

VANLANGENBERG, CHRISTOPHER D., Ph.D. Data Generation and Estimation for Axially Symmetric Processes on the Sphere . (2016)  
Directed by Dr. Haimeng Zhang. 77 pp.

**Review and update later**

Global-scale processes and phenomena are of utmost importance in the geophysical sciences. Data from global networks and satellite sensors have been used to monitor a wide array of processes and variables, such as temperature, precipitation, etc. In this dissertation, we are planning to achieve explicitly the following objectives,

- (1) Develop both non-parametric and parametric approaches to model global data dependency.
- (2) Generate global data based on given covariance structure.
- (3) Develop kriging methods for global prediction.
- (4) Explore one or more of the popularly discussed global data sets in literature such as MSU (Microwave Sounding Units) data, the tropospheric temperature data from National Oceanic and Atmospheric and TOMS (Total Ozone Mapping Spectrometer) data, total column ozone from the Laboratory for Atmospheres at NASA's Goddard Space Flight Center Administration satellite-based Microwave Sounding Unit.

Global scale data have been widely studied in literature. A common assumption on describing global dependency is the second order stationarity. However, with the scale of the Earth, this assumption is in fact unrealistic. In recent years, researchers have focused on studying the so-called axially symmetric processes on the sphere, whose spatial dependency often exhibit homogeneity on each latitude, but not across

the latitudes due to the geophysical nature of the Earth. In this research, we have obtained some results on the method of non-parametric estimation procedure, in particular, the method of moments, in the estimation of spatial dependency. Our initial result shows that the spatial dependency of axially symmetric processes exhibits both anti-symmetric and symmetric characteristics across latitudes. We will also discuss detailed methods on generating global data and finally we will outline our methodologies on kriging techniques to make global prediction.

DATA GENERATION AND ESTIMATION FOR AXIALLY SYMMETRIC  
PROCESSES ON THE SPHERE

by

Christopher D. Vanlangenberg

A Dissertation Submitted to  
the Faculty of the Graduate School at  
The University of North Carolina at Greensboro  
in Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements for the Degree  
Doctor of Philosophy

Greensboro  
2016

Approved by

---

Committee Chair

© 2016 by Christopher D. Vanlangenberg

*In memory of my fater, Donald Anthony Vanlangenberg*

## APPROVAL PAGE

This dissertation written by Christopher D. Vanlangenberg has been approved by the following committee of the Faculty of The Graduate School at The University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

Committee Chair \_\_\_\_\_  
Haimeng Zhang

Committee Members \_\_\_\_\_  
Sat Gupta

\_\_\_\_\_  
Scott Richter

\_\_\_\_\_  
Xiaoli Gao

\_\_\_\_\_  
Shan Suthaharan

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date of Acceptance by Committee

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date of Final Oral Examination

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Complete later.....!

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES . . . . .	vi
LIST OF FIGURES . . . . .	vii
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
1.1. Spatial random field . . . . .	1
1.2. Circulant matrix . . . . .	13
II. LITERATURE REVIEW (DUE AUGUST 28) . . . . .	19
III. COVARIANCE AND VARIOGRAM ESTIMATION ON THE CRICLE . . . . .	20
3.1. Stationary process on a circle . . . . .	20
3.2. Estimation . . . . .	22
3.3. Data generation on a circle . . . . .	28
IV. RANDOM PROCESS ON A SPHERE . . . . .	36
4.1. Covariance on sphere . . . . .	36
4.2. Variogram on a sphere . . . . .	41
4.3. Random process on a sphere . . . . .	42
4.4. Axially symmetry . . . . .	44
4.5. Longitudinally reversible process . . . . .	49
V. GLOBAL DATA GENERATION ON THE SPHERE . . . . .	50
5.1. Theoretical development . . . . .	50
5.2. Generalization of parametric models . . . . .	52
5.3. Method development . . . . .	58
5.4. Property of MOM . . . . .	68
VI. FUTURE RESEARCH (DUE AUGUST 28) . . . . .	74
REFERENCES . . . . .	75



# LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 1. Validity of covariance functions on the sphere, $a > 0, \theta \in [0, \pi]$ . *When $\alpha \in (0, 1]$ , power model is valid on the sphere for some $c_0 \geq \int_0^\pi (\theta/a)^\alpha \sin \theta d\theta$ . . . . .	40
Table 2. some proposed $C_m(\phi_P, \phi_Q)$ models . . . . .	49

## LIST OF FIGURES

	Page
Figure 1. Random process on a circle at 24 points ( $\Delta\lambda = 15^0$ ), the red dots represent the observed values at a given time and each point is associated with a random process of it's own. . . . .	29
Figure 2. Theoretical and empirical covariance (with bias) comparison on a circle . . . . .	31
Figure 3. Theoretical and empirical covariance comparison on a circle . . . . .	32
Figure 4. Theoretical and empirical covariance comparison on a circle, after removing biasness . . . . .	33
Figure 5. Theoretical and empirical comparison for variogram on a circle . . . . .	34
Figure 6. Four consecutive axially symmetric data snapshots based on model 2, grid resolution $2^0 \times 1^0$ (data scale -10 and 10). . . . .	70
Figure 7. Cross covariance comparison of model1 . . . . .	71
Figure 8. Cross covariance comparison of model2 . . . . .	72
Figure 9. Cross covariance comparison of model3 . . . . .	73

# CHAPTER I

## INTRODUCTION

In this chapter we have given a brief introduction to some of the basic concepts in spatial statistics which are necessary to follow other chapters in this dissertation. Moreover, we have discuss about stationarity, isotropy, intrinsic stationarity, covariance function and it properties, variogram, continuity and differentiability, spectral representations, Bochner's theorem, spectral densities, circulant matrices and it's properties with special cases.

### 1.1 Spatial random field

A real-valued spatial process in  $d$  dimensions or a spatial random field can be denoted as  $\{Z(x) : x \in D \subset \mathbb{R}^d\}$  where  $x$  is the location of process  $Z(x)$  and  $x$  varies over the set  $D$  which is fixed and discrete. The distribution of the random vector  $Z(\underline{X}) = (Z(x_1), \dots, Z(x_n))$  is given by the associated finite-dimensional joint distributions

$$F\{Z(x_1), \dots, Z(x_n)\} = P\{Z(x_1) \leq h_1, \dots, Z(x_n) \leq h_n\} \quad (1.1)$$

A random process is a collection of random variables  $X \in \{X(s) : s \in D\}$ , defined in a common probability space. In general, if

- $s \in N$ :  $X(s)$  is a random sequence which is used in time series.
- $s \in R^1$ :  $X(s)$  is a random process which is also referred as a stochastic process.
- $s \in R^d$ :  $X(s)$  is a random field or a spatial process if  $d > 1$
- $s \in S^2$ :  $X(s)$  is a random process on the sphere.
- $s \in R^d \times R$ :  $X(s)$  is a spatio-temporal process which involves location and time.

*? comment : more words*

### *Stationarity and Isotropy*

A spatial random field is strict stationarity, for all finite  $n$ ,  $x_1, \dots, x_n \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $h_1, \dots, h_n \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , if the random field is invariant under translation. that is,

$$P\{Z(x_1 + x) \leq h_1, \dots, Z(x_n + x) \leq h_n\} = P\{Z(x_1) \leq h_1, \dots, Z(x_n) \leq h_n\} \quad (1.2)$$

Strict stationarity is a too strong condition as it involves the distribution of the random field but many spatial methods are based moments. Therefore, it is sufficient to use weak assumptions and we could say a random process  $Z(x)$  is weakly stationary

if,

$$\begin{aligned} E(Z(x)) &= \mu \\ E^2(Z(x)) &< \infty \\ C(h) &= \text{Cov}(Z(x), Z(x+h)) \end{aligned} \tag{1.3}$$

if  $Z(x)$  has a finite second moment with constant mean and  $C(h)$  the covariance (also referred as auto-covariance) function depends on the spatial distance only. Further strictly stationary random fields with finite second moment is also weakly stationary, but weak stationarity does not imply strict stationarity. However, in the case of Gaussian random fields that weakly stationary are also strict stationarity because the first two moments  $(\mu, \sigma)$  will explain the distribution.

Suppose  $Z(x)$  is weakly stationary on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  with autocovariance function  $C(h)$  then it has the following properties,

- (i)  $C(0) \geq 0$
- (ii)  $C(h) = C(-h)$
- (iii)  $|C(h)| \leq C(0)$
- (iv) If  $C_1, C_2, C_n$  are valid covariance functions then following  $C(x)$  functions are also valid covariance functions
  - (a)  $C(x) = a_1 C_1 + a_2 C_2, \forall a_1, a_2 \geq 0$

$$(b) \ C(x) = C_1(x)C_2(x)$$

$$(c) \ \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} C_n(x) = C(x), \ \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^d$$

A covariance function  $C(\cdot)$  on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  is non-negative definite if and only if

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^N a_i a_j C(x_i - x_j) \geq 0, \quad (1.4)$$

for any integer  $N$ , any constants  $a_1, a_2, \dots, a_N$ , and any locations  $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . Positive definiteness is a necessary and sufficient condition to have a valid covariance function.

A weakly stationary process with a covariance function  $C(\|h\|)$  which is free from direction is called isotropy. The random field,  $Z(x)$ , on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  is strictly isotropy if the joint distributions are invariant under all rigid motions. *i.e.*, for any orthogonal  $d \times d$  matrix  $H$  and any  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$

$$P\{Z(Hx_1+x) \leq h_1, \dots, Z(Hx_n+x) \leq h_n\} = P\{Z(x_1) \leq h_1, \dots, Z(x_n) \leq h_n\} \quad (1.5)$$

Isotropy assumes that it is not required to distinguish one direction from another for the random field  $Z(x)$ .

If the variance between two locations solely depends on the distance between the two locations then the process is said to be intrinsically stationary. Semivariogram is an alternative to the covariance function proposed by Matheron. For an intrinsically stationary random field  $Z(x)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} E[Z(s)] &= \mu, \\ \gamma(h) &= \frac{1}{2} \text{Var}(Z(s+h) - Z(x)), \end{aligned} \tag{1.6}$$

Where  $\gamma$  is the semivariogram and  $\gamma(h) = C(0) - C(h)$  for a weakly stationary process with covariance function  $C(h)$ . Intrinsic stationary is defined in terms of variogram and it is more general than weak stationary which is defined in terms of covariance. Clearly, when  $C(h)$  is known we can get  $\gamma(h)$  but not  $C(h)$  when  $\gamma(h)$  is known. For example consider a linear semi variogram function,

$$\gamma(h) = \begin{cases} a^2 + \sigma^2 h & h > 0 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

when  $\lim_{h \rightarrow \infty} \gamma(h) \rightarrow \infty$  thus this is not weak stationary and  $C(h)$  does not exist.

Similar to covariance the variogram is conditionally negative definite if only if

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^N a_i a_j 2\gamma(x_i - x_j) \leq 0, \quad (1.7)$$

for any integer  $N$ , any constants  $a_1, a_2, \dots, a_N$  with  $\sum a_i = 0$ , and any locations  $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N \in \mathbb{R}^d$ .

*spectral representation of variogram*

*Mean square continuity & differentiability*

There is no simple relationship between  $C(h)$  and the smoothness of  $Z(x)$ . For a sequence of random variables  $X_1, X_2, \dots$  and a random variable  $X$  defined on a common probability space. Define,  $X_n \xrightarrow{L^2} X$  if,  $E(X^2) < \infty$  and  $E(X_n - X)^2 \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . We can say,  $\{X_n\}$  converges in  $L^2$  if there exists such a  $X$ .

Suppose  $Z(x)$  is a random field on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , Then  $Z(x)$  is mean square continuous at  $x$  if,

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} E(Z(x+h) - Z(x))^2 = 0$$

If  $Z(x)$  is weak stationary and  $C(\cdot)$  is the covariance function then  $E(Z(x+h) - Z(x))^2 = 2(C(0) - C(h))$ . Therefore  $Z(x)$  is mean square continuous iff  $C(\cdot)$  is continuous at the origin.



### *Circularly-symmetry Gaussian random vectors*

Sometimes it is convenient to use complex valued random functions, rather than real valued random functions.

We say,  $Z(x) = U(x) + iV(x)$  is a complex random field if  $U(x), V(x)$  are real random fields. If  $U(x), V(x)$  are weakly stationary so does  $Z(x)$ . The covariance function can be defined as,

$$C(h) = \text{cov}(Z(x+h), \overline{Z(x)}), \quad C(-x) = \overline{C(x)},$$

for any complex constants  $c_1, \dots, c_n$ , and any locations  $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n$ ,

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^n c_i \bar{c}_j C(x_i - x_j) \geq 0 \tag{1.8}$$

In general, a normal family has two parameters, location parameter  $\mu$  and scale parameter  $\Sigma$ . But when we are dealing with complex normal family there is one additional parameter, the relation matrix also referred as pseudo-covariance matrix. In the case of real normal family the pseudo-covariance matrix is equivalent to covariance matrix.

According to [Gal08], a complex random variable  $Z = Z^{Re} + iZ^{Im}$  is Gaussian, if  $Z^{Re}, Z^{Im}$  both are real and jointly Gaussian. Then  $Z$  is circularly-symmetric if both  $Z$  and  $e^{i\phi}Z$  has the same probability distribution for all real  $\phi$ . Since  $E[e^{i\phi}Z] = e^{i\phi}E[Z]$ , any circularly-symmetric complex random vector must have  $E[Z] = 0$ , in other words its mean must be zero.

Let the covariance matrix  $K_Z$  and the pseudo-covariance matrix  $M_Z$  of a zero mean  $2n$  complex random vector  $\underline{Z} = (Z_1, Z_2, \dots, Z_n)^T$ , where  $Z_j = (Z_j^{Re}, Z_j^{Im})^T$  and  $j = 1, 2, \dots, n$  can be defined as follows,

$$K_{\underline{Z}} = E[\underline{Z}\underline{Z}^*] \quad (1.9)$$

$$M_{\underline{Z}} = E[\underline{Z}\underline{Z}^T] \quad (1.10)$$

where  $\underline{Z}^*$  is the conjugate transpose of  $\underline{Z}$ .

For example, consider a vector  $\underline{Z} = (Z_1, Z_2)^T$  where  $Z_1 = Z_1^{Re} + iZ_1^{Im}$  and  $Z_2 = Z_1^*$  ( $Z_2^{Re} = Z_1^{Re}, Z_2^{Im} = -Z_1^{Im}$ ). The four real and imaginary parts of  $\underline{Z}$  are jointly Gaussian (each  $N(0, 1/2)$ ), so  $\underline{Z}$  is complex Gaussian.

Now, the covariance and pseudo-covariance matrices are different defined by 1.9 and 1.10 respectively given by

$$M_Z = E \begin{bmatrix} Z_1^2 & Z_1 Z_1^* \\ Z_1 Z_1^* & Z_1^2 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

similarly,  $K_Z = E \begin{bmatrix} Z_1 Z_1^* & Z_1^2 \\ Z_1^2 & Z_1 Z_1^* \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$

It is easy to notice that  $E[Z_1^2] = E[z_1^{Re} z_1^{Re} - z_1^{Im} z_1^{Im}] = 1/2 - 1/2 = 0$  and if  $Z_1$  is real (obviously also  $Z_2$ ) then covarince and pseudo-covariance matrices are the same *i.e.*  $M_Z \equiv K_Z$

The covariance matrix of real  $2n$  random vector  $\underline{Z} = (\underline{Z}^{Re}, \underline{Z}^{Im})^T$  is determined by both  $K_{\underline{Z}}$  and  $M_{\underline{Z}}$  as follows,

$$\begin{aligned} E[\underline{Z}^{Re} \underline{Z}^{Re}] &= \frac{1}{2} Re(K_{\underline{Z}} + M_{\underline{Z}}), \\ E[\underline{Z}^{Im} \underline{Z}^{Im}] &= \frac{1}{2} Re(K_{\underline{Z}} - M_{\underline{Z}}), \\ E[\underline{Z}^{Re} \underline{Z}^{Im}] &= \frac{1}{2} Im(-K_{\underline{Z}} + M_{\underline{Z}}), \\ E[\underline{Z}^{Im} \underline{Z}^{Re}] &= \frac{1}{2} Im(K_{\underline{Z}} + M_{\underline{Z}}) \end{aligned} \tag{1.11}$$

We can get the covariance of  $\underline{Z} = (\underline{Z}^{Re}, \underline{Z}^{Im})^T$  as follows,

$$\begin{aligned} Cov(\underline{Z}) &= E(\underline{Z}\underline{Z}^T) \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} E[\underline{Z}^{Re} \underline{Z}^{Re}] & E[\underline{Z}^{Re} \underline{Z}^{Im}] \\ E[\underline{Z}^{Im} \underline{Z}^{Re}] & E[\underline{Z}^{Im} \underline{Z}^{Im}] \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

*Theorem 1.1.1* (Gallager, 2008).

Let  $\underline{Z}$  be a zero mean Gaussian random vector then  $M_{\underline{Z}} = 0$  if and only if  $\underline{Z}$  is circularly-symmetric.

*Spectral representation of a random field*

Suppose  $\omega_1, \dots, \omega_n \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and let  $Z_1, \dots, Z_n$  be mean zero complex random variables with  $E(Z_i \bar{Z}_j) = 0, i \neq j$  and  $E|Z_i|^2 = f_i$ . Then the random sum

$$Z(x) = \sum_{k=1}^n Z_k e^{i\omega_k^T x}. \quad (1.12)$$

Then  $Z(x)$  given above is a weakly stationary complex random field in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  with covariance function  $C(x) = \sum_{k=1}^n f_k e^{i\omega_k^T x}$

Further, if we think about the integral as a limit in  $L^2$  of the above random sum, then the covariance function can be represented as,

$$C(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{i\omega^T x} F(d\omega) \quad (1.13)$$

where  $F$  is the so-called spectral distribution. There is a more general result from Bochner.

*Theorem 1.1.2* (Bochner's Theorem).

A complex valued covariance function  $C(\cdot)$  on  $\mathbb{R}$  for a weakly stationary mean square continuous complex-valued random field on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  iff it can be represented as above, where  $F$  is a positive measure.

If  $F$  has a density with respect to Lebesgue measure (spectral density) denoted by  $f$ , (*i.e.* if such  $f$  exists) we can use the inversion formula to obtain  $f$

$$f(\omega) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{-i\omega^T x} C(x) dx \quad (1.14)$$

### *Spectral densities*

- (i) Rational Functions that are even, non-negative and integrable the corresponding covariance functions can be expressed in terms of elementary functions. For

example if  $f(\omega) = \phi(\alpha^2 + \omega^2)^{-1}$ , then  $C(h) = \pi\phi\alpha^{-1}e^{-\alpha|h|}$  (obtained by contour integration).

- (ii) Gaussian are the most commonly used covariance function for a smooth process on  $\mathbb{R}$  where the covariance function is given by  $C(h) = ce^{-\alpha h^2}$  and the corresponding spectral density is  $f(\omega) = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\pi\alpha}}ce^{-\frac{\omega^2}{4\alpha}}$ .
- (iii) *Matérn* class has more practical use and more frequently used in spatial statistics. The spectral density of the form  $f(\omega) = \frac{1}{\phi(\alpha^2 + \omega^2)^{\nu+1/2}}$  where  $\phi, \nu, \alpha > 0$  and the corresponding covariance function given by,

$$C(h) = \frac{\pi^{1/2}\phi}{2^{\nu-1}\Gamma(\nu+1/2)\alpha^{2\nu}}(\alpha|h|)^{\nu}Y_{\nu}(\alpha|h|) \quad (1.15)$$

where  $Y_{\nu}$  is the modified Bessel function, the larger the  $\nu$  smoother the  $Y$ . Further,  $Y$  will be  $m$  times square differentiable iff  $\nu > m$ . When  $\nu$  is in the form of  $m + 1/2$  with  $m$  a non negative integer. The spectral density is rational and the covariance function is in the form of  $e^{-\alpha|h|} \cdot \text{polynomial}(|h|)$  for example, when  $\nu = \frac{1}{2}$   $C(h)$  corresponds to exponential model and  $\nu = \frac{3}{2}$  is transformation of exponential family of order 2.

$$\begin{aligned}\nu = 1/2 & \quad : \quad C(h) = \pi\phi\alpha^{-1}e^{-\alpha|h|} \\ \nu = 3/2 & \quad : \quad C(h) = \frac{1}{2}\pi\phi\alpha^{-3}e^{-\alpha|h|}(1 + \alpha|h|)\end{aligned}$$

## 1.2 Circulant matrix

A square matrix  $A_{n \times n}$  is a circulant matrix if the elements of each row (except first row) has the previous row shifted by one place to the right.

$$A = \text{circ}[a_0, a_1, \dots, a_{n-1}] = \begin{bmatrix} a_0 & a_1 & a_2 & \cdots & a_{n-1} \\ a_{n-1} & a_0 & a_1 & \cdots & a_{n-2} \\ a_{n-2} & a_{n-1} & a_0 & \cdots & a_{n-3} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ a_1 & a_2 & a_3 & \cdots & a_0 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (1.16)$$

The eigenvalues of  $A$  are given by

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda_l &= \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} a_k e^{i2lk\pi/n} \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} a_k \rho_l^k, \quad l = 0, 1, 2, \dots, n-1,\end{aligned}$$

where  $\rho_l = e^{i2\pi l/n}$  represents the  $l$ th root of 1, and the corresponding (unitary) eigenvector is given by

$$\psi_l = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}(1, \rho_l, \rho_l^2, \dots, \rho_l^{n-1})^T.$$

If matrix  $A$  is real symmetric then its eigen values are real; for even  $n = 2h$  the eigen values  $\lambda_j = \lambda_{n-j}$  or there are either two eigen values or none with odd multiplicity, for odd  $n = 2h - 1$  the eigen value  $\lambda_0$  equal to any  $\lambda_j$  for  $1 \leq j \leq h - 1$  or  $\lambda_0$  occurs with odd multiplicity. A square matrix  $B$  is Hermitian, if and only if  $B^* = B$  where  $B^*$  is the complex conjugate. If  $B$  is real then  $B^* = B^T$ . According to [Tee05] Hermitian matrices has a full set of orthogonal eigen vectors with corresponding real eigen values.

#### *Block circulant matrices*

The idea of a block circulant matrix was first proposed by [Mui20]. A matrix  $B_{np \times np}$  is a block-circulant matrix if it has the following form,



$$B = bcirc[a_o, a_1, \dots, a_{n-1}] = \begin{bmatrix} a_0 & a_1 & a_2 & \cdots & a_{n-1} \\ a_{n-1} & a_0 & a_1 & \cdots & a_{n-2} \\ a_{n-2} & a_{n-1} & a_0 & \cdots & a_{n-3} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ a_1 & a_2 & a_3 & \cdots & a_0 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (1.17)$$

where  $a_j$  are  $(p \times p)$  sub matrices of complex or real valued elements. [DMG83] proposed some methodologies to find the inverse of  $B$ . Let  $M$  be a block-permutation matrix

$$M = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & I_p & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & I_p & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & I_p \\ I_p & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

where  $I_p$  is  $p \times p$  identity matrix and  $B$  can be defined as follows,

$$B = \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} a_k M^k.$$

Define  $M^0$  as  $(np \times np)$  identity matrix and the eigen values of  $M$  given by  $\rho_l$ , the eigen matrix of  $M$  can be given by  $Q_{np \times np} = \{\psi_0, \psi_1, \dots, \psi_{n-1}\}$ . From [Tra73] it can be shown that  $Q^{-1} = Q^*/n$  where  $Q^*$  is the conjugate transpose of  $Q$  now we can write,

$$M = QDQ^{-1} = \frac{QDQ^*}{n}$$

where  $D$  is a diagonal matrix and the diagonal elements  $d_i$   $i = 0, 1, n-1$  are the discrete Fourier transform of the blocks  $a_j$ ,

$$d_i = \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} a_k e^{i2lk\pi/n}$$

That is the inverse of matrix  $B$  takes the following form,

$$B^{-1} = Q \cdot \begin{pmatrix} d_0^{-1} & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & d_1^{-1} & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & d_{n-1}^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \cdot Q^{-1}.$$

The eigen matrix  $Q$  is solely depending on the dimension of  $B$  and the eigen values of  $B$  ( $\rho_l$ 's) or in other words  $B$  is not depending on the blocks ( $a_j$ 's) *i.e.* for any block diagonal matrix  $D_{np \times np}$ ,  $QDQ^{-1}$  is a block circulant matrix and immediately follows that the inverse of the matrix  $B$  is also a block circulant matrix.

When  $a_{j_1 \times 1}$ ,  $B = A$ ,  $d_i^{-1} = \lambda^{-1}$ , and the eigen matrix has a dimension of  $n \times n$  then

$$A^{-1} = Q\Lambda^{-1}Q^T \quad \text{where } \Lambda = \{\lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_{n-1}\}$$

When  $A$  is real symmetric  $Q$  is real also symmetric and  $Q^{-1} = Q^T$ .

*should we add the following special cases?*

Case 1 : When  $a_j$ 's are symmetric (*by Tee, add citation*)

Case 2 : When  $a_j$ 's are circulant

CHAPTER II  
LITERATURE REVIEW (DUE AUGUST 28)

# CHAPTER III

## COVARIANCE AND VARIOGRAM ESTIMATION ON THE CRICLE

### 3.1 Stationary process on a circle

In this chapter we consider a real valued process  $\{X(P) : P \in S\}$  on the unit circle  $S$ , with finite second moment and continuity in quadratic mean. According to [DR76] the process  $\{X(P)\}$  can be represented in a Fourier series which is convergent in quadratic mean,

$$X(P) = A_0 + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (A_n \cos(nP) + B_n \sin(nP)). \quad (3.1)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{where } A_0 &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_S X(P) dP, \\ A_n &= \frac{1}{\pi} \int_S \cos(nP) dP \\ B_n &= \frac{1}{\pi} \int_S \sin(nP) dP \end{aligned} \quad (3.2)$$

Let  $P, Q$  be any two points on the circle, the covariance  $R(P, Q)$  between the two points can be defined as,

$$R(P, Q) = E(X(P)X(Q)) = cov(X(P), X(Q))$$

The process  $X(P)$  is stationary if  $E(X(P))$  is a constant and  $R(P, Q)$  is function of the angular distance  $\theta_{PQ}$  between  $P$  and  $Q$ . If the process  $X(P)$  is stationary on the circle,

$$cov(A_n, A_m) = a_n \delta(n, m) = cov(B_n, B_m), \quad \text{for } n, m \geq 0. \quad (3.3)$$

Let  $\{X(t_k)\}$  be a collection of gridded observations on a circle, with  $t_k = (k - 1) * 2\pi/n, k = 1, 2, \dots, n$ . Let  $C(\theta), \theta \in [0, \pi]$  denote a stationary covariance function on the circle, the underlying process is stationary if it's covariance function solely depends on the distance  $\theta$  and given as follows,

$$C(\theta) = cov(X(t_k + \theta), X(t_k)), \quad \theta \in [0, \pi]. \quad (3.4)$$

The above covariance function can be written as a Fourier summation ([Roy72])

$$C(\theta) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n \cos(n\theta), \quad (3.5)$$

with  $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n < \infty$ , and  $a_n \geq 0$ . Note that

$$a_n = \frac{2}{\pi} \int_0^{\pi} C(\theta) \cos(n\theta) d\theta \quad \text{and} \quad a_0 = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_0^{\pi} C(\theta) d\theta.$$

### 3.2 Estimation

Assuming the covariance function  $C(\theta)$  on a circle is a continuous function on  $[0, \pi]$  and the gridded points  $\{X(t_k)\}$  on a circle can be represented as  $\underline{X} = (X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n)^T$ . The variance-covariance matrix of the sample vector  $\underline{X}$  is given by  $\Sigma$ . Let's assume  $E(X(t)) = \mu$  is unknown, and estimated by  $\bar{X} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X(t_i)$ . Further, we can denote  $\bar{X}$  in the following form,

$$\bar{X} = \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{1}_n^T \underline{X}$$



$$\begin{aligned}
\text{then, } \text{var}(\bar{X}) &= \text{cov}\left(\frac{1}{n}\mathbf{1}_n^T X, \frac{1}{n}\mathbf{1}_n^T X\right) \\
&= \frac{1}{n^2}\mathbf{1}_n^T \Sigma \mathbf{1}_n \\
&= \frac{1}{n} \left( C(0) + C(\pi) + 2 \sum_{m=1}^{N-1} C(m2\pi/n) \right)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{When } n \rightarrow \infty, \frac{1}{n} \left( 2 \sum_{m=0}^N C(m2\pi/n) \right) &= \frac{1}{\pi} \frac{\pi}{N} \left( \sum_{m=0}^N C(m2\pi/n) \right) \\
&\rightarrow \frac{1}{\pi} \int_0^\pi C(\theta) d\theta = a_0.
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Hence } \text{var}(\bar{X}) &= \frac{1}{n} \left( 2 \sum_{m=0}^N C(m2\pi/n) \right) - \frac{1}{n} (C(0) + C(\pi)) \\
&\rightarrow a_0, \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty.
\end{aligned}$$

We can conclude that  $var(\bar{X}) \rightarrow \frac{1}{\pi} \int_0^\pi C(\theta) d\theta$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

*Proposition 3.2.1.* Let  $\bar{X}$  be an unbiased estimator for  $\mu$  then  $\bar{X}$  is not a consistent estimator for  $\mu$ , mean on a circle.

**proof:** If  $\bar{X}$  is consistant we get the following,

$$P(|\bar{X} - \mu| > \varepsilon) \rightarrow 0.$$

If  $var(\bar{X}) \rightarrow 0$  and from Chebyshev's inequality we have

$$P(|\bar{X} - \mu| > \varepsilon) \leq \frac{var(\bar{X})}{\varepsilon^2} \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{for any } \varepsilon > 0.$$

Therefore,  $var(\bar{X}) \rightarrow 0$  is a sufficient condition for consistency, but it is not necessary. However, if we assume  $\underline{X}$  is multivariate normally distributed, then  $\bar{X}$  follows normal distribution with mean  $\mu$  and approximate variance  $\sigma_0$ . Then  $(Z \sim N(0, 1))$

$$\begin{aligned}
P(|\bar{X} - \mu| > \varepsilon) &= P\left(\frac{|\bar{X} - \mu|}{\sqrt{a_0}} > \frac{\varepsilon}{\sqrt{a_0}}\right) \\
&= P\left(|Z| > \frac{\varepsilon}{\sqrt{\sigma_0}}\right) \not\rightarrow 0
\end{aligned}$$

since  $\frac{\varepsilon}{\sqrt{\sigma_0}}$  is a fixed constant for each fixed  $\varepsilon > 0$ .

#### *Estimation of covariance on a circle*

We used method of moments (MOM) to estimate the covariance  $C(\theta)$  on a circle, the estimator can be given by

$$\hat{C}(\Delta\lambda) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (X(t_i + \Delta\lambda) - \bar{X})(X(t_i) - \bar{X}), \quad (3.6)$$

where  $\Delta\lambda = 0, 2\pi/n, 4\pi/n, \dots, 2(N-1)\pi/n$ .

We can show that the above estimator is a biased estimator for  $C(\theta)$ .

$$\begin{aligned}
E(\hat{C}(\Delta\lambda)) &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n E((X(t_i + \Delta\lambda) - \bar{X})(X(t_i) - \bar{X})) \\
&= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n E((X(t_i + \Delta\lambda) - \mu - (\bar{X} - \mu))(X(t_i) - \mu - (\bar{X} - \mu))) \\
&= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \text{cov}(X(t_i + \Delta\lambda), X(t_i)) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n E((X(t_i + \Delta\lambda) - \mu)(\bar{X} - \mu)) \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n E((X(t_i) - \mu)(\bar{X} - \mu)) + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n E((\bar{X} - \mu)(\bar{X} - \mu)) \\
&= C(\Delta\lambda) - E((\bar{X} - \mu)(\bar{X} - \mu)) - E((\bar{X} - \mu)(\bar{X} - \mu)) \\
&\quad + E((\bar{X} - \mu)(\bar{X} - \mu)) \\
&= C(\Delta\lambda) - \text{var}(\bar{X}).
\end{aligned}$$

**Remark 1** The MOM estimator  $\hat{C}(\Delta\lambda)$  of the covariance function is actually a biased estimator with the shift amount of  $a_0$ . Therefore, if  $a_0 = 0$  for a covariance function, we have the unbiased estimator  $\hat{C}(\Delta\lambda)$ .

**Remark 2** If the gridded points were on a line, for example in time series,  $E(\bar{X} - \mu)^2 \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  under the assumption that the covariance function  $C(\theta) \rightarrow 0$  when  $\theta \rightarrow \infty$  (which is practically feasible), that is,  $\bar{X}$  is consistent in the case of points on a line. In the case of circle, we might not have  $C(\theta)$  close to 0 since  $\theta$  is within a bounded region  $((0, \pi)$  for the circle) and we normally assume  $C(\theta)$  is continuous for  $\theta$ .

*Estimation of variogram on a circle*

The theoretical variogram function is given by,

$$\gamma(\theta) = C(0) - C(\theta). \quad (3.7)$$

and the MOM estimator for the variogram is given by,

$$\hat{\gamma}(\Delta\lambda) = \frac{1}{2n} \sum_{i=1}^n (X(t_i + \Delta\lambda) - X(t_i))^2. \quad (3.8)$$

We can show that variogram estimator through MOM is an unbiased estimator,

$$\begin{aligned}
E(\hat{\gamma}(\Delta\lambda)) &= \frac{1}{2n} \sum_{i=1}^n E(X(t_i + \Delta\lambda) - X(t_i))^2 \\
&= \frac{1}{2n} \sum_{i=1}^n E((X(t_i + \Delta\lambda) - \mu) - (X(t_i) - \mu))^2 \\
&= \frac{1}{2n} \sum_{i=1}^n \text{cov}(X(t_i + \Delta\lambda) - X(t_i), X(t_i + \Delta\lambda) - X(t_i)) \\
&= \frac{1}{2n} \sum_{i=1}^n \{ \text{cov}(X(t_i + \Delta\lambda), X(t_i + \Delta\lambda)) + \text{cov}(X(t_i), X(t_i)) \\
&\quad - 2\text{cov}(X(t_i + \Delta\lambda), X(t_i)) \} \\
&= \frac{1}{2n} \sum_{i=1}^n (C(0) + C(0) - 2C(\Delta\lambda)) \\
&= C(0) - C(\Delta\lambda) = \gamma(\Delta\lambda).
\end{aligned}$$

*need to prove consistency*

### 3.3 Data generation on a circle

First, we will discuss how to generate correlated data at  $n$  girded points on a circle when the covarince function is defined and compare above covariance and variogram estimators. Since the observed data are correlated, the covariance function can be written as a function of distance (angle). For the data generation process we will use exponential family and power family covariance function as given below,

$$C(\theta) = C_1 e^{-a|\theta|} \quad a > 0, C_1 > 0 \quad (3.9)$$




Figure 1. Random process on a circle at 24 points ( $\Delta\lambda = 15^\circ$ ), the red dots represent the observed values at a given time and each point is associated with a random process of it's own.

$$C(\theta) = c_0 - (|\theta|/a)^\alpha \quad a > 0, \alpha \in (0, 2] \text{ and } c_0 \geq \int_0^\pi (\theta/a)^\alpha \sin \theta d\theta \quad (3.10)$$

where  $\theta = i * \Delta\lambda = \pm i * 2\pi/n, i = 1, 2, \dots, \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$

Clearly, each location is correlated with other  $n - 1$  locations and  $C(\theta) = C(-\theta)$  the variance-covariance matrix  $\Sigma$  is circulant and will be in the following form,

$$\begin{aligned}
\Sigma &= \text{circ}(C(0), C(\delta), C(2\delta), \dots, C((N-1)\delta), C(\pi), C((N-1)\delta), \dots, C(\delta)) \\
&= \begin{pmatrix} C(0) & \dots & C((N-1)\delta) & C(\pi) & C((N-1)\delta) & \dots & C(\delta) \\ C(\delta) & \dots & C((N-2)\delta) & C((N-1)\delta) & C(\pi) & \dots & C(2\delta) \\ C(2\delta) & \dots & C((N-3)\delta) & C((N-2)\delta) & C((N-1)\delta) & \dots & C(3\delta) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ C(\delta) & \dots & C(\pi) & C((N-1)\delta) & C((N-2)\delta) & \dots & C(0) \end{pmatrix} \\
&= Q\Lambda Q^T,
\end{aligned}$$

where  $\delta = 2\pi/n$ ,  $\Lambda = \{\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n\}$  and  $Q = \{\psi_1, \psi_2, \dots, \psi_n\}$  are the respective eigen values and eigen vectors of the above circulant matrix. Now using singular value decomposition (SVD) we can obtain the correlated data  $\underline{X}$  on a circle as follows,

$$\underline{X} = \Sigma^{1/2} * Z = Q\Lambda^{1/2}Q^T * Z$$

where  $Z \sim N(\underline{0}, 1_n)$ .

#### *Compare covariance estimator*

In section 3.2 we proved that, in general the covarince estimator (3.6) on a circle is biased, with a bias of  $var(\bar{X})$ . In order to make things simple we set  $C_1, a = 1$



when  $\alpha = 0.5$   $c_0 \geq \int_0^\pi (\theta)^{0.5} \sin \theta d\theta$ , from Fresnel intergal it can be shown that  $c_0 \geq 2.4353$ . Now we compare the covariance estimator to it's theoretical covarince given by equations 3.9 and 3.10. We computed the MOM estimator  $\hat{C}(\theta)$  with 48 gridded observations on the circle from 500 simulations.




Figure 2. Theoretical and empirical covariance (with bias) comparison on a circle

**Remark 1:** We noticed that the shift between theoretical and empirical values were approximately equal to  $a_0$  and we can obtain  $a_0$  for the above covarince as follows,

$$\text{exponential : } a_0 = \frac{C_1}{a\pi}(1 - e^{-a\pi})$$

$$\text{power : } a_0 = c_0 - \left(\frac{\pi}{a}\right)^\alpha \frac{1}{\alpha + 1}$$

Now we consider the following covariance function, after subtracting  $a_0$  from  $C(\theta)$ .

$$D(\theta) = C(\theta) - a_0.$$

If the new covariance function  $D(\theta)$  was used to generate the data on a circle then the theoretical and empirical values will match perfectly.




Figure 3. Theoretical and empirical covariance comparison on a circle

**Remark 2:** If the process is a zero mean process the covariance estimator will be unbiased (*i.e.*  $Var(\bar{X}) = 0$ ) hence we will get a perfect match between theoretical and empirical values.

**Remark 3:** We have shown that covariance estimator is biased and the biasness will approach to  $a_0$ . When covariance function is unknown the biasness  $a_0$  is also known and the biasness cannot be estimated (cannot find the variance of  $\bar{X}$ ) from one circle, however in both exponential and power covariance models it can be estimated if multiple copies of data (on a circle) were generated *i.e.*  $\hat{a} = var(\bar{X})$ .




Figure 4. Theoretical and empirical covariance comparison on a circle, after removing biasness

### Compare variogram estimator

We proved that in general the variogram estimator is unbiased *and consistent*. The theoretical variogram based on exponential covariance is given below,

$$\gamma(\theta) = C(0) - C(\theta) = C_1(1 - e^{-a|\theta|})$$

We computed the variogram estimator  $\hat{\gamma}(\theta)$  with 48 gridded observations on the circle from 500 simulations and there is a better fit between theoretical and empirical values compared to covariance models.




Figure 5. Theoretical and empirical comparison for variogram on a circle

**Remark 4** *should we talk about how  $n_L$  is related with number of simulations*

## CHAPTER IV

### RANDOM PROCESS ON A SPHERE

Suppose  $X \in \{X(s) : s \in D\}$ , defined in a common probability space  $s \in S^2$ :  $X(s)$  is a random process or a spatial processes on the sphere  $S^2$  with radius  $r$  and  $s$  represents any location on sphere by latitude  $L$  and longitude  $l$ , where  $0 \geq L \geq \pi$  and  $-\pi \geq l \geq \pi$ .

#### 4.1 Covariance on sphere

The random process  $X(\cdot)$  is said to be homogeneous (or isotropy) on  $S^2$  if second moment is finite and invariant under the rotations on the sphere with constant mean. Similarly, we can define an isoropic random process on a sphere as,

$$\begin{aligned} E(X(s)) &= \mu \quad \text{for any } s \in S^2 \\ \text{Cov}(X(s_1), X(s_2)) &= C(\theta_{s_1 s_2}) \end{aligned}$$

where  $\theta_{s_1 s_2}$  is the spherical angle between two locations  $s_1, s_2$ . For a unit sphere ( $r = 1$ ), the distance between the two locations can be defined as great circle distance ( $\text{gcd}_{s_1 s_2}$ ) or chordal distance ( $ch_{s_1 s_2}$ ) as follows,

$$\begin{aligned}
\theta_{s_1 s_2} &= \arcsin(\sin(L_1) \sin(L_2) + \cos(L_1) \cos(L_2) \cos(l_1 - l_2)) \\
gcd_{s_1 s_2} &= 1 \cdot \theta_{s_1 s_2} \\
ch_{s_1 s_2} &= 2 \sin(\theta_{s_1 s_2}/2)
\end{aligned}$$

In the case of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , non-negative definite is a necessary and sufficient condition for a valid covariance function defined on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  (1.4). Similarly, a real continuous function  $C(\cdot)$  defined on the sphere is a valid covariance function if and only if it is non-negative definite,

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^N a_i a_j C(\theta_{s_1 s_2}) \geq 0, \quad (4.1)$$

for any integer  $N$ , any constants  $a_1, a_2, \dots, a_N$ , and any locations  $s_1, s_2, \dots, s_N \in S^2$ .

According to [Sch42] a real continuous function  $C(\theta)$  is a valid covariance function on  $S^d$ , where  $d = 1, 2, \dots$ , if and only if it can be written in the following form

$$C(\theta) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} c_k P_k^{(r)}(\cos \theta) \quad r = \frac{1}{2}(d-1) \quad (4.2)$$

where  $P_k(\cdot)$  are Legendre polynomials with  $\forall c_k \geq 0$  and  $\sum c_k < \infty$ .

When  $d = 1$  the covariance on a circle can be expressed as follows,

$$C(\theta) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} c_k \cos \theta \quad (4.3)$$

When  $d = 2$  the covariance on a sphere ( $S^2$ ) can be expressed as follows,

$$C(\theta) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} c_k P_k(\cos \theta) \quad (4.4)$$

Suppose  $C(\cdot)$  is a covariance functions that is valid in  $S^d$  then it is valid on  $S^r$   $r \leq d$  but covariance functions that are valid on  $S^r$  may not be valid on  $S^d$   $d > r$  *example?*.

*?if a covariance function is not valid on  $S^r$  it is not valid on  $S^d$   $d > r$  (example).*

Since the Legendre polynomials are orthogonal we have



$$\int_{-1}^1 P_n(x)P_m(x)dx = \frac{2}{2n+1}\delta_{nm}$$

and on a sphere the coefficients  $c_k$  can be obtained by

$$c_\nu = \frac{2\nu+1}{2} \int_0^\pi C(\theta)P_\nu(\cos\theta)d\theta. \quad \nu = 0, 1, 2, \dots \quad (4.5)$$

One can directly use the above integral to evaluate the validity of a covariance function on the sphere by checking if  $c_k$  is non-negative and  $\sum c_k < \infty$  .

All covariance models that are valid on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  are not valid on the sphere ( $S^2$ ), [HZR11] evaluated the validity of commonly used covariance on a sphere that are valid on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , they showed that some models are not valid on the sphere and some models are valid only for certain parameter values.

Model	Covariance function	Validity $S^2$
Spherical	$\left(1 - \frac{3\theta}{2a} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\theta^3}{a^3}\right) \mathbf{1}_{(\theta \leq a)}$	Yes
Stable	$\exp\left\{-\left(\frac{\theta}{a}\right)^\alpha\right\}$	Yes for $\alpha \in (0, 1]$ No for $\alpha \in (1, 2]$
Exponential	$\exp\left\{-\left(\frac{\theta}{a}\right)\right\}$	Yes
Gaussian	$\exp\left\{-\left(\frac{\theta}{a}\right)^2\right\}$	No
Power*	$c_0 - (\theta/a)^\alpha$	Yes for $\alpha \in (0, 1]$ No for $\alpha \in (1, 2]$
Radon transform of order 2	$e^{-\theta/a}(1 + \theta/a)$	No
Radon transform of order 4	$e^{-\theta/a}(1 + \theta/a + \theta^2/3a^2)$	No
Cauchy	$(1 + \theta^2/a^2)^{-1}$	No
Hole - effect	$\sin a\theta/\theta$	No

Table 1. Validity of covariance functions on the sphere,  $a > 0, \theta \in [0, \pi]$ . \*When  $\alpha \in (0, 1]$ , power model is valid on the sphere for some  $c_0 \geq \int_0^\pi (\theta/a)^\alpha \sin \theta d\theta$ .

Furthermore, [Gne13] argued that Matérn covariance function is valid on the sphere when the smoothness parameter  $\nu \in (0, 1/2)$  and it is not valid if  $\nu > 1/2$ . [Yad83] showed that if  $K(\cdot)$  is valid isotropic covariance function on  $\mathbb{R}^3$  then

$$C(\theta) = K(2 \sin(\theta/2))$$

is a valid isotropic covariance function on the unit sphere (where  $\theta$  is *gcd*).

## 4.2 Variogram on a sphere

A random process  $X(\cdot)$  on a sphere, [HZR11] defined, if  $E(X(s)) = \mu$  for all  $s \in S^2$  and  $Var(X(s_1) - X(s_2)) = 2\gamma(\theta_{s_1 s_2})$  and for all  $s_1, s_2 \in S^2$  then  $X(\cdot)$  is intrinsically stationary on  $S^2$  where  $2\gamma(\cdot)$  is the variogram. The variogram is conditionally negative definite

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^N a_i a_j 2\gamma(\theta_{s_1 s_2}) \leq 0, \quad (4.6)$$

for any integer  $N$ , any constants  $a_1, a_2, \dots, a_N$  with  $\sum a_i = 0$ , and any locations  $s_1, s_2, \dots, s_N \in S^2$ . Immediately from 4.7 for a continuous  $2\gamma(\cdot)$  with  $\gamma(0) = 0$  the variogram is negative definite if and only if

$$C(\theta) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} c_k (1 - P_k(\cos \theta)) \quad (4.7)$$

where  $P_k(\cdot)$  are Legendre polynomials with  $\forall c_k \geq 0$  and  $\sum c_k < \infty$ .

In the introduction we pointed out in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  one can always construct the variogram if the covariance function is given but not the converse. However, in  $S^2$  [Yag61] argued that for a valid  $\gamma(\theta)$   $\theta \in [0, \pi]$  one can always construct covariance function  $C(\theta) = c_0 - \gamma(\theta)$  for some  $c_0 \geq \int_0^\pi \gamma(\theta) \sin(\theta) d\theta$ .

### 4.3 Random process on a sphere

[Jon63] showed that a random process on a sphere, can be written as a summation of spherical harmonics  $Y_\nu^m(P)$ .

A random process  $X(P)$  on a unit sphere  $S^2$ , where  $P = (\lambda, \phi) \in S^2$  where  $P = (\lambda, \phi) \in S^2$  with longitude  $\lambda \in [-\pi, \pi)$  and latitude  $\phi \in [0, \pi]$ . Suppose the process is isotropy and continuous in quadratic mean with respect to the location  $P$  then the process can be represented by spherical harmonics,  $P_\nu^m(\cdot)$  normalized associated Legendre polynomials, with the sum converges in mean square ([LN97, HZR12]).

$$X(P) = \sum_{\nu=0}^{\infty} \sum_{m=-\nu}^{\nu} Z_{\nu,m} e^{im\lambda} P_\nu^m(\cos \phi), \quad (4.8)$$

Since  $\cos(\phi) \in [-1, 1]$  we have  $\int_{-1}^1 [P_\nu^m(\cos(\phi))]^2 d\cos(\phi) = 1$ , and  $Z_{\nu,m}$  are complex-valued coefficients satisfying.

$$Z_{\nu,m} = \int_{S^2} X(P) e^{-im\lambda} P_\nu^m(\cos \phi) dP. \quad (4.9)$$

Suppose the process  $X(P)$  is isotropy with 0 mean (without loss of generality) which implies  $E(Z_{\nu,m}) = 0$ . Let  $P = (\lambda_P, \phi_P)$  and  $Q = (\lambda_Q, \phi_Q)$  be two arbitrary locations on the sphere, if the covariance function  $R(P, Q)$  on  $S^2$  solely depends on the spherical distance between  $(P, Q)$  and from 4.7, 4.5 we can derive the covariance function as follows,

$$\begin{aligned} R(P, Q) &= E(X(P) \overline{X(Q)}) \\ &= \sum_{\nu=0}^{\infty} \sum_{\mu=0}^{\infty} \sum_{m=-\nu}^{\nu} \sum_{n=-\mu}^{\mu} E(Z_{\nu,m} \overline{Z_{\mu,n}}) e^{im\lambda_P} P_\nu^m(\cos \phi_P) e^{-in\lambda_Q} P_\mu^n(\cos \phi_Q) \\ &= \sum_{\nu=0}^{\infty} \frac{(2\nu+1)f_\nu}{2} P_\nu(\cos \theta(P, Q)). \end{aligned} \quad (4.10)$$

where  $\bar{Z}$  denotes the complex conjugate of  $Z$ ,  $\theta(P, Q)$  is the spherical distance,  $P_\nu(\cdot)$  is the Legendre polynomial, and  $\sum_{\nu=0}^{\infty} (2\nu+1)f_\nu < \infty$ . Here, the random variable  $Z_{\nu,m}$  satisfies

$$E(Z_{\nu,m} \overline{Z_{\mu,n}}) = \delta_{\nu,\mu} \delta_{n,m} f_\nu,$$

where  $\delta_{a,b} = 1$  if  $a = b$ , and 0 otherwise.

#### 4.4 Axially symmetry

In the previous sections we discussed why it is necessary to use  $S^2$  instead of  $R^3$  when studying about random processes on Earth and isotropy is often assumed ([Yad83, Yag87]). However, many studies have pointed out this assumption is not reasonable ([Ste07, JS08, BL11]) for random processes on the sphere primarily on Earth. [Ste07] argued that Total Ozone Mapping Spectrometer (TOMS) data varies strongly with latitudes and homogeneous models are not suitable. Moreover, aerosol depth (AOD) from Multi-angle Imaging Spectrometer (MISR), Sea Surface Temperature (SST) from RRMM Microwave Imager (TMI) are some other example for anisotropy global data on a sphere (on Earth). In order to study non homogeneous processes on the sphere [Jon63] introduces the concept of axially symmetry, where the covariance between two spatial points depend on the longitudes only through their difference between two points.

A random process  $X(P) : P \in S^2$  on the sphere and let  $R(P, Q)$  be a valid covariance function on the sphere where  $P = (L_P, l_P), Q = (L_Q, l_Q)$  then  $X(P)$  is axially symmetric if and only if

$$R(L_P, L_Q, l_P, l_Q) = R(L_P, L_Q, l_P - l_Q).$$

Currently, to our knowledge there are no methods to test axially symmetry in real data. However, this assumption is more plausible and reasonable when modeling spatial data. For example, temperature, moisture, etc. most likely symmetric on longitudes rather than latitudes. [Ste07] propose a method to model axially symmetric process on a sphere (the fitted model is not the best, but this was a good start). When modeling spatial data stationary models are less useful; but using the concept of axially symmetry [JS08] proposed a flexible class of parametric covariance models to capture the non-stationarity of global data. [HS12] discussed about the properties of an existing class of models for axially symmetric Gaussian processes on the sphere. They applied first-order differential operators to an isotropic process. [HZR12] developed a new representation of axially symmetric process on the sphere and further introduced some parametric covariance models that are valid on  $S^2$ .

if the process is axially symmetric  $E(Z_{\nu,m}\overline{Z}_{\mu,n})$  can be expressed as,

$$E(Z_{\nu,m}\overline{Z}_{\mu,n}) = \delta_{n,m}f_{\nu,\mu,m}.$$

Hence, for an axially symmetric process the covariance function 4.10 will be the following form ([HZR12])

$$\begin{aligned}
R(P, Q) &= R(\phi_P, \phi_Q, \lambda_P - \lambda_Q) \\
&= \sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{\nu=|m|}^{\infty} \sum_{\mu=|m|}^{\infty} f_{\nu, \mu, m} e^{im(\lambda_P - \lambda_Q)} P_{\nu}^m(\cos \phi_P) P_{\mu}^m(\cos \phi_Q). \quad (4.11)
\end{aligned}$$

In order to have a valid covariance function,  $f_{\nu, \mu, m} = \bar{f}_{\mu, \nu, m}$  and for each fixed integer  $m$ , the matrix  $F_m(N) = \{f_{\nu, \mu, m}\}_{\nu, \mu=|m|, |m|+1, \dots, N}$  must be positive definite for all  $N \geq |m|$ .

$$R(P, Q) = R(\phi_P, \phi_Q, \Delta\lambda) = \sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty} e^{im\Delta\lambda} C_m(\phi_P, \phi_Q) \quad m = 0, \pm 1, \pm 2, \dots \quad (4.12)$$

where  $\Delta\lambda \in [-\pi, \pi]$  and  $\phi_P, \phi_Q \in [0, \pi]$

*Properties of  $C_m(\phi_P, \phi_Q)$*

The covariance function  $R(P, Q)$  based on the concept of axially symmetry is clearly defined by both latitudes and longitudes (difference). The following conditions for  $C_m(\phi_P, \phi_Q)$  are very important to have a valid covariance function defined by 5.1.

- Hermitian and positive definite.
- $\sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty} |C_m(\phi_P, \phi_Q)| < \infty$  for  $m = 0, \pm 1, \pm 2, \dots$
- Is a continuous function.



*Theorem 4.4.1* (Mercer's theorem (simplified version) ).

A kernal  $K : [a, b] \times [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a symmetric continuous function that is non-negative definite,

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n a_i a_j K(s, t) \geq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad K(s, t) = K(t, s)$$

for all  $(s, t) \in [a, b]$  and  $a_i > 0$ . Let  $T_k : L_2 \rightarrow L_2$  be an intergral operator defined by

$$[T_k f](\cdot) = \int_a^b K(\cdot, s) f(s) ds$$

is positive, for all  $f \in L_2$

$$\int_a^b K(s, t) f(s) f(t) ds dt \geq 0.$$

The corresponding orthonormal eigen functions  $\psi_i \in L_2$  and non negative eigen values  $\lambda_i \geq 0$  of the operator  $T_k$  is defined as

$$T_k(\psi_i(\cdot)) = \int K(\cdot, s)\psi(s)ds = \lambda_i\psi_i(\cdot) \quad \int \psi_i(\cdot)\psi_j(\cdot) = \delta_{ij}$$

then the kernal  $K(\cdot)$  is a uniformly convergent series in terms of eigen functions and associated eigen values of  $T_k$  as follows,

$$K(s, t) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \lambda_j \psi_j(s) \psi_j(t)$$

Since  $C_m(\phi_P, \phi_Q)$  is continuous, Hermitian and positive definite, Mercer's theorem can be directly applied to  $C_m(\phi_P, \phi_Q)$  such that the covariance function on a axially symmetric sphere defined by 5.1 can be written as ([HZR12])

$$R(\phi_P, \phi_Q) = \sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{\nu=0}^{\infty} \eta_{m,\nu} e^{im\Delta\lambda} \psi_{m,\nu}(\phi_P) \overline{\psi_{m,\nu}(\phi_Q)},$$

Model	Cm	paramters
model 1	: $C_m = Cp^m$	$m = 0, \pm 1, \pm 2, \dots \quad p \in [0, 1]$
model 2	: $C_m = \frac{Cp^m}{m^n}$ and $C_0 = 0$	$m = \pm 1, \pm 2, \dots \quad p \in [0, 1]$
model 3	: $C_m = \frac{C}{m^4}$ and $C_0 = 0$	$m = \pm 1, \pm 2, \dots$

Table 2. some proposed  $C_m(\phi_P, \phi_Q)$  models

Where  $\Delta\lambda \in [0, \pi]$ ,  $\eta_{m,\nu} \geq 0$  and  $\psi_{m,\nu}(\cdot)$  are the eigen values eigen functions of  $C_m(\phi_P, \phi_Q)$  respectively.

In general for covariance function defined on a sphere ([Ste07]) requires triple summation and required to estimate  $O(n^3)$  parameters. In contrast, the covariance function 5.1 defined by [HZR12] requires to estimate  $O(n^2)$  parameters which is a huge reduction of computational compelextity and we will continue to use this covariance model in our approach on global data generation which is discussed in the next chapter.

In the covariance model provided by [HZR12], the choice of  $C_m(\phi_P, \phi_Q)$  is very important and they have proposed some functions for  $C_m(\phi_P, \phi_Q)$  .

#### 4.5 Longitudinally reversible process

The idea was first introduced by [Ste07]. Suppose  $K(\cdot)$  is a valid covariance function defined on a sphere if  $K(L_1, L_2, l_1 - l_2) = K(L_1, L_2, l_2 - l_1)$  then underline process is said to be logitudinally reversible. For example the covariance model proposed by [HZR12] is clearly yileds a longitudinally reveresible process as  $R(\phi_P, \phi_Q, \Delta\lambda) = R(\phi_P, \phi_Q, -\Delta\lambda)$

## CHAPTER V

### GLOBAL DATA GENERATION ON THE SPHERE

#### 5.1 Theoretical development

Let  $X(P)$  be a complex-valued random process on a unit sphere  $S^2$ , where  $P = (\lambda, \phi) \in S^2$  with longitude  $\lambda \in [-\pi, \pi)$  and latitude  $\phi \in [0, \pi]$ .

A covariance function for continuous axially symmetric processes on a sphere given by [HZR12, proposition 1]:

$$R(P, Q) = R(\phi_P, \phi_Q, \Delta\lambda) = \sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty} e^{im\Delta\lambda} C_m(\phi_P, \phi_Q) \quad (5.1)$$

where  $\Delta\lambda \in [-\pi, \pi]$ , and  $C_m(\phi_P, \phi_Q)$  is Hermitian and *p.d.* with  $\sum_{-\infty}^{\infty} |C_m(\phi_P, \phi_Q)| < \infty$ .

One can derive  $C_m$  based on an axially symmetric covariance function  $R(P, Q)$  defined on a sphere, as we have

$$C_m(\phi_P, \phi_Q) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} R(\phi_P, \phi_Q) e^{-im\Delta\lambda} d\Delta\lambda$$

since  $C_m(\phi_P, \phi_Q)$  is continuous and both Hermitian and positive definite, by Mercer's theorem, there exists an orthonormal basis  $\{\psi_{m,\nu}, \nu = 0, 1, \dots\}$  in  $L^2$ , a complex-valued functional Hilbert space on  $[o, \pi]$ , such that

$$C_m(\phi_P, \phi_Q) = \sum_{\nu=0}^{\infty} \eta_{m,\nu} \psi_{m,\nu}(\phi_P) \overline{\psi_{m,\nu}(\phi_Q)},$$

Where  $\eta_{m,\nu} \geq 0$  are the eigen values and  $\psi_{m,\nu}(\cdot)$  are the eigen functions.

Further, according to [HZR12][remark 2.5] a continuous axially symmetric process,  $X(P)$ , is given as:

$$X(P) = X(\phi, \lambda) = \sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty} W_{m,\nu}(\phi) e^{im\lambda} \psi_{m,\nu}(\phi), \quad (5.2)$$

where  $\lambda$  is the longitude,  $\phi$  is the latitude and  $\psi_{m,\nu}(\cdot)$  is a orthonormal basis. When the process is real and Gaussian,  $W_{m,\nu}$  are independent normal random variables. In addition, this process can be viewed as a homogeneous random process on the circle with angular distance given by  $\Delta\lambda$ . That is, for each  $\phi$ , one can expand  $X(P)$  in a Fourier series that is convergent in quadratic mean [Roy72]:

$$X(\phi, \lambda) = \sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty} W_m(\phi) e^{im\lambda} \quad (5.3)$$

,

where

$$W_m(\phi) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} X(\phi, \lambda) e^{-im\lambda} d\lambda,$$

with  $E(W_m(\phi_P) \overline{W_n(\phi_Q)}) = \delta_{m,n} C_m(\phi_P, \phi_Q)$ .

## 5.2 Generalization of parametric models

The  $R(P, Q)$  given in equation 5.1, is clearly a function of both longitude and latitude. The simplest model is the separable model where,

$$R(P, Q) = \tilde{C}(\Delta\lambda) C_m(\phi_P, \phi_Q)$$

In order to make things easier one could assume that  $C_m(\phi_P, \phi_Q) = \tilde{C}_m(\phi_P - \phi_Q)$  only depends on the difference of  $\phi_P$  and  $\phi_Q$ , [HZR11] proposed a simple separable

covariance function when both covariance components are exponential

$$R(P, Q) = c_0 e^{-a|\Delta\lambda|} e^{-b|\phi_P - \phi_Q|}.$$

Lets assume,

$$C_m(\phi_P, \phi_Q) = c_m e^{-a_m|\phi_P - \phi_Q|} (\cos \omega_m(\phi_P - \phi_Q) + i \sin \omega_m(\phi_P - \phi_Q)), \quad C_m \geq 0, a_m \geq 0, \omega_m \in R.$$

[HZR12, Remark 2.4]states that for real-valued process, the covariance function  $R(P, Q)$  is also real-valued, and

$$R(P, Q) = C_{0,R}(\phi_P, \phi_Q) + 2 \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \cos(m\Delta\lambda) C_{m,R}(\phi_P, \phi_Q) - \sin(m\Delta\lambda) C_{m,I}(\phi_P, \phi_Q),$$

where  $C_m(\phi_P, \phi_Q) = C_{m,R}(\phi_P, \phi_Q) + i C_{m,I}(\phi_P, \phi_Q)$ .

$C_{0,R}(\phi_P, \phi_Q) = c_0 e^{-a_0|\phi_P - \phi_Q|} \cos \omega_0(\phi_P - \phi_Q)$ ,  $C_{m,R}(\phi_P, \phi_Q) = c_m e^{-a_m|\phi_P - \phi_Q|} \cos \omega_m(\phi_P - \phi_Q)$ ,

$C_{m,I}(\phi_P, \phi_Q) = c_m e^{-a_m|\phi_P - \phi_Q|} \sin \omega_m(\phi_P - \phi_Q)$

If one takes  $a_m = a$ ,  $\omega_m = mu$  we can get the following form for  $R(P, Q)$ ,

$$R(P, Q) = c_0 e^{-a|\phi_P - \phi_Q|} + 2e^{-a|\phi_P - \phi_Q|} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} c_m \cos[m\theta(P, Q, u)],$$

where  $\theta(P, Q, u) = \Delta\lambda + u(\phi_P - \phi_Q) - 2k\pi$ , and  $k$  is chosen such that  $\theta(P, Q, u) \in [0, 2\pi]$ .

Moreover, by carefully choosing functions for  $C_m(\phi_P, \phi_Q)$  [HZR12] proposed some nonseparable covariance models ( $R(P, Q)$ ) models valid on the sphere,

$$R(P, Q) = C e^{-a|\phi_P - \phi_Q|} \frac{1 - p^2}{1 - 2p \cos \theta(P, Q, u) + p^2} \quad (5.4)$$

$$R(P, Q) = C e^{-a|\phi_P - \phi_Q|} \log \frac{1}{(1 - 2p \cos \theta(P, Q, u) + p^2)} \quad (5.5)$$

$$R(P, Q) = 2C e^{-a|\phi_P - \phi_Q|} \left( \frac{\pi^4}{90} - \frac{\pi^2 \theta^2(P, Q, u)}{12} + \frac{\pi \theta^3(P, Q, u)}{12} - \frac{\theta^4(P, Q, u)}{48} \right) \quad (5.6)$$

There is one big disadvantage for all of them. They are assumed not only stationarity on longitudes, but stationarity on latitudes as well.

Modifying the covariance models to include non-stationarity



- (1) We have noticed that when  $\phi_P = \phi_Q$ , the first model reduces to

$$R(P, Q) = C \frac{1 - p^2}{1 - 2p \cos(\Delta\lambda) + p^2},$$

and if  $\Delta\lambda = 0$ , the variance over all latitudes would be constant. This is not supposed to be the case, since both MSU data and TOMS data in figures ?? and ?? shows that variance is highly depending on the latitude.

- (2) A modification of the above approach is to replace the function

$$C(\phi_P, \phi_Q) = C e^{-a|\phi_P - \phi_Q|}$$

by a non-stationary covariance function, which depends on the latitudes, even when  $\phi_P = \phi_Q$ . Here are the two functions that have been used in our analysis.

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{C}(\phi_P, \phi_Q) &= C_1(C_2 - e^{-a|\phi_P|} - e^{-a|\phi_Q|} + e^{-a|\phi_P - \phi_Q|}), \\ \tilde{C}(\phi_P, \phi_Q) &= C_1 \left( C_2 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{a^2 + \phi_P^2}} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{a^2 + \phi_Q^2}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{a^2 + (\phi_P - \phi_Q)^2}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Here  $C_1, a > 0$ , and  $C_2 \geq 1$  to ensure the positive definiteness of the above function. When  $\phi_P = \phi_Q$ , both functions are actually the function of  $\phi_P$ .

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{C}(\phi_P, \phi_P) &= C_1(C_2 - 2e^{-a|\phi_P|} + 1), \\ \tilde{C}(\phi_P, \phi_P) &= C_1 \left( C_2 - \frac{2}{\sqrt{a^2 + \phi_P^2}} + \frac{1}{a} \right).\end{aligned}$$

- (3) A more general non-stationary covariance function is given as following. If  $C(\cdot) = C(x - y)$  is the stationary covariance function and  $f(\omega) \geq 0$  is the corresponding spectral density, then

*Proposition 5.2.1.* A more general non stationary covariance function is given as following. If  $C(\cdot) = C(x - y)$  is the stationary covariance function and  $f(\omega) \geq 0$  is the corresponding spectral density, then

$$\tilde{C}(x, y) = C_2 - C(x) - C(y) + C(x - y), \quad C_2 \geq \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dF(\omega) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(\omega) d\omega > 0$$

is the non stationary covariance function. Note that the covariance function  $C(\cdot)$  implies that, by Bochner's theorem, there exists a bounded measure  $F$  such that

$$C(x) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-ix\omega} dF(\omega).$$

When  $F(\cdot)$  is absolutely continuous, there exists a spectral density  $f(\cdot) \geq 0$  such that

$$C(x) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-ix\omega} f(\omega) d\omega.$$

Now we choose a sequence of complex numbers  $a_i, i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ , and any sequence of real numbers  $t_i, i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ , taking  $C_2 = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(\omega) d\omega$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n a_i \bar{a}_j \tilde{C}(t_i, t_j) &= \sum_i \sum_j a_i \bar{a}_j (C_2 - C(t_i) - C(-t_j) + C(t_i - t_j)) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n a_i \bar{a}_j \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} (1 - e^{-it_i\omega} - e^{it_j\omega} + e^{-i(t_i-t_j)\omega}) f(\omega) d\omega \\ &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(\omega) d\omega \left| \sum_{i=1}^n a_i (e^{-it_i\omega} - 1) \right|^2 \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

So we propose a five-parameter model for the covariance on a sphere

$$R(P, Q) = \tilde{C}(\phi_P, \phi_Q) C(\theta(P, Q, u)),$$

where  $C_1 > 0, C_2 > 0, a, u, p$  can be estimated from the data.

### 5.3 Method development

We can construct normal independent (complex) random variate  $W_m(\phi)$  associated with the variance-covariance matrix  $C_m(\phi_P, \phi_Q)$  to construct an axially symmetric process. Then finite summation can be used to approximate above (5.3) infinite summation as given below,

$$X(P) = X(\phi, \lambda) = \sum_{m=-N}^N W_m(\phi) e^{im\lambda} \quad (5.7)$$

where this would provide the gridded data. Since  $W_m$ 's are independent for  $m = 1, 2, \dots$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} Cov(X(P), X(Q)) &= Cov\left(\sum_{m=-N}^N W_m(\phi_P) e^{im\lambda_P}, \sum_{j=-N}^N W_j(\phi_Q) e^{ij\lambda_Q}\right) \\ &= \sum_{m,j} e^{im\lambda_P} e^{-ij\lambda_Q} Cov(W_m(\phi_P), W_j(\phi_Q)) \\ &= \sum_m e^{im(\lambda_P - \lambda_Q)} C_m(\phi_P, \phi_Q) \end{aligned}$$

The above generated data will be complex random variates. Therefore to have the real-valued data observations or to obtain a real process, we need to have

$$C_{-m}(\phi_P, \phi_Q) = \overline{C_m(\phi_P, \phi_Q)}, \quad \text{for } m = 1, 2, \dots, N \quad (5.8)$$

Lets write  $W_m(\phi) = W_m^r(\phi) + iW_m^i(\phi)$  in terms of a real component and an imaginary component. We also write  $C_m(\phi_P, \phi_Q) = C_m^r(\phi_P, \phi_Q) + iC_m^i(\phi_P, \phi_Q)$  and with the relationship 5.8 above, we have

$$C_{-m}^r(\phi_P, \phi_Q) = C_{-m}^r(\phi_P, \phi_Q), \quad C_{-m}^i(\phi_P, \phi_Q) = -C_{-m}^i(\phi_P, \phi_Q).$$

Now,

$$\begin{aligned} Cov(W_m(\phi_P), W_m(\phi_Q)) &= Cov(W_m^r(\phi_P) + iW_m^i(\phi_P), W_m^r(\phi_Q) + iW_m^i(\phi_Q)) \\ &= [Cov(W_m^r(\phi_P), W_m^r(\phi_Q)) + Cov(W_m^i(\phi_P), W_m^i(\phi_Q))] \\ &\quad + i [-Cov(W_m^r(\phi_P), W_m^i(\phi_Q)) + Cov(W_m^i(\phi_P), W_m^r(\phi_Q))] \\ &= C_m^r(\phi_P, \phi_Q) + iC_m^i(\phi_P, \phi_Q). \end{aligned}$$

If we let  $W_{-m}(\phi) = \overline{W_m(\phi)}$ , then the covariance function would satisfy the above relationship 5.8. In addition, we will set the following,

$$Cov(W_m^r(\phi_P), W_m^r(\phi_Q)) = Cov(W_m^i(\phi_P), W_m^i(\phi_Q)) = \frac{1}{2}C_m^r(\phi_P, \phi_Q), \quad (5.9)$$

$$Cov(W_m^i(\phi_P), W_m^r(\phi_Q)) = -Cov(W_m^r(\phi_P), W_m^i(\phi_Q)) = \frac{1}{2}C_m^i(\phi_P, \phi_Q). \quad (5.10)$$

Therefore, if we denote  $\underline{W}_m(\phi) = (W_m^r(\phi), W_m^i(\phi))^T$ , then the variance-covariance matrix for  $\underline{W}_m(\phi)$  is given by

$$\frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} C_m^r(\phi_P, \phi_Q) & -C_m^i(\phi_P, \phi_Q) \\ C_m^i(\phi_P, \phi_Q) & C_m^r(\phi_P, \phi_Q) \end{pmatrix}.$$

However, we cannot have a vector of random variables  $\underline{W}_m(\phi)$  with a non-symmetric variance-covariance matrix unless  $C_m^i(\phi_P, \phi_Q) = 0$ . In the next section we will demonstrate how to generate  $\underline{W}_m(\phi)$  with a symmetric variance-covariance

The process given by (5.3) is now simplified as the following (real) process,

$$\begin{aligned}
X(P) &= \sum_{m=-N}^N W_m(\phi) e^{im\lambda} = W_0(\phi) + \sum_{m=1}^N W_m(\phi) e^{im\lambda} + \sum_{m=-1}^{-N} W_m(\phi) e^{im\lambda} \\
&= W_0(\phi) + \sum_{m=1}^N W_m(\phi) e^{im\lambda} + \sum_{m=1}^N \overline{W_m(\phi)} e^{-im\lambda} \\
&= W_0(\phi) + \sum_{m=1}^N [(W_m^r(\phi) + iW_m^i(\phi))(\cos(m\lambda) + i\sin(m\lambda)) \\
&\quad + (W_m^r(\phi) - iW_m^i(\phi))(\cos(m\lambda) - i\sin(m\lambda))] \\
&= W_0(\phi) + 2 \sum_{m=1}^N [W_m^r(\phi) \cos(m\lambda) - W_m^i(\phi) \sin(m\lambda)] . \tag{5.11}
\end{aligned}$$

### *Data generation*

Now for each fixed  $m = 0, 1, 2, \dots, N$ , we consider  $W_m(\phi) = W_m^r(\phi) + iW_m^i(\phi)$  then  $W_m^*(\phi) = W_m^r(\phi) - iW_m^i(\phi)$  (where  $W_m^*(\phi)$  is the conjugate of  $W_m(\phi)$ ). We may assume that  $W_m^r(\phi)$  and  $W_m^i(\phi)$  are independent, each following a (normal) distribution with mean zero and the same variance  $\sigma_m^2(\phi) = \frac{1}{2}C_m^r(\phi, \phi)$ , ( $C_m^i(\phi, \phi) = 0$  implies  $W_m^r(\phi)$  and  $W_m^i(\phi)$  are uncorrelated, or independent for Gaussian). From 1.1.1,  $W_m(\phi)$  is the circularly-symmetric complex random variable ([Gal08]).

Now for a set of distinct latitudes  $\Phi = \{\phi_1, \phi_2, \dots, \phi_{n_l}\}$ , we consider a sequence of complex random variables  $\{W_m(\phi) : \phi \in \Phi\}$ , which forms a multivariate complex random vector  $\underline{W}_m = (W_m(\phi_1), W_m(\phi_2), \dots, W_m(\phi_{n_l}))^T$  where  $W_m(\phi_i) = W_m^r(\phi_i) +$

$iW_m^r(\phi_i)$  with associated  $2 \times n_l$ -dimensional real random vector

$$\underline{V}_m = (W_m^r(\phi_1), W_m^i(\phi_1), W_m^r(\phi_2), W_m^i(\phi_2), \dots, W_m^r(\phi_{n_l}), W_m^i(\phi_{n_l}))^T.$$

Now we calculate the covariance matrix  $K_W = E(\underline{W}_m \underline{W}_m^*)$  (where  $\underline{W}_m^*$  is the conjugated transpose) and pseudo-covariance  $M_W = E(\underline{W}_m \underline{W}_m^T)$ . Further, from 1.1.1 a complex random vector is circularly-symmetric if and only if  $M_W$  is zero.

$$\begin{aligned} M_W &= \begin{pmatrix} E[W_m(\phi_1)W_m(\phi_1)] & E[W_m(\phi_1)W_m(\phi_2)] & \cdots & E[W_m(\phi_1)W_m(\phi_{n_l})] \\ E[W_m(\phi_2)W_m(\phi_1)] & E[W_m(\phi_2)W_m(\phi_2)] & \cdots & E[W_m(\phi_2)W_m(\phi_{n_l})] \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ E[W_m(\phi_{n_l})W_m(\phi_1)] & E[W_m(\phi_{n_l})W_m(\phi_2)] & \cdots & E[W_m(\phi_{n_l})W_m(\phi_{n_l})] \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \mathbf{0} \end{aligned}$$

We can easily show the above for  $\forall i, j$ ,



$$\begin{aligned}
& E[W_m(\phi_i)W_m(\phi_j)] \\
= & E[(W_m^r(\phi_i) + iW_m^i(\phi_i))(W_m^r(\phi_j) + iW_m^i(\phi_j))] \\
= & E(W_m^r(\phi_i)W_m^r(\phi_j)) - E(W_m^i(\phi_i)W_m^i(\phi_j)) + i[E(W_m^r(\phi_i)W_m^i(\phi_j)) + E(W_m^i(\phi_i)W_m^r(\phi_j))] \\
& \text{for } i \neq j \\
= & \frac{1}{2}(C_m^r(\phi_i, \phi_j) - C_m^r(\phi_i, \phi_j)) + i[-\frac{1}{2}C_m^i(\phi_i, \phi_j) + \frac{1}{2}C_m^i(\phi_i, \phi_j)] = 0 \\
& \text{for } i = j \\
= & \frac{1}{2}(C_m^r(\phi_i, \phi_i) - C_m^r(\phi_i, \phi_i)) + i[0 + 0] = 0 \quad ; W_m^r(\phi_i), W_m^i(\phi_i) \text{ are independent}
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,  $\underline{W}_m$  is circularly-symmetric. In addition,

$$\begin{aligned}
K_W &= E(W_m W_m^*) \\
&= \begin{pmatrix} E[W_m(\phi_1)W_m^*(\phi_1)] & E[W_m(\phi_1)W_m^*(\phi_2)] & \cdots & E[W_m(\phi_1)W_m^*(\phi_{n_l})] \\ E[W_m(\phi_2)W_m^*(\phi_1)] & E[W_m(\phi_2)W_m^*(\phi_2)] & \cdots & E[W_m(\phi_2)W_m^*(\phi_{n_l})] \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ E[W_m(\phi_{n_l})W_m^*(\phi_1)] & E[W_m(\phi_{n_l})W_m^*(\phi_2)] & \cdots & E[W_m(\phi_{n_l})W_m^*(\phi_{n_l})] \end{pmatrix} \\
&= \begin{pmatrix} C_m^r(\phi_1, \phi_1) & C_m^r(\phi_1, \phi_2) + iC_m^i(\phi_1, \phi_2) & \cdots & C_m^r(\phi_1, \phi_{n_l}) + iC_m^i(\phi_1, \phi_{n_l}) \\ C_m^r(\phi_2, \phi_1) - iC_m^i(\phi_2, \phi_1) & C_m^r(\phi_2, \phi_2) & \cdots & C_m^r(\phi_2, \phi_{n_l}) + iC_m^i(\phi_2, \phi_{n_l}) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ C_m^r(\phi_{n_l}, \phi_1) - iC_m^i(\phi_{n_l}, \phi_1) & C_m^r(\phi_{n_l}, \phi_2) - iC_m^i(\phi_{n_l}, \phi_2) & \cdots & C_m^r(\phi_{n_l}, \phi_{n_l}) \end{pmatrix} \\
&= \begin{pmatrix} C_m^r(\phi_1, \phi_1) & C_m^r(\phi_1, \phi_2) & \cdots & C_m^r(\phi_1, \phi_{n_l}) \\ C_m^r(\phi_2, \phi_1) & C_m^r(\phi_2, \phi_2) & \cdots & C_m^r(\phi_2, \phi_{n_l}) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ C_m^r(\phi_{n_l}, \phi_1) & C_m^r(\phi_{n_l}, \phi_2) & \cdots & C_m^r(\phi_{n_l}, \phi_{n_l}) \end{pmatrix} \\
&\quad + i \begin{pmatrix} 0 & C_m^i(\phi_1, \phi_2) & \cdots & C_m^i(\phi_1, \phi_{n_l}) \\ -C_m^i(\phi_2, \phi_1) & 0 & \cdots & C_m^i(\phi_2, \phi_{n_l}) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ -C_m^i(\phi_{n_l}, \phi_1) & -C_m^i(\phi_{n_l}, \phi_2) & \cdots & 0 \end{pmatrix} \\
&= Re(K_W) + iIm(K_W)
\end{aligned}$$

Now,

$$K_V = E(\underline{V}_m \underline{V}_m^*) = E(\underline{V}_m \underline{V}_m^T)$$

In order to generate  $K_V$  for  $n_l$ -tuple case, we reorganize the vector  $\underline{V}_m$  into the following form.

$$\underline{V}_m = (W_m^r(\phi_1), W_m^r(\phi_2), \dots, W_m^r(\phi_{n_l}), W_m^i(\phi_1), W_m^i(\phi_2), \dots, W_m^i(\phi_{n_l}))^T = (Re(\underline{W}_m), Im(\underline{W}_m))^T$$

that is, we grouped all real components and imaginary components together. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} K_V &= E(\underline{V}_m \underline{V}_m^T) \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} E[Re(\underline{W}_m) Re(\underline{W}_m)^T] & E[Re(\underline{W}_m) Im(\underline{W}_m)^T] \\ E[Im(\underline{W}_m) Re(\underline{W}_m)^T] & E[Im(\underline{W}_m) Im(\underline{W}_m)^T] \end{pmatrix}_{2n_l \times 2n_l} \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\underline{W}_m$  is circularly-symmetric from 1.11 we can get the following results,

$$E[Re(\underline{W}_m)Re(\underline{W}_m)^T] = E[Im(\underline{W}_m)Im(\underline{W}_m)^T] = \frac{1}{2}(Re(K_W))_{n_l \times n_l}$$

$$E[Re(\underline{W}_m)Im(\underline{W}_m)^T] = -E[Im(\underline{W}_m)Re(\underline{W}_m)^T] = \frac{1}{2}(Im(K_W))_{n_l \times n_l}$$

$$K_V = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} Re(K_W) & Im(K_W)^T \\ Im(K_W) & Re(K_W) \end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} Re(K_W) & -Im(K_W) \\ Im(K_W) & Re(K_W) \end{pmatrix}$$

Since  $K_V$  is a non-negative definite and matrix, it can be represented as follows,

$$K_V = Q\Lambda Q^T,$$

where  $\Lambda$  is a diagonal matrix with eigen values (real-positive) of  $K_V$  and  $Q$  are the corresponding orthonormal eigenvectors. We can choose  $A = Q\Lambda^{1/2}Q^T$  to obtain,

$$\underline{V}_m = A_{2n_l \times 2n_l} Z_{2n_l \times 1},$$

where  $Z = \{z_1, z_2, \dots, z_{n_l}, z_1^*, z_2^*, \dots, z_{n_l}^*\}$  and each  $z_i \sim N(0, 1)$  hence we can get  $\underline{W}_m$ . Now for each latitude  $\phi_l, l = 1, 2, \dots, n_l$  and  $\lambda_k, k = 1, 2, \dots, n_L$  ( $N = n_L/2$ ), we denote the axially symmetric data (real) as  $X(\phi_l, \lambda_k)$ . These random variates can be obtained from the equation (5.11), let's rewrite the equation as follows,

$$X(\phi_l, \lambda_k) = W_0(\phi_l) + 2 \sum_{m=1}^N [W_m^r(\phi_l) \cos(m\lambda_k) - W_m^i(\phi_l) \sin(m\lambda_k)] \quad (5.12)$$

#### *Pseudo-code*

- Choose a cross covariance function,  $R(P, Q)$
- Initialize the parameters  $(C_1, C_2, a, u, p)$  and choose a resolution  $\phi_1, \dots, \phi_{n_l}, \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{n_L}$  (or  $n_l \times n_L$ ),
- Derive  $C_m(\phi_P, \phi_Q)$  based on  $R(P, Q)$  where  $m = 0, 1, \dots, n_L/2$ ,
  - (1) for each  $m$  get  $Re(K_W)$  and  $Im(K_W)$  hence obtain  $K_V$
  - (2) use SVD to get  $\underline{V}_m$  ( $n_l - tuples$ )

(3) get  $\underline{W}_m$ 's from  $\underline{V}_m$

- apply the equation (5.12) to generate grid data.

#### 5.4 Property of MOM

*we might have to omit this section, add a discussion about variogram*

We should conform the validity of proposed covariance functions  $R(P, Q)$ . Since  $R(P, Q)$  functions are cross covariance functions, we can compute the empirical covariance, by method of moments and compare.

We can estimate the cross covariance between any two arbitrary latitudes at each longitudinal difference (empirical covariance) based on method of moments and compare it with the theoretical  $R(P, Q)$  values. According to [Wac13] a cross covariance function is not an even function so does the proposed  $R(P, Q)$  functions, *i.e.*  $R(P, Q, \Delta\lambda) \neq R(P, Q, -\Delta\lambda)$ . The empirical (cross) covariance between any two latitudes  $\phi_P$  and  $\phi_Q$  with a zero mean processes can be given as follows,

$$\hat{R}(\phi_P, \phi_Q, \theta) = \frac{1}{n_L} \sum_{k=1}^{n_L} (X(\phi_P, \theta + \lambda_k) \cdot X(\phi_Q, \lambda_k)), \quad (5.13)$$

where  $\theta = m\Delta\lambda$ .

In general, the spatial processes are stationary at a given latitude but not within latitudes. If the processes are not zero mean once could simply subtract the product of means from the above MOM estimator. The above estimate is clearly unbiased as

we have, for fixed two locations  $P, Q \in S^2$ ,

$$E[\hat{R}(\phi_P, \phi_Q, \theta)] = R(P, Q).$$

Later we will prove this estimator is consistent, *i.e.*, for any  $\varepsilon > 0$ ,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P(|\hat{R}(\phi_P, \phi_Q, \theta) - R(P, Q)| > \varepsilon) = 0.$$

### *Results*

#### **Simulated data sample:**




Figure 6. Four consecutive axially symmetric data snapshots based on model 2, grid resolution  $2^0 \times 1^0$  (data scale -10 and 10).



Comprison of the proposed models with MOM estimates:

- Model 1




Figure 7. Cross covariance comparison of model1

- Model 2




Figure 8. Cross covariance comparison of model2

- Model 3




Figure 9. Cross covariance comparison of model3

CHAPTER VI  
FUTURE RESEARCH (DUE AUGUST 28)

Future research work !!

## REFERENCES

- [BL11] David Bolin and Finn Lindgren, *Spatial models generated by nested stochastic partial differential equations, with an application to global ozone mapping*, The Annals of Applied Statistics (2011), 523–550.
- [CJ08] Noel Cressie and Gardar Johannesson, *Fixed rank kriging for very large spatial data sets*, Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology) **70** (2008), no. 1, 209–226.
- [DMG83] T De Mazancourt and D Gerlic, *The inverse of a block-circulant matrix*, IEEE transactions on antennas and propagation **31** (1983), no. 5, 808–810.
- [DR76] Jean-Marie Dufour and Roch Roy, *On spectral estimation for a homogeneous random process on the circle*, Stochastic Processes and their Applications **4** (1976), no. 2, 107 – 120.
- [Gal08] Robert G Gallager, *Circularly-symmetric gaussian random vectors*, preprint (2008), 1–9.
- [Gne13] Tilmann Gneiting, *Strictly and non-strictly positive definite functions on spheres*, Bernoulli **19** (2013), no. 4, 1327–1349.
- [HS12] Marcin Hitzchenko and Michael L Stein, *Some theory for anisotropic processes on the sphere*, Statistical Methodology **9** (2012), no. 1, 211–227.
- [HZR11] Chunfeng Huang, Haimeng Zhang, and Scott M Robeson, *On the validity of commonly used covariance and variogram functions on the sphere*, Mathematical Geosciences **43** (2011), no. 6, 721–733.
- [HZR12] ———, *A simplified representation of the covariance structure of axially symmetric processes on the sphere*, Statistics & Probability Letters **82** (2012), no. 7, 1346–1351.
- [JJ15] Jaehong Jeong and Mikyoung Jun, *A class of matérn-like covariance functions for smooth processes on a sphere*, Spatial Statistics **11** (2015), 1–18.
- [Jon63] Richard H Jones, *Stochastic processes on a sphere*, The Annals of mathematical statistics **34** (1963), no. 1, 213–218.

- [JS08] Mikyoung Jun and Michael L Stein, *Nonstationary covariance models for global data*, The Annals of Applied Statistics (2008), 1271–1289.
- [KC11] Matthias Katzfuss and Noel Cressie, *Spatio-temporal smoothing and em estimation for massive remote-sensing data sets*, Journal of Time Series Analysis **32** (2011), no. 4, 430–446.
- [Li13] Yang Li, *Non-parametric and semi-parametric estimation of spatial covariance function*.
- [LN97] Ta-Hsin Li and Gerald R North, *Aliasing effects and sampling theorems of spherical random fields when sampled on a finite grid*, Annals of the Institute of Statistical Mathematics **49** (1997), no. 2, 341–354.
- [LRL11] Finn Lindgren, Håvard Rue, and Johan Lindström, *An explicit link between gaussian fields and gaussian markov random fields: the stochastic partial differential equation approach*, Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology) **73** (2011), no. 4, 423–498.
- [Mui20] Sir Thomas Muir, *The theory of determinants*, 1920.
- [Roy72] Roch Roy, *Spectral analysis for a random process on the circle*, Journal of Applied Probability (1972), 745–757.
- [Sch42] I. J. Schoenberg, *Positive definite functions on spheres*, Duke Math. J. **9** (1942), no. 1, 96–108.
- [Ste99] Michael L Stein, *Interpolation of spatial data: some theory for kriging*, Springer Science & Business Media, 1999.
- [Ste07] ———, *Spatial variation of total column ozone on a global scale*, The Annals of Applied Statistics (2007), 191–210.
- [Tee05] Garry J Tee, *Eigenvectors of block circulant and alternating circulant matrices*.
- [Tra73] George E Trapp, *Inverses of circulant matrices and block circulant matrices*, Kyungpook Mathematical Journal **13** (1973), no. 1, 11–20.
- [Wac13] Hans Wackernagel, *Multivariate geostatistics: an introduction with applications*, Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.
- [Yad83] Mikhail Iosifovich Yadrenko, *Spectral theory of random fields*, Optimization Software, 1983.

- [Yag61] Akiva M Yaglom, *Second-order homogeneous random fields*, Proc. 4th Berkeley Sympos. Math. Statist. and Prob, vol. 2, 1961, pp. 593–622.
- [Yag87] AM Yaglom, *Correlation theory of stationary and related random functions: Vol.: 1: Basic results*, Springer-Verlag, 1987.