Web table C Summary of study validity

	Criterion					
Study	Randomisati on*	Representativen ess†	Comparabilit y‡	Measuremen t§	Statistical test¶	<ul><li>Number of criteria met</li></ul>
Interventions primarily to promote cycling	2					
Hemmingsson et al, 2009 <sup>1</sup>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	5
Groesz, 2007 <sup>2</sup>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	5
Wilmink and Hartman, 1987 <sup>3</sup>	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	3
Troelsen et al, 2004-5 <sup>4, 5</sup>	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	3
Sloman et al, 2009 <sup>6</sup>	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	3
Rissel et al, 2010 <sup>7</sup>	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	4
Individualised marketing of "environment	ally friendly" m	odes of transport				
Haq et al, 2004 <sup>8</sup>	No	No	No	No	No	0
TravelSmart Brisbane, 2002 <sup>9</sup>	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	2
Viernheim Household Transport, 2003 <sup>10</sup>	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	2
TravelSmart Perth, 2003 <sup>11</sup>	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	3
TravelSmart Frome, 2002 <sup>14, 15</sup>	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	2
TravelSmart Gloucester, 2004 <sup>16-18</sup>	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	2
TravelSmart Nottingham, 2004 <sup>19</sup>	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	2
TravelSmart Sheffield, 2004 <sup>20</sup>	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	2
TravelSmart Melville, 2004 <sup>21</sup>	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	2
TravelSmart Bishopston, 2004 <sup>22</sup>	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	2
TravelSmart Cramlington, 2004 <sup>23</sup>	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	2
Travel Options Kingston, 2004 <sup>24</sup>	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	2
TravelSmart Doncaster, 2007 <sup>25</sup>	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	2
TravelSmart East Inverness, 2008 <sup>26</sup>	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	2
TravelSmart Lancashire, 2006-7 <sup>27, 28</sup>	No	No	No	Yes	No	1
TravelSmart Gloucester (Barton, Tredworth and White City), 2006 <sup>29</sup>	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	2

Interventions to change travel behaviour in general										
Cervero et al, 2002 <sup>30-32</sup>	No	No	No	No	No	0				
Hodgson et al, 1998 <sup>33</sup>	No	No	No	No	No	0				
Shoup, 1997 <sup>34, 35</sup>	No	Yes	No	No	No	1				

<sup>\*</sup>Were participants, groups, or areas randomly allocated to intervention and control groups?

§Were the instruments used to measure cycling behaviour either shown to be valid and reliable in published research or in a pilot study, or otherwise recognised as an established method?

¶Was a test of statistical significance applied specifically to the observed net change in cycling behaviour?

## References

- Hemmingsson E, Udden J, Neovius M, Ekelund U, Rossner S. Increased physical activity in abdominally obese women through support for changed commuting habits: a randomized clinical trial. *Int J Obes* 2009;33:645-52.
- 2 Groesz LM. A conceptual evaluation of a school-based utilitarian exercise model [PhD thesis]. University of Texas at Austin, 2007.
- Wilmink A, Hartman J. Evaluation of the Delft bicycle network plan: final summary report. Ministry of Transport and Public Works, Netherlands, 1987.
- 4 Troelsen J. Transport og sundhed: Odense—Danmarks Nationale Cykelby 1999-2002 [Transport and health: Odense—the National Cycling City of Denmark, 1999-2002] [Danish]. Ugeskrift for Laeger 2005;167:1164-6.
- 5 Troelsen J, Jensen S, Andersen T. Evaluering af Odense—Danmarks nationale cykelby [Evaluation of Odense—Denmark's national cycle city] [Danish]. Odense Kommune, 2004.
- 6 Sloman L, Cavill N, Cope A, Muller L, Kennedy A. Analysis and synthesis of evidence on the effects of investment in six cycling demonstration towns. Department for Transport and Cycling England, UK, 2009.
- Rissel C, New C, Wen LM, Merom D, Bauman A, Garrard J. The effectiveness of community-based cycling promotion: findings from the Cycling Connecting Communities project in Sydney, Australia. *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act* 2010;7:8.
- 8 Haq G, Whitelegg J, Cinderby S, Johnson D. Intelligent travel: personalised travel planning in the city of York. Stockholm Environmental Institute, 2004.
- 9 Marinelli P, Roth M. TravelSmart suburbs Brisbane: a successful pilot of a voluntary travel behaviour change technique. Australasian Transport Research Forum, 2002.

<sup>†</sup>Were study samples randomly recruited from the study population with a response rate of at least 65%, or were they otherwise shown to be representative of the study population?

<sup>‡</sup>Were baseline characteristics of intervention and control groups, populations, or areas comparable, or, if there were important differences in potential confounders at baseline, were these appropriately adjusted for in analysis?

- Viernheim Household Transport. Travel awareness, publicity and education supporting a sustainable transport strategy in Europe (TAPESTRY). Viernheim Household Transport, 2003. www.max-success.eu/tapestry/www.eu-tapestry.org/.
- Department for Planning and Infrastructure. Travel behaviour change program for the city of South Perth under the TravelSmart program: technical appendix. Department for Planning and Infrastructure, Government of Western Australia, 2003.
- Socialdata Australia. Community survey and marketing campaign for the South Perth TravelSmart project: report of the second evaluation. Department for Planning and Infrastructure, Government of Western Australia, 1999.
- Socialdata Australia. Community survey and marketing campaign for the South Perth TravelSmart project: third evaluation report. Department for Planning and Infrastructure, Government of Western Australia, 2000.
- 14 Sustrans. TravelSmart Frome pilot project. Sustrans, 2002.
- 15 Sustrans. Unpublished technical report on TravelSmart Frome pilot project. Sustrans, 2002.
- 16 Sustrans. TravelSmart Gloucester pilot project. Sustrans, 2002.
- 17 Sustrans. Unpublished technical report on TravelSmart Gloucester pilot project. Sustrans, 2002.
- Sustrans. TravelSmart Gloucester (Quedgeley) 2003-04: a report on the individualised marketing project funded through the Department for Transport's personalised travel planning demonstration programme. Sustrans, 2004.
- Sustrans. Greater Nottingham TravelSmart (Lady Bay and the Meadows): a report on the individualised marketing project funded through the Department for Transport's personalised travel planning demonstration programme. Sustrans, 2004.
- Sustrans. TravelSmart Sheffield (Hillsborough/Middlewood) 2003-04: a report on the individualised marketing project funded through the Department for Transport's personalised travel planning demonstration programme. Sustrans, 2004.
- Socialdata Australia. Travel behaviour change program for parts of the Perth Metropolitan Area under the TravelSmart program 2001 to 2005. Final report: TravelSmart® households program, city of Melville. Socialdata Australia, 2004.
- Sustrans. Bishopston TravelSmart: a report on the individualised marketing project funded through the Department for Transport's personalised travel planning demonstration programme. Sustrans, 2004.
- Sustrans. Cramlington TravelSmart: a report on the individualised marketing project funded through the Department for Transport's personalised travel planning demonstration programme. Sustrans, 2004.
- Socialdata. Provision of services for individualised marketing pilot scheme for Kingston Council: final report. Institute for Transport and Infrastructure Research Ltd, 2004.
- Socialdata, Sustrans. TravelSmart in Doncaster. Final report on the Individualised Travel Marketing Campaign in Bessacarr, 2006. Report for Miller Homes, Ben Bailey Homes and Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council. Socialdata, Sustrans, 2007.
- Socialdata, Sustrans. TravelSmart in East Inverness. Final Report on the individualised travel marketing campaign in Cradlehall, Smithton, Culloden and Balloch, 2007. Report for the Scottish Government and the Highland Council. Socialdata, Sustrans, 2008.
- Socialdata, Sustrans. Lancashire TravelSmart Programme. Interim evaluation of stage 2.1 (Torrisholme). Report for Lancashire County Council. Socialdata, Sustrans, 2007.

- Socialdata, Sustrans. Lancashire travel behaviour research baseline survey 2006: key findings on promoting cycling. Sustrans, 2006.
- Socialdata, Sustrans. TravelSmart in Gloucester: Barton, Tredworth and White City. Final report for the individualised travel marketing programme 2005-06. Report for Gloucester City Council. Socialdata, Sustrans, 2006.
- 30 Cervero R. City CarShare: first-year travel demand impacts. Institute of Urban and Regional Development, University of California at Berkeley, 2002.
- 31 Cervero R, Creedman N, Pohan M, Pai M. City CarShare: assessment of short-term travel-behavior impacts. Institute of Urban and Regional Development, University of California at Berkeley, 2002.
- 32 Cervero R, Creedman N, Pohan M, Pai M, Tsai Y-H. City CarShare: assessment of intermediate-term travel-behavior impacts. Institute of Urban and Regional Development, University of California at Berkeley, 2002.
- Hodgson F, May T, Tight M, Conner M. Evaluation of the MIST travel awareness campaign: 2. The before-and-after study. *Traffic Eng Control* 1998;39:103-12.
- 34 Shoup D. Evaluating the effects of cashing out employer-paid parking: eight case studies. *Transport Policy* 1997;4:201-16.
- 35 Shoup D. Evaluating the effects of parking cash out: eight case studies. Air Resources Board Research Division, California Environmental Protection Agency, 1997.