

Hausdorff Distance-Based Record Linkage for Improved Matching of Households and Individuals in Different Databases

Thais Pacheco Menezes¹, Thomas Brendan Murphy^{1,2,3,4,*}, and Michael Fop^{1,*}

¹School of Mathematics and Statistics, University College Dublin

²Insight Centre for Data Analytics, University College Dublin

³Institut d'Études Avancées, Université de Lyon

⁴ERIC, Université de Lyon

*Thomas Brendan Murphy and Michael Fop have contributed equally to this work
Corresponding author:thais.pachecomenezes@ucdconnect.ie

Abstract

Matching households and individuals across different databases poses challenges due to the lack of unique identifiers, typographical errors, and changes in attributes over time. Record linkage tools play a crucial role in overcoming these difficulties. This paper presents a multi-step record linkage procedure that incorporates household information to enhance the entity-matching process across multiple databases. Our approach utilizes the Hausdorff distance to estimate the probability of a match between households in multiple files. Subsequently, probabilities of matching individuals within these households are computed using a logistic regression model based on attribute-level distances. These estimated probabilities are then employed in a linear programming optimization framework to infer one-to-one matches between individuals. To assess the efficacy of our method, we apply it to link data from the Italian Survey of Household Income and Wealth across different years. Through internal and external validation procedures, the proposed method is shown to provide a significant enhancement in the quality of the individual matching process, thanks to the incorporation of household information. A comparison with a standard record linkage approach based on direct matching of individuals, which neglects household information, underscores the advantages of accounting for such information.

Keywords: Hausdorff distance; Household information; Linear programming; Matching databases; Record linkage

1 Introduction

Record linkage is the process of matching information from different sources that are believed to be related to the same entity (Herzog et al., 2007). Due to the digitization of census and survey-based data collection approaches, the application of record linkage methods to match entries across different databases is a field of growing interest, which enables the investigation of changes in population, demographic patterns, and family transitions over time (Ruggles et al., 2018; Abramitzky et al., 2020, 2021; Helgertz et al., 2022). The challenges regarding this task are related to the fact that the matching procedure is often based on information reported by the entity in the study, a process highly subject to typographical errors, inconsistencies, and changes over time (Abramitzky et al., 2021). Furthermore, errors in the data may appear as a consequence of how the survey was designed (Biancotti et al., 2008).

Concerning general record linkage methodology, a large body of work has been produced. One of the most famous approaches is the Fellegi-Sunter model (Fellegi and Sunter, 1969), which is widely used (e.g. Sadinle and Fienberg, 2013), and has also been recently implemented in conjunction with a linear programming framework (Moretti et al., 2019). Bayesian extensions of the Fellegi-Sunter

model and other approaches for record linkage have also been proposed in recent years (e.g. Steorts et al., 2016; Sadinle, 2017; Tancredi and Liseo, 2011; Fortini et al., 2001). Other approaches consider graph matching methods: Papadakis et al. (2022), for example, compares the performance of multiple bipartite graph matching algorithms.

One of the motivations behind our novel contribution derives from the fact that most of the widely used record linkage methods are focused solely on matching individuals, ignoring any available grouping information, such as household membership. The incorporation of such information in the linkage process has not been extensively explored. Frisoli and Nugent (2018) investigate the effect of including household information when matching records, comparing the results of record linkage procedures with and without such information. The model proposed by Fu et al. (2014) uses a graph matching framework which is shown to improve linkage accuracy when including the complete household structure in the matching process. Another work that considers household information is the one of Fu et al. (2011), where the main idea is to use the household membership to clean and link the data in a way that records containing errors and variations can be corrected, reducing the number of wrongly matched entities. Record linkage with grouping information is also explored by On et al. (2007), who propose a metric to measure similarity between groups that allows eliminating sets unlikely to be matching, enabling to focus the matching of entities in those groups having high similarity. Following this theme of including household information when matching entities, we define a general multi-step record linkage procedure that allows the incorporation of household information to improve the process of matching records across different databases. The methodology is developed and illustrated in application to record linkage of the Bank of Italy Survey of Household Income and Wealth (SHIW) databases (Bank of Italy, 2022).

An important step in matching databases is the quantification of the dissimilarity or similarity between pairs of records. Different metrics are employed to measure the dissimilarity between records, which are normally computed on the variables the entities are matched upon. According to the nature of these variables (text, numerical, categorical, etc.), different metrics can be used (Cohen et al., 2003; Herzog et al., 2007; Sayers et al., 2015). For example, for string variables, the Jaro-Winkler metric (Winkler, 1990) is the most commonly used. If the variables to be compared are categories chosen by the respondent, the comparison can be directly done so that the dissimilarity would be zero if the entities belong to the same category or one otherwise. When entities are grouped according to some structure, the standard distance metrics employed for record linkage need to be modified, as in this situation it is required to measure the dissimilarity between sets of individuals (see Eiter and Mannila, 1997, for a comprehensive overview of distance measures between two sets of points). In our proposed methodology, the membership to a given household is incorporated in the matching process, and to quantify the dissimilarity of two households across databases, we propose the use of the Hausdorff distance (Hausdorff, 1914). The Hausdorff distances between households are computed on the individual-level reported information and employed in a model used to predict the probability of a match between households. Subsequently, the matching of individuals is implemented by leveraging the information about the matched households and using a supervised learning method in combination with a linear programming optimization procedure. The use of the Hausdorff distance to incorporate household information is shown to be beneficial to the quality of the record linkage process.

The paper is organized as follows: Section 2 describes the motivating Bank of Italy SHIW data; Section 3 presents the Hausdorff distance and the approach used to measure the dissimilarity between records, also introducing the supervised learning models employed to estimate matching probabilities between households and individuals within households; Section 5 presents and discusses the results of the process of matching households and individuals for the SHIW databases; Section 6 concludes the paper with a discussion about limitations and potential developments.

2 Data: Italian Survey of Household Income and Wealth

The Bank of Italy has been conducting the Italian Survey of Household Income and Wealth (SHIW) since 1960 to collect information about the incomes and savings of Italians. Over the years, the survey has been extended to include information about wealth, financial behaviour, and other general economic aspects. The study uses a sample drawn in two stages, with municipalities and households as the primary and secondary sampling units, respectively. The sample represents the population officially resident in Italy, not accounting for people living in institutions (convents, hospitals, prisons, etc.) or those who are in the country illegally. The size of the sample has gradually increased reaching about 8000 households. In order to guarantee comparability across years, since 1989, part of the sample comprises households that were interviewed in the previous study. In this way, about 50% of the households are present in consecutive surveys.

Data from the surveys are published approximately every two years on the Bank of Italy website (Bank of Italy, 2022). The published microdata do not contain any information that could lead indirectly to the identification of the respondent, and, at the moment, they are available for download since 1989 in different formats. Additional material, containing the questionnaire and data description, is also provided.

Due to the nature of the survey procedure, the true match status between households is available via the unique identifier assigned to each household the first time it was included in the study and retained for all future inclusions. For individuals, their matching status can be validated due to the presence of individual IDs in prior surveys. These will enable the assessment of the matching performance of the proposed method in a supervised manner. An important point to highlight is that only matches between individuals who remained in the same household can be detected since an individual’s ID is solely associated with their household. This constraint emerges from the data collection procedure, as transitioning to a new household, like through marriage, necessitates the creation of a new individual ID, thus erasing any previous linkage.

The record linkage framework proposed here is shown in application to the SHIW databases of 2014, 2016, and 2020. The 2014 database includes 19366 individuals spread across 8156 households, whereas the 2016 database consists of 16462 individuals within 7420 households. The 2020 database, on the other hand, comprises 15198 individuals distributed among 6239 households.

The questionnaire used in the survey includes several variables. Table 1 presents the name, the description, and the range of the variables considered in this work. Attention was given to variables conducive to constructing individual profiles, such as sex, year of birth, region of residence, and employment status. These variables offer a comprehensive view of the respondent’s profile, although certain aspects may change over time, posing challenges in the matching process. Financial variables were omitted due to their sensitivity and volatility. In general, the majority of these variables are categorical, typically consisting of fewer than 10 distinct levels. There are, however, a few exceptions: variables such as those indicating the region of birth (NASCREG) and residence (IREG), as well as the variable detailing the sector of activity of the individual’s employer (NACE), exhibit a more extensive range with over 20 levels. Additionally, the variable representing the year of birth (ANASC) is the

Table 1: Description of the variables considered for the matching procedure available in the 2014, 2016, and 2020 Italian survey.

Variable	Description	Range
SEX	Individual’s sex	2 levels
CIT	Indicator if an individual is an Italian citizen or not	2 levels
ANASC	Year of birth	Discrete
STUDIO	Educational qualification	8 levels
NASCREG	Region of birth	21 levels
NACE	Sector of activity of the company where the individual works/worked	22 levels
IREG	Region of residence	20 levels
QUAL	Employment status	7 levels




Figure 1: Barplot for the distribution of the size of the households in the 2014, 2016, and 2020 Italian survey.

only numerical variable in the data, characterized by a discrete range.

The databases include some missing values, generated under a not-missing-at-random mechanism. For the variable NASCREG, recording the region of birth, the absence of an answer is related to individuals not born in Italy. Hence, the missing entry is replaced by an extra category indicating that a subject is not born in Italy. The variable that indicates the sector of activity of the company (NACE) also has missing values, with most cases being individuals with working status corresponding to unemployed or pensioner. Also in this case a new category reflecting this information is created. However, eleven cases in 2016 still include missing information. These cases are missing at random since their working status is specified but no information about their activity sector is available. In practice, this means that, when compared with the other individuals, these eleven cases will be considered to have maximum dissimilarity with other cases for the variable NACE.

Across the 2014 and 2016 datasets, the SHIW data include 3804 matched households and 8660 matched individuals. For the 2016 and 2020 datasets, a total of 2983 household matches and 6434 individual matches are present. In the data, for most matched households, the size of the households across survey years remains the same. Figure 1 presents the barplot illustrating the distribution of household sizes for the years 2014, 2016, and 2020. A comparative analysis reveals a reduction in the count of single-person households within the 2020 survey. The growth in household size is evident in the calculated average household sizes: 2.37 for 2014, 2.22 for 2016, and an increase to 2.44 for 2020. However, it is worth noting that, aside from this shift, the overall distribution of household sizes remains relatively consistent across the three examined years with the majority of households being formed by up to two individuals. Regarding the area of residence, among the matched households across 2014 and 2016, only three changed their region of residence between surveys. This number increases to seven when comparing matched households between 2016 and 2020. These considerations underscore that the household structure tends to remain stable over survey years, and, given that most households are composed of two or more individuals, the inclusion of household information proves to be a valuable factor in the matching process.

It is essential to acknowledge that the SHIW data may be susceptible to errors and inconsistencies across survey years. A study by Biancotti et al. (2008) delves into data quality and measurement errors in the SHIW data, revealing that inconsistencies can arise in responses due to factors like interview duration, the interview process, and the broader survey design. These inconsistencies can pose challenges in identifying matching entities accurately. Thus, incorporating multiple sources of information at both household and individual levels could prove advantageous for enhancing record linkage accuracy.

The subsequent section introduces the record linkage framework, which is exemplified using the SHIW databases of 2014, 2016, and 2020. Our model primarily builds upon the 2014 and 2016 surveys, serving as foundational data for both the training and testing phases. Meanwhile, the 2020 database is exclusively employed in a specific test scenario, as elucidated later.

3 Record Linkage with Household Information

We propose the *household-and-Hausdorff-distance-based record linkage method*, **hhlink**, a two-step record linkage framework that uses the Hausdorff distance as the input to a supervised learning method for matching households between databases. The matched households are then employed as the basis for matching individuals using a combination of supervised learning and linear programming optimization. In this section, we present the main components of **hhlink**. Since the training process employs the 2014 and 2016 databases, we will illustrate the methodology using these survey years.

3.1 Hausdorff Distance Between Households

The Hausdorff distance (Hausdorff, 1914) measures the distance between two sets of points and it states that two sets are close if every point of either set is close to some point of the other one (Eiter and Mannila, 1997).

Consider that the individual i comes from the household \mathcal{H}_s from the set of all households in the 2014 database \mathcal{H}^{2014} , while the individual j is from household \mathcal{H}_t from the set \mathcal{H}^{2016} of all the households in the 2016 survey file. The distance between individuals i and j for a feature k is denoted with d_{ijk} . Consider $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_k, \dots, \beta_K$ a collection of non-negative coefficients. The linear combination of all K feature distances between individuals i and j is defined as

$$d_{ij} = \sum_{k=1}^K \beta_k d_{ijk}.$$

The Hausdorff distance between households \mathcal{H}_s and \mathcal{H}_t is then defined as:

$$\Delta_{st} = \max \left\{ \max_{i \in \mathcal{H}_s} \min_{j \in \mathcal{H}_t} d_{ij}; \max_{j \in \mathcal{H}_t} \min_{i \in \mathcal{H}_s} d_{ij} \right\}. \quad (1)$$

The Hausdorff distance corresponds to the greatest distance from any individual in one household to the most similar individual in the other household. Therefore, two households are considered close and likely to be a match if every individual in a household is close to the individuals in the other household. Consequently, pairs of households with the lowest Hausdorff distance are more likely to include matching individuals. Hence, the identification of similar households will enhance the process of linking individuals. The estimation of the β_k coefficients is implemented via maximum likelihood, as it is explained in Section 3.2.

For categorical variables, the distance d_{ijk} for two individuals is 0 if the individuals belong to the same category and 1 otherwise. For the numeric variable year of birth, the distance is calculated as the absolute difference between the years as $d_{ijk} = |ANASC_i - ANASC_j|/50$, where $ANASC_i$ and $ANASC_j$ are the year of birth of individual i and of individual j respectively; the factor 50 is to scale this distance so that it is close in range to 0 and 1. It is important to highlight that this factor is considered for interpretability only and does not affect the results.

3.2 Household Model

Let y_{st} be the indicator binary variable of matching status between households, taking the value of 1 if households \mathcal{H}_s and \mathcal{H}_t are a match and 0 otherwise. We are interested in determining the probability p_{st} of a match between the households \mathcal{H}_s and \mathcal{H}_t . The household model defines this probability as a logistic function dependent on the Hausdorff distance (1) between households:

$$p_{st} = P(y_{st} = 1 | \Delta_{st}) = \frac{e^{\beta_0 - \Delta_{st}}}{1 + e^{\beta_0 - \Delta_{st}}}, \quad \text{with } \beta_k \geq 0 \text{ for } k = 1, \dots, K, \quad (2)$$

where β_0 is the intercept. Note that the coefficients β_k are in the linear combination in the term Δ_{st} . Grouping all the parameters into the vector $\boldsymbol{\beta} = (\beta_0, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_k, \dots, \beta_K)$ and considering a Bernoulli model, the log-likelihood for two databases is given as follows:

$$\ell(\boldsymbol{\beta}) = \sum_{s=1}^{N^{2014}} \sum_{t=1}^{N^{2016}} \{y_{st} \log p_{st} + (1 - y_{st}) \log(1 - p_{st})\},$$

where N^{2014} and N^{2016} are the total number of households in 2014 and 2016 respectively.

The model is estimated and assessed within a supervised learning framework, hence consider a partition of the available data into a training and a test set. The procedure for dividing the data into training and test sets will be elucidated in Section 4.1. During the training process, the true match status y_{st} between households is known, and the parameter vector $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ is estimated through maximum likelihood:

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} = \arg \max_{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \ell(\boldsymbol{\beta}) = \sum_{s=1}^{N^{2014}} \sum_{t=1}^{N^{2016}} \{y_{st} \log p_{st} + (1 - y_{st}) \log(1 - p_{st})\}, \quad \text{with } \beta_k \geq 0 \text{ for } k = 1, \dots, K.$$

The above optimization is performed using standard box-constrained optimization via L-BFGS-B, as implemented in the R package `optimx` (R Core Team, 2022; Nash and Varadhan, 2011; Nash, 2014; Nash et al., 2022). Since we are dealing with distances, the model should encompass the fact that increasing the distance would cause the probability of a match to decrease. For this purpose, we impose the constraint that the β_k parameters are non-negative ($\beta_k \geq 0$ for $k = 1, \dots, K$). It is important to highlight that this log-likelihood is a complex non-linear function of the $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ parameters throughout the Hausdorff distance Δ_{st} in (1) presented in the calculation of the probability of the household being a match (2).

Upon obtaining the estimated set of parameters $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ we can proceed to calculate the Hausdorff distance between any two households in the test data, using the equation:

$$\hat{\Delta}_{st}^* = \max \left\{ \max_{i \in \mathcal{H}_s^*} \min_{j \in \mathcal{H}_t^*} d_{ij}^*; \max_{j \in \mathcal{H}_t^*} \min_{i \in \mathcal{H}_s^*} d_{ij}^* \right\}.$$

Here, $d_{ij}^* = \sum_{k=1}^K \hat{\beta}_k d_{ijk}^*$ represents the linear combination of the individual's distances in the test data for the K features, taking into account the estimated parameter values $\hat{\beta}_k$. Following the computation of the Hausdorff distance, we can compute the estimated probability of a match between two households using the equation:

$$\hat{p}_{st}^* = P(\hat{y}_{st}^* = 1 | \hat{\Delta}_{st}^*) = \frac{e^{\hat{\beta}_0 - \hat{\Delta}_{st}^*}}{1 + e^{\hat{\beta}_0 - \hat{\Delta}_{st}^*}}.$$

Utilizing these estimated probabilities, we can proceed to estimate the indicator \hat{y}_{st}^* , which denotes whether two households in the test data \mathcal{H}_s^* and \mathcal{H}_t^* are classified as a match. Specifically, \hat{y}_{st}^* is assigned a value of 1 if the estimated probability \hat{p}_{st}^* associated with household \mathcal{H}_t^* is the highest among all possible matches for household \mathcal{H}_s^* and if $\hat{p}_{st}^* \geq \tau$. The threshold τ serves to control the proportion of matched households, enabling to determine that a household in one year does not have a match in the following survey if the highest probability of a match for that household is not sufficiently high. Spanning a range from 1 to 0, τ is defined as the highest value according to which the estimated proportion of matched households in the training data is as close as possible to the true proportion of matching households in the training set. It is essential to highlight that τ is estimated in the training phase and subsequently employed to determine the match status of households in the test data. Moreover, τ being equal to zero would imply that all households in 2014 will be matched with a household in 2016, while a value of one would signify that no households will be matched. In general, a higher value of τ corresponds to a lower proportion of matched households.

3.3 Individual Model

To estimate the probability of a match between individuals in linked households, an individual-level logistic regression model is employed. The model is defined in terms of the linear combination of distances between the individuals to be matched:

$$D_{ij} = \alpha_1 d_{ij1} + \cdots + \alpha_k d_{ijk} + \cdots + \alpha_K d_{ijK},$$

where d_{ijk} are the individual level distances between subjects i and j on variable k . The α_k parameters are the regression coefficients, which weigh the impact of the distance on the probability of a match between two individuals. Similar to the household model, to ensure that when increasing the distance the probability of a match must decrease, the α_k parameters are constrained to be non-negative.

To train this model, only the households in the training data that have a match ($y_{st} = 1$) are considered and all individuals inside these households are paired together. We define a binary variable z_{ij} which takes the value of 1 if individuals i and j are a match. The probability of a match for a pair of individuals from the two matching households, denoted as q_{ij} , is expressed as follows:

$$q_{ij} = P(z_{ij} = 1 | D_{ij}, y_{st} = 1) = \frac{e^{\alpha_0 - D_{ij}}}{1 + e^{\alpha_0 - D_{ij}}}, \quad \text{with } \alpha_k \geq 0 \text{ for } k = 1, \dots, K,$$

where α_0 is the intercept. Defining $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k, \dots, \alpha_K)$ the vector of parameters, the model log-likelihood can be written as

$$\ell(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) = \sum_{s=1}^{N^{2014}} \sum_{t=1}^{N^{2016}} y_{st} \sum_{i=1}^{n^{2014}} \sum_{j=1}^{n^{2016}} \{z_{ij} \log q_{ij} + (1 - z_{ij}) \log(1 - q_{ij})\} I_{i \in \mathcal{H}_s} I_{j \in \mathcal{H}_t},$$

in which the indicator variables $I_{i \in \mathcal{H}_s}$ and $I_{j \in \mathcal{H}_t}$ take the value one if the individuals i and j belong to the households \mathcal{H}_s or \mathcal{H}_t , respectively, and zero otherwise; n^{2014} is the total number of individuals in the database for the year 2014, and n^{2016} is the total number of individuals in the database for the year 2016. The model training involves considering instances of matching individuals within matching households.

The model incorporates a non-negativity constraint on the coefficients. Furthermore, a ridge penalty is considered to correct for quasi-separation (Albert and Anderson, 1984; Heinze, 2006) and to obtain non-divergent and interpretable coefficient estimates. Consequently, to estimate the $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ parameters, we maximize the following penalized log-likelihood:

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} = \arg \max_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} \ell(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) = \sum_{s=1}^{N^{2014}} \sum_{t=1}^{N^{2016}} y_{st} \sum_{i=1}^{n^{2014}} \sum_{j=1}^{n^{2016}} \{z_{ij} \log q_{ij} + (1 - z_{ij}) \log(1 - q_{ij})\} I_{i \in \mathcal{H}_s} I_{j \in \mathcal{H}_t} + \lambda \sum_{k=1}^K \alpha_k^2,$$

subject to $\alpha_k \geq 0$ for $k = 1, \dots, K$.

This penalized log-likelihood is equivalent to a penalized logistic regression model with a response variable corresponding to the matching status of individuals. Hence, the estimation is implemented using the efficient routines available in the R package `glmnet` (Friedman et al., 2010, 2021), which allows the inclusion of the ridge penalty and the non-negativity constraints. Tuning of the penalty hyperparameter λ is performed using the default cross-validation procedure in the package.

With the estimated parameter vector $\hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$, and conditioning upon the fact that the households \mathcal{H}_s^* and \mathcal{H}_t^* in the test data are predicted to be a match, we can estimate the probability of a match between two individuals inside these households, using,

$$\hat{q}_{ij}^* = P(z_{ij}^* = 1 | \hat{D}_{ij}^*, \hat{y}_{st}^* = 1) = \frac{e^{\hat{\alpha}_0 - \hat{D}_{ij}^*}}{1 + e^{\hat{\alpha}_0 - \hat{D}_{ij}^*}},$$

where $\hat{D}_{ij}^* = \hat{\alpha}_1 d_{ij1}^* + \dots + \hat{\alpha}_k d_{ijk}^* + \dots + \hat{\alpha}_K d_{ijK}^*$. This probability quantifies the likelihood of a match between the specific pair of individuals i and j in the test data, based on the estimated model parameters. Subsequently, we use these estimated probabilities, \hat{q}_{ij}^* , within a linear programming framework to compute the estimate \hat{z}_{ij}^* , taking the value of 1 if a match predicted between individuals i and j , and 0 otherwise. The details of the linear programming framework are presented in the following section.

3.4 Linear Programming

The proposed record linkage approach can be seen as a linear programming framework where a matrix of weights is assigned to each pair. In this context, the identification of the matches can be performed by maximizing the probability of a match under the constraint that each individual can be matched at most with one other individual. Following Moretti et al. (2019), we propose a similar approach to match individuals within households: the probabilities estimated from the individual-level logistic regression are used in a linear programming optimization framework to enforce one-to-one matches between individuals in the matched households across the databases. Consider two matched households $\mathcal{H}_s, \mathcal{H}_t$ with N_s and N_t individuals to be matched, respectively, and for which the estimated $\hat{y}_{st} = 1$. Let \hat{q}_{ij} denote the estimated probability of a match for the pair of individuals i and j , and let z_{ij} be the binary indicator of whether individual i from household \mathcal{H}_s is a match for individual j from household \mathcal{H}_t to be estimated. The matching problem can be expressed as the following linear programming optimization problem:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{z}_{ij} = \arg \max_{z_{ij}} & \sum_{i=1}^{N_s} \sum_{j=1}^{N_t} \hat{q}_{ij} z_{ij} \\ \text{subject to} & \sum_{i=1}^{N_s} z_{ij} \leq 1 \quad j = 1, \dots, N_t, \\ & \sum_{j=1}^{N_t} z_{ij} \leq 1 \quad i = 1, \dots, N_s, \\ & \sum_{i=1}^{N_s} z_{ij} \hat{q}_{ij} \geq \bar{q} \quad j = 1, \dots, N_t, \\ & \sum_{j=1}^{N_t} z_{ij} \hat{q}_{ij} \geq \bar{q} \quad i = 1, \dots, N_s, \end{aligned}$$

where \bar{q} is the average estimated probability of a match between all the individuals in the matched households, $\bar{q} = \sum_{i,j} q_{ij} / (N_s N_t)$. In practice, the first two constraints indicate that each individual in 2014 can be matched with only up to one other individual in 2016, and vice versa. The last two constraints prevent matches for certain individuals, accounting for potential household changes such as individuals leaving or joining a household in the time between surveys. A pair of individuals within a matched household will not be matched if their probability of a match is below the average probability of a match for all pairs within that household. This criterion ensures that only individuals with a probability exceeding the average are assigned matches, while others remain unlinked.

We note that the same linear programming framework is implemented to estimate the matching status z_{ij}^* of individuals in the test data, using accordingly the corresponding estimated probabilities \hat{q}_{ij}^* and household matching labels \hat{y}_{st}^* .

4 Assessment of the Record Linkage Procedure

The `hhlink` approach proposed in the previous section is a supervised learning framework. Therefore, its performance is evaluated by considering a training and test splitting procedure of the SHIW data. Different metrics are employed for evaluation, and the performance of `hhlink` is compared with that one of a Fellegi-Sunter model employed to link all the individuals directly.

4.1 Training and Test Data

In the training process, the true match status between households and individuals is available and employed to estimate the parameters of the `hhlink` two-step approach. In the testing stage, the estimated models are used to assess the framework’s performance in linking households and individuals. For this purpose, the available SHIW data are partitioned into training and test sets. Due to the structure of the data, the linkage goal, and the data collection process, two distinct methods are explored to split the data. These correspond to *internal* and *external* validation, respectively.

The first approach serves as an essential step in internally validating our methodology. Here, the training set is composed by selecting 60% of matching households and 60% of non-matching households for both 2014 and 2016 databases. Specifically, from the pool of households in 2014 that has a match in 2016, 60% are randomly chosen along with their corresponding matches. Simultaneously, among the households in the 2014 data that do not have a corresponding match in the 2016 database, 60% are randomly chosen to complete the training data for that year. This process is then repeated for the 2016 data, where 60% of the non-matched households from that year are similarly selected to create the corresponding training data. The remaining non-selected households will form the test set. The record linkage approach is subsequently deployed to predict match statuses on both the training and test data. To ensure that the results obtained are not merely the result of favorable training and test data partitions, the procedure is replicated ten times, and the results presented will reflect the model’s average performance across all of these partitions.

The external validation approach involves training the model using the complete data from the 2014 and 2016 surveys and subsequently testing its performance by matching the 2016 database with the 2020 database. This method ensures the absence of data leakage, as none of the information from the 2014 database or the real matching status is employed in the testing phase. Moreover, there is no overlap across databases for training and testing, given that the testing phase includes an entirely new database whose instances are not present at all in the training phase. This validation approach provides a distinct demarcation between the training and testing datasets. Furthermore, by conducting external validation, we can assess the model’s performance when a new survey is released, with the objective of matching the fresh data to the latest available survey.

4.2 Performance Measures

Given that information on actually matching households and individuals is available in the data, standard metrics can be used to assess the proposed record linkage framework’s predictive performance.

The class distribution of matching/non-matching instances is considerably unbalanced due to the nature of the record linkage problem. For this reason, we consider the F_1 score to measure the performance of the models:

$$F_1 = \frac{2(\text{precision} \times \text{recall})}{\text{precision} + \text{recall}} = \frac{2\text{tp}}{2\text{tp} + \text{fp} + \text{fn}},$$

where tp represents true positives, fp stands for false positives, and fn denotes false negatives. Values of this score close to 1 indicate good performance. In the score calculation, precision measures the proportion of correct matches among all matches made, while recall reflects the percentage of correct matches considering the known true match status.

We consider also the false positive (FPR) and false negative (FNR) rates, defined as:

$$\text{FPR} = \frac{\text{fp}}{\text{fp} + \text{tn}}$$

$$\text{FNR} = \frac{\text{fn}}{\text{fn} + \text{tp}}.$$

The FPR measures the proportion of records that were wrongly assigned as matches while the FNR corresponds to the proportion of missed matching instances; lower values in both metrics are preferable.

These metrics will be utilized to evaluate the quality of the record linkage process and to compare the performance of the proposed `hhlink` with a model that matches individuals directly without taking into account household information.

4.3 Method for Comparison

The primary objective of this paper is to demonstrate the enhancement achieved in the individual matching process through the preliminary matching of households. To ascertain the degree of improvement in match quality resulting from the inclusion of household information, we will conduct a comparative analysis against an alternative linking methodology. This evaluation aims to contrast our proposed approach with an alternative method that matches individuals directly.

The considered alternative method implements the Fellegi-Sunter model, estimated using the Expectation-Maximization algorithm as implemented in the `fastLink` R package (Enamorado et al., 2019, 2020); in what follows, we denote with `fastLink` the Fellegi-Sunter model as implemented in the R package.

Given the computationally intensive nature of direct individual matching in `fastLink`, significant computational resources and time are essential prerequisites. This arises from the necessity to check the match possibilities for all potential pairs, a task that can become overwhelmingly large. For example, matching the 2014 and 2016 data would require evaluating an enormous number of pairs, totaling 19366×16462 . To alleviate this computational burden, blocking is applied, a common practice in record linkage scenarios.

Blocking partitions records into exclusive groups, such that only records within the same block are eligible for matching. This approach dramatically reduces the number of pairs that require evaluation (Steorts et al., 2014). We consider blocking on two factors: gender and region of birth, striving to achieve a balance between block size and the total number of blocks. Consequently, only individuals with the same gender and born in the same region are considered potential matches when applying the `fastLink` method.

5 Record Linkage of the SHIW Databases

As outlined in Section 3.2, we evaluate the model’s performance by utilizing the estimated parameters to predict the match status between households \mathcal{H}_t and \mathcal{H}_s in training and test sets. Within each pair of households identified as a match, we assess the classification performance of the individual’s model, as detailed in Section 3.3. In this context, the parameters derived from the logistic regression and the linear programming optimization process enable us to estimate the indicator variable of whether individuals i and j constitute a match.

5.1 Internal Validation

Initially, we present the outcomes obtained when the databases of 2014 and 2016 were randomly divided into training and test data ten times. We note that due to the tenfold repetition of model fitting and testing, we are able to assess not only the variability of the parameter estimates but also the variability in the model’s performance metrics.

Table 2 presents the average estimates of the model coefficients β_k alongside the standard deviation of the estimates considering all splits. The estimates show that the variable accounting for the distance

Table 2: Average estimates of the household model’s parameters. The StDev represents the standard deviation associated with each estimate.

	Intercept	SEX	ANASC	CIT	STUDIO	NACE	NASCREG	IREG	QUAL
Estimate	-0.27	2.82	13.74	0.00	1.63	1.41	3.33	7.98	0.01
StDev	0.06	0.07	0.60	0.00	0.04	0.06	0.07	3.06	0.01

between the years of birth (ANASC) is the one with the largest weight in the calculation of the Hausdorff distance. We highlight that the values for this variable are continuous while all the others are equal to 1 if they are exactly the same for two individuals or 0 otherwise. The variable with the second largest weight is the variable indicating the region of residence of the household (IREG) while the indicator of Italian citizenship (CIT) does not contribute to the distance in the model.

Concerning variability, for the majority of variables, the estimates tend to vary closely around the mean value. The variable IREG exhibits the highest standard deviation, signifying greater variability in the estimations across model replications. Notably, despite the low standard deviation for the employment status variable (QUAL), the combination of a low average estimate suggests a substantial variability in this estimate, with a coefficient of variation of 100%.

Leveraging the available ground truth on matching households, Figure 2 presents quality measures for the household model considering all possible pairs of households. In this scenario, each household in 2014 was paired with all households in the 2016 set. The results indicate a high F_1 Score, driven by high recall and positive predictive values, suggesting that, in general, the model can correctly classify household pairs. Specifically, the average recall of 73% for the training data and 75% for the test data underscores the model’s ability to accurately identify household pairs known to be a match. It is important to note that the high false-negative rate may be attributed to situations where the highest probability of a match was not associated with the true matching household, or the estimated probability of a match fell below the defined threshold τ . In the training data, τ is determined as the value that makes the estimated total number of matches between households approximately equal to the proportion of matches in the training data. Given an average matching proportion of 46.65% in the training data, the estimated value for τ is 0.11 on average. This implies that to achieve around 46% matches between households in the training data, only households with probabilities greater than 0.11 are considered as potential matches. The estimated τ value is then applied to the test data to filter the potential matches in the household model.




Figure 2: Boxplots illustrating performance metrics for household pair match status prediction.




Figure 3: The left plot illustrates the proportion of correctly matched households among those with a match in each data split. The right plot shows the proportion of households accurately identified as not having a match among those without a match.

We also assess the household model’s performance by examining the predictive performance for each household in the 2014 database individually, rather than considering all possible pairs. We examine whether the model correctly matches households that have a match and whether it accurately identifies households without a match for each household in 2014. Figure 3 illustrates, for each data partition, the proportion of correctly matched households (Correct Matches) and the proportion of households correctly classified as not having a match (Correct Non-Matches). The results demonstrate that, among households with a match, approximately 72% to 74% were correctly matched in the training set, expanding to 73% to 76% in the test data. For households without a match, the proportion of correct non-matches is higher, ranging from around 75% to 81% in the training data and 78% to 85% in the test data. These results focused on assessing the model’s performance for each 2014 household in the training and test data underscores the model’s ability to effectively match these households or to accurately identify when they do not have a match.

To gain insights into the estimated probabilities of a match, we assess the rank of these probabilities for each household in 2014 in relation to the corresponding true matches in the 2016 database. For each split, the estimated probabilities of a match between a 2014 household and all 2016 households are ranked in descending order. Accurate model estimates would position the true matching household at the top. Table 3 presents the average percentage of actual matching households occupying the first position in the predicted probabilities, ranked in descending order, for both the training and test sets. The table shows that, on average, approximately 76.74% of the highest probability from the model corresponds to the true match in the training data. For the test data, this value is 79.55%. Moreover, the top three positions correspond, on average, to actually matching pairs in around 85% of the cases for both training and test sets. The results indicate that selecting the top three households with the highest probability of a match will likely include the true match in the selection.

Table 3: Rank of the probability of the correctly matching household. The rank 1 indicates that the highest probability is associated with the 2016 household which is the correct match. Likewise, rank 2 implies that the match had the second-highest probability, and so on.

Rank	Training	Test
1	76.74	79.55
2	4.92	4.19
3	1.76	1.14
4	1.09	0.64
≥ 5	15.49	14.48

Table 4: Average estimates of the individual’s model parameters.

	Intercept	SEX	ANASC	CIT	STUDIO	NACE	NASCREG	IREG	QUAL
Estimate	1.88	2.77	4.44	0.46	1.18	0.46	0.96	0.00	0.58
StDev	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.10	0.02	0.02	0.03	0.00	0.02

After having matched the households, the subsequent phase involves matching individuals within each linked household. Across each of the ten data splits into training and test subsets, conditionally on the matching households, we employ the logistic regression model outlined in Section 3.3 to predict the probability of a match between individuals. Table 4 provides the average parameter estimates for the individual’s model, along with their corresponding standard deviations. The variables associated with year of birth (ANASC) and sex (SEX) are the ones with the largest coefficients in the model, indicating that they contribute the most to the probability of two individuals being a match. The coefficient of the variable related to the region of residence (IREG) is shrunk to zero, in contrast to the household-level model where it had the second largest weight in the Hausdorff distance. This indicates that the region of residence largely contributes to linking two households, but it is no longer relevant when matching individuals within a pair of matched households. Regarding the variability of the estimates, the conclusion is similar to the one observed in the household model: most of the estimates do not vary too much around the mean.

Given the estimated matched households and the fitted individual-level logistic regression model, the probabilities from the logistic regression are employed in an optimization framework, as explained in Section 3.4. When assessing the individual’s model performance, we highlight that the results account only for the pair of individuals inside matched households.

As detailed in Section 4.3, we compare our proposed **hhlink**, which incorporates household information, with the **fastLink** method, which directly matches individuals. For each training and testing split, we compute performance metrics to assess the model’s ability to correctly classify pairs as matches or non-matches. Figure 4 illustrates the boxplots of these performance measures for the test sets.

As we examine the model’s performance on the unseen test data, **hhlink** demonstrates superior performance across all metrics except for the false positive rate. The lower false positive rate exhibited by **fastLink** can be attributed to its propensity to assign only a limited number of pairs as matches.




Figure 4: Boxplots illustrating performance metrics for individual pair match status prediction on the test data for **fastLink** and **hhlink** methods.

Consequently, it has a reduced chance of making false positive errors, as it predominantly categorizes matches as non-matches, incurring a higher false negative rate. The precision and recall values underscore the advantages of incorporating household information in the matching process. These values are significantly higher for `hhlink` compared to `fastLink`, which directly matches individuals. Specifically, the recall value indicates that `hhlink` correctly identifies approximately 87% of pairs known to match, in contrast to the 62% achieved by `fastLink`.

It is worth highlighting further that the number of pairs of individuals to be examined across databases is quite large, posing some computational burdens, since a large number of matching probabilities need to be estimated. Although blocking techniques can help alleviate this issue to some extent, `fastLink` still demands consideration of more than 3,000,000 potential pairs on the training data and more than 1,500,000 on the test data. In contrast, `hhlink` offers an effective remedy by reducing the number of individual pairs requiring evaluation. Notably, the detection of matching households essentially serves as an additional blocking step. Consequently, one only needs to consider pairs between households that have been identified as matches, significantly reducing the number of pairs to be examined to around 33,000 on the training set and 21,000 on the test data.

Given the substantial volume of pairs for comparison, and the unbalanced nature of the framework in which most of the individual’s pairs are non-matching pairs, good performance measures can also be achieved by a method that assigns most pairs as non-matching, even if the method is not well designed. Additionally, previous results are only accounting for pairs of individuals within matched households. Individuals inside households that were not matched have not been paired with any other individual, making it impossible to assess the model’s ability to correctly classify individual pairs in those cases. Therefore, it is of interest to assess the performance of the record linkage methods at identifying if an individual in the 2014 database has a match in the 2016 database, regardless of the number of total pairs, and if the matched individual in 2016 is correctly identified. In this case, we have two correct outcomes: the model correctly identifies the individual’s match (Correct Matches) or it is able to correctly detect that the individual does not have a match (Correct Non-Matches).

In this regard, Figure 5 presents boxplots illustrating the difference between the percentage of correct matches and correct non-matches identified by our `hhlink` approach in comparison to the `fastLink` method. In this figure, positive values indicate that `hhlink`, incorporating household information, is better at identifying more correct matches or non-matches compared to `fastLink`. Conversely, negative values suggest that `fastLink` performed better. An examination of the results reveals that, on average, `hhlink` exhibits a higher proportion of correctly identified matches in the training data, surpassing the `fastLink` proportion by 10.59 percentage points. In the test data, this average difference is reduced to 4.39 points. Notably, `hhlink` excels in accurately identifying individuals without matches, exhibiting a substantial average improvement of 57.39 points in the training data and




Figure 5: Boxplot displaying the difference in percentages between correctly identified matches and correct non-matches between `hhlink` and `fastLink`. The plot represents the average point-to-point difference between these approaches, with positive values denoting the `hhlink` better performance.

Table 5: Estimates of the household model parameters trained using the 2014 and 2016 survey data.

	Intercept	SEX	ANASC	CIT	STUDIO	NACE	NASCREG	IREG	QUAL
Estimate	-0.69	2.86	14.76	0.00	1.60	1.42	3.35	7.15	0.00

53.32 points in the test data when compared to the `fastLink` approach.

In summary, the results underscore the effectiveness of the `hhlink` method in correctly matching households. Additionally, the benefits of matching households become evident in the subsequent step of matching individuals, with consistently superior performance compared to methods directly matching individuals.

These findings are derived from the split of the survey databases from 2014 and 2016 into various training and test sets. In the following section, we will present the results of a validation involving an external test data set, where the model is trained using complete surveys from 2014 and 2016, and then evaluated by matching the 2016 survey with the 2020 data.

5.2 External Validation

This validation simulates a scenario where a new survey is available and a researcher is asked to match the individuals on this new database with the individuals on the previous survey. In this scenario, we will assess the method performance by using the surveys of 2014 and 2016 to train the method, then test it by matching the 2016 survey with the new 2020 data.

Table 5 provides the parameter estimates for the household model in this scenario. The estimates mirror those obtained in the internal validation, as detailed in Table 2. The variable ANASC (year of birth) is the one with the highest estimated weight in the Hausdorff distance, while CIT (Italian citizenship) and QUAL (employment status) do not contribute to the distance. We note that in this instance the model is trained on the entirety of the 2014 and 2016 survey data, hence no standard deviation is associated with the estimates.

Considering all possible pairs of households to be classified as matches or non-matches, Table 6 presents the performance measure for the household model considering the training (2014-2016) and test (2016-2020) scenario. The household model yields a positive predictive value (PPV) of 68.37% when matching households from the 2014 database with the 2016 database, and a value of 60.19% for matching households between the 2016 and 2020 surveys. These results indicate that, among all pairs classified as matches, the majority corresponds to true matches. Additionally, the high recall values suggest that the model is effective in identifying matching pairs. However, the results show an increase in the false negative rate in the test scenario. This discrepancy can be traced back to the threshold estimation process. The threshold is determined to achieve a proportion of estimated households in the training phase equal to the true percentage (46.64%) of matching households between 2014 and 2016. However, when this threshold is applied to match households in the 2016-2020 pair, which features a notably lower true proportion of matching households (40.20%), the estimated threshold

Table 6: Performance metrics for predicting the match status of household pairs. The 2014-2016 column displays results from the training phase utilizing the entire 2014 and 2016 databases. The 2016-2020 column reports results on the test scenario when matching the 2016 database with the 2020 data.

Metric	2014-2016	2016-2020
F_1 Score	70.30	57.17
FNR	27.66	45.56
FPR	0.002	0.002
PPV	68.37	60.19
Recall	72.34	54.44

Table 7: Ranking of correctly matching households by probability. The first column displays results from the training process using the 2014 and 2016 data, while the second column presents results for matching the 2016 survey with the 2020 data. A rank of 1 signifies that the highest probability corresponds to the correct household match. Similarly, rank 2 indicates the second-highest probability match, and so on.

Rank	2014-2016	2016-2020
1	74.21	64.06
2	5.16	5.49
3	1.97	2.43
4	1.39	2.18
≥ 5	17.26	25.85

may be deemed too high for the more recent surveys. Consequently, this discrepancy contributes to an increase in the false negative rate.

Table 7 provides the rank analysis for the household model. The rank serves as a metric indicating the position of the true match within the household matching process. The results consistently echo the previous findings obtained in the internal validation. In both scenarios, the highest match probability is predominantly associated with the true match in the subsequent survey for the majority of households. In particular, when matching households from 2016 to 2020, in 64.06% of cases the highest probability is associated with the true match. In general, across both scenarios, the true household match tends to fall within the top three highest match probabilities. However, for the 2014 – 2016 case, there are instances (17.36%) where a household’s probability of a match with its true match exceeds rank 4, while for the 2016 – 2020 case, this occurs in 25.85% of cases. As the scenario of training the model on the 2014-2016 databases and matching the 2016 survey to the 2020 data is more challenging, the likelihood of including the actually matching household in the top four positions is reduced.

After the household matching step across databases, the subsequent step involves fitting the individual model given the estimated household match status. Table 8 provides the parameter estimates for the individual model, which is trained using pairs of individuals within the matched households from the 2014 and 2016 surveys. The estimates are in line with those reported in the internal validation, where the model was trained only on random subsets of the 2014 and 2016 databases, as reported in Table 4. Also in this case ANASC and SEX have the largest weights, and IREG does not exert a significant impact in matching individuals. This consistency underscores the robustness of the estimates across different evaluation scenarios.

As elaborated in Section 3.4, following the estimation of the parameters in the individual model, we compute the probability of a match for all the pairs of individuals. Subsequently, leveraging a linear programming framework, we link individuals across databases. We apply `hhlink` to match pairs of individuals across the 2014 and 2016 surveys in the training phase, as well as link individuals between the 2016 and 2020 surveys in the testing phase. We also use the `fastLink` approach to match individuals across the databases for comparison. We remark that, in applying `fastLink`, blocking is employed to mitigate computational workload, as detailed in Section 4.3. The match performance in each of these scenarios is reported in Table 9.

The `hhlink` approach has an F_1 score higher than `fastLink` in both linking the 2014 with the 2016 survey and the 2016 and 2020 database. This indicates that the record linkage of individuals based on matched household information outplays `fastLink` which matches individuals directly. As before, the lower false positive rate (FPR) of `fastLink` is associated with fewer matches being assigned in

Table 8: Estimates of the individual model parameters trained using the data of 2014 and 2016

	Intercept	SEX	ANASC	CIT	STUDIO	NACE	NASCREG	IREG	QUAL
Estimate	1.88	2.77	4.43	0.50	1.17	0.47	0.95	0.00	0.58

Table 9: Comparison of individuals matching quality between **hhlink** and **fastLink**.

	hhlink		fastLink	
	2014-2016	2016-2020	2014-2016	2016-2020
F_1 Score	87.29	82.93	30.37	26.57
FNR	13.25	16.69	57.47	61.88
FPR	5.05	7.44	0.12	0.12
PPV	87.84	82.55	23.62	20.03
Recall	86.75	83.31	42.53	38.12

this method, resulting in a higher false negative rate (FNR). Finally, the precision and recall values reinforce that the inclusion of household information is beneficial to the process of matching individuals since such values for **hhlink** are more than double than those of **fastLink**.

As before, the extensive number of individual pairs across multiple databases presents significant computational challenges, especially when dealing with complete sets of databases from 2014, 2016, and 2020, reaching evaluation of 7,000,000 pairs in the **fastLink**. Such a large volume of pairs can potentially skew performance assessments. Therefore, it’s crucial to assess record linkage methods based on their ability to accurately identify matches in the 2016 database for individuals in 2014, or matches in the 2020 database for individuals in 2016, regardless of the total number of pairs. This evaluation focuses on two outcomes: correctly identifying matches (Correct Matches) and accurately discerning non-matches (Correct Non-Matches). Table 10 provides a comprehensive overview of these performance metrics for the examined record linkage approaches.

The **hhlink** approach consistently outperforms the direct individual linkage approach. When household information is factored in, it results in the detection of 5578 (or 64.41%) of the 8660 actual matches between individuals in the 2014 and 2016 datasets and 2985 (46.39%) of 6434 for the individuals in the 2016 and 2020 datasets. In stark contrast, the **fastLink** approach lags behind with detection of only 3659 (42.25%) and 2420 (37.61%) respectively. It’s crucial to note that the **hhlink** approach can correctly identify more than 90% of the individuals that do not have a match while the percentage is around 30% for the **fastLink** approach. We highlight that the reduced performance when matching the 2016 survey with the 2020 database in the testing phase, in comparison to the internal validation results, may be attributed to the amends done in 2020 in the traditional sampling design to improve the sample representativeness of some population groups, as informed in the Bank of Italy website. The four-year gap between these surveys, instead of the usual two years can also contribute to this. Nonetheless, these findings underscore the significant enhancement achieved by incorporating household information, leading to an increased number and quality of correctly identified matches.

6 Discussion and Conclusions

This work introduced a novel record linkage approach, **hhlink**, contributing to two key aspects. Firstly, it introduces the Hausdorff distance as a valuable metric for effectively measuring the dissimilarity between households during the matching process. Secondly, it underscores the advantages of initi-

Table 10: Number of correctly detected individual matches and non-matches for **hhlink** and **fastLink**.

	hhlink		fastLink	
	2014-2016	2016-2020	2014-2016	2016-2020
Correct Matches	5578 (64.41%)	2985 (46.39%)	3659 (42.25%)	2420 (37.61%)
Correct Non-Matches	10125 (94.57%)	9615 (95.88%)	3103 (28.98%)	3473 (34.63%)

ating the matching process at the household level when linking individual records across databases, ultimately improving data integration and the quality of the matched results.

The proposed **hhlink** approach is a multi-step methodology. The first step employs the Hausdorff distance to estimate the probability of a match between pairs of households, based on linear combinations of distances between individual features. The following step employs logistic regression and linear programming optimization to match individual records within identified matched households.

The **hhlink** method is showcased and evaluated in application to record linkage of the Italian Survey of Household Income and Wealth (SHIW) data, demonstrating the substantial benefits of considering household information when linking individual records across databases. Across internal and external validation frameworks, evaluation metrics consistently indicate superior performance of **hhlink** compared to a method that directly matches individual records without leveraging household information.

A limitation of the proposed approach is in the supervised nature of the method, which requires the availability of labeled data where identifiers of matching households and individuals between databases are needed for training. This opens interesting avenues for future research. Future work will explore extensions to unsupervised learning for record linkage, where grouping information of the instances is available but not identifiers that can be used for matching. Unsupervised extensions of the proposed approach could be particularly useful in matching surveys with a larger time gap.

The proposed approach has been developed in application to record linkage of survey data collected at the household level. However, we remark that the proposed framework holds the potential for record linkage in other databases with grouping and hierarchical structures. The methodology's applicability extends beyond the specific data used, making it a valuable tool for data integration and analysis in various domains where grouping information on the individual records to be linked is available.

Declarations

Funding: This publication has emanated from research conducted with the financial support of Science Foundation Ireland under grant numbers 18/CRT/6049 and 12/RC/2289_P2 and a visiting period at Collegium de Lyon.

Conflicts of interest: The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest.

Ethical Conduct: The manuscript is only submitted to the Journal of Classification. The submitted work is original and is not published elsewhere in any form or language.

Data Availability: The data that support the findings of this study are openly available on the Bank of Italy website (Bank of Italy, 2022).

References

- Abramitzky, R., Boustan, L., Eriksson, K., Feigenbaum, J., and Pérez, S. (2021). Automated linking of historical data. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 59(3):865–918.
- Abramitzky, R., Mill, R., and Pérez, S. (2020). Linking individuals across historical sources: A fully automated approach. *Historical Methods: A Journal of Quantitative and Interdisciplinary History*, 53(2):94–111.
- Albert, A. and Anderson, J. A. (1984). On the existence of maximum likelihood estimates in logistic regression models. *Biometrika*, 71(1):1–10.
- Bank of Italy (2022). Bilanci delle famiglie Italiane. <https://www.bancaditalia.it/statistiche/tematiche/indagini-famiglie-imprese/bilanci-famiglie/documentazione/index.html> (Accessed: 2022-10-11 and 2023-08-03).
- Biancotti, C., D’Alessio, G., and Neri, A. (2008). Measurement error in the Bank of Italy’s Survey of Household Income and Wealth. *Review of Income and Wealth*, 54(3):466–493.
- Cohen, W. W., Ravikumar, P., and Fienberg, S. E. (2003). A comparison of string distance metrics for name-matching tasks. In *Proceedings of the 2003 International Conference on Information Integration on the Web*, pages 73—78. AAAI Press.
- Eiter, T. and Mannila, H. (1997). Distance measures for point sets and their computation. *Acta Informatica*, 34(2):109–133.
- Enamorado, T., Fifield, B., and Imai, K. (2019). Using a probabilistic model to assist merging of large-scale administrative records. *American Political Science Review*, 113(2):353–371.
- Enamorado, T., Fifield, B., and Imai, K. (2020). *fastLink: Fast Probabilistic Record Linkage with Missing Data*. R package version 0.6.0.
- Fellegi, I. P. and Sunter, A. B. (1969). A theory for record linkage. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 64(328):1183–1210.
- Fortini, M., Liseo, B., Nuccitelli, A., and Scanu, M. (2001). On Bayesian record linkage. *Research in Official Statistics*, 4(1):185–198.
- Friedman, J., Hastie, T., and Tibshirani, R. (2010). Regularization paths for generalized linear models via coordinate descent. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 33(1):1–22.
- Friedman, J., Hastie, T., Tibshirani, R., Narasimhan, B., Tay, K., Simon, N., Qian, J., and Yang, J. (2021). *glmnet: Lasso and Elastic-Net Regularized Generalized Linear Models*. R package version 4.1-1.
- Frisoli, K. and Nugent, R. (2018). Exploring the effect of household structure in historical record linkage of early 1900s Ireland census records. In *2018 IEEE International Conference on Data Mining Workshops (ICDMW)*, pages 502–509.
- Fu, Z., Christen, P., and Boot, M. (2011). Automatic cleaning and linking of historical census data using household information. In *2011 IEEE 11th International Conference on Data Mining Workshops*, pages 413–420.
- Fu, Z., Christen, P., and Zhou, J. (2014). A graph matching method for historical census household linkage. In Tseng, V. S., Ho, T. B., Zhou, Z.-H., Chen, A. L. P., and Kao, H.-Y., editors, *Advances in Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, pages 485–496. Springer International Publishing.
- Hausdorff, F. (1914). *Grundzüge der Mengenlehre*. Leipzig, Von Veit.

- Heinze, G. (2006). A comparative investigation of methods for logistic regression with separated or nearly separated data. *Statistics in Medicine*, 25(24):4216–4226.
- Helgertz, J., Price, J., Wellington, J., Thompson, K. J., Ruggles, S., and Fitch, C. A. (2022). A new strategy for linking U.S. historical censuses: A case study for the IPUMS multigenerational longitudinal panel. *Historical Methods: A Journal of Quantitative and Interdisciplinary History*, 55(1):12–29.
- Herzog, T. N., Scheuren, F. J., and Winkler, W. E. (2007). *Data Quality and Record Linkage Techniques*, volume 1. Springer.
- Moretti, D., Valentino, L., and Tuoto, T. (2019). Optimization routines for enforcing one-to-one matches in record linkage problems. *The R Journal*, 11(1):185.
- Nash, J. C. (2014). On best practice optimization methods in R. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 60(2):1–14.
- Nash, J. C. and Varadhan, R. (2011). Unifying optimization algorithms to aid software system users: optimx for R. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 43(9):1–14.
- Nash, J. C., Varadhan, R., and Grothendieck, G. (2022). *optimx: Expanded Replacement and Extension of the ‘optim’ Function*. R package version 2022-4.30.
- On, B.-W., Koudas, N., Lee, D., and Srivastava, D. (2007). Group linkage. In *2007 IEEE 23rd International Conference on Data Engineering*, pages 496–505.
- Papadakis, G., Efthymiou, V., Thanos, E., and Hassanzadeh, O. (2022). Bipartite graph matching algorithms for clean-clean entity resolution: An empirical evaluation. In *Proceedings of the 25th International Conference on Extending Database Technology (EDBT)*, pages 462–474.
- R Core Team (2022). *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria.
- Ruggles, S., Fitch, C. A., and Roberts, E. (2018). Historical census record linkage. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 44(1):19–37.
- Sadinle, M. (2017). Bayesian estimation of bipartite matchings for record linkage. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 112(518):600–612.
- Sadinle, M. and Fienberg, S. E. (2013). A generalized Fellegi–Sunter framework for multiple record linkage with application to homicide record systems. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 108(502):385–397.
- Sayers, A., Ben-Shlomo, Y., Blom, A. W., and Steele, F. (2015). Probabilistic record linkage. *International Journal of Epidemiology*, 45(3):954–964.
- Steorts, R. C., Hall, R., and Fienberg, S. E. (2016). A Bayesian approach to graphical record linkage and deduplication. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 111(516):1660–1672.
- Steorts, R. C., Ventura, S. L., Sadinle, M., and Fienberg, S. E. (2014). A comparison of blocking methods for record linkage. In Domingo-Ferrer, J., editor, *Privacy in Statistical Databases*, pages 253–268. Springer International Publishing.
- Tancredi, A. and Liseo, B. (2011). A hierarchical Bayesian approach to record linkage and population size problems. *The Annals of Applied Statistics*, 5(2B):1553–1585.
- Winkler, W. E. (1990). String comparator metrics and enhanced decision rules in the Fellegi-Sunter model of record linkage. In *Proceedings of the Section on Survey Research Methods*, pages 354–359. American Statistical Association.