

# BMJ Open

BMJ Open is committed to open peer review. As part of this commitment we make the peer review history of every article we publish publicly available.

When an article is published we post the peer reviewers' comments and the authors' responses online. We also post the versions of the paper that were used during peer review. These are the versions that the peer review comments apply to.

The versions of the paper that follow are the versions that were submitted during the peer review process. They are not the versions of record or the final published versions. They should not be cited or distributed as the published version of this manuscript.

BMJ Open is an open access journal and the full, final, typeset and author-corrected version of record of the manuscript is available on our site with no access controls, subscription charges or pay-per-view fees (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com>).

If you have any questions on BMJ Open's open peer review process please email [editorial.bmjopen@bmj.com](mailto:editorial.bmjopen@bmj.com)

# BMJ Open

## Associations between neighborhood walkability and sedentary time in New Zealand adults

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2017-016128
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	01-Feb-2017
Complete List of Authors:	Hinckson, Erica; Auckland University of Technology, Faculty of Health and Environmental Sciences Cerin, Ester; Australian Catholic University Mavoa, Suzanne; University of Melbourne Smith, Melody; University of Auckland Badland, Hannah; RMIT University Witten, Karen; Massey University Kearns, Robin; University of Auckland Schofield, Grant; Auckland University of Technology, Faculty of Health and Environmental Sciences
<b>Primary Subject Heading</b>:	Public health
Secondary Subject Heading:	Epidemiology
Keywords:	PUBLIC HEALTH, EPIDEMIOLOGY, PREVENTIVE MEDICINE, SOCIAL MEDICINE

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

only

1  
2  
3 **Associations between neighborhood walkability and sedentary time in New Zealand adults**  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8

9  
10 **Hinckson E<sup>1\*</sup>, Cerin E<sup>2, 3</sup>, Mavoa S<sup>4, 5</sup>, Smith M<sup>6</sup>, Badland H<sup>7</sup>, Witten, K<sup>5</sup>, Kearns, R<sup>6</sup>,**  
11 **Schofield G<sup>1</sup>**  
12  
13

14  
15 <sup>1</sup>Auckland University of Technology, Human Potential Centre, New Zealand  
16

17  
18 <sup>2</sup>Institute for Health and Ageing, Australian Catholic University, Australia  
19

20  
21 <sup>3</sup>School of Public Health, The University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong, China  
22  
23

24  
25 <sup>4</sup>McCaughey VicHealth Community Wellbeing Unit, Melbourne School of Population and  
26  
27 Global Health, Faculty of Medicine, Dentistry and Health Science, The University of Melbourne,  
28  
29 Australia  
30

31  
32  
33 <sup>5</sup>SHORE & Whariki Research Centre, Massey University, New Zealand  
34

35  
36 <sup>6</sup>The University of Auckland, New Zealand  
37

38  
39 <sup>7</sup>RMIT University, Australia  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44

45  
46 Short title: Built environment and sedentary time  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51

52 Please address correspondence to: Erica Hinckson\*  
53  
54

55 Associate Professor  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Auckland University of Technology  
4  
5

6 Faculty of Health and Environmental Sciences  
7  
8

9  
10 Auckland 92006, New Zealand  
11

12  
13 Email: [erica.hinckson@aut.ac.nz](mailto:erica.hinckson@aut.ac.nz)  
14  
15

16  
17  
18 Ester Cerin: Ester.Cerin@acu.edu.au  
19

20  
21 Suzanne Mavoa: [suzanne.mavoa@unimelb.edu.au](mailto:suzanne.mavoa@unimelb.edu.au)  
22

23  
24 Melody Smith: [melody.smith@auckland.ac.nz](mailto:melody.smith@auckland.ac.nz)  
25

26  
27 Hannah Badland: [hannah.badland@rmit.edu.au](mailto:hannah.badland@rmit.edu.au)  
28

29  
30 Karen Witten: [K.Witten@massey.ac.nz](mailto:K.Witten@massey.ac.nz)  
31

32  
33 Robin Kearns: Robin Kearns: [r.kearns@auckland.ac.nz](mailto:r.kearns@auckland.ac.nz)  
34

35  
36 Grant Schofield: [grant.schofield@aut.ac.nz](mailto:grant.schofield@aut.ac.nz)  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Associations between neighbourhood walkability and sedentary time in New Zealand adults

### Abstract

Objectives: We estimated associations between objectively-determined neighbourhood 'walkability' attributes and accelerometer-derived sedentary time (ST) by sex, city, or type of day.

Design: A cross-sectional study

Setting: The URBAN study was conducted in 48 neighborhoods across four cities in New Zealand (August 2008-October 2010).

Participants: The response rate was 41% (2029 recruited participants/5007 eligible households approached). In total, 1762 participants (aged  $41.4 \pm 12.1$ ,  $M \pm SD$ ) met the data inclusion criteria and were included in analyses.

Primary and secondary outcome measures: The exposure variables were GIS measures of neighborhood walkability (i.e. street connectivity, residential density, land use mix, retail-floor area ratio) for street network buffers of 500 m and 1000 m around residential addresses.

Participants wore an accelerometer for seven days. The outcome measure was average daily minutes of ST.

Results: Data were available from 1762 participants (aged  $41.4 \pm 12.1$  years; 58% female). No significant main effects of GIS-based neighborhood walkability measures were found with ST.

Retail-floor area ratio was negatively associated with sedentary time in women, significant only for 500 m residential buffers. An increase of 1 decile in street connectivity was significantly

1  
2  
3 associated with a decrease of over 5 minutes of ST per day in Christchurch residents for both  
4 residential buffers.  
5  
6

7  
8 Conclusion: Neighborhoods with proximal retail and higher street connectivity seem to be  
9 associated with less ST. These effects were sex and city specific.  
10  
11

12  
13  
14  
15 Key words: Built environment, Connectivity, Dwelling density, Mixed land use, Sitting.  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Strengths and Limitations of this study

- The strength of this paper is the large sample size from across four cities in New Zealand with sufficient numbers to make inter-city comparisons and the use of objective measures for sedentary time and the built environment.
- Data on retail floor area were not available and so the retail building footprint was used as a proxy.
- The retail land use was derived from zoning data which potentially excludes smaller retail areas.
- The effects of neighbourhood self-selection and neighborhood characteristics that promoted sedentary time were not differentiated.
- The lack of variation between New Zealand cities (low walkability in the global sense) may have also influenced our findings.
- The type of sedentary behavior participants engaged in were not identified.
- Hip-mounted accelerometers can misclassify very light activity and standing as sedentary behaviour.

## 1.0 Background

Sedentary behavior is a common behavior in adults, characterised by sitting times (median or mean) of 5 to 8 hours per day<sup>1,2</sup>. Evidence indicates that prolonged periods of inactivity, induced through sitting, have detrimental health effects<sup>3</sup>. A dose–response association has been reported between sitting time and all-cause mortality and cardiovascular disease,<sup>3,4</sup> as well as higher risk for obesity and Type 2 diabetes<sup>5</sup>. These adverse effects are present even in individuals who meet public health guidelines for moderate-to-vigorous physical activity<sup>6</sup>.

Correlates of sedentary behaviour identified thus far in adults include age, attitudes, body mass index, depressive symptoms/quality of life, education, employment status, gender, income, moderate-to-vigorous physical activity and smoking status<sup>7</sup>. A socio-ecological approach to understanding health behaviours suggests that broader factors such as the built environment may play a role<sup>8</sup>. However, while there is a large body of research focusing on behavioural and sociodemographic correlates of sedentary behaviour, research on social and environmental correlates remains scarce.

A recent systematic review on built environment attributes and sedentary behaviour relationships<sup>8</sup> found that very few studies showed significant associations between neighborhood built environment attributes and sedentary behaviors in the expected direction. However, overall, residents living in urban areas with diverse destinations close to their residential address had lower



1  
2  
3 levels of sedentary behavior<sup>8</sup>. It is theorized that environments more conducive to physical  
4 activity may encourage less sitting<sup>9</sup>. It is also theorized that the neighborhood environment may  
5 have an added direct influence on women than men because in general women are more likely to  
6 engage with their residential neighborhood through shopping/running errands and therefore more  
7 likely to be affected by the neighborhood design<sup>10</sup>.

8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18 Studies thus far have used a mixture of self-reported and objectively measured sedentary  
19 behaviour and built environment measures. The latest review by Kooshari and colleagues<sup>8</sup> did  
20 not differentiate between objective and subjective measures of either the built environment or  
21 sedentary behaviour, presumably due to the limited number of studies available in this area.

22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27 Objective measures are generally more reliable and valid than self-reports<sup>11</sup>.

28  
29  
30  
31  
32 In response, the main aim of this paper was to examine associations between Geographical  
33 Information System (GIS)-measured components of the neighborhood built environment within  
34 500 m and 1000 m individual buffer zones of participant's homes and objectively measured  
35 sedentary time. We also explored whether these associations varied by sex, city, or type of day  
36 (weekday versus weekend).

## 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 **2.0 Methods**

49  
50 A detailed description of the methods has been reported previously<sup>12</sup>. Briefly, cross-sectional  
51 data were collected from designated neighborhoods in four cities in New Zealand; North Shore,  
52 Waitakere, Wellington, and Christchurch. The URBAN Study commenced in April 2008 in  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 North Shore City and was completed in August 2010 in Christchurch. The host institutions of the  
4  
5 research granted ethical approval for the study procedures (AUTEC: 07/126, MUHECN:  
6  
7 07/045).  
8  
9

## 10 11 12 13 14 15 **2.1 Neighborhood selection**

16  
17 Twelve neighborhoods were selected from each city, resulting in a total of 48 neighborhoods  
18  
19 being sampled. Neighborhoods were selected based on the walkability profile and ethnic  
20  
21 population distribution (Māori, indigenous people) within contiguous mesh blocks (geographic  
22  
23 census unit of approximately 100 households) of the selected cities.<sup>13</sup> Neighborhood selection  
24  
25 resulted in three high walkability/high Māori, three high walkability/low Māori, three low  
26  
27 walkability/high Māori and three low walkability/low Māori neighborhoods. The study was  
28  
29 relevant nationally by over-sampling for Māori. Māori are the indigenous people of New  
30  
31 Zealand, and are the second largest ethnic group (after New Zealand European) in New Zealand.  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
<sup>14</sup> The walkability index was based on measures of street connectivity, dwelling density, land use  
mix, and retail floor area ratio, and was generated using GIS software, ArcInfo 9.1 (ESRI,  
Redlands, CA). The construction of these measures replicated existing research<sup>15</sup>.

## 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60 **2.2 Procedures**

The method of recruitment was by door to door; random start points were created in each  
neighborhood and every  $n^{\text{th}}$  house (n ranged from one to four according to neighborhood  
dwelling density) was approached. Five maximum visits were made to the eligible house. One

1  
2  
3 adult (20-65 years) per household was invited to participate. Once the participant agreed to take  
4 part in the study, two subsequent visits were arranged eight days apart. At the first visit, the study  
5 was introduced, informed consent was gained, and the accelerometer and compliance log were  
6 provided to the participants. At the second visit, the researcher collected the accelerometer and  
7 compliance log (participants wore the accelerometer for seven consecutive days) and completed  
8 the survey and anthropometric measures.  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

### 22 **2.3 Sample size and sample**

23  
24 We intended to recruit 2,000 adults for the URBAN study. We also expected a reduction in our  
25 data by 10% for lack of compliance. Therefore, the predicted sample size for full analysis was  
26 estimated to 1,800 adults. On the basis of 12 background covariates explaining 25% of the  
27 variability of the dependent variable, and intraclass correlation coefficient cluster effects of 0.05,  
28 the predicted sample of 1,800 adults,  $\alpha=0.05$  and statistical power of 80%, the clustered multi-  
29 linear regression models was set to detect the smallest change in  $r^2$  of  $\leq 2.3\%$  and clustered  
30 logistic regression models odds ratio of  $\leq 1.27$  if the prevalence rate of overweight/obesity was  
31 60%.  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45

46 From each neighborhood 42 adults were randomly recruited. Participants from selected  
47 households were identified using the next birthday method. Exclusion criteria were: falling  
48 outside the age ranges, not intending to live in the household over the measurement period,  
49 unable to speak the English language, or impaired ability to walk.  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## 2.4 Measures

**Sedentary time.** Sedentary time was objectively measured with the Actical accelerometer (Mini-Mitter, Sunriver, OR) fitted to an elastic waistband and worn above the right hip. The units have been shown to be reliable and valid<sup>16, 17</sup>. Prior to distribution, the units were tested for functionality and set up to record physical activity in 30-second epochs. Participants were instructed to wear the monitors during waking hours, but remove them when participating in water-based or contact activities. The threshold for sedentary time was set to <100 counts/minute using the Crouter 2R equation for the count threshold<sup>18</sup>. Data from participants with at least 10 hours of wear time for at least 5 days (including 1 weekend day) were included in the analyses. Non-wear time was defined as 60 minutes or more of consecutive zero counts<sup>19</sup>.

**2.5 Demographic variables.** Participants completed a face-to-face survey from which the following demographic characteristics were extracted: age, sex, ethnicity, marital status, academic qualification, total household income, and employment status.

**2.6 Walkability measures.** We extracted measures of neighborhood built environment from a GIS database that used ArcGIS 9.3 software (Environmental Systems Research Institute, California). The methods have been described in detail elsewhere<sup>12, 21</sup>. Briefly the walkability variables were:

- Street connectivity, estimated by calculating intersection density, the number of intersections per square kilometer within 20 meters of a mesh-block boundary.
- Dwelling density, number of dwellings, estimated by dividing the number of dwellings by the residential land area for each meshblock.
- Mixed land use, use of land including commercial, residential, industrial, open space and other, was calculated using an entropy index,<sup>15</sup> where 0 indicates homogeneity of land use and 1 heterogeneity.
- Retail floor area ratio, which, in the absence of floor area data, was estimated as the area of the retail building footprint divided by the area of the retail land parcel. A higher ratio facilitates pedestrian access as it has smaller setbacks and less surface parking<sup>22</sup>.

Walkability measures were calculated for administrative units and also for 500 m and 1000 m road network buffers calculated around participant's residential addresses.

## 2.7 Data analytic plan

Data were analyzed in July 2014. Descriptive statistics (means, standard deviations and percentages) were computed for the whole sample and by city for all variables. Generalized additive mixed models (GAMMs)<sup>23</sup> were used to estimate associations between walkability and sedentary time. GAMMs can account for dependency in residuals (multiple measures taken on the same participants sampled from selected administrative units), and estimate complex, dose-response relationships of unknown form<sup>23</sup>. Three-level random intercept GAMMs with Gaussian variance and identity link functions, appropriate for approximately normally distributed residuals (diagnostic tests were conducted to determine the appropriateness of the variance and link

1  
2  
3 functions), were used to estimate the above associations. These models accounted for three levels  
4  
5 of variability in the outcome – namely, variability at the administrative units selected for  
6  
7 participant recruitment, at the person level (i.e., between-participant differences), and at the  
8  
9 within-person level (within-participant differences between weekday and weekend day estimates  
10  
11 of sedentary time).  
12  
13  
14

15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20 Separate main-effect GAMMs estimated the dose-response relationships of walkability  
21  
22 components for the 500 m and 1 km road network buffers, respectively, with accelerometry-  
23  
24 based sedentary time, adjusting for city, socio-demographic covariates (sex, age, marital status,  
25  
26 educational attainment, ethnicity, and employment status), neighborhood deprivation (NZ  
27  
28 Deprivation Index), average minutes of accelerometer wear time, number of valid days of wear,  
29  
30 and type of day (weekday versus weekend day). It was possible to simultaneously enter all GIS  
31  
32 variables in the GAMMs as they were not collinear (mean absolute correlation = 0.26; range of  
33  
34 absolute correlations = 0.07 - 0.48). Curvilinear relationships of environmental attributes with  
35  
36 outcomes were estimated using non-parametric smooth terms in GAMMs, which were modeled  
37  
38 using thin-plate splines<sup>23</sup>. Smooth terms failing to provide sufficient evidence of a curvilinear  
39  
40 relationship (based on Akaike Information Criterion (AIC)) were replaced by simpler linear  
41  
42 terms. Separate GAMMs were run to estimate two-way and three-way walkability component by  
43  
44 sex, city and type of day interaction effects. The significance of interaction effects was evaluated  
45  
46 by comparing AIC values of models with and without a specific interaction term. An interaction  
47  
48 effect was deemed significant if it yielded a >2-unit smaller AIC than the main effect model<sup>24</sup>.  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60 Significant interaction effects were probed by computing the sex-, city-, and/or type of day-

1  
2  
3 specific associations (as appropriate) of GIS-based components of walkability with  
4  
5  
6 accelerometry-based sedentary time via linear functions.  
7  
8  
9

10  
11  
12 There were 12.5% cases with missing or invalid accelerometer data (252 out of 2014), and these  
13  
14 were excluded in the analyses. Participants with valid accelerometer data were older ( $p<.001$ ),  
15  
16 more likely to live in high SES neighbourhoods ( $p=.010$ ) and be employed ( $p<.001$ ). All  
17  
18 regression models were adjusted for these variables. There were less than 1.3% of remaining  
19  
20 participants with missing data on any other variables. Given the low percentage of missing data,  
21  
22 these values were imputed with the most common values for the sample (mean values or modes,  
23  
24 as appropriate). All analyses were conducted in R<sup>25</sup> using the packages ‘car’<sup>26</sup> and ‘mgcv’<sup>23</sup>.  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33

### 34 **3.0 Data availability**

35  
36 The datasets generated during and/or analyzed during the current study are not publicly available  
37  
38 due to the Institution’s ethical approval process and the requirement of consent by participants  
39  
40 (indigenous and otherwise) but are available from the corresponding author on reasonable  
41  
42 request.  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

### 48 **4.0 RESULTS**

49  
50 The response rate was 41% (2029 recruited participants/5007 eligible households approached).  
51  
52 In total, 1762 participants (aged  $41.4\pm 12.1$ ,  $M\pm SD$ ) met the data inclusion criteria and were  
53  
54 included in analyses. Table 1 reports the descriptive statistics of participants with accelerometer  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 data for each city. This includes sample socio-demographic characteristics, GIS-based  
4  
5 walkability components and accelerometry-based variables. Mean age of the total sample was  
6  
7 41.4 years (SD=12.1). Average sitting time was lower on weekends (mean = 409 minutes/day)  
8  
9 than weekdays (mean = 480 minutes per day). Participants living in Christchurch had the highest  
10  
11 sitting time on weekends, but the lowest on weekdays.  
12  
13

14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20 On average, selected neighborhoods in Christchurch had the lowest levels of dwelling density  
21  
22 and net retail floor area ratios, whilst Wellington had the highest levels of dwelling density,  
23  
24 intersection density and land use mix.  
25  
26

27  
28  
29  
30 PLEASE INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE  
31  
32  
33

#### 34 35 36 37 38 39 **4.1 Associations between socio-demographic variables, city and type of day with** 40 41 **accelerometry-based sedentary time**

42  
43 Men, older participants, and more highly educated participants engaged in significantly more  
44  
45 sedentary time than their counterparts (Table 2). For example, compared with participants with  
46  
47 less than secondary schooling, those who completed tertiary education accumulated 41.7 more  
48  
49 minutes of sedentary time per day. Being employed, living with a partner (as opposed to being  
50  
51 single) and not being of Asian or Māori/Polynesian ethnicity was associated with lower levels of  
52  
53 sedentary time. On average, participants from Wellington accumulated less sedentary time than  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 those from other study sites. Weekend days were on average associated with approximately 18  
4  
5 fewer minutes of sedentary time than weekdays (Table 2).  
6  
7  
8

---

9  
10 PLEASE INSERT TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE  
11  
12  
13

---

#### 14 15 **4.2 Associations of walkability components with accelerometry-based sedentary time**

16  
17 No significant main effects of GIS-based walkability components with accelerometry-based  
18  
19 sedentary time were found (Table 3). However, significant interaction effects were found  
20  
21 between street connectivity by city, and net retail floor area ratio by sex. Street connectivity was  
22  
23 significantly negatively associated with sedentary time in Christchurch only. Among participants  
24  
25 from Christchurch, an increase of 1 decile in street connectivity was associated with a decrease  
26  
27 of over 5 minutes of sedentary time per day. This effect was observed for both residential buffer  
28  
29 sizes. While net retail floor area ratio was not predictive of sedentary time in men, it was  
30  
31 negatively associated with sedentary time in women across all cities. However, this effect was  
32  
33 stronger (and significant only) for 500 m residential buffers across the four cities (Table 3).  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

---

50 PLEASE INSERT TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

---

## 5.0 Discussion

There were no significant main effects of GIS-based walkability on sedentary time, however significant interaction effects were found between street connectivity in one city-Christchurch and net retail floor area ratio in women. This and the study by Van Dyck<sup>19</sup> and colleagues are the only studies that have examined associations between objectively measured built environment and sedentary time in adults.

Our a priori assumption was that built environments more conducive to physical activity may encourage less time spent in sedentary behavior. Our findings do not necessarily support this, as there were no significant main effects of GIS-based walkability on sedentary time. Perhaps sedentary behavior is influenced by neighborhood cultural or social phenomena or built environment factors not measured in the study such as public transport (which is highest in Wellington). Also, since sedentary behavior is not the reverse of physical activity,<sup>27</sup> the presence of walkable features may not influence the transition from sitting to walking. Another explanation may be that since sedentary time seems to be associated with home-based activities (e.g. television watching, computer use)<sup>28</sup> perhaps built environment associations around smaller buffers (close proximity to the home) may have been more appropriate. Certainly, in our study, there was only one significant interaction effect observed within a 1000 m buffer and only two interaction effects within the 500 m buffer. Nonetheless, smaller buffers may be problematic in countries in which neighborhoods are of comparatively low walkability such as New Zealand

1  
2  
3<sup>29</sup>. On the other hand, a measure of regional accessibility may need to be included to account for  
4 environments of residents that commonly access (work and non-work) beyond the neighborhood.  
5  
6 Regional accessibility is defined as being determined by large regional shopping centers and  
7  
8 employment clusters, usually farther away, offering a variety of services<sup>30</sup>. It is possible that  
9  
10 multi-purpose trips are done in this way, conceivably reducing the possibility of local  
11  
12 accessibility irrespective of the neighborhood environment. Ubiquity of car ownership, as is the  
13  
14 case for New Zealand, is also important. Ivory and colleagues<sup>10</sup> saw a strong relationship  
15  
16 between built environment characteristics and car access, where almost half of those with  
17  
18 restricted car access lived in the most connected street network areas, compared with  
19  
20 approximately a third who had full car access. Lastly, it is plausible that different GIS measures  
21  
22 may need to be considered for the development of sedentary behavior index in the future but  
23  
24 extensive conceptualization and research must take place first.  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38

39 In the interaction effects model, two relationships showed significance: street connectivity in  
40  
41 Christchurch (within both 500m and 1000 m neighborhood buffer) and retail floor area ratio in  
42  
43 women (within 500m neighborhood buffer only). For participants from Christchurch, an  
44  
45 increase of 1 decile in street connectivity was associated with a decrease of over 5 minutes of  
46  
47 sedentary time per day. The result makes sense due to the city's relatively flat topography and  
48  
49 city design in comparison to Auckland and Wellington. Christchurch was one of four cities in the  
50  
51 world (prior to the 2010 Christchurch earthquake) that was designed in a rectangular grid fashion  
52  
53 with a central city square, surrounded by four city squares and a parklands area<sup>31</sup>. Literature has  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 shown that street connectivity is positively associated with overall walking<sup>32</sup> and walking for  
4 transport<sup>32,33</sup>. In terms of the second interaction effect, a significant association was observed  
5  
6 between sedentary time and higher floor area retail ratio within the 500 m, but not the 1000 m  
7  
8 neighbourhood buffer. Across all cities, the presence of retail outlets within a 500 m  
9  
10 neighborhood buffer was predictive of less sedentary time in women but not men. Aside from the  
11  
12 sex difference, we theorized that neighbourhoods more conducive to physical activity, in this  
13  
14 case presence of retail (any type) in close proximity, may encourage reduction of sedentary time.  
15  
16 Mixing residential neighborhoods with retail and other uses is not a new concept and remained  
17  
18 the design of traditional European cities and towns for several centuries. Traditional  
19  
20 neighborhoods morphed around the individual's needs to walk short distances to a destination. In  
21  
22 terms of the sex difference, a similar sex association has been shown with self-reported sedentary  
23  
24 behaviour in women and neighbourhood walkability,<sup>34</sup> women residing in low-walkable  
25  
26 neighbourhoods reported increased levels of television viewing compared with those who lived  
27  
28 in higher-walkable neighbourhoods<sup>34</sup>. While other studies have not investigated sex differences,  
29  
30 Kooshari and colleagues<sup>35</sup> reported that in high walkable Australian neighbourhoods, in  
31  
32 particular those with high retail area ratio, residents spent less time sitting in cars, while in  
33  
34 Belgian adults, Van Dyck and associates,<sup>19</sup> found that daily sedentary time was higher for  
35  
36 residents living in a high walkable environment. Nonetheless, according to our results, one may  
37  
38 infer that women who reside in neighbourhoods with better access to retail spend less time in  
39  
40 sedentary pursuits because they walk to a destination of interest frequently. These associations  
41  
42 need to be investigated further to understand the reasons behind these.  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 The strength of this paper is the large sample size from across four cities in New Zealand with  
4 sufficient numbers to make inter-city comparisons. An additional strength is the use of objective  
5 measures for sedentary time and the built environment. Notwithstanding the strengths of the  
6 study, there are limitations that need to be acknowledged. One of the main limitations is that the  
7 data were derived from a cross-sectional study and causation cannot be assumed. While the retail  
8 floor area ratio potentially identifies differences between big-box retail and strips (includes  
9 carparking), the spatial data used for this measure were limited in two ways. First, data on retail  
10 floor area were not available and so the retail building footprint was used as a proxy. Second,  
11 retail land use was derived from zoning data which potentially excludes smaller retail areas.  
12 Further, given that our study neighborhoods were located in areas unlikely to be within 1000 m  
13 of big box retail, in our study we consider the retail floor area ratio as a proxy for access to retail.  
14 We were unable to differentiate between the effects of neighborhood self-selection and  
15 neighborhood characteristics that promoted sedentary time. It is possible that an alternative  
16 aggregate of GIS measures might have captured city differences better than the measures that  
17 we've used; for example, topography was not included in the GIS variables measured. The lack  
18 of variation between New Zealand cities (low walkability in the global sense) may have also  
19 influenced our findings and possibly the reason for the difference in findings with the Belgian  
20 study. Since we used accelerometry to determine sedentary behavior, we were unable to  
21 determine the type of sedentary behavior participants engaged in. Finally, hip-mounted  
22 accelerometers can misclassify very light activity and standing with sedentary behavior. For this  
23 reason hip-mounted accelerometers tend to overestimate sedentary behavior.  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## 6.0 Conclusion

Our results imply that sedentary behaviour (time) was not correlated with the built environment in the New Zealand context. While there were no significant main effects between GIS-based walkability and sedentary time, neighborhoods within a 500 m neighborhood buffer that included retail were associated with less sedentary time in women residents only. In Christchurch, higher street connectivity was associated with less sedentary time. Taken together, it is possible that since sedentary behavior is not the reverse of physical activity,<sup>27</sup> the presence of walkable features may not influence the transition from sitting to walking and other factors (social and cultural) may supersede. This paper provided several alternatives to explain these results.

### Declarations

Ethics approval and consent to participate

The host institutions of the research granted ethical approval for the study procedures (AUTEC: 07/126, MUHECN: 07/045).

### Consent for publication

All authors have consented to publication of this manuscript.

### Availability of data and material

The datasets used and/or analyzed during the current study are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

### Competing interests

1  
2  
3 The authors declare there is no conflict of interest.  
4  
5  
6  
7

## 8 Funding

9

10 This work was funded by the Health Research Council (HRC) of New Zealand [grant numbers:  
11 07/356 and 08/048]. The funding body was not involved in the design, conduct, data collection,  
12 management, or publication of the study. The authors also gratefully acknowledge the  
13 participants who completed the study, research assistants who collected the data and the  
14 territorial authorities for providing the GIS datasets. EC is supported by an Australian Research  
15 Council (ARC) Future Fellowship (FT#140100085). HB and SM are in part supported by  
16 VicHealth, the National Health and Medical Research Council (NHMRC) Centre of Research  
17 Excellence in Healthy Liveable Communities (#1061404), and The Australian Prevention  
18 Partnership Centre (#9100001) with funding provided by NHMRC, ACT Health, NSW Health,  
19 the Australian National Preventive Health Agency, the Hospitals Contribution Fund of Australia  
20 and the HCF Research Foundation.  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38

## 39 Authors' contributions

40 EH has provided the first draft and subsequent drafts, is the corresponding author, and  
41 conceptualised the content of manuscript and analysis, CE analyzed the data and provided the  
42 results and tables, SM conducted the GIS analysis and contributed to the manuscript, MS  
43 contributed to the manuscript, HB managed the study and contributed to the manuscript, KW co-  
44 primary investigator and contributed to the manuscript, RK, contributed to the manuscript, GS  
45 co-primary investigator and contributed to the manuscript.  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

For peer review only



## REFERENCES

**Table 1. Overall and site-specific area and sample characteristics**

	Study site				
	All sites	North Shore	Waitakere	Wellington	Christchurch
Overall N	1762	463	466	417	443
Socio-demographics					
Mean age (SD)	41.4 (12.1)	41.8 (11.6)	41.5 (11.7)	40.0 (12.5)	42.1 (12.5)
[Missing: 1.2%]					
Sex, %men [Missing: 0.0%]	42.1	36.2	39.9	47.2	45.4
Education, %					
[Missing: 0.3%]					
Less than secondary school	4.5	2.3	4.5	0.5	10.4
Completed secondary school	56.3	58.0	64.2	45.1	56.9
Tertiary education	38.9	38.8	31.3	54.4	32.5
Work status, %working [Missing: 0.0%]	82.9	78.0	84.6	86.8	82.2
Marital status,	65.6	72.0	74.0	59.5	56.0

1  
2  
3 %couple [Missing:  
4  
5 0.2%]  
6  
7

8 Ethnicity, %  
9

10 [Missing: 0.0%]  
11

12 Maori/Polynesian 15.8 18.1 21.7 10.1 12.6

13 Asian 9.8 9.6 14.8 8.2 6.3

14 NZ European /  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21 Pakeha / Other

22 Mean environmental  
23

24 variables (SD) [Missing:  
25  
26 0.0%]  
27  
28

29 NZ Deprivation Index 5.1 (2.6) 4.2 (2.2) 5.3 (2.6) 4.7 (2.3) 6.2 (2.8)

30 Dwelling density –  
31  
32  
33  
34 500m buffers

35 Street connectivity – 5.4 (2.8) 4.4 (2.7) 4.8 (2.8) 6.3 (3.1) 6.4 (2.2)

36  
37  
38  
39 500m buffers

40 Land use mix – 500m 5.5 (2.9) 4.7 (2.7) 4.6 (2.6) 7.2 (2.8) 5.6 (2.7)

41  
42  
43 buffers

44 Net retail floor area 4.4 (2.9) 4.0 (3.3) 4.8 (4.8) 5.5 (3.6) 3.2 (3.4)

45  
46  
47 ratio – 500m buffers

48 Dwelling density – 5.5 (2.9) 5.1 (2.9) 6.2 (2.8) 7.0 (2.1) 3.7 (2.5)

49  
50  
51  
52 1km buffers

53 Street connectivity – 5.4 (2.9) 3.7 (2.2) 4.3 (2.4) 7.5 (2.9) 6.5 (2.1)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1km buffers						
Land use mix – 1km	5.5 (2.8)	4.0 (2.7)	4.2 (2.4)	8.2 (1.8)	5.7 (2.1)	
buffers						
Net retail floor area	5.3 (3.1)	4.5 (2.3)	6.0 (4.5)	6.6 (2.4)	4.1 (1.8)	
ratio – 1km buffers						
Mean accelerometry-						
based variables (SD)						
[Missing: 0.0%]						
Daily minutes of wear	789.5	796.4	802.2	812.8	748.2 (136.7)	
time - weekdays	(134.9)	(122.9)	(153.3)	(111.4)		
Daily minutes of wear	681.1	697.1	649.9	717.2	668.0 (208.8)	
time - weekend	(191.7)	(187.8)	(207.1)	(141.9)		
Percent of valid	89.4 (15.8)	92.0 (13.2)	90.6 (17.0)	85.9 (14.3)	88.7 (17.3)	
weekdays						
Percent of valid	74.5 (33.0)	79.8 (32.0)	69.8 (36.7)	75.8 (22.7)	73.4 (36.5)	
weekend days						
Sedentary time –	479.5	483.2	489.7	484.4	460.8 (130.4)	
weekdays (min/day)	(130.8)	(124.5)	(137.3)	(128.7)		
Sedentary time –	409.3	410.3	406.1	407.7	413.1 (154.9)	
weekend (min/day)	(148.6)	(148.5)	(160.2)	(125.1)		

For peer review only

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

**Table 2. Associations of socio-demographic characteristics, type of day and study sites with accelerometry-based sedentary time**

Predictor	b	95% CI	p
<b>Socio-demographic</b>			
Sex (reference: female)			
Male	18.1	9.5, 26.8	<.001
Education (reference: less than secondary school )			
Completed secondary school	18.7	-2.8, 40.2	.096
Tertiary education	41.7	19.1, 64.3	<.001
Working status (reference: not working)			
Working	-12.6	-24.1, -1.1	.032
Marital status (reference: single)			
Couple	-23.6	-32.8, -14.4	<.001
Ethnicity (reference: Maori/Polynesian)			
Asian	-0.1	-18.0, 17.9	.978
European / Pakeha / Other	-14.5	-27.1, -1.8	.025
Age (yrs)	0.7	0.3, 1.0	<.001
New Zealand Deprivation Index	0.3	-4.6, 5.1	.860
<b>Study site (reference: North Shore)</b>			
Waitakere	8.1	-6.43, 22.5	.287
Wellington	-17.3	-33.0, -1.6	.039
Christchurch	3.2	-13.1, 19.4	.548

**Type of day (reference: weekday)**

Weekend	-17.9	-23.7, -12.1	<.001
---------	-------	--------------	-------

---

Note. All models adjusted for valid days of accelerometer wear and average daily minutes of wear. All models accounted for correlated residuals at the neighborhood and participant levels. b = regression coefficients; 95% CI = 95% confidence intervals.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

**Table 3. Associations of GIS-based walkability components for 500m and 1km residential buffers with accelerometry-based sedentary time**

Predictor	500m residential buffers			1km residential buffers		
	b	95% CI	p	b	95% CI	p
<b>Main effect models</b>						
Dwelling density	-0.39	-2.08, 1.31	.654	-0.57	-2.49, 1.35	.564
Street connectivity	0.14	-1.90, 2.18	.892	-0.34	-2.58, 1.90	.768
Land use mix	1.04	-1.64, 1.15	.265	1.03	-1.08, 3.14	.339
Net retail floor area ratio	-0.24	-1.64, 1.15	.733	-0.02	-1.88, 1.84	.982
<b>Interaction effects</b>						
Street connectivity by study site						
Effect of street connectivity in North Shore	1.02	-2.37, 4.43	.556	0.20	-4.00, 4.41	.927
Effect of street connectivity in Waitakere	1.26	-2.02, 4.55	.452	-0.65	-4.43, 3.12	.733
Effect of street connectivity in Wellington	1.55	-1.78, 4.88	.363	2.12	-1.14, 5.38	.203
Effect of street connectivity in Christchurch	-5.06	-9.25, -0.86	<b>.019</b>	-5.18	-9.50, -0.86	<b>.019</b>

## Net retail floor area ratio (NRFA) by sex

Effect of NRFA in men	1.49	-0.36, 3.35	.116	1.58	-0.86, 4.01	.205
Effect of NRFA in women	-1.95	-3.60, -0.29	<b>.022</b>	-1.48	-3.59, 0.64	.172

Notes. All models adjusted for other walkability components, socio-demographics, New Zealand Deprivation Index, study site, and type of day (weekday versus weekend). All models accounted for correlated residuals at the neighborhood and participant levels. b = regression coefficients; 95% CI = 95% confidence intervals.

1. Bauman A, Ainsworth BE, Sallis JF, et al. The descriptive epidemiology of sitting: a 20-country comparison using the International Physical Activity Questionnaire (IPAQ). *Am. J. Prev. Med.* 2011;**41**(2):228-35 doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.amepre.2011.05.003>[published Online First: Epub Date]].
2. Hagströmer M, Troiano RP, Sjörström M, et al. Levels and patterns of objectively assessed physical activity—a comparison between Sweden and the United States. *Am. J. Epidemiol.* 2010 doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/aje/kwq069>[published Online First: Epub Date]].
3. Katzmarzyk PT, Church TS, Craig CL, et al. Sitting time and mortality from all causes, cardiovascular disease, and cancer. *Med. Sci. Sports Exerc.* 2009;**41**(5):998 doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1249/MSS.0b013e3181930355>[published Online First: Epub Date]].
4. Thorp AA, Owen N, Neuhaus M, et al. Sedentary behaviors and subsequent health outcomes in adults: a systematic review of longitudinal studies, 1996–2011. *Am. J. Prev. Med.* 2011;**41**(2):207-15 doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.amepre.2011.05.004>[published Online First: Epub Date]].
5. Hu FB, Li TY, Colditz GA, et al. Television watching and other sedentary behaviors in relation to risk of obesity and type 2 diabetes mellitus in women. *JAMA* 2003;**289**(14):1785-91 doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1001/jama.289.14.1785>[published Online First: Epub Date]].



6. Healy GN, Wijndaele K, Dunstan DW, et al. Objectively measured sedentary time, physical activity, and metabolic risk. *Diabetes Care* 2008;**31**(2):369-71 doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.2337/dc07-1795>[published Online First: Epub Date]].
7. Rhodes RE, Mark RS, Temmel CP. Adult sedentary behavior: a systematic review. *Am. J. Prev. Med.* 2012;**42**(3):e3-e28 doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.amepre.2011.10.020>[published Online First: Epub Date]].
8. Koohsari MJ, Sugiyama T, Sahlqvist S, et al. Neighborhood Environmental Attributes and Adults' Sedentary Behaviors: Review and Research Agenda. *Prev. Med.* 2015;**77**:141-49 doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.yjmed.2015.05.027>[published Online First: Epub Date]].
9. Barnett A, Cerin E, Ching CS, et al. Neighbourhood environment, sitting time and motorised transport in older adults: a cross-sectional study in Hong Kong. *BMJ open* 2015;**5**(4):e007557 doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2014-007557>[published Online First: Epub Date]].
10. Ivory VC, Blakely T, Pearce J, et al. Could strength of exposure to the residential neighbourhood modify associations between walkability and physical activity? *Soc. Sci. Med.* 2015;**147**:232-41 doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2015.10.053>[published Online First: Epub Date]].
11. Dyrstad SM, Hansen BH, Holme IM, et al. Comparison of self-reported versus accelerometer-measured physical activity. *Med. Sci. Sports Exerc.* 2014;**46**(1):99-106 doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1249/MSS.0b013e3182a0595f>[published Online First: Epub Date]].
12. Badland HM, Schofield GM, Witten K, et al. Understanding the Relationship between Activity and Neighbourhoods(URBAN) Study: research design and methodology. *BMC Public Health* 2009;**9**(1):224 doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/1471-2458-9-224>[published Online First: Epub Date]].
13. Statistics New Zealand. Census of population and dwellings: Auckland City. What we look like locally. Wellington: Statistics NZ, 2006.
14. Statistics New Zealand. New Zealand in profile: An overview of New Zealand's people, economy, and environment. Wellington: Statistics New Zealand, 2009.
15. Leslie E, Coffee N, Frank L, et al. Walkability of local communities: using geographic information systems to objectively assess relevant environmental attributes. *Health Place* 2007;**13**(1):111-22 doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.healthplace.2005.11.001>[published Online First: Epub Date]].
16. Esliger DW, Tremblay MS. Technical reliability assessment of three accelerometer models in a mechanical setup. *Med. Sci. Sports Exerc.* 2006;**38**(12):2173-81 doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1249/01.mss.0000239394.55461.08>[published Online First: Epub Date]].
17. Esliger DW, Probert A, Gorber SC, et al. Validity of the Actical Accelerometer Step-Count Function. *Med. Sci. Sports Exerc.* 2007;**39**(7):1200-04 doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1249/mss.0b013e3804ec4e9>[published Online First: Epub Date]].
18. Crouter SE, DellaValle DM, Horton M, et al. Validity of the Actical for estimating free-living physical activity. *Eur. J. Appl. Physiol.* 2011;**111**(7):1381-89 doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00421-010-1758-2>[published Online First: Epub Date]].
19. Van Dyck D, Cardon G, Deforche B, et al. Neighborhood walkability and sedentary time in Belgian adults. *Am. J. Prev. Med.* 2010;**39**(1):25-32 doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.amepre.2010.03.004>[published Online First: Epub Date]].
20. Oliver M, Badland HM, Schofield GM, et al. Identification of accelerometer nonwear time and sedentary behavior. *Res. Q. Exerc. Sport* 2011;**82**(4):779-83 doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02701367.2011.10599814>[published Online First: Epub Date]].
21. Mavoa S, Witten K, Pearce J, et al. Measuring Neighbourhood Walkability in New Zealand Cities, 2009.

22. Frank LD, Sallis JF, Saelens BE, et al. The development of a walkability index: application to the Neighborhood Quality of Life Study. *Br. J. Sports Med.* 2010;**44**(13):924-33 doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/bjism.2009.058701>[published Online First: Epub Date]].
23. Wood S. *Generalized additive models: an introduction with R*. Boca Raton, Florida: Chapman & Hall, 2006.
24. Burnham K, Anderson D. *Model selection and multimodel inference: a practical information-theoretic approach, 2nd ed* New York, NY: Springer, 2002.
25. R Core Team. *R: A language and environment for statistical computing*. Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing, 2013.
26. Fox J, Weisberg S. *An R companion to applied regression, 2nd ed*. Thousand Oaks CA: Sage, 2011.
27. Healy GN, Dunstan DW, Salmon JO, et al. Television time and continuous metabolic risk in physically active adults. *Med. Sci. Sports Exerc.* 2008;**40**(4):639 doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1249/MSS.0b013e3181607421>[published Online First: Epub Date]].
28. Owen N, Sugiyama T, Eakin EE, et al. Adults' sedentary behavior: determinants and interventions. *Am. J. Prev. Med.* 2011;**41**(2):189-96 doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.amepre.2011.05.013>[published Online First: Epub Date]].
29. Sallis JF, Bowles HR, Bauman A, et al. Neighborhood environments and physical activity among adults in 11 countries. *Am. J. Prev. Med.* 2009;**36**(6):484-90 doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.amepre.2009.01.031>[published Online First: Epub Date]].
30. Handy S. Regional versus local accessibility: Implications for nonwork travel. University of California: University of California Transportation Center, 1993:58-66.
31. Wilson J, Dowson S, Adam J, et al. Contextual Historical Overview of Christchurch City. Christchurch: Christchurch City Council, 2005.
32. Witten K, Blakely T, Bagheri N, et al. Neighborhood built environment and transport and leisure physical activity: findings using objective exposure and outcome measures in New Zealand. *Environ. Health Perspect.* 2012;**120**(7):971-77 doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1289/ehp.1104584>[published Online First: Epub Date]].
33. Koohsari MJ, Sugiyama T, Lamb KE, et al. Street connectivity and walking for transport: Role of neighborhood destinations. *Prev. Med.* 2014;**66**:118-22 doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.yjmed.2014.06.019>[published Online First: Epub Date]].
34. Sugiyama T, Salmon J, Dunstan DW, et al. Neighborhood walkability and TV viewing time among Australian adults. *Am. J. Prev. Med.* 2007;**33**(6):444-49 doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.amepre.2007.07.035>[published Online First: Epub Date]].
35. Koohsari MJ, Sugiyama T, Kaczynski AT, et al. Associations of leisure-time sitting in cars with neighborhood walkability. *J. Phys. Act. Health* 2014;**11**(6):1129-32 doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1123/jpah.2012-0385>[published Online First: Epub Date]].

STROBE 2007 (v4) Statement—Checklist of items that should be included in reports of cross-sectional studies

Section/Topic	Item #	Recommendation	Reported on page #
Title and abstract	1	(a) Indicate the study’s design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract	3
		(b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found	3
<b>Introduction</b>			
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported	6-7
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses	7
<b>Methods</b>			
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper	7-8
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection	7-8
Participants	6	(a) Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants	8-9
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable	9-10
Data sources/ measurement	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group	9-11
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias	11
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at	9
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why	11-13
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding	11-12
		(b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions	11-12
		(c) Explain how missing data were addressed	13
		(d) If applicable, describe analytical methods taking account of sampling strategy	
		(e) Describe any sensitivity analyses	
<b>Results</b>			

Participants	13*	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed (b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage (c) Consider use of a flow diagram	13
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders (b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest	13-14
Outcome data	15*	Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures	13-15
Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included (b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized (c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period	13-15
Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses	
<b>Discussion</b>			
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives	16-18
Limitations	19	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias	19
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence	16-20
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results	19
<b>Other information</b>			
Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based	21

\*Give information separately for cases and controls in case-control studies and, if applicable, for exposed and unexposed groups in cohort and cross-sectional studies.

**Note:** An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at <http://www.plosmedicine.org/>, Annals of Internal Medicine at <http://www.annals.org/>, and Epidemiology at <http://www.epidem.com/>). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at [www.strobe-statement.org](http://www.strobe-statement.org).

# BMJ Open

## What are the associations between neighborhood walkability and sedentary time in New Zealand adults? The URBAN cross-sectional study

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2017-016128.R1
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	02-Jul-2017
Complete List of Authors:	Hinckson, Erica; Auckland University of Technology, Faculty of Health and Environmental Sciences Cerin, Ester; Australian Catholic University Mavoa, Suzanne; University of Melbourne Smith, Melody; University of Auckland Badland, Hannah; RMIT University Witten, Karen; Massey University Kearns, Robin; University of Auckland Schofield, Grant; Auckland University of Technology, Faculty of Health and Environmental Sciences
<b>Primary Subject Heading</b>:	Public health
Secondary Subject Heading:	Epidemiology
Keywords:	PUBLIC HEALTH, EPIDEMIOLOGY, PREVENTIVE MEDICINE, SOCIAL MEDICINE

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

1  
2  
3 **What are the associations between neighborhood walkability and sedentary time in New**  
4 **Zealand adults? The URBAN cross-sectional study**  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9

10  
11  
12 **Hinckson E<sup>1\*</sup>, Cerin E<sup>2, 3</sup>, Mavoa S<sup>4, 5</sup>, Smith M<sup>6</sup>, Badland H<sup>7</sup>, Witten, K<sup>5</sup>, Kearns, R<sup>6</sup>,**  
13 **Schofield G<sup>1</sup>**  
14  
15

16  
17  
18 <sup>1</sup>Auckland University of Technology, Human Potential Centre, New Zealand  
19

20  
21 <sup>2</sup>Institute for Health and Ageing, Australian Catholic University, Australia  
22

23  
24 <sup>3</sup>School of Public Health, The University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong, China  
25

26  
27 <sup>4</sup>McCaughey VicHealth Community Wellbeing Unit, Melbourne School of Population and  
28 Global Health, Faculty of Medicine, Dentistry and Health Science, The University of Melbourne,  
29 Australia  
30  
31  
32

33  
34  
35 <sup>5</sup>SHORE & Whariki Research Centre, Massey University, New Zealand  
36

37  
38 <sup>6</sup>The University of Auckland, New Zealand  
39

40  
41 <sup>7</sup>RMIT University, Australia  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

48 Short title: Built environment and sedentary time  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54

55 Please address correspondence to: Erica Hinckson\*  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Associate Professor  
4

5  
6 Auckland University of Technology  
7

8  
9 Faculty of Health and Environmental Sciences  
10

11  
12 Auckland 92006, New Zealand  
13

14  
15 Email: [erica.hinckson@aut.ac.nz](mailto:erica.hinckson@aut.ac.nz)  
16  
17

18  
19  
20  
21 Ester Cerin: [Ester.Cerin@acu.edu.au](mailto:Ester.Cerin@acu.edu.au)  
22

23  
24 Suzanne Mavoa: [suzanne.mavoa@unimelb.edu.au](mailto:suzanne.mavoa@unimelb.edu.au)  
25

26  
27 Melody Smith: [melody.smith@auckland.ac.nz](mailto:melody.smith@auckland.ac.nz)  
28

29  
30 Hannah Badland: [hannah.badland@rmit.edu.au](mailto:hannah.badland@rmit.edu.au)  
31

32  
33 Karen Witten: [K.Witten@massey.ac.nz](mailto:K.Witten@massey.ac.nz)  
34

35  
36 Robin Kearns: Robin Kearns: [r.kearns@auckland.ac.nz](mailto:r.kearns@auckland.ac.nz)  
37

38  
39 Grant Schofield: [grant.schofield@aut.ac.nz](mailto:grant.schofield@aut.ac.nz)  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Associations between neighbourhood walkability and sedentary time in New Zealand adults

### Abstract

Objectives: We estimated associations between objectively-determined neighbourhood 'walkability' attributes and accelerometer-derived sedentary time (ST) by sex, city, or type of day.

Design: A cross-sectional study

Setting: The URBAN study was conducted in 48 neighborhoods across four cities in New Zealand (August 2008-October 2010).

Participants: The response rate was 41% (2029 recruited participants/5007 eligible households approached). In total, 1762 participants (aged  $41.4 \pm 12.1$ ,  $M \pm SD$ ) met the data inclusion criteria and were included in analyses.

Primary and secondary outcome measures: The exposure variables were GIS measures of neighborhood walkability (i.e. street connectivity, residential density, land use mix, retail footprint area ratio) for street network buffers of 500 m and 1000 m around residential addresses.

Participants wore an accelerometer for seven days. The outcome measure was average daily minutes of ST.

Results: Data were available from 1762 participants (aged  $41.4 \pm 12.1$  years; 58% female). No significant main effects of GIS-based neighborhood walkability measures were found with ST.

Retail footprint area ratio was negatively associated with sedentary time in women, significant only for 500 m residential buffers. An increase of 1 decile in street connectivity was significantly



1  
2  
3 associated with a decrease of over 5 minutes of ST per day in Christchurch residents for both  
4 residential buffers.  
5  
6

7  
8 Conclusion: Neighborhoods with proximal retail and higher street connectivity seem to be  
9 associated with less ST. These effects were sex and city specific.  
10  
11

12  
13  
14  
15 Key words: Built environment, Connectivity, Net dwelling density, Mixed land use, Sitting.  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Strengths and Limitations of this study

- The strength of this paper is the large sample size from across four cities in New Zealand with sufficient numbers to make inter-city comparisons and the use of objective measures for sedentary time and the built environment.
- Data on retail floor area were not available and so the retail building footprint was used as a proxy.
- The retail land use was derived from zoning data which potentially excludes smaller retail areas.
- The effects of neighbourhood self-selection and neighborhood characteristics that promoted sedentary time were not differentiated.
- The lack of variation between New Zealand cities (low walkability in the global sense) may have also influenced our findings.

## 1.0 Background

Sedentary behavior is a common behavior in adults, characterised by sitting times (median or mean) of 5 to 8 hours per day<sup>1,2</sup>. Evidence indicates that prolonged periods of inactivity, induced through sitting, have detrimental health effects<sup>3</sup>. A dose–response association has been reported between sitting time and all-cause mortality and cardiovascular disease,<sup>3,4</sup> as well as higher risk for obesity and Type 2 diabetes<sup>5</sup>. These adverse effects are present even in individuals who meet public health guidelines for moderate-to-vigorous physical activity<sup>6</sup>.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6 Correlates of sedentary behaviour identified thus far in adults include age, attitudes, body mass  
7  
8 index, depressive symptoms/quality of life, education, employment status, gender, income,  
9  
10 moderate-to-vigorous physical activity and smoking status <sup>7</sup>. A socio-ecological approach to  
11  
12 understanding health behaviours suggests that broader factors such as the built environment may  
13  
14 play a role <sup>8</sup>. However, while there is a large body of research focusing on behavioural and  
15  
16 sociodemographic correlates of sedentary behaviour, research on social and environmental  
17  
18 correlates remains scarce.  
19  
20  
21

22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27 A recent systematic review on built environment attributes and sedentary behaviour relationships <sup>8</sup>  
28  
29 found that very few studies showed significant associations between neighborhood built  
30  
31 environment attributes and sedentary behaviors in the expected direction. However, overall,  
32  
33 residents living in urban areas with diverse destinations close to their residential address had lower  
34  
35 levels of sedentary behavior <sup>8</sup>. It is theorized that environments more conducive to physical  
36  
37 activity may encourage less sitting <sup>9</sup>. It is also theorized that the neighborhood environment may  
38  
39 have an added direct influence on women than men because in general women are more likely to  
40  
41 engage with their residential neighborhood through shopping/running errands and therefore more  
42  
43 likely to be affected by the neighborhood design <sup>10</sup>.  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

50  
51 Studies thus far have used a mixture of self-reported and objectively measured sedentary  
52  
53 behaviour and built environment measures. The latest review by Kooshari and colleagues <sup>8</sup> did  
54  
55 not differentiate between objective and subjective measures of either the built environment or  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 sedentary behaviour, presumably due to the limited number of studies available in this area.  
4  
5 Objective measures are generally more reliable and valid than self-reports <sup>11</sup>.  
6  
7  
8  
9

10 In response, the main aim of this paper was to examine associations between Geographical  
11 Information System (GIS)-measured components of the neighborhood built environment within  
12 500 m and 1000 m individual buffer zones of participant's homes and objectively measured  
13 sedentary time. We also explored whether these associations varied by sex, city, or type of day  
14 (weekday versus weekend).  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

## 27 **2.0 Methods**

28  
29 Data for the current analysis were supplied by the Understanding the Relationship between  
30 Activity and Neighbourhoods (URBAN) Study. A detailed description of the methods has been  
31 reported previously <sup>12</sup>. Briefly, cross-sectional data were collected from designated  
32 neighborhoods in four cities in New Zealand; North Shore, Waitakere, Wellington, and  
33 Christchurch. The URBAN Study commenced in April 2008 in North Shore City and was  
34 completed in August 2010 in Christchurch. Although data collection started at different time  
35 points across the four locations, they were collected in a balanced manner across 12-14 months  
36 in each location to avoid clustering of seasonal effects by city. The host institutions of the  
37 research granted ethical approval for the study procedures (AUTEC: 07/126, MUHECN:  
38 07/045).  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## 2.1 Neighborhood selection

Twelve neighborhoods were selected from each city, resulting in a total of 48 neighborhoods being sampled. Neighborhoods were selected based on the walkability profile and ethnic population distribution (Māori, indigenous people) within contiguous mesh blocks (geographic census unit of approximately 100 households, median area: 0.30 km<sup>2</sup>, range: 1.03 km<sup>2</sup>) of the selected cities.<sup>13</sup> Neighborhood selection resulted in three high walkability/high Māori, three high walkability/low Māori, three low walkability/high Māori and three low walkability/low Māori neighborhoods. The study was relevant nationally by over-sampling for Māori. Māori are the indigenous people of New Zealand, and are the second largest ethnic group (after New Zealand European) in New Zealand.<sup>14</sup> The walkability index was based on measures of street connectivity, net dwelling density, land use mix, and retail footprint area ratio, and was generated using GIS software, ArcInfo 9.1 (ESRI, Redlands, CA). The construction of these measures replicated existing research<sup>15</sup>.

## 2.2 Procedures

The method of recruitment was by door to door; random start points were created in each neighborhood and every n<sup>th</sup> house (n ranged from one to four according to neighborhood net dwelling density) was approached. Five maximum visits were made to the eligible house. One adult (20-65 years) per household was invited to participate. Once the participant agreed to take part in the study, two subsequent visits were arranged eight days apart. At the first visit, the study was introduced, informed consent was gained, and the accelerometer and compliance log were provided to the participants. A compliance log is a “diary” where participants note the time they

1  
2  
3 have taken off or put on the accelerometer and reason, time they went to bed or woke up in the  
4 morning or any other information relevant to the accelerometer. At the second visit, the  
5 researcher collected the accelerometer and compliance log (participants wore the accelerometer  
6 for seven consecutive days) and completed the survey and anthropometric measures.  
7  
8  
9

10  
11  
12 From each neighborhood 42 adults were randomly recruited. Participants from selected  
13 households were identified using the next birthday method. Exclusion criteria were: falling  
14 outside the age ranges, not intending to live in the household over the measurement period,  
15 unable to speak the English language, or impaired ability to walk.  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

### 29 2.3 Measures

30  
31 **Sedentary time.** Sedentary time was objectively measured with the Actical accelerometer (Mini-  
32 Mitter, Sunriver, OR) fitted to an elastic waistband and worn above the right hip. The units have  
33 been shown to be reliable and valid <sup>16, 17</sup>. Prior to distribution, the units were tested for  
34 functionality and set up to record physical activity in 30-second epochs. Participants were  
35 instructed to wear the monitors during waking hours, but remove them when participating in  
36 water-based or contact activities. The threshold for sedentary time was set to <100  
37 counts/minute using the Crouter 2R equation for the count threshold <sup>18</sup>. Data from participants  
38 with at least 10 hours of wear time for at least 5 days (including 1 weekend day) were included  
39 in the analyses. Non-wear time was defined as 60 minutes or more of consecutive zero counts <sup>19</sup>,  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458  
459  
460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528  
529  
530  
531  
532  
533  
534  
535  
536  
537  
538  
539  
540  
541  
542  
543  
544  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
560  
561  
562  
563  
564  
565  
566  
567  
568  
569  
570  
571  
572  
573  
574  
575  
576  
577  
578  
579  
580  
581  
582  
583  
584  
585  
586  
587  
588  
589  
590  
591  
592  
593  
594  
595  
596  
597  
598  
599  
600  
601  
602  
603  
604  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618  
619  
620  
621  
622  
623  
624  
625  
626  
627  
628  
629  
630  
631  
632  
633  
634  
635  
636  
637  
638  
639  
640  
641  
642  
643  
644  
645  
646  
647  
648  
649  
650  
651  
652  
653  
654  
655  
656  
657  
658  
659  
660  
661  
662  
663  
664  
665  
666  
667  
668  
669  
670  
671  
672  
673  
674  
675  
676  
677  
678  
679  
680  
681  
682  
683  
684  
685  
686  
687  
688  
689  
690  
691  
692  
693  
694  
695  
696  
697  
698  
699  
700  
701  
702  
703  
704  
705  
706  
707  
708  
709  
710  
711  
712  
713  
714  
715  
716  
717  
718  
719  
720  
721  
722  
723  
724  
725  
726  
727  
728  
729  
730  
731  
732  
733  
734  
735  
736  
737  
738  
739  
740  
741  
742  
743  
744  
745  
746  
747  
748  
749  
750  
751  
752  
753  
754  
755  
756  
757  
758  
759  
760  
761  
762  
763  
764  
765  
766  
767  
768  
769  
770  
771  
772  
773  
774  
775  
776  
777  
778  
779  
780  
781  
782  
783  
784  
785  
786  
787  
788  
789  
790  
791  
792  
793  
794  
795  
796  
797  
798  
799  
800  
801  
802  
803  
804  
805  
806  
807  
808  
809  
810  
811  
812  
813  
814  
815  
816  
817  
818  
819  
820  
821  
822  
823  
824  
825  
826  
827  
828  
829  
830  
831  
832  
833  
834  
835  
836  
837  
838  
839  
840  
841  
842  
843  
844  
845  
846  
847  
848  
849  
850  
851  
852  
853  
854  
855  
856  
857  
858  
859  
860  
861  
862  
863  
864  
865  
866  
867  
868  
869  
870  
871  
872  
873  
874  
875  
876  
877  
878  
879  
880  
881  
882  
883  
884  
885  
886  
887  
888  
889  
890  
891  
892  
893  
894  
895  
896  
897  
898  
899  
900  
901  
902  
903  
904  
905  
906  
907  
908  
909  
910  
911  
912  
913  
914  
915  
916  
917  
918  
919  
920  
921  
922  
923  
924  
925  
926  
927  
928  
929  
930  
931  
932  
933  
934  
935  
936  
937  
938  
939  
940  
941  
942  
943  
944  
945  
946  
947  
948  
949  
950  
951  
952  
953  
954  
955  
956  
957  
958  
959  
960  
961  
962  
963  
964  
965  
966  
967  
968  
969  
970  
971  
972  
973  
974  
975  
976  
977  
978  
979  
980  
981  
982  
983  
984  
985  
986  
987  
988  
989  
990  
991  
992  
993  
994  
995  
996  
997  
998  
999  
1000

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8 **2.4 Demographic variables.** Participants completed a face-to-face survey from which the  
9  
10 following demographic characteristics were extracted: age, sex, ethnicity, marital status,  
11  
12 academic qualification, total household income, and employment status.  
13  
14

15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20 **2.5 Walkability measures.** We extracted measures of neighborhood built environment from a  
21  
22 GIS database that used ArcGIS 9.3 software (Environmental Systems Research Institute,  
23  
24 California). The methods have been described in detail elsewhere<sup>12, 21</sup>. Briefly the walkability  
25  
26 variables were:  
27

- 28  
29 • Street connectivity, estimated by calculating intersection density, the number of  
30 intersections per square kilometer ~~within 20 meters of a mesh block boundary.~~  
31  
32 Intersections were extracted from road centreline data provided by Territorial Local  
33  
34 Authorities.  
35  
36
- 37  
38 • Net dwelling density, number of dwellings, estimated by dividing the number of  
39 dwellings by the residential land area for each meshblock. Dwelling data was sourced  
40  
41 from the 2006 New Zealand census.  
42  
43  
44
- 45  
46 • Mixed land use, use of land including commercial, residential, industrial, open space and  
47  
48 other, was calculated using an entropy index,<sup>15</sup> where 0 indicates homogeneity of land  
49  
50 use and 1 heterogeneity. Zoning data sourced from Territorial Local Authorities was used  
51  
52 as a proxy for land use.  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

$$\text{LUM} = -\frac{\sum_k(p_k \ln p_k)}{\ln N}$$

where  $k$  is the land use category,  $p$  is the proportion of land area in a specific land use, and  $N$  is the number of land uses.

- Retail footprint area ratio, which, due to the lack of floor area data, was estimated as the area of the retail building footprint divided by the area of the retail land parcel.

Participants with no retail land use in their buffer were assigned a retail footprint area ratio of zero. A higher ratio facilitates pedestrian access as it has smaller setbacks and less surface parking<sup>22</sup>.

Walkability measures were calculated for administrative units and also for 500 m and 1000 m road network buffers calculated around participant's residential addresses. Road network buffers were created using the ArcGIS Service Area function. Road centreline data was sourced from Territorial Local Authorities and prior to calculation of the buffers, roads not accessible to pedestrians (e.g., motorways and on- and off-ramps) were removed.

## 2.6 Data analytic plan

Data were analyzed in July 2014. Descriptive statistics (means, standard deviations and percentages) were computed for the whole sample and by city for all variables. Generalized additive mixed models (GAMMs)<sup>23</sup> were used to estimate associations between walkability and sedentary time. GAMMs can account for dependency in residuals (multiple measures taken on the same participants sampled from selected administrative units), and estimate complex, dose-response relationships of unknown form<sup>23</sup>. Three-level random intercept GAMMs with Gaussian variance and identity link functions, appropriate for approximately normally distributed residuals



1  
2  
3 (diagnostic tests were conducted to determine the appropriateness of the variance and link  
4 functions), were used to estimate associations between walkability and sedentary time. These  
5 models accounted for three levels of variability in the outcome – namely, variability at the  
6 administrative units selected for participant recruitment, at the person level (i.e., between-  
7 participant differences), and at the within-person level (within-participant differences between  
8 weekday and weekend day estimates of sedentary time).  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

22 First, a GAMM estimated the independent associations of socio-demographic characteristics,  
23 type of day and study sites with accelerometry-based sedentary time. Then, separate main-effect  
24 GAMMs estimated the dose-response relationships of walkability components for the 500 m and  
25 1 km road network buffers, respectively, with accelerometry-based sedentary time, adjusting for  
26 city, socio-demographic covariates (sex, age, marital status, educational attainment, ethnicity,  
27 and employment status), neighborhood deprivation (NZ Deprivation Index), average minutes of  
28 accelerometer wear time, number of valid days of wear, and type of day (weekday versus  
29 weekend day). It was possible to simultaneously enter all GIS variables in the GAMMs as they  
30 were not collinear (mean absolute correlation = 0.26; range of absolute correlations = 0.07 -  
31 0.48). It was possible to simultaneously enter all GIS variables in the GAMMs as they were not  
32 collinear (mean absolute correlation = 0.20; range of absolute correlations = 0.07 – 0.48; mean  
33 Variance Inflation Factor, VIF = 1.14; range of VIF = 1.01 – 1.56). Curvilinear relationships of  
34 environmental attributes with outcomes were estimated using non-parametric smooth terms in  
35 GAMMs, which were modeled using thin-plate splines<sup>23</sup>. Smooth terms failing to provide  
36 sufficient evidence of a curvilinear relationship (based on Akaike Information Criterion (AIC))  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 were replaced by simpler linear terms. Separate GAMMs were run to estimate two-way and  
4  
5 three-way walkability component by sex, city and type of day interaction effects. The  
6  
7 significance of interaction effects was evaluated by comparing AIC values of models with and  
8  
9 without a specific interaction term. An interaction effect was deemed significant if it yielded a  
10  
11 >2-unit smaller AIC than the main effect model<sup>24</sup>. Significant interaction effects were probed  
12  
13 by computing the sex-, city-, and/or type of day-specific associations (as appropriate) of GIS-  
14  
15 based components of walkability with accelerometry-based sedentary time via linear functions.  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

25 There were 12.5% cases with missing or invalid accelerometer data (252 out of 2014), and these  
26  
27 were excluded in the analyses. Participants with valid accelerometer data were older ( $p<.001$ ),  
28  
29 more likely to live in high SES neighbourhoods ( $p=.010$ ) and be employed ( $p<.001$ ). All  
30  
31 regression models were adjusted for these variables. There were less than 1.3% of remaining  
32  
33 participants with missing data on any other variables. Given the low percentage of missing data,  
34  
35 these values were imputed with the most common values for the sample (mean values or modes,  
36  
37 as appropriate). All analyses were conducted in R<sup>25</sup> using the packages 'car'<sup>26</sup> and 'mgcv'<sup>23</sup>.  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45

### 46 **3.0 Data availability**

47  
48 The datasets generated during and/or analyzed during the current study are not publicly available  
49  
50 due to the Institution's ethical approval process and the requirement of consent by participants  
51  
52 (indigenous and otherwise) but are available from the corresponding author on reasonable  
53  
54 request.  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## 4.0 RESULTS

The response rate was 41% (2029 recruited participants/5007 eligible households approached).

In total, 1762 participants (aged 41.4±12.1, M±SD) met the data inclusion criteria and were included in analyses. Table 1 reports the descriptive statistics of participants with accelerometer data for each city. This includes sample socio-demographic characteristics, GIS-based walkability components and accelerometry-based variables. Mean age of the total sample was 41.4 years (SD=12.1). Average sitting time was lower on weekends (mean = 409 minutes/day) than weekdays (mean = 480 minutes per day). Participants living in Christchurch had the highest sitting time on weekends, but the lowest on weekdays.

On average, selected neighborhoods in Christchurch had the lowest levels of net dwelling density and retail footprint area ratios, whilst Wellington had the highest levels of net dwelling density, intersection density and land use mix.

---

PLEASE INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE

---

### 4.1 Associations between socio-demographic variables, city and type of day with accelerometry-based sedentary time

1  
2  
3 Men, older participants, and more highly educated participants engaged in significantly more  
4 sedentary time than their counterparts (Table 2). For example, compared with participants with  
5 less than secondary schooling, those who completed tertiary education accumulated 41.7 more  
6 minutes of sedentary time per day. Being employed, living with a partner (as opposed to being  
7 single) and not being of Asian or Māori/Polynesian ethnicity was associated with lower levels of  
8 sedentary time. On average, participants from Wellington accumulated less sedentary time than  
9 those from other study sites. Weekend days were on average associated with approximately 18  
10 fewer minutes of sedentary time than weekdays (Table 2).  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

---

23  
24 PLEASE INSERT TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33

---

#### 34 **4.2 Associations of walkability components with accelerometry-based sedentary time**

35  
36 No significant main effects of GIS-based walkability components with accelerometry-based  
37 sedentary time were found (Table 3). However, significant interaction effects were found  
38 between street connectivity by city, and retail footprint area ratio by sex. Street connectivity was  
39 significantly negatively associated with sedentary time in Christchurch only. Among participants  
40 from Christchurch, an increase of 1 decile in street connectivity was associated with a decrease  
41 of over 5 minutes of sedentary time per day. This effect was observed for both residential buffer  
42 sizes. While retail footprint area ratio was not predictive of sedentary time in men, it was  
43 negatively associated with sedentary time in women across all cities. However, this effect was  
44 stronger (and significant only) for 500 m residential buffers across the four cities (Table 3).  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6 The proportions of sedentary time variance attributable to between-neighbourhood, between-  
7  
8 participant (within neighbourhoods) and between-day (within participants) differences were,  
9  
10 respectively, 0.02 ( $p=.002$ ), 0.35 ( $p<.001$ ) and 0.63 ( $p<.001$ ). The final GAMMs, including all  
11  
12 covariates, environmental variables and interaction terms, explained 95% of the between-  
13  
14 neighbourhood, 34% of between-participant and 55% of between-day variance. The proportions  
15  
16 of unexplained sitting time variance attributable to differences between neighbourhood, persons  
17  
18 and days were approximately  $<0.01$  ( $p>.250$ ), 0.45 ( $p<.001$ ) and 0.54 ( $p<.001$ ).  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

---

28  
29 PLEASE INSERT TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39

---

## 40 5.0 Discussion

41  
42  
43 There were no significant main effects of GIS-based walkability on sedentary time, however  
44  
45 significant interaction effects were found between street connectivity in one city-Christchurch  
46  
47 and retail footprint area ratio in women. This and the study by Van Dyck <sup>19</sup> and colleagues are  
48  
49 the only studies that have examined associations between objectively measured built  
50  
51 environment and sedentary time in adults.  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7 Our a priori assumption was that built environments more conducive to physical activity may  
8  
9 encourage less time spent in sedentary behavior. Our findings do not necessarily support this, as  
10  
11 there were no significant main effects of GIS-based walkability on sedentary time and only 2%  
12  
13 of the variance in sitting time was due to differences between neighborhoods. Perhaps sedentary  
14  
15 behavior is influenced by neighborhood cultural or social phenomena or built environment  
16  
17 factors not measured in the study such as public transport (Wellington region has the highest use  
18  
19 of public transport per capita use in New Zealand). Also, the administrative units used to capture  
20  
21 neighborhood-level variability in sedentary time may not represent the optimal geographical  
22  
23 scale to detect environmental influences on this specific behavior. Moreover, since sedentary  
24  
25 behavior is not the reverse of physical activity,<sup>27</sup> the presence of walkable features may not  
26  
27 influence the transition from sitting to walking. Another explanation may be that since sedentary  
28  
29 time seems to be associated with home-based activities (e.g. television watching, computer use)  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35<sup>28</sup> perhaps built environment associations around smaller buffers (close proximity to the home)  
36  
37 may have been more appropriate. Certainly, in our study, there was only one significant  
38  
39 interaction effect observed within a 1000 m buffer and only two interaction effects within the  
40  
41 500 m buffer. Nonetheless, smaller buffers may be problematic in countries in which  
42  
43 neighborhoods are of comparatively low walkability such as New Zealand<sup>29</sup>. On the other hand,  
44  
45 a measure of regional accessibility may need to be included to account for environments of  
46  
47 residents that commonly access (work and non-work) beyond the neighborhood. Regional  
48  
49 accessibility is defined as being determined by large regional shopping centers and employment  
50  
51 clusters, usually farther away, offering a variety of services<sup>30</sup>. It is possible that multi-purpose  
52  
53 trips are done in this way, conceivably reducing the possibility of local accessibility irrespective  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 of the neighborhood environment. Ubiquity of car ownership, as is the case for New Zealand, is  
4 also important. Ivory and colleagues<sup>10</sup> saw a strong relationship between built environment  
5 characteristics and car access, where almost half of those with restricted car access lived in the  
6 most connected street network areas, compared with approximately a third who had full car  
7 access. Lastly, it is plausible that different GIS measures may need to be considered for the  
8 development of sedentary behavior index in the future but extensive conceptualization and  
9 research must take place first.  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19

20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27 In the interaction effects model, two relationships showed significance: street connectivity in  
28 Christchurch (within both 500m and 1000 m neighborhood buffer) and retail footprint area ratio  
29 in women (within 500m neighborhood buffer only). For participants from Christchurch, an  
30 increase of 1 decile in street connectivity was associated with a decrease of over 5 minutes of  
31 sedentary time per day. The result makes sense due to the city's relatively flat topography and  
32 city design in comparison to Auckland and Wellington. Christchurch was one of four cities in the  
33 world (prior to the 2010 Christchurch earthquake) that was designed in a rectangular grid fashion  
34 with a central city square, surrounded by four city squares and a parklands area<sup>31</sup>. Literature has  
35 shown that street connectivity is positively associated with overall walking<sup>32</sup> and walking for  
36 transport<sup>32,33</sup>. In terms of the second interaction effect, a significant association was observed  
37 between sedentary time and higher footprint area retail ratio within the 500 m, but not the 1000  
38 m neighbourhood buffer. Across all cities, the floor area retail ratio within a 500 m neighborhood  
39 buffer was predictive of less sedentary time in women but not men. Aside from the sex  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 difference, we theorized that neighbourhoods more conducive to physical activity, in this case  
4 presence of retail (any type) in close proximity, may encourage reduction of sedentary time.  
5  
6 Mixing residential neighborhoods with retail and other uses is not a new concept and remained  
7  
8 the design of traditional European cities and towns for several centuries. Traditional  
9  
10 neighborhoods morphed around the individual's needs to walk short distances to a destination. In  
11  
12 terms of the sex difference, a similar sex association has been shown with self-reported sedentary  
13  
14 behaviour in women and neighbourhood walkability,<sup>34</sup> women residing in low-walkable  
15  
16 neighbourhoods reported increased levels of television viewing compared with those who lived  
17  
18 in higher-walkable neighbourhoods<sup>34</sup>. While other studies have not investigated sex differences,  
19  
20 Kooshari and colleagues<sup>35</sup> reported that in high walkable Australian neighbourhoods, in  
21  
22 particular those with high retail footprint area ratio, residents spent less time sitting in cars, while  
23  
24 in Belgian adults, Van Dyck and associates,<sup>19</sup> found that daily sedentary time was higher for  
25  
26 residents living in a high walkable environment. Nonetheless, according to our results, one may  
27  
28 infer that women who reside in neighbourhoods with better access to retail spend less time in  
29  
30 sedentary pursuits because they walk to a destination of interest frequently. These associations  
31  
32 need to be investigated further to understand the reasons behind these.  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

The strength of this paper is the large sample size from across four cities in New Zealand with sufficient numbers to make inter-city comparisons. An additional strength is the use of objective measures for sedentary time and the built environment. Notwithstanding the strengths of the study, there are limitations that need to be acknowledged. One of the main limitations is that the



1  
2  
3 data were derived from a cross-sectional study and causation cannot be assumed. While the retail  
4 footprint area ratio potentially identifies differences between big-box retail and strips (includes  
5 carparking), the spatial data used for this measure were limited in two ways. First, data on retail  
6 floor area ratio were not available and so the retail building footprint was used as a proxy.  
7  
8 Second, retail land use was derived from zoning data which potentially excludes smaller retail  
9 areas and doesn't necessarily correspond to current use. Further, given that our study  
10 neighborhoods were located in areas unlikely to be within 1000 m of big box retail, in our study  
11 we consider the retail footprint area ratio as a proxy for access to retail. We were unable to  
12 differentiate between the effects of neighborhood self-selection and neighborhood characteristics  
13 that promoted sedentary time. It is possible that an alternative aggregate of GIS measures might  
14 have captured city differences better than the measures that we've used; for example, topography  
15 was not included in the GIS variables measured. The lack of variation between New Zealand  
16 cities (low walkability in the global sense) may have also influenced our findings and possibly  
17 the reason for the difference in findings with the Belgian study<sup>19</sup>. Since we used accelerometry  
18 to determine sedentary behavior, we were unable to determine the type of sedentary behavior  
19 participants engaged in. Finally, hip-mounted accelerometers can misclassify very light activity  
20 and standing with sedentary behavior. For this reason hip-mounted accelerometers tend to  
21 overestimate sedentary behavior.  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51

## 52 **6.0 Conclusion**

53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Our results imply that sedentary behaviour (time) was not correlated with the built environment  
4 in the New Zealand context. While there were no significant main effects between GIS-based  
5 walkability and sedentary time, neighborhoods within a 500 m neighborhood buffer that included  
6 retail were associated with less sedentary time in women residents only. In Christchurch, higher  
7 street connectivity was associated with less sedentary time. Taken together, it is possible that  
8 since sedentary behavior is not the reverse of physical activity,<sup>27</sup> the presence of walkable  
9 features may not influence the transition from sitting to walking and other factors (social and  
10 cultural) may supersede. This paper provided several alternatives to explain these results.  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

#### 24 Declarations

##### 25 Ethics approval and consent to participate

26  
27 The host institutions of the research granted ethical approval for the study procedures (AUTEC:  
28 07/126, MUHECN: 07/045).  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35

##### 36 Consent for publication

37 All authors have consented to publication of this manuscript.  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43

##### 44 Availability of data and material

45 The datasets used and/or analyzed during the current study are available from the corresponding  
46 author on reasonable request.  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52

##### 53 Competing interests

54 The authors declare there is no conflict of interest.  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Funding

This work was funded by the Health Research Council (HRC) of New Zealand [grant numbers: 07/356 and 08/048]. The funding body was not involved in the design, conduct, data collection, management, or publication of the study. The authors also gratefully acknowledge the participants who completed the study, research assistants who collected the data and the territorial authorities for providing the GIS datasets. EC is supported by an Australian Research Council (ARC) Future Fellowship (FT#140100085). HB and SM are in part supported by VicHealth, the National Health and Medical Research Council (NHMRC) Centre of Research Excellence in Healthy Liveable Communities (#1061404), and The Australian Prevention Partnership Centre (#9100001) with funding provided by NHMRC, ACT Health, NSW Health, the Australian National Preventive Health Agency, the Hospitals Contribution Fund of Australia and the HCF Research Foundation.

## Authors' contributions

EH has provided the first draft and subsequent drafts, is the corresponding author, and conceptualised the content of manuscript and analysis, CE analyzed the data and provided the results and tables, SM conducted the GIS analysis and contributed to the manuscript, MS contributed to the manuscript, HB managed the study and contributed to the manuscript, KW co-primary investigator and contributed to the manuscript, RK, contributed to the manuscript, GS co-primary investigator and contributed to the manuscript.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

For peer review only

## REFERENCES

**Table 1. Overall and site-specific area and sample characteristics**

	Study site				
	All sites	North Shore	Waitakere	Wellington	Christchurch
Overall N	1762	463	466	417	443
Socio-demographics					
Mean age (SD)	41.4 (12.1)	41.8 (11.6)	41.5 (11.7)	40.0 (12.5)	42.1 (12.5)
[Missing: 1.2%]					
Sex, %men [Missing: 0.0%]	42.1	36.2	39.9	47.2	45.4
Education, %					
[Missing: 0.3%]					
Less than secondary school	4.5	2.3	4.5	0.5	10.4
Completed secondary school	56.3	58.0	64.2	45.1	56.9
Tertiary education	38.9	38.8	31.3	54.4	32.5
Work status, %working [Missing: 0.0%]	82.9	78.0	84.6	86.8	82.2
Marital status,	65.6	72.0	74.0	59.5	56.0

1  
2  
3 %couple [Missing:  
4  
5 0.2%]  
6  
7

8 Ethnicity, %  
9

10 [Missing: 0.0%]  
11

12 Maori/Polynesian 15.8 18.1 21.7 10.1 12.6  
13

14 Asian 9.8 9.6 14.8 8.2 6.3  
15

16 NZ European / 74.4 72.3 63.5 81.8 81.0  
17  
18

19 Pakeha / Other  
20

21 Mean environmental  
22

23 variables (SD) [Missing:  
24  
25 0.0%]  
26  
27

28 NZ Deprivation Index 5.1 (2.6) 4.2 (2.2) 5.3 (2.6) 4.7 (2.3) 6.2 (2.8)  
29  
30

31 Net dwelling density 5.5 (2.9) 5.5 (2.9) 5.6 (3.0) 6.3 (2.7) 4.5 (2.5)  
32  
33

34 (dwellings/km<sup>2</sup>) – 500m  
35

36 buffers  
37

38 Street connectivity 5.4 (2.8) 4.4 (2.7) 4.8 (2.8) 6.3 (3.1) 6.4 (2.2)  
39  
40

41 (intersections/km<sup>2</sup>) –  
42

43 500m buffers  
44

45 Land use mix 0.55 (0.29) 0.47 (0.27) 0.46 (0.26) 0.72 (0.28) 0.56 (0.27)  
46  
47

48 (entropy score)–  
49

50 500m buffers  
51

52 Net retail footprint 0.44 (0.29) 0.40 (0.33) 0.48 (0.48) 0.55 (0.36) 0.32 (0.34)  
53  
54

55 area ratio (area of retail  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1						
2						
3	building footprint/ area					
4	of retail land parcel) –					
5						
6	500m buffers					
7						
8	Net dwelling density	5.5 (2.9)	5.1 (2.9)	6.2 (2.8)	7.0 (2.1)	3.7 (2.5)
9						
10	(dwellings/km <sup>2</sup> )–					
11						
12	1km buffers					
13						
14	Street connectivity	5.4 (2.9)	3.7 (2.2)	4.3 (2.4)	7.5 (2.9)	6.5 (2.1)
15						
16	(intersections/km <sup>2</sup> )–					
17						
18	1km buffers					
19						
20	Land use mix	0.55 (0.28)	0.40 (0.27)	0.42 (0.24)	0.82 (0.18)	0.57 (0.21)
21						
22	(entropy score) –					
23						
24	1km buffers					
25						
26	Net retail footprint	0.53 (0.31)	0.45 (0.23)	0.60 (0.45)	0.66 (0.24)	0.41 (0.18)
27						
28	area ratio (area of retail					
29	building footprint/ area					
30	of retail land parcel) –					
31						
32	1km buffers					
33						
34	Mean accelerometry-					
35	based variables (SD)					
36						
37	[Missing: 0.0%]					
38						
39	Daily minutes of	789.5	796.4	802.2	812.8	748.2 (136.7)
40						
41	wear time - weekdays	(134.9)	(122.9)	(153.3)	(111.4)	
42						
43	Daily minutes of	681.1	697.1	649.9	717.2	668.0 (208.8)
44						
45						
46						
47						
48						
49						
50						
51						
52						
53						
54						
55						
56						
57						
58						
59						
60						

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

wear time - weekend	(191.7)	(187.8)	(207.1)	(141.9)	
Percent of valid	89.4 (15.8)	92.0	90.6 (17.0)	85.9 (14.3)	88.7 (17.3)
weekdays		(13.2)			
Percent of valid	74.5 (33.0)	79.8	69.8 (36.7)	75.8 (22.7)	73.4 (36.5)
weekend days		(32.0)			
Sedentary time –	479.5	483.2	489.7	484.4	460.8 (130.4)
weekdays (min/day)	(130.8)	(124.5)	(137.3)	(128.7)	
Sedentary time –	409.3	410.3	406.1	407.7	413.1 (154.9)
weekend (min/day)	(148.6)	(148.5)	(160.2)	(125.1)	

---



**Table 2. Associations of socio-demographic characteristics, type of day and study sites with accelerometry-based sedentary time**

Predictor	b	95% CI	p
<b>Socio-demographic</b>			
Sex (reference: female)			
Male	18.1	9.5, 26.8	<.001
Education (reference: less than secondary school )			
Completed secondary school	18.7	-2.8, 40.2	.096
Tertiary education	41.7	19.1, 64.3	<.001
Working status (reference: not working)			
Working	-12.6	-24.1, -1.1	.032
Marital status (reference: single)			
Couple	-23.6	-32.8, -14.4	<.001
Ethnicity (reference: Maori/Polynesian)			
Asian	-0.1	-18.0, 17.9	.978
European / Pakeha / Other	-14.5	-27.1, -1.8	.025
Age (yrs)	0.7	0.3, 1.0	<.001
New Zealand Deprivation Index	0.3	-4.6, 5.1	.860
<b>Study site (reference: North Shore)</b>			
Waitakere	8.1	-6.43, 22.5	.287
Wellington	-17.3	-33.0, -1.6	.039
Christchurch	3.2	-13.1, 19.4	.548

**Type of day (reference: weekday)**

Weekend	-17.9	-23.7, -12.1	<.001
---------	-------	--------------	-------

Note. The regression model was adjusted for valid days of accelerometer wear and average daily minutes of wear and accounted for correlated residuals at the neighborhood and participant levels. b = regression coefficients; 95% CI = 95% confidence intervals.

**Table 3. Associations of GIS-based walkability components for 500m and 1km residential buffers with accelerometry-based sedentary time**

Predictor	500m residential buffers			1km residential buffers		
	b	95% CI	p	b	95% CI	p
<b>Main effect models</b>						
Net dwelling density	-0.39	-2.08, 1.31	.654	-0.57	-2.49, 1.35	.564
Street connectivity	0.14	-1.90, 2.18	.892	-0.34	-2.58, 1.90	.768
Land use mix*	1.04	-1.64, 1.15	.265	1.03	-1.08, 3.14	.339
Net retail footprint area ratio*	-0.24	-1.64, 1.15	.733	-0.02	-1.88, 1.84	.982
<b>Interaction effects</b>						
Street connectivity by study site						
Effect of street connectivity in North Shore	1.02	-2.37, 4.43	.556	0.20	-4.00, 4.41	.927
Effect of street connectivity in Waitakere	1.26	-2.02, 4.55	.452	-0.65	-4.43, 3.12	.733
Effect of street connectivity in Wellington	1.55	-1.78, 4.88	.363	2.12	-1.14, 5.38	.203
Effect of street connectivity in Christchurch	-5.06	-9.25, -0.86	<b>.019</b>	-5.18	-9.50, -0.86	<b>.019</b>

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

Net retail footprint area ratio (NRFA) by sex

Effect of NRFA in men	1.49	-0.36, 3.35	.116	1.58	-0.86, 4.01	.205
Effect of NRFA in women	-1.95	-3.60, -0.29	<b>.022</b>	-1.48	-3.59, 0.64	.172

Notes. All models adjusted for other walkability components, socio-demographics, New Zealand Deprivation Index, study site, and type of day (weekday versus weekend). All models accounted for correlated residuals at the neighborhood and participant levels. b = regression coefficients; 95% CI = 95% confidence intervals.

\* The original values of land use mix and net retail footprint area ratio were multiplied by 10 to obtain point estimates of the regression coefficients that would correspond to the difference in min/day of sedentary time associated with a 0.10 increase in these environmental predictors rather than the difference in outcomes between the theoretical minimum (i.e. 0) and maximum (i.e., 1) values of the predictors.

## References

1. Bauman A, Ainsworth BE, Sallis JF, et al. The descriptive epidemiology of sitting: a 20-country comparison using the International Physical Activity Questionnaire (IPAQ). *Am. J. Prev. Med.* 2011;**41**(2):228-35 doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.amepre.2011.05.003>[published Online First: Epub Date]].
2. Hagströmer M, Troiano RP, Sjöström M, et al. Levels and patterns of objectively assessed physical activity—a comparison between Sweden and the United States. *Am. J. Epidemiol.* 2010 doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/aje/kwq069>[published Online First: Epub Date]].
3. Katzmarzyk PT, Church TS, Craig CL, et al. Sitting time and mortality from all causes, cardiovascular disease, and cancer. *Med. Sci. Sports Exerc.* 2009;**41**(5):998 doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1249/MSS.0b013e3181930355>[published Online First: Epub Date]].
4. Thorp AA, Owen N, Neuhaus M, et al. Sedentary behaviors and subsequent health outcomes in adults: a systematic review of longitudinal studies, 1996–2011. *Am. J. Prev. Med.* 2011;**41**(2):207-15 doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.amepre.2011.05.004>[published Online First: Epub Date]].
5. Hu FB, Li TY, Colditz GA, et al. Television watching and other sedentary behaviors in relation to risk of obesity and type 2 diabetes mellitus in women. *JAMA* 2003;**289**(14):1785-91 doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1001/jama.289.14.1785>[published Online First: Epub Date]].
6. Healy GN, Wijndaele K, Dunstan DW, et al. Objectively measured sedentary time, physical activity, and metabolic risk. *Diabetes Care* 2008;**31**(2):369-71 doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.2337/dc07-1795>[published Online First: Epub Date]].
7. Rhodes RE, Mark RS, Temmel CP. Adult sedentary behavior: a systematic review. *Am. J. Prev. Med.* 2012;**42**(3):e3-e28 doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.amepre.2011.10.020>[published Online First: Epub Date]].

- 1  
2  
3 8. Koohsari MJ, Sugiyama T, Sahlqvist S, et al. Neighborhood Environmental Attributes and Adults' Sedentary Behaviors: Review and Research  
4  
5 Agenda. *Prev. Med.* 2015;**77**:141-49 doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ypmed.2015.05.027>[published Online First: Epub Date]].  
6
- 7  
8 9. Barnett A, Cerin E, Ching CS, et al. Neighbourhood environment, sitting time and motorised transport in older adults: a cross-sectional study in  
9  
10 Hong Kong. *BMJ open* 2015;**5**(4):e007557 doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2014-007557>[published Online First: Epub Date]].  
11
- 12 10. Ivory VC, Blakely T, Pearce J, et al. Could strength of exposure to the residential neighbourhood modify associations between walkability and  
13  
14 physical activity? *Soc. Sci. Med.* 2015;**147**:232-41 doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2015.10.053>[published Online First: Epub  
15  
16 Date]].  
17
- 18 11. Dyrstad SM, Hansen BH, Holme IM, et al. Comparison of self-reported versus accelerometer-measured physical activity. *Med. Sci. Sports*  
19  
20 *Exerc.* 2014;**46**(1):99-106 doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1249/MSS.0b013e3182a0595f>[published Online First: Epub Date]].  
21  
22
- 23 12. Badland HM, Schofield GM, Witten K, et al. Understanding the Relationship between Activity and Neighbourhoods(URBAN) Study: research  
24  
25 design and methodology. *BMC Public Health* 2009;**9**(1):224 doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/1471-2458-9-224>[published Online First: Epub  
26  
27 Date]].  
28
- 29 13. Statistics New Zealand. Census of population and dwellings: Auckland City. What we look like locally. Wellington: Statistics NZ, 2006.  
30
- 31 14. Statistics New Zealand. New Zealand in profile: An overview of New Zealand's people, economy, and environment. Wellington: Statistics  
32  
33 New Zealand, 2009.  
34
- 35 15. Leslie E, Coffee N, Frank L, et al. Walkability of local communities: using geographic information systems to objectively assess relevant  
36  
37 environmental attributes. *Health Place* 2007;**13**(1):111-22 doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.healthplace.2005.11.001>[published Online First:  
38  
39 Epub Date]].  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45

- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49
16. Esliger DW, Tremblay MS. Technical reliability assessment of three accelerometer models in a mechanical setup. *Med. Sci. Sports Exerc.* 2006;**38**(12):2173-81 doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1249/01.mss.0000239394.55461.08>[published Online First: Epub Date]].
  17. Esliger DW, Probert A, Gorber SC, et al. Validity of the Actical Accelerometer Step-Count Function. *Med. Sci. Sports Exerc.* 2007;**39**(7):1200-04 doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1249/mss.0b013e3804ec4e9>[published Online First: Epub Date]].
  18. Crouter SE, DellaValle DM, Horton M, et al. Validity of the Actical for estimating free-living physical activity. *Eur. J. Appl. Physiol.* 2011;**111**(7):1381-89 doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00421-010-1758-2>[published Online First: Epub Date]].
  19. Van Dyck D, Cardon G, Deforche B, et al. Neighborhood walkability and sedentary time in Belgian adults. *Am. J. Prev. Med.* 2010;**39**(1):25-32 doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.amepre.2010.03.004>[published Online First: Epub Date]].
  20. Oliver M, Badland HM, Schofield GM, et al. Identification of accelerometer nonwear time and sedentary behavior. *Res. Q. Exerc. Sport* 2011;**82**(4):779-83 doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02701367.2011.10599814>[published Online First: Epub Date]].
  21. Mavoa S, Witten K, Pearce J, et al. Measuring Neighbourhood Walkability in New Zealand Cities, 2009.
  22. Frank LD, Sallis JF, Saelens BE, et al. The development of a walkability index: application to the Neighborhood Quality of Life Study. *Br. J. Sports Med.* 2010;**44**(13):924-33 doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/bjism.2009.058701>[published Online First: Epub Date]].
  23. Wood S. *Generalized additive models: an introduction with R*. Boca Raton, Florida: Chapman & Hall, 2006.
  24. Burnham K, Anderson D. *Model selection and multimodel inference: a practical information-theoretic approach, 2nd ed* New York, NY: Springer, 2002.
  25. R Core Team. *R: A language and environment for statistical computing*. Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing, 2013.
  26. Fox J, Weisberg S. *An R companion to applied regression, 2nd ed*. Thousand Oaks CA: Sage, 2011.

- 1  
2  
3 27. Healy GN, Dunstan DW, Salmon JO, et al. Television time and continuous metabolic risk in physically active adults. *Med. Sci. Sports Exerc.*  
4  
5 2008;**40**(4):639 doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1249/MSS.0b013e3181607421>[published Online First: Epub Date]].  
6  
7  
8 28. Owen N, Sugiyama T, Eakin EE, et al. Adults' sedentary behavior: determinants and interventions. *Am. J. Prev. Med.* 2011;**41**(2):189-96 doi:  
9  
10 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.amepre.2011.05.013>[published Online First: Epub Date]].  
11  
12 29. Sallis JF, Bowles HR, Bauman A, et al. Neighborhood environments and physical activity among adults in 11 countries. *Am. J. Prev. Med.*  
13  
14 2009;**36**(6):484-90 doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.amepre.2009.01.031>[published Online First: Epub Date]].  
15  
16 30. Handy S. Regional versus local accessibility: Implications for nonwork travel. University of California: University of California  
17  
18 Transportation Center, 1993:58-66.  
19  
20 31. Wilson J, Dowson S, Adam J, et al. Contextual Historical Overview of Christchurch City. Christchurch: Christchurch City Council, 2005.  
21  
22 32. Witten K, Blakely T, Bagheri N, et al. Neighborhood built environment and transport and leisure physical activity: findings using objective  
23  
24 exposure and outcome measures in New Zealand. *Environ. Health Perspect.* 2012;**120**(7):971-77 doi:  
25  
26 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1289/ehp.1104584>[published Online First: Epub Date]].  
27  
28 33. Koohsari MJ, Sugiyama T, Lamb KE, et al. Street connectivity and walking for transport: Role of neighborhood destinations. *Prev. Med.*  
29  
30 2014;**66**:118-22 doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.yjmed.2014.06.019>[published Online First: Epub Date]].  
31  
32 34. Sugiyama T, Salmon J, Dunstan DW, et al. Neighborhood walkability and TV viewing time among Australian adults. *Am. J. Prev. Med.*  
33  
34 2007;**33**(6):444-49 doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.amepre.2007.07.035>[published Online First: Epub Date]].  
35  
36 35. Koohsari MJ, Sugiyama T, Kaczynski AT, et al. Associations of leisure-time sitting in cars with neighborhood walkability. *J. Phys. Act.*  
37  
38 *Health* 2014;**11**(6):1129-32 doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1123/jpah.2012-0385>[published Online First: Epub Date]].  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

For peer review only

STROBE 2007 (v4) Statement—Checklist of items that should be included in reports of cross-sectional studies

Section/Topic	Item #	Recommendation	Reported on page #
Title and abstract	1	(a) Indicate the study’s design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract	3
		(b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found	3
<b>Introduction</b>			
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported	6-7
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses	7
<b>Methods</b>			
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper	7-8
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection	7-8
Participants	6	(a) Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants	8-9
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable	9-10
Data sources/ measurement	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group	9-11
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias	11
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at	9
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why	11-13
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding	11-12
		(b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions	11-12
		(c) Explain how missing data were addressed	13
		(d) If applicable, describe analytical methods taking account of sampling strategy	
		(e) Describe any sensitivity analyses	
<b>Results</b>			

Participants	13*	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed (b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage (c) Consider use of a flow diagram	13
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders (b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest	13-14
Outcome data	15*	Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures	13-15
Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included (b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized (c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period	13-15
Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses	
<b>Discussion</b>			
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives	16-18
Limitations	19	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias	19
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence	16-20
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results	19
<b>Other information</b>			
Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based	21

\*Give information separately for cases and controls in case-control studies and, if applicable, for exposed and unexposed groups in cohort and cross-sectional studies.

**Note:** An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at <http://www.plosmedicine.org/>, Annals of Internal Medicine at <http://www.annals.org/>, and Epidemiology at <http://www.epidem.com/>). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at [www.strobe-statement.org](http://www.strobe-statement.org).