



# Revisiting urban economics in light of data

---

Marc Barthelemy

CEA, Institut de Physique Théorique, Saclay, France

EHESS, Centre d'Analyse et de Mathématiques sociales, Paris, France

`marc.barthelemy@cea.fr`

`www.quanturb.com`


# Outline

- Urban science: state of the art
- The polycentric structure of data
  - Mobile phone data
  - Patterns of commuting
  - Measuring hotspots
- Understanding polycentrism and scaling exponents
  - The edge-city model (Krugman)
  - classical model: Fujita-Ogawa
  - Revisiting the Fujita-Ogawa model
  - Computing scaling exponents

# Outline

- Understanding mobility
  - Mobility: gravity law
  - The radiation model
- Relation between commuting distance and income
  - Empirical results
  - Testing the McCall model of job search
  - The 'closest opportunity' model
- Infrastructure
  - Multilayer networks
  - Time evolution of the road network



# Importance of cities: urbanization rate



Projection: in 2050: 70% of the world population lives in cities


Data from: HYDE historical database

# Importance of cities: megacities




Data from [www.geohive.com](http://www.geohive.com) (UN data)

# Importance of cities



Heterogeneous distribution of growth rates


## The world's megacities



SOURCE: UN-HABITAT 2008 NOTE: S' ANA = SANTA ANA


# Cities are about concentration

Urbanized area




NASA 2001

CO2 emissions



ONU-HABITAT 2011


GDP




ONU 2011



# Finding the logic behind the apparent diversity of cities




# Many 'theories' in urbanism...and nevertheless



- Brasilia (1960)
- Thought for cars
- Plan too rigid

# Many 'theories' in urbanism...and nevertheless



“Villes nouvelles” (1960): pendular movement...enhanced !

Many 'theories' in urbanism...and nevertheless




Urban sprawl: high environment, social and economical cost

# KAEC is the Largest Integrated Economic City at Over 168km<sup>2</sup> With 64km of Waterfront



~ Size of Washington, D.C.



# Many 'theories' of urbanism but nevertheless, we observe a large number of problems !

- Social and economical problems (spatial income segregation, crime, accessibility, ...)
  - Traffic problems; pollution
  - Sustainability of these structures ?
- We need a robust theoretical guide for urbanism
  - Necessity to understand these phenomena and to achieve a 'science of cities' (or 'quantitative urbanism') validated by data (in particular, for large-scale projects)

# Long term goal: 'quantitative urbanism'




Fig. 5.25. Simulation of road network around a central node by Monte Carlo procedures. Source: Morrill, 1965.

- Long standing, interdisciplinary effort !  
Quantitative geography (1960s)
- Morrill (1965)  
Stochastic model of road network evolution
- Historical approaches
  - Cellular-automaton
  - Percolation, DLA
  - Urban economics

# Science and cities: state of the art

Number of  
parameters

Urban economics  
(physics also):  
Very abstract  
models, empirical  
tests ?  
Applicability of the  
model ?

Minimal model: the smallest  
number of parameters and the  
largest number of verified  
predictions

Complex  
simulations (LUTI  
models):  
Validity ? Large  
(random)  
perturbation ?

Loop: theory-empirical data



# (Urban) Economics and real-world systems

- **Equilibrium:** systems such as cities are not in equilibrium (existence of many time scales)
- **Utility:** Choice usually impacts the analytical form of functions... You cannot measure an utility but usually the outcome of a theory
- **Decision process:** rationality is not driving all our decisions. A large number of factors, and large fluctuations among individuals...
- **Urban systems:** Monocentric assumption, homogeneous infrastructure, complete social graph, etc.

# Towards a (new) science of cities


- “The physicist point of view”:
  - 1. Get the data
  - 2. Extract useful information; ask (interesting) questions
  - 3. Propose a hierarchy of mechanisms
  - 4. Propose a model, extract predictions
  - 5. Compare predictions with data if not ok go back to 3 and 4

Note 1: the model should be with the smallest number of parameters and able to reproduce a large number of empirical facts

Note 2: Modeling the city, or an aspect of the city ?

# Towards a (new) science of cities

- Game changer ? Always more data about cities !
- Different scales, different phenomena



Mobility  
(phone, GPS, RFID)

Socio-economical  
data

Transportation  
networks

OD matrix;  
spatial structure  
of cities (polycenters)

Scaling; Effect  
of income  
(segregation,  
commuting)

Evolution of infrastructure  
networks  
(roads and transportation)







# New data

- New datasets (mobile phone, GPS, RFIDs, etc) with detailed (real-time) origin-destination matrix, allow to:
  - Answer old questions: statistics of OD matrices; choice of trips; relation with socio-economical factors (income).
  - Ask new ones: information about the city structure (coarse-graining the OD matrix); relation mobility-social network; familiar strangers effect, etc.



# Cross-checking different sources of mobility informat

(LeNormand et al. 2014, [arxiv.org:1404.0333](https://arxiv.org/abs/1404.0333))



# 1. Mesoscale information from mobile phone data

---

How can we extract useful information  
from new data ?

# Mobile phone data


- Aggregated
  - For all antennas, at any time: number of mobile phones
  - No mobility information
- Individual data logs
  - Allow to 'track' individuals
  - Contains the OD matrix

```
id-caller|id-receiver|date|duration|op-caller|op-receiver|zone-start|zone-end|
9590|9899|01/10/2015 04:29:05|136|Other|Telefonica|A|A
9590|9899|01/10/2015 04:33:18|88|Other|Telefonica|A|A
9590|9899|01/10/2015 04:59:06|21|Other|Telefonica|A|C
9001|9899|01/10/2015 06:33:30|33|Other|Telefonica|B|D
9086|9875|01/10/2015 02:05:51|58|Other|Telefonica|C|C
...
```


# Data : two months of usage data from mobile phones in (31) Spanish urban areas



(a)



(b)



a=500m

a=1km

a=2km

100 km




## Individuals raw data (logs)

```
id-caller|id-receiver|date|duration|op-caller|op-receiver|zone-start|zone-end|
9590|9899|01/10/2015 04:29:05|136|Other|Telefonica|A|A
9590|9899|01/10/2015 04:33:18|88|Other|Telefonica|A|A
9590|9899|01/10/2015 04:59:06|21|Other|Telefonica|A|C
9001|9899|01/10/2015 06:33:30|33|Other|Telefonica|B|D
9086|9875|01/10/2015 02:05:51|58|Other|Telefonica|C|C
...
```




# Mobile phone activity vs. time


## Barcelona




## Bilbao




## Madrid




## Palma




## Valencia



## Zaragoza




# A common urban rhythm




# Space time varying density

- State of the art: how to represent a time and space varying density
  - 1. A first approach with “Hotspots” or “Activity centers”: an important concept in urban studies and spatial economics
  - 2. Weighted quantities (Venables index)

Zaragoza urban area



Bilbao urban area




# Typology of mobility patterns (journey to work trips)

## Motivation:

Compare the spatial structure of mobility patterns in many cities

## Question:


How to build a quantitative typology of cities based on the spatial structure of the mobility patterns ?



(Bertaud & Malpezzi 2003)

# How to compare OD commuting matrices of different cities?


- The OD matrix is a large and complicated object
- Difficult to compare different cities !
  - Different sizes
  - Potentially different spatial resolutions
- We need a **simpler, clearer** picture:  
coarse-grained information




# Hotspots: local maxima of density

## City structure (mono- vs. polycentric)

Aire urbaine de Zaragoza




Aire urbaine de Bilbao




# Hotspots location

Example : the urban area of Barcelona


8h30




13h30



17h30



21h30




Density (/km<sup>2</sup>)

- (2,17)
- (17,103)
- (103,184)
- (184,390)
- (390,4.62e+03)

# Hotspot identification

- State of the art
  - No clear method
  - Density larger than a given threshold is a hotspot
  - Problem of the threshold choice
- A simple approach
  - Discussion on the Lorentz curve
  - Identify a lower and upper threshold

$$F_{LouBar} = 1 - \frac{\bar{\rho}}{\rho_{max}}$$





# How to compare OD commuting matrices of different cities?

1. Determine Residential and work hotspots (Louail et al, 2014)

2. Separate 4 categories of flows: I, C, D, R


Integrated: Hotspot->Hotspot

Convergent: Non hotspot->hotspot

Divergent: Hotspot->non hotspot

Random: non hotspot->non hotspot

Louail, et al, Nature Comms 2015




# Structure of flows versus population (30 largest urban areas in Spain)


The importance of Integrated flows decreases when population size increases, in favor of an increase of "Random" flows

Weights of Divergent and Convergent flows are constant

I and R alone seem enough to characterize cities




## ICDR vs. Population size



The importance of Integrated flows seems to decrease when population size increases, in favor of an increase of “Random” flows


Weights of **D**ivergent and **C**onvergent flows seem constant whatever the city size

## ICDR ranked by decreasing I



**I** and **R** alone seem sufficient to classify cities

# Structure des flots (Espagne)




Vient des possibilité plus grandes dans les grandes villes de se deplacer (?)

Structure spatiale "délocalisée" des grandes villes

# Hierarchical clustering of cities based on their I, C, D, R values


1km \* 1km grid

Largest cities are clustered together



2km \* 2km grid

Robust with different sizes of the aggregation grid



## II. Understanding the polycentric structure



---

# Numbers of hotspots vs. population size of the city

Exponent value is remarkably smaller for work/school/daily activity hotspots


→ in Spanish urban areas, the number of activity places grows slower than the number of major residential places.

Sublinear in both cases  
!!!




# Polycentric structure

- Activity centers (# of employees per zip code, USA)




San Antonio (TX), USA



Winter Haven (FL), USA

- For each city, we can count the secondary centers (9000 cities US, 1994-2010)

$$k \sim P^\beta \quad \beta \simeq 0.64$$





# Polycentric structure

- We have a polycentric structure, evolving with  $P$
- We can count the number  $H$  of centers

$$H \sim P^\beta \quad \beta \approx 0.5 - 0.6$$

- Mobility is the key: we need to model how individuals choose their home and work place
- Problem largely studied in geography, and in spatial economics: Edge-city model (Krugman), Fujita-Ogawa model (1982): utility maximization
- Revisiting Fujita-Ogawa: predicting the value of  $\beta$

# Mobility is the key

- We have a polycentric structure, evolving with P
- We need to model how individuals move from home to work
  - Connected to the spatial structure of the city
  - Once known allows to compute all mobility/transport related quantities

# Spatial economics: the edge city model (Krugman 1996)

- The important ingredient is the 'market potential'

$$\Pi(x) = \int K(x - z)\rho(z)dz$$

- Describes the spillovers due to the density in  $z$
- Specifically

$$K(u) = A(u) - B(u)$$

- The average market potential is

$$\bar{\Pi} = \frac{1}{\Omega} \int \Pi(x)\rho(x)dx$$

# Spatial economics: the edge city model (Krugman 1996)

- The equation for the evolution of business density is

$$\frac{d\rho}{dt} = \gamma (\Pi(x) - \bar{\Pi})$$

- Linearize around flat situation  $\rho(x) = \rho_0 + \delta\rho(x)$

$$\delta\rho(k) \sim e^{\gamma K(k)t}$$

- At least one maximum at  $k=k^*$ ; the number of hotspots is then:

$$H \sim \Omega k_*^2$$

- Scaling with the population ?
- Link micromotives-macrobehavior ?


# Spatial economics: Fujita-Ogawa (1982)

- A model for the spatial structure of cities: an agent will choose to live in  $x$  and work in  $y$  such that

$$Z_0(x, y) = W(y) - C_R(x) - C_T(x, y)$$

is maximum

- $W(y)$  is the wage at  $y$
- $C_R(x)$  is the rent at  $x$
- $C_T(x, y)$  is the transportation cost from  $x$  to  $y$  [proportional to  $d(x, y)$ ]




$$C_T(x, y) = td(x, y)$$

# Spatial economics: Fujita-Ogawa (1982)

- And a similar equation for companies (maximum profit)

$$P(y) = \Pi(y) - C_R(y) - L(y)W(y)$$


- $W(y)$  is the wage at  $y$
- $C_R(y)$  is the rent at  $y$
- $L(y)$  number of workers  
( $N=ML_0$ )
- $\Pi(y)$  is the benefit to come to  $y$ :  
Agglomeration effect !



$$\Pi(y) = \int K(y - z)\rho(z)dz$$

$$K(u) = ke^{-\alpha|u|}$$

# Spatial economics: Fujita-Ogawa (1982)



- Main result: monocentric configuration stable if

$$\frac{t}{k} \leq \alpha$$

- $t$ : transport cost
- $1/\alpha$  interaction distance between firms

- Effect of congestion: larger cost  $t$

# Spatial economics: Fujita-Ogawa (1982)

- This model is unable to predict the spatial structure and the number of activity centers....
- We have to simplify the problem !



# Spatial economics: Fujita-Ogawa (1982)

- There are many problems with this model:
  - Not dynamical: optimization. We want an out-of-equilibrium model
  - No congestion (!) We want to include congestion (for car traffic)
  - No empirical test. Extract testable predictions (see the book: Spatial Economics, by Fujita, Krugman, Venables)

# A physicist's variant of Fujita-Ogawa

- Assumptions and simplifications:
  - Assume that home is uniformly distributed ( $x$ ): find a job !

$$Z_0(x, y) = W(y) - C_T(x, y)$$

- We have now to discuss  $W$  and  $C_T$

# A physicist's variant of Fujita-Ogawa

- Assumptions and simplifications:
  - Add congestion (BPR function,  $t = \text{cost}/\text{distance}$ ) and the generalized cost reads:

$$C_T(i, j) = td_{ij} \left[ 1 + \left( \frac{T(j)}{c} \right)^\mu \right]$$

- Wages: a typical physicist assumption ( $s$ : typical salary)

$$W(j) = s\eta_j$$

The 'attractivity'  $\eta$  is random (in  $[0, 1]$ ) (cf. Random Matrix Theory)

# Note: length scales

- We have  $t$ : transportation cost per unit distance
- We have  $s$ : salary scale

$$\ell = s/t \quad (\text{usually large: } \sim 10^2\text{-}10^3\text{kms})$$

A new length: effective commuting distance financially sustainable

=>No naive scaling...

~~$$L_{tot} \propto \sqrt{A}$$~~

$$L_{tot} = \sqrt{A} F\left(\frac{\ell}{\sqrt{A}}\right)$$

# Summary: the model

- Every time step, add a new individual at a random  $i$
- The individual will choose to work in  $j$  (among  $N_c$  possible centers) such that

$$Z(i, j) = \eta_j - \frac{d_{ij}}{\ell} \left[ 1 + \left( \frac{T(j)}{c} \right)^\mu \right]$$


is maximum

- $W(j)$  is the wage at  $j$  --> random
- $C_T(i, j)$  is the transportation cost from  $i$  to  $j$ : depends on the traffic from  $i$  to  $j$  --> congestion effects

# Results


- Depending on the values of parameters, we see three type of mobility patterns:

1. Monocentric: one activity center




# Results

- Depending on the values of parameters, we see three type of mobility patterns:
  1. Attractivity driven polycentrism: many activity centers, activity  $\eta$  dominates
  2. Attractivity driven polycentrism: many activity centers, activity  $\eta$  dominates



# Results

- Depending on the values of parameters, we see three type of mobility patterns:
  1. Spatial monocentrism: one activity center, basins spatially incoherent
  2. Spatial monocentrism: one activity center, basins spatially coherent
  3. Spatial polycentrism: many activity centers, basins spatially coherent





# Monocentric-polycentric transition

- Start with one center  $\eta_1 > \eta_j$
- All other subcenters have a zero traffic  $T(j)=0$
- The number of individuals  $P$  increases,  $T(1)$  increases and at a certain point there is another  $j$  such that:

$$Z(i, j) > Z(i, 1)$$

Or:

$$\eta_j - \frac{d_{ij}}{\ell} > \eta_1 - \frac{d_{i1}}{\ell} \left[ 1 + \left( \frac{P}{c} \right)^\mu \right]$$

# Monocentric-polycentric transition

$$\eta_j - \frac{d_{ij}}{\ell} > \eta_1 - \frac{d_{i1}}{\ell} \left[ 1 + \left( \frac{P}{c} \right)^\mu \right]$$

- Mean-field type argument
  - $d_{i1} \sim d_{ij} \sim L$  ( $L = \sqrt{A}$ )
  - The new subcenter has the second largest attractivity  $\eta_2$
  - on average

$$\overline{\eta_1 - \eta_2} \simeq 1/N_c$$

- We obtain a ‘critical’ value for the population

$$P > P^* = c \left( \frac{\ell}{LN_c} \right)^{1/\mu}$$

# Monocentric-polycentric transition

- Critical value for the population: effect of congestion !

$$P > P^* = c \left( \frac{\ell}{LN_c} \right)^{1/\mu}$$

- $c$  sets the scale
- If  $\ell$  is too small,  $P^* < 1$  and the monocentric regime is never stable

# Monocentric-polycentric transition

- If the population continues to increase, other subcenters will appear. We assume that for  $P$ , we have  $k-1$  subcenters:

$$\eta_1 \geq \eta_2 \geq \dots \geq \eta_{k-1}$$

with traffic:  $T(1) \sim T(2) \sim \dots T(k-1) \sim \frac{P}{k-1}$

- The next individual will choose a new subcenter  $k$  if:

$$Z_{ik} > \max_{1, \dots, k-1} Z_{ij}$$

$$\eta_k - \frac{d_{ik}}{\ell} > \max_{1, \dots, k-1} \left\{ \eta_j - \frac{d_{ij}}{\ell} \left[ 1 + \left( \frac{T(j)}{c} \right)^\mu \right] \right\}$$

- We assume:  $d_{ik} \sim d_{ij} \sim L$

# Results: scaling for the number of centers

- We obtain the average population for which a  $k^{\text{th}}$  subcenter appears is:

$$\bar{P}_k = P^* (k - 1)^{\frac{\mu+1}{\mu}}$$

- Which implies:

$$k \sim \left( \frac{P}{P^*} \right)^{\frac{\mu}{\mu+1}}$$


Sublinear relation !

- From US employment data (9000 cities)

$$k \sim P^{0.64} \quad (\Rightarrow \mu \simeq 2)$$

# 'Urban transition: Phase diagram'

Number of hotspots  $H$  versus population  $P$  (Mean-Field analysis)



- From US employment data (9000 cities)

$$H \sim P^{0.64} (\Rightarrow \mu \simeq 2)$$

# III. Scaling of socio-economical quantities

---

# Scaling





$$Y \sim P^\beta$$

**Table 1. Scaling exponents for urban indicators vs. city size**

$Y$	$\beta$	95% CI	Adj- $R^2$	Observations	Country-year
New patents	1.27	[1.25,1.29]	0.72	331	U.S. 2001
Inventors	1.25	[1.22,1.27]	0.76	331	U.S. 2001
Private R&D employment	1.34	[1.29,1.39]	0.92	266	U.S. 2002
"Supercreative" employment	1.15	[1.11,1.18]	0.89	287	U.S. 2003
R&D establishments	1.19	[1.14,1.22]	0.77	287	U.S. 1997
R&D employment	1.26	[1.18,1.43]	0.93	295	China 2002
Total wages	1.12	[1.09,1.13]	0.96	361	U.S. 2002
Total bank deposits	1.08	[1.03,1.11]	0.91	267	U.S. 1996
GDP	1.15	[1.06,1.23]	0.96	295	China 2002
GDP	1.26	[1.09,1.46]	0.64	196	EU 1999–2003
GDP	1.13	[1.03,1.23]	0.94	37	Germany 2003
Total electrical consumption	1.07	[1.03,1.11]	0.88	392	Germany 2002
New AIDS cases	1.23	[1.18,1.29]	0.76	93	U.S. 2002–2003
Serious crimes	1.16	[1.11, 1.18]	0.89	287	U.S. 2003
Total housing	1.00	[0.99,1.01]	0.99	316	U.S. 1990
Total employment	1.01	[0.99,1.02]	0.98	331	U.S. 2001
Household electrical consumption	1.00	[0.94,1.06]	0.88	377	Germany 2002
Household electrical consumption	1.05	[0.89,1.22]	0.91	295	China 2002
Household water consumption	1.01	[0.89,1.11]	0.96	295	China 2002
Gasoline stations	0.77	[0.74,0.81]	0.93	318	U.S. 2001
Gasoline sales	0.79	[0.73,0.80]	0.94	318	U.S. 2001
Length of electrical cables	0.87	[0.82,0.92]	0.75	380	Germany 2002
Road surface	0.83	[0.74,0.92]	0.87	29	Germany 2002




# Scaling in cities: measures



US cities+ some OECD data (Louf, MB, 2013)


# Other quantities

- We know the location of home and office => we can compute other mobility-related quantities
- Scaling of delay due to traffic jams (US cities)



# Other quantities


- Emitted CO<sub>2</sub> (transport-related)



Louf, MB Sci. Rep (2013);  
Env Plan B (2014)

- Superlinear !

# Naive scaling: Total commuting distance



Monocentric

$$l_1 \sim \sqrt{A}$$

$$L_{tot}/\sqrt{A} \sim P$$

Nearest neighbor

$$l_1 \sim 1/\sqrt{\rho} \sim \frac{\sqrt{A}}{\sqrt{P}}$$

$$L_{tot}/\sqrt{A} \sim P^{1/2}$$

- We obtain

$$\frac{L_{tot}}{\sqrt{A}} \sim P^\beta \quad \beta \in [0.5, 1]$$

$$\beta \simeq 0.66 \quad (\text{Samaniego, Moses, 2008})$$


# What is wrong with the naive scaling ?

- Assume  $k$  'hotspots' or activity centers:

$$A = kA_1$$

$$L_{tot} = k \frac{P}{k} \sqrt{A_1}$$

$$\Rightarrow \frac{L_{tot}}{\sqrt{A}} = \frac{P}{\sqrt{k}}$$



- Can change scaling exponents if  $k$  varies with  $P$  !

# Total area

- We have  $A = k \left( \frac{L_{tot}}{P} \right)^2$  and  $\frac{L_{tot}}{P} \sim \text{const.}$
- The number of subcenters is

$$k \sim \left( \frac{P}{P_*} \right)^{\frac{\mu}{\mu+1}}$$

- We obtain

$$A \sim \ell^2 P^{2\mu/2\mu+1}$$

- Numerically

$$A/\ell^2 \sim P^{0.78} \quad (0.85)$$

# Total delay due to congestion

- We have

$$\tau = \sum_{i,j} \frac{d_{ij}}{v_0} \left[ 1 + \left( \frac{T(j)}{c} \right)^\mu \right]$$

- Delay

$$\frac{\delta\tau}{\tau_0} \sim P^{1+\delta}, \quad \delta = \frac{\mu}{2\mu + 1}$$

- From the data

$$\frac{\delta\tau}{\tau_0} \sim P^{1.39} \quad (1.27) \quad \text{Superlinear !}$$

- CO2 emitted (car related)

$$Q_{CO_2} \propto \tau \sim P^{1+\delta}$$

# Predicting the exponent values

Quantity	Theoretical dependence on $P$ ( $\delta = \alpha/\alpha + 1$ )	Predicted value	Measured value
$A/\ell^2$	$\left(\frac{P}{c}\right)^{2\delta}$	$2\delta = 0.78 \pm 0.20$	$0.853 \pm 0.011$ ( $r^2 = 0.93$ ) [USA]
$L_N/\ell$	$\sqrt{P} \left(\frac{P}{c}\right)^\delta$	$\frac{1}{2} + \delta = 0.89 \pm 0.10$	$0.765 \pm 0.033$ ( $r^2 = 0.92$ ) [USA]
$\delta\tau/\tau$	$P \left(\frac{P}{c}\right)^\delta$	$1 + \delta = 1.39 \pm 0.10$	$1.270 \pm 0.067$ ( $r^2 = 0.97$ ) [USA]
$Q_{gas,CO_2}/\ell$	$P \left(\frac{P}{c}\right)^\delta$	$1 + \delta = 1.39 \pm 0.10$	$1.262 \pm 0.089$ ( $r^2 = 0.94$ ) [USA] $1.212 \pm 0.098$ ( $r^2 = 0.83$ ) [OECD]




# Predicting the exponent values

- Polycentrism is the natural response of cities to congestion, but not enough !
- For large  $P$ : Effect of congestion becomes very large  
=> large cities based on individual cars are not economically sustainable !

# Predicting the exponent values

- $Q_{\text{gas}}/P$  is not a simple function of density (cf. Newman & Kenworthy)



# Discussion and outlook

- Pushing the models and compute predictions; testing predictions against data. Goal: understand the hierarchy of mechanisms (and a model with a minimal number of parameters).
- End of story ? Integrating socio-economical factors: rent, other transportation modes, income,...
- Discussion: importance of scaling exponents  $Y \sim P^\beta$ 
  - 'close' to 1: the value depends on assumptions
  - one cannot rule out the linear behavior

Is this scaling nonlinear?

Leitao, Miotto, Gerlach, Altmann, arXiv preprint arXiv:1604.02872 (2016)