Urbanization and Livestock Disease: Evidence from Bovine Tuberculosis in Great Britain

Zekuan Dong, Aleks Schaefer, Frank Lupi, Songqing Jin

Abstract

Urban expansion is reshaping agricultural sectors, leading to unexpected and unclear externalities through the spread of livestock disease. This paper assesses the effects of urbanization on the presence, intensity, and prevalence of bovine tuberculosis (bTB) in Great Britain. Our results suggest that while localized urbanization can slightly alleviate the local bTB situation, urbanization across a larger area can aggravate it over broader regions. In other words, the externalities of urbanization on local and regional livestock disease are heterogeneous. We estimate that the externalities of urbanization on bTB can result in about £1.7 million in direct cattle death losses in Great Britain per year, and £11 million in general economic loss each year in the UK.

Keywords: urbanization, livestock disease, bovine tuberculosis, externality

JEL Codes: Q12, Q18, R11

1   Introduction

Livestock disease is a common threat to society, and its patterns are reshaped by rapid urbanization in modern history. Today, approximately 55% of the global population lives in urban areas, but this is expected to increase to 68% by 2050 (United Nations, 2018). It is recognized that this landscape evolution in human geography has led to changes in the livestock industry (Abu Hatab, Cavinato, and Lagerkvist, 2019), and theories about how urbanization affects livestock disease have been proposed (Hassell et al., 2017). A large body of literature suggests a positive relationship between urbanization and livestock disease. Human population concentration, higher livestock production, increased movement of humans and animals, increased trade, pollution, etc., are some of the potential channels through which urbanization can act as a stressor that can aggravate livestock disease (Ahmed et al., 2019; Hassell et al., 2017; Jones et al., 2013). Some literature has proposed the competing view that urbanization could mediate livestock disease through channels like higher disease prevention, detection, and management abilities, as well as changes in regulations and policies (Perry, Grace & Sones, 2013; Chakravorty, Fisher & Umetsu, 2007). Moreover, channels like land-use change, climate change, livestock production concentration, and wildlife population and distribution change may have both positive and negative impacts on livestock disease or heterogeneous impacts on different diseases (Kappes et al., 2023; Mackenstedt, Jenkins & Romig, 2015; Perry, Grace & Sones, 2013; Bradley & Altizer, 2007).

However, there have been fewer quantitative studies providing evidence for any of the arguments above. Ecologists, biologists, or animal scientists usually link urbanization and livestock disease through theoretical analyses and case studies instead of statistical analyses. Although some epidemiologists provide empirical evidence linking urbanization with wildlife–livestock–human disease, much of the focus is on health risks to humans instead of livestock (Hassell et al., 2023; Blasdell et al., 2022). There is a large body of empirical economic studies surrounding topics of livestock disease or urbanization, however, these two topics are usually isolated with limited work linking them together (Schaefer, Scheitrum, and Van Winden, 2022; Seeger et al., 2021; Zhao et al., 2022).

Our study empirically analyzes the impacts of urban areas on livestock disease by combining urbanization measurements and bovine tuberculosis (bTB) data in Great Britain (GB) from 2008 to 2018. We employ property market indexes and nightlight measurements as two major proxies for urbanization, and we further use population density as an alternative measure for a robustness check. We find that, while localized urbanization decreases bTB presence and prevalence, the urbanization level over larger regions aggravates the bTB situation. We suggest one mechanism that leads to the results is that urban areas can push away badgers (the major source of bTB infections) and usually have stricter badger control enforcement, thus they will alleviate localized bTB situations, but generate negative externalities to other herds in larger regions as they increase the density and movement of badgers into other areas. Our findings are consistent with the field experiment results of

57 Donnelly et al. (2006), which show that badger culling can reduce the incidence of cattle TB
58 incidence in the areas that are culled, but culling increases the incidence in neighboring areas. Their
59 field experiment covers thirty trial areas, with each about 100km^2 and only examines badger culling
60 activities (Donnelly et al., 2006), however, our analyses cover the whole of Great Britain and further
61 links bTB with urbanization.

62 Moreover, we provide monetary loss estimates for urban areas' externalities on bTB. Based on our
63 estimates, the externalities lead to about £1.7 million direct cattle death losses in Great Britain every
64 year. And if we take indirect loss into consideration, urbanization leads to about £11 million in
65 economic losses each year in the UK through bTB.

66 The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 introduces the background of bTB
67 situations and related government policies. Section 3 presents the datasets we use. Section 4 describes
68 the econometric strategies and provides summary statistics. Section 5 presents the empirical findings,
69 while Section 6 provides several robustness checks. Section 7 estimates the bTB economic losses
70 related to urbanization. Finally, Section 8 concludes with implications for policy and future research.

71 ## 2   Background

72 Bovine tuberculosis (bTB) is a bacterial infection occurring in bovine animals that causes illness,
73 coughing, and death. It is caused by the bacterium *Mycobacterium bovis* (*M. bovis*), and nearly all
74 mammals are susceptible to infection to a variable degree (HAIRS, 2015). Transmission of *M. bovis*
75 can occur between animals, from animals to humans, and, more rarely, between humans and from
76 humans to animals (HAIRS, 2015). Previous literature shows that the presence of wild animals, like
77 deer, brushtail possum, wild boar, and badgers, are one of the major impediments to controlling bTB
78 in the cattle industry (O'Brien et al., 2002; Vicente et al., 2006; Donnelly et al., 2006; Allen, Skuce &
79 Byrne, 2018).

80 Since 1950, Great Britain has had an extensive surveillance testing program whereby livestock are
81 routinely tested for bTB (Atkins & Robinson, 2013). Animals that test positive for the bTB test (i.e.,
82 reactors) are compulsorily isolated and slaughtered; cleaning and disinfection are also compulsorily
83 applied to the isolation areas after the reactor cattle have been removed. As soon as bTB is suspected
84 or confirmed in a cattle herd, movement and milk restrictions are also automatically applied to the
85 whole herd, and a 60-day short-interval skin testing (SIT) protocol is triggered. This restriction status
86 is sustained until all the required skin testing (and any other supplementary tests) are completed with
87 negative results, which results in restoration of the bTB-free status for the herd[1]. Although the
88 program helps control Bovine TB, bTB is still one of the biggest challenges for the UK cattle farming
89 industry today, particularly in parts of Wales, and the West and Southwest of England (TBhub,

---

[1] Details of these policies and procedures can been found at: https://tbhub.co.uk/advice-during-a-tb-breakdown/actions-once-tb-is-suspected-or-confirmed/

90 2025a). In 2023, the incidence rate of cattle herd bTB in England, Scotland, and Wales was 7.3%,
91 0.6%, and 6.8%, respectively[2].

3 Data

93 We combine three major databases to accomplish our empirical study. The Animal and Plant Health
94 Agency (APHA) SAM database provides herd-monthly level cattle bTB records between January
95 2008 and December 2018 in England, Scotland, and Wales. The Visible Infrared Imaging Radiometer
96 Suite (VIIRS) data and the HM Land Registry Price Paid Data serve as two alternative measures of
97 urbanization. The Visible Infrared Imaging Radiometer Suite (VIIRS) data provide monthly average
98 nightlight measurements encompassing England, Scotland, and Wales, but it's available only after
99 January 2014. The HM Land Registry Price Paid Data provides monthly property transaction data
100 covering only England and Wales, but it has been available since 1995. We process these three
101 databases and integrate them into a uniform geographic information system for further analysis.

3.1 Animal and Plant Health Agency (APHA) SAM database

103 Animal and Plant Health Agency (APHA) SAM database records monthly information for all British
104 beef herds, including the number of animals in the herd, the number of bTB skin and blood tests
105 conducted, the number of positive reactors, and disease restriction status from January 2008 to
106 December 2018. For example, in December 2018, Britain had about 8.6 million head of cattle, with a
107 heavy concentration in Western England, Wales, and Eastern Scotland (Panel (a) of Figure 1). In
108 December 2018, about 0.76 million cattle received skin tests, about 20,000 had blood tests, and 3,551
109 cattle had positive bTB results. A bit different from the herd distribution, the bTB-positive reactor
110 animals are more concentrated in Western England and Wales (Panel (b) of Figure 1).

111

112   Figure 1: Spatial Distribution of Cattle and bTB reactors in Dec. 2018

113

114   (a) Cattle distribution   (b) bTB reactors distribution

3.2 Visible Infrared Imaging Radiometer Suite (VIIRS) data

116   The Suomi National Polar-orbiting Partnership (SNPP) Visible Infrared Imaging Radiometer Suite
117   (VIIRS) uses satellites to provide global daily measurements of nocturnal visible and near-infrared
118   (NIR) light that are suitable for Earth system science and application studies[3]. The VIIRS Day-Night
119   Band (DNB) data provides high-quality light measures with spatial accuracy and temporal
120   comparability, thus, this data is widely used in recent economic studies to measure night light (Gibson
121   et al., 2021). Furthermore, because the lights that can be detected with satellites are mainly for urban
122   economic activity, the night light data is well accepted as a proxy for urban development (Gibson et
123   al., 2022; Ch, Martin, and Vargas, 2021).

124   This paper uses the adjusted VIIRS DNB data provided by the Earth Observation Group (EOG)[4],
125   which is more ready-to-use as it removes interferences from sunlit, moonlit, cloudy pixels, fires,
126   aurora, background, etc.[5] We use monthly composites of night lights, which are available after 2014.
127   Although the monthly VIIRS DNB provided by EOG has been available since April 2012, it excludes
128   any data affected by stray light. A large ratio of night light data in Great Britain is excluded,
129   especially during the summer, as the northern hemisphere has less nighttime coverage due to longer
130   days, and the observations are strongly affected by the stray light. EOG also provides adjusted
131   monthly nightlight data, which includes some of these stray-light-affected data if the radiance values
132   could have undergone the stray-light correction procedure (Elvidge et al., 2021), but this set is only

---

[3] Detailed introductions see: https://ladsweb.modaps.eosdis.nasa.gov/missions-and-measurements/products/VNP46A1/

[4] As of May 2024, the VIIRS DNB data provide by EOG can be downloaded through: https://eogdata.mines.edu/products/vnl/eguide.html

[5] Details adjustments see: https://eogdata.mines.edu/products/vnl/

133 available after 2014[6]. For a larger coverage[7] of Great Britain, we chose the set starting in 2014. It

134 covers the earth from 180W, 75N to 180E, 65S; it has a resolution at 15 arc seconds (about 500

135 meters), and it provides monthly-average nightlight intensity measured in the unit $nW/cm^2/sr$.

136 Figure 2 shows the nightlight map of GB in December 2018. We can see that it highly overlaps with

137 British urban areas. We combine the nightlight data with the herds' records into the same geographic

138 information system and assign the nightlight measurements to herds as a proxy for localized

139 urbanization level.

140 <center>Figure 2: Nightlight Map of The GB in Dec. 2018</center>

141

142 **3.3 HM Land Registry Price Paid Data**

143 HM Land Registry Price Paid Data[8] records all the property sale registrations in England and Wales.

144 Records are released each month and provide information on the sales price, street-level address of

145 the property, date of transfer, postcode, etc., for each transaction. With the data, we observe

146 approximately 1 million home sales each year. Since the Price Paid Data is available after 1995, it

147 covers the whole data period of the APHA SAM database.

148 The postcodes provided by Price Paid Data can reveal relatively accurate location information, so we

149 need to adapt the postcode information to the geographic information system we are using. We apply

150 the ONS Postcode Directory (November 2016) for the UK[9], which provides 1-meter resolution UK

---

[6] Specifically, we use the set denoted with "vcmslcfg" and "avg_rade9h_masked". Here the "masked" means they use a set of annual "masked medians" to clear out fires and zero out the background (Elvidge et al., 2021). Details can be seen through: https://eogdata.mines.edu/products/vnl/

[7] Although this set has larger and longer coverage of Great Britain, there are still some areas in Scotland that don't have reliable monthly nightlight observations during June and July, so we have to keep them as missing observations.

[8] See: https://www.gov.uk/government/statistical-data-sets/price-paid-data-downloads#using-or-publishing-our-price-paid-data, data extracted in Aug. 2024.

[9] See: https://geoportal.statistics.gov.uk/datasets/e018152cd9a3445d89c3d751603f703b/about, data extracted in Aug. 2024.

151 Grid references (i.e., easting and northing) for every postcode in 2016, to attach spatial information to
152 the Price Paid Data.

4   Methodology

154 In this section, we describe herd-level regression models to examine the effects of localized and
155 regional urbanization on bTB presence, intensity, and prevalence in the British cattle industry.

4.1   Localized urbanization on herd-level bTB disease situation

157 Our local model considers a herd's bTB situation as a function of its previous bTB status, the local
158 bTB pressure, local urbanization level, the number of cattle in the herd, and bTB testing. We also
159 include time and herd-level fixed effects to capture herd-invariant and time-invariant unobservable
160 factors. Our baseline regression model is:

$$
\begin{aligned}
bTB_{it} = \alpha &+ \beta Urbanization_{it} + \gamma bTB_{i,t-1} + \delta Pressure_{i,t-1} + \eta Cattle_{it} + \varphi Test_{it} \\
&+ \lambda h_i + \mu m_t + \varepsilon_{it}
\end{aligned} \tag{1}
$$

162 where bTB_{it} measures the disease situation of herd i at time t. We consider three alternative
163 methods to construct bTB_{it}. In the first construction, it is a dummy variable that indicates whether
164 herd i has at least one positive bTB reactor at time t; we denote this with bTB_Dummy_{it}, and it
165 captures bTB "presence". In the second method, it is a ratio that shows the share of positive bTB
166 cattle in herd i at time t in percentage, i.e., $bTB_{it} \in [0\%, 100\%]$; we denote this with
167 bTB_Ratio_{it}, and it captures bTB "intensity". For the third method, bTB_{it} is the number of positive
168 bTB cattle in herd i at time t, which we denote bTB_Number_{it} to capture bTB "prevalence".

169 $Urbanization_{it}$ is the localized urbanization measurement of herd i at time t. We apply two
170 alternative proxies separately, one is the nightlight intensity measurement at about 15 arc seconds
171 resolution (about 500 meters), and the other is the property transaction measurement at 100-meter
172 resolution.

173 Notice that, while nightlight intensity data is a raster dataset that covers our study area, the property
174 transactions data, although combined with ONS Postcode Directory, are just points that scatter across
175 our study area. We still need to transfer the property transactions data from points to the raster layer to
176 cover the surface of Great Britain, so we can assign the estimated urbanization measurement to every
177 herd. To do so, we use the Kernel Density Estimator (KDE) in QGIS to generate heatmaps of property
178 transactions as a proxy for urbanization. We set the radius of KDE to 2 kilometers, which assumes
179 every transaction represents the urbanization level of adjacent areas, and this representation will
180 diminish to zero at 2 kilometers away. To set the Kernel Shape, we use the Epanechnikov function as
181 described in Appendix A. To get smoother and continuous estimated property market "heat", we set
182 the resolution of KDE to 100 meters. We set the weight of every transaction as its deflated transaction
183 price; thus, more expensive property sales will represent a higher urbanization level. More details and
184 an illustration of this method are provided in Appendix A, and a heatmap example of all the property

185   transactions in December 2018 is shown in Appendix Figure A3. We then match the geographic

186   information of herds with the property market heatmap and assign the localized property market

187   "heat" to herds as an alternative measurement of urbanization level.

188    $Pressure_{i,t-1}$ is a variable that captures the local disease pressure around herd i at time $t-1$. We

189   employ the Kernel Density Estimator (KDE) in QGIS to generate the heatmap of bTB situations.

190   Specifically, we use monthly bTB-positive animal reactors to generate a heatmap. We set the radius of

191   KDE as 100 kilometers, which assumes every herd with positive bTB reactors would exert disease

192   pressure on other herds within 100 kilometers. We set the Kernel Shape decided by Epanechnikov

193   function as is discussed in Appendix B. We set the weight of every bTB-contaminated herd as its

194   number of positive animal reactors, thus herds with more positive bTB reactors will exert more

195   disease pressure on other herds. The details and an illustration of this method are provided in

196   Appendix B, and an example of the bTB disease pressure heatmap of December 2018 is shown in

197   Figure B4. After generating the bTB heatmap, which serves as a proxy of disease pressure, we match

198   the geocode of the herd i to the heatmap and assign the local bTB "heat" as the disease pressure

199    $Pressure_{i,t}$. We use a one-period lagged $Pressure_{i,t-1}$ in the regression to avoid endogeneity, as

200   bTB_{it} have impacts on the contemporary $Pressure_{i,t}$.

201    $bTB_{i,t-1}$ is the lagged dependent variable. $Cattle_{it}$ is the number of all the cattle in herd i at time

202   t. It's straightforward to think that the number of cattle in the herd influences bTB_{it}, for example, the

203   number of bTB reactors can't exceed the total number of cattle. $Test_{it}$ measures bTB testing in herd

204   i at time t, and the construction of $Test_{it}$ depends on the specification of bTB_{it}. Specifically, when

205   bTB_{it} is a dummy variable that indicates if the herd has any positive bTB animal, $Test_{it}$ is also a

206   dummy variable that indicates if the herd had any bTB test during the same period. When bTB_{it} is a

207   ratio showing the share of positive bTB cattle in herd i at time t, $Test_{it}$ is the ratio of total tests

208   (including skin tests and blood tests) over the total number of cattle in percentage, which can exceed

209   100% because cattle can be tested more than once or with both blood and skin tests in a month. When

210   bTB_{it} is the number of positive bTB cattle in a herd i at time t, $Test_{it}$ is the number of total tests.

211   h_i and m_t are herd-level and year-month-level fixed effects, respectively.

4.2 Regional urbanization on herd-level bTB disease situation

213   After testing how localized urbanization level affects the bTB situation of cattle herds, we turn to

214   whether urbanization in larger areas has different effects on local herds. The regional urbanization

215   regression model is:

216
$$bTB_{it} = \alpha + \beta Urbanization_{rt} + \gamma bTB_{i,t-1} + \delta Pressure_{i,t-1} + \eta Cattle_{it} + \varphi Test_{it}$$
$$+ \lambda h_i + \mu m_t + \varepsilon_{it} \qquad (2)$$

217   where most variables have the same definition as in Section 4.1, but the difference is that we include

218   the regional urbanization measurement $Urbanization_{rt}$ instead of localized urbanization. The

219   construction of regional urbanization is the average localized urbanization measurement of all herds

220   located in the same Local Authority District (LAD) r at time t, i.e., $Urbanization_{rt} =$

221 $\frac{\sum_{herd\ i\ located\ in\ LAD\ r\ at\ time\ t}Urbanization_{it}}{number\ of\ herds\ located\ in\ LAD\ r\ at\ time\ t}$. Thus, the regional urbanization levels here are LAD-level

222 measurements for urbanization. A map of the 2016 Local Authority Districts (LADs) in provided in

223 Appendix Figure E1.

224 **4.3 Summary statistics**

225 In this section, we provide summary statistics for the variables used in our analyses. Although the

226 APHA SAM database covers England, Wales, and Scotland from 2008 to 2018, the VIIRS data and

227 HM Land Registry Price Paid Data are more spatiotemporally limited. Thus, we further extract two

228 subgroups of APHA SAM data to match with VIIRS data and HM Land Registry Price Paid Data

229 separately. Two cohorts of data are thus created for further analyses. Specifically, the first cohort

230 matches the APHA SAM database (herd data) with VIIRS data (nightlight data) and forms a dataset

231 with 5,024,081 observations covering England, Wales, and Scotland from Jan. 2014 to Dec. 2018.

232 The second cohort matches the APHA SAM database with property market heatmaps generated from

233 HM Land Registry Price Paid Data and forms a dataset with 11,813,973 observations covering

234 England and Wales from Jan. 2008 to Dec. 2018. The detailed summary statistics of these two cohorts

235 are shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Summary Statistics

Cohort with the nightlight as the urbanization measurements

Coverage: Covering England, Wales, and Scotland from Jan. 2014 to Dec. 2018

Number of observations: 5,024,081

Variables	Alternatives	Definitions	Mean	Std. dev.	Min	Max
bTB	Dummy	Equals to 1 if there's at least one bTB reactor in the herd	0.0096	0.0973	0	1
	Ratio	The ratio of bTB reactors to the head of cattle in the herd in percentage	0.0275	0.8670	0	100
	Number	Number of bTB reactors	0.0363	0.7683	0	352
Urbanization	Localized Nightlight	Monthly average localized nightlight measurement	1.1867	3.1450	0	457.65
	Regional Nightlight	The average of nightlight measurements of all the herds within the same LAD	1.1867	1.7244	0	100.95
Pressure	-	local disease pressure generated by QGIS	266.5999	253.9095	0	1172.11
Cattle	-	Number of cattle in the herd	99.3925	183.7856	0	7824
Test	Dummy	Equal to 1 if there's at least one bTB test has been conducted	0.1281	0.3342	0	1
	Ratio	The ratio of the total number of any kind of tests to the number of cattle in percentage	6.6236	100.4416	0	105900
	Number	Number of total tests conducted	9.4286	60.1823	0	5020

Cohort with the property market heat as the urbanization measurements

Coverage: Covering England and Wales from Jan. 2008 to Dec. 2018

Number of observations: 11,813,973

Variables	Alternatives	Definitions	Mean	Std. dev.	Min	Max
bTB	Dummy	Equals to 1 if there's at least one bTB reactor in the herd	0.0092	0.0954	0	1
	Ratio	The ratio of bTB reactors to the head of cattle in the herd in percentage	0.0283	0.9554	0	100
	Number	Number of bTB reactors	0.0328	0.6970	0	352
Urbanization	Localized Property market heat	Monthly property market heat generated by QGIS	0.3976	1.5072	0	457.05
	Regional Property market heat	The average of property market heat measurements of all the herds within the same LAD	0.3976	1.1354	0	396.06
Pressure	-	local disease pressure generated by QGIS	298.3764	250.3600	0	1172.11
Cattle	-	Number of cattle in the herd	76.7569	151.1299	0	5956
Test	Dummy	Equal to 1 if there's at least one bTB test been conducted	0.1123	0.3157	0	1
	Ratio	The ratio of the total number of any kind of tests to the number of cattle in percentage	5.8793	114.2641	0	114700
	Number	Number of total tests conducted	7.6526	51.4784	0	21100

5 Empirical results

We estimate the coefficients in Equation (1) and Equation (2) to assess the impacts of localized and regional urbanization levels on the bTB situation of cattle herds in Great Britain. We analyze the bTB situation through three dimensions, i.e., disease presence, intensity, and prevalence. We use nightlight measurement and property market heat as two proxies of urbanization. Broadly speaking, our empirical results show that localized urbanization decreases the bTB presence and prevalence, however, the regional urbanization level in larger areas aggravates bTB.

5.1 Impacts of localized urbanization on herd-level bTB disease situations

We report the results of testing the impacts of localized urbanization levels on herds' bTB situations in Table 2. Columns (1)-(3) report the results of using nightlight measurements as the proxy for urbanization, and Columns (4)-(6) report the results of using property market heat as the proxy. Moreover, Columns (1) and (4) show the results for bTB_Dummy as the dependent variable to test the effects on bTB presence. Columns (2) and (5) use bTB_Ratio as the dependent variable to test the effects on bTB intensity, whereas columns (3) and (6) use bTB_Number as the dependent variable to test the effects on bTB prevalence. Specifically, when using nightlight measurements as the proxy, we find that localized urbanization level can statistically significantly decrease bTB presence. If the nightlight measurement increases 1 $nW/cm^2/sr$, the possibility of the herds getting bTB infection decreases by 0.000032. Notice that the average possibility of a herd getting bTB is 0.0096, so this means that a 1 standard deviation (SD) increase in nightlight measurement will make the herd 1.05%[10] less likely to get bTB. When using property market heat as the proxy, we see that if the property market heat increases by 1 unit, the number of positive bTB reactors in a herd will statistically significantly decrease -0.000181. Notice that the average number of bTB reactors in a herd is 0.0328, so this means that a 1 SD increase in property measurement will make the number of bTB reactors in a herd drop about 0.83%[11]. The urbanization coefficients for the other model specifications, although not statistically significant, are usually negative. Generally speaking, we find that increasing localized urbanization levels will decrease the bTB presence and prevalence among cattle herds depending on the measure of urbanization.

The estimated effects of the control variables are consistent with intuition. The coefficients of $Pressure_{i,t-1}$ are significantly positive across all specifications, indicating that higher bTB pressure from neighboring areas (within a 100 km radius) worsens a herd's bTB situation. Specifically, based on both the nightlight- and property market–based specifications, a one SD increase in one month lagged bTB pressure raises the probability of infection by 18.51%–35.37%, increases disease intensity

---

[10] $-1.05\% \approx -0.000032 * 3.145 \div 0.0096 * 100\%$

[11] $-0.83\% \approx -0.000181 * 1.5072 \div 0.0328 * 100\%$

by 10.16%–40.69%, and elevates prevalence by 29.38%–45.80%[12]. The coefficients of lagged bTB_Dummy, bTB_Ratio, bTB_Number are generally positive[13], suggesting that bTB infection can persist over time. Moreover, the coefficients of $Cattle_{it}$ are significantly positive in all the specifications, implying that larger herds are more susceptible to bTB infection, and experience greater intensity and prevalence once infected. Finally, the estimated coefficients of all testing-related variables are significantly positive, as expected, since only tested herds can be detected with bTB.

Table 2: Localized urbanization on bTB situations

	Nightlight			Property		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
	bTB_Dummy_{it}	bTB_Ratio_{it}	bTB_Number_{it}	bTB_Dummy_{it}	bTB_Ratio_{it}	bTB_Number_{it}
$Urbanization\_Nightlight_{it}$	-0.000032*	-0.000003	0.000030	-	-	-
	(0.000020)	(0.000242)	(0.000108)	-	-	-
$Urbanization\_Property_{it}$				-0.000004	-0.000025	-0.000181**
				(0.000015)	(0.000159)	(0.000090)
$Pressure_{i,t-1}$	0.000007***	0.000011*	0.000042***	0.000013***	0.000046***	0.000060***
	(0.000001)	(0.000007)	(0.000007)	(0.000000)	(0.000006)	(0.000004)
$Cattle_{it}$	0.000036***	0.000047**	0.000511***	0.000037***	0.000033**	0.000413***
	(0.000002)	(0.000020)	(0.000047)	(0.000002)	(0.000014)	(0.000029)
$bTB\_Dummy_{i,t-1}$	-0.004795***			0.027520***		
	(0.001776)			(0.001241)		
$Test\_Dummy_{it}$	0.063616***			0.071899***		
	(0.000549)			(0.000512)		
$bTB\_Ratio_{i,t-1}$		0.012718			0.040646***	
		(0.010302)			(0.006792)	
$Test\_Ratio_{it}$		0.002075***			0.002098***	
		(0.000438)			(0.000333)	
$bTB\_Number_{i,t-1}$			0.000109			0.031671**
			(0.007157)			(0.013378)
$Test\_Number_{it}$			0.001211***			0.001243***
			(0.000062)			(0.000053)
Constant	-0.004050***	0.005819*	-0.037158***	-0.005859***	-0.001341	-0.027375***
	(0.000353)	(0.003222)	(0.005334)	(0.000233)	(0.002158)	(0.002821)
Herd Fixed Effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Year-Month Fixed Effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	5024081	5024081	5024081	11813973	11813973	11813973

Cluster standard errors in parentheses. Standard errors are clustered at the herd level.

* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$

---

[12] $18.51\% \approx 0.000007 * 253.9095 \div 0.0096 * 100\%$; $35.37\% \approx 0.000013 * 250.3600 \div 0.0092 * 100\%$; $10.16\% \approx 0.000011 * 253.9095 \div 0.0275 * 100\%$; $40.69\% \approx 0.000046 * 250.3600 \div 0.0283 * 100\%$; $29.38\% \approx 0.000042 * 253.9095 \div 0.0363 * 100\%$; $45.80\% \approx 0.000060 * 250.3600 \div 0.0328 * 100\%$

[13] Notice that the coefficient of $bTB\_Dummy_{i,t-1}$ is negative, which is counterintuitive. However, after including up to 12 periods lagged bTB_Dummy variable into regressions shown in Appendix Table C7, the linear aggregation of the 12 lagged bTB_Dummy coefficients are positive, which equals to 0.053131 and significant at 1% level.

5.2 Impacts of regional urbanization on herd-level bTB disease situations

Table 3 reports the regression results evaluating the impacts of regional urbanization on herds' bTB situations. Columns (1)-(3) report the results of using nightlight measurements as the proxy for urbanization, whereas columns (4)-(6) use property market heat as the urbanization proxy. Columns (1) and (4) show the results using bTB_Dummy as the dependent variable to test the effects on bTB presence. Columns (2) and (5) use bTB_Ratio as the dependent variable to test the effects on bTB intensity, and columns (3) and (6) use bTB_Number as the dependent variable to test the effects on bTB cases.

Broadly speaking, we find that regional urbanization level will aggravate herds' bTB situations, which is the opposite of the effects for localized urbanization. Specifically, when using nightlight measurements as the proxy, we find that localized urbanization level can statistically significantly increase the bTB reactors in a herd. If the nightlight measurement increases by 1 $nW/cm^2/sr$, the number of bTB reactors in a herd will increase 0.000867. Notice that the average bTB reactors in a herd are 0.0363, so this means that a 1 SD increase in nightlight measurement will make the bTB reactors in a herd increase by 4.12%[14]. When using property market heat as the proxy, we see that the regional urbanization level has a significantly positive relationship with all three bTB measurements. If the property market heat increases by 1 unit, the possibility of a herd testing positive with bTB will increase 0.000034, the ratio of positive reactors in a herd will increase 0.000387%, and the real cases of bTB reactors will increase 0.000316. After comparing with the herds' average bTB situation measurements, our results indicate that if the regional property market heat increases 1 SD, the possibility of a herd tested positive with bTB will increase by 0.42%[15], the ratio of positive reactors in a herd will increase by 1.55%[16], and the number of positive bTB reactors in a herd will increase by 1.09%[17]. The estimated effects of the other variables are consistent with intuition and highly similar to the estimations in section 5.1.

---

[14] $4.12\% \approx 0.000867 * 1.7244 \div 0.0363 * 100\%$

[15] $0.42\% \approx 0.000034 * 1.1354 \div 0.0092 * 100\%$

[16] $1.55\% \approx 0.000387\% * 1.1354 \div 0.0283\% * 100\%$

[17] $1.09\% \approx 0.000316 * 1.1354 \div 0.0328 * 100\%$

Table 3: Regional urbanization on bTB situations

	Nightlight			Property		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
	bTB_Dummy_{it}	bTB_Ratio_{it}	bTB_Number_{it}	bTB_Dummy_{it}	bTB_Ratio_{it}	bTB_Number_{it}
$Urbanization\_Nightlight_{rt}$	-0.000048	0.000440	0.000867*	-	-	-
	(0.000065)	(0.000587)	(0.000498)	-	-	-
$Urbanization\_Property_{rt}$				0.000034*	0.000387**	0.000316**
				(0.000019)	(0.000170)	(0.000129)
$Pressure_{i,t-1}$	0.000007***	0.000011*	0.000042***	0.000013***	0.000046***	0.000060***
	(0.000001)	(0.000007)	(0.000007)	(0.000000)	(0.000006)	(0.000004)
$Cattle_{it}$	0.000036***	0.000047**	0.000511***	0.000037***	0.000033**	0.000413***
	(0.000002)	(0.000020)	(0.000047)	(0.000002)	(0.000014)	(0.000029)
$bTB\_Dummy_{i,t-1}$	-0.004795***			0.027520***		
	(0.001776)			(0.001241)		
$Test\_Dummy_{it}$	0.063616***			0.071899***		
	(0.000549)			(0.000512)		
$bTB\_Ratio_{i,t-1}$		0.012718			0.040646***	
		(0.010302)			(0.006792)	
$Test\_Ratio_{it}$		0.002075***			0.002098***	
		(0.000438)			(0.000333)	
$bTB\_Number_{i,t-1}$			0.000108			0.031671**
			(0.007157)			(0.013378)
$Test\_Number_{it}$			0.001211***			0.001243***
			(0.000062)			(0.000053)
Constant	-0.004032***	0.005301*	-0.038137***	-0.005872***	-0.001477	-0.027540***
	(0.000360)	(0.003205)	(0.005298)	(0.000234)	(0.002158)	(0.002822)
Herd Fixed Effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Year-Month Fixed Effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	5024081	5024081	5024081	11813973	11813973	11813973

Cluster standard errors in parentheses. Standard errors are clustered at the herd level.

$^*\, p < 0.1, \,^{**}\, p < 0.05, \,^{***}\, p < 0.01$

6 Robustness checks

We conduct several robustness checks to test the consistency of our findings with alternative
urbanization proxies and model specifications. Section 6.1 re-estimates the effects of regional
urbanization on bTB situations using population density as an alternative proxy for urbanization. In
addition, we further use historical population density as an instrumental variable (IV) to avoid
potential endogeneity issues. Instead of estimating the impacts of localized and regional urbanization
separately, Section 6.2 includes both measurements in one regression to estimate the effects
simultaneously. Section 6.3 discusses results of some other alternative specifications.

6.1 Using population density and the IV approach

While nightlight and property transactions are often used as proxies for urbanization in recent literature, population density is a more traditional and widely used measurement for urbanization (Ch, Martin, and Vargas, 2021; Dong and Schaefer, 2025; Michaels, Rauch, and Redding, 2012; Davis, 2015). However, we did not apply the population density as the primary proxy for urbanization in this paper for two reasons. First, the available population density data have lower spatiotemporal resolution. We obtain population data from the UK's Office for National Statistics[18]. Although this data covers the whole of Great Britain from 1981 to 2019, it only provides mid-year population estimation for Local Authority Districts. Thus, while property transaction data and nightlight data can provide monthly urbanization measurements with less than 500-meter resolution, the annual LAD-level population densities would be insufficiently granular, especially when testing the effects of localized urbanization. Second, using population density as the proxy for urbanization to study the effects on bTB situations may bring some endogeneity issues. Although we use fixed effect estimation to control for unobserved factors, omitted variables like pollution, beef prices, and local government budgets may have relationships with both bTB situations and local populations. For example, an increase in rural pollution levels may exacerbate livestock diseases (Cox et al., 2016) and lead to population decline through net outmigration (Chen, Oliva, & Zhang, 2022). This mechanism may lead to an overestimate of urbanization's effects on alleviating bTB situations. Additionally, using population data may introduce "reverse causality" issues, as the bTB situations may also affect the local population. Although, to the best of our knowledge, there is no direct evidence that suggests the population is affected by bTB, many works show that bTB outbreaks lead to significant losses to ranchers from not only the death/slaughter of cattle, but also the restrictions on herds (Godfray et al., 2018; Schaefer, Scheitrum, and van Winden, 2022). This burden from bTB may affect the local economy and lead to potential impacts on the rural population. While population density includes rural populations, which may be affected by bTB and rural pollution levels, nightlight and property markets are more closely related to urban activities and less affected by changes in rural areas. Based on the reasons discussed above, we choose to use nightlight data or property transaction data as baseline approaches because they can better avoid potential endogeneity issues.

Despite the issues we discussed above regarding using population density as the proxy for urbanization, we provide a robustness check with it to align with previous literature and further support our findings. With the mid-year population estimates data from the UK's Office for National Statistics and the LADs' areas of 2020 administrative geography, we calculated the annual population density estimates in persons per square kilometer for every LAD from 1981 to 2019. We first use an OLS regression similar to Equation (2) to provide baseline results. Furthermore, to deal with the potential endogeneity issues discussed above, we employ two-staged least squares (2SLS) using 20-years-before historical population densities from 1988 to 1998 as an instrumental variable for the

---

[18] See:
https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/populationandmigration/populationestimates/adhocs/13221populationestimatesbylocalauthoritiesofgreatbritainmid1981tomid2019. Data extracted in Feb. 2025.

14

population densities of our study period, which is from 2008 to 2018. Notice that the population density data is only available at the LAD level, thus, we are only able to test the effects of regional urbanization. The results are shown in Table 4. Columns (1) to (3) report the results with the OLS approach, and Columns (4) to (6) report 2SLS results. We can see that the OLS approach doesn't generate any statistically significant results, but the 2SLS IV approach yields a statistically significant relationship between regional population density and herds' bTB reactors. This result suggests that when the regional population density increases 1 person per square kilometer, the expected number of bTB reactors in a herd will increase 0.00001641. Notice that the average number of bTB cattle in a herd of this cohort is 0.0279, and the average population density is about 225 people per square kilometer. Thus, our estimators suggest that if the population density increases by 10%, the number of bTB cattle will increase by about 1.3%[19]. These results are consistent with our baseline findings, which further support the positive relationship between regional urbanization and bTB severity.

---

[19] $1.3\% \approx 0.00001641 * (225 * 10\%) \div 0.0279 * 100\%$

Table 4: Regional urbanization measured by population density on bTB situations

	OLS Approach			2SLS Approach		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
	bTB_Dummy_{it}	bTB_Ratio_{it}	bTB_Number_{it}	bTB_Dummy_{it}	bTB_Ratio_{it}	bTB_Number_{it}
$Urbanization\_Pop.dens._{rt}$	-0.00000083	-0.00000002	0.00000399	-0.00000111	-0.00000015*	0.00001641*
	(0.00000075)	(0.00000005)	(0.00000386)	(0.00000124)	(0.00000009)	(0.00000857)
$Pressure_{i,t-1}$	0.00001255***	0.00000043***	0.00005784***	0.00001255***	0.00000043***	0.00005773***
	(0.00000048)	(0.00000006)	(0.00000374)	(0.00000048)	(0.00000006)	(0.00000374)
$Cattle_{it}$	0.00003142***	0.00000027**	0.00034053***	0.00003142***	0.00000027**	0.00034054***
	(0.00000171)	(0.00000012)	(0.00002408)	(0.00000171)	(0.00000012)	(0.00002408)
$bTB\_Dummy_{i,t-1}$	0.02810623***			0.02810624***		
	(0.00124053)			(0.00124053)		
$Test\_Dummy_{it}$	0.06935620***			0.06935625***		
	(0.00049366)			(0.00049366)		
$bTB\_Ratio_{i,t-1}$		0.04139388***			0.04139388***	
		(0.00679759)			(0.00679758)	
$Test\_Ratio_{it}$		0.00206464***			0.00206464***	
		(0.00032312)			(0.00032312)	
$bTB\_Number_{i,t-1}$			0.03251488**			0.03251498**
			(0.01319175)			(0.01319174)
$Test\_Number_{it}$			0.00124030***			0.00124030***
			(0.00005224)			(0.00005224)
Constant	-0.00479364***	-0.00000188	-0.02480253***	-0.00407049***	0.00005508	-0.02301357***
	(0.00025881)	(0.00002111)	(0.00255306)	(0.00042236)	(0.00004015)	(0.00380713)
Herd Fixed Effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Year-Month Fixed Effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	13971493	13971493	13971493	13971493	13971493	13971493

Cluster standard errors in parentheses. Standard errors are clustered at the herd level.

The 2SLS approach passes the underidentification test and weak IV test.

* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$

6.2 Including both localized and regional urbanization proxies into one regression

In our baseline regressions, we estimate the influence of localized and regional urbanization levels on bTB situations separately because these two variables may lead to an underestimate of each other. In this section, we provide a robustness check by estimating their effects simultaneously, which may help avoid potential omitted variable issues resulting from the separate estimation. This approach can be illustrated by the following equation:

$$bTB_{it} = \alpha + \beta_1 Urbanization_{it} + \beta_2 Urbanization_{rt} + \gamma bTB_{i,t-1} + \delta Pressure_{i,t-1} + \eta Cattle_{it} + \varphi Test_{it} + \lambda h_i + \mu m_t + \varepsilon_{it} \tag{3}$$

The results of this approach are shown in Table 5. Columns (1) to (3) show the result of using nightlight as the proxy for urbanization, and Columns (4) to (6) report results with property market heat as the proxy. Generally speaking, although slightly different, the results are still consistent and have the same direction as our baseline approaches. While the estimates for the localized and regional

nightlight variables get slightly smaller and less significant compared to the baseline results, the

381 estimates for property transaction variables get much larger and more significant.

382   Table 4: Localized and regional urbanization on bTB situations

	Nightlight			Property		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
	bTB_Dummy_{it}	bTB_Ratio_{it}	bTB_Number_{it}	bTB_Dummy_{it}	bTB_Ratio_{it}	bTB_Number_{it}
$Urbanization\_Nightlight_{it}$	-0.000030	-0.000051	-0.000060	-	-	-
	(0.000020)	(0.000265)	(0.000111)	-	-	-
$Urbanization\_Nightlight_{rt}$	-0.000019	0.000488	0.000923*	-	-	-
	(0.000068)	(0.000658)	(0.000517)	-	-	-
$Urbanization\_Property_{it}$	-	-	-	-0.000025	-0.000255	-0.000459***
	-	-	-	(0.000022)	(0.000221)	(0.000132)
$Urbanization\_Property_{rt}$	-	-	-	0.000059*	0.000642**	0.000776***
	-	-	-	(0.000031)	(0.000263)	(0.000204)
$Pressure_{i,t-1}$	0.000007***	0.000011*	0.000042***	0.000013***	0.000046***	0.000060***
	(0.000001)	(0.000007)	(0.000007)	(0.000000)	(0.000006)	(0.000004)
$Cattle_{it}$	0.000036***	0.000047**	0.000511***	0.000037***	0.000033**	0.000413***
	(0.000002)	(0.000020)	(0.000047)	(0.000002)	(0.000014)	(0.000029)
$bTB\_Dummy_{i,t-1}$	-0.004795***			0.027520***		
	(0.001776)			(0.001241)		
$Test\_Dummy_{it}$	0.063616***			0.071899***		
	(0.000549)			(0.000512)		
$bTB\_Ratio_{i,t-1}$		0.012718			0.040646***	
		(0.010302)			(0.006792)	
$Test\_Ratio_{it}$		0.002075***			0.002098***	
		(0.000438)			(0.000333)	
$bTB\_Number_{i,t-1}$			0.000108			0.031671**
			(0.007157)			(0.013378)
$Test\_Number_{it}$			0.001211***			0.001243***
			(0.000062)			(0.000053)
Constant	-0.004029***	0.005305*	-0.038132***	-0.005872***	-0.001477	-0.027540***
	(0.000360)	(0.003206)	(0.005298)	(0.000234)	(0.002158)	(0.002822)
Herd Fixed Effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Year-Month Fixed Effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	5024081	5024081	5024081	11813973	11813973	11813973

383 Cluster standard errors in parentheses. Standard errors are clustered at the herd level.

384 * $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$

6.3 Other robustness checks

386 In Appendix C, we further provide some other alternative robustness checks. Firstly, recent

387 econometrics works show that the TWFE regressions estimate weighted sums of the average

388 treatment effects (ATEs) in each group and period, thus, if the ATEs are heterogeneous across groups

389 or periods, the weights of some ATEs could be negative, which leads to the linear regression

390 coefficient being biased or even opposite to the real ATEs (Sun and Shapiro, 2022; De Chaisemartin

391 and d'Haultfoeuille, 2020). To deal with this potential issue related to the two-way fixed effects

392 (TWFE) estimators, Appendix C.1 reports the results without fixed effects or only with one-way fixed
393 effects. Secondly, Appendix C.2 includes the interaction term of urbanization measurements and
394 lagged bTB pressure to capture potential joint effects. Appendix C3 tests the specifications with some
395 dynamic variables to test if previous urbanization levels have lagged effects on current bTB situation.

7   Economic loss estimation

397 Our empirical results suggest that while localized urbanization can alleviate bTB situations, regional
398 urban expansion can aggravate the disease situation. With this evidence showing the externalities
399 generated from urbanization, we turn to estimating the associated monetary losses or gains. To do so,
400 we construct a counterfactual scenario to evaluate the cattle death loss results from urbanization. We
401 first reset the localized and regional urbanization level of all the herds to zero and calculate the
402 counterfactual changes in the number of cattle that would have been slaughtered[20] in every herd. The
403 detailed illustration of this step is provided in Appendix D. With the counterfactual changes in
404 slaughtered cattle, we further calculate the counterfactual number of slaughtered cattle and compare
405 this with the observed number. This comparison is illustrated in Figure 3. We can see that, in England,
406 Wales, and Scotland, from Jan. 2014 to Dec. 2018, there were on average 3,309 cattle slaughtered
407 because of bTB in each month, and there would have been about 141 fewer slaughtered cattle per
408 month if we had set the urbanization level to zero. This change accounts for an about 4.27%[21]
409 decrease in the number of cattle slaughtered because of bTB. For these cattle slaughtered because of
410 bTB, the UK government pays compensation based upon average livestock market prices for the
411 relevant categories. Using these monthly disclosed compensation rates[22], we derive the estimated bTB
412 death losses from urbanization shown in Figure 4. From Jan. 2014 to Dec. 2018, urbanization leads to
413 an average of about £150,000 in monetary death losses per month in Great Britain, corresponding to
414 about £1.7 million in death losses annually.

415 Although we provide the urbanization-affected bTB death loss estimates, this is only a portion of the
416 total bTB economic loss resulting from urbanization. As the UK government implements the bTB
417 eradication strategy as we discussed in Section 2, the policy costs taxpayers millions of pounds per
418 annum in wildlife control, testing, research, and slaughter compensation (Godfray et al., 2018).
419 Besides the direct government outlays, bTB outbreaks also lead to losses for the cattle industry from
420 channels like cattle slaughter, extra labor, movement and trade restrictions, and farmers' mental stress

---

[20] In our baseline empirical settings, we use bTB reactors information to evaluate the impacts of urbanization on bTB prevalence. However, when calculating the death loss, we use the number of cattle been slaughtered because of bTB. This is because the numbers of cattle slaughtered are not always equal to the numbers of positive bTB reactors. According to the UK government, not only the cattle confirmed of bTB affection (bTB positive reactors) should be slaughtered, but those suspected of having bTB are also slaughtered. Thus the number of cattle slaughtered sometimes exceeds the number of reactors.

[21] 4.27% ≈141/3309*100%

[22] See: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/bovine-tb-historical-compensation-value-tables. Data extracted in Mar. 2025. Specifically, we use the monthly average compensation rate of non-pedigree beef sector cattle over 20 months and over (not calved for the female). This application aligns with Schaefer, Scheitrum, and van Winden (2022).

421 (Defra, 2008a).[23] Thus, to better estimate the general economic loss of urbanization-affected bTB, we
422 collect information for government payments and farmer losses from many sources. Table 5
423 summarizes the data we collected. The data about UK government payments is sufficient, which
424 suggests about £150 million annual cost in recent years, and this cost has increased in the past decades
425 (APHA, 2023; Defra, 2008b; Defra 2009; Defra 2010; Defra, 2011; Defra, 2022). However, we only
426 get limited cost estimates for cattle industry losses, which is between £50 million to £75 million each
427 year in England, and is unavailable for Scotland, Wales, or Northern Ireland. With the limitations in
428 available data, we can't provide a precise evaluation of urbanization externalities on bTB economic
429 costs. However, we provide some rough estimations based on the data we have and with more
430 assumptions. First, if we combine the information provided by Godfray et al. (2018) and Defra
431 (2014), we can estimate that the cost for the England cattle industry is around 70% to 75%[24] of the
432 cost for England taxpayers. Second, we further assume this ratio can be applied to the whole UK and
433 use the data provided by APHA (2023) to calculate that the bTB losses for the UK cattle industry are
434 between £105 million to £112.5 million each year[25]. Finally, since in this section we get an estimate of
435 a 4.27% decrease in bTB cattle slaughtered under a zero-urbanization counterfactual scenario, we
436 further assume this ratio can be applied to the general economic losses estimations. Thus, we estimate
437 that the urbanization-led bTB general economic loss in the UK is about £11 million per year, where
438 about £6.4 million is paid by taxpayers and £4.8 million falls on the cattle industry[26].

439 In sum, urban areas exert negative externalities on the UK cattle industry through bTB. Based on our
440 estimation, the externalities lead to about £1.7 million direct cattle death losses in Great Britain every
441 year. If we further include indirect loss into consideration, urbanization leads to about £11 million
442 economic loss each year in the UK through bTB.

443

---

[23] See: https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/incidence-of-tuberculosis-tb-in-cattle-in-great-britain/quarterly-tb-in-cattle-in-great-britain-statistics-notice-december-2024 and https://randd.defra.gov.uk/ProjectDetails?ProjectId=15201

[24] 70% ≈£50 million /£70 million *100%; 75% =£75 million /£100 million *100%

[25] £105 million =£150 million *70%; £112.5 million =£150 million *75%

[26] £11 million ≈£150 million *4.27% +£105 million *4.27%; £11 million ≈£150 million *4.27% +£112.5 million *4.27%; £6.4 million ≈£150 million *4.27%; £4.8 million =£11 million -£6.4 million

444   Figure 3: Estimated effects of urbanization on the number of slaughtered cattle

445

446   Figure 4: Cattle death loss because of urbanization

447

448

449   Table 5: Government reported economic loss of bTB

Financial year or report year	Geographical coverage	Cost for government[1]	Cost for cattle industry[2]	Data sources
Reported in 2025	England	About £100 million every year	-	TBhub (2025b)
Reported in 2023	UK	Averagely £150 million per annum	-	APHA (2023)
Financial year 2022/23	Northern Ireland	About £53 million	-	DAERA (2024)
Financial years from 2012 to 2022	England	Averagely £100 million per annum	-	Defra (2022)
The five financial years between 2016/17 and 2020/21	Northern Ireland	Averagely £38.4 million per annum	-	DAERA (2024)
Reported in 2018	England	Averagely £70 million per annum	Averagely £50 million per annum	Godfray et al. (2018)
Reported in 2014	England	Averagely £100 million per annum	Averagely £75 million per annum	Defra (2014)
Financial years from 1998 to 2010	Great Britain	Averagely £71 million per annum	-	Defra, 2008b; Defra 2009; Defra 2010; Defra, 2011

450   *Note:* 1. The cost for government is the money paid by government in bTB testing, compensation, surveillance, badger culling, and research,
451   etc. 2. The cost for cattle industry includes extra labor, movement and trade restrictions, output losses, etc. If one data source reports
452   economic costs for several financial years separately, we calculate the average annual costs and report them in the table to save space.

453 # 8   Conclusion and Discussion

454   As urban environments expand, their externalities on the agricultural sector are becoming more
455   significant but also more intricate. This paper evaluates externalities from the perspective of livestock
456   disease. We assess the effects of localized and regional urbanization levels on the bTB presence,
457   intensity, and prevalence in the context of the British cattle industry. We use nightlight, property
458   market, and population density measurements as alternative proxies for urbanization and combine
459   them with monthly herd-level bTB records for all cattle herds in Great Britain from Jan. 2008 to Dec.
460   2018. Our results indicate that while bTB situations of herds can be slightly alleviated by localized
461   urbanization, they are aggravated if regional urbanization in relatively larger areas increases. Based on
462   our estimates, urban areas' externalities contribute to about 4.27% of total bTB death loss, which
463   corresponds to about £1.7 million in cattle death losses in Great Britain and about £11 million overall
464   economic losses in the UK per year.

465   Policy implications are many. As urbanization brings visible economic benefits to the agricultural
466   industry through economic growth, value chains, market access, etc., the effects on animal health are

usually neglected. While urbanization may lower livestock disease outbreaks in local areas, it may lead to larger negative externalities to nearby areas. Policymakers could be more careful in planning human economic activities near livestock to alleviate the potential health risks to farm animals, which will also help control human health risks under zoonotic diseases. The government could zone different industries through holistic urban-suburban-rural thinking to maximize the economic benefit of urbanization. Adjusting farm management practices to better cope with ongoing urbanization in nearby areas is always a complex and a tough problem for farmers, so our study also provides insights into farm allocation, wildlife control, and animal disease control. For example, farmers can allocate their farm near a township that located in a less urban area. Thus, they can benefit from local urbanization's positive effects in bTB alleviation while decreasing the negative impacts from urbanization in larger areas.

Our work also brings some unsolved research questions for further studies. We empirically provide evidence to link urbanization and bTB in the cattle industry. In alignment with Donnelly et al. (2006), we propose a mechanism that the urban areas have stronger badger culling forces and can push away badgers to nearby areas, thus leading to heterogeneous effects on localized and regional areas' bTB situations. However, we couldn't further provide direct evidence for this proposed mechanism since we don't have enough micro-level data for the badgers' spatiotemporal distributions. Studies are still needed to explore the linkage mechanisms for urbanization and livestock disease. Moreover, our study focuses on cattle bTB, of which wildlife is the major infection source, but the effects of population concentration on the spread of other diseases, especially those zoonoses with human beings as a considerable infection source, are still unclear.

Reference

Abu Hatab, A., Cavinato, M. E. R., & Lagerkvist, C. J. (2019). Urbanization, livestock systems and food security in developing countries: A systematic review of the literature. Food Security, 11(2), 279-299.

Ahmed, S., Dávila, J. D., Allen, A., Haklay, M., Tacoli, C., & Fèvre, E. M. (2019). Does urbanization make emergence of zoonosis more likely? Evidence, myths and gaps. Environment and Urbanization, 31(2), 443-460.

Allen, A. R., Skuce, R. A., & Byrne, A. W. (2018). Bovine tuberculosis in Britain and Ireland–A perfect storm? The confluence of potential ecological and epidemiological impediments to controlling a chronic infectious disease. Frontiers in Veterinary Science, 5, 109.

APHA (Animal and Plant Health Agency). (2023). New APHA tools for the fight against bovine TB. https://aphascience.blog.gov.uk/2023/03/24/tb-day-2023/. Accessed in Apr. 2025.

Atkins, P. J., & Robinson, P. A. (2013). Bovine tuberculosis and badgers in Britain: relevance of the past. Epidemiology & Infection, 141(7), 1437-1444.

Bradley, C. A., & Altizer, S. (2007). Urbanization and the ecology of wildlife diseases. Trends in Ecology & Evolution, 22(2), 95-102.

Blasdell, K. R., Morand, S., Laurance, S. G., Doggett, S. L., Hahs, A., Trinh, K., ... & Firth, C. (2022). Rats and the city: Implications of urbanization on zoonotic disease risk in Southeast Asia. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 119(39), e2112341119.

Chakravorty, U., Fisher, D. K., & Umetsu, C. (2007). Environmental effects of intensification of agriculture: livestock production and regulation. Environmental Economics and Policy Studies, 8, 315-336.

Ch, R., Martin, D. A., & Vargas, J. F. (2021). Measuring the size and growth of cities using nighttime light. Journal of Urban Economics, 125, 103254.

Chen, S., Oliva, P., & Zhang, P. (2022). The effect of air pollution on migration: Evidence from China. Journal of Development Economics, 156, 102833.

Cox, B., Gasparrini, A., Catry, B., Fierens, F., Vangronsveld, J., & Nawrot, T. S. (2016). Ambient air pollution-related mortality in dairy cattle: Does it corroborate human findings? Epidemiology, 27(6), 779-786.

Davis, K. (2015). The urbanization of the human population. In The City Reader (pp. 43-53). Routledge.

DAERA (Department of Agriculture, Environment and Rural Affairs). (2024). Reducing the rate of compensation for cattle removed under the Bovine (bTB) Programme. https://www.daera-

521   ni.gov.uk/consultations/reducing-rate-compensation-cattle-removed-under-bovine-btb-programme.

522   Accessed in Apr. 2025.

523   Defra (Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs). (2008a). Investigate the longer-term

524   effects on farm businesses of a bTB breakdown.

525   https://randd.defra.gov.uk/ProjectDetails?ProjectId=15201. Accessed in Oct. 2025.

526   Defra (Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs). (2008b). Breakdown of bovine TB

527   expenditure in Great Britain: 1998/99 - 2007/08 (£ m). https://www.bovinetb.info/docs/tb-

528   expenditure0708.pdf. Accessed in Apr. 2025.

529   Defra (Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs). (2009). Bovine TB expenditure for GB

530   2008/09. https://www.bovinetb.info/docs/Costs0809.pdf. Accessed in Apr. 2025.

531   Defra (Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs). (2010). Bovine TB expenditure for GB

532   2009/10. https://www.bovinetb.info/docs/Bovine_TB_expenditure_for_GB_200910.pdf.

533   https://www.bovinetb.info/docs/Costs0809.pdf. Accessed in Apr. 2025.

534   Defra (Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs). (2011). Bovine TB Eradication

535   Programme for England.

536   https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/5a78a776ed915d07d35b1624/pb13601-bovinetb-

537   eradication-programme-110719.pdf. Accessed in Apr. 2025.

538   Defra (Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs). (2014). Economic assessment of the

539   SOA pre-movement testing exemption removal. https://consult.defra.gov.uk/bovine-tb/proposed-

540   enhancements-to-bovine-tb-cattle-control/. Accessed in Apr. 2025.

541   Defra (Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs). (2022). Bovine Tuberculosis: Disease

542   Control. https://questions-statements.parliament.uk/written-questions/detail/2022-10-11/HL2483/.

543   Accessed in Apr. 2025.

544   Donnelly, C. A., Woodroffe, R., Cox, D. R., Bourne, F. J., Cheeseman, C. L., Clifton-Hadley, R. S., ...

545   & Morrison, W. I. (2006). Positive and negative effects of widespread badger culling on tuberculosis

546   in cattle. Nature, 439(7078), 843-846.

547   Dong, Z., & Schaefer, K. A. (2025). Urbanization and the industrialization of agriculture. European

548   Review of Agricultural Economics, jbaf044, https://doi.org/10.1093/erae/jbaf044

549   Elvidge, C. D., Zhizhin, M., Ghosh, T., Hsu, F. C., & Taneja, J. (2021). Annual time series of global

550   VIIRS nighttime lights derived from monthly averages: 2012 to 2019. Remote Sensing, 13(5), 922.

551   Gibson, J., Olivia, S., Boe-Gibson, G., & Li, C. (2021). Which night lights data should we use in

552   economics, and where? Journal of Development Economics, 149, 102602.

553   Gibson, J., Olivia, S., & Boe-Gibson, G. (2020). Night lights in economics: Sources and uses 1.

554   Journal of Economic Surveys, 34(5), 955-980.

555 Godfray, H. C. J., Donnelly, C., Hewinson, G., Winter, M., & Wood, J. (2018). Bovine TB strategy
556 review. Defra report. https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/5beed433e5274a2af111f622/tb-
557 review-final-report-corrected.pdf. Accessed in Oct. 2025.

558 Hassell, J. M., Begon, M., Ward, M. J., & Fèvre, E. M. (2017). Urbanization and disease emergence:
559 dynamics at the wildlife–livestock–human interface. Trends in Ecology & Evolution, 32(1), 55-67.

560 Hassell, J. M., Muloi, D. M., VanderWaal, K. L., Ward, M. J., Bettridge, J., Gitahi, N., ... & Fèvre, E.
561 M. (2023). Epidemiological connectivity between humans and animals across an urban landscape.
562 Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 120(29), e2218860120.Human Animal Infections
563 and Risk Surveillance group (HAIRS). 2015. M. bovis: information for farmers on reducing the risk
564 of human infection, https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/mycobacterium-bovis-mbovis-
565 reducing-the-risk-of-human-infection

566 Jones, B. A., Grace, D., Kock, R., Alonso, S., Rushton, J., Said, M. Y., ... & Pfeiffer, D. U. (2013).
567 Zoonosis emergence linked to agricultural intensification and environmental change. Proceedings of
568 the National Academy of Sciences, 110(21), 8399-8404.

569 Kappes, A., Tozooneyi, T., Shakil, G., Railey, A. F., McIntyre, K. M., Mayberry, D. E., ... & Marsh,
570 T. L. (2023). Livestock health and disease economics: a scoping review of selected literature.
571 Frontiers in Veterinary Science, 10, 1168649.

572 Mackenstedt, U., Jenkins, D., & Romig, T. (2015). The role of wildlife in the transmission of parasitic
573 zoonoses in peri-urban and urban areas. International Journal for Parasitology: Parasites and Wildlife,
574 4(1), 71-79.

575 Michaels, G., Rauch, F., & Redding, S. J. (2012). Urbanization and structural transformation. The
576 Quarterly Journal of Economics, 127(2), 535-586.

577 O'Brien, D. J., Schmitt, S. M., Fierke, J. S., Hogle, S. A., Winterstein, S. R., Cooley, T. M., ... &
578 Kaneene, J. B. (2002). Epidemiology of Mycobacterium bovis in free-ranging white-tailed deer,
579 Michigan, USA, 1995–2000. Preventive Veterinary Medicine, 54(1), 47-63.

580 Perry, B. D., Grace, D., & Sones, K. (2013). Current drivers and future directions of global livestock
581 disease dynamics. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 110(52), 20871-20877.

582 Schaefer, K. A., Scheitrum, D. P., & van Winden, S. (2022). Returns on investment to the British
583 bovine tuberculosis control programme. Journal of Agricultural Economics, 73(2), 472-489.

584 Scheitrum, D. P., Schaefer, K. A., & Van Winden, S. (2023). Moral hazard in the British bovine
585 tuberculosis control programme. European Review of Agricultural Economics, 50(2), 624-654.

586 Seeger, R. M., Hagerman, A. D., Johnson, K. K., Pendell, D. L., & Marsh, T. L. (2021). When poultry
587 take a sick leave: Response costs for the 2014–2015 highly pathogenic avian influenza epidemic in
588 the USA. Food Policy, 102, 102068.

589   Shepard, D. (1968). A two-dimensional interpolation function for irregularly-spaced data.
590   Proceedings of the 1968 23rd ACM national conference, 517-524.

591   TBhub. (2025a). About bovine TB. https://tbhub.co.uk/preventing-tb-breakdowns/about-bovine-tb/.
592   Accessed in Apr. 2025.

593   TBhub. (2025b). Bovine TB eradication strategy for England. https://tbhub.co.uk/bovine-tb-
594   eradication-strategy-for-england/. Accessed in Apr. 2025.

595   Vicente, J., Höfle, U., Garrido, J. M., Fernández-De-Mera, I. G., Juste, R., Barral, M., & Gortazar, C.
596   (2006). Wild boar and red deer display high prevalences of tuberculosis-like lesions in Spain.
597   Veterinary Research, 37(1), 107-119.

598   Zhao, Z., Peng, P., Zhang, F., Wang, J., & Li, H. (2022). The impact of the urbanization process on
599   agricultural technical efficiency in northeast China. Sustainability, 14(19), 12144.

Appendix A. Construction of property transaction heatmaps

We employ monthly Price Paid Data with the Kernel Density Estimator (KDE) in QGIS to generate heatmaps of property transactions in England and Wales. The basic idea of our construction is that a property transaction represents some "heat" level of the nearby property market, and multiple heats generated by multiple transactions can be spatially aggregated if their areas of influence have overlaps. Thus, with all the property transaction data in England and Wales, we can generate a heatmap for the property market activities, which can be considered as a measurement of urban areas.

In the Kernel Density Estimator (KDE) program in QGIS, we set the weight of every transaction (which represent the "heat" level) as its price in million £ deflated by the Consumer Prices Index, including owner occupiers' Housing costs (CPIH)[1]. Thus more expensive property sales will represent a higher urbanization level. We set the radius of KDE as 2 kilometers[2], which assumes every transaction represents the urbanization level of adjoining areas within 2 kilometers. To get smoother and continuous estimated property market "heat", we set the resolution of KDE as 100 meters. We set the Kernel Shape decided by the Epanechnikov function, which is shown as below:

$$K(u) = \frac{3}{4}(1 - u^2), u \in [-1,1] \tag{A1}$$

By employing the Epanechnikov function into our property market heat context, it can be rewrite as:

$$H_{ij} = KWI \frac{3}{4}\left(1 - \left(\frac{d_{ij}}{radius}\right)^2\right), |d_{ij}| \le radius \tag{A2}$$

Where H_{ij} is the property market heat that property transaction i generates on location j, K is a constant, W is the weight, I represents intensity. Notice that in QGIS, it has an option to set "weight", this means different from our W in the function. The "weight" in QGIS can be considered as the product of $K * W * I$. d_{ij} is the distance between property transaction i and location j. $radius$ is the farthest distance that a property transaction can exert "heat". By inputting our settings, the function is:

$$H_{i,j,t} = Price_{i,t} * \frac{3}{4} * \left(1 - \left(\frac{d_{i,j,t}}{2}\right)^2\right), d_{i,j,t} \le 2 \tag{A3}$$

Where $Price_{i,t}$ is the transaction price of property transaction i occurred at time t. This transaction price is in million £ and is deflated with CPIH.

---

[1] See: https://www.ons.gov.uk/economy/inflationandpriceindices/timeseries/l522/mm23. Data extracted in Oct. 2024.

[2] We choose 2-kilometer radius based on two reasons. First, after cross checking with the nightlight maps, we notice that the nightlight measurements usually drop to zero about 1 to 3 kilometers away from the postcode locations where property transactions occurred. So we choose 2-kilometer radius to make it more consistent with the nightlight proxy. Second, Donnelly et al. (2006) show that the badger control efforts would generate negative to adjoining areas, thus, if we choose too large radius for KDE method, it might mix up the urbanization effects on urban areas with the externality on rural areas.

Thus, for a specific point j, the estimated property market heat is:

$$U_{j,t} = \sum_{i=1}^{m} Price_{i,t} * \frac{3}{4} * \left(1 - \left(\frac{d_{i,j,t}}{2}\right)^2\right) \qquad \text{(A4)}$$

Where m is the total number of transaction that occurred within 2 kilometers of point j at time t.

Figure A1 provides an example of this calculation. In Figure A1, there are three property transactions at the same time t, denoted as Points A, B, and C. The numbers below the points (i.e. 1, 2, and 0.5) are the deflated transaction prices in million £. The circles around Points A, B, and C represent 2 km radius. Point j is the point at which we need to estimate its local property market heat. Since the distance between point C and j is more than 2 km, point C doesn't exert any heat on point j. Thus, only Point A (with a distance of d_{Aj}=0.8 km) and Point B (with a distance of d_{Bj}=1.8 km) generate disease pressure on Point j. The property market heat of Point j is then:

$$U_{j,t} = Price_{A,t} * \frac{3}{4} * \left(1 - \left(\frac{d_{A,j,t}}{2}\right)^2\right) + Price_{B,t} * \frac{3}{4} * \left(1 - \left(\frac{d_{B,j,t}}{2}\right)^2\right)$$

$$= 1 * \frac{3}{4} * \left(1 - \left(\frac{0.8}{2}\right)^2\right) + 2 * \frac{3}{4} * \left(1 - \left(\frac{1.8}{2}\right)^2\right) = 0.63 + 0.285 = 0.915$$

Another point that needs to be noticed is, the local property market heat at Point A (denotes as $U_{a,t}$) is not equals to $Price_{A,t}$=1, it also needs to be calculated by the method above. Specifically, it is:

$$U_{a,t} = Price_{A,t} * \frac{3}{4} * \left(1 - \left(\frac{d_{A,a,t}}{2}\right)^2\right) + Price_{C,t} * \frac{3}{4} * \left(1 - \left(\frac{d_{C,a,t}}{2}\right)^2\right)$$

$$= 1 * \frac{3}{4} * \left(1 - \left(\frac{0}{100}\right)^2\right) + 0.5 * \frac{3}{4} * \left(1 - \left(\frac{1.6}{2}\right)^2\right) = 0.75 + 0.135 = 0.885$$

Figure A1: Example of KDE

The reason we use Epanechnikov function is that it allows the property market heat that a transaction exerts to decrease as distance increases, and the decreasing rate is faster as distance increases. It means, in the Equation A1, $K'(u) < 0, K''(u) < 0$. Also, this property market heat will become 0 at the edge of the settled radius. Figure A2 is the function graph of Equation A1, it can better show the trend.

Figure A2: Graph of Epanechnikov function

Figure A3 shows a heatmap example generated by KDE with property transactions in Dec. 2018. Finally, we match the geocode of herds with the property market heatmap and assign the localized property market "heat" to herds as an alternative proxy of urbanization level.

Figure A3: Property transactions heatmap example in Dec. 2018

Appendix B. Using Kernel Density Estimator to generate local bTB disease pressure

We employ the Kernel Density Estimator (KDE) in QGIS to generate the heatmap of bTB prevalence. First, we use monthly bTB-positive animal reactors to generate the heatmap. For example, in Dec. 2018, about 8.6 million head of cattle lived in Britain, with a heavy concentration in Western England, Wales, and Eastern Scotland. About 0.76 million cattle received skin tests, about 20,000 had blood tests, and finally, 3551 cattle had positive bTB results. Figure B1 shows their spatial distribution. Thus, these bTB-positive herds will generate disease pressure on others.

Figure B1: Spatial distribution of bTB reactors in Dec. 2018

We then set the radius of KDE as 100 kilometers, which means every herd with positive bTB reactors would exert disease pressure on other herds within 100 kilometers. We set the Kernel Shape decided by Epanechnikov function. We set the weight of every bTB-contaminated herd as its number of positive cattle reactors, thus herds with more positive bTB cattle will exert more disease pressure on other herds.

The Epanechnikov function is shown below:

$$K(u) = \frac{3}{4}(1 - u^2), u \in [-1,1] \tag{B1}$$

By employing the Epanechnikov function into our disease pressure context, it can be rewritten as:

$$P_{ij} = KWI\frac{3}{4}\left(1 - \left(\frac{d_{ij}}{radius}\right)^2\right), |d_{ij}| \leq radius \tag{B2}$$

Where P_{ij} is the disease pressure that the herd i generates on point j, K is a constant, W is the weight, I represents intensity. Notice that in QGIS, it has an option to set "weight", which is different from our W in the function. The "weight" in QGIS can be considered as the product of $K * W * I$. d_{ij} is the distance between the herd i and point j. $radius$ is the farthest distance that a bTB-positive herd can exert disease pressure. By inputting our settings, the function is:

$$P_{i,j,t} = Num\_Reactors_{i,t} * \frac{3}{4} * \left(1 - \left(\frac{d_{i,j,t}}{100}\right)^2\right), d_{i,j,t} \leq 100 \tag{B3}$$

Where $Num\_Reactors_{i,t}$ is the number of positive animal reactors in a herd i at time t.

Thus, for a specific point j, the estimated disease pressure is:

$$D_{j,t} = \sum_{i=1}^{m} Num\_Reactors_{i,t} * \frac{3}{4} * \left(1 - \left(\frac{d_{i,j,t}}{100}\right)^2\right) \tag{B4}$$

Where m is the total number of herds with positive bTB reactors that are within 100 kilometers of a point j.

Figure B2 provides an example of this calculation. In Figure B2, there are three bTB-positive herds at the same time t, denoted as Points A, B, and C. The numbers below the points (i.e. 10, 100, and 30) are the number of positive animals. The circles around Points A, B, and C represent a 100 km radius. Point j is the point at which we need to estimate its local disease pressure. Since the distance between point C and j is more than 100 km, point C doesn't exert any pressure on point j. Thus, only Point A (with a distance of d_{Aj}=40 km) and Point B (with a distance of d_{Bj}=90 km) generate disease pressure on Point j. The disease pressure of Point j is then:

$$D_{j,t} = Num\_Reactors_{A,t} * \frac{3}{4} * \left(1 - \left(\frac{d_{A,j,t}}{100}\right)^2\right) + Num_{Reactors_{B,t}} * \frac{3}{4} * \left(1 - \left(\frac{d_{B,j,t}}{100}\right)^2\right)$$

$$= 10 * \frac{3}{4} * \left(1 - \left(\frac{40}{100}\right)^2\right) + 100 * \frac{3}{4} * \left(1 - \left(\frac{90}{100}\right)^2\right) = 6.3 + 14.25 = 20.55$$

Another point that needs to be noticed is the local disease pressure of Point A (denoted as $D_{a,t}$) is not equal to $Num\_Reactors_{A,t}$=10, it also needs to be calculated by the method above. Specifically, it is:

$$D_{a,t} = Num\_Reactors_{A,t} * \frac{3}{4} * \left(1 - \left(\frac{d_{A,a,t}}{100}\right)^2\right) + Num_{Reactors\,C,t} * \frac{3}{4} * \left(1 - \left(\frac{d_{C,a,t}}{100}\right)^2\right)$$

$$= 10 * \frac{3}{4} * \left(1 - \left(\frac{0}{100}\right)^2\right) + 30 * \frac{3}{4} * \left(1 - \left(\frac{80}{100}\right)^2\right) = 7.5 + 8.1 = 15.6$$

Figure B2: Example of KDE

The reason we use Epanechnikov function is that it allows the disease pressure that a herd exerts to decrease as distance increases, and the decreasing rate is faster as distance increases. It means, in Equation B1, $K'(u) < 0, K''(u) < 0$. Also, this disease pressure will become 0 at the edge of the settled radius. Figure A3 is the function graph of Equation B1, which can better show the trend.

Figure B3: Graph of Epanechnikov function

Finally, Figure B4 shows a heatmap example generated by KDE with bTB-positive reactors in Dec. 2018.

Figure B4: bTB heatmap example in Dec. 2018

Appendix C. More Robustness Checks

Appendix C1. Specifications with different fixed effect settings

Although in our baseline approaches we apply two-way fixed effects to control unobserved time-invariant and herd-invariant factors, we provide results without fixed effects or with only one-way fixed effects and help test the robustness of our findings. Another reason for this robustness check is that the two-way fixed effects approach may result in biased estimations under some circumstances (Sun and Shapiro, 2022; De Chaisemartin and d'Haultfoeuille, 2020).

Table C1 reports the results for robustness checks by changing the fixed effects settings and using the localized nightlight measurement as the proxy for urbanization. Table C2 reports the results of using the localized property market measurement as the proxy. Table C3 reports the results of using the regional nightlight measurement as the proxy. Table C4 reports the results of using the regional property market measurement as the proxy.

In Table C1, Columns (1) to (3) use the specifications with bTB_Dummy_{it} to test the relationship between bTB presence with localized urbanization. Columns (4) to (6) use the specifications with bTB_Ratio_{it} to test the relationship between bTB intensity with localized urbanization. And Column (7) to (8) use the specifications with bTB_Number_{it} to test the relationship between bTB prevalence with localized urbanization. Columns (1), (4), and (7) are specifications without any fixed effects. Columns (2), (5), and (8) are specifications only with herd-level fixed effects. Columns (3), (6), and (9) are specifications only with year-month level fixed effects. We can see that all the estimated coefficients of localized nightlight measurements, if statistically significant, are negative. These results also suggest that localized urbanization levels can alleviate the bTB situations, which are highly consistent with our baseline results. And the magnitudes of these estimations are larger than those of our baseline approaches.

Similar to the specifications in Table C2, but applying the regional nightlight measurement as the independent variable, Table C2 shows the results between regional urbanization and bTB situations with one-way fixed effect or without any fixed effects. These results are not always consistent with our baseline results. In our baseline approach, we find that the number of bTB cases is positively related to regional nightlight measurement. However, as reported in Table C2, if we only hold one-way fixed effects or no fixed effects, we generated negative relationships. And notice that these robustness checks are not generating consistent results among themselves. For example, if we test the relationship with bTB presence (i.e. bTB_Dummy_{it}) without fixed effect or with only year-month fixed effect, we will generate statistically significant negative results, on the other hand, if we only keep herd level fixed effect, it will generate positive results. These inconsistencies suggest that both herd-invariant and time-invariant unobserved factors have significant impacts on the findings, thus we believe our baseline approach with two-way fixed effects could better control these factors and generate more reliable results.

Table C3 reports the results for checking the relationship between bTB situations and localized property market measurement with one-way fixed effects or without fixed effects. We can see that almost all the estimated coefficients of localized property market measurements, if statistically significant, are negative. The only positive result is the one testing bTB presence (i.e. bTB_Dummy_{it}) with only year-month fixed effect, which can't control for herd-level unobserved factors. Despite this one different result, most robustness checks here also suggest that localized urbanization level can alleviate the bTB situations, which are highly consistent with our baseline results.

Table C4 reports the results for testing the relationship between bTB situations and regional property market measurement with one-way fixed effects or without fixed effects. Like the results of using regional nightlight, these results are inconsistent among themselves.

References

Sun, L., & Shapiro, J. M. (2022). A linear panel model with heterogeneous coefficients and variation in exposure. Journal of Economic Perspectives, 36(4), 193-204.

De Chaisemartin, C., & d'Haultfoeuille, X. (2020). Two-way fixed effects estimators with heterogeneous treatment effects. American Economic Review, 110(9), 2964-2996.

Table C1: Localized nightlight and bTB disease with one-way fixed effect or without fixed effects

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
	bTB_Dummy_{it}	bTB_Dummy_{it}	bTB_Dummy_{it}	bTB_Ratio_{it}	bTB_Ratio_{it}	bTB_Ratio_{it}	bTB_Number_{it}	bTB_Number_{it}	bTB_Number_{it}
$Urbanization\_Nightlight_{it}$	-0.000126***	0.000008	-0.000131***	-0.000762***	0.000024	-0.000768***	-0.000517***	-0.000217**	-0.000501***
	(0.000014)	(0.000019)	(0.000014)	(0.000117)	(0.000239)	(0.000115)	(0.000072)	(0.000105)	(0.000073)
$Pressure_{i,t-1}$	0.000014***	0.000007***	0.000014***	0.000054***	0.000005	0.000056***	0.000078***	0.000043***	0.000080***
	(0.000000)	(0.000001)	(0.000000)	(0.000007)	(0.000006)	(0.000007)	(0.000002)	(0.000006)	(0.000002)
$Cattle_{it}$	0.000037***	0.000036***	0.000037***	0.000007	0.000047**	0.000006	0.000184***	0.000511***	0.000183***
	(0.000002)	(0.000002)	(0.000002)	(0.000005)	(0.000020)	(0.000005)	(0.000013)	(0.000047)	(0.000013)
$bTB\_Dummy_{i,t-1}$	0.068230***	-0.004788***	0.068180***	-	-	-	-	-	-
	(0.001512)	(0.001777)	(0.001512)	-	-	-	-	-	-
$Test\_Dummy_{it}$	0.068493***	0.063478***	0.068579***	-	-	-	-	-	-
	(0.000632)	(0.000548)	(0.000633)	-	-	-	-	-	-
$bTB\_Ratio_{i,t-1}$	-	-	-	0.060354***	0.012721	0.060345***	-	-	-
	-	-	-	(0.012331)	(0.010302)	(0.012332)	-	-	-
$Test\_Ratio_{it}$	-	-	-	0.002164***	0.002075***	0.002164***	-	-	-
	-	-	-	(0.000457)	(0.000438)	(0.000457)	-	-	-
$bTB\_Number_{i,t-1}$	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.062282***	0.000110	0.062282***
	-	-	-	-	-	-	(0.006470)	(0.007157)	(0.006470)
$Test\_Number_{it}$	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.001754***	0.001211***	0.001754***
	-	-	-	-	-	-	(0.000073)	(0.000062)	(0.000074)
Constant	-0.007059***	-0.003948***	-0.007119***	-0.002558***	0.007414**	-0.003092***	-0.020895***	-0.037058***	-0.021368***
	(0.000166)	(0.000341)	(0.000166)	(0.000985)	(0.003121)	(0.000932)	(0.001357)	(0.005289)	(0.001366)
Herd fixed effects	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No
Year-month fixed effects	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes
Observations	5024081	5024081	5024081	5024081	5024081	5024081	5024081	5024081	5024081

Cluster standard errors in parentheses. Standard errors are clustered at the herd level.

* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$

Table C2: Regional nightlight and bTB disease with one-way fixed effect or without fixed effects

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
	bTB_Dummy_{it}	bTB_Dummy_{it}	bTB_Dummy_{it}	bTB_Ratio_{it}	bTB_Ratio_{it}	bTB_Ratio_{it}	bTB_Number_{it}	bTB_Number_{it}	bTB_Number_{it}
$Urbanization\_Nightlight_{rt}$	-0.000283***	0.000261***	-0.000305***	-0.001792***	0.000525	-0.001835***	-0.001264***	-0.001234***	-0.001226***
	(0.000029)	(0.000048)	(0.000030)	(0.000240)	(0.000581)	(0.000232)	(0.000162)	(0.000366)	(0.000166)
$Pressure_{i,t-1}$	0.000014***	0.000007***	0.000014***	0.000053***	0.000005	0.000055***	0.000078***	0.000043***	0.000079***
	(0.000000)	(0.000001)	(0.000000)	(0.000007)	(0.000006)	(0.000007)	(0.000002)	(0.000007)	(0.000002)
$Cattle_{it}$	0.000037***	0.000036***	0.000037***	0.000006	0.000047**	0.000006	0.000184***	0.000511***	0.000183***
	(0.000002)	(0.000002)	(0.000002)	(0.000005)	(0.000020)	(0.000005)	(0.000013)	(0.000047)	(0.000013)
$bTB\_Dummy_{i,t-1}$	0.068210***	-0.004789***	0.068156***						
	(0.001512)	(0.001777)	(0.001512)						
$Test\_Dummy_{it}$	0.068479***	0.063481***	0.068565***						
	(0.000632)	(0.000548)	(0.000633)						
$bTB\_Ratio_{i,t-1}$				0.060347***	0.012721	0.060338***			
				(0.012331)	(0.010302)	(0.012332)			
$Test\_Ratio_{it}$				0.002164***	0.002075***	0.002164***			
				(0.000457)	(0.000438)	(0.000457)			
$bTB\_Number_{i,t-1}$							0.062278***	0.000110	0.062278***
							(0.006470)	(0.007157)	(0.006470)
$Test\_Number_{it}$							0.001754***	0.001211***	0.001754***
							(0.000073)	(0.000062)	(0.000074)
Constant	-0.006843***	-0.004262***	-0.006879***	-0.001149	0.006790**	-0.001617	-0.019871***	-0.035793***	-0.020365***
	(0.000170)	(0.000346)	(0.000171)	(0.001118)	(0.003333)	(0.001053)	(0.001376)	(0.005266)	(0.001385)
Herd fixed effects	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No
Year-month fixed effects	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes
Observations	5024081	5024081	5024081	5024081	5024081	5024081	5024081	5024081	5024081

Cluster standard errors in parentheses. Standard errors are clustered at the herd level.

* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$

Table C3: Localized property market measurement and bTB disease with one-way fixed effect or without fixed effects

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
	bTB_Dummy_{it}	bTB_Dummy_{it}	bTB_Dummy_{it}	bTB_Ratio_{it}	bTB_Ratio_{it}	bTB_Ratio_{it}	bTB_Number_{it}	bTB_Number_{it}	bTB_Number_{it}
$Urbanization\_Property_{it}$	0.000016	-0.000079***	0.000049***	-0.000695***	-0.000393**	-0.000529***	0.000090	-0.000155*	0.000121
	(0.000015)	(0.000018)	(0.000015)	(0.000161)	(0.000172)	(0.000149)	(0.000087)	(0.000086)	(0.000088)
$Pressure_{i,t-1}$	0.000012***	0.000011***	0.000013***	0.000058***	0.000032***	0.000061***	0.000065***	0.000051***	0.000067***
	(0.000000)	(0.000000)	(0.000000)	(0.000004)	(0.000005)	(0.000004)	(0.000002)	(0.000003)	(0.000002)
$Cattle_{it}$	0.000045***	0.000038***	0.000045***	0.000013**	0.000034**	0.000013**	0.000267***	0.000413***	0.000267***
	(0.000001)	(0.000002)	(0.000001)	(0.000005)	(0.000014)	(0.000005)	(0.000015)	(0.000029)	(0.000015)
$bTB\_Dummy_{i,t-1}$	0.074845***	0.027578***	0.074755***	-	-	-	-	-	-
	(0.001095)	(0.001241)	(0.001094)	-	-	-	-	-	-
$Test\_Dummy_{it}$	0.074190***	0.071658***	0.074380***	-	-	-	-	-	-
	(0.000558)	(0.000511)	(0.000559)	-	-	-	-	-	-
$bTB\_Ratio_{i,t-1}$	-	-	-	0.071589***	0.040661***	0.071572***	-	-	-
	-	-	-	(0.007161)	(0.006792)	(0.007161)	-	-	-
$Test\_Ratio_{it}$	-	-	-	0.002174***	0.002098***	0.002174***	-	-	-
	-	-	-	(0.000342)	(0.000333)	(0.000342)	-	-	-
$bTB\_Number_{i,t-1}$	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.075022***	0.031678**	0.075019***
	-	-	-	-	-	-	(0.012451)	(0.013379)	(0.012450)
$Test\_Number_{it}$	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.001670***	0.001243***	0.001671***
	-	-	-	-	-	-	(0.000065)	(0.000053)	(0.000065)
Constant	-0.006952***	-0.005138***	-0.007074***	-0.004564***	0.002813	-0.005388***	-0.022344***	-0.024636***	-0.022921***
	(0.000115)	(0.000222)	(0.000116)	(0.000624)	(0.001968)	(0.000606)	(0.001079)	(0.002773)	(0.001090)
Herd fixed effects	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No
Year-month fixed effects	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes
Observations	11813973	11813973	11813973	11813973	11813973	11813973	11813973	11813973	11813973

Cluster standard errors in parentheses. Standard errors are clustered at the herd level.

* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$

Table C4: Regional property market measurement and bTB disease with one-way fixed effect or without fixed effects

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
	bTB_Dummy_{it}	bTB_Dummy_{it}	bTB_Dummy_{it}	bTB_Ratio_{it}	bTB_Ratio_{it}	bTB_Ratio_{it}	bTB_Number_{it}	bTB_Number_{it}	bTB_Number_{it}
$Urbanization\_Property_{rt}$	0.000040***	-0.000169***	0.000099***	-0.001033***	-0.000627***	-0.000746***	0.000073	0.000355**	0.000127
	(0.000015)	(0.000040)	(0.000018)	(0.000239)	(0.000215)	(0.000190)	(0.000095)	(0.000150)	(0.000089)
$Pressure_{i,t-1}$	0.000012***	0.000011***	0.000013***	0.000058***	0.000032***	0.000061***	0.000065***	0.000051***	0.000067***
	(0.000000)	(0.000000)	(0.000000)	(0.000004)	(0.000005)	(0.000004)	(0.000002)	(0.000003)	(0.000002)
$Cattle_{it}$	0.000045***	0.000038***	0.000045***	0.000013**	0.000034**	0.000013**	0.000267***	0.000414***	0.000267***
	(0.000001)	(0.000002)	(0.000001)	(0.000005)	(0.000014)	(0.000005)	(0.000015)	(0.000029)	(0.000015)
$bTB\_Dummy_{i,t-1}$	0.074845***	0.027578***	0.074755***	-	-	-	-	-	-
	(0.001095)	(0.001241)	(0.001094)	-	-	-	-	-	-
$Test\_Dummy_{it}$	0.074191***	0.071658***	0.074380***	-	-	-	-	-	-
	(0.000558)	(0.000511)	(0.000559)	-	-	-	-	-	-
$bTB\_Ratio_{i,t-1}$	-	-	-	0.071588***	0.040661***	0.071572***	-	-	-
	-	-	-	(0.007161)	(0.006792)	(0.007161)	-	-	-
$Test\_Ratio_{it}$	-	-	-	0.002174***	0.002098***	0.002174***	-	-	-
	-	-	-	(0.000342)	(0.000333)	(0.000342)	-	-	-
$bTB\_Number_{i,t-1}$	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.075022***	0.031678**	0.075019***
	-	-	-	-	-	-	(0.012451)	(0.013379)	(0.012450)
$Test\_Number_{it}$	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.001670***	0.001242***	0.001671***
	-	-	-	-	-	-	(0.000065)	(0.000053)	(0.000065)
Constant	-0.006964***	-0.005109***	-0.007097***	-0.004414***	0.002888	-0.005292***	-0.022334***	-0.024801***	-0.022921***
	(0.000114)	(0.000222)	(0.000116)	(0.000632)	(0.001967)	(0.000611)	(0.001070)	(0.002774)	(0.001081)
Herd fixed effects	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No
Year-month fixed effects	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes
Observations	11813973	11813973	11813973	11813973	11813973	11813973	11813973	11813973	11813973

Cluster standard errors in parentheses. Standard errors are clustered at the herd level.

$^{*}\ p < 0.1,\ ^{**}\ p < 0.05,\ ^{***}\ p < 0.01$

Appendix C2. Specifications with the interaction terms

In this section, we conduct a battery of robustness checks by adding the interaction terms between urbanization measurements and local bTB pressure. With this added interaction, we are able to see if the impacts of urbanization on bTB disease situations are also affected by bTB pressures. For example, maybe higher urban areas are more powerful in controlling bTB prevalence when the nearby bTB pressure is low, as it can denote more resources in wild animal control. But urban areas may be less effective in controlling when the nearby bTB pressure is higher because there are more frequent livestock trades that can bring in the disease.

Table C5 reports the results of testing the relationships with localized urbanization levels. Columns (1) to (3) use nightlight measurements, and Columns (4) to (6) use property market measurements. The results indicate that the effects of localized urbanization on bTB disease situations are affected by nearby bTB pressures. Specifically, notice that the estimated coefficient of the interaction terms in Column (1), (3), (4), and (6) are all significantly negative, which indicates that as nearby bTB pressure increases, the urban areas will get worse in controlling bTB presence and prevalence (i.e. bTB_Dummy_{it} and bTB_Number_{it}). However, we don't observe similar effects with bTB intensity (i.e. bTB_Ratio_{it}). We provide the estimated marginal effects of urbanization measurements on bTB situations at the average bTB pressure levels at the bottom of the table. We can see that the marginal effects are consistent with our baseline findings that localized urbanization can generally alleviate the bTB situations.

Table C6 reports the results of testing the impacts of regional urbanization levels. Columns (1) to (3) use nightlight measurements, and Columns (4) to (6) use property market measurements. Specifically, when looking at the estimated coefficient of the interaction terms in Columns (1) and (3) with the nightlight measurements, we observe similar conclusions that as nearby bTB pressure increases, the urban areas will get worse in controlling bTB presence and prevalence. However, we don't observe similar effects with the rest specifications. We also provide the estimated marginal effects of urbanization measurements on bTB situations at the average bTB pressure levels at the bottom of the table. Nevertheless, most of the marginal effects are not statistically significant, which contributes little as a robustness check.

Table C5: Localized urbanization measurements and bTB situations with interaction terms

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
	bTB_Dummy_{it}	bTB_Ratio_{it}	bTB_Number_{it}	bTB_Dummy_{it}	bTB_Ratio_{it}	bTB_Number_{it}
$Urbanization\_Nightlight_{it}$	0.000008	-0.000083	0.000368***	-	-	-
	(0.000018)	(0.000172)	(0.000116)	-	-	-
$Urbanization\_Nightlight_{it}$ $* Pressure_{i.t-1}$	-0.000000**	0.000001	-0.000003***	-	-	-
	(0.000000)	(0.000001)	(0.000001)	-	-	-
$Urbanization\_Property_{it}$	-	-	-	0.000044***	0.000158	0.000278***
	-	-	-	(0.000014)	(0.000128)	(0.000084)
$Urbanization\_Property_{it}$ $* Pressure_{i.t-1}$	-	-	-	-0.000000**	-0.000001	-0.000002***
	-	-	-	(0.000000)	(0.000001)	(0.000001)
$Pressure_{i.t-1}$	0.000008***	0.000011	0.000044***	0.000013***	0.000046***	0.000061***
	(0.000001)	(0.000007)	(0.000007)	(0.000000)	(0.000006)	(0.000004)
$Cattle_{it}$	0.000036***	0.000047**	0.000511***	0.000037***	0.000033**	0.000413***
	(0.000002)	(0.000020)	(0.000047)	(0.000002)	(0.000014)	(0.000029)
$bTB\_Dummy_{i,t-1}$	-0.004797***	-	-	0.027520***		
	(0.001776)	-	-	(0.001241)		
$Test\_Dummy_{it}$	0.063616***	-	-	0.071899***		
	(0.000549)	-	-	(0.000512)		
$bTB\_Ratio_{i,t-1}$	-	0.012718	-		0.040646***	
	-	(0.010303)	-		(0.006792)	
$Test\_Ratio_{it}$	-	0.002075***	-		0.002098***	
	-	(0.000438)	-		(0.000333)	
$bTB\_Number_{i,t-1}$	-	-	0.000107			0.031670**
	-	-	(0.007157)			(0.013378)
$Test\_Number_{it}$	-	-	0.001211***			0.001243***
	-	-	(0.000062)			(0.000053)
Constant	-0.004081***	0.005881*	-0.037425***	-0.005875***	-0.001402	-0.027528***
	(0.000354)	(0.003212)	(0.005348)	(0.000234)	(0.002162)	(0.002825)
Marginal effects of urbanization measurements at average $Pressure_{i.t-1}$	-0.000072**	0.000074	-0.000301	-0.000031	-0.000128	-0.000440***
	(0.000032)	(0.000373)	(0.000186)	(0.000025)	(0.000232)	(0.000147)
Herd fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Year-month fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	5024081	5024081	5024081	11813973	11813973	11813973

Cluster standard errors in parentheses. Standard errors are clustered at the herd level.

* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$

Table C6: Regional urbanization measurements and bTB situations with interaction terms

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
	bTB_Dummy_{it}	bTB_Ratio_{it}	bTB_Number_{it}	bTB_Dummy_{it}	bTB_Ratio_{it}	bTB_Number_{it}
$Urbanization\_Nightlight_{rt}$	0.000014	0.000359	0.001581***	-	-	-
	(0.000067)	(0.000574)	(0.000490)	-	-	-
$Urbanization\_Nightlight_{rt}$	-0.000001**	0.000001	-0.000008***	-	-	-
$* Pressure_{i.t-1}$	(0.000000)	(0.000003)	(0.000003)	-	-	-
$Urbanization\_Property_{rt}$	-	-	-	0.000042*	0.000640***	0.000188
	-	-	-	(0.000024)	(0.000237)	(0.000154)
$Urbanization\_Property_{rt}$	-	-	-	-0.000000	-0.000003	0.000001
$* Pressure_{i.t-1}$	-	-	-	(0.000000)	(0.000002)	(0.000002)
$Pressure_{i.t-1}$	0.000008***	0.000010	0.000049***	0.000013***	0.000047***	0.000060***
	(0.000001)	(0.000008)	(0.000008)	(0.000001)	(0.000006)	(0.000004)
$Cattle_{it}$	0.000036***	0.000047**	0.000511***	0.000037***	0.000033**	0.000413***
	(0.000002)	(0.000020)	(0.000047)	(0.000002)	(0.000014)	(0.000029)
$bTB\_Dummy_{i,t-1}$	-0.004796***			0.027520***		
	(0.001776)			(0.001241)		
$Test\_Dummy_{it}$	0.063616***			0.071899***		
	(0.000549)			(0.000512)		
$bTB\_Ratio_{i,t-1}$		0.012718			0.040646***	
		(0.010302)			(0.006792)	
$Test\_Ratio_{it}$		0.002075***			0.002098***	
		(0.000438)			(0.000333)	
$bTB\_Number_{i,t-1}$			0.000106			0.031671**
			(0.007157)			(0.013378)
$Test\_Number_{it}$			0.001211***			0.001243***
			(0.000062)			(0.000053)
Constant	-0.004069***	0.005349*	-0.038564***	-0.005875***	-0.001564	-0.027496***
	(0.000362)	(0.003203)	(0.005321)	(0.000234)	(0.002161)	(0.002826)
Marginal effects of urbanization measurements at average $Pressure_{i.t-1}$	-0.000175*	0.000605	-0.000587	0.000014	-0.000177	0.000601
	(0.000094)	(0.000925)	(0.000821)	(0.000059)	(0.000589)	(0.000419)
Herd fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Year-month fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	5024081	5024081	5024081	11813973	11813973	11813973

Cluster standard errors in parentheses. Standard errors are clustered at the herd level.

* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$

Appendix C3. Specifications with dynamic variables in the regressions.

In this section, we provide the robustness checks with up to 12 months' lags of urbanization measurements and nearby bTB pressures. This approach can check if the urban expansions have lagged effects on bTB situations.

Table C7 reports the regression results using localized urbanization measurements. Columns (1) to (3) use nightlight measurements proxy for localized urbanization, and Columns (4) to (6) apply property market measurements as the proxy. In the table, we also report the linear combinations of estimated coefficients for urbanization measurements (i.e. $\sum_{t-12}^{t} Estimator\ of\ Urbanization\_Proxy_{it}$), which represent the aggregated estimated effects of current and past 12 months' urbanization level on bTB situations. From Column (2), we can see that localized nightlight increases can statistically significantly decrease herds' bTB intensity. Although we don't observe a significant negative estimator for localized nightlight on bTB presence, we can see that the estimators are almost significant (-0.000160 is the estimated coefficient and 0.000098 is the clustered standard error). These results well support our baseline findings.

Table C8 shows the results using regional urbanization measurements. Linear combinations of estimated coefficients for urbanization measurements (i.e. $\sum_{t-12}^{t} Estimator\ of\ Urbanization\_Proxy_{rt}$) are also provided at the bottom of the table. Columns (1) to (3) use the nightlight measurements proxy for localized urbanization. When using the nightlight proxy, we observe a statistically significant negative relationship between past 12 months' regional urbanization and current bTB intensity (see Column (2) of Table C8), but we don't observe significant impacts on bTB presence or prevalence. Columns (4) to (6) apply the property market measurement as the proxy. We only observe a significant positive relationship between aggregated regional property market heat measurements and bTB intensity (see Column (5) of Table C8), which is consistent with our baseline results but inconsistent with the ones using nightlight as the proxy in this section (see Column (2) of Table C8). For the estimated impacts on bTB presence and cases, although not significant, are still positive. These results, especially those using the property market index, further support our baseline findings that regional urbanization will aggravate bTB situations.

Table C7: Localized urbanization measurements and bTB situations with dynamic variables

	Nightlight			Property		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
	bTB_Dummy_{it}	bTB_Ratio_{it}	bTB_Number_{it}	bTB_Dummy_{it}	bTB_Ratio_{it}	bTB_Number_{it}
$Urbanization\_Proxy_{it}$	-0.000026	-0.000116	-0.000058	-0.000025	-0.000076	-0.000250***
	(0.000026)	(0.000276)	(0.000131)	(0.000017)	(0.000141)	(0.000091)
$Urbanization\_Proxy_{i,t-1}$	0.000001	-0.000194	0.000069	0.000074***	0.000458	0.000214**
	(0.000026)	(0.000257)	(0.000133)	(0.000026)	(0.000306)	(0.000102)
$Urbanization\_Proxy_{i,t-2}$	0.000012	-0.000324*	0.000057	0.000010	-0.000073	-0.000068
	(0.000024)	(0.000192)	(0.000143)	(0.000017)	(0.000124)	(0.000107)
$Urbanization\_Proxy_{i,t-3}$	-0.000011	-0.000323*	-0.000072	-0.000024	-0.000213	-0.000226**
	(0.000023)	(0.000194)	(0.000137)	(0.000020)	(0.000135)	(0.000095)

$Urbanization\_Proxy_{i,t-4}$	-0.000020	-0.000274	0.000066	-0.000019	0.000077	0.000002
	(0.000026)	(0.000191)	(0.000152)	(0.000024)	(0.000181)	(0.000121)
$Urbanization\_Proxy_{i,t-5}$	-0.000031	-0.000408**	-0.000499***	0.000014	-0.000061	0.000094
	(0.000024)	(0.000185)	(0.000169)	(0.000023)	(0.000125)	(0.000121)
$Urbanization\_Proxy_{i,t-6}$	-0.000048*	-0.000038	-0.000272*	-0.000008	0.000071	-0.000039
	(0.000025)	(0.000193)	(0.000144)	(0.000019)	(0.000148)	(0.000116)
$Urbanization\_Proxy_{i,t-7}$	-0.000024	-0.000167	0.000009	-0.000007	-0.000069	0.000005
	(0.000025)	(0.000159)	(0.000131)	(0.000022)	(0.000138)	(0.000119)
$Urbanization\_Proxy_{i,t-8}$	-0.000031	0.000015	0.000015	0.000014	0.000174	0.000273
	(0.000024)	(0.000169)	(0.000180)	(0.000023)	(0.000220)	(0.000213)
$Urbanization\_Proxy_{i,t-9}$	0.000029	-0.000070	0.000148	-0.000003	-0.000117	-0.000134
	(0.000028)	(0.000199)	(0.000205)	(0.000019)	(0.000125)	(0.000116)
$Urbanization\_Proxy_{i,t-10}$	0.000049*	0.000054	0.000043	-0.000009	-0.000046	-0.000039
	(0.000026)	(0.000171)	(0.000170)	(0.000019)	(0.000131)	(0.000110)
$Urbanization\_Proxy_{i,t-11}$	-0.000034	-0.000261	-0.000093	-0.000023	-0.000090	-0.000144
	(0.000021)	(0.000172)	(0.000151)	(0.000019)	(0.000150)	(0.000116)
$Urbanization\_Proxy_{i,t-12}$	-0.000002	-0.000069	0.000056	0.000005	0.000098	0.000033
	(0.000027)	(0.000240)	(0.000156)	(0.000020)	(0.000157)	(0.000112)
$Pressure_{i,t-1}$	0.000004***	0.000003	0.000025***	0.000006***	0.000013**	0.000025***
	(0.000001)	(0.000009)	(0.000009)	(0.000001)	(0.000005)	(0.000004)
$Pressure_{i,t-2}$	0.000004***	0.000011	0.000015*	0.000005***	0.000019***	0.000016***
	(0.000001)	(0.000009)	(0.000009)	(0.000001)	(0.000006)	(0.000004)
$Pressure_{i,t-3}$	0.000003***	0.000017*	0.000004	0.000004***	0.000022***	0.000014***
	(0.000001)	(0.000010)	(0.000009)	(0.000001)	(0.000006)	(0.000004)
$Pressure_{i,t-4}$	0.000001	-0.000006	-0.000002	-0.000002***	-0.000002	-0.000010**
	(0.000001)	(0.000009)	(0.000009)	(0.000001)	(0.000006)	(0.000004)
$Pressure_{i,t-5}$	-0.000002*	-0.000016*	-0.000007	-0.000002***	-0.000011*	-0.000006
	(0.000001)	(0.000009)	(0.000009)	(0.000001)	(0.000006)	(0.000005)
$Pressure_{i,t-6}$	-0.000001	-0.000011	-0.000004	-0.000001	-0.000004	-0.000003
	(0.000001)	(0.000009)	(0.000011)	(0.000001)	(0.000006)	(0.000005)
$Pressure_{i,t-7}$	-0.000001	-0.000010	-0.000002	-0.000000	0.000001	-0.000003
	(0.000001)	(0.000009)	(0.000009)	(0.000001)	(0.000006)	(0.000004)
$Pressure_{i,t-8}$	0.000000	0.000005	0.000025**	0.000000	0.000001	0.000011**
	(0.000001)	(0.000008)	(0.000010)	(0.000001)	(0.000006)	(0.000004)
$Pressure_{i,t-9}$	-0.000001	0.000016*	-0.000010	0.000000	0.000011*	0.000003
	(0.000001)	(0.000009)	(0.000009)	(0.000001)	(0.000006)	(0.000004)
$Pressure_{i,t-10}$	-0.000000	0.000010	0.000011	0.000001**	0.000005	0.000005
	(0.000001)	(0.000010)	(0.000009)	(0.000001)	(0.000006)	(0.000004)
$Pressure_{i,t-11}$	-0.000002**	-0.000004	0.000001	-0.000001**	0.000002	-0.000001
	(0.000001)	(0.000008)	(0.000010)	(0.000001)	(0.000005)	(0.000004)
$Pressure_{i,t-12}$	0.000005***	0.000013	0.000025***	0.000005***	0.000009	0.000016***
	(0.000001)	(0.000009)	(0.000009)	(0.000001)	(0.000006)	(0.000004)
$Cattle_{it}$	0.000042***	0.000072***	0.000732***	0.000027***	0.000037***	0.000379***

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
	(0.000003)	(0.000018)	(0.000077)	(0.000002)	(0.000013)	(0.000027)
$bTB\_Situation_{i,t-1}$	-0.022000***	-0.001989	-0.014740*	0.006337***	0.018519***	-0.003784
	(0.001860)	(0.010276)	(0.008041)	(0.001244)	(0.006594)	(0.007184)
$bTB\_Situation_{i,t-2}$	0.038673***	0.017746	0.066986***	0.069233***	0.062665***	0.103646***
	(0.002091)	(0.015625)	(0.024584)	(0.001435)	(0.009451)	(0.012975)
$bTB\_Situation_{i,t-3}$	0.140430***	0.094183***	0.099538***	0.121282***	0.095819***	0.119665***
	(0.002250)	(0.016675)	(0.012274)	(0.001474)	(0.010666)	(0.010568)
$bTB\_Situation_{i,t-4}$	-0.009147***	0.012569	-0.004514	0.014258***	0.032484***	0.021244***
	(0.001664)	(0.011342)	(0.007882)	(0.001119)	(0.006881)	(0.007153)
$bTB\_Situation_{i,t-5}$	0.013950***	0.018044	-0.005831	0.023075***	0.020783***	0.009994*
	(0.001802)	(0.011761)	(0.010042)	(0.001099)	(0.007192)	(0.005873)
$bTB\_Situation_{i,t-6}$	-0.003713**	-0.012235	-0.001449	0.005928***	0.011708	0.009681**
	(0.001584)	(0.008227)	(0.005547)	(0.001017)	(0.007143)	(0.004401)
$bTB\_Situation_{i,t-7}$	-0.020842***	-0.017293**	-0.015597***	-0.003445***	-0.003158	0.009498**
	(0.001412)	(0.008185)	(0.004510)	(0.000914)	(0.006058)	(0.003783)
$bTB\_Situation_{i,t-8}$	-0.027552***	-0.029392***	-0.010737	-0.010897***	-0.008959	-0.001690
	(0.001433)	(0.005848)	(0.006588)	(0.000906)	(0.005875)	(0.003841)
$bTB\_Situation_{i,t-9}$	-0.026149***	-0.022641***	-0.016786***	-0.006060***	-0.009867**	0.004689
	(0.001389)	(0.006597)	(0.003219)	(0.000908)	(0.004555)	(0.003480)
$bTB\_Situation_{i,t-10}$	-0.020114***	-0.022940***	-0.022900***	-0.004011***	-0.002939	-0.006690**
	(0.001392)	(0.005715)	(0.003876)	(0.000927)	(0.005119)	(0.002726)
$bTB\_Situation_{i,t-11}$	-0.008106***	-0.012824*	-0.015687***	0.007886***	-0.002543	0.003801
	(0.001529)	(0.007465)	(0.003861)	(0.000945)	(0.004032)	(0.003145)
$bTB\_Situation_{i,t-12}$	-0.002299	-0.009685	-0.009859*	0.011051***	0.003583	0.014784***
	(0.001483)	(0.007050)	(0.005267)	(0.000972)	(0.004669)	(0.004707)
$Test\_Dummy_{it}$	0.064557***			0.066346***		
	(0.000581)			(0.000483)		
$Test\_Ratio_{it}$		0.002991***			0.002003***	
		(0.000592)			(0.000353)	
$Test\_Number_{it}$			0.001076***			0.000993***
			(0.000067)			(0.000046)
Constant	-0.005834***	-0.003197	-0.062543***	-0.007475***	-0.012928***	-0.033112***
	(0.000856)	(0.007670)	(0.011611)	(0.000280)	(0.002963)	(0.002839)
Linear combinations of estimated coefficients for urbanization measurements	-0.000136	-0.002174***	-0.000531	0.000000	0.000134	-0.000279
	(0.000088)	(0.000711)	(0.000553)	(0.000024)	(0.000224)	(0.000178)
Herd fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Year-month fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	3273261	3273261	3273261	10731777	10731777	10731777

Cluster standard errors in parentheses. Standard errors are clustered at the herd level.

$^{*}\ p < 0.1,\ ^{**}\ p < 0.05,\ ^{***}\ p < 0.01$

Table C8: Regional urbanization measurements and bTB situations with dynamic variables

	Nightlight			Property		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
	bTB_Dummy_{it}	bTB_Ratio_{it}	bTB_Number_{it}	bTB_Dummy_{it}	bTB_Ratio_{it}	bTB_Number_{it}
$Urbanization\_Proxy_{rt}$	-0.000026	0.000539	0.000275	-0.000045**	0.000021	-0.000140
	(0.000084)	(0.000716)	(0.000549)	(0.000022)	(0.000147)	(0.000130)
$Urbanization\_Proxy_{r,t-1}$	-0.000053	-0.000468	0.000667	0.000044**	0.000262	0.000108
	(0.000065)	(0.000687)	(0.000486)	(0.000022)	(0.000173)	(0.000113)
$Urbanization\_Proxy_{r,t-2}$	0.000052	-0.000461	-0.000461	0.000021	-0.000027	-0.000024
	(0.000064)	(0.000541)	(0.000461)	(0.000022)	(0.000133)	(0.000122)
$Urbanization\_Proxy_{r,t-3}$	0.000254***	0.000268	0.000585	0.000001	-0.000051	-0.000209
	(0.000064)	(0.000631)	(0.000499)	(0.000023)	(0.000184)	(0.000128)
$Urbanization\_Proxy_{r,t-4}$	0.000142**	-0.000085	-0.000820	-0.000013	-0.000123	0.000108
	(0.000068)	(0.000520)	(0.000607)	(0.000020)	(0.000179)	(0.000129)
$Urbanization\_Proxy_{r,t-5}$	-0.000185***	0.000021	-0.000728	0.000002	0.000047	0.000117
	(0.000070)	(0.000506)	(0.000819)	(0.000021)	(0.000153)	(0.000138)
$Urbanization\_Proxy_{r,t-6}$	-0.000493***	-0.001635**	-0.001380***	0.000006	0.000064	0.000174
	(0.000065)	(0.000635)	(0.000521)	(0.000024)	(0.000210)	(0.000139)
$Urbanization\_Proxy_{r,t-7}$	-0.000007	0.000186	0.000587	-0.000027	-0.000057	-0.000046
	(0.000071)	(0.000542)	(0.000490)	(0.000023)	(0.000207)	(0.000146)
$Urbanization\_Proxy_{r,t-8}$	-0.000215***	-0.000933	-0.000732	-0.000028	0.000273	0.000025
	(0.000071)	(0.000645)	(0.000519)	(0.000023)	(0.000208)	(0.000145)
$Urbanization\_Proxy_{r,t-9}$	-0.000070	0.000357	-0.000770	0.000002	-0.000025	-0.000007
	(0.000070)	(0.000583)	(0.000664)	(0.000023)	(0.000197)	(0.000141)
$Urbanization\_Proxy_{r,t-10}$	0.000384***	0.000718	0.002011***	0.000096***	0.000313	0.000179
	(0.000069)	(0.000643)	(0.000489)	(0.000030)	(0.000216)	(0.000163)
$Urbanization\_Proxy_{r,t-11}$	-0.000207***	-0.002231***	-0.001288**	-0.000011	-0.000256	-0.000083
	(0.000070)	(0.000694)	(0.000514)	(0.000023)	(0.000180)	(0.000169)
$Urbanization\_Proxy_{r,t-12}$	0.000159**	-0.000135	0.000968*	-0.000036	-0.000062	0.000026
	(0.000081)	(0.000707)	(0.000565)	(0.000023)	(0.000168)	(0.000189)
$Pressure_{i.t-1}$	0.000004***	0.000003	0.000024***	0.000006***	0.000013**	0.000025***
	(0.000001)	(0.000008)	(0.000009)	(0.000001)	(0.000005)	(0.000004)
$Pressure_{i.t-2}$	0.000004***	0.000011	0.000014	0.000005***	0.000019***	0.000016***
	(0.000001)	(0.000009)	(0.000009)	(0.000001)	(0.000006)	(0.000004)
$Pressure_{i.t-3}$	0.000003***	0.000017*	0.000003	0.000004***	0.000022***	0.000014***
	(0.000001)	(0.000010)	(0.000009)	(0.000001)	(0.000006)	(0.000004)
$Pressure_{i.t-4}$	0.000001	-0.000006	-0.000001	-0.000002***	-0.000002	-0.000010**
	(0.000001)	(0.000009)	(0.000009)	(0.000001)	(0.000006)	(0.000004)
$Pressure_{i.t-5}$	-0.000002	-0.000016*	-0.000007	-0.000002***	-0.000011*	-0.000006
	(0.000001)	(0.000009)	(0.000009)	(0.000001)	(0.000006)	(0.000005)
$Pressure_{i.t-6}$	-0.000000	-0.000011	-0.000004	-0.000001	-0.000004	-0.000004
	(0.000001)	(0.000009)	(0.000011)	(0.000001)	(0.000006)	(0.000005)
$Pressure_{i.t-7}$	-0.000001	-0.000011	-0.000001	-0.000000	0.000001	-0.000003
	(0.000001)	(0.000009)	(0.000009)	(0.000001)	(0.000006)	(0.000004)

$Pressure_{i,t-8}$	0.000000	0.000004	0.000024**	0.000000	0.000001	0.000011**
	(0.000001)	(0.000008)	(0.000010)	(0.000001)	(0.000006)	(0.000004)
$Pressure_{i,t-9}$	-0.000001	0.000015*	-0.000009	0.000000	0.000011*	0.000003
	(0.000001)	(0.000009)	(0.000009)	(0.000001)	(0.000006)	(0.000004)
$Pressure_{i,t-10}$	0.000000	0.000010	0.000012	0.000001**	0.000005	0.000005
	(0.000001)	(0.000010)	(0.000009)	(0.000001)	(0.000006)	(0.000004)
$Pressure_{i,t-11}$	-0.000002**	-0.000004	0.000002	-0.000001**	0.000002	-0.000001
	(0.000001)	(0.000008)	(0.000009)	(0.000001)	(0.000005)	(0.000004)
$Pressure_{i,t-12}$	0.000005***	0.000012	0.000025***	0.000005***	0.000009	0.000016***
	(0.000001)	(0.000009)	(0.000009)	(0.000001)	(0.000006)	(0.000004)
$Cattle_{it}$	0.000037***	0.000068***	0.000647***	0.000027***	0.000037***	0.000379***
	(0.000003)	(0.000016)	(0.000068)	(0.000002)	(0.000013)	(0.000027)
$bTB\_Situation_{i,t-1}$	-0.022093***	-0.002389	-0.013547*	0.006337***	0.018519***	-0.003784
	(0.001857)	(0.010248)	(0.008051)	(0.001244)	(0.006594)	(0.007184)
$bTB\_Situation_{i,t-2}$	0.039470***	0.018951	0.065919***	0.069233***	0.062665***	0.103646***
	(0.002083)	(0.015529)	(0.024387)	(0.001435)	(0.009451)	(0.012975)
$bTB\_Situation_{i,t-3}$	0.140533***	0.094371***	0.098478***	0.121282***	0.095819***	0.119665***
	(0.002247)	(0.016672)	(0.012159)	(0.001474)	(0.010666)	(0.010568)
$bTB\_Situation_{i,t-4}$	-0.009010***	0.012642	-0.004688	0.014258***	0.032484***	0.021244***
	(0.001658)	(0.011347)	(0.007750)	(0.001119)	(0.006881)	(0.007153)
$bTB\_Situation_{i,t-5}$	0.013984***	0.018252	-0.005890	0.023075***	0.020783***	0.009994*
	(0.001796)	(0.011827)	(0.009905)	(0.001099)	(0.007192)	(0.005873)
$bTB\_Situation_{i,t-6}$	-0.003704**	-0.012236	-0.000920	0.005928***	0.011708	0.009681**
	(0.001580)	(0.008200)	(0.005537)	(0.001017)	(0.007143)	(0.004401)
$bTB\_Situation_{i,t-7}$	-0.020913***	-0.017923**	-0.015735***	-0.003445***	-0.003158	0.009499**
	(0.001407)	(0.008153)	(0.004449)	(0.000914)	(0.006058)	(0.003783)
$bTB\_Situation_{i,t-8}$	-0.027554***	-0.029809***	-0.010955*	-0.010897***	-0.008959	-0.001690
	(0.001429)	(0.005828)	(0.006521)	(0.000906)	(0.005875)	(0.003841)
$bTB\_Situation_{i,t-9}$	-0.026152***	-0.022227***	-0.016912***	-0.006060***	-0.009867**	0.004689
	(0.001383)	(0.006585)	(0.003181)	(0.000908)	(0.004555)	(0.003480)
$bTB\_Situation_{i,t-10}$	-0.020004***	-0.022984***	-0.022866***	-0.004011***	-0.002939	-0.006690**
	(0.001387)	(0.005685)	(0.003826)	(0.000927)	(0.005119)	(0.002726)
$bTB\_Situation_{i,t-11}$	-0.008076***	-0.012996*	-0.015866***	0.007886***	-0.002543	0.003801
	(0.001523)	(0.007487)	(0.003817)	(0.000945)	(0.004032)	(0.003145)
$bTB\_Situation_{i,t-12}$	-0.002482*	-0.009886	-0.010196*	0.011051***	0.003583	0.014784***
	(0.001477)	(0.007016)	(0.005208)	(0.000972)	(0.004669)	(0.004707)
$Test\_Dummy_{it}$	0.062459***			0.066346***		
	(0.000562)			(0.000483)		
$Test\_Ratio_{it}$		0.002818***			0.002003***	
		(0.000533)			(0.000353)	
$Test\_Number_{it}$			0.001062***			0.000993***
			(0.000066)			(0.000046)
Constant	-0.005215***	0.000715	-0.057168***	-0.007478***	-0.012983***	-0.033233***

	(0.000834)	(0.007347)	(0.011349)	(0.000280)	(0.002963)	(0.002841)
Linear combinations of estimated coefficients for urbanization measurements	-0.000267	-0.003858**	-0.001087	0.000014	0.000380**	0.000228
	(0.000221)	(0.001737)	(0.001602)	(0.000019)	(0.000191)	(0.000147)
Herd fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Year-month fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	3608843	3608843	3608843	10731777	10731777	10731777

Cluster standard errors in parentheses. Standard errors are clustered at the herd level.

* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$

Appendix D Method for estimating death loss

Our baseline empirical results provide evidence for the externality generated from urbanization on the bTB situation, and we are interested in the monetary loss caused by this externality. In this section, we illustrate the method for how we calculate the death loss resulting from urbanization.

To do so, we first construct a regression to estimate the impacts of urbanization on slaughtered cattle. The reason we redo estimations with the number of slaughtered cattle as the dependent variable instead of bTB positive reactors is that they are sometimes not equal to each other. According to the UK government, not only are the cattle confirmed to have bTB (bTB positive reactors) slaughtered, but those suspected of having bTB are also slaughtered. Thus, the number of slaughtered cattle would sometimes exceed the number of reactors, and since we are now estimating the death loss, using slaughtered cattle would be more appropriate and accurate. Further, since we want to synthetically analyze the impacts of urbanization on death loss, we include both the localized and regional urbanization measurements into one regression. Specifically, we use the nightlight measurements as the proxy for urbanization, we estimate the coefficients of Equation D1, and the regression results are provided in Table D1.

$$Slaughter_{it} = \alpha + \beta_1 Urbanization_{it} + \beta_2 Urbanization_{rt} + \gamma Slaughter_{i,t-1} + \delta Pressure_{i,t-1}$$
$$+ \eta Cattle_{it} + \varphi Test_{it} + \lambda h_i + \mu m_t + \varepsilon_{it} \tag{D1}$$

Second, with the coefficients estimated by Equation D1, we construct a counterfactual scenario where the localized and regional urbanization level of all the herds are zero. We then calculate the counterfactual change in slaughtered cattle due to these changes in urbanization levels. The method for calculating the counterfactual changes is:

$$\Delta Slaughter\_Number_{it} = Slaughter\_Number_{it}^c - Slaughter\_Number_{it}^o$$
$$= -\beta_1 Urbanization_{it}^o - \beta_2 Urbanization_{rt}^o + \gamma \times \Delta Slaughter\_Number_{i,t-1}$$
$$+ \delta \times \Delta Pressure_{i,t-1} \tag{D2}$$

where $\Delta Slaughter\_Number_{it}$ is the counterfactual change in slaughtered cattle from herd i at time t. $Slaughter\_Number_{it}^c$ is the counterfactual slaughtered cattle after setting the urbanization level to zero, where superscript c means "counterfactual". $Slaughter\_Number_{it}^o$ is the original number of slaughtered cattle with the observed urbanization level, where superscript o means "original". $Urbanization_{it}^o$ is the original localized urbanization level measured by nightlight, $Urbanization_{rt}^o$ is the original regional urbanization level. Other symbols are defined similarly as before.

Notice that Equation D2 has lagged variables $\Delta Slaughter\_Number_{i,t-1}$ and $\Delta Pressure_{i,t-1}$. It's natural to think that our counterfactual scenario will also lead to changes in these lagged variables. However, if we allow a change to dynamically affect infinite following periods, it would highly increase the complexity and be more likely to overestimate the impacts of urbanization. Thus, for simplicity and realizability, we use the following Equation D3 to calculate the $\Delta Pressure_{i,t-1}$, and we use the Equation D4 to calculate the $\Delta Slaughter\_Number_{i,t-1}$.

$$\Delta Pressure_{i,t-1} = \frac{\overline{\Delta Slaughter\_Number_{it}}}{Slaughter\_Number_{it}^O} Pressure_{i,t-1}^O =$$

$$\approx \frac{-\beta_1 \overline{Urbanization_{it}} - \beta_2 \overline{Urbanization_{rt}}}{Slaughter\_Number_{it}^O} Pressure_{i,t-1}^O$$

$$\approx \frac{0.000010 \times 1.18672 - 0.001044 \times 1.18672}{0.03892} Pressure_{i,t-1}^O$$

$$= \frac{0.0000118672 - 0.00123893568}{0.03892} Pressure_{i,t-1}^O$$

$$\approx -0.03153 \times Pressure_{i,t-1}^O \tag{D3}$$

where $\overline{\Delta Slaughter\_Number_i}$ is the average counterfactual changes in slaughtered cattle in all herds in all periods. $\overline{Urbanization_{it}}$ is the mean of localized urbanization levels, and $\overline{Urbanization_{rt}}$ is the mean of the regional urbanization levels. To compute the previous period's change in slaughtered cattle, we use:

$$\Delta Slaughter\_Number_{i,t-1} = -\beta_1 Urbanization_{i,t-1}^O - \beta_2 Urbanization_{r,t-1}^O \tag{D4}$$

Finally, with the equations and estimated coefficients above, we are able to build the function for calculating the $\Delta Slaughter\_Number_{it}$, which is shown below:

$$\Delta Slaughter\_Number_{it} =$$
$$= -\beta_1 Urbanization_{it}^O - \beta_2 Urbanization_{rt}^O + \gamma \times \Delta Slaughter\_Number_{i,t-1}$$
$$+ \delta \times \Delta Pressure_{i,t-1}$$
$$\approx 0.000010 \times Urbanization_{it}^O - 0.001044 \times Urbanization_{rt}^O$$
$$+ \gamma \times \left(0.000010 \times Urbanization_{i,t-1}^O - 0.001044 \times Urbanization_{r,t-1}^O\right)$$
$$+ \delta \times 0.0315 \times Pressure_{i,t-1}^O$$
$$\approx 0.00001 \times Urbanization_{it}^O - 0.00104 \times Urbanization_{rt}^O$$
$$+ 0.02013 \times (0.00001 \times Urbanization_{it}^O - 0.00104 \times Urbanization_{rt}^O)$$
$$- 0.00005 \times 0.03153 \times Pressure_{i,t-1}^O$$

Thus, we calculated the counterfactual change in slaughtered cattle to get the counterfactual number of slaughtered cattle and compared this with the observed number of slaughtered cattle.

Table D1: Regression results for effect of urbanization on the number of slaughtered cattle

	$Slaughter_{it}$
$Urbanization\_Nightlight_{it}$	-0.00001022
	(0.00011686)
$Urbanization\_Nightlight_{rt}$	0.00104439*
	(0.00058397)
$Pressure_{i,t-1}$	0.00004873***
	(0.00000807)
$Cattle_{it}$	0.00055844***
	(0.00005239)
$Slaughter_{i,t-1}$	0.02013411*
	(0.01066237)
$Test\_Number_{it}$	0.00124741***
	(0.00006576)
Constant	-0.04331127***
	(0.00621394)
Herd Fixed Effects	Yes
Year-Month Fixed Effects	Yes
Observations	5024081

Cluster standard errors in parentheses. Standard errors are clustered at the herd level.

$^{*} p < 0.1, ^{**} p < 0.05, ^{***} p < 0.01$

Appendix E Supplementary tables and figures

Figure E1: Map of 2016 Local Authority Districts (LADs)

Data source: Office for National Statistics of UK government