

1 **Title**

2 Evolution of the spatial distribution of alcohol consumption following alcohol control policies: a 25-
3 year cross-sectional study in a Swiss urban population

4 **Authors**

5 David De Ridder^{1,2,3,4}, José Sandoval^{2,4}, Rebecca Himsl^{1,2}, Pedro Marques Vidal⁵, Silvia Stringhini^{2,4},
6 Stéphane Joost^{1,2,4,6*}, Idris Guessous^{1,2,3,4*}

7 **Affiliations**

8 ¹Unit of Population Epidemiology, Division of Primary Care Medicine, Department of Primary Care
9 Medicine, Geneva University Hospitals, Geneva, Switzerland

10 ²Group of Geographic Information Research and Analysis in Population Health (GIRAPH), Geneva,
11 Switzerland

12 ³Laboratory of Geographic Information Systems (LASIG), School of Architecture, Civil and
13 Environmental Engineering (ENAC), École Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne (EPFL), Lausanne,
14 Switzerland

15 ⁴Faculty of Medicine, University of Geneva, Geneva, Switzerland

16 ⁵Department of Medicine, Internal Medicine, Lausanne University Hospital, Lausanne, Switzerland

17 ⁶La Source, School of Nursing, University of Applied Sciences and Arts Western Switzerland (HES-
18 SO), Lausanne, Switzerland

19 **Contact information**

20 David De Ridder: David.DeRidder@unige.ch

21 José Sandoval: jose.sandoval@cantab.net

22 Rebecca Himsl: Rebecca.Himsl@gmail.com

23 Pedro Marques-Vidal: Pedro-Manuel.Marques-Vidal@chuv.ch

24 Silvia Stringhini: Silvia.Stringhini@hcuge.ch

25 Stéphane Joost: Stephane.Joost@epfl.ch

26 Idris Guessous: Idris.Guessous@hcuge.ch

27 * Correspondence: Idris.Guessous@hcuge.ch, T.+41 (0)22 305 58 61

28 **Keywords:** Geospatial analysis; Alcohol consumption; Alcohol control policies; Spatial clustering;
29 Spatial modelling; GWR; MGWR; GIS.

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44 **Funding**

45 The Bus Santé study is funded by the General Directorate of Health of the State of Geneva,
46 Switzerland, and the Geneva University Hospitals.

47 **Acknowledgments**

48 The authors are grateful to the participants of the Bus Santé study.

49 **Conflicts of Interest**

50 The authors declare no conflict of interest. The funders had no role in the design of the study; in the
51 collection, analyses, or interpretation of data; in the writing of the manuscript, or in the decision to
52 publish the results.

53 **Data availability**

54 All data produced in the present study are available upon reasonable request to the authors

55 **Author Contributions**

56 Conceptualization, I.G., S.J., and D.D.R.; methodology, I.G., S.J., P.M.- V., and D.D.R.; formal
57 analysis, D.D.R.; writing—original draft preparation, D.D.R., I.G., and S.J.; writing—review and
58 editing, D.D.R., J.S., R.H., P.M.-V., S.S., S.J., and I.G.; figures, D.D.R.; supervision, S.J. and I.G.;
59 project administration, S.J. and I.G.; funding acquisition, S.J. and I.G. All authors have read and
60 agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91

92 Abstract

93 Background

94 Alcohol consumption is a major risk factor for multiple chronic diseases and overall mortality.
95 Consequently, multiple alcohol control policies have been implemented in Switzerland. Recent
96 evidence shows that population-wide policies may have impacted some population subgroups and
97 places differently. While the determinants of alcohol consumption are complex, understanding where
98 interventions are needed is necessary for implementing targeted policies. Spatial statistics and
99 modeling allow incorporating this spatial context into the analysis of alcohol consumption and its
100 determinants.

101 102 Methods

103 We used the 1993-2018 Bus Santé annual population-based surveys including 18,515 participants
104 aged 35-74 years residing in the canton of Geneva, Switzerland. We assessed the existence of spatial
105 clustering of alcohol consumption the local Moran's *I* spatial statistics. To evaluate how the spatial
106 distribution of alcohol consumption may have changed over time, we subdivided the study sample
107 into three subsamples according to periods of alcohol-control policies implementation: before (Period
108 1 (P1): 1993.01.01-1999.06.30), during (Period 2 (P2): 1999.07.01-2009.10.31), and after (Period 3
109 (P3): 2009.11.01-2018.12.31). We also investigated socio-demographic and built environment
110 determinants of alcohol consumption across periods and provided a comparison of the performance
111 and results of global ordinary least squares (OLS), local geographically weighted regression (GWR),
112 and multiscale GWR (MGWR) models.

113 114 Results

115 We found spatial clustering of alcohol consumption in the three analyzed periods. Alcohol
116 consumption in local clusters markedly decreased across periods despite increasing alcohol outlet
117 accessibility. The spatial distribution of higher alcohol consumption clusters (i.e., hot spots) and of
118 lower alcohol consumption clusters (i.e., cold spots) changed slightly across periods. Alcohol
119 consumption in hot spots remained above recommendations in P3 (26.0 g/day, SD \pm 17.2 g/day),
120 particularly for women. Cold spots increased in size (4.6% of the participants in P1, 9.3% in P3),
121 particularly in the period following the implementation of policies (P2 to P3) while hot spots
122 remained stable (3.2% of the participants). Alcohol consumption was significantly higher in hot spots
123 than cold spots in all three periods ($p < 0.001$).

124 The MGWR model outperformed the OLS and GWR models in most cases and revealed that alcohol
125 consumption was influenced by a mix of global and local relationships. Several of these relationships
126 evolved across periods. Interestingly, in models adjusted for individual-level determinants, we found
127 significant positive relationships between bar density and alcohol consumption in P1 and between
128 density of off-premises alcohol outlets and alcohol consumption in P2. However, these two
129 associations were not significant in P3 potentially due to alcohol control policies.

130 Conclusion

131 Our results reveal that certain areas and subgroups in need of public health intervention and show that
132 a mix of global and local processes best model alcohol consumption. In addition, this study highlights
133 the potential of geospatial approaches to provide a refined understanding of the determinants of
134 alcohol consumption, and the spatial scales at which they vary.

135

136

137

138

139 Introduction

140 Alcohol consumption remains a major risk factor of avoidable disease burden [1,2]. It has been
141 associated with an increased risk of developing numerous non-communicable diseases, infectious
142 diseases, and injuries, which together are estimated to represent about 6% of worldwide mortality [1].
143 Policies, programs, and initiatives aiming at reducing alcohol consumption had overall success in the
144 past decades [3]. In Switzerland, alcohol consumption per capita decreased from around 15 liters of
145 pure alcohol in the 1990s to 10 liters in 2016 [4].

146 Controlling for the availability of alcohol is a key approach for reducing excessive alcohol
147 consumption [5]. A recent review found that greater outlet density is associated with increased
148 alcohol consumption [6,7]. As in other countries, multiple alcohol control laws were implemented
149 over the last two decades in Switzerland, particularly in the canton of Geneva [4]. In 1999, a cantonal
150 law limiting alcohol and tobacco advertisement was introduced. In 2004, the taxation on alcopop
151 beverages was substantially increased (+300%). In 2005, the legal blood alcohol content driving
152 limited was lowered, off-premises alcohol sale between 9 p.m. and 7 a.m. was interdicted, and an
153 alcohol sale ban in video stores and gas stations were implemented. Moreover, in 2009, a smoking
154 ban in indoor public spaces was introduced. Smoking bans have been suggested to be associated with
155 reduced alcohol consumption [8].

156 However, population-wide strategies are a one-size-fits-all approach and may not be sufficient for
157 prevention and control. Additionally, these approaches, depending on their design, may not address
158 alcohol-related health inequalities due to unequal responsiveness. For example, in Geneva, despite
159 structural policies implemented over the past decade that probably contributed to a decrease in alcohol
160 consumption, they were not sufficient to reduce the social inequality gap in alcohol consumption,
161 with high consumption persisting in individuals of lower socioeconomic status (SES) [9].

162 Recent studies have highlighted the existence of spatial clustering of alcohol consumption, raising
163 questions about the factors that may explain such clustering [10–12]. How different policies influence
164 the geographical distribution of alcohol consumption remains unclear.

165 Health behaviors, including alcohol consumption, are influenced by a complex array of individual-
166 level and social, economic, and built environment factors, themselves shaped by policies [13].
167 Identifying populations and places where alcohol consumption remains above recommended levels
168 and uncovering how individual and neighborhood-level determinants of alcohol consumption may
169 have evolved following the implementation of alcohol control policies could help define targeted
170 local public health interventions and urban planning policies, complementing global alcohol
171 regulations [11]. However, most existing studies assessing the relationships between individual and
172 neighborhood-level characteristics and alcohol consumption did not account for spatial dependence
173 between individuals [14–17]. The presence of spatial dependence may bias the obtained results in
174 meaningful ways. Notably, it violates the assumption of independence of the studied observations
175 required by traditional linear and multilevel regression models [18].

176 Using a large, repeated cross-sectional population-based surveys spanning 25 years (1993-2018), we
177 aimed to examine the existence of spatial clusters of alcohol consumption in three periods defined by
178 the implementation of alcohol control policies: i) before (1993.01.01-1999.06.30), ii) during
179 (1999.07.01-2009.10.31) and iii) after implementation (2009.11.01-2018.12.31). A secondary
180 objective was to investigate the individual and neighborhood-level socioeconomic and build-
181 environment determinants of alcohol consumption and whether these determinants may have changed
182 across periods.

183

184

185 **Methods**

186 **Study design and sample**

187 Data for this study was collected through the Bus Santé study, a continuing population-based study in
188 the canton of Geneva (population of approximately 500,000 inhabitants in 2021), monitoring health
189 and cardiovascular risk factors. As previously described [19], independent samples of residents were
190 subjected to health examination surveys since 1993. The Bus Santé study's recruitment methods have
191 been described in details elsewhere [19,20]. The geocoded residential address of each participant was
192 used for spatial analyses. Since using small units of analysis allows increased resolution of spatial
193 analysis, we used individual points to avoid the bias resulting from the modifiable areal unit problem
194 (MAUP), which affects results when point-based measures are aggregated [21]. The Bus Santé study
195 was approved by the Cantonal Research Ethics Commission of Geneva, Switzerland (PB 2016-
196 00363).

197 **Periods of alcohol control policies**

198 We defined three time periods to enable analyses and comparisons before, during, and after
199 implementing alcohol control policies. The period from 1993.01.01 to 1999.06.30 correspond to the
200 first period (P1) before implementing alcohol control policies. The period 1999.07.01-2009.10.31
201 corresponds the second period (P2), during which a set of policies to control alcohol consumption
202 were implemented in Switzerland and the canton of Geneva particularly. Finally, the period
203 2009.11.01-2018.12.31 corresponds to the period after implementing alcohol control policies (P3).
204 Separating each policy into specific periods according to their implementation date would have been
205 of interest to study their potential impact. However, this would have created several short periods with
206 few participants thus reducing power for spatial and statistical analyses.

207 **Outcome variable**

208 Total daily alcohol intake was determined using a self-administered, semiquantitative food frequency
209 questionnaire (FFQ) originally developed and validated against 24-hour dietary recalls [22]. The FFQ
210 considers consumption frequency, ranging from “never during the last four weeks” to “two or more
211 times per day”, and the type of alcohol beverage (wine, beer, aperitifs, champagne, and spirits like
212 liqueur, brandy, or whisky) and average serving size compared with a 10g alcohol standard for each
213 beverage (similar, bigger or smaller) [9]. The same FFQ was used throughout the entire study period
214 (1993-2018), and data derived from this FFQ has integrated large international consortia [23,24].

215 **Individual and neighborhood-level covariates**

216 Individual-level covariates included gender, age, educational attainment (tertiary education: yes or
217 no), civil status (married-cohabiting: yes or no), nationality (Swiss-born, foreign-born), occupational
218 level (low—manual and lower occupations, medium—non-manual occupations, high—professional
219 and intermediate professions, and not working), and smoking status (current smoker: yes or no).
220 Individual income data being missing for participants before 2007, we used the annual neighborhood
221 median household income for the years from 2005 to 2016. We assigned this area-level income to
222 participants based on their year of participation and their corresponding statistical subsector in
223 Geneva (GIRECs) – a neighborhood definition created by the canton of Geneva (Office Cantonal de
224 la Statistique, www.ge.ch/statistique). Participants from 1993 to 2005 were assigned neighborhood
225 income values from 2005, and participants from 2016 to 2018 were attributed values from 2016.

226 **Physical accessibility to alcohol outlets**

227 We obtained the dataset of all registered companies in the canton of Geneva compiled by the the
228 “Répertoire des entreprises de Genève” (REG) [25] and made available by the “Système
229 d’information du territoire à Genève (SITG)” [26]. Yearly listings of all the companies registered in
230 the canton were available from 2003 to 2018 (excepted 2006 and 2007). They contained designations

231 that allowed us to disaggregate by outlet type, including off-premise outlets (convenience stores,
232 grocery shops, gas stations, and supermarkets) and on-premise outlets (restaurants, nightclubs, and
233 bars). We excluded the category “gas stations” from the calculation of off-premises outlet density
234 after 2005 to consider the implementation of an alcohol sale ban in these amenities starting that year.
235 Geographic coordinates of each amenity were provided in the dataset. For each participant, we
236 assessed the density of each alcohol outlet category through street network-based accessibility
237 analyses. To consider the evolution in the built environment over the study period (1993–2018), we
238 matched the participation year of each participant to the closest year available in the alcohol outlet
239 dataset (Table S1).

240 For each alcohol outlet category, alcohol outlet density was calculated as the sum of alcohol outlets in
241 participants’ neighborhoods defined as 1,200m street network buffers. The street network of the
242 canton of Geneva was obtained using the OSMnx Python package [27]. The study participants and
243 alcohol outlets were snapped to the nearest segment of the street network using a maximum snapping
244 distance of 50m. The Pandana Python package was used to create the street network buffers and
245 perform the accessibility analyses [28]. A linear decay was used to give more weight to nearby
246 locations compared to farther ones. The distance of 1,200m was selected based on the results of the
247 global autocorrelation analysis and corresponded to a walking time of around 15min, which has been
248 considered relevant to individuals’ residential spatial scale [29].

249 **Exclusion criteria**

250 We included participants with ages between 35 and 74 years, the age group that has been consistently
251 recruited since the beginning of the Bus Santé study. We excluded abstinent participants (n = 3,568,
252 15.7%) and participants with missing data for alcohol consumption (n = 53, 0.2%) on civil status (n =
253 25, 0.1%), educational attainment (n = 222, 1.2%), nationality (n = 91, 0.5%) and neighborhood
254 median household income (n = 294, 1.6%). Data from the remaining 18,515 individuals (P1, n =
255 5,215; P2, n = 7,013; P3, n = 6,287) were used for the analyses (Table 1).

256 **Regression analyses**

257 The assumptions of traditional global regression models such as ordinary least squares (OLS) might
258 not be satisfied in the presence of spatial autocorrelation as these assume that relationships are
259 constant across the study area [18,30]. However, many individuals and environmental characteristics
260 are spatially dependent. Local models such as the geographically weighted regression (GWR) have
261 been introduced to relax this assumption of spatial stationarity by allowing relationships to vary over
262 space and obtains local parameter estimates by calibrating a locally weighted regression at each
263 location of the dataset [31]. GWR generally provides increased model fit and reduced residual spatial
264 autocorrelation compared to traditional global models that assume that relationships are constant over
265 space [32,33].

266 Local regressions are fitted through a distance-weighting scheme using a spatial weights matrix that
267 defines the relationships between observations and places more weight on closer data points than
268 remote ones [34]. The spatial weights matrix is defined by three characteristics, a kernel function, a
269 bandwidth, and proximity measure. We used a bi-square kernel function with a bandwidth parameter
270 based on the number of nearest neighbors away from the calibration point that minimizes a corrected
271 Akaike information criterion (AICc). The bi-square function presents the advantage of assigning a
272 weight of zero to observations outside the bandwidth, facilitating interpretation compared to the
273 Gaussian kernel function that may retain non-zero weights for all observations. One limitation of the
274 GWR is that it uses the same bandwidth for all relationships, thus assuming that all spatial processes
275 vary at the same scale [34]. A recent extension to the GWR, the multiscale GWR (MGWR), relaxes
276 this assumption using a different bandwidth for each relationship, ensuring that a correct data-
277 borrowing scale is employed, thus capturing spatial heterogeneity more accurately [31].

278 To investigate the relationships between individual and neighborhood-level socio-demographic and
279 environmental characteristics and daily alcohol intake (g/day), we first calibrated global ordinary least

280 squares (OLS) regression models at each period (i.e., P1, P2, and P3). The built-environment
281 explanatory variables included in the multivariate regression models were selected using univariate
282 OLS models and based on statistical significance ($p < 0.05$) and a variance inflation factor (VIF)
283 below 7.5. Next, we assessed the presence of spatial autocorrelation in the residuals using the global
284 Moran's I statistic using a fixed distance bandwidth of 1,200m. Subsequently, GWR and MGWR
285 models were calibrated for the three periods. Model selection between OLS, GWR, and MGWR was
286 done using AICc, examining overall model fit and complexity; lower AICc values indicating a better
287 fit.

288 **Global spatial clustering**

289 We assessed the presence of overall spatial dependence in the outcome variable with the Global
290 Moran's I statistic, which is the most commonly used statistic to test for global spatial autocorrelation
291 [35]. Each observation is analyzed within the context of those neighboring observations within a
292 specified critical distance. Relationships between observations are defined using a spatial weights
293 matrix. To determine the distance corresponding to the maximum spatial autocorrelation, the distance
294 at which the spatial process is the most pronounced, we computed the Global Moran's I at
295 incremental fixed distance bands (200m, 400m, 600m, 800m, 1,000m, and 1,200m) and the distance
296 at which the statistically significant z-score peaked was selected. Observations within the distance
297 band are assigned the same weight, and observations outside the selected distance are assigned a zero
298 weight and thus do not influence calculations for that observation. Statistical significance was
299 assessed through a Monte Carlo procedure consisting of 999 random permutations, which return a
300 pseudo-p-value associated with the Moran's I statistic.

301 **Local spatial clustering**

302 Global clustering statistics evaluate spatial clustering in the study area but cannot detect where local
303 clusters may exist. Investigating the presence of local spatial clustering in alcohol consumption
304 through spatial cluster detection provides insights into the impact of alcohol control policies on the
305 spatial distribution of alcohol consumption. Univariate local spatial cluster analysis was conducted by
306 calculating the local Moran's I statistic [36]. This analysis returns a local Moran's I value, a z-score, a
307 pseudo-p-value, and a category representing the cluster type for each statistically significant
308 observation. There are four categories of statistically significant values, hot spots (High-High), low-
309 spots (Low-Low), and spatial outliers: high value surrounded by low values (High-Low) and low
310 value surrounded by high values (Low-High). Observations with a p-value smaller than 0.05 are
311 considered statistically significant. To investigate whether individual and neighborhood-level socio-
312 demographic characteristics and alcohol availability may explain local clustering of alcohol
313 consumption, we calculated and mapped the local Moran's I categories before and after adjustment
314 for covariates using the best performing model among OLS, GWR, and MGWR. After adjustment, a
315 reduction of local clusters signifies that the covariates in the adjustment model explained the spatial
316 clustering.

317 **Changes in the characteristics of high-high and low-low spatial clusters of alcohol** 318 **consumption**

319 To investigate a potential change in the characteristics of individuals belonging to hot spots and cold
320 spots of alcohol consumption across the three periods, we compared their socio-demographic and
321 alcohol availability characteristics using Welch's t-tests and Fisher exact tests for numeric and binary
322 variables, respectively. We presented these results using radar plots to optimize the visualization of
323 many studied explanatory variables.

324

325

326

327 Results

328 Descriptive statistics

329 Sample individual and neighborhood-level characteristics are described in Table 1. There was
 330 significant variation in the physical access to alcohol outlets due to the study area comprising rural
 331 and urban areas. Globally, access to alcohol outlets increased from period one to period three, with a
 332 stronger trend for on-premises outlets.

333 **Table 1 - Socio-demographic characteristics of the Bus Santé participants, Geneva, Switzerland**
 334 **(1993-2018)**

	Period 1 (P1)	Period 2 (P2)	Period 3 (P3)
Sample size (n)	5,215	7,013	6,287
Age, mean (SD)	51.3 (10.5)	51.7 (10.9)	52.2 (11.0)
Neighborhood median household income (CHF), mean (SD)	122,989.8 (36,573.3)	127,293.0 (39,729.3)	138,323.2 (45,052.5)
Sex (%)			
Woman	2,423 (46.5)	3,286 (46.9)	3,015 (48.0)
Man	2,792 (53.5)	3,727 (53.1)	3,272 (52.0)
Marital status (%)			
Married/cohabiting	4,113 (78.9)	5,241 (74.7)	4,309 (68.5)
Not married/cohabiting	1,102 (21.1)	1,772 (25.3)	1,978 (31.5)
Education			
Tertiary	1,595 (30.6)	2,630 (37.5)	3,119 (49.6)
Lower than tertiary	3,620 (69.4)	4,383 (62.5)	3,168 (50.4)
Occupational level			
Not working	140 (2.7)	167 (2.4)	161 (2.6)
Low	2,119 (40.6)	3,023 (43.1)	3,081 (49.0)
Medium	1,902 (36.5)	2,428 (34.6)	1,899 (30.2)
High	1,054 (20.2)	1,395 (19.9)	1,146 (18.2)
Smoking status (%)			
Smoker	1,188 (22.8)	1741 (24.8)	1,313 (20.9)
Non-smoker	4,027 (77.2)	5,272 (75.2)	4,974 (79.1)
Nationality (%)			
Swiss	3,781 (72.5)	5,073 (72.3)	4,305 (68.5)
Other	1,434 (27.5)	1,940 (27.7)	1,982 (31.5)

335 *Note: SD, standard deviation*

336 Median daily alcohol consumption stratified by period and individual characteristics are provided in
 337 Table 2. Over half of the respondents of each period were male. This slight imbalance can be
 338 explained by the exclusion of non-drinkers which are predominantly women. The mean age was
 339 around 50 years for all three periods.

340

341 **Table 2 - Alcohol intake (g/day) of the Bus Santé participants, Geneva, Switzerland (1993-2018)**
 342 **stratified by individual-level characteristics**

	Period 1 (P1)	Period 2 (P2)	Period 3 (P3)
--	---------------	---------------	---------------

	Period 1 (P1)	Period 2 (P2)	Period 3 (P3)
Sample size (n)	5,215	7,013	6,287
Gender [IQR]			
Woman	10.8 [2.7-14.1]	9.9 [2.5-13.2]	8.2 [1.8-11.1]
Man	23.5 [7.1-32.3]	21.4 [5.9-28.6]	16.2 [4.4-20.3]
Marital status [IQR]			
Married/cohabiting	17.7 [4.0-22.7]	16.2 [3.6-21.0]	12.5 [2.9-16.0]
Not married/cohabiting	17.1 [3.6-22.6]	15.5 [3.0-19.8]	12.0 [2.8-15.8]
Education [IQR]			
Tertiary	16.3 [4.0-21.6]	14.0 [3.2-19.4]	11.2 [3.0-14.8]
Lower than tertiary	18.2 [3.8-23.7]	17.2 [3.6-22.3]	13.5 [2.8-16.6]
Occupational level [IQR]			
Not working	11.8 [1.7-14.5]	11.3 [2.8-16.2]	10.3 [2.5-13.5]
Low	18.1 [4.4-23.7]	15.6 [4.0-20.5]	12.1 [3.0-16.1]
Medium	14.7 [2.8-19.2]	13.6 [2.8-17.4]	10.3 [2.5-13.2]
High	22.7 [4.7-33.0]	21.8 [4.7-33.0]	16.5 [2.9-20.8]
Smoking status [IQR]			
Smoker	23.6 [6.0-33.3]	20.3 [4.7-27.5]	15.5 [3.3-19.8]
Non-smoker	15.8 [3.3-20.7]	14.6 [3.0-19.8]	11.5 [2.8-14.4]
Country of birth [IQR]			
Switzerland	16.8 [3.6-21.6]	15.2 [3.3-19.8]	12.0 [2.9-15.8]
Other	19.6 [4.2-26.6]	18.2 [3.6-25.3]	13.1 [2.8-16.0]

343 *Note: IQR, interquartile range*

344 **Regression analyses**

345 The univariate OLS models showed that categories of alcohol outlets were significantly associated
346 with alcohol consumption, at different periods. Bar density had a positive relationship with alcohol
347 consumption in P1, and both off-premises outlet density and on-premises outlet density had
348 statistically significant positive relationship with alcohol consumption in P2. No significant
349 association between measures of alcohol outlets density and alcohol consumption were identified in
350 P3.

351 We calibrated a separate multivariate OLS model for each of the three retained alcohol outlet
352 categories (i.e., bars, off-premises, and on-premises) for each period. All models controlled for
353 individual and neighborhood-level socio-demographic covariates. The coefficient estimates and
354 standard errors are presented in table S2. In P1, age, smoking status, a high occupational level,
355 neighborhood median income, and bar density were positively associated with alcohol consumption.
356 Being a woman had a strong negative relationship with alcohol consumption and, to a lesser degree,
357 having Swiss nationality. In P2, the same relationships were observed apart from neighborhood
358 median income, which was not significantly associated with alcohol consumption. Additionally, while
359 bar density was not associated with alcohol consumption, the density of on-premises and off-premises
360 alcohol outlets had a relatively strong positive relationship with alcohol consumption. Finally, in P3,
361 we found a negative relationship between tertiary education and alcohol consumption and no
362 statistically significant relationships between alcohol outlets density and alcohol consumption. Of
363 note, gender, age, high occupational level, and smoking status remained associated with alcohol
364 consumption, but to a lesser extent than in P1 and P2. The global spatial autocorrelation analysis in
365 the models' residuals revealed statistically significant global Moran's I in several models (Table S3),
366 suggesting that global OLS models may be inappropriate.

367 GWR models were calibrated using the same sets of explanatory variables used in global models. In
368 P1 and P2, the optimal bandwidths included all nearest neighbors (i.e., global scale), indicating that
369 all the data was included in each local subset. In P3, the optimal bandwidths were relatively more
370 regional, with 4,327 nearest neighbors in model 1, 3,676 in model 2, and 3,763 in model 3. GWR
371 models showed mixed performance. Values of R^2 were slightly higher in P1 and P2 and much higher
372 in P3. In terms of AIC, in P1 and P2, GWR showed a worse model fit than OLS, while in P3, GWR
373 outperformed the global model. Finally, residual spatial autocorrelation remained in several instances.
374 Therefore, a MGWR model may be necessary to allow processes to vary at unique scales.

375 The MGWR model showed improved performance in most cases (Table S3), with lower AICc and
376 reduced residual spatial autocorrelation. The calibration of a MGWR model produced an optimized
377 bandwidth for each explanatory variable, describing the spatial scale at which each spatial process
378 varies (Table S4) [34]. Relationships are thus not forced to be global or local a priori. Indeed, we
379 observed that certain relationships occurred globally, indicated by a bandwidth comprising all
380 neighbors, while others had small bandwidths indicating that they vary locally (Fig S1-3). This
381 resulted in lower AIC and AICc and higher R^2 .

382 We only presented parameter estimate surfaces for the best performing model of each period, model 1
383 in P1 (Fig S1) and model 3 in P2 (Fig S2) and P3 (Fig S3). Several spatial patterns can be observed
384 thanks to the MGWR parameter estimates surfaces (Fig S1-3, right) in comparison to those from
385 GWR (Fig S1-3, left). First, few parameters are effectively global with a statistically significant
386 relationship with alcohol consumption: intercept, gender, nationality, neighborhood median income in
387 P1; intercept, gender, high occupational level, and off-premises outlet density in P2; and none in P3.
388 These showed little or no spatial variation and are in accordance with the GWR models where
389 bandwidths were global in P1 and P2 and more local in P3. The negative or positive character of these
390 global relationships was consistent with the results of the global regression models. Second, some
391 parameters were found to be only statistically significant in some areas where there is little spatial
392 variation: bar density in P1; tertiary education and nationality in P2 and P3. Again, the observed
393 relationships with alcohol consumption agree with global models. Third, another category included
394 surfaces with statistically significant parameters that vary locally: age and smoking status in P1 and
395 P2; and intercept, age, gender, and smoking status in P3. Finally, some parameters were not
396 statistically significant across the study area: civil status, educational attainment, occupational level in
397 P1; civil status, medium- and low occupational level, neighborhood-level median income in P2; civil
398 status, low and medium occupational level, neighborhood-level median income, off-premises outlet
399 density in P3.

400 **Global spatial autocorrelation**

401 There were spatial patterns in the physical accessibility to alcohol outlets in all periods. Global
402 Moran's I values for most measures of physical accessibility were statistically significant ($p = 0.001$).
403 The density of participants and the high variability of daily alcohol consumption made it impossible
404 to detect spatial patterns by simple observation. The global Moran's I calculation at incremental fixed
405 distance bands showed that spatial autocorrelation in alcohol consumption peaked with a 400m fixed-
406 distance band in P1 and a 1,200m band in P3 (Table S2). Alcohol consumption showed no statistically
407 significant spatial autocorrelation in P2. We conducted spatial analyses using both 400m and 1,200m
408 distance bands, but only results for 1,200m are presented. We preferred 1,200m over 400m because
409 many participants, especially in rural areas, would not have neighbors at that distance, thus excluding
410 them for spatial analyses. Both distances showed similar spatial patterns.


411 **Local clustering of alcohol consumption**

412 We found local spatial clusters of alcohol consumption in each period. Spatial clusters of high and
413 low daily alcohol consumption for the three periods are mapped in Fig 1-3. The spatial distribution of
414 clusters was relatively stable across periods, with large hot and cold spots appearing in the same areas
415 (Fig S4). The percentage of individuals in cold spots decreased from P1 to P2 and doubled from P2 to
416 P3. The percentage of individuals in hot spots remained more stable in size. From P1 to P2, it showed


417 a slight increase that reduced to P1 levels in P3. P2 shows a distinctive pattern with a large hot spot
418 located in the urban part of the canton of Geneva (Fig 2A).

419

420 The local cluster analyses of adjusted alcohol consumption, using the MGWR residuals, showed that
421 local spatial clusters were greatly attenuated in P2 and P3, suggesting that the explanatory variables in
422 the models were responsible for most of the spatial clustering (Fig 1-3B). In P1, the clusters remained
423 stable after adjustment.




424




425

426 **Figure 1 - Local spatial clustering of alcohol consumption in period 1 (P1 – 1993.01.01-2009.06.30).** Local
427 Moran's I spatial clusters of alcohol consumption (A) unadjusted and (B) adjusted for socio-demographic
428 characteristics and physical accessibility to bars using a multiscale geographically weighted regression
429 (MGWR model 1). The dark red markers (1 High-High) correspond to the individuals with a high alcohol
430 consumption surrounded by individuals with a high alcohol consumption. The light blue markers (2 Low-High)
431 correspond to individuals with a low alcohol consumption surrounded by individuals with a high alcohol
432 consumption. The dark blue markers (3 Low-Low) correspond to individuals with a low alcohol consumption
433 surrounded by individuals with a low alcohol consumption. The light red markers (4 High-Low) correspond to
434 individuals with a high alcohol consumption surrounded by individuals with a low alcohol consumption. White
435 markers are not significant at $\alpha = 0.05$. Black lines correspond to municipality delimitations. The bar plot
436 shows the average alcohol consumption (g/day) according to LISA cluster categories. Error bars show 95%
437 confidence intervals.


438






440

441 *Figure 2 - Local spatial clustering of alcohol consumption in period 2 (P2 – 1999.07.01-2009.10.31). Local*
442 *Moran's I spatial clusters of alcohol consumption (A) unadjusted and (B) adjusted for socio-demographic*
443 *characteristics and physical accessibility to off-premises alcohol outlets using a multiscale geographically*
444 *weighted regression (MGWR model 3). The interpretation of local cluster categories remains the same as*
445 *described on Fig 1.*





447

448 **Figure 3 - Local spatial clustering of alcohol consumption in period 3 (P3 – 2009.11.01-2018.12.31).** Local
449 Moran's I spatial clusters of alcohol consumption (A) unadjusted and (B) adjusted for socio-demographic
450 characteristics and physical accessibility to off-premises alcohol outlets using a multiscale geographically
451 weighted regression (MGWR model 3). The interpretation of local cluster categories remains the same as
452 described on Fig 1.

453 **Characteristics of local spatial clusters of alcohol consumption**

454 Individuals belonging to hot and cold spots had significant differences in socio-demographic
455 characteristics and access to alcohol outlets.


456 In P1, individuals in the high-high category had an average alcohol consumption of 43.8g/day (SD ±
457 22.5g/day), while individuals in the low-low category had an alcohol consumption of 6.7g/day (SD ±
458 5.1g/day). Alcohol consumption was significantly higher in hot spots than in cold spots in all three
459 periods ($p < 0.001$). Significance was assessed with Welch's t-tests. The proportion of high
460 occupational level individuals, smokers, men, and physical accessibility to alcohol outlets were higher
461 in the high-high category. Neighborhood median household income and the proportion of individuals
462 with a medium occupational level were higher in the low-low category (Fig 4A).

463 In P2, the differences in socio-demographic characteristics and alcohol accessibility were
464 exacerbated, notably concerning physical accessibility to alcohol outlets, which was much higher for

465 individuals in the high-high category (Fig 4B). Additionally, high-high clusters had a lower
466 neighborhood median income and a higher proportion of smokers. Of note, nationality and the
467 proportion of married and cohabiting individuals were significantly higher in the low-low category.
468 The average alcohol consumption decreased among individuals in the high-high category compared to
469 P1 (37.3g/day, SD \pm 22.3g/day). The consumption remained relatively stable in the low-low category
470 (5.8g/day, SD \pm 4.3g/day).


471 Finally, in P3, which corresponds to the period after the implementation of alcohol control policies,
472 differences were strongly attenuated or even inverted (Fig 4C). The high-high category had lower
473 physical accessibility to alcohol outlets than the low-low category. While inverted, the difference was
474 less contrasted than in P1 and P2. The high-high category had a significantly higher proportion of
475 Swiss nationality, married or cohabiting individuals, and individuals with a high occupational level.
476 Additionally, individuals in the high-high category were significantly older than those in the low-low
477 category. The proportion of individuals having a tertiary education was significantly higher in the
478 low-low category. The average alcohol consumption among individuals in the high-high category
479 decreased starkly (26.0g/day, SD \pm 17.2g/day) compared to P2, yet it remained at levels harmful for
480 health. The alcohol consumption in the low-low category decreased slightly to 4.6g/day (SD \pm
481 3.2g/day).

482




483

484



485



486

487 **Figure 4 - Characterization of local spatial clusters.** Radar plot of standardized socio-demographic
 488 characteristics and physical alcohol availability in high-high and low-low spatial clusters for (A) period (P1),
 489 (B) period 2 (P2) and (C) period 3 (P3). Mean, (SD) is provided under each characteristic. HH, high-high
 490 class; LL, low-low class. Statistical significance evaluated using Welch's t-tests for continuous variables and
 491 Fisher's exact tests for binary variables. *p-value < 0.05.

492

493

494

495

496

497

498

499

500

501

502

503

504 Discussion

505 In this study, we detected spatial clustering of alcohol consumption in the canton of Geneva and
506 changes in their spatial distribution before, during, and after the implementation of alcohol control
507 policies. We found significant associations between alcohol consumption, individual and
508 neighborhood-level socio-demographic characteristics and physical availability of alcohol outlets.
509 Additionally, several of these associations evolved across periods. The results also demonstrate the
510 potential of local models to improve the understanding of the determinants of alcohol consumption
511 and the spatial scales at which they influence it.

512 In the first period (P1—1993.01.01-1999.06.30), individuals in hot spots of alcohol consumption had
513 an average alcohol consumption much higher than the recommendation for low-risk alcohol
514 consumption of 10g/day for women and 20g/day for men [37]. We found that average alcohol
515 consumption in hot spots decreased between P1 and P2 (1999.07.01-2009.10.31) and, even more
516 importantly, between P2 and P3 (2009.11.01-2018.12.31), despite increasing physical availability of
517 alcohol outlets. In P3, alcohol consumption was closer to recommendations yet remaining inadequate,
518 particularly for women. This highlights the potential of individual-level spatial analyses in uncovering
519 precise areas and populations at risk of harmful chronic alcohol consumption and that would benefit
520 from specific public health interventions. Studies conducted at lower spatial resolution may have
521 missed such local variations in alcohol consumption behaviors due to the lost variance inherent to
522 spatial aggregation [21,38].

523 Although at a much coarser spatial scale, local spatial clustering of alcohol consumption was
524 previously reported in the literature [39]. Another study using individual-level data found no
525 significant spatial clustering in alcohol consumption [11]; however the studied population were
526 adolescents. Interestingly, the observed hot spots of alcohol consumption were much smaller than hot
527 spots previously reported in the canton of Geneva for other risk factors such as body mass index,
528 sugar-sweetened beverages, and salt intake [40–42]. Of note, hot spots decreased, and cold spots
529 increased in size from P2 to P3, the period after implementing alcohol-control policies. Together, this
530 suggests that the alcohol reduction strategies implemented in P2 were effective beyond reducing
531 overall consumption [4,9] through a reduction in the size of consumption hot spots.

532 The adjustment for socio-demographic and physical alcohol availability led to an almost complete
533 disappearance of spatial clusters of alcohol consumption, suggesting that these factors were
534 responsible for most of the spatial clustering. However, other factors not accounted for in this study
535 could explain the remaining spatial patterns. For example, we did not consider alcohol temporal and
536 price availability, which has been reported to affect consumption [5,14]. Furthermore, non-spatial
537 determinants of alcohol consumption have been reported in the literature, including the critical
538 influence of individuals' social networks [43].

539 Our regression analyses, notably using the modern MGWR modeling technique, highlighted the
540 existence of both global and local relationships between socio-demographic and physical availability
541 of alcohol outlets and alcohol consumption. These relationships changed across periods, which could
542 be due to the implementation of alcohol control policies. For example, there was a positive
543 association between physical accessibility to bars and alcohol consumption in P1 and on-premises and
544 off-premises alcohol outlets in P2, while no significant association was observed in P3. This trend
545 was also observed in the hot and cold spots differences in alcohol availability between hot and cold
546 spots, which were drastically reduced between P2 and P3. This suggests that the relationship between
547 the built environment and alcohol consumption, reported in previous studies [5,44], may have
548 changed over time, potentially due to the effectiveness of alcohol control policies implemented in P2
549 and explicitly targeting the availability of alcohol (i.e., restricted alcohol sale hours and sale
550 interdiction in gas stations and video stores) [6,17].

551 Finally, results also showed the complementarity of MGWR and local clustering. Indeed, geographic
552 variation in the intercept of MGWR models corresponded to high and low alcohol consumption areas
553 adjusted for the explanatory variables included in the model. This information supported the results of

554 the local clustering analyses. Indeed, spatial patterns in the intercept coincided with the observed
555 spatial clusters after adjustment for covariates. For example, the large hot spot identified in P3
556 corresponded to the area where the MGWR model showed a strong negative and significant
557 relationship between higher education and alcohol consumption. This suggests that in that area where
558 alcohol consumption is generally high, higher education is particularly protective against at-risk
559 alcohol consumption.

560 **Strengths and limitations**

561 First, our study uses data from a large population-based study over a long period and with a
562 homogenous and dense geographical distribution across the study area. The spatial scales of analysis
563 were objectively determined for spatial autocorrelation analysis and regression analyses. Our spatial
564 clustering analyses relied on widely used spatial statistics. The global and local Moran's I have been
565 shown to be valid and robust indicators of spatial autocorrelation [30]. Additionally, our
566 implementation of GWR and MGWR followed best practices for robust modeling of multiscale
567 multivariate processes [31,34]. To the best of our knowledge, no existing studies have examined the
568 spatial context of the determinants of alcohol consumption using MGWR. Such a geospatial approach
569 was notably lacking in Switzerland, as most existing studies focused on US and UK populations
570 [6,11]. Our study also aimed to address several methodological gaps reported in the literature [5]. We
571 examined the relationship between alcohol physical availability and alcohol consumption using
572 objective geographic measures of the built environment. Current and historical business listings were
573 collected from a public source to avoid potential biases and missing data associated with business
574 listings obtained from private companies. We used a street network-based approach recognized to
575 capture better human mobility patterns than buffer or container approaches used in many previous
576 studies [6]. We also examined both aggregated (i.e., on- and off-premises alcohol outlets) and
577 disaggregated outlet categorizations to measure outlet density. This approach has been previously
578 recommended to disentangle whether observed relationships apply to all outlet types or only certain
579 ones [5]. Of note, our regression analyses showed no significant relationship between most
580 disaggregated outlet categories and alcohol consumption, apart from bar density in P1. Additionally,
581 our study focuses on the problem of average alcohol consumption, which has received little attention
582 compared to acute alcohol consumption and related harms [45,46].

583 Several limitations of this study merit comment. First, the cross-sectional nature of the Bus Santé
584 study precludes from evaluating the causality of observed relationships. Secondly, alcohol
585 consumption was derived from self-reported FFQ data; we thus cannot exclude a social desirability
586 bias. However, the same FFQ was used throughout the study period. The magnitude of the bias may
587 have remained constant over time, allowing trends to be unaffected. Third, while recruitment methods
588 of the Bus Santé study aimed at collecting information on a representative sample of the general
589 population, participation bias may exist. Still, multiple strategies described in detail elsewhere have
590 been introduced in the Bus Santé study recruitment to limit such bias [42]. Finally, we were only able
591 to consider individuals' exposure to alcohol outlets around the place of residence. Recent evidence
592 suggests additional exposure outside of the residential neighborhood. Future research should ideally
593 draw on travel surveys and GPS data to better capture individuals' exposures. Nevertheless, exposure
594 assessment is even complicated by increasing online alcohol advertising and sale with home delivery
595 [5].

596

597

598

599

600

601

602 **Conclusions and policy implications**

603 Local clustering of alcohol consumption was detected in three time periods (P1, 1993-1999; P2, 1999-
604 2009; P3, 2009-2018) defined by the implementation of an array of alcohol control policies from 1999
605 to 2009. While decreasing substantially across periods, alcohol consumption in hot spots remained at
606 inappropriate levels, particularly for women. Furthermore, the determinants of alcohol consumption
607 changed over periods. Our findings show that specific socio-demographic and built environment
608 characteristics are associated with increased alcohol consumption regardless of location (i.e., global
609 scale). These may be the focus of population-wide programs and strategies. In contrast, other factors
610 such as smoking status, nationality, being a woman, and higher education had more local relationships
611 with alcohol consumption in the most recent period (2009-2018). By shedding light on the mix of
612 spatial scales at which socio-demographic characteristics and alcohol availability influence alcohol
613 consumption, our results may facilitate the development of improved, targeted public health
614 interventions.

615

616

617

618

619

620

621

622

623

624

625

626

627

628

629

630

631

632

633

634

635

636

637 Bibliography

- 638 1. WHO. *Global Status Report on Alcohol and Health 2018.*; 2018.
- 639 2. Marmet S, Rehm J, Gmel G, Frick H, Gmel G. Alcohol-attributable mortality in Switzerland in
640 2011 - Age-specific causes of death and impact of heavy versus non-heavy drinking. *Swiss*
641 *Med Wkly.* 2014;144(2122):13947. doi:10.4414/smw.2014.13947
- 642 3. OECD. *Tackling Harmful Alcohol Use.* OECD; 2015. doi:10.1787/9789264181069-en
- 643 4. Dumont S, Marques-Vidal P, Favrod-Coune T, et al. Alcohol policy changes and 22-year
644 trends in individual alcohol consumption in a Swiss adult population: A 1993-2014 cross-
645 sectional population-based study. *BMJ Open.* 2017;7(3). doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2016-014828
- 646 5. Holmes J, Guo Y, Maheswaran R, Nicholls J, Meier PS, Brennan A. The impact of spatial and
647 temporal availability of alcohol on its consumption and related harms: A critical review in the
648 context of UK licensing policies. *Drug Alcohol Rev.* 2014;33(5):515-525.
649 doi:10.1111/dar.12191
- 650 6. Popova S, Giesbrecht N, Bekmuradov D, Patra J. Hours and days of sale and density of
651 alcohol outlets: Impacts on alcohol consumption and damage: A systematic review. *Alcohol*
652 *Alcohol.* 2009;44(5):500-516. doi:10.1093/alcalc/agg054
- 653 7. Campbell CA, Hahn RA, Elder R, et al. The Effectiveness of Limiting Alcohol Outlet Density
654 As a Means of Reducing Excessive Alcohol Consumption and Alcohol-Related Harms. *Am J*
655 *Prev Med.* 2009;37(6):556-569. doi:10.1016/j.amepre.2009.09.028
- 656 8. Picone GA, Sloan F, Trogdon JG. The effect of the tobacco settlement and smoking bans on
657 alcohol consumption. *Health Econ.* 2004;13(10):1063-1080. doi:10.1002/hec.930
- 658 9. Sandoval JL, Leão T, Theler JM, et al. Alcohol control policies and socioeconomic
659 inequalities in hazardous alcohol consumption: A 22-year cross-sectional study in a Swiss
660 urban population. *BMJ Open.* 2019;9(5):e028971. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2019-028971
- 661 10. Faeh D, Viswanathan B, Chiolerio A, Warren W, Bovet P. Clustering of smoking, alcohol
662 drinking and cannabis use in adolescents in a rapidly developing country. *BMC Public Health.*
663 2006;6(1):169. doi:10.1186/1471-2458-6-169
- 664 11. Duncan DT, Rienti M, Kulldorff M, et al. Local spatial clustering in youths' use of tobacco,
665 alcohol, and marijuana in Boston. *Am J Drug Alcohol Abuse.* 2016;42(4):412-421.
666 doi:10.3109/00952990.2016.1151522
- 667 12. Assanangkornchai S, Li J, McNeil E, Saingam D. Clusters of alcohol and drug use and other
668 health-risk behaviors among Thai secondary school students: A latent class analysis. *BMC*
669 *Public Health.* 2018;18(1):1272. doi:10.1186/s12889-018-6205-z
- 670 13. Gruenewald PJ, Remer LG, Lascala EA. Testing a social ecological model of alcohol use: The
671 California 50-city study. *Addiction.* 2014;109(5):736-745. doi:10.1111/add.12438
- 672 14. Bryden A, Roberts B, McKee M, Petticrew M. A systematic review of the influence on alcohol
673 use of community level availability and marketing of alcohol. *Heal Place.* 2012;18(2):349-
674 357. doi:10.1016/j.healthplace.2011.11.003
- 675 15. Bryden A, Roberts B, Petticrew M, McKee M. A systematic review of the influence of
676 community level social factors on alcohol use. *Heal Place.* 2013;21:70-85.
677 doi:10.1016/j.healthplace.2013.01.012
- 678 16. Collins SE. Associations between socioeconomic factors and alcohol outcomes. *Alcohol Res*
679 *Curr Rev.* 2016;38(1):83-94.

- 680 17. Sherk A, Stockwell T, Chikritzhs T, et al. Alcohol consumption and the physical availability
681 of take-away alcohol: Systematic reviews and meta-analyses of the days and hours of sale and
682 outlet density. *J Stud Alcohol Drugs*. 2018;79(1):58-67. doi:10.15288/jsad.2018.79.58
- 683 18. Chaix B, Merlo J, Chauvin P. Comparison of a spatial approach with the multilevel approach
684 for investigating place effects on health: The example of healthcare utilisation in France. *J*
685 *Epidemiol Community Health*. 2005;59(6):517-526. doi:10.1136/jech.2004.025478
- 686 19. Guessous I, Bochud M, Theler JM, Gaspoz JM, Pechère-Bertschi A. 1999-2009 trends in
687 prevalence, unawareness, treatment and control of hypertension in Geneva, Switzerland.
688 Barengo NC, ed. *PLoS One*. 2012;7(6):e39877. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0039877
- 689 20. Morabia A, Bernstein M, Héritier S, Ylli A. Community-based surveillance of cardiovascular
690 risk factors in Geneva: Methods, resulting distributions, and comparisons with other
691 populations. *Prev Med (Baltim)*. 1997;26(3):311-319. doi:10.1006/pmed.1997.0146
- 692 21. Openshaw S. *The Modifiable Areal Unit Problem*. Vol 38. Geo Books; 1983.
- 693 22. Morabia A, Bernstein M, Kumanyika S, et al. Développement et validation d'un questionnaire
694 alimentaire semi-quantitatif à partir d'une enquête de population. *Sozial- und Präventivmedizin*
695 *SPM*. 1994;39(6):345-369. doi:10.1007/BF01299666
- 696 23. Mozaffarian D, Fahimi S, Singh GM, et al. Global Sodium Consumption and Death from
697 Cardiovascular Causes. *N Engl J Med*. 2014;371(7):624-634. doi:10.1056/nejmoa1304127
- 698 24. Micha R, Khatibzadeh S, Shi P, et al. Global, regional, and national consumption levels of
699 dietary fats and oils in 1990 and 2010: A systematic analysis including 266 country-specific
700 nutrition surveys. *BMJ*. 2014;348. doi:10.1136/bmj.g2272
- 701 25. REG. Accessed January 7, 2021. [https://www.ge.ch/utiliser-repertoire-entreprises-](https://www.ge.ch/utiliser-repertoire-entreprises-reg/consulter-reg)
702 [reg/consulter-reg](https://www.ge.ch/utiliser-repertoire-entreprises-reg/consulter-reg)
- 703 26. SITG. Catalogue | SITG. Accessed January 7, 2021.
704 https://ge.ch/sitg/sitg_catalog/sitg_donnees
- 705 27. Boeing G. OSMnx: New methods for acquiring, constructing, analyzing, and visualizing
706 complex street networks. *Comput Environ Urban Syst*. 2017;65:126-139.
707 doi:10.1016/j.compenvurbsys.2017.05.004
- 708 28. Foti F, Waddell P, Luxen D. *A Generalized Computational Framework for Accessibility* □:
709 *From the Pedestrian to the Metropolitan Scale.*; 2012.
- 710 29. Buehler R, Pucher J, Merom D, Bauman A. Active travel in Germany and the U.S.:
711 Contributions of daily walking and cycling to physical activity. *Am J Prev Med*.
712 2011;41(3):241-250. doi:10.1016/j.amepre.2011.04.012
- 713 30. Auchincloss AH, Gebreab SY, Mair C, Diez Roux A V. A review of spatial methods in
714 epidemiology, 2000-2010. *Annu Rev Public Health*. 2012;33(1):107-122.
715 doi:10.1146/annurev-publhealth-031811-124655
- 716 31. Oshan TM, Li Z, Kang W, Wolf LJ, Stewart Fotheringham A. MGWR: A python
717 implementation of multiscale geographically weighted regression for investigating process
718 spatial heterogeneity and scale. *ISPRS Int J Geo-Information*. 2019;8(6).
719 doi:10.3390/ijgi8060269
- 720 32. Chen DR, Truong K. Using multilevel modeling and geographically weighted regression to
721 identify spatial variations in the relationship between place-level disadvantages and obesity in
722 Taiwan. *Appl Geogr*. 2012;32(2):737-745. doi:10.1016/j.apgeog.2011.07.018

- 723 33. Chi SH, Grigsby-Toussaint DS, Bradford N, Choi J. Can Geographically Weighted Regression
724 improve our contextual understanding of obesity in the US? Findings from the USDA Food
725 Atlas. *Appl Geogr*. 2013;44:134-142. doi:10.1016/j.apgeog.2013.07.017
- 726 34. Oshan TM, Smith JP, Fotheringham AS. Targeting the spatial context of obesity determinants
727 via multiscale geographically weighted regression. *Int J Health Geogr*. 2020;19(1):11.
728 doi:10.1186/s12942-020-00204-6
- 729 35. Diggle P. *Applied Spatial Statistics for Public Health Data*. Vol 100. John Wiley & Sons, Inc.;
730 2005. doi:10.1198/jasa.2005.s15
- 731 36. Anselin L. Local Indicators of Spatial Association—LISA. *Geogr Anal*. 1995;27(2):93-115.
732 doi:10.1111/j.1538-4632.1995.tb00338.x
- 733 37. Consommation d'alcool à risque. Accessed May 4, 2021.
734 [https://www.bag.admin.ch/bag/fr/home/gesund-leben/sucht-und-](https://www.bag.admin.ch/bag/fr/home/gesund-leben/sucht-und-gesundheit/alkohol/problemkonsum.html)
735 [gesundheit/alkohol/problemkonsum.html](https://www.bag.admin.ch/bag/fr/home/gesund-leben/sucht-und-gesundheit/alkohol/problemkonsum.html)
- 736 38. Tatem AJ. Innovation to impact in spatial epidemiology. *BMC Med*. 2018;16(1):209.
737 doi:10.1186/s12916-018-1205-5
- 738 39. Fu SH, Jha P, Gupta PC, Kumar R, Dikshit R, Sinha D. Geospatial analysis on the
739 distributions of tobacco smoking and alcohol drinking in India. *PLoS One*. 2014;9(7).
740 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0102416
- 741 40. Guessous I, Joost S, Jeannot E, Theler JM, Mahler P, Gaspoz JM. A comparison of the spatial
742 dependence of body mass index among adults and children in a Swiss general population. *Nutr*
743 *Diabetes*. 2014;4(3):e111-e111. doi:10.1038/nutd.2014.8
- 744 41. Joost S, De Ridder D, Marques-Vidal P, et al. Overlapping spatial clusters of sugar-sweetened
745 beverage intake and body mass index in Geneva state, Switzerland. *Nutr Diabetes*.
746 2019;9(1):1-10. doi:10.1038/s41387-019-0102-0
- 747 42. De Ridder D, Belle FN, Marques-Vidal P, et al. Geospatial analysis of sodium and potassium
748 intake: A swiss population-based study. *Nutrients*. 2021;13(6):1798.
749 doi:10.3390/nu13061798
- 750 43. Huang GC, Soto D, Fujimoto K, Valente TW. The interplay of friendship networks and social
751 networking sites: Longitudinal analysis of selection and influence effects on adolescent
752 smoking and alcohol use. *Am J Public Health*. 2014;104(8). doi:10.2105/AJPH.2014.302038
- 753 44. Lo CC, Weber J, Cheng TC. A spatial analysis of student binge drinking, alcohol-outlet
754 density, and social disadvantages. *Am J Addict*. 2013;22(4):391-401. doi:10.1111/j.1521-
755 0391.2013.12022.x
- 756 45. Zhu L, Gorman DM, Horel S. Alcohol outlet density and violence: A geospatial analysis.
757 *Alcohol Alcohol*. 2004;39(4):369-375. doi:10.1093/alcalc/agh062
- 758 46. Ying YH, Wu CC, Chang K. The effectiveness of drinking and driving policies for different
759 alcohol-related fatalities: A quantile regression analysis. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*.
760 2013;10(10):4628-4644. doi:10.3390/ijerph10104628
- 761