

Peer Review Report

Review Report on Scoping review on the effectiveness of movement-friendly environments on health: mobility infrastructures in Europe

Review, Public Health Rev

Reviewer: Bern Grush

Submitted on: 22 Dec 2023

Article DOI: 10.3389/phrs.2024.1606862

EVALUATION

Q 1 Please summarize the main theme of the review.

Do changes (improvements) in active mobility infrastructure impact human health and environmental health? Which changes? What Impacts?

Yes, changes that increase walking, and bike use have a positive impact on human health and a positive impact on environmental health.

Q 2 Please highlight the limitations and strengths.

A major strength is the overwhelming confirmation that improving the active environment has a noticeable effect on its active use.

A major limitation is that the study looked predominantly at the impact of adding or changing things to the active environment (carrots). It did not (and was not designed to) include the impact of removing incentives from driving (sticks), for example, increasing parking fees, removing road lanes, reducing parking spots, road pricing, etc.) We need to study what that does AND how the carrots and sticks can be integrated.

For example, widening my sidewalk did not change my driving behaviour, but increasing parking pricing downtown increased my use of the subway (true story). You need BOTH.

Q 3 Please provide your detailed review report to the authors, structured in major and minor comments.

My detailed review is provided throughout my other comments.

I want to comment about the tables and illustrations. (no place on the review form). I clicked that they were inadequate. All I mean is that they can be improved graphically... otherwise OK...

Here are three other reviews in 2023 (a question I was asked, but no place to list them):

These other authors are also claiming that this is an under-reviewed issue... Frankly, I was surprised...

<https://www.mdpi.com/2673-7590/3/4/76/pdf>

https://www.annfamned.org/content/21/Supplement_1/3657

<https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2023.10.03.23296478v1>

PLEASE COMMENT

Q 4 Does the reference list cover the relevant literature adequately and in an unbiased manner?

Yes. The reference list is unbiased relative to the TITLE, but not to the broader, underlying, unstated QUESTION/ TOPIC "how can we MAXIMIZE active transportation and MINIMIZE motor vehicle use."

This is NOT a criticism of execution of the study and report, it is a general criticism of tackling one half of a very complex problem.

Q 5 Does this manuscript refer only to published data? (unpublished data is not allowed for Reviews)

Yes.

Q 6 Does the manuscript cover the issue in an objective and analytical manner

Yes.

Q 7 Was a review on the issue published in the past 12 months?

Yes.

Q 8 Does the review have international or global implications?

Yes, the review indicates it's better to have active transportation environments, and that would be better for human health everywhere — i.e., internationally.

One indication is these reviews from other countries...

<https://www.mdpi.com/2673-7590/3/4/76/pdf>

https://www.annfamned.org/content/21/Supplement_1/3657

<https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2023.10.03.23296478v1>

Q 9 Is the title appropriate, concise, attractive?

Appropriate, but unattractive.

Do active transportation environments have positive impacts on human and environmental health? Mobility infrastructures in Europe.

Q 10 Are the keywords appropriate?

Add WALKING, CYCLING, ACTIVE INFRASTRUCTURE, MOBILITY INFRASTRUCTURE

Drop CO-BENEFITS, HEALTH (too generic) even BEHAVIOUR CHANGE is a bit generic, but keep it...

Q 11 Is the English language of sufficient quality?

yes, but it could use another pass...

Q 12 Is the quality of the figures and tables satisfactory?

No.

QUALITY ASSESSMENT

Q 13 → Quality of generalization and summary

Q 14 → Significance to the field

Q 15 → Interest to a general audience

Q 16 → Quality of the writing

REVISION LEVEL

Q 17 → Please take a decision based on your comments:

Minor revisions.