

1 **Intervention Characteristics and Mechanisms and their Relationship with**  
2 **the Influence of Social Prescribing: a Systematic Review**

3

4 **Authors**

5 Eveline M. Dubbeldeman<sup>1</sup>, Jessica C. Kiefte-de Jong<sup>1,2</sup>, Frank H. Ardesch<sup>2</sup>, Mirte Boelens<sup>2</sup>,  
6 Laura A. van der Velde<sup>2</sup>, Sophie G.L. van der Steen<sup>1</sup>, Miriam L. Heijnders<sup>3</sup>, and Mathilde R.  
7 Crone<sup>1</sup>.

8

9 <sup>1</sup> Leiden University Medical Center, Department of Public Health and Primary Care, P.O.  
10 Box 9600, 2300 RC Leiden, The Netherlands,

11 <sup>2</sup> Leiden University Medical Center/Health Campus The Hague, Department of Public Health  
12 and Primary Care, 2511 DP The Hague, The Netherlands.

13 <sup>3</sup> Dutch Social Prescribing Network, 3431 LZ Nieuwegein, The Netherlands

14

15 **Academic address and address for correspondence**

16 Eveline M Dubbeldeman, Leiden University Medical Center, Department of Public Health  
17 and Primary Care, P.O. Box 9600, 2300 RC Leiden, the Netherlands

18 Email: E.M.Dubbeldeman@lumc.nl

19

20 **Abstract**

21 **Introduction.** Social Prescribing (SP) is an integrated care program aimed to improve  
22 individuals' health and wellbeing. Understanding the influence of SP and determining best  
23 practices and processes is challenging due to variability in its delivery, implementation, and  
24 intervention characteristics between different studies and countries. This study aimed to  
25 identify the intervention characteristics, mechanisms, and outcomes associated with SP

26 research, and explore how these factors relate to the influence of SP on health and wellbeing,  
27 healthcare utilization, and care experiences. **Method.** A comprehensive search was conducted  
28 in 12 databases, Google Scholar, and reference lists of relevant studies published from  
29 January 2010 up to April 2023. Searches were limited to literature written in English or  
30 Dutch. The methodological quality of the included studies was assessed using the Mixed  
31 Methods Appraisal Tool and the risk of bias was evaluated using the Cochrane RoB2 and the  
32 ROBINS-I. We coded all intervention characteristics, mechanisms, and relevant outcomes.  
33 Qualitative data were visually presented using Harvest Plots and qualitative data were  
34 narratively summarized. **Results and discussion.** In total, 49 papers were included, of which  
35 seven qualitative, seventeen quantitative, and 25 mixed method studies. Moreover, the  
36 findings highlights the importance of social-related mechanisms, including loneliness and  
37 social connectedness, in contributing to the observed positive influence of SP on mental  
38 health and wellbeing. The observed outcomes seem to be influenced by various  
39 characteristics, including gender, age, the presence of a link worker, and the use of behavior  
40 change techniques. However, we should be cautious when interpreting these results due to  
41 limitations in study designs, such as the lack of controlled trials and statistical considerations.  
42 Further rigorous research is needed to comprehensively understand the impact and potential  
43 benefits of SP.

44

## 45 **1. Introduction**

46 Social Prescribing (SP) is an integrated care program that enables healthcare professionals  
47 (HCPs) to refer individuals who do not benefit from medical and/or psychological treatment  
48 to a range of voluntary, community, and social (VCS) services to support their health and  
49 wellbeing [1,2]. It is suggested that SP increases social networks, which in turn may  
50 contribute to the quadruple aim by 1) improving population health and wellbeing, 2) reducing

51 or stabilizing costs in health care and other sectors, and 3) improving individuals' and 4)  
52 HCPs' experience with care [3]. Several processes underlie the effects of SP including social  
53 support, social connectedness, and loneliness reduction [4,5]. These processes, also called  
54 mechanisms are hypothesized to empower individuals with resilience, which in turn, reduces  
55 stress and improves wellbeing and other health-related outcomes. [6-9]. However, the extent  
56 to which SP affects such mechanisms and, in turn, quadruple aim outcomes are still unclear.

57

58 Since the implementation of SP in the UK, there is a growing interest in SP in other countries  
59 such as the Netherlands [10], Australia [11], and Scandinavian countries [12]. Although there  
60 is an overall aim within the different SP programs, the implementation and delivery varies  
61 per country, making it difficult to understanding the mechanisms for SP [13]. These  
62 variations in implementation are also reflected in the studies that evaluate SP, where there is a  
63 wide range of intervention characteristics (i.e. context, structure, and content of the  
64 interventions) [14-16]. Contextual characteristics refer to elements such as the delivery  
65 setting and target group. While most SP studies focus on general populations with  
66 psychosocial factors, some target specific groups like young people [17], individuals with  
67 type 2 diabetes [18], or families with preschool children [19]. Structural characteristics  
68 include type of referral pathways, collaboration between professionals, the intensity and  
69 duration of SP and its activities. Content characteristics include the available VCS-services  
70 and specific strategies used to implement and deliver the service. Due to variations in  
71 intervention and study characteristics, it is challenging to determine what contributes to the  
72 influence of SP.

73

#### 74 **1.1. Review objectives**

75 To understand the influence of SP and clarify what constitutes the best SP practice and  
76 process, it is important to identify both the intervention characteristics as well as mechanisms  
77 that contribute to different health and wellbeing outcomes. With this systematic review, we  
78 aimed to 1) identify intervention characteristics, mechanisms, and quadruple aim outcomes in  
79 SP research and 2) explore how these characteristics and mechanisms relate to the influence  
80 of SP on the quadruple aim outcomes.

81

## 82 **2. Methods**

83 This systematic review was registered in PROSPERO on April 2022 (CRD42022319765).  
84 We followed the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses  
85 (PRISMA) guidelines (Appendix A) [20].

86

### 87 **2.1. Search Strategy**

88 We searched multiple databases including Medline, PubMed, Embase, Web of Science,  
89 Cochrane Library, PsycINFO, Emcare, Epistemonikos database, Academic Search Premier,  
90 Social Services Abstracts, Sociological Abstracts, ERIC, NHS economic evaluation database  
91 / Health Technology Assessment database on November 9, 2021 and April 6, 2023 (update).

92 Since the target population for SP and outcomes of interest varied widely, we did not use the  
93 PICO method for search term specification. Instead, our search terms included keywords and  
94 phrases related to 'social prescribing', 'arts on prescription', 'social intervention', or ('link  
95 worker' and 'primary care') (Appendix B). Additionally, on November 15, 2022 we searched  
96 the first 200 hits relating to 'Social Prescribing' and 'Welzijn op Recept' in Google Scholar  
97 to identify grey literature and we searched all references from the included papers [21]. The  
98 search strategy was developed in consultation with an information specialist from the Leiden  
99 University Medical Center.

100

## 101 **2.2. Eligibility criteria**

102 *Population:* We included papers primarily reporting on interventions targeting  
103 individuals seeking primary care for psychosocial problems, such as those outlined by  
104 Heijnders and Meijs (e.g., depression, anxiety, frequent healthcare visits, social isolation)  
105 [22]. Studies that exclusively included individuals with long-term conditions and did not  
106 account for the presence of psychosocial problems were excluded from the analysis. We also  
107 excluded papers that solely focused on individuals under eighteen.

108 *Intervention:* We included papers reporting on interventions primarily focusing on the  
109 transfer from the primary care to any VCS-based activities aimed at increasing individuals'  
110 wellbeing. We excluded papers focusing on interventions in which individuals are referred to  
111 VCS organizations from another setting than primary care (e.g., exercise referral schemes for  
112 clinical depression or cardiac rehabilitation) and interventions in which the primary aim is not  
113 to increase individuals' wellbeing (e.g. exercise referral schemes to increase physical activity  
114 in sedentary adults).

115 *Comparator:* No comparator criterium was applied since we included all types of  
116 empirical studies.

117 *Outcome:* We included papers reporting on outcomes related to the dimensions of the  
118 quadruple aim: 1) health and wellbeing, 2) health care use and costs, 3) HCPs' and 4)  
119 participants' experience with SP. Papers without the focus on at least the first two dimensions  
120 were excluded.

121 *Type of study:* We included papers reporting on (non-)randomized controlled trials  
122 (RCTs), observational studies, quasi-experimental designs, and qualitative studies written in  
123 English or Dutch. Studies in other languages were excluded due to language barriers of the  
124 authors. Since 2010, there has been an increased recognition and adoption of SP by HCPs'

125 and a growth of community-based organizations. Accordingly, we limited our inclusion  
126 criteria to papers published from 2010 onward.

127

### 128 **2.3. Selection of papers**

129 Duplicates were removed in Endnote (version 20). One researcher (EMD) conducted the title  
130 and abstract screening using the AI-aided screening tool ASReview [23], which combines  
131 machine learning with an active learning model to predict inclusion likelihood [24]. A dataset  
132 containing all references retrieved from the search was imported into ASReview. Based on a  
133 study examining active learning model performance [25], we selected the Naïve Bayes as the  
134 classifier to make relevancy predictions and the TF-IDF as the feature extraction technique  
135 (i.e., a technique to numerically represent textual content as feature vectors, which allows the  
136 classifier to predict relevancy). Certainty-based sampling was used as the query strategy to  
137 prioritize relevant papers. Screening was stopped after assessing 25% of all papers to  
138 minimize time spent on irrelevant papers [25,26]. EMD reviewed the full-text papers for  
139 inclusion, and a random 20% sample was cross-checked by two additional researchers (FHA  
140 and MRC). Any disagreements were resolved by consensus, a fourth researcher (MLH) was  
141 consulted in case of uncertainty about inclusion.

142

### 143 **2.4. Data extraction**

144 Data extraction was performed by five researchers independently. To ensure consistency and  
145 optimize the data extraction protocol, a random sample of seven studies was assessed by five  
146 researchers (EMD, FHA, SGLS, MB, and LAV) and the assessment of the remaining papers  
147 was divided among the researchers. Following Cochrane guidelines [27], a coding system  
148 was developed to code all intervention characteristics that could moderate the influence of  
149 SP. We extracted data on contextual (e.g., participants, delivery setting), structural (e.g.,

150 presence of a link worker, activity duration), and applied behavior change techniques (BCTs)  
151 as content characteristics. BCTs are strategies and methods to promote the adoption or  
152 modification of behaviors, such as goal-setting, self-monitoring, and social support  
153 (Appendix C) [28]. Outcomes related to the quadruple aim and mechanisms (e.g., social  
154 connectedness, self-confidence, knowlegde) were also extracted [4,5]. Statistical analysis  
155 details were coded as they varied between studies. Based on descriptive statistics or  
156 significance of inferential statistics, outcomes were classified as ‘improvement,  
157 ‘deterioration, or ‘no influence’. Additionally, information on citation details, study design,  
158 study method, country, and intervention name was extracted from each included paper. The  
159 percentage agreement was calculated and discrepancies were solved through discussion.  
160 MRC was consulted to solve any disagreement. Percent agreements for study characteristics,  
161 intervention characteristics, and outcomes were 94.2%, 89.2%, and 66.0% respectively  
162 (Appendix D).

163

## 164 **2.5. Quality assessment and risk of bias**

165 The Mixed Method Appraisal Tool version 2018 (MMAT) was used to appraise the quality of  
166 each included paper [29]. The MMAT is designed to critically appraise both qualitative,  
167 quantitative, and mixed method studies and is, therefore, suitable for systematic reviews with  
168 mixed studies. Every criterion is rated as ‘yes’ (1) or ‘no/can’t tell’ (0) for every applicable  
169 item. We rated each paper ‘low’, ‘moderate’, or ‘high’ quality based on the number of criteria  
170 met (1-2 = low, 3=moderate, 4-5=high). For mixed methods studies, the overall quality score  
171 was determined by the lowest score among the components [29]. Papers were not excluded  
172 based on their quality score, but scores were incorporated in the data synthesis. Percent  
173 agreement ranged from 68.0% (category mixed methods) to 92.0% (category qualitative  
174 studies) (Appendix D). Risk of bias was assessed for RCTs and non-randomized studies using

175 the Cochrane RoB2 [30] and the ROBINS-I [31] respectively. Uncontrolled before-after and  
176 cross-sectional studies were considered at high risk of bias due to the lack of control groups,  
177 following the Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions [27].

178

## 179 **2.6. Data Synthesis**

180 Because of heterogeneity in the outcomes of the quadruple aim, we were not able to pool the  
181 results in a meta-analysis and meta-regression. We therefore used Harvest plots to graphically  
182 present the results [32]. Harvest plots allow for graphically displaying evidence from  
183 complex and diverse studies or results, wherein outcomes are non-identical or combining data  
184 through conventional meta-analysis is not feasible. Based on available data, we created plots  
185 for different outcomes related to the quadruple aim. Results were stratified for intervention  
186 characteristics and mechanisms, and we incorporated the quality assessment, the research  
187 methods, and the type of analysis used to assess the influence of SP (i.e., descriptive statistics  
188 and inferential statistics) in the plots. Plots were created using R Studio version 2022.02.3  
189 [33]. We summarized qualitative data narratively to identify outcomes in papers reporting on  
190 qualitative methods and to explore the influence of SP on these outcomes.

191

## 192 **3. Results**

### 193 **3.1 Study selection**

194 In total, 6018 unique papers were retrieved. Title and abstract screening resulted in the  
195 exclusion of 5806 papers, and full-text screening resulted in the exclusion of 183 papers,  
196 resulting in 30 papers that met the inclusion criteria. After searching the reference lists  
197 manually and the search update, a total of 49 papers were included for data extraction (Figure  
198 1). Appendix E provides a list of publications excluded in the full-text screening stage,  
199 including reasons for exclusion. The primary reasons for exclusion encompassed studies that



200 did not specifically examine the influence of SP (e.g., process evaluations), lacked a primary  
201 care referral component, or involved interventions embedded within a mental health recovery  
202 program or an exercise referral program.

203

204 [FIGURE 1]

205

### 206 **3.2 Study characteristics**

207 Seventeen used quantitative methods, mainly a before-after design [8,17,34-48], of which  
208 two also included a control group [40,48]. One paper described a RCT [41]. Seven papers  
209 reported on qualitative methods, using primarily interviews [10,49-54]. Furthermore, 25  
210 papers reported on a mixed methods study in which mainly before-after designs (including  
211 one with a control group [55]) and interviews were used [2,6,55-77]. The majority of studies  
212 were performed in the UK (43, 87.8%). Other studies were performed in Australia [34,72],  
213 the Netherlands [10,48], Canada [49], and South Korea [38]. Characteristics of the included  
214 papers are shown in Table 1.

215

#### 216 *3.2.1. Participant characteristics*

217 For participants attending SP, baseline sample sizes varied between  $n=10$  [38] and  $n=2250$   
218 [63] in papers reporting on quantitative methods and between  $n=5$  [54] and  $n=1272$  [53] in  
219 papers reporting on qualitative methods. All papers included in this review reported on a  
220 combined total baseline number of  $n=18631$  participants ( $n=17084$  receiving SP,  $n=1547$   
221 controls). The percentage of women ranged from 22% to 100% and participants' baseline  
222 mean age ranged from 38 to 82 years. Within studies, reported referral reasons were diverse,  
223 with mild to moderate mental health problems, social isolation, frequent attenders, housing  
224 and financial problems, and significant life changes as commonly reported reasons. Only a

225 few papers reported information on participants' ethnicity, employment, living, and/or  
226 socioeconomic status [6,38,41,46,49,52,55,57,58,63,67-69,71,73,75-77]. Most of the  
227 participants were white, unemployed or retired, lived alone, and had a lower socioeconomic  
228 status. Sample sizes for SP service staff (i.e., referrers, link workers, and VCS staff) varied  
229 between  $n=4$  [54] and  $n=42$  [62]. Five studies did not report detailed information on  
230 participant and SP service staff sample sizes for the qualitative parts [56,58,60,61,69].

231

### 232 3.2.2. *Intervention characteristics*

233 Based on the information provided in the papers, only 14.3% ( $n=7$ ) stated that the referrer  
234 was trained or had SP-specific knowledge and skills [36,39,41,49,62,69,74]. In 73.5% ( $n=36$ )  
235 of the papers, a link worker was involved of which 32.7% ( $n=16$ ) stated that the link worker  
236 was trained or had SP-specific knowledge and skills [10,36,37,39-43,55-57,63,68,69,71,75].  
237 The most often used BCT was providing social support (53.1%,  $n=26$ ), followed by tailoring  
238 (51.0%,  $n=25$ ) and needs assessment (42.9%,  $n=21$ ). Examples of social support were  
239 meeting for a cup of tea, attending or help with access to prescribed activities, or one-to-one  
240 support meetings (i.e., emotional, practical, and unspecified support).

241

242 [TABLE 1]

243

### 244 3.3. **Quality assessment and risk of bias**

245 Of the papers reporting on quantitative methods, we rated five as high methodological  
246 quality, four as moderate, and eight as low. All seven papers reporting on qualitative methods  
247 were rated as high quality. Two papers reporting on mixed methods were rated as high, two  
248 as moderate, 21 as low quality. Overall methodological quality was low. Risk of bias was  
249 assessed for one cluster-RCT [41] and two controlled before-after studies [48,55]. Risk of

250 bias was rated as high for the cluster-RCT and moderate for the latter two. The cluster-RCT  
251 had bias related to the timing of identification and recruitment of participants, as well as  
252 outcome measurement. The controlled before-after studies had bias related to confounding  
253 factors and selection of reported results. More detailed information is present in Appendix D.

254

### 255 **3.4. Papers reporting on quantitative methods**

#### 256 *3.4.1 Outcome measures*

257 The majority of studies measured participants' wellbeing [17,35-37,41-43,45,46,55,57-  
258 59,61,62,64-78]. Other outcome measures were general and physical health, health behaviors  
259 [34,41,44,55,57,58,60,62,66,68,71,72,75,78], mental health  
260 [34,37,38,41,42,46,55,60,62,68,69,75,76], anxiety [41,42,46,55,57,60,62,68,75,76], and  
261 quality of life [8,34,41,57,58]. Wellbeing was most often measured using the (Short)  
262 Warwick Edinburgh Mental Wellbeing Scale [17,35,37,42,43,45,46,57,58,64-67,70,72-78].  
263 Others used the ONS Personal Wellbeing Scale [17,57,68], the Measure Yourself Concerns  
264 and Wellbeing [57,71], the ICEpop CAPability measure for Adults [41], the Measure  
265 Yourself Medical Outcome Profile [55], or self-developed questionnaires [36,61,62,68]. A  
266 variety of instruments were used to measure general health such as the EuroQol Visual  
267 Analogue Scale [34,57,75], separate items from validated quality of life questionnaires  
268 [34,60], or self-developed questionnaires [55,58]. Polley et al., 2019 used physiological  
269 measures to measure physical health (i.e., blood pressure and body mass index) [71].  
270 Validated questionnaires used were the Work and Social Adjustment Scale [41,78], the  
271 International Physical Activity Questionnaire [44,68], or separate items from validated  
272 quality of life questionnaires [60,62]. To measure health behaviors, self-reported measures  
273 such as physical exercise, fruit and vegetable intake, sleep, smoking, and alcohol  
274 consumption were most often used [41,66,72]. Mental health was measured using the Patient

275 Health Questionnaire [46,68,76], the Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale [41,42,55], The  
276 Kessler Psychological Distress Scale [34], the Short Mood Scale [37], and the Geriatric  
277 Depression Scale [38]. Others used separate items from quality of life questionnaires  
278 [60,62,75] or a self-developed mental health measure [69]. Anxiety was measured using the  
279 Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale [41,42,55], the General Anxiety Disorder scale  
280 [46,68,76], or separate items from validated (quality of life) questionnaires [57,60,62,75].  
281 Different variations of the EQ-5D were most often used to measure quality of life [41,57,58].  
282 Aggar et al., 2021 used the World Health Organization Quality of Life Brief Version [34] and  
283 Bertotti et al., 2020 used separate items of the ONS Personal Wellbeing scale [57] as quality  
284 of life related measures.

285       Regarding health care use and/or costs, the majority of papers analyzed primary health  
286 care use such as general practitioner (GP) visits [6,39,47,55,57-60,62,65-71,75], accident and  
287 emergency (A&E) visits [57,59-61,67,70], and GPs' phone calls [39,67,68]. Secondary health  
288 care use, primarily hospital admissions, was analyzed in three papers [60,61,70]. Four papers  
289 analyzed medication use [39,47,55,66] and three analyzed health care costs [40,48,70]. The  
290 majority relied on self-reported measures to analyze the influence of SP on primary health  
291 care use and/or costs. Others used routine data [47,48,59,61,65-68,71] or providers'  
292 perceived stopped need for health care use [62,69].

293       Only two papers reported outcomes related to providers' and participants' experience  
294 with SP and its process using self-developed questionnaires [36,71].

295       Several papers analyzed the influence of SP on outcomes considered as mechanisms.  
296 Social-related mechanisms such as loneliness, social connectedness, and social support were  
297 analyzed most frequently [6,8,17,34,36,38,55,57,60,63,64,66,68,69,71,75,76]. Other  
298 mechanisms measured were beliefs about capabilities (e.g., self-efficacy and confidence)  
299 [34,38,42,60,64,66,71,76] and participants' and link workers' knowledge and skills

300 [36,60,76]. Loneliness was measured using the UCLA Loneliness Scale [17,34,38,63,66], the  
301 Campaign to End Loneliness Measurement tool [57,69,75], or the De Jong Gierveld  
302 Loneliness Scale [71]. Outcomes related to social connectedness (e.g., social isolation, social  
303 participation, community belonging) were measured using the Friendship scale [68], the  
304 Social Participation Scale for the Elderly Living Alone [38], the Social Inclusion Scale [76],  
305 or self-developed items (based on validated questionnaires) [6,8,34,55,57,60,64,69]. Social  
306 support was measured using self-developed items (based on validated questionnaires)  
307 [34,36,57,69].

308

#### 309 *3.4.2 Influence of SP on the quadruple aim*

310 Harvest plots were created for the most frequent assessed outcomes, namely 1) wellbeing, 2)  
311 mental health, 3) general and physical health, 4) primary health care use, and 5) social-related  
312 mechanisms.

313 Figure 2A through C shows the influence of SP on participants' wellbeing, mental  
314 health, and general and physical health, respectively. In total, 25 papers reported improved  
315 wellbeing outcomes and only four papers reported no influence on participants' wellbeing  
316 [41,55,57,58]. Sixty-two percent of the improvements were based on inferential statistics.  
317 None of the papers including a control group showed positive results [41,55]. Results related  
318 to mental health were generally positive. Ten papers reported improvements of which 70%  
319 were based on inferential statistics, while the remaining three -including those with a control  
320 group- reported no influences [34,41,55]. Results for general and physical health and health  
321 behaviors were mixed. About half of the papers reported positive results for general and  
322 physical health [34,57,62,68,71,75,78], while the other half -including those with a control  
323 group- reported no influence [34,41,55,58,60,71,72]. Health behavior measures such as  
324 smoking, alcohol consumption, exercise, and sleep were also mixed [41,44,55,60,66,72].

325 Results on primary health care use were mixed (Figure 3). Thirteen papers showed a  
326 reduction in primary health care use and eight showed no changes. Palmer et al., 2017  
327 showed an increase in GP visits [70]. In only 38.5% of the cases, inferential statistics were  
328 used to analyze changes in primary healthcare use.

329 Papers that reported on the influence of SP on social-related mechanisms are shown in  
330 figure 4. Most papers reported positive outcomes [6,8,17,36,38,57,60,63,64,66,68,69,75,76].  
331 In 44.0% of these cases, inferential statistics were used. In papers that reported no influence,  
332 all used inferential statistics to analyze the influence of SP on social-related mechanisms  
333 [34,55,57,71].

334

### 335 *3.4.3 Influence of SP stratified for intervention characteristics and mechanisms*

336 Stratified results for gender, age group, presence of a link worker, applied BCTs (i.e., social  
337 support, tailoring, and needs assessment), and social-related mechanisms are shown in  
338 Appendix F. Regarding participants' wellbeing, results showed that participants with positive  
339 results on social-related mechanisms also showed positive results on wellbeing scores. This  
340 was also shown in results on mental health. Moreover, most improvements in mental health  
341 were found in studies with primarily women (i.e., >73%). General and physical health tended  
342 to be more often improved in participants between 50 and 65 years. Furthermore, SP seemed  
343 less effective on general and physical health for women and in interventions without a link  
344 worker or when (based on the information provided in the papers) needs assessments,  
345 tailoring, and social support were not incorporated in the interventions.

346 Regarding primary health care use, improvements were more often found in studies  
347 where both men and women were included and in studies where (based on the information in  
348 the papers) needs assessment was incorporated in the intervention.

349 Stratified results for social-related mechanisms did not show any differences.

350

### 351 **3.5. Papers reporting on qualitative methods**

#### 352 *3.5.1. Influence of SP on health, wellbeing, and health care use*

353 Participants reported a positive influence of SP on wellbeing [51,59-61,63,70,77], mental  
354 health [49,53,68], and general and physical health [6,10,53,61]. These improvements were  
355 also perceived by SP service staff (i.e., referrers, link workers, and VCS staff) [6,50,65].  
356 Furthermore, few studies found that SP had a positive influence on health-related behaviors  
357 such as physical activity and smoking [10,71].

358 Only few studies discussed the influence on healthcare use. Some studies reported that  
359 GPs noticed that participants were making fewer GP appointments [65,67], while in other  
360 studies participants' perspective on their healthcare use was mixed [56,60].

361

#### 362 *3.5.2. Mechanisms*

363 The most discussed outcomes considered as a mechanism were social-related, namely 1)  
364 from the participants' environment (i.e., loneliness, social connectedness, and social support  
365 from peers) [6,10,49-53,59-61,66,70,73-77] and 2) from the SP service staff (i.e., social  
366 support) [6,10,49,51,52,56,59,60,63,67,71]. Regarding the social-related mechanisms from  
367 the participants' environment, joining the activities offered within SP was of major influence  
368 in the social lives of the participants. Having a regular group to go to, establishing new  
369 friendships, engaging with others, and sharing experiences contributed to reduced feelings of  
370 loneliness, social isolation, and improved social connectedness, which in turn improved their  
371 wellbeing [10,51,71,77]. Social support from the SP service staff was considered as  
372 particularly important to participants. They described the importance of having someone to  
373 express themselves to; someone who was prepared to listen [6,49,51,56,60,61,71]. Referrers  
374 and link workers also informed participants about suitable services and facilitated access to

375 these services, , providing some practical support [6,10,52,56,60,67]. Nevertheless, studies  
376 also discussed the challenges in the dose and duration of support, especially for participants  
377 with complex problems [6,10,63]. Foster et al. (2021) highlighted participants' challenges to  
378 maintain improvements in loneliness after the support finished. In this study, participants  
379 indicated to miss the trustful relationship they had developed with the link worker, or they  
380 were reliant on them to attend activities [63].

381 SP also increased participants self-confidence, which can also be seen as a  
382 mechanism for the effects of SP. Participants confidence to join activities and interact with  
383 others was mediated by among others support from link workers and VCS staff  
384 [6,10,52,54,56,60,71]. Also, due to participating in various activities, participants gained  
385 confidence in for example, picking up old or exploring new hobbies, and engaging in  
386 volunteering, for example, as a health and wellbeing champion [6,50,51,61,63,73-75].  
387 Participants' confidence and ability to manage or cope with their (long-term) problems was  
388 also improved due to SP [10,49,53,59-61,78].

389 Another reported mechanism was participants' optimism regarding SP as well as their  
390 future perspective. They were motivated to explore new things and were hopeful to benefit  
391 from SP [49,50,72,75-77]. Furthermore, participants regained perspective over their lives,  
392 developed a positive outlook on their present situation, and gained a sense of purpose [10,50-  
393 52,61,66,74-76].

394

### 395 *3.5.3 Participants' experiences with the service*

396 Most of the participants had positive overall experiences with SP [57,64,66,73].  
397 However, the study of Carnes et al. (2017) reported that only half of the participants were  
398 satisfied with the SP service and the majority of participants in the studies by Bertotti et al.  
399 (2017, 2018, 2020) had poor experience with SP [55,57,58]. In the latter studies, participants



400 argued that the time between the referral and the first contact (i.e., 2 months) was too long.  
401 Additionally, the study by Polley et al. (2019) demonstrated the value of communication  
402 between link workers and participants [71]. Shortly after receiving the referral letter,  
403 participants were called by the link worker to provide them with more information on SP.  
404 This was considered important, especially for those with low agency and those who were  
405 unlikely to proactively book an appointment by themselves. In several studies, participants  
406 reported challenges with engaging with the services because of their lack of knowledge about  
407 SP, psychological and physical problems, or aspects of participants' situation or environment  
408 such as home, family, or financial barriers [56,57,63,65,66]. Challenges in engaging  
409 participants in SP were also reported by link workers [63].

410

### 411 *3.5.3 SP service staff experiences with the service*

412 Overall, SP service staff acknowledged the potential of SP in improving participants' health  
413 and wellbeing and reducing healthcare use [6,49,54,57,69,78]. However, some issues were  
414 discussed on the implementation of SP. First, skilled and knowledgeable referrers and link  
415 workers was a recurring topic [34,54,56-58,60,63,65,67,78]. Although referrers and link  
416 workers perceived the training on SP as important for its implementation [56,57,60,65], they  
417 lacked specific skills regarding for example, social security benefits and entitlements or how  
418 to deal with participants with complex needs [54,65,67]. Referrers also highlighted the value  
419 of link workers' communication skills [60]. Knowledge on suitable sources of support within  
420 the VCS domain was also considered important [56,60,65,69,78]. Bertotti et al. (2018) argued  
421 that poor knowledge on VCS domains leads to obstacles to referral [56]. The importance of  
422 skilled and knowledgeable referrers and link workers was also confirmed by participants  
423 [63,67]. Second, the balance between demand and supply was also an issue [54,57,58]. This  
424 concerned both the capacity of the SP service as well as the capacity of services within the

425 VCS domain. Other issues that inhibited the implementation of SP were referrers' perceived  
426 high workload [65] and recruiting volunteers to support participants [63].

427

#### 428 **4. Discussion**

429 With this systematic review, we aimed to identify intervention characteristics, mechanisms,  
430 and outcomes in SP research and to explore how these characteristics and mechanisms relate  
431 to the influence of SP on the quadruple aim outcomes. In total, 49 papers were included, of  
432 which seven qualitative, seventeen quantitative, and 25 mixed method studies. Quantitative  
433 data revealed that SP has a positive influence on the wellbeing and mental health of  
434 participants, as well as social-related mechanisms, such as loneliness, social connectedness,  
435 and social support. Notably, the participants with an improved wellbeing and mental health  
436 were also more likely to show improvements in social-related mechanisms. The qualitative  
437 data confirmed these findings by revealing the importance of social-related mechanisms on  
438 participant health and wellbeing and showed the importance of increased self-confidence and  
439 optimism. Additionally, according to the qualitative input, the quality of the SP service,  
440 including knowledgeable referrers and link workers with effective communication skills and  
441 sufficient capacity within the service and the VCS organizations, is a crucial part in  
442 facilitating positive experiences for participants and SP service staff. The quantitative  
443 findings, however, were primarily based on uncontrolled before-after studies and the analysis  
444 of controlled studies revealed no significant effect of SP on quadruple aim outcomes and  
445 mechanisms. Therefore, the findings in our study should be interpreted with caution.

446

447 The results in our review are consistent with recent evaluations on the influence of SP [79-  
448 82]. SP is a holistic approach that recognizes health as more than just the absence of disease,  
449 and acknowledges the importance of social networks, purpose, and meaning in overall

450 (mental) wellbeing [14]. Our review supports this view by showing that participants who  
451 experienced improvements in social-related mechanisms also showed improvements in  
452 mental health and wellbeing outcomes. These social influences included both link workers  
453 and VCS services, as well as influences of participants' personal environment and peers.  
454 Joining the activities offered within SP was of major influence in the social lives of the  
455 participants. Having a regular group to go to, establishing new friendships, engaging with  
456 others, and sharing experiences contributed to reduced feelings of loneliness and improved  
457 social connectedness, which in turn improved their wellbeing [10,51,71,77]. Mercer et al.  
458 (2019) highlighted the importance of social support from link workers [41]. Despite no  
459 overall significant differences between the intervention and control group, the authors  
460 showed that participants who saw the link worker three or more times had significant  
461 improvements in their health and wellbeing. However, we identified that some link worker  
462 reported that providing the right dose and duration of support was challenging. While some  
463 participants may require ongoing support to maintain behavior change and sustain the  
464 benefits of SP, others may require less intensive support once they have established  
465 connections with VCS services. Therefore, we advocate for the regular assessment of  
466 participants' progress and requirements by link workers or referrers to determine the  
467 necessity of sustained support. In addition, researchers are urged to evaluate the frequency of  
468 link worker sessions.

469 In addition, this review also confirmed the importance of participants gaining a sense  
470 of purpose. A sense of purpose after SP can help to sustain the positive influences of the  
471 intervention and promote long-term wellbeing [83]. Some SP interventions offer the  
472 opportunity for participants to volunteer as health and wellbeing champions [36,49,69].  
473 Health and wellbeing champions can contribute to promoting health and wellbeing within  
474 their communities. They can share their personal experiences with SP and perceived benefits,

475 act as mentors or coaches, and provide guidance and encouragement to help other participants  
476 engage in the service and achieve their goals [84,85]. Furthermore, health and wellbeing  
477 champions can identify opportunities for collaboration and partnership within the community,  
478 leading to new resources and support for SPs [84].

479

480 Several physical activities are offered in SP such as walking groups, yoga, and gardening, as  
481 these activities have been shown to have numerous health benefits that involve both the body  
482 and mind. The influence of SP on general and physical health, however, was mixed, which is  
483 in line with a recent review [80]. This may be due to the challenges participants face with  
484 starting and adhering to the referred activities. Our review showed that improvements in  
485 general and physical health were more often present in interventions with needs assessments,  
486 tailoring, social support, and with the involvement of a link worker. Participants who  
487 perceive an intervention as personally relevant, tailored to their needs, and those who felt  
488 supported might be more likely to be motivated to participate and adhere to the intervention.  
489 Another potential reason for the mixed results in this review is the use of different outcome  
490 measures (e.g., physiological measures, behavioral measures, and physical activity), making  
491 it difficult to compare results between studies and provide an overall conclusion about the  
492 influence of SP on physical health.

493 Moreover, it is important to note that most participants in prior research were referred  
494 to SP programs to address psychosocial and mental health concerns, raising questions about  
495 the suitability of general and physical health outcomes to draw conclusions about the  
496 influence of SP. To evaluate the influence of SP, research should include tailored measures in  
497 addition to fixed measures. For example, goal setting is an important component of SP as it  
498 enables participants to establish and work towards specific objectives, as confirmed by  
499 Cooper et al. (2022) [81]. SP prioritizes participant-centeredness, and the achievement of

500 participant goals serves as a direct reflection of how well the intervention aligns with their  
501 needs and preferences. Considering the anticipated positive influence of long-term goal  
502 achievement on health-related outcomes [86], it is worth considering incorporating goal  
503 achievement as an intermediate outcome measure in future SP research.

504

### 505 **Strengths and limitations**

506 To our knowledge, this systematic review is the first to use Harvest Plots to evaluate the  
507 influence of SP on different outcomes. Harvest Plots are valuable for evaluating SP given the  
508 diverse range of outcomes. They allow for a comprehensive assessment of evidence to  
509 identify strongly influenced outcomes and those needing further investigation. Furthermore,  
510 Harvest Plots help to detect patterns and inconsistencies in the data that guide clinical  
511 decisions and future research. Furthermore, we used several strategies to rigorously search for  
512 relevant literature such as ASReview, grey literature search, and handsearching.

513         Nevertheless, some limitations of this systematic review and the included studies  
514 should be noted. First, the lack of controlled studies in SP research makes it difficult to  
515 determine the influence of SP on health outcomes, as observed changes may be due to other  
516 factors, which is also highlighted by several other reviews [81,87,88]. Additionally, a great  
517 amount of the studies reporting positive outcomes were based on descriptive statistics, which  
518 raises questions about the significance of the results. It is noteworthy that nearly none of the  
519 controlled studies reported significant improvements in outcomes evaluated in this review:  
520 only Carnes et al. (2017) showed significant improvements in GP consultations rates [55].  
521 However, these findings should be interpreted with care due to the large number of controls  
522 and potential influence of regression to the mean rather than the effectiveness of the  
523 intervention. The authors acknowledged the challenges associated with incorporating an  
524 appropriate control group and randomization [41,55]. Including a control group in SP

525 research is challenging due to the individualization of SP and the difficulty in standardizing  
526 them [89]. Additionally, SP is often implemented in real-world settings, such as community  
527 centers, making it difficult to control for confounding variables and ensure fidelity to the  
528 intervention protocol. Alternative methods to improve the practicality of randomized designs  
529 should be considered such as pragmatic trials or trial of intervention principles (meaning that  
530 the theoretical principles of the intervention are tested) [90].

531         Next, although the studies included in this review successfully reached individuals  
532 who were suitable for SP based on their employment, marital status, and socioeconomic  
533 status, they generally failed to include ethnic minority groups. Evidence suggests that these  
534 groups are at higher risk of experiencing psychosocial problems [91]. Such individuals may  
535 face multiple barriers to accessing healthcare services, which can limit their ability to access  
536 SP. Additionally, they may not recognize the potential benefits of SP or the intervention may  
537 not be designed to tailor to the specific language and cultural needs of individuals from ethnic  
538 minority groups [92]. Although reducing health inequalities is one of the core principles of  
539 SP [93], Moscrop argues that SP may exacerbate health inequalities by excluding those who  
540 are most in need and may not have the resources to engage with SP [94]. To address this  
541 issue, it is important to ensure that SP is culturally sensitive, inclusive, and accessible to all  
542 individuals, regardless of their ethnicity.

543         Finally, the data extraction process for intervention characteristics was solely based on  
544 information reported in the included papers, without additional insights from authors or  
545 websites. Therefore, the accuracy and completeness of our findings may be limited.  
546 Reporting intervention core principles is essential for researchers to comprehensively  
547 evaluate intervention effectiveness, assess fidelity, as well as the underlying mechanisms for  
548 producing its effects. Such information is crucial in determining the intervention's efficacy  
549 and for improving its design in future studies. Also, most studies did not provide detailed

550 information on the type, dosage, and duration of activities offered as part of SP.  
551 Consequently, we were unable to examine the influence of these factors on outcomes. As  
552 activities offered in SP can differ between countries, it would be valuable to investigate the  
553 influence of specific activities. For instance, in the Netherlands, basic needs concerns such as  
554 financial and housing issues are not considered as criteria for a referral to SP and thus advice  
555 on these issues is not offered [95], whereas, in the UK, SP also includes activities such as  
556 providing debt and financial advice, adult literacy classes, and job center support [96].  
557 Therefore, it is important to assess the potential benefits of expanding the scope of SP to  
558 encompass a wider range of challenges.

559

## 560 **Conclusion**

561 The quantitative findings suggest a positive influence of SP on participants' mental health  
562 and wellbeing. Moreover, the findings highlights the importance of social-related  
563 mechanisms, including loneliness and social connectedness, in contributing to the observed  
564 positive influence of SP on mental health and wellbeing. These findings were supported by  
565 qualitative data, highlighting the importance of social influences and increased self-  
566 confidence and optimism resulting from SP participation. The study emphasizes the need for  
567 high-quality SP services with knowledgeable referrers and link workers, effective  
568 communication skills, and sufficient capacity to facilitate positive experiences for  
569 participants and SP service staff. We should, however, be cautious when interpreting these  
570 results due to limitations in study design, such as the lack of controlled trials, appropriate  
571 outcome measures, and statistical considerations, as well as the suboptimal reach of the target  
572 group. Therefore, while SP demonstrates promise in improving health and wellbeing  
573 outcomes, more rigorous and comprehensive research is needed to fully understand its  
574 influence and potential benefits.

575

576 **Supplementary Material**

577 Appendix A: PRISMA reporting guidelines

578 Appendix B: Search Strategy for different databases

579 Appendix C: Behavioral Change Techniques Taxonomy (v1)

580 Appendix D: Results of the 1) Percent Agreement, 2) Quality Assessment Mixed Method

581 Appraisal Tool, and 3) Risk of Bias Assessment Cochrane RoB2 and ROBINS-I

582 Appendix E: Overview of publications excluded in the full-text screening stage, including

583 reasons for exclusion

584 Appendix F: Stratified Harvest Plots for wellbeing, mental health, general and physical

585 health, primary care use, and social-related mechanisms.

586

587 **Abbreviations**

588 BCT: Behavioral Change Technique

589 HCP: Health Care Provider

590 SP: Social Prescribing

591 VCS: Voluntary, Community, and Social

592

593 **Declarations**

594

595 **Data availability**

596 The data used to support the findings of this systematic review are available from the

597 corresponding author upon request.

598

599 **Conflicts of interest**



600 The authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest.

601

602 **Funding**

603 This work was supported by ZonMw; The Netherlands Institute for Health Research and  
604 Development [grant number 10390052010010].

605

606 **Acknowledgement**

607 We would like to thank J.W. Schoones for his assistance in conducting the literature search.

608

## 609 References

- 610 1. South, J., et al., *Can social prescribing provide the missing link?* Primary Health Care Research  
611 & Development, 2008. **9**(4): p. 310-318.
- 612 2. Friedli, L., et al., *Social prescribing for mental health—A guide to commissioning and delivery.*  
613 *Vol. 9. Care Services Improvement Partnership.* 2008.
- 614 3. Bodenheimer, T. and C. Sinsky, *From triple to quadruple aim: care of the patient requires*  
615 *care of the provider.* The Annals of Family Medicine, 2014. **12**(6): p. 573-576.
- 616 4. Carey, R.N., et al., *Behavior change techniques and their mechanisms of action: a synthesis of*  
617 *links described in published intervention literature.* Annals of Behavioral Medicine, 2019.  
618 **53**(8): p. 693-707.
- 619 5. Connell, L.E., et al., *Links between behavior change techniques and mechanisms of action: An*  
620 *expert consensus study.* Annals of Behavioral Medicine, 2019. **53**(8): p. 708-720.
- 621 6. Kellezi, B., et al., *The social cure of social prescribing: a mixed-methods study on the benefits*  
622 *of social connectedness on quality and effectiveness of care provision.* BMJ Open, 2019.  
623 **9**(11): p. e033137.
- 624 7. Wakefield, J.R., et al., *When groups help and when groups harm: Origins, developments, and*  
625 *future directions of the “Social Cure” perspective of group dynamics.* Social and Personality  
626 Psychology Compass, 2019. **13**(3): p. e12440.
- 627 8. Wakefield, J.R.H., et al., *Social Prescribing as ‘Social Cure’: A longitudinal study of the health*  
628 *benefits of social connectedness within a Social Prescribing pathway.* Journal of Health  
629 Psychology, 2020: p. 1359105320944991.
- 630 9. Haslam, C., et al., *The new psychology of health: Unlocking the social cure.* 2018: Routledge.
- 631 10. Heijnders, M.L. and J.J. Meijs, *‘Welzijn op Recept’ (Social Prescribing): a helping hand in re-*  
632 *establishing social contacts - an explorative qualitative study.* Primary Health Care Research  
633 & Development, 2018. **19**(3): p. 223-231.
- 634 11. Zurynski, Y., A. Vedovi, and K.-I. Smith. *Social prescribing: a rapid literature review to inform*  
635 *primary care policy in Australia.* in *Consumers’ Health Forum of Australia.* 2020.
- 636 12. Jensen, A., et al., *Arts on prescription in Scandinavia: a review of current practice and future*  
637 *possibilities.* Perspectives in public health, 2017. **137**(5): p. 268-274.
- 638 13. Baska, A., et al., *Social prescribing and lifestyle medicine—a remedy to chronic health*  
639 *problems?* International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 2021. **18**(19):  
640 p. 10096.
- 641 14. Bickerdike, L., et al., *Social prescribing: less rhetoric and more reality. A systematic review of*  
642 *the evidence.* BMJ open, 2017. **7**(4): p. e013384.
- 643 15. Pilkington, K., M. Loef, and M. Polley, *Searching for real-world effectiveness of health care*  
644 *innovations: scoping study of social prescribing for diabetes.* Journal of medical Internet  
645 research, 2017. **19**(2): p. e6431.
- 646 16. Kimberlee, R., *Developing a social prescribing approach for Bristol.* Bristol CCG, 2013.
- 647 17. Brettell, M., C. Fenton, and E. Foster, *Linking Leeds: A Social Prescribing Service for Children*  
648 *and Young People.* International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 2022.  
649 **19**(3): p. 1426.
- 650 18. Wildman, J. and J.M. Wildman, *Evaluation of a Community Health Worker Social Prescribing*  
651 *Program Among UK Patients With Type 2 Diabetes.* JAMA network open, 2021. **4**(9): p.  
652 e2126236-e2126236.
- 653 19. Burns, J., et al., *Linking families with pre-school children from healthcare services to*  
654 *community resources: a systematic review protocol.* Systematic reviews, 2017. **6**(1): p. 1-7.
- 655 20. Moher, D., et al., *Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the*  
656 *PRISMA statement.* PLoS medicine, 2009. **6**(7): p. e1000097.
- 657 21. Haddaway, N.R., et al., *The role of Google Scholar in evidence reviews and its applicability to*  
658 *grey literature searching.* PloS one, 2015. **10**(9): p. e0138237.

- 659 22. Heijnders, M. and J.J. Meijs, *Handboek Welzijn op Recept: Zorg en welzijn maken samen het*  
660 *verschil*. 2019: Springer Nature.
- 661 23. Van de Schoot, R., et al., *ASReview: Active learning for systematic reviews (Version v0.19)*.  
662 Zenodo. Retrieved from, 2020. **10**.
- 663 24. van de Schoot, R., et al., *An open source machine learning framework for efficient and*  
664 *transparent systematic reviews*. *Nature Machine Intelligence*, 2021. **3**(2): p. 125-133.
- 665 25. Ferdinands, G., et al., *Active learning for screening prioritization in systematic reviews-A*  
666 *simulation study*. 2020.
- 667 26. Yu, Z. and T. Menzies, *Fast2: An intelligent assistant for finding relevant papers*. *Expert*  
668 *Systems with Applications*, 2019. **120**: p. 57-71.
- 669 27. Higgins, J.P., et al., *Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions*. 2019: John  
670 Wiley & Sons.
- 671 28. Michie, S., et al., *Making psychological theory useful for implementing evidence based*  
672 *practice: a consensus approach*. *BMJ Quality & Safety*, 2005. **14**(1): p. 26-33.
- 673 29. Hong, Q.N., et al., *The Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool (MMAT) version 2018 for information*  
674 *professionals and researchers*. *Education for information*, 2018. **34**(4): p. 285-291.
- 675 30. Sterne, J.A., et al., *RoB 2: a revised tool for assessing risk of bias in randomised trials*. *bmj*,  
676 2019. **366**.
- 677 31. Sterne, J.A., et al., *ROBINS-I: a tool for assessing risk of bias in non-randomised studies of*  
678 *interventions*. *bmj*, 2016. **355**.
- 679 32. Ogilvie, D., et al., *The harvest plot: a method for synthesising evidence about the differential*  
680 *effects of interventions*. *BMC medical research methodology*, 2008. **8**(1): p. 1-7.
- 681 33. RStudio Team, *RStudio: Integrated Development Environment for R*. 2022: RStudio, PBC,  
682 Boston, MA.
- 683 34. Aggar, C., et al., *Social Prescribing for Individuals Living with Mental Illness in an Australian*  
684 *Community Setting: A Pilot Study*. *Community Mental Health Journal*, 2021. **57**(1): p. 189-  
685 195.
- 686 35. Crone, D.M., et al., *'Artlift' arts-on-referral intervention in UK primary care: updated findings*  
687 *from an ongoing observational study*. *European Journal of Public Health*, 2018. **28**(3): p. 404-  
688 409.
- 689 36. Farenden, C., et al., *Community navigation in Brighton & Hove. Evaluation of a social*  
690 *prescribing pilot*. Hove: Brighton & Hove Impetus, 2015.
- 691 37. Holt, N.J., *Tracking momentary experience in the evaluation of arts-on-prescription services:*  
692 *using mood changes during art workshops to predict global wellbeing change*. *Perspectives*  
693 *in Public Health*, 2020. **140**(5): p. 270-276.
- 694 38. Kim, J.E., et al., *Effects of social prescribing pilot project for the elderly in rural area of South*  
695 *Korea during COVID-19 pandemic*. *Health Science Reports*, 2021. **4**(3): p. e320.
- 696 39. Loftus, A.M., F. McCauley, and M.O. McCarron, *Impact of social prescribing on general*  
697 *practice workload and polypharmacy*. *Public Health*, 2017. **148**: p. 96-101.
- 698 40. Maughan, D.L., et al., *Primary-care-based social prescribing for mental health: an analysis of*  
699 *financial and environmental sustainability*. *Primary Health Care Research & Development*,  
700 2016. **17**(2): p. 114-21.
- 701 41. Mercer, S.W., et al., *Effectiveness of Community-Links Practitioners in Areas of High*  
702 *Socioeconomic Deprivation*. *Annals of Family Medicine*, 2019. **17**(6): p. 518-525.
- 703 42. Morton, L., M. Ferguson, and F. Baty, *Improving wellbeing and self-efficacy by social*  
704 *prescription*. *Public health*, 2015. **3**(129): p. 286-289.
- 705 43. Pescheny, J.V., et al., *The impact of the Luton social prescribing programme on mental well-*  
706 *being: a quantitative before-and-after study*. *Journal of Public Health*, 2021. **43**(1): p. e69-  
707 e76.
- 708 44. Pescheny, J.V., et al., *The impact of the Luton social prescribing programme on energy*  
709 *expenditure: a quantitative before-and-after study*. *BMJ Open*, 2019. **9**(6): p. e026862.

- 710 45. Sumner, R.C., et al., *Factors associated with attendance, engagement and wellbeing change*  
711 *in an arts on prescription intervention*. Journal of Public Health, 2020. **42**(1): p. e88-e95.
- 712 46. Sumner, R.C., et al., *Arts on prescription: observed changes in anxiety, depression, and well-*  
713 *being across referral cycles*. Public Health, 2021. **192**: p. 49-55.
- 714 47. Lynch, M. and C.R. Jones, *Social prescribing for frequent attenders in primary care: An*  
715 *economic analysis*. Frontiers in Public Health, 2022: p. 3580.
- 716 48. Pomp, M., *Effectstudy Welbeing on Prescription [Effectstudie Welzijn op Recept]*. 2015.
- 717 49. Bhatti, S., et al., *Using self-determination theory to understand the social prescribing process:*  
718 *a qualitative study*. Bjpg Open, 2021. **5**(2).
- 719 50. Crone, D., et al., *'It helps me make sense of the world': the role of an art intervention for*  
720 *promoting health and wellbeing in primary care—perspectives of patients, health*  
721 *professionals and artists*. Journal of Public Health, 2012. **20**(5): p. 519-524.
- 722 51. Hanlon, P., et al., *Does Self-Determination Theory help explain the impact of social*  
723 *prescribing? A qualitative analysis of patients' experiences of the Glasgow 'Deep-End'*  
724 *Community Links Worker Intervention*. Chronic Illness, 2021. **17**(3): p. 173-188.
- 725 52. Payne, K., E. Walton, and C. Burton, *Steps to benefit from social prescription: a qualitative*  
726 *interview study*. British Journal of General Practice, 2020. **70**(690): p. e36-e44.
- 727 53. Redmond, M., et al., *'Light in dark places': exploring qualitative data from a longitudinal*  
728 *study using creative arts as a form of social prescribing*. Arts & Health, 2019. **11**(3): p. 232-  
729 245.
- 730 54. Simpson, S., et al., *Supporting access to activities to enhance well-being and reduce social*  
731 *isolation in people living with motor neurone disease*. Health & Social Care in the  
732 Community, 2020. **28**(6): p. 2282-2289.
- 733 55. Carnes, D., et al., *The impact of a social prescribing service on patients in primary care: a*  
734 *mixed methods evaluation*. BMC Health Services Research, 2017. **17**(1): p. 835.
- 735 56. Bertotti, M., et al., *A realist evaluation of social prescribing: an exploration into the context*  
736 *and mechanisms underpinning a pathway linking primary care with the voluntary sector*.  
737 Primary Health Care Research & Development, 2018. **19**(3): p. 232-245.
- 738 57. Bertotti, M., C. Frostick, and O. Temirov, *An evaluation of Social Prescribing in the London*  
739 *Borough of Redbridge: final evaluation report*. 2020.
- 740 58. Bertotti, M., et al., *The social prescribing service in the London Borough of Waltham Forest:*  
741 *final evaluation report*. 2017.
- 742 59. Dayson, C., *Evaluating social innovations and their contribution to social value: the benefits*  
743 *of a 'blended value' approach*. Policy and Politics, 2017. **45**(3): p. 395-411.
- 744 60. Dayson, C. and E. Bennett, *Evaluation of Doncaster Social Prescribing Service: understanding*  
745 *outcomes and impact*. 2016.
- 746 61. Dayson, C. and E. Bennett, *Evaluation of the Rotherham mental health social prescribing*  
747 *pilot*. 2015.
- 748 62. Envoy Partnership, *Self-Care social prescribing*. 2018, Kensington & Chelsea Social Council  
749 and NHS West London Clinical Commissioning Group: London.
- 750 63. Foster, A., et al., *Impact of social prescribing to address loneliness: A mixed methods*  
751 *evaluation of a national social prescribing programme*. Health & Social Care in the  
752 Community, 2021. **29**(5): p. 1439-1449.
- 753 64. Howarth, M., et al., *Social prescribing: a 'natural' community-based solution*. British Journal  
754 of Community Nursing, 2020. **25**(6): p. 294-298.
- 755 65. Jones, C. and M. Lynch, *Spice time credits social prescribing pilot evaluation*. Final Report,  
756 2019.
- 757 66. Jones, C. and M. Lynch, *Grow well social prescribing pilot evaluation*. Final Report, 2020.
- 758 67. Kimberlee, R., *Gloucestershire clinical commissioning group's social prescribing service:*  
759 *evaluation report*. 2016.

- 760 68. Kimberlee, R., et al., *Measuring the economic impact of the wellspring healthy living centre's*  
761 *social prescribing wellbeing programme for low level mental health issues encountered by GP*  
762 *services. Project Report. South West Forum, UK. 2013. POV\_Final\_Report\_March\_2014.*  
763 69. Mulligan, K., et al., *Social prescribing in Ontario, final report.* Toronto: Alliance for Healthier  
764 Communities, 2020.
- 765 70. Palmer, D., et al., *Social prescribing in Bexley: pilot evaluation report.* 2017: Mind in Bexley.  
766 71. Polley, M., H. Seers, and A. Fixsen, *Evaluation report of the social prescribing demonstrator*  
767 *site in Shropshire–Final Report.* University of Westminster, 2019.
- 768 72. Poulos, R.G., et al., *Arts on prescription for community-dwelling older people with a range of*  
769 *health and wellness needs.* Health & Social Care in the Community, 2019. **27**(2): p. 483-492.
- 770 73. van de Venter, E. and A.M. Buller, *Arts on referral interventions: a mixed-methods study*  
771 *investigating factors associated with differential changes in mental well-being.* Journal of  
772 Public Health, 2015. **37**(1): p. 143-150.
- 773 74. Vogelpoel, N. and K. Jarrold, *Social prescription and the role of participatory arts*  
774 *programmes for older people with sensory impairments.* Journal of Integrated Care, 2014.  
775 **22**(2): p. 39+.
- 776 75. Woodall, J., et al., *Understanding the effectiveness and mechanisms of a social prescribing*  
777 *service: a mixed method analysis.* BMC Health Services Research, 2018. **18**(1): p. 604.
- 778 76. Potter S, *Arts on Prescription 2014-15: Evaluation report.* 2015.
- 779 77. Hughes, S., et al., *Understanding well-being outcomes in primary care arts on referral*  
780 *interventions: a mixed method study.* European Journal for Person Centered Healthcare,  
781 2019. **7**(3): p. 1768.
- 782 78. Friedli, L., M. Themessl-Huber, and M. Butchart, *Evaluation of Dundee equally well sources of*  
783 *support: social prescribing in Maryfield.* Evaluation report four, 2012.
- 784 79. Vidovic, D., G.Y. Reinhardt, and C. Hammerton, *Can social prescribing foster individual and*  
785 *community well-being? A systematic review of the evidence.* International journal of  
786 environmental research and public health, 2021. **18**(10): p. 5276.
- 787 80. Costa, A., et al., *Effectiveness of social prescribing programs in the primary health-care*  
788 *context: a systematic literature review.* Sustainability, 2021. **13**(5): p. 2731.
- 789 81. Cooper, M., et al., *Effectiveness and active ingredients of social prescribing interventions*  
790 *targeting mental health: a systematic review.* BMJ open, 2022. **12**(7): p. e060214.
- 791 82. Napierala, H., et al., *Social Prescribing: Systematic Review of the Effectiveness of Psychosocial*  
792 *Community Referral Interventions in Primary Care.* International Journal of Integrated Care,  
793 2022. **22**(3).
- 794 83. Hill, P.L., et al., *The value of a purposeful life: Sense of purpose predicts greater income and*  
795 *net worth.* Journal of research in personality, 2016. **65**: p. 38-42.
- 796 84. Pescheny, J.V., Y. Pappas, and G. Randhawa, *Facilitators and barriers of implementing and*  
797 *delivering social prescribing services: a systematic review.* BMC Health Services Research,  
798 2018. **18**(1): p. 1-14.
- 799 85. Brandling, J. and W. House, *Social prescribing in general practice: adding meaning to*  
800 *medicine.* British Journal of General Practice, 2009. **59**(563): p. 454-456.
- 801 86. Tabaei-Aghdaei, Z., J.R. McColl-Kennedy, and L.V. Coote, *Goal setting and health-related*  
802 *outcomes in chronic diseases: a systematic review and meta-analysis of the literature from*  
803 *2000 to 2020.* Medical Care Research and Review, 2023. **80**(2): p. 145-164.
- 804 87. Percival, A., et al., *Systematic review of social prescribing and older adults: where to from*  
805 *here?* Family Medicine and Community Health, 2022. **10**(Suppl 1): p. e001829.
- 806 88. Chatterjee, H.J., et al., *Non-clinical community interventions: a systematised review of social*  
807 *prescribing schemes.* Arts & Health, 2018. **10**(2): p. 97-123.
- 808 89. Husk, K., et al., *Social prescribing: where is the evidence?* 2019, British Journal of General  
809 Practice. p. 6-7.

- 810 90. Mohr, D.C., et al., *Trials of intervention principles: evaluation methods for evolving*  
811 *behavioral intervention technologies*. Journal of medical Internet research, 2015. **17**(7): p.  
812 e4391.
- 813 91. Williams, D.R. and S.A. Mohammed, *Discrimination and racial disparities in health: evidence*  
814 *and needed research*. Journal of behavioral medicine, 2009. **32**: p. 20-47.
- 815 92. Netto, G., et al., *How can health promotion interventions be adapted for minority ethnic*  
816 *communities? Five principles for guiding the development of behavioural interventions*.  
817 Health promotion international, 2010. **25**(2): p. 248-257.
- 818 93. UK Government. *Social prescribing: applying All Our Health*. 2019 Januari 27th, 2022 [cited  
819 2023 April 19th]; Available from: [https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/social-](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/social-prescribing-applying-all-our-health/social-prescribing-applying-all-our-health)  
820 [prescribing-applying-all-our-health/social-prescribing-applying-all-our-health](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/social-prescribing-applying-all-our-health/social-prescribing-applying-all-our-health).
- 821 94. Moscrop, A., *Social prescribing is no remedy for health inequalities*. 2023, British Medical  
822 Journal Publishing Group.
- 823 95. Landelijk Netwerk Welzijn op Recept. *Welzijn op Recept*. 2021 [cited 2023 April 19th ];  
824 Available from: [www.welzijnoprecept.nl/](http://www.welzijnoprecept.nl/).
- 825 96. Sandhu, S., et al., *Intervention components of link worker social prescribing programmes: a*  
826 *scoping review*. Health & Social Care in the Community, 2022.
- 827




Figure 1. PRISMA flowchart.

**Table 1.** Characteristics of the included papers.

Authors	Study design	Intervention	Intervention characteristics			Numer of participants	Measures
			Country	Context	Structure		
Papers reporting on quantitative methods							
Aggar et al., 2020* [34]	Uncontrolled before-after	The Social Plus Program  Australia	<i>Participants:</i> individuals living with mental illness  <i>Referrer:</i> GPs  <i>Activity:</i> arts and craft groups	<i>Link worker:</i> yes  <i>Duration:</i> unknown	<i>Needs assessment; tailoring; social support (unspecified); providing information (practical)</i>	Participant=13	QA1: QoL; general health; psychosocial distress  QA2: hospital admissions  <i>Mechanisms:</i> self-efficacy; loneliness; welfare needs and support; social participation; economic participation
Brettell, Fenton, and Foster, 2022* [17]	Uncontrolled before-after	Linking Leeds  UK	<i>Participants:</i> young people struggling to cope with stress related to non-medical issues  <i>Referrer:</i> GPs; self-referral; other care providers  <i>Activity:</i> support with housing and financial advice and support to engage in social and other activities	<i>Link worker:</i> yes  <i>Duration:</i> unknown	<i>Participate in decision making</i>	Participant=21	QA1: wellbeing  <i>Mechanism:</i> loneliness
Crone et al., 2018*** [35]; Sumner et al., 2020*** [45]	Uncontrolled before-after	Art Lift  UK	<i>Participants:</i> individuals with mental health problems, psychosocial problems or stress from illness or pain  <i>Referrer:</i> GPs; other care providers  <i>Activity:</i> arts	<i>Link worker:</i> no  <i>Duration:</i> 8 or 10 weeks	<i>Goal setting (unspecified); social support (unspecified)</i>	Participant=129 7	QA1: wellbeing
Farenden et al., 2015** [36]	Cross-sectional	Community Navigation in Brighton and Hove  UK	<i>Participants:</i> unknown with mental health problems, psychosocial problems or serious illness  <i>Referrer:</i> GPs; nurses (included in study)  <i>Activity:</i> activities within the VCS domain	<i>Link worker:</i> yes  <i>Duration:</i> unknown	<i>Needs assessment; social support (unspecified); social support (practical); social support (emotional);</i>	Participant=100 Referrer=35 Link worker=11	QA1: wellbeing QA3: satisfaction with the service QA4: satisfaction with the service (referrer and link worker)



						<i>Mechanisms: social support; goals</i>
Holt, 2020*** [37]	Uncontrolled before-after	Arts on Prescription  UK	<i>Participants:</i> unknown with depression, anxiety, social isolation and chronic pain  <i>Referrer:</i> primary care providers  <i>Activity:</i> arts	<i>Link worker:</i> yes  <i>Duration:</i> 12 or 24 weeks	Participant=66	QA1: wellbeing
Kim et al., 2021* [38]	Uncontrolled before-after	Social Prescribing†  South Korea	<i>Participants:</i> elderly people during the COVID-19 pandemic  <i>Referrer:</i> unknown  <i>Activity:</i> music storytelling, self-help groups, and gardening	<i>Link worker:</i> unknown  <i>Duration:</i> 10 weeks	Participant=10	QA1: depression  <i>Mechanisms:</i> loneliness; self-efficacy; self-esteem
Loftus, McCauley, and McCarron, 2017* [39]	Uncontrolled before-after	Social Prescribing†  UK	<i>Participants:</i> unknown over 65 years of age with a chronic condition (including depression and anxiety) or evidence of polypharmacy and frequent attenders  <i>Referrer:</i> GP  <i>Activity:</i> social clubs, Men's Shed, counselling, arts program, falls prevention, exercises classes, crochet classes, personal development, craft classes, befriending and computer courses	<i>Link worker:</i> yes  <i>Duration:</i> 12 weeks  <i>Providing information (practical)</i>	Participant=28	QA2: GP visits, home visits, telephone calls, new repeat medications
Lynch and Jones, 2022** [47]	Uncontrolled before-after	Social Prescribing†  UK	<i>Participants:</i> with anxiety and social issues, depression and social difficulties, low mood and isolation, stress and social issues  <i>Referrer:</i> GP  <i>Activity:</i> non-medical sources of support within the community such as charities, the voluntary sector, and community groups	<i>Link worker:</i> yes  <i>Duration:</i> unknown	Participant=78	QA2: GP appointments, prescription dispensed
Maughan et al., 2016* [40]	Controlled before-after	The Connect Project	<i>Participants:</i> unknown with mental health problems, frequent attenders, and social isolation	<i>Link worker:</i> yes  <i>Duration:</i>	<i>Tailoring;</i> instructions on how to perform the behavior; <i>providing</i>  <i>Intervention:</i> Participant=26	QA2: financial and environmental costs of GP appointments, medications use, and secondary-

		UK	<p><i>Referrer:</i> GPs; other health care providers</p> <p><i>Activity:</i> self-help, self-management resources, educational, leisure and recreational facilities and fitness-, health- and exercise-related activities</p>	between 6 and 18 months	<p><i>information (unspecified); restructuring the physical environment</i></p>	<p><i>Control:</i> care referrals</p> <p>Participant=29</p>	
<p>Mercer et al., 2019* [41]</p>	<p>Cluster randomized controlled trial</p>	<p>Glasgow Deep End Link Worker Program</p> <p>UK</p>	<p><i>Participants:</i> unknown visiting primary care with mainly social problems that exacerbated long-term health problems</p> <p><i>Referrer:</i> GPs; nurse practitioners</p> <p><i>Activity:</i> walking groups, debt management support, welfare rights, drug and alcohol management support, lunch clubs, befriending schemes, crafting clubs, bereavement support</p>	<p><i>Link worker:</i> yes</p> <p><i>Duration:</i> unknown</p>	<p><i>Needs assessment; tailoring; social support (unspecified); social support (practical); restructuring the physical environment; participate in decision making</i></p>	<p><i>pomp</i></p>	<p><i>QAI:</i> wellbeing; QoL; depression; anxiety; impairment in functioning; exercise; alcohol consumption; smoking</p>
<p>Morton, Ferguson, and Baty, 2015*** [42]</p>	<p>Uncontrolled before-after</p>	<p>Social Prescribing†</p> <p>UK</p>	<p><i>Participants:</i> unknown with mild to moderate mental health problems mild to moderate mental health difficulties such as anxiety/stress, depression and low self-esteem</p> <p><i>Referrer:</i> psychologists; nurse practitioners; occupational therapists; other health care providers; self-referral</p> <p><i>Activity:</i> activities offered by VCS and local authority organizations (e.g., arts and crafts, leisure, stress management, cultural, educational or environmental activities)</p>	<p><i>Link worker:</i> yes</p> <p><i>Duration:</i> unknown</p>	<p><i>Participate in decision making</i></p>	<p>Participant=136</p>	<p><i>QAI:</i> wellbeing; depression; anxiety</p> <p><i>Mechanisms:</i> self-efficacy</p>
<p>Pescheny et al., 2019** [44]</p>	<p>Uncontrolled before-after</p>	<p>The Luton Social Prescribing Program</p> <p>UK</p>	<p><i>Participants:</i> people with high risk for diabetes and chronic COPD, mild to moderate mental health problems, loneliness, social isolation, and carers</p> <p><i>Referrer:</i> GPs</p> <p><i>Activity:</i> activities offered by VCS and local authority organizations (e.g., advice service, physical activities, gardening, social activities, stress management and</p>	<p><i>Link worker:</i> yes</p> <p><i>Duration:</i> 12 sessions</p>	<p><i>Needs assessment; tailoring; social support (unspecified); social support (practical); social support (emotional)</i></p>	<p>Participant=186</p>	<p><i>QAI:</i> physical activity</p>

			relaxation courses and creative activities)				
Peschey et al., 2021** [43]	Uncontrolled before-after	The Luton Social Prescribing Program  UK	<i>Participants:</i> people with high risk for diabetes and chronic COPD, mild to moderate mental health problems, loneliness, social isolation, and carers  <i>Referrer:</i> GPs  <i>Activity:</i> activities offered by VCS and local authority organizations (e.g., advice service, physical activities, gardening, social activities, stress management and relaxation courses and creative activities)	<i>Link worker:</i> yes  <i>Duration:</i> 12 sessions	<i>Needs assessment;</i> <i>tailoring;</i> social support (practical); social support (emotional)	Participant=63	QA1: wellbeing
Pomp, 2015** [48]	Controlled before-after	Welzijn op Recept  The Netherlands	<i>Participants:</i> unknown with psychosocial problems  <i>Referrer:</i> GPs; nurse practitioners; physical therapists; psychologists  <i>Activity:</i> activities within VCS organizations	<i>Link worker:</i> yes  <i>Duration:</i> unknown		<i>Intervention:</i> Participant=171  <i>Control:</i> Participant=604	QA2: healthcare costs
Sumner et al., 2021*** [46]	Uncontrolled before-after	Arts on Prescription  UK	<i>Participants:</i> unknown with mild depressive symptoms, psychosocial problems or stress from illness or pain  <i>Referrer:</i> GPs; social prescribers; nurse practitioners; other health care providers  <i>Activity:</i> art based activities	<i>Link worker:</i> yes  <i>Duration:</i> 8 weeks	<i>Goal setting (unspecified);</i> social support (unspecified)	Participant=245	QA1: wellbeing; depression; anxiety;
Wakefield et al., 2020* [8]  (same dataset as Kellezi et al., 2019 [6])	Uncontrolled before-after	Social Prescribing†  UK	<i>Participants:</i> unknown with long-term physical/mental health conditions, social isolation, lonely or socially anxious  <i>Referrer:</i> GPs; nurse practitioners; self-referral  <i>Activity:</i> activities offered by VCS and local authority organizations	<i>Link worker:</i> yes  <i>Duration:</i> unknown	Monitoring of behavior by others without feedback; monitoring of outcomes of behavior without feedback; social support (practical)	Participant=630	QA1: QoL  <i>Mechanisms:</i> group membership
Papers reporting on qualitative methods							

Bhatti et al., 2021*** [49]	Focus groups and interviews	Rx: Community Canada	<p><i>Participants:</i> unknown with mild to moderate depressive symptoms, psychosocial problems, social isolation, and unmet needs</p> <p><i>Referrer:</i> physicians; nurse practitioners</p> <p><i>Activity:</i> support from and activities within VCS organizations</p>	<p><i>Link worker:</i> yes</p> <p><i>Duration:</i> unknown</p>	<p>Goal setting (behavior); action planning; social support (unspecified); <i>participate in decision making</i></p>	<p>Participant=96</p>	<p><i>QA1:</i> mental health</p> <p><i>QA3:</i> satisfaction with the service</p> <p><i>Mechanisms:</i> self-management; social support; social connectedness; community belonging</p>
Crone et al., 2012*** [50]	Focus groups and interviews	Arts on Prescription UK	<p><i>Participants:</i> unknown needing to reduce stress, anxiety or depression, improve self-confidence, self-esteem or wellbeing, or to help manage chronic pain, illness or bereavement</p> <p><i>Referrer:</i> GPs; nurse practitioners</p> <p><i>Activity:</i> arts</p>	<p><i>Link worker:</i> no</p> <p><i>Duration:</i> 10 weeks</p>		<p>Participant=10</p> <p>Referrer=3</p> <p>VCS=5</p>	<p><i>QA1:</i> perceived health benefits</p> <p><i>QA3:</i> role and value of the intervention; setting and referral process</p> <p><i>QA4:</i> role and value of the intervention; setting and referral process</p>
Hanlon et al., 2021*** [51]	Interviews	Links Worker Program UK	<p><i>Participants:</i> unknown with physical or mental health problems and social isolation</p> <p><i>Referrer:</i> GPs; nurse practitioners; self-referral</p> <p><i>Activity:</i> activities within or support from VCS services or other sources of support for their needs and difficulties</p>	<p><i>Link worker:</i> yes</p> <p><i>Duration:</i> unknown</p>	<p><i>Tailoring;</i> social support (unspecified); instructions on how to perform the behavior; <i>providing information (unspecified)</i></p>	<p>Participant=12</p>	<p><i>QA1:</i> perceived health benefits</p> <p><i>Mechanisms:</i> relatedness; competence; autonomy; regulations of behavior</p>
Heijnders and Meijs, 2018*** [10]	Interviews	Welzijn op Recept The Netherlands	<p><i>Participants:</i> unknown with psychosocial problems</p> <p><i>Referrer:</i> GPs; nurse practitioners; physical therapists; psychologists</p> <p><i>Activity:</i> activities within VCS organizations</p>	<p><i>Link worker:</i> yes</p> <p><i>Duration:</i> unknown</p>	<p><i>Needs assessment;</i> <i>tailoring;</i> feedback on behavior; <i>providing information (practical);</i> verbal persuasion about capabilities; focus on past success</p>	<p>Participant=10</p>	<p><i>QA1:</i> perceived health benefits</p> <p><i>QA3:</i> satisfaction with referral and intake process</p> <p><i>Mechanism:</i> social participation; self-reliance; coping</p>
Payne, Walton, and Burton, 2020*** [52]	Interviews	Social Prescribing† UK	<p><i>Participants:</i> unknown with psychosocial problems and mental health problems</p> <p><i>Referrer:</i> health care providers</p>	<p><i>Link worker:</i> no</p> <p><i>Duration:</i></p>		<p>Participant=17</p>	<p><i>Mechanisms:</i> social support; social participation; beliefs about capabilities; goals</p>

			<i>Activity:</i> activities within relevant VCS groups or within the organization to advocacy, health trainers, and social cafés	unknown			
Redmond et al., 2019*** [53]	Qualitative survey	Art Lift UK	<i>Participants:</i> unknown with mild depressive symptoms, psychosocial problems or stress from illness or pain  <i>Referrer:</i> GPs; other care providers  <i>Activity:</i> arts	<i>Link worker:</i> no  <i>Duration:</i> 10 weeks	<i>Goal setting (unspecified); social support (unspecified)</i>	Participant=129 7	<i>QA1:</i> perceived health benefits  <i>QA3:</i> satisfaction with the service
Simpson et al., 2020*** [54]	Interviews	Social Prescribing† UK	<i>Participants:</i> people living with motor neuron disease who are socially isolated  <i>Referrer:</i> health care providers  <i>Activity:</i> VCS-based activities	<i>Link worker:</i> yes  <i>Duration:</i> unknown	Action planning; <i>tailoring</i> ; social support (unspecified); restructuring the physical environment	Participant=5 Link worker=4	<i>QA1:</i> perceived health benefits <i>QA3:</i> satisfaction with the service <i>QA4:</i> overall experience (link workers)  <i>Mechanisms:</i> confidence
Papers reporting on mixed methods							
Bertotti et al., 2017** [58]	Uncontrolled before-after and interviews	Waltham Forest Social Prescribing Service UK	<i>Participants:</i> unknown with a wide range of health and non-health issues including social and economic concerns  <i>Referrer:</i> GPs; adult and social care department within the council (included in the study n=unknown)  <i>Activity:</i> activities within an support from statutory or VCS organizations	<i>Link worker:</i> yes  <i>Duration:</i> unknown	Review behavior goals; <i>needs assessment</i> ; <i>tailoring</i> ; feedback on outcomes of behaviour; <i>providing information (practical); participate in decision making</i>	Participant=32-48 (survey) Referrer/link worker/VCS=unknown (interview)	<i>QA1:</i> wellbeing; QoL; general health; mental wellbeing <i>QA2:</i> GP visits; A&E visits <i>QA3:</i> satisfaction with the service <i>QA4:</i> overall experience (referrers, link workers, VCS organizations)  <i>Mechanisms:</i> patient activation measure
Bertotti et al., 2018** [56]	Cross-sectional and interviews	City and Hackney Social Prescribing	<i>Participants:</i> unknown with symptoms of social isolation, mild to moderate mental health problems, presenting with a social problem, or frequent	<i>Link worker:</i> yes  <i>Duration:</i>	Action planning; <i>needs assessment</i> ; <i>tailoring</i> ; <i>participate in decision</i>	Participant=17 (interview) Referrer=52	<i>QA2:</i> GP attendance; A&E visits (from referrers' perspective) <i>QA3:</i> satisfaction with the service

		UK	attenders	unknown	<i>making</i>	(survey)	QA4: overall experience (referrers)
			<i>Referrer:</i> GPs				
			<i>Activity:</i> physical activity classes, health advice, networking activities (e.g., lunch clubs), psychological support, art and other services				
Bertotti et al., 2020* [57]	Uncontrolled before-after, interviews and focus groups	Redbridge Social Prescribing UK	<i>Participants:</i> individuals with diabetes, low mental health level, social isolation and carers <i>Referrer:</i> GPs <i>Activity:</i> activities within an support from statutory or VCS organizations	<i>Link worker:</i> yes <i>Duration:</i> 12 weeks	Action planning; <i>needs assessment; goal setting (unspecified);</i> social support (unspecified);	Participant=97-104 (survey) and 12 (interview)  Referrer/VCS=6 (interview)  Link worker=8 (focus group)	QA1: wellbeing; QoL QA2: GP consultations; A&E visits QA3: process evaluation QA4: process evaluation (referrers, link workers, and VCS) <i>Mechanisms:</i> loneliness; social capital
Carnes et al., 2017** [55]	Controlled before-after and interviews	Social Prescribing† UK	<i>Participants:</i> frequent attenders and/or socially isolated <i>Referrer:</i> GPs <i>Activity:</i> activities within and support from statutory or VCS organizations	<i>Link worker:</i> yes  <i>Duration:</i> unknown	Goal setting (behavior); action planning; social support (unspecified); <i>participate in decision making</i>	<i>Intervention:</i> Participant=184 (survey) and 20 (interview)  <i>Control:</i> Participant=302	QA1: wellbeing; general health; depression; anxiety QA2: GP consultation; medication use QA3: process evaluation; satisfaction with the service <i>Mechanisms:</i> regular activities; active engagement in life
Dayson et al., 2015* [61]	Uncontrolled before-after and interviews	Rotherham Social Prescribing Service UK	<i>Participants:</i> unclear <i>Referrer:</i> GPs <i>Activity:</i> activities within and support from statutory or VCS organizations	<i>Link worker:</i> yes  <i>Duration:</i> unknown	<i>Needs assessment;</i> monitoring of behaviour by others without feedback; monitoring of outcomes of behaviour by others without feedback; <i>providing information (unspecified)</i>	Participant=939 (routine data), 1068 (survey), and 6 (interviews)  Referrer=7 (interview)  Link worker=2	QA1: wellbeing; mental wellbeing; physical health QA2: A&E attendance; hospital episodes QA3: satisfaction with the service <i>Mechanisms:</i> loneliness; social support; social connectedness;

						(interview)	social isolation; coping; self-image
Dayson and Bennett, 2016* [60]	Uncontrolled before-after, cross-sectional, and interviews	Doncaster Social Prescribing Service UK	<p><i>Participants:</i> individuals with long term physical/mental health condition, mild to moderate depression or anxiety, poor mental wellbeing affected by social circumstance, or frequent attenders</p> <p><i>Referrer:</i> GPs; nurse practitioners</p> <p><i>Activity:</i> activities within and support from statutory or VCS organizations</p>	<p><i>Link worker:</i> yes</p> <p><i>Duration:</i> unknown</p>	<p><i>Needs assessment; tailoring; feedback on behavior; feedback on outcomes of behavior; social support (unspecified);</i></p>	<p>Participant=215 (survey), 292 (survey), and unknown (interview)</p> <p>Referrer/link worker=unknown (interview)</p>	<p>QA1: QoL</p> <p>QA2: GP visits; nurse visits; mental health service appointments; psychotherapy appointments</p> <p>QA3: satisfaction with the service</p> <p>QA4: process evaluation (referrers and link workers)</p> <p><i>Mechanisms:</i> social isolation; financial management</p>
Dayson, 2017* [59]	Uncontrolled before-after and interviews	Social Prescribing UK	<p><i>Participants:</i> unclear</p> <p><i>Referrer:</i> health care providers</p> <p><i>Activity:</i> social, therapeutic and practical support provided by VCS organizations</p>	<p><i>Link worker:</i> yes</p> <p><i>Duration:</i> unknown</p>	<p><i>Needs assessment; tailoring; monitoring of behaviour by others without feedback; providing information (practical)</i></p>	<p>Participant=108 (survey), 280 (survey), and 17 (interview)</p>	<p>QA1: wellbeing;</p> <p>QA2: A&amp;E attendance; hospital episodes</p> <p>QA3: satisfaction with the service</p> <p><i>Mechanisms:</i> loneliness; social isolation; social support; connectedness</p>
Envoy Partnership, 2018** [62]	Uncontrolled before-after and interviews	Self-Care Social Prescribing UK	<p><i>Participants:</i> individuals with three or more long-term conditions, mental health or social care needs</p> <p><i>Referrer:</i> GPs</p> <p><i>Activity:</i> activities within and support from statutory or VCS organizations (e.g., arts, music, befriending, career support, exercise, information and advice)</p>	<p><i>Link worker:</i> yes</p> <p><i>Duration:</i> unknown</p>	<p><i>Problem solving; review behavior goals; review outcome goals; needs assessment; tailoring; monitoring of behaviour by others without feedback; monitoring of outcomes of behaviour by others without feedback; feedback on outcomes of behavior; providing information (unspecified)</i></p>	<p>Participant=134 (survey) and 33 (interview)</p> <p>Referrer=3 (interview)</p> <p>Link worker=42 (survey) and 31 (interview)</p> <p>VCS=12 (interview)</p>	<p>QA1: wellbeing (from referrers' perspective); depression; anxiety; physical health (from referrers' perspective); pain</p> <p>QA2: stopped need for GP visits (from referrers' perspective)</p> <p>QA3: satisfaction with the service</p> <p>QA4: process evaluation (referrers, link workers, and VCS)</p> <p><i>Mechanisms:</i> patient activation</p>

							measure
Foster et al., 2021*** [63]	Uncontrolled before-after and interviews	Social Prescribing† UK	<i>Participants:</i> people with feelings of loneliness <i>Referrer:</i> GPs <i>Activity:</i> activities within and support from statutory or VCS organizations	<i>Link worker:</i> yes <i>Duration:</i> 12 weeks	<i>Needs assessment;</i> <i>tailoring;</i> social support (practical); social support (emotional); restructuring the physical environment	Participant=225 0 (survey) and 26 (interview) Link worker=24 (interview)	QA3: process evaluation QA4: process evaluation (link workers) <i>Mechanisms:</i> loneliness
Friedli, Themessl-Huber, and Butchart, 2012* [78]	Uncontrolled before-after and interviews	Sources of Support UK	<i>Participants:</i> people with structural and environmental issues, lifestyle issues, social isolation, psychosocial problems, family and relationship problems <i>Referrer:</i> GPs <i>Activity:</i> activities within and support from statutory or VCS organizations	<i>Link worker:</i> yes <i>Duration:</i> unknown	<i>Needs assessment;</i> <i>tailoring;</i> feedback on behavior; feedback on outcomes of behavior; social support (unspecified); social support (practical);	Participant=16 (survey) and 12 (interview) Referrer=2 (interview) Link worker=3 (interview)	QA1: wellbeing; functional impairment; QA3: satisfaction with the service QA4: process evaluation (referrers and link workers)
Howarth et al., 2020* [64]	Uncontrolled before-after and focus groups	Wellbeing Garden UK	<i>Participants:</i> unknown with depression, anxiety, low overall health, low self-confidence and physical ill-health <i>Referrer:</i> unknown <i>Activity:</i> gardening	<i>Link worker:</i> unknown <i>Duration:</i> 12 weeks	<i>Tailoring</i>	Participant=47 (survey) and 9 (interview)	QA1: wellbeing <i>Mechanisms:</i> social isolation; confidence
Hughes, Sumner, and Redmund, 2019** [77]	Uncontrolled before-after and interviews	Arts on Prescription UK	<i>Participants:</i> people with anxiety, depression, or stress, low self-esteem, confidence, or overall wellbeing, stress from chronic illness or pain, in need of distraction from behaviour-related health issues, or had experienced a recent major life change or loss <i>Referrer:</i> GPs; other health care providers <i>Activity:</i> Arts	<i>Link worker:</i> no <i>Duration:</i> 8 weeks	<i>Goal setting (unspecified);</i> social support (unspecified)	Participant=441 (survey) and 407 (interview)	QA1: wellbeing QA3: satisfaction with the service; barriers and facilitators
Jones and Lynch, 2019* [65]	Uncontrolled before-after, interviews, and focus	Spice Time Credits	<i>Participants:</i> people presenting with low level anxiety and depression	<i>Link worker:</i> yes <i>Duration:</i>		Participant=11 (survey) and 11 (interview)	QA1: wellbeing QA2: GP appointments;



	groups	UK	<i>Referrer:</i> GPs <i>Activity:</i> time credits (volunteering)	unknown		Referrer=12 (focus group) and 2 (interview)	prescription dispensed QA3: satisfaction with the service; barriers and facilitators QA4: process evaluation (referrers and link workers); barriers and facilitators
Jones and Lynch, 2020* [66]	Uncontrolled before-after, and focus groups	Grow Well UK	<i>Participants:</i> people with low level anxiety and depression and psychosocial issues <i>Referrer:</i> GPs <i>Activity:</i> gardening	<i>Link worker:</i> yes <i>Duration:</i> unknown		Participant=11 (survey) and 8 (focus group)	QA1: wellbeing; physical activity; fruit and vegetable intake; sleep QA2: GP appointments; prescription dispensed QA3: satisfaction with the service; perceived benefits <i>Mechanisms:</i> loneliness; self-efficacy
Kellezi et al., 2019*** [6] (same dataset as Wakefield et al., 2020 [8])	Uncontrolled before-after and interviews	Social Prescribing† UK	<i>Participants:</i> individuals suffering from chronic conditions exacerbated by loneliness (e.g., depression, obesity) <i>Referrer:</i> GPs; nurse practitioners; self-referral <i>Activity:</i> activities within and support from VCS organizations	<i>Link worker:</i> yes <i>Duration:</i> 8 weeks	<i>Needs assessment; tailoring; monitoring of behaviors by others without feedback; monitoring of outcomes of behavior without feedback; social support (unspecified)</i>	Participant=630 (survey) and 19 (interview) Referrer=16 (interview)	QA2: health care use QA3: overall experience with the service QA4: process evaluation (referrers) <i>Mechanisms:</i> group membership; community belonging
Kimberlee et al., 2014** [68]	Uncontrolled before-after and interviews	Wellspring's Wellbeing Program UK	<i>Participants:</i> individuals with mild depressive symptoms, psychosocial problems or stress from illness or pain <i>Referrer:</i> GPs <i>Activity:</i> peer-support groups, arts-based activities, physical activities, complementary therapies, volunteering, training and employment opportunities	<i>Link worker:</i> yes <i>Duration:</i> 9 weeks (average)	<i>Action planning; tailoring; participate in decision making; social support (unspecified); social support (practical); social support (emotional)</i>	Participant=128 (survey), 80 (database) and 40 (interview) Referrer/link worker/VCS=20 (interview)	QA1: wellbeing; depression; anxiety; physical activity QA3: perceived benefits QA4: process evaluation (referrers, link workers, and VCS) <i>Mechanisms:</i> social isolation; social support; social capital


Kimberlee, 2016* [67]	Uncontrolled before-after, interviews and focus groups	Gloucestershire Social Prescribing service UK	<i>Participants:</i> people with social isolation, low general health and fitness, psychosocial problems, and caring responsibilities  <i>Referrer:</i> GPs  <i>Activity:</i> activities within the VCS domain	<i>Link worker:</i> yes  <i>Duration:</i> unknown	<i>Needs assessment; tailoring;</i> social support (unspecified); instructions on how to perform the behavior	Participant=204 7 (survey) and 13 (interview)  Referrer=5 (interview)  Link worker=6 (interview)  VCS=6 (interview)	<i>QA1:</i> wellbeing  <i>QA2:</i> GP visits; A&E attendance; home visits; phone calls  <i>QA3:</i> overall experience with the service  <i>QA4:</i> process evaluation (referrers, link workers, and VCS)
Mulligan et al., 2020** [69]	Uncontrolled before-after, cross-sectional and interviews	Rx: Community UK	<i>Participants:</i> people with loneliness, social isolation, housing problems, work problems, sad feelings, getting older, no one to rely on  <i>Referrer:</i> GPs; nurse practitioners; interprofessional team members (such as nurses, dieticians, social workers etc.)  <i>Activity:</i> activities within the VCS domain	<i>Link worker:</i> yes  <i>Duration:</i> unknown	<i>Needs assessment; tailoring;</i> feedback on behavior; feedback on outcomes of behavior; social support (practical); <i>providing information (unspecified);</i> restructuring the physical environment; identification of self as role model; <i>participate in decision making</i>	Participant=108 -118 (survey) and unknown (interview)  Referrer=31 (survey) and unknown (interview)	<i>QA1:</i> wellbeing (from referrers' perspective)  <i>QA2:</i> GP visits (from referrers' perspective)  <i>QA4:</i> process evaluation (referrers)  <i>Mechanisms:</i> loneliness; community belonging; social support
Palmer and Sango, 2017** [70]	Uncontrolled before-after and interviews	Clocktower social prescribing project UK	<i>Participants:</i> people with social isolation, frequent attenders, low general health, recent major life change, or loss carers  <i>Referrer:</i> GPs; self-referral  <i>Activity:</i> activities within and support from statutory or VCS organizations	<i>Link worker:</i> yes  <i>Duration:</i> unknown	<i>Tailoring;</i> prompts/cues	Participant=81 (survey) and 49 (interview)	<i>QA1:</i> wellbeing  <i>QA2:</i> GP appointments; A&E visits and costs; hospital episodes; length of stay; impact on ambulance service  <i>QA3:</i> overall experience with the service; perceived benefits
Polley, Seers, and Fixsen,	Uncontrolled before-after, cross-	Shropshire Social	<i>Participants:</i> individuals with risk of cardiovascular disease and individuals who met any of the SP service eligibility criteria (loneliness, mental health	<i>Link worker:</i> yes	<i>Needs assessment; tailoring;</i> social support	Participant=134 (survey), 105 (survey), and 10	<i>QA1:</i> wellbeing; physical health  <i>QA2:</i> GP consultations; nurse visits

2019** [71]	sectional and interviews	Prescribing UK	issues, long term conditions) <i>Referrer:</i> GPs <i>Activity:</i> activities within and support from statutory or VCS organizations	<i>Duration:</i> unknown	(unspecified)	(interview) Referrer/link worker/VCS=15 (interview)	<i>QA3:</i> overall experience with the service; perceived benefits <i>QA4:</i> overall experience with the service <i>Mechanisms:</i> patient activation measure; loneliness
Potter, 2015** [76]	Uncontrolled before-after and interviews	Arts and Minds UK	<i>Participants:</i> people with mental health issues and/or learning disabilities <i>Referrer:</i> GPs <i>Activity:</i> Arts	<i>Link worker:</i> yes <i>Duration:</i> 12 weeks	<i>Tailoring;</i> prompts/cues	Participant=45 (survey) and 45 (interview)	<i>QA1:</i> wellbeing; depression; anxiety <i>QA3:</i> overall experience with the service <i>Mechanisms:</i> social inclusion; self-belief; motivation
Poulos et al., 2018** [72]	Uncontrolled before-after, interviews, and focus groups	Arts on Prescription Australia	<i>Participants:</i> people with mental health needs <i>Referrer:</i> GPs; nurse practitioners; pharmacists; other care professionals <i>Activity:</i> Arts	<i>Link worker:</i> no <i>Duration:</i> 8-10 weeks	Instructions on how to perform the behavior; <i>providing instructions (practical)</i>	Participant=127 (survey) and 52 (interview)	<i>QA1:</i> wellbeing; physical health <i>QA3:</i> perceived benefits
van de Venter and Buller, 2015** [73]	Uncontrolled before-after and interviews	Artshine UK	<i>Participants:</i> individuals with mild to moderate anxiety & depression, stress, social isolation, low self-esteem, Long term illness / health conditions or chronic pain, or difficult life changes or challenges <i>Referrer:</i> GPs; health trainers; midwives; mental health workers <i>Activity:</i> Arts	<i>Link worker:</i> no <i>Duration:</i> 20 weeks		Participant=44 (survey) and 6 (interview)	<i>QA1:</i> wellbeing <i>QA3:</i> overall experience with the service <i>Mechanisms:</i> social isolation; social support; self-efficacy
Vogelpoel and Jarrold, 2014** [74]	Uncontrolled before-after and interviews	Sense UK	<i>Participants:</i> individuals with sensory impairments and socially isolated <i>Referrer:</i> GPs <i>Activity:</i> Arts	<i>Link worker:</i> no <i>Duration:</i> 12 weeks	Social support (unspecified); <i>providing information (unspecified);</i> prompts/cues; restructuring the	Participant=12 (survey) and 12 (interview)	<i>QA1:</i> wellbeing <i>QA3:</i> perceived benefits <i>Mechanisms:</i> social isolation; social contacts; self-confidence

						physical environment	
Woodall et al., 2018** [75]	Uncontrolled before-after, interviews, and focus groups	Social Prescribing† UK	<i>Participants:</i> people presenting conditions that can be addressed without medical intervention  <i>Referrer:</i> GPs; other (health) care professionals; self-referral  <i>Activity:</i>	<i>Link worker:</i> yes  <i>Duration:</i> 6-16 weeks	<i>Needs assessment;</i> <i>tailoring;</i> social support (unspecified); social support (emotional); <i>providing information (practical)</i>	Participant=436 (survey) and 26 (interview)	<i>QA1:</i> wellbeing; QoL; general health  <i>QA2:</i> GP visits  <i>QA3:</i> perceived benefits  <i>Mechanisms:</i> social isolation; social support


§ *italicized* behavior change techniques are inductively added to those described by Michie et al., 2005 [28]; \* low methodological quality; \*\* moderate methodological quality; \*\*\* high methodological quality; † no specific name is provided for the Social Prescribing program; GP=general practitioner; QA1=quadruple aim 1 (health and wellbeing); QA2=quadruple aim 2 (health care use and costs); QA3=quadruple aim 3 (individuals' experience); QA4=quadruple aim 4 (providers' experience); VCS=voluntary, community, and social; QoL=quality of life;

It is made available under a [CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).




**Figure 2.** The influence of Social Prescribing on wellbeing (A), mental health (B), and general and physical health and health behaviors (C). The height of the bars represents the methodological quality; the symbols on top of the bars represents the statistical analysis: + = inferential statistics and - = descriptive statistics; the numbers below the bars represents the reference number; CS=cross-sectional; BA=before-after; BA-C=before-after with controls; RCT=randomized control trial.

It is made available under a [CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/) .



**Figure 3.** The influence of Social Prescribing on primary health care use. The height of the bars represents the methodological quality; the symbols on top of the bars represents the statistical analysis: + = inferential statistics and - = descriptive statistics; the numbers below the bars represents the reference number; CS=cross-sectional; BA=before-after; BA-C=before-after with controls; RCT=randomized control trial.

It is made available under a [CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/) .



**Figure 4.** The influence of Social Prescribing on social-related mechanisms. The height of the bars represents the methodological quality; the symbols on top of the bars represents the statistical analysis: + = inferential statistics and - = descriptive statistics; the numbers below the bars represents the reference number; CS=cross-sectional; BA=before-after; BA-C=before-after with controls; RCT=randomized control trial.