

1
2
3
4 **Multitemporal settlement and population mapping from Landsat using Google Earth**

5
6
7 **Engine**

8
9
10 Nirav N. Patel^{a,*}, Emanuele Angiuli^b, Paolo Gamba^b, Andrea Gaughan^c, Gianni Lisini^b, Forrest
11
12 R. Stevens^d, Andrew J Tatem^{e,f,g}, and Giovanna Trianni^b

13
14
15 a. Department of Geography and Geoinformation Science, George Mason University, 4400
16
17 University Drive, MS 6C3, Fairfax VA 22030 USA

18
19
20 b. Department of Electrical, Biomedical and Computer Engineering, University of Pavia, Italy

21
22
23 c. Department of Geography and Geosciences, University of Louisville, 213 Lutz Hall,
24
25 Louisville, Kentucky 40205 USA

26
27
28 d. Department of Geography, Land Use and Environmental Change Institute, University of
29
30 Florida, Gainesville, Florida 32609 USA

31
32
33 e. Department of Geography and Environment, University of Southampton, Highfield,
34
35 Southampton SO17 1BJ, UK.

36
37
38 f. Fogarty International Center, National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, MD 20892, USA.

39
40
41 g. Flowminder Foundation, 17177 Stockholm, Sweden

42
43
44 *Corresponding author at: 13706 Sun Court, Tampa, Florida, 33624, Tel: +01 813-766-2801

45
46
47 Email address: niravpatel65@gmail.com (N.N. Patel)

48
49
50
51 **Abstract**

52
53
54
55
56
57 As countries become increasingly urbanized, understanding how urban areas are
58
59 changing within the landscape becomes increasingly important. Urbanized areas are the often

1
2
3
4 the strongest indicators of human interaction with the environment, and understanding how
5
6 urban areas develop through remotely sensed data allows for more sustainable practices. The
7
8 Google Earth Engine (GEE) leverages cloud computing services to provide analysis
9
10 capabilities on over 40 years of Landsat data. As a remote sensing platform, its ability to
11
12 analyze global data rapidly lends itself to being an invaluable tool for studying the growth of
13
14 urban areas. Here we present (i) an approach for the automated extraction of urban areas
15
16 from Landsat imagery using GEE, validated using higher resolution images, (ii) a novel
17
18 method of validation of the extracted urban extents using changes in the statistical
19
20 performance of a high resolution population mapping method. Temporally distinct urban
21
22 extractions were classified from the GEE catalog of Landsat 5 and 7 data over the Indonesian
23
24 island of Java by using a Normalized Difference Spectral Vector (NDSV) method. Statistical
25
26 evaluation of all of the tests were performed, and the value of population mapping methods
27
28 in validating these urban extents were also examined. Results showed that the automated
29
30 classification from GEE produced accurate urban extent maps, and that the integration of
31
32 GEE derived urban extents also improved the quality of the population mapping outputs.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 Keywords: Landsat, Multitemporal, Population Mapping, Google Earth Engine, Settlement
42
43 Mapping, Urbanization, spatial demography
44

45 46 47 **1. Introduction** 48

49
50 Landsat imagery have proven to be useful in understanding global urbanization trends over
51
52 different timescales. Satellite-derived data have been integral in understanding trends in urban
53
54 sprawl and many other dynamics of urbanization (Guindon et al., 2004; Angel et al., 2005;
55
56 Burchfield et al., 2006; Schneider & Woodcock, 2008; Potere et al., 2009; Schneider, 2012;
57
58 Taubenböck et al., 2012; Sexton et al., 2013).
59
60
61

1
2
3
4 The Google Earth Engine (GEE) is an online environmental data monitoring platform that
5
6 incorporates data from the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) as well as
7
8 the Landsat Program. After the USGS opened access to its records of Landsat imagery in 2008,
9
10 Google saw an opportunity to use its cloud computing resources to allow records of Landsat
11
12 imagery to be accessed and processed over its online system. This has enabled users to reduce
13
14 processing times in analyses of Landsat imagery and make global scale Landsat projects more
15
16 feasible (e.g. Hansen et al., 2013). The 30m spatial and multi-spectral resolution is ideal for
17
18 defining urban areas, and its revisit time is sufficient for monitoring applications (Woodcock et
19
20 al., 2008). Moreover, because of Landsat's temporal continuity from 1972 to the present day, it is
21
22 a popular platform to use for urban change analysis (Alberti et al., 2004; Bagan & Yamagata,
23
24 2012; Rawashdeh & Saleh, 2006; Yuan et al., 2005).
25
26
27
28
29
30

31
32 In the past two decades, the Landsat platform has been paired with imagery from the
33
34 Advanced Very High Resolution Radiometer (AVHRR) (Hansen et al., 1998), the Defense
35
36 Meteorological Satellite Program's Operational Linescan System's nighttime imagery (Elvidge
37
38 et al., 1996, 1997, 1999; Sutton, 2003), and NASA's Moderate Resolution Imaging
39
40 Spectroradiometer (MODIS) (Schneider et al., 2003, 2009, 2010) to improve the accuracy of
41
42 urban detection and mapping across large areas. The improvement of methods for detecting
43
44 urban extents has also driven improvements in population mapping. Satellite imagery has formed
45
46 the basis of many large area population mapping efforts, such as the Global Rural-Urban
47
48 Mapping Project (Center for International Earth Science Information Network (CIESIN), 2004)
49
50 LandScan (Bhaduri et al., 2007) and WorldPop (Linard et al. 2012, Gaughan et al. 2013, "The
51
52 WorldPop Project," 2014). Satellite-derived urban extents and, more generally, land cover tend
53
54 to form an important component of accurate population mapping (Linard & Tatem 2012, Linard
55
56
57
58
59
60
61

1
2
3
4 et al., 2011), but detailed data can often be costly or time consuming to produce. The GEE
5
6 presents the possibility for analyzing and classifying satellite data with great speed, so that more
7
8 relevant and accurate outputs in terms of distributions of population can become a reality
9
10 (Hansen et al., 2013).
11
12
13

14
15 Here we present an approach for the automated extraction of urban areas from Landsat
16
17 imagery built into the GEE, and a novel method of validation of this mapping using changes in
18
19 the statistical performance of a high resolution population mapping method (Stevens et al.,
20
21 2014).
22
23
24

25 **2. Methods**

26 **2.1 Study Area**

27
28
29 The study area is the Indonesian island of Java, which, along with being the world's most
30
31 populous island, is also only the fourth largest island in Indonesia but contains more than half of
32
33 the island nation's population. Jakarta, the capital city is also located on the island and is
34
35 Indonesia's largest city. The island is 661 miles long from east to west, it ranges in width from
36
37 about 60 miles in the center to more than 100 miles near each end (Fig. 1).
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 **2.2 Urban Extent Extraction Procedure**

45
46
47 The urban extraction methodology proposed here is based on supervised classification of
48
49 multispectral data. In this work we consider "urban areas" all the portion of a scene with
50
51 spectrum similar to selected training areas. These training areas include buildings, roads and
52
53 other artificial surfaces. Therefore, in the following "urban extents" do not correspond to "built-
54
55 up extents". Our definition of urban areas is instead more similar to "impervious surfaces".
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 Accordingly, the implemented processing chain is a spectral-based analysis followed by a
5
6 spatial regularization that is undertaken using the Google Earth Engine cloud computing
7
8 environment. Processing and implementation in a cloud environment allows for a consistent
9
10 scaling of the computational efforts when dealing with wide geographical areas. The extraction
11
12 procedure includes three steps, briefly detailed below: (i) preprocessing and selection of a set of
13
14 Landsat scenes covering the geographical area and time span of interest, (ii) computation of the
15
16 Normalized Difference Spectral Vector index (NDSV), a collection of spectral indices that have
17
18 already been proven (Angiuli & Trianni, 2014) to be an efficient input to urban extent
19
20 classification algorithms classification and, (iii) spatial-based post-processing.
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 2.2.1 Preprocessing and scene selection

28
29 Pre-processing include orthorectification and coregistration of all the scenes, so that data
30
31 acquired at multiple dates overlap. This is done internally and seamlessly by the GEE platform at
32
33 the ingestion of the data from the USGS repository. No radiometric intercalibration or
34
35 atmospheric correction is performed however. Therefore, although all scenes are calibrated
36
37 according to the sensor parameters, some differences in radiance values due to the illumination
38
39 and atmospheric conditions still affect overlapping regions among scenes.
40
41
42
43
44

45 Scene selection is instead performed by our algorithm. Specifically, in order to reduce the
46
47 Landsat data set to the most suitable scenes, a filter on scene parameters is first applied, to
48
49 consider only those with less than 10% of cloud coverage and the highest radiometric quality.
50
51
52

53 2.2.2 Implementation of the Normalized Difference Spectral Vector Index Stack into the Google 54 55 Earth Engine 56 57 58 59 60 61

1
2
3
4 Unlike threshold-based recognition of human settlement (one index) approaches
5 developed by Pesaresi et al. (2008) and Xu, (2008), the main input to the urban extent extraction
6 outlined here is the Normalized Difference Spectral Vector (NDSV), proposed in the technical
7 literature (Angiuli & Trianni, 2014) as a means to group existing normalized difference indices
8 (such as the Normalized Difference Vegetation Index - NDVI, the Normalized Difference Water
9 Index - NDWI, and the Normalized Difference Built-up Index - NDBI). NDSV includes in one
10 single vector all the possible normalized indexes that can be computed starting from a Landsat 5
11 or 7 image, considering therefore 6 bands and 15 possible combinations (the dual ones are not
12 considered as their result is the same but with just the opposite sign).
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 NDSV includes in one single vector all the possible normalized indexes that can be
28 computed starting from the 30 m spatial resolution bands a Landsat 5 or 7 image. For each band
29 pair this is computed:
30
31
32
33
34

$$(1) NDSV_{ij} = \frac{b_i - b_j}{b_i + b_j}$$

35
36
37
38
39 Hence, using 6 bands and applying Eq. (1) to any possible pair of different bands, a total
40 of 30 indexes are obtained. Due to the symmetry of the definition, 15 of them are only the
41 negative of the other ones, and can be discarded. Each pixel is thus characterized by a set of
42 values, some of which correspond to known indexes (e.g., $NDSV_{43} = NDVI$, $NDSV_{42} = NDWI$,
43 $NDSV_{45} = NDBI$), while other ones have not been explored so far.
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52 Each pixel is thus characterized by a set of values that have been at this point “labeled”
53 only partially. Considering a radiometrically and geometrically corrected Landsat scene, the
54 NDSV features characterizing urban areas, compared to other classes, are shown for a few
55 sample pixels in Fig. 2. It can be noted that urban areas exhibit a distinct NDSV spectral
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 signature which can be discriminated from other classes by their distinct behavior in this new
5
6 “multispectral” 15-dimensional space. Fig. 2 demonstrates NDSV profiles that can be obtained
7
8 from an image.
9

10
11 In summary, instead of relying on threshold-based recognition of human settlements
12 according to a single index ((Pesaresi et al., 2008) and (Xu, 2008)), the procedure implemented
13
14 in this work considers more information as input to a suitable classification chain, aimed at
15
16 providing a consistent methodology that works in many different environments, and is
17
18 reasonably robust with respect to the date of acquisition of the image and unaffected by
19
20 differences in spatial patterns.
21
22
23
24
25

26 27 2.2.3 Processing of multitemporal urban extents over Java 28 29

30
31 Four tests were conducted in order to validate the creation of urban extents using the
32 procedure discussed in the preceding subsections. A census-based population disaggregation
33 method was used for validation, a method that rasterizes GIS data and distributes population
34 counts based on the GIS data that is provided. This method was used because it provides the
35 ability to analyze how the urban extents improve the statistical correlations in the disaggregation
36 process.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45
46 In three of four tests, the urban extents were considered as one of the inputs to a census-
47 based population disaggregation method (Stevens et al., 2014). In the first test, instead, the same
48 method was run using the original data sets detailed in Table 1 and the landcover map, including
49 urban extents, was taken from the EarthSat Geocover land cover thematic mapper-based dataset
50 (2007, 30m) by MDA Federal (MDA Federal Inc., 2007). Test 1 served as the baseline data for
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 validation because it does not use any Google Earth Engine urban extents and because its
5
6 classification has been validated by MDA Federal, serving as a useful control test.
7
8

9
10 The qualitative differences of these different landcover-based experiments:

- 11
12 • Test 1: EarthSat GeoCover Landsat Thematic Mapper (TM) derived land cover data from
13 MDA Federal (2007)
14
15
- 16
17 • Test 2: GEE urban extents for Java derived using three collections: Imagery from 2006,
18 2007 and 2008 merged with GeoCover
19
20
- 21
22 • Test 3: GEE urban extents for Java derived using three collections: Imagery from 2009
23 T1 (January through April), 2009 T2 (May through August), 2009 T3 (September
24 through December) merged with GeoCover
25
26
- 27
28 • Test 4: GEE urban extents for Java derived using three collections: Imagery from 2008,
29 2009, 2010 merged with GeoCover
30
31

32
33 The GEE urban extractions were obtained using Landsat 5 or Landsat 7 data sets, because
34
35 both satellites were operative in the years of interest. Specifically, multiple Landsat images in
36
37 the same area and covering a finite period of time were combined in a so called GEE collection,
38
39 and each pixel was assigned the median value for all images where it appears. Collections are a
40
41 powerful way to get rid of many of the cloud contaminated pixels, because clouds do not appear
42
43 in the same position in all images. A better approach would be to mask cloud pixels with a
44
45 dedicated filter, a function which unavailable in GEE. Therefore, although we understand that
46
47 cloud-contaminated pixels may still be present in areas with consistent cloud coverage along the
48
49 year, this technique was assumed as the best available option. Additionally, it must be noted that
50
51 collections change the radiometric properties of the data, reducing the effectiveness of the
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61

1
2
3
4 proposed urban extent procedure. To reduce this effect, urban extents for one year were obtained
5
6 by subdividing the year into thirds. Computing collections for each of these time periods
7
8 involved extracting urban extents and then combining the resulting maps by majority voting.
9
10 Similarly, three year collections were subdivided into thirds (one for each year) and then
11
12 combined by majority voting. To prove the usefulness of the proposed approach for mapping
13
14 urban extents (and derive population counts) along multiple years, the fourth test repeats the
15
16 approach of the third one, but using Landsat data collected two years later (2009 versus 2007).
17
18
19
20
21

22 2.2.4 Post-processing 23 24

25 Human settlements can be characterized by peculiar spatial patterns, however, it is important
26
27 to include a post-processing step aimed at reducing issues related to misclassifications at the
28
29 pixel level. The simplest and most effective approach is to include morphological operators
30
31 aimed at discarding isolated pixels and at improving the homogeneity of the extracted
32
33 settlements with respect to their spatial distribution. Additionally, as the classification results
34
35 may be affected by spectral patterns (and sub-pixel mixing problems) similar to urban ones in
36
37 water bodies with high turbidity (Carpenter & Carpenter, 1983; Foody, 2000), such as inner
38
39 reservoirs, coastal areas and river estuaries, these zones are automatically masked out from the
40
41 classification in GEE using ancillary GIS data. Similar issues may be caused by clouds, and thus
42
43 “cloud removal” approaches had to be considered.
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 2.3 High Resolution Population Mapping Method 51 52

53 As mentioned above, the population mapping algorithm in Stevens et al. (2014) is an
54
55 essential portion of this study. Thus, its processing steps are briefly described in the following
56
57 paragraphs.
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

2.3.1 Population data grid

The 130 census polygons for Java (Figure 1) contained population counts from the year 2010. The population mapping algorithm outlined in Stevens et al (2014) was used, where census counts from the census year are redistributed according to weights, then adjusted up/down based on rural and urban growth rates to a particular year of interest (2007 in this case). This is usually based on the classified urban/rural land cover (built pixels are classified as urban vs. rural using Schneider, et al. (2010) urban/rural MODIS-derived classifications), but in this circumstance uses the new GEE-derived urban delineations to identify urban built pixels. The urban/non-urban delineation was integrated into the MDA landcover data as “built” areas (“_BLT”). The particular year of interest that was selected was 2007 for all datasets, to pick one year for counts to match and for a point of comparison for the accuracy assessment detailed in 2.3.3.

The administrative units were used to delineate the areas where the landcover data in continuous raster format and converted vector format are interpolated by means of the Random Forest method to generate a weighting layer (Stevens et al 2014). Once this weighting layer is generated, population counts for each census unit are distributed over the weighting layer to provide a map of population counts at a 100 by 100 meter resolution (See Table 1 for detail on all covariate datasets used in the process).

2.3.2 Data preparation and the Random Forest population disaggregation method

The general process used for the data preparation, modeling and validation for the population mapping is outlined in Fig. 3. Full details on these steps are provided in Stevens et al., (2014). In brief, the steps in green represent the data preparation tasks. The aggregated population counts and the raster and vector layers shown in Table 1 are then used to create a

1
2
3
4 Random Forest model (Breiman, 2001) to predict log population density. Random Forest (RF)
5
6 models are an ensemble, nonparametric modeling approach that grows a "forest" of individual
7
8 classification or regression trees and improves upon bagging (Breiman, 1996) by using the best
9
10 of a random selection of predictors at each node in each tree (Breiman, 2001; Liaw & Wiener,
11
12 2002).
13
14

15
16
17 As expected when combining multiple observations that are mostly independent, the best,
18
19 most unbiased prediction was arrived at by taking the mean of all trees within the forest and
20
21 back-transforming the log to arrive at an estimate of per-pixel population density. Medians and
22
23 percentile ranges were also assessed as alternative approaches for prediction; however, the back-
24
25 transformed mean consistently out-performed the alternative summary methods during
26
27 validation. The resulting country-wise population density map was then used as a weighting
28
29 layer for a standard dasymetric mapping approach as described for the AfriPop and AsiaPop
30
31 (now WorldPop) data sets by (Gaughan, et al., 2013; Linard, et al., 2012; Linard & Tatem, 2012;
32
33 Tatem et al., 2007).
34
35
36
37
38

39 40 2.3.3 Accuracy Assessment 41

42
43 The four output population maps produced using administrative level 1 input census data
44
45 (Fig. 1), were then compared to the level 2 census counts to provide one method of assessing
46
47 mapping accuracies, following Gaughan et al. (2013). The individual cell values of the output
48
49 population maps represent people per cell, and were then added together for each census unit.
50
51 These “predicted” sums were then compared with the observed census counts within each unit.
52
53 Summary statistics were then calculated, including root mean square error (RMSE), the RMSE
54
55 divided by the mean census unit count (%RMSE) and the mean absolute error (MAE). Together
56
57 these statistics were used to compare the predictive ability of each methodology.
58
59
60
61

3. Results

3.1 Urban Extraction Results

For the urban extraction results in the test areas, all of them referring to Landsat scenes recorded in 2007, the validation was performed as follows: human settlement extents were manually digitized from Very High Resolution (VHR) Quickbird images available in Google Earth™, and recoded in 2007, if possible in the same month of the corresponding Landsat scene. The relatively small cities of Manado and Bandung, as well as the big urban agglomeration of Jakarta were considered.

The mapping results are shown in Fig. 4, while the quantitative validation results for Manado with and without spatial post-processing (see section 2.2.2) are reported in Table 2. Visually, the approach shows an accurate extraction of the human settlement extents at the pixel level, with a few misclassifications outside the actual urban area, and missing areas within the boundary of the larger blocks. The quantitative evaluation shows instead a large omission error percentage. After post-processing, however, the overall accuracy improves to 85% and the omission error decreases from 87% to below 19%. Satisfied with the relative accuracy of detecting urban areas using the NDSV classifier on the GEE system, the process was applied to three collections on the Google Earth Engine, and then integrated with the MDA Landcover dataset. This combined land cover dataset, using the GEE-derived built area delineations was then applied to the population mapping process and evaluated statistically for prediction accuracy.

A small sample of the urban extents generated for tests 2, 3 and 4 are shown in Fig. 5 for the central part of Jakarta along with the urban extents for the same area in the MDA data set.

3.2 Random Forest Statistical Output

The differences between results are determined by the ancillary datasets used in the population mapping detailed in Table 1.

Referring to the covariate names in Table 1, there are two significant covariates in the Random Forest mapping process, “BLT” (Built) and “lig” (VIIRS Nightlights). Table 3 provides some insight into the importance of the variables in the mapping process by showing how much Mean Squared Error (MSE) increases when the specified covariate is randomly permuted and predictions re-calculated. The most important variables include the “BLT” covariates, indicating “Built” areas, which include urban and rural settlements. In addition, for all tests, except for Test 4 (GEE 2008-2010), the “lig” (VIIRS Nightlights data) have higher importance than other covariates.

Table 3 also displays the increase in node purity in each test, which documents reduction in residual sum of squared error for the predictions at the ends of the branches of each tree when the specified variable is used during the Random Forest mapping process. Again referring to the variables detailed in Table 1, we show that the “BLT” (built) classes with the GEE integrations in Tests 2, 3 and 4 are the most important in the Random Forest process.

Again referring to the variables detailed in Table 1, it can be observed that the “BLT” classes with the GEE integrations in Tests 2, 3 and 4 are making the built classes the most important in the Random Forest process.

3.3 Random Forest Accuracy Assessment

The accuracy assessment process detailed in Section 2.3.3 shows how much the urban extents improve the output when the census data were aggregated from district to province. The

1
2
3
4 tests in the previous sections detail how well the RF does in predicting population values at the
5
6 census unit level, but more importantly is whether the population map produced using built land
7
8 cover data from the three GEE-derived approaches is better at redistributing the population
9
10 numbers from coarser census units. Two different error assessment methods are presented: root
11
12 mean square error (RMSE), also expressed as a percentage of the mean population size of the
13
14 administrative level (% RMSE); and the mean absolute error (MAE).
15
16
17
18

19
20 For both RMSE and MAE, the results in Table 4 indicate that Test 4 increased population
21
22 mapping accuracy the most, with Test 3 slightly better than Test 1. Notably, the urban extraction
23
24 from Test 2, which used built extents derived from years 2006 to 2008 had the lowest
25
26 redistribution accuracy. It is notable that the landcover changes allow for Test 3 and Test 4 to
27
28 outperform the MDA dataset in reducing error, creating more concurrent built data to correlate
29
30 better with our other datasets.
31
32

33 34 35 **4. Discussion and conclusions** 36 37

38 The possibilities that the Google Earth Engine offers in analyzing remotely sensed data
39
40 on a global scale with the power of Google's cloud computing are substantial. The inclusion of
41
42 continuously updated Landsat data along with classification tools and significant processing
43
44 power will enable newer and more accurate ways to map human settlements across large areas at
45
46 30 m spatial resolution, document past changes and continually update current estimates. The
47
48 potential of this resource has been recently illustrated for multitemporal forest mapping (Hansen
49
50 et al., 2013), and here we outline initial steps for similar efforts in human settlement and
51
52 population mapping.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 The application of the NDSV within the GEE shows significant potential for settlement
5 mapping within the tool. Characterizing human settlements can be considered as a binary
6 problem, but where the “non-urban” class is very heterogeneous. It therefore requires a classifier
7 which is non-parametric, i.e. that does not assume any peculiar statistical distributions of the
8 input values. Moreover, since the NDSV is built through a composition of 15 bands, the
9 classifier has to be able to manage high-dimensional spaces. Therefore, classifiers developed for
10 hyperspectral data are preferable, using, for example, the spectral angle mapper classifier
11 (Angiuli & Trianni, 2014), that captures the differences in multispectral vectors and is robust
12 with respect to difference in illumination. Since this classifier is not available in the GEE
13 environment, Support Vector Machines (SVM) and Classification and Regression Trees (CART)
14 were considered instead ("Earthengine-api - Earth Engine Access Library - Google Project
15 Hosting," 2014), with similarly strong results shown.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 Both the SVM and CART are suitable to binary problems, but our tests suggested that
35 CART produced more accurate urban extent maps. The statistical indices explored in the
36 Random Forest population mapping process in Table 3 highlight to what degree the distance to
37 “built” environments (lan_dstBLT) covariate plays a role in reducing error and increasing the
38 quality of the output of the population mapping process. When the focus was on which variable,
39 if removed, would increase the RMSE, the GEE experiments (Tests 2, 3, and 4) showed that the
40 distance to “built” covariate was an important one. Table 3 also reflects the same results in
41 increasing node purity in the process. It is important to note that in tests 2 and 4, urban extents
42 extracted in 3 consecutive years are combined, while in test 3 a single year is considered. Test 2
43 showed the greatest amount of error, utilizing urban extents that were obtained from the GEE for
44 years 2006, 2007 and 2008. It is clear that the modification of the landcover from test 1 for the
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 same time period reflected in test 2, changes the areas within Jakarta significantly. The improved
5
6 accuracy of test 1 over test 2 could just reflect a better correlation of values instead of informing
7
8 what is making the data more spatially significant, and in that circumstance, it can be argued that
9
10 the GEE urban extents can be a critical component in the creation of multitemporal datasets that
11
12 can modify existing landcover datasets in order to examine trends, in an efficient manner, for
13
14 different years. Table 4 shows how the integration of GEE extents correlates well in the
15
16 population mapping process and decreases error, by adding more concurrent built data along
17
18 with our other covariate datasets.
19
20
21
22
23

24
25 In using census data from 2010, land cover data closest to this year stands a better chance
26
27 of being the best proxy for disaggregation if all other factors are equal. In this sense, there is an
28
29 inherent bias in the tests, but it also highlights the benefits of the GEE approach, that is being
30
31 able to produce an accurate urban extent map for any time period, with the ability to match up
32
33 land cover data to particular census dates.
34
35
36

37
38 Overall, the NDSV is shown here to be a reliable method to detect urban extents,
39
40 especially when using a powerful tool to analyze the data such as the GEE. Moreover, the GEE
41
42 represents one of the most powerful tools offered today in remote sensing with its ability to
43
44 analyze and classify remotely sensed data over different temporal scales. Finally, the use of
45
46 NDSV derived extents produced in the GEE and integrated in a flexible population mapping
47
48 method enables testing of the validity of the classifications in improving population distribution
49
50 mapping, providing an additional novel accuracy assessment approach. As urbanization
51
52 processes continue to accelerate in many countries around the world, accurate, powerful and
53
54 efficient methods for rapid mapping of settlements and their changes, as well as populations
55
56 within them are a prerequisite for strategic planning and impact assessments. The results here
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 point towards the integration of classification and population mapping methods within GEE as a
5
6 way of meeting this need.
7

8
9
10 **Acknowledgements:**

11
12
13 The work by NNP during his stay at the University of Pavia was supported by the
14
15 CARIPLO Foundation, Project 2009-2936 for the Internationalization of the PhD programs in
16
17 ICT and Bioengineering of the University of Pavia. PG acknowledges support from the Google
18
19 Foundation for the preliminary phase of this research. AJT acknowledges funding support from
20
21 the RAPIDD program of the Science and Technology Directorate, Department of Homeland
22
23 Security, and the Fogarty International Center, National Institutes of Health, and is also
24
25 supported by grants from the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation (#49446, #1032350). The
26
27 funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or
28
29 preparation of the manuscript. This work forms an output of the WorldPop project
30
31 (www.worldpop.org.uk) and Flowminder Foundation (www.flowminder.org).
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 **References:**

39
40
41 Alberti, M., Weeks, R., & Coe, S. (2004). Urban Land-Cover Change Analysis in Central Puget
42
43 Sound. *Photogrammetric Engineering & Remote Sensing*, 70(9), 1043-1052. doi:
44
45 10.14358/PERS.70.9.1043
46
47
48
49 Angel, S., Sheppard, S. C., Civco, D. L., Buckley, R., Chabaeva, A., Gitlin, L., Kraley, A.,
50
51 Parent, J., Perlin, M. (2005). The dynamics of global urban expansion. Washington, D.C.: World
52
53 Bank, Transport and Urban Development Department.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4 Angiuli, E., & Trianni, G. (2014). Urban Mapping in Landsat Images Based on Normalized
5
6 Difference Spectral Vector. *IEEE Geoscience and Remote Sensing Letters*, 11(3), 661-665. doi:
7
8 10.1109/LGRS.2013.2274327
9
- 10
11
12 Bagan, H., & Yamagata, Y. (2012). Landsat analysis of urban growth: How Tokyo became the
13
14 world's largest megacity during the last 40 years. *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 127, 210-222.
15
16 doi: 10.1016/j.rse.2012.09.011
17
18
- 19
20 Bhaduri, B., Bright, E., Coleman, P., & Urban, M. L. (2007). LandScan USA: A high-resolution
21
22 geospatial and temporal modeling approach for population distribution and dynamics.
23
24 *GeoJournal*, 69(1-2), 103-117. doi: 10.1007/s10708-007-9105-9
25
26
- 27
28 Breiman, L. (1996). Bagging Predictors. *Machine Learning*, 24(2), 123–140.
29
30
- 31
32 Breiman, L. (2001). Random Forests. *Machine Learning*, 45(1), 5–32.
33
34 doi:10.1023/A:1010933404324
35
36
- 37
38 Burchfield, M., Overman, H. G., Puga, D., & Turner, M. A. (2006). Causes of Sprawl: A Portrait
39
40 from Space. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 121(2), 587-633. doi:
41
42 10.1162/qjec.2006.121.2.587
43
44
- 45
46 Carpenter, D., & Carpenter, S. (1983). Modeling inland water quality using Landsat data. *Remote*
47
48 *Sensing of Environment*, 13(4), 345-352. doi: 10.1016/0034-4257(83)90035-4
49
50
- 51
52 Center for International Earth Science Information Network (CIESIN), Columbia University,
53
54 International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI), The World Bank and Centro Internacional
55
56 de Agricultura Tropical (CIAT). (2004). Global Rural–Urban Mapping Project (GRUMP): Urban
57
58 Extents. Palisades, New York, CIESIN, Columbia University.
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 Earthengine-api - Earth Engine Access Library - Google Project Hosting. (2014). Retrieved
5
6 February 1, 2014, from <http://code.google.com/p/earthengine-api/>
7
8

9
10 Elvidge, C., Baugh, K., Kihn, E. A., & Davis, E. R. (1996). Mapping city lights with nighttime
11
12 data from the DMSP operational linescan system. *Photogrammetric Engineering and Remote*
13
14 *Sensing*, 63, 727 – 734.
15
16

17
18 Elvidge, C. D., Baugh, K. E., Dietz, J. B., Bland, T., Sutton, P. C., & Kroehl, H. W. (1999).
19
20 Radiance calibration of DMSP-OLS low-light imaging data of human settlements. *Remote*
21
22 *Sensing of Environment*, 68, 77 – 88.
23
24

25
26 Elvidge, C., Baugh, K. E., Hobson, V. R., Kihn, E. A., Kroehl, H. W., Davis, E. R., et al. (1997).
27
28 Satellite inventory of human settlements using nocturnal radiation emissions: A contribution to
29
30 the global toolchest. *Global Change Biology*, 3, 387 – 395.
31
32

33
34 Foody, G. M. (2000). Estimation of sub-pixel land cover composition in the presence of
35
36 untrained classes. *Computers & Geosciences*, 26, 469 – 478.
37
38

39
40 Gaughan, A. E., Stevens, F. R., Linard, C., Jia, P., & Tatem, A. J. (2013). High Resolution
41
42 Population Distribution Maps for Southeast Asia in 2010 and 2015. (F. Pappalardo, Ed.) *PLoS*
43
44 *ONE*, 8(2), e55882. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0055882
45
46

47
48 GeoHive. (2014). - *Population Statistics*. Retrieved October 1st, 2013, from
49
50 <http://www.geohive.com/>
51
52

53
54 Global Administrative Areas. (2014). *Global Administrative Areas*. Retrieved October 1st, 2013,
55
56 from <http://www.gadm.org/>
57
58
59
60
61

1
2
3
4 Guindon, B., Zhang, Y., & Dillabaugh, C. (2004). Landsat urban mapping based on a combined
5
6 spectral–spatial methodology. *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 92(2), 218-232. doi:
7
8 10.1016/j.rse.2004.06.015
9

10
11 Hansen, M. C., P. V. Potapov, R. Moore, M. Hancher, S. A. Turubanova, A. Tyukavina, D.
12
13 Thau, S. V. Stehman, S. J. Goetz, T. R. Loveland, A. Kommareddy, A. Egorov, L. Chini, C. O.
14
15 Justice, & J. R. G. Townshend (2013). High-Resolution Global Maps of 21st-Century Forest
16
17 Cover Change. *Science*, 342(6160), 850-853. doi: 10.1126/science.1244693
18
19

20
21 Hansen, M., DeFries, R., Townshend, J. R. G., & Sohlberg, R. (1998). 1km land cover
22
23 classification derived from AVHRR. College Park, Maryland. The Global Land Cover Facility.
24
25

26
27 IUCN and UNEP. (2012). *The World Database on Protected Areas (WDPA)*. Cambridge, UK:
28
29 UNEP-WCMC. Retrieved October 15th, 2013 from <http://www.protectedplanet.net>
30
31

32
33 Lehner, B., Verdin, K., Jarvis, A., & Fund, W. W. (2006). *HydroSHEDS Technical*
34
35 *Documentation* (p. 27). World Wildlife Fund.
36
37

38
39 Liaw, A., & Wiener, M. (2002). Classification and Regression by randomForest. *R News*, 2(3),
40
41 18–22.
42
43

44
45 Linard, C., Gilbert, M., Snow, R. W., Noor, A. M., & Tatem, A. J. (2012). Population
46
47 distribution, settlement patterns and accessibility across Africa in 2010. *PloS ONE*, 7(2), e31743.
48
49 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0031743
50

51
52 Linard, C., Gilbert, M., & Tatem, A. J. (2011). Assessing the use of global land cover data for
53
54 guiding large area population distribution modelling. *GeoJournal*, 76(5), 525-538. doi:
55
56 10.1007/s10708-010-9364-8
57
58
59
60
61

1
2
3
4 Linard, C., & Tatem, A. J. (2012). Large-scale spatial population databases in infectious disease
5 research. *International Journal of Health Geographics*, 11, 7. doi:10.1186/1476-072X-11-7
6
7

8
9
10 MDA Federal Inc. (2007). EarthSat GeoCover LC Overview. Retrieved October 15, 2013, from
11 <http://www.mdafederal.com/geocover/geocoverlc/gclcoverview>
12
13

14
15 NGA. (2005). Vector Map (VMap) Level 0. National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency (NGA).
16 Retrieved April 24, 2013, from
17 http://geoengine.nga.mil/geospatial/SW_TOOLS/NIMAMUSE/webinter/rast_roam.html
18
19
20
21

22
23 NOAA. (2012). VIIRS Nighttime Lights - 2012. Earth Observation Group, National Geophysical
24 Data Center, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA). Retrieved April 08,
25 2013, from http://www.ngdc.noaa.gov/dmsp/data/viirs_fire/viirs_html/viirs_ntl.html
26
27
28
29

30
31 OSM. (2013). OpenStreetMap Base Data. OpenStreetMap.org. Retrieved October 15th, 2013,
32 from <http://www.openstreetmap.org/>
33
34

35
36
37 Pesaresi, M., Gerhardinger, A., & Kayitakire, F. (2008). A Robust Built-Up Area Presence Index
38 by Anisotropic Rotation-Invariant Textural Measure. *IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Applied*
39 *Earth Observations and Remote Sensing*, 1(3), 180-192. doi: 10.1109/JSTARS.2008.2002869
40
41
42

43
44
45 Potere, D., Schneider, A., Angel, S., & Civco, D. (2009). Mapping urban areas on a global scale:
46 Which of the eight maps now available is more accurate? *International Journal of Remote*
47 *Sensing*, 30(24), 6531-6558. doi: 10.1080/01431160903121134
48
49
50

51
52
53 Rawashdeh, S. A., & Saleh, B. (2006). Satellite Monitoring of Urban Spatial Growth in the
54 Amman Area, Jordan. *Journal of Urban Planning and Development*, 132(4), 211. doi:
55 10.1061/(ASCE)0733-9488(2006)132:4(211)
56
57
58
59
60
61

1
2
3
4 Schneider, A., & Woodcock, C. E. (2008). Compact, Dispersed, Fragmented, Extensive? A
5
6 Comparison of Urban Growth in Twenty-five Global Cities using Remotely Sensed Data, Pattern
7
8 Metrics and Census Information. *Urban Studies*, 45(3), 659-692. doi:
9
10 10.1177/0042098007087340
11
12

13
14
15 Schneider, A. (2012). Monitoring land cover change in urban and peri-urban areas using dense
16
17 time stacks of Landsat satellite data and a data mining approach. *Remote Sensing of*
18
19 *Environment*, 124, 689-704. doi: 10.1016/j.rse.2012.06.006
20
21

22
23 Schneider, A., Friedl, M. A., & Potere, D. (2009). A new map of global urban extent from
24
25 MODIS satellite data. *Environmental Research Letters*, 4(4), 044003. doi: 10.1088/1748-
26
27 9326/4/4/044003
28
29

30
31 Schneider, A., Friedl, M. A., & Potere, D. (2010). Mapping global urban areas using MODIS
32
33 500-m data: New methods and datasets based on ‘urban ecoregions’. *Remote Sensing of*
34
35 *Environment*, 114(8), 1733-1746. doi: 10.1016/j.rse.2010.03.003
36
37

38
39 Schneider, A., Friedl, M. A., McIver, D. K., & Woodcock, C. E. (2003). Mapping urban areas by
40
41 fusing multiple sources of coarse resolution remotely sensed data. *Photogrammetric Engineering*
42
43 *and Remote Sensing*, 69, 1377 – 1386
44
45

46
47 Sexton, J. O., Song, X., Huang, C., Channan, S., Baker, M. E., & Townshend, J. R. (2013).
48
49 Urban growth of the Washington, D.C.–Baltimore, MD metropolitan region from 1984 to 2010
50
51 by annual, Landsat-based estimates of impervious cover. *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 129,
52
53 42-53. doi: 10.1016/j.rse.2012.10.025
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61

1
2
3
4 Stevens, F. R., Gaughan, A. E., Linard, C., & Tatem, A. J. (2014). Disaggregating census data
5
6 for population mapping using Random Forests with remotely-sensed and other ancillary data.
7

8
9 *Manuscript Submitted for Publication.*
10

11
12 Sutton, P. (2003). A scale-adjusted measure of urban sprawl using nighttime satellite imagery.
13
14 *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 86, 353 – 369.
15

16
17
18 Tatem, A. J., Noor, A. M., Von Hagen, C., Di Gregorio, A., & Hay, S. I. (2007). High resolution
19
20 population maps for low income nations: combining land cover and census in East Africa. *PloS*
21
22 *ONE*, 2(12), e1298. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0001298
23

24
25
26 Taubenböck, H., Esch, T., Felbier, A., Wiesner, M., Roth, A., & Dech, S. (2012). Monitoring
27
28 urbanization in mega cities from space. *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 117, 162-176. doi:
29
30 10.1016/j.rse.2011.09.015
31

32
33
34 The WorldPop Project. (2014). Retrieved from <http://www.worldpop.org.uk/>
35

36
37 Woodcock, C.E., Allen, R., Anderson, M., Belward, A., Bindschadler, R., Cohen, W., Gao, F.,
38
39 Goward, S.N., Helder, D., Helmer, E., Nemani, R., Oreopoulos, L., Schott, J., Thenkabail, P.S.,
40
41 Vermote, E.F., Vogelmann, J., Wulder, M.A., Wynne, R. (2008). Free Access to Landsat
42
43 Imagery. *Science*, 320(5879), 1011a-1011a. doi: 10.1126/science.320.5879.1011a
44
45

46
47
48 Xu, H. (2008). A new index for delineating built-up land features in satellite imagery.
49
50 *International Journal of Remote Sensing*, 29(14), 4269-4276. doi: 10.1080/01431160802039957
51

52
53
54 Yuan, F., Sawaya, K. E., Loeffelholz, B. C., & Bauer, M. E. (2005). Land cover classification
55
56 and change analysis of the Twin Cities (Minnesota) Metropolitan Area by multitemporal Landsat
57

remote sensing. *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 98(2-3), 317-328. doi:
10.1016/j.rse.2005.08.006

Tables

Table 1: Test-specific data sources and variable names used for population density estimation used for dasymetric weights.

Type	Variable Name(s)*	Description	Indonesia Java Data
Census		Country-specific census and scale	2010, Admin-level 2 (GADM,2014), (Geohive, 2014)
Land Cover	lan_cls011, lan_dst011	Cultivated terrestrial lands	Landcover Experiments detailed in Table 2
	lan_cls040, lan_dst040	Woody / Trees	
	lan_cls130, lan_dst130	Shrubs	
	lan_cls140, lan_dst140	Herbaceous	
	lan_cls150, lan_dst150	Other terrestrial vegetation	
	lan_cls160, lan_dst160	Aquatic vegetation	
	lan_cls190, lan_dst190	Urban area	
	lan_cls200, lan_dst200	Bare areas	
	lan_cls210, lan_dst210	Water bodies	
	lan_cls230, lan_dst230	No data, cloud/shadow	
	lan_cls240, lan_dst240	Rural settlement	
	lan_cls250, lan_dst250	Industrial area	
	lan_clsBLT, lan_dstBLT	Built, merged urban/rural class	
Continuous Raster-Format	lig	Lights at night	Suomi VIIRS-Derived

	tem	Mean temperature, 1950-2000	(NOAA, 2012) WorldClim/BioClim
	pre	Mean precipitation, 1950-2000	WorldClim/BioClim
	ele	Elevation	HydroSHEDS (Lehner et al., 2006)
	ele_slope	Slope	HydroSHEDS-Derived (Lehner et al., 2006)
Converted			
Vector-Format	roa_dst	Distance to roads	OSM (2013)
	riv_dst	Distance to rivers/streams	OSM (2013)
	pop_cls, pop_dst	Generic populated places	VMAPO <i>merged</i> [†]
	wat_cls, wat_dst	Water bodies	World Food Programme
	pro_cls, pro_dst	Protected areas	WDPA, IUCN (2012)
	poi_cls, poi_dst	Populated Points	OSM (2013)
	bui_cls, bui_dst	Buildings	OSM (2013)

* The variable names are used in Random Forest model output and throughout the text as reference to the specific data they were derived from. The first three letters are derived from the data type (e.g. “lan” indicates land cover) and the last three letters, if present, indicates what type of data each variable represents (e.g. “_cls” is a binary classification and “_dst” is a calculated Euclidean distance-to variable).

† The default data for populated places is merged from several VMAPO data sources. There are three VMAPO data sets used: The point data pop/builtupp and pop/mispopp are buffered to 100 m and merged with the pop/builtupa polygons creating a vector-based built layer. This layer is then converted to binary class and distance-to rasters for use in modeling. (NGA, 2005)

Table 2. Confusion Matrices for Kota Manado without (top) and with (bottom) the Spatial Post-Processing Step (Fig. 4):

Overall Accuracy =(2242/4000) 56.05%			
	Ground Truth (Pixels)		
Class	urban	non urban	Total
urban	245	3	248
non urban	1755	1997	3752
Total	2000	2000	4000
Overall Accuracy = (3398/4000) 84.95%			
	Ground Truth (Pixels)		
Class	urban	non urban	Total
urban	1625	227	1852
non urban	375	1773	2148
Total	2000	2000	4000

Table 3: Top Five Statistical Outputs: Percent Increase of Mean Squared Error When Variable is Randomly Permuted and Total Decrease in Residual Sum of Squares When Variable is Selected For Decision Tree Node

Percent Increase of Mean Squared Error When Variable Randomly Permuted

Test 1 (MDA) (total of 23 covariates used), (81% Variance Explained)	Test 2 (GEE 2006-2008) (total of 22 covariates used), (83% Variance Explained)
20.2 (Lights)	18.4 (Lights)
12.7 (Landcover Distance to Built Areas)	17.4 (Landcover Distance to Built Areas)
10.8 (Distance to Populated Points)	10.6 (Distance to Populated Points)
9.24 (Distance to Buildings)	7.91 (Distance to Generic Population Places, VMAP0)
9.08 (Landcover Distance to Cultivated Terrestrial Areas)	7.79 (Landcover Distance to Cultivated Terrestrial Areas)
Test 3 (GEE 2009) (total of 22 covariates used), (83% Variance Explained)	Test 4 (GEE 2008-2010) (total of 23 covariates used), (84% Variance Explained)
19.3 (Lights)	19.8 (Landcover Distance to Built Areas)
16.5 (Landcover Distance to Built Areas)	18.8 (Lights)
9.13 (Distance to Populated Points)	8.00 (Distance to Populated Points)
7.13 (Distance to Roads)	7.77 (Landcover Distance to Cultivated Terrestrial Areas)
6.90 (Landcover Distance to Cultivated Terrestrial Areas)	7.23 (Distance to Roads)
Total Decrease in Residual Sum of Squares When Covariate Used	
Test 1 (MDA) (total of 23 covariates used) , (81% Variance Explained)	Test 2 (GEE 2006-2008) (total of 22 covariates used), (83% Variance Explained)
53.8 (Lights)	49.3 (Landcover Distance to Built Areas)
31.7 (Landcover Distance to Built Areas)	43.7 (Lights)
19.1 (Distance to Roads)	17.7 (Distance to Populated Points)
17.2 (Distance to Populated Points)	16.9 (Distance to Roads)
16.9 (Distance to Buildings)	13.7(Distance to Buildings)
Test 3 (GEE 2009) (total of 22 covariates used), (83% Variance Explained)	Test 4 (GEE 2008-2010) (total of 23 covariates used), (84% Variance Explained)
56.5 (Landcover Distance to Built Areas)	58.4 (Landcover Distance to Built Areas)
46.6 (Lights)	45.3 (Lights)
15.3 (Distance to Roads)	15.3 (Distance to Roads)
13.5(Distance to Populated Points)	12.0 (Distance to Populated Points)
9.76 (Distance to Generic Populated Places, VMAP0)	11.2 (Distance to Buildings)


Table 4: Accuracy Assessment Results for Four Urban Land Cover Treatments

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

	RMSE	%RMSE	MAE
Test 1 (MDA)	1450.286	0.129064	787.8362
Test 2 (GEE 2006-2008)	2277.501	0.20268	1352.685
Test 3 (GEE 2009)	1377.889	0.122621	773.6329
Test 4 (GEE 2008-2010)	1346.32	0.119812	759.3168

Figures

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65



Sources: Global Administrative Areas (GADM, <http://www.gadm.org>), Thematic Mapping (<http://thematicmapping.org/>)

Fig. 1: Map of study area and Java administrative boundaries levels 1 and 2

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65




Fig. 2. Normalized Difference Spectral Vector (NDSV) profiles for urban areas, vegetation, water and bare soil.

Fig. 3: General structure of the data processing and map production procedure used to compare



the methodology outlined in Stevens et al (2014). The orange boxes represent items that are specific to the research presented here and not part of end-user map data product generation. The green boxes represent data pre-processing stages. Items in blue represent Random Forest model estimation, per-pixel prediction and dasymetric redistribution of census counts.




Fig. 4: Human settlement extraction results for Manado, Bandung and Jakarta, in Indonesia.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65





Fig. 5: A small sample of the area around central Jakarta used in the tests. Test 1 displays the EarthSat GeoCover Land Cover Thematic Mapper from MDA Federal (reflecting extents from 2007). Tests 2, 3 and 4 represent the Google Earth Engine derived extents that are merged into Test 1. Test 2 integrates urban areas from 3 collections from 2006, 2007 and 2008 (a collection for each year), Test 3 integrates urban areas from 3 collections in 2009, and Test 4 integrates urban areas from 2008, 2009, and 2010 (a collection for each year). Classifications reflected in the Legend are all from the MDA Federal dataset other than the “Urban Area” class, which was obtained from the Google Earth Engine derived NDSV extents.

Figure 1

[Click here to download high resolution image](#)



Sources: Global Administrative Areas (GADM, <http://www.gadm.org>), Thematic Mapping (<http://thematicmapping.org/>)

Figure 2
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)







Figure 3
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)




Figure 4
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)




Figure 5
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)

