

# **Green space and loneliness: a systematic review with theoretical and methodological guidance for future research**

## **Authors**

Thomas Astell-Burt 1,2\*

Terry Hartig 3, 4

I Gusti Ngurah Edi Putra 1

Ramya Walsan 1, 5

Tashi Dendup 1

Xiaoqi Feng 1, 2, 5

## **Affiliations**

1 Population Wellbeing and Environment Research Lab (PowerLab), NSW, Australia

2 School of Health and Society, Faculty of Arts, Social Sciences, and Humanities, University of Wollongong, Wollongong, Australia

3 Institute for Housing and Urban Research, Uppsala University, Sweden

4 Department of Psychology, Uppsala University, Sweden

5 School of Population Health, Faculty of Medicine, University of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia

\* Corresponding author: [thomasab@uow.edu.au](mailto:thomasab@uow.edu.au) +61 4221 5081

**Acknowledgements:** We thank Dr Tewodros Hailemariam for helping to conduct some of the early literature searches on a related topic.

**Declaration of interest statement:** The authors have no interests to declare.

**Word count:** 14,984 / 15,000

**Green space and loneliness: a systematic review with theoretical and methodological guidance for future research**

## **Abstract**

Urban greening may help to reduce the population health impacts of loneliness and its concomitants, such as hopelessness and despair. However, the literature lacks both a critical appraisal of extant evidence and a conceptual model to explain how green space would work as a structural intervention. Both are needed to guide decision making and further research. We conducted a systematic review of quantitative studies testing associations between green space and loneliness, searching seven databases. Twenty two studies were identified by 25/01/2022. Most of the studies were conducted in high-income countries and fifteen (68%) had cross-sectional designs. Green space was measured inconsistently using either objective or subjective indicators. Few studies examined specific green space types or qualities. The majority of studies measured general loneliness (e.g. using the UCLA loneliness scale). Different types of loneliness (social, emotional, existential) were not analysed. Of 132 associations, 88 (66.6%) indicated potential protection from green space against loneliness, with 44 (33.3%) reaching statistical significance ( $p < 0.05$ ). We integrated these findings with evidence from qualitative studies to elaborate and extend the existing pathway domain model linking green space and health. These elaborations and extensions acknowledge the following: (a) different types of green space have implications for different types of loneliness; (b) multilevel circumstances influence the likelihood a person will benefit or suffer harm from green space; (c) personal, relational, and collective processes operate within different domains of pathways linking green space with loneliness and its concomitants; (d) loneliness and its concomitants are explicitly positioned as mediators within the broader causal system that links green space with health and wellbeing. This review and model provide guidance for decision making and further epidemiological research on green space and loneliness.



# **Green space and loneliness: a systematic review with theoretical and methodological guidance for future research**

## **INTRODUCTION**

Many scientists and health practitioners warn of an epidemic of loneliness affecting up to a quarter of adults in countries such as the US,<sup>1</sup> the UK,<sup>2</sup> Australia<sup>3</sup> and Sweden.<sup>4</sup> Loneliness, characterised by felt deprivation of connection, comradery and companionship, is a concept often misunderstood and misconstrued. Loneliness is stereotypically associated with ageing, yet it can affect people of any age.<sup>5</sup> It is a highly sensitive, often stigmatised condition<sup>6</sup> described alarmingly by some commentators as 'a social cancer'<sup>7</sup> and 'the leprosy of the 21st century'.<sup>8</sup> Loneliness is typically overlooked by health sector-led prevention strategies and yet, scientists and health practitioners now understand it to be an aversive state associated with an increased risk of multiple chronic diseases.<sup>9-15</sup> Loneliness is not a disease, but it has been medicalised.<sup>16</sup> Attempts to address loneliness so far have been mostly person-focussed and weak, or ineffective.<sup>17 18</sup>

Policy options that shift the locus of intervention from individuals to the community context need to be identified.<sup>19</sup> Urban greening was specifically highlighted as a policy option in the UK loneliness strategy.<sup>20</sup> The potential of parks and other forms of green space to be part of a scalable public policy strategy to reduce loneliness is highly compelling, especially in light of the already well-documented benefits for health,<sup>21-23</sup> climate and biodiversity.<sup>24-26</sup> Recognizing these other benefits, cities around the world have made durable commitments to increase vegetation cover and quality (e.g.

Sydney,<sup>27</sup> Canberra,<sup>28</sup> Barcelona,<sup>29</sup> Seattle,<sup>30</sup> Singapore<sup>31</sup> and Vancouver<sup>32</sup>). These may be amenable to tailoring with a view to ameliorating loneliness.

It is important to recognize that 'loneliness' is often used in a general sense, but previous work (e.g. Weiss<sup>33</sup>) has distinguished between 'social loneliness' and 'emotional loneliness'. Whereas the former refers to the feeling of being marginalized from a network of friends and family, the latter occurs when a person feels deprived of significant others whom they feel they could rely on, or share intimate moments with. A third way of feeling lonely, 'existential loneliness', involves a sense of emptiness arising from feelings of disconnection and disempowerment.<sup>34</sup> Despair is a close companion of existential loneliness, and loneliness in general. It is described as having multiple dimensions including 'cognitive' (feelings of defeat, worthlessness and hopelessness), 'emotional' (excessive sadness, hostility and anhedonia), 'behavioural' (risk taking, recklessness, self-destructiveness), and 'biological' (homeostatic imbalance).<sup>35</sup> Case and Deaton attributed rising 'deaths of despair' to multiple processes aligned with loneliness that have "cumulatively undermined the meaning of life".<sup>36</sup> It is plausible that different types and qualities of green spaces afford different experiences and so may work to reduce different forms of loneliness and its concomitants.

Numerous qualitative studies<sup>37-41</sup> and theoretical contributions<sup>42 43</sup> indicate multiple potential pathways by which green space may reduce loneliness, both in general and in people with particular life circumstances. However, there is currently no model coherently weaving together these rich seams of scholarship. Likewise, the literature lacks a review of quantitative studies that estimate association between green space and loneliness, whether approached as direct effects or as indirect effects realized

through mediating processes. Accordingly, this paper reports findings from a systematic review of the quantitative research that provides estimates of association and mediating processes. We integrate these quantitative findings with findings from a selective review of qualitative studies in a conceptual model that provides needed theoretical and methodological guidance for future investigation. The model and the results it organizes will be useful to social policy makers, urban planners and landscape architects who can use placemaking and greening strategies to help reduce levels of loneliness in society, while also pursuing other sustainability goals, including climate change adaptation and biodiversity protection.

## **METHODS**

### **Search strategy**

This systematic review followed the guidelines from the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis (PRISMA) <sup>44</sup>. The systematic search was conducted on 25 January 2022 using seven frequently accessed databases. These include PubMed, Scopus, Web of Science, PsycINFO, CINAHL, Cochrane Library, and ProQuest. Previously published systematic reviews guided identification and selection of search terms relevant to green space<sup>45</sup> and loneliness.<sup>10</sup> Table 1 presents the terms that were searched in the titles, abstracts, and/or keywords of the articles. Moreover, the systematic search also included checking the references from eligible articles.

### **Eligibility or selection criteria**

The selection criteria specified studies that: 1) used quantitative methods with an observational or experimental design; 2) assessed at least one measure of green space in relation to loneliness; 3) utilised either objective or subjective/perceived measures

of green space; and 4) examined loneliness as an outcome or a mediating variable through which green space affected some other health outcome. Further, the studies selected for review were published 5) since 2000; 6) in peer-reviewed journals; 7) in English. Non-peer reviewed articles, commentaries, case reports and conference papers, studies that did not test associations, and studies examining proxy measures of loneliness, such as living alone and marital status, were excluded from the systematic review, but were retained to help inform discussion of future areas for quantitative research.

The main outcome of interest in this review was loneliness. Given the association, though not direct equivalence, of loneliness with social isolation, terms such as social isolation, social withdrawal, and social disconnectedness were also included to ensure a comprehensive search of the literature. The main independent variable was green space. Green space refers to both natural and artificial (designed and built) outdoor green and open spaces with prominent vegetation components such as trees (including street trees), shrubs, grass and flowerbeds. It includes gardens, parks and diverse other settings that people can view or visit.<sup>23</sup> Green space in this review includes all attributes and features outlined in Table 1. Green space indicators assessed using land use databases, geographic information systems (GIS), satellite imagery, and field observations were regarded as objective measures. Exposure variables obtained through interviews and questionnaires were classified as subjective measures.

### **Selection strategy and data extraction**

The process to search and select articles for this systematic review is illustrated in Figure 1. All articles retrieved from each of the databases were downloaded into the

reference manager EndNote. Duplicate papers were removed initially by using the EndNote function followed by manual removal. The titles and abstracts were assessed by two reviewers independently against the selection criteria (EP, TD). Each reviewer then reviewed the articles requiring full-text assessment. Any disagreements and differences were resolved through discussion and consultation with a third reviewer (RW). Data on the publication year, author, study design, study sample and size, exposure measure and assessment, outcome measure, the measure of association, and covariates adjusted for were extracted (Supplementary Table 1).

### **Data analysis**

The risk of bias and quality of each study included were assessed by two reviewers (EP, TD) using the U.S. National Institutes of Health quality assessment tool for intervention and observational (cohort and cross-sectional) studies.<sup>46</sup> Two reviewers assessed the quality of eligible papers and any discrepancies were discussed with the third reviewer (RW). The evidence, including direction and magnitude of association in the selected studies, was narratively synthesised. Meta-analysis was not possible due to heterogeneity in study designs and variable measurement. The findings were then discussed and potential areas of future research were proposed.

## **RESULTS**

### **Sample**

Figure 1 presents the results of systematic search using the PRISMA guidelines. Out of the total of 17,485 articles retrieved from the seven databases, 2,665 duplicates were removed, followed by the exclusion of 14,559 articles that did not have information on



green space and/or loneliness, leaving 221 articles for abstract review. After abstract and full-paper review, a total of 22 papers were included.

### **Study characteristics**

Table 2 and Supplementary Table 1 present a summary of the studies included in the systematic review. The majority (13 studies) were conducted in European countries: five in the Netherlands<sup>47-51</sup>; three from the UK<sup>52-54</sup>; one each in Spain<sup>55</sup> and Germany<sup>56</sup>; and three that used data from multiple European countries.<sup>57-59</sup> The remaining studies were conducted in the US (four studies),<sup>60-63</sup> Australia (1),<sup>64</sup> China (1),<sup>65</sup> Hong Kong (1),<sup>66</sup> Japan (1),<sup>67</sup> and other multiple countries (1).<sup>68</sup> Of the 22 studies, three were randomized trials,<sup>55 60 63</sup> two were small-scale quasi-experiments with longitudinal (pre/post) designs,<sup>62 66</sup> two were longitudinal studies,<sup>64 68</sup> and the remaining 15 were cross-sectional surveys. The unit of analysis in all of these studies was the individual, with no ecological studies examining rates of loneliness across geographical units observed. Two<sup>64 68</sup> and thirteen<sup>48 49 53-60 63 66 67</sup> of the studies were judged to be of good and fair quality, respectively while the remaining seven studies<sup>47 50-52 61 62 65</sup> had poor quality. Around 82% of the studies were conducted in the most recent 5-year period (2016-2021). Data collection for five studies was carried out during the Covid-19 pandemic.<sup>53 59 63 65 67</sup>

Each of the experimental studies had a small sample size ( $n < 79$ )<sup>55 60 62 63 66</sup> and two cross-sectional studies analysed a sample of  $\leq 200$ .<sup>47 50</sup> The largest sample size was in a cross-sectional study in the UK with 209,525 participants,<sup>54</sup> followed by a study in Germany with 17,602 participants.<sup>56</sup> The two longitudinal studies had a sample size of 397 participants (11,193 assessments)<sup>68</sup> and 8049 participants.<sup>64</sup> While most studies

were conducted among individuals  $\geq 16$  years of age, a few recruited older adults aged  $\geq 50$  and  $\geq 60$  years.<sup>55 61 62 66</sup> One cross-sectional study had participants who were as young as 12 years of age.<sup>49</sup> In addition, some studies only involved participants with specific characteristics, such nursing-home dwellers,<sup>62</sup> registered elderly voters,<sup>61</sup> and male prisoners.<sup>65</sup>

### **Green space measures**

Studies examined different subjective and/or objective measures of green space in relation to loneliness (Table 2 and Supplementary Table 1). Nine studies assessed subjective measures,<sup>48 50 53 56 58 59 61 65 68</sup> three studies<sup>52 57 67</sup> examined both objective and subjective measures, and the other ten studies used objective measures only.<sup>47 49 51 54 55 60 62-64 66</sup>

The most common subjective measures were time spent visiting green space (three studies<sup>48 57 58</sup>) and frequency of visiting green space (five studies<sup>52 53 57 59 67</sup>). Other subjective measures included the perceived amount of green space,<sup>57</sup> perceived contact with nature,<sup>68</sup> having access to green space,<sup>61</sup> walking distance to green space,<sup>56 59</sup> having an outdoor area (garden, allotment),<sup>52 59</sup> having a green view,<sup>52 67</sup> visibility, frequency, and duration of viewing green space through window<sup>65</sup>, time noticing nature or nature engagement,<sup>53</sup> and types of green space use.<sup>50</sup> One study obtained a 'nature relatedness score' using the Nature Relatedness Scale<sup>59</sup> and another a 'nature connectedness score' using the Nature Connection Index,<sup>53</sup> both taken to indicate the extent that participants felt connected to nature and/or natural settings, while not explicitly measuring contact with green space.

The objective measures such as percentage of green space or residential greenness within a particular buffer or administrative area were assessed using land use data or normalised difference vegetation index (NDVI) in six studies.<sup>49 52 54 57 64 67</sup> Two studies objectively measured the distance to green space.<sup>51 57</sup> One study assessed whether participants were members of allotment sites as a proxy for exposure to green space.<sup>47</sup> Four studies used intervention-based exposure to green space that consisted of indoor gardening programs,<sup>62 66</sup> a community intervention through visiting kitchen gardens and walking in neighbourhood green spaces,<sup>55</sup> exposure to nature imagery in a lab setting,<sup>63</sup> and a 'park prescription' which provided counselling about benefits of experiencing nature.<sup>60</sup>

### **Loneliness and social isolation measures**

The main data on loneliness came from self-report measures, wherein individuals were asked about time spent with other people at a specified time, how embedded they felt within groups of friends, how often they felt left-out and isolated from others, if they lacked companionship, as well as direct feelings of loneliness. With several exceptions,<sup>47 51 53-55 64 68</sup> most studies used the UCLA loneliness scale,<sup>69</sup> with variation between the three-item,<sup>48 50 56 60 63</sup>, six-item,<sup>49 57 58 65</sup> and 20-item versions.<sup>59 62 66 67</sup> Two studies examined social isolation<sup>52 54</sup> in relation to green space, and another one assessed social disconnectedness,<sup>61</sup> obtained using a single-item question. Loneliness or social isolation was assessed as a secondary outcome or as a candidate mediator in four studies.<sup>49 52 57</sup>

58

### **Association between green space and loneliness**

We extracted 132 associations from the 22 studies. These included associations for multiple measures of green space, and loneliness, as well as multiple associations stratified by different effect modifiers within individual studies (Table 3). The majority (n=88, 66.6%) were in the expected direction (negative): more green space exposure or experience was attended by less loneliness. Of the 88 associations in the expected direction, 44 (50%; or 33.3% from the total) were statistically significant ( $p < 0.05$ ). One study reported a statistically significant association in the unexpected direction.<sup>53</sup>

### *Evidence from the longitudinal studies*

Astell Burt et al's<sup>64</sup> study in Australia found a lower cumulative incident of loneliness (over 4 years) with an increase in urban greening within 1.6 km. This association was stronger in individuals living alone. Associations between green space within shorter distances (400m, 800m) and loneliness were weaker. A study by Hammoud, et al.<sup>68</sup> involving 11,193 ecological momentary assessments nested within 397 participants indicated that contact with nature was associated with lower odds of loneliness.

### *Evidence from cross-sectional studies*

Studies are presented by the type of green space measure analysed. Zijlema, et al.<sup>57</sup> assessed residential green space quantity within buffers of 100 m, 300 m, and 500 m in multiple cities. Soga, et al.<sup>67</sup> used a buffer of 250 m for measuring green space quantity. Neither study found a reliable association between objectively-measured green space and loneliness. Meanwhile, a study by Lai, et al.<sup>54</sup> with more than 200,000 participants found a statistically significant association between residential greenness within a buffer of 500 m and social isolation, but not loneliness. A study by Ward Thompson, et al.<sup>52</sup> found a small non-statistically significant association between the percentage of

green space within an administrative area and social isolation. By contrast, findings from a study by Maas, et al. <sup>49</sup> in the Netherlands indicate that higher percentages of green space within 1 and 3 km radii were associated with lower odds of feeling lonely. That study also investigated modifying effects of age groups, education, household income, and urbanicity. Statistically significant associations in the expected direction were found among children, adults, and elderly, but not among youth, those with lower education, those with low household income, or those living in urban municipalities. Another study from the Netherlands<sup>51</sup> and a multi-city study<sup>57</sup> (comprising Barcelona, Spain; Doetinchem, the Netherlands; and Stoke-on-Trent, United Kingdom) tested and found no clear evidence of association between objectively measured distance to green space and loneliness. In addition, van den Berg, et al. <sup>47</sup> found age group moderated the association with loneliness of being an allotment gardener (as established by the researchers). Among participants 62 years and above (but not in other age groups), those with an allotment garden reported less loneliness than neighbours without one.

Perceived quantity of green space was not associated with loneliness in the multi-city study by Zijlema et al.<sup>57</sup> This study reported no statistically significant association between residential distance (measured objectively as the Euclidean distance) to the nearest natural outdoor environment and loneliness,<sup>57</sup> but another found lower levels of loneliness with more self-reported time spent visiting green space.<sup>58</sup> Buecker, et al. <sup>56</sup> and van Houwelingen-Snippe, et al. <sup>59</sup> found that participants who reported longer walking distances to nearby nature, public parks, and sports and leisure facilities had a higher level of loneliness. Time spent sightseeing and visiting an amusement park and zoo was found to be associated with lower levels of loneliness in a Dutch study by MacDonald, et al. <sup>48</sup>

Five studies tested for association between frequency of visiting green space and loneliness or social isolation.<sup>52 53 57 59 67</sup> Only a study by Soga, et al.<sup>67</sup> conducted during the Covid-19 pandemic in Japan reported higher frequencies of visiting green space were associated with lower levels of loneliness. In addition, that study also indicated that having a green view through a window also potentially reduced feelings of loneliness. However, the study by Ward Thompson, et al.<sup>52</sup> using a smaller sample size and correlation analysis without control for potential confounders did not report an equivalent association between having a view to green space or hills with social isolation. Similarly, a study among male prisoners by Li, et al.,<sup>65</sup> found no associations between visibility, frequency, and duration of viewing green space through window and loneliness. A study of older registered adult voters in the USA found no association between having access to well-maintained and safe parks within walking distance and social disconnectedness.<sup>61</sup>

Two studies estimated the association between reports on having an outdoor area such as a garden or allotment with loneliness or social isolation.<sup>52 59</sup> While no association was reported by van Houwelingen-Snippe, et al.<sup>59</sup>, Ward Thompson, et al.<sup>52</sup> reported a statistically significant negative correlation between having access to an allotment or garden and loneliness, but without adjustment for possible confounders. In addition, a study by Bergefurt et al. showed that individuals who frequently used public space for passive activities such as sitting, watching and gathering were less likely to feel lonely, though the association was not statistically significant.<sup>50</sup> The studies that obtained 'nature relatedness'<sup>59</sup> and 'nature connectedness'<sup>53</sup> scores did not find them statistically significantly associated with loneliness in the expected direction. A study by Richardson

and Hamlin found a statistically significant association between time noticing nature or nature engagement with loneliness in the unexpected direction.<sup>53</sup>

Some of the cross-sectional studies assessed loneliness or social isolation as a mediator of the association between exposure to green space and health-related outcomes. Maas, et al. <sup>49</sup> found that loneliness mediated associations between percentages of greenness within buffers of 1 and 3 km and several health measures, including perceived general health, number of health complaints, and psychiatric morbidity. Similarly, van den Berg, et al. <sup>58</sup> reported mediation by loneliness of associations between time spent visiting green space and both mental health and vitality. Ward Thompson, et al. <sup>52</sup> indicate that social isolation mediated association between having an allotment or garden and perceived stress. However, no mediation by loneliness was reported by Zijlema, et al. <sup>57</sup> for association between distance to the nearest outdoor environment and cognitive function, possibly due to lack of clear association between the same green space exposure measure and loneliness.

### ***Evidence from trial-based studies***

Tse <sup>66</sup> conducted a quasi-experimental study of an 8-week indoor gardening program for nursing home residents in Hong Kong. The gardeners realized a significantly greater reduction in loneliness compared to controls. The results were corroborated by qualitative data which indicated some participants expressed less loneliness post-intervention. However, a similar study done in the US among older rural nursing home residents did not find a statistically significant difference in loneliness between those receiving a 5-week indoor gardening program and the control group that received a 20-minute visit during the same period.<sup>62</sup> Both studies had small samples, used the UCLA

loneliness scale, and had short intervention periods, but the latter<sup>62</sup> lacked a proper control.

Razani et al.'s randomised trial with low-income parents found no difference in loneliness between those who received a park prescription only compared with those who also received additional enablers for park visits, indicating the enabling intervention did not have an extra effect on loneliness reduction at 1- and 3-month follow ups.<sup>60</sup> Nevertheless, this study reported an overall reduction in loneliness in the whole group and a positive impact on park visits. Rodríguez-Romero, et al. <sup>55</sup> demonstrated that interventions comprising kitchen garden visits and walks through greener neighbourhoods as a part of a broader intervention package over 6 months did more to reduce loneliness than did care as usual. This study was conducted among persons >64 years old with some degree of lonely feelings and limited autonomy.<sup>55</sup> Laboratory-based studies by Neale, et al. <sup>63</sup> found a reduction in loneliness scores among participants in a group with exposure to 'nature' vs. 'urban' imagery. There were no differences in loneliness scores between those exposed to natural or urban stimuli 'with' and 'without' people in the imagery shown.

## **DISCUSSION**

### **Main findings**

The balance of evidence indicates more green space is inversely associated with loneliness, with 88 of 132 (66.6%) associations reported in the expected direction and 44 (33.3%) achieving statistical significance ( $p < 0.05$ ). However, the quantity of evidence is currently low, with just 22 studies overall, of which most had only fair quality. The evidence is based mostly on cross-sectional data; there are few trials,<sup>55 60 62</sup>



<sup>63</sup> <sup>66</sup> and longitudinal studies<sup>64</sup> <sup>68</sup> are especially scarce. With two exceptions,<sup>50</sup> <sup>61</sup> the current literature is agnostic with respect to assessment of the different types and qualities of green space, and only two studies have considered whether loneliness mediated associations between green space and distal health outcomes. Only one study has examined a potential pathway linking green space with loneliness (via nature identity).<sup>63</sup> Few studies have assessed effect modifiers, and these focused on individual differences (e.g. age,<sup>47</sup> relationship status<sup>64</sup>). Contextual contingencies and different types of loneliness were not examined, nor were ecological studies conducted.

### **Strengths and limitations**

To our knowledge, this is the first systematic review providing a synthesis of current evidence on the association between green space and loneliness. We used PRISMA guidelines in developing and reporting the systematic review. Screening for eligible studies used seven frequently accessed databases, adopting keywords from previous systematic reviews, and checks on references of included studies bolstered comprehensiveness.

There are some limitations of the methodological aspect of this review and eligible articles reviewed. With regard to the review method, articles published in non-English are not included, and articles that deal with related concepts, such as social connectedness and social support, were not included, reflecting our reluctance to interpret low levels of such concepts as necessarily indicative of loneliness. With regard to the evidence reviewed, synthesis of findings indicates that, at this stage in the development of the literature, the evidence for association between green space and loneliness is weak; most of the studies included were cross sectional in design and do

not support strong causal inferences. Different measures of green space yielded mixed findings on the association between green space and loneliness. Consequently, more studies with stronger designs are warranted to confidently make recommendations regarding the amount of neighbourhood green space needed; provisions for particularly important aspects of green space; and the design of interventions. Furthermore, most studies in this review were from high-income countries, and hence, the findings might not generalise to settings in middle-and low-income countries.<sup>70 71</sup>

### **Theoretical and methodological guidance for future research**

A more general limitation of the extant literature on green space and loneliness is the lack of a coherent, dedicated conceptual model integrated with wider research on nature and health.<sup>21 23 26</sup> Such a model is necessary to guide future research that will better support practical applications.

As a starting point for the development of such a model here, we recognize that loneliness takes multiple forms and has diverse concomitants (as outlined in the Introduction). This recognition is required for elucidating the potentially multiple mechanisms that link experiences with different kinds of green space with different ways of feeling lonely, as well as specifying the circumstances upon which particular green space – loneliness associations are contingent.

Figure 2 fuses the results of this systematic review with findings from other relevant qualitative and quantitative studies to elaborate and extend a general conceptual model first proposed to clarify how contact with green space can lead to health benefits via multiple pathways, organized in domains defined in terms of their adaptive relevance

(reducing harm, building capacities, restoring capacities).<sup>21</sup> The model was recently modified to link health with biodiversity<sup>26</sup> and wildlife,<sup>72</sup> in each case expanded with the addition of a fourth domain of pathways, those by which aspects of biodiversity could cause harm. Innovations depicted by our conceptual model include: (a) acknowledgement of the potentially rich diversity of green space types, or green places to which a person may have access; (b) the level of congruence between personal and place-based differences in circumstances that condition a person's susceptibility to both the benefits and dis-benefits of green space, and their capacities for engaging meaningfully with it; (c) the experiences (personal, relational, collective) a person may have with green space and other people present or absent within it; (d) the domains of pathways through which green space experience engenders effects, customized to loneliness and its concomitants; and (e) the explicit positioning of loneliness and its concomitants as mediators within the broader causal system that links green space with health and wellbeing.<sup>21 26</sup>

We also acknowledge a complex circularity inherent to this system with arrows running bidirectionally between opportunities and experience, through circumstances, reflecting the understanding that, over time, a person's or group's history of experience with a given green space will feed back to shape the character of the opportunity recognized in the green space. Similarly influential feedback is represented by the arrows emerging from loneliness and health, running back to green space. In this regard, ample research indicates the propensity for relocating between neighbourhoods is highly selective and green space provision may be an important factor in choices made.<sup>73</sup> Healthier people are more likely to move to less deprived areas<sup>74</sup> which tend to have more green space (e.g.<sup>75</sup>), while people in poorer health may be either less likely to

move home,<sup>76</sup> or are more likely to relocate to affordable housing in deprived areas, given the documented relationship between health and socioeconomic circumstances.<sup>77</sup> However, despite associations between loneliness and poor health being well-documented (e.g.<sup>10</sup>), the general understanding of loneliness as a signal for an individual to connect and satisfy some unmet need for companionship<sup>78</sup> may drive people who feel lonely into areas with more green space in efforts to build or restore feelings of connection, unless they already feel socially isolated living in an area with few people but extensive green space.<sup>79</sup> This potentially complex, bi-directional relationship between loneliness and residential mobility is under-researched and may have important implications for future epidemiological studies on the topic.

Hereafter, we discuss the major components of our conceptual model and in doing so, we offer guidance for future research designed to estimate association between green space, loneliness and its concomitants, as well as candidate mediators and potential effect modifiers.

### *(a) Opportunities*

Inequities in the availability of green space<sup>75 80 81</sup> generally and tree canopy cover<sup>82-88</sup> in particular have been reported in various countries. This component of the model is described in terms of the existing 'opportunities' for experiencing green space, rather than 'exposure', to emphasise that (1) particular types of green spaces have been arranged, designed, and/or managed to serve particular sets of activities that serve particular sets of needs, and (2) they have acquired meanings over time that may also figure significantly in a person's experience, on a given occasion and over repeated visits. Here we also want to acknowledge that the opportunities people have for

experiencing green space may involve some degree of separation; a person need not be physically within a green space to appreciate, for example, the laughter of children playing there and other sounds that reach one's window.<sup>89 90</sup> This could even extend to simple knowledge of existence (e.g. through storytelling of historic events for maintaining cultural connections across generations<sup>91</sup>). This terminology is purposefully aligned with the 'cumulative opportunities' concept,<sup>92</sup> in which the network of green spaces to which a person may have access is important, not simply the distance or travel-time to that which is nearest.

Through this model we also recognise that opportunities permitted and promoted by green spaces may be multifactorial within the same setting and distinctively clustered across settings. This acknowledges that the types and qualities of green space people can readily access are likely to be pivotal for reducing loneliness, with the 'qualities' aligned with the ways in which the given green spaces enable people to do things they think will enrich their lives.<sup>93</sup> These qualitative differences, together with the meanings assigned to those green spaces over time, encourage a distinction between spaces and places, often applied in environmental psychology, human geography, landscape architecture and other fields. In the following, we will maintain the connection to the broader literature by using the term 'green space'; however, it will become apparent that we are often referring to 'green places,' and that the distinction between space and place is relevant for some pathways to loneliness.

Take for instance two distinctive types of green spaces: cemeteries, which support remembrance of past lives, and allotments, which encourage nurturing of new life. It was notable that several of the quantitative studies we reviewed considered

allotments<sup>47 52 59</sup> and gardens,<sup>55</sup> while none examined the role of cemeteries. However, qualitative research indicates both of these types of green spaces bring people together to bond over public rituals and physical activities.<sup>94-96</sup> As settings where people visit, linger and interact, sometimes over many generations, these particular green spaces have been invested with particular shared meanings that can support and sustain cohesion and prosocial behavior in local communities.<sup>39 97</sup> Were either of these types of green spaces threatened or neglected, those who have some relationship with them could be expected to act for their protection and maintenance.<sup>98 99</sup> Should their decline be allowed to continue, their potency for generating and strengthening connections between people would likely be vastly diminished and may even signal a community in decline.<sup>100</sup> Yet, along with these commonalities, the two types of green place also serve particular functions, and so have special values and involve behavioral norms and management practices with a bearing on relief (or aggravation) of particular forms of loneliness. For example, a common scenario in popular literature and films involves a person having a graveside conversation with a lost loved one, the absence of whom is profoundly painful and unsettling, and continuing visits to whom offer comfort and stability in the grieving process.<sup>101</sup>

Future work needs to theorise how different types and qualities of green spaces and places may be connected, for good or ill, with specific types of loneliness and its concomitants, and proceed to measure and map inequities in the cumulative opportunities available. To this point we have focused on green space opportunities that currently exist for a person. Yet, diverse contextual factors determine which green spaces and places are available. For example, substantial literature has documented inequities in the availability of green space<sup>75 80 81</sup> generally and tree canopy cover<sup>82-88</sup> in

particular, within and across various countries. In addition to closer attention to the significance of activity affordances, behavioral norms, and meanings particular to different types of green spaces, future work needs to measure and map the direct effects of inequities and other contextual variables on the availability of opportunities. This work will complement efforts to understand how the circumstances of people who could use a green space shape the ways in which they engage with and experience it as well as the pathways from their experiences to proximal and distal outcomes. We turn now to consider those circumstances.

### *(b) Circumstances*

Relations between green space, loneliness and its concomitants are likely to be sensitive to a complex interplay among personal and place-based differences in circumstances. These circumstances have import right the way across Figure 2 beyond traditional conceptualisations of effect modification, from determining opportunities for contact with green space, through to modifying the potency of various pathways and so net-impacts on loneliness. Here we reflect on key stages of influence.

#### *Shaping opportunities for contact with green space through multilevel processes*

Circumstances can directly affect opportunities for contact with green space by influencing their availability, while also shaping the risk of becoming lonely through impacts of demographic and socioeconomic change on the local environment, including the quality and quantity of green space and the social characteristics and activities of people in the green space. A notable and well-known example occurs at the level of the individual person, with lower personal socioeconomic circumstances usually restricting choice to more affordable housing stock often located in poorer neighbourhoods.<sup>102</sup>

These are typically less expensive in part because they have lower quantity and/or quality green space.<sup>103-105</sup> Conversely, individuals with higher incomes and other advantages are able to exercise preferences with greater options in the housing market by purchasing property with or near to things that nourish their lives, like more and better quality green spaces (and in many contexts, blue spaces such as coastal and beach communities). Over time, the accumulation of these individually selective migrations is known to aggravate geographical segregation between communities by various demographic and socioeconomic characteristics.<sup>106 107</sup> These population-level migratory processes also concentrate fiscal and political power that can help affluent communities preserve and maintain local green spaces, with those elsewhere left more vulnerable to dilapidation and elimination via “redevelopment”.<sup>108</sup> The net result is not only a widening of spatial differences in health and wellbeing,<sup>109</sup> but also the perpetuation of inequities in the quantity and quality of green space available, with flow-on effects for the risks of loneliness and its concomitants for current and future residents. Thus, while there is a tendency for research to be done with data at the level of the individual, this suggests that there also remains a need for investigation of how migration flows and selective (im)mobility (including aspects of gentrification and displacement, which we turn to later in a section on potential harms) influence geographies of loneliness and associations with green space availability using area-based longitudinal data analyses.

#### *Person-place congruence in circumstances*

An intermediate and hitherto under-recognised next step in the sequence depicted by Figure 2 is the interface of multilevel circumstances that we refer to as “person-place congruence.” This is an explicit recognition that the degree of alignment between



personal and place-based circumstances can shape if and how people interact with nearby green space and the degree of susceptibility an individual exhibits towards it. Therefore person-place congruence, or lack thereof, has potential to unleash or mute specific domains of pathways linking green space with loneliness and its concomitants, before levels of magnitude are estimated. Thus, incongruence in these circumstances has potential to sabotage potential positive influences of green space on loneliness, or exacerbate negative influences, in complex ways. Qualitative and some quantitative studies provide rich illustration of the importance of person-place congruence and underline why it is important to consider both personal and place-based circumstances simultaneously in future research. Here, we present a suite of examples with emphasis on place and personal circumstances, while also providing some reflections on intersecting issues of temporality and lifecourse.

Many place-based sources of incongruence are remarkably common, despite their negative impacts being relatively well-known or self-evident. For example, typical features of cities such as major roads with inadequate crossing infrastructure, dilapidated footpaths and scarcely inclusive alternatives to steps and stairways can present significant barriers to visiting green space in general, and especially for people living with disability.<sup>110-112</sup> Such circumstances can spatially marginalize and entrench feelings of being “out of place” among people with disability,<sup>113</sup> who are already vulnerable to loneliness<sup>114 115</sup> and therefore have high potential to benefit from the enrichment of environments to support social connection.<sup>116</sup> However, place-based sources of incongruence can also emerge from efforts to be inclusive. For example, permitting of dogs to be off-leash will attract dog owners to green space and support associated benefits (e.g. walking<sup>117</sup>), but this can also discourage visits by those who

worry about aggressive dogs and associated incivilities.<sup>118 119</sup> Finally, some sources of place-based incongruence can stem from actions to intentionally exclude. Examples include the replacement of simple park benches in many cities with ones designed to prevent homeless people from sleeping on them (e.g. curved, hard surfaces).<sup>120-122</sup> Even more overt are the rising levels of surveillance and privatisation of green space, both temporarily for commercial activities and also entirely with large areas fully under the jurisdiction of corporations, that can foster unpleasant feelings of being monitored and signal that certain groups of people and particular activities are not welcome.<sup>123 124</sup>

Emphasis on personal-differences in circumstances is also warranted and may further help to explain heterogeneity in prior results for green space, loneliness and health more generally. For instance, emerging research highlights adolescents higher in introversion and/or neuroticism personality traits, who have increased risks of loneliness,<sup>125</sup> tend to benefit more from having quality green space nearby than their more extraverted and/or emotionally stable peers.<sup>126</sup> Conceivably, these personality traits increase an individual's susceptibility to stressful antecedent conditions and therefore create differentially greater potential for relief from social anxieties and chronic rumination through processes of restoration and social (re)connection promoted by green space.<sup>43</sup>

Another potential case of differential susceptibility involves the extent to which people seek contact with green space because of intrinsically motivating reasons to do with personal interest and emotional connection (perhaps aligned with "nature connectedness" and "nature relatedness" concepts), or extrinsic factors such as peer pressure, felt risk of social alienation, or some form of economic incentive. Self

determination theory proponents<sup>127</sup> have evidenced how behavioural change can be sustained through leveraging intrinsic motivations, whereas the effectiveness of strategies that apply extrinsic motivational techniques are not only shortlived, but may also undermine intrinsic motivations. The implications of this theory are that the utility of nearby green space as a passive intervention for reducing loneliness and its concomitants may be more effective in individuals with high levels of intrinsic motivation for engaging with nature, but the use of interventions that employ extrinsic techniques (e.g. a “nature prescription” from a health professional) may in some circumstances have unintended consequences.

Similarly, expectations have important roles in framing the extent that nearby green spaces are considered as attractive opportunities for experiences that could engage restoration or other pathways. For example, some of the people interviewed by Rupprecht, et al<sup>128</sup> felt that informal green spaces have authenticity that is lacking in other types: *“It’s real, not fake like a park.”* This may extend to whether the quality of a green space matches how a person thinks it ought to be, whether in some ideal world or as it was in some remembered past. This is illustrated by Birch et al<sup>37</sup>: *“If you... walk through like parks and you look at the playgrounds that haven’t been done up in twenty years, and everything’s falling apart, it makes some places that should be happy more miserable.”* This scenario bears distinct similarities to the concept of ‘solastalgia’ introduced by Albrecht and colleagues,<sup>129</sup> in which the observable degradation of environmental systems is considered to induce psychological distress akin to grief (also see<sup>130</sup>). In such circumstances, it may be that having dilapidated green spaces nearby aggravates, rather than provides relief from, loneliness and its concomitants, reminding of times and people past and gone.

Importantly, many of the aforementioned personal and place-based circumstances are subject to change over time, and may also be subject to conditioning based upon prior experiences (e.g. in early life). Some are characteristics of people, such as age-related ability, or of relationships between people, as with the formation, deepening, or dissolution of intimate relationships. Others reflect adaptations people make to local circumstances to secure benefits from green space, as with changes in working hours or commuting modes to enable more frequent visitation. Still others are characteristic of the broader social and cultural context; changes in these variables may simultaneously affect characteristics of green spaces, the people who can experience them, and the experiences they might have with them. These include ongoing urbanization, changes in occupations and lifestyles, and what many see as a widening disconnect between people and the natural world.<sup>23 108</sup> It is therefore realistic to anticipate that pathways from green space to loneliness are subject to effect modification by variables at multiple levels over different stages of the lifecourse.<sup>79</sup> Understanding of the relationships in question will gain from studies that are explicitly multilevel, taking into account person-place congruence. For example, scenario-based experimentation has illustrated how appreciation for a single possible visit – walking in a forest<sup>131</sup> or sitting in a park<sup>132</sup> – depends upon both current levels of cognitive fatigue (i.e., a need for restoration that varies within a person across time) and whether the person would be alone or in the company of a friend (also see <sup>42</sup>). Understanding should also improve with studies that apply longitudinal designs, as exemplified by the one longitudinal cohort in our review, which could identify determinants of the incidence of loneliness, including green space opportunities which a person could have taken advantage of over a period of years.<sup>64</sup>

### *(c) Experiences*

We assume that pathways from green space to loneliness run through experience. The presentations of the established<sup>21</sup> and recently extended<sup>26,70</sup> pathway domain models have primarily focused on individual-level processes and the consequences of personal experiences with green space. We see a need to consider experience on additional levels of analysis, with a particular view to experiences shaped and shared by multiple individuals.<sup>133</sup>

Recognition of this need is exemplified by recent theorizing concerned with pathways in the restoration domain. Restoration processes emphasized by the extant pathway domain models have focused on ways in which ongoing adaptation to everyday demands drains psychophysiological and cognitive resources that individuals need to mobilize and direct action. These resources can be replenished through experiences with green space, according to attention restoration theory (ART)<sup>134</sup> and stress reduction theory (SRT; also known as psycho-evolutionary theory).<sup>135</sup> Applications of these theories in the green space and health literature, including that on loneliness synthesized in this review, have been largely agnostic to other scales at which experiences with green spaces and places can carry restorative processes that may be of equal, if not greater relevance to the outcomes of interest. This includes the experiences of green space that manifest on the scales of relationships between individuals in small groups (e.g. couples') and larger collectives (e.g. communities), which may be crucial to expanding knowledge and informing potential policy options.

Two recent theoretical additions call attention to restorative processes that work on these higher levels of analysis. Relational restoration theory (RRT)<sup>43</sup> emphasizes the extent to which experiences with green space can permit and promote pro-social interactions and supportive exchanges between individuals in close relationships. This can among other things restore relational resources should they have become depleted, which may in turn help to reduce loneliness. Collective restoration theory (CRT)<sup>43</sup> refers to the attenuation of demands and promotion of positive shared experiences within local communities, cities and societies that may result from policies that enable widespread and simultaneous green space visitation and so the potential spread of benefits among those who come together in them, whether known or unknown to one another (e.g. public park provisions, public holidays, national vacation legislation<sup>136</sup>; see also <sup>38</sup>).

Application of multilevel theorizing in future research is needed to understand the ways in which experiencing green spaces may not only help to permit and generate meaningful relationships that alleviate and prevent loneliness, but also the extent to which loneliness is reduced via individual and shared processes catalyzed by individual actions and exogenous factors that shift how entire communities view, relate to and interact with green spaces. These multiple scales of experiences with green space and the personal, relational and collective processes aligned with them are then manifest across all four domains pathways that extend towards loneliness and its concomitants.

#### ***(d) Domains of Pathways***

Consideration of these multilevel processes of restoration has informed our integration of theories linking green space with loneliness and its concomitants within domains of

pathways described in precursors to the present model.<sup>21 23 26 70</sup> An important aspect of this integration is recognition of three possibilities: experiences in green space can engage multiple pathways simultaneously; these multiple pathways may be in the same domain (i.e., share the same kind of adaptive relevance) and/or in different domains; and multiple pathways may complement or compete with one another in the generation of effects.

The three domains of beneficial pathways (Building Capacities, Restoring Capacities, and Reducing Harm) from the original model,<sup>21</sup> plus the fourth (Causing Harm) recently added,<sup>26 70</sup> are all retained in our conceptual model (Figure 2). As described in ‘circumstances’ and in keeping with an earlier conceptual model<sup>23</sup>, pathways in all of the domains are subject to effect modification and, therefore, are candidates for moderated mediation analyses as well as mediation tests that address the ways in which mechanisms engaged along different pathways may work together or at odds with one another.<sup>137</sup>

### *Domain 1: Building capacities*

Perhaps the most intuitive link between green space, loneliness and its concomitants involves building social connections. Whether they engender connections characterized as strong or weak<sup>138</sup>, pathways in this domain work to prevent loneliness. Green spaces can constitute pleasant, free-to-enter ‘Third Places’<sup>139</sup> where people can go to satisfy momentary desires for more social interaction, thereby staving off more persistent feelings of loneliness.<sup>140</sup> This may occur through serendipitous pro-social encounters, planned gatherings, and/or daily shared rituals.<sup>43</sup>

A fair amount of literature bearing on green space and health has addressed the workings of this kind of capacity building, for individuals and on the neighbourhood or community level<sup>23</sup>; however, relatively little has focused on loneliness as an outcome. The one longitudinal cohort study in our review indicated that those with more than 30% green space within 1600 m of the residence had less incident loneliness than those with less than 10% after four years of followup, while those who reported often feeling lonely at the start of the period did not report more relief at followup based on the amount of green space<sup>64</sup>. This speaks to prevention; however, as we will note later, this does not exclude the operation of restorative pathways, as the loneliness measure used did not differentiate among types of loneliness. The study also lacked relevant measures of social connection that could be used to directly test mediation hypotheses.

Qualitative evidence, however, indicates how green spaces can reinforce and foster new ties that evoke the warm feeling of embeddedness within community.<sup>39 97</sup> Findings from semi-structured interviews of community garden members reveal how their participation is wrapped up in a sense of connection and camaradery.<sup>94 95</sup> These green spaces may provide readily identifiable places where people can seek connection with others who share similar interests. They may also help to compensate for a lack of other green space in dense multi-family housing (e.g. apartments),<sup>141</sup> which might contribute to loneliness. Similar might be observed of sports fields, which can serve as spaces not only for physical activity, but also for communal gatherings, cheering, marvel, bonding and formation of shared memories that can stimulate and reinforce a sense of belonging. This is likely facilitated by programming, which can activate green spaces as sites for volunteering and regular activities that engender feelings of belonging, as documented by interviews of participants on 'Parkrun', which operates in 23 countries



around the world,<sup>142-144</sup> for example: *“The real motivation for coming is the community thing. I always know that I’ll see someone I know and I nearly always end up talking to someone I’ve never met before”* (pp.97<sup>144</sup>).

### *Domain 2: Restoring capacities*

Support for building social connections is the obvious, but not necessarily the only mechanism by which green space might reduce loneliness. We already indicated in the section on ‘experiences’ that restorative processes may work on multiple levels. Here we can elaborate on processes of restoring capacities as distinct from processes of building capacities. For instance, evidence by Maas, et al. <sup>49</sup> in this review indicated participants living in greener areas had lower odds of feeling lonely, while at the same time, those with more green space nearby did not experience more interactions with friends and neighbours, indicating alternative mechanisms to those aligned with the building capacities domain. The Restoring Capacities domain may involve one or more of at least three related mechanisms with green space supporting restorative experiences in solitude and providing relief for people experiencing the distress, distrust and lack of felt safety that characterises loneliness.<sup>78</sup>

Firstly, green spaces and community gardens in particular may serve as ‘affective sanctuaries’, permitting therapeutic settings for people experiencing emotional and physical exhaustion (i.e. ‘burnout’) to feel a sense of refuge. Or for those experiencing feelings of existential loneliness stemming from a sense of liminality (e.g. due to the diagnosis of a terminal illness), experiences with green space can afford opportunities for reflection on the meaning of these health states for an individual’s sense of self and

hope for the future. <sup>145-147</sup> While this may be in the company of others, the restorative benefits may not necessarily require any direct interaction with other humans.

Secondly, regular momentary sharing of green spaces with other people, but without necessarily any direct interaction, may still generate a sense of undemanding connectedness and belonging to community. For example, interviews by Neal et al (2015, pp.472-473): *“In the park you feel like you’re kind of interacting even if you’re not speaking with them directly, but you’re sharing the space together [...] you’ve both come to the park to enjoy what it is”*.<sup>39</sup> This may be closely entwined with activities that result in the same people regularly visiting the same green spaces for the same, shared reasons, for instance, in the case of hillwalkers and those who walk dogs.<sup>148</sup>

Thirdly, ethnographic research indicates experiences with green space can evoke comforting memories that provide solace, which may be intentionally without the company of other humans.<sup>40 41</sup> Interviews by Birch, et al. <sup>37</sup>, for example, indicate that some people seek nature in solitude for its provision of non-judgemental, ego-free and dependable support: *“it’s just like the idea of being around nature I find very soothing. I think it’s ego free... nature doesn’t judge you.”*

This quote highlights what we call the ‘lean on green’ hypothesis, in which feelings of loneliness might be alleviated and/or prevented through establishing felt connection with the ‘more than human world’ and processes of restoration permitted and promoted by contact with nature, absent other humans. This might involve green spaces facilitating experiences with animals, such as dogs for which there is well-documented evidence of mental health benefits.<sup>149 150</sup> Beyond pets, evidence indicates

that visiting green spaces can afford sublime and life-affirming experiences that evoke wonder, awe, inspiration, and reverence for nature.<sup>37 151 152</sup> Some studies report that a felt affinity for nature is associated with greater levels of eudemonic and hedonic wellbeing<sup>153 154</sup> and pro-environmental behavior.<sup>155 156</sup> Positive self-concept is purported to mediate reports of a so-called ‘warm glow’ following engagement in pro-environmental behavior<sup>157</sup> (i.e. because a person feels it is the right thing to do or they are fulfilling a personal interest). Recent work indicates that a sense of meaning in life resulting from environmental engagement may also help to reduce loneliness.<sup>158</sup> Mediation analyses are needed to quantify the contribution of the ‘lean on green’ hypothesis to association between green space and loneliness, from those which are likely to be supported by restoring social connections, provision of affective sanctuaries, and promoting a sense of belonging to community.

### *Domain 3: Reducing harms*

Depression, despair, hopelessness, reckless risk taking and self-destructive behaviour are all concomitants of loneliness<sup>35</sup> that, collectively, reflect on loss of meaning in life.<sup>36</sup> Increasing evidence indicates that contact with green space may help to reduce these states, the antecedent conditions that sustain them, and the harms that can eventuate if action is not taken. Indeed, it may be that reducing harms is necessary for the effects of other domain pathways to flourish.

For example, qualitative research indicates violence in the community can result in people confining themselves indoors, inducing social isolation and potential loneliness.<sup>159</sup> Greening may mitigate this harm. Evidence presented in a review by Mancus and Campbell (2019) concluded that *“the perception of safety is supported by*

*quality, accessibility, and aesthetic dimensions of neighborhood [sic] green space*".<sup>160</sup>

Another review, by Shepley, et al. <sup>161</sup>, found that ca. 70% of the included studies (9 of 13) reported lower levels of crime in areas with more tree canopy cover (e.g.<sup>162</sup>). There is also an increasing number of pre-post intervention studies that report reductions in crime overall, and gun violence in particular, within communities where vacant areas of land have been cleared of refuse and grass and trees have been planted (e.g.<sup>163 164</sup>). Interestingly, these studies not only confirmed that residents in the intervention areas felt safer, but also reported improvements in mental health and more time outdoors spent relaxing and socialising.<sup>164 165</sup> This further illustrates how pathways within different domains are interdependent and potentially synergistic in their operation.

There are many other examples emerging for the harm reduction domain pathway that have potential synergies with other pathways. For example, it is plausible that restorative processes at personal, relational and collective scales combine with lower levels of neighbourhood violence and increased social connection to facilitate reductions in pain,<sup>166-168</sup> cigarette smoking,<sup>169</sup> opioid dependence,<sup>170</sup> substance misuse in adolescents,<sup>171</sup> and risks of self-harm and suicidal ideation.<sup>172-175</sup> Each of these emerging harm reduction pathways warrant further investigation, potentially with moderated mediation models and other methods that may be suitable to distinguish between pathways operating in serial or parallel.<sup>137</sup>

#### *Domain 4: Causing harms*

In efforts to understand the health benefits of green space, few studies hypothesise or test plausible ways in which urban greening may have direct or indirect unintended consequences that could result in harms to health.<sup>176</sup> Yet, some studies<sup>177-180</sup> have found

higher risks of poor health, obesity and mortality in areas with more green space. A potential contributor to these counterintuitive results involves public green space that is low in quality and not attractive to visit, or that is private and inaccessible (e.g. private golf courses, agglomerations of large back gardens in suburban sprawl); such spaces may actually reduce walkability<sup>181</sup> and opportunities to interact with neighbours.<sup>49</sup> This may be aggravated further by perceptions of the behaviour of other people in those green spaces that discourage visitation, as was found in interviews by Byrne <sup>182</sup>: *“I never go there because there are a lot of people drinking. I am afraid that they are going to do something to me...I don’t go because of the people.”*

Gentrification stands as an important example of how secular shifts in the local social context can have such multi-pronged effects along pathways that engender differing degrees of loneliness. <sup>183 184</sup> With gentrification, the scarcity of green space within a city is implicated in rising housing costs in greener neighbourhoods to levels that can be unaffordable to some residents, resulting in exclusion from their homes. Anguelovski, et al.<sup>108</sup> indicate this can result in *“social, cultural, and mental displacement, and dispossession,”* with remaining residents losing neighbours and sense of belonging.<sup>185</sup> <sup>186</sup> Thus, it may be possible that for some residents, the increasing availability of green space may come to be associated with higher risks of loneliness due to the loss of community belonging brought about by gentrification.

### **Conclusions and future directions**

This review reveals the quantum of evidence linking green space and loneliness remains small, limited mostly to studies of cross-sectional design, and absent of a clear conceptual model. We have provided such a model, together with theoretical and

methodological guidance for future work. Our framework elaborates and extends existing frameworks,<sup>21 26</sup> and is informed by findings from a range of qualitative and quantitative studies on related topics (e.g. despair, violence, gentrification, attitudes to nature). As the dire public health and societal consequences of inaction on loneliness and its concomitants continues to increase in the public and policymaker consciousness, it is clear that some well-meaning planners and health professionals will be motivated to 'green' our cities and support interventions to get people into green space (e.g. 'nature prescriptions'), assuming benefits will come. That may eventually occur, but our review indicates a significant, persistent deficit in our knowledge of the potentially many ways in which experiences with green spaces influence loneliness and its concomitants. Overcoming these deficits should increase the likelihood that interventions are viewed as credible in decision-making situations. There remains a chasm in our understanding of for whom the effects of green space might be sufficiently potent to bring about the desired results and for whom additional support is required. Finally, in the context of finite resources for preventive health strategies where there is already established evidence, for investing in green space and mechanisms to enable more time in green space for people who would benefit from it, we need studies to show how these types of interventions might be implemented effectively, cost-effectively, and sustainably and coordinated with efforts to address other major societal challenges, including climate change and biodiversity loss, without which ours may become a lonely planet indeed.

## References

1. Jeste DV, Lee EE, Cacioppo S. Battling the Modern Behavioral Epidemic of Loneliness: Suggestions for Research and Interventions. *JAMA psychiatry* 2020;**77.6**:553-54.
2. Cross C-OBR. Trapped in a bubble: An investigation into triggers for loneliness in the UK. <https://www.redcross.org.uk/-/media/documents/about-us/research-publications/health-social-care-and-support/co-op-trapped-in-a-bubble-report.pdf?la=en&hash=32EDC253C12C3466CD39267417507E467A44CA2F>.
3. Australian Psychology Society. Australian Loneliness Report. <https://psychweek.org.au/wp/wp-content/uploads/2018/11/Psychology-Week-2018-Australian-Loneliness-Report.pdf>.
4. Thelander K. *Ensamhet dödar – ofrivillig ensamhet*. Stockholm: Arena Idé, 2020.
5. Luhmann M, Hawkley LC. Age differences in loneliness from late adolescence to oldest old age. *Dev Psychol* 2016;**52**(6):943.
6. Kerr NA, Stanley TB. Revisiting the social stigma of loneliness. *Pers Individ Dif* 2021;**171**:110482.
7. Haslam A. Loneliness is a social cancer, every bit as alarming as cancer itself. *SBS Insight* 2019;**November**.
8. Ferguson M. How does it really feel to be lonely? *The Economist* 1843 2018;**March**.
9. Erzen E, Çikrikci Ö. The effect of loneliness on depression: A meta-analysis. *Int J Soc Psychiatry* 2018;**64**(5):427-35.
10. Valtorta NK, Kanaan M, Gilbody S, et al. Loneliness and social isolation as risk factors for coronary heart disease and stroke: systematic review and meta-analysis of longitudinal observational studies. *Heart* 2016;**102**(13):1009-16.
11. Smith K. The association between loneliness, social isolation and inflammation: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Neurosci Biobehav Rev* 2020;**112**:519-41.
12. Lara E, Martín-María N, De la Torre-Luque A, et al. Does loneliness contribute to mild cognitive impairment and dementia? A systematic review and meta-analysis of longitudinal studies. *Ageing research reviews* 2019;**52**:7-16.
13. Holt-Lunstad J, Smith TB, Baker M, et al. Loneliness and Social Isolation as Risk Factors for Mortality A Meta-Analytic Review. *Perspect Psychol Sci* 2015;**10**(2):227-37.
14. Gvion Y, Levi-Belz Y. Serious suicide attempts: Systematic review of psychological risk factors. *Frontiers in psychiatry* 2018;**9**:56.
15. Troya MI, Babatunde O, Polidano K, et al. Self-harm in older adults: systematic review. *The British Journal of Psychiatry* 2019;**214**(4):186-200.
16. McLennan AK, Uliaszek SJ. Beware the medicalisation of loneliness. *The Lancet* 2018;**391**(10129):1480.
17. Masi CM, Chen H-Y, Hawkley LC, et al. A meta-analysis of interventions to reduce loneliness. *Pers Soc Psychol Rev* 2011;**15**(3):219-66.
18. Gardiner C, Geldenhuys G, Gott M. Interventions to reduce social isolation and loneliness among older people: an integrative review. *Health & social care in the community* 2018;**26**(2):147-57.
19. The National Academies of Sciences Engineering and Medicine. *Social Isolation and Loneliness in Older Adults: Opportunities for the Health Care System*. Washington DC: National Academies Press, 2020.
20. HM Government. *A connected society. A strategy for tackling loneliness – laying the foundations for change*. London: Department for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport, 2018.

21. Markevych I, Schoierer J, Hartig T, et al. Exploring pathways linking greenspace to health: Theoretical and methodological guidance. *Environ Res* 2017;**158**:301-17.
22. Bratman GN, Anderson CB, Berman MG, et al. Nature and mental health: An ecosystem service perspective. *Science advances* 2019;**5**(7):eaax0903.
23. Hartig T, Mitchell R, de Vries S, et al. Nature and Health. *Annu Rev Public Health* 2014;**35**:207-28.
24. Gunawardena KR, Wells MJ, Kershaw T. Utilising green and bluespace to mitigate urban heat island intensity. *Sci Total Environ* 2017;**584**:1040-55.
25. Kumar P, Druckman A, Gatersleben B, et al. The nexus between air pollution, green infrastructure and human health. *Environ Int* 2019;**133**:105181.
26. Marselle MR, Hartig T, Cox DT, et al. Pathways linking biodiversity to human health: A conceptual framework. *Environ Int* 2021;**150**:106420.
27. City of Sydney. Greening Sydney Strategy. <https://www.cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au/strategies-action-plans/greening-sydney-strategy>. 12/10/2021
28. The ACT Government. *Canberra's Living Infrastructure Plan: Cooling The City*. Canberra: The ACT Government, 2019.
29. City of Barcelona. Trees for Life: Master Plan for Barcelona's Trees 2017 - 2037. [https://www.c40knowledgehub.org/s/article/Trees-for-Life-Master-Plan-for-Barcelona-s-Trees-2017-2037?language=en\\_US](https://www.c40knowledgehub.org/s/article/Trees-for-Life-Master-Plan-for-Barcelona-s-Trees-2017-2037?language=en_US). Accessed 13/03/2021
30. City of Seattle. Trees For Seattle. <https://www.seattle.gov/trees/management/canopy-cover>. Accessed 13/03/2021
31. Tan PY, Wang J, Sia A. Perspectives on five decades of the urban greening of Singapore. *Cities* 2013;**32**:24-32.
32. City of Vancouver. Park Board achieves target to plant 150,000 trees by 2020. <https://vancouver.ca/news-calendar/park-board-achieves-target-to-plant-150000-trees-by-2020.aspx>. Accessed 13/03/2021
33. Weiss RS. *Loneliness: The experience of emotional and social isolation*. Cambridge: The MIT Press, 1973.
34. Bolmsjö I, Tengland P-A, Rämngård M. Existential loneliness: An attempt at an analysis of the concept and the phenomenon. *Nurs Ethics* 2019;**26**(5):1310-25.
35. Shanahan L, Hill SN, Gaydosh LM, et al. Does despair really kill? A roadmap for an evidence-based answer. *Am J Public Health* 2019;**109**(6):854-58.
36. Kelly B. Deaton testifies before U.S. Senate on America's deadly opioid epidemic. <http://www.princeton.edu/news-and-events/news/item/deaton-testifies-us-senate-america's-deadly-opioid-epidemic>. 2020/11/15
37. Birch J, Rishbeth C, Payne SR. Nature doesn't judge you—how urban nature supports young people's mental health and wellbeing in a diverse UK city. *Health & Place* 2020:102296.
38. Etzioni A. Toward a theory of public ritual. *Sociological Theory* 2000;**18**(1):44-59.
39. Neal S, Bennett K, Jones H, et al. Multiculture and public parks: Researching super-diversity and attachment in public green space. *Population, space and place* 2015;**21**(5):463-75.
40. Rishbeth C, Powell M. Place attachment and memory: Landscapes of belonging as experienced post-migration. *Landscape Research* 2013;**38**(2):160-78.
41. Sobel D. A place in the world: Adults' memories of childhood's special places. *Children's Environments Quarterly* 1990:5-12.



42. Korpela K, Staats H. Solitary and Social Aspects of Restoration in Nature. In: Coplan RJ, Bowker, J.C. and Nelson, L.J., ed. *The Handbook of Solitude: Psychological Perspectives on Social Isolation, Social Withdrawal, Being Alone*. New York: John Wiley & Sons., 2021:325-39.
43. Hartig T. Restoration in nature: Beyond the conventional narrative. In: Schutte AR, Torquati J, Stevens JR, eds. *Nature and psychology: Biological, cognitive, developmental, and social pathways to well-being (Proceedings of the 67th Annual Nebraska Symposium on Motivation)*. Cham, Switzerland: Springer Nature, 2021.
44. Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, et al. Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA Statement. *PLOS Medicine* 2009;**6**(7):e1000097.
45. Twohig-Bennett C, Jones A. The health benefits of the great outdoors: A systematic review and meta-analysis of greenspace exposure and health outcomes. *Environ Res* 2018;**166**:628-37.
46. National Institutes of Health U.S. Department of Health & Human Services. Study Quality Assessment Tools. <https://www.nhlbi.nih.gov/health-topics/study-quality-assessment-tools>. 7 September
47. van den Berg AE, van Winsum-Westra M, de Vries S, et al. Allotment gardening and health: a comparative survey among allotment gardeners and their neighbors without an allotment. *Environmental Health* 2010;**9**(1):74.
48. MacDonald KJ, Willemsen G, Boomsma DI, et al. Predicting Loneliness from Where and What People Do. 2020;**9**(4):51.
49. Maas J, van Dillen SME, Verheij RA, et al. Social contacts as a possible mechanism behind the relation between green space and health. *Health & place* 2009;**15**(2):586-95.
50. Bergefurt L, Kemperman A, van den Berg P, et al. Loneliness and Life Satisfaction Explained by Public-Space Use and Mobility Patterns. *International journal of environmental research and public health* 2019;**16**(21):4282.
51. van den Berg P, Kemperman A, de Kleijn B, et al. Ageing and loneliness: the role of mobility and the built environment. *Travel Behaviour and Society* 2016;**5**:48-55.
52. Ward Thompson C, Aspinall P, Roe J, et al. Mitigating Stress and Supporting Health in Deprived Urban Communities: The Importance of Green Space and the Social Environment. *International journal of environmental research and public health* 2016;**13**(4):440-40.
53. Richardson M, Hamlin I. Nature engagement for human and nature's well-being during the Corona pandemic. *Journal of Public Mental Health* 2021;**20**(2):83-93.
54. Lai KY, Sarkar C, Kumari S, et al. Calculating a national Anomie Density Ratio: Measuring the patterns of loneliness and social isolation across the UK's residential density gradient using results from the UK Biobank study. *Landscape and Urban Planning* 2021;**215**.
55. Rodríguez-Romero R, Herranz-Rodríguez C, Kostov B, et al. Intervention to reduce perceived loneliness in community-dwelling older people. *Scandinavian Journal of Caring Sciences* 2020;**n/a**(n/a).
56. Buecker S, Ebert T, Götz FM, et al. In a Lonely Place: Investigating Regional Differences in Loneliness. *Social Psychological and Personality Science* 2020;**12**(2):147-55.
57. Zijlema WL, Triguero-Mas M, Smith G, et al. The relationship between natural outdoor environments and cognitive functioning and its mediators. *Environmental research* 2017;**155**:268-75.

58. van den Berg MM, van Poppel M, van Kamp I, et al. Do Physical Activity, Social Cohesion, and Loneliness Mediate the Association Between Time Spent Visiting Green Space and Mental Health? *Environment and Behavior* 2017;**51**(2):144-66.
59. van Houwelingen-Snippe J, van Rompay TJL, Allouch SB. Feeling connected after experiencing digital nature: A survey study. *International journal of environmental research and public health* 2020;**17**(18):1-16.
60. Razani N, Morshed S, Kohn MA, et al. Effect of park prescriptions with and without group visits to parks on stress reduction in low-income parents: SHINE randomized trial. *PLoS One* 2018;**13**(2):e0192921.
61. Cao Q, Dabelko-Schoeny HI, White KM, et al. Age-friendly communities and perceived disconnectedness: the role of built environment and social engagement. *Journal of Aging and Health* 2019;**32**(9):937-48.
62. Brown VM, Allen AC, Dwozan M, et al. Indoor gardening and older adults: Effects on socialization, activities of daily living, and loneliness. 2004;**30**(10):34-42.
63. Neale C, Lopez S, Roe J. Psychological Restoration and the Effect of People in Nature and Urban Scenes: A Laboratory Experiment. *SUSTAINABILITY* 2021;**13**(11).
64. Astell-Burt T, Hartig T, Eckermann S, et al. More green, less lonely? A longitudinal cohort study. *Int J Epidemiol* 2022;**51**:99–110.
65. Li H, Zhang X, You C, et al. Can Viewing Nature Through Windows Improve Isolated Living? A Pathway Analysis on Chinese Male Prisoners During the COVID-19 Epidemic. *Frontiers in Psychiatry* 2021;**12**.
66. Tse MMY. Therapeutic effects of an indoor gardening programme for older people living in nursing homes. *Journal of Clinical Nursing* 2010;**19**(7-8):949-58.
67. Soga M, Evans MJ, Tsuchiya K, et al. A room with a green view: the importance of nearby nature for mental health during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Ecological Applications* 2020.
68. Hammoud R, Tognin S, Bakolis I, et al. Lonely in a crowd: investigating the association between overcrowding and loneliness using smartphone technologies. *Scientific Reports* 2021;**11**(1).
69. Russell D, Peplau LA, Cutrona CE. The revised UCLA Loneliness Scale: concurrent and discriminant validity evidence. *J Pers Soc Psychol* 1980;**39**(3):472.
70. Shuvo F, Feng X, Akaraci S, et al. Urban green space and health in low and middle-income countries: a critical review. *Urban Forestry and Urban Greening* 2020:126662.
71. Gallegos-Riofrío CA, Arab H, Carrasco-Torrontegui A, et al. Chronic deficiency of diversity and pluralism in research on nature's mental health effects: A planetary health problem. *Current Research in Environmental Sustainability* 2022:100148.
72. Johansson M, Flykt A, Frank J, et al. Appraisals of wildlife during restorative opportunities in local natural settings. *Frontiers in Environmental Science* 2021;**9**.
73. Cheshire P. *Segregated neighbourhoods and mixed communities: A critical analysis*. York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation, 2007.
74. Norman P, Boyle P, Rees P. Selective migration, health and deprivation: a longitudinal analysis. *Soc Sci Med* 2005;**60**(12):2755-71.
75. Astell-Burt T, Feng X, Mavoa S, et al. Do low-income neighbourhoods have the least green space? A cross-sectional study of Australia's most populous cities. *BMC Public Health* 2014;**14**:292.

76. Cox M, Boyle PJ, Davey P, et al. Does health-selective migration following diagnosis strengthen the relationship between Type 2 diabetes and deprivation? *Soc Sci Med* 2007;**65**(1):32-42.
77. Boyle P, Norman P. Migration and health. In: Brown T, McLafferty S, Moon G, eds. *A companion to health and medical geography*. London: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009:346-74.
78. Cacioppo JT, Cacioppo S. Loneliness in the modern age: An evolutionary theory of loneliness (ETL). *Adv Exp Soc Psychol*: Elsevier, 2018:127-97.
79. Astell-Burt T, Mitchell R, Hartig T. The association between green space and mental health varies across the lifecourse. A longitudinal study. *Journal of Epi & Community Health* 2014;**68**:578-83.
80. Rigolon A, Browning MH, Lee K, et al. Access to urban green space in cities of the Global South: A systematic literature review. *Urban Science* 2018;**2**(3):67.
81. Mitchell R, Astell-Burt T, Richardson EA. A comparison of green space indicators for epidemiological research. *J Epidemiol Community Health* 2011;**65**(10):853-58.
82. Riley CB, Gardiner MM. Examining the distributional equity of urban tree canopy cover and ecosystem services across United States cities. *PLoS One* 2020;**15**(2):e0228499.
83. Astell-Burt T, Navakatikyan M, Feng X. Urban green space, tree canopy and 11-year risk of dementia in a cohort of 109,688 Australians. *Environ Int* 2020;**145**:106102.
84. Escobedo FJ, Nowak DJ, Wagner JE, et al. The socioeconomics and management of Santiago de Chile's public urban forests. *Urban forestry & urban greening* 2006;**4**(3-4):105-14.
85. Krafft J, Fryd O. Spatiotemporal patterns of tree canopy cover and socioeconomics in Melbourne. *Urban forestry & urban greening* 2016;**15**:45-52.
86. Landry SM, Chakraborty J. Street trees and equity: evaluating the spatial distribution of an urban amenity. *Environ Plan A* 2009;**41**(11):2651-70.
87. Schwarz K, Fragkias M, Boone CG, et al. Trees grow on money: urban tree canopy cover and environmental justice. *PLoS One* 2015;**10**(4):e0122051.
88. Mushangwe S, Astell-Burt T, Steel D, et al. Ethnic inequalities in green space availability: Evidence from Australia. *Urban forestry & urban greening* 2021:127235.
89. Payne SR, Bruce N. Exploring the relationship between urban quiet areas and perceived restorative benefits. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* 2019;**16**(9):1611.
90. Irvine KN, Devine-Wright P, Payne SR, et al. Green space, soundscape and urban sustainability: an interdisciplinary, empirical study. *Local environment* 2009;**14**(2):155-72.
91. de Kleyn L, Mumaw L, Corney H. From green spaces to vital places: connection and expression in urban greening. *Australian Geographer* 2020;**51**(2):205-19.
92. Ekkel ED, de Vries S. Nearby green space and human health: Evaluating accessibility metrics. *Landscape and Urban Planning* 2017;**157**:214-20.
93. Nguyen P-Y, Astell-Burt T, Rahimi-Ardabili H, et al. Green Space Quality and Health: A Systematic Review. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* 2021;**18**(21):11028.
94. Kingsley J, Foenander E, Bailey A. "You feel like you're part of something bigger": exploring motivations for community garden participation in Melbourne, Australia. *BMC Public Health* 2019;**19**(1):1-12.
95. Kingsley J, Foenander E, Bailey A. "It's about community": Exploring social capital in community gardens across Melbourne, Australia. *Urban forestry & urban greening* 2020;**49**:126640.

96. Swensen G, Skår M. Urban cemeteries' potential as sites for cultural encounters. *Mortality* 2019;**24**(3):333-56.
97. Francis J, Giles-Corti B, Wood L, et al. Creating sense of community: The role of public space. *J Environ Psychol* 2012;**32**(4):401-09.
98. Trembecka A, Kwartnik-Pruc A. An analysis of the changes in the structure of allotment gardens in Poland and of the process of regulating legal status. *Sustainability* 2018;**10**(11):3829.
99. Thomas N, Oehler P, Drilling M. The Power of the Many-The Fight for Allotment Gardens in Basel, Switzerland. *Nordisk Arkitekturforskning* 2017;**28**(3).
100. Rink D. Wilderness: The nature of urban shrinkage? The debate on urban restructuring and restoration in Eastern Germany. *Nature and Culture* 2009;**4**(3):275-92.
101. Brant C, Metcalf J, Wildgoose J. Life Writing and Death: Dialogues of the Dead. *European Journal of Life Writing* 2020;**9**.
102. Galster GC. Quantifying the Effect of Neighbourhood on Individuals: Challenges, Alternative Approaches, and Promising Directions. *Schmollers Jahrbuch* 2008;**128**(1):7-48.
103. Daams MN, Sijtsma FJ, Veneri P. Mixed monetary and non-monetary valuation of attractive urban green space: A case study using Amsterdam house prices. *Ecol Econ* 2019;**166**:106430.
104. Trojanek R, Gluszek M, Tanas J. The effect of urban green spaces on house prices in Warsaw. *International Journal of Strategic Property Management* 2018;**22**(5):358-71.
105. Wu J, Wang M, Li W, et al. Impact of urban green space on residential housing prices: Case study in Shenzhen. *Journal of Urban Planning Development* 2015;**141**(4):05014023.
106. Schelling TC. Dynamic Models of Segregation. *Journal of Mathematical Sociology* 1971;**1**(2):143-86.
107. Clark WA, Fossett M. Understanding the social context of the Schelling segregation model. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 2008;**105**(11):4109-14.
108. Anguelovski I, Connolly JJ, Garcia-Lamarca M, et al. New scholarly pathways on green gentrification: What does the urban 'green turn' mean and where is it going? *Progress in human geography* 2019;**43**(6):1064-86.
109. Boyle P, Norman P, Popham F. Social mobility: Evidence that it can widen health inequalities. *Soc Sci Med* 2009;**68**(10):1835-42.
110. Perry M, Cotes L, Horton B, et al. "Enticing" but Not Necessarily a "Space Designed for Me": Experiences of Urban Park Use by Older Adults with Disability. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* 2021;**18**(2):552.
111. Corazon SS, Gramkov MC, Poulsen DV, et al. I would really like to visit the forest, but it is just too difficult: a qualitative study on mobility disability and green spaces. *Scandinavian Journal of Disability Research* 2019;**21**(1).
112. Wojnowska-Heciak M, Suchocka M, Błaszczyk M, et al. Urban Parks as Perceived by City Residents with Mobility Difficulties: A Qualitative Study with In-Depth Interviews. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* 2022;**19**(4):2018.
113. Kitchin R. 'Out of Place', 'Knowing One's Place': Space, power and the exclusion of disabled people. *Disability and Society* 2010;**13**(3):343-56.

114. Emerson E, Fortune N, Llewellyn G, et al. Loneliness, social support, social isolation and wellbeing among working age adults with and without disability: cross-sectional study. *Disability health journal* 2021;**14**(1):100965.
115. Macdonald SJ, Deacon L, Nixon J, et al. 'The invisible enemy': disability, loneliness and isolation. *Disability and Society* 2018;**33**(7):1138-59.
116. Tough H, Siegrist J, Fekete C. Social relationships, mental health and wellbeing in physical disability: a systematic review. *BMC Public Health* 2017;**17**(1):1-18.
117. Christian HE, Westgarth C, Bauman A, et al. Dog ownership and physical activity: a review of the evidence. *Journal of physical activity & health* 2013;**10**(5):750-59.
118. Middle I. Between a dog and a green space: applying ecosystem services theory to explore the human benefits of off-the-leash dog parks. *Landscape Research* 2019.
119. Gómez E. Dog Parks: Benefits, Conflicts, and Suggestions. *Journal of Park Recreation Administration* 2013;**31**(4).
120. Davis M. *City of quartz: Excavating the future in Los Angeles*. New York 1992.
121. Chellew C. Defending suburbia. *Canadian Journal of Urban Research* 2019;**28**(1):19-33.
122. Atkinson R. Urban policy, city control and social catharsis: The attack on social frailty as therapy. *British Journal of Criminology* 2015;**55**(5):866-82.
123. Colding J, Gren Å, Barthel S. The incremental demise of urban green spaces. *Land* 2020;**9**(5):162.
124. Leclercq E, Pojani D. Public space privatisation: are users concerned? *Journal of Urbanism: International Research on Placemaking and Urban Sustainability* 2021:1-18.
125. Buecker S, Maes M, Denissen JJ, et al. Loneliness and the Big Five Personality Traits: A Meta-analysis. *European Journal of Personality* 2019.
126. Feng X, Astell-Burt T, Standl M, et al. Green space quality and adolescent mental health: do personality traits matter? *Environ Res* 2022:112591.
127. Ryan RM, Deci EL. Intrinsic and extrinsic motivations: Classic definitions and new directions. *Contemp Educ Psychol* 2000;**25**(1):54-67.
128. Rupprecht CD, Byrne JA, Ueda H, et al. 'It's real, not fake like a park': Residents' perception and use of informal urban green-space in Brisbane, Australia and Sapporo, Japan. *Landscape and Urban Planning* 2015;**143**:205-18.
129. Albrecht G, Sartore G-M, Connor L, et al. Solastalgia: the distress caused by environmental change. *Australasian psychiatry* 2007;**15**(sup1):S95-S98.
130. Galway LP, Beery T, Jones-Casey K, et al. Mapping the solastalgia literature: A scoping review study. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* 2019;**16**(15):2662.
131. Staats H, Hartig T. Alone or with a friend: A social context for psychological restoration and environmental preferences. *J Environ Psychol* 2004;**24**(2):199-211.
132. Staats H, Jahncke H, Herzog TR, et al. Urban options for psychological restoration: Common strategies in everyday situations. *PLoS One* 2016;**11**:e0146213.
133. Holt-Lunstad J. Why social relationships are important for physical health: A systems approach to understanding and modifying risk and protection. *Annu Rev Psychol* 2018;**69**:437-58.
134. Kaplan R, Kaplan S. *The Experience of Nature: A Psychological Perspective*: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
135. Ulrich RS. Aesthetic and affective response to natural environment. In: Altman I, Wohlwill JF, eds. *Human behaviour and environment: Advances in theory and*

- research Behaviour and the natural environment. New York: Plenum Press, 1983:85-125.
136. Hartig T, Catalano R, Ong M, et al. Vacation, collective restoration, and mental health in a population. *Society and Mental Health* 2013;**3**(3):221-36.
  137. Dzhambov AM, Browning MH, Markevych I, et al. Analytical approaches to testing pathways linking greenspace to health: A scoping review of the empirical literature. *Environ Res* 2020;**186**:109613.
  138. Henning C, Lieberg M. Strong ties or weak ties? Neighbourhood networks in a new perspective. *Scandinavian Housing and Planning Research* 1996;**13**(1):3-26.
  139. Oldenburg R. *The great good place: Café, coffee shops, community centers, beauty parlors, general stores, bars, hangouts, and how they get you through the day*. New York: Paragon House Publishers, 1989.
  140. Altman I. *The environment and social behavior*. Monterey: Brooks/Cole, 1975.
  141. Gonzalez MT, Hartig T, Patil GG, et al. A prospective study of group cohesiveness in therapeutic horticulture for clinical depression. *Int J Ment Health Nurs* 2011;**20**(2):119-29.
  142. Wiltshire G, Stevinson C. Exploring the role of social capital in community-based physical activity: qualitative insights from parkrun. *Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health* 2018;**10**(1):47-62.
  143. Morris P, Scott H. Not just a run in the park: a qualitative exploration of parkrun and mental health. *Advances in mental health* 2019;**17**(2):110-23.
  144. Hindley D. "More than just a run in the park": an exploration of parkrun as a shared leisure space. *Leisure Sciences* 2020;**42**(1):85-105.
  145. Butterfield A, Martin D. Affective sanctuaries: Understanding Maggie's as therapeutic landscapes. *Landscape Research* 2016;**41**(6):695-706.
  146. Hartig T, Marcus CC. Essay: Healing gardens—places for nature in health care. *The Lancet* 2006;**368**:S36-S37.
  147. Bell SL, Foley R, Houghton F, et al. From therapeutic landscapes to healthy spaces, places and practices: A scoping review. *Soc Sci Med* 2018;**196**:123-30.
  148. Graham TM, Glover TD. On the fence: Dog parks in the (un) leashing of community and social capital. *Leisure Sciences* 2014;**36**(3):217-34.
  149. Brooks HL, Rushton K, Lovell K, et al. The power of support from companion animals for people living with mental health problems: a systematic review and narrative synthesis of the evidence. *BMC Psychiatry* 2018;**18**(1):1-12.
  150. Kruger KA, Serpell JA. Animal-assisted interventions in mental health: Definitions and theoretical foundations. *Handbook on animal-assisted therapy*: Elsevier, 2010:33-48.
  151. Bethelmy LC, Corraliza JA. Transcendence and sublime experience in nature: Awe and inspiring energy. *Front Psychol* 2019;**10**:509.
  152. Vining J, Merrick MS. Environmental epiphanies: Theoretical foundations and practical applications. In: Clayton S, ed. *The Oxford handbook of environmental and conservation psychology*. Oxford Oxford University Press, 2012:485–508.
  153. Capaldi CA, Dopko RL, Zelenski JM. The relationship between nature connectedness and happiness: a meta-analysis. *Front Psychol* 2014;**5**:976.
  154. Pritchard A, Richardson M, Sheffield D, et al. The relationship between nature connectedness and eudaimonic well-being: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Happiness Studies* 2020;**21**(3):1145-67.

155. DeVille NV, Tomasso LP, Stoddard OP, et al. Time Spent in Nature Is Associated with Increased Pro-Environmental Attitudes and Behaviors. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* 2021;**18**(14):7498.
156. Martin L, White MP, Hunt A, et al. Nature contact, nature connectedness and associations with health, wellbeing and pro-environmental behaviours. *J Environ Psychol* 2020;**68**:101389.
157. Taufik D, Bolderdijk JW, Steg L. Acting green elicits a literal warm glow. *Nature Climate Change* 2015;**5**(1):37-40.
158. Jia F, Soucie K, Matsuba K, et al. Meaning in Life Mediates the Association between Environmental Engagement and Loneliness. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* 2021;**18**(6):2897.
159. Tung EL, Johnson TA, O'Neal Y, et al. Experiences of community violence among adults with chronic conditions: qualitative findings from Chicago. *J Gen Intern Med* 2018;**33**(11):1913-20.
160. Mancus GC, Campbell J. Integrative review of the intersection of green space and neighborhood violence. *J Nurs Scholarsh* 2018;**50**(2):117-25.
161. Shepley M, Sachs N, Sadatsafavi H, et al. The impact of green space on violent crime in urban environments: an evidence synthesis. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* 2019;**16**(24):5119.
162. Kondo MC, South EC, Branas CC, et al. The association between urban tree cover and gun assault: a case-control and case-crossover study. *Am J Epidemiol* 2017;**186**(3):289-96.
163. Garvin EC, Cannuscio CC, Branas CC. Greening vacant lots to reduce violent crime: a randomised controlled trial. *Inj Prev* 2013;**19**(3):198-203.
164. Branas CC, South E, Kondo MC, et al. Citywide cluster randomized trial to restore blighted vacant land and its effects on violence, crime, and fear. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 2018;**115**(12):2946-51.
165. South EC, Hohl BC, Kondo MC, et al. Effect of greening vacant land on mental health of community-dwelling adults: a cluster randomized trial. *JAMA network open* 2018;**1**(3):e180298-e98.
166. Li H, Zhang X, Bi S, et al. Can residential greenspace exposure improve pain experience? A comparison between physical visit and image viewing. *Healthcare* 2021;**9**(7):918.
167. Stanhope J, Breed MF, Weinstein P. Exposure to greenspaces could reduce the high global burden of pain. *Environ Res* 2020;**187**:109641.
168. Han J-W, Choi H, Jeon Y-H, et al. The effects of forest therapy on coping with chronic widespread pain: Physiological and psychological differences between participants in a forest therapy program and a control group. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* 2016;**13**(3):255.
169. Martin L, White MP, Pahl S, et al. Neighbourhood greenspace and smoking prevalence: Results from a nationally representative survey in England. *Soc Sci Med* 2020;**265**:113448.
170. Berry MS, Rung JM, Crawford MC, et al. Using greenspace and nature exposure as an adjunctive treatment for opioid and substance use disorders: Preliminary evidence and potential mechanisms. *Behav Processes* 2021;**186**:104344.
171. Mennis J, Li X, Meenar M, et al. Residential greenspace and urban adolescent substance use: Exploring interactive effects with peer network health, sex, and executive function. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* 2021;**18**(4):1611.

172. Jiang W, Stickley A, Ueda M. Green space and suicide mortality in Japan: An ecological study. *Soc Sci Med* 2021;114137.
173. Helbich M, De Beurs D, Kwan M-P, et al. Natural environments and suicide mortality in the Netherlands: a cross-sectional, ecological study. *The Lancet Planetary Health* 2018;**2**(3):e134-e39.
174. Shen Y-S, Lung S-CC, Cui S. Exploring multiple pathways and mediation effects of urban environmental factors for suicide prevention. *Environmental Pollution* 2022;**294**:118642.
175. Helbich M, O'Connor RC, Nieuwenhuijsen M, et al. Greenery exposure and suicide mortality later in life: A longitudinal register-based case-control study. *Environ Int* 2020;**143**:105982.
176. Astell-Burt T, Feng X, Kolt GS. Neighbourhood green space and the odds of having skin cancer: multilevel evidence of survey data from 267 072 Australians. *J Epidemiol Community Health* 2014;**68**:370-74.
177. Richardson EA, Mitchell R, Hartig T, et al. Green cities and health: a question of scale? *J Epidemiol Community Health* 2012;**66**(2):160-65.
178. Astell-Burt T, Mitchell R, Hartig T. The association between green space and mental health varies across the lifecourse. A longitudinal study. *J Epidemiol Community Health* 2014;**68**:568-73.
179. Astell-Burt T, Feng X. Association of Urban Green Space With Mental Health and General Health Among Adults in Australia. *JAMA Network Open* 2019;**2**(7):e198209.
180. Cummins S, Fagg J. Does greener mean thinner? Associations between neighbourhood greenspace and weight status among adults in England. *Int J Obes* 2011;**36**(8):1108-13.
181. Shuvo FK, Mazumdar S, Labib S. Walkability and greenness do not walk together: investigating associations between greenness and walkability in a large metropolitan city context. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* 2021;**18**(9):4429.
182. Byrne J. When green is White: The cultural politics of race, nature and social exclusion in a Los Angeles urban national park. *Geoforum* 2012;**43**(3):595-611.
183. Rigolon A, Németh J. Green gentrification or 'just green enough': Do park location, size and function affect whether a place gentrifies or not? *Urban Studies* 2020;**57**(2):402-20.
184. Wolch JR, Byrne J, Newell JP. Urban green space, public health, and environmental justice: The challenge of making cities 'just green enough'. *Landscape and Urban Planning* 2014;**125**:234-44.
185. Hyra D. Commentary: Causes and consequences of gentrification and the future of equitable development policy. *Cityscape* 2016;**18**(3):169-78.
186. Marcuse P. To control gentrification: anti-displacement zoning and planning for stable residential districts. *Review of Law and Social Change* 1984;**13**:931-45.



**Table 1.** Search terms used for the systematic search

Main keywords	Search terms
Green space	“green space” OR greenspace OR “green area” OR greenness OR greenery OR grass OR tree OR natur* OR "natural environment" OR vegetation OR park* OR “open space” OR garden OR “national park” OR “play space” OR “urban park” OR “recreation* resource” OR woodland OR wilderness OR “wild land” OR “natural land” OR “municipal land” OR “community land” OR “public land” OR “open land” OR “shinrin-yoku” OR “forest bathing” OR “park availability” OR “city park” OR bush
Loneliness	lonely OR loneliness OR lone* OR isolation OR “social isolation” OR “feeling isolated” OR “solitude” OR “solace” OR “seclusion” OR “lives alone” OR “living alone” OR “felt alone” OR “feeling alone” OR “social withdrawal” OR “socially disconnected”

*\*truncation symbol used to search all possible variations of the word*

**Table 2.** Summary of final studies reviewed

Characteristics	Categories	n
Study design	Quasi-experimental	2
	Randomized experimental	3
	Longitudinal study	2
	Cross-sectional	15
Countries	Netherlands	5
	USA	4
	Multi-country	4
	Spain	1
	Germany	1
	United Kingdom	3
	Australia	1
	China	1
	Hong Kong	1
	Japan	1
Country income level	High income	20
	Middle income	1
	Mixed income levels	1
Study year	2004	1
	2009	1
	2010	2
	2016	2
	2017	2
	2018	1
	2019	2
	2020	5

	2021	6	
Loneliness measures*	UCLA loneliness scale	14	
	Other loneliness scales	6	
	Social isolation/disconnectedness	3	
Green space measures*			
	<i>Objective</i>		
	Residential greenness	3	
	Percentage of green space	3	
	Distance to green space	2	
	Being a member of allotment sites	1	
	Viewing static or moving nature imagery	1	
	Participation in activities with exposure to the green space	3	
<i>Subjective</i>	Perceived amount of green space	1	
	Perceived contact with green space	1	
	Time spent visiting green space	3	
	Frequency visiting green space	5	
	Access to green space	1	
	Walking distance to green space	2	
	Having outdoor area (garden, allotment)	2	
	Having green view from home	2	
	Visibility of green space through window	1	
	Frequency of viewing green space through window	1	
	Duration of viewing green space through window	1	
	Time noticing nature or nature engagement	1	
	Nature relatedness score	1	
	Nature connectedness score	1	
	Types of green space use (recreational use, purposeful use and cycling, gardening, active use, passive use, and visit green space)	1	
	Study quality#	Good	2
		Fair	13
Poor		7	


n: number; UCLA: University of California Los Angeles; \*studies may be counted more than once since some studies assessed more than one green space measure; #study quality assessed using the National Institutes of Health's quality assessment tool for observational (cohort and cross-sectional), and for intervention studies

**Table 3.** Summary of associations extracted from 22 articles


Green space measures	n <sup>a</sup>	Associations				
		Significant <sup>b</sup>		Non-significant <sup>c</sup>		
		E <sup>d</sup>	UE <sup>e</sup>	E <sup>d</sup>	UE <sup>e</sup>	NR <sup>f</sup>
<b>Objective measures</b>						
Residential greenness within buffers of buffers of:						
- 100 m	1					1
- 250 m	1				1	
- 300 m	1					1
- 500 m	3	1		1		1
Percentage of green space within buffers of						
- within an administrative area	1			1		
- 400 m	2			1	1	
- 800 m	2			2		
- 1 km	17	6		8	3	
- 1.6 km	33	7		14	12	
- 3 km	17	9		6	2	
Distance to green space	2			1	1	
Being a member of allotment sites	2	1			1	
Viewing static or moving nature imagery	8	2		3	3	
Participation in community intervention with exposure to green spaces <sup>g</sup>	2	2				
Participation in park prescription groups <sup>g</sup>	5	5				
Participation in indoor gardening <sup>g</sup>	4	2				2
<b>Sub-total</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Subjective measures</b>						
Perceived amount of green space	1					1
Perceived contact with green space	1	1				
Time spent visiting green space	3	2				1
Frequency visiting green space	6	1		2	1	2
Access to well-maintained green space	1				1	
Walking distance to green space, sports, leisure facilities	3	3				
Having outdoor area (garden, allotment)	2	1			1	
Having green space view from home	2	1				1
Visibility of green space through window	1			1		
Frequency of viewing green space through window	1			1		
Duration of viewing green space through window	1				1	
Time noticing nature or nature engagement	1		1			
Nature relatedness score	1			1		
Nature connectedness score	1			1		
Types of green space use						
- Recreational use	1					1
- Purposeful use and cycling	1					1
- Gardening	1					1

- Active use	1					1
- Passive use	1			1		
- Visit green space	1					1
<b>Sub-total</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Total: n (%)</b>	<b>132</b>	<b>44</b> <b>(33.3)</b>	<b>1</b> <b>(0.8)</b>	<b>44</b> <b>(33.3)</b>	<b>28</b> <b>(21.2)</b>	<b>15</b> <b>(11.4)</b>

<sup>a</sup>number of associations of between green space and loneliness that count multiple indicators of green space and multiple associations within a single study (e.g., analysis stratified by effect modifiers); <sup>b</sup>statistically significant association ( $p < 0.05$ ); <sup>c</sup>non-statistically significant association ( $p \geq 0.05$ ); <sup>d</sup>association in expected direction; <sup>e</sup>association in unexpected direction; <sup>f</sup>association in non-reported direction; <sup>g</sup>in-person observation used as data source for exposure to green space in experimental studies



*Figure 1: Flowchart illustrating the systematic search process*



*Figure 2: Conceptual model linking green space with loneliness and concomitants*

Supplementary Table 1 (ONLINE ONLY). Study characteristics and results

References; Country & Income level/s	Study design	Sample size / gender	Age (years)	Green space measure/s	Green space data source/s	Loneliness measure	Statistical method/s	Results/ estimates	Factors adjusted	Study quality
Astell-Burt et al., 2021; Australia / HIC	LS (with 4-year follow up)	8049 / M & F  Sample 1: 6766 participants who were not lonely; Sample 2: 1282 participants who were lonely	≥15	Percentage of green space within buffers of 400 m, 800 m, and 1,600 m within an administrative area (statistical area, level 1 – SA1)	Land use database	A single item loneliness scale (a higher score indicates higher agreement on loneliness, responses were categorised as lonely and ambivalent/ not lonely)  Two main outcome were evaluated: cumulative incidence of new-onset loneliness for Sample 1; cumulative incidence	Multilevel logistic regression; absolute risk reductions in loneliness were calculated	Cummulative incidence of loneliness: - Increased percentage of green space within 1600 m by 10% was associated with the decreased odds of loneliness (OR= 0.927; 95%CI= 0.862, 0.996) ~ 0.66% reductions in loneliness prevalence ( <b>significant in expected direction</b> ) - No associations between increased percentage of green space within 800 m and 400 m with loneliness ( <b>non-significant in expected and unexpected direction, respectively</b> )  Cummulative incidence of relief from loneliness: - Increased percentage of green space within 1600, 800, and 400 m by 10% was associated with the increased odds of relief from loneliness, but all	age group, sex, children, cohabitation status, highest educational qualifications, annual household income, % of last 12 months spent unemployed, disability or limiting long-term health condition, area-level socioeconomic circumstances	Good

						<p>of relief from loneliness for Sample 2</p>	<p>associations were not statistically significant. <b><i>(non-significant in expected direction)</i></b></p> <p>Effect modification by married or cohabitation status (stratified model) on the association between green space percentage within 1600 m and cumulative incidence of loneliness.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased percentage of green space associated with decreased odds of loneliness among those living alone throughout (OR=0.828; 95%CI= (0.725, 0.944) <b><i>(significant in expected direction)</i></b>; other associations were not significant <b><i>(non-significant in expected and unexpected direction; one for each)</i></b>)</li> </ul> <p>Percentages of green space within 1,600 m were classified as &lt;10%, 10-20%, 20-30%, &gt;30%:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Compared to &lt;10% green space, higher percentage of green space was associated with lower odds of</li> </ul>		
--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--	--	--



								loneliness among full and living alone samples ( <i>five significant associations and one non-significant association in expected direction</i> )		
								No effect modification by age, sex, and disability status on the associations between green space and loneliness or relief from loneliness ( <i>non-significant in expected and unexpected direction; 11 for each</i> )		
Bergefurt et al., 2019; Netherlands / HIC	CSS	200 / M & F	≥18	Six components (variables) of the use of specific public spaces were constructed using a principal component analysis, consisting of “recreational use”, “purposeful use and cycling”, “gardening”, “active use”, “passive use”, and “visit green space”. Specific public spaces include parks, sport fields, garden, day recreational area, agricultural area, and forest.	Self-reported measure	UCLA loneliness scale (3 items, a higher score indicates a higher degree of loneliness)	Path analysis	Only the association between passive use of public space and loneliness was reported ( $\beta = -0.04$ ; $p < 0.1$ ). ( <i>non-significant in expected direction</i> )  Associations for other five components of public-space use were not reported. ( <i>non-significant in non-reported direction</i> )	Age, education, income, household composition, activities of daily living, car and train use, area attachment, social cohesion, walkability	Poor

Brown et al., 2004; USA / HIC	QES (pretest-posttest control group)	66 / M & F (living in nursing homes)	60-96	Phase 1: Participation in indoor gardening once a week for 5 weeks vs. receiving 20-minute visits for 5 weeks.  Phase 2: Participation in indoor gardening once a week for 5 weeks vs. indoor gardening twice a week for 2 weeks.	In-person observation	UCLA loneliness scale version 3 (20 items, a higher score indicates a higher degree of loneliness)	Analysis of variance (ANOVA) & Multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA)	No significant differences in loneliness between intervention and control groups in phase 1 and 2. <b><i>(non-significant in non-reported direction)</i></b>	-	Poor
Buecker et al., 2020; Germany / HIC	CSS	17,602 / M & F	18-103	Walking distance to public parks; and sports/leisure facilities (in minutes)	Self-reported measure	UCLA loneliness scale (3 items, a higher score indicates a higher degree of loneliness)	Linear mixed-effects model	Distance to public parks was associated with loneliness ( $\beta=0.03$ ; 95%CI= 0.02, 0.05; $p<0.001$ ). <b><i>(significant in expected direction)</i></b>  Distance to sports/leisure activities was associated with loneliness ( $\beta=0.03$ ; 95%CI= 0.02, 0.05; $p<0.001$ ). <b><i>(significant in expected direction)</i></b>	Age, gender, migration background, income, education, migration background, work and relationship status, social contacts, general health, distance to public transport, distance to nearest city centre, relation to neighbours, residential status, age composition, area deprivation, population	Fair

									change and density, remoteness	
Cao et al., 2019; USA / HIC	CSS	342 / M & F (only registered elderly voters)	≥50	Access to well-maintained safe parks within walking distance (no, yes, not sure)	Self-reported measure	A single item measure of perceived social disconnection ('disagree' and 'agree')	Hierarchical logistic regression	OR = 1.60 (95% CI= 0.63, 24.08) for well-maintained and safe parks (yes), and OR = 4.49 (95% CI= 0.85, 23.71), for well-maintained and safe parks (not sure) compared to "no" access. <b>(non-significant in unexpected direction)</b>	Age, gender, income, living alone, self-reported health, crime, home accessibility, driving status, and transport barriers	Poor
Hammoud et al., 2021; Multiple countries or global	LS (with 42 ecological momentary assessments in 14 days)	397 with a total of 11,193 assessments / M, F, and others; analyses also included different numbers of sample	16-73	Contact with nature measured using 5 items; total scores were dichotomised	Self-reported measure	A single item loneliness scale (a higher score indicates higher agreement on loneliness)	Multilevel ordinal logistic regression	Contact with nature was negatively associated with momentary loneliness (OR = 0.72; 95% CI: 0.65, 0.80). <b>(significant in expected direction)</b>  Contact with nature appeared to interact with the association between social inclusivity and loneliness, but no interaction with overcrowding and population density.	Age, gender, ethnicity, education, and occupation	Good
Lai et al., 2021; UK / HIC	CSS	204,191 for loneliness; 209,525 for social isolation / M & F	38-73	Residential greenness within a buffer of 500 m (not the main independent variable)	NDVI	Two binary outcomes: loneliness and social isolation. Loneliness	Binary logistic regression	Residential greenness was not statistically significant associated with loneliness (OR=0.997; 95% CI=0.97, 1.02; p=0.8996). <b>(non-</b>	Residential density, age, gender, education, employment status, number of children,	Fair

						was assessed using two-item scale.  Social isolation was measured using three-item scale.		<i>significant in expected direction)</i>  Residential greenness was negatively associated with social isolation (OR=0.974 (0.95, 0.99; p=0.0357). <i>(significant in expected direction)</i>	minutes per week for walking, weekly use of mobile phone, BMI, cardiovascular status, mental health status, betweenness centrality, density of public transport, destination accessibility, traffic intensity, terrain variability	
Li et al., 2021; China / MIC	CSS	269 / M (prisoners )	Mean = 34.45	Three measures of green space: visibility, frequency, and duration of viewing green space through window	Self-reported measure	UCLA loneliness scale (6 items, a higher score indicates a higher degree of loneliness)	Structural equation modelling	Visibility (r=-0.082), frequency (r=-0.022), and duration (r=0.048) of viewing green space through window were not statistically significant correlated with loneliness. <i>(two non-significant associations in expected and one in unexpected direction)</i>	-	Poor
Maas et al., 2009; Netherlands / HIC	CSS	10,089 / M & F	≥12	Percentage of green space within buffers of 1 and 3 km from a respondent's home	Land use database	UCLA loneliness scale (6 items, a higher score	Multilevel linear regression	Percentage of green space within a buffer of 1 km was associated with loneliness (β= -0.002; p<0.05). <i>(significant in expected direction)</i>	Age, gender, education, household income, urbanicity, household size	Fair

						<p>indicates a higher degree of loneliness)</p> <p>Loneliness was assessed as a mediator.</p>		<p>Percentage of green space within a buffer of 3 km was associated with loneliness (<math>\beta = -0.005</math>; <math>p &lt; 0.01</math>). <i>(significant in expected direction)</i></p> <p>Effect modifiers were investigated. The association was found among children, children, young adults, older adults, elderly, those with lower and middle education, low income, and living in urban areas. <i>(significant in expected direction)</i></p> <p>Loneliness was reported as a mediator for associations between percentage of green space within both 1 and 3 km radius with self-perceived health, number of health complaints, and self-reported propensity to psychiatric morbidity, respectively.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--	--	--

MacDonald et al., 2020; Netherlands / HIC	CSS	7854 / M & F & Other	17-97	Spend time in nature, go sightseeing or to an amusement park or zoo (responses from 'hardly ever' to 'several times a week')	Self-reported measure	UCLA loneliness scale (3 items, a higher score indicates a higher degree of loneliness)	Multiple linear regression	Spend time in nature, sightseeing or amusement park or zoo was associated with loneliness ( $\beta = -0.04$ ; $p < 0.05$ ). ( <b>significant in expected direction</b> )	Age, gender, urbanization, leisure activity variables	Fair
Neale et al., 2021; USA/ HIC	ES, within group, randomized crossover design (pretest-posttest control group)	Study 1: 45 / M & F & Other Study 2: 47 / M & F Study 3: 200 / M & F & Other	Study 1: 18-34 Study 2: 18-29 Study 3: 21-73	Three laboratory-based studies:  Study 1: exposure to static nature imagery vs. static urban imagery;  Study 2: exposure to nature 'with' vs. 'without' people using static imagery;  Study 3: exposure to urban and natural settings 'with' vs. 'without' people using moving imagery (video)	In-person observation	UCLA loneliness scale (3 items, a higher score indicates a higher degree of loneliness)	Independent and paired t-tests; one-way ANOVA	Study 1: - Loneliness decreased after the exposure to nature imagery. ( <b>significant in expected direction</b> ) - There were differences in mean score changes between exposure to static nature vs. urban imagery. ( <b>significant in expected direction</b> )  Study 2 - Small declines in loneliness after the exposure to nature 'with' vs. 'without' people. ( <b>non-significant in expected direction</b> ) - There were no differences in mean score changes between exposure to nature 'with' vs. 'without' people.  Study 3	-	Fair

								<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There was a decline in loneliness after the exposure to nature 'with' people, but an increase in loneliness after the exposure to nature 'without' people (<i>non-significant in expected and unexpected direction, respectively</i>)</li> <li>- There were no differences in mean score changes between exposure to urban and natural settings 'with' vs. 'without' people. (<i>non-significant in unexpected direction</i>)</li> </ul> <p>Nature identity measured using the Inclusion of Nature in Self scale might mediate the association between exposure to static nature imagery and loneliness.</p>		
Razani et al., 2018; USA/HIC	RCT (pretest-posttest)	78 / M & F (low-income parents)	≥18	Independent park prescription group vs. supported park prescription group.  Park prescription – counseling about nature, local park maps, a journal, and pedometer.	In-person observation	UCLA loneliness scale (3 items, a higher score indicates a higher degree of loneliness)	Paired & Independent sample t-tests	<p>For all participants: Loneliness decreased from baseline to 3-month follow-up (<math>\chi^2 = -1.03</math>; 95% CI= -1.52, -0.54; <math>p &lt; 0.001</math>). (<i>significant in expected direction</i>)</p> <p>For changes within groups at 1- and 3-month follow-up:</p>	-	Fair (no control group)

				Supported park prescription group received additional phone and text reminders to attend three weekly family nature outings with free transportation, food, and programming.				<p>Loneliness decreased from baseline to 1-month follow up among participant in both independent (<math>x\bar{\square} = -1.25</math>; 95%CI= -2.09, -0.41; <math>p &lt; 0.05</math>) and supported park prescription group (<math>x\bar{\square} = -1.03</math>; 95%CI= -1.61, -0.45; <math>p &lt; 0.05</math>). <i>(significant in expected direction)</i></p> <p>Loneliness decreased from baseline to 3-month follow up among participant in both independent (<math>x\bar{\square} = -0.77</math>; 95%CI= -1.48, -0.06; <math>p &lt; 0.05</math>) and supported park prescription group (<math>x\bar{\square} = -1.17</math>; 95%CI= -1.84, -0.50; <math>p &lt; 0.05</math>). <i>(significant in expected direction)</i></p> <p>No difference between independent and supported group at 1-month (<math>\Delta x\bar{\square} = -0.22</math> (95% CI= -1.20, 0.76; <math>p = 0.650</math>) and at 3-month follow-up (<math>\Delta x\bar{\square} = 0.39</math>; 95% CI= -0.65, 1.44; <math>p = 0.453</math>).</p>		
Richardson & Hamlin et al., 2021/	CSS	4,206 / M & F & other	16-93	Nature connectedness (measured using Nature Connection	Self-reported measure	A single item loneliness	Linear regression	Nature connectedness ( $\beta = 0.01$ ; $p \geq 0.05$ ), frequency visiting nature	Age, gender, employment status,	Fair



UK/ HIC				Index); time noticing nature or nature engagement; frequency of visiting nature in past 12 months; frequency of visiting nature in last 14 days		scale (a higher score indicates less frequent of feeling lonely)		in past 12 months ( $\beta=0.00$ ; $p\geq 0.05$ ), in last 14 days ( $\beta=0.01$ ; $p\geq 0.05$ ) were not associated with loneliness. ( <i>non-significant in expected direction</i> ).  Time noticing nature was associated with loneliness ( $\beta=-0.05$ ; $p<0.05$ ). ( <i>significant in unexpected direction</i> ).	ethnicity	
Rodríguez-Romero et al., 2020; Spain / HIC	RCT (pretest-posttest control group)	55 / M & F (moderate-severe loneliness and with moderate autonomy/dependence)	$\geq 65$	Participation in community intervention (intervention group) vs. receiving usual care (control group)  There were eighteen sessions over 6 months for community intervention. Garden visit and walk through the green neighborhood areas are parts of the intervention.	In-person observation	UCLA loneliness scale	Independent sample t-test	Loneliness decreased among participants in intervention group after 6-month follow-up ( $p<0.001$ ). ( <i>significant in expected direction</i> ).  There was a difference in loneliness between control and intervention groups at 6-month follow-up ( $\Delta x^2 = 8.63$ ; 95% CI= 1.97, 15.3; $p=0.012$ ). ( <i>significant in expected direction</i> )	-	Fair
Soga et al., 2020; Japan / HIC	CSS	3000 / M & F	$\geq 20$	Neighbourhood greenness within a buffer of 250 m from home using the postcode; frequency of visiting green space (in days); and green view through window	NDVI; self-reported measure	UCLA loneliness scale version 3 (20 items, a higher score indicates a	Multiple linear regression	Frequency of visiting green space ( $\beta=-0.08$ ; 95%CI= -0.11, -0.04; $p<0.001$ ) and green view ( $\beta=-0.11$ ; 95%CI= -0.20, -0.02; $p=0.018$ ) were negatively associated with loneliness ( $p<0.05$ ).	Gender, age, annual household income, housing type, impact of Covid-19 on income,	Fair

				(yes, no)		higher degree of loneliness)		<i>(significant in expected direction)</i>  Neighbourhood greenness was not associated with loneliness ( $\beta=0.01$ ; 95%CI= -0.03, 0.04; $p=0.673$ ). <i>(non-significant in unexpected direction)</i>	frequency of smoking and alcohol drinking, number of working days per week, presence of a pet, number of children in the home	
Tse, 2010; Hong Kong/ HIC	QES (pretest-posttest control group)	53 / M & F (living in nursing homes)	$\geq 60$	Participation in 8-week indoor gardening programme (intervention group) vs. receiving regular care (control group)	In-person observation	UCLA loneliness scale version 3 (20 items, a higher score indicates a higher degree of loneliness)	Mann-Whitney U-tests and the Wilcoxon Signed Rank test	Loneliness decreased among participants in intervention group after 8-week follow-up ( $\Delta x = -5.58$ , $p < 0.01$ ). <i>(significant in expected direction)</i> .  There was a difference in loneliness between control and intervention groups at 8-week follow-up ( $p < 0.01$ ). <i>(significant in expected direction)</i>	-	Fair
van den Berg et al., 2010; Netherlands / HIC	CSS	184 / M & F	30-87	Members of allotment sites (yes vs. no - neighbours). Allotment sites include residential parks, day-recreational parks, and food production parks.	In-person observation	Two-item loneliness scale (a higher score indicates a higher degree of loneliness)	General linear model (ANCOVA)	Modifying effect of age was tested. Loneliness score was different between allotment gardeners and neighbours for participants aged $\geq 62$ ( $p > 0.05$ ) - <i>(significant in expected direction)</i> , but not for those aged $< 62$ years ( $p > 0.05$ ) - <i>(non-significant in unexpected direction)</i> .	Gender, age, education, income, access to garden, stressful events experience, physical activity in winter	Poor

van den Berg et al., 2016; Netherlands / HIC	CSS	344 / M & F	≥18	Distance to public green (in km)	Statistics-based measure using postal code	A single item loneliness scale (a higher score indicates higher disagreement on loneliness)	Ordered logistic regression	Distance to public green was not associated with loneliness (coefficient= 0.08; p>0.1) ( <i>non-significant in unexpected direction</i> ).	Gender, age, marital status, household composition, education, working status, health condition, social contacts, place of living, period of being a local resident, perceived neighbourhood and facilities, area density, distance to daily shop and highway, type of transportation	Poor
van den Berg et al., 2017; Spain, Lithuania, Netherlands , and United Kingdom / HICs	CSS	3748 / M & F	18-75	Time spent visiting green spaces in last four weeks (in hours)	Self-reported measure	UCLA loneliness scale (6 items, a higher score indicates a higher degree of loneliness)  Loneliness was assessed as a mediator.	Multilevel linear regression	Time spent visiting green space was associated with loneliness ( $\beta = -0.005$ ; $p < 0.001$ ). ( <i>significant in expected direction</i> )  Loneliness was reported as a mediator for associations between time spent visiting green space with mental health and vitality, respectively.	Gender, age, education, income, employment, household composition (children <12 years), and city	Fair

van Houwelingen-Snippe et al., 2020; Austria, Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Netherlands, UK, USA/ HICs	CSS	1203 / M & F & Other	≥18	Outdoor area (none, garden, balcony, garden and balcony); number of nature interactions during a week; walking time towards nearby nature (in minutes); and nature relatedness score (measured using Nature Relatedness Scale).	Self-reported measure	UCLA loneliness scale version 3 (20 items, a higher score indicates a higher degree of loneliness)	Multiple linear regression	<p>The increase time of walking towards nearby nature was associated with increased loneliness (<math>\beta=0.301</math>; <math>p&lt;0.001</math>). <b><i>(significant in expected direction)</i></b></p> <p>Outdoor area (<math>\beta=0.032</math>) and nature interactions (<math>\beta=0.001</math>) were not associated with loneliness. <b><i>(non-significant in unexpected direction)</i></b>.</p> <p>Nature relatedness score was not associated with loneliness (<math>\beta= -0.011</math>). <b><i>(non-significant in expected direction)</i></b>.</p>	Year of birth, gender, country of residence, education, employment status, marital status, living situation, living area, lockdown, connectedness to the community.	Fair
Ward Thompson et al., 2016; Scotland, United Kingdom/ HIC	CSS	406 / M & F (living in deprived urban areas)	16-87	Percentage of green space; frequency to visit nearest green space ('every day' to 'never'), having allotment or garden (yes, no); and view to green space or hills (yes, no)	Land use database; self-reported measure	<p>Social isolation (one item with three responses: often, some of the time, hardly never.</p> <p>Social isolation was assessed as a mediator.</p>	Spearman's correlation	<p>No reliable correlation between percentage of green space and social isolation (<math>\rho= 0.003</math>; <math>p=0.962</math>). <b><i>(non-significant in expected direction)</i></b></p> <p>Correlation was reported between having allotment or garden with social isolation (<math>\rho= -0.118</math>; <math>p=0.041</math>). <b><i>(significant in expected direction)</i></b></p>	-	Poor

								<p>No correlations reported for other green space indicators (frequency to visit green space; view to green space or hills). <b><i>(non-significant in non-reported direction)</i></b></p> <p>Social isolation was reported as a mediator for the association between having allotment or garden with perceived stress.</p>		
Zijlema et al., 2017; Spain, Netherlands, and United Kingdom/ HICs	CSS	1570 / M & F	18-75	Distance to nearest outdoor environment (NOE) (per 100 m); residential surrounding greenness within buffers of 100 m, 300 m, 500 m; perceived amount of NOE ('not at all' to 'very'); visit frequency to NOE ('never' to 'almost daily'); and total time spent visiting NOE (in hours)	GIS; land use database; NDVI; self-reported measure	UCLA loneliness scale (6 items, a higher score indicates a higher degree of loneliness)  Loneliness was assessed as a mediator.	Multilevel linear regression	<p>No statistically significant association was reported between residential distance to NOE with loneliness (<math>\beta=0.91</math>; 95%CI= -0.27, 2.11). <b><i>(non-significant in expected direction)</i></b></p> <p>No associations were reported for other NOE indicators. <b><i>(non-significant in non-reported direction)</i></b></p> <p>Loneliness did not mediate the association between distance to NOE and cognitive function.</p>	Gender, age, education, time spent away from home, area socioeconomic status, and cognitive test quality	Fair

HIC: high-income country; MIC: middle-income country M: Male; F: Female; CSS: cross-sectional study; LS: longitudinal study; ES: experimental study; RCT: randomized clinical trial; QES: quasi-experimental study; UCLA: University of California Los Angeles; GIS: geographic information system; NDVI: normalized difference vegetation index; NOE: natural outdoor environment; BMI: body mass index;  $\beta$ =regression coefficient; OR: odds ratio;  $\Delta x$  = mean differences;  $\rho$ = Spearman's rho correlation coefficient



