Physical Activity and the Environment

Evidence Reviews – Appendix 3

1. Search Strategy

Search methods

A systematic search of electronic databases was conducted to identify relevant studies. Searching took place on 22-24 June 2016 for transport interventions and on 29 June 2016 for open space interventions. The strategies were developed by an information specialist at NICE and peer reviewed by a colleague from the same team.

The databases were searched using a combination of subject headings and free-text terms arranged in the following format:

- (Physical activity AND Transport interventions) OR Named interventions AND 2006-2016 AND Limits
- (Physical activity AND Open space interventions) AND 2006-2016 AND Limits

Date limits were applied to restrict the database results to 2006-Current. Database functionality was used, where available, to exclude:

- non-English language papers
- studies reporting experiments on animals
- editorials, letters and commentaries
- conference abstracts and posters
- theses and dissertations
- duplicates.

The search strategy was developed in MEDLINE (Ovid interface, 1946 to June 2016) after discussing with PHAC members at meeting 0 in June 2016. The strategy was adapted for use in the other databases, taking into account their size, search functionality and subject coverage. The following databases were searched:

- Applied Social Science Index and Abstracts (ASSIA) via ProQuest - 1987-Current
- Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL) via Wiley - Issue 5 of 12, May 2016
- Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews (CDSR) via Wiley - Issue 6 of 12, June 2016
- Database of Abstracts of Reviews of Effects (DARE) via Wiley - Issue 2 of 4, April 2015 (last date of entry, no longer being updated)

- Embase via Ovid - 1974 to 2016 June 22 [transport interventions]; 1974 to 2016 Week 26 [open space]
- Greenfile via EBSCO
- Health Management Information Consortium (HMIC) via Ovid - 1979 to May 2016
- MEDLINE via Ovid - 1946 to June Week 3 2016
- MEDLINE-in-Process via Ovid - Ovid MEDLINE(R) In-Process & Other Non-Indexed Citations June 22, 2016 [transport interventions]; June 28, 2016 [open space]
- Social Policy and Practice (SPP) via Ovid - 201604
- Transport via Ovid - Pre-1987 to May 2016
- Trials Register of Promoting Health Interventions (TRoPHI) via https://eppi.ioe.ac.uk/webdatabases4/Intro.aspx?ID=12

The following additional databases were searched to identify cost effectiveness literature:

- Benefit-Costs Results via http://www.wsipp.wa.gov/BenefitCost
- Health Technology Assessment database via Wiley - Issue 2 of 4, April 2016
- EconLit via Ovid - 1886 to May 2016
- EconPapers via http://econpapers.repec.org
- NHS Economics Evaluation Database (NHS EED) via Wiley - Issue 2 of 4, April 2015 (last date of entry, no longer being updated)

The MEDLINE strategy is presented below and the full strategies for the other sources are available on request.

The database searches were supplemented by extracting potentially relevant references from:

- The draft scope consultation for this topic
- NICE Evidence Update (April 2014) Physical activity and the environment
- Papers cited in the surveillance review “Consideration of an update of the public health guidance on ‘Physical activity and the environment’ (PH8). April 2014”.
- The internal NICE document “What’s new in your subject? Public health” from January 2015 to June 2016
- Suggestions received from topic experts, committee members, stakeholders and others

- Papers marked as possibly relevant during the screening process for “Surveillance report - physical activity: walking and cycling (2012) NICE guideline PH41”
- Papers cited in a forthcoming systematic review received in confidence.

The results from this reference harvesting were added to the relevant EndNote files.

For transport interventions, the 10,060 results (10041 from database searching and 19 from reference harvesting) were processed in EndNote and 2325 duplicates were removed using a combination of automated and manual processes. There were 7735 records remaining after removing the duplicates. The 7735 records were exported from EndNote in a ris file for uploading to EPPI-Reviewer.

For the open space interventions, the 10,366 results (10292 from database searching and 74 from reference harvesting) were processed in EndNote and 2578 duplicates were removed using a combination of automated and manual processes. There were 7788 records remaining after removing the duplicates. The 7788 records were exported from EndNote in a ris file for uploading to EPPI-Reviewer.

Systematic reviews potentially relevant to any of the review questions were marked during the screening process for further investigation. The reference lists of 18 relevant systematic reviews that closely met the inclusion criteria were checked. Of the studies included in these systematic reviews, twenty three appeared relevant and were screened at title and abstract. Full papers were ordered for 7 studies. Of these, 4 were included.

A search of relevant websites was conducted from 1 to 5 August 2016. The websites were selected after consultation with PHAC members at meeting 0 in June 2016 and they are listed below. The websites were browsed on screen and the details of documents relevant to any of the review questions were added to a Word document. 259 results were recorded in Word for initial screening.

Search strategy: transport interventions

Database name: MEDLINE
Date searched: 23 June 2016
Searcher: Paul Levay
QA: Tom Hudson
Database platform: Ovid
Database version: Ovid MEDLINE(R) 1946 to June Week 3 2016
No. of results: 3170

Ovid MEDLINE(R) 1946 to June Week 3 2016

Search Strategy:

#	Searches	Results
1	Physical Fitness/	24137
2	Recreation/	5913
3	hobbies/	836
4	leisure activities/	7225
5	Exercise/	78946
6	exp running/	15973
7	exp walking/	24628
8	bicycling/	8984
9	motor activity/	87976
10	((physical or leisure) adj1 (fit* or train* or activit* or endurance* or exercis*) adj3 (barrier* or hinder* or block* or obstacle* or restrict* or restrain* or obstruct* or inhibit* or imped* or delay* or constrain* or hindrance or decreas* or reduc* or discourag* or prevent* or refus* or facilitat* or uptak* or taking up or take up or increas* or impact* or effect* or improv* or enhanc* or encourag* or support* or promot* or optimiz* or optimis* or adher* or access* or motivat* or accept* or satisfaction or compliance or comply or complie* or availab* or provision or provid* or offer or incentiv* or start* or attend* or utiliz* or utilis* or sustain* or maintain* or disincentiv* or higher* or lower* or affect*)).ti,ab.	27347

11	(outdoor* adj3 (activit* or pursuit* or experience* or adventure* or event*) adj3 (barrier* or hinder* or block* or obstacle* or restrict* or restrain* or obstruct* or inhibit* or imped* or delay* or constrain* or hindrance or decreas* or reduc* or discourag* or prevent* or refus* or facilitat* or uptak* or taking up or take up or increas* or impact* or effect* or improv* or enhanc* or encourag* or support* or promot* or optimiz* or optimis* or adher* or access* or motivat* or accept* or satisfaction or compliance or comply or complie* or availab* or provision or provid* or offer or incentiv* or start* or attend* or utiliz* or utilis* or sustain* or maintain* or disincentiv* or higher* or lower* or affect*)).ti,ab.	219
12	((bicycle* or exercis* or fitness or walking* or running* or exertion or jogging* or bicycling* or cycling* or bike*1 or biking or hobbies or hobby or rollerskat* or roller skat* or roller blad* or rollerblad* or hike* or hiking or rambling* or ramblers or strength training or resilience training) adj3 (barrier* or hinder* or block* or obstacle* or restrict* or restrain* or obstruct* or inhibit* or imped* or delay* or constrain* or hindrance or decreas* or reduc* or discourag* or prevent* or refus* or facilitat* or uptak* or taking up or take up or increas* or impact* or effect* or improv* or enhanc* or encourag* or support* or promot* or optimiz* or optimis* or adher* or access* or motivat* or accept* or satisfaction or compliance or comply or complie* or availab* or provision or provid* or offer or incentiv* or start* or attend* or utiliz* or utilis* or sustain* or maintain* or disincentiv* or higher* or lower* or affect*)).ti,ab.	95350
13	((active* or multimodal* or multi-modal* or mixed or healthy or healthier or modal* shift*) adj3 (travel* or trip*1 or transport* or commute* or commuting)).ti,ab.	13162
14	(active* adj3 (living or lifestyle* or ageing or aging or play* or game*)).ti,ab.	7584
15	(physical activit* adj3 (daily or everyday* or incidental* or intens*)).ti,ab.	4167
16	((avoid* or barrier* or hinder* or block* or obstacle* or restrict* or restrain* or obstruct* or inhibit* or imped* or delay* or constrain* or hindrance or decreas* or reduc* or discourag* or prevent*) adj3 (sedentary or deskbound* or desk bound* or inactiv*)).ti,ab.	12668
17	or/1-16	320753
18	Transportation/	7998
19	exp Motor Vehicles/	17234
20	exp Railroads/	2584
21	Automobile Driving/	15694
22	parking facilities/	342

23	((cycle* or cycling or bike* or bicycl* or cyclist*) adj4 (route* or lane* or path* or trail* or infrastructure* or network* or corridor* or facilit* or storage* or store* or storing or rack* or park* or equipment* or segregat* or highway* or superhighway* or hire* or hiring)).ti,ab.	7906
24	((walk* or pedestrian*1) adj4 (route* or lane* or path* or trail* or infrastructure* or network* or corridor*)).ti,ab.	1130
25	(speed* adj3 (hump* or bump* or limit* or restrict* or reduc* or chicane* or camera* or mph or miles per hour or "m.p.h." or kph or "k.p.h." or kilometres per hour or kilometers per hour)).ti,ab.	4511
26	((limit* or restrict*) adj3 (mph or miles per hour or "m.p.h." or kph or "k.p.h." or kilometres per hour or kilometers per hour)).ti,ab.	79
27	((automobile* or autos or car or cars or motorcycle* or motorbike* or traffic or vehic* or motoring) adj3 (restrict* or restrain* or inhibit* or imped* or delay* or constrain* or decreas* or reduc* or discourag* or prevent* or disincentiv*)).ti,ab.	4479
28	((car or cars) adj3 (use* or usage* or trip* or journey* or share* or sharing or pool* or club*)).ti,ab.	887
29	((driver*1 or motorist*) adj3 (behaviour* or behavior*)).ti,ab.	858
30	((congestion or "rush hour" or tailback* or "tail back*" or road*) adj3 (charge* or charging or price or pricing or zone* or toll or tolls or pay or payment* or levy or levies or tax* or tariff* or duty or duties)).ti,ab.	199
31	((road* or street* or highway*) adj3 (safety or open or calm* or closing or closure* or restrict* or limit* or play* or design* or redesign* or layout* or placement* or chicane* or furniture*)).ti,ab.	2931
32	((junction* or intersection* or roundabout* or pavement* or sidewalk* or footpath* or trail* or kerb* or paving*) adj3 (safety or design* or redesign* or layout* or placement* or repair* or disrepair* or fix or fixing or maintenance* or broke* or dropped or dropping)).ti,ab.	933
33	((road* or street* or highway* or pedestrian*1 or zebra or toucan or pelican or puffin or cone or tactile) adj3 crossing*).ti,ab.	438
34	((parking* or car park*) adj3 (restrict* or restrain* or inhibit* or imped* or delay* or constrain* or decreas* or reduc* or discourag* or prevent* or disincentiv* or workplace* or ratio* or density or densities or charge* or charging or price or pricing or zone* or toll or tolls or pay or payment* or levy or levies or tax* or control*)).ti,ab.	65
35	((shared or share or sharing or allocat* or reallocat* or segregat* or demarcat* or tactile) adj3 (space* or street* or road* or highway* or route* or walkway* or pavement* or footpath* or path* or lane* or trail* or surface*)).ti,ab.	6586

36	(railtrail* or rail trail* or busway* or bus way or playstreet* or play street* or school street* or schoolstreet* or walkab* or safe* route* or cycleway* or cycle way* or traffic calm* or green corridor* or pedestrianis* or pedestrianiz* or carpool* or streetscap* or LEZ or low emission* zone* or rideshar*).ti,ab.	855
37	((bus or buses) adj4 (route* or lane* or infrastructure* or network* or corridor*)).ti,ab.	105
38	((public or community or affordable or rural or sustainable* or green) adj3 (travel* or transport*)).ti,ab.	1928
39	((mechanised or mechanized or motor*4 or personal or private) adj3 (travel* or transport* or vehicle*) adj3 (restrict* or restrain* or inhibit* or imped* or delay* or constrain* or decreas* or reduc* or discourag* or prevent* or disincentiv*)).ti,ab.	460
40	((railway* or light rail* or railroad* or bus or buses or tram or trams or tramway* or train or trains or streetcar* or subway* or underground rail* or non-auto or non-motor*4) adj3 (increas* or improv* or enhanc* or encourag* or support* or promot* or optimiz* or optimis* or adher* or access* or availab* or provision or provid* or offer or incentiv* or start* or utiliz* or utilis* or sustain* or maintain*)).ti,ab.	1732
41	(park adj2 ride*).ti,ab.	14
42	or/18-41	70224
43	17 and 42	5085
44	(ciclovia* or iconnect* or connect2* or guided bus* or "cycling city" or "cycling cities" or "walking city" or "walking cities" or Bikeability or "Cycling Cities and Towns" or "cycling demonstrator town*" or ipen or "International Physical activity and Environment Network" or open streets or dutch roundabout* or bikeshar*).ti,ab.	110
45	43 or 44	5148
46	animals/ not humans/	4233089
47	45 not 46	4782
48	limit 47 to (letter or historical article or comment or editorial or news)	168
49	47 not 48	4614
50	limit 49 to english language	4381
51	limit 50 to yr="2006-Current"	3332

52	remove duplicates from 51	3170

Search strategy – open space interventions

Database name: Medline
Date searched: 29 June 2016
Searcher: Paul Levay
QA: Tom Hudson
Database platform: Ovid
Database version: Ovid MEDLINE(R) 1946 to June Week 3 2016
No. of results: 3517

Database(s): **Ovid MEDLINE(R)** 1946 to June Week 3 2016

Search Strategy:

#	Searches	Results
1	Physical Fitness/	24137
2	Dancing/	2171
3	gardening/	679
4	Recreation/	5913
5	hobbies/	836
6	leisure activities/	7225
7	Exercise/	78946
8	exp Exercise Movement Techniques/	6142
9	exp Sports/	147020
10	exp walking/	24628
11	motor activity/	87976

12	((physical or leisure) adj1 (fit* or train* or activit* or endurance* or exercis*) adj3 (barrier* or hinder* or block* or obstacle* or restrict* or restrain* or obstruct* or inhibit* or imped* or delay* or constrain* or hindrance or decreas* or reduc* or discourag* or prevent* or refus* or facilitat* or uptak* or taking up or take up or increas* or impact* or effect* or improv* or enhanc* or encourag* or support* or promot* or optimiz* or optimis* or adher* or access* or motivat* or accept* or satisfaction or compliance or comply or complie* or availab* or provision or provid* or offer or incentiv* or start* or attend* or utiliz* or utilis* or sustain* or maintain* or disincentiv* or higher* or lower* or affect*)).ti,ab.	27347
13	(outdoor* adj3 (activit* or pursuit* or experience* or adventure* or event*) adj3 (barrier* or hinder* or block* or obstacle* or restrict* or restrain* or obstruct* or inhibit* or imped* or delay* or constrain* or hindrance or decreas* or reduc* or discourag* or prevent* or refus* or facilitat* or uptak* or taking up or take up or increas* or impact* or effect* or improv* or enhanc* or encourag* or support* or promot* or optimiz* or optimis* or adher* or access* or motivat* or accept* or satisfaction or compliance or comply or complie* or availab* or provision or provid* or offer or incentiv* or start* or attend* or utiliz* or utilis* or sustain* or maintain* or disincentiv* or higher* or lower* or affect*)).ti,ab.	219
14	((bicycle* or aqua* or exercis* or fitness or walking* or running* or sport* or yoga or tai ji or tai chi or swim* or exertion or jogging* or bicycling* or cycling* or bike*1 or biking or dancing or dance* or gardening* or hobbies or hobby or athletic* or boxing* or football* or golf* or gym* or hockey* or martial art* or karate* or judo or mountaineer* or rugby* or skating* or soccer* or ski* or snowboard* or snow board* or volleyball* or water ski* or wakeboard* or weight lift* or wrestling* or tennis* or badminton* or canoe* or yacht* or rowing or kayak* or bodyboard* or windsurf* or sail* or basketball* or netball* or cricket* or baseball* or lacrosse* or rollerskat* or roller skat* or roller blad* or rollerblad* or hike* or hiking or rambling* or ramblers or orienteering* or climbing or abseil* or aerobics or pilates or "keep fit" or circuits or strength training or resilience training) adj3 (barrier* or hinder* or block* or obstacle* or restrict* or restrain* or obstruct* or inhibit* or imped* or delay* or constrain* or hindrance or decreas* or reduc* or discourag* or prevent* or refus* or facilitat* or uptak* or taking up or take up or increas* or impact* or effect* or improv* or enhanc* or encourag* or support* or promot* or optimiz* or optimis* or adher* or access* or motivat* or accept* or satisfaction or compliance or comply or complie* or availab* or provision or provid* or offer or incentiv* or start* or attend* or utiliz* or utilis* or sustain* or maintain* or disincentiv* or higher* or lower* or affect*)).ti,ab.	193387
15	((active* or multimodal* or multi-modal* or mixed or healthy or healthier or modal* shift*) adj3 (travel* or trip*1 or transport* or commute* or commuting)).ti,ab.	13162
16	(active* adj3 (living or lifestyle* or ageing or aging or play* or game*)).ti,ab.	7584
17	(physical activit* adj3 (daily or everyday* or incidental* or intens*)).ti,ab.	4167

18	((avoid* or barrier* or hinder* or block* or obstacle* or restrict* or restrain* or obstruct* or inhibit* or imped* or delay* or constrain* or hindrance or decreas* or reduc* or discourag* or prevent*) adj3 (sedentary or deskbound* or desk bound* or inactiv*)).ti,ab.	12668
19	or/1-18	474847
20	Forests/	2342
21	Wetlands/	4497
22	exp fresh water/	45821
23	wilderness/	183
24	trees/	21431
25	bathing beaches/	960
26	public facilities/	1023
27	parks, recreational/	106
28	cities/	11279
29	urban population/	51695
30	urbanization/	4785
31	or/20-30	137247
32	Esthetics/	9666
33	environment design/	4630
34	"Environmental Restoration and Remediation"/	5507
35	Conservation of Natural Resources/	30859
36	"Architecture as Topic"/	2430
37	Toilet facilities/	1255

38	parking facilities/	342
39	"Play and playthings"/	7812
40	health promotion/	61011
41	exp social planning/	9425
42	Health Impact Assessment/	316
43	exp Public Policy/	120310
44	exp Policy Making/	21302
45	or/32-44	250272
46	31 and 45	11139
47	(natural environment* or nature reserve* or nature preserve* or moors or moorland* or heathland* or rural or countryside* or green* or field* or garden*1 or allotment* or outdoor* or park or parks or parkland* or wood or woods or woodland* or forest* or tree* or wetland* or river* or lake* or pond* or canal* or waterway* or sea or seaside* or seashore* or beach* or coast* or foreshore* or piazza* or plaza* or square* or public space* or public realm* or public land* or common land* or recreation* space* or recreation* area* or recreation* ground* or conservation* or footpath* or pedestrianis* or pedestrianiz* or piazza* or pavement* or sidewalk* or footpath* or streetscape* or openspace* or open space* or greyspace* or grey space* or bluespace* or blue space*).ti,ab.	1166021
48	((urban* or town* or city* or cities* or neighbourhood or neighborhood*) adj4 (environment* or square* or plaza* or space*)).ti,ab.	6548
49	47 or 48	1169721
50	(impact adj4 assess*).ti,ab.	30770
51	((local or regional* or city or cities or county* or council* or neighbourhood* or neighborhood* or town* or administration*) adj3 (plan or plans or planning or policy or policies or recommendation* or strategy or strategies or guidance* or guideline*)).ti,ab.	12353
52	(planning adj4 (application* or policy or policies or recommendation* or strategy or strategies or guidance* or guideline*)).ti,ab.	7033
53	((cycle* or cycling or bike* or bicycl* or cyclist*) adj4 (route* or lane* or path* or trail* or infrastructure* or network* or corridor* or facilit* or storage* or store* or storing or rack* or park* or equipment* or segregat* or highway* or superhighway* or hire* or hiring)).ti,ab.	7906

54	((pavement* or sidewalk* or footpath* or trail*) adj4 (safety or design* or redesign* or layout* or placement* or sign or signs or signpost* or signage or wayfind* or way find*)).ti,ab.	287
55	((walk* or pedestrian*1) adj4 (route* or lane* or path* or trail* or infrastructure* or network* or corridor*)).ti,ab.	1130
56	(play* adj4 (ground* or area* or facility or facilities or amenit* or equipment* or space*)).ti,ab.	2862
57	(playground* or playspace*).ti,ab.	1093
58	or/50-57	62430
59	49 and 58	8418
60	(eaprs or "environmental assessment of public recreation spaces" or soparc or "System for Observing Play and Recreation in Communities" or "healthy town*" or "healthy new town*" or "age friendly city*" or "age friendly cities" or "urban 40" or "pocket park*" or "play street*" or "health* street*").ti,ab.	70
61	(environment* adj4 (campaign* or interven* or program* or project* or initiative* or scheme*)).ti,ab.	7133
62	((pavement* or sidewalk* or sign or signs or signpost* or signage or wayfind* or way find* or path* or trail* or footpath* or age friendl* or lighting or fencing or traffic* or securit* or securing or cycleway* or cycle way* or cycling* or bicycling* or transport* or parking or car park* or toilet* or lavator* or bathroom* or washroom* or shelter* or bench or benches or seat or seats or seating or opening time* or opening hour*) adj4 (natural environment* or nature reserve* or nature preserve* or moors or moorland* or heathland* or rural or countryside* or green* or field* or garden*1 or allotment* or outdoor* or park or parks or parkland* or wood or woods or woodland* or forest* or tree* or wetland* or river* or lake* or pond* or canal* or waterway* or sea or seaside* or seashore* or beach* or coast* or foreshore* or piazza* or plaza* or square* or public space* or public realm* or public land* or common land* or recreation* space* or recreation* area* or recreation* ground* or openspace* or open space* or greyspace* or grey space* or bluespace* or blue space*)).ti,ab.	11778
63	((upgrad* or promot* or landscap* or architect* or renew* or regenerat* or conserv* or preserv* or redesign* or structur* or layout* or facilit* or feature* or amenit* or develop* or design* or land us* or aesthetic* or esthetic* or access* or connect* or inclusiv* or safety or renovat* or refurb* or management* or improv* or adapt* or enhanc* or optimiz* or optimis* or sustain* or maintain* or maintenance* or beautify or beautifies or beautific* or infrastructur* or campaign* or intervention* or program* or project* or initiative* or scheme*) adj4 (natural environment* or nature reserve* or nature preserve* or moors or moorland* or heathland* or rural or countryside* or green* or field* or garden*1 or allotment* or outdoor* or park or parks or parkland* or wood or woods or woodland* or forest* or tree* or wetland* or river* or lake* or pond* or canal* or waterway* or sea or seaside* or seashore* or beach* or coast* or foreshore* or piazza* or	99022

	plaza* or square* or public space* or public realm* or public land* or common land* or recreation* space* or recreation* area* or recreation* ground* or openspace* or open space* or greyspace* or grey space* or bluespace* or blue space*)).ti,ab.	
64	46 or 59 or 60 or 61 or 62 or 63	131080
65	19 and 64	6369
66	animals/ not humans/	4233089
67	65 not 66	5355
68	limit 67 to (letter or historical article or comment or editorial or news)	132
69	67 not 68	5223
70	limit 69 to english language	5017
71	limit 70 to yr="2006-Current"	3736
72	remove duplicates from 71	3517

Website searching

The following websites were browsed from 1 to 5 August 2016:

- Active Living Research http://activelivingresearch.org/
- Active Scotland http://www.activescotland.org.uk/
- Association for the Study of Obesity http://www.aso.org.uk/
- Association of Directors of Public Health http://www.adph.org.uk/
- Big Lottery Fund https://www.biglotteryfund.org.uk/
- Centre for Active Design https://centerforactivedesign.org/
- Chartered Institute of Environmental Health http://www.cieh.org/
- Chartered Institute of Logistics and Transport https://www.ciltuk.org.uk/
- Children's Commissioner for England http://www.childrenscommissioner.gov.uk/
- Cycling UK http://www.cyclinguk.org/

- Department for Transport https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/department-for-transport
- Design Council http://www.designcouncil.org.uk/
- Environment Agency https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/environment-agency
- Faculty of Public Health http://www.fph.org.uk
- Greenspace Scotland http://greenspacescotland.org.uk/
- Healthy Transport http://www.healthytransport.com/tools-and-projects
- Living Streets https://www.livingstreets.org.uk/
- Local Government Association http://www.local.gov.uk/
- London Cycling Campaign http://lcc.org.uk/
- London Play http://www.londonplay.org.uk/
- National Audit Office http://www.nao.org.uk/
- Natural England https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/natural-england
- Natural Resources Wales https://naturalresources.wales/?lang=en
- NHS England https://www.england.nhs.uk/
- Public Health Agency for Northern Ireland http://www.publichealth.hscni.net/
- Public Health England https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/public-health-england
- Public Health Wales http://www.publichealthwales.wales.nhs.uk/
- Ramblers http://www.ramblers.org.uk/
- Royal Society for Public Health https://www.rsph.org.uk/
- Royal Town Planning Institute http://www.rtpi.org.uk/
- RNIB http://www.rnib.org.uk
- Scottish Government http://www.gov.scot/
- Scottish Natural Heritage http://www.snh.gov.uk/
- Scottish Public Health Network http://www.scotphn.net/
- Scottish Public Health Observatory http://www.scotpho.org.uk/
- Sport and Recreation Alliance http://www.sportandrecreation.org.uk/
- Sport England https://www.sportengland.org/

- Sustrans http://www.sustrans.org.uk/
- Town and Country Planning Association http://www.tcpa.org.uk/
- Transport for Greater Manchester http://www.tfgm.com/Pages/default.aspx
- Transport for London https://tfl.gov.uk/corporate/publications-and-reports/
- Transport Research & Innovation Portal http://www.transport-research.info/
- Transport Scotland http://www.transport.gov.scot/
- TRL http://www.trl.co.uk/
- UK Active http://www.ukactive.com/
- UK Health Forum http://www.ukhealthforum.org.uk/
- Urban Transport Group http://www.urbantransportgroup.org/
- Welsh Assembly Government http://www.assembly.wales/en/Pages/Home.aspx
- Wheels for Wellbeing http://www.wheelsforwellbeing.org.uk/

The following websites were searched on 5 August 2016 for terms relating to cycling, walking, physical activity, physical activities, active living, active travel and active transport:

- NICE Evidence Search http://www.evidence.nhs.uk - searches restricted to Area of Interest>Public Health and filters applied for Policy & Service Development, Population Intelligence, Guidance, Primary Research.
- OpenGrey http://www.opengrey.eu/ - searches restricted to documents from the UK and in report format from after 2006 e.g. cycling origin:"GB" doctype:(R - Report) and excluded dissertations.
- Google.co.uk - https://www.google.co.uk/ results were restricted to the .gov.uk, .org.uk and .nhs.uk domains, pdf format and the first 100 results (or 10 pages) were reviewed.

2. Review Protocols

Topic 1	**Transport interventions in the built or natural environment**	
Component of protocol	Description	Additional comments
Review question 1	Which transport interventions are effective and cost-effective in encouraging and supporting physical activity in all population groups, including those less able to be physically active?	
Context and objectives	To determine the effectiveness and cost effectiveness of interventions that focus on transport, including the planning and provision of walking and cycling routes, prioritising the needs of active transport users and the provision of public transport, to: • support and encourage people to build physical activity into their daily lives • increase opportunities for, and uptake of, formal or informal recreational activity • reduce sedentary time • increase the opportunity for, and uptake of, active travel such as walking or cycling (including the use of adapted cycles)	
Types of study to be included/excluded	Inclusions: Comparative studies including: • Randomised or non-randomised controlled trials • Before and after studies • Cohort studies • Case-control studies Economic studies: • Economic evaluations • Cost-utility (cost per QALY) • Cost benefit (i.e. Net benefit)	• If there is a large number of includes for the question, evidence may be prioritised, where available, by study design (e.g. RCTs prioritised over observational studies) in consultation with PHAC. Where there is a lack of higher quality

Topic 1	**Transport interventions in the built or natural environment**	
Component of protocol	Description	Additional comments
	• Cost-effectiveness (Cost per unit of effect) • Cost minimisation • Cost-consequence	evidence for different population groups, in particular those who are less able to be physically active, a lower quality of evidence may be considered. • It is unlikely that cross-sectional and other surveys will be included in the review unless there is an absence of other evidence. This will be agreed with PHAC as appropriate. • Systematic reviews will only be used as a source for primary evidence. • Only full economic analyses will be included – papers reporting costs only will be excluded.
Participants/population	Whole population (adults and children) with particular consideration of groups who are less able to be physically active including: • Older people	

Topic 1	**Transport interventions in the built or natural environment**	
Component of protocol	Description	Additional comments
	• People with disabilities including mental, physical, sensory and learning impairments which impact on their ability to be physically active	
Intervention(s)	Interventions which prioritise the needs of pedestrians, cyclists and users of other modes of active transport, including: • re-allocating road space to support physically active modes of transport such as cycling and walking e.g. shared road space • interventions that enable people with restricted mobility to be physically active by ensuring their local environments are accessible and can be used by all groups e.g. road crossing times, introduction/improvement of pedestrian crossings • planning and providing walking and cycling networks (such as Connect2), infrastructure links with existing networks and facilities e.g. signed only and segregated walking/cycle paths, wayfinding networks/signage, on-street cycle parking • public transport provision, networks, links and facilities (e.g. cycle parking) • parking restrictions and charges e.g. controlled parking zones, parking charges, waiting and loading restrictions • traffic-calming measures to restrict vehicle speeds e.g. sign only speed limits, physical interventions such as road humps and speed cushions • speed restrictions • road-user charging schemes e.g. congestion zones, local emission zones (LEZs) • temporary road closures e.g. ciclovia, 'School Streets' • Other named interventions e.g. 'Cycling Cities', 'Walking Cities'	The following interventions will not be included: • Interventions to increase physical activity as part of managing chronic or other conditions. • Interventions that aim to change individual behaviour by providing and encouraging people to take up activities that take place in the built or natural environment e.g. exercise classes, green gyms and organised walks. • Interventions covered by PH41 (walking and cycling) which covers the design, deliver and promotion of interventions within

Topic 1	**Transport interventions in the built or natural environment**	
Component of protocol	Description	Additional comments
		the environment rather than changes to the physical environment itself. • Re traffic calming, speed cushions and speed restrictions to be aware that may be overlap with PH31 and PH29
Comparator(s)/control	Comparators that will be considered are: • Other interventions • Status quo/do nothing/control • Time (before and after) or area (i.e. matched city a vs b) comparisons	
Outcome(s)	The outcomes that will be considered when assessing the impact on physical activity are: Primary outcomes: • total physical activity (as measured by e.g. time/distance/number of steps/levels of activity/levels of recommended PA) • total sedentary time (as measured by time) • Domain-specific physical activity levels (active travel or physical activity in everyday life (such as measures of walking, cycling or active play)) • public transport use (as a proxy measure of physical activity) Secondary outcomes:	• Included studies should have an indicator of physical activity reported. • Included studies reporting any health outcomes will be noted in EPPI/the evidence tables and forwarded on to EMU for economic modelling and not for the purposes of this review.

Topic 1	**Transport interventions in the built or natural environment**	
Component of protocol	Description	Additional comments
	• changes to road environment e.g. introduction of traffic calming measures • changes to transport (such as changes in modal share) • vehicle speeds • car use	

Topic 1	**Transport interventions in the built or natural environment**	
Component of protocol	Description	Additional comments
Review question 2	Does the effectiveness and cost effectiveness vary for different population groups in terms of encouraging and supporting physical activity? In particular, does this vary for those groups who are less able to be physically active, and if so how?	
Context and objectives	To determine any variation in the effectiveness and cost effectiveness of transport interventions (such as the planning and provision of walking and cycling routes, prioritising the needs of active transport users and the provision of public transport) between different population groups, in particular for groups who are less able to be physically active.	
Types of study to be included/excluded	Inclusions: Comparative studies including: • Randomised or non-randomised controlled trials • Before and after studies • Cohort studies • Case-control studies	• If there is a large number of includes for the question, evidence may be prioritised, where available, by study design (e.g. RCTs prioritised over

Topic 1	**Transport interventions in the built or natural environment**	
Component of protocol	Description	Additional comments
	Economic studies: • Economic evaluations • Cost-utility (cost per QALY) • Cost benefit (i.e. Net benefit) • Cost-effectiveness (Cost per unit of effect) • Cost minimisation • Cost-consequence	observational studies) in consultation with PHAC. Where there is a lack of higher quality evidence for different population groups, in particular those who are less able to be physically active, a lower quality of evidence may be considered. • It is unlikely that cross-sectional and other surveys will be included in the review unless there is an absence of other evidence. This will be agreed with PHAC as appropriate. • Systematic reviews will only be used as a source for primary evidence. • Only full economic analyses will be included – papers

Topic 1	**Transport interventions in the built or natural environment**	
Component of protocol	Description	Additional comments
		reporting costs only will be excluded.
Participants/population	Whole population (adults and children) with particular consideration of groups who are less able to be physically active including: • Older people • People with disabilities including mental, physical, sensory and learning impairments which impact on their ability to be physically active	
Intervention(s)	Interventions which prioritise the needs of pedestrians, cyclists and users of other modes of active transport, including: • re-allocating road space to support physically active modes of transport such as cycling and walking e.g. shared road space • interventions that enable people with restricted mobility to be physically active by ensuring their local environments are accessible and can be used by all groups e.g. road crossing times, introduction/improvement of pedestrian crossings • planning and providing walking and cycling networks (such as Connect2), infrastructure links with existing networks and facilities e.g. signed only and segregated walking/cycle paths, wayfinding networks/signage, on-street cycle parking • public transport provision, networks, links and facilities (e.g. cycle parking) • parking restrictions and charges e.g. controlled parking zones, parking charges, waiting and loading restrictions • traffic-calming measures to restrict vehicle speeds e.g. sign only speed limits, physical interventions such as road humps and speed cushions • speed restrictions	The following interventions will not be included: • Interventions to increase physical activity as part of managing chronic or other conditions. • Interventions that aim to change individual behaviour by providing and encouraging people to take up activities that take place in the built or natural environment e.g. exercise classes, green gyms and organised walks.

Topic 1	**Transport interventions in the built or natural environment**	
Component of protocol	Description	Additional comments
	• road-user charging schemes e.g. congestion zones, local emission zones (LEZs) • temporary road closures e.g. ciclovia, 'School Streets' • Other named interventions e.g. 'Cycling Cities', 'Walking Cities'	• Interventions covered by PH41 (walking and cycling) which covers the design, deliver and promotion of interventions within the environment rather than changes to the physical environment itself. • Re traffic calming, speed cushions and speed restrictions to be aware that may be overlap with PH31 and PH29
Comparator(s)/control	Comparators that will be considered are: • Other intervention • Status quo Time (before and after) or area (i.e. matched city a vs b) comparisons	
Outcome(s)	The following outcomes will be considered when assessing variation in factors such as age, disability, special needs: Primary outcomes: • total physical activity (as measured by e.g. time/distance/number of steps/levels of activity/levels of recommended PA) • total sedentary time (as measured by time)	• Included studies should have an indicator of physical activity reported. • Included studies reporting any health outcomes will be noted in EPPI/the

Topic 1	**Transport interventions in the built or natural environment**	
Component of protocol	Description	Additional comments
	• Domain-specific physical activity levels (active travel or physical activity in everyday life (such as measures of walking, cycling or active play)). • public transport use (as a proxy measure of physical activity) according to factors such as age disability special needs etc Secondary outcomes: • car use according to factors such as age, disability, special needs etc	evidence tables and forwarded on to EMU for economic modelling and not for the purposes of this review.

Topic 1	**Transport interventions in the built or natural environment**	
Component of protocol	Description	Additional comments
Review question 3	Are there any adverse or unintended effects of transport interventions in terms of (1) physical activity and (2) other aspects of health and wellbeing? a. Do these vary for different population groups, in particular those who are less able to be physically active? b. How can the effects of any unintended or adverse effects be minimised?	
Context and objectives	To determine if transport interventions which encourage and support physical activity have any unintended or adverse effects in all groups, particularly in those groups that are less able to be physically active.	

Topic 1	**Transport interventions in the built or natural environment**	
Component of protocol	Description	Additional comments
Types of study to be included/excluded	Inclusions: Comparative studies including: • Randomised or non-randomised controlled trials • Before and after studies • Cohort studies • Case-control studies Economic studies: • Economic evaluations • Cost-utility (cost per QALY) • Cost benefit (i.e. Net benefit) • Cost-effectiveness (Cost per unit of effect) • Cost minimisation • Cost-consequence Qualitative studies: • Focus groups • Interviews	• If there is a large number of includes for the question, effectiveness evidence may be prioritised, where available, by study design (e.g. RCTs prioritised over observational studies) in consultation with PHAC. Where there is a lack of higher quality evidence for different population groups, in particular those who are less able to be physically active, a lower quality of evidence may be considered. • It is unlikely that cross-sectional and other surveys will be included in the review unless there is an absence of other evidence. This will be

Topic 1	**Transport interventions in the built or natural environment**	
Component of protocol	Description	Additional comments
		agreed with PHAC as appropriate. • Systematic reviews will only be used as a source for primary evidence. • Only full economic analyses will be included – papers reporting costs only will be excluded. Only qualitative studies from the UK which provide insight into the unintended consequences or adverse effects of specific interventions and how these vary by population group will be included. Studies will be limited to the UK (rather than EU/OECD countries as for effectiveness studies) as the context (national legislation, local government structures

Topic 1	**Transport interventions in the built or natural environment**	
Component of protocol	Description	Additional comments
		and powers etc) will be particularly relevant here. Qualitative studies which are linked to interventions identified through reviews 1 and 2 may be prioritised if the volume of studies is high. This would be agreed with PHAC.
Participants/population	Whole population (adults and children) with particular consideration of groups who are less able to be physically active including: • Older people • People with disabilities including mental, physical, sensory and learning impairments which impact on their ability to be physically active	
Intervention(s)	Interventions which prioritise the needs of pedestrians, cyclists and users of other modes of active transport, including: • re-allocating road space to support physically active modes of transport such as cycling and walking e.g. shared road space • interventions that enable people with restricted mobility to be physically active by ensuring their local environments are accessible and can be used by all groups e.g. road crossing times, introduction/improvement of pedestrian crossings	The following interventions will not be included: • Interventions to increase physical activity as part of managing chronic or other conditions. • Interventions that aim to change individual

Topic 1	**Transport interventions in the built or natural environment**	
Component of protocol	Description	Additional comments
	• planning and providing walking and cycling networks (such as Connect2), infrastructure links with existing networks and facilities e.g. signed only and segregated walking/cycle paths, wayfinding networks/signage, on-street cycle parking • public transport provision, networks, links and facilities (e.g. cycle parking) • parking restrictions and charges e.g. controlled parking zones, parking charges, waiting and loading restrictions • traffic-calming measures to restrict vehicle speeds e.g. sign only speed limits, physical interventions such as road humps and speed cushions • speed restrictions • road-user charging schemes e.g. congestion zones, local emission zones (LEZs) • temporary road closures e.g. ciclovia, 'School Streets' • Other named interventions e.g. 'Cycling Cities', 'Walking Cities'	behaviour by providing and encouraging people to take up activities that take place in the built or natural environment e.g. exercise classes, green gyms and organised walks. • Interventions covered by PH41 (walking and cycling) which covers the design, deliver and promotion of interventions within the environment rather than changes to the physical environment itself.
Comparator(s)/control	Comparators that will be considered are: • Other intervention • Status quo Time (before and after) or area (i.e. matched city a vs b) comparisons	
Outcome(s)	From comparative studies	• Included studies should have an

Topic 1	**Transport interventions in the built or natural environment**	
Component of protocol	Description	Additional comments
	Indicators of physical activity and variation in these according to factors such as age, disability, special needs: • decrease in total physical activity • increase in total sedentary time • decrease in domain-specific physical activity levels • decrease in public transport use (as a proxy measure of physical activity) Other aspects of health and wellbeing and variation in these according to factors such as age, disability, special needs, including: • Rates/numbers of accidents, injuries or fatalities e.g. road traffic accidents, falls <u>From qualitative studies</u> Adverse/unintended effects of interventions in terms of: • Intentions to be physically active • Perceptions (such as barriers, stigma, safety, isolation, feeling of exclusion, lack of sense of belonging and connectedness, increased fear of crime)	indicator of physical activity reported. • Included studies reporting any health outcomes will be noted in EPPI/the evidence tables and forwarded on to EMU for economic modelling and not for the purposes of this review.

Topic 1	**Transport interventions in the built or natural environment**	
Component of protocol	Description	Additional comments
Review question 4	What factors relating to transport interventions to encourage and support physical activity, ensure that interventions are acceptable to all groups, including those less able to be physically active?	
Context and objectives	To identify any factors relating to transport interventions that may facilitate the uptake of opportunities to be physically active or conversely prevent uptake of those opportunities. In particular to identify factors which may facilitate uptake by one group but in doing so create barriers for others.	
Types of study to be included/excluded	Inclusions: Qualitative studies: • Focus groups • Interviews	Exclusions: • All quantitative studies • Systematic reviews will only be included as a source for primary evidence. Only qualitative studies from the UK which provide insight into the unintended consequences or adverse effects of specific interventions and how these vary by population group will be included. Studies will be limited to the UK (rather than EU/OECD countries as for effectiveness studies) as the context (national

Topic 1	**Transport interventions in the built or natural environment**	
Component of protocol	Description	Additional comments
		legislation, local government structures and powers etc) will be particularly relevant here. Qualitative studies which are linked to interventions identified through reviews 1 and 2 may be prioritised if the volume of studies is high. This would be agreed with PHAC.
Participants/population	Whole population (adults and children) with particular consideration of groups who are less able to be physically active including: • Older people • People with disabilities including mental, physical, sensory and learning impairments which impact on their ability to be physically active	
Intervention(s)	Interventions which prioritise the needs of pedestrians, cyclists and users of other modes of active transport, including: • re-allocating road space to support physically active modes of transport such as cycling and walking e.g. shared road space • interventions that enable people with restricted mobility to be physically active by ensuring their local environments are accessible and can be used by all groups e.g. road crossing times, introduction/improvement of pedestrian crossings • planning and providing walking and cycling networks (such as Connect2), infrastructure links with existing networks and	The following interventions will not be included: • Interventions to increase physical activity as part of managing chronic or other conditions. • Interventions that aim to change individual

Topic 1	**Transport interventions in the built or natural environment**	
Component of protocol	Description	Additional comments
	facilities e.g. signed only and segregated walking/cycle paths, wayfinding networks/signage, on-street cycle parking • public transport provision, networks, links and facilities (e.g. cycle parking) • parking restrictions and charges e.g. controlled parking zones, parking charges, waiting and loading restrictions • traffic-calming measures to restrict vehicle speeds e.g. sign only speed limits, physical interventions such as road humps and speed cushions • speed restrictions • road-user charging schemes e.g. congestion zones, local emission zones (LEZs) • temporary road closures e.g. ciclovia, 'School Streets' • Other named interventions e.g. 'Cycling Cities', 'Walking Cities'	behaviour by providing and encouraging people to take up activities that take place in the built or natural environment e.g. exercise classes, green gyms and organised walks. • Interventions covered by PH41 (walking and cycling) which covers the design, deliver and promotion of interventions within the environment rather than changes to the physical environment itself.
Comparator(s)/control	Comparators that will be considered are: • Other intervention • Status quo Time (before and after) or area (i.e. matched city a vs b) comparisons	
Outcome(s)	• Intentions (e.g. to be physically active) • Perceptions (e.g. feelings of inclusion, increased sense of belonging and connectedness, increased sense of safety, reduced fear of crime)	

Topic 1	**Transport interventions in the built or natural environment**	
Component of protocol	Description	Additional comments
	• Preferences (e.g. for different modes of transport) • Knowledge / Attitudes / beliefs (e.g. of interventions) • Acceptability of interventions	

Topic 1	**Transport interventions in the built or natural environment**	
Component of protocol	Description	Additional comments
Review question 5	Who needs to be involved to ensure that transport interventions are effective and cost-effective for everyone in encouraging and supporting them to be physically active (including those less able to be physically active)?	
Context and objectives	To determine what the key characteristics of the people involved in the development and delivery of transport interventions (e.g. job roles and competencies) are which affect an intervention's effectiveness and cost effectiveness.	
Types of study to be included/excluded	Inclusions: Comparative studies including: • Randomised or non-randomised controlled trials • Before and after studies • Cohort studies • Case-control studies Economic studies: • Economic evaluations • Cost-utility (cost per QALY) • Cost benefit (i.e. Net benefit) • Cost-effectiveness (Cost per unit of effect) • Cost minimisation	• If there is a large number of includes for the question, effectiveness evidence may be prioritised, where available, by study design (e.g. RCTs prioritised over observational studies) in consultation with PHAC. Where there is a lack of higher quality evidence for different

Topic 1	**Transport interventions in the built or natural environment**	
Component of protocol	Description	Additional comments
	• Cost-consequence Qualitative studies: • Focus groups • Interviews	population groups, in particular those who are less able to be physically active, a lower quality of evidence may be considered. • It is unlikely that cross-sectional and other surveys will be included in the review unless there is an absence of other evidence. This will be agreed with PHAC as appropriate. • Systematic reviews will only be used as a source for primary evidence. • Only full economic analyses will be included – papers reporting costs only will be excluded. Only qualitative studies from the UK which provide insight into the

Topic 1	**Transport interventions in the built or natural environment**	
Component of protocol	Description	Additional comments
		unintended consequences or adverse effects of specific interventions and how these vary by population group will be included. Studies will be limited to the UK (rather than EU/OECD countries as for effectiveness studies) as the context (national legislation, local government structures and powers etc) will be particularly relevant here. Qualitative studies which are linked to interventions identified through reviews 1 and 2 may be prioritised if the volume of studies is high. This would be agreed with PHAC.
Participants/population	Whole population (adults and children) with particular consideration of groups who are less able to be physically active including: • Older people	

Topic 1	**Transport interventions in the built or natural environment**	
Component of protocol	Description	Additional comments
	• People with disabilities including mental, physical, sensory and learning impairments which impact on their ability to be physically active	
Intervention(s)	Interventions which prioritise the needs of pedestrians, cyclists and users of other modes of active transport, including: • re-allocating road space to support physically active modes of transport such as cycling and walking e.g. shared road space • interventions that enable people with restricted mobility to be physically active by ensuring their local environments are accessible and can be used by all groups e.g. road crossing times, introduction/improvement of pedestrian crossings • planning and providing walking and cycling networks (such as Connect2), infrastructure links with existing networks and facilities e.g. signed only and segregated walking/cycle paths, wayfinding networks/signage, on-street cycle parking • public transport provision, networks, links and facilities (e.g. cycle parking) • parking restrictions and charges e.g. controlled parking zones, parking charges, waiting and loading restrictions • traffic-calming measures to restrict vehicle speeds e.g. sign only speed limits, physical interventions such as road humps and speed cushions • speed restrictions • road-user charging schemes e.g. congestion zones, local emission zones (LEZs) • temporary road closures e.g. ciclovia, 'School Streets' • Other named interventions e.g. 'Cycling Cities', 'Walking Cities'	The following interventions will not be included: • Interventions to increase physical activity as part of managing chronic or other conditions. • Interventions that aim to change individual behaviour by providing and encouraging people to take up activities that take place in the built or natural environment e.g. exercise classes, green gyms and organised walks. • Interventions covered by PH41 (walking and cycling) which covers the design, deliver and promotion of interventions within

Topic 1	**Transport interventions in the built or natural environment**	
Component of protocol	Description	Additional comments
		the environment rather than changes to the physical environment itself. • Re traffic calming, speed cushions and speed restrictions to be aware that may be overlap with PH31 and PH29
Comparator(s)/control	Comparators that will be considered are: • Other interventions • Status quo/do nothing/control • Time (before and after) or area (i.e. matched city a vs b) comparisons	
Outcome(s)	The outcomes that will be considered when assessing the impact on physical activity are: Primary outcomes: • total physical activity (as measured by e.g. time/distance/number of steps/levels of activity/levels of recommended PA) • total sedentary time (as measured by time) • Domain-specific physical activity levels (active travel or physical activity in everyday life (such as measures of walking, cycling or active play)) • public transport use (as a proxy measure of physical activity) Secondary outcomes:	• Included effectiveness studies should have an indicator of physical activity reported. • Included studies reporting any health outcomes will be noted in EPPI/the evidence tables and forwarded on to EMU for economic modelling and not for

Topic 1	**Transport interventions in the built or natural environment**	
Component of protocol	Description	Additional comments
	• changes to road environment e.g. introduction of traffic calming measures • changes to transport (such as changes in modal share) • vehicle speeds • car use Qualitative outcomes: • Perceptions (e.g. of the key characteristics of the people involved in the development and delivery of transport interventions which make them effective) • Preferences (e.g. for the person delivering the intervention) Descriptive outcomes: • Key characteristics of the people involved in the development and delivery of transport interventions which make them effective e.g. job roles, competencies	the purposes of this review.

Topic 2	**Design and accessibility of public open spaces[1] in the built or natural environment**	
Component of protocol	Description	Additional comments
Review question 6	Which interventions related to the design and accessibility of public open spaces are effective and cost-effective at encouraging and supporting physical activity in all population groups, including those less able to be physically active?	

[1] Public open spaces in the built and natural environment include open urban spaces (such as the external areas of buildings and open 'grey' space e.g. urban squares and pedestrianised areas), green spaces (such as urban parks, open green areas, woods and forests, coastland and countryside, and paths and routes connecting them) and blue spaces (including the sea, lakes, rivers and canals).

Topic 2	**Design and accessibility of public open spaces[1] in the built or natural environment**	
Component of protocol	Description	Additional comments
Context and objectives	To determine the effectiveness and cost effectiveness of interventions that focus on the design and accessibility of public open spaces (such as access by public transport, on foot, by bicycle and using other modes of physically active transport and through ensuring open spaces are managed maintained safe and welcoming to everyone), which may result in: • supporting and encouraging people to build physical activity into their daily lives • increasing opportunities for, and uptake of, formal or informal recreational activity • reducing sedentary time • increasing the opportunity for, and uptake of, active travel such as walking or cycling (including the use of adapted cycles)	
Types of study to be included/excluded	Inclusions: Comparative studies including: • Randomised or non-randomised controlled trials • Before and after studies • Cohort studies • Case-control studies Economic studies: • Economic evaluations • Cost-utility (cost per QALY) • Cost benefit (i.e. Net benefit) • Cost-effectiveness (Cost per unit of effect) • Cost minimisation	• If there is a large number of includes for the question, evidence may be prioritised, where available, by study design (e.g. RCTs prioritised over observational studies) in consultation with PHAC. Where there is a lack of higher quality evidence for different population groups, in

Topic 2	**Design and accessibility of public open spaces[1] in the built or natural environment**	
Component of protocol	Description	Additional comments
	• Cost-consequence	particular those who are less able to be physically active, a lower quality of evidence may be considered. • It is unlikely that cross-sectional and other surveys will be included in the review unless there is an absence of other evidence. This will be agreed with PHAC as appropriate. • Systematic reviews will only be used as a source for primary evidence. • Only full economic analyses will be included – papers reporting costs only will be excluded.
Participants/population	Whole population (adults and children) with particular consideration of groups who are less able to be physically active including: • Older people	

Topic 2	**Design and accessibility of public open spaces[1] in the built or natural environment**	
Component of protocol	Description	Additional comments
	• People with disabilities including mental, physical, sensory and learning impairments which impact on their ability to be physically active	
Intervention(s)	• Access to open spaces by public transport, on foot, by bicycle or using other forms of active transport (such as Connect2) • Connections between open spaces through traffic-free networks of footpaths, trails or cycle routes (such as green corridors) • Maintenance and management, conservation or landscaping of open spaces • Facilities in open spaces such as accessible toilets, shelter, signage, accessible parking • Safety of open spaces, for example through layout, lighting or security • Regeneration projects • Street and neighbourhood design • Named interventions that involve changes to the design and accessibility of public open spaces, such as Healthy Towns/Healthy New Towns, Age Friendly Cities, Urban 40 project, Olympic parks, Pocket Parks, Play Streets, Healthy Streets	The following interventions related to the design and accessibility of public open spaces will not be included: • Interventions to increase physical activity as part of managing chronic or other conditions. • Interventions that aim to change individual behaviour by providing and encouraging people to take up activities that take place in the built or natural environment e.g. exercise classes, green gyms and organised walks. • Interventions covered by PH41 (walking and

Topic 2	**Design and accessibility of public open spaces[1] in the built or natural environment**	
Component of protocol	Description	Additional comments
		cycling) which covers the design, deliver and promotion of interventions within the environment rather than changes to the physical environment itself.
Comparator(s)/control	Comparators that will be considered are: • Other intervention • Status quo Time (before and after) or area (i.e. matched area a vs b)	
Outcome(s)	The outcomes that will be considered when assessing the impact on physical activity are: Primary outcomes: • total physical activity (as measured by e.g. time/distance/number of steps/levels of activity/levels of recommended PA) • total sedentary time (as measured by time) Domain-specific physical activity levels (active travel or physical activity in everyday life (such as measures of walking, cycling or active play)). • public transport use (as a proxy measure of physical activity) Intermediate outcomes: • changes to urban planning	• Included studies should have an indicator of physical activity reported. • Included studies reporting any health outcomes will be noted in EPPI/the evidence tables and forwarded on to EMU for economic modelling and not for the purposes of this review.

Topic 2	**Design and accessibility of public open spaces[1] in the built or natural environment**	
Component of protocol	Description	Additional comments
	• changes to transport (such as changes in modal share) • changes to the infrastructure for both green and blue spaces • access to and use of natural environment including green and blue space • access to grey space	

Topic 2	**Design and accessibility of public open spaces[1] in the built or natural environment**	
Component of protocol	Description	Additional comments
Review question 7	Does the effectiveness and cost effectiveness of interventions related to the design and accessibility of public open spaces vary for different population groups in terms of encouraging and supporting physical activity? In particular, does this vary for those groups who are less able to be physically active, and if so how?	
Context and objectives	To determine any variation in the effectiveness and cost effectiveness of interventions related to the design and accessibility of public open spaces, between different population groups, in particular for groups who are less able to be physically active.	
Types of study to be included/excluded	Inclusions: Comparative studies including: • Randomised or non-randomised controlled trials • Before and after studies • Cohort studies • Case-control studies	• If there is a large number of includes for the question, evidence may be prioritised, where available, by study design (e.g. RCTs

Topic 2	**Design and accessibility of public open spaces[1] in the built or natural environment**	
Component of protocol	Description	Additional comments
	Economic studies: • Economic evaluations • Cost-utility (cost per QALY) • Cost benefit (i.e. Net benefit) • Cost-effectiveness (Cost per unit of effect) • Cost minimisation • Cost-consequence	prioritised over observational studies) in consultation with PHAC. Where there is a lack of higher quality evidence for different population groups, in particular those who are less able to be physically active, a lower quality of evidence may be considered. • It is unlikely that cross-sectional and other surveys will be included in the review unless there is an absence of other evidence. This will be agreed with PHAC as appropriate. • Systematic reviews will only be used as a source for primary evidence. • Only full economic analyses will be

Topic 2	**Design and accessibility of public open spaces[1] in the built or natural environment**	
Component of protocol	Description	Additional comments
		included – papers reporting costs only will be excluded.
Participants/population	Whole population (adults and children) with particular consideration of groups who are less able to be physically active including: • Older people • People with disabilities including mental, physical, sensory and learning impairments which impact on their ability to be physically active	
Intervention(s)	• Access to open spaces by public transport, on foot, by bicycle or using other forms of active transport (such as Connect2) • Connections between open spaces through traffic-free networks of footpaths, trails or cycle routes (such as green corridors) • Maintenance and management, conservation or landscaping of open spaces • Facilities in open spaces such as accessible toilets, shelter, signage, accessible parking • Safety of open spaces, for example through layout, lighting or security • Regeneration projects • Street and neighbourhood design • Named interventions that involve changes to the design and accessibility of public open spaces, such as Healthy Towns/Healthy New Towns, Age Friendly Cities, Urban 40 project, Olympic parks, Pocket Parks, Play Streets, Healthy Streets	The following interventions related to the design and accessibility of public open spaces will not be included: • Interventions to increase physical activity as part of managing chronic or other conditions. • Interventions that aim to change individual behaviour by providing and encouraging people to take up activities that take place in the built or natural

Topic 2	**Design and accessibility of public open spaces[1] in the built or natural environment**	
Component of protocol	Description	Additional comments
		environment e.g. exercise classes, green gyms and organised walks. • Interventions covered by PH41 (walking and cycling) which covers the design, deliver and promotion of interventions within the environment rather than changes to the physical environment itself.
Comparator(s)/control	Comparators that will be considered are: • Other intervention • Status quo Time (before and after) or area (i.e. matched area a vs b)	
Outcome(s)	The following outcomes will be considered when assessing variation in factors such as age, disability, special needs: Primary outcomes: • total physical activity (as measured by e.g. time/distance/number of steps/levels of activity/levels of recommended PA) • total sedentary time (as measured by time)	• Included studies should have an indicator of physical activity reported. • Included studies reporting any health outcomes will be noted in EPPI/the evidence tables and forwarded on to EMU

Topic 2	**Design and accessibility of public open spaces[1] in the built or natural environment**	
Component of protocol	Description	Additional comments
	• Domain-specific physical activity levels (active travel or physical activity in everyday life (such as measures of walking, cycling or active play)). • public transport use (as a proxy measure of physical activity) according to factors such as age disability special needs etc Secondary outcomes: • access to and use of natural environment including green and blue space and variation in this according to factors such as age, disability, special needs • access to grey space and variation in this according to factors such as age, disability, special needs	for economic modelling and not for the purposes of this review.

Topic 2	**Design and accessibility of public open spaces[1] in the built or natural environment**	
Component of protocol	Description	Additional comments
Review question 8	Are there any adverse or unintended effects of interventions related to the design and accessibility of public open spaces in terms of (1) physical activity and (2) other aspects of health and wellbeing? a. Do these vary for different population groups, in particular those who are less able to be physically active? b. How can the effects of any unintended or adverse effects be minimised?	

Topic 2	**Design and accessibility of public open spaces[1] in the built or natural environment**	
Component of protocol	Description	Additional comments
Context and objectives	To determine if interventions related to the design and accessibility of public open spaces have any adverse or unintended effects, in all groups and particularly in those groups that are less able to be physically active.	
Types of study to be included/excluded	Inclusions: Comparative studies including: • Randomised or non-randomised controlled trials • Before and after studies • Cohort studies • Case-control studies Economic studies: • Economic evaluations • Cost-utility (cost per QALY) • Cost benefit (i.e. Net benefit) • Cost-effectiveness (Cost per unit of effect) • Cost minimisation • Cost-consequence Qualitative studies: • Focus groups • Interviews	• If there is a large number of includes for the question, effectiveness evidence may be prioritised, where available, by study design (e.g. RCTs prioritised over observational studies) in consultation with PHAC. Where there is a lack of higher quality evidence for different population groups, in particular those who are less able to be physically active, a lower quality of evidence may be considered. • It is unlikely that cross-sectional and other surveys will be

Topic 2	**Design and accessibility of public open spaces[1] in the built or natural environment**	
Component of protocol	Description	Additional comments
		included in the review unless there is an absence of other evidence. This will be agreed with PHAC as appropriate. • Systematic reviews will only be used as a source for primary evidence. • Only full economic analyses will be included – papers reporting costs only will be excluded. Only qualitative studies from the UK which provide insight into the unintended consequences or adverse effects of specific interventions and how these vary by population group will be included. Studies will be limited to the UK (rather than EU/OECD countries as

Topic 2	**Design and accessibility of public open spaces[1] in the built or natural environment**	
Component of protocol	Description	Additional comments
		for effectiveness studies) as the context (national legislation, local government structures and powers etc) will be particularly relevant here. Qualitative studies which are linked to interventions identified through reviews 1 and 2 may be prioritised if the volume of studies is high. This would be agreed with PHAC.
Participants/population	Whole population (adults and children) with particular consideration of groups who are less able to be physically active including: • Older people • People with disabilities including mental, physical, sensory and learning impairments which impact on their ability to be physically active	
Intervention(s)	• Access to open spaces by public transport, on foot, by bicycle or using other forms of active transport (such as Connect2) • Connections between open spaces through traffic-free networks of footpaths, trails or cycle routes (such as green corridors) • Maintenance and management, conservation or landscaping of open spaces	The following interventions related to the design and accessibility of public open spaces will not be included:

Topic 2	**Design and accessibility of public open spaces[1] in the built or natural environment**	
Component of protocol	Description	Additional comments
	• Facilities in open spaces such as accessible toilets, shelter, signage, accessible parking • Safety of open spaces, for example through layout, lighting or security • Regeneration projects • Street and neighbourhood design • Named interventions that involve changes to the design and accessibility of public open spaces, such as Healthy Towns/Healthy New Towns, Age Friendly Cities, Urban 40 project, Olympic parks, Pocket Parks, Play Streets, Healthy Streets	• Interventions to increase physical activity as part of managing chronic or other conditions. • Interventions that aim to change individual behaviour by providing and encouraging people to take up activities that take place in the built or natural environment e.g. exercise classes, green gyms and organised walks. • Interventions covered by PH41 (walking and cycling) which covers the design, deliver and promotion of interventions within the environment rather than changes to the physical environment itself.
Comparator(s)/control	Comparators that will be considered are:	

Topic 2	**Design and accessibility of public open spaces[1] in the built or natural environment**	
Component of protocol	Description	Additional comments
	• Other intervention • Status quo Time (before and after) or area (i.e. matched area a vs b)	
Outcome(s)	<u>From comparative studies</u> Indicators of physical activity and variation in these according to factors such as age, disability, special needs: • decrease in total physical activity • increase in total sedentary time • decrease in domain-specific physical activity levels • decrease in public transport use (as a proxy measure of physical activity) Other aspects of health and wellbeing and variation in these according to factors such as age, disability, special needs, including: • Rates/numbers of accidents, or injuries or fatalities e.g. road traffic accidents, falls <u>From qualitative studies</u> Adverse/unintended effects of interventions in terms of: • Intentions to be physically active • Perceptions (such as barriers, stigma, safety, isolation, feeling of exclusion, lack of sense of belonging and connectedness, increased fear of crime) •	• Included studies should have an indicator of physical activity reported. • Included studies reporting any health outcomes will be noted in EPPI/the evidence tables and forwarded on to EMU for economic modelling and not for the purposes of this review.

Topic 2	**Design and accessibility of public open spaces[1] in the built or natural environment**	
Component of protocol	Description	Additional comments
Review question 9	What factors relating to interventions which focus on the design and accessibility of public open spaces ensure that interventions are acceptable to all groups, including those less able to be physically active?	
Context and objectives	To identify any factors relating to the design and accessibility of public open spaces, that may facilitate the uptake of opportunities to be physically active or conversely prevent uptake of those opportunities. In particular to identify factors which may facilitate uptake by one group but in doing so create barriers for others.	
Types of study to be included/excluded	Inclusions: Qualitative studies: • Focus groups • Interviews	Exclusions: • All quantitative studies • Systematic reviews will only be included as a source for primary evidence. Only qualitative studies from the UK which provide insight into the unintended consequences or adverse effects of specific interventions and how these vary by population group will be included. Studies will be limited to the UK (rather than EU/OECD countries as

Topic 2	**Design and accessibility of public open spaces[1] in the built or natural environment**	
Component of protocol	Description	Additional comments
		for effectiveness studies) as the context (national legislation, local government structures and powers etc) will be particularly relevant here. Qualitative studies which are linked to interventions identified through reviews 1 and 2 may be prioritised if the volume of studies is high. This would be agreed with PHAC.
Participants/population	Whole population (adults and children) with particular consideration of groups who are less able to be physically active including: • Older people • People with disabilities including mental, physical, sensory and learning impairments which impact on their ability to be physically active	
Intervention(s)	• Access to open spaces by public transport, on foot, by bicycle or using other forms of active transport (such as Connect2) • Connections between open spaces through traffic-free networks of footpaths, trails or cycle routes (such as green corridors) • Maintenance and management, conservation or landscaping of open spaces	The following interventions related to the design and accessibility of public open spaces will not be included:

Topic 2	**Design and accessibility of public open spaces[1] in the built or natural environment**	
Component of protocol	Description	Additional comments
	• Facilities in open spaces such as accessible toilets, shelter, signage, accessible parking • Safety of open spaces, for example through layout, lighting or security • Regeneration projects • Street and neighbourhood design • Named interventions that involve changes to the design and accessibility of public open spaces, such as Healthy Towns/Healthy New Towns, Age Friendly Cities, Urban 40 project, Olympic parks, Pocket Parks, Play Streets, Healthy Streets	• Interventions to increase physical activity as part of managing chronic or other conditions. • Interventions that aim to change individual behaviour by providing and encouraging people to take up activities that take place in the built or natural environment e.g. exercise classes, green gyms and organised walks. • Interventions covered by PH41 (walking and cycling) which covers the design, deliver and promotion of interventions within the environment rather than changes to the physical environment itself.
Comparator(s)/control	Comparators that will be considered are:	

Topic 2	**Design and accessibility of public open spaces[1] in the built or natural environment**	
Component of protocol	Description	Additional comments
	• Other intervention • Status quo • Time (before and after) or area (i.e. matched area a vs b)	
Outcome(s)	• Intentions (e.g. to be physically active) • Perceptions (e.g. feelings of inclusion, increased sense of belonging and connectedness, increased sense of safety, reduced fear of crime) • Knowledge / Attitudes / beliefs (e.g. of interventions) • Acceptability of interventions	

Topic 1	**Transport interventions in the built or natural environment**	
Component of protocol	Description	Additional comments
Review question 10	Who needs to be involved to ensure that interventions related to the design and accessibility of public open spaces are effective and cost-effective for everyone in encouraging and supporting them to be physically active, including those less able to be physically active?	
Context and objectives	To determine what the key characteristics of the people involved in the design and accessibility of public open spaces (e.g. job roles and competencies) are which affect an intervention's effectiveness and cost effectiveness.	
Types of study to be included/excluded	Inclusions: Comparative studies including: • Randomised or non-randomised controlled trials • Before and after studies • Cohort studies	• If there is a large number of includes for the question, effectiveness evidence may be prioritised, where

Topic 1	**Transport interventions in the built or natural environment**	
Component of protocol	Description	Additional comments
	• Case-control studies Economic studies: • Economic evaluations • Cost-utility (cost per QALY) • Cost benefit (i.e. Net benefit) • Cost-effectiveness (Cost per unit of effect) • Cost minimisation • Cost-consequence Qualitative studies: • Focus groups • Interviews	available, by study design (e.g. RCTs prioritised over observational studies) in consultation with PHAC. Where there is a lack of higher quality evidence for different population groups, in particular those who are less able to be physically active, a lower quality of evidence may be considered. • It is unlikely that cross-sectional and other surveys will be included in the review unless there is an absence of other evidence. This will be agreed with PHAC as appropriate. • Systematic reviews will only be used as a source for primary evidence.

Topic 1	**Transport interventions in the built or natural environment**	
Component of protocol	Description	Additional comments
		• Only full economic analyses will be included – papers reporting costs only will be excluded. Only qualitative studies from the UK which provide insight into the unintended consequences or adverse effects of specific interventions and how these vary by population group will be included. Studies will be limited to the UK (rather than EU/OECD countries as for effectiveness studies) as the context (national legislation, local government structures and powers etc) will be particularly relevant here. Qualitative studies which are linked to interventions identified through reviews 1 and 2 may be prioritised if the volume of

Topic 1	**Transport interventions in the built or natural environment**	
Component of protocol	Description	Additional comments
		studies is high. This would be agreed with PHAC.
Participants/population	Whole population (adults and children) with particular consideration of groups who are less able to be physically active including: • Older people • People with disabilities including mental, physical, sensory and learning impairments which impact on their ability to be physically active	
Intervention(s)	• Access to open spaces by public transport, on foot, by bicycle or using other forms of active transport (such as Connect2) • Connections between open spaces through traffic-free networks of footpaths, trails or cycle routes (such as green corridors) • Maintenance and management, conservation or landscaping of open spaces • Facilities in open spaces such as accessible toilets, shelter, signage, accessible parking • Safety of open spaces, for example through layout, lighting or security • Regeneration projects • Street and neighbourhood design • Named interventions that involve changes to the design and accessibility of public open spaces, such as Healthy Towns/Healthy New Towns, Age Friendly Cities, Urban 40 project, Olympic parks, Pocket Parks, Play Streets, Healthy Streets	The following interventions will not be included: • Interventions to increase physical activity as part of managing chronic or other conditions. • Interventions that aim to change individual behaviour by providing and encouraging people to take up activities that take place in the built or natural environment e.g. exercise classes, green gyms and organised walks.

Topic 1	**Transport interventions in the built or natural environment**	
Component of protocol	Description	Additional comments
		• Interventions covered by PH41 (walking and cycling) which covers the design, deliver and promotion of interventions within the environment rather than changes to the physical environment itself.
Comparator(s)/control	Comparators that will be considered are: • Other interventions • Status quo/do nothing/control • Time (before and after) or area (i.e. matched city a vs b) comparisons	
Outcome(s)	The outcomes that will be considered when assessing the impact on physical activity are: Primary outcomes: • total physical activity (as measured by e.g. time/distance/number of steps/levels of activity/levels of recommended PA) • total sedentary time (as measured by time) • Domain-specific physical activity levels (active travel or physical activity in everyday life (such as measures of walking, cycling or active play)) • public transport use (as a proxy measure of physical activity) Secondary outcomes:	• Included effectiveness studies should have an indicator of physical activity reported. • Included studies reporting any health outcomes will be noted in EPPI/the evidence tables and forwarded on to EMU for economic modelling and not for

Topic 1	**Transport interventions in the built or natural environment**	
Component of protocol	Description	Additional comments
	• changes to urban planning • changes to transport (such as changes in modal share) • changes to the infrastructure for both green and blue spaces • access to and use of natural environment including green and blue space • access to grey space Qualitative outcomes: • Perceptions (e.g. of the key characteristics of the people involved in the development and delivery of transport interventions which make them effective) • Preferences (e.g. for the person delivering the intervention) Descriptive outcomes: • Key characteristics of the people involved in the design and accessibility of public open spaces which make them effective e.g. job roles, competencies	the purposes of this review.

3. Quality Appraisal Checklists

QA EPOC Checklist for RCTs, non-randomised controlled trials and controlled before-after studies

Administrative details

Study name or author and year **[Type study name, or author and year (include letter if more than 1 paper with the same author and year, e.g. 'Smith 2010a')]**	**STAR ID** **[Type STAR ID]**
Citation **[Include citation details – usually authors, title of study, journal details, year]**	
Linked studies (study name or author, year, STAR ID) **[Include study name or author, year and STAR ID of any related studies, or state 'None']**	
Final study quality score **[Click to choose the final quality score. See 'Calculation of final study quality score' below for details on how to complete this.]**	
Date of QA **[Click to choose the date the QA was completed]**	**Reviewer(s) names** **[Type name of the reviewer/reviewers completing the quality assessment]**

Calculation of final study quality score (from box 6.1 on page 95 of the NICE Guidelines Manual)

- **++** All or most of the checklist criteria have been fulfilled, and where they have not been fulfilled the conclusions are very unlikely to alter.
- **+** Some of the checklist criteria have been fulfilled, and where they have not been fulfilled, or are not adequately described, the conclusions are unlikely to alter.
- **-** Few or no checklist criteria have been fulfilled and the conclusions are likely or very likely to alter.

Quality Assessment

For all questions:

++	'Yes'	The study full meets the criterion.
+	'Partly'	The study largely meets the criterion but differs in some important respect.
-	'No'	The study deviates substantially from the criterion.
	'Unclear'	Report provides insufficient information to judge whether the study complies with the criterion.
	'NA (not applicable'	The criterion is not relevant in this particular instance.

Item	Decision	Comments
1. Was the allocation sequence adequately generated?	[Click here to choose a decision. ++ if a random component in the sequence generation process is described (e.g. a random number table), - if a non-random method is used (e.g. date of admission) or if study is a non-randomised controlled trial or controlled before-after study]	[State how the allocation sequence was generated.]
2. Was the allocation adequately concealed?	[Click here to choose a decision. ++ if allocation by institution, team or professional and allocation performed on all units at start of the study, or if the unit of allocation was by patient or episode of care and there was a centralised randomisation scheme (on-site computer system or sealed opaque envelopes). – if controlled before-after study.]	[State how the allocation was concealed.]
3. Were baseline outcome measurements similar?	[Click here to choose a decision.++ if performance or patient outcomes were measured prior to intervention and no important differences present across study groups. In RCTs score ++ if imbalanced but appropriate adjusted analysis was performed (e.g. analysis of covariance). Score - if important differences were present and not adjusted for in analysis.]	[State whether the baseline outcome measurements were similar.]
4. Were baseline characteristics similar?	[Click here to choose a decision. ++ if baseline characteristics of the study and control providers are	[State whether the baseline characteristics were similar.]

	reported and similar. Score - if there is no report of characteristics or if there are differences between control and intervention providers.]	
5. Were incomplete outcome data adequately addressed?	[Click here to choose a decision. ++ if missing outcome measures were unlikely to bias the results (e.g. the proportion of missing data was similar in the intervention and control groups or the proportion of missing data was less than the effect size i.e. unlikely to overturn the study result). Score - if missing outcome data was likely to bias the results.]	[State whether incomplete outcome data were adequately addressed.]
6. Was knowledge of the allocated interventions adequately prevented during the study?	[Click here to choose a decision. ++ if the authors state explicitly that primary outcome variables were assessed blindly, or outcomes are objective, e.g. length of hospital stay. Score - if primary outcomes were not assessed blindly.]	[State whether knowledge of the allocated interventions was adequately prevented during the study.]
7. Was the study adequately protected against contamination?	[Click here to choose a decision. ++ if allocation by community, institution or practice and it is unlikely that the control group received the intervention. Score - if it is likely that the control group received the intervention (e.g. if patients rather than professionals were randomised). Score “unclear” if professionals were allocated within a clinic or practice and it is possible that communication between intervention and control professionals could have occurred (e.g. physicians within practices	[State whether the study was adequately protected against contamination.]

	were allocated to intervention or control).]	
8. Was the study free from selective outcome reporting?	[Click here to choose a decision. ++ if there is no evidence that outcomes were selectively reported (e.g. all relevant outcomes in the methods section are reported in the results section). Score - if some important outcomes are subsequently omitted from the results.]	[State whether the study was free from selective outcome reporting.]
9. Was the study free from other risks of bias?	[Click here to choose a decision. Score ++ if there is no evidence of other risk of biases.]	[State whether the study was free from other risks of bias.]

QA EPHPP Checklist for uncontrolled before and after studies (EPHPP)

Administrative details

Study name or author and year **[Type study name, or author and year (include letter if more than 1 paper with the same author and year, e.g. 'Smith 2010a')]**	***STAR ID*** **[Type STAR ID]**
Citation **[Include citation details – usually authors, title of study, journal details, year]**	
Linked studies (study name or author, year, STAR ID) **[Include study name or author, year and STAR ID of any related studies, or state 'None']**	
Final study quality score **[Click to choose the final quality score. See 'Calculation of final study quality score' below for details on how to complete this.]**	
Date of QA **[Click to choose the date the QA was completed]**	***Reviewer(s) names*** **[Type name of the reviewer/reviewers completing the quality assessment]**

Calculation of final study quality score (from EPHPP tool http://www.ephpp.ca/PDF/Quality%20Assessment%20Tool_2010_2.pdf)

- **++** Strong. No weak ratings.
- **+** Moderate. One weak rating.
- **-** Weak. Two or more weak ratings.

Quality Assessment

Item	*Component Rating*	*Section Rating*	*Comments*
Selection bias			

1. Are the individuals selected to participate in the study likely to be representative of the target population?	[Click here to choose a rating. Score 'very likely' if randomly selected from a comprehensive list of individuals in target population, 'somewhat likely' if referred from a source (e.g. clinic) in a systematic manner, 'not likely' if self-referred.]	[Click here to choose a decision. 'Strong' if Q1 is 'very likely' and Q2 is 80 to 100%. 'Moderate' if Q1 is 'very likely' or 'somewhat likely' and Q2 is 60 or 79% or 'can't tell'. 'Weak' if Q1 is 'not likely' or 'can't tell' and Q2 is 'can't tell'.]	[Add comments if necessary.]
2. What percentage of selected individuals agreed to participate?	[Click here to choose a rating.]		
Study design			
3. What is the study design?	[Click here to choose a rating.]	[Click here to choose a decision. 'Strong' if RCT or CCT, 'moderate' if cohort analytic study, case control study, a cohort design, or interrupted time series, 'weak' for any other method or did not state method used.]	[Add comments if necessary, including description of study design if 'other'.]
4. Was the study described as randomised?	[Click here to choose a rating. If 'no', mark questions 5 and 6 as 'not applicable' and go straight to 'Confounders' section.]		
5. Was the method of randomisation described?	[Click here to choose a rating.]		
6. Was the method of randomisation appropriate?	[Click here to choose a rating.]		
Confounders			
7. Were there important differences between groups prior to the intervention?	[Click here to choose a rating. Example of confounders include race, sex, marital status/family, age, socioeconomic status, education, health status, pre-intervention score on outcome measure.]	[Click here to choose a decision. 'Strong' if Q7 is 'no' or Q2 is 80% or more. 'Moderate' if Q7 is 'yes' and Q8 is 60 to 79%. 'Weak' if Q7 is 'yes' and Q8 is less than 60%, or if Q7 is 'cant' tell' and Q8 is 'can't tell'.]	[Add comments if necessary.]
8. If yes, what percentage of relevant confounders were controlled (either in the design [e.g. stratification, matching] or analysis)?	[Click here to choose a rating.]		
Blinding			

9. Was/were the outcome assessor/s aware of the intervention or exposure status of participants?	[Click here to choose a rating.]	[Click here to choose a decision. 'Strong' if Q9 is 'no' and Q10 is 'no'. 'Moderate' if Q9 is 'no' or Q10 is 'no', or Q9 is 'can't tell' and Q10 is 'can't tell'. 'Weak' if Q9 is 'yes' and Q10 is 'yes'.]	[Add comments if necessary.]
10. Were the study participants aware of the research question?	[Click here to choose a rating.]		
Data collection methods			
11. Were data collection tools shown to be valid?	[Click here to choose a rating.]	[Click here to choose a decision. 'Strong' if Q11 is 'yes' and Q12 is 'yes'. 'Moderate' if Q11 is 'yes' and Q12 is 'no' or Q12 is 'can't tell'. 'Weak' if Q11 is 'no' or Q11 is 'can't tell' and Q12 is 'can't tell'.]	[Add comments if necessary.]
12. Were data collection tools shown to be reliable?	[Click here to choose a rating.]		
Withdrawals and drop-outs			
13. Were withdrawals and drop-outs reported in terms of numbers and/or reasons per group?	[Click here to choose a rating.]	[Click here to choose a decision. 'Strong' if Q14 is 80% or more. 'Moderate' if Q14 is 60 to 79% or 'not applicable'. 'Weak' if Q14 is less than 60% or 'can't tell'.]	[Add comments if necessary.]
14. What percentage of participants completed the survey?	[Click here to choose a rating. If percentage differs by groups, record the lowest.]		
Intervention integrity			
15. What percentage of participants received the allocated intervention or exposure of interest?	[Click here to choose a rating. If percentage differs by groups, record the lowest.]	Section rating not required.	[Add comments if necessary.]
16. Was the consistency of the intervention measured?	[Click here to choose a rating.]		
17. Is it likely that subjects received an	[Click here to choose a rating.]		

unintended intervention (contamination or co-intervention) that may influence the results?			
Analyses			
18. What is the unit of allocation?	[Click here to choose a rating.]	Section rating not required.	[Add comments if necessary. Add details if 'other' selected for question 18 and/or 19.]
19. What is the unit of analysis?	[Click here to choose a rating.]		
20. Are the statistical methods appropriate for the study design?	[Click here to choose a rating.]		
21. Is the analysis performed by intervention allocation status (i.e. intention to treat) rather than the actual intervention received?	[Click here to choose a rating.]		

Methodology checklist: Qualitative studies

Study identification	
Guidance topic:	**Key research question/aim:**
Checklist completed by:	

Theoretical approach		
1. Is a qualitative approach appropriate? *For example,* • Does the research question seek to understand processes or structures, or illuminate subjective experiences or meanings? • Could a quantitative approach better have addressed the research question?	Choose an item.	Comments:
2. Is the study clear in what it seeks to do? *For example,* • Is the purpose of the study discussed – aims/objectives/research question/s? • Is there adequate/appropriate reference to the literature? • Are underpinning values/assumptions/theory discussed?	Choose an item.	Comments:

Study design		
3. How defensible/rigorous is the research design/methodology? *For example,* • Is the design appropriate to the research question? • Is a rationale given for using a qualitative approach? • Are there clear accounts of the rationale/justification for the sampling, data collection and data analysis techniques used? • Is the selection of cases/sampling strategy theoretically justified?	Choose an item.	Comments:

Data collection		
4. How well was the data collection carried out? *For example,* • Are the data collection methods clearly described? • Were the appropriate data collected to address the research question? • Was the data collection and record keeping systematic?	Choose an item.	Comments:

Trustworthiness		
5. Is the role of the researcher clearly described? *For example,* • Has the relationship between the researcher and the participants been adequately considered? • Does the paper describe how the research was explained and presented to the participants?	Choose an item.	Comments:
6. Is the context clearly described? *For example,* • Are the characteristics of the participants and settings clearly defined? • Were observations made in a sufficient variety of circumstances? • Was context bias considered?	Choose an item.	Comments:
7. Were the methods reliable? *For example,* • Was data collected by more than one method? • Is there justification for triangulation, or for not triangulating? • Do the methods investigate what they claim to?	Choose an item.	Comments:

Analysis		
8. Is the data analysis sufficiently rigorous? *For example,* • Is the procedure explicit – i.e. is it clear how the data was analysed to arrive at the results? • How systematic is the analysis, is the procedure reliable/dependable? • Is it clear how the themes and concepts were derived from the data?	Choose an item.	Comments:
9. Is the data 'rich'? *For example,* • How well are the contexts of the data described? • Has the diversity of perspective and content been explored? • How well has the detail and depth been demonstrated? • Are responses compared and contrasted across groups/sites?	Choose an item.	Comments:
10. Is the analysis reliable? *For example,* • Did more than one researcher theme and code transcripts/data? • If so, how were differences resolved? • Did participants feed back on the transcripts/data if possible and relevant? • Were negative/ discrepant results addressed or ignored?	Choose an item.	Comments:
11. Are the findings convincing? *For example,* • Are the findings clearly presented? • Are the findings internally coherent? • Are extracts from the original data included? • Is the data appropriately referenced? • Is the reporting clear and coherent?	Choose an item.	Comments:
12. Are the findings relevant to the aims of the study?	Choose an item.	Comments:

13. Conclusions *For example,* • How clear are the links between data, interpretation and conclusions? • Are the conclusions plausible and coherent? • Have alternative explanations been explored and discounted? • Does this enhance understanding of the research topic? • Are the implications of the research clearly defined? • Is there adequate discussion of any limitations encountered?	Choose an item.	Comments:

Ethics		
14. How clear and coherent is the reporting of ethics? *For example,* • Have ethical issues been taken into consideration? • Are they adequately discussed e.g. do they address consent and anonymity? • Have the consequences of the research been considered i.e. raising expectations, changing behaviour etc? • Was the study approved by an ethics committee?	Choose an item.	Comments:
Overall Assessment		
As far as can be ascertained from the paper, how well was the study conducted?	Choose an item.	Comments:

Quality of Included Studies

Effectiveness Studies

EFFECTIVENESS STUDIES (EPOC Checklist) (N=3)										
Review 1	**Question**									**Score**
	1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**	
Boarnet et al 2013	NA	NA	++	+	++	-	+	++	+	+
Brown et al 2016	NA	NA	Unclear	-	+	NA	-	++	+	-
Loader and Stanley 2009	NA	NA	Unclear	Unclear	NA	Unclear	++	-	Unclear	-

EFFECTIVENESS STUDIES (EPOC Checklist) (N=15)										
Review 2	**Question**									**Score**
	1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**	
Bjornskau et al 2012	NA	NA	Unclear	Unclear	NA	-	-	NA	+	-
Clark et al 2014	NA	NA	-	Unclear	++	++	++	++	+	+
D'Haese et al 2015	NA	NA	+	+	+	++	-	++	-	+
Dill et al 2014	NA	NA	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	-

EFFECTIVENESS STUDIES (EPOC Checklist) (N=15)										
Review 2	**Question**									**Score**
	1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**	
Fitzhugh et al 2010	NA	NA	++	-	NA	+	Unclear	+	++	+
Goodman et al 2013a	NA	NA	+	+	++	-	+	++	+	+
Gustat et al 2012	NA	NA	Unclear	-	NA	Unclear	+	-	+	-
Hoelscher et al 2016	NA	NA	Unclear	+	-	+	+	++	-	-
Krizek et al 2009	NA	NA	-	Unclear	NA	-	+	++	+	-
Orenstein et al 2007 (controlled study)	NA	NA	Unclear	Unclear	++	-	+	+	-	-
Ostergaard et al 2015	NA	NA	-	+	-	-	+	+	++	-
Parker et al 2013	NA	NA	-	+	++	-	+	++	++	-
Rissel et al 2015	NA	NA	Unclear	Unclear	-	Unclear	-	-	-	-
Sloman et al 2009	NA	NA	Unclear	Unclear	NA	-	+	+	++	-
West and Shores 2011	NA	NA	+	-	-	+	-	++	++	-
West and Shores 2015	NA	NA	+	+	+	NA	+	++	+	+

EFFECTIVENESS STUDIES (EPOC Checklist) (N=14)										
Review 3	**Question**									**Score**
	1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**	
Bohn Goldbaum et al 2013	NA	NA	-	-	NA	-	-	-	++	-
Christian et al 2013	NA	NA	++	++	Unclear	Unclear	+	++	+	+
Chomitz et al 2012	NA	NA	-	-	Unclear	++	+	-	+	-
Cohen et al 2009	NA	NA	+	-	NA	-	Unclear	-	-	-
Cohen et al 2014	NA	NA	-	-	++	-	-	-	++	-
Cohen et al 2015	NA	NA	-	Unclear	++	-	-	-	-	-
Droomers et al 2016	NA	NA	-	Unclear	NA	+	+	+	++	+
Dunton et al 2012	NA	NA	-	++	++	+	+	-	+	+
Norwood et al 2014	NA	NA	-	+	NA	-	+	++	-	-
Quigg Et al 2011	NA	NA	-	+	+	Unclear	-	-	+	-
Slater et al 2016	NA	NA	+	++	++	-	-	-	++	-

EFFECTIVENESS STUDIES (EPOC Checklist) (N=14)										
Review 3	**Question**									**Score**
	1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**	
Tester and Baker 2009	NA	NA	Unclear	++	NA	-	-	+	+	-
Veitch et al 2012	NA	NA	-	+	NA	+	-	+	+	-
Ward Thompson et al 2014	NA	NA	Unclear	+	Unclear	NA	++	-	-	-

U = Unclear NA = Not applicable

Key to questions:
1. Was the allocation sequence adequately generated?
2. Was the allocation adequately concealed?
3. Were baseline outcome measurements similar?
4. Were baseline characteristics similar?
5. Were incomplete outcome data adequately addressed?
6. Was knowledge of the allocated interventions adequately prevented during the study?
7. Was the study adequately protected against contamination?
8. Was the study free from selective outcome reporting?
9. Was the study free from other risks of bias?

Before and After Studies

UNCONTROLLED BEFORE AND AFTER STUDIES (EPHPP) (N=13)							
Review 1	**Question**						**Score**
	Selection Bias	**Study Design**	**Confounders**	**Blinding**	**Data Collection Methods**	**Withdrawals and Dropouts**	
Bergman et al 2010	Moderate	Moderate	Strong	Moderate	Moderate	Strong	+
Brockman and Fox, 2011	Moderate	Moderate	NA	Weak	Weak	NA	-
Brown and Werner 2007	Moderate	Weak	Weak	Moderate	Weak	Weak	-
Brown and Werner 2009	Moderate	Moderate	Strong	Moderate	Weak	Weak	-
Brown et al 2015	Weak	Weak	NA	Weak	Moderate	Strong	-
Collins and Agarwal 2015	Weak	Weak	NA	Moderate	Weak	Weak	-
Foley et al 2017	Moderate	Moderate	Weak	Moderate	Weak	Weak	-
Heinen et al 2015	Weak	Moderate	NA	Strong	Weak	Weak	-
Karlstrom and Franklin 2009	Moderate	Moderate	Weak	Weak	Weak	Moderate	-
Miller et al 2015	Weak	Weak	NA	Weak	Moderate	Strong	-
Panter et al 2016	Weak	Moderate	NA	Moderate	Strong	Weak	-
Sharaby and Shiftan 2012	Weak	Moderate	NA	Weak	Weak	Weak	-

UNCONTROLLED BEFORE AND AFTER STUDIES (EPHPP) (N=13)							
Review 1	**Question**						**Score**
	Selection Bias	**Study Design**	**Confounders**	**Blinding**	**Data Collection Methods**	**Withdrawals and Dropouts**	
Transport for London 2008	Moderate	Moderate	NA	Moderate	Weak	NA	+

UNCONTROLLED BEFORE AND AFTER STUDIES (EPHPP) (N=9)							
Review 2	**Question**						**Score**
	Selection Bias	**Study Design**	**Confounders**	**Blinding**	**Data Collection Methods**	**Withdrawals and Dropouts**	
Adams and Cavill 2015	Weak	Moderate	Weak	Moderate	Weak	Strong	-
Goodman et al 2013b	Weak	Moderate	NA	Moderate	Moderate	Weak	-
Goodman et al 2014	Weak	Moderate	NA	Moderate	Moderate	Weak	-
Hendricks et al 2009	Weak	Moderate	NA	Moderate	Weak	NA	-
Hunter et al 2009	Moderate	Moderate	Weak	Moderate	Weak	NA	-
Parker et al 2011	NA	Moderate	NA	Weak	Moderate	NA	-
Poindexter et al 2007	Moderate	Moderate	NA	Strong	Weak	NA	-
Stewart et al 2014	Weak	Moderate	NA	Weak	Weak	Weak	-
Torres et al 2016	Weak	Weak	Weak	Weak	Weak	Moderate	-

UNCONTROLLED BEFORE AND AFTER STUDIES (EPHPP) (N=6)							
Review 3	**Question**						**Score**
	Selection Bias	**Study Design**	**Confounders**	**Blinding**	**Data Collection Methods**	**Withdrawals and Dropouts**	
Gidlow et al 2010	Weak	Weak	NA	Weak	Weak	Weak	-
King et al 2015	NA	Weak	NA	Moderate	Strong	NA	+
Knuiman et al 2014	Moderate	Moderate	NA	Moderate	Strong	Weak	+
O'Brien and Morris 2009	Weak	Moderate	NA	Weak	Weak	NA	-
Paton-Lopez et al 2015	NA	Weak	NA	Moderate	Weak	Weak	-
Roemmich et al 2014	Weak	Moderate	Weak	Weak	Strong	NA	-

Intervention integrity and **Analyses** are included in the tool but a section rating is not required. Therefore they are not included in this summary.

Qualitative Studies

QUALITATIVE STUDIES (N=2)															
Review 1	**Question**														**Score**
	1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**	**10**	**11**	**12**	**13**	**14**	
Jones et al 2013	Appropriate	Clear	Defensible	NS	U	Clear	NS	NS	Rich	Reliable	Convincing	Relevant	Adequate	Appropriate	++
Kesten et al 2015	Appropriate	Clear	Defensible	Appropriately	Not described	Clear	NS	Rigorous	Rich	Reliable	Convincing	Relevant	Adequate	Appropriate	++

QUALITATIVE STUDIES (N=2)															
Review 2	**Question**														**Score**
	1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**	**10**	**11**	**12**	**13**	**14**	
Orenstein et al 2007	N	N	N	N	Unclear	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	-
Sahlqvist et al 2015	Y	Y	Y	Not sure	Unclear	N	Y	Y	Not sure	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	+

QUALITATIVE STUDIES (N=3)															
Review 3	**Question**														**Score**
	1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**	**10**	**11**	**12**	**13**	**14**	
Coulson et al 2011	Y	Y	Y	Y	Unclear	N	Not sure	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	+

QUALITATIVE STUDIES (N=3)															
Review 3	**Question**														**Score**
	1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**	**10**	**11**	**12**	**13**	**14**	
Gidlow Revoiewet al 2010	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	-
Trayers et al 2006	Y	Mixed	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	+

Key to questions:

1. Is a qualitative approach appropriate?
2. Is the study clear in what it seeks to do?
3. How defensible / rigorous is the research design / methodology?
4. How well was the data collection carried out?
5. Is the role of the researcher clearly described?
6. Is the context clearly described?
7. Were the methods reliable?
8. Is the data analysis sufficiently rigorous?
9. Is the data 'rich'?
10. Is the analysis reliable?
11. Are the findings convincing?
12. Are the findings relevant to the aims of the study?
13. Conclusions
14. How clear and coherent is the reporting of ethics?

NS = Not sure / inadequately reported
U = Unclear

4. Excluded Studies

Authors	Title	Reason for exclusion
Aird (2015)	Active aging: Exploration into self-ratings of "being active," out-of-home physical activity, and participation among older australian adults living in four different settings	• EXCLUDE on intervention
Albildso et al, 2012	Assessing the cost effectiveness of a community rail-trail in achieving physical activity gains	• EXCLUDE - unavailable
Anonymous (2015)	Impact of Safe Routes to School programs on walking and biking	• EXCLUDE - study type
Arredondo (2013)	Advocating for environmental changes to increase access to parks: engaging promotoras and youth leaders	• EXCLUDE on outcomes
Audrey (2015)	Healthy urban environments for children and young people: A systematic review of intervention studies	• EXCLUDE relevant systematic review
Aytur (2008)	Urban Containment Policies and Physical Activity. A Time-Series Analysis of Metropolitan Areas, 1990-2002	• EXCLUDE on intervention
Backing the bus (2006)	Backing the bus	• EXCLUDE - study type
Barnes et al., 2006	A longitudinal analysis of the effect of bicycle facilities on commute mode share	• EXCLUDE - duplicate
Bassett (2013)	Estimated energy expenditures for school-based policies and active living	• EXCLUDE on study type
Beale (2012)	Should we invest in environmental interventions to encourage physical activity in England? An economic appraisal	• EXCLUDE on study type
Bicycles 2010 (2010)	Bicycles 2010	• EXCLUDE - unavailable
Boarnet et al (2008)	Walking, Urban Design, and Health Toward a Cost-Benefit Analysis Framework	• EXCLUDE - study type
Boehm (2013)	Transformation of an Urban Corridor	• EXCLUDE no data to extract
Boone-Heinonen et al, 2010	Residential self-selection bias in the estimation of built environment effects on physical activity between adolescence and young adulthood	• EXCLUDE - no data to extract

Brown (2015)	Congestion Pricing and Active Transport - Evidence from Five Opportunities for Natural Experiment	• EXCLUDE - relevant systematic review
Brown (2016)	A systematic review of economic analyses of active transport interventions that include physical activity benefits	• EXCLUDE - relevant systematic review
Bruhova (2012)	Statistical analysis of the impact of policies on active transport in European cities	• EXCLUDE on intervention
Buckley (2013)	Evaluating safe routes to school events that designate days for walking and bicycling	• EXCLUDE on intervention
Burbage (2014)	Building mutually beneficial partnerships to improve physical activity opportunities through shared-use efforts in under-resourced communities in Los Angeles County	• EXCLUDE - out of scope
Burbidge (2008)	Evaluating the Impact of Neighborhood Trail Development on Active Travel Behavior and Overall Physical Activity	• EXCLUDE - out of scope
Burgoyne (2007)	Walking in a city neighbourhood, paving the way	• EXCLUDE - out of scope
Burke (2009)	The Path to Active Living: Physical Activity Through Community Design in Somerville, Massachusetts	• EXCLUDE on outcomes
Calise (2012)	The effect of a neighborhood built environment on physical activity behaviors	• EXCLUDE on intervention
Carlson (2009)	Reducing Auto Congestion Around Schools: Transportation Demand Strategies for Schools Phase II Report	• EXCLUDE on intervention
Carman (2007)	Walking to Maintain and Improve Health: How the Integration of Sidewalks and Walking Paths in Senior Communities Promotes Successful Aging	• EXCLUDE no data to extract
Catacchio (2011)	More Cyclists + Better Design = Safer Roadways	• EXCLUDE - no data to extract
Caulfield (2014)	Re-cycling a City--Examining the Growth of Cycling in Dublin	• EXCLUDE - study type
Cavill (2011)	Cycling demonstration towns: A cost-effective investment to promote physical activity	• EXCLUDE - no data to extract

Cedervall (2010)	Physical activity and implications on well-being in mild Alzheimer's disease: A qualitative case study on two men with dementia and their spouses	• EXCLUDE on country
Chapman (2014)	Increasing active travel: aims, methods and baseline measures of a quasi-experimental study	• EXCLUDE - no data to extract
Chaufan (2012)	The safe routes to school program in California: an update	• EXCLUDE - study type
Cheadle (2010)	Approaches to measuring the extent and impact of environmental change in three California community-level obesity prevention initiatives	• EXCLUDE on study type
Cheadle (2012)	Kaiser Permanente's Community Health Initiative in Northern California: evaluation findings and lessons learned	• EXCLUDE on intervention
Chillon (2011)	A systematic review of interventions for promoting active transportation to school	• EXCLUDE - relevant systematic review
Clark (2010)	Key stakeholder perspectives on the development of walkable neighbourhoods	• EXCLUDE - out of scope
Cleland (2014)	Identifying solutions to increase participation in physical activity interventions within a socio-economically disadvantaged community: A qualitative study	• EXCLUDE on intervention
Cobiac et al 2009	Cost-effectiveness of interventions to promote physical activity: a modelling study	• EXCLUDE - study type
Cohen (2008)	Impact of a new bicycle path on physical activity	• EXCLUDE - no data to extract
Cohen (2012)	Impact and cost-effectiveness of family Fitness Zones: A natural experiment in urban public parks	• EXCLUDE on intervention [Info] Green gym equipment
Cohen (2016)	CicLavia: Evaluation of participation, physical activity and cost of an open streets event in Los Angeles	• EXCLUDE - study type
Cope et al 2010	Cycling demonstration Towns - an economic evaluation.	• EXCLUDE - duplicate [Info] *data reported elsewhere*

COWI and City of Copenhagen 2009	Economic Evaluation of cycle projects - methodology and unit prices	• EXCLUDE on study type [Info] Cross sectional survey
Cranney (2016)	Impact of an outdoor gym on park users' physical activity: A natural experiment	• EXCLUDE on intervention [Info] outdoor gym installation
Crawford (2013)	Tampa combines bus and toll lanes	• EXCLUDE - unavailable
Davey (2008)	Design of a pragmatic cluster randomised controlled trial: Ecological approach to increasing physical activity in an urban community	• EXCLUDE on intervention
De Cocker , Katrien A, De Bourdeaudhuij , Ilse M, Brown Wendy J, and Cardon Greet M, 2007	Effects of '10,000 Steps Ghent' A Whole-Community Intervention	• EXCLUDE on intervention
De Oliveira (2013)	How effective is the Forestry Commission Scotland's woodland improvement programme-'Woods In and Around Towns' (WIAT)-at improving psychological well-being in deprived urban communities? A quasi-experimental study	• EXCLUDE no data to extract
De Smedt et al 2012	A cost-effectiveness study of the community-based intervention "10 000 Steps Ghent"	• EXCLUDE on intervention
Deehr (2009)	Active Seattle: Achieving Walkability in Diverse Neighborhoods	• EXCLUDE on outcomes
Dobson (2009)	From Partnership to Policy: The Evolution of Active Living by Design in Portland, Oregon	• EXCLUDE on outcomes
Economic appraisal of... (2006)	Economic appraisal of local walking and cycling routes	• EXCLUDE - unavailable
Engelberg (2014)	Ciclovia participation and impacts in San Diego, CA: The first CicloSDias	• EXCLUDE on outcomes
Farley (2007)	Safe play spaces to promote physical activity in inner-city children: Results from a pilot study of an environmental intervention	• EXCLUDE on intervention [Info] schoolyards
Fishman (2015)	Dutch Cycling: Quantifying the Health and Related Economic Benefits	• EXCLUDE - study type
Frank (2008)	Urban planning and public health: A story of separation and reconnection	• EXCLUDE - no data to extract

Frew et al 2014	Cost-effectiveness of a community-based physical activity programme for adults (be active) in the UK: an economic analysis within a natural experiment	• EXCLUDE on intervention
Frost (2010)	Effects of the built environment on physical activity of adults living in rural settings	• EXCLUDE - relevant systematic review
Ganten (2010)	Health co-benefits of policies to tackle climate change	• EXCLUDE - no data to extract
Garrard and Crawford, 2010	Evaluation of the Victorian Ride2School Program: Impacts and Insights into Promoting Active Travel to School.	• EXCLUDE on intervention
Geraghty (2009)	Partnership Moves Community Toward Complete Streets	• EXCLUDE on study type
Gerike (2016)	Physical Activity through Sustainable Transport Approaches (PASTA): A study protocol for a multicentre project	• EXCLUDE - no data to extract
Ghekiere (2014)	Critical environmental factors for transportation cycling in children: A qualitative study using bike-along interviews	• EXCLUDE - study type
Gomez-Feliciano (2009)	Active Living Logan Square: Joining Together to Create Opportunities for Physical Activity	• EXCLUDE on intervention
Gotschi (2011)	Costs and benefits of bicycling investments in Portland, Oregon	• EXCLUDE - study type
Greg (2010)	Do transport planning tools reflect the needs of the older traveller?	• EXCLUDE - qualitative
Guell (2012)	Towards a differentiated understanding of active travel behaviour: using social theory to explore everyday commuting	• EXCLUDE on intervention
Gunn L D, Lee Y, Geelhoed E, Shiell A, and Giles-Corti B, 2014	The cost-effectiveness of installing sidewalks to increase levels of transport-walking and health	• EXCLUDE on study type [Info] Cross sectional survey
Guo (2010)	An economic evaluation of health-promotive built environment changes	• EXCLUDE - study type
Haerens et al 2007	Acceptability, feasibility and effectiveness of a computer-tailored physical activity interventin in adolescents	• EXCLUDE on intervention
Hallgrimsdottir Berglind, Svensson Helena, and Stahl Agneta, 2015	Long term effects of an intervention in the outdoor environment--a comparison of older people's perception in two residential areas, in one of which accessibility improvements were introduced	• EXCLUDE on study type [Info] Cross sectional survey
Heath (2012)	Evidence-based intervention in physical activity: Lessons from around the world	• EXCLUDE - relevant systematic review

Heinen (2015)	Sociospatial patterning of the use of new transport infrastructure: Walking, cycling and bus travel on the Cambridgeshire guided busway	• EXCLUDE - study type
Henderson (2013)	Safe routes to school: a public health practice success story-Atlanta, 2008-2010	• EXCLUDE on intervention
Hinckson (2011)	School travel plans: preliminary evidence for changing school-related travel patterns in elementary school children	• EXCLUDE on intervention
Hooker (2007)	Walkable Neighborhoods for Seniors: The Alameda County experience	• EXCLUDE on intervention
Hooker (2009)	Evaluation of the Walkable Neighborhoods for Seniors Project in Sacramento County	• EXCLUDE on intervention
Hooper (2014)	Evaluating the Implementation and Active Living Impacts of a State Government Planning Policy Designed to Create Walkable Neighborhoods in Perth, Western Australia	• EXCLUDE - no baseline data
Hunter (2015)	The impact of interventions to promote physical activity in urban green space: A systematic review and recommendations for future research	• EXCLUDE relevant systematic review
Hylton (2007)	The Walking Life	• EXCLUDE - no data to extract
Impacts of better use... (2009)	Impacts of better use transport interventions - review of the evaluation evidence base	• EXCLUDE - unavailable
Irvine (2013)	Understanding urban green space as a health resource: A qualitative comparison of visit motivation and derived effects among park users in sheffield, UK	• EXCLUDE - Qualitative
Jalaludin B, Maxwell M, Saddik B, Lobb E, Byun R, Gutierrez R, and Paszek J, 2012	A pre-and-post study of an urban renewal program in a socially disadvantaged neighbourhood in Sydney, Australia	• EXCLUDE on intervention
Jones (2012)	Getting the British back on bicycles - The effects of urban traffic-free paths on everyday cycling	• EXCLUDE - study type
Jones (2012)	Motivations for active commuting: a qualitative investigation of the period of home or work relocation	• EXCLUDE - study type
Jones et al 2016	CycleBOOM: Design for lifelong health and wellbeing	• EXCLUDE - qualitative

Jordan et al 2008	Evaluation of the Gold Medal Schools Program	• EXCLUDE on intervention
Kaida and Kaida 2014	Spillover effect of congestion charging on pro-environmental behavior	• EXCLUDE on study type [Info] Cross sectional survey
Keuleers (2006)	Behavioural Change in Activity-Travel Patterns in Response to Road User Charging	• EXCLUDE - study type
Kinney (2012)	Isanti County Active Living: Measuring Change in Perception and Behavior	• EXCLUDE on study type
Kirby (2009)	Active travel to school: views of 10-13 year old schoolchildren in Scotland	• EXCLUDE - Qualitative
Klassen (2014)	Analyzing the severity of bicycle-motor vehicle collision using spatial mixed logit models: A city of edmonton case study	• EXCLUDE - out of scope
Koohsari et al 2014	Street connectivity and walking for transport: role of neighborhood destinations	• EXCLUDE - no data to extract
Krieger (2009)	High point walking for health: creating built and social environments that support walking in a public housing community	• EXCLUDE on intervention
Krizec (2007)	Estimating the Economic Benefits of Bicycling and Bicycle Facilities: An Interpretive Review and Proposed Methods	• EXCLUDE - unavailable
Kuhlberg (2014)	Open streets initiatives in the United States: closed to traffic, open to physical activity	• EXCLUDE on study type[Info] Not a systematic review
Laine (2014)	Cost-Effectiveness of Population-Level Physical Activity Interventions: A Systematic Review	• EXCLUDE - relevant systematic review [Info] cost effectiveness of interventions to increase PA - some environmental changes in there that might be relevant
Lanzendorf (2014)	The cycling boom in large German cities--Empirical evidence for successful cycling campaigns	• EXCLUDE - study type

Lawrie (2006)	Research Pays Off: Bikeways to Prosperity: Assessing the Economic Impact of Bicycle Facilities	• EXCLUDE on outcomes
Learnihan et al 2011	Effect of scale on the links between walking and urban design.	• EXCLUDE on study type [Info] Cross sectional survey
Lee et al, 2009	The built environment and physical activity levels: the Harvard Alumni Health Study	• EXCLUDE - no data to extract
Li (2012)	Congestion charging and car use: A review of stated preference and opinion studies and market monitoring evidence	• EXCLUDE on outcomes
Loader (2009)	Growing bus patronage and addressing transport disadvantage The Melbourneexperience	• INCLUDE - transport
MacDonald (2010)	The Effect of Light Rail Transit on Body Mass Index and Physical Activity	• EXCLUDE - study type [Info] cross sectional association
Maddock (2008)	Increasing access to places for physical activity through a joint use agreement: a case study in urban Honolulu	• EXCLUDE on intervention
Margaret (2006)	Age-friendly cities	• EXCLUDE on study type
Martens (2007)	Promoting Bike-and-Ride: The Dutch Experience	• EXCLUDE - study type
Mason (2011)	Ciclovìa in Chicago: a strategy for community development to improve public health	• EXCLUDE on outcomes
McCormack (2011)	In search of causality: A systematic review of the relationship between the built environment and physical activity among adults	• EXCLUDE - relevant systematic review
McCreedy (2009)	Get Active Orlando: Changing the Built Environment to Increase Physical Activity	• EXCLUDE on study type
McDonald (2013)	Impact of the Safe Routes to School program on walking and biking: Eugene, Oregon study	• EXCLUDE on outcomes [Info] Analysis combines educational intervention with environmental changes so cannot tell whihc part of the

		intervention is effective
McDonald (2014)	Impact of the Safe Routes to School Program on Walking and Bicycling	• EXCLUDE - study type
McKee (2007)	Promoting walking to school: results of a quasi-experimental trial	• EXCLUDE on intervention
Mehdipanah (2013)	An evaluation of an urban renewal program and its effects on neighborhood resident's overall wellbeing using concept mapping	• EXCLUDE on country
Mendes (2009)	Neighborhood Social Cohesion and Disorder in Relation to Walking in Community-Dwelling Older Adults: A Multilevel Analysis	• EXCLUDE - study type [Info] association study
Michael (2014)	Environmental influences on healthy and active ageing: a systematic review	• EXCLUDE on intervention
Miller (2009)	Slavic Village: incorporating active living into community development through partnerships	• EXCLUDE on outcomes
Montemurro (2011)	"Walkable by Willpower": Resident perceptions of neighbourhood environments	• EXCLUDE on country
Moran (2014)	Understanding the relationships between the physical environment and physical activity in older adults: A systematic review of qualitative studies	• EXCLUDE - Qualitative
Moudon and Stewart, 2012	Moving Forward: Safe Routes to School Progress in Five States	• EXCLUDE - duplicate [Info] *Stewart 2014 duplicate*
Muller-Riemenschneider (2009)	Cost-effectiveness of interventions promoting physical activity	• EXCLUDE relevant systematic review
Mulvaney (2015)	Cycling infrastructure for reducing cycling injuries in cyclists	• EXCLUDE - relevant systematic review
Murthy (2015)	Making Our Communities Walkable for Older Adults	• EXCLUDE - no data to extract

Newton (2010)	Increasing Independence for Older People through Good Street Design	• EXCLUDE - qualitative
Nicaise (2012)	Evaluation of a redesigned outdoor space on preschool children's physical activity during recess	• EXCLUDE - out of scope
Nicholson (2014)	Developing a Measure of Traffic Calming Associated with Elementary School Students' Active Transport	• EXCLUDE - study type
O'Fallon, 2010	Bike Now: Exploring methods of building sustained participation in cycle commuting in New Zealand.	• EXCLUDE on intervention
Ogilvie (2010)	Shoe leather epidemiology: Active travel and transport infrastructure in the urban landscape	• EXCLUDE out of scope
Ogilvie (2010)	Commuting and health in Cambridge: a study of a 'natural experiment' in the provision of new transport infrastructure	• EXCLUDE - no data to extract
Ogilvie (2011)	An applied ecological framework for evaluating infrastructure to promote walking and cycling: the iConnect Study	• EXCLUDE - no data to extract
Ogilvie (2012)	Evaluating the travel, physical activity and carbon impacts of a 'natural experiment' in the provision of new walking and cycling infrastructure: Methods for the core module of the iConnect study	• EXCLUDE - no data to extract
Ogilvie (2016)	Health impacts of the Cambridgeshire Guided Busway: a natural experimental study (Structured abstract)	• EXCLUDE - duplicate[Info] data reported elsewhere
Ogilvie (2016)	Health impacts of the Cambridgeshire Guided Busway : a natural experimental study	• EXCLUDE - duplicate
Omishakin (2009)	Achieving Built-Environment and Active Living Goals Through Music City Moves	• EXCLUDE on study type
Orenstein (2007)	Safe Routes to School: Safety & Mobility Analysis: Report to the California Legislature	• EXCLUDE - duplicate
Panken and Holaly-Zembo, 2015	Using an integrated approach to evaluate "Where do Flint's families play"	• EXCLUDE - no baseline data

Petticrew (2009)	The SHARP study: A quantitative and qualitative evaluation of the short-term outcomes of housing and neighbourhood renewal	• EXCLUDE on intervention
Pucher (2010)	Infrastructure, programs, and policies to increase bicycling: An international review	• EXCLUDE - relevant systematic review
Rantakokko (2012)	Perceived barriers in the outdoor environment and development of walking difficulties in older people	• EXCLUDE - Qualitative
Reed (2009)	Profile differences of users of paved versus natural-surface trails	• EXCLUDE on outcomes
Reynolds (2014)	Systematic review of incidental physical activity community interventions	• EXCLUDE - out of scope
Richardson (2013)	Building HIA approaches into strategies for green space use: an example from Plymouth's (UK) Stepping Stones to Nature project	• EXCLUDE no data to extract
Rind (2015)	"I used to be as fit as a linnet" - Beliefs, attitudes, and environmental supportiveness for physical activity in former mining areas in the North-East of England	• EXCLUDE - Qualitative
Rissel (2013)	Evaluating the transport, health and economic impacts of new urban cycling infrastructure in Sydney, Australia - protocol paper	• EXCLUDE - no data to extract
Rose and Marfurt, 2007	Travel behaviour change impacts of a major ride to work day event.	• EXCLUDE on intervention
Rosenberg (2011)	Physical activity among persons aging with mobility disabilities: Shaping a research agenda	• EXCLUDE on study type
Rutt (2008)	Using policy and built environment interventions to improve public health	• EXCLUDE - no data to extract
Saelens (2008)	Built environment correlates of walking: a review	• EXCLUDE on study type
Sarmiento (2010)	The Ciclovia-Recreativa: A mass-recreational program with public health potential	• EXCLUDE relevant systematic review [Info] Not all papers relevant, country dependent
Sayers (2012)	Bike, Walk, and Wheel: A Way of Life in Columbia, Missouri, Revisited	• EXCLUDE - study type

Schasberger (2009)	Promoting and Developing a Trail Network Across Suburban, Rural, and Urban Communities	• EXCLUDE on outcomes
Schasberger (2009)	Promoting and Developing a Trail Network Across Suburban, Rural, and Urban Communities	• EXCLUDE on outcomes
Simons (2014)	Why do young adults choose different transport modes? A focus group study	• EXCLUDE on country
Skelton (2013)	Environmental and behavioural interventions for reducing physical activity limitation in community-dwelling visually impaired older people	• EXCLUDE relevant systematic review
Slavulj (2012)	Stimulation of Public Urban Passenger Transport through Transport Demand Management (Poticanje javnoga gradskoga putni~kog prijevoza upravljanjem prijevozne potra`nje)	• EXCLUDE - unavailable
Soler (2013)	Play streets: working together to encourage healthier living in communities. Interviewed by Jamie Devereaux	• EXCLUDE - study type
SQW Consulting 2007	Valuing the benefits of cycling: A report to Cycling England	• EXCLUDE - no data to extract
SQW Consulting 2008	Planning for cycling: report to Cycling England	• EXCLUDE - unavailable
Stevens (2011)	Walkable new urban LEED_Neighborhood-Development (LEED-ND) community design and children's physical activity: Selection, environmental, or catalyst effects?	• EXCLUDE - no baseline data
Stewart (2015)	What interventions increase commuter cycling? A systematic review	• EXCLUDE - relevant systematic review
Stokes (2008)	Estimating the effects of light rail transit on health care costs	• EXCLUDE on study type
Strath (2007)	Operationalizing environmental indicators for physical activity in older adults	• EXCLUDE out of scope
Strath (2007)	Operationalizing environmental indicators for physical activity in older adults	• EXCLUDE - out of scope
Susilo (2012)	The Influence of Individuals' Environmental Attitudes and Urban Design Features on Their Travel Patterns in Sustainable Neighborhoods in the UK	• EXCLUDE on study type [Info] cross sectional survey

Sustrans Scotland 2014	Sustrans Scotland: walking and cycling outcomes, Sustrans' Scottish Government Grant 2012-2015.	• EXCLUDE on intervention
Taylor (2007)	Changing social and built environments to promote physical activity: recommendations from low income, urban women	• EXCLUDE - study type
Tenbrink (2009)	Project U-Turn: Increasing Active Transportation in Jackson, Michigan	• EXCLUDE - no data to extract
Thomas (2009)	Bike, Walk, and Wheel: A Way of Life in Columbia, Missouri	• EXCLUDE on study type
Timperio (2015)	Playability: Built and Social Environment Features That Promote Physical Activity Within Children	• EXCLUDE on study type [Info] Relevant SR - all cross sectional studies included
Toftager (2011)	SPACE for physical activity--a multicomponent intervention study: study design and baseline findings from a cluster randomized controlled trial	• EXCLUDE on study type [Info] The paper describes the study design, data collection, intervention components and implementation. No results presented.
Trayers (2006)	Improving health through neighbourhood environmental change: Are we speaking the same language? A qualitative study of views of different stakeholders	• EXCLUDE - no data to extract
Tully (2013)	Built environment interventions for increasing physical activity in adults and children	• EXCLUDE relevant systematic review [Info] open space and transport
Tully (2013)	Physical activity and the rejuvenation of Connswater (PARC study): protocol for a natural experiment investigating the impact of urban regeneration on public health	• EXCLUDE - no data to extract
Umstattd (2016)	Physical Activity-Related Policy and Environmental Strategies to Prevent Obesity in Rural Communities: A Systematic Review of the Literature, 2002-2013	• EXCLUDE - out of scope

Van Cauwenberg (2014)	Using manipulated photographs to identify features of streetscapes that may encourage older adults to walk for transport	• EXCLUDE - out of scope
van Sluijs (2007)	Effectiveness of Interventions to Promote Physical Activity in Children and Adolescents: Systematic Review of Controlled Trials	• EXCLUDE on intervention [Info] systematic review but not relevant
Van Sluijs (2008)	Effectiveness of interventions to promote physical activity in children and adolescents: Systematic review of controlled trials	• EXCLUDE on intervention
Vandenberg (2016)	Walking and Walkability: Is Wayfinding a Missing Link? Implications for Public Health Practice	• EXCLUDE on intervention
Vanwolleghem (2014)	Feasibility and effectiveness of drop-off spots to promote walking to school	• EXCLUDE - out of scope
Veitch (2014)	A natural experiment to examine the impact of park renewal on park-use and park-based physical activity in a disadvantaged neighbourhood: the REVAMP study methods	• EXCLUDE - no data to extract
Verstraete et al 2006	Increasing children's physical activity levels during recess periods in elementary schools: the effects of providing game equipment	• EXCLUDE on intervention
Villa-Gonzalez (2016)	Effectiveness of an active commuting school-based intervention at 6-month follow-up	• EXCLUDE on intervention
Vuori (2011)	Promoting cycling: a review of interventions	• EXCLUDE - relevant systematic review
Wells (2008)	Neighborhood Design and Walking. A Quasi-Experimental Longitudinal Study	• EXCLUDE on intervention
Wen (2008)	Increasing active travel to school: Are we on the right track? A cluster randomised controlled trial from Sydney, Australia	• EXCLUDE on intervention
West (2011)	The impacts of building a greenway on proximate residents' physical activity	• EXCLUDE - duplicate
Wilson and Cope 2011	Value for money of walking and cycling interventions: making the case for investment in active travel.	• EXCLUDE - no data to extract
Wolf (2015)	The impact of a temporary recurrent street closure on physical activity in New York City	• EXCLUDE - study type

Zangenehpour (2016)	Are signalized intersections with cycle tracks safer? A case-control study based on automated surrogate safety analysis using video data	• EXCLUDE - study type
Zapata Diomedi et al 2016	The effects of built environment attributes on physical activity-related health and healthcare costs outcomes in Australia	• EXCLUDE - relevant systematic review
Zheng (2016)	Time-dependent area-based pricing for multimodal systems with heterogeneous users in an agent-based environment	• EXCLUDE - study type
Zhu (2014)	A retrospective study on changes in residents' physical activities, social interactions, and neighborhood cohesion after moving to a walkable community	• EXCLUDE on study type
Zieff (2014)	A "Ciclovia" in San Francisco: Characteristics and physical activity behavior of Sunday Streets participants	• EXCLUDE on study type [Info] Cross sectional survey
Zook (2012)	Design and Pedestrianism in a Smart Growth Development	• EXCLUDE - study type

5. Non-Comparative Studies (Excluded)

Aarts M J, de Vries , S I, van Oers , H A M, and Schuit A J. (2012). Outdoor play among children in relation to neighborhood characteristics: a cross-sectional neighborhood observation study. *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity*, 9, pp.no pagination.

Aarts Marie-Jeanne, Mathijssen Jolanda J. P, van Oers , Johannes A M, and Schuit Albertine J. (2013). Associations between environmental characteristics and active commuting to school among children: a cross-sectional study. *International journal of behavioral medicine*, 20(4), pp.538-55.

Abildso Christiaan G, Zizzi Sam, Abildso Laurie C, Steele Jenessa C, and Gordon Paul M. (2007). Built Environment and Psychosocial Factors Associated With Trail Proximity and Use. *American Journal of Health Behavior*, 31(4), pp.374-383.

Adams E J, Goodman A, Sahlqvist S, Bull F C, and Ogilvie D. (2013). Correlates of walking and cycling for transport and recreation: Factor structure, reliability and behavioural associations of the perceptions of the environment in the neighbourhood scale (PENS). *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity*, 10, pp.no pagination.

Adams M A, Ding D, Sallis J F, Bowles H R, Ainsworth B E, Bergman P, Bull F C, Carr H, Craig C L, De Bourdeaudhuij , I , Gomez L F, Hagstromer M, Klasson-Heggebo L, Inoue S, Lefevre J, Macfarlane D J, Matsudo S, Matsudo V, McLean G, Murase N, Sjostrom M, Tomten H, Volbekiene V, and Bauman A. (2013). Patterns of neighborhood environment attributes related to physical activity across 11 countries: A latent class analysis. *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity*, 10, pp.no pagination.

Adams M A, Todd M, Kurka J, Conway T L, Cain K L, Frank L D, and Sallis J F. (2015). Patterns of Walkability, Transit, and Recreation Environment for Physical Activity. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 49(6), pp.878-887.

Adams Marc A, Frank Lawrence D, Schipperijn Jasper, Smith Graham, Chapman James, Christiansen Lars B, Coffee Neil, Salvo Deborah, du Toit, Lorinne , Dygryn Jan, Hino Adriano Akira Ferreira, Lai Poh-chin, Mavoa Suzanne, Pinzon Jose David, Van de Weghe , Nico , Cerin Ester, Davey Rachel, Macfarlane Duncan, Owen Neville, and Sallis James F. (2014). International variation in neighborhood walkability, transit, and recreation environments using geographic information systems: the IPEN adult study. *International journal of health geographics*, 13, pp.43.

Adams Marc A, Sallis James F, Conway Terry L, Frank Lawrence D, Saelens Brian E, Kerr Jacqueline, Cain Kelli L, and King Abby C. (2012). Neighborhood environment profiles for physical activity among older adults. *American journal of health behavior*, 36(6), pp.757-69.

Adams Marc A, Sallis James F, Kerr Jacqueline, Conway Terry L, Saelens Brian E, Frank Lawrence D, Norman Gregory J, and Cain Kelli L. (2011). Neighborhood environment profiles related to physical activity and weight status: A latent profile analysis. *Preventive Medicine*, 52(5), pp.326-331.

Aditjandra Paulus, Teguh , Mulley Corinne, Nelson John, and D . (2013). The influence of neighbourhood design on travel behaviour: Empirical evidence from North East England. *Transport Policy*, 26, pp.54-65.

Aibar Alberto, Bois Julien E, Generelo Eduardo, Bengoechea Enrique García, Paillard Thierry, and Zaragoza Javier. (2015). Effect of Weather, School Transport, and Perceived Neighborhood Characteristics on Moderate to Vigorous Physical Activity Levels of Adolescents From Two European Cities. *Environment & Behavior*, 47(4), pp.395-417.

Alton D, Adab P, Roberts L, and Barrett T. (2007). Relationship between walking levels and perceptions of the local neighbourhood environment. *Archives of Disease in Childhood*, 92(1), pp.29-33.

Arango C M, Paez D C, Reis R S, Brownson R C, and Parra D C. (2013). Association between the perceived environment and physical activity among adults in Latin America: A systematic review. *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity*, 10, pp.no pagination.

Arvidsson Daniel, Eriksson Ulf, Lonn Sara Larsson, and Sundquist Kristina. (2013). Neighborhood walkability, income, and hour-by-hour physical activity patterns. *Medicine and science in sports and exercise*, 45(4), pp.698-705.

Arvidsson Daniel, Kawakami Naomi, Ohlsson Henrik, and Sundquist Kristina. (2012). Physical activity and concordance between objective and perceived walkability. *Medicine and science in sports and exercise*, 44(2), pp.280-7.

Aytur S A, Rodriguez D A, Evenson K R, Catellier D J, and Rosamond W D. (2008). The sociodemographics of land use planning: Relationships to physical activity, accessibility, and equity. *Health and Place*, 14(3), pp.367-385.

Babey Susan H, Hastert Theresa A, Huang Winnie, and Brown E Richard. (2009). Sociodemographic, Family, and Environmental Factors Associated with Active Commuting to School among US Adolescents. *Journal of Public Health Policy*, 30(supplement), pp.S203-S220.

Babey Susan H, Hastert Theresa A, Yu Hongjian, and Brown E Richard. (2008). Physical Activity among Adolescents: When Do Parks Matter?. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 34(4), pp.345-348.

Babey Susan H, Tan Diane, Wolstein Joelle, and Diamant Allison L. (2015). Neighborhood, family and individual characteristics related to adolescent park-based physical activity. *Preventive Medicine*, 76, pp.31-36.

Badland H M, Oliver M, Kearns R A, Mavoa S, Witten K, Duncan M J, and Batty G D. (2012). Association of neighbourhood residence and preferences with the built environment, work-related travel behaviours, and health implications for employed adults: Findings from the URBAN study. *Social Science and Medicine*, 75(8), pp.1469-1476.

Badland Hannah M, Schofield Grant M, and Garrett Nick. (2008). Travel behavior and objectively measured urban design variables: Associations for adults traveling to work. *Health & Place*, 14(1), pp.85-95.

Bai Hua, Wilhelm Stanis, Sonja A, Kaczynski Andrew T, and Besenyi Gina M. (2013). Perceptions of neighborhood park quality: associations with physical activity and body mass index. *Annals of behavioral medicine : a publication of the Society of Behavioral Medicine*, 45 Suppl 1, pp.S39-48.

Bakhtari Aghdam, Fatemeh , Baghiani Moghaddam, Mohammad Hossein, Asghari Jafarabadi, Mohammad , Allahverdipour Hamid, Dabagh Nikookheslat, Saed , and Noorizadeh Roghaieh. (2013). Explaining the role of personal, social and physical environment factors on employed women's physical activity: a structural equation analysis. *Global journal of health science*, 5(4), pp.189-99.

Ball K, Timperio A, Salmon J, Giles-Corti B, Roberts R, and Crawford D. (2007). Personal, social and environmental determinants of educational inequalities in walking: A multilevel study. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health*, 61(2), pp.108-114.

Baskin Monica L, Dulin-Keita Akilah, Thind Herpreet, and Godsey Emily. (2015). Social and Cultural Environment Factors Influencing Physical Activity Among African-American Adolescents. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 56(5), pp.536-542.

Beenackers Marille A, Foster Sarah, Kamphuis Carlijn B. M, Titze Sylvia, Divitini Mark, Knuiman Matthew, van Lenthe , Frank J, and Giles-Corti Billie. (2012). Taking Up Cycling After Residential Relocation: Built Environment Factors. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 42(6), pp.610-615.

Berke E M, Koepsell T D, Moudon A V, Hoskins R E, and Larson E B. (2007). Association of the built environment with physical activity and obesity in older persons. *American Journal of Public Health*, 97(3), pp.486-492.

Berrigan David, Pickle Linda W, and Dill Jennifer. (2010). Associations between street connectivity and active transportation. *International journal of health geographics*, 9, pp.20.

Bird S R, Radermacher H, Sims J, Feldman S, Browning C, and Thomas S. (2010). Factors affecting walking activity of older people from culturally diverse groups: An Australian experience. *Journal of Science and Medicine in Sport*, 13(4), pp.417-423.

Bloemen M A, Backx F J, Takken T, Wittink H, Benner J, Mollema J, de Groot , and J F. (2015). Factors associated with physical activity in children and adolescents with a physical disability: a systematic review. *Developmental medicine and child neurology*, 57(2), pp.137-148.

Boarnet Marlon G, Forsyth Ann, Day Kristen, and Oakes J Michael. (2011). The Street Level Built Environment and Physical Activity and Walking: Results of a Predictive Validity Study for the Irvine Minnesota Inventory. *Environment & Behavior*, 43(6), pp.735-775.

Bocarro Jason N, Floyd Myron F, Smith William R, Edwards Michael B, Schultz Courtney L, Baran Perver, Moore Robin A, Cosco Nilda, and Suau Luis J. (2015). Social and Environmental Factors Related to Boys' and Girls' Park-Based Physical Activity. *Preventing chronic disease*, 12, pp.E97.

Boer Rob, Zheng Yuhui, Overton Adrian, Ridgeway Gregory K, and Cohen Deborah A. (2007). Neighborhood design and walking trips in ten U.S. metropolitan areas. *American journal of preventive medicine*, 32(4), pp.298-304.

Boone-Heinonen Janne, Popkin Barry M, Song Yan, and Gordon-Larsen Penny. (2010). What neighborhood area captures built environment features related to adolescent physical activity?. *Health & Place*, 16(6), pp.1280-1286.

Bopp M, Hastmann T J, and Norton A N. (2013). Active commuting among K-12 educators: A study examining walking and biking to work. *Journal of Environmental and Public Health*, 2013, pp.no pagination.

Bopp Melissa, Sims Dangaia, Colgan Joanna, Rovniak Liza, Matthews Stephen A, and Poole Erika. (2016). An Examination of Workplace Influences on Active Commuting in a Sample of University Employees. *Journal of public health management and practice : JPHMP*, 22(4), pp.387-91.

Borst Hieronymus C, Miedema Henk M. E, de Vries , Sanne I, Graham Jamie M. A, van Dongen , and Jef E F. (2008). Relationships between street characteristics and perceived attractiveness for walking reported by elderly people. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 28(4), pp.353-361.

Boschmann E Eric, Brady Sylvia, and A . (2013). Travel behaviors, sustainable mobility, and transit-oriented developments: a travel counts analysis of older adults in the Denver, Colorado metropolitan area. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 33, pp.1-11.

Bracy N L, Millstein R A, Carlson J A, Conway T L, Sallis J F, Saelens B E, Kerr J, Cain K L, Frank L D, and King A C. (2014). Is the relationship between the built environment and physical activity moderated by perceptions of crime and safety?. *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity*, 11(1), pp.no pagination.

Brazdova Zuzana Derflerova, Klimusova Helena, Hruska Dalibor, Prokopova Alice, Burjanek Ales, and Wulff Krauff Rainer Schwanhaeuser. (2015). Assessment of Environmental Determinants of Physical Activity: a Study of Built Environment Indicators in Brno, Czech Republic. *Central European journal of public health*, 23 Suppl, pp.S23-9.

Bringolf-Isler Bettina, Grize Leticia, Mader Urs, Ruch Nicole, Sennhauser Felix H, Braun-Fahrlander Charlotte, and team Scarpol. (2008). Personal and environmental factors associated with active commuting to school in Switzerland. *Preventive Medicine*, 46(1), pp.67-73.

Broberg Anna, and Sarjala Satu. (2015). School Travel Mode Choice and the Characteristics of the Urban Built Environment: The Case of Helsinki, Finland. *Transport Policy*, 37, pp.1-10.

Brown Barbara B, Smith Ken R, Hanson Heidi, Fan Jessie X, Kowaleski-Jones Lori, and Zick Cathleen D. (2013). Neighborhood Design for Walking and Biking: Physical Activity and Body Mass Index. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 44(3), pp.231-238.

Buck Christoph, Tkaczick Tobias, Pitsiladis Yannis, De Bourdehaudhuij , Ilse , Reisch Lucia, Ahrens Wolfgang, and Pigeot Iris. (2015). Objective measures of the built environment and physical activity in children: from walkability to moveability. *Journal of urban health : bulletin of the New York Academy of Medicine*, 92(1), pp.24-38.

Buehler Ralph, and Pucher John. (2012). Cycling to Work in 90 Large American Cities: New Evidence on the Role of Bike Paths and Lanes. *Transportation*, 39(2), pp.409-32.

Buehler Ralph, and Pucher John. (2012). Walking and Cycling in Western Europe and the United States: Trends, Policies, and Lessons. *TR News*, , pp.34-42.

Buehler Ralph, Hamre Andrea, Sonenklar Dan, and Goger Paul. (2011). Trends and Determinants of Cycling in the Washington, DC Region. *This report was sponsored by the U.S. Department of Transportation*, , pp..

Buehler Ralph, Hamre Andrea, Sonenklar Dan, and Goger Paul. (2012). Cycling Trends and Policies in the Washington, DC Region. *World Transport Policy & Practice*, 18, pp.6-29.

Buehler Ralph. (2012). Determinants of Bicycle Commuting in the Washington, DC Region: The Role of Bicycle Parking, Cyclist Showers, and Free Car Parking at Work. *Transportation Research: Part D: Transport and Environment*, 17(7), pp.525-31.

Bungum Timothy J, Landers Merrill, Azzarelli Maria, and Moonie Sheniz. (2012). Perceived environmental physical activity correlates among Asian Pacific Islander Americans. *Journal of physical activity & health*, 9(8), pp.1098-104.

Bungum Timothy J, Lounsbery Monica, Moonie Sheniz, and Gast Julie. (2009). Prevalence and Correlates of Walking and Biking to School Among Adolescents. *Journal of Community Health*, 34(2), pp.129-134.

Cain K L, Millstein R A, Sallis J F, Conway T L, Gavand K A, Frank L D, Saelens B E, Geremia C M, Chapman J, Adams M A, Glanz K, and King A C. (2014). Contribution of streetscape audits to explanation of physical activity in four age groups based on the Microscale Audit of Pedestrian Streetscapes (MAPS). *Social Science and Medicine*, 116, pp.82-92.

Calogiuri Giovanna, and Chroni Stiliani. (2014). The impact of the natural environment on the promotion of active living: an integrative systematic review. *BMC public health*, 14, pp.873.

Calvey J C, Shackleton J P, Taylor M D, and Llewellyn R. (2015). Engineering Condition Assessment of Cycling Infrastructure: Cyclists' Perceptions of Satisfaction and Comfort. *Transportation Research: Part A: Policy and Practice*, 78(0), pp.134-43.

Cao Xinyu. (2006). The Causal Relationship between the Built Environment and Personal Travel Choice: Evidence from Northern California. *University of California, and Davis. Institute of Transportation Studies. Research report*, , pp.191.

Carlson J A, Sallis J F, Conway T L, Saelens B E, Frank L D, Kerr J, Cain K L, and King A C. (2012). Interactions between psychosocial and built environment factors in explaining older adults' physical activity. *Preventive Medicine*, 54(1), pp.68-73.

Carlson Jordan A, Bracy Nicole L, Sallis James F, Millstein Rachel A, Saelens Brian E, Kerr Jacqueline, Conway Terry L, Frank Lawrence D, Cain Kelli L, and King Abby C. (2014). Sociodemographic moderators of relations of neighborhood safety to physical activity. *Medicine and science in sports and exercise*, 46(8), pp.1554-63.

Carlson Jordan A, Saelens Brian E, Kerr Jacqueline, Schipperijn Jasper, Conway Terry L, Frank Lawrence D, Chapman Jim E, Glanz Karen, Cain Kelli L, and Sallis James F. (2015). Association between neighborhood walkability and GPS-measured walking, bicycling and vehicle time in adolescents. *Health & Place*, 32, pp.1-7.

Carlson Jordan A, Sallis James F, Kerr Jacqueline, Conway Terry L, Cain Kelli, Frank Lawrence D, and Saelens Brian E. (2014). Built environment characteristics and parent active transportation are associated with active travel to school in youth age 12-15. *British journal of sports medicine*, 48(22), pp.1634-9.

Carson Valerie, Rosu Andrei, and Janssen Ian. (2014). A cross-sectional study of the environment, physical activity, and screen time among young children and their parents. *BMC public health*, 14, pp.61.

Carver A, Timperio A F, and Crawford D A. (2008). Neighborhood road environments and physical activity among youth: The CLAN study. *Journal of Urban Health*, 85(4), pp.532-544.

Carver Alison, Timperio Anna, and Crawford David. (2008). Perceptions of neighborhood safety and physical activity among youth: the CLAN study. *Journal of physical activity & health*, 5(3), pp.430-44.

Carver Alison, Timperio Anna, and Crawford David. (2008). Playing it safe: the influence of neighbourhood safety on children's physical activity. A review. *Health & place*, 14(2), pp.217-27.

Carver Alison, Timperio Anna, Hesketh Kylie, and Crawford David. (2010). Are safety-related features of the road environment associated with smaller declines in physical activity among youth?. *Journal of urban health : bulletin of the New York Academy of Medicine*, 87(1), pp.29-43.

Casagrande Sarah Stark, Whitt-Glover Melicia C, Lancaster Kristie J, Odoms-Young Angela M, and Gary Tiffany L. (2009). Built environment and health behaviors among African Americans: a systematic review. *American journal of preventive medicine*, 36(2), pp.174-81.

Cauwenberg J, Clarys P, Bourdeaudhuij I, Holle V, Verté D, Witte N, Donder L, Buffel T, Dury S, and Deforche B. (2013). Older adults' transportation walking: a cross-sectional study on the cumulative influence of physical environmental factors. *International journal of health geographics*, 12, pp.37.

Cerin E, Vandelanotte C, Leslie E, and Merom D. (2008). Recreational Facilities and Leisure-Time Physical Activity: An Analysis of Moderators and Self-Efficacy as a Mediator. *Health Psychology*, 27(2 SUPPL. 2), pp.S126-S135.

Cerin Ester, Cain Kelli L, Conway Terry L, Van Dyck , Delfien , Hinckson Erica, Schipperijn Jasper, De Bourdeaudhuij , Ilse , Owen Neville, Davey Rachel C, Hino Adriano Akira Ferreira, Mitas Josef, Orzanco-Garralda Rosario, Salvo Deborah, Sarmiento Olga L, Christiansen Lars B, Macfarlane Duncan J, Schofield Grant, and Sallis James F. (2014). Neighborhood environments and objectively measured physical activity in 11 countries. *Medicine and science in sports and exercise*, 46(12), pp.2253-64.

Chaix B, Meline J, Duncan S, Jardinier L, Perchoux C, Vallee J, Merrien C, Karusisi N, Lewin A, Brondeel R, and Kestens Y. (2013). Neighborhood environments, mobility, and health: Towards a new generation of studies in environmental health research. *Revue d'Epidemiologie et de Sante Publique*, 61(SUPPL.3), pp.S139-S145.

Chaix B, Simon C, Charreire H, Thomas F, Kestens Y, Karusisi N, Vallee J, Oppert J M, Weber C, and Pannier B. (2014). The environmental correlates of overall and neighborhood based recreational walking (a cross-sectional analysis of the RECORD Study). *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity*, 11(1), pp.no pagination.

Chaudhury Habib, Campo Michael, Michael Yvonne, and Mahmood Atiya. (2016). Neighbourhood environment and physical activity in older adults. *Social Science & Medicine*, 149(C), pp.104-113.

Cheah Whye L, Chang Ching T, and Saimon Rosalia. (2012). Environment factors associated with adolescents' body mass index, physical activity and physical fitness in Kuching South City, Sarawak: a cross-sectional study. *International journal of adolescent medicine and health*, 24(4), pp.331-7.

Chomitz Virginia Rall, Aske Denise Burke, McDonald Julia, Cabral Howard, and Hacker Karen Ann. (2011). The role of recreational spaces in meeting physical activity recommendations among middle school students. *Journal of physical activity & health*, 8 Suppl 1, pp.S8-S16.

Chriqui Jamie F, Nicholson Lisa M, Thrun Emily, Leider Julien, and Slater Sandy J. (2016). More Active Living-Oriented County and Municipal Zoning Is Associated With Increased Adult Leisure Time Physical Activity - United States, 2011. *Environment and Behavior*, 48(1), pp.111.

Chrisman Matthew, Nothwehr Faryle, Janz Kathleen, Yang Jingzhen, and Oleson Jacob. (2015). Perceived Resources and Environmental Correlates of Domain-Specific Physical Activity in Rural Midwestern Adults. *Journal of physical activity & health*, 12(7), pp.962-7.

Christensen Keith M, Holt Judith M, and Wilson Justin F. (2010). Effects of perceived neighborhood characteristics and use of community facilities on physical activity of adults with and without disabilities. *Preventing chronic disease*, 7(5), pp.A105.

Christiansen Lars Breum, Madsen Thomas, Schipperijn Jasper, Ersboll Annette K, and Troelsen Jens. (2014). Variations in active transport behavior among different neighborhoods and across adult lifestages. *Journal of transport & health*, 1(4), pp.316-325.

Christiansen Lars, B , Toftager Mette, Schipperijn Jasper, Ersboll Annette, K , Giles Corti, Billie , and Troelsen Jens. (2014). School site walkability and active school transport - association, mediation and moderation. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 34, pp.7-15.

Chung G L, and Youngtae C. (2009). Relationship between perceived neighborhood characteristics and vigorous physical activity among adult Seoul residents. *Journal of Preventive Medicine and Public Health*, 42(4), pp.215-222.

Clark Andrew F, Scott Darren M, and Yiannakoulias Nikolaos. (2014). Examining the Relationship between Active Travel, Weather, and the Built Environment: A Multilevel Approach Using a GPS-Enhanced Dataset. *Transportation*, 41(2), pp.325-38.

Cleland Verity J, Ball Kylie, Salmon Jo, Timperio Anna F, and Crawford David A. (2010). Personal, social and environmental correlates of resilience to physical inactivity among women from socio-economically disadvantaged backgrounds. *Health education research*, 25(2), pp.268-81.

Cohen D A, Ashwood J S, Scott M M, Overton A, Evenson K R, Staten L K, Porter D, McKenzie T L, and Catellier D. (2006). Public parks and physical activity among adolescent girls. *Pediatrics*, 118(5), pp.e1381-9.

Cohen Deborah A, Han Bing, Nagel Catherine J, Harnik Peter, McKenzie Thomas L, Evenson Kelly R, Marsh Terry, Williamson Stephanie, Vaughan Christine, and Katta Sweatha. (2016). The First National Study of Neighborhood Parks: Implications for Physical Activity. *American journal of preventive medicine*, , pp..

Cole-Hunter T, and et al. (2015). Objective Correlates and Determinants of Bicycle Commuting Propensity in an Urban Environment. *Transportation Research: Part D: Transport and Environment*, 40(0), pp.132-43.

Coughenour Courtney, Coker Lisa, and Bungum Tim J. (2014). Environmental and social determinants of youth physical activity intensity levels at neighborhood parks in Las Vegas, NV. *Journal of community health*, 39(6), pp.1092-6.

Coughenour Courtney, Paz Alexander, de la Fuente-Mella , Hanns , and Singh Ashok. (2015). Multinomial logistic regression to estimate and predict perceptions of bicycle and transportation infrastructure in a sprawling metropolitan area. *Journal of public health (Oxford, and England)*, , pp..

Cozens P, and Love T. (2009). Manipulating permeability as a process for controlling crime: balancing security and sustainability in local contexts. *BUILT ENVIRONMENT*, 35, pp.346-65.

Cradock Angie L, Melly Steven J, Allen Joseph G, Morris Jeffrey S, and Gortmaker Steven L. (2009). Youth Destinations Associated with Objective Measures of Physical Activity in Adolescents. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 45(3s), pp.S91-S98.

Crawford D, Cleland V, Timperio A, Salmon J, Andrianopoulos N, Roberts R, Giles-Corti B, Baur L, and Ball K. (2010). The longitudinal influence of home and neighbourhood environments on children's body mass index and physical activity over 5 years: The CLAN study. *International Journal of Obesity*, 34(7), pp.1177-1187.

Creatore M I, Glazier R H, Moineddin R, Fazli G S, Johns A, Gozdyra P, Matheson F I, Kaufman-Shriqui V, Rosella L C, Manuel D G, and Booth G L. (2016). Association of neighborhood walkability with change in overweight, obesity, and diabetes. *JAMA - Journal of the American Medical Association*, 315(20), pp.2211-2220.

Curriero Frank C, James Nathan T, Shields Timothy M, Gouvis Roman, Caterina , Furr-Holden C Debra M, Cooley-Strickland Michele, and Pollack Keshia M. (2013). Exploring walking path quality as a factor for urban elementary school children's active transport to school. *Journal of physical activity & health*, 10(3), pp.323-34.

Curtis Carey, Babb Courtney, and Olaru Doina. (2015). Built environment and children's travel to school. *Transport Policy*, 42(C), pp.21-33.

Cutts B B, Darby K J, Boone C G, and Brewis A. (2009). City structure, obesity, and environmental justice: An integrated analysis of physical and social barriers to walkable streets and park access. *Social Science and Medicine*, 69(9), pp.1314-1322.

Cutumisu Nicoleta, Belanger-Gravel Ariane, Laferte Marilie, Lagarde Francois, Lemay Jean-Frederic, and Gauvin Lise. (2014). Influence of area deprivation and perceived neighbourhood safety on active transport to school among urban Quebec preadolescents. *Canadian journal of public health = Revue canadienne de sante publique*, 105(5), pp.e376-82.

D'Haese Sara, Meester Femke De, Cardon Greet, Bourdeaudhuij Ilse De, Deforche Benedicte, and Dyck Delfien Van. (2015). Changes in the perceived neighborhood environment in relation to changes in physical activity: A longitudinal study from childhood into adolescence. *Health & Place*, 33, pp.132-141.

D'Alessandro Daniela, Buffoli Maddalena, Capasso Lorenzo, Fara Gaetano Maria, Rebecchi Andrea, Capolongo Stefano, Hygiene on Built EnvironmentWorking Group on Healthy Building, Preventive Medicine, and Public Health. (2015). Green areas and public health: improving wellbeing and physical activity in the urban context. *Epidemiologia e prevenzione*, 39(4 Suppl 1), pp.8-13.

Dalton Madeline A, Longacre Meghan R, Drake Keith M, Gibson Lucinda, Adachi-Mejia Anna M, Swain Karin, Xie Haiyi, and Owens Peter M. (2011). Built Environment Predictors of Active Travel to School among Rural Adolescents. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 40(3), pp.312-319.

Damant-Sirois Gabriel, and El-Geneidy Ahmed M. (2015). Who Cycles More? Determining Cycling Frequency through a Segmentation Approach in Montreal, Canada. *Transportation Research: Part A: Policy and Practice*, 77(0), pp.113-25.

Datar Ashlesha, Nicosia Nancy, Wong Elizabeth, and Shier Victoria. (2015). Neighborhood environment and children's physical activity and body mass index: evidence from military personnel installation assignments. *Childhood obesity (Print)*, 11(2), pp.130-8.

Davidson Z, Simen-Kapeu A, and Veugelers P J. (2010). Neighborhood determinants of self-efficacy, physical activity, and body weights among Canadian children. *Health & Place*, 16(3), pp.567-572.

Day Kristen, Loh Lawrence, Ruff Ryan Richard, Rosenblum Randi, Fischer Sean, and Lee Karen K. (2014). Does Bus Rapid Transit promote walking? An examination of New York City's Select Bus Service. *Journal of physical activity & health*, 11(8), pp.1512-6.

de Geus , Bas , De Bourdeaudhuij , Ilse , Jannes Caroline, and Meeusen Romain. (2008). Psychosocial and environmental factors associated with cycling for transport among a working population. *Health Education Research*, 23(4), pp.697-708.

De Meester , F , Van Dyck , D , De Bourdeaudhuij , I , Deforche B, and Cardon G. (2013). Does the perception of neighborhood built environmental attributes influence active transport in adolescents?. *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity*, 10, pp.no pagination.

De Meester , F , Van Dyck , D , De Bourdeaudhuij , I , Deforche B, and Cardon G. (2013). Do psychosocial factors moderate the association between neighborhood walkability and adolescents' physical activity?. *Social Science and Medicine*, 81, pp.1-9.

De Meester , Femke , Van Dyck , Delfien , De Bourdeaudhuij , Ilse , Deforche Benedicte, Sallis James F, and Cardon Greet. (2012). Active living neighborhoods: is neighborhood walkability a key element for Belgian adolescents?. *BMC public health*, 12, pp.7.

de Sa , E , and Ardern C I. (2014). Neighbourhood walkability, leisure-time and transport-related physical activity in a mixed urban-rural area. *PeerJ*, 2014(1), pp.no pagination.

de Sa , Eric , and Ardern Chris I. (2014). Associations between the built environment, total, recreational, and transit-related physical activity. *BMC public health*, 14, pp.693.

De Vries , S , van Dillen , S M E, Groenewegen P P, and Spreeuwenberg P. (2013). Streetscape greenery and health: Stress, social cohesion and physical activity as mediators. *Social Science and Medicine*, 94, pp.26-33.

De Vries , S I, Bakker I, Van Mechelen , W , and Hopman-Rock M. (2007). Determinants of activity-friendly neighborhoods for children: Results from the SPACE study. *American Journal of Health Promotion*, 21(4 SUPPL.), pp.312-316.

de Vries , S I, Hopman-Rock M, Bakker I, Hirasing R A, van Mechelen , and W . (2010). Built environmental correlates of walking and cycling in dutch urban children: Results from the SPACE study. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 7(5), pp.2309-2324.

De Witte , A , Macharis C, and Mairesse O. (2008). How persuasive is free public transport? A survey among commuters in the Brussels Capital Region. *TRANSPORT POLICY*, 15, pp.216-224.

Deforche B, Van Dyck , D , Verloigne M, De Bourdeaudhuij , and I . (2010). Perceived social and physical environmental correlates of physical activity in older adolescents and the moderating effect of self-efficacy. *Preventive Medicine*, 50, pp.S24-S29.

D'Haese S, De Meester , F , De Bourdeaudhuij , I , Deforche B, and Cardon G. (2011). Criterion distances and environmental correlates of active commuting to school in children. *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity*, 8, pp.no pagination.

D'Haese S, Van Dyck , D , De Bourdeaudhuij , I , Deforche B, and Cardon G. (2014). The association between objective walkability, neighborhood socio-economic status, and physical activity in Belgian children. *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity*, 11(1), pp.no pagination.

D'Haese S, Vanwolleghem G, Hinckson E, De Bourdeaudhuij , I , Deforche B, Van Dyck , D , and Cardon G. (2015). Cross-continental comparison of the association between the physical environment and active transportation in children: A systematic review. *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity*, 12(1), pp.no pagination.

Dill Jennifer, Mohr Cynthia, and Ma Liang. (2014). How Can Psychological Theory Help Cities Increase Walking and Bicycling?. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 80, pp.36-51.

Dills James E, Rutt Candace D, and Mumford Karen G. (2012). Objectively Measuring Route-To-Park Walkability in Atlanta, Georgia. *Environment & Behavior*, 44(6), pp.841-860.

Ding D, Adams M A, Sallis J F, Norman G J, Hovell M F, Chambers C D, Hofstetter C R, Bowles H R, Hagstromer M, Craig C L, Gomez L F, De Bourdeaudhuij , I , Macfarlane D J, Ainsworth B E, Bergman P, Bull F C, Carr H, Klasson-Heggebo L, Inoue S, Murase N, Matsudo S, Matsudo V, McLean G, Sjostrom M, Tomten H, Lefevre J, Volbekiene V, and Bauman A E. (2013). Perceived neighborhood environment and physical activity in 11 countries: Do associations differ by country?. *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity*, 10(1), pp.no pagination.

Djurhuus S, Hansen H S, Aadahl M, and Glumer C. (2014). The association between access to public transportation and self-reported active commuting. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 11(12), pp.12632-12651.

Djurhuus Sune, Hansen Henning Sten, Aadahl Mette, and Glumer Charlotte. (2014). Individual Public Transportation Accessibility is Positively Associated with Self-Reported Active Commuting. *Frontiers in public health*, 2, pp.240.

Dolash Karry, He Meizi, Yin Zenong, and Sosa Erica T. (2015). Factors That Influence Park Use and Physical Activity in Predominantly Hispanic and Low-Income Neighborhoods. *Journal of physical activity & health*, 12(4), pp.462-9.

Downward Paul, and Rasciute Simona. (2015). Assessing the Impact of the National Cycle Network and Physical Activity Lifestyle on Cycling Behaviour in England. *Transportation Research: Part A: Policy and Practice*, 78(0), pp.425-37.

Doyle Scott, Kelly Schwartz, Alexia , Schlossberg Marc, and Stockard Jean. (2006). Active Community Environments and Health: The Relationship of Walkable and Safe Communities to Individual Health. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 72, pp.19-31.

Dulin-Keita A, Clay O, Whittaker S, Hannon L, Adams I K, Rogers M, and Gans K. (2015). The influence of HOPE VI neighborhood revitalization on neighborhood-based physical activity: A mixed-methods approach. *Social Science and Medicine*, 139, pp.90-99.

Duncan G E, Cash S W, Horn E E, and Turkheimer E. (2015). Quasi-causal associations of physical activity and neighborhood walkability with body mass index: A twin study. *Preventive Medicine*, 70, pp.90-95.

Duncan Susan C, Strycker Lisa A, Chaumeton Nigel R, and Cromley Ellen K. (2016). Relations of Neighborhood Environment Influences, Physical Activity, and Active Transportation to/from School across African American, Latino American, and White Girls in the United States. *International journal of behavioral medicine*, 23(2), pp.153-61.

Dunton Genevieve Fridlund, Almanza Estela, Jerrett Michael, Wolch Jennifer, and Pentz Mary Ann. (2014). Neighborhood Park Use by Children: Use of Accelerometry and Global Positioning Systems. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 46(2), pp.136-142.

Durand C P, Andalib M, Dunton G F, Wolch J, and Pentz M A. (2011). A systematic review of built environment factors related to physical activity and obesity risk: implications for smart growth urban planning. *Obesity reviews : an official journal of the International Association for the Study of Obesity*, 12(5), pp.e173-82.

Dyck D, Sallis J F, Cardon G, Deforche B, Adams M A, Geremia C, and Bourdeaudhuij I. (2013). Associations of neighborhood characteristics with active park use: an observational study in two cities in the USA and Belgium. *International journal of health geographics*, 12, pp.26.

Dygryn Jan, Mitas Josef, Gaba Ales, Rubin Lukas, and Fromel Karel. (2015). Changes in Active Commuting to School in Czech Adolescents in Different Types of Built Environment across a 10-Year Period. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, 12(10), pp.12988-98.

Echeverría Sandra E, Ohri-Vachaspati Punam, and Yedidia Michael J. (2015). The Influence of Parental Nativity, Neighborhood Disadvantage and the Built Environment on Physical Activity Behaviors in Latino Youth. *Journal of Immigrant and Minority Health*, 17(2), pp.519-526.

Edwards N, Hooper P, Knuiman M, Foster S, and Giles-Corti B. (2015). Associations between park features and adolescent park use for physical activity. *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity*, 12(1), pp.no pagination.

Eichinger M, Titze S, Haditsch B, Dorner T E, and Stronegger W J. (2015). How are physical activity behaviors and cardiovascular risk factors associated with characteristics of the built and social residential environment. *PLoS ONE*, 10(6), pp.no pagination.

Ellis Geraint, Hunter Ruth, Tully Mark A, Donnelly Michael, Kelleher Luke, and Kee Frank. (2016). Connectivity and physical activity: using footpath networks to measure the walkability of built environments. *Environment & Planning B: Planning & Design*, 43(1), pp.130-151.

Engbers L H, and Hendriksen I J. M. (2010). Characteristics of a population of commuter cyclists in the Netherlands: Perceived barriers and facilitators in the personal, social and physical environment. *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity*, 7, pp.no pagination.

Esteban-Cornejo Irene, Carlson Jordan A, Conway Terry L, Cain Kelli L, Saelens Brian E, Frank Lawrence D, Glanz Karen, Roman Caterina G, and Sallis James F. (2016). Parental and Adolescent Perceptions of Neighborhood Safety Related to Adolescents' Physical Activity in Their Neighborhood. *Research quarterly for exercise and sport*, 87(2), pp.191-9.

Etman Astrid, Kamphuis Carlijn B. M, Prins Richard G, Burdorf Alex, Pierik Frank H, van Lenthe , and Frank J. (2014). Characteristics of residential areas and transportational walking among frail and non-frail Dutch elderly: does the size of the area matter?. *International journal of health geographics*, 13, pp.7.

Evenson K R, Murray D M, Birnbaum A S, and Cohen D A. (2010). Examination of perceived neighborhood characteristics and transportation on changes in physical activity and sedentary behavior: The Trial of Activity in Adolescent Girls. *Health & place*, 16(5), pp.977-85.

Evenson Kelly R, Scott Molly M, Cohen Deborah A, and Voorhees Carolyn C. (2007). Girls' perception of neighborhood factors on physical activity, sedentary behavior, and BMI. *Obesity (Silver Spring, and Md.)*, 15(2), pp.430-45.

Everett Jones, Sherry , and Sliwa Sarah. (2016). School Factors Associated With the Percentage of Students Who Walk or Bike to School, School Health Policies and Practices Study, 2014. *Preventing chronic disease*, 13, pp.E63.

Fan Jessie X, Wen Ming, and Kowaleski-Jones Lori. (2014). An ecological analysis of environmental correlates of active commuting in urban U.S. *Health & Place*, 30, pp.242-250.

Ferdinand Alva O, Sen Bisakha, Rahurkar Saurabh, Engler Sally, and Menachemi Nir. (2012). The relationship between built environments and physical activity: a systematic review. *American journal of public health*, 102(10), pp.e7-e13.

Feuillet Thierry, Charreire Helene, Menai Mehdi, Salze Paul, Simon Chantal, Dugas Julien, Hercberg Serge, Andreeva Valentina A, Enaux Christophe, Weber Christiane, and Oppert Jean-Michel. (2015). Spatial heterogeneity of the relationships between environmental characteristics and active commuting: towards a locally varying social ecological model. *International journal of health geographics*, 14, pp.12.

Fields Robert, Kaczynski Andrew T, Bopp Melissa, and Fallon Elizabeth. (2013). Built environment associations with health behaviors among hispanics. *Journal of physical activity & health*, 10(3), pp.335-42.

Findholt Nancy E, Michael Yvonne L, Jerofke Linda J, and Brogoitti Victoria W. (2011). Environmental influences on children's physical activity and eating habits in a rural Oregon County. *American journal of health promotion : AJHP*, 26(2), pp.e74-85.

Floyd Myron F, Bocarro Jason N, Smith William R, Baran Perver K, Moore Robin C, Cosco Nilda G, Edwards Michael B, Suau Luis J, and Fang Kunsheng. (2011). Park-Based Physical Activity Among Children and Adolescents. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 41(3), pp.258-265.

Frank L D, Kerr J, Sallis J F, Miles R, and Chapman J. (2008). A hierarchy of sociodemographic and environmental correlates of walking and obesity. *Preventive Medicine*, 47(2), pp.172-178.

Frank Lawrence Douglas, Saelens Brian E, Powell Ken E, and Chapman James E. (2007). Stepping towards causation: Do built environments or neighborhood and travel preferences explain physical activity, driving, and obesity?. *Social Science & Medicine*, 65(9), pp.1898-1914.

Frank Lawrence, D , Sallis James, F , Conway Terry, L , Chapman James, E , Saelens Brian, E , and Bachman William. (2006). Many Pathways from Land Use to Health: Associations between Neighborhood Walkability and Active Transportation, Body Mass Index, and Air Quality. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 72, pp.75-87.

Fraser Simon D. S. (2011). Cycling for transport and public health : a systematic review of the effect of the environment on cycling. *European Journal of Public Health*, 21(6), pp..

Freeman Lance, Neckerman Kathryn, Schwartz-Soicher Ofira, Quinn James, Richards Catherine, Bader Michael D. M, Lovasi Gina, Jack Darby, Weiss Christopher, Konty Kevin, Arno Peter, Viola Deborah, Kerker Bonnie, and Rundle Andrew G. (2013). Neighborhood walkability and active travel (walking and cycling) in New York City. *Journal of urban health : bulletin of the New York Academy of Medicine*, 90(4), pp.575-85.

Friederichs Stijn A. H, Kremers Stef P. J, Lechner Lilian, de Vries , and Nanne K. (2013). Neighborhood walkability and walking behavior: the moderating role of action orientation. *Journal of physical activity & health*, 10(4), pp.515-22.

Frost Stephanie S, Goins R Turner, Hunter Rebecca H, Hooker Steven P, Bryant Lucinda L, Kruger Judy, and Pluto Delores. (2010). Effects of the Built Environment on Physical Activity of Adults Living in Rural Settings. *American Journal of Health Promotion*, 24(4), pp.267-283.

G Boarnet Marlon. (2008). Walking, Urban Design, and Health Toward a Cost-Benefit Analysis Framework. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 27(3), pp.341-358.

Gallimore Jonathan M, Brown Barbara B, and Werner Carol M. (2011). Walking routes to school in new urban and suburban neighborhoods: An environmental walkability analysis of blocks and routes. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 31(2), pp.184-191.

Galvez M P, McGovern K, Knuff C, Resnick S, Brenner B, Teitelbaum S L, and Wolff M S. (2013). Associations between neighborhood resources and physical activity in inner-city minority children. *Academic Pediatrics*, 13(1), pp.20-26.

Gell N M, Rosenberg D E, Carlson J, Kerr J, and Belza B. (2015). Built environment attributes related to GPS measured active trips in mid-life and older adults with mobility disabilities. *Disability and Health Journal*, 8(2), pp.290-295.

Gi-Hyoug Cho, and Rodríguez Daniel A. (2015). Neighborhood design, neighborhood location, and three types of walking: results from the Washington DC area. *Environment & Planning B: Planning & Design*, 42(3), pp.526-540.

Giles-Corti B, Bull F, Knuiman M, McCormack G, Van Niel , K , Timperio A, Christian H, Foster S, Divitini M, Middleton N, and Boruff B. (2013). The influence of urban design on neighbourhood walking following residential relocation: Longitudinal results from the RESIDE study. *Social Science and Medicine*, 77(1), pp.20-30.

Giles-Corti B, Kelty S F, Zubrick S R, and Villanueva K P. (2009). Encouraging walking for transport and physical activity in children and adolescents: How important is the built environment?. *Sports Medicine*, 39(12), pp.995-1009.

Giles-Corti B, Knuiman M, Timperio A, Van Niel , K , Pikora T J, Bull F C. L, Shilton T, and Bulsara M. (2008). Evaluation of the implementation of a state government community design policy aimed at increasing local walking: Design issues and baseline results from RESIDE, Perth Western Australia. *Preventive Medicine*, 46(1), pp.46-54.

Giles-Corti Billie, Wood Gina, Pikora Terri, Learnihan Vincent, Bulsara Max, Van Niel , Kimberly , Timperio Anna, McCormack Gavin, and Villanueva Karen. (2011). School site and the potential to walk to school: The impact of street connectivity and traffic exposure in school neighborhoods. *Health & Place*, 17(2), pp.545-550.

Glazier R H, Creatore M I, Weyman J T, Fazli G, Matheson F I, Gozdyra P, Moineddin R, Shriqui V K, and Booth G L. (2014). Density, destinations or both? A comparison of measures of walkability in relation to transportation behaviors, obesity and diabetes in Toronto, Canada. *PLoS ONE*, 9(1), pp.no pagination.

Gong Y, Gallacher J, Palmer S, and Fone D. (2014). Neighbourhood green space, physical function and participation in physical activities among elderly men: The Caerphilly Prospective study. *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity*, 11(1), pp.no pagination.

Granner Michelle L, Sharpe Patricia A, Hutto Brent, Wilcox Sara, and Addy Cheryl L. (2007). Perceived individual, social, and environmental factors for physical activity and walking. *Journal of physical activity & health*, 4(3), pp.278-93.

Grigsby-Toussaint Diana S, Chi Sang-Hyun, Fiese Barbara H, and Group Strong Kids Project Writing. (2011). Where they live, how they play: neighborhood greenness and outdoor physical activity among preschoolers. *International journal of health geographics*, 10, pp.66.

Gropp K M, Pickett W, and Janssen I. (2012). Multi-level examination of correlates of active transportation to school among youth living within 1 mile of their school. *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity*, 9, pp.no pagination.

Grow H M, Saelens B E, Kerr J, Durant N H, Norman G J, and Sallis J F. (2008). Where are youth active? Roles of proximity, active transport, and built environment. *Medicine and Science in Sports and Exercise*, 40(12), pp.2071-2079.

Gustat Jeanette, O'Malley Keelia, Hu Tian, Tabak Rachel G, Goins Karin Valentine, Valko Cheryl, Litt Jill, and Eyler Amy. (2014). Support for Physical Activity Policies and Perceptions of Work and Neighborhood Environments: Variance by BMI and Activity Status at the County and Individual Levels. *American Journal of Health Promotion*, 28(3), pp.S33-S43.

Hajna S, Ross N A, Joseph L, Harper S, and Dasgupta K. (2015). Neighbourhood walkability, daily steps and utilitarian walking in Canadian adults. *BMJ Open*, 5(11), pp.no pagination.

Hajna Samantha, Dasgupta Kaberi, Halparin Max, and Ross Nancy A. (2013). Neighborhood Walkability: Field Validation of Geographic Information System Measures. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 44(6), pp.e55-e59.

Hajna Samantha, Ross Nancy A, Brazeau Anne-Sophie, Belisle Patrick, Joseph Lawrence, and Dasgupta Kaberi. (2015). Associations between neighbourhood walkability and daily steps in adults: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMC public health*, 15, pp.768.

Handy Susan, Cao Xinyu, Mokhtarian Patricia, and L . (2006). Self-Selection in the Relationship between the Built Environment and Walking: Evidence from Northern California. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 72, pp.55-74.

Hanibuchi Tomoya, Kawachi Ichiro, Nakaya Tomoki, Hirai Hiroshi, and Kondo Katsunori. (2011). Neighborhood built environment and physical activity of Japanese older adults: results from the Aichi Gerontological Evaluation Study (AGES). *BMC public health*, 11, pp.657.

Hanibuchi Tomoya, Nakaya Tomoki, Yonejima Mayuko, and Honjo Kaori. (2015). Perceived and Objective Measures of Neighborhood Walkability and Physical Activity among Adults in Japan: A Multilevel Analysis of a Nationally Representative Sample. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, 12(10), pp.13350-64.

Hankey S, Marshall J D, and Brauer M. (2012). Health impacts of the built environment: Within-urban variability in physical inactivity, air pollution, and ischemic heart disease mortality. *Environmental Health Perspectives*, 120(2), pp.247-253.

Hanson Heather M, Schiller Claire, Winters Meghan, Sims-Gould Joanie, Clarke Philippa, Curran Eileen, Donaldson Meghan G, Pitman Beverley, Scott Vicky, McKay Heather A, and Ashe Maureen C. (2013). Concept mapping applied to the intersection between older adults' outdoor walking and the built and social environments. *Preventive Medicine*, 57(6), pp.785-791.

Haybatollahi Mohammad, Czepkiewicz Michal, Laatikainen Tiina, and Kytta Marketta. (2015). Neighbourhood preferences, active travel behaviour, and built environment: An exploratory study. *Transportation Research Part F: Traffic Psychology and Behaviour*, 29, pp.57-69.

Heesch K C, Giles-Corti B, and Turrell G. (2015). Cycling for transport and recreation: Associations with the socio-economic, natural and built environment. *Health and Place*, 36, pp.152-161.

Heeswijck Torbjorn van, Paquet Catherine, Kestens Yan, Thierry Benoit, Morency Catherine, and Daniel Mark. (2015). Differences in associations between active transportation and built environmental exposures when expressed using different components of individual activity spaces. *Health & Place*, 33, pp.195-202.

Heinen Eva, Panter Jenna, Dalton Alice, Jones Andy, and Ogilvie David. (2015). Sociospatial patterning of the use of new transport infrastructure: Walking, cycling and bus travel on the Cambridgeshire guided busway. *Journal of transport & health*, 2(2), pp.199-211.

Helbich M, Emmichoven M J. Z. V, Dijst M J, Kwan M P, Pierik F H, and Vries S I. D. (2016). Natural and built environmental exposures on children's active school travel: A Dutch global positioning system-based cross-sectional study. *Health and Place*, 39, pp.101-109.

Henao Alejandro, Piatkowski Daniel, Luckey Kara, S , Nordback Krista, Marshall Wesley, E , Krizek Kevin, and J . (2015). Sustainable Transportation Infrastructure Investments and Mode Share Changes: A 20-Year Background of Boulder, Colorado. *Transport Policy*, 37, pp.64-71.

Hess G, and Peterson M N. (2015). "Bicycles May use Full Lane" signage communicates U.S. Roadway rules and increases perception of safety. *PLoS ONE*, 10(8), pp.no pagination.

Hillsdon M, Panter J, Foster C, and Jones A. (2006). The relationship between access and quality of urban green space with population physical activity. *Public Health*, 120(12), pp.1127-1132.

Hipp J Aaron, Eyler Amy A, and Kuhlberg Jill A. (2013). Target population involvement in urban ciclovias: a preliminary evaluation of St. Louis open streets. *Journal of urban health : bulletin of the New York Academy of Medicine*, 90(6), pp.1010-5.

Hirsch J A, Moore K A, Clarke P J, Rodriguez D A, Evenson K R, Brines S J, Zagorski M A, and Roux A V. D. (2014). Changes in the built environment and changes in the amount of walking over time: Longitudinal results from the Multi-Ethnic study of Atherosclerosis. *American Journal of Epidemiology*, 180(8), pp.799-809.

Hirsch Jana A, Moore Kari A, Evenson Kelly R, Rodriguez Daniel A, Diez Roux, and Ana V. (2013). Walk Score(TM) and Transit Score(TM) and Walking in the Multi-Ethnic Study of Atherosclerosis. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 45(2), pp.158-166.

Hoerster K D, Millstein R A, Hall K S, Gray K E, Reiber G E, Nelson K M, and Saelens B E. (2015). Individual and contextual correlates of physical activity among a clinical sample of United States Veterans. *Social Science and Medicine*, 142, pp.100-108.

Holle V V, Van Cauwenberg , J , Gheysen F, Van Dyck , D , Deforche B, Van De Weghe , N , De Bourdeaudhuij , and I . (2016). The association between Belgian older adults' physical functioning and physical activity: What is the moderating role of the physical environment?. *PLoS ONE*, 11(2), pp.no pagination.

Hooper P, Knuiman M, Bull F, Jones E, and Giles-Corti B. (2015). Are we developing walkable suburbs through urban planning policy? Identifying the mix of design requirements to optimise walking outcomes from the 'Liveable Neighbourhoods' planning policy in Perth, Western Australia. *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity*, 12(1), pp.no pagination.

Hooper P, Knuiman M, Foster S, and Giles-Corti B. (2015). The building blocks of a 'Liveable Neighbourhood': Identifying the key performance indicators for walking of an operational planning policy in Perth, Western Australia. *Health and Place*, 36, pp.173-183.

Hosler A S, Gallant M P, Riley-Jacome M, and Rajulu D T. (2014). Relationship between objectively measured walkability and exercise walking among adults with diabetes. *Journal of Environmental and Public Health*, 2014, pp.no pagination.

Hou Ningqi, Popkin Barry M, Jacobs David R, Jr , Song Yan, Guilkey David, Lewis Cora E, and Gordon-Larsen Penny. (2010). Longitudinal associations between neighborhood-level street network with walking, bicycling, and jogging: The CARDIA study. *Health & Place*, 16(6), pp.1206-1215.

Hume Clare, Timperio Anna, Salmon Jo, Carver Alison, Giles-Corti Billie, and Crawford David. (2009). Walking and Cycling to School: Predictors of Increases Among Children and Adolescents. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 36(3), pp.195-200.

Hutchinson Jayne, White Piran C. L, and Graham Hilary. (2014). Differences in the social patterning of active travel between urban and rural populations: findings from a large UK household survey. *International journal of public health*, 59(6), pp.993-8.

Hwang L D, Hurvitz P M, and Duncan G E. (2016). Cross sectional association between spatially measured walking bouts and neighborhood walkability. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 13(4), pp.no pagination.

Inoue Shigeru, Murase Norio, Shimomitsu Teruichi, Ohya Yumiko, Odagiri Yuko, Takamiya Tomoko, Ishii Kaori, Katsumura Toshihito, and Sallis James F. (2009). Association of physical activity and neighborhood environment among Japanese adults. *Preventive Medicine*, 48(4), pp.321-325.

Inoue Shigeru, Ohya Yumiko, Odagiri Yuko, Takamiya Tomoko, Ishii Kaori, Kitabayashi Makiko, Suijo Kenichi, Sallis James F, and Shimomitsu Teruichi. (2010). Association between perceived neighborhood environment and walking among adults in 4 cities in Japan. *Journal of epidemiology / Japan Epidemiological Association*, 20(4), pp.277-86.

Inoue Shigeru, Ohya Yumiko, Odagiri Yuko, Takamiya Tomoko, Kamada Masamitsu, Okada Shinpei, Oka Kohichiro, Kitabatake Yoshinori, Nakaya Tomoki, Sallis James F, and Shimomitsu Teruichi. (2011). Perceived neighborhood environment and walking for specific purposes among elderly Japanese. *Journal of epidemiology / Japan Epidemiological Association*, 21(6), pp.481-90.

Ivory V C, Blakely T, Pearce J, Witten K, Bagheri N, Badland H, and Schofield G. (2015). Could strength of exposure to the residential neighbourhood modify associations between walkability and physical activity?. *Social Science and Medicine*, 147, pp.232-241.

Jack E, and McCormack G R. (2014). The associations between objectively-determined and self-reported urban form characteristics and neighborhood-based walking in adults. *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity*, 11(1), pp.no pagination.

Jago Russell, Baranowski Tom, and Baranowski Janice C. (2006). Observed, GIS, and Self-Reported Environmental Features and Adolescent Physical Activity. *American Journal of Health Promotion*, 20(6), pp.422-428.

Janssen I, and King N. (2015). Walkable school neighborhoods are not playable neighborhoods. *Health and Place*, 35, pp.66-69.

Janssen I, and Rosu A. (2015). Undeveloped green space and free-time physical activity in 11 to 13-year-old children. *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity*, 12(1), pp.no pagination.

Jauregui Alejandra, Soltero Erica, Santos-Luna Rene, Hernandez-Barrera Lucia, Barquera Simon, Jauregui Edtna, Levesque Lucie, Lopez-Taylor Juan, Ortiz-Hernandez Luis, and Lee Rebecca. (2016). A Multisite Study of Environmental Correlates of Active Commuting to School in Mexican Children. *Journal of physical activity & health*, 13(3), pp.325-32.

Jerrett M, Almanza E, Davies M, Wolch J, Dunton G, Spruitj-Metz D, and Pentz M A. (2013). Smart growth community design and physical activity in children. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 45(4), pp.386-392.

Jia Ying-Nan, and Fu Hua. (2014). Associations between perceived and observational physical environmental factors and the use of walking paths: a cross-sectional study. *BMC public health*, 14, pp.627.

Jones Andy, Hillsdon Melvyn, and Coombes Emma. (2009). Greenspace access, use, and physical activity: Understanding the effects of area deprivation. *Preventive Medicine*, 49(6), pp.500-505.

Jones Michael, G , Ryan Sherry, Donlon Jennifer, Ledbetter Lauren, Ragland David, R , Arnold Lindsay, and S . (2010). Seamless Travel: Measuring Bicycle and Pedestrian Activity in San Diego County and Its Relationship to Land Use, Transportation, Safety, and Facility Type. *PATH Research Report*, , pp.120.

Jongeneel-Grimen Birthe, Droomers Mariel, van Oers , Hans A M, Stronks Karien, and Kunst Anton E. (2014). The relationship between physical activity and the living environment: A multi-level analyses focusing on changes over time in environmental factors. *Health & Place*, 26, pp.149-160.

Kaczynski A T, Potwarka L R, and Saelens P B. E. (2008). Association of park size, distance, and features with physical activity in neighborhood parks. *American Journal of Public Health*, 98(8), pp.1451-1456.

Kaczynski Andrew T, and Glover Troy D. (2012). Talking the talk, walking the walk: examining the effect of neighbourhood walkability and social connectedness on physical activity. *Journal of Public Health*, 34(3), pp.382-389.

Kaczynski Andrew T, Johnson Amanda J, and Saelens Brian E. (2010). Neighborhood land use diversity and physical activity in adjacent parks. *Health & Place*, 16(2), pp.413-415.

Kaczynski Andrew T, Koohsari Mohammad Javad, Stanis Sonja A. Wilhelm, Bergstrom Ryan, and Sugiyama Takemi. (2014). Association of street connectivity and road traffic speed with park usage and park-based physical activity. *American journal of health promotion : AJHP*, 28(3), pp.197-203.

Kaczynski Andrew T, Robertson-Wilson Jennifer, and Decloe Melissa. (2012). Interaction of perceived neighborhood walkability and self-efficacy on physical activity. *Journal of physical activity & health*, 9(2), pp.208-17.

Kaczynski Andrew T. (2010). Neighborhood walkability perceptions: associations with amount of neighborhood-based physical activity by intensity and purpose. *Journal of physical activity & health*, 7(1), pp.3-10.

Kamada Masamitsu, Kitayuguchi Jun, Inoue Shigeru, Kamioka Hiroharu, Mutoh Yoshiteru, and Shiwaku Kuninori. (2009). Environmental correlates of physical activity in driving and non-driving rural Japanese women. *Preventive Medicine*, 49(6), pp.490-496.

Kamruzzaman M, Washington Simon, Baker Douglas, Brown Wendy, Giles-Corti Billie, and Turrell Gavin. (2016). Built Environment Impacts on Walking for Transport in Brisbane, Australia. *Transportation*, 43(1), pp.53-77.

Karusisi N, Thomas F, Meline J, Brondeel R, and Chaix B. (2014). Environmental conditions around itineraries to destinations as correlates of walking for transportation among adults: The RECORD cohort study. *PLoS ONE*, 9(5), pp.no pagination.

Kasehagen Laurin, Busacker Ashley, Kane Debra, and Rohan Angela. (2012). Associations between neighborhood characteristics and physical activity among youth within rural-urban commuting areas in the US. *Maternal and child health journal*, 16 Suppl 2, pp.258-67.

Kearney Patricia M, and Kenny Rose Anne. (2015). The factors associated with self-reported physical activity in older adults living in the community. *Age and Ageing*, 44(4), pp.586-592.

Kegler Michelle C, Swan Deanne W, Alcantara Iris, Feldman Lynne, and Glanz Karen. (2014). The influence of rural home and neighborhood environments on healthy eating, physical activity, and weight. *Prevention science : the official journal of the Society for Prevention Research*, 15(1), pp.1-11.

Kelly Cheryl M, Lian Min, Struthers Jim, and Kammrath Anna. (2015). Walking to Work: The Roles of Neighborhood Walkability and Socioeconomic Deprivation. *Journal of physical activity & health*, 12 Suppl 1, pp.S70-5.

Kelly Cheryl, Wilson Jeffrey S, Schootman Mario, Clennin Morgan, Baker Elizabeth A, and Miller Douglas K. (2014). The built environment predicts observed physical activity. *Frontiers in public health*, 2, pp.52.

Kemperman Astrid, and Timmermans Harry. (2014). Environmental Correlates of Active Travel Behavior of Children. *Environment & Behavior*, 46(5), pp.583-608.

Kerr J, Emond J A, Badland H, Reis R, Sarmiento O, Carlson J, Sallis J F, Cerin E, Cain K, Conway T, Schofield G, Macfarlane D J, Christiansen L B, Van Dyck , D , Davey R, Aguinaga-Ontoso I, Salvo D, Sugiyama T, Mitas J, Owen N, and Natarajan L. (2016). Perceived neighborhood environmental attributes associated with walking and cycling for transport among adult residents of 17 cities in 12 countries: The IPEN study. *Environmental Health Perspectives*, 124(3), pp.290-298.

Kerr J, Norman G J, Sallis J F, and Patrick K. (2008). Exercise aids, neighborhood safety, and physical activity in adolescents and parents. *Medicine and Science in Sports and Exercise*, 40(7), pp.1244-1248.

Kerr J, Rosenberg D, Sallis J F, Saelens B E, Frank L D, and Conway T L. (2006). Active commuting to school: Associations with environment and parental concerns. *Medicine and Science in Sports and Exercise*, 38(4), pp.787-794.

Kerr Jacqueline, Norman Greg, Millstein Rachel, Adams Marc A, Morgan Cindy, Langer Robert D, and Allison Matthew. (2014). Neighborhood environment and physical activity among older women: findings from the San Diego Cohort of the women's health initiative. *Journal of physical activity & health*, 11(6), pp.1070-7.

Kerr Jacqueline, Norman Gregory J, Adams Marc A, Ryan Sherry, Frank Lawrence, Sallis James F, Calfas Karen J, and Patrick Kevin. (2010). Do neighborhood environments moderate the effect of physical activity lifestyle interventions in adults?. *Health & Place*, 16(5), pp.903-908.

Kerr Jacqueline, Sallis James F, Owen Neville, De Bourdeaudhuij , Ilse , Cerin Ester, Sugiyama Takemi, Reis Rodrigo, Sarmiento Olga, Fromel Karel, Mitas Josef, Troelsen Jens, Christiansen Lars Breum, Macfarlane Duncan, Salvo Deborah, Schofield Grant, Badland Hannah, Guillen-

Grima Francisco, Aguinaga-Ontoso Ines, Davey Rachel, Bauman Adrian, Saelens Brian, Riddoch Chris, Ainsworth Barbara, Pratt Michael, Schmidt Tom, Frank Lawrence, Adams Marc, Conway Terry, Cain Kelli, Van Dyck , Delfien , and Bracy Nicole. (2013). Advancing science and policy through a coordinated international study of physical activity and built environments: IPEN adult methods. *Journal of physical activity & health*, 10(4), pp.581-601.

King A C, Toobert D, Ahn D, Resnicow K, Coday M, Riebe D, Garber C E, Hurtz S, Morton J, and Sallis J F. (2006). Perceived environments as physical activity correlates and moderators of intervention in five studies. *American Journal of Health Promotion*, 21(1), pp.24-35.

King Abby C, Sallis James F, Frank Lawrence D, Saelens Brian E, Cain Kelli, Conway Terry L, Chapman James E, Ahn David K, and Kerr Jacqueline. (2011). Aging in neighborhoods differing in walkability and income: Associations with physical activity and obesity in older adults. *Social Science & Medicine*, 73(10), pp.1525-1533.

King D. (2008). Neighborhood and individual factors in activity in older adults: Results from the neighborhood and senior health study. *Journal of Aging and Physical Activity*, 16(2), pp.144-170.

King Diane K, Allen Peg, Jones Dina L, Marquez David X, Brown David R, Rosenberg Dori, Janicek Sarah, Allen Laila, and Belza Basia. (2016). Safe, Affordable, Convenient: Environmental Features of Malls and Other Public Spaces Used by Older Adults for Walking. *Journal of physical activity & health*, 13(3), pp.289-95.

King Tania L, Thornton Lukar E, Bentley Rebecca J, and Kavanagh Anne M. (2012). Does parkland influence walking? The relationship between area of parkland and walking trips in Melbourne, Australia. *The international journal of behavioral nutrition and physical activity*, 9, pp.115.

Kligerman M, Sallis J F, Ryan S, Frank L D, and Nader P R. (2007). Association of neighborhood design and recreation environment variables with physical activity and body mass index in adolescents. *American Journal of Health Promotion*, 21(4), pp.274-277.

Knuiman M W, Christian H E, Divitini M L, Foster S A, Bull F C, Badland H M, and Giles-Corti B. (2014). A longitudinal analysis of the influence of the neighborhood built environment on walking for transportation: the RESIDE study. *American journal of epidemiology*, 180(5), pp.453-61.

Koh Puay, Ping , Wong Yiik, and Diew . (2013). Comparing pedestrians' needs and behaviours in different land use environments. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 26, pp.43-50.

Kondo K, Lee J S, Kawakubo K, Kataoka Y, Asami Y, Mori K, Umezaki M, Yamauchi T, Takagi H, Sunagawa H, and Akabayashi A. (2009). Association between daily physical activity and neighborhood environments. *Environmental Health and Preventive Medicine*, 14(3), pp.196-206.

Koohsari M J, Sugiyama T, Mavoa S, Villanueva K, Badland H, Giles-Corti B, and Owen N. (2016). Street network measures and adults' walking for transport: Application of space syntax. *Health and Place*, 38, pp.89-95.

Koohsari Mohammad Javad, Karakiewicz Justyna Anna, and Kaczynski Andrew T. (2013). Public Open Space and Walking: The Role of Proximity, Perceptual Qualities of the Surrounding Built Environment, and Street Configuration. *Environment & Behavior*, 45(6), pp.706-736.

Koohsari Mohammad Javad, Sugiyama Takemi, Lamb Karen Elaine, Villanueva Karen, and Owen Neville. (2014). Street connectivity and walking for transport: Role of neighborhood destinations. *Preventive Medicine*, 66, pp.118-122.

Koohsari Mohammad Javad, Sugiyama Takemi, Sahlqvist Shannon, Mavoa Suzanne, Hadgraft Nyssa, and Owen Neville. (2015). Neighborhood environmental attributes and adults' sedentary behaviors: Review and research agenda. *Preventive Medicine*, 77, pp.141-149.

Kostova Deliana. (2011). Can the Built Environment Reduce Obesity? The Impact of Residential Sprawl and Neighborhood Parks on Obesity and Physical Activity. *Eastern Economic Journal*, 37(3), pp.390-402.

Kozo Justine, Sallis James F, Conway Terry L, Kerr Jacqueline, Cain Kelli, Saelens Brian E, Frank Lawrence D, and Owen Neville. (2012). Sedentary behaviors of adults in relation to neighborhood walkability and income. *Health Psychology*, 31(6), pp.704-713.

Kramer Danielle, Maas Jolanda, Wingen Marleen, and Kunst Anton E. (2013). Neighbourhood safety and leisure-time physical activity among Dutch adults: a multilevel perspective. *The international journal of behavioral nutrition and physical activity*, 10, pp.11.

Krizek Kevin, J , Barnes Gary, and Thompson Kristin. (2009). Analyzing the Effect of Bicycle Facilities on Commute Mode Share over Time. *Journal of Urban Planning and Development*, 135, pp.66-73.

Kuhnimhof Tobias, Georg , Chlond Bastian, von der Ruhren, and Stefan . (2006). Users of Transport Modes and Multimodal Travel Behavior: Steps Toward Understanding Travelers' Options and Choices. *Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board*, , pp.40-48.

Kurka Jonathan M, Adams Marc A, Todd Michael, Colburn Trina, Sallis James F, Cain Kelli L, Glanz Karen, Frank Lawrence D, and Saelens Brian E. (2015). Patterns of neighborhood environment attributes in relation to children's physical activity. *Health & Place*, 34, pp.164-170.

Kwarteng Jamila L, Schulz Amy J, Mentz Graciela B, Zenk Shannon N, and Opperman Alisha A. (2014). Associations between observed neighborhood characteristics and physical activity: findings from a multiethnic urban community. *Journal of public health (Oxford, and England)*, 36(3), pp.358-67.

Kytta A Marketta, Broberg Anna K, and Kahila Maarit H. (2012). Urban environment and children's active lifestyle: softGIS revealing children's behavioral patterns and meaningful places. *American journal of health promotion : AJHP*, 26(5), pp.e137-48.

Lachapelle Ugo, Noland Robert, and B . (2012). Does the commute mode affect the frequency of walking behavior? The public transit link. *Transport Policy*, 21, pp.26-36.

Lachowycz K, and Jones A P. (2011). Greenspace and obesity: A systematic review of the evidence. *Obesity Reviews*, 12(501), pp.e183-e189.

Lake A A, Townshend T, Alvanides S, Stamp E, and Adamson A J. (2009). Diet, physical activity, sedentary behaviour and perceptions of the environment in young adults. *Journal of Human Nutrition and Dietetics*, 22(5), pp.444-454.

Lamiquiz Patxi, J , Lopez Dominguez, and Jorge . (2015). Effects of built environment on walking at the neighbourhood scale. A new role for street networks by modelling their configurational accessibility?. *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice*, 74, pp.148-163.

Larco Nico, Steiner Bethany, Stockard Jean, and West Amanda. (2012). Pedestrian-Friendly Environments and Active Travel for Residents of Multifamily Housing: The Role of Preferences and Perceptions. *Environment & Behavior*, 44(3), pp.303-333.

Larouche R. (2015). Built Environment Features that Promote Cycling in School-Aged Children. *Current Obesity Reports*, 4(4), pp.494-503.

Larouche Richard, Chaput Jean-Philippe, Leduc Genevieve, Boyer Charles, Belanger Priscilla, LeBlanc Allana G, Borghese Michael M, and Tremblay Mark S. (2014). A cross-sectional examination of socio-demographic and school-level correlates of children's school travel mode in Ottawa, Canada. *BMC public health*, 14, pp.497.

Larsen B A, Pekmezi D, Marquez B, Benitez T J, and Marcus B H. (2013). Physical activity in Latinas: Social and environmental influences. *Women's Health*, 9(2), pp.201-210.

Larsen K, Gilliland J, Hess P, Tucker P, Irwin J, and He M. (2009). The influence of the physical environment and sociodemographic characteristics on children's mode of travel to and from school. *American Journal of Public Health*, 99(3), pp.520-526.

Laxer Rachel E, and Janssen Ian. (2013). The proportion of youths' physical inactivity attributable to neighbourhood built environment features. *International journal of health geographics*, 12, pp.31.

Lee Chanam, and Li Li. (2014). Demographic, physical activity, and route characteristics related to school transportation: an exploratory study. *American journal of health promotion : AJHP*, 28(3 Suppl), pp.S77-88.

Lee Chanam, Zhu Xuemei, Yoon Jeongjae, and Varni James W. (2013). Beyond distance: children's school travel mode choice. *Annals of behavioral medicine : a publication of the Society of Behavioral Medicine*, 45 Suppl 1, pp.S55-67.

Lee H, Kang H M, Ko Y J, Kim H S, Kim Y J, Bae W K, Park S, and Cho B. (2015). Influence of urban neighbourhood environment on physical activity and obesity-related diseases. *Public Health*, 129(9), pp.1204-1210.

Lee I Min, Ewing Reid, and Sesso Howard D. (2009). The Built Environment and Physical Activity Levels: The Harvard Alumni Health Study. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 37(4), pp.293-298.

Lee J S, Kawakubo K, Kohri S, Tsujii H, Mori K, and Akabayashi A. (2007). Association between residents' perception of the neighborhood's environments and walking time in objectively different regions. *Environmental Health and Preventive Medicine*, 12(1), pp.3-10.

Lee K Y, Lee P H, and Macfarlane D. (2014). Associations between moderate-to-vigorous physical activity and neighbourhood recreational facilities: The features of the facilities matter. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 11(12), pp.12594-12610.

Lee Murray C, Orenstein Marla R, and Richardson Maxwell J. (2008). Systematic review of active commuting to school and childrens physical activity and weight. *Journal of physical activity & health*, 5(6), pp.930-49.

Lee R E, Mama S K, Medina A V, Ho A, and Adamus H J. (2012). Neighborhood factors influence physical activity among African American and Hispanic or Latina women. *Health and Place*, 18(1), pp.63-70.

Lee Rebecca E, Mama Scherezade K, McAlexander Kristen P, Adamus Heather, and Medina Ashley V. (2011). Neighborhood and PA: neighborhood factors and physical activity in African American public housing residents. *Journal of physical activity & health*, 8 Suppl 1, pp.S83-90.

Lee Rebecca E, Soltero Erica G, Jáuregui Alejandra, Mama Scherezade K, Barquera Simón, Jauregui Edtna, y Taylor, Juan Lopez, Ortiz-Hernández Luis, and Lévesque Lucie. (2016). Disentangling Associations of Neighborhood Street Scale Elements With Physical Activity in Mexican School Children. *Environment and Behavior*, 48(1), pp.150.

Leslie E, Kremer P, Toumbourou J W, and Williams J W. (2010). Gender differences in personal, social and environmental influences on active travel to and from school for Australian adolescents. *Journal of Science and Medicine in Sport*, 13(6), pp.597-601.

Leslie Eva, Coffee Neil, Frank Lawrence, Owen Neville, Bauman Adrian, and Hugo Graeme. (2007). Walkability of local communities: Using geographic information systems to objectively assess relevant environmental attributes. *Health & Place*, 13(1), pp.111-122.

Levasseur Melanie, Genereux Melissa, Bruneau Jean-Francois, Vanasse Alain, Chabot Eric, Beaulac Claude, and Bedard Marie-Michele. (2015). Importance of proximity to resources, social support, transportation and neighborhood security for mobility and social participation in older adults: results from a scoping study. *BMC public health*, 15, pp.503.

Li F, Harmer P A, Cardinal B J, Bosworth M, Acock A, Johnson-Shelton D, and Moore J M. (2008). Built Environment, Adiposity, and Physical Activity in Adults Aged 50-75. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 35(1), pp.38-46.

Li F, Harmer P, Cardinal B J, Bosworth M, Johnson-Shelton D, Moore J M, Acock A, and Vongjaturapat N. (2009). Built environment and 1-year change in weight and waist circumference in middle-aged and older adults: Portland neighborhood environment and health study. *American Journal of Epidemiology*, 169(4), pp.401-408.

Li Fuzhong, Harmer Peter A, Cardinal Bradley J, Bosworth Mark, Acock Alan, Johnson-Shelton Deborah, and Moore Jane M. (2008). Built Environment, Adiposity, and Physical Activity in Adults Aged 50-75. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 35(1), pp.38-46.

Li Yue, Hsu Jennifer Anna, and Fernie Geoff. (2013). Aging and the use of pedestrian facilities in winter-the need for improved design and better technology. *Journal of urban health : bulletin of the New York Academy of Medicine*, 90(4), pp.602-17.

Liao Y, Harada K, Shibata A, Ishii K, Oka K, Nakamura Y, Inoue S, and Shimomitsu T. (2011). Perceived environmental factors associated with physical activity among normal-weight and overweight Japanese men. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 8(4), pp.631-943.

Lovasi Gina S, Schwartz-Soicher Ofira, Neckerman Kathryn M, Konty Kevin, Kerker Bonnie, Quinn James, and Rundle Andrew. (2013). Aesthetic amenities and safety hazards associated with walking and bicycling for transportation in New York City. *Annals of behavioral medicine : a publication of the Society of Behavioral Medicine*, 45 Suppl 1, pp.S76-85.

Lusk Anne C, Morency Patrick, Miranda-Moreno Luis F, Willett Walter C, and Dennerlein Jack T. (2013). Bicycle guidelines and crash rates on cycle tracks in the United States. *American journal of public health*, 103(7), pp.1240-8.

Ma Liang, and Dill Jennifer. (2015). Associations between the Objective and Perceived Built Environment and Bicycling for Transportation. *Journal of Transport & Health*, 2, pp.248-255.

MacDonald John M, Stokes Robert J, Cohen Deborah A, Kofner Aaron, and Ridgeway Greg K. (2010). The Effect of Light Rail Transit on Body Mass Index and Physical Activity. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 39(2), pp.105-112.

Macniven R, Richards J, Gubhaju L, Joshy G, Bauman A, Banks E, and Eades S. (2016). Physical activity, healthy lifestyle behaviors, neighborhood environment characteristics and social support among Australian Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal adults. *Preventive Medicine Reports*, 3, pp.203-210.

Maddison R, Hoorn S V, Jiang Y, Mhurchu C N, Exeter D, Dorey E, Bullen C, Utter J, Schaaf D, and Turley M. (2009). The environment and physical activity: The influence of psychosocial, perceived and built environmental factors. *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity*, 6, pp.no pagination.

Maisel Jordana L. (2016). Impact of Older Adults' Neighborhood Perceptions on Walking Behavior. *Journal of aging and physical activity*, 28(2), pp.247-55.

Maki-Opas Tomi E, de Munter , Jeroen , Maas Jolanda, den Hertog, Frank , and Kunst Anton E. (2014). The association between physical environment and cycling to school among Turkish and Moroccan adolescents in Amsterdam. *International journal of public health*, 59(4), pp.629-36.

Mandic S, Leon de la Barra, S , Garcia Bengoechea, E , Stevens E, Flaherty C, Moore A, Middlemiss M, Williams J, and Skidmore P. (2015). Personal, social and environmental correlates of active transport to school among adolescents in Otago, New Zealand. *Journal of Science and Medicine in Sport*, 18(4), pp.432-437.

Mantjes J A, Jones A P, Corder K, Jones N R, Harrison F, Griffin S J, van Sluijs , and E M F. (2012). School related factors and 1yr change in physical activity amongst 9-11 year old English schoolchildren. *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity*, 9, pp.no pagination.

Marquet O, and Miralles-Guasch C. (2015). Neighbourhood vitality and physical activity among the elderly: THE role of walkable environments on active ageing in Barcelona, Spain. *Social Science and Medicine*, 135, pp.24-30.

McAlexander Kristen M, Mama Scherezade K, Medina Ashley V, O'Connor Daniel P, and Lee Rebecca E. (2012). Concordance and correlates of direct and indirect built environment measurement among minority women. *American journal of health promotion : AJHP*, 26(4), pp.239-44.

McCormack G R, and Shiell A. (2011). In search of causality: A systematic review of the relationship between the built environment and physical activity among adults. *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity*, 8, pp.no pagination.

McCormack G R, Shiell A, Doyle-Baker P K, Friedenreich C M, and Sandalack B A. (2014). Subpopulation differences in the association between neighborhood urban form and neighborhood-based physical activity. *Health and Place*, 28, pp.109-115.

McCormack G R, Shiell A, Giles-Corti B, Begg S, Veerman J L, Geelhoed E, Amarasinghe A, and Emery J C. H. (2012). The association between sidewalk length and walking for different purposes in established neighborhoods. *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity*, 9, pp.no pagination.

McCormack Gavin R, Friedenreich Christine M, Giles-Corti Billie, Doyle-Baker Patricia K, and Shiell Alan. (2013). Do motivation-related cognitions explain the relationship between perceptions of urban form and neighborhood walking?. *Journal of physical activity & health*, 10(7), pp.961-73.

McCormack Gavin R, Friedenreich Christine, Sandalack Beverly A, Giles-Corti Billie, Doyle-Baker Patricia K, and Shiell Alan. (2012). The relationship between cluster-analysis derived walkability and local recreational and transportation walking among Canadian adults. *Health & Place*, 18(5), pp.1079-1087.

McDonald K, Hearst M, Farbakhsh K, Patnode C, Forsyth A, Sirard J, and Lytle L. (2012). Adolescent physical activity and the built environment: A latent class analysis approach. *Health and Place*, 18(2), pp.191-198.

McDonald N C. (2007). Active Transportation to School. Trends Among U.S. Schoolchildren, 1969-2001. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 32(6), pp.509-516.

McGinn A P, Evenson K R, Herring A H, Huston S L, and Rodriguez D A. (2007). Exploring associations between physical activity and perceived and objective measures of the built environment. *Journal of Urban Health*, 84(2), pp.162-184.

McGrath Leslie J, Hinckson Erica A, Hopkins Will G, Mavoa Suzanne, Witten Karen, and Schofield Grant. (2016). Associations Between the Neighborhood Environment and Moderate-to-Vigorous Walking in New Zealand Children: Findings from the URBAN Study. *Sports medicine (Auckland, and N.Z.)*, 46(7), pp.1003-17.

McGrath Leslie J, Hopkins Will G, and Hinckson Erica A. (2015). Associations of objectively measured built-environment attributes with youth moderate-vigorous physical activity: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Sports medicine (Auckland, and N.Z.)*, 45(6), pp.841-65.

McMinn David, Oreskovic Nicolas M, Aitkenhead Matt J, Johnston Derek W, Murtagh Shemane, and Rowe David A. (2014). The physical environment and health-enhancing activity during the school commute: global positioning system, geographical information systems and accelerometry. *Geospatial health*, 8(2), pp.569-72.

Mecredy G, Pickett W, and Janssen I. (2011). Street connectivity is negatively associated with physical activity in Canadian youth. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 8(8), pp.3333-3350.

Merchant A T, Dehghan M, Behnke-Cook D, and Anand S S. (2007). Diet, physical activity, and adiposity in children in poor and rich neighbourhoods: A cross-sectional comparison. *Nutrition Journal*, 6, pp.no pagination.

Mertens L, Compernolle S, Gheysen F, Deforche B, Brug J, Mackenbach J D, Lakerveld J, Oppert J M, Feuillet T, Glonti K, Bardos H, De Bourdeaudhuij , and I . (2016). Perceived environmental correlates of cycling for transport among adults in five regions of Europe. *Obesity Reviews*, 17, pp.53-61.

Miles R. (2008). Neighborhood Disorder, Perceived Safety, and Readiness to Encourage Use of Local Playgrounds. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 34(4), pp.275-281.

Millstein Rachel A, Strobel Joe, Kerr Jacqueline, Sallis James F, Norman Gregory J, Durant Nefertiti, Harris Sion, and Saelens Brian E. (2011). Home, school, and neighborhood environment factors and youth physical activity. *Pediatric exercise science*, 23(4), pp.487-503.

Molina-Garcia Javier, Castillo Isabel, and Sallis James F. (2010). Psychosocial and environmental correlates of active commuting for university students. *Preventive Medicine*, 51(2), pp.136-138.

Moniruzzaman Md, and Paez Antonio. (2016). An investigation of the attributes of walkable environments from the perspective of seniors in Montreal. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 51, pp.85-96.

Morris K S, McAuley E, and Motl R W. (2008). Self-efficacy and environmental correlates of physical activity among older women and women with multiple sclerosis. *Health Education Research*, 23(4), pp.744-752.

Mota Jorge, Gomes Helena, Almeida Mariana, Ribeiro Jose Carlos, Carvalho Joana, and Santos Maria Paula. (2007). Active versus passive transportation to school-differences in screen time, socio-economic position and perceived environmental characteristics in adolescent girls. *Annals of human biology*, 34(3), pp.273-82.

Muller-Riemenschneider Falk, Pereira Gavin, Villanueva Karen, Christian Hayley, Knuiman Matthew, Giles-Corti Billie, and Bull Fiona C. (2013). Neighborhood walkability and cardiometabolic risk factors in Australian adults: an observational study. *BMC public health*, 13, pp.755.

Murayama H, Yoshie S, Sugawara I, Wakui T, and Arami R. (2012). Contextual effect of neighborhood environment on homebound elderly in a Japanese community. *Archives of Gerontology and Geriatrics*, 54(1), pp.67-71.

Mytton Oliver T, Townsend Nick, Rutter Harry, and Foster Charlie. (2012). Green space and physical activity: An observational study using Health Survey for England data. *Health & Place*, 18(5), pp.1034-1041.

Nagel C L, Carlson N E, Bosworth M, and Michael Y L. (2008). The relation between neighborhood built environment and walking activity among older adults. *American Journal of Epidemiology*, 168(4), pp.461-468.

Nathan Andrea, Wood Lisa, and Giles-Corti Billie. (2014). Examining correlates of self-reported and objectively measured physical activity among retirement village residents. *Australasian journal on ageing*, 33(4), pp.250-6.

Nelson Norah M, and Woods Catherine B. (2010). Neighborhood perceptions and active commuting to school among adolescent boys and girls. *Journal of physical activity & health*, 7(2), pp.257-66.

Nielsen Thomas Alexander Sick, Olafsson Anton S, Carstensen Trine A, and Skov-Petersen Hans. (2013). Environmental Correlates of Cycling: Evaluating Urban Form and Location Effects Based on Danish Micro-data. *Transportation Research: Part D: Transport and Environment*, 22(0), pp.40-44.

Noonan R J, Boddy L M, Knowles Z R, and Fairclough S J. (2016). Cross-sectional associations between high-deprivation home and neighbourhood environments, and health-related variables among Liverpool children. *BMJ Open*, 6(1), pp.no pagination.

Norman Gregory J, Carlson Jordan A, O'Mara Stephanie, Sallis James F, Patrick Kevin, Frank Lawrence D, and Godbole Suneeta V. (2013). Neighborhood preference, walkability and walking in overweight/obese men. *American journal of health behavior*, 37(2), pp.277-82.

Ogilvie D, Mitchell R, Mutrie N, Petticrew M, and Platt S. (2008). Perceived characteristics of the environment associated with active travel: Development and testing of a new scale. *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity*, 5, pp.no pagination.

Oliver Lisa, Schuurman Nadine, Hall Alexander, and Hayes Michael. (2011). Assessing the Influence of the Built Environment on Physical Activity for Utility and Recreation in Suburban Metro Vancouver. *BMC Public Health*, 11, pp.9.

Oliver M, Badland H, Mavoa S, Witten K, Kearns R, Ellaway A, Hinckson E, Mackay L, and Schluter P J. (2014). Environmental and socio-demographic associates of children's active transport to school: A cross-sectional investigation from the URBAN Study. *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity*, 11(1), pp.no pagination.

Oliver M, Mavoa S, Badland H, Parker K, Donovan P, Kearns R A, Lin E Y, and Witten K. (2015). Associations between the neighbourhood built environment and out of school physical activity and active travel: An examination from the Kids in the City study. *Health and Place*, 36, pp.57-64.

Oliver Melody, Witten Karen, Blakely Tony, Parker Karl, Badland Hannah, Schofield Grant, Ivory Vivienne, Pearce Jamie, Mavoa Suzanne, Hinckson Erica, Sweetsur Paul, and Kearns Robin. (2015). Neighbourhood built environment associations with body size in adults: mediating effects of activity and sedentariness in a cross-sectional study of New Zealand adults. *BMC public health*, 15, pp.956.

Oluyomi Abiodun O, Whitehead Lawrence W, Burau Keith D, Symanski Elaine, Kohl Harold W, and Bondy Melissa. (2014). Physical activity guideline in Mexican-Americans: does the built environment play a role?. *Journal of immigrant and minority health / Center for Minority Public Health*, 16(2), pp.244-55.

Olvera Norma, Smith Dennis W, Lee Chanam, Liu Jian, Lee Jay, Kellam Stephanie, and Kim Jun-Hyun. (2012). Hispanic maternal and children's perceptions of neighborhood safety related to walking and cycling. *Health & Place*, 18(1), pp.71-75.

Ord K, Mitchell R, and Pearce J. (2013). Is level of neighbourhood green space associated with physical activity in green space?. *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity*, 10, pp.no pagination.

Oreskovic N M, Blossom J, Robinson A I, Chen M L, Uscanga D K, and Mendoza J A. (2014). The influence of the built environment on outcomes from a "walking school bus study": a cross-sectional analysis using geographical information systems. *Geospatial health*, 9(1), pp.37-44.

Orzanco-Garralda M Rosario, Guillen-Grima Francisco, Sainz Suberviola, Lourdes , Redin Areta, M Dolores, de la Rosa Eduardo, Rosana , and Aguinaga-Ontoso Ines. (2016). Influence of Urbanistic Characteristics in the Level of Physical Activity in People Aged 18 to 65 of the Metropolitan Area Pamplona, Spain. *Influencia de las caracteristicas urbanisticas ambientales en el nivel de actividad fisica de la poblacion de 18 a 65 anos del area metropolitana de Pamplona. rorzancg@cfnavarra.es.*, 90, pp.e1-e10.

Ou J Y, Levy J I, Peters J L, Bongiovanni R, Garcia-Soto J, Medina R, and Scammell M K. (2016). A walk in the park: The influence of urban parks and community violence on physical activity in Chelsea, MA. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 13(1), pp.no pagination.

Owen Neville, Cerin Ester, Leslie Eva, duToit Lorinne, Coffee Neil, Frank Lawrence D, Bauman Adrian E, Hugo Graeme, Saelens Brian E, and Sallis James F. (2007). Neighborhood Walkability and the Walking Behavior of Australian Adults. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 33(5), pp.387-395.

Owen Neville, De Bourdeaudhuij , Ilse , Sugiyama Takemi, Leslie Eva, Cerin Ester, Van Dyck , Delfien , and Bauman Adrian. (2010). Bicycle Use for Transport in an Australian and a Belgian City: Associations with Built-Environment Attributes. *Journal of Urban Health*, 87, pp.189-198.

Page A S, Cooper A R, Griew P, and Jago R. (2010). Independent mobility, perceptions of the built environment and children's participation in play, active travel and structured exercise and sport: The PEACH Project. *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity*, 7, pp.no pagination.

Panter J R, and Jones A P. (2008). Associations between physical activity, perceptions of the neighbourhood environment and access to facilities in an English city. *Social Science and Medicine*, 67(11), pp.1917-1923.

Panter J R, Jones A P, van Sluijs , and E M F. (2008). Environmental determinants of active travel in youth: A review and framework for future research. *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity*, 5, pp.no pagination.

Panter J R, Jones A P, Van Sluijs , E M F, and Griffin S J. (2010). Attitudes, social support and environmental perceptions as predictors of active commuting behaviour in school children. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health*, 64(1), pp.41-48.

Panter J, Corder K, Griffin S J, Jones A P, van Sluijs , and E M F. (2013). Individual, socio-cultural and environmental predictors of uptake and maintenance of active commuting in children: Longitudinal results from the SPEEDY study. *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity*, 10, pp.no pagination.

Panter Jenna R, Jones Andrew P, Van Sluijs , Esther M F, and Griffin Simon J. (2010). Neighborhood, Route, and School Environments and Children's Active Commuting. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 38(3), pp.268-278.

Panter Jenna R, Jones Andrew P, van Sluijs , Esther M F, Griffin Simon J, and Wareham Nicholas J. (2011). Environmental and psychological correlates of older adult's active commuting. *Medicine and science in sports and exercise*, 43(7), pp.1235-43.

Panter Jenna Rachel, and Jones Andy. (2010). Attitudes and the environment as determinants of active travel in adults: what do and don't we know?. *Journal of physical activity & health*, 7(4), pp.551-61.

Panter Jenna, Desousa Carol, and Ogilvie David. (2013). Incorporating walking or cycling into car journeys to and from work: The role of individual, workplace and environmental characteristics. *Preventive Medicine*, 56(3-4), pp.211-217.

Panter Jenna, Griffin Simon, and Ogilvie David. (2014). Active commuting and perceptions of the route environment: a longitudinal analysis. *Preventive medicine*, 67, pp.134-40.

Panter Jenna, Griffin Simon, Jones Andrew, Mackett Roger, and Ogilvie David. (2011). Correlates of time spent walking and cycling to and from work: baseline results from the commuting and health in Cambridge study. *The international journal of behavioral nutrition and physical activity*, 8, pp.124.

Park Sungjin, Choi Keechoo, Lee Jae, and Seung . (2015). To Walk or Not to Walk: Testing the Effect of Path Walkability on Transit Users' Access Mode Choices to the Station. *International Journal of Sustainable Transportation*, 9, pp.529-541.

Pasanen Tytti P, Tyrvainen Liisa, and Korpela Kalevi M. (2014). The relationship between perceived health and physical activity indoors, outdoors in built environments, and outdoors in nature. *Applied psychology. Health and well-being*, 6(3), pp.324-46.

Peachey Andrew A, and Baller Stephanie L. (2015). Perceived Built Environment Characteristics of On-Campus and Off-Campus Neighborhoods Associated With Physical Activity of College Students. *Journal of American College Health*, 63(5), pp.337.

Pelclova J, Fromel K, and Cuberek R. (2014). Gender-Specific associations between perceived neighbourhood walkability and meeting walking recommendations when walking for transport and recreation for Czech inhabitants over 50 years of age. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 11(1), pp.527-536.

Perdue L A, Michael Y L, Harris C, Heller J, Livingston C, Rader M, and Goff N M. (2012). Rapid health impact assessment of policies to reduce vehicle miles traveled in Oregon. *Public Health*, 126(12), pp.1063-1071.

Perry Cynthia K, Herting Jerald R, Berke Ethan M, Nguyen Huong Q, Vernez Moudon, Anne , Beresford Shirley A. A, Ockene Judith K, Manson JoAnn E, and LaCroix Andrea Z. (2013). Does neighborhood walkability moderate the effects of intrapersonal characteristics on amount of walking in post-menopausal women?. *Health & Place*, 21, pp.39-45.

Pikora T J, Giles-Corti B, Knuiman M W, Bull F C, Jamrozik K, and Donovan R J. (2006). Neighborhood environmental factors correlated with walking near home: Using SPACES. *Medicine and Science in Sports and Exercise*, 38(4), pp.708-714.

Pizarro A N, Santos M P, Ribeiro J C, and Mota J. (2012). Physical activity and active transport are predicted by adolescents' different built environment perceptions. *Journal of Public Health (Germany)*, 20(1), pp.5-10.

Pojani Dorina, and Boussauw Kobe. (2014). Keep the children walking: active school travel in Tirana, Albania. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 38, pp.55-65.

Pouliou Theodora, Sera Francesco, Griffiths Lucy, Joshi Heather, Geraci Marco, Cortina-Borja Mario, and Law Catherine. (2015). Environmental influences on children's physical activity. *Journal of epidemiology and community health*, 69(1), pp.77-85.

Pratt Michael, Yin Shaoman, Soler Robin, Njai Rashid, Siegel Paul Z, and Liao Youlian. (2015). Does perceived neighborhood walkability and safety mediate the association between education and meeting physical activity guidelines?. *Preventing chronic disease*, 12, pp.E46.

Price Anna Elizabeth, Reed Julian A, Long Savannah, Maslow Andrea L, and Hooker Steven P. (2012). The association of natural elements with physical activity intensity during trail use by older adults. *Journal of physical activity & health*, 9(5), pp.718-23.

Prince S A, Gresty K M, Reed J L, Wright E, Tremblay M S, and Reid R D. (2014). Individual, social and physical environmental correlates of sedentary behaviours in adults: A systematic review protocol. *Systematic Reviews*, 3(1), pp.no pagination.

Prince S A, Reed J L, Nerenberg K A, Kristjansson E A, Hiremath S, Adamo K B, Tulloch H E, Mullen K A, Fodor J G, Wright E, and Reid R D. (2015). Intrapersonal, social and physical environmental determinants of moderate-to-vigorous physical activity in working-age women: A systematic review protocol. *Systematic Reviews*, 3(1), pp.no pagination.

Rahman T, Cushing R A, and Jackson R J. (2011). Contributions of built environment to childhood obesity. *Mount Sinai Journal of Medicine*, 78(1), pp.49-57.

Reed Julian, and Ainsworth Barbara. (2007). Perceptions of environmental supports on the physical activity behaviors of university men and women: a preliminary investigation. *Journal of American college health : J of ACH*, 56(2), pp.199-204.

Reyer Maren, Fina Stefan, Siedentop Stefan, and Schlicht Wolfgang. (2014). Walkability is only part of the story: walking for transportation in Stuttgart, Germany. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, 11(6), pp.5849-65.

Reynolds Kim D, Wolch Jennifer, Byrne Jason, Chou Chih-Ping, Feng Guanjun, Weaver Susan, and Jerrett Michael. (2007). Trail Characteristics as Correlates of Urban Trail Use. *American Journal of Health Promotion*, 21(Supplement), pp.335-345.

Rhodes R E, Courneya K S, Blanchard C M, and Plotnikoff R C. (2007). Prediction of leisure-time walking: An integration of social cognitive, perceived environmental, and personality factors. *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity*, 4, pp.no pagination.

Ries A V, Dunsiger S, and Marcus B H. (2009). Physical activity interventions and changes in perceived home and facility environments. *Preventive Medicine*, 49(6), pp.515-517.

Ries Amy V, Voorhees Carolyn C, Roche Kathleen M, Gittelsohn Joel, Yan Alice F, and Astone Nan M. (2009). A Quantitative Examination of Park Characteristics Related to Park Use and Physical Activity Among Urban Youth. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 45(3s), pp.S64-S70.

Robertson L B, Ward Thompson, C , Aspinall P, Millington C, McAdam C, and Mutrie N. (2012). The influence of the local neighbourhood environment on walking levels during the walking for wellbeing in the west pedometer-based community intervention. *Journal of Environmental and Public Health*, 2012, pp.no pagination.

Rodriguez Ariel, and Vogt Christine A. (2009). Demographic, environmental, access, and attitude factors that influence walking to school by elementary school-aged children. *The Journal of school health*, 79(6), pp.255-61.

Rodriguez Daniel A, Aytur Semra, Forsyth Ann, Oakes J Michael, and Clifton Kelly J. (2008). Relation of modifiable neighborhood attributes to walking. *Preventive Medicine*, 47(3), pp.260-264.

Rodriguez Daniel A, Evenson Kelly R, Diez Roux, Ana V, and Brines Shannon J. (2009). Land use, residential density, and walking. The multi-ethnic study of atherosclerosis. *American journal of preventive medicine*, 37(5), pp.397-404.

Roemmich J N, Epstein L H, Raja S, and Yin L. (2007). The neighborhood and home environments: Disparate relationships with physical activity and sedentary behaviors in youth. *Annals of Behavioral Medicine*, 33(1), pp.29-38.

Roemmich J N, Epstein L H, Raja S, Yin L, Robinson J, and Winiewicz D. (2006). Association of access to parks and recreational facilities with the physical activity of young children. *Preventive Medicine*, 43(6), pp.437-441.

Rosenberg Dori E, Huang Deborah L, Simonovich Shannon D, and Belza Basia. (2013). Outdoor built environment barriers and facilitators to activity among midlife and older adults with mobility disabilities. *The Gerontologist*, 53(2), pp.268-79.

Rossen Lauren M, Pollack Keshia M, Curriero Frank C, Shields Timothy M, Smart Mieka J, Furr-Holden C, Debra M, and Cooley-Strickland Michele. (2011). Neighborhood incivilities, perceived neighborhood safety, and walking to school among urban-dwelling children. *Journal of physical activity & health*, 8(2), pp.262-71.

Rosso A L, Auchincloss A H, and Michael Y L. (2011). The urban built environment and mobility in older adults: A comprehensive review. *Journal of Aging Research*, 2011, pp.no pagination.

Rothman Linda, To Teresa, Buliung Ron, Macarthur Colin, and Howard Andrew. (2014). Influence of social and built environment features on children walking to school: An observational study. *Preventive Medicine*, 60, pp.10-15.

Rundle A G, Sheehan D M, Quinn J W, Bartley K, Eisenhower D, Bader M M. D, Lovasi G S, and Neckerman K M. (2016). Using GPS Data to Study Neighborhood Walkability and Physical Activity. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 50(3), pp.e65-e72.

Rung Ariane L, Mowen Andrew J, Broyles Stephanie T, and Gustat Jeanette. (2011). The role of park conditions and features on park visitation and physical activity. *Journal of physical activity & health*, 8 Suppl 2, pp.S178-87.

Ryan Sherry, Frank Lawrence, and F . (2009). Pedestrian Environments and Transit Ridership. *Journal of Public Transportation*, 12, pp.39-57.

Saelens Brian E, Sallis James F, Frank Lawrence D, Cain Kelli L, Conway Terry L, Chapman James E, Slymen Donald J, and Kerr Jacqueline. (2012). Neighborhood environment and psychosocial correlates of adults' physical activity. *Medicine and science in sports and exercise*, 44(4), pp.637-46.

Saelens Brian E, Sallis James F, Frank Lawrence D, Couch Sarah C, Zhou Chuan, Colburn Trina, Cain Kelli L, Chapman James, and Glanz Karen. (2012). Obesogenic Neighborhood Environments, Child and Parent Obesity: The Neighborhood Impact on Kids Study. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 42(5), pp.e57-e64.

Saito Yoshinobu, Oguma Yuko, Inoue Shigeru, Tanaka Ayumi, and Kobori Yoshitaka. (2013). Environmental and individual correlates of various types of physical activity among community-dwelling middle-aged and elderly Japanese. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, 10(5), pp.2028-42.

Sallis J F, Cerin E, Conway T L, Adams M A, Frank L D, Pratt M, Salvo D, Schipperijn J, Smith G, Cain K L, Davey R, Kerr J, Lai P C, Mitas J, Reis R, Sarmiento O L, Schofield G, Troelsen J, Van Dyck , D , De Bourdeaudhuij , I , and Owen N. (2016). Physical activity in relation to urban environments in 14 cities worldwide: A cross-sectional study. *The Lancet*, 387(10034), pp.2207-2217.

Sallis J F, Conway T L, Dillon L I, Frank L D, Adams M A, Cain K L, and Saelens B E. (2013). Environmental and demographic correlates of bicycling. *Preventive Medicine*, 57(5), pp.456-460.

Sallis James F, Bowles Heather R, Bauman Adrian, Ainsworth Barbara E, Bull Fiona C, Craig Cora L, Sjostrom Michael, De Bourdeaudhuij , Ilse , Lefevre Johan, Matsudo Victor, Matsudo Sandra, Macfarlane Duncan J, Gomez Luis Fernando, Inoue Shigeru, Murase Norio, Volbekiene Vida, McLean Grant, Carr Harriette, Heggebo Lena Klasson, Tomten Heidi, and Bergman Patrick. (2009). Neighborhood Environments and Physical Activity Among Adults in 11 Countries. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 36(6), pp.484-490.

Sallis James F, Saelens Brian E, Frank Lawrence D, Conway Terry L, Slymen Donald J, Cain Kelli L, Chapman James E, and Kerr Jacqueline. (2009). Neighborhood built environment and income: examining multiple health outcomes. *Social science & medicine (1982)*, 68(7), pp.1285-93.

Salvo Deborah, Reis Rodrigo S, Stein Areyh D, Rivera Juan, Martorell Reynaldo, and Pratt Michael. (2014). Characteristics of the built environment in relation to objectively measured physical activity among Mexican adults, 2011. *Preventing chronic disease*, 11, pp.E147.

Sanders T, Feng X, Fahey P P, Lonsdale C, and Astell-Burt T. (2015). The influence of neighbourhood green space on children's physical activity and screen time: Findings from the longitudinal study of Australian children. *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity*, 12(1), pp.no pagination.

Schipperijn Jasper, Bentsen Peter, Troelsen Jens, Toftager Mette, and Stigsdotter Ulrika K. (2013). Associations between physical activity and characteristics of urban green space. *Urban Forestry & Urban Greening*, 12(1), pp.109-116.

Schulz Amy, Mentz Graciela, Johnson-Lawrence Vicki, Israel Barbara A, Max Paul, Zenk Shannon N, Wineman Jean, and Marans Robert W. (2013). Independent and joint associations between multiple measures of the built and social environment and physical activity in a multi-ethnic urban community. *Journal of urban health : bulletin of the New York Academy of Medicine*, 90(5), pp.872-87.

Serrano-Sanchez J A, Lera-Navarro A, Dorado-Garcia C, Gonzalez-Henriquez J J, and Sanchis-Moysi J. (2012). Contribution of individual and environmental factors to physical activity level among Spanish adults. *PLoS ONE*, 7(6), pp.no pagination.

Shigematsu R, Sallis J F, Conway T L, Saelens B E, Frank L D, Cain K L, Chapman J E, and King A C. (2009). Age differences in the relation of perceived neighborhood environment to walking. *Medicine and Science in Sports and Exercise*, 41(2), pp.314-321.

Shimura Hiroko, Sugiyama Takemi, Winkler Elisabeth, and Owen Neville. (2012). High neighborhood walkability mitigates declines in middle-to-older aged adults' walking for transport. *Journal of physical activity & health*, 9(7), pp.1004-8.

Shimura Hiroko, Winkler Elisabeth, and Owen Neville. (2014). Individual, Psychosocial, and environmental correlates of 4-year declines in walking among middle-to-older aged adults. *Journal of physical activity & health*, 11(6), pp.1078-84.

Shores K A, and West S T. (2008). The relationship between built park environments and physical activity in four park locations. *Journal of Public Health Management and Practice*, 14(3), pp.E9-E16.

Shores Kindal A, and West Stephanie T. (2010). Rural and urban park visits and park-based physical activity. *Preventive Medicine*, 50, pp.S13-S17.

Siceloff E R, Coulon S M, and Wilson D K. (2014). Physical activity as a mediator linking neighborhood environmental supports and obesity in African Americans in the path trial. *Health psychology : official journal of the Division of Health Psychology, and American Psychological Association*, 33(5), pp.481-9.

Sisson Susan B, Lee Sarah M, Burns Elizabeth K, and Tudor-Locke Catrine. (2006). Suitability of Commuting by Bicycle to Arizona Elementary Schools. *American Journal of Health Promotion*, 20(3), pp.210-213.

Sisson Susan B, McClain James J, and Tudor-Locke Catrine. (2008). Campus Walkability, Pedometer-Determined Steps, and Moderate-to-Vigorous Physical Activity: A Comparison of 2 University Campuses. *Journal of American College Health*, 56(5), pp.585-592.

Slater S J, Ewing R, Powell L M, Chaloupka F J, Johnston L D, and O'Malley P M. (2010). The association between community physical activity settings and youth physical activity, obesity, and body mass index. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 47(5), pp.496-503.

Slater Sandy J, Nicholson Lisa, Chriqui Jamie, Barker Dianne C, Chaloupka Frank J, and Johnston Lloyd D. (2013). Walkable Communities and Adolescent Weight. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 44(2), pp.164-168.

Solomon E, Rees T, Ukoumunne O C, Metcalf B, and Hillsdon M. (2013). Personal, social, and environmental correlates of physical activity in adults living in rural south-west England: a cross-sectional analysis. *The international journal of behavioral nutrition and physical activity*, 10, pp.129.

Spivock M, Gauvin L, and Brodeur J M. (2007). Neighborhood-Level Active Living Buoys for Individuals with Physical Disabilities. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 32(3), pp.224-230.

Spivock M, Gauvin L, Riva M, and Brodeur J M. (2008). Promoting Active Living Among People with Physical Disabilities. Evidence for Neighborhood-Level Buoys. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 34(4), pp.291-298.

Steinbach R, Green J, and Edwards P. (2012). Look who's walking: Social and environmental correlates of children's walking in London. *Health and Place*, 18(4), pp.917-927.

Stone Michelle R, Faulkner Guy E, Mitra Raktim, and Buliung Ron. (2012). Physical activity patterns of children in Toronto: the relative role of neighbourhood type and socio-economic status. *Canadian journal of public health = Revue canadienne de sante publique*, 103(9 Suppl 3), pp.eS9-14.

Strath S J, Greenwald M J, Isaacs R, Hart T L, Lenz E K, Dondzila C J, and Swartz A M. (2012). Measured and perceived environmental characteristics are related to accelerometer defined physical activity in older adults. *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity*, 9, pp.no pagination.

Stronegger Willibald J, Titze Sylvia, and Oja Pekka. (2010). Perceived characteristics of the neighborhood and its association with physical activity behavior and self-rated health. *Health & Place*, 16(4), pp.736-743.

Su J G, Jerrett M, McConnell R, Berhane K, Dunton G, Shankardass K, Reynolds K, Chang R, and Wolch J. (2013). Factors influencing whether children walk to school. *Health and Place*, 22, pp.153-161.

Sugiyama Takemi, Cerin Ester, Owen Neville, Oyeyemi Adewale L, Conway Terry L, Van Dyck , Delfien , Schipperijn Jasper, Macfarlane Duncan J, Salvo Deborah, Reis Rodrigo S, Mitas Josef, Sarmiento Olga L, Davey Rachel, Schofield Grant, Orzanco-Garralda Rosario, and Sallis James F. (2014). Perceived neighbourhood environmental attributes associated with adults' recreational walking: IPEN Adult study in 12 countries. *Health & Place*, 28, pp.22-30.

Sugiyama Takemi, Giles-Corti Billie, Summers Jacqui, Toit Lorinne du, Leslie Eva, and Owen Neville. (2013). Initiating and maintaining recreational walking: A longitudinal study on the influence of neighborhood green space. *Preventive Medicine*, 57(3), pp.178-182.

Sugiyama Takemi, Gunn Lucy D, Christian Hayley, Francis Jacinta, Foster Sarah, Hooper Paula, Owen Neville, and Giles-Corti Billie. (2015). Quality of Public Open Spaces and Recreational Walking. *American journal of public health*, 105(12), pp.2490-5.

Sugiyama Takemi, Leslie Eva, Giles-Corti Billie, and Owen Neville. (2009). Physical activity for recreation or exercise on neighbourhood streets: Associations with perceived environmental attributes. *Health & Place*, 15(4), pp.1058-1063.

Sugiyama Takemi, Paquet Catherine, Howard Natasha J, Coffee Neil T, Taylor Anne W, Adams Robert J, and Daniel Mark. (2014). Public open spaces and walking for recreation: Moderation by attributes of pedestrian environments. *Preventive Medicine*, 62, pp.25-29.

Sugiyama Takemi, Shibata Ai, Koohsari Mohammad J, Tanamas Stephanie K, Oka Koichiro, Salmon Jo, Dunstan David W, and Owen Neville. (2015). Neighborhood environmental attributes and adults' maintenance of regular walking. *Medicine and science in sports and exercise*, 47(6), pp.1204-10.

Sugiyama Takemi, Ward Thompson, and Catharine . (2008). Associations between characteristics of neighbourhood open space and older people's walking. *Urban Forestry & Urban Greening*, 7(1), pp.41-51.

Suminski Richard R, Heinrich Katie M, Poston Walker S. C, Hyder Melissa, and Pyle Sara. (2008). Characteristics of urban sidewalks/streets and objectively measured physical activity. *Journal of urban health : bulletin of the New York Academy of Medicine*, 85(2), pp.178-90.

Sundquist K, Eriksson U, Kawakami N, Skog L, Ohlsson H, and Arvidsson D. (2011). Neighborhood walkability, physical activity, and walking behavior: The Swedish Neighborhood and Physical Activity (SNAP) study. *Social Science and Medicine*, 72(8), pp.1266-1273.

Sundquist Kristina, Eriksson Ulf, Mezuk Briana, and Ohlsson Henrik. (2015). Neighborhood walkability, deprivation and incidence of type 2 diabetes: A population-based study on 512,061 Swedish adults. *Health & Place*, 31, pp.24-30.

Takahashi P Y, Baker M A, Cha S, and Targonski P V. (2012). A cross-sectional survey of the relationship between walking, biking, and the built environment for adults aged over 70 years. *Risk Management and Healthcare Policy*, 5, pp.35-41.

Taylor Lorian M, Leslie Eva, Plotnikoff Ronald C, Owen Neville, and Spence John C. (2008). Associations of perceived community environmental attributes with walking in a population-based sample of adults with type 2 diabetes. *Annals of behavioral medicine : a publication of the Society of Behavioral Medicine*, 35(2), pp.170-8.

Taylor Victoria M, Liu Qi, Yasui Yutaka, Talbot Jocelyn, Sos Channdara, Ornelas India, Coronado Gloria, and Bastani Roshan. (2012). Physical activity among Cambodian Americans: an exploratory study. *Journal of community health*, 37(5), pp.1040-8.

Teschke Kay, Harris M Anne, Reynolds Conor C. O, Winters Meghan, Babul Shelina, Chipman Mary, Cusimano Michael D, Brubacher Jeff R, Hunte Garth, Friedman Steven M, Monro Melody, Shen Hui, Vernich Lee, and Cripton Peter A. (2012). Route infrastructure and the risk of injuries to bicyclists: a case-crossover study. *American journal of public health*, 102(12), pp.2336-43.

Thielman Justin, Rosella Laura, Copes Ray, Lebenbaum Michael, and Manson Heather. (2015). Neighborhood walkability: Differential associations with self-reported transport walking and leisure-time physical activity in Canadian towns and cities of all sizes. *Preventive medicine*, 77, pp.174-80.

Timperio A, Ball K, Salmon J, Roberts R, Giles-Corti B, Simmons D, Baur L A, and Crawford D. (2006). Personal, family, social, and environmental correlates of active commuting to school. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 30(1), pp.45-51.

Timperio A, Veitch J, and Carver A. (2015). Safety in numbers: Does perceived safety mediate associations between the neighborhood social environment and physical activity among women living in disadvantaged neighborhoods?. *Preventive Medicine*, 74, pp.49-54.

Timperio Anna, Giles-Corti Billie, Crawford David, Andrianopoulos Nick, Ball Kylie, Salmon Jo, and Hume Clare. (2008). Features of public open spaces and physical activity among children: Findings from the CLAN study. *Preventive Medicine*, 47(5), pp.514-518.

Tin Sandar Tin, Woodward Alistair, Thornley Simon, Langley John, Rodgers Anthony, and Ameratunga Shanthi. (2010). Cyclists' attitudes toward policies encouraging bicycle travel: findings from the Taupo Bicycle Study in New Zealand. *Health Promotion International*, 25(1), pp.54-62.

Titze Sylvia, Giles-Corti Billie, Knuiman Matthew W, Pikora Terri J, Timperio Anna, Bull Fiona C, van Niel , and Kimberly . (2010). Associations between intrapersonal and neighborhood environmental characteristics and cycling for transport and recreation in adults: baseline results from the RESIDE study. *Journal of physical activity & health*, 7(4), pp.423-31.

Titze Sylvia, Stronegger Willibald J, Janschitz Susanne, and Oja Pekka. (2008). Association of built-environment, social-environment and personal factors with bicycling as a mode of transportation among Austrian city dwellers. *Preventive Medicine*, 47(3), pp.252-259.

Trapp G S. A, Giles-Corti B, Christian H E, Bulsara M, Timperio A F, McCormack G R, and Villaneuva K P. (2011). On your bike! a cross-sectional study of the individual, social and environmental correlates of cycling to school. *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity*, 8, pp.no pagination.

Trapp Georgina S. A, Giles-Corti Billie, Christian Hayley E, Bulsara Max, Timperio Anna F, McCormack Gavin R, and Villaneuva Karen P. (2012). Increasing children's physical activity: individual, social, and environmental factors associated with walking to and from school. *Health education & behavior : the official publication of the Society for Public Health Education*, 39(2), pp.172-82.

Troped Philip J, Wilson Jeffrey S, Matthews Charles E, Cromley Ellen K, and Melly Steven J. (2010). The Built Environment and Location-Based Physical Activity. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 38(4), pp.429-438.

Tsunoda K, Tsuji T, Kitano N, Mitsuishi Y, Yoon J Y, Yoon J, and Okura T. (2012). Associations of physical activity with neighborhood environments and transportation modes in older Japanese adults. *Preventive Medicine*, 55(2), pp.113-118.

Turrell Gavin, Haynes Michele, Wilson Lee-Ann, and Giles-Corti Billie. (2013). Can the built environment reduce health inequalities? A study of neighbourhood socioeconomic disadvantage and walking for transport. *Health & Place*, 19, pp.89-98.

Ulmer Jared M, Chapman James E, Kershaw Suzanne E, Campbell Monica, and Frank Lawrence D. (2015). Application of an evidence-based tool to evaluate health impacts of changes to the built environment. *Canadian journal of public health = Revue canadienne de sante publique*, 106(1 Suppl 1), pp.eS26-34.

Van Cauwenberg , J , Cerin E, Timperio A, Salmon J, Deforche B, and Veitch J. (2015). Park proximity, quality and recreational physical activity among mid-older aged adults: Moderating effects of individual factors and area of residence. *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity*, 12(1), pp.no pagination.

Van Cauwenberg , J , De Bourdeaudhuij , I , De Meester , F , Van Dyck , D , Salmon J, Clarys P, and Deforche B. (2011). Relationship between the physical environment and physical activity in older adults: A systematic review. *Health and Place*, 17(2), pp.458-469.

Van Cauwenberg , J , Van Holle , V , De Bourdeaudhuij , I , Van Dyck , D , and Deforche B. (2016). Neighborhood walkability and health outcomes among older adults: The mediating role of physical activity. *Health and Place*, 37, pp.16-25.

Van Cauwenberg , Jelle , Clarys Peter, De Bourdeaudhuij , Ilse , Van Holle , Veerle , Verte Dominique, De Witte , Nico , De Donder , Liesbeth , Buffel Tine, Dury Sarah, and Deforche Benedicte. (2012). Physical environmental factors related to walking and cycling in older adults: the Belgian aging studies. *BMC public health*, 12, pp.142.

Van Dyck , D , Cerin E, Conway T L, De Bourdeaudhuij , I , Owen N, Kerr J, Cardon G, Frank L D, Saelens B E, and Sallis J F. (2012). Perceived neighborhood environmental attributes associated with adults' transport-related walking and cycling: Findings from the USA, Australia and Belgium. *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity*, 9, pp.no pagination.

Van Dyck , D , Cerin E, Conway T L, De Bourdeaudhuij , I , Owen N, Kerr J, Cardon G, Frank L D, Saelens B E, and Sallis J F. (2012). Associations between perceived neighborhood environmental attributes and adults' sedentary behavior: Findings from the USA, Australia and Belgium. *Social Science and Medicine*, 74(9), pp.1375-1384.

Van Dyck , D , Cerin E, Conway T L, De Bourdeaudhuij , I , Owen N, Kerr J, Cardon G, Frank L D, Saelens B E, and Sallis J F. (2013). Perceived neighborhood environmental attributes associated with adults' leisure-time physical activity: Findings from Belgium, Australia and the USA. *Health and Place*, 19(1), pp.59-68.

Van Dyck , D , Veitch J, De Bourdeaudhuij , I , Thornton L, and Ball K. (2013). Environmental perceptions as mediators of the relationship between the objective built environment and walking among socio-economically disadvantaged women. *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity*, 10, pp.no pagination.

Van Dyck , Delfien , Cardon Greet, Deforche Benedicte, De Bourdeaudhuij , and Ilse . (2009). Lower neighbourhood walkability and longer distance to school are related to physical activity in Belgian adolescents. *Preventive Medicine*, 48(6), pp.516-518.

Van Dyck , Delfien , Cardon Greet, Deforche Benedicte, Giles-Corti Billie, Sallis James F, Owen Neville, De Bourdeaudhuij , and Ilse . (2011). Environmental and psychosocial correlates of accelerometer-assessed and self-reported physical activity in Belgian adults. *International journal of behavioral medicine*, 18(3), pp.235-45.

Van Dyck , Delfien , Cardon Greet, Deforche Benedicte, Owen Neville, Sallis James F, De Bourdeaudhuij , and Ilse . (2010). Neighborhood Walkability and Sedentary Time in Belgian Adults. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 39(1), pp.25-32.

Van Dyck , Delfien , Cardon Greet, Deforche Benedicte, Owen Neville, De Bourdeaudhuij , and Ilse . (2011). Relationships between neighborhood walkability and adults' physical activity: How important is residential self-selection. *Health & Place*, 17(4), pp.1011-1014.

Van Dyck , Delfien , Cardon Greet, Deforche Benedicte, Sallis James F, Owen Neville, De Bourdeaudhuij , and Ilse . (2010). Neighborhood SES and walkability are related to physical activity behavior in Belgian adults. *Preventive Medicine*, 50, pp.S74-S79.

Van Dyck , Delfien , De Meester , Femke , Cardon Greet, Deforche Benedicte, De Bourdeaudhuij , and Ilse . (2013). Physical environmental attributes and active transportation in Belgium: what about adults and adolescents living in the same neighborhoods?. *American journal of health promotion : AJHP*, 27(5), pp.330-8.

Van Dyck , Delfien , Deforche Benedicte, Cardon Greet, De Bourdeaudhuij , and Ilse . (2009). Neighbourhood walkability and its particular importance for adults with a preference for passive transport. *Health & Place*, 15(2), pp.496-504.

Van Holle , V , Van Cauwenberg , J , Van Dyck , D , Deforche B, Van de Weghe , N , De Bourdeaudhuij , and I . (2014). Relationship between neighborhood walkability and older adults' physical activity: Results from the Belgian Environmental Physical Activity Study in Seniors (BEPAS Seniors). *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity*, 11(1), pp.no pagination.

Van Holle , Veerle , Deforche Benedicte, Van Cauwenberg , Jelle , Goubert Liesbet, Maes Lea, Van de Weghe , Nico , De Bourdeaudhuij , and Ilse . (2012). Relationship between the physical environment and different domains of physical activity in European adults: a systematic review. *BMC public health*, 12, pp.807.

Van Kann , D H H, Kremers S P. J, Gubbels J S, Bartelink N H. M, de Vries , S I, de Vries , N K, and Jansen M W. J. (2015). The Association Between the Physical Environment of Primary Schools and Active School Transport. *Environment & Behavior*, 47(4), pp.418-435.

van Sluijs , Esther M F, Jones Natalia R, Jones Andrew P, Sharp Stephen J, Harrison Flo, and Griffin Simon J. (2011). School-level correlates of physical activity intensity in 10-year-old children. *International journal of pediatric obesity : IJPO : an official journal of the International Association for the Study of Obesity*, 6(2-2), pp.e574-81.

Vanhelst Jeremy, Beghin Laurent, Salleron Julia, Ruiz Jonatan R, Ortega Francisco B, De Bourdeauhuij , Ilse , Molnar Denes, Manios Yannis, Widhalm Kurt, Vicente-Rodriguez German, Mauro Beatrice, Moreno Luis A, Sjostrom Michael, Castillo Manuel J, Gottrand Frederic, and Group Helena Study. (2013). A favorable built environment is associated with better physical fitness in European adolescents. *Preventive Medicine*, 57(6), pp.844-849.

VanZerr Mariah. (2008). Resident Perceptions of Bicycle Boulevards: A SE Salmon Street Case Study. , , pp.40.

Vaughn Amber E, Ball Sarah C, Linnan Laura A, Marchetti Lauren M, Hall William L, and Ward Dianne S. (2009). Promotion of walking for transportation: a report from the Walk to School day registry. *Journal of physical activity & health*, 6(3), pp.281-8.

Veitch J, Salmon J, and Ball K. (2010). Individual, social and physical environmental correlates of children's active free-play: A cross-sectional study. *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity*, 7, pp.no pagination.

Veitch Jenny, Timperio Anna, Crawford David, Abbott Gavin, Giles-Corti Billie, and Salmon Jo. (2011). Is the neighbourhood environment associated with sedentary behaviour outside of school hours among children?. *Annals of behavioral medicine : a publication of the Society of Behavioral Medicine*, 41(3), pp.333-41.

Veugelers P, Sithole F, Zhang S, and Muhajarine N. (2008). Neighborhood characteristics in relation to diet, physical activity and overweight of Canadian children. *International Journal of Pediatric Obesity*, 3(3), pp.152-159.

Villanueva Karen, Knuiman Matthew, Nathan Andrea, Giles-Corti Billie, Christian Hayley, Foster Sarah, and Bull Fiona. (2014). The impact of neighborhood walkability on walking: Does it differ across adult life stage and does neighborhood buffer size matter?. *Health & Place*, 25, pp.43-46.

Voorhees Carolyn C, Yan Alice F, Clifton Kelly J, and Wang Min Qi. (2011). Neighborhood environment, self-efficacy, and physical activity in urban adolescents. *American journal of health behavior*, 35(6), pp.674-88.

Wahlgren L, and Schantz P. (2014). Exploring bikeability in a suburban metropolitan area using the active commuting route environment scale (ACRES). *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 11(8), pp.8276-8300.

Wang Zhe, and Lee Chanam. (2010). Site and neighborhood environments for walking among older adults. *Health & Place*, 16(6), pp.1268-1279.

Ward Thompson, C , Aspinall P, Roe J, Robertson L, and Miller D. (2016). Mitigating stress and supporting health in deprived urban communities: The importance of green space and the social environment. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 13(4), pp.no pagination.

Weimann Hanna, Bjork Jonas, Rylander Lars, Bergman Patrick, and Eiben Gabriele. (2015). Neighborhood environment and physical activity among young children: a cross-sectional study from Sweden. *Scandinavian journal of public health*, 43(3), pp.283-93.

Wendel-Vos G C. W, Van Hooijdonk , C , Uitenbroek D, Agyemang C, Lindeman E M, and Droomers M. (2008). Environmental attributes related to walking and bicycling at the individual and contextual level. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health*, 62(8), pp.689-694.

Wendel-Vos W, Droomers M, Kremers S, Brug J, Van Lenthe , and F . (2007). Potential environmental determinants of physical activity in adults: A systematic review. *Obesity Reviews*, 8(5), pp.425-440.

West Stephanie T, Shores Kindal A, and Mudd Lanay M. (2012). Association of available parkland, physical activity, and overweight in America's largest cities. *Journal of public health management and practice : JPHMP*, 18(5), pp.423-30.

Wilson Lee-Ann M, Giles-Corti Billie, Burton Nicola W, Giskes Katrina, Haynes Michele, and Turrell Gavin. (2011). The association between objectively measured neighborhood features and walking in middle-aged adults. *American journal of health promotion : AJHP*, 25(4), pp.e12-21.

Winters M, Teschke K, Brauer M, and Fuller D. (2016). Bike Score: Associations between urban bikeability and cycling behavior in 24 cities. *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity*, 13(1), pp.no pagination.

Winters Meghan, and Teschke Kay. (2010). Route preferences among adults in the near market for bicycling: findings of the cycling in cities study. *American journal of health promotion : AJHP*, 25(1), pp.40-7.

Winters Meghan, Brauer Michael, Setton Eleanor M, and Teschke Kay. (2010). Built environment influences on healthy transportation choices: bicycling versus driving. *Journal of urban health : bulletin of the New York Academy of Medicine*, 87(6), pp.969-93.

Witten K, Blakely T, Bagheri N, Badland H, Ivory V, Pearce J, Mavoa S, Hinckson E, and Schofield G. (2012). Neighborhood built environment and transport and leisure physical activity: Findings using objective exposure and outcome measures in New Zealand. *Environmental Health Perspectives*, 120(7), pp.971-977.

Witten Karen, Hiscock Rosemary, Pearce Jamie, and Blakely Tony. (2008). Neighbourhood access to open spaces and the physical activity of residents: A national study. *Preventive Medicine*, 47(3), pp.299-303.

Woldeamanuel Mintesnot, and Kent Andrew. (2015). Measuring Walk Access to Transit in Terms of Sidewalk Availability, Quality, and Connectivity. *Journal of Urban Planning and Development*, , pp.Content-04015019.

Wood L, Frank L D, and Giles-Corti B. (2010). Sense of community and its relationship with walking and neighborhood design. *Social Science and Medicine*, 70(9), pp.1381-1390.

Xing Yan, Handy Susan L, and Mokhtarian Patricia L. (2010). Factors Associated with Proportions and Miles of Bicycling for Transportation and Recreation in Six Small US Cities. *Transportation Research: Part D: Transport and Environment*, 15(2), pp.73-81.

Yang Lin, Hipp J Aaron, Adlakha Deepti, Marx Christine M, Tabak Rachel G, and Brownson Ross C. (2015). Choice of commuting mode among employees: Do home neighborhood environment, worksite neighborhood environment, and worksite policy and supports matter?. *Journal of transport & health*, 2(2), pp.212-218.

Yang Yizhao, Schlossberg Marc, Johnson Bethany, and Parker Robert. (2010). Understanding School Travel: How Location Choice and the Built Environment Affect Trips to School. *This research was sponsored by the U.S. Department of Transportation*, , pp..

Yildirim G, Ince M L, and Muftuler M. (2012). Physical activity and perceptions of neighborhood walkability among Turkish women in low and high socio-economic environments: an exploratory study. *Perceptual and motor skills*, 115(2), pp.661-75.

Yu Chia-Yuan, and Zhu Xuemei. (2015). Impacts of Residential Self-Selection and Built Environments on Children's Walking-to-School Behaviors. *Environment & Behavior*, 47(3), pp.268-287.

Yuji Matsuda, and Kazuhiko Nishide. (2012). A STUDY ON IMPEDIMENTS OF INDEPENDENT WALKING OF ADVENTITIOUSLY BLINDED PERSON ( ). *Journal of Architecture and Planning (Transactions of AIJ)*, 77, pp.1837-1846.

Zapata-Diomedi Belen, and Veerman J Lennert. (2016). The association between built environment features and physical activity in the Australian context: a synthesis of the literature. *BMC public health*, 16(1), pp.484.

Zhou Huaguo, Yang Jidong, Hsu Peter, and Chen Shaoqiang. (2010). Factors Affecting Students' Walking/Biking Rates: Initial Findings from a Safe Route to School Survey in Florida. *Journal of Transportation Safety & Security*, 2, pp.27.

Zhu X, Arch B, and Lee C. (2008). Personal, social, and environmental correlates of walking to school behaviors: Case study in Austin, Texas. *TheScientificWorldJournal*, 8, pp.859-872.

Zhu X, Yu C Y, Lee C, Lu Z, and Mann G. (2014). A retrospective study on changes in residents' physical activities, social interactions, and neighborhood cohesion after moving to a walkable community. *Preventive Medicine*, 69(S), pp.S93-S97.

Zhu Xuemei, and Lee Chanam. (2009). Correlates of walking to school and implications for public policies: survey results from parents of elementary school children in Austin, Texas. *Journal of public health policy*, 30 Suppl 1, pp.S177-202.

Zieff Susan G, Kim Mi-Sook, Wilson Jackson, and Tierney Patrick. (2014). A "Ciclovia" in San Francisco: Characteristics and physical activity behavior of Sunday Streets participants. *Journal of physical activity & health*, 11(2), pp.249-55.

Zwald Marissa L, Hipp James A, Corseuil Marui W, and Dodson Elizabeth A. (2014). Correlates of walking for transportation and use of public transportation among adults in St Louis, Missouri, 2012. *Preventing chronic disease*, 11, pp.E112.