

# Ethical and Privacy Considerations with Location Based Data Research

Leonardo Tonetto

Technical University of Munich  
Garching bei München, Germany

Nitinder Mohan

Technical University of Munich  
Garching bei München, Germany  
mohan@in.tum.de

Pauline Kister

Technical University of Munich  
Garching bei München, Germany

Jörg Ott

Technical University of Munich  
Garching bei München, Germany  
ott@in.tum.de

## ABSTRACT

Networking research, especially focusing on human mobility, has evolved significantly in the last two decades and now relies on collection and analyzing larger datasets. The increasing sizes of datasets are enabled by larger automated efforts to collect data as well as by scalable methods to analyze and unveil insights, which was not possible many years ago. However, this fast expansion and innovation in human-centric research often comes at a cost of privacy or ethics. In this work, we review a vast corpus of scientific work on human mobility and how ethics and privacy were considered. We reviewed a total of 118 papers, including 149 datasets on individual mobility. We demonstrate that these ever growing collections, while enabling new and insightful studies, have not all consistently followed a pre-defined set of guidelines regarding acceptable practices in data governance as well as how their research was communicated. We conclude with a series of discussions on how data, privacy and ethics could be dealt within our community.

## KEYWORDS

human mobility, ethics, privacy

## 1 INTRODUCTION

Understanding human mobility has been a quest of scientific research for many years, but it was not until the popularization of smart phones and its embedded sensors that we could deeply study it. The field itself has grown tremendously in the past two decades. From survey-based studies with limited number of subjects, sensing human movements through mobile systems enabled large scale studies benefiting the design of better communication protocols, urban policies and containment of infectious diseases. As the research problems and scope in the field evolved and grew, so did the data collection methods utilizing new sensing technologies, multiple experiment sources, number of involved subjects, etc. As such, the human mobility datasets have become larger and more diverse, more robust and complex methods and models

were devised to study these sets, and a vast amount of work has revealed potential privacy implications with such data (e.g., de-anonymization methods [46, 65, 164]).

To handle the growing ethical concerns from research studies involving human subjects, outlets for scientific articles are increasingly requiring ethical statements from authors at the time of submission itself. For example, venues associated with ACM, such as SIGCOMM (e.g., IMC, HotNets, CoNEXT) and SIGMOBILE (e.g. MobiCom, MobiSys, MobiHoc) as well as workshops on the topic require authors to refer to their principles and code of ethics [48, 109] and submit a statement accompanying the article explicitly mentioning any ethical concerns raised by the study and steps undertaken by authors to mitigate them [2]. However, most of these policies are still evolving and ethical issues from published scientific studies and datasets have still not been eradicated [113, 152]. We believe that the primary contributor to this is the metamorphosis in the definition of “ethics” in research as the views around data ownership in collection evolve with technological advancements. However, untimely discovery of ethical issues within research not only jeopardizes the privacy of involved subjects but can cause embarrassment to involved researchers through dataset redactions, erratas (sometimes retractions [118]) along with widespread clarifications.

Despite serious implications, no recent study has reviewed and discussed how research articles, especially focusing on network research, used personal data of its subjects whilst dealing with privacy and ethics. In this paper, we plug this gap in research and focus on research on individual mobility data – as those have been extensively used in recent networking research (e.g., [75, 103, 168]) and arguably are a source of data the general public (outside of the research community) relates to most (e.g., [154]). In this article, we do not aim at reviewing the latest methods for studying human mobility, but rather we reexamine how individual location data was used in those studies, in light of recent developments in data regulations and ethics, along with the different properties of the data used. To this purpose, we discuss (1) the various

types of datasets used for mobility research, (2) recent developments in data de-/anonymization that may shape public opinion on ethical concerns involving different data types, (3) the current state for regulations in certain countries for the use of individual location data, (4) how human mobility papers have treated this matter over the years, and finally (5) we discuss approaches future human mobility research could follow to establish a sustainable environment for both researchers and subjects.

To the best of our knowledge, ours is the first work to take a broader, multi-faceted look at the evolving state of human mobility research through ethical lenses. We believe that the observations and discussions raised in this work can extend to other fields of research, wherever personal information of human subjects is involved. As we point out later in this paper, we believe that more could be done to unify and standardize best practices on data governance as well as how research results should be communicated. The relevance of this topic lies in (1) protecting the privacy of those subjects being studied, and (2) preserving the trust of the general public with such research in a preventive manner, allowing for even more studies to be published.

## 2 RELATED WORK

In recent years, a series of scientific papers have discussed different aspects of ethics in networking research. While Partridge *et al.* [113] advocated for an “*ethical considerations*” section in all network measurements papers, the work by van der Ham *et al.* [159] and Thomas *et al.* [152] reviewed the use of datasets in network measurements research. The work by van der Ham *et al.* [159] discussed the ethical implications of four case studies where publicly available data contained more information than expected, compromising the privacy of their subjects. The work by Thomas *et al.* [152] reviewed the ethics of using datasets of illicit origins for research. Their work discussed the limitations regarding the lack of informed consent in such studies whenever humans are part of the leaked data. Furthermore, they present a series of case studies where leaked data were used in security related scientific papers. The authors present and rebut some commonly used arguments to justify the use of such data, and conclude that both researchers and scientific outlets should take a more responsible and ethical approach towards researching on stolen data. On the same topic, Ienca *et al.* [82] reviewed the use of hacked data in machine learning papers, suggesting pondering benefits and risks of each dataset while being clear about the means through which data were obtained and how researchers dealt with personal information, if present. From a different angle, we discuss how datasets legally obtained were used, while containing personal data and how these were communicated in their published manuscript.

The ethical implications of re-using data as well as reproducibility of results have also been addressed. Boté *et al.* [31] discussed the ethical and privacy problems associated with the re-usability of research data, arguing for its benefits regarding reproducibility and further research results from an already existing set. Furthermore, reviewing a series of Internet measurement papers, a recent study by Demir *et al.* [47] reviewed the reproducibility of methods used in those papers, along with observations about the content of these papers. The authors observe that almost two-thirds of the analyzed papers (N=117) do not provide an ethics section, in spite of mostly focusing on security and privacy work. We make similar observations for papers using human mobility data, which is arguably a topic likely to reach non-scientific audiences. Additionally, we discuss other aspects related to privacy, such as IRB checks, consent

Furthermore, while Iqbal *et al.* [3] reviewed the progress and citations of ACM SIGCOMM papers over recent decades, an early study by Kurkowski *et al.* [93] discussed how various methods for simulating mobility were used in the early 2000s. In this work, we include a survey covering over 20 years of research and how mobility datasets have evolved.

## 3 HUMAN MOBILITY DATASETS

Individual human mobility datasets may be collected from multiple sources, but are fundamentally described in the same way. They capture the historical presence of a person (or a handheld smart device) at a given point in space and time. Next we present a logical separation of the main classes of mobility data, with its main characteristics summarized on Table 1.

### 3.1 Communication Infrastructure based

This source of data relies on existing communication infrastructure to sense the presence of a subject. This presence is inferred by records (or logs) created when a subject’s mobile device communicates with a point of access, which could be of a Wi-Fi network or of a mobile cellular network [29]. While Wi-Fi setups are often limited to confined areas, such as companies or universities [11, 35], they offer room-level accuracy for their locations. Mobile cellular networks on the other hand may cover entire countries but have their accuracy between 100s meters to 10s kilometers [70] with call detail records (CDR). In both cases, the availability of location records may be a function of the activity of the user, such as when an incoming/outgoing phone call happens or a device associates to an access point upon arriving to a new area. Additionally, certain network settings allow location records to be captured whenever *any* data or even signaling events happen between the network and a subject’s device (e.g., eXtended Detail Records (XDR) and control panel records

**Table 1: Summary of data types used for human mobility studies.**

Class	Source	Location Accuracy	Sample Trigger	Area Covered
<b>Communication Infrastructure</b>	Telco	100 m - 10 km [111]	CDR: calls XDR: calls+data CPR: cell signalling	city, country
	CCR	room, building [51]	user purchase	city, country
	Wi-Fi	room, building [35]	de-/association + active scanning	campus, city any
<b>Experiments</b>	GPS sensor	10 m - 100 m [140]	phone setting	any
	Bluetooth	10 m - room [140]	phone setting	any
<b>Internet Based Services</b>	OSN	10 m - 100 m [88]	content post	any
	Web	100 m - 10,000 km [73]	page/app interaction	any
<b>Public Transport Infrastructure</b>	SmartCard	0 m - 10 m [142]	get on/off transport	city

(CPR) [111]). For such, subjects often agree on *terms and services* for the use of the offered infrastructure, and the collection of location data can be seen as a byproduct of this interaction. Alternatively, Credit Card Records (CCR) can also provide rich information about its user’s whereabouts whenever a card is used for payment at a physical store [51].

### 3.2 Designed Experiments

Another class of human mobility data source originates from designed experiments, in which a phone app or pre-configured devices are distributed among subjects (*e.g.*, [59, 140]). These types of effort often provide the highest level of flexibility and uniformity in how data are sampled, at times also providing data from other non-location sensors, such as accelerometers. These extra readings enable a higher accuracy in segmenting events, such as the duration of stops. However, as these studies are based on recruiting people, and given its costly setup and lack of secondary benefits for subjects (such as Internet access through a Wi-Fi access point), cohorts are limited in their size when compared to communication infrastructure based efforts [140]. Location data collected through these studies often include continuous GPS coordinates, Bluetooth (BT) and Wi-Fi scans of nearby devices.

### 3.3 Internet Based Services

Another infrastructure provider that captures location data are those enabling the exchange of information on the Internet. Web services, such as online social networks (OSN) [88], search engines [170] and map services [170] provide online users with services while also logging their physical

location, for example by means of geotagged posts or geolocating devices based on their IP address [32, 73]. Unlike the sources previously discussed, the sampling of location records by web services is highly dependent on how often a subject interacts with those services, leading to a skewed availability of data per device. Alternatively, location data may be captured in the background but only if allowed by the user (*e.g.*, [16, 71]). Additionally, these web services can also capture extra features, such as the content of what is being searched or posted as well as the social graph of their users, which can be used to further enrich any analysis being made. Similar to the communication infrastructure, subjects agree to *terms and conditions* for that service that states their location data will be logged and may (or may not) be used for further studies.

### 3.4 Public Transport Infrastructure

Smart Cards have replaced old paper-based ticketing system in most modern public transportation systems in large metropolitan areas [142]. They provide an integrated and automated way for passengers to pay for transport rides as well as manage different pricing schemes (*e.g.*, senior citizens or students discounts). Users are required to present their smart cards before starting a ride, for example when entering a subway station or boarding a bus, and in some cases the same is expected when alighting. In this way, the system records the timestamps of discrete location points a subject has been. As human mobility tends to produce repeatable patterns [136], location data from public transport tends to be consistent and homogeneously through time, at least until a global pandemic changes how people move. Similar to all




Figure 1: Size of datasets per publication date.

infrastructure-based sources, subjects agree to the *terms and services* of using a smart card for their corresponding transport system. Additionally, smart cards have also been used to trace the behavior of students in a university campus, logging various activities and services used by students [98]. Other examples of mobility data gathered from public transport are shared bikes [1], taxis [146].

Given the various data sources discussed above, we now turn to a set of observations drawn on the scales of the papers surveyed and their respective datasets.

## 4 MEASUREMENT METHODOLOGY

### 4.1 Literature Selection

*Clarity and justifiable choices* are of paramount importance when personal human data are used as an input to a research study. To understand how individual mobility data has been utilized in research till date, we conduct a survey on most relevant outlets for computer science with special focus on networking research venues (e.g., IMC, Mobicom, INFOCOM) and journals involving general sciences (e.g., PNAS, Nature, Science). Within this dataset, we filter for works that used human mobility dataset through keywords such as *human mobility* and *individual location data*, as well as including their respective relevant citations. We further filtered studies where authors clearly stated that they had access to some form of user identifier (anonymized or not) and multiple spatial points per subject (e.g., geographical coordinates, points of interest) in the description. To limit the scope of this review, we explicitly excluded research from *Transportation* and *Geographic Information Systems* fields. We also did not

consider any *car/vehicle* dataset, as those often involved taxi drivers or cars with multiple owners (i.e., encompassing more than one subject).

We performed this survey across the past 24 years (1998–2022) resulting in **118** research articles. Of these 118 papers we surveyed, we identified a total of **149** datasets with varying properties based on the description given in their respective papers. We categorized the papers in *six* different buckets based on their method for estimating locations of involved subjects, specifically bluetooth (*BT*), *GPS*, *Wi-Fi*, credit card records (*CCR*), web browser (*web*), online social networks (*OSN*), telecommunication networks (*telco*) and public transport smartcards (*smartcard*). We observed that, thanks to the advancements in data collection methods, the collected sizes of mobility data has grown exponentially over the years (see figure 1). Furthermore, we also observed that recent studies on the subject tend to incorporate more than one data sources to collect information of its subjects, as discussed in the previous section – further expanding the involved dataset sizes, both in number of participants and the amount of collected data.

### 4.2 Scale of Selected Studies

With a growing deployment of Wi-Fi networks at universities and company facilities, logs from these setups have allowed researchers to obtain reliable mobility data from hundreds and even thousands of residents, including from their dormitories. While several mobility models were built with such data (e.g., [22]), these were mostly limited to workdays and covered only a small geographical area. To overcome that limitation, the late 2000s and early 2010s saw the emergence of a wide variety of mobility data sources, with even larger pool of subjects and, in a few cases, even covering multiple countries. From our analysis we also observed that while the number of subjects increased over time and larger data collections periods were used, although those did not correlate with the cohort sizes. Additionally, Figure 2 depicts the distribution of dataset sizes per data source, further highlighting the disparities in cohort sizes between studies that often provide informed consent or not, as will be discussed later in this article. Unsurprisingly, sets covering larger areas also tend to include more users, as shown in Figure 3. However as multiple countries are only included in OSN and Web collections (see their limitations above) those do not necessarily have the largest groups.

We also find that a majority of articles tend to not properly describe the properties of their dataset well within their text. Surprisingly, almost half of the datasets (81, or 54.4%) within the selected articles did not report the number of records (or table rows) used in the study. For those which reported those numbers, we also observed a similar growth trend for overall




Figure 2: Size of datasets per source.




Figure 3: Size of datasets per geographical area/type coverage.

number of rows in datasets over the years. Only one in eight of the total datasets (19, or 12.8%) reported the number of rows used (*i.e.*, after initial filtering), and for those which reported values, on average half (50.4%) of the total rows were discarded. This filtering is typically done to reduce temporal sparsity without significantly reducing temporal resolution. Similarly for the number of subjects available for each study after filtering, one in four (43, or 28.9%) report total and filtered values where on average nearly two thirds (62.1%) of subjects are discarded. This filtering, while necessary for a homogenized set of subjects over time, may also introduce biases to the results, which should also be discussed. In Section 7 we discuss how the papers we surveyed often had access to more information about their subjects than it was actually needed for their studies, such as *home* location and their social graph.

Our analysis on the scale of mobility datasets provides context to the increasing magnitude in the number of subjects and rows as well as in geographical extent of measurement studies in the field over the years. While the scales of datasets used for such studies has grown significantly, so has the general public’s awareness of possible privacy issues related to those data [14]. Complementary to this awareness, as new research on anonymization methods became popular, new




Figure 4: Data source, sampling duration and area type per dataset. Entries sorted by date their papers were published.

de-anonymization approaches have followed suit. Next, we

review the literature on such methods as they support our understanding of how future research on human mobility ought to follow.

## 5 THE PRIVATE DATA CONUNDRUM

In 2006, AOL shared a sample of historical queries from over 650,000 users for research purposes. The identities of these users were altered in order to protect their privacy, but shortly after its release a series of users were *de-anonymized* making the headlines of newspapers (e.g., [21, 130]). Furthermore, even data not released on purpose may be leaked through security breaches (e.g., [24]). Consequently, these events populate public opinion about data security and privacy, leading to new or modified legislation as well as ethical guidelines. These new directions finally shape recent network research by limiting what can be done when personal data are used, or at least it should.

To tackle these constraints when dealing with personal data, researchers have paid significant attention to methods for both anonymizing private personal records, simultaneously to de-anonymize it. These works often aim at raising awareness of possible weaknesses in identity protection, and how to provide minimal guarantees to one’s privacy, respectively.

Even though we do not analyze the full life-cycle of datasets, in several occasions sets were either made public or at least used in further studies carried by the original research group. On that topic, Allman and Paxson addressed the ethical concerns of releasing and using data, including privacy protection [13]. They emphasize that raw datasets containing identifiable information should not be shared publicly, and research should prioritize preserving the privacy of individuals. Additionally, the authors advise against trusting anonymization approaches as deanonymization counter-attacks quickly become available.

We now provide a brief review of some of such methods as those are often cited, as we observe, as reasons for an unconditional care whenever individual data are used.

### 5.1 Location-based data de-anonymization techniques

When sharing individual data, personal attributes which can *directly* identify any subject (e.g., name or phone number) may be changed to *pseudonyms* in order to protect their privacy. These steps, however, yield only partial privacy protection as highlighted by a plethora of studies on de-anonymization attacks [62, 66]. Following the taxonomy of Fung *et al.* [66] and Fiore *et al.* [62], we review some of these attacks which we later refer to when discussing individual location data in mobility research. The relevance of these studies to our current work lies in the observation

that all papers we surveyed state that user identifiers were *anonymized*, and in some cases that being the only privacy related content in the manuscript.

On a study on attacks through *record linkage*, in which an attacker has a database containing (quasi-)similar location records from their victims, De Montjoye *et al.* [46] showed how any two location records could de-anonymize 50% of subjects and how four locations could increase this trajectory uniqueness up to 95%, from a set of 1.5 million persons. However, a comprehensive study by Wang *et al.* [164] showed that former methods actually underperformed when applied to real-world large scale data, reporting a de-anonymization hit rate lower than 20% in all cases. Wang *et al.* then finally proposed a Markov-based model that achieves a 40% success rate in linking records from heterogeneous databases.

Another relevant surface of attack is through a side-channel, such as a victim’s profile. By using both *home* and *work* information of victims, Freudiger *et al.* [65] show how an adversary can uniquely identify individuals in large datasets with up to 90% accuracy. Furthermore, knowledge on the whereabouts of one’s friends, or her *social graph*, may reveal relevant information about her current location. Using data from online social networks, Sadilek *et al.* [123] proposed an unsupervised method, achieving 57% and 77% accuracy in predicting a victim’s location given information from two and nine of her friends, respectively. Similarly with a supervised learning approach, the authors obtained accuracies of 77% and 84.3%, respectively. Using a different approach and a set of smaller but denser networks, Srivatsa *et al.* [139] reported that up to 80% of subjects’ identity could be recovered by matching social graphs links with increased physical proximity.

Taken together, these attacks are vivid examples of how individual location data can uniquely identify a person and what some vectors for de-anonymization are. These threats may shape not only the contents of academic research but also the general public view on the harm such data impose to their individual privacy. To counteract these perils and uncertainties two alternatives are often presented: (1) stronger anonymization methods, and (2) ethical guidelines and regulations aimed at protecting a person’s right for anonymity. We further discuss both of these point, next.

### 5.2 Stronger anonymization for location-based data

Given the threats to an individual’s privacy brought by the de-anonymization attacks discussed above, a growing literature on anonymization methods has produced relevant results. Following the taxonomy of Fiore *et al.* [62], anonymization

techniques follow three main principles. (1) *Indistinguishability*, in which the records of a subject must be indistinguishable from those of the same size-limited anonymity set, essentially removing the unicity from one’s trajectory. A commonly used formal approach for indistinguishability is *k-anonymity* [143]. (2) *Uninformativeness*, in which an adversary’s knowledge about a victim must remain unchanged after accessing a dataset the victim is part of. This principle is generally achieved through differential privacy [57]. (3) *Mitigation*, in which preventive measures are taken to assure one’s data privacy, without a well-define principle. Such principle is addressed with alterations in the original location data, aimed at discarding certain unique aspects of one’s trajectories, however without providing formal guarantees.

On *indistinguishability*, ensuring *k-anonymity* has taken a multitude of solutions, such as: (a) *spatiotemporal generalization*, in which spatial and temporal resolutions are reduced until traces from members of an anonymity set are indistinguishable. Achieving this goal, however, quickly reduces the quality of an anonymized location dataset as more trajectories are aggregated, as revealed by De Montjoye *et al.* [46]. (b) *Suppression*, in which points are removed from trajectories until their unicity is lost [149]. (c) *Spatial uncertainty*, in which *k-anonymity* is relaxed to include entire trajectories that fall within a defined threshold, as demonstrated by Abul *et al.* [4]. It is important to note that *k-anonymity* has its own shortcomings, addressed by extensions such as *ldiversity* that enforces an extra diversity criteria per group [104].

On *uninformativeness*, proposed solutions formally follow differential privacy in which consecutive similar queries to a dataset should return similar results, even if the trajectories of a subject have been added or removed from the set. This has been shown, for example, by Shokri *et al.* [132] who adapted differential privacy for location data. Other examples of differential privacy include altering the representation of the trajectory data using different data structures [37] as well as aggregating observations as probability distributions [74].

On *mitigation*, proposed solutions do not provide formal privacy guarantees and also often reduce the utility of the original location data. This is achieved through: (a) *obfuscation*, in which noise is added to location data (e.g., [55]). (b) *Cloaking*, in which spatial or temporal resolutions are reduced (e.g., [122]). (c) *Segmentation*, in which new pseudonyms are used for multiple segments that are artificially added to the data (e.g., Song *et al.* [138]). (d) *Swapping*, in which pseudonyms are randomly swapped between different trajectories (e.g., [126]).

The observations in these studies remind us that replacing real identifiers by pseudonyms is not enough to protect one’s privacy. A myriad and ever growing literature on de-anonymization approaches highlights not only the risks

of dealing with personal data, but also the importance of stronger anonymization techniques. These protective methods, however, often degrade information present only in the original datasets. This inevitable drawback affects what studies are capable of doing, by eliminating important nuances, as well as whether or not data can be shared, and in which format.

## 6 ETHICAL GUIDELINES AND REGULATIONS OUTLOOK

Given all the risks to one’s privacy regarding location data, ethical guidelines as well as regulatory bodies have adapted their take on these topics. These efforts are of paramount importance as they aim at protecting subjects in circumstances where only hindsight can assure privacy, even if only partially. Ethical considerations are relevant in all stages of human mobility research, from the design of research questions, the analysis of data, the articles being reviewed and published as well as to the dissemination of the work that is either being done or that is already completed [64].

To safeguard individual’s privacy, the European Union General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) noticeably covers exclusively personal data. In the GDPR, personal data are defined with respect to the identifiability of an individual based on the data being regarded. However, if data are not personal or have been sufficiently anonymized they are no longer protected by the GDPR laws [5]. As we previously discussed, there is a large body of research on how most methods of anonymization are flawed and do not guarantee lack of unicity. Therefore, human mobility research for often dealing with personal location data has to ensure not only laws are met, but that research is conducted and presented following up-to-date ethical guidelines. This would ensure public *trust* and the continuity of this research area.

With a similar purpose, the California Consumer Privacy Act (CCPA) [108] establishes a set of rules to protect the privacy of online users, with special regards to the sale of personal data. A fundamental difference between the CCPA and the GDPR concerns the origin of the data covered by each law. While the former covers data provided by the consumer the latter makes no distinction, as long as it is identifiable.

An inexorable aspect of privacy, both ethically and in various law instances, is the need for consent. From a subject’s point of view, individuals have reported being more willing to consent with the use of their data if the proposed research had clear benefits, either personally or for society [156]. That is, if one assumes a utilitarian view, where benefits may justify potential risks, subjects are more likely to agree in taking part in a study if either them or society may benefit from the results of the study. One issue here, we argue, is that unlike medical research, human mobility studies from computer



or social scientists are less tangible. Therefore, drawing a line to what is or is not ethical becomes harder. Nevertheless, mobility research can still assure subjects when data are being collected, what analyses are being done, and what the overall impact might be as those elements define public opinion on whether or not their data should be used [19, 134]. We note, however, that ensuring this transparency between researchers and subjects is often referred in the surveyed papers as one of the main reasons *no data* can be shared. As a result, the *reproducibility* of results is impaired, which we further discuss in Section 8.

Another important facet of this complex problem is the ethical tradition of researchers and subjects' culture in different countries [64]. Traditionally, US and UK scientists are more *utilitarian* in which the value of the research being done justifies the potential ethical risks associated, whereas their European counterparts favor a more *deontological* view, *i.e.*, it favors moral values as well as rules before weighing and considering the outcome. Regarding subjects that in some studies may be from several countries, such as those using OSN data, their personal and cultural understanding and assumptions on privacy are *ambiguous, contested and changing* [64]. That is, given this vast combinatorial of cultural understandings and expectations regarding privacy and its associated risks, a cautious and preventive approach is undoubtedly beneficial in helping guide future scientific (and possibly commercial) efforts using personal location data.

There are, however, a series of steps human mobility research can follow in order to safeguard subjects' privacy as well as scientific and general public's trust on what is being studied. Even though these actions often require additional intricate effort from researchers, we observe an increase in its adoption by publication outlets. These include: (a) reviews from ethical review boards (or institutional review board, ERB/IRB), with these reviews/assessments being required to be independently verifiable (*e.g.*, with a protocol number); (b) including comprehensive ethical statements, where the possible *vulnerability* of and *harm* to subjects is discussed, and what might have been the expectations of users of a studied service when interacting with it; (c) whether or not informed consent was given to the specific study being conducted, beyond the *terms and services* of that platform providing the location data; and finally overall; and (d) what was done to minimize *risk* for subjects, given all that has been discussed thus far. In the next section we review how, in the past, research papers have addressed some of the outstanding challenges human mobility faces regarding ethics, followed by a discussion on how we believe this should be done in the future.

## 7 ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS IN THE LITERATURE

In this section we discuss how human mobility research papers dealt with some of the ethical aspects presented in the previous section. We present numbers based on a review of 118 papers from CS and general sciences, published from 1998 and 2022, which used individual location data, totalling 149 datasets (*i.e.*, papers could contain multiple sets). In all cases, we consider only the first publication to include a given dataset (see § 4), and a basic of description of all papers is presented in Table 2.

We begin by making a distinction between datasets collected *deliberately* for a study and those which were shared with researchers through an *agreement*. From all datasets, one in four (37, or 24.8%) were collected *deliberately*, as an integral part of the study. Additionally, sets covering larger areas, or that were collected more recently, or sets with larger subject counts showed a lower likelihood of a deliberate collection effort. This could, in part, be explained by a predominant use of CDR and OSN/Web based data in recent years, as depicted in Figure 1, as those sources often capture location data for basic operations, such as billing, and which are then repurposed for mobility research.

Data sharing remains the exception, understandably. While data sharing has grown in importance for reproducing and validating existing results or fostering new research, privacy concerns and NDA's often prevent any data being shared. From all sets, one in ten (16, or 10.7%) were shared in either their original form or modified along with the paper (*e.g.*, [91, 101]). However, we note that, in some cases, authors provide the contact of the data provider stating that those sets could still be retrieved upon agreement.

In some cases, papers took deliberate actions to protect subjects privacy, beyond anonymizing user identifiers one single time. For that, we identified one in 15 (10, or 6.7%) of sets received extra steps, with no clear distinction between CS and general sciences. Additionally, we note that such measures became more common in more recent papers. Examples of such mitigating measures include *spatial aggregation* (*e.g.*, [9, 26, 92, 100]) where records per individual are still available but the spatial resolution is reduced, similarly with *temporal aggregation* (*e.g.*, [103]) where records are grouped in large time slices, and *periodical changes in user identifiers* (*e.g.*, [75]). It is worth noting that only some papers state what might be clear, that "*obeying data privacy regulations is important when analyzing mobile phone usage data*", and after explaining what was done conclude that "*thereby the local regulations have been met and the recommendations of the GSMA, the alliance of mobile phone providers have been followed.*" [75]



**Table 2: Papers surveyed. Year published, if *Deliberate* privacy was considered, if an ethical *Statement* was present, if an *IRB* approval was present, if subjects gave *Consent* to the exact terms of the study, and which data *Sources* were used. Sources: W - Wi-Fi; T - Telco; B - Bluetooth; O - Online Social Networks; S - Smartcards; E - Web Services; C - Credit Card Records. (● - Yes; ○ - No)**

Paper	Year	Deliberate	Statement	IRB	Consent	Sources	Paper	Year	Deliberate	Statement	IRB	Consent	Sources
[94]	1998	○	○	○	○	W	[170]	2013	○	○	○	○	E
[144]	1999	○	○	○	○	W	[179]	2013	○	○	○	○	S
[145]	2000	○	○	●	○	W	[162]	2014	●	●	●	○	W
[81]	2002	○	○	○	○	W	[167]	2014	●	●	●	●	G
[90]	2002	○	○	○	○	W	[140]	2014	●	●	●	●	T
[150]	2003	○	○	○	○	W	[49]	2014	○	○	○	○	T
[20]	2003	○	○	○	○	W	[181]	2014	○	●	○	○	T, S
[76]	2004	○	○	○	○	W	[141]	2014	○	○	○	○	S
[39]	2004	●	○	○	○	W	[163]	2015	○	○	○	○	T
[129]	2004	●	○	○	○	W	[112]	2015	○	○	○	○	T
[105]	2005	○	○	○	○	W	[97]	2015	○	○	○	○	O
[59]	2005	○	●	○	●	T	[23]	2015	○	○	○	○	T
[158]	2005	○	○	○	○	W	[155]	2015	○	○	○	○	T
[80]	2005	●	○	○	●	B	[88]	2015	○	●	●	○	O
[35]	2007	●	○	○	●	B	[87]	2016	○	○	○	○	T
[121]	2008	○	○	○	○	G	[50]	2016	○	○	○	○	T
[6]	2008	○	○	○	○	W	[160]	2016	●	●	●	●	G
[70]	2008	○	○	○	○	T	[110]	2016	○	○	○	○	T
[136]	2009	○	○	○	○	T	[77]	2016	○	○	○	○	O
[147]	2009	○	○	○	○	T	[151]	2016	○	○	○	○	O
[58]	2009	●	○	○	●	T	[153]	2017	●	○	○	○	T
[43]	2009	○	○	○	○	O	[102]	2017	○	●	●	○	T
[44]	2010	○	○	○	○	G	[161]	2017	●	○	○	○	G
[42]	2010	○	○	○	○	O	[173]	2017	○	○	○	○	E, T
[119]	2010	○	○	○	○	T	[180]	2017	○	○	○	○	G
[135]	2010	○	○	○	○	T	[15]	2017	●	○	○	○	G
[85]	2010	○	○	○	○	T, G, W, B	[10]	2017	○	○	○	○	T
[115]	2010	○	○	○	○	T	[86]	2017	○	○	○	○	T
[89]	2011	○	○	○	○	T	[34]	2017	○	○	○	○	W
[17]	2011	○	○	○	○	T	[33]	2017	○	○	○	○	T
[26]	2011	●	●	○	○	T	[8]	2017	●	●	●	●	G
[95]	2011	●	●	○	○	S	[9]	2018	●	●	●	●	G
[128]	2011	○	○	○	○	O	[168]	2018	●	○	○	○	T
[83]	2011	●	●	○	○	T	[174]	2018	○	○	○	○	T
[116]	2011	○	○	○	○	T	[166]	2018	○	○	○	○	O
[114]	2011	○	○	○	○	T	[36]	2018	○	○	○	○	T
[106]	2011	○	○	○	○	W	[60]	2018	○	○	○	○	T
[40]	2011	○	○	○	○	O, T	[11]	2018	○	○	○	○	W
[38]	2011	○	○	○	○	O	[125]	2018	○	○	○	○	T
[123]	2012	○	●	○	○	O	[78]	2018	○	○	○	○	S
[96]	2012	○	○	○	○	S	[61]	2018	○	○	○	○	O, E, T
[45]	2012	○	○	○	○	T	[51]	2018	○	○	○	○	T
[30]	2012	○	●	○	○	T	[148]	2019	●	○	○	○	G, T
[107]	2012	○	○	○	○	O	[41]	2019	○	○	○	○	G
[120]	2012	○	○	○	○	T	[157]	2019	●	○	○	○	G
[54]	2012	●	○	○	○	G	[165]	2019	●	●	●	○	T
[12]	2012	○	○	○	○	O	[75]	2020	●	●	○	○	T
[169]	2012	○	○	○	○	T	[103]	2020	●	●	●	○	T
[124]	2012	○	○	○	○	G	[69]	2020	○	○	○	○	T
[171]	2012	○	○	○	○	S	[92]	2020	●	●	●	○	E
[133]	2012	○	○	○	○	T	[7]	2020	○	○	○	○	E
[99]	2012	○	○	○	○	T	[67]	2020	○	○	○	○	E
[27]	2013	○	○	○	○	S	[175]	2020	○	○	○	○	E
[137]	2013	○	○	○	○	G	[176]	2021	●	●	●	○	E
[100]	2013	●	○	○	○	T	[131]	2021	○	○	○	○	E
[46]	2013	○	○	○	○	T	[84]	2021	●	○	○	○	G
[142]	2013	○	○	○	○	S	[79]	2021	○	○	○	○	O
[25]	2013	○	●	○	○	T	[172]	2021	●	○	●	○	G
[117]	2013	○	○	○	○	T	[98]	2022	○	○	○	○	S

As discussed previously, beyond the use of user identifiers, subjects can be de-anonymized through other bits of information, such as the places they visit, the schedule they follow, and their social network. Therefore, approaches can be taken to minimize the availability of such information, which in many cases still allows the same research questions to be answered. One of these approaches is a periodic change of anonymized identifiers per subject (e.g., daily), which was observed in only one in 16 (9, or 6.0%) of the datasets we observed. Knowing the home of a subject (or approximate location) can provide unicity to a subject and in six out of seven (126, or 84.6%) of sets this information was present but only in a third (47, or 37.3%) of those that information was actually used. Similarly, information on other places, schedule and social network was available in 137 (91.9%), 147 (98.7%) and 145 (97.3%) of datasets respectively, out of which were only used in 61 (44.5%), 61 (41.5%) and 37 (25.5%) respectively. These numbers highlight the availability of information past mobility research had access to which was not needed in some way, and therefore could have been left out during the data collection process. These extra cautionary steps taken in future research may help with public opinion and trust.

Given all the extra data available to researchers, any form of pre-processing beyond the change in identifiers is our next observation. For that, only one in 15 (10, or 6.7%) of sets went through some kind of pre-processing done, out of which three out of five (6, or 60.0%) had their methods clearly explained and nine in ten (9, or 90.0%) clearly stated *who* performed those extra steps. Once again, these extra bits of information help not only other researchers better understand what was done, but more importantly help assure public trust on the true aims and practices of mobility research.

Another important aspect of this analysis is how papers dealt with ethics. Even though ERB/IRB are not mandatory in most of the outlets we studied, one in six (24, or 16.1%) of papers had an IRB statement. Out of these studies, only one ([102]) provided a protocol which allows for an independent verification of that approval.

*Informed consent.* Given the importance of informed consent previously discussed (§ 6), we report that one in eight (19, or 12.8%) of the listed papers declared having received authorization from subjects to perform the study being presented. This goes with how people expect their data being used in accordance with the terms and services they sign before using a service, that is, an OSN user will agree in having their data being stored and processed to be used by the platform providing them the services, not some third party trying to understand changes in mobility. In most cases when consent was given, papers describe consent being given for a particular study, e.g., “*All users of Locaccino, regardless of how*

*they were recruited, gave informed consent to participate in the study work*” [44]. There are, however, exceptional cases in which a double-consent was requested to cover not only the data collection but also the specifics of the study, e.g., “*Therefore, YJ performed a double consent process, where the users who have given their consent to the usage of location information and web search queries were asked again, if they wish to provide their consent to be included in the [COVID19] dataset.*” [177].

## 8 OUTLOOK ON HUMAN MOBILITY RESEARCH USING INDIVIDUAL DATA

In this paper, we surveyed 118 papers dating back over 20 years with the goal of reviewing how individual mobility data were used, and how methods and results were communicated with special attention to privacy and ethics. We now conclude with a series of final remarks, pushing for a future with more accountability, protecting the trust of subjects, researchers and the general public to avoid a *tragedy of the data commons* [178]. Given all the data and methods reviewed in this paper, we summarize a series of ideas and guidelines networking research using personal data could follow in the upcoming years. We do not focus on the exact steps to achieve those goals, but we leave those to the community to decide.

**IMC ethical considerations.** Ethical concerns have been part of network measurement community (especially IMC) for long [52]. Ethical statements are required by several scientific outlets, such as those under SIGCOMM [72], typically in the form of a required section where ethical considerations are discussed [113], and more recently, requiring that the IRB review application form be submitted along with the manuscript. Furthermore, the inclusion of ethics course as an integral part of Computer Science curricula have also been extensively discussed over the years [63, 127], fostering a growing ethical ethos among scientists. Therefore, we believe the mindset of ethically doing research with personal data should be present from the initial steps of any investigation endeavour, similar to the moral philosophy discussed by Bietti [28] for the tech industry. However, as we have highlighted with our review, a significant number of papers do not include ethical discussions even amongst recent work, let alone consider IRB reviews which need to happen *a priori* (i.e., need to be considered even before a submission, not *only once this is accepted*). We also find in our review that the definitions of “ethics” and “personal data” have evolved over time. Methods to ask for consent have become more minimalist (and often implicit) so as to not inhibit a user’s “quality-of-experience”. Simultaneously, we observe that the ethical boundaries of large-scale (or in-the-wild) measurements are only known implicitly to researchers already well-versed

with the field. Let's take, for example, research in conducting Internet-wide scans. While there is plethora of work easily accessible via quick search on tools and methods to perform IP scanning [68]; reports on best scanning practices [53], ownership within the context of Internet [52] and guidelines for designing ethical scanning methodologies [56] are much less popularly known and sought after. Additionally, we believe a minimalist and careful handling of personal data must be practiced at all steps of the scientific process. This cautionary approach, combined with higher clarity in describing how data were used, and higher accountability are of paramount relevance for a clearer implementation of ethics in research. That is, a call for the wider adoption of the intrinsic values of ethics over the instrumental ones [28], where in the former ethics is seen as a commitment to a process while in the latter ethics is simply a means to an end (e.g., fulfill requirements in a document being written). IRB reviews should be followed, and if they fail, then a redesign of the study is needed. Conferences should require a copy of the IRB check, as it is already done at IMC and other outlets.

**Scientific Data Sharing** Amongst the issues discussed, we believe this is one the hardest to meaningfully address with assertive measures. While on the one hand data sharing is of significant importance to the validation and reproducibility of research [47], on the other hand protecting the privacy of subjects prevents sets being shared in their original form. Current solutions require at least some level of differential privacy (see 5.2) to be met, which results in loss of information, or sharing some kind of synthetic dataset, which may still hold valuable information about the original subjects or render significantly different results from those present in the original work. Restricting research to use only shareable data are likely not the solution either. That is, limiting papers from being published only with data that have been fully anonymized and which could be shared, even under any strong NDA, cannot be a solution as it may hinder scientific development. To the problem of sharing data while protecting subject's privacy, no single rule shall be applied and the work of ethical review boards, once more, becomes even more relevant.

**Ethical statements** A comprehensive and thorough ethical statement must be present in all research done using individual data. While in some venues this is the norm, there are still outlets which do not enforce this as a requirement. Note, however, that is not an invitation for the inception of "ethics wash" [28] (i.e., whitewash) in our community, where statements will be written only to fulfill a given requirement using *boilerplate* sentences, hiding the fact that no particular attention was paid to ethics or privacy. That is, ethical statements should not be used to cover up for bad behavior or any form of wrongdoing.

**The explicit consent dilemma** As we have shown, publication are using larger pools of subjects and using a growing variety of data sources. Therefore, it is naïve to expect studies with hundreds of millions of subjects will get explicit consent from every single subject, when for example, not all questions are known *a priori*, as previously discussed in the Menlo Report [18]. While no alternatives for better data governance are put in place it is the researcher's responsibility to take all cautionary steps to ensure the privacy of subjects is preserved, that all the steps taken to process and analyze those data are clearly described, and that the benefits of their research are clearly communicated for all audiences.

**Ethics check committee at conferences and journals** Similar to the already existing reproducibility checks, conferences and journals could implement an ethics check committee, responsible for double-checking whether essential ethics guidelines were followed (e.g., ethical statement, IRB approval, informed consent). This would be available for any paper containing personal data, and as its reproducibility counterpart, would not affect the acceptance likelihood of the work. We hypothesize this *opt-in* solution could create incentives for authors to behave more ethically, and make that clear on their manuscripts, without stringent measures that could hinder scientific development in the short term.

**A model for better individual mobility data governance** In order to get around some of the issues discussed in this paper, we believe better traceability and accountability are plausible alternatives, but we leave the exact details of implementation for the community to decide. Regardless of the architecture of such solution, this system would be responsible for collecting, filtering, aggregating and sharing these data with internet services interested in using that information. These data points could include readings from sensors (accelerometers, GPS), contextual physical information such as proximity to others through Bluetooth, as well as online behavior. Users would then have the choice of whether or not any of those data are collected, how and if they should be aggregated or filtered, before being shared. Researchers could, in turn, publish calls for data, explaining in details their objectives and data are needed. This system could also work as a bookkeeper to all accesses to a subject's data, as well as whenever the original data are finally deleted, ensuring better accountability and possibly wider availability of data for research studies.

## REFERENCES

- [1] 2010. Urban cycles and mobility patterns: Exploring and predicting trends in a bicycle-based public transport system. *Pervasive and Mobile Computing* 6, 4 (2010), 455–466. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pmcj.2010.07.002> Human Behavior in Ubiquitous Environments: Modeling of Human Mobility Patterns.

- [2] 2015. *NS Ethics '15: Proceedings of the 2015 ACM SIGCOMM Workshop on Ethics in Networked Systems Research* (London, United Kingdom). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA.
- [3] 2019. Five decades of the ACM Special Interest Group on Data Communications (SIGCOMM): A bibliometric perspective. *Computer Communication Review* 49, 5 (2019), 29–37. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3371934.3371948>
- [4] Osman Abul, Francesco Bonchi, and Mirco Nanni. 2008. Never Walk Alone: Uncertainty for Anonymity in Moving Objects Databases. In *2008 IEEE 24th International Conference on Data Engineering*, Vol. 00. IEEE, 376–385. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICDE.2008.4497446>
- [5] British Academy and the Royal Society. 2017. Data management and use: governance in the 21st century.
- [6] Mikhail Afanasyev, Tsuwei Chen, Geoffrey M. Voelker, and Alex C. Snoeren. 2008. Analysis of a Mixed-Use Urban Wifi Network: When Metropolitan Becomes Neapolitan. In *Proceedings of the 8th ACM SIGCOMM Conference on Internet Measurement (Vouliagmeni, Greece) (IMC '08)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 85–98. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1452520.1452531>
- [7] Laura Alessandretti, Ulf Aslak, and Sune Lehmann. 2020. The scales of human mobility. *Nature* 587, 7834 (2020), 402–407.
- [8] Laura Alessandretti, Piotr Sapiezynski, Sune Lehmann, and Andrea Baronchelli. 2017. Multi-scale spatio-temporal analysis of human mobility. *PLOS ONE* 12, 2 (02 2017), 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0171686>
- [9] Laura Alessandretti, Piotr Sapiezynski, Vedran Sekara, Sune Lehmann, and Andrea Baronchelli. 2018. Evidence for a conserved quantity in human mobility. *Nature human behaviour* 2, 7 (2018), 485–491.
- [10] Fahad Alhasoun, May Alhazzani, Faisal Aleissa, Riyadh Alnasser, and Marta González. 2017. City scale next place prediction from sparse data through similar strangers. In *Proceedings of ACM KDD Workshop*. 191–196.
- [11] Babak Alipour, Leonardo Tonetto, Aaron Yi Ding, Roozbeh Ketabi, Jörg Ott, and Ahmed Helmy. 2018. Flutes vs. Cellos: Analyzing Mobility-Traffic Correlations in Large WLAN Traces. In *2018 IEEE Conference on Computer Communications, INFOCOM 2018, Honolulu, HI, USA, April 16-19, 2018*. IEEE, 1637–1645. <https://doi.org/10.1109/INFOCOM.2018.8486360>
- [12] Miltiadis Allamanis, Salvatore Scellato, and Cecilia Mascolo. 2012. Evolution of a location-based online social network: analysis and models. In *Proceedings of the 12th ACM SIGCOMM Internet Measurement Conference, IMC '12, Boston, MA, USA, November 14-16, 2012*, John W. Byers, Jim Kurose, Ratul Mahajan, and Alex C. Snoeren (Eds.). ACM, 145–158. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2398776.2398793>
- [13] Mark Allman and Vern Paxson. 2007. Issues and etiquette concerning use of shared measurement data. In *Proceedings of the 7th ACM SIGCOMM Internet Measurement Conference, IMC 2007, San Diego, California, USA, October 24-26, 2007*, Constantine Dovrolis and Matthew Roughan (Eds.). ACM, 135–140. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1298306.1298327>
- [14] Fatma Alrayes and Alia Abdelmoty. 2016. Towards Location Privacy Awareness on Geo-Social Networks. In *2016 10th International Conference on Next Generation Mobile Applications, Security and Technologies (NGMAST)*. 105–114. <https://doi.org/10.1109/NGMAST.2016.26>
- [15] Ionut Andone, Konrad Blaszkiewicz, Matthias Böhmer, and Alexander Markowetz. 2017. Impact of location-based games on phone usage and movement: a case study on Pokémon GO. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Conference on Human-Computer Interaction with Mobile Devices and Services, MobileHCI 2017, Vienna, Austria, September 4-7, 2017*, Matt Jones, Manfred Tscheligi, Yvonne Rogers, and Roderick Murray-Smith (Eds.). ACM, 102:1–102:8. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3098279.3122145>
- [16] Apple. 2022. About privacy and Location Services in iOS and iPadOS. Retrieved May 18, 2022 from <https://support.apple.com/en-gb/HT203033>
- [17] James P. Bagrow, Dashun Wang, and Albert-László Barabási. 2011. Collective response of human populations to large-scale emergencies. *CoRR abs/1106.0560* (2011). arXiv:1106.0560 <http://arxiv.org/abs/1106.0560>
- [18] Michael Bailey, David Dittrich, Erin Kenneally, and Douglas Maughan. 2012. The Menlo Report. *IEEE Secur. Priv.* 10, 2 (2012), 71–75. <https://doi.org/10.1109/MSP.2012.52>
- [19] Vian Bakir, Jonathan Cable, Lina Dencik, Arne Hintz, and Andrew McStay. 2015. Public feeling on privacy, security and surveillance. (2015).
- [20] Magdalena Balazinska and Paul C. Castro. 2003. Characterizing Mobility and Network Usage in a Corporate Wireless Local-Area Network. In *Proceedings of the First International Conference on Mobile Systems, Applications, and Services, MobiSys 2003, San Francisco, CA, USA, May 5-8, 2003*, Daniel P. Siewiorek, Mary Baker, and Robert T. Morris (Eds.). USENIX, 303–316. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1066116.1066127>
- [21] Michael Barbaro and Tom Zeller Jr. 2006. A Face Is Exposed for AOL Searcher No. 4417749. Retrieved May 18, 2022 from <https://www.nytimes.com/2006/08/09/technology/09aol.html>
- [22] Hugo Barbosa, Marc Barthelemy, Gourab Ghoshal, Charlotte R. James, Maxime Lenormand, Thomas Louail, Ronaldo Menezes, José J. Ramasco, Filippo Simini, and Marcello Tomasini. 2018. Human mobility: Models and applications. *Physics Reports* 734 (2018), 1–74. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physrep.2018.01.001> Human mobility: Models and applications.
- [23] Hugo Barbosa, Fernando Buarque de Lima Neto, Alexandre G. Evsukoff, and Ronaldo Menezes. 2015. The effect of recency to human mobility. *EPJ Data Sci.* 4, 1 (2015), 21. <https://doi.org/10.1140/epjds/s13688-015-0059-8>
- [24] BBC News. 2017. Yahoo 2013 data breach hit 'all three billion accounts'. Retrieved May 18, 2022 from <https://www.bbc.com/news/business-41493494>
- [25] Richard A. Becker, Ramón Cáceres, Karrie J. Hanson, Sibren Isaacman, Ji Meng Loh, Margaret Martonosi, James Rowland, Simon Urbanek, Alexander Varshavsky, and Chris Volinsky. 2013. Human mobility characterization from cellular network data. *Commun. ACM* 56, 1 (2013), 74–82. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2398356.2398375>
- [26] Richard A. Becker, Ramón Cáceres, Karrie J. Hanson, Ji Meng Loh, Simon Urbanek, Alexander Varshavsky, and Chris Volinsky. 2011. A Tale of One City: Using Cellular Network Data for Urban Planning. *IEEE Pervasive Comput.* 10, 4 (2011), 18–26. <https://doi.org/10.1109/MPRV.2011.44>
- [27] Sourav Bhattacharya, Santi Phithakkitnukoon, Petteri Nurmi, Arto Klami, Marco Veloso, and Carlos Bento. 2013. Gaussian process-based predictive modeling for bus ridership. In *The 2013 ACM International Joint Conference on Pervasive and Ubiquitous Computing, UbiComp '13, Zurich, Switzerland, September 8-12, 2013 - Adjunct Publication*, Friedemann Mattern, Silvia Santini, John F. Canny, Marc Langheinrich, and Jun Rekimoto (Eds.). ACM, 1189–1198. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2494091.2497349>
- [28] Elettra Bietti. 2020. From ethics washing to ethics bashing: A view on tech ethics from within moral philosophy. In *Proceedings of the 2020 conference on fairness, accountability, and transparency*. 210–219.
- [29] Vincent D. Blondel, Adeline Decuyper, and Gautier Krings. 2015. A survey of results on mobile phone datasets analysis. *EPJ Data Science* 4, 1 (2015), 1–55. <https://doi.org/10.1140/epjds/s13688-015-0046-0> arXiv:1502.03406

- [30] Joshua E Blumenstock. 2012. Inferring patterns of internal migration from mobile phone call records: evidence from Rwanda. *Information Technology for Development* 18, 2 (2012), 107–125.
- [31] Juan-José Boté and Miquel Termens. 2019. Reusing Data Technical and Ethical Challenges. *DESIDOC Journal of Library and Information Technology* 39, 06 (dec 2019), 329–337. <https://doi.org/10.14429/djlit.39.06.14807>
- [32] Patricia Callejo, Marco Gramaglia, Rubén Cuevas, and Ángel Cuevas. 2022. A deep dive into the accuracy of IP Geolocation Databases and its impact on online advertising. *IEEE Transactions on Mobile Computing* (2022), 1–1. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TMC.2022.3166785>
- [33] Jin Cao, Sining Chen, W. Sean Kennedy, Nicolas Kim, and Lisa Zhang. 2017. Extracting mobile user behavioral similarity via cell-level location trace. In *2017 IEEE Conference on Computer Communications Workshops, INFOCOM Workshops, Atlanta, GA, USA, May 1-4, 2017*. IEEE, 378–383. <https://doi.org/10.1109/INFCOMW.2017.8116406>
- [34] Paul Y. Cao, Gang Li, Adam C. Champion, Dong Xuan, Steve Romig, and Wei Zhao. 2017. On human mobility predictability via WLAN logs. In *2017 IEEE Conference on Computer Communications, INFOCOM 2017, Atlanta, GA, USA, May 1-4, 2017*. IEEE, 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1109/INFOCOM.2017.8057234>
- [35] Augustin Chaintreau, Pan Hui, Jon Crowcroft, Christophe Diot, Richard Gass, and James Scott. 2007. Impact of Human Mobility on Opportunistic Forwarding Algorithms. *IEEE Trans. Mob. Comput.* 6, 6 (2007), 606–620. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TMC.2007.1060>
- [36] Guangshuo Chen, Sahar Hoteit, Aline Carneiro Viana, Marco Fiore, and Carlos Sarraute. 2018. Enriching sparse mobility information in Call Detail Records. *Comput. Commun.* 122 (2018), 44–58. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.comcom.2018.03.012>
- [37] Rui Chen, Benjamin CM Fung, Bipin C Desai, and Néria M Sossou. 2012. Differentially private transit data publication: a case study on the montreal transportation system. In *Proceedings of the 18th ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining*, 213–221.
- [38] Zhiyuan Cheng, James Caverlee, Kyumin Lee, and Daniel Z. Sui. 2011. Exploring Millions of Footprints in Location Sharing Services. In *Proceedings of the Fifth International Conference on Weblogs and Social Media, Barcelona, Catalonia, Spain, July 17-21, 2011*, Lada A. Adamic, Ricardo Baeza-Yates, and Scott Counts (Eds.). The AAAI Press. <http://www.aaai.org/ocs/index.php/ICWSM/ICWSM11/paper/view/2783>
- [39] Francisco Chinchilla, Mark Lindsey, and Maria Papadopouli. 2004. Analysis of wireless information locality and association patterns in a campus. In *Proceedings IEEE INFOCOM 2004, The 23rd Annual Joint Conference of the IEEE Computer and Communications Societies, Hong Kong, China, March 7-11, 2004*. IEEE, 906–917. <https://doi.org/10.1109/INFCOM.2004.1356978>
- [40] Eunjoon Cho, Seth A. Myers, and Jure Leskovec. 2011. Friendship and mobility: user movement in location-based social networks. In *Proceedings of the 17th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining, San Diego, CA, USA, August 21-24, 2011*, Chid Apté, Joydeep Ghosh, and Padhraic Smyth (Eds.). ACM, 1082–1090. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2020408.2020579>
- [41] Seungeun Chung, Inyoung Hwang, Jiyoun Lim, and Hyun Tae Jeong. 2019. Finding Points-of-Interest (PoIs) from Life-logging and Location Trace Data. In *2019 International Conference on Information and Communication Technology Convergence (ICTC)*. 1300–1303. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICTC46691.2019.8940021>
- [42] David J. Crandall, Lars Backstrom, Dan Cosley, Siddharth Suri, Daniel P. Huttenlocher, and Jon M. Kleinberg. 2010. Inferring social ties from geographic coincidences. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* 107, 52 (2010), 22436–22441. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1006155107>
- [43] David J. Crandall, Lars Backstrom, Daniel P. Huttenlocher, and Jon M. Kleinberg. 2009. Mapping the world’s photos. In *Proceedings of the 18th International Conference on World Wide Web, WWW 2009, Madrid, Spain, April 20-24, 2009*, Juan Quemada, Gonzalo León, Yoëlle S. Maarek, and Wolfgang Nejdl (Eds.). ACM, 761–770. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1526709.1526812>
- [44] Justin Cranshaw, Eran Toch, Jason I. Hong, Aniket Kittur, and Norman M. Sadeh. 2010. Bridging the gap between physical location and online social networks. In *UbiComp 2010: Ubiquitous Computing, 12th International Conference, UbiComp 2010, Copenhagen, Denmark, September 26-29, 2010, Proceedings (ACM International Conference Proceeding Series)*, Jakob E. Bardram, Marc Langheinrich, Khai N. Truong, and Paddy Nixon (Eds.). ACM, 119–128. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1864349.1864380>
- [45] Balázs Csanád Csáji, Arnaud Browet, Vincent A. Traag, Jean-Charles Delvenne, Etienne Huens, Paul Van Dooren, Zbigniew Smoreda, and Vincent D. Blondel. 2012. Exploring the Mobility of Mobile Phone Users. *CoRR* abs/1211.6014 (2012). arXiv:1211.6014 <http://arxiv.org/abs/1211.6014>
- [46] Yves Alexandre De Montjoye, César A. Hidalgo, Michel Verleysen, and Vincent D. Blondel. 2013. Unique in the Crowd: The privacy bounds of human mobility. *Scientific Reports* 3 (2013), 1–5. <https://doi.org/10.1038/srep01376>
- [47] Nurullah Demir, Matteo Große-Kampmann, Tobias Urban, Christian Wressnegger, Thorsten Holz, and Norbert Pohlmann. 2022. Reproducibility and Replicability of Web Measurement Studies. In *Proceedings of the ACM Web Conference 2022*, Vol. 1. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 533–544. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3485447.3512214>
- [48] Education Department of Health and Welfare. 1979. *The Belmont Report: Ethical Principles and Guidelines for the Protection of Human Subjects of Research*. <https://www.hhs.gov/ohrp/regulations-and-policy/belmont-report/read-the-belmont-report/index.html>
- [49] Pierre Deville, Catherine Linard, Samuel Martin, Marius Gilbert, Forrest R Stevens, Andrea E Gaughan, Vincent D Blondel, and Andrew J Tatem. 2014. Dynamic population mapping using mobile phone data. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 111, 45 (2014), 15888–15893.
- [50] Pierre Deville, Chaoming Song, Nathan Eagle, Vincent D. Blondel, Albert-László Barabási, and Dashun Wang. 2016. Scaling identity connects human mobility and social interactions. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 113, 26 (2016), 7047–7052. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1525443113> arXiv:<https://www.pnas.org/doi/pdf/10.1073/pnas.1525443113>
- [51] Riccardo Di Clemente, Miguel Luengo-Oroz, Matias Travizano, Sharon Xu, Babu Vaitla, and Marta C González. 2018. Sequences of purchases in credit card data reveal lifestyles in urban populations. *Nature communications* 9, 1 (2018), 1–8.
- [52] Sven Dietrich, Jeroen van der Ham, Aiko Pras, Roland van Rijswijk-Deij, Darren Shou, Anna Sperotto, Aimee van Wynsberghe, and Lenore D. Zuck. 2014. Ethics in Data Sharing: Developing a Model for Best Practice. In *35. IEEE Security and Privacy Workshops, SPW 2014, San Jose, CA, USA, May 17-18, 2014*. IEEE Computer Society, 5–9. <https://doi.org/10.1109/SPW.2014.43>
- [53] David Dittrich et al. 2012. The Menlo Report: Ethical Principles Guiding Information and Communication Technology Research. *US DHS* (2012).
- [54] Trinh Minh Tri Do and Daniel Gatica-Perez. 2012. Contextual conditional models for smartphone-based human mobility prediction. In *The 2012 ACM Conference on Ubiquitous Computing, UbiComp ’12, Pittsburgh, PA, USA, September 5-8, 2012*, Anind K. Dey, Hao-Hua Chu, and Gillian R. Hayes (Eds.). ACM, 163–172. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2370216.2370242>

- [55] Matt Duckham and Lars Kulik. 2005. A formal model of obfuscation and negotiation for location privacy. In *International conference on pervasive computing*. Springer, 152–170.
- [56] Zakir Durumeric, Eric Wustrow, and J. Alex Halderman. 2013. ZMap: Fast Internet-Wide Scanning and Its Security Applications. In *Proceedings of the 22nd USENIX Conference on Security (Washington, D.C.) (SEC'13)*. USENIX Association, USA, 605–620.
- [57] Cynthia Dwork. 2008. Differential Privacy: A Survey of Results. In *Theory and Applications of Models of Computation*. Vol. 4978 LNCS. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1–19. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-79228-4\\_1](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-79228-4_1)
- [58] Nathan Eagle, Aaron Clause, and John A. Quinn. 2009. Location Segmentation, Inference and Prediction for Anticipatory Computing. In *Technosocial Predictive Analytics, Papers from the 2009 AAAI Spring Symposium, Technical Report SS-09-09, Stanford, California, USA, March 23-25, 2009*. AAAI, 20–25. <http://www.aaai.org/Library/Symposia/Spring/2009/ss09-09-005.php>
- [59] Nathan Eagle and Alex Pentland. 2006. Reality mining: sensing complex social systems. *Pers. Ubiquitous Comput.* 10, 4 (2006), 255–268. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00779-005-0046-3>
- [60] Zhihan Fang, Fan Zhang, Ling Yin, and Desheng Zhang. 2018. MultiCell: Urban Population Modeling Based on Multiple Cellphone Networks. *Proc. ACM Interact. Mob. Wearable Ubiquitous Technol.* 2, 3 (2018), 106:1–106:25. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3264916>
- [61] Jie Feng, Yong Li, Chao Zhang, Funing Sun, Fanchao Meng, Ang Guo, and Depeng Jin. 2018. DeepMove: Predicting Human Mobility with Attentional Recurrent Networks. In *Proceedings of the 2018 World Wide Web Conference on World Wide Web, WWW 2018, Lyon, France, April 23-27, 2018*, Pierre-Antoine Champin, Fabien Gandon, Mounia Lalmas, and Panagiotis G. Ipeirotis (Eds.). ACM, 1459–1468. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3178876.3186058>
- [62] Marco Fiore, Panagiota Katsikouli, Elli Zavou, Mathieu Cunche, Françoise Fessant, Dominique Le Hello, Ulrich Aivodji, Baptiste Olivier, Tony Quertier, and Razvan Stanica. 2020. Privacy in trajectory micro-data publishing: a survey. *Transactions on Data Privacy* 13 (2020), 91–149.
- [63] Task Force. 2020. Computing Curricula 2020: Paradigms for global computing education. *Assoc. Comput. Mach.(ACM) IEEE Comput. Comput.(IEEE-CS), New York, NY, USA, Rep 10* (2020), 3467967.
- [64] aline shakti franzke, Anja Bechmann, Michael Zimmer, and Charles Ess. 2020. Internet Research: Ethical Guidelines 3.0. *Association of Internet Researchers* (2020).
- [65] Julien Freudiger, Reza Shokri, and Jean-Pierre Hubaux. 2012. Evaluating the Privacy Risk of Location-Based Services. In *Lecture Notes in Computer Science (including subseries Lecture Notes in Artificial Intelligence and Lecture Notes in Bioinformatics)*. Vol. 7035 LNCS. 31–46. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-27576-0\\_3](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-27576-0_3)
- [66] Benjamin CM Fung, Ke Wang, Rui Chen, and Philip S Yu. 2010. Privacy-preserving data publishing: A survey of recent developments. *ACM Computing Surveys (Csur)* 42, 4 (2010), 1–53.
- [67] Laetitia Gauvin, Michele Tizzoni, Simone Piaggese, Andrew Young, Natalia Adler, Stefaan Verhulst, Leo Ferres, and Ciro Cattuto. 2020. Gender gaps in urban mobility. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications* 7, 1 (2020), 1–13.
- [68] GeekFlare. 2022. *11 Best IP Scanner Tools for Network Management*. <https://geekflare.com/network-scanner/>
- [69] John R. Giles, Elisabeth zu Erbach-Schoenberg, Andrew J. Tatem, Lauren Gardner, Ottar N. Bjørnstad, C. J. E. Metcalf, and Amy Wesolowski. 2020. The duration of travel impacts the spatial dynamics of infectious diseases. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 117, 36 (2020), 22572–22579. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1922663117> [arXiv:https://www.pnas.org/doi/pdf/10.1073/pnas.1922663117](https://www.pnas.org/doi/pdf/10.1073/pnas.1922663117)
- [70] Marta C Gonzalez, Cesar A Hidalgo, and Albert-Laszlo Barabasi. 2008. Understanding individual human mobility patterns. *nature* 453, 7196 (2008), 779–782. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature06958>
- [71] Google. 2022. Manage your Android device’s location settings. Retrieved May 18, 2022 from <https://support.google.com/accounts/answer/3467281?hl=en>
- [72] DW Gotterbarn, Bo Brinkman, Catherine Flick, Michael S Kirkpatrick, Keith Miller, Kate Vazansky, and Marty J Wolf. 2018. ACM code of ethics and professional conduct. (2018).
- [73] Matthieu Gouel, Kevin Vermeulen, Robert Beverly, Olivier Fourmaux, and Timur Friedman. 2021. IP Geolocation Database Stability and Implications for Network Research: A Reproducibility Study. In *5th Network Traffic Measurement and Analysis Conference, TMA 2021, Virtual Event, September 14-15, 2021*, Vaibhav Bajpai, Hamed Had-dadi, and Oliver Hohlfeld (Eds.). IFIP. <http://dl.ifip.org/db/conf/tma/tma2021/tma2021-paper2.pdf>
- [74] Mehmet Emre Gursoy, Ling Liu, Stacey Truex, and Lei Yu. 2018. Differentially private and utility preserving publication of trajectory data. *IEEE Transactions on Mobile Computing* 18, 10 (2018), 2315–2329.
- [75] Georg Heiler, Tobias Reisch, Jan Hurt, Mohammad Forghani, Aida Omani, Allan Hanbury, and Farid Karimpour. 2020. Country-wide Mobility Changes Observed Using Mobile Phone Data During COVID-19 Pandemic. In *2020 IEEE International Conference on Big Data (IEEE BigData 2020), Atlanta, GA, USA, December 10-13, 2020*, Xintao Wu, Chris Jermaine, Li Xiong, Xiaohua Hu, Olivera Kotevska, Siyuan Lu, Weijia Xu, Srinivas Aluru, Chengxiang Zhai, Eyhab Al-Masri, Zhiyuan Chen, and Jeff Saltz (Eds.). IEEE, 3123–3132. <https://doi.org/10.1109/BigData50022.2020.9378374>
- [76] Tristan Henderson, David Kotz, and Ilya Abyzov. 2004. The changing usage of a mature campus-wide wireless network. In *Proceedings of the 10th Annual International Conference on Mobile Computing and Networking, MOBICOM 2004, 2004, Philadelphia, PA, USA, September 26 - October 1, 2004*, Zygumnt J. Haas, Samir R. Das, and Ravi Jain (Eds.). ACM, 187–201. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1023720.1023739>
- [77] Desislava Hristova, Matthew J. Williams, Mirco Musolesi, Pietro Panzarasa, and Cecilia Mascolo. 2016. Measuring Urban Social Diversity Using Interconnected Geo-Social Networks. In *Proceedings of the 25th International Conference on World Wide Web, WWW 2016, Montreal, Canada, April 11 - 15, 2016*, Jacqueline Bourdeau, Jim Hendler, Roger Nkambou, Ian Horrocks, and Ben Y. Zhao (Eds.). ACM, 21–30. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2872427.2883065>
- [78] Jie Huang, David Levinson, Jiaoe Wang, Jiangping Zhou, and Zijia Wang. 2018. Tracking job and housing dynamics with smart-card data. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 115, 50 (2018), 12710–12715. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1815928115> [arXiv:https://www.pnas.org/doi/pdf/10.1073/pnas.1815928115](https://www.pnas.org/doi/pdf/10.1073/pnas.1815928115)
- [79] Xiao Huang, Zhenlong Li, Yuqin Jiang, Xinyue Ye, Chengbin Deng, Jiajia Zhang, and Xiaoming Li. 2021. The characteristics of multi-source mobility datasets and how they reveal the luxury nature of social distancing in the US during the COVID-19 pandemic. *International Journal of Digital Earth* 14, 4 (2021), 424–442.
- [80] Pan Hui, Augustin Chaintreau, James Scott, Richard Gass, Jon Crowcroft, and Christophe Diot. 2005. Pocket switched networks and human mobility in conference environments. In *Proceedings of the 2005 ACM SIGCOMM Workshop on Delay-Tolerant Networking, WDTN '05, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, USA, August 26, 2005*, Kevin Fall and Srinivasan Keshav (Eds.). ACM, 244–251. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1080139.1080142>
- [81] Ron Hutchins and Ellen W. Zegura. 2002. Measurements from a campus wireless network. In *IEEE International Conference on Communications, ICC 2002, April 28 - May 2, 2002, New York City, NY, USA*.

- IEEE, 3161–3167. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICC.2002.997419>
- [82] Marcello Ienca and Effy Vayena. 2021. Ethical requirements for responsible research with hacked data. *Nature Machine Intelligence* 3, 9 (2021), 744–748.
- [83] Sibren Isaacman, Richard A. Becker, Ramón Cáceres, Stephen G. Kobourov, Margaret Martonosi, James Rowland, and Alexander Varshavsky. 2011. Ranges of human mobility in Los Angeles and New York. In *Ninth Annual IEEE International Conference on Pervasive Computing and Communications, PerCom 2011, 21-25 March 2011, Seattle, WA, USA, Workshop Proceedings*. IEEE Computer Society, 88–93. <https://doi.org/10.1109/PERCOMW.2011.5766977>
- [84] Olle Järvi, Ago Tominga, Kerli Müürisepp, and Siiri Silm. 2021. The impact of COVID-19 on daily lives of transnational people based on smartphone data: Estonians in Finland. *J. Locat. Based Serv.* 15, 3 (2021), 169–197. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17489725.2021.1887526>
- [85] Bjørn Sand Jensen, Jakob Eg Larsen, Kristian Jensen, Jan Larsen, and Lars Kai Hansen. 2010. Estimating human predictability from mobile sensor data. In *2010 IEEE International Workshop on Machine Learning for Signal Processing*. 196–201. <https://doi.org/10.1109/MLSP.2010.5588997>
- [86] Shan Jiang, Joseph Ferreira Jr., and Marta C. González. 2017. Activity-Based Human Mobility Patterns Inferred from Mobile Phone Data: A Case Study of Singapore. *IEEE Trans. Big Data* 3, 2 (2017), 208–219. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TBDDATA.2016.2631141>
- [87] Shan Jiang, Yingxiang Yang, Siddharth Gupta, Daniele Veneziano, Shounak Athavale, and Marta C. González. 2016. The TimeGeo modeling framework for urban mobility without travel surveys. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 113, 37 (2016), E5370–E5378. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1524261113> arXiv:<https://www.pnas.org/doi/pdf/10.1073/pnas.1524261113>
- [88] Raja Jurdak, Kun Zhao, Jiajun Liu, Maurice AbouJaoude, Mark Cameron, and David Newth. 2015. Understanding human mobility from Twitter. *PLoS ONE* 10, 7 (2015), 35. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0131469> arXiv:arXiv:1412.2154v2
- [89] Chaogui Kang, Xiujun Ma, Daoqin Tong, and Yu Liu. 2012. Intra-urban human mobility patterns: An urban morphology perspective. *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications* 391, 4 (2012), 1702–1717. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physa.2011.11.005>
- [90] David Kotz and Kobby Essien. 2005. Analysis of a Campus-Wide Wireless Network. *Wirel. Networks* 11, 1-2 (2005), 115–133. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11276-004-4750-0>
- [91] David Kotz and Tristan Henderson. 2005. Crawdad: A community resource for archiving wireless data at dartmouth. *IEEE Pervasive Computing* 4, 4 (2005), 12–14.
- [92] Moritz UG Kraemer, Adam Sadilek, Qian Zhang, Nahema A Marchal, Gaurav Tuli, Emily L Cohn, Yulin Hswen, T Alex Perkins, David L Smith, Robert C Reiner, et al. 2020. Mapping global variation in human mobility. *Nature Human Behaviour* 4, 8 (2020), 800–810.
- [93] Stuart Kurkowski, Tracy Camp, and Michael Colagrosso. 2005. MANET simulation studies: The Incredibles. *ACM SIGMOBILE Mobile Computing and Communications Review* 9, 4 (oct 2005), 50–61. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1096166.1096174>
- [94] Kevin Lai, Mema Roussopoulos, Diane Tang, Xinhua Zhao, and Mary Baker. 1998. Experiences with a Mobile Testbed. In *Worldwide Computing and Its Applications, International Conference, WWCA '98, Second International Conference, Tsukuba, Japan, March 4-5, 1998, Proceedings (Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Vol. 1368)*, Yoshifumi Masunaga, Takuya Katayama, and Michiharu Tsukamoto (Eds.). Springer, 222–237. [https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-64216-1\\_51](https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-64216-1_51)
- [95] Neal Lathia and Licia Capra. 2011. How smart is your smartcard?: measuring travel behaviours, perceptions, and incentives. In *UbiComp 2011: Ubiquitous Computing, 13th International Conference, UbiComp 2011, Beijing, China, September 17-21, 2011, Proceedings*, James A. Landay, Yuanchun Shi, Donald J. Patterson, Yvonne Rogers, and Xing Xie (Eds.). ACM, 291–300. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2030112.2030152>
- [96] Neal Lathia, Daniele Quercia, and Jon Crowcroft. 2012. The Hidden Image of the City: Sensing Community Well-Being from Urban Mobility. In *Pervasive Computing - 10th International Conference, Pervasive 2012, Newcastle, UK, June 18-22, 2012. Proceedings (Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Vol. 7319)*, Judy Kay, Paul Lukowicz, Hideyuki Tokuda, Patrick Olivier, and Antonio Krüger (Eds.). Springer, 91–98. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-31205-2\\_6](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-31205-2_6)
- [97] Maxime Lenormand, Bruno Gonçalves, Antonia Tugores, and José J Ramasco. 2015. Human diffusion and city influence. *Journal of The Royal Society Interface* 12, 109 (2015), 20150473.
- [98] Shan Lu, Jichang Zhao, and Huiwen Wang. 2022. Academic failures and co-location social networks in campus. *EPJ Data Science* 11, 1 (2022). <https://doi.org/10.1140/epjds/s13688-022-00322-0>
- [99] Xin Lu, Linus Bengtsson, and Petter Holme. 2012. Predictability of population displacement after the 2010 Haiti earthquake. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 109, 29 (2012), 11576–11581.
- [100] Xin Lu, Erik Wetter, Nita Bharti, Andrew J Tatem, and Linus Bengtsson. 2013. Approaching the limit of predictability in human mobility. *Scientific reports* 3, 1 (2013), 1–9.
- [101] Massimiliano Luca, Gianni Barlacchi, Bruno Lepri, and Luca Papalardo. 2021. A Survey on Deep Learning for Human Mobility. *ACM Comput. Surv.* 55, 1, Article 7 (nov 2021), 44 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3485125>
- [102] Shaojun Luo, Flaviano Morone, Carlos Sarraute, Matias Travizano, and Hernán A Makse. 2017. Inferring personal economic status from social network location. *Nature Communications* 8, 1 (2017), 1–7.
- [103] Andra Lutu, Diego Perino, Marcelo Bagnulo, Enrique Frias-Martinez, and Javad Khangosstar. 2020. A Characterization of the COVID-19 Pandemic Impact on a Mobile Network Operator Traffic. In *IMC '20: ACM Internet Measurement Conference, Virtual Event, USA, October 27-29, 2020*. ACM, 19–33. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3419394.3423655>
- [104] Ashwin Machanavajjhala, Daniel Kifer, Johannes Gehrke, and Muthuramakrishnan Venkitasubramaniam. 2007. l-diversity: Privacy beyond k-anonymity. *ACM Transactions on Knowledge Discovery from Data (TKDD)* 1, 1 (2007), 3–es.
- [105] Marvin McNett and Geoffrey M. Voelker. 2005. Access and mobility of wireless PDA users. *ACM SIGMOBILE Mob. Comput. Commun. Rev.* 9, 2 (2005), 40–55. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1072989.1072995>
- [106] Saeed Moghaddam and Ahmed Helmy. 2011. Multidimensional modeling and analysis of wireless users online activity and mobility: a neural-networks map approach. In *Proceedings of the 14th International Symposium on Modeling Analysis and Simulation of Wireless and Mobile Systems, MSWiM 2011, Miami, Florida, USA, October 31 - November 4, 2011*, Ahmed Helmy, Björn Landfeldt, and Luciano Bononi (Eds.). ACM, 401–408. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2068897.2068965>
- [107] Anastasios Noulas, Salvatore Scellato, Renaud Lambiotte, Massimiliano Pontil, and Cecilia Mascolo. 2011. A tale of many cities: universal patterns in human urban mobility. *CoRR abs/1108.5355* (2011). arXiv:1108.5355 <http://arxiv.org/abs/1108.5355>
- [108] State of California Department of Justice. 2018. California Consumer Privacy Act (CCPA). Retrieved May 18, 2022 from <https://oag.ca.gov/privacy/ccpa>
- [109] Association of Computing Machinery (ACM). 2021. *ACM Publications Policy on Research Involving Human Participants and Subjects*. <https://www.acm.org/publications/policies/research-involving-human-participants-and-subjects>
- [110] Eduardo Mucelli Rezende Oliveira, Aline Carneiro Viana, Carlos Sarraute, Jorge Brea, and J. Ignacio Alvarez-Hamelin. 2016. On the regularity of human mobility. *Pervasive Mob. Comput.* 33 (2016),



- 73–90. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pmcj.2016.04.005>
- [111] Luca Pappalardo, Leo Ferres, Manuel Sacasa, Ciro Cattuto, and Loreto Bravo. 2021. Evaluation of home detection algorithms on mobile phone data using individual-level ground truth. *EPJ Data Sci.* 10, 1 (2021), 29. <https://doi.org/10.1140/epjds/s13688-021-00284-9>
- [112] Luca Pappalardo, Filippo Simini, Salvatore Rinzivillo, Dino Pedreschi, Fosca Giannotti, and Albert-László Barabási. 2015. Returners and explorers dichotomy in human mobility. *Nature communications* 6, 1 (2015), 1–8.
- [113] Craig Partridge and Mark Allman. 2016. Ethical considerations in network measurement papers. *Commun. ACM* 59, 10 (2016), 58–64. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2896816>
- [114] Santi Phithakkitnukoon, Francesco Calabrese, Zbigniew Smoreda, and Carlo Ratti. 2011. Out of Sight Out of Mind-How Our Mobile Social Network Changes during Migration. In *PASSAT/SocialCom 2011, Privacy, Security, Risk and Trust (PASSAT), 2011 IEEE Third International Conference on and 2011 IEEE Third International Conference on Social Computing (SocialCom), Boston, MA, USA, 9-11 Oct., 2011*. IEEE Computer Society, 515–520. <https://doi.org/10.1109/PASSAT/SocialCom.2011.11>
- [115] Santi Phithakkitnukoon, Teerayut Horanont, Giusy Di Lorenzo, Ryosuke Shibasaki, and Carlo Ratti. 2010. Activity-Aware Map: Identifying Human Daily Activity Pattern Using Mobile Phone Data. In *Human Behavior Understanding, First International Workshop, HBU 2010, Istanbul, Turkey, August 22, 2010. Proceedings (Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Vol. 6219)*, Albert Ali Salah, Theo Gevers, Nicu Sebe, and Alessandro Vinciarelli (Eds.). Springer, 14–25. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-14715-9\\_3](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-14715-9_3)
- [116] Santi Phithakkitnukoon and Carlo Ratti. 2011. Inferring asymmetry of inhabitant flow using call detail records. (2011).
- [117] Nicolas B. Ponieman, Alejo Salles, and Carlos Sarraute. 2013. Human mobility and predictability enriched by social phenomena information. In *Advances in Social Networks Analysis and Mining 2013, ASONAM '13, Niagara, ON, Canada - August 25 - 29, 2013*, Jon G. Rokne and Christos Faloutsos (Eds.). ACM, 1331–1336. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2492517.2500236>
- [118] Kangjie Lu Qiusi Wu. 2021. *Retraction – On the Feasibility of Stealthily Introducing Vulnerabilities in Open-Source Software via Hypocrite Commits*. <https://www-users.cse.umn.edu/~kjl/papers/withdrawal-letter.pdf>
- [119] Daniele Quercia, Neal Lathia, Francesco Calabrese, Giusy Di Lorenzo, and Jon Crowcroft. 2010. Recommending Social Events from Mobile Phone Location Data. In *ICDM 2010, The 10th IEEE International Conference on Data Mining, Sydney, Australia, 14-17 December 2010*, Geoffrey I. Webb, Bing Liu, Chengqi Zhang, Dimitrios Gunopulos, and Xindong Wu (Eds.). IEEE Computer Society, 971–976. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICDM.2010.152>
- [120] Gyan Ranjan, Hui Zang, Zhi-Li Zhang, and Jean Bolot. 2012. Are call detail records biased for sampling human mobility? *ACM SIGMOBILE Mob. Comput. Commun. Rev.* 16, 3 (2012), 33–44. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2412096.2412101>
- [121] Injong Rhee, Minsu Shin, Seongik Hong, Kyunghan Lee, and Song Chong. 2008. On the Levy-Walk Nature of Human Mobility. In *INFOCOM 2008. 27th IEEE International Conference on Computer Communications, Joint Conference of the IEEE Computer and Communications Societies, 13-18 April 2008, Phoenix, AZ, USA*. IEEE, 924–932. <https://doi.org/10.1109/INFOCOM.2008.145>
- [122] Luca Rossi, James Walker, and Mirco Musolesi. 2015. Spatio-temporal techniques for user identification by means of GPS mobility data. *EPJ Data Science* 4, 1 (2015), 11.
- [123] Adam Sadilek, Henry Kautz, and Jeffrey P. Bigham. 2012. Finding your friends and following them to where you are. *WSDM 2012 - Proceedings of the 5th ACM International Conference on Web Search and Data Mining* (2012), 723–732. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2124295.2124380>
- [124] Adam Sadilek and John Krumm. 2012. Far Out: Predicting Long-Term Human Mobility. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Sixth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, July 22-26, 2012, Toronto, Ontario, Canada*, Jörg Hoffmann and Bart Selman (Eds.). AAAI Press. <http://www.aaai.org/ocs/index.php/AAAI/AAAI12/paper/view/4845>
- [125] Amin Sadri, Flora D. Salim, Yongli Ren, Wei Shao, John Krumm, and Cecilia Mascolo. 2018. What Will You Do for the Rest of the Day?: An Approach to Continuous Trajectory Prediction. *Proc. ACM Interact. Mob. Wearable Ubiquitous Technol.* 2, 4 (2018), 186:1–186:26. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3287064>
- [126] Julián Salas, David Megías, Vicenç Torra, Marina Toger, Joel Dahne, and Raazesh Sainudiin. 2020. Swapping trajectories with a sufficient sanitizer. *Pattern Recognition Letters* 131 (2020), 474–480.
- [127] Jeffrey S Saltz, Neil I Dewar, and Robert Heckman. 2018. Key concepts for a data science ethics curriculum. In *Proceedings of the 49th ACM technical symposium on computer science education*. 952–957.
- [128] Salvatore Scellato and Cecilia Mascolo. 2011. Measuring user activity on an online location-based social network. In *2011 IEEE Conference on Computer Communications Workshops (INFOCOM WKSHPS)*. 918–923. <https://doi.org/10.1109/INFOCOMW.2011.5928943>
- [129] D. Schwab and R. Bunt. 2004. Characterising the use of a campus wireless network. In *IEEE INFOCOM 2004, Vol. 2. 862–870 vol.2*. <https://doi.org/10.1109/INFOCOM.2004.1356974>
- [130] searchids. 2006. Search-ID. Retrieved May 18, 2022 from <http://searchids.com/>
- [131] Yohei Shida, Hideki Takayasu, Shlomo Havlin, and Misako Takayasu. 2021. Universal scaling of human flow remain unchanged during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Appl. Netw. Sci.* 6, 1 (2021), 75. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41109-021-00416-0>
- [132] Reza Shokri, George Theodorakopoulos, Carmela Troncoso, Jean-Pierre Hubaux, and Jean-Yves Le Boudec. 2012. Protecting location privacy. In *Proceedings of the 2012 ACM conference on Computer and communications security - CCS '12*. ACM Press, New York, New York, USA, 617. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2382196.2382261>
- [133] Filippo Simini, Marta C González, Amos Maritan, and Albert-László Barabási. 2012. A universal model for mobility and migration patterns. *Nature* 484, 7392 (2012), 96–100.
- [134] The Royal Society. 2017. Data governance: public engagement review. *British Academy* (2017).
- [135] Chaoming Song, Tal Koren, Pu Wang, and Albert-László Barabási. 2010. Modelling the scaling properties of human mobility. *Nature physics* 6, 10 (2010), 818–823.
- [136] C. Song, Z. Qu, N. Blumm, and A.-L. Barabasi. 2010. Limits of Predictability in Human Mobility. *Science* 327, 5968 (2010), 1018–1021. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1177170> arXiv:0307014 [cond-mat]
- [137] Xuan Song, Quanshi Zhang, Yoshihide Sekimoto, Teerayut Horanont, Satoshi Ueyama, and Ryosuke Shibasaki. 2013. Modeling and probabilistic reasoning of population evacuation during large-scale disaster. In *The 19th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining, KDD 2013, Chicago, IL, USA, August 11-14, 2013*, Inderjit S. Dhillon, Yehuda Koren, Rayid Ghani, Ted E. Senator, Paul Bradley, Rajesh Parekh, Jingrui He, Robert L. Grossman, and Ramasamy Uthrusamy (Eds.). ACM, 1231–1239. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2487575.2488189>
- [138] Yi Song, Daniel Dahlmeier, and Stéphane Bressan. 2014. Not So Unique in the Crowd: a Simple and Effective Algorithm for Anonymizing Location Data. In *Proceeding of the 1st International Workshop on Privacy-Preserving IR: When Information Retrieval Meets Privacy and*

- Security co-located with 37th Annual International ACM SIGIR conference, PIR@SIGIR 2014, Gold Coast, Australia, July 11, 2014 (CEUR Workshop Proceedings, Vol. 1225)*, Luo Si and Hui Yang (Eds.). CEUR-WS.org, 19–24. [http://ceur-ws.org/Vol-1225/pir2014\\_submission\\_11.pdf](http://ceur-ws.org/Vol-1225/pir2014_submission_11.pdf)
- [139] Mudhakar Srivatsa and Mike Hicks. 2012. Deanonimizing mobility traces. In *Proceedings of the 2012 ACM conference on Computer and communications security - CCS '12*. ACM Press, New York, New York, USA, 628. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2382196.2382262>
- [140] Arkadiusz Stopczynski, Vedran Sekara, Piotr Sapiezynski, Andrea Cuttone, Mette My Madsen, Jakob Eg Larsen, and Sune Lehmann. 2014. Measuring large-scale social networks with high resolution. *PLoS ONE* 9, 4 (2014). <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0095978> arXiv:1401.7233
- [141] Lijun Sun, Kay W Axhausen, Der-Horng Lee, and Manuel Cebrian. 2014. Efficient detection of contagious outbreaks in massive metropolitan encounter networks. *Scientific reports* 4, 1 (2014), 1–6.
- [142] Lijun Sun, Kay W. Axhausen, Der-Horng Lee, and Xianfeng Huang. 2013. Understanding metropolitan patterns of daily encounters. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 110, 34 (2013), 13774–13779. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1306440110> arXiv:<https://www.pnas.org/doi/pdf/10.1073/pnas.1306440110>
- [143] Latanya Sweeney. 2002. k-anonymity: A model for protecting privacy. *International Journal of Uncertainty, Fuzziness and Knowledge-Based Systems* 10, 05 (2002), 557–570. <https://doi.org/10.1142/S0218488502001648>
- [144] Diane Tang and Mary Baker. 1999. Analysis of a Metropolitan-Area Wireless Network. In *MOBICOM '99, The Fifth Annual ACM/IEEE International Conference on Mobile Computing and Networking, Seattle, Washington, USA, August 15-19, 1999*, Harel Kodesh, Victor Bahl, Tomasz Imielinski, and Martha Steenstrup (Eds.). ACM, 13–23. <https://doi.org/10.1145/313451.313460>
- [145] Diane Tang and Mary Baker. 2000. Analysis of a local-area wireless network. In *MOBICOM 2000, Proceedings of the sixth annual international conference on Mobile computing and networking, Boston, MA, USA, August 6-11, 2000*, Raymond L. Pickholtz, Sajal K. Das, Ramón Cáceres, and J. J. Garcia-Luna-Aceves (Eds.). ACM, 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1145/345910.345912>
- [146] Jinjun Tang, Fang Liu, Yinhai Wang, and Hua Wang. 2015. Uncovering urban human mobility from large scale taxi GPS data. *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications* 438 (2015), 140–153. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physa.2015.06.032>
- [147] Andrew J Tatem, Youliang Qiu, David L Smith, Oliver Sabot, Abdullah S Ali, and Bruno Moonen. 2009. The use of mobile phone data for the estimation of the travel patterns and imported Plasmodium falciparum rates among Zanzibar residents. *Malaria journal* 8, 1 (2009), 1–12.
- [148] Douglas do Couto Teixeira, Aline Carneiro Viana, Mário S. Alvim, and Jussara M. Almeida. 2019. Deciphering Predictability Limits in Human Mobility (*SIGSPATIAL '19*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 52–61. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3347146.3359093>
- [149] Manolis Terrovitis and Nikos Mamoulis. 2008. Privacy preservation in the publication of trajectories. In *The Ninth international conference on mobile data management (mdm 2008)*. IEEE, 65–72.
- [150] Suttipong Thajchayapong and Jon M. Peha. 2003. Mobility patterns in microcellular wireless networks. In *2003 IEEE Wireless Communications and Networking, WCNC 2003, New Orleans, LA, USA, 16-20 March, 2003*. IEEE, 1963–1968. <https://doi.org/10.1109/WCNC.2003.1200688>
- [151] Kanchana Thilakarathna, Suranga Seneviratne, Kamal Gupta, Mohamed Ali Kâafar, and Aruna Seneviratne. 2017. A deep dive into location-based communities in social discovery networks. *Comput. Commun.* 100 (2017), 78–90. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.comcom.2016.11.008>
- [152] Daniel R. Thomas, Sergio Pastrana, Alice Hutchings, Richard Clayton, and Alastair R. Beresford. 2017. Ethical issues in research using datasets of illicit origin. *Proceedings of the ACM SIGCOMM Internet Measurement Conference, IMC (2017)*, 445–462.
- [153] Etienne Thuillier, Laurent Moalic, Sid Lamrous, and Alexandre Caminada. 2018. Clustering Weekly Patterns of Human Mobility Through Mobile Phone Data. *IEEE Trans. Mob. Comput.* 17, 4 (2018), 817–830. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TMC.2017.2742953>
- [154] The New York Times. 2020. How the Virus Got Out. Retrieved May 18, 2022 from <https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2020/03/22/world/coronavirus-spread.html>
- [155] Jameson L Toole, Carlos Herrera-Yaqui, Christian M Schneider, and Marta C González. 2015. Coupling human mobility and social ties. *Journal of The Royal Society Interface* 12, 105 (2015), 20141128.
- [156] Wellcome Trust. 2013. Summary report of qualitative research into public attitudes to personal data and linking personal data.
- [157] Kota Tsubouchi, Tomoki Saito, and Masamichi Shimosaka. 2019. Context-Based Markov Model toward Spatio-Temporal Prediction with Realistic Dataset (*PredictGIS'19*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 24–32. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3356995.3364534>
- [158] Cristian Tuduce and Thomas R. Gross. 2005. A mobility model based on WLAN traces and its validation. In *INFOCOM 2005. 24th Annual Joint Conference of the IEEE Computer and Communications Societies, 13-17 March 2005, Miami, FL, USA*. IEEE, 664–674. <https://doi.org/10.1109/INFCOM.2005.1497932>
- [159] Jeroen van der Ham. 2017. Ethics and Internet Measurements. In *2017 IEEE Security and Privacy Workshops, SP Workshops 2017, San Jose, CA, USA, May 25, 2017*. IEEE Computer Society, 247–251. <https://doi.org/10.1109/SPW.2017.17>
- [160] Sudip Vhaduri and Christian Poellabauer. 2016. Cooperative Discovery of Personal Places from Location Traces. In *25th International Conference on Computer Communication and Networks, ICCCN 2016, Waikoloa, HI, USA, August 1-4, 2016*. IEEE, 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICCCN.2016.7568500>
- [161] Sudip Vhaduri, Christian Poellabauer, Aaron Striegel, Omar Lizardo, and David Hachen. 2017. Discovering places of interest using sensor data from smartphones and wearables. In *2017 IEEE SmartWorld, Ubiquitous Intelligence & Computing, Advanced & Trusted Computed, Scalable Computing & Communications, Cloud & Big Data Computing, Internet of People and Smart City Innovation, SmartWorld/SCALCOM/UIC/ATC/CBDCom/IOPI/SCI 2017, San Francisco, CA, USA, August 4-8, 2017*. IEEE, 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1109/UIC-ATC.2017.8397495>
- [162] Long H. Vu, Phuong Nguyen, Klara Nahrstedt, and Björn Richerzhagen. 2015. Characterizing and modeling people movement from mobile phone sensing traces. *Pervasive Mob. Comput.* 17 (2015), 220–235. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pmcj.2014.12.001>
- [163] Dashun Wang and Chaoming Song. 2015. Impact of human mobility on social networks. *J. Commun. Networks* 17, 2 (2015), 100–109. <https://doi.org/10.1109/JCN.2015.000023>
- [164] Huangdong Wang, Chen Gao, Yong Li, Gang Wang, Depeng Jin, and Jingbo Sun. 2018. De-anonymization of Mobility Trajectories: Dissecting the Gaps between Theory and Practice. In *Proceedings 2018 Network and Distributed System Security Symposium*, Vol. 20. Internet Society, Reston, VA, 796–815. <https://doi.org/10.14722/ndss.2018.23211>
- [165] Huangdong Wang, Yong Li, Sihan Zeng, Gang Wang, Pengyu Zhang, Pan Hui, and Depeng Jin. 2019. Modeling Spatio-Temporal App Usage for a Large User Population. *Proc. ACM Interact. Mob. Wearable Ubiquitous Technol.* 3, 1 (2019), 27:1–27:23. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3314414>

- [166] Qi Wang, Nolan Edward Phillips, Mario L. Small, and Robert J. Sampson. 2018. Urban mobility and neighborhood isolation in America's 50 largest cities. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 115, 30 (2018), 7735–7740. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1802537115> arXiv:<https://www.pnas.org/doi/pdf/10.1073/pnas.1802537115>
- [167] Rui Wang, Fanglin Chen, Zhenyu Chen, Tianxing Li, Gabriella M. Harari, Stefanie Tignor, Xia Zhou, Dror Ben-Zeev, and Andrew T. Campbell. 2014. StudentLife: assessing mental health, academic performance and behavioral trends of college students using smartphones. In *The 2014 ACM Conference on Ubiquitous Computing, UbiComp '14, Seattle, WA, USA, September 13-17, 2014*, A. J. Brush, Adrian Friday, Julie A. Kientz, James Scott, and Junehwa Song (Eds.). ACM, 3–14. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2632048.2632054>
- [168] Xu Wang, Zimu Zhou, Fu Xiao, Kai Xing, Zheng Yang, Yunhao Liu, and Chunyi Peng. 2019. Spatio-Temporal Analysis and Prediction of Cellular Traffic in Metropolis. *IEEE Trans. Mob. Comput.* 18, 9 (2019), 2190–2202. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TMC.2018.2870135>
- [169] Amy Wesolowski, Nathan Eagle, Andrew J Tatem, David L Smith, Abdisalan M Noor, Robert W Snow, and Caroline O Buckee. 2012. Quantifying the impact of human mobility on malaria. *Science* 338, 6104 (2012), 267–270.
- [170] Robert West, Ryen W. White, and Eric Horvitz. 2013. Here and there: goals, activities, and predictions about location from geotagged queries. In *The 36th International ACM SIGIR conference on research and development in Information Retrieval, SIGIR '13, Dublin, Ireland - July 28 - August 01, 2013*, Gareth J. F. Jones, Paraic Sheridan, Diane Kelly, Maarten de Rijke, and Tetsuya Sakai (Eds.). ACM, 817–820. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2484028.2484125>
- [171] Matthew J. Williams, Roger M. Whitaker, and Stuart M. Allen. 2012. Measuring Individual Regularity in Human Visiting Patterns. In *2012 International Conference on Privacy, Security, Risk and Trust, PASSAT 2012, and 2012 International Conference on Social Computing, SocialCom 2012, Amsterdam, Netherlands, September 3-5, 2012*. IEEE Computer Society, 117–122. <https://doi.org/10.1109/SocialCom-PASSAT.2012.93>
- [172] Brian M Wood, Jacob A Harris, David A Raichlen, Herman Pontzer, Katherine Sayre, Amelia Sancilio, Colette Berbesque, Alyssa N Crittenden, Audax Mabulla, Richard McElreath, et al. 2021. Gendered movement ecology and landscape use in Hadza hunter-gatherers. *Nature human behaviour* 5, 4 (2021), 436–446.
- [173] Fengli Xu, Zhen Tu, Yong Li, Pengyu Zhang, Xiaoming Fu, and Depeng Jin. 2017. Trajectory Recovery From Ash: User Privacy Is NOT Preserved in Aggregated Mobility Data. In *Proceedings of the 26th International Conference on World Wide Web, WWW 2017, Perth, Australia, April 3-7, 2017*, Rick Barrett, Rick Cummings, Eugene Agichtein, and Evgeniy Gabrilovich (Eds.). ACM, 1241–1250. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3038912.3052620>
- [174] Yang Xu, Alexander Belyi, Iva Bojic, and Carlo Ratti. 2018. Human mobility and socioeconomic status: Analysis of Singapore and Boston. *Comput. Environ. Urban Syst.* 72 (2018), 51–67. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compenvurbsys.2018.04.001>
- [175] Takahiro Yabe, Kota Tsubouchi, Naoya Fujiwara, Takayuki Wada, Yoshihide Sekimoto, and Satish V Ukkusuri. 2020. Non-compulsory measures sufficiently reduced human mobility in Tokyo during the COVID-19 epidemic. *Scientific reports* 10, 1 (2020), 1–9.
- [176] Takahiro Yabe, Kota Tsubouchi, Yoshihide Sekimoto, and Satish V. Ukkusuri. 2022. Early warning of COVID-19 hotspots using human mobility and web search query data. *Comput. Environ. Urban Syst.* 92 (2022), 101747. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compenvurbsys.2021.101747>
- [177] Takahiro Yabe, Kota Tsubouchi, Yoshihide Sekimoto, and Satish V. Ukkusuri. 2022. Early warning of COVID-19 hotspots using human mobility and web search query data. *Comput. Environ. Urban Syst.* 92 (2022), 101747. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compenvurbsys.2021.101747>
- [178] Jane Yakowitz. 2011. Tragedy of the data commons. *Harv. J. L. & Tech.* 25 (2011), 1.
- [179] Nicholas Jing Yuan, Yingzi Wang, Fuzheng Zhang, Xing Xie, and Guangzhong Sun. 2013. Reconstructing Individual Mobility from Smart Card Transactions: A Space Alignment Approach. In *2013 IEEE 13th International Conference on Data Mining, Dallas, TX, USA, December 7-10, 2013*, Hui Xiong, George Karypis, Bhavani M. Thuraisingham, Diane J. Cook, and Xindong Wu (Eds.). IEEE Computer Society, 877–886. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICDM.2013.37>
- [180] Sihan Zeng, Huandong Wang, Yong Li, and Depeng Jin. 2017. Predictability and Prediction of Human Mobility Based on Application-Collected Location Data. In *14th IEEE International Conference on Mobile Ad Hoc and Sensor Systems, MASS 2017, Orlando, FL, USA, October 22-25, 2017*. IEEE Computer Society, 28–36. <https://doi.org/10.1109/MASS.2017.32>
- [181] Desheng Zhang, Jun Huang, Ye Li, Fan Zhang, Cheng-Zhong Xu, and Tian He. 2014. Exploring human mobility with multi-source data at extremely large metropolitan scales. In *The 20th Annual International Conference on Mobile Computing and Networking, MobiCom '14, Maui, HI, USA, September 7-11, 2014*, Sung-Ju Lee, Ashutosh Sabharwal, and Prasun Sinha (Eds.). ACM, 201–212. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2639108.2639116>