son for the different results could be the increased tissue temperature (T = 20 °C) in the high photon flux density forcing. This is, however, presumably not the case, since in earlier studies no differences were found in the DRR-curves obtained in the forcing temperatures of 17°C and 22°C (Hänninen and Pelkonen 1988, Hänninen 1990).

For a given experiment, the DRR-curve provides an estimate of the cumulative frequency distribution of the chilling requirement for growth competence in the examined population. The results of the present study suggest that this estimate may be affected by the forcing conditions used in the experiment. Much greater variance of the estimated chilling requirement distribution (greater slope of the DRR-curve) was obtained with forcing in an unnaturally low photon flux density than with forcing in a more natural photon flux density (Fig. 1). This finding suggests that the high within-population variation in the chilling requirement for growth competence that has been found with low photon flux density forcing both in the present and in some previous studies (Hänninen and Pelkonen 1988, Hänninen 1990) is an artefact. In this case, photon flux densities similar to those prevailing under natural conditions during the spring should be used in forcing experiments in order to reveal the real genetic within-population variation in the chilling requirement for growth competence.
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Old inventory data have been widely used as prior information in forest inventory using the method of sampling with partial replacement (SPR). In this method knowledge about forest growth has not been utilized. However, the accuracy of the inventory results can be improved if this knowledge is utilized. The usability of the inventory results can be improved if the prior information is updated by triewise growth models. In this paper a statistical basis is presented for a method in which such information can be used. The applicability of the method is also discussed. An example is given to demonstrate the method.
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1 Introduction

There are at least two good reasons for using prior information in forest inventory. We can either improve the accuracy of the results and keep the costs the same as before, or, reduce the costs and keep the accuracy of the results the same as before. In forest inventory many kinds of prior information can be used: satellite imagery or aerial photographs, models estimated from data of previous samples, statistics or data measured in previous inventories.

The most commonly used method for using data from previous inventories in forest inventory is the method of sampling with partial replacement (SPR, Ware and Cunia 1962, see also Jessen 1942). For estimating the current population mean two independent estimates are combined to form a single linear unbiased estimator. The weight placed on the two estimates is dependent on the correlation between the timer volumes of the remeasured plots on first and second occasions and also on the population variances on these two occasions.

In the SPR method knowledge about the forest growth is not utilized. When information on forest growth is utilized the estimation is more efficient (Dixon and Howitt 1979).

In the approach of Dixon and Howitt (1979) the Kalman filter was used (see Kalman 1960). The sampling error is handled using the model based on inference theory and updated data from previous inventories were used as prior information. The growth model used in their study is crude: it simply gives the proportional change of the state vector over time. It may be assumed that the efficiency and usability of the method can be improved, when more detailed models are incorporated.

Often forest inventory and forest management are treated as separate problems. The data measured should be used as efficiently as possible. Thus, the same data should be applicable for both objectives. In the approach of Dixon and Howitt (1979) information about all control actions (harvests, cultural treatments etc.) is used in the forest inventory. However, the use of these inventory results in forest management systems is limited, because only means and sums are known. For most management systems more detailed information is needed.

The required information can be obtained when tree wise growth models are used for updating the data.

In Finland the MELA-system is used both for forest management and for updating the inventory data (Stiltenen 1983). The inventory data are updated by tree wise growth models, and the control actions are taken into account using the values obtained from statistics as restrictions in a linear optimization model.

In Finland, updated data have so far only been used until new data were measured, because methods for using both updated and measured data have not been available. Nowadays such methods are more and more important. The information used in decision making must be as recent as possible. Thus, new measurements are needed more often than before. Due to this the number of sample plots measured in one area at a time will decrease if the costs are not allowed to increase. Consequently, the accuracy of the results will also decrease if only the latest measurements are used.

In this paper a method for using old inventory data as prior information in forest inventory is presented. Using this method, data updated by tree wise growth models can be used as prior information. The method by which the precision of the results can be estimated, when both the measured and updated data are used, is also presented. Finally, the usefulness of biased prior information is discussed.

2 The methods based on superpopulation models

In the approach of Dixon and Howitt the growth model can be written as

\[ X_{t+1} = AX_t + B \eta_t + e_t \]  \hspace{1cm} (1)

where

\[ X_t = [T_{t-1}, \ldots, T_0, 0, \ldots, 0]' \]

The error terms, \( e_t \), are normally distributed with mean zero and covariance matrix \( \Omega \). Vector \( x \) is the vector of the state variables, vector \( u \) is the vector of control actions, matrix \( A \) is the state transition matrix and matrix \( B \) gives the impact of control actions. The model of the sampling system can be written as

\[ y_t = C x_t + v_t \]  \hspace{1cm} (2)

Matrix \( C \) is needed if the observed variables (vector \( y \)) are not the same as the state variables (vector \( x \)). The error terms, \( v_t \), are also normally distributed with mean zero and covariance matrix \( \Theta \). The error term describes the sampling error (see e.g. Cassel et al. 1977).

The Kalman estimator of the state vector can be calculated by the following procedure. The Kalman filter has a prediction step and an update step that follow each other in sequence.

The predicted conditional mean given all the data through time \( t \) is

\[ X_{t+1|t} = AX_{t|t} + Bu_t \]  \hspace{1cm} (3)

and the conditional covariance \( P \) of this estimator is

\[ P_{t+1|t} = AP_{t|t} A' + \Omega \]  \hspace{1cm} (4)

when \( P_t \) is \( \Theta \).

A sample is then taken to obtain \( y_{t+1} \). The predicted value will almost always not be the same as the observed value, so a residual vector can be defined as

\[ \eta_{t+1} = y_{t+1} - X_{t+1|t} \]  \hspace{1cm} (5)

The prior information, \( x_{t+1} \), and the sample information, \( \eta_{t+1} \), are then combined in the update cycle to yield

\[ X_{t+1|t+1} = X_{t+1|t} + K_{t+1} \eta_{t+1} \]  \hspace{1cm} (6)

where

\[ K_{t+1} = (P_{t+1|t} + C \Theta C')^{-1} \]  \hspace{1cm} (7)

The conditional covariance of this estimator is

\[ P_{t+1|t+1} = (P_{t+1|t} + C \Theta C')^{-1} \]  \hspace{1cm} (8)

In this paper the approach is, in principle, the same as that of Dixon and Howitt (1979); only the state transition matrix is more complex. The state transition matrix is assumed to consist of many models. The system consists of tree wise growth models and plot wise cutting, mortality and ingrowth models. The plot wise models are probability models. These components could not be estimated in a tree wise manner, but they were transformed into tree wise form with the aid of other models.

The simplest possible model of the sampling system was used in this study. The model used can be written as

\[ y_t = \mu_t + v_t \]  \hspace{1cm} (9)

where \( y_t \) is the value observed from sample plot \( i \), \( \mu \) is the unknown population parameter and \( v_t \) is the error term. The error terms are assumed to be normally distributed with mean zero and covariance matrix \( \Sigma \). In this study, \( y_t \) is the timber volume (per hectare) of the plot and \( \mu \) is the mean timber volume in the area considered.

In this study the mixed estimator of Theil (1971) was used instead of the Kalman estimator in calculating the inventory results. The Kalman estimator and the mixed estimator are, however, equivalent if certain assumptions hold true (see e.g. Dixon and Howitt 1979). The mixed estimator was selected because the growth models were used to update the initial tree wise data, and not the state vector as in the Kalman filter approach. In each step the volumes of the plots were calculated from the updated data for the mixed estimator, but they were not...
3 Estimation of the MSE of the updated data

If formula (14) is going to be used, the error variances of sample data and updated data must first be estimated. The error variance of sample data, $\sigma^2$, can be estimated by fitting model (9) to the sample. Estimating the error variance of the updated data is not as simple, because it contains both sampling error and error caused by updating.

The error caused by updating in one five-year updating period was estimated by simulations. The state of the sample plots in the beginning of the period was estimated using increment measurements. The state of these plots was then updated by the models. The error variance was estimated by comparing the true state and the updated state in each of the plots at the end of the period.

If the data is updated for more than one five-year period, the error will increase exponentially as the number of updating periods increase. The error variance after $t$ updating periods can be calculated recursively by Kalman filter method using formula (4) of conditional covariances, if the updating errors are not correlated over subsequent periods.

Thus, $t$ is the number of updating periods, $\Omega$ is the updating error in one period, $P_t$ is the sampling error ($\sigma^2$), $A$ is the proportional change of state vector in one period and $P_{t+1}$ is the total error variance of updated data after $t$ updating periods. Coefficient $k$ can then be written as a function of conditional variances for the two updating periods

$$k(t) = \frac{P_t}{P_{t+1}}$$

If the updating errors are, however, correlated over subsequent updating periods, the formula used for calculating the conditional covariances can be written as

$$P_{t+1} = A^2P_t + \Omega^2 + 2A\Omega \text{cov}(E_{t+1}, E_t)$$

instead of (4). If sampling error, $\Omega$, is large when compared with the updating error $\Omega$, or the number of updating periods is small, the effect of correlation is small even when the correlation is large; the greater the updating error the greater effect the correlation has. In Fig. 2 coefficient $k$ is shown as a function of the number of updating periods with four different assumptions of correlation.

![Coefficient k as a function of the number of updating periods with three different assumptions of correlation. Here $P_1$ is 94.1, $\Omega$ is 49.9 and $A$ is 1.089.](image)

![Diagram showing the relationship between coefficient $k$ and the number of updating periods.](diagram)
4 The precision of the mixed estimator

The precision of the estimate of \( \mu \) can be calculated from the formula of the variance of the GLS-estimator when estimator (11) is used. The variance can be written as

\[
\text{var}(\hat{\mu})=(D'\Sigma^{-1}D)^{-1}
\]

(17)

When the mixed estimator (14) is used the variance is

\[
\text{var}(\hat{\mu})=\sigma^2(I+D'\Sigma^{-1}D)^{-1}=\sigma^2(n+\frac{m}{k})\frac{1}{k}
\]

(18)

The precision of the mixed estimator as a function of \( k \) compared with the accuracy of the basic estimator (in which no prior information has been used) is shown in Fig. 3. The variance of the mixed estimator is always less than that of the basic estimator. The reduction in variance diminishes as the value of \( k \) increases.

If the prior information is not unbiased, as is often the case, the true but unknown model of prior information is not (12) but

\[
X_k=D\mu+g+E_k
\]

(19)

where \( g \) is the unknown bias (Teräsvirta 1980). If the prior information is biased the mixed estimator of \( \mu \) is also biased. The bias is (Toutenburg 1982)

\[
b(\hat{\mu})=k^{-1}(D'\Sigma^{-1}D)'(D'\Sigma^{-1}D)^{-1}D'g=
\]

\[
\frac{mg}{k(n+\frac{m}{k})}
\]

(20)

If the prior information is biased, the accuracy and the precision of the estimators must be studied with the aid of the MSE instead of the variance. Toutenburg (1982) has shown that the MSE of the mixed estimator is smaller than that of the basic estimator if (21) holds true.

\[
\sigma^2g^T(1+k+D_k(D'\Sigma^{-1}D)'(D'\Sigma^{-1}D)^{-1}D_k')\Sigma^{-1}g\geq \sigma^2n+\frac{m}{k}
\]

(21)

The value of coefficient \( k \) has an impact on the usefulness of the biased prior information: the smaller the value of \( k \), the smaller the bias that can be tolerated in the prior information. Furthermore, the greater the error variance \( \sigma^2 \), the greater the bias which can be tolerated. This tolerated amount of bias as a function of \( k \) is shown in Fig. 4, with three different assumptions of error variance. However, if the mixed estimator must be unbiased, the prior information must also be unbiased.

5 An example

In the example, data from 7th Finnish National Forest Inventory (measured in 1977-1978) were updated for two five-year periods to match with data of 8th NFI (measured in 1986-1987). The updated data and data from 8th NFI were then used in a mixed estimator in order to obtain the best linear unbiased estimator of the mean volume.

The data used were from southern Finland from six forestry board districts. Only one seventh of the measured sample plots were used in the example: the plots from which only tally trees were measured were not used in this study. The values estimated from all sample plots were assumed to be the true values. However, these values also contain sampling error. Table 1 contains the mean volumes by district in 7th and 8th NFI. Details of the models used can be found in Kangas (1991).

The sampling error was estimated by fitting model (9) to the sample plots. The estimated value of the error variance was 94.1. The updating error, \( \Omega \), was estimated by si-
Table 1. The mean volumes in six forestry board districts in 7th and 8th National Forest Inventory, estimated from all sample plots and from sample plots used in the example.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>7th rev true m³/ha</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>8th rev true m³/ha</th>
<th>Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>119.6</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>140.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>114.0</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>129.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>95.3</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>102.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>121.8</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>154.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>114.1</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>134.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>117.2</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>118.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>112.8</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>128.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Updated true volume by districts calculated from the sample plots.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>True value</th>
<th>Updated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>140.2</td>
<td>142.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>129.8</td>
<td>129.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>102.1</td>
<td>105.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>154.6</td>
<td>148.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>134.5</td>
<td>131.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>118.1</td>
<td>120.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>128.2</td>
<td>128.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The performance of the models does not, however, affect to the method presented. In the empirical examples it is assumed that the sample plots are independent of each other. This means that the sample is assumed to be taken by simple random sampling. In fact the sample was taken by systematic cluster sampling. Therefore, there is positive spatial autocorrelation between the sample plots. Simple random sampling is assumed in order to simplify the approach, but the spatial autocorrelation can, however, be taken into account with correlation functions (see e.g. Matern 1960).

It is also assumed that the mean square error of the updated data is independent of the sample plot, that no measurement errors occur and that the variables, such as height and age of the trees, are known without error. Table 3 contains the true mean volumes, the estimate obtained from sample plots, the estimate obtained from the updated data of 7th NFI and the mixed estimator. The updated volumes deviate more from the true values than the sample volumes, which is quite natural. In three districts the updated value is, however, nearer to the true value than the sample value. The mixed estimator is the best of these estimators, in the sense that the deviations from true values are small in all districts: the probability of great differences is smaller when prior information is used. If the mixed estimator is sensitive to the value of coefficient k, it is not useful in practice. Coefficient k used in the calculations will not be precisely optimal for more than one variable at a time. Nevertheless, the same coefficient must be used for all variables of interest, otherwise there may be inconsistencies in the estimated state vector. Sensitivity calculations made with four different assumptions of coefficient k are shown in Table 4.

The last two values of coefficient k come from the assumption that the correlation of the updating errors over the two updating periods is 0.5 and 0.9. If the correlation is 0.5 and the updating variance on each period is assumed to be constant over time, the conditional error variance of prior information, Pi, can be calculated as

133.8² + 2(0.5 × 49.9²) = 142.8²

and the coefficient k as

142.8²/94.1² = 2.33

Sensitivity of the mixed estimators is greatest in the districts where the deviation between the sample estimate and the updated estimate is greatest (districts 3 and 8). Yet the changes are quite small in these districts also. When the relative change in coefficient k is about 15...
per cent, the change in the mean volume in all districts is less than one per cent. Thus, the mixed estimator is quite robust.

Table 5 shows the standard error of the basic estimator and the standard error of the mixed estimator with three different assumptions of correlation between the updating errors in the two periods. The reduction in the standard error, when the mixed estimator is used, is almost 20 per cent when compared with the basic estimator for the total mean. Thus, the accuracy of the inventory results can be greatly improved even with simple updating models. The sensitivity of the estimator of the standard error is, however, greater than that of the mixed estimator. The relative change in the estimate of the standard error of the total mean is 2.5 per cent when the relative change in coefficient k is 15 per cent. Therefore, coefficient k must be carefully estimated so as not to make too optimistic assumptions about the standard error.

The updating did not seem to cause bias to the data (see Table 2), but the possibility of bias must be taken into account. The largest bias that gives the MSE of the mixed estimator smaller than that of the basic estimator can be calculated from equation (21) as

\[
g \times \sqrt{\frac{2147}{1923}} \times 94.1^2
\]

In this example a bias as great as 3.6 m³/ha can be allowed. The usefulness of biased prior information also depends on the amount of bias in the mixed estimator that is judged tolerable. If, for example, a 1 m³/ha bias in the estimator of mean volume is tolerable, the bias in the prior information may be 2.8 m³/ha.

6 Discussion

In this study the data updated by treewise growth models are used as prior information in forest inventory. Many simplifying assumptions, which may affect the results, have been made about the covariance structure of the sampling and updating errors. The measurement errors and the errors of models used for predicting, for instance, volume or height of trees have not been taken into account. Considering this, the results obtained may seem too optimistic.

In a real situation models used for updating will probably be much more accurate than the models used here (e.g. MELA-system) and also the updating period will often be shorter. These factors can make the benefit, which is obtained using prior information, even bigger.

If the method is to be applicable in real situations, other forms of prior information must also be compatible. This is apparent when model based inference is used. For example, the information obtained from satellite imagery can be used by giving areal weights to the plots, in addition to the weights obtained from error variances (see also Mandallaz 1991). The information obtained from satellite imagery or statistics could also be used in a model form, as stochastic restrictions, like the updated data in equation 14.

The method presented is not yet applicable in practice. The model describing the sampling system must be improved so that the effects of systematic cluster sampling can be taken into account. The measurement and model errors must also be considered. The estimation of the updating error and coefficient k need further study, as does the sensitivity of variables other than volume to coefficient k. The calculations made so far have, however, shown that the presented method is promising way to use updated prior information in forest inventory.
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