

# Is the Perceived Neighborhood Built Environment Associated With Domain-Specific Physical Activity in Latin American Adults? An Eight-Country Observational Study

**Gerson Ferrari** (✉ [gersonferrari08@yahoo.com.br](mailto:gersonferrari08@yahoo.com.br))

Universidade Federal de Sao Paulo <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3177-6576>

**André O. Werneck**

Universidade de Sao Paulo

**Danilo Rodrigues Silva**

Universidade Federal de Sergipe

**Irina Kovalskys**

Pontificia Universidad Catolica Argentina

**Georgina Gómez**

Universidad de Costa Rica

**Attilio Rigotti**

Pontificia Universidad Católica de Santiago

**Lilia Yadira Cortés Sanabria**

Pontificia Universidad Javeriana

**Martha Cecilia Yépez García**

Universidad San Francisco de Quito

**Rossina G. Pareja**

Instituto de Investigacion Nutricional

**Marianella Herrera-Cuenca**

Universidad Central de Venezuela

**Ioná Zalcmán Zimberg**

Universidade Federal de Sao Paulo

**Viviana Guajardo**

Pontificia Universidad Catolica Argentina

**Michael Pratt**

University of California San Diego

**Carlos Cristi-Montero**

Pontificia Universidad Catolica de Valparaiso

**Fernando Rodríguez-Rodríguez**

Pontificia Universidad Catolica de Valparaiso

**Adilson Marques**

Universidade de Lisboa

**Ester Cerin**

Australian Catholic University

**Delfien Van Dyck**

Universiteit Gent

**Carlos André Miranda Pires**



Universidade de Coimbra

**Mauro Fisberg**

**Research**

**Keywords:** Epidemiology, active transportation, physical activity, neighborhood built environment, Latin America

**DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-58015/v1>

**License:**   This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License. [Read Full License](#)

---

## Abstract

**Background:** Characteristics of the neighborhood built environment are associated with physical activity (PA). However, few studies with representative samples have examined environmental correlates of domain-specific PA in Latin America. We examined the associations of the perceived neighborhood built environment with domain-specific PA in a large sample of adults from eight Latin American countries.

**Methods:** This study examined data from 8185 adults (aged 18–65 years) from eight Latin American countries. The Neighbourhood Environment Walkability Survey - Abbreviated (NEWS-A) scale was used to assess perceptions of land use mix–diversity, land use mix-access, street connectivity, walking/cycling facilities, aesthetics, safety from traffic, and safety from crime. Perceived proximity from home to public open spaces (metropolitan parks, playgrounds, public squares) and to shopping centers was also assessed. Transport-related and leisure-time PA were assessed using the long form of the International Physical Activity Questionnaire. Both logistic and linear regression models were estimated on pooled data.

**Results:** Perceptions of higher land use mix-access (OR: 1.40; 95% CI: 1.22,1.61), the existence of many alternative routes in the neighbourhood (1.12; 1.04,1.20), slow speed of traffic (1.19; 1.03,1.35) and few drivers exceeding the speed limits (1.09; 1.03,1.15) were associated with greater odds of reporting at least 10 min/week of transport-related PA. Perceptions of higher levels of land use mix-diversity, better aesthetics and greater safety from crime, the presence of crosswalks and pedestrian signals, and greater proximity of shopping centers were associated with more min/week of transport-related PA. Perceptions of higher land use mix-diversity (1.12; 1.05,1.20), higher land use mix-access (1.27; 1.13,1.43), more walking/cycling facilities (1.18; 1.09,1.28), and better aesthetics (1.10; 1.02,1.18) were associated with greater odds of engaging in at least 10 min/week of leisure-time PA versus none. Perceptions of higher land use mix-diversity were associated with more min/week of leisure PA.

**Conclusions:** Different perceived neighborhood built environment characteristics were associated with domain-specific PA among adults from Latin America countries. Interventions designed to modify perceptions of the neighbourhood built environment might influence initiation or maintenance of domain-specific PA.

**Trial registration:** ClinicalTrials.Gov NCT02226627. Retrospectively registered on August 27, 2014.

## Introduction

The health benefits of physical activity (PA) are well established. They include a lower incidence of cardiovascular disease (CVD), cognitive impairment, depression, blood pressure, obesity, breast and colon cancer, stroke, and mortality [1]. To achieve these physical and mental health benefits, adults should perform at least 150 minutes of moderate-to-vigorous PA or at least 75 minutes of vigorous PA intensity throughout the week [1]. In Latin America, only 39.1% of adults meet the PA guidelines [2].

In recent years, Latin America has undergone an accelerated urbanization process, with significant demographic, epidemiological, and socioeconomic changes. These changes resulted in improvements in general health and education indicators but also in a decrease in PA [3]. Eight out of ten individuals in Latin American countries live in cities, making it the most urbanized region in the world [4]. Latin American countries are characterized by high population density, disorganized and heavy traffic, air and noise pollution, rising crime rates, high-income inequality, high levels of poverty, and population aging which might inhibit PA [5, 6].

Some efforts have been made to promote PA in Latin America through programs focusing on the built environment, such as the *Ciclovía* [7, 8]. *Ciclovía* is a program in which streets are closed temporarily to motorized transport, encouraging PA for recreation and socialization. In addition to using public space for recreation, the *Ciclovía* creates socially cohesive environments, promotes efficient and sustainable modes of transportation like cycling, and provides community activities such as PA classes [7]. However, there has been little systematic monitoring or follow-up of how such programs might impact regional levels of PA. It remains unclear how other effective neighborhood-based interventions specific to the Latin American context can be developed and evaluated.

Studies on the associations between neighborhood built environment factors and PA has increased in recent years. Neighborhood aspects such as destination accessibility, street connectivity, recreational facilities, and public transport have been linked to PA among adults [9]. These studies suggest that neighborhood environmental correlates of PA depend on the PA domain. For example, factors such as street connectivity, land use and distance to local destination have been found to be associated with both transport and leisure-time PA, but other factors, such as proximity to parks and safety from crime tend to show stronger associations with leisure-time PA [10–12]. Nonetheless, most previous research was conducted in the USA, Europe, or Australia [13–18]. Considering the distinct features of Latin American countries, it is not possible to directly translate findings from other countries (e.g., the USA or European countries) to this region. More specifically examining how characteristics of the built environment are associated with PA in eight Latin American countries may provide useful insights for guiding public policies and strategies for PA promotion in this region.

Only one of the existing Latin American studies used a representative sample of the urban population which may limit the generalizability of the observed associations [19–21]. The purpose of the present study was to examine the associations of perceived neighborhood built environment with domain-specific PA in representative samples of adults from eight Latin America countries by country and overall adjusted for sociodemographic variables.

## Methods

### Latin American Study of Nutrition and Health

The Latin American Study of Nutrition and Health (*Estudio Latinoamericano de Nutrición y Salud*, ELANS) is an eight-country (Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Peru, and Venezuela), observational epidemiological study using a common design and comparable methods across countries. The study uses a large representative sample from these eight countries and focuses on urban populations [22]. Data collection dates ranged from September 2014 to February 2015. The overarching ELANS protocol was approved by the Western Institutional Review Board (#20140605) and is registered at ClinicalTrials.gov (#NCT02226627). Ethical approval was obtained from site-specific local institutional review boards. All participants provided informed consent/assent before data collection.

The entire ELANS study consisted of 9218 (4409 men; aged 15–65 years) participants who were chosen using a random complex, multistage sampling frame with a random selection of Primary Sampling Units (PSUs) and Secondary Sampling Units (SSUs). The PSUs were areas (e.g., counties, municipalities, neighborhoods, residential areas) within each selected city in each country. An “n” size proportional to population weight was used for the selection of PSUs. In this case, a simple random sampling of “n” with replacement was performed to adhere to the principle of statistical independence of the selection of the areas included in the PSU sample. For these random selections, the probability proportional to size (PPS) method was applied. Thus, within each of the areas included in the PSU allocation, a representative sample of SSUs was randomly selected using the PPS method.

For the selection of households, we implemented a four-step, systematic randomization procedure by establishing a selection interval (k): a) the total urban population was used to proportionally define the main regions and to select cities representing each region, including key cities and other representative cities in the region, using a random method and sampling criteria, while attempting to cover the determined urban population; b) the sampling points (survey tracts) of each city were randomly designated, and c) clusters of households were selected from each sampling unit. Addresses were chosen systematically using standard random route procedures, beginning with an initial address selected at random. The households were designated with three systematic jumps; that is, a given household was selected by randomly picking the first home and subsequently skipping three households; d) the designated respondent within each household was selected using the birthday method (half chosen using the next birthday; the other half using the last birthday).

In each country, stratified recruitment of individuals was done across sex, age group (15-19.9, 20-34.9, 35-49.9, and 50–65 years), and socioeconomic level (low, medium, high). Socioeconomic levels were weighted according to the national indices of each country. The number of individuals required per socioeconomic level has been addressed in more detail elsewhere [22].

In total, 92 cities participated in this study (7 to 23 cities in each country) [23]. The required sample size was calculated using a power analysis with a 95% confidence level, a maximum error of 3.5%, and a survey design effect of 1.75, resulting in a required sample size of 9090.

For household selection within cities, the systematic randomization method was used. The exclusion criteria adopted were: a) pregnant and lactating women; b) persons with physical or mental disabilities; c) unsigned consent form; d) individuals living in non-family residential environments; and e) individuals who could not read. More information on the ELANS study is provided in Fisberg et al. [22]

The perceived neighborhood built environment and PA protocol used in ELANS includes self-reported data collected by questionnaires. In this study, the questionnaires (perceived neighborhood built environment and PA) were interviewer-administered during the home visit, and 8185 (18–65 years old) participants had complete data. We excluded adolescents (15 to 17 years old) from the analyses because the ELANS study did not include adolescents of all ages. Also, adolescents may have restricted independent mobility [24] that may yield different environment-PA associations than those observed in adults. In addition, PA guidelines for adolescents differ from those for adults [25].

#### Perceived neighborhood built environment

To assess perceptions of the neighborhood built environment characteristics, the Neighborhood Environment Walkability Scale - Abbreviated (NEWS-A) [26] previously translated into Spanish and adapted for use in Latin America [16, 27]. Apart from translating the NEWS-A from English into the local language of the participating countries, scale adaptation also encompassed the addition of two items to the safety from crime subscale, an item measuring the proximity of shopping centers and three items gauging the proximity to three types of public open space (metropolitan parks, playgrounds and public squares) as shown in Table 1. The reliability and validity of NEWS-A have been evaluated in several countries with all included scales having test-retest reliability intraclass correlations > 0.50 [28, 29].

Table 1  
Summary of environmental scales, items and Cronbach's alpha

Scale	Items	Response Category	Cronbach's alpha
Land use mix-diversity  (mean of 23 items – the higher the score, the higher the diversity)	About how long would it take to get from your home to the nearest businesses or facilities listed below if you walked to them?  Items: convenience/small grocery store, supermarket, blacksmith, fruit/vegetable market, laundry/dry cleaners, clothing store, post office, library, university/school, other educational centers, book store, fast food restaurant or street food, bakery/coffee shop, bank, non-fast food restaurant, video store, pharmacy/drug store, salon/barber shop, your job or school, public transport stop, park or square, gym or fitness facility	5-point scale: 5 min (5), 6–10 min (4), 11–20 min (3), 20–30 min (2), 30 + min (1)	0.934
Land use mix-access  (mean of 5 items)	Stores are within easy walking distance of my home.  It is easy to walk to a transit stop (bus, train) from my home.  There are many places to go within easy walking distance of my home.  The streets in my neighborhood are hilly, making my neighborhood difficult to walk in (reversed).  There are major barriers to walking in my local area that make it hard to get from place to place (for example, freeways, railway lines, rivers) (reversed).	4-point scale: strongly disagree (1), disagree (2), agree (3), strongly agree (4)	0.693
Street connectivity  (mean of 3 items)	The streets in my neighborhood do not have many cul-de-sacs (dead-end streets).  The distance between intersections in my neighborhood is usually short (100 yards or less; the length of a football field or less).  There are many alternative routes for getting from place to place in my neighborhood. (I don't have to go the same way every time).	4-point scale: strongly disagree (1), disagree (2), agree (3), strongly agree (4)	0.432
Walking/cycling facilities  (mean of 3 items)	There are sidewalks on most of the streets in my neighborhood.  Sidewalks are separated from the road/traffic in my neighborhood by parked cars.  There is a grass/dirt strip that separates the streets from the sidewalks in my neighborhood.	4-point scale: strongly disagree (1), disagree (2), agree (3), strongly agree (4)	0.614
Aesthetics  (mean of 4 items)	There are trees along the streets in my neighborhood.  There are many interesting things to look at while walking in my neighborhood.  There are many attractive natural sights in my neighborhood (such as landscaping, views).  There are attractive buildings/homes in my neighborhood.	4-point scale: strongly disagree (1), disagree (2), agree (3), strongly agree (4)	0.803
Safety from traffic  (mean of 4 items)	There is so much traffic along nearby streets that it makes it difficult or unpleasant to walk in my neighborhood (reversed).  The speed of traffic on most nearby streets is usually slow (50 km/h or less)  Most drivers exceed the posted speed limits while driving in my neighborhood (reversed)  There are crosswalks and pedestrian signals to help walkers cross busy streets in my neighborhood.	4-point scale: strongly disagree (1), disagree (2), agree (3), strongly agree (4)	0.191

\* items not in the NEWS-A scale.

Scale	Items	Response Category	Cronbach's alpha
Safety from crime  (mean of 7 items)	My neighborhood streets are well lit at night.  Walkers and bikers on the streets in my neighborhood can be easily seen by people in their homes.  There is a high crime rate in my neighborhood (reversed).  The crime rate in my neighborhood makes it unsafe to go on walks during the day (reversed).  The crime rate in my neighborhood makes it unsafe to go on walks at night (reversed).  The parks, public squares, green areas and recreation areas in my neighborhood are unsafe during the day (reversed).*  The parks, public squares, green areas and recreation areas in my neighborhood are unsafe at night (reversed).*	4-point scale: strongly disagree (1), disagree (2), agree (3), strongly agree (4)	0.805
Proximity of public open spaces*  (mean of 3 items)	How long, approximately, does it take you to walk from your home to the following types of public open spaces: metropolitan parks (large, with many green areas), playgrounds, public squares.	5-point scale: 5 min (1), 6–10 min (2), 11–20 min (3), 20–30 min (4), 30 + min (5)	0.695
Proximity of shopping centers*  (1 item)	How long, approximately, does it take you to walk from your home to shopping centers?	5-point scale: 5 min (1), 6–10 min (2), 11–20 min (3), 20–30 min (4), 30 + min (5)	-
* items not in the NEWS-A scale.			

The following characteristics were assessed: land use mix–diversity, land use mix-access, street connectivity, walking/cycling facilities, aesthetics, safety from traffic, and safety from crime. The land use mix-diversity scale is assessed by the perceived walking proximity from home to 23 different types of destinations, with responses ranging from 1-5-min walking distance (coded as 5, indicative of high walkability) to > 30-min walking distance (coded as 1, indicative of low walkability). The remaining six scales are average ratings of items answered on a four-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree to 4 = strongly agree). Scales were scored in a direction consistent with higher walkability and safety, with individual items reversed when necessary. The scales 'street connectivity' and 'safety from traffic' from NEWS-A were not included in the results due to low internal consistency. Instead, the individual items were analysed separately (Table 1).

\*\*\*Table 1\*\*\*

## Physical activity assessment

Participants reported their PA levels by completing the long-form of the last 7 days, interview version of the International Physical Activity Questionnaire (IPAQ) in Spanish [30]. We adapted the IPAQ by using only the questions that covered the active transport-related and leisure-time domains [23]. The IPAQ has been validated to assess PA in individuals aged 15–69 years [31, 32].

The participants were instructed to report the frequency and duration (bouts of > 10 minutes) of PA in the domains of active transport and leisure. Specifically, the following questions were asked: a) "During the last 7 days, did you walk or use a bicycle (pedal cycle) for at least 10 minutes continuously to get to and from places?" (Yes, No); b) "During the last 7 days, on how many days did you walk or ride a bicycle for at least 10 minutes at a time to go from place to place?"; c) "How much time did you usually spend on one of those days to bicycle or walk from place to place?" These questions were asked separately for walking and cycling. Concerning leisure PA, the following questions were asked: a) "During the last 7 days, did you walk, or do any moderate or vigorous PA for at least 10 minutes continuously?" (Yes, No); b) "During the last 7 days, on how many days did you walk, or do moderate or vigorous PA for at least 10 minutes at a time in your leisure time?"; c) "How much time do you spend walking or doing moderate-to-vigorous PA in your leisure time?" Questions were asked separately for walking, moderate-intensity, and vigorous-intensity activities. Details on the assessment of PA by IPAQ have been published elsewhere [23].

IPAQ PA data are reported as min/week of walking, moderate and vigorous PA during leisure-time, and min/week of walking and cycling for transport-related purposes. Time (min/week) spent in each of the PA domains (i.e., transport-related and leisure-time) was calculated and used in analysis. In this study, we used transport-related PA (walking + bicycle) and leisure-time PA (walking + moderate + vigorous) separately.

An international comparison showed that IPAQ had comparable reliability and validity to other self-report PA assessment methods [30]. There is evidence for an acceptable degree of reliability and validity of the transport-related and leisure-time PA items of the IPAQ. For these items, intraclass correlation coefficients ranging from 0.42 to 0.75 have been reported [33, 34]. Also, moderate correlations (0.50–0.63) were found between diary measures of transport-related and leisure-time PA and the corresponding IPAQ items. In our study, the intraclass correlation coefficients of self-reported total weekly minutes of walking, transport-related, and leisure-time PA with accelerometry-estimated weekly minutes of moderate-intensity PA were between 0.24 and 0.35 (unpublished data).

## Statistical analysis

Statistical analyses were carried out with the software SPSS v.26. Means, standard deviations (SD), ranges, and percentages were computed, as appropriate, to describe the variables. Weighting was done according to sociodemographic characteristics, sex, socioeconomic level, and country [22].

Cronbach's alpha was used to assess the internal consistency of the neighborhood environment characteristics' scales. Because the PA variables were positively skewed and had a large number of zeros, two different multilevel regression models, with the country as the second level, were used to estimate the associations of neighborhood characteristics with PA (transport-related and leisure-time): a logistic regression model (odds ratio: OR; confidence interval 95%: 95%CI) with a binary dependent variable (0 = "<10 minutes of PA/week", 1 = "≥10 minutes of PA/week") followed by a linear model with the min/week of PA as the dependent variable. The linear regression model ( $\beta$ ; 95%CI) was estimated using data from the respondents who reported ≥ 10 minutes of PA per week. Due to the non-normality of data, the minutes of PA were log-transformed for the linear models. Both models were adjusted for sex, age, socioeconomic level, and country. We present the overall (i.e., pooled) and country-specific results (Additional file 1: Table S1-S4). A significance level of 5% was adopted.

## Results

### Descriptive data

The final sample with all complete data consisted of 8185 participants. The characteristics of the participants are presented in Table 2. Overall, 53% of the sample consisted of females and the mean age was 37.4 (SD: 13.3) years. Mean transport-related and leisure-time PA were 159.2 (SD: 221.4) and 162.2 (SD: 272.7) min/week, respectively. Average transport-related PA ranged between 105.0 min/week (SD: 179.5) (Venezuela) and 214.3 min/week (SD: 259.1) (Costa Rica), while leisure-time PA ranged between 98.5 min/week (SD: 235.3) (Venezuela) and 315.5 min/week (SD: 321.6) (Ecuador).



Table 2  
Demographic characteristics and physical activity (PA) of participants

Variables	Overall	Argentina	Brazil	Chile	Colombia	Costa Rica	Ecuador	Peru	Venezuela
Sample size (n)	8185	1137	1803	770	1105	710	668	979	1013
Sociodemographic									
Age, mean (SD)	37.4 (13.3)	38.4 (13.2)	37.9 (13.1)	38.0 (13.4)	38.3 (13.9)	37.0 (13.2)	35.9 (13.4)	35.9 (12.9)	36.5 (13.2)
Sex (%)									
Men	47.0	43.6	46.3	47.3	48.2	48.9	49.0	46.3	48.4
Women	53.0	56.4	53.7	52.7	51.8	51.1	51.0	53.7	51.6
Socioeconomic level (%)									
Low	52.0	47.4	46.2	46.0	63.0	33.0	51.2	47.6	77.9
Medium	38.4	47.2	45.2	44.7	31.6	53.2	35.9	31.7	17.2
High	9.6	5.4	8.6	9.4	5.4	13.8	12.9	20.7	4.9
PA (min/week)									
Transportation mean (SD)	159.2 (221.4)	165.3 (237.5)	141.5 (205.1)	157.3 (221.8)	172.9 (235.2)	214.3 (259.1)	191.0 (222.8)	165.4 (207.9)	105.0 (179.5)
Leisure mean (SD)	162.2 (272.7)	146.0 (253.1)	125.4 (252.6)	191.9 (291.7)	169.4 (272.9)	162.9 (269.8)	315.5 (321.6)	178.3 (273.2)	98.5 (235.3)
SD: standard deviation; PA: physical activity.									

\*\*\*Table 2\*\*\*

Table 3 shows the overall and country-specific descriptive statistics for the perceived environmental attributes. Land use mix- diversity (5-points scale from 1 to 5) was the highest in Colombia (mean: 3.1; SD: 0.7), Argentina (mean: 3.0; SD: 0.8) and Ecuador (mean: 3.0; SD: 0.6), and the lowest in Venezuela (mean: 2.4; SD: 0.8). The overall mean score was 2.8 (SD: 0.8).

Table 3  
Overall and country-specific perceived-environment scores

	Overall	Argentina	Brazil	Chile	Colombia	Costa Rica	Ecuador	Peru	Venezuela
Sample size	8185	1137	1803	770	1105	710	668	979	1013
Land use mix-diversity (score 1–5)	1.0–5.0 2.8 (0.8)	1.0–5.0 3.0 (0.8)	1.0–4.9 2.6 (0.8)	1.0–4.9 2.6 (0.6)	1.0–5.0 3.1 (0.7)	1.0–4.8 2.8 (0.8)	1.0–4.6 3.0 (0.6)	1.0–4.8 2.7 (0.7)	1.0–4.9 2.4 (0.8)
Land use mix-access (score 1–4)	1.0–4.0 3.0 (0.4)	1.5–4.0 3.2 (0.4)	1.5–4.0 3.0 (0.4)	1.7–4.0 3.2 (0.4)	1.5–4.0 2.9 (0.4)	1.2–4.0 3.2 (0.4)	1.8–4.0 2.9 (0.4)	1.5–4.0 3.0 (0.4)	1.0–4.0 3.0 (0.4)
Walking/cycling facilities (score 1–4)	1.0–4.0 2.8 (0.6)	1.0–4.0 2.9 (0.5)	1.0–4.0 2.7 (0.6)	1.0–4.0 3.2 (0.6)	1.0–4.0 2.7 (0.5)	1.0–4.0 2.8 (0.8)	1.0–4.0 2.6 (0.4)	1.0–4.0 2.6 (0.7)	1.0–4.0 2.8 (0.6)
Aesthetics (score 1–4)	1.0–4.0 2.6 (0.7)	1.0–4.0 2.6 (0.7)	1.0–4.0 2.5 (0.7)	1.0–4.0 2.9 (0.8)	1.0–4.0 2.6 (0.6)	1.0–4.0 2.6 (0.7)	1.0–4.0 2.4 (0.6)	1.0–4.0 2.3 (0.7)	1.0–4.0 2.6 (0.7)
Safety from crime (score 1–4)	1.0–4.0 2.5 (0.6)	1.0–4.0 2.4 (0.5)	1.0–4.0 2.4 (0.6)	1.0–4.0 2.8 (0.6)	1.0–4.0 2.6 (0.5)	1.0–4.0 2.5 (0.6)	1.0–4.0 2.6 (0.5)	1.0–4.0 2.6 (0.5)	1.0–4.0 2.2 (0.6)
Proximity of public open spaces (score 1–5)	1.0–5.0 2.7 (1.1)	1.0–5.0 3.0 (1.0)	1.0–5.0 2.4 (1.0)	1.0–5.0 3.4 (0.8)	1.0–5.0 2.7 (1.0)	1.0–5.0 3.3 (0.9)	1.0–5.0 2.6 (0.9)	1.0–5.0 2.4 (1.0)	1.0–5.0 2.2 (1.1)
Proximity of shopping centers <sup>(1)</sup>	1.0–5.0 2.0 (1.3)	1.0–5.0 2.9 (1.5)	1.0–5.0 1.5 (0.9)	1.0–5.0 2.0 (1.1)	1.0–5.0 2.0 (1.1)	1.0–5.0 2.5 (1.4)	1.0–5.0 1.7 (1.0)	1.0–5.0 1.9 (1.2)	1.0–5.0 2.1 (1.4)
<b>Street connectivity items<sup>(2)</sup></b>									
The streets in my neighborhood do not have many cul-de-sacs (dead-end streets).	1.0–4.0 2.5 (0.9)	1.0–4.0 2.6 (1.0)	1.0–4.0 2.7 (0.9)	1.0–4.0 2.6 (1.1)	1.0–4.0 2.5 (0.8)	1.0–4.0 2.4 (0.9)	1.0–4.0 2.3 (0.7)	1.0–4.0 2.3 (0.8)	1.0–4.0 2.5 (0.9)
The distance between intersections in my neighborhood is usually short (100 yards or less; the length of a football field or less).	1.0–4.0 2.8 (0.8)	1.0–4.0 3.0 (0.8)	1.0–4.0 2.7 (0.8)	1.0–4.0 3.0 (0.9)	1.0–4.0 2.9 (0.7)	1.0–4.0 2.9 (0.8)	1.0–4.0 2.8 (0.7)	1.0–4.0 2.9 (0.8)	1.0–4.0 2.7 (0.8)

Results presented as minimum-maximum and mean (standard deviation).

<sup>(1)</sup> 5-point scale: 5 min (1), 6–10 min (2), 11–20 min (3), 20–30 min (4), 30 + min (5); <sup>(2)</sup> 4-point scale: strongly disagree (1), disagree (2), agree (3), strongly agree (4).

	Overall	Argentina	Brazil	Chile	Colombia	Costa Rica	Ecuador	Peru	Venezuela
There are many alternative routes for getting from place to place in my neighborhood. (I don't have to go the same way every time.)	1.0–4.0 3.0 (0.8)	1.0–4.0 3.1 (0.8)	1.0–4.0 4.0 3.0 (0.8)	1.0–4.0 4.0 3.2 (0.8)	1.0–4.0 3.0 (0.7)	1.0–4.0 4.0 3.1 (0.8)	1.0–4.0 3.0 (0.7)	1.0–4.0 4.0 3.0 (0.7)	1.0–4.0
									3.0 (0.8)
<b>Safety from traffic items<sup>(2)</sup></b>									
There is so much traffic along nearby streets that it makes it difficult or unpleasant to walk in my neighborhood. (reversed)	1.0–4.0 2.4 (0.9)	1.0–4.0 2.3 (0.9)	1.0–4.0 4.0 2.3 (0.9)	1.0–4.0 4.0 2.4 (0.9)	1.0–4.0 2.5 (0.8)	1.0–4.0 4.0	1.0–4.0 2.5 (0.8)	1.0–4.0 4.0 2.6 (0.8)	1.0–4.0 2.4 (0.8)
						2.3 (1.0)			
The speed of traffic on most nearby streets is usually slow (50 km/h or less).	1.0–4.0 2.5 (0.8)	1.0–4.0 2.4 (0.8)	1.0–4.0 4.0 2.7 (0.8)	1.0–4.0 4.0 2.6 (0.9)	1.0–4.0 2.6 (0.7)	1.0–4.0 4.0 2.5 (0.9)	1.0–4.0 2.6 (0.7)	1.0–4.0 4.0 2.6 (0.7)	1.0–4.0 2.5 (0.8)
Most drivers exceed the posted speed limits while driving in my neighborhood. (reversed)	1.0–4.0 2.3 (0.8)	1.0–4.0 2.2 (0.8)	1.0–4.0 4.0 2.1 (0.8)	1.0–4.0 4.0 2.3 (0.9)	1.0–4.0 2.4 (0.8)	1.0–4.0 4.0 2.2 (0.9)	1.0–4.0 2.3 (0.8)	1.0–4.0 4.0 2.4 (0.8)	1.0–4.0 2.4 (0.8)
There are crosswalks and pedestrian signals to help walkers cross busy streets in my neighborhood.	1.0–4.0 2.4 (0.9)	1.0–4.0 2.4 (0.9)	1.0–4.0 4.0 2.6 (0.9)	1.0–4.0 4.0 2.8 (0.9)	1.0–4.0 2.3 (0.8)	1.0–4.0 4.0 2.3 (0.9)	1.0–4.0 2.4 (0.8)	1.0–4.0 4.0 2.2 (0.8)	1.0–4.0 2.1 (0.9)
Results presented as minimum-maximum and mean (standard deviation).									
<sup>(1)</sup> 5-point scale: 5 min (1), 6–10 min (2), 11–20 min (3), 20–30 min (4), 30 + min (5); <sup>(2)</sup> 4-point scale: strongly disagree (1), disagree (2), agree (3), strongly agree (4).									

The overall mean scores (4-points scales from 1 to 4) of land use mix-access (mean: 3.0; SD: 0.4) and walking/cycling facilities (mean: 2.8; SD: 0.6), suggested relatively high perceived land use mix-access and lack of facilities for walking or cycling. The country-specific means were similar to the overall means for both scales (differences  $\leq 0.2$ ), except for the walking/cycling facilities score in Chile, where the mean score was the lowest (mean: 3.2; SD: 0.6). The overall scores of aesthetics (mean: 2.6; SD: 0.7) and safety from crime (mean: 2.5; SD: 0.6) were close to the center of the scales (4-points scales from 1 to 4). Perceived safety from crime was the lowest in Venezuela (mean: 2.2; SD: 0.6) and the highest in Chile (mean: 2.8; SD: 0.6). Chile was also the country with the highest aesthetics mean score (mean: 2.9; SD: 0.8) (Table 3).

The overall mean scores of proximity of public open spaces (mean: 2.7; SD: 1.1) and of shopping centers (mean: 2.0; SD: 1.3) (5-points scales from 1 to 5) indicated greater perceived proximity of public open spaces than to shopping centers. The

differences between the two scores were particularly large in Chile (mean: 3.4; SD: 0.8 – proximity of public open spaces; mean: 2.0; SD: 1.1 – proximity of shopping centers) and small in Argentina (mean: 3.0; SD: 1.0 – proximity of public open spaces; mean: 2.9; SD: 1.5 – proximity of shopping centers). The mean scores of the items of street connectivity and safety from traffic were similar across all countries (differences  $\leq 0.2$ ) (Table 3).

\*\*\*Table 3\*\*\*

#### Associations of environmental perceptions with transport-related PA

Pooled estimated associations of perceived neighborhood built environment subscales with transport-related PA (logistic and linear regression) are shown in Table 4. Perceived land use mix-access (OR: 1.40; 95%CI: 1.22, 1.61) and the existence of many alternative routes in the neighbourhood (OR: 1.12; 95%CI: 1.04, 1.20) were associated with higher odds of reporting any transport-related PA (here defined as  $\geq 10$  min/week). Perceived slow speed of traffic (OR: 1.19; 95%CI: 1.03, 1.35) and few drivers exceeding the speed limits (OR: 1.09; 95%CI: 1.03, 1.15) were also related to higher odds of reporting any transport-related PA.

Table 4  
Multilevel regression models for transport-related physical activity (PA)

	Logistic Regression <sup>(1)</sup>		Linear Regression <sup>(2)</sup>	
	Any transport-related PA		Non-zero reported transport-related PA	
	(0 = < 10 min/week, 1 ≥ 10 min/week)		LOG10 (min/week) within participants with min/week ≥ 10	
Independent variables	OR (95%CI)	p	β (95%CI)	p
Land use mix-diversity (score 1–5) <sup>(3)</sup>	0.93 (0.86,1.01)	0.067	<b>0.119</b> <b>(0.036,0.192)</b>	<b>0.025</b>
Land use mix-access (score 1–4) <sup>(3)</sup>	<b>1.40</b> <b>(1.22,1.61)</b>	<b>&lt; 0.001</b>	-0.003 (-0.032,0.026)	0.855
Walking/cycling facilities (score 1–4) <sup>(3)</sup>	1.06 (0.96,1.16)	0.270	-0.001 (-0.021,0.019)	0.923
Aesthetics (score 1–4) <sup>(3)</sup>	1.02 (0.93,1.11)	0.714	<b>0.028</b> <b>(0.010,0.046)</b>	<b>0.003</b>
Safety from crime (score 1–4) <sup>(3)</sup>	1.07 (0.97,1.19)	0.176	<b>0.123</b> <b>(0.044,0.181)</b>	<b>0.037</b>
Proximity of public open spaces (score 1–5) <sup>(4)</sup>	1.00 (0.94,1.06)	0.898	0.003 (-0.009,0.016)	0.594
Proximity of shopping centers <sup>(4)</sup>	1.01 (0.96,1.06)	0.621	<b>0.011</b> <b>(0.001,0.021)</b>	<b>0.037</b>
<b>Street connectivity items <sup>(5)</sup></b>				
The streets in my neighbourhood do not have many cul-de-sacs (dead-end streets).	0.97 (0.91,1.03)	0.330	-0.001 (-0.014,0.011)	0.844
The distance between intersections in my neighbourhood is usually short (100 yards or less; the length of a football field or less).	0.99 (0.93,1.06)	0.838	-0.008 (-0.023,0.006)	0.252
There are many alternative routes for getting from place to place in my neighbourhood. (I don't have to go the same way every time.)	<b>1.12</b> <b>(1.04,1.20)</b>	<b>0.004</b>	0.009 (-0.007,0.025)	0.249
<b>Safety from traffic items <sup>(5)</sup></b>				
There is so much traffic along nearby streets that it makes it difficult or unpleasant to walk in my neighbourhood (reversed).	0.99 (0.92,1.06)	0.706	0.007 (-0.007,0.021)	0.318
The speed of traffic on most nearby streets is usually slow (50 km/h or less).	<b>1.19</b> <b>(1.03,1.35)</b>	<b>0.002</b>	0.001 (-0.013,0.015)	0.927
Most drivers exceed the posted speed limits while driving in my neighbourhood (reversed).	<b>1.09</b> <b>(1.03,1.15)</b>	<b>0.017</b>	0.002 (-0.012,0.017)	0.765

OR: odds ratio; β: regression coefficient; CI: confidence interval.

<sup>(1)</sup> Multilevel logistic regression model (country as 2nd level) with transport-related physical activity time (0 = < 10 min/week, 1 ≥ 10 min/week) as dependent variable, adjusted for sex, age, and socioeconomic level; <sup>(2)</sup> Multilevel linear regression model (country as 2nd level) with transport-related physical activity time (LOG10 (min/week)) as dependent variable in participants with transport-related physical activity ≥ 10 min/week, adjusted for sex, age, socioeconomic level; <sup>(3)</sup> higher scores indicate perception of higher land use mix-diversity, higher land use mix-access, more walking/cycling facilities, better aesthetics, and more safety from crime; <sup>(4)</sup> higher scores indicate greater proximity; <sup>(5)</sup> 4-point scale: strongly disagree (1), disagree (2), agree (3), strongly agree (4).

	Logistic Regression <sup>(1)</sup>		Linear Regression <sup>(2)</sup>	
	Any transport-related PA		Non-zero reported transport-related PA	
	(0 = < 10 min/week, 1 ≥ 10 min/week)		LOG10 (min/week) within participants with min/week ≥ 10	
There are crosswalks and pedestrian signals to help walkers cross busy streets in my neighbourhood.	0.95 (0.89,1.02)	0.134	0.020 (0.007,0.033)	0.003
OR: odds ratio; β: regression coefficient; CI: confidence interval.				
(1) Multilevel logistic regression model (country as 2nd level) with transport-related physical activity time (0 = < 10 min/week, 1 ≥ 10 min/week) as dependent variable, adjusted for sex, age, and socioeconomic level; (2) Multilevel linear regression model (country as 2nd level) with transport-related physical activity time (LOG10 (min/week)) as dependent variable in participants with transport-related physical activity ≥ 10 min/week, adjusted for sex, age, socioeconomic level; (3) higher scores indicate perception of higher land use mix-diversity, higher land use mix-access, more walking/cycling facilities, better aesthetics, and more safety from crime; (4) higher scores indicate greater proximity; (5) 4-point scale: strongly disagree (1), disagree (2), agree (3), strongly agree (4).				

The linear regression model showed that higher perceived land use mix-diversity ( $\beta$ : 0.119, 95%CI: 0.036, 0.192), aesthetics ( $\beta$ : 0.028; 95%CI: 0.010, 0.046), and safety from crime ( $\beta$ : 0.123; 95%CI: 0.044, 0.181), greater proximity to shopping centers ( $\beta$ : 0.011; 95%CI: 0.011, 0.021), and the presence of crosswalks and pedestrian signals ( $\beta$ : 0.020; 95%CI: 0.007, 0.033) were associated with more minutes of transport-related PA (Table 4).

The country-specific results of associations of environmental perceptions with transport-related PA are available in Tables S1-S2 (Additional file). Different associations by country were observed between perceived neighborhood built environment and transport-related PA. Argentina was the country with the strongest associations between perceived aspects of the neighborhood built environment (land use mix-diversity, land use mix-access, aesthetics, safety from crime, public open spaces, streets in neighbourhood do not have many cul-de-sacs, the existence of many alternative routes in the neighbourhood, much traffic, and most drivers exceed the posted speed limits) and transport-related PA (Additional file: Tables S1-S2).

\*\*\*Table 4\*\*\*

#### Associations of environmental perceptions with leisure-time PA

In the pooled analyses, the odds of reporting any leisure PA were higher in participants perceiving higher land use mix-diversity (OR: 1.12; 95%CI: 1.05, 1.20), higher land use mix-access (OR: 1.27; 95%CI: 1.13, 1.43), more walking/cycling facilities (OR: 1.18; 95%CI: 1.09, 1.28), and better aesthetics (OR: 1.10; 95%CI: 1.02, 1.18). The linear regression analyses showed that higher perceived land use mix-diversity was associated with more min/week of leisure PA in respondents who did any leisure PA ( $\beta$ : 0.127; 95%CI: 0.051, 0.193) (Table 5).

Table 5  
Multilevel regression models for leisure physical activity (PA)

Independent variables	Logistic Regression <sup>(1)</sup>		Linear Regression <sup>(2)</sup>	
	Any leisure-time PA (0 = < 10 min/week, 1 ≥ 10 min/week)		Non-zero reported leisure-time PA  LOG10 (min/week) within participants with min/week ≥ 10	
	OR (95%CI)	p	β (95%CI)	p
Land use mix-diversity (score 1–5) <sup>(3)</sup>	1.12 (1.05,1.20)	0.001	0.127 (0.051,0.193)	0.028
Land use mix-access (score 1–4) <sup>(3)</sup>	1.27 (1.13,1.43)	< 0.001	0.007 (-0.035,0.050)	0.740
Walking/cycling facilities (score 1–4) <sup>(3)</sup>	1.18 (1.09,1.28)	< 0.001	-0.028 (-0.057,0.002)	0.063
Aesthetics (score 1–4) <sup>(3)</sup>	1.10 (1.02,1.18)	0.016	-0.007 (-0.033,0.020)	0.630
Safety from crime (score 1–4) <sup>(3)</sup>	1.04 (0.95,1.13)	0.400	-0.011 (-0.042,0.019)	0.462
Proximity of public open spaces (score 1–5) <sup>(4)</sup>	0.98 (0.93,1.03)	0.324	0.005 (-0.012,0.023)	0.545
Proximity of shopping centers <sup>(4)</sup>	1.02 (0.98,1.07)	0.255	0.010 (-0.004,0.024)	0.160
<b>Street connectivity items <sup>(5)</sup></b>				
The streets in my neighbourhood do not have many cul-de-sacs (dead-end streets).	0.98 (0.94,1.03)	0.526	-0.014 (-0.032,0.004)	0.120
The distance between intersections in my neighbourhood is usually short (100 yards or less; the length of a football field or less).	0.98 (0.92,1.04)	0.508	-0.006 (-0.027,0.015)	0.557
There are many alternative routes for getting from place to place in my neighbourhood. (I don't have to go the same way every time.)	1.02 (0.96,1.09)	0.509	0.015 (-0.008,0.038)	0.190
<b>Safety from traffic items <sup>(5)</sup></b>				
There is so much traffic along nearby streets that it makes it difficult or unpleasant to walk in my neighbourhood (reversed).	1.00 (0.94,1.06)	0.960	0.009 (-0.011,0.029)	0.367
The speed of traffic on most nearby streets is usually slow (50 km/h or less).	1.01 (0.96,1.07)	0.663	-0.007 (-0.027,0.013)	0.511
Most drivers exceed the posted speed limits while driving in my neighbourhood (reversed).	1.05 (0.98,1.11)	0.154	0.001 (-0.020,0.022)	0.933

OR: odds ratio; β: regression coefficient; CI: confidence interval.

<sup>(1)</sup> Multilevel logistic regression model (country as 2nd level) with leisure-time physical activity (0 = < 10 min/week, 1 ≥ 10 min/week) as dependent variable, adjusted for sex, age, and socioeconomic level; <sup>(2)</sup> Multilevel linear regression model (country as 2nd level) with leisure-time physical activity (LOG10 (min/week)) as dependent variable in participants with leisure physical activity ≥ 10 min/week, adjusted for sex, age, socioeconomic level; <sup>(3)</sup> higher scores indicate perception of higher land use mix-diversity, higher land use mix-access, more walking/cycling facilities, better aesthetics, and more safety from crime; <sup>(4)</sup> higher scores indicate greater proximity; <sup>(5)</sup> 4-point scale: strongly disagree (1), disagree (2), agree (3), strongly agree (4).

	Logistic Regression <sup>(1)</sup>		Linear Regression <sup>(2)</sup>	
	Any leisure-time PA		Non-zero reported leisure-time PA	
	(0 = < 10 min/week, 1 ≥ 10 min/week)		LOG10 (min/week) within participants with min/week ≥ 10	
There are crosswalks and pedestrian signals to help walkers cross busy streets in my neighbourhood.	0.97 (0.92,1.02)	0.253	0.018 (-0.001,0.037)	0.066
OR: odds ratio; β: regression coefficient; CI: confidence interval.				
<sup>(1)</sup> Multilevel logistic regression model (country as 2nd level) with leisure-time physical activity (0 = < 10 min/week, 1 ≥ 10 min/week) as dependent variable, adjusted for sex, age, and socioeconomic level; <sup>(2)</sup> Multilevel linear regression model (country as 2nd level) with leisure-time physical activity (LOG10 (min/week)) as dependent variable in participants with leisure physical activity ≥ 10 min/week, adjusted for sex, age, socioeconomic level; <sup>(3)</sup> higher scores indicate perception of higher land use mix-diversity, higher land use mix-access, more walking/cycling facilities, better aesthetics, and more safety from crime; <sup>(4)</sup> higher scores indicate greater proximity; <sup>(5)</sup> 4-point scale: strongly disagree (1), disagree (2), agree (3), strongly agree (4).				

The country-specific associations of environmental perceptions with leisure-time PA are shown in Tables S3-S4 (Additional file). Distinct associations by country were observed between perceived neighborhood built environment characteristics and leisure-time PA. Brazil was the country with the strongest associations between perceived aspects of the neighborhood built environment (land use mix-diversity, mix-access, walking/cycling facilities, the distance between intersections in the neighbourhood, speed of traffic, the presence of crosswalk and pedestrian signals, and proximity of shopping centers) and leisure-time PA (Additional file: Tables S3-S4).

\*\*\*Table 5\*\*\*

## Discussion

The present study examined the associations between a wide range of perceived neighborhood built environment characteristics and domain-specific PA among adults from eight Latin American countries. Overall, perceived good access to services, many alternative routes to and from destinations, and low traffic speed were associated with higher odds of reporting any transport-related PA. In addition, perceived aesthetics, access to diverse destinations, safety from crime, presence of crosswalks and pedestrian signals, and proximity of shopping centers were positively associated with more weekly minutes of transport-related PA. The odds of reporting any leisure-time PA were higher among those who perceived their neighborhoods to be more aesthetically pleasing, having better access to diverse destinations and amenities, and better walking/cycling facilities. Only higher levels of perceived access to diverse destinations were associated with more time spent in leisure-time PA.

In line with the findings of our pooled analyses, the International Physical Activity Network (IPEN) study of adults from 17 cities in 12 countries, including three cities from Latin America (Bogota [Colombia], Curitiba [Brazil], Cuernavaca [Mexico]), reported positive associations of transport-related walking with perceived land use mix – access, land use mix - diversity, street connectivity, and aesthetics [11]. The IPEN Adult study also observed positive associations of objectively-assessed street intersection density, parks, and land use mix with transport-related PA [16, 35]. Support for the positive effects of street connectivity and access to destination on adults' transport-related PA can be also found in recent studies from Europe and New Zealand [36, 37]. Two countries in our study (Argentina and Costa Rica) showed a negative association between land use mix – diversity and any transport-related PA. This could be due to various reasons specific to the local environment such as area-level socio-economic status or crime rates, factors that were not included in the regression models of land use mix - diversity. Alternatively, the actual level of access to various destinations might have been so high that many respondents could reach destinations with minimal walking. In fact, recent studies have observed negative effects of extreme levels of access to destinations on transport-related walking [38, 39]. These patterns are more likely to occur in locations with high population and



destination densities as in many Latin American cities [6, 7]. Unexpected relationships between the built environment, parks and transport PA were also observed in Cuernavaca, Mexico and attributed to the local context [16].

The IPEN Adult study also found positive associations between leisure-time PA and aesthetics and access to diverse destinations but did not show an association with walking/cycling infrastructure as in our study [10]. Similarly, no significant associations between aesthetics and weekly minutes of recreational walking were observed in the IPEN Adult Latin American countries. This suggests that, in the context of Latin America, aesthetics may promote the adoption of leisure-time PA but may not have a substantial impact on the accumulated amount of leisure-time PA. Interestingly, as in the IPEN Adult study [11], aesthetics were found to be positively related to transportation-PA in the pooled analyses, although this attribute is hypothesized to impact only leisure-time PA [40]. It may be that aesthetically pleasing environments and green spaces can act as motivators for engaging in or spending more time in active transport. Alternatively, the distinction between leisure and transport PA may be unclear in dense, diverse communities where many trips fulfill both purposes.

While previous studies have found inconsistent associations between safety and transport-related PA we observed positive associations between transport PA and safety from crime and traffic [11, 36]. Perhaps, the degree of danger from both crime and traffic in Latin American cities accounts for these observations [5, 6]. These relationships may be especially challenging to tease out in Latin America where crime, traffic, and access to public transport vary greatly by neighborhood and where lower income residents must engage in active transport regardless of safety issues because they have no other choice [42, 43]. As in previous studies we found that multiple aspects of the built environment are associated with walking for transport or leisure [10, 19, 37, 40]. These findings are not surprising given that walking is the most common form of leisure-time PA among adults in all countries, and in most Latin American cities walking is also an essential part of urban mobility [41]. Our results support thoughtful integration of efforts to improve conditions for walking with major public transit development such as Bus Rapid Transit systems (BRT) [42, 43]. In Latin America, BRT systems have been widely implemented as a cost-effective solution for urban mobility [44], but they also have the potential to stimulate the use of active modes of transport and reduce private car use, thus promoting PA [45].

This study has several limitations. Only urban areas were included in the study, thus the samples are not nationally representative. The cross-sectional design precludes determination of causality even with careful adjustment for covariates [38, 46, 47]. The use of self-report measures for both neighborhood environments and PA must be considered in the interpretation of the findings. Cultural differences have been reported in interpretation of IPAQ, and the lack of precision of IPAQ compared with objective measures of PA could decrease the likelihood of significant associations with environmental attributes [48]. NEWS has been found to assess density and access to services more accurately in low-to-medium density urban environments [49]. This study does have a number of strengths. These include the examination of perceptions of urban environments across eight countries, a large number of environmental variables assessed using common environmental measures, the large sample size, and comparable data collection protocols, which are rare in studies from Latin America. By providing a unique Latin American dataset, the present study enables cross-country comparisons not previously possible.

## Conclusion

Perceived neighbourhood built environment characteristics are differentially associated with domain-specific PA in Latin America and can inform the development of PA promotion programs. Prospective studies of environmental characteristics and PA are needed, as well as evidence from intervention studies in order to further our understanding of these relationships and better inform public health policy and programs.

Improving perceptions of neighbourhood built environment as well as modifying the actual neighbourhood built environment could potentially increase PA among adults from Latin America.

## Abbreviations

95%CI: confidence interval 95%; CVD: cardiovascular disease; ELANS: *Estudio Latinoamericano de Nutrición y Salud*; IPAQ: International Physical Activity Questionnaire; IPEN: International Physical Activity Network; NEWS-A: Neighbourhood Environment Walkability Survey – Abbreviated; OR: odds ratio; PA: Physical activity; PSUs: Primary Sampling Units; PPS: probability proportional to size; SSUs: Secondary Sampling Units; SD: standard deviations.

## Declarations

### Ethics approval and consent to participate

Ethical approval was provided by the Western Institutional Review Board (#20140605), and by the ethical review boards of the participating institutions. ELANS is registered at Clinical Trials #NCT02226627. Written informed consent/assent was obtained from all individuals, before commencement of the study.

### Consent for publication

Not applicable

### Availability of data and material

The datasets generated and/or analyzed during the current study are not publicly available due the terms of consent/assent to which the participants agreed but are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request. Please contact the corresponding author to discuss availability of data and materials.

### Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no competing interests

## Funding

The ELANS was supported by a scientific grant from the Coca Cola Company, and support from the Ferrero, Instituto Pensi / Hospital Infantil Sabara, International Life Science Institute of Argentina, Universidad de Costa Rica, Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile, Pontificia Universidad Javeriana, Universidad Central de Venezuela (CENDES-UCV)/Fundación Bengoa, Universidad San Francisco de Quito, and Instituto de Investigación Nutricional de Peru. The founding sponsors had no role in study design, in the collection, analyses, or interpretation of data, in the writing of the manuscript, and in the decision to publish the results. This study is registered at [www.clinicaltrials.gov](http://www.clinicaltrials.gov) (No. NCT02226627).

### Author contributions

G.F., E.C., and D.V.D, conceived, designed, and helped to write and revise the manuscript; I.K., G.G., A.R., L.Y.C.S., M.C.Y.G, R.G.P, M.H-C., I.Z.Z., V.G., M.P, M.F., were responsible for coordinating the study, contributed to the intellectual content, and revise the manuscript, A.O.W., D.R.S., C.C-M., F.R-R., A.M., interpreted the data, helped to write and revise the manuscript. All authors contributed to the study design, critically reviewed the manuscript, and approved the final version.

## Acknowledgments

We would like to thank the following individuals at each of the participating sites who made substantial contributions to the ELANS: Luis A. Moreno, Beate Lloyd, Brenda Lynch, Mariela Jauregui, Alejandra Guidi, Luis Costa, and Regina Mara Fisberg.

‡The following are members of ELANS Study Group: Chairs: Mauro Fisberg and Irina Kovalskys; Co-chair: Georgina Gómez; Core Group members: Attilio Rigotti, Lilia Yadira Cortés Sanabria, Georgina Gómez, Martha Cecilia Yépez García, Rossina

Gabriella Pareja Torres, and Marianella Herrera-Cuenca; Steering Committee: Berthold Koletzko, Luis A. Moreno, Michael Pratt, and Regina Mara Fisberg; Project Managers: Viviana Guajardo and Ioná Zalcman Zimberg; International Life Sciences Institute-Argentina: Irina Kovalskys, Viviana Guajardo, María Paz Amigo, Ximena Janezic; Instituto Pensi-Hospital Infantil Sabara-Brazil: Mauro Fisberg, Ioná Zalcman Zimberg, and Natasha Aparecida Grande de França; Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile: Attilio Rigotti, Guadalupe Echeverría, Leslie Landaeta, and Óscar Castillo; Pontificia Universidad Javeriana-Colombia: Lilia Yadira Cortés Sanabria, Luz Nayibe Vargas, Luisa Fernanda Tobar, and Yuri Milena Castillo; Universidad de Costa Rica Georgina Gómez and Anne Chinnock, Instituto Costarricense de Enseñanza e Investigación en Nutrición y Salud: Rafael Monge Rojas; Universidad San Francisco de Quito-Ecuador: Martha Cecilia Yépez García, Mónica Villar Cáceres, and María Belén Ocampo; Instituto de Investigación Nutricional-Perú: Rossina Pareja Torres, María Reyna Liria, Krysty Meza; Universidad Central de Venezuela: Marianella Herrera-Cuenca, Maritza Landaeta, Betty Méndez, Maura Vasquez, Omaira Rivas, Carmen Meza, Servando Ruiz, Guillermo Ramirez, and Pablo Hernández; Accelerometry analysis: Priscila Bezerra Gonçalves and Claudia Alberico; Physical activity advisor: Gerson Luis de Moraes Ferrari.

## References

1. US Department of Health and Human Services. 2018 Physical Activity Guidelines Advisory Committee. 2018 Physical Activity Guidelines Advisory Committee Scientific Report. Washington, DC: US. Department of Health and Human Services. 2018.
2. Guthold R, Stevens GA, Riley LM, Bull FC. Worldwide trends in insufficient physical activity from 2001 to 2016: a pooled analysis of 358 population-based surveys with 1.9 million participants. *Lancet Glob Health*. 2018;6(10):e1077-e86. doi:10.1016/S2214-109X(18)30357-7.
3. Greene J, Guanais F. An examination of socioeconomic equity in health experiences in six Latin American and Caribbean countries. *Rev Panam Salud Publica*. 2018;42:e127. doi:10.26633/RPSP.2018.127.
4. United Nations UN. 2012. World urbanization Prospects: The 2011 Revision: Data tables and highlights 2011 rev ed. 2012.
5. Lund C, De Silva M, Plagerson S, Cooper S, Chisholm D, Das J, et al. Poverty and mental disorders: breaking the cycle in low-income and middle-income countries. *Lancet*. 2011;378(9801):1502–14. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(11)60754-X.
6. Kane JC, Vinikoor MJ, Haroz EE, Al-Yasiri M, Bogdanov S, Mayeya J, et al. Mental health comorbidity in low-income and middle-income countries: a call for improved measurement and treatment. *Lancet Psychiatry*. 2018;5(11):864–6. doi:10.1016/S2215-0366(18)30301-8.
7. Montes F, Sarmiento OL, Zarama R, Pratt M, Wang G, Jacoby E, et al. Do health benefits outweigh the costs of mass recreational programs? An economic analysis of four Ciclovía programs. *Journal of urban health: bulletin of the New York Academy of Medicine*. 2012;89(1):153–70. doi:10.1007/s11524-011-9628-8.
8. Hoehner CM, Ribeiro IC, Parra DC, Reis RS, Azevedo MR, Hino AA, et al. Physical activity interventions in Latin America: expanding and classifying the evidence. *Am J Prev Med*. 2013;44(3):e31–40. doi:10.1016/j.amepre.2012.10.026.
9. Tabatabaie S, Litt JS, Carrico A. A Study of Perceived Nature, Shade and Trees and Self-Reported Physical Activity in Denver. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2019;16(19). doi:10.3390/ijerph16193604.
10. Sugiyama T, Cerin E, Owen N, Oyeyemi AL, Conway TL, Van Dyck D, et al. Perceived neighbourhood environmental attributes associated with adults recreational walking: IPEN Adult study in 12 countries. *Health Place*. 2014;28:22–30. doi:10.1016/j.healthplace.2014.03.003.
11. Kerr J, Emond JA, Badland H, Reis R, Sarmiento O, Carlson J, et al. Perceived Neighborhood Environmental Attributes Associated with Walking and Cycling for Transport among Adult Residents of 17 Cities in 12 Countries: The IPEN Study. *Environ Health Perspect*. 2016;124(3):290–8. doi:10.1289/ehp.1409466.
12. Schipperijn J, Cerin E, Adams MA, Reis R, Smith G, Cain K, et al. Access to parks and physical activity: an eight country comparison. *Urban For Urban Green*. 2017;27:253–63. doi:10.1016/j.ufug.2017.08.010.
13. Mitas J, Sas-Nowosielski K, Groffik D, Fromel K. The Safety of the Neighborhood Environment and Physical Activity in Czech and Polish Adolescents. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2018;15(1). doi:10.3390/ijerph15010126.

14. Loh VHY, Veitch J, Salmon J, Cerin E, Mavoa S, Villanueva K, et al. Environmental Mismatch: Do Associations between the Built Environment and Physical Activity among Youth Depend on Concordance with Perceptions? *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2020;17(4). doi:10.3390/ijerph17041309.
15. Perez LG, Ruiz JM, Berrigan D. Neighborhood Environment Perceptions among Latinos in the U.S. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2019;16(17). doi:10.3390/ijerph16173062.
16. Jauregui A, Salvo D, Lamadrid-Figueroa H, Hernandez B, Rivera JA, Pratt M. Perceived neighborhood environmental attributes associated with leisure-time and transport physical activity in Mexican adults. *Prev Med*. 2017;103S:21-S6. doi:10.1016/j.ypmed.2016.11.014.
17. Jauregui A, Salvo D, Lamadrid-Figueroa H, Hernandez B, Rivera-Dommarco JA, Pratt M. Perceived and Objective Measures of Neighborhood Environment for Physical Activity Among Mexican Adults, 2011. *Prev Chronic Dis*. 2016;13:E76. doi:10.5888/pcd13.160009.
18. Jauregui A, Pratt M, Lamadrid-Figueroa H, Hernandez B, Rivera JA, Salvo D. Perceived Neighborhood Environment and Physical Activity: The International Physical Activity and Environment Network Adult Study in Mexico. *Am J Prev Med*. 2016;51(2):271–9. doi:10.1016/j.amepre.2016.03.026.
19. Sallis JF, Cerin E, Kerr J, Adams MA, Sugiyama T, Christiansen LB, et al. Built Environment, Physical Activity, and Obesity: Findings from the International Physical Activity and Environment Network (IPEN) Adult Study. *Annu Rev Public Health*. 2020;41:119–39. doi:10.1146/annurev-publhealth-040218-043657.
20. Sallis JF, Cerin E, Conway TL, Adams MA, Frank LD, Pratt M, et al. Physical activity in relation to urban environments in 14 cities worldwide: a cross-sectional study. *Lancet*. 2016;387(10034):2207–17. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(15)01284-2.
21. Salvo D, Reis RS, Stein AD, Rivera J, Martorell R, Pratt M. Characteristics of the built environment in relation to objectively measured physical activity among Mexican adults, 2011. *Prev Chronic Dis*. 2014;11:E147. doi:10.5888/pcd11.140047.
22. Fisberg M, Kovalskys I, Gomez G, Rigotti A, Cortes LY, Herrera-Cuenca M, et al. Latin American Study of Nutrition and Health (ELANS): rationale and study design. *BMC Public Health*. 2016;16(1):93. doi:10.1186/s12889-016-2765-y.
23. Ferrari GLM, Kovalskys I, Fisberg M, Gómez G, Rigotti A, Sanabria LYC, et al. Methodological design for the assessment of physical activity and sedentary time in eight Latin American countries - the ELANS study. *MethodsX*. 2020;S2214-1405(19)30076-3. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jth.2019.100788.
24. Guthold R, Stevens GA, Riley LM, Bull FC. Global trends in insufficient physical activity among adolescents: a pooled analysis of 298 population-based surveys with 1.6 million participants. *Lancet Child Adolesc Health*. 2020;4(1):23–35. doi:10.1016/S2352-4642(19)30323-2.
25. Hallal PC, Andersen LB, Bull FC, Guthold R, Haskell W, Ekelund U, et al. Global physical activity levels: surveillance progress, pitfalls, and prospects. *Lancet*. 2012;380(9838):247–57. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(12)60646-1.
26. Cerin E, Saelens BE, Sallis JF, Frank LD. Neighborhood Environment Walkability Scale: validity and development of a short form. *Med Sci Sports Exerc*. 2006;38(9):1682–91. doi:10.1249/01.mss.0000227639.83607.4d.
27. Salvo D, Reis RS, Sarmiento OL, Pratt M. Overcoming the challenges of conducting physical activity and built environment research in Latin America: IPEN Latin America. *Prev Med*. 2014;69(Suppl 1):86–92. doi:10.1016/j.ypmed.2014.10.014.
28. Cerin E, Sit CH, Cheung MC, Ho SY, Lee LC, Chan WM. Reliable and valid NEWS for Chinese seniors: measuring perceived neighborhood attributes related to walking. *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act*. 2010;7:84. doi:10.1186/1479-5868-7-84.
29. Starnes HA, McDonough MH, Tamura K, James P, Laden F, Troped PJ. Factorial validity of an abbreviated neighborhood environment walkability scale for seniors in the Nurses' Health Study. *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act*. 2014;11:126. doi:10.1186/s12966-014-0126-8.
30. Craig CL, Marshall AL, Sjostrom M, Bauman AE, Booth ML, Ainsworth BE, et al. International physical activity questionnaire: 12-country reliability and validity. *Med Sci Sports Exerc*. 2003;35(8):1381–95. doi:10.1249/01.MSS.0000078924.61453.FB.
31. Kim Y, Park I, Kang M. Convergent validity of the international physical activity questionnaire (IPAQ): meta-analysis. *Public Health Nutr*. 2013;16(3):440–52. doi:10.1017/S1368980012002996.

32. Ferrari GLM, Kovalskys I, Fisberg M, Gomez G, Rigotti A, Sanabria LYC, et al. Anthropometry, dietary intake, physical activity and sitting time patterns in adolescents aged 15–17 years: an international comparison in eight Latin American countries. *BMC Pediatr.* 2020;20(1):24. doi:10.1186/s12887-020-1920-x.
33. Van Holle V, De Bourdeaudhuij I, Deforche B, Van Cauwenberg J, Van Dyck D. Assessment of physical activity in older Belgian adults: validity and reliability of an adapted interview version of the long International Physical Activity Questionnaire (IPAQ-L). *BMC Public Health.* 2015;15:433. doi:10.1186/s12889-015-1785-3.
34. Oyeyemi AL, Bello UM, Philemon ST, Aliyu HN, Majidadi RW, Oyeyemi AY. Examining the reliability and validity of a modified version of the International Physical Activity Questionnaire, long form (IPAQ-LF) in Nigeria: a cross-sectional study. *BMJ Open.* 2014;4(12):e005820. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2014-005820.
35. Christiansen LB, Cerin E, Badland H, Kerr J, Davey R, Troelsen J, et al. International comparisons of the associations between objective measures of the built environment and transport-related walking and cycling: IPEN Adult Study. *Journal of transport health.* 2016;3(4):467–78. doi:10.1016/j.jth.2016.02.010.
36. Van Holle V, Deforche B, Van Cauwenberg J, Goubert L, Maes L, Van de Weghe N, et al. Relationship between the physical environment and different domains of physical activity in European adults: a systematic review. *BMC Public Health.* 2012;12:807. doi:10.1186/1471-2458-12-807.
37. Witten K, Blakely T, Bagheri N, Badland H, Ivory V, Pearce J, 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):971–7. doi:10.1289/ehp.1104584.
38. Cerin E, Barnett A, Zhang CJP, Lai PC, Sit CHP, Lee RSY. How urban densification shapes walking behaviours in older community dwellers: a cross-sectional analysis of potential pathways of influence. *Int J Health Geogr.* 2020;19(1):14. doi:10.1186/s12942-020-00210-8.
39. Boakye-Dankwa E, Barnett A, Pachana NA, Turrell G, Cerin E. Associations Between Latent Classes of Perceived Neighborhood Destination Accessibility and Walking Behaviors in Older Adults of a Low-Density and a High-Density City. *J Aging Phys Act.* 2019;27(4):553–64. doi:10.1123/japa.2018-0297.
40. Van Cauwenberg J, Nathan A, Barnett A, Barnett DW, Cerin E, Council on E, et al. Relationships Between Neighbourhood Physical Environmental Attributes and Older Adults' Leisure-Time Physical Activity: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Sports Med.* 2018;48(7):1635–60. doi:10.1007/s40279-018-0917-1.
41. Lee IM, Buchner DM. The importance of walking to public health. *Med Sci Sports Exerc.* 2008;40(7 Suppl):512-8. doi:10.1249/MSS.0b013e31817c65d0.
42. Parra DC, Gómez LF, Pratt M, Samiento OL, Triche E, Mosquera J. Policy and built environment changes in Bogotá and their importance in health promotion. *Indoor Built Environment.* 2007;16:344–8. doi:10.1177/1420326X07080462.
43. Gomez LF, Sarmiento R, Ordonez MF, Pardo CF, de Sa TH, Mallarino CH, et al. Urban environment interventions linked to the promotion of physical activity: a mixed methods study applied to the urban context of Latin America. *Soc Sci Med.* 2015;131:18–30. doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2015.02.042.
44. Wright L. *Bus rapid transit. Sustainable transport: a sourcebook for policy-makers in developing cities.* Eschborn: Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit; 2002.
45. Sallis JF, Frank LD, Saelens BE, Kraft MK. Active transportation and physical activity: opportunities for collaboration on transportation and public health research. *Transportation Research Part A Policy Practice.* 2004;38:249–68.
46. Schirmer PM, van Eggermond MAB, Axhausen KW. The role of location in residential location choice models: a review of literature. *J Transport Land Use.* 2014;7:3–21. doi:10.5198/jtlu.v7i2.740.
47. Lewis PG, Baldassare M. The complexity of public attitudes toward compact development. *J Am Planning Assoc.* 2010;76:219–37. doi:10.1080/01944361003646471.
48. Cerin E, Cain KL, Oyeyemi AL, Owen N, Conway TL, Cochrane T, et al. Correlates of Agreement between Accelerometry and Self-reported Physical Activity. *Med Sci Sports Exerc.* 2016;48(6):1075–84. doi:10.1249/MSS.0000000000000870.
49. Cerin E, Conway TL, Adams MA, Barnett A, Cain KL, Owen N, et al. Objectively-assessed neighbourhood destination accessibility and physical activity in adults from 10 countries: An analysis of moderators and perceptions as mediators.

## Supplementary Files

This is a list of supplementary files associated with this preprint. Click to download.

- [Manuscriptsupplemetarymaterial.doc](#)