

Gabriel M. Ahlfeldt*, Elisabetta Pietrostefani*

Studies reviewed in The effects of compact urban form: A quantitative evidence review

Version: November 2016

Summary of study attributes

ID	Author	Year	Cause	Cat.	Outcome	Density	Country	Model	SMS	Qual.	Elasticity
P1	Abel et al.	2012	a	1	Labour productivity	PD	US	OLS IV	4	1	3.00%
P2	Ananat et al.	2013	a	1	Wages	ED	US	OLS FE	2	1	.
P3	Andersson et al.	2014	a	1	Wages	ED	Sweden	panel FE	3	1	1.00%
P4	Andersson et al.	2016	a	1	Wages	ED	Sweden	panel	3	1	3.00%
P5	Baldwin et al.	2010	a	1	Labour productivity	ED	Canada	FD, GMM, IV	3	1	.
P6	Barde	2010	a	1	Wages	ED	France	CrossSec, IV	4	1	3.50%
P7	Ciccone	2002	a	1	Labour productivity	ED	Europe	FE, IV	4	1	4.50%
P8	Ciccone & Hall	1996	a	1	Total factor productivity	ED	US	OLS IV	3	1	6.00%
P9	Combes et al.	2008	a	1	Wages	ED	France	panel IV	4	1	3.00%
P10	Dekle & Eaton	1999	a	1	Wages	ED	Japan	panel FE	3	1	1.00%
P11	Drennan & Kelly	2011	a	1	Rent	PD	US	panel FE	3	1	.
P12	Echeverri-Carroll & Ayala	2011	a	1	Wages	PD	US	OLS IV	4	1	3.05%
P13	Garate & Pennington-Cross	2013	a	1	Retail sales	PD	Chile	panel IV	4	0	.

* London School of Economics and Political Sciences (LSE) and Centre for Economic Policy Research (CEPR), Houghton Street, London WC2A 2AE, g.ahlfeldt@lse.ac.uk, www.ahlfeldt.com

* London School of Economics and Political Sciences (LSE).

ID	Author	Year	Cause	Cat.	Outcome	Density	Country	Model	SMS	Qual.	Elasticity
P14	Glaeser et al.	2006	a	1	Wages	HD	US	panel	3	1	.
P15	Graham	2007	a	1	Labour productivity	ED	UK	GLS CONTR	2	1	4.02%
P16	Graham et al.	2010	a	1	Labour productivity	ED	UK	panel GMM	3	1	9.05%
P17	Larsson	2014	a	1	Wages	ED	Sweden	panel IV	3	1	1.00%
P18	Rosenthal & Strange	2008	a	1	Wages	ED	US	OLS, GMM, IV	4	1	4.50%
P19	Morikawa	2011	a	1	Total factor productivity	PD	Japan	panel	2	1	11.00%
P20	Tabuchi	1986	a	1	Labour productivity	PD	Japan	CrossSec IV	4	1	6.15%
P21	Faberman & Freedman	2016	a	1	Wages	PD	US	panel IV	3	1	6.98%
P22	Barufi et al.	2016	a	1	Wages	ED	Brazil	panel IV	3	1	7.30%
P23	Ahlfeldt et al.	2015	a	1	Total factor productivity	ED	Germany	DID, GMM	4	1	8.00%
P24	Ahlfeldt & Feddersen	2015	a	1	Labour productivity	ED	Germany	DID IV	4	1	3.80%
P25	Combes et al.	2012	a	1	Total factor productivity	ED	France	panel IV	4	1	3.20%
P26	Ahlfeldt & Wendland	2013	a	1	Total factor productivity	SPP	Germany	panel FE	3	1	5.90%
P27	Fu	2007	a	1	Wages	ED	US	CrossSec FE	2	1	3.70%
P28	Henderson	2003	a	1	Labour productivity	ED	US	panel IV	3	1	.
P29	Cheshire & Magrini	2009	a	1	GDP per capita	PD	Europe	CrossSec FE	2	-1	.
P30	Rappaport	2008	a	1	Total factor productivity	PD	US	CGEM	1	1	15.00%
P31	Chauvin et al.	2016	a	1	Wages	PD	US	panel IV	3	1	5.00%
P32	Chauvin et al.	2016	a	1	Wages	PD	Brazil	panel IV	3	1	2.60%
P33	Chauvin et al.	2016	a	1	Wages	PD	China	panel IV	3	1	20.00%
P34	Chauvin et al.	2016	a	1	Wages	PD	India	panel IV	3	1	7.50%
P35	Albouy & Lue	2015	a	1	Wages	PD	US	OLS CONTR	2	1	9.80%
I1	Antonelli	1987	a	2	Ratio patenting firms	ED	Italy	OLS CONTR	2	-1	.
I2	Carlino et al.	2007	a	2	Patents/capita	ED	US	OLS IV	4	1	20.00%
I3	Echeverri-Carroll & Ayala	2011	a	2	Patents/capita	PD	US	OLS IV	4	1	5.04%
I4	Gonçalves & Almeida	2009	a	2	Ratio patenting firms	ED	Brazil	OLS IV	4	1	.
I5	Knudsen et al.	2007	a	2	Patents/capita	ED	US	OLS CONTR	2	1	.
I6	Lobo et al.	2013	a	2	Patents	PS	OECD	OLS	1	1	.
I7	Lobo et al.	2013	a	2	Patents	PS	US	OLS	1	1	.
I8	Sedgley & Elmslie	2011	a	2	Patents	PD	US	panel FE	3	1	.

ID	Author	Year	Cause	Cat.	Outcome	Density	Country	Model	SMS	Qual.	Elasticity
I9	Wilhelmsson	2009	a	2	Inventor networking	ED	Sweden	panel FE	3	1	.
I10	Spencer	2015	b	2	Creative Firm location	SDI	Canada	DESC	0	0	.
VS1	Amato	1969	a	3	Land value	PD	Colombia	DESC	0	-1	.
VS2	Amato	1970	a	3	Land value	PD	South America	DESC	0	-1	.
VS3	Brueckner et al.	2016	b	3	Land value	FAR	China	panel IV	3	1	.
VS4	Brueckner et al.	2016	b	3	Land value	FAR	China	panel IV	3	1	.
VS5	Ding	2013	b	3	House prices	FAR	China	NLLS IV	3	1	.
VS6	Fitriani	2015	a	3	Land value	PD	Indonesia	OLS SLX	3	1	.
VS7	Kholodilin & Ulbricht	2015	a	3	House prices	PD	Europe	OLS QR	2	1	25.00%
VS8	Kim & Sohn	2002	b	3	Land use density	SC	Japan	COR	1	1	.
VS9	Lynch & Rasmussen	2004	a	3	House prices	PD	US	OLS CONTR	2	-1	-1.79%
VS10	Miles	2012	a	3	House prices	PD	UK	DESC	0	1	.
VS11	Ottensmann	1977	a	3	Land value	PS	US	OLS	1	1	.
VS12	Ottensmann	1977	b	3	Land value	HD	US	OLS	1	-1	.
VS13	Palm et al.	2014	a	3	Rent	PD	US	OLS FE	2	1	4.50%
VS14	Stankowski & Trenton	1972	a	3	Land use density	PD	US	DESC	0	1	.
VS15	Ahlfeldt & Mcmillen	2015	b	3	House prices	BH	US	LWR IV	3	1	.
VS16	Xiao et al.	2016	b	3	House prices	SC	China	FD, FE	3	0	.
VS17	Aurand	2010	c	3	# Affordable housing units	MX	US	OLS CONTR	2	-1	.
VS18	Sivitanidou	1995	b	3	Rent	FAR	US	OLS FE	2	1	.
VS19	Combes et al.	2013	a	3	House prices	PD	France	OLS IV	2	1	21.00%
VS20	Ahlfeldt, Moeller, et al.	2015	a	3	House prices	PD	Germany	SPVAR IV	4	1	4.65%
VS21	Song & Knaap	2004	c	3	House prices	PD	US	OLS IV	4	-1	-1.70%
VS22	Ahlfeldt & Wendland	2013	a	3	Rent	SPP	Germany	panel FE	3	1	7.00%
VS23	Liu et al.	2016	a	3	Rent	ED	US	OLS FE	2	1	10.00%
VS24	Albouy & Lue	2015	a	3	House prices	PD	US	OLS CONTR	2	1	26.80%
JA1	Bertaud & Brueckner	2005	b	4	Commuting cost	FAR	India	OLS	1	1	.
JA2	Boussauw et al.	2012	c	4	Distance to work	MX	Belgium	OLS, SL, SE	2	0	.
JA3	Boussauw et al.	2012	a	4	Distance to work	ED	Belgium	OLS, SL, SE	2	-1	.

ID	Author	Year	Cause	Cat.	Outcome	Density	Country	Model	SMS	Qual.	Elasticity
JA4	Murphy	2009	c	4	Commuting cost	ED	Ireland	CrossSec	1	1	.
JA5	Shunfeng	1994	a	4	Distance to work	ED	US	OLS, NLLS	2	0	.
JA6	Veneri	2010	a	4	Av. Commuting time	PD	Italy	OLS, ML	2	-1	-2.12%
JA7	Yang et al.	2012	a	4	Commuting time reduction	PD	China	OLS CONTR	2	-1	-20.85%
JA8	Zhao et al.	2010	a	4	Commuting within periphery	PD	China	LOGIT	2	1	0.00%
JA9	Pouyanne	2004	a	4	Commuting length reduction	PD	France	OLS, LOGIT	2	1	20.65%
JA10	Pouyanne	2004	a	4	Commuting length reduction	ED	France	OLS, LOGIT	2	1	11.04%
JA11	Chatman	2003	a	4	Commercial trip length red.	ED	US	LOGIT, TOBIT	2	1	23.27%
JA12	Barter	2000	b	4	VKT	UB	Eastern Asia	DESC	0	-1	.
JA13	Duranton & Turner	2015	a	4	VKT	PD	US	panel IV	4	1	8.50%
JA14	Harari	2015	b	4	Av. Commuting length	PD	India	panel IV	4	-1	.
JA15	Albouy & Lue	2015	a	4	Commuting cost red.	PD	US	LPROB	2	-1	-0.40%
JA16	Cervero & Kockelman	1997	a	4	VMT	ED	US	LOGIT	2	1	24.70%
JA17	Cervero & Kockelman	1997	a	4	VMT (non-work trip)	ED	US	LOGIT	2	1	6.30%
JA18	Brownstone & Thomas	2013	a	4	Red. total vehicle mileage/year	HD	US	OLS	2	1	12.22%
SA1	Alperovich	1980	a	5	Level of amenities	PD	Israel	OLS CONTR	2	1	.
SA2	Alperovich	1980	b	5	Level of amenities	BD	Israel	OLS CONTR	2	1	.
SA3	Aquino & Gainza	2014	b	5	Commercial activity	BD	Chile	OLS CONTR	2	1	.
SA4	Rappaport	2008	a	5	Level of amenities	PD	US	CGEM	1	1	.
SA5	Ahlfeldt, Redding, et al.	2015	a	5	Quality of life	ED	Germany	DID, GMM	4	1	15.00%
SA6	Schiff	2015	a	5	Cuisine variety	PD	US	OLS IV	4	1	18.50%
SA7	Couture	2016	a	5	Restaurant prices	PD	US	OLS LOGIT IV	4	1	8.00%
SA8	Couture	2016	a	5	Restaurant prices	PD	US	OLS LOGIT IV	4	1	16.00%
SA9	Albouy	2008	a	5	Quality of life	PD	US	OLS FE	2	1	2.00%
SA10	Albouy & Lue	2015	a	5	Quality of life	PD	US	OLS CONTR	2	1	3.10%
SA11	Chauvin et al.	2016	a	5	Real wages	PD	US	panel IV	3	-1	-2.00%
SA12	Chauvin et al.	2016	a	5	Real wages	PD	Brazil	panel IV	3	0	-1.00%
SA13	Chauvin et al.	2016	a	5	Real wages	PD	China	panel IV	3	-1	-5.20%

ID	Author	Year	Cause	Cat.	Outcome	Density	Country	Model	SMS	Qual.	Elasticity
SA14	Chauvin et al.	2016	a	5	Real wages	PD	India	panel IV	3	-1	-6.90%
SA15	Levinson	2008	a	5	Rail station density	PD	UK	panel	3	1	0.23%
SA16	Levinson	2008	a	5	Underground station density	PD	UK	panel	3	1	0.27%
SA17	Ahlfeldt et al.	2015	a	5	Underground station density	PD	Germany	SPVAR IV	4	1	3.50%
PS1	Carruthers & Ulfarsson	2003	a	6	Red. total spending	PD	US	CrossSec FE	2	1	14.40%
PS2	Carruthers & Ulfarsson	2003	a	6	Red. spending capital	PD	US	CrossSec FE	2	1	14.40%
PS3	Carruthers & Ulfarsson	2003	a	6	Red. spending roadways	PD	US	CrossSec FE	2	1	28.80%
PS4	Carruthers & Ulfarsson	2003	a	6	Red. spending transport	PD	US	CrossSec FE	2	-1	-48.00%
PS5	Carruthers & Ulfarsson	2003	a	6	Red. spending sewerage	PD	US	CrossSec FE	2	0	-14.40%
PS6	Carruthers & Ulfarsson	2003	a	6	Red. spending trash	PD	US	CrossSec FE	2	0	9.60%
PS7	Carruthers & Ulfarsson	2003	a	6	Red. spending police	PD	US	CrossSec FE	2	1	9.60%
PS8	Carruthers & Ulfarsson	2003	a	6	Red. spending education	PD	US	CrossSec FE	2	1	19.20%
PS9	Carruthers & Ulfarsson	2003	b	6	Red. total spending	GAR	US	CrossSec FE	2	1	1.95%
PS10	Ladd	1994	a	6	Change per capita spending	PD	US	CrossSec FE	2	-1	-3.02%
PS11	Speir & Stephenson	2002	b	6	Red. water & sewer costs	BD	US	DESC	0	1	.
PS12	Ahlfeldt et al.	2016	a	6	Broadband cost	PD	UK	panel RDD	4	1	.
PS13	Kolko	2012	a	6	Broadband availab.	PD	US	panel IV	4	1	.
PS14	Prieto et al.	2015	a	6	Water supply cost per capita	PD	Spain	LOGIT	2	1	39.70%
PS15	Prieto et al.	2015	a	6	Sewage cost per capita	PD	Spain	LOGIT	2	1	50.70%
PS16	Prieto et al.	2015	a	6	Paving cost per capita	PD	Spain	LOGIT	2	1	81.20%
SE1	Ananat et al.	2013	a	7	Red. in black-white wage gap	ED	US	OLS FE	2	-1	-0.33%
SE2	Bond Huie & Frisbie	2000	a	7	Ratio black/white residents	PD	US	OLS	2	-1	.
SE3	Galster & Cutsinger	2007	a	7	Dissimilarity index	PD	US	OLS CONTR	2	1	256.75%
SE4	Maloutas	2004	a	7	Migrant numbers	PD	Greece	DESC	0	1	.
SE5	Pendall & Carruthers	2003	a	7	Dissimilarity index	PD	US	CrossSec FE	2	-1	.
SE6	Rothwell	2011	a	7	Dissimilarity index	PD	US	CrossSec IV	4	1	39.20%
SE7	Rothwell & Massey	2010	a	7	Red. Gini coefficient	PD	US	CrossSec IV	4	1	456.35%
SE8	Rothwell & Massey	2009	a	7	Dissimilarity index	PD	US	CrossSec IV	4	1	32.61%
SE9	Wheeler	2004	a	7	Red. 90th vs. 10th decile	PD	US	GLS IV	4	1	17.00%
SE10	Fogarty & Garofalo	1980	a	7	Income equality	PD	US	OLS CONTR	2	1	.

ID	Author	Year	Cause	Cat.	Outcome	Density	Country	Model	SMS	Qual.	Elasticity
SF1	Ardian et al.	2014	a	8	Crime rate	PD	Iran	CORR	0	1	.
SF2	Browning et al.	2010	a	8	Red. homicide	ED	US	OLS	3	1	.
SF3	Browning et al.	2010	a	8	Assault rates	ED	US	OLS	3	1	.
SF4	Browning et al.	2010	a	8	Robbery rates	ED	US	OLS	3	-1	.
SF5	Chang	2011	b	8	Burglary rate	INT	South Korea	CORR	1	1	.
SF6	Mladenka & Hill	1976	a	8	Crime rate	PD	US	OLS	1	-1	.
SF7	Nakaya & Yano	2010	a	8	Assault rates	PD	Japan	DESC	0	-1	.
SF8	Newman & Franck	1982	b	8	Crime rate	BH	US	CORR	1	1	.
SF9	Raleigh & Galster	2015	a	8	Red. assault	PD	US	OLS CONTR	2	1	35.62%
SF10	Raleigh & Galster	2015	a	8	Red. robbery	PD	US	OLS CONTR	2	1	82.88%
SF11	Raleigh & Galster	2015	a	8	Red. violence	PD	US	OLS CONTR	2	1	52.34%
SF12	Raleigh & Galster	2015	a	8	Red. burglary	PD	US	OLS CONTR	2	1	34.17%
SF13	Raleigh & Galster	2015	a	8	Red. vandalism	PD	US	OLS CONTR	2	1	35.62%
SF14	Raleigh & Galster	2015	a	8	Red. narcotics	PD	US	OLS CONTR	2	1	81.42%
SF15	Raleigh & Galster	2015	a	8	Vehicle theft	PD	US	OLS CONTR	2	1	27.63%
SF16	Raleigh & Galster	2015	a	8	Property theft	PD	US	OLS CONTR	2	1	45.80%
SF17	Raleigh & Galster	2015	b	8	Crime rate	VC	US	OLS CONTR	2	-1	.
SF18	Sampson	1983	b	8	Robbery	BD	US	CORR	1	-1	.
SF19	Tang	2015	a	8	Red. assault	PD	UK	panel	3	1	8.45%
SF20	Tang	2015	a	8	Property theft	PD	UK	panel	3	1	9.02%
SF21	Twinam	2016	a	8	Red. robbery	PD	US	panel IV	4	1	46.79%
SF22	Twinam	2016	a	8	Red. assault	PD	US	panel IV	4	1	53.14%
OG1	Blair	1996	b	9	Bird biodiversity	ULU	US	DESC (CCA)	0	1	.
OG2	Lewis et al.	2009	b	9	Open space conservation	HD	US	PROBIT	2	-1	.
OG3	Lin et al.	2015	b	9	Foliage Projection Cover	HD	Australia	OLS	1	-1	-6.00%
OG4	Tratalos et al.	2007	a	9	Cover of green space	HD	UK	OLS CONTR	1	-1	.
OG5	Tratalos et al.	2007	b	9	Cover of green space	BD	UK	OLS CONTR	1	-1	.
OG6	Aquino & Gainza	2014	a	9	Cover of green space	BD	Chile	OLS CONTR	2	-1	.
OG7	Wong & Chen	2010	b	9	Cover of green space	BD	Singapore	DESC	0	-1	.
PO1	Eeftens et al.	2013	b	10	Air pollution level	FAR	Netherlands	OLS	1	-1	.

ID	Author	Year	Cause	Cat.	Outcome	Density	Country	Model	SMS	Qual.	Elasticity
PO2	Tang & Wang	2007	b	10	Red. CO2 concentration	HD	China	CORR	1	-1	-23.00%
PO3	Hatt et al.	2004	b	10	TSS concentrations	SDI	Australia	CORR	1	-1	.
PO4	Salomons & Berghauser Pont	2012	a	10	Red. Noise	PD	Netherlands	CORR	1	1	4.00%
PO5	Albouy & Stuart	2014	a	10	Red. Pollution (particulates)	PD	US	NLLS CONTR	2	-1	-15.00%
PO6	Sarzynski	2012	a	10	Red. Nox m. metric tons	PD	World	CrossSec	2	1	43.80%
PO7	Sarzynski	2012	a	10	Red. VOCs m. metric tons	PD	World	CrossSec	2	1	33.00%
PO8	Sarzynski	2012	a	10	Red. CO m. metric tons	PD	World	CrossSec	2	1	22.80%
PO9	Sarzynski	2012	a	10	Red. SO2 m. metric tons	PD	World	CrossSec	2	1	37.60%
PO10	Hilber & Palmer	2014	a	10	Red. NOx µg/m3	PD	OECD	panel FE	3	1	23.82%
PO11	Hilber & Palmer	2014	a	10	Red. SOx µg/m3	PD	OECD	panel FE	3	1	200.80%
PO12	Hilber & Palmer	2014	a	10	Red. PM10 µg/m3	PD	OECD	panel FE	3	-1	-47.40%
PO13	Hilber & Palmer	2014	a	10	Red. NOx µg/m3	PD	non-OECD	panel FE	3	-1	-78.16%
PO14	Hilber & Palmer	2014	a	10	Red. SOx µg/m3	PD	non-OECD	panel FE	3	-1	-183.67%
PO15	Hilber & Palmer	2014	a	10	Red. PM10 µg/m3	PD	non-OECD	panel FE	3	1	34.82%
EN1	Norman et al.	2006	b	11	Red. CO2 emissions	HD	Canada	CORR	1	1	8.90%
EN2	Hong & Shen	2013	a	11	Red. CO2 transport	PD	US	OLS IV	4	1	31.00%
EN3	Barter	2000	a	11	Red. Emission/capita	PD	Eastern Asia	DESC	0	1	29.40%
EN4	Aguiléra & Voisin	2014	c	11	CO2 emissions commutes	MX	France	COR	1	1	.
EN5	Aguilera & Voisin	2014	a	11	Total CO2 emissions	ED	France	COR	1	1	.
EN6	Veneri	2010	a	11	Env. impact of mobility index	PD	Italy	OLS, ML	2	1	.
EN7	Su	2011	b	11	Gasoline consumption	FSDI	US	OLS CONTR	2	-1	-9.20%
EN8	Su	2011	a	11	Gasoline consumption	PD	US	OLS CONTR	2	1	6.80%
EN9	Travisi et al.	2010	b	11	Env. impact reduction	PD	Italy	pooled WLS	3	1	0.92%
EN10	Mindali et al.	2004	a	11	Energy consumption	ED	US	CORR	0	0	0.00%
EN11	Mindali et al.	2004	a	11	Energy consumption	ED	Europe	CORR	0	1	0.00%
EN12	Cirilli & Veneri	2014	a	11	CO2 emissions commutes	PD	Italy	OLS IV	4	1	23.46%
EN13	Breheny	1995	a	11	CO2 emissions commutes	PD	UK	DESC	0	-1	.
EN14	Holden & Norland	2005	a	11	Red. domestic energy	HD	Norway	OLS	2	1	11.00%
EN15	Howard et al.	2012	a	11	Building energy consumption	PD	US	DESC	1	0	.
EN16	Larson & Yezer	2015	b	11	Urban Energy Footprint	BD	US	N/A	2	-1	.

ID	Author	Year	Cause	Cat.	Outcome	Density	Country	Model	SMS	Qual.	Elasticity
EN17	Osman et al.	2016	a	11	Red. gasoline consumption	PD	Egypt	OLS	1	1	3.54%
EN18	Ratti et al.	2005	b	11	Building energy consumption	BH	Europe	LT model	1	0	.
EN19	Cho & Choi	2014	a	11	NO2 averages	PD	South Korea	panel FE	3	-1	.
EN20	Raupach et al.	2010	a	11	Total CO2 emissions	PD	World	CORR	1	-1	.
EN21	Muñiz & Galindo	2005	a	11	Red. ecological footprint	PD	Spain	OLS	2	1	36.48%
EN22	Brownstone & Thomas	2013	a	11	Red. gasoline consumption	HD	US	OLS	2	1	14.40%
EN23	Larson et al.	2012	b	11	Red. residential energy	FACAP	US	OLS	2	1	3.38%
EN24	Larson et al.	2012	b	11	Red. residential energy	FACAP	US	OLS	2	1	4.67%
EN25	Glaeser & Kahn	2010	a	11	Red. gasoline consumption	PD	US	CORR	1	1	3.20%
EN26	Glaeser & Kahn	2010	a	11	Red. gasoline consumption	PD	US	CORR	1	1	9.74%
EN27	Glaeser & Kahn	2010	a	11	CO2 private driving	PD	US	CORR	1	1	8.21%
EN28	Glaeser & Kahn	2010	a	11	CO2 public transport	PD	US	CORR	1	-1	-36.85%
EN29	Glaeser & Kahn	2010	a	11	CO2 heating	PD	US	CORR	1	-1	-3.39%
EN30	Glaeser & Kahn	2010	a	11	CO2 electricity	PD	US	CORR	1	1	6.82%
EN31	Glaeser & Kahn	2010	a	11	CO2 Total	PD	US	CORR	1	1	5.27%
EN32	Resch et al.	2016	b	11	Energy/capita	FACAP	World	VBSA	1	1	.
EN33	Newman & Kenworthy	1989	a	12	Gasoline consumption	PD	World	LOGIT	1	1	.
C1	Barter	2000	b	12	Road length/capita	ASDI	US	DESC	0	-1	.
C2	Graham et al.	2014	b	12	Traffic volume	SC	US	panel PSM	3	0	.
C3	Maitra et al.	1999	a	12	Congestion level	RDC	India	CORR	2	-1	.
C4	McDonald	2009	c	12	Traffic volume index	PD	US	MC	1	1	.
C5	Duranton & Turner	2015	a	12	Travel speed	PD	US	panel IV	4	-1	-11.00%
C6	Couture	2016	a	12	Travel speed	PD	US	OLS IV	4	-1	-13.00%
MC1	Zahabi et al.	2016	a	13	Cycling choice	PD	Canada	Panel LOGIT	3	1	.
MC2	Zahabi et al.	2016	b	13	Cycling choice	SC	Canada	Panel LOGIT	3	1	.
MC3	Brown et al.	2014	b	13	Walking choice	UB	US	LOGIT	2	1	.
MC4	Cervero & Duncan	2003	a	13	Walking choice	ED	US	LOGIT	2	1	.
MC5	Cervero & Duncan	2003	a	13	Car share	ED	US	LOGIT	2	-1	.
MC6	Cervero et al.	2006	b	13	Walking choice	SDI	Colombia	LOGIT	2	1	.
MC7	Cervero et al.	2006	b	13	Cycling choice	SDI	Colombia	LOGIT	2	1	.

ID	Author	Year	Cause	Cat.	Outcome	Density	Country	Model	SMS	Qual.	Elasticity
MC8	Chatman	2003	c	13	Driving choice	ED	US	LOGIT TOBIT	2	1	43.73%
MC9	de Sa & Ardern	2014	a	13	Walking/cycling choice	PD	Canada	LOGIT	2	1	10.93%
MC10	Frank et al.	2008	a	13	Transit choice (work trip)	PD	US	LOGIT	2	1	26.00%
MC11	Frank et al.	2008	a	13	Cycle choice (work trip)	PD	US	LOGIT	2	1	84.00%
MC12	Frank et al.	2008	a	13	Walk choice (work trip)	PD	US	LOGIT	2	1	43.00%
MC13	Frank et al.	2008	a	13	Transit choice (non-work trip)	PD	US	LOGIT	2	1	24.00%
MC14	Frank et al.	2008	a	13	Cycle choice (non-work trip)	PD	US	LOGIT	2	-1	-8.00%
MC15	Frank et al.	2008	b	13	Walk choice (non-work trip)	PD	US	LOGIT	2	1	28.00%
MC16	Giles-Corti et al.	2011	b	13	Walking choice	SC	Australia	LOGIT	2	1	.
MC17	Kaplan et al.	2016	b	13	Walking/cycling choice	SC	Denmark	Heckman	4	1	.
MC18	Krizek & Johnson	2006	c	13	Walking choice	MX	US	LOGIT	1	1	.
MC19	Larsen et al.	2009	a	13	Walking choice	PD	US	LOGIT	2	-1	.
MC20	McMillan	2007	b	13	Walking/cycling choice	SDI	US	LOGIT	2	0	.
MC21	McMillan	2007	c	13	Walking/cycling choice	MX	US	LOGIT	2	1	.
MC22	Nielsen et al.	2013	a	13	Cycle distance	PD	Denmark	Heckman	4	-1	-8.70%
MC23	Nielsen et al.	2013	c	13	Cycle distance	MX	Denmark	Heckman	4	-1	.
MC24	Saelens et al.	2003	a	13	Walking/cycling choice	ED	US	DESC	0	1	.
MC25	Saelens et al.	2003	c	13	Walking/cycling choice	MX	US	DESC	0	1	.
MC26	Vance & Hedel	2007	a	13	Kilometres driven	ED	Germany	PROBIT IV	4	1	.
MC27	Vance & Hedel	2007	c	13	Kilometres driven	SDI	Germany	PROBIT IV	4	0	.
MC28	Zhao	2014	a	13	Walking choice	PD	China	LOGIT	2	0	0.13%
MC29	Zhao	2014	a	13	Cycling choice	PD	China	LOGIT	2	0	0.34%
MC30	Zhao	2014	a	13	Walking choice	ED	China	LOGIT	2	0	4.18%
MC31	Zhao	2014	a	13	Cycling choice	ED	China	LOGIT	2	0	12.65%
MC32	Zhao	2014	b	13	Cycling choice	SDI	China	LOGIT	2	1	.
MC33	Zhao	2014	b	13	Cycling choice	SDI	China	LOGIT	2	1	.
MC34	Aguiléra & Voisin	2014	a	13	Walking choice	ED	France	COR	0	1	.
MC35	Aguilera & Voisin	2014	a	13	Public transport choice	ED	France	COR	0	1	.
MC36	Aguilera & Voisin	2014	a	13	Driving choice	ED	France	COR	0	1	.
MC37	Cervero	1996	a	13	Public transport choice	PD	US	PROBIT	2	1	.

ID	Author	Year	Cause	Cat.	Outcome	Density	Country	Model	SMS	Qual.	Elasticity
MC38	Cervero	1996	a	13	Walking/cycling choice	PD	US	PROBIT	2	1	.
MC39	Pouyanne	2004	a	13	Car share rate	PD	France	OLS, LOGIT	2	-1	-2.10%
MC40	Pouyanne	2004	a	13	Public transport choice	PD	France	OLS, LOGIT	2	1	42.03%
MC41	Pouyanne	2004	a	13	Walking choice	PD	France	OLS, LOGIT	2	1	43.90%
MC42	Pouyanne	2004	a	13	Cycling choice	PD	France	OLS, LOGIT	2	1	201.43%
MC43	Chao & Qing	2011	a	13	Walking choice	PD	US	OLS CONTR	2	1	15.73%
MC44	Bento et al.	2005	a	13	Driving choice	PD	US	LOGIT	2	1	.
MC45	Bento et al.	2005	a	13	Public transport choice	PD	US	LOGIT	2	1	.
MC46	Zhang	2004	a	13	Transit choice (work trip)	PD	US	LOGIT	2	1	11.80%
MC47	Zhang	2004	a	13	Walk choice (work trip)	PD	US	LOGIT	2	1	10.50%
MC48	Zhang	2004	a	13	Driving choice (work trip)	PD	US	LOGIT	2	1	4.40%
MC49	Zhang	2004	a	13	Car share (work trip)	PD	US	LOGIT	2	1	7.10%
MC50	Zhang	2004	a	13	Public transport choice	PD	US	LOGIT	2	1	12.60%
MC51	Zhang	2004	a	13	Driving choice	PD	US	LOGIT	2	1	4.00%
MC52	Zhang	2004	a	13	Walking/cycling choice	PD	US	LOGIT	2	1	6.00%
MC53	Zhang	2004	a	13	Car share red.	PD	US	LOGIT	2	1	3.30%
MC54	Zhang	2004	a	13	Transit choice (work trip)	ED	US	LOGIT	2	1	9.00%
MC55	Zhang	2004	a	13	Driving choice (work trip)	ED	US	LOGIT	2	1	3.10%
MC56	Zhang	2004	a	13	Walking/cycling (work trip)	ED	US	LOGIT	2	1	2.60%
MC57	Zhang	2004	a	13	Car share red. (work trip)	ED	US	LOGIT	2	1	4.40%
MC58	Zhang	2004	a	13	Public transport choice	ED	US	LOGIT	2	1	0.40%
MC59	Zhang	2004	a	13	Driving choice	ED	US	LOGIT	2	1	0.10%
MC60	Zhang	2004	a	13	Walking/cycling choice	ED	US	LOGIT	2	1	0.40%
MC61	Zhang	2004	a	13	Car share red.	ED	US	LOGIT	2	1	0.30%
MC62	Zhang	2004	a	13	Transit choice (work trip)	PD	Hong Kong	LOGIT	2	1	0.50%
MC63	Zhang	2004	a	13	Driving choice (work trip)	PD	Hong Kong	LOGIT	2	1	3.90%
MC64	Zhang	2004	a	13	Taxi red.	PD	Hong Kong	LOGIT	2	1	2.60%
MC65	Zhang	2004	a	13	Public transport choice	PD	Hong Kong	LOGIT	2	1	1.40%
MC66	Zhang	2004	a	13	Driving choice red.	PD	Hong Kong	LOGIT	2	1	11.00%
MC67	Zhang	2004	a	13	Taxi red.	PD	Hong Kong	LOGIT	2	1	12.80%

ID	Author	Year	Cause	Cat.	Outcome	Density	Country	Model	SMS	Qual.	Elasticity
MC68	Zhang	2004	a	13	Transit choice (work trip)	ED	Hong Kong	LOGIT	2	1	1.10%
MC69	Zhang	2004	a	13	Driving choice (work trip)	ED	Hong Kong	LOGIT	2	1	7.70%
MC70	Zhang	2004	a	13	Taxi red.	ED	Hong Kong	LOGIT	2	1	11.80%
MC71	Zhang	2004	a	13	Public transport choice	ED	Hong Kong	LOGIT	2	1	0.60%
MC72	Zhang	2004	a	13	Driving choice	ED	Hong Kong	LOGIT	2	1	7.00%
MC73	Zhang	2004	a	13	Taxi red.	ED	Hong Kong	LOGIT	2	1	2.40%
MC74	Cervero & Kockelman	1997	a	13	Non-personal vehicle	ED	US	LOGIT	2	1	9.80%
MC75	Cervero & Kockelman	1997	a	13	Non-pers. vehicle (non work)	ED	US	LOGIT	2	1	8.40%
MC76	Cervero & Kockelman	1997	a	13	Non-pers. vehicle (work trip)	ED	US	LOGIT	2	1	11.30%
H1	Chaix et al.	2006	a	14	IHD risk red.	PD	Sweden	Panel LOGIT	3	-1	-29.86%
H2	Chaix et al.	2006	a	14	Lung cancer risk red.	PD	Sweden	Panel LOGIT	3	-1	-19.49%
H3	Chaix et al.	2006	a	14	Pulmonary disease red.	PD	Sweden	Panel LOGIT	3	-1	-57.79%
H4	Fecht et al.	2016	a	14	Premature mortalities	PD	UK	CrossSec	2	-1	-29.00%
H5	Fecht et al.	2016	b	14	Premature mortalities	SDI	UK	CrossSec	2	-1	-50.00%
H6	Maantay & Maroko	2015	b	14	Mental health disorder	VC	UK	OLS, SAR, GWR	2	1	.
H7	Melis et al.	2015	a	14	Red. metal health prescriptions	PD	Italy	OLS, panel	2	0	1.27%
H8	Graham & Glaister	2003	a	14	Pedestrian casualty red.	PD	UK	LOGLIN	2	1	52.90%
H9	Graham & Glaister	2003	a	14	Pedestrian casualty red.	ED	UK	LOGLIN	2	-1	-82.60%
H10	Graham & Glaister	2003	a	14	KSI reduction	PD	UK	LOGLIN	2	1	39.90%
H11	Graham & Glaister	2003	a	14	KSI reduction	ED	UK	LOGLIN	2	-1	-5.10%
H12	Graham & Glaister	2003	a	14	Pedestrian casualty red.	SDI	UK	LOGLIN	2	-1	.
H13	Guite et al.	2006	b	14	Mental health score	PD	UK	LOGIT	2	-1	.
H14	Howe et al.	1993	a	14	Red. all cancer rate	PD	US	COR	1	-1	-5.50%
H15	Mahoney et al.	1990	a	14	Mortality red. (all cancers)	PD	US	LOGIT	2	-1	-3.80%
H16	Reijneveld et al.	1999	a	14	Mortality red.	PD	Netherlands	LOGLIN	2	-1	-9.06%
WB1	Tu & Lin	2008	a	15	Environmental quality	PD	Taiwan	LOGIT	1	1	.
WB2	Brueckner & Largey	2006	a	15	Social contacts	PD	US	PROBIT IV	4	-1	-1.59%
WB3	Brueckner & Largey	2006	a	15	Visit neighbour/week	PD	US	PROBIT IV	4	-1	-4.46%
WB4	Brueckner & Largey	2006	a	15	# people can confide in	PD	US	PROBIT IV	4	-1	-0.56%

ID	Author	Year	Cause	Cat.	Outcome	Density	Country	Model	SMS	Qual.	Elasticity
WB5	Brueckner & Largey	2006	a	15	# close friends	PD	US	PROBIT IV	4	-1	-0.81%
WB6	Brueckner & Largey	2006	a	15	# times attends club meeting	PD	US	PROBIT IV	4	-1	-7.96%
WB7	Harvey et al.	2015	b	15	Perceived safety	FAR	US	OLS, LOGIT	2	1	6.90%
WB8	Fassio et al.	2013	a	15	Self-rep. social satisfaction	PD	Italy	COR	1	-1	-42.32%
WB9	Fassio et al.	2013	a	15	Self-rep. env. health	PD	Italy	COR	1	-1	-33.84%
WB10	Fassio et al.	2013	a	15	Self-rep. physical health	PD	Italy	COR	1	-1	-13.80%
WB11	Fassio et al.	2013	a	15	Self-rep. psychological status	PD	Italy	COR	1	-1	-31.89%
WB12	Walton et al.	2008	a	15	Relaxing life	PD	New Zealand	COR	1	0	.
WB13	Brown et al.	2015	a	15	Life satisfaction	PD	OECD	PROBIT	2	-1	.
WB14	Brereton et al.	2008	a	15	Sel-rep. well-being	PD	Ireland	OLS	2	1	.
WB15	Glaeser et al.	2016	a	15	Sel-rep. well-being	PD	US	panel	3	-1	-0.37%
WB16	Newman & Franck	1982	b	15	Fear of crime	BH	US	CORR	1	-1	.

Legend

Cause		Density		Maryland Scientific Method Scale (WWC)		Qual. Result Classification	
a	Residential and employment density	PD	Population density	0	Descriptive data	1	Positive
b	Morphological density	PS	Population size	1	Correlations, cross-sectional no control variables	0	Insignificant
c	Mixed Use	ED	Employment or other economic density	2	Cross-sectional, adequate control variables	-	
Category		SPP	Spillover potential	3	Panel data methods	1	Negative
	1	Productivity	FACAP	4	Instrumental variables, RDD		
	2	Innovation	INT	5	Randomised control trials		
	3	Value of space	SC		Street connectivity/configuration		
	4	Job accessibility	BH		Building height		
	5	Services access	BD		Building density		
	6	Efficiency of public services delivery	SDI		Street density/intersection		
	7	Social equity	GAR		Geographic area reduction		
	8	Safety	FAR		Floor area ration and related measures		
	9	Open space preservation and biodiversity	VC		Vacant land		
	10	Pollution reduction	ULU		Urban land use		
	11	Energy efficiency	UB		Urban boundary		
	12	Traffic flow	RDC		Road capacity		
	13	Sustainable mode choice	FSDI		Freeway density		
	14	Health	ASDI		Arterial street density		
	15	Wellbeing	HD		Development density		
		MX	Mixed Use				

Full Bibliography

- Abel, J.R., Dey, I. & Gabe, T.M., 2012. Productivity and the density of Human Capital. *Journal of Regional Science*, 52(4), pp.562–586.
- Aguiléra, A. & Voisin, M., 2014. Urban form, commuting patterns and CO2 emissions: What differences between the municipality's residents and its jobs? *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice*, 69, pp.243–251.
- Ahlfeldt, G.M., Redding, S.J., et al., 2015. The Economics of Density : Evidence from the Berlin Wall. *Econometrica*, 83(6), pp.2127–2189.
- Ahlfeldt, G.M. & Feddersen, A., 2015. *From Periphery to Core : Measuring Agglomeration Effects Using High-Speed Rail*.
- Ahlfeldt, G.M., Koutroumpis, P. & Valletti, T., 2016. Speed 2.0. *Working Paper*, (January).
- Ahlfeldt, G.M. & Mcmillen, D.P., 2015. *The Vertical City : The Price of Land and the Height of Buildings in Chicago 1870-2010*.
- Ahlfeldt, G.M., Moeller, K. & Wendland, N., 2015. Chicken or egg? The PVAR econometrics of transportation. *Journal of Economic Geography*, 15(6), pp.1169–1193.
- Ahlfeldt, G.M. & Wendland, N., 2013. How polycentric is a monocentric city ? Centers, spillovers and hysteresis. *Journal of Economic Geography*, 13(September 2012), pp.53–83.
- Albouy, D., 2008. Are Big Cities Bad Places to Live? Estimating Quality of Life across Metropolitan Areas. *National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper Series*, No. 14472.
- Albouy, D. & Lue, B., 2015. Driving to opportunity: Local rents, wages, commuting, and sub-metropolitan quality of life. *Journal of Urban Economics*, 89, pp.74–92.
- Albouy, D. & Stuart, B., 2014. Urban Population and Amenities. *National Bureau of Economic Research, Inc, NBER Working Papers: 19919*.
- Alperovich, G., 1980. Neighbourhood amenities and their impact on density gradients. *Annals of Regional Science*, 14(2).
- Amato, P.W., 1970. A Comparison: Population Densities, Land Values and Socioeconomic Class in Four Latin American Cities. *Land Economics*, 46(4), pp.447–455.
- Amato, P.W., 1969. Population Densities, Land Values, and Socioeconomic Class in Bogota, Colombia. *Land Economics*, 45(1), pp.66–73.
- Ananat, E., Fu, S. & Ross, S.L., 2013. Race-Specific Agglomeration Economies: Social Distance and the Black-White Wage Gap. *NBER Working Paper 18933 (National Bureau of Economic Research)*, pp.13–24.
- Andersson, M., Klaesson, J. & Larsson, J.P., 2016. How Local are Spatial Density Externalities ? Neighbourhood Effects in Agglomeration Economies. *Regional Studies*, 50(6), pp.1082–1095.
- Andersson, M., Klaesson, J. & Larsson, J.P., 2014. The sources of the urban wage premium by worker skills : Spatial sorting or agglomeration economies ? *Papers in Regional Science*, 93(4), pp.727–747.
- Antonelli, C., 1987. The Determinants of the Distribution of Innovative Activity in a Metropolitan Area: The Case of Turin. *Regional Studies*, 21(2), pp.85–93.
- Aquino, F.L. & Gainza, X., 2014. Understanding density in an uneven city, Santiago de Chile: Implications for social and environmental sustainability. *Sustainability*, 6(9), pp.5876–5897.
- Ardian, N. et al., 2014. The Spatial Analysis of Hot Spots in Urban Areas of Iran. The Case Study: Yazd. *REVISTA DE CERCETARE SI INTERVENTIE SOCIALE*, 44, pp.103–116.
- Aurand, A., 2010. Density, Housing Types and Mixed Land Use : Smart Tools for Affordable Housing ? *Urban Studies*, 47(October 2008), pp.1015–1036.
- Baldwin, J.R., Brown, W.M. & Rigby, D.L., 2010. Agglomeration economies: Microdata panel estimates from Canadian manufacturing. *Journal of Regional Science*, 50(5), pp.915–934.
- Barde, S., 2010. Increasing Returns and the Spatial Structure of French Wages. *Spatial Economic Analysis*, 5(1), p.73.
- Barter, P.A., 2000. Transport Dilemmas in Dense Urban Areas: Examples from Eastern Asia. In *Compact Cities: Sustainable Urban Forms for Developing Countries*. London & New York: SPON Press.
- Barufi, A.M.B., Haddad, E.A. & Nijkamp, P., 2016. Industrial scope of agglomeration economies in Brazil. *Annals of Regional Science*, 56(3), pp.707–755.
- Bento, A. et al., 2005. The Effects of Urban Spatial Structure on Travel Demand in the United States. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 87(3), pp.466–478.
- Bertaud, A. & Brueckner, J.K., 2005. Analyzing building-height restrictions: predicted impacts and welfare costs.

- Regional Science and Urban Economics*, 35, pp.109–125.
- Blair, R.B., 1996. Land use and avian species diversity along an urban gradient. *Ecological Applications*, 6(2), pp.506–519.
- Bond Huie, S.A. & Frisbie, P.W., 2000. Southern Demographic Association The Components of Density and the Dimensions of Residential Segregation. *Population Research and Policy Review*, 19, pp.505–524.
- Boussauw, K., Neutens, T. & Witlox, F., 2012. Relationship between Spatial Proximity and Travel-to-Work Distance: The Effect of the Compact City. *Regional Studies*, 46(6), pp.687–706.
- Breheny, M., 1995. The compact city and transport energy consumption. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 20(1), pp.81–101.
- Brereton, F., Clinch, J.P. & Ferreira, S., 2008. Happiness, geography and the environment. *Ecological Economics*, 65(2), pp.386–396.
- Brown, S.C. et al., 2014. Walking and proximity to the urban growth boundary and central business district. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 47(4), pp.481–486.
- Brown, Z.S., Oueslati, W. & Silva, J., 2015. Exploring the Effect of Urban Structure on Individual Well-Being. *OECD Environment working papers*, (95), p.35.
- Browning, C.R. et al., 2010. Commercial Density, Residential Concentration, and Crime: Land Use Patterns and Violence in Neighborhood Context. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 47(3), pp.329–357.
- Brownstone, D. & Thomas, F.G., 2013. The impact of residential density on vehicle usage and fuel consumption: Evidence from national samples. *Energy Economics*, 40(1), pp.196–206.
- Brueckner, J.K. et al., 2016. *Measuring the Stringency of Land-Use Regulation : The Case of China's Building-Height Limits*.
- Brueckner, J.K. & Largey, A.G., 2006. Social interaction and urban sprawl. *CESifo WP*, 1843(1), pp.18–34.
- Carlino, G.A., Chatterjee, S. & Hunt, R.M., 2007. Urban density and the rate of invention. *Journal of Urban Economics*, 61(3), pp.389–419.
- Carruthers, J.I. & Ulfarsson, G.F., 2003. Urban sprawl and the cost of public services. *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design*, 30(4), pp.503–522.
- Cervero, R. et al., 2006. *Influences of Built Environments on Walking and Cycling: Lessons from Bogotá*.
- Cervero, R., 1996. Mixed land-uses and commuting: Evidence from the American housing survey. *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice*, 30(5 PART A), pp.361–377.
- Cervero, R. & Duncan, M., 2003. *Walking, Bicycling, and Urban Landscapes: Evidence from the San Francisco Bay Area*.
- Cervero, R. & Kockelman, K., 1997. Travel demand and the 3Ds: Density, diversity, and design. *Transportation Research Part D: Transport and Environment*, 2(3), pp.199–219.
- Chaix, B. et al., 2006. Disentangling contextual effects on cause-specific mortality in a longitudinal 23-year follow-up study: Impact of population density or socioeconomic environment? *International Journal of Epidemiology*, 35(3), pp.633–643.
- Chang, D., 2011. Social Crime or Spatial Crime? Exploring the Effects of Social, Economical, and Spatial Factors on Burglary Rates. *Environment and Behavior*, 43(1), pp.26–52.
- Chao, L. & Qing, S., 2011. An empirical analysis of the influence of urban form on household travel and energy consumption. *Computers, Environment and Urban Systems*, 35(5), pp.347–357.
- Chatman, D., 2003. How Density and Mixed Uses at the Workplace Affect Personal Commercial Travel and Commute Mode Choice. *Transportation Research Record*, 1831(3), pp.193–201.
- Chauvin, J.P. et al., 2016. What is different about urbanization in rich and poor countries? Cities in Brazil, China, India and the United States. *Journal of Urban Economics*, pp.1–33.
- Cheshire, P. & Magrini, S., 2009. Urban growth drivers in a Europe of sticky people and implicit boundaries. *Journal of Economic Geography*, 9(1), pp.85–115.
- Cho, H.-S. & Choi, M., 2014. Effects of Compact Urban Development on Air Pollution: Empirical Evidence from Korea. *Sustainability*, 6(9), pp.5968–5982.
- Ciccone, A., 2002. Agglomeration effects in Europe. *European Economic Review*, 46(2), pp.213–227.
- Ciccone, A. & Hall, R.E., 1996. Productivity and the Density of Economic Activity Productivity and the Density of Economic Activity. *The American Economic Review*, 86(1), pp.54–70.
- Cirilli, A. & Veneri, P., 2014. Spatial Structure and Carbon Dioxide (CO₂) Emissions Due to Commuting: An Analysis of Italian Urban Areas. *Regional Studies*, 48(12), pp.1993–2005.
- Combes, P.-P. et al., 2012. The Productivity Advantages of Large Cities: Distinguishing Agglomeration From Firm Selection. *Econometrica*, 80(6), pp.2543–2594.
- Combes, P.-P., Duranton, G. & Gobillon, L., 2008. Spatial wage disparities: Sorting matters! *Journal of Urban Economics*, 63(2), pp.723–742.
- Combes, P., Duranton, G. & Gobillon, L., 2013. The Costs of Agglomeration : Land Prices in French Cities.

- Working Paper*, (7027), p.28.
- Couture, V., 2016. Valuing the Consumption Benefits of Urban Density. *Working Paper: Univeristy of California, Berkeley*, (September).
- Dekle, R. & Eaton, J., 1999. Agglomeration and Land Rents: Evidence from the Prefectures. *Journal of Urban Economics*, 46(2), pp.200–214.
- Ding, C., 2013. Building height restrictions, land development and economic costs. *Land Use Policy*, 30(1), pp.485–495.
- Drennan, M.P. & Kelly, H.F., 2011. Measuring urban agglomeration economies with office rents. *Journal of Economic Geography*, 11(3), pp.481–507.
- Duranton, G. & Turner, M.A., 2015. Urban form and driving: Evidence from US cities. *Working Paper*.
- Echeverri-Carroll, E.L. & Ayala, S.G., 2011. Urban Wages : Does City Size Matter ? *Urban Studies*, 48(2), pp.253–271.
- Eeftens, M. et al., 2013. Quantifying urban street configuration for improvements in air pollution models. *Atmospheric Environment*, 72, pp.1–9.
- Faberman, R.J. & Freedman, M., 2016. The urban density premium across establishments. *Journal of Urban Economics*, 93, pp.71–84.
- Fassio, O., Rollero, C. & De Piccoli, N., 2013. Health, Quality of Life and Population Density: A Preliminary Study on 'Contextualized' Quality of Life. *Social Indicators Research*, 110(2), pp.479–488.
- Fecht, D. et al., 2016. Associations between urban metrics and mortality rates in England. *Environmental health : a global access science source*, 15 Suppl 1(Suppl 1), p.34.
- Fitriani, R., 2015. Spatial Extent of Land Use Externalities in the Jakarta Fringe: Spatial Econometric Analysis. *Review of Urban and Regional Development studies*, 27(3).
- Fogarty, M. & Garofalo, G., 1980. Urban size and the amenity structure of cities. *Journal of Urban Economics*, 361, pp.350–361.
- Frank, L. et al., 2008. Urban form, travel time, and cost relationships with tour complexity and mode choice. *Transportation*, 35(1), pp.37–54.
- Fu, S., 2007. Smart Café Cities: Testing human capital externalities in the Boston metropolitan area. *Journal of Urban Economics*, 61(1), pp.86–111.
- Galster, G. & Cutsinger, J., 2007. Racial Settlement and Metropolitan Land-Use Patterns: Does Sprawl Abet Black-White segregation? *Urban Geography*, 28(6), pp.516–553.
- Garate, S. & Pennington-Cross, A., 2013. Measuring the Impact of Agglomeration on Productivity: Evidence from Chilean Retailers. *Urban Studies*, 51(June 2014), pp.1–19.
- Giles-Corti, B. et al., 2011. School site and the potential to walk to school: The impact of street connectivity and traffic exposure in school neighborhoods. *Health and Place*, 17(2), pp.545–550.
- Glaeser, E.L., Gottlieb, J.D. & Ziv, O., 2016. Unhappy Cities. *Journal of Labor Economics*, 34(2), pp.S129–S182.
- Glaeser, E.L., Gyourko, J. & Saks, R.E., 2006. Urban growth and housing supply. *Journal of Economic Geography*, 6(1), pp.71–89.
- Glaeser, E.L. & Kahn, M.E., 2010. The greenness of cities: Carbon dioxide emissions and urban development. *Journal of Urban Economics*, 67(3), pp.404–418.
- Gonçalves, E. & Almeida, E., 2009. Innovation and Spatial Knowledge Spillovers: Evidence from Brazilian Patent Data. *Regional Studies*, 43(4), pp.513–528.
- Graham, D.J., 2007. Agglomeration, productivity and transport investment. *Journal of Transport Economics and Policy*, 41(3), pp.317–343.
- Graham, D.J. et al., 2014. Quantifying Causal Effects of Road Network Capacity Expansions on Traffic Volume and Density via a Mixed Model Propensity Score Estimator. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 109(508), pp.1440–1449.
- Graham, D.J. et al., 2010. Testing for causality between productivity and agglomeration economies. *Journal of Regional Science*, 50(5), pp.935–951.
- Graham, D.J. & Glaister, S., 2003. Spatial Variation in Road Pedestrian Casualties: The Role of Urban Scale, Density and Land-use Mix. *Urban Studies*, 40(8), pp.1591–1607.
- Guite, H.F., Clark, C. & Ackrill, G., 2006. The impact of the physical and urban environment on mental well-being. *Public Health*, 120(12), pp.1117–1126.
- Harari, M., 2015. *Cities in Bad Shape : Urban Geometry in India*,
- Harvey, C. et al., 2015. Effects of skeletal streetscape design on perceived safety. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 142, pp.18–28.
- Hatt, B.E. et al., 2004. The influence of urban density and drainage infrastructure on the concentrations and loads of pollutants in small streams. *Environmental Management*, 34(1), pp.112–124.
- Henderson, V.J., 2003. Marshall's scale economies. *Journal of Urban Economics*, 53(1), pp.1–28.

- Hilber, C.A.L. & Palmer, C., 2014. Urban Development and Air Pollution: Evidence from a Global Panel of Cities. *SSRN Electronic Journal*, (175).
- Holden, E. & Norland, I., 2005. Three challenges for the compact city as a sustainable urban form: Household consumption of energy and transport in eight residential areas in the greater Oslo Region. *Urban Studies*, 42(12), pp.2145–2166.
- Hong, J. & Shen, Q., 2013. Residential density and transportation emissions : Examining the connection by addressing spatial autocorrelation and self-selection. *Transportation Research Part D*, 22, pp.75–79.
- Howard, B. et al., 2012. Spatial distribution of urban building energy consumption by end use. *Energy and Buildings*, 45, pp.141–151.
- Howe, H.L., Keller, J.E. & Lehnher, M., 1993. Relation between Population Density and Cancer Incidence, Illinois, 1986-1990. *American Journal of Epidemiology*, 138(1), pp.29–36.
- Kaplan, S., Nielsen, T.A.S. & Prato, C.G., 2016. Walking, cycling and the urban form: A Heckman selection model of active travel mode and distance by young adolescents. *Transportation Research Part D: Transport and Environment*, 44, pp.55–65.
- Kholodilin, K.A. & Ulbricht, D., 2015. Urban house prices: A tale of 48 cities. *Economics*, 9.
- Kim, H.-K. & Sohn, D.W., 2002. An analysis of the relationship between land use density of office buildings and urban street configuration: Case studies of two areas in Seoul by space syntax analysis. *Cities*, 19(6), pp.409–418.
- Knudsen, B. et al., 2007. *Urban density, creativity, and innovation*.
- Kolko, J., 2012. Broadband and local growth. *Journal of Urban Economics*, 71(1), pp.100–113.
- Krizek, K. & Johnson, P.J., 2006. Proximity to Trails and Retail: Effects on Urban Cycling and Walking. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 72(1), pp.33–42.
- Ladd, H.F., 1994. Fiscal impacts of local population growth: A conceptual and empirical analysis. *Regional Science and Urban Economics*, 24(6), pp.661–686.
- Larsen, K. et al., 2009. The influence of the physical environment and sociodemographic characteristics on children's mode of travel to and from school. *American Journal of Public Health*, 99(3), pp.520–526.
- Larson, W., Liu, F. & Yezer, A., 2012. Energy footprint of the city: Effects of urban land use and transportation policies. *Journal of Urban Economics*, 72(2–3), pp.147–159.
- Larson, W. & Yezer, A., 2015. The energy implications of city size and density. *Journal of Urban Economics*, 90, pp.35–49.
- Larsson, J.P., 2014. The neighborhood or the region? Reassessing the density-wage relationship using geocoded data. *Annals of Regional Science*, 52(2), pp.367–384.
- Levinson, D., 2008. Density and dispersion: The co-development of land use and rail in London. *Journal of Economic Geography*, 8(1), pp.55–77.
- Lewis, D.J., Provencher, B. & Butsic, V., 2009. The dynamic effects of open-space conservation policies on residential development density. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management*, 57(3), pp.239–252.
- Lin, B., Meyers, J. & Barnett, G., 2015. Understanding the potential loss and inequities of green space distribution with urban densification. *Urban Forestry and Urban Greening*, 14(4), pp.952–958.
- Liu, C.H., Rosenthal, S.S. & Strange, W.C., 2016. *The Vertical City: Rent Gradients and Spatial Structure*.
- Lobo, J., Strumsky, D. & Rothwell, J., 2013. Scaling of patenting with urban population size: Evidence from global metropolitan areas. *Scientometrics*, 96(3), pp.819–828.
- Lynch, A.K. & Rasmussen, D.W., 2004. Proximity, Neighbourhood and the Efficacy of Exclusion. *Urban Studies*, 41(2), pp.285–98.
- Maantay, J. & Maroko, A., 2015. 'At-risk' places: inequities in the distribution of environmental stressors and prescription rates of mental health medications in Glasgow, Scotland. *Environmental Research Letters*, 10(11), p.115003.
- Mahoney, M.C. et al., 1990. Population density and cancer incidence differentials in New York State, 1978-82. *International Journal of Epidemiology*, 19(3), pp.483–490.
- Maitra, B., Sikdar, P.K. & Dhingra, S.L., 1999. Modeling Congestion on Urban Roads and of Assessing Level of Service. *Journal of Transportation Engineering*, 125(6), pp.508–514.
- Maloutas, T., 2004. Segregation and residential mobility. Spatially entrapped social mobility and its impact on segregation in Athens. *European Urban and Regional Studies*, 11(3), pp.195–211.
- McDonald, J.F., 2009. Calibration of a monocentric city model with mixed land use and congestion. *Regional Science and Urban Economics*, 39(1), pp.90–96.
- McMillan, T.E., 2007. The relative influence of urban form on a child's travel mode to school. *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice*, 41(1), pp.69–79.
- Melis, G. et al., 2015. The effects of the urban built environment on mental health: A cohort study in a large

- northern Italian city. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 12(11), pp.14898–14915.
- Miles, D., 2012. Population Density, House Prices and Mortgage Design. *Scottish Journal of Political Economy*, 59(5), pp.444–466.
- Mindali, O., Raveh, A. & Salomon, I., 2004. Urban density and energy consumption: A new look at old statistics. *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice*, 38(2), pp.143–162.
- Mladenka, K.R. & Hill, K.Q., 1976. A reexamination of the etiology of urban crime. *Criminology*, 13(4), pp.491–506.
- Morikawa, M., 2011. Economies of Density and Productivity in Service Industries: An Analysis of Personal Service Industries Based on Establishment-Level Data. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 93(1), pp.179–192.
- Muñiz, I. & Galindo, A., 2005. Urban form and the ecological footprint of commuting. The case of Barcelona. *Ecological Economics*, 55(4), pp.499–514.
- Murphy, E., 2009. Excess commuting and modal choice. *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice*, 43(8), pp.735–743.
- Nakaya, T. & Yano, K., 2010. Visualising crime clusters in a space-time cube: An exploratory data-analysis approach using space-time kernel density estimation and scan statistics. *Transactions in GIS*, 14(3), pp.223–239.
- Newman, O. & Franck, K.A., 1982. The Effects of Building Size on Personal Crime and Fear of Crime. *Population and Environment*, 5(4), pp.203–220.
- Newman, P. & Kenworthy, J., 1989. *Cities and automobile dependence : a sourcebook*, Aldershot : Avebury Technical.
- Nielsen, T.A.S. et al., 2013. Environmental correlates of cycling: Evaluating urban form and location effects based on Danish micro-data. *Transportation Research Part D: Transport and Environment*, 22, p.4044.
- Norman, J., MacLean, H. & Kennedy, C., 2006. Comparing high and low residential density: life-cycle analysis of energy use and greenhouse gas emissions. *J Urban Plann Dev*, 132(1), pp.10–21.
- Osman, T., Divigalpitiya, P. & Osman, M.M., 2016. The impact of Built Environment Characteristics on Metropolitans Energy Consumption: An Example of Greater Cairo Metropolitan Region. *Buildings*, 6(2), p.12.
- Ottensmann, J.R., 1977. Urban Sprawl , Land Values and the Density of Development. *Land Economic*, 53(4), pp.389–399.
- Palm, M. et al., 2014. The trade-offs between population density and households' transportation-housing costs. *Transport Policy*, 36, pp.160–172.
- Pendall, R. & Carruthers, J.I., 2003. Does density exacerbate income segregation. *Housing Policy Debate*, 14(4), pp.541–589.
- Pouyanne, G., 2004. *Urban Form and Travel Patterns*,
- Prieto, Á.M., Zofío, J.L. & Álvarez, I., 2015. Cost economies, urban patterns and population density: The case of public infrastructure for basic utilities. *Papers in Regional Science*, 94(4), pp.795–816.
- Raleigh, E. & Galster, G., 2015. Neighborhood Disinvestment, Abandonment, And Crime Dynamics. *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 37(4), pp.367–396.
- Rappaport, J., 2008a. A productivity model of city crowdedness. *Journal of Urban Economics*, 63(2), pp.715–722.
- Rappaport, J., 2008b. Consumption amenities and city population density. *Regional Science and Urban Economics*, 38, pp.533–552.
- Ratti, C., Baker, N. & Steemers, K., 2005. Energy consumption and urban texture. *Energy and Buildings*, 37(7), pp.762–776.
- Raupach, M.R., Rayner, P.J. & Paget, M., 2010. Regional variations in spatial structure of nightlights, population density and fossil-fuel CO2 emissions. *Energy Policy*, 38(9), pp.4756–4764.
- Reijneveld, S.A., Verheij, R.A. & de Bakker, D.H., 1999. Relative importance of urbanicity, ethnicity and socioeconomic factors regarding area mortality differences. *Journal of epidemiology and community health*, 53(7), pp.444–5.
- Resch, E. et al., 2016. Impact of urban density and building height on energy use in cities. *Energy Procedia*.
- Rosenthal, S.S. & Strange, W.C., 2008. The attenuation of human capital spillovers. *Journal of Urban Economics*, 64(2), pp.373–389.
- Rothwell, J. & Massey, D.S., 2009. The Effect of Density Zoning on Racial Segregation in U.S. Urban Areas. *Urban Affairs Review*, 44(6), pp.779–806.
- Rothwell, J.T., 2011. Racial enclaves and density zoning: The institutionalized segregation of racial minorities in the United States. *American Law and Economics Review*, 13(1), pp.290–358.
- de Sa, E. & Ardern, C.I., 2014. Associations between the built environment, total, recreational, and transit-related physical activity. *BMC public health*, 14(1), p.693.

- Saelens, B.E., Sallis, J.F. & Frank, L.D., 2003. Environmental correlates of walking and cycling: findings from the transportation, urban design, and planning literatures. *Annals of behavioral medicine: a publication of the Society of Behavioral Medicine*, 25(2), pp.80–91.
- Salomons, E.M. & Berghauser Pont, M., 2012. Urban traffic noise and the relation to urban density, form, and traffic elasticity. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 108(1), pp.2–16.
- Sampson, R.J., 1983. Structural Density and Criminal Victimization. *Criminology*, 21(2), pp.276–293.
- Sarzynski, A., 2012. Bigger Is Not Always Better: A Comparative Analysis of Cities and their Air Pollution Impact. *Urban Studies*, 49(14), pp.3121–3138.
- Schiff, N., 2015. Cities and product variety: Evidence from restaurants*. *Journal of Economic Geography*, 15(6), pp.1085–1123.
- Sedgley, N. & Elmslie, B., 2011. Do We Still Need Cities? Evidence on Rates of Innovation from Count Data Models of Metropolitan Statistical Area Patents. *American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, 70(1), pp.86–108.
- Shunfeng, S., 1994. *Does Generalizing Density Functions Better Explain Urban Commuting? Some Evidence from the Los Angeles Region*.
- Sivitanidou, R., 1995. Urban Spatial Variations in Office-Commercial Rents: The Role of Spatial Amenities and Commercial Zoning. *Journal of Urban Economics*, 38(1), pp.23–49.
- Song, Y. & Knaap, G.J., 2004. Measuring the effects of mixed land uses on housing values. *Regional Science and Urban Economics*, 34(6), pp.663–680.
- Speir, C. & Stephenson, K., 2002. Does Sprawl Cost Us All?: Isolating the Effects of Housing Patterns on Public Water and Sewer Costs. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 68(1), pp.56–70.
- Spencer, G.M., 2015. Knowledge Neighbourhoods : Urban Form and Evolutionary Economic Geography. *Regional Studies*, 49(5), pp.883–898.
- Stankowski, S.J. & Trenton, N.J., 1972. Population Density as an Indirect Indicator of Urban and Suburban Land-Surface Modifications. In *U.S. Geological Survey Professional Paper*.
- Su, Q., 2011. The effect of population density, road network density, and congestion on household gasoline consumption in U.S. urban areas. *Energy Economics*, 33(3), pp.445–452.
- Tabuchi, T., 1986. Urban agglomeration, capital augmenting technology, and labor market equilibrium. *Journal of Urban Economics*, 20(2), pp.211–228.
- Tang, C.K., 2015. Urban Structure and Crime. *Working Paper*.
- Tang, U.W. & Wang, Z.S., 2007. Influences of urban forms on traffic-induced noise and air pollution: Results from a modelling system. *Environmental Modelling and Software*, 22(12), pp.1750–1764.
- Tratalos, J. et al., 2007. Urban form, biodiversity potential and ecosystem services. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 83(4), pp.308–317.
- Travisi, C.M., Camagni, R. & Nijkamp, P., 2010. Impacts of urban sprawl and commuting: a modelling study for Italy. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 18(3), pp.382–392.
- Tu, K.J. & Lin, L.T., 2008. Evaluative structure of perceived residential environment quality in high-density and mixed-use urban settings: An exploratory study on Taipei City. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 87(3), pp.157–171.
- Twinam, T., 2016. *Danger Zone: Local government Land use Regulation and Neighbourhood Crime*.
- Vance, C. & Hedel, R., 2007. The impact of urban form on automobile travel: Disentangling causation from correlation. *Transportation*, 34(5), pp.575–588.
- Veneri, P., 2010. Urban polycentricity and the costs of commuting: Evidence from Italian metropolitan areas. *Growth and Change*, 41(3), pp.403–429.
- Walton, D., Murray, S.J. & Thomas, J.A., 2008. Relationships between population density and the perceived quality of neighbourhood. *Social Indicators Research*, 89(3), pp.405–420.
- Wheeler, C.H., 2004. Wage inequality and urban density. *Journal of Economic Geography*, 4(4), pp.421–437.
- Wilhelmsson, M., 2009. The spatial distribution of inventor networks. *Annals of Regional Science*, 43(3 SPEC. ISS.), pp.645–668.
- Wong, N.-H. & Chen, Y., 2010. The Role of Urban Greenery in High-Density cities. In *Designing High-density Cities for Social and Environmental Sustainability*. London, Sterling VA: Earthscan.
- Xiao, Y., Webster, C. & Orford, S., 2016. Identifying house price effects of changes in urban street configuration : An empirical study in Nanjing, China. *Urban Studies*, 53(1), pp.112–131.
- Yang, J. et al., 2012. Transport Impacts of Clustered Development in Beijing: Compact Development versus Overconcentration. *Urban Studies*, 49(5), pp.1315–1331.
- Zahabi, S.A. et al., 2016. Exploring the link between the neighborhood typologies, bicycle infrastructure and commuting cycling over time and the potential impact on commuter GHG emissions. *Transportation Research Part D*, 47, pp.89–103.

- Zhang, M., 2004. The role of land use in travel mode choice - Evidence from Boston and Hong kong. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 70(3), pp.344–360.
- Zhao, P., 2014. The Impact of the Built Environment on Bicycle Commuting: Evidence from Beijing. *Urban Studies*, 51(5), pp.1019–1037.
- Zhao, P., Luë, B. & de Roo, G., 2010. Urban expansion and transportation: The impact of urban form on commuting patterns on the city fringe of Beijing. *Environment and Planning A*, 42(10), pp.2467–2486.