Generative Models for Spatial-Temporal Processes with Applications to Predictive Criminology

Yoon-Sik Cho, Aram Galstyan
USC Information Sciences Institute
Marina del Rey, CA 90292
{yoonsik, galstyan}@isi.edu

Jeff Brantingham
UCLA
Los Angeles, CA 90095
pjb@anthoro.ucla.edu

George Tita
UCI
Irvine, CA 92697
gtita@uci.edu

Abstract

We present a generative model for spatial-temporal data that describes geographically distributed interactions between pairs of entities. We develop an efficient approximate algorithm to infer unknown participants in an event given the location and the time of the event. As a concrete application of the proposed approach, we focus on the problem of modeling inter-gang violence, where the objective is to infer the identities of participants in violent inter-gang attacks, based on the past observations of such attacks. We validate the model on synthetic as well as real-world data, and obtain very promising results on the identity-inference task. Furthermore, it is shown that combining both spatial and temporal information yields better accuracy than using either information separately.

1 Introduction

Spatial-temporal data describes processes or phenomena that are extended both in space and time. A classical problem associated with spatial-temporal data is tracking the trajectories of kinematic objects such as missiles and vehicles. More recently, cell records have been used to map, track, and predict the movement of cell-phone users. In general, the emergence of various types of sensors has made it possible to gather spatial-temporal data for numerous real-world processes, which has made it imperative to have efficient computational models for modeling and predicting with spatial-temporal data.

In this paper, we consider a particular type of spatial-temporal process – the sequence of violent events occurring among rival street gangs. Specifically, we use Los Angeles Police Department’s (LAPD) data on gang related violent crimes that covers a period from 1999 to 2002 in the Hollenbeck neighborhood of Los Angeles [8]. In this dataset, each entry describes a violent incident that includes the date and time of the incident as well as the latitudinal and longitudinal coordinates. Furthermore, each record might also contain information about the victim and/or the perpetrator of the attack. Often, the latter type of information is not available. On the other hand, knowing the identities of the gangs involved in an attack would be potentially helpful for predicting and/or preventing subsequent retaliatory attacks. Thus, the ability to infer the event participants would help the law-enforcement agencies to prioritize their resources efficiently for controlling outbursts of violent activities.

One of the main characteristics of gang-related activities is that different events are not statistically independent, but exhibit non-trivial correlations. In particular, recent observations suggest that events tend to cluster both temporally and spatially. To account for such correlations, here we suggest a generative model that is based on self-exciting Hawkes process. Due to the missing information about the participants, exact inference and learning is intractable for even moderately large datasets. Toward this end we develop an efficient algorithm for learning and inference based on the variational EM approach [1]. Our preliminary results on both synthetic and real-world data suggest that the model is able to recover missing data with reasonable accuracy.

2 Background

2.1 Predictive Models for Crime

The costs of crime can be substantial both in human and financial terms [5]. Not surprisingly, there has been significant effort among criminologists to develop approaches to predicting the spatial and temporal distribution of crime, with the goal that law enforcement resources may be directed to likely locations (and at likely times) to prevent crime. Crime
hotspotting [2], capturing the fact that crime tends to concentrate in some places and not others, and repeat-victimization [3, 11], tracing the regular recurrence of crime against the same people or targets, have featured prominently in attempts to predict crime. However, many practical questions remain in these approaches. For the most part, predicting crime has primarily been backwards-looking, assigning law enforcement resources only to locations that have recently experienced crime. The past is a good guide to the present, but crime patterns evolve dynamically meaning that today’s crime locations may not be identical to tomorrow’s [4]. It has also been the case that predictive models have tended to use fixed model parameters based on mean system characteristics. We address both of these issues specifically in the case of modeling inter-gang violence in Los Angeles.

3 Spatial-Temporal Model of Inter-Gang Violence

Here we describe our spatial-temporal model for characterizing interactions between a pair of entities. For the spatial component of our model, we assume that events occurring between two participants are likely to be clustered in space. In the case of the gang violence data, this assumption asserts that attacks between a pair of gangs are likely to be geographically confined. As stated above, the existence of non-trivial temporal correlations between the events precludes the use of simple Poisson point process model. Instead, here we will use a Hawkes Process, which is a variant of a self-exciting process [6]. Self-exciting models have been used extensively in earthquake modeling, where a central event (earthquake) might excite other events (aftershocks) [6]. A justification of this choice for the inter-gang violence data is that an attack by a gang on its rival is likely to cause a retaliatory response from the victim.

3.1 Generative Model for Inter-Gang Violence

We assume we have a set of events (e.g., gang attacks) that are distributed in time and space. The set of observation is the time, and location of events occurring between the gangs. Further, we assume there are $M$ gangs, and that each event involves one of the $M(M-1)/2$ pairs among those gangs.

We model the sequence of events between the pairs by a Hawkes Process [6]. Namely, we assume that the intensity of events between the gangs $i$ and $j$ has the following form:

$$\lambda_{ij}(t|\mathcal{H}_t) = \mu_{ij} + \sum_{p:t > t_p} g_{ij}(t-t_p)$$  \hspace{1cm} (1)$$

where $\mathcal{H}_t$ denote the history of events up to time $t$ as the set of all the events that have occurred before that time. For simplicity, we omit $\mathcal{H}_t$ in the expression of rate function. Here $\mu_{ij}$ describes the background rate of event occurrence that is time-independent, whereas the second term describes the self-excitation part, so that events in the past affect the probability of an event in the near future. The overall rate $\lambda$ increases as each event $p$ at $t_p$ occurs, reflecting the retaliation to a previous attack. Here we will use a two-parameter family for the self-excitation term:

$$g_{ij}(t-t_p) = \beta_{ij}\omega_{ij}\exp\{-\omega_{ij}(t-t_p)\}$$ \hspace{1cm} (2)$$

Here $\beta_{ij}$ describes the weight of the self-excitation term (compared to the background rate), while $\omega_{ij}$ describes the decay rate of the excitation.

The generative process begins with the sampling of the first time of the incident.

1. For each pair, sample the first time of the incident using an exponential distribution with rate parameter $\mu$.

2. For each pair, sample the duration of time until the next incident using Poisson thinning. Since we are dealing with non-homogeneous Poisson process, we use the so called thinning algorithm [7] to sample the next time of the event. By repeating step 2, we obtain the timestamps of incidents for each pair.

3. For every timestamp of a given pair we sample the location of the incident. We assume the location of incidents follows a Gaussian distribution.

Let us introduce binary indicator variables $z_{pq}^n$ for each event $n$, so that $z_{pq}^n = 1$ when the gangs $p$ and $q$ are involved in the $n$-th event, and $z_{pq}^n = 0$ otherwise. To simplify notation, from this point on we denote $z_{pq}^n$ as $z_k^n$, where $k$ enumerates one of the possible pairs. For a sequence of $N$ incidents, the joint probability of the location $r^{1:N}$, time $t^{1:N}$ and the latent variables $z_{1:N}^k$ can be written in the following form:

$$p(r^{1:N}, t^{1:N}, Z^{1:N} \mid \Theta) = \prod_k p_1(z_k^n \mid \lambda_k(t^n)) p_3(r_k^1 \mid z_k^1) \times \prod_{k,n>1} p_2(t^n, z_k^n \mid \lambda_k(t^n), Z_k^{n-1}) p_3(r^n \mid z_k^n)$$ \hspace{1cm} (3)$$

where $\Theta$ is the set of model parameters, $p_1$ is time-homogeneous exponential distribution, $p_2$ is non-homogeneous exponential, and $p_3(\cdot | z_k^n)$ is Gaussian
when \( z^u_k = 1 \), and a constant otherwise:

\[
p_3(r^n|z^u_k) = \begin{cases} \mathcal{N}(m_k, \Sigma_k) & z^u_k = 1 \\ \text{const.} & z^u_k = 0 \end{cases} \tag{4}
\]

Here \( m_k, \Sigma_k \) are the mean and covariance matrix of multivariate normal distribution that describes the spatial distribution of events involving the \( k \)-th pair. For simplicity, we assume that the off-diagonal elements of the covariance matrix are zero, thus discarding correlation between latitudinal longitudinal coordinates.

We focus on the temporal-only part in above equation by ignoring the spatial component of the model. The first component of temporal part follows the exponential distribution with fixed rate, and solely determined by the background rate:

\[
\prod_k p_1(t^1, z^u_k | \mu_k) = \prod_k \{ \mu_k \exp(-\mu_k t^1) \} z^u_k \tag{5}
\]

The rate function from the 2nd event is determined by the previous events, and changes over time:

\[
\prod_{k,n>1} p_2(t^n, z^u_k | Z_{1:n-1}^{1:n-1}) = \prod_{k,n>1} \{ \lambda_k(t^n) \} z^u_k \exp \left\{ - \int_{t_k(Z_{1:n-1})}^{t^n} \lambda_k(t) dt \right\} \tag{6}
\]

where the lower limit of integration \( t_k(Z_{1:n-1}) \) is the time of the most recent event prior to the \( n \)-th event that involves the pair \( k \).

Equations 3-6 complete the definition of the model. Due to the presence of latent variables \( z^u_k \), there is no closed-form expression for the likelihood of the observed sequence of events. Instead, one has to resort to approximate techniques for learning and inference, which is described next.

## 4 Learning and Inference

The latent variables indicate assignments of pairs to particular incidents. If sufficient labeled data was available, then standard estimation techniques (such as maximum likelihood estimation) can be used. However, this is not feasible when there is a substantial amount of missing data, which is generally the case with police records. In this particular dataset, at least one of the participants is unknown for almost 70% of incidents. The EM approach presented here deals with this type of scenario. In our model, labeled data is used by clamping the corresponding latent variables to their true values. We rely on variational EM by positing a simpler distribution \( Q(X) \) over the latent variables with free parameters for learning and inference. The free parameters are adjusted so that the distribution is close to the true posterior in KL divergence.

\[
D_{KL}(Q || P) = \int_X Q(X) \log \frac{Q(X)}{P(X,Y)} dX \tag{7}
\]

where \( X \) is the hidden variables, and \( Y \) is the observed variables. In our case, \( X \) is the hidden identity of gangs involved in the incident, whereas \( Y \) describes the location and the time of the incident.

We introduce the following factorized variational multinomial distribution, which are independent of each other across steps and pairs:

\[
Q(Z_{1:N} | \Phi) = \prod_{k,n} q(z^u_k | \bar{\phi}^n) \tag{8}
\]

where free variational parameters \( \bar{\phi}^n \) describe the probability that the \( k \)-th pair is involved in the \( n \)-th event. Note that the present choice of the variational distribution discards correlations between past and future incidents, thus making the calculation tractable.

Minimizing the KL-divergence between \( Q(X) \), and \( P(X,Y) \) leads to the following approximate lower bound for the log-likelihood:

\[
L_{\Phi}(Q, \Theta) = E_Q[\log \prod_{k,n} p_1(r^n|z^u_k)] + E_Q[\log \prod_{k,n>2} p_2(z^u_k|Z_{1:n-1}^{1:n-1} \Theta)] + E_Q[\log \prod_{k} p_1(z^u_k|\Theta)] - E_Q[\log \prod_{k,n} q(z^u_k | \bar{\phi}^n)] \tag{9}
\]

where \( \Phi \) is the set of variational parameters, and \( \Theta \) is the set of model parameters.

Variational EM algorithm works by iterating between the E-step of calculating the expectation value using the variational distribution, and the M-step of updating the model (hyper)parameters so that the data likelihood is locally maximized. The update equations for the parameters are rather cumbersome and will be provided elsewhere. The overall pseudo algorithm is shown in Algorithm 1. Next we provide our results.

### 4.1 Variational E-step

In the variational E-step, we minimize the KL distance over the variational parameters. Taking the derivative of KL distance with respect to each variational parameter and setting it to zero, we obtain a set of equations...
Algorithm 1 Variational EM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size:</th>
<th>consider total of N events, K pairs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Input:</td>
<td>data $\mathbf{r}^{1:N}$, $\mathbf{t}^{1:N}$, $\mathbf{Z}$ of complete events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Start with initial guess of hyper parameters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>repeat</td>
<td>Initialize all $\phi_k^{1:N}$ to $\frac{1}{K}$ with unknown pairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>repeat</td>
<td>for $n = 1$ to $N$ do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>if the pairs of $n$-th event is unknown then</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Update ${\phi}^n = f({\phi}^{1:n-1}, {\phi}^{n+1:N}, \mathbf{r}^n)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>end if</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>end for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>until</td>
<td>convergence across all time steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update hyper parameters.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>until</td>
<td>convergence in hyper parameters</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

that can be solved. For the $k$-th component of variational parameter $\phi_k^n$ at time $\eta$,

$$
\phi_k^n \propto \exp \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial \phi_k^n} E_Q \left[ \sum_{k,n} z_k^n \log \lambda_k(t^n) \right] \right)
- \int_{t_k(Z^{1:n-1})}^{t^n} \lambda_k(t) dt \right) \right) p_2(r^n|m_k, \Sigma_k) \tag{10}
$$

In the summation of expectation of $\log \lambda_k(t^n; Z^{1:n-1})$, $\phi_k^n$ is contained when $n > \eta$ as well as $n = \eta$. For certain time step when $n = \eta$, since we are taking the derivative with respect to $\phi_k^n$, we need to compute the expectation of $\lambda_k$ after time $t^{n-1}$. Hence, we solve the above equation using the equations below:

$$
\frac{\partial}{\partial \phi_k^n} E_Q[\log \lambda_k(t^n)] = \sum_{k,n} \prod_{z_k^{n-1}} \phi_k^n (1 - \phi_k^n)^{1-z_k^n} \times \log \left[ \mu_k + \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} z_k^n \beta_k \omega_k e^{-\omega \Delta t_i^n} \right] \tag{11}
$$

Similarly, we can calculate the derivative with respect to $\phi_k^n$ for the terms with $n > \eta$.

$$
\frac{\partial}{\partial \phi_k^n} E_Q[\log \lambda_k(t^n)] = \sum_{z_k^{n-1}} \phi_k^n \prod_{i \neq \eta} (1 - \phi_k^n)^{1-z_k^n} \times \log \left[ \frac{\mu_k + \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} z_k^n g_k(t_k - t_i) + g_k(t_k - t_\eta)}{\mu_{ij} + \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} z_k^n g_k(t_k - t_i)} \right] \tag{12}
$$

4.2 Variational M-step

The M-step in the EM algorithm computes the parameters by maximizing the expected log-likelihood found in the E-step. The model parameters we are using are $m_k, \Sigma_k, \beta_k, \mu_k$, and $\omega_k$.

The re-estimation formulas for the spatial parameters, (i.e., the mean and the variance of Gaussian distribution), are straightforward:

$$
m_k = \frac{\sum_n \phi_k^n \mathbf{r}^n}{\sum_n \phi_k^n} \tag{13}
$$

$$
\sigma^2_{k,lat} = \frac{\sum_n \phi_k^n (r_{lat}^n - m_{k,lat})^2}{\sum_n \phi_k^n} \tag{14}
$$

$$
\sigma^2_{k,long} = \frac{\sum_n \phi_k^n (r_{long}^n - m_{k,long})^2}{\sum_n \phi_k^n} \tag{15}
$$

The re-estimation of the temporal parameters are more involved. For instance, to estimate $\mu_k$, we nullify the derivative of the likelihood with respect to $\mu_k$, $\frac{\partial E_Q}{\partial \mu_k} = 0$, which yields

$$
\sum_n \sum_{z_k^{n-1}} \phi_k^n \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} z_k^n (1 - \phi_k^n)^{(1-z_k^n)} (1 - \phi_k^n) \beta_k \omega_k e^{-\omega(t_n - t_i)} = t^N - t^0
$$

Similar equations for the parameters $\beta_k$ and $\omega_k$ are omitted.

Unfortunately, the resulting equations do not allow closed form solutions, so they have to be solved using numerical methods, such as the Newton’s method employed here.

5 Experiments

In this section, we report on our experiments using the generative model described above. Given a sequence of events, where some information about participants is missing, our goal is to reconstruct the missing information. Below we provide an evaluation of our algorithm on both synthetic and real-world data.

5.1 Synthetic data

Here we report our experiments with synthetically generated data. To compare the performance of our model with previous approaches, we follow the experimental set-up proposed in [9], were the authors used temporal-only information for reconstructing missing information in synthetically generated event data. In particular, [9] suggested an alternative to maximum likelihood (ML) estimation, by replacing the (combinatorial) ML objective by an appropriately defined energy function over relaxed continuous variables. They then perform constrained optimization of the new objective function using $l^1$, $l^2$ normalization for the relaxed variables. Although their method does not assign proper probabilities to the various timelines, it can provide a ranking of most likely participants.

Table I shows the overall performance of estimating 4 incomplete events (unknown actors) in 40 events of
Table 1: Total of N = 40 events between 6 pairs. Only 4 events have unknown participants. The parameters are $\mu = 10^{-2}\text{days}^{-1}$, $\omega = 10^{-1}\text{days}^{-1}$, and $\beta = 0.5$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Accuracy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exact ML</td>
<td>47.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>max $l_1$</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>max $l_2$</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variational EM</td>
<td>46.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6 pairs. For our algorithm the results are averaged over 1000 runs. The top method is the exact inference, while as the second, and third are from using the optimization problem with $l_1$, $l_2$-normalization respectively. Note that all four methods perform almost identically. Also we see that the result is remarkably higher than the random baseline $\frac{1}{6}$, where each pair is selected randomly. We would like to emphasize that the above results rely on temporal information only. As we will see below, including spatial information will improve the results, often significantly.

Table 2: Total of N = 40 events between 6 pairs, with different fraction of unknown participants: {10%, 25%, 50%}. The parameters are $\mu = 10^{-2}\text{days}^{-1}$, $\omega = 10^{-1}\text{days}^{-1}$ and $\beta = 0.5$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fraction of Unknown</th>
<th>Accuracy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>46.9 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25%</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Next, we examine the impact of more missing information on the accuracy of inference using temporal-only information. The results are presented in Table 2, where we vary the fraction of events with unknown participants from 10% to 50%. Although the accuracy deteriorates, we note that even when the half of the events miss participant information, the accuracy of the model predictions are still well above the random baseline $\sim 16\%$.

In our next set of experiments we examine the relative importance of spatial and temporal parts by comparing three variants of our algorithm that use 1. Temporal only data ($T$), 2. Spatial-only data ($S$); 3. Combined spatial and temporal data ($ST$). For the spatial component of the data, we use six multivariate normal distributions with the center of each on the vertex point of hexagon (for all 6 pairs). We fix the side length of the hexagon to 1, and analyzed how varying the standard deviation of the normal distribution affects the overall performance. Specifically, we varied the standard deviation $\sigma$ from 0.2 to 4, and averaged results over 100 times for each case for spatial only and temporal+spatial. As expected, the relative importance of the spatial information decreases when increasing $\sigma$. In the limit when $\sigma$ is very large, location of an event do not contain any useful information about the participants, so that the accuracy based on spatial information only should converge to the random baseline $1/6$.

![Figure 1: Average accuracy of 100 trials respect to various settings of standard deviations. Blue bar is from the inference based on spatial temporal data, and red bar is from the inference based on spatial data. Blue line is from the previous experiment which only used temporal data](image1)

On the other hand, for small values of $\sigma$, the spatial information helps to increase accuracy. Indeed, Figure 1 shows that inference using combined spatial-temporal data produces more accurate results for the whole range of the values of $\sigma$.

5.2 Real–World data

Next we describe our experiments on real-world dataset collected in the Hollenbeck division of Los Angeles from in 1999 to 2002.

5.2.1 Description of the data

Hollenbeck is a 15.2 square mile (39.4 km$^2$) policing division of the Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD), located on the eastern edge of the City of Los Angeles, with approximately 220,000 residents. Overall, 31 active criminal street gangs were identified in Hollenbeck between 1999-2002 [10]. Only 29 were still active by the end of 2002. These 29 gangs formed at least
66 unique rivalries, which are responsible for the vast majority of violent exchanges observed between gangs. Between November 14, 1999 and September 28, 2002 (1049 days), there were 1208 violent crimes attributed to criminal street gangs in the area. Of these, 1132 crimes explicitly identify the gang affiliation of the suspect, victim, or both. The remaining events include crimes such as shots fired which are known to be gang related, but the intended victim and suspect gang is not clear. For each violent crime, the collected information includes the street address where the crime occurred as well as the date and time of the event [10], allowing examination of the spatial-temporal dynamics of gang violence. Due to computational complexity, we ignore the causal relation between two incidents which are separated from each other by more than 3 weeks. This assumption also agrees with the Hawkes intensity function which decays exponentially over time.

Experiments with most active pairs We first extract the events which are related to the three most active rivalries: (Eastlake-Clover), (OPAL ST-VNE), and (CUATRO FLATS-TMC). In Figure 2(a) we depict the locations of the incident color coded by one of three pairs, while Figure 2(b) depicts the temporal timeline of the attacks between different pairs.

Since each rivalry shows strong pattern in spatial domain, the inference only using spatial information is fairly good. But there were 4 events which was estimated incorrectly. We expect that adding temporal information will yield better estimate. Figure 2 (right) shows that the temporal data is highly clustered. Combining the temporal and spatial information, we were able to recover a single event to the correct rivalry. Hence, when the localization is strong, having temporal feature slightly increases the accuracy. This trend was shown in the result from the simulation on synthetic data. In the experiment using synthetic data, the improvement became smaller as standard deviation decreases(highly localized).

Experiments involving all gangs 31 active gangs which had more than 4 crime with in the period, and 40 pairs which had at least two crimes between each other were considered as candidates in the whole data. Of the data 7.33% misses the information of both gangs in a pair, 62.07% only knows one of two gang, which is mostly victim. Only 30.6% of the events contain information about both participants. Three locations which are isolated from clusters have been removed for estimating the means, and variance of Gaussian through our Experiment II. Our objective is to infer the unknown gangs with better estimates of the parameters. For this specific experiment we only use 30.6% of the whole data where we can compare our inference exactly to the original information. From this point, we denote this data as ‘all known’ data.

With all the information of pairs and their locations and time for the all known data, we compute the mean and variance of locations for each pair. The inference using only spatial data, which is better than the inference using only temporal data is set as a baseline to compare. The most likely pairs for each incidents were picked based on the inference using spatial data, assuming the information of pairs are hidden. We compared our most likely pairs to the actual ones and the overall accuracy was 53.04%.

The top histogram in Figure 3 depicts the number of incidents between different pairs. It shows that inactive pairs which had only two incidents outnumber active pairs. Furthermore, the pairs that have only a few attacks between them, do not exhibit well–defined
spatial clustering, with higher variance in locations of incidents. This can be partly attributed to the fact that attacks between gangs that do not have intense rivalries are mostly random, as opposed to the patterns of attacks between gangs that have intense rivalries. In the latter case, self-excitation (i.e., retaliation) is likely to play a greater role.

To see how our method can recover missing data better than the inference based on spatial data, we compare our inference to the baseline. Further, we compare our result to the other inference of which the temporal process follows homogenous Poisson process while the spatial process is the same as ours. For this experiment, we assume the spatial parameters: mean and variance of Gaussian are given, which is the same setting of baseline, while as temporal parameters: parameters of Hawkes process are being estimated in the algorithm. We assume some of the portion of the data as hidden, and try to recover based on their location, and other incidents around the given time. By controlling the ration from 10, to 70%, we compare our most likely pairs to the actual pairs, and compute the average count of correct inference. Each experiment was repeated 20 times by selecting incidents randomly. Figure 4 shows that as we infuse more information, we obtain better estimate. Besides, over a wide range, our method shows better performance than the baseline.
tual participant among the top 3 choices an impressive 90% of the time.

Table 3: Each row shows how often the partial observed events were inferred correct counting correct if the one of top n inferred pairs had the known gang. The accuracy in parentheses refer to the accuracy of random guess

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Accuracy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spatial Only</td>
<td>68.03% (3.125%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top 1 (Spatial Temporal)</td>
<td>72.44% (3.125%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top 2 (Spatial Temporal)</td>
<td>84.72% (6.250%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top 3 (Spatial Temporal)</td>
<td>89.13% (9.375%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6 Conclusion

Buoyed by the availability of large scale geo-coded data, an increasing number of agencies are adopting a predictive rather than purely reactive approaches to law enforcement. Thus, there is a growing need for efficient computational approaches for modeling complex spatial-temporal data. Here we have described a preliminary generative model and applied it to the problem of inferring participants and identities of perpetrators in violent inter-gang events, based on the past observations of such attacks. Our results on synthetic and real-world data show that by combining the temporal process with the spatial process, we achieve a better estimate. For the real-world data, we tested our model using the police data on gang crimes in Hollenbeck, and obtained reasonable results. Most prior crime models relied on maximum likelihood estimation on the model parameter with the complete set of data. However, in most cases, we are faced with incomplete data, without any knowledge of the actual parameters. The variational EM algorithm suggested here presents an efficient and reasonably accurate approach for dealing with incomplete data.

It will be interesting to examine other models that can account for the temporal correlations and clustering observed in the real-world data. One natural possibility is to use Hidden Markov Models (HMM) or switching Markov processes to characterize jumps in the intensity of inter-gang violence. Further work will also take into account possible impact of law-enforcement agents on the temporal characteristics of inter-gang violence. Finally, we would like to note that while the main focus here was crime prediction, the model presented here can be generalized broadly to other data sets that describe geographically distributed sequence of social interactions between different entities, where the event depends on the history of its interaction.
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