

**Nature prescriptions: a scoping review with a nested meta-analysis**

**Population Wellbeing and Environment Research Lab (PowerLab), School of Population Health, University of New South Wales, Sydney, New South Wales, Australia:** Phi-Yen Nguyen, MPH; Dr Hania Rahimi-Ardabili, PhD; A/Prof Xiaoqi Feng, PhD

**School of Public Health and Preventive Medicine, Monash University, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia:** Phi-Yen Nguyen, MPH

**Centre for Health Informatics, Australian Institute of Health Innovation, Macquarie University, Sydney, New South Wales, Australia:** Dr Hania Rahimi-Ardabili, PhD

**Population Wellbeing and Environment Research Lab (PowerLab), School of Health and Society, Faculty of Arts, Social Sciences, and Humanities, University of Wollongong, Wollongong, New South Wales, Australia:** A/Prof Xiaoqi Feng, PhD; Prof Thomas Astell-Burt, PhD

Corresponding to: Xiaoqi Feng

Address: Room 322, Samuels Building, School of Population Health, UNSW, SYDNEY NSW 2052 AUSTRALIA

Contact: [xiaoqi.feng@unsw.edu.au](mailto:xiaoqi.feng@unsw.edu.au)

## Summary (367 words)

### Background

“Nature prescriptions” are gaining popularity as a form of social prescribing and in response to calls for sustainable healthcare. Our review and meta-analysis appraised evidence of effectiveness of nature prescriptions on various health outcomes. In doing so, we sought to determine the factors that are critical for the success of nature prescriptions, based on Social Cognitive Theory.

### Methods

This is a scoping review with a nested meta-analysis for a subset of outcomes. Five databases were searched up to July 25, 2021. Randomised and non-randomised controlled studies featuring a nature prescription (i.e. an instruction or organised programme, by a health or social provider, to promote spending time in nature) are included. All health outcomes are eligible, but only key pre-specified outcomes are qualified for meta-analysis. Two reviewers independently conducted all steps of study selection; one reviewer conducted data collection and risk of bias assessment. Summary data was extracted from published reports for analysis. Random-effect models for meta-analysis were conducted using Review Manager 5.4.1.

### Findings

We identified 86 unique studies (116 reports), of which 26 studies contributed data to meta-analysis. Compared to control, nature prescription programmes resulted in a greater reduction in systolic blood pressure (MD = -4.9mmHg [-9.6 to -0.1],  $I^2=65%$ ) and diastolic blood pressure (MD = -3.6mmHg [-7.4 to 0.1],  $I^2=67%$ ). They also had a moderate-to-large effect on depression scores (SMD=0.5 [0.2 to 0.8],  $I^2=79%$ ) and anxiety score (SMD=0.6 [0.1 to 1.2],  $I^2=90%$ ). Lastly, they resulted in a greater increase in daily step counts (MD = 900 steps [790-1010],  $I^2=0%$ ), but did not improve weekly time of moderate physical activities (MD = 25.9 minutes [-10.3 to 62.1],  $I^2=53%$ ). Most studies have moderate to high risk of bias, principally due to non-blinding nature of the interventions, small sample size and lack of analysis plan to rule out risks of bias.

### Interpretation

Nature prescription programmes may provide cardiometabolic and mental health benefits and increase physical activity. Effective nature prescription programmes can select from a range of natural settings, activities and might be implemented via social and community channels, besides health providers. The Social Cognition Theory is useful in designing future nature prescription programmes.

**Funding:** This work was supported by the Hort Frontiers Green Cities Fund, part of the Hort Frontiers strategic partnership initiative developed by Hort Innovation, with co-investment from the University of Wollongong (UOW) Faculty of Social Sciences, the UOW Global Challenges initiative and contributions from the Australian Government (project number #GC15005). T.A-B. was supported by a National Health and Medical Research Council Boosting Dementia Research Leader Fellowship (#1140317). X.F. was supported by a National Health and Medical Research Council Career Development Fellowship (#1148792).

## **Panel: Research in context**

### **Evidence before this study**

Extensive evidence indicates contact with nature is associated with social, mental and physical health. However, little evidence exists on the effectiveness of nature prescriptions, which involve a health provider (e.g. general practitioner) recommending a patient to spend a fixed amount of time a week in a natural setting (e.g. a park). Other studies have attempted to evaluate the benefits of food prescription or green prescription programmes, which do not necessarily involve nature exposure. Only one systematic review on nature prescriptions has been conducted to date, which is a qualitative review without meta-analysis. The review concluded that the evidence (studies up to June 2019) was too sparse to discern any clear evidence of health impacts. There was insufficient information to assess the risk of bias or quality of evidence in the review. Moreover, the review included only nature prescriptions dispensed in outpatient settings, which left out prescription programmes implemented by other institutions, such as welfare centres, social services, universities or workplaces.

### **Added value of this study**

Our review is the first to provide comprehensive appraisal including meta-analysis of the effectiveness of nature prescription programs on multiple health outcomes. The scoping review identified a range of promising nature-based interventions that were dispensed outside the clinic setting and did not self-label as a nature prescription, but would be effective as one. The nested meta-analyses on key outcomes demonstrated positive benefits on blood pressure, symptoms of depression and anxiety, and physical activity levels.

### **Implications of all the available evidence**

Our findings suggest that an effective nature prescription programme can select from a range of natural settings, activities and can be implemented via social and community channels, in addition to health providers. In addition, we also demonstrated that the Social Cognition Theory framework is useful in designing future nature prescription programmes.

**Word count:** 3,400 words (excluding Summary, Panel, Tables, Figures & References)

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Extensive evidence indicates contact with nature is associated with social, mental and physical health<sup>1-3</sup>. These potential benefits include favourable pregnancy outcomes<sup>4</sup> through to reduced risks of cardiometabolic<sup>5,6</sup> and neurodegenerative diseases<sup>7,8</sup> in older adults. While addressing the well-documented inequities in green space<sup>9</sup> are warranted, improving provision will be insufficient to ensure everyone benefits<sup>10</sup>.

Nature prescriptions have emerged as a potential solution to enable and empower people to spend more time in nature where that was not previously the case. Nature prescriptions are an adjunct to conventional healthcare, such as the educational and pharmaceutical treatment of non-communicable diseases. A nature prescription typically involves a health provider (e.g. general practitioner) recommending a patient to spend a fixed amount of time a week in a natural setting, such as a park. It is widely considered that the benefits of nature prescribing will reach far beyond health, such as increasing social connectedness<sup>11</sup> and pro-environmental behaviours<sup>12</sup>.

To our knowledge, only one systematic review has been conducted on nature prescription to date. This qualitative review by Kondo and colleagues identified eleven nature prescription studies published up to June 2019<sup>13</sup> and concluded that the evidence was too sparse to discern any clear evidence of health impacts. Another study adopted a survey approach to investigate the benefits of green space programmes for mental health<sup>14</sup>. From 2020 onwards, we noted a substantial upswing in interest and publication of new nature prescription studies. This raises the potential for meta-analysis and critical appraisal of the importance of personal/cognitive, behavioural and environmental factors to the success of these intervention programmes using Social Cognitive Theory (SCT)<sup>15</sup>.

Accordingly, the objective of this review is to identify evidence for effective nature prescriptions and to determine the factors which are critical for their success. We pose the following questions:

- (a) To what extent can nature prescriptions improve social, mental and physical health?
- (b) What are the design characteristics of nature prescriptions with demonstrated health benefits?
- (c) What are potential channels to dispense a nature prescription beside a clinic or hospital?

## 2. METHODS

Reporting of this review was guided by the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) guidelines<sup>16</sup>. This review was not registered *a priori*.

### 2.1. Search strategy

We searched the following databases for articles from inception up to July 25, 2021: MEDLINE via Ovid, Embase via Ovid, PsycINFO via Ovid, CINALH via EBSCO and CENTRAL via Cochrane Library. The search was supplemented by manual search of reference list from relevant systematic reviews. The search strategy is available in Supplementary file S1.

### 2.2. Study selection

Two reviewers (PN and HA) independently screened all titles and abstracts in duplicate and excluded studies that did not meet inclusion criteria (Table 1). Full texts of selected articles were reviewed by one reviewer (PN) and checked by a second reviewer (H-RA). Disagreement was resolved by discussion with senior reviewers (XF and TA-B). All stages of study screening were conducted using Covidence (Veritas Health Innovation, Australia). We excluded interventions with a dietary focus as these have been previously investigated<sup>17</sup>.

### **2.3 Data collection**

One reviewer (PN) extracted data using a standardised extraction form. Data extracted included characteristics of studies, participants, interventions and outcomes. Study characteristics included study design, sample size and location. Participant characteristics included social background, pre-existing medical conditions and age groups, as defined in the eligibility criteria. Interventions were characterised based on the nature setting where the intervention took place, types of activities undertaken by participants, whether the nature setting was indoor or outdoor, and the institutions who introduced the participants to the intervention ('referring institutions'). The referring institutions must have an established medical or social connection to the patients, such as treating hospitals, social services, welfare centres, etc. We recorded "None" if the participants were recruited through standard trial recruitment methods, such as mass emails, academic recruiters or public bulletins. We categorised the outcomes measured as physical, psychological/cognitive or behavioural outcomes. Biomarkers were recorded separately. We also recorded specific outcomes where a positive benefit was reported based on 95% confidence intervals or p-value <0.05 (if 95% confidence intervals were not available), and recorded whether the findings were based on within-group (pre- vs post-intervention) comparisons or between-group (intervention vs control group) comparisons.

We planned to conduct a nested systematic review and meta-analysis for the following outcomes: systolic blood pressure (SBP), diastolic blood pressure (DBP), depression, anxiety, step counts and time spent on physical activities. Therefore, for studies that reported these outcomes, we additionally recorded the means and standard deviations for both groups, either as changes from baseline or post-intervention measurements, whichever available. If not provided, standard deviations (SD) were calculated from standard errors or 95% confidence intervals of the mean<sup>18</sup>. If an outcome was measured at multiple follow-ups, we selected the time point most often reported amongst all studies, to make results more comparable amongst studies. If an outcome was measured using multiple scales, we record the scale most often reported amongst all studies. In one study, metabolic equivalent of task (MET) minutes were converted to minutes spent doing moderate physical activities by dividing means and SD by a factor of four<sup>19</sup>. Mean changes from baseline and post-intervention means were synthesised separately in subgroup meta-analyses, and their results were pooled together in the final meta-analysis. Studies that provided no extractable data or no data to calculate SD were excluded from meta-analysis and presented narratively.

### **2.4. Risk of bias assessment**

Risk of bias assessment was conducted by one reviewer (PN) for studies included in the nested meta-analysis, using the ROBINS-I tool for non-randomised studies and the ROB 2.0 tool for randomised trials.

### **2.5. Statistical analysis**

We performed descriptive statistics (frequency and percentage) of intervention characteristics, including participant age groups, settings and activity types, as well as the referring institutions.

We assume the true treatment effects would likely differ among studies due to heterogeneity in age groups, pre-existing health conditions and intervention characteristics. Hence, we used DerSimonian-Laird random-effect models for meta-analysis of all outcomes. Standardised mean differences were used in meta-analysis of depression and anxiety, which were measured using various scales, and interpreted based on rule of thumb (0.2 as small effect, 0.5 as moderate effect, 0.8 as large effect). For other outcomes, mean differences were used. If both mean changes from baseline and post-intervention means were reported, post-intervention means were used. All analyses were conducted in Review Manager 5.4.1.

### **2.6. Role of the funding source**

The funder of the study had no role in study design, data collection, data analysis, data interpretation, or writing of the report. All aspects related to the conduct of this study including the views stated and the decision to publish the findings are those of the authors only.

## **3. RESULTS**

We retrieved a total of 5,115 records from 5 databases, with an additional of 6 studies from backward/forward citation checking during screening. The final sample consisted of 86 unique studies (116 reports). The study selection process is summarised in Figure 1. The list of excluded full texts with reasons is in Supplementary File S3.

### 3.1. Study & participant characteristics

The included studies ranged from 1999 to 2021, with a significant drop in publication in 2019, possibly due to influences of the COVID-19 pandemic (Supplementary Figure S1). Most included studies are randomised controlled trials (n=67, 73%). Most studies are concentrated in high-income countries (Supplementary Figure S2). Countries where most interventions took place were South Korea (n=18, 20%), the United States (US) (n=16, 17%) and Japan (n=10, 11%). The studies examined a diverse range of age groups, mainly adults (n=59, 64%) or elderly (n=25, 27%). Only 11 studies (12%) involved participants under the age of 18. Eleven studies (12%) specifically recruited participants with socioeconomically-disadvantaged backgrounds, such as low-income families or minor ethnic groups. The most common pre-existing conditions are psychiatric disorders (e.g. schizophrenia, ADHD, etc.) (n=13, 14%), cardiovascular disorders (e.g. post-stroke, congestive heart failure, etc.) (n=12, 13%) and musculoskeletal disorders (fibromyalgia, history of falls or balancing issues, etc.) (n=6, 7%).

Risk-of-bias assessments are available in Supplementary File S2. The most important concerns for risk of bias were missing outcome data (due to high rates of dropouts without explicit reasons) and bias from measurement of outcomes (due to non-blinding nature of the intervention and the subjective nature of psychological assessment scales used).

### 3.2. Intervention characteristics

All included studies feature aspects of a nature prescription i.e. instructing the participants to spend time engaging with nature at various capacities. Only four studies, however, identified themselves as a nature or park prescription intervention<sup>20-23</sup>. The most common settings for such nature-based therapy are forests and nature reserves (n=32, 35%), parks (n=26, 28%), small community or home gardens (n=15, 16%), or botanical gardens/allotments (n=10, 11%). Two studies (2%) also featured blue spaces such as beaches. The most common activities recommended to participants were walking in nature (n=42, 46%), farming or gardening (n=27, 29%) and mindfulness exercises (e.g. meditation, breathing exercises) (n=27, 29%), among a range of other activities (e.g. art and craft, group sports, reading or listening to music, etc.). Seven studies (8%) allowed participants to freely choose their activities<sup>20-26</sup>.

Participants were commonly introduced to the trials by their health providers (n=23, 24%) or community service providers (n=24, 26%). The community service providers were diverse in nature, and tended to be associated with pre-existing conditions of the participants (e.g. day care services or senior centres for elderly in long-term care, job rehabilitation centres for people on extended sick leave or welfare centres for low-income families). The health providers were also varied, ranging from general practitioner (GP) clinics, family health centres, post-stroke rehabilitation centres to hospitals.

We evaluated the design of all interventions to see if they demonstrate aspects of the Social Cognitive Theory (SCT) framework for behavioural change i.e. an increased engagement with nature. All studies featured behavioural factors such as selecting activities that participants can easily carry out on their own (n=61, 66%), or providing training (n=46, 50%) or tools (n=37, 40%) to assist with the activities e.g. gardening equipment, exercise equipment or maps of walking paths. Most studies (n=77, 84%) featured environmental factors such as conducting activities in group for peer support (n=52, 57%), selecting nature sites within the proximity of participants' home, their regular health providers' or community service providers' offices (n=38, 41%). In twelve studies (13%), the authors mentioned providing measures to enable access such as transportation or free tickets for gym entry. However, the third aspect of the SCT, cognitive factors, were only featured in a third of studies (n=26, 28%) such as educating participants on the benefits of nature exposure (n=18, 20%) and setting goals to motivate participants (n=17, 18%).

Table 2 provides summary statistics for all included studies. Intervention characteristics and evaluation of programmes based on SCT framework are available in Supplementary File S4.

### 3.3. Health outcomes

Thirty-nine studies (42%) reported benefits on outcomes related to physical health. Outcomes measured tended to be specific to the pre-existing health conditions. For example, interventions addressing cardiovascular disorders reported benefits on cardiometabolic indicators such as blood pressures, heart rates, aerobic fitness and body weight. Interventions for musculoskeletal and neurological disorders reported benefits on pain and various gross motor function tests such as Timed Sit-to-Stand or Timed Up-and-Go.

Two-third of studies (n=62, 67%) reported benefits on psychological or cognitive outcomes. A diverse range of measurement scales were used, mainly to assess moods (e.g. Profile of Mood States), depression (e.g. Beck's Depression Inventory), stress (e.g. Perceived Stress Scale), anxiety (e.g. State-Trait Anxiety Scale) and quality of life (e.g. 36-item Short-Form Survey).

Twenty-three studies (25%) reported improved behavioural outcomes, mainly time spent outdoor, time spent on moderate-vigorous physical activities and step counts via pedometers. Eleven of these studies (58%) featured all three components of the SCT framework.

Twenty studies (22%) measured various biomarkers, mainly indicators of stress (e.g. salivary cortisol) and inflammatory responses (e.g. cytokines) and components of the haemodynamic control system (e.g. endothelin-1, AT1 receptors).

Table 3 provides a summary of findings for all included studies.

#### 3.3.1. Blood pressures

Five RCTs and two non-randomised studies (NRSs) contributed data to the meta-analysis (Figures 2A-B). The follow-up time ranged from 1 week to 12 weeks from baseline, except for one study<sup>27</sup> which conducted baseline and follow-up measurements within the same day. Compared to control, nature prescription programmes resulted in a greater reduction in SBP (MD = -4.9mmHg, 95% CI -9.6 to -0.1, I<sup>2</sup>=65%) and DBP (MD = -3.6mmHg, 95% CI -7.4 to 0.1, I<sup>2</sup>=67%).

Seven other studies, comprising five RCTs and two NRSs, were not included in the meta-analysis because of insufficient data or reasons related to study design (see Supplementary File S4). One study evaluated a clinic-community programme of organised games and sports at urban parks for obese children. The study reported a significant decrease in percentage of children classified as high or borderline blood pressure after 6 months, but no significant improvements in actual SBP or DBP percentile<sup>28</sup>. Other studies reported that walking in forests or parks was linked to a higher decrease in SBP and DBP compared to control among elderly with hypertension<sup>29-31</sup> and healthy adults<sup>31,32</sup>. A cross-over trial reported improved blood pressure outcomes after walking in a green environment, but the improvement was not different from walking in a suburban environment<sup>33</sup>.

#### 3.3.2. Depression and anxiety

Eleven RCTs and four NRSs contributed data to the meta-analysis (Figure 2C-D). The follow-up time ranged from 2 weeks to 1 year from baseline, except for one study<sup>34</sup> which followed up within 2 days from baseline. Compared to control, nature prescription programmes had a moderate-to-large effect on depression scores (SMD=0.5, 95% CI 0.2 to 0.8, I<sup>2</sup>=79%) and anxiety score (SMD=0.6, 95% CI 0.1 to 1.2, I<sup>2</sup>=90%). The most frequently-used tools were Beck Depression Inventory (n=5) for depression, and State-Trait Anxiety Inventory (n=4) or Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale (n=4) for anxiety.

Five other studies, comprising four RCTs and one NRS, were not included in the meta-analysis because insufficient data was provided in the articles. All five studies evaluated horticulture therapies, and all reported that horticulture or gardening activities improved depression and anxiety symptoms among the elderly<sup>35</sup>, stroke survivors<sup>36</sup> or military veterans<sup>37</sup> compared to baseline, but not significantly better than control. For psychiatric patients, Vujcic and colleagues<sup>38</sup> reported that horticulture therapy relieved stress but not depression nor anxiety.

#### 3.3.3. Physical activity levels

Seven RCTs and three NRSs contributed data to the meta-analysis (Figure 2E-F). The follow-up time ranged from 10 weeks to 1 year from baseline. Compared to control, nature prescription programmes resulted in a

greater increase in daily step counts (MD = 900 steps, 95% CI 790-1010,  $I^2=0\%$ ), but did not improve weekly time of moderate physical activities (MD = 25.9 minutes, 95% CI -10.3 to 62.1,  $I^2=53\%$ ).

Six other studies, comprising three RCTs and three NRSs, were not included in the meta-analysis because of insufficient data or reasons related to study design (see Supplementary File S4). One study showed that office workers taking lunch walks in a natural environment was more likely to achieve target step counts than those in a built environment<sup>39</sup>. Similar benefits were observed in community gardening programme for obese adults<sup>40</sup> or farm-based day care for patients with dementia<sup>41</sup>. In a study of cancer survivors, however, outdoor exercises did not have greater impact on long-term physical activities than indoor exercises<sup>42</sup>. Among school students, nature-based activities did not increase moderate physical activity during play time more than playground sports<sup>43</sup>. Razani and colleagues<sup>23</sup> reported that compared to park prescription alone, addition support in forms of text reminders and invitation to group nature outings resulted in a significant increase in park visits, but not levels of moderate physical activities.

#### 4. DISCUSSION

The rising popularity of nature prescription programmes is a response to assumptions in healthcare challenged by COVID-19 and our ongoing climate crisis<sup>44,45</sup>. Our scoping review identified a range of promising nature-based interventions that can be implemented as nature prescriptions. These interventions were demonstrated to be effective for various age groups, including children and the elderly, and targeted various health conditions, such as cardiovascular conditions, musculoskeletal disorders and psychiatric disorders. In addition, the nested meta-analyses on key outcomes demonstrated positive benefits on blood pressure, symptoms of depression and anxiety, and physical activity levels. This aligns with findings from studies on the effects of the nature environment on cardiometabolic health<sup>5</sup> and mental health<sup>14</sup>.

The following key observations were made after examining the characteristics of these interventions, which can inform design of future nature prescription programmes. Firstly, these nature prescription programmes took place across diverse nature settings, including both green spaces and blue spaces. Green spaces can be urban landscape such as parks, botanic gardens, or nature environments tailored to the activities such as farms and gardens for horticulture, or forests for forest bathing. Secondly, nature prescription programmes can utilise a range of different activities suitable to the health conditions of the participants. Many of the included studies included multimodal interventions which incorporated a vigorous physical activity (e.g. walking, gardening) with a mindfulness-based activity (e.g. meditation, relaxation). Thirdly, beside health providers, social and community services were also effective channels to introduce participants to the intervention. Some studies were implemented as workplace programmes for knowledge-intensive or office workers. These institutions should be tapped on when designing future nature prescription programmes to maximise outreach and recruitment. Lastly, most of the included studies that reported positive impact on behavioural changes also demonstrated all three aspects of the SCT framework. This suggests the usefulness of the SC to guide the design of future prescription programmes.

Our review complements previous findings on nature prescriptions, which was limited to prescriptions dispensed in an outpatient setting<sup>13</sup>. By using a broad scope, our review captured nature-based interventions that were dispensed outside the clinic setting and did not self-label as nature prescriptions, but nonetheless would be effective as one. Moreover, we conducted meta-analysis to quantify effectiveness of these interventions across physical, psychological and behavioural outcomes, demonstrating the holistic nature of nature prescription programmes in health promotion.

Our study was not without limitations. Since our primary aim is to conduct a scoping review on all potential nature-based interventions, our search strategy was designed to be generic. Therefore, we may miss some studies that feature unconventional nature-based therapies. In addition, as we only included studies reported in English, we may exclude relevant studies reported in other languages and introduce bias due to missing data, especially considering many studies are from East Asian countries (e.g. South Korea or Japan). Our data collection and risk-of-bias assessment was not conducted in duplicate, which potentially introduces some subjectivity.

Heterogeneity statistics from our meta-analysis suggests high degree of heterogeneity in true effects among our included studies, possibly due to different target populations, nature settings and activities featured in the



intervention. Future studies are required to examine the varying effectiveness of nature-based prescriptions based on these factors. Moreover, a comparison of effectiveness on increasing physical activity levels based on different elements of the SCT will help identify factors that make a behavioural change programme successful. Most studies have moderate to high risk of bias, principally due to non-blinding nature of the interventions, small sample size and a lack of published documentations to rule out bias, such as an a priori analysis plan or protocol. This calls for future efforts to enhance the standards of reporting and conduct of trials in this area of research to improve the overall quality of evidence.

## 5. CONCLUSION

Nature prescription programmes are increasing in popularity around the world. A key impetus is for nature prescription programs to supplement health practitioner focus on biomedical options by attending to health and social needs that standard care cannot reach. Our review and meta-analysis concludes that present evidence indicates nature prescriptions can provide positive benefits on blood pressure, symptoms of depression and anxiety, and physical activity levels. Nature prescriptions should incorporate nature-based interventions, which can feature a range of natural settings and activities. Social and community channels should be utilised for outreach, in addition to health providers. The Social Cognitive Theory framework can be used to guide the design of an effective nature prescription programme.

### Contributor

P-Y.N: data curation (database search), formal analysis (study selection & data collection, ROB assessment, meta-analysis), writing - original draft

H.R-A: formal analysis (study selection & data collection)

X.F.: conceptualisation, funding acquisition, supervision, writing - review & editing

T.A-B: conceptualisation, funding acquisition, supervision, writing - review & editing

All authors had full access to all the data in the study and had final responsibility for the decision to submit for publication.

More than one author has directly accessed and verified the underlying data reported in the manuscript.

### Declaration of interests

All authors certify that they have no affiliations with or involvement in any organization or entity with any financial interest (such as honoraria; educational grants; participation in speakers' bureaus; membership, employment, consultancies, stock ownership, or other equity interest; and expert testimony or patent-licensing arrangements), or non-financial interest (such as personal or professional relationships, affiliations, knowledge or beliefs) in the subject matter or materials discussed in this manuscript.

### Acknowledgement

This work was supported by the Hort Frontiers Green Cities Fund, part of the Hort Frontiers strategic partnership initiative developed by Hort Innovation, with co-investment from the University of Wollongong (UOW) Faculty of Social Sciences, the UOW Global Challenges initiative and contributions from the Australian Government (project number #GC15005). T.A-B. was supported by a National Health and Medical Research Council Boosting Dementia Research Leader Fellowship (#1140317). X.F. was supported by a National Health and Medical Research Council Career Development Fellowship (#1148792).

### Data availability statement

All data and materials used to generate the results are available in the manuscript and Supplementary Files.

**Table 1. Eligibility criteria for study selection**

	<b>Inclusion</b>	<b>Exclusion</b>
<b>Participant</b>	Any participant	Animal studies
<b>Intervention</b>	<p>An instruction by a health or social provider to patients to spend time in a nature setting, such as a park; or</p> <p>Any programme organised by a health or social institutions for their patients or clients that features nature-based interventions.</p> <p>Nature-based interventions are defined as interventions that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Used nature-based therapy to improve health outcomes; and</li> <li>• Involved exposure to a nature environment, including green spaces and blue spaces</li> </ul> <p>Multimodal programmes where one component is nature-based activities are eligible.</p>	<p>1) Interventions aimed at only changing the environment in which people live:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Building new green spaces, changing design or providing facilities within green spaces</li> <li>• Provision of gardens, indoor vegetation, community allotments, outdoor gyms etc. without organising any activity</li> </ul> <p>2) Programmes requiring high levels of safety and skilled organisers (e.g. wilderness adventure programmes, animal-assisted therapies, mountain hiking, etc.)</p> <p>3) Simulation of nature spaces (e.g. virtual reality, photos, audio records) without actual nature exposure</p> <p>4) School and after-school curricular activities, or any interventions aimed at increasing play time without a clear nature focus</p>
<b>Control</b>	No intervention or intervention taking place in a non-nature setting	No control group
<b>Outcomes</b>	Physical, psychological/cognitive health and behavioural outcomes	<p>Studies that only measure these outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Social, economic and financial outcomes</li> <li>• Diet composition and dietary patterns</li> </ul>
<b>Study design</b>	Randomised controlled trials (RCTs), non-randomised or quasi-randomised controlled trials	<p>Observational studies</p> <p>Qualitative studies</p> <p>Conference abstracts/proceedings, editorials, thesis, letters to editors, short reports</p>
<b>Other</b>	..	Non-English studies

**Table 2. Study characteristics**

	Frequency (%)
<b>Study characteristics</b>	
Study design	
Randomised controlled studies	67 (73%)
Non-randomised controlled studies	25 (27%)
Study location	
South Korea	18 (20%)
United States of America	16 (17%)
Japan	10 (11%)
United Kingdom	7 (8%)
China	5 (5%)
Other	36 (39%)
<b>Participant characteristics</b>	
Age group	
Children (<10 years old)	9 (10%)
Adolescent (10-18 years old)	2 (2%)
Adults (18-65 years old)	59 (64%)
Elderly (>65 years old)	25 (27%)
Social background of participants	
University students	16 (17%)
Socioeconomically-disadvantaged background	11 (12%)
Military members	2 (2%)
Office workers	2 (2%)
Long-term care residents	2 (2%)
Underlying health conditions	
Psychiatric disorders	13 (14%)
Cardiovascular disorders	12 (13%)
Musculoskeletal disorders	6 (7%)
Cancer	4 (4%)
Neurological disorders	4 (4%)
Sexual health	2 (2%)
Respiratory disorders	1 (1%)
Substance use disorder	1 (1%)
<b>Intervention characteristics</b>	
Identified as 'nature' or 'green prescription'	4 (4%)
Setting of nature-based therapy	
Forests & nature reserves	32 (35%)
Parks	26 (28%)
Small gardens	15 (16%)
Botanical gardens	10 (11%)
Farms	5 (5%)
Other urban green spaces	5 (5%)
Greenhouses	2 (2%)
Beaches	2 (2%)
Activities taken by participants	
Walking	42 (46%)
Farming/gardening	27 (29%)
Mindfulness & relaxation	25 (27%)
Other physical exercises	23 (25%)
Group games, including sports	7 (8%)
Art & craft	4 (4%)
Socialising activities, including dance	3 (3%)
Enjoying nature & relaxation	2 (2%)
Listening to music	1 (1%)
Any activity chosen by participants	7 (8%)
Institutions introducing participants to intervention	
Health providers	23 (25%)

Welfare & community service providers	24 (26%)
Employers	4 (4%)
Probation service centre	2 (2%)
Long-term care providers	2 (2%)
Schools	1 (1%)
<b>Application of Social Cognitive Theory framework</b>	
<b>Behavioural factors</b>	<b>92 (100%)</b>
Participants able to carry out activities on their own	61 (66%)
Training provided	46 (50%)
Tools provided	37 (40%)
<b>Environmental factors</b>	<b>77 (84%)</b>
Activities conducted in groups	52 (57%)
Nature sites accessible to participants	38 (41%)
If not, measures in place to enable access	12 (13%)
<b>Cognitive factors</b>	<b>26 (28%)</b>
Informing participants on benefits of nature exposure	18 (20%)
Setting goals for participants	17 (18%)
<b>Evidence of health benefits</b>	
Physical health outcomes	39 (42%)
Psychological & cognitive outcomes	62 (67%)
Behavioural outcomes	23 (25%)
Biomarkers measured	20 (22%)

1 **Table 3: Summary of study designs and findings**

Study ID	Study design <sup>a</sup>	Sample size	Social background	Underlying health conditions	Age group <sup>b</sup>	Mean age (SD)	Female (%)	Outcomes with reported positive effects <sup>c,d</sup>
Akgoz_2020 <sup>46</sup>	RCT	22	..	Moderate cardiovascular risks	Adults	N/R	N/R	H: <b>Cardiovascular disease risk; total cholesterol, systolic blood pressure (SBP); diastolic blood pressure (DBP); weight; body mass index (BMI), waist circumference</b>
Ameli_2021 <sup>47</sup>	RCT	12	Military service members	..	Adults	35 (12)	75	P: <b>Post-walk distress score; post-walk mindfulness score</b>
Arbillaga-Etxarri_2017 <sup>48</sup>	RCT	407	..	Chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD)	Adults	69 (8)	13	H: Severe COPD exacerbation in previous 12 months; health-related quality of life (QoL) P: Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale (HADS)-Depression BH: <b>Daily step counts</b> ; Clinical visit-PROactive Physical Activity in COPD
Baba_2021 <sup>49</sup>	RCT	78	Long-term care residents	..	Elderly	84 (6)	65	H: Timed-Up-and-Go (TUG) BH: Daily step counts
Ballew_2018 <sup>50</sup>	RCT	100	University students	..	Adults	19 (2)	55	P: <b>Absorption; awe; positive emotions</b>
Bang_2017 <sup>19</sup>	NRS	99	University students	..	Adults	24 (4)	54	H: <b>% body fat; parasympathetic nerve activity</b> ; SBP; low-density lipoprotein; triglyceride; bone density P: <b>Beck Depression Inventory (BDI)</b> BH: <b>Weekly MET-minutes; health promoting behaviours (physical activities, healthy nutrition, stress management)</b>
Bang_2018 <sup>51</sup>	NRS	59	Low-income families	..	Children	12 (1)	58	P: Self-esteem; Children's Depression Inventory
Barton_2012 <sup>52</sup>	NRS	53	..	Mental health conditions	Adults	53 (15)	62	P: <b>Profile of Mood States (POMS) – Total Mood Disturbance</b> ; Self-esteem
Barton_2015 <sup>43</sup>	NRS	52	Low-income families	..	<b>Children</b>	<b>9 (0)</b>	<b>N/R</b>	P: Self-esteem BH: Moderate PA minutes during lunch break
Bielinis_2021 <sup>53</sup>	RCT	22	University students	..	Adults	23 (5)	50	P: <b>POMS; Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS), Restorative Outcome Scale; Subjective Vitality Scale</b>
Bloom_2017 <sup>54</sup>	RCT	153	Knowledge-intensive workers	..	Adults	47 (10)	90	P: Restoration, fatigue, relaxation & detachment (with seasonal effects)
Brito_2020 <sup>33</sup>	NRS	24	..	..	Adults	50 (7)	83	H: <b>Heart rate variability (HRV)</b> ; SBP
Brown_2014 <sup>39</sup>	RCT	94	Office workers	..	Adults	42 (11)	20	H: <b>SBP; DBP; heart rate (HR) (resting, stress &amp; recovery); HRV</b> P: <b>SF-8 mental health</b> BH: No. of active lunch times; daily step counts
Calogiuri_2016 <sup>55</sup>	RCT	14	Employees	..	Adults	49 (8)	50	BM: <b>Serum cortisol</b> P: <b>Perceived Restorativeness Scale (PRS); Physical Activity Affective Scale</b>
Chun_2017 <sup>56</sup>	RCT	59	..	Post-stroke	Elderly	61 (9)	32	BM: <b>Biological antioxidant potential</b> P: <b>BDI; Hamilton Rating Scale for Depression (17 Questions); State-Trait Anxiety Inventory (STAI)</b>
Cimprich_2003 <sup>57</sup>	RCT	120	..	Breast cancer	Adults	54 (11)	100	P: <b>Total attention tests' score</b>

Clutterbuck_2020 <sup>58</sup>	RCT	54	..	Cerebral palsy	Children	9 (2)	35	H: <b>Test of Gross Motor Development; Modified Canadian Occupational Performance Measure</b> ; sprint test; muscle power sprint test; standing broad jump
Cohen_2017 <sup>59</sup>	RCT	18170	..	-	N/R	43 (.)	62	BH: <b>Participation in park programmes</b>
Corazon_2018 <sup>60</sup>	NRS	20	..	Binge eating disorder	Adults	47 (.)	94	P: Self-esteem BH: Binge-eating episodes
Demark-Wahnefried_2018 <sup>61</sup>	RCT	46	..	Cancer survivors	Elderly	70 (8)	70	H: Waist circumference; 2-minute Step Test; Timed 8-foot Walk; 8-foot Get-Up-And-Go; <b>SF-36 Physical Health</b> BM: Telomerase P: <b>Reassurance of worth; SF-36 Mental Health</b> BH: Vegetable & fruit intake
Detweiler_2015 <sup>37</sup>	RCT	24	Veterans	Substance use disorder	Adults	46 (12)	4	P: QoL Enjoyment & Satisfaction Questionnaire Short Form; Post-traumatic Stress Disorder Checklist Civilian Version; Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale
Djernis_2021 <sup>62</sup>	RCT	60	University students	Stress	Adults	31 (8)	87	P: <b>Self-compassion Scale; Five-Facet Mindfulness Questionnaire; Connectedness to Nature Scale at 3 months</b>
Elsley_2018 <sup>63</sup>	NRS	134	Probationers	..	Adults	33 (.)	29	No evidence of benefits reported
Finkelstein_2013 <sup>64</sup>	RCT	147	..	..	Children	8 (2)	46	BH: <b>Daily step counts</b> ; 6-minute Walk Test
Flowers_2018 <sup>65</sup>	RCT	60	University students	..	Adults	20 (4)	32	P: <b>POMS-Vigour</b>
Fruhauf_2016 <sup>66</sup>	NRS	14	..	Depression	Adults	32 (11)	57	P: <b>Mood Survey Scale; Perceived activation</b>
Garshol_2020 <sup>41</sup>	NRS	136	Day care users	Dementia	Elderly	74 (7)	59	H: <b>TUG</b> P: <b>Clinical dementia rating</b> BH: <b>Daily step counts; Daily light &amp; medium PA minutes</b>
Gascon_2020 <sup>67</sup>	RCT	12	..	..	Adults	37 (13)	75	No evidence of benefits reported
Gladwell_2016 <sup>68</sup>	RCT	13	..	..	Adults	39 (14)	46	H: <b>HRV</b>
Grazuleviciene_2015 <sup>27</sup>	RCT	20	..	Coronary artery disease	Elderly	62 (13)	35	H: <b>Short-term SBP and HR recovery post-exercise</b> ; SBP; DBP
Han_2016 <sup>34</sup>	NRS	61	..	Chronic widespread pain	Adults	42 (7)	57	H: <b>HRV</b> ; Pain Visual Analogue Scale (VAS) BM: <b>Natural killer cells</b> P: BDI; <b>EuroQol-VAS</b>
Han_2018 <sup>69</sup>	RCT	28	..	Mental health conditions	Elderly	80 (3)	86	H: Senior Fitness Test BM: Salivary cortisol
Heilmayr_2018 <sup>70</sup>	RCT	138	University students	..	<b>Adults</b>	<b>21 (3)</b>	<b>69</b>	H: Self-reported health composite score P: Emotional wellbeing composite score BH: Stanford Leisure-Time Activity Categorical Item
Hoffman_2018 <sup>28</sup>	RCT	100	Ethnic minority	Overweight/obesity	Children	9 (2)	53	H: <b>Reduction in BP category at 6mths</b> P: <b>Social avoidance at 3mths</b> BH: <b>Sugar-sweetened beverage intake at 6mths; Physical Activity Questionnaire at 3 and 6mths</b>
Jeon_2021 <sup>71</sup>	NRS	50	Probationers	..	Adolescents	16 (.)	6	H: <b>HRV</b> P: <b>Well-Being Manifestation Measure Scale</b>

Kam_2010 <sup>72</sup>	RCT	24	..	Mental health conditions	Adults	44 (12)	29	P: <b>Depression Anxiety Stress Scale</b>
Kang_2021 <sup>73</sup>	RCT	33	Sibling of children with disability	..	Children	9 (2)	38	H: Brain function quotients P: Han's Stress Scale; Self-esteem Scale
Kim_2018a <sup>74</sup>	RCT	36	..	..	Adults	N/R	100	P: Self-rated Depression Scale; STAI; Ego-identify scale
Kim_2018b <sup>51</sup>	RCT	47	..	..	Elderly	73 (5)	91	H: <b>Fitness tests</b> ; weight; BMI; lean mass; % body fat; waist circumference BM: <b>Insulin levels; Homeostatic Model Assessment for Insulin Resistance; chemerin</b> ; blood glucose
Kim_2021 <sup>75</sup>	RCT	38	University students	..	Adults	22 (2)	37	P: POMS; Stress Response Inventory-Modified Form; Concise Measure of Subjective Well-being
Kobayashi_2018 <sup>76</sup>	RCT	520	University students	..	Adults	22 (2)	0	H: <b>HRV</b>
Koselka_2019 <sup>77</sup>	NRS	24	University students	..	Adults	23 (5)	47	P: <b>PNAS; STAI; Perceived Stress Scale (PSS)</b>
Lacharite-Lemieux_2015 <sup>78</sup>	RCT	23	..	Post-menopausal	Adults	60 (5)	100	BM: BDI BH: Physical Activity Scale for the Elderly
Lee_2014 <sup>79</sup>	RCT	70	..	..	Elderly	70 (5)	100	H: <b>SBP; DBP; pulmonary function; cardio-ankle vascular index</b>
Leiros-Rodriguez_2014 <sup>80</sup>	RCT	28	..	Balance issues	Elderly	69 (3)	100	P: SF-12
Li_2016 <sup>81</sup>	RCT	19	..	..	Adults & elderly	51 (9)	0	H: <b>Pulse rate</b> BM: <b>Noradrenaline; Dopamine; Adiponectin</b> P: <b>POMS</b>
Liu_2020 <sup>82</sup>	RCT	42	..	..	Elderly	69 (5)	71	No evidence of benefits reported
Makizako_2020 <sup>83</sup>	RCT	89	..	Dementia, depression	Elderly	73 (6)	51	BM: Serum brain-derived neurotrophic factor (BDNF) P: <b>Logical memory scores</b> ; Geriatric Depression Scale-15; BH: Daily step counts ( <i>decreased</i> ); Daily moderate PA minutes
Mao_2012a <sup>84</sup>	RCT	20	University students	..	Adults	21 (1)	0	BM: <b>Interleukin-6 (IL-6); tumor necrosis factor-alpha (TNF-a); malondialdehyde (MDA); total B-cells; Endotheline-1 (ET-1); serum cortisol</b> P: <b>POMS</b>
Mao_2012b <sup>29</sup>	RCT	24	..	Hypertension	Elderly	68 (4)	N/R	H: <b>SBP; DBP</b> BM: <b>ET-1; angiotensinogen (AGT); Angiotensin II type 1 (AT1); AT2; IL-6</b> P: <b>POMS</b>
Mao_2017 <sup>85</sup>	RCT	33	..	Congestive heart failure	Elderly	73 (6)	42	BM: <b>ET-1; IL-6; MDA; Brain natriuretic peptide; total superoxide dismutase; AT-2</b> P: <b>POMS</b>
McEwan_2019 <sup>20</sup>	NRS	582	..	..	Adults	29 (10)	60	P: Recovering QoL scale; Inclusion of Nature with Self scale; Type of Positive Affect scale; Nature Relatedness scale
Miller_2020 <sup>42</sup>	RCT	19	..	Cancer survivors	Adolescents; Adults	20 (.)	53	No evidence of benefits reported
Mohamed_2018 <sup>40</sup>	NRS	61	..	Overweight/obesity	Adults	46 (9)	79	H: <b>BMI; body weight</b> ; % body fat BH: <b>Vegetable intake; Calorie intake; Weekly MET-minutes</b>
Morris_2021 <sup>24</sup>	NRS	178	..	Cancer patients	Adults	60 (12)	72	H: <b>Aerobic fitness</b>

Muller-Riemenschneider_2020 <sup>21</sup>	RCT	160	..	..	Adults	51 (6)	79	BH: <b>Weekly minutes of recreational PA</b>
Ng_2018 <sup>35</sup>	RCT	59	..	..	Elderly	67 (5)	79	BM: Serum IL-6; Serum BDNF P: Scales of Psychological Well-being; Zung Self-Rating Anxiety Scale
Ngo_2014 <sup>86</sup>	RCT	285	..	..	Children	8 (2)	46	BH: <b>Weekly outdoor time</b>
Oh_2018 <sup>87</sup>	NRS		..	Schizophrenia	Adults	42 (13)	29	P: Positive and Negative Syndrome Scale (PANSS)
Palsdottir_2020 <sup>36</sup>	RCT	101	..	Post-stroke	Elderly	66 (.)	60	H: Modified Rankin Scale P: Mental fatigue scale; HADS
Park_2010 <sup>31</sup>	RCT	280	University students	..	Adults	22 (2)	0	H: <b>Pulse rate; SBP; DBP; HRV</b> BM: <b>Salivary cortisol</b>
Park_2020a <sup>88</sup>	NRS	40	..	..	Elderly	72 (5)	65	H: Hand dexterity test P: <b>Mini Mental State Examination</b>
Park_2020b <sup>89</sup>	RCT	53	..	..	Adults	N/R	100	BM: Serum serotonin
Payne_2020 <sup>22</sup>	RCT	200	University students	..	Adults	31 (12)	82	P: <b>PSS</b> ; Maslach Burnout Inventory; Satisfaction with Life Scale
Plotnikoff_2017 <sup>90</sup>	RCT	84	..	Overweight/obesity; T2DM/high risk of DM	Adults	45 (14)	70	H: <b>Aerobic fitness at 10wks; Lower body muscular fitness; Functional mobility</b> <b>Upper body muscular fitness; waist circumference and SBP at 10 and 20wks</b> BH: <b>Daily step counts at 10wks</b>
Razani_2018 <sup>23</sup>	RCT	78	Parents in low-income neighbourhoods	..	Adults & children	38 (.)	87	BM: Serum cortisol at 3mths P: PSS-10 at 1 and 3mths; Loneliness at 1 and 3mths; Nature affinity at 3mths BH: Park visits at 1mth; weekly minutes of moderate PA at 1 and 3mths
Ryu_2020 <sup>91</sup>	RCT	60	..	Schizophrenia	Adults	39 (10)	47	P: <b>Brief Psychiatric Rating Scale; BDI; STAI; Global Assessment of Functioning Scale; Wisconsin Card Sorting Test for executive function</b> ; Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale BH: <b>Daily step counts</b>
Sales_2017 <sup>92</sup>	RCT	66	..	History of falls	Elderly	71 (7)	67	H: <b>Single leg stance; knee strength; 2-min walk; timed sit-to-stand</b>
Serrat_2020 <sup>93</sup>	RCT	169	..	Fibromyalgia	Adults	54 (9)	99	H: <b>Fibromyalgia impact questionnaire revised; VAS-Fatigue; VAS-Pain</b> P: <b>HADS; SF-36; PANAS</b>
Shin_1999 <sup>94</sup>	NRS	27	..	..	Elderly	N/R	100	H: <b>VO2 max; Forced vital capacity; SBP; DBP; flexibility</b> P: <b>POMS</b>
Siu_2020 <sup>95</sup>	RCT	82	..	Mental health conditions	Adults	50 (10)	55	P: <b>Short Warwick-Edinburgh Mental Well-Being Scale</b>
Song_2013 <sup>32</sup>	RCT	485	University students	..	Adults	22 (2)	0	H: <b>DBP; pulse rate</b>
Song_2019 <sup>96</sup>	RCT	12	University students	..	Adults	21 (1)	100	H: <b>HRV; HR</b> P: <b>POMS</b>
South_2021 <sup>25</sup>	RCT	36	Ethnic minority; Low-income neighbourhoods	Postpartum	Adults	28 (6)	100	BH: <b>Number of green space visits (as-treated analysis only)</b>
Stigsdotter_2018 <sup>97</sup>	RCT	84	Sick leave	Adjustment disorders; severe stress	Adults	48 (8)	76	P: Psychological General Well-Being Index; Shirom-Melamed Burnout Questionnaire



Sung_2012 <sup>98</sup>	NRS	56	..	Hypertension	Elderly	66 (7)	39	H: SBP BM: Salivary cortisol P: <b>SF-36</b>
Takayama_2014 <sup>99</sup>	RCT	45	University students	..	Adults	21 (1)	0	P: <b>POMS; PANAS</b>
Tharrey_2020 <sup>100</sup>	NRS	132	..	..	<b>Adults</b>	<b>44 (14)</b>	<b>76</b>	No evidence of benefits reported
Turner_2017 <sup>101</sup>	RCT	22	..	..	Adults	33 (9)	36	P: <b>Affective responses; Subjective Vitality Scale</b>
Ura_2021 <sup>102</sup>	NRS	29	..	Dementia	Elderly	76 (10)	N/R	P: <b>World Health Organization-Five Well-Being Index</b>
VanDenBerg_2011a <sup>103</sup>	RCT	30	..	..	Adults	58 (.)	73	BM: Salivary cortisol P: <b>PANAS</b>
VanDenBerg_2011b <sup>104</sup>	NRS	12	..	Attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder	Children	13 (2)	17	P: <b>PRS; Test of Everyday Attention for Children</b>
Verra_2012 <sup>105</sup>	NRS	79	..	Chronic musculoskeletal pain	Adults	N/R	N/R	H: SF-36-Physical role & Bodily pain; Back Performance Scale P: SF-36-Mental; West Haven-Yale Multidimensional Pain Inventory-Life control
Vujcic_2017 <sup>38</sup>	RCT	30	..	Psychiatric disorders	Adults	45 (10)	70	P: <b>Depression Anxiety Stress Scale</b>
Wang_2018 <sup>106</sup>	RCT	28	University students	..	Adults	N/R	32	BM: <b>Urinary hydrogen peroxide; urinary 8-hydroxy-20-deoxyguanosine</b>
Wexler_2021 <sup>26</sup>	RCT	171	..	..	<b>Adults</b>	<b>N/R</b>	<b>N/R</b>	BH: Park visits; Park-based PA minutes
Wichrowski_2005 <sup>107</sup>	RCT	107	..	Cardiac rehabilitation patients	Adults	N/R	39	H: HR P: POMS
Willert_2014 <sup>108</sup>	NRS	93	Sick leave	Stress-related symptoms	Adults	N/R	83	P: PSS; Basic Nordic Sleep Questionnaire; Five Facet Mindfulness Questionnaire; Self-efficacy Scale; Self-assessed Work Ability
Wong_2021 <sup>109</sup>	RCT	59	..	..	Elderly	67 (4)	78	BM: CD8 <sup>+</sup> T cells; TEMRA cells
Wu_2020 <sup>30</sup>	RCT	31	..	Hypertension	Elderly	74 (6)	39	H: <b>DBP; pulse oxygen saturation (SpO<sub>2</sub>); HRV; HR</b> BM: <b>High-sensitive C-reactive protein</b> P: <b>POMS</b>
Yi_2021 <sup>110</sup>	NRS	69	..	..	<b>Elderly</b>	<b>75 (5)</b>	<b>52</b>	H: <b>Bioimpedance; EEG</b> P: Montreal Cognitive Assessment
Zhu_2016 <sup>111</sup>	RCT	110	..	Schizophrenia	Adults; Elderly	47 (9)	44	P: <b>PANSS</b>

<sup>a</sup> RCT: Randomised controlled trials; NRS: Non-randomised studies: non-randomised controlled trials and quasi-experimental studies

<sup>b</sup> Children: <10 years old; Adolescent: 10-18 years old; Adults: 18-65 years old; Elderly: >65 years old

<sup>c</sup> H: Physical health outcomes; BM: Biomarkers; P: Psychological, cognitive & quality of life outcomes; BH: Behavioural outcomes

<sup>d</sup> Bold typeface represents significant between-group (intervention vs control) difference; normal typeface represents significant within-group (pre- vs post-) difference. Statistical significance at  $\alpha=0.05$ .

2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7

## 8 REFERENCE

- 9 1 Markevych I, Schoierer J, Hartig T, *et al.* Exploring pathways linking greenspace to health:  
10 Theoretical and methodological guidance. *Environ. Res.* 2017; **158**: 301–17.
- 11 2 Twohig-Bennett C, Jones A. The health benefits of the great outdoors: A systematic review and meta-  
12 analysis of greenspace exposure and health outcomes. *Environ Res* 2018; **166**: 628–37.
- 13 3 Bratman GN, Anderson CB, Berman MG, *et al.* Nature and mental health: An ecosystem service  
14 perspective. *Sci Adv* 2019; **5**: 903–27.
- 15 4 Akaraci S, Feng X, Suesse T, Jalaludin B, Astell-Burt T. A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of  
16 Associations between Green and Blue Spaces and Birth Outcomes. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*  
17 2020; **17**: 2949.
- 18 5 Astell-Burt T, Feng X. Urban green space, tree canopy and prevention of cardiometabolic diseases: A  
19 multilevel longitudinal study of 46 786 Australians. *Int J Epidemiol* 2020; **49**: 926–33.
- 20 6 Seo S, Choi S, Kim K, Kim SM, Park SM. Association between urban green space and the risk of  
21 cardiovascular disease: A longitudinal study in seven Korean metropolitan areas. *Environ Int* 2019;  
22 **125**: 51–7.
- 23 7 Paul LA, Hystad P, Burnett RT, *et al.* Urban green space and the risks of dementia and stroke.  
24 *Environ Res* 2020; **186**. DOI:10.1016/J.ENVRES.2020.109520.
- 25 8 Astell-Burt T, Navakatikyan MA, Feng X. Urban green space, tree canopy and 11-year risk of  
26 dementia in a cohort of 109,688 Australians. *Environ Int* 2020; **145**: 106102.
- 27 9 Rigolon A. A complex landscape of inequity in access to urban parks: A literature review. *Landsc*  
28 *Urban Plan* 2016; **153**: 160–9.
- 29 10 Astell-Burt T, Feng X. Paths through the woods. *Int J Epidemiol* 2021; published online Dec 9.  
30 DOI:10.1093/IJE/DYAB233.
- 31 11 Leavell MA, Leiferman JA, Gascon M, Braddick F, Gonzalez JC, Litt JS. Nature-Based Social  
32 Prescribing in Urban Settings to Improve Social Connectedness and Mental Well-being: a Review.  
33 *Curr Environ Heal reports* 2019; **6**: 297–308.
- 34 12 Martin L, White MP, Hunt A, Richardson M, Pahl S, Burt J. Nature contact, nature connectedness  
35 and associations with health, wellbeing and pro-environmental behaviours. *J Environ Psychol* 2020;  
36 **68**: 101389.
- 37 13 Kondo MC, Oyekanmi KO, Gibson A, South EC, Bocarro J, Hipp JA. Nature Prescriptions for  
38 Health: A Review of Evidence and Research Opportunities. *Int J Environ Res Public Heal* 2020, *Vol*  
39 *17, Page 4213* 2020; **17**: 4213.
- 40 14 Masterton W, Park K, Carver H, Parkes T. Greenspace programmes for mental health: A survey study  
41 to test what works, for whom, and in what circumstances. *Health Place* 2021; **72**: 102669.
- 42 15 Bandura A. Social cognitive theory: An agentic perspective. *Annu Rev Psychol* 2001; **52**: 1–26.
- 43 16 Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, *et al.* The PRISMA 2020 statement: An updated guideline for  
44 reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ.* 2021; **372**. DOI:10.1136/bmj.n71.
- 45 17 Bhat S, Coyle DH, Trieu K, *et al.* Healthy Food Prescription Programs and their Impact on Dietary  
46 Behavior and Cardiometabolic Risk Factors: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Adv Nutr*  
47 2021; **12**: 1944–56.
- 48 18 Higgins JP, Li T, Deeks JJ. Chapter 6: Choosing effect measures and computing estimates of effect.  
49 In: Higgins J, Thomas J, Chandler J, *et al.*, eds. *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of*  
50 *Interventions*, 6.2. Cochrane: 2021.
- 51 19 Bang K-S, Lee I, Kim S, *et al.* The Effects of a Campus Forest-Walking Program on Undergraduate  
52 and Graduate Students' Physical and Psychological Health. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* 2017; **14**:  
53 728.
- 54 20 McEwan K, Richardson M, Sheffield D, Ferguson FJ, Brindley P. A Smartphone App for Improving

- 55 Mental Health through Connecting with Urban Nature. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* 2019; **16**.  
56 DOI:<https://dx.doi.org/10.3390/ijerph16183373>.
- 57 21 Müller-Riemenschneider F, Petrunoff N, Yao J, *et al.* Effectiveness of prescribing physical activity in  
58 parks to improve health and wellbeing - the park prescription randomized controlled trial. *Int J Behav*  
59 *Nutr Phys Act* 2020; **17**: 42.
- 60 22 Payne EA, Loi NM, Thorsteinsson EB. The Restorative Effect of the Natural Environment on  
61 University Students' Psychological Health. *J Environ Public Health* 2020; **2020**: 4210285.
- 62 23 Razani N, Morshed S, Kohn MA, *et al.* Effect of park prescriptions with and without group visits to  
63 parks on stress reduction in low-income parents: SHINE randomized trial. *PLoS One* 2018; **13**:  
64 e0192921–e0192921.
- 65 24 Morris SL, Newhouse I, Larocque T, Gillis K-J, Smith L, Nisbet EK. Becoming One with Nature: A  
66 Nature Intervention for Individuals Living with Cancer Participating in a Ten-Week Group Exercise  
67 and Wellness Program. *Int J Exerc Sci* 2021; **14**: 498–518.
- 68 25 South EC, Lee K, Oyekanmi K, *et al.* Nurtured in Nature: a Pilot Randomized Controlled Trial to  
69 Increase Time in Greenspace among Urban-Dwelling Postpartum Women. *J Urban Heal* 2021.  
70 DOI:10.1007/s11524-021-00544-z.
- 71 26 Wexler N, Fan Y, Das K V, French S. Randomized Informational Intervention and Adult Park Use  
72 and Park-Based Physical Activity in Low-Income, Racially Diverse Urban Neighborhoods. *J Phys*  
73 *Act Heal* 2021; **18**: 920–8.
- 74 27 Grazuleviciene R, Vencloviene J, Kubilius R, *et al.* The Effect of Park and Urban Environments on  
75 Coronary Artery Disease Patients: A Randomized Trial. *Biomed Res Int* 2015; **2015**: 403012.
- 76 28 Hoffman J, Frerichs L, Story M, *et al.* An Integrated Clinic-Community Partnership for Child Obesity  
77 Treatment: A Randomized Pilot Trial. *Obes. Stigma, Trends, Interv.* 2018; : 103–16.
- 78 29 Mao G-X, Cao Y-B, Lan X-G, *et al.* Therapeutic effect of forest bathing on human hypertension in  
79 the elderly. *J Cardiol* 2012; **60**: 495–502.
- 80 30 Wu Q, Ye B, Lv X, *et al.* Adjunctive Therapeutic Effects of Cinnamomum Camphora Forest  
81 Environment on Elderly Patients with Hypertension | International Journal of Gerontology. *Int J*  
82 *Gerontol* 2020; **14**: 327–31.
- 83 31 Park BJ, Tsunetsugu Y, Kasetani T, Kagawa T, Miyazaki Y. The physiological effects of Shinrin-  
84 yoku (taking in the forest atmosphere or forest bathing): evidence from field experiments in 24 forests  
85 across Japan. *Environ Health Prev Med* 2010; **15**: 18–26.
- 86 32 Song C, Ikei H, Lee J, Park B-J, Kagawa T, Miyazaki Y. Individual differences in the physiological  
87 effects of forest therapy based on Type A and Type B behavior patterns. *J Physiol Anthropol* 2013;  
88 **32**: 14.
- 89 33 de Brito JN, Pope ZC, Mitchell NR, *et al.* The effect of green walking on heart rate variability: A  
90 pilot crossover study. *Environ Res* 2020; **185**: 109408.
- 91 34 Han J-W, Choi H, Jeon Y-H, Yoon C-H, Woo J-M, Kim W. The Effects of Forest Therapy on Coping  
92 with Chronic Widespread Pain: Physiological and Psychological Differences between Participants in  
93 a Forest Therapy Program and a Control Group. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* 2016; **13**.  
94 DOI:<https://dx.doi.org/10.3390/ijerph13030255>.
- 95 35 Ng KST, Sia A, Ng MKW, *et al.* Effects of Horticultural Therapy on Asian Older Adults: A  
96 Randomized Controlled Trial. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* 2018; **15**: 1705.
- 97 36 Pálsdóttir AM, Stigmar K, Norrving B, *et al.* The Nature stroke study; NASTRU - A randomised  
98 controlled trial of nature-based post-stroke fatigue rehabilitation. 2019. DOI:10.21203/rs.2.461/v1.
- 99 37 Detweiler MB, Self JA, Lane S, *et al.* Horticultural therapy: a pilot study on modulating cortisol  
100 levels and indices of substance craving, posttraumatic stress disorder, depression, and quality of life  
101 in veterans. *Altern Ther Health Med* 2015; **21**: 36–41.
- 102 38 Vujcic M, Tomicevic-Dubljevic J, Grbic M, Lecic-Tosevski D, Vukovic O, Toskovic O. Nature  
103 based solution for improving mental health and well-being in urban areas. *Environ Res* 2017; **158**:


- 104 385–92.
- 105 39 Brown DK, Barton JL, Pretty J, Gladwell VF. Walks4Work: Assessing the role of the natural  
106 environment in a workplace physical activity intervention. *Scand J Work Environ Health* 2014; **40**:  
107 390–9.
- 108 40 Mohamed W, Azlan A, Talib RABD. Benefits of Community Gardening Activity in Obesity  
109 Intervention: Findings from F.E.A.T. Programme. *Curr Res Nutr Food Sci J* 2018; **6**: 700–10.
- 110 41 Finnanger Garshol B, Ellingsen-Dalskau LH, Pedersen I. Physical activity in people with dementia  
111 attending farm-based dementia day care - a comparative actigraphy study. *BMC Geriatr* 2020; **20**:  
112 219.
- 113 42 Miller JM, Sadak KT, Shahriar AA, *et al.* Cancer survivors exercise at higher intensity in outdoor  
114 settings: The GECCOS trial. *Pediatr Blood Cancer* 2020; **68**. DOI:10.1002/pbc.28850.
- 115 43 Barton J, Sandercock G, Pretty J, Wood C. The effect of playground- and nature-based playtime  
116 interventions on physical activity and self-esteem in UK school children. *Int J Environ Health Res*  
117 2015; **25**: 196–206.
- 118 44 Davidson PM, Padula W V, Daly J, Jackson D. Moral outrage in COVID19—Understandable but not  
119 a strategy. *J Clin Nurs* 2020. DOI:10.1111/jocn.15318.
- 120 45 Zhang Y, Beggs PJ, McGushin A, *et al.* The 2020 special report of the MJA–Lancet Countdown on  
121 health and climate change: lessons learnt from Australia’s “Black Summer”. *Med J Aust* 2020; **213**:  
122 490.
- 123 46 Dağistan Akgöz A, Gözüml S. Effectiveness of a nurse-led physical activity intervention to decrease  
124 cardiovascular disease risk in middle-aged adults: A pilot randomized controlled study. *J Vasc Nurs*  
125 2020; **38**: 140–8.
- 126 47 Ameli R, Skeath P, Abraham PA, *et al.* A nature-based health intervention at a military healthcare  
127 center: a randomized, controlled, cross-over study. *PeerJ* 2021; **9**: e10519–e10519.
- 128 48 Arbillaga-Etxarri A, Gimeno-Santos E, Barberan-Garcia A, *et al.* Long-term efficacy and  
129 effectiveness of a behavioural and community-based exercise intervention (Urban Training) to  
130 increase physical activity in patients with COPD: a randomised controlled trial. *Eur Respir J* 2018;  
131 **52**: 1800063.
- 132 49 Baba Y, Ooyama C, Tazawa Y, Kohzuki M. Effects of Adachi Rehabilitation Programme on older  
133 adults under long-term care: A multi-centre controlled trial. *PLoS One* 2021; **16**: e0245646–  
134 e0245646.
- 135 50 Ballew MT, Omoto AM. Absorption: How Nature Experiences Promote Awe and Other Positive  
136 Emotions. *Ecopsychology* 2018; **10**: 26–35.
- 137 51 Bang K-S, Kim S, Song MK, Kang KI, Jeong Y. The Effects of a Health Promotion Program Using  
138 Urban Forests and Nursing Student Mentors on the Perceived and Psychological Health of  
139 Elementary School Children in Vulnerable Populations. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* 2018; **15**:  
140 1977.
- 141 52 Barton J, Griffin M, Pretty J. Exercise-, nature- and socially interactive-based initiatives improve  
142 mood and self-esteem in the clinical population. *Perspect Public Health* 2011; **132**: 89–96.
- 143 53 Bielinis E, Janeczko E, Takayama N, *et al.* The effects of viewing a winter forest landscape with the  
144 ground and trees covered in snow on the psychological relaxation of young Finnish adults: A pilot  
145 study. *PLoS One* 2021; **16**: e0244799–e0244799.
- 146 54 de Bloom J, Sianoja M, Korpela K, *et al.* Effects of park walks and relaxation exercises during lunch  
147 breaks on recovery from job stress: Two randomized controlled trials. *J Environ Psychol* 2017; **51**:  
148 14–30.
- 149 55 Calogiuri G, Evensen K, Weydahl A, *et al.* Green exercise as a workplace intervention to reduce job  
150 stress. Results from a pilot study. *Work* 2016; **53**: 99–111.
- 151 56 Chun MH, Chang MC, Lee SJ. The effects of forest therapy on depression and anxiety in patients  
152 with chronic stroke. *Int J Neurosci* 2017; **127**: 199–203.

- 153 57 Cimprich B, Ronis DL. An Environmental Intervention to Restore Attention in Women With Newly  
154 Diagnosed Breast Cancer. *Cancer Nurs* 2003; **26**: 284–92.
- 155 58 Clutterbuck GL, Auld ML, Johnston LM. SPORTS STARS: a practitioner-led, peer-group sports  
156 intervention for ambulant children with cerebral palsy. Activity and participation outcomes of a  
157 randomised controlled trial. *Disabil Rehabil* 2020; : 1–9.
- 158 59 Cohen DA, Han B, Derose KP, *et al.* Promoting physical activity in high-poverty neighborhood  
159 parks: A cluster randomized controlled trial. *Soc Sci Med* 2017; **186**: 130–8.
- 160 60 Corazon SS, Sidenius U, Vammen KS, Klinker SE, Stigsdotter UK, Poulsen DV. The Tree Is My  
161 Anchor: A Pilot Study on the Treatment of BED through Nature-Based Therapy. *Int J Environ Res  
162 Public Health* 2018; **15**: 2486.
- 163 61 Demark-Wahnefried W, Cases MG, Cantor AB, *et al.* Pilot Randomized Controlled Trial of a Home  
164 Vegetable Gardening Intervention among Older Cancer Survivors Shows Feasibility, Satisfaction,  
165 and Promise in Improving Vegetable and Fruit Consumption, Reassurance of Worth, and the  
166 Trajectory of Central Adipos. *J Acad Nutr Diet* 2018; **118**: 689–704.
- 167 62 Djernis D, O’Toole MS, Fjorback LO, *et al.* A Short Mindfulness Retreat for Students to Reduce  
168 Stress and Promote Self-Compassion: Pilot Randomised Controlled Trial Exploring Both an Indoor  
169 and a Natural Outdoor Retreat Setting. *Healthc (Basel, Switzerland)* 2021; **9**: 910.
- 170 63 Elsey H, Farragher T, Tubeuf S, *et al.* Assessing the impact of care farms on quality of life and  
171 offending: a pilot study among probation service users in England. *BMJ Open* 2018; **8**: e019296–  
172 e019296.
- 173 64 Finkelstein EA, Tan Y-T, Malhotra R, Lee C-F, Goh S-S, Saw S-M. A Cluster Randomized  
174 Controlled Trial of an Incentive-Based Outdoor Physical Activity Program. *J Pediatr* 2013; **163**: 167-  
175 172.e1.
- 176 65 Flowers EP, Freeman P, Gladwell VF. Enhancing the acute psychological benefits of green exercise:  
177 An investigation of expectancy effects. *Psychol Sport Exerc* 2018; **39**: 213–21.
- 178 66 Frühauf A, Niedermeier M, Elliott LR, Ledochowski L, Marksteiner J, Kopp M. Acute effects of  
179 outdoor physical activity on affect and psychological well-being in depressed patients – A  
180 preliminary study. *Ment Health Phys Act* 2016; **10**: 4–9.
- 181 67 Gascon M, Harrall KK, Beavers AW, *et al.* Feasibility of collection and analysis of microbiome data  
182 in a longitudinal randomized trial of community gardening. *Future Microbiol* 2020; **15**: 633–48.
- 183 68 Gladwell VF, Kuoppa P, Tarvainen MP, Rogerson M. A Lunchtime Walk in Nature Enhances  
184 Restoration of Autonomic Control during Night-Time Sleep: Results from a Preliminary Study. *Int J  
185 Environ Res Public Health* 2016; **13**: 280.
- 186 69 Han A-R, Park S-A, Ahn B-E. Reduced stress and improved physical functional ability in elderly  
187 with mental health problems following a horticultural therapy program. *Complement Ther Med* 2018;  
188 **38**: 19–23.
- 189 70 Heilmayr D, Friedman HS. Cultivating healthy trajectories: An experimental study of community  
190 gardening and health. *J Health Psychol* 2018; **25**: 2418–27.
- 191 71 Jeon JY, Kim IO, Yeon P-S, Shin WS. The Physio-Psychological Effect of Forest Therapy Programs  
192 on Juvenile Probationers. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* 2021; **18**: 5467.
- 193 72 Kam MCY, Siu AMH. Evaluation of a Horticultural Activity Programme for Persons with Psychiatric  
194 Illness. *Hong Kong J Occup Ther* 2010; **20**: 80–6.
- 195 73 Kang S-J, Kim H-S, Baek K-H. Effects of Nature-Based Group Art Therapy Programs on Stress,  
196 Self-Esteem and Changes in Electroencephalogram (EEG) in Non-Disabled Siblings of Children with  
197 Disabilities. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* 2021; **18**: 5912.
- 198 74 Kim K-H, Park S-A. Horticultural therapy program for middle-aged women’s depression, anxiety,  
199 and self-identify. *Complement Ther Med* 2018; **39**: 154–9.
- 200 75 Kim JG, Jeon J, Shin WS. The Influence of Forest Activities in a University Campus Forest on  
201 Student’s Psychological Effects. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* 2021; **18**: 2457.

- 202 76 Kobayashi H, Song C, Ikei H, *et al.* Forest Walking Affects Autonomic Nervous Activity: A  
203 Population-Based Study. *Front public Heal* 2018; **6**: 278.
- 204 77 Koselka EPD, Weidner LC, Minasov A, *et al.* Walking Green: Developing an Evidence Base for  
205 Nature Prescriptions. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* 2019; **16**: 4338.
- 206 78 Lacharité-Lemieux M, Brunelle JP, Dionne IJ. Adherence to exercise and affective responses:  
207 comparison between outdoor and indoor training. *Menopause* 2015; **22**: 731–40.
- 208 79 Lee J-Y, Lee D-C. Cardiac and pulmonary benefits of forest walking versus city walking in elderly  
209 women: A randomised, controlled, open-label trial. *Eur J Integr Med* 2014; **6**: 5–11.
- 210 80 Leiros-Rodríguez R, García-Soidan JL. Balance Training in Elderly Women Using Public Parks. *J*  
211 *Women Aging* 2014; **26**: 207–18.
- 212 81 Li Q, Kobayashi M, Kumeda S, *et al.* Effects of Forest Bathing on Cardiovascular and Metabolic  
213 Parameters in Middle-Aged Males. *Evid Based Complement Alternat Med* 2016; **2016**: 2587381.
- 214 82 Liu Y-C, Yang W-W, Fang I-Y, Pan HL-L, Chen W-H, Liu C. Training Program With Outdoor  
215 Fitness Equipment in Parks Offers No Substantial Benefits for Functional Fitness in Active Seniors:  
216 A Randomized Controlled Trial. *J Aging Phys Act* 2020; **28**: 828–35.
- 217 83 Makizako H, Tsutsumimoto K, Doi T, *et al.* Exercise and Horticultural Programs for Older Adults  
218 with Depressive Symptoms and Memory Problems: A Randomized Controlled Trial. *J Clin Med*  
219 *2020*; **9**: 99.
- 220 84 Mao GX, Lan XG, Cao YB, *et al.* Effects of short-term forest bathing on human health in a broad-  
221 leaved evergreen forest in Zhejiang Province, China. *Biomed Environ Sci* 2012; **25**: 317–24.
- 222 85 Mao G, Cao Y, Wang B, *et al.* The Salutary Influence of Forest Bathing on Elderly Patients with  
223 Chronic Heart Failure. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* 2017; **14**: 368.
- 224 86 Ngo CS, Pan C-W, Finkelstein EA, *et al.* A cluster randomised controlled trial evaluating an  
225 incentive-based outdoor physical activity programme to increase outdoor time and prevent myopia in  
226 children. *Ophthalmic Physiol Opt* 2014; **34**: 362–8.
- 227 87 Oh Y-A, Park S-A, Ahn B-E. Assessment of the psychopathological effects of a horticultural therapy  
228 program in patients with schizophrenia. *Complement Ther Med* 2018; **36**: 54–8.
- 229 88 Park B-J, Shin C-S, Shin W-S, *et al.* Effects of Forest Therapy on Health Promotion among Middle-  
230 Aged Women: Focusing on Physiological Indicators. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* 2020; **17**: 4348.
- 231 89 Park S-A, Son SY, Lee A-Y, Park H-G, Lee W-L, Lee CH. Metabolite Profiling Revealed That a  
232 Gardening Activity Program Improves Cognitive Ability Correlated with BDNF Levels and  
233 Serotonin Metabolism in the Elderly. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* 2020; **17**: 541.
- 234 90 Plotnikoff RC, Wilczynska M, Cohen KE, Smith JJ, Lubans DR. Integrating smartphone technology,  
235 social support and the outdoor physical environment to improve fitness among adults at risk of, or  
236 diagnosed with, Type 2 Diabetes: Findings from the ‘eCoFit’ randomized controlled trial. *Prev Med*  
237 *(Baltim)* 2017; **105**: 404–11.
- 238 91 Ryu J, Jung JH, Kim J, *et al.* Outdoor cycling improves clinical symptoms, cognition and objectively  
239 measured physical activity in patients with schizophrenia: A randomized controlled trial. *J Psychiatr*  
240 *Res* 2020; **120**: 144–53.
- 241 92 Sales M, Polman R, Hill KD, Levinger P. A Novel Exercise Initiative for Seniors to Improve Balance  
242 and Physical Function. *J Aging Health* 2017; **29**: 1424–43.
- 243 93 Serrat M, Almirall M, Musté M, *et al.* Effectiveness of a Multicomponent Treatment for  
244 Fibromyalgia Based on Pain Neuroscience Education, Exercise Therapy, Psychological Support, and  
245 Nature Exposure (NAT-FM): A Pragmatic Randomized Controlled Trial. *J Clin Med* 2020; **9**: 3348.
- 246 94 Shin Y. The Effects of a Walking Exercise Program on Physical Function and Emotional State of  
247 Elderly Korean Women. *Public Health Nurs* 1999; **16**: 146–54.
- 248 95 Siu AMH, Kam M, Mok I. Horticultural Therapy Program for People with Mental Illness: A Mixed-  
249 Method Evaluation. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* 2020; **17**: 711.

- 250 96 Song C, Ikei H, Kagawa T, Miyazaki Y. Effects of Walking in a Forest on Young Women. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* 2019; **16**: 229.  
251
- 252 97 Stigsdotter UK, Corazon SS, Sidenius U, Nyed PK, Larsen HB, Fjorback LO. Efficacy of nature-  
253 based therapy for individuals with stress-related illnesses: randomised controlled trial. *Br J*  
254 *Psychiatry* 2018; **213**: 404–11.
- 255 98 Sung J, Woo J-M, Kim W, Lim S-K, Chung E-J. The Effect of Cognitive Behavior Therapy-Based  
256 “Forest Therapy” Program on Blood Pressure, Salivary Cortisol Level, and Quality of Life in Elderly  
257 Hypertensive Patients. *Clin Exp Hypertens* 2012; **34**: 1–7.
- 258 99 Takayama N, Korpela K, Lee J, *et al.* Emotional, restorative and vitalizing effects of forest and urban  
259 environments at four sites in Japan. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* 2014; **11**: 7207–30.
- 260 100 Tharrey M, Sachs A, Perignon M, *et al.* Improving lifestyles sustainability through community  
261 gardening: results and lessons learnt from the JArdinS quasi-experimental study. *BMC Public Health*  
262 2020; **20**: 1798.
- 263 101 Turner TL, Stevinson C. Affective outcomes during and after high-intensity exercise in outdoor green  
264 and indoor gym settings. *Int J Environ Health Res* 2017; **27**: 106–16.
- 265 102 Ura C, Okamura T, Yamazaki S, *et al.* Rice farming care as a novel method of green care farm in East  
266 Asian context: an implementation research. 2020. DOI:10.21203/rs.3.rs-42692/v2.
- 267 103 Van Den Berg AE, Custers MHG. Gardening Promotes Neuroendocrine and Affective Restoration  
268 from Stress. *J Health Psychol* 2010; **16**: 3–11.
- 269 104 van den Berg AE, van den Berg CG. A comparison of children with ADHD in a natural and built  
270 setting. *Child Care Health Dev* 2010; **37**: 430–9.
- 271 105 Verra Martin L, Angst F, Beck T, *et al.* Horticultural therapy for patients with chronic  
272 musculoskeletal pain: results of a pilot study. *Altern Ther Health Med* 2012; **18**: 44–50.
- 273 106 Wang D-H, Yamada A, Miyanaga M. Changes in Urinary Hydrogen Peroxide and 8-Hydroxy-2'-  
274 Deoxyguanosine Levels after a Forest Walk: A Pilot Study. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* 2018;  
275 **15**: 1871.
- 276 107 Wichrowski M, Whiteson J, Haas F, Mola A, Rey MJ. Effects of Horticultural Therapy on Mood and  
277 Heart Rate in Patients Participating in an Inpatient Cardiopulmonary Rehabilitation Program. *J*  
278 *Cardiopulm Rehabil* 2005; **25**: 270–4.
- 279 108 Willert MV, Wieclaw J, Thulstrup AM. Rehabilitation of individuals on long-term sick leave due to  
280 sustained stress-related symptoms: A comparative follow-up study. *Scand J Public Health* 2014; **42**:  
281 719–27.
- 282 109 Wong GCL, Ng TKS, Lee J Le, *et al.* Horticultural Therapy Reduces Biomarkers of  
283 Immunosenescence and Inflammaging in Community-Dwelling Older Adults: A Feasibility Pilot  
284 Randomized Controlled Trial. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci* 2021; **76**: 307–17.
- 285 110 Yi J, Kim SG, Khil T, *et al.* Psycho-Electrophysiological Benefits of Forest Therapies Focused on  
286 Qigong and Walking with Elderly Individuals. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* 2021; **18**: 3004.
- 287 111 Zhu S, Wan H, Lu Z, *et al.* Treatment Effect of Antipsychotics in Combination with Horticultural  
288 Therapy on Patients with Schizophrenia: A Randomized, Double-blind, Placebo-controlled Study.  
289 *Shanghai Arch psychiatry* 2016; **28**: 195–203.
- 290


Figure 1. PRISMA flowchart of record retrieval and selection






**Figure 2. Forest plots of health outcomes**


**(A) Systolic blood pressure (mmHg)**




**(B) Diastolic blood pressure (mmHg)**




### (C) Depression score



### (E) Anxiety score



### (F) Daily step count ('000 steps)



Note: Data is presented as thousands ('000) of steps.

### (G) Weekly time of moderate physical activities (minutes)

