
SOCIO-SPATIAL SEGREGATION AND HUMAN MOBILITY: A REVIEW OF EMPIRICAL EVIDENCE

A PREPRINT

 **Yuan Liao***

Department of Space, Earth and Environment
Chalmers University of Technology
Gothenburg, Sweden
yuan.liao@chalmers.se

 **Jorge Gil**

Department of Architecture and Civil Engineering
Chalmers University of Technology
Gothenburg, Sweden
jorge.gil@chalmers.se

 **Sonia Yeh**

Department of Space, Earth and Environment
Chalmers University of Technology
Gothenburg, Sweden
sonia.yeh@chalmers.se

 **Rafael H. M. Pereira**

Institute for Applied Economic Research (Ipea) - Brazil
Data Science Division, Brazil
rafael.pereira@ipea.gov.br

 **Laura Alessandretti**

Department of Applied Mathematics and Computer Science
Technical University of Denmark
Lyngby, Denmark
lauale@dtu.dk

June 27, 2024

ABSTRACT

Social segregation, the spatial and social separation between individuals from different backgrounds, can affect sustainable urban development and social cohesion. The literature has traditionally focused on residential segregation, examining how individuals' residential locations are distributed differently across neighborhoods based on income, ethnicity, and education. However, this approach overlooks the complexity of spatial segregation because daily activities often extend far beyond residential areas. Since the 2010s, emerging mobility data sources have enabled a new understanding of socio-spatial segregation by considering daily activities such as work, school, shopping, and leisure visits. From traditional surveys to GPS trajectories, diverse data sources reveal that day-to-day mobility can impact segregation by reducing or amplifying segregation levels obtained when considering residential aspects alone. This literature review focuses on three critical questions: (a) How do human mobility patterns relate to individuals' segregation experiences? (b) What key factors explain the relationship between one's mobility patterns and segregation experiences? and (c) What are the strengths and limitations of segregation research that incorporates extensive mobility data? Our literature review enhances the understanding of socio-spatial segregation at the individual level and clarifies core concepts and methodological challenges in the field. By incorporating studies from computational social science, urban science, and transportation, our review aims to provide actionable insights for reducing segregation and addressing research gaps in this increasingly interdisciplinary area.

Keywords Spatial segregation · Social integration · Individual mobility · Transport · Activity space · Urban space

*Corresponding author. Also affiliated with Department of Applied Mathematics and Computer Science, Technical University of Denmark, Lyngby, Denmark.

1 Introduction

Socio-spatial segregation is the phenomenon where individuals from different socioeconomic backgrounds are systematically separated both socially and spatially. Spatial segregation manifests as a distinct, uneven distribution of these groups across different geographical areas and is often characterized by limited social interactions, i.e., social segregation between them. Understanding segregation holds significant importance in our increasingly urbanized planet. Sustainable urban development fosters diverse populations and promotes social cohesion by facilitating access to vital resources, public services [Joelsson and Ekman Ladru, 2022], educational [Zhang et al., 2022a], and employment opportunities [Silm and Ahas, 2014a] to all socioeconomic groups. However, segregated cities can lead to differentiated access to such services and opportunities, perpetuating disparities in economic, social, and health outcomes [Li et al., 2022a, Hu et al., 2022, Xu, 2023]. Furthermore, high levels of segregation mean fewer opportunities for individuals from different socioeconomic backgrounds to come into contact with each other, resulting in limited opportunities for group interaction and exposure [Moro et al., 2021].

Quantitative studies on socio-spatial segregation focus on the geographic separation or clustering of social groups within physical spaces [Li et al., 2022a]. They assume the precursor of social interaction is being in the same place, i.e., the co-presence of individuals [Rokem and Vaughan, 2018] or framed as socioeconomic mixing and exposure among diverse individuals [Nilforoshan et al., 2023]. Socio-spatial segregation is a long-standing research topic deeply rooted in urbanization history, significantly advanced by the Chicago School of Sociology [e.g., Park and Burgess, 2019]. These scholars have measured segregation from a static standpoint by looking at how residential locations are sorted into different neighborhoods based on income, race, and education [Feitosa et al., 2007]. The residential environment is a solid basis for studying socio-spatial segregation, as it strongly influences individuals' access to key urban resources. However, a large body of recent work shows that residential segregation alone cannot fully capture the complexity of spatial segregation in urban areas [Netto and Krafta, 2001]. Thus, understanding spatial segregation requires considering other activity locations beyond residential spaces [Kwan, 2013, Silm and Ahas, 2014a]. These include locations visited for work [Zhou et al., 2021], school, shopping, and leisure [Toger et al., 2023] both indoor and outdoor, as well as locations visited when en route, i.e., in the process of reaching these destinations.

To engage in out-of-home activities, people need to move outside where they live, making mobility a key aspect of understanding socio-spatial segregation. Over the past one to two decades, many studies have advanced a dynamic understanding of segregation by incorporating activity spaces [Sampson and Levy, 2020, Candipan et al., 2021], considering the geography of individuals' daily activity and mobility patterns beyond their residential area, thus providing a more comprehensive understanding of socio-spatial segregation. This enhanced understanding largely stems from the widespread availability of extensive human mobility data, shedding light on how individuals allocate their time among various activity locations. The activity space approaches are driven by empirical mobility data from traditional data sources, such as travel surveys [Li and Wang, 2017], and emerging sources of big geolocation data covering large populations and geographical extent, e.g., GPS tracking devices [Roulston and Young, 2013], mobile phone data [Silm and Ahas, 2014a, Xu et al., 2019], or social media platforms [Wang et al., 2018, Candipan et al., 2021].

Despite increasing studies considering activities beyond residential areas, there is a lack of a comprehensive review of the empirical findings on how and why individual mobility interacts with socio-spatial segregation in everyday life. The role of individual mobility in socio-spatial segregation remains partly unclear, given that the literature has shown contradictory findings: time spent outside the residence can reinforce or alleviate segregation [Kwan, 2013]. In exploring the role of individual mobility in socio-spatial segregation patterns based on the existing literature, we attempt to answer three questions:

- How do human mobility patterns relate to individuals' segregation experiences?
- What key factors explain the relationship between one's mobility patterns and segregation experiences?
- What are the strengths and limitations of segregation research that incorporates extensive mobility data?

Answering these questions can contribute to providing actionable insights for reducing segregation and social inequalities.

In this paper, we review segregation research through the prism of individual mobility, drawing empirical evidence from the activity space perspective and built environment research, including transport and urban science. Based on the literature, we first define socio-spatial segregation and its quantification (Section 2). We then review studies based on activity space approaches, including evidence on the relationship between mobility level and segregation experiences (Section 3), followed by methodological reflections on the existing studies (Section 4). In Section 5, we further draw findings from the built environment research, including urban science and transport, to discuss critical factors explaining socio-spatial segregation experienced by varying socioeconomic groups. Finally, we synthesize these findings, highlight research gaps, and suggest directions for future research (Section 6).

2 Measuring socio-spatial segregation

Socio-spatial segregation reflects the degree of physical separation among different socioeconomic groups, including race/ethnicity [e.g., Vachuska, 2023], birth background [e.g., Bertoli et al., 2021], income [e.g., Moro et al., 2021], education [e.g., Zhang et al., 2022a], housing [e.g., Zhang et al., 2019], etc. Estimating segregation requires first to identify individuals in the same location and subsequently to assess the mix of populations in and across various locations using quantitative metrics [Yao et al., 2019, Li et al., 2022a, Müürisepp et al., 2022]. The metrics developed in the literature cover different aspects of the phenomenon: evenness, especially the dissimilarity index and its variants, isolation-exposure, concentration, centralization, and clustering [Massey and Denton, 1988], which can be combined into spatial exposure/isolation and spatial evenness/clustering metrics [Reardon and O’Sullivan, 2004].




Figure 1: Conceptual framework of measuring spatial segregation. (1) Residential segregation quantifies the extent to which different groups live separately from one another in different neighborhoods. (2) Built environment approach analyzes transport networks and urban spaces to evaluate the potential of reaching different socioeconomic groups from one’s residence. (3) Activity space approaches driven by empirical mobility data assess individuals’ co-presence with others across their activity space and quantify the social mixing level in these geographic areas. This study includes (2-3) for the evidence synthesis.

This section first presents a brief discussion of the key concept of co-presence (Section 2.1), followed by a summary of the three main approaches to measuring socio-spatial segregation (Section 2.2). Due to limited space, we refer the reader to Section B for a more detailed introduction to the different metrics applied in each approach. Further, we refer to the study by Yao et al. [2019] for a more systematic review of the metrics and models used to quantify socio-spatial segregation.

2.1 Co-presence: a precursor to social interaction

A key concept for measuring socio-spatial segregation in the literature is that of *co-presence*. In this review, we define *co-presence* as the state where two or more individuals are present in the same location at the same time. This definition originates from space syntax theory [Hillier and Vaughan, 2007], which examines the relationship between spatial configurations (e.g., road networks) and social behaviors (e.g., mixing between groups) within built environments. In the literature, other terms such as *exposure*, *encounter*, *mixing*, *co-existence*, and *co-location* [Rokem and Vaughan, 2018, Deurloo et al., 2022, Şevik and Çalişkan, 2022, Juhász et al., 2023, Nilforoshan et al., 2023] are used interchangeably to indicate co-presence.

Co-presence in urban spaces creates opportunities for different groups to meet, serving as a precursor to social interaction [Collins, 2004, Netto et al., 2015]. However, it is important to recognize that there is a spectrum from mere co-presence to meaningful social engagement; with various interactions such as handshake, eye contact, and conversation occurring at points in between [Rokem and Vaughan, 2018]. Contact theory posits that interpersonal interactions between groups can potentially reduce prejudice and foster positive attitudes toward unfamiliar others [Allport et al., 1954]. Therefore, quantifying co-presence patterns is meaningful in understanding and reducing socio-spatial segregation. Due to limited space, we present other key concepts within the socio-spatial segregation literature and their definitions in Table A.2.

A vast body of literature on socio-spatial segregation focused on co-presence within an individual’s own residential neighborhood. Recent approaches consider that individuals can also be co-present with others when outside their neighborhood. We see a rapidly growing number of studies leveraging observed mobility patterns of individuals to

quantify co-presence empirically. The empirical mobility data in this literature varies, including “small” traditional travel surveys [Park and Kwan, 2018] and “big” mobile phone GPS records [Moro et al., 2021].

2.2 Approaches and their spatiotemporal scale

Figure 1 illustrates three primary approaches to measuring socio-spatial segregation, according to how co-presence is evaluated: the *residential*, *built environment* and *activity space* approaches. In this section, we discuss these three approaches.

Traditionally, most studies have focused on *residential segregation*. Here, segregation is considered a static area-based phenomenon [Duncan and Duncan, 1955]. The idea is to measure the co-presence of individuals with different socioeconomic backgrounds within their area of residence, often an administrative or statistical subdivision [e.g., Andersson et al., 2010], and then to evaluate how the population groups are spatially separated across these areal units.

A second approach, based on the built environment, focuses on measuring how transport networks and urban spaces can bring different populations together [Netto et al., 2015, Carpio-Pinedo, 2021]. Most of the studies that use this approach quantify the potential opportunities for co-presence between different socioeconomic groups through street network centrality measures developed within the field of space syntax analysis [Rokem and Vaughan, 2018, Carpio-Pinedo, 2021, Yunitsyna and Shtepani, 2023]. Therefore, the type of segregation measured in these studies can be defined as *network segregation*. This type of analysis focuses on potential co-presence in locations individuals can reach from home through walk, car, or transit networks [e.g., Rokem and Vaughan, 2018]. This perspective considers that individual mobility facilitates social encounters outside the residence, but the analysis methods are not based on empirical mobility data.

A third approach underscored in recent research conceptualizes socio-spatial segregation dynamically, by considering individuals’ travel behavior and daily visited locations. Studies based on this approach are driven by empirical mobility data from traditional sources such as travel surveys [Ravalet, 2006, Wang et al., 2012, Le Roux et al., 2017, Park and Kwan, 2018, Landis, 2022, Lin and Ta, 2023] or emerging ones such as mobile phone GPS records and social media geolocation data [Östh et al., 2018, Wang et al., 2018, Candipan et al., 2021, Moro et al., 2021, Huang et al., 2022, Wu et al., 2023]. Here, we refer to the type of segregation measured in these studies as *activity space segregation*. The mobility data commonly used to measure segregation for large populations include high-resolution location data from smartphone applications [Moro et al., 2021], telecommunications companies [Östh et al., 2018], and geotagged tweets [Netto et al., 2018, Wang et al., 2018, Candipan et al., 2021]. These data can include the geolocations of millions of individuals over months and years, at the resolution of meters and seconds [Barbosa et al., 2018]. Utilizing large-scale digital data, it was shown that there is a significant correlation between spatial (co-presence) and social (interactions) segregation [Blumenstock and Fratamico, 2013], demonstrating that human mobility data offers a realistic approximation of socioeconomic exposure [Nilforoshan et al., 2023].

The activity space approach describes dynamic segregation building on empirical mobility data and focusing on two aspects: urban spaces (*visiting segregation*) and individuals (*experienced segregation*). Some recent studies combine the two perspectives [Xu et al., 2019, Moro et al., 2021]. The stream on *visiting segregation* focuses on urban spaces, considering the time-varying socioeconomic mixing and exposure of individuals [Nilforoshan et al., 2023]. It seeks to understand how segregated a given location is, given how mixed its visitors are [Netto et al., 2015, Phillips et al., 2021]. These studies examine the composition of the visitors of urban spaces based on characteristics such as income, ethnicity, birth background, etc. [e.g., Netto et al., 2015, Moro et al., 2021]. Unlike the place-based segregation, e.g., workplace segregation [e.g., Boterman and Musterd, 2016], *visiting segregation* offers a realistic perspective by considering time-varying co-presence in different urban places, rather than belonging to a workplace or a neighborhood.

In contrast, the stream on *experienced segregation* focuses on individuals. It captures how much a person is exposed to/encounters diverse groups as they go about their daily lives [Wu et al., 2023]. In other words, the experienced segregation of a person refers to the overall level of segregation experienced as a combined result of her residential location, travel behavior patterns, and the locations where she conducts her daily activities (activity spaces). It considers the average segregation they experience across these activity visits [Zhang et al., 2019, Ta et al., 2021]. It is worth noting that *experienced segregation*, as defined here, does not capture the actual social interactions individuals experience (see Section 2.1). How exposure to diverse individuals translates to meaningful social interactions between groups is another crucial topic in segregation research [Legeby et al., 2015], which studies based on passively collected mobility data alone can not answer.

Due to data availability, the experienced segregation has been commonly approximated by measuring the stays at various places, excluding interactions happening while individuals are moving (e.g., on public transport) [e.g., Moro et al., 2021]. However, some studies particularly investigate en route segregation, pointing to equitable transport systems [Shen, 2019, Abbasi et al., 2021, Zhou et al., 2023].

In summary, there are different facets of measuring segregation (Table 1). The literature has witnessed a clear paradigm shift from a traditional static view toward a mobility perspective that is dynamic and data-driven [Li et al., 2022a]. Big geolocation data are widely used to better understand socio-spatial segregation in the urban landscape, focusing more on individuals [Müürisepp et al., 2022]. Different definitions of segregation and related concepts in the literature are summarized in Table A.2.

Table 1: Three approaches to socio-spatial segregation by their spatiotemporal scale of (potential) co-present individuals.

Approach	Segregation type	Perspective	Subject	Time scale
Residential	Residential	Urban space	Residents	Static (year)
Built Environment	Network			
Activity space	Visiting	Urban space	Visitors	Dynamic (minutes–hours)
	Experienced	Individual	Travels and activities	

3 Individual segregation experiences

In this section, we critically assess the existing literature on how human mobility influences individual segregation experiences, examining whether it mitigates or reinforces segregation patterns observed at the residential level (Sections 3.1, 3.2, and 3.3), followed by a summary of the disparities between socioeconomic and ethnicity/birth background groups in their segregation experiences (Section 3.4). We also explore how experienced segregation considering mobility amid and after crises, e.g., hurricanes and the COVID-19 pandemic (Section 3.5).

An important question is whether experienced segregation is lower or higher than residential segregation. To answer this question, we draw evidence from the literature by only including studies that explicitly define segregation metrics and simultaneously compute residential and experienced segregation levels (Sections 3.1 and 3.2).

On the one hand, visiting various locations beyond one’s residential neighborhood could enable one to encounter diverse populations. Hence, the segregation level across one’s activity space may be lower than the segregation level at one’s residence [Alfeo et al., 2019, Hedman et al., 2021]. On the other hand, visiting various activity locations could strengthen segregation patterns depending on the nature of these encounters, the individuals’ openness to engagement, and the broader societal and systemic factors that influence social interactions and integration [Shdema et al., 2018]. Furthermore, how people travel is often influenced by economic and social factors, which means that not everyone has the same ability to travel outside their residential area [Tiznado-Aitken et al., 2023]. The results revealed by the literature are contradictory, partly indicating that the potential of moving beyond residential areas to reduce segregation can vary widely among different individuals and groups.

3.1 Studies observing that moving outside residence reinforces segregation

Using traditional data sources such as surveys and interviews, a small body of activity space literature concludes that moving outside residential areas reinforces segregation. Aksyonov [2011] suggest that while residential segregation in St. Petersburg, Russia, is relatively weak, activity space segregation level is much more prominent. Similarly, in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, the US, Gordon [2018] reports that racial segregation is pronounced, with distinct patterns of daily mobility among different racial groups. This notion of persistent segregation patterns is further supported by Le Roux et al. [2017], who found that the most segregated group during the night in Paris remained the most segregated during the day, indicating a strong correlation between night-time and day-time segregation. Consistent with these findings, studies on ethnic groups in urban China reveal that a residents’ home neighborhood continues to be a strong predictor of segregation in their daily activity locations [Tan et al., 2017, 2019].

These findings are corroborated by studies informed by large-scale data [Roulston and Young, 2013, Hilman et al., 2022]. For example, [Candipan et al., 2021] identify black-white residential segregation as a critical determinant of segregation that considers people’s movement between urban spaces. Complementing these findings, Zhang et al. [2022a] establish a significant and strong correlation ($r = 0.646$, $p < 0.001$) between residential segregation and activity space-based segregation concerning education in Beijing.

3.2 Studies finding that moving outside residence reduces segregation

In contrast, several studies have found that accounting for daily mobility outside residence significantly reduces individuals’ levels of segregation compared to approaches that measure segregation solely at residential locations. Wong and Shaw [2011] reveal that high levels of segregation in residential spaces might be moderated by lower levels of

segregation at activity locations. In fact, activity places are substantially more heterogeneous regarding key social characteristics than residential neighborhoods [Jones and Pebley, 2014, Pinchak et al., 2021]. A lack of exposure to diversity (higher segregation) in the residential neighborhood may be compensated by greater workplace exposure or transport exposure [Boterman and Musterd, 2016, Wang and Li, 2016, Lin and Ta, 2023]. Therefore, studies have uncovered reduced segregation levels considering daytime activities [Le Roux et al., 2017, Li and Wang, 2017, Park and Kwan, 2018, Garlick et al., 2022, Fuentes et al., 2022].

Emerging data sources such as geotagged tweets and mobile phone data also reveal a similar reducing effect of moving outside residence on segregation [Grujić et al., 2019, Athey et al., 2021, Moya-Gómez et al., 2021, Silm et al., 2021, Xian et al., 2022, Xu, 2022]. Research indicates that individuals from poor and black neighborhoods in the city are more mobile within the metro area than previously thought, often traveling outside their neighborhoods for work or other activities [Shelton et al., 2015]. This trend is also seen in Sweden’s metropolitan areas, where daily mobility, especially among those who frequent central places, can lessen segregation levels [Östh et al., 2018]. However, this reduction in segregation is less noticeable in areas with low accessibility and mobility levels, typically located on the city outskirts [Östh et al., 2018]. In Seoul, South Korea, a significant decrease in daytime segregation of 20% was observed when compared to residential segregation levels [Hong, 2020], a trend similarly reflected in Turkey in the context of segregation between Syrian refugees and the native population [Bertoli et al., 2021].

3.3 Beyond the reinforcing-reducing dichotomy

Studies using both “small” mobility datasets, e.g., traditional travel surveys, and “big” emerging data, such as mobile phone GPS records, reveal that the impact of moving outside residence on individual segregation experiences is not as simple as reinforcing or reducing segregation. The relationship between residential (home vicinity and sub-neighborhood) and experienced segregation outside the residence is complex [Schnell and Haj-Yahya, 2014, Selim, 2015]. For instance, Goldhaber and Schnell [2007] found a weak correlation between one’s residential and experienced segregation levels, indicating that factors influencing each type of spatial segregation vary. It turns out that sharing residential neighborhoods does not necessarily translate into shared routines, particularly across different socioeconomic statuses [Schnell and Yoav, 2001, Browning et al., 2017]. Interestingly, Lin and Ta [2023] reveal that people with higher migrant exposure in their residential areas often experience lower migrant exposure in their activity locations, and vice versa, suggesting a negative correlation between residential and experienced segregation levels.

Whether moving outside residence reduces or reinforces the experienced segregation depends largely on individuals’ lifestyle, i.e., which kind of locations they visit and when during the day [Zhang et al., 2023]. Using mobile phone data, Silm et al. [2018] find that places of daily activities outside home and work are less segregated, noting a surprising trend of higher workplace segregation than residential segregation, particularly in age groups 30 – 39 and above 60. However, Silm et al. [2021] observed higher segregation in residential areas than workplaces, with segregation levels during leisure activities fluctuating based on the specific activity. Zhang et al. [2022b] further contribute to this understanding by using location-based service data in Beijing, revealing more pronounced segregation at workplaces than residences and a general decrease in segregation outside these typical environments. Additionally, the city structure and distribution of amenities emerge as a critical factor for socioeconomic mixing, where diverse and unique amenities, particularly in city centers, tend to attract a mix of socioeconomic groups [Dannemann et al., 2018, Juhász et al., 2023]. A low segregation level is generally associated with being in the middle of the day, away from home, such as in places like workplaces, restaurants, commercial areas, and outdoor spaces, supported by extensive geolocation data on human mobility [Sampson and Levy, 2020, Abbasi et al., 2021, Athey et al., 2021, Qiao et al., 2021, Moro et al., 2021]. However, not everyone can equally access these places to fulfill their daily activity demand, i.e., what they plan to do in their daily lives.

3.4 Differences by socioeconomic status and ethnicity/birth background

Different social groups have different daily-life activity spaces, depending on age, race/ethnicity, and income level [Moro et al., 2021]. These differences can exacerbate socio-spatial segregation [Wang et al., 2012]. In this section, we discuss the effect of socioeconomic status (Section 3.4.1) and ethnicity and birth background (Section 3.4.2) on individuals’ segregation experiences.

3.4.1 Socioeconomic status

The wealthiest and the poorest groups demonstrate contrasting mobility behaviors and activity demand [Aksyonov, 2011, Farber et al., 2012, Östh et al., 2018], resulting in systematically different activity spaces [Wang et al., 2012]. Heringa et al. [2014] reveal that social status (in terms of education and income), as well as the opportunity to perform leisure activities, influences the extent of inter-ethnic contact more than neighborhood attributes. In turn, performing

leisure activities is strongly influenced by economic factors, according to large-scale mobile phone data collected in Stockholm [Toger et al., 2023].

Table 2 summarizes the characteristics of individual mobility and activity spaces by income level observed in various studies. Data from developed countries shows that wealthier individuals use various types of urban areas [Wang et al., 2022] and travel longer distances [Xu et al., 2022], more likely to form connections with all classes [Farber et al., 2012]. In contrast, the less wealthy experience limited activity spaces, leading to a more localized life. These may translate to the higher segregation levels experienced by less wealthy populations [Wu and Huang, 2022]. In Hong Kong, this mobility gap between high- and low-income is widening between 2002 and 2011 [Tao et al., 2020a].

Table 2: Characteristics of individual mobility and activity space by income level and ethnicity observed in studies.

Aspect	Group	Mobility patterns	Activity space
Income	Wealthy	Longer trip distance [Xu et al., 2022, Farber et al., 2012]	Diverse and widely spread [Wang et al., 2022] Sports, leisure [Zambon et al., 2017], business [Wang et al., 2012, Heringa et al., 2014], shopping [Aksyonov, 2011]
	Less wealthy	Shorter trip distance [Wu and Huang, 2022] Less frequently travel outside city [Aksyonov, 2011]	Constrained and localized [Netto et al., 2015, Zhou et al., 2015] Convenience stores [Aksyonov, 2011]
Ethnicity/ birth background	Majority	Longer commuting [Garlick et al., 2022]	Social, recreational, errand [Shirgaokar and Nobler, 2021]
	Minority	Shorter travel distance [Silm and Ahas, 2014a]	Exercise, education [Shirgaokar and Nobler, 2021]

In some contexts, however, a different effect was observed, with the wealthy living relatively more segregated lives [Shelton et al., 2015, Xu et al., 2019] than the less wealthy. Atkinson [2016] illustrate that the super-rich in London creates a “cloud space” or “flowing enclave,” engaging with the city’s diversity in a limited way. This phenomenon of segregation among the upper classes is also observed in the Paris region, where Le Roux et al. [2017] note that they remain the most segregated group both in residence and during daytime activities. In developing countries, the less wealthy population does not always travel less or have more limited activity spaces than the rest [Wissink and Hazelzet, 2016, Moya-Gómez et al., 2021].

Socio-economic status often interacts with housing type, which affects individual mobility and segregation experiences [Demoraes et al., 2021]. This is evidenced by the poor families in public housing facing increased isolation [Li and Wang, 2017] and varied activity spaces among social groups [Zhang et al., 2019], resulting in limited interaction opportunities between groups.

3.4.2 Ethnicity and birth background

Ethnic groups exhibit distinct segregation experiences [Bora et al., 2014, Raanan and Shoval, 2014]. These segregation experiences by ethnicity or birth background can be ascribed to their distinct mobility and activity space patterns (Table 2). For example, the study by Järv et al. [2015] suggests that ethnic differences in spatial behavior become more pronounced in leisure-related activities and other non-routine behaviors [Silm and Ahas, 2014a]. Ethnicity also affects transport choices. Living in co-ethnic neighborhoods increases the likelihood of inter-household carpooling for Asian and Hispanic groups, while this is not the case for African Americans [Shin, 2017].

Intersectionality has received attention in a few studies, as ethnicity or birth background often intertwines with factors like income and education. High-income natives [Boterman and Musterd, 2016] and low-income minorities [Tan et al., 2019] can experience higher segregation levels than the other populations. Most racial-ethnic groups’ ethnicity/birth background segregation increases along with higher economic status [Wu et al., 2023], except for Asian groups with diverse interactions regardless of economic status [Salgado et al., 2021].

3.5 Amid and post-crisis segregation experiences

Socio-spatial segregation can change dramatically during and after crises. This section reviews the findings in the field, focusing on the impact of COVID-19 and natural disasters, where we observe a surge in the use of extensive mobile

phone GPS data from large populations in understanding segregation. These studies provide valuable insights into segregation and related policy interventions. Instead of focusing solely on general findings, this section complements the review with crisis-specific insights related to segregation.

The COVID-19 pandemic tends to amplify socio-spatial segregation. In the US, racial segregation significantly influenced urban spatial patterns and behaviors, such as public transportation usage [Hu et al., 2022], further intensifying segregation [Marlow et al., 2021, Li et al., 2022b, Lu and Giuliano, 2023]. Similarly, in Sweden, the pandemic exacerbated socio-economic and ethnic segregations, resulting in high mortality rates in low-income, multi-ethnic neighborhoods [Joelsson and Ekman Ladru, 2022].

The literature highlights that changes in mobility patterns due to the COVID-19 pandemic, such as reduced public transport usage and increased reliance on cars, have deepened existing inequalities [Joelsson and Ekman Ladru, 2022, Shin, 2021, Bonaccorsi et al., 2021]. This impact is particularly pronounced among young and vulnerable groups in socially disadvantaged neighborhoods, who often depend on public transport for their jobs with irregular hours [Joelsson and Ekman Ladru, 2022]. Similarly, in cities like New York, Los Angeles, and Sao Paulo, poor peripheries with high population density and limited access to individual transportation options faced heightened virus transmission risks [Sathler and Leiva, 2022].

Besides pandemics like COVID-19, segregation is a salient issue in evacuations during and after disasters. Large populations are displaced in this context, underscoring social inequalities and intensifying segregation. Analyzing large-scale mobility data, Yabe and Ukkusuri [2020] found that higher-income individuals were more likely to evacuate disaster-affected areas and relocate to less damaged areas. This disparity in mobility resulted in prolonged spatial income segregation post-disaster, with higher-income individuals avoiding severely damaged areas while lower-income individuals remained, exacerbating segregation. Similar patterns were observed during Hurricane Harvey’s evacuation [Deng et al., 2021].

In summary, crises tend to magnify existing segregation, mainly through individual mobility differences. Given the critical role of mobility in disaster evacuation and disease transmission, it is imperative to closely examine the mobility disparities across socioeconomic groups and formulate targeted policies to reduce segregation and mitigate the adverse effects of disasters.

4 Methodological reflections

Segregation studies that use extensive mobility data, e.g., collected from smartphones, can provide a rich and nuanced picture of segregation for large populations. However, it is important to be careful when interpreting and comparing the results of these studies. There is no consensus on the best methods for analyzing this data, and there are inherent differences in the data collection and analysis processes. Consequently, some of the variations in study findings may arise from these methodological differences.

In this section, we present and reflect upon the methodologies used in the studies included in this review (45 studies and the methodological aspects of each of them are presented in more detail in the Supplementary material.) First, we present how the term segregation is used differently across studies (Section 4.1), followed by how segregation is computed (Section 4.2), and lastly, we discuss limitations of existing approaches (Section 4.3).

4.1 Use of the term segregation

The studies referenced in this review engage with the term *segregation* either in a direct or an indirect way. 60% of the referenced studies engage directly with the concept by trying to quantify it (see Section 3 for a description of the different metrics employed). For instance, the unevenness metric has been developed to quantify visiting and experienced income segregation in the US, capturing the uneven spatial distribution of groups by income quintiles [Moro et al., 2021].

The remaining 40% of the referenced studies only indirectly address the term segregation, i.e., without quantifying it using specific metrics. These studies examine disparities in the mobility patterns and activity spaces of different socio-economic groups, only hinting at the segregation of such groups across urban spaces (Section 3.4). For example, Wu and Huang [2022] apply social media data to reveal the isolation of different racial-ethnic and economic groups in the US cities via their distinct human movement patterns.

4.2 Discrepancy in computation

In this section, we reflect on three key methodological aspects: the measurement of activity space (Section 4.2.1), the choice of individuals considered co-present (Section 4.2.2), and the time resolution considered to measure co-presence (Section 4.2.3).

4.2.1 Measuring activity space

The term “activity space” refers to the set of places individuals visit as a result of their daily activities. It can be measured in different ways and at different spatial resolutions. While some studies consider the set of specific points of interest that people visit, e.g., restaurants, museums [Moro et al., 2021], others focus on entire administrative regions, e.g., districts [Silm et al., 2018], or defined grid areas, e.g., grids of 0.6 km² [Zhang et al., 2022b].

Among the studies we reviewed, 18% measure activity spaces with the spatial resolution of point-of-interest, while the rest use administrative units (38%), e.g., census block groups [Hilman et al., 2022], customized areal units (42%), e.g., Voronoi cells [Moya-Gómez et al., 2021], and network edges (2%). Notably, these different definitions of “activity space” can significantly influence the resulting measurements and analyses because segregation can occur even within relatively small areas. It was shown, for example, that two restaurants located next to each other can cater to distinct populations [Moro et al., 2021]. Hence, studies that consider interactions over relatively large areas [e.g., Silm and Ahas, 2014a] due to the low spatiotemporal resolution of the data, e.g., call detail records (CDR) or social media data, may conceal detailed segregation experiences in a specific location. GPS records, instead, capture visits with higher granularity and thus offer a more nuanced and accurate description of segregation.

4.2.2 Measuring co-presence: Individuals included

A key methodological choice when measuring co-presence has to do with whether the visitor of a given area is regarded as co-present with the residents or with the other visitors of that area.

Approximately 24% of the reviewed studies consider that any individual visiting a given area is exposed to the residents of that area. Conversely, 54% of the studies consider the individual to be exposed to other visitors of that area (see more details in Supplementary material). The distinction is critical because the characteristics of residents [e.g., Wang et al., 2018] and visitors to an area [e.g., Nilforoshan et al., 2023] can differ significantly. This methodological inconsistency partly contributes to heterogeneous findings in the literature on how mobility patterns affect segregation (Sections 3.1 and 3.2), as these approaches capture social mixing at different levels [Moro et al., 2021, Athey et al., 2021].

Indeed, among the studies that simultaneously quantify residential and experienced segregation levels (Section 3), the reinforcing effect of mobility on segregation is found only by those considering the residents as the population exposed. Instead, when segregation is quantified using co-present visitors, the results generally converge to mobility having a reducing effect on experienced segregation.

4.2.3 Measuring co-presence: Temporal resolution

Another important aspect related to the measurement of segregation is the temporal resolution considered when measuring co-presence. In principle, any two individuals should be considered co-present only if they are located in the same area at the same time (computationally, this can be approximated by considering very short time intervals).

However, only 31% among the referenced studies explicitly adopt this approach and discuss how segregation varies by time of day. These studies measure co-presence considering time intervals that range from five minutes [Östh et al., 2018] to day/night periods [Moya-Gómez et al., 2021]. Nonetheless, because of the trade-off between spatial and temporal data granularity, most studies aggregate co-presence considering a period of one day to examine how co-presence differs by day of the week or weekday/weekend [Mooses et al., 2016]. One recent study captures fine-scale co-presence, i.e., 50 meters of each other within 5 minutes, to identify pairs of individuals exposed to each other [Nilforoshan et al., 2023]. These efforts have advanced the field towards more accurately quantifying “true” co-presence in segregation research [Nilforoshan et al., 2023, Xu et al., 2024].

4.3 Limits of existing approaches

The heterogeneity of methods in the literature on mobility and segregation can hamper the comparability of results across studies. Moreover, this literature has a few key limitations. First, most of the studies analyzed in this review are predominantly correlational. They focus on describing the results and associating them with ambient factors. This highlights a significant gap in the field, emphasizing the need for more causal, counterfactual-based [Yabe et al., 2023],

and hypothesis-based [Moro et al., 2021] methodologies to derive robust conclusions. This is particularly important to enhance the real-world impact of these studies, i.e., how we use the knowledge to mitigate segregation.

A second key limitation of the existing work is that co-presence does not necessarily capture meaningful social interactions. This has been revealed in several studies. Schnell and Haj-Yahya [2014] show that mobility influences aspects of segregation and integration, but it cannot fully counteract societal structural stratification that leads to limited social interactions between groups. Zhou and Cheng [2019] also note that physical proximity alone does not guarantee social interactions between co-present individuals. Dorman et al. [2020] even find that co-presence between groups sometimes decreases the chance of having social interactions.

In conclusion, the results drawn from mobility-based studies on social segregation are influenced by methodological choices and the extent to which co-presence in these locations approximates social interactions. Big geolocation data of human mobility offers a nuanced understanding of socio-spatial segregation, but this type of data alone cannot fully capture the complexity of urban segregation. Combining quantitative and qualitative approaches will be essential for drawing robust conclusions.

5 Explaining segregation experiences

Using activity space approaches on empirical mobility data, studies have revealed persistent segregation in individuals' daily mobility and shed light on how different populations experience various levels of segregation in their daily lives (Section 3).

In this section, we further integrate the insights from the transport and urban science research literature to systematize key factors that help explain observed disparities in individual segregation experiences (Figure 2). Individuals' experienced segregation is related to both subjective factors, e.g., preferences for certain activities [Moro et al., 2021], and objective factors, e.g., unequal access to diverse social settings [Netto et al., 2015] such as housing, transport access, etc. These factors contribute to different levels of mobility and shape individuals' activity spaces. Ultimately, they translate into distinct movement networks, leading to different encounter opportunities. These daily experiences eventually create homophilic personal networks, therefore perpetuating segregated class networks. Taken together, these elements shape how individuals are exposed to different socioeconomic groups.

Covering various components of how spatial segregation is produced across activity space, we investigate five aspects of explaining individual segregation experiences in this section: activity demand and lifestyle (Section 5.1), other individual aspects such as values (Section 5.2), housing and urban sprawl characterizing the relative spatial relationship between residence and other activity locations (Section 5.3), transport access describing how easy one can reach various resources and opportunities (Section 5.4), and urban design characterizing the built environment of activity spaces (Section 5.5).

5.1 Activity demand and lifestyle

Individuals are more likely to interact with others from similar socio-economic backgrounds, a phenomenon called homophily [Amini et al., 2014, Xu et al., 2022]. This can happen along many socioeconomic dimensions, such as income [Yip et al., 2016, Wu and Huang, 2022], race/ethnicity [Gordon, 2018, Jones and Pebley, 2014, Bora et al., 2014, Hedman et al., 2021], birth background [Hedman et al., 2021], and religion [Davies et al., 2019], even when other factors are controlled such as traveling distance [Wang et al., 2018], travel time, and opportunities for interaction [Heine et al., 2021]. In short, people are less likely to travel between areas considered to be distant not only in geographical terms but also in socioeconomic terms [Park et al., 2021, Chen et al., 2024].

Individuals' activity demands and lifestyles partly drive this homophily, leading to their different experienced segregation levels. Studies based on GPS data have revealed that experienced segregation is affected by individuals' lifestyles, as captured by the kind of places that they visit in their daily life [Moro et al., 2021]. Lifestyles with more socializing, shopping weekends, and coffee shop visits are associated with higher social integration [Yang et al., 2023, Nilforoshan et al., 2023]. Instead, individuals visiting entertainment venues and restaurants may experience higher levels of segregation because those locations cater to specific income groups, and their cost or cultural context may exclude lower-income individuals [Moro et al., 2021]. Di Clemente et al. [2018] identify that depending on spatial spending records, i.e., the records of where money is spent on what, a strong homophily effect can be observed in a few particular groups, such as commuter, household, young, hi-tech, dinner-out, and average lifestyle groups. Moro et al. [2021] suggest that people who actively explore different places tend to be more economically integrated, experiencing less income segregation.




Figure 2: Conceptual framework explaining socio-spatial segregation. Activity demand and lifestyle (Section 5.1), and Other individual aspects (Section 5.2) deal with individual factors. Housing and urban sprawl (Section 5.3) examines housing and its relationship with workplace locations. Transport access (Section 5.4) refers to access from one’s residence, linking the home with the rest of the activity space. Urban design (Section 5.5) covers the spatial aspect of activity space.

The evidence reveals that individuals residing in the same area with similar housing and transportation accessibility may experience segregation differently due to their diverse activity demands and lifestyles [Yang et al., 2023]. Lifestyle changes such as working from home, e-commerce, food delivery, etc., can affect individuals’ segregation experiences. For example, working from home increases isolation [Xiao et al., 2021a] and limits the interactions in the residential neighborhood, contributing to a high level of experienced segregation. Counterfactual analysis by Yabe et al. [2023] revealed that, two years after the first COVID-19 wave, changes in experienced segregation persist mainly due to lifestyle changes, such as reduced willingness to explore new places.

5.2 Other individual aspects

Besides activity demand and lifestyle, individual values, fears, trust, and social networks affect individual segregation experiences.

Individuals with different values and preferences may experience different levels of segregation in their daily lives. Järv et al. [2021] identify the subjective self-estimated social status as a critical factor affecting the extent of activity spaces and experiences of segregation. People’s inclination towards ascriptive (traditional roles) or achievable (personal accomplishments) status affects their spatial segregation [Goldhaber and Schnell, 2007]. Those focusing on achievable status are more likely to move beyond their ethnic enclaves, while ascriptive-oriented individuals stay within them.

Security barriers and fear also affect the ability to move, interact, and use specific spaces, perpetuating the cycle of segregation [Roulston and Young, 2013, Selim, 2015]. Dixon et al. [2020] suggest that religious segregation results not only from socioeconomic and institutional forces but also from individual mobility choices influenced by perceived intergroup threats and contact experiences. This perceived fear often restricts residents’ willingness to travel, leading to geographical isolation and limited access to work, education, and other activities [Hernandez and Titheridge, 2016]. Furthermore, trust plays a crucial role in segregation experiences, with Browning et al. [2017] finding that high levels of neighborhood trust can mitigate the effects of socioeconomic inequality on spatial segregation in daily routines.

Besides cultural differences or socio-economic factors, social networks within ethnic groups strongly affect segregation patterns [Silm and Ahas, 2014a]. Segregation experiences can vary significantly between individuals; they show a strong correlation at a broader social level between social network segregation and spatial segregation [Xu et al., 2019].

5.3 Housing and urban sprawl

Housing locations and types primarily affect individual mobility and segregation experiences (Table 3). Minorities often live in disadvantaged neighborhoods, which makes it hard to mix with the other groups [Tao et al., 2020b], with

the built environment's slow evolution locking urban communities into persistent settlement patterns and inequalities to resources [Patias et al., 2023].

Table 3: Housing effects on segregation experience.

Aspect	Impact
Rural vs. urban	Rural migrants experience higher birth background segregation in both residential and activity spaces than urban migrants [Lin and Ta, 2023, Shen and Luo, 2023].
Land-use diversity	Areas with high land-use diversity shows less daytime segregation, despite high levels of nighttime segregation [Fuentes et al., 2022].
High land values	Lead to segregation both day and night, attracting high-class residents and contributing to segregation [Fuentes et al., 2022].
Disadvantaged neighborhoods	Face difficulties mixing with other groups due to persistent settlement patterns, with urban evolution fostering segregation into "ghettos" [Power, 2012].
Peripheral and disconnected areas	Poorer populations residing in these areas face socio-economic disadvantages due to limited access to services and job opportunities [Kronenberger and De Saboya, 2017, Atuesta et al., 2018].

Urban sprawl is the uncontrolled expansion of low-density urban areas into the surrounding rural land. Escalating segregation levels usually accompany such increasing size of cities [Monkkonen et al., 2018, Nilforoshan et al., 2023], observed in several countries, such as Brazil [Bittencourt et al., 2021], China [Zhao, 2013], Iran [Azhdari et al., 2018], and Chile [Figueroa et al., 2019]. Increasing urban compactness counteracts urban sprawl, significantly enhancing upward mobility through better job accessibility and indirectly mitigating poverty segregation [Ewing et al., 2016]. Conversely, urban sprawl contributes to disparities in public transportation and job opportunities [Bittencourt et al., 2021, Zhao, 2013], a decline in street network accessibility [Figueroa et al., 2019], and the isolation of peripheral areas [Azhdari et al., 2018, Figueroa et al., 2019]. These aspects intensify segregation through housing aspects.

As a consequence of residential segregation, “spatial mismatch” refers to the geographical separation between low-income communities, often inhabited by racial or ethnic minorities, and employment opportunities, typically located in areas located far from these communities [Kain, 1968]. Spatial mismatch creates a complex interplay between where people live and where they can work or access services. Minority groups tend to experience higher spatial mismatch levels than their white counterparts living in the same Metropolitan Statistical Areas in the US [Easley, 2018]. Spatial mismatch leads to longer commuting times for low-wage workers [Blázquez et al., 2010, Wang et al., 2022]. In China, the low-income population faces a trade-off between service accessibility and the floor area of their residences [Chen and Yeh, 2019]. However, the availability of low-rent housing within urban villages, coupled with short commuting times, alleviates the spatial mismatch for disadvantaged groups in specific regions [Chen et al., 2021].

Housing and urban sprawl largely affect individuals' home and work locations, determining access to key urban resources, e.g., transport. They are vital in shaping individuals' mobility patterns and segregation experiences across their activity spaces. Housing segregation has been extensively studied within urbanization history [e.g., Park and Burgess, 2019] and understood with a variety of models [e.g., Schelling, 1971] that relate residential segregation patterns to the progressive growth of cities. Many theories have been developed to explain observed residential segregation patterns, covering human-ecology-inspired segregation theory, behavioral theory, structural theory, political theory, and local urban and housing policy [Musterd, 2020]. Due to limited space, we refer interested readers to the book by Musterd [2020].

5.4 Transport accessibility

This section first reviews evidence on how transport accessibility differs by income and ethnicity (Section 5.4.1) and brings attention to transport equity and how it affects socio-spatial segregation (Section 5.4.2).

Transport accessibility plays a crucial role in shaping experienced segregation patterns via mobility. Because spatial accessibility reflects how easy it is to reach locations and activities, it ultimately determines the range of places and social environments people can visit. Limited transportation opportunities are closely linked to an increased risk of social exclusion for various individuals or groups [Lucas et al., 2016, Luz and Portugal, 2022], which is accentuated in a pre- and post-pandemic analysis by Gallego Méndez et al. [2023]. Given these challenges, to foster better social integration, Rokem and Vaughan [2019] argues for substantially reevaluating transport infrastructure accessibility, which is central to measuring the equity impacts of transport investments [Pereira et al., 2017].

5.4.1 Factors of income and ethnicity/birth background

Transport access disparity between low and high-income groups may explain their distinct mobility patterns, as reviewed in Section 3.4.1. High-income groups generally have better accessibility than the other groups [Jang and Yi, 2021, Arellana et al., 2021]. Lower-income households limit where they go due to low affordability and poor accessibility [Logiodice et al., 2015, Hernandez and Titheridge, 2016, Martínez et al., 2018, Cortés, 2021], leading to socioeconomic segregation in their activity spaces [Hu et al., 2017, Peña et al., 2022, Cromley and Lin, 2023].

How transport access affects mobility also depends on ethnicity/birth background. Racial residential segregation is associated with lower equitable travel across neighborhoods [Haque, 2016] and fewer visits to common hubs Sampson and Levy [2020]. In the US, living in racially segregated metropolitan areas leads to longer travel times for Black individuals when compared to White individuals, particularly when driving [Landis, 2022]. Although homophily in activity spaces holds across races, for White residents, it is more a preference rather than accessibility [Vachuska, 2023]. While for Black and Hispanic residents, this is mainly due to lower accessibility of various transport modes. Ethnicity/birth background often interacts with socioeconomic status, resulting in different accessibility patterns [Xiao et al., 2021b]. Rokem and Vaughan [2019] reveal two distinct migrant groups - economic migrants and refugees, where the economic migrants have activity spaces closer to the city center, indicating better mobility opportunities than refugees.

The poor transport access where low-income and minority groups live tends to create a vicious circle of segregation and inequalities [Bittencourt et al., 2021]. Extended travel times and restricted access to resources expose the low-income to a greater risk of long-term unemployment [Korsu and Wenglenski, 2010], diminishing their opportunities for upward mobility. In Turkey, Syrian refugees have limited accessibility to various transportation methods and activities due to a lack of language skills, further compounding their poverty and social exclusion [Ozkazanc, 2021]. In contrast, efficient transportation networks, e.g., better job accessibility, can offset the adverse effects of residential segregation and narrow the income disparity between socioeconomic groups [Galaskiewicz et al., 2021, Eom, 2022].

5.4.2 Transport equity

Transport access discrimination against certain social groups partly stems from planning stages being intentionally or unintentionally biased towards privileged groups and might perpetuate existing social segregation [Govender and Maharaj, 2012, Golub et al., 2013, Naranjo Gomez, 2016]. For example, road infrastructure enhancements in peri-urban communities often improve connectivity and attract middle-to-high-income individuals seeking enhanced services [Adugbila et al., 2023]. However, this influx tends to displace low-income residents, pushing them into hinterlands and leading to fragmentation within these peri-urban areas. Elevated highways and urban freeways deepen socio-spatial divisions by favoring affluent commuters and exposing marginalized groups to environmental risks and poor services [Graham, 2018, Mahajan, 2023]. However, even public transport infrastructure, primarily intended for promoting social integration, can have discriminatory consequences against disadvantaged groups. High-income neighborhoods benefit more from public transport investments than low-income ones, reinforcing residential segregation [Heilmann, 2018]. Compared with lower-income homeowners, higher-income homeowners can better take advantage of transit-induced price capitalization effects on their property values and upgrade to more affluent neighborhoods [Nilsson and Delmelle, 2020].

5.5 Urban design

Socio-spatial segregation is influenced not only by current socioeconomic variables but also by historical patterns of urbanization and transformation [Zhou et al., 2015]. This section reviews how urban spaces affect individuals' segregation experiences, where specific forms of urban areas are better than others in facilitating individual mobility and fostering social inclusion [Goldblatt and Omer, 2015], as illustrated in Table 4.

Architecture, urban design, and planning are vital in mitigating inequalities [Legeby and Feng, 2022]. Consequently, the built environment's impact on segregation variation demands careful consideration. To effectively address segregation dynamics, it is essential to examine the co-presence of social groups in public spaces, utilizing urban form to foster positive change [Miranda, 2020]. As a crucial public space, urban parks enhance social integration [Samson, 2017], demanding inclusive design to encourage shared activities to foster interaction among diverse community members [Abdelmonem and McWhinney, 2015, Xiao et al., 2019]. Providing equitable park access is crucial for mitigating segregation experiences [Van Nes and Aghabeik, 2015, Miller, 2019].

Table 4: Urban design effects on segregation experiences.

Aspect	Impact
Hierarchical urban structures	Limit public space use and social inclusion, particularly affecting immigrants [Legeby and Marcus, 2011].
Distribution of consumption spaces	Drives segregation in public space usage, indicating urban exclusion [Bolzoni, 2016].
Streets with slower traffic and good environment	Enhance social integration and contribute to vibrant public life [Sauter and Huettenmoser, 2008].
High spatial integration	Leads to enhanced access to services, reducing segregation [Van Nes and Aghabeik, 2015, Garnica-Monroy and Alvanides, 2019, Legeby and Feng, 2022].
High pedestrian density, walkability, and bikability	Aligns with lower segregation through synergistic urban patterns with the surrounding cities [Alghatam, 2019, van den Berg et al., 2017, Mouratidis and Poortinga, 2020, Wang and Liu, 2022].
Multi-scalar spatial configurations	Facilitates urban encounters and improves social integration [Şevik and Çalişkan, 2022].
Mixed-use design and linear parks	Enhances activity interactions and socioeconomic integration [Gao and Lim, 2023].

5.6 Facilitating mobility to promote integration

Moving outside one’s residence generally reduces segregation level, as Section 3 suggests. Evidence in transport and urban science research also highlights the essential role of mobility in promoting integration [Camarero and Oliva, 2019, Mooses et al., 2020, Huang et al., 2022]. Therefore, we have this section to briefly summarize practices and policies from various regions focusing on housing, public transport, and urban design that impact segregation (detailed in Table B.2).

Housing policies could facilitate interactions between socioeconomic groups and promote social integration when they account for affordability and lack of transport access faced by minorities [Utzig, 2017]. In transport and urban development, the car-centric urban development is often associated with increased segregation [Sanchez et al., 2004], restricting transport access to essential opportunities like jobs, education, and healthcare [Sanchez et al., 2004, McDonagh, 2006]. Better public transportation may enhance exposure levels between population groups and reduce overall levels of segregation experienced by individuals [Wong and Shaw, 2011, Kryvobokov and Bouzouina, 2014, Landis, 2022, Power, 2012, Utzig, 2017, Carpio-Pinedo, 2021, Athey et al., 2021, Huang et al., 2022]. Transit-oriented development planning is a way to break the vicious cycle of car-centric mode, where we need strategic methods to counter spatial inequality to fully unleash its potential in promoting integration in modern cities. In this process, Mueller et al. [2018] emphasize the integration of affordable housing preservation into city planning, particularly near transit corridors.

In urban design, targeted initiatives in walkability, public space, and housing design can enhance urban vitality and social cohesion. In implementing these initiatives, Unceta et al. [2020] highlight the importance of considering local context and potential in space and society rather than solely relying on land regularization and imported solutions. One example is a measuring tool by Alipour and Galal Ahmed [2021] for assessing social sustainability indicators, covering factors like density, land use, mobility options, street layouts, etc., potentially revealing segregation in public urban spaces.

6 Discussion

This review article makes three contributions: a conceptual framework, critical methodological reflections, and cross-disciplinary insights. Firstly, it defines core concepts and clarifies their connections, addressing the diverse and inconsistent terms used in the field. Secondly, it reviews studies that adopt activity space approaches and critically examines the methodologies employed with emerging mobility data sources. Lastly, by incorporating insights from computational social science, urban science, and transportation, this review enhances the understanding of socio-spatial segregation at the individual level and offers actionable insights for reducing segregation in an interdisciplinary context.

Our analysis of over 170 research works reveals that increased mobility enables individuals to interact with more diverse populations, particularly outside their residential neighborhoods, offering the potential to reduce the levels of segregation experienced by individuals and groups. However, the extent to which moving outside one’s residence

reduces segregation depends on various factors. These include the nature of the encounters, the individuals' willingness to engage with others, and the broader societal and systemic influences at play. The effectiveness of moving around in lessening segregation varies significantly across different groups and individuals, mainly due to economic and social factors influencing their travel capacity. This interplay between residential segregation and individually experienced segregation patterns is intricate, as economic, cultural, physical, and spatial factors not only shape individual mobility patterns but also, in turn, influence individual segregation experiences. Such complexity underscores the multifaceted nature of socio-spatial segregation and its challenges.

This section synthesizes the literature review to answer the research questions proposed in this study regarding people's movement in space and time and their segregation experiences. Initially, we shift our focus from a static residential viewpoint to a dynamic activity-space paradigm, exploring what this perspective shift reveals (Section 6.1). We then examine the factors associated with disparities in individual segregation experiences (Section 6.2). Subsequently, we evaluate the burgeoning literature utilizing emerging data sources, assessing its potential and challenges in understanding spatial segregation (Section 6.3). Finally, we pinpoint existing research gaps and propose corresponding future directions.

6.1 Mobility level associated with individual segregation experiences

This study investigated the literature using the activity space approach and empirical mobility data in quantifying socio-spatial segregation to examine whether moving outside one's residence contributes to lower segregation levels than traditional residential segregation. The literature using either traditional or emerging data sources reveals mixed results.

Several studies underscore the correlation between residential segregation and experienced segregation, drawing attention to the phenomenon of mobility homophily. These studies indicate that despite increased mobility, segregation patterns often persist or become more pronounced, with mobility sometimes restricted to within certain community bounds or along racial, ethnic, or tribal lines. Conversely, other research have found that moving outside one's residence can mitigate segregation experiences, revealing disparities among different socioeconomic groups. They highlight instances where we see lower levels of segregation in activity spaces than in neighborhoods. This reduction is due to greater exposure to diverse groups in nonresidential environments, workplaces, and other activity locations. These mixed findings result in large part due to differences in the concepts and methods used across studies, as discussed in Section 4)

Overall, the literature highlights the segregation-reducing effect of mobility compared to the other side of the coin, i.e., its segregation-reinforcing effect. However, these two aspects are not contradictory to each other. Some studies highlight both sides [e.g., Silm et al., 2018, Zhang et al., 2022b, Lin and Ta, 2023], drawing attention to the complexity of the relationship between residential and experienced segregation levels.

6.2 Mechanisms in segregation experiences

In this section, we synthesize the findings from the literature in a broader context, summarizing the mechanisms of spatial segregation from an activity space perspective.

Economic and social influences. Job opportunities, leisure options, and cultural preferences based on ethnicity, birth background, and income level significantly shape individual mobility and, consequently, segregation experiences. Differences in wealth lead to distinct mobility patterns. In developed countries, those with higher socioeconomic status often engage in more diverse activities, accessing various locations, which dilutes their experienced segregation levels. Conversely, lower-income individuals typically have more localized mobility, intensifying their experienced segregation levels. In developing countries, the opposite effect has been observed. Different ethnic groups display unique mobility patterns, often gravitating towards or remaining within areas predominantly occupied by their communities. This tendency is influenced by various factors such as economic constraints, security perceptions, and targeted policing practices.

Social networks and lifestyles. The nature of social networks within ethnic communities, neighborhood trust levels, and preferences for social interaction contribute to forming segregation patterns. Mobility homophily, or the tendency to interact with similar socioeconomic groups, further reinforces these patterns across activity spaces. People's preferences, whether leaning towards traditional or achievement-oriented values, also shape their activity spaces.

Physical and spatial factors. The design of urban spaces, including the layout of neighborhoods, proximity to amenities, and public transportation systems, influence how individuals experience segregation in their daily lives. Therefore, housing policies, urban planning decisions, and transport infrastructure can potentially mitigate or exacerbate segregation experiences. These elements determine where people can reside, work, and participate in daily activities, significantly influencing their segregation experiences.

6.3 Emerging data sources: nuanced understanding at scale

We have found over 70 reference studies using geolocation information from emerging data sources such as GPS tracking devices, mobile phone GPS, Call Detail Records, and geotagged tweets to study socio-spatial segregation. Studies using emerging data sources, compared to those relying on traditional data, provide evidence based on actual behavioral data on mobility rather than stated preferences and offer broader spatial and population coverage with high spatiotemporal granularity [Nilforoshan et al., 2023].

6.3.1 Novel insights

These emerging-data studies typically quantify multi-dimensional aspects of socio-spatial segregation, simultaneously examining race/ethnicity, birth background, income, and other factors [e.g., Heine et al., 2021]. In contrast, traditional data-driven studies often focus on a single aspect of segregation, e.g., housing [Wang et al., 2012], linking it to other relevant and readily available explanatory variables in the applied data. With data from a wide range of users, these sources offer diverse demographic insights, capturing the experiences and behaviors of different social groups and revealing interacting effects between various dimensions, e.g., income and birth background [Gao et al., 2021].

Emerging data sources often provide large-scale insights into segregation levels while preserving nuanced understandings to zoom in at the block level [Moro et al., 2021, Nilforoshan et al., 2023]. Most studies examining the entire country [Vachuska, 2023] or major metropolitan areas [Moro et al., 2021, Wu and Huang, 2022, Huang et al., 2022] use data collected from the US. Leveraging these widely available data sources allows for a detailed examination of various points of interest [Moro et al., 2021] and regions, uncovering segregation patterns at the block level [Wu and Huang, 2022]. They also enable near real-time analysis with high temporal granularity, providing insights into dynamic segregation patterns and trends as they change over different times of the day [Shen and Luo, 2023] and seasons of the year [Mooses et al., 2016].

The abundance and intricacy of big data have spurred the development of innovative analytical methods and tools in spatial segregation research. For example, the theory of mobility homophily, confirmed across multiple regions [Xu et al., 2019, Heine et al., 2021, Huang et al., 2022], extends its relevance beyond residential segregation to include daily segregation experiences. Leveraging emerging data sources allows for integrating extensive mobility geolocation data with social network data, unveiling patterns previously unobservable at such refined scales [Xu et al., 2019, Silm et al., 2021]. Building on this, Moro et al. [2021] have developed a social exploration and preferential return model using vast human mobility geolocation data, effectively capturing the dual aspects of economic integration: social and place explorations. By harnessing extensive mobility data from large populations, it becomes feasible to construct a large-scale mobility network [Nilforoshan et al., 2023] and employ network analysis tools, like community detection, to uncover insights into segregation patterns at a national level [Huang et al., 2022].

This review considers segregation as a physical and spatial in-person process. However, emerging data sources allow us to go beyond this boundary [Ye and Andris, 2021]. In developed countries, online social media is becoming more prevalent, sometimes substituting in-person interactions. Thus, we only observe part of the experienced segregation from mobility data while missing the other part in the digital world. For example, using credit card transactions and Twitter mentions, a study found that offline and online segregation experiences are very similar in Turkey [Dong et al., 2020].

6.3.2 Challenges

Studies using emerging data sources, such as mobile phone applications and GPS-enabled services, face four significant challenges: population bias, uneven sampling of locations, association with census data, and methodology for quantifying spatial segregation.

Population bias arises because the user demographics behind this big geodata, including age, gender, and ethnicity, often do not accurately represent the broader population. Therefore, appropriately weighting individual devices in spatial segregation analysis is crucial to prevent inaccurate results [Wang et al., 2018]. Saxon [2021] show that spatial models using mobile phone GPS data have systematic bias, notably towards overestimating the park access of minority populations, which results in understating inequity.

An uneven sampling of locations brings two types of biases in the collected geolocation data on human mobility. Firstly, self-reported geolocations such as geotagged tweets have selective biases, overly representing leisure and non-routine activities [Liao et al., 2019]. Secondly, passively collected geodata from call detail records or GPS-enabled phone applications are contingent on user interactions with mobile phones, resulting in data sparsity and biases, particularly towards activities in the afternoon and nighttime [Liao, 2021]. These factors significantly influence the analysis of segregation experiences, considering the recorded activity spaces visited instead of the full range.

Analyzing socio-spatial segregation with anonymized mobile phone data necessitates implementing home detection methods to infer the sociodemographic attributes of the device users. Traced by human circadian rhythms, temporal rules are commonly used to infer individuals' home and work locations from mobile phone data [e.g., Gao et al., 2021]. There is a notable lack of validation against ground truth data, mainly due to privacy concerns and the anonymization of big geolocation data [Verma et al., 2024]. However, accurately identifying home and work locations remains crucial for understanding daily mobility patterns and capturing individual segregation experiences. More work is needed to examine and enhance the validity of these methods for practical applications in socio-spatial segregation research [Pappalardo et al., 2021].

Another limitation is regarding the collection and analysis of demographic and household data. The inability to directly ascertain gender, age, or family composition, alongside reliance on residential location to infer income, restricts our understanding of socio-economic diversity. Additionally, the focus on individual mobile devices, without access to household-level information, limits insights into how household structure affects mobility and segregation patterns, highlighting a significant gap in analyzing collective household dynamics.

The fourth challenge is the methodology for analyzing socio-spatial segregation, described in Section 4. Studies that try to measure segregation levels using an activity space approach present significant differences in how they define activity spaces, co-presence, and the temporal resolution deployed in the analyses. For instance, considering co-present visitors rather than exposed residents results in more heterogeneous experienced segregation levels [Xu, 2022]. A critical limitation is the absence of causal analysis, which confines the studies to descriptive and correlational assessments, thereby reducing their potential real-world impact. Untangling to what extent experienced segregation results from different factors (urban design, housing, transportation, and individual aspects) remains a challenge.

6.4 Future research directions

Numerous studies employing activity space approaches quantify spatial segregation, utilizing both small and large data sets. These approaches are predominantly descriptive, focusing on defining and measuring social segregation through human mobility data. Their principal contribution lies in transcending traditional residential perspectives. With over a decade since this paradigm shift in socio-spatial segregation research, moving from a static residential viewpoint to a dynamic, mobility-based one, the field is now poised to advance beyond mere descriptive analysis. There is a pressing need to explain observed social segregation phenomena within various spatiotemporal contexts using more causal, counterfactual, and hypothesis-testing methods.

As highlighted in this review (Section 5), numerous transport and urban science studies have provided insights into socio-spatial segregation in diverse spatial contexts over time. However, these studies often treat socio-spatial segregation primarily as a static residential phenomenon, seldom considering how individuals experience it daily. For instance, in transport equity evaluations, accessibility is primarily calculated based on residential locations. Despite these efforts, the direct contributions of these factors to individuals' daily segregation experiences remain somewhat ambiguous.

Looking ahead, we advocate for three critical research directions that emphasize the need for a cross-disciplinary approach at the intersection of urban social science and transportation. These include exploring how people experience social segregation daily and devising region-specific explanations. First, we suggest that activity space approaches fueled by big geodata should be integrated with additional data sources that quantify transport systems and urban spaces. This integration would enable a more comprehensive analysis of the relationships among housing, transport access, urban design, and individual segregation experiences [Zhang et al., 2022a, Vachuska, 2023, Nilforoshan et al., 2023], thereby maximizing the potential of big data's scale effect. Second, studies employing urban space analysis to foster spatial integration should incorporate empirical insights into people's mobility behaviors. As empirical mobility data reveals, the urban design challenge for promoting social inclusion may reside in bridging the gap between intended and observed social mixing between different populations. Third, one shall explore the causal relationships between land use, transportation infrastructure, and experienced segregation. Investigating how variations in land use patterns and accessibility levels influence human mobility could yield valuable insights into the effectiveness of policy interventions that foster social mixing. This approach could help identify strategies for mitigating segregation and enhancing community cohesion through urban planning and policy design.

Acknowledgements

We thank E. Moro for providing insightful comments on an earlier draft of this manuscript. This research is funded by the Swedish Research Council (Project Number 2022-06215).

During the preparation of this work the authors used GPT-4 and Jenni.ai in order to improve the language use. After using this tool/service, the authors reviewed and edited the content as needed and take full responsibility for the content of the preprint.

A Literature selection methods

This literature review is centered around three pivotal concepts: segregation, activity space, and the role of the built environment in facilitating mobility. The included studies were extracted from the Scopus database on Oct 18, 2023, covering the original research in English published as journal or conference articles. Table A.1 shows the search keywords and search query, which are designed to identify the role of mobility in shaping individual segregation experiences quantified using activity space approaches and gain relevant insights in the field of built environment, including transport and urban science research.

Table A.1: Keywords for literature search.

Theme	Keywords
(1) Segregation	segregation, spatial integration, social integration, socio-spatial integration, social cohesion
(2) Activity space	spatial mobility, human mobility, daily mobility, personal mobility, individual mobility, spatio-temporal mobility, spatiotemporal mobility, socio-spatial mobility, sociospatial mobility, urban mobility, spatial movement, activity space, action space, spatial network, spatial behavior, spatio-temporal behavior, spatiotemporal behavior, use of space, lifeworld, person-based, individual-based
(3) Encounter	social mix, encountering, encounter, encounter network, social ties, third places, cross-cultural encounters, shared experiences, connectivity, co-presence, co-existence, co-presenting
(4) Built environment	mobility, access inequality, accessibility, access, social and spatial inequality, transport-related social exclusion, urban sprawl, transport modes, modal split, transit deserts, transport justice, active transportation, transit-oriented development, multi-modality, travel behavior, transport affordability, traffic congestion, public transport subsidies
Search query	Titles, abstract, and keywords include (1 AND 2) OR (1 AND 3) OR (1 AND 4)

Our study focuses on research that employs empirical data to quantify socio-spatial segregation from an activity space viewpoint. This approach addresses our first research question regarding the influence of mobility on individual segregation experiences, encompassing Themes 1 & 2, which are detailed in Sections 3 and 3.4. We categorize the studies into two groups: those relying on traditional data sources like travel surveys, census, and register data and those employing emerging data sources, including GPS trackers and mobile phone data. Additionally, we examine studies that estimate potential interactions facilitated by the built environment alongside insights from transport and urban science regarding housing, transport accessibility, and urban design. These studies, which align with Themes 1 & 3 and Themes 1 & 4, are explored in Section 5. They contribute to our second research question, aiming to elucidate segregation experiences and propose potential solutions to socio-spatial segregation.

Figure A.1 summarizes the included original studies. Figures A.1a-b show the studies cited under Sections 3-3.4 on empirical findings of individual segregation experiences using activity space approaches. Figures A.1c-d illustrate those references under Section 6 on explaining segregation from a built environment perspective.

We summarize the core concepts defined and used in this study in Table A.2.

B Segregation metrics and implications from practices

A variety of metrics are used to quantify socio-spatial segregation. In Table B.1, we present a selection of segregation metrics, categorized into three types based on their adoption in the three approaches defined in this study. The first class (Type 1) consists of traditional segregation metrics developed for residential segregation, which can also be used for evaluating the co-presence outside homes in activity space approaches. The second class (Type 2) considers network centrality metrics to quantify potential co-presence, e.g., the likelihood of different population groups occupying or traversing the same spaces within a spatial network [Legeby et al., 2015]. The third class (Type 3) comprises metrics commonly seen in studies using activity space approaches.




Figure A.1: Referenced papers from activity space and built environment perspectives. These statistics only include original studies published in journals or conference proceedings, excluding reviews, opinions, and other articles cited in this study. (a) Number of activity space papers by studied country, year, and data source (Themes 1 & 2.) (b) Number of transport and urban science papers by studied country and year (Themes 1 & 3 and Themes 1 & 4.)

In Table B.2, we present a brief summary of policies and actions in housing, public transport, and urban design that have implications for segregation.

References

- Tanja Joelsson and Danielle Ekman Ladru. Cracks in the well-plastered façade of the nordic model: reflections on inequalities in housing and mobility in (post-) coronavirus pandemic sweden. *Children's Geographies*, 20(4): 478–486, 2022.
- Yanji Zhang, Liang Cai, Guangwen Song, Lin Liu, and Chunwu Zhu. From residential neighborhood to activity space: The effects of educational segregation on crime and their moderation by social context. *Annals of the American Association of Geographers*, 112(8):2393–2412, 2022a.
- Siiri Silm and Rein Ahas. Ethnic differences in activity spaces: A study of out-of-home nonemployment activities with mobile phone data. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 104(3):542–559, 2014a.
- Qing-Quan Li, Yang Yue, Qi-Li Gao, Chen Zhong, and Joana Barros. Towards a new paradigm for segregation measurement in an age of big data. *Urban Informatics*, 1(1):5, 2022a.
- Songhua Hu, Chenfeng Xiong, Hannah Younes, Mofeng Yang, Aref Darzi, and Zhiyu Catherine Jin. Examining spatiotemporal evolution of racial/ethnic disparities in human mobility and covid-19 health outcomes: Evidence from the contiguous united states. *Sustainable Cities and Society*, 76:103506, 2022.
- Alice Z Xu. Segregation and the spatial externalities of inequality: A theory of interdependence and public goods in cities. *American Political Science Review*, pages 1–18, 2023.
- Esteban Moro, Dan Calacci, Xiaowen Dong, and Alex Pentland. Mobility patterns are associated with experienced income segregation in large us cities. *Nature communications*, 12(1):4633, 2021.
- Jonathan Rokem and Laura Vaughan. Segregation, mobility and encounters in jerusalem: The role of public transport infrastructure in connecting the ‘divided city’. *Urban Studies*, 55(15):3454–3473, 2018.
- Hamed Nilforoshan, Wenli Looi, Emma Pierson, Blanca Villanueva, Nic Fishman, Yiling Chen, John Sholar, Beth Redbird, David Grusky, and Jure Leskovec. Human mobility networks reveal increased segregation in large cities. *Nature*, pages 1–7, 2023.
- Robert E Park and Ernest W Burgess. *The city*. University of Chicago Press, 2019.
- Flávia F Feitosa, Gilberto Camara, Antônio Miguel Vieira Monteiro, Thomas Koschitzki, and Marcelino PS Silva. Global and local spatial indices of urban segregation. *International Journal of Geographical Information Science*, 21(3):299–323, 2007.
- V de M Netto and Romulo Krafta. Socio-spatial networks: social segregation as a real-time phenomenon. In *Proceedings of the III International Space Syntax Symposium, Atlanta 2001*, 2001.

Table A.2: Glossary of core concepts.

Concept	Definition	Similar concepts
Co-presence	The sharing of place/urban space between individuals. Originated from space syntax theory [Hillier and Vaughan, 2007].	Exposure [Nilforoshan et al., 2023], Encounter [Rokem and Vaughan, 2018], Mixing [Juhász et al., 2023], Co-existence [Şevik and Çalişkan, 2022], Co-location [Deurloo et al., 2022], Population exposed
Interaction (social)	The process by which individuals act and react in relation to others within a social context.	Contact/“Distanced” interaction [Allport et al., 1954]
Place/urban space	A location within a city defined by its physical, social, or functional characteristics, e.g., parks.	Amenity [Juhász et al., 2023]
Areal unit	A defined area or segment of space used as the basis for segregation analysis, e.g., census tracts and administrative divisions.	Spatial unit, Neighborhood
Mobility	The movement of individuals in space and time [Barbosa et al., 2018].	Human mobility
Activity space	A geographic space encompassing an individual’s activity locations and movement over time [Golledge, 1997].	Daily path [Hägerstrand et al., 1975]
Socio-spatial segregation	The social and spatial separation between individuals from different socioeconomic backgrounds, suggesting their uneven spatial distributions and a lack of inter-group interactions [Yao et al., 2019].	Isolation, Discrimination
Residential segregation	The uneven spatial distribution of the residential location of different groups within a city or metropolitan region.	Housing segregation
Network segregation	The uneven spatial distribution of the potential co-presence in locations different socio-economic groups can reach from home through walk, car, or transit networks.	Centrality measures of spatial network [Rokem and Vaughan, 2018]
Place-based segregation	The spatial separation of different groups within distinct geographic areas or locations.	Workplace segregation [Hellerstein and Neumark, 2008]
Visiting segregation	The spatial separation of different groups within distinct geographic areas or locations, considering the time-varying co-presence.	Mobility-based segregation [Park et al., 2021, Iyer et al., 2023]
Experienced segregation	How segregated an individual is across his/her activity space.	Multi-contextual segregation [Park and Kwan, 2018], Segregation experiences
Lifestyle	The way a person or a group chooses to live.	Habits, Behavior
Homophily	Individuals are more likely to be co-present with others from similar socioeconomic backgrounds [Amini et al., 2014, Xu et al., 2022].	Homophilic mobility

Mei-Po Kwan. Beyond space (as we knew it): Toward temporally integrated geographies of segregation, health, and accessibility: Space–time integration in geography and giscience. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 103(5):1078–1086, 2013.

Xingang Zhou, Zifeng Chen, Anthony GO Yeh, and Yang Yue. Workplace segregation of rural migrants in urban china: A case study of shenzhen using cellphone big data. *Environment and Planning B: Urban Analytics and City Science*, 48(1):25–42, 2021.

Table B.1: Selection of key segregation metrics. Type I = Classic, developed for quantifying residential segregation. Type II = Network analysis, applied in built environment research in approximating the potential co-presence of individuals. Type III = Activity space, applied or developed in the context of activity space approaches, often along with a large amount of geolocation data on human mobility.

Type	Index/Model	Description
I	Evenness or Dissimilarity	How evenly groups are distributed across a geographical space [Reardon and O’Sullivan, 2004].
	Exposure Indices	Potential contact between groups [Silm and Ahas, 2014b].
	Concentration Indices	The extent to which minority populations are situated in specific regions [Johnston et al., 2007].
	Spatial Distribution Indices Spatial Clustering Indices	Broader spatial patterns [Demoraes et al., 2021]. The degree of clustering of high-density group areas, e.g., Moran’s I [O’Sullivan and Wong, 2007].
II	Integration Analysis/Closeness	Connectedness of each space highlighting areas likely to be frequented by diverse groups [Yunitsyna and Shtepani, 2023].
	Choice Analysis/Betweenness	It quantifies a space’s role in facilitating encounters [Rokem and Vaughan, 2018].
	Visibility Graph Analysis	Which spaces are visually connected, providing insight into interaction opportunities [Turner et al., 2001].
	Angular Segment Analysis	Spaces accessible with fewer angular changes often being busier and thus prime for co-presence [Turner, 2001].
	Combined integration and choice values	They identify the network’s most accessible areas [Rokem and Vaughan, 2018].
III	Multi-accessibility	Simultaneous ease of access to a place by multiple transport modes [Carpio-Pinedo, 2021].
	Socio-Spatial Isolation Indices	Individual isolation within activity locations [Athey et al., 2021].
	Social Interaction Potential	Metric of exposure based on time-geography for metropolitan scale [Farber et al., 2015].
	i-STP index	Individual-level segregation index considering different times of the day [Park and Kwan, 2018].
	Flow-based spatial interaction model	It can capture the impact of specified commuting routes on segregation experiences [Shen, 2019].
	Segregation hotspots	Cluster multiscalar fingerprint to identify hotspots of segregation in urban spaces [Olteanu and Lamirel, 2020].
	Segregated Mobility Index (SMI)	Racial segregation in how neighborhoods of varying racial compositions are connected [Candipan et al., 2021].
	Income Unevenness	Quantifies income unevenness in US cities using population income quartiles [Moro et al., 2021].
	Graph Embedding	Income segregation that combines residential and mobility perspectives [Zhang et al., 2021].
Index of Concentration at the Extremes (ICE)	How population concentrates at certain groups in a given area [Iyer et al., 2023].	
Spatial Segregation Index	This index integrates distance-decay functions to measure individual experienced segregation [Wu et al., 2023].	

Marina Toger, Umut Türk, John Östh, Karima Kourtit, and Peter Nijkamp. Inequality in leisure mobility: An analysis of activity space segregation spectra in the stockholm conurbation. *Journal of transport geography*, 111:103638, 2023.

Robert J Sampson and Brian L Levy. Beyond residential segregation: Mobility-based connectedness and rates of violence in large cities. *Race and social problems*, 12(1):77–86, 2020.

Jennifer Candipan, Nolan Edward Phillips, Robert J Sampson, and Mario Small. From residence to movement: The nature of racial segregation in everyday urban mobility. *Urban Studies*, 58(15):3095–3117, 2021.

Fei Li and Donggen Wang. Measuring urban segregation based on individuals’ daily activity patterns: A multidimensional approach. *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space*, 49(2):467–486, 2017.

Stephen Roulston and Orna Young. Gps tracking of some northern ireland students—patterns of shared and separated space: divided we stand? *International Research in Geographical and Environmental Education*, 22(3):241–258, 2013.

Yang Xu, Alexander Belyi, Paolo Santi, and Carlo Ratti. Quantifying segregation in an integrated urban physical-social space. *Journal of the Royal Society Interface*, 16(160):20190536, 2019.

Table B.2: Policies and actions in housing, public transport, and urban design and their impact on segregation. 1 = Housing, 2 = Public transport, and 3 = Urban design.

#	Policy/Action	Description	Segregation implications
1	Urban village placement for rural migrant workers (China)	Good job accessibility for rural workers in urban villages.	Lowers workplace segregation [Zhu et al., 2017, Zhou et al., 2021].
	Urban renewal (China)	Urban village demolition due to renewal policies.	Risks increasing segregation due to displacement [Zhu et al., 2022].
	Housing Choice Voucher program (US)	Housing affordability programs.	Effectiveness limited by entrenched socio-demographic barriers [Garboden, 2021].
2	Minibus taxi system (South Africa)	Integrated transport systems for diverse populations.	Could decrease segregation by serving actual transport needs [Nelson, 2023].
	Public transport fare reform (Portugal)	Enhancing commuter accessibility.	May reduce social inequalities and segregation [Silver et al., 2023].
	Bus and metro systems (Colombia)	Public transport accessible to the poor.	Reduces segregation by improving transport access for the poor [Valenzuela-Levi, 2023].
	Light-rail transportation (US)	Light-rail construction in neighborhoods.	Gentrification risk with potential for demographic shifts [Hess, 2020].
3	Bike share program (US)	Equitable bike station planning.	Equitable transport access can lower segregation [Bhuyan et al., 2019].
	Cycle hire scheme (UK)	Wider distribution of city cycling schemes.	Enhanced inclusiveness and reduced income segregation [Lovelace et al., 2020].
	Inclusive sidewalk design (Saudi Arabia)	Gender-responsive public space design.	Targets gender-based segregation reduction [Almahmood et al., 2018].
	Urban transformation (Turkey)	Social inclusion efforts for refugees.	Fosters integration and combats segregation in mixed-use areas [Altaema and Hatipoğlu, 2023].
	Carpooling (US)	Carpooling algorithms for diverse groups.	Encourages social integration via shared transport [Librino et al., 2020].

Qi Wang, Nolan Edward Phillips, Mario L Small, and Robert J Sampson. Urban mobility and neighborhood isolation in america's 50 largest cities. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 115(30):7735–7740, 2018.

Karl Vachuska. Racial segregation in everyday mobility patterns: Disentangling the effect of travel time. *Socius*, 9: 23780231231169261, 2023.

Simone Bertoli, Caglar Ozden, and Michael Packard. Segregation and internal mobility of syrian refugees in turkey: Evidence from mobile phone data. *Journal of Development Economics*, 152:102704, 2021.

Xue Zhang, Jue Wang, Mei-Po Kwan, and Yanwei Chai. Reside nearby, behave apart? activity-space-based segregation among residents of various types of housing in beijing, china. *Cities*, 88:166–180, 2019.

Jing Yao, David WS Wong, Nick Bailey, and Jonathan Minton. Spatial segregation measures: A methodological review. *Tijdschrift voor economische en sociale geografie*, 110(3):235–250, 2019.

Kerli Müürisepp, Olle Järv, Tiit Tammaru, and Tuuli Toivonen. Activity spaces and big data sources in segregation research: A methodological review. *Frontiers in Sustainable Cities*, 4:861640, 2022.

Douglas S Massey and Nancy A Denton. The dimensions of residential segregation. *Social forces*, 67(2):281–315, 1988.

Sean F Reardon and David O'Sullivan. Measures of spatial segregation. *Sociological methodology*, 34(1):121–162, 2004.

Bill Hillier and Laura Vaughan. The city as one thing. *Progress in planning*, 67(3):205–230, 2007.

Marinus Cornelis Deurloo, Sako Musterd, Bart Sleutjes, and Jeroen Slot. Co-location of different population categories. micro-level segregation dynamics: The case of amsterdam. In *Vertical Cities*, pages 99–115. Edward Elgar Publishing, 2022.

Ebru Şevik and Olgu Çalışkan. Coexistence in space: Stimulating encounter in the socially fragmented open urban fabrics. *Built Environment*, 48(3):364–392, 2022.

- Sándor Juhász, Gergő Pintér, Ádám J Kovács, Endre Borza, Gergely Mónus, László Lőrincz, and Balázs Lengyel. Amenity complexity and urban locations of socio-economic mixing. *EPJ Data Science*, 12(1):34, 2023.
- Randall Collins. *Interaction ritual chains*. Princeton university press, 2004.
- Vinicius M Netto, Maíra Pinheiro Soares, and Roberto Paschoalino. Segregated networks in the city. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 39(6):1084–1102, 2015.
- Gordon Willard Allport, Kenneth Clark, and Thomas Pettigrew. The nature of prejudice. 1954.
- Yoo Min Park and Mei-Po Kwan. Beyond residential segregation: A spatiotemporal approach to examining multi-contextual segregation. *Computers, Environment and Urban Systems*, 71:98–108, 2018.
- Otis Dudley Duncan and Beverly Duncan. A methodological analysis of segregation indexes. *American sociological review*, 20(2):210–217, 1955.
- Roger Andersson, Åsa Bråmås, and Emma Holmqvist. Counteracting segregation: Swedish policies and experiences. *Housing studies*, 25(2):237–256, 2010.
- Jose Carpio-Pinedo. Multimodal transport and potential encounters with social difference: A novel approach based on network analysis. *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 43(1):93–116, 2021.
- Anna Yunitsyna and Ernest Shtepani. Investigating the socio-spatial relations of the built environment using the space syntax analysis—a case study of tirana city. *Cities*, 133:104147, 2023.
- E Ravalet. Segregation and daily mobility, an international comparison. *WIT Transactions on the Built Environment*, 89, 2006.
- Donggen Wang, Fei Li, and Yanwei Chai. Activity spaces and sociospatial segregation in beijing. *Urban Geography*, 33(2):256–277, 2012.
- Guillaume Le Roux, Julie Vallée, and Hadrien Commenges. Social segregation around the clock in the paris region (france). *Journal of Transport Geography*, 59:134–145, 2017.
- John D Landis. Minority travel disparities and residential segregation: Evidence from the 2017 national household travel survey. *Transportation Research Part D: Transport and Environment*, 112:103455, 2022.
- Shuting Lin and Na Ta. Does social exposure influence locals’ and migrants’ city attachment? comparing residential areas and activity spaces. *Population, Space and Place*, 29(3):e2643, 2023.
- John Östh, Ian Shuttleworth, and Thomas Nedomysl. Spatial and temporal patterns of economic segregation in sweden’s metropolitan areas: A mobility approach. *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space*, 50(4): 809–825, 2018.
- Xiao Huang, Yuhui Zhao, Siqin Wang, Xiao Li, Di Yang, Yu Feng, Yang Xu, Liao Zhu, and Biyu Chen. Unfolding community homophily in us metropolitans via human mobility. *Cities*, 129:103929, 2022.
- Meiliu Wu, Xinyi Liu, Yuehan Qin, and Qunying Huang. Revealing racial-ethnic segregation with individual experienced segregation indices based on social media data: A case study in los angeles-long beach-anaheim. *Computers, Environment and Urban Systems*, 104:102008, 2023.
- Vinicius M Netto, João Vitor Meirelles, Maíra Pinheiro, and Henrique Lorea. A temporal geography of encounters. *CyberGeo: European Journal of Geography*, 2018.
- Hugo Barbosa, Marc Barthelemy, Gourab Ghoshal, Charlotte R James, Maxime Lenormand, Thomas Louail, Ronaldo Menezes, José J Ramasco, Filippo Simini, and Marcello Tomasini. Human mobility: Models and applications. *Physics Reports*, 734:1–74, 2018.
- Joshua Blumenstock and Lauren Fratamico. Social and spatial ethnic segregation: A framework for analyzing segregation with large-scale spatial network data. In *Proceedings of the 4th Annual Symposium on Computing for Development*, pages 1–10, 2013.
- Nolan E Phillips, Brian L Levy, Robert J Sampson, Mario L Small, and Ryan Q Wang. The social integration of american cities: Network measures of connectedness based on everyday mobility across neighborhoods. *Sociological Methods & Research*, 50(3):1110–1149, 2021.
- Willem R Boterman and Sako Musterd. Cocooning urban life: Exposure to diversity in neighbourhoods, workplaces and transport. *Cities*, 59:139–147, 2016.
- Na Ta, Mei-Po Kwan, Shuting Lin, and Qiuyu Zhu. The activity space-based segregation of migrants in suburban shanghai. *Applied Geography*, 133:102499, 2021.
- Ann Legeby, Meta Berghauser Pont, and Lars Marcus. Streets for co-presence?: Mapping potentials. In *The 10th International Space Syntax Symposium (SSS10), London, 13-17 July 2015*, pages 108–1. Space Syntax Laboratory, The Bartlett School of Architecture, University ..., 2015.

- Yao Shen. Segregation through space: A scope of the flow-based spatial interaction model. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 76:10–23, 2019.
- Sorath Abbasi, Joonho Ko, and Jaehong Min. Measuring destination-based segregation through mobility patterns: Application of transport card data. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 92:103025, 2021.
- Yirong Zhou, Ran Wei, Xiaoyue Cathy Liu, Danielle Wallace, and Tony Grubestic. Delineating race-specific driving patterns for identifying racial segregation. *Transportation Research Part D: Transport and Environment*, 119:103769, 2023.
- Antonio Luca Alfeo, Mario GCA Cimino, Bruno Lepri, Alexander Sandy Pentland, and Gigliola Vaglini. Assessing refugees' integration via spatio-temporal similarities of mobility and calling behaviors. *IEEE Transactions on Computational Social Systems*, 6(4):726–738, 2019.
- Lina Hedman, Kati Kadarik, Roger Andersson, and John Östh. Daily mobility patterns: Reducing or reproducing inequalities and segregation? *Social Inclusion*, 9(2):208–221, 2021.
- Ilan Shdema, Nasreen Haj-Yahya, and Izhak Schnell. The social space of arab residents of mixed israeli cities. *Geografiska Annaler: Series B, Human Geography*, 100(4):359–376, 2018.
- Ignacio Tiznado-Aitken, Giovanni Vecchio, Luis A Guzman, Julián Arellana, Mateus Humberto, Eduardo Vasconcellos, and Juan Carlos Muñoz. Unequal periurban mobility: Travel patterns, modal choices and urban core dependence in latin america. *Habitat International*, 133:102752, 2023.
- KE Aksyonov. Social segregation of personal activity spaces in a posttransformation metropolis (case study of st. petersburg). *Regional Research of Russia*, 1:52–61, 2011.
- Daanika Gordon. Daily mobility in the black-white segregated city: Linking material realities and repertoires of meaning. *Sociological Perspectives*, 61(4):661–680, 2018.
- Yiming Tan, Mei-Po Kwan, and Yanwei Chai. Examining the impacts of ethnicity on space-time behavior: Evidence from the city of xining, china. *Cities*, 64:26–36, 2017.
- Yiming Tan, Yanwei Chai, and Zifeng Chen. Social-contextual exposure of ethnic groups in urban china: from residential place to activity space. *Population, Space and Place*, 25(7):e2248, 2019.
- Rafiazka Millanida Hilman, Gerardo Iñiguez, and Márton Karsai. Socioeconomic biases in urban mixing patterns of us metropolitan areas. *EPJ data science*, 11(1):32, 2022.
- David WS Wong and Shih-Lung Shaw. Measuring segregation: An activity space approach. *Journal of geographical systems*, 13:127–145, 2011.
- Malia Jones and Anne R Pebley. Redefining neighborhoods using common destinations: Social characteristics of activity spaces and home census tracts compared. *Demography*, 51(3):727–752, 2014.
- Nicolo P Pinchak, Christopher R Browning, Catherine A Calder, and Bethany Boettner. Activity locations, residential segregation and the significance of residential neighbourhood boundary perceptions. *Urban Studies*, 58(13):2758–2781, 2021.
- Donggen Wang and Fei Li. Daily activity space and exposure: A comparative study of hong kong's public and private housing residents' segregation in daily life. *Cities*, 59:148–155, 2016.
- Sarah Garlick, Gemma Catney, Frances Darlington-Pollock, and Christopher D Lloyd. Is there greater ethnic mixing in residential or workplace spaces? *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, pages 1–21, 2022.
- Luis Fuentes, Ricardo Truffello, and Mónica Flores. Impact of land use diversity on daytime social segregation patterns in santiago de chile. *Buildings*, 12(2):149, 2022.
- Nastasija Grujić, Sanja Brdar, Olivera Novović, Miro Govedarica, and Vladimir Crnojević. Evidence of urban segregation from mobile phone data: A case study of novi sad. In *2019 27th Telecommunications Forum (TELFOR)*, pages 1–4. IEEE, 2019.
- Susan Athey, Billy Ferguson, Matthew Gentzkow, and Tobias Schmidt. Estimating experienced racial segregation in us cities using large-scale gps data. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 118(46):e2026160118, 2021.
- Borja Moya-Gómez, Marcin Stępnia, Juan Carlos García-Palomares, Enrique Frías-Martínez, and Javier Gutiérrez. Exploring night and day socio-spatial segregation based on mobile phone data: The case of medellin (colombia). *Computers, Environment and Urban Systems*, 89:101675, 2021.
- Siiri Silm, Veronika Mooses, Anniki Puura, Anu Masso, Ago Tominga, and Erki Saluveer. The relationship between ethno-linguistic composition of social networks and activity space: A study using mobile phone data. *Social Inclusion*, 9(2):192–207, 2021.

- Shi Xian, Zhixin Qi, and Ngai-ming Yip. Beyond home neighborhood: Mobility, activity and temporal variation of socio-spatial segregation. *Journal of transport geography*, 99:103304, 2022.
- Wenfei Xu. The contingency of neighbourhood diversity: Variation of social context using mobile phone application data. *Urban Studies*, 59(4):851–869, 2022.
- Taylor Shelton, Ate Poorthuis, and Matthew Zook. Social media and the city: Rethinking urban socio-spatial inequality using user-generated geographic information. *Landscape and urban planning*, 142:198–211, 2015.
- Seong-Yun Hong. Open-source tools for the measurement of socio-spatial segregation in activity spaces. *Transactions in GIS*, 24(5):1248–1263, 2020.
- Izhak Schnell and Nasreen Haj-Yahya. Arab integration in jewish-israeli social space: does commuting make a difference? *Urban Geography*, 35(7):1084–1104, 2014.
- Gehan Selim. The landscape of differences: contact and segregation in the everyday encounters. *Cities*, 46:16–25, 2015.
- Ravit Goldhaber and Izhak Schnell. A model of multidimensional segregation in the arab ghetto in tel aviv-jaffa. *Tijdschrift voor economische en sociale geografie*, 98(5):603–620, 2007.
- Izhak Schnell and Benjamini Yoav. The sociospatial isolation of agents in everyday life spaces as an aspect of segregation. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 91(4):622–636, 2001.
- Christopher R Browning, Catherine A Calder, Lauren J Krivo, Anna L Smith, and Bethany Boettner. Socioeconomic segregation of activity spaces in urban neighborhoods: Does shared residence mean shared routines? *RSF: The Russell Sage Foundation Journal of the Social Sciences*, 3(2):210–231, 2017.
- Yongjun Zhang, Siwei Cheng, Zhi Li, and Wenhao Jiang. Human mobility patterns are associated with experienced partisan segregation in us metropolitan areas. *Scientific Reports*, 13(1):9768, 2023.
- Siiri Silm, Rein Ahas, and Veronika Mooses. Are younger age groups less segregated? measuring ethnic segregation in activity spaces using mobile phone data. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 44(11):1797–1817, 2018. doi:10.1080/1369183X.2017.1400425.
- Yanji Zhang, Jiejing Wang, and Changcheng Kan. Temporal variation in activity-space-based segregation: A case study of beijing using location-based service data. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 98:103239, 2022b.
- Teodoro Dannemann, Boris Sotomayor-Gómez, and Horacio Samaniego. The time geography of segregation during working hours. *Royal Society open science*, 5(10):180749, 2018.
- Mengling Qiao, Yandong Wang, Shanmei Wu, Xiaokang Fu, Yanyan Gu, and Mingxuan Dou. A realistic and multilevel measurement of citywide spatial patterns of economic segregation based on human activities. *Cities*, 110:103067, 2021.
- Steven Farber, Antonio Páez, and Catherine Morency. Activity spaces and the measurement of clustering and exposure: A case study of linguistic groups in montreal. *Environment and Planning A*, 44(2):315–332, 2012.
- Aafke Heringa, Gideon Bolt, Martin Dijst, and Ronald Van Kempen. Individual activity patterns and the meaning of residential environments for inter-ethnic contact. *Tijdschrift voor economische en sociale geografie*, 105(1):64–78, 2014.
- Hui Wang, Mei-Po Kwan, Mingxing Hu, Junheng Qi, Jiemin Zheng, and Bin Han. Time allocation and the activity-space-based segregation of different income groups: A case study of nanjing. *Land*, 11(10):1717, 2022.
- Yang Xu, Paolo Santi, and Carlo Ratti. Beyond distance decay: Discover homophily in spatially embedded social networks. *Annals of the American Association of Geographers*, 112(2):505–521, 2022.
- Meiliu Wu and Qunying Huang. Human movement patterns of different racial-ethnic and economic groups in us top 50 populated cities: What can social media tell us about isolation? *Annals of GIS*, 28(2):161–183, 2022.
- Sui Tao, Sylvia Y He, Mei-Po Kwan, and Shuli Luo. Does low income translate into lower mobility? an investigation of activity space in hong kong between 2002 and 2011. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 82:102583, 2020a.
- Ilaria Zambon, Pere Serra, David Sauri, Margherita Carlucci, and Luca Salvati. Beyond the ‘mediterranean city’: Socioeconomic disparities and urban sprawl in three southern european cities. *Geografiska Annaler: Series B, Human Geography*, 99(3):319–337, 2017.
- Suhong Zhou, Lifang Deng, Mei-Po Kwan, and Ruogu Yan. Social and spatial differentiation of high and low income groups’ out-of-home activities in guangzhou, china. *Cities*, 45:81–90, 2015.
- Manish Shirgaokar and Erin Nobler. Differences in daily trips between immigrants and us-born individuals: Implications for social integration. *Transport policy*, 105:103–114, 2021.

- Rowland Atkinson. Limited exposure: Social concealment, mobility and engagement with public space by the super-rich in london. *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space*, 48(7):1302–1317, 2016.
- Bart Wissink and Arjan Hazelzet. Bangkok living: Encountering others in a gated urban field. *Cities*, 59:164–172, 2016.
- Florent Demoraes, Marc Souris, and Yasna Contreras Gatica. Live nearby, be different, work apart? some learnings from action spaces discrepancies in santiago de chile. *Geographical Analysis*, 53(2):329–354, 2021.
- Nibir Bora, Yu-Han Chang, and Rajiv Maheswaran. Mobility patterns and user dynamics in racially segregated geographies of us cities. In *Social Computing, Behavioral-Cultural Modeling and Prediction: 7th International Conference, SBP 2014, Washington, DC, USA, April 1-4, 2014. Proceedings 7*, pages 11–18. Springer, 2014.
- Malka Greenberg Raanan and Noam Shoval. Mental maps compared to actual spatial behavior using gps data: A new method for investigating segregation in cities. *Cities*, 36:28–40, 2014.
- Olle Järv, Kerli Müürisepp, Rein Ahas, Ben Derudder, and Frank Witlox. Ethnic differences in activity spaces as a characteristic of segregation: A study based on mobile phone usage in tallinn, estonia. *Urban Studies*, 52(14):2680–2698, 2015.
- Eun Jin Shin. Ethnic neighborhoods, social networks, and inter-household carpooling: A comparison across ethnic minority groups. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 59:14–26, 2017.
- Ariel Salgado, Weixin Li, Fahad Alhasoun, Inés Caridi, and Marta Gonzalez. Street context of various demographic groups in their daily mobility. *Applied Network Science*, 6(1):1–14, 2021.
- Thomas Marlow, Kinga Makovi, and Bruno Abrahao. Neighborhood isolation during the covid-19 pandemic. *Sociological Science*, 8:170–190, 2021.
- Xiao Li, Xiao Huang, Dongying Li, and Yang Xu. Aggravated social segregation during the covid-19 pandemic: Evidence from crowdsourced mobility data in twelve most populated us metropolitan areas. *Sustainable Cities and Society*, 81:103869, 2022b.
- Yougeng Lu and Genevieve Giuliano. Where do people meet? time-series clustering for social interaction levels in daily-life spaces during the covid-19 pandemic. *Cities*, 137:104298, 2023.
- Eun Jin Shin. Spatial segregation of chinese immigrants in seoul, south korea, during the covid-19 pandemic: Evidence from population data derived from mobile phone signals. *The Social Science Journal*, pages 1–22, 2021.
- Giovanni Bonaccorsi, Francesco Pierri, Francesco Scotti, Andrea Flori, Francesco Manaresi, Stefano Ceri, and Fabio Pammolli. Socioeconomic differences and persistent segregation of italian territories during covid-19 pandemic. *Scientific reports*, 11(1):21174, 2021.
- Douglas Sathler and Guilherme Leiva. The city matters: urbanization, regional analysis and urban segregation in times of the covid-19 pandemic. *Revista Brasileira de Estudos de População*, 39:e0205, 2022.
- Takahiro Yabe and Satish V Ukkusuri. Effects of income inequality on evacuation, reentry and segregation after disasters. *Transportation research part D: transport and environment*, 82:102260, 2020.
- Hengfang Deng, Daniel P Aldrich, Michael M Danziger, Jianxi Gao, Nolan E Phillips, Sean P Cornelius, and Qi Ryan Wang. High-resolution human mobility data reveal race and wealth disparities in disaster evacuation patterns. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 8(1):1–8, 2021.
- Veronika Mooses, Siiri Silm, and Rein Ahas. Ethnic segregation during public and national holidays: A study using mobile phone data. *Geografiska Annaler: Series B, Human Geography*, 98(3):205–219, 2016.
- Wenfei Xu, Zhuojun Wang, Nada Attia, Youssef Attia, Yucheng Zhang, and Haotian Zong. An experienced racial-ethnic diversity dataset in the united states using human mobility data. *Scientific Data*, 11(1):638, 2024.
- Takahiro Yabe, Bernardo García Bulle Bueno, Xiaowen Dong, Alex Pentland, and Esteban Moro. Behavioral changes during the covid-19 pandemic decreased income diversity of urban encounters. *Nature Communications*, 14(1):2310, 2023.
- Xiang Zhou and Yuning Cheng. Between state and family: discussion on the segregation and integration of the daily living space within shanghai historic lane neighborhood. *Home Cultures*, 16(3):163–190, 2019.
- Michael Dorman, Tal Svoray, and Itai Kloog. How does socio-economic and demographic dissimilarity determine physical and virtual segregation? *Journal of Spatial Information Science*, (21):177–202, 2020.
- Alexander Amini, Kevin Kung, Chaogui Kang, Stanislav Sobolevsky, and Carlo Ratti. The impact of social segregation on human mobility in developing and industrialized regions. *EPJ Data Science*, 3(1):1–20, 2014.
- Ngai Ming Yip, Ray Forrest, and Shi Xian. Exploring segregation and mobilities: Application of an activity tracking app on mobile phone. *Cities*, 59:156–163, 2016.

- Gemma Davies, John Dixon, Colin G Tredoux, J Duncan Whyatt, Jonny J Huck, Brendan Sturgeon, Bree T Hocking, Neil Jarman, and Dominic Bryan. Networks of (dis) connection: mobility practices, tertiary streets, and sectarian divisions in north belfast. *Annals of the American Association of Geographers*, 109(6):1729–1747, 2019.
- Cate Heine, Cristina Marquez, Paolo Santi, Marcus Sundberg, Miriam Nordfors, and Carlo Ratti. Analysis of mobility homophily in stockholm based on social network data. *PloS one*, 16(3):e0247996, 2021.
- Souneil Park, Taylor M Oshan, Abdallah El Ali, and Alessandro Finamore. Are we breaking bubbles as we move? using a large sample to explore the relationship between urban mobility and segregation. *Computers, Environment and Urban Systems*, 86:101585, 2021.
- Fei Chen, Suhong Zhou, Junwen Lu, and Zhong Zheng. A behavioral explanation of the activity-space segregation: Individuals' preference of choosing an activity destination. *Environment and Planning B: Urban Analytics and City Science*, page 23998083241229110, 2024.
- Yanni Yang, Alex Pentland, and Esteban Moro. Identifying latent activity behaviors and lifestyles using mobility data to describe urban dynamics. *EPJ Data Science*, 12(1):15, 2023.
- Riccardo Di Clemente, Miguel Luengo-Oroz, Matias Travizano, Sharon Xu, Babu Vaitla, and Marta C González. Sequences of purchases in credit card data reveal lifestyles in urban populations. *Nature communications*, 9(1):3330, 2018.
- Yijing Xiao, Burcin Becerik-Gerber, Gale Lucas, and Shawn C Roll. Impacts of working from home during covid-19 pandemic on physical and mental well-being of office workstation users. *Journal of occupational and environmental medicine*, 63(3):181–190, 2021a.
- Olle Järv, Anu Masso, Siiri Silm, and Rein Ahas. The link between ethnic segregation and socio-economic status: An activity space approach. *Tijdschrift voor economische en sociale geografie*, 112(3):319–335, 2021.
- John Dixon, Colin Tredoux, Gemma Davies, Jonny Huck, Bree Hocking, Brendan Sturgeon, Duncan Whyatt, Neil Jarman, and Dominic Bryan. Parallel lives: Intergroup contact, threat, and the segregation of everyday activity spaces. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 118(3):457, 2020.
- Daniel Oviedo Hernandez and Helena Titheridge. Mobilities of the periphery: Informality, access and social exclusion in the urban fringe in colombia. *Journal of transport geography*, 55:152–164, 2016.
- Sui Tao, Sylvia Y He, and Shuli Luo. The influence of job accessibility on local residential segregation of ethnic minorities: A study of hong kong. *Population, Space and Place*, 26(8):e2353, 2020b.
- Nikos Patias, Francisco Rowe, and Dani Arribas-Bel. Local urban attributes defining ethnically segregated areas across english cities: A multilevel approach. *Cities*, 132:103967, 2023.
- Yue Shen and Xueyao Luo. Linking spatial and temporal contexts to multi-contextual segregation by hukou status in urban china. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 107:103540, 2023.
- Anne Power. Social inequality, disadvantaged neighbourhoods and transport deprivation: an assessment of the historical influence of housing policies. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 21:39–48, 2012.
- Bruna Da Cunha Kronenberger and Renato Tibirica De Saboya. A configurational study of sociospatial segregation in the metropolitan region of florianopolis, brazil. In *Proceedings 11th International Space Syntax Symposium*, volume 11, pages 75–1, 2017.
- Laura H Atuesta, J Eduardo Ibarra-Olivo, Nancy Lozano-Gracia, and Uwe Deichmann. Access to employment and property values in mexico. *Regional Science and Urban Economics*, 70:142–154, 2018.
- Paavo Monkkonen, Andre Comandon, Jorge Alberto Montejano Escamilla, and Erick Guerra. Urban sprawl and the growing geographic scale of segregation in mexico, 1990–2010. *Habitat International*, 73:89–95, 2018.
- Taina A Bittencourt, Mariana Giannotti, and Eduardo Marques. Cumulative (and self-reinforcing) spatial inequalities: Interactions between accessibility and segregation in four brazilian metropolises. *Environment and Planning B: Urban Analytics and City Science*, 48(7):1989–2005, 2021.
- Pengjun Zhao. The impact of urban sprawl on social segregation in beijing and a limited role for spatial planning. *Tijdschrift voor economische en sociale geografie*, 104(5):571–587, 2013.
- Abolghasem Azhdari, Mohammad Ali Sasani, and Ali Soltani. Exploring the relationship between spatial driving forces of urban expansion and socioeconomic segregation: The case of shiraz. *Habitat international*, 81:33–44, 2018.
- Cristhian Figueroa, Margarita Greene, and Rodrigo Mora. Urban structure and the layout of social segregation. In *12th International Space Syntax Symposium, SSS 2019*, 2019. URL <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85083951364&partnerID=40&md5=923976dd7c66c98cde0aa1997cf7c53c>.

- Reid Ewing, Shima Hamidi, James B Grace, and Yehua Dennis Wei. Does urban sprawl hold down upward mobility? *Landscape and urban planning*, 148:80–88, 2016.
- John F Kain. Housing segregation, negro employment, and metropolitan decentralization. *The quarterly journal of economics*, 82(2):175–197, 1968.
- Janeria Easley. Spatial mismatch beyond black and white: Levels and determinants of job access among asian and hispanic subpopulations. *Urban Studies*, 55(8):1800–1820, 2018.
- Maite Blázquez, Carlos Llano, and Julian Moral. Commuting times: Is there any penalty for immigrants? *Urban Studies*, 47(8):1663–1686, 2010.
- Zifeng Chen and Anthony Gar-On Yeh. Accessibility inequality and income disparity in urban china: a case study of guangzhou. *Annals of the American Association of Geographers*, 109(1):121–141, 2019.
- Chen Chen, Lin Cheng, Chunliang Xiu, and Jiuquan Li. Spatial mismatch or not? evidence from public janitors in xi’an, china. *Chinese Geographical Science*, 31:376–386, 2021.
- Thomas C Schelling. Dynamic models of segregation. *Journal of mathematical sociology*, 1(2):143–186, 1971.
- Sako Musterd. *Urban segregation: contexts, domains, dimensions and approaches*. Edward Elgar Publishing, March 2020. ISBN 978-1-78811-560-5. doi:10.4337/9781788115605.00007.
- Karen Lucas, Giulio Mattioli, Ersilia Verlinghieri, and Alvaro Guzman. Transport poverty and its adverse social consequences. In *Proceedings of the institution of civil engineers-transport*, volume 169, pages 353–365. Thomas Telford Ltd, 2016.
- Gregorio Luz and Licinio Portugal. Understanding transport-related social exclusion through the lens of capabilities approach. *Transport Reviews*, 42(4):503–525, 2022.
- Jorge Gallego Méndez, Lina M García-Moreno, Jackeline Murillo-Hoyos, and Ciro Jaramillo Molina. Social inequality in popular neighborhoods: A pre-and post-pandemic perspective from joint accessibility. *Sustainability*, 15(13):10587, 2023.
- Jonathan Rokem and Laura Vaughan. Geographies of ethnic segregation in stockholm: The role of mobility and co-presence in shaping the ‘diverse’ city. *Urban Studies*, 56(12):2426–2446, 2019.
- Rafael HM Pereira, Tim Schwanen, and David Banister. Distributive justice and equity in transportation. *Transport reviews*, 37(2):170–191, 2017.
- Seongman Jang and Changhyo Yi. Imbalance between local commuting accessibility and residential locations of households by income class in the seoul metropolitan area. *Cities*, 109:103011, 2021.
- Julian Arellana, Daniel Oviedo, Luis A Guzman, and Vilma Alvarez. Urban transport planning and access inequalities: A tale of two colombian cities. *Research in Transportation Business & Management*, 40:100554, 2021.
- Pedro Logiodice, Renato Arbex, Diego Bogado Tomasiello, and Mariana A Giannotti. Spatial visualization of job inaccessibility to identify transport related social exclusion. In *GeoInfo*, pages 105–118, 2015.
- Cristhian Figueroa Martínez, Frances Hodgson, Caroline Mullen, and Paul Timms. Creating inequality in accessibility: The relationships between public transport and social housing policy in deprived areas of santiago de chile. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 67:102–109, 2018.
- Yasna Cortés. Spatial accessibility to local public services in an unequal place: An analysis from patterns of residential segregation in the metropolitan area of santiago, chile. *Sustainability*, 13(2):442, 2021.
- Yujie Hu, Fahui Wang, and Chester G Wilmot. Commuting variability by wage groups in baton rouge, 1990–2010. *Papers in Applied Geography*, 3(1):14–29, 2017.
- Javier Peña, Julian Arellana, and Luis A Guzman. Which dots to connect? employment centers and commuting inequalities in bogotá. *Journal of Transport and Land Use*, 15(1):17–34, 2022.
- Gordon Cromley and Jie Lin. Examining the interplay between racial segregation patterns and access to hospital care. *Environment and Planning B: Urban Analytics and City Science*, 50(1):117–129, 2023.
- Ismail Haque. Discriminated urban spaces: A study of spatial segregation in urban west bengal. *Economic and Political Weekly*, pages 41–50, 2016.
- Weiye Xiao, Yehua Dennis Wei, and Han Li. Spatial inequality of job accessibility in shanghai: A geographical skills mismatch perspective. *Habitat international*, 115:102401, 2021b.
- Emre Korsu and Sandrine Wenglenki. Job accessibility, residential segregation and risk of long-term unemployment in the paris region. *Urban Studies*, 47(11):2279–2324, 2010.

- Seher Ozkazanc. Transportation experiences of syrian refugees under the clampdown of poverty, social exclusion and spatial segregation. *Cities*, 112:103117, 2021.
- Joseph Galaskiewicz, Kathryn Freeman Anderson, and Kendra Thompson-Dyck. Minority-white income inequality across metropolitan areas: The role of racial/ethnic residential segregation and transportation networks. *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 43(1):16–39, 2021.
- Hyunjo Eom. Does job accessibility matter in the suburbs? black suburbia, job accessibility, and employment outcomes. *Land*, 11(11):1952, 2022.
- Sives Govender and Brij Maharaj. Segregation, buffer zones and transport routes: The saga of the second access road to chatsworth. *The Oriental Anthropologist*, 12(2):379–399, 2012.
- Aaron Golub, Richard A Marcantonio, and Thomas W Sanchez. Race, space, and struggles for mobility: Transportation impacts on african americans in oakland and the east bay. *Urban Geography*, 34(5):699–728, 2013.
- Jose Manuel Naranjo Gomez. Impacts on the social cohesion of mainland spain’s future motorway and high-speed rail networks. *Sustainability*, 8(7):624, 2016.
- Emmanuel Junior Adugbila, Javier A Martinez, and Karin Pfeffer. Road infrastructure expansion and socio-spatial fragmentation in the peri-urban zone in accra, ghana. *Cities*, 133:104154, 2023.
- Stephen Graham. Elite avenues: flyovers, freeways and the politics of urban mobility. *City*, 22(4):527–550, 2018.
- Avichal Mahajan. Highways and segregation. *Journal of Urban Economics*, page 103574, 2023.
- Kilian Heilmann. Transit access and neighborhood segregation. evidence from the dallas light rail system. *Regional Science and Urban Economics*, 73:237–250, 2018.
- Isabelle Nilsson and Elizabeth C Delmelle. Impact of new rail transit stations on neighborhood destination choices and income segregation. *Cities*, 102:102737, 2020.
- Ran Goldblatt and Itzhak Omer. The relationship between spatial configuration and a rab minority residential patterns in i sraeli mixed cities. *Tijdschrift voor economische en sociale geografie*, 106(3):321–338, 2015.
- Ann Legeby and Lars Marcus. Does the urban structure of swedish cities inhibit the sharing of public space? *Built Environment*, 37(2):155–169, 2011.
- Magda Bolzoni. Spaces of distinction, spaces of segregation. nightlife and consumption in a central neighbourhood of turin. *Méditerranée. Revue géographique des pays méditerranéens/Journal of Mediterranean geography*, (127): 59–68, 2016.
- Daniel Sauter and Marco Huettenmoser. Liveable streets and social inclusion. *Urban Design International*, 13(2): 67–79, 2008.
- A Van Nes and L Aghabeik. Ethnic groups and spatial behaviour in rotterdam’s neighbourhoods. In *SSS10: Proceedings of the 10th International Space Syntax Symposium, London, UK, 13-17 July 2015*, pages 102.1–102.17. Space Syntax Laboratory, The Bartlett School of Architecture, UCL, 2015.
- Ruben Garnica-Monroy and Seraphim Alvanides. Spatial segregation and urban form in mexican cities. *Environment and Planning B: Urban Analytics and City Science*, 46(7):1347–1361, 2019.
- Ann Legeby and Chen Feng. Towards just cities: An architectural approach to mapping unequal living conditions. In *13th International Space Syntax Symposium, SSS 2022, Bergen, Norway, Jun 20 2022-Jun 24 2022*. Western Norway University of Applied Sciences (HVL), 2022.
- W Alghatam. The generic patterns of urban village space: the ugly side of integration and the power of choice movement. In *12th International Space Syntax Symposium, SSS 2019*, 2019.
- Pauline van den Berg, Fariya Sharmeen, and Minou Weijs-Perrée. On the subjective quality of social interactions: Influence of neighborhood walkability, social cohesion and mobility choices. *Transportation research part A: policy and practice*, 106:309–319, 2017.
- Kostas Mouratidis and Wouter Poortinga. Built environment, urban vitality and social cohesion: Do vibrant neighborhoods foster strong communities? *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 204:103951, 2020.
- Xiaomeng Wang and Zhilin Liu. Neighborhood environments and inclusive cities: An empirical study of local residents’ attitudes toward migrant social integration in beijing, china. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 226:104495, 2022.
- Tongchaoran Gao and Samson Lim. Socio-spatial integration in innovation districts: Singapore’s mixed-use experiment. *Cities*, 140:104405, 2023.
- Arianna Salazar Miranda. The shape of segregation: The role of urban form in immigrant assimilation. *Cities*, 106: 102852, 2020.

- Navya P. Samson. The socio-spatial relations of the accessibility of parks in Chicago. In *Proceedings - 11th International Space Syntax Symposium, SSS 2017*, pages 108.1–108.14, 2017. URL <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85031100525&partnerID=40&md5=7bc2cf1f9af412a9f28434ec88343ad7>.
- Mohamed Gamal Abdelmonem and Rachel McWhinney. In search of common grounds: Stitching the divided landscape of urban parks in Belfast. *Cities*, 44:40–49, 2015.
- Yang Xiao, De Wang, and Jia Fang. Exploring the disparities in park access through mobile phone data: Evidence from Shanghai, China. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 181:80–91, 2019.
- Shaleen Miller. Park access and equity in a segregated, southern US city: A case study of Tallahassee, FL. *Environmental Justice*, 12(3):85–91, 2019.
- Luis Camarero and Jesús Oliva. Thinking in rural gap: mobility and social inequalities. *Palgrave Communications*, 5(1), 2019.
- Veronika Mooses, Siiri Silm, Tiit Tammaru, and Erki Saluveer. An ethno-linguistic dimension in transnational activity space measured with mobile phone data. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 7(1):1–13, 2020.
- Lukas Utzig. Urban integration of refugee homes: Spatial potential for integrative social processes. In *Proceedings - 11th International Space Syntax Symposium, SSS 2017*, pages 156.1–156.14, 2017.
- Thomas W Sanchez, Rich Stolz, and Jacinta S Ma. Inequitable effects of transportation policies on minorities. *Transportation research record*, 1885(1):104–110, 2004.
- John McDonagh. Transport policy instruments and transport-related social exclusion in rural Republic of Ireland. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 14(5):355–366, 2006.
- Marko Kryvobokov and Louafi Bouzouina. Willingness to pay for accessibility under the conditions of residential segregation. *International Journal of Strategic Property Management*, 18(2):101–115, 2014.
- Elizabeth J Mueller, Thomas W Hilde, and Marla J Torrado. Methods for countering spatial inequality: Incorporating strategic opportunities for housing preservation into transit-oriented development planning. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 177:317–327, 2018.
- Pablo Muñoz Unceta, Birgit Hausleitner, and Marcin Dąbrowski. Socio-spatial segregation and the spatial structure of ‘ordinary’ activities in the global south. *Urban Planning*, 5(3):303–318, 2020.
- SM Hossein Alipour and Khaled Galal Ahmed. Assessing the effect of urban form on social sustainability: A proposed ‘integrated measuring tools method’ for urban neighborhoods in Dubai. *City, Territory and Architecture*, 8:1–21, 2021.
- Qi-Li Gao, Yang Yue, Wei Tu, Jinzhou Cao, and Qing-Quan Li. Segregation or integration? exploring activity disparities between migrants and settled urban residents using human mobility data. *Transactions in GIS*, 25(6):2791–2820, 2021.
- Xinyue Ye and Clio Andris. Spatial social networks in geographic information science, 2021.
- Xiaowen Dong, Alfredo J Morales, Eaman Jahani, Esteban Moro, Bruno Lepri, Burcin Bozkaya, Carlos Sarraute, Yaneer Bar-Yam, and Alex Pentland. Segregated interactions in urban and online space. *EPJ Data Science*, 9(1):20, 2020.
- James Saxon. Empirical measures of park use in American cities, and the demographic biases of spatial models. *Geographical Analysis*, 53(4):665–685, 2021.
- Yuan Liao, Sonia Yeh, and Gustavo S Jeuken. From individual to collective behaviours: exploring population heterogeneity of human mobility based on social media data. *EPJ Data Science*, 8(1):1–22, 2019.
- Yuan Liao. *Understanding Mobility and Transport Modal Disparities Using Emerging Data Sources: Modelling Potentials and Limitations*. Chalmers Tekniska Hogskola (Sweden), 2021.
- Rajat Verma, Shagun Mittal, Zengxiang Lei, Xiaowei Chen, and Satish V Ukkusuri. Comparison of home detection algorithms using smartphone GPS data. *EPJ Data Science*, 13(1):6, 2024.
- Luca Pappalardo, Leo Ferres, Manuel Sacasa, Ciro Cattuto, and Loreto Bravo. Evaluation of home detection algorithms on mobile phone data using individual-level ground truth. *EPJ data science*, 10(1):29, 2021.
- Reginald G Golledge. *Spatial behavior: A geographic perspective*. Guilford Press, 1997.
- Torsten Hägerstrand et al. Space, time and human conditions. *Dynamic allocation of urban space*, 3:2–12, 1975.
- Judith K Hellerstein and David Neumark. Workplace segregation in the United States: Race, ethnicity, and skill. *The review of economics and statistics*, 90(3):459–477, 2008.
- Nandini Iyer, Ronaldo Menezes, and Hugo Barbosa. Mobility and transit segregation in urban spaces. *Environment and Planning B: Urban Analytics and City Science*, page 23998083231219294, 2023.

- Siiri Silm and Rein Ahas. The temporal variation of ethnic segregation in a city: Evidence from a mobile phone use dataset. *Social Science Research*, 47:30–43, 2014b.
- Ron Johnston, Michael Poulsen, and James Forrest. Ethnic and racial segregation in us metropolitan areas, 1980-2000: The dimensions of segregation revisited. *Urban Affairs Review*, 42(4):479–504, 2007.
- David O’Sullivan and David WS Wong. A surface-based approach to measuring spatial segregation. *Geographical analysis*, 39(2):147–168, 2007.
- Alasdair Turner, Maria Doxa, David O’Sullivan, and Alan Penn. From isovists to visibility graphs: a methodology for the analysis of architectural space. *Environment and Planning B: Planning and design*, 28(1):103–121, 2001.
- Alasdair Turner. Angular analysis. In *Proceedings of the 3rd international symposium on space syntax*, volume 30, pages 30–11. Georgia Institute of Technology Atlanta, GA, 2001.
- Steven Farber, Morton O’Kelly, Harvey J Miller, and Tijs Neutens. Measuring segregation using patterns of daily travel behavior: A social interaction based model of exposure. *Journal of transport geography*, 49:26–38, 2015.
- Madalina Olteanu and Jean-Charles Lamirel. When clustering the multiscalar fingerprint of the city reveals its segregation patterns. In *Advances in Self-Organizing Maps, Learning Vector Quantization, Clustering and Data Visualization: Proceedings of the 13th International Workshop, WSOM+ 2019, Barcelona, Spain, June 26-28, 2019 13*, pages 140–149. Springer, 2020.
- Tong Zhang, Xiaoqi Duan, David WS Wong, and Yashan Lu. Discovering income-economic segregation patterns: A residential-mobility embedding approach. *Computers, Environment and Urban Systems*, 90:101709, 2021.
- Pengyu Zhu, Songnian Zhao, Liping Wang, and Salem Al Yammahi. Residential segregation and commuting patterns of migrant workers in china. *Transportation Research Part D: Transport and Environment*, 52:586–599, 2017.
- Pengyu Zhu, Songnian Zhao, and Yanpeng Jiang. Residential segregation, built environment and commuting outcomes: experience from contemporary china. *Transport Policy*, 116:269–277, 2022.
- Philip ME Garboden. You can’t get there from here: Mobility networks and the housing choice voucher program. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, page 0739456X211051774, 2021.
- Ruth Joan Nelson. The spatial and social logic of the minibus taxi network: how access may support social inclusion in cape town, south africa. *Applied Mobilities*, 8(1):1–25, 2023.
- Kelli Silver, André Lopes, David Vale, and Nuno Marques da Costa. The inequality effects of public transport fare: The case of lisbon’s fare reform. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 112:103685, 2023.
- Nicolás Valenzuela-Levi. Income inequality and rule-systems within public transport: A study of medellín (colombia) and santiago (chile). *Journal of Transport Geography*, 112:103700, 2023.
- Chris L Hess. Light-rail investment in seattle: Gentrification pressures and trends in neighborhood ethn racial composition. *Urban Affairs Review*, 56(1):154–187, 2020.
- Istiak A Bhuyan, Celeste Chavis, Amirreza Nickkar, and Philip Barnes. Gis-based equity gap analysis: Case study of baltimore bike share program. *Urban Science*, 3(2):42, 2019.
- Robin Lovelace, Roger Beecham, Eva Heinen, Eugeni Vidal Tortosa, Yuanxuan Yang, Chris Slade, and Antonia Roberts. Is the london cycle hire scheme becoming more inclusive? an evaluation of the shifting spatial distribution of uptake based on 70 million trips. *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice*, 140:1–15, 2020.
- Mohammed Almahmood, Oliver Schulze, Trine Agervig Carstensen, and Gertrud Jørgensen. The sidewalk as a contested space: Women’s negotiation of socio-spatial processes of exclusion in public urban space in saudi arabia; the case of al tahlia street. *Planning Practice & Research*, 33(2):186–210, 2018.
- Mariam Altaema and Hatice Kalfaoğlu Hatipoğlu. The urban socio-environmental impact of a mixed-use street in fostering refugee integration in the host society. *Journal of Asian Architecture and Building Engineering*, pages 1–13, 2023.
- Federico Librino, M Elena Renda, Paolo Santi, Francesca Martelli, Giovanni Resta, Fabio Duarte, Carlo Ratti, and Jinhua Zhao. Home-work carpooling for social mixing. *Transportation*, 47:2671–2701, 2020.