

Population-weighted greenspace exposure tied to lower COVID-19 mortality rates: A nationwide dose-response study

Yuwen Yang^{a, b}, Yi Lu^c, Bin Jiang^{a, b, *}

Affiliations:

^aUrban Environments and Human Health Lab, HKUrbanLabs, Faculty of Architecture, The University of Hong Kong, HK.

^bDivision of Landscape Architecture, Department of Architecture, The University of Hong Kong, HK.

^cDepartment of Architecture and Civil Engineering, College of Engineering, City University of Hong Kong, HK.

*Corresponding author: Bin Jiang, RM614, 6/F, Knowles Building, The University of Hong Kong, Pok fu lam Road, Hong Kong; email: jiangbin@hku.hk

1 Population-weighted greenspace exposure tied to lower COVID-19 mortality rates: A 2 nationwide dose-response study

3 4 Abstract

5
6 The COVID-19 outbreak has caused enormous deaths and profound social and economic
7 disruption globally. Accumulating evidence suggests exposure to greenspace may reduce the risk
8 of COVID-19 mortality. Greenspace exposure enhances immune functioning, reduces
9 inflammation, and replenishes gut microbiota may protect against the risk of mortality among
10 those with COVID-19. However, previous studies often fail to distinguish the health effect of
11 different types of greenspace, explore the dose-response association and optimal buffer distance,
12 and consider the spatial dynamics of population distribution and geographic locations of
13 greenspace.

14
15 This study examined the associations among ratio of different types of greenspaces, population-
16 weighted exposure to different types of greenspaces, and COVID-19 mortality rates using a
17 negative binomial generalized linear mixed effects model across 3,025 counties, adjusted for
18 socioeconomic, demographic, pre-existing chronic disease, policy and regulation, behavioral, and
19 environmental factors. The population-weighted measure gave proportionally greater weight to
20 greenspace near areas of higher population density.

21
22 Exposure to forest and pasture was negatively associated with COVID-19 mortality rates, while
23 developed open space has insignificant or positive associations with mortality rates. *Forest outside*
24 *park* has the largest effect size across all buffer distances, followed by *forest inside park*. The
25 optimal exposure buffer distance is 1km for *forest outside park*, with 1 unit of increase in exposure
26 associated with a 9.9% decrease in mortality rates (95% confidence interval: 6.9% -12.8%). The
27 optimal exposure buffer distance of *forest inside park* is 400m, with 1 unit of increase in exposure,
28 associated with a 4.7% decrease in mortality rates (95% confidence interval: 2.4% - 6.9%).

29
30 Greenspaces, especially nearby forest, may be effective at lowering the mortality risk of
31 COVID-19 patients. Our findings suggest that policymakers and planners should prioritize forestry
32 within walking distance of residential clusters to mitigate mortality rates during current and future
33 respiratory pandemics.

34
35
36 **Keywords:** *COVID-19 mortality rate; Greenspace; Forest; Dose-response; Optimal buffer*
37 *distance*

38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 **1. Introduction**

51 Since its outbreak in 2019, COVID-19 has spread rapidly throughout the world, leading to
52 numerous infections and deaths. In the United States, COVID-19 is largely responsible for the
53 substantial 17.7% increase in total deaths from 2019 to 2020 and became the third leading cause
54 of death following heart disease and cancer (Ahmad, Cisewski, Miniño, & Anderson, 2021). By
55 the end of 2020, COVID-19 deaths were estimated at 348,600; by February 2020, they had reached
56 over 933,000 (Johns Hopkins University & Medicine, 2021; Viglione, 2020). In the US, COVID-
57 19 was estimated to reduce life expectancy by 1.13 years annually (Andrasfay & Goldman, 2021).

58 The COVID-19 pandemic also overwhelmed healthcare systems and caused substantial
59 economic loss. COVID-19 infection and deaths cast escalating pressure on testing capacities and
60 hospitalizations in the U.S. (Dyer, 2020; Miller, Becker, Grenfell, & Metcalf, 2020). Critically ill
61 COVID-19 patients faced shortages in intensive care units (ICUs) compounded by other critical
62 health conditions (Halpern & Tan, 2020). The cumulative economic costs of the COVID-19
63 pandemic due to premature deaths, unemployment, and business revenue decline was estimated to
64 be US\$1.4 trillion GDP by 2030 (Cutler & Summers, 2020; Chen et al. 2021).

65 Accumulating evidence suggests links between both nature and the built environment and
66 COVID-19 mortality rates. Exposure to air pollution (Ali & Islam, 2020; Konstantinou et al.,
67 2021; Liang et al., 2020), crowded housing (Brandén et al., 2020; Hu, Roberts, Azevedo, & Milner,
68 2021; van Ingen et al., 2021), and lower average temperature (Ma et al., 2020; Perone, 2021) were
69 found to increase COVID-19 deaths. The relationship between greenspace and COVID-19
70 mortality rates has received far less attention (Jiang, Yang, et al., 2021; Klomp maker et al., 2021;
71 Lu, Chen, et al., 2021), despite the numerous salutary effects of nature exposure on human health.

72

73 **1.1 How might exposure to greenspace alleviate COVID-19 mortality rates?**

74 An overwhelming amount of research has shown that exposure to greenspace can improve both
75 physical and mental health (Jiang, Chang, & Sullivan, 2014; Lu, Chen, et al., 2021). Particularly,
76 studies have shown that contact with greenspace boosts our defense capacity against viruses by
77 increasing Natural Killer (NK) and T cells and cytotoxic activities (Liisa Andersen, Sus Sola Sola
78 Corazon, & Ulrika Karlsson Karlsson Stigsdotter, 2021; Li, 2010; Roviello, Gilhen-Baker,
79 Vicidomini, & Roviello, 2021), reducing inflammation (Kuo, 2015; Ribeiro, Tavares, Guttentag,
80 & Barros, 2019), and replenishing gut microbiota (Parajuli, 2019; Parajuli et al., 2020; Marja I.
81 Roslund et al., 2020). Hospitalized COVID-19 patients with severe or fatal cases have consistently
82 shown immune interference (e.g., lower NK and T cell count, exaggerated cytotoxic activities)
83 (Castelli, Cimini, & Ferri, 2020; Girija, Shankar, & Larsson, 2020; Qin et al., 2020), hyper-
84 inflammation or ‘cytokine storm’(e.g., delayed but elevated of pro-inflammatory cytokines)
85 (Paranjpe et al., 2020; Potempa, Rajab, Hart, Bordon, & Fernandez-Botran, 2020; Yang et al.,
86 2020), and decreased gut microbiota diversity (Dhar & Mohanty, 2020) compared to non-critically
87 ill patients. Thus, contact with nature has the potential to mitigate severe COVID-19 prognosis
88 and deaths.

89 **1.2 A critical gap: The relationship between different types of greenspace and COVID-19** 90 **mortality rate.**

91 Several studies have shown a significant association between greenness and COVID-19
92 mortality rates in the U.S. (Klompaker et al., 2021; Lee et al., 2021; Russette et al., 2021;
93 Spotswood et al., 2021). These studies define greenspace as the total area of vegetation within a
94 boundary (e.g., Normalized Difference Vegetation Index and Leaf Area Index).They did not
95 distinguish between open space, forest, grassland/herbaceous, and hay/pasture, nor did they

96 consider the impacts of greenspace proximity and recreational function provision on COVID-19
97 health outcomes. While previous evidence suggests different types of greenspace does not have
98 same impacts on health outcomes (Akpinar, Barbosa-Leiker, and Brooks 2016; Ekkel & de Vries
99 2017; Kim & Miller 2019; Johnson et al. 2020; Ma et al. 2022). For instance, greenspace such as
100 greenness and park had negative association with COVID-19 infection (Russette et al. 2021;
101 Spotswood et al. 2021; Wang et al. 2021; Johnson et al. 2020), but park mobility and green space
102 with better accessibility were positively associated with COVID-19 transmission (Pan, Bardhan,
103 and Jin 2021; DePhillipo et al., 2021). We still do not know whether and to what extent different
104 types of greenspace can influence the COVID-19 mortality rates.

105 Second, existing studies estimate the amount of greenness in a county but ignore the spatial
106 distribution of greenspace in relation to population (Klomp maker et al., 2021; Russette et al., 2021).
107 Despite being widely used and effective, the accuracy of ‘greenness’ metric can be greatly
108 improved by considering spatial relations between location of greenspace and population
109 distribution (Ben et al., 2019). Further, one study used deciles of ‘greenness’ to assess the dose-
110 response association (Russette et al., 2021). Though, the dose-response associations for different
111 types of greenspace within various buffer distances are unclear. Many previous studies suggested
112 that distance matters for greenspace’s impact on health outcomes, and health effect might drop
113 after a threshold distance (Coombes, Jones, and Hillsdon 2010; Grahn and Stigsdotter 2003;
114 Nielsen and Hansen 2007). Still, we do not know whether the association of nearby greenspace on
115 mortality risk is significantly stronger than distant ones. We do not know which distances are
116 optimal. Without addressing these critical gaps, policymakers and urban planners are unable to
117 develop evidence-based urban greening solutions and policy to promote public health for current
118 and future pandemics.

119 **1.3 Research questions**

120 In this study, we investigated the associations among the ratio of six types of greenspace,
121 population-weighted exposure to six types of greenspace at different buffer distances, and full-
122 year COVID-19 mortality rates after controlling for potential confounding covariates. We seek to
123 answer the following three questions: 1) What are the associations between the ratio of six types
124 of greenspace and COVID-19 mortality rates after controlling for confounding variables? 2) What
125 are the associations between population-weighted exposure to six types of greenspace and
126 COVID-19 mortality rates within various buffer distances after controlling for confounding
127 variables? (3) Which exposure distances of the significant types of greenspace have the strongest
128 association with COVID-19 mortality rates?

129 **2. Methods**


130 We combined COVID-19 mortality data, sociodemographic characteristics, healthcare and
131 testing data, pre-existing chronic disease data, policy and regulation data, behavior data, and
132 environmental factors from diverse sources for 3,025 counties. The greenspace exposures were
133 calculated in GEE. We first used a negative binomial generalized linear mixed effects model to
134 evaluate the association between the ratio of six types of greenspace and COVID-19 mortality
135 rates in the U.S. from January 22 to December 31, 2020, adjusted for socioeconomic, demographic,
136 pre-existing chronic disease, policy and regulation, behavioral, and environmental factors. Then,
137 we examined the associations between the population-weighted exposure to greenspace at varying
138 distances within 4km and COVID-19 mortality rates, adjusted for confounders.

139 **2.1 Data**

140 *2.1.1 COVID-19 mortality data*

141 COVID-19 mortality data are publicly available at the US Centers for Disease Control and
142 Prevention (CDC) and State government websites (Kolak et al., 2021). We define the COVID-19

143 mortality rates as the cumulative number of COVID-19 deaths per 100,000 people for each of
144 3,025 counties from January 22, 2020 to December 31, 2020 (Fig. 1). We limit our research period
145 at the end of 2020 to avoid the possible confounding effect from large-scale vaccination, which
146 will have significantly impact on mortality rates (see Supplementary Table 1 for descriptive
147 COVID-19 mortality data).




149 **Fig. 1 | County-level COVID-19 deaths per 100,000 population in the United States (from**
150 **Jan 18 to Dec 30, 2020).**

151
152 *2.1.2 Greenspace exposure data*

153 We assessed greenspace exposure using two metrics. First, we quantified the ratios of six types
154 of greenspaces within a county, which measures the area of each greenspace over the county area.
155 The ratio of *forest inside park*, *forest outside park*, *grassland/herbaceous*, *hay/pasture*, *open space*
156 *inside park*, and *open space outside park* were calculated use the National Land Cover Database
157 2016 (NLCD, 2016) (Fig. 2). We distinguished open space and forest within park from open

158 space and forest outside park use the boundary derived from the USA parks from Esri (Esri,
159 2021).



160

161 **Fig. 2 | Ratio of greenspace at the county level in the United States. (A) forest inside park (B) forest outside park;**
162 **(C) hay/pasture; (D) grassland/herbaceous; (E) developed open space inside park; (F) developed open space outside**
163 **park.**

164 Second, we quantified the population-weighted exposure to greenspaces within different
165 distances from human settlements using two datasets: the National Land Cover Datasets in 2016
166 (Yang et al., 2018) and the 2020 WorldPop Global Project Population Data (Sorichetta et al.,
167 2015). The 30-meter resolution NLCD 2016 Landsat imagery was re-projected to match the 100-

168 meter spatial resolution of WorldPop Dataset. We estimated population-weighted greenspace
169 exposures within 4km in GEE (Gorelick et al., 2017), because past studies suggest few walking
170 activities occur beyond 4km (Yang & Diez-Roux, 2012). These measures considered population
171 spatial distributions and gave proportionally greater weight to greenspace near areas of higher
172 population density, which previous studies fail to address (Chen et al., 2018). Considering
173 population distribution in greenspace exposure measurement can reduce bias caused by a
174 mismatch between population and greenspaces within an area. The buffer interval is set as 200m
175 within 2km and 500m between 2km to 4m. The population-weighted exposure to greenspaces
176 with varying buffer sizes in each county is defined by Equation 1 (Chen et al., 2018),

$$177 \quad FE = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N P_i \times F_i^b}{\sum_{i=1}^N P_i} \text{ (Equation 1)}$$

178 where P_i represents the population of the i^{th} grid, F_i^b represents the land cover of the i^{th} grid at a
179 buffer size of b meters, N denotes the total number of grids for a given county, and FE is the
180 estimated greenspace exposure level for the given county (see Supplementary Table 2 for
181 descriptive greenspace exposure data).

182 *2.1.3. Predictors of COVID-19 mortality*

183 We considered a number of predictors of COVID-19 mortality as potential covariates in analyses.
184 Many studies have found sociodemographic, chronic disease, behavioral, healthcare, and
185 environmental factors linked to COVID-19 mortality. The county-level sociodemographic,
186 healthcare, and testing data from the US Census Bureau (US Census Bureau, 2019) and US
187 COVID Atlas of the Center for Spatial Data Science (Kolak et al., 2021). These variables included
188 population density, the ratio of female household, non-Hispanic black, white, and Hispanic, the
189 proportion of residents older than 65, median household income, Gini index, poverty rate, median
190 housing value, unemployment rate, Gini index, the ratio of residents without a high school diploma

191 and without a college degree, percent without health insurance coverage, and COVID-19 testing
192 rates.

193 The pre-existing chronic diseases were shown to affect COVID-19 mortality risk, included rates
194 of hypertension, heart failure, stroke mortality, diabetes, and obesity (CDC, 2021; Prevention.,
195 2022). The policy and regulation factors included stay-at-home order intensity, public mask
196 mandates, and bar and restaurant closing and reopening orders (Chernozhukov et al., 2021;
197 VoPham et al., 2020). The behavior risk factors included the proportion of current smokers and
198 the proportion of essential workers, the proportion of workers who commuted to work by public
199 transportation, walking, and private cars, and the proportion of leisure-time physical inactivity,
200 median max-distance traveled, and foot traffic to different out-of-home activities. The
201 environmental risk factors included particulate matter (e.g., PM_{2.5} and PM₁₀), temperature, relative
202 humidity, precipitation, wind speed, and transportation density. All descriptive statistics of
203 covariates and data sources are available in Supplementary Table 1.

204 **2.2 Statistical analysis**

205 We used a negative binomial generalized linear mixed effects model to evaluate the associations
206 between the ratios of six types of greenspace and COVID-19 mortality rates, and state was used
207 in analyses as a random effect to account for state-level variability and non-independence in our
208 data. The analyses were adjusted for a range of covariates. We applied restricted maximum
209 likelihood (REML) with a negative binomial link function. The negative binomial mixed effect
210 model and state as random effect accounts for our over-dispersed count data and partially
211 accounts for the presence of spatial autocorrelation. The variance inflation factor (VIF) test was
212 used to identify multi-collinearity between the independent variables. Variables with a VIF ≥ 4
213 were excluded from our models (O'Brien, 2007).

214 To identify the optimal exposure distance for significant greenspaces, we used a negative
215 binomial generalized linear mixed effects model to evaluate associations between population-
216 weighted exposures to six types of greenspace with COVID-19 mortality rates. The analyses use
217 the same sets of covariates as previous analysis and state was used as random effect. All
218 explanatory variables were centered and scaled.

219 We used Moran's I test to assess spatial autocorrelation of COVID-19 mortality residuals. We
220 confirmed the presence of spatial autocorrelation with Moran's $I=0.21$, $p < 0.0001$. The Moran's
221 I value equal to 0 indicates a lack of spatial autocorrelation, and positive values indicate
222 clustering of similar values. The analyses were performed in R v.4.1.2 (Team, 2015), and Moran's
223 I test was performed using the package 'spdep' (Bivand & Wong, 2018). The negative binomial
224 mixed effects models were performed using the package lme4 (Bates, Mächler, Bolker, &
225 Walker, 2014).

226 **2.3 Model validation**


227 The negative binomial generalized linear mixed effects model provides an appropriate error
228 structure for the overdispersed COVID-19 mortality count data. Due to the presence of spatial
229 autocorrelation (Moran's $I=0.21$, $p < 0.0001$), we built additional spatial autoregressive models
230 (SAR) to validate the results of the negative binomial mixed effects model. The queen's criteria
231 were used to build the neighbors matrix. We used the Akaike information criterion (AIC) value
232 to compare the spatial error model, spatial lag model, and spatial Durbin model. The spatial error
233 model has the lowest AIC values, which suggests that spatial dependence occurs in the error
234 term. The model validation confirms the negative associations between *forest inside park*, *forest*
235 *outside park*, pasture, and COVID-19 mortality rates (See results of SAR models in
236 Supplementary Table 5). Given the structure of our data, model coefficients and the magnitude

237 of effects, we chose to interpret our result using the negative binomial generalized linear mixed
238 effects model.

239 **3. Results**

240 **3.1 Associations among ratio of six types of greenspaces and COVID-19 mortality rates.**

241 We found *forest inside park* and *forest outside park* are significantly negatively associated with
242 COVID-19 mortality rates ($p < 0.0001$); *open space outside park* is significantly positively
243 associated with COVID-19 mortality rates ($p < 0.01$); grassland/herbaceous, hay/pasture and *open*
244 *space inside park* are not significantly associated with COVID-19 mortality rates, after controlling
245 for all covariates (Fig. 3). Among the six types of greenspace, *forest outside park* has the greatest
246 effect size ($\beta = -0.097$), which is slightly larger than that of *forest inside park* ($\beta = -0.082$). We
247 found 1 unit of increase in *forest outside park* is associated with a 9.2% decrease in COVID-19
248 mortality rates (MRR 95% CI: 6.3 - 12.1%), whereas 1 unit of increase in *forest inside park* is
249 associated with a 7.8% decrease (MRR 95% CI: 4.3 - 11.2%). In contrast, 1 unit of increase in
250 *developed open space outside park* is associated with a 5.8% increase in COVID-19 mortality rates
251 (MRR 95% CI: 2.3 - 9.5%) (Table 1).



252
 253 **Fig. 3 | Exposure to forest is associated with lower COVID-19 mortality rates adjusted for covariates.** Coefficient
 254 values represent effect sizes for the associations between mortality rates of COVID-19 (cases per 100,000 people) and
 255 ratio of grassland/herbaceous, hay/pasture, *open space in park*, *open space outside park*, *forest inside park*, *forest*
 256 *outside park*, and all covariates. Coefficient values are represented as dots, bars represent 95% CI, and significant
 257 variables are shown in color: grey = $p \geq 0.01$; yellow = $p < 0.01$; red = $p < 0.0001$.

258

259

260

261 **Table 1** | Mortality rate ratios (MRR), 95% confidence intervals (CI) of all variables in the model
 262 for COVID-19 mortality rates.

Variables		MRR (95% CI)
Socioeconomic and demographic factors	Population density	1.073 (1.041, 1.105)
	Black non-Hispanic	1.057 (1.021, 1.095)
	Population aged 65+	1.162 (1.129, 1.196)
	Gini Index	1.019 (0.993, 1.045)
	Median home value	0.878 (0.842, 0.915)
	Unemployment rate	0.970 (0.941, 1.000)
	Population without high school diploma	1.139 (1.095, 1.185)
Healthcare and testing factors	Population without insurance	0.973 (0.920, 1.029)
	Testing rate	1.092 (1.060, 1.126)
Pre-existing chronic disease factors	Diabetes rate	1.018 (0.993, 1.045)
	Obesity rate	0.988 (0.961, 1.015)
	Stroke mortality	1.033 (1.004, 1.062)
	Hypertension mortality	1.013 (0.986, 1.040)
	Heart disease mortality	1.024 (0.996, 1.052)
Behavioral factors	Smoker	0.993 (0.951, 1.037)
	Essential worker	1.031 (0.996, 1.067)
	POI visits	1.022 (0.997, 1.047)
	Commute to work by walking or bicycle	0.987 (0.962, 1.014)
	Leisure time physical inactivity	1.042 (1.011, 1.074)
	Mobility	0.981 (0.962, 1.000)
	Mobility 50index	0.988 (0.966, 1.011)
Policy and regulation factors	Stay-at-home orders	1.027 (0.987, 1.068)
	Public mask mandates	0.950 (0.831, 1.085)
	Bar	1.097 (0.956, 1.258)
	Restaurant	0.95 (0.808, 1.118)
Environmental factors	Crowded Housing	1.073 (1.042, 1.105)
	Proximity to highway	1.013 (0.990, 1.038)
	Airport density	0.968 (0.947, 0.989)
	Railway density	0.964 (0.938, 0.990)
	Highway and secondary road density	1.001 (0.964, 1.038)
	PM _{2.5}	1.015 (0.978, 1.052)
	PM ₁₀	0.968 (0.924, 1.014)
	NO ₂	1.012 (0.976, 1.050)
	Maximum temperature	0.975 (0.915, 1.038)
	Humidity	0.886 (0.842, 0.933)
	Wind speed	1.010 (0.980, 1.042)

Green space factors	Grassland / Herbaceous	1.016 (0.986, 1.046)
	Hay / Pasture	0.970(0.945, 0.995)
	<i>Open space in park</i>	1.024 (0.988, 1.060)
	<i>Open space outside park</i>	1.058 (1.023, 1.095)
	<i>Forest in park</i>	0.922 (0.888, 0.957)
	<i>Forest outside park</i>	0.908 (0.879, 0.937)


263

264 **3.2 Associations of population-weighted exposures to greenspace with COVID-19 mortality** 265 **rates at various buffer distances.**

266 We also found population-weighted exposure to *forest inside park*, *forest outside park* and
267 pasture are significantly and negatively associated with COVID-19 mortality rates. Population-
268 weighted exposure to *forest inside park* is significantly and negatively associated with mortality
269 rates between 100 to 400m and 1,800m to 4km, and the distance for largest effect size is 4km ($\beta =$
270 -0.050). The effect size increases as buffer distance gets larger, though the increase remains limited
271 (400m $\beta = -0.048$ vs 4km $\beta = -0.050$, 4% of increase) (Fig. 4). With 1 unit of increase in *forest*
272 *exposure in park* at 4km, there is a 4.9% decrease in COVID-19 mortality rates (MRR 95% CI:
273 2.7-7.0%) (Table 2).


274 The population-weighted to *forest outside park* is consistently and significantly negatively
275 associated with COVID-19 mortality rates across all buffer distances, and the greatest reduction
276 occurs at 1km ($\beta = -0.104$). The effect size increases as the buffer increases from 100m to 1km
277 and decrease beyond 1km (Fig. 5). We found a 9.9% decrease in COVID-19 mortality rates per
278 unit increase in *forest exposure outside park* at 1km (MRR 95% CI: 6.9–12.8%) (Table 2).

279 The population-weighted exposure to *pasture* is significantly negatively associated with
280 mortality rates from 2,500m to 4km with increasing effect size, and reaches optimal effect at 4km
281 ($\beta = -0.036$). With 1 unit of increase in pasture exposure at 4km, the associated mortality rates
282 decrease by 3.5% (MRR 95% CI: 5.9 - 10.0%) (Table 2).



283

284 **Fig. 4 | The effect size of population-weighted exposure to forest inside park within 4km on COVID-19 mortality**
285 **rates.** Coefficient values represent effect sizes from a negative binomial mixed effects model for the relationship
286 between mortality of COVID-19 mortality rates (death count per 100,000 people) and population-weighted exposure
287 to forest inside park. Coefficient values are represented as dots, grey = $p > 0.05$; red = $p < 0.0001$.
288



289

290 **Fig. 5 | The effect size of population weighted exposure to forest outside park within 4km on COVID-19 mortality**
291 **rates.** Coefficient values represent effect sizes from a negative binomial mixed effects model for the relationship
292 between mortality of COVID-19 mortality rates (death count per 100,000 people) and population-weighted exposure
293 to forest outside park. Coefficient values are represented as dots, red = $p < 0.0001$.

294 **Table 2** | Mortality Rate Ratio in models of population-weighted exposure to greenspaces with
295 COVID-19 mortality rates at optimal distances.
296

Variables	COVID-19 MRR (95% CI)
<i>Forest inside park 400m</i>	0.953 (0.931, 0.976)
<i>Forest inside park 4km</i>	0.951 (0.930, 0.973)
<i>Forest outside park 1km</i>	0.901 (0.872, 0.931)
<i>Hay/pasture 4km</i>	0.965 (0.941, 0.990)

297

298 4. Discussion

299 We found exposure to forest and pasture to be negatively associated with COVID-19 mortality
300 rates, while exposure to developed open space has mixed association with mortality rates.
301 Exposure to *forest outside park* has the largest effect size on reduced COVID-19 mortality rates
302 across all buffer distances, followed by *forest inside park*. Further, the effect size of exposure to
303 *forest outside park* increases until the distance reaches 1km, then declines beyond 1km. The effect
304 size of population-weighted exposure to *forest inside park* increase with larger buffer size and is
305 greatest at 4km, though similar to that at 400m.


306 While this cross-sectional study cannot infer any causal relationships, previous findings suggest
307 multiple mechanisms that might explain the observed associations. We proposed a framework of
308 potential mechanisms that may contribute to the observed associations. We consider why exposure
309 to *forest outside park* may have a larger effect size than *forest inside park*. We provide
310 explanations for optimal exposure buffer size for significant greenspace types. Last, we discuss
311 the contributions of our findings and identify questions for future research.

312 4.1. Potential mechanisms for observed associations.

313 4.1.1 How might forest and pasture alleviate COVID-19 mortality risk?

314 We found that forest and pasture exposure were significantly and negatively associated with
315 COVID-19 mortality rates in the US, after control for all covariates. This finding aligns with
316 previous studies (Klompaker et al., 2021; Lee et al., 2021; Russette et al., 2021; Spotswood et
317 al., 2021). Greenspace may lower COVID-19 mortality risk if it boosts biological processes that
318 fight against the prognosis of COVID-19 (Andersen et al., 2021; Roslund et al., 2020; Roviello et
319 al., 2021), making affected patients less vulnerable to death (Roviello & Roviello, 2021). We
320 suggest that contact with greenspace may reduce mortality rates through increased biogenic

321 volatile organic compound (VOC) exposure, increased environmental microbiota exposure,
322 reduced psychological stress and air pollution, and increased physical activity (Fig. 6).



323

324 **Fig. 6 | The proposed theoretical model for negative associations between greenspace exposure and COVID-19**
325 **mortality rates.**

326 **Exposure to the forest environment increases exposure to biogenic volatile organic**
327 **compounds (VOCs).** Forests are abundant with phytoncides (e.g., terpenes, limonene and pinene),
328 a group of biogenic VOCs given off by forest trees that have been found to enhance immune
329 capacity and reduce inflammation (Andersen, Corazon, & Stigsdotter, 2021; Cho et al., 2017;
330 Huang et al., 2020; Kim, Song, Cho, & Lee, 2020). Studies suggest forest bathing increases natural
331 killer (NK) cell counts and activity, and the effect can last for more than a month (Li, 2010; Li et
332 al., 2008; Li et al., 2007; Tsao et al., 2018). NK cells activate receptors to recognize virus-infected
333 cells and trigger cytotoxicity (phagocytosis or apoptosis) (Market et al., 2020; Yokoyama, 2005).
334 A recent study found COVID-19 mortality rates are lower in areas with high ratios of hectares of
335 Mediterranean forest per capita, where biogenic VOCs are abundant (Roviello & Roviello, 2021).
336 In addition, studies have shown that nearby greenspaces are associated with a lower level of a
337 biomarker of inflammation - high sensitivity C-reactive protein (Del Valle et al., 2020; Mandel,

338 Harari, Gurevich, & Achiron, 2020; Ribeiro et al., 2019). Forests can increase exposure to VOCs
339 that might boost the NK defenses, compensate for reduced NK cell counts, and modulate excess
340 inflammatory responses in severely affected patients (Market et al., 2020; Osman et al., 2020);

341 **Exposure to forest and pasture can diversify gut microbiota profile.** Though our gut
342 microbial composition is shaped by the interplay of multiple factors, such as diet and genetics
343 (Dhar & Mohanty, 2020), many studies have found microbiome from surrounding green
344 environments can transfer to humans (Grönroos et al., 2019; Parajuli et al., 2018; Parajuli et al.,
345 2020). A 28-day intervention study in Finland found that daily contact with backyard forest and
346 grass areas within 500m can diversify children's gut microbiota profile and enhance immune
347 capacity (e.g., increases in plasma TGF- β 1 levels and the proportion of regulatory T cells)
348 (Roslund et al., 2020). If exposed to greenspaces, the disturbed gut microbe condition and immune
349 function may improve for COVID-19 patients (Claesson et al., 2012; Donati Zeppa, Agostini,
350 Piccoli, Stocchi, & Sestili, 2020; Roslund et al., 2020; Yeoh et al., 2021; Zuo et al., 2020).

351 **Greenspaces can decrease patients' exposure to air pollutants.** Many studies have noted an
352 inverse association between air pollution and COVID-19 mortality rates (Jaafari, Shabani,
353 Moeinaddini, Danehkar, & Sakieh, 2020; Martelletti & Martelletti, 2020; Shen & Lung, 2017).
354 Chronic exposure to air pollutants was associated with delays in recovery of COVID-19 patients
355 and led to more fatal conditions (Domingo & Rovira, 2020). This may be attributed to modified
356 host respiratory immune responses, perturbed anti-microbial responses, and triggered
357 inflammatory cytokine release from air pollution exposure (Bauer, Diaz-Sanchez, & Jaspers, 2012;
358 Ciencewicki & Jaspers, 2007; Glencross, Ho, Camiña, Hawrylowicz, & Pfeffer, 2020). Forests can
359 reduce air pollutants by intercepting particulate matter on plant surfaces and absorbing gaseous
360 pollutants (Nowak, Hirabayashi, Bodine, & Greenfield, 2014; Nowak, Hirabayashi, Doyle,

361 McGovern, & Pasher, 2018). Trees and forests in the U.S. remove an estimated 17.4 million tonnes
362 (t) of air pollution annually (Nowak et al., 2014). It is thus reasonable to speculate that forests can
363 reduce COVID-19 mortality rates by removing air pollutants.

364 **Forests can reduce patients' psychological stress.** Patients infected with COVID-19 show a
365 high prevalence of mental problems (Kong et al., 2020; Wang et al., 2021). Mental stress has been
366 linked to dysregulation of the immune system and increased pro-inflammatory cytokines (Gouin
367 et al., 2012; Morey, Boggero et al., 2015; Steptoe et al., 2007). Patients with increased contact with
368 nature or nature views from home during the pandemic were found to have decreased depression
369 and anxiety (Soga et al., 2021). Previous theoretical and empirical studies support nature's stress-
370 reducing effect (Gidlow et al., 2016; Jiang et al., 2014; Lee et al., 2011; Mancus et al., 2020; Ulrich
371 et al., 1991). It is possible that patients can have strengthened immune function and healthier
372 inflammation level benefit from the stress-reduction effect of contact with forest.

373 **Green space can promote physical activities (PA) during the pandemic.** Since the COVID-
374 19 outbreak, people have escaped to nature. Recreational activities, such as walking or cycling in
375 parks and trails, have spiked globally during the pandemic (Geng et al., 2021; Lu et al., 2021;
376 Venter et al., 2020; Venter et al., 2021). Physical activity can boost COVID-19 patients' immune
377 response, modulate inflammation levels, and lower the risk of obesity. Exercise increases NK & T
378 cells, enhances recirculation, and increases lymphocyte concentration and cytotoxic activity
379 (Amatriain-Fernández et al., 2020; Fernandez et al., 2018; Nieman & Wentz, 2019). People who
380 exercise in forested areas can benefit from the synergistic effect from physical activity and
381 exposure to forest (Pretty et al., 2005). Moreover, physical activity has a direct anti-inflammatory
382 effect and can dampen systemic inflammation (Biddle et al., 2019; DeSantis et al., 2012; Nieman
383 & Wentz, 2019). Exercise lowers the risk of obesity, a risk factor for COVID-19. Obesity is the

384 precursor of a range of chronic diseases that have been found to increase COVID-19 mortality
385 (Bastien et al., 2014; Calle & Thun, 2004; Chan et al., 1994; Hussain et al., 2020; Klang et al.,
386 2020; Krauss et al., 1998). Thus, the benefits of greenspace on reduced obesity through physical
387 activity may contribute to the negative association between greenspace and COVID-19 mortality
388 rates (Coombes et al., 2010; De la Fuente et al., 2021; Ghimire et al., 2017; Jia et al., 2020).

389 ***4.1.2 How might open space exacerbates COVID-19 mortality risk?***

390 We found the ratio of *open space outside park* is significantly and positively associated with
391 COVID-19 mortality rates. This finding contradicts previous studies that have reported health
392 benefits from exposure to open spaces. Our results suggest that exposure to open space may not
393 be effective or may even be detrimental to COVID-19 mortality rate. Open space in our study is
394 defined as “large-lot single-family housing units or vegetation planted in developed settings”
395 (NLCD, 2016). On one hand, open space can provide health benefits by promoting physical
396 activity, social interaction, and reduced air pollutants (Lu, Chen, et al., 2021), though the effect
397 may not be as strong as it is for forests (Reid, Clougherty, Shmool, & Kubzansky, 2017). On the
398 other hand, the lower supply of open space per capita in urban areas makes it hard to comply with
399 safe social distancing in non-park open spaces (e.g., streets and backyards), and may exacerbate
400 mortality risk. Though outdoor transmission of COVID-19 is rare (Bulfone et al. 2021), people
401 who participate in outdoor social activities such as talking or partying were at higher risk of
402 spreading the disease (Domènech-Montoliu et al. 2021; Peng et al. 2022). Presumably, the higher
403 infection risk might lead to higher COVID-19 mortality rates. More evidence is needed to
404 understand the mechanisms of the mixed effects of open space on COVID-19 mortality rates.

405 ***4.1.3 Why might forest outside park have a stronger effect than forest inside park?***


406 We found *forest outside park* to have a larger effect size than *forest inside park* on COVID-19
407 mortality rates after accounting for other covariates. This finding aligns with previous studies of
408 stronger health-promoting effect outside park areas (Reid et al., 2017; Allard-Poesi et al., 2022).
409 The difference in forest exposure inside and outside park may explain the stronger effect of *forest*
410 *outside park*. The US population has a ten times greater opportunity to be exposed to *forest inside*
411 *park* than *forest outside park* within walking distance (Fig. 7). Second, social activities in parks
412 might increase risk of close contact and inhale droplets from infected people (DePhillipo et al.,
413 2021; Praharaj & Han, 2021), thus increase infection risk. Thus, it is reasonable to argue that the
414 increased infection risk caused by the social interactions in parks may offset the other health
415 benefits of *forests inside park* on mortality. Further, the health effect of *forest inside park* may be
416 weakened in part due to shutdown policies in some states, which closed parks due to COVID-19
417 spread risk (Volenec et al., 2021; Smith et al., 2021).

418 **4.1.4 Optimal exposure buffer distance: what and why?**

419 We found the effect of population-weighted exposure to *forest outside park* increases with a
420 larger buffer distance and reaches an optimal effect at 1km. This suggests that exposure to nearby
421 *forest outside park* within 1km is more effective than exposure to forests that are at a greater
422 walking distance. This may be because nearby forests are visited more often than forests located
423 further away. Studies suggest that the frequency of visits to greenspaces declines as distance
424 increases (Coombes et al., 2010). A distance of 1,120 m (0.7 miles) is the mean walking distance
425 in the U.S. (Yang & Diez-Roux, 2012).

426 We also found the effect size of *forest inside park* is optimal at 4km, though the effect size is
427 close to that at 400m (2% increase). This suggests the effect of *forest inside park* is less sensitive
428 to buffer size within walking distance. Studies suggest people walk much longer for recreation

429 purposes as opposed to other purposes (Yang & Diez-Roux, 2012). Considering the effect size and
430 previous literature on walking behaviors, we suggest the optimal exposure buffer distance for
431 *forest outside park* to be 1km and the optimal exposure buffer distance for *forest inside park* to be
432 400m.



433
434
435 **Fig. 7 | Mean population-weighted exposure to *forest inside park* and *forest outside park* within 4km.** The bar
436 represents the average population-weighted forest exposure at county level within each buffer distance.

437
438 **4.2 Contributions and implications**

439 To our knowledge, this is the first nationwide study distinguish the impact of different types of
440 greenspace on COVID-19 mortality rates in the U.S. In this study, the greenspace exposure
441 measure integrated the dynamics of population distribution and geographic location of greenspaces
442 into exposure assessment, providing a more precise and reasonable exposure estimates. The dose-
443 response associations between different types of green spaces at various buffer distances and

444 COVID-19 mortality rates were examined, allowing us to identify an optimal effect distance,
445 which was previously lacking in the literature.

446 Evidence from this study suggests that planners and policymakers should prioritize the supply
447 of nearby forests. Specifically, we recommend ensuring that forests outside parks be located within
448 1000m from residents, and forests inside parks be located within 400m from residents. These
449 forested areas will be especially beneficial in highly urbanized, low-SES, and minority-dominated
450 areas where COVID-19 mortality rates are disproportionately high (Lu et al., 2021). Many
451 greenspaces were temporarily closed during the pandemic to reduce the spread of disease (Ugolini
452 et al., 2020). The findings in this study advocate for keeping nearby greenspace open, especially
453 forested areas. Cities with accessible forested areas can promote health and resilience during the
454 current and future pandemics.

455 **4.3 Limitations and future research opportunities**

456 This study has several limitations, which pose opportunities for future research. This is an
457 ecological study using aggregated data at the county level. It is subjected to ecological fallacy.
458 Future studies can use individual level data or experimental studies to confirm the causal relations
459 and the potential underlying mechanisms (Jiang et al., 2021).

460 Second, the unit of analysis is the county due to the availability of COVID-19 mortality data
461 and other confounding variable. Though county data are widely used in nationwide studies, future
462 studies should use finer-grained data (i.e., census tract level data). Different scales of analyses may
463 reveal different associations between neighborhood greenspace and health outcomes (Richardson
464 et al., 2012).

465 Third, our research investigated associations using data from 2020, but the situation has
466 continued to evolve with the emergence of vaccines and COVID-19 variants (e.g., Delta and
467 Omicron). Future studies should consider the new situations accordingly.

468 **5. Conclusion**

469 Our findings suggest that during 2020, exposure to more green spaces, especially forests, was
470 significantly associated with a lower level of COVID-19 mortality rates, while exposure to more
471 *developed open space* has insignificant or positive associations with the COVID-19 mortality rates.
472 *Forest outside park* is more beneficial than *forest inside park*, with the optimal buffer distance
473 being 1km for *forest outside park*, and within 400m for *forest inside park*. These findings imply
474 that policymakers and planners should prioritize urban greening within optimal distances of
475 residential clusters and keep beneficial greenspaces accessible for COVID-19 and future
476 pandemics.

477

478

479

480

481

482

483

484

485

486

487

488

489

490

491

492

493

494

495

496

497

498 **Acknowledgements**

499 We thank to Long Chen, Xueming Liu, and Xueying Wu for data collection; Bin Chen for
500 methodological help; and Linda Larsen for proof reading the article.

501 **Funding**

502 This work was supported by the University Grants Committee [grant numbers
503 102010054.088616.01100.302.01] and the Research Grants Council of the Hong Kong SAR
504 [grant number CityU11207520].

505 **References**

- 506 1. Ahmad, F. B., Cisewski, J. A., Miniño, A., & Anderson, R. N. (2021). Provisional mortality
507 data—united states, 2020. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report*, 70 (14), 519.
- 508 2. Akpınar, Abdullah, Celestina Barbosa-Leiker, and Kerry R Brooks. 2016. "Does green space
509 matter? Exploring relationships between green space type and health indicators." *Urban*
510 *Forestry & Urban Greening* 20: 407-418.
- 511 3. Ali, N., & Islam, F. (2020). The Effects of Air Pollution on COVID-19 Infection and
512 Mortality-A Review on Recent Evidence. *Frontiers in public health*, 8, 580057-580057.
- 513 4. Allard-Poesi, F., Matos, L. B. S., & Massu, J. (2022). Not all types of nature have an equal
514 effect on urban residents' well-being: A structural equation model approach. *Health &*
515 *place*, 74, 102759.
- 516 5. Amatriain-Fernández, S., Gronwald, T., Murillo-Rodríguez, E., Imperatori, C., Solano, A. F.,
517 Latini, A., & Budde, H. (2020). Physical exercise potentials against viral diseases like
518 COVID-19 in the elderly. *Frontiers in medicine*, 7, 379.
- 519 6. Andersen, L., Corazon, S. S. S., & Stigsdotter, U. K. K. (2021). Nature exposure and its
520 effects on immune system functioning: a systematic review. *International Journal of*
521 *Environmental Research and Public Health*, 18(4), 1416.
- 522 7. Andrasfay, T., & Goldman, N. (2021). Reductions in 2020 US life expectancy due to COVID-
523 19 and the disproportionate impact on the Black and Latino populations. *Proceedings of*
524 *the National Academy of Sciences*, 118(5), e2014746118.
- 525 8. Bastien, M., Poirier, P., Lemieux, I., & Després, J.-P. (2014). Overview of epidemiology and
526 contribution of obesity to cardiovascular disease. *Progress in cardiovascular diseases*,
527 56(4), 369-381.
- 528 9. Bates, D., Mächler, M., Bolker, B., & Walker, S. (2014). Fitting linear mixed-effects models
529 using lme4. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1406.5823*.
- 530 10. Bauer, R. N., Diaz-Sanchez, D., & Jaspers, I. (2012). Effects of air pollutants on innate
531 immunity: the role of Toll-like receptors and nucleotide-binding oligomerization domain-
532 like receptors. *The Journal of allergy and clinical immunology*, 129(1), 14-26.
- 533 11. Ben, Y., Ma, F., Wang, H., Hassan, M. A., Yevheniia, R., Fan, W., . . . Dong, Z. (2019). A
534 spatio-temporally weighted hybrid model to improve estimates of personal PM_{2.5}
535 exposure: Incorporating big data from multiple data sources. *Environmental pollution*,
536 253, 403-411.
- 537 12. Biddle, S. J., Ciaccioni, S., Thomas, G., & Vergeer, I. (2019). Physical activity and mental
538 health in children and adolescents: An updated review of reviews and an analysis of
539 causality. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 42, 146-155.
- 540 13. Bivand, R. S., & Wong, D. W. (2018). Comparing implementations of global and local
541 indicators of spatial association. *Test*, 27(3), 716-748.
- 542 14. Brandén, M., Aradhya, S., Kolk, M., Härkönen, J., Drefahl, S., Malmberg, B., . . . Mussino,
543 E. (2020). Residential context and COVID-19 mortality among adults aged 70 years and
544 older in Stockholm: a population-based, observational study using individual-level data.
545 *The Lancet Healthy Longevity*, 1(2), e80-e88.
- 546 15. Bulfone, Tommaso Celeste, Mohsen Malekinejad, George W Rutherford, and Nooshin
547 Razani. 2021. "Outdoor transmission of SARS-CoV-2 and other respiratory viruses: a
548 systematic review." *The Journal of infectious diseases* 223 (4): 550-561.
- 549 16. Bureau, U. S. C. (2019). *Interactive Atlas of Heart Disease and Stroke*. Retrieved from
550 <https://nccd.cdc.gov/DHDSPAtlas/Default.aspx>

- 551 17. Calle, E. E., & Thun, M. J. (2004). Obesity and cancer. *Oncogene*, 23(38), 6365-6378.
- 552 18. Castelli, V., Cimini, A., & Ferri, C. (2020). Cytokine storm in COVID-19: "when you come
553 out of the storm, you won't be the same person who walked in". *Frontiers in*
554 *Immunology*, 11.
- 555 19. CDC. (2021). Interactive Atlas of Heart Disease and Stroke. Retrieved from
556 <http://nccd.cdc.gov/DHDSPATlas>. <http://nccd.cdc.gov/DHDSPATlas>.
- 557 20. Chan, J. M., Rimm, E. B., Colditz, G. A., Stampfer, M. J., & Willett, W. C. (1994). Obesity,
558 fat distribution, and weight gain as risk factors for clinical diabetes in men. *Diabetes*
559 *care*, 17(9), 961-969.
- 560 21. Chen, B., Song, Y., Jiang, T., Chen, Z., Huang, B., & Xu, B. (2018). Real-time estimation of
561 population exposure to PM_{2.5} using mobile-and station-based big data. *International*
562 *Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 15(4), 573.
- 563 22. Chen, B., Song, Y., Kwan, M.-P., Huang, B., & Xu, B. (2018). How do people in different
564 places experience different levels of air pollution? Using worldwide Chinese as a lens.
565 *Environmental pollution*, 238, 874-883.
- 566 23. Chen, Simiao, Klaus Prettnner, Michael Kuhn, and David E Bloom. 2021. "The economic
567 burden of COVID-19 in the United States: Estimates and projections under an infection-
568 based herd immunity approach." *The Journal of the Economics of Ageing* 20: 100328.
- 569 24. Chernozhukov, V., Kasahara, H., & Schrimpf, P. (2021). Causal impact of masks, policies,
570 behavior on early covid-19 pandemic in the U.S. *Journal of Econometrics*, 220(1), 23-62.
- 571 25. Cho, K. S., Lim, Y.-r., Lee, K., Lee, J., Lee, J. H., & Lee, I.-S. (2017). Terpenes from forests
572 and human health. *Toxicological research*, 33(2), 97-106.
- 573 26. Ciencewicky, J., & Jaspers, I. (2007). Air pollution and respiratory viral infection. *Inhalation*
574 *toxicology*, 19(14), 1135-1146.
- 575 27. Claesson, M. J., Jeffery, I. B., Conde, S., Power, S. E., O'Connor, E. M., Cusack, S., . . .
576 O'Toole, P. W. (2012). Gut microbiota composition correlates with diet and health in the
577 elderly. *Nature*, 488(7410), 178-184.
- 578 28. Coombes, E., Jones, A. P., & Hillsdon, M. (2010). The relationship of physical activity and
579 overweight to objectively measured green space accessibility and use. *Social Science &*
580 *Medicine*, 70(6), 816-822.
- 581 29. Coombes, Emma, Andrew P. Jones, and Melvyn Hillsdon. 2010. "The relationship of
582 physical activity and overweight to objectively measured green space accessibility and
583 use." *Social Science & Medicine* 70 (6): 816-822.
- 584 30. Cutler, D. M., & Summers, L. H. (2020). The COVID-19 Pandemic and the \$16 Trillion
585 Virus. *JAMA*, 324(15), 1495-1496. doi:10.1001/jama.2020.19759
- 586 31. De la Fuente, F., Saldías, M. A., Cubillos, C., Mery, G., Carvajal, D., Bowen, M., &
587 Bertoglia, M. P. (2021). Green space exposure association with type 2 diabetes mellitus,
588 physical activity, and obesity: a systematic review. *International Journal of*
589 *Environmental Research and Public Health*, 18(1), 97.
- 590 32. Del Valle, D. M., Kim-Schulze, S., Huang, H.-H., Beckmann, N. D., Nirenberg, S., Wang,
591 B., . . . Gnjjatic, S. (2020). An inflammatory cytokine signature predicts COVID-19
592 severity and survival. *Nature Medicine*, 26(10), 1636-1643.
- 593 33. DePhillipo, N. N., Chahla, J., Busler, M., & LaPrade, R. F. (2021). Mobile phone gps data
594 and prevalence of covid-19 infections: Quantifying parameters of social distancing in the
595 us. *Archives of Bone and Joint Surgery*, 9(2), 217.

- 596 34. DeSantis, A., DiezRoux, A., Hajat, A., Aiello, A., Golden, S., Jenny, N., . . . Shea, S. (2012).
597 Associations of salivary cortisol levels with inflammatory markers: the Multi-Ethnic
598 Study of Atherosclerosis. *Psychoneuroendocrinology*, *37*(7), 1009-1018.
- 599 35. Dhar, D., & Mohanty, A. (2020). Gut microbiota and Covid-19- possible link and
600 implications. *Virus Research*, *285*, 198018.
- 601 36. Domènech-Montoliu, Salvador, Maria Rosario Pac-Sa, Paula Vidal-Utrillas, Marta Latorre-
602 Poveda, Alba Del Rio-González, Sara Ferrando-Rubert, Gema Ferrer-Abad, Manuel
603 Sánchez-Urbano, Laura Aparisi-Esteve, and Gema Badenes-Marques. 2021. "Mass
604 gathering events and COVID-19 transmission in Borriana (Spain): A retrospective cohort
605 study." *PloS one* *16* (8): e0256747.
- 606 37. Domingo, J. L., & Rovira, J. (2020). Effects of air pollutants on the transmission and severity
607 of respiratory viral infections. *Environmental research*, *187*, 109650.
- 608 38. Donati Zeppa, S., Agostini, D., Piccoli, G., Stocchi, V., & Sestili, P. (2020). Gut Microbiota
609 Status in COVID-19: An Unrecognized Player? *Frontiers in Cellular and Infection
610 Microbiology*, *10*(742).
- 611 39. Donovan, G. H., Butry, D. T., Michael, Y. L., Prestemon, J. P., Liebhold, A. M., Gatziolis,
612 D., & Mao, M. Y. (2013). The Relationship Between Trees and Human Health: Evidence
613 from the Spread of the Emerald Ash Borer. *American journal of preventive medicine*,
614 *44*(2), 139-145.
- 615 40. Dyer, O. (2020). Covid-19: US testing ramps up as early response draws harsh criticism. In:
616 British Medical Journal Publishing Group.
- 617 41. Ekkel, E. Dinand, and Sjerp de Vries. 2017. "Nearby green space and human health:
618 Evaluating accessibility metrics." *Landscape and Urban Planning* *157*: 214-220.
- 619 42. Esri. (2021). *USA Parks*. Retrieved from:
620 <https://www.arcgis.com/home/item.html?id=578968f975774d3fab79fe56c8c90941>
- 621 43. Fernandez, D. M., Clemente, J. C., & Giannarelli, C. (2018). Physical Activity, Immune
622 System, and the Microbiome in Cardiovascular Disease. *Frontiers in physiology*, *9*(763).
- 623 44. Geng, D., Innes, J., Wu, W., & Wang, G. (2021). Impacts of COVID-19 pandemic on urban
624 park visitation: a global analysis. *Journal of Forestry Research*, *32*(2), 553-567.
- 625 45. Ghimire, R., Ferreira, S., Green, G. T., Poudyal, N. C., Cordell, H. K., & Thapa, J. R. (2017).
626 Green space and adult obesity in the United States. *Ecological Economics*, *136*, 201-212.
- 627 46. Gidlow, C. J., Randall, J., Gillman, J., Smith, G. R., & Jones, M. V. (2016). Natural
628 environments and chronic stress measured by hair cortisol. *Landscape and Urban
629 Planning*, *148*, 61-67.
- 630 47. Giriya, A., Shankar, E. M., & Larsson, M. (2020). Could SARS-CoV-2-induced
631 hyperinflammation magnify the severity of coronavirus disease (CoViD-19) leading to
632 acute respiratory distress syndrome? *Frontiers in Immunology*, *11*, 1206.
- 633 48. Glencross, D. A., Ho, T.-R., Camiña, N., Hawrylowicz, C. M., & Pfeffer, P. E. (2020). Air
634 pollution and its effects on the immune system. *Free Radical Biology and Medicine*, *151*,
635 56-68.
- 636 49. Gorelick, N., Hancher, M., Dixon, M., Ilyushchenko, S., Thau, D., & Moore, R. (2017).
637 Google Earth Engine: Planetary-scale geospatial analysis for everyone. *Remote sensing of
638 Environment*, *202*, 18-27.
- 639 50. Gouin, J.-P., Glaser, R., Malarkey, W. B., Beversdorf, D., & Kiecolt-Glaser, J. (2012).
640 Chronic stress, daily stressors, and circulating inflammatory markers. *Health Psychology*,
641 *31*(2), 264.

- 642 51. Grahn, Patrik, and Ulrika A. Stigsdotter. 2003. "Landscape planning and stress." *Urban*
643 *Forestry & Urban Greening* 2 (1): 1-18.
- 644 52. Grönroos, M., Parajuli, A., Laitinen, O. H., Roslund, M. I., Vari, H. K., Hyöty, H., . . .
645 Sinkkonen, A. (2019). Short-term direct contact with soil and plant materials leads to an
646 immediate increase in diversity of skin microbiota. *Microbiologyopen*, 8(3), e00645.
647 doi:10.1002/mbo3.645
- 648 53. Halpern, N., & Tan, K. (2020). United states resource availability for COVID-19. Society of
649 Critical Care Medicine. *Updated May, 12*.
- 650 54. Hu, M., Roberts, J. D., Azevedo, G. P., & Milner, D. (2021). The role of built and social
651 environmental factors in Covid-19 transmission: A look at America's capital city.
652 *Sustainable Cities and Society*, 65, 102580.
- 653 55. Huang, Q., Wu, X., Zheng, X., Luo, S., Xu, S., & Weng, J. (2020). Targeting inflammation
654 and cytokine storm in COVID-19. *Pharmacological Research*, 159, 105051.
- 655 56. Hussain, A., Mahawar, K., Xia, Z., Yang, W., & El-Hasani, S. (2020). Obesity and mortality
656 of COVID-19. Meta-analysis. *Obesity research & clinical practice*, 14(4), 295-300.
- 657 57. Jaafari, S., Shabani, A. A., Moeinaddini, M., Daneshkar, A., & Sakieh, Y. (2020). Applying
658 landscape metrics and structural equation modeling to predict the effect of urban green
659 space on air pollution and respiratory mortality in Tehran. *Environmental Monitoring and*
660 *Assessment*, 192(7), 412-412.
- 661 58. Jia, P., Cao, X., Yang, H., Dai, S., He, P., Huang, G., . . . Wang, Y. (2020). Green space
662 access in the neighbourhood and childhood obesity. *Obesity Reviews*.
- 663 59. Jiang, B. (2014). Establishing dose-response curves for the impact of urban forests on
664 recovery from acute stress and landscape preference. University of Illinois at Urbana-
665 Champaign.
- 666 60. Jiang, B., Chang, C.-Y., & Sullivan, W. C. (2014). A dose of nature: Tree cover, stress
667 reduction, and gender differences. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 132, 26-36.
- 668 61. Jiang, B., Shen, K., Sullivan, W. C., Yang, Y., Liu, X., & Lu, Y. (2021). A natural
669 experiment reveals impacts of built environment on suicide rate: Developing an
670 environmental theory of suicide. *Science of the total environment*, 776, 145750.
- 671 62. Jiang, B., Yang, Y., Chen, L., Liu, X., Wu, X., Chen, B., . . . Lu, Y. (2021). Green spaces,
672 especially forest, linked to lower SARS-CoV-2 infection rates: A one-year nationwide
673 study. *medRxiv*.
- 674 63. Johnson, Thomas F, Lisbeth A Hordley, Matthew P Greenwell, and Luke C Evans. 2020.
675 "Effect of park use and landscape structure on COVID-19 transmission rates." *MedRxiv*:
676 2020.10. 20.20215731.
- 677 64. Kim, Gunwoo, and Patrick A Miller. 2019. "The impact of green infrastructure on human
678 health and well-being: The example of the Huckleberry Trail and the Heritage
679 Community Park and Natural Area in Blacksburg, Virginia." *Sustainable Cities and*
680 *Society* 48: 101562.
- 681 65. Kim, T., Song, B., Cho, K. S., & Lee, I.-S. (2020). Therapeutic potential of volatile terpenes
682 and terpenoids from forests for inflammatory diseases. *International journal of molecular*
683 *sciences*, 21(6), 2187.
- 684 66. Klang, E., Kassim, G., Soffer, S., Freeman, R., Levin, M. A., & Reich, D. L. (2020). Severe
685 obesity as an independent risk factor for COVID-19 mortality in hospitalized patients
686 younger than 50. *Obesity*, 28(9), 1595-1599.

- 687 67. Klompmaker, J. O., Hart, J. E., Holland, I., Sabath, M. B., Wu, X., Laden, F., . . . James, P.
688 (2021). County-level exposures to greenness and associations with COVID-19 incidence
689 and mortality in the United States. *Environmental Research*, *199*, 111331.
- 690 68. Kolak, M., Lin, Q., Halpern, D., Paykin, S., Martinez-Cardoso, A., & Li, X. (2021). The US
691 Covid Atlas. Retrieved from <https://www.uscovidatlas.org>
- 692 69. Kong, X., Zheng, K., Tang, M., Kong, F., Zhou, J., Diao, L., . . . Dong, Y. (2020). Prevalence
693 and factors associated with depression and anxiety of hospitalized patients with COVID-
694 19. *medRxiv*.
- 695 70. Konstantinoudis, G., Padellini, T., Bennett, J., Davies, B., Ezzati, M., & Blangiardo, M.
696 (2021). Long-term exposure to air-pollution and COVID-19 mortality in England: A
697 hierarchical spatial analysis. *Environment international*, *146*, 106316.
- 698 71. Krauss, R. M., Winston, M., Fletcher, B. J., & Grundy, S. M. (1998). Obesity: impact on
699 cardiovascular disease. *Circulation*, *98*(14), 1472-1476.
- 700 72. Kuo, M. (2015). How might contact with nature promote human health? Promising
701 mechanisms and a possible central pathway. *Frontiers in psychology*, *6*, 1093.
- 702 73. Lee, J., Park, B. J., Tsunetsugu, Y., Ohira, T., Kagawa, T., & Miyazaki, Y. (2011). Effect of
703 forest bathing on physiological and psychological responses in young Japanese male
704 subjects. *Public health*, *125*(2), 93-100.
- 705 74. Lee, W., Kim, H., Choi, H. M., Heo, S., Fong, K. C., Yang, J., . . . Bell, M. L. (2021). Urban
706 environments and COVID-19 in three Eastern states of the United States. *Science of the
707 total environment*, *779*, 146334.
- 708 75. Li, Q. (2010). Effect of forest bathing trips on human immune function. *Environmental
709 health and preventive medicine*, *15*(1), 9-17.
- 710 76. Li, Q., Morimoto, K., Kobayashi, M., Inagaki, H., Katsumata, M., Hirata, Y., . . . Miyazaki,
711 Y. (2008). A forest bathing trip increases human natural killer activity and expression of
712 anti-cancer proteins in female subjects. *J Biol Regul Homeost Agents*, *22*(1), 45-55.
- 713 77. Li, Q., Morimoto, K., Nakadai, A., Inagaki, H., Katsumata, M., Shimizu, T., . . . Miyazaki,
714 Y. (2007). Forest bathing enhances human natural killer activity and expression of anti-
715 cancer proteins. *International journal of immunopathology and pharmacology*, *20*, 3-8.
- 716 78. Liang, D., Shi, L., Zhao, J., Liu, P., Sarnat, J. A., Gao, S., . . . Chang, H. H. (2020). Urban
717 Air Pollution May Enhance COVID-19 Case-Fatality and Mortality Rates in the United
718 States. *The Innovation*, *1*(3), 100047.
- 719 79. Lu, Y., Chen, L., Liu, X., Yang, Y., Sullivan, W. C., Xu, W., . . . Jiang, B. (2021). Green
720 spaces mitigate racial disparity of health: A higher ratio of green spaces indicates a lower
721 racial disparity in SARS-CoV-2 infection rates in the USA. *Environment international*,
722 *152*, 106465.
- 723 80. Lu, Y., Sarkar, C., & Xiao, Y. (2018). The effect of street-level greenery on walking
724 behavior: Evidence from Hong Kong. *Social Science & Medicine*, *208*, 41-49.
- 725 81. Lu, Y., Zhao, J., Wu, X., & Lo, S. M. (2021). Escaping to nature during a pandemic: A
726 natural experiment in Asian cities during the COVID-19 pandemic with big social media
727 data. *Science of the total environment*, *777*, 146092.
- 728 82. Ma, Jianfang, Haihong Zhu, Peng Li, Chengcheng Liu, Feng Li, Zhenwei Luo, Meihui
729 Zhang, and Lin Li. 2022. "Spatial Patterns of the Spread of COVID-19 in Singapore and
730 the Influencing Factors." *ISPRS International Journal of Geo-Information* *11* (3): 152.

- 731 83. Ma, Y., Zhao, Y., Liu, J., He, X., Wang, B., Fu, S., . . . Luo, B. (2020). Effects of
732 temperature variation and humidity on the death of COVID-19 in Wuhan, China. *Science*
733 *of the total environment*, 724, 138226.
- 734 84. Mancus, G., Cimino, A. N., Hasan, M. Z., Campbell, J. C., Winch, P. J., Sharps, P., . . .
735 Stockman, J. K. (2020). Residential Greenness Positively Associated with the Cortisol to
736 DHEA Ratio among Urban-Dwelling African American Women at Risk for HIV. *Journal*
737 *of Urban Health*, 1-9.
- 738 85. Mandel, M., Harari, G., Gurevich, M., & Achiron, A. (2020). Cytokine prediction of
739 mortality in COVID19 patients. *Cytokine*, 134, 155190.
- 740 86. Market, M., Angka, L., Martel, A. B., Bastin, D., Olanubi, O., Tennakoon, G., . . . Auer, R.
741 C. (2020). Flattening the COVID-19 Curve With Natural Killer Cell Based
742 Immunotherapies. *Frontiers in Immunology*, 11(1512).
- 743 87. Martelletti, L., & Martelletti, P. (2020). Air Pollution and the Novel Covid-19 Disease: a
744 Putative Disease Risk Factor. *SN comprehensive clinical medicine*, 1-5.
- 745 88. Medicine, J. H. U. (2021). COVID-19 United States Deaths by County. Retrieved from
746 <https://coronavirus.jhu.edu/us-map>
- 747 89. Miller, I. F., Becker, A. D., Grenfell, B. T., & Metcalf, C. J. E. (2020). Disease and
748 healthcare burden of COVID-19 in the United States. *Nature Medicine*, 26(8), 1212-
749 1217.
- 750 90. Morey, J. N., Boggero, I. A., Scott, A. B., & Segerstrom, S. C. (2015). Current Directions in
751 Stress and Human Immune Function. *Current opinion in psychology*, 5, 13-17.
- 752 91. Nielsen, Thomas Sick, and Karsten Bruun Hansen. 2007. "Do green areas affect health?
753 Results from a Danish survey on the use of green areas and health indicators." *Health &*
754 *Place* 13 (4): 839-850.
- 755 92. Nieman, D. C., & Wentz, L. M. (2019). The compelling link between physical activity and
756 the body's defense system. *Journal of sport and health science*, 8(3), 201-217.
- 757 93. NLCD. (2016). National Land Cover Database Class Legend and Description Retrieved from
758 [https://www.mrlc.gov/data/legends/national-land-cover-database-class-legend-and-](https://www.mrlc.gov/data/legends/national-land-cover-database-class-legend-and-description)
759 [description](https://www.mrlc.gov/data/legends/national-land-cover-database-class-legend-and-description)
- 760 94. Nowak, D. J., Hirabayashi, S., Bodine, A., & Greenfield, E. (2014). Tree and forest effects
761 on air quality and human health in the United States. *Environmental pollution*, 193, 119-
762 129.
- 763 95. Nowak, D. J., Hirabayashi, S., Doyle, M., McGovern, M., & Pasher, J. (2018). Air pollution
764 removal by urban forests in Canada and its effect on air quality and human health. *Urban*
765 *Forestry & Urban Greening*, 29, 40-48.
- 766 96. Osman, M., Faridi, R. M., Sligl, W., Shabani-Rad, M.-T., Dharmani-Khan, P., Parker, A., . . .
767 Cohen Tervaert, J. W. (2020). Impaired natural killer cell counts and cytolytic activity in
768 patients with severe COVID-19. *Blood advances*, 4(20), 5035-5039.
- 769 97. Pan, Jiayu, Ronita Bardhan, and Ying Jin. 2021. "Spatial distributive effects of public green
770 space and COVID-19 infection in London." *Urban Forestry & Urban Greening* 62:
771 127182.
- 772 98. Parajuli, A. (2019). The effect of living environment and environmental exposure on the
773 composition of microbial community in soil, on human skin and in the gut.
- 774 99. Parajuli, A., Grönroos, M., Siter, N., Puhakka, R., Vari, H. K., Roslund, M. I., . . . Hyöty, H.
775 (2018). Urbanization reduces transfer of diverse environmental microbiota indoors.
776 *Frontiers in microbiology*, 9, 84.

- 777 100. Parajuli, A., Hui, N., Puhakka, R., Oikarinen, S., Grönroos, M., Selonen, V. A., . . . Vari, H.
778 K. (2020). Yard vegetation is associated with gut microbiota composition. *Science of the*
779 *total environment*, 713, 136707.
- 780 101. Paranjpe, I., Russak, A., De Freitas, J. K., Lala, A., Miotto, R., Vaid, A., . . . Meyer, D.
781 (2020). Clinical characteristics of hospitalized Covid-19 patients in New York City.
782 *medRxiv*.
- 783 102. Peng, Zhe, AL Pineda Rojas, E Kropff, W Bahnfleth, Giorgio Buonanno, SJ Dancer, Jarek
784 Kurnitski, Yuguo Li, Marcel GLC Loomans, and Linsey C Marr. 2022. "Practical
785 indicators for risk of airborne transmission in shared indoor environments and their
786 application to covid-19 outbreaks." *Environmental science & technology*.
- 787 103. Perone, G. (2021). The determinants of COVID-19 case fatality rate (CFR) in the Italian
788 regions and provinces: An analysis of environmental, demographic, and healthcare
789 factors. *Science of the total environment*, 755, 142523.
- 790 104. Potempa, L. A., Rajab, I. M., Hart, P. C., Bordon, J., & Fernandez-Botran, R. (2020).
791 Insights into the use of C-reactive protein as a diagnostic index of disease severity in
792 COVID-19 infections. *The American journal of tropical medicine and hygiene*, 103(2),
793 561.
- 794 105. Pretty, J., Peacock, J., Sellens, M., & Griffin, M. (2005). The mental and physical health
795 outcomes of green exercise. *International Journal of Environmental Health Research*,
796 15(5), 319-337.
- 797 106. Prevention., C. f. D. C. a. (2022). Interactive Atlas of Heart Disease and Stroke. Retrieved
798 from <http://nccd.cdc.gov/DHDSPAtlas>.
- 799 107. Qin, C., Zhou, L., Hu, Z., Zhang, S., Yang, S., Tao, Y., . . . Tian, D. S. (2020).
800 Dysregulation of Immune Response in Patients With Coronavirus 2019 (COVID-19) in
801 Wuhan, China. *Clin Infect Dis*, 71(15), 762-768.
- 802 108. Qiu, Y., Zuo, S., Yu, Z., Zhan, Y., & Ren, Y. (2021). Discovering the effects of integrated
803 green space air regulation on human health: A bibliometric and meta-analysis. *Ecological*
804 *Indicators*, 132, 108292.
- 805 109. Reid, C. E., Clougherty, J. E., Shmool, J. L., & Kubzansky, L. D. (2017). Is all urban green
806 space the same? A comparison of the health benefits of trees and grass in New York City.
807 *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 14(11), 1411.
- 808 110. Ribeiro, A. I., Tavares, C., Guttentag, A., & Barros, H. (2019). Association between
809 neighbourhood green space and biological markers in school-aged children. Findings
810 from the Generation XXI birth cohort. *Environment international*, 132, 105070.
- 811 111. Richardson, E. A., Mitchell, R., Hartig, T., De Vries, S., Astell-Burt, T., & Frumkin, H.
812 (2012). Green cities and health: a question of scale? *J Epidemiol Community Health*,
813 66(2), 160-165.
- 814 112. Roslund, M. I., Puhakka, R., Grönroos, M., Nurminen, N., Oikarinen, S., Gazali, A. M., . . .
815 Vari, H. K. (2020). Biodiversity intervention enhances immune regulation and health-
816 associated commensal microbiota among daycare children. *Science Advances*, 6(42),
817 eaba2578.
- 818 113. Roviello, V., & Roviello, G. N. (2021). Less COVID-19 deaths in southern and insular Italy
819 explained by forest bathing, Mediterranean environment, and antiviral plant volatile
820 organic compounds. *Environmental Chemistry Letters*, 1-11.

- 821 114. Roviello, V., Gilhen-Baker, M., Vicidomini, C., & Roviello, G. N. (2021). Forest-bathing
822 and physical activity as weapons against COVID-19: a review. *Environmental Chemistry*
823 *Letters*, 1-10.
- 824 115. Russette, Helen, Jon Graham, Zachary Holden, Erin O Semmens, Elizabeth Williams, and
825 Erin L Landguth. 2021. "Greenspace exposure and COVID-19 mortality in the United
826 States: January–July 2020." *Environmental research* 198: 111195.
- 827 116. Shen, Y.-S., & Lung, S.-C. C. (2017). Mediation pathways and effects of green structures
828 on respiratory mortality via reducing air pollution. *Scientific reports*, 7(1), 1-9.
- 829 117. Smith, M Kyle S, Izak PJ Smit, Louise K Swemmer, Mohlamatsane M Mokhatla, Stefanie
830 Freitag, Dirk J Roux, and Luthando Dziba. 2021. "Sustainability of protected areas:
831 Vulnerabilities and opportunities as revealed by COVID-19 in a national park
832 management agency." *Biological Conservation* 255: 108985.
- 833 118. Soga, M., Evans, M. J., Tsuchiya, K., & Fukano, Y. (2021). A room with a green view: the
834 importance of nearby nature for mental health during the COVID-19 pandemic.
835 *Ecological Applications*, 31(2), e2248.
- 836 119. Sorichetta, A., Hornby, G. M., Stevens, F. R., Gaughan, A. E., Linard, C., & Tatem, A. J.
837 (2015). High-resolution gridded population datasets for Latin America and the Caribbean
838 in 2010, 2015, and 2020. *Scientific data*, 2(1), 1-12.
- 839 120. Spotswood, E. N., Benjamin, M., Stoneburner, L., Wheeler, M. M., Beller, E. E., Balk,
840 D., . . . McDonald, R. I. (2021). Nature inequity and higher COVID-19 case rates in less-
841 green neighbourhoods in the United States. *Nature Sustainability*, 4(12), 1092-1098.
- 842 121. Steptoe, A., Hamer, M., & Chida, Y. (2007). The effects of acute psychological stress on
843 circulating inflammatory factors in humans: a review and meta-analysis. *Brain, behavior,*
844 *and immunity*, 21(7), 901-912.
- 845 122. Team, R. C. (2015). R: A language and environment for statistical computing. Vienna,
846 Austria; 2014. In.
- 847 123. Tsao, T.-M., Tsai, M.-J., Hwang, J.-S., Cheng, W.-F., Wu, C.-F., Chou, C.-C. K., & Su, T.-
848 C. (2018). Health effects of a forest environment on natural killer cells in humans: an
849 observational pilot study. *Oncotarget*, 9(23), 16501-16511.
- 850 124. Ugolini, F., Massetti, L., Calaza-Martínez, P., Cariñanos, P., Dobbs, C., Ostoic, S. K., . . .
851 Šaulienė, I. (2020). Effects of the COVID-19 pandemic on the use and perceptions of
852 urban green space: an international exploratory study. *Urban Forestry & Urban*
853 *Greening*, 126888.
- 854 125. Ulrich, R. S., Simons, R. F., Losito, B. D., Fiorito, E., Miles, M. A., & Zelson, M. (1991).
855 Stress recovery during exposure to natural and urban environments. *Journal of*
856 *environmental psychology*, 11(3), 201-230.
- 857 126. Van Ingen, T., Brown, K. A., Buchan, S. A., Akingbola, S., Daneman, N., & Smith, B. T.
858 (2021). Neighbourhood-level risk factors of COVID-19 incidence and mortality.
859 *medRxiv*.
- 860 127. Venter, Z. S., Barton, D. N., Gundersen, V., Figari, H., & Nowell, M. S. (2021). Back to
861 nature: Norwegians sustain increased recreational use of urban green space months after
862 the COVID-19 outbreak. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 214, 104175.
- 863 128. Venter, Z., Barton, D., Gundersen, V., Figari, H., & Nowell, M. (2020). Urban nature in a
864 time of crisis: recreational use of green space increases during the COVID-19 outbreak in
865 Oslo, Norway. *Environmental Research Letters*.

- 866 129. Viglione, G. (2020). How many people has the coronavirus killed? Retrieved from
867 <https://www.nature.com/articles/d41586-020-02497-w>
- 868 130. Villeneuve, P. J., Jerrett, M., G. Su, J., Burnett, R. T., Chen, H., Wheeler, A. J., &
869 Goldberg, M. S. (2012). A cohort study relating urban green space with mortality in
870 Ontario, Canada. *Environmental Research*, 115, 51-58.
- 871 131. Volenec, Z. M., Abraham, J. O., Becker, A. D., & Dobson, A. P. (2021). Public parks and
872 the pandemic: How park usage has been affected by COVID-19 policies. *PloS one*, 16(5),
873 e0251799.
- 874 132. VoPham, T., Weaver, M. D., Hart, J. E., Ton, M., White, E., & Newcomb, P. A. (2020).
875 Effect of social distancing on COVID-19 incidence and mortality in the US. *medRxiv*.
- 876 133. Wang, Jingjing, Xueying Wu, Ruoyu Wang, Dongsheng He, Dongying Li, Linchuan Yang,
877 Yiyang Yang, and Yi Lu. 2021. "Review of associations between built environment
878 characteristics and severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 infection risk."
879 *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* 18 (14): 7561.
- 880 134. Wang, M., Hu, C., Zhao, Q., Feng, R., Wang, Q., Cai, H., . . . Guo, C. (2021). Acute
881 psychological impact on COVID-19 patients in Hubei: a multicenter observational study.
882 *Translational psychiatry*, 11(1), 1-9.
- 883 135. Yang, B.-Y., Hu, L.-W., Jalaludin, B., Knibbs, L. D., Markevych, I., Heinrich, J., . . . Dong,
884 G.-H. (2020). Association Between Residential Greenness, Cardiometabolic Disorders,
885 and Cardiovascular Disease Among Adults in China. *JAMA Network Open*, 3(9),
886 e2017507-e2017507.
- 887 136. Yang, L., Jin, S., Danielson, P., Homer, C., Gass, L., Bender, S. M., . . . Fry, J. (2018). A
888 new generation of the United States National Land Cover Database: Requirements,
889 research priorities, design, and implementation strategies. *ISPRS Journal of*
890 *Photogrammetry and Remote Sensing*, 146, 108-123.
- 891 137. Yang, Y., & Diez-Roux, V. A. (2012). Walking Distance by Trip Purpose and Population
892 Subgroups. *American journal of preventive medicine*, 43(1), 11-19.
- 893 138. Yeoh, Y. K., Zuo, T., Lui, G. C.-Y., Zhang, F., Liu, Q., Li, A. Y., . . . Fung, K. S. (2021).
894 Gut microbiota composition reflects disease severity and dysfunctional immune
895 responses in patients with COVID-19. *Gut*, 70(4), 698-706.
- 896 139. Yokoyama, W. M. (2005). Natural killer cell immune responses. *Immunol Res*, 32(1-3),
897 317-325.
- 898 140. Zuo, T., Zhang, F., Lui, G. C. Y., Yeoh, Y. K., Li, A. Y. L., Zhan, H., . . . Ng, S. C. (2020).
899 Alterations in Gut Microbiota of Patients With COVID-19 During Time of
900 Hospitalization. *Gastroenterology*, 159(3), 944-955.e948.