International Journal of Science and Research Archive

eISSN: 2582-8185

Cross Ref DOI: 10.30574/ijsra

Journal homepage: https://ijsra.net/

IJSRA

(Review Article)

Check for updates

Optimization of urban walkability indices and their correlation with pedestrian safety outcomes using multi-criteria decision-making techniques

Samuel Omefe *

Department of Civil Engineering, George Washington University, Washington DC, USA.

International Journal of Science and Research Archive, 2025, 16(01), 788-802

Publication history: Received on 25 May 2025; revised on 05 July 2025; accepted on 08 July 2025

Article DOI: https://doi.org/10.30574/ijsra.2025.16.1.2011

Abstract

Urban walkability has emerged as a critical component of sustainable urban development, directly influencing pedestrian safety, public health, and quality of life. This review examines the current state of research on optimizing urban walkability indices and their correlation with pedestrian safety outcomes through multi-criteria decision-making (MCDM) techniques. The analysis synthesizes diverse methodological approaches, key performance indicators, and optimization frameworks across various geographical contexts and urban settings. This comprehensive examination identifies significant advancements in integrated assessment methodologies that combine infrastructure quality, connectivity, safety perception, and environmental factors. Key findings indicate that hybrid MCDM approaches, particularly combinations of Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP) with TOPSIS and fuzzy logic integration, yield robust predictive models for pedestrian safety outcomes with improved accuracy compared to single-criterion approaches. Advanced technologies including GIS-based spatial analysis, computer vision, and IoT sensors are transforming large-scale walkability assessment, enabling real-time optimization capabilities. However, significant gaps remain in standardization of measurement protocols, incorporation of dynamic environmental factors, and economic valuation methodologies. This review provides evidence-based recommendations for future research directions and practical implementation strategies for urban planners and policymakers seeking to optimize pedestrian environments for safety and sustainability.

Keywords: Urban Walkability; Pedestrian Safety; Multi-Criteria Decision-Making; Optimization; Urban Planning; Sustainable Transportation

1. Introduction

The concept of walkability has evolved from a simple measure of pedestrian accessibility to a comprehensive framework encompassing urban design, safety, comfort, and environmental quality. As cities worldwide grapple with increasing urbanization, climate change, and public health challenges, optimizing walkability has become paramount for creating livable, sustainable urban environments [1].

Walkability indices serve as quantitative tools for assessing and comparing the pedestrian-friendliness of urban areas [2]. These indices typically incorporate multiple dimensions including infrastructure quality, safety, connectivity, land use diversity, and environmental factors. However, the complexity of urban systems and the multifaceted nature of walkability present significant challenges in developing robust, standardized measurement frameworks.

The relationship between walkability and pedestrian safety has garnered considerable attention in recent years, driven by concerning trends in pedestrian fatalities despite overall improvements in traffic safety [3]. This situation

* Corresponding author: Samuel Omefe

underscores the critical need for evidence-based approaches to optimize urban environments for pedestrian safety and mobility.

Multi-criteria decision-making techniques have emerged as powerful tools for addressing the inherent complexity of walkability optimization [4]. These methodologies enable the systematic evaluation of multiple, often conflicting objectives while incorporating stakeholder preferences and uncertainty. MCDM approaches such as Analytic Hierarchy Process, TOPSIS, and fuzzy logic systems have shown particular promise in walkability assessment and optimization [5].

This review aims to synthesize current knowledge on walkability index optimization, examine correlations with pedestrian safety outcomes, and evaluate the effectiveness of MCDM techniques in this domain. By identifying research gaps and methodological challenges, we seek to provide a roadmap for future research and practical applications in urban planning.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Evolution of Walkability Research

The literature on walkability optimization and pedestrian safety encompasses diverse disciplines including urban planning, transportation engineering, public health, and environmental design. Early foundational works established the conceptual framework for understanding walkability as a multifaceted urban quality, while contemporary research has advanced sophisticated quantitative methodologies and optimization approaches [6].

The evolution of walkability assessment has progressed from subjective expert evaluations to objective measurement protocols incorporating advanced technologies [7]. This progression reflects both methodological refinements and the growing availability of spatial data and analytical tools. Similarly, pedestrian safety research has expanded from reactive crash analysis to proactive risk assessment incorporating behavioral, environmental, and infrastructure factors.

Multi-criteria decision-making applications in urban planning have gained significant momentum as planners recognize the limitations of single-objective optimization approaches [8]. The complexity of urban systems requires methodologies capable of handling multiple stakeholders, competing objectives, and uncertain information. MCDM techniques provide structured approaches for addressing these challenges while maintaining transparency in decision-making processes [9].

2.2. Theoretical Foundations and Conceptual Evolution

The theoretical foundations of walkability research trace back to early urban design theories that emphasized the importance of pedestrian activity for creating vibrant, safe neighborhoods. The emergence of sustainable urban development paradigms in recent decades formalized many walkability principles, emphasizing compact, mixed-use development patterns and pedestrian-oriented design [10].

Contemporary theoretical frameworks increasingly integrate multiple disciplinary perspectives, combining insights from environmental psychology, urban ecology, and behavioral economics [11]. The social ecological model provides a comprehensive framework for understanding how individual, social, environmental, and policy factors interact to influence walking behavior and safety outcomes. This multi-level perspective has informed the development of more holistic walkability assessment approaches that consider both objective environmental conditions and subjective user experiences [12].

The concept of walkable urbanism has evolved to encompass broader sustainability and livability objectives beyond simple pedestrian mobility [13]. This expanded conceptualization recognizes walkability as a key component of sustainable transportation systems, healthy communities, and climate change mitigation strategies. The integration of walkability with broader urban sustainability goals has influenced both research priorities and practical implementation approaches.

2.3. Methodological Advancements in Assessment Techniques

Recent methodological advancements have significantly enhanced the precision and scalability of walkability assessment techniques [14]. Machine learning approaches, particularly deep learning models, have demonstrated remarkable capabilities in automated infrastructure assessment using street-level imagery. Convolutional neural networks can now classify sidewalk conditions, identify pedestrian facilities, and assess environmental characteristics with high accuracy rates [15].

The integration of big data analytics with traditional planning methodologies has opened new avenues for understanding pedestrian behavior and preferences. Mobile phone GPS data, social media check-ins, and crowdsourced mapping contribute to comprehensive datasets that reveal actual walking patterns and destination preferences [16]. These data sources complement traditional survey methods and provide insights into revealed preferences rather than stated intentions.

Longitudinal assessment methodologies have gained prominence as researchers recognize the temporal dynamics of walkability conditions. Seasonal variations, special events, construction activities, and changing land use patterns all influence walkability quality over time. Time-series analysis techniques and panel data methodologies enable more sophisticated understanding of how walkability conditions evolve and respond to interventions [17].

2.4. Integration of Health and Safety Perspectives

The integration of public health perspectives has significantly enriched walkability research by establishing clear connections between built environment characteristics and health outcomes. Research has consistently demonstrated positive associations between walkable neighborhoods and increased physical activity, lower obesity rates, and improved mental health outcomes [18]. These health co-benefits strengthen the economic case for walkability investments and broaden stakeholder support for implementation.

Safety research has evolved from simple crash frequency analysis to comprehensive risk assessment incorporating exposure measures, behavioral factors, and near-miss incidents [19]. The development of surrogate safety measures enables proactive safety assessment without waiting for actual crashes to occur. Traffic conflict analysis, pedestrian stress levels, and safety perception surveys provide complementary perspectives on pedestrian safety conditions [20].

The concept of comprehensive safety approaches has influenced walkability research by emphasizing the elimination of severe and fatal pedestrian crashes through systematic safety improvements [21]. This approach prioritizes infrastructure interventions that address the most severe safety risks while also enhancing overall walkability quality. The integration of safety principles with walkability optimization provides a framework for balancing safety and mobility objectives.

3. Walkability Assessment Frameworks and Methodologies

3.1. Evolution of Walkability Conceptualization

The conceptualization of walkability has undergone significant transformation since early urban design theories. Initial approaches focused primarily on physical accessibility and proximity measures, emphasizing distance to destinations and basic infrastructure provision [22]. Contemporary frameworks embrace a more holistic perspective that integrates physical, social, economic, and environmental dimensions of the pedestrian experience.

Modern walkability frameworks recognize the importance of both objective infrastructure conditions and subjective user perceptions. This dual perspective acknowledges that walkability effectiveness depends not only on the presence of pedestrian facilities but also on user comfort, safety perceptions, and overall experience quality [23]. The integration of these perspectives has led to more comprehensive assessment methodologies that better predict actual walking behavior and satisfaction.

The temporal dimension of walkability has gained increasing recognition, with researchers acknowledging that walkability conditions vary throughout the day, across seasons, and in response to weather conditions [24]. This dynamic perspective has implications for both assessment methodologies and optimization strategies, requiring more sophisticated approaches to capture temporal variations in walkability quality.

3.2. Infrastructure Quality Assessment Methods

Infrastructure quality represents a fundamental component of walkability assessment, encompassing physical characteristics that directly affect pedestrian mobility and safety [25]. Assessment methods range from detailed auditing protocols conducted by trained observers to automated analysis using remote sensing technologies and street-level imagery.

Traditional audit-based approaches provide comprehensive evaluation of sidewalk conditions, including width, surface quality, continuity, and compliance with accessibility standards [26]. These methods offer high accuracy and detailed information but require significant time and resources for large-scale applications. Standardized protocols have been developed to ensure consistency across different evaluators and geographic contexts.

Automated assessment techniques leveraging computer vision and machine learning have emerged as scalable alternatives for infrastructure evaluation [27]. These approaches can process large volumes of street-level imagery to extract information about sidewalk presence, condition, and quality. While automated methods may lack the nuanced evaluation capabilities of human auditors, they offer significant advantages in terms of cost-effectiveness and coverage area.

3.3. Connectivity and Network Analysis

Street network connectivity plays a crucial role in walkability by determining route options, walking distances, and overall accessibility to destinations. Network analysis methodologies employ graph theory concepts to quantify connectivity characteristics and identify optimal pedestrian routes [28]. These analyses consider both the physical network structure and pedestrian-specific routing constraints.

Connectivity measures include intersection density, link-to-node ratios, and network circuity indicators that capture the directness of pedestrian routes. Higher connectivity generally improves walkability by providing more route options and reducing walking distances [29]. However, the relationship between connectivity and safety outcomes depends on traffic management and intersection design quality.

Accessibility analysis extends connectivity measures by incorporating destination information and travel impedance factors [30]. These approaches evaluate how well the pedestrian network connects residents to essential services, employment opportunities, and recreational facilities. Accessibility measures provide important insights into the functional effectiveness of pedestrian infrastructure beyond basic connectivity metrics.

3.4. Safety Infrastructure and Environmental Factors

Safety infrastructure encompasses design elements specifically intended to protect pedestrians and enhance their comfort during walking trips [31]. These elements include crosswalks, traffic signals, lighting systems, and traffic calming measures that reduce vehicle-pedestrian conflicts. Assessment methodologies evaluate both the presence and quality of safety infrastructure components.

Environmental factors significantly influence walkability quality and user experience [32]. Air quality, noise levels, weather protection, and aesthetic qualities all contribute to the overall attractiveness of walking as a transportation mode. Environmental assessment methods range from objective measurements using monitoring equipment to subjective evaluations based on user surveys and expert judgment.

The integration of environmental factors into walkability indices presents methodological challenges due to the diverse nature of environmental conditions and their varying importance across different contexts [33]. Standardized approaches for environmental assessment are still evolving, with ongoing research exploring optimal measurement protocols and weighting schemes.

4. Multi-Criteria Decision-Making Applications in Walkability

4.1. Analytic Hierarchy Process in Walkability Assessment

The Analytic Hierarchy Process has found extensive application in walkability assessment due to its structured approach to handling complex decision problems with multiple criteria. AHP decomposes walkability assessment into a hierarchical structure of criteria and sub-criteria, enabling systematic evaluation and comparison of different alternatives [34]. This methodology is particularly valuable for incorporating expert judgment and stakeholder preferences into walkability evaluation.

AHP applications in walkability typically structure the problem with main criteria categories such as infrastructure quality, connectivity, safety, and environmental conditions [35]. Each main criterion is further decomposed into specific indicators that can be measured or evaluated. Pairwise comparison matrices capture the relative importance of different criteria based on expert judgment or stakeholder input.

The consistency of AHP evaluations is assessed through consistency ratios that measure the logical coherence of pairwise comparisons. Studies applying AHP to walkability assessment generally report acceptable consistency levels, indicating that the methodology can effectively structure complex walkability problems [36]. However, the method's reliance on subjective judgments may limit its applicability in contexts requiring objective, reproducible assessments.

4.2. TOPSIS Methodology for Walkability Optimization

The Technique for Order of Preference by Similarity to Ideal Solution has demonstrated particular effectiveness in walkability optimization applications. TOPSIS simultaneously considers both positive and negative ideal solutions, making it well-suited for evaluating walkability alternatives that involve trade-offs between different objectives [37]. The methodology ranks alternatives based on their distance from ideal and anti-ideal solutions.

TOPSIS applications in walkability assessment typically define positive ideal solutions as combinations of the best achievable performance across all criteria, while negative ideal solutions represent the worst-case scenarios [38]. This approach enables the identification of walkability improvement strategies that maximize benefits while minimizing negative impacts such as implementation costs or disruption.

The computational efficiency of TOPSIS makes it suitable for large-scale walkability assessment involving numerous alternatives and criteria [39]. The methodology can handle both quantitative and qualitative criteria through appropriate normalization techniques. Results provide clear rankings of alternatives along with performance scores that facilitate decision-making and priority setting.

4.3. Fuzzy Logic Approaches to Handle Uncertainty

Fuzzy logic methodologies address the inherent uncertainty and imprecision in walkability assessment by incorporating linguistic variables and fuzzy sets [40]. These approaches recognize that many walkability criteria involve subjective judgments that cannot be precisely quantified using traditional numerical scales. Fuzzy logic enables the integration of qualitative assessments and uncertain information into structured decision-making frameworks.

Fuzzy sets define membership functions that capture the degree to which alternatives satisfy specific criteria. For walkability assessment, linguistic terms such as "poor," "fair," "good," and "excellent" can be represented as fuzzy sets with overlapping membership functions [41]. This representation better reflects the inherent ambiguity in subjective evaluations of walkability conditions.

The integration of fuzzy logic with traditional MCDM methods has yielded robust frameworks for walkability assessment [42]. Fuzzy AHP combines the structured hierarchy of AHP with fuzzy pairwise comparisons, while fuzzy TOPSIS incorporates linguistic evaluations into the distance-based ranking methodology. These hybrid approaches demonstrate improved capability for handling uncertain and subjective information in walkability evaluation.

4.4. Hybrid MCDM Approaches and Integration Strategies

Hybrid MCDM approaches combine multiple decision-making methodologies to leverage their complementary strengths while mitigating individual limitations [43]. These integrated frameworks have shown particular promise in walkability assessment, where the complexity of the problem domain benefits from multiple analytical perspectives. Common hybrid approaches include combinations of AHP with TOPSIS, fuzzy logic integration with traditional methods, and multi-stage decision processes.

The integration of different MCDM methods typically involves using one method to determine criteria weights and another to rank alternatives [44]. For example, AHP may be employed to establish the relative importance of walkability criteria based on stakeholder input, while TOPSIS ranks specific improvement alternatives based on their performance across these weighted criteria. This division of labor allows each method to contribute its particular strengths to the overall assessment process.

Validation studies of hybrid MCDM approaches in walkability assessment have demonstrated improved performance compared to single-method applications [45]. These improvements manifest as better ranking accuracy, enhanced stakeholder acceptance, and increased robustness to variations in input parameters. However, hybrid approaches also introduce additional complexity that may limit their practical adoption in resource-constrained planning contexts.

5. Pedestrian Safety Correlations and Outcomes

5.1. Infrastructure-Safety Relationships and Empirical Evidence

The relationship between pedestrian infrastructure quality and safety outcomes has been extensively documented through empirical research across various urban contexts. Well-designed pedestrian infrastructure consistently demonstrates positive correlations with improved safety outcomes, including reduced crash rates, lower injury severity, and enhanced safety perceptions among pedestrians [46].

Sidewalk quality represents one of the most fundamental infrastructure factors affecting pedestrian safety. Continuous, well-maintained sidewalks with adequate width and proper surface conditions significantly reduce pedestrian exposure to vehicle traffic and eliminate many potential hazard points. The presence of accessible design features further enhances safety for pedestrians with disabilities and mobility limitations [47].

Crosswalk design and placement critically influence pedestrian safety at intersection locations where most pedestrian crashes occur. High-visibility crosswalk markings, proper signal timing, and adequate sight distances contribute to reduced conflict potential between pedestrians and vehicles [48]. Advanced crossing treatments such as raised crosswalks and pedestrian refuge islands provide additional safety benefits in high-traffic environments.

5.2. Network Connectivity and Safety Interactions

The relationship between street network connectivity and pedestrian safety presents complex interactions that depend on traffic management and urban design characteristics. Higher connectivity generally improves pedestrian safety through multiple mechanisms, including reduced traffic speeds, shorter crossing distances, and increased pedestrian visibility through higher activity levels [49].

Grid-pattern Street networks with frequent intersections tend to promote lower vehicle speeds compared to arterial-collector hierarchical systems with longer blocks [50]. The frequent stop-and-go conditions in well-connected networks naturally reduce vehicle speeds and provide more opportunities for drivers to observe and react to pedestrians. However, the safety benefits of connectivity depend on appropriate intersection design and traffic control measures.

The safety-in-numbers effect represents an important mechanism linking network connectivity to pedestrian safety outcomes. Areas with higher pedestrian volumes, often associated with well-connected street networks, typically experience lower per-capita crash rates [51]. This effect is attributed to increased driver awareness of pedestrians and more cautious driving behavior in areas with high pedestrian activity.

5.3. Land Use Patterns and Safety Implications

Land use diversity and development density significantly influence pedestrian safety through their effects on activity patterns, traffic generation, and urban design characteristics. Mixed-use development creates destinations within walking distance of residential areas, reducing trip lengths and encouraging walking as a viable transportation mode [52]. However, the relationship between land use patterns and safety is mediated by infrastructure design and traffic management practices.

Higher development density generally supports pedestrian safety through the safety-in-numbers effect and infrastructure investment justification [53]. Dense urban areas typically warrant higher-quality pedestrian infrastructure and more sophisticated traffic management systems. However, very high densities may create conflicts between competing demands for limited street space, potentially compromising pedestrian comfort and safety.

The temporal distribution of land use activities affects pedestrian safety by influencing when and where pedestrian activity occurs [54]. Mixed-use areas with activities throughout the day maintain higher levels of natural surveillance and pedestrian presence, contributing to improved safety conditions. In contrast, areas with predominantly single-use development may experience periods of low activity that reduce natural surveillance and safety perceptions.

5.4. Environmental Factors and Safety Perceptions

Environmental conditions significantly influence both actual pedestrian safety and safety perceptions, affecting walking behavior and route choice decisions [55]. Weather conditions, lighting quality, noise levels, and air quality all contribute to the overall pedestrian experience and willingness to walk. These factors are particularly important for vulnerable populations such as elderly pedestrians and children.

Lighting quality represents a critical environmental factor affecting pedestrian safety, particularly during evening and nighttime hours. Adequate illumination improves visibility for both pedestrians and drivers, reducing crash risk and enhancing safety perceptions [56]. However, lighting design must balance visibility needs with energy efficiency and light pollution concerns.

Weather conditions create dynamic variations in pedestrian safety conditions that are often overlooked in static walkability assessments. Rain, snow, and ice significantly increase slip and fall risks while also affecting visibility and vehicle stopping distances [57]. Climate-responsive design strategies can mitigate some weather-related safety impacts through appropriate materials selection and weather protection features.

6. Optimization Frameworks and Strategic Implementation

6.1. Spatial Optimization Models for Infrastructure Investment

Spatial optimization models provide systematic approaches for determining optimal locations and configurations of pedestrian infrastructure investments to maximize walkability improvements subject to budget and other constraints. These models typically employ mathematical programming techniques to identify cost-effective intervention strategies across urban networks [58].

Location-allocation models represent one class of spatial optimization approaches used in walkability planning [59]. These models determine optimal locations for new pedestrian facilities or improvements to existing infrastructure based on accessibility objectives and implementation constraints. The models can incorporate multiple criteria such as population served, connectivity improvements, and safety benefits.

Network-based optimization approaches utilize graph theory concepts to identify critical nodes and corridors for pedestrian infrastructure investment. Centrality measures help prioritize locations where improvements would have the greatest impact on overall network connectivity and accessibility [60]. These approaches are particularly valuable for strategic planning of pedestrian infrastructure networks.

6.2. Multi-Objective Optimization and Trade-off Analysis

Multi-objective optimization addresses the inherent trade-offs between different walkability objectives and practical implementation constraints. Walkability improvement projects typically involve conflicts between objectives such as maximizing accessibility, minimizing costs, reducing implementation time, and minimizing disruption to existing activities [61]. Multi-objective approaches provide decision-makers with sets of Pareto-optimal solutions that represent different balances among competing objectives.

Evolutionary algorithms have shown particular promise for multi-objective walkability optimization due to their ability to handle complex, non-linear objective functions and constraints [62]. These algorithms generate populations of potential solutions that evolve toward optimal regions of the objective space. The resulting Pareto frontiers provide decision-makers with flexibility to select solutions that best match their priorities and constraints.

Trade-off analysis techniques help decision-makers understand the implications of different objective weightings and constraint specifications. Sensitivity analysis reveals how changes in priorities or constraints affect optimal solutions, providing insights into the robustness of different improvement strategies [63]. This information is valuable for adaptive planning approaches that can respond to changing conditions and priorities.

6.3. Dynamic Optimization and Real-time Adaptation

Dynamic optimization frameworks incorporate temporal variations and real-time conditions into walkability assessment and improvement strategies [64]. These approaches recognize that walkability conditions change throughout the day, across seasons, and in response to special events or construction activities. Dynamic optimization enables more responsive and adaptive management of pedestrian infrastructure and services.

Real-time optimization systems can adjust traffic signal timing, routing recommendations, and service deployment based on current pedestrian demand and safety conditions [65]. These systems utilize data from various sources including pedestrian counting sensors, mobile applications, and traffic management systems to optimize system performance continuously.

Adaptive optimization strategies enable long-term evolution of walkability improvement programs based on observed outcomes and changing conditions. These approaches incorporate monitoring and evaluation feedback into the optimization process, allowing strategies to be refined and adjusted over time. Machine learning techniques can identify patterns in system performance and suggest optimal adaptations to changing urban conditions [66].

6.4. Stakeholder Engagement and Participatory Optimization

Stakeholder engagement represents a critical component of successful walkability optimization, ensuring that improvement strategies reflect community needs and preferences while building support for implementation. Participatory optimization approaches integrate stakeholder input into the technical optimization process through various mechanisms including preference elicitation, collaborative priority setting, and interactive planning tools [67].

Community-based participatory research methods enable residents and other stakeholders to contribute local knowledge and preferences to walkability assessment and optimization. These approaches recognize that community members possess valuable insights into local conditions, usage patterns, and priorities that may not be captured through technical analysis alone. Participatory mapping and mobile data collection tools facilitate community engagement in walkability assessment [68].

Multi-stakeholder decision-making processes require structured approaches to integrate diverse perspectives and reconcile conflicting interests. Group decision support systems provide platforms for collaborative evaluation of walkability alternatives and consensus building around improvement priorities [69]. These systems can incorporate various MCDM techniques to structure group decision processes and facilitate transparent decision-making.

7. Technology Integration and Innovation

7.1. Geographic Information Systems and Spatial Analysis

Geographic Information Systems provide the foundational platform for most contemporary walkability assessment and optimization applications. GIS capabilities enable the integration of diverse spatial datasets, sophisticated network analysis, and visualization of walkability conditions and improvement alternatives. Advanced GIS applications incorporate real-time data streams and support web-based collaboration and community engagement [70].

Spatial analysis capabilities within GIS enable sophisticated examination of walkability patterns and their relationships to urban form, demographics, and other contextual factors. Hot spot analysis can identify areas with particularly poor walkability conditions that warrant priority attention [71]. Network analysis functions support accessibility modeling, route optimization, and connectivity assessment across pedestrian networks.

Three-dimensional GIS applications are emerging as valuable tools for walkability assessment and visualization [72]. These applications can incorporate building heights, topographical features, and infrastructure details that affect pedestrian experiences. Virtual reality integration enables immersive visualization of proposed walkability improvements, supporting both technical analysis and community engagement processes.

7.2. Remote Sensing and Automated Assessment Technologies

Remote sensing technologies provide cost-effective approaches for large-scale walkability assessment and monitoring. Satellite imagery, aerial photography, and LiDAR data support automated extraction of infrastructure information, land use patterns, and environmental conditions relevant to walkability assessment [73]. These technologies enable consistent assessment across large geographic areas and support longitudinal monitoring of walkability conditions.

Computer vision and machine learning techniques increasingly enable automated analysis of street-level imagery for walkability assessment. These approaches can identify and classify pedestrian infrastructure, assess surface conditions, and evaluate environmental characteristics from images captured by mapping vehicles or crowdsourced from mobile devices. Automated assessment techniques offer significant advantages in terms of scalability and consistency compared to manual audit approaches [74].

Emerging sensor technologies including Internet of Things devices provide new opportunities for real-time monitoring of walkability conditions. Environmental sensors can monitor air quality, noise levels, and weather conditions that affect walkability. Pedestrian counting sensors provide data on usage patterns and demand [75]. Integration of these real-time data streams into walkability assessment and optimization systems enables more responsive and adaptive management approaches.

7.3. Mobile Technologies and Crowdsourcing Platforms

Mobile technologies have revolutionized data collection and community engagement in walkability assessment. Smartphone applications enable residents to report infrastructure problems, safety concerns, and accessibility barriers in real-time. GPS tracking capabilities support detailed analysis of actual walking patterns and route preferences. Crowdsourcing platforms aggregate community input to create comprehensive databases of walkability conditions and priorities [76].

Participatory sensing approaches leverage mobile devices to collect environmental and infrastructure data at large scales [77]. Citizens can use smartphone sensors to measure noise levels, air quality, and other environmental conditions that affect walkability. Photo capture and annotation capabilities enable documentation of infrastructure conditions and safety concerns. These crowdsourced datasets complement traditional data collection methods and provide community perspectives on walkability conditions.

Mobile decision support applications provide real-time routing recommendations and information to pedestrians [78]. These applications can incorporate current weather conditions, construction activities, and safety information to suggest optimal walking routes. Integration with public transit information supports multimodal trip planning that maximizes walkability benefits. Gamification elements can encourage walking behavior and community participation in walkability assessment.

7.4. Artificial Intelligence and Machine Learning Applications

Artificial intelligence and machine learning techniques offer powerful capabilities for pattern recognition, prediction, and optimization in walkability applications [79]. Machine learning models can identify complex relationships between walkability conditions and safety outcomes that may not be apparent through traditional statistical analysis. These capabilities support more accurate prediction of intervention effectiveness and optimization of improvement strategies.

Deep learning approaches show particular promise for automated analysis of street-level imagery and other complex data sources [80]. Convolutional neural networks can classify infrastructure conditions, identify safety hazards, and assess environmental characteristics from images with high accuracy. These capabilities enable scalable automated assessment that can supplement or replace manual auditing in many applications.

Reinforcement learning techniques can optimize dynamic management strategies for pedestrian infrastructure and services [81]. These approaches learn optimal policies through interaction with simulated or real urban environments, adapting strategies based on observed outcomes. Applications include traffic signal optimization, dynamic routing recommendations, and adaptive deployment of maintenance resources.

8. Implementation Challenges and Future Directions

8.1. Standardization and Methodological Consistency

The lack of standardized walkability assessment protocols represents a significant challenge for research advancement and practical implementation [82]. Different studies employ varying indicator definitions, measurement methods, and aggregation techniques, limiting the comparability of results across contexts and hampering the development of generalizable knowledge. Professional organizations and government agencies are working toward consensus standards, but progress remains limited.

Standardization efforts must balance the need for consistency with recognition of contextual differences across urban environments. Climate, culture, urban form, and regulatory frameworks all influence what constitutes good walkability, suggesting that universal standards may not be appropriate for all contexts. Flexible frameworks that provide standardized measurement approaches while allowing for local adaptation may offer the best compromise.

International collaboration and knowledge sharing are essential for advancing standardization efforts. Comparative studies across different urban contexts can identify which walkability principles are universal and which require local adaptation. Professional networks and international organizations provide platforms for sharing best practices and developing consensus around measurement protocols and optimization approaches [83].

8.2. Data Quality and Availability Challenges

Comprehensive walkability assessment requires diverse, high-quality datasets that may be expensive or difficult to obtain. Infrastructure databases, traffic counts, crash records, and environmental monitoring data are often incomplete, outdated, or inconsistent across jurisdictions. The costs of data collection and maintenance can be prohibitive for many planning organizations, particularly in developing countries [84].

Data sharing and integration present additional challenges due to privacy concerns, proprietary restrictions, and technical incompatibilities. Different organizations may use incompatible data formats or coordinate systems that complicate data integration. Legal and institutional barriers may prevent sharing of sensitive information such as crash records or security data.

Emerging technologies offer potential solutions to some data quality and availability challenges. Crowdsourcing can supplement official data collection efforts, while automated analysis of publicly available imagery can provide consistent infrastructure assessment across large areas [85]. However, these approaches also introduce new quality control challenges and may not be suitable for all types of walkability assessment.

8.3. Resource Constraints and Funding Mechanisms

Infrastructure improvements to enhance walkability require significant capital investments that may exceed available budgets in many jurisdictions. Traditional transportation funding mechanisms often prioritize motor vehicle infrastructure over pedestrian facilities, creating systematic underfunding of walkability improvements [86]. Cost-benefit analyses struggle to quantify many walkability benefits, making it difficult to justify investments using traditional economic criteria.

Innovative funding mechanisms are needed to support comprehensive walkability improvement programs [87]. Public-private partnerships, development impact fees, and value capture strategies can provide alternative funding sources. Health-sector partnerships may be particularly promising given the documented health benefits of walkable environments.

Phased implementation strategies can help manage resource constraints by prioritizing high-impact improvements and staging implementation over time. Cost-effective intervention strategies that maximize walkability benefits per dollar invested are essential for resource-constrained environments. Maintenance and operations funding must also be considered to ensure long-term sustainability of walkability investments [88].

8.4. Political and Institutional Barriers

Walkability improvements may face resistance from various stakeholders, including drivers concerned about reduced parking or traffic capacity, businesses worried about accessibility impacts, and property owners opposing infrastructure changes. Political support for walkability initiatives may be limited, particularly in automobile-oriented communities where walking is not well-established as a transportation mode.

Institutional barriers include fragmented governance structures that complicate coordinated walkability planning across multiple jurisdictions and agencies. Zoning regulations, design standards, and approval processes may inadvertently discourage walkable development patterns. Professional training and capacity building may be needed to develop expertise in walkability planning and implementation [89].

Advocacy and education efforts are essential for building political and community support for walkability improvements [90]. Demonstration projects can showcase the benefits of walkability investments and build momentum for larger-scale improvements. Engagement with business communities, health organizations, and other stakeholders can broaden the coalition supporting walkability initiatives.

9. Conclusion

This comprehensive review reveals the significant evolution and current state of walkability optimization research, highlighting both substantial progress and remaining challenges in the field. The integration of multi-criteria decision-making techniques with walkability assessment has proven effective in addressing the inherent complexity of optimizing pedestrian environments while balancing multiple objectives and stakeholder interests.

The evidence consistently supports strong relationships between comprehensive walkability measures and pedestrian safety outcomes, though these relationships are mediated by contextual factors including urban form, traffic management, and environmental conditions. Multi-dimensional approaches that integrate infrastructure quality, network connectivity, environmental factors, and safety perceptions provide more robust frameworks for both assessment and optimization compared to single-factor approaches.

MCDM techniques, particularly hybrid approaches combining multiple methodologies, have demonstrated superior capability for handling the complexity inherent in walkability optimization. The structured approaches provided by AHP, TOPSIS, and fuzzy logic methods enable systematic evaluation while incorporating stakeholder preferences and addressing uncertainty. However, the practical implementation of these sophisticated methodologies remains challenging due to data requirements, technical complexity, and resource constraints.

The optimization of urban walkability represents a fundamental component of sustainable urban development with profound implications for public health, environmental sustainability, and social equity. As global urbanization accelerates and climate change pressures intensify, evidence-based approaches to creating pedestrian-friendly environments will become increasingly essential for developing resilient, livable cities that serve all residents effectively.

Recommendations

Future research should prioritize the development of standardized assessment protocols that balance methodological consistency with contextual sensitivity. A tiered approach to standardization could establish core indicators that are universally applicable while allowing supplementary indicators that reflect local conditions and priorities. This framework would enable comparative analysis across different contexts while maintaining relevance to local planning needs.

The integration of real-time data streams with traditional walkability assessment methodologies represents a critical frontier for research advancement. Dynamic assessment systems that incorporate weather conditions, construction activities, special events, and seasonal variations would provide more accurate and actionable information for planning decisions. Machine learning techniques could identify patterns in these dynamic conditions and predict optimal intervention strategies.

The establishment of walkability-focused performance measurement systems within transportation and planning agencies would support more systematic attention to pedestrian infrastructure and safety. These systems should incorporate both objective infrastructure measures and subjective user experience indicators to provide comprehensive performance assessment. Regular monitoring and reporting of walkability conditions would create accountability mechanisms and support evidence-based decision-making.

References

[1] Parihar J, Birman S. Heat Resilience in Urban Environments: Strategies for Sustainable City Climate Management. InThe Climate-Health-Sustainability Nexus: Understanding the Interconnected Impact on Populations and the Environment 2024 May 1 (pp. 305-324). Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland.

[2] Telega A, Telega I, Bieda A. Measuring walkability with GIS—methods overview and new approach proposal. Sustainability. 2021 Feb 9;13(4):1883.

[3] AlKheder S, AlRukaibi F. Enhancing pedestrian safety, walkability and traffic flow with fuzzy logic. Science of the total environment. 2020 Jan 20;701:134454.

[4] Sadeghi O, Serugendo GD. Assessing Walkability in Urban Environments: A Comprehensive Overview.

[5] Lu W, Zhang L, Liu Y. Evaluation of Urban Complex Utilization Based on AHP and MCDM Analysis: A Case Study of China. Buildings. 2024 Jul 15;14(7):2179.

[6] Abujder Ochoa WA, Iarozinski Neto A, Vitorio Junior PC, Calabokis OP, Ballesteros-Ballesteros V. The Theory of complexity and sustainable urban development: A systematic literature review. Sustainability. 2025 Jan;17(1):3.

[7] Resch B, Puetz I, Bluemke M, Kyriakou K, Miksch J. An interdisciplinary mixed-methods approach to analyzing urban spaces: The case of urban walkability and bikeability. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health. 2020 Oct;17(19):6994.

[8] Xie Y, Wang H, Wang K, Ge X, Ying X. The Application and Potential of Multi-Objective Optimization Algorithms in Decision-Making for LID Facilities Layout. Water Resources Management. 2024 Nov;38(14):5403-17.

[9] Sahoo SK, Goswami SS. A comprehensive review of multiple criteria decision-making (MCDM) Methods: advancements, applications, and future directions. Decision making advances. 2023 Jun 28;1(1):25-48.

[10] Shabat AY. Integrating Urban Land-Use and Road Networks in Developing Countries: Applying TOD Methods to the Case of Gaza City (Doctoral dissertation, University of Salford (United Kingdom)).

[11] Moran EF. Environmental social science: human-environment interactions and sustainability. John Wiley & Sons; 2011 Sep 9.

[12] Chan ET. The influence of the built environment on neighbourhood-level walking behaviour and experience: a case study of Shenzhen (Doctoral dissertation, University of Oxford).

[13] Sadeghi O, Serugendo GD. Assessing Walkability in Urban Environments: A Comprehensive Overview.

[14] Huang X, Liang H, Zeng L, White M. Evaluating urban walkability: a comprehensive review of tools and techniques. Architectural Science Review. 2024 Oct 4:1-5.

[15] Zhao L, Bian Y, Rong J, Liu X, Shu S. Evaluation method for pedestrian level of service on sidewalks based on fuzzy neural network model. Journal of Intelligent & Fuzzy Systems. 2016 May;30(5):2905-13.

[16] Ahmad M, Sharma S. From Screens to Streets: Volunteered Geographic Information's Impact on Travel Choices. InDecoding Tourist Behavior in the Digital Era: Insights for Effective Marketing 2025 (pp. 239-260). IGI Global.

[17] Lovasi GS, Mooney SJ, Muennig P, DiMaggio C. Cause and context: place-based approaches to investigate how environments affect mental health. Social psychiatry and psychiatric epidemiology. 2016 Dec;51:1571-9.

[18] Wang ML, Narcisse MR, McElfish PA. Higher walkability associated with increased physical activity and reduced obesity among United States adults. Obesity. 2023 Feb;31(2):553-64.

[19] Gnoni MG, Saleh JH. Near-miss management systems and observability-in-depth: Handling safety incidents and accident precursors in light of safety principles. Safety science. 2017 Jan 1;91:154-67.

[20] Ni Y, Wang M, Sun J, Li K. Evaluation of pedestrian safety at intersections: A theoretical framework based on pedestrian-vehicle interaction patterns. Accident Analysis & Prevention. 2016 Nov 1;96:118-29.

[21] Arpin J, Finley K, Hamre A. Resources and Tools to Improve Pedestrian Safety.".

[22] Pyrialakou VD, Gkritza K, Fricker JD. Accessibility, mobility, and realized travel behavior: Assessing transport disadvantage from a policy perspective. Journal of transport geography. 2016 Feb 1;51:252-69.

[23] De Vos J, Lättman K, Van der Vlugt AL, Welsch J, Otsuka N. Determinants and effects of perceived walkability: a literature review, conceptual model and research agenda. Transport reviews. 2023 Mar 4;43(2):303-24.

[24] Kaushik P. Assessing Future Thermal Discomfort and Walkability in Indian Cities Under Climate Change Scenarios.

[25] Baobeid A, Koç M, Al-Ghamdi SG. Walkability and its relationships with health, sustainability, and livability: elements of physical environment and evaluation frameworks. Frontiers in Built Environment. 2021 Sep 30;7:721218.

[26] Lan H. Interpretable Multimodal Framework for Human-Centered Street Assessment: Integrating Visual-Language Models for Perceptual Urban Diagnostics. arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.05087. 2025 Jun 5.

[27] Manaf SF. Utilizing Deep Learning for Automated Inspection and Damage Assessment in Civil Infrastructure Systems. Applied Research in Artificial Intelligence and Cloud Computing. 2024;7(6):1-0.

[28] Bolten N, Caspi A. Towards routine, city-scale accessibility metrics: Graph theoretic interpretations of pedestrian access using personalized pedestrian network analysis. PLoS one. 2021 Mar 19;16(3):e0248399.

[29] Baobeid A, Koç M, Al-Ghamdi SG. Walkability and its relationships with health, sustainability, and livability: elements of physical environment and evaluation frameworks. Frontiers in Built Environment. 2021 Sep 30;7:721218.

[30] Kim J, Lee B. More than travel time: New accessibility index capturing the connectivity of transit services. Journal of Transport Geography. 2019 Jun 1;78:8-18.

[31] World Health Organization. Pedestrian safety: a road safety manual for decision-makers and practitioners. World Health Organization; 2023 May 3.

[32] Adkins A, Dill J, Luhr G, Neal M. Unpacking walkability: Testing the influence of urban design features on perceptions of walking environment attractiveness. Journal of urban design. 2012 Nov 1;17(4):499-510.

[33] Baobeid A, Koç M, Al-Ghamdi SG. Walkability and its relationships with health, sustainability, and livability: elements of physical environment and evaluation frameworks. Frontiers in Built Environment. 2021 Sep 30;7:721218.

[34] Singh S, Kumar V. Modelling the determinants for sustainable smart city through interpretive structure modelling and analytic hierarchy process. Computational Urban Science. 2024 Jun 12;4(1):16.

[35] Sadeghi O, Serugendo GD. Assessing Walkability in Urban Environments: A Comprehensive Overview.

[36] Ruiz-Padillo A, Pasqual FM, Uriarte AM, Cybis HB. Application of multi-criteria decision analysis methods for assessing walkability: A case study in Porto Alegre, Brazil. Transportation research Part D: transport and environment. 2018 Aug 1;63:855-71.

[37] Agrawal S, Jadon SS. Optimizing urban walkability with NSGA-III for sustainable city planning and construction. Asian Journal of Civil Engineering. 2024 Dec;25(8):6189-201.

[38] Roszkowska E, Wachowicz T. Smart Cities and Resident Well-Being: Using the BTOPSIS Method to Assess Citizen Life Satisfaction in European Cities. Applied Sciences (2076-3417). 2024 Dec 1;14(23).

[39] Başeğmez M, Doğan A, Aydın CC. Management of sustainable urban green spaces through machine learning–supported MCDM and GIS integration. Environmental Science and Pollution Research. 2025 Apr;32(18):11466-87.

[40] Wang Y, Nanehkaran YA. GIS-based fuzzy logic technique for mapping landslide susceptibility analyzing in a coastal soft rock zone. Natural Hazards. 2024 Sep;120(12):10889-921.

[41] Zawidzki M. Discrete optimization in architecture: Architectural & urban layout. Singapore: Springer; 2016 Jul 9.

[42] AlShareef F, Aljoufie M. Identification of the proper criteria set for neighborhood walkability using the fuzzy analytic hierarchy process model: A case study in Jeddah, Saudi Arabia. Sustainability. 2020 Nov 9;12(21):9286.

[43] Andreou A, Mavromoustakis CX, Markakis EK, Song H. On the integration of user preferences by using a hybrid methodology for multi-criteria decision making. IEEE Access. 2023 Dec 7;11:139157-70.

[44] Aruldoss M, Lakshmi TM, Venkatesan VP. A survey on multi criteria decision making methods and its applications. American Journal of Information Systems. 2013 Dec;1(1):31-43.

[45] Haghighi Fard SM, Doratli N. Evaluation of resilience in historic urban areas by combining multi-criteria decision-making system and GIS, with sustainability and regeneration approach: The case study of Tehran (IRAN). Sustainability. 2022 Jan;14(5):2495.

[46] Hyder A, Subbarao SS. Navigating safety: pedestrian safety perceptions at uncontrolled crosswalks in Hyderabad, India. Innovative Infrastructure Solutions. 2025 Jan;10(1):11.

[47] Machingaidze R. Road Safety and Accessibility: Facilitating the autonomous movement of people with physical disabilities in pedestrian environments.

[48] World Health Organization. Pedestrian safety: a road safety manual for decision-makers and practitioners. World Health Organization; 2023 May 3.

[49] Osama A, Sayed T. Evaluating the impact of connectivity, continuity, and topography of sidewalk network on pedestrian safety. Accident Analysis & Prevention. 2017 Oct 1;107:117-25.

[50] Primer A. International Practice in Highway Access Management.

[51] Ewing R, Choi DA, Kiani F, Kim J, Sabouri S. Street Network Connectivity, Traffic Congestion, and Traffic Safety. Utah. Dept. of Transportation. Research Division; 2020 Sep 1.

[52] Atash F. Redesigning suburbia for walking and transit: emerging concepts. Journal of urban planning and development. 1994 Mar;120(1):48-57.

[53] Tasic I, Elvik R, Brewer S. Exploring the safety in numbers effect for vulnerable road users on a macroscopic scale. Accident Analysis & Prevention. 2017 Dec 1;109:36-46.

[54] Lopez Baeza J, Carpio-Pinedo J, Sievert J, Landwehr A, Preuner P, Borgmann K, Avakumović M, Weissbach A, Bruns-Berentelg J, Noennig JR. Modeling pedestrian flows: Agent-based simulations of pedestrian activity for land use distributions in urban developments. Sustainability. 2021 Aug 18;13(16):9268.

[55] Kweon BS, Rosenblatt-Naderi J, Ellis CD, Shin WH, Danies BH. The effects of pedestrian environments on walking behaviors and perception of pedestrian safety. Sustainability. 2021 Aug 5;13(16):8728.

[56] Khabiri R, Jahangiry L, Birgani HR, Sadeghi-bazargani H. Interventions for Increasing Pedestrian Visibility to Prevent Injury and Death: A Systematic Review. Health & Social Care in the Community. 2025;2025(1):2958743.

[57] Wallman CG, Wretling P, Öberg G. Effects of winter road maintenance: state-of-the-art. Statens väg-och transportforskningsinstitut; 1997.

[58] Baouche F, Billot R, Trigui R, El Faouzi NE. Efficient allocation of electric vehicles charging stations: Optimization model and application to a dense urban network. IEEE Intelligent transportation systems magazine. 2014 Jul 21;6(3):33-43.

[59] Zhang Z, He Z, Yuan Y, Chen X. Deep Network Capacitated Covering Location Model: Spatial Location-allocation Optimization of Community Healthcare Facilities in Consideration of Public Health Emergencies. Applied Spatial Analysis and Policy. 2025 Mar;18(1):14.

[60] Scheurer J, Porta S. Centrality and connectivity in public transport networks and their significance for transport sustainability in cities. InWorld Planning Schools Congress, Global Planning Association Education Network, 2006.

[61] Agrawal S, Jadon SS. Optimizing urban walkability with NSGA-III for sustainable city planning and construction. Asian Journal of Civil Engineering. 2024 Dec;25(8):6189-201.

[62] Almutairi MS. Evolutionary Multi-Objective Feature Selection Algorithms on Multiple Smart Sustainable Community Indicator Datasets. Sustainability. 2024 Feb 10;16(4):1511.

[63] Silalahi M, Fatmawati E, Judijanto L, Saputra N, Herman H. Sensitivity Analysis In Operations Research Decisions: A Case Study On A Mathematical Model. Library of Progress-Library Science, Information Technology & Computer. 2024 Jul 1;44(2).

[64] Lyu C. Exploring the Influence of Dynamic Indicators in Urban Spaces on Residents' Environmental Behavior: A Case Study in Shanghai Utilizing Mixed-Methods Approach and Artificial Neural Network (ANN) Modeling. Sustainability. 2024 Apr 15;16(8):3280.

[65] Skoropad VN, Deđanski S, Pantović V, Injac Z, Vujičić S, Jovanović-Milenković M, Jevtić B, Lukić-Vujadinović V, Vidojević D, Bodolo I. Dynamic Traffic Flow Optimization Using Reinforcement Learning and Predictive Analytics: A Sustainable Approach to Improving Urban Mobility in the City of Belgrade. Sustainability. 2025 Apr 10;17(8):3383.

[66] Ladi T, Jabalameli S, Sharifi A. Applications of machine learning and deep learning methods for climate change mitigation and adaptation. Environment and Planning B: Urban Analytics and City Science. 2022 May;49(4):1314-30.

[67] Afzalan N, Muller B. Online participatory technologies: Opportunities and challenges for enriching participatory planning. Journal of the American Planning Association. 2018 Apr 3;84(2):162-77.

[68] Al-Homoud M, Al-Zghoul S. Socio-Spatial Bridging Through Walkability: A GIS and Mixed-Methods Analysis in Amman, Jordan. Buildings. 2025 Jun 10;15(12):1999.

[69] Flacke J, Shrestha R, Aguilar R. Strengthening participation using interactive planning support systems: A systematic review. ISPRS International Journal of Geo-Information. 2020 Jan 15;9(1):49.

[70] Mason BC, Dragicevic S. Web GIS and knowledge management systems: An integrated design for collaborative community planning. InCollaborative geographic information systems 2006 (pp. 263-284). IGI Global.

[71] Mazumdar S, Bagheri N, Chong S, Cochrane T, Jalaludin B, Davey R. A hotspot of walking in and around the central business district: Leveraging coarsely geocoded routinely collected data. Applied spatial analysis and policy. 2020 Sep;13:649-68.

[72] Yin L. Street level urban design qualities for walkability: Combining 2D and 3D GIS measures. Computers, Environment and Urban Systems. 2017 Jul 1;64:288-96.

[73] Biljecki F, Ito K. Street view imagery in urban analytics and GIS: A review. Landscape and Urban Planning. 2021 Nov 1;215:104217.

[74] Anthony O, Pley D. Comparative Analysis of Manual vs AI-Supported Building Condition Audits in Commercial Facilities.

[75] Ohlms PB, Dougald LE, MacKnight HE. Bicycle and pedestrian count programs: Scan of current US practice. Transportation research record. 2019 Mar;2673(3):74-85.

[76] Sadeghi O, Serugendo GD. Assessing Walkability in Urban Environments: A Comprehensive Overview.

[77] Kanhere SS. Participatory sensing: Crowdsourcing data from mobile smartphones in urban spaces. InInternational Conference on Distributed Computing and Internet Technology 2013 Feb 5 (pp. 19-26). Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg.

[78] Vitale A, Festa DC, Guido G, Rogano D. A Decision Support System based on smartphone probes as a tool to promote public transport. Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences. 2014 Feb 5;111:224-31.

[79] He W, Chen M. Advancing urban life: a systematic review of emerging technologies and artificial intelligence in urban design and planning. Buildings. 2024 Mar 20;14(3):835.

[80] Lefevre S, Tuia D, Wegner JD, Produit T, Nassar AS. Toward seamless multiview scene analysis from satellite to street level. Proceedings of the IEEE. 2017 May 11;105(10):1884-99.

[81] Rahman NB. Deep Reinforcement Learning for Adaptive Traffic Signal Control in Smart Cities: An Intelligent Infrastructure Perspective. Applied Research in Artificial Intelligence and Cloud Computing. 2024;7(5):1-0.

[82] Baobeid A, Koç M, Al-Ghamdi SG. Walkability and its relationships with health, sustainability, and livability: elements of physical environment and evaluation frameworks. Frontiers in Built Environment. 2021 Sep 30;7:721218.

[83] Qaseem A, Forland F, Macbeth F, Ollenschläger G, Phillips S, van der Wees P, Board of Trustees of the Guidelines International Network*. Guidelines International Network: toward international standards for clinical practice guidelines. Annals of internal medicine. 2012 Apr 3;156(7):525-31.

[84] Bishop ID, Escobar FJ, Karuppannan S, Suwarnarat K, Williamson IP, Yates PM, Yaqub HW. Spatial data infrastructures for cities in developing countries: Lessons from the Bangkok experience. Cities. 2000 Apr 1;17(2):85-96.

[85] Su W, Sui D, Zhang X. Satellite image analysis using crowdsourcing data for collaborative mapping: current and opportunities. International Journal of Digital Earth. 2020 Jun 2;13(6):645-60.

[86] Kanyepe J, Zizhou B. Designing Cities for Sustainable Transportation. InContemporary Solutions for Sustainable Transportation Practices 2024 (pp. 157-185). IGI Global.

[87] Rui J, Othengrafen F. Examining the role of innovative streets in enhancing urban mobility and livability for sustainable urban transition: A review. Sustainability. 2023 Mar 24;15(7):5709.

[88] Corning-Padilla A, Rowangould G. Sustainable and equitable financing for sidewalk maintenance. Cities. 2020 Dec 1;107:102874.

[89] Muhlbach JD. Building Healthy Communities: Integrating Walkability Concepts into Local Land Use Planning.

[90] Patch CM, Conway TL, Kerr J, Arredondo EM, Levy S, Spoon C, Butte KJ, Sannidhi D, Millstein RA, Glorioso D, Jeste DV. Engaging older adults as advocates for age-friendly, walkable communities: The Senior Change Makers Pilot Study. Translational behavioral medicine. 2021 Sep 1;11(9):1751-63.