

Sentiment and the City: Modeling the Effect of the Urban Environment on Civil Sentiment

Jayedi Aman ^{a, b*}, Timothy C Matisziw ^{a, c, d*}

^a Department of Geography, University of Missouri, Columbia, MO 65211, USA

^b Department of Architectural Studies, University of Missouri, Columbia, MO 65211, USA

^c Department of Civil & Environmental Engineering, University of Missouri, Columbia, MO 65211, USA

^d Institute for Data Science & Informatics, University of Missouri, Columbia, MO 65211, USA

^a jayediaman@mail.missouri.edu, 0000-0002-6128-8293

^b matisziwt@missouri.edu, 0000-0003-2159-4904

* Contributed equally

Abstract

Background: Understanding the interaction between individuals and the urban streetscape is an essential component of sustainable city planning. Numerous studies have characterized the attributes and spatial dynamics of urban environments; however, little is known about the relationship between the built environment and the sentiment of the civil population.

Objectives: To assess the extent to which civil sentiment may be influenced by characteristics of the urban environment and how these relationships might change over time.

Methods: An analytical framework for characterizing streetscape characteristics and civil sentiment is proposed. Geotagged social media posts and street level imagery are employed to account for individual sentiment and geospatial context. Natural Language Processing (NLP) and computer vision (CV) are then used to infer sentiment and model the urban environment with which individuals interact. An application of the developed framework is conducted using Instagram posts and Google Street View imagery as the basis for characterizing sentiment and urban context respectively. The extent to which elements of urban context correlate with civil sentiment is then assessed.

Results:

Conclusions: The results of the application indicate that the interaction between individuals and the built environment likely does impact the sentiment of the civil population to varying degrees over time and space. Such analyses can provide urban planners and policymakers with

Commented [MTC1]: I changed the body style to 12pt font.

Commented [AJ(S2)]: I'll right the result portion later

valuable insights on how different planning decision may affect civil sentiment. This opens up a new avenue for research into expanding built environment measurement methods to include perceptions as well as urban environment attributes.

Keywords: Urban design; GeoAI; spatial behavior; social media; built environment

1 Introduction

It is increasingly recognized that the relationship between individuals' location and sentiment are important considerations for a variety of decision-making tasks, such as managing urban growth, disaster response, humanitarian assistance, and recovery operations (USGIF, 2021). For instance, in the event of a crisis, knowledge of individuals' sentiment is essential decision support for addressing potential hazards and threats to life and/or supporting infrastructure (Luo et al., 2011; Sadiq et al., 2020). Further, numerous studies indicate that the design, condition, and spatial configuration of urban environment features such as buildings, traffic infrastructure, and parks can elicit a wide range of collective and individual human experiences (Kaklauskas et al., 2021; Batty et al., 2010). Thus, planning agencies are increasingly taking into consideration how individuals experience urban spaces in decisions related to infrastructure design. One example of how these more complex considerations are being jointly conceptualized is the notion of the 'streetscape'. A streetscape in this sense is a synthesis of multiple urban characteristics comprising the environment that individuals experience when moving through urban space (Benabbou and Lee, 2019; Herrera-Yagüe, et al., 2015; Salesses et al., 2013). Developing a better understanding of the extent to which streetscapes may influence individuals' sentiment could therefore provide important insights on urban semantics, better incorporating the needs of the civil population in planning efforts.

Understanding how the characteristics of streetscapes relate to individual sentiment is a crucial component of many decision-making tasks (Ma et al., 2021; Minou et al., 2020; Yuan et al., 2019). However, given the complex spatiotemporal interplay of individual perception, behavior, and geospatial context, quantifying and assessing these relationships can present a challenge. For instance, collecting information on civil sentiment and characteristics of streetscapes via field surveys, voluntary self-reporting, workshops, and interviews can entail a tremendous amount of effort (Jacobsen et al., 2007; Montello et al., 2003; Ben-Akiva and Bierlaire, 1999; Tveit et al.,

2018; Choudhry et al., 2015; Hadavi et al., 2015; Ewing et al., 2006). Thus, given the effort associated with such data collection methodologies, their use is typically limited to smaller regions of interest and frequently requires complex research protocols to ensure their applicability over larger geographic areas or time periods (Larkin et al., 2021).

As geospatial data collection technologies such as overhead and street-level sensors, global positioning systems (GPS), and smart phones are yielding an enormous amount of information about the urban environment and its inhabitants, there is great opportunity to utilize these sources of information to study large populations' perceptions and spatial dynamics of cities (Ahn et al., 2022). For example, GPS data collected with a smartphone can shed light on complex spatial dynamics such as those underlying desirability (Salazar Miranda et al., 2021; Malleson et al., 2018), the relationship between physical activity and land cover (Matisziw et al., 2016), and transportation behavior (Williams, 2020). Satellite imagery has been utilized to aid in the assessment and monitoring of safety (Nadai et al., 2016), conflict zones (Kurgan, 2013) and urban heat island effects (Wang et al., 2019). More recently, street-level imagery has been used to better represent the human perspective in a range of contexts such as, urban mobility, street quality, and pedestrian behavior (Biljecki and Ito, 2021; Ye et al., 2019; Zhang et al., 2019; Rzotkiewicz et al., 2018).

Although these relatively new initiatives provide information on a wide range of aspects of urban systems and interplay, the extent to which individual sentiments are linked to the built environment is far less well understood. Few studies attempt to quantify sentiments in urban situations by combining subjective perception data with other geographical data. In this respect, crowd sourced social media data has emerged as a valuable resource (Ilieva and McPhearson, 2018). Location-based social media (LSM) data has been used to support urban analysis such as, assessing accessibility to public places (Hamstead et al., 2022; Marti et al., 2017), spatial interaction (Lovelace et al., 2014), mobility (Luo et al., 2016; Hasan and Ukkusuri, 2014), and disaster management (Murakami et al., 2016). Further, combined with SVIs, the LSM data has been used to reveal insights on inconspicuous urban places (Zhang et al., 2020), urban function (Ye et al., 2020), urban land use (Cao and Qiu, 2018) and cognitive emotion of urban places (Jang and Kim, 2019). Although research in this context has focused on establishing urban environment

measurements, the evidence linking these metrics to sentiments remains mixed (Saelens and Handy, 2008).

Therefore, there are several research needs that are important to address. First, with respect to urban planning, the connections between the built environment and the sentiments may offer a way to improve comprehension of urban analyses, such as identifying the traits of crime-free regions, regular travel routes, streetscape preferences, and so forth. However, because the link varies considerably over both place and time, assessing the association for this purpose requires a comprehensive process of collection and analysis of sophisticated spatiotemporal data. Second, in terms of disaster management, the analysis of the built environment that may influence the civil sentiments necessitates an in-depth data collection and analysis effort to better account for monitoring disaster situations. Recent studies have also shown how aspects of the built environment have an impact on urban attitudes, which in turn has an impact on health and wellness (Robinson et al., 2018). How the built environment affects health can be significantly changed by considering sentiments of the built environment, such as how pleasant the place is. To address these issues, a novel analysis framework is presented for coupling imagery and social media data reflecting conditions and sentiment in the urban streetscape. The developed framework is then applied to a case study to illustrate the procedures, decision points, computational considerations, and applicability of the analyses. Finally, discussion and conclusions are provided.

2 Background

2.1 *Impact of urban form on public sentiment*

Urban form and function have long been central to the urban planning process. A variety of spatial features those urban planners have long-sighted to be connected to how pedestrians experience the city is measured (Gehl, 2013; Ewing, 1996; Handy, 1993; Jacobs, 1961; Lynch, 1960). According to Talen (2006), a "compact, pedestrian-friendly, and mixed-use neighborhood" is essential, and that urban attributes design should consider sensory, aesthetic, temporal, and cognitive issues during the early stages of urban planning as well as the urban renewal process (Carmona et al., 2010; Talen and Ellis, 2002). Lynch (1960) identified three components that make up an individual's feelings about the environment: identity, structure, and meaning, with meaning indicating the practical and perceptual value of the location to the individual. Rachel and Stephen

Commented [MTC3]: Cleanly outline the relevant research needs.

Commented [AJ(S4R3): And then talk about how helpful it can be to address disaster response/humanitarian assistance using SVI and LSM data?

Commented [MTC5R3]: No, I think it would be better to discuss urban planning, response, etc. needs in the intro as a motivation for the research. Then, in the background you can add some details on how social media and imagery has been used in urban planning, disaster response, etc.

Commented [AJ(S6R3): Got it. thanks

Commented [AJ(S7R3):

Kaplan's research focused on understanding the impact of nature on people's perceptions and mental health from the standpoint of environmental psychology (Kaplan and Kaplan, 1989). Similarly, Ulrich's research demonstrated that the natural environment could elicit aesthetic and affective responses in people (Ulrich, 1983).

Ewing and Handy (2009) created a number of metrics for urban form that are strongly linked to the civil experience, including visual enclosure, human dimension, and streetscape complexity. While being challenging to quantify at the urban scale, these indicators have been operationalized in numerous research projects to gauge how people feel about the environment (Salazar Miranda et al., 2021). The degree to which streetscape segments are visually delimited by buildings, walls, vegetation, and other vertical components is measured by visual enclosure. Less visibly confined urban areas, according to literature, are regarded to be less preferred for pedestrians (Southworth and Owens, 1993). While streetscape complexity measures the visual richness of a location and is determined by the diversity and quantity of urban features, such as people, bicycles, minibikes, cars, and streetlights, the human dimension assesses the spatial environment attributes, such as sidewalks and their coherence, that match the scale and proportion of an individual. These two actions are inspired by the idea that pedestrian-friendly streets can help create surroundings where people can stroll safely and are also important motivators for pedestrian exploration (Zacharias, 1997b).

2.2 *Measuring sentiment*

There has been a growing interest in quantifying people's sentiments. Goodchild (2007) proposed the concept of "Citizens as Sensors" in his seminal work, comparing common citizens to environmental sensors capable of observing and collecting a wide range of geographic data. The use of sentiment analysis has been used in a variety of research areas, including walkability (Motieyan et al., 2022; Baobeid et al., 2021), bikability (Ito and Biljecki, 2021; Nagata et al., 2021), safety (Costa et al., 2022; Ogneva-Himmelberger et al., 2020; Naik et al., 2014), and risks (McCluskey and Rausser, 2001), memorability (Isola et al., 2011), greenery (Ma et al., 2021; Uebel et al., 2021), and aesthetics (Fayn et al., 2015), to obtain valuable insights into public opinion on particular areas of interest. Various methods and tools for collecting and quantifying information about individual sentiment have been proposed. A large experimental literature has focused on in-person assessments or field observations using slides, photographs, or text-based questionnaires

Commented [AJ(S8): Feedbacks by Dr. M.

Need to provide background on the ways in which sentiment has been considered and studied.

Need to describe what studies have attempted to do this, methods they have used, limitations, etc.

as an instrument to investigate people's sentiments (Hadavi et al., 2015; Hartig and Staats, 2005; Kaplan, 1985). These studies generally used a Likert scale as the dependent variable, for instance, inviting subjects to rate the physical setting of a place using 1-5 scale. (Wilson et al., 2012; Michael, 2005; Nasar, 1997).

In recent years, a plethora of crowdsourcing technology such as street view imagery has improved the ability to collect a massive amount of data to represent the physical setting of a place and anticipate sensory responses. Further to that, significant progress has been made on deep learning (DL) algorithms for complex analysis such as text and speech processing (Young et al., 2018), image feature detection and segmentation (LeCun et al., 2015). For example, from 2010 to 2015, the MIT Media Lab's Place Pulse project collected 1.5 million crowd-sourced perceptions for over 110,000 street view imageries and developed Computer Vision (CV) algorithms to predict up to 74% of overall perception similarities among image pairs (Dubey et al., 2016). Qiu et al. (2021) used crowdsourced survey data, deep learning, and machine learning to evaluate perceptual evaluation questions. While the data locations revealed a wide variety of geospatial contexts, the socio-demographics of Place Pulse image ranking participants remain unknown (Larkin et al., 2021).

Individual sentiment can also be inferred from textual content using modeling approaches. Some modeling approaches that have been utilized in this context include lexicon-based techniques, statistical approaches (e.g., machine learning and deep learning approaches), and hybrid techniques that combine the lexicon-based and statistical techniques (Ligthart et al., 2021; Cambria, 2016). Lexicon-based sentiment classification relies on predefined dictionaries like WordNet and SentiWordNet (Baccianella et al., 2010). Bilro et al. (2019) investigated the related concepts in online customer reviews (involvement, emotional states, experience, and brand advocacy) to identify the sentimental drivers of online customer engagement using text mining and lexicon-based sentiment analysis. On the other hand, a variety of machine learning techniques have been used to deal with the task of categorizing civil sentiments. Sentiment analysis based on machine learning approaches, as opposed to lexicon-based approaches, trains the models with sentimental features in the text to enable them to detect sentiments automatically (Xu et al., 2022). The sentiment analysis research efforts have extensively used the K-Nearest Neighbors, Support Vector Machine, Random Forest, and Decision Tree algorithms. In recent years, deep learning

Commented [MTC9]: Discuss methods for inferring sentiment from text

(DL) based Natural Language Processing (NLP) models have better performed in sentiment analysis. The Convolutional Neural Network, Long Short-Term Memory, and Bidirectional Encoder Representations from Transformers (BERT) have been used for improved outputs in perception studies (Khan et al., 2022; Duan et al., 2019; Martin et al., 2018).

Six commonly used sentiment markers are, 'safe,' 'lively,' 'bored,' 'affluent,' 'gloomy,' and 'beautiful.' Geotagged postings can be processed using a normalized rating system to reliably classify them by sentiment (Zhang et al., 2018). There are several pre-trained Transformers models that can recognize the context and assign meaning to each word in a sentence, allowing for greater parallelization and shorter training and prediction times (Colón-Ruiz and Cristóbal, 2020). For instance, the Hugging Face API contains several BERT-based pre-trained Transformers models as well as access to create new training models for predicting multilingual sentiment from texts given BERT's ability to create contextually appropriate word embeddings (Colón-Ruiz and Cristóbal, 2020; Devlin et al. 2019). The pretrained models using the transformers NLP algorithm automatically translates each post into a rating system.

Textual content generated by social media networks, primarily microblogging platforms like Twitter and Instagram, is increasingly being used to measure sentiments. According to Batty (2013), what is shared on social media has inherent and intimate personal value. Thus, location-based textual contents obtained from social media data may reflect a connection and shared experience with one's surroundings, with the added benefit of coming directly from citizens themselves (Johnson et al., 2013). For instance, Guerrero et al. (2016) examined how social media posts can be used to learn about how people interact with and perceive urban green spaces, with the goal of informing future sustainable infrastructure planning. Marti et al. (2017) used social media posts and urban cartographies to demonstrate what characteristics may make open public spaces, such as urban plazas, more successful than others. Further research efforts include querying caption verbs from social media postings as the proxy for human activities (Ye et al., 2021), user density data to analyze the time-spatial distribution of urban park users (Chen et al., 2018) and the impact of built environment attributes on social followings (Tang et al., 2022).

Commented [AJ(S10): Should this part be in background? Or should I put it in the application segment? This part explains the specific bert model we used for our analysis

Commented [MTC11R10]: I would just explain the bert model here...inputs, outputs, training, etc.

3 Methods

The proposed analytical framework involves characterizing sentiment and urban context, and then coupling the two to assess their relationship (Figure 2). In the sentiment inference stage, information that can be used to infer individual sentiment is gathered and processed. Social media postings are a rich source of data in this respect since they can contain texture and tone reflective of an individual's sentiment. Many social media posts include indicators of geographic location (latitude and longitude) as well as temporal references (e.g., date/time stamps) that can be used to locate the posting sites in space and time. The contents of each post (e.g., text, emoji's, etc.) can then be analyzed in an attempt to associate them with an appropriate sentiment. Numerous options for accomplishing this exists, such as natural language processing algorithms that have been trained to detect indicators of certain sentiments. Thus, for each posting, the desired output is a point feature representing the location of the post, attributed with a measure of sentiment.




Figure 2: Analytical Framework of the paper

In the urban context inference stage, metrics of urban form such as enclosure, human dimension, and complexity in determining sentiment can be derived for locations proximate to sites of social media postings. Computer vision methods such as the PSPNet (Zhao et al., 2017) for image semantic segmentation and Mask R-CNN (He et al., 2017) for image detection models can be used to classify features such as sky, vegetation, roads, buildings, and sidewalks in each image (Qiu et al., 2021). Pyramid scene parsing network (PSPNet) calculates probability values for the objects for each pixel in the image and then categorizes the pixel as belonging to the object with the highest probability. The visual enclosure and human dimension measures can be evaluated

Commented [AJ(S12): Should we mention our proceeding paper somewhere in the methodology section?

Commented [MTC13R12]: I'm not sure yet. If we can come up w/ a lot of new facets of the approach/results, then we might be able to.

Commented [MTC14]: Need to generalize this figure some. For example, no need to mention Instagram or nlp as those are not required. No need to mention pois for social media stage, etc.

Also, I remember that the poi issue for the imagery was a bit confusing. Need to elaborate on this. Shouldn't the pois for the imagery be the social media posting sites? IF not, what was the logic again?

Commented [AJ(S15R14): POI issue: Initially, for Instagram location searches, we generated points at 150m and 200m (tentative) intervals. We got 16 POIs and 115 locations based on 200m. Later, I cross-checked the locations with 100m/150m (100m generates 60 POIs, which differs from the proceeding) and found that the location number does not increase because these are available Instagram locations within this boundary. We needed more POIs for street level imagery to avoid information gaps. According to the literature, a 30m interval is a good distance for Google Street View to capture the data. We could use the same number of POIs in both cases, but the querying process for location search was a little more complicated and had some limitations.

Commented [MTC17]: Change 'phase 1' to 'Sentiment Inference'. Change 'phase 2' to 'Urban Context Inference'

Commented [MTC16R14]: Ok, I see. However, to simply things for the reader, we may want to avoid focusing on the pois for the instagram specific steps we had to take.

using PSPNet. The PSPNet model must first be trained to accurately compute these measures though. Training such a model necessitates a large image chip database for training, testing, and validation, as well as a time-consuming annotation process. The PSPNet architecture has a higher percentage of pixelwise accuracy in classifying object categories since it uses the image's global context to predict local level assumptions, having similar performance to other predominant models such as the FCN (ArcGIS API, 2022) and DeepLab (Tsang, 2018). Similarly, the Mask-RCNN model can be used to calculate the complexity of a streetscape. The Mask-RCNN structure generates masks for each recognized object and improves object detection speed and efficiency, producing results comparable to other detection model such as YOLO v5 (Zhu et al., 2021) and U-Net Convolutional Network (Quoc et al., 2020). Whereas one option is to collect and annotate a training dataset specific to a particular region/setting, a more practical option is to use one of the many publicly available image repositories. For example, several that may be suitable for training a model for enclosure, human dimension and complexity classification are the ADE20k (Zhou et al., 2017), COCO (Lin et al., 2014) and ImageNet (Deng et al., 2009) datasets.

Once trained, the models predict segmentation and detection results, confidence scores, and image bounding box coordinates. Finally, the sentiment metrics associated with the posting sites can be paired with the measures of urban form to assess the relationship visual enclosure, human dimension, streetscape complexity, and sentiment.

4 Case Study

An application to the City of Columbia, MO, USA was examined to demonstrate the analysis framework (Figure 2). Columbia (Figure 3) is a city in the midwestern United States with a population of 126,254 that is home to several major universities/colleges (United States Census Bureau, 2020).

Commented [MTC18]: Need to discuss the training procedure, options for training, details of several datasets that could be applicable, etc.




Figure 3: Study region

4.1 Location-based Social Media Data Acquisition

In this application, public Instagram posts are used to represent expressions of sentiment toward the city's streetscapes. Previous research initiatives used hashtag-based postings (for example, #Columbiainmissouri, #Southboston, #cambridge, and so on) to gather data from Instagram for urban emotion analysis (Kim et al., 2020) and to explore identity-related interpretations in understanding urban identity (Jang and Kim, 2019). While this process has aided in exploring the potential of social media data in urban contexts, some limitations exist. First, many postings lack location information (i.e., latitude/longitude coordinates) which makes associating the posts with a specific geographic location very difficult. Additionally, not all postings may contain expressions of individual sentiment. For example, a large proportion of public posts are often advertisements for goods and/or services. Thus, instead of retrieving Instagram posting using a hashtag-based approach, Instagram postings from known posting sites (i.e., Facebook locations) were sought instead. However, at the time of this research, there was no direct way to query all Instagram posting sites within a city. The only way to search for posting sites was to specify the coordinates of a location within a city and to query posting sites that are nearby, a capability that is provided by the *instagramapi* Python package (<https://github.com/adw0rd/instagramapi>). To this end, representative locations throughout the study area were used to query all Instagram posting sites within the study region using the functionalities of the *instagramapi* Python package (Figure 4b).




Figure 4: a) POIs for querying the Instagram locations, b) Instagram posting locations.

Feature types:

1. Education
2. Food
3. Healthcare
4. Recreation
5. Retail
6. Service

Commented [AJ(S19): As you advised to reduce the focus on the POIs for location searches, I think we can avoid the left picture. Any suggestions regarding this picture frame? Just one picture? Or Do I need to provide any other info such as python script or any other info?

Commented [MTC20R19]: Yep, remove the left panel.

Commented [AJ(S21): Also I'll need to talk about the feature types captured through the location search

In total 135 unique Instagram posting sites were identified in the study region. Given the set of Instagram posting sites, InstaLoadGram, a third-party data provider, was able to retrieve all public posting associated with those sites. A total of 111 places (out of the primary 135 sites) included the public posts, yielding a total of 63,861 posts spanning a seven-year period (January 1, 2015- October 20, 2021). Several posts lacked a caption, requiring the removal of the empty postings, resulting in 59,918 usable posts for analysis. Figure 5 depicts the number of posts per month over the seven years. In 2015, the number of public posts per month averaged 481 with a peak of 747 in October. From 2016 public posts increased to an average of 850 per month, exhibiting several clear peaks each year in the months of April, August, and October. From late 2019/ early 2020, a sharp decline in postings occurs, corresponding with the onset of the COVID 19 pandemic. By late 2020, the fall peak begins to re-emerge and towards the end of 2021, the fall peak returns to pre-pandemic levels.




Figure 5: Monthly Instagram posting frequency over the years 2015-2021.

4.2 Sentiment Analysis

In order to reliably classify post by sentiment, the geotagged postings were processed using a normalized rating system (Zhang et al., 2018). Several deep learning (DL) models were investigated in this respect. Ultimately, a pre-trained Transformers model, the Hugging Face API a Bidirectional Encoder Representations from Transformers (BERT) based pre-trained Transformers model, on social media data was selected (Colón-Ruiz and Cristóbal, 2020; Devlin et al. 2019). An example of which is depicted in Figure 1 (Hugging Face, 2021). The model

Commented [MTC22]: Need to explain how these were narrowed down. I believe some were removed given they were not true posting sites, but rather proxy coordinates used to represent general locations such as Columbia, MO right?

Commented [AJ(S23R22)]: Yes. First, we received 116 locations out of 135 locations from InstaLoadGram. I looked into my email to find out if they explained anything regarding the missing locations, however, I was not in the email chain. I think, you may have the email from them explaining about missing ones.

As far I remember, I also believe that “some were removed given they were not true posting sites, but rather proxy coordinates used to represent general locations such as Columbia, MO”

Commented [AJ(S24R22)]: Then, I removed the other 5 locations, as the locations did not contain any postings. Also, we filtered the empty postings from each dataset.

“distilbert-base-uncased-finetuned”, trained on 8 16 GB V100 for 90 hours using the BERT approach on 11,038 unpublished books and one million human evaluations, automatically translates each post into the binary rating (Negative = 0; Positive = 1) (Sanh et al., 2019).




Figure 5: BERT-based NLP Model

4.3 SVIs Retrieval

SVIs of georeferenced street segments can be retrieved for spatial feature classification. SVIs provide street-level and profile views of the urban environment and thus represent what individuals navigating the city may encounter. Google Street view is one publicly accessible source of SVIs. The Google Street view database hosts 220 billion Street View images from over 100 countries around the world. The images are captured on a regular basis by driving, pedaling, sailing, and walking around and capturing pictures with special cameras that accumulate pictures in numerous directions at the same time, and only one image date is retained for each location (Google Street View, 2022). The database can be accessed using the Google API which requires a set of parameters pitch, heading, and location information (latitude and longitude) to identify and retrieve relevant SVIs for a site. Thus, to query the Google API, 341 points of interest (POI) were established at 30-meter intervals along roads in the study region to represent locations traversed by individuals. Each of the POI were then used to retrieve GSV images using Google API (Figure 4 - left panel). Given the sequence in which these locations would be traversed along the roadways was known, four different viewing perspectives were considered for each POI $i \in I$: a) in the direction of the next POI $i+1$, b) 90.0 degrees from POI $i+1$, c) 180.0 degrees from POI $i+1$, and d) 270.0 degrees from POI $i+1$ as illustrated in Figure 5 (right panel). Whereas the horizontal field of view was kept at 90.0 degrees, the "pitch" of the returned 800x400 pixel images was set to 0.0 degrees. In total, 1,364 images were retrieved for the sampled POIs.

Commented [MTC25]: which model?

Commented [AJ(S26): Should this part be in background? Or should I put it in the application segment? This part explains the specific bert model we used for our analysis

Commented [MTC27R26]: I would just explain the bert model here...inputs, outputs, training, etc.

Commented [MTC28]: Need to add some details explaining the google streetview database, what it contains, how svIs are collected, hosted, etc.

Commented [MTC29]: This makes sense given one road with consecutive points. However, there are several cases where this description is not adequate. 1) for a point that is the last point in a sequence on a road, 2) for multiple roads. So, let me know exactly how a sequence was defined. For example, was the sequence defined for a road, a road segment, etc? What rule did you apply for the last point in a sequence? I need to know the details so I can modify the notation accordingly.

Commented [AJ(S30R29): The most important aspect here is the HEADING for google street view which we obtained while creating the points along the streets. Whereas ArcGIS does not have this function when creating points, QGIS generates angles that can be used as headings (https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=nmXGAu6_9qM). As far I understood, the angle is related to the degree of angle between the point (always north is up) and the street angle. Now, if $i=10$ degree for (a), $i=10+90$ degree will be for (b)

Commented [MTC31]: So, 4 images per each of the 341 pois. However, there are only 111 posting sites. So, how were the posting sites linked with the images/segmentation results for the streetview pois? Need to provide details on this.

Also, we need to justify why we bothered identifying potential pois before we knew where the sm postings were coming from. That is, why evaluate all 341 pois when some of them are likely to not be used in the analysis?

Commented [AJ(S32R31): So, as you know, we received one feedback, and it was our concern as well that we did not know whether the postings were from the inside or outside. The posting locations' latitudes and longitudes are not exactly on the streets (Figure 8). So, we used NEAR geoprocessing to use the nearby POIs (109 59k postings) —341 locations).




Figure 6: a) POIs along the street segments, b) SVIs per POI.

4.4 Spatial Feature Classification

PSPNet (Zhao et al., 2017) and Mask R-CNN (He et al., 2017) image detection and semantic segmentation models were used to classify features in each image. The visual enclosure and human dimension measures were evaluated using PSPNet. The 150-category ADE20k dataset was used to train the model. Out of the 150 categories of the dataset, 12 urban feature categories were focused that capture relevant features of the built environment and combined them to create the metrics. The urban feature categories for groups of similar objects, such as trees and plants, that are added together to produce categorical estimates (Table 2).

Table 2: Metrics of urban form developed by the urban feature categories.

Metrics of Urban Form	Urban Feature categories	Urban Features Denoted in the CV Models
Visual Enclosure	Sky	Sky
	Wall	Wall
	Fence	Fence
	Greenery	Tree, grass, field, flower, plant
	Building	Building, house, skyscraper

Commented [MTC33]: Are the pois here the same as those shown in the earlier figure? If so, no need to include them in another figure. Also, for panel b), it would be good to do something a bit different from the proceedings paper.... Perhaps using a set of different images, including the orientation of the observer on the ground (e.g., angle), showing the poi in red in the legend as the current observation point, etc.

Human Dimension	Road	Road
	Sidewalk	Sidewalk, bench, path, step
Streetscape Complexity	Person	People
	Bicycle	Bicycle, bike
	Motorcycle	Car, Bus, Truck
	Streetlight	Streetlight, pole
	Signboard	Signboard

To represent the level of enclosure that people were likely to experience, the proportion of an image classified as sky, walls, fences, trees, and buildings was used. visual enclosure. The percentage of an image classified as sidewalk or road was used to estimate human dimension. The number of people, bicycles, motorbikes, cars, and streetlights present in each image as computed by the Mask R-CNN was used to characterize the level of complexity present in the urban environment. Object estimates for each location are the average estimates derived from all downloaded images at that location.




Figure 7: Spatial Feature Classification

4.5 Spatial Autocorrelation Analysis

Hotspot analysis for preferability mapping

SAR for calculating the correlation between the features and sentiments

One way ANOVA to see the variance in impact of different feature types on the sentiment rankings

Commented [AJ(S34)]: I'll revise the picture to make a change of the style used in the conference proceeding

Commented [MTC35R34]: Perhaps a simpler figure would work. Maybe show as 3 panel graphic w/ panel a) the GSV, b) segmentation, and c) the detection result for a single interesting image. Then, we can add in the supplemental materials the videos showing the changing results as we did in the presentations.

Commented [AJ(S36R34)]: That sounds great


Commented [AJ(S37)]: Is this section necessary? Here, I am planning to talk about the formulas used for the statistical analyses

Commented [MTC38R37]: I don't know yet...need to see how things come together.

5 Results and Discussion

5.1 Sentiment Mapping

Computations for the sentiment analysis was performed using the Google Colab Pro platform with a system configuration of Nvidia Tesla P100-PCIE GPU and 16GB RAM. Assessing the sentiment associated with each of the 63,861 postings took 35,756 seconds of computational time. Figure 8(a) summarizes the proportion of each sentiment classification at each posting site. At many posting sites, a majority of the posts are classified as very positive. There is quite a bit of variation though in the spatial distribution of negative sentiment, with locations having higher proportions of such sentiment located in the Northwest, Northeast, and Central portions of the study region.



Commented [JA39]: Need some suggestions regarding result

I have one confusion about the result analysis for both sections (Preferability mapping; and the relationship between the urban features and sentiments). I believe there are several aspects to be considered, but I'm not sure which one will be the most meaningful.

> Finalizing hotspot and regression of **all data (from 2015 to 2021)**, separated by daytime period (i.e., Morning, noon, afternoon, night, or Weekdays, weekends)

> Finalizing hotspot and regression of **all data (from 2015 to 2021)**, separated by month (i.e., January-April (Spring), May-August (Summer), September-December (Fall), or January, February, March.....)

> Finalizing hotspot and regression of **yearly data (2021, 2020, 2019....)**, separated by daytime period (i.e., Morning, noon, afternoon, night, or Weekdays, weekends)

> Finalizing hotspot and regression of **yearly data (2021, 2020, 2019....)**, separated by month (i.e., January-April (Spring), May-August (Summer), September-December (Fall), or January, February, March.....)


Which way should I choose to finalize the results?

Figure 8: a) proportion of sentiment ranking on each location, b) Hotspot analysis.

A Getis-Ord Gi* hotspot analysis (Getis and Ord, 1992) of the proportion of positive postings at each location (Figure 8(b)) reveals the presence of statistically significant spatial autocorrelation at several sites in the study region. In particular, 25 sites in the South portion of the region were found to exhibit statistically significant positive spatial autocorrelation at the 0.90 confidence level or above (14 at the 0.95 confidence level or above, 2 at the 0.99 confidence level or above). Two areas to the North-western region were found to exhibit statistically significant spatial autocorrelation of lower proportion of posts classified as positive at the 0.90 confidence level or above (4 at the 0.95 confidence level, 7 at the 0.99 confidence level or above).

5.2 Relationship between the Urban Environment and Sentiments

5.2.1 Relationship between metrics of urban form and the sentiments




Commented [MTC40]: For which time period??

Commented [AJ(S41R40)]: This one was a place holder to capture the correlation results for all time. Once we finalize the time segments, I'll revise the diagram. Correlation matrix for each time period sounds great

Commented [MTC42]: What is used as the basis for the relationship here...regression results, correlations, etc?

Why not do the correlation matrix like you did in the proceedings for each time period?

Commented [AJ(S43R42)]: noted



Commented [AJ(S44)]: Place holder.

This diagram provides the frequency of the urban feature for positive and negative postings for different time periods of day (morning, afternoon, evening, night). Can create confusion as we may consider monthly or yearly calculation rather than daily changes. A similar but way simpler diagram showing urban feature distribution based on months may be more meaningful??

5.2.2 Relationship changes over time

Regression analysis results_Urban Features---Sentiment Ranking

Jan- April 2021

Urban Metrics	Urban Features	<i>b</i>	<i>SE_b</i>	<i>t</i>	Cor. & Sig.	Lower Bound a	Upper Bound a	β
Results	Intercept	0.97	0.05	19.13	<i>p</i> < .05	0.87	1.07	0.00
Enclosure	Sky	-1.18	0.05	-23.17	-0.57***	-1.28	-1.08	-0.49
	Wall	-0.35	0.08	-4.34	-0.41***	-0.51	-0.19	-0.09
	Building	-0.11	0.04	-2.54	0.22*	-0.20	-0.03	-0.05
	Fence	-0.07	0.08	-0.88	-0.04	-0.24	0.09	-0.02
	Tree	0.19	0.05	3.77	0.26***	0.09	0.28	0.07
Human Scale	Road	-0.17	0.05	-3.37	-0.48***	-0.26	-0.07	-0.07
	Sidewalk	0.37	0.04	9.37	0.39***	0.29	0.45	0.18
	Streetlight	-0.47	0.05	-9.05	-0.12***	-0.57	-0.37	-0.15
	Signboard	0.76	0.37	2.07	-0.03*	0.04	1.49	0.03

Commented [MTC45]: Some considerations here: a) is 2021 a solid year to evaluate? From the posting distribution earlier, 2021 looks a little abnormal early in 2021. So, it may be worth comparing with a prepandemic year like 2019. b) Also from the distribution chart, it is clear that there are two peaks in the postings....one in spring and one or two in the fall. Thus, we need to be careful not to put these peaks into bins that split the individual peaks up from one another.

Commented [AJ(S46R45)]: a) I have done analysis for 2019, 2020 and 2021 (results are posted here as a place holder). I can add more years if that convey more comparable results. Specially, 2017 has the highest post (11182 posts) followed by 10614 posts in 2018 b) I divided these individual years into 3 segments (Jan-April (Spring), May-Aug (Summer), Sep-Dec (Fall)). Now that I see in the data distribution chart as you said, peaks can be observed generally in the months of April, August, October. I think, peaks can be distributed in 2 segments may be? Like Jan-June, July-Dec? Will that be thoughtful? What do you think?

Complexity	Person	0.27	0.04	6.43	0.32***	0.19	0.35	0.12
	Bicycle	0.24	0.03	7.08	0.26***	0.17	0.30	0.13
	Motor	-0.07	0.07	-1.08	-0.11	-0.20	0.06	-0.02
	Vehicle							

*** $p < .001$, ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$

$F(12, 2120) = 191.1, p < .001$ and represented a large effect ($R^2_{adj} = 0.52$)

$AIC = 1344.05, BIC = 1423.16$

^a95% confidence interval

May- August 2021

Urban Metrics	Urban Features	b	SE_b	t	Cor. & Sig.	Lower Bound ^a	Upper Bound ^a	β
Results	Intercept	0.89	0.04	23.11	$p < .05$	0.81	0.96	0.00
Enclosure	Sky	-1.45	0.04	-34.59	-0.66***	-1.53	-1.36	-0.66
	Wall	0.10	0.06	1.81	-0.41	-0.01	0.21	0.03
	Building	-0.18	0.04	-5.06	0.33***	-0.25	-0.11	-0.08
	Fence	-0.57	0.08	-7.28	-0.05***	-0.73	-0.42	-0.11
	Tree	0.22	0.04	6.09	0.32***	0.15	0.29	0.10
Human Scale	Road	0.03	0.04	0.88	-0.53	-0.04	0.11	0.02
	Sidewalk	0.56	0.03	18.87	0.37***	0.50	0.62	0.29
Complexity	Streetlight	-0.24	0.04	-6.05	-0.20***	-0.31	-0.16	-0.08
	Signboard	0.15	0.31	0.49	0.03	-0.46	0.76	0.01
	Person	0.21	0.03	6.35	0.27***	0.14	0.27	0.09
	Bicycle	0.35	0.03	10.59	0.18***	0.28	0.41	0.17
	Motor Vehicle	0.14	0.06	2.57	-0.10*	0.03	0.25	0.04

*** $p < .001$, ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$

$F(12, 2067) = 329.7, p < .001$ and represented a large effect ($R^2_{adj} = 0.60$)

$AIC = 1042.07, BIC = 1124.32$

^a95% confidence interval

Sep- Dec 2021

Urban Metrics	Urban Features	b	SE_b	t	Cor. & Sig.	Lower Bound ^a	Upper Bound ^a	β
Results	Intercept	0.92	0.05	20.29	$p < .05$	0.83	1.01	0.00
Enclosure	Sky	-1.42	0.05	-29.46	-0.64***	-1.51	-1.32	-0.60
	Wall	-0.07	0.07	-1.07	-0.39	-0.20	0.06	-0.02
	Building	-0.06	0.04	-1.35	0.31	-0.14	0.03	-0.03
	Fence	-0.57	0.08	-6.85	-0.12***	-0.73	-0.40	-0.12
	Tree	0.20	0.05	4.05	0.31***	0.10	0.30	0.07
	Road	0.03	0.04	0.75	-0.49*	-0.05	0.12	0.02

Human Scale	Sidewalk	0.44	0.04	12.04	0.39***	0.37	0.52	0.22
Complexity	Streetlight	-0.42	0.05	-9.04	-0.12***	-0.51	-0.33	-0.14
	Signboard	0.94	0.35	2.71	0.02**	0.26	1.62	0.05
	Person	0.21	0.04	5.16	0.32***	0.13	0.29	0.09
	Bicycle	0.32	0.03	9.63	0.23***	0.26	0.39	0.17
	Motor Vehicle	-0.04	0.07	-0.61	-0.10	-0.17	0.09	-0.01

*** $p < .001$, ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$

$F(12, 2648) = 329.7$, $p < .001$ and represented a large effect ($R^2_{adj} = 0.58$)

$AIC = 1066.33$, $BIC = 1145.09$

^a 95% confidence interval

Jan- April 2020

Urban Metrics	Urban Features	b	SE_b	t	Cor. & Sig.	Lower Bound _a	Upper Bound _a	β
Results	Intercept	0.93	0.06	15.62	$p < .05$	0.82	1.05	0.00
Enclosure	Sky	-1.19	0.05	-21.84	-0.48***	-1.29	-1.08	-0.51
	Wall	0.05	0.09	0.62	-0.28	-0.11	0.22	0.01
	Building	-0.13	0.05	-2.67	-0.53**	-0.23	-0.03	-0.06
	Fence	-0.62	0.10	-5.94	-0.02***	-0.83	-0.42	-0.14
	Tree	0.19	0.06	3.28	-0.59**	0.08	0.30	0.07
Human Scale	Road	-0.18	0.05	-3.45	-0.38***	-0.28	-0.08	-0.08
	Sidewalk	0.43	0.05	9.45	-0.23***	0.34	0.52	0.19
Complexity	Streetlight	-0.35	0.05	-7.06	-0.11	-0.44	-0.25	-0.13
	Signboard	-0.25	0.56	-0.45	0.28***	-1.36	0.85	-0.01
	Person	0.31	0.04	7.20	-0.41***	0.22	0.39	0.15
	Bicycle	0.30	0.05	6.56	-0.35	0.21	0.39	0.17
	Motor Vehicle	0.07	0.08	0.80	-0.54	-0.10	0.23	0.02

*** $p < .001$, ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$

$F(12, 1671) = 142.30$, $p < .001$ and represented a large effect ($R^2_{adj} = 0.51$)

$AIC = 1136.84$, $BIC = 1212.60$

^a 95% confidence interval

May- August 2020

Urban Metrics	Urban Features	b	SE_b	t	Cor. & Sig.	Lower Bound _a	Upper Bound _a	β
Results	Intercept	1.00	0.06	16.30	$p < .05$	0.88	1.12	0.00
Enclosure	Sky	-1.34	0.06	-23.93	-0.42***	-1.45	-1.23	-0.61
	Wall	0.08	0.08	0.97	-0.20	-0.08	0.24	0.02
	Building	-0.23	0.05	-4.71	-0.67***	-0.33	-0.14	-0.08
	Fence	-0.72	0.12	-6.17	-0.10***	-0.95	-0.49	-0.14
	Tree	0.20	0.05	3.96	-0.58***	0.10	0.30	0.09

Human Scale	Road	0.04	0.05	0.71	-0.38	-0.07	0.14	0.02
	Sidewalk	0.54	0.05	11.46	-0.37***	0.45	0.64	0.24
Complexity	Streetlight	-0.44	0.05	-8.01	-0.03***	-0.55	-0.33	-0.15
	Signboard	0.25	0.37	0.66	0.00	-0.49	0.98	0.01
	Person	0.14	0.04	3.61	-0.39***	0.07	0.22	0.07
	Bicycle	0.33	0.05	6.60	-0.12***	0.23	0.43	0.15
	Motor Vehicle	-0.10	0.08	-1.29	-0.53	-0.26	0.05	-0.03

*** $p < .001$, ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$

$F(12, 1687) = 137.09$, $p < .001$ and represented a large effect ($R^2_{adj} = 0.49$)

$AIC = 1167.78$, $BIC = 1243.67$

^a95% confidence interval

Sep- Dec 2020

Urban Metrics	Urban Features	b	SE_b	t	Cor. & Sig.	Lower Bound _a	Upper Bound _a	β
Results	Intercept	1.18	0.06	21.11	$p < .05$	1.07	1.29	0.00
Enclosure	Sky	-1.35	0.05	-26.81	-0.30	-1.45	-1.25	-0.58
	Wall	-0.42	0.09	-4.78	-0.35	-0.59	-0.25	-0.10
	Building	-0.15	0.05	-3.07	-0.58	-0.24	-0.05	-0.07
	Fence	-0.17	0.09	-1.84	0.10	-0.35	0.01	-0.04
	Tree	-0.07	0.05	-1.30	-0.48	-0.17	0.04	0.02
Human Scale	Road	-0.21	0.05	-3.84	-0.49	-0.32	-0.10	0.09
	Sidewalk	0.37	0.05	7.44	-0.30	0.27	0.46	0.15
Complexity	Streetlight	-0.38	0.05	-7.21	0.01	-0.48	-0.28	-0.13
	Signboard	1.39	0.35	3.92	0.07	0.69	2.08	0.08
	Person	0.21	0.04	4.80	-0.37	0.13	0.30	0.09
	Bicycle	0.16	0.04	3.63	-0.28	0.07	0.24	0.07
	Motor Vehicle	-0.15	0.07	-2.26	-0.52	-0.28	-0.02	-0.04

*** $p < .001$, ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$

$F(12, 1975) = 154.71$, $p < .001$ and represented a large effect ($R^2_{adj} = 0.48$)

$AIC = 1434.6$, $BIC = 1512.72$

^a95% confidence interval

Jan- April 2019

Urban Metrics	Urban Features	b	SE_b	t	Cor. & Sig.	Lower Bound _a	Upper Bound _a	β
Results	Intercept	1.02	0.05	21.16	$p < .05$	0.93	1.11	0.00
Enclosure	Sky	-1.00	0.05	-21.54	-0.48***	-1.09	-0.91	-0.44
	Wall	-0.22	0.07	-2.99	-0.16**	-0.36	-0.07	-0.05
	Building	-0.03	0.04	-0.81	-0.53	-0.12	0.05	-0.02
	Fence	-0.45	0.09	-4.91	-0.04***	-0.63	-0.27	-0.09

	Tree	0.16	0.05	3.48	-0.56***	0.07	0.25	0.06
Human Scale	Road	-0.22	0.05	-4.78	-0.44***	-0.30	-0.13	-0.09
	Sidewalk	0.38	0.04	10.64	-0.23***	0.31	0.45	0.17
Complexity	Streetlight	-0.45	0.04	-11.87	-0.06***	-0.52	-0.38	-0.19
	Signboard	-0.98	0.51	-1.90	0.24	-1.98	0.03	-0.03
	Person	0.24	0.03	6.94	-0.37***	0.17	0.31	0.12
	Bicycle	0.30	0.04	8.08	-0.33***	0.22	0.37	0.17
	Motor Vehicle	-0.32	0.06	-5.01	-0.49***	-0.44	-0.19	-0.08

*** $p < .001$, ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$

$F(51, 2533) = 43.82$, $p < .001$ and represented a large effect ($R^2_{adj} = 0.52$)

$AIC = 1699.31$, $BIC = 1781.21$

^a 95% confidence interval

May- August 2019

Urban Metrics	Urban Features	b	SE_b	t	Cor. & Sig.	Lower Bound ^a	Upper Bound ^a	β
Results	Intercept	0.93	0.04	20.86	$p < .05$	0.84	1.02	0.00
Enclosure	Sky	-1.08	0.04	-25.58	-0.48	-1.16	-1.00	-0.51
	Wall	0.06	0.06	0.97	-0.17	-0.06	0.18	0.02
	Building	-0.01	0.04	-0.35	-0.59	-0.10	0.07	-0.01
	Fence	-0.66	0.10	-6.38	-0.12	-0.86	-0.46	-0.10
	Tree	0.08	0.04	1.83	-0.53	-0.01	0.16	0.03
Human Scale	Road	-0.14	0.04	-3.33	-0.35	-0.22	-0.06	-0.06
	Sidewalk	0.42	0.04	11.66	-0.30	0.35	0.49	0.17
Complexity	Streetlight	-0.32	0.04	-8.14	-0.03	-0.39	-0.24	-0.13
	Signboard	-1.56	0.43	-3.61	0.07	-2.41	-0.71	-0.06
	Person	0.36	0.03	12.41	-0.36	0.30	0.42	0.18
	Bicycle	0.35	0.04	9.57	-0.07	0.28	0.42	0.16
	Motor Vehicle	-0.17	0.06	-2.68	-0.51	-0.29	-0.04	-0.04

*** $p < .001$, ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$

$F(53, 2467) = 58.13$, $p < .001$ and represented a large effect ($R^2_{adj} = 0.55$)

$AIC = 1440.39$, $BIC = 1522.48$

^a 95% confidence interval

Sep- Dec 2019

Urban Metrics	Urban Features	b	SE_b	t	Cor. & Sig.	Lower Bound ^a	Upper Bound ^a	β
Results	Intercept	1.01	0.05	21.53	$p < .05$	0.92	1.10	0.00
	Sky	-1.06	0.04	-24.94	-0.40	-1.14	-0.97	-0.48

Enclosure	Wall	-0.04	0.06	-0.65	-0.32	-0.17	0.09	-0.01
	Building	-0.19	0.04	-4.61	-0.52	-0.26	-0.11	-0.08
	Fence	-0.33	0.08	-3.90	-0.08	-0.49	-0.16	-0.08
	Tree	0.17	0.05	3.67	-0.58	0.08	0.26	0.07
Human Scale	Road	-0.24	0.04	-6.05	-0.37	-0.32	-0.17	-0.11
	Sidewalk	0.45	0.04	11.96	-0.25	0.38	0.52	0.20
Complexity	Streetlight	-0.35	0.04	-9.16	-0.05	-0.43	-0.28	-0.15
	Signboard	-0.63	0.51	-1.24	0.22	-1.63	0.37	0.02
	Person	0.33	0.03	9.49	-0.43	0.26	0.39	0.16
	Bicycle	0.26	0.03	7.42	-0.32	0.19	0.33	0.15
	Motor Vehicle	-0.17	0.07	-2.30	-0.56	-0.31	-0.02	-0.04

*** $p < .001$, ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$

$F(55, 2257) = 35.70$, $p < .001$ and represented a large effect ($R^2_{adj} = 0.52$)

$AIC = 1399.99$, $BIC = 1480.34$

* 95% confidence interval

5.2.3 Association of Feature types and Sentiments

A one-way ANOVA was conducted to find out whether there are differences in impacts of different feature types on positive and negative sentiment rankings are statistically significant. The test indicated that different feature types (Education, Food, Healthcare, Recreation, Retail, Service) were significantly different with regards to the rankings; $F(5, 100) = 8.57$, $p < .05$ (Figure 07b). The result had an overall large effect size, $\omega^2 = 0.26$. Post-Hoc procedures using Tukey adjustments revealed that Education ($M = 68.54$, $SD = 7.65$), Recreation ($M = 67.31$, $SD = 13.22$) and Service ($M = 68.09$, $SD = 15.52$) feature types have significantly ($p < .05$) higher impact on positive rankings than healthcare ($M = 62.55$, $SD = 10.93$) and food ($M = 51.99$, $SD = 10.99$). Assumptions using Shapiro-wilk normality test and Levene test indicated no concerns with normality and homogeneity of variance respectively.




Figure 07: a) Different feature types, b) variances of different feature types on the sentiment rankings.

Commented [AJ(S47): Place holder. I'll change the results and move the figure to coincide with the writeups

6 Discussion

Studies have shown a range of findings due to the variation in the methodologies employed to examine the civil feelings with regard to the built environment. For instance,

The research reported in this article provides evidence that indeed supports many of these relationships. However, this research also highlights that.....

This study examines the relationship between sentiments and built environment in an urban neighborhood setting. Observations of sentiments were crowd-sourced from social media and were then evaluated by NLP model. While other studies have data collection from a limited number of participants for a limited time period, here the This robust data collection effort was essential to improve the reliability of the sentiment results.

Moreover, each individuals' activity was analyzed for different time periods (Jan-.....) to better understand the extent to which these temporal regimes may affect the relationships between sentiments and built environment.

Results indicate that visual enclosure has a significant positive relationship to human sentiments across all time periods considered.

7 Conclusion

Making urban human settlements more inclusive, safe, and resilient, as well as encouraging healthy lifestyles and well-being at all ages, are critical to long-term urban sustainability. The way people perceive and value places, infrastructures, and events in their daily lives has far-reaching implications for sustainability planning and implementation efforts. To this end, the aim of this research is to provide vital insights into street semantics to promote more informed community planning decisions (what SDG 11 aims to achieve by 2030). The paper details a framework for linking individual sentiment to characteristics of the streetscape. Open-source social media postings and are processed using deep learning methods to infer sentiment and characterize visibility at locations along a transportation system to make these associations possible. The framework is applied to a small case study to illustrate the procedures involved and demonstrate the applicability of the process.

(ii) what aspects of the urban environment relate to the sentiments, and (iii) how these relationships change over time. The first stage of the research involves developing a streetscape preferability mapping based on sentiment ranking. To assess preferability, the study combines collected LSM data with a natural language processing (NLP) algorithm. A positive and negative ranking system on social media postings is used to determine whether individuals like or dislike the specific spaces. In the second stage of the study, a variety of urban attributes that urban planners have long-sighted to be connected to how pedestrians experience the city is measured (Gehl, 2013; Jacobs, 1961; Lynch, 1960). Metrics of urban form including visual enclosure (e.g., sky, trees, buildings etc.), human dimension (e.g., roads and sidewalks), and streetscape complexity (e.g., people, cars, bicycles and so on) are constructed utilizing open-source geospatial datasets, such as Google Street View pictures of urban elements, roadways, and CV methods. In order to assess if the metrics affect sentiments over time, a spatial autocorrelation analysis is performed.

Commented [MTC48]: Either integrate in the methods section or move to conclusion to rehash what was done.

To that end, this study investigates which street segments have more or less enclosure, human scale visibility, or complexity, which can be used to compare with preferred locations.

Commented [MTC49]: Integrate in methods section or use in conclusion rehash contribution.

The paper makes two major contributions to the literature. The first is methodological in the construction of preferability mapping and associations of urban environment attributes. This study extends the exploration by creating a comprehensive framework integrating LSM data, SVI, GIS and ML algorithms to improve the understanding of urban dynamics.

The second contribution of the study is to shine new light on certain urban environment attributes of the urban fabric that can help urban planners and regulatory bodies during the early stages of urban development as well as during urban renewal plans.

Commented [MTC50]: Move to conclusion when rehashing the contributions

There are various decision points, constraints, and extensions to this study that might be worthwhile directions for future research. First, the Google street-level imagery that was utilized in the application of the developed framework was selected for use given that it is publicly available for many locations world-wide, making it an ideal source from the perspective of replicability/applicability of the framework to other regions of interest. However, the Google imagery database at the time of this research is not temporally longitudinal. As such, temporal mismatches between the date/time of sentiment expression and the characteristics of the urban

environment can exist. In future applications, the ability to have imagery with good temporal correspondence with sentiment expression is expected to yield better results. Likewise, whereas street-level imagery was utilized in this application as a source of urban characteristics individuals may encounter as they traverse the city, other sources could also be integrated to provide additional geospatial context. For example, data feeds such as crime and accident reports, weather and traffic conditions, power outages, service delays, resource shortages, etc. could provide valuable context to civil sentiment. The use of social media postings as indicators of sentiment also involves a few challenges in that inferring sentiment from postings is not perfect as it is subject to much uncertainty. For instance, the sentiments inferred from the postings may not directly correlate to elements of the streetscape in all cases. Further, inferring the sentiment of many different individuals over time with a trained model alone cannot be expected to provide perfect results as there are many nuances of human communication that are difficult to infer, and comprehensive ground-truth of sentiment isn't typically practical. Regardless, greater attention to model training and ground-truth is expected to improve inference of sentiment.

In the future, real-time social media datasets that incorporate both space and time into analysis, such as Emerging Hot Spot Analysis (EHSA) as a spatiotemporal application of the Getis-Ord Gi* statistical analysis, would be robust and efficient in analyzing urban streetscape. Finally, developing a website-based user-friendly interface for the city residents can be quite beneficial in obtaining real-time responses.

CRedit authorship contribution statement

Jayedi Aman: Conceptualization, Methodology, Scripting, Formal analysis, Writing – original draft. **Timothy C Matisziw:** Methodology, Software and Scripting, Formal analysis, Writing - original draft, review, and editing.

Commented [AJ(S51): Place holder

Declaration of Competing Interest

The authors declare that they do not have any known competing commercial interests or personal relations that could emerge to have influenced the tasks discussed in this article.

Acknowledgements

The Army Research Laboratory funded the study, which was carried out under Cooperative Agreement Number W911NF-21-2-0276. The views and conclusions expressed in this document are those of the authors and should not be interpreted as representing the Army Research Office's or the United States Government's official policies, expressed or implied. Regardless of any copyright notation herein, the United States Government is authorized to reproduce and distribute reprints for government purposes.

References

- Ahn, C., Ignaccolo, C., & Salazar-Miranda, A. (2022). Measuring the City: The Power of Urban Metrics. *Projections*, 16. *Measuring the City: The Power of Urban Metrics* (MIT Press). <https://projections.pubpub.org/pub/xusawg1f/release/3>
- Baccianella, S., Esuli, A., & Sebastiani, F. (2010). *SENTIWORDNET 3.0: An Enhanced Lexical Resource for Sentiment Analysis and Opinion Mining*. 5.
- Baobeid, A., Koç, M., & Al-Ghamdi, S. G. (2021). Walkability and Its Relationships With Health, Sustainability, and Livability: Elements of Physical Environment and Evaluation Frameworks. *Frontiers in Built Environment*, 7. <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fbuil.2021.721218>
- Batty, M. (2013). Big data, smart cities and city planning. *Dialogues in Human Geography*, 3(3), 274–279. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2043820613513390>
- Batty, M., Hudson-Smith, A., Milton, R., & Crooks, A. (2010). Map mashups, Web 2.0 and the GIS revolution. *Annals of GIS*, 16(1), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19475681003700831>
- Benabbou, R., & Lee, H. (2019). Exploring the evolution of urban emotions in the City of Seoul using social media information. *International Journal of Knowledge-Based Development*, 10(3), 232–248. <https://doi.org/10.1504/IJKB.2019.103208>
- Ben-Akiva, M., & Bierlaire, M. (1999). Discrete Choice Methods and their Applications to Short Term Travel Decisions. In R. W. Hall (Ed.), *Handbook of Transportation Science* (pp. 5–33). Springer US. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4615-5203-1_2
- Biljecki, F., & Ito, K. (2021). Street view imagery in urban analytics and GIS: A review. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 215, 104217. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landurbplan.2021.104217>
- Bilro, R. G., Loureiro, S. M. C., & Guerreiro, J. (2019). Exploring online customer engagement with hospitality products and its relationship with involvement, emotional states, experience and brand advocacy. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management*, 28(2), 147–171. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19368623.2018.1506375>
- Cambria, E. (2016). Affective Computing and Sentiment Analysis. *IEEE Intelligent Systems*, 31(2), 102–107. <https://doi.org/10.1109/MIS.2016.31>
- Cao, R., & Qiu, G. (2018). Urban Land Use Classification Based on Aerial and Ground Images. *2018 International Conference on Content-Based Multimedia Indexing (CBMI)*, 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.1109/CBMI.2018.8516552>
- Carmona, M. (2010). *Public Places, Urban Spaces: The Dimensions of Urban Design*. Routledge.
- Chen, Y., Liu, X., Gao, W., Wang, R. Y., Li, Y., & Tu, W. (2018). Emerging social media data on measuring urban park use. *Urban Forestry & Urban Greening*, 31, 130–141. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ufug.2018.02.005>
- Choudhry, K. Z., Coles, R., Qureshi, S., Ashford, R., Khan, S., & Mir, R. R. (2015). A review of methodologies used in studies investigating human behaviour as determinant of outcome for exposure to 'naturalistic and urban environments.' *Urban Forestry & Urban Greening*, 14(3), 527–537. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ufug.2015.03.007>
- Colón-Ruiz, C., & Segura-Bedmar, I. (2020). Comparing deep learning architectures for sentiment analysis on drug reviews. *Journal of Biomedical Informatics*, 110, 103539. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbi.2020.103539>

- Costa, G., Soares, C., & Marques, M. (2019). Finding Common Image Semantics for Urban Perceived Safety Based on Pairwise Comparisons. *2019 27th European Signal Processing Conference (EUSIPCO)*, 1–5. <https://doi.org/10.23919/EUSIPCO.2019.8903115>
- De Nadai, M., Vieri, R. L., Zen, G., Dragicevic, S., Naik, N., Caraviello, M., Hidalgo, C. A., Sebe, N., & Lepri, B. (2016). Are Safer Looking Neighborhoods More Lively? A Multimodal Investigation into Urban Life. *Proceedings of the 24th ACM International Conference on Multimedia*, 1127–1135. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2964284.2964312>
- Devlin, J., Chang, M.-W., Lee, K., & Toutanova, K. (2019). BERT: Pre-training of Deep Bidirectional Transformers for Language Understanding. *ArXiv:1810.04805 [Cs]*. <http://arxiv.org/abs/1810.04805>
- Duan, S., Shen, Z., & Luo, X. (2022). Exploring the Relationship between Urban Youth Sentiment and the Built Environment Using Machine Learning and Weibo Comments. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 19(8), 4794. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph19084794>
- Dubey, A., Naik, N., Parikh, D., Raskar, R., & Hidalgo, C. A. (2016). Deep Learning the City: Quantifying Urban Perception at a Global Scale. In B. Leibe, J. Matas, N. Sebe, & M. Welling (Eds.), *Computer Vision – ECCV 2016* (pp. 196–212). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-46448-0_12
- Ewing, R. (n.d.). *PEDESTRIAN- AND TRANSIT-FRIENDLY DESIGN: A Primer for Smart Growth*. 26.
- Ewing, R., & Handy, S. (2009). Measuring the Unmeasurable: Urban Design Qualities Related to Walkability. *Journal of Urban Design*, 14(1), 65–84. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13574800802451155>
- Ewing, R., Handy, S., Brownson, R. C., Clemente, O., & Winston, E. (2006). Identifying and Measuring Urban Design Qualities Related to Walkability. *Journal of Physical Activity & Health*, 3(s1), S223–S240. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jpah.3.s1.s223>
- Fayn, K., MacCann, C., Tiliopoulos, N., & Silvia, P. J. (2015). Aesthetic Emotions and Aesthetic People: Openness Predicts Sensitivity to Novelty in the Experiences of Interest and Pleasure. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 6. <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fpsyg.2015.01877>
- Gehl, J. (2013). *Cities for People*. Island Press.
- Getis, A., & Ord, J. K. (1992). The Analysis of Spatial Association by Use of Distance Statistics. *Geographical Analysis*, 24(3), 189–206. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1538-4632.1992.tb00261.x>
- Google Street View, A. (n.d.). *Street View Static API overview*. Google Developers. Retrieved July 14, 2022, from <https://developers.google.com/maps/documentation/streetview/overview>
- Guerrero, P., Möller, M. S., Olafsson, A. S., & Snizek, B. (2016). Revealing Cultural Ecosystem Services through Instagram Images: The Potential of Social Media Volunteered Geographic Information for Urban Green Infrastructure Planning and Governance. *Urban Planning*, 1(2), 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.17645/up.v1i2.609>
- Hadavi, S., Kaplan, R., & Hunter, M. C. R. (2015). Environmental affordances: A practical approach for design of nearby outdoor settings in urban residential areas. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 134, 19–32. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landurbplan.2014.10.001>
- Handy, S. (1993). *Regional Versus Local Accessibility: Implications for Nonwork Travel*. <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/2z79q67d>
- Hartig, T., & Staats, H. (2006). The need for psychological restoration as a determinant of environmental preferences. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 26(3), 215–226. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2006.07.007>
- Hasan, S., & Ukkusuri, S. V. (2014). Urban activity pattern classification using topic models from online geo-location data. *Transportation Research Part C: Emerging Technologies*, 44, 363–381. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trc.2014.04.003>
- He, K., Gkioxari, G., Dollár, P., & Girshick, R. (2017). Mask R-CNN. *2017 IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, 2980–2988. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICCV.2017.322>
- Herrera-Yagüe, C., Schneider, C. M., Couronné, T., Smoreda, Z., Benito, R. M., Zufiria, P. J., & González, M. C. (2015). The anatomy of urban social networks and its implications in the searchability problem. *Scientific Reports*, 5(1), 10265. <https://doi.org/10.1038/srep10265>
- Hu, Y., Deng, C., & Zhou, Z. (2019). A Semantic and Sentiment Analysis on Online Neighborhood Reviews for Understanding the Perceptions of People toward Their Living Environments. *Annals of the American Association of Geographers*, 109(4), 1052–1073. <https://doi.org/10.1080/24694452.2018.1535886>

Commented [MTC52]: I think this is the journal that we should pursue first.

Commented [AJ(S53R52)]: Ha ha ha...Believe me, that is the first thing I was thinking last day. Several papers I reviewed, and your previous paper too are from this journal.

- Hugging face API. (2022). *Hugging face API: bert-base-uncased*. <https://huggingface.co/>
- Ilieva, R. T., & McPhearson, T. (2018). Social-media data for urban sustainability. *Nature Sustainability*, 1(10), 553–565. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41893-018-0153-6>
- Isola, P., Xiao, J., Torralba, A., & Oliva, A. (2011). *What makes an image memorable?* 8.
- Ito, K., & Biljecki, F. (2021). Assessing bikeability with street view imagery and computer vision. *Transportation Research Part C: Emerging Technologies*, 132, 103371. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trc.2021.103371>
- Jacobs, J. (1961). *The death and life of great American cities*. Random House, Inc.
- Jang, K. M., & Kim, Y. (2019). Crowd-sourced cognitive mapping: A new way of displaying people's cognitive perception of urban space. *PLoS ONE*, 14(6), e0218590. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0218590>
- Kaklauskas, A., Bardauskiene, D., Cerkauskienė, R., Ubarte, I., Raslanas, S., Radvile, E., Kaklauskaitė, U., & Kaklauskienė, L. (2021). Emotions analysis in public spaces for urban planning. *Land Use Policy*, 107, 105458. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2021.105458>
- Kang, Y., Zhang, F., Gao, S., Lin, H., & Liu, Y. (2020). A review of urban physical environment sensing using street view imagery in public health studies. *Annals of GIS*, 26(3), 261–275. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19475683.2020.1791954>
- Kaplan, R. (1985). The analysis of perception via preference: A strategy for studying how the environment is experienced. *Landscape Planning*, 12(2), 161–176. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-3924\(85\)90058-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-3924(85)90058-9)
- Kaplan, R., & Kaplan, S. (n.d.). *A Psychological Perspective*. 6.
- Khan, L., Amjad, A., Ashraf, N., & Chang, H.-T. (2022). Multi-class sentiment analysis of urdu text using multilingual BERT. *Scientific Reports*, 12(1), 5436. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-022-09381-9>
- Kim, E., Rosenwasser, D., & Jose Luis, G. del C. L. (2020). Urban Emotion—The interrogation of social media and its implications within urban context. *Werner, L and Koering, D (Eds.), Anthropologic: Architecture and Fabrication in the Cognitive Age - Proceedings of the 38th ECAADe Conference - Volume 2, TU Berlin, Berlin, Germany, 16-18 September 2020, Pp. 475-482. http://papers.cumincad.org/cgi-bin/works/paper/ecade2020_497*
- Kurgan, L. (2013). *Close Up at a Distance: Mapping, Technology, and Politics*. Zone Books. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt14bs159>
- Larkin, A., Gu, X., Chen, L., & Hystad, P. (2021). Predicting perceptions of the built environment using GIS, satellite and street view image approaches. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 216, 104257. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landurbplan.2021.104257>
- LeCun, Y., Bengio, Y., & Hinton, G. (2015). Deep learning. *Nature*, 521(7553), 436–444. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature14539>
- Ligthart, A., Catal, C., & Tekinerdogan, B. (2021). Systematic reviews in sentiment analysis: A tertiary study. *Artificial Intelligence Review*, 54(7), 4997–5053. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10462-021-09973-3>
- Lovelace, R., Malleson, N., Harland, K., & Birkin, M. (2014). *Geotagged tweets to inform a spatial interaction model: A case study of museums*. 34.
- Luo, F., Cao, G., Mulligan, K., & Li, X. (2016). Explore spatiotemporal and demographic characteristics of human mobility via Twitter: A case study of Chicago. *Applied Geography*, 70, 11–25. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apgeog.2016.03.001>
- Luo, J., Joshi, D., Yu, J., & Gallagher, A. (2011). Geotagging in multimedia and computer vision—A survey. *Multimedia Tools and Applications*, 51(1), 187–211. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11042-010-0623-y>
- Lynch, K. (2008). *The image of the city* (33. print). M.I.T. Press.
- Ma, B., Hauer, R. J., Xu, C., & Li, W. (2021). Visualizing evaluation model of human perceptions and characteristic indicators of landscape visual quality in urban green spaces by using nomograms. *Urban Forestry & Urban Greening*, 65, 127314. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ufug.2021.127314>
- Ma, Y., Yang, Y., & Jiao, H. (2021). Exploring the Impact of Urban Built Environment on Public Emotions Based on Social Media Data: A Case Study of Wuhan. *Land*, 10(9), 986. <https://doi.org/10.3390/land10090986>
- Malleson, N., Vanky, A., Hashemian, B., Santi, P., Verma, S. K., Courtney, T. K., & Ratti, C. (2018). The characteristics of asymmetric pedestrian behavior: A preliminary study using passive smartphone location data. *Transactions in GIS*, 22(2), 616–634. <https://doi.org/10.1111/tgis.12336>

- Martí, P., Serrano-Estrada, L., & Nolasco-Cirugeda, A. (2017). Using locative social media and urban cartographies to identify and locate successful urban plazas. *Cities*, 64, 66–78. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2017.02.007>
- Martí, P., Serrano-Estrada, L., & Nolasco-Cirugeda, A. (2019). Social Media data: Challenges, opportunities and limitations in urban studies. *Computers, Environment and Urban Systems*, 74, 161–174. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compenvurbsys.2018.11.001>
- Martín, C. A., Torres, J. M., Aguilar, R. M., & Díaz, S. (2018). Using Deep Learning to Predict Sentiments: Case Study in Tourism. *Complexity*, 2018, e7408431. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2018/7408431>
- Matisziw, T. C., Nilon, C. H., Wilhelm Stanis, S. A., LeMaster, J. W., McElroy, J. A., & Sayers, S. P. (2016). The right space at the right time: The relationship between children's physical activity and land use/land cover. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 151, 21–32. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landurbplan.2016.03.006>
- Montello, D. R., Goodchild, M. F., Gottsegen, J., & Fohl, P. (2003). Where's Downtown?: Behavioral Methods for Determining Referents of Vague Spatial Queries. *Spatial Cognition & Computation*, 3(2–3), 185–204. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13875868.2003.9683761>
- Motieyan, H., Kaviari, F., & Mostofi, N. (2022). Quantifying walking capability: A novel aggregated index based on spatial perspective and analyses. *Papers in Regional Science*, 101(2), 483–503. <https://doi.org/10.1111/pirs.12652>
- Murakami, D., Peters, G. W., Yamagata, Y., & Matsui, T. (2016). Participatory Sensing Data Tweets for Micro-Urban Real-Time Resiliency Monitoring and Risk Management. *IEEE Access*, 4, 347–372. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2016.2516918>
- Nagata, S., Nakaya, T., Hanibuchi, T., Amagasa, S., Kikuchi, H., & Inoue, S. (2020). Objective scoring of streetscape walkability related to leisure walking: Statistical modeling approach with semantic segmentation of Google Street View images. *Health & Place*, 66, 102428. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.healthplace.2020.102428>
- Naik, N., Philipoom, J., Raskar, R., & Hidalgo, C. (2014). Streetscore – Predicting the Perceived Safety of One Million Streetscapes. *2014 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Workshops*, 793–799. <https://doi.org/10.1109/CVPRW.2014.121>
- Nasar, J. L. (1990). The Evaluative Image of the City. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 56(1), 41–53. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01944369008975742>
- Ogneva-Himmelberger, Y., Ross, L., Caywood, T., Khananayev, M., & Starr, C. (2019). Analyzing the Relationship between Perception of Safety and Reported Crime in an Urban Neighborhood Using GIS and Sketch Maps. *ISPRS International Journal of Geo-Information*, 8(12), 531. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijgi8120531>
- Qi, L., Li, J., Wang, Y., & Gao, X. (2019). Urban Observation: Integration of Remote Sensing and Social Media Data. *IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Applied Earth Observations and Remote Sensing*, 12(11), 4252–4264. <https://doi.org/10.1109/JSTARS.2019.2908515>
- Qiu, W., Li, W., Liu, X., & Huang, X. (2021). Subjectively Measured Streetscape Perceptions to Inform Urban Design Strategies for Shanghai. *ISPRS International Journal of Geo-Information*, 10(8), 493. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijgi10080493>
- Qiu, W., Li, W., Liu, X., & Huang, X. (2022). Subjectively Measured Streetscape Qualities for Shanghai with Large-Scale Application of Computer Vision and Machine Learning. In P. F. Yuan, H. Chai, C. Yan, & N. Leach (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 2021 DigitalFUTURES* (pp. 242–251). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-16-5983-6_23
- Robinson, O., Tamayo, I., de, C. M., Valentin, A., Giorgis, -Allemand Lise, Hjertager, K. N., Marit, A. G., Ambros, A., Ballester, F., Bird, P., Chatzi, L., Cirach, M., D, édélé A., Donaire, -Gonzalez David, Gra, žuleviciene R., Iakovidis, M., Ibarluzea, J., Kampouri, M., Lepeule, J., ... Basaga, ña X. (n.d.). The Urban Exposome during Pregnancy and Its Socioeconomic Determinants. *Environmental Health Perspectives*, 126(7), 077005. <https://doi.org/10.1289/EHP2862>
- Rzotkiewicz, A., Pearson, A. L., Dougherty, B. V., Shortridge, A., & Wilson, N. (2018). Systematic review of the use of Google Street View in health research: Major themes, strengths, weaknesses and possibilities for future research. *Health & Place*, 52, 240–246. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.healthplace.2018.07.001>
- Sadiq, A. M., Ahn, H., & Choi, Y. B. (2020). Human Sentiment and Activity Recognition in Disaster Situations Using Social Media Images Based on Deep Learning. *Sensors (Basel, Switzerland)*, 20(24), 7115. <https://doi.org/10.3390/s20247115>
- Saelens, B. E., & Handy, S. L. (2008). Built Environment Correlates of Walking: A Review. *Medicine and Science in Sports and Exercise*, 40(7 Suppl), S550–S566. <https://doi.org/10.1249/MSS.0b013e31817c67a4>

- Salazar Miranda, A., Fan, Z., Duarte, F., & Ratti, C. (2021). Desirable streets: Using deviations in pedestrian trajectories to measure the value of the built environment. *Computers, Environment and Urban Systems*, 86, 101563. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compenvurbsys.2020.101563>
- Salesses, P., Schechtner, K., & Hidalgo, C. A. (2013). The Collaborative Image of The City: Mapping the Inequality of Urban Perception. *PLOS ONE*, 8(7), e68400. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0068400>
- Sanh, V., Debut, L., Chaumond, J., & Wolf, T. (2019). DistilBERT, a distilled version of BERT: smaller, faster, cheaper and lighter. *ArXiv, abs/1910.01108*.
- Southworth, M., & Owens, P. M. (1993). The Evolving Metropolis: Studies of Community, Neighborhood, and Street Form at the Urban Edge. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 59(3), 271–287. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01944369308975880>
- Steen Jacobsen, J. K. (2007). Use of Landscape Perception Methods in Tourism Studies: A Review of Photo-Based Research Approaches. *Tourism Geographies*, 9(3), 234–253. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616680701422871>
- Talen, E. (2006). Connecting New Urbanism and American planning: An historical interpretation. *URBAN DESIGN International*, 11(2), 83–98. <https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.udi.9000166>
- Talen, E., & Ellis, C. (2002). Beyond Relativism: Reclaiming the Search for Good City Form. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 22(1), 36–49. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0739456X0202200104>
- Tang, Y., Zhang, J., Liu, R., & Li, Y. (2022). Exploring the Impact of Built Environment Attributes on Social Followings Using Social Media Data and Deep Learning. *ISPRS International Journal of Geo-Information*, 11(6), 325. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijgi11060325>
- Tong, M., She, J., Tan, J., Li, M., Ge, R., & Gao, Y. (2020). Evaluating Street Greenery by Multiple Indicators Using Street-Level Imagery and Satellite Images: A Case Study in Nanjing, China. *Forests*, 11(12), 1347. <https://doi.org/10.3390/f11121347>
- Tveit, M. S., Ode Sang, Å., & Hagerhall, C. M. (2018). Scenic Beauty. In *Environmental Psychology* (pp. 45–54). John Wiley & Sons, Ltd. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119241072.ch5>
- Uebel, K., Marselle, M., Dean, A. J., Rhodes, J. R., & Bonn, A. (2021). Urban green space soundscapes and their perceived restorativeness. *People and Nature*, 3(3), 756–769. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pan3.10215>
- Ulrich, R. S. (1983). Aesthetic and Affective Response to Natural Environment. In I. Altman & J. F. Wohlwill (Eds.), *Behavior and the Natural Environment* (pp. 85–125). Springer US. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4613-3539-9_4
- United States Census Bureau. (2020). *Census of Columbia* [Data]. <https://data.census.gov/cedsci/table?q=columbia,%20mo&tid=DECENNIALPL2020.P1>
- USGIF. (2021, March). Advancing the Interoperability of Geospatial Intelligence Tradecraft with 3D Modeling, Simulation, and Game Engines. *Modeling, Simulation & Gaming (MS&G) Working Group*. Modeling, Simulation & Gaming (MS&G) Working Group, United States. https://usgif.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/USGIF_MSGWG_OGC_Technical_Paper_March_2021.pdf
- Wang, W., Liu, K., Tang, R., & Wang, S. (2019). Remote sensing image-based analysis of the urban heat island effect in Shenzhen, China. *Physics and Chemistry of the Earth, Parts A/B/C*, 110, 168–175. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pce.2019.01.002>
- Wang, Y., Kotze, D. J., Vierikko, K., & Niemelä, J. (2019). What makes urban greenspace unique – Relationships between citizens' perceptions on unique urban nature, biodiversity and environmental factors. *Urban Forestry & Urban Greening*, 42, 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ufug.2019.04.005>
- Weijis-Perrée, M., Dane, G., & van den Berg, P. (2020). Analyzing the Relationships between Citizens' Emotions and their Momentary Satisfaction in Urban Public Spaces. *Sustainability*, 12(19), 7921. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12197921>
- Williams, S. (2020). *Data Action: Using Data for Public Good*. MIT Press.
- Wilson, J. S., Kelly, C. M., Schootman, M., Baker, E. A., Banerjee, A., Clennin, M., & Miller, D. K. (2012). Assessing the Built Environment Using Omnidirectional Imagery. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 42(2), 193–199. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amepre.2011.09.029>
- Xu, Q. A., Chang, V., & Jayne, C. (2022). A systematic review of social media-based sentiment analysis: Emerging trends and challenges. *Decision Analytics Journal*, 3, 100073. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dajour.2022.100073>

- Ye, C., Zhang, F., Mu, L., Gao, Y., & Liu, Y. (2021). Urban function recognition by integrating social media and street-level imagery. *Environment and Planning B: Urban Analytics and City Science*, 48(6), 1430–1444. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2399808320935467>
- Ye, Y., Zeng, W., Shen, Q., Zhang, X., & Lu, Y. (2019). The visual quality of streets: A human-centred continuous measurement based on machine learning algorithms and street view images. *Environment and Planning B: Urban Analytics and City Science*, 46(8), 1439–1457. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2399808319828734>
- Young, T., Hazarika, D., Poria, S., & Cambria, E. (2018). Recent Trends in Deep Learning Based Natural Language Processing [Review Article]. *IEEE Computational Intelligence Magazine*, 13(3), 55–75. <https://doi.org/10.1109/MCI.2018.2840738>
- Zang, P., Liu, X., Zhao, Y., Guo, H., Lu, Y., & Xue, C. Q. L. (2020). Eye-Level Street Greenery and Walking Behaviors of Older Adults. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 17(17), 6130. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17176130>
- Zhang, F., Wu, L., Zhu, D., & Liu, Y. (2019). Social sensing from street-level imagery: A case study in learning spatio-temporal urban mobility patterns. *ISPRS Journal of Photogrammetry and Remote Sensing*, 153, 48–58. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.isprsjprs.2019.04.017>
- Zhang, F., Zhou, B., Liu, L., Liu, Y., Fung, H. H., Lin, H., & Ratti, C. (2018). Measuring human perceptions of a large-scale urban region using machine learning. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 180, 148–160. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landurbplan.2018.08.020>
- Zhang, F., Zu, J., Hu, M., Zhu, D., Kang, Y., Gao, S., Zhang, Y., & Huang, Z. (2020). Uncovering inconspicuous places using social media check-ins and street view images. *Computers, Environment and Urban Systems*, 81, 101478. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compenvurbsys.2020.101478>
- Zhang, Y., Fu, X., Lv, C., & Li, S. (2021). The Premium of Public Perceived Greenery: A Framework Using Multiscale GWR and Deep Learning. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 18(13), 6809. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18136809>
- Zhao, H., Shi, J., Qi, X., Wang, X., & Jia, J. (2017). Pyramid Scene Parsing Network. *2017 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 6230–6239. <https://doi.org/10.1109/CVPR.2017.660>