

# BMJ Open

BMJ Open is committed to open peer review. As part of this commitment we make the peer review history of every article we publish publicly available.

When an article is published we post the peer reviewers' comments and the authors' responses online. We also post the versions of the paper that were used during peer review. These are the versions that the peer review comments apply to.

The versions of the paper that follow are the versions that were submitted during the peer review process. They are not the versions of record or the final published versions. They should not be cited or distributed as the published version of this manuscript.

BMJ Open is an open access journal and the full, final, typeset and author-corrected version of record of the manuscript is available on our site with no access controls, subscription charges or pay-per-view fees (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com>).

If you have any questions on BMJ Open's open peer review process please email [editorial.bmjopen@bmj.com](mailto:editorial.bmjopen@bmj.com)

# BMJ Open

## Cross-sectional and prospective associations of neighborhood environmental attributes with screen time

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2017-019608
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	15-Sep-2017
Complete List of Authors:	Liao, Yung; National Taiwan Normal University, Department of Health Promotion and Health Education; Waseda University, Faculty of Sport Sciences Shibata, Ai ; University of Tsukuba, Faculty of Health and Sport Sciences ISHII, Kaori; Waseda University, Faculty of Sport Sciences Koohsari, Mohammad ; Waseda University, Faculty of Sport Sciences; Australian Catholic University, Institute for Health and Ageing OKA, Koichiro; Faculty of Sport Sciences, Waseda University
<b>Primary Subject Heading</b>:	Public health
Secondary Subject Heading:	Epidemiology
Keywords:	screen time, built environment, prospective

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

1  
2  
3 1 **Cross-sectional and prospective associations of neighborhood environmental**  
4  
5 2 **attributes with screen time**  
6  
7  
8

9  
10 4 Yung Liao <sup>1,2§</sup>, Ai Shibata <sup>3</sup>, Kaori Ishii <sup>2</sup>, Mohammad Javad Koohsari <sup>2,4,5</sup>, Koichiro  
11  
12 5 Oka <sup>2</sup>  
13

14  
15  
16 7 <sup>1</sup> Department of Health Promotion and Health Education, National Taiwan Normal  
17  
18 8 University, 162, Heping East Road Section 1, Taipei, Taiwan. YL:  
19  
20  
21 9 [liaoyung@ntnu.edu.tw](mailto:liaoyung@ntnu.edu.tw)  
22

23 10 <sup>2</sup> Faculty of Sport Sciences, Waseda University, 2-579-15 Mikajima Tokorozawa,  
24  
25 11 Saitama 359-1192, Japan. KI: [ishiikaori@aoni.waseda.jp](mailto:ishiikaori@aoni.waseda.jp) ; KO: [koka@waseda.jp](mailto:koka@waseda.jp)  
26

27 12 <sup>3</sup> Faculty of Health and Sport Sciences, University of Tsukuba, 3-29-1 Otsuka  
28  
29 13 Bunkyo, Tokyo 112-0012, Japan. AS: [ai.o.shibata@gmail.com](mailto:ai.o.shibata@gmail.com)  
30

31 14 <sup>4</sup> Institute for Health and Ageing, Australian Catholic University, Level 6, 215 Spring  
32  
33 15 Street, Melbourne, VIC 3000 Australia. MJK: [Javad.Koohsari@bakeridi.edu.au](mailto:Javad.Koohsari@bakeridi.edu.au)  
34  
35

36 16 <sup>5</sup> Behavioural Epidemiology Laboratory, Baker IDI Heart and Diabetes Institute,  
37  
38 17 Level 4, 99 Commercial Rd, Melbourne, Victoria 3004, Australia  
39  
40

41 18  
42  
43 19 <sup>§</sup>Corresponding author:

44  
45 20 Y.L., E-mail: [liaoyung@ntnu.edu.tw](mailto:liaoyung@ntnu.edu.tw)  
46

47 21 Tel.: +886-7734-1722; Fax: +886-2-2363-3026  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Abstract

**Objectives:** This study examined cross-sectional and 2-year prospective associations of perceived and objectively-measured environmental attributes with screen time among middle-aged Japanese adults.

**Design:** Prospective cohort study

**Setting:** Nerima and Kanuma City of Japan

**Participants:** Data were collected from adults aged 40 to 69 years living in 2 cities of Japan in 2011 (baseline: n=1011; 55.3±8.4 years) and again in 2013 (follow-up: n=533; 52.7% of baseline sample).

**Measures:** The exposure variables were five GIS-based and perceived attributes of neighborhood environments (residential density, access to shops and public transport, footpaths, street connectivity), respectively. The outcome variables were baseline screen time (TV viewing time and leisure-time Internet use) and its change over two years. Multilevel generalized linear modelling was used.

**Results:** At baseline, mean screen time was 2.3 hour/day. There were cross-sectional associations of objective ( $\exp(\beta)$ ):1.11; 95%CI: 1.01, 1.22) and perceived (1.12; 1.02, 1.23) good access to public transport, perceived good access to shop (1.18; 1.04, 1.36), and perceived good street connectivity (1.11; 1.01, 1.23) with higher time spent in screen time at baseline. On average, participants slightly decreased screen time from 2.3 to 2.2 hour/day ( $p=0.238$ ) over two years. No objective and perceived environmental attributes were significantly associated with change in screen time.

**Conclusions:** Activity-supportive neighborhood environmental attributes appear to be related to higher level of screen time cross-sectionally. Pattern of screen time might be maintained rather changed over time under the same neighborhood environments.

1  
2  
3 46 Environmental intervention for promoting physical activity may need to consider the  
4  
5 47 potential negative health impact on screen time in Japan.  
6  
7  
8 48

9  
10 49 **Key words: screen time, built environment, prospective**  
11  
12 50  
13  
14 51

## 16 52 **Strengths and limitations of this study**

- 19 53 1. This study used both cross-sectional and prospective design to provide more  
20  
21 54 confirmative evidence on this issue.  
22  
23 55 2. This study utilized both subjectively and objectively-measured environmental  
24  
25 56 measures, which could better understand what specific conditions of built  
26  
27 57 environment people actually live in and how people perceive and realize these  
28  
29 58 specific environmental attributes could influence their time spent in screen time  
30  
31 59 3. The outcome variable, self-reported screen time, may be subject to recall bias.  
32  
33 60 4. A potential confounder - self-selection of neighborhoods was not examined in this  
34  
35 61 study.  
36  
37  
38  
39 62  
40  
41 63  
42  
43  
44 64  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## 65 Introduction

66 Sedentary behavior, defined as any waking behavior characterized by an energy  
67 expenditure  $\leq 1.5$  metabolic equivalents while in a sitting or reclining posture, has  
68 been recognized a novel risk factor for health [1]. Literature has shown the  
69 deleterious associations between sitting time and all-cause mortality, cardiovascular  
70 disease, type 2 diabetes, overweight/obesity, specific types of cancer and mental  
71 health, independent of physical activity [2,3]; In particular, among several domains  
72 of sedentary behavior, screen-based sedentary behavior is highly prevalent and  
73 increasing rapidly among adults partly because of easily available media-related  
74 technologies [4]. Research has reported screen time (TV viewing and leisure-time  
75 Internet use) is associated with negative health outcomes [5-7] and has been found to  
76 be a predominant component of leisure-time sedentary behavior in adults [8,9].  
77 Therefore, with the increasing engagement of screen time [4,10], there is an urgent  
78 need to develop effective strategies to reduce screen time for disease and obesity  
79 prevention.

80  
81 From the ecological perspective, it is crucial to better understand environmental  
82 determinants of screen time to develop population-based interventions for a long-term  
83 impact [10,11]. However, previous studies examining associations between built  
84 environment attributes and screen-based sedentary behavior are limited in several  
85 significant ways. Most of these previous studies were cross-sectional design [12-14],  
86 reporting from Australia [12,15] and the United States [13,14], as well as more  
87 focusing on only TV viewing and objectively-measured walkability [12,13,15]. These  
88 previous studies have reported that lowly walkable neighbourhood environment is  
89 associated with higher TV viewing time [12,14,15], whereas one study has found no

1  
2  
3 90 associations [13]. However, it remains unclear what specific conditions of built  
4  
5 91 environment people actually live in and how people perceive and realize these  
6  
7 92 specific environmental attributes could influence their time spent in screen time. Thus,  
8  
9  
10 93 in order to strengthen the basis of evidence for developing environmental  
11  
12 94 interventions, further studies examining longitudinal relationship between specific  
13  
14 95 built perceived and objectively-measured neighborhood environment attributes and  
15  
16 96 screen time in adults are needed. In particular, limited studies have focused on Asian  
17  
18 97 countries, it is crucial to further examine how both perceived and objectively-  
19  
20  
21 98 measured environmental attributes are related to changes in screen time in different  
22  
23 99 density, cultural and environmental contexts. These findings would be important to  
24  
25 100 inform policy makers and intervention designers for developing strategies to reduce  
26  
27 101 the increase in screen time through environmental approaches. Therefore, the present  
28  
29 102 study examined cross-sectional and 2-years prospective associations of objective and  
30  
31 103 perceived environmental attributes with screen time in middle-aged Japanese adults.  
32  
33  
34 104

## 35 36 105 **Materials and methods**

### 37 38 39 106 **Participants**

40  
41  
42 107 The present study is a prospective cohort study with two waves of data collection:  
43  
44 108 baseline in 2011 and follow-up in 2013. This study used data from a part of the  
45  
46 109 Healthy Built Environment in Japan (HEBEJ) project. At baseline, a total of 3,000  
47  
48 110 residents aged 40 to 69 years and living in 2 cities in Japan (Nerima City, part of the  
49  
50 111 Tokyo metropolitan area with 716,124 residents and an area of 48 km<sup>2</sup>; Kanuma City,  
51  
52 112 a regional city with 102,348 residents and an area of 491 km<sup>2</sup>) were randomly  
53  
54  
55 113 selected from the registry of residential addresses based on gender, age group, and  
56  
57  
58 114 residential city. The baseline survey was completed by 1,076 residents (response rate:  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 115 35.9%). Excluding the missing data, the final sample was 1011 for the cross-sectional  
4  
5 116 analyses. After two year, 533 (52.7 % of the baseline respondents) completed the  
6  
7 117 follow-up survey.  
8

9  
10 118

## 119 **Outcome variable**

14 120 Participants reported their time spent in the television viewing and leisure-time  
15  
16 121 internet use over a usual week, respectively, which was measured at both baseline and  
17  
18 122 follow-up survey using items with reasonable validity and reliability [16]. The  
19  
20 123 validity and test–retest reliability of the items was both moderate [17]. The outcome  
21  
22 124 variable was calculated by multiplying the number of days participants screen time  
23  
24 125 (the sum of television viewing and leisure-time internet use time) by the average  
25  
26 126 amount of time spent doing so per day. For cross-sectional associations, the outcome  
27  
28 127 variable was baseline screen time per day. For prospective associations, the outcome  
29  
30 128 variable was change of screen time per week from baseline to follow-up survey.  
31  
32

33  
34 129

## 36 130 **Exposure variables**

37  
38  
39 131 The exposure variables of this study were five perceived and five objectively-  
40  
41 132 measured environmental attributes at baseline, selected on the basis of walkability  
42  
43 133 components and other environmental attributes from previous reviews [18,19]. The  
44  
45 134 perceived measures included population density, sidewalk availability, access to  
46  
47 135 public transportation, access to destinations and street connectivity. They were  
48  
49 136 identified using the Japanese version of the IPAQ-E with a 4-point Likert scale  
50  
51 137 (*strongly agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree, and strongly disagree*), which  
52  
53 138 has been shown to have good reliability [20]. These five perceived environmental  
54  
55 139 attributes were categorized into “agree” (*strongly agree and somewhat agree*) and  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 140 “disagree” (*somewhat disagree* and *strongly disagree*). Objective environmental  
4  
5 141 attributes was measured using Geographic Information Systems (GIS). The following  
6  
7 142 five measures were calculated for each participant within a 800-m radius buffer of  
8  
9 143 their residential address (this buffer area corresponded to a neighborhood setting,  
10  
11 144 which was also used to obtain participant’s perceptions): (1) population density (the  
12  
13 145 number of population per square kilometer); (2) sidewalk availability (the length of  
14  
15 146 roads with sidewalks (m) per square km); (3) access to public transportation (the total  
16  
17 147 number of train stations and bus stops per square km); (4) access to destinations (the  
18  
19 148 total number of 30 destination types including convenience store, supermarket,  
20  
21 149 hardware shop, fruit store, dry cleaning store, coin laundry, clothing store, post office,  
22  
23 150 library, book store, fast food store, café, bank, restaurant, video shop, video rental  
24  
25 151 shop, pharmacy, drug store, the hairdresser’s, park, gym, fitness club, sports facility,  
26  
27 152 kindergarten, elementary school, junior high school, high school, 2-year college, 4-  
28  
29 153 year college, university based on a previous study and International Physical Activity  
30  
31 154 Questionnaire-Environmental Module (IPAQ-E) [20,21]; (5) street connectivity (the  
32  
33 155 total number of intersections per square kilometer). These five objectively-measured  
34  
35 156 environmental attributes were dichotomised using the median.  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42

### 158 **Sociodemographic variables**

43  
44  
45 159 Data on respondents’ gender (men, women), age (40–49, 50–59, or 60–69 years),  
46  
47 160 current marital status (married, unmarried), educational level (less than 13 years, 13  
48  
49 161 years or more), employment status (full-time employment, not full-time employment),  
50  
51 162 household income (less than 5 million yen, or 5 million yen or more), body mass  
52  
53 163 index (less than 25kg/m<sup>2</sup>, 25kg/m<sup>2</sup> and higher) and residential area (Nerima city and  
54  
55 164 Kanuma city) were included.  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 1654  
5 166 **Statistical analyses**

6  
7 167 For cross-sectional associations, generalized linear modelling (GLM), specifying a  
8  
9  
10 168 gamma distribution and a log link, was utilized to examine cross-sectional  
11  
12 169 associations of perceived and objectively-measured environmental attributes with  
13  
14 170 screen time at baseline because the distribution of outcome variable was skewed. The  
15  
16 171 covariates were adjusted for baseline demographic variables including gender, age,  
17  
18 172 marital status, education attainment, household income, working status and MVPA.  
19  
20 173 For prospective associations, GLM was also used to identify the relationships of  
21  
22 174 perceived and objectively-measured environmental attributes at baseline with follow-  
23  
24 175 up screen time over 2 years, adjusted for socio-demographic variables at baseline,  
25  
26 176 screen time at baseline and employment status change. This approach is equivalent to  
27  
28 177 modelling change in screen time and controls for regression to the mean, which has  
29  
30 178 been used in previous study [15]. Residence area was utilized as the area level unit of  
31  
32 179 all analysis. Results of each model are reported as antilogarithms of the regression  
33  
34 180 coefficients (and their respective 95%CI). The expected proportional increase (for  
35  
36 181 values > 1) or decrease (for values <1) in screen time for “environmental conditions  
37  
38 182 that would support physical activity” environment (reference: “not support” category).  
39  
40 183 Statistical analyses were conducted using STATA 13 (Stata Corp, College Station,  
41  
42 184 Texas); the level of significance was set at  $p < 0.05$ .

43  
44  
45  
46  
47 18548  
49 186 **Results**

50  
51  
52 187 Basic characteristics of the baseline sample (n=1011) and follow-up sample  
53  
54 188 (n=553) are presented in Table 1. On average, baseline screen time was 2.3 hour/day.  
55  
56 189 At baseline, cross-sectional associations of objectively-measured ( $\exp(\beta)$ :1.11; 95%CI:

1  
2  
3 190 1.01, 1.22) and perceived (exp( $\beta$ ):1.12; 95%CI: 1.02, 1.23) good access to public  
4  
5 191 transport, perceived good access to shop (exp( $\beta$ ):1.18; 95%CI: 1.04, 1.36), and  
6  
7 192 perceived good street connectivity (exp( $\beta$ ):1.11; 95%CI: 1.01, 1.23) with higher time  
8  
9  
10 193 spent in screen time were found. On average, participants slightly decreased screen  
11  
12 194 time from 2.3 to 2.2 hour/day (p=0.238) over two years. For the prospective  
13  
14 195 associations, no objectively-measured and perceived environmental attributes were  
15  
16 196 significantly associated with change in screen time.  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21 198

**Table 1. Characteristics of baseline and follow-up respondents**

	Sample for cross-sectional analyses (n=1011)	Sample for Prospective analyses (n=533)
<b>Baseline</b>		
Gender, % men	512(51.2)	276(51.8)
Age, mean (SD)	55.(84.3)	54.6(8.3)
Marital status, % married	844(84.3)	454(85.2)
Educational attainment, % with tertiary education	536(53.6)	308(57.8)
Household income, %		0
<¥5,000,000 p.a.	492(49.2)	244(45.8)
¥5,000,000 p.a. +	494(49.4)	283(53.1)
Refusing answer or missing	15(1.5)	6(1.1)
Work status, % non-working	743(74.2)	406(76.2)
Physical function, mean (SD)	49.9(6.1)	50(6.3)
BMI, mean (SD)	23(3.2)	22.9(3.3)
MVPA (hr/day), mean (SD)	9.3(13.4)	9.2(12.4)
Screen time (hr/day), mean (SD)	2.3(1.9)	2.3(1.9)
<b>Follow-up</b>		
Change in working status	-	
Keep working	-	388(72.8)
Start working	-	17(3.2)
Stop working	-	18(3.4)
No working	-	110(20.6)
Screen time (hr/day), mean (SD)	-	2.2(1.7)

199

200

201 Table 2: Proportional change (95%CI) in screen time according to objective and perceived  
 202 environmental attributes at baseline (N=1011)

	Exp(B)	95%CI
<b>Perceived</b>		
Residential density (High)	1.02	0.93-1.13
Access to destination (Good)	1.12	1.02-1.23*
Access to public transportation (Good)	1.18	1.04-1.36*
Sidewalk (Yes)	1.06	0.97-1.17
Street connectivity (Good)	1.11	1.01-1.23*
<b>GIS</b>		
Residential density (High)	0.96	0.87-1.06
Access to destination (Good)	1.05	0.96-1.16
Access to public transportation (Good)	1.11	1.01-1.22*
Sidewalk (Yes)	0.99	0.91-1.10
Street connectivity (Good)	1.00	0.91-1.11

203 \* p < 0.05

204 Generalized linear model (specifying a gamma distribution and using a log link)

205 Covariates: gender, age, marital status, education attainment, household income, employment status,

206 car ownership status, BMI and MVPA at baseline

207 Results of each model are reported as antilogarithms of the regression coefficients (and their respective

208 95%CI). The expected proportional increase (for values > 1) or decrease (for values <1) in screen time

209 for “environmental conditions that would support physical activity” (reference: “not support”

210 category).

211

212

213 Table 3: Proportional change (95%CI) in screen time over 2 years according to objective and perceived  
 214 environmental attributes, after adjusted for baseline leisure-time sitting for transport (N=533)

	Exp (B)	95%CI
<b>Perceived</b>		
Residential density (High)	1.11	0.97-1.27
Access to destination (Good)	1.00	0.88-1.14
Access to public transportation (Good)	1.08	0.89-1.3
Sidewalk (Yes)	0.99	0.87-1.12
Street connectivity (Good)	1.06	0.92-1.22
<b>GIS</b>		
Residential density (High)	1.05	0.92-1.2
Access to destination (Good)	1.07	0.94-1.23
Access to public transportation (Good)	1.02	0.9-1.16
Sidewalk (Yes)	1.11	0.98-1.26
Street connectivity (Good)	1.08	0.94-1.24

215 \* p < 0.05

216 Generalized linear model (specifying a gamma distribution and using a log link)

217 Covariates: gender, age, marital status, education attainment, household income, BMI, leisure-time

218 sitting for transport and MVPA at baseline, change in employment status and car ownership

219 Results of each model are reported as antilogarithms of the regression coefficients (and their respective

220 95%CI). The expected proportional increase (for values > 1) or decrease (for values <1) in screen time

221 for “environmental conditions that would support physical activity” (reference: “not support” category)

222

## 223 Discussion

224 To our knowledge, this is the first study to examine both cross-sectional and  
225 prospective associations between neighborhood environments and screen time using  
226 both perceived and objective measures of specific neighborhood environmental  
227 attributes among middle-aged Japanese adults in an Asian country. The results of this  
228 study support previous finding on built environment attributes of neighborhoods that  
229 are related to physical activity also may play an important role in influencing  
230 sedentary behavior independently [12,14,15,22] and further extend the results for  
231 revealing both perceived (good access to public transport, access to shop, and street  
232 connectivity) and objectively-measured (good access to public transport) physical  
233 activity-supportive environmental attributes are related to higher levels of screen time  
234 cross-sectionally. These findings would be important to inform policy makers and  
235 intervention designers that when designing environmental approach to promote  
236 physical activity, it would be crucial to consider its negative impact on screen time, at  
237 least in Japan.

238  
239 Contrary to expectations, adults who live in neighborhood environment with GIS-  
240 measured good access to public transportation, and perceived good access to  
241 destinations, good access to public transportation, good street connectivity was  
242 positively associated with higher levels of screen time, which have been found to be  
243 positively related to higher levels of physical activity [18,23]. The present results  
244 were also inconsistent with previous studies which have reported the inverse  
245 associations between high walkable environment and screen-based sedentary time  
246 from Western countries [12,14,15]. Only one Belgium study reported similar result  
247 with the present study that high walkable environment is positively associated with

1  
2  
3 248 total sitting time [22]. The possible speculation for these results could be that physical  
4  
5 249 activity-supportive neighborhood environment (e.g. there are so many shops, train  
6  
7 250 stations, and bus stops within 1.6km radius of their house) could reduce the time spent  
8  
9  
10 251 in commute and daily errand, and thus adults may have more leisure-time to engage in  
11  
12 252 screen time. Although there is limited evidence in existing literature to draw the  
13  
14 253 conclusion and possible mechanism regarding the inverse associations between  
15  
16 254 environment and screen time, the present study may have several important  
17  
18 255 implications. First of all, the perceptions of environmental attributes should be  
19  
20  
21 256 considered to be predictors of screen time for future studies. Moreover, further  
22  
23 257 evidence in Asian countries using specific environmental measures are needed due to  
24  
25 258 the difference in residential density, culture and built environment between Western  
26  
27 259 countries and Asian country. Finally, examining the relationships among  
28  
29 260 environmental factors, physical activity and sedentary behavior concurrently would be  
30  
31 261 the priority to better understand the potential positive or negative health effects of  
32  
33 262 environment on both physical activity and sedentary behavior for the policy initiatives.  
34  
35  
36 263  
37  
38 264 Another novel finding is that no prospective associations of screen time over 2 years  
39  
40 265 with objective and perceived environmental attributes. The possible explanation for  
41  
42 266 this result could be that the follow-up duration of this study was only two years and  
43  
44 267 screen time is a highly domestic behaviour for adults during leisure time, which may  
45  
46 268 maintain for years unless the adjustment of home environment or the change in  
47  
48 269 employment status. Therefore, the present study might provide a preliminary  
49  
50 270 understanding on built environmental determinants of screen time for developing  
51  
52 271 effective population-based interventions [10,11]. Therefore, to further confirm the  
53  
54 272 prospective associations, studies with a longer follow-up time are needed in the future.  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 273  
4

5 274 This study has several limitations. First, the outcome variable - self-reported screen  
6  
7 275 time may be subject to recall bias. Thus, future studies should consider measuring  
8  
9 276 screen time using objectively measurement to provide more confirmative evidence.  
10  
11 277 Second, a potential confounder - self-selection of neighborhoods was not examined in  
12  
13 278 this study. Despite such limitations, the strengths of this study were the both cross-  
14  
15 279 sectional and prospective design and the utilization of five both subjectively and  
16  
17 280 objectively-measured environmental components, which could provide more  
18  
19 281 confirmative evidence on this issue.  
20  
21  
22

23 282

## 24 283 **Conclusion**

25  
26  
27  
28 284 Activity-supportive neighborhood environmental attributes appear to be related to  
29  
30 285 higher level of screen time cross-sectionally. Pattern of screen time might be  
31  
32 286 maintained rather changed over time under the same neighborhood environments.  
33  
34 287 Environmental intervention for promoting physical activity may need to consider the  
35  
36 288 potential negative health impact of screen time in Japan.  
37  
38

39 289

40  
41 290  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 291 **Declarations**  
4

5  
6 292 **Ethics approval and consent to participate**  
7

8  
9 293 Written informed consent was obtained from all respondents. This survey received prior approval from  
10  
11 294 the Institutional Ethics Committee of Waseda University.

12  
13 295 **Consent for publication**  
14

15 296 Our manuscript did not include any details, images, or videos relating to individual participants. All  
16  
17 297 participants agreed with that their self-reported data will be used for publication.

18  
19 298 **Availability of data and material**  
20

21 299 This study used data from a part of the Healthy Built Environment in Japan (HEBEJ) project. Data and  
22  
23 300 material is available in Lab of Behavioral Sciences (Oka Koichiro), College of Sport Sciences at  
24  
25 301 Waseda University (Address: 2-579-15 Mikajima Tokorozawa, Saitama 359-1192, Japan)

26  
27 302 **Contributorship statement**  
28

- 29 303 1. Study concept and design: Oka, Shibata, Ishii.  
30  
31 304 2. Acquisition, analysis, or interpretation of data: Liao, Shibata  
32  
33 305 3. Drafting of the manuscript: Liao, Shibata, Koohsari.  
34  
35 306 4. Critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content: Oka, Shibata, Ishii, Koohsari  
36  
37 307 5. Statistical analysis: Liao, Shibata.  
38  
39 308 6. Administrative, technical, or material support: Ishii, Koohsari  
40  
41 309 7. Study supervision: Oka, Shibata.

42  
43 310 **Funding**  
44

45 311 This study was supported by the Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (No.26242070) from Japan  
46  
47 312 Society for the Promotion of Science and the 29<sup>th</sup> Research Grant in Medical and Health Science of  
48  
49 313 Meiji Yasuda Life Foundation of Health and Welfare.

50  
51 314 **Conflict of Interest Statement**  
52

53 315 The authors declare that there are no conflicts of interest.  
54

55 316 **Acknowledgements**  
56

57  
58 317 Not applicable.  
59  
60

## 318 **References**

- 319 1. Owen N, Salmon J, Koohsari MJ, Turrell G, Giles-Corti B. Sedentary behaviour  
320 and health: mapping environmental and social contexts to underpin chronic  
321 disease prevention. *Br J Sports Med.* 2014;48(3):174-7.
- 322 2. Thorp AA, Owen N, Neuhaus M, Dunstan DW. Sedentary behaviors and  
323 subsequent health outcomes in adults a systematic review of longitudinal studies,  
324 1996-2011. *Am J Prev Med.* 2011;41(2):207-15.
- 325 3. Teychenne M, Ball K, Salmon J. Sedentary behavior and depression among  
326 adults: a review. *Int J Behav Med.* 2010;17:246-54.
- 327 4. Institute for Information and Communications Policy. Survey of communication  
328 media use and behavior; 2014 [cited 2016 Jul 4]. Available from:  
329 [http://www.soumu.go.jp/main\\_content/000357570.pdf](http://www.soumu.go.jp/main_content/000357570.pdf) (in Japanese)
- 330 5. Grontved A, Hu FB. Television viewing and risk of type 2 diabetes,  
331 cardiovascular disease, and all-cause mortality: a meta-analysis. *JAMA.* 2011;  
332 305:2448-55.
- 333 6. Matthews CE, Chen KY, Freedson PS, Buchowski MS, Beech BM, Pate RR, et al.  
334 Amount of time spent in sedentary behaviors in the United States, 2003-2004. *Am*  
335 *J Epidemiol.* 2008;167(7):875-81.
- 336 7. Vandelanotte C, Sugiyama T, Gardiner P, Owen N. Associations of leisuretime  
337 Internet and computer use with overweight and obesity, physical activity and  
338 sedentary behaviors: cross-sectional study. *J Med Internet Res.* 2009;11(3):e28.
- 339 8. Owen N, Leslie E, Salmon J, Fotheringham MJ. Environmental determinants of  
340 physical activity and sedentary behavior. *Exerc Sport Sci Rev.* 2000;28:153-8.

- 1  
2  
3 341 9. Sugiyama T, Healy GN, Dunstan DW, Salmon J, Owen N. Is television viewing  
4  
5 342 time a marker of a broader pattern of sedentary behavior? *Ann Behav Med.* 2008;  
6  
7 343 35:245-50.  
8  
9  
10 344 10. Owen N, Sugiyama T, Eakin EE, Gardiner PA, Tremblay MS, Sallis JF. Adults'  
11  
12 345 sedentary behavior determinants and interventions. *Am J Prev Med.* 2011;  
13  
14 346 41(2):189-96.  
15  
16 347 11. Owen N. Sedentary behavior: understanding and influencing adults' prolonged  
17  
18 348 sitting time. *Prev Med.* 2012;55(6):535-9.  
19  
20  
21 349 12. Sugiyama T, Salmon J, Dunstan DW, Bauman AE, Owen N. Neighborhood  
22  
23 350 walkability and TV viewing time among Australian adults. *Am J Prev Med.*  
24  
25 351 2007;33(6):444-9.  
26  
27 352 13. Coogan PF, White LF, Evans SR, Palmer JR, Rosenberg L. The Influence of  
28  
29 353 Neighborhood Socioeconomic Status and Walkability on TV viewing time. *J Phys*  
30  
31 354 *Act Health.* 2012;9(8):1074-9.  
32  
33  
34 355 14. Kozo J, Sallis JF, Conway TL, Kerr J, Cain K, Saelens BE, et al. Sedentary  
35  
36 356 behaviors of adults in relation to neighborhood walkability and income. *Health*  
37  
38 357 *Psychol.* 2012;31(6):704-13.  
39  
40  
41 358 15. Ding D, Sugiyama T, Winkler E, Cerin E, Wijndaele K, Owen N. Correlates of  
42  
43 359 Change in Adults' Television Viewing Time: A Four-Year Follow-up Study. *Med*  
44  
45 360 *Sci Sports Exerc.* 2012;44(7):1287-92.  
46  
47  
48 361 16. Salmon J, Owen N, Crawford D, Bauman A, Sallis JF. Physical activity and  
49  
50 362 sedentary behavior: a population-based study of barriers, enjoyment, and  
51  
52 363 preference. *Health Psychol.* 2003;22(2):178-88.  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 364 17. Ishii K, Shibata A, Oka K. Sociodemographic and Anthropometric Factors  
4  
5 365 Associated With Screen-Based Sedentary Behavior Among Japanese Adults: A  
6  
7 366 Population-Based Cross-Sectional Study. *J Epidemiol.* 2013;23(5):382-8.  
8  
9  
10 367 18. Brownson RC, Hoehner CM, Day K, Forsyth A, Sallis JF. Measuring the built  
11  
12 368 environment for physical activity: state of the science. *Am J Prev Med.* 2009;  
13  
14 369 36(4):S99-123.e12.  
15  
16 370 19. Saelens BE, Sallis JF, Frank LD. Environmental correlates of walking and cycling:  
17  
18 371 findings from the transportation, urban design, and planning literatures. *Ann*  
19  
20 372 *Behav Med.* 2003;25(2):80-9.  
21  
22  
23 373 20. Inoue S, Murase N, Shimomitsu T, Ohya Y, Odagiri Y, Takamiya T, et al.  
24  
25 374 Association of Physical Activity and Neighborhood Environment among Japanese  
26  
27 375 Adults. *Prev Med.* 2009; 48(4):321-5.  
28  
29  
30 376 21. Hanibuchi T, Kawachi I, Nakaya T, Hirai H, Kondo K. Neighborhood built  
31  
32 377 environment and physical activity of Japanese older adults: results from the Aichi  
33  
34 378 Gerontological Evaluation Study (AGES). *BMC Public Health.* 2011;11:657.  
35  
36 379 22. Van Dyck D, Cardon G, Deforche B, Owen N, Sallis JF, De Bourdeaudhuij I.  
37  
38 380 Neighborhood walkability and sedentary time in Belgian adults. *Am J Prev Med.*  
39  
40 381 2010;39(1):25-32.  
41  
42  
43 382 23. Saelens BE, Handy SL. Built environment correlates of walking: a review. *Med*  
44  
45 383 *Sci Sports Exerc.* 2008;40:S550-66.  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

# BMJ Open

## Cross-sectional and prospective associations of neighborhood environmental attributes with screen time in Japanese middle-aged and older adults

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2017-019608.R1
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	28-Dec-2017
Complete List of Authors:	Liao, Yung; National Taiwan Normal University, Department of Health Promotion and Health Education; Waseda University, Faculty of Sport Sciences Shibata, Ai ; University of Tsukuba, Faculty of Health and Sport Sciences ISHII, Kaori; Waseda University, Faculty of Sport Sciences Koohsari, Mohammad ; Waseda University, Faculty of Sport Sciences; Australian Catholic University, Institute for Health and Ageing OKA, Koichiro; Faculty of Sport Sciences, Waseda University
<b>Primary Subject Heading</b>:	Public health
Secondary Subject Heading:	Epidemiology
Keywords:	screen time, built environment, prospective

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

Only

1 **Cross-sectional and prospective associations of neighborhood environmental**  
2 **attributes with screen time in Japanese middle-aged and older adults**

3

4 Yung Liao <sup>1,2§</sup>, Ai Shibata <sup>3</sup>, Kaori Ishii <sup>2</sup>, Mohammad Javad Koohsari <sup>2,4,5</sup>, Koichiro  
5 Oka <sup>2</sup>

6

7 <sup>1</sup> Department of Health Promotion and Health Education, National Taiwan Normal  
8 University, 162, Heping East Road Section 1, Taipei, Taiwan. YL:  
9 [liaoyung@ntnu.edu.tw](mailto:liaoyung@ntnu.edu.tw)

10 <sup>2</sup> Faculty of Sport Sciences, Waseda University, 2-579-15 Mikajima Tokorozawa,  
11 Saitama 359-1192, Japan. KI: [ishiikaori@aoni.waseda.jp](mailto:ishiikaori@aoni.waseda.jp) ; KO: [koka@waseda.jp](mailto:koka@waseda.jp)

12 <sup>3</sup> Faculty of Health and Sport Sciences, University of Tsukuba, 3-29-1 Otsuka  
13 Bunkyo, Tokyo 112-0012, Japan. AS: [ai.o.shibata@gmail.com](mailto:ai.o.shibata@gmail.com)

14 <sup>4</sup> Institute for Health and Ageing, Australian Catholic University, Level 6, 215 Spring  
15 Street, Melbourne, VIC 3000 Australia. MJK: [Javad.Koohsari@bakeridi.edu.au](mailto:Javad.Koohsari@bakeridi.edu.au)

16 <sup>5</sup> Behavioural Epidemiology Laboratory, Baker IDI Heart and Diabetes Institute,  
17 Level 4, 99 Commercial Rd, Melbourne, Victoria 3004, Australia

18

19 <sup>§</sup>Corresponding author:

20 Y.L., E-mail: [liaoyung@ntnu.edu.tw](mailto:liaoyung@ntnu.edu.tw)

21 Tel.: +886-7734-1722; Fax: +886-2-2363-3026

22

## Abstract

23 **Objectives:** This study examined cross-sectional and 2-year prospective associations  
24 of perceived and objectively-measured environmental attributes with screen time  
25 among middle-aged Japanese adults.

26 **Design:** Prospective cohort study

27 **Setting:** Nerima and Kanuma City of Japan

28 **Participants:** Data were collected from adults aged 40 to 69 years living in 2 cities of  
29 Japan in 2011 (baseline: n=1011; 55.3±8.4 years) and again in 2013 (follow-up:  
30 n=533; 52.7% of baseline sample).

31 **Measures:** The exposure variables were five GIS-based and perceived attributes of  
32 neighborhood environments (residential density, access to shops and public transport,  
33 footpaths, street connectivity), respectively. The outcome variables were baseline  
34 screen time (TV viewing time and leisure-time Internet use) and its change over two  
35 years. Multilevel generalized linear modelling was used.

36 **Results:** On average, participants' screen time was not statistically different over 2  
37 years (2.3 hours/day at baseline and 2.2 hours/day at follow-up; p=0.24). There were  
38 cross-sectional associations of objective ( $\exp(\beta)$ :1.11; 95%CI: 1.01, 1.22) and  
39 perceived (1.12; 1.02, 1.23) good access to public transport, perceived good access to  
40 shop (1.18; 1.04, 1.36), and perceived good street connectivity (1.11; 1.01, 1.23) with  
41 higher time spent in screen time at baseline. No objective and perceived  
42 environmental attributes were significantly associated with change in screen time.

43 **Conclusions:** Activity-supportive neighborhood environmental attributes appear to be  
44 related to higher level of screen time cross-sectionally. Pattern of screen time might  
45 be maintained rather changed over time under the same neighborhood environments.

1  
2  
3 46 Environmental intervention for promoting physical activity may need to consider the  
4  
5 47 potential negative health impact on screen time in Japan.  
6  
7 48

8  
9 49 **Key words: screen time, built environment, prospective**  
10  
11 50  
12  
13 51  
14  
15

## 16 52 **Strengths and limitations of this study**

- 17  
18  
19 53 1. This study used both cross-sectional and prospective design to provide more  
20  
21 54 confirmative evidence on this issue.  
22  
23 55 2. This study utilized both subjectively and objectively-measured environmental  
24  
25 56 measures, which could better understand what specific conditions of built  
26  
27 57 environment people actually live in and how people perceive and realize these  
28  
29 58 specific environmental attributes could influence their time spent in screen time  
30  
31 59 3. The outcome variable, self-reported screen time, may be subject to recall bias.  
32  
33  
34 60 4. Potential confounders such as self-selection of neighborhoods and home  
35  
36 61 environment were not examined in this study  
37  
38 62 5. The final sample may not be representative of the populations of Nerima City and  
39  
40 63 Kanuma City.  
41  
42  
43 64  
44  
45 65  
46  
47 66  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



## 67 **Introduction**

68 Sedentary behavior, defined as any waking behavior characterized by an energy  
69 expenditure  $\leq 1.5$  metabolic equivalents while in a sitting or reclining posture, has  
70 been recognized a novel risk factor for health [1]. Literature has shown the  
71 deleterious associations between sitting time and all-cause mortality, cardiovascular  
72 disease, type 2 diabetes, overweight/obesity, specific types of cancer and mental  
73 health, independent of physical activity [2,3]. In particular, among several domains of  
74 sedentary behavior, screen-based sedentary behavior is highly prevalent and  
75 increasing rapidly among adults partly because of easily available media-related  
76 technologies [4]. Research has reported screen time (TV viewing and leisure-time  
77 Internet use) is associated with negative health outcomes [5-7] and has been found to  
78 be a predominant component of leisure-time sedentary behavior in adults [8,9].  
79 Therefore, with the increasing engagement of screen time [4,10], there is an urgent  
80 need to develop effective strategies to reduce screen time for disease and obesity  
81 prevention.

82  
83 From the ecological perspective, it is crucial to better understand environmental  
84 determinants of screen time to develop population-based interventions for a long-term  
85 impact [10,11]. However, previous studies examining associations between built  
86 environment attributes and screen-based sedentary behavior are limited in several  
87 significant ways. Most of these previous studies were cross-sectional design [12-14],  
88 reporting from Australia [12,15] and the United States [13,14], as well as more  
89 focusing on only TV viewing and objectively-measured walkability [12,13,15]. These  
90 previous studies have reported that lowly walkable neighbourhood environment is  
91 associated with higher TV viewing time [12,14,15], whereas one study has found no

1  
2  
3 92 associations [13]. However, it remains unclear what specific conditions of built  
4  
5 93 environment people actually live in and how people perceive and realize these  
6  
7 94 specific environmental attributes could influence their time spent in screen time. Thus,  
8  
9 95 in order to strengthen the basis of evidence for developing environmental  
10  
11 96 interventions, further studies examining longitudinal relationship between specific  
12  
13 97 built perceived and objectively-measured neighborhood environment attributes and  
14  
15 98 screen time in adults are needed. In particular, limited studies have focused on Asian  
16  
17 99 countries, it is crucial to further examine how both perceived and objectively-  
18  
19  
20 100 measured environmental attributes are related to changes in screen time in different  
21  
22 101 density, cultural and environmental contexts. These findings would be important to  
23  
24 102 inform policy makers and intervention designers for developing strategies to reduce  
25  
26 103 the increase in screen time through environmental approaches. Therefore, the present  
27  
28 104 study examined cross-sectional and 2-years prospective associations of objective and  
29  
30  
31 105 perceived environmental attributes with screen time in middle-aged Japanese adults.  
32  
33  
34

## 35 107 **Materials and methods**

### 38 108 **Participants**

39  
40  
41 109 The present study is a prospective cohort study with two waves of data collection:  
42  
43 110 baseline in 2011 and follow-up in 2013. This study used data from a part of the  
44  
45 111 Healthy Built Environment in Japan (HEBEJ) project. At baseline, a total of 3,000  
46  
47 112 residents aged 40 to 69 years and living in 2 cities in Japan (Nerima City, part of the  
48  
49 113 Tokyo metropolitan area with 716,124 residents and an area of 48 km<sup>2</sup>; Kanuma City,  
50  
51 114 a regional city with 102,348 residents and an area of 491 km<sup>2</sup>) were randomly  
52  
53  
54 115 selected from the registry of residential addresses based on gender, age group, and  
55  
56 116 residential city. The baseline survey was completed by 1,076 residents (response rate:  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 117 35.9%). Excluding the missing data, the final sample was 1,011 for the cross-sectional  
4  
5 118 analyses. After two years, 533 (52.7 % of the baseline respondents) completed the  
6  
7 119 follow-up survey.  
8

9  
10  
11 120

## 121 **Outcome variable**

122 Participants reported their time spent in the television viewing and leisure-time  
123 internet use over a usual week (screen time). Participants were asked, “On how many  
124 days did you do the activity during leisure time in the past 7 days?” and “On average,  
125 how many minutes did you do the activity during leisure time on the days that you did  
126 it?” Using this format, we identified time spent sitting in screen time by multiplying  
127 the number of days participants watched television and used internet during leisure  
128 time by the average amount of time spent doing so per day. The scale was previously  
129 shown to have reasonable reliability and validity [16]. The test–retest reliability of the  
130 items was moderate (range 0.6–0.8) and the validity, defined as correlations with 3-  
131 day behavioral log data was also moderate (range 0.3–0.6) [17]. For cross-sectional  
132 associations, the outcome variable was baseline screen time per day. For prospective  
133 associations, the outcome variable was change of screen time per week from baseline  
134 to follow-up survey.  
135

136

## 136 **Exposure variables**

137 The exposure variables of this study were five environmental attributes – population  
138 density, sidewalk availability, access to public transportation, access to destinations,  
139 and street connectivity – measured both subjectively and objectively at baseline.

140 These domains were selected on the basis of walkability components and other  
141 environmental attributes from previous reviews [18,19]. The perceived measures were

1  
2  
3 142 identified using the Japanese version of the International Physical Activity  
4  
5 143 Questionnaire Environmental Module (IPAQ-E) with a 4-point Likert scale (*strongly*  
6  
7 144 *agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree, and strongly disagree*). The scale has  
8  
9 145 been shown to have good reliability [20]. Five items of IPAQ-E were included: (1)  
10  
11 146 population density (“What is the main type of housing in your neighborhood?” For  
12  
13 147 this question, the five options were detached single-family housing; apartments with  
14  
15 148 2–3 stories; mix of single-family housing and apartments with 2–3 stories; condos  
16  
17 149 with 4–12 stories; and condos with >13 stories); (2) sidewalk availability (“There are  
18  
19 150 sidewalks on most of the streets in my neighbourhood”); (3) access to public  
20  
21 151 transportation (“It is less than a 10–15 min walk to a transit station from my home”);  
22  
23 152 (4) access to destinations (“There are many places to go within easy walking distance  
24  
25 153 of my home”); (5) street connectivity (“There are many 4-way intersections in my  
26  
27 154 neighbourhood”). Population density was divided into “lower (detached single-family  
28  
29 155 housing)” and “higher (others)”. Other four perceived environmental attributes were  
30  
31 156 categorized into “agree” (*strongly agree* and *somewhat agree*) and “disagree”  
32  
33 157 (*somewhat disagree* and *strongly disagree*).  
34  
35  
36  
37 158  
38  
39 159 Objective environmental attributes was measured using Geographic Information  
40  
41 160 Systems (GIS). The following five measures were calculated for each participant  
42  
43 161 within a 800-m radius buffer of their residential address (this buffer area  
44  
45 162 corresponded to a neighborhood setting, which was also used to obtain participant’s  
46  
47 163 perceptions): (1) population density (the number of population per square kilometer);  
48  
49 164 (2) sidewalk availability (the length of roads with sidewalks (m) per square km); (3)  
50  
51 165 access to public transportation (the total number of train stations and bus stops per  
52  
53 166 square km); (4) access to destinations (the total number of 30 destination types  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 167 including convenience store, supermarket, hardware shop, fruit store, dry cleaning  
4  
5 168 store, coin laundry, clothing store, post office, library, book store, fast food store, café,  
6  
7 169 bank, restaurant, video shop, video rental shop, pharmacy, drug store, the  
8  
9 170 hairdresser's, park, gym, fitness club, sports facility, kindergarten, elementary school,  
10  
11 171 junior high school, high school, 2-year college, 4-year college, university based on a  
12  
13 172 previous study and IPAQ-E [20,21]; (5) street connectivity (the total number of  
14  
15 173 intersections per square kilometer). These five objectively-measured environmental  
16  
17 174 attributes were dichotomised using the median.  
18  
19  
20  
21

## 22 176 **Covariates**

23  
24  
25 177 The selection of covariates was based on previous studies [22, 23]. Data on  
26  
27 178 respondents' gender (men, women), age (40–49, 50–59, or 60–69 years), current  
28  
29 179 marital status (married, unmarried), educational level (less than 13 years, 13 years or  
30  
31 180 more), employment status (full-time employment, not full-time employment),  
32  
33 181 household income (less than 5 million yen, or 5 million yen or more), body mass  
34  
35 182 index (less than 25kg/m<sup>2</sup>, 25kg/m<sup>2</sup> and higher) and residential area (Nerima city and  
36  
37 183 Kanuma city), physical function and moderate-to-vigorous physical activity (MVPA)  
38  
39 184 were included. Physical function was measured by The Japanese version of the  
40  
41 185 Medical Outcomes Study (MOS) Short Form 8-Item Health Survey (SF-8) [24].  
42  
43 186 Participants were ask “During the past 4 weeks, how much did physical health  
44  
45 187 problems limit your physical activities (such as walking or climbing stairs)?”. MVPA  
46  
47 188 was measured by the self-administered, short Japanese version of the International  
48  
49 189 Physical Activity Questionnaire (IPAQ-SV). The test-retest reliability ( $r = 0.72-0.93$ )  
50  
51 190 and criterion validity ( $r = 0.39$ ) of the version of the IPAQ-SV are good and  
52  
53 191 acceptable, respectively [25]. The total number of minutes per week in vigorous-  
54  
55  
56  
57

1  
2  
3 192 intensity physical activity, moderate-intensity physical activity, and walking was  
4  
5 193 computed.

6  
7 194

8  
9 195

## 10 196 **Statistical analyses**

11  
12  
13 197 For cross-sectional associations, generalized linear modelling (GLM), specifying a  
14  
15 198 gamma distribution and a log link, was utilized to examine cross-sectional  
16  
17 199 associations of perceived and objectively-measured environmental attributes with  
18  
19 200 screen time at baseline because the distribution of outcome variable was skewed. The  
20  
21 201 covariates were adjusted for baseline demographic variables including gender, age,  
22  
23 202 marital status, education attainment, household income, working status and MVPA.

24  
25 203 For prospective associations, GLM was also used to identify the relationships of  
26  
27 204 perceived and objectively-measured environmental attributes at baseline with follow-  
28  
29 205 up screen time over 2 years, adjusted for socio-demographic variables at baseline,  
30  
31 206 screen time at baseline and employment status change. This approach is equivalent to  
32  
33 207 modelling change in screen time and controls for regression to the mean, which has  
34  
35 208 been used in previous study [15]. Residence area was utilized as the area level unit of  
36  
37 209 all analysis. Results of each model are reported as antilogarithms of the regression  
38  
39 210 coefficients (and their respective 95%CI). The expected proportional increase (for  
40  
41 211 values > 1) or decrease (for values <1) in screen time for “environmental conditions  
42  
43 212 that would support physical activity” environment (reference: “not support” category).

44  
45 213 For cross-sectional analysis, coefficients less than 1 denote proportionally less time  
46  
47 214 spent in screen time (e.g.  $\text{Exp}(B)=0.95$  means 5% less time), whereas coefficients  
48  
49 215 more than 1 denote proportionally more time spent in screen time, relative to the  
50  
51 216 reference category. (e.g.  $\text{Exp}(B)=1.06$  means 6% more time). For prospective

1  
2  
3 217 analysis, coefficients less than 1 denote proportionally decreased time spent in screen  
4  
5 218 time, whereas coefficients more than 1 denote proportionally increased time spent in  
6  
7 219 screen time, relative to the reference category. Statistical analyses were conducted  
8  
9 220 using STATA 13 (Stata Corp, College Station, Texas); the level of significance was  
10  
11 221 set at  $p < 0.05$ .

12  
13 222

## 14 15 223 **Results**

16  
17  
18 224 Basic characteristics of the baseline sample ( $n=1011$ , mean age:  $55.8\pm 4.3$  years)  
19  
20 225 and follow-up sample ( $n=553$ , mean age:  $54.6\pm 8.3$  years) are presented in Table 1. On  
21  
22 226 average, participants' screen time was not statistically different over 2 years (2.3  
23  
24 227 hours/day at baseline and 2.2 hours/day at follow-up;  $p=0.24$ ). Table 2 shows that at  
25  
26 228 baseline, after adjusted for potential confounders (model 2), cross-sectional  
27  
28 229 associations of objectively-measured ( $\exp(\beta):1.11$ ; 95%CI: 1.01, 1.22) and perceived  
29  
30 230 ( $\exp(\beta):1.12$ ; 95%CI: 1.02, 1.23) good access to public transport, perceived good  
31  
32 231 access to shop ( $\exp(\beta):1.18$ ; 95%CI: 1.04, 1.36), and perceived good street  
33  
34 232 connectivity ( $\exp(\beta):1.11$ ; 95%CI: 1.01, 1.23) with higher time spent in screen time  
35  
36 233 were found. As Table 3 shows, for the prospective associations, no objectively-  
37  
38 234 measured and perceived environmental attributes were significantly associated with  
39  
40 235 change in screen time.

41  
42 236

43  
44 237

238 **Table 1. Characteristics of baseline and follow-up respondents**

	Sample for cross-sectional analyses (n=1011)	Sample for Prospective analyses (n=533)
<b>Baseline</b>		
Gender, % men	512(51.2)	276(51.8)
Age, mean (SD)	55.8(4.3)	54.6(8.3)
Marital status, % married	844(84.3)	454(85.2)
Educational attainment, % with tertiary education	536(53.6)	308(57.8)
Household income, %		
<¥5,000,000 p.a.	492(49.2)	244(45.8)
¥5,000,000 p.a. +	494(49.4)	283(53.1)
Refusing answer or missing	15(1.5)	6(1.1)
Work status, % non-working	743(74.2)	406(76.2)
BMI, mean (SD)	23(3.2)	22.9(3.3)
MVPA (hr/week), mean (SD)	9.3(13.4)	9.2(12.4)
Screen time (hr/day), mean (SD)	2.3(1.9)	2.3(1.9)
<b>Follow-up</b>		
Change in working status	-	
Keep working	-	388(72.8)
Start working	-	17(3.2)
Stop working	-	18(3.4)
No working	-	110(20.6)
Screen time (hr/day), mean (SD)	-	2.2(1.7)

239 Abbreviation: MVPA, moderate-to-vigorous physical activity; BMI, body mass index.

240



241 Table 2: Proportional change (95%CI) in screen time according to objective and perceived  
 242 environmental attributes at baseline (N=1011)

	Model 1			Model 2		
	Exp(B)	95%CI	p-value	Exp(B)	95%CI	p-value
<b>Perceived</b>						
Residential density (High)	1.02	0.91-1.14	0.69	1.02	0.93-1.13	0.66
Access to destination (Good)	1.10	0.99-1.22	0.06	1.12	1.02-1.23	0.02*
Access to public transportation (Good)	1.20	1.03-1.39	0.01*	1.18	1.04-1.36	0.01*
Sidewalk (Yes)	1.04	0.94-1.15	0.43	1.06	0.97-1.17	0.20
Street connectivity (Good)	1.10	0.99-1.23	0.08	1.11	1.01-1.23*	0.04*
<b>GIS</b>						
Residential density (High)	0.96	0.87-1.06	0.45	0.96	0.87-1.06	0.44
Access to destination (Good)	1.07	0.96-1.18	0.21	1.05	0.96-1.16	0.29
Access to public transportation (Good)	1.13	1.03-1.25	0.01*	1.11	1.01-1.22	0.03*
Sidewalk (Yes)	0.99	0.89-1.10	0.88	0.99	0.91-1.10	0.98
Street connectivity (Good)	0.97	0.88-1.08	0.60	1.00	0.91-1.11	0.95

243 \* p < 0.05

244 Generalized linear model (specifying a gamma distribution and using a log link)

245 Model 1: Unadjusted model; Model 2: Adjusted for gender, age, marital status, education attainment,  
 246 household income, employment status, car ownership status, BMI, physical function and MVPA at  
 247 baseline

248 Results of each model are reported as antilogarithms of the regression coefficients (and their respective  
 249 95%CI). Coefficients less than 1 denote proportionally less time spent in screen time, whereas  
 250 coefficients more than 1 denote proportionally more time spent in screen time, relative to the reference  
 251 category.

252 Abbreviation: MVPA, moderate-to-vigorous physical activity; BMI, body mass index.

253

254

255 Table 3: Proportional change (95%CI) in screen time over 2 years according to objective and perceived  
 256 environmental attributes, after adjusted for baseline leisure-time sitting for transport (N=533)

	Model 1			Model 2		
	Exp (B)	95%CI	p-value	Exp (B)	95%CI	p-value
<b>Perceived</b>						
Residential density (High)	1.06	1.16-1.25	0.37	1.11	0.97-1.27	0.14
Access to destination (Good)	0.96	0.84-1.10	0.54	1.00	0.88-1.14	0.97
Access to public transportation (Good)	1.06	0.87-1.29	0.54	1.08	0.89-1.30	0.46
Sidewalk (Yes)	0.96	0.84-1.09	0.50	0.99	0.87-1.12	0.84
Street connectivity (Good)	1.03	0.89-1.19	0.72	1.06	0.92-1.22	0.39
<b>GIS</b>						
Residential density (High)	1.01	0.88-1.14	0.94	1.05	0.92-1.20	0.47
Access to destination (Good)	1.06	0.93-1.20	0.41	1.07	0.94-1.23	0.29
Access to public transportation (Good)	1.02	0.90-1.16	0.78	1.02	0.90-1.16	0.74
Sidewalk (Yes)	1.10	0.97-1.24	0.16	1.11	0.98-1.26	0.10
Street connectivity (Good)	1.04	0.91-1.18	0.58	1.08	0.94-1.24	0.26

257 \* p < 0.05

258 Generalized linear model (specifying a gamma distribution and using a log link)

259 Model 1: Unadjusted model; Model 2: Adjusted for gender, age, marital status, education attainment,  
 260 household income, BMI, physical function and MVPA at baseline, change in employment status and  
 261 car ownership.

262 Results of each model are reported as antilogarithms of the regression coefficients (and their respective  
 263 95%CI). Coefficients less than 1 denote proportionally decreased time spent in screen time, whereas  
 264 coefficients more than 1 denote proportionally increased time spent in screen time, relative to the  
 265 reference category.

266 Abbreviation: MVPA, moderate-to-vigorous physical activity; BMI, body mass index.

267

268

## 269 Discussion

270 To our knowledge, this is the first study to examine both cross-sectional and  
271 prospective associations between neighborhood environments and screen time using  
272 both perceived and objective measures of specific neighborhood environmental  
273 attributes among middle-aged Japanese adults in an Asian country. The results of this  
274 study support previous finding on built environment attributes of neighborhoods that  
275 are related to physical activity also may play an important role in influencing  
276 sedentary behavior independently [12,14,15,26] and further extend the results for  
277 revealing both perceived (good access to public transport, access to shop, and street  
278 connectivity) and objectively-measured (good access to public transport) physical  
279 activity-supportive environmental attributes are related to higher levels of screen time  
280 cross-sectionally. These findings would be important to inform policy makers and  
281 intervention designers that when designing environmental approach to promote  
282 physical activity, it would be crucial to consider its negative impact on screen time, at  
283 least in Japan.

284  
285 Contrary to expectations, adults who live in neighborhood environment with GIS-  
286 measured good access to public transportation, and perceived good access to  
287 destinations, good access to public transportation, good street connectivity was  
288 positively associated with higher levels of screen time, which have been found to be  
289 positively related to higher levels of physical activity [18,27]. The present results  
290 were also inconsistent with previous studies which have reported the inverse  
291 associations between high walkable environment and screen-based sedentary time  
292 from Western countries [12,14,15]. Only one Belgium study reported similar result  
293 with the present study that high walkable environment is positively associated with

1  
2  
3 294 total sitting time [26]. The possible speculation for these results could be that physical  
4  
5 295 activity-supportive neighborhood environment (e.g. there are so many shops, train  
6  
7 296 stations, and bus stops within 1.6km radius of their house) could reduce the time spent  
8  
9 297 in commute and daily errand, and thus adults may have more leisure-time to engage in  
10  
11 298 screen time. Although there is limited evidence in existing literature to draw the  
12  
13 299 conclusion and possible mechanism regarding the inverse associations between  
14  
15 300 environment and screen time, the present study may have several important  
16  
17 301 implications. First of all, the perceptions of environmental attributes should be  
18  
19 302 considered to be predictors of screen time for future studies. The present results  
20  
21 303 indicate that perceived environmental attributes might be better predictors of screen  
22  
23 304 time than objective ones. It is possible how middle-to-older-aged adults perceive and  
24  
25 305 understand their neighbourhood environment might be more important for their  
26  
27 306 decision on spending time in screen time in their home. Moreover, further evidence in  
28  
29 307 Asian countries using specific environmental measures are needed due to the  
30  
31 308 difference in residential density, culture and built environment between Western  
32  
33 309 countries and Asian country. Finally, examining the relationships among  
34  
35 310 environmental factors, physical activity and sedentary behavior concurrently would be  
36  
37 311 the priority to better understand the potential positive or negative health effects of  
38  
39 312 environment on both physical activity and sedentary behavior for the policy initiatives.  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44 313  
45  
46 314 Another novel finding is that no prospective associations of screen time over 2 years  
47  
48 315 with objective and perceived environmental attributes. The possible explanation for  
49  
50 316 this result could be that the follow-up duration of this study was only two years and  
51  
52 317 screen time is a highly domestic behaviour for adults during leisure time, which may  
53  
54 318 maintain for years unless the adjustment of home environment or the change in

1  
2  
3 319 employment status. Therefore, the present study might provide a preliminary  
4  
5 320 understanding on built environmental determinants of screen time for developing  
6  
7 321 effective population-based interventions [10,11]. Therefore, to further confirm the  
8  
9 322 prospective associations, studies with a longer follow-up time are needed in the future.  
10

11  
12 323

13 324 This study has several limitations. First, the outcome variable - self-reported screen  
14  
15 325 time may be subject to recall bias. Thus, future studies should consider measuring  
16  
17 326 screen time using objectively measurement to provide more confirmative evidence.  
18  
19  
20 327 Second, the use of the IPAQ-SV may have overestimated time spent in MVPA. Third,  
21  
22 328 potential confounders such as self-selection of neighborhoods and home environment  
23  
24 329 were not examined in this study. Finally, the participants who responded the follow-  
25  
26 330 up survey were more likely to have higher educational levels (58.1% vs. 47.4%, p  
27  
28 331 =0.002) and have higher income (53.4% vs. 43.9%, p =0.01) than those who did not.  
29  
30  
31 332 Thus, the final sample may not be representative of the populations of Nerima City  
32  
33 333 and Kanuma City. Despite such limitations, the strengths of this study were the both  
34  
35 334 cross-sectional and prospective design and the utilization of five both subjectively and  
36  
37 335 objectively-measured environmental components, which could provide more  
38  
39 336 confirmative evidence on this issue.  
40

41  
42 337

## 43 44 338 **Conclusion**

45  
46  
47 339 Activity-supportive neighborhood environmental attributes appear to be related to  
48  
49 340 higher level of screen time cross-sectionally. Pattern of screen time might be  
50  
51 341 maintained rather changed over time under the same neighborhood environments.  
52  
53 342 Environmental intervention for promoting physical activity may need to consider the  
54  
55 343 potential negative health impact of screen time in Japan.  
56  
57

## 344 **Declarations**

### 345 **Ethics approval and consent to participate**

346 Written informed consent was obtained from all respondents. This survey received prior approval from  
347 the Institutional Ethics Committee of Waseda University (2010-238).

### 348 **Consent for publication**

349 Our manuscript did not include any details, images, or videos relating to individual participants. All  
350 participants agreed with that their self-reported data will be used for publication.

### 351 **Availability of data and material**

352 This study used data from a part of the Healthy Built Environment in Japan (HEBEJ) project. Data and  
353 material is available in Lab of Behavioral Sciences (Oka Koichiro), College of Sport Sciences at  
354 Waseda University (Address: 2-579-15 Mikajima Tokorozawa, Saitama 359-1192, Japan)

### 355 **Contributorship statement**

- 356 1. Study concept and design: Oka, Shibata, Ishii.
- 357 2. Acquisition, analysis, or interpretation of data: Liao, Shibata
- 358 3. Drafting of the manuscript: Liao, Shibata, Koohsari.
- 359 4. Critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content: Oka, Shibata, Ishii, Koohsari
- 360 5. Statistical analysis: Liao, Shibata.
- 361 6. Administrative, technical, or material support: Ishii, Koohsari
- 362 7. Study supervision: Oka, Shibata.

### 363 **Funding**

364 This study was supported by the Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (No.26242070) from Japan  
365 Society for the Promotion of Science and the 29<sup>th</sup> Research Grant in Medical and Health Science of  
366 Meiji Yasuda Life Foundation of Health and Welfare.

### 367 **Conflict of Interest Statement**

368 The authors declare that there are no conflicts of interest.

### 369 **Acknowledgements**

370 Not applicable.

## 371 **References**

- 372 1. Owen N, Salmon J, Koohsari MJ, Turrell G, Giles-Corti B. Sedentary behaviour  
373 and health: mapping environmental and social contexts to underpin chronic  
374 disease prevention. *Br J Sports Med.* 2014;48(3):174-7.
- 375 2. Thorp AA, Owen N, Neuhaus M, Dunstan DW. Sedentary behaviors and  
376 subsequent health outcomes in adults a systematic review of longitudinal studies,  
377 1996-2011. *Am J Prev Med.* 2011;41(2):207-15.
- 378 3. Teychenne M, Ball K, Salmon J. Sedentary behavior and depression among  
379 adults: a review. *Int J Behav Med.* 2010;17:246-54.
- 380 4. Institute for Information and Communications Policy. Survey of communication  
381 media use and behavior; 2014 [cited 2016 Jul 4]. Available from:  
382 [http://www.soumu.go.jp/main\\_content/000357570.pdf](http://www.soumu.go.jp/main_content/000357570.pdf) (in Japanese)
- 383 5. Grontved A, Hu FB. Television viewing and risk of type 2 diabetes,  
384 cardiovascular disease, and all-cause mortality: a meta-analysis. *JAMA.* 2011;  
385 305:2448-55.
- 386 6. Matthews CE, Chen KY, Freedson PS, Buchowski MS, Beech BM, Pate RR, et al.  
387 Amount of time spent in sedentary behaviors in the United States, 2003-2004. *Am*  
388 *J Epidemiol.* 2008;167(7):875-81.
- 389 7. Vandelanotte C, Sugiyama T, Gardiner P, Owen N. Associations of leisuretime  
390 Internet and computer use with overweight and obesity, physical activity and  
391 sedentary behaviors: cross-sectional study. *J Med Internet Res.* 2009;11(3):e28.
- 392 8. Owen N, Leslie E, Salmon J, Fotheringham MJ. Environmental determinants of  
393 physical activity and sedentary behavior. *Exerc Sport Sci Rev.* 2000;28:153-8.

- 1  
2  
3 394 9. Sugiyama T, Healy GN, Dunstan DW, Salmon J, Owen N. Is television viewing  
4  
5 395 time a marker of a broader pattern of sedentary behavior? *Ann Behav Med.* 2008;  
6  
7 396 35:245-50.  
8  
9 397 10. Owen N, Sugiyama T, Eakin EE, Gardiner PA, Tremblay MS, Sallis JF. Adults'  
10  
11 398 sedentary behavior determinants and interventions. *Am J Prev Med.* 2011;  
12  
13 399 41(2):189-96.  
14  
15 400 11. Owen N. Sedentary behavior: understanding and influencing adults' prolonged  
16  
17 401 sitting time. *Prev Med.* 2012;55(6):535-9.  
18  
19 402 12. Sugiyama T, Salmon J, Dunstan DW, Bauman AE, Owen N. Neighborhood  
20  
21 403 walkability and TV viewing time among Australian adults. *Am J Prev Med.*  
22  
23 404 2007;33(6):444-9.  
24  
25 405 13. Coogan PF, White LF, Evans SR, Palmer JR, Rosenberg L. The Influence of  
26  
27 406 Neighborhood Socioeconomic Status and Walkability on TV viewing time. *J Phys*  
28  
29 407 *Act Health.* 2012;9(8):1074-9.  
30  
31 408 14. Kozo J, Sallis JF, Conway TL, Kerr J, Cain K, Saelens BE, et al. Sedentary  
32  
33 409 behaviors of adults in relation to neighborhood walkability and income. *Health*  
34  
35 410 *Psychol.* 2012;31(6):704-13.  
36  
37 411 15. Ding D, Sugiyama T, Winkler E, Cerin E, Wijndaele K, Owen N. Correlates of  
38  
39 412 Change in Adults' Television Viewing Time: A Four-Year Follow-up Study. *Med*  
40  
41 413 *Sci Sports Exerc.* 2012;44(7):1287-92.  
42  
43 414 16. Salmon J, Owen N, Crawford D, Bauman A, Sallis JF. Physical activity and  
44  
45 415 sedentary behavior: a population-based study of barriers, enjoyment, and  
46  
47 416 preference. *Health Psychol.* 2003;22(2):178-88.  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



- 1  
2  
3 417 17. Ishii K, Shibata A, Oka K. Sociodemographic and Anthropometric Factors  
4  
5 418 Associated With Screen-Based Sedentary Behavior Among Japanese Adults: A  
6  
7 419 Population-Based Cross-Sectional Study. *J Epidemiol.* 2013;23(5):382-8.  
8  
9 420 18. Brownson RC, Hoehner CM, Day K, Forsyth A, Sallis JF. Measuring the built  
10  
11 421 environment for physical activity: state of the science. *Am J Prev Med.* 2009;  
12  
13 422 36(4):S99-123.e12.  
14  
15 423 19. Saelens BE, Sallis JF, Frank LD. Environmental correlates of walking and cycling:  
16  
17 424 findings from the transportation, urban design, and planning literatures. *Ann*  
18  
19 425 *Behav Med.* 2003;25(2):80-9.  
20  
21 426 20. Inoue S, Murase N, Shimomitsu T, Ohya Y, Odagiri Y, Takamiya T, et al.  
22  
23 427 Association of Physical Activity and Neighborhood Environment among Japanese  
24  
25 428 Adults. *Prev Med.* 2009; 48(4):321-5.  
26  
27 429 21. Hanibuchi T, Kawachi I, Nakaya T, Hirai H, Kondo K. Neighborhood built  
28  
29 430 environment and physical activity of Japanese older adults: results from the Aichi  
30  
31 431 Gerontological Evaluation Study (AGES). *BMC Public Health.* 2011;11:657.  
32  
33 432 22. Ding D, Sugiyama T, Winkler E, Cerin E, Wijndaele K, Owen N. Correlates of  
34  
35 433 Change in Adults' Television Viewing Time: A Four-Year Follow-up Study. *Med*  
36  
37 434 *Sci Sports Exerc.* 2012;44(7):1287-92.  
38  
39 435 23. Shibata A, Oka K, Sugiyama T, Ding D, Salmon J, Dunstan DW, Owen N.  
40  
41 436 Perceived neighbourhood environmental attributes and prospective changes in TV  
42  
43 437 viewing time among older Australian adults. *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act.*  
44  
45 438 2015;12:50.  
46  
47 439 24. Fukuhara S, Suzukamo Y. Manual of the SF- 8 Japanese edition. Kyoto: Institute  
48  
49 440 for Health Outcomes & Process Evaluation Research; 2004. (in Japanese)  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 441 25. Murase N, Katsumura T, Ueda C, Inoue S, Shimomitsu T. International  
4  
5 442 Standardization of Physical Activity Level: Reliability and Validity Study of the  
6  
7 443 Japanese Version of the International Physical Activity Questionnaire (IPAQ)  
8  
9 444 (Kosei no Shihyo) J Health Welfare Statistics. 2003;49:1–9. (in Japanese)  
10  
11 445 26. Van Dyck D, Cardon G, Deforche B, Owen N, Sallis JF, De Bourdeaudhuij I.  
12  
13 446 Neighborhood walkability and sedentary time in Belgian adults. Am J Prev Med.  
14  
15 447 2010;39(1):25-32.  
16  
17 448 27. Saelens BE, Handy SL. Built environment correlates of walking: a review. Med  
18  
19 449 Sci Sports Exerc. 2008;40:S550-66.  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## STROBE Statement—checklist of items that should be included in reports of observational studies

	Item No	Recommendation
<b>Title and abstract</b>	1	(a) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract Page 1, Line 1-2 (b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found Page 2, Line 2, Line 36 to Page 3, Line 47
<b>Introduction</b>		
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported Page 5, Line 92-103
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses Page 5, Line 103-105
<b>Methods</b>		
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper Page 5, Line 109-110
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection Page 5, Line 111 to Page 6, Line 119
Participants	6	(a) <i>Cohort study</i> —Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants. Describe methods of follow-up Page 5, Line 111 to Page 6, Line 119 <i>Case-control study</i> —Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of case ascertainment and control selection. Give the rationale for the choice of cases and controls <i>Cross-sectional study</i> —Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants (b) <i>Cohort study</i> —For matched studies, give matching criteria and number of exposed and unexposed <i>Case-control study</i> —For matched studies, give matching criteria and the number of controls per case
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable Page 6, Line 121 to Page 9, Line 193
Data sources/ measurement	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group Page 6, Line 121 to Page 9, Line 193
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias Page 5, Line 114-116
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at Page 5, Line 116 to Page 6, line 118
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why Page 8, Line 178-183
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Page 9, Line 196 to Page 10, Line 221

---

(b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions

---

(c) Explain how missing data were addressed

---

(d) *Cohort study*—If applicable, explain how loss to follow-up was addressed

*Case-control study*—If applicable, explain how matching of cases and controls was addressed

*Cross-sectional study*—If applicable, describe analytical methods taking account of sampling strategy

---

(e) Describe any sensitivity analyses

Continued on next page

For peer review only

**Results**

Participants	13*	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed Page 10, Line 224-225
		(b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage
		(c) Consider use of a flow diagram
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders Page 10, Line 224-227
		(b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest
		(c) <i>Cohort study</i> —Summarise follow-up time (eg, average and total amount)
Outcome data	15*	<i>Cohort study</i> —Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures over time Page 10, Line 225-227
		<i>Case-control study</i> —Report numbers in each exposure category, or summary measures of exposure
		<i>Cross-sectional study</i> —Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures
Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included Page 10, Line 227-234
		(b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized
		(c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period
Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses No other analyses were done

**Discussion**

Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives Page 14, Line 269-282
Limitations	19	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias Page 17, Line 323-328
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence Page 14, Line 284 to Page 16, Line 321
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results Page 16, Line 328-332

**Other information**

Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based Page 17, Line 362-365
---------	----	--

\*Give information separately for cases and controls in case-control studies and, if applicable, for exposed and unexposed groups in cohort and cross-sectional studies.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

**Note:** An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at <http://www.plosmedicine.org/>, Annals of Internal Medicine at <http://www.annals.org/>, and Epidemiology at <http://www.epidem.com/>). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at [www.strobe-statement.org](http://www.strobe-statement.org).

For peer review only