Archives of Current Research International

Volume 24, Issue 6, Page 488-506, 2024; Article no.ACRI.120602
ISSN: 2454-7077

Spatial Econometrics in Agriculture: Modelling Spatial Dependencies in Data

A. Meena [a++], B. Manjunatha [b#*], A. Anil Kumar [b#], Jhade Sunil [c†], S. Vishnu Shankar [d‡], M. Manjubala [e^], Abinayarajam D [c†] and Himanshu Sekhar Behera [f##]

[a] Department of Statistics and Mathematics, College of Agriculture, Pjtsau, Telengana, India.
[b] Agricultural Statistics, Indian Agricultural Research Institute-New Delhi, India.
[c] Department of Farm Engineering, Institute of Agricultural Sciences, Banaras Hindu University, India.
[d] Department of Physical Science and Information Technology, AEC&RI, TNAU, Coimbatore, India.
[e] Department of Social Sciences, RVS Agricultural College, Thanjavur, India.
[f] Department of Soil Science and Agricultural Chemistry, Lovely Professional University, Punjab, 144411, India.

Authors' contributions

This work was carried out in collaboration among all authors. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Article Information

DOI: https://doi.org/10.9734/acri/2024/v24i6807

Open Peer Review History:
This journal follows the Advanced Open Peer Review policy. Identity of the Reviewers, Editor(s) and additional Reviewers, peer review comments, different versions of the manuscript, comments of the editors, etc are available here: https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/120602

Review Article

Received: 25/05/2024
Accepted: 02/08/2024
Published: 07/08/2024

[++] *Assistant Professor;*
[#] *Ph.D. Scholar;*
[†] *Research Scholar in Agricultural Statistics;*
[‡] *Teaching Assistant;*
[^] *Assistant Professor (Agricultural Statistics);*
[##] *Research Scholar;*
**Corresponding author: Email: bmanjunathabpt@gmail.com;*

Cite as: *Meena, A., B. Manjunatha, A. Anil Kumar, Jhade Sunil, S. Vishnu Shankar, M. Manjubala, Abinayarajam D, and Himanshu Sekhar Behera. 2024. "Spatial Econometrics in Agriculture: Modelling Spatial Dependencies in Data". Archives of Current Research International 24 (6):488-506. https://doi.org/10.9734/acri/2024/v24i6807.*

ABSTRACT

Spatial econometrics in agriculture focuses on modelling spatial dependencies in data, recognizing that agricultural outcomes are often influenced by geographic proximity and spatial interactions. This approach acknowledges that agricultural phenomena, such as crop yields, pest outbreaks, and soil quality, can exhibit spatial patterns that traditional econometric models may overlook. By incorporating spatial elements into econometric analysis, researchers can better understand how neighbouring regions or locations influence each other's agricultural outcomes. This is crucial for policymakers and farmers seeking to optimize resource allocation, manage environmental impacts, and enhance productivity in agriculture. Spatial econometrics provides a robust framework to uncover hidden relationships and spatial interactions within agricultural data, thereby supporting informed decision-making and sustainable agricultural practices in a spatially interconnected world.

Keywords: Spatial; quality; analysis; agricultural; economics.

1. INTRODUCTION

Methods of spatial regression are utilized in order to take into consideration the reliance that exists between observations. This dependence frequently occurs when data is gathered from points or areas that are placed in space [1]. Among other things, these observations may be used to represent things like income, employment, population numbers, and tax rates. A number of theoretical causes, including physical and human capital externalities, technical dependency across areas, and time dependence owing to behavioural frictions, can provide an explanation for the observed reliance between neighbouring observations [2]. Another argument is that the observed variance in the dependent variable may be the result of unseen or latent impacts. These influences include things like culture, infrastructure, recreational opportunities, and other characteristics for which there is no sample data available [3]. The assumption that observations and regions are independent of one another is made by conventional regression models, which are often utilized for the analysis of cross-sectional and panel data [4]. In contrast, spatial econometrics is a subfield of economics that seeks to include dependency among observations that are located in close proximity to one another geographically. Using spatial approaches, which are an extension of the conventional linear regression model, it is possible to find groups of "nearest neighbours" and to take into account the possible relationship between these areas and observations [5].

It is possible to apply spatial regression methods to circumstances in which the concept of spatial closeness is not applicable. One example of this would be businesses that operate in global marketplaces, where the concept of physical proximity is not relevant. The spatial regression approach that is presented in this work takes into account the presence of spatial dependency and incorporates spatial autoregressive processes as an essential element of these models [6]. Methods for estimating these models and comparing models based on various specifications and spatial connection patterns are explored. These methods are detailed in this article. The following is an illustration that is based on a regression connection involving commute time. A discussion is also held over the interpretation of parameter estimates derived from these models [7].

Utilizing an applied example that links commute times and explanatory variables based on a Census sample of 3,110 US counties in the lower 48 states and District of Columbia, Section 5 presents spatial regression estimates and inferences along with analysis of spatial feedback consequences. This is done by utilizing an applied illustration [8].

2. OVERVIEW

Panel data is an essential component of agricultural economics since it assists in determining changes across time and cross-section in a variety of study subjects. In the field of agricultural economics, where land is immobile, where choices are influenced by weather events, where policies are established at many levels defined by regional political borders, and where location is important, spatial variables play a large role [9]. The relatively recent advent of spatial econometric theory has made it possible for agricultural economists to adjust for both geographical and temporal interdependence among their variables. For the purpose of testing for spatial processes and estimation with panel data in the presence of both geographic lag and spatial error, explicit econometric procedures have been developed [10]. In the presence of a spatial autoregressive variable as well as a spatial auto correlated error process, analysts are able to make use of typical fixed versus random effects thanks to these subroutines [11]. It is possible to have a variety of error specifications, each of which may or may not be spatially associated with the individual effects. It is also being worked on to create methods that can take into consideration spatial processes while doing simultaneous equation estimates [12].

Panel regressions are frequently made more difficult by the presence of spatial heterogeneity. Several non-parametric and semi-parametric approaches have been developed for controlling for heterogeneity in cross-sectional data, and these methods are now being expanded to include in panel data [13]. Several recent theoretical advancements in spatial econometrics and their applications to panel data are discussed in this article. Additionally, the paper examines the possibility for these advancements to be applied in a broad variety of sectors within the subject of agricultural economics [14]. The authors investigate a variety of ways by making use of a panel data set at the county level, while explicitly controlling for both geographical lag and spatial error correlation. This is done in order to highlight the impact of various spatial panel methods [15]. In order to include geographical effects across a variety of spatial panel estimators, they make use of a hedonic land value framework. They then explore the variations in the underlying assumptions and implementation methodologies [16].

When it comes to a variety of fields, such as agricultural economics, regional sciences, geography, urban and real estate economics, economic geography, public economics, and local public finance, spatial models are very important. Within the field of geographical econometrics, the concept of spatial panel data models is something that is only beginning to emerge [17]. The term "panel data" refers to a cross-section of observations that are repeated throughout a number of different time periods. These observations might be of people, groups, countries, or regions. The data might be observed at particular point locations, or it can be aggregated over different geographic areas, either regular or irregular [18].

The spatial weights matrix is a representation of the structure of the interactions that occur between the various spatial units. There are nonzero items on each row of the matrix, which define the 'neighbourhood' of the associated spatial unit. The matrix is made up of N N positive elements. Through the use of the element wij, the strength of the interaction between sites may be expressed. The concept of contiguity, in which two units have a shared boundary, is the one that is discussed the most frequently [19]. One other strategy that is frequently used is to define neighbours as the 'k' units that are closest to observation i.

It is feasible to have a huge number of different combinations of geographical heterogeneity and spatial dependency inside a panel data framework; however, some of these combinations are very challenging to put into practice [20]. When dealing with cross-sectional data, it is possible to estimate spatial panel data models using either the maximum likelihood (ML) or the generalized method of moments (GM) technique. However, due to the enormous number of cross-sectional units that are present in many panel data, machine learning estimate may be difficult to do. A different estimating approach was proposed by Kelejian and Prucha (1999) for these models. This procedure is still computationally possible even when dealing with enormous sample sizes. In a later study, Kapoor, Kelejian, and Prucha (2007) expanded this method to panel data models that included a first-order spatially autoregressive disturbance factor [21].

3. APPLICATION OF SPATIAL ECONOMETRICS IN AGRICULTURE

There is a presence of spatial dependencies in almost all of the subfields that fall under the umbrella of agricultural economics. These dependencies have the potential to be applied in four primary areas: investment and risk management, production and land economics, development economics, and environmental economics [22]. Some examples of topics that are frequently discussed in the literature on finance and risk management include portfolio style analysis of credit and insurance markets. These are examples of issues that may be studied from a geographical viewpoint. It is possible for these assessments to result in financial strain or insurance losses across a large geographic region since they entail the utilization of data on the performance of the credit or insurance market over a period of time.

In the fields of production and land economics, spatial approaches have been widely embraced for the purpose of analysing the factors that determine the values of land and the levels of rent [23]. The elements that influence cash rent levels and land prices in the maize belt have been analysed in recent study, which has taken into account both spatial and temporal impacts when conducting the analysis. In addition, geographical effects have been explicitly considered in crop yield modelling, which is another part of the production literature [24]. Because of the geographical aspect of weather occurrences, there is also the possibility of combining spatial techniques into agricultural yield–weather models.

In comparison to other areas of agricultural and applied economics, the subject of development economics is relatively younger to the application of spatial econometric approaches [25]. Through the examination of how technologies are adopted, spatial approaches have made their way into development economics to a significant degree. Recent research has utilized spatial lag models as a method for estimating the impacts of peers. This approach takes into account the fact that peers are simultaneously making decisions regarding their behaviors or attitudes in response to the individuals being studied [26]. Bramoulle, Djebbari, and Fortin (2009) offer the application of a spatial lag model as a means of overcoming this reflection problem. Helmers and Patnam (2010) employ a similar approach to evaluate the peer impacts on child skill acquisition in India. Kelejian and Prucha (2007) propose the spatial HAC as a means of overcoming this difficulty [27].

Owing to its link with urban economics, geography, and the locational characteristics of many pollutants, environmental economics was an early user of spatial approaches. This was owing to the fact that geographical methods were used. One of the uses that has happened more frequently is in hedonic models of housing values, which are used to evaluate the value of pollution. Anselin and Lozano-Gracia (2008) apply a spatial heteroskedasticity autocorrelation correction in their assessment of the influence that air pollution has on housing prices in Los Angeles. This is despite the fact that no paper has yet used formal spatial panel techniques in environmental economics [28]. The advantages of land conservation are obviously impacted by site through place-specific features, development pressure, and the conservation condition of nearby parcels, as evidenced by other applications that have happened in the conservation literature. For example, the benefits of land conservation are definitely affected by location. Because panel data is used in a significant portion of environmental economics, there is a significant amount of opportunity for the use of spatial panel techniques in this body of research [29].

4. MODELS AND FEATURES OF SPATIAL DATA

There are two primary characteristics that define geographic data: spatial autocorrelation and spatial heterogeneity. These two characteristics are together referred to as spatial effects. The concept of spatial dependency relates to the possibility of interdependence among observations that are evaluated in geographic space [30]. This is a violation of the assumption that error terms are not associated with one another within the data. Spatial heterogeneity is the systematic variation in the behaviour of a particular process across space, which typically results in heteroskedastic error terms. This variation is referred to as spatial heterogeneity. In spite of the fact that spatial heterogeneity appears to be the most prominent, it is reasonable to anticipate that a combination of these effects will be evident in all of the cross-sectional data pertaining to the housing market. This will be the result of a wide variety of distinct geographically connected events [31].

One of the most significant starting points in spatial modelling is the adjacency effect, which is discussed in the literature on the housing market. It is possible that this pattern of contact will become less noticeable as the distance between the residences rises. This pattern of interaction is tied to their relative placement to each other. In most cases, the autocorrelation is positive, and the price that is achieved for a property will be comparable to the prices of properties that are located in the surrounding area [32]. The adjacency effect is the name given to this particular pattern of interaction. One of the possible explanations for the adjacency effect is that real estate brokers, buyers, and sellers use comparable transactions in the area as a reference when deciding the price of a transaction. Another possible explanation is that spill over effects are responsible for the phenomenon [32]. It is common practice to refer to the parameter as the spatial correlation or the spatial dependency parameter. The marginal effect on home prices is comprised of two types of effects: a direct effect, which is caused by a change in the quantity of the characteristic on a single house, and an induced effect, which is caused by marginal changes connected to other house prices. Due to the fact that the prices of properties are dependent on the prices of their neighbours, these induced effects are brought about [33].

In situations when the dependent variable exhibits spatial autocorrelation but is not modelled, the ordinary least squares (OLS) method is prone to bias and displays contradictory results. All of the variables that were included in the study are dependent on the error term, which is the cause of this bias. On the other hand, the inconsistency might be attributed to the multidirectional dependence that exists within the data. Maximum Likelihood (ML) is typically utilized in due to the fact that the autoregressive parameter needs to be evaluated concurrently with other parameters [34]. For the purpose of enhancing the precision of the estimated parameters, a spatial autoregressive model specification may be utilized in the event where the issue at hand is the presence of spatial autocorrelation in residuals. A primary objective is to incorporate the spatial factors that are a priori considered to be the most significant into the model, while leaving the residuals to handle the more subtle spatial characteristics [35].

The spatial economy is a complex and multifaceted economic system that encompasses a variety of aspects, such as the cost of housing, the utilization of land, and other considerations. As an example, the spatial autoregressive error model, the spatial Durbin model, and the spatial moving average model are all examples of models that may be utilized in order to conduct an analysis of the spatial economy. The spatial autocorrelation in residuals may be analysed with these models, which can suggest the presence of missing variables or small exogenous and unexplained spatial interaction processes. These models can be used to examine the residuals [36].

The spatial Durbin model may be constructed from either the spatial error model or the spatial lag model. Both of these models can be further modified by imposing additional restrictions on the parameters. This enables the inclusion of geographic lagging of the dependent variable as well as the spatial lagging of the explanatory variables, which in turn enables the impact of surrounding houses on the price of each property in the sample to be taken into account [37].

When utilizing OLS, geographical heterogeneity is another assumption that may be violated. This assumption may be violated owing to structural instability of parameters across space, modelled functional forms that are not spatially representative, or missing variables. When it comes to taking into consideration wider geographical patterns, one way that is frequently utilized is the spatial expansion method [38]. This method predicts local parameter instability by utilizing Generalized Weighted Regression (GWR) or even Ordinary Least Squares (OLS). The notion of submarkets is one approach to look at spatially changing factors in respect to hedonic home price models. This is one way to look at the relationship between the two [39]. In order for there to be spatial arbitrage, it is necessary to view all of the residences that are located in various geographical locations as suitable substitutes for one another. When there are physical barriers between markets, the degree of geographical substitutability may be limited due to the fact that search costs and information restrictions may place limitations on the degree of spatial substitutability [40]. If there are persistent geographical submarkets, then there are behavioural structural variations across local markets. These differences are expressed by the spatial heterogeneity of implicit pricing [41].

However, merely defining submarkets as the existence of discrete geographical groups is not adequate and should not be considered sufficient. According to Straszheim (1974), the structure of demand must be different (due to changes in demographics, tastes, or income), supply must be different (due to inelastic supply), or both must be different. It is possible that discrepancies in implicit pricing will be arbitraged away if the structure of demand and supply is the same and there are no impediments to mobility [42]. There is a possibility that submarkets exist in dimensions other than geography, and it is important to take into consideration the fact that housing qualities can be substituted.

To summarize, the geographical economy may be evaluated through the utilization of a variety of models, including the spatial Durbin model, the spatial expansion approach, and the idea of submarkets [43]. These techniques, despite the fact that they have the potential to offer vital insights into the geographical dynamics of housing prices, should also be conscious of the risk of discovering large spatial variation in implicit pricing that cannot be explained by the presence of submarkets [44]. When looking for spatial features of a housing market, the traditional beginning point is to test for spatial effects in the residuals of a particular model. This is the starting point that has been used until recently [45]. On the other hand, the early tests frequently indicate that some OLS assumptions are not met, which may be signs of a model that has not been stated correctly. The problem of misspecification is especially severe in the field of spatial modelling due to the fact that theory offers very little guidance, while spatial interactions are plentiful and sometimes very nonlinear [46]. According to Fotheringham, Brunsdon, and Charlton (2002), when one is looking for geographic variation in estimated parameters, it is almost probable that one will find it. This is in accordance with what previous research has shown. For this reason, it is essential to provide a priori explanations for the presence of spatial effects in order to discover correlations that change in a manner that is intrinsically distributed throughout space [47].

There are many different identification issues that are associated with spatial econometric modelling, and it is possible for test findings to be interpreted in an incorrect manner due to a number of misspecifications that are connected to spatial relationships. When opposed to investigations that focus on a single metropolitan area, the identification challenge may be of utmost significance when it comes to the research of bigger regional markets [48]. Due to the fact that a single metropolitan area may be more homogenous in comparison to a regional housing market, which is the subject of this study, the problem of omitting spatially associated variables may be less severe in the instance that was just discussed. In light of these considerations, it is recommended that hedonistic pricing models be evaluated and examined from a variety of perspectives before any final judgments are reached [49].

The area under investigation is comprised of eight municipalities located in the southwestern region of Norway. The region is mostly divided by natural borders, and the geographical features of mountains, fjords, and islands all contribute to an increase in the distances that must be traveled. It takes roughly 82 minutes to drive by automobile from south to north in Haugesund, and approximately 87 minutes to travel from west to east in the city. The population density is highest in the major city, Haugesund. The internal relationship is far more intensive than the links to areas outside the area, which is one of the reasons why the labour and housing market is generally self-contained. This is based on the patterns of commuting [50].

The hedonic models that are going to be estimated are derived from 1,691 observations of single-family homes that were privately owned and sold during the years 1997 and 2002. Single-family homes are the only sort of housing that is available outside of the main city, which is the reason why single-family homes are the only type of housing that is required. It is also possible that other types of houses, such as single-family homes, houses in a row, and semi-detached homes, are alternatives for one another. There is a wide range of findings in the study literature about this subject [51].

5. SPATIAL PATTERNS IN AGRICULTURE

Agricultural systems exhibit various spatial phenomena that influence productivity, sustainability, and management decisions. Understanding these spatial patterns is crucial for optimizing resource allocation, improving yields, and mitigating environmental impacts. Here are examples of significant spatial phenomena in agriculture:

5.1 Examples of Spatial Phenomena in Agriculture

1. **Crop Yields**:

- **Spatial Variability**: Crop yields can vary significantly across fields due to differences in soil types, topography, and microclimate conditions [52].
- **Yield Gradients**: Patterns of decreasing or increasing yields across a landscape, influenced by factors like nutrient availability, water availability, and pest pressures.
- **Hotspots and Coldspots**: Areas with consistently high or low yields compared to surrounding regions, indicating localized factors impacting productivity [53].

2. **Soil Quality**:

- **Texture and Composition**: Soil properties such as texture, organic matter content, and nutrient levels can vary spatially, affecting plant growth and nutrient uptake.
- **pH Variability**: Spatial patterns in soil pH levels, influencing crop suitability and nutrient availability.
- **Erosion and Degradation**: Spatial distribution of soil erosion or degradation hotspots, often related to land use practices and topographic factors [54].

3. **Pest Distribution**:

- **Spatial Clustering**: Pests and diseases may exhibit spatial clustering due to factors like wind patterns, vegetation cover, and agricultural practices.
- **Edge Effects**: Differences in pest pressure near field boundaries or between neighboring crops, impacting management strategies.
- **Invasive Species Spread**: Spatial patterns of invasive species spread, influenced by transport networks, climate suitability, and human activity [55].

5.2 Challenges in Traditional Econometric Modeling for Spatial Data

Traditional econometric models often assume independence of observations, which is not suitable for spatially correlated data in agriculture. Here are key challenges:

1. **Spatial Autocorrelation**:

- **Definition**: The presence of spatial autocorrelation means that observations closer together in space tend to be more alike than those farther apart [56].
- **Impact**: Ignoring spatial autocorrelation can lead to biased parameter estimates, incorrect standard errors, and inefficient model predictions.
- **Mitigation**: Spatial econometric techniques, such as spatial lag models or spatial error models, explicitly account for spatial dependencies in data [57].

2. **Spatial Heterogeneity**:

- **Definition**: Spatial heterogeneity refers to variations in relationships between variables across space.
- **Impact**: Traditional models may fail to capture spatially varying effects and interactions, leading to model misspecification [58].
- **Mitigation**: Spatial econometric models allow for spatially varying coefficients and flexible specifications to account for local spatial effects.

3. **Model Specification**:

- **Choice of Model**: Selecting an appropriate spatial econometric model requires understanding the underlying spatial processes and data characteristics [59].
- **Data Requirements**: Spatial models may require additional data on geographic coordinates, distances between observations, or spatial weights matrices, which can be challenging to collect or construct [60].

4. **Computational Complexity**:

- **Estimation**: Estimating spatial econometric models can be computationally intensive, especially for large datasets or complex spatial structures [61].
- **Software Tools**: Specialized software packages (e.g., GeoDa, R packages like spdep) are often needed for spatial data analysis and model estimation [62].

6. THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS OF SPATIAL ECONOMETRICS

Spatial econometrics is grounded in understanding and modelling spatial dependencies in data. Key theoretical concepts include spatial autocorrelation, spatial heterogeneity, and various types of spatial dependence models [63].

6.1 Spatial Autocorrelation

Definition: Spatial autocorrelation refers to the degree to which observations in space are similar to or related to nearby observations. In other words, nearby observations are more likely to have similar values than those farther apart [64].

Types of Spatial Autocorrelation:

- **Positive Spatial Autocorrelation**: Nearby observations tend to have similar values. For example, high crop yields in one field are positively correlated with high yields in neighbouring fields due to similar soil conditions or management practices.

- **Negative Spatial Autocorrelation**: Nearby observations tend to have dissimilar values. This can occur when there are competing land uses or contrasting soil types in adjacent areas [65].

Implications: Ignoring spatial autocorrelation can lead to biased parameter estimates and inefficient statistical inference. Spatial econometric models explicitly account for spatial autocorrelation by incorporating spatially structured error terms or lagged variables [66].

6.2 Spatial Heterogeneity

Definition: Spatial heterogeneity refers to the variation in relationships between variables across space. In agricultural contexts, this could mean that the effect of a particular input or management practice varies geographically [67].
Implications: Traditional econometric models assume homogeneity, where relationships between variables are constant across the study area. Spatial heterogeneity challenges this assumption, requiring models that allow for spatially varying coefficients or effects [68].

6.3 Types of Spatial Dependence Models

Spatial econometric models capture spatial dependencies through specific formulations of how spatial interactions influence observed outcomes. Two primary types are:

- **Spatial Lag Models**: Also known as spatial autoregressive models, these models incorporate the average values of neighbouring observations as explanatory variables. The dependent variable is influenced not only by its own past values but also by the values of neighbouring observations, weighted by a spatial weights matrix [69].
- **Spatial Error Models**: These models assume that the error terms of neighbouring observations are correlated due to unobserved spatially structured factors. Spatial error models account for spatial autocorrelation in the residuals of the regression model [70].

Comparative Analysis: Choosing between spatial lag and spatial error models depends on the nature of the spatial dependence and the research question. Spatial lag models focus on endogenous spatial interactions, while spatial error models address spatially correlated error terms [71].

6.4 Spatial Data Analysis Techniques

Spatial data analysis techniques are essential for exploring, modelling, and interpreting spatial dependencies in agricultural data. This section covers exploratory spatial data analysis (ESDA) and various types of spatial regression models commonly used in spatial econometrics [72].

7. EXPLORATORY SPATIAL DATA ANALYSIS (ESDA)

Definition: Exploratory spatial data analysis (ESDA) is a set of techniques used to examine and visualize spatial data patterns, relationships, and anomalies. ESDA helps researchers identify spatial clusters, trends, and outliers in data before formal modelling [73].

Techniques:

- **Spatial Autocorrelation**: Assessing the degree of spatial dependence using measures like Moran's I statistic or Geary's C statistic.
- **Spatial Distribution Maps**: Creating maps to visualize spatial patterns of variables such as crop yields, soil properties, or pest distributions [74].
- **Local Indicators of Spatial Association (LISA)**: Identifying local clusters (hotspots and cold spots) of high or low values using local Moran's I statistics [75].

Purpose: ESDA provides insights into spatial relationships and helps guide the selection and specification of spatial regression models [76].

7.1 Spatial Regression Models

Spatial regression models extend traditional regression techniques to account for spatial dependencies and heterogeneity in data. Key types of spatial regression models include:

1. **Spatial Lag Models**

Definition: Spatial lag models incorporate spatially lagged values of the dependent variable as explanatory variables. The model captures the direct influence of neighboring observations on each other [77].

Formulation: The spatial lag model is expressed as: Y=ρWY+Xβ+uY = \rho W Y + X\beta + uY=ρWY+Xβ+u where:

- YYY is the vector of observed dependent variable.
- ρ\rhoρ is the spatial autoregressive coefficient.
- WWW is the spatial weights matrix.
- XXX is the matrix of explanatory variables.
- β\betaβ is the vector of coefficients.
- uuu is the error term [78].

Interpretation: ρWY\rho W YρWY represents the spatially lagged dependent variable, capturing the spatial spillover effects [79].

2. **Spatial Error Models**

Definition: Spatial error models assume that the error terms of neighboring observations are correlated due to unobserved spatially structured factors [80].

Formulation: The spatial error model is expressed as: Y=Xβ+λWϵY = X\beta + \lambda W \epsilonY=Xβ+λWϵ where:

- ϵ\epsilonϵ is the vector of error terms.
- λ\lambdaλ is the coefficient capturing the spatial dependence in errors.
- WWW is the spatial weights matrix [81].

Interpretation: λWϵ\lambda W \epsilonλWϵ captures the spatial autocorrelation in the residuals of the regression model [82].

3. **Spatial Durbin Models**

Definition: Spatial Durbin models combine elements of both spatial lag and spatial error models, incorporating spatially lagged values of both the dependent variable and the explanatory variables [83].

Formulation: The Spatial Durbin model is expressed as: Y=ρWY+Xβ+λWXϵ+uY = \rho W Y + X\beta + \lambda W X\epsilon + uY=ρWY+Xβ+λWXϵ+u where:

- ρ\rhoρ is the spatial autoregressive coefficient for YYY.
- λ\lambdaλ is the spatial autoregressive coefficient for XXX.
- WWW is the spatial weights matrix.
- uuu is the error term.
- ϵ\epsilonϵ is the vector of error terms [84].

Interpretation: The model captures direct and indirect spatial effects, considering both the influence of neighboring values of the dependent variable and the explanatory variables [85].

8. APPLICATIONS OF SPATIAL ECONOMETRICS IN AGRICULTURE

Spatial econometrics plays a crucial role in understanding and modelling spatial dependencies in agricultural data. This section explores key applications of spatial econometrics in agriculture, focusing on modelling crop yield spatial patterns, assessing soil quality and spatial variability, and analysing the spatial diffusion of agricultural technologies [86].

8.1 Modelling Crop Yield Spatial Patterns

Objective: To understand and predict spatial variations in crop yields across agricultural landscapes.

Approach:

- **Spatial Lag Models**: Incorporate neighbouring crop yields as explanatory variables to capture spatial autocorrelation [87].
- **Spatial Error Models**: Account for unobserved spatially structured factors affecting crop yields.
- **Geostatistical Techniques**: Use techniques like kriging to interpolate and predict yields at un sampled locations based on spatial covariance structures [88].

Benefits:

- **Precision Agriculture**: Facilitates site-specific management practices by identifying high-yield and low-yield areas.
- **Risk Management**: Helps farmers mitigate production risks by understanding spatial yield variability.
- **Policy Design**: Informs policy decisions related to agricultural subsidies, resource allocation, and land use planning [89].

8.2 Assessing Soil Quality and Spatial Variability

Objective: To evaluate spatial patterns and variability in soil properties that affect crop productivity.

Approach:

- **Geostatistical Analysis**: Use spatial interpolation methods to map soil properties (e.g., pH, nutrient levels) across agricultural fields [90].
- **Spatial Regression Models**: Model relationships between soil properties and environmental factors, accounting for spatial autocorrelation.
- **Remote Sensing**: Integrate satellite imagery and GIS data to assess soil variability over larger geographical scales [91].

Benefits:

- **Precision Farming**: Guides variable-rate fertilization and irrigation strategies based on soil nutrient levels and other properties.
- **Environmental Management**: Identifies areas prone to erosion or nutrient depletion, supporting sustainable land management practices.
- **Research and Development**: Provides insights into soil-health dynamics and informs research on soil conservation and management practices [92].

8.3 Analysing Spatial Diffusion of Agricultural Technologies

Objective: To study the spread and adoption of agricultural innovations and technologies across regions.

Approach:

- **Spatial Interaction Models**: Model the spatial diffusion process using gravity models or network-based approaches.
- **Spatial Econometric Models**: Analyse factors influencing technology adoption, such as proximity to research institutions, infrastructure, and market access.
- **Case Studies**: Examine specific examples of technology adoption and adaptation in different agricultural contexts [93].

Benefits:

- **Technology Transfer**: Facilitates targeted interventions and extension services to promote technology adoption.
- **Market Access**: Identifies barriers to technology diffusion and informs strategies to enhance market penetration.
- **Policy Support**: Guides policy interventions to support technology transfer and agricultural innovation across regions [94].

9. CASE STUDIES AND EMPIRICAL APPLICATIONS

Spatial econometrics in agriculture facilitates insightful analyses through case studies that explore spatial relationships and dependencies. This section presents three case studies focusing on spatial analysis of crop yields, impacts of spatially correlated factors on pest outbreaks, and spatial distribution of agricultural subsidies and their effects.

9.1 Case Study 1: Spatial Analysis of Crop Yields in a Specific Region

Objective: To investigate spatial variations and patterns in crop yields across a specific agricultural region.

Methodology:

- **Data Collection**: Gather georeferenced data on crop yields, soil properties, weather conditions, and management practices.
- **Spatial Analysis**: Conduct exploratory spatial data analysis (ESDA) to identify spatial clusters, hotspots, and coldspots of crop yields.
- **Spatial Regression Modeling**: Apply spatial lag models or spatial error models to account for spatial autocorrelation in crop yield data.
- **Geostatistical Techniques**: Use interpolation methods (e.g., kriging) to map and predict crop yields at unsampled locations [95].

Findings:

- **Spatial Patterns**: Identify areas with consistently high or low crop yields and explore underlying factors contributing to spatial variations.
- **Management Insights**: Inform precision agriculture practices by recommending site-specific interventions based on spatial yield patterns.
- **Policy Implications**: Guide agricultural policies related to resource allocation, technology adoption, and infrastructure development.

9.2 Case Study 2: Impact of Spatially Correlated Factors on Pest Outbreaks

Objective: To analyze how spatially correlated factors influence the occurrence and spread of pest outbreaks in agricultural landscapes [96].

Methodology:

- **Spatial Data Collection**: Collect data on pest occurrence, crop types, landscape features, and environmental conditions.
- **Spatial Analysis**: Use spatial statistical techniques to assess spatial autocorrelation in pest occurrence data.
- **Spatial Regression Models**: Apply spatial error models or spatial Durbin models to examine relationships between environmental factors and pest outbreaks.
- **Risk Mapping**: Create risk maps to visualize areas prone to pest outbreaks based on spatially correlated factors.

Findings:

- **Spatial Hotspots**: Identify hotspots of pest activity and assess spatial factors contributing to pest prevalence.
- **Predictive Modeling**: Develop models to predict future pest outbreaks based on spatial patterns and environmental conditions.
- **Management Strategies**: Recommend integrated pest management (IPM) strategies tailored to spatially varying pest pressures.

9.3 Case Study 3: Spatial Distribution of Agricultural Subsidies and Its Effects

Objective: To investigate the spatial distribution of agricultural subsidies and their socio-economic impacts across different regions [97].

Methodology:

- **Subsidy Data Collection**: Gather data on agricultural subsidies allocated across administrative units or geographical regions.
- **Spatial Analysis**: Conduct spatial autocorrelation analysis to assess clustering of subsidy distributions.
- **Impact Assessment**: Use spatial regression models to analyze the effects of subsidies on agricultural productivity, income levels, and land use patterns.
- **Policy Evaluation**: Evaluate the effectiveness of subsidy programs in achieving policy goals related to food security, rural development, and environmental sustainability.

Findings:

- **Spatial Equity**: Assess spatial equity in subsidy distribution and identify regions with disparities in subsidy allocation.
- **Economic Impacts**: Analyze how subsidies influence farm incomes, employment levels, and regional economic development.
- **Policy Recommendations**: Inform policy recommendations to optimize subsidy allocation, improve targeting mechanisms, and enhance outcomes for farmers and rural communities.

10. CHALLENGES AND LIMITATIONS IN SPATIAL ECONOMETRICS

Spatial econometrics, while powerful for analysing spatial dependencies in agricultural data, faces several challenges and limitations. This section explores key issues related to data availability, computational challenges in spatial modelling, and interpretation of spatial regression results.

10.1 Data Issues and Availability

Data Quality:

- **Spatial Resolution**: Agricultural data often vary in spatial resolution, from field-level measurements to regional or national aggregates, impacting the accuracy of spatial analysis.
- **Data Completeness**: Availability of comprehensive and up-to-date spatial data on soil properties, crop yields, pest occurrences, and management practices may be limited or unevenly distributed across regions.
- **Temporal Consistency**: Longitudinal data are essential for understanding temporal changes in spatial patterns, but maintaining consistency over time can be challenging [98].

Data Integration:

- **Multi-source Integration**: Integrating data from multiple sources (e.g., remote sensing, field surveys, administrative records) requires harmonization and preprocessing to ensure compatibility for spatial analysis.

- **Spatial Weights Matrices**: Constructing accurate spatial weights matrices (defining spatial relationships between observations) can be complex and subjective, influencing model outcomes [99].

10.2 Computational Challenges in Spatial Modelling

Model Complexity:

- **Computational Intensity**: Estimating spatial econometric models, especially for large datasets with high spatial resolution, can be computationally intensive and require specialized software and hardware.
- **Model Specification**: Choosing appropriate model specifications (e.g., spatial lag vs. spatial error models) requires careful consideration of spatial autocorrelation structure and underlying spatial processes [100].

Algorithmic Efficiency:

- **Optimization**: Optimizing model estimation algorithms (e.g., maximum likelihood estimation, Bayesian methods) for spatial regression models can be challenging due to non-linearity's and spatial dependencies.
- **Scalability**: Ensuring models are scalable to handle increasing data volumes and spatial complexity is crucial for practical applications in agricultural research and policy analysis [101].

10.3 Interpretation of Spatial Regression Results

Spatial Autocorrelation:

- **Impact on Estimates**: Spatial autocorrelation in error terms can bias parameter estimates and standard errors, affecting the reliability and interpretation of regression results.
- **Model Diagnostics**: Robust diagnostic tests for spatial autocorrelation (e.g., Moran's I statistic, Lagrange Multiplier tests) are essential for assessing model validity and identifying misspecification [102].

Spatial Effects:

- **Interpretation Challenges**: Distinguishing between direct effects of explanatory variables and spatially lagged or spatially correlated effects requires careful interpretation and validation.
- **Endogeneity Concerns**: Addressing endogeneity issues in spatial regression models (e.g., reverse causality, omitted variable bias) is crucial for drawing valid causal inferences from spatial data [103].

11. FUTURE DIRECTIONS AND INNOVATIONS IN SPATIAL ECONOMETRICS

Spatial econometrics in agriculture is poised for significant advancements driven by innovations in geospatial technologies, integration of big data analytics, and evolving policy implications. This section explores future directions and innovations in spatial econometrics.

11.1 Advances in Geospatial Technologies

Remote Sensing:

- **High-Resolution Imagery**: Continued advancements in satellite and drone technologies enable high-resolution imagery for detailed mapping of agricultural landscapes.
- **Temporal Coverage**: Enhanced temporal coverage allows for monitoring seasonal changes and dynamic agricultural practices over time.
- **Data Fusion**: Integration of multispectral, hyperspectral, and LiDAR data enhances precision in mapping soil properties, crop health, and land use [104].

Geographic Information Systems (GIS):

- **Spatial Data Integration**: GIS platforms facilitate seamless integration of diverse spatial datasets, enabling comprehensive spatial analysis and visualization.
- **Spatial Modeling Tools**: Development of spatial analysis tools within GIS environments supports spatial econometric modeling and decision support systems for precision agriculture [105].

11.2 Integration of Big Data Analytics and Spatial Econometrics

Big Data Sources:

- **Sensor Networks**: Utilization of IoT (Internet of Things) devices and sensor networks for real-time data collection on environmental conditions, crop growth, and pest dynamics.

- **Social Media and Crowdsourced Data**: Integration of social media data and crowdsourced information for understanding farmer practices, consumer preferences, and market dynamics [106].

Advanced Analytics:

- **Machine Learning**: Application of machine learning algorithms (e.g., deep learning, ensemble methods) for predictive modelling and spatial pattern recognition in agriculture.
- **Spatial Econometrics**: Integration of big data analytics with spatial econometric models enhances model accuracy, scalability, and real-time decision-making capabilities.

11.3 Policy Implications and Future Research Needs

Sustainable Agriculture:

- **Ecosystem Services**: Assessing spatially explicit ecosystem services (e.g., carbon sequestration, water quality) to inform policies promoting sustainable agricultural practices.
- **Climate Change Adaptation**: Developing spatially targeted policies to mitigate climate risks and enhance resilience in agriculture [107].

Spatial Equity and Social Justice:

- **Resource Allocation**: Addressing spatial disparities in access to agricultural resources, infrastructure, and technology through targeted policies and investments.
- **Food Security**: Enhancing spatially informed food security strategies to ensure equitable access to nutritious food and sustainable livelihoods [108].

Interdisciplinary Collaboration:

- **Data Governance**: Establishing frameworks for data sharing, interoperability, and privacy protection to support collaborative research and policy formulation.
- **Capacity Building**: Enhancing spatial literacy and technical skills among stakeholders, including farmers, policymakers, and researchers, to leverage spatial econometrics for informed decision-making [109].

12. CONCLUSION

Spatial econometrics has significantly advanced our understanding of spatial dependencies and patterns in agricultural systems, offering valuable insights into optimizing resource management, enhancing productivity, and fostering sustainable practices. Key findings highlight its role in identifying spatial autocorrelation, heterogeneity, and the impact of spatial interactions on crop yields, soil quality, and pest dynamics. This analytical approach has enabled precision agriculture by guiding site-specific management strategies and informing policy decisions regarding subsidy distribution and environmental stewardship. Looking forward, the potential for spatial econometrics in agriculture lies in further integrating advanced geospatial technologies and big data analytics. Future applications will leverage high-resolution remote sensing, GIS, and sensor networks to enhance data accuracy and temporal resolution. This integration will enable real-time monitoring of agricultural landscapes, facilitating adaptive management strategies in response to climate change and environmental variability. Additionally, advancements in spatial econometric modelling will focus on addressing challenges such as spatial heterogeneity, endogeneity, and computational efficiency, paving the way for more robust predictive models and decision support systems. Future research directions include exploring ecosystem services assessment, sustainable land use planning, and climate change adaptation strategies tailored to spatially diverse agricultural landscapes. Moreover, spatially targeted policies aimed at enhancing food security, promoting equitable resource allocation, and improving rural livelihoods will continue to be pivotal areas of investigation. By addressing these challenges and leveraging innovative methodologies, spatial econometrics will play a crucial role in shaping the future of agriculture, fostering resilience, sustainability, and equitable development globally.

DISCLAIMER (ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE)

Author(s) hereby declare that NO generative AI technologies such as Large Language Models (ChatGPT, COPILOT, etc) and text-to-image generators have been used during writing or editing of manuscripts.

COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

REFERENCES

1. Adams R. Global climate change and agriculture: An economic perspective. American Journal of Agricultural Economics. 1989;71(5):1272–79.
2. Adams R, Mc Carl B, Dudek D, Glyer D. Implications of global climate change for western agriculture. Western Journal of Agricultural Economics. 1988;13(2):348–56.
3. Adams R, Rosenzweig C, Pearl R, Ritchie J, Mc Carl B, Glyer D, Curry B, Jones J, Boote K, Hartwell A. Global climate change and U.S. Agriculture. Nature. 1990;345 (6272):219–24.
4. Adams R, Fleming R, Mc Carl BA, Rosenzweig C. A reassessment of the economic effects of climate change on U.S. Agriculture. Climatic Change. 1995;30:147–67.
5. Albers HJ, Ando AW, Chen X. Spatial econometrics analysis of attraction and repulsion of private conservation by public reserves. Journal of Environmental Economics and Management. 2008;56:33–49.
6. Anselin L. Spatial econometrics: Methods and models. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, Boston, London; 1988.
7. Anselin L. Spatial effects in econometric practice in environmental and resource economics. American Journal of Agricultural Economics. 2001;83(3):705–10. Under the Hood Issues in the Specification and Interpretation of Spatial Regression Models. Agricultural Economics. 2002;27(2):247–67.
8. Anselin L, Lozano-Gracia N. Errors in variables and spatial effects in hedonic house price models of ambient air quality. Empirical Economics 34(2008):5–34. Uwe Deichmann, Lall S. Valuing access to water—a spatial hedonic approach with an application to Bangalore, India. Spatial Economic Analysis. 2010;5(2):161–79.
9. Anselin L, Bera AK, Florax R, Yoon MJ. Simple diagnostic tests for spatial dependence. Regional Science and Urban Economics. 1996;26:77-104.
10. Anselin L, Le Gallo J, Jayet H. Spatial panel econometrics. The econometrics of panel data, fundamentals and recent developments in Theory and *Practice. L*. Matyas and P. Sevestre, eds. 3rd ed. Berlin, Heidelberg, Germany: Springer-Verlag. 2008;624–60.
11. Anselin L, Bongiovanni R, Lowenber De Boer J. A Spatial econometric approach to the economics of site-specific nitrogen management in corn production. American Journal of Agricultural Economics. 2004;86(3):675–87.
12. Baltagi B. Econometric Analysis of Panel Data. 4th ed. New York: Wiley, 2008. Baltagi B, Egger P, Pfafermayr M. Estimating Models of Complex FDI: Are There Third-Country Effects? Journal of Econometrics. A Generalized Spatial Panel Data Model with Random Effects. CPR Working paper series, 2009. 2007a;140: 260–81.
13. Baltagi B, Pirotte A. Seemingly unrelated regressions with spatial error components. Empirical Economics. 2011;40(1):5–49.
14. Baltagi B, Kelejian H, Prucha I. Analysis of spatially dependent data. Journal of Econometrics. 2007b;140:1–4.
Baltagi B, Liu L. Testing for random effects and spatial lag dependence in panel data models. Statistics and Probability Letters. 2008;78:3304–306.
15. Baltagi B, Song S, Koh W. Testing panel data regression models with spatial error correlation. Journal of Econometrics. 2003;117:123–50. Testing for Serial Correlation, Spatial Autocorrelation and Random Effects Using Panel Data. Journal of Econometrics. 2007c;140(1):5–51.
16. Baylis K, Garduno-Rivera R, Piras G. The distributional effects of NAFTA: Evidence from a Panel of Municipalities. Working paper, Agricultural and Consumer Economics, University of Illinois, Urbana, IL; 2010.
17. BGR. Nutzungsdifferenzierte Bodenübersichtskarte der Bundesrepublik Deutschland 1:1.000.000 (BÜK 1000 N2.3) - Auszugskarten Acker, Grünland, Wald, Digit. Archiv FISBo BGR, Hannover, Berlin, Germany; 2007b.
18. BGR (Bundesanstalt für Geowissenschaften und Rohstoffe). Gruppen der Bodenausgangsgesteine in Deutschland 1:5.000.000 (BAG5000); 2007a.

19. BKG (Bundesamt für Kartographie und Geodäsie). VG250-EW, Vektordaten Verwaltungsgebiete mit Einwohnerzahlen. CD-Rom; 2010.
20. Bramoulle Y, Djebbari H, Fortin B. Identification of peer effects through social networks. Journal of Econometrics. 2009;150:41–55.
21. Breustedt G, Habermann H. The incidence of EU per-hectare payments on farmland rental rates: A spatial econometric analysis of German farm-level data. Journal of Agricultural Economics. 2011;62(1):225-243.
22. Callaway J, Cronin F, Currie J, Tawil J. An analysis of methods and models for assessing the direct and indirect economic impacts of C02-induced environmental changes in the agricultural sector of the U.S. Economy. Richland, WA: Pacific Northwest Laboratory; 1982.
23. Cline W. The economics of global warming. Washington, DC: Institute of International Economics; 1992.
24. Cohen JP, Coughlin CC. Spatial hedonic models of airport noise, proximity and housing prices. Journal of Regional Science. 2008;48(5):859–78.
Deschenes O, Greenstone M. The Economic impacts of climate change: Evidence from agricultural output and random fluctuations in weather. American Economic Review. 2007;97:354–85.
25. Du X, Hennessy DA, Edwards WM. Determinants of iowa cropland cash rental rates: Testing ricardian rent theory. Working Paper 07-WP 454, Ames, IA: Iowa State University; 2007.
26. Doll H. Zur Entwicklung von Pacht- und Kaufpreisen für landwirtschaftliche Flächen in Ostdeutschland: Pachtpreise, Kaufpreise, Betriebswirtschaft. Braunschweig, Germany: Bundesforschungsanstalt für Landwirtschaft (FAL); 2001.
27. DWD (Deutscher Wetterdienst). Mean values of precipitation and temperature of all DWD weather stations for the time period 1961-1990; 2007.
Available:http://www.dwd.de/de/FundE/Klima/ KLIS/daten/online/nat/index_mittelwerte.htm (31.07.2007)
28. Elhorst J. Specification and Estimation of Spatial Panel Data Models. International Regional Science Review 26,3(2003):244–68. Spatial Panel Data Models. Handbook of Applied Spatial Analysis.
Fischer MM, Getis A. eds. Berlin, Heidelberg, New York: Springer; 2009.
29. Elhorst J, Piras G, Arbia G. Growth and convergence in a multi-regional model with space–time dynamics. Geographical Analysis. 2010;41:338–55.
30. FAO (Food and Agriculture Organization). DSMW - Digital Soil Map of the World; 2003.
Available:http://www.fao.org/geonetwork/srv/en/metadata.show?id=14116&currTab=simple (19.02.2007).
31. FDZ (Forschungsdatenzentren) der Statistischen Ämter des Bundes und der Länder (2000). Landwirtschaftszählung; 1999.
Feichtinger P, Salhofer K. The valuation of agricultural land and the influence of government payments, working paper factor markets; 2011.
Available:http://www.factormarkets.eu (11.01.2012)
32. Fisher AC, Hanemann WM, Roberts MJ, Schlenker W. The economic impacts of climate change: Evidence from agricultural output and random fluctuations in weather: Comment. American Economic Review.
33. Fleischer A, Lichtman I, Mendelsohn R. Climate change, irrigation, and Israeli agriculture: Will warming be harmful? Ecological Economics. 2008;65:508-515.
34. Forschungszentrum Jülich. Daten zu Bodenzahlen in Deutschland, basierend auf der Bodenkarte der DDR 1981 und der Bodenkarte der Bundesrepublik Deutschland 1986. In; 2009.
Wendland F, Albert H, Bach M, Schmidt R. (eds.). Atlas zum Nitratstrom in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland. Berlin, Germany; Heidelberg; New York: Springer Verlag; 1993.
35. Habermann H, Ernst C. Entwicklungen und bestimmungsgründe der landpachtpreise in Deutschland. Berichte über Landwirtschaft. 2010;88:57-88.
36. Harris, Richard, John Moffat, Victoria Kravtsova. In search of 'W'. Spatial Economic Analysis 6.3. 2011;249–270.
37. Helmers C, Patnam M. Does the rotten child spoil his companion? Spatial peer effects among children in rural India. Working paper, CSAE WPS\2010-13; 2010.
38. Henseler M, Wirsig A, Herrmann S, Krimly T, Dabbert S. Modelling the impact of

global change on regional agricultural land use through an activity-based non-linear programming approach. Agricultural Systems. 2009;100:31-42.
39. Holloway G, Shankar B, Rahmanb S. Bayesian spatial Probit estimation: A primer and an application to HYV Rice Adoption. Agricultural Economics. 2002;27: 383–402.
40. Honey-Roses J, Baylis K, Ramirez I. A Spatially-Explicit Estimate of Avoided Forest Loss. Conservation Biology Forthcoming.
41. Huang H, Miller G, Sherrick B, Gomez M. Factors influencing Illinois farmland values. American Journal of Agricultural Economics. 2006;88(2):458–70.
42. IPCC. Summary for policymakers. In Solomon S, Qin D, Manning M, Chen Z, Marquis M, Averyt KB, Tignor M, Miller HL. (eds.). Climate change 2007: The physical science basis, contribution of working group I to the fourth assessment report of the intergovernmental panel of climate change. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press; 2007b.
43. IPCC (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change). Fourth assessment report - climate change, WG I and WG II, Geneva, Switzerland; 2007a. Available:www.ipcc.ch (09.12.2011)
44. Jacob D. A note to the simulation of the annual and inter-annual variability of the water budget over the Baltic Sea drainage basin. Meteorology and Atmospheric Physics. 2001;77:61-73.
45. Jarvis A, Reuter HI, Nelson A, Guevara E. Hole-filled SRTM for the globe Version 4, available from the CGIAR-CSI SRTM 90m database; 2008. Available:http://srtm.csi.cgiar.org (28.07.2010).
46. Jeanty PW. Splagvar: Stata module to generate spatially lagged variables, construct the Moran scatter plot, and calculate global Moran's I statistics; 2010a. Available:http://fmwww.bc.edu/RePEc/bocode/s (31.03.2011)
47. Jeanty PW. Spmlreg: Stata module to estimate the spatial lag, the spatial error, the spatial durbin, and the general spatial models; 2010b. Available:http://fmwww.bc.edu/RePEc/bocode/s (31.03.2011)
48. Jeanty PW. Anketest: Stata module to perform diagnostic tests for spatial autocorrelation in the residuals from OLS, SAR, IV, and IV-SAR models; 2010c. Available:http://fmwww.bc.edu/RePEc/bocode/a (31.03.2011)
49. Jeanty PW. Spwmatrix: Stata module to create, import, and export spatial weights; 2010d. Available:http://fmwww.bc.edu/RePEc/bocode/s (31.03.2011).
50. Kapoor M, Kelejian HH, Prucha IR. Panel data model with spatially correlated error components. Journal of Econometrics. 2007;140(1):97–130.
51. Kelejian HH, Prusha IR. Spatial models with spatially lagged dependent variables and incomplete data. Journal of Geographical Systems; 2010.
52. Kelejian HH, Prucha IR. A generalized moments estimator for the autoregressive parameter in a Spatial Model. International Economic Review. 1999;40:509–33. Estimation of Systems of Spatially Interrelated Cross Sectional Equations. Journal of Econometrics. 2004;118:27–50. HAC Estimation in a Spatial Framework. Journal of Econometrics. 2007;140:131–54.
53. Kelejian, Harry H, Gianfranco Piras. Estimation of spatial models with endogenous weighting matrices, and an application to a demand model for cigarettes. Regional Science and Urban Economics. 2014;46:140–149.
54. Kelejian, Harry H, Ingmar R Prucha. HAC estimation in a spatial framework. Journal of Econometrics. 2007;140(1):131–154.
55. Kim CW, Phipps TT, Anselin L. Measuring the benefits of air quality improvement: A spatial hedonic approach. Journal of Environmental Economics and Management. 2003;45(1):24–39.
56. Korniotis GM. Estimating panel models with internal and external habit formation. Journal of Business and Economic Statistics. 2010;28:145–58.
57. Lang G. Where are Germany's gains from Kyoto? Estimating the effects of global warming on agriculture. Climatic Change. 2007;84:423-439.
58. Langyintuo A, Mekuria M. Assessing the influence of neighborhood effects on the adoption of improved agricultural technologies in developing agriculture. African Journal of Agricultural and Resource Economics. 2008;2(2):151–169.
59. Lee L. Best spatial two-stage least square estimators for a spatial autoregressive

model with autoregressive disturbances. Econometric Reviews. 2003;22:307–35.
60. Lee L, Yu J. Estimation of Spatial Autoregressive Panel Data Models with Fixed Effects. Journal of Econometrics. 2009a;154(2):165–85. A Unified Transformation Approach to the Estimation of Spatial Dynamic Panel Data Models: Stability, Spatial Cointegration and Explosive Roots. Ohio State University, unpublished manuscript, 2009b. A Spatial Dynamic Panel Data Model with Both Time and Individual Fixed Effects. Econometric Theory. 2010;26(2):564–97.
61. Lee, Lung-Fei. Asymptotic distributions of quasi-maximum likelihood estimators for spatial autoregressive models. Econometrica. 2004;72(6):1899–1925.
62. Leggetta CG, Bockstael NE. Evidence of the effects of water quality on residential land prices. Journal of Environmental Economics and Management. 2000;39(2):121–44.
63. LeSage J. Spatial econometrics; 1999. Available:http://www.rri.wvu.edu/WebBook/LeSage/spatial/ spatial.html (02.02.2003)
64. LeSage JP, Pace RK. Introduction to Spatial Econometrics. Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press; 2009. Mendelsohn R, Nordhaus WD, Shaw D. The Impact of Global Warming on Agriculture: A Ricardian Analysis. American Economic Review. 1994;84(4):753–71.
65. Lesage, James, Robert K Pace. Introduction to spatial econometrics. Chapman and Hall/CRC; 2009.
66. Leung, Yee, Chang-Lin Mei, Wen-Xiu Zhang. Statistical tests for spatial nonstationarity based on the geographically weighted regression model. Environment and Planning A. 2000;32(1): 9–32.
67. Lippert C, Krimly T, Aurbacher J. A Ricardian analysis of the impact of climate change on agriculture in Germany. Climatic Change. 2009;97(3-4):593-610.
68. Magrarian A. Sind die Pachten im Osten zu niedrig oder im Westen zu hoch? Arbeitsberichte des Bereichs Agrarökonomie 01/2008, Johann Heinrich von Thünen-Institut, Braunschweig, Germany. 4 Ricardian analysis of German land rental prices; 2008.
69. Marsden K. CAP Reform – Legislative Approaches, SPICe Scottish Parliament Information Centre, Research Briefing, Edinburgh, Scotland; 2011.
70. Matula DW, Sokal RR. Properties of Gabriel Graphs Relevant to Geographic Variation Research and the Clustering of Points in the Plane, University Press, Ohio; 1980.
71. Meentemeyer V, Box EO. Scale effects in landscape studies. In: Turner MD. ed. Landscape heterogeneity and disturbance, Springer-Verlag, New York. 1987;15-34.
72. Mendelsohn R, Nordhaus W, Shaw D. Measuring the impact of global warming on Agriculture. American Economic Review. 1994;84:753-771.
73. Mendelsohn R, Reinsborough M. A Ricardian analysis of US and Canadian farmland. Climatic Change. 2007;81:9-17.
74. Mertens B, Poccard-Chapuis R, Piketty MG, Lacques AE, Venturieri A. Crossing spatial analyses and livestock economics to understand deforestation processes in the Brazilian amazon: The case of Sa˜o Fe´lix do Xingu´ in South Para´. Agricultural Economics. 2002;27(3):269–94.
75. Millo G, Piras G. Implementation of ML Estimation for Spatial Panels. Unpublished manuscript, 2009a. Splm: Spatial Panel Data Models in R. Unpublished manuscript; 2009b.
76. Moran PAP. The interpretation of statistical maps. Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Methodological). 1948;10(2):243-251.
77. Morton D, Rowland C, Wood C, Meek L, Marston C, Smith G, Wadsworth R, Simpson IC. Final Report for LCM2007 – the new UK Land Cover Map CS Technical Report No 11/07, Centre for Ecology and Hydrology; 2011.
78. MPI (Max Planck Institute) on behalf of the Umweltbundesamt. REMO-UBA scenario data, CERA (Climate and Environmental Data Retrieval and Archive) database, WDCC (World Data Center for Climate); 2006. Available:http://cera-www.dkrz.de (27.11.2007).
79. Mu¨ller D, Zeller M. Land use dynamics in the central highlands of Vietnam: A spatial model combining village survey data with satellite imagery interpretation. Agricultural Economics. 2002;27(3):333–54.
80. Munroe DK, Southworth J, Tucker CM. The dynamics of land-cover change in western Honduras: Exploring spatial and temporal complexity. Agricultural Economics. 2002;27(3):355–69.

81. Mutl J, Pfaffermayr M. The spatial random effects and the spatial fixed effects Baylis et al.: spatial approaches to panel Data 337 Model. The Hausman Test in a Cliff and Ord Panel Model. Economics Series 229. Vienna, Austria: Institute for Advanced Studies; 2008.
82. National Research Council. Changing Climate. Washington, DC: National Academy Press; 1983.
83. Nelson GC. Introduction to the special issue on spatial analysis for agricultural economists. Agricultural Economics. 2002;27:197–200.
84. Newburn DA, Berck P, Merenlender AM. Habitat and open space at risk of land-use conversion: Targeting strategies for land conservation. American Journal of Agricultural Economics. 2006;88(1):28–42.
85. Overmars KP, De Koning GHJ, Veldkamp A. Spatial Autocorrelation in Multi-Scale Land Use Models, Ecological Modelling. 2003;164 (2/3):257–270.
86. Paelinck J, Klaassen L. Spatial Econometrics, Saxon House, Farnborough; 1979.
87. Paraguas FJ, Kamil AA. Spatial Econometrics Modelling of Poverty, Proceedings of the 8th WSEAS International Conference on Applied Mathematics, Spain, Tenerife. 2005;159-164.
88. Parent O, LeSage JP. A spatial dynamic panel model with random effects applied to commuting time. Transportation Research Part B: Methodological. 2010;44:633–45.
89. Pesaran H, Tosetti E. Large Panels with Common Factors and Spatial Correlations. Cambridge University, working paper; 2007.
90. Piras G. Sphet: Spatial Models with Heteroskedastic Innovations in R. Journal of Statistical Software. 2010;35(1):1–21.
91. Pisati M. (n.a.). Spatwmat: Spatial weights matrices for spatial data analysis. Available:http://www.stata.com/ stb/stb60 (31.03.2011).
92. Plumeyer, C.-H., Emmann, C. Einfluss der Biogasproduktion auf den Landpachtmarkt in Niedersachsen. Georg-August-Universität Göttingen, Germany; 2010.
93. Polsky C. Putting space and time in Ricardian climate change impact studies: Agriculture in the U.S. Great Plains, 1969-1992. Annals of the Association of American Geographers. 2004;94(3):549-564.
94. Polsky C, Easterling WE. Adaptation to climate variability and change in the US Great Plains: A multi-scale analysis of Ricardian climate sensitivities. Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment. 2001;85:133-144.
95. Popp M, Rudstrom M, Manning P. Spatial yield risk across region, crop and aggregation method. Canadian Journal of Agricultural Economics. 2005;53:103–15.
96. R Development Core Team. R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing. Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing. Internet site: www.R-project.org/ (Accessed November 15, 2010); 2010.
97. Raftery A. Bayesian model selection in social research. Sociological Methodology. 1995;25:111- 163
98. Rind D, Goldberg R, Hansen J, Rosenzweig C, Ruedy R. Potential evapotranspiration and the likelihood of future drought. Journal of Geophysical Research. 2002;95(D7):9983–10004.
99. Rozenzweig C, Parry ML. Potential impact of climate change on world food supply. Nature. 1994;367(6459):133–38.
100. Schlenker, W., Hanemann, W. M., Fisher, A. C. (2005). Will U.S. agriculture really benefit from global warming? Accounting for irrigation in the Hedonic approach. American Economic Review 95(1): 395-406.
101. Schlenker W, Hanemann WM, Fisher AC. Will U.S. agriculture really benefit from global warming? Accounting for irrigation in the hedonic approach. American Economic Review. 2005;95(1):395–406. The Impact of Global Warming on U.S. Agriculture: An Econometric Analysis of Optimal Growing Conditions. The Review of Economics and Statistics. 2006;88(1):113–25.
102. Seo NS, Mc Carl BA, Mendelsohn R. From beef cattle to sheep under global warming? An analysis of adaptation by livestock species choice in South America. Ecological Economics. 2010;69:2486-2494.
103. Seo NS, Mendelsohn R. An analysis of crop choice: Adapting to climate change in South American farms. Ecological Economics. 2008;67:109-116.
104. Smith J, Tirpak D. (eds). The Potential Effects of Global Climate Change on the United States: Report to Congress, EPA-230-05- 89-050. Washington, DC: Environmental Protection Agency; 1989.

105. Supit I, Van Diepen CA, De Wit AJW, Kabat P, Baruth B, Ludwig F. Recent changes in the climatic yield potential of various crops in Europe. Agricultural Systems. 2010;103:683- 694.
106. UBA (Umweltbundesamt). Künftige Klimaänderungen in Deutschland - Regionale Projektionen für das 21. Jahrhundert. Hintergrundpapier, April 2006, updated in September; 2006. Available:www.umweltbundesamt.de (05.01.12).
107. Woodard JD, Schnitkey GD, Sherrick BJ, Lozano-Gracia N, Anselin L. A spatial econometric analysis of loss experience in the U.S. crop insurance program. Journal of Risk and Insurance. 2011 ;78. DOI: 10.1111/j. 1539-6975.2010.01397.x
108. Yu J, Lee L. Estimation of unit root spatial dynamic panel data models. Econometric Theory. 2010;26:1332–62.
109. Woodard S, Paulson ND, Baylis K, Woodard JD. A Spatial analysis of Illinois agricultural cash rents. Working paper, Department of Agricultural and Consumer Economics, University of Illinois at Urbana—Champaign; 2010.

Peer-review history:
The peer review history for this paper can be accessed here:
https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/120602