

Countrywide natural experiment reveals impact of built environment on physical activity

Tim Althoff¹, Boris Ivanovic², Jennifer L. Hicks³, Scott L. Delp^{3,4}, Abby C. King^{5,6}, Jure Leskovec^{7,8}

¹Allen School of Computer Science & Engineering, University of Washington

²NVIDIA Research, Santa Clara, CA

³Department of Bioengineering, Stanford University

⁴Department of Mechanical Engineering, Stanford University

⁵Department of Epidemiology & Population Health, Stanford University School of Medicine

⁶Stanford Prevention Research Center, Department of Medicine, Stanford University School of Medicine

⁷Department of Computer Science, Stanford University

⁸Chan Zuckerberg Biohub, San Francisco, CA

Abstract

While physical activity is critical to human health, most people do not meet recommended guidelines^{1,2}. More walkable built environments have the potential to increase activity across the population³⁻⁸. However, previous studies on the built environment and physical activity have led to mixed findings, possibly due to methodological limitations such as small cohorts, few or single locations, over-reliance on self-reported measures, and cross-sectional designs^{5,7,9-11}. Here, we address these limitations by leveraging a large U.S. cohort of smartphone users (N=2,112,288) to evaluate within-person longitudinal behavior changes that occurred over 248,266 days of objectively-measured physical activity across 7,447 relocations among 1,609 U.S. cities. By analyzing the results of this natural experiment, which exposed individuals to differing built environments, we find that increases in walkability are associated with significant increases in physical activity after relocation (and vice versa). These changes hold across subpopulations of different genders, age, and body-mass index (BMI), and are sustained over three months after moving. The added activity observed after moving to a more walkable location is predominantly composed of moderate-to-vigorous physical activity (MVPA), which is linked to an array of associated health benefits across the life course¹. A simulation experiment demonstrates that substantial walkability improvements (i.e., bringing all US locations to the walkability level of Chicago or Philadelphia) may lead to 10.3% or 33 million more Americans meeting aerobic physical activity guidelines. Evidence against residential self-selection confounding is reported. Our findings provide robust evidence supporting the importance of the built environment in directly improving health-enhancing physical activity, in addition to offering potential guidance for public policy activities in this area.




Figure 1: Physical activity levels undergo significant changes following relocation between U.S. cities of different walkability levels. **a**, During the observation period, 5,424 subjects relocated 7,447 times between 1,609 U.S. cities. Circle area is proportional to the square root of the number of relocations to and from the city. **b**, Subjects' physical activity levels were tracked through smartphone accelerometry over several months before and after relocation, creating a countrywide study of 7,447 quasi-experiments. **c,e** Physical activity of subjects moving from less walkable locations to New York City, **d,f** in comparison to subjects moving in the opposite direction (Methods). Activity levels change significantly immediately after relocation and are symmetric but inverted for subjects moving in the opposite direction. All error bars throughout this paper correspond to bootstrapped 95% confidence intervals.




Figure 2: Relocations with changes in walkability are associated with corresponding changes in physical activity across most demographics. **a**, Difference in average daily steps aggregated across all relocations. We find that significantly more walkable locations are associated with increases of about 1100 daily steps, and significantly less walkable locations are associated with similar decreases (for 49-80 point Walk Score increase/decrease). Moving to locations of similar walkability is associated with unchanged physical activity levels. **b**, Higher walkability is associated with increased daily steps across age, gender, BMI, and baseline activity level groups. Bars show the steps gained per day for each point increase in walkability score (assuming linear model; Methods). Positive values across all bars reveal that, with increasing walkability, more steps are taken by every subgroup, which is significant for all the subgroups except women over age 50 (Student’s t-tests, all $P < 0.05$; women over 50 $P = 0.14$).




Figure 3: Improvements in walkability are associated with increases in moderate-to-vigorous physical activity (MVPA) and with twice as many subjects meeting aerobic physical activity guidelines (49+ point increase). **a-c**, Changes in physical activity stratified by intensity of physical activity (steps/minute) following relocation to more (a; more than 16 point walkability increase), less (b; more than 16 point walkability decrease) and similarly walkable environments (c; 16 point walkability difference or less). **a**, We find that walkability-induced additional physical activity (Figure 2a) predominantly consists of MVPA, which has been shown to be beneficial for many health outcomes.^{12,13} **b**, Moving to less walkable locations is associated with a symmetric loss of MVPA that is equivalent to the increase in more walkable locations (a). **c**, Further, moving to similarly walkable locations is associated with an unchanged distribution of intensity levels. This suggests that relocation, in and of itself, is not generally associated with increases in physical activity, for instance due to an individual's motivation to increase physical activity. **d**, Change in MVPA (minutes/week) versus differences in walkability. $\Delta T(I)$ is defined as the change in weekly minutes of activity at intensity level I after relocation, in units of steps per minute. ΔT_{MVPA} is computed by summing $\Delta T(I)$ for $I \geq 100$ (inset). Large increases in walkability (*i.e.*, 49-80 points) are associated with an increase of about one hour per week in MVPA. **e**, The increases in time spent in MVPA lead to twice as many subjects meeting national and international aerobic physical activity guidelines of 150 min/week or more in MVPA (before 21.5%, after 42.5%). **f**, A simulation based on these estimates predicts that if all U.S. cities had the walkability of Chicago or Philadelphia (Walkability score 78), subjects would increase their average activity by 443 more daily steps and 24 more minutes of MVPA per week, and 11.2% or 36 million additional Americans would then meet national physical activity guidelines for MVPA (Methods).

1 Main Text

A substantial number of people worldwide are physically inactive^{4,14,15} and therefore at risk for common and deadly noncommunicable diseases such as cardiovascular disease, cancer and diabetes^{12,13,15}. Meanwhile, urban environments worldwide have grown rapidly with current estimates predicting 6.7 billion people living in cities by 2050¹⁶. While the evidence base on the impacts of the design of urban environments on physical activity levels has grown, further information is needed on the putative causal impacts of diverse urban environments on key health behaviors such as physical activity^{5,7,10,11,17} and interactions between environmental and individual factors¹⁸. Specifically, current evidence has not been able to disentangle whether physical activity levels are directly influenced by the built environment or are mainly a product of personal preferences^{10,19}. Understanding these factors is critical for developing optimal public policy^{8,20,21} as well as for planning cities^{5,22} and designing behavior change interventions^{23,24}.

Previous studies on the effects of the built environment on physical activity have led to mixed or modest findings and have not been able to reliably distinguish between direct environmental impacts and individual preferences. Common methodological limitations include small cohorts, single or only a few locations, over-reliance on self-reported activity, with its attendant biases²⁵, cross-sectional designs that constrain temporal understanding and causal inference, residential self-selection, and other confounding factors^{5,7,9,19,26,27}. Today's mobile phones, including the now globally dominant smartphone, can capture physical activity and geolocation in a continuous fashion and are a powerful tool for studying large-scale population dynamics and health²³, revealing the basic patterns of physical activity³, sleep²⁸, human movement²⁹, and mood rhythms³⁰, along with the dynamics of the spread of diseases such as malaria³¹ and COVID-19³², and linkages with socioeconomic status in developing countries³³. In this study, we use a large-scale physical activity dataset to disentangle built environment influences from personal proclivities through a natural experiment, and quantify the impact of walkability, on changes in individual and population physical activity levels.

We study 248,266 days of minute-by-minute step recordings from 5,424 users of the Azumio Argus smartphone application, who relocated at least once within a 3-year observation period (Supplementary Table 1). Overall, these subjects relocated a total of 7,447 times among 1,609 cities within the United States, forming a nationwide natural experiment (Figure 1a). The dataset

includes smartphone-derived accelerometry recordings of physical activity for free-living individuals that were exposed to different built environments, enabling us to compare their objectively measured, longitudinal physical activity for up to 90 days pre- and post-relocation (Figure 1b). The average subject recorded 5574 steps per day (standard deviation $\sigma = 3055$) over an average span of 14.2 hours. Research has demonstrated that smartphones provide accurate step counts³⁴ and reliable activity estimates in both laboratory and free-living settings³⁵. Previous work further verified that data from the Argus smartphone application reproduced established relationships between age, gender, weight status, and activity, as well as country-level variations in activity and obesity levels³.

Our large-scale activity measurements enable us to characterize the impact of built environments on physical activity. Consider the 178 subjects relocating to New York City (walkability 89/100) coming from various less walkable U.S. locations (Figure 1c; at least one standard deviation or 15.4 points lower Walk Score; mean walkability 48). When exposed to the built environment of New York City after relocating, these subjects increased their physical activity by 1,400 steps from 5,600 to 7,000 average daily steps ($P < 10^{-10}$, Figure 1e). Subjects relocating in the opposite direction, i.e., from New York City to other less walkable U.S. cities (Figure 1d), exhibited an inverted, symmetric effect of decreasing their physical activity by 1,400 steps from 7,000 to 5,600 average daily steps ($P < 10^{-10}$, Figure 1f; more examples in Figure 4).

To investigate whether moving to more walkable environments generally leads to increased physical activity, we aggregate changes in physical activity across all relocations in the dataset (Figure 2a; Methods). We find that relocations to more walkable cities (Walk Score increases of 49 and higher) are associated with increases of about 1100 daily steps, equivalent to 11 minutes of additional walking activity every day³⁶. While individuals may be more motivated to walk more immediately after relocation, we observe that these increases are sustained over three months after moving (Figure 7c and Figure 8).

Of note, individuals moving to environments with walkability scores similar to the environment from which they came exhibited unchanged activity levels, while the physical activity increases observed with moves to more walkable environments mirrored the physical activity decreases observed when moving to less walkable environments (Figure 2a; Figure 6). Thus, the relationship between walkability and daily steps appears to be monotonic and symmetric. We find

similar, consistent effects of walkability increases and decreases (Methods) between cities in similar climates (*e.g.*, Ellicott City, MD to New York, NY in Figure 2a and more generally across relocations during all seasons (Figure 14), and after relocating to cities of higher, similar, and lower median household income (Figure 15). These results suggests that physical activity levels are directly influenced by the built environment and not simply a product of personal preferences or other types of confounding in the dataset.

We find that higher walkability is associated with significantly more daily steps across all age, gender, body mass index (BMI), and baseline activity level groups, which is significant for all the subgroups except women over age 50 (Figure 2b; Student's t-tests, all $P < 0.05$; women over age 50, $P = 0.14$). Previous research has identified additional barriers to physical activity relevant to older women including cultural expectations, norms, societal messages discouraging physical activity, family priorities, and safety^{37,38}. The relationship between walkability and activity is strongest for highly active women (gaining 43.7 steps per walkability point increase). Importantly, we find that regardless of BMI status, individuals record more steps after moving to more walkable cities, and that these increases are also shared by individuals who were less active prior to moving (Figure 2b). These findings suggest that compared to interventions targeting individuals and reaching small numbers of people, changes to the built environment can influence large populations. However, the relatively smaller effect for older women suggests that, for this group in particular, built environment changes may need to be accompanied by additional age- and gender-specific interventions aimed at their specific constraints.

Next, we investigated whether the walkability-induced increase in steps reflected an increase in moderate-to-vigorous physical activity (MVPA), which has been shown to be beneficial for many health outcomes, including lower all-cause-mortality risk^{12,13}. Using minute-by-minute step data, we find that additional steps taken after moving to a more walkable location are predominantly composed of MVPA corresponding to brisk walks (Figure 3a). We estimate that large increases in walkability (*i.e.*, 49-80 points) are associated with an increase in MVPA of about one hour per week (Figure 3d) Further emphasizing the consistency and symmetry of built environment effects, we find that similar amounts of MVPA are lost when relocating to a less walkable location (Figure 3b), and that the activity intensity distribution remains effectively unchanged when relocating to a similarly walkable location (Figure 3c). U.S. national physical activity guidelines

recommend, similar to international guidelines, 150 or more minutes per week of MVPA in order to obtain optimal health benefits³⁹. For a walkability increase between 48 and 80 points increase, we find that the associated increases in MVPA would support 42.5% of subjects meeting guidelines for MVPA versus 21.5% before relocation, a 98% relative increase (Methods). Our findings substantively expand previous literature indicating that improving the walkability of built environments can lead to better health outcomes across large populations.

We performed a simulation study to predict how improving walkability would support increasing the fraction of the U.S. population that meets aerobic physical activity guidelines (Methods). Our dataset covers 1,609 U.S. cities, which are home to more than 41% of the country's population (137 million), and we adjust for age-differences between the smartphone user population and the U.S. adult population (Methods). According to our smartphone-based objective measurements, about 18% or 58 million Americans met the guidelines for MVPA between 2013–2016. Our estimate of 18% meeting aerobic guidelines is within expectations, given well-established differences between accelerometer-derived and self-reported physical activity (Methods).^{40,41} Our simulation (Figure 3f) predicts that bringing all U.S. locations to the level of Chicago or Philadelphia (walkability score 78) may lead to 11.2% or 36 million more Americans meeting aerobic physical activity guidelines. Bringing all U.S. locations to the level of New York City (walkability score 89) may lead to 14.5% or 47 million more Americans meeting these guidelines.

There are limitations to the device-based instrument (i.e., people's personal smartphones) we used to collect physical activity data in their natural environments. For example, our sample may be biased towards individuals of higher socioeconomic status and people interested in their activity and health. However, we find that walkability improvements led to increased physical activity after relocating to cities of higher, similar, and lower median household income (Figure 15). We further acknowledge that other city characteristics may affect walking and be correlated with the city's walkability (e.g., length of work days). However, we find that walkability differences are associated with physical activity differences in cities of similar climate (Figure 13) and across all seasons (Figure 14). While relocation uniquely enables the quasi-experimental study of behavioral changes in different environments, there may be selection effects driving relocation referred to as residential self-selection¹⁹. However, since we observe no change in activity levels for individuals who moved to a similarly walkable city, and symmetric activity losses in individuals who moved

to less walkable cities, this suggests that the changes we observe are not simply due to individuals who move being more motivated to be more active (Figure 2a, Figure 3c-e, Figure 6). Further, we find that subjects relocating to locations of higher, similar, and lower walkability are similar in age, weight status, and baseline activity levels, limiting our concerns for potential selection effects based on relocation preferences (Figure 12). In addition, the population of relocating subjects closely matched U.S. Census estimates in terms of age and gender distribution (Figure 10; Methods).

Over 90% of adults in the United States already own a smartphone⁴² and the number of mobile connections worldwide has risen to 8.5 billion⁴³, exhibiting significant year-to-year increases. Therefore, we expect any biases related to smartphone ownership and usage to continue to diminish in the future. This study is restricted to a single country and results may not generalize to other countries. However, previous studies have found, in general, similar types of built environment relationships across countries diverse in climate, demographics, income, culture, and activity supportiveness^{5,44-46}. Since these studies employed walkability indices that were based on elements shared with the measure used here (Methods), this suggests that our findings may generalize to other countries. We chose a simple, highly used, and extensively validated measure of walkability at a city level⁴⁷⁻⁵¹. However, this type of aggregated, non-divisible walkability score precludes the ability to identify which elements of walkability may confer the largest benefits. Further research is indicated to identify key environmental features on a neighborhood level and disentangle their individual contributions, building on past cross-sectional research and smaller-scale studies using self-report physical activity measures which currently constitute the majority of research in the field⁵². While walking is the most popular aerobic physical activity⁵³, our dataset may fail to capture time spent in activities where it is impractical to carry a phone (*e.g.*, soccer) or steps are not a major component of the activity (*e.g.*, bicycling), and there may exist systematic differences in wear time, because subjects in the current dataset had to carry their phone for steps to be recorded. The increasing prevalence of wearable activity trackers in the form of smartwatches and similar devices will continue to enable more convenient methods of capturing daily movement and steps. However, our smartphone dataset reproduces previously established relationships between activity across geographic locations, gender and age³. Further, we find that the span of time over which steps were recorded is uncorrelated with relocating to higher or lower walkability

areas (Figure 17), and thus systematic wear time differences are unlikely to affect our analyses. Together, these results increase confidence that our dataset is able to identify activity differences between built environments and groups based on gender, age, and weight status.

This countrywide natural experiment presents prospective evidence of built environments affecting physical activity across 7,447 relocations among 1,609 U.S. cities over a 3-year timespan. It reveals the direct behavioral impacts of differing built environments on individuals' physical activity levels and demonstrates the utility of such massive digitally-enabled real-world datasets for evidence-based policy. Our findings suggest that designing built environments to be more activity-friendly could have significant effects on the physical activity of large populations, and serve as a powerful complement to interventions that focus on changing behavior at the individual-level. However, changes in built environments may need to be accompanied by additional age- and gender-specific interventions aimed at specific subgroups who could particularly benefit from physical activity increases (i.e., women over 50 years old). The quality of the prospective device-collected evidence and consistency of findings across numerous cities, demographic groups, and relocation-related walkability differentials highlight the fundamental importance of the urban built environment in improving physical activity and health.

2 Methods

2.1 Study Design

We conducted a countrywide, prospective, longitudinal physical activity study of United States residents that evaluated their physical activity levels within the context of the walkability of their built environments before and after relocation (“subjects”). We leveraged the naturally occurring physical activity data that was captured by a health app on subjects’ phones to compare each person’s physical activity levels before and after they relocated to a different U.S. area. While similar relocation-based study designs have been used previously to estimate effects of place and built environments^{26,54,55}, the vast majority have been limited by relatively small sample sizes, use only self-report physical activity measurement, and the limited diversity with respect to the areas to which they relocated. Objective measures of both urban walkability and physical activity were used and are discussed in more detail below. We analyzed anonymized, prospectively collected data from 2,112,288 U.S. smartphone users employing the Azumio Argus health app over three years (March 2013 to February 2016) to identify 5,424 subjects that relocated 7,447 times among 1,609 U.S. cities. These 1,609 cities are home to 137 million Americans, or more than 42% of the United States population. We note that relocation is neither purely exogenous nor random and discuss important implications below. We follow established best-practices for analyzing large-scale health data from wearables and smartphone apps⁵⁶.

The Azumio Argus app is a free smartphone application for tracking physical activity and other health behaviors. subjects were excluded from a particular analysis if necessary information was unreported (for example, subjects with no reported age were excluded from the analysis of Figure 2b). Table 1 includes basic statistics on study population demographics and weight status (Body Mass Index; BMI). Data handling and analysis was conducted in accordance with the guidelines of the Stanford University Institutional Review Board.

2.2 Identifying Subject Relocation

We defined subject relocation as the action of moving to a new place for a substantial amount of time. We identified subject relocation as follows. Subject location on a given day was assigned to a city based on the weather update in the subject’s app activity feed. Weather updates are automatically added to the feed of each subject according to the nearest cell phone tower. We

searched for subjects that stayed in one location within a 100 km radius for at least 14 days, and then moved to a different location that was at least 100 km away. Subjects were required to stay within a 100 km radius of this new location for at least another 14 days. The 14 day threshold was chosen to filter out short trips that may be related to business or leisure travel. Using this threshold, we find that most subjects do not relocate again and spend a median of 81 days in the new location, effectively excluding the impact of short-term travel on our analyses. Most subjects stopped to track their activity at this time, rather than relocating again. In addition, we repeated our analyses with thresholds of 21 and 30 days and found highly consistent results (Figure 16). We required a substantial move distance (100 km or more) to ensure that relocating subjects were exposed to a new built environment. We allowed for up to 5 days of intermediate travel between these two locations and ignored these days during analyses. We applied this method to 2,112,288 users of the Argus smartphone app and identified 31,034 relocations. Among these, we required subjects to have used the app to track their physical activity for at least 10 days within 30 days before and after their relocation (as in previous work³). We further required at least one day of tracked physical activity pre- and post-relocation to ensure that whenever we compare two subject populations, that these populations are identical and therefore comparable (i.e., we seek to identify within-subject changes in physical activity). We repeated our statistical analyses with alternative data inclusion criteria, such as the number of days with tracked physical activity, and found similar results.

2.3 Physical Activity Measure

Our device-based (historically often called "objective") measure of physical activity was the number of steps over time recorded by the subject's smartphone. Steps were determined based on the smartphone accelerometers and the manufacturer's proprietary algorithms for step counting. The Azumio Argus app records step measurements on a minute-by-minute basis. Table 2 includes basic statistics on physical activity and tracking in the study population.

Data from the Azumio Argus app have been used previously to study physical activity in large populations^{3,57,58}, where the authors showed that this form of data follows well-established trends.³ For example, they demonstrated that activity decreased with increasing age^{14,18,59,60} and BMI^{18,60,61}, and is lower in females than in males^{14,18,59,60,62}, trends which are consistent with national surveillance data in this area. Physical activity estimates were also reasonably well corre-

lated with self-report-based population estimates on a country level³.

Several studies have established significant differences between accelerometer-derived and self-reported physical activity.^{41,63} Self-reports typically overestimate moderate and vigorous activity and underestimate sedentary activity.⁶³ In a U.S. study using NHANES 2005–2006 data, 59.6% of adults self-reported meeting MVPA guidelines for aerobic physical activity, while estimates using accelerometry were much lower at 9.6%.⁴¹ For our observation period between 2013-2016, the U.S. National Health Interview Survey reported 49.6-52.6% meeting MVPA guidelines. Nationally representative accelerometer-based estimates for this time are not available. Our smartphone-accelerometry-based estimate of 18% is within expectations, given the differences in measurement and prior data.⁴¹ In addition, unlike many prior studies mailing accelerometers to study participants to wear for a week, our study focuses on real-world physical activity by free-living individuals that may not be equally affected by their awareness of being observed (i.e., the Hawthorne effect).

Our estimate of 18% meeting aerobic guidelines is within expectations, given well-established differences between accelerometer-derived and self-reported physical activity (Methods).^{41,64}

We filtered out days as invalid when less than 500 or more than 50,000 steps had been recorded. We further ignored days immediately preceding and following the relocation itself (5 days before/after relocation), because the process of relocating, rather than the new built environment itself, could impact physical activity during these days. Physical activity was relatively stable outside this period (Figure 9). We considered physical activity within a window of 30 days before and 30 days after relocation (with the exception of Figure 7 and Figure 8 that use 90 day windows to illustrate long-term changes). In total, our dataset included 248,266 days of objectively-measured minute-by-minute physical activity surrounding 7,447 relocations (595,803 days for the 180 day period).

We used the following measures as primary outcomes in this study: (1) Change in average daily steps following relocation (Figure 1e-f and Figure 2a-b). (2) Change in average weekly minutes spent in moderate-to-vigorous physical activity (MVPA) following relocation, where we considered all minutes spent at intensities greater or equal to 100 steps/minute as MVPA³⁶: $\Delta T_{MVPA} = \sum_{I=100}^{\infty} \Delta T(I)$, where $\Delta T(I)$ is defined as the change in weekly minutes of activity at intensity level I , in units of steps per minute, after moving. Figures 3a-c shows changes in average weekly

minutes spent at different intensity levels. (3) Change in the fraction of the population that met aerobic physical activity guidelines following relocation, defined as spending at least 150 minutes per week in MVPA²⁰ (Figure 3e-f). All error bars correspond to bootstrapped 95% confidence intervals⁶⁵.

2.4 Walkability Measure

We considered relocations among 1,609 cities in the United States. Walkability scores for these cities were based on the publicly available and systematically developed Walk Score⁶⁶. Scores are on a scale of 1 to 100 (100 = most walkable) and are based on amenities (*e.g.*, grocery stores, schools, parks, restaurants, and retail) within a 0.25 to 1.5 mile radius (a decay function penalizes more distant amenities) and measures of friendliness to pedestrians, such as city block length and intersection density. Table 3 includes basic statistics on the cities included in our study and their walkability scores.

The Walk Score measure is a frequently employed measure of walkability that is freely and widely available across the United States and other countries including Canada and Australia⁶⁶. It is highly correlated⁵⁰ with other walkability measures⁶⁷⁻⁶⁹, and was found to offer the best fit to walking trips in a study conducted in Montréal⁵⁰. It is widely used in the literature and has been extensively validated^{47-51,70}. While other measures of walkability exist⁶⁷⁻⁶⁹, the Walk Score measure was chosen in light of the pragmatic focus of the investigation and its ease of use and accessibility. More comprehensive walkability indices could provide further granular information related to specific aspects of walkability that might be of prime importance.

Among the 7,447 relocations, 2.4% (2.4%) were associated with 49+ walkability point increases (decreases), 20.7% (21.3%) were associated with 16-48 walkability point increases (decreases), and 53.1% of relocations were to similarly walkability locations (-16 to 16 point difference).

2.5 Aggregating Relocation-based Quasi-experiments Across United States

We aggregated changes in physical activity following relocation based on the difference in walkability scores between the origin and destination city, Δ . In Figure 2a, each circle corresponds to a pair of cities sized by the number of subjects moving between those cities. We fit a linear model $m \cdot \Delta + b$ to these data with slope $m = 16.6$ (Student's t-test; $P < 10^{-10}$) and intercept $b = 25.0$

(Student’s t-test; $P = 0.462$).

We considered potential confounders such as differences in climate and median income between the origin and destination city. We found that the relationship between walkability and walking behavior still holds within pairs of cities with similar climate, for instance moving from Miami, Florida to Jacksonville, Florida, or from Amarillo, Texas to Euless, Texas (see annotations in Figure 2a as well as more generally in Figure 13). Further, we found similar effects across relocations in all seasons (Figure 14), and relocations to cities with higher, lower, and similar median household income levels (Figure 15).

2.6 Impact Of Walkability Across Demographics, Weight Status, And Activity Level

We considered the effect of walkability differences on change in physical activity across subgroups based on demographics, weight status, previous activity level, and gender (ages 18-29, age 30-49, and age 50+ years; normal, overweight, and obese levels of BMI; below 5000, 5000-8500, and above 8500 average daily steps before relocation; males and females). Due to the approximately linear nature of the relationship between walkability changes and physical activity changes (Figure 2a), we used a linear model for estimation. For each subgroup, we ran independent linear regressions of the difference in daily steps on differences in walkability between cities at the level of individual relocations. The models included an intercept coefficient: $m \cdot \Delta + b$. We determined the estimated coefficient of walkability (m ; that is, the increase in daily steps for each one-point increase in walkability of a city) along with 95% confidence intervals (based on Student’s t-distribution) for each subgroup (Figure 2b). We performed Student’s t-tests on the regression model coefficients, which establish that relocation to a city of higher walkability is associated with significantly more daily steps across all age, gender, BMI, and activity level groups (Student’s t-test; all $P < 0.05$), with the exception of women over 50 years for which the positive difference was not statistically significant (Student’s t-test, $P = 0.14$). We found that the effect was diminished in overweight and obese women relative to normal-weight women. Thus, the non-significant effect on women over 50 years of age may be explained in part by the larger average BMI of this group (27.4) compared to other women (25.3; $P < 10^{-10}$). In comparison, men over 50 years of age also had a larger BMI compared to other men, but the difference was smaller than in women

(28.2 vs. 27.0; $P < 10^{-7}$).

2.7 Adjusting For Seasonality

Physical activity is influenced by climate and weather⁷¹ and relocations are not equally distributed across seasons (Figure 7a). We found that differences in physical activity levels following relocations may be influenced by seasonal variation, especially when considering comparatively long observation periods of about six months (Figure 7bc). For analyses of variation in activity over time (Figure 1e-f, Figure 4, Figure 7, Figure 8), we adjusted for these seasonal effects by weighting relocations in each calendar months equally. This was achieved by first estimating physical activity levels separately for each calendar month and then taking the average. This process is repeated 1000 times in our bootstrap estimates.

2.8 Selection Effects In Relocation And Mobile App Usage

While relocation uniquely enabled the quasi-experimental study of behavioral changes in different environments, there may be selection effects driving relocation, often referred to as residential self-selection. According to a 2013 U.S. Census Bureau report, 97% of people moved primarily for reasons of housing, family, and employment⁷². Less than 1% of people moved primarily for health reasons. In addition, neighborhood selection may be influenced by personal preferences such as exercise and walking activities¹⁹. With respect to this possibility, note that we found no indication of increases in physical activity after moving to a location of similar walkability (Figure 2a and Figure 3c). This suggests that those relocating subjects are not simply more motivated to exercise, on average, but that changes in physical activity may be explained by the changing built environment. We further acknowledge that other city characteristics may affect walking and be correlated with the city's walkability (*e.g.*, length of work days). We investigated potential selection effects further by comparing the population of relocating mobile app users, first, to the overall U.S. population, and second, to the overall mobile app user population, including non-relocating app users. We found that the relocating subject population is similar in age (36 vs 37.7 median age) and gender (49.8 vs 51.0% female, $P = 0.132$) to the U.S. population. We adjusted for differences in age for the simulation estimates in Figure 3f and Figure 5. Within the app user population, we found that movers and non-movers (*i.e.*, relocating and non-relocating subjects) tend to be close in age (43.8 vs 37.9 and 38.5 vs 33.7 average age for men and women, respectively; Figures 11a and 11b), and

weight status (68.1 vs 59.8 and 45.6 vs 44.3 percent overweight and obese for men and women, respectively; Figures 11c and 11d). However, movers were generally more physically active than non-movers (6,284 vs 5,825 and 5,279 vs 4,635 average daily steps for men and women, respectively; Figures 11e and 11f). Further, we found that within movers, those that relocate to higher, similar, and lower walkability locations were similar in age, weight status, and previous physical activity levels (Figure 12).

2.9 Simulating The Impact Of Walkability Improvements Across The U.S. Population

We simulated the impact of U.S. nationwide walkability improvements on U.S. population physical activity levels. Concretely, we simulated the impact of increasing U.S. city walkability scores to a constant target walkability score between 1 and 100. We additionally highlight the walkability scores of Chicago and Philadelphia (78) as well as New York City (89) to aid interpretation. Since the relocation population was not explicitly drawn to be representative of the U.S. population, we adjusted our estimates through ratio-based post-stratification weights across age-based strata⁷³. We used civilian population estimates from the U.S. Census Bureau for 2016 as the target population distribution. While there were no significant differences in the gender distribution (49.8% female vs 51.0% female, $P = 0.132$), we found slight differences in age (36.0 vs 37.7 median age) that we corrected for through sampling weights. We acknowledge that other selection effects and heterogeneous treatment effects may exist. Using a bootstrap with 1000 replications, we estimated the difference in the overall U.S. population that would meet U.S. national aerobic physical activity guidelines for MVPA¹ after relocating based on the relocation-induced difference in walkability. We used a linear regression model and data from relocations associated with both walkability increases and decreases. We estimated the total fraction of U.S. population meeting aerobic physical activity guidelines as the sum between the fraction of people already meeting these guidelines before relocating plus the estimated addition based on the regression model. Confidence intervals represent bootstrapped 95% confidence intervals. Final estimates are depicted in Figure 3f and Figure 5.

2.10 Role of the Funding Source

We thank Azumio for donating the data for independent research, and M. Zitnik, E. Pierson, R. Susic, S. Kumar, and D. Hallac for comments and discussions. T.A., B.I., J.L.H, S.L.D., A.C.K., and J.L. were supported by a National Institutes of Health (NIH) grant (U54 EB020405, Mobilize Center, NIH Big Data to Knowledge Center of Excellence). T.A. was supported in part by NSF IIS-1901386, NSF CAREER IIS-2142794, Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation (INV-004841) grants. J.L.H and S.L.D. were supported by NIH grants P41 EB027060, P2C CHD101913, R01 GM124443, and the Wu Tsai Human Performance Alliance. A.C.K. King was supported in part by US National Institutes of Health (NIH) National Institute on Aging grant 5R01AG07149002. Funders were not involved in planning or executing the study and they were not involved in preparing the manuscript. The authors had full access to all of the data in the study and had the final responsibility for the decision to submit for publication.

Data availability. Data are available at

<https://github.com/behavioral-data/movers-public>.

Code availability. Code is available at

<https://github.com/behavioral-data/movers-public>.

Bibliography

1. 2018 Physical Activity Guidelines Advisory Committee and others. 2018 Physical Activity Guidelines Advisory Committee Scientific Report (2018).
2. Bull, F. C. *et al.* World health organization 2020 guidelines on physical activity and sedentary behaviour. *British Journal of Sports Medicine* **54**, 1451–1462 (2020).
3. Althoff, T. *et al.* Large-scale physical activity data reveal worldwide activity inequality. *Nature* **547**, 336 (2017).
4. Kohl, H. W. *et al.* The pandemic of physical inactivity: global action for public health. *Lancet* **380**, 294–305 (2012).
5. Sallis, J. F. *et al.* Physical activity in relation to urban environments in 14 cities worldwide: a cross-sectional study. *Lancet* **387**, 2207–2217 (2016).
6. Giles-Corti, B. *et al.* City planning and population health: a global challenge. *Lancet* **388**, 2912–2924 (2016).
7. Deweerdt, S. Mobility: The urban downshift. *Nature* **531**, S52–S53 (2016).
8. Graham-Rowe, D. Public Planning: Designs fit for purpose. *Nature* **493**, S4 (2013).
9. Goenka, S. & Andersen, L. B. Our health is a function of where we live. *Lancet* **387**, 2168–2170 (2016).
10. Ding, D. *et al.* Moving to an active lifestyle? a systematic review of the effects of residential relocation on walking, physical activity and travel behaviour. *British Journal of Sports Medicine* **52**, 789–799 (2018). URL <https://bjsm.bmj.com/content/52/12/789>.
<https://bjsm.bmj.com/content/52/12/789.full.pdf>.
11. Prince, S. A. *et al.* Examining the state, quality and strength of the evidence in the research on built environments and physical activity among adults: An overview of reviews from high income countries. *Health & Place* **77**, 102874 (2022). URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1353829222001356>.

12. Lee, I.-M. *et al.* Effect of physical inactivity on major non-communicable diseases worldwide: an analysis of burden of disease and life expectancy. *Lancet* **380**, 219–229 (2012).
13. WHO. *Global recommendations on physical activity for health* (World Health Organization, Geneva, 2010).
14. Hallal, P. C. *et al.* Global physical activity levels: surveillance progress, pitfalls, and prospects. *Lancet* **380**, 247–257 (2012).
15. Sallis, J. F. *et al.* Progress in physical activity over the olympic quadrennium. *Lancet* **388**, 1325–1336 (2016).
16. UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs. *World Urbanization Prospects: The 2018 Revision* (2018).
17. Stearns, J. A. *et al.* An umbrella review of the best and most up-to-date evidence on the built environment and physical activity in older adults ≥ 60 years. *Public Health Reviews* **44** (2023). URL <https://www.ssph-journal.org/articles/10.3389/phrs.2023.1605474>.
18. Bauman, A. E. *et al.* Correlates of physical activity: why are some people physically active and others not? *Lancet* **380**, 258–271 (2012).
19. McCormack, G. R. & Shiell, A. In search of causality: a systematic review of the relationship between the built environment and physical activity among adults. *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity* **8**, 125 (2011).
20. Physical Activity Guidelines Advisory Committee. *Physical Activity Guidelines Advisory Committee Report. Department of Health and Human Services, Washington, DC* (2008).
21. Chokshi, D. A. & Farley, T. A. Changing behaviors to prevent noncommunicable diseases. *Science* **345**, 1243–1244 (2014).
22. Bettencourt, L. & West, G. A unified theory of urban living. *Nature* **467**, 912 (2010).
23. Servick, K. Mind the phone. *Science* **350**, 1306–1309 (2015).

24. Reis, R. S. *et al.* Scaling up physical activity interventions worldwide: stepping up to larger and smarter approaches to get people moving. *Lancet* **388**, 1337–1348 (2016).
25. Prince, S. A. *et al.* A comparison of direct versus self-report measures for assessing physical activity in adults: a systematic review. *Int. J. Behav. Phys. Act.* **5**, 56 (2008).
26. Giles-Corti, B. *et al.* The influence of urban design on neighbourhood walking following residential relocation: longitudinal results from the reside study. *Social Science & Medicine* **77**, 20–30 (2013).
27. Ludwig, J. *et al.* Neighborhood effects on the long-term well-being of low-income adults. *Science* **337**, 1505–1510 (2012).
28. Walch, O. J., Cochran, A. & Forger, D. B. A global quantification of “normal” sleep schedules using smartphone data. *Sci. Adv.* **2**, e15017705 (2016).
29. González, M. C., Hidalgo, C. A. & Barabási, A.-L. Understanding individual human mobility patterns. *Nature* **453**, 779–782 (2008).
30. Golder, S. A. & Macy, M. W. Diurnal and seasonal mood vary with work, sleep, and daylength across diverse cultures. *Science* **333**, 1878–1881 (2011).
31. Wesolowski, A. *et al.* Quantifying the impact of human mobility on malaria. *Science* **338**, 267–270 (2012).
32. Chang, S. *et al.* Mobility network models of covid-19 explain inequities and inform reopening. *Nature* **589**, 82–87 (2021).
33. Blumenstock, J., Cadamuro, G. & On, R. Predicting poverty and wealth from mobile phone metadata. *Science* **350**, 1073–1076 (2015).
34. Case, M. A., Burwick, H. A., Volpp, K. G. & Patel, M. S. Accuracy of smartphone applications and wearable devices for tracking physical activity data. *JAMA* **313**, 625–626 (2015).
35. Hekler, E. B. *et al.* Validation of physical activity tracking via android smartphones compared to ActiGraph accelerometer: laboratory-based and free-living validation studies. *JMIR mHealth uHealth* **3**, e36 (2015).

36. Marshall, S. J. *et al.* Translating physical activity recommendations into a pedometer-based step goal: 3000 steps in 30 minutes. *American journal of preventive medicine* **36**, 410–415 (2009).
37. Vrazel, J., Saunders, R. P. & Wilcox, S. An overview and proposed framework of social-environmental influences on the physical-activity behavior of women. *American journal of health promotion* **23**, 2–12 (2008).
38. Eyler, A. A. *et al.* Environmental, policy, and cultural factors related to physical activity in a diverse sample of women: the women’s cardiovascular health network project—introduction and methodology. *Women & health* **36**, 1–15 (2002).
39. US Department of Health and Human Services. Physical Activity Guidelines for Americans. <https://health.gov/our-work/nutrition-physical-activity/physical-activity-guidelines/current-guidelines> (2018). Accessed September 7, 2023.
40. Prince, S. A. *et al.* A comparison of direct versus self-report measures for assessing physical activity in adults: a systematic review. *International journal of behavioral nutrition and physical activity* **5**, 1–24 (2008).
41. Tucker, J. M., Welk, G. J. & Beyler, N. K. Physical activity in us adults: compliance with the physical activity guidelines for americans. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine* **40**, 454–461 (2011).
42. Pew Research Center. Mobile fact sheet. <http://www.pewinternet.org/fact-sheet/mobile/> (2024). Accessed February 19, 2024.
43. Ericsson. Ericsson Mobility Report, November 2023. <https://www.ericsson.com/4ae12c/assets/local/reports-papers/mobility-report/documents/2023/ericsson-mobility-report-november-2023.pdf> (2023). Accessed February 19, 2024.

44. Kerr, J. *et al.* Advancing science and policy through a coordinated international study of physical activity and built environments: Ipen adult methods. *Journal of Physical Activity and Health* **10**, 581–601 (2013).
45. Adams, M. A. *et al.* International variation in neighborhood walkability, transit, and recreation environments using geographic information systems: the ipen adult study. *International journal of health geographics* **13**, 43 (2014).
46. Cerin, E. *et al.* Neighborhood environments and objectively measured physical activity in 11 countries. *Medicine and science in sports and exercise* **46**, 2253 (2014).
47. Duncan, D. T., Aldstadt, J., Whalen, J., Melly, S. J. & Gortmaker, S. L. Validation of Walk Score® for estimating neighborhood walkability: an analysis of four US metropolitan areas. *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health* **8**, 4160–4179 (2011).
48. Carr, L. J., Dunsiger, S. I. & Marcus, B. H. Walk score™ as a global estimate of neighborhood walkability. *American journal of preventive medicine* **39**, 460–463 (2010).
49. Carr, L. J., Dunsiger, S. I. & Marcus, B. H. Validation of walk score for estimating access to walkable amenities. *Br J Sports Med* **45**, 1144–1148 (2011).
50. Manaugh, K. & El-Geneidy, A. Validating walkability indices: How do different households respond to the walkability of their neighborhood? *Transportation research part D: transport and environment* **16**, 309–315 (2011).
51. Hirsch, J. A., Moore, K. A., Evenson, K. R., Rodriguez, D. A. & Roux, A. V. D. Walk score® and transit score® and walking in the multi-ethnic study of atherosclerosis. *American journal of preventive medicine* **45**, 158–166 (2013).
52. Smith, M. *et al.* Systematic literature review of built environment effects on physical activity and active transport—an update and new findings on health equity. *International journal of behavioral nutrition and physical activity* **14**, 1–27 (2017).
53. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. CDC vital signs: more people walk to better health. <http://www.cdc.gov/vitalsigns/walking/> (2012). Accessed November 3, 2016.

54. Chetty, R. & Hendren, N. The impacts of neighborhoods on intergenerational mobility i: Childhood exposure effects. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* **133**, 1107–1162 (2018).
55. Christie, C. D., Friedenreich, C. M., Vena, J. E., Turley, L. & McCormack, G. R. Cross-sectional and longitudinal associations between the built environment and walking: effect modification by socioeconomic status. *BMC public health* **22**, 1233 (2022).
56. Hicks, J. L. *et al.* Best practices for analyzing large-scale health data from wearables and smartphone apps. *NPJ digital medicine* **2**, 45 (2019).
57. Althoff, T., Jindal, P. & Leskovec, J. Online actions with offline impact: How online social networks influence online and offline user behavior. In *Proceedings of the tenth ACM International Conference on Web Search and Data Mining*, 537–546 (2017).
58. Shamel, A., Althoff, T., Saberi, A. & Leskovec, J. How gamification affects physical activity: Large-scale analysis of walking challenges in a mobile application. In *Proceedings of the 26th International Conference on World Wide Web*, 455–463 (2017).
59. Bassett, D. R., Wyatt, H. R., Thompson, H., Peters, J. C. & Hill, J. O. Pedometer-measured physical activity and health behaviors in U.S. adults. *Med. Sci. Sport. Exer.* **42**, 1819–1825 (2010).
60. Troiano, R. P. *et al.* Physical activity in the United States measured by accelerometer. *Med. Sci. Sport. Exer.* **40**, 181–188 (2008).
61. Van Dyck, D. *et al.* International study of objectively measured physical activity and sedentary time with body mass index and obesity: IPEN adult study. *Int. J. Obes.* **39**, 199–207 (2015).
62. Tudor-Locke, C., Johnson, W. D. & Katzmarzyk, P. T. Accelerometer-determined steps per day in US adults. *Med. Sci. Sport. Exer.* **41**, 1384–1391 (2009).
63. Prince, S. A. *et al.* A comparison of self-reported and device measured sedentary behaviour in adults: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity* **17**, 1–17 (2020).

64. Colley, R. C., Butler, G., Garriguet, D., Prince, S. A. & Roberts, K. C. Comparison of self-reported and accelerometer-measured physical activity in canadian adults. *Health Reports* **29**, 3–15 (2018).
65. Efron, B. & Tibshirani, R. J. *An introduction to the bootstrap* (CRC press, 1994).
66. Walk Score. <https://www.walkscore.com/cities-and-neighborhoods/>. Accessed June 17, 2018.
67. Frank, L. D., Schmid, T. L., Sallis, J. F., Chapman, J. & Saelens, B. E. Linking objectively measured physical activity with objectively measured urban form: findings from smartraq. *American journal of preventive medicine* **28**, 117–125 (2005).
68. Kuzmyak, J., Baber, C. & Savory, D. Use of walk opportunities index to quantify local accessibility. *Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board* 145–153 (2006).
69. Porta, S. & Renne, J. L. Linking urban design to sustainability: formal indicators of social urban sustainability field research in perth, western australia. *Urban Design International* **10**, 51–64 (2005).
70. Brown, J. A., Curtin, K. D., Thomson, M., Kung, J. Y. & Nykiforuk, C. I. Contributions and limitations walk score® in the context of walkability: A scoping review. *Environment and Behavior* 00139165231201611 (2023).
71. Tucker, P. & Gilliland, J. The effect of season and weather on physical activity: a systematic review. *Public health* **121**, 909–922 (2007).
72. U.S. Census Bureau. Current Population Survey, Annual Social and Economic Supplement. <https://www.census.gov/content/dam/Census/library/publications/2014/demo/p20-574.pdf>. Accessed July 25, 2018.
73. Bethlehem, J. *Applied survey methods: A statistical perspective*, vol. 558 (John Wiley & Sons, 2009).

Supplementary Information




Figure 4: Subjects’ physical activity levels undergo significant changes following relocation to and from specific locations of different walkability. Examples show physical activity levels for subjects moving from/to New York, NY, San Jose, CA, and Albuquerque, NM (differences in walkscore of more than one standard deviation of 15.4 points). Physical activity levels change significantly by about 1,200 - 1,400 daily steps depending on the location. Note the symmetry between moving from (left) and to (right) specific locations.




Figure 5: **Simulating the impact of walkability improvements on United States physical activity levels.** **a**, Estimated fraction of population with 150 minutes or MVPA or more per week following an increase in walkability across all represented U.S. locations. **b**, Average amount of MVPA added across population following an increase in walkability across all represented U.S. locations. **c**, Average amount of daily steps added across population following an increase in walkability across all represented U.S. locations.




Figure 6: **Changes in average daily steps following relocation between specific walkability score quintiles.** Changes in physical activity levels are approximately symmetric and close to zero for relocations to the same walkability score quintile.




Figure 7: Relocations are not uniformly distributed across the year and activity levels need to be adjusted to exclude seasonal effects (Methods). **a**, Histogram of number of days with tracked physical activity is non-uniform with more relocations in December and January. **b**, Changes in physical activity when relocating from highly walkable to less walkable built environments, without adjusting for the number of relocations across seasons. We observe clearly changing physical activity levels before and after relocation that may be explained by the more moderate weather in fall and spring versus winter. **c**, After adjusting for seasonal effects by weighting all months equally, physical activity levels before and after relocation are more stable.




Figure 8: Changes in physical activity levels following relocation are still observed after three months. Examples show physical activity levels for subjects moving from/to San Diego, CA, San Francisco, CA, and Baltimore, MD. The observation period is extended from 30 days to 90 days pre- and post-relocation. Observed changes in physical activity levels suggest that built environment influences persist over at least three months and may lead to sustained long-term behavior change.




Figure 9: **Five days immediately before and after relocation are filtered out to exclude effects from the relocation process itself.** Outside this interval, subjects' physical activity levels were relatively stable. Figure depicts relocations to similarly walkable locations (walkability score difference between -16 and 16).




Figure 10: **Demographics of relocating subjects (Movers) in our dataset compared to U.S. Census estimates for movers.** While there are no significant differences in the gender distribution (49.8% female vs. 50.4% female, $P = 0.423$, Z-test), we find a slightly lower age in our data for movers compared to the US Census reported movers (36.0 vs 37.7 median age), that we corrected for in the simulation experiment (Figure 3f, Figure 5).




Figure 11: **Comparison of relocating subjects (movers) to all subjects in our dataset to understand potential selection effects.** Within the study population, we find that movers and non-movers (*i.e.*, relocating and non-relocating subjects) tend to be **a-b**, close in age (43.8 vs 37.9 and 38.5 vs 33.7 average age for men and women, respectively), **c-d**, and weight status (68.1 vs 59.8 and 45.6 vs 44.3 percent overweight and obese for men and women, respectively). **e-f**, However, movers were generally more physically active than non-movers (6,284 vs 5,825 and 5,279 vs 4,635 average daily steps for men and women, respectively).




Figure 12: **Comparison of different groups of relocating subjects (movers) to understand potential selection effects.** Within the study population, we find that movers to higher (greater than 16 walkability points), similar (within 16 walkability points), and lower (less than -16 walkability points) walkability locations tend to be **a-b**, close in age (44.4 vs 43.7 vs 45.0 and 39.0 vs 38.3 vs 38.3 average age for men and women moving to higher, similar, and lower walkability locations, respectively), **c-d**, weight status (69.3 vs 67.3 vs 66.5 and 46.6 vs 44.9 vs 46.1 percent overweight and obese for men and women moving to higher, similar, and lower walkability locations, respectively), **e-f**, and baseline physical activity levels (6,257 vs 6,229 vs 6,301 and 5,422 vs 5,239 vs 5,405 average daily steps for men and women moving to higher, similar, and lower walkability locations, respectively).




Figure 13: **Relationship between city walkability and physical activity holds for relocations to the same Köppen climate type.** We find that that relocations to more walkable cities are associated with significant increases in physical activity across moves to the same Köppen climate type. These results suggest that our main result—city walkability impacts physical activity—is independent of any potential climate bias in our sample (i.e., moves to a more favorable climate for physical activity are not driving the differences we observe).




Figure 14: **Relationship between city walkability and physical activity holds for relocations within any given season.** We find that that relocations to more walkable cities are associated with significant increases in physical activity across moves that occur within any given season (all $P < 10^{-3}$). These results suggest that our main result—city walkability impacts physical activity—is independent of any potential temporal bias in our sample (i.e., moves during a time that is more favorable for physical activity are not driving the differences we observe).




Figure 15: **Relationship between city walkability and physical activity holds within U.S. cities of similar income.** We find that that relocations to more walkable cities are associated with significant increases in physical activity across all three groups (increasing, similar, and decreasing median county household income in USD). These results suggest that our main result—city walkability impacts physical activity—is robust to potential socioeconomic bias in our sample.




Figure 16: **Different definitions of relocation lead to highly consistent results.** After relocation, subjects are required to stay in the new location for at least 14, 21, or 30 days. We find that all of these definitions lead to highly consistent results as most relocating subjects stay for substantially longer periods of time (median 81 days). In the rest of the paper, we use the 14 day definition (purple).




Figure 17: **Higher physical activity in more walkability cities is not explained by differences in estimated wear time.** Subjects have an average span of 14.2h between the first and last recorded step, our proxy for daily wear time (Methods). **a**, Wear time estimates before and after relocation are 14.16 hours and 14.18 hours, respectively, with no significant difference ($P = 0.807$). **b**, We find no significant association between relocation-induced difference in walkability and wear time. The line shows the best linear fit using data from all relocations. Its slope is not significantly different from zero (slope 0.0014; $P = 0.371$). These results suggest that differences in recorded steps after relocation are due to actual differences in physical activity behavior and are not explained by differences in wear time.

Table 1: Summary of demographic statistics for the study subjects (Methods). Study observation period ranged from March 2013 to February 2016. Percentages are in parentheses. NA refers to missingness in data.

Quantity	All subjects	Movers	Non-movers
Total subjects	2,112,288 (100.0)	5,424 (100.0)	2,106,864 (100.0)
Median Age	32	36	32
Moves per subject	-	Min: 1.0, Max: 9.0, Avg: 1.37	-
# Female	413,373 (48.1)	1,732 (49.8)	411,641 (48.1)
# Male	446,406 (51.9)	1,748 (50.2)	444,658 (51.9)
# gender NA	1,252,509 (59.3)	1,944 (35.8)	1,250,565 (59.4)
# Overweight	347,964 (30.4)	1,549 (33.2)	346,415 (30.4)
# Obese	241,842 (21.2)	1,073 (23.0)	240,769 (21.2)
# BMI NA	969,538 (45.9)	760 (14.0)	968,778 (46.0)

Table 2: Summary of physical activity statistics for the study subjects (Methods). Statistics are averages unless otherwise noted with standard deviations in parentheses.

Quantity	Value
# Daily Steps	
Overall	5574 (3055)
Before Move	5559 (3059)
After Move	5588 (3051)
# Minutes MVPA	
Overall	103 (104)
Before Move	102 (101)
After Move	104 (106)
% Population Meeting PA Guidelines	
Overall	23.9
Before Move	23.4
After Move	24.4
# Days Tracked per Relocation (30 days)	
Total	248,266
Min	2
Max	51
Mean	33.3 (12.7)
# Days Tracked per Relocation (90 days)	
Total	595,803
Min	1
Max	153
Mean	80.0 (39.4)

Table 3: Location and walkability statistics for all locations included in our study with at least 70 moving subjects (sorted alphabetically). Percentages are in parentheses.

City	Walkability	# Moving subjects	# Female	# Overweight
Atlanta, GA	48	140	46 (53.5)	37 (30.6)
Austin, TX	39	123	38 (49.4)	37 (35.6)
Boston, MA	81	106	34 (53.1)	27 (32.1)
Charlotte, NC	26	71	20 (51.3)	20 (37.0)
Chicago, IL	78	222	60 (48.4)	61 (32.8)
Dallas, TX	45	121	27 (34.2)	46 (43.4)
Denver, CO	60	72	28 (58.3)	24 (36.9)
Honolulu, HI	63	74	19 (37.3)	27 (39.7)
Houston, TX	48	167	48 (43.2)	54 (38.6)
Las Vegas, NV	40	179	43 (38.7)	57 (38.8)
Los Angeles, CA	66	224	77 (48.7)	62 (31.3)
Miami, FL	78	98	21 (39.6)	32 (37.6)
New Orleans, LA	57	70	26 (56.5)	13 (20.6)
New York, NY	89	257	90 (55.2)	74 (32.0)
Orlando, FL	41	195	57 (44.9)	72 (42.1)
Philadelphia, PA	78	75	26 (54.2)	20 (32.3)
Phoenix, AZ	40	97	32 (43.2)	38 (42.2)
Portland, OR	64	72	30 (55.6)	19 (31.1)
San Antonio, TX	36	102	25 (36.8)	32 (35.6)
San Diego, CA	50	196	57 (47.5)	54 (32.1)
San Francisco, CA	86	205	57 (42.5)	61 (33.3)
San Jose, CA	50	95	31 (51.7)	21 (24.7)
Seattle, WA	73	103	29 (50.0)	24 (26.4)