Geospatial indicators of bikeability index as cycle-friendly city design: a systematic review
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ABSTRACT
The aim was to identify the main geospatial indicators used in bikeability index through constructive methodological studies. The study protocol was registered in PROSPERO under the registration number CRD42020166795, following the PRISMA (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses) guide. Original studies indexed in the electronic databases Lilacs, PubMed, Science Direct, Scopus, SPORTDiscus, Trid, and Web of Science were selected. The review also included grey literature through Google Scholar, OpenGrey, ProQuest, and a list of references and documents pointed out by experts. After removing duplicates and analyzing titles and abstracts, the review considered only 11 out of the 703 initial papers, which provided 100 environment indicators with varied definitions and metrics for estimating the Bikeability index. The census tract was the most used unit of the analysis found in the papers, which used GIS (Geographic Information System) data besides self-reported information on environmental characteristics. The results indicate that the most usual indicators relate to infrastructure – existence and width of bike lanes – destination, slope, speed limit, and connectivity and intersections. The creation and maintenance of bicycle-friendly environments could consider the implementation of more infrastructure on flat and connected streets with changes in speed limits in neighborhoods, especially in regions with low density of intersections, to decrease accidents and increase cyclists’ perception of safety.
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INTRODUCTION
Urban planning has often focused on cars because of the development characteristics of urban zoning with separate residential and commercial uses. It has prevented and discouraged using active modes of transportation in large centers since it implies the need to travel long distances to access stores and services. Such a scenario has brought adverse effects to the population, such as increased congestion, traffic insecurity due to high automobile speeds, and noise and air pollution due to CO₂ emissions.

Alternative means of transportation, such as bicycling, mitigate some effects in urban centers and reduce health problems such as obesity, hypertension,
and cardiovascular diseases associated with active travel\(^6\)-\(^8\). From a public health perspective, a cost-benefit analysis of bike/pedestrian in Lincoln, USA, showed that for every dollar invested in it, there is a return on investment of $2.94 in health\(^9\). Studies point out the high potential that the use of bicycles can have in increasing levels of physical activity and reducing morbidities in the population, generating lower individual costs, since people use less the private and public health insurance\(^8,10\). There is also evidence of lower spending on daily commuting between home and services, favouring the economic growth of cities. Also, 85\% of the London district representatives consider that using bicycles boosts business performance, allowing people to access the local business\(^11\).

Bicycle-friendly cities such as Amsterdam\(^12\), Copenhagen\(^13\), and Paris\(^14\) have traditional and successful programs to encourage bicycling as a means of transportation. The reason is the favorable characteristics such as high street intersection density, mixed land use combinations, direct destination connections, and allocation of street space for pedestrians and cyclists, managing access modes through design to reduce traffic conflicts\(^15\). On the other side, in developing country cities such as Curitiba\(^16\) and Cali\(^17\), where bicycling prevalence is low, the lack of these features added to insecurity and poor or non-existent infrastructure can limit bicycling\(^17,18\).

In this context, measures that concentrate environmental indicators in a grouped way, in the form of scores, can better represent the urban design structures related to the mobility of the population, specifically concerning bicycle use. Thus, bikeability proposes using indicators to represent areas with features related to bicycle use. The authors suggest using metrics and indicators to establish the bikeability index, which reveals dissensus and destandardization on the term and evaluation of the areas. Thus, this systematic review identifies and synthesizes the essential indicators used in the bikeability index construction.

**Methods**

This systematic review followed the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-analyses (PRISMA) guide\(^19\).

**Protocol and Registration**

The study protocol underwent registration in the International Prospective Register of Systematic Reviews (PROSPERO) under the registration number CRD42020166795, which is available at https://www.crd.york.ac.uk/prospero.

**Eligibility Criteria**

- **Inclusion Criteria**
  The review evaluated the local variables and included observational and semi-experimental studies to build the bikeability index. It used quantitative and quantitative-qualitative analyses with subjective – questionnaires and target groups – and objective measures – Global Positioning System and Geographic Information System. The search was not restricted by language, date, or publication status, and includes articles that have been accepted but not yet published.

- **Exclusion Criteria**
  The studies underwent the following exclusion criteria: 1) environment other than urban; 2) outcome variables not relating to the composition indicators of the bikeability index; 3) secondary studies (review articles, opinion articles, letters to the editor, books, book chapters, among others); 4) studies with qualitative results only; 5) studies that do not describe the indicators used in the composition of the bikeability index.

- **Information Source**
  The conduction of individual search strategies guided each of the following electronic databases LILACS, PubMed, Science Direct, Scopus, SPORTDiscus, Trid, Web of Science. Also, there was the assistance of grey literature through Google Scholar, OpenGrey, and ProQuest. The additional articles result from hand-searching of references in the manuscripts from the review and contact through e-mail with experts who indicated relevant articles on the topic.

**Research**

The searches were adapted according to the electronic bases used. More information on search strategies is provided in Appendix 1, which can be found in the supplementary files for the online version of this article. All references were organized in EndNote software (EndNote X8® Basic Thomson Reuters, New York, USA) and duplicate articles were removed. The final date of the survey in all databases was December 7, 2019 and updated on July 12, 2020.

**Selection of Studies**

The selection of the studies took place in two phases.
In the first phase, two reviewers (ALEMV, PABA) independently evaluated the titles and abstracts found in the electronic databases discarding the papers that did not meet the inclusion criteria. Secondly, the reviewers (ALEMV, PABA) independently used the same selection criteria on the full text of the articles. The divergences in the first or second phase underwent discussion and agreement between the reviewers to find a solution. Not reaching a consensus, a third reviewer (AASL) was involved in the final decision. In both phases, the Rayyan QCRI software assisted the selection of the studies.

Data Collection Process
Two reviewers (ALEMV, PABA) performed the data collection process independently. After individual collection, they carried out cross-checked information. The disagreements underwent discussion between the two reviewers, so they found a solution. A third reviewer (AASL) made the final decision when the others could not agree.

Data Extraction
The data extraction considered the registration of information – author, year of publication, city, country, definition of bikeability, unit of analysis, the number of units analyzed, and type of measurement – from the characteristics of the studies developing the bikeability index. We also extracted the categories and the respective indicators and synthesized them. The stages of identification, definition and grouping of classes for bikeability were conducted according to the indicators’ relevance and frequency of the indicators, the grouping took place according to similar characteristics and as suggested by the literature (Chart 1).

Analysis of the Risk of Bias in Individual Studies
As a methodological option, the risk of bias analysis was not performed due to the characteristics of the included studies, which were designed to develop models to estimate the bikeability index.

Results

Study selection
The initial search identified 703 articles that were found in the seven electronic databases searched. After removing duplicates, 470 articles were evaluated with an inter-rater agreement level of 95%. In addition, 197 studies have been identified in the grey literature, 5 being selected and included in study, 3 with 100% agreement between the evaluators. In the first selection phase (reading titles and abstracts), 31 studies were selected to be evaluated in full text with a level above 90% of agreement between the evaluators and others seven identified through references. Subsequently, 27 articles were excluded using the eligibility criteria (Appendix 2). The experts did not provide additional articles and in the update, there were no new articles to be included. Finally, 11 articles were included in the review process. Figure 1 shows a flowchart describing and detailing this process.

Characteristics of the Studies
The articles included were published between 2006 and 2019, of which 10 were published after 2012. The articles were found on only three continents, mostly in North America, with emphasis on the United States of America (n = 4) and Canada (n = 1). In South America, only Brazil (n = 1) and Colombia (n = 1) presented articles. While in Europe, Austria (n = 1), Switzerland (n = 1) and Norway (n = 1) presented. Among the articles in the review, only six presented conceptual definitions for the term bikeability. The most commonly employed unit of analysis was the census tract (n = 4), followed by neigh-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>Support for the construction or maintenance of macro and micro scale characteristics of the urban environment. Related to physical facilities and / or policies that handle the use of certain locations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topography</td>
<td>Description of the physical structure of the land surface, identifying its contour, dimension, and position.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land use</td>
<td>Delimitation and characterization of the use of the geographically demarcated areas. There can be integration between the different land uses and legislative control of the type of zoning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>It aims at the integrity of the citizen, through his / her perception and / or objective measure of the reliability of transit through a certain place. Its absence, caused by others and / or by poor conservation of urban furniture, may imply imminent or distant risk of damage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>A condition that ensures the citizen the possibility of enjoying, with autonomy and practicality, spaces, services, and urban facilities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The number of units shows up in six articles, ranging from 1 to 401. All 11 papers used Geographic Information System (GIS) data, and two of them also employed self-reported information on environmental characteristics (Table 1).

**Discussion**

The review results show that the development of the bikeability index is still recent. Most of the publications have appeared since 2012. It sets the topic as contemporary and explains the small number of papers relating to the issue. There is a conceptual inconsistency of the term, possibly because of the differences in the results of structural modifications of cities, which encompass interdisciplinary features of an expanding area. Among the six papers that defined bikeability, three presented the word convenience, and two, the word comfort. It is probably because such terms are frequently reported elements in research involving bicycling. The preferred routes are those separated from motor vehicles, with lower traffic volume, well-established speed limits, and a larger connected and flat bicycle network. Besides, the review results reveal specific indicators as essential when determining the index. Thus, based on the set of different existing concepts, in terms that make up the characteristics most favourable to bicycle use and in the indicators grouped into categories in this review, bikeability can be defined as: The ability to reach destinations in a comfortable, convenient, and safe way, by bicycle. Linking appropriate physical and political facilities in...
Table 1 – Characteristics of bikeability index development studies included in the systematic review (n = 11).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Definition of bikeability</th>
<th>Analysis Unit</th>
<th>Number of units analysed</th>
<th>Measurement scale</th>
<th>Measurement type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sisson et al 24</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Mesa</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>It is regarded as the ease in which street segments can be travelled on bicycle.</td>
<td>Street segment</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td>GIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mc Neil 26</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>Neighbourhood</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Ratio</td>
<td>GIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowry et al 25</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Moscow</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>An assessment of an entire bikeway network for perceived comfort and convenience and access to important destinations.</td>
<td>City community</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Interval</td>
<td>GIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter et al 28</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Greater Vancouver</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>Census tract</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>Ratio</td>
<td>GIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesa &amp; Barajas 17</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Santiago de Cali</td>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>Neighbourhood</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>Interval</td>
<td>GIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krenn et al 30</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Graz</td>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>Neighbourhood</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>Ratio</td>
<td>GIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenstein 27</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>It is used to determine the level of interaction between aspects associated with bicycling and the route environment, route distance and other factors that affect the conditions of a specific bicycle trip.</td>
<td>Census tract</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td>Ratio GIS + Self-reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motta 29</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Curitiba</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>Census tract</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>Ordinal Interval</td>
<td>GIS + Self-reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lin &amp; Wei 33</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Taipei</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>Village</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Interval</td>
<td>GIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grigore et al 31</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Basel</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>Quadrant 100x100</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>Ratio</td>
<td>GIS + Self-reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rugtvedt 32</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Grenland</td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>Census districts</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>Interval</td>
<td>GIS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N/D = Does not describe; GIS = Geographic Information System.

Table 2 – Bikeability index indicators extracted from the studies included in the systematic review (n = 11).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author (year)</th>
<th>Bikeability index categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sisson et al. (2006) 24</td>
<td>Outside lane width</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bike lane width</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pavement factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of through lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average daily traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mc Neil (2011) 26</td>
<td>Width of outside lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Width of bike lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Width of shoulder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Occupied on-street parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vehicle traffic volume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of heavy vehicles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pavement condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presence of curb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowry et al. (2012) 35</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Importance of destination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vehicle speed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accessibility of location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time of travel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trip cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Distance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Bikeability Index Categories Extracted from the Studies Included in the Systematic Review (n = 11)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author (year)</th>
<th>Bikeability index categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Winter et al. (2013)          | Infrastructure: Bicycle route density, Bicycle route separation  
                              | Topography: Slope  
                              | Land use: Destination density  
                              | Safety: -  
                              | Accessibility: Connectivity of bicycle-friendly streets |
| Mesa & Barajas (2013)         | Infrastructure: Bicycle facilities, Extra bicycle amenities, Parking hindrance  
                              | Topography: Temperature of surface, Vegetation index, Normalized difference vegetation index, Leaf water content index  
                              | Land use: -  
                              | Safety: Personal safety  
                              | Accessibility: Safety aspects - |
| Krenn et al. (2015)           | Infrastructure: Cycling infrastructure, Separated bicycle pathways  
                              | Topography: Slope  
                              | Land use: Green and aquatic areas  
                              | Safety: -  
                              | Accessibility: - |
| Greenstein (2015)             | Infrastructure: Bicycle facilities  
                              | Topography: Slope  
                              | Land use: -  
                              | Safety: Natural and physical barriers  
                              | Accessibility: Network connectivity |
| Motta (2017)                  | Infrastructure: Bicycle route, Shared sidewalk, General roads, Exclusive bus lanes  
                              | Topography: Slope  
                              | Land use: Mixed land use  
                              | Safety: Number of accidents with cyclists  
                              | Accessibility: - |
| Grigore et al. (2018)         | Infrastructure: -  
                              | Topography: -  
                              | Land use: Center of destination (hectares), Number of workplaces  
                              | Safety: -  
                              | Accessibility: Perception of shorter distance |
| Lin & Wei (2018)              | Infrastructure: Average slope, Tree Shade, Air quality  
                              | Topography: Transit service, Public bike service, Public bike unavailability, Mixed land use  
                              | Land use: Green space  
                              | Safety: Law enforcement, Smooth traffic, Conflictless traffic  
                              | Accessibility: Intersection density, Bikeway ratio |
| Rugtvedt (2019)               | Infrastructure: Bicycle Infrastructure, The share of heavy vehicles  
                              | Topography: Slope  
                              | Land use: -  
                              | Safety: Speed limit  
                              | Accessibility: Street connectivity |

= There is no indicator for this category.
cities, with favourable surfaces on the ground, integration with different land uses, aiming at the integrity of the citizens and the variability of choice options that ensure conditions of access to spaces and services\textsuperscript{17,24-33}.

The Geographic Information System (GIS) was the primary tool in every article identified in this review. In only two\textsuperscript{29,31}, the perception of the environment was along with GIS, which shows that it has been a relevant and emerging tool. However, GIS requires complementary measures to understand the physical characteristics of cities and quantitative and qualitative aspects of the environmental micro-scale, besides the perception of issues such as aesthetics and safety of the neighborhood that relates to the people’s lifestyle\textsuperscript{39}. Moreover, there is a lack of availability and enough detailing of georeferenced data to allow proper analysis of isolated indicators or grouped into scores\textsuperscript{40}. These usually have secondary sources, large coverage areas, such as census sectors, being the unit of analysis\textsuperscript{27-29,32} and, therefore, their acquisition does not aim the creation of bikeability indexes. Thus, it is necessary to filter the data from the existing databases and independently measure the environmental indicators through multiple tools. It is possible, for example, to identify the geographic location of bicycle paths\textsuperscript{41}, the actual routes traveled by bicycle\textsuperscript{42}, and the characteristics of the urban landscape related to bicycle use\textsuperscript{43} as a mechanism to capture up-to-date indicators with accurate measurement and from various sources.

It is clear that, in the composition of the bikeability index, there is variability in the indicators, of which 100 concerning the built environment have different definitions and metrics, distributed among the eleven articles. The destandardization in the indicator use interferes with the comparison of studies. The lack of a standard in the use of these indicators can also be confirmed in a systematic review dealing with the effects of cycling interventions, which has also faced the diversification of scales, design of studies, of the data collection method and consequently in a diversity of indicators, in terms of definition and metric\textsuperscript{44}.

Topography was a category that appeared in the largest number of studies, with the slope of the terrain the most used indicator\textsuperscript{45} and bicycle use. Thus, flat terrain promotes the expansion of the bicycle network. Since there is no way to modify the terrain surface, the topography is relevant when building bicycle paths. Furthermore, when composing the bikeability index, it is possible to identify places with high slopes that can lead to the non-use of bicycle paths. Cyclists tend to avoid routes with steep gradients\textsuperscript{46}. A gradient of up to 4% in slope degrees is satisfactory for bicycling\textsuperscript{5}. However, the cultural context of each city should guide such aspects.

Concerning infrastructure, the bike lane width\textsuperscript{24,25,33} was the most common indicator. The reason is that the authors relied on the Highway Capacity Manual (HCM), a manual that provides a methodology to calculate the level of service of the multimodal high-
way. It provides guidelines such as measures, limits, and procedures for automobiles, transportation modes, bicycles, and pedestrians. However, a considerable number of indicators show the relevance of this category when composing the bikeability index, especially in the separation of bicycle and vehicle routes. Evidence points to the importance of this separation and the feeling of safety while cycling. Greater bicycle use and commuting by bicycle.

Regarding the safety category, the indicators speed limit and average daily traffic show up in more than two studies. Research has shown how high traffic volumes and speeds affect the feeling of comfort when cycling. Bicycle users prefer routes where speed limits, average daily traffic, noise, air pollution, and interactions with motor vehicles are lower. Thus, a local intervention can limit the speed of vehicular traffic in regions with a higher density of destinations and the presence of bicycles on the roads, providing a greater sense of security.

Among the land use indicators, the destination was the most frequent, corroborating three studies that found similar results. Close retail destinations were associated with a higher frequency of bicycling. Furthermore, proximity to a variety of services, shops, and mass transit facilities has a positive effect on bicycle share programs. Regarding accessibility, the key indicator was street connectivity, reinforcing the premise that regions with higher street connectivity are favorable for bicycle use as a mode of transportation. In Switzerland, for example, this indicator composed the bikeability index, and the results showed that the higher the street intersection density, the shorter the distances perceived by cyclists. On the other hand, more intersections could be more stressful or dangerous, requiring cyclists to pay more attention. Cycling infrastructure assessments include geometric dimensions, traffic characteristics and intersections. In this sense, the master plans must also consider the relationship of the quality of the cycle paths that connect them to services and spaces, improving access to public transport stations by bicycle and modifying intersections with the presence of raised medians and implementation of signs to protect cyclists from exposure to the dangers of the road traffic.

The variability in the composition of the bikeability index comes from the differences in the local geographic and social characteristics and the availability of data, which may be inexistent or restricted by the public administration. In upper-middle-income countries, there are other social factors such as violence, which may have a higher weight in choosing whether to use the bicycle than in other more developed regions, making it necessary to take a specific approach in each context. Therefore, all these countries included the safety category in the calculation of the bikeability index against 50% in high-income countries as shown in Table 3. Studies from South America countries have chosen to employ not only road safety, but also safety against crime, as indicators in the composition of their indexes. In Curitiba, Brazil, a survey identified that the lack of safety was reported as a major barrier to bicycle use (22.4% of respondents), even above the absence of a bike path (14.1% of respondents). This calls for attention to interventions in these places with the aim of promoting the use of bicycles.

In this systematic review the studies show that the indicators related to the infrastructure category are the most widely used. Thus, one of the practical implications would be to invest in infrastructure for bicycle use, since it is a key element in promoting bicycle use in urban centers. Investing in cycling conditions could also be another important strategy to improve the conditions of bicycle use, such as reducing the speed limit of traffic on roads that have a cycle path. Although this does not necessarily change the infrastructure, it may result in safer cycling conditions. Another widely used element is access to destinations and street connectivity, including elements such as signage at intersections, generally associated with increased perceived user safety.

In addition to the indicators presented in this study for the ideal construction of a bikeability index, the main studies of this review will be presented by category. Although one study described indicators in all the categories, in order to enhance the index in representing the use of bicycles, it is important to complement the studies by category, for example, for infrastructure, topography, land use, and accessibility. Data quality and arrangement, especially in upper- and middle-income countries, may vary across regions and over time. Indeed, data in developed countries are more available and typically of better quality.

Greenstein reported that the presence of bicycle facilities, road network connectivity, topography and physical barriers are key indicators of bikeability, particularly types of land use. According to Grigore et al.,
applying the index in Switzerland, provides information on which streets are suitable to include in the city’s bicycle lane network, since it assesses the quality of streets and intersections. Lowry et al., measured bikeability in Moscow, USA, using the bicycle suitability equation, demonstrating scenarios including new bike paths. In Portland, USA, McNeil, the methodology produced an objective bikeability score by destination of around 20 minutes away. In Cali, Colombia, Mesa & Barajas, the methodology addressed four categories for bikeability, highlighting environmental quality through satellite photos and safety. In Brazil, Motta found no significant differences in the assessment of aspects that affect cycling and bicycle use, although assigning different weights to categories had an impact on the index. In Asia, Lin & Wei considered interdependencies between criteria and zones using an analytical network process (ANP), analyzing the varied performance within a zone applying grey numbers in the criterion by measuring and evaluating bikeability across multiple criteria. In Norway, the method used by Rugtvedt was based on a statistical summary with map layers of different sizes and different levels of aggregation. This approach is based on multi-scale indicators with weights and algorithms able to reproduce the results. In Mesa, USA, Sisson et al. found that the streets around the schools were suitable for cycling and its prevalence was significantly higher in schools with limited transportation. In Vancouver, Canada, Winter et al. reported that bikeability mapping provided a powerful visual aid and quantitative metric for identifying and prioritizing locations for new infrastructure. And in Austria, Krenn et al. related that the cycling index was comprised of five components and GIS data. The tool detects areas where cycling conditions need to be improved.

New investigations can prioritize not only analyses with secondary geospatial data but also collect them for this purpose. Nevertheless, it seems that the adaptations made to indicators from secondary sources represent well the main characteristics of a bikeability index, especially when the necessary information is scarce. In addition, understanding the multi-indicators that can affect bicycle use in different regions of the world can be promoted by combined analysis about bicycles use policies. The integration and evaluations of activists, stakeholders, planners, and city managers, regarding the implementation and maintenance of infrastructures, encourage active commuting and the use of scientific evidence to design cycle-friendly cities.

As a main limitation, it was not possible to perform the risk of bias analysis due to the characteristics of the studies included in the review and the lack of a specific evaluation scale. Analysis of the risk of bias is a very important step in the systematic review and, whenever possible, should be performed. As strong points, the use of valid procedures for systematic search of evidence stands out, and the inclusion of international and interdisciplinary bases that broadened the scope of the search. The search, reading and extraction method was also used by two independent reviewers, with high agreement in the stages (> 90%).

Finally, as a suggestion for future studies, public managers and health professionals can use the data from this review to identify which geospatial indicators are available in their municipalities and, thus being able to estimate the bikeability index or being able to collect data to estimate their own indicators. It is possible to propose adjustments to the indicators to better represent the local contextual characteristics. In addition, it is also possible to analyze the effects of the indicators on the use of bicycles, especially in low- and middle-income countries, such as Brazil. Association and intervention studies are needed that address outcomes related to physical activity and health, to improve the quality of information and its applicability, ensuring estimates of real impacts on the population from bikeability geospatial indicators.

In upper-middle-income countries, new evidence is needed on effective interventions that are contextually appropriate. The science of scalability will be greatly advanced by research that systematically identifies the key steps and processes required for successful scaling up of interventions. However, this requires more robust and standardized measures and indicators. Many of the databases are governmental or are on reports or websites rather than peer-reviewed scientific literature. This paucity of evidence in the peer-reviewed literature raises important questions about the methodological rigor and the internal and external validity of such evidence. Therefore, researchers from all regions of the world should do more program analysis studies to strengthen the global evidence base based on practice, which can be achieved using rigorous research methods to establish the impact of scaled-up interventions in the real world.

Conclusion
When building a bikeability index, one should consider
the indicators of bike lane width, road gradient, destination, speed limits, and street intersection density in its composition. These indicators are interconnected and reflect characteristics that favor bicycling in urban centers. The main indicators found can be related to data availability\(^7\). Also, the quality of these data can vary considerably between countries and even within a country or over the time. Countries with better development rates also tend to have better quality data. Planning and maintenance of bicycle-friendly environments could consider implementing more infrastructure in locations of flat and connected streets, changing the speed limits in neighborhoods, especially in regions with low-density street intersections, to decrease crashes and increase cyclists’ perception of safety.
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