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Figure S1: Evolution of the yearly (a) amount of land exchanged ($L_t$) and (b) number of active countries ($C_t$) in the LTN between 2000 and 2015 used to calculate the Activity Index (See Methods section and Figure 3).
Figure S2: The Land Trade Network in Phase 1, 2, and 3 (panels (a), (b), and (c), respectively). The size of a node represents the total amount of land exchanged (imported + exported), the color refers to the country classification from Pure Importer to Pure Exporter. The size of an edge represents the total amount of land transferred from the target to the investor country and the color refers to the target country.
Network metrics

Figure S3: Boxplot distribution (median, 1st and 3rd quartiles, and outliers) of in and out degree (number of import and export partners), and ranking of top ten countries according to in and out degree in (a) Phase 1, (b) Phase 2 and (c) Phase 3.

Figure S4: Boxplot distribution (median, 1st and 3rd quartiles, and outliers) of authority and hub centrality, and ranking of top ten countries according to authority and hub centrality in (a) Phase 1, (b) Phase 2 and (c) Phase 3.
Figure S5: Boxplot distribution (median, 1st and 3rd quartiles, and outliers) of in and out deals, and ranking of top ten countries according to in and out deals in (a) Phase 1, (b) Phase 2 and (c) Phase 3.

Figure S6: Boxplot distribution (median, 1st and 3rd quartiles, and outliers) of in and out strength (ie. Imported and exported land, in Ha) and ranking of top ten countries according to in and out strength in (a) Phase 1, (b) Phase 2 and (c) Phase 3.
We find that at least half of the outlier countries (over 1% of relative export) are also outliers for the absolute out-strength (in hectares, Figure S6) during all phases. This means that their role is independent on the metric we use (absolute or relative). The other countries are more dependent on other metrics (number of deals or partners), rather than size, that classify them in different communities. However, note that Argentina, Brazil and India would not be considered as competitive exporters as they would have exported less than 1% of their territory by 2015 (0.3% for Argentina, 0.4% for Brazil and less than 0.1% for India). In Phase 2, this also applies to Russia and Tanzania, and in Phase 3 to Sudan, Uganda, Zambia, Tanzania and Nigeria.