
A UNIFIED STATISTICAL AND COMPUTATIONAL FRAMEWORK FOR EX-POST HARMONISATION OF AGGREGATE STATISTICS

A PREPRINT

Cynthia A. Huang 

Department of Econometrics and Business Statistics, Monash University

cynthia.huang@monash.edu

June 21, 2024

ABSTRACT

Ex-post harmonisation is one of many data preprocessing processes used to combine the increasingly vast and diverse sources of data available for research and analysis. Documenting provenance and ensuring the quality of multi-source datasets is vital for ensuring trustworthy scientific research and encouraging reuse of existing harmonisation efforts. However, capturing and communicating statistically relevant properties of harmonised datasets is difficult without a universal standard for describing harmonisation operations. Our paper combines mathematical and computer science perspectives to address this need. The *Crossmaps Framework* defines a new approach for transforming existing variables collected under a specific measurement or classification standard to an imputed counterfactual variable indexed by some target standard. It uses computational graphs to separate intended transformation logic from actual data transformations, and avoid the risk of syntactically valid data manipulation scripts resulting in statistically questionable data. In this paper, we introduce the *Crossmaps Framework* through the example of ex-post harmonisation of aggregated statistics in the social sciences. We define a new provenance task abstraction, the **crossmap transform**, and formalise two associated objects, the **shared mass array** and the **crossmap**. We further define graph, matrix and list encodings of crossmaps and discuss resulting implications for understanding statistical properties of ex-post harmonisation and designing error minimising workflows.

1 Introduction

As the availability of data continues to grow, opportunities for leveraging conceptually related but separately collected data also increase combinatorically. Joint analysis of data collected over multiple years, or multiple jurisdictions under similar but distinct survey instruments is a common and appealing opportunity for research in the social sciences. However, harmonising and integrating existing datasets is a complex process involving many diverse tasks. Preparing an harmonised dataset often requires data access rights, domain expertise, statistical design and data engineering, amongst other skills. Dataset preparation and analysis can span multiple individuals within a team, or even multiple independent parties, due to these diverse requirements. Unfortunately, the lack of standardised formats for documenting multi-source datasets limiting the reusability of data preparation efforts. Idiosyncratic approaches, particularly to the implementation of a harmonisation strategy, can make it difficult to assess the quality and characteristics of harmonised datasets. Details and decisions that could be pivotal to the suitability and robustness of downstream analysis can easily get lost in the long process of wrangling multiple datasets into a single analysis-ready dataset.

The specific details of a harmonisation strategy are often hidden away in custom data wrangling scripts, and only described in general terms as part of the data preparation process. Mapping details are often relegated to footnotes, appendices or supplementary materials, if recorded at all. For example, Humlum (2022) harmonises and integrates

Danish micro-data with occupation codes from the 1988 and 2008 versions of the Statistics Denmark’s Classification of Occupations (DISCO88 and DISCO08) to study interactions between robot adoption and labour market dynamics. In the absence of an officially published DISCO88 to DISCO08 correspondence, Humlum combines multiple published correspondences from both the International Labour Organisation and Statistics Denmark with relations inferred from job code changes in the microdata. Detailed notes on the DISCO88-DISCO08 correspondence created for and used to prepare the analysis data are not included in the main paper or appendix, and can only be found in a separate documentation note on the author’s website (Humlum 2021).

Even when preparation scripts and reproducible workflows are diligently provided, the length of such scripts often increases exponentially with number of data sources and the complexity of harmonising concepts between them. Combined with the idiosyncrasies of different coding languages and data manipulation tools, reproducibility alone is not sufficient to facilitate comprehensive auditing or understanding of an integrated dataset within a reasonable time frame and amount of effort. Identifying, documenting and communicating key data preparation decisions is also a precondition for answering the larger and more interesting question of how the provenance of datasets and preprocessing decisions affects downstream analysis and conclusions.

This paper offers a unified framework for overcoming these limitations and designing workflows and documentation formats that facilitate auditability in addition to reproducibility. The *Crossmaps* framework provides abstract conceptual and formal mathematical tools for the production, documentation and validation of data integration workflows based on examples in the social sciences. Compared to existing data wrangling frameworks, we focus on a much narrower task scope. The example tasks we illustrate specifically involve harmonising numeric data that form a shared aggregate, such as industry-level output statistics or labour force counts by occupation, rather than other similar harmonisation tasks such as recoding categorical variables in individual survey responses.

We proceed by reviewing the process of ex-post harmonisation and briefly review existing attempts to standardise documentation of harmonisation workflows. We then formally define the abstract task of interest, the **crossmap transform**, and the inputs to the operation, **shared mass arrays** and **crossmaps**. Next, we define graph, matrix and tabular encodings of crossmaps and highlight some advantages and utility of each encoding. From these definitions, we discuss statistical and computational insights that arise from the *Crossmaps Framework*. This includes the correspondence between crossmaps and the commonly described mapping cases: one-to-one, one-to-many, many-to-one and many-to-many; as well as how to audit existing datasets and design safeguards for harmonisation workflows. Finally, we discuss future work and opportunities for implementing and extending the insights presented in this paper.

2 Background

2.1 Data Harmonisation

2.1.1 Nomenclature

The transformation and merging of related datasets into a cohesive analysis dataset has various names including *data fusion*, *data integration*, or *data harmonisation*. The diversity in terms likely reflects the appetite for and growing practice of preparing multi-source datasets across the many domains and applications of data science.

We focus specifically on retrospective efforts to harmonise already collected datasets in the social sciences, and follow Kołczyńska (2022) in using the term **ex-post data harmonisation**. Figure 1 illustrates a stylised example of combining two country-specific datasets into a single ex-post harmonised dataset.

2.1.2 Harmonisation Strategies

Existing literature on data harmonisation often focuses on innovations in harmonisation strategy and validity of particular approaches (e.g. Pierce and Schott 2012; Lohr and Raghunathan 2017). However, the ideas in this paper arise from specific efforts to improve the ease and reliability of transforming data using some predefined ex-post harmonisation logic. As such, we do not directly address the design of mappings between statistical classifications. Instead, we focus on abstracting and formalising the data manipulation operations involved in ex-post harmonisation.

Our approach most closely relates to existing frameworks in computer science and statistical programming for specifying and implementing data-wrangling workflows at the domain problem level rather than in lower-level database manipulations. The design of the *Crossmaps Framework* is informed by domain-specific languages and interfaces for interactive discovery and correction of data discrepancies (e.g. Raman and Hellerstein 2000; Kandel, Paepcke, et al. 2011), and Wickham (2014)’s *Tidy Data* principles for data wrangling and analysis in the R language.

2.1.3 Ex-Post Survey Data Harmonisation

The challenges of preparing ex-post harmonised datasets are well documented in the existing literature on survey data harmonisation (Granda, Wolf, and Hadorn 2010; Dubrow and Tomescu-Dubrow 2016; Fortier et al. 2016; Ehling 2003). The difficulty of implementing and documenting ex-post harmonisation increases with the number of data

COLLECT & CLEAN

TRANSFORM

MERGE




Figure 1: Decomposition of an Ex-Post Harmonisation Process for combining two source observations collected using different classifications. The source observation for USA is already in the target classification, represented by the letter index and green shading. However, the observation for AUS, totalling 140 units, was collected in alternative “source” classification, represented by the shape index and blue shading. Thus, in addition to any necessary source specific cleaning steps, the AUS observation also requires a *Crossmap Transform* into the target “green-letter” index.

sources and the complexity of correspondence between the semantically similar but distinct classification standards. The combination of iterative and sequential steps, subjective imputation and mapping choices, as well as technical idiosyncrasies associated with different data storage formats and programming languages or software all contribute to the difficulty of standardising documentation and methods.

In their study of survey data harmonisation efforts, Dubrow and Tomescu-Dubrow (2016), reiterate earlier calls by Granda, Wolf, and Hadorn (2010) for “development of software that standardises the documentation process”. However, existing ex-post harmonisation guidelines predominantly focus on survey design considerations and ensuring the comparability of measures over the specifics of implementation. For instance, Fortier et al. (2016) relegates data processing to being “achieved using algorithms”, followed by separate ad-hoc quality checks and verification of said algorithms. Kołczyńska (2022) attempts to address this gap in specific implementation guidance by proposing the use of annotated lookup tables, also known as crosswalks. In Section 2.3.3, we contextualise their suggestion within the related concepts of schema crosswalks and concordance tables, and illustrate how crossmaps overcome key limitations of crosswalks.

2.2 Data Provenance

This work addresses the role of data provenance and access in broader conversations about computational reproducibility and replicability (e.g. Peng and Hicks 2021). We contribute to existing efforts to documenting the provenance and preprocessing of datasets at different granularities. Tools such as data information cards (e.g. Gebu et al. 2021; Pushkarna, Zaldivar, and Kjartansson 2022), and metadata standards (e.g. Koren et al. 2022) are designed for broad capture of data provenance information. Such tools attempt, as far as possible, to encourage and support the full documentation of dataset genealogy from collection, preprocessing, through to licensing and archival availability. Extending beyond high-level dataset documentation, there exist some attempts to capture and communicate specific preprocessing steps.

Standardised description of specific preprocessing steps is challenging due to the wide variety of possible data alterations. Moreover, as observed by Lucchesi et al. (2022), definitions of data preprocessing vary with audience and context from highly specific lists of tasks, to broadly encompassing boundaries within a longer data pipeline. Existing provenance tools such as (Lucchesi et al. 2022; Kai Xiong et al. 2022; Wang et al. 2022) attempt to achieve generality by comparing dataset snapshots at various points in a preprocessing pipeline. Lucchesi et al. (2022) and Kai Xiong et al. (2022) both trace code execution between snapshots, and attempt to illustrate the data pipeline using glyph representations of function calls. A related approach is visualising step-wise data pipelines as directed-acyclic-graphs (e.g. Landau 2021).

Unfortunately, difference tracing is often not sufficient for capturing the complexities of mapping between classifications. Harmonisation mappings are seldom simple one-to-one functions of data frames, and in many cases input and output data frames cannot uniquely identify the mapping used to produce the output. For example, it should be clear multiple combinations of “blue-shape” index and “green-letter” mappings could result in the transformed data in Figure 1 as one-to-many redistributions can be offset by many-to-one aggregations. The challenge of resolving ambiguity in transformations has been mentioned multiple times in existing work on data wrangling (e.g Wickham 2014), but is often dismissed as uncommon (e.g. Niederer et al. 2018) or impossible (e.g. Kandel, Heer, et al. 2011).

2.3 Existing Workflows and Toolkits

In the absence of specialised software or standard documentation formats, researchers are encouraged to share data preparation scripts. Unfortunately, even when available, custom harmonisation scripts can be difficult to audit or reuse. The specific mappings used are obscured by the idiosyncrasies of the programming language or data wrangling approach.

One approach to overcoming the difficulties of reusing scripts is the development of generic tool for harmonisation tasks such as transformation description and implementation. Tools vary greatly in scope and functionality. Descriptive tools generally involves specifying and documenting harmonisation logic and mappings between taxonomies, whilst workflow helpers aim to assist with implementing the desired harmonisations.

2.3.1 Descriptive Tools

Harmonisation description tools overlap somewhat with generic data provenance tools, but tend to focus documenting harmonisation logic. Examples include Goerlich and Ruiz (2018), which attempts to define a domain specific language for encoding transformations between geographic units; Denk and Froeschl (2004) which offers a formal semantic model describing hierarchical-taxonomic classifications and algebraic transformations between them; and Dang et al. (2015) which offers matrix and graph visualisations of taxonomic alignments, but does not support transformation of datasets.

2.3.2 Domain Specific Toolkits

Domain specific toolkits attempt to provide some combination of descriptive and workflow functionality tailored to commonly used data sources or types. In the social sciences domain, helpers for working with official statistics, census and electoral data are common. For example, *strayr* (Mackey et al. 2023) provides crosswalks and helper functions for transforming data to or from statistical classifications published by Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS), while *countrycode* (Arel-Bundock, Enevoldsen, and Yetman 2018) provides helpers for working with country names and codes.

Domain specific toolkits are clearly preferable over standalone scripts or replication packages for facilitating the reuse of data harmonisation efforts. Such tools often offer more detailed documentation than paper replication packages and have the potential to develop credibility through popular adoption. However, such packages are likely to suffer from at least some of same comprehension issues as bespoke wrangling scripts.

2.3.3 Crosswalks and Lookup Based Approaches

Crosswalks are lookup tables, which encode mappings between two related measures. They consist of at least two columns, one with keys in the source measure and one for the target measure. They can also include columns for annotating the source and target measures with more descriptive labels or other useful information. As shown in Table 1, crosswalk tables structure recoding logic in a format that is both natural for people to read, and can also store metadata such as extended descriptions or notes. Furthermore, as lookup tables, they can be used to transform data without any additional reshaping or row-wise translation into programming commands.

The terminology for crosswalks differs depending on the specific mapping task and domain. For example, crosswalks used to harmonise values in related variables are referred to as *correspondence* or *concordance* tables in economics and official statistics (e.g. Pierce and Schott 2012; Dorner and Harhoff 2018), while Kołczyńska (2022) uses the term *value crosswalks*. Each row in a *correspondence* or *concordance* table encodes link between keys in the equivalent code standards. The term crosswalk can also refer to lookup tables used to collect already compatible variables from different datasets. Such tables are referred to as *Metadata or Schema crosswalks* in database and computing contexts (Khan,

Table 1: Example crosswalk mapping between the two, three and numeric country codes from the 2020 release of the *ISO-3166 International Standard for country codes and codes for their subdivisions*

Country	ISO2	ISO3	ISONumeric
Afghanistan	AF	AFG	004
Albania	AL	ALB	008
Algeria	DZ	DZA	012
American Samoa	AS	ASM	016
Andorra	AD	AND	020

Table 2: Crossmap for recoding and distributing country statistics

from	to	weight
BLX	BEL	0.5
BLX	LUX	0.5
E.GER	DEU	1.0
W.GER	DEU	1.0
AUS	AUS	1.0

Shafi, and Rizvi 2015; Cheney, Chiticariu, and Tan 2007, 430), while Kołczyńska (2022) refers to them as *variable crosswalks*.

Unfortunately, crosswalks only contain enough information to transform aggregate statistics according to unambiguous one-to-one or many-to-one relations between **source** and **target keys**. The two-column structure is unable to support transformations where a single source key is related to multiple targets, otherwise known as one-to-many relations. As such, crosswalk based approaches and tools generally treat one-to-many relations as a special cases. These special cases reintroduce the need for bespoke code, hindering the auditing and reuse of the harmonised dataset and increasing the potential for mistakes.

2.3.4 Assertive Data Validation

A common recommendation for avoiding mistakes in data preparation is adding verification assertions into the preparation pipeline. In R, assertive programming and data validation is supported by packages such as `assertr` Fischetti (2024), `pointblank` Iannone and Vargas (2022) and `validate` van der Loo and de Jonge (2021). As general purpose tools, the design and selection of useful assertions is left up to the data analyst. In the case of simple transformations sensible assertions are relatively straightforward to write. However, designing appropriate checks for more complex correspondences and transformations is non-trivial. For example, it is often useful to check the number of rows in a data table matches expectations after performing a transformation. However, when working with multiple many-to-many transformations, it can be difficult to determine whether the transformed data should have more or less rows than the original dataset as this will depend on whether transformation involves more aggregating or disaggregating relations.

3 Crossmaps Framework

Developing tools for and understanding the statistical implications of Ex-Post Harmonisation procedures is a multi-faceted challenge. As detailed above, solutions for and discussion of these various facets are split across computer science, statistics and domain-specific literatures. To the best of our knowledge, this paper is the first attempt to directly address the description, validation and implementation of ex-post harmonisation in a unified manner.

The *Crossmaps Framework* overcomes the limitations of crosswalks, whilst retaining the benefits of lookup-based approaches, by extend crosswalks to handle one-to-many transformations. The addition of weights to the relation between source and target classifications facilitates a shift from comparison based provenance and script based validation, to direct examination and verification of data inputs and transformation logic via conditions on the crossmap structure. As shown in Table 2, the weights can encode decisions about how numeric values, attached to source keys, such as GDP or other country-level statistics, are redistributed to multiple targets.

Formalisation also offers new ways to examine the statistical properties of ex-post harmonisation. The modularised structure of crossmaps supports standardised specification, implementation and comparison of alternative harmonisations of a single set of source datasets. This standardised workflow can be used to test the robustness of downstream analysis to alternative harmonisation decisions. Furthermore, observing that crossmaps are computational graphs, we can use graph properties to examine and quantify imputation in ex-post harmonisation procedures.

3.1 Ex-Post Harmonisation Task Abstraction

Existing definitions of ex-post harmonisation tend to enumerate requirements in a checklist style format, chronological steps or a mixture of both (Granda and Blasczyk 2016; Fortier et al. 2016; Kołczyńska 2020). For example, Kołczyńska (2020) defines a linear process for ex-post harmonisation as follows: (1) concept definition, (2) data preparation, (3) harmonisation transformation and (4) verification and documentation. We propose a new abstract definition based on Bors et al. (2019)’s provenance task abstraction framework:

1. **Data Collection:** discovering and obtaining datasets containing harmonisable data
2. **Source Specific Cleaning:** identifying and resolving issues specific to a data source and collection method
3. **Crossmap Transforms:** transforming each source dataset into a common measurement standard, including both the design or selection of mappings between source and target keys and the actual data manipulation.
4. **Data Merging:** merging each transformed data into a single analysis-ready dataset.

Our definition is illustrated in Figure 1, and focuses on abstracting high level mapping and transformation tasks, rather than describing the workflow commonly used when producing harmonised datasets. Our definition differs from existing definition in two significant ways.

First, we distinguish source-specific data preparation from harmonisation focused data transformation and merging. Source-specific tasks include missing data imputation and format conversion, as well as variable selection and renaming, and schema matching in preparation for harmonisation. Although downstream harmonisation strategies and analysis plans can inform source-specific preparation, data altered in this stage will generally be suitable for transformation into multiple reasonable target measures and combinations.

Secondly, our definition does not include a separate step for documentation and verification of the harmonised dataset, which should instead be performed at each stage with appropriate tools. As we will see, the crossmap structure can unify verification and documentation into a single mathematical abstraction. Verification of quality indicators, such as the equivalence of numeric totals before and after transformation, will follow from satisfying formal mathematical definitions. Documentation formats, such as tabular summaries or graph visualisations, correspond to alternative representations of the computational graph used to transform the data.

3.2 Crossmap Transforms




Figure 2: Conceptual illustration of the *Crossmaps Framework* using the same harmonisation shown in Figure 1. The example **shared mass array** data inputs and outputs of a **crossmap transform** are shown either side of the **crossmap** input which specifies the mapping between **source** and **target keys**. The equivalent graph, matrix and list encodings of the crossmap are all illustrated.

We refer to the abstract operation of transforming source key-indexed values into values indexed by a set of related target keys as a **crossmap transform**. A crossmap transform operation takes source data and applies transformations according to a weighted relation between the source and target keys and returns data in the target standard or measure. Under the declarative data transformation language framework of Kandel, Paepcke, et al. (2011) and Wickham (2014), a crossmap transform is a high-level action consisting of three lower-level data-wrangling operations: join, map/transform and aggregation. We loosely use *transform*¹ as a noun to denote a single operation, and transformation to refer to a sequence or collection of related transforms.

¹This nomenclature is borrowed from Raman and Hellerstein (2000), but applied at a higher level of abstraction. In the formalism that follows, nomenclature decisions attempt to straddle notation conventions across set theory, statistics, graph theory, linear algebra and databases. However, pragmatics demand deviations from these conventions in several cases.

The data input $A_{[\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{X}]}$ and output $A_{[\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{Y}]}$ of a **crossmap transform** are **shared mass arrays**. The logic encoding input of a crossmap transform is a **crossmap**. Figure 2 illustrates the inputs and output of a crossmap transform, which we proceed to formally define below:

Definition 3.1. A **shared mass array** with index set $\mathcal{K} = \kappa_i : i = 1 \dots K$, is an associative array of K key-value pairs, such that $A_{[\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{X}]} = \{(\kappa_i, x_i) : \kappa_i \in \mathcal{K}, x_i \in \mathbb{R}^+\}$, where $x_i = A(\kappa_i)$ is the positive real value retrievable by the key κ_i and:

- each key κ_i corresponds to part of the conceptual unit defined by the index set \mathcal{K} (e.g. state in a country), and
- the sum $\sum_{i=1}^K x_i$ forms a numeric mass belonging to the same unit (e.g. GDP in each state).

We could also define $A_{[\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{X}]}$ as the function $A : \mathcal{K} \rightarrow \{x\}$, where $\{x\}$ is the set of unique x_i values. However, defining shared mass arrays as associative arrays of key-value pairs more closely aligns with the tabular format by which such data are generally presented and shared.

We refer to the value transforming mapping between the source and target measures as **crossmaps**, and define them as follows:

Definition 3.2. A **crossmap** is a collection $\mathcal{X} = (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{W})$ with elements satisfying the following:

- $\mathcal{S} = \{s_j : j = 1 \dots S\}$ and $\mathcal{T} = \{t_k : k = 1 \dots T\}$ are two sets, referred to as the source and target key sets respectively;
- $\mathcal{R} = \{(s_j, t_k) : s_j \in \mathcal{S} \text{ shares value with } t_k \in \mathcal{T}\} \subseteq \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{T}$ is a binary relation between source and target keys, such that there exists $(s_j, t_k) \in \mathcal{R}$ for all source keys $s_j \in \mathcal{S}$; and
- $\mathcal{W} = \{w_{jk} \in (0, 1] \text{ if } (s_j, t_k) \in \mathcal{R} : \forall j \sum_k w_{jk} = 1\} \subseteq (0, 1]^{S \times T}$, is a set of weights representing the share of value attached to a source key to be distributed to the target key.

Weights will only be fractional in the case of redistribution from a single source key to multiple target key, and must total one across all pairs originating from a given source key. The condition $\mathcal{K} \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ in Definition 3.3 corresponds to a subtle but clear requirement that the crossmap input to a crossmap transform must contain mapping logic for all key-value pairs in the data input. We refer to pairs of shared mass arrays and crossmaps which satisfy this condition as **conformable**. Now that the required inputs and outputs are defined, we proceed with defining the operation of interest:

Definition 3.3. A **crossmap transform** is an operation that applies a *crossmap* $\mathcal{X} = (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{W})$ to a shared mass array $A_{[\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{X}]}$, where $\mathcal{K} \subseteq \mathcal{S}$. The operation redistributes the total numeric mass $\sum_{i=1}^K x_i$ across a target index \mathcal{T} and returns a shared mass array: $A_{[\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{Y}]} = \{(t_k, y_k) : t_k \in \mathcal{T}, y_k = \sum_{i: (\kappa_i, t_k) \in \mathcal{R}} x_i w_{ik}\}$

Corollary 3.1. For any valid crossmap transform that applies a crossmap \mathcal{X} to a shared mass array $A_{[\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{X}]}$, resulting in $A_{[\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{Y}]}$, numeric mass is preserved through the operation such that $\sum_{k=1}^T y_k = \sum_{i=1}^K x_i$.

Proof. This follows naturally from the definition of the output shared mass array and crossmap weights. Since $\mathcal{K} \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ in a valid crossmap transform, $\kappa_i \in \mathcal{S}$ for all $i = 1 \dots K$. Then, by Definition 3.2, $\exists (\kappa_i, t_k) \in \mathcal{R}$ for all $i = 1 \dots K$. The total mass of the output array can be rewritten as $\sum_{k=1}^T y_k = \sum_{k=1}^T (\sum_{i=1}^K x_i w_{ik}) = \sum_{i=1}^K x_i \sum_{k=1}^T w_{ik}$. Again by Definition 3.2, $\sum_{k=1}^T w_{ik} = 1$ for all $i = 1 \dots K$. Thus, $\sum_{i=1}^K x_i \sum_{k=1}^T w_{ik} = \sum_{i=1}^K x_i = \sum_{k=1}^T y_k$ \square

Corollary 3.1 shows that the condition $\forall j \sum_k w_{jk} = 1$ in Definition 3.2 ensures total mass is preserved, and we refer to both the condition on the crossmap and on the data operation as the **mass-preserving condition**.

3.3 Collections of Crossmaps

Let us briefly situate these definitions in the overall process of ex-post harmonisation. In particular, note that under the above abstractions, producing an ex-post harmonised dataset could require multiple parallel and/or sequential crossmap transforms. For example, consider harmonising occupation counts from multiple countries and years, where each country-year observation is collected using a country-specific list of occupation codes, which itself is subject to updates over time. Harmonising observations within the same country requires mapping the time-varying occupation codes into a single target classification, whilst harmonisation across countries requires mapping country-year observations into a relevant target classification, such as the International Standard Code of Occupations (ISCO). Each linkage between classifications forms the basis for another crossmap transform.

The added complexity of managing collections of crossmaps could seem contrived. However, the above definitions provide a mathematical basis for implementing and validating harmonisation workflows. They set out various explicit

and implicit conditions under which a crossmap transform is feasible. Explicit conditions include what combinations of relations and weights form valid logic for preserving total mass when transforming numeric values from the index they were collected under to a counter-factual target index.

3.4 Suitable Applications

Crossmaps can encode logic for any combination of common harmonisation tasks including category recoding (one-to-one), value aggregating (many-to-one) and value redistributing (one-to-many) relations. However, crosswalks are considerably more parsimonious than crossmaps for implementing one-to-one recodings. Categorical variables can be converted into shared mass array through one-hot-encoding, and transformed by applying crossmaps with binary weights between the source and target categories. However, this introduces unnecessary data reshaping, and requires explicitly specifying weights that are implicit in the crosswalk format.

Similarly, if the harmonisation logic involves continuous variables, alternative functional descriptions may be more suitable. This includes cases where the source and target key sets are uncountable by definition. For example, consider the common task of binning income into defined ranges. Although in practice currency is generally truncated to two decimal places, the theoretical source key set is \mathbb{R}^+ . The target key set, and codomain of the binning function, is the set of income ranges defined in the data preparation process. This transformation can be cast in terms of Definition 3.3 if we restrict the source key set to income values actually observed in the source shared mass array. However, the resulting crossmap would be likely be much more difficult to understand compared to a rule or function based description of the binning process.

The relative utility of crossmaps arises when documenting and implementing more complex transformations between countable source and target index sets such as value redistribution between geographic units, or concordance of numeric mass between statistical classifications.

4 Equivalent Encodings and Features

Crossmaps can be represented in various forms for different purposes. The computational graph encoding facilitates flexible documentation through summary and visualisation and provides a mathematical lens for identifying interesting characteristics of a crossmap transforms. The transformation matrix encoding illuminates the verification properties of crossmaps by casting crossmap transforms as linear mappings. The edge list encoding allows crossmaps to be used directly to transform shared mass arrays via database operations. The notation used for encodings in this section is summarised in Figure 2. We define and discuss each encoding in turn, beginning with graph encoding of crossmaps.

4.1 Graph Encoding and Provenance Documentation

Definition 4.1. Given a crossmap $\mathcal{X} = (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{W})$, let $G = (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{R}, \mathbf{B})$ be a directed bipartite graph where:

- \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T} are the disjoint node sets,
- \mathcal{R} is the edge set, and
- $\mathbf{B} \in \mathbb{R}_+^{P \times P}$, is the weighted adjacency matrix, where $P = S + T$.


G is the computational **graph encoding** of the crossmap \mathcal{X} if and only if \mathbf{B} has following block structure: $[\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{C}; \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{0}]$, where $\mathbf{C} = [c_{jk} : c_{jk} = c_{jk} \in \mathcal{W} > 0 \text{ if } (s_j, t_k) \in \mathcal{R} \text{ and } b_{jk} = 0 \text{ otherwise}]$ is a $S \times T$ matrix, containing weights from \mathcal{W} , row-indexed by \mathcal{S} and column-indexed by \mathcal{T} .

4.1.1 Lateral Mappings

The asymmetric block structure of \mathbf{B} reflects the fact that, except in the case of one-to-one renaming, weighted linkages between classifications are lateral (i.e. one-way). Consider reversing the aggregation illustrated from $\{111311, 111312, 111399\}$ to $\{1111\}$ in Figure 3. It should be clear that defined the reverse transformation using the transpose of \mathbf{B} , $\{1111\}$ would have three links outgoing links with weights of one, violating the *mass-preserving condition*. This lateral property reveals an additional connection between crosswalks and crossmaps, whereby crosswalks can only encode the binary relation ‘ s shares value with t ’, whilst crossmaps encode the ternary relation ‘ s distributes value to t according to w ’.

4.1.2 Visualising Harmonisation Logic

Computational graph encodings provide a natural framework for designing interfaces for editing, auditing, exploring and communicating the logic of complex crossmap transforms. Figure 3 is a visualisation design for one-step crossmaps proposed in related work (Huang 2023). The proposed visualisation leverages multiple visual channels to highlight important features relevant for auditing and comprehension of the harmonisation logic embedded in the crossmap. Line style, ordering, opacity and labels are used to help the viewer focus their attention on links that warrant closer inspection. Line style is used to highlight source codes which are part of split relations, which carry stronger imputation assumptions



anzsco22	anzsco22_descr	isco8	isco8_descr
111111	Chief Executive or Managing Director	1112	Senior government officials
111211	Corporate General Manager	1114	Senior officials of special-interest organizations
111212	Defence Force Senior Officer	1120	Managing directors and chief executives
111311	Local Government Legislator	0110	Commissioned armed forces officers
111312	Member of Parliament	1111	Legislators
111399	Legislators nec		

Figure 3: Graph and List representations of a crossmap based on a subset of the crosswalk between the 2022 update of the Australian and New Zealand Standard Classification of Occupations (ANZSCO22) and the fourth iteration of the International Standard Classification of Occupations (ISCO08) published by the Australian Bureau of Statistics Australian Bureau of Statistics (2022)

relative to the solid one-to-one unique and shared links. The layout also highlights the existence of sub-structures in crossmaps that correspond to the commonly known mapping cases: one-to-one, one-to-many, many-to-one and many-to-many. We discuss these special cases in more detail in Section 5.1.

Although static visualisations are useful for understanding the general structure of simple crossmaps, interactivity is the natural option for visualisation of larger and more complex crossmaps. Building upon the use of line style in Figure 3, less interesting parts of the crossmap could be hidden or collapsed, allowing users to examine more interesting parts of a crossmap, such as sub-graphs with fractional weights. Interactivity also provides an avenue for non-code specification of crossmaps by domain experts, which could be validated in real time, and used directly to transform data with minimal additional data wrangling code.

Next, we examine the validation properties of crossmaps by casting crossmap transforms as linear mappings.

4.2 Matrix Encoding and Mapping Validation

Definition 4.2. The **matrix encoding** of $\mathcal{X} = (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{W})$ is the $S \times T$ matrix $\mathbf{C} = [c_{jk} : c_{jk} = w_{jk} \in \mathcal{W} > 0 \text{ if } (s_j, t_k) \in \mathcal{R}, \text{ and } c_{jk} = 0 \text{ otherwise}]$.

It should be clear that the matrix encoding is the same as the block component \mathbf{C} from the adjacency matrix \mathbf{B} of the crossmap graph encoding G defined in Definition 4.1.

4.2.1 Linear Mappings

Linkages between statistical classification can be characterised as linear mappings between source and target vector spaces, as shown by Hulliger (1998). Following their approach, we characterise crossmap transforms as linear mappings by first defining discrete vector spaces based on the source and target sets. For a given crossmap \mathcal{X} , recall that the cardinality of the source and target index sets are denoted S and T respectively. First, attach an $S \times 1$ identification vector o_j to each item $s_j \in \mathcal{S}$, which has 0 in all entries except for the j -th entry which is 1. The identification vectors $\{o_j\}$ define the source vector space \mathcal{O} . Similarly attach to each target item $t_k \in \mathcal{T}$ a $T \times 1$ identification vector d_k , which has 0 in all entries except for the k -th entry which is 1. The vectors d_k define the target vector space \mathcal{D} . Now, attach a vector of values $\mathbf{x} = [x_1, \dots, x_S]$ to each source category s_j to form a shared mass array $A_{[\mathcal{S}, \mathbf{x}]}$. The crossmap \mathcal{X} induces a linear mapping $W : \mathcal{O} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$, where $W(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{y}$ and $y_k = \sum_{j=1}^S w_{jk} x_j$ for $j = 1, \dots, t$. Since $\sum_{i=1}^S w_{ij} = 1$ for all $i = 1, \dots, s$, the linear mapping $W : \mathcal{O} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ preserves the shared numeric mass, and satisfies the *mass-preserving condition*. The matrix which encodes the linear mapping W is the transformation matrix encoding of the crossmap \mathcal{X} .

4.2.2 Validation Conditions

Using the above correspondence between crossmaps and linear mappings, we proceed to show how crossmaps are restricted by definition to only encode valid transformation logic.

Corollary 4.1. *The matrix encoding \mathbf{C} of crossmap \mathcal{X} is row-indexed by S and column-indexed by T and satisfies the matrix multiplication $\mathbf{C}\ell = \ell$, where ℓ is a vector of ones with length S .*

Proof. The result follows from the requirement that the sum of weights originating from a given source key must total one for every source key in a crossmap. Let $\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{C}\ell = [z_j = \sum_{k=1}^T c_{jk}]$, which returns the sum of each row j in \mathbf{C} . By Definition 4.2, $\sum_{k=1}^T c_{jk} = \sum_{k:(s_j, t_k) \in \mathcal{R}} w_{jk} + \sum_{k:(j, k) \notin \mathcal{R}} 0$. By Definition 3.2, $\forall j \sum_{k:(s_j, t_k) \in \mathcal{R}} w_{jk} = 1$. Therefore, $\mathbf{z} = \ell$. \square

Corollary 4.1 provides a principled way to look for data leakage in the transformation pipeline. Data leakage in the context of crossmap transforms refers to the unintended loss or creation of numeric value. A common check for data leakage is comparing the aggregate totals before and after the transformation. Unfortunately, passing this condition is a necessary but not sufficient condition to ensure that the harmonisation operations are valid and match the intended design. This is because there are multiple ways to re-aggregate or re-distribute a disaggregated mass which will preserve the total numeric mass. For example, multiple sub-industry re-groupings could preserve the fixed total of GDP collected using some initial sub-industry classification. Crossmaps not only flag when aggregates will not be preserved but also facilitate straightforward location and correction of any errors. Based on Corollary 4.1, we can see that any rows in $\mathbf{C}\ell$ not equal to one correspond to a source key with at least one incorrectly specified outgoing relation.

Proposition 4.1. *For a given crossmap transform of $A_{[\mathcal{K}, \mathbf{x}]}$ by a conformable crossmap $\mathcal{X} = (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{W})$ with matrix encoding \mathbf{C} resulting in $A_{[\mathcal{T}, \mathbf{y}]}$, if \mathcal{K} and S are identical ordered sets, then $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{C}'\mathbf{x}$ is equivalent to $A_{[\mathcal{T}, \mathbf{y}]}$, where \mathbf{x} is the vector of all values $x_i = A(\kappa_i)$.*

Proof. Let \mathcal{K} be S identical ordered sets with index $i = 1 \dots S$. Now express $A_{[\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{X}]}$ as a column vector $\mathbf{x} = [x_i]_{i=1 \dots S}$. Then $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{C}'\mathbf{x} = [\sum_{i=1}^S c_{ik}x_i]_{j=1 \dots S}$. By Definition 4.2, $\sum_{i=1}^S c_{ik}x_i = \sum_{i:(s_i, t_k) \in \mathcal{R}} x_i w_{ik} + \sum_{i:(s_i, t_k) \notin \mathcal{R}} x_i 0$ for all $t_k \in \mathcal{T}$. Thus, $\mathbf{y} = [y_k = \sum_{i:(s_i, t_k) \in \mathcal{R}} w_{ik}x_i]$ as per Definition 3.3. \square

Proposition 4.1 is a refinement of the crossmap transform operation in terms of matrix multiplication. Under this matrix representation, *conformable* crossmaps and shared mass array inputs are additionally restricted to conformable matrix dimensions. In other words, to implement a crossmap transform using matrix multiplication, the condition $\mathcal{K} \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ from Definition 3.3 becomes $\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{S}$.

4.3 Edge List Representation and Human-Centred Computing

Definition 4.3. Given a crossmap $\mathcal{X} = (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{W})$ with graph encoding $G = (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{R}, \mathbf{B})$, let $E(s_j, t_k, w)$ be a table with primary key $(s_j, t_k) \in \mathcal{R}$ and attribute $w = w_{jk} \in \mathcal{W}$ such that each record represents a weighted edge in G . E is the **edge list encoding** of \mathcal{X} .

The edge list encoding corresponds directly to the extension on crosswalks introduced at the start of Section 3.2 and illustrated in Table 2. The rows in E also correspond to non-zero entries in the matrix encoding \mathbf{C} . If we remove the attribute w , the remaining primary key (s_j, t_k) forms a crosswalk table of the form discussed in Section 2.3.3. Thus, as noted by Hulliger (1998), E is a sparse representation of the linear mapping W between the source and target vector spaces.

4.3.1 Matrix Multiplication via Database Queries

It has been shown that properties of directed graphs can be obtained via matrix multiplication on the edge list encoding (Zhou and Ordonez 2020). Crossmaps are a special case of directed graphs, and as such the matrix-vector transformation detailed in Proposition 4.1 can be implemented as the following database query:

Listing 1 Query Implementation of Matrix-Vector Multiplication. Adapted from Zhou and Ordonez (2020).

```
SELECT E.k as k, sum(E.w * S.x) as y
FROM E JOIN S AS E.j=S.j
GROUP BY E.k
```

For any conformable crossmap \mathcal{X} and shared mass array $A_{[\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{X}]}$, Listing 1 corresponds to implementing the crossmap transform via the following steps:

1. For each tuple (s_j, x_j) in $A_{[\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{X}]}$, append the attribute t_k such that $(j, k) \in \mathcal{R}$; then
2. For each tuple (t_k, s_j, x_j) multiply x_j by $w_{jk} \in \mathcal{W}$ to obtain $(s_j, t_k, x_j w_{jk})$; then
3. For each group of tuples defined by t_k , calculate the aggregate $y_k = \sum_j x_j w_{jk}$ to obtain (t_k, y_k) , which corresponds to the output $A_{[\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{Y}]}$.

4.3.2 Tidy Data Harmonisation

The tabular data structure of edge lists provide a conceptual bridge between existing idiosyncratic practices of ex-post harmonisation and human-centred approaches to data wrangling and analysis such as *Tidy Data* principles and the *tidyverse* suite of R packages (Wickham 2014; Wickham et al. 2019). The correspondence between the above algorithm and Proposition 4.1, via possibility redundant calculations, permits the specification, implementation and storage of crossmap transform logic with only tabular data structures.

Redundancy of calculations can arise through properties of the crossmap. For instance, for a given crossmap \mathcal{X} , step 1 can be thought of as renaming source keys $s \in \mathcal{S}$ to target keys $t \in \mathcal{T}$, and is the only necessary step when implementing categorical variable recoding. Intuitively, this corresponds with the observation that renaming source keys in $A_{[\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{X}]}$ does not modify the values in \mathbf{x} . Similarly, step 2 is not strictly necessary if \mathcal{T} is a hierarchical structure over \mathcal{S} , as in the case of aggregation operations. In such as case, all weights w_{jk} with be 1, and the unmultiplied values x_j are identical to the multiplied values $x_j w_{jk}$.

Now that we have established the equivalence graph, matrix and edge list representations of crossmap transforms, we proceed to recast and examine common mapping concepts, data quality considerations and workflow challenges in ex-post harmonisations in terms of crossmaps. We show in the following examples how combinations of perspectives offered by each encoding can lead to useful practical and theoretical insights.

5 Conceptual and Statistical Implications

5.1 One-to-one, One-to-Many, Many-to-One and Many-to-Many Components

It should be clear visually that the computational graph in Figure 3 can be partitioned into three disjoint subgraphs. The bottom subgraph corresponds to a *many-to-one* relationship, while the middle subgraph corresponds to *one-to-one* relationships between source and target keys. The remaining subgraph contains two intersecting/overlapping *one-to-many* relationships, corresponding to the ancillary relationship type *many-to-many*. It should also be clear that the *many-to-many* subgraph introduces stronger imputation assumptions in the transformation process than the *one-to-one* subgraph. From an auditing or review perspective, *one-to-many* and *many-to-many* redistribution weights require additional scrutiny relative to binary relationships between source and target keys (i.e. statements of the form s_j shares value with t_k without reference to weights).

Identifying and grouping disjoint subgraphs can facilitate the examination of these two distinct types of assumptions in harmonisation strategies. The most obvious set of disjoint subgraphs is the partition defined by the set of all disjoint components in G , ignoring the direction of the edges, which corresponds to the separate disjoint subgraphs visible in Figure 3. In larger crossmaps, there could be hundreds of subgraph components, especially as every one-to-one link forms a disjoint component. Thus, it is useful to define conditions on the subgraphs which can group them into meaningful subsets.

Grouping conditions should naturally correspond to the type of relationship between source and target keys in the subgraph. Starting first with *one-to-one* relationships, define a subset \mathcal{R}^1 of the relation \mathcal{R} which satisfies the binary condition “ s_j and t_k share value only with each other”. This condition corresponds to separating all the comparatively trivial one-to-one renaming operations from aggregating and disaggregating operations encoded in a crossmap. Next, consider *one-to-many* and *many-to-one* relationships, which are mirrors of each other. Define a subset \mathcal{R}^2 which satisfies the exclusive OR condition “either s_j is connected to more than one t_k , OR t_k is connected to more than one s_j ”. Finally, let remaining components belong to the subset \mathcal{R}^M . This subset contains *many-to-many* relationships, which are overlapping combinations of the previous relationship types.

The conditions for \mathcal{R}^1 and \mathcal{R}^2 can be translated into conditions on the node degree and number of edges of each disjoint component. Thus, the partition described above could be achieved via the following steps:

1. Identify disjoint components via breadth-first or depth-first search over the vertices of the graph (Hopcroft and Tarjan 1973).
2. Compute the number of edges in each component and group any components with only one edge into \mathcal{R}^1 .
3. Compute the node degrees for the remaining components and group into \mathcal{R}^2 any components with all node degrees equal to 1, except for one node, which has a node degree equal to the number of edges in the component.
4. Group any remaining components into \mathcal{R}^M .

The above partition can be paired with appropriately chosen graph summary and visualisation techniques to improve the readability and concision of provenance documents for ex-post harmonisation datasets. For instance, since one-to-one and many-to-one relations always have edge weights of 1, they could be summarised in tabular form without reference to weights. Conversely, given the complexity of many-to-many components, visualising the components in a style similar to Figure 3 would likely be preferable over tabular presentations.

5.2 Data Preprocessing Sensitivity and Robustness Checks

Crossmaps provide a conceptual link between ex-post harmonisation and existing theoretical and applied research on data preprocessing. It is generally accepted that empirical results should be tested for robustness under plausible alternative model assumptions. However, as observed by Blocker and Meng (2013), the same attention is not given to data preprocessing decisions, despite the risk to the validity of downstream analyses. They propose a formal framework for exploring the statistical implications of preprocessing decisions under the banner of multi-phase inference. They formulate data preprocessing decisions in terms of existing work on multiple imputation and missing data (see Rubin 1976, 1996), and consider theoretical bounds on the performance of multi-phase procedures under various scenarios.

5.2.1 Missing Data Imputation

Crossmap transforms can be viewed as single imputation procedures that map indexed numeric values, (i.e. a shared mass array), into counterfactual values indexed under an alternative index. The transformed values are counterfactual in the sense that they correspond to an estimate or imputation of what we would have observed if the initial source data were also collected or measured under the target classification. For example, in the case of occupation statistics, consider transforming data collected under the 2022 Australian and New Zealand Standard Classification of Occupations (ANZSCO22) into the closest International Standard Classification of Occupations (ISCO08) as illustrated in Figure 3.

The resultant data reflects a single deterministic estimate of which ISCO08 occupation respondents to the original ANZSCO22 survey would have selected if asked to select from the ISCO08 occupation list. The crossmap used to map ANZSCO22 occupation codes to ISCO08 implicitly specifies the assumptions used to impute the missing counterfactual data.

5.2.2 Quantifying Imputation

Compared to filling missing values for individual survey responses, imputation in crossmap transforms exists at the aggregated level of the shared mass array. This makes quantifying and describing the degree of imputation applied much more difficult than counting up the number of missing values. However, observe that crossmaps are both computational graphs and data imputation models for the missing counterfactual target shared mass array in a crossmap transform. Thus, graph summary techniques could be used to describe and quantify the *potential imputation* of a crossmap and the actual degree of imputation applied to create a specific ex-post harmonised dataset. Here we use the term *potential imputation* to refer to how much a given crossmap could modify the values in a conformable shared mass array.

Measures for potential imputation include properties such as the relative share of each type of subgraph component defined in Section 5.1, where crossmaps with only one-to-one components form a zero imputation baseline from which more complex crossmaps can be compared. The actual degree of imputation embedded in a harmonised dataset is determined by both the potential imputation, and the actual input data. The interaction between these two inputs to a crossmap transform determines the degree to which the output shared mass array produced by a given crossmap transform reflects the observed source data versus assumptions about the counterfactual world. Consider two potential shared mass array inputs to the crossmap in Figure 3, one with the majority of the overall shared mass in 111212, and one with the majority in 111111. In the former case, most of the mass is just re-indexed as 111212 forms a one-to-one relation with 0110. However, in the latter case, the value for 111111 is split up between {1112, 1114, 1120}, producing an output array with much stronger counterfactual assumptions than in the former case.

5.2.3 Multiple Imputation and Data Multiverses

Following similar motivations as guide multiple imputation, Steegen et al. (2016) argue against the practice of preparing a single analysis dataset. They observe that empirical research often takes for granted that any dataset used in a given analysis is just one of many potential datasets that could have been prepared from the available raw data and suggest that empirical researchers perform *multiverse analyses* to increase transparency and check the robustness of their findings to alternative reasonable preprocessing decisions. Multiverse analysis involves constructing a “data multiverse” containing multiple reasonable preparations of the raw data, and then calculating a resulting “multiverse of statistical results” by applying the same downstream analysis to each alternative dataset.

The crossmaps framework offers a systematic and structured tool for extending the principles of multiverse analysis to studies using ex-post harmonised datasets. The dual nature of crossmaps as logic encodings and functional inputs to crossmap transform operations avoids creating multiple data preparation scripts. Instead, different crossmaps can be passed into a crossmap transform workflow with a fixed collection of shared mass arrays to generate a multiverse of ex-post harmonised datasets. In addition to increasing the scientific reliability of studies using ex-post harmonised datasets, multiverse analyses could provide insight for future research into the statistical properties of ex-post harmonisation as a data preprocessing procedure.

6 Computation and Design Implications

6.1 Understanding and Auditing Existing Scripts and Datasets

6.1.1 Extracting Crossmaps

We can use insights from Proposition 4.1 to extract the crossmap embedded in existing code and to confirm the validity of the implemented transformations. To illustrate, Listing 2 provides sample STATA code used aggregate occupation codes into larger categories. Notice on line 7, there is an interaction between the conditions for `teacher` and `professional`, whereby the mapping into `professional` depends on `teacher==0`. Such interactions make it more difficult for other data users to understand and validate the overall mapping logic.

Recall that the output of a crossmap transform corresponds to the matrix-vector multiplication $C'\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{y}$. The crossmap transform embedded in Listing 2 could also be represented in this form, where C' corresponds with the STATA commands in Listing 2, \mathbf{x} is the S -length vector component of a shared mass array formed from the input data `occupation.dta` on line 1, and \mathbf{y} is the data created by running the script. Let us replace the input vector \mathbf{x} with an identification vector o_j for the j -th key in the S element source index set \mathcal{S} . $C'o_j = \mathbf{y}$ returns a T -length vector with the weights for any outgoing links from s_j to elements in \mathcal{T} . It should thus be clear that we can extract the implied crossmap by passing n identity vectors, one for each source key, through the script and combining the output data. This corresponds to obtaining $C'\mathbf{I} = C'$, where \mathbf{I} is a $S \times S$ identity matrix.

In practice, extracting embedded crossmap logic can be complicated by the structure of a given script. However, in the case of Listing 2, we were able to replace the script input with an identify vector formed from the `occupation.dta`, and extract a valid crossmap. Table 3 summarises some key features of the crossmap extracted from Listing 2, and illustrates how the validation properties implied by Corollary 4.1 can be verified using simple summary calculations. In particular, notice that the extracted crossmap has 12 disjoint components, 11 of which are many-to-one relations with the remaining component forming a one-to-one relation. The implied weights on all the edges are thus 1, and the mass preserving condition $C\ell = \ell$ is trivially satisfied. We can also confirm that Listing 2 implements each source-to-target link only once, as the number of links extracted equals the number of unique source keys. Finally, observe that the largest grouping `assprofclerk` combines 87 source keys, while smaller groupings such as `armforces` and `driver` combine only 4 and 7 source keys respectively. This discrepancy might warrant further investigation depending on how the transformed data is used and/or interpreted.

Listing 2 Example STATA script for merging multiple occupations into larger groups. Included with permission from authors.

```
use "occupation.dta", clear

gen farmer=0
replace farmer=1 if occupn>6000 & occupn<7000
gen teacher=0
replace teacher=1 if occupn>2400 & occupn<2500
gen professional=0
replace professional=1 if occupn>2000 & occupn<3000 & teacher==0
gen manager=0
replace manager=1 if occupn>1000 & occupn<1129
replace manager=1 if occupn>1131 & occupn<2000
gen armforces=0
replace armforces=1 if occupn<200
gen xefe=0
replace xefe=1 if occupn==1130
gen assprofclerk=0
replace assprofclerk=1 if occupn>3000 & occupn<5000
gen svcsales=0
replace svcsales=1 if occupn>5000 & occupn<6000
replace svcsales=1 if occupn>9000 & occupn<9200
gen labourer=0
replace labourer=1 if occupn>9200 & occupn<9320
gen driver=0
replace driver=1 if occupn>8320 & occupn<8330
replace driver=1 if occupn>9330 & occupn<9340
gen crafrademach=0
replace crafrademach=1 if occupn>7000 & occupn<9000 & driver==0
gen notclass=0
replace notclass=1 if occupn>9990 & occupn<10000

sum professional manager teacher assprofclerk svcsales armforces xefe ///
farmer crafrademach labourer driver notclass if p3p30_school_level==6
```

6.1.2 Concurrent Crossmap Transforms

The above example illustrates how crossmaps can be extracted and examined from a script implementing a single crossmap transform. However, as mentioned in Section 3.3, an ex-post harmonised dataset will likely involve multiple sequential and/or concurrent crossmap transforms. Decomposing ex-post harmonised datasets as outputs of a set of crossmap transforms provides a new perspective for understanding properties of the overall harmonised dataset. Figure 4 visualises a single transformation step in the ex-post harmonisation of country-year records from the INDSTAT 4 dataset. Each tile represents the country-year specific crossmap transform for a shared mass array of industry-level output indexed by country-specific industry codes into 4-digit codes from ISIC Revision 3. The colour of the tile indicates whether any recorded values were split in the process of transforming the data into the target schema of ISIC Revision 3, while the facets arrange the country-year transforms by their 1996 world bank income group. Compared

Table 3: Summary of Aggregation Logic based on Crossmap extracted from Listing 2

Target Key	No. Incoming Sources	Incoming Source Keys
assprofclerk	87	3111,3112,3113,3114,3115,3116,3117,3118,3119,3121,...
crafrademach	70	7111,7112,7113,7121,7122,7123,7124,7129,7131,7132,...
professional	57	2111,2112,2113,2114,2121,2122,2131,2132,2133,2141,...
svcsales	36	5111,5112,5113,5121,5122,5123,5131,5132,5133,5134,...
manager	32	1110,1120,1141,1142,1143,1210,1221,1222,1223,1224,...
farmer	17	6111,6112,6113,6114,6121,6122,6123,6124,6129,6130,...
teacher	10	2410,2421,2422,2431,2432,2440,2450,2461,2462,2469
driver	7	8321,8322,8323,8324,9331,9332,9333
labourer	6	9211,9212,9213,9311,9312,9313
armforces	4	110,120,140,190
notclass	2	9998,9999
xefe	1	1130

to long-form explanatory notes, such visualisations offer an alternative and more structured format for summarising and communicating publisher (e.g. country) or observation (e.g. country-year) level variations in data quality and data modification.

6.1.3 Sequential Crossmap Transforms

In addition to the concurrent crossmap transforms above, we can also consider examining a sequence of related crossmap transforms. Hulliger (1998) describes mathematically how correspondence matrices, which are equivalent in definition to the matrix encoding C , can be combined to describe concatenated correspondences from a source classification to a target classification via one or multiple intermediate classifications, as well as to describe correspondences involving changes at multiple levels of a hierarchical classification schema. An example of the former case occurs in the transformation of INDSTAT 4 data from Revision 4 to Revision 2 of the *International Standard Industrial Classification of All Economic Activities (ISIC)*.

Official concordances are available between ISIC2 and ISIC3.1, as well as ISIC3.1 and ISIC 4, but not directly between ISIC4 and ISIC2. It should be clear from the results in Section 4.2 that the concatenated crossmap from ISIC4 to ISIC2 can be described by the matrix product $C_{42} = C_{43}C_{32}$, where the subscripts ab indicate the source a and target b indexes. This may seem trivial in a two-step transformation, but consider increasing the size of the dataset to be transformed or the number of transformation steps. In the former case, collapsing multiple steps eliminates intermediate computations which reduces the time required to produce the transformed dataset. In the latter case, the concatenated crossmap can be summarised in a style similar to Table 3, to inspect the composition of the transformed data directly in terms of the initial source keys, rather than as a chain of transformations.

6.2 Workflow Design

In addition to improving documentation, the crossmap format provide a conceptual foundation for modular and auditable workflows for ex-post harmonisation. The formalisation of crossmap transform operations and the associated conformability conditions give rise to meaningful constraints and principles for implementing ex-post harmonisation workflows. Pivoting between matrix and database representations of crossmap transforms can help us to design workflows and tools that insure against various implementation errors and risks. In particular, we highlight several subtle and difficult-to-trace programming errors that can be avoided by translating constraints from the matrix representations into table based workflows.

6.2.1 Data Leakage and Crossmap Coverage

We previously discussed in Section 4.2 how the structure of crossmaps and conformability conditions theoretically preclude data leakage. Retaining these conditions in a data wrangling workflow requires identifying and validating properties of the data structures used to store crossmap edge lists and shared mass arrays. For instance, the **mass preserving condition** corresponds to checking the sum of weights grouped by source key in the edge list equals one. Depending on whether weights are implemented symbolically or numerically, the validation may be subject to some floating point tolerance. Additionally, the conformability condition corresponds to checking that the unique set of source keys in the edge list E contains all the index keys in the shared mass array, which we refer to as a **coverage check**. Recall from Listing 1 that implementing matrix-vector multiplication involves joining the edge list E with the input shared mass array on the source keys. The flexibility of database joins means that, without a coverage check, it is

Country-Year Output Observation Transformations

Source: INDSTAT4 REV.3 Industry Level Data, 1985-2016




Figure 4: Summary visualisation of a set of concurrent crossmap transforms applied to industry level output statistics collected according to country-year specific industry codes. Each tile represents a country-year observation of output (GDP) production in the INDSTAT4 Revision 3 Industry Level Dataset. The colour of the tile indicates whether that country-year observation contained industry codes and associated output values that were redistributed to the codes in the target ISIC classification

Panel Map does not cover fully Source Data




Figure 5: Stylised example of a data leakage error. The crossmap shown on the left-hand side does not contain mapping instructions for the source key x7285!. Thus, under a naive transformation the associated value 3895 could be lost.




Figure 6: Stylised example of a potential missing value arithmetic error. The error results from passing a missing NA value to a valid one-to-many relationship in the example crossmap. The implied transformation for the missing value is a splitting of value between the target keys D6 and D7.

possible to perform a non-conformable crossmap transform, which could cause data leakage if the join drops rows from the shared mass array with non-zero values. Figure 5 illustrates an scenario where data leakage could occur.

6.2.2 Missing Value Handling

In addition to conditions on the crossmap edge list, the structure of crossmap transform operations give rise to implementation constraints for shared mass arrays. Except in the case of strictly one-to-one crossmap transforms, the presence of missing values (i.e. NA or NULL values) can lead to *missing value arithmetic* errors. Missing value arithmetic errors occur when we perform programmatically valid calculations, which may not be mathematically valid. Missing values in the crossmap edge list E are precluded by definition. It is less obvious that missing values in the input shared mass array should be dealt with prior to performing the crossmap transform operation. However, consider the scenario shown in Figure 6, where a NA value attached to x5555 is split into D6 and D7, and also combined with other incoming values. It is straightforward programmatically to implement this conformable crossmap transform using the query in Listing 1. However, the output of the transform varies depending on the treatment of missing values in the multiplication and aggregation steps. If the missing value is propagating into the final sum, other incoming values would be overwritten. Alternatively, if the calculation of the final sum is modified to remove missing values, then the crossmap transform implementation effectively treats NA values as zeroes. It is hard to imagine that the former case would ever be intended, however, even when the later case is intended, it is much clearer from a provenance perspective to replace missing values with zeroes prior to the crossmap transform.

6.2.3 Addition and Removal of Index Keys

The addition and removal of index keys between revisions of statistical classifications should also be handled outside of the crossmap transform rather than implicitly within the operation. Hulliger (1998) shows that births and deaths of categories can be represented as columns or rows of zeroes in the correspondence matrix C . However, this representation conflicts with the invariance of numeric totals across the crossmap transform, and represents an ontological question of whether the shared mass in the source and target classifications are comparable. Rather than combine recoding and redistribution actions with removing or appending elements of category-indexed variables, we suggest removing any unwanted categories prior to applying the crossmap, and attaching any new categories after transforming the existing data. For example, the existence of a target key without a corresponding source key suggests that the target shared mass could be larger or smaller than the observed shared mass. If this is the case, then the additional target key-value pair should be added after the crossmap transform for corresponding source-target links. This preserves cross-taxonomy transformation as a redistribution operation, rather than one that creates or destroys numeric mass and thus avoids unnecessary data validation challenges.

6.3 Computational Constraints and Interface Design

6.3.1 Floating Point Discrepancies

In Section 6.1, we treated crossmaps as perfect representations of harmonisation logic embedded in existing scripts. However, as alluded to in Section 6.2.1, the output dataset produced by applying an extracted crossmap could differ from the output produced by the original data wrangling approach and code. To illustrate, consider a mapping that equally distributes some source value x to three target keys. The corresponding computational graph would have three links connecting the source key and target keys with weights of one-third on each link. If the weights are implemented using floating point representation, then the value assigned to each target key will be $0.\overline{333}x$, subject to the defined floating point precision. Compare this to implementing the value redistribution using a FOR LOOP, such that for each of the three target keys, we write a rule that divides the source value in thirds and assign that value to the target key. Then the resulting target value would be $x/3$ rather than $0.\overline{333}x$. Floating point weights also complicate verification of the *mass-preserving condition*, by necessitating some floating point tolerance when comparing the sum of weights to one.

In practice, such floating point discrepancies are likely to occur in all alternative implementations of a particular multi-source dataset. However, the crossmap structure materialises such discrepancies multiple times in a given workflow. Floating point inaccuracies can arise when the crossmaps are created, as well as when they are applied to transform source datasets. Furthermore, since the *mass-preserving condition* must be satisfied for every single source key, the cumulative extent of discrepancies grows with the size of the crossmap graph, as discussed in Bauer (1974). For this reason, symbolic representations of link weights are recommended when implementing data structures for crossmaps.

6.3.2 Multipartite Graph Layouts

As shown in Section 4.1, opportunities exist to adapt and extend existing graph visualisation tools and algorithms to realise the potential communication and interface benefits of crossmaps. In particular, sequential transformations are a natural match for multi-partite graph visualisation methods. For example, Sankey layout algorithms are more suitable for the layered structure of crossmaps relative to more general purpose network graph layout algorithms. However, the most commonly implemented multi-layer graph layout algorithm is the heuristic algorithm Sugiyama, Tagawa, and Toda (1981), which does not support by default support grouping of substructures as shown in Figure 3. As discussed in Huang (2023), Zarate et al. (2018) offer an alternative layout algorithm that supports grouping which could be adapted to visualising crossmaps.

6.3.3 Multi-Table Data Wrangling

As illustrated in Figure 4, and discussed in Section 3.3, producing harmonised datasets often involves handling multiple data tables and crossmaps. Designing tools and interfaces which support the management and use of multiple crossmaps and source datasets is closely related to work on *Multi-Table Data Wrangling* as discussed by Kasica, Berret, and Munzner (2021). They observe in their study of data wrangling practices by data journalists that previous wrangling frameworks emphasise operations within a single table, but journalists often use and combine multiple tables for their analysis. The combine operations and merge actions in their *Multi-Table Data Wrangling* frameworks most closely align with the operations in our proposed framework.

7 Conclusion, Limitations and Future Work

Ex-Post Harmonisation is an increasingly common practice as the volume and diversity of data sources grows in the social sciences and other fields. This paper presents a unified framework for exploring and solving the various workflow, provenance and statistical challenges associated with ex-post harmonised dataset. We have introduced a new task abstraction and formalised a structure for encoding mappings used to transform aggregated statistics from one classification standard to another. We show with multiple examples how equivalent graph, matrix and list representations of these mappings can reveal insights and guide novel approaches to theoretical and practical issues in ex-post harmonisation.

The results in this paper are limited to the transforming aggregated statistics with meaningful alternative groupings. Furthermore, as discussed earlier in Section 3.4, the framework is most useful for complex mappings involving countable source and target key sets. We chose a narrow task scope to support precise mathematical abstraction and formalisation at the expense of direct applicability to other common ex-post harmonisation task. However, we believe the framework could be adapted or extended to other similar workflows and tasks.

Planned future work includes developing software and interactive tools based on the framework, and applying and testing the framework on examples from other domains. We implement a selection of the crossmap features discussed in this paper in the R package `xmap` (Huang and Puzello 2023). The package implements matrix, graph and edge list representations of crossmaps, tools for specifying, validating, and applying crossmap transforms. We plan to

implement symbolic fractional weights to circumvent floating point issues and provide helper functions for visualising and summarising crossmaps. The package is designed to be compatible with the `tidyverse` suite of R packages (Wickham et al. 2019), and is built upon the `vctrs` package for defining and validating data structures in R (Wickham, Henry, and Vaughan 2023). The package is currently in active development, and we welcome contributions and feedback from interested parties.

References

- Arel-Bundock, Vincent, Nils Enevoldsen, and CJ Yetman. 2018. “Countrycode: An r Package to Convert Country Names and Country Codes.” *Journal of Open Source Software* 3 (28): 848. <https://doi.org/10.21105/joss.00848>.
- Australian Bureau of Statistics. 2022. “ANZSCO - Australian and New Zealand Standard Classification of Occupations.” <https://www.abs.gov.au/statistics/classifications/anzsco-australian-and-new-zealand-standard-classification-occupations/2022>.
- Bauer, Friedrich L. 1974. “Computational Graphs and Rounding Error.” *SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis* 11 (1): 87–96. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2156433>.
- Blocker, Alexander W., and Xiao-Li Meng. 2013. “The Potential and Perils of Preprocessing: Building New Foundations.” *Bernoulli* 19 (4). <https://doi.org/10.3150/13-BEJSP16>.
- Bors, Christian, John Wenskovitch, Michelle Dowling, Simon Attfield, Leilani Battle, Alex Endert, Olga Kulyk, and Robert S. Laramee. 2019. “A Provenance Task Abstraction Framework.” *IEEE Computer Graphics and Applications* 39 (6): 46–60. <https://doi.org/10.1109/MCG.2019.2945720>.
- Cheney, James, Laura Chiticariu, and Wang-Chiew Tan. 2007. “Provenance in Databases: Why, How, and Where.” *Foundations and Trends in Databases* 1 (4): 379–474. <https://doi.org/10.1561/19000000006>.
- Dang, Tuan, Nico Franz, Bertram Ludascher, and Angus Graeme Forbes. 2015. “ProvenanceMatrix: A Visualization Tool for Multi-Taxonomy Alignments.” *CEUR Workshop Proceedings* 1456 (January): 13–24.
- Denk, M., and K. A. Froeschl. 2004. “East of Neuchatel: A Universal Model for the Representation of Statistical Taxonomy Systems.” In *Proceedings. 16th International Conference on Scientific and Statistical Database Management, 2004.*, 373–82. Santorini Island, Greece: IEEE. <https://doi.org/10.1109/SSDM.2004.1311233>.
- Dorner, Matthias, and Dietmar Harhoff. 2018. “A Novel Technology-Industry Concordance Table Based on Linked Inventor-Establishment Data.” *Research Policy* 47 (4): 768–81. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2018.02.005>.
- Dubrow, Joshua Kjerulf, and Irina Tomescu-Dubrow. 2016. “The Rise of Cross-National Survey Data Harmonization in the Social Sciences: Emergence of an Interdisciplinary Methodological Field.” *Quality & Quantity* 50 (4): 1449–67. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11135-015-0215-z>.
- Ehling, Manfred. 2003. “Harmonising Data in Official Statistics.” In *Advances in Cross-National Comparison*, edited by Jürgen H. P. Hoffmeyer-Zlotnik and Christof Wolf, 17–31. Boston, MA: Springer US. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4419-9186-7_2.
- Fischetti, Tony. 2024. *Assertr: Assertive Programming for r Analysis Pipelines*. <https://docs.ropensci.org/assertr/> (website) <https://github.com/ropensci/assertr>.
- Fortier, Isabel, Parminder Raina, Edwin R Van Den Heuvel, Lauren E Griffith, Camille Craig, Matilda Saliba, Dany Doiron, et al. 2016. “Maelstrom Research Guidelines for Rigorous Retrospective Data Harmonization.” *International Journal of Epidemiology*, June. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ije/dyw075>.
- Gebru, Timnit, Jamie Morgenstern, Briana Vecchione, Jennifer Wortman Vaughan, Hanna Wallach, Hal Daumé Iii, and Kate Crawford. 2021. “Datasheets for Datasets.” *Communications of the ACM* 64 (12): 86–92. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3458723>.
- Goerlich, Francisco, and Francisco Ruiz. 2018. “Typology and Representation of Alterations in Territorial Units: A Proposal.” *Journal of Official Statistics* 34 (1): 83–106. <https://doi.org/10.1515/jos-2018-0005>.
- Granda, Peter, and Emily Blasczyk. 2016. “Data Harmonization.” In *Guidelines for Best Practice in Cross-Cultural Surveys*. Ann Arbor, MI: Survey Research Center, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan.
- Granda, Peter, Christof Wolf, and Reto Hadorn. 2010. “Harmonizing Survey Data.” In *Survey Methods in Multinational, Multiregional, and Multicultural Contexts*, edited by Janet A. Harkness, Michael Braun, Brad Edwards, Timothy P. Johnson, Lars Lyberg, Peter Ph. Mohler, Beth-Ellen Pennell, and Tom W. Smith, 1st ed., 315–32. Wiley. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470609927.ch17>.
- Hopcroft, John, and Robert Tarjan. 1973. “Algorithm 447: Efficient Algorithms for Graph Manipulation.” *Communications of the ACM* 16 (6): 372–78. <https://doi.org/10.1145/362248.362272>.
- Huang, Cynthia A. 2023. “Visualising Category Recoding and Numeric Redistributions.” August 12, 2023. <http://arxiv.org/abs/2308.06535>.
- Huang, Cynthia A., and Laura Puzello. 2023. “Xmap: A Principled Approach to Recoding and Redistributing Data Between Nomenclature.”
- Hulliger, Beat. 1998. “Linking of Classifications by Linear Mappings.” *Journal of Official Statistics* 14 (January): 255–66.

- Humlum, Anders. 2021. “Crosswalks Between (D)ISCO88 and (D)ISCO08 Occupational Codes.” <https://www.anders-humlum.com/codes>.
- . 2022. “Robot Adoption and Labor Market Dynamics.” Rockwool Foundation Research Unit.
- Iannone, Richard, and Mauricio Vargas. 2022. *Pointblank: Data Validation and Organization of Metadata for Local and Remote Tables*.
- Kai Xiong, Siwei Fu, Guoming Ding, Zhongsu Luo, Rong Yu, Wei Chen, Hujun Bao, and Yingcai Wu. 2022. “Visualizing the Scripts of Data Wrangling with SOMNUS.” *IEEE Transactions on Visualization and Computer Graphics*, January, 1–1. <https://doi.org/10.1109/tvcg.2022.3144975>.
- Kandel, Sean, Jeffrey Heer, Catherine Plaisant, Jessie Kennedy, Frank van Ham, Nathalie Henry Riche, Chris Weaver, Bongshin Lee, Dominique Brodbeck, and Paolo Buono. 2011. “Research Directions in Data Wrangling: Visualizations and Transformations for Usable and Credible Data.” *Information Visualization* 10 (4): 271–88. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1473871611415994>.
- Kandel, Sean, Andreas Paepcke, Joseph Hellerstein, and Jeffrey Heer. 2011. “Wrangler: Interactive Visual Specification of Data Transformation Scripts.” In *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, 3363–72. Vancouver BC Canada: ACM. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1978942.1979444>.
- Kasica, Stephen, Charles Berret, and Tamara Munzner. 2021. “Table Scraps: An Actionable Framework for Multi-Table Data Wrangling From An Artifact Study of Computational Journalism.” *IEEE Transactions on Visualization and Computer Graphics* 27 (2): 957–66. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TVCG.2020.3030462>.
- Khan, Nadim Akhtar, S M Shafi, and Sabiha Zehra Rizvi. 2015. “Metadata Crosswalks as a Way Towards Interoperability.” In *Encyclopedia of Information Science and Technology*, edited by Mehdi Khosrow-Pour, D.B.A., Third, 1834–42. IGI Global. <https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-4666-5888-2.ch177>.
- Kołczyńska, Marta. 2020. “Micro- and Macro-Level Determinants of Participation in Demonstrations: An Analysis of Cross-National Survey Data Harmonized Ex-Post.” *Methods, Data, Analyses* 14 (1): 36. <https://doi.org/10.12758/mda.2019.07>.
- . 2022. “Combining Multiple Survey Sources: A Reproducible Workflow and Toolbox for Survey Data Harmonization.” *Methodological Innovations* 15 (1): 62–72. <https://doi.org/10.1177/20597991221077923>.
- Koren, Miklós, Marie Connolly, Joan Lull, and Lars Vilhuber. 2022. “Data and Code Availability Standard,” December. <https://doi.org/10.5281/ZENODO.7436134>.
- Landau, William Michael. 2021. “The Targets R Package: A Dynamic Make-like Function-Oriented Pipeline Toolkit for Reproducibility and High-Performance Computing.” *Journal of Open Source Software* 6 (57): 2959.
- Lohr, Sharon L., and Trivellore E. Raghunathan. 2017. “Combining Survey Data with Other Data Sources.” *Statistical Science* 32 (2). <https://doi.org/10.1214/16-STS584>.
- Lucchesi, Lydia R., Petra M. Kuhnert, Jenny L. Davis, and Lexing Xie. 2022. “Smallset Timelines: A Visual Representation of Data Preprocessing Decisions.” In *2022 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, 1136–53. Seoul Republic of Korea: ACM. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3531146.3533175>.
- Mackey, Will, Matt Johnson, David Diviny, Matt Cowgill, Bryce Roney, William Lai, and Benjamin Wee. 2023. *Strayr: Ready-to-use Australian Common Structures and Classifications and Tools for Working with Them*. Manual.
- Niederer, Christina, Holger Stitz, Reem Hourieh, Florian Grassinger, Wolfgang Aigner, and Marc Streit. 2018. “TACO: Visualizing Changes in Tables Over Time.” *IEEE Transactions on Visualization and Computer Graphics* 24 (1): 677–86. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TVCG.2017.2745298>.
- Peng, Roger D., and Stephanie C. Hicks. 2021. “Reproducible Research: A Retrospective.” *Annual Review of Public Health* 42 (1): 79–93. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-publhealth-012420-105110>.
- Pierce, Justin R., and Peter K Schott. 2012. “A Concordance Between Ten-Digit U.S. Harmonized System Codes and SIC/NAICS Product Classes and Industries.” *Journal of Economic and Social Measurement* 37 (1-2): 61–96.
- Pushkarna, Mahima, Andrew Zaldivar, and Oddur Kjartansson. 2022. “Data Cards: Purposeful and Transparent Dataset Documentation for Responsible AI.” In *2022 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, 1776–826. Seoul Republic of Korea: ACM. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3531146.3533231>.
- Raman, Vijayshankar, and Joseph M Hellerstein. 2000. “An Interactive Framework for Data Cleaning.” UCB/CSD-0-1110. Computer Science Division (EECS): University of California.
- Rubin, Donald B. 1976. “Inference and Missing Data.” *Biometrika* 63 (3): 581–92. <https://doi.org/10.1093/biomet/63.3.581>.
- . 1996. “Multiple Imputation After 18+ Years.” *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 91 (434): 473–89. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01621459.1996.10476908>.
- Steegeen, Sara, Francis Tuerlinckx, Andrew Gelman, and Wolf Vanpaemel. 2016. “Increasing Transparency Through a Multiverse Analysis.” *Perspectives on Psychological Science* 11 (5): 702–12. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691616658637>.
- Sugiyama, Kozo, Shojiro Tagawa, and Mitsuhiko Toda. 1981. “Methods for Visual Understanding of Hierarchical System Structures.” *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics* 11 (2): 109–25. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TSMC.1981.4308636>.

- van der Loo, Mark P. J., and Edwin de Jonge. 2021. “Data Validation Infrastructure for R.” *Journal of Statistical Software* 97 (10): 1–31. <https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v097.i10>.
- Wang, April Yi, Will Epperson, Robert A DeLine, and Steven M. Drucker. 2022. “Diff in the Loop: Supporting Data Comparison in Exploratory Data Analysis.” In *CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, 1–10. New Orleans LA USA: ACM. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3491102.3502123>.
- Wickham, Hadley. 2014. “Tidy Data.” *Journal of Statistical Software* 59 (10). <https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v059.i10>.
- Wickham, Hadley, Mara Averick, Jennifer Bryan, Winston Chang, Lucy D’Agostino McGowan, Romain François, Garrett Grolemond, et al. 2019. “Welcome to the Tidyverse.” *Journal of Open Source Software* 4 (43): 1686. <https://doi.org/10.21105/joss.01686>.
- Wickham, Hadley, Lionel Henry, and Davis Vaughan. 2023. *Vctrs: Vector Helpers*. <https://vctrs.r-lib.org/>.
- Zarate, David Cheng, Pierre Le Bodic, Tim Dwyer, Graeme Gange, and Peter Stuckey. 2018. “Optimal Sankey Diagrams Via Integer Programming.” In *2018 IEEE Pacific Visualization Symposium (PacificVis)*, 135–39. <https://doi.org/10.1109/PacificVis.2018.00025>.
- Zhou, Xiantian, and Carlos Ordonez. 2020. “Matrix Multiplication with SQL Queries for Graph Analytics.” In *2020 IEEE International Conference on Big Data (Big Data)*, 5872–73. Atlanta, GA, USA: IEEE. <https://doi.org/10.1109/BigData50022.2020.9378275>.