ANNEXES

Annex 1.1 Dataset on the Gini coefficient

The dataset of Gini coefficients used in this report draws on data from (1) "All the Ginis" dataset as developed by Branko L. Milanovic, which consists of data sets of the standardized Gini from various sources; [1] (2) UNU- WIDER's World Income Inequality Database (WIID), specifically WIID3.4 released in January 2017;[2] (3) Standardized World Income Inequality Database (SWIID) developed by Frederick Solt;[3] (4) Inequality Project of the University of Texas's Estimated Household Income Inequality Data Set (EHII);[4] (5) Asian Development Outlook 2012: Confronting Rising Inequality in Asia;[5] and (6) ESCAP Statistical Database.[6] For Asia and the Pacific, data are available for 46 countries, including the region's developed countries (Australia, Japan and New Zealand).[7]

In constructing the dataset, priority was given to Gini coefficients based on market or gross income, which excludes transfers and taxes. In some cases, due to data limitations, Gini coefficients based on expenditure or consumption were used. Linear interpolation was used to estimate missing Gini coefficient data. Data for the early 1990s includes average Gini coefficients for each country based on the observations available between 1990 and 1994, while the early 2010s period includes average Gini coefficients for 2010-2014. For the regression analyses, the sample used includes 31 Asia-Pacific countries for which Gini coefficients are available for at least one year within five five-year periods: 1990-1994, 1995-1999, 2000-2004, 2005-2009, and 2010-2014.

Annex 1.2 Kakwani decomposition of the Gini coefficient for components of per capita GDP

When income can be expressed as the sum of various components, it is possible to decompose the Gini coefficient into the contribution of each component following Kakwani (1977, p. 724), as

$$Gini = \sum_k S_k C_k ,$$

where S_k and C_k are, respectively, the share and the concentration index of the k^{th} income component. The concentration index C_k is conceptually similar to the Gini coefficient for the k^{th} income component, but is obtained by ordering the units for which the calculation is performed according to increasing values of total income instead of increasing values of the k^{th} income component.[8] Based on the decomposition above, Wan, Wang and Zhang (2016) obtain the following equation of changes of the Gini coefficient over time:

$$\Delta Gini = \sum_k 0.5(C_{kt} + C_{kt+1})\Delta S_k + \sum_k 0.5(S_{kt} + S_{kt+1})\Delta C_k = \sum_k (C_k^* \Delta S_k + S_k^* \Delta C_k).$$

[1] www.gc.cuny.edu/Page-Elements/Academics-Research-Centers-Initiatives/Centers-and-Institutes/Stone-Center-on-Socio-Economic-Inequality/Core-Faculty,-Team,-and-Affiliated-LIS-Scholars/Branko-Milanovic/Datasets.
[2] www.wider.unu.edu/project/wiid-world-income-inequality-database.
[3] http://fsolt.org/swiid/.
[4] https://utip.lbj.utexas.edu/data.html.
[5] www.adb.org/sites/default/files/publication/29704/ado2012.pdf.
[6] http://data.unescap.org/escap_stat/#data/.
[7] See Basu (2017)
[8] If, for example, we are considering personal income as the sum of labour income and property income, the calculation of concentration indexes for labour income and property income requires sorting individuals from the lowest to the highest level of their personal income. The concentration indexes for labour and property income will only be equivalent to the Gini coefficients for these income components if they are sorted in the same order as personal income. Kakwani (1977, p. 721) shows that -G_k ddC_k dd G_k, where G_k is the Gini coefficient for the kth income component.

The equation indicates that a change in inequality can be attributed to changes in the income shares $\sum_k C_k^* \Delta S_k$ and changes in concentration indexes $\sum_k S_k^* \Delta C_k$. The first component represents the impact on inequality of structural transformation, while the second represents the impact on total inequality of changes in the inequality of its components. In the text we use this decomposition to analyse the contributions to GDP per capita inequality of both its supply-side components (agriculture, manufacturing and services) and its demand-side components (private consumption, investment, government consumption and net exports).

Annex 1.3 Regression analysis for the driving forces of income inequality

Estimations of the driving forces of income inequality were obtained through pooled cross-country, time series regressions:

$$Gini_{it} = \alpha + \beta' X_{it} + \mu_i + \varphi_t + \varepsilon_{it}$$

where Gini is the Gini coefficient for country i in period t. Based on data availability, the dataset includes five periods – 1990-1994, 1995-1999, 2000-2004, 2005-2009, and 2010-2014 – and 31 countries: Afghanistan, Armenia, Australia, Azerbaijan, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Cambodia, China, Fiji, Georgia, India, Indonesia, Islamic Republic of Iran, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Malaysia, Maldives, Mongolia, Nepal, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Russian Federation, Sri Lanka, Tajikistan, Thailand, Turkey, Uzbekistan and Viet Nam.

The vector X_{it} contains the logarithm of GDP per capita and its square, capital stock per capita, value of the human capital index, TFP growth, ratio of manufacturing to agriculture sector, trade openness, total tax revenue and its square, environmental damage and its square, renewable natural capital, and four indicators of governance and its square. μ_i and φ_i represent unobserved country- and year-specific effects, and ε_{it} is the error term. The dependent variable, income inequality, is measured as the Gini coefficient (see Annex 1.1 for details). GDP per capita and the capital stock per capita are measured in US dollars of 2011 adjusted for differences in purchasing power. These variables together with the human capital index, which represents the quality of the labour force,[9] and TFP growth are from the Penn World Table (PWT) version 9.0.

The ratio of the manufacturing value added over the agriculture value added and trade openness are from the World Bank's World Development Indicators (WDI). Trade openness is measured as exports plus imports over the GDP. Tax revenue as a share of the GDP comes from the IMF's World Revenue Longitudinal Data set (WoRLD).[10] Environmental damage is defined as foregone labour income, measured in current US dollars, caused by exposure of a country's population to ambient concentrations of particulates measuring less than 2.5 microns in diameter (PM2.5), ambient ozone pollution and indoor concentrations of PM2.5 in households cooking with solid fuels. These data come from WDI.[11] Renewable natural capital is defined as the sum of the value of the rents generated over the lifetime of forests, agriculture land and protected areas. It is measured in US dollars of 2014, and the data source is the World Bank Wealth Accounts data base.[12] Finally, the four governance indicators, that come from World Bank's Worldwide Governance Indicators, are government effectiveness, rule of law, political stability and absence of violence and regulatory quality.[13]

[9] See www.rug.nl/ggdc/docs/human_capital_in_pwt_90.pdf for details.

[10] https://data.world/imf/world-revenue-longitudinal-dat.

[11] http://databank.worldbank.org/data/reports.aspx?source=2&type=metadata&series= NY.ADJ.DPEM.CD.

[12] http://databank.worldbank.org/data/reports.aspx?source=wealth-accounts#dbMetadata.

[13] http://info.worldbank.org/governance/wgi/#home.

Table A.1 Driving forces of income inequality, Gini coefficient, Asia-Pacific countries

	Col 1	Col 2	Col 3	Col 4
log (GDP per capita)	52.952***	50.558***	34.768***	41.029***
	(9.033)	(8.129)	(9.490)	(8.800)
log (GDP per capita) squared	-3.379***	-3.257***	-2.304***	-2.646***
	(0.521)	(0.479)	(0.564)	(0.519)
Capital stock per capita	0.185***	0.162***	0.144***	0.173***
	(0.028)	(0.023)	(0.023)	(0.024)
Human capital index	-5.123**	-6.764***	-6.238***	-7.821***
	(2.100)	(2.318)	(2.288)	(2.289)
TFP growth	10.014***	11.142***	11.228***	10.004***
	(3.786)	(3.857)	(4.044)	(3.765)
Ratio of manufacturing to agriculture	-0.732***	-0.848***	-0.793***	-0.717***
	(0.217)	(0.255)	(0.241)	(0.227)
Trade openness	0.032***	0.032***	0.031***	0.025***
	(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.007)
Total revenue	0.375*	0.454**	0.588***	0.495**
	(0.205)	(0.215)	(0.222)	(0.215)
Total revenue squared	-0.007*	-0.008*	-0.011**	-0.009**
	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.005)	(0.004)
log (environment damage)	-13.175***	-14.027***	-14.593***	-14.441***
	(2.457)	(2.321)	(2.281)	(2.226)
log (environment damage) squared	0.446***	0.468***	0.464***	0.464***
	(0.056)	(0.054)	(0.053)	(0.053)
log (natural capital)	-3.803**	-4.597***	-3.518**	-4.442***
	(1.523)	(1.760)	(1.703)	(1.677)
Governance effective	0.174**			
	(0.070)			
Governance effective squared	-0.001			
	(0.001)			
Governance law		0.185**		
		(0.091)		
Governance law squared		-0.002		
		(0.001)		
Governance stability			0.093***	
			(0.030)	
Governance stability squared			-0.001*	
			(0.000)	
Governance regulatory				0.245***
				(0.075)
Governance regulatory squared				-0.003***
				(0.001)
_cons	18.013	65.278	113.285*	108.521*
	(58.331)	(66.161)	(58.594)	(56.630)
Country dummy	Y	Y	Y	Y
Year dummy	Y	Y	Y	Y
N	239	239	239	239
Adj. R-square	0.924	0.921	0.922	0.922

Note: Robust standard errors in parentheses; * p < 0.1, ** p < 0.05, *** p < 0.01.

Annex 1.4 Regression analysis for the impact of income inequality on growth

To examine the relationship between inequality and economic growth, pooled time series and cross-section regressions were used. The estimations are based on the following equation:

$$GDP_{it} = \alpha + \beta' Gini_{it} + \delta' Z_{it} + \mu_i + \varphi_t + \varepsilon_{it}$$

where the dependent variable is GDP per capita for country *i* in year *t*. $Gini_{it}$ is the Gini coefficient, and Z_{it} includes control variables representing technology, investment, labour, sector structure and trade openness. μ_i and φ_i represent unobserved country- and year-specific effects, and ε_{it} is the error term. With the inclusion of country-specific effects, the estimator is focused on the variation within countries. As such, the aim of the estimations is to test whether decreases in GDP per capita are associated with rising income inequality across Asia-Pacific countries.

The only additional variable is ESCAP's Access to Physical Infrastructure Index (APII). This index includes four dimensions of infrastructure: (1) transport, which includes access to road and railways; (2) energy, which captures electricity and power consumption; (3) information and communications technology (ICT), which includes access to Internet, mobile and fixed lines; and (4) water supply and sanitation.[14]

Table A.2 Relationship between GDP per capita and income inequality, Asia-Pacific countries

	Col 1	Col 2	Col 3
Gini coefficient	-163.571***	-157.073***	-140.100**
	(49.109)	(59.134)	(58.744)
Capital stock per capita	0.113***	0.106***	0.116***
	(0.014)	(0.015)	(0.015)
Human capital index	1.258	1.881	1.039
	(1.853)	(1.931)	(1.918)
TFP	3.387***	3.391***	3.964***
	(1.076)	(1.040)	(1.225)
ESCAP Physical Infrastructure index	0.019***	0.017***	0.022***
	(0.004)	(0.005)	(0.005)
Ratio of manufacturing to agriculture	0.001	0.002	0.003
	(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.007)
Trade openness	2.048	4.268	0.068
	(5.291)	(5.005)	(5.178)
Governance effective	67.674***		
	(14.249)		
Governance law		73.530***	
		(14.521)	
Governance regulatory			25.933*
			(14.055)
Constant	-2.0e+03	-2.9e+03	-1.5e+03
	(6635.262)	(6893.576)	(7069.753)
Country dummy	Y	Y	Y
Year dummy	Y	Y	Y
N	328	328	328
Adj. R-square	0.992	0.992	0.992

Note: Robust standard errors in parentheses; * p < 0.1, ** p < 0.05, *** p < 0.01

[14] See ESCAP (2017c, Annex II) for details on the construction of this index.

Table A.3 Relationship between GDP per capita and income inequality, Asia-Pacific countries, lagged variables

	Col 1	Col 2	Col 3
lag. Gini coefficient	-135.473*** (49.817)	-131.755** (58.591)	-114.841** (58.269)
lag. Capital stock per capita	0.104*** (0.014)	0.097*** (0.015)	0.106*** (0.015)
lag. Human capital index	2.200 (1.874)	2.798 (1.922)	2.031 (1.908)
lag. TFP	3.548*** (1.066)	3.480*** (1.023)	3.974*** (1.235)
lag. ESCAP Physical Infrastructural index	0.018*** (0.004)	0.016*** (0.004)	0.021*** (0.004)
lag. Ratio of manufacturing to agriculture	0.009 (0.008)	0.009 (0.007)	0.011 (0.008)
lag. Trade openness	2.738 (5.544)	5.345 (5.210)	0.798 (5.388)
lag. Governance effective	61.232*** (14.012)		
lag.Governance law		75.451*** (14.690)	
lag. Governance regulatory			30.136** (12.962)
Constant	-4.6e+03 (6492.959)	-5.5e+03 (6664.226)	-4.4e+03 (6825.543)
Country dummy	Y	Y	Y
Year dummy	Y	Y	Y
N	327	327	327
Adj. R-square	0.993	0.993	0.992

Note: Robust standard errors in parentheses; * p < 0.1, ** p < 0.05, *** p < 0.01.

Annex 1.5 The impact of inequality on extreme poverty

The methodology of the calculations shown in Section 1.5.2 is based on Zhang and Wan (2006), who modified a decomposition framework proposed by Datt and Ravallion (1992). ΔP, the change in poverty index P between period 0 and period T can be expressed as

$$\Delta P = P(Y_T; I_T) - P(Y_0; I_0)$$

where Y is average income or consumption and I is an indicator for income distribution or inequality, such as the Gini coefficient. The poverty cost of rising inequality is defined as the change in poverty due to a change in inequality while holding Y constant. Let be the poverty estimate from a hypothetical distribution with $i = 0$ or T, $j = 0$ or T and $i \neq j$. The poverty cost can be computed as:

Poverty cost = $P(Y_0, I_T) - P(Y_0; I_0)$

or

Poverty cost = $P(Y_T, I_T) - P(Y_T; I_0)$

It is easy to see that the above two estimates may differ simply because the reference year is different. One way to obtain a single estimate is to compute average of these two estimates:

$$\text{Poverty cost} = 0.5\{[P(Y_0, I_T) - P(Y_0; I_0)] + [P(Y_T; I_T) - P(Y_T, I_0)]\}.$$

For more details, see Zhang and Wan (2006) who used the term of "distribution or inequality impact" instead of "poverty cost".

Gini coefficients data for the early 1990s and 2010s for 24 countries in the Asia-Pacific region are based on data as in Annex 1.1. The data on mean expenditure is from the World Bank's PovcalNet database.

Annex 2.1 Calculating the Dissimilarity Index

The dissimilarity index, or D-index, is a measure similar to the Gini coefficient, which can be used for measuring inequality for binary variables, such as having access to an opportunity (e.g. education) or not.[15] The D-index measures how all different population groups fare in terms of accessing this opportunity. For example, two countries with identical secondary education attainment rates may have a very different D-index if the distribution of attainment in one country excludes certain groups (such as rural women). To obtain the D-index, inequalities in access among all possible population groups are calculated using the following equation:

$$D = \frac{1}{2\bar{p}} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \beta_i \, |p_i - \bar{p}|$$

where β_i is the weighted sampling proportion of group *i*, (sum β_i of equals 1), $\bar{p}$ is the average attainment rate for secondary or higher education in the country and p_i is the level of attainment of that level for population group *i*, and takes values from 0 to 1. Unlike the Gini coefficient, where there is no ideal level, the ideal level of a D-index of 0, whereby everyone has access to an opportunity and there is no inequality.

There are n number of groups defined by using the interactions of the circumstances selected for the analysis. In the case of secondary education attainment, three circumstances are used forming 8 groups: wealth (2 groups); residence (2 groups); sex (2 groups). This produces at least n=8 groups (2x2x2), covering the entire sample population.

Annex 2.2 Shapley decomposition

The Shapley decomposition method estimates the marginal contribution each circumstance has on inequality in access to a certain opportunity. The basic idea behind this decomposition, taken from cooperative game theory, is to measure how much the estimated D-index would change when a circumstance was added to the pre-existing set of circumstances. The change in inequality caused by the addition of a new circumstance would be a reasonable indicator of its contribution to the overall inequality.[16]

The impact of adding a circumstance A (e.g. wealth) is given by the following formula:

$$D_A = \sum_{S \subseteq N\{A\}} \frac{|S|!(n-|S|-1)!}{n!} [D(S \cup \{A\}) - D(S)]$$

Where N is the set of all n circumstances, which are different depending on the opportunity, as shown in Table 2.1; and S is the subset of N circumstances obtained after omitting the circumstance A. D(S) is the D-index estimated with the sub set of circumstances S. D(SU{A}) is the D-index calculated with set of circumstances S and the circumstance A.

The contribution of characteristic A to the D-index is then formula:

$$M_A = \frac{D_A}{D(N)}$$

The critical property satisfied by the Shapley decomposition is that the sum of contributions of all characteristics adds up to 1 (100 per cent).

[15] Barros, Ferreira, Vega and Chanduvi (2009).

[16] Shorrocks (2013).

Annex 2.3 Who are the furthest behind in all opportunities?

Country/ Circumstances	Who are those left behind in terms of...																				
	...access to full-time employment?						...secondary education attainement?			...higher education attainement?			...access to professional help during childbirth?					...access to contraception?				
	Age group	Educa-tion	Resi-dence	Marital status	Sex	Have children	Wealth	Resi-dence	Sex	Wealth	Resi-dence	Sex	Wealth	Age group	Children under 5	Resi-dence	Educa-tion	Wealth	Educa-tion	Age group	Children under 5	Resi dence
Afghanistan	15-49	Low		Sgl	M		B40	Rur	W	B40	Rur	W	B40	>25	1					15-24		Rur
Armenia			Rur	Sgl or Sep			B40		M	B40		M	B40	25-34				B40		15-24 or >35		
Bangladesh			Rur		W		B40		W	B40		W	B40				Low			15-24	No	
Bhutan					W	NC	B40	Rur	W	B40	Rur	W	B40		2 - 4					15-24		
Cambodia	25-64	Low	Rur	Mar or Sep	W		B40	Rur	W	B40	Rur	W	B40				Low			15-24 or >35	No	Urb
India	15-24			Sgl			B40		W	B40		W	B40		1		Low			15-24		
Indonesia		Low		Mar or Sep	W		B40	Rur	W	B40	Rur		B40			Rur	Low			15-24 or 25-34	No	
Kazakhstan	15-24						B40		M	B40		M		>25		Rur	Low or High			15-24 or 25-34	No	
Kyrgyzstan		Sec	Rur			NC	B40	Rur	W	B40	Rur	M		>35						15-24		
Lao PDR	25-49	Low	Rur		W		B40	Rur	W	B40	Rur		B40		2 - 9		Low		Low or High		Yes	
Maldives							B40	Rur	W	B40	Rur	W		>35	1					15-24 or 25-34	No	
Mongolia	15-24 or 50-64	Low	Rur				B40	Rur	M	B40	Rur	M			2 - 4		Low		Sec or High		No	Urb
Myanmar	50-64				W		B40	Rur	W	B40	Rur											
Pakistan	50-64						B40		W	B40		W	B40	>35			Low			15-24		
Philippines	50-64				W		B40		M	B40		M	B40				Low		Low or High		No	
Tajikistan	25-49	Low					B40		W	B40	Rur	W	B40							15-24		
Thailand	15-24 or 50-64	Low	Urb	Sgl or Mar			B40			B40			B40	25-34					Low or High			
Timor-Leste							B40	Rur	W	B40	Rur	W	B40	>35		Rur	Low		Low		No	
Turkmenistan	15-24				W	NC	B40		W	B40	Rur	W	B40	>25						15-24		
Vanuatu							B40	Rur	W	B40	Rur	W	B40		2 - 3				Low or High	15-24 or >35	No	
Viet Nam		Low or Sec	Rur		W	NC	B40		W	B40		W					Low			15-24		
Australia	15-24																					
Azerbaijan			Rur	Sgl or Sep	WoM																	
China	15-24 or 50-64	Low			W																	
Georgia			Rur	Mar	W																	
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	15-24 or 50-64	Low or Sec				NC																
Japan		Low or Sec	Urb	Mar or Sep	W																	
Malaysia	15-24 or 50-64				W																	
Nepal	15-24 or 50-64	Low	Rur		W																	
New Zealand	15-24																					
Republic of Korea				Sep																		
Russian Federation	15-24																					
Singapore	50-64	Sec		Mar																		
Sri Lanka	15-24 or 50-64	Low			M	NC																
Turkey				Mar	W																	
Uzbekistan		Low or Sec	Rur	Mar	W	C																

Source: ESCAP calculations using data from the latest DHS and MICS surveys for countries in Asia-Pacific Low = Lower education (no or primary education), Sec = Secondary education, High = Higher education, Urb = Urban areas, Rur = Rural areas, Sep = Separate, Mar = Married, Sgl = Single, NC = No Children, C = Have children, M = Men, W = Women, B40 = Bottom 40% households, T60 = Top 60% households.

Country/ Circumstances	Who are those left behind in terms of…																			
	…access to electricity?			…access to clean fuels?			…access to mobile phone?			…access to bank account?			…access to clean water?			…access to safe sanitation?			…basic household services?		
	Wealth	Educa-tion	Resi-dence	Wealth	Educa-tion	Resi-dence	Wealth	Resi-dence	Educa-tion	Wealth	Educ-ation	Resi-dence	Wealth	Educa-tion	Resi-dence	Wealth	Educa-tion	Resi-dence	Wealth	Resi-dence	Educa-tion
Afghanistan		Low	Rur	B40	Low or sec	Rur	B40		Low	B40	Low		B40	Low		B40	Low	Rur	B40	Rur	Low or Sec
Armenia	B40		Urb	B40		Rur	B40		Low or sec	B40	Low or sec		B40		Rur	B40		Rur	B40	Rur	Low or Sec
Bangladesh	B40	Low		B40		Rur			Low	B40	Low		B40	Low		B40	Low		B40	Rur	
Bhutan	B40			B40			B40		Low	B40	Low		B40	Low		B40	Low		B40	Rur	
Cambodia	B40	Low or high		B40		Rur	B40		Low	B40	Low		B40	Low or high		B40	Low		B40	Rur	Low or Sec
India	B40	Low		B40	Low		B40		Low	B40	Low		B40			B40	Low		B40	Rur	Low
Indonesia	B40	Low	Rur	B40	Low	Rur			Low	B40	Low high	Rur	B40 B40	Low or Low		B40	Low				
Kazakhstan	B40	Low or sec		B40	Low or sec				Low or sec		Low or sec		B40	Sec				Urb	B40		Low or Sec
Kyrgyzstan	B40	High	Rur	B40	Low or sec	Rur	B40		Low or sec	B40	Low or sec		B40	Low or sec		T60		Urb	B40		Low or Sec
Lao PDR	B40	Low		B40		Rur	B40		Low	B40	Low		B40	Low		B40	Low		B40	Rur	Low
Maldives		Low or high		B40	Low or sec				Low	B40	Low		B40	Low or high		B40	Low		B40		Low
Mongolia	B40		Rur	B40		Rur	B40	Rur		B40		Rur	B40	Sec	Rur	B40			B40		
Myanmar																B40	Low				
Pakistan	B40	Low		B40	Low	Rur	B40		Low	B40	Low		B40	Low		B40	Low		B40	Rur	
Philippines	B40	Low		B40		Rur			Low				B40	Low		B40	Low				
Tajikistan	B40	Low or sec		B40	High		B40		Low or sec		Low or sec	Urb	B40	Low			Low or Sec	Urb	B40	Rur	Low or Sec
Thailand	B40	Low or high		B40		Rur	B40		Low	B40	Low		B40	Low or sec	Rur	B40		Urb	B40		Low
Timor-Leste	B40	Low		T60	Low	Rur	B40		Low	B40	Low	Rur	B40	Low or high		B40	Low		B40	Rur	Low
Turkmenistan		High			Sec	Urb		Urb	Low or sec	B40	Low or sec		B40	Low or high			Low or Sec	Urb		Rur	Low or Sec
Vanuatu	B40		Rur	B40		Rur	B40	Rur					T60		Rur	B40					
Viet Nam		Low		B40	Low or high				Low	B40	Low or sec		B40	Sec		B40			B40		Low

Source: ESCAP calculations using data from the latest DHS and MICS surveys for countries in Asia-Pacific Low = Lower education (no or primary education), Sec = Secondary education, High = Higher education, Urb = Urban areas, Rur = Rural areas, B40 = Bottom 40% households, T60 = Top 60% households.

Country/ Circumstances	Who are those left behind in terms of...														
	...stunting among children?					...wasting among children?					...overweight among children?				
	Wealth	Mother's education	Residence	Number of siblings	Sex	Wealth	Mother's education	Residence	Number of siblings	Sex	Wealth	Mother's education	Residence	Number of siblings	Sex
Afghanistan															
Armenia		Low	Rur			B40	Low							3-6	B
Bangladesh		Low	Rur		B	B40				B		High			
Bhutan	B40	Low				T60	Low or sec	Rur		B		Sec			
Cambodia	B40					B40				B			Urb		
India	B40	Low		3+		B40				B		Sec or high	Urb		
Indonesia															
Kazakhstan		Sec		1+		T60	Sec					High	Urb	1	
Kyrgyzstan	B40			2+	B		High	Urb			B40			1-3	
Lao PDR	B40	Low				B40	Low or sec			B				3-9	
Maldives	B40			2+		B40	Low	Rur	3-6			Sec or high		3-7	
Mongolia	B40		Rur	1-2			Low or higher	Rur	1-10	B		High		1	
Myanmar		Low					Low					Low			
Pakistan	B40	Low			B	B40			4-10			High			
Philippines															
Tajikistan	B40						Low				T60		Rur	1-3	
Thailand	B40		Rur				Low or sec			B	T60	Low or high	Rur		
Timor-Leste	B40		Rur		B		Low	Rur		B	B40			4-8	
Turkmenistan				2+				Rur	1		T60			2-7	
Vanuatu		Low			B			Urb		G			Urb		B
Viet Nam	B40	Low				B40	Low			B			Urb		

Source: ESCAP calculations using data from the latest DHS and MICS surveys for countries in Asia-PacificLow = Lower education (no or primary education), Sec = Secondary education, High = Higher education, Urb = Urban areas, Rur = Rural areas, B = Boys, G = Girls, B40 = Bottom 40% households, T60 = Top 60% households.