1 Estimating global economic well-being with unlit settlements

- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5 Ian McCallum¹
- 6 Christopher Conrad Maximillian Kyba²
- 7 Juan Carlos Laso Bayas¹
- 8 Elena Moltchanova³
- 9 Matt Cooper⁴
- 10 Jesus Crespo Cuaresma ^{5, 1}
- 11 Shonali Pachauri¹
- 12 Linda See¹
- 13 Olga Danylo¹
- 14 Inian Moorthy¹
- 15 Myroslava Lesiv¹
- 16 Kimberly Baugh⁶
- 17 Christopher D. Elvidge ⁷
- 18 Martin Hofer¹
- 19 Steffen Fritz¹
- 20
- ¹ International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis, Schlossplatz 1, A-2361, Laxenburg,
- 22 Austria
- ² GFZ, German Research Centre for Geosciences, Telegrafenberg, 14473, Potsdam, Germany
- ³ School of Mathematics & Statistics, University of Canterbury, Private Bag 4800, 8041,
- 25 Christchurch, New Zealand
- ⁴ T.H. Chan School of Public Health, Harvard University, 677 Huntington Ave, 02115, Boston,
- 27 MA, USA
- ⁵ Vienna University of Economics and Business, Welthandelsplatz 1, 1020, Vienna, Austria
- ⁶ Cooperative Institute for Research in the Environmental Sciences, University of Colorado, 216
- 30 UCB, 80309 Boulder, CO, USA
- ⁷ Earth Observation Group, Payne Institute for Public Policy, Colorado School of Mines, 1500
- 32 Illinois St., 80401, Golden, CO, USA
- 33
- 34
- 35
- 36
- 37
- 38

Supplementary Information

Continental and national statistics

| 43 | As a first step, we analyzed the continental statistics for unlit settlements. The following table |
|----|---|
| 44 | (Supplementary Table 1) provides, by continent, the total area of all human World Settlement |
| 45 | Footprint (WSF) settlements (km ²), the total area of unlit WSF settlements (km ²) the percentage |
| 46 | of unlit WSF settlements, the percentage of unlit urban settlements and the percentage of unlit |
| 47 | rural settlements. See methods for details on how these were calculated. |
| 48 | |
| | |

49 Supplementary Table 1. Continental statistics of Total WSF settlement area (km²), Unlit WSF

50 settlement area (km²), Total Percent Unlit (%), Urban Unlit (%) and Rural Unlit (%).

| Continent | Total_WSF (km2) | Unlit_WSF (km2) | Total Percent Unlit (%) | Urban Unlit (%) | Rural Unlit (%) |
|---------------|--------------------|--------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Africa | 113923 | 44219 | 39 | 14 | 65 |
| Asia | 593547 | 137584 | 23 | 13 | 40 |
| Europe | 290257 | 47876 | 16 | 3 | 27 |
| North America | 202057 | 12031 | 6 | 0 | 15 |
| Oceania | 15733 | 2179 | 14 | 0 | 33 |
| South America | 57024 | 1202 | 2 | 0 | 8 |

| 54 | Likewise, for each country, we summarized the total area of human WSF settlements (km ²), the |
|----|--|
| 55 | total area of unlit WSF settlements (km ²), the total percentage of the unlit settlements, the |
| 56 | percent of urban unlit settlements and the percent of rural unlit settlements (Supplementary |
| 57 | Data). These data were used to produce Figure 1 a and b in the main document. Supplementary |

- 58 Figs. 1-2 below demonstrate the global country-level unlit settlement percentages for urban and
- 59 rural areas respectively. See methods for details on how these were calculated.







Supplementary Fig. 1. Global country-level unlit settlement percentages for urban areas. a) map
of countries classified according to their percentage of settlements (building footprints) with no
associated satellite-derived nighttime radiance in urban areas; b) African and Asian countries
with population exceeding 50 million ranked according to percentage of urban unlit settlements.





Supplementary Fig. 2. Global country-level unlit settlement percentages for rural areas. a) map of countries classified according to their percentage of settlements (building footprints) with no associated satellite-derived nighttime radiance in rural areas; b) African and Asian countries with population exceeding 50 million ranked according to percentage of rural unlit settlements.

76

77 Urban Population

78

One of the factors playing a potential role in the amount of unlit human settlements within a country is the percentage of the total population that is urban (Supplementary Fig. 3). Clearly visible here are the high rates of urbanization in most of South America which might partially explain the low rates of unlit infrastructure there.



- 85 Supplementary Fig. 3. Urban population (% of total population). Source:
- 86 <u>https://data.worldbank.org/indicator</u>
- 87
- 88

89 **Consumption and Unlit Settlements**

90 The World Bank's Living Standards Measurement Study (LSMS) allows for the computation of 91 consumption spending from geocoded household surveys. Similar to a recent study on poverty 92 prediction¹, we have generated a comparison between percent unlit infrastructure and 93 consumption for four African countries (Supplementary Fig. 4). The majority of the rural 94 household clusters experience high levels of unlit settlements and low levels of consumption. 95 Urban households tend to experience higher levels of consumption and lower levels of unlit 96 settlements, while generally remaining above the extreme poverty line. Nonetheless, some urban 97 households are found to be associated with higher levels of unlit settlements, possibly pointing to 98 urban slum areas recorded during surveys.



Supplementary Fig. 4. Relationship between daily per capita consumption expenditure (measured
in 2011 U.S. dollars) and unlit settlements (%) at the cluster level for four African countries (ad), based on LSMS household surveys. Vertical black lines show the official international
extreme poverty line (\$1.90 per person per day), and colored lines (red, blue) are fits to the data
points for rural and urban clusters with corresponding 95% confidence intervals in grey.

108 **Bivariate regressions**

Comparable to studies with established relationships between economic indicators and radiance²⁻ 110 111 ⁷, we find significant relationships by continent between unlit settlement footprint fraction and 112 GDP (per capita), along with electricity consumption (per capita), secondary school enrollment 113 (% gross) and urban population (%) (Supplementary Fig. 5). Bivariate regressions (log-log) were 114 used to model relationships within continents, treating each country as a unique observation (see 115 Methods). In particular, the relationships are found to be statistically significant for Africa and 116 Asia across all four indicators with large effect sizes, but less so for other continents 117 (Supplementary Table 3). 118 119 For Africa and Asia, a 10% increase in the GDP per capita was associated with an average 10% 120 and 9% decrease in the odds of the area being unlit, respectively. A 10% increase in per capita 121 electricity consumption was associated with, on average, a 6% and 7% decrease in the odds of 122 the area being unlit, for Africa and Asia, respectively. An increase of 10% in the odds of school 123 enrollment was associated with, on average, a 3% and 2% decrease in the odds of the area being 124 unlit, while an extra 10% in the odds of the population being urban was associated with, on 125 average, a 4% and 3% decrease in the odds of the area being unlit, for Africa and Asia, 126 respectively. Across all economic indicators, Africa and Asia have notably a higher share of unlit 127 settlements than other continents, along with generally lower levels of GDP per capita, electricity 128 consumption, school enrollment and urban population. 129





132 Supplementary Fig. 5. Observed trends between unlit settlement footprints and world 133 development indicators by continent, namely, a) GDP per capita; b) electricity consumption 134 (kWh per capita); c) school enrollment (% gross); and d) urban population (%). Oceania was 135 excluded from 2b) having only two data points. School enrollment 2c) may exceed 100% due to 136 over enrollment. Colors refer to continents with dot area proportional to population size 137 (millions). Lines represent modeled trends (bivariate regressions log-log). Countries with more 138 than 200 million inhabitants are labeled. Logit transformations are applied for school enrollment 139 and urban population, whereas log transformations for GDP and electricity consumption.

Bivariate regressions (log-log) were used to model relationships by continent between the unlit
settlement footprint fraction and GDP (per capita), electricity consumption (per capita), school
enrollment (%) and urban population (%), with results of bivariate regressions by continent and
indicator provided in Supplementary Tables 2-5.

Supplementary Table 2. The effects of a 10% increase in GDP (per capita) on the odds of an areabeing unlit (%).

| Continent | Estimate | 95% CI | p-value | |
|---------------|----------|-----------------|----------|--|
| Africa | -9.81 | (-12.55; -6.99) | < 0.0001 | |
| Asia | -9.25 | (-12.75; -5.62) | < 0.0001 | |
| Europe | -1.07 | (-5.9; 4.01) | 0.6755 | |
| North America | -5.43 | (-11.5; 1.05) | 0.1012 | |
| Oceania | -1.81 | (-7.8; 4.57) | 0.5705 | |
| South America | -4.05 | (-17.39; 11.45) | 0.5896 | |

Supplementary Table 3. The effects of a 10% increase in electricity consumption (per capita) on
the odds of an area being unlit (%). As Oceania contained only two data points, its results can be
ignored.

| Continent | Estimate | 95% CI | p-value | |
|---------------|----------|-------------------|----------|--|
| Africa | -6.27 | (-9.12; -3.33) | 0.0001 | |
| Asia | -7.33 | (-10.25; -4.33) | < 0.0001 | |
| Europe | -2.97 | (-7.39; 1.65) | 0.2064 | |
| North America | -3.4 | (-7.23; 0.6) | 0.0977 | |
| Oceania | 55.02 | (-85.98; 1614.65) | 0.7215 | |
| South America | -1.1 | (-11.47; 10.48) | 0.8448 | |

159 Supplementary Table 4. The effects of a 10% increase in the odds of school enrollment

160 (secondary) on the odds of an area being unlit (%).

| Continent | Estimate | 95% CI | p-value |
|---------------|----------|----------------|---------|
| Africa | -3.05 | (-4.66; -1.41) | 0.0006 |
| Asia | -1.25 | (-2.64; 0.15) | 0.085 |
| Europe | 0.54 | (-2.8; 3.99) | 0.7567 |
| North America | -0.6 | (-3.19; 2.07) | 0.6599 |
| Oceania | 0.96 | (-2.97; 5.06) | 0.638 |
| South America | -0.34 | (-3.87; 3.33) | 0.8553 |

164 Supplementary Table 5. The effects of a 10% increase in the odds of an urban population on the

165 odds of an area being unlit (%).

| | Continent | Estimate | 95% CI | p-value | | | |
|-----|--|---------------|---------------------------------|--------------|--|--|--|
| | Africa | -3.69 | (-5.12; -2.24) | <0.0001 | | | |
| | Asia | -3.52 | (-5.17; -1.85) | 0.0001 | | | |
| | Europe | -0.37 | (-1.9; 1.18) | 0.6363 | | | |
| | North America | -2.9 | (-7.09; 1.48) | 0.194 | | | |
| | Oceania | -0.6 | (-2.85; 1.69) | 0.6039 | | | |
| | South America | -0.74 | (-3.23; 1.81) | 0.5657 | | | |
| 167 | | | | | | | |
| 168 | | | | | | | |
| 169 | Demographic and Health So | urveys | | | | | |
| 170 | | | | | | | |
| 171 | The relationship between the percentage of unlit settlements and a harmonized geo-spatial wealth | | | | | | |
| 172 | index (DHS) was used to dev | elop our appr | oach. The DHS locations we used | are shown in | | | |

173 Supplementary Fig. 6.





Supplementary Fig. 6. Locations of 100,602 harmonized DHS geo-located villages (blue dots)
used in this study. A total of ~2,400,000 households were used as input to create the village-level
data across 51 countries.

180 Category-specific accuracies were determined for each country using Naïve Bayes with 10-fold

181 cross-validation. The results by continent and country are presented in Supplementary Tables 6-8

182 for Africa, Asia and the Americas respectively. We present results by aggregated wealth class,

along with an overall value for each country. Supplementary Figs. 7, 8 and 9 present boxplots of

184 the country-level results for Africa, Asia and the Americas, split by urban and rural

185 classification, respectively. Supplementary Table 9 presents the overall accuracy by continent for

rural and urban areas.

187



Supplementary Fig. 7. Boxplots for African countries showing the mean percentage area of unlit settlements within a 2 km buffer (urban) or 5 km buffer (rural) of a DHS household cluster against the mode of the wealth indices of all households assigned to the household cluster. The midline represents the median with the lower and upper limits of the box being the 1st and 3rd quartiles.

194

195 Supplementary Table 6. Category-specific accuracy by country for Africa.

| | Poorer | Average | Richer | Overall |
|---------------|--------|---------|--------|---------|
| Angola | 99 | 91.2 | 89.6 | 95.5 |
| Benin | 99.4 | 68.6 | 73.8 | 95 |
| Burkina | 98.2 | 84.6 | 88.7 | 93.9 |
| Faso | | | | |
| Burundi | 98.4 | 76.8 | 89.2 | 94.9 |
| Cameroon | 100 | 90 | 100 | 98.9 |
| Chad | 99.3 | 78.6 | 100 | 95.9 |
| Comoros | 96.6 | 78 | 90.3 | 90 |
| Congo | 99 | 81.6 | 73.6 | 96.7 |
| Democratic | | | | |
| Republic | | | | |
| Cote d'Ivoire | 100 | 53.9 | 99.3 | 94.7 |
| Ethiopia | 99.2 | 87.3 | 93.9 | 97 |
| Gabon | 95.3 | 83.9 | 82.1 | 90.7 |
| Ghana | 50 | 96.9 | 70.4 | 81.4 |
| Guinea | 98.4 | 85.2 | 84.6 | 94.8 |
| Kenya | 71.2 | 71.5 | 90.9 | 72.6 |
| Lesotho | 100 | 90 | 100 | 96.9 |
| Liberia | 99.3 | 65.5 | 92.5 | 93 |
| Madagascar | 99.9 | 52.9 | 87 | 92.5 |
| Malawi | 98.8 | 72.6 | 73.3 | 96.1 |
| Mali | 99.4 | 76.6 | 91.7 | 96.6 |
| Morocco | 96 | 73.6 | 81.9 | 84.7 |
| Mozambique | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Namibia | 98.7 | 83.6 | 86.1 | 96.3 |

| Nigeria | 99.5 | 74.9 | 93.6 | 93 |
|--------------|------|------|------|------|
| Rwanda | 96.5 | 68.7 | 83.2 | 87.2 |
| Senegal | 50 | 100 | 92.3 | 89.3 |
| Sierra Leone | 98.5 | 79.6 | 85.7 | 94 |
| Tanzania | 98.4 | 74.6 | 79.4 | 93.4 |
| Togo | 97.9 | 78.3 | 88.8 | 94.6 |
| Uganda | 100 | 85.7 | 97.6 | 94.6 |
| Zambia | 99.1 | 85.7 | 81.9 | 96.9 |
| Zimbabwe | 100 | 76 | 75 | 84.1 |
| All | 94.8 | 79.8 | 87.4 | 92.6 |



Supplementary Fig. 8. Boxplots for Asian countries showing the mean percentage area of unlit
settlements within a 2 km buffer (urban) or 5 km buffer (rural) of a DHS household cluster
against the mode of the wealth indices of all households assigned to the household cluster. The
midline represents the median with the lower and upper limits of the box being the 1st and 3rd
quartiles.

| | Poorer | Average | Richer | Overall |
|-------------|--------|---------|--------|---------|
| Bangladesh | 98.5 | 76.9 | 61.9 | 96.5 |
| Cambodia | 78.6 | 38.1 | 49.9 | 62 |
| India | 94.6 | 92.1 | 85.6 | 91.2 |
| Indonesia | 46.4 | 94.3 | 81.5 | 77.4 |
| Myanmar | 57.1 | 100 | 80 | 87.7 |
| Nepal | 97.3 | 70.6 | 88.5 | 89.8 |
| Pakistan | 51.6 | 91.2 | 85.8 | 85.7 |
| Philippines | 96 | 95.1 | 69 | 94.2 |
| Tajikistan | 90.9 | 90.1 | 89.5 | 89.8 |
| Timor-Leste | 97.8 | 58.7 | 100 | 88.2 |
| All | 80.9 | 80.7 | 79.2 | 86.2 |

206 Supplementary Table 7. Category-specific accuracy by country for Asia.



| 210 | Supplementary Fig. 9. Boxplots for the Americas showing the mean percentage area of unlit |
|-----|--|
| 211 | settlements within a 2 km buffer (urban) or 5 km buffer (rural) of a DHS household cluster |
| 212 | against the mode of the wealth indices of all households assigned to the household cluster. The |
| 213 | midline represents the median with the lower and upper limits of the box being the 1^{st} and 3^{rd} |
| 214 | quartiles. |

216 Supplementary Table 8. Category-specific accuracy by country for the Americas.

| | Poorer | Average | Richer | Overall |
|--------------------|--------|---------|--------|---------|
| Bolivia | 0 | 100 | 83.3 | 78.6 |
| Colombia | 31.7 | 83.8 | 87.3 | 82.3 |
| Dominican Republic | 66.7 | 99.3 | 88.9 | 94 |
| Guatemala | 68.8 | 89.9 | 94.6 | 91.6 |
| Guyana | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Haiti | 45 | 90.6 | 76 | 77.8 |
| Honduras | 96.9 | 75.1 | 78 | 87.5 |
| Peru | 89.2 | 59.1 | 67.8 | 73.6 |
| All | 62.3 | 87.2 | 84.5 | 85.7 |

218 Supplementary Table 9. Overall continent-specific accuracy (for urban and rural settlements)

| Continent | Rural Accuracy (%) | Urban Accuracy (%) |
|---------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Africa | 92.5 | 84.4 |
| Asia | 82.4 | 86.2 |
| North America | 82.2 | 83.6 |
| South America | 71.4 | 82.6 |

221 Supplementary References

1. Jean, N. et al. Combining satellite imagery and machine learning to predict poverty. Science

, 790 (2016).

- 225 2. Chen, X. & Nordhaus, W. D. Using luminosity data as a proxy for economic statistics. *Proc*226 *Natl Acad Sci USA* 108, 8589 (2011).
- 227 3. Proville, J., Zavala-Araiza, D. & Wagner, G. Night-time lights: A global, long term look at
- links to socio-economic trends. *PLOS ONE* **12**, e0174610 (2017).
- 4. Doll, C. N. H., Muller, J.-P. & Morley, J. G. Mapping regional economic activity from night-
- time light satellite imagery. *Ecological Economics* **57**, 75–92 (2006).
- 5. Henderson, J. V., Storeygard, A. & Weil, D. N. Measuring Economic Growth from Outer
 Space. *American Economic Review* 102, 994–1028 (2012).
- 233 6. Pinkovskiy, M. & Sala-i-Martin, X. Lights, Camera ... Income! Illuminating the National
- Accounts-Household Surveys Debate *. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 131, 579–631
 (2016).
- 7. Kyba, C. C. M. *et al.* Artificially lit surface of Earth at night increasing in radiance and extent. *Sci Adv* 3, (2017).
- 238