

1

2

3

Examining the impact of outdoor walk group attendance on health among older adults with

4

mobility limitations in the Getting Older Adults Outdoors (GO-OUT) randomized trial

5

6

7

Tai-Te Su, PhD,¹ Ruth Barclay, PhD,² Rahim Moineddin, PhD,³ and Nancy M. Salbach PhD^{1, 4}

8

1. Department of Physical Therapy, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada

9

2. Department of Physical Therapy, University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada

10

3. Department of Family and Community Medicine, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario,

11

Canada

12

4. KITE Research Institute, Toronto Rehabilitation Institute - University Health Network,

13

Toronto, Ontario, Canada

14

15

Author Notes

16

Tai-Te Su  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7166-0247>

17

Ruth Barclay  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2961-5821>

18

Rahim Moineddin  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5506-084X>

19

Nancy M. Salbach  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6178-0691>

20

Please address all correspondence to Nancy Salbach, PhD, 160-500 University Avenue, Toronto

21

Ontario, M5G 1V7 Canada. Email: nancy.salbach@utoronto.ca

22 **Abstract**

23 **Objective:** The Getting Older Adults Outdoors randomized trial showed a 10-week outdoor walk
24 group (OWG) program was not superior to 10 weekly phone reminders on increasing physical
25 and mental health; however, OWG attendance varied. This study examined whether a dose-
26 response relationship existed between OWG attendance and improvement in physical and mental
27 health among older adults with mobility limitations.

28 **Methods:** We analyzed data from 98 older adults randomized to a 10-week park-based OWG
29 program. Participants were classified as attending 0–9, 10–15, and 16–20 OWG sessions based
30 on attendance tertiles. Outcomes included change in scores on measures of walking endurance,
31 comfortable and fast walking speed, balance, lower extremity strength, walking self-efficacy,
32 and emotional well-being pre- to post-intervention.

33 **Results:** Seventy-nine older adults with complete information on the seven health outcomes were
34 included (age=74.7±6.6 years, 72% female). Compared to those who attended 0–9 OWG
35 sessions, participants attending 16–20 sessions exhibited a 52.7-meter greater improvement in
36 walking endurance (95% CI:12.3, 93.1); 0.15-meter/second greater improvement in comfortable
37 walking speed (95% CI:0.00, 0.29); and 0.17-meter/second greater improvement in fast walking
38 speed (95% CI:0.02, 0.33). Higher attendance was also associated with higher odds of
39 experiencing an improvement in walking self-efficacy (OR=4.03; 95% CI:1.05, 16.85) and fast
40 walking speed (OR=9.00, 95% CI:1.59, 61.73). No significant dose-response relationships for
41 balance, lower extremity strength, and emotional well-being were observed.

42 **Conclusions:** Higher attendance in outdoor walking interventions is associated with greater
43 improvements in walking endurance, walking speed, and walking self-efficacy among older
44 adults with mobility limitations.

45 **INTRODUCTION**

46 Walking in outdoor natural environments plays a critical role in supporting the health and well-
47 being of older adults. An accumulating body of evidence has shown that outdoor walking is
48 associated with a wide array of health benefits, including improved physical activity and fitness
49 [1,2] better cognitive and mental functioning [3,4], along with increased energy and greater
50 feelings of revitalization [5]. In addition, exposure to natural environments is associated with a
51 decreased incidence of chronic health conditions such as diabetes, stroke, coronary heart disease,
52 and all-cause mortality [6,7]. The combination of physical activity and natural environments
53 makes outdoor walking an ideal and promising strategy to promote healthy aging.

54 Although walking outdoors is a preferred mode of physical activity [5], a recent
55 systematic review and meta-analysis found no significant difference between outdoor community
56 ambulation and other comparison interventions (e.g., standard care or educational lectures) in
57 improving older adults' walking endurance and depression [8]. While the limited number of
58 studies included and quality of evidence partly account for this phenomenon [8], attendance may
59 play a major role in shaping the overall effects of outdoor walking. In particular, previous studies
60 have shown that attendance, defined as the number or proportion of sessions attended, can
61 fluctuate between 58% and 77% among older adults participating in exercise interventions [9–
62 14]. Given that attendance levels can affect the total amount of training and environmental
63 stimuli received, it is important to understand whether and how the effects of outdoor walking
64 may vary depending on participants' attendance to the interventions.

65 The Getting Older Adults Outdoors (GO-OUT) study [15] provides a basis for examining
66 the impact of outdoor walking attendance on older adults' health. The GO-OUT trial is a two-
67 group randomized controlled trial designed to evaluate the effectiveness of a park-based, task-

68 oriented walking program on walking activity and capacity among older adults with mobility
69 limitations [15]. One group participated in a 1-day educational workshop plus a 10-week outdoor
70 walk group (OWG) program, while the other group received the same workshop plus 10 weekly
71 telephone reminders. The trial was conducted across four large Canadian cities, and outcome
72 assessments were performed at baseline, 3 months, 5.5 months, and 12 months. Despite
73 participants providing positive feedback during the interviews [16], our quantitative analyses
74 revealed no significant difference between the two groups in changes in minutes walked
75 outdoors pre- to post-intervention [17]. Further, the impact of the OWG was also not superior to
76 the weekly reminders in improving indicators of walking capacity, health-promoting behaviors,
77 and successful aging with one exception. The OWG led to greater improvement in walking self-
78 efficacy compared to the weekly reminders group [17]. As noted in the process evaluation of the
79 GO-OUT trial [18], the observed lack of effects may be attributed to varying levels of attendance
80 within the OWG, as mean attendance ranged from 43.8% to 84.9% across the study sites.

81 To better understand the benefits of outdoor walking interventions and inform their
82 implementation in community settings, the objective of this study was to explore whether a dose-
83 response relationship existed between attendance in the OWG program and improvements in
84 health among older adults with mobility limitations. We focused on seven physical and mental
85 health outcomes measured in the GO-OUT trial: walking endurance, comfortable and fast
86 walking speed, balance, lower extremity strength, walking self-efficacy, and emotional well-
87 being. These outcomes were investigated because of their relevance to the core components of
88 the OWG program and their reciprocal relationship with outdoor walking behavior among older
89 adults [16,19,20]. Knowledge derived from the present study will not only help to equip clinical

90 practitioners with evidence-based recommendations but also inform marketing strategies to
91 motivate older adults to engage with community-based exercise programs.

92 **METHODS**

93 **Study Design and Participants**

94 The GO-OUT randomized controlled trial was conducted across four urban cities in Canada:
95 Edmonton, Winnipeg, Toronto and Montreal, and was registered on ClinicalTrials.gov
96 (registration number: NCT03292510). Between February 20, 2018 and June 15, 2019, the GO-
97 OUT trial enrolled 190 older adults aged 65 years and older, living independently in the
98 community, who self-reported difficulty walking outdoors but affirmed the capacity to walk at
99 least one block (50m) with or without a walking aid, expressed willingness to sign a liability
100 waiver or obtain physician clearance for exercise, exhibited mental competency (scoring at least
101 18 out of 22 on the Mini-Mental State Exam telephone version), and were able to speak and
102 understand English [15].

103 Upon enrollment, participants attended a 1-day educational workshop designed to
104 enhance knowledge and skills to engage in outdoor walking and prevent falls. After the
105 workshop, participants were stratified by study site and participant type (enrolled as an
106 individual or a dyad) and randomized into either the 10-week weekly reminders group (n=92) or
107 the 10-week OWG program (n=98). Outcome assessments were performed at baseline, 3 months,
108 5.5 months, and 12 months. As this study primarily focused on the dose-response relationship
109 between attendance in the OWG and improvement in health, we utilized attendance data and
110 limited our analytic sample to participants randomly assigned to the OWG program with
111 complete data in all seven health outcomes at month 3 (n=79). Research ethics boards at each
112 site approved the trial protocol and participants provided written informed consent prior to

113 baseline assessment. Detailed information on the GO-OUT trial was described in the study
114 protocol [15].

115 **Outdoor Walk Group Program and Attendance**

116 Building upon a conceptual framework of community mobility [21], the OWG program was
117 designed to enhance older adults' competency in multiple dimensions of mobility such as
118 walking distance, walking speed, postural transitions, and external physical load, within an
119 outdoor environment [15]. The program involved two 1-hour sessions of group-based outdoor
120 walking in large parks each week for a duration of 10 weeks (maximum of 20 sessions). The
121 OWG program was progressive, task-specific, and implemented during summer months (June–
122 August). Each session consisted of a 10-minute warm up, a distance walk, practice of a specific
123 outdoor walking skill, a second distance walk, and a 10-minute cool down. Each OWG had a
124 leader (physiotherapist or kinesiologist), who was authorized to adjust the program's difficulty to
125 ensure an optimal level of challenge for the participants [18]. Leaders were supported by
126 additional trained staff to ensure a 1:3 ratio of OWG facilitators (leader/assistant) to participants.

127 After each OWG session, group leaders completed standardized forms to document
128 implementation of session activities and participant attendance [18]. For the analysis of this
129 study, participants were grouped into three categories based on attendance tertiles, which
130 reflected the tri-modal distribution of attendance in the OWG program. The first, second, and
131 third tertiles corresponded to participants attending 0–9, 10–15, and 16–20 total OWG sessions,
132 respectively.

133 **Outcomes for Dose-Response Analysis**

134 **Walking Endurance**

135 Walking endurance was assessed using the 6-minute walk test [22]. Participants received
136 instructions to walk as far as possible in six minutes by walking back and forth along a straight,
137 30-meter walkway. Participants were asked to complete the test using their assistive devices and
138 corrective eyewear as applicable. The maximum distance walked within six minutes was
139 documented in meters. The 6-minute walk test demonstrates excellent test-retest reliability (intra-
140 class correlation coefficients $ICC=0.95$) and is considered a valid test of physical functioning and
141 endurance among older adults [23,24].

142 **Walking Speed at Comfortable and Fast Paces**

143 Walking speed was assessed using the 10-meter walk test [25]. Participants were instructed to
144 walk over a 14-meter walkway twice, once at a comfortable and once at a fast pace. Participants
145 were asked to use their usual assistive devices and corrective eyewear to complete the test as
146 applicable. The time taken to walk the central 10 meters was documented in seconds and used to
147 calculate comfortable and fast walking speed (meter/second). The 10-meter walk test
148 demonstrates excellent test-test reliability ($ICCs=0.96-0.98$) and is recommended for clinical
149 assessment of walking speed among older adults [26,27].

150 **Balance**

151 Balance was evaluated using the Mini Balance Evaluation System test (mini-BESTest) [28]. The
152 mini-BESTest is a 14-item test developed to assess four balance domains [29]. Scores for
153 anticipatory postural adjustments, reactive postural control, and sensory orientation range from 0
154 to 6, whereas the score for dynamic gait ranges from 0 to 10. Higher scores indicate greater
155 balance in the respective subsystem. A total summed score, ranging from 0 to 28, is calculated to
156 measure overall balance function. The mini-BESTest demonstrates good to excellent reliability
157 ($ICC>0.90$). Evidence of construct validity has been reported [28,30].

158 **Lower Extremity Strength**

159 The 30-second sit-to-stand test [31] was adopted as a proxy measure of lower extremity muscle
160 strength. Participants were instructed to sit in the middle of the chair, place arms folded across
161 the chest, keep their feet placed on the floor, and repeat rising to a full standing position and
162 sitting back down. The number of sit-to-stands completed in 30 seconds was documented. The
163 30-second sit-to-stand test has shown excellent test-retest reliability (ICC=0.95) and validity
164 among community-dwelling older adults [31,32].

165 **Walking Self-Efficacy**

166 The ambulatory self-confidence questionnaire [33] was used to evaluate walking self-efficacy. A
167 total of 22 items were asked to measure how confident participants are in their ability to walk in
168 different environmental situations. Participants rated their responses to each item on a 10-point
169 scale (0 not at all confident to 10 extremely confident). The total score is calculated as the mean
170 of item scores and ranges from 0 to 10, with higher scores indicating greater confidence with
171 walking ability. The ambulatory self-confidence questionnaire demonstrates excellent internal
172 consistency (Cronbach's $\alpha=0.95$) and test-retest reliability (ICC=0.92) among community-
173 dwelling older adults [33].

174 **Emotional Well-Being**

175 We used the emotional well-being scale within the RAND 36-Item Health Survey (RAND-36) to
176 measure participants' emotional well-being [34]. Participants answered five questions on their
177 emotions and experiences over the past four weeks. Total scores range from 0 to 100, with higher
178 scores indicating better emotional well-being. The RAND-36 Health Survey was adapted from
179 the instruments administered in the Medical Outcome Study [34], and its emotional well-being
180 scale has demonstrated internal consistency and reliability (Cronbach's $\alpha=0.90$).

181 **Participant Characteristics**

182 Information on individual characteristics was collected at baseline [15]. Participants self-reported
183 their age (years), sex (male vs. female), highest level of education, and use of walking aids. The
184 Charlson Comorbidity Index [35] was used to assess participants' diagnosis of 18 comorbidities
185 such as diabetes, hypertension, cancer, and heart diseases at baseline. The final weighted score
186 ranges from 0 to 39, with higher scores indicating the presence of greater and more severe
187 comorbidities.

188 **Statistical Analysis**

189 Descriptive statistics were computed to describe participant characteristics and measures of
190 physical and mental health at baseline in each attendance tertile groups (i.e., attended 0–9, 10–
191 15, and 16–20 sessions). We conducted nonparametric Kruskal-Wallis and chi-squared tests to
192 compare differences in baseline characteristics and health between the tertile groups.

193 To examine potential dose-response relationships between attendance and improvement
194 in health among older adults enrolled in the OWG program, we followed established
195 methodologies and operationalized the definition of response using three approaches: the extent
196 of improvement [36], the odds of improvement [37], and the overall count of improvement in
197 health [38]. *Extent of improvement*: First, we calculated absolute change scores on each of the
198 seven health outcomes (walking endurance, comfortable and fast walking speed, balance, lower
199 extremity strength, walking self-efficacy, and emotional well-being) from baseline to 3 months,
200 where a positive change score indicates an improvement in the respective outcome. We
201 employed linear regression models, using change scores as the dependent variable, and regressed
202 them against the three attendance tertile groups. This allowed us to investigate whether higher
203 attendance was associated with a greater extent of improvement in physical and mental health. A

204 total of seven regression models were tested, with each focusing on a specific health outcome. In
205 addition, we reported Hedges' g effect sizes to provide insights into the magnitude of the dose-
206 response relationship tested, with values of 0.15, 0.40, 0.75 representing small, medium, and
207 large effects [39]. *Odds of improvement*: Second, we created a binary response variable to
208 represent improvement (yes for change score > 0 ; no for change score ≤ 0) in each of the seven
209 health outcomes. Separate logistic regression models were implemented to compare the odds of
210 experiencing improvement in each health outcome across the three attendance groups. *Overall*
211 *count of improvement in health*: Third, an overall count of improved health outcomes was
212 created for each participant. A score of 0 suggests no improvement was found, while a score of 7
213 indicates improvement in all seven physical and mental health outcomes. A Poisson regression
214 model was used to assess whether the number of improved health outcomes increased as a
215 function of attendance in the OWG program. All models were adjusted for participant sex and
216 study site, which were the two characteristics that differed across the attendance groups.

217 Recognizing that our analytic sample was restricted to 79 out of 98 OWG participants
218 who had complete data on all seven health outcomes at month 3, we employed the two-stage
219 Heckman correction [40,41] to account for potential selection bias. Specifically, we first
220 computed the inverse Mills ratio based on the full sample of older adults who were assigned to
221 the outdoor walking group ($n=98$) using a probit model. This ratio was then included in the
222 regression models as an explanatory variable to adjust for non-selection hazards [40]. We
223 conducted sensitivity analysis to compare findings with and without the Heckman correction. A
224 two-tailed p -value less than 0.05 was considered statistically significant. All statistical analyses
225 were performed using R software (Version 4.0.5).

226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241

RESULTS

Descriptive Statistics

Table 1 presents baseline participant characteristics and health outcomes for the entire sample and by level of outdoor walk group attendance of the 79 older adults included in the dose-response analysis. Mean age was 74.7 years (standard deviation [SD]=6.6), and 72% of the participants were female. Prior to the OWG program, the mean distance that participants achieved on the 6-minute walk test was 362.6 meters (SD=91.8). The average walking speed was 1.09 m/s (SD=0.24) at a comfortable pace and 1.43 m/s (SD=0.31) at a fast pace. The mean score of mini-BESTest, 30-second sit-to-stand test, and ambulatory self-confidence questionnaire was 20.6 (SD=4.7; out of 28), 8.2 (SD=3.5), and 7.9 (SD=1.6; out of 10), respectively. Upon closer examination of the three attendance tertile groups, participants from the Montreal (53%) and Winnipeg (56%) sites attended 16 or more outdoor walking sessions more frequently than those from Edmonton (16%) and Toronto (15%) sites ($p=0.007$). Additionally, around 55% of the 28 male participants but only 28% of the 72 female participants attended 16 or more outdoor walking sessions ($p=0.02$). Remaining baseline individual and clinical characteristics did not differ across the three attendance tertile groups.

242 **Table 1.** Participant characteristics and performance on health outcome measures at baseline by level of outdoor walk group attendance

Participant characteristics (units or scoring)	Pooled (n = 79)	OWG attendance tertile*			p value
		1 st tertile (n = 17)	2 nd tertile (n = 34)	3 rd tertile (n = 28)	
		Mean ± SD / n (%)			
Study sites					.007
Edmonton	19 (24)	8 (42)	8 (42)	3 (16)	
Montreal	15 (19)	1 (7)	6 (40)	8 (53)	
Toronto	20 (25)	6 (30)	11 (55)	3 (15)	
Winnipeg	25 (32)	2 (8)	9 (36)	14 (56)	
Participant type					.45
Individual	61 (77)	15 (25)	24 (39)	22 (36)	
Dyad	18 (23)	2 (11)	10 (56)	6 (33)	
Cohort					.81
2018-19	29 (37)	7 (24)	13 (45)	9 (31)	
2019-20	50 (63)	10 (20)	21 (42)	19 (38)	
Age years)	74.7 ± 6.6	73.5 ± 6.5	74.4 ± 6.3	75.8 ± 7.1	.58
Sex					.02
Male	22 (28)	1 (5)	9 (41)	12 (55)	
Female	57 (72)	16 (28)	25 (44)	16 (28)	
Educational attainment					.37
Secondary or lower	19 (24)	3 (16)	6 (32)	10 (53)	
Some college	29 (37)	5 (17)	14 (48)	10 (34)	
Bachelor's degree or higher	31 (39)	9 (29)	14 (45)	8 (26)	
Uses a walking aid	22 (28)	5 (23)	11 (50)	6 (27)	.63
Charlson comorbidity index (0–39)	2.1 ± 2.0	2.1 ± 3.0	2.2 ± 1.6	1.9 ± 1.7	.40
6-minute walk test (m)	362.6 ± 91.8	401.7 ± 87.5	346.0 ± 91.7	360.1 ± 90.8	.14
10-meter walk test at comfortable pace (m/s)	1.09 ± 0.24	1.21 ± 0.26	1.06 ± 0.22	1.04 ± 0.24	.07
10-meter walk test at fast pace (m/s)	1.43 ± 0.31	1.56 ± 0.32	1.37 ± 0.28	1.41 ± 0.34	.12
Mini-BESTest (0–28)	20.6 ± 4.7	21.4 ± 4.4	20.2 ± 4.6	20.6 ± 5.0	.71
30-second sit-to-stand (# stands)	8.2 ± 3.5	8.3 ± 3.8	8.1 ± 3.5	8.1 ± 3.6	.98
ASCQ (0–10)	7.9 ± 1.6	8.1 ± 1.6	7.6 ± 1.7	8.2 ± 1.4	.36
RAND-36 emotional well-being (0–100)	76.4 ± 16.9	69.7 ± 20.8	79.7 ± 13.6	76.6 ± 17.3	.28

243 *Note:* OWG = outdoor walk group; Mini-BESTest = Mini Balance Evaluation System test; ASCQ = ambulatory self-confidence questionnaire; SD = standard
244 deviation; m = meters; m/s = meters/second. *The 1st tertile group attended 0–9 sessions; the 2nd tertile group attended 10–15 sessions; the 3rd tertile group
245 attended 16–20 sessions. Tertiles were calculated based on all enrolled participants in the outdoor walk group program (n=98). Values in the parenthesis indicate
246 row percentages.

247 **Influence of Outdoor Walk Group Attendance on the Extent of Improvement in Health**

248 The associations between attendance in the OWG program and extent of improvement in the
249 seven physical and mental health outcomes are summarized in Table 2. Compared to those who
250 attended 0–9 outdoor walking sessions (1st tertile), participants who attended 16–20 sessions (3rd
251 tertile) exhibited, on average, a 52.72-meter greater improvement in the 6-minute walk test
252 performance from baseline to 3 months (95% CI: 12.31, 93.13, $p=0.01$). A similar yet
253 nonsignificant dose-response pattern was observed, where participants attending 16–20 sessions
254 exhibited a tendency towards greater improvement in walking endurance than those who
255 attended 10–15 sessions ($b=27.28$, 95% CI: -2.10, 56.66, $p=0.07$). The effect sizes of the dose-
256 response relationships observed were small in magnitude (Hedges' g range: 0.28–0.36; see
257 Supplementary Table 1).

258 **Table 2.** Associations between outdoor walk group attendance and the extent of improvement in health outcome measures from baseline to 3
 259 months

Health outcome measures (units or scoring)	Comparisons between OWG attendance tertiles		
	2 nd tertile (10–15 sessions) vs 1 st tertile (0–9 sessions)	3 rd tertile (16–20 sessions) vs 1 st tertile (0–9 sessions)	3 rd tertile (16–20 sessions) vs 2 nd tertile (10–15 sessions)
	Unstandardized regression coefficient <i>b</i> [95% confidence intervals]		
6-minute walk test (m)	25.44 [-10.07, 60.94]	52.72 [12.31, 93.13] *	27.28 [-2.10, 56.66] †
10-meter walk test at comfortable pace (m/s)	0.10 [-0.03, 0.22]	0.15 [0.00, 0.29] *	0.05 [-0.05, 0.15]
10-meter walk test at fast pace (m/s)	0.14 [0.00, 0.27] *	0.17 [0.02, 0.33] *	0.04 [-0.07, 0.15]
Mini-BESTest (0–28)	-1.10 [-3.37, 1.16]	0.02 [-2.59, 2.63]	1.13 [-0.74, 2.99]
30-second sit-to-stand (# stands)	-0.33 [-1.88, 1.22]	0.29 [-1.50, 2.07]	0.62 [-0.66, 1.89]
ASCQ (0–10)	0.39 [-0.40, 1.18]	0.48 [-0.46, 1.41]	0.09 [-0.61, 0.78]
RAND-36 emotional well-being (0–100)	-6.70 [-16.31, 2.91]	-2.79 [-14.03, 8.46]	3.91 [-4.46, 12.29]

260 *Note:* The regression coefficients are in reference to the lower tertile/attendance group, with positive values suggesting potential dose-response relationships. All
 261 regression models were adjusted for participant sex, study site, and the Heckman correction. † $p < 0.10$; * $p < 0.05$

262 Participants attending 10–15 outdoor walking sessions exhibited a greater extent of
263 improvement in fast walking speed compared to those with 0–9 sessions ($b=0.14$, 95% CI: 0.00,
264 0.27, $p=0.048$). Similarly, those attending 16–20 sessions demonstrated greater improvements in
265 both comfortable walking speed ($b=0.15$, 95% CI: 0.00, 0.29, $p=0.04$) and fast walking speed
266 ($b=0.17$, 95% CI: 0.02, 0.33, $p=0.03$) compared to participants with 0–9 sessions. The effects
267 observed were medium to strong in magnitude (Hedges' g range: 0.48–0.80). There were no
268 significant relationships found between attendance and absolute changes in measures of balance,
269 lower extremity strength, walking self-efficacy, and emotional well-being. Fig 1 presents results
270 without covariate adjustment.

271

272 **Fig 1. Changes in measures of physical and mental health from baseline to 3 months across three**
273 **outdoor walk group attendance groups.**

274 *Note:* The 1st tertile group attended 0–9 sessions; the 2nd tertile group attended 10–15 sessions; the 3rd
275 tertile group attended 16–20 sessions. Dots above the horizontal dashed line indicate an improvement
276 (change score > 0) in the respective health outcome measure from baseline to 3 months.

277

278 **Influence of Outdoor Walking Attendance on the Odds of Improvement in Health**

279 Table 3 presents the associations between outdoor walking attendance and the odds of
280 experiencing an improvement in health. Results from the adjusted logistic regression models
281 showed that compared to those attending only 0–9 OWG sessions, the odds of experiencing an
282 improvement in comfortable walking speed from baseline to 3 months tended to be about 6 times
283 larger among participants who attended 16–20 outdoor walking sessions (Odds ratio [OR]=5.97,
284 95% CI: 1.02, 42.69, $p=0.06$). The odds of experiencing an improvement in fast walking speed
285 were 9 times larger among participants who attended 16–20 outdoor walking sessions than those

286 attending 0–9 sessions (OR=9.00, 95% CI: 1.59, 61.73, $p=0.02$). Likewise, the odds of
287 experiencing an improvement in walking self-efficacy, as measured by the ambulatory self-
288 confidence questionnaire, was about 4 times larger among participants attending 10–15 outdoor
289 walking sessions in comparison to those attending 0–9 sessions (OR=4.03, 95% CI: 1.05, 16.85,
290 $p=0.047$). The raw percentages of participants experiencing an improvement in health across the
291 three attendance tertile groups are presented in Supplementary Fig 1.

292 **Table 3.** Associations between outdoor walk group attendance and the odds of experiencing improvement in health outcome measures from
 293 baseline to 3 months

Health outcome measures	Comparisons between OWG attendance tertiles		
	2 nd tertile (10–15 sessions) vs 1 st tertile (0–9 sessions)	3 rd tertile (16–20 sessions) vs 1 st tertile (0–9 sessions)	3 rd tertile (16–20 sessions) vs 2 nd tertile (10–15 sessions)
	Odds ratio [95% confidence intervals]		
6-minute walk test (m)	1.92 [0.21, 14.84]	4.02 [0.36, 45.31]	2.09 [0.41, 10.62]
10-meter walk test at comfortable pace (m/s)	3.45 [0.74, 18.56]	5.97 [1.02, 42.69] †	1.73 [0.48, 6.23]
10-meter walk test at fast pace (m/s)	3.10 [0.75, 13.62]	9.00 [1.59, 61.73] *	2.91 [0.75, 11.30]
Mini-BESTest (0–28)	0.64 [0.16, 2.58]	0.94 [0.19, 4.63]	1.45 [0.47, 4.47]
30-second sit-to-stand (# stands)	0.39 [0.08, 1.56]	0.90 [0.15, 4.87]	2.34 [0.73, 7.48]
ASCQ (0–10)	4.03 [1.05, 16.85] *	3.08 [0.65, 16.07]	0.76 [0.23, 2.56]
RAND-36 emotional well-being (0–100)	0.43 [0.11, 1.58]	0.54 [0.11, 2.45]	1.26 [0.40, 3.97]

294 *Note:* The odds ratios are in reference to the lower tertile/attendance group, with values greater than 1 suggesting potential dose-response relationships. All
 295 regression models were adjusted for participant sex, study site, and the Heckman correction. † $p < 0.10$; * $p < 0.05$

296 **Influence of Outdoor Walking Attendance on the Number of Improvements in Health**

297 Table 4 presents results from the Poisson regression model of the relationship between OWG
298 program attendance and the overall count of improved health from baseline to 3 months. The
299 total number of improvements in the seven health outcomes increased with the number of
300 outdoor walking sessions attended: 3.71 ± 1.61 for 0–9 sessions, 4.03 ± 1.66 for 10–15 sessions,
301 and 4.43 ± 1.50 for 16–20 sessions; the differences across groups, however, were not statistically
302 significant. Analyses conducted with and without the Heckman correction yielded similar results.
303 Therefore, the findings from the models without the correction are presented in Supplementary
304 Tables 2-4.

305
306 **Table 4.** Associations between outdoor walk group attendance and the total count of improvement on
307 health outcome measures from baseline to 3 months

Outdoor walk group attendance	Total count of improvement on health outcome measures (range: 0–7)	
	Mean \pm SD	Incident rate ratio [95% CIs]
1 st tertile (0–9 sessions)	3.71 ± 1.61	1.00 (Reference)
2 nd tertile (10–15 sessions)	4.03 ± 1.66	1.18 [0.86, 1.63]
3 rd tertile (16–20 sessions)	4.43 ± 1.50	1.36 [0.94, 1.96]
2 nd tertile (10–15 sessions)		1.00 (Reference)
3 rd tertile (16–20 sessions)		1.15 [0.89, 1.50]

308 *Note:* CIs = confidence intervals. The incident rate ratios are in reference to the lower tertile/attendance group, with
309 values greater than 1 suggesting potential dose-response relationships. The Poisson regression model was adjusted
310 for participant sex, study site, and the Heckman correction.

311

312 **DISCUSSION**

313 This study investigated the potential dose-response relationships between attendance in an OWG
314 program and improvement in seven physical and mental health outcomes among community-
315 dwelling older adults with mobility limitations. Results showed that compared to lower
316 attendance levels, higher attendance was associated with greater improvement in walking
317 endurance and comfortable and fast walking speed before and after the intervention, as well as

318 increased odds of experiencing improvements in comfortable and fast walking speed and
319 walking self-efficacy.

320 Overall, our findings are in line with the existing body of literature that documents the
321 health benefits of walking interventions [4,42,43] and provides further information about park-
322 based outdoor walk group programs. Firstly, we found that older adults who attended 16–20
323 outdoor walking sessions exhibited a greater improvement in walking endurance, as measured by
324 the 6-minute walk test, compared to those attending only 0–9 sessions. This finding is similar to
325 those reported by Dondzila et al. [44], where 6-minute walk test performance gradually
326 improved as older adults engaged in higher levels of walking activity per day (e.g., from 2,500
327 steps/day to 7,500 steps/day). Notably, our study revealed a mean difference of 52.7 meters in 6-
328 minute walk test performance between the high and low attendance groups, which exceeds the
329 established minimal clinically important difference of 30.5 meters for the test [45]. Our study
330 presents preliminary evidence suggesting that participating in 16 or more sessions of a park-
331 based OWG program over a period of 10 weeks may be needed to provide sufficient training for
332 achieving improvements in walking endurance among older adults with mobility limitations.
333 Second, the present study also identified dose-response relationships between the number of
334 outdoor walking sessions attended and improvements in comfortable and fast walking speed in a
335 community setting. While direct comparisons to our findings are limited, several previous studies
336 have explored related concepts [46–49]. For instance, a recent randomized controlled trial led by
337 Klassen and colleagues [47] showed that acute stroke patients receiving high-dose exercise
338 interventions (40 sessions) in an indoor hospital setting exhibited significant improvements in
339 gait speed compared to those receiving standard stroke care, while no such improvements were
340 observed among those with low-dose interventions (20 sessions). Similarly, a meta-analysis

341 involving 2,054 community-dwelling older adults suggested that high-dose therapeutic exercise
342 interventions, defined as three 60-minute sessions per week, had a significant positive impact on
343 improving gait speed, whereas low-dose interventions did not yield similar effects [48]. By
344 highlighting the relationship between attendance in outdoor walking interventions and
345 improvement in physical functioning, our findings provide additional insights into the broader
346 context of exercise dosage and may guide the design, offering, and evaluation of community-
347 based exercise programs aimed to support the health and functional independence of older adults
348 [50,51].

349 To delve deeper into the impact of attendance in the OWG program, our study expanded
350 its scope beyond merely measuring changes in health. We incorporated two additional
351 approaches to operationalize dose-response and investigate how attendance would affect both the
352 odds and overall count of improvements in health. Through this approach, we identified evidence
353 indicating that attending a greater number of outdoor walking sessions positively influences
354 older adults' walking self-efficacy, which is a phenomenon not detected using the standard
355 method of measuring absolute change. As a range of methodological approaches have been
356 developed to examine dose-response relationships across fields of health sciences [36–38],
357 further research utilizing distinct operational definitions of response is warranted to evaluate the
358 potential benefits of outdoor walking interventions on health of older adults.

359 Contrary to expectations, our analysis revealed no significant association between
360 attendance in the OWG program and improvement in balance, lower extremity strength, and
361 emotional well-being. Several factors may shed light on these findings. First and foremost, the
362 OWG program focused primarily on task-specific training designed to enhance older adults'
363 competency and skills in outdoor ambulation, including walking, turning, and stepping sideways

364 [15]. The targeted nature of our intervention may explain why significant improvements were
365 observed in walking endurance, walking speed, and walking self-efficacy, but not in other
366 general health outcomes. Second, a meta-analysis involving 1,252 participants across 10 studies
367 demonstrated a U-shaped relationship between nature-based exercise and mental health [52].
368 Particularly, they found that the largest benefits of nature and green exercise were observed at
369 the shortest duration of 5 minutes per day. These benefits diminished as the duration increased to
370 10-60 min and half-day sessions but rose again for the whole day duration. This phenomenon
371 may partly explain the lack of clear dose-response relationship in our study. Interestingly, an
372 experimental study conducted by Li and colleagues showed contrasting effects of outdoor
373 walking based on timing and location [53]. They found that while walking in an urban
374 environment during nighttime was associated with positive effects on blood pressure, emotions
375 and moods among middle-aged and older adults, walking in the same environment during
376 daytime instead had negative effects on health potentially due to urban stressors such as noise,
377 crowding, and air pollution. As our OWG program was administered in parks within four large
378 Canadian cities during the day, it is possible that the timing and location of the walks may have
379 influenced the observed outcomes. Taken together, these insights highlight the complexity of
380 designing and implementing outdoor walking interventions for older adults, suggesting the need
381 to leverage an integrated paradigm that accounts for the diverse individual, environmental, and
382 contextual factors involved in these initiatives [19].

383 This study possesses numerous strengths. Our OWG program is among the first that
384 incorporates task-specific outdoor activities targeted towards enhancing community mobility
385 skills among older adults [8]. In addition, our study spanned four major cities across Canada,
386 which strengthens the external validity of our findings and allows generalization to similar urban

387 environments. Moreover, the inclusion of a broad range of outcome measures and operational
388 definitions of response contributes to a better understanding of the impact of outdoor walking
389 interventions on older adults' health. However, findings should be interpreted within the context
390 of their limitations. For example, although we observed gradients in the association between
391 outdoor walking attendance and total count of improved health outcomes, the lack of
392 significance may result from limited sample size compared to prior studies involving outdoor
393 community ambulation interventions among older adults [8]. Our study was also not designed to
394 establish the optimal attendance level or other dose parameters, such as intensity, frequency, and
395 duration, for outdoor walking interventions. Future research is needed to investigate the impact
396 of attendance in tandem with these dose parameters on the effectiveness of outdoor walking
397 interventions.

398 In conclusion, this study demonstrates the positive impact of higher attendance in an
399 outdoor walking program on improving walking endurance, walking speed, and walking self-
400 efficacy among older adults with mobility limitations. Our findings reinforce the importance of
401 ongoing clinical and research endeavors to explore factors that may influence outdoor walking
402 attendance and engagement among older adults [11–13,54]. Meanwhile, attention should also be
403 paid to verify how attendance in the intervention programs would influence long-term behavior
404 change. Ultimately, these efforts will allow us to translate volume into value, maximizing the
405 potential of outdoor walking in improving the lives of older adults.

406 **Conflict of Interest**

407 None declared.

408 References


- 409 1. Jacobs JM, Cohen A, Hammerman-Rozenberg R, Azoulay D, Maaravi Y, Stessman J.
410 Going outdoors daily predicts long-term functional and health benefits among ambulatory
411 older people. *J Aging Health*. 2008;20: 259–272. doi:10.1177/0898264308315427
- 412 2. Fritschi JO, Brown WJ, Laukkanen R, van Uffelen JGZ. The effects of pole walking on
413 health in adults: a systematic review. *Scandinavian Journal of Medicine & Science in
414 Sports*. 2012;22: e70–e78. doi:10.1111/j.1600-0838.2012.01495.x
- 415 3. Fujita K, Fujiwara Y, Chaves PHM, Motohashi Y, Shinkai S. Frequency of going outdoors
416 as a good predictors for incident disability of physical function as well as disability
417 recovery in community-dwelling older adults in rural Japan. *J Epidemiol*. 2006;16: 261–
418 270. doi:10.2188/jea.16.261
- 419 4. Hanson S, Jones A. Is there evidence that walking groups have health benefits? A
420 systematic review and meta-analysis. *Br J Sports Med*. 2015;49: 710–715.
421 doi:10.1136/bjsports-2014-094157
- 422 5. Thompson Coon J, Boddy K, Stein K, Whear R, Barton J, Depledge MH. Does
423 participating in physical activity in outdoor natural environments have a greater effect on
424 physical and mental wellbeing than physical activity indoors? A systematic review. *Environ
425 Sci Technol*. 2011;45: 1761–1772. doi:10.1021/es102947t
- 426 6. Twohig-Bennett C, Jones A. The health benefits of the great outdoors: a systematic review
427 and meta-analysis of greenspace exposure and health outcomes. *Environ Res*. 2018;166:
428 628–637. doi:10.1016/j.envres.2018.06.030
- 429 7. Gascon M, Triguero-Mas M, Martínez D, Dadvand P, Rojas-Rueda D, Plasència A, et al.
430 Residential green spaces and mortality: a systematic review. *Environ Int*. 2016;86: 60–67.
431 doi:10.1016/j.envint.2015.10.013
- 432 8. Bhatia D, Salbach NM, Akinrolie O, Alsbury-Nealy K, Dos Santos RB, Eftekhar P, et al.
433 Outdoor community ambulation interventions to improve physical and mental health in
434 older adults: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Aging Phys Act*. 2022;30: 1061–
435 1074. doi:10.1123/japa.2021-0151
- 436 9. Hawley-Hague H, Horne M, Skelton DA, Todd C. Review of how we should define (and
437 measure) adherence in studies examining older adults' participation in exercise classes.
438 *BMJ Open*. 2016;6: e011560. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2016-011560
- 439 10. Hawley-Hague H, Horne M, Campbell M, Demack S, Skelton DA, Todd C. Multiple levels
440 of influence on older adults' attendance and adherence to community exercise classes.
441 *Gerontologist*. 2014;54: 599–610. doi:10.1093/geront/gnt075
- 442 11. Rivera-Torres S, Fahey TD, Rivera MA. Adherence to exercise programs in older adults:
443 informative report. *Gerontol Geriatr Med*. 2019;5: 2333721418823604.
444 doi:10.1177/2333721418823604

- 445 12. Picorelli AMA, Pereira LSM, Pereira DS, Felício D, Sherrington C. Adherence to exercise
446 programs for older people is influenced by program characteristics and personal factors: a
447 systematic review. *J Physiother.* 2014;60: 151–156. doi:10.1016/j.jphys.2014.06.012
- 448 13. Davila VS, Conroy DE, Danilovich MK. Factors that influence walking intervention
449 adherence for older adults living in retirement communities. *J Aging Phys Act.* 2021;30:
450 65–72. doi:10.1123/japa.2020-0279
- 451 14. Pavey T, Taylor A, Hillsdon M, Fox K, Campbell J, Foster C, et al. Levels and predictors of
452 exercise referral scheme uptake and adherence: a systematic review. *J Epidemiol
453 Community Health.* 2012;66: 737–744. doi:10.1136/jech-2011-200354
- 454 15. Salbach NM, Barclay R, Webber SC, Jones CA, Mayo NE, Lix LM, et al. A theory-based,
455 task-oriented, outdoor walking programme for older adults with difficulty walking
456 outdoors: protocol for the Getting Older Adults Outdoors (GO-OUT) randomised controlled
457 trial. *BMJ Open.* 2019;9: e029393. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2019-029393
- 458 16. Kokorelias KM, Ripat J, Barclay R, Jones A, Mayo NE, Grant T, et al. Qualitative process
459 evaluation of GO-OUT (Getting Older Adults Outdoors): a randomized trial of outdoor
460 walking. *J Geriatr Phys Ther.* 2023;46: E1-59. doi:10.1519/JPT.0000000000000375
- 461 17. Salbach NM, Mayo NE, Webber SC, Jones A, Lix LM, Ripat J, et al. Main findings from
462 GO-OUT (Getting Older Adults Outdoors): a randomized trial of outdoor walking. *J Geriatr
463 Phys Ther.* 2023;46: E60-86. doi:10.1519/JPT.0000000000000376
- 464 18. Barclay R, Webber SC, Hahn F, Jones CA, Mayo NE, Sivakumaran S, et al. A park-based
465 group mobility program for older adults with difficulty walking outdoors: a quantitative
466 process evaluation of the Getting Older Adults Outdoors (GO-OUT) randomized controlled
467 trial. *BMC Geriatrics.* 2023;23: 833. doi:10.1186/s12877-023-04524-7
- 468 19. Liu Y, Salbach NM, Webber SC, Barclay R. Individual and environmental variables related
469 to outdoor walking among older adults: verifying a model to guide the design of
470 interventions targeting outdoor walking. *PLOS ONE.* 2024;19: e0296216.
471 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0296216
- 472 20. Simonsick EM, Newman AB, Visser M, Goodpaster B, Kritchevsky SB, Rubin S, et al.
473 Mobility limitation in self-described well-functioning older adults: importance of endurance
474 walk testing. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci.* 2008;63: 841–847.
475 doi:10.1093/gerona/63.8.841
- 476 21. Patla AE, Shumway-Cook A. Dimensions of mobility: defining the complexity and
477 difficulty associated with community mobility. *J Aging Phys Act.* 1999;7: 7–19.
478 doi:10.1123/japa.7.1.7
- 479 22. Holland AE, Spruit MA, Troosters T, Puhan MA, Pepin V, Saey D, et al. An official
480 European Respiratory Society/American Thoracic Society technical standard: field walking
481 tests in chronic respiratory disease. *Eur Respir J.* 2014;44: 1428–1446.
482 doi:10.1183/09031936.00150314

- 483 23. Steffen TM, Hacker TA, Mollinger L. Age- and gender-related test performance in
484 community-dwelling elderly people: Six-Minute Walk Test, Berg Balance Scale, Timed Up
485 & Go Test, and gait speeds. *Phys Ther.* 2002;82: 128–137. doi:10.1093/ptj/82.2.128
- 486 24. Rikli RE, Jones CJ. The reliability and validity of a 6-Minute Walk Test as a measure of
487 physical endurance in older adults. *J Aging Phys Act.* 1998;6: 363–375.
488 doi:10.1123/japa.6.4.363
- 489 25. Perera S, Mody SH, Woodman RC, Studenski SA. Meaningful change and responsiveness
490 in common physical performance measures in older adults. *J Am Geriatr Soc.* 2006;54:
491 743–749. doi:10.1111/j.1532-5415.2006.00701.x
- 492 26. Peters DM, Fritz SL, Krotish DE. Assessing the reliability and validity of a shorter walk
493 test compared with the 10-Meter Walk Test for measurements of gait speed in healthy,
494 older adults. *J Geriatr Phys Ther.* 2013;36: 24–30. doi:10.1519/JPT.0b013e318248e20d
- 495 27. Kim H, Park I, Lee H joo, Lee O. The reliability and validity of gait speed with different
496 walking pace and distances against general health, physical function, and chronic disease in
497 aged adults. *J Exerc Nutrition Biochem.* 2016;20: 46–50. doi:10.20463/jenb.2016.09.20.3.7
- 498 28. Horak FB, Wrisley DM, Frank J. The balance evaluation systems test (BESTest) to
499 differentiate balance deficits. *Phys Ther.* 2009;89: 484–498. doi:10.2522/ptj.20080071
- 500 29. Franchignoni F, Horak F, Godi M, Nardone A, Giordano A. Using psychometric techniques
501 to improve the Balance Evaluation System’s Test: the mini-BESTest. *J Rehabil Med.*
502 2010;42: 323–331. doi:10.2340/16501977-0537
- 503 30. Godi M, Franchignoni F, Caligari M, Giordano A, Turcato AM, Nardone A. Comparison of
504 reliability, validity, and responsiveness of the mini-BESTest and Berg Balance Scale in
505 patients with balance disorders. *Phys Ther.* 2013;93: 158–167. doi:10.2522/ptj.20120171
- 506 31. Rikli RE, Jones CJ. Development and validation of a functional fitness test for community-
507 residing older adults. *J Aging Phys Act.* 1999;7: 129–161. doi:10.1123/japa.7.2.129
- 508 32. Jones CJ, Rikli RE, Beam WC. A 30-s chair-stand test as a measure of lower body strength
509 in community-residing older adults. *Res Q Exerc Sport.* 1999;70: 113–119.
510 doi:10.1080/02701367.1999.10608028
- 511 33. Asano M, Miller WC, Eng JJ. Development and psychometric properties of the ambulatory
512 self-confidence questionnaire. *Gerontology.* 2007;53: 373–381. doi:10.1159/000104830
- 513 34. Hays RD, Sherbourne CD, Mazel RM. The RAND 36-item health survey 1.0. *Health Econ.*
514 1993;2: 217–227. doi:10.1002/hec.4730020305
- 515 35. Charlson ME, Pompei P, Ales KL, MacKenzie CR. A new method of classifying prognostic
516 comorbidity in longitudinal studies: Development and validation. *J Chronic Dis.* 1987;40:
517 373–383. doi:10.1016/0021-9681(87)90171-8

- 518 36. Zheng P, Pleuss JD, Turner DS, Ducharme SW, Aguiar EJ. Dose–response association
519 between physical activity (daily mims, peak 30-minute mims) and cognitive function
520 among older adults: NHANES 2011–2014. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci*. 2023;78: 286–
521 291. doi:10.1093/gerona/glac076
- 522 37. Kline CE, Sui X, Hall MH, Youngstedt SD, Blair SN, Earnest CP, et al. Dose–response
523 effects of exercise training on the subjective sleep quality of postmenopausal women:
524 exploratory analyses of a randomised controlled trial. *BMJ Open*. 2012;2: e001044.
525 doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2012-001044
- 526 38. Maloney A, Simonsson USH, Schaddelee M. D optimal designs for three Poisson dose–
527 response models. *J Pharmacokinet Pharmacodyn*. 2013;40: 201–211. doi:10.1007/s10928-
528 013-9300-x
- 529 39. Brydges CR. Effect size guidelines, sample size calculations, and statistical power in
530 gerontology. *Innov Aging*. 2019;3: igz036. doi:10.1093/geroni/igz036
- 531 40. Heckman JJ. Sample selection bias as a specification error. *Econometrica*. 1979;47: 153–
532 161. doi:10.2307/1912352
- 533 41. Koné S, Bonfoh B, Dao D, Koné I, Fink G. Heckman-type selection models to obtain
534 unbiased estimates with missing measures outcome: theoretical considerations and an
535 application to missing birth weight data. *BMC Med Res Methodol*. 2019;19: 231.
536 doi:10.1186/s12874-019-0840-7
- 537 42. Kassavou A, Turner A, French DP. Do interventions to promote walking in groups increase
538 physical activity? A meta-analysis. *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act*. 2013;10: 18.
539 doi:10.1186/1479-5868-10-18
- 540 43. MacRae PG, Asplund LA, Schnelle JF, Ouslander JG, Abrahamse A, Morris C. A walking
541 program for nursing home residents: effects on walk endurance, physical activity, mobility,
542 and quality of life. *J Am Geriatr Soc*. 1996;44: 175–180. doi:10.1111/j.1532-
543 5415.1996.tb02435.x
- 544 44. Dondzila CJ, Gennuso KP, Swartz AM, Tarima S, Lenz EK, Stein SS, et al. Dose-response
545 walking activity and physical function in older adults. *J Aging Phys Act*. 2015;23: 194–199.
546 doi:10.1123/japa.2013-0083
- 547 45. Bohannon RW, Crouch R. Minimal clinically important difference for change in 6-minute
548 walk test distance of adults with pathology: a systematic review. *J Eval Clin Pract*. 2017;23:
549 377–381. doi:10.1111/jep.12629
- 550 46. Li P-S, Hsieh C-J, Tallutondok EB, Peng H-J. The dose-response efficacy of physical
551 training on frailty status and physical performance in community-dwelling elderly: a
552 systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Healthcare (Basel)*.
553 2022;10: 586. doi:10.3390/healthcare10030586

- 554 47. Klassen TD, Dukelow SP, Bayley MT, Benavente O, Hill MD, Krassioukov A, et al.
555 Higher doses improve walking recovery during stroke inpatient rehabilitation. *Stroke*.
556 2020;51: 2639–2648. doi:10.1161/STROKEAHA.120.029245
- 557 48. Lopopolo RB, Greco M, Sullivan D, Craik RL, Mangione KK. Effect of therapeutic
558 exercise on gait speed in community-dwelling elderly people: a meta-analysis. *Phys Ther*.
559 2006;86: 520–540. doi:10.1093/ptj/86.4.520
- 560 49. Kaushal N, Langlois F, Desjardins-Crépeau L, Hagger MS, Bherer L. Investigating dose–
561 response effects of multimodal exercise programs on health-related quality of life in older
562 adults. *Clin Interv Aging*. 2019;14: 209–217. doi:10.2147/CIA.S187534
- 563 50. Aravind G, Bashir K, Cameron JI, Howe J-A, Jaglal SB, Bayley MT, et al. Community-
564 based exercise programs incorporating healthcare-community partnerships to improve
565 function post-stroke: feasibility of a 2-group randomized controlled trial. *Pilot Feasibility*
566 *Stud*. 2022;8: 88. doi:10.1186/s40814-022-01037-9
- 567 51. Alsbury-Nealy K, Colquhoun H, Jaglal S b., Munce S, Salbach N m. Referrals from
568 healthcare professionals to community-based exercise programs targeting people with
569 balance and mobility limitations: an interviewer-administered survey. *Physiotherapy*
570 *Canada*. 2023; e20220069. doi:10.3138/ptc-2022-0069
- 571 52. Barton J, Pretty J. What is the best dose of nature and green exercise for improving mental
572 health? A multi-study analysis. *Environ Sci Technol*. 2010;44: 3947–3955.
573 doi:10.1021/es903183r
- 574 53. Li H, Liu H, Yang Z, Bi S, Cao Y, Zhang G. The effects of green and urban walking in
575 different time frames on physio-psychological responses of middle-aged and older people
576 in Chengdu, China. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2021;18: 90.
577 doi:10.3390/ijerph18010090
- 578 54. Vseteckova J, Dadova K, Gracia R, Ryan G, Borgstrom E, Abington J, et al. Barriers and
579 facilitators to adherence to walking group exercise in older people living with dementia in
580 the community: a systematic review. *Eur Rev Aging Phys Act*. 2020;17: 15.
581 doi:10.1186/s11556-020-00246-6



Figure