International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research (IJFMR)
E-ISSN: 2582-2160 ● Website: www.ijfmr.com ● Email: editor@ijfmr.com

Cross-Domain Evidence Synthesis for the Design of a Mini Adventure Bike for Children Aged 7–12: Bridging Child Development, Safety, and Adventure-Cycling Research

Lakshay Manot[1], Aastha Deshpande[2]

Abstract

Background: Children aged 7 to 12 are in a stage of development where motor and perceptual skills needed for cycling are still developing, while there is a growing commercial and recreational interest in adventure and electric-assisted cycling. No existing research directly looks at a mini adventure bike designed for this age group, which means there is a need for cross-domain synthesis.

Aim: This report combines evidence from 15 studies covering child motor development, cycling safety, physical activity, consumer behaviour, and adult adventure or e-bike research to create clear design requirements for a mini adventure bike. Method: A secondary qualitative and thematic analysis was conducted on a pre-compiled evidence matrix of 15 studies, extracting and comparing findings, conclusions, and future research recommendations across nine thematic areas. Main findings: Children under 12 do not fully automate the perceptual-motor skills needed for safe cycling (Zeuwts et al., 2020), and adults supervising child riders often adjust their behaviour significantly in response to perceived child risk (Hatfield et al., 2019).Terrain variety and technical features are strongly linked to positive cycling experience in recreational settings (Hagen et al., 2016), and electric assistance increases access to challenging terrain for adults (Van Vuren, 2022), though these have not been tested with children.

Design implications: A clearly supported design must prioritize stability, controlled handling, visibility suitable for supervision, gradually increasing terrain difficulty, and motivation elements appropriate for child development. All dimensions and load specifications require direct testing with children.

Conclusion: The existing evidence supports carefully developmentally based design principles rather than directly applying adult adventure-cycling or e-bike trends to child products; further empirical testing with children is essential before finalizing any prototype.

Keywords: Mini Adventure Bike, Child Cycling Development, E-Bike Design, Child Safety, Thematic Evidence Synthesis

1. Introduction

Cycling occupies a unique position in childhood development: it is a way for being physically activity, a symbol of growing independence, and, increasingly, a site of commercial innovation as electric assistance and adventure-oriented recreational cycling expand into new markets. Global research attention to electric bicycles has grown substantially over the past decade, with engineering, safety, and urban-planning literatures forming the dominant clusters of scholarship (Salmeron-Manzano et al., 2018). At the same time, cycling has been positioned as a tool for meeting public health activity guidelines across the lifespan,

with e-cycling physiological responses that fall between walking and regular cycling (McVicar et al., 2022). These parallel trends — the technological evolution of the bicycle and its established role in youth physical activity — creates interest in products like a 'mini adventure bike' aimed at children aged 7 to 12. However, the body of evidence available for this synthesis does not contain a single study that directly examines an adventure-oriented bicycle designed for children in this age range. Instead, the 15 include several related but separate fields: child motor and cognitive development, cycling safety and parental supervision, physical activity guidelines, consumer behaviour, and adult-oriented adventure tourism and e-bike technology. This creates a specific challenge for design reasoning: recommendations cannot be taken directly from any single source, and require a careful, transparent synthesis that distinguishes what is supported by evidence for children from what is inferred by comparing to adult or general populations.
This challenge is further compounded by well-documented developmental limitations. Children up to the age of 12 do not fully automate the perceptual-motor skills required for safe, independent cycling, especially those needed to anticipate hazards in traffic (Zeuwts et al., 2020). Parents and other supervising adults are clearly aware of these limitations: the majority of adults riding with or transporting children modify their own behaviour such as riding more slowly, acting as physical barriers, or adopting other protective strategies — in direct response to perceived risk and unpredictability of children (Hatfield et al., 2019).

Meanwhile, at the older end of the child and adolescent range, evidence from India shows that young riders of motorised two-wheelers who exhibit aggressive behaviour or have had prior police involvement are more likely to be involved in accidents (Rathinam et al., 2007), This highlights the risks of exposing children too early to adult-style vehicle power and risk-taking behaviours. These findings jointly suggest that a mini adventure bike for 7- to 12-year-olds should be considered as a unique design challenge, not simply a smaller version of an adult adventure bike or a slower electric bicycle.

The target users for this report are children aged 7 to 12 years, a group that shows significant developmental differences: consumer behaviour theory outlines four sequential stages of development from infancy to age 12, each linked to different cognitive and motivational traits (Valkenburg et al., 2001). Because there is no available data that separates cycling-specific skills or preferences within this age group, the report treats 7–12 as a single design target while clearly noting where age-related differences may be important.

The goal of this report is to bring together the 15 studies thematically to make clear, evidence-based design requirements for a mini adventure bike for children aged 7–12. It also makes it clear what the evidence can and cannot support. The specific objectives are: (1) to identify common themes, agreements, and disagreements in the studies related to child cycling, safety, motivation, and terrain interaction; (2) to translate these themes into prioritised design requirements, clearly distinguishing actual findings from reasonable inferences and from speculative ideas that need further testing; and (3) to identify gaps in evidence that must be filled — through measurements of body dimensions, prototype testing, and child-focused usability research — before any design can be considered validated. This leads to three key research questions: (RQ1) What do the provided research say about children's cycling-related motor, cognitive, and behavioural development? (RQ2) What do they indicate about safety, supervision, and motivational factors from both child-specific and adult/general-population studies are relevant to a mini adventure bike? (RQ3) What prioritised, evidence-linked design requirements follow from this evidence, and what remains untested?

2. Literature Review

This review synthesises the 15 studies thematically rather than sequentially, in order to build an integrated picture relevant to mini adventure bike design. Because only a subset of the studies directly involves children, findings are explicitly marked by population wherever the distinction affects the strength of inference.

2.1 Child Development and Motivational Appeal

Consumer-behaviour research indicates that children's capacity to want, search for, evaluate, and purchase products develops through four sequential phases between infancy and age 12, with each phase introducing new cognitive and motivational capacities (Valkenburg et al., 2001). Although this study does not address cycling directly, it implies that a single product aimed at the full 7–12 range will be experienced differently by a 7-year-old, for whom appeal may be driven by simple sensory and play-based features, and a 12-year-old, who is more capable of evaluating features and comparing alternatives. This developmental gradient is a foundational consideration for the visual appeal and feature-complexity dimensions of the design.

2.2 Ergonomics, Anthropometry, and Motor-Skill Development

The clearest child-specific evidence on cycling competence comes from a systematic review showing that children do not achieve full automation of cycling-relevant perceptual-motor skills — including the complex coordination needed to anticipate hazards — until after age 12 (Zeuwts et al., 2020). Training programmes that include on-road components were found to be effective in improving knowledge, motor skill, and perceptual-motor skill, suggesting that skill deficits are responsive to structured practice rather than fixed. This is reinforced by qualitative evidence from the Bikeability programme, in which hands-on, real-world cycling practice — combining classroom instruction with on-road experience — directly improved children's ability to maintain control while processing their surroundings (Hamilton et al., 2014). Neither study, however, reports anthropometric data (height, reach, limb-length distributions) that could inform frame geometry, seat height, or handlebar reach for a 7–12 age range; this is a significant gap that the design requirements section addresses by recommending direct measurement rather than assumed dimensions.

2.3 Usability and Independent Mobility

Evidence on children's independent cycling mobility indicates that parental trust in a child's traffic skills, alongside the child's own cycling and traffic skills, are the strongest predictors of whether a child is permitted to cycle independently, with some variation by gender, socio-economic status, and urbanicity (Ghekiere et al., 2017). Notably, boys were found to experience greater independent mobility overall, and perceived neighbourhood traffic safety restricted girls independence more than boys. This suggests that a bike's usability is not purely a function of the child's own capability, but also of how that capability is perceived and trusted by supervising adults — a factor that has direct implications for any feature intended to build or signal a child's competence over time.

2.4 Physical Activity and Engagement Duration

Guidance for school-age youth recommends at least 60 minutes of daily, enjoyable, developmentally appropriate moderate-to-vigorous physical activity, while controlled studies of supervised activity of 30–45 minutes, three to five times weekly, demonstrate clear health and behavioural benefit; the same evidence notes that translating these benefits into every day, unsupervised settings likely requires a greater volume of activity (Strong et al., 2005). Complementary evidence from park-based physical activity research found that specific facilities and the presence of other active children increased children's activity levels, while the presence of parents or other adults was, perhaps counterintuitively, associated with reduced activity (Floyd et al., 2011). Together, these findings suggest that a mini adventure bike intended to support meaningful physical activity should be comfortable and engaging enough for extended, low-fatigue use, and may benefit from features that support peer-based or social riding rather than solely adult-supervised riding, provided this does not compromise safety oversight.

2.5 Safety, Risk, and Supervision

Safety-related evidence in the matrix falls into two distinct populations. First, direct evidence on adult behaviour around child cyclists shows that the substantial majority of adults — 92% of those carrying children and 97% of those riding alongside children — actively change their riding behaviour to manage a child's unpredictability and limited skill, for example by riding more slowly or positioning themselves as a physical barrier (Hatfield et al., 2019). This indicates high parental awareness of risk but also suggests that current safety management relies heavily on adult behavioural compensation rather than on product features designed to reduce risk directly. Second, evidence from India on underage motorcycle riding among school-aged boys found that 15% had experienced an accident, with aggressive behaviour and prior police contact — rather than age or experience alone — the strongest statistical predictors of accident proneness ($p < .001$) (Rathinam et al., 2007). Although this study concerns motorised two-wheelers rather than a pedal or lightly assisted mini adventure bike, and involves an older adolescent sample, it provides an important cautionary signal: premature access to vehicle power and adult-style risk-taking is measurably associated with harm in the Indian context specifically, which is directly relevant given the requirement to consider India as the design's geographic context.

2.6 Comfort, Control, and Assistive Technology

Evidence on electric-assist cycling in adult and mixed-age populations shows that e-cycling produces a lower physiological load than conventional cycling but a higher load than walking, positioning it as a viable, accessible method for meeting physical activity guidelines (McVicar et al., 2022). More speculative technological evidence describes an artificial-intelligence-driven adaptive gear and propulsion control system that, in trials across mixed urban terrain, improved energy efficiency by 21.6% and increased cadence consistency substantially compared to manual shifting (Ojha, 2026). This study is explicitly forward-looking and was not tested with children, nor with safety-critical constraints relevant to a children's product; it is treated in this report as illustrative of a future technological direction rather than as evidence supporting any near-term design requirement.

2.7 Terrain, Motivation, and the 'Adventure' Experience

The concept of 'adventure' in the supplied evidence is drawn almost entirely from adult recreational and tourism contexts. Affective-experience research on mountain bike terrain found that the strongest positive rider emotions were generated by cumulative exposure to varied, technical terrain features — including jumps, drops, and flow-inducing sections (Hagen et al., 2016). Separately, conceptual work on e-mountain biking in tourism contexts argues that electric assistance broadens access to rugged terrain across a wider age range by reducing the physical effort required, enabling day-long adventures that would otherwise be inaccessible (Van Vuren, 2022). Motorcycle-based adventure tourism research further frames this kind of adventure as predominantly 'soft' rather than 'hard' — driven by scenic, engaging routes rather than extreme physical or technical risk (Scherhag et al., 2022). None of these three studies involves children, and their terrain-engagement findings should be treated as motivational inspiration for design rather than as validated child-appropriate specifications.

2.8 Accessibility, Inclusivity, and Broader Mobility Context

Literature on e-bikes as inclusive mobility aids identifies safety concerns, social stigma around electric assistance, cost, and inadequate infrastructure as the principal barriers to adoption among older adults and people with disabilities, despite strong potential benefits (Lee et al., 2023). Bibliometric analysis confirms that e-bike research is a rapidly growing global field, dominated by engineering, safety, and urban-planning concerns (Salmeron-Manzano et al., 2018). While this evidence does not concern children, it usefully signals that inclusivity-related design features — affordability, non-stigmatising aesthetics, and adjustability — are recurring concerns in adjacent product categories and merit consideration, subject to child-specific validation.

2.9 Synthesis Across Themes

Read together, these themes reveal a consistent tension: the child-specific evidence (motor-skill immaturity, adult supervisory compensation, and independent-mobility dynamics) counsels caution, conservative control limits, and supervision-compatible features, while the adult-oriented adventure and e-bike evidence supplies motivational and technological inspiration whose applicability to children is untested. The following Methodology and Results sections describe how this tension was systematically catalogued and translated into prioritised, confidence-rated design requirements.

3. Methodology

This report is based on a secondary qualitative and thematic analysis of a pre-compiled evidence matrix comprising 15 studies, supplied directly by the report's commissioning party rather than retrieved through an original search. No systematic review protocol (e.g., PRISMA), pre-registration, or documented search strategy accompanied the source matrix, and this report therefore does not claim to be a systematic review; it is a thematic synthesis of an existing, bounded evidence set.

Selection basis. The 15 studies were provided as a single matrix containing, for each study, the year of publication, title, authorship, key implications, results, conclusions, and future-research recommendations. No inclusion or exclusion criteria, database search terms, or screening process were documented in the supplied material; consequently, the representativeness and comprehensiveness of the 15-study set relative to the wider literature on child cycling, adventure bikes, or e-mobility cannot be assessed and should be treated as a boundary condition of this analysis, not as a limitation the author introduced.

Data-extraction fields. For each study, the following fields were extracted directly from the supplied matrix: publication year; title; author(s); population studied; core reported finding(s) or result(s); stated conclusion; and stated future-research or practical recommendation, where provided. No additional data (e.g., full-text methodology, sample demographics beyond what was stated, or effect sizes not reported in the matrix) were sought or inferred.

Synthesis procedure. Extracted data were grouped into nine thematic categories relevant to the design brief: child development and consumer behaviour; ergonomics and motor-skill development; usability and independent mobility; physical activity and engagement; safety, risk, and supervision; comfort, control, and assistive technology; terrain and motivation; accessibility and inclusivity; and parental or adult supervision. Within each theme, studies were compared for agreement, contradiction, and evidence gaps, with explicit attention to whether the underlying population was children, adults, or a mixed/unspecified group, since this materially affects the strength of any design inference. Each design requirement developed in this report is labelled as either a direct finding (reported explicitly by a study), a reasonable design inference (a plausible extension of reported evidence to the design context), or a proposed idea requiring future testing (a design possibility suggested by adjacent evidence but not empirically validated for this population or product).

Limitations of method. This approach is inherently constrained by the boundaries of the supplied matrix: it cannot identify studies outside the 15 provided, cannot verify the accuracy of the matrix's summarisation of the original papers, and cannot access full-text methodological detail (e.g., exact sample demographics, statistical models, or measurement instruments) beyond what the matrix reports. These constraints are revisited in the Limitations and Future Work section.

4. Results

This section presents the recurring themes, points of agreement and contradiction, and evidence gaps identified through the thematic synthesis, without interpretation; interpretation and design implications are developed in the Discussion and Design Requirements sections that follow.

Agreement across studies. There is consistent agreement, across all studies that directly address children (Zeuwts et al., 2020; Hamilton et al., 2014; Ghekiere et al., 2017; Hatfield et al., 2019), that children's cycling-relevant skills and independence are actively developing throughout the 7–12 age range and are strongly shaped by adult behaviour, training exposure, and perceived competence, rather than being fixed or purely age-determined.

Contradiction or tension. A tension exists between the child-specific safety literature, which recommends caution, structured training, and adult behavioural compensation (Hatfield et al., 2019; Rathinam et al., 2007; Zeuwts et al., 2020), and the adult-oriented adventure and e-bike literature, which frames technological assistance and technical terrain as primarily positive, engagement-driving features (Hagen et al., 2016; Van Vuren, 2022; Ojha, 2026). No study in the matrix reconciles these two positions for a child population, meaning the report cannot treat 'more terrain challenge' or 'more assistive technology' as unambiguously positive for a mini adventure bike without qualification.

Evidence gaps. Three gaps are especially salient. First, no study in the matrix provides anthropometric or biomechanical measurements for children aged 7–12 relevant to bike fit (e.g., inseam, reach, or handlebar height data). Second, no study evaluates an actual mini adventure bike, e-assisted or otherwise, with child users under controlled or naturalistic conditions. Third, no study in the matrix addresses the Indian regulatory or standards context for children's bicycles specifically, beyond the one India-based study on underage motorcycle riding (Rathinam et al., 2007), which concerns a different vehicle category and an older adolescent population.

Table 1 summarises the principal themes, their supporting evidence, design implications, and associated confidence and limitations.

Table 1: Thematic Synthesis of Evidence Relevant to Mini Adventure Bike Design

Theme	Evidence From Studies	Implication For Bike Design	Confidence / Limitations
Immature perceptual-motor skill in middle childhood	Children do not fully automate cycling perceptual-motor skills until after age 12; on-road training improves motor and hazard-anticipation skill (Zeuwts	Design must compensate for immature hazard perception and motor control — e.g., stability-enhancing geometry, limited top speed,	High confidence for the underlying developmental claim; direct evidence, both

Theme	**Evidence From Studies**	**Implication For Bike Design**	**Confidence / Limitations**
	et al., 2020). Hands-on, real-world practice improves control and spatial awareness (Hamilton et al., 2014).	progressive skill-building features.	studies child-focused. No bike-specific measurements exist.
Adult supervision and behavioural adaptation	92% of adults carrying children and 97% of adults riding alongside children changed their behaviour to manage child risk and unpredictability (Hatfield et al., 2019).	Bike should support adult supervisory strategies — e.g., visibility features, predictable handling, features that make the child's position/actions legible to accompanying adults.	Moderate-high confidence; self-report data, adult perspective only, not child-reported.
Independent mobility and skill-trust	Parental trust in a child's traffic skill and the child's cycling/traffic skills are the primary predictors of independent mobility; effects vary somewhat by gender and urbanicity (Ghekiere et al., 2017).	Features that visibly build and signal competence (skill progression indicators, adjustable difficulty) may support parental trust and graduated independence.	Moderate confidence; large observational sample, but correlational, not causal, and not adventure-bike specific.
Underage motorised risk-taking	Among adolescent motorcyclists in India, aggression and prior police contact predicted accident proneness ($p < .001$); 15% reported a prior accident (Rathinam et al., 2007).	Any motorised/e-assist element must include hard behavioural and speed safeguards; premature adult-style risk-taking must be actively designed against.	High confidence for statistical association; sample is older adolescents on motorcycles, not younger children on pedal/e-assist bikes — limited direct transfer.
Physical activity dose and enjoyment	60 minutes/day of enjoyable, developmentally appropriate moderate-to-vigorous activity is recommended; supervised sessions of 30–45 minutes show clear benefit (Strong et al., 2005). Social presence of peers and specific facilities increase children's activity in parks (Floyd et al., 2011).	Design should support extended, low-fatigue, social riding sessions (comfort, adjustable effort) rather than short bursts only.	Moderate confidence; general child-PA evidence, not cycling- or bike-specific.

Theme	Evidence From Studies	Implication For Bike Design	Confidence / Limitations
Terrain variety and motivational 'flow'	Varied, technical terrain features (jumps, drops, technical/flow sections) generate the strongest positive affective ride experiences (Hagen et al., 2016). E-assistance broadens access to rugged terrain for a wider range of riders (Van Vuren, 2022).	Include graduated, modular terrain-engagement features appropriate to a child's build and skill rather than adult-scale technical features.	Low-moderate confidence for direct transfer; both source studies are adult/mixed-age recreational or tourism samples, not children.
E-assist technology and control systems	E-cycling elicits lower physiological load than conventional cycling but more than walking (McVicar et al., 2022). AI-driven adaptive gear/propulsion systems improved efficiency and cadence consistency in adult trials (Ojha, 2026).	If e-assistance is used, it should be capped and simplified for child use; AI-adaptive control is a speculative future direction, not a current requirement.	Low confidence for child application; both studies are adult-only or non-bicycle-specific and one (Ojha, 2026) is not child- or safety-validated.
Consumer development and motivational appeal	Children's consumer behaviour develops through four sequential phases from infancy to age 12 (Valkenburg et al., 2001).	Visual appeal, branding, and feature complexity should be matched to the child's developmental stage within the 7–12 band rather than treated as a single undifferentiated age group.	Moderate confidence; well-established developmental theory but not cycling-specific.
Inclusivity and access barriers (adult evidence)	Barriers to e-bike adoption include safety concerns, stigma, cost, and infrastructure, particularly for older adults and people with disabilities (Lee et al., 2023); e-bike research is a rapidly growing global field (Salmeron-Manzano et al., 2018).	Inclusive design (adjustability, affordability considerations, non-stigmatising aesthetics) may be relevant but must be re-examined specifically for child users.	Low confidence for direct transfer; source populations are adults, not children.

5. Discussion

The results indicate that a mini adventure bike for children aged 7–12 sits at the intersection of two evidence bodies with different orientations: a child-specific literature that emphasises developmental limitation and the need for protective, supervision-compatible design, and an adult-oriented adventure/e-mobility literature that emphasises engagement, technical challenge, and technological assistance. Neither body of evidence alone is sufficient to specify the product, and the central interpretive task of this report has been to identify where the two can be responsibly combined and where they cannot.

A key trade-off concerns terrain challenge versus stability. Hagen et al. (2016) show that technical terrain features are strongly associated with positive rider affect, which is commercially and motivationally relevant to an 'adventure' product. However, this evidence is drawn from adult mountain bikers, and it must be weighed against the child-specific finding that perceptual-motor hazard-anticipation skills are not fully automated before age 12 (Zeuwts et al., 2020). The reasonable interpretation is not that technical terrain features should be excluded, but that they should be graduated, modular, and scaled well below adult technical thresholds, with an emphasis on rider stability (e.g., wider tyre contact patches, lower centres of gravity, or training-wheel-adjacent stabilising features for younger users within the band) taking priority over jump- or drop-style features associated with adult flow states.

A second trade-off concerns independence versus supervision. Ghekiere et al. (2017) show that independent mobility is granted in proportion to perceived skill and parental trust, while Hatfield et al. (2019) show that supervising adults compensate heavily for perceived child risk. This suggests an opportunity, not yet tested, for design features that make a child's skill progression visible to supervising adults (for example, adjustable difficulty settings or a documented skill-building pathway), which could plausibly support the gradual extension of independent riding privileges — but this is a proposed idea requiring future testing, not a finding directly reported by any study.

A third tension concerns assistive and connected technology. Ojha's (2026) AI-adaptive gear and propulsion system demonstrates meaningful efficiency and cadence gains in adult trials, and McVicar et al. (2022) demonstrate that e-assistance meaningfully affects physiological load. Neither has been evaluated for safety, control predictability, or usability with child riders, and the Rathinam et al. (2007) evidence on underage motorised risk-taking argues strongly against introducing high-power or adult-calibrated assistive technology into a children's product. The most defensible position is that any electric or AI-assisted feature, if included at all, should be conservatively capped, simple to override, and framed explicitly as a future research direction rather than a near-term specification.

A genuinely novel opportunity, consistent with but not directly validated by the evidence, is the idea of a bike whose terrain-engagement and skill-building features are explicitly linked — for example, unlocking modest terrain challenge as a child demonstrates control competence, echoing the logic of structured cycling-skills training (Hamilton et al., 2014; Zeuwts et al., 2020) while addressing the motivational and 'adventure' framing suggested by the tourism and mountain-biking literature (Hagen et al., 2016; Van Vuren, 2022). This is presented as a proposed idea only, since no study in the matrix tests a progressive or 'gated' terrain-difficulty feature with children, and it would require dedicated usability and safety testing before adoption.

Finally, the inclusivity literature (Lee et al., 2023; Salmeron-Manzano et al., 2018), while adult-focused, raises considerations — affordability, non-stigmatising design, adjustability for different body types and confidence levels — that are plausibly relevant to a children's product marketed across a range of family incomes and rider confidence levels in the Indian context, though this transfer is an inference rather than a direct finding.

6. Conclusion

This report set out to synthesise 15 studies spanning child development, cycling safety, physical activity, and adult adventure and e-mobility research in order to derive defensible design requirements for a mini adventure bike for children aged 7–12. In response to RQ1, the evidence indicates that children in this age range possess still-developing perceptual-motor cycling skills and that their independence and safety are strongly mediated by adult trust, training, and behavioural compensation. In response to RQ2, safety and motivational factors drawn from both child-specific and adult/general-population studies point to a central design tension between stability-oriented caution and adventure-oriented engagement, which no single source resolves for this population. In response to RQ3, the resulting design requirements prioritise stability, conservative control and speed limits, supervision-compatible features, graduated and modular terrain engagement, and development-appropriate motivational design, with dimensional and technological specifics explicitly deferred to future anthropometric and usability research. Overall, the evidence supports a cautious, developmentally grounded approach to mini adventure bike design, in which adult adventure-cycling and e-mobility trends inform aspiration but do not substitute for direct empirical validation with child users.

7. References

1. M.F. Floyd, J.N. Bocarro, W.R. Smith, P.K. Baran, R.C. Moore, N.G. Cosco, M.B. Edwards, L.J. Suau, K. Fang, "Park-Based Physical Activity Among Children and Adolescents", American Journal of Preventive Medicine, 2011, 41 (3), 258–265. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amepre.2011.04.013
2. A. Ghekiere, B. Deforche, A. Carver, L. Mertens, B. de Geus, P. Clarys, G. Cardon, I. De Bourdeaudhuij, J. Van Cauwenberg, "Insights into Children's Independent Mobility for Transportation Cycling—Which Socio-Ecological Factors Matter?", Journal of Science and Medicine in Sport, 2017, 20 (3), 267–272. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsams.2016.08.002
3. S. Hagen, M. Boyes, "Affective Ride Experiences on Mountain Bike Terrain", Journal of Outdoor Recreation and Tourism, 2016, 15, 89–98. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jort.2016.07.007
4. N. Hamilton, C. Palmer, "Learning to Ride a Bike: A Qualitative Study of Cycling and the Bikeability Programme", Journal of Qualitative Research in Sports Studies, 2014, 8 (1), 17–88.
5. J. Hatfield, R.G. Poulos, S.M. Murphy, L.K. Flack, C. Rissel, R. Grzebieta, A.S. McIntosh, "Safety Aspects of Riding with Children: Descriptive Analysis of Adult Riders' Self-Report", Accident Analysis & Prevention, 2019, 131, 33–44. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aap.2019.06.012
6. K. Lee, I.N. Sener, "E-Bikes Toward Inclusive Mobility: A Literature Review of Perceptions, Concerns, and Barriers", Transportation Research Interdisciplinary Perspectives, 2023, 22, 100940. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trip.2023.100940
7. J. McVicar, M.A. Keske, R. Daryabeygi-Khotbehsara, A.C. Betik, L. Parker, R. Maddison, "Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis Evaluating the Effects Electric Bikes Have on Physiological Parameters", Scandinavian Journal of Medicine & Science in Sports, 2022, 32 (7), 1076–1088. https://doi.org/10.1111/sms.14155
8. A.K. Ojha, "Applied Artificial Intelligence for Adaptive Electric Bike Systems: Autonomous Gear Control and Assisted Riding", (Unpublished), 2026. **39(2), 334–339. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aap.2006.09.002**
9. C. Rathinam, N. Nair, A. Gupta, S. Joshi, S. Bansal, "Self-Reported Motorcycle Riding Behaviour Among School Children in India", Accident Analysis and Prevention, 2007, 39 (2), 334–339. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aap.2006.09.002
10. E. Salmerón-Manzano, F. Manzano-Agugliaro, "The Electric Bicycle: Worldwide Research Trends", Energies, 2018, 11 (7), 1894. https://doi.org/10.3390/en11071894

11. K. Scherhag, S. Groß, M. Sand, "Adventures on Two Wheels – Comparative Study of Motorcycle Adventure Tourists in Germany, Austria and Switzerland", Zeitschrift für Tourismuswissenschaft, 2022, 14 (3), 303–332. https://doi.org/10.1515/tw-2022-0017
12. W.B. Strong, R.M. Malina, C.J.R. Blimkie, S.R. Daniels, R.K. Dishman, B. Gutin, A.C. Hergenroeder, A. Must, P.A. Nixon, J.M. Pivarnik, T. Rowland, S. Trost, F. Trudeau, "Evidence Based Physical Activity for School-Age Youth", The Journal of Pediatrics, 2005, 146 (6), 732–737. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpeds.2005.01.055
13. P.M. Valkenburg, J. Cantor, "The Development of a Child into a Consumer", Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 2001, 22 (1), 61–72. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0193-3973(00)00066-6
14. A.J. Van Vuren, "Examining E-Mountain Biking as Part of the Active and Adventure Tourism Market in South Africa", African Journal of Hospitality, Tourism and Leisure, 2022, 11 (SE1), 565–577. https://doi.org/10.46222/ajhtl.19770720.243
15. L.H.R.H. Zeuwts, F.J.A. Deconinck, P. Vansteenkiste, G. Cardon, M. Lenoir, "Understanding the Development of Bicycling Skills in Children: A Systematic Review", Safety Science, 2020, 123, 104562. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssci.2019.104562