Environmental and Policy Approaches to Increase Physical Activity: Point-of-Decision Prompts to Encourage Use of Stairs Summary Evidence Table

Author & year (study period)					Results				
Design suitability (design) Quality of execution (# of Limitations) Evaluation setting	Intervention and comparison elements	Study population & description Sample size		Reported baseline		ed effect	Value us summ		FU time
Adams 2002 (2000) Moderate (timeseries) Fair (4) Medical school of the University of Newcastle ()	Location: Tyne, England, United Kingdom Components: Placement of 39 signs next to the elevator buttons on each floor and 1 sign in each elevator Comparison: Measurements during the baseline period without the signs	All users of the stairs and elevators including medical, dental and biomedical sciences undergraduate and postgraduate students, teaching, research and support staff, and visitors  N = 1750 observations at baseline N = 1770 observations at 1 week N = 1773 observations at 4 weeks	Change in stair use in response to the intervention Stairs	Baseline 20.1%	1 wk FU 20.6%	4 wks FU 19.5%	Diff RC 0.5% 2.49	p NS	4 wks

Author & year (study period) Design suitability					Results	1	
(design) Quality of execution (# of Limitations) Evaluation setting	Intervention and comparison elements	Study population & description Sample size	Effect measure	Reported	Reported effect	Value used in summary	FU time
Anderson 1998 (NR) Moderate (time- series) Fair (2) Shopping mall	Location: USA (Baltimore, MD) Components: 1) Placement of a "health benefits" sign near the escalator and stairs 2) Placement of a "weight control" sign near the escalator and stairs Comparison: Measurements during the baseline period without the signs	All users of stairs and evelators in a shopping mall Exclusions: persons carrying baggage larger than a briefcase; persons carrying a baby or child; and those judged to be younger than 18 years of age  N = 17,901 adult patrons	Percent of people using the stairs  "Health Benefits" sign  "Weight Control" sign	Baseline 4.8% 4.8%	FU 6.9% 7.2%	Diff RC p 2.1% 43.75 sig 2.4% 50.00 sig	3 mos
Anderson 2000 (NR) Moderate (time- series) Fair (2) Setting NR	Location: USA Components: Placement of a sign with an African American women climbing the stairs Comparison: Measurements during the baseline period without the sign and after the removal of the sign	African American commuters $N = 5287$ observations with no sign $N = 4479$ observations with the sign $N = 4548 \ 2^{nd}$ observation without the sign $N = 1721 \ 2^{nd}$ observation with the sign posted	Percent of people using the stairs  African Americans  White Americans	Baseline 10.2% 23.1%	<u>FU</u> 16.2% 28.2%	Diff RC p 6.0% 58.82 <.001 5.1% 22.08 <.001	NR

Author & year (study period)			Results					
Design suitability (design)								
Quality of execution (# of Limitations)	Intervention and comparison	Study population & description		Reported		Value used in		
<b>Evaluation setting</b>	=	Sample size	Effect measure		Reported effect	summary	FU time	
Blamey 1995 (NR) Moderate (timeseries) Fair (3) Underground train station	Location: England Components: Placement of a signs where stairs and escalators were adjacent Comparison: Measurements during the baseline period without the sign and after the removal of the sign	Scottish commuters or shoppers N = 22,275 observations	Percent of people using the stairs Total	Baseline 8%	<u>FU</u> 16%	Diff RC p 8% 100 sig	3 wks	
Boutelle 2001(1997) Moderate (timeseries) Fair (2) University of Minnesota School of Public Health building (worksite)	Location: USA (Minneapolis, MN) Components: 1) Placement of a sign at the decision point for the stairs, escalators, above all of the elevator buttons, and on the stairwell doors 2) Artwork and music added to the stairwell Comparison: Measurements during the baseline period without the sign and after the removal of the sign	Full- and part-time employees N = 35,475 observations	Percent of people using the stairs  Signs	Baseline 11.1%	<u>FU</u> 12.7%	Diff RC p 1.6% 14.41 <0.01	4 wks	

Author & year (study period)			Results							
Design suitability (design)										
Quality of execution (# of Limitations)	Intervention and comparison	Study population & description		Reported		Value used in				
<b>Evaluation setting</b>	elements	Sample size	Effect measure	baseline	Reported effect	summary	FU time			
Brownell 1980 (NR)	Location: USA (PA)	Commuters or	Percent of people using the	<u>Baseline</u>	<u>FU</u>	Diff RC p	2 wks			
Moderate (time- series)	Components: Placement of a sign at	shoppers N = 21.091	stairs  Totals for all phases	6.3%	14.4%	8.1% 128.57 <.0001				
Fair (2) Shopping mall, train	the decision point for the stairs and	observations N = 24,603 observations	Mall Train station	7.2% 5.6%	17.8% 12.7%	10.6%				
station, and bus terminal	escalators Comparison: Measurements during	observations	Bus station Train station II	5.9% 11.6%	10.6% 18.3%	7.1% 126.79 4.7% 79.66				
	the baseline period without the sign		3.63.611 11			6.7% 57.76 <.0001				

Author & year (study period)					Results				
Design suitability (design)									
Quality of execution	Intervention and	Study population &							
(# of Limitations) Evaluation setting	comparison elements	description Sample size	Effect measure	Reported	Reported effect	Value used in	FU time		
Coleman 2001	Location: USA (EI	Patrons and	Percent of people using the	Baseline	Reported effect	summary	1 mo		
	Paso, TX)	employees of the	stairs	baseiiile	<u>FU</u>	Diff RC p	1 1110		
Moderate (time-	Components:	airport, bank, office buidling, and the	Individual-oriented sign						
Good (1) Airport, bank, office	Placement of 2 types of signs (individual perspective and family perspective)	library  N = 10,155 observations (at	<u>Bank</u> Men Women	1.4% 2.0%	4.6% 4.5%	3.2% 228.57 sig 2.5% 125.00 sig			
lihrary	Comparison: Measurements during the baseline period	bank) N = 34,125 observations (at airport)	<u>Airport</u> Men Women Library	5.1% 3.5%	5.8% 4.5%	0.7% 13.73 NS 1.0% 28.57 sig			
Worksite-	without the sign and after the removal of the sign	after the removal of the sign  N = 9257 observations (at library) N = 8361 observations (at office building) N = 38,022	after the removal of the sign $N = 9257$ observations (at library) $N = 8361$ observations (at office building) $N = 38,022$	after the removal of the sign $N = 9257$ observations (at library) $N = 8361$ observations (at office building)	er the removal of sign  N = 9257  observations (at library)  N = 9257  Men  Women  Family-oriented sign	41.0% 30.6%		-5.4% - 13.17 NS -1.8% -5.88 sig	
					office buidli N = 38,022	office buidling) N = 38,022	Office builiding Men Women	29.8% 36.6%	23.7% 37.6%
		(at airport) N = 15,233 observations	<u>Airport</u> Men Women	4.8% 2.7%	8.1% 4.0%	20.47 sig 1.0% 2.73 NS			
		(at library)	<u>Library</u> Men Women	45.7% 25.7%	38.9% 33.2%	3.3% 68.75 sig 1.3% 48.15 sig			
						-6.8% - 14.88 sig 7.5% 29.18 sig			

Author & year (study period)			Results								
Design suitability (design)											
Quality of execution (# of Limitations)	Intervention and comparison	Study population & description		Reported		Value used in					
<b>Evaluation setting</b>		Sample size	Effect measure		Reported effect	summary	FU time				
series) Fair (2) Shopping mall	Location: England Components: Placement of banners on alternate stair risers Comparison: Measurements during the baseline period without the banners and after the removal of the banners		Perecent of people using the stairs	Baseline 8.1%	18.4%	Diff RC p 10.3% 127.16 sig	6 wks				

Author & year (study period)					Results			
Design suitability (design)								
Quality of execution (# of Limitations)	Intervention and	Study population & description						
Evaluation setting	comparison elements	Sample size	Effect measure	Reported baseline	Reported effect	Value use summa		FU time
Kerr 2004 (1998– 2002) Moderate (time- series) Fair (2) Worksite	Location: USA (Atlanta, GA) Components: 1) Installation of new carpet, painting the walls, and painting large numbers on the doors to identify building floors 2) Adding framed artwork to the stair landings 3) Display of motivational signs throughout the building and on the computer kiosk in the lobby 4) Adding a stereo system which played various types of music in the stairwell Comparison: Measurements during the baseline period	Permanent and temporary employees who used the stairs N = 664 (total building population)	Mean trips per day per occupant Signs (weeks 1–3)	Baseline NR	FU NR	Diff RC NR 8.88	<u>p</u> <.05	3 mos

Author & year (study period)					Results		
Design suitability (design) Quality of execution (# of Limitations) Evaluation setting	Intervention and comparison elements	Study population & description Sample size	Effect measure	Reported baseline	Reported effect	Value used in summary	FU time
Marshall 2002 (NR) Moderate (timeseries) Good (1) Healthcare facility	Location: Australia Components: Placement of colored signs on the wall next to elevator and stair areas and vinyl footprints on the floor leading to the stairs Comparison: Measurements during baseline period without signs and footprints and after removal of signs and footprints	Patrons and employees who used the stairs and elevators N = 158,350 motion-sensing device (MSD) counts	Observed stair use	Baseline 15.5%	<u>FU</u> 16.3	<u>Diff RC p</u> 0.8% 5.16 NR	12 wks
Russell 1999 (NR) Moderate (timeseries) Fair (3) University library	Location: USA (Illinois) Components: Placement of a sign on the main floor between two elevators at eye level stating that elevators to be used only by staff and physically challenged Comparison: Measurements during baseline period with standard sign and with no sign (combined in analysis)	Consumers of the library who used the stairs and elevators N = 6216 observations N = 2486 indviduals chose the stairs	Percent of people using the stairs	Baseline 39.7%	<u>FU</u> 41.9%	Diff RC p 2.2% 5.54 <.05	5 wks

Author & year (study period)						Results				
Design suitability (design)										
Quality of execution (# of Limitations)	Intervention and comparison	Study population & description			Reported		Valu	ue us	ed in	
<b>Evaluation setting</b>	elements	Sample size		Effect measure	baseline	Reported effect	sı	ımma	ary	FU time
Russell 2000 (NR) Moderate (timeseries) Fair (2) Midwest airport	Location: USA Components: 1) Placement of a health promotion sign at eye level on the ground floor directly between stairs and escalators 2) Placement of a deterrent sign limiting elevator use to staff and those individuals unable to use stairs located at eye level on the ground floor directly between stairs and escalators Comparison: Measurements during baseline period without signs and after removal of signs	Travelers who used the stairs and escalators N = 3369 indviduals observed	1)	Percent of people using the stairs Health Promotion sign Deterrent sign	Baseline 8.22% 8.22%	<u>FU</u> 14.89% 14.4%	Diff 6.67% 6.18%		<u>P</u> 81.14 NR 75.18 NR	5 wks

Diff absolute difference; FU follow up; mo month; N sample size; NR not reported; NS non-significant; p p-value; RC relative change; significant; wk week; yr year;