Table S1. Reviewed studies.

References	Field Background	Main Theories and Methodologies that Guide the Paper	Walkable Factors (Efficiency and Comfort, Pleasantness, Safety, Attractiveness)	Type of Data: M; EJ; HS	Data and Covariables	Sample Social Group Profile scale	Validation
Bader et al. (2015) [80]	Urban planning and Public health	Influence of urban form on people behaviour	**Attractiveness:** number and type of land uses; **Efficiency and comfort:** sidewalk width; street design; **Safety and security:** mix of use; transparency and permeability of built environment; geometry of crossings and facilities for pedestrians at crossings; **Pleasantness:** aesthetic of place; architectural and landscape design	***M; EJ***	Audit on line	US metropolitan areas; census tract level	RB
Oswald Beiler and Phillips (2016) [82]	Urban planning and public health	Influence of urban form on health, social capital	**Attractiveness:** mix of use; **Efficiency and comfort:** cost; sidewalk width; connectivity; continuity; barriers; design of the street; slope; pavement conditions; **Safety and security:** mix of use; lighting; car traffic volume, design speed of the route; crossing facilities; **Pleasantness:** aesthetic of place; shelter and shade; sedibility; transparency and permeability	***M***	GIS data and manual field data collection	Union County four type of paths; street level	EX
Bias et al. (2010) [99]	Urban planning and public health	Relation between physical environment and physical activity	**Attractiveness:** mix of use; **Efficiency and comfort:** costs, hilliness, street connectivity, **Pleasantness:** aesthetics;	***EJ***	Telephone survey	Morgantown and Cabell County, West Virginia	SP; RB

References	Field Background	Main Theories and Methodologies that Guide the Paper	Walkable Factors (Efficiency and Comfort, Pleasantness, Safety, Attractiveness)	Type of Data: M; EJ; HS	Data and Covariables	Sample Social Group Profile scale	Validation
			Safety and security: speed of vehicular traffic, availability of sidewalks and crosswalks; presence of people			40-65 years old residents;	
Blečić et al. (2015) [10]	Urban and transport planning	Operational measure of urban walkability	**Efficiency and comfort:** cost distance and slope, street type, bicycle track, footway width and maintenance, shelter and shade, benches; **Attractiveness:** presence, typology and intensity of activities; building density; **Safety and Security:** street lighting, on street parking, integration of the street with the surrounding; **Pleasantness:** scenery; environmental/architectural interest;	***M***	OSM dataset; built environment data collected with on field audit and computer aided methods	City of Alghero, Italy, street segment level and points of urban fabric	-
Boulange et al. (2018) [22]	Urban and transport Planning	Influence of urban form on walking	**Efficiency and comfort:** street connectivity; intersection density; distance to closest public transport stop/train station/supermarket; land use mix, dwelling density; **Attractiveness:** local living destinations; housing diversity	***M; EJ***	Travel survey and participatory workshop Official GIS, layers, census	Broadmeadows suburb, Melbourne, neighbourhood level	SP
Buck et al. (2011) [39]	Public health	Influence of urban form on physical activity for children	**Efficiency and comfort**: intersections density, urban form, sidewalk and transit station presence;	***M***	GIS data, municipal geospatial	Delmenhorst Germany; 596 Children (2-10 years old);	-

References	Field Background	Main Theories and Methodologies that Guide the Paper	Walkable Factors (Efficiency and Comfort, Pleasantness, Safety, Attractiveness)	Type of Data: M; EJ; HS	Data and Covariables	Sample Social Group Profile scale	Validation
			Attractiveness: presence of public facilities		information system; demos; economic data	block level	
Carr, et al. (2010) [93]	Urban planning	Operational measure of urban walkability	**Attractiveness**: presence and density of activities; **Efficiency and comfort**: street connectivity, street density, average block length;	***M***	Census; GIS dataset (Tiger); street network Internet-based reference service database	296 participants, Rhode Island, USA, block level	EX
Cerin et al. (2006) [100]	Transportation planning and public health	Relationship between urban form and walkability and cyclability for recreation	**Efficiency and comfort:** shelters and shade; cost; design of the street; design of the street (connectivity), signalization; **Pleasantness:** scenery; architectural and urban design; cleanliness/pollution; S**afety and security:** separation features; lighting; volume/crowding if cars in the street; design of the street; crime/policy presence; urban texture;	***M; EJ***	Neighbourhood surveys and GIS database; socioeconomic status	King County; 16 neighbourhood s 1286 adults; census block	RB

References	Field Background	Main Theories and Methodologies that Guide the Paper	Walkable Factors (Efficiency and Comfort, Pleasantness, Safety, Attractiveness)	Type of Data: M; EJ; HS	Data and Covariables	Sample Social Group Profile scale	Validation
			Attractiveness: presence, density; typology; mix of activities and opportunities;				
Cervero and Duncan (2003) [1]	Urban planning and public health	Influence of urban form on physical activity (walking and bicycling)	**Efficiency and comfort:** cost distance and slope; street connectivity; block size; walking and cycling facilities; **Attractiveness:** presence; typology density and intensity of activities; **Safety and Security:** low income %, street lighting/darkness	***M***	Census, travel survey, geodatabase and GIS data	San Francisco Bay area, households; block scale	RB
Cervero and Kockelman (1997) [63]	Urban planning	Relationship between built environment and travel demand	**Efficiency and comfort:** block length, street patterns, proportion of intersections, street connectivity, sidewalk width, slope, street trees; **Safety and security:** pedestrian and cycling provisions, distance between overhead street lights, signalized intersections, overhead street lights; **Attractiveness:** population and employment density, commercial intensity, land use mix	***M;EJ***	Travel data, census, land use data field survey	50 neighbourhood s in the San Francisco Bay Area; census tracts level	RB
Clifton et al. (2007) [2]	Urban planning	Relationship between physical environment and walking behaviour	**Efficiency and comfort**: design of the street; pavement type and conditions; obstructions; continuity of the route; connectivity; cost; off parking facilities; signalization, information availability and signage;	***M***	Audit data	College Park and Montgomery County; 3635 segments	-

References	Field Background	Main Theories and Methodologies that Guide the Paper	Walkable Factors (Efficiency and Comfort, Pleasantness, Safety, Attractiveness)	Type of Data: M; EJ; HS	Data and Covariables	Sample Social Group Profile scale	Validation
			Pleasantness: architectural and urban design, cleanliness/pollution; bicycle lanes, urban texture, shelters and shade; **Safety and security:** lighting; separation features; pavement type and conditions; design speed of the route; on street parking facilities; **Attractiveness:** presence, number of activities, typology			of a pedestrian network or pathways; street level	
Colclough (2009) [101]	Urban and transport planning	Relationship between physical environment and pedestrian accessibility	**Efficiency and comfort:** cost, distance, path gradient, block size intersections, street connectivity; **Attractiveness:** dwelling, density, percentage	***M;EJ***	OS Integrated Transport Network (ITN), GIS datasets by official sources, digital height data, field audit, survey	West Northamptonshire (UK); 2km catchment area level	EX; SP
Emery et al. (2003) [84]	Public health	Influence of urban form on physical activity	**Efficiency and comfort:** continuity of the route; **Safety and Security**: Volume of cars on the street; design of the street; pavement conditions; design speed of the route; separation features; lighting	***M***	Audit and survey data	the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill; 31 urban and rural road segments identified within 10	EX

References	Field Background	Main Theories and Methodologies that Guide the Paper	Walkable Factors (Efficiency and Comfort, Pleasantness, Safety, Attractiveness)	Type of Data: M; EJ; HS	Data and Covariables	Sample Social Group Profile scale	Validation
						miles of the campus; street level	
Ewing and Cervero (2010) [28]	Urban and transportation planning	Relationship between physical environment and walking behaviour	**Efficiency and comfort:** cost and distance to destinations (stores, transit stop, etc.) intersection/street density; **Attractiveness:** population and job density jobs-housing balance land use mix (entropy index)	***M***	Data from individual primary studies	-	RB
Ewing and Handy (2009) [12]	Urban planning	Relationship between urban form and walkability	**Efficiency and comfort:** directness of route; sedibility; **Pleasantness:** volume/crowding of pedestrians on the street; architectural and urban design; noise level; scenery; landscape design; urban texture; **Security:** activities' atmosphere; **Attractiveness:** presence, density of active uses; typology indoor/outdoor	***M***	Survey data	New York; 48 video-clips in commercial streets; street level	EX
Forsyth et al. (2008) [30]	Urban and transportation planning	Relationship between physical environment and walking behaviour	**Efficiency and Comfort:** street pattern (road and block length, intersection density, ...), pedestrian-oriented infrastructure (sidewalk length, street trees, traffic calming measures, transit stop density, ..); **Attractiveness**: amenities and mixed use density, entropy index	***M; EJ***	GIS datasets; survey, seven day travel diary accelerometer, computer mapping and survey	715 participants in the Twin Cities, Minnesota; street and neighbourhood level	-

References	Field Background	Main Theories and Methodologies that Guide the Paper	Walkable Factors (Efficiency and Comfort, Pleasantness, Safety, Attractiveness)	Type of Data: M; EJ; HS	Data and Covariables	Sample Social Group Profile scale	Validation
Frank et al. (2006 [4]; (2010) [56]	Urban planning	Influence of urban form on physical activity	**Efficiency and comfort:** cost; easy of walk; design of the street (connectivity); cost (frequency of walking); **Attractiveness:** presence, density of active uses; mix and typology of activities	***M***	NQoL data; statistical data; survey; demos,	City of Baltimore; adults; Block level	RB
Ghani, et al 2013 [85]	Urban and transportation planning	Influence of urban form on travel behaviour	**Efficiency and comfort:** design of the street (sidewalk presence and continuity), distance, **Safety and security:** pavement; lighting; separation; signals; traffic calming **Attractiveness:** presence and proximity of active land uses	***M***	Field survey on a set of roads of different hierarchy	Taman Bukit lndah, Johor Bahru, Malaysia; neighbourhood and street level	
Giles-Corti et al. (2014) [90]	Urban and transportation planning	Influence of urban form on travel behaviour	**Efficiency:** street connectivity, **Attractiveness:** residential or dwelling density and land use mix.	***M***	Australian state government datasets: cadastre, dwellings, street networks, census	North West Region of Melbourne, Australia; neighbourhood level, walkable service area level (15 min)	EX
Glazier et al. (2013) [31]	Public health	Relationship between physical environment and walking behaviour	**Efficiency and comfort**: cost; street connectivity; **Attractiveness**: presence, density and mix land use;	**M**	Statistical data Demos	City of Toronto, 248 million people census tracts and block level	RB

References	Field Background	Main Theories and Methodologies that Guide the Paper	Walkable Factors (Efficiency and Comfort, Pleasantness, Safety, Attractiveness)	Type of Data: M; EJ; HS	Data and Covariables	Sample Social Group Profile scale	Validation
			Security: urban texture;				
Hajna et al. (2013) [32]	Public health	Relationship between physical environment and walking behaviour	**Efficiency and comfort:** design of the street (connectivity; sidewalk presence); continuity of the route; cost; **Safety and security**: pavement; lighting; feel safe; **Pleasantness**: urban texture; **Attractiveness**: presence, density of active uses	***M; EJ***	Statistical data; Audit data	Montreal; adults with diabetes; street level	EX
Tal and Handy (2011) [95]	Integrated land use and transport planning	Relationship between urban form and pedestrian connectivity and accessibility	**Efficiency and comfort:** distance, directness, connectivity; **Attractiveness:** density and variety of amenities	***M***	GIS datasets, pedestrian network, demos	City of Davis, USA suburban areas; neighbourhood and street level	EX; RB
Iacono et al. (2010) [33]	Urban and transportatio n planning	Relationship between physical environment and non motorized travel (walking and cycling) behaviour	**Efficiency and comfort:** impedance distance and time, pedestrian and bicycling facilities; **Attractiveness**: presence, number, type, dimension of land-use	***M; EJ***	Household travel survey data; Establishmen t-level data; parcel-level land use data	1600 block groups in South Minneapolis; block level	RB
Keyvanfar et al. (2018) [60]	Integrated land use and transport planning	Relationship between physical environment and pedestrian behaviour	**Efficiency and comfort:** width of walking zones, sidewalks networking; street furniture, trees, shelters, street lighting, type of sidewalk pavement, steepness, obstacles/nuisance;	***EJ***	self-report questionnair e to capture pedestrian's DTM for walking	Taman University neighbourhood, Skudai city, Malaysia;	SP

References	Field Background	Main Theories and Methodologies that Guide the Paper	Walkable Factors (Efficiency and Comfort, Pleasantness, Safety, Attractiveness)	Type of Data: M; EJ; HS	Data and Covariables	Sample Social Group Profile scale	Validation
			Safety and security: bike lanes, on-street parking, mid-block crossings, traffic signals, signage, traffic calming devices, medians, lighting, street surveillance, street-facing entrances, street-level façade transparency; **Pleasantness:** enclosure, buffer zone; **Attractiveness:** land use mix, diversity of buildings		towards 3 shopping centres.	path and neighbourhood level	
Koohsari et al. (2013) [87]	Public health	Relationship between urban form and walkability; Influence of urban form on physical activity	**Efficiency and comfort:** shelters and shade; cost; design of the street; design of the street (connectivity), signalization; **Pleasantness:** scenery; architectural and urban design; cleanliness/pollution; **Safety and security:** separation features; lighting; volume/crowding if cars in the street; design of the street; crime/policy presence; **Attractiveness:** presence and number of active services and urban opportunities; presence, density, typology of services	***M; EJ***	Neighbourhood surveys (questionnaires); GIS databases; demos	Melbourne; 330 households 990	RB
Krizek (2003) [62]	Urban planning	Relationship between physical environment and neighbourhood accessibility	**Efficiency and comfort:** block size intersection density, street connectivity;	***M***	Census block-level data, GIS	Central Puget	EX

References	Field Background	Main Theories and Methodologies that Guide the Paper	Walkable Factors (Efficiency and Comfort, Pleasantness, Safety, Attractiveness)	Type of Data: M; EJ; HS	Data and Covariables	Sample Social Group Profile scale	Validation
			Attractiveness: presence and density housing residents and employees, land use mix		dataset (Tiger)	Sound metropolitan area, Washington; 150-meter grid cells level	
Lee and Moudon (2006) [64]	Urban planning	Relationship between physical environment and walking behaviour.	**Efficiency and comfort**: cost, route directness; **Attractiveness**: number of services and urban opportunities; presence and density of active uses; type of services and activities; mix of activities	***M***	Survey data, GIS data, demos	Seattle and suburban area; 608 adult; census block level	RB
Leslie et al. (2007) [102]	Urban planning and public health	Influence of urban form on physical activity	**Efficiency and comfort**: connectivity **Attractiveness**: density **Safety and security:** mixed use;	***M***	Dwelling data, tax valuation and cadastral (parcel) data, PLACE data Census	Adelaide, Australia; census tract level	RB
Lwin and Murayama (2011) [92]	Urban planning	Relation between urban environment and walkability; influence of urban form on physical activity	**Efficiency and comfort:** cost and distance; **Pleasantness:** scenery; **Attractiveness:** number of activities; quality and building footprint	***M***	Fine scale GIS data	Tsukuba, Japan; street level	-
Moura et al. (2017) [81]	Urban and transportation planning	Relationship between physical environment and walking behaviour of	**Efficiency and Comfort:** path connectivity continuity and directness, convenience, land use diversity, sidewalk width, pavement	***M; EJ***	Neighbourhoods and street	2 districts of Lisbon; neighbourhood and street level	SP

References	Field Background	Main Theories and Methodologies that Guide the Paper	Walkable Factors (Efficiency and Comfort, Pleasantness, Safety, Attractiveness)	Type of Data: M; EJ; HS	Data and Covariables	Sample Social Group Profile scale	Validation
		different groups and trip purposes	quality; conspicuousness and visibility of landmarks and wayfinding; public space planning and design standards; **Safety and security:** coexistence between pedestrian and other modes, location of pedestrian crossings and traffic, vigilance effect and perception; **Attractiveness:** conviviality of meeting places and anchor places, street design;		surveys; GIS databases		
Owen et al. (2007) [35]	Public health	Relationship between physical environment and walking behaviour	**Efficiency and comfort:** street connectivity, street intersection density, and proximity; **Attractiveness:** dwelling density, land-use mix, net retail area	***M***	Census data; GIS databases, survey;	Adelaide, Australia; 2650 adults recruited from 32 neighbourhood s with high or low walkability; district level	RB
Peiravian et al. (2014) [36]	Urban and transport planning	Relationship between physical environment and walking behaviour	**Efficiency and comfort**: intersection density; **Attractiveness**: land-use diversity, commercial density, population density	***M***	Census, GIS data	City of Chicago; sub traffic zones level	-

References	Field Background	Main Theories and Methodologies that Guide the Paper	Walkable Factors (Efficiency and Comfort, Pleasantness, Safety, Attractiveness)	Type of Data: M; EJ; HS	Data and Covariables	Sample Social Group Profile scale	Validation
Pikora et al. (2002) [67]	Public health	Relation between built environment and physical activity	**Efficiency and comfort**: street permeability; intersections distance and design; walking surface; streets layout; sedibility; trees; **Safety and security**: lighting; surveillance; traffic volume; on street parking; crossing characteristics; path/lane obstruction; social width; **Attractiveness**: destinations presence; number and type of buildings; **Pleasantness:** Aesthetic of streetscape; sky exposure; facade continuity; softness, visual complexity architecture; trees; maintenance; pollution; cleanliness	***M; EJ***	Data collected with audit; information from external sources (i.e. traffic authorities); GIS datasets	Perth Western Australia; street level	EX; SP
Porta and Renne (2005) [7]	Urban planning	Relationship between built environment and urban sustainability	**Efficiency and comfort:** cost; sedibility; design of the street; **Attractiveness**: presence; typology; **Pleasantness:** softness of spaces; scenery; site's atmosphere; **Safety and security:** Urban texture; Presence of activities	***M***	Statistical data; survey data with photos	Fremantle and Joondalup, Perth, Australia; road survey; street level	-
Rogers et al. (2011) [58]	Urban planning	Influence on urban form on social capital and walkability;	**Efficiency and comfort:** frequency of walk; cost (distance, time); **Pleasantness:** trusting; **Security:** trusting	***EJ***	Neighbourhood audits, statistical data; demos;	Manchester and Portsmouth; census block	-

References	Field Background	Main Theories and Methodologies that Guide the Paper	Walkable Factors (Efficiency and Comfort, Pleasantness, Safety, Attractiveness)	Type of Data: M; EJ; HS	Data and Covariables	Sample Social Group Profile scale	Validation
					social capital metrics		
Ruiz-Padillo et al. (2018) [50]	Transport and urban planning	Influence of urban form on physical activity	**Efficiency and comfort:** road connectivity; steepness of the street, sidewalk width; buildings quality (visual and aesthetic), street furniture quality and cleanliness; pavement materials **Safety and security**: high vehicle traffic flow, crosswalks, assaults and thefts incidence; number of shops and services typology;	***M***	Neighbourhood audits, statistical data; demos;	City of Porto Alegre, Brazil,	SP
Saelens et al. (2003) [42]	Public health	Influence of urban form on physical activity	**Attractiveness:** residential density; mixed land use; **Efficiency and comfort:** street pattern and street connectivity; land use mix–access; sidewalks and pedestrian/bike trails; **Safety and security:** traffic safety and crime safety; **Pleasantness:** aesthetics;	***M; EJ***	Measure of physical activity by accelerometer; survey with self-report measures of neighbourhood environment	San Diego, California; 107 adults of 2 neighbourhoods with high and low walkability; neighbourhood level	RB
Schlossberg et al.(2007) [103]	Transport and urban planning	Relationship between urban form and pedestrian mobility	**Efficiency and comfort:** street network, road types (major, minor), impedance characteristics, street	***M***	GIS dataset	Oregon; 4 middle school areas and transit stop zones;	-

References	Field Background	Main Theories and Methodologies that Guide the Paper	Walkable Factors (Efficiency and Comfort, Pleasantness, Safety, Attractiveness)	Type of Data: M; EJ; HS	Data and Covariables	Sample Social Group Profile scale	Validation
			connectivity, intersection density; pedestrian catchment area ratio;			catchment area level (1.5 mi)	
Su et al. (2019) [68]	Transport and urban planning	Relationship between physical environment and walking behaviour	**Efficiency and comfort:** street connectivity; sidewalk width, slope and curvature; **Attractiveness**: land use mix; destination density; **Pleasantness:** greenspace coverage and quality **Safety and Security:** perceived greenery and enclosure	***M***	Census, demos; geodatabase; camera signaling data	Hangzhou metropolitan area, China	RB
Sundquist et al. (2011) []46	Urban planning and public health	Influence of urban form on physical activity; relationship between physical environment and walking behaviour	**Efficiency and comfort:** street connectivity; **Attractiveness**: land-use mix, residential density;	***M; EJ***	Census, demos; geodatabase; survey;	32 Stockholm; neighbourhood level	RB
Talen (2002) [37]	Urban Planning	Relationship between physical environment and walking behaviour	**Efficiency and comfort:** path distance and topography; **Safety and Security:** design speed of the route; design of the street; **Attractiveness:** presence; typology; quality	***M; EJ***	Census data; demos	Portland; census block	-
Van Dyck et al. (2011) [43]	Public health	Influence of urban form on physical activity and on individual quality of life. *The "PLACE" theory*	**Pleasantness:** scenery; neighbourhood satisfaction; urban texture; cleanliness/pollution; architectural and urban design; landscape design;	***M; HS;EJ***	Questionnaire; planning data; demos	Ghent (59 neighbourhoods); 3500 Belgian adults (20-65); statistical sector	RB

References	Field Background	Main Theories and Methodologies that Guide the Paper	Walkable Factors (Efficiency and Comfort, Pleasantness, Safety, Attractiveness)	Type of Data: M; EJ; HS	Data and Covariables	Sample Social Group Profile scale	Validation
			Security: crime/police presence; A**ttractiveness:** mix of activities, typology; **Comfort**: noise level				
Van Dyck et al. (2013) [44]	Public health	Influence of urban form on physical activity	**Efficiency and comfort:** shelters and shade; cost; design of the street; design of the street (connectivity); signalisation; **Pleasantness:** scenery; architectural and urban design; cleanliness/pollution; urban texture; **Safety and security:** separation features; lighting; activities' atmosphere; volume/crowding if cars in the street; design of the street; crime/policy presence; urban texture; **Attractiveness:** residential density; mix of activities and typology;	***M; EJ***	Statistical data; telephone and mail surveys; demos, social data	Seattle, Baltimore Adelaide, Ghent; adults; administrative unit	RB
Walkonomics [97]	Urban and transportation planning	Influence of urban form on travel behaviour	**Attractiveness:** presence and number of activities; **Efficiency and comfort:** street width, physical barriers, provision and quality of pavement, presence of sidewalk; slope; **Safety and security:** lighting, vandalism, graffiti and presence of police; road accident statistics, street type, traffic speeds. **Pleasantness**:	***M; EJ***	Geospatial open data and crowdsourced reviews from local residents and visitor	San Francisco, New York and England streets; street level	SP

References	Field Background	Main Theories and Methodologies that Guide the Paper	Walkable Factors (Efficiency and Comfort, Pleasantness, Safety, Attractiveness)	Type of Data: M; EJ; HS	Data and Covariables	Sample Social Group Profile scale	Validation
			cleanliness, presence of trees or green vegetation, site atmosphere, aesthetic of places, architectural and landscape design, scenery, pedestrian activity;				
Walkshed [98]	Urban and transportation planning	Influence of urban form on travel behaviour	**Attractiveness:** presence and number of activities; **Efficiency and comfort:** impedance factors	***M***	City governments, Bing, and InfoUSA, and NYC Data Mine	Philadelphia and New York; street level	-
Zuniga-Teran et al. (2017) [45]	Urban planning and public health	Relationship between built environment and walking	**Efficiency and comfort**: street grid; cul-de-sac; back alleys; street connectivity; alternative routes; fences; dwelling type unit; shade; hilly streets; services within 10 min walking distance **Safety, security and certainty:** sidewalks; bike lanes; mixed use; on-street parking; vegetated/dirt strip between sidewalk and carriageway; crosswalks and pedestrian signals; speed bumps; speed limit; dirt trails; streets lit at night; front porches; buildings close to the street; front garage doors; back alleys with garages; signage; landmarks	***M; EJ***	Neighbourhood surveys	Four neighbourhoods in Tucson, Arizona; 380 residents; neighbourhood level	SP, RB

References	Field Background	Main Theories and Methodologies that Guide the Paper	Walkable Factors (Efficiency and Comfort, Pleasantness, Safety, Attractiveness)	Type of Data: M; EJ; HS	Data and Covariables	Sample Social Group Profile scale	Validation
			Attractiveness: greenspace location; greenspace proximity to houses; community facilities proximity; density and diversity of activities and services **Pleasantness:** graffiti, trash/litter, natural sights to look at; attractive buildings and homes; interactions with wildlife; slope; shade, trees along the streets				

LEGEND	Type of Data			Validation		
	Measures (M)	Judgment (J)	Hedonic State (H)	Expert Opinion (EX)	Revealed Behaviors (RB)	Stated Preferences (SP)

References

99. Bias, T.K.; Leyden, K.M.; Abildso, C.G.; Reger-Nash, B.; Bauman, A.E. The importance of being parsimonious: Reliability of a brief community walkability assessment instrument. *Heal. Place* **2010**, *16*, 755–758.
100. Cerin, E.; Saelens, B.E.; Sallis, J.F.; Frank, L.D. Neighborhood environment walkability scale: Validity and development of a short form. *Med. Sci. Sports Exerc*. **2006**, *38*, 1682–1691.
101. Colclough, J.G. Modelling Pedestrian Accessibility Using GIS Techniques to Assess Development Sustainability. *Eur. Transp. Conf.* **2009**, 9 pp. Available online: http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.684.903&rep=rep1&type=pdf (accessed on 27 May 2020).
102. Leslie, E.; Coffee, N.; Frank, L.D.; Owen, N.; Bauman, A.E.; Hugo, G. Walkability of local communities: Using geographic information systems to objectively assess relevant environmental attributes. *Heal. Place* **2007**, *13*, 111–122.
103. Schlossberg, M.; Agrawal, A.W.; Irvin, K. An Assessment of GIS-Enabled Walkability Audits. *J. Urban Reg. Inf. Syst. Assoc.* **2007**. Available online: https://pages.uoregon.edu/schlossb/articles/schlossberg_GIS_audits.pdf (accessed on 27 May 2020).