Khuc et al 2018 – if poverty rates increase, so did deforestation and degradation in VN. Poverty is strongly associated with income, land, and literacy. Income associated with agriculture, literacy, migration. Agriculture associated with skill, infrastructure. Concluding that higher income and lower poverty could reduce deforestation and degradation. Rural livelihood improvement contributes to a reduction in forest loss. Also found that population density was positively associated with deforestation.

Linkie et al 2018. Increased affluence across Asia is correlated with increasing wildlife trade.

Bonilla-Bedoya et al 2019 – local socioeconomics, including poverty, influence LUC.

Ceddia 2019 – increases in inequality promotes agricultural expansion. Income inequality effect is larger than wealth and land inequality.

Ceddia et al 2015 – recognition of indigenous and local peoples’ forest rights has positive effect on land-sparing (agric intensification)

Fox & Volger 2005 – LUC in mountain areas of SEA will be driven by national-level policies and local economic drivers which encourage moving from traditional swidden agriculture to commercial monoculture.

Gatto et al 2015 – urban and rural population density was important for driving forest loss (agricultural expansion) depending on whether it was for rubber or for oil palm. Rubber is labour intensive, so rural populations need to be high to provide labour. But oil palm is not so labour intensive, so no incentive to switch from rubber to oil palm in highly populated rural areas. Demand for agric products from increasing urban populations also drive land conversion.

Gaughan et al 2009 – forest loss around Angkor driven by small-scale agricultural expansion and charcoal production for the booming tourism industry.

Gong et al 2013 – urban forests in China fragmentation driven by urban structure change, industry-related economic boom, increased in-migration. Increased income of city residents drove reforestation of forest fragments.

Hought et al 2012 – deforestation in northwest Cambodia largely driven by small-holder agricultural expansion for subsistence crops (initially because of migrants returning to the area post-conflict), expansion of cash crop production (cassava). Exposure of smallholder economies to volatile cassava market had severe consequences for livelihoods and food security. Privatisation of forest resources via agricultural expansion has the potential to further disenfranchise already marginalised groups e.g., female-headed households, by reducing access to NTFPs including food, medicine, shelter, and income.

Geist & Lambin 2002 – underlying causes of tropical deforestation include: demographic factors (migration, pop den, pop distribution), economic factors (markets, commercialisation, urbanisation), policy and institutional factors (property rights), cultural factors (attitudes, values, beliefs, individual household behaviour). Proximate (direct) causes – infrastructure extension (transport, markets, settlements, public services), agricultural expansion (permanent cultivation, shifting cultivation, cattle, colonisation), wood extraction (commercial, fuel, poles, charcoal).

Geist & Lambin 2003 – tropical deforestation is caused by interplay between economic, institutional, social, and demographic variables. Poverty was previously assumed to be the main driver of deforestation, and that there were therefore win-win policies like agricultural intensification through technology that would both reduce poverty and thus reduce deforestation – they rarely worked. Poverty is a factor linked to many other, more fundamental causes rather than a single variable causing deforestation. In a meta-analysis they found 16 poverty-related issues that were associated with ultimate causes of deforestation, including resource-poor farming, survival economies, food deficit, land scarcity, low income, and marginalisation. These were more often found in Asian case studies. Majority of the poverty-related cases were also associated with human population dynamics, and with pro-deforestation government policies.

Lomborg 2001 – makes lots of claims about how deforestation is linked to poverty. Lots of landless poor people, with no land tenure or governance.

Kong et al 2019 – in northwest Cambodia there are a bunch of direct and indirect drivers of LUC and forest loss since 1975. In terms of socioeconomics – clearance for subsistence agriculture, repatriation of KR, in-migration, refugee repatriation. Living conditions improved between 2006 and 2015, probably because of increasing incomes from crops, but also potentially because of increased access to credit. The LUCC in the Northwest of Cambodia is not a simple cause-effect relationship related to maize and cassava expansion, but rather a complex dynamic associated with different proximate causes and underlying factors interacting on different temporal and spatial scales.

Krishnadas et al 2019 – high human population density reduces forest cover, even around PAs.SO do roads.

Liu et al 2016 – in more urban area, population pressure, economic growth, and fruit and cash crop consumption are primary drivers of forest loss and fragmentation. In non-urban area, increases in incomes, fruit consumption, infrastructure and tourism development drive forest loss and fragmentation.