EFFECTS OF BUFFER SIZE AND SHAPE ON ASSOCIATIONS BETWEEN THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT AND ENERGY BALANCE

PETER JAMES (HARVARD SCHOOL OF PUBLIC HEALTH) DAVID BERRIGAN (NATIONAL CANCER INSTITUTE) JAIME E HART (HARVARD SCHOOL OF PUBLIC HEALTH) CHRISTINE M HOEHNER (WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY ST. LOUIS) JACQUELINE KERR (UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA SAN DIEGO) JACQUELINE M MAJOR (UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA) MASAYOSHI OKA (WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY ST. LOUIS) FRANCINE LADEN (HARVARD SCHOOL OF PUBLIC HEALTH)

ACTIVE LIVING RESEARCH 2013

Uncertain Geographic Context Problem

• Inconsistent findings in built environment and energy balance research

Uncertain Geographic Context Problem

 "The spatial uncertainty in the actual areas that exert the contextual influences under study and the temporal uncertainty in the timing and duration in which individuals experienced these contextual influences"*

* Kwan M. Annals of the Association of American Geographers, 102(5) 2012, pp. 958–968.

Inconsistent Findings in Built Environment Literature

- Previous research has relied mainly on pre-defined areas, or **buffers**, around a geocoded home address
- Buffer definitions are based primarily on the transportation literature describing the upper limit of the distance that individuals will walk
- However, there is no uniform buffer type used across studies

Aims

- We examined how defining the **built environment** with different **buffer sizes and buffer shapes** could influence associations with **physical activity and BMI**
- We hypothesized that
 - Measures of intersections (count and density) and businesses (count and density) would be positively associated with physical activity and negatively associated with BMI
 - There would be an optimal buffer shape and size to isolate these associations

Population

- Participants were selected from two large states in the nationwide the Nurses Health Study II, a large ongoing prospective cohort study
 - All female
 - Predominantly white
 - Pennsylvania (n=11,178)
 - Texas (n=6,255)
 - Had a geocoded home address at the street level in
 Pennsylvania or Texas and data on BMI in the year 2009



Exposure

• Geocoded questionnaire mailing addresses

 Street network data from TIGER 2010-based road network (Streetmap USA, ESRI)

 Business data from the commercially available InfoUSA 2009 database



Methods: Exposure

- Geographic information systems (GIS) created
 - Line-based network and radial buffers
 - –400m, 800m, 1200m, and 1600m

• Estimated business and intersection counts and densities within each buffer















Methods: Outcome

- Two self-reported energy balance-related variables:
 - Body mass index (BMI) (kg/m²)
 - Walking in metabolic equivalent hours per week (MET hrs/wk)
 - Questionnaires included recreational physical activity during the past year, with questions on the average time per week spent walking or hiking outdoors
 - Multiplied the reported time spent weekly at each activity by its typical energy expenditure requirements expressed in MET hours per week score

Methods: Statistical Analysis

- Cross-sectional linear regression
- Log-transformed built environment variables
- Adjusted for
 - Age (in years)
 - Census tract median income (in \$) and household value (in \$)
 - Smoking status (never, past, current <15/day, current ≥15/day)
 - Husband's education (<HS, HS, College, Grad School, Missing or Not Married)



Results: N=17,433

Variable	Mean	Std Dev
BMI	28.2	6.7
Walking METs (hrs/wk)*	6.4	8.9
Census Tract Median Income	\$ 63,571	\$ 23,532
Census Tract Median Household Value	\$ 129,349	\$ 66,884
Census Tract Percent White	89.9	12.8
Census Tract Population Density	2378.2	3368.1
Census Tract Percent Urban	79.2	32.8
Census Tract Percent No High School Ed	13.3	8.6

*N=13,666 for walking analyses

LATIONAL ANCER ISTITUTE

Results: N=17,433

1



Harvard University | University of California, San Diego | University of Pennsylvania | Washington University in St. Louis | Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center

10

LATONA NSTITUT



Coefficients are presented as the effect on each outcome of a one unit increase in the lognormal value of each built environment measure

All analyses adjusted for age, Census tract median income and household value, smoking status, and husband's education

18



Coefficients are presented as the effect on each outcome of a one unit increase in the lognormal value of each built environment measure

All analyses adjusted for age, Census tract median income and household value, smoking status, and husband's education



Coefficients are presented as the effect on each outcome of a one unit increase in the lognormal value of each built environment measure

All analyses adjusted for age, Census tract median income and household value, smoking status, and husband's education

Conclusions

- Results indicate that the scale and type of built environment measures can have an impact on study results and may partly explain inconsistent findings from past studies of the built environment and energy balance
- These findings underscore the issue of the Uncertain Geographic Context Problem, an emerging key concern for studies of associations between environment and behavior

Acknowledgements

- Thanks to all my co-authors in the Transdisciplinary Research in Energetics and Cancer (TREC) Spatial and Contextual Measures and Modeling Working Group who contributed greatly to this analysis and presentation
- TREC Grant U54 CA155626
- CVD Epi Training Grant T32 HL 098048



Thank you

• Any questions or comments, please contact me

Peter James, MHS, ScD Postdoctoral Fellow Department of Epidemiology Department of Environmental Health Harvard School of Public Health pjames@hsph.harvard.edu



Built Environment Measures Positively Associated with Walking

Walking		Intersection		Business	
Buffer Size	Buffer Shape	Count	Density (count per km ²⁾	Count	Density (count per km ²⁾
400m	Line Based	0.10 (-0.06, 0.27)	0.03 (-0.12, 0.18)	0.10 (-0.02, 0.22)	0.02 (-0.07, 0.11)
	Radial	0.09 (-0.06, 0.24)	0.08 (-0.05, 0.21)	0.10 (-0.01, 0.22)	0.08 (-0.02, 0.19)
800m	Line Based	0.14 (-0.01, 0.28)	0.16 (-0.04, 0.37)	0.12 (0.02, 0.21)	0.11 (0.01, 0.21)
	Radial	0.12 (-0.02, 0.25)	0.12 (-0.03, 0.27)	0.08 (-0.02, 0.18)	0.08 (-0.02, 0.19)
1200m	Line Based	0.16 (0.02, 0.29)	0.25 (0.03, 0.48)	0.10 (0.01, 0.19)	0.12 (0.02, 0.23)
	Radial	0.13 (0.02, 0.24)	0.15 (0.02, 0.28)	0.08 (-0.02, 0.17)	0.09 (-0.02, 0.20)
1600m	Line Based	0.12 (-0.01, 0.25)	0.17 (-0.06, 0.40)	0.10 (0.02, 0.19)	0.14 (0.03, 0.25)
	Radial	0.09 (-0.05, 0.23)	0.09 (-0.07, 0.25)	0.07 (-0.02, 0.17)	0.09 (-0.02, 0.20)

All analyses adjusted for age, Census tract median income and household value, smoking status, and husband's education Coefficients are presented as the effect on each outcome of a one unit increase in the lognormal value of each built environment measure ²⁵ Bolded coefficients indicate p < 0.05



BMI Positively Associated with Built Environment Measures

BMI		Intersection		Busii	ness
Buffer Size	Buffer Shape	Count	Density (count per km ²⁾	Count	Density (count per km ²⁾
400m	Line Based	0.20 (0.09, 0.31)	0.16 (0.06, 0.26)	0.10 (0.02, 0.19)	0.08 (0.02, 0.14)
	Radial	0.15 (0.05, 0.25)	0.13 (0.04, 0.22)	0.11 (0.03, 0.19)	0.11 (0.04, 0.18)
800m	Line Based	0.14 (0.05, 0.24)	0.15 (0.01, 0.28)	0.09 (0.03, 0.16)	0.09 (0.03, 0.16)
	Radial	0.12 (0.02, 0.21)	0.13 (0.03, 0.22)	0.09 (0.03, 0.16)	0.10 (0.02, 0.17)
1200m	Line Based	0.13 (0.04, 0.22)	0.17 (0.02, 0.32)	0.09 (0.03, 0.14)	0.09 (0.02, 0.16)
	Radial	0.07 (0.00, 0.14)	0.09 (0.00, 0.18)	0.07 (0.01, 0.13)	0.08 (0.00, 0.15)
1600m	Line Based	0.11 (0.03, 0.20)	0.15 (-0.01, 0.30)	0.08 (0.02, 0.14)	0.09 (0.02, 0.17)
	Radial	0.11 (0.02, 0.21)	0.13 (0.02, 0.23)	0.07 (0.01, 0.13)	0.07 (0.00, 0.15)

All analyses adjusted for age, Census tract median income and household value, smoking status, and husband's education Coefficients are presented as the effect on each outcome of a one unit increase in the lognormal value of each built environment measure 26Bolded coefficients indicate p < 0.05