

1

2

3

4 Factors influencing the effectiveness of nature-based Interventions (NBIs) aimed at  
5 improving mental health and wellbeing: Protocol of an umbrella review

6

7 Topaz Shrestha<sup>1</sup> ¶\*, Cheryl Voon Yi Chi<sup>1</sup> ¶, Marica Cassarino<sup>1,2</sup> ¶, Sarah Foley<sup>1</sup> ¶, and Zelda  
8 Di Blasi<sup>1</sup> ¶.

9

10

11

12

13 <sup>1</sup> School of Applied Psychology, University College Cork, Cork, Ireland

14 <sup>2</sup> Environmental Research Institute, University College Cork, Cork, Ireland

15

16

17 \* Topaz Shrestha

18 E-mail: 115441352@umail.ucc.ie

19

20 ¶ These authors contributed equally to this work.

## 21 **Abstract**

22       Several systematic reviews support the use of nature-based interventions (NBIs) as a  
23 mechanism of enhancing mental health and wellbeing. However, the available evidence for  
24 the effectiveness of these interventions is fragmentary and mixed. The heterogeneity of  
25 existing evidence and significant fragmentation of knowledge within the field make it  
26 difficult to draw firm conclusions regarding the effectiveness of NBIs. The aim of this mixed  
27 method umbrella review is to synthesise evidence on the effectiveness of nature-based  
28 interventions through a summative review of existing published systematic reviews and meta-  
29 analyses. A systematic search in PsycINFO, PubMed, Greenfile, Web of Science, Embase,  
30 Scopus, Academic Search Complete (EBSCO), Environment Complete (EBSCO), Cochrane  
31 Library, CINAHL, Health Policy Reference Center and Google Scholar will be performed  
32 from inception to May 2022. The search strategy will aim to find published systematic  
33 reviews of nature-based interventions (NBIs) where improving health and wellbeing is an  
34 explicit goal. This is a mixed method review and systematic reviews with both quantitative  
35 and qualitative data synthesis will be considered. Two authors will independently perform the  
36 literature search, record screening, data extraction, and quality assessment of each included  
37 systematic review and meta-analysis. The individual qualitative and quantitative syntheses  
38 will be conducted in parallel and then combined in an overarching narrative synthesis. The  
39 quantitative evidence will be used to assess the strength and direction of effect of nature-  
40 based interventions on mental health and wellbeing outcomes. Evidence drawn from  
41 qualitative studies will be analysed and synthesised to understand the various pathways to  
42 engagement, process of involvement and experiential factors which may mediate experiences.  
43 The risk of bias of the systematic reviews will be assessed using a 16-item Assessment of  
44 Multiple Systematic Reviews 2 (AMSTAR2) checklist. This review is registered on  
45 PROSPERO (CRD42022329179).

## 46 **Introduction**

47 Connecting with nature is an important element of many people’s lives and a substantial  
48 body of research supports nature’s restorative influence on our mental health and wellbeing  
49 (1-3). More recently, the benefits of nature–based interactions are becoming increasingly  
50 acknowledged across disciplines from Positive Psychology and Urban Planning to Medicine  
51 and Public Health. This research demonstrates a consistent positive trend between  
52 engagement with nature and improved physical and mental health outcomes (4, 5). Therefore,  
53 it is of significant concern that urbanisation, environmental degradation and the challenges of  
54 modern living are leading to a reduction in engagement with the natural environment. A  
55 presiding narrative in developed nations is that modern-urbanized lifestyles have diminished  
56 healthy human relationships with natural environments resulting in a multitude of health  
57 issues and reduced wellbeing (4, 6). Many of us seem to be both physically and  
58 psychologically disconnected from nature and this has implications, for both the wellbeing of  
59 the environment and individuals (7). While long-acknowledged as practices across cultures,  
60 nature–based therapeutic interventions have grown substantially in number and type in recent  
61 years (1, 8). Western science is beginning to realise what indigenous cultures have always  
62 known – engagement with the natural environment can support, enhance and restore our  
63 health and wellbeing (5).

64  
65 There is growing interdisciplinary interest in the potential for ‘nature–based interventions’  
66 (NBIs) to assist in promoting and restoring mental health and wellbeing. Nature–based  
67 interventions can facilitate change through a relatively structured promotion of nature–based  
68 experiences. Although a generally accepted definition is lacking, NBIs can be defined as  
69 intentional programmes, activities or strategies that aim to engage people in nature–based  
70 experiences with the specific objective of enhancing health and wellbeing (9, 10). NBIs are

71 deliberate therapeutic processes that recognize nature–human kinship (11). These  
72 interventions can be broadly categorized into those that change the environment in which  
73 people live, learn, work, recreate and heal (for example, the provision of parks in cities or  
74 gardens in hospitals) and those that alter behaviour (for example, engaging people through  
75 organized programmes such as wilderness therapy) (9). Significant variety exists in practice,  
76 from sea swimming and forest-bathing to expedition-based wilderness programmes (5, 12,  
77 13). These interventions can be centred around green space, blue space or an amalgamation  
78 of both. Greenspace is habitually comprised of vegetation and associated with natural  
79 elements. There are two possible interpretations of greenspace. Firstly, the interpretation that  
80 greenspace refers to areas of vegetation in a landscape, such as forests and wilderness areas,  
81 gardens and backyards, street trees and parks, farmland, geological formations, coastal areas  
82 and food crops. This interpretation encompasses the overarching concept of nature, or natural  
83 areas in general. The second interpretation focuses on urban vegetation, including parks,  
84 gardens, urban forests and urban farms – usually relating to a vegetated variation of open  
85 space (12). Blue space can be defined as all visible, outdoor, natural surface waters with  
86 potential for the promotion of human health and wellbeing e.g. rivers, lakes, coasts, sea, etc.  
87 (24). Research has highlighted the specific potential for freshwater, coastal and marine  
88 ecosystems to promote and restore mental health and wellbeing (24). It is evident that there is  
89 considerable overlap between blue and green spaces, however, both green and blue spaces  
90 offer very different sensory experiences and are utilised in different ways with different  
91 health outcomes and benefits that are often overlooked and remain poorly understood. Many  
92 existing reviews of NBIs define nature exposure using metrics such as the amount of green  
93 or blue space present in any given area (e.g. number of parks with access to greenery, lakes  
94 etc.) (1, 14, 15). An inherent limitation of these metrics is that they assume exposure revolves  
95 around geographic proximity, without considering whether nearby nature was actually

96 utilised, of good quality, or inaccessible (e.g. near a busy road crossing) (16, 17). This has  
97 resulted in a call for researchers to broaden their definition of nature exposure to also  
98 investigate different types of natural settings and their characteristics (1, 14, 18). To address  
99 this, the current review focused on NBIs where ‘nature-based’ encompasses what Bloomfield  
100 (3) refers to as “time spent outside in places defined as rich in natural beauty and/or  
101 biodiversity” (p. 82). This includes both biodiverse, unregulated, wild nature lacking human  
102 involvement (3) and publicly accessible, managed urban green spaces or blues paces ( e.g.  
103 parks, gardens/allotments and man-made lakes/reservoirs) (19). Understanding what NBIs are  
104 available and the various factors influencing the effectiveness of these interventions is  
105 necessary if we are to gain a clear picture of the current state of the research.

106

107 Globally, the growing interest in the restorative potential of NBIs, within healthcare,  
108 seems to be driven by a global mental health crisis and rise of non-communicable diseases (1,  
109 20). The issue of mental health and wellbeing is particularly relevant, with rising suicide rates  
110 and lack of funding for services highlighted internationally (21). Moreover, evidence shows  
111 that there was a significant gravitation towards natural environments during the COVID-19  
112 pandemic and that this increased engagement with nature may have buffered the negative  
113 mental and behavioural impacts of recurrent lockdowns (22). Public health administrations  
114 are beginning to acknowledge the significance of proximity to, and engagement with, natural  
115 environments ‘as an upstream health promotion intervention for populations’ (23). The  
116 recognition of the value of nature and place as a determinant of mental health and wellbeing  
117 presents a crucial opportunity to struggling healthcare systems seeking new and cost-effective  
118 services (24).

119

120 Several comparative studies, randomized controlled trials, observational studies, and  
121 subsequently systematic reviews and meta-analyses, have been conducted to investigate the  
122 efficacy of nature-based interventions (NBIs) on mental health and wellbeing outcomes (2,  
123 10, 25, 26). Considering that nearly 80 systematic reviews are published each day, and given  
124 the extensive number of systematic reviews assessing NBIs, it is crucial to synthesize the  
125 findings of these reviews to consolidate the evidence and better inform science and practice  
126 (9, 30, 31). Systematic reviews conducted with optimal methodological rigor can provide  
127 high-quality evidence informing further research and the development of effective policies.  
128 With the increased number of systematic reviews of NBIs available, a logical and necessary  
129 next step is to conduct an umbrella review of existing systematic reviews, allowing the  
130 findings of separate reviews to be compared and contrasted, thereby providing decision  
131 makers in healthcare with an overall synthesis of the body of information available (27, 29).  
132 This is a rapidly growing field and the recent interest in nature-based solutions (NBS) and  
133 proliferation of ‘nature-based interventions’ is surpassing the policy and knowledge base.  
134 This has resulted in a general lack of understanding regarding the practical implementation of  
135 NBIs within public planning and policy and the factors influencing the effectiveness of these  
136 interventions (9, 28). This can only limit the leveraging of natural environments to improve  
137 health and wellbeing outcomes, potentially resulting in ineffective and ill-targeted  
138 investment decisions. A higher order or meta-level synthesis is required to make sense of this  
139 evidence. This will provide a broader picture of the types of interventions available, the  
140 specific mental health and wellbeing outcomes they impact upon, the drivers and barriers to  
141 using NBIs, and the methodological quality of the existing research.

142

143 There is significant fragmentation of knowledge within the field and previous studies  
144 highlight evidence gaps concerning effectiveness of interventions (1, 9, 24). The universal

145 application of NBIs to different groups, and the diversity of nature itself has led to significant  
146 heterogeneity of intervention designs (9). There is a need for a comprehensive overview of  
147 existing evidence regarding the effectiveness of interventions, particularly given the plurality  
148 of interventions, delivery approaches, and patient groups for which they are being used (16).  
149 Moreover, vague intervention descriptions and an absence of theoretical frameworks guiding  
150 NBI design has limited the critical appraisal of these interventions (27). A deficit of  
151 comprehensive conceptual and theoretical articulation exists specifically for nature’s  
152 contribution or role in improving wellbeing outcomes, leaving NBIs without an explicit  
153 theory of change for their application as a clinical practice. This umbrella review aims to  
154 explore the drivers influencing the effectiveness of NBIs subsequently, providing insight into  
155 the theoretical underpinnings of the nature–wellbeing relationship. The decision to include  
156 both quantitative and qualitative evidence, in this mixed method review, was based on the  
157 commitment to provide an extensive and accurate summary of the existing evidence of NBIs.  
158 It is expected that the quantitative evidence will be used to assess the strength and direction  
159 of effect of NBIs on mental health and wellbeing outcomes, thereby providing particular  
160 insight into the effectiveness of interventions. Alternatively, the qualitative studies will be  
161 used to provide a more nuanced perspective of the factors influencing the effectiveness of  
162 nature–based interventions. It is anticipated that the qualitative analysis will capture the  
163 holistic experience of nature–based interventions, for participants involved, and help to  
164 understand the experience and meaning of participation in nature–based interventions,  
165 pathways to engagement, process of involvement, and factors which may mediate their  
166 experiences. The synthesis of both quantitative and qualitative findings will provide a  
167 comprehensive overview of current evidence and will help to identify gaps in knowledge,  
168 potential quality needs and directions for future research. Further knowledge and

169 communication about the effectiveness of interventions is likely to be a valuable precursor  
170 for their use (9).

171

172 The overall objective of this mixed method umbrella review is to synthesize the evidence  
173 on the effectiveness of nature-based interventions, aimed at enhancing mental health and  
174 wellbeing, through a summative review of existing published systematic reviews and meta-  
175 analyses. Accordingly, our specific objectives were to identify: 1) what nature-based  
176 interventions (NBIs) are available, 2) what specific mental health and wellbeing outcomes  
177 might they achieve for whom, 3) what are the drivers influencing the effectiveness of NBIs,  
178 4) what are the barriers/limitations influencing the extent to which these interventions  
179 succeed and 5) recommendations for future research, policymaking and practice.

180

## 181 **Methods and analysis**

### 182 **Protocol registration**

183 The umbrella review will adhere to the predesigned protocol that has been developed  
184 based on the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis Protocols  
185 (PRISMA-P) guidelines (32) (S1 Table). This project has been registered with the  
186 International Prospective Register of Systematic Reviews (PROSPERO) (registration number  
187 CRD42022329179).

188

### 189 **Data sources and search strategies**

190 We will conduct a comprehensive umbrella review of all available systematic reviews on  
191 the topic using the methodology described in previous reports (31). We will adopt the Joanna  
192 Briggs Institute (JBI) methodology for umbrella reviews, which provide further guidelines

193 specific for synthesizing the findings from multiple reviews (29). Umbrella reviews are  
194 defined as systematic overviews of systematic reviews and/or meta-analyses, that can be used  
195 to provide a summary of the evidence from multiple research syntheses (33). The systematic  
196 overview resulting from the conduct of an umbrella review is useful to explore whether the  
197 evidence base around a topic is consistent or contradictory, and to examine the reasons for the  
198 findings (29).

199

200 A systematic search of the following twelve databases will be completed: PsycINFO,  
201 PubMed, Greenfile, Web of Science, Embase, Scopus, Academic Search Complete (EBSCO),  
202 Environment Complete (EBSCO), Cochrane Library, CINAHL, Health Policy Reference  
203 Center and Google Scholar. No date limit will be placed on the search until. The search  
204 strategy will aim to find published systematic reviews of nature-based interventions (NBIs)  
205 where improving health and wellbeing is an explicit goal. Our search strategy will be  
206 comprised of three elements. Search terms relating to (i) nature-based interventions/green or  
207 blue spaces and (ii) mental health and wellbeing outcomes will be combined with (iii)  
208 systematic review OR meta-analysis and searched for in title, abstract, and keywords. We  
209 will search databases using a set of search query including keywords and Boolean operators  
210 to retrieve the relevant literature as per the objective of this review. The search strategy  
211 consists of keywords related to the natural environment, mental health, and systematic  
212 review. The selection of search terms was based on existing theories and research defining  
213 nature-based interventions as well as initial preliminary searches for the umbrella review.  
214 Each search term will be applied twice—initially by itself, then paired with the term  
215 “systematic review” to reduce the number of returns on some of the searches, with additional  
216 searches using hyphenated variants where appropriate. The search terms for nature-based  
217 interventions/green and blue spaces and health/wellbeing outcomes will be combined with

218 the Boolean AND and within each group the Boolean OR will be used. Aiming for as  
219 complete coverage as possible, the search may be widened, beyond the protocol, by scanning  
220 identified articles' bibliographies and "snowballing." The detailed search strategy, which has  
221 been developed by the full research team in consultation with a Faculty Librarian, is available  
222 in S2 Table. The results of the search will be fully reported in the final study and presented in  
223 a flowchart following the PRISMA guidelines.

224

225 Our inclusion criteria is based on the Cochrane criteria for what constitutes a systematic  
226 review as well as the AMSTAR 2 tool for the quality assessment of systematic reviews, in  
227 order to incorporate only high quality systematic reviews (34). The AMSTAR 2 domains will  
228 be used as indicators of eligibility for our study. All systematic reviews and meta-analyses  
229 that investigate the impact of nature-based interventions (NBIs) on mental health and  
230 wellbeing will be included. The search will be limited to peer-reviewed studies published in  
231 English and results will be filtered, by study type, to include solely systematic reviews. This  
232 umbrella review will include systematic reviews, with or without meta-analysis, which  
233 review any type of nature-based intervention (NBI). Unpublished grey literature will not be  
234 included. Inclusion criteria will be restricted to studies with: defined search terms, inclusion  
235 criteria and quality assessment.

236

237 The above mentioned criteria – defined search terms, inclusion criteria, quality assessment  
238 – are fundamental components of a high quality systematic review (1). Systematic reviews  
239 which examine both randomized controlled trials (RCT) and non-randomized controlled trials  
240 and observational studies (which do not have a control group) will be included in this  
241 overview. The rationale behind this decision is that the field largely consists of non-  
242 randomized trials, and excluding systematic reviews which include non-RCT studies may

243 result in an incomplete synthesis of findings (35). Finally, this is a mixed method review and  
244 systematic reviews with both quantitative and qualitative data synthesis will be considered.

245

246 EndNote 20 software (Thomson Reuters, Toronto, Ontario, Canada) will be used to  
247 remove duplicates and screen literature. Two researchers (TS and CVYC) will independently  
248 review titles, abstracts and full-text of eligible articles. Interrater reliability (IRR) will be  
249 reported at all three stages of screening and data extraction to ensure consistency and clarity  
250 (36). Any disagreements will be resolved by discussion or by the involvement of a third  
251 reviewer (ZDB) until consensus is reached. When titles and abstracts are insufficient to  
252 determine whether to include or exclude reviews, we will download full texts to determine  
253 eligibility. Based on the umbrella review methodology, when numerous systematic reviews  
254 provide duplicated datasets for the same comparison, the systematic review with the greatest  
255 number of studies providing study-level effect estimates will be retained for further analysis  
256 (37). The following are the detailed inclusion criteria:

257

## 258 **Participants**

259 There are no age or gender restrictions for participants. Children, adolescents and adults  
260 with or without mental and/or physical health problems. The routes to participation (e.g.  
261 motivations and barriers) will be considered throughout analysis to further understand how  
262 nature-based interventions could influence health and wellbeing of participants and in what  
263 contexts. It is anticipated that the qualitative evidence will provide insight into the routes to  
264 participation in nature-based interventions.

265

## 266 **Interventions**

267 In this umbrella review we will include any systematic review focused on real nature–  
268 based interventions (NBIs)/exposure to green and blue spaces. Real nature is defined as a  
269 large range of green landscapes in the indoor and outdoor environment. This includes green  
270 spaces (e.g. botanic garden, or tree canopy), indoor nature (e.g. potted plants, green walls, or  
271 flowers), or real nature views (e.g. window views) (38). For the purpose of this study, NBIs  
272 are defined as programmes, activities or strategies that aim to engage people in nature–based  
273 experiences with the specific intention of improving health and wellbeing outcomes (9).

274

275 Nature–based Interventions can be broadly categorised into (i) those that change the  
276 environment in which people live, work, learn, heal or recreate (for example, the provision of  
277 gardens in schools and hospitals or parks in cities) and (ii) those that change behaviour (for  
278 example, encouraging people to engage with nature through organized programmes or other  
279 activities, green prescriptions, forest bathing and green exercise) (9). Many existing reviews  
280 of NBIs define nature exposure using metrics such as the amount or of greenspace (1, 14, 15).  
281 An inherent limitation of these metrics is that they assume exposure revolves around  
282 geographic proximity, without considering whether nearby nature was actually utilised, of  
283 good quality, or inaccessible (e.g. near a busy road crossing) (16, 17). In order to adopt a  
284 comprehensive definition of nature exposure which considers different types of natural  
285 settings and their characteristics (1, 14, 18), the current review focused on NBIs where  
286 ‘nature-based’ encompasses what Bloomfield (3) refers to as “time spent outside in places  
287 defined as rich in natural beauty and/or biodiversity” (p. 82). This included both biodiverse,  
288 unregulated, wild nature lacking human involvement (3) and publicly accessible, managed  
289 urban greenspaces ( e.g. parks and gardens/allotments) (19). All included studies must  
290 encompass NBIs which integrate explicit and purposeful nature contact, incorporating blue or  
291 green space through direct nature exposure to an authentic natural setting (e.g., walking in

292 nature/ being in a park etc.). We will exclude interventions that examined the effects of  
293 artificial nature, virtual/simulated nature, animal therapy, animal interventions, fish tanks, or  
294 nature sounds. The justification of this revolves around our focus on ‘real nature’ (38) and  
295 our conception of NBIs where ‘nature-based’ encompasses what Bloomfield (3) refers to as  
296 “time spent outside in places defined as rich in natural beauty and/or biodiversity” (p. 82).

297

## 298 **Outcomes**

299 All systematic reviews which assess the mental health and wellbeing impacts experienced  
300 by individuals following active participation in a nature-based interventions will be included.  
301 Mental health, as defined by the World Health Organization (WHO), is “a state of wellbeing  
302 in which the individual realizes his or her own abilities, can cope with the normal stresses of  
303 life, can work productively and fruitfully, and is able to make a contribution to his or her  
304 community” (39). Wellbeing encompasses positive emotions and mood, the absence of  
305 negative emotions, satisfaction with life, fulfilment, and positive functioning (40) (41). All  
306 included interventions must have the promotion of mental health and wellbeing outcomes as  
307 an explicit goal (i.e., programmes that solely aim to connect people with nature without the  
308 objective of also delivering health and wellbeing benefits will be excluded).

309 Quantitative research

310 Includable primary outcomes will include any recognised measure of mental health and  
311 wellbeing assessed using self-reported and objective measures. Outcomes can be defined as  
312 the psychological effects of nature-based interventions related to mental health and wellbeing  
313 (e.g. life satisfaction, quality of life, vitality, stress, anxiety, exhaustion, burnout and  
314 depression). The outcomes can be categorized as: (i) mental health indices, (ii) restoration  
315 and recovery, (iii) executive functioning/cognitive ability, (iv) work and life satisfaction, and  
316 (v) psychophysiological indicators of psychological wellbeing (e.g., cortisol levels).

317 Qualitative research

318 Includable qualitative study's findings will be in the form of themes, concepts and metaphors  
319 relating to the experience, meaning and perceived impacts of nature-based interventions and  
320 any factors that help or hinder their success e.g. direct quotes, and author analysis of  
321 qualitative findings.

322

## 323 **Data collection and verification**

324 We will develop a standardized form for extracting data from each systematic review. The  
325 ad hoc data extraction sheet will be developed and piloted prior to data collection and will be  
326 used to ensure a controlled analysis and data retrieval. Two authors will collect the variables  
327 listed below and cross-check the accuracy of the data. Extracted data will include:

328

- 329 ☐ Author(s), country of origin, year of publication.
- 330 ☐ Number of articles included
- 331 ☐ Search Terms
- 332 ☐ Type/Definition of intervention reviewed
- 333 ☐ Definition of mental health/ wellbeing outcome(s) reviewed
- 334 ☐ Quality Assessment
- 335 ☐ Quantitative findings – main findings and effect sizes
- 336 ☐ Qualitative findings – themes, concepts and metaphors relating to the experience,  
337 meaning and perceived impacts of nature-based interventions and any factors  
338 influencing effectiveness of NBIs e.g. direct quotes, and author analysis of qualitative  
339 findings

340

## 341 **Critical appraisal**

342 Methodological quality of the included systematic reviews will be assessed by two  
343 independent researchers using the Assessment of Multiple Systematic Reviews 2  
344 (AMSTAR2, an updated version of AMSTAR) tool, a 16-item checklist used to critically rate  
345 the quality of an individual systematic review as high, moderate, low and critically low based  
346 on the total score of the AMSTAR2 (34). The AMSTAR 2 tool has been updated to facilitate  
347 a more detailed assessment of systematic reviews that include both randomised and non-  
348 randomised studies of healthcare interventions. The risks of bias will be analysed in relation  
349 to the particular design, conduct, and synthesis of the systematic review. Risk of bias  
350 assessment will assess methods of randomization and intervention allocation. In the case of  
351 disagreements, a discussion will be conducted with a third reviewer to reach a consensus. In  
352 the case of insufficient or additional information, the study authors will be contacted.

353

## 354 **Data analysis**

355 The strategy for data synthesis will consist of firstly extracting the quantitative and  
356 qualitative data from each review, which will be entered into the screening and data  
357 extraction table. Findings will be structured around a synthesis of the characteristics of  
358 included studies, the classification of interventions used, and the types of outcomes reported.  
359 A narrative synthesis will be used to present the potential factors influencing the  
360 effectiveness of NBIs. The umbrella review format will enable a unique form of evidence  
361 synthesis whereby the researchers can stand back and gain a comprehensive summary of the  
362 breadth of research on NBIs. The results will be reported descriptively in the text, and in  
363 tables. Where possible visual techniques will be used to present the quantitative synthesis in  
364 an accessible manner, for example for a narrative approach table (indicating factors such as  
365 study quality, strength and direction/s of results) will be used to visually represent the trends

366 in the results. Similarly, visual techniques will be used to illustrate the nature of the  
367 qualitative data and synthesis e.g. graphs, tables, flow charts etc.

368

369 Quantitative studies will be used to appraise the strength and direction of evidence of  
370 effect. However, we anticipate a limited scope for meta-analysis due to the likelihood that  
371 many individual studies will be included in more than one review, resulting in inaccurate  
372 statistical power and a risk for misleading results. Additionally the heterogeneity of  
373 intervention type given the plurality of disciplinary origins of these interventions, delivery  
374 approaches, and patient groups for which they are being used will further impede the  
375 potential for meta-analysis. As our review considers one type of “intervention” (nature–  
376 based), however of varying composition (e.g. ecotherapy, green infrastructure, or blue  
377 environments), and its effect on several different health outcomes, we consider the challenge  
378 of dissecting each included review, extracting the results from each individual study included,  
379 and the subsequent amalgamation of the results, to be of insubstantial value given the  
380 heterogeneity in the outcome measures and the unreliable accuracy of a pooled effect  
381 estimate (42). Where the quantitative study design or outcomes are so heterogeneous as to  
382 preclude meta-analysis a narrative synthesis approach will be used (43).

383

384 Qualitative studies will be used to provide a more nuanced perspective of the factors  
385 influencing the effectiveness of nature–based interventions. It is anticipated that the  
386 qualitative analysis will capture the holistic experience of nature–based interventions, for  
387 participants involved, and help to understand the experience and meaning of participation in  
388 nature–based interventions, pathways to engagement, process of involvement and factors  
389 which may mediate their experiences. Exact methods of synthesis for the included qualitative  
390 research will depend on the nature of the evidence identified. The synthesis will be sensitive

391 to factors which may affect the impact on wellbeing, such as the demographics of  
392 participants, the context of the activities, and the implementation and specifics of the  
393 interventions.

394

### 395 **Overarching synthesis**

396 The individual qualitative and quantitative syntheses will be conducted in parallel and  
397 then combined in an overarching narrative synthesis (43). Narrative synthesis supports the  
398 contextualised integration of diverse forms of evidence to better understand the topic of the  
399 review. This approach is particularly useful in reviews of complex intervention effectiveness  
400 such as NBIs. If data permits, the analysis will be sensitive to impacts on different groups of  
401 people (e.g. age, those with mental ill health, those recovering from specific conditions or  
402 addictions). The qualitative evidence will also be used to explore those factors which help or  
403 hinder the successful development, implementation and sustainability of the particular form  
404 of NBI for different groups of people. The combined narrative synthesis will be used to  
405 develop a conceptual model (44). The model will be grounded in formulated on the  
406 synthesised results of both the qualitative and quantitative evidence.

407

## 408 **Discussion**

409 By incorporating evidence from published systematic reviews and meta-analyses, we will  
410 provide a comprehensive overview of the factors influencing effectiveness of nature-based  
411 interventions (NBIs) which are aimed at enhancing mental health and wellbeing.

412

413 The recent and rapid proliferation of ‘nature-based interventions’ (NBIs), is surpassing  
414 the policy and knowledge base. This results in challenges in understanding and evaluating

415 their tangible impact on the publics' mental health and wellbeing (5, 12, 24). There is a need  
416 for further evidence regarding the effectiveness of interventions, particularly given the  
417 plurality of interventions, delivery approaches, and patient groups for which they are being  
418 used. While multiple interventions exist, all proposing engagement with nature as means of  
419 enhancing mental health and wellbeing, there is a dearth of guidance as to what NBIs are  
420 available and the drivers influencing their effectiveness (9). This can only impede the  
421 leveraging of natural environments to improve mental health and wellbeing outcomes,  
422 potentially leading to ineffective and ill-targeted investment decisions. We postulate that this  
423 knowledge gap exists due to the diversity of intervention designs and therapeutic approaches.  
424 Moreover, the lack of financial prioritization allocated to cost-effective NBIs impedes the  
425 potential for such interventions to ameliorate health and wellbeing on a larger scale. With the  
426 rising prevalence of substandard mental health, and the established link between poor mental  
427 health and a myriad of other noncommunicable diseases, the general population bears a  
428 significant socioeconomic burden (45, 46). We recognise that NBIs are part of a complex  
429 system influenced by social, cultural, and political factors. Subsequently, the pathways  
430 between health and nature are unequivocally linked to health inequalities (1, 16, 47, 48). It is  
431 often the most underprivileged, i.e. people with lower socioeconomic status, that stand to  
432 benefit from access to and engagement with high quality nature (12, 16, 49). Nature-based  
433 interventions could be a cost and time-effective mechanism of enhancing wellbeing at a  
434 population level. However, a concerted and systematic effort is required to understand what  
435 factors influence the effectiveness of interventions (16). Furthermore, there is evidence that  
436 policy makers and those interested in cost-effective health improvement programmes around  
437 the world are increasingly considering supporting the promotion of 'nature-based solutions'  
438 (NBS) (1, 50, 51). It is therefore timely that the evidence of effectiveness of nature-based  
439 interventions is reviewed in a systematic and rigorous manner.

440

441 With the increase in the amount of systematic reviews conducted, a logical next step to  
442 provide decision makers in healthcare with the evidence they require has been the conduct of  
443 reviews of existing systematic reviews. An umbrella review was chosen to provide an  
444 overview of the evidence from multiple research syntheses through an overall examination of  
445 the body of systematic and analytic reviews. This form of evidence synthesis supports  
446 comparative analysis. This method allows us to collectively evaluate the state of the evidence  
447 in broad categories of research, which may make more sense in clinical practice rather than  
448 evaluating [them] one by one (27). The umbrella reviews' most distinguishing feature is that  
449 only the highest level of evidence, namely other systematic reviews and meta-analyses, are  
450 considered for inclusion (29, 31). By synthesising high-level evidence of the factors  
451 influencing the effectiveness of NBIs we will gain a comprehensive overview of the strengths  
452 and weaknesses of such interventions. Thus, supporting the implementation of interventions  
453 which are more targeted and subsequently more effective. Whilst there appears to be a  
454 considerable body of literature which has sought to understand the potential mental health  
455 and wellbeing benefits of nature-based interventions, no previous umbrella review, which  
456 has addressed the factors influencing the effectiveness of interventions, was identified.  
457 Several linked reviews were identified but these were either limited in scope (e.g. focusing  
458 specifically on nature's role in psychotherapy (4), assessing exclusively built/urban natural  
459 environments (1, 52, 53), or don't focus explicitly on nature-based interventions e.g.  
460 exploring exposure to natural environments in general rather than intentional NBIs (2).  
461 Moreover, to the best of our knowledge, this is the first mixed method umbrella review that  
462 summarizes the factors influencing the effectiveness of nature-based interventions (NBIs)  
463 thus providing particular insight into the practical application of NBIs within public planning  
464 and policy. The focus on mental health and wellbeing outcomes in wider contexts will

465 provide a better understanding of potential approaches and pathways which are needed to  
466 gain an evidenced-based knowledge of the benefits of NBIs.

467

468 The empirical evidence relating to our research questions, both quantitative and qualitative,  
469 will be identified, appraised and synthesized. The quantitative evidence will be used to assess  
470 the strength and direction of effect of nature-based interventions on mental health and  
471 wellbeing outcomes. Evidence drawn from qualitative studies will be used to understand the  
472 various pathways to engagement, process of involvement and factors which may mediate  
473 experiences. The aim of this umbrella review is not to repeat the searches, assessment of  
474 study eligibility, assessment of risk of bias or meta-analyses from the included reviews, but  
475 rather to provide an overall picture of findings for the specific phenomenon of NBIs.

476 Compared with a systematic review or meta-analysis limited to one treatment comparison, an  
477 umbrella review can provide a broader picture of many treatments or intervention types (29).

478 This is more effective to inform guidelines and clinical practice when all of the management  
479 options must be considered. This umbrella review intends to provide a resource for decision-  
480 makers, in government, non-government organisations, and other interested parties, by  
481 outlining potential interventions, the specific mental health and wellbeing outcomes they  
482 might achieve for whom, the drivers influencing the extent to which these interventions  
483 succeed, and target beneficiaries. It is expected that the findings of this review will provide a  
484 roadmap for decision-makers and support the integration of NBIs into public planning and  
485 policy.

486

487 There are some limitations inherent to our umbrella review. It is anticipated that the  
488 included systematic reviews will vary in their heterogeneity and quality. This is likely to be  
489 due to the diversity of intervention type, disciplinary origins of these interventions, delivery

490 approaches, and patient groups for which they are being used (9, 16). In addition,  
491 heterogeneity is expected to be linked to the breadth of the aims and uses of the interventions  
492 that will be potentially includable in the review, which will range from exposure to  
493 greenspace through to specific therapeutic interventions. As a result, we anticipate a limited  
494 scope for meta-analysis. We will use the AMSTAR 2 checklist to assess the risk of bias of  
495 each included study and address the concerns around the quality of included reviews.

496

497 Despite anticipated limitations, we believe that the result of this umbrella review will  
498 benefit practitioners, landscape and urban design professionals, policy-makers and the  
499 general public. A synthesis of the evidence including the methodological quality of the  
500 research, will also be of great importance to researchers in this field.

501

## 502 **Supporting Information**

503 **S1 Table. PRISMA-P Checklist.**

504 (DOC)

505 **S2 Table. Search Strategy.**

506 (DOCX)

507

## 508 **Acknowledgments**

509

## 510 **Authors' contributions**

511 **Conceptualisation:** Topaz Shrestha, Zelda Di Blasi, Sarah Foley, Marica Cassarino.

512 **Data curation:** Topaz Shrestha, Zelda Di Blasi, Sarah Foley, Marica Cassarino, Cheryl Voon  
513 Yi Chi.

514 **Formal analysis:** Topaz Shrestha, Zelda Di Blasi, Sarah Foley, Marica Cassarino.

515 **Investigation:** Topaz Shrestha, Zelda Di Blasi, Sarah Foley, Marica Cassarino.

516 **Methodology:** Topaz Shrestha, Zelda Di Blasi, Sarah Foley, Marica Cassarino and Cheryl  
517 Voon Yi Chi.

518 **Supervision:** Zelda Di Blasi, Sarah Foley, Marica Cassarino.

519 **Writing – original draft:** Topaz Shrestha.

520 **Writing – review & editing:** Topaz Shrestha, Zelda Di Blasi, Sarah Foley, Marica Cassarino

521 and Cheryl Voon Yi Chi.

## 522 References

- 523 1. Van den Bosch M, Sang ÅO. Urban natural environments as nature-based solutions  
524 for improved public health—A systematic review of reviews. *Environmental research*.  
525 2017;158:373-84.
- 526 2. Hossain MM, Sultana A, Ma P, Fan Q, Sharma R, Purohit N, et al. Effects of natural  
527 environment on mental health: an umbrella review of systematic reviews and meta-analyses.  
528 2020.
- 529 3. Bloomfield D. What makes nature-based interventions for mental health successful?  
530 *BJPsych international*. 2017;14(4):82-5.
- 531 4. Harper NJ, Fernee CR, Gabrielsen LE. Nature’s role in outdoor therapies: an umbrella  
532 review. *International journal of environmental research and public health*. 2021;18(10):5117.
- 533 5. Capaldi CA, Passmore H-A, Nisbet EK, Zelenski JM, Dopko RL. Flourishing in  
534 nature: A review of the benefits of connecting with nature and its application as a wellbeing  
535 intervention. *International Journal of Wellbeing*. 2015;5(4).
- 536 6. Hartig T, Mitchell R, De Vries S, Frumkin H. Nature and health. *Annual review of*  
537 *public health*. 2014;35:207-28.
- 538 7. Annerstedt van den Bosch M, Depledge MH. Healthy people with nature in mind.  
539 *BMC Public Health*. 2015;15(1):1-7.
- 540 8. Moeller C, King N, Burr V, Gibbs GR, Gomersall T. Nature-based interventions in  
541 institutional and organisational settings: A scoping review. *International Journal of*  
542 *Environmental Health Research*. 2018;28(3):293-305.
- 543 9. Shanahan DF, Astell-Burt T, Barber EA, Brymer E, Cox DT, Dean J, et al. Nature-  
544 based interventions for improving health and wellbeing: The purpose, the people and the  
545 outcomes. *Sports*. 2019;7(6):141.
- 546 10. Gritzka S, Macintyre TE, Dörfel D, Baker-Blanc JL, Calogiuri G. The effects of  
547 workplace nature-based interventions on the mental health and well-being of employees: A  
548 systematic review. *Frontiers in Psychiatry*. 2020;11.
- 549 11. Pretty J, Barton J. Nature-based interventions and mind–body interventions: Saving  
550 public health costs whilst increasing life satisfaction and happiness. *International Journal of*  
551 *Environmental Research and Public Health*. 2020;17(21):7769.
- 552 12. Van den Berg M, Wendel-Vos W, van Poppel M, Kemper H, van Mechelen W, Maas  
553 J. Health benefits of green spaces in the living environment: A systematic review of  
554 epidemiological studies. *Urban forestry & urban greening*. 2015;14(4):806-16.
- 555 13. Hunter RF, Cleland C, Cleary A, Droomers M, Wheeler BW, Sinnott D, et al.  
556 Environmental, health, wellbeing, social and equity effects of urban green space  
557 interventions: A meta-narrative evidence synthesis. *Environment International*.  
558 2019;130:104923-.
- 559 14. Houlden V, Weich S, Porto de Albuquerque J, Jarvis S, Rees K. The relationship  
560 between greenspace and the mental wellbeing of adults: A systematic review. *PloS one*.  
561 2018;13(9):e0203000.
- 562 15. Lachowycz K, Jones AP. Towards a better understanding of the relationship between  
563 greenspace and health: Development of a theoretical framework. *Landscape and urban*  
564 *planning*. 2013;118:62-9.
- 565 16. Wilkie S, Davinson N. Prevalence and effectiveness of nature-based interventions to  
566 impact adult health-related behaviours and outcomes: A scoping review. *Landscape and*  
567 *Urban Planning*. 2021;214:104166.
- 568 17. Holland I, DeVille NV, Browning MH, Buehler RM, Hart JE, Hipp JA, et al.  
569 Measuring nature contact: a narrative review. *International Journal of Environmental*  
570 *Research and Public Health*. 2021;18(8):4092.

- 571 18. Keniger LE, Gaston KJ, Irvine KN, Fuller RA. What are the benefits of interacting  
572 with nature? *International journal of environmental research and public health*.  
573 2013;10(3):913-35.
- 574 19. Taylor L, Hochuli DF. Defining greenspace: Multiple uses across multiple disciplines.  
575 *Landscape and urban planning*. 2017;158:25-38.
- 576 20. Bragg R, Atkins G. A review of nature-based interventions for mental health care.  
577 *Natural England Commissioned Reports*. 2016;204:18.
- 578 21. Pirkis J, John A, Shin S, DelPozo-Banos M, Arya V, Analuisa-Aguilar P, et al.  
579 Suicide trends in the early months of the COVID-19 pandemic: an interrupted time-series  
580 analysis of preliminary data from 21 countries. *The Lancet Psychiatry*. 2021;8(7):579-88.
- 581 22. Labib SM, Browning MHEM, Rigolon A, Helbich M, James P. Nature's contributions  
582 in coping with a pandemic in the 21st century: A narrative review of evidence during  
583 COVID-19. *Science of The Total Environment*. 2022;833:155095.
- 584 23. Maller C, Townsend M, Pryor A, Brown P, St Leger L. Healthy nature healthy  
585 people: 'Contact with nature' as an upstream health promotion intervention for populations.  
586 *Health Promotion International*. 2006;21(1):45-54.
- 587 24. Britton E, Kindermann G, Domegan C, Carlin C. Blue care: a systematic review of  
588 blue space interventions for health and wellbeing. *Health promotion international*.  
589 2020;35(1):50-69.
- 590 25. Coventry PA, Brown JE, Pervin J, Brabyn S, Pateman R, Breedvelt J, et al. Nature-  
591 based outdoor activities for mental and physical health: Systematic review and meta-analysis.  
592 *SSM - Population Health*. 2021;16.
- 593 26. Djernis D, Lerstrup I, Poulsen D, Stigsdotter U, Dahlgard J, O'Toole M. A  
594 Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Nature-Based Mindfulness: Effects of Moving  
595 Mindfulness Training into an Outdoor Natural Setting. *International Journal of*  
596 *Environmental Research and Public Health*. 2019;16(17).
- 597 27. Papatheodorou S. Umbrella reviews: what they are and why we need them. *European*  
598 *journal of epidemiology*. 2019;34(6):543-6.
- 599 28. van den Bogerd N, Coosje Dijkstra S, Koole SL, Seidell JC, de Vries R, Maas J.  
600 Nature in the indoor and outdoor study environment and secondary and tertiary education  
601 students' well-being, academic outcomes, and possible mediating pathways: A systematic  
602 review with recommendations for science and practice. *Health Place*. 2020;66:102403.
- 603 29. Aromataris E, Fernandez R, Godfrey CM, Holly C, Khalil H, Tungpunkom P.  
604 Summarizing systematic reviews: methodological development, conduct and reporting of an  
605 umbrella review approach. *JBIC Evidence Implementation*. 2015;13(3):132-40.
- 606 30. Hoffmann F, Allers K, Rombey T, Helbach J, Hoffmann A, Mathes T, et al. Nearly 80  
607 systematic reviews were published each day: Observational study on trends in epidemiology  
608 and reporting over the years 2000-2019. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology*. 2021;138:1-11.
- 609 31. Smith V, Devane D, Begley CM, Clarke M. Methodology in conducting a systematic  
610 review of systematic reviews of healthcare interventions. *BMC medical research*  
611 *methodology*. 2011;11(1):1-6.
- 612 32. Moher D, Shamseer L, Clarke M, Ghersi D, Liberati A, Petticrew M, et al. Preferred  
613 reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015  
614 statement. *Systematic reviews*. 2015;4(1):1-9.
- 615 33. Biondi-Zoccai G. Umbrella reviews. Evidence synthesis with overviews of reviews  
616 and meta-epidemiologic studies Cham, Switzerland: Springer International. 2016.
- 617 34. Shea BJ, Reeves BC, Wells G, Thuku M, Hamel C, Moran J, et al. AMSTAR 2: a  
618 critical appraisal tool for systematic reviews that include randomised or non-randomised  
619 studies of healthcare interventions, or both. *bmj*. 2017;358.

- 620 35. Corazon SS, Sidenius U, Poulsen DV, Gramkow MC, Stigsdotter UK. Psycho-  
621 physiological stress recovery in outdoor nature-based interventions: A systematic review of  
622 the past eight years of research. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public*  
623 *Health*. 2019;16(10).
- 624 36. Belur J, Tompson L, Thornton A, Simon M. Interrater reliability in systematic review  
625 methodology: exploring variation in coder decision-making. *Sociological methods &*  
626 *research*. 2021;50(2):837-65.
- 627 37. Ioannidis JP. Integration of evidence from multiple meta-analyses: a primer on  
628 umbrella reviews, treatment networks and multiple treatments meta-analyses. *Cmaj*.  
629 2009;181(8):488-93.
- 630 38. van den Bogerd N, Dijkstra SC, Koole SL, Seidell JC, de Vries R, Maas J. Nature in  
631 the indoor and outdoor study environment and secondary and tertiary education students'  
632 well-being, academic outcomes, and possible mediating pathways: A systematic review with  
633 recommendations for science and practice. *Health & Place*. 2020;66:102403.
- 634 39. Organization WH. Global status report on noncommunicable diseases 2014: World  
635 Health Organization; 2014.
- 636 40. Diener E. Subjective well-being: The science of happiness and a proposal for a  
637 national index. *American psychologist*. 2000;55(1):34.
- 638 41. La Placa V, McNaught A, Knight A. Discourse on wellbeing in research and practice.  
639 *International Journal of Wellbeing*. 2013;3(1).
- 640 42. Brok J, Thorlund K, Glud C, Wetterslev J. Trial sequential analysis reveals  
641 insufficient information size and potentially false positive results in many meta-analyses.  
642 *Journal of clinical epidemiology*. 2008;61(8):763-9.
- 643 43. Popay J, Roberts H, Sowden A, Petticrew M, Arai L, Rodgers M, et al. Guidance on  
644 the conduct of narrative synthesis in systematic reviews. A product from the ESRC methods  
645 programme Version. 2006;1(1):b92.
- 646 44. Anderson LM, Petticrew M, Rehfuss E, Armstrong R, Ueffing E, Baker P, et al.  
647 Using logic models to capture complexity in systematic reviews. *Research synthesis methods*.  
648 2011;2(1):33-42.
- 649 45. Stein DJ, Benjet C, Gureje O, Lund C, Scott KM, Poznyak V, et al. Integrating mental  
650 health with other non-communicable diseases. *Bmj*. 2019;364.
- 651 46. Patel V, Chatterji S. Integrating mental health in care for noncommunicable diseases:  
652 an imperative for person-centered care. *Health Affairs*. 2015;34(9):1498-505.
- 653 47. Kruize H, van der Vliet N, Staatsen B, Bell R, Chiabai A, Muiños G, et al. Urban  
654 green space: creating a triple win for environmental sustainability, health, and health equity  
655 through behavior change. *International journal of environmental research and public health*.  
656 2019;16(22):4403.
- 657 48. Barton H, Grant M. A health map for the local human habitat. *Journal of the Royal*  
658 *Society for the Promotion of Health*. 2006;126(6):252-.
- 659 49. Twohig-Bennett C, Jones A. The health benefits of the great outdoors: A systematic  
660 review and meta-analysis of greenspace exposure and health outcomes. *Environmental*  
661 *research*. 2018;166:628-37.
- 662 50. Cohen-Shacham E, Walters G, Janzen C, Maginnis S. Nature-based solutions to  
663 address global societal challenges. IUCN: Gland, Switzerland. 2016;97:2016-36.
- 664 51. Dick J, Miller JD, Carruthers-Jones J, Dobel AJ, Carver S, Garbutt A, et al. How are  
665 nature based solutions contributing to priority societal challenges surrounding human well-  
666 being in the United Kingdom: a systematic map protocol. *Environmental Evidence*.  
667 2019;8(1):1-11.

- 668 52. Bird E, Ige J, Pilkington P, Pinto A, Petrokofsky C, Burgess-Allen J. Built and natural  
669 environment planning principles for promoting health: an umbrella review. BMC public  
670 health. 2018;18(1):1-13.
- 671 53. Núñez-González S, Delgado-Ron JA, Gault C, Lara-Vinueza A, Calle-Celi D, Porreca  
672 R, et al. Overview of “systematic reviews” of the built environment’s effects on mental  
673 health. Journal of Environmental and Public Health. 2020;2020.