

The performance of Iterative Proportional Fitting for spatial microsimulation: applying new tests to an old technique

Robin Lovelace

February 12, 2014

Abstract

Iterative Proportional Fitting (IPF) is an established technique in Regional Science and has been used for a variety of purposes in the field, primary amongst these being the generation of small area microdata. The technique is mature, widely used and relatively straight-forward yet there have been few studies focussed on evaluation of its performance. An additional research problem is the tendency of researchers to ‘start from scratch’, resulting in a variety of ad-hoc implementations, with little evidence of the merits of differing approaches. Although IPF is well described mathematically, reproducible examples of the algorithm, written in modern programming language, are rare in the academic literature. These knowledge gaps mean that answers to methodological questions must be guessed: Under what conditions can a ‘perfect’ match be expected, and how can one test whether these conditions exist in the input datasets? How many iterations should be used for any given application? What is the impact of initial weights on the final results? And what impact will integerisation have on accuracy? This paper tackles such questions, using a systematic methodology based on publicly available code and input data. The results confirm IPF’s status as robust and widely applicable method for combining areal and individual-level data and demonstrate the importance of various parameters determining its performance. We conclude with an agenda for future tests and offer more general guidance on how the method can be optimised to maximise its utility for future research.

Keywords: Iterative proportional fitting, spatial microsimulation, modelling

JEL Code: C

1 Introduction

The aggregation of survey data has a long history in the social sciences. The most common form of aggregation conducted by national statistical agencies collecting data about citizens is ‘flattening’: converting data from ‘long’ to ‘flat’ form. This involves a) converting all variables into discrete categories (e.g. an individual with an income of £13,000 per year would be allocated to band of £10,000 to £15,000 per year), b) assigning a column to each category and c) assigning integer counts to cells in each column (Fig. 1). Each row

in this aggregated form can represent the entire dataset or subsets thereof. (Geographical aggregation – one row per zone – is the most common form of aggregation, but any subsets, from social class, time period or other *cross-tabulations* of the dataset can be used).

The main advantage of 'flat' data is that it can summarise information about a very large number of individuals in a small number of rows. Often, such flattened datasets are the only format in which statistical agencies make large datasets (e.g. the National Census) available, to save storage space, ease data analysis and ensure the anonymity and unidentifiability of survey respondents. The main disadvantage is that the process of flattening is almost always associated with data loss: we do not know from a flat dataset if the hypothetical individual mentioned above earns £10,000, £15,000 or anywhere in between. Also, when flattening is associated with geographical aggregation, there is usually a loss of geographical resolution: instead of knowing the person's full postcode from the full dataset, we may only be able to pin them down to a relatively large administrative zone such as a Local Authority in the UK context in the flattened dataset. Finally, the cross-tabulations between the variables are generally during the process of flattening.

Both types of data representation are common in the physical sciences, although the raw data is usually available in long-form. In the social sciences, by contrast, the long format is often unavailable. As indicated above, this can be attributed to the long history of and confidentiality issues surrounding officially collected survey data. National Census datasets — in which characteristics of every individual are recorded — and some of the best datasets in social science are only available in flat form, however, posing major challenges to researchers in the sciences.

A related long-standing research problem especially prevalent in geography and regional science is the scale of analysis. There is often a trade-off between the quality and resolution of the data, which can result in a compromise between detail and accuracy of results (Ballas and Clarke, 2003). A common scenario facing researchers investigating a spatial problem is being presented with two datasets: one long aspatial survey table where each row represents the characteristics of an individual — such as age, sex, employment status and income — and another of 'flat', geographically aggregated dataset containing count data for each category.

As presented in Fig. 1, flat datasets are wider and shorter, containing multiple columns for each variable from the raw dataset. The loss of information about the linkages between the different variables is common, but not essential, in flat datasets. The solution to this problem, however, makes the flat datasets even more unwieldy, as each new cross tabulation would add $nv1 \times nv2$ additional columns, where $nv1$ and $nv2$ are the number of discrete categories in contained in the variables to be cross tabulated.¹ The lack of cross tabulation is problematic because in many cases information about the linkages between different variables is needed to address policy-relevant questions. To pick one example related to policies targeted at skilled unemployed young adults: how many unemployed people reside in each geographical area who at the same time have a university

¹To provide a concrete example, a cross-tabulation of mode of travel to work by sex and social class would contain 540 ($12 * 3 * 15$) columns, due to the number of categories present in each variable. Given that there are dozen of additional variables in any large census, this clearly become unwieldy.

degree, are female and over 25 years old? This question is impossible to answer with a geographically aggregated (flat) dataset.

Spatial microsimulation tackles this problem by simulating the individuals within each administrative zone. The most detailed output of this process of spatial microsimulation is ‘spatial microdata’, a long table of individuals with associated attributes and weights for each zone (table 1). Because these individuals correspond to observations in the survey dataset, the spatial microdata can be stored with only 3 columns: person identification number (ID), zone and weight. Weights are critical to spatial microdata generated in this way, as they determine how representative each individual is of each zone. Thus, an even more compact way of storing spatial microdata taken from a single dataset is as a ‘weight matrix’ (table 2).

Representing the data in this form offers a number of advantages (Clarke and Holm, 1987). These include:

- The ability to investigate intra-zone variation (by analysing a the variable after subsetting a single area from the data frame), and inter-zone variation in the same dataset.
- Cross-tabulations can be created for any combination of variables (e.g. age and employment status).
- The presentation of continuous variables such as income as real numbers, rather than as categorical count data, in which there is always data loss.
- The data is in a form that is ready to be passed into an individual-level model. For example individual behaviour could simulate traffic, migration or the geographical distribution of future demand for healthcare.

These benefits have not gone unnoticed by the spatial modelling community. Spatial microsimulation is now more than a methodology, and can be considered as a research field in its own right, with a growing body of literature, methods and results (Tanton and Edwards, 2013). In tandem with these methodological developments, a growing number of applied studies has emerged to take advantage of the new possibilities opened up by such small area individual-level data, with applications as diverse as the location of health services (Tomintz et al., 2008) to the analysis of commuting (Lovelace et al., 2014). Various strategies for generating small area microdata are available, as described in recent overviews on the subject (Tanton and Edwards, 2013; Ballas et al., 2013; Hermes and Poulsen, 2012). However, it is not always clear which one is most appropriate, as highlighted in the conclusions of a recent Reference Guide to spatial microsimulation (Clarke and Harding, 2013, p 270): “It would be desirable if the spatial microsimulation community were able to continue to analyse which of the various reweighting/synthetic reconstruction techniques is most accurate — or to identify whether one approach is superior for some applications while another approach is to be preferred for other applications”.

The longest-established and most straight-forward of these is Iterative Proportional Fitting (IPF), the performance of which is the subject of this paper...

2 IPF: theory and applications

Iterative Proportional Fitting has a long history in Statistics and the social sciences (especially in Economics and Geography). In statistical language, IPF is used to estimate the values of internal cells in a cross-tabulated table to fit known margins. The method is also known as matrix raking or scaling, biproportional fitting, RAS, and entropy maximising. There are a number of texts discussing the method in a mathematical formal way in some detail (for example Mosteller, 1968; Fienberg, 1970; Pritchard and Miller, 2012). (Birkin and Clarke, 1988) provide a succinct presentation of the mathematics of IPF and their work is the foundation of the work presented here...

3 Evaluation techniques

To verify the integrity of any model, it is necessary to compare its outputs with empirical observations or prior expectations gleaned from theory. The same principles apply to spatial microsimulation, which can be evaluated using both internal and *external* validation methods (Edwards and Clarke, 2009). *Internal validation* is the process whereby the aggregate-level outputs of spatial microsimulation are compared with the input constraint variables. Internal validation typically tackle such issues as “do the simulated populations in each area microdata match the total populations implied by the constrain variables?” and “what is the level of correspondence between the cell values of different attributes in the aggregate input data and the aggregated results of spatial microsimulation?” As we shall see below, ideally we would hope for a perfect fit between the input and output datasets during internal evaluation. *External validation* is the process whereby the variables that are being estimated are compared to data from another source, external to the estimation process, so the output dataset is compared with another known dataset for those variables.

This section outlines the evaluation techniques that are commonly used in the field, with a strong focus on internal validation. The options for external validation are heavily context dependent so must generally be decided on a case-by-case basis, and are mentioned in passing with a focus on general principles rather than specific advice. The methods are presented in ascending order of complexity and roughly descending order of frequency of use, ranging from Pearson’s coefficient of correlation to entropy based measures. Before these methods are described, it is worth stating the the purpose of this section is not to find the ‘best’ evaluation metric: each has advantages and disadvantages, the importance of which will vary depending on the nature of the research. A final point is that the use of a variety of techniques in this paper is of interest in itself. The high degree of correspondence between them (presented in section 6), suggests that researchers need only to present one or two metrics (but should perhaps try more, for corroboration) to establish relative levels of goodness of fit between different model configurations.

3.1 Scatter plots and Pearson’s coefficient of correlation

A scatter plot of cell counts for each category for the original and simulated variables is a basic but very useful preliminary diagnostic tool in spatial mi-

crossimulation (?). In addition marking the points, depending on the variable and category which they represent, can help identify which variables are particularly problematic, aiding the process of improving faulty code (sometimes referred to as ‘debugging’).

In these scatter plots each data point represents a single zone-category combination (e.g. 16-25 year old female in zone 001), with the x axis value corresponding to the number of individuals of that description in the input constraint table. The y value corresponds to the aggregated count of individuals in the same category in the aggregated (flat) representation of the spatial microdata output from the model. This stage can be conducted either before or after *integration* (more on this below). As taught in basic statistics courses, the closer the points to the 1:1 (45 degree, assuming the axes have the same scale) line, the better the fit.

Pearson’s coefficient of correlation (henceforth Pearson’s r) is a quantitative indicator of how much deviation there is from this ideal 1:1 line. It varies from 0 to 1, and in this context reveals how closely the simulated values fit the actual (census) data. An r value of 1 represents a perfect fit; an r value close to zero suggests no correspondence between then constraints and simulated outputs (i.e. that the model has failed). We would expect to see very high coefficient of determination for internal validation (the constraint) and strong positive correlation between target variables that have been estimated and external datasets (e.g. income).

3.2 Standard error around identity (SEI)

here SEI is the standard error around identity, y are the estimated values for each area, y_{rel} are the reliable estimates for each area from a census or other data source and \bar{y}_{rel} is the mean estimate for all areas where reliable data are available. This estimate has been used in validation by both Ballas and Tanton (see Ballas et al. 2007; Tanton et al. 2011).

3.3 Total Absolute and Standardized Error (TAE and SAE)

The SAE addresses this issue by using the population size as the denominator, but generally, authors seem to use total population, rather than the population for that categorization of the variable, which may be deemed to understate the size of the errors. Also, this measure does not provide any information on whether any differences are statistically significant (Edwards and Tanton, 2013).

3.4 Z scores

Here, the evaluation mainly takes place at the cell level (for a single constraint in a single area). However, there should also be attention for the overall picture like spatial concentration.

4 Input data

Three input datasets form the basis of the scenarios tested in this paper, ‘simple’, ‘small-area’ and ‘sheffield’. Each consists of a set of aggregate constraints and

corresponding individual-level survey tables. The latter are anonymous and have been ‘scrambled’ to enable their publication on the internet. This enables the results to be replicated by others, without breaching the user licenses of the data. To this end, all the input data (and code) used to generate the results reported in the paper are available online on the code-sharing site GitHub. The simplest scenario consists of 6 zones which must be populated by a sample survey dataset of only five individuals, constrained by two variables. This scenario is purely hypothetical and is used to represent the IPF procedure and the tests in the simplest possible terms. Its small size allows the entirety of the input data to be viewed in a couple of tables that fit on a single page (see table 1 and table 2). As with all data used in this paper, these tables can be viewed and downloaded online.

Table 1: Individual-level data for the simple scenario. Available on github from here.

| Id | Age | Sex |
|----|-----|-----|
| 1 | 59 | m |
| 2 | 54 | m |
| 3 | 35 | m |
| 4 | 73 | f |
| 5 | 49 | f |

Table 2: Constraint variables for the simple scenario, also available online.

| Age constraint | | Sex constraint | |
|----------------|-----|----------------|--|
| 16 – 49 | | m | |
| 1 | 8 4 | 6 6 | |
| 2 | 2 8 | 4 6 | |
| 3 | 7 4 | 3 8 | |
| 4 | 5 4 | 7 2 | |
| 5 | 7 3 | 6 4 | |
| 6 | 5 3 | 2 6 | |

5 Method: model experiments

6 Results

7 Conclusions

References

- Ballas, D., Clarke, G., Hynes, S., Lennon, J., Morrissey, K., Donoghue, C.O., 2013. A Review of Microsimulation for Policy Analysis, in: O’Donoghue, C., Ballas, D., Clarke, G., Hynes, S., Morrissey, K. (Eds.), *Spatial Microsimulation for Rural Policy Analysis*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg. *Advances in Spatial Science*. chapter 3, pp. 35–54.

- Ballas, D., Clarke, G.P., 2003. Microsimulation and regional science: 30 years of spatial microsimulation of populations, in: 50th Annual North American Meeting of the Regional Science Association, Philadelphia, USA, pp. 19–22.
- Birkin, M., Clarke, M., 1988. SYNTHESIS – a synthetic spatial information system for urban and regional analysis: methods and examples. *Environment and Planning A* 20, 1645–1671.
- Clarke, G., Harding, A., 2013. Conclusions and Future Research Directions, in: Tanton, R., Edwards, K. (Eds.), *Spatial Microsimulation: A Reference Guide for Users*. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg. chapter 16, pp. 259–273.
- Edwards, K.L., Clarke, G.P., 2009. The design and validation of a spatial microsimulation model of obesogenic environments for children in Leeds, UK: SimObesity. *Social science & medicine* 69, 1127–34.
- Fienberg, S., 1970. An iterative procedure for estimation in contingency tables. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics* 41, 907–917.
- Hermes, K., Poulsen, M., 2012. A review of current methods to generate synthetic spatial microdata using reweighting and future directions. *Computers, Environment and Urban Systems* 36, 281–290.
- Lovelace, R., Ballas, D., Watson, M., 2014. A spatial microsimulation approach for the analysis of commuter patterns: from individual to regional levels. *Journal of Transport Geography* 34, 282–296.
- Mosteller, F., 1968. Association and estimation in contingency tables. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 63, 1–28.
- Pritchard, D.R., Miller, E.J., 2012. Advances in population synthesis: fitting many attributes per agent and fitting to household and person margins simultaneously. *Transportation* 39, 685–704.
- Tanton, R., Edwards, K., 2013. *Spatial Microsimulation: A Reference Guide for Users*. Springer.
- Tomintz, M.N.M., Clarke, G.P., Rigby, J.E.J., 2008. The geography of smoking in Leeds: estimating individual smoking rates and the implications for the location of stop smoking services. *Area* 40, 341–353.