



## 10 **Abstract**

11 Physical activity is essential to combating the obesity epidemic. parkrun organise free  
12 weekly 5km events. Previous studies have identified characteristics of people that act as  
13 barriers to new registrants engaging in and returning to events. The current study identifies  
14 characteristics of parkrun events that are associated with the return rate of new  
15 participants. The return rate of adult first-time participants to parkrun was determined for  
16 all events in Scotland over a 1-year period between 2/2019 and 1/2020. A GLMM was used  
17 to determine factors associated with whether they returned to parkrun. Return rates were  
18 higher for smaller events and events with more other first-time participants. Older  
19 participants and male participants were more likely to return. Those that finished in a  
20 relatively slow time were disproportionately less likely to return. Events with routes that run  
21 alongside freshwater had higher return rates for women. New participants at parkrun are  
22 more likely to return if they attended a smaller event suggesting that parkrun should  
23 continue to create new events to make parkrun more efficient at retaining new participants.  
24 New participants also returned more readily if they attended an event with a high  
25 proportion of other adult new participants so specific recruitment events could be  
26 advertised to encourage new participants to attend their first event together. New events  
27 could be prioritised in proximity to those events that currently experience the highest  
28 attendances.

29

## 30 Introduction

31 Studies have shown there are more barriers to participating in physical activity for  
32 women than men [1,2]. The context in which women will engage in physical activity differs  
33 from that of men [3,4]. Motivations for taking part in sport also differ between the genders  
34 [5-6]. Encouraging women to participate in sports is important as lack of activity can lead to  
35 morbid obesity with 1.4 billion adults estimated to be partaking in insufficient levels of  
36 physical activity [7]. Consequently, promotion of wider participation in sport has become a  
37 global priority [8].

38 The environmental context within which people exist can also play an important role  
39 in driving the obesity epidemic [9]. These upstream factors can have both negative and  
40 positive influences and their management could influence their impacts. For example, the  
41 provision of more positive influences, such cycle routes and pleasant spaces in which to  
42 exercise, can encourage increased levels of physical activity [9]. Understanding how the  
43 genders respond to the provision of positive upstream factors is likely to be crucial to their  
44 management and effectiveness [10].

45 One example of a positive upstream factor is parkrun who organise approximately  
46 2000 weekly 5km events globally [11]. The results of each parkrun event are published on  
47 the parkrun website creating a huge dataset on the finishing time, gender and age group of  
48 individual participants. In the UK alone when parkrun was suspended in 2020 due to the  
49 covid-19 pandemic over 2 million participants had recorded over 30 million runs [12].  
50 Identifying patterns in how individuals respond to their exposure to parkrun could provide  
51 important information about how to maximise its effectiveness in promoting physical  
52 activity. The parkrun results database is likely to contain potentially important information

53 that could aid better understanding of patterns of participation, for example, identifying the  
54 characteristics of those event venues most successful at encouraging first-time parkrun  
55 participants to return and attend a second event.

56 The parkrun dataset contains a huge amount of information on the participation  
57 behaviour of the two genders which could be invaluable to identifying barriers to  
58 participation and characteristics that encourage new participants to return. A recent study  
59 has identified that 43% of people who register for parkrun never take part in an event and a  
60 further 22% only participate once [13]. This study questioned those that registered for  
61 parkrun to identify barriers to participation and returning [13]. This identified that women,  
62 younger adults and the inactive were least likely to participate or return [13].

63 Studies have revealed that parkrun not only provides an important public health  
64 benefit by encouraging physical activity but also improves mental health and well-being [14-  
65 18]. Many parkrun routes have sections that run alongside water. Exposure to blue spaces  
66 has recently been shown to be particularly effective in improving mental health so routes  
67 that run alongside water might provide additional mental health benefits [19].

68 Previous studies of the parkrun results have generally used descriptive statistics in  
69 combination with surveys. The application of more advanced analytical techniques on the  
70 parkrun dataset, such as generalised linear modelling, could extract additional potentially  
71 important information for both health practitioners prescribing parkrun and to those  
72 identifying event venue locations and their routes. These models can quantify the relative  
73 importance of different factors and identify interactions between them. They can also be  
74 used to partition within and between event venue variance and identify features of events  
75 associated with participation [20]. The aim of this study was to use a generalised linear

76 model with a binomial error distribution identify factors associated with first-time  
77 participants returning to parkrun.

78

## 79 **Methods**

80 This was an analytical study of aggregated secondary data.

### 81 **Data sources**

82 The primary data source was the parkrun results for all events that occurred over a year  
83 long period from February 2019 to January 2020 in Scotland [12]. The results for each event  
84 were processed using an Excel macro which extracted information about each participant  
85 including their age category, parkrun ID number, gender, age group, finishing time, number  
86 of participations and date [21]. The Macro extracted the name of participants but this was  
87 not harvested or included in the dataset. Adults participating in their first parkrun were  
88 identified. Age is provided as a 5-year cohort except for 18-19 year olds. Age was converted  
89 to a continuous variable by assigning participants the mid-point for their cohort group. The  
90 parkrun results pages provide a link to all participants parkrun history. This was accessed in  
91 November and December 2022 meaning all participants had a period of at least 33 months  
92 up to a maximum of 46 months after their first participation to return to parkrun. However,  
93 it should be noted that Scottish parkrun events were suspended for a period of 17 months  
94 between March 2020 and July 2021 because of the SARS-cov2 pandemic. Additional  
95 characteristics were collected for the first event each of the participants attended. These  
96 were the number of participants, the number of new adult participants, the gender ratio of  
97 the participants, the elevation gained on the route, the type of surface and whether a

98 substantial part of the route runs alongside water and whether this is freshwater or  
99 saltwater [12]. The dataset consisted of 20,191 adult participants made up of 11,459  
100 females and 8,732 males across 56 different event venues.

101

## 102 **Statistical methodology**

103 The data were analysed using R x64 4.1.1 [22]. A generalised linear mixed model (GLMM)  
104 with a binomial error distribution of age graded score was generated using the lme4  
105 function [23]. All continuous explanatory variables were scaled to have a mean of zero and a  
106 standard deviation of one including quadratic terms generated for finishing time, number of  
107 participants, proportion of first-time participants and date. Event venue was included as a  
108 random effect. Minimum Akaike Information Criterion was used to select the optimal  
109 model. A general linear model of the finishing time of first-time participants was generated  
110 to investigate if this varied with the remoteness of an event and the size of an event using  
111 the lm function [24].

112

## 113 **Results**

### 114 **Factors determining the return rate of first-time parkrun participants**

115 The overall return rate of first-time participants to parkrun was 64.18%. A glm identified a  
116 number of significant factors associated with return rate (Table 1). There was a significant  
117 increase in return rate with age (Table1, Fig 1). Date was strongly negatively associated with  
118 return rate. A significant quadratic term shows that the association with date weakens over

119 time. Male participants (66.5%) were highly significantly more likely to return (Figure 1) than  
120 female participants (62.4%). The finishing time at a participants first parkrun was also an  
121 important determinant of return rate. The non-significant linear term and significant  
122 quadratic term suggests little effect of time on return amongst the faster runners but a  
123 disproportionately negative impact of the slowest times on return rates (Figure 2). There  
124 was a highly significant quadratic association between the proportion of new participants at  
125 an event and return rate, with participants disproportionately more likely to return from  
126 events with the highest proportion of new participants (Figure 3). There was also a highly  
127 significant association between event size and return rate with first-time participants more  
128 likely to return when attending smaller events. The travelling time to the next nearest  
129 parkrun also was negatively correlated with return rate. The mean travelling time to the  
130 next nearest event was 30 mins for those that returned and 33 for those that did not return.  
131 Routes that ran alongside freshwater had significantly higher return rates than events that  
132 lacked water and a significant interaction term with gender shows this was particularly the  
133 case for women (Table 2). Gender ratio of the field, surface type and elevation gain were  
134 not retained in the model.

135 Table 1. A generalised linear model with binomial error distribution of return rate to parkrun  
136 of adult first-time participants. All continuous explanatory variables were scaled. A single  
137 interaction term and three quadratic terms were retained in the model.

Parameter	Z <sub>20,178</sub>	Estimate	Standard Error	P
Intercept	-	0.411	0.060	<0.001
Age	9.94	0.158	0.016	<0.001
Date	6.26	-0.095	0.015	<0.001

Date <sup>2</sup>	4.08	0.063	0.015	<0.001
Gender (male)	3.43	0.186	0.054	<0.001
Proportion of first timers	1.68	-0.070	0.042	N.S.
Proportion of first timers <sup>2</sup>	3.38	0.147	0.044	<0.001
Number of participants	3.20	-0.098	0.030	0.001
Alongside freshwater	2.96	0.230	0.078	0.003
Alongside saltwater	1.02	0.118	0.116	N.S.
Finishing time	1.22	0.113	0.093	N.S.
Finishing time <sup>2</sup>	2.91	-0.262	0.090	0.004
Travelling time to next parkrun	2.65	-0.078	0.029	0.008
Gender (male) * alongside freshwater	2.69	-0.181	0.067	0.007
Gender (male) * alongside saltwater	0.96	-0.086	0.089	N.S.

138

139

140 Fig 1. The return rate of adult first-time participants to parkrun events in Scotland against  
 141 their age. Standard error bars are provided for the mean return rate for each age cohort for  
 142 both sexes.

143 Figure 2. The return rate of adult first-time participants to parkrun against their finishing  
 144 time. Standard error bars are provided for cohorts based upon finishing time. N.B. Finishing  
 145 time was treated as a continuous variable in the analyses. Cohorts have simply been created  
 146 to aid illustration of the data.

147 Figure 3. The proportion of first-time adult participants to Scottish events that returned to  
 148 parkrun against the proportion of new adult participants at the event venues they attended.



149 Standard error bars are provided for cohorts based upon the proportion of adult  
150 participants attending events. N.B. Proportion of new adult participants was treated as a  
151 continuous variable in the analyses. Cohorts have simply been created to aid illustration of  
152 the data.

153 Table 2. The return rate of adult first time parkrunners by gender and route type  
154 categorised by whether the route runs alongside freshwater, saltwater or no water.

Route type	Gender	Return Rate	S.E.	N
Alongside freshwater	Female	0.643	0.006	5812
Alongside saltwater	Female	0.596	0.011	1864
Not alongside water	Female	0.609	0.008	3783
Alongside freshwater	Male	0.667	0.007	4216
Alongside saltwater	Male	0.637	0.012	1497
Not alongside water	Male	0.675	0.009	3019

155

## 156 **Factors Determining Choice of First parkrun Venue**

157 A general linear model was generated that revealed that events with larger number  
158 of runners had faster finishing times ( $F_{1,20188}=231.4$ ,  $P<0.001$ ) for first time participants and  
159 that more remote events ( $F_{1,20188}=14.9$ ,  $P<0.001$ ) had slower finishing times for first time  
160 participants.

161

## 162 **Discussion**

### 163 **Return rates to parkrun**

164 The overall return rate of 64.18% is higher than the 61.95% reported in an earlier study [13].  
165 In the current study participants had a longer period of time within which to return (33-46  
166 months compared to 2 years). However, Scottish parkruns were suspended for 17 months  
167 during the pandemic meaning that the possible return period was effectively 16-29 months  
168 which is reasonable comparable to, albeit on average slightly shorter than, the previous  
169 study. This suggests that Scottish parkruns might be relatively effective at getting new  
170 participants to return to parkrun. There was an association between date and return rate  
171 showing those that had a longer time to return had a slightly higher return rate suggesting  
172 that some first timers do eventually return to parkrun a few years after they attended their  
173 first event.

174

## 175 **Characteristics of first-time participants associated with return rate to** 176 **parkrun**

177 Age and gender were both found to affect likelihood of returning to parkrun for first-time  
178 participants in Scotland. This is consistent with the finding of a larger scale study covering  
179 the UK, Ireland and Australia [13]. The gap in return rate between the genders was slightly  
180 wider in Scotland (66.5% for males, 62.4% for females) compared to the broader geographic  
181 study that found return rates of 63.7% for men and 60.4% in women [13]. The wider gap in  
182 Scotland might be indicative of a larger gender gap in activity in Scotland.

183 The broader geographic study found from surveying participants that those that engaged  
184 more readily in physical activity were more likely to return. The current study found the  
185 finishing time of first-time participants were associated with return rate with the return

186 rates of those with finishing times of over 40 minutes (Figure 2) disproportionately low.  
187 Those that exercise more regularly are likely to be fitter, and therefore run faster times, so  
188 this finding is also consistent with the previous study suggesting that the least active, and  
189 those most likely to benefit from parkrun, are those that are least likely to return [13].

## 190 **Characteristics of parkrun events associated with the return rate of new** 191 **participants**

192 This study was the first to investigate what characteristics of parkrun events are associated  
193 with the return rate of first-time parkrun participants. Those who attended events with a  
194 higher proportion of other adult first-time parkrunners were more likely to return. First time  
195 participants who attended an event where the travelling time to the next nearest event was  
196 lower were also more likely to return. This suggests that density of parkruns within a local  
197 area could be influencing return rates with individuals more likely to return to parkrun in  
198 areas with a higher density of event venues. Individuals who enjoyed the general experience  
199 of parkrun but maybe not the specific course at the venue they attended could be more  
200 likely to try a different parkrun if they have another local alternative.

201 First-time parkrun participants were also more likely to return after attending events with  
202 smaller field sizes suggesting that smaller events might feel more welcoming to new  
203 participants. The study also found that first-time participants with the slowest finishing  
204 times were more likely to attend smaller and more remote events. This suggests that these  
205 events might also appear more attractive to first-time participants as an initial choice of  
206 venue as well as providing an experience that is more effective at encouraging them to  
207 return.

208 This study was also the first to try to relate a geospatial feature, whether or not the route  
209 ran alongside freshwater or saltwater, to return rate and found that female first-time  
210 participants were more likely to return to parkrun if they completed a route with a  
211 freshwater blue space. Both exposure to blue spaces and attendance at parkrun have  
212 recently been found to be associated with better mental health [15-19]. This study suggests  
213 that freshwater blue spaces might well also contribute to the mental health benefit gained  
214 by parkrunners by encouraging participants to return.

215

## 216 **Implications for parkrun**

217 These findings suggest that route design could influence whether first timers return.  
218 Therefore, parkrun event directors might want to consider these factors when creating new  
219 events. The fact that return rates were higher at smaller events and at events where the  
220 travelling time to other events was lower both support the continued creation of more  
221 parkrun venues. This recommendation does assume that local areas can sustain additional  
222 events by finding enough volunteers willing to contribute to running them.

223 The discovery that new participants are more likely to return after attending an event with a  
224 higher proportion of other first-time participants suggests that parkrun might want to  
225 consider introducing specific event days when new participants are particularly encouraged  
226 to attend so the proportion of new attendees is higher.

227 Another implication of the findings of this study relates to the parkrun practice initiative<sup>24</sup>.  
228 Practitioners utilising the parkrun practice might want to consider prescribing specific local  
229 event parkrun events that could particularly increase the patient's likelihood of returning,

230 for example, by recommending smaller events, attending events with friends also  
231 considering parkrun and, in the case of female patients, events that include a section  
232 alongside freshwater.

233

## 234 **Limitations of the study**

235 The study was limited to a year-long period due to the considerable time needed to generate  
236 the dataset. It is known that the gender gap in participation has been narrowing and this could  
237 be partly driven by changes in the return rate of the different genders over time. Therefore, it  
238 would be useful to compare this study to other time periods to determine how general the  
239 findings are. It is notable in this study that although return rates were lower for female first-  
240 time participants there were still more returning female than male first-time participants  
241 because the difference in return rate was more than compensated by the higher proportion of  
242 female first-time participants. Therefore, the study period was associated with a clear narrowing  
243 of the gender gap and shows that, at least in Scotland, the majority of new parkrunners that  
244 return to parkrun are actually female which is really encouraging and suggests that parkrun is  
245 successful at overcoming traditional barriers to female participation in sports. The restriction of  
246 the study to Scotland is another limitation. It would be useful to conduct similar analyses of  
247 parkrun return rates in other areas to determine the generality of the findings.

248 The sars-cov-2 pandemic resulted in parkrun being suspended in Scotland for a period of 17  
249 months. This could have impacted the return rates of participants. The sample duration for first-  
250 time participants was specifically chosen to cover the full one-year period before news of the  
251 potential pandemic hit the media to make the findings reasonably current but without being the  
252 pandemic influencing the sample. Therefore, all participants attended their first event without

253 knowledge of the pandemic, but many will have not returned by the point that news of the  
254 emerging pandemic was hitting the media and also at the point that parkrun was suspended in  
255 Scotland. The higher return rates found in this study which straddles the covid suspension  
256 suggests that it may not have negatively impacted return rates. It would be interesting to  
257 investigate the impacts of the pandemic on return rates further by investigating them for first  
258 time participants from February 2020 onwards when they would have known about the  
259 pandemic.

260 The single geospatial characteristic of events used in the study was crude in simply considering  
261 whether the route ran alongside fresh or saltwater. Therefore, the associations found should be  
262 treated with caution. A more detailed geospatial analysis of various aspects of parkrun routes  
263 might well provide a lot more information about why certain events have higher return rates  
264 than others. Understanding what processes different events adopt to encourage first timers to  
265 return would also be worthy of study.

## 266 **Conclusion**

267 Previous studies have highlighted how parkrun is a mass participation event that is having a  
268 positive impact on the health and wellbeing of its attendees [25-27]. This study has identified  
269 various novel features of parkrun events that could be used to make parkrun even more  
270 effective and successful by creating more events, smaller events, higher densities of events and  
271 by having specific recruitment days events for new participants.

272

## 273 **Acknowledgements**

274 The author acknowledges the use of data owned by parkrun Global. The data have been  
275 accessed as a permitted act for independent non-commercial research purposes through  
276 fair dealing legislation allowing access to publicly available databases. Only a tiny proportion  
277 of the parkrun results database was accessed (data from just 56 of more than 2000 events).  
278 The author has no official connection to parkrun but is a regular participant and volunteer.

279 The author did not collect any personal information but used aggregated secondary  
280 data. Ethical approval was obtained from the Stirling University General University Ethics  
281 Committee.

## 282 **References**

- 283 1. Yungblut HE, Schinke RJ, McGannon KR. Views of adolescent female youth on  
284 physical activity during early adolescence. *J Sports Sci Med.* 2012; 11: 39-50.
- 285 2. O'Reilly N, Brunette M, Bradish C. Lifelong Female Engagement in Sport A  
286 Framework for Advancing Girls' and Women's Participation. *J Appl Sport Man.* 2018;  
287 10:15-30.
- 288 3. Aaltonen S, Waller K, Vähä-Ypyä H, Rinne J, Sievänen H, Silventoinen K, Kaprio J,  
289 Kujala UM. Motives for physical activity in older men and women: A twin study using  
290 accelerometer-measured physical activity. *Scand J Med Sci Sports.* 2020; 30: 1409–  
291 1422.
- 292 4. Burke SM, Carron AV, Eys MA. Physical activity context: Preferences of university  
293 students. *Psych Sport Exer.* 2006; 7: 1-13.
- 294 5. Saez I, Solabarrieta J, Rubio I. Motivation for Physical Activity in University Students  
295 and Its Relation with Gender, Amount of Activities, and Sport Satisfaction.  
296 *Sustainability.* 2021; 13: 3183.

- 297 6. Sattler KM, Deane FP, Tapsell L, Kelly PJ. Gender differences in the relationship of  
298 weight-based stigmatisation with motivation to exercise and physical activity in  
299 overweight individuals. *Health Psych Open*. 2018; 5: 2055102918759691
- 300 7. Guthold R, Stevens GA, Riley LM, Bull FC. Worldwide trends in insufficient physical  
301 activity from 2001 to 2016: a pooled analysis of 358 population-based surveys with  
302 1.9 million participants. *Lancet Glob Health*. 2018; 6: 1077–86.
- 303 8. WHO. *Global Action Plan on Physical Activity 2018–2030: More Active People for a*  
304 *Healthier World*. Geneva, Switzerland: World Health Organization (WHO); 2018.
- 305 9. Lakerveld J, Mackenbach J. The Upstream Determinants of Adult Obesity. *Obes*  
306 *Facts*. 2017; 10: 216-222.
- 307 10. Crawford D, Ball K. Behavioural determinants of the obesity epidemic.  
308 *Asia Pac J Clin Nutr* 2002; 11: S718–S721.
- 309 11. parkrunGlobal. <https://www.parkrun.com/>
- 310 12. parkrunUK. <https://www.parkrun.org.uk/>
- 311 13. Recce LJ, Owen K, Graney M, Jackson C, Shields M, Turner G, Wellington C. Barriers  
312 to initiating and maintaining participation in parkrun. *BMC Public Health*. 2022; 22:  
313 83
- 314 14. Stevinson C, Hickson M. Parkrun, activity and health: The public health potential of  
315 parkrun. *J Phys Act Health*. 2018; 15: S153
- 316 15. Grunseit A, Richards J, Merom D. Running on a high: parkrun and personal well-  
317 being. *BMC Public Health*. 2018; 18: 59.
- 318 16. Morris P, Scott H. Not just a run in the park: a qualitative exploration of parkrun and  
319 mental health. *Adv Ment Health*. 2019; 17: 110-123.




- 320 17. Dunne A, Haake S, Quirk H, Bullas A. Motivation to Improve Mental Wellbeing via  
321 Community Physical Activity Initiatives and the Associated Impacts-A Cross-Sectional  
322 Survey of UK parkrun Participants. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2021; 18: 13072.
- 323 18. Stevinson C, Hickson M. Changes in physical activity, weight and wellbeing outcomes  
324 among attendees of a weekly mass participation event: a prospective 12-month  
325 study. *J Public Health*. 2019; 41: 807-814.
- 326 19. McDougall CW, Hanley N, Quilliam RS, Bartie PJ, Robertson T, Griffiths M, Oliver DM.  
327 Neighbourhood blue space and mental health: A nationwide ecological study of  
328 antidepressant medication prescribed to older adults. *Landsc Urban Plan*. 2021; 214:  
329 104132
- 330 20. Gilburn AS. New parkrunners are slower and the attendance gender gap narrowing  
331 making parkrun more inclusive. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. (forthcoming).
- 332 21. Hoffman R. <https://www.facebook.com/groups/parkrunstatsgeeks/files> version  
333 published October 31st 2019.
- 334 22. R Core Team. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation  
335 for Statistical Computing. Vienna, Austria. URL <https://www.R-project.org/>. Accessed  
336 (2021).
- 337 23. Bates D, Mächler M, Bolker B, & Walker S. Fitting Linear Mixed-Effects Models Using  
338 lme4. *J Stat Softw*. 2015; 67: 1–48.
- 339 24. <https://www.rdocumentation.org/packages/stats/versions/3.6.2/topics/lm>
- 340 25. Fleming J, Wellington C, Parsons J, Dale J. Collaboration between primary care and a  
341 voluntary, community sector organisation: Practical guidance from the  
342 parkrun practice initiative. *Health Soc Care Community*. 2021; DOI:  
343 10.1111/hsc.13236

- 344 26. Reece LJ, Quirk H, Wellington C, Haake SJ, Wilson F. Bright spots, physical activity  
345 investments that work: parkrun; a global initiative striving for healthier and happier  
346 communities. *Br J Sports Med*. 2019; 53: 326–7.
- 347 27. Stevinson C, Hickson M. Exploring the public health potential of a mass community  
348 participation event. *J Public Health*. 2013; 36: 268-274.
- 349 28. Grunseit AC, Richards J, Reece L, Bauman A, Merom D. Evidence on the reach and  
350 impact of the social physical activity phenomenon parkrun: A scoping review. *Prev*  
351 *Med Rep*. 2020; 20: 101231

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.03.14.23287282>; this version posted March 20, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

Proportion that returned to parkrun




Gender  
— Female  
- - - Male

Figure

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.03.14.23287282>; this version posted March 20, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](#).

Proportion that returned to parkrun




Figure

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.03.14.23287282>; this version posted March 20, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

Proportion that returned to parkrun



Figure