1 A global meta-analysis of effects of green infrastructure on COVID-19 infection

2 and mortality rates

- 3 Bopaki Phogole and Kowiyou Yessoufou*
- 4 Department of Geography, Environmental Management, and Energy Studies,
- 5 University of Johannesburg, Johannesburg, South Africa

6

- 7
- 8 *Correspondence: <u>kowiyouy@uj.ac.za</u>

10 Abstract

Evidence of the benefits of greenspaces or greenness to human wellbeing in the 11 context of COVID-19 is fragmented and sometimes contradictory. This calls for a 12 meta-analysis of existing studies to clarify the matter. Here, we identified 621 studies 13 across the world, which were then filtered down to 13 relevant studies covering 14 Africa, Asia, Europe, and USA. These studies were meta-analysed, with the impacts 15 of greenspaces on COVID-19 infection rate quantified using regression estimates 16 17 whereas impacts on mortality was measured using mortality rate ratios. We found evidence of significant negative correlations between greenness and both COVID-19 18 19 infection and mortality rates. We further found that the impacts on COVID-19 20 infection and mortality are moderated by year of publication, greenness metrics, sample size, health and political covariates. This clarification has far-reaching 21 implications on policy development towards the establishment and management of 22 green infrastructure for the benefits of human wellbeing. 23

24 Introduction

25 Global human population is changing rapidly following an exponential growth path, 26 putting tremendous pressures on natural resources. Currently, it is approximately 7.9 billion people¹ and is predicted to reach above 9 billion by 2050 or 11 billion by 27 2100². In response, nature fights back in various ways to bring down global 28 population to a sustainable level. One of these ways is through global pandemics, 29 30 e.g., COVID-19. Indeed, the world has been witnessing COVID-19 pandemic since 2020, with over half a million of infection cases and over 20,000 deaths in 2020^3 . In 31 32 2022, these figures grew tremendously, reaching over 600 million cumulative cases with over 6 million cumulative deaths⁴. Subsequently, various studies, using different 33 34 metrics of greenness (the total amount of vegetation in an area), were conducted 35 across the globe to investigate whether greenness act as buffer infrastructure against the spread of COVID-19 infection rates and severity. 36

37

However, the findings reported in these studies are mixed^{5,6}. For example, ref.⁷ 38 found that a 0.1 increase in NDVI is linked to 4.1% reduction in COVID-19 incidence 39 rate ratio in the USA. A similar pattern was observed using street-level indicators of 40 greenness⁸. The mitigating effects of greenness have also been reported elsewhere: 41 42 in China and India, an increase in greenness shows a strong negative association with the spread of COVID-19 infections and mortalities^{9,10}. These negative effects 43 may be interpreted as follows: activities of the Natural Killer (NK) cells in human 44 body are boosted with frequent exposure to vegetation^{3,11} – NK cells, as part of the 45 immune system, attack to eliminate virus-infected cells¹². Also, by safeguarding 46 47 against air pollution, vegetation contributes to lower health risks that may aggravate the severity of COVID-19 infection^{13,14}. Additionally, green infrastructure often 48 provides spacious environment for physical exercise, recreation, and social events 49 with reduced chances of person-to-person contact^{15,16}. As opposed to these negative 50 correlations between greenness and COVID-19 infection rates, reports of positive 51 correlations are also documented. For example, ref.⁶ found that urban greenspaces 52 were associated with an increase in the spread of COVID-19 infections (see also 53 ref.^{15,16}). 54

56 These mixed findings could be linked to the differences in how COVID-19 severity 57 was measured, e.g., as hospitalization rates, mortality rates, admission rate to ICU, 58 etc. Additional sources of differences in findings may be linked to differences in sample size, type and number of covariates considered, and choice of statistical 59 tests^{17,18}. Furthermore, the mixed findings may be linked to differences in how 60 61 greenness was measured in different studies. Indeed, greenness was variously 62 measured as street trees, botanical gardens, natural forests and grasslands, and residential gardens or as amount of greenness captured in NDVI or EVI or as guality 63 of green infrastructure^{7,8,19,20}. For example, ref.¹⁵ measured greenness as 'green 64 space density' which is the proportion of specific vegetation types in a given spatial 65 unit which they correlated with COVI-19 infection risk measured as 'venue density' 66 (number of buildings visited by confirmed COVID-19 positive cases). Since 67 greenspaces are attraction sites, they attract increasing number of visitors, thus 68 increasing the infection risks, and leading to a positive correlation between 69 greenness and infection rate¹⁵. Furthermore, the mixed findings may be linked to the 70 71 use of various confounding factors in the model of COVID-19 infection and mortality rates. These factors may be age^{21} , ethnicity²², and poverty level²³, among others. 72

73

74 The emergence of conflicting findings presents a challenge with regards to the 75 generalization of the benefits of greenness to human wellbeing in the context of COVID-19 pandemic. In such context, a meta-analysis of existing evidence presents 76 77 an opportunity to integrate the conflicting reported effects of greenness on COVID-19 infection rates and severity to investigate whether generalization is possible. 78 79 Scientifically rigorous methodologies are increasingly adopted in various studies to improve the validity of findings and lower between-study heterogeneity. These 80 include the use of larger sample sizes, use of multiple predictors, choice of relevant 81 statistical tests and covariates, and use of fine spatial scales²³⁻²⁶. Regardless of 82 83 these advances, consolidation of measured effect sizes and determination of between-study heterogeneity is still needed. To date, several studies have 84 85 investigated the relationships between the provision and quantity of greenness and its effects on the spread and severity of COVID-19^{5,7,10,20}. However, in the context of 86 87 conflictual findings reported, a meta-analysis imposes itself or becomes an obligation 88 if we are to clarify how greenness or green infrastructure relates to COVID-19. In the 89 present study, our main objective is to provide such clarifications.

90 Results

91 Characteristics of studies included in the meta-analysis

A total of 621 studies across the world (Figure 1A) were identified through the search of Scopus, PubMed, and Google scholar platforms. After removing irrelevant and duplicate studies, 25 studies remained, covering Africa, Asia, Europe, and USA (Figure 1B). A review of the 25 full-text articles resulted in a removal of 12 studies that were either review/commentary in nature or did not report the required statistical parameters for meta-analysis.

98

The study characteristics are summarized in Table S1. Nine studies that tested the 99 relationships between greenness and COVID-19 infections and four studies that 100 101 investigated the relationships between greenness and COVID-19 mortality rates 102 were included in the final synthesis. Most of the studies (nine out of 13) were 103 conducted in the United States of America (USA) whereas China, England, India, and South Africa each had one study (Figure 1B). A total of 7 out of 13 studies used 104 105 more than one predictor of COVID-19 impact in each study with normalised 106 difference vegetation index (NDVI) and abundance of greenness as the mostly used 107 measures of greenness (Figure 2A). Because multiple predictors are used in a single 108 study, a total of 45 different correlations between infection rates and greenness were 109 produced in all 13 studies and 14 correlations between mortality rates and greenness were produced from four studies of COVID-19. We classified covariates 110 111 into five broad groups: climatic, demographic, economic, health, and political. All 13 studies considered at least one demographic covariate in their analyses, and only 112 four studies included climatic, demographic, economic, health, and political 113 covariates (Figure 2B). 114

115

116 Greenness and COVID-19 infections

We found a statistically significant negative effect of greenness on COVID-19 infections (β = -0.08, 95% CI: -0.1396 - -0.0252; t=-2.90; p=0.006) with a prediction interval of [-0.3601 - 0.1954] (95% CI) (Figure 3). Between-study heterogeneity variance was estimated at τ^2 = 0.0184 (95% CI: 0.0185 - -0.0813), with an I² value of 94.1% (95% CI: 92.9% - 95.1%). Subgroup analyses reveal that between-study heterogeneity can be attributed to year of publication (X^2 =8.24; p=0.02), choice of

predictors (X^2 =129.68; p<0.01), and use of political covariates (X^2 =8.27; p<0.01)

124 (see Table 1 and Figures S1 - S6).

125

126 Greenness and COVID-19 mortalities

127 We found that an increase in greenness was strongly linked to lower mortality rate 128 ratio (MRR= 0.9272; 95% CI: 0.8788 - 0.9783; t=-3.05; p=0.009) with a prediction 129 interval of [0.7683 – 1.1189] (95% CI) (Figure 4). Furthermore, an estimated 0.0069 between-study heterogeneity variance (95% CI: 0.0032 - 0.0228) was observed with 130 an I² value of 92% (95% CI: 88.3% – 94.5%). We also found that year of publication 131 $(X^{2}=19.10; p<0.01)$, sample size $(X^{2}=7.92; p<0.01)$, choice of predictors $(X^{2}=14.92; p<0.01)$ 132 p<0.01), and use of health ($X^2=7.92$; p<0.01) and political ($X^2=22.75$; p<0.01) 133 134 covariates strongly impact the degree of heterogeneity (see Table 2 & Figures S7 -135 S13).

136

137 **Publication bias**

Existence of publication bias was investigated using the Funnel approach and Orwin fail-safe number. The presence of funnel plot symmetry (Figure 5A) indicated a lack of publication bias for studies that investigate the effect of greenness on COVID-19 infections (Fail-safe N: 45). Publication bias was, however, observed for studies that test the relationship between greenness and COVID-19 mortalities (Figure 5B; Failsafe N: 14).

144

145

146 **Discussion**

Our meta-analysis provides evidence that an increase in abundance or exposure to 147 greenness is associated with a significant reduction in COVID-19 infection rates and 148 death cases^{10,19,27}. However, we found high heterogeneity between the studies that 149 150 were included in the meta-analysis. Subgroup analyses revealed that heterogeneity 151 in studies on COVID-19 infections and mortality is strongly predicted by the studies' years of publication, choices of predictors (metrics of greenness), and inclusion of 152 153 political covariates. Additionally, sample size and consideration of health covariates 154 strongly affect heterogeneity of studies on COVID-19 mortalities.

156 The sensitivity of effect size to year of publication can be attributed to availability of 157 data to adequately model the impact of COVID-19. The spread of COVID-19 and 158 increased global testing for COVID-19 infection accelerated overtime, thus allowing successive studies to have an increasingly larger data pool^{28,29}. This may also 159 impact sample sizes that are adopted in each study. As more regions produce more 160 161 data on COVID-19 infections and mortality, their eligibility to be included in studies 162 investigating the correlations between COVID-19 and greenness may enhance study 163 designs. In our subgroup analysis, we found that studies that used smaller sample sizes (n<2000) are likely to report larger effect sizes compared to studies with larger 164 sample sizes. Given the importance of selecting an appropriate sample size³⁰, the 165 166 need to define an appropriate sample size for investigating the health benefits of 167 green infrastructure remains critical.

168

169 The diversity of greenness metrics, ranging from street trees to large forests, 170 presents a unique challenge while measuring their impacts. Commonly, studies that 171 cover large study areas use vegetation indices such as NDVI or EVI which are retrieved from satellite imagery³¹⁻³³. Since health benefits of greenness are usually 172 felt closer to the greenness^{34,35}, several studies consider local greenness such as 173 household gardens³⁶, street trees^{37,38}, and local parks^{39,40} in their analysis. However, 174 175 this approach is only feasible when focusing on smaller areas. In some cases, subjective measures of greenness were used^{41,42}. Our findings in the present study 176 177 suggest that the choice of greenness metrics adopted in different studies affects the its effect size. The use of NDVI, EVI or vegetation canopy size produces large effects 178 179 of greenness against COVID-19 infections and mortalities. In contrast, studies that use proximity or visitation patterns are likely to report marginal effects. 180

181

182 All studies in our meta-analysis have included demographic covariates, and 92% of 183 studies included economic covariates. While modelling the effects of greenness, the 184 inclusion of demographic variables such as population density and age structure, as 185 well as economic indicators such as gross domestic product (GDP) and household income level as covariates have been largely adopted^{7,9,27,43}. Furthermore, the use of 186 health covariates featured in several studies^{5,19,26}. However, consideration of political 187 188 covariates in the modelling of greenness benefits to human wellbeing in the context of COVID-19 is only starting to emerge^{5,6}. Political factors such as promulgation of 189

mobility restrictions^{15,44} and face-masks mandates⁴⁵ have shown to be significant 190 191 predictors of COVID-19 impacts, although their inclusion in studies linking greenness 192 to COVID-19 infection and severity remains limited. We found that the use of political 193 covariates significantly affects the effect size. Inclusion of political covariables 194 resulted in a greater effect size in studies of COVID-19 mortality and in a smaller 195 effect size in studies of COVID-19 infections. This may suggest that existing policies 196 are more effective in reducing COVID-19 fatalities than curbing the spread of 197 infections.

198

199 Overall, meta-analysing studies from Africa, Asia, Europe, and USA, we found strong 200 support for beneficial effects of greenness to human in the face of COVID-19 201 infection and severity, suggesting that positive correlations reported in some studies between greenness vs. infection and mortality rates^{15,16} might simply imply that the 202 203 greenness metrics used in those studies (e.g., green space density or accessibility to 204 greenspaces) do not fully capture important facets of greenness. This calls for a 205 need to homogenize greenness metrics in studies to come. There is also a need for 206 homogenization of COVID-19 severity metrics since we could not include 207 hospitalization rate in the present study as a measure of COVID-19 severity because 208 very limited studies have investigated hospitalization rate. Lastly, our results showed 209 high degree of between-study heterogeneity which can be explained by year of 210 publication, sample size, and choice of predictor variables and covariates. However, 211 evidence from existing studies show that green infrastructure moderates the impact 212 of COVID-19 by reducing prevalence of infections and associated mortalities.

213

Nevertheless, our findings have some far-reaching implications for the establishment and management of green infrastructure: greenspaces must be acknowledged as critical infrastructure that has substantial broader public health values, and as such, deserve enough fundings from governments worldwide, especially in the developing world.

- 219
- 220
- 221
- 222
- 223

224 Methods

225 Study selection

The Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRIMSA) guidelines⁴⁶ were followed to search for literature that focus on green infrastructure and its impact on COVID-19. All search results were reviewed for relevance based on their title and abstract to be considered for meta-analysis (Figure 6). Furthermore, reference lists of all included articles were reviewed to identify studies that meet the inclusion criteria.

232

233 Search strategy

Literature search was limited to PubMed, Scopus, and Google Scholar. The following search string was used to search for literature on the 17th of April 2023: ("Greenspace" or "green space" or "greenery" or "greenness" or "vegetation" or "trees" or "forest" or "grass" or "grassland") and ("COVID-19" or "SARS-CoV-2" or "coronavirus" or "COVID"). We did not apply any restrictions on publication date in the search.

240

241 Eligibility criteria

Inclusion criteria for this study were as follow: (a) original research that investigates effects of green infrastructure on COVID-19 infections and related mortalities; (b) fulltext is available; (c) publication is in English; (d) required statistical parameters for meta-analysis are reported in the main article or supplementary files (i.e., regression estimates for predicting COVID-19 infections, and mortality rate ratios for predicting COVID-19 mortalities). Exclusion criteria were review or commentary articles, articles without required parameters, and articles not in English (see Figure 6).

249

250 Data extraction and analysis

A predetermined template was used to collect study characteristics which are surname of first author, year of publication, country of study, measure of green infrastructure, temporal extent of study, sample size, measure of COVID-19, effect type, effect size, standard error or confidence interval, and list of covariates. All data analysed in this study are available as Supplemental Information (Appendix 1).

All analyses were conducted in R version 4.2.3⁴⁷ (see R script in Supplemental 257 258 Information). Two separate meta-analyses were conducted, focusing on impacts of 259 greenness on COVID-19 infections (meta-analysis 1) and COVID-19 mortalities 260 (meta-analysis 2). Regression estimates were used as pre-calculated effect type when analysing COVID-19 infections, and mortality rate ratios (MRR) were used as 261 262 pre-calculated effect type when analysing COVID-19 mortalities. Subsequently, 263 subgroup analyses were applied to the same data to test the effects of predictor variables, sample size, and selection of covariates. Random models were selected in 264 each analysis using *metagen* function found in the "Metafor" R library⁴⁸. 265

266

Outcomes are reported as pooled regression estimates for COVID-19 infections and 267 268 as pooled MRR for COVID-19 deaths. Furthermore, in each case, a 95% confidence 269 interval (CI), t-value, and p-values are reported with p<0.005 considered as an 270 indicator of statistical significance. Between-studies heterogeneity was quantified using Higgins & Thompson's I² statistic⁴⁹ with the I² value of less than 25%, 50% and 271 272 75% indicating low, moderate, or high heterogeneity, respectively. Heterogeneity 273 variance and prediction interval were also reported to measure the extent of between-study heterogeneity. Publication bias was tested using the Funnel 274 approach⁵⁰ (Sterne & Egger 2001) and the Orwin's fail-safe number⁵¹. 275

276 Acknowledgements:

- 277 KY acknowledges the South Africa's National Research Foundation (grant #
- 278 SRUG22051210107).

279 Author Contributions:

- 280 KY conceived the project, BP collected the data, BP analysed the data, KY and BP
- wrote the paper.

282 Data Availability:

- All data generated or analysed in this study are included in this article (and its
- 284 Supplementary Information files).

285 Conflict of Interest Statement

- 286 The authors declare no conflict of interests.
- Code availability: Code to replicate all results in this paper is available as
 Supplemental Information.

289 **References**

290 1- UN DESA (United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs). 291 Global Population Growth and Sustainable Development Goals. 2021. 292 Available online: 293 https://www.un.org/development/desa/pd/sites/www.un.org.development.desa .pd/files/undesa_pd_2022_global_population_growth.pdf (accessed on 12 294 December 2021). 295 296 2- Bongaarts, J. 2016. Development: Slow down population growth. Nature 530, 297 409-412. 298 WHO (World Health Organisation). 2020. Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-299 Situation Report-Available 19). 65. at https://www.who.int/publications/m/item/situation-report---65 300 4- WHO (World Health Organisation). 2022. WHO coronavirus (COVID-19) 301 302 dashboard. Available at https://covid19.who.int/ 303 5- Yang, Y., Lu, Y. & Jiang, B. (2022). Population-weighted exposure to green 304 spaces tied to lower COVID-19 mortality rates: A nationwide dose-response study in the USA. Science of The Total Environment, 851: 158333. 305 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2022.158333. 306 6-Zhai, W., Yue, H. & Deng, Y. (2022). Examining the association 307 between urban green space and viral transmission of COVID-19 during the 308 Applied Geography, 147: 309 early outbreak. 102768. 310 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apgeog.2022.102768. Spotswood, E.N., Benjamin, M., Stoneburner, L., Wheeler, M. M., 311 7-Beller, E. E., Balk, D., McPhearson, T., Kuo, M. & McDonald, R. I. (2021). 312 inequity and higher COVID-19 case rates 313 Nature in less-green 314 neighbourhoods in the United States. Nature Sustainability, 4(12): 1092–1098. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41893-021-00781-9. 315 316 8-Nguyen, Q.C., Huang, Y., Kumar, A., Duan, H., Keralis, J.M., Dwivedi, P., Meng, H.W., Brunisholz, K.D., Jay, J., Javanmardi, M. & Tasdizen, T. 317 318 (2020). Using 164 Million Google Street View Images to Derive Built Environment Predictors of COVID-19 Cases. International Journal of 319 Public 320 Environmental Research and Health, 17(17): 6359. Doi: 10.3390/ijerph17176359. PMID: 32882867; PMCID: PMC7504319. 321 322 9-Peng, W., Dong, Y., Tian, M., Yuan, J., Kan, H., Jia, X. & Wang, W. (2022). City-level greenness exposure is associated with covid-19 incidence 323 Environmental 209: 324 China. Research, 112871. in https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2022.112871. 325 10-Sikarwar, A., Rani, R., Duthé, G. & Golaz, V. (2023). Association of Greenness 326 327 with covid-19 deaths in India: An Ecological Study at district level. Environmental 217: 114906. 328 Research. 329 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2022.114906. 11-Li, Q. 2010. Effects of forest bathing trips on human immune function. 330 Environmental Health and Preventive Medicine, 15, 9–17. 331 332 12-Vivier, E., Tomasello, E., Baratin, M., Walzer, T. & Ugolini, S. 2008. Functions of natural killer cells. Nature Immunology, 9, 503–510. 333 13-Chen, Q.X., Huang, C.L., Yuan, Y. & Tan, H.P. 2020. Influence of COVID-19 334 event on air quality and their association in mainland China. Aerosol and Air 335 Quality Research, 20: 1541–1551. 336

337	14-Lin, J., Kroll, C. N., Nowak, D. J., & Greenfield, E. J. (2019). A review of urban
338	forest modeling: Implications for management and future research. Urban
339	Forestry & Urban Greening, 43, Article 126366
340	15-Huang, X., Shao, X., Xing, L., Hu, Y., Sin, D.D. & Zhang, X. (2021). The
341	impact of lockdown timing on COVID-19 transmission across US counties.
342	EClinicalMedicine, 38: 101035. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eclinm.2021.101035.
343	16- Pan J., Bardhan R., Jin Y. *, Ying Jin 2021. Spatial distributive effects
344	of public green space and COVID-19 infectionin London
345	17- Zhang, L. & Tan, P.Y. (2019). Associations between Urban Green
346	Spaces and Health are Dependent on the Analytical Scale and How Urban
347	Green Spaces are Measured. International Journal of Environmental
348	Research and Public Health, 16(4): 578.
349	https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph16040578
350	18- Labib S.M., Lindley S. & Huck J.J. (2020). Scale effects in remotely
351	sensed greenspace metrics and how to mitigate them for environmental
352	health exposure assessment. Computers, Environment and Urban Systems,
353	82: 101501. Doi: 10.1016/j.compenvurbsys.2020.101501.
354	19- Jiang, B., Yang, Y., Chen, L., Liu, X., Wu, X., Chen, B., Webster, C.,
355	Sullivan, W. C., Larsen, L., Wang, J., & Lu, Y. (2022). Green spaces,
356	especially nearby forest, may reduce the SARS-COV-2 infection rate: A
357	nationwide study in the United States. Landscape and Urban Planning, 228:
358	104583. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landurbplan.2022.104583.
359	20- Chen, K., Klompmaker, J. O., Roscoe, C. J., Nguyen, L. H., Drew, D.
360	A., James, P., Laden, F., Fecht, D., Wang, W., Gulliver, J., Wolf, J., Steves, C.
361	J., Spector, T. D., Chan, A. T. & Hart, J. E. (2023). Associations between
362	greenness and predicted COVID-19-like illness incidence in the United States
363	and the United Kingdom. Environmental Epidemiology (Philadelphia, Pa.),
364	7(1): e244. https://doi.org/10.1097/EE9.000000000000244.
365	21- Bajaj, V., Gadi, N., Spihlman, A. P., Wu, S. C., Choi, C. H. & Moulton, V.
366	R. (2021). Aging, Immunity, and COVID-19: How Age Influences the Host
367	Immune Response to Coronavirus Infections? Frontiers in Physiology, 11.
368	https://doi.org/10.3389/fphys.2020.571416.
369	22- Mathur, R., Rentsch, C.T., Morton, C.E., Hulme, W.J., Schultze, A.,
370	Mackenna, B., Eggo, R.M., Bhaskaran, K., Wong, A.Y.S., Williamson, E.J.,
371	Forbes, H., Wing, K., Mcdonald, H.I., Bates, C., Bacon, S., Walker, A.J.,
372	Evans, D., Inglesby, P., Mehrkar, A., Curtis, H.J., Devito, N.J., Croker, R.,
373	Drysdale, H., Cockburn, J., Parry, J., Hester, F., Harper, S., Douglas, I.J.,
374	Tomlinson, L., Evans, S.J.W., Grieve, R., Harrison, D., Rowan, K., Khunti, K.,
375	Chaturvedi, N., Smeeth, L. & Goldacre, B. (2021). Ethnic differences in
376	SARS-CoV-2 infection and COVID-19-related hospitalisation, intensive care
377	unit admission, and death in 17 million adults in England: an observational
378	cohort study using the OpenSAFELY platform. The Lancet, 397(10286): 1711
379	– 1724.
380	23- Hussey, H., Zinyakatira, N., Morden, E., Ismail, M., Paleker, M., Bam,
381	L., London, L., Boulle, A. & Davies, A. (2021). Higher COVID-19 mortality in
382	low-income communities in the City of Cape Town – a descriptive ecological
383	study. Gates Open Research, 5.
384	https://doi.org/10.12688/gatesopenres.13288.1.
385	24- Lu, Y., Chen, L., Liu, X., Yang, Y., Sullivan, W. C., Xu, W., Webster, C.
386	& Jiang, B. (2021). Green spaces mitigate racial disparity of health: A higher

387	ratio of green spaces indicates a lower racial disparity in SARS-COV-2
388	infection rates in the USA. Environment International, 152: 106465.
389	https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2021.106465.
390	25- Li, H., Zhang, G. & Cao, Y. (2022). Forest Area, CO2 Emission, and
391	COVID-19 Case-Fatality Rate: A Worldwide Ecological Study Using Spatial
392	Regression Analysis. Forests, 13(5), 736. https://doi.org/10.3390/f13050736.
393	26-Lin, J., Huang, B., Kwan, M.P., Chen, M. & Wang, Q. (2023). Covid-19
394	infection rate but not severity is associated with availability of greenness in the
395	United States. Landscape and Urban Planning, 233: 104704.
396	https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landurbplan.2023.104704.
397	27- Klompmaker, J.O., Hart, J.E., Holland, I., Sabath, M.B., Wu, X., Laden,
398	F., Dominici, F. & James, P. (2020). County-level exposures to Greenness and
399	associations with covid-19 incidence and mortality in the United States.
400	Science of the Total Environment, 199: 111331.
401	https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.26.20181644.
402	28- Singh, S., Chowdhury, C., Panja, A. K. & Neogy, S. (2021). Time Series
403	Analysis of COVID-19 Data to Study the Effect of Lockdown and Unlock in
404	India. Journal of The Institution of Engineers (India): Series B, 102(6): 1275-
405	1281. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40031-021-00585-7
406	29- OWD (Our World in Data). 2023. Total COVID-19 tests.
407	https://ourworldindata.org/grapher/full-list-total-tests-for-covid-19. (Accessed
408	02.05.2023).
409	30- Springate, S. D. (2012). The effect of sample size and bias on the
410	reliability of estimates of error: A comparative study of Dahlberg's formula.
411	European Journal of Orthodontics, 34(2): 158-163.
412	https://doi.org/10.1093/ejo/cjr010
413	31- Fong, K., Hart, J. E. & James, P. (2018). A Review of Epidemiologic
414	Studies on Greenness and Health: Updated Literature Through 2017. Current
415	environmental health reports, 5(1): 77. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40572-018-
416	0179-у.
417	32- Brochu, P., Jimenez, M. P., James, P., Kinney, P. L. & Lane, K. (2022).
418	Benefits of Increasing Greenness on All-Cause Mortality in the Largest
419	Metropolitan Areas of the United States Within the Past Two Decades.
420	Frontiers in Public Health, 10, https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2022.841936.
421	33- Grigsby-Toussaint, D.S. & Shin, J.C. (2022). Covid-19, Green Space
422	Exposure, and Mask Mandates. Science of The Total Environment, 836:
423	155302. https://doi.org/10.1016/i.scitotenv.2022.155302.
424	34- Noom, R., Gosselin, P., Blais, C. & Rochette, L. (2016), Type and
425	Proximity of Green Spaces Are Important for Preventing Cardiovascular
426	Morbidity and Diabetes—A Cross-Sectional Study for Quebec. Canada.
427	International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health. 13(4).
428	https://doi.org/10.3390/iierph13040423.
429	35- Dennis, M., Cook, P.A., James, P., Wheater, P. & Lindley, S.J. (2020).
430	Relationships between health outcomes in older populations and urban green
431	infrastructure size, guality and proximity BMC Public Health 20 626
432	https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-020-08762-x
433	36- Chalmin-Pui, L. S., Griffiths, A. Roe, J. Heaton, T. & Cameron, R.
434	(2021) Why garden? – Attitudes and the perceived health benefits of home
135	ardening Cities 112: 103118 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities 2021.103118

436 37-Marselle, M. R., Bowler, D. E., Watzema, J., Eichenberg, D., Kirsten, T., & Bonn, A. (2020). Urban street tree biodiversity and antidepressant 437 438 prescriptions. Scientific Reports, 10(1), 1-11. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-439 020-79924-5. Wolf, K. L., Lam, S. T., McKeen, J. K., Richardson, R. A. & Bardekjian, 440 38-A. C. (2020). Urban Trees and Human Health: A Scoping Review. 441 442 International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 17(12). https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17124371 443 Orstad, S. L., Szuhany, K., Tamura, K., Thorpe, L. E. & Jay, M. (2020). 39-444 Park Proximity and Use for Physical Activity among Urban Residents: 445 Associations with Mental Health. International Journal of Environmental 446 Research and Public Health, 17(13): 4885. 447 https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17134885. 448 40-Weber, K.A., Yang, W., Carmichael, S. L., Collins, R.T., Luben, T.J., 449 Desrosiers, T.A., Insuf, T.I., Le, M.T., Evans, S.P., Romitti, P.A., Yazdy, M.M., 450 451 Nembhard, W.N. & Shaw, G.M. (2023). The National Birth Defects Prevention 452 Study. (2023). Assessing associations between residential proximity to 453 greenspace and birth defects in the national birth defects prevention study. Environmental Research, 216: 114760 doi:10.1016/j.envres.2022.114760. 454 Yessoufou, K., Sithole, M. & Elansary, H. O. (2020). Effects of urban 455 41-456 green spaces on human perceived health improvements: Provision of green spaces is not enough but how people use them matters. PLOS ONE, 15(9): 457 e0239314. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0239314. 458 42-Lehberger, M., Kleih, A. & Sparke, K. (2021). Self-reported well-being 459 and the importance of green spaces – A comparison of garden owners and 460 non-garden owners in times of COVID-19. Landscape and Urban Planning, 461 462 212, 104108. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landurbplan.2021.104108. Russette, H., Graham, J., Holden, Z., Semmens, E.O., Williams, E. & 43-463 464 Landguth, E.L. (2021). Greenspace exposure and covid-19 mortality in the United States: January–July 2020. Environmental Research, 198: 111195. 465 466 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2021.111195. 44-Haug, N., Geyrhofer, L., Londei, A., Dervic, E., Loreto, V., Pinior, B., 467 Thurner, S. & Klimek, P. (2020). Ranking the effectiveness of worldwide 468 COVID-19 government interventions. Nature Human Behaviour, 4(12): 1303-469 470 1312. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-020-01009-0. 45-Aravindakshan, A., Boehnke, J., Gholami, E. & Nayak, A. (2022). The 471 impact of mask-wearing in mitigating the spread of COVID-19 during the early 472 473 phases of the pandemic. PLOS Global Public Health 2(9): e0000954. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pgph.0000954. 474 Page, M.J., McKenzie, J.E., Bossuyt, P.M., Boutron, I., Hoffmann, T.C., 475 46-476 Mulrow, C.D., Shamseer, L., Tetzlaff, J.M., Akl, E.A., Brennan, S.E., Chou, R., 477 Glanville, J., Grimshaw, J.M., Hróbjartsson, A., Lalu, M.M., Li, T., Loder, E.W., 478 Mayo-Wilson, E., McDonald, S., McGuinness, L.A., Stewart, L.A., Thomas, J., Tricco, A.C., Welch, V.A., Whiting, P. & Moher, D. (2021). The PRISMA 2020 479 statement: An updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. PLoS Med 480 481 18(3): e1003583. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1003583. 482 47-R Core Team. (2021). R: A language and environment for statistical 483 computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. 484 https://www.R-project.org/.

485	48- Viechtbauer, W. (2010). Conducting meta-analyses in R with the
486	metafor package. Journal of Statistical Software, 36(3): 1-48.
487	https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v036.i03.
488	49- Higgins, J.P. & Thompson, S.G. (2002). Quantifying heterogeneity in a
489	meta-analysis. Statistics in Medicine, 21(11): 1539 – 1558.
490	https://doi.org/10.1002/sim.1186.
491	50- Sterne, J.A.C. & Egger, M. (2001). Funnel plots for detecting bias in
492	meta-analysis: guidelines on choice of axis. Journal of Clinical Epidemiology,
493	54:1046–1055
494	51- Orwin RG. A fail-safe N for effect size in meta-analysis. Journal of
495	Educational Statistics. 1983;8(2):157–159.
496	

497	Table 1	1:	Stratified	analyses	of	pooled	estimate	of	COVID-19	infections	and	green
498	infrastru	ctu	ıre.									

Stratified analysis	Number of results	Pooled estimate [95% Cl]	Subgroup difference X ² , df (p-value)		
Study year	45	-0.08 [-0.14; -0.03]	8.24, df = 2 (p = 0.02)		
2021	15	-0.07 [-0.15; 0.01]			
2022	20	-0.02 [-0.06; 0.02]			
2023	10	-0.32 [-0.57; -0.07]			
Sample size	45	-0.08 [-0.14; -0.03]	0.01, df = 1 (p = 0.91)		
Small (n<2000)	19	-0.09 [-0.16; -0.02]			
Large (n≥2000)	26	-0.08 [-0.18; 0.02]			
Predictor	45	-0.08 [-0.14; -0.03]	129.68, df = 4 (p < 0.01)		
Abundance	25	-0.06 [-0.12; -0.00]			
NDVI/EVI	11	-0.24 [-0.55; 0.07]			
Canopy	3	-0.44 [-0.62; -0.27]			
Visitation	5	0.01 [0.00; 0.01]			
Proximity	1	-0.02 [-0.08; 0.04]			
Covariates: demographic	45	-0.08 [-0.14; -0.03]	NA		
With demographic covariates	45	-0.08 [-0.14; -0.03]			
Without demographic covariates	0				
Covariates: health	45	-0.08 [-0.14; -0.03]	1.35, df = 1 (p = 0.25)		
With health covariates	37	-0.06 [-0.11; 0.00]			
Without health covariates	8	-0.13 [-0.28; 0.01]			
Covariates: economic	45	-0.08 [-0.14; -0.03]	NA		
With economic covariates	45	-0.08 [-0.14; -0.03]			
Without economic covariates	0				
Covariates: climatic	45	-0.08 [-0.14; -0.03]	0.35, df = 1 (p = 0.56)		
With climatic covariates	19	-0.12 [-0.27; 0.03]			
Without climatic covariates	26	-0.08 [-0.14; -0.02]			
Covariates: political	45	-0.08 [-0.14; -0.03]	8.27, df = 1 (p < 0.01)		
With political covariates	14	-0.01 [-0.04; 0.01]			
Without political covariates	31	-0.15 [-0.24; -0.05]			

Table 2: Stratified analyses of pooled mortality rate ratio of COVID-19 deaths.

Stratified analysis	Number of results	Pooled mortality rate ratio [95% Cl]	Subgroup difference X ² , df (p-value)
Year of publication	14	0.93 [0.88; 0.98]	19.10, df = 2 (p< 0.01)
2021	4	0.90 [0.78; 1.03]	
2022	6	0.99 [0.96; 1.02]	
2023	4	0.83 [0.73; 0.96]	
Sample size	14	0.93 [0.88; 0.98]	7.92, df = 1 (p< 0.01)
Small (n<2000)	4	0.83 [0.73; 0.96]	
Large (n≥2000)	10	0.96 [0.91; 1.01]	
Predictor	14	0.93 [0.88; 0.98]	14.92, df = 2 (p< 0.01)
Canopy	3	0.87 [0.72; 1.05]	
NDVI/EVI	5	0.87 [0.76; 0.99]	
Abundance	6	0.99 [0.96; 1.02]	
Covariates: demographic	14	0.93 [0.88; 0.98]	NA
With demographic covariates	14	0.93 [0.88; 0.98]	
Without demographic covariates	0		
Covariates: health	14	0.93 [0.88; 0.98]	7.92, df = 1 (p< 0.01)
With health covariates	10	0.96 [0.91; 1.01]	
Without health covariates	4	0.83 [0.73; 0.96]	
Covariates: economic	14	0.93 [0.88; 0.98]	2.60, df = 1 (p= 0.11)
With economic covariates	11	0.95 [0.89; 1.01]	
Without economic covariates	3	0.87 [0.72; 1.05]	
Covariates: climatic	14	0.93 [0.88; 0.98]	2.60, df = 1 (P = 0.11)
With climatic covariates	11	0.95 [0.89; 1.01]	
Without climatic covariates	3	0.87 [0.72; 1.05]	
Covariates: political	14	0.93 [0.88; 0.98]	22.75, df = 1 (p< 0.01)
With political covariates	7	0.85 [0.80; 0.92]	
Without political covariates	7	0.99 [0.97; 1.01]	

526 **FIGURE CAPTIONS**

Figure 1. Geography of studies investigating the effects of greenness on COVID-19 infection and mortality rates. (A) Geographical distribution of 621 studies that were retrieved through the search of Scopus, PubMed, and Google scholar; (B) Geographical distribution of studies from our search that focus specifically on the effects of greenness on COVID-19 infections and severity.

Figure 2. Venn diagram showing the shared factors used in multiple studies that investigate the effects of greenness on COVID-19 infection and mortality rates. A) different metrics of greenness; B) socio-environmental and economic co-variates used those studies.

Figure 3. Forest plot of the relationship between greenness and COVID-19 infections.

Figure 4. Forest plot of the relationship between greenness and COVID-19 mortalities.

Figure 5. Funnel plot to test for publication bias in studies on A) COVID-19 infections, and B) on COVID-19 mortality.

542 **Figure 6.** PRISMA low diagram for literature search and screening.

543 SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

544 **TABLES**

545 **Table S1**. Characteristics of all studies included in the present meta-analysis.

546

- **Figures S1-S6**. Subgroup analyses of between-study heterogeneity can be attributed to year of publication (X^2 =8.24; p=0.02), choice of predictors (X^2 =129.68; p<0.01), and use of political covariates (X^2 =8.27; p<0.01).
- 550

Figures S7-S13. Between-study heterogeneity of variance showing that year of publication (X^2 =19.10; p<0.01), sample size (X^2 =7.92; p<0.01), choice of predictors

- 553 (X^2 =14.92; p<0.01), and use of health (X^2 =7.92; p<0.01) and political (X^2 =22.75;
- p<0.01) covariates strongly impact the degree of heterogeneity.
- 555

556 Appendices

- 557 **Appendix 1.** Data collected and analysed in this study.
- 558 **Appendix 2.** R script used to reproduce the present study.







medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.05.08.23289655411874496164)osted May 8, 2023. The stimate (B) er for this preprint Study a license to display the preprint perpetuity. Study (B) s made available onder a CC-BY-WC-ND 2.09 mernational license to display the preprint perpetuity.

Heterogeneity: Iau ² = 0.	.0184; Chi ⁻ = 749.60, c	זג = 44 (P	′ < 0.01); I [−] = 94%	-1.5 -1 -0.5 0 0.5 1 1.4	5
	0404 05 ² 740 00	16 44/5	[-0.36; 0.20]		
Total (95% CI)		100.0%	-0.08 [-0.14; -0.03]	◆	
zhai	0.0070 0.0020	3.0%	0.01 [0.00; 0.01]		
zhai	0.0060 0.0020	3.0%	0.01 [0.00; 0.01]	1	
zhai	0.0060 0.0020	3.0%	0.01 [0.00; 0.01]		
zhai	0.0050 0.0020	3.0%	0.00 [0.00; 0.01]		
zhai	0.0040 0.0020	3.0%	0.00 [0.00; 0.01]	The second s	
spotswood	-0.0200 0.0300	2.9%	-0.02 [-0.08: 0.04]	in a state in the	
spotswood	-0.0600 0.0200	2.9%	-0.06 [-0.10: -0.02]		
phogole	-0.3410 0.0605	2.5%	-0.34 [-0.46; -0.22]	—	
phogole	0.1397 0.0473	2.7%	0.14 [0.05: 0.23]		
phogole	-0.2707 0.0588	2.5%	-0.27 [-0.39; -0.16]	₩	
phogole	-0.0158 0.0473	2.7%	-0.02 [-0.11; 0.08]		
phogole	-0.2665 0.0651	2.4%	-0.27 [-0.39; -0.14]		
phogole	-0.2707 0.0588	2.5%	-0.27 [-0.39; -0.16]		
peng	-0.0830 0.0130	3.0%	-0.08 [-0.11; -0.06]		
lu	-0.0900 0.1097	1.8%	-0.09 [-0.30; 0.13]		
lu	0.0100 0.0944	2.0%	0.01 [–0.18; 0.19]		
lu	0.0100 0.1225	1.6%	0.01 [-0.23; 0.25]		
lu	-0.1200 0.0918	2.1%	-0.12 [-0.30; 0.06]		
lu	-0.4200 0.1020	1.9%	-0.42 [-0.62; -0.22]		
lu	-0.3200 0.1250	1.6%	-0.32 [-0.56; -0.07]	- 	
lu	-0.3100 0.1122	1.8%	-0.31 [-0.53; -0.09]		
lu	-0.3100 0.1250	1.6%	-0.31 [-0.56; -0.07]		
lin	-0.8000 0.3725	0.4%	-0.80 [-1.53; -0.07]		
lin	-0.8700 0.3699	0.4%	-0.87 [-1.59; -0.14]		
lin	-0.6900 0.3112	0.5%	-0.69 [-1.30; -0.08]		
lin	-1.1300 0.3291	0.4%	-1.13 [-1.78; -0.49]		
johnson	0.0240 0.0108	3.0%	0.02 [0.00; 0.04]	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	
johnson	0.0320 0.0110	3.0%	0.03 [0.01; 0.05]	•	
johnson	-0.0570 0.0084	3.0%	-0.06 [-0.07; -0.04]	<u>.</u>	
johnson	0.0035 0.0110	3.0%	0.00 [-0.02; 0.02]		
johnson	0.1100 0.0110	3.0%	0.11 [-0.01; 0.03]		
jiang	-0.0870 0.0080	3.0%	-0.09 [-0.10; -0.07]		
jiang	-0.0580 0.0090	3.0%	-0.06 [-0.08; -0.04]	<u>.</u>	
jiang	0.0580 0.0080	3.0%	0.06 [0.04; 0.07]	_ 	
jiang 	0.0160 0.0080	3.0%	0.02 [0.00; 0.03]	<u>.</u>	
jiang	-0.0220 0.0060	3.0%	-0.02 [-0.03; -0.01]	<u>.</u>	
jiang	0.0170 0.0070	3.0%	0.02 [0.00; 0.03]		
jiang 	0.0190 0.0090	3.0%	0.02 [0.00; 0.04]		
jiang	-0.0590 0.0070	3.0%	-0.06 [-0.07; -0.05]	<u>.</u>	
grigsby_toussaint	-0.3500 0.1800	1.1%	-0.35 [-0.70; 0.00]		
grigsby_toussaint	-0.5000 0.1300	1.6%	-0.50 [-0.75; -0.25]	- 	
grigsby_toussaint	-0.4300 0.1400	1.4%	-0.43 [-0.70; -0.16]	- <u>-</u>	
grigsby_toussaint	0.0300 0.3200	0.5%	0.03 [-0.60; 0.66]		
grigsby_toussaint	0.4600 0.2100	0.9%	0.46 [0.05; 0.87]	∎	
grigsby_toussaint	0.3100 0.2400	0.7%	0.31 [–0.16; 0.78]		
			.		

				Incidence Rate Ratio	Incidence Rate Ratio
Study	logIRR	SE	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% CI
klompmaker	-0.0269	0.0083	8.2%	0.97 [0.96; 0.99]	+
russette	-0.0862	0.0284	7.4%	0.92 [0.87; 0.97]	
russette	-0.1079	0.0298	7.3%	0.90 [0.85; 0.95]	
russette	-0.2291	0.0357	7.0%	0.80 [0.74; 0.85]	— <mark>——</mark> —
sikarwar	-0.0737	0.0573	5.6%	0.93 [0.83; 1.04]	
sikarwar	-0.1701	0.0604	5.4%	0.84 [0.75; 0.95]	
sikarwar	-0.2147	0.0613	5.3%	0.81 [0.71; 0.91]	
sikarwar	-0.2765	0.0636	5.2%	0.76 [0.67; 0.86]	— —
yang	0.0069	0.0065	8.2%	1.01 [0.99; 1.02]	
yang	-0.0132	0.0008	8.2%	0.99 [0.99; 1.00]	
yang	0.0103	0.0039	8.2%	1.01 [1.01; 1.03]	
yang	0.0245	0.0232	7.6%	1.02 [0.95; 1.04]	
yang	-0.0353	0.0083	8.2%	0.97 [0.95; 0.98]	
yang	-0.0419	0.0071	8.2%	0.96 [0.95; 0.97]	=
Total (95% CI) 100.0%				0.93 [0.88; 0.98]	•
Prediction interval [0.77: 1.12]					
Heterogeneity: $Tau^2 = 0.0069$; $Chi^2 = 163.02$, $df = 13$ (P < 0.01); $l^2 = 92\%$					
5			- , -		0.8 1 1.25



Estimate (ß)

Incidence Rate Ratio

В

Α



