

Uncovering the socioeconomic facets of human mobility

Hugo Barbosa,¹ Surendra Hazarie,² Brian Dickinson,³ Aleix Bassolas,⁴ Adam Frank,²
Henry Kautz,³ Adam Sadilek,^{5,*} José J. Ramasco,^{6,†} and Gourab Ghoshal^{2,3,‡}

¹*Department of Computer Science, University of Exeter, Exeter, UK*

²*Department of Physics & Astronomy,
University of Rochester, Rochester, NY, 14627, USA.*

³*Department of Computer Science, University of Rochester, Rochester, NY, 14627, USA.*

⁴*School of Mathematical Sciences, Queen Mary University of London,
Mile End Road, E1 4NS, London, UK*

⁵*Google Inc., 1600 Amphitheatre Parkway, Mountain View, CA, 94043, USA*

⁶*Instituto de Física Interdisciplinar y Sistemas Complejos IFISC (CSIC-UIB),
Campus UIB, 07122, Palma de Mallorca, Spain*

Abstract

Given the rapid recent trend of urbanization, a better understanding of how urban infrastructure mediates socioeconomic interactions and economic systems is of vital importance. While the accessibility of location-enabled devices as well as large-scale datasets of human activities, has fueled significant advances in our understanding, there is little agreement on the linkage between socioeconomic status and its influence on movement patterns, in particular, the role of inequality. Here, we analyze a heavily aggregated and anonymized summary of global mobility and investigate the relationships between socioeconomic status and mobility across a hundred cities in the US and Brazil. We uncover two types of relationships, finding either a clear connection or little-to-no interdependencies. The former tend to be characterized by low levels of public transportation usage, inequitable access to basic amenities and services, and segregated clusters of communities in terms of income, with the latter class showing the opposite trends. Our findings provide useful lessons in designing urban habitats that serve the larger interests of all inhabitants irrespective of their economic status.

* sadilekadam@google.com

† jramasco@ifisc.uib-csic.es

‡ gghoshal@pas.rochester.edu

I. INTRODUCTION

The recent trend of rapid global urbanization [1] poses major economic, social and structural challenges to cities [2], accentuated by the environmental, and population impacts of climate change [3, 4]. Added to this, rising economic inequality jeopardizes the health and livelihoods of many urban residents. Indeed, the percentage of Americans living in middle-income neighborhoods has decreased from 65% to 42% in the last 40 years, while the inhabitants of neighborhoods at the lower and higher ends of the income spectrum have grown [5]. Much of the urban growth has been driven by the less wealthy who have progressively moved from the rural areas to cities [6]. While the rise in economic inequality is a global phenomenon, different patterns are observed between countries and cultures. For instance, while low-income households are typically located in the outskirts in Paris, they live downtown in Detroit [7]. Such patterns of economic segregation and inequalities are connected as well to racial segregation, urban decay [8] and gentrification [9]. In fact, over the course of history, many policies and resulting infrastructure changes were put in place in ways that hurt minority communities and already vulnerable portions of cities. This has been thoroughly documented in [10] for the case of New York and similar instances have been occurring around the world. Understanding the factors behind this and developing public policy to alleviate these trends is therefore crucial to enhance social mobility and economic progress, as well as positively impact the health of citizens [11–14].

Residential segregation is only a partial view of the whole picture, given that cities are a product of several interconnected systems. City infrastructure and dynamics are significantly connected to their underlying social systems, in particular influencing development and productivity indicators [15–19]. However, these mechanisms affect cities of different sizes in particular ways. On the one hand, technological advances are more rewarding to larger cities [20], while urban democratization tends to be more beneficial for smaller cities [21]. Underlying these intra-city mechanics are the people, and their mobility patterns [22].

Indeed, the increasing accessibility of location-enabled devices and large-scale datasets of human activities, such as credit-card purchases, taxi rides and mobile phone usage are fueling significant advances in our understanding of human mobility behavior [23–30]. Yet, the connection of these observed mobility patterns with socioeconomic status is surprisingly




FIG. 1. **Visualization of mobility data.** Flows at the country level for the US (left-panel), with New York City shown in the inset. Flows at the country level for Brazil (right-panel), with Rio shown in the inset.

unclear and in many cases contradictory. For instance, while mobility patterns across different socioeconomic classes exhibit very similar characteristics in Boston and Singapore [31], a similar study in Louisville, KY, revealed that low-income residents tended to travel further on average than those in affluent ones [32]. On the other hand, analysis of cell phone data from an emerging Latin American economy revealed that wealthier citizens traveled to more locations and longer distances [33]. An analysis of mobility in Bogotá, Colombia found the most mobile population to be the upper-middle class instead of the wealthiest [34]. Employment status played a role in movement patterns in both Riyadh and Spain, where the unemployed tended to travel less and spend more time at home [35, 36]. Two studies in French municipalities found a connection between the diversity of location visits with income, but no connection to the distance traveled [37, 38]. These bewildering variety of results from studies around the globe indicates that the observed diversity in trends are the result of a complex interplay between urban infrastructure and socioeconomic processes. However, each of these studies were conducted in a relatively small set of cities, different underlying datasets, and different methodologies. Greater clarity and insight may be uncovered by conducting the studies at scale, globally, and with a uniform methodology. To that effect, here, we explore the multiple facets connecting human travel behavior in a city to its socioeconomic landscape, through a country-wide analysis encompassing one hundred cities in the United States and Brazil. The two countries were selected due to their similarity

in total population and the number of large cities, with one being a developed economy, while the other an emerging economy with markedly different socioeconomic characteristics. We find differences within and between the two countries, with two distinct classes of cities; one where there is a strong connection between the socioeconomic status of the residents and their movement patterns, and another class where there appears little-to-no connection. The latter class of cities are characterized by wider use of public transportation, equitable access to amenities and services as well as greater mixing among neighborhoods in terms of income profiles. The former class of cities show the opposite trends. We conclude with a discussion of the implications of our findings, including possible policy directions as it relates to urban planning.

II. DATA DESCRIPTION

A. Mobility data

The Google Aggregated Mobility Research Dataset contains anonymized mobility flows aggregated over users who have turned on the Location History setting, which is off by default. This is similar to the data used to show how busy certain types of places are in Google Maps, helping identify, for instance, when a local business tends to be the most crowded. The dataset aggregates flows of people between regions, specifically ZIP Code Tabulation Areas (ZCTAs) for the United States, and the comparable census Weighting Area (WA) for Brazil, both of which we generically refer to as *sub-areas* (SAs).

To produce this dataset, machine learning is applied to logs data to automatically segment it into semantic trips [4]. To provide strong privacy guarantees, all trips were anonymized and aggregated using a differentially private mechanism to aggregate the flows [39]. This research is done on the resulting heavily aggregated and differentially private data. No individual user data was ever manually inspected, only heavily aggregated flows of large populations were handled. As a result, the data is represented as a flow matrix \mathbf{T} whose elements T_{ij} correspond to annualized out-flows from location i to j . For the purposes of our analysis we consider the 50 largest cities in the United States and analogously in Brazil ranked according to their population. In Fig. 1 we show the resulting mobility network for

the United States and Brazil, with New York and Rio shown as inset. The nodes correspond to cities, and the edges are weighted normalized flows between the various locations. The full list of cities along with their populations are shown in Supplementary Tables S1 and S2.

B. Socioeconomic Indicators

To represent socioeconomic status we collected data from the most recent 2016 five-year American Community Survey (ACS) for the United States [40], and analogously the 2010 decennial census for Brazil [41]. Among the metrics collected were age, race, level of education, population, median income, sex composition, among others. A representative sample of the data, aggregated at the level of ZCTA's is shown for Rochester, NY in Supplementary Table S3, and at the level of WA's for Campinas in Supplementary Table S4. The choice of resolution is driven by the fact that both geographical levels are designated by the respective census authorities in such a way that their underlying populations are as socioeconomically homogeneous as possible.

In Supplementary Figs. S1 and S2, we show correlation matrices displaying the Spearman rank correlation between a selection of indicators for both countries, finding that household median income has the strongest correlation with a number of other measures. Given that income is an indicator that is queried in most sociodemographic surveys throughout the globe and is the most direct way to estimate the economic capacities of different groups to afford mobility costs, it serves as a parsimonious measure. Consequently, without loss of generality and for the purposes of simplicity, in what follows, we use household median income as a low-dimensional proxy for socioeconomic status. We make use of two different income metrics. The first, ID_q , refers to the median income quintile of a given SA. When using this metric we define *high* and *low* income sub-areas as the top and bottom median income quintiles within their city. This metric is useful for simply categorizing the income of different sub-areas in a city. Our second metric, ID_f , is based on separate census-defined income breaks. In this case income is represented as a probability vector of the percentage of residents within each nationally defined income bracket and allows for more fine-grained analysis of income distribution. For more details on the metrics see Supplementary Section S1.

C. Amenities

Mobility patterns of urban residents are not only influenced by considerations of cost or income constraints, but also by the number and diversity of amenities and services accessible to them. To collect this information, we query the OpenStreetMap (OSM) database [42], that contains geo-referenced information for a broad array of urban amenities, including schools, banks, libraries, groceries and universities, to name a few. The OSM data contains 691 different types of urban facilities belonging to eight main classes: healthcare (e.g., hospital and pharmacy), sustenance (e.g., restaurant and cafe), financial (e.g., bank and ATM), education (e.g., library and university), art-culture (e.g., arts center and theater), entertainment (e.g., cinema and nightclub), transportation (bicycle parking and bus station) and others (e.g., police station and post office).

For the purposes of our analysis, we consider basic amenities related to food, healthcare, education and finance. A representative list of such amenities is shown for four different cities in the United States in Supplementary Table S5. To calculate the distance between a particular zip code and an amenity we use the geodesic distance between the centroid of the zip code and the coordinates of the amenity, represented by its latitude and longitude. This metric is an estimation of the characteristic distance the average individual in the zip code will need to travel to reach the amenity. It ignores population distribution within the zip code, as well as travel restrictions such as buildings and terrain to simplify computation. Despite these limitations, this distance is sufficient for our purposes.

III. RESULTS

A. Mobility metrics

We characterize the mobility patterns of an area based on two representative quantities. The first metric is the average travel distance, or weighted average out-flow length, which is intended to capture the mobility-related costs that are directly proportional to travel

distances. For each location i it can be computed as

$$M_i^{dist} = \frac{\sum_j T_{ij} d_{ij}}{\sum_{j \neq i} T_{ij}}, \quad (1)$$

where T_{ij} is the number of trips going from an area i to a different area j and d_{ij} is the geodesic distance between the centroid of the two areas. The second metric we consider is the total flow per capita originating from location i , computed as

$$M_i^{freq} = \frac{\sum_j T_{ij}}{P_i}, \quad (2)$$

where P_i is the population of location i . The city-level values are then computed by summing over all locations i within the city. The measure serves as a proxy for trip frequency which is a useful complement to trip distance, as it represents an activity rate. Activity patterns, which are connected to employment status [36], combined with average distance traveled, indicate the distance and frequency of travel for residents in a given location. These factors are potentially influenced by the socioeconomic resources of the residents as well as their proximity to opportunities, and enables targeted ways of understanding the influence of city infrastructure and services on its residents.

We begin with a country-wide analysis of the mobility patterns of the lower and upper 20% of SA's by median income. The choice of income range enables a first look at the trends for residents at the opposite end of the socioeconomic spectrum, that is those with the most and least potential constraints on their traveling behavior. In Fig. 2**A,B** we plot the probability density functions for M_i^{dist} and M_i^{freq} in the United States and in Fig. 2**C,D** for Brazil. In the US, we find that poor residents generally travel shorter distances but more often than the rich. Conversely, in Brazil, we see that mobility is dominated by the wealthier individuals, who travel more frequently and for longer distances, with the magnitude of separation in the mobility metrics between the different income groups being more pronounced in Brazil. However, for both countries, there is considerable width and overlap to the distributions, suggestive of a diversity in trends for individual cities. To check whether these observed features are due to biases in the data coverage based on income, in Fig. S3, we plot the mobility outflow as a function of the population for both income brackets in the two countries. We find a strong monotonic dependence, indicating that




FIG. 2. **Distribution of mobility metrics** Equations (1) and (2) for the upper and lower 20% residents in terms of income. **A** In the United States, flows originating from low-income areas (red) tend to be of slightly shorter length compared to the ones from the high-income regions (blue). **B** The opposite trend exists for travel frequency suggesting that wealthier residents travel less as compared to their poorer counterparts. **C**. Like in the United States, in Brazil, trips originating from low-income areas are significantly shorter in comparison with those from high-income zones. However, the discrepancy is more accentuated than in American cities. **D**, Unlike the United States, the frequency of trips is also much higher for wealthier residents in Brazil.

the flow provides equal representation of population irrespective of income. Indeed this is reflective of the fact that both over 90% of households in the United States and Brazil own mobile phones and both countries rank among the top five in terms of smartphone usage¹.

B. Socio-mobility correlations

Given the observed country-level signal between the mobility metrics at the opposite ends of the income scale, we next conduct a more granular analysis across all census-determined income breaks ID_f , and at the level of individual cities. Given an income distribution of n income intervals, we construct for each urban area, n income distribution vectors \mathcal{I} of m positions each $\mathcal{I}_{j1\dots n} = [f_1, f_2, \dots, f_m]$, where m denotes the number of SAs in that city.

¹ <https://www.pewresearch.org/global/2016/02/22/smartphone-ownership-and-internet-usage-continues-to-climb-in-emerging-economies/>




FIG. 3. **Correlation between income and mobility.** For each income bracket (divided into eight buckets), Spearman correlation between the share of residents and the average travel distance, as well as average travel frequency for the United States (**A** and **B**) and Brazil (**C** and **D**). The colors indicate the level of correlation from dark-blue (-1) to dark orange (+1).

Here, f_m is the probability that an individual within the income interval n lives in SA m . We compute the Spearman rank correlation coefficient between each \mathcal{I}_j and the vectors for M^{freq} and M^{dist} for all m . For the results reported here, $n = 8$ for the United States and $n = 9$ for Brazil as determined by the respective censuses.

In Fig. 3 we plot these correlations for both mobility metrics for all hundred cities. In the United States, we see two distinct correlation patterns for both mobility variables: cities with strong correlations (depicted as darker colors) or cities with weak correlations (lighter colors) across income brackets. For the lower-income brackets in cities like San Antonio and Sacramento there is a marked negative correlation with M^{dist} (Fig. 3A) and a positive correlation with M^{freq} (Fig. 3B), indicating that low income populations in those cities tend to travel over shorter distances but more frequently. Surprisingly, for these same cities, when we look at the high-income regions of the plot, we see an opposite relationship, with trips being longer (positive correlation with M^{dist}) and less frequent (negative correlation with M^{freq}), a pattern that is observed in many other cities. Conversely, the other remaining

cities display little-to-no socio-mobility correlations. For example, in New York, Seattle, Chicago and Washington DC, the correlations are quite weak throughout the entire income range, indicating that income has little influence on how far or how frequently people travel. The Brazilian cities, on the other hand display markedly distinct trends. While there are a few cities with relatively little correlations such as Caxias do Sul, Campinas and Blumenau, the majority of cities display high positive correlations across metrics and income ranges, with the strongest signal being in the middle-income range (Fig. 3C,D). Whereas in the US, we see a mix of positive and negative correlations, in Brazil the correlations are by and large positive, except for the lowest income bracket being anti-correlated with travel frequency in a number of cities. The trends indicate a distinct mobility advantage for those higher up in the income scale both in terms of travel distance and frequency.

C. City Clusters

The results from Fig. 3 suggest a multiplicity of patterns in terms of the connection between mobility and income in both countries. In order to check if cities can be classified into distinct groups according to these trends, we implement a clustering method to partition the cities according to their socio-mobility correlation patterns. Using the Manhattan distance between the pairs of correlation values in each city, we perform a divisive hierarchical clustering [43], finding a clear partition of the cities in the United States into two different groups, color-coded in teal and orange as shown in Fig. 4A. Some interesting trends are immediately apparent. The largest seven cities (≥ 5 M inhabitants) are all in the orange cluster. On the other hand, the remaining cities are evenly distributed across both clusters, suggesting that population size is not a key factor in the observed partitioning (see Supplementary Section S4 for details on the clustering).

In Fig. 4B we plot the correlations across the 8 income breaks, separately for each cluster. A clear distinction emerges, whereby the teal cluster exhibits both stronger positive and stronger negative correlations, with lower income brackets traveling shorter distances but more often than the wealthy. This is in stark contrast to the orange cluster, where income and mobility variables exhibit relatively flat correlations across all the income breaks. These cluster assignments, quantitatively confirm the trends seen in Fig. 3A, and suggests




FIG. 4. **Clustering analyses of cities in United States** **A** Dendrogram obtained from a divisive hierarchical clustering method to partition cities into two different groups color-coded in teal and orange. **B** Spearman correlation between eight income breaks (ID_f), and the average flow distance and out-strength per capita. **C** Fraction of the population using mass transit for each of the clusters. **D** Fraction of basic amenities accessible as a function of distance for 5 income breaks (ID_q) for each of the clusters.

the existence of two different classes of cities in the United States; those where travel patterns are determined by income, and those which are broadly independent of socioeconomic characteristics.

We next investigate the factors behind this difference in correlations. A way to mitigate the disadvantages due to income is having efficient and cheap public transportation systems. In Figure 4C we plot the percentage of individuals that use public transit in either cluster (extracted from the census), finding that a larger fraction of residents in the orange cluster use mass transit methods compare to those residing in the teal one. We note from a previous analysis [4], that those cities that are in the orange cluster tend to be more hierarchical and centralized in terms of mobility-flows as compared to those in the teal cluster that are

sprawled and decentralized. Hierarchical cities have higher levels of infrastructure for public transit, and the observed higher usage of public transit is not just a behavioral feature but also reflects wider availability.

As mentioned earlier, another feature that might influence mobility patterns is the availability of amenities and services. Correspondingly, we check the typical distance residents of a particular location have to travel before they come across a number of basic amenities (food, healthcare, education and finance). For ease of display, instead of using all eight income breaks, we split the income groups into five categories (low, mid-low, mid, mid-high) and plot the fraction of amenities accessible up to 10km from the resident location. (See Supplementary Section S1 for details on the income-breaks). Using this data we analyze the distances different income groups, ID_q , would have to travel, in order to reach a certain percentage of basic amenities and plot our results in Fig. 4D. In the orange cluster, the accessibility of amenities is relatively stable across income groups, indicating that in cities where low and high income groups move in similar ways, they tend to be at similar distances from basic amenities. This is either due to a more equitable distribution of resources, or the fact that both the wealthy and the less-so, tend to live in roughly the same areas. In contrast, within the teal cluster, we see an interesting trend, whereby, the distance traveled to reach the same fraction of amenities increases with income. In other words, the less wealthy live closer to basic amenities (at least in quantity, if not quality, a feature we investigate later), as compared to those with higher income. This is likely a reflection of the differences in urban organization between the orange and teal clusters, where in the latter, more sprawled configuration, lower income groups live in the inner-city (where a number of amenities are in close proximity), with the wealthier residents living in suburbs.

In order to check whether our results are broadly stable across multiple datasets of human mobility, we next conduct a similar analysis on publicly available commuting data from the United States census bureau’s LODES database [44]. Unlike the aggregate location history signals, this captures primarily work-home commuting trips. Nevertheless the aggregate mobility flows are strongly correlated with the LODES data up to around 10^3 commuters as seen in Fig. S5. Beyond this limit, the datasets diverge significantly indicating that the mobility data contains more information on non-commuting flows. With respect to the trends seen in Fig. 2, the commuting data is in qualitative agreement in terms of the average

distance traveled, but differs in terms of the trip-frequency (Fig. S6). Here, there is little difference between the income groups in terms of how often they travel. The key reason here is the way that work-home commutes are calculated from the LODES database. Irrespective of how many times an individual commutes to work over the year, it is counted as a single instance of the flow. Thus apart from not capturing non-commuting flows, the LODES data is limited in terms of accurately reflecting the true number of trips made between locations. With this in mind, we reproduce the clustering analysis conducted in Fig. 4 for the commuting data and plot the results in Fig. S7. The resulting clusters are shown in Fig. S7A and a comparison to the divisions in Fig. 4 yields a Fowlkes-Mallows index score of 0.8 [45], indicating that the splits are by and large similar. Yet there are some notable differences; cities such as Portland, Seattle and Kansas City that were originally in the orange cluster are now found in the teal cluster. On the other hand, some cities in the teal cluster such as Detroit, Milwaukee and St. Louis move to the orange cluster. The correlation of the average distance traveled with ID_f , mirrors that seen for Fig. 4 although the differences between the two clusters are less pronounced (Fig. S7B). On the other hand, the correlations with trip-frequency are markedly different, with the teal cluster now showing a flat trend, and the orange cluster showing a small positive trend with income. In terms of public transportation use in each cluster (Fig. S7C) the trends are the same, largely due to the fact that the major metropolitan areas with high prevalence of public-transit-usage remain in the orange cluster for both datasets. A similar pattern emerges in terms of the distance to amenities, split by ID_q , with the orange cluster having little-to-no income dependence on amenity accessibility, whereas in the green cluster the higher income groups on average live further away from basic amenities (Fig. S7D). Subtle differences exist in terms of the precise fraction of amenities accessed between the two datasets. Thus the primary difference between the location and commuting data, is the weaker or lack of correlations with mobility metrics in the latter due to the lower resolution in trip-frequency. This results in the switching of some cities between the clusters (some rather misleading, as in putting Detroit and NYC in the same cluster as we will show later). The qualitative features extracted from both datasets, however, are the same attesting to the robustness of the analysis.

Next, we analyze the cities in Brazil (Supplementary Figure S8A), resulting in two clusters of roughly the same size, color-coded yellow and blue. Unlike the more mixed patterns in the




FIG. 5. Diversity of urban amenities per median income quintile. Entropy of amenities in each of the sub-areas as a function of the median income in the United States (**A**) and Brazil (**B**). Entropy of amenities in each of the sub-areas as a function of the income in Detroit (**C**), a typical city of the teal cluster in the United States. Areas with higher median income tend also to have a higher diversity of amenities, a similar pattern seen for Rio de Janeiro (**D**) a typical city of the blue cluster in Brazil. In New York City, NY (**E**) (orange cluster), the trends are flat, and in Campinas (**F**) noisy, though higher-income areas on average, have higher amenity diversity.

United States in terms of population size, nearly all the Brazilian cities in the blue cluster are the largest metropolitan areas and the capital cities of their respective states, with the

exception of Lagos and São José dos Campos. Among the cities in the yellow cluster, the only state capital is Florianópolis. In Supplementary Fig. S8B, we plot the correlation of the mobility metrics with ID_f for each of the clusters, finding that the trends are quite different from that found in the United States. In both clusters there is an increase in correlation with both metrics as one goes up the the income ladder, with the strongest connection being in the middle income range. The correlations are always positive and stronger in magnitude than in the United States. In the yellow cluster while the lowest and highest income ranges travel similar distances, the wealthier travel much more frequently. In the blue cluster, the wealthy travel much longer distances and more frequently than the poor. Indeed, in both clusters the poor have similar movement patterns.

Public transit usage (Supplementary Fig. S8C) is moderately higher in the blue cluster (which also contains the largest cities in Brazil), but given the the similar trends seen for the mobility patterns for the lower income groups in both clusters, it does not play the same role as an equalizer as seen in the United States. In terms of access to the fraction of amenities, Supplementary Fig. S8D indicates that for both clusters, access is skewed to the higher income ranges, who have to travel less to access services as compared to the poor. The main difference between the two clusters is that residents in the blue group, have an even higher advantage for the wealthy as compared to the yellow cluster. In many ways all of the Brazilian cities are similar to the teal cluster in the United States, the difference being the correlations with income are even more pronounced, and the the wealthy have an advantage in both flavors of mobility metrics.

D. Diversity of amenities

In the teal cluster for the United States, we found that the lower income groups were more proximate to basic services as compared to those in the higher income range. Note that this is a measure only of the number of such basic amenities and provides no information on the quality of such services. While defining quality is difficult and can be probably only be extracted from targeted surveys, a reasonable proxy is to measure the mix of amenities. Indeed, for instance, lower income residents in inner-cities may have access to a number of grocery stores, or corner-shops but may be lacking in financial or health-care services. To




FIG. 6. Socioeconomic in-flow heatmaps for selected cities in the US and Brazil. Colors represent the income level of the origin area that produced mobility flow into the plotted destination region. We see that cities such as Atlanta and Boston in the US experience considerable overlap between low and high income destinations, suggesting that income is not a defining factor in where people are able to live and go. In other cities like Detroit and Rochester, we see that the destinations of high and low income residents are relatively partitioned, suggesting that the particular land use decisions made in these cities have allowed lower income residents better access to amenities by living in the downtown areas. We see consistent separation between high and low income destinations in Brazil across all cities, suggesting that amenity access is generally shaped by residential location.

determine, this we examine the “diversity” of amenities for each each SA in the cities by measuring the entropy H_l^a in each SA l (see Supplementary Section S6 for details of the calculation). Higher values of the entropy indicate a more homogenous distribution of the types of basic amenities, while lower values indicate that the distribution is dominated by a sub-type.

In Fig. 5A,B we plot H_l^a according to the income buckets ID_q at the country-level for the United States and Brazil. For the United States, the entropy is relatively flat across income, with a minor disadvantage for the lowest income bucket. In Brazil, on the other hand, a clear signal emerges, with a monotonically increasing trend of the entropy with income, indicating that the wealthy have access to a much wider mix of services as compare to the poor. This reinforces the advantage of the wealthy when coupled with the observation of closer access to a large fraction of total basic amenities as seen in Supplementary Fig. S8D. Even in the United States, the situation is more nuanced when we examine cities belonging to different clusters. In Fig. 5C we plot the trend for Detroit, a representative city in the teal cluster, and in Fig. 5E, New York, an exemplar of the orange cluster. In Detroit we once

again see a monotonic trend of H_l^a with ID_q indicating that while people of lower incomes are proximate to amenities in terms of their number, they have a distinct disadvantage with respect to the wealthy in terms of diversity of such services. In NY, on the other hand, the trend is flat, indicating that there is no income advantage when either accessing the number or type of amenities in the city. Thus similar to the mobility metrics, the primary difference between the two clusters is the presence or absence of any correlation with income.

For the case of Brazil, Rio de Janeiro a city from the blue cluster also shows a wealth advantage (Fig. 5D) with a similar trend to Detroit, with a more pronounced difference between the lowest and highest income groups. Campinas (Fig. 5F) from the yellow cluster, shows more noisy trends, although even here there is a marked difference in the entropy between the lowest and highest income groups. The primary difference between the two clusters is that in one there is a clear monotonic trend, and in the other there is variability in the middle income range.

E. Spatial Effects

Our analysis thus far has neglected any spatial effects, although the observed trends hint at differences in how cities are organized in terms of residences and their income distribution. For instance, we speculated that the difference between the orange and teal clusters in the United States are reflective of the differences in each city-type in how residences and amenities are spatially located. We next investigate whether such features indeed exist.

We begin by explicitly measuring the destinations of the upper 20% and lower 20% of SA's in terms of median income. For each SA, we examine the in-flow and trace back to the origin of those flows to the income profile of the neighborhoods they originate from. For those regions where the in-flows are predominantly from low income areas, we color the region red, and for those where the origins are from high-income areas we color the region blue. In areas where there is an overlap of both flavors of flow, the regions are colored purple. In the left panel of Fig. 6 we show the results for four American cities, Detroit and Rochester from the teal cluster, and Atlanta and Boston from the orange cluster. For the latter cities, while there are regions exclusively visited by either high- or low-income groups, there are large areas of overlap particularly in the central parts of the city. Conversely, in




FIG. 7. **Income spatial autocorrelation.** Ranking of Moran's I values for cities in both the US (A) and Brazil (B) colored according to the cluster assigned. A high value (~ 1) indicates that zip codes are grouped closely with zip codes of similar income, while a value close to 0 indicates a random arrangement. The average values for each cluster are shown as inset.

both Rochester and Detroit, we see a more segregated profile, where there are two distinct regions of high- and low-income areas with relatively less overlap as compared to cities in the orange cluster. Additionally, as suspected from the results of our clustering analysis, the lower-income group tend to visit the city center, whereas the visits by higher-income groups are more concentrated in suburban areas. In the right panel of Fig. 6 we show the case for four Brazilian cities, with Brasilia and Campinas from the yellow cluster, and Sao Paulo and Rio de Janeiro from the blue cluster. In all four cities, there is a clear separation of regions visited in terms of income, with practically no overlap. Furthermore, unlike in the US, visits by the wealthy are overwhelmingly concentrated in the central part of the cities, with the poor by and large traversing the periphery. In terms of mixing of the income groups, there is little difference between the two Brazilian clusters.

Where people visit in a city are reflective of the residential patterns. To determine how these are distributed, we next compute the spatial autocorrelation or Moran's I (I_M) of the SAs in each city in terms of the median income in that area (see Supplementary Information Section S7 for details of the calculation). The spatial autocorrelation lies in the range $-1 \leq I_M \leq 1$, and is a measure for the similarity between the incomes of adjacent SAs. Its maximum value occurs for a perfectly segregated arrangement where all high- and low-income neighborhoods are adjacent only to each other, whereas the lowest values occur for a perfectly uniform distribution of incomes. A random arrangement with no spatial correlation yields values close to zero.

In Fig. 7A we plot the results for the 50 cities in the United States, with each city colored according to the cluster it belongs to. As an inset we show the average values $\langle I_M \rangle$ for each cluster. A very clear trend emerges where cities in the teal cluster have markedly higher values of $\langle I_M \rangle$ than those in the orange cluster, indicating a more segregated profile of neighborhoods in terms of income. This serves as a quantitative confirmation for the different trends seen in each cluster in terms of their correlation with income and patterns of access to the number and diversity of amenities. For cities in the orange cluster, neighborhoods are organized in a more random fashion than the clustered ones in the teal cluster, and provides a possible explanation for the relatively more equitable access to basic services, the higher mixing in visitation patterns, and the general lack of correlations of mobility with income indicators. The comparatively more segregated residential patterns provide one possible causative mechanism for the trends seen in the teal cluster.

In Fig. 7B we show the results for Brazil, once again finding a clear separation between the blue and yellow clusters, with the former having a larger value of $\langle I_M \rangle$. While the differences in the connection between mobility and income is less pronounced between the two clusters, we recall that the blue cluster had higher correlations than the yellow one. The fact that cities in the blue cluster are more segregated, provides further evidence for residential patterns being a causative mechanism for the observed mobility patterns.

F. Limitations

These results should be interpreted in light of important limitations. First, the Google mobility data is limited to smartphone users who have opted in to Google’s Location History feature. These data may not be representative of the population as whole in all parts of the world, and their representativeness may vary by location. Importantly, these limited data are only viewed through the lens of differential privacy algorithms, specifically designed to protect user anonymity and obscure fine detail. Limitations also apply in terms of the data on amenities, given the nature of the source (based on voluntary reporting).

IV. DISCUSSION

Taken together our results shed greater clarity on the connection between socioeconomic features and movement patterns as compared to previous studies, given the scale of our investigation. A study of a hundred cities in two large countries comparable in size and population but differing in levels of economic development, revealed that cities can be broadly classified into two categories; those where resident’s movements are influenced by their income profile (with varying degrees of influence), and those where mobility is largely independent of their socioeconomic condition. This classification of course applies in an averaged sense, given the differences in cities both between and within the countries.

The two categories find their clearest manifestation in the United States, with a roughly even split between the 50 cities, that was uncovered with a clustering approach, with cities in the income-correlated cluster labeled teal and those in the weakly-correlated cluster, orange. The wider availability of public transportation in the orange cluster appears to be a feature that mitigates the correlation between income and movement, perhaps playing the role of an equalizing feature for those in the lower income brackets. Another key aspect is the availability and diversity of basic services. While lower-income residents in the teal cluster are on average closer to basic amenities, this appears to be a function of them living in the city-center, with the higher-income groups concentrated in suburbs. When it comes to the diversity of services available, there is a clear advantage to those in the higher-income bracket. These cities are also segregated by income, whereby high-income

and low-income residents tend to be concentrated in specific areas. This is also manifested in the parts of the cities that they visit, with relatively little mixing between the income groups. Indeed, given the connection with income and race (Figs. S1, S2) this is also a reflection of racial segregation. By contrast, residents in cities belonging to the orange cluster have comparatively more equitable access to services in terms of both proximity and quality, and are less segregated in terms of both where they live and where they choose to visit.

In Brazil, we also find two categories, however unlike in the United States, movement in both clusters is correlated with socioeconomic features, with the difference being one cluster (blue) displays even stronger correlations than the other (yellow). While public transportation usage is comparable across cities, the accessibility to services in terms of proximity and quality is strongly skewed towards the highest income brackets in the blue cluster, although the income advantage is also found to a lesser extent in the yellow cluster. Additionally cities in the blue cluster have a more segregated residential profile than those in the yellow one. Both clusters, however display, a sharp divide between rich and poor in terms of which parts of the city is visited, with the rich being concentrated in the city-center and the poor primarily moving in the periphery. In some sense, the Brazilian cities mirror the teal cluster from the United States, with stronger differences in mobility in terms of the socioeconomic characteristics.

To validate our results, we also conducted our analysis on a different dataset; the commuting patterns extracted from the United States census. The qualitative results are essentially identical, with some differences in the clustering of the cities, stemming from the fact that the census does not accurately capture the frequency of travel. This resulted in a few cities changing clusters, but by and large the differences in terms of transportation usage, accessibility of services and residential segregation were preserved, attesting to the robustness of our analysis. A similar analysis could not be conducted for Brazil given that such data is not available in that country’s census. This points to another strength of this new approach: its applicability globally by leveraging aggregate signals such as mobility that are inexpensive to compute and available in a timely fashion. Methods relying on traditional census data do not generalize to many regions where census is unavailable, unreliable, or considerably delayed in time.

To the extent that it is undesirable to have cities with residents whose ability to navigate and access resources is dependent on their socioeconomic status, public policy measures to mitigate this phenomenon are the need of the hour. While it is difficult to disentangle the causal mechanisms behind the observed disparities, investment in affordable and robust public transportation may enhance equality of access [46], although the extent of its efficacy may vary from region to region, given the observed differences between the United States and Brazil. Certainly more efforts must be made in terms of improving the quality of services in low-income areas. Given that this disparity might arise from the residential patterns seen in both countries, inclusive zoning and incentives to foster mixed-income neighborhoods may well be an effective policy [47, 48]. Indeed, such initiatives have been tried in cities such as New York, Boston and Chicago, which all incidentally lie in the orange cluster.

Nevertheless, much remains to be uncovered, in particular whether the reported trends here exist in countries in different regions and varying degrees of economic development. Effective strategies and measures will also vary from region to region and more tailored studies would be required to identify the contextual causes of different socio-mobility profiles. We anticipate many more studies along this direction in the near future.

-
- [1] Department of Economic and Social Affairs, United Nations. The speed of urbanization around the world. *Population Facts* 1–2 (2018).
 - [2] Danan, G., Gerland, P., Pelletier, F. & Cohen, B. Risk of Exposure and Vulnerability to Natural Disasters at the City Level: A Global Overview. *United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs* **2**, 1–40 (2015).
 - [3] Ford, A. *et al.* A multi-scale urban integrated assessment framework for climate change studies: A flooding application. *Computers, Environment and Urban Systems* **75**, 229–243 (2019).
 - [4] Bassolas, A. *et al.* Hierarchical organization of urban mobility and its connection with city livability. *Nature Communications* **10** (2019).
 - [5] Bischoff, K. & Reardon, S. F. Residential segregation by income, 1970–2009. *Diversity and disparities: America enters a new century* **43** (2014).
 - [6] Massey, D. S. The age of extremes: Concentrated affluence and poverty in the twenty-first century. *Demography* **33**, 395–412 (1996).

- [7] Brueckner, J., Thisse, J. & Zenou, Y. Why is downtown paris so rich and detroit so poor? an amenity based explanation. *European Economic Review* **43**, 91–107 (1999).
- [8] Andersen, H. S. Excluded places: the interaction between segregation, urban decay and deprived neighbourhoods. *Housing, Theory and Society* **19**, 153–169 (2002).
- [9] Brueckner, J. K. & Rosenthal, S. S. Gentrification and neighborhood housing cycles: Will america’s future downtowns be rich? *The Review of Economics and Statistics* **91**, 725–743 (2009).
- [10] Killeen, D. & Caro, R. A. *The Power Broker: Robert Moses and the Fall of New York* (Knopf, New York, New York, USA, 1975).
- [11] Ostendorf, W., Musterd, S. & De Vos, S. Social mix and the neighbourhood effect. policy ambitions and empirical evidence. *Housing studies* **16**, 371–380 (2001).
- [12] Musterd, S. Segregation, urban space and the resurgent city. *Urban Studies* **43**, 1325–1340 (2006).
- [13] Eagle, N., Macy, M. & Claxton, R. Network diversity and economic development. *Science* **328**, 1029–1031 (2010).
- [14] Lobmayer, P. & Wilkinson, R. G. Inequality, residential segregation by income, and mortality in us cities. *Journal of Epidemiology & Community Health* **56**, 183–187 (2002).
- [15] Bettencourt, L. M. a. The origins of scaling in cities. *Science* **340**, 1438–41 (2013).
- [16] Pan, W., Ghoshal, G., Krumme, C., Cebrian, M. & Pentland, A. Urban characteristics attributable to density-driven tie formation. *Nature Communications* **4**, 1961 (2013).
- [17] Youn, H. *et al.* Scaling and universality in urban economic diversification. *Journal of The Royal Society Interface* **13**, 20150937 (2016).
- [18] Lee, M., Barbosa, H., Youn, H., Holme, P. & Ghoshal, G. Morphology of travel routes and the organization of cities. *Nature Communications* **8**, 2229 (2017).
- [19] Kirkley, A., Barbosa, H., Barthelemy, M. & Ghoshal, G. From the betweenness centrality in street networks to structural invariants in random planar graphs. *Nature Communications* **9**, 2501 (2018).
- [20] Henderson, J. V. Cities and development. *Journal of Regional Science* **50**, 515–540 (2010).
- [21] Henderson, J. V. & Wang, H. G. Urbanization and city growth: The role of institutions. *Regional Science and Urban Economics* **37**, 283–313 (2007).
- [22] Barbosa, H. *et al.* Human mobility: Models and applications. *Physics Reports* **734**, 1–74

- (2018).
- [23] Yuan, J., Zheng, Y. & Xie, X. Discovering regions of different functions in a city using human mobility and POIs. *Proceedings of the 18th ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining - KDD '12* 186 (2012). 1010.0436.
 - [24] Zhan, X., Hasan, S., Ukkusuri, S. V. & Kamga, C. Urban link travel time estimation using large-scale taxi data with partial information. *Transportation Research Part C: Emerging Technologies* **33**, 37–49 (2013).
 - [25] Lenormand, M. *et al.* Influence of sociodemographic characteristics on human mobility. *Scientific reports* **5**, 10075 (2015).
 - [26] Wang, W., Pan, L., Yuan, N., Zhang, S. & Liu, D. A comparative analysis of intra-city human mobility by taxi. *Physica A* **420**, 134–147 (2015).
 - [27] Luo, F., Cao, G., Mulligan, K. & Li, X. Explore spatiotemporal and demographic characteristics of human mobility via twitter: A case study of chicago. *Applied Geography* **70**, 11–25 (2016).
 - [28] Louail, T., Lenormand, M., Murillo Arias, J. & Ramasco, J. J. Crowdsourcing the Robin Hood effect in cities. *Applied Network Science* **2**, 11 (2017).
 - [29] González, M. C., Hidalgo, C. A. & Barabási, A. L. Understanding individual human mobility patterns. *Nature* **453**, 779–782 (2008). 0806.1256.
 - [30] Di Clemente, R. *et al.* Sequences of purchases in credit card data reveal lifestyles in urban populations. *Nature communications* **9** (2018).
 - [31] Xu, Y., Belyi, A., Bojic, I. & Ratti, C. Human mobility and socioeconomic status: Analysis of Singapore and Boston. *Computers, Environment and Urban Systems* **72**, 51–67 (2018).
 - [32] Shelton, T., Poorthuis, A. & Zook, M. Social media and the city: Rethinking urban socio-spatial inequality using user-generated geographic information. *Landscape and Urban Planning* **142**, 198–211 (2015).
 - [33] Frias-Martinez, V. & Virseda, J. On the relationship between socio-economic factors and cell phone usage. In *Proceedings of the fifth international conference on information and communication technologies and development*, 76–84 (ACM, 2012).
 - [34] Lotero, L., Hurtado, R. G., Floría, L. M. & Gómez-Gardeñes, J. Rich do not rise early: spatio-temporal patterns in the mobility networks of different socio-economic classes. *Royal Society open science* **3**, 150654 (2016).

- [35] Llorente, A., Garcia-Herranz, M., Cebrian, M. & Moro, E. Social media fingerprints of unemployment. *PLoS ONE* **10**, e0128692 (2015).
- [36] Almaatouq, A., Prieto-Castrillo, F. & Pentland, A. Mobile Communication Signatures of Unemployment. In *Encyclopedia of Library and Information Sciences, Third Edition*, vol. 1, 4814–4819 (CRC Press, 2009). 9780201398298.
- [37] Pappalardo, L., Pedreschi, D., Smoreda, Z. & Giannotti, F. Using big data to study the link between human mobility and socio-economic development. *Proceedings - 2015 IEEE International Conference on Big Data, IEEE Big Data 2015* 871–878 (2015).
- [38] Gabrielli, L. *et al.* An analytical framework to nowcast well-being using mobile phone data. *International Journal of Data Science and Analytics* **2**, 75–92 (2016).
- [39] Wilson, R. *et al.* Differentially private sql with bounded user contribution (2020).
- [40] United States Census Bureau. 2016 5-year american community survey [s0601]. <https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/acs> (2016).
- [41] Brazilian Institute of Geography and Statistics (IBGE). 2010 population census summary. <http://ghdx.healthdata.org/record/brazil-demographic-census-2010> (2010).
- [42] Openstreetmap contributors. <https://www.openstreetmap.org> (accessed 2019).
- [43] Guénoche, A., Hansen, P. & Jaumard, B. Efficient algorithms for divisive hierarchical clustering with the diameter criterion. *Journal of Classification* **8**, 5–30 (1991).
- [44] United States Census Bureau. Longitudinal employer-household dynamics. <https://lehd.ces.census.gov/data/> (2016).
- [45] Fowlkes, E. B. & Mallows, C. L. A method for comparing two hierarchical clusterings. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **78**, 553–569 (1983).
- [46] Teunissen, T., Sarmiento, O., Zuidgeest, M. & Brussel, M. Mapping equality in access: The case of bogotá’s sustainable transportation initiatives. *International Journal of Sustainable Transportation* **9**, 457–467 (2015).
- [47] Graves, E. M. The structuring of urban life in a mixed-income housing “community”. *City & Community* **9**, 109–131 (2010).
- [48] Joseph, M. & Chaskin, R. Living in a mixed-income development: Resident perceptions of the benefits and disadvantages of two developments in chicago. *Urban Studies* **47**, 2347–2366 (2010).

Supporting Information

Uncovering the socioeconomic facets of human mobility

Hugo Barbosa, Surendra Hazarie, Brian Dickinson, Aleix Bassolas, Adam Frank, Henry Kautz, Adam Sadilek, José J. Ramasco, and Gourab Ghoshal

S1 Census data and income metrics

To represent socioeconomic status we collected information on median income, age, sex composition and race from the 2016 5-year American Community Survey (ACS) estimates for the United States and the 2010 decennial census for Brazil [38,39]. The full set of cities are shown in Tabs. S1 and S2. An example of the data for the city of Rochester, NY is shown in Tab. S3, and for Campinas, Brazil in Tab. S4. The spearman correlation between these variables indicates a strong correlation with median income in both the United States (Fig. S1) and Brazil (Fig. S2).

To capture income, we utilize two different representations of the income data, both obtained from the nominal income household variables. The first is the fraction f_i of the populations within an area having a per capita income within one of the n income brackets, as defined by the corresponding census authorities, such that $\sum_{i=1}^n f_i = 1$. For the case of the US, there were $n = 8$ income breaks, ranging from below 10k to above 75kUSD per year. Therefore, each area in the data is characterized by a vector of n values. For instance, if in a given area in the US data (e.g., ZCTA) has an income breakdown vector

$$I = [0.09, 0.1, 0.15, 0.15, 0.25, 0.15, 0.10, 0.01],$$

it means that 9 % of that population has a income per-capita below 10k USD a year whereas 1 % has an income above 75k USD. We refer to this fraction-based income variable as ID_f .

Similarly for Brazil, household-level incomes are partitioned into $n = 9$ intervals relative to the Brazilian National Minimum Wage (NMW), ranging from less than 1/2 NMW to nominal incomes above 20 NMWs. The second variable is extracted from the median income per capita of an area (ZCTA or WA). From this median income, we split the regions into five income quantiles, which we label as *low* (bottom 20%), *mid-low* (between 20%-40%), *mid* (between 40%-60%), *mid-high* (between 60%-80%) and *high* (above 80%). These income quantiles are relative to each individual city, accounting therefore for the socioeconomic differences across cities. This metric, referred to as ID_q allows us to label an area of a city according to its overall income characteristics.

	Urban Area	Population
1	Albany–Schenectady, NY Urbanized Area	669473
2	Allentown, PA–NJ Urbanized Area	822617
3	Atlanta, GA Urbanized Area	5381110
4	Austin, TX Urbanized Area	1711701
5	Baltimore, MD Urbanized Area	2294493
6	Birmingham, AL Urbanized Area	855126
7	Boston, MA–NH–RI Urbanized Area	4704737
8	Bridgeport–Stamford, CT–NY Urbanized Area	1019263
9	Buffalo, NY Urbanized Area	1038718
10	Charlotte, NC–SC Urbanized Area	1747070
11	Chicago, IL–IN Urbanized Area	8917324
12	Cincinnati, OH–KY–IN Urbanized Area	1848639
13	Cleveland, OH Urbanized Area	1999159
14	Columbus, OH Urbanized Area	1512446
15	Dallas–Fort Worth–Arlington, TX Urbanized Area	5996274
16	Denver–Aurora, CO Urbanized Area	2681764
17	Detroit, MI Urbanized Area	4035863
18	Hartford, CT Urbanized Area	1105969
19	Houston, TX Urbanized Area	5412762
20	Indianapolis, IN Urbanized Area	1690182
21	Kansas City, MO–KS Urbanized Area	1645871
22	Las Vegas–Henderson, NV Urbanized Area	1905136
23	Los Angeles–Long Beach–Anaheim, CA Urbanized...	12686477
24	Louisville/Jefferson County, KY–IN Urbanized ...	1078499
25	Miami, FL Urbanized Area	5832060
26	Milwaukee, WI Urbanized Area	1486454
27	Minneapolis–St. Paul, MN–WI Urbanized Area	2933169
28	New Orleans, LA Urbanized Area	967547
29	New York–Newark, NY–NJ–CT Urbanized Area	18987636
30	Oklahoma City, OK Urbanized Area	1125647
31	Omaha, NE–IA Urbanized Area	803087
32	Orlando, FL Urbanized Area	1866002
33	Philadelphia, PA–NJ–DE–MD Urbanized Area	5821389
34	Phoenix–Mesa, AZ Urbanized Area	4038319
35	Pittsburgh, PA Urbanized Area	1955719
36	Portland, OR–WA Urbanized Area	2080902
37	Providence, RI–MA Urbanized Area	1188589
38	Rochester, NY Urbanized Area	806269
39	Sacramento, CA Urbanized Area	1889988
40	San Antonio, TX Urbanized Area	2091059
41	San Diego, CA Urbanized Area	3097903
42	San Francisco–Oakland, CA Urbanized Area	3508790
43	San Jose, CA Urbanized Area	1733914
44	Seattle, WA Urbanized Area	3429707
45	Springfield, MA–CT Urbanized Area	674903
46	St. Louis, MO–IL Urbanized Area	2309620
47	Tampa–St. Petersburg, FL Urbanized Area	2689944
48	Virginia Beach, VA Urbanized Area	1554524
49	Washington, DC–VA–MD Urbanized Area	5098266
50	Worcester, MA–CT Urbanized Area	541879

Table S1: List of US cities and their populations

	Urban Area	Population
1	Aglomeracao Urbana de So Lus	1014741
2	Anapolis	332727
3	Bauru	343877
4	Belm	1865652
5	Belo Horizonte	3854722
6	Blumenau	308402
7	Bragana Paulista	160665
8	Braslia	2566723
9	Campinas	1924733
10	Campo Grande	785683
11	Caraguatatuba	113317
12	Caxias do Sul	435791
13	Cuiab	803497
14	Curitiba	2227447
15	Florianopolis	629936
16	Fortaleza	2985515
17	Goinia	1757432
18	Guarulhos	1222308
19	Ilhus-Itabuna	204310
20	Itaja	5544
21	Itapecerica da Serra	714128
22	Joinville	515128
23	Joo Pessoa	722866
24	Juiz de Fora	516417
25	Jundia	369862
26	Lagos	14368000
27	Londrina	507114
28	Macei	931636
29	Manaus	1793000
30	Mogi das Cruzes	968510
31	Natal	1006137
32	Osasco	1474647
33	Osrio	40000
34	Piracicaba	363890
35	Porto Alegre	2876717
36	Presidente Prudente	207841
37	Recife	2808854
38	Ribeiro Preto	604494
39	Rio de Janeiro	10816739
40	Salvador	2917528
41	Santos	1297281
42	So Jos do Rio Preto	408079
43	So Jos dos Campos	1118953
44	So Paulo	12698814
45	Sorocaba	586084
46	Teresina	812594
47	Tubaro	104937
48	Uberlndia	604148
49	Vale do Paraba Fluminense	232296
50	Vitria	1497160

Table S2: List of BR cities and their populations

	Urban Area	ZCTA	Median Income (\$)	Fraction Bachelors degree	Median Age	Fraction White
8429	Rochester, NY	14424	29692.0	0.177	46.3	0.948
8430	Rochester, NY	14425	34762.0	0.264	37.0	0.913
8431	Rochester, NY	14428	32452.0	0.209	47.1	0.977
8432	Rochester, NY	14445	31355.0	0.196	35.9	0.883
8433	Rochester, NY	14450	39894.0	0.302	45.3	0.930
8434	Rochester, NY	14467	32915.0	0.189	39.8	0.770
8435	Rochester, NY	14468	32431.0	0.163	42.7	0.970
8436	Rochester, NY	14502	33661.0	0.197	41.2	0.963
8437	Rochester, NY	14506	59107.0	0.355	45.9	0.986
8438	Rochester, NY	14514	33598.0	0.208	41.3	0.890
8439	Rochester, NY	14519	30990.0	0.160	44.6	0.948
8440	Rochester, NY	14526	40069.0	0.258	44.5	0.919
8441	Rochester, NY	14534	47629.0	0.328	46.1	0.888
8442	Rochester, NY	14543	36729.0	0.242	50.4	0.965
8443	Rochester, NY	14544	28083.0	0.102	43.1	0.988
8444	Rochester, NY	14546	31126.0	0.191	41.8	0.874
8445	Rochester, NY	14548	30110.0	0.114	48.3	0.973
8446	Rochester, NY	14559	34586.0	0.229	42.9	0.954
8447	Rochester, NY	14564	40391.0	0.270	42.5	0.954
8448	Rochester, NY	14568	32311.0	0.244	37.9	0.983
8449	Rochester, NY	14580	35109.0	0.250	43.5	0.913
8450	Rochester, NY	14586	36719.0	0.255	32.9	0.756
8451	Rochester, NY	14589	27301.0	0.124	45.3	0.928
8452	Rochester, NY	14604	16330.0	0.083	43.9	0.550
8453	Rochester, NY	14605	11290.0	0.073	25.8	0.285
8454	Rochester, NY	14606	23630.0	0.109	36.4	0.631
8455	Rochester, NY	14607	27811.0	0.320	30.0	0.799
8456	Rochester, NY	14608	15074.0	0.128	29.6	0.225
8457	Rochester, NY	14609	25608.0	0.146	33.5	0.544
8458	Rochester, NY	14610	39575.0	0.266	44.1	0.875
8459	Rochester, NY	14611	16054.0	0.062	30.7	0.267
8460	Rochester, NY	14612	31247.0	0.201	45.5	0.894
8461	Rochester, NY	14613	19657.0	0.097	30.5	0.400
8462	Rochester, NY	14614	8894.0	0.041	28.7	0.360
8463	Rochester, NY	14615	23572.0	0.148	35.9	0.634
8464	Rochester, NY	14616	28127.0	0.159	41.5	0.847
8465	Rochester, NY	14617	34438.0	0.272	44.2	0.930
8466	Rochester, NY	14618	36906.0	0.274	40.1	0.859
8467	Rochester, NY	14619	22250.0	0.114	32.6	0.199
8468	Rochester, NY	14620	24646.0	0.252	31.4	0.714
8469	Rochester, NY	14621	15884.0	0.060	33.0	0.343
8470	Rochester, NY	14622	30134.0	0.176	46.4	0.881
8471	Rochester, NY	14623	21566.0	0.215	27.7	0.722
8472	Rochester, NY	14624	30507.0	0.204	41.2	0.838
8473	Rochester, NY	14625	36157.0	0.272	48.4	0.956
8474	Rochester, NY	14626	30845.0	0.176	47.0	0.886

Table S3: Socioeconomic variables for zip codes in Rochester, NY

	Urban Area	Area Code	Median Income (\$)	Fraction Bachelors degree	Median Age	Fraction White
1287	Campinas	3501608005001	1500.0	0.278	41.0	0.913
1288	Campinas	3501608005002	1000.0	0.255	33.0	0.714
1289	Campinas	3501608005003	850.0	0.209	30.0	0.698
1290	Campinas	3501608005004	1200.0	0.262	33.0	0.791
1291	Campinas	3501608005005	1500.0	0.270	33.0	0.795
1292	Campinas	3501608005006	1000.0	0.249	31.0	0.733
1293	Campinas	3501608005007	1400.0	0.231	36.0	0.815
1294	Campinas	3501608005008	1500.0	0.295	38.0	0.907
1295	Campinas	3501608005009	1500.0	0.290	38.0	0.862
1296	Campinas	3501608005010	1000.0	0.252	32.0	0.743
1342	Campinas	3509502005001	940.0	0.173	33.0	0.657
1343	Campinas	3509502005002	1500.0	0.249	36.0	0.802
1344	Campinas	3509502005003	1750.0	0.258	32.0	0.770
1345	Campinas	3509502005004	2500.0	0.221	34.0	0.812
1346	Campinas	3509502005005	2000.0	0.266	39.0	0.782
1347	Campinas	3509502005006	2000.0	0.259	34.0	0.804
1348	Campinas	3509502005007	1850.0	0.283	37.0	0.860
1349	Campinas	3509502005008	1200.0	0.228	34.0	0.743
1350	Campinas	3509502005009	1500.0	0.290	36.0	0.787
1351	Campinas	3509502005010	2500.0	0.261	37.0	0.874
1352	Campinas	3509502005011	2850.0	0.187	35.0	0.836
1353	Campinas	3509502005012	4200.0	0.216	42.0	0.906
1354	Campinas	3509502005013	1700.0	0.325	36.0	0.799
1355	Campinas	3509502005014	2000.0	0.281	39.0	0.897
1356	Campinas	3509502005015	1110.0	0.263	32.0	0.716
1357	Campinas	3509502005016	1200.0	0.291	37.0	0.747
1358	Campinas	3509502005017	1000.0	0.245	31.0	0.622
1359	Campinas	3509502005018	1000.0	0.262	31.0	0.641
1360	Campinas	3509502005019	1500.0	0.269	33.0	0.712
1361	Campinas	3509502005020	1510.0	0.310	37.0	0.793
1362	Campinas	3509502005021	1000.0	0.247	31.0	0.651
1363	Campinas	3509502005022	1500.0	0.272	35.0	0.787
1364	Campinas	3509502005023	1200.0	0.270	34.0	0.724
1365	Campinas	3509502005024	800.0	0.170	26.0	0.457
1366	Campinas	3509502005025	900.0	0.239	28.0	0.499
1367	Campinas	3509502005026	826.4	0.192	27.0	0.499
1368	Campinas	3509502005027	900.0	0.200	27.0	0.470
1369	Campinas	3509502005028	1000.0	0.273	30.0	0.512
1370	Campinas	3509502005029	860.0	0.192	27.0	0.484
1371	Campinas	3509502005030	900.0	0.205	28.0	0.484
1372	Campinas	3509502005031	850.0	0.208	29.0	0.512
1373	Campinas	3509502005032	700.0	0.134	24.0	0.378
1374	Campinas	3509502005033	930.0	0.226	28.0	0.585
1375	Campinas	3509502005034	1000.0	0.229	31.0	0.572
1376	Campinas	3509502005035	1100.0	0.271	31.0	0.659
1377	Campinas	3509502005036	800.0	0.195	27.0	0.458
1495	Campinas	3519071005001	1200.0	0.296	31.0	0.680
1496	Campinas	3519071005002	1000.0	0.280	30.0	0.549
1497	Campinas	3519071005003	1000.0	0.272	30.0	0.608
1498	Campinas	3519071005004	839.0	0.191	27.0	0.475

Table S4: Socioeconomic variables for area codes in Campinas




Figure S1: Spearman correlations between 4 selected dimensions of the survey data taken from 50 American cities.




Figure S2: Spearman correlations between 4 selected dimensions of the survey data taken from 50 Brazilian cities.

S2 Basic amenities data

	Atlanta, GA	Boston, MA	Detroit, MI	Rochester, NY
marketplace	15	13	9	0
restaurant	1020	1447	566	182
food court	2	6	0	0
fast food	534	513	341	64
hospital	6	13	7	0
doctors	39	49	77	6
dentist	23	67	20	4
clinic	21	18	40	3
pharmacy	107	129	96	16
kindergarten	11	18	4	2
school	1231	1253	1253	339
college	11	22	3	5
university	4	18	3	1
library	84	648	41	36
bank	124	212	103	44
atm	234	164	36	27

Table S5: Number of basic amenities by category for Atlanta, GA, Boston MA, Detroit, MI, and Rochester, NY.

S3 Connecting outflow and resident population based on income




Figure S3: Box-plots of mobility outflows for the top and bottom 20% of zip codes in terms of median income, for the US (top) and Brazil (bottom.) The data is binned by population, and the boxes indicate quartiles of the distributions. We see that in all four cases, population is positively correlated with mobility (Pearson correlations: US $< 20\%$: .85, $> 80\%$: .73; BR $< 20\%$: .81, $> 80\%$: .67) indicating that mobility is representative of population regardless of income.

S4 Cluster analysis

The clustering of cities was done using a divisive hierarchical method to split the cities into disjoint groups of urban areas with similar patterns in their mobility/socioeconomic correlations. To determine the ideal number of partitions we use a silhouette analysis. The silhouette value is a measure of how similar a data point is to the cluster it has been assigned to in comparison to its average distance to another candidate cluster. More precisely, the silhouette score $s(i)$ of a data point i with regards do a partitioning structure C can be defined as

$$s(i) = \frac{b(i) - a(i)}{\max(a(i), b(i))}$$

where

$$a(i) = \frac{1}{|C_i| - 1} \sum_{j \in C_i, i \neq j} d(i, j)$$

is the mean distance $d(i, j)$ between the point i and all other points (j) in the same cluster C_i and

$$b(i) = \min_{k \neq i} \frac{1}{|C_k|} \sum_{j \in C_k} d(i, j)$$

where $b(i)$ is the minimum average distance of the point i to the points of one of the other clusters. Here, $b(i)$ is the distance of i to the cluster it is the most similar with, other than the one it has been assigned to. Therefore, $s(i) \in [-1, 1]$ such that if the silhouette score $s(i) > 0$ that data point is in the best cluster it could belong to. Conversely, if $s(i) < 0$ the point i is not assigned to its most natural cluster, suggesting that the partitioning structure is not ideal. The ideal partitioning structure is expected to be the one that produces only positive silhouette scores at the same time that maximizes the average silhouette score. Figure S4 shows the average silhouette scores for $k = 2$ to $k = 10$. For both countries $k = 2$ produces the maximum average silhouette score.




Figure S4: Average Silhouette scores for the partitioning structures produced by the divisive hierarchical clustering algorithm as a function of the number of clusters, k . For both the US (**A**) and Brazil (**B**) the best partition is obtained for $k = 2$.

S5 Commuting data




Figure S5: (The mobility flows from the location based data as a function of the commuting flow extracted from the United States census.




Figure S6: Average travel distance across income groups matches the trends seen in Fig. 2, where higher income groups travel longer distances on average. However, the trip frequency trends are quite different with no discernible difference between groups.




Figure S7: Reproduction of core findings using LODS commuting dataset. **A** The identified city clusters are similar (Fowlkes-Mallows score = 0.8), though not identical, to the clusters shown in Fig. 4. **B** The trends in the correlation between income and average flow distance are similar to, but less exaggerated than, those found when using location data. The correlation with out-strength per capita however is quite different. **C** The difference in mass transit usage between clusters **D** Finally while we see limited differences in amenity distance between clusters at most income levels, we find that in the teal cluster, high-income individuals live on average further from basic amenities, similar to the trend seen in Fig. 4.




Figure S8: **A.** Dendrogram obtained from socio-mobility clustering analysis in Brazilian cities. Cluster 1 (blue) contains almost all the largest metropolitan areas and the capital cities of their respective states, with the exceptions of Lagos and São José dos Campos whereas among those in Cluster 2 (yellow) the only state capital is Florianópolis. **B** Spearman correlation between the number residents of each income bracket and the average flow distance and out-strength per capita. All cities show a high correlation, and the only difference between them is the magnitude of such correlation and how it affects the middle class. **C** Fraction of mass transit usage for each of the clusters. **D** Fraction of basic amenities as a function of distance for 5 income levels.

S6 Amenity diversity

The amenity diversity was defined as the Shannon entropy, computed from the relative frequencies of the amenities' distribution. In our analyses we considered a set eight major categories of amenities, namely: $A = \{\text{art-culture, education, entertainment, finance, healthcare, sustenance, transportation, other}\}$. For each spatial location unit l we computed the entropy

$$H_l^a = - \sum_{i \in l} p_i \log p_i$$

where p_i is the fraction of amenities in the area such that $p_i = \frac{n_i}{N}$ with N being the total number of amenities in the area and n_i the number of amenities of type i .

S7 Spatial autocorrelation of areas according to income

The spatial autocorrelation of median incomes across zip codes, is calculated as:

$$I = \frac{N}{W} \frac{\sum_{i,j} w_{ij} (x_i - \bar{x})(x_j - \bar{x})}{\sum_i (x_i - \bar{x})^2} \quad (\text{S1})$$

where N is the total number of zip codes i in a city, x_i is the median income of zip code i , \bar{x} is the mean of all median incomes in the city, $w_{ij} = 1$ if zip code j is touching i and 0 otherwise, and W is the sum of all w_{ij} .

The metric measures how alike zip codes are to their direct neighbors within a city by comparing them to the city-average. I is near -1 for a totally mixed distribution of zip code incomes (zip codes are unlike their neighbors relative to the average, leading to negative numerator contributions), 0 for a random arrangement, and 1 if high and low income zip-codes are completely separated (zip codes are completely alike their neighbors, leading to positive numerator contributions.) We can interpret the autocorrelation of median income as a measure of the degree to which incomes are spatially mixed within a city. Higher values indicate that zip codes of a particular income tend to be grouped together (as in the presence of “downtown areas”,) whereas lower values indicate a more homogeneous distribution throughout a city.