**, 257–274.
- [7] Guttorp, P. & Thompson, M. (1990). Nonparametric estimation of intensities for sampled counting processes, *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series B* **52**, 157–173.
- [8] Heinrich, L. (1991). Goodness-of-fit tests for the second moment function of a stationary multidimensional Poisson process, *Statistics* **22**, 245–278.
- [9] Kagan, Y.Y. (1991). Likelihood analysis of earthquake catalogs, *Journal of Geophysical Research* **106**, 135–148.
- [10] Kagan, Y. & Vere-Jones, D. (1996). Problems in the modelling and statistical analysis of earthquakes, in *Lecture Notes in Statistics (Athens Conference on Applied Probability and Time Series Analysis)*, Vol. 114, C.C. Heyde, Yu.V. Prorohov, R. Pyke & S.T. Rachev, eds, Springer-Verlag, New York, pp. 398–425.
- [11] Kallenberg, O. (1983). *Random Measures*, 3rd Edition, Akademie-Verlag, Berlin.
- [12] Karr, A. (1991). *Point Processes and Their Statistical Inference*, 2nd Edition, Marcel Dekker, New York.
- [13] Lu, C., Harte, D. & Bebbington, M. (1999). A linked stress release model for historical Japanese earthquakes: coupling among major seismic regions, *Earth, Planets, Space* **51**, 907–916.
- [14] Merzbach, E. & Nualart, D. (1986). A characterization of the spatial Poisson process and changing time, *The Annals of Probability* **14**, 1380–1390.
- [15] Musmeci, F. & Vere-Jones, D. (1992). A space–time clustering model for historical earthquakes, *The Annals of the Institute of Statistical Mathematics* **44**, 1–11.
- [16] Nadeau, R., Antolik, M., Johnson, P.A., Foxall, W. & McEvelly, T.V. (1994). Seismological studies at Parkfield III: microearthquake clusters in the study of fault-zone dynamics, *Bulletin of the Seismic Society of America* **84**, 247–263.
- [17] Ogata, Y. (1998). Space–time point process models for earthquake occurrences, *The Annals of the Institute of Statistical Mathematics* **50**, 379–402.
- [18] Rathbun, S.L. (1993). Modeling marked spatio-temporal point patterns, *Bulletin of the International Statistical Institute* **55**, 379–396.
- [19] Rathbun, S. & Cressie, N. (1994). Asymptotic properties of estimators for the parameters of spatial inhomogeneous Poisson point processes, *Advances in Applied Probability* **26**, 122–154.

-
- [20] Ripley, B. (1979). Tests of ‘randomness’ for spatial point patterns, *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series B* **41**, 368–374.
 - [21] Schoenberg, F. (1997). Assessment of multi-dimensional point processes, Ph.D. Thesis, University of California, Berkeley.
 - [22] Schoenberg, F. (1999). Transforming spatial point processes into Poisson processes, *Stochastic Process Applications* **81**, 155–164.
 - [23] Snyder, D.L. & Miller, M.I. (1991). *Random Point Processes in Time and Space*, Wiley, New York.
 - [24] Vere-Jones, D. (1992). Statistical methods for the description and display of earthquake catalogs, in *Statistics in the Environmental and Earth Sciences*, A. Walden & P. Guttorp, eds, Edward Arnold, London, pp. 220–246.
 - [25] Vere-Jones, D. & Thomson, P.J. (1984). Some aspects of space–time modelling, in *Proceedings of the Twelfth International Biometrics Conference*, Tokyo, pp. 265–275.
 - [26] Zheng, X. & Vere-Jones, D. (1994). Further applications of the stochastic stress release model to historical earthquake data, *Tectonophysics* **229**, 101–121.
- (See also **Point processes, dynamic; Stochastic model; Stochastic process**)

FREDERIC PAIK SCHOENBERG,
DAVID R. BRILLINGER & PETER GUTTORP