

Artificial light at night: a global disruptor of the nighttime environment

Salvador Bará^{1,*} and Fabio Falchi^{1,2}

¹ *Departamento de Física Aplicada, Universidade de Santiago de Compostela (USC), Santiago de Compostela, 15782 Galicia (Spain)*

² *ISTIL Istituto di Scienza e Tecnologia dell'Inquinamento Luminoso –Light Pollution Science and Technology Institute, I-36016 Thiene, Italy*

Keywords: Light pollution, artificial light at night, environmental pollutants

Summary

Light pollution is the alteration of the natural levels of darkness by an increased concentration of light particles in the nighttime environment, resulting from human activity. Light pollution is changing in a deep way the environmental conditions of the night in wide areas of the planet, and is a relevant stressor whose effects on life are being unveiled by a compelling body of research. In this paper we briefly review the basic aspects of artificial light at night as a pollutant, describing its character, magnitude and extent, its worldwide distribution, its temporal and spectral change trends, as well as its dependence on current light production technologies and prevailing social uses of light. It is shown that the overall effects of light pollution are not restricted to local disturbances, but give rise to a global, multiscale disruption of the nighttime environment.

1. Introduction

Artificial light is a key resource for humankind. It provides our societies with an unprecedented freedom from the natural illumination cycles, enabling the extension of human activities into nighttime and the use during the day of many indoor spaces lacking enough natural light. A long and rich history of technological breakthroughs enabled the production and control of ever-increasing amounts of light since ancient times [1], a process intensely accelerated in the last centuries [2, 3]. The industrial supply of artificial light is nowadays an integral feature of many societies, and its widespread availability is so taken for granted that lighting has become part of the 'invisible infrastructures' [4, 5], essential for everyday life but whose existence is properly noticed only if (and when) they fail.

The massive use of this resource, however, comes at a price. Outdoor light sources of any type, as well as indoor sources whose light spills outdoors, increase the concentration of light particles (photons) in the environment [6], giving rise to light pollution. Light directly propagated from the lamps, reflected on surfaces, or scattered in turbid media (air and water) contribute to this increase. Photons know no borders [7] and a significant fraction of them travel long distances [8-11] before interacting with atmospheric constituents, inert surfaces, or living matter. As a result, many areas surrounding cities do not experience the true darkness of the night but face a kind of permanent twilight. The *New world atlas of artificial night sky brightness* shows that more than 80% of the world population live under light-polluted skies and 23% of the world's land surfaces between 75°N and 60°S experience light-polluted nights [12]. Recent estimates of the increasing artificial light emissions and the decreasing number of stars visible with the unaided eye (see section 3) strongly suggest that the situation may have deteriorated since the *New World Atlas* was published (2016). The loss of the natural night is not restricted to terrestrial areas and their aerial space [13]; it is also experienced in the seas [14-17]

*Author for correspondence (salva.bara@usc.gal). Former profesor titular at USC (retired).
SB ORCID: 0000-0003-1274-8043, FF ORCID: 0000-0002-3706-5639

and freshwaters [18-20], at their surfaces [12, 21-23], air space [24, 25] and down along the water column [26-30].

Light-matter interactions mediate a wealth of physiological and behavioral processes, including metabolism, foraging, reproduction, predation, and migrations [31]. Light provides energy for sustaining basic processes in animals and plants, and carries information both visual (space awareness) and non-visual (circadian and seasonal entrainment) [32, 33]. Expectedly, life in the photic sphere of the Earth developed efficient adaptations to anticipate and take advantage of the periodic cycles of light and darkness. It is not surprising that the introduction of artificial light in the environment disrupts in meaningful ways the ecological nightscape in which life evolved and thrived during millions of years [34]. Artificial light effects take place at multiple size and complexity scales, ranging from molecular to ecosystem level [31].

Fragmentary examples of phototactic responses elicited by artificial light were already described in ancient literatures [35], and detailed accounts of the disruptive effects of artificial light on some taxa were reported in the 19th century [36]. Substantial advances in the understanding of light pollution as an environmental problem were made in the second half of the 20th century [37-40]. This approach gained widespread recognition in 2004, when Travis Longcore and Catherine Rich coined the concept "ecological light pollution" [41] paving the way for a wider and better appraisal of the polluting character of artificial light. Nowadays, environmental light pollution studies are a thriving field of research [32-34, 42-48] whose findings add to a growing body of knowledge on the disruptive effects of artificial light at night in ground-based astronomy [49, 50], cultural heritage [51, 52], and public health [53-56]. A comprehensive review of the environmental light pollution literature since its modern onset up to present times would clearly demand more space than is available in this paper [57, 58]. An updated list of references can be found in the *Artificial light at night literature database* [59].

In this paper we formalize some aspects of artificial light as a 'proper' pollutant (section 2). We provide a general overview of its spatial and temporal distribution (section 3), its spectral change trends (section 4), as well as its dependence on current light production technologies and prevailing social uses of light (section 5). Additional remarks and conclusions are drawn in section 6.

2. A pollutant hidden in plain sight

The term "light pollution" became commonplace in the last third of the 20th century, when serious concerns on the negative effects of artificial light at night for astrophysical research were expressed by the astronomy community [60-62]. However, during a relatively long period of time the word "pollution" conveyed in this context a sense of relevant nuisance, rather than the action and effect of a pollutant proper. Light pollution was deemed substantially different from 'hard' contamination types, like the chemical pollution of air or water [61]. This misconception left its footprint on several working definitions of light pollution, which frequently contained a somewhat confusing mix of causes and effects, descriptive lists of particular manifestations of the problem (glare, skyglow, light trespass, clutter...), and wrong dichotomies (useful light vs. polluting light). Some examples of this kind are, e.g., "artificial light that shines where it is neither wanted, nor needed" [63] or "the inappropriate or excessive use of artificial light" [64]. Other definitions are analyzed in [65]. However, the polluting character of artificial light *per se* can no longer be ignored. In this section we describe how artificial light at night fulfils the conditions to be considered a classical, standard pollutant.

(a) Artificial light at night is an actual pollutant

Leaving aside narrow or ad-hoc definitions intended for specific applications, usual scientific and legal practice consider pollutants those

- (i) forms of matter or energy that
- (ii) are produced by human activity,
- (iii) are present in the environment in concentrations that alter the natural ones, and
- (iv) cause or may reasonably cause harm to humans, the environment, and/or other goods of any nature,

see, e.g. [66, 67, 6] for their realization in the UN Convention on Long-range Transboundary Air Pollution (1979). According to the available body of knowledge (see Introduction above) it would be difficult to argue that artificial light at night does not fulfill conditions (i) to (iv). In fact it does, in the same sense as they are met by conventional (e.g. chemical) pollutants.

Every pollutant has specific characteristics, and artificial light at night is not an exception. Artificial light is a mid-range pollutant, capable of producing measurable environmental effects at multiple distance scales, from the immediate neighbourhood of the lamps up to hundreds of km away. It is composed of particles (photons) that carry the smallest possible bits of electromagnetic energy [68]. Photons propagate at the speed $c=299\,792\,458\text{ m}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$ in vacuum. The average time spent by a photon in the terrestrial atmosphere is short, typically ranging from microseconds to milliseconds before they interact with atmospheric constituents, terrain, built environment, any form of living matter, or leave for outer space. Notwithstanding these short effective lives, the concentration of artificial photons in the atmosphere is often stationary or slowly varying in time, due to the huge amounts of light particles continuously produced by artificial sources (see section (b) below). The physical composition of the natural atmosphere becomes that way modified at nighttime. Although the photon number concentration rapidly vanishes if the light sources are switched off, the disruptive effects already produced in the environment may take much longer to disappear (e.g. an area might not be immediately recovered if light-induced habitat fragmentation gave rise to biodiversity loss). It is a well known fact that light gives rise to different environmental effects depending on its wavelength, direction of propagation and polarization. This allows to define appropriate photon classes for the problems under study, binned according to their momentum-energy (wavelength and direction of propagation) and polarization modes.

(b) Expressing light pollution in terms of the concentration of artificial light particles

The usual way of specifying illumination has somehow contributed to obscure its deep connection with other types of pollutants, whose presence in the environment is commonly expressed in terms of concentrations (e.g. number of molecules per unit volume). Lighting levels, however, can also be described in a natural way in terms of concentrations.

Light is commonly measured in terms of energy or photon flux densities per unit area around a point (irradiances, in $\text{W}\cdot\text{m}^{-2}$ or $\text{photon}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}\cdot\text{m}^{-2}$), per unit solid angle around a propagation direction (radiant intensities, in $\text{W}\cdot\text{sr}^{-1}$ or $\text{photon}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}\cdot\text{sr}^{-1}$), or both (radiances, in $\text{W}\cdot\text{m}^{-2}\cdot\text{sr}^{-1}$ or $\text{photon}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}\cdot\text{m}^{-2}\cdot\text{sr}^{-1}$), integrating their spectral distributions (densities per unit wavelength interval) [69] within the relevant spectral passbands. In lighting engineering and for some applications in visual science these radiant quantities tend to be specified in human-centric photometric units (lx, cd, and $\text{cd}\cdot\text{m}^{-2}$, respectively) based on the SI unit for luminous intensity, the candela [70]. Detailed descriptions of radiometric and photometric quantities pertinent for ecological studies can be found in [17, 69, 71].

As shown in [6], every radiant quantity defined in terms of photon flux densities can be equivalently expressed in terms of photon concentrations per unit volume. For instance, one lux (lx) is equivalent to 1.36×10^7 photons per cubic meter propagating towards the measurement surface, within the human visual band. The photon concentrations for other radiometric quantities and spectral bands can be easily calculated. The equivalence of flux densities and concentrations is complete and both descriptions are equally correct, valid and interchangeable. This means that we can keep the customary units for specifying light in environmental and visual science (no change in usual practice is required), and at the same time keep in mind that we are effectively dealing with increased concentrations of particles in the atmospheric or aquatic environment, like we do with other types of pollutants.

(c) 'All' artificial light at night is pollutant or wasted

On the other hand, the wrong dichotomy of useful versus polluting light, present in some light pollution definitions and coded in lighting regulations [72], overlooks the basic fact that practically all light emitted by outdoor lighting installations, even 'perfect' ones, is pollutant, if not wasted by absorption in urban surfaces. Lighting engineering criteria consider 'useful light' that which illuminates the areas intended to be illuminated, at the right times and with the right intensity and spectrum. A perfect lighting installation, from an engineering viewpoint, is the one that only produces useful light. Adhering to good lighting practices to

approximate as much as possible actual installations to 'perfect' ones according to this definition is of course an appropriate and recommended practice. However, let us consider what happens to the light once it reaches the areas intended to be illuminated. First, a big share of the incident photons (~80%) is directly absorbed by these surfaces, whose reflectance in the optical band tends to be within the range 10%-30% for common pavement and façade materials (Fig 1a). Second, and more important from a light pollution viewpoint, only an exceedingly tiny fraction of the reflected photons are actually useful for human vision. As shown in [73], less than 1 photon out of every 22 million reflected ones is captured by the eye of an average observer at 10 m from the reflection point (Fig 1b). The remaining ones, that is, the practical totality in environmental terms, propagate in other directions, being finally absorbed or ending in places that were not intended to be lit, thus contributing to the build up of the total light pollution affecting these sites. This "1/22M+" is an essential limit that cannot be overcome by technological improvements applicable to urban lighting at large scale. In practical terms, then, 'all' light used outdoors is polluting, when not directly lost.




Fig 1. (a) A ~20% of artificial light incident on urban surfaces is reflected, but only an extremely small fraction of it is actually used for human vision, the rest is polluting or lost; (b) The eye only captures those reflected photons propagating in the cone of directions defined by the reflection point and the eye pupil rim. For isotropic reflecting materials this is a fraction $\eta = r^2/(2d^2)$ of the total number of reflected photons, being r the eye pupil radius and d the distance to the point [73].

(d) Polluting agents and polluted media

It seems advisable to establish an operative distinction between polluting agents and the media that are polluted resulting from their presence. Chemical or biological contaminants, particulate matter, sound and light, among others, are pollutants that affect the quality of the atmospheric and underwater environments. Within this framework, artificial light at night should legitimately be considered an air and water pollutant.

3. Spatial distribution and temporal dynamics

The spatial distribution of artificial light sources is strongly correlated with urbanized spaces, connective roadways, infrastructures (factories, ports and airports, ...) and any other areas where human activity is assumed or expected at nighttime. This enables using remote sensing of nighttime lights as a proxy indicator for urbanization [74] and economic activity [75]. The widespread mesh of artificial light sources directly pollutes its immediate surroundings, altering substantially their natural darkness and being a relevant factor for habitat fragmentation via phototactic effects that disrupt nighttime ecological corridors [76-78].

The spatial distribution of their polluting effects, however, is not limited to short distances. Artificial light may reach very distant places propagating through the atmosphere. Following basic physical principles of

light propagation the resulting light distributions are smoothed by atmospheric scattering and by the superposition of the effects of myriads of individual sources. The light pollution maps can then be thought of as "blurred" versions of the sources' maps. This is apparent at the macro-scale by comparing satellite nighttime images showing the sharply defined structure of sources [79-81] with the much more continuous and smoother maps corresponding to their polluting effects, as e.g. the ones shown in [12, 82] for several artificial night sky brightness indicators. The extension of human settlements, the increase in emissions and the broadening effects of the atmosphere cooperate to the progressive encroachment of natural protected spaces [15, 83] and to the deterioration of former pristine sites in which reference astronomical observatories are located [49, 50].

The temporal dynamics of light pollution shows a characteristic multiscale behavior. Firstly, there is a long-term trend of increasing emissions that, depending on the world region and estimation methodology, spans the range 0%-20% per year [43], with independent estimates suggesting an average increase of radiance of order 1.8%-2.2% per year during 2012-2016 in the panchromatic VIIRS-DNB band (500-900 nm) [3]. This is consistent with recent results from the period 1992 to 2017, pointing to an increase of the panchromatic band emissions by at least 49% during these 25 years, that is, about a 1.6% annual, with an estimated increase of the radiance in the visible spectrum of order 270%-400% during the same period on specific places [84]. Note that the rate of deterioration of the night sky visually detected by humans may be significantly faster than the rate of increase of emissions measured by satellites. The last available results in the human visual band suggest actual increases in the range 7%-10% per year during the period 2011-2022, with a world average of order 9.6% [85]. This different progression rates, that could also be expected for other ecologically relevant photometric bands, may be explained by a combination of several factors including changes in the spectral composition of the sources [84, 86], see section 4, and changes in the source number, type or structure that give rise to effects detectable from ground but not from the nadir view of the satellites [85, 87, 88], as e.g. the accelerated installation of ultra-bright LED billboards in central urban areas.

Secondly, there is a seasonal trend in light emissions associated with changes in human activity and ground albedo (related to snow or vegetation cover) [89, 90]. Thirdly, weekly patterns dependent on the workdays cycle as well as hourly patterns along the night are also easily discernable [91, 92]. Emergency situations and catastrophic events frequently give rise to sudden changes in emissions [93-95]. Emissions may also change after urban lighting remodellings driven by energy savings goals [96, 97]. Simultaneous to these human-driven changes in emissions, the highly variable state of the atmosphere (aerosol concentration and types, presence of clouds, ...) [98-104], with different characteristic time scales, determines how the light polluting photons will propagate to long distances from the sources until reaching their final destinations.

4. Nightscape blues: the shifting color of the artificial night

One of the most noticeable features of the global outdoor lighting transition experienced in the last two decades is the spectral shift of the emitted light towards shorter (bluer) wavelengths. The yellowish and orange HPS lamps of low correlated color temperature (CCT), 1900-2200 K, are being widely replaced by white LED with a higher blue content and correspondingly higher CCTs (3000-5000 K) [105, 106]. The increase in blue content of the artificial nightscape has some unintended environmental consequences. Artificial light is a relevant stimulus across all regions of the optical spectrum, see e.g. [107-109], but short wavelengths, including blue, violet and near ultraviolet, are particularly effective as visual stimuli eliciting behavioural responses across many taxa [110-113]. The current process of replacing HPS lamps by white LEDs has then the potential to produce new ecological effects even in those places where the absolute lighting levels, measured in human photopic units, are not changed.

The change from warm to white outdoor light was not motivated by any explicit demand of the lighting sector nor by any relevant visual need that could not be met with HPS lamps; it was rather a by-product of the industry attempt to keep the luminous efficacy of the phosphor-coated LED lamps comparable to the one of the HPS they intended to outphase. During the first steps of solid-state lighting deployment, harsh white LEDs were marginally more efficient than warm ones, requiring less amounts of phosphors for their fabrication, a difference that nowadays is of secondary importance. In fact the meaningful energy savings enabled by LEDs in outdoor lighting do not primarily stem from their luminous efficacy but from the fact that

their light can be more precisely directed to where it is needed, decreasing the spilled light and increasing the overall utilization factor, and from their ability to regulate at will the amount of emitted light with extremely short response times. An active marketing campaign based on concepts like modernity, color rendering, scotopic vision and others, often incorrectly applied, contributed to make white light the 'new normal' in ample areas of the world.

5. Lighting technologies, rebound effects, and social uses of light

Many technological changes in light emitting systems are purportedly driven by the search of lamps with higher luminous efficacies, that is, higher ratios of produced visible light to consumed electrical power. It is somehow expected that this would lead, in the long term, to a reduction in the overall amount of energy used to maintain our actual lifestyles. However, the documented history of artificial lighting shows that increases of luminous efficacy tend to give rise larger amounts of emitted light (via the extension of the illuminated surface, the number of users, and the development of new uses of light), and in the long run to net increases in energy consumption [2], a rebound associated with the reduction of the effective price of light [114]. The present process of deployment of solid-state lighting provides no compelling reason for expecting a different outcome. Furthermore, LEDs are expected to have average useful lifetimes longer than gas-discharge lamps. While this is a desirable feature, it certainly puts pressure on different industrial lighting agents, since the income derived from maintenance and periodic lamp replacements is consequently reduced. This may lead to compensatory income strategies based on the extension of the illuminated surface and the intensification of uses and times of operation in those areas already saturated with streetlights. As a matter of fact there is a widespread trend of installing new lighting systems intended for ornamental, non-functional uses, including the generalized illumination of façades, monuments, bridges, beaches, cliffs, woods and even botanic gardens, not to mention the massive installation of ultra-bright LED billboards of large sizes in the central town districts or in view from high traffic roads [115]. There is also large room for increasing the urban light levels at nighttime, since the human visual system has a poor memory and can easily adapt to illuminances from a few tenths of lx to more than 10^5 lx. Although conjunctural shortages in energy supply and increased energy prices may slow somewhat this process during limited time periods, it is not clear whether they will effectively stop the progressive loss of the natural night. They did not stop it in previous energy crises.

The ways and extent of lighting the night are, ultimately, the result of social choices. There is no pre-defined way in which the artificial night should be lit. Our present lighting schemes are strongly tied to particular models of transportation and mobility, and specially to the double assumption that (i) vehicles should be able to run through the cities at high speed, in spaces conflicting with pedestrian mobility and (ii) increasing illumination would contribute to reduce traffic accidents. Both these assumptions are on question today, either by the emergence of new mobility and lighting paradigms [116, 117] or by the critical reappraisal of the relationship between illumination levels and safety [118-120]. As a matter of fact, basic physical principles indicate that the limitation of the total amount of emitted light is a necessary, unavoidable condition for controlling light pollution [121], whereas technical updates and correct engineering of lighting installations may be a complementary tool.

6. Additional remarks and conclusions

The human perception of the world is deeply rooted in visual inputs, and artificial light is not only taken for granted as a basic resource of modern societies but has a prevalent positive cultural connotation. These facts have contributed somehow to delay the correct appreciation of its actual polluting character. In this paper we argue that light pollution is a standard form of pollution and that artificial light at night should be consequently treated as a conventional environmental pollutant. The multiple unknowns that still remain about the interactions of artificial light with living matter at various size, time, and complexity scales, see e.g. [42], do not detract from the huge amount of converging evidence about the disruptive effects of anthropogenic light in the nocturnal environment of our planet. The widespread misconception that

electromagnetic radiation in the optical band can only produce detrimental effects through ionizing or thermal processes overlooks the basic fact that the main interactions between optical radiation and living matter take place through photochemical processes activating visual and non-visual pathways.

In conclusion, artificial light at night is a useful resource and, at the same time, an environmental pollutant. Light pollution is caused by an increase of the concentration of light particles (photons) above the natural nighttime levels as a consequence of human activity. Light pollution is a multiscale disruptor of the nighttime environment, affecting from molecular processes to ecosystems, from the immediate vicinity of the sources up to hundreds of km away, with time scales ranging from seconds or less to decades, and with atmospheric variations superimposed on periodic daily and seasonal oscillations, within a general interannual increase trend.

References

- Guarnieri M. 2018 An Historical Survey on Light Technologies. *IEEE Access* **6**, 25881-25897. doi: 10.1109/ACCESS.2018.2834432
- Fouquet R, Pearson PJG. 2006 Seven Centuries of Energy Services: The Price and Use of Light in the United Kingdom (1300-2000). *The Energy Journal* **27**(1), 139–177. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/23296980>
- Kyba CCM, Kuester T, Sánchez de Miguel A, Baugh K, Jechow A, Hölker F, Bennie J, Elvidge CD, Gaston KJ, Guanter L. 2017 Artificially lit surface of Earth at night increasing in radiance and extent. *Sci. Adv.* **3**(11), e1701528. (doi: 10.1126/sciadv.1701528)
- Schulte-Römer, N. 2015. Innovating in public. The introduction of LED lighting in Berlin and Lyon. (Doctoral thesis). pp 321-324 Berlin, DE: Technical University Berlin. (doi: 10.14279/depositonce-4908)
- Schulte-Römer, N. (Forthcoming) Sensory governance: Managing the public sense of light and water. In: Sensing Collectives – Aesthetic and Political Practices Intertwined. J-P Voß, N Rigamonti, M Suarez, J Watson (Eds). Bielefeld: Transkript.
- Bará S, Bao-Varela C, Falchi F. 2022 Light pollution and the concentration of anthropogenic photons in the terrestrial atmosphere. *Atmos. Pollut. Res.* **13**(9), 101541. (doi: 10.1016/j.apr.2022.101541)
- Bará S, Lima RC. 2018 Photons without borders: quantifying light pollution transfer between territories. *Int. J. Sustain. Light.* **20**(2), 51-61. (doi: 10.26607/ijsl.v20i2.87)
- Cinzano P, Falchi F. 2012 The propagation of light pollution in the atmosphere. *Mon. Notices Royal Astron. Soc.* **427**, 3337–3357. (doi:10.1111/j.1365-2966.2012.21884.x)
- Kocifaj M. 2007 Light-pollution model for cloudy and cloudless night skies with ground-based light sources. *Appl. Opt.* **46**, 3013-3022. (doi: 10.1364/AO.46.003013)
- Kocifaj M. 2018 Multiple scattering contribution to the diffuse light of a night sky: A model which embraces all orders of scattering. *J Quant Spectrosc Radiat Transf* **206**, 260-272. (doi: 10.1016/j.jqsrt.2017.11.020)
- Aubé M. 2015 Physical behaviour of anthropogenic light propagation into the nocturnal environment. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. B* **370**, 20140117. (doi: 10.1098/rstb.2014.0117)
- Falchi F, Cinzano P, Duriscoe D, Kyba CCM, Elvidge CD, Baugh K, Portnov BA, Rybnikova NA, Furgoni R. 2016 The new world atlas of artificial night sky brightness. *Sci. Adv.* **2**, e1600377. (doi: 10.1126/sciadv.1600377)
- Degen T, Kolláth Z, Degen J. 2022 X,Y, and Z: A bird's eye view on light pollution. *Ecol. Evol.* **12**, e9608. (doi: 10.1002/ece3.9608)
- Davies TW, Duffy JP, Bennie J, Gaston KJ. 2014 The nature, extent, and ecological implications of marine light pollution. *Front. Ecol. Environ.* **12**(6), 347–355.
- Davies TW, Duffy JP, Bennie J, Gaston KJ. 2016 Stemming the Tide of Light Pollution Encroaching into Marine Protected Areas. *Conserv. Lett.* **9**(3), 164–171. (doi: 10.1111/conl.12191).
- Marangoni LFB, Davies T, Smyth T, Rodríguez A, Hamann M, Duarte C, Pendoley K, Berge J, Maggi E, Levy O. 2022 Impacts of Artificial Light at Night (ALAN) in marine ecosystems – a review. *Glob. Change Biol.* **28**, 5346–5367. (doi: 10.1111/gcb.16264)
- Tidau S, Smyth T, McKee D, Wiedenmann J, D'Angelo C, Wilcockson D, Ellison A, Grimmer AJ, Jenkins SR, Widdicombe S, Queirós AM, Talbot E, Wright A, Davies TW. 2021 Marine artificial light at night: An empirical and technical guide. *Methods Ecol. Evol.* **12**, 1588–1601. (doi 10.1111/2041-210X.13653)
- Perkin EK, Hölker F, Richardson JS, Sadler JP, Wolter C, Tockner K. 2011 The influence of artificial light on stream and riparian ecosystems: questions, challenges, and perspectives. *Ecosphere* **2**, 122. (doi: 10.1890/ES11-00241.1)
- Jechow A, Hölker F. 2019 How dark is a river? Artificial light at night in aquatic systems and the need for comprehensive night-time light measurements. *WIREs Water* **6**, e1388. (doi: 10.1002/wat2.1388)
- Jechow A, Schreck G, Kyba CCM, Berger SA, Bistarelli LT, Bodenlos M, Gessner MO, Grossart HP, et al. 2021 Mimicking skyglow at ecosystem level in a large-scale lake enclosure facility. *Sci. Rep.* **11**, 23478. (doi: 10.1038/s41598-021-02772-4)
- Jechow A, Kolláth Z, Lerner A, Hölker F, Hänel A, Shashar N, Kyba CCM. 2017 Measuring Light Pollution with Fisheye Lens Imagery from a Moving Boat, A Proof of Concept. *Int. J. Sustain. Light.* **36**(1), 15-25. (doi: 10.26607/ijsl.v19i1.62)
- Ges X, Bará S, García-Gil M, Zamorano J, Ribas SJ, Masana E. 2018 Light pollution offshore: zenithal sky glow measurements in the Mediterranean coastal waters. *J. Quant. Spectrosc. Radiat. Transf.* **210**, 91–100. (doi: 10.1016/j.jqsrt.2018.02.014)
- Pérez-Couto X, Falchi S, Bará S. 2023 On the Posch ratio for irradiance in coastal waters and the high seas. *J. Quant. Spectrosc. Radiat. Transf.* **298**, 108503. (doi: 10.1016/j.jqsrt.2023.108503)
- Rodríguez A, Holmes ND, Ryan PG, Wilson K-J, Faulquier L, Murillo Y, et al. 2017 Seabird mortality induced by land-based artificial lights. *Conserv. Biol.* **31**, 986–1001. (doi: 10.1111/cobi.12900)
- Rodríguez A, Rodríguez B, Acosta Y, Negro JJ. 2022 Tracking Flights to Investigate Seabird Mortality Induced by Artificial Lights. *Front. Ecol. Evol.* **9**, 786557. (doi: 10.3389/fevo.2021.786557)
- Tamir R, Lerner A, Haspel C, Dubinsky Z, Iluz D. 2017 The spectral and spatial distribution of light pollution in the waters of the northern Gulf of Aqaba (Eilat). *Sci. Rep.* **7**, 42329. (doi: 10.1038/srep42329)
- Davies TW, McKee D, Fishwick J., et al. 2020 Biologically important artificial light at night on the seafloor. *Sci Rep* **10**, 12545. (doi: 10.1038/s41598-020-69461-6)
- Berge J, Geoffroy M, Daase M, et al. 2020 Artificial light during the polar night disrupts Arctic fish and zooplankton behaviour down to 200 m depth. *Commun. Biol.* **3**, 102. (doi: 10.1038/s42003-020-0807-6)
- Smyth TJ, Wright AE, McKee D, Tidau S, Tamir R, Dubinsky Z, Iluz D, Davies TW. 2021 A global atlas of artificial light at night under the sea. *Elem. Sci. Anth.* **9**(1), 00049. (doi: 10.1525/elementa.2021.00049)

30. Smyth TJ, Wright AE, Edwards-Jones A, McKee D, Queirós A, Rendon O, Tidau S, Davies TW. 2022 Disruption of marine habitats by artificial light at night from global coastal megacities. *Elem. Sci. Anth.* **10**, 1. (doi: 10.1525/elementa.2022.00042)
31. Gaston KJ, Visser ME, Hölker F. 2015 The biological impacts of artificial light at night: the research challenge. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. B* **370**, 20140133. (doi: 10.1098/rstb.2014.0133)
32. Hölker F, Wolter C, Perkin EK, Tockner K. 2010 Light pollution as a biodiversity threat. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* **25**(12), 681–682. (doi: 10.1016/j.tree.2010.09.007)
33. Gaston KJ, Bennie J, Davies TW, Hopkins J. 2013 The ecological impacts of nighttime light pollution: a mechanistic appraisal. *Biol. Rev. Camb. Philos. Soc.* **88**(4), 912–27. (doi: 10.1111/brv.12036)
34. Gaston KJ, Sánchez de Miguel A. 2022 Environmental Impacts of Artificial Light at Night. *Annu. Rev. Environ. Resour.* **47**(1), 373–398. (doi: 10.1146/annurev-environ-112420-014438)
35. Aristotle (c. 350 BC). *Historia Animalium*. Book VIII, part 27. English translation by D'Arcy Wentworth Thompson. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1910.
36. Allen JA. 1880 Destruction of birds by light-houses. *Bulletin of the Nuttall Ornithological Club* **5**(3), 131–138. (<https://www.jstor.org/stable/24723046>)
37. Verheijen FJ. 1960 The Mechanisms of the Trapping Effect of Artificial Light Sources Upon Animals. *Archives Néerlandaises de Zoologie* **13**(1), 1–107. (doi: 10.1163/036551660x00017)
38. McFarlane RW. 1963 Disorientation of Loggerhead Hatchlings by Artificial Road Lighting. *Copeia* **1963**(1), 153. (doi: 10.2307/1441283)
39. Verheijen FJ. 1985 Photopollution: artificial light optic spatial control systems fail to cope with. Incidents, causations, remedies. *Experimental Biology* **1985**, 1–18.
40. Böttcher M., editor. 2001. Auswirkungen von Fremdlicht auf die Fauna im Rahmen von Eingriffen in Natur und Landschaft. Schriftenreihe für Landschaftspflege und Naturschutz, Heft 67. Bundesamt für Naturschutz (BfN), Bonn-Bad Godesberg <https://d-nb.info/964099632/04>
41. Longcore T, Rich C. 2004 Ecological light pollution. *Front. Ecol. Environ.* **2**, 191–198. (doi: 10.1890/1540-9295(2004)002[0191:ELP]2.0.CO;2)
42. Hölker F, Bolliger J, Davies TW, Giavi S, Jechow A, Kalinkat G, Longcore T, Spoelstra K, Tidau S, Visser ME, Knop E. 2021 11 Pressing Research Questions on How Light Pollution Affects Biodiversity. *Front. Ecol. Evol.* **9**, 767177. (doi:10.3389/fevo.2021.767177)
43. Hölker F, Moss T, Griefahn B, Kloas W, Voigt CC, Henckel D, Hänel A, Kappeler PM, Völker S, Schwöpe A, et al. 2010 The dark side of light: a transdisciplinary research agenda for light pollution policy. *Ecol. Soc.* **15**(4), 13. (<http://www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol15/iss4/art13/>)
44. Gaston KJ, Duffy JP, Gaston S, Bennie J, Davies TW. 2014 Human alteration of natural light cycles: causes and ecological consequences. *Oecologia* **176**, 917–931. (doi: 10.1007/s00442-014-3088-2)
45. Gaston KJ, Ackermann S, Bennie J, Cox DTC, Phillips BB, Sánchez de Miguel A, Sanders D. 2021 Pervasiveness of Biological Impacts of Artificial Light at Night. *Integr. Comp. Biol.* **61**(3), 1098–1110. (doi: 10.1093/icb/icab145)
46. Davies TW, Bennie J, Inger R, Gaston KJ. 2013 Artificial light alters natural regimes of night-time sky brightness. *Sci. Rep.* **3**, 1722. (doi: 10.1038/srep01722)
47. Davies TW, Smyth T. 2018 Why artificial light at night should be a focus for global change research in the 21st century. *Glob Change Biol.* **24**, 872–882. (doi: 10.1111/gcb.13927)
48. Challéat S, Barré K, Laforge A, Lapostolle D, Franchomme M, Sirami C, Le Viol I, Milian J, Kerbirou C. 2021 Grasping darkness: the dark ecological network as a social-ecological framework to limit the impacts of light pollution on biodiversity. *Ecol. Soc.* **26**(1), 15. (doi: 10.5751/ES-12156-260115)
49. Falchi F, Ramos F, Bará S, Sanhueza P, Jaque-Arancibia M, Damke G, Cinzano P. 2023 Light pollution indicators for all the major astronomical observatories. *Mon. Notices Royal Astron. Soc.* **519**(1), 26–33. (doi: 10.1093/mnras/stac2929)
50. Green RF, Luginbuhl CB, Wainscoat RJ, Duriscoe D. 2022 The growing threat of light pollution to ground-based observatories. *Astron. Astrophys. Rev.* **30**, 1. (doi: 10.1007/s00159-021-00138-3)
51. Marín C, Jafari J. 2008 StarLight: A Common Heritage; StarLight Initiative La Palma Biosphere Reserve, Instituto De Astrofísica De Canarias, Government of The Canary Islands, Spanish Ministry of The Environment, UNESCO-MaB (Canary Islands, Spain).
52. Bogard P. 2013 *The End of Night: Searching for Natural Darkness in an Age of Artificial Light*. Little, Brown and Company (New York, USA)
53. IARC Monographs Vol 124 group. 2019 Carcinogenicity of night shift work. *Lancet Oncol.* **20** (8), 1058–1059. (doi: 10.1016/S1470-2045(19)30455-3)
54. Bonmati-Carrion MA, Arguelles-Prieto R, Martinez-Madrid MJ, Reiter R, Hardeland R, Rol MA, Madrid JA. 2014 Protecting the Melatonin Rhythm through Circadian Healthy Light Exposure. *Int. J. Mol. Sci.* **15**, 23448–23500. (doi: 10.3390/ijms151223448)
55. Brown TM, Brinard GC, Cajochen C, Czeisler CA, Hanifin JP, Lockley SW, et al. 2022 Recommendations for daytime, evening, and nighttime indoor light exposure to best support physiology, sleep, and wakefulness in healthy adults. *PLoS Biol.* **20**(3), e3001571. (doi: 10.1371/journal.pbio.3001571)
56. Smolensky MH, Sackett-Lundeen LL, Portaluppi F. 2015 Nocturnal light pollution and underexposure to daytime sunlight: Complementary mechanisms of circadian disruption and related diseases. *Chronobiol. Int.* **32**(8), 1029–1048. (doi: 10.3109/07420528.2015.1072002)
57. Rich C, Longcore T. editors. 2006 *Ecological consequences of artificial night lighting*. (Washington, D.C.: Island Press).
58. Svechikina A, Portnov BA, Trop T. 2020 The impact of artificial light at night on human and ecosystem health: a systematic literature review. *Landscape Ecol.* **35**, 1725–1742. (doi: 10.1007/s10980-020-01053-1)
59. Artificial light at night literature database. https://www.zotero.org/groups/2913367/alan_db (Last accessed, Feb 17th, 2023)
60. Walker MF. 1970 The California Site Survey. *Publ. Astron. Soc. Pac.* **82**, 672–698. (<https://www.jstor.org/stable/40674892>)
61. Crawford D. 1991 Introduction to the Issues. International Astronomical Union Colloquium **112**, 1–4. (doi:10.1017/S0252921100003560)
62. Crawford D. 1991 Light Pollution – A Problem for All of Us. International Astronomical Union Colloquium **112**, 7–10. (doi:10.1017/S0252921100003572)
63. International Astronomical Union. 2023 Controlling Light Pollution. IAU Commission B7 https://www.iau.org/public/themes/light_pollution/
64. IDA. 2023 Light Pollution. International Dark-Sky Association. Retrieved from <http://darksky.org>
65. Meier, J. 2019. *By Night. An Investigation into Practices, Policies and Perspectives on Artificial Outdoor Lighting*. Ph.D. Thesis, Technische Universität Berlin, Berlin, Germany. pp.12–14. (doi:10.14279/depositonce-8285)
66. United Nations. 1996 "1979 Convention on Long-Range Transboundary Air Pollution and its Protocols." [E/]ECE/EB.AIR/50. UN (New York & Geneva). (<https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/237573?ln=en>)
67. United Nations. 2018. Report of the International Law Commission. Seventieth session (30 April 1 June and 2 July 10 August 2018) General Assembly, Official Records, Seventy third Session. Supplement No. 10 (A/73/10), VI. Protection of the atmosphere p.171. (<https://legal.un.org/ilc/reports/2018/>)
68. Einstein A. 1905 Über einen die Erzeugung und Verwandlung des Lichtes betreffenden heuristischen Gesichtspunkt [On a Heuristic Point of View about the Creation and Conversion of Light]. *Ann. Phys.* **17**(6), 132–148. (doi: 10.1002/andp.19053220607)
69. Nilsson D-E, Smolka J. 2021 Quantifying biologically essential aspects of environmental light. *J. R. Soc. Interface* **18**, 20210184. (doi: 10.1098/rsif.2021.0184)
70. BIPM. 2018 On the revision of the International System of Units (SI). Resolution 1 of the 26th CGPM. (<https://www.bipm.org/en/committees/cg/cgpm/26-2018/resolution-1>)
71. Grubisic M, Haim A, Bhusal P, Dominoni DM, Gabriel KMA, Jechow A., Kupprat F, Lerner A, Marchant P, et al. 2019 Light pollution, circadian photoreception, and melatonin in vertebrates. *Sustainability* **11**(22), 6400. doi: 10.3390/su11226400
72. CIE, Commission Internationale de l'Éclairage. 2017 Guide on the Limitation of the Effects of Obtrusive Light from Outdoor Lighting Installations, 2nd Edition CIE 150:2017. (doi: 10.25039/TR.150.2017)
73. Bará S. 2022 A note on the overall efficiency of outdoor lighting systems (1.1). *Zenodo*. (doi: 10.5281/zenodo.6588230)
74. He X, Zhang Z, Yang Z. 2021 Extraction of urban built-up area based on the fusion of night-time light data and point of interest data. *R. Soc. Open Sci.* **8**, 210838. (doi: 10.1098/rsos.210838)

75. Pérez-Sindín XS, Chen T-HK, Prishchepov AV. 2021 Are night-time lights a good proxy of economic activity in rural areas in middle and low-income countries? Examining the empirical evidence from Colombia. *Remote Sens. Appl.: Soc. Environ.* **24**, 100647. (doi: 10.1016/j.rsase.2021.100647)
76. Sordello R, Busson S, Cornuau JH, Deverchère P, Faure B, Guetté A, Hölker F, Kerbiriou C, Lengagne T, Le Viol I, et al. 2022 A plea for a worldwide development of dark infrastructure for biodiversity – Practical examples and ways to go forward. *Landsc Urban Plan.* **219**, 104332. (doi: 10.1016/j.landurbplan.2021.104332)
77. Ditmer MA, Stoner DC, Carter NH. 2021. Estimating the loss and fragmentation of dark environments in mammal ranges from light pollution. *Biol. Conserv.* **257**, 109135. (doi: 10.1016/j.biocon.2021.109135)
78. Bennie J, Duffy JP, Davies TW, Correa-Cano ME, Gaston KJ. 2015 Global trends in exposure to light pollution in natural terrestrial ecosystems. *Remote Sens.* **7**(3), 2715–2730. (doi: 10.3390/rs70302715)
79. Elvidge CD, Zhizhin M, Ghosh T, Hsu F-C, Taneja J. 2021 Annual Time Series of Global VIIRS Nighttime Lights Derived from Monthly Averages: 2012 to 2019. *Remote Sens.* **13**, 922. (doi: 10.3390/rs13050922)
80. Román MO, Wang Z, Sun Q, Kalb V, Miller SD, Molthan A, Schultz L, Bell J, Stokes EC, Pandey B, et al. 2018 NASA's Black Marble nighttime lights product suite. *Remote Sens. Environ.* **210**, 113–143. (doi: 10.1016/j.rse.2018.03.017)
81. Kyba CCM, Garz S, Kuechly H, Sánchez de Miguel A, Zamorano J, Fischer J, Hölker F. 2015 High-Resolution Imagery of Earth at Night: New Sources, Opportunities and Challenges. *Remote Sens.* **7**, 1–23. (doi: 10.3390/rs70100001)
82. Falchi F, Bará, S. 2021 Computing light pollution indicators for environmental assessment. *Nat. Sci.* **1**, e10019. (doi: 10.1002/ntls.10019)
83. Cox, D. T. C., de Miguel, A. S., Dzurjak, S. A., Bennie, J., & Gaston, K. J. (2020). National scale spatial variation in artificial light at night. *Remote Sensing*, **12**(10), 1591. (doi: 10.3390/rs12101591)
84. Sánchez de Miguel A, Bennie J, Rosenfeld E, Dzurjak S, Gaston KJ 2021 First Estimation of Global Trends in Nocturnal Power Emissions Reveals Acceleration of Light Pollution. *Remote Sens.* **13**, 3311. (doi: 10.3390/rs13163311)
85. Kyba CCM, Altintas YO, Walker CE, Newhouse M. 2023 Citizen scientists report global rapid reductions in the visibility of stars from 2011 to 2022. *Science* **379**, 265–268. (doi: 10.1126/science.abq7781)
86. Bará S, Rigueiro I, Lima RC. 2019 Monitoring transition: expected night sky brightness trends in different photometric bands. *J. Quant. Spectrosc. Radiat. Transf.* **239**, 106644. (doi: 10.1016/j.jqsrt.2019.106644).
87. Bará S, Bao-Varela C, Kocifaj M. 2023 Modeling the artificial night sky brightness at short distances from streetlights. *J. Quant. Spectrosc. Radiat. Transf.* **296**, 108456. (doi: 10.1016/j.jqsrt.2022.108456)
88. Bará S, Bao-Varela C. 2022 Skyglow inside your eyes: intraocular scattering and artificial brightness of the night sky. *Int. J. Sustain. Light.* in press. (doi: 10.48550/arXiv.2212.09103)
89. Levin N. 2017 The impact of seasonal changes on observed nighttime brightness from 2014 to 2015 monthly VIIRS DNB composites. *Remote Sens. Environ.* **193**, 150–164. (doi: 10.1016/j.rse.2017.03.003)
90. Wallner S, Kocifaj M. 2019 Impacts of surface albedo variations on the night sky brightness – A numerical and experimental analysis. *J. Quant. Spectrosc. Radiat. Transf.* **239**, 106648. (doi: 10.1016/j.jqsrt.2019.106648)
91. Doblér G, Ghandehari M, Koonin SE, Nazari R, Patrinos A, Sharma MS, Tafvizi A, Vo HT, Wurtele JS. 2015 Dynamics of the urban lightscape. *Inf. Syst.* **54**, 115–126. (doi: /10.1016/j.is.2015.06.002)
92. Bará S, Rodríguez-Arós A, Pérez M, Tosar B, Lima RC, Sánchez de Miguel A, Zamorano J. 2019 Estimating the relative contribution of streetlights, vehicles, and residential lighting to the urban night sky brightness. *Lighting Res. Technol.* **51**, 1092–1107. (doi: 10.1177/1477153518808337)
93. Román MO, Stokes EC, Shrestha R, Wang Z, Schultz L, Carlo EAS, Sun Q, Bell J, Molthan A, Kalb V, et al. 2019 Satellite-based assessment of electricity restoration efforts in Puerto Rico after Hurricane Maria. *PLoS ONE* **14**(6), e0218883. (doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0218883)
94. Elvidge CD, Ghosh T, Hsu FC, Zhizhin M, Bazilian M. 2020 The dimming of lights in China during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Remote Sens.* **12**(17), 2851. (doi: 10.3390/RS12172851)
95. Enenkel M, Shrestha RM, Stokes E, Román M, Wang Z, Espinosa MTM, Hajzmanova I, Ginnetti J, Vinck P. 2020 Emergencies do not stop at night: Advanced analysis of displacement based on satellite-derived nighttime light observations. 2020 *IBM J. Res. Dev.* **64**(1/2), 8:1–8:12. (doi: 10.1147/JRD.2019.2954404)
96. Bará S, Bao-Varela C, Lima RC. 2023 Quantitative evaluation of outdoor artificial light emissions using low Earth orbit radiometers. *J. Quant. Spectrosc. Radiat. Transf.* **295**, 108405. (doi: 10.1016/j.jqsrt.2022.108405)
97. Barentine JC, Walker CCE, Kocifaj M, Kundracik F, Juan A, Kanemoto J, Monrad CK. 2018 Skyglow changes over Tucson, Arizona, resulting from a municipal LED street lighting conversion. *J. Quant. Spectrosc. Radiat. Transf.* **212**, 10–23. (doi: 10.1016/j.jqsrt.2018.02.038)
98. Jechow A, Hölker F. 2019 Snowglow—The Amplification of Skyglow by Snow and Clouds can Exceed Full Moon Illuminance in Suburban Areas. *J. Imaging* **5**(8), 69. (doi: 10.3390/jimaging5080069)
99. Kyba CCM, Ruhtz T, Fischer J, Hölker F. 2012 Red is the new black: how the colour of urban skyglow varies with cloud cover. *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **425**, 701–708. (doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2966.2012.21559.x)
100. Puschig J, Schwöpe A, Posch T, Schwarz R. 2014 The night sky brightness at Potsdam-Babelsberg including overcast and moonlit conditions. *J. Quant. Spectrosc. Radiat. Transf.* **139**, 76–81. (doi: 10.1016/j.jqsrt.2013.12.011)
101. Ribas SJ, Torra J, Figueras F, Paricio S, Canal-Domingo R. 2016 How Clouds are Amplifying (or not) the Effects of ALAN. *Int. J. Sustain. Light.* **35**, 32–39. (doi: 10.22644/ijsl.2016.35.1.032).
102. Solano Lamphar HA, Kocifaj M. 2016 Urban night-sky luminance due to different cloud types: A numerical experiment, *Lighting Res. Technol.* **48**, 1017–1033. (doi: 10.1177/1477153515597732)
103. Bustamante-Calabria M, Sánchez de Miguel A, Martín-Ruiz S, Ortiz JL, Vilchez JM, Pelegrina A, Zamorano J, Bennie J, Gaston KJ. 2021 Effects of the COVID-19 Lockdown on Urban Light Emissions: Ground and Satellite Comparison. *Remote Sens.* **13**, 258. (doi: 10.3390/rs13020258)
104. Jechow A, Hölker F. 2020 Evidence That Reduced Air and Road Traffic Decreased Artificial Night-Time Skyglow during COVID-19 Lockdown in Berlin, Germany. *Remote Sens.* **12**, 3412. (doi:10.3390/rs12203412)
105. Sánchez de Miguel A, Bennie J, Rosenfeld E, Dzurjak S, Gaston KJ. 2022 Environmental risks from artificial nighttime lighting widespread and increasing across Europe. *Sci. Adv.* **8**, eabl6891 (doi: 10.1126/sciadv.abl6891)
106. Sánchez de Miguel A, Aubé M, Zamorano J, Kocifaj M, Roby J, Tapia C. 2017 Sky Quality Meter measurements in a colour-changing world. *Mon. Notices Royal Astron. Soc.* **467**(3), 2966–2979. (doi: 10.1093/mnras/stx145)
107. Kühne JL, van Grunsven RHA, Jechow A, Hölker F. 2021 Impact of Different Wavelengths of Artificial Light at Night on Phototaxis in Aquatic Insects. *Integr. Comp. Biol.* **61**(3), 1182–1190. (doi: 10.1093/icb/icab149)
108. Seymoure BM, Linares C, White J. 2019 Connecting spectral radiometry of anthropogenic light sources to the visual ecology of organisms. *J. Zool.* **308**, 93–110. (doi: 10.1111/jzo.12656)
109. O'Carroll DC, Warrant EJ. 2017 Vision in dim light: highlights and challenges. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. B* **372**, 20160062. (doi: 10.1098/rstb.2016.0062)
110. Deichmann JL, Ampudia Gatty C, Andía Navarro JM, Alonso A, Linares-Palomino R, Longcore T. 2021 Reducing the blue spectrum of artificial light at night minimises insect attraction in a tropical lowland forest. *Insect Conserv. Divers.* **14**, 247–259. (doi: 10.1111/icad.12479)
111. Donners M, van Grunsven RHA, Groenendijk D, van Langevelde F, Bikker JW, Longcore T, Veenendaal EM. 2018 Colors of attraction: Modeling insect flight to light behavior. *J. Exp. Zool.* **329**, 434–440. (doi: 10.1002/jez.2188)
112. Longcore T, Aldern HL, Eggers JF, Flores S, Franco L, Hirshfield-Yamanishi E, Petrinc LN, Yan WA, Barroso AM. 2015 Tuning the white light spectrum of light emitting diode lamps to reduce attraction of nocturnal arthropods. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. B* **370**, 20140125. (doi: 10.1098/rstb.2014.0125)
113. Longcore T, Rodríguez A, Witherington B, Penniman JF, Herf L, Herf M. 2018 Rapid assessment of lamp spectrum to quantify ecological effects of light at night. *J. Exp. Zool.* **329**, 511–521. (doi: 10.1002/jez.2184)
114. Fouquet R, Pearson PJG. 2012 The long run demand for lighting: elasticities and rebound effects in different phases of economic development. *Econ. Energy Environ.*

Policy 1(1), 83-100. (doi: 10.5547/2160-5890.1.1.8)

115. Zielińska-Dąbkowska KM, Xavia K. 2019 Global approaches to reduce light pollution from media architecture and non-static, self-luminous LED displays for mixed-use urban developments. *Sustainability* 11, 3446. (doi: 10.3390/su11123446)
116. Zielinska-Dabkowska KM, Bobkowska K. 2022 Rethinking Sustainable Cities at Night: Paradigm Shifts in Urban Design and City Lighting. *Sustainability* 14, 6062. (doi: 10.3390/su14106062)
117. Zielinska-Dabkowska KM. 2022 Healthier and Environmentally Responsible Sustainable

- Cities and Communities. A New Design Framework and Planning Approach for Urban Illumination. *Sustainability* 14, 14525. (doi: 10.3390/su142114525)
118. Marchant PR, Norman PD. 2022 To determine if changing to white light street lamps improves road safety: A multilevel longitudinal analysis of road traffic collisions during the relighting of Leeds, a UK city. *Appl. Spatial Analysis* 15, 1583–1608. (doi: 10.1007/s12061-022-09468-w)
119. Steinbach R, Perkins C, Tompson L, Johnson S, Armstrong B, Green J, Grundy C, Wilkinson P, Edwards P. 2015 The effect of reduced street lighting on road casualties and

- crime in England and Wales: controlled interrupted time series analysis. *J. Epidemiol. Community Health* 69, 1118–1124. (doi: 10.1136/jech-2015-206012)
120. Marchant PR. 2010 Have new street lighting schemes reduced crime in London? *Radical Statistics* 104, 32-42. https://www.radstats.org.uk/no104/Marchant_2_104.pdf
121. Bará S, Falchi F, Lima RC, Pawley M. 2021 Keeping light pollution at bay: a red-lines, target values, top-down approach. *Environmental Challenges* 5, 100212. (doi: 10.1016/j.envc.2021.100212)

Competing Interests

We declare no competing interests.

Funding

No specific funding was allocated to this work.