

# UNDERSTANDING OF SPATIAL PROBLEM FOR LARGE DATASETS

YEWEN CHEN

## CONTENTS

1	Gaussian random field and its challenge	2
2	Several approaches to overcome this large matrix problem	3
2.1	Likelihood approximations in the spatial domain by low rank methods	3
2.2	Likelihood approximations in the spatial domain by sparse covariance methods . . . . .	4
2.3	Likelihood approximations in the spatial domain by sparse precision methods . . . . .	5
2.4	Likelihood approximations in the spectral Domain: Circulant embedding and Periodic embeddings . . . . .	6

## LIST OF FIGURES

## LIST OF TABLES

# 1 GAUSSIAN RANDOM FIELD AND ITS CHALLENGE

Gaussian spatial processes has been popular for decades in spatial data contexts like geostatistics where they are known as kriging, and in computer experiments where they are deployed as surrogate models or emulators. More recently, they have become a popular prediction engine in the machine learning literature. The reasons are many, but the most important are probably that: the Gaussian structure affords a large degree of analytic capability not enjoyed by other general-purpose approaches to nonparametric nonlinear modeling; and because they perform well in out-of-sample tests.

Assume there is a response or dependent variable  $Y(s)$  at a generic location  $s \in \mathbf{D} \subset \mathbb{R}^2$  along with a  $p \times 1$  vector of spatially referenced predictors  $\mathbf{X}(s)$ . A spatial regression model has the form

$$y(s) = \beta \mathbf{X}(s) + w(s) + \epsilon(s) \quad (1)$$

where  $\beta$  is the vector of regression coefficients. The residual from the regression is decomposed into two independent parts: a spatial process,  $w(s)$ , modelling spatial association, and an independent process,  $\epsilon(s)$ , also known as the nugget effect, modelling measurement error.

The nugget effect  $\epsilon(s)$  is often assumed to follow a normal distribution with variance  $\tau^2$  for every location  $s$ . The spatial process  $w(s)$  in (1) is often referred to as spatial random effects, capturing the effect of unmeasured or unobserved covariates with spatial pattern.

The most common specification for  $w(s)$  is  $w(s) \sim \text{GP}(0, \mathbf{C}(\cdot, \cdot))$ , a zero-mean Gaussian process with a valid covariance function  $\mathbf{C}(s, s')$ . It is often reasonable to assume a constant process variance and thus we specify  $\mathbf{C}(s, s') = \sigma^2 \rho(s, s'; \theta)$ , where  $\rho(s, s'; \theta)$  is a correlation function and  $\theta$  is a vector of correlation parameters which needs to be estimated from a finite number of observations,  $\mathbf{Y} = (y(s_1), \dots, y(s_n))'$ .

Therefore,  $y(s)$  follows a spatial Gaussian process, and thus we have the log-likelihood function for  $(\beta, \tau^2, \sigma^2, \theta)$ :

$$l(\beta, \tau^2, \sigma^2, \theta) \propto -\frac{1}{2} \log |\Sigma| - \frac{1}{2} (\mathbf{Y} - \beta \mathbf{X})' \Sigma^{-1} (\mathbf{Y} - \beta \mathbf{X}) \quad (2)$$

where  $\Sigma = \mathbf{C} + \tau^2 \mathbf{I}$ . Then best linear unbiased prediction (BLUP) at an unobserved location  $s_0$  can be obtained by the kriging equation:

$$\hat{y}(s_0) = \beta \mathbf{X}(s_0) + \mathbf{c}'_{s_0} \Sigma^{-1} (\mathbf{Y} - \beta \mathbf{X}) \quad (3)$$

where  $\mathbf{c}_{s_0} = (\mathbf{C}(s_0, s_1), \dots, \mathbf{C}(s_0, s_n))'$ .

However, with large or massive data, direct implementation of these statistical process, including parameter estimation by (2) and interpolation by (3), becomes computationally prohibitive, since evaluating the log-likelihood in (2) and solving the kriging equation (3) involve the Cholesky factorization of an  $n \times n$  covariance matrix for data of size  $n$ , which requires  $O(n^3)$  operations and  $O(n^2)$  memory in general (see Porcu et al. [2012], Sang and Huang [2012], Heaton et al. [2019], Ma and Kang [2020]).

## 2 SEVERAL APPROACHES TO OVERCOME THIS LARGE MATRIX PROBLEM

Solutions to this computational intractability focus on model development, the design of efficient and parallel algorithms, and the improvement and efficient use of modern computing platforms (e.g. Using [TensorFlow](#) and [GPU](#)).

Model:

- 1) Conditional distributions: [Michael L. Stein](#) (The restricted likelihood, [2004](#));
- 2) Sparse covariance by tapering method: [Reinhard Furrer](#)([2006](#)); [Douglas Nychka](#)(bias correction, [2008](#)); [Michael L. Stein](#)(Statistical Properties, [2013](#));
- 3) Low-Rank methods: [Noel Cressie](#) (FRK, [2008](#)), [Sudipto Banerjee](#) (Predictive process, [2008](#));
- 4) Sparse precision: [Douglas Nychka](#)(lattice kriging, [2015](#)) by basis-function; [Matthias Katfuss](#)(multiresolution approximation, [2017](#)) by basis-function; [Finn Lindgren](#) (GRMF Approximations, [2011](#)) by SPDE; [Abhi Datta](#) (NNGP, [2016a](#), [2016b](#), [2016c](#), [2019](#)) by conditional distributions;
- 5) Spectral method: [Montserrat Fuentes](#) and [Joe Guinness](#)( Circulant embedding, [2017](#) and Periodic Embeddings, [2007](#), [2019](#)).
- 6) Discrete process convolutions. [Dave Higdon](#)([2002](#)); [Bruno Sansó](#)([2009](#)); [Francky Fouedjio](#)([2016](#)).

Algorithms and platforms:

- 1) INLA: [Haavard Rue](#).
- 2) Parallel algorithm: [Matthias Katfuss](#).
- 3) TensorFlow: [Andrew Zammit-Mangion](#).

Other scholars: [Christopher K. Wikle](#), [Robert B. Gramacy](#), [Bradley P. Carlin](#), [Jonathan R. Stroud](#), [YongTao Guan](#), [Alan E. Gelfand](#), [Peter J. Diggle](#), [Huiyan Sang](#), [Andrw Finley](#), [Matthew J. Heaton](#), [Ying Sun](#), [Furong Sun](#).

From an **approximation** point of view, the approximation of the likelihood in either the spatial or spectral domain is another solution to overcome computational obstacles.

### 2.1 Likelihood approximations in the spatial domain by low rank methods

**Comments:** The reduced rank based methods usually fail to accurately capture the local, small scale dependence structure [[Sang and Huang, 2012](#)].

#### 2.1.1 *Fixed Rank Kriging*

FRK ([[Cressie and Johannesson, 2006](#)], [[Cressie and Johannesson, 2008](#)]) aims to approximate the spatial process  $w(s)$  in (1) by a linear combination of  $r$  ( $\ll n$ ) basis functions which ensures that all estimation and prediction equations only contain inverses of matrices of size  $r \times r$ .

### 2.1.2 Gaussian Predictive Processes (GPP)

With regard to the challenge of computational cost on covariance matrices, [Banerjee et al. \[2008\]](#) proposed a class of models based on the idea of a spatial predictive process which is motivated by Kriging equation in (3). The predictive process projects the original process,  $w(s)$  in (1), onto a subspace generated by realizations of the original process at a specified set of locations (or knots). The approach is in the same spirit as process modeling approaches using basis functions and kernel convolutions, that is, specifications which attempt to facilitate computations through lower dimensional process representations.

#### Comments:

- 1) One advertised advantage of using the GPP approach as opposed to [FRK](#) or [LatticeKrig](#) is that the GPP basis functions are completely determined by the choice of covariance function  $C(\cdot, \cdot)$ , and note that the subsequent [Multiresolution approximations](#) is in step with GPP in this regard.
- 2) At the same time, however, when  $C(\cdot, \cdot)$  is governed by unknown parameters (which is nearly always the case) the GPP basis functions need to be calculated iteratively rather than once as in FRK or LatticeKrig which will subsequently increase computation time.

## 2.2 Likelihood approximations in the spatial domain by sparse covariance methods

### 2.2.1 Tapering

Including [tapering for estimation](#) (e.g. approximation log-likelihood function by a tapered covariance. See [Kaufman et al. \[2008\]](#)) and [tapering for Kriging](#) (or for interpolation or for prediction, e.g. approximation kriging equation by replacing the original covariance by a tapered version. See [Furrer et al. \[2006\]](#) and some R packages: [spam](#), 2010; [KriSp](#), 2006; [fields](#), 2017).

**Comments:** The covariance tapering has shown great computational gains, but it also has its own drawbacks.

- 1) The covariance tapering may not be effective in accounting for **spatial dependence with long range**.
- 2) The accuracy of the tapering approximation for **nonstationary problems** remains an open question, and the application of tapering techniques to **multivariate random fields** remains to be explored due to the lack of flexible compactly supported cross-covariance functions, see [Porcu et al. \[2012\]](#).

### 2.2.2 Spatial Partitioning

By dividing region  $D$  into  $m$  disjoint subregions ( $d = 1, 2, \dots, m$ ), and then the modeling approach based on spatial partitioning is to again assume the model in (4) but take on the assumption of independence between observations across subregions.

$$y_d = \beta X_d + H_d w + \xi_d + \epsilon_d \quad (4)$$

where  $H_d$  is a matrix of spatial basis function for subregions  $d$ .

#### Comments:

- 1) Notice that, in (4) each subregion shares common  $\beta$  and  $w$  parameters which allows smoothing across subregions in spite of the independence assumption. Further, the assumption of independence across subregions effectively creates a block-diagonal structure for  $\Sigma$  and allows the likelihood to be computed in parallel (with one node per subregion), thereby facilitating computation.
- 2) The key to implementing the spatial partitioning approach is the choice of partition and the literature is replete with various options. A priori methods to define the spatial partitioning include partitioning the region into equal areas ([Sang et al., 2011]), partitioning based on centroid clustering ([Kim et al., 2005]), hierarchical clustering based on spatial gradients ([Heaton et al., 2017]). Alternatively, model-based approaches to spatial partitioning include treed regression([Konomi et al., 2014]) and mixture modeling (Neelon et al. [2014]), but these approaches typically require more computation.

### 2.3 Likelihood approximations in the spatial domain by sparse precision methods

The sparse precision methods focus on basis function and conditional likelihood.

#### 2.3.1 *LatticeKrig*

[Nychka et al., 2015]

#### 2.3.2 *Multiresolution Approximations*

(see [Katzfuss and Hammerling, 2017] and [Katzfuss, 2017])

#### 2.3.3 *SPDE/INLA*

The numerical factorization of the precision matrix using sparse matrix algorithms can be done at a typical cost of  $O(n^{3/2})$  for two-dimensional GMRFs.

**Comments:** The drawback of this approach is that we can only find the explicit form of GMRFs for those Gaussian random fields that have a Matérn covariance structure at certain integer smoothnesses. they can be extended to model Matérn covariances on the sphere, nonstationary locally isotropic Gaussian random fields, Gaussian random fields with oscillating correlation functions, and non-isotropic fields.

#### 2.3.4 *NNGP*

The nearest neighbor Gaussian process (Datta et al. [2016a], Datta et al. [2016b], Finley et al. [2019] ) is defined from the conditional specification of the joint distribution of spatial process  $w(s)$  in (1), one forms of composite likelihoods which is motivated by Vecchia (1988) ideas. The total flop counts is of the order  $(n + k)m^3$ , where  $m(\approx 20)$ , NNGP is much faster than the full Gaussian model which requires  $O(n^3)$  flops.

Composite likelihoods which points out the difficulty in choosing conditioning sets and evaluation of the approximation accuracy, but with the advent of the NNGP approach, the problem has been solved.

## 2.4 Likelihood approximations in the spectral Domain: Circulant embedding and Periodic embeddings

**Comments:** The spectral methods are computationally efficient by avoiding the calculation of determinants and can be easily adapted to model nonstationary processes as a mixture of independent stationary processes. [15] presented a version of Whittle's approximation to the Gaussian negative log-likelihood by introducing a lattice process which can be used to deal with irregularly spaced data. Additional computational savings were obtained by truncating the spectral representation of the lattice process. If  $n$  is the total number of observations of the process  $Y$ ,  $m$  is lattice size, the calculation requires  $O(m \log_2 m + n)$  operations rather than  $O(n^3)$  for the exact likelihood of  $Y$ .

However, they do not overcome the difficulty in prediction with massive data.

## REFERENCES

- S. Banerjee, A. E. Gelfand, A. O. Finley, and H. Sang. Gaussian predictive process models for large spatial data sets. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 70(4):825–848, 2008. URL [https://chenyw68.github.io/Literature/\[2008\]Gaussianpredictiveprocessmodelsforlargespacialdatasets.pdf](https://chenyw68.github.io/Literature/[2008]Gaussianpredictiveprocessmodelsforlargespacialdatasets.pdf).
- N. Cressie and G. Johannesson. Fixed rank kriging for very large spatial data sets. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 70(1):209–226, 2008. URL [https://chenyw68.github.io/Literature/\[2008\]Fixedrankkrigingforverylargespacialdatasets.pdf](https://chenyw68.github.io/Literature/[2008]Fixedrankkrigingforverylargespacialdatasets.pdf).
- N. A. Cressie and G. Johannesson. Spatial prediction for massive datasets. *Proceedings of the Australian Academy of Science Elizabeth and Frederick White Conference*, 2006. URL [https://chenyw68.github.io/Literature/\[2006\]Spatialpredictionformassivedatasets.pdf](https://chenyw68.github.io/Literature/[2006]Spatialpredictionformassivedatasets.pdf).
- A. Datta, S. Banerjee, A. O. Finley, and A. E. Gelfand. Hierarchical nearest-neighbor gaussian process models for large geostatistical datasets. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 111(514):800–812, 2016a. URL [https://chenyw68.github.io/Literature/\[2016\]Hierarchicalnearest-neighborGaussianprocessmodelsforlargegeostatisticaldatasets.pdf](https://chenyw68.github.io/Literature/[2016]Hierarchicalnearest-neighborGaussianprocessmodelsforlargegeostatisticaldatasets.pdf).
- A. Datta, S. Banerjee, A. O. Finley, N. A. Hamm, and M. Schaap. Nonseparable dynamic nearest neighbor gaussian process models for large spatio-temporal data with an application to particulate matter analysis. *The annals of applied statistics*, 10(3):1286, 2016b. URL [https://chenyw68.github.io/Literature/\[2016\]NonseparabledynamicNNGPmodelsforlargespatio-temporaldata.pdf](https://chenyw68.github.io/Literature/[2016]NonseparabledynamicNNGPmodelsforlargespatio-temporaldata.pdf).
- A. O. Finley, A. Datta, B. D. Cook, D. C. Morton, H. E. Andersen, and S. Banerjee. Efficient algorithms for bayesian nearest neighbor gaussian processes. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, 28(2):401–414, 2019. URL [https://chenyw68.github.io/Literature/\[2019\]Efficientalgorithmsforbayesiannearestneighborgaussianprocesses.pdf](https://chenyw68.github.io/Literature/[2019]Efficientalgorithmsforbayesiannearestneighborgaussianprocesses.pdf).



- R. Furrer, M. G. Genton, and D. Nychka. Covariance tapering for interpolation of large spatial datasets. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, 15(3):502–523, 2006. URL [https://chenyw68.github.io/Literature/\[2006\]Covariancetaperingforinterpolationoflargespatialdatasets.pdf](https://chenyw68.github.io/Literature/[2006]Covariancetaperingforinterpolationoflargespatialdatasets.pdf).
- M. J. Heaton, W. F. Christensen, and M. A. Terres. Nonstationary gaussian process models using spatial hierarchical clustering from finite differences. *Technometrics*, 59(1):93–101, 2017. URL [https://chenyw68.github.io/Literature/\[2017\]NonstationaryGaussianProcessModelsUsingSpatialHierarchicalClusteringfromFiniteDifferences.pdf](https://chenyw68.github.io/Literature/[2017]NonstationaryGaussianProcessModelsUsingSpatialHierarchicalClusteringfromFiniteDifferences.pdf).
- M. J. Heaton, A. Datta, A. O. Finley, R. Furrer, J. Guinness, R. Guhaniyogi, F. Gerber, R. B. Gramacy, D. Hammerling, M. Katzfuss, et al. A case study competition among methods for analyzing large spatial data. *Journal of Agricultural, Biological and Environmental Statistics*, 24(3):398–425, 2019. URL [https://chenyw68.github.io/Literature/\[2018\]Acasestudycompetitionamongmethodsforanalyzinglargespatialdata.pdf](https://chenyw68.github.io/Literature/[2018]Acasestudycompetitionamongmethodsforanalyzinglargespatialdata.pdf).
- M. Katzfuss. A multi-resolution approximation for massive spatial datasets. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 112(517):201–214, 2017. URL [https://chenyw68.github.io/Literature/\[2017\]AMulti-ResolutionApproximationforMassiveSpatialDatasets.pdf](https://chenyw68.github.io/Literature/[2017]AMulti-ResolutionApproximationforMassiveSpatialDatasets.pdf).
- M. Katzfuss and D. Hammerling. Parallel inference for massive distributed spatial data using low-rank models. *Statistics and Computing*, 27(2):363–375, 2017. URL [https://chenyw68.github.io/Literature/\[2017-formal\]Parallelinferenceformassivedistributedspatialdatausinglow-rankmodels.pdf](https://chenyw68.github.io/Literature/[2017-formal]Parallelinferenceformassivedistributedspatialdatausinglow-rankmodels.pdf).
- C. G. Kaufman, M. J. Schervish, and D. W. Nychka. Covariance tapering for likelihood-based estimation in large spatial data sets. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 103(484):1545–1555, 2008. URL [https://chenyw68.github.io/Literature/\[2008\]CovarianceTaperingforLikelihoodBasedEstimationinLargeSpatialDataSets.pdf](https://chenyw68.github.io/Literature/[2008]CovarianceTaperingforLikelihoodBasedEstimationinLargeSpatialDataSets.pdf).
- H.-M. Kim, B. K. Mallick, and C. Holmes. Analyzing nonstationary spatial data using piecewise gaussian processes. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 100(470):653–668, 2005. URL [https://chenyw68.github.io/Literature/\[2005\]AnalyzingnonstationaryspatialdatausingpiecewiseGaussianprocesses.pdf](https://chenyw68.github.io/Literature/[2005]AnalyzingnonstationaryspatialdatausingpiecewiseGaussianprocesses.pdf).
- B. A. Konomi, H. Sang, and B. K. Mallick. Adaptive bayesian nonstationary modeling for large spatial datasets using covariance approximations. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, 23(3):802–829, 2014. URL [https://chenyw68.github.io/Literature/\[2014\]AdaptiveBayesianNonstationaryModelingforLargeSpatialDatasetsUsingCovarianceApproximations.pdf](https://chenyw68.github.io/Literature/[2014]AdaptiveBayesianNonstationaryModelingforLargeSpatialDatasetsUsingCovarianceApproximations.pdf).
- P. Ma and E. L. Kang. A fused gaussian process model for very large spatial data. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, pages 1–11, 2020. URL [https://chenyw68.github.io/Literature/\[2020\]AFusedGaussianProcessModelforVeryLargeSpatialData.pdf](https://chenyw68.github.io/Literature/[2020]AFusedGaussianProcessModelforVeryLargeSpatialData.pdf).

- B. Neelon, A. E. Gelfand, and M. L. Miranda. A multivariate spatial mixture model for areal data: examining regional differences in standardized test scores. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series C, Applied statistics*, 63(5):737, 2014. URL [https://chenyw68.github.io/Literature/\[2014\]Amultivariatespatialmixturemodelforarealdata.pdf](https://chenyw68.github.io/Literature/[2014]Amultivariatespatialmixturemodelforarealdata.pdf).
- D. Nychka, S. Bandyopadhyay, D. Hammerling, F. Lindgren, and S. Sain. A multiresolution gaussian process model for the analysis of large spatial datasets. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, 24(2):579–599, 2015.
- E. Porcu, J.-M. Montero, and M. Schlather. *Advances and challenges in space-time modelling of natural events*, volume 207. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012. URL [https://chenyw68.github.io/Literature/\[2012\]AdvancesandChallengesinSpace-timeModellingofNaturalEvents.pdf](https://chenyw68.github.io/Literature/[2012]AdvancesandChallengesinSpace-timeModellingofNaturalEvents.pdf).
- H. Sang and J. Z. Huang. A full scale approximation of covariance functions for large spatial data sets. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 74(1):111–132, 2012. URL [https://chenyw68.github.io/Literature/\[2012\]Afullscaleapproximationofcovariancefunctionsforlargespatialdatasets.pdf](https://chenyw68.github.io/Literature/[2012]Afullscaleapproximationofcovariancefunctionsforlargespatialdatasets.pdf).
- H. Sang, M. Jun, and J. Z. Huang. Covariance approximation for large multivariate spatial data sets with an application to multiple climate model errors. *The Annals of Applied Statistics*, pages 2519–2548, 2011. URL [https://chenyw68.github.io/Literature/\[2011\]Covarianceapproximationforlargemultivariatespatialdatasets.pdf](https://chenyw68.github.io/Literature/[2011]Covarianceapproximationforlargemultivariatespatialdatasets.pdf).