

Extensions to the `ebp` function in the R package `emdi`

Felix Skarke
Freie Universität Berlin

Ann-Kristin Kreutzmann
Freie Universität Berlin

Nora Würz
Otto Friedrich
University Bamberg

Abstract

The empirical best prediction (EBP) approach proposed by [Molina and Rao \(2010\)](#), and generalized in [Guadarrama *et al.* \(2016\)](#) as the census EBP, is implemented in the `ebp` function of the R package `emdi`. A first version of the function allowed for the estimation of point and MSE estimates under non-informative sampling. The log and Box-Cox transformations were provided to make the distribution of the error terms closer to normal. For the latter, the transformation parameter can be estimated from the data as suggested in [Rojas-Perilla *et al.* \(2020\)](#). Their evaluation study further shows that the transformations log-shift and Dual transformation perform well. Furthermore, [Guadarrama *et al.* \(2018\)](#) reveal the benefits of considering the sampling design in the EBP under informative sampling. Therefore, the second version of the `ebp` function includes two new functionalities: (a) additional data-driven transformations for the EBP under non-informative sampling, the log-shift and Dual transformation, (b) the inclusion of sampling weights to consider informative sampling. The functionality of these extensions is demonstrated by examples based on synthetic data included in the package.

Keywords: Official statistics, survey statistics, small area estimation.

1. Introduction

The empirical best prediction (EBP) by [Molina and Rao \(2010\)](#) is one of the most popular unit-level models in the field of small area estimation (SAE) along with e.g., the World Bank method also known as ELL by [Elbers *et al.* \(2003\)](#). Therefore, it is one of the small area estimation methods implemented in the R package `emdi` ([Kreutzmann *et al.* 2019](#)). However, the approach provided by function `ebp` relies, among others, on the following assumptions: 1. normality of the error terms, and 2. a non-informative sampling design.

Several studies address the first aspect. While [Diallo and Rao \(2014\)](#) relax the normality assumption by allowing for skew-normal error terms, [Graf *et al.* \(2019\)](#) propose the usage of the more flexible distribution generalized beta of the second kind (GB2). [Marino *et al.* \(2019\)](#) investigate a semi-parametric empirical best predictor that estimates the distribution of the random effects from the data. Another, more straightforward approach is transforming the dependent variable. Extensive evaluation studies in [Rojas-Perilla *et al.* \(2020\)](#) find that data-driven transformations help to achieve at least symmetric distributions. The transformations compared are the Box-Cox ([Box and Cox 1964](#)), Dual ([Yang 2006](#)) and log-shift ([Feng *et al.* 2016](#)) transformation. Therefore, the Dual and log-shift transformations have been added

to the `ebp` function complementing the log and Box-Cox transformation that were already implemented in the first version of the package.

The second point affects the estimation when the sampling design of the survey used in the EBP is informative. [Guadarrama *et al.* \(2018\)](#) propose the incorporation of sampling weights by using the Pseudo empirical best linear unbiased predictor (PEBLUP) ([You and Rao 2002](#)) for the estimation of the model parameters. They show that the weighted EBP estimator has a lower bias than the unweighted EBP estimator under informative sampling and comparable results under non-informative sampling. The new version of the `ebp` function includes both options.

The first version of the `ebp` function is explained in detail in [Kreutzmann *et al.* \(2019\)](#). Therefore, this vignette will focus only on short introductions to the newly implemented features and will further show how to use the functionality. Throughout the vignette, it is assumed that a finite population of size N is partitioned into D domains of sizes N_1, \dots, N_D . The index $i = 1, \dots, D$ refers to an i th domain and $j = 1, \dots, N_i$ to the j th household/individual. From the population, a random sample is drawn of size n with n_1, \dots, n_D observations belonging to that domain.

2. Additional data-driven transformations

The underlying model in the EBP is the nested error linear regression model that is a unit-level mixed model with a random intercept ([Battese *et al.* 1988](#)). One way to make the data better conform with the assumptions imposed by linear and linear mixed models is transforming the dependent variable. The transformation may help to achieve linearity, homoscedasticity and normality. The EBP crucially depends on the latter since the random domain-specific effect and the unit-level error term are drawn from a normal distribution in the Monte Carlo simulation. Therefore, we will focus on normality in this vignette even though the transformations may also improve the model in other aspects ([Rojas-Perilla 2018](#), pp. 9-45).

2.1. Methodology

The most common transformation to achieve normality in the error terms is the log transformation, especially when the distribution of the dependent variable is right-skewed which is often observed for e.g., income. Since the logarithm cannot be applied for negative values, a deterministic shift can be added as follows:

$$y_{ij}^* = \log(y_{ij} + s),$$

where y_{ij} is the variable of interest of domain i and unit j and s is a deterministic shift chosen such that $y_{ij} + s > 0$.

While the log transformation is especially beneficial for practitioners that are interested in the interpretation of parameters, it does not need to be the best option in a predictive model due to the missing ability to adapt to the data. In contrast, transformations with a transformation parameter λ can be fitted to the data. [Rojas-Perilla *et al.* \(2020\)](#) compare the log-shift ([Feng *et al.* 2016](#)), Box-Cox ([Box and Cox 1964](#)), and Dual transformation ([Yang 2006](#)) in the EBP context.

The log-shift transformation is the simplest way to make the log transformation more flexible and adaptable to the data. Instead of a deterministic shift, the data is shifted by an optimal

shift before the logarithm is applied:

$$y_{ij}^* = \log(y_{ij} + \lambda),$$

where y_{ij} is the variable of interest of domain i and unit j and $\lambda \geq s$ is an estimated shift. When $\lambda = s$, this transformation equals the implemented log transformation with deterministic shift.

The Box-Cox transformation is a famous transformation in the family of power transformations (Box and Cox 1964). Since the Box-Cox transformation is not suitable for negative values, a deterministic shift can be added as for the log transformation. Its shifted version is defined by:

$$y_{ij}^*(\lambda) = \begin{cases} \frac{(y_{ij}+s)^\lambda - 1}{\lambda} & \text{if } \lambda \neq 0; \\ \log(y_{ij} + s) & \text{if } \lambda = 0, \end{cases}$$

where y_{ij} is the variable of interest of domain i and unit j and s is a deterministic shift chosen such that $y_{ij} + s > 0$. One characteristic of the Box-Cox transformation is that the cases of no transformation when $\lambda = 1$ (the data is only shifted) and applying the log transformation with a deterministic shift when $\lambda = 0$ are covered. A known drawback is the truncation of y_{ij}^* . The transformed variable y_{ij}^* is bounded from below by $\frac{1}{\lambda}$ when $\lambda > 0$, and bounded from above by $\frac{-1}{\lambda}$ when $\lambda < 0$.

The Dual transformation overcomes this issue. It is originally only defined for strictly positive values, but Rojas-Perilla *et al.* (2020) include a deterministic shift as follows:

$$y_{ij}^*(\lambda) = \begin{cases} ((y_{ij} + s)^\lambda - (y_{ij} + s)^{-\lambda})/2\lambda & \lambda > 0; \\ \log(y_{ij} + s) & \lambda = 0, \end{cases}$$

where y_{ij} is the variable of interest of domain i and unit j and s is a deterministic shift chosen such that $y_{ij} + s > 0$. The transformation parameter λ cannot be negative.

For the estimation of the transformation parameter in linear mixed regression models, Gurka *et al.* (2006) propose maximum likelihood and residual maximum likelihood (REML) methods. Rojas-Perilla *et al.* (2020) investigate the maximum likelihood based methods as well as alternative approaches. So far, the package **emdi** only provides the REML approach for the model fitting and the estimation of the transformation parameter. For the explanation of how the transformations are included in the EBP, we refer to Kreutzmann *et al.* (2019, Section 2.2) and Rojas-Perilla *et al.* (2020).

2.2. Functionality

In the following, we will show how the new transformations can be used in the **ebp** function of package **emdi**. The argument **transformation** is determining the chosen transformation. In the new version of function **ebp** following options will be available:

- **no**: No transformation
- **log**: Log transformation with a deterministic shift
- **box.cox**: Box-Cox transformation with a deterministic shift
- **dual**: Dual transformation with a deterministic shift

Transformation	Default interval
<code>box.cox</code>	$c(-1, 2)$
<code>dual</code>	$c(0, 2)$
<code>log.shift</code>	$c(a, b)$ with $a = \max(0, \min(y) + 1)$, $b = \frac{\max(y) - \min(y)}{2}$

Table 1: Default values for the estimation of the transformation parameter λ .

- `log.shift`: Log transformation with an optimized shift

The Box-Cox transformation is chosen to be the default transformation since it covers the options of no transformation and the logarithm. For the REML estimation of the transformation parameter λ , an interval needs to be specified. To simplify the usage, a default interval is defined for all data-driven transformations, Box-Cox, Dual and log-shift, if no specific values are chosen. Table 1 shows the default intervals implemented for function `ebp`. In the following, the different data-driven transformations are applied with the data of Austrian districts provided in the package (Kreutzmann *et al.* 2019).

```
R> library("emdi")
R> # Load sample data set
R> data("eusilcA_smp")
R> data('eusilcA_pop')
```

Box-Cox transformation

The Box-Cox transformation remains the default transformation. The following code produces the same results that are shown in Kreutzmann *et al.* (2019). The estimated transformation parameter equals to 0.6046901. The summary also shows residual diagnostics that suggest a normally distributed random effect, while the Shapiro-Wilk test for the unit-level error rejects normality. A look at the kurtosis and the QQ-plots reveals that the problem lies in the tails. Outlying observations could be one driving factor for these observations.

```
R> ebp_bc <- ebp(fixed = eqIncome ~ gender + eqsize + cash + self_empl +
+               unempl_ben + age_ben + surv_ben + sick_ben + dis_ben +
+               rent + fam_allow + house_allow + cap_inv + tax_adj,
+               pop_data = eusilcA_pop, pop_domains = "district",
+               smp_data = eusilcA_smp, smp_domains = "district",
+               threshold = 10885.33)
R> summary(ebp_bc)
```

Empirical Best Prediction

Call:

```
ebp(fixed = eqIncome ~ gender + eqsize + cash + self_empl + unempl_ben +
    age_ben + surv_ben + sick_ben + dis_ben + rent + fam_allow +
    house_allow + cap_inv + tax_adj, pop_data = eusilcA_pop,
    pop_domains = "district", smp_data = eusilcA_smp, smp_domains = "district",
```

```

threshold = 10885.33)

Out-of-sample domains: 24
In-sample domains: 70

Sample sizes:
Units in sample: 1945
Units in population: 25000
           Min. 1st Qu. Median      Mean 3rd Qu. Max.
Sample_domains      14   17.0   22.5  27.78571   29.00  200
Population_domains  5  126.5  181.5 265.95745  265.75 5857

Explanatory measures:
Marginal_R2 Conditional_R2
0.6325942      0.709266

Residual diagnostics:
           Skewness Kurtosis Shapiro_W      Shapiro_p
Error      0.7523871  9.646993  0.9619824  3.492626e-22
Random_effect 0.4655324  2.837176  0.9760574  1.995328e-01

ICC: 0.2086841

Transformation:
Transformation Method Optimal_lambda Shift_parameter
      box.cox      reml      0.6046901      0

R> qqnorm(ebp_bc)

```




Figure 1: QQ-plots of the error term and random effect using the Box-Cox transformation.

Dual transformation

The Dual transformation in this case is similar to the Box-Cox transformation. Therefore, the estimated transformation parameter differs only slightly with a value of 0.6047161 and also the diagnostics are comparable, with the conclusion of a normally distributed random effect and a distribution of the unit-level error that shows fat tails.

```
R> ebp_dual <- ebp(fixed = eqIncome ~ gender + eqsize + cash + self_empl +
+                 unempl_ben + age_ben + surv_ben + sick_ben + dis_ben +
+                 rent + fam_allow + house_allow + cap_inv + tax_adj,
+                 pop_data = eusilcA_pop, pop_domains = "district",
+                 smp_data = eusilcA_smp, smp_domains = "district",
+                 threshold = 10885.33, transformation = 'dual')
R> summary(ebp_dual)
```

Empirical Best Prediction

Call:

```
ebp(fixed = eqIncome ~ gender + eqsize + cash + self_empl + unempl_ben +
    age_ben + surv_ben + sick_ben + dis_ben + rent + fam_allow +
    house_allow + cap_inv + tax_adj, pop_data = eusilcA_pop,
    pop_domains = "district", smp_data = eusilcA_smp, smp_domains = "district",
    threshold = 10885.33, transformation = "dual")
```

Out-of-sample domains: 24

In-sample domains: 70

Sample sizes:

Units in sample: 1945

Units in population: 25000

	Min.	1st Qu.	Median	Mean	3rd Qu.	Max.
Sample_domains	14	17.0	22.5	27.78571	29.00	200
Population_domains	5	126.5	181.5	265.95745	265.75	5857

Explanatory measures:

Marginal_R2	Conditional_R2
0.6325965	0.7092674

Residual diagnostics:

	Skewness	Kurtosis	Shapiro_W	Shapiro_p
Error	0.752435	9.647438	0.9619800	3.487023e-22
Random_effect	0.465552	2.837214	0.9760562	1.995026e-01

ICC: 0.2086831

Transformation:

Transformation	Method	Optimal_lambda	Shift_parameter
dual	reml	0.6047161	0

```
R> qqnorm(ebp_dual)
```




Figure 2: QQ-plots of the error term and random effect using the Dual transformation.

Log-shift transformation

In contrast to the Box-Cox and Dual transformation, the transformation parameter of the log-shift transformation is on the scale of the dependent variable. In this example, λ equals 27907.57. The diagnostics in the summary show that the log-shift transformation slightly improves the kurtosis. From the QQ-plots, it can be concluded that the normality of the unit-level error is most likely rejected because of two outliers.

```
R> ebp_ls <- ebp(fixed = eqIncome ~ gender + eqsize + cash + self_empl +
+               unempl_ben + age_ben + surv_ben + sick_ben + dis_ben +
+               rent + fam_allow + house_allow + cap_inv + tax_adj,
+               pop_data = eusilcA_pop, pop_domains = "district",
+               smp_data = eusilcA_smp, smp_domains = "district",
+               threshold = 10885.33, transformation = 'log.shift')
R> summary(ebp_ls)
```

Empirical Best Prediction

Call:

```
ebp(fixed = eqIncome ~ gender + eqsize + cash + self_empl + unempl_ben +
    age_ben + surv_ben + sick_ben + dis_ben + rent + fam_allow +
    house_allow + cap_inv + tax_adj, pop_data = eusilcA_pop,
    pop_domains = "district", smp_data = eusilcA_smp, smp_domains = "district",
    threshold = 10885.33, transformation = "log.shift")
```

Out-of-sample domains: 24

In-sample domains: 70

Sample sizes:

Units in sample: 1945

Units in population: 25000

	Min.	1st Qu.	Median	Mean	3rd Qu.	Max.
Sample_domains	14	17.0	22.5	27.78571	29.00	200
Population_domains	5	126.5	181.5	265.95745	265.75	5857

Explanatory measures:

Marginal_R2	Conditional_R2
0.6233538	0.7054886

Residual diagnostics:

	Skewness	Kurtosis	Shapiro_W	Shapiro_p
Error	0.6222910	7.607189	0.9706711	1.705890e-19
Random_effect	0.4788713	2.726898	0.9737695	1.487627e-01

ICC: 0.2180689

Transformation:

Transformation	Method	Optimal_lambda
log.shift	reml	27907.57

R> qqnorm(ebp_ls)




Figure 3: QQ-plots of the error term and random effect using the log-shift transformation.

Summary

While the transformations help to achieve normality for the random effect but not for the unit-level error term in this specific example, they all lead to almost symmetric distributions and show better results compared to an application without transformation.

3. Empirical Best Prediction under informative sampling

3.1. Methodology

Point Estimation

The EBP proposed by [Molina and Rao \(2010\)](#) assumes non-informative sampling, which means that the inclusion probability of the sample is correlated with the outcome variable of interest. The sampling design is said to be non-informative when

$$P(\text{sm}p \mid y) = P(\text{sm}p), \forall y \in \mathbb{R}^N, \forall \text{sm}p,$$

where $P(\text{sm}p \mid y)$ is the probability of sample $\text{sm}p$.

In many applications, the first stage of the sample is selected with probability proportional to its population size. In these cases, the sampling design is very likely to be informative. In these cases, sampling weights should be included in the estimation of the model parameters in order to avoid biased results. Please note, that the inclusion of sample weights only avoid biased results in target domains that are included in the sample ([Pfeffermann and Sverchkov 2007](#)). [Guadarrama et al. \(2018\)](#) transfer the conditioning idea of the unweighted EBP to the EBP under informative sampling. Instead of conditioning on the unweighted sample mean \bar{y}_{is} during prediction, they condition on the weighted sample mean $\bar{y}_{ij} = w_i^{-1} \sum_{j \in \text{sm}p_i} w_{ij} y_{ij}$. w_{ij} is the sampling weight for the j th unit in domain i and $w_i = \sum_{j \in \text{sm}p_i} w_{ij}$ is the sum of sampling weights within domain i .

The pseudo best (PB) estimator for $I_{ij} = i(y_{ij})$ is therefore $\tilde{I}_{ij}^{PB}(\theta) = E[i(y_{ij}) \mid \bar{y}_{iw}; \theta]$ with model parameters θ and the estimator of the additive domain parameter I_i is defined as

$$\tilde{I}_i^{PB}(\theta) = \frac{1}{N_i} \left[\sum_{j \in \text{sm}p_i} i(y_{ij}) + \sum_{j \in \text{nsmp}_i} \tilde{I}_{ij}^{PB}(\theta) \right].$$

The abbreviation nsmp stands for the non-sampled observations in the census. In **emdi**, the PB is implemented as the census PB (CPB) and given by

$$\tilde{I}_i^{CPB}(\theta) = \frac{1}{N_i} \sum_{j \in i} \tilde{I}_{ij}^{PB}(\theta).$$

This means that the indicator is predicted for all observations in the census and not just for the out-of-sample elements. The reason behind the implementation is that sample observations can very rarely be identified in the census. This procedure is also mentioned in of [Guadarrama et al. \(2018\)](#).

As with the EBP, the PB estimator depends on the true values of the model parameters $\theta = (\beta, \sigma_u^2, \sigma_e^2)$, which are not known and therefore need to be estimated. θ in the pseudo EB predictor is replaced by a consistent estimator. The resulting predictor is called the pseudo empirical best predictor (PEBP). The authors mention two ways of estimating the model parameters. One feasible approach of [Pfeffermann and Sverchkov \(2007\)](#) is based on the sample likelihood. The likelihood is used to find the maximum likelihood (ML) estimates of the regression coefficients β and of the variances σ_u^2 and σ_e^2 . In the second approach, β is estimated using the weighted method of moments of [You and Rao \(2002\)](#). The needed

variance parameters σ_u^2 and σ_e^2 are estimated using ML (or REML). In **emdi**, the second approach is implemented and the variance parameters are estimated by REML.

For out-of-sample observations, the following relationships hold under the nested error population model:

$$y_{ij} | \bar{y}_{iw} \stackrel{ind.}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(\mu_{ij|smp}^w, \sigma_{ij|smp}^{2w}),$$

$$\mu_{ij|smp}^w = x_{ij}^\top \beta + \gamma_{iw}(\bar{y}_{iw} - \bar{x}_{iw}^\top \beta), \quad \sigma_{ij|smp}^{2w} = \sigma_u^2(1 - \gamma_{iw}) + \sigma_e^2.$$

The mean $\mu_{ij|smp}^w$ is obtained by replacing the unweighted best predictor of the domain effect u_i by its weighted version, given by $\tilde{u}_{iw} = \gamma_{iw}(\bar{y}_{iw} - \bar{x}_{iw}^\top \beta)$. This approach of conditioning on the weighted sample mean \bar{y}_{iw} protects against bias due to informative sampling in sampled areas.

In **emdi**, a Monte Carlo procedure is applied to approximate the predictor for all indicators using the following algorithm:

1. The dependent variable is transformed according to chosen transformation ('no', 'log') to obtain $T(y_{ij}) = y_{ij}^*$.
2. The sample data is used to estimate the nested error linear regression model

$$y_{ij}^* = x_{ij}^\top \beta + u_i + e_{ij}, \quad u_i \stackrel{iid}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_u^2), \quad e_{ij} \stackrel{iid}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_e^2)$$

with the `lme` function from the package [Pinheiro et al. \(2021\)](#). Please note, that no weights are included within the estimation of the above model using the `lme` function. The shrinkage parameter $\hat{\gamma}_{iw} = \hat{\sigma}_u^2 / (\hat{\sigma}_u^2 + \hat{\sigma}_e^2 \hat{\delta}_i^2)$, for $\hat{\delta}_i^2 = w_i^{-2} \sum_{j \in smp_i} w_{ij}^2$ is also computed and the coefficients for the fixed effects (following [You and Rao 2002](#)) are then obtained as:

$$\hat{\beta} = \left(\sum_{i=1}^D \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} w_{ij} x_{ij} (x_{ij} - \hat{\gamma}_{iw} \bar{x}_{iw})^\top \right)^{-1} \left(\sum_{i=1}^D \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} w_{ij} (x_{ij} - \hat{\gamma}_{iw} \bar{x}_{iw}) y_{ij} \right),$$

where $\bar{x}_{iw} = w_i^{-1} \sum_{j \in smp_i} w_{ij} x_{ij}$.

3. For $l = 1, \dots, L$:
 - (a) For in-sample domains (domains that are part of the sample data set), a synthetic population of the target variable is generated by $y_{ij}^{*(l)} = x_{ij}^\top \hat{\beta} + \hat{u}_i + \nu_{ij}^{(l)} + e_{ij}^{(l)}$, where $\nu_i^{(l)} \stackrel{iid}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, \hat{\sigma}_u^2(1 - \hat{\gamma}_{iw}))$, $e_{ij} \stackrel{iid}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, \hat{\sigma}_e^2)$ and $\hat{u}_i = \hat{\gamma}_{iw}(\bar{y}_{iw} - \bar{x}_{iw}^\top \hat{\beta})$. For out-of-sample domains (domains with no data in the sample), the conditional expectation of u_i cannot be computed, hence for these domains a synthetic population is generated by using $y_{ij}^{*(l)} = x_{ij}^\top \hat{\beta} + \nu_{ij}^{(l)} + e_{ij}^{(l)}$, where $\nu_i^{(l)} \stackrel{iid}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, \hat{\sigma}_u^2)$ and $e_{ij} \stackrel{iid}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, \hat{\sigma}_e^2)$.
 - (b) The predicted dependent variable is back-transformed to the original scale $y_{ij}^{(l)} = T^{-1}(y_{ij}^{*(l)})$ and the target indicator $I_i^{(l),PEBP} = I_i(y_{ij}^{(l)})$ is calculated in each domain.
4. Final estimates are computed by taking the mean over the L Monte Carlo simulations in each domain, $\hat{I}_i^{PEBP} = \frac{1}{L} \sum_{l=1}^L I_i^{(l),PEBP}$

Parametric bootstrap MSE estimator

Guadarrama *et al.* (2018) moreover propose a parametric bootstrap MSE estimator that is very similar to the procedure in Molina and Rao (2010), which is based on the method developed by González-Manteiga *et al.* (2008). The bootstrap implemented in **emdi** takes into account, that in applications the sample can rarely be identified within the census:

1. The same nested error model is fit to the sample data (possibly under transformation) as for the point estimates and the model parameters are obtained $(\hat{\beta}, \hat{\sigma}_u^2, \hat{\sigma}_e^2)$.
2. For $b = 1, \dots, B$, with large B , $u_i^{(b)} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \hat{\sigma}_u^2)$ and $e_{ij}^{(b)} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \hat{\sigma}_e^2)$, $j = 1, \dots, N_i$, $i = 1, \dots, D$ are generated independently.
3. B bootstrap populations are generated as

$$y_{ij}^{*(b)} = x_{ij}^\top \hat{\beta} + u_i^{(b)} + e_{ij}^{(b)}, \quad j = 1, \dots, N_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, D.$$

4. From each bootstrap population the true value of the domain indicator $I_i^{(b)} = N_i^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^{N_i} I(y_{ij}^{(b)})$, $b = 1, \dots, B$ is calculated.
5. Additionally a bootstrap sample is generated as

$$y_{ij}^{*(b)} = x_{ij}^\top \hat{\beta} + u_i^{(b)} + e_{ij}^{(b)}, \quad j = 1, \dots, n_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, D.$$

This sample is used in conjunction with the known population vectors $x_{ij}, j \in U_i$ to calculate the bootstrap PEBP of I_i , denoted $\hat{I}_i^{PEBP(b)}$, $b = 1, \dots, B$.

6. A bootstrap estimator of $\text{MSE}(\hat{I}_i^{PEBP})$ is then given by

$$\text{mse}(\hat{I}_i^{PEBP}) = \frac{1}{B} \sum_{b=1}^B \left(\hat{I}_i^{PEBP(b)} - I_i^{(b)} \right)^2.$$

3.2. Functionality

Overall, there are only slight changes for the user from the first version of the function **ebp**. Since the Pseudo EBP method uses survey weights in the estimation part, the **ebp** function has a new argument **weights**. The argument defaults to **NULL** and is to be used like the argument **smpl_domains**, when the sampling design is informative. The function expects a character string as input for the argument that indicates the name of the weights variable in the sample dataset. The variable itself has to be numeric.

Since Rojas-Perilla *et al.* (2020) find that the usage of data-driven transformations can be favourable for the estimation of the EBP under non-informative sampling, the **transformation** argument of the **ebp** function in **emdi** is set to "box.cox" implying that the dependent variable is transformed with the Box-Cox transformation. Users of the weighted version of the EBP will have to choose "no" for no transformation or "log" for a logarithmic transformation, because data-driven transformations for the PEBP are still a topic for research. If the argument

is not changed an informative message will be displayed and the estimation process will be halted.

While two options to estimate the MSE are provided for the unweighted EBP, the MSE estimation for PEBP allows only for a parametric bootstrap which is the default for both estimation approaches (`boot_type="parametric"`).

Model estimation

The original version of the EBP can still be used without any changes to the arguments of the function. The following function call almost equals the shown example in [Kreutzmann et al. \(2019\)](#):

```
R> ebp_noweights <- ebp(fixed = eqIncome ~ gender + eqsize + cash + self_empl +
+                       unempl_ben + age_ben + surv_ben + sick_ben + dis_ben +
+                       rent + fam_allow + house_allow + cap_inv + tax_adj,
+                       pop_data = eusilcA_pop, pop_domains = "district",
+                       smp_data = eusilcA_smp, smp_domains = "district",
+                       threshold = 10885.33, MSE = TRUE)
```

Bootstrap started

10	of	50	Bootstrap iterations completed	Approximately	00:00:02:06	remaining
20	of	50	Bootstrap iterations completed	Approximately	00:00:01:33	remaining
30	of	50	Bootstrap iterations completed	Approximately	00:00:01:02	remaining
40	of	50	Bootstrap iterations completed	Approximately	00:00:00:31	remaining

Bootstrap completed

When using the PEBP, the aforementioned changes to two arguments are necessary in order to run the model:

- **weights:** Adding the name of the variable that indicates the sampling weights
- **transformation:** Since the default transformation, Box-Cox, is not yet available for the weighted EBP, it needs to be changed to "no" or "log"

```
R> ebp_weights <- ebp(fixed = eqIncome ~ gender + eqsize + cash + self_empl +
+                       unempl_ben + age_ben + surv_ben + sick_ben + dis_ben +
+                       rent + fam_allow + house_allow + cap_inv + tax_adj,
+                       pop_data = eusilcA_pop, pop_domains = "district",
+                       smp_data = eusilcA_smp, smp_domains = "district",
+                       threshold = 10885.33, MSE = TRUE,
+                       weights = "weight", transformation = "log")
```

```

Bootstrap started
10 of 50 Bootstrap iterations completed      Approximately 00:00:01:42 remaining
20 of 50 Bootstrap iterations completed      Approximately 00:00:01:15 remaining
30 of 50 Bootstrap iterations completed      Approximately 00:00:00:49 remaining
40 of 50 Bootstrap iterations completed      Approximately 00:00:00:24 remaining

Bootstrap completed

```

The `model` component of an `'ebp'` object that considers weights has a new list element with the weighted coefficients (You and Rao 2002). The other return components for the class are the same as for the unweighted EBP. After running the model, all the S3 methods that are available for the unweighted version of the EBP, can also be used to inspect the estimation results of the weighted EBP. An overview of all available methods can be found with `help(emdiObject)`.

Model diagnostics

The function call returned in the summary indicates if sampling weights are used for the estimation. Furthermore, the PEBP output clarifies that the returned explanatory measures and residual diagnostics belong to the mixed model used for the estimation of the variance components. While the data information as the in- and out-of-sample domains or sample sizes do not differ between the models, differences can be seen in the model diagnostics which is due to the different transformation used.

```

R> # without weights
R> summary(ebp_noweights)

```

Empirical Best Prediction

Call:

```

ebp(fixed = eqIncome ~ gender + eqsize + cash + self_empl + unempl_ben +
    age_ben + surv_ben + sick_ben + dis_ben + rent + fam_allow +
    house_allow + cap_inv + tax_adj, pop_data = eusilcA_pop,
    pop_domains = "district", smp_data = eusilcA_smp, smp_domains = "district",
    threshold = 10885.33, MSE = TRUE)

```

Out-of-sample domains: 24

In-sample domains: 70

Sample sizes:

Units in sample: 1945

Units in population: 25000

	Min.	1st Qu.	Median	Mean	3rd Qu.	Max.
Sample_domains	14	17.0	22.5	27.78571	29.00	200
Population_domains	5	126.5	181.5	265.95745	265.75	5857

Explanatory measures:

Marginal_R2	Conditional_R2
0.6325942	0.709266

Residual diagnostics:

	Skewness	Kurtosis	Shapiro_W	Shapiro_p
Error	0.7523871	9.646993	0.9619824	3.492626e-22
Random_effect	0.4655324	2.837176	0.9760574	1.995328e-01

ICC: 0.2086841

Transformation:

Transformation Method	Optimal_lambda	Shift_parameter
box.cox	reml	0.6046901
		0

R> # with weights

R> summary(ebp_weights)

Empirical Best Prediction

Call:

```
ebp(fixed = eqIncome ~ gender + eqsize + cash + self_empl + unempl_ben +
  age_ben + surv_ben + sick_ben + dis_ben + rent + fam_allow +
  house_allow + cap_inv + tax_adj, pop_data = eusilcA_pop,
  pop_domains = "district", smp_data = eusilcA_smp, smp_domains = "district",
  threshold = 10885.33, transformation = "log", MSE = TRUE,
  weights = "weight")
```

Out-of-sample domains: 24

In-sample domains: 70

Sample sizes:

Units in sample: 1945

Units in population: 25000

	Min.	1st Qu.	Median	Mean	3rd Qu.	Max.
Sample_domains	14	17.0	22.5	27.78571	29.00	200
Population_domains	5	126.5	181.5	265.95745	265.75	5857

Explanatory measures for the mixed model:

Marginal_R2	Conditional_R2
0.5022296	0.5909727

Residual diagnostics for the mixed model:

```

                Skewness Kurtosis Shapiro_W   Shapiro_p
Error          -2.1828119 17.863231 0.8670156 8.641339e-38
Random_effect -0.6609709  3.361441 0.9682563 7.261244e-02
    
```

ICC: 0.1782811

```

Transformation:
Transformation Shift_parameter
                log                0
    
```

The method `plot` works independent of the usage of weights and plots residual diagnostics for the mixed model used in the estimation of the variance components.

R> `plot(ebp_weights)`




Figure 4: Output of `plot(ebp_weights)`: (a) normal quantile-quantile (Q-Q) plots of the error term and random effects, (b) and (c): kernel densities of the distribution of the error term and random effects (blue) in comparison to a standard normal distribution (black), (d): Cooks distance plot. All results refer to the error terms from the mixed model with log transformation.

To analyse the model coefficients, we added an additional argument `weights` to the `coef.ebp` method, which defaults to `FALSE`. When using the default, the coefficients for the mixed model

are displayed. Setting the argument to TRUE returns the weighted regression coefficients as in You and Rao (2002).

```
R> # default
R> head(coef(ebp_weights), 2)
```

	(Intercept)	genderfemale	eqsize	cash
Neusiedl am See	9.259754	-0.01087928	-0.06553293	2.984645e-05
Oberwart	9.079019	-0.01087928	-0.06553293	2.984645e-05
	self_empl	unempl_ben	age_ben	surv_ben
Neusiedl am See	2.297232e-05	1.988227e-05	3.017273e-05	2.969203e-05
Oberwart	2.297232e-05	1.988227e-05	3.017273e-05	2.969203e-05
	sick_ben	dis_ben	rent	fam_allow
Neusiedl am See	2.640426e-05	3.46888e-05	1.459455e-05	3.068898e-06
Oberwart	2.640426e-05	3.46888e-05	1.459455e-05	3.068898e-06
	house_allow	cap_inv	tax_adj	
Neusiedl am See	5.035249e-05	1.752919e-05	-1.194406e-05	
Oberwart	5.035249e-05	1.752919e-05	-1.194406e-05	

```
R> # weighted coefficients
R> coef(ebp_weights, weights = TRUE)
```

(Intercept)	genderfemale	eqsize	cash	self_empl
9.150540e+00	3.396113e-03	-6.104507e-02	3.272744e-05	2.486388e-05
unempl_ben	age_ben	surv_ben	sick_ben	dis_ben
2.182578e-05	3.355522e-05	3.122066e-05	2.847899e-05	3.778051e-05
rent	fam_allow	house_allow	cap_inv	tax_adj
1.514303e-05	3.655281e-07	4.582541e-05	1.807290e-05	-1.191243e-05

Estimation results

The analysis of estimation results does also not differ between the estimation of the EBP or the PEBP. Exemplarily, we show the first five rows of the head count ratio and the poverty gap for the Austrian districts for both estimation approaches.

```
R> # without weights
R> head(estimators(ebp_noweights, indicator = c("Head_Count", "Poverty_Gap")))
```

	Domain	Head_Count	Poverty_Gap
1	Eisenstadt-Umgebung	0.03252174	0.006666679
2	Eisenstadt (Stadt)	0.02918919	0.007225508
3	Güssing	0.15459459	0.034668361
4	Jennersdorf	0.35877551	0.099130465
5	Mattersburg	0.07908257	0.015634492
6	Neusiedl am See	0.09316129	0.017250369


```
R> # with weights
R> head(estimators(ebp_weights, indicator = c("Head_Count", "Poverty_Gap")))
```

	Domain	Head_Count	Poverty_Gap
1	Eisenstadt-Umgebung	0.04939130	0.00844820
2	Eisenstadt (Stadt)	0.03567568	0.00756965
3	Güssing	0.19216216	0.03653299
4	Jennersdorf	0.39306122	0.09112366
5	Mattersburg	0.10733945	0.01791921
6	Neusiedl am See	0.11122581	0.01800804

The point and uncertainty estimates can also be plotted on maps to analyse the spatial distribution of e.g., poverty incidence.

```
R> # load shape file
R> load_shapeaustria()
R> # plot for PEBP (weights) for head count ratio
R> map_plot(object = ebp_weights, CV = TRUE,
+           map_obj = shape_austria_dis, indicator = c("Head_Count"),
+           map_dom_id = "PB")
```




Figure 5: Map of predictions (a) and CV (b) of the head count ratio from the EBP using sampling weights.

Summary

The usage of function `ebp` changes only slightly for the user when weights are added compared to the unweighted option. All diagnostic and analysis tools are available for both options.

4. Specifying a level of aggregation

In many practical SAE applications, several spatial variables are available in the dataset. In these cases, it is possible to specify the random effect at a different level than the target

areas for which results are output. In other words, this feature relaxes the requirement that the random effects need to be specified at the target domain level. Marhuenda *et al.* (2017) discuss such cases in model- and design-based simulations. A new argument has been added to the `ebp` function (`aggregate_to`) to specify the target domain level.

4.1. Methodology

Point Estimation

For the independent determination of the target domain level additional to the domain level for the calculation of the random effects, there are changes in Step 3 and 4 of the Monte Carlo procedure. These changes only apply to the index for the domains. Therefore, we have two different domain levels and indexes with i the domains on which the random effect is specified and with i^{agg} the target level on which the results are output. Please note, if no entry is made in `aggregate_to` then $i^{agg} = i$ and both levels coincide.

3. For $l = 1, \dots, L$:

- (a) For in-sample domains (domains that are part of the sample data set), a synthetic population of the target variable is generated by $y_{ij}^{*(l)} = x_{ij}^\top \hat{\beta} + \hat{u}_i + \nu_{ij}^{(l)} + e_{ij}^{(l)}$, where $\nu_i^{(l)} \stackrel{iid}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, \hat{\sigma}_u^2(1 - \hat{\gamma}_{iw}))$, $e_{ij} \stackrel{iid}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, \hat{\sigma}_e^2)$ and $\hat{u}_i = \hat{\gamma}_{iw}(\bar{y}_{iw} - \bar{x}_{iw}^\top \hat{\beta})$. For out-of-sample domains (domains with no data in the sample), the conditional expectation of u_i cannot be computed, hence for these domains a synthetic population is generated by using $y_{ij}^{*(l)} = x_{ij}^\top \hat{\beta} + \nu_{ij}^{(l)} + e_{ij}^{(l)}$, where $\nu_i^{(l)} \stackrel{iid}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, \hat{\sigma}_u^2)$ and $e_{ij} \stackrel{iid}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, \hat{\sigma}_e^2)$.
- (b) The predicted dependent variable is back-transformed to the original scale $y_{ij}^{(l)} = T^{-1}(y_{ij}^{*(l)})$ and the target indicator $I_{i^{agg}}^{(l),EBP} = I_{i^{agg}}(y_{i^{agg}j}^{(l)})$ is calculated for each target domain (i^{agg}) which can differ from the domain indicated with i for the random effect.

4. Final estimates are computed by taking the mean over the L Monte Carlo simulations in each target domain, $\hat{I}_{i^{agg}}^{EBP} = \frac{1}{L} \sum_{l=1}^L I_{i^{agg}}^{(l),EBP}$. This methodology for adding the level of aggregation can also be applied analogously to the PEBP (Section 3).

This extension for the independent specification of the target level is particularly relevant for non-linear indicators (e.g. the Gini coefficient). For linear indicators such as the mean, it is convenient, but the respective point estimate for higher levels could also be obtained by a weighted mean.

Parametric bootstrap MSE estimator

Accordingly, the index for the target domain is also adapted for the MSE parametric bootstrap procedure starting with step 4:

4. From each bootstrap population, the true value of the target domain indicator $I_{i^{agg}}^{(b)} = N_{i^{agg}}^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^{N_{i^{agg}}} I(y_{i^{agg}j}^{(b)})$, $b = 1, \dots, B$ is calculated.

The S3 object for the output does not differ in structure from the one where the level of the random effect and the target level are the same. When using an independent target domain level, it must be noted that in the component `ind` and `MSE` the indicators are given at the target level. In the component `model`, the information about the random effect is specified at the level as defined in `pop_domains`.

Estimation results

The estimation results for the EBP with target level state and district are different in the representation as the target domain level differs.

```
R> # output on district level
R> estimators(ebp_state, indicator = c("Mean", "Gini"))
```

```
Indicator/s: Mean, Gini
      Domain      Mean      Gini
1   Burgenland 20483.68 0.2851968
2 Lower Austria 19872.20 0.2643735
3      Vienna 19971.33 0.2459263
4   Carinthia 20006.25 0.2558451
5      Styria 19401.55 0.2723257
6 Upper Austria 20385.73 0.2698892
7   Salzburg 19210.84 0.2668539
8      Tyrol 18971.87 0.2609626
9 Vorarlberg 22268.24 0.2815550
```

Instead of showing the output for all 94 districts, we present the results for the first 9 districts, which together comprise the state Burgenland. In addition, we add a variable `proportion` to this table, which describes the proportion of the respective district in the total population of Burgenland.

```
R> # output on state level while the random effect is on district level
R> tab_districts_Burgenland <-
+   estimators(ebp_district, indicator = c("Mean", "Gini"))$ind[1:9,]
R> tab_districts_Burgenland$proportion <-
+   table(eusilcA_pop$district)[1:9] / sum(table(eusilcA_pop$district)[1:9])
R> tab_districts_Burgenland
```

```
      Domain      Mean      Gini  proportion
1 Eisenstadt-Umgebung 27509.02 0.2214688 0.143929912
2 Eisenstadt (Stadt) 53654.42 0.2872751 0.046307885
3      Güssing 17189.34 0.1906263 0.092615770
4   Jennersdorf 13402.65 0.2098103 0.061326658
5   Mattersburg 21260.09 0.2091353 0.136420526
6   Neusiedl am See 19004.31 0.1865026 0.193992491
7   Oberpullendorf 17671.04 0.1951648 0.131414268
```

```

8           Oberwart 13954.69 0.2067836 0.187734668
9           Rust (Stadt) 15457.77 0.1740471 0.006257822

```

For linear indicators, such as the mean, the indicator at state level can be determined directly from the corresponding values of the districts using the proportions of the district to the total state population. For non-linear indicators, this relationship does not exist.

```
R> sum(tab_districts_Burgenland$Mean * tab_districts_Burgenland$proportion)
```

```
[1] 20483.68
```

```
R> sum(tab_districts_Burgenland$Gini * tab_districts_Burgenland$proportion)
```

```
[1] 0.2059686
```

The results can be shown on maps on variable levels to analyze spatial distributions of poverty indicators like the Gini index. To reproduce the map on state level, please download the Austrian shape file for the states (<https://data-synergis.opendata.arcgis.com/maps/a16c7b8ef72f4ec2b36f7c7ebbcdf2e5>) and name it `shape_austria_state`.

```
R> # Load shape file
R> load_shapeaustria()
```

```
R> # Create map for Gini indicator on district level
R> map_plot(object = ebp_district, map_obj = shape_austria_dis,
            indicator = c("Gini"), map_dom_id = "PB")
```

```
R> # Create map for Gini indicator on state level using map_tab for assignment
R> map_plot(object = ebp_state, map_obj = shape_austria_state,
            indicator = c("Gini"), map_dom_id = "BL", map_tab = map_tab)
```

Summary

The usage of function `ebp` changes only slightly for the user when a different aggregation level for the results is definable. All diagnostic and analysis tools are available. Please note that the model diagnostics refer to the level at which the random effect is specified. In contrast, the results are presented at the target level for aggregation.

5. Inclusion of population weights

The EBP is a unit-level SAE model. It is, therefore, calculated at the level about which you want to find something out. In some cases, this targeted level is not available in the population or sample data. For example, household data are available and a statement on the individuals is desired or cluster level data, e.g. grid data, are available and an estimate on the household or individuals is wanted. In such cases, the household size or the number of households/inhabitants per grid can be used for weighting (Masaki *et al.* 2020; Elbers *et al.*




Figure 6: Map of predictions on district (a) and state (b) level of the Gini indicator from the EBP with random effects on district level and various output level.

2003). These population weights are utilized when aggregating results to target domains and are distinct from the survey weights used to estimate the model that were discussed in Section 3 above. The argument `weights` indicates a variable in the survey and `pop_weights` a variable in the population. If using the argument `pop_weights`, the indicators within each Monte-Carlo simulation are calculated as a weighted indicator using population weights. The changing interpretation of the results will be explained later in detail for the head count ratio.

5.1. Methodology

In terms of methodology, only the calculation of the indicator changes within each Monte Carlo repetition. The indicator is formed in step 3 (b) for the point estimates. All other extensions that also affect the indicator, such as (a) using survey weights or (b) defining an independent level for aggregation can be combined with the population weights. The basic indicator $I_i^{(l)}$ for each Monte-Carlo $l = 1, \dots, L$ and every domain $i = 1, \dots, D$ in the population is defined for the variable of interest y estimated for each unit $j = 1, \dots, N_i$ as

$$I_i^{(l)} = I_i(y_{ij}^{(l)}).$$

In addition, the weights from the population (w_{ij}^{pop}) must now be taken into account in the calculation of the indicator:

$$I_i^{(l)} = I_i(y_{ij}^{(l)}, w_{ij}^{pop}).$$

Using the head count ratio as an example, this leads to a weighted version for calculating the indicator

$$HCR_i^{(l)} = HCR_i(y_{ij}^{(l)}) = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{N_i} p_{ij}}{N_i} \quad HCR_i^{(l)} = HCR_i(y_{ij}^{(l)}, w_{ij}^{pop}) = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{N_i} p_{ij} w_{ij}^{pop}}{\sum_{j=1}^{N_i} w_{ij}^{pop}},$$

where $p_{ij} = 1$ indicates that the statistics y_{ij} form unit j in domain i is underneath the poverty threshold and $p_{ij} = 0$ that it is above this threshold.

To calculate the bootstrap MSE estimator, the indicator in Step 5 has to be adjusted in the same way to allow for population weights.

5.2. Functionality

Model estimation

The original version of the EBP can still be used without any changes to the arguments of the function. The following function call almost equals the shown example in [Kreutzmann et al. \(2019\)](#):

```
R> # EBP without population weights
R> ebp_unit <- ebp(fixed = eqIncome ~ gender + eqsize + cash + self_empl +
+                 unempl_ben + age_ben + surv_ben + sick_ben + dis_ben +
+                 rent + fam_allow + house_allow + cap_inv + tax_adj,
+                 pop_data = eusilcA_pop, pop_domains = "district",
+                 smp_data = eusilcA_smp, smp_domains = "district",
+                 na.rm = TRUE)
```

When using population weights the only change is to give this variable to the argument `pop_weights`. This variable has to be represented in the population data. Here, we want to take the equalized household size into account for calculating the indicators.

```
R> # EBP with population weights
R> ebp_eqsize <- ebp(fixed = eqIncome ~ gender + eqsize + cash + self_empl +
+                 unempl_ben + age_ben + surv_ben + sick_ben + dis_ben +
+                 rent + fam_allow + house_allow + cap_inv + tax_adj,
+                 pop_data = eusilcA_pop, pop_domains = "district",
+                 smp_data = eusilcA_smp, smp_domains = "district",
+                 na.rm = TRUE, pop_weights = "eqsize")
```

The S3 object for the output does not differ in structure from the model without population weights.

Estimation results

In the following, the estimation results without and with population weights are shown for the head count ratio.

```
R> head(estimators(ebp_unit, indicator = c("Head_Count")))
```

	Domain	Head_Count
1	Eisenstadt-Umgebung	0.03304348
2	Eisenstadt (Stadt)	0.02972973
3	Güssing	0.15648649
4	Jennersdorf	0.36081633
5	Mattersburg	0.07963303
6	Neusiedl am See	0.09445161

```
R> head(estimators(ebp_eqsize, indicator = c("Head_Count")))
```

	Domain	Head_Count
1	Eisenstadt-Umgebung	0.03600198
2	Eisenstadt (Stadt)	0.02704918
3	Güssing	0.14928450
4	Jennersdorf	0.36713178
5	Mattersburg	0.08422993
6	Neusiedl am See	0.08797319

The results differ slightly, because household size is correlated with poverty status. When interpreting the results, it should be specified exactly what is being addressed: (1) without population weights (`ebp_unit`) the result refers to the share of households below the poverty threshold and (2) with population weights (`ebp_eqsize`) the result refers to the share of persons belonging to households below the poverty line.

Custom Indicator

The indicator can now depend on the population weights, so weights must always be indicated when the indicator is to be determined.

```
R> ebp_eqsize_custom_indicator <- ebp(
+   fixed = eqIncome ~ gender + eqsize + cash + self_empl + unempl_ben +
+   age_ben + surv_ben + sick_ben + dis_ben + rent + fam_allow +
+   house_allow + cap_inv + tax_adj,
+   pop_data = eusilcA_pop, pop_domains = "district",
+   smp_data = eusilcA_smp, smp_domains = "district",
+   custom_indicator = list(HCR_singleHH =
+     function(y, pop_weights, threshold) {
+       mean(y[pop_weights == 1] < threshold)
+     }
+   ),
+   na.rm = TRUE, pop_weights = "eqsize")
```

```
R> head(estimators(ebp_eqsize_custom_indicator,
+   indicator = c("Head_Count", "HCR_singleHH")))
```

	Domain	Head_Count	HCR_singleHH
1	Eisenstadt-Umgebung	0.03600198	0.008571429
2	Eisenstadt (Stadt)	0.02704918	0.000000000
3	Güssing	0.14928450	0.165600000
4	Jennersdorf	0.36713178	0.317500000
5	Mattersburg	0.08422993	0.055833333
6	Neusiedl am See	0.08797319	0.141904762

The argument `custom_indicator` allows for a customized indicator. For this purpose, a function must be defined containing the arguments `y`, and optional can contain `threshold`, and

`pop_weights`. Such a customized indicator allows a variety of statistics to be calculated with `ebp`. In the present case, `HCR_singleHH` is defined to estimate the share of single households that are below the poverty line respectively the share of persons living in single households that are below the poverty line. Here, we get the same results regardless of whether we still include the population weights for a weighted mean, since the `eqsize` of a single households is 1.

Summary

The usage of function `ebp` changes only slightly for the user when population weights are definable. All diagnostic and analysis tools are available. Please note, that the diagnostic on weights refer to the survey weights as explained in Chapter 3.

5.3. Conclusion

This vignette shows the most recent changes of function `ebp` in the R package **emdi**: (a) additional data-driven transformations, (b) the inclusion of sampling weights into the estimation procedure of the EBP (c) the option for an independent determination for the level of aggregation (d) the possibility to include population weights. A topic for further research is the inclusion of the above described data-driven transformations in the estimation of the PEBP.

Acknowledgments

The authors gratefully acknowledge financial support from the UK Foreign, Commonwealth & Development Office and from the World Bank Group. We further thank [Guadarrama *et al.* \(2018\)](#) for the provision of code along with the paper.

References

- Battese GE, Harter RM, Fuller WA (1988). “An Error-Components Model for Prediction of County Crop Areas using Survey and Satellite Data.” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, **83**(401), 28–36. doi:10.1080/01621459.1988.10478561.
- Box G, Cox D (1964). “An Analysis of Transformations.” *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society B*, **26**(2), 211–252.
- Diallo M, Rao J (2014). “Small Area Estimation of Complex Parameters Under Unit-level Models with Skew-Normal Errors.” *JSM 2014*, Survey Research Methods Section.
- Elbers C, Lanjouw J, Lanjouw P (2003). “Micro-level estimation of poverty and inequality.” *Econometrica*, **71**(1), 355–364.
- Feng Q, Hannig J, Marron JS (2016). “A Note on Automatic Data Transformation.” *Stat*, **5**(1), 82–87. URL <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/sta4.104>.
- González-Manteiga W, Lombardía M, Molina I, Morales D, Santamaría L (2008). “Analytic and Bootstrap Approximations of Prediction Errors Under a Multivariate Fay-Herriot Model.” *Computational Statistics and Data Analysis*, **52**(12), 5242–5252.
- Graf M, Marín J, Molina I (2019). “A generalized mixed model for skewed distributions applied to small area estimation.” *TEST*, **28**, 565–597.
- Guadarrama M, Molina I, Rao J (2016). “A comparison of small area estimation methods for poverty mapping.” *Joint Issue: Statistics in Transition New Series Survey Methodology*, **17**(1), 41–66.
- Guadarrama M, Molina I, Rao J (2018). “Small area estimation of general parameters under complex sampling designs.” *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, **121**, 20–40.
- Gurka M, Edwards L, Muller K, Kupper L (2006). “Extending the Box-Cox transformation to the linear mixed model.” *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society A*, **169**(Part 2), 273–288.
- Kreutzmann AK, Pannier S, Rojas-Perilla N, Schmid T, Templ M, Tzavidis N (2019). “The R Package **emdi** for Estimating and Mapping Regionally Disaggregated Indicators.” *Journal of Statistical Software*, **91**(7), 1–33. doi:10.18637/jss.v091.i07.
- Marhuenda Y, Molina I, Morales D, Rao JNK (2017). “Poverty Mapping in Small Areas under a Twofold Nested Error Regression Model.” **180**(4), 1111–1136.
- Marino M, Ranalli MG SN, Alfo M (2019). “Semiparametric Empirical Best Prediction for Small Area Estimation of Unemployment Indicators.” *Annals of Applied Statistics*, **13**(2), 1166–1197.
- Masaki T, Newhouse D, Silwal AR, Bedada A, Engstrom R (2020). “Small area estimation of non-monetary poverty with geospatial data.” *Statistical Journal of the IAOS*, pp. 1–17.
- Molina I, Rao J (2010). “Small Area Estimation of Poverty Indicators.” *The Canadian Journal of Statistics*, **38**(3), 369–385. doi:10.1002/cjs.10051.

- Pfeffermann D, Sverchkov M (2007). “Small-Area Estimation under Informative Probability Sampling of Areas and within the Selected Areas.” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, **102**(480), 1427–1439.
- Pinheiro J, Bates D, DebRoy S, Sarkar D, R Core Team (2021). *nlme: Linear and Nonlinear Mixed Effects Models*. R package version 3.1-152, URL <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=nlme>.
- Rojas-Perilla N (2018). *The Use of Data-Driven Transformations and their Application in Small Area Estimation*. Ph.D. thesis, Freie Universität Berlin.
- Rojas-Perilla N, Pannier S, Schmid T, Tzavidis N (2020). “Data-driven transformations in small area estimation.” *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society A*, **183**(1), 121–148.
- Yang Z (2006). “A modified family of power transformations.” *Economics Letters*, **92**(1), 14–19. URL [doi:10.1016/j.econlet.2006.01.011](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.econlet.2006.01.011).
- You Y, Rao J (2002). “A Pseudo-Empirical Best Linear Unbiased Prediction Approach to Small Area Estimation Using Survey Weights.” *The Canadian Journal of Statistics*, **30**(3), 431–439.

Affiliation:

Felix Skarke, Ann-Kristin Kreutzmann
Institute for Statistics and Econometrics
School of Business & Economics
Freie Universität Berlin
Garystr. 21, 14195 Berlin, Germany
E-mail: felix.skarke@fu-berlin.de, ann-kristin.kreutzmann@fu-berlin.de

Nora Würz
Chair of Statistics and Econometrics
Faculty of Social and Economic Sciences
Otto Friedrich University Bamberg
Feldkirchenstraße 21, 96045 Bamberg, Germany
E-mail: nora.wuerz@uni-bamberg.de