

# Predicting the local intensity of partially observed data from a revisited kriging for point processes

Edith Gabriel<sup>a,\*</sup>, Florent Bonneu<sup>a</sup>, Pascal Monestiez<sup>b</sup>, Joël Chadœuf<sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup>*Avignon University, LMA EA 2151, 84000 Avignon, France*

<sup>b</sup>*INRA, BioSP, 84000 Avignon, France*

<sup>c</sup>*INRA, Statistics, GAFL, UR 1052, 84000 Avignon, France*

---

## Abstract

We consider a spatial point pattern observed within a large window. We assume that the process is stationary and isotropic, and that it is obtained by a weak dependent process with a parameter driven by a stationary random field at a larger scale. In order to predict the local intensity, we propose to define the first- and second-order characteristics of the random field from the ones of the point process and to interpolate the local intensity by using a revisited kriging.

*Keywords:* Intensity estimation; Point process; Prediction; Spatial statistics.

---

## 1. Introduction

When estimating the intensity of a point process, we observe the full point pattern within a window  $S$  and we want to know its local changes over a given mesh. This issue has been addressed in several ways: kernel smoothing, see [1] and [2] in presence of covariates, or parametrical methods; see for instance [3] for a review. A recurrent and remaining question in these approaches is which bandwidth/mesh should we use? These issues has been addressed by using cross-validation [4] or double kernel [5].

In contrast to the previous methods which look at the local intensity changes inside the observation window, our main interest lies in predicting the local intensity outside the observation window, all the more when it is not connected as it frequently happens when sampling in plant ecology. [6] proposed a reconstruction method based on the first- and second-order characteristics of the point process. Once the empirical point pattern predicted within a given window, one can get the local intensity by kernel smoothing. As it is a simulation-based method, it requires long computation times, especially when the prediction window is large and/or the point process is complex.

Few authors model the point pattern by a point process with the intensity driven by a stationary random field. In [7] and [8], the approach is heavily based

---

\*Corresponding author

Email address: [edith.gabriel@univ-avignon.fr](mailto:edith.gabriel@univ-avignon.fr) (Edith Gabriel)

on a complete modelling and considers a log-Gaussian model. The parameter estimation, the intensity estimation and its prediction outside the observation window are obtained using a bayesian framework. The method developed in [9] and [10] is close to classical geostatistics. Basically, it consists in counting the number of points within some grid cells, computing the related empirical variogram and theoretically relating it to the one obtained from the random field driving the intensity. Then, the variogram is fitted and kriging is used to predict the intensity. Its advantage is that the model is only defined by its first- and second-order moments and does not need to be fully specified. While this approach requires few hypotheses, the model is constrained within a given class (mainly Cox) and the mesh size is arbitrary defined.

Here, we consider a similar approach to the latter: it does not require model specification, addresses a larger class of point processes and optimises the scale of investigation. Our idea is the following. We assume that the point process is stationary and isotropic and that it is obtained by a weak dependent process with a parameter driven by a stationary random field at a larger scale. The local intensity can then be written as  $\Lambda(x) = \lambda + Y(x)$ , where  $\lambda$  is the mean of the random field and  $Y(x)$  is a centered random field. The number of points within a Borel set  $B$  can be written as

$$N(B) = \Phi(B) = \lambda\nu(B) + \int_B Y(x) dx + \eta, \quad (1)$$

*i.e.* as the sum of the global mean, local intensity variation and an error related to the difference between the observations and the local intensity.

Equation (1) is very similar to the geostatistical decomposition. Thus, we propose to define the first- and second-order characteristics of the random field from the ones of the point process.

We can then interpolate the local intensity by kriging, where the kriging weights depend on the local structure of the point process. Hence, our method uses all the data to locally predict at a given point, which it is not the case of kernel methods, and it also uses the information at fine scale of the point process, which it is not the case in geostatistical approaches. Furthermore, it does not require a specific model but only (an estimation of) the first- and second-order characteristics of the point process.

In Section 2 we define the random field of point counts on grid cells and we link up the mean and variogram of this random field to the intensity and pair correlation function of the point process. The kriging weights, the properties of the kriging interpolator and the optimal grid size are given in Section 3. A short discussion is given in Section 4.

## 2. Linking up characteristics of the two theories

In our context, data are defined as informative point locations, the realisation of a point process  $\Phi$ , while the geostatistical calculations (kriging) need to be carried out over the values of a random field  $Z$  observed at several sampling locations, grid cell centers for example. Thus, we must regularize our process over a compact. This consists in defining  $Z(x)$  by the count  $\Phi(B)$  of the point process  $\Phi$  over the grid cell  $B$  centered at  $x$  *i.e.*  $Z(x) = \Phi(x \oplus B)$ .

### 2.1. About geostatistics

Let,  $Z(x)$ , be a real valued random field. Its first-order characteristic is the mean value function:  $\mathbb{E}[Z(x)] = m(x)$ , its second-order characteristics are classically described in geostatistics [11, 12] by the (semi)-variogram, *i.e.* the mean squared difference at distance  $h$ :  $\gamma(h) = \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}[(Z(x) - Z(x+h))^2]$ . Here we assume the random field to be isotropic and stationary, thus

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[Z(x)] &= m, \\ \gamma(h) &= \sigma^2 - \text{Cov}(Z(x), Z(x+h)),\end{aligned}\tag{2}$$

where  $\sigma^2$  is the field variance.

We can predict the value  $Z(x_o)$  at the unsampled location  $x_o$  by using the best linear unbiased predictor, so-called kriging interpolator:  $\hat{Z}(x_o) = \mu^T Z$ , where  $Z$  is the vector of observations of the random field at locations  $x_i$  and  $\mu$  is a vector of weights. In the case of ordinary kriging [13], which is of interest here as the mean value of the random field is unknown, we have

$$\mu = C^{-1}C_o + \frac{1 - \mathbf{1}^T C^{-1}C_o}{\mathbf{1}^T C^{-1}\mathbf{1}} C^{-1}\mathbf{1},\tag{3}$$

where  $C = \{\text{Cov}(Z(x_i), Z(x_j))\}_{i,j}$  is the  $n \times n$  covariance matrix between the observations,  $C_o = \{\text{Cov}(Z(x_i), Z(x_o))\}_i$  is the covariance vector between the observations and  $Z(x_o)$  and  $\mathbf{1}$  is the  $n$ -vector of 1.

### 2.2. About point processes

Let  $\Phi$  be a point process defined in  $\mathbb{R}^2$  observed in  $S$ , then its first- and second-order characteristics are described through its intensity  $\lambda$  and the  $K$ -function or the pair correlation function ( $g$ ):

$$\lambda = \frac{\mathbb{E}[\Phi(S)]}{\nu(S)},\tag{4}$$

$$K^*(r) = \frac{1}{\lambda} \mathbb{E}[\Phi(b(0, r)) - 1|0 \in \Phi],\tag{5}$$

$$g(r) = \frac{1}{2\pi r} \frac{\partial K^*(r)}{\partial r},\tag{6}$$

where  $\nu(S)$  is the area of  $S$  and  $b(0, r)$  is the disc centered at 0, with radius  $r$ . The intensity  $\lambda$  is thus the expected number of points per unit area,  $\lambda K^*(r)$  is the mean number of points in a circle of radius  $r$  around a typical point of the point process minus this point, whereas  $g(r)$  measures how  $K^*$  changes with  $r$ . See for instance [14] for a review about the theory of point processes.

**Lemma 2.1.** *Let  $\Phi$  be a point process with intensity  $\lambda$  and  $B, D$  two Borel sets. Then,*

1.  $\mathbb{P}[\{\Phi(B) = 1\} \cap \{\Phi(D) = 1\}] = \lambda\nu(B \cap D) + \lambda^2 \int_{B \times D} g(x - y) dx dy,$
2.  $\mathbb{E}[\Phi^2(B)] = \lambda\nu(B) + \lambda^2 \int_{B \times B} g(x - y) dx dy,$
3.  $\text{Var}(\Phi(B)) = \lambda\nu(B) + \lambda^2 \int_{B \times B} (g(x - y) - 1) dx dy,$
4. *If  $B \cap D = \emptyset$ , then  $\text{Cov}(\Phi(B), \Phi(D)) = \lambda^2 \int_{B \times D} (g(x - y) - 1) dx dy.$*

### 2.3. Linking up

From the first- and second-order moments defined in the previous sections, we can link up the characteristics of the point process  $\Phi$  to the ones of the random field of point counts  $Z$ . Because of the stationary assumption it can also be related to the covariance function (Equation (2)), thus in the following we shall consider the latter.

**Proposition 2.2.** *For the count random field defined by  $\Phi(B)$ , where  $B$  is a given Borel set, we have:*

1.  $m^* = \lambda\nu(B),$
2. *For  $B$  and  $D$  two regularization blocks,  $B_D = B \setminus D, D_B = D \setminus B,$*

$$\begin{aligned} 2\gamma^*(B, D) = & \lambda(\nu(B_D) + \nu(D_B)) + \lambda^2 \left( \int_{B_D \times B_D} g(x - y) dx dy \right. \\ & \left. + \int_{D_B \times D_B} g(x - y) dx dy - 2 \int_{B_D \times D_B} g(x - y) dx dy \right). \end{aligned}$$

3. *If  $B$  and  $D$  are two disjoint elementary surfaces, centered at points with a distance  $r$ , then for  $\nu(B) = \nu(D) \rightarrow 0$*

$$\text{Cov}(\Phi(B), \Phi(D)) \simeq \lambda\nu(B) \left( \mathbb{I}_{\{B=D\}} + \lambda\nu(B)(g(r) - 1) \right). \quad (7)$$

The proof of Proposition 2.2 is straightforward from Lemma 2.1 and from the approximation  $\mathbb{P}[\{\Phi(B) = 1\} \cap \{\Phi(D) = 1\}] \approx \lambda^2 \nu(B) \nu(D) g(r)$ .

### 3. Revisited kriging for point processes

In the following we consider a regular grid such that  $n$  is the number of points of the grid,  $x = \cup_{i=1}^n \{x_i\}$  is the set of points of the grid. Let  $B$  be an elementary square centered at 0,  $B_i = x_i \oplus B$  the elementary square centered at  $x_i$  such that  $B_i \cap B_j = \emptyset$ . We denote  $S = \cup_{i=1}^n B_i$  the area of interest defined by the union of the observation and the prediction areas, thus  $n = \frac{\nu(S)}{\nu(B)}$ .

### 3.1. Defining the interpolator

We want to interpolate the conditional local intensity  $\lambda(x|\Phi(S))$ . According to the classical geostatistical method defined in Section 2, the kriging interpolator at  $x_o$  should be  $\lambda(x_o|\Phi(S)) = \mu^T \Lambda$ , for some kriging weights  $\mu$  and observations  $\Lambda = (\lambda(x_1|\Phi(S)), \dots, \lambda(x_n|\Phi(S)))^T$ . Note that in our case we cannot observe the local intensity at  $x_i$ , thus we can estimate it by

$$\tilde{\lambda}(x_i|\Phi(S)) = \frac{\Phi(B_i)}{\nu(B)}. \quad (8)$$

The interpolator is then defined in Proposition 3.1.

**Proposition 3.1.** *The interpolator of the local intensity at  $x_o$  defined by*

$$\hat{\lambda}(x_o|\Phi(S)) = \sum_{i=1}^n \mu_i \frac{\Phi(B_i)}{\nu(B)}, \quad (9)$$

where  $\mu = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_n) = C^{-1}C_o + \frac{1 - \mathbf{1}^T C^{-1} C_o}{\mathbf{1}^T C^{-1} \mathbf{1}} C^{-1} \mathbf{1}$ , is the best linear unbiased predictor (BLUP).

The weights depend on

- the covariance matrix  $C = \lambda\nu(B) [I + \lambda\nu(B)(G - 1)]$ ,  
where  $G = \{g_{ij}\}_{i,j=1,\dots,n}$ , with  $g_{ij} = \frac{1}{\nu^2(B)} \int_{B \times B} g(x_i - x_j + u - v) du dv$ ,  
and  $I$  is the  $n \times n$ -identity matrix,
- the covariance vector  $C_o = \lambda\nu(B)\mathbb{I}_{x_o} + \lambda^2\nu^2(B)(G_o - 1)$ ,  
where  $G_o = \{g_{io}\}_{i=1,\dots,n}$ , and  $\mathbb{I}_{x_o}$  is the  $n$ -vector with zero values and one term equals to one where  $x_o = x_i$  (what only happens in estimation).

**Proof:** The kriging weights such that  $\hat{\lambda}(x_o|\Phi(S)) = \sum_{i=1}^n \mu_i \frac{\Phi(B_i)}{\nu(B)}$  is a BLUP are given by the ordinary kriging equations [15]: minimising the variance error  $\text{Var}(\hat{\lambda}(x_o|\Phi(S)) - \lambda(x_o|\Phi(S)))$  under the unbiasedness constraint  $(\sum_{i=1}^n \mu_i = 1)$  and using Equation (7) lead to:

$$\mu = \nu(B)C^{-1}\tilde{C}_o + \frac{1 - \nu(B)\mathbf{1}^T C^{-1}\tilde{C}_o}{\mathbf{1}^T C^{-1} \mathbf{1}} C^{-1} \mathbf{1},$$

where  $\tilde{C}_o = \left\{ \text{Cov}(\Phi(B_i), \lambda(x_o|\Phi(S))) \right\}_{i=1,\dots,n}$ .

To get  $\text{Cov}(\Phi(B_i), \lambda(x_o|\Phi(S)))$ , note that

- for  $x_i \neq x_o$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\Phi(B_o)\Phi(B_i)] &= \mathbb{E}[\Phi(B_i)\mathbb{E}[\Phi(B_o)|\Phi(B_i)]] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\Phi(B_i)\nu(B)\lambda(x_o|\Phi(B_i))] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\Phi(B_i)\nu(B)\mathbb{E}[\lambda(x_o|\Phi(S))|\Phi(B_i)]] \\ &= \nu(B)\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[\Phi(B_i)\lambda(x_o|\Phi(S))|\Phi(B_i)]] \\ &= \nu(B)\mathbb{E}[\Phi(B_i)\lambda(x_o|\Phi(S))] \end{aligned}$$

which leads to  $\mathbb{E} [\Phi(B_i)\lambda(x_o|\Phi(S))] = \frac{1}{\nu(B)}\mathbb{E} [\Phi(B_o)\Phi(B_i)]$ .

- whereas for  $x_i = x_o$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E} [\Phi^2(B_o)] &= \mathbb{E} [\mathbb{E} [\Phi^2(B_o)|\Phi(S)]] = \mathbb{E} [\Phi(B_o)\mathbb{E} [\Phi(B_o)|\Phi(S)]] \\ &= \mathbb{E} [\Phi(B_o)\nu(B)\lambda(x_o|\Phi(S))] \\ &= \nu(B)\mathbb{E} [\Phi(B_o)\lambda(x_o|\Phi(S))]\end{aligned}$$

which leads to  $\mathbb{E} [\Phi(B_o)\lambda(x_o|\Phi(S))] = \frac{1}{\nu(B)}\mathbb{E} [\Phi^2(B_o)]$ .

Thus,  $\tilde{C}_o = \frac{1}{\nu(B)}C_o$  (what is also obvious in prediction) and we get

$$\mu = C^{-1}C_o + \frac{1 - \mathbf{1}^T C^{-1}C_o}{\mathbf{1}^T C^{-1}\mathbf{1}}C^{-1}\mathbf{1}.$$

□

Note that, because of the equalities given in the proof of Proposition 3.1, interpolating  $\Phi(B_o)$  or  $\lambda(x_o|\Phi(S))$  leads to the same kriging weights.

### 3.2. Properties of the interpolator

The variance of the interpolator defined in Equation (9) is given in the following Proposition.

**Proposition 3.2.** *If  $B$  tends to 0 and  $S$  is large enough, then*

- *for  $x_o$  lying in the observation window,*

$$\mathbb{V}\text{ar} \left( \hat{\lambda}(x_o|\Phi(S)) \right) \approx \frac{\lambda}{\nu(B)} \quad (10)$$

- *for  $x_o$  outside the observation window,*

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{V}\text{ar} \left( \hat{\lambda}(x_o|\Phi(S)) \right) &= \lambda^3 \nu^2(B)(G_o - 1)^T (G_o - 1) \\ &\quad + \lambda^4 \nu^3(B)(G_o - 1)^T J_\lambda (G_o - 1) \\ &\quad + \frac{1 - \left[ \lambda \nu(B) \mathbf{1}^T (G_o - 1) + \lambda^2 \nu^2(B) \mathbf{1}^T J_\lambda (G_o - 1) \right]^2}{\frac{\nu(S)}{\lambda} + \nu^2(B) \mathbf{1}^T J_\lambda \mathbf{1}}\end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

where  $J_\lambda = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (-1)^k \lambda^{k-1} H^k$

and  $H^k = \int_{S^{k+1}} \prod_{m=1}^k (g(x_m, x_{m+1}) - 1) dx_1 \dots dx_{k+1}$ .

**Proof:** The variance of  $\hat{\lambda}(x_o|\Phi(S))$  is given by

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{V}\text{ar} \left( \hat{\lambda}(x_o|\Phi(S)) \right) &= \mathbb{V}\text{ar} \left( \sum_{i=1}^n \mu_i \frac{\Phi(B_i)}{\nu(B)} \right) = \frac{1}{\nu^2(B)} \mu^T C \mu \\ &= \frac{1}{\nu^2(B)} \left\{ C_o^T C^{-1} C_o + \frac{1 - (\mathbf{1}^T C^{-1} C_o)^2}{\mathbf{1}^T C^{-1} \mathbf{1}} \right\}.\end{aligned}$$

In order to further develop the variance of the kriging interpolator, we use the following series expansion for the inverse of the covariance matrix  $C$ :

$$C^{-1} = \frac{1}{\lambda\nu(B)} \left[ \mathbf{I} + \nu(B) \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (-1)^k \lambda^k H^k \right]. \quad (12)$$

- When estimating the local intensity, we have

$$C_o = \lambda\nu(B)\mathbb{I}_{x_o} + \lambda^2\nu^2(B)(G_o - 1).$$

Thus, from equation (12):

$$\begin{aligned} C_o^T C^{-1} C_o &= \lambda\nu(B) \left[ 1 + \lambda\nu(B) \left( \tilde{J}_\lambda(x_o, x_o) + 2\mathbb{I}_{x_o}^T (G_o - 1) \right) \right. \\ &\quad \lambda^2\nu^2(B) \left( 2\mathbb{I}_{x_o}^T J_\lambda(G_o - 1) + (G_o - 1)^T (G_o - 1) \right) \\ &\quad \left. \lambda^3\nu^3(B)(G_o - 1)^T J_\lambda(G_o - 1) \right], \end{aligned}$$

where  $\tilde{J}_\lambda(y, z) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (-1)^k \lambda^{k-1} \tilde{H}^k(y, z)$  and  $\tilde{H}^k(y, z) = \int_{S^{k-1}} (g(y, x_1) - 1) \prod_{m=1}^{k-2} (g(x_m, x_{m+1}) - 1) (g(x_{k-1}, z) - 1) dx_1 \dots dx_{k-1}$ ,

$$\mathbf{1}^T C^{-1} C_o = 1 + \lambda\nu(B) \left[ \mathbf{1}^T J_\lambda \mathbb{I}_{x_o} + \mathbf{1}^T (G_o - 1) + \lambda\nu(B) \mathbf{1}^T J_\lambda (G_o - 1) \right],$$

and

$$\mathbf{1}^T C^{-1} \mathbf{1} = \frac{1}{\lambda\nu(B)} \left[ n + \lambda\nu(B) \mathbf{1}^T J_\lambda \mathbf{1} \right] = \frac{\nu(S)}{\lambda\nu^2(B)} + \mathbf{1}^T J_\lambda \mathbf{1}.$$

Then, if  $B$  tends to 0 and  $S$  is large enough, we get Equation (10).

- When  $x_o$  is outside the observation window, we have  $C_o = \lambda^2\nu^2(B)(G_o - 1)$ . Thus, from

$$C_o^T C^{-1} C_o = \lambda^3\nu^3(B)(G_o - 1)^T (G_o - 1) + \lambda^4\nu^4(B)(G_o - 1)^T J_\lambda (G_o - 1)$$

and

$$\mathbf{1}^T C^{-1} C_o = \lambda\nu(B) \mathbf{1}^T (G_o - 1) + \lambda^2\nu^2(B) \mathbf{1}^T J_\lambda (G_o - 1)$$

we get Equation (11). □

### 3.3. Defining an optimal mesh size

When estimating the local intensity, the optimal mesh of the interpolation grid is found by minimising the Integrated Mean Squared Error of  $\hat{\lambda}(x|\Phi(S))$  :

$$\begin{aligned} IMSE \left( \hat{\lambda}(x|\Phi(S)) \right) &= \int_S \left[ \left( \lambda(x|\Phi(S)) - \mathbb{E}[\hat{\lambda}(x|\Phi(S))] \right)^2 + \text{Var} \left( \hat{\lambda}(x|\Phi(S)) \right) \right] dx \\ &\approx \frac{\sqrt{\nu(B)}}{12} \int_S \|\text{grad}(\lambda(x|\Phi(S)))\|^2 dx + \frac{\lambda\nu(S)}{\nu(B)} \end{aligned}$$

This approximation can easily be obtained by considering the Taylor expansion of  $\lambda(x|\Phi(S))$ .

Thus, we get the following optimal mesh:

$$\nu_{opt}(B) = \left( \frac{24\lambda\nu(S)}{\int_S \|\text{grad}(\lambda(x|\Phi(S)))\|^2 dx} \right)^{2/3}.$$

Note that because the optimal mesh depends on the inverse of the gradient of the local intensity, it decreases for clustered point patterns. Conversely, it increases for regular point patterns.

When predicting the local intensity, the smaller the mesh, the better. Computation time is the only limit.

## 4. Discussion and perspectives

### 4.1. In practice

Estimating the matrix  $C^{-1}$  using Equation (12) is somewhat cumbersome. Thus, we propose instead to inverse the covariance matrix numerically. Several approximations can be used, depending mainly on the width of  $B$  with respect to  $\lambda$  and the curvature of the pair correlation function  $g$ :

1. if the diameter of  $B$  is large, the covariance between two tiles at distance  $d$  is equal to  $\lambda\nu(B)\mathbb{I}_{r=o} + \lambda^2 \int_{B \times D} (g(r+x-y) - 1) dx dy$ . It can be approximated numerically by computing for example the integral on a fine grid. Then the finer the grid, the smaller the difference between the exact values and the approximations, but the computing time cost can become prohibitive.
2. when the diameter of  $B$  becomes small, the integral can be approximated by  $\nu(B)^2 g(r)$  so that the covariance is approximated by  $\lambda\nu(B)\mathbb{I}_{r=o} + \nu(B)^2 \lambda^2 g(r)$ ,
3. when the diameter becomes very small,  $C$  may be approximated by  $\lambda\nu(B)\mathbf{I}$ , a situation seldom met in practice, since it needs a tile  $B$  small enough to neglect point dependence.

Approximation 2) will thus be the most reasonable one, needing only a  $B$  small enough to consider that  $g(u+x)$  is almost constant for  $x \in B$ , but avoiding too small  $B$  leading to large matrix inversion time.

In practice the optimal mesh can be approximated by estimating the gradient of the intensity over a fine grid.

### 4.2. Simulation results

The simulation results will be presented in the next version of this manuscript. The contribution of our approach will be illustrated for several point processes: more or less clustered or regular. We will show the influence of the mesh,  $B$ , and study the properties of our interpolator both in estimation and in prediction for each process according to the size of  $S$ , the intensity of the process, the range of the second-order characteristics ( $g$ ) and the percentage of unobserved areas.



## References

- [1] B. Silverman, Density Estimation for Statistics and Data Analysis, Chapman & Hall/CRC, London, 1986.
- [2] Y. Guan, On consistent nonparametric intensity estimation for inhomogeneous spatial point processes, *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 103 (483) (2008) 1238–1247.
- [3] J. Illian, A. Penttinen, H. Stoyan, D. Stoyan, Statistical Analysis and Modelling of Spatial Point Patterns, John Wiley & Sons, London, 2008.
- [4] W. Härdle, Smoothing techniques, with implementation in S, Springer & Verlag, New York, 1991.
- [5] L. Devroye, The double kernel method in density estimation, *Les Annales de l'I.H.P.*, section B 25 (4) (1989) 533–12.
- [6] A. Tscheschel, D. Stoyan, Statistical reconstruction of random point patterns, *Computational Statistics and Data Analysis* 51 (2006) 859–871.
- [7] P. Diggle, P. Ribeiro, Model-Based Geostatistics, Springer, New York, 2007.
- [8] P. Diggle, P. Moraga, B. Rowlingson, B. Taylor, Spatial and spatio-temporal log-gaussian cox processes: Extending the geostatistical paradigm, *Statistical Science* 28 (4) (2013) 542–563.
- [9] P. Monestiez, L. Dubroca, E. Bonnin, J. Durbec, C. Guinet, Geostatistical modelling of spatial distribution of balaenoptera physalus in the northwestern mediterranean sea from sparse count data and heterogeneous observation efforts, *Ecological Modelling* 193 (2006) 615–628.
- [10] E. Bellier, P. Monestiez, G. Certain, J. Chadœuf, V. Bretagnolle, Reducing the uncertainty of wildlife population abundance: model-based versus design-based estimates, *Environmetrics* 24 (7) (2013) 476–488.
- [11] G. Matheron, *Traité de géostatistique appliquée: Mémoires du Bureau de Recherches Géologiques et Minières. Tome I*, no. 14, Editions Technip, Paris, 1962.
- [12] G. Matheron, *Traité de géostatistique appliquée: Le krigeage. Tome II*, no. 24, Editions BRGM, Paris, 1963.
- [13] N. Cressie, *Statistics for Spatial Data*, revised Edition, John Wiley & Sons, New York, 1993.
- [14] D. Stoyan, W. Kendall, J. Mecke, *Stochastic Geometry and Its Applications*, 2nd Edition, John Wiley & Sons, New York, 1996.
- [15] J. Chilès, P. Delfiner, *Geostatistics: Modeling Spatial Uncertainty*, 2nd Edition, John Wiley & Sons, New York, 2012.