Population-weighted greenspace exposure tied to lower COVID-19 mortality rates: A nationwide dose-response study

Yuwen Yang[a, b], Yi Lu[c], Bin Jiang[a, b, *]

Affiliations:

[a]Urban Environments and Human Health Lab, HKUrbanLabs, Faculty of Architecture, The University of Hong Kong, HK.

[b]Division of Landscape Architecture, Department of Architecture, The University of Hong Kong, HK.

[c]Department of Architecture and Civil Engineering, College of Engineering, City University of Hong Kong, HK.

*Corresponding author: Bin Jiang, RM614, 6/F, Knowles Building, The University of Hong Kong, Pok fu lam Road, Hong Kong; email: jiangbin@hku.hk

Population-weighted greenspace exposure tied to lower COVID-19 mortality rates: A nationwide dose-response study

Abstract

The COVID-19 outbreak has caused enormous deaths and profound social and economic disruption globally. Accumulating evidence suggests exposure to greenspace may reduce the risk of COVID-19 mortality. Greenspace exposure enhances immune functioning, reduces inflammation, and replenishes gut microbiota may protect against the risk of mortality among those with COVID-19. However, previous studies often fail to distinguish the health effect of different types of greenspace, explore the dose-response association and optimal buffer distance, and consider the spatial dynamics of population distribution and geographic locations of greenspace.

This study examined the associations among ratio of different types of greenspaces, population-weighted exposure to different types of greenspaces, and COVID-19 mortality rates using a negative binomial generalized linear mixed effects model across 3,025 counties, adjusted for socioeconomic, demographic, pre-existing chronic disease, policy and regulation, behavioral, and environmental factors. The population-weighted measure gave proportionally greater weight to greenspace near areas of higher population density.

Exposure to forest and pasture was negatively associated with COVID-19 mortality rates, while developed open space has insignificant or positive associations with mortality rates. *Forest outside park* has the largest effect size across all buffer distances, followed by *forest inside park*. The optimal exposure buffer distance is 1km for *forest outside park*, with 1 unit of increase in exposure associated with a 9.9% decrease in mortality rates (95% confidence interval: 6.9% -12.8%). The optimal exposure buffer distance of *forest inside park* is 400m, with 1 unit of increase in exposure, associated with a 4.7% decrease in mortality rates (95% confidence interval: 2.4% - 6.9%).

Greenspaces, especially nearby forest, may be effective at lowering the mortality risk of COVID-19 patients. Our findings suggest that policymakers and planners should prioritize forestry within walking distance of residential clusters to mitigate mortality rates during current and future respiratory pandemics.

Keywords: *COVID-19 mortality rate; Greenspace; Forest; Dose-response; Optimal buffer distance*

1. Introduction

Since its outbreak in 2019, COVID-19 has spread rapidly throughout the world, leading to numerous infections and deaths. In the United States, COVID-19 is largely responsible for the substantial 17.7% increase in total deaths from 2019 to 2020 and became the third leading cause of death following heart disease and cancer (Ahmad, Cisewski, Miniño, & Anderson, 2021). By the end of 2020, COVID-19 deaths were estimated at 348,600; by February 2020, they had reached over 933,000 (Johns Hopkins University & Medicine, 2021; Viglione, 2020). In the US, COVID-19 was estimated to reduce life expectancy by 1.13 years annually (Andrasfay & Goldman, 2021).

The COVID-19 pandemic also overwhelmed healthcare systems and caused substantial economic loss. COVID-19 infection and deaths cast escalating pressure on testing capacities and hospitalizations in the U.S. (Dyer, 2020; Miller, Becker, Grenfell, & Metcalf, 2020). Critically ill COVID-19 patients faced shortages in intensive care units (ICUs) compounded by other critical health conditions (Halpern & Tan, 2020). The cumulative economic costs of the COVID-19 pandemic due to premature deaths, unemployment, and business revenue decline was estimated to be US$1.4 trillion GDP by 2030 (Cutler & Summers, 2020; Chen et al. 2021).

Accumulating evidence suggests links between both nature and the built environment and COVID-19 mortality rates. Exposure to air pollution (Ali & Islam, 2020; Konstantinoudis et al., 2021; Liang et al., 2020), crowded housing (Brandén et al., 2020; Hu, Roberts, Azevedo, & Milner, 2021; van Ingen et al., 2021), and lower average temperature (Ma et al., 2020; Perone, 2021) were found to increase COVID-19 deaths. The relationship between greenspace and COVID-19 mortality rates has received far less attention (Jiang, Yang, et al., 2021; Klompmaker et al., 2021; Lu, Chen, et al., 2021), despite the numerous salutary effects of nature exposure on human health.

1.1 How might exposure to greenspace alleviate COVID-19 mortality rates?

An overwhelming amount of research has shown that exposure to greenspace can improve both physical and mental health (Jiang, Chang, & Sullivan, 2014; Lu, Chen, et al., 2021). Particularly, studies have shown that contact with greenspace boosts our defense capacity against viruses by increasing Natural Killer (NK) and T cells and cytotoxic activities (Liisa Andersen, Sus Sola Sola Corazon, & Ulrika Karlsson Karlsson Stigsdotter, 2021; Li, 2010; Roviello, Gilhen-Baker, Vicidomini, & Roviello, 2021), reducing inflammation (Kuo, 2015; Ribeiro, Tavares, Guttentag, & Barros, 2019), and replenishing gut microbiota (Parajuli, 2019; Parajuli et al., 2020; Marja I. Roslund et al., 2020). Hospitalized COVID-19 patients with severe or fatal cases have consistently shown immune interference (e.g., lower NK and T cell count, exaggerated cytotoxic activities) (Castelli, Cimini, & Ferri, 2020; Girija, Shankar, & Larsson, 2020; Qin et al., 2020), hyper-inflammation or 'cytokine storm'(e.g., delayed but elevated of pro-inflammatory cytokines) (Paranjpe et al., 2020; Potempa, Rajab, Hart, Bordon, & Fernandez-Botran, 2020; Yang et al., 2020), and decreased gut microbiota diversity (Dhar & Mohanty, 2020) compared to non-critically ill patients. Thus, contact with nature has the potential to mitigate severe COVID-19 prognosis and deaths.

1.2 A critical gap: The relationship between different types of greenspace and COVID-19 mortality rate.

Several studies have shown a significant association between greenness and COVID-19 mortality rates in the U.S. (Klompmaker et al., 2021; Lee et al., 2021; Russette et al., 2021; Spotswood et al., 2021). These studies define greenspace as the total area of vegetation within a boundary (e.g., Normalized Difference Vegetation Index and Leaf Area Index).They did not distinguish between open space, forest, grassland/herbaceous, and hay/pasture, nor did they

consider the impacts of greenspace proximity and recreational function provision on COVID-19 health outcomes. While previous evidence suggests different types of greenspace does not have same impacts on health outcomes (Akpinar, Barbosa-Leiker, and Brooks 2016; Ekkel & de Vries 2017; Kim & Miller 2019; Johnson et al. 2020; Ma et al. 2022). For instance, greenspace such as greenness and park had negative association with COVID-19 infection (Russette et al. 2021; Spotswood et al. 2021; Wang et al. 2021; Johnson et al. 2020), but park mobility and green space with better accessibility were positively associated with COVID-19 transmission (Pan, Bardhan, and Jin 2021; DePhillipo et al., 2021). We still do not know whether and to what extent different types of greenspace can influence the COVID-19 mortality rates.

Second, existing studies estimate the amount of greenness in a county but ignore the spatial distribution of greenspace in relation to population (Klompmaker et al., 2021; Russette et al., 2021). Despite being widely used and effective, the accuracy of 'greenness' metric can be greatly improved by considering spatial relations between location of greenspace and population distribution (Ben et al., 2019). Further, one study used deciles of 'greenness' to assess the dose-response association (Russette et al., 2021). Though, the dose-response associations for different types of greenspace within various buffer distances are unclear. Many previous studies suggested that distance matters for greenspace's impact on health outcomes, and health effect might drop after a threshold distance (Coombes, Jones, and Hillsdon 2010; Grahn and Stigsdotter 2003; Nielsen and Hansen 2007). Still, we do not know whether the association of nearby greenspace on mortality risk is significantly stronger than distant ones. We do not know which distances are optimal. Without addressing these critical gaps, policymakers and urban planners are unable to develop evidence-based urban greening solutions and policy to promote public health for current and future pandemics.

1.3 Research questions

In this study, we investigated the associations among the ratio of six types of greenspace, population-weighted exposure to six types of greenspace at different buffer distances, and full-year COVID-19 mortality rates after controlling for potential confounding covariates. We seek to answer the following three questions: 1) What are the associations between the ratio of six types of greenspace and COVID-19 mortality rates after controlling for confounding variables? 2) What are the associations between population-weighted exposure to six types of greenspace and COVID-19 mortality rates within various buffer distances after controlling for confounding variables? (3) Which exposure distances of the significant types of greenspace have the strongest association with COVID-19 mortality rates?

2. Methods

We combined COVID-19 mortality data, sociodemographic characteristics, healthcare and testing data, pre-existing chronic disease data, policy and regulation data, behavior data, and environmental factors from diverse sources for 3,025 counties. The greenspace exposures were calculated in GEE. We first used a negative binomial generalized linear mixed effects model to evaluate the association between the ratio of six types of greenspace and COVID-19 mortality rates in the U.S. from January 22 to December 31, 2020, adjusted for socioeconomic, demographic, pre-existing chronic disease, policy and regulation, behavioral, and environmental factors. Then, we examined the associations between the population-weighted exposure to greenspace at varying distances within 4km and COVID-19 mortality rates, adjusted for confounders.

2.1 Data

2.1.1 COVID-19 mortality data

COVID-19 mortality data are publicly available at the US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) and State government websites (Kolak et al., 2021). We define the COVID-19

mortality rates as the cumulative number of COVID-19 deaths per 100,000 people for each of 3,025 counties from January 22, 2020 to December 31, 2020 (Fig. 1). We limit our research period at the end of 2020 to avoid the possible confounding effect from large-scale vaccination, which will have significantly impact on mortality rates (see Supplementary Table 1 for descriptive COVID-19 mortality data).



Fig. 1 | County-level COVID-19 deaths per 100,000 population in the United States (from Jan 18 to Dec 30, 2020).

2.1.2 Greenspace exposure data

We assessed greenspace exposure using two metrics. First, we quantified the ratios of six types of greenspaces within a county, which measures the area of each greenspace over the county area. The ratio of *forest inside park*, *forest outside park*, grassland/herbaceous, hay/pasture, *open space inside park*, and *open space outside park* were calculated use the National Land Cover Database 2016 (NLCD, 2016) (Fig. 2). We distinguished open space and forest within park from open

space and forest outside park use the boundary derived from the USA parks from Esri (Esri, 2021).



Fig. 2 | Ratio of greenspace at the county level in the United States. (**A**) forest inside park (**B**) forest outside park; (**C**) hay/pasture; (**D**) grassland/herbaceous; (**E**) developed open space inside park; (**F**) developed open space outside park.

Second, we quantified the population-weighted exposure to greenspaces within different distances from human settlements using two datasets: the National Land Cover Datasets in 2016 (Yang et al., 2018) and the 2020 WorldPop Global Project Population Data (Sorichetta et al., 2015). The 30-meter resolution NLCD 2016 Landsat imagery was re-projected to match the 100-

meter spatial resolution of WorldPop Dataset. We estimated population-weighted greenspace exposures within 4km in GEE (Gorelick et al., 2017), because past studies suggest few walking activities occur beyond 4km (Yang & Diez-Roux, 2012). These measures considered population spatial distributions and gave proportionally greater weight to greenspace near areas of higher population density, which previous studies fail to address (Chen et al., 2018). Considering population distribution in greenspace exposure measurement can reduce bias caused by a mismatch between population and greenspaces within an area. The buffer interval is set as 200m within 2km and 500m between 2km to 4m. The population-weighted exposure to greenspaces with varying buffer sizes in each county is defined by Equation 1 (Chen et al., 2018),

$$FE = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N} P_i \times F_i^b}{\sum_{i=1}^{N} P_i} \text{ (Equation 1)}$$

where P_i represents the population of the ith grid, F_i^b represents the land cover of the ith grid at a buffer size of b meters, N denotes the total number of grids for a given county, and FE is the estimated greenspace exposure level for the given county (see Supplementary Table 2 for descriptive greenspace exposure data).

2.1.3. Predictors of COVID-19 mortality

We considered a number of predictors of COVID-19 mortality as potential covariates in analyses. Many studies have found sociodemographic, chronic disease, behavioral, healthcare, and environmental factors linked to COVID-19 mortality. The county-level sociodemographic, healthcare, and testing data from the US Census Bureau (US Census Bureau, 2019) and US COVID Atlas of the Center for Spatial Data Science (Kolak et al., 2021). These variables included population density, the ratio of female household, non-Hispanic black, white, and Hispanic, the proportion of residents older than 65, median household income, Gini index, poverty rate, median housing value, unemployment rate, Gini index, the ratio of residents without a high school diploma

and without a college degree, percent without health insurance coverage, and COVID-19 testing rates.

The pre-existing chronic diseases were shown to affect COVID-19 mortality risk, included rates of hypertension, heart failure, stroke mortality, diabetes, and obesity (CDC, 2021; Prevention., 2022). The policy and regulation factors included stay-at-home order intensity, public mask mandates, and bar and restaurant closing and reopening orders (Chernozhukov et al., 2021; VoPham et al., 2020). The behavior risk factors included the proportion of current smokers and the proportion of essential workers, the proportion of workers who commuted to work by public transportation, walking, and private cars, and the proportion of leisure-time physical inactivity, median max-distance traveled, and foot traffic to different out-of-home activities. The environmental risk factors included particulate matter (e.g., $PM_{2.5}$ and PM_{10}), temperature, relative humidity, precipitation, wind speed, and transportation density. All descriptive statistics of covariates and data sources are available in Supplementary Table 1.

2.2 Statistical analysis

We used a negative binomial generalized linear mixed effects model to evaluate the associations between the ratios of six types of greenspace and COVID-19 mortality rates, and state was used in analyses as a random effect to account for state-level variability and non-independence in our data. The analyses were adjusted for a range of covariates. We applied restricted maximum likelihood (REML) with a negative binomial link function. The negative binomial mixed effect model and state as random effect accounts for our over-dispersed count data and partially accounts for the presence of spatial autocorrelation. The variance inflation factor (VIF) test was used to identify multi-collinearity between the independent variables. Variables with a VIF ≥ 4 were excluded from our models (O'Brien, 2007).

To identify the optimal exposure distance for significant greenspaces, we used a negative binomial generalized linear mixed effects model to evaluate associations between population-weighted exposures to six types of greenspace with COVID-19 mortality rates. The analyses use the same sets of covariates as previous analysis and state was used as random effect. All explanatory variables were centered and scaled.

We used Moran's I test to assess spatial autocorrelation of COVID-19 mortality residuals. We confirmed the presence of spatial autocorrelation with Moran's I=0.21, $p < 0.0001$. The Moran's I value equal to 0 indicates a lack of spatial autocorrelation, and positive values indicate clustering of similar values. The analyses were performed in R v.4.1.2 (Team, 2015), and Moran' I test was performed using the package 'spdep' (Bivand & Wong, 2018). The negative binomial mixed effects models were performed using the package lme4 (Bates, Mächler, Bolker, & Walker, 2014).

2.3 Model validation

The negative binomial generalized linear mixed effects model provides an appropriate error structure for the overdispersed COVID-19 mortality count data. Due to the presence of spatial autocorrelation (Moran's I=0.21, $p < 0.0001$), we built additional spatial autoregressive models (SAR) to validate the results of the negative binomial mixed effects model. The queen's criteria were used to build the neighbors matrix. We used the Akaike information criterion (AIC) value to compare the spatial error model, spatial lag model, and spatial Durbin model. The spatial error model has the lowest AIC values, which suggests that spatial dependence occurs in the error term. The model validation confirms the negative associations between *forest inside park*, *forest outside park*, pasture, and COVID-19 mortality rates (See results of SAR models in Supplementary Table 5). Given the structure of our data, model coefficients and the magnitude

of effects, we chose to interpret our result using the negative binomial generalized linear mixed effects model.

3. Results

3.1 Associations among ratio of six types of greenspaces and COVID-19 mortality rates.

We found *forest inside park* and *forest outside park* are significantly negatively associated with COVID-19 mortality rates ($p < 0.0001$); *open space outside park* is significantly positively associated with COVID-19 mortality rates ($p < 0.01$); grassland/herbaceous, hay/pasture and *open space inside park* are not significantly associated with COVID-19 mortality rates, after controlling for all covariates (Fig. 3). Among the six types of greenspace, *forest outside park* has the greatest effect size (β = -0.097), which is slightly larger than that of *forest inside park* (β = -0.082). We found 1 unit of increase in *forest outside park* is associated with a 9.2% decrease in COVID-19 mortality rates (MRR 95% CI: 6.3 - 12.1%), whereas 1 unit of increase in *forest inside park* is associated with a 7.8% decrease (MRR 95% CI: 4.3 - 11.2%). In contrast, 1 unit of increase in *developed open space outside park* is associated with a 5.8% increase in COVID-19 mortality rates (MRR 95% CI: 2.3 - 9.5%) (Table 1).



Fig. 3 | Exposure to forest is associated with lower COVID-19 mortality rates adjusted for covariates. Coefficient values represent effect sizes for the associations between mortality rates of COVID-19 (cases per 100,000 people) and ratio of grassland/herbaceous, hay/pasture, *open space in park*, *open space outside park*, *forest inside park*, *forest outside park*, and all covariates. Coefficient values are represented as dots, bars represent 95% CI, and significant variables are shown in color: grey = $p \geq 0.01$; yellow = $p < 0.01$; red = $p < 0.0001$.

Table 1| Mortality rate ratios (MRR), 95% confidence intervals (CI) of all variables in the model for COVID-19 mortality rates.

Variables		MRR (95% CI)
Socioeconomic and demographic factors	Population density	1.073 (1.041, 1.105)
	Black non-Hispanic	1.057 (1.021, 1.095)
	Population aged 65+	1.162 (1.129, 1.196)
	Gini Index	1.019 (0.993, 1.045)
	Median home value	0.878 (0.842, 0.915)
	Unemployment rate	0.970 (0.941, 1.000)
	Population without high school diploma	1.139 (1.095, 1.185)
Healthcare and testing factors	Population without insurance	0.973 (0.920, 1.029)
	Testing rate	1.092 (1.060, 1.126)
Pre-existing chronic disease factors	Diabetes rate	1.018 (0.993, 1.045)
	Obesity rate	0.988 (0.961, 1.015)
	Stroke mortality	1.033 (1.004, 1.062)
	Hypertension mortality	1.013 (0.986, 1.040)
	Heart disease mortality	1.024 (0.996, 1.052)
Behavioral factors	Smoker	0.993 (0.951, 1.037)
	Essential worker	1.031 (0.996, 1.067)
	POI visits	1.022 (0.997, 1.047)
	Commute to work by walking or bicycle	0.987 (0.962, 1.014)
	Leisure time physical inactivity	1.042 (1.011, 1.074)
	Mobility	0.981 (0.962,1.000)
	Mobility 50index	0.988 (0.966, 1.011)
Policy and regulation factors	Stay-at-home orders	1.027 (0.987, 1.068)
	Public mask mandates	0.950 (0.831, 1.085)
	Bar	1.097 (0.956, 1.258)
	Restaurant	0.95 (0.808, 1.118)
Environmental factors	Crowded Housing	1.073 (1.042, 1.105)
	Proximity to highway	1.013 (0.990, 1.038)
	Airport density	0.968 (0.947, 0.989)
	Railway density	0.964 (0.938, 0.990)
	Highway and secondary road density	1.001 (0.964, 1.038)
	$PM_{2.5}$	1.015 (0.978, 1.052)
	PM_{10}	0.968 (0.924, 1.014)
	NO_2	1.012 (0.976, 1.050)
	Maximum temperature	0.975 (0.915, 1.038)
	Humidity	0.886 (0.842, 0.933)
	Wind speed	1.010 (0.980, 1.042)

Green space factors	Grassland / Herbaceous	1.016 (0.986, 1.046)
	Hay / Pasture	0.970(0.945, 0.995)
	Open space in park	1.024 (0.988, 1.060)
	Open space outside park	1.058 (1.023, 1.095)
	Forest in park	0.922 (0.888, 0.957)
	Forest outside park	0.908 (0.879, 0.937)

3.2 Associations of population-weighted exposures to greenspace with COVID-19 mortality rates at various buffer distances.

We also found population-weighted exposure to *forest inside park*, *forest outside park* and pasture are significantly and negatively associated with COVID-19 mortality rates. Population-weighted exposure to *forest inside park* is significantly and negatively associated with mortality rates between 100 to 400m and 1,800m to 4km, and the distance for largest effect size is 4km (β = -0.050). The effect size increases as buffer distance gets larger, though the increase remains limited (400m β= -0.048 vs 4km β = -0.050, 4% of increase) (Fig. 4). With 1 unit of increase in *forest exposure in park* at 4km, there is a 4.9% decrease in COVID-19 mortality rates (MRR 95% CI: 2.7-7.0%) (Table 2).

The population-weighted to *forest outside park* is consistently and significantly negatively associated with COVID-19 mortality rates across all buffer distances, and the greatest reduction occurs at 1km (β = -0.104). The effect size increases as the buffer increases from 100m to 1km and decrease beyond 1km (Fig. 5). We found a 9.9% decrease in COVID-19 mortality rates per unit increase in *forest exposure outside park* at 1km (MRR 95% CI: 6.9–12.8%) (Table 2).

The population-weighted exposure to *pasture* is significantly negatively associated with mortality rates from 2,500m to 4km with increasing effect size, and reaches optimal effect at 4km (β = -0.036). With 1 unit of increase in pasture exposure at 4km, the associated mortality rates decrease by 3.5% (MRR 95% CI: 5.9 - 10.0%) (Table 2).



Fig. 4 | The effect size of population-weighted exposure to *forest inside park* within 4km on COVID-19 mortality rates. Coefficient values represent effect sizes from a negative binomial mixed effects model for the relationship between mortality of COVID-19 mortality rates (death count per 100,000 people) and population-weighted exposure to *forest inside park*. Coefficient values are represented as dots, grey = $p > 0.05$; red = $p < 0.0001$.



Fig. 5 | The effect size of population weighted exposure to *forest outside park* within 4km on COVID-19 mortality rates. Coefficient values represent effect sizes from a negative binomial mixed effects model for the relationship between mortality of COVID-19 mortality rates (death count per 100,000 people) and population-weighted exposure to *forest outside park*. Coefficient values are represented as dots, red = $p < 0.0001$.

Table 2 | Mortality Rate Ratio in models of population-weighted exposure to greenspaces with COVID-19 mortality rates at optimal distances.

Variables	**COVID-19 MRR (95% CI)**
Forest inside park 400m	0.953 (0.931, 0.976)
Forest inside park 4km	0.951 (0.930, 0.973)
Forest outside park 1km	0.901 (0.872, 0.931)
Hay/pasture 4km	0.965 (0.941, 0.990)

298 **4. Discussion**

299 We found exposure to forest and pasture to be negatively associated with COVID-19 mortality
300 rates, while exposure to developed open space has mixed association with mortality rates.
301 Exposure to *forest outside park* has the largest effect size on reduced COVID-19 mortality rates
302 across all buffer distances, followed by *forest inside park*. Further, the effect size of exposure to
303 *forest outside park* increases until the distance reaches 1km, then declines beyond 1km. The effect
304 size of population-weighted exposure to *forest inside park* increase with larger buffer size and is
305 greatest at 4km, though similar to that at 400m.

306 While this cross-sectional study cannot infer any causal relationships, previous findings suggest
307 multiple mechanisms that might explain the observed associations. We proposed a framework of
308 potential mechanisms that may contribute to the observed associations. We consider why exposure
309 to *forest outside park* may have a larger effect size than *forest inside park*. We provide
310 explanations for optimal exposure buffer size for significant greenspace types. Last, we discuss
311 the contributions of our findings and identify questions for future research.

312 **4.1. Potential mechanisms for observed associations.**

313 ***4.1.1 How might forest and pasture alleviate COVID-19 mortality risk?***

314 We found that forest and pasture exposure were significantly and negatively associated with
315 COVID-19 mortality rates in the US, after control for all covariates. This finding aligns with
316 previous studies (Klompmaker et al., 2021; Lee et al., 2021; Russette et al., 2021; Spotswood et
317 al., 2021). Greenspace may lower COVID-19 mortality risk if it boosts biological processes that
318 fight against the prognosis of COVID-19 (Andersen et al., 2021; Roslund et al., 2020; Roviello et
319 al., 2021), making affected patients less vulnerable to death (Roviello & Roviello, 2021). We
320 suggest that contact with greenspace may reduce mortality rates through increased biogenic

321 volatile organic compound (VOC) exposure, increased environmental microbiota exposure,
322 reduced psychological stress and air pollution, and increased physical activity (Fig. 6).



323

324 **Fig. 6 | The proposed theoretical model for negative associations between greenspace exposure and COVID-19**
325 **mortality rates.**

326 **Exposure to the forest environment increases exposure to biogenic volatile organic**
327 **compounds (VOCs).** Forests are abundant with phytoncides (e.g., terpenes, limonene and pinene),
328 a group of biogenic VOCs given off by forest trees that have been found to enhance immune
329 capacity and reduce inflammation (Andersen, Corazon, & Stigsdotter, 2021; Cho et al., 2017;
330 Huang et al., 2020; Kim, Song, Cho, & Lee, 2020). Studies suggest forest bathing increases natural
331 killer (NK) cell counts and activity, and the effect can last for more than a month (Li, 2010; Li et
332 al., 2008; Li et al., 2007; Tsao et al., 2018). NK cells activate receptors to recognize virus-infected
333 cells and trigger cytotoxicity (phagocytosis or apoptosis) (Market et al., 2020; Yokoyama, 2005).
334 A recent study found COVID-19 mortality rates are lower in areas with high ratios of hectares of
335 Mediterranean forest per capita, where biogenic VOCs are abundant (Roviello & Roviello, 2021).
336 In addition, studies have shown that nearby greenspaces are associated with a lower level of a
337 biomarker of inflammation - high sensitivity C-reactive protein (Del Valle et al., 2020; Mandel,

338 Harari, Gurevich, & Achiron, 2020; Ribeiro et al., 2019). Forests can increase exposure to VOCs
339 that might boost the NK defenses, compensate for reduced NK cell counts, and modulate excess
340 inflammatory responses in severely affected patients (Market et al., 2020; Osman et al., 2020);

341 **Exposure to forest and pasture can diversify gut microbiota profile.** Though our gut
342 microbial composition is shaped by the interplay of multiple factors, such as diet and genetics
343 (Dhar & Mohanty, 2020), many studies have found microbiome from surrounding green
344 environments can transfer to humans (Grönroos et al., 2019; Parajuli et al., 2018; Parajuli et al.,
345 2020). A 28-day intervention study in Finland found that daily contact with backyard forest and
346 grass areas within 500m can diversify children's gut microbiota profile and enhance immune
347 capacity (e.g., increases in plasma TGF-β1 levels and the proportion of regulatory T cells)
348 (Roslund et al., 2020). If exposed to greenspaces, the disturbed gut microbe condition and immune
349 function may improve for COVID-19 patients (Claesson et al., 2012; Donati Zeppa, Agostini,
350 Piccoli, Stocchi, & Sestili, 2020; Roslund et al., 2020; Yeoh et al., 2021; Zuo et al., 2020).

351 **Greenspaces can decrease patients' exposure to air pollutants**. Many studies have noted an
352 inverse association between air pollution and COVID-19 mortality rates (Jaafari, Shabani,
353 Moeinaddini, Danehkar, & Sakieh, 2020; Martelletti & Martelletti, 2020; Shen & Lung, 2017).
354 Chronic exposure to air pollutants was associated with delays in recovery of COVID-19 patients
355 and led to more fatal conditions (Domingo & Rovira, 2020). This may be attributed to modified
356 host respiratory immune responses, perturbed anti-microbial responses, and triggered
357 inflammatory cytokine release from air pollution exposure (Bauer, Diaz-Sanchez, & Jaspers, 2012;
358 Ciencewicki & Jaspers, 2007; Glencross, Ho, Camiña, Hawrylowicz, & Pfeffer, 2020). Forests can
359 reduce air pollutants by intercepting particulate matter on plant surfaces and absorbing gaseous
360 pollutants (Nowak, Hirabayashi, Bodine, & Greenfield, 2014; Nowak, Hirabayashi, Doyle,

361 McGovern, & Pasher, 2018). Trees and forests in the U.S. remove an estimated 17.4 million tonnes
362 (t) of air pollution annually (Nowak et al., 2014). It is thus reasonable to speculate that forests can
363 reduce COVID-19 mortality rates by removing air pollutants.

364 **Forests can reduce patients' psychological stress.** Patients infected with COVID-19 show a
365 high prevalence of mental problems (Kong et al., 2020; Wang et al., 2021). Mental stress has been
366 linked to dysregulation of the immune system and increased pro-inflammatory cytokines (Gouin
367 et al., 2012; Morey, Boggero et al., 2015; Steptoe et al, 2007). Patients with increased contact with
368 nature or nature views from home during the pandemic were found to have decreased depression
369 and anxiety (Soga et al., 2021). Previous theoretical and empirical studies support nature's stress-
370 reducing effect (Gidlow et al., 2016; Jiang et al., 2014; Lee et al., 2011; Mancus et al., 2020; Ulrich
371 et al., 1991). It is possible that patients can have strengthened immune function and healthier
372 inflammation level benefit from the stress-reduction effect of contact with forest.

373 **Green space can promote physical activities (PA) during the pandemic.** Since the COVID-
374 19 outbreak, people have escaped to nature. Recreational activities, such as walking or cycling in
375 parks and trails, have spiked globally during the pandemic (Geng et al., 2021; Lu et al., 2021;
376 Venter et al., 2020; Venter et al, 2021). Physical activity can boost COVID-19 patients' immune
377 response, modulate inflammation levels, and lower the risk of obesity. Exercise increases NK & T
378 cells, enhances recirculation, and increases lymphocyte concentration and cytotoxic activity
379 (Amatriain-Fernández et al., 2020; Fernandez et al., 2018; Nieman & Wentz, 2019). People who
380 exercise in forested areas can benefit from the synergistic effect from physical activity and
381 exposure to forest (Pretty et al, 2005). Moreover, physical activity has a direct anti-inflammatory
382 effect and can dampen systemic inflammation (Biddle et al., 2019; DeSantis et al., 2012; Nieman
383 & Wentz, 2019). Exercise lowers the risk of obesity, a risk factor for COVID-19. Obesity is the

384 precursor of a range of chronic diseases that have been found to increase COVID-19 mortality
385 (Bastien et al., 2014; Calle & Thun, 2004; Chan et al., 1994; Hussain et al., 2020; Klang et al.,
386 2020; Krauss et al., 1998). Thus, the benefits of greenspace on reduced obesity through physical
387 activity may contribute to the negative association between greenspace and COVID-19 mortality
388 rates (Coombes et al., 2010; De la Fuente et al., 2021; Ghimire et al., 2017; Jia et al., 2020).

389 ***4.1.2 How might open space exacerbates COVID-19 mortality risk?***

390 We found the ratio of *open space outside park* is significantly and positively associated with
391 COVID-19 mortality rates. This finding contradicts previous studies that have reported health
392 benefits from exposure to open spaces. Our results suggest that exposure to open space may not
393 be effective or may even be detrimental to COVID-19 mortality rate. Open space in our study is
394 defined as "large-lot single-family housing units or vegetation planted in developed settings"
395 (NLCD, 2016). On one hand, open space can provide health benefits by promoting physical
396 activity, social interaction, and reduced air pollutants (Lu, Chen, et al., 2021), though the effect
397 may not be as strong as it is for forests (Reid, Clougherty, Shmool, & Kubzansky, 2017). On the
398 other hand, the lower supply of open space per capita in urban areas makes it hard to comply with
399 safe social distancing in non-park open spaces (e.g., streets and backyards), and may exacerbate
400 mortality risk. Though outdoor transmission of COVID-19 is rare (Bulfone et al. 2021), people
401 who participate in outdoor social activities such as talking or partying were at higher risk of
402 spreading the disease (Domènech-Montoliu et al. 2021; Peng et al. 2022). Presumably, the higher
403 infection risk might lead to higher COVID-19 mortality rates. More evidence is needed to
404 understand the mechanisms of the mixed effects of open space on COVID-19 mortality rates.

405 ***4.1.3 Why might forest outside park have a stronger effect than forest inside park?***

We found *forest outside park* to have a larger effect size than *forest inside park* on COVID-19 mortality rates after accounting for other covariates. This finding aligns with previous studies of stronger health-promoting effect outside park areas (Reid et al., 2017; Allard-Poesi et al., 2022). The difference in forest exposure inside and outside park may explain the stronger effect of *forest outside park*. The US population has a ten times greater opportunity to be exposed to *forest inside park* than *forest outside park* within walking distance (Fig. 7). Second, social activities in parks might increase risk of close contact and inhale droplets from infected people (DePhillipo et al., 2021; Praharaj & Han, 2021), thus increase infection risk. Thus, it is reasonable to argue that the increased infection risk caused by the social interactions in parks may offset the other health benefits of *forests inside park* on mortality. Further, the health effect of *forest inside park* may be weakened in part due to shutdown policies in some states, which closed parks due to COVID-19 spread risk (Volenec et al., 2021; Smith et al., 2021).

4.1.4 Optimal exposure buffer distance: what and why?

We found the effect of population-weighted exposure to *forest outside park* increases with a larger buffer distance and reaches an optimal effect at 1km. This suggests that exposure to nearby *forest outside park* within 1km is more effective than exposure to forests that are at a greater walking distance. This may be because nearby forests are visited more often than forests located further away. Studies suggest that the frequency of visits to greenspaces declines as distance increases (Coombes et al., 2010). A distance of 1,120 m (0.7 miles) is the mean walking distance in the U.S. (Yang & Diez-Roux, 2012).

We also found the effect size of *forest inside park* is optimal at 4km, though the effect size is close to that at 400m (2% increase). This suggests the effect of *forest inside park* is less sensitive to buffer size within walking distance. Studies suggest people walk much longer for recreation

purposes as opposed to other purposes (Yang & Diez-Roux, 2012). Considering the effect size and previous literature on walking behaviors, we suggest the optimal exposure buffer distance for *forest outside park* to be 1km and the optimal exposure buffer distance for *forest inside park* to be 400m.



Fig. 7 | Mean population-weighted exposure to *forest inside park* and *forest outside park* within 4km. The bar represents the average population-weighted forest exposure at county level within each buffer distance.

4.2 Contributions and implications

To our knowledge, this is the first nationwide study distinguish the impact of different types of greenspace on COVID-19 mortality rates in the U.S. In this study, the greenspace exposure measure integrated the dynamics of population distribution and geographic location of greenspaces into exposure assessment, providing a more precise and reasonable exposure estimates. The dose-response associations between different types of green spaces at various buffer distances and

444 COVID-19 mortality rates were examined, allowing us to identify an optimal effect distance,
445 which was previously lacking in the literature.

446 Evidence from this study suggests that planners and policymakers should prioritize the supply
447 of nearby forests. Specifically, we recommend ensuring that forests outside parks be located within
448 1000m from residents, and forests inside parks be located within 400m from residents. These
449 forested areas will be especially beneficial in highly urbanized, low-SES, and minority-dominated
450 areas where COVID-19 mortality rates are disproportionally high (Lu et al., 2021). Many
451 greenspaces were temporarily closed during the pandemic to reduce the spread of disease (Ugolini
452 et al., 2020). The findings in this study advocate for keeping nearby greenspace open, especially
453 forested areas. Cities with accessible forested areas can promote health and resilience during the
454 current and future pandemics.

455 **4.3 Limitations and future research opportunities**

456 This study has several limitations, which pose opportunities for future research. This is an
457 ecological study using aggregated data at the county level. It is subjected to ecological fallacy.
458 Future studies can use individual level data or experimental studies to confirm the causal relations
459 and the potential underlying mechanisms (Jiang et al., 2021).

460 Second, the unit of analysis is the county due to the availability of COVID-19 mortality data
461 and other confounding variable. Though county data are widely used in nationwide studies, future
462 studies should use finer-grained data (i.e., census tract level data). Different scales of analyses may
463 reveal different associations between neighborhood greenspace and health outcomes (Richardson
464 et al., 2012).

Third, our research investigated associations using data from 2020, but the situation has continued to evolve with the emergence of vaccines and COVID-19 variants (e.g., Delta and Omicron). Future studies should consider the new situations accordingly.

5. Conclusion

Our findings suggest that during 2020, exposure to more green spaces, especially forests, was significantly associated with a lower level of COVID-19 mortality rates, while exposure to more *developed open space* has insignificant or positive associations with the COVID-19 mortality rates. *Forest outside park* is more beneficial than *forest inside park,* with the optimal buffer distance being 1km for *forest outside park*, and within 400m for *forest inside park*. These findings imply that policymakers and planners should prioritize urban greening within optimal distances of residential clusters and keep beneficial greenspaces accessible for COVID-19 and future pandemics.

Acknowledgements

We thank to Long Chen, Xueming Liu, and Xueying Wu for data collection; Bin Chen for methodological help; and Linda Larsen for proof reading the article.

Funding

This work was supported by the University Grants Committee [grant numbers 102010054.088616.01100.302.01] and the Research Grants Council of the Hong Kong SAR [grant number CityU11207520].

References

1. Ahmad, F. B., Cisewski, J. A., Miniño, A., & Anderson, R. N. (2021). Provisional mortality data—united states, 2020. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report,* 70 (14), 519.
2. Akpinar, Abdullah, Celestina Barbosa-Leiker, and Kerry R Brooks. 2016. "Does green space matter? Exploring relationships between green space type and health indicators." *Urban Forestry & Urban Greening* 20: 407-418.
3. Ali, N., & Islam, F. (2020). The Effects of Air Pollution on COVID-19 Infection and Mortality-A Review on Recent Evidence. *Frontiers in public health,* 8, 580057-580057.
4. Allard-Poesi, F., Matos, L. B. S., & Massu, J. (2022). Not all types of nature have an equal effect on urban residents' well-being: A structural equation model approach. *Health & place*, 74, 102759.
5. Amatriain-Fernández, S., Gronwald, T., Murillo-Rodríguez, E., Imperatori, C., Solano, A. F., Latini, A., & Budde, H. (2020). Physical exercise potentials against viral diseases like COVID-19 in the elderly. *Frontiers in medicine, 7*, 379.
6. Andersen, L., Corazon, S. S. S., & Stigsdotter, U. K. K. (2021). Nature exposure and its effects on immune system functioning: a systematic review. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 18*(4), 1416.
7. Andrasfay, T., & Goldman, N. (2021). Reductions in 2020 US life expectancy due to COVID-19 and the disproportionate impact on the Black and Latino populations. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 118*(5), e2014746118.
8. Bastien, M., Poirier, P., Lemieux, I., & Després, J.-P. (2014). Overview of epidemiology and contribution of obesity to cardiovascular disease. *Progress in cardiovascular diseases, 56*(4), 369-381.
9. Bates, D., Mächler, M., Bolker, B., & Walker, S. (2014). Fitting linear mixed-effects models using lme4. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1406.5823*.
10. Bauer, R. N., Diaz-Sanchez, D., & Jaspers, I. (2012). Effects of air pollutants on innate immunity: the role of Toll-like receptors and nucleotide-binding oligomerization domain-like receptors. *The Journal of allergy and clinical immunology, 129*(1), 14-26.
11. Ben, Y., Ma, F., Wang, H., Hassan, M. A., Yevheniia, R., Fan, W., . . . Dong, Z. (2019). A spatio-temporally weighted hybrid model to improve estimates of personal PM2. 5 exposure: Incorporating big data from multiple data sources. *Environmental pollution, 253*, 403-411.
12. Biddle, S. J., Ciaccioni, S., Thomas, G., & Vergeer, I. (2019). Physical activity and mental health in children and adolescents: An updated review of reviews and an analysis of causality. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise, 42*, 146-155.
13. Bivand, R. S., & Wong, D. W. (2018). Comparing implementations of global and local indicators of spatial association. *Test, 27*(3), 716-748.
14. Brandén, M., Aradhya, S., Kolk, M., Härkönen, J., Drefahl, S., Malmberg, B., . . . Mussino, E. (2020). Residential context and COVID-19 mortality among adults aged 70 years and older in Stockholm: a population-based, observational study using individual-level data. *The Lancet Healthy Longevity, 1*(2), e80-e88.
15. Bulfone, Tommaso Celeste, Mohsen Malekinejad, George W Rutherford, and Nooshin Razani. 2021. "Outdoor transmission of SARS-CoV-2 and other respiratory viruses: a systematic review." *The Journal of infectious diseases* 223 (4): 550-561.
16. Bureau, U. S. C. (2019). *Interactive Atlas of Heart Disease and Stroke*. Retrieved from https://nccd.cdc.gov/DHDSPAtlas/Default.aspx

17. Calle, E. E., & Thun, M. J. (2004). Obesity and cancer. *Oncogene, 23*(38), 6365-6378.
18. Castelli, V., Cimini, A., & Ferri, C. (2020). Cytokine storm in COVID-19:"when you come out of the storm, you won't be the same person who walked in". *Frontiers in Immunology, 11*.
19. CDC. (2021). Interactive Atlas of Heart Disease and Stroke. Retrieved from http://nccd.cdc.gov/DHDSPAtlas. http://nccd.cdc.gov/DHDSPAtlas.
20. Chan, J. M., Rimm, E. B., Colditz, G. A., Stampfer, M. J., & Willett, W. C. (1994). Obesity, fat distribution, and weight gain as risk factors for clinical diabetes in men. *Diabetes care, 17*(9), 961-969.
21. Chen, B., Song, Y., Jiang, T., Chen, Z., Huang, B., & Xu, B. (2018). Real-time estimation of population exposure to PM2. 5 using mobile-and station-based big data. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 15*(4), 573.
22. Chen, B., Song, Y., Kwan, M.-P., Huang, B., & Xu, B. (2018). How do people in different places experience different levels of air pollution? Using worldwide Chinese as a lens. *Environmental pollution, 238*, 874-883.
23. Chen, Simiao, Klaus Prettner, Michael Kuhn, and David E Bloom. 2021. "The economic burden of COVID-19 in the United States: Estimates and projections under an infection-based herd immunity approach." *The Journal of the Economics of Ageing* 20: 100328.
24. Chernozhukov, V., Kasahara, H., & Schrimpf, P. (2021). Causal impact of masks, policies, behavior on early covid-19 pandemic in the U.S. *Journal of Econometrics, 220*(1), 23-62.
25. Cho, K. S., Lim, Y.-r., Lee, K., Lee, J., Lee, J. H., & Lee, I.-S. (2017). Terpenes from forests and human health. *Toxicological research, 33*(2), 97-106.
26. Ciencewicki, J., & Jaspers, I. (2007). Air pollution and respiratory viral infection. *Inhalation toxicology, 19*(14), 1135-1146.
27. Claesson, M. J., Jeffery, I. B., Conde, S., Power, S. E., O'Connor, E. M., Cusack, S., . . . O'Toole, P. W. (2012). Gut microbiota composition correlates with diet and health in the elderly. *Nature, 488*(7410), 178-184.
28. Coombes, E., Jones, A. P., & Hillsdon, M. (2010). The relationship of physical activity and overweight to objectively measured green space accessibility and use. *Social Science & Medicine, 70*(6), 816-822.
29. Coombes, Emma, Andrew P. Jones, and Melvyn Hillsdon. 2010. "The relationship of physical activity and overweight to objectively measured green space accessibility and use." *Social Science & Medicine* 70 (6): 816-822.
30. Cutler, D. M., & Summers, L. H. (2020). The COVID-19 Pandemic and the $16 Trillion Virus. *JAMA, 324*(15), 1495-1496. doi:10.1001/jama.2020.19759
31. De la Fuente, F., Saldías, M. A., Cubillos, C., Mery, G., Carvajal, D., Bowen, M., & Bertoglia, M. P. (2021). Green space exposure association with type 2 diabetes mellitus, physical activity, and obesity: a systematic review. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 18*(1), 97.
32. Del Valle, D. M., Kim-Schulze, S., Huang, H.-H., Beckmann, N. D., Nirenberg, S., Wang, B., . . . Gnjatic, S. (2020). An inflammatory cytokine signature predicts COVID-19 severity and survival. *Nature Medicine, 26*(10), 1636-1643.
33. DePhillipo, N. N., Chahla, J., Busler, M., & LaPrade, R. F. (2021). Mobile phone gps data and prevalence of covid-19 infections: Quantifying parameters of social distancing in the us. *Archives of Bone and Joint Surgery*, *9*(2), 217.

34. DeSantis, A., DiezRoux, A., Hajat, A., Aiello, A., Golden, S., Jenny, N., . . . Shea, S. (2012). Associations of salivary cortisol levels with inflammatory markers: the Multi-Ethnic Study of Atherosclerosis. *Psychoneuroendocrinology, 37*(7), 1009-1018.
35. Dhar, D., & Mohanty, A. (2020). Gut microbiota and Covid-19- possible link and implications. *Virus Research, 285*, 198018.
36. Domènech-Montoliu, Salvador, Maria Rosario Pac-Sa, Paula Vidal-Utrillas, Marta Latorre-Poveda, Alba Del Rio-González, Sara Ferrando-Rubert, Gema Ferrer-Abad, Manuel Sánchez-Urbano, Laura Aparisi-Esteve, and Gema Badenes-Marques. 2021. "Mass gathering events and COVID-19 transmission in Borriana (Spain): A retrospective cohort study." *PloS one* 16 (8): e0256747.
37. Domingo, J. L., & Rovira, J. (2020). Effects of air pollutants on the transmission and severity of respiratory viral infections. *Environmental research, 187*, 109650.
38. Donati Zeppa, S., Agostini, D., Piccoli, G., Stocchi, V., & Sestili, P. (2020). Gut Microbiota Status in COVID-19: An Unrecognized Player? *Frontiers in Cellular and Infection Microbiology, 10*(742).
39. Donovan, G. H., Butry, D. T., Michael, Y. L., Prestemon, J. P., Liebhold, A. M., Gatziolis, D., & Mao, M. Y. (2013). The Relationship Between Trees and Human Health: Evidence from the Spread of the Emerald Ash Borer. *American journal of preventive medicine, 44*(2), 139-145.
40. Dyer, O. (2020). Covid-19: US testing ramps up as early response draws harsh criticism. In: British Medical Journal Publishing Group.
41. Ekkel, E. Dinand, and Sjerp de Vries. 2017. "Nearby green space and human health: Evaluating accessibility metrics." *Landscape and Urban Planning* 157: 214-220.
42. Esri. (2021). *USA Parks*. Retrieved from: https://www.arcgis.com/home/item.html?id=578968f975774d3fab79fe56c8c90941
43. Fernandez, D. M., Clemente, J. C., & Giannarelli, C. (2018). Physical Activity, Immune System, and the Microbiome in Cardiovascular Disease. *Frontiers in physiology, 9*(763).
44. Geng, D., Innes, J., Wu, W., & Wang, G. (2021). Impacts of COVID-19 pandemic on urban park visitation: a global analysis. *Journal of Forestry Research, 32*(2), 553-567.
45. Ghimire, R., Ferreira, S., Green, G. T., Poudyal, N. C., Cordell, H. K., & Thapa, J. R. (2017). Green space and adult obesity in the United States. *Ecological Economics, 136*, 201-212.
46. Gidlow, C. J., Randall, J., Gillman, J., Smith, G. R., & Jones, M. V. (2016). Natural environments and chronic stress measured by hair cortisol. *Landscape and Urban Planning, 148*, 61-67.
47. Girija, A., Shankar, E. M., & Larsson, M. (2020). Could SARS-CoV-2-induced hyperinflammation magnify the severity of coronavirus disease (CoViD-19) leading to acute respiratory distress syndrome? *Frontiers in Immunology, 11*, 1206.
48. Glencross, D. A., Ho, T.-R., Camiña, N., Hawrylowicz, C. M., & Pfeffer, P. E. (2020). Air pollution and its effects on the immune system. *Free Radical Biology and Medicine, 151*, 56-68.
49. Gorelick, N., Hancher, M., Dixon, M., Ilyushchenko, S., Thau, D., & Moore, R. (2017). Google Earth Engine: Planetary-scale geospatial analysis for everyone. *Remote sensing of Environment, 202*, 18-27.
50. Gouin, J.-P., Glaser, R., Malarkey, W. B., Beversdorf, D., & Kiecolt-Glaser, J. (2012). Chronic stress, daily stressors, and circulating inflammatory markers. *Health Psychology, 31*(2), 264.

51. Grahn, Patrik, and Ulrika A. Stigsdotter. 2003. "Landscape planning and stress." *Urban Forestry & Urban Greening* 2 (1): 1-18.
52. Grönroos, M., Parajuli, A., Laitinen, O. H., Roslund, M. I., Vari, H. K., Hyöty, H., . . . Sinkkonen, A. (2019). Short-term direct contact with soil and plant materials leads to an immediate increase in diversity of skin microbiota. *Microbiologyopen, 8*(3), e00645. doi:10.1002/mbo3.645
53. Halpern, N., & Tan, K. (2020). United states resource availability for COVID-19. Society of Critical Care Medicine. *Updated May, 12*.
54. Hu, M., Roberts, J. D., Azevedo, G. P., & Milner, D. (2021). The role of built and social environmental factors in Covid-19 transmission: A look at America's capital city. *Sustainable Cities and Society, 65*, 102580.
55. Huang, Q., Wu, X., Zheng, X., Luo, S., Xu, S., & Weng, J. (2020). Targeting inflammation and cytokine storm in COVID-19. *Pharmacological Research, 159*, 105051.
56. Hussain, A., Mahawar, K., Xia, Z., Yang, W., & El-Hasani, S. (2020). Obesity and mortality of COVID-19. Meta-analysis. *Obesity research & clinical practice, 14*(4), 295-300.
57. Jaafari, S., Shabani, A. A., Moeinaddini, M., Danehkar, A., & Sakieh, Y. (2020). Applying landscape metrics and structural equation modeling to predict the effect of urban green space on air pollution and respiratory mortality in Tehran. *Environmental Monitoring and Assessment, 192*(7), 412-412.
58. Jia, P., Cao, X., Yang, H., Dai, S., He, P., Huang, G., . . . Wang, Y. (2020). Green space access in the neighbourhood and childhood obesity. *Obesity Reviews*.
59. Jiang, B. (2014). Establishing dose-response curves for the impact of urban forests on recovery from acute stress and landscape preference. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.
60. Jiang, B., Chang, C.-Y., & Sullivan, W. C. (2014). A dose of nature: Tree cover, stress reduction, and gender differences. *Landscape and Urban Planning, 132*, 26-36.
61. Jiang, B., Shen, K., Sullivan, W. C., Yang, Y., Liu, X., & Lu, Y. (2021). A natural experiment reveals impacts of built environment on suicide rate: Developing an environmental theory of suicide. *Science of the total environment, 776*, 145750.
62. Jiang, B., Yang, Y., Chen, L., Liu, X., Wu, X., Chen, B., . . . Lu, Y. (2021). Green spaces, especially forest, linked to lower SARS-CoV-2 infection rates: A one-year nationwide study. *medRxiv*.
63. Johnson, Thomas F, Lisbeth A Hordley, Matthew P Greenwell, and Luke C Evans. 2020. "Effect of park use and landscape structure on COVID-19 transmission rates." *MedRxiv*: 2020.10. 20.20215731.
64. Kim, Gunwoo, and Patrick A Miller. 2019. "The impact of green infrastructure on human health and well-being: The example of the Huckleberry Trail and the Heritage Community Park and Natural Area in Blacksburg, Virginia." *Sustainable Cities and Society* 48: 101562.
65. Kim, T., Song, B., Cho, K. S., & Lee, I.-S. (2020). Therapeutic potential of volatile terpenes and terpenoids from forests for inflammatory diseases. *International journal of molecular sciences, 21*(6), 2187.
66. Klang, E., Kassim, G., Soffer, S., Freeman, R., Levin, M. A., & Reich, D. L. (2020). Severe obesity as an independent risk factor for COVID-19 mortality in hospitalized patients younger than 50. *Obesity, 28*(9), 1595-1599.

67. Klompmaker, J. O., Hart, J. E., Holland, I., Sabath, M. B., Wu, X., Laden, F., . . . James, P. (2021). County-level exposures to greenness and associations with COVID-19 incidence and mortality in the United States. *Environmental Research, 199*, 111331.
68. Kolak, M., Lin, Q., Halpern, D., Paykin, S., Martinez-Cardoso, A., & Li, X. (2021). The US Covid Atlas. Retrieved from https://www.uscovidatlas.org
69. Kong, X., Zheng, K., Tang, M., Kong, F., Zhou, J., Diao, L., . . . Dong, Y. (2020). Prevalence and factors associated with depression and anxiety of hospitalized patients with COVID-19. *medRxiv*.
70. Konstantinoudis, G., Padellini, T., Bennett, J., Davies, B., Ezzati, M., & Blangiardo, M. (2021). Long-term exposure to air-pollution and COVID-19 mortality in England: A hierarchical spatial analysis. *Environment international, 146*, 106316.
71. Krauss, R. M., Winston, M., Fletcher, B. J., & Grundy, S. M. (1998). Obesity: impact on cardiovascular disease. *Circulation, 98*(14), 1472-1476.
72. Kuo, M. (2015). How might contact with nature promote human health? Promising mechanisms and a possible central pathway. *Frontiers in psychology, 6*, 1093.
73. Lee, J., Park, B. J., Tsunetsugu, Y., Ohira, T., Kagawa, T., & Miyazaki, Y. (2011). Effect of forest bathing on physiological and psychological responses in young Japanese male subjects. *Public health, 125*(2), 93-100.
74. Lee, W., Kim, H., Choi, H. M., Heo, S., Fong, K. C., Yang, J., . . . Bell, M. L. (2021). Urban environments and COVID-19 in three Eastern states of the United States. *Science of the total environment, 779*, 146334.
75. Li, Q. (2010). Effect of forest bathing trips on human immune function. *Environmental health and preventive medicine, 15*(1), 9-17.
76. Li, Q., Morimoto, K., Kobayashi, M., Inagaki, H., Katsumata, M., Hirata, Y., . . . Miyazaki, Y. (2008). A forest bathing trip increases human natural killer activity and expression of anti-cancer proteins in female subjects. *J Biol Regul Homeost Agents, 22*(1), 45-55.
77. Li, Q., Morimoto, K., Nakadai, A., Inagaki, H., Katsumata, M., Shimizu, T., . . . Miyazaki, Y. (2007). Forest bathing enhances human natural killer activity and expression of anti-cancer proteins. *International journal of immunopathology and pharmacology, 20*, 3-8.
78. Liang, D., Shi, L., Zhao, J., Liu, P., Sarnat, J. A., Gao, S., . . . Chang, H. H. (2020). Urban Air Pollution May Enhance COVID-19 Case-Fatality and Mortality Rates in the United States. *The Innovation, 1*(3), 100047.
79. Lu, Y., Chen, L., Liu, X., Yang, Y., Sullivan, W. C., Xu, W., . . . Jiang, B. (2021). Green spaces mitigate racial disparity of health: A higher ratio of green spaces indicates a lower racial disparity in SARS-CoV-2 infection rates in the USA. *Environment international, 152*, 106465.
80. Lu, Y., Sarkar, C., & Xiao, Y. (2018). The effect of street-level greenery on walking behavior: Evidence from Hong Kong. *Social Science & Medicine, 208*, 41-49.
81. Lu, Y., Zhao, J., Wu, X., & Lo, S. M. (2021). Escaping to nature during a pandemic: A natural experiment in Asian cities during the COVID-19 pandemic with big social media data. *Science of the total environment, 777*, 146092.
82. Ma, Jianfang, Haihong Zhu, Peng Li, Chengcheng Liu, Feng Li, Zhenwei Luo, Meihui Zhang, and Lin Li. 2022. "Spatial Patterns of the Spread of COVID-19 in Singapore and the Influencing Factors." *ISPRS International Journal of Geo-Information* 11 (3): 152.

83. Ma, Y., Zhao, Y., Liu, J., He, X., Wang, B., Fu, S., . . . Luo, B. (2020). Effects of temperature variation and humidity on the death of COVID-19 in Wuhan, China. *Science of the total environment, 724*, 138226.
84. Mancus, G., Cimino, A. N., Hasan, M. Z., Campbell, J. C., Winch, P. J., Sharps, P., . . . Stockman, J. K. (2020). Residential Greenness Positively Associated with the Cortisol to DHEA Ratio among Urban-Dwelling African American Women at Risk for HIV. *Journal of Urban Health*, 1-9.
85. Mandel, M., Harari, G., Gurevich, M., & Achiron, A. (2020). Cytokine prediction of mortality in COVID19 patients. *Cytokine, 134*, 155190.
86. Market, M., Angka, L., Martel, A. B., Bastin, D., Olanubi, O., Tennakoon, G., . . . Auer, R. C. (2020). Flattening the COVID-19 Curve With Natural Killer Cell Based Immunotherapies. *Frontiers in Immunology, 11*(1512).
87. Martelletti, L., & Martelletti, P. (2020). Air Pollution and the Novel Covid-19 Disease: a Putative Disease Risk Factor. *SN comprehensive clinical medicine*, 1-5.
88. Medicine, J. H. U. (2021). COVID-19 United States Deaths by County. Retrieved from https://coronavirus.jhu.edu/us-map
89. Miller, I. F., Becker, A. D., Grenfell, B. T., & Metcalf, C. J. E. (2020). Disease and healthcare burden of COVID-19 in the United States. *Nature Medicine, 26*(8), 1212-1217.
90. Morey, J. N., Boggero, I. A., Scott, A. B., & Segerstrom, S. C. (2015). Current Directions in Stress and Human Immune Function. *Current opinion in psychology, 5*, 13-17.
91. Nielsen, Thomas Sick, and Karsten Bruun Hansen. 2007. "Do green areas affect health? Results from a Danish survey on the use of green areas and health indicators." *Health & Place* 13 (4): 839-850.
92. Nieman, D. C., & Wentz, L. M. (2019). The compelling link between physical activity and the body's defense system. *Journal of sport and health science, 8*(3), 201-217.
93. NLCD. (2016). National Land Cover Database Class Legend and Description Retrieved from https://www.mrlc.gov/data/legends/national-land-cover-database-class-legend-and-description
94. Nowak, D. J., Hirabayashi, S., Bodine, A., & Greenfield, E. (2014). Tree and forest effects on air quality and human health in the United States. *Environmental pollution, 193*, 119-129.
95. Nowak, D. J., Hirabayashi, S., Doyle, M., McGovern, M., & Pasher, J. (2018). Air pollution removal by urban forests in Canada and its effect on air quality and human health. *Urban Forestry & Urban Greening, 29*, 40-48.
96. Osman, M., Faridi, R. M., Sligl, W., Shabani-Rad, M.-T., Dharmani-Khan, P., Parker, A., . . . Cohen Tervaert, J. W. (2020). Impaired natural killer cell counts and cytolytic activity in patients with severe COVID-19. *Blood advances, 4*(20), 5035-5039.
97. Pan, Jiayu, Ronita Bardhan, and Ying Jin. 2021. "Spatial distributive effects of public green space and COVID-19 infection in London." *Urban Forestry & Urban Greening* 62: 127182.
98. Parajuli, A. (2019). The effect of living environment and environmental exposure on the composition of microbial community in soil, on human skin and in the gut.
99. Parajuli, A., Grönroos, M., Siter, N., Puhakka, R., Vari, H. K., Roslund, M. I., . . . Hyöty, H. (2018). Urbanization reduces transfer of diverse environmental microbiota indoors. *Frontiers in microbiology, 9*, 84.

100. Parajuli, A., Hui, N., Puhakka, R., Oikarinen, S., Grönroos, M., Selonen, V. A., . . . Vari, H. K. (2020). Yard vegetation is associated with gut microbiota composition. *Science of the total environment, 713*, 136707.
101. Paranjpe, I., Russak, A., De Freitas, J. K., Lala, A., Miotto, R., Vaid, A., . . . Meyer, D. (2020). Clinical characteristics of hospitalized Covid-19 patients in New York City. *medRxiv*.
102. Peng, Zhe, AL Pineda Rojas, E Kropff, W Bahnfleth, Giorgio Buonanno, SJ Dancer, Jarek Kurnitski, Yuguo Li, Marcel GLC Loomans, and Linsey C Marr. 2022. "Practical indicators for risk of airborne transmission in shared indoor environments and their application to covid-19 outbreaks." *Environmental science & technology*.
103. Perone, G. (2021). The determinants of COVID-19 case fatality rate (CFR) in the Italian regions and provinces: An analysis of environmental, demographic, and healthcare factors. *Science of the total environment, 755*, 142523.
104. Potempa, L. A., Rajab, I. M., Hart, P. C., Bordon, J., & Fernandez-Botran, R. (2020). Insights into the use of C-reactive protein as a diagnostic index of disease severity in COVID-19 infections. *The American journal of tropical medicine and hygiene, 103*(2), 561.
105. Pretty, J., Peacock, J., Sellens, M., & Griffin, M. (2005). The mental and physical health outcomes of green exercise. *International Journal of Environmental Health Research, 15*(5), 319-337.
106. Prevention., C. f. D. C. a. (2022). Interactive Atlas of Heart Disease and Stroke. Retrieved from http://nccd.cdc.gov/DHDSPAtlas.
107. Qin, C., Zhou, L., Hu, Z., Zhang, S., Yang, S., Tao, Y., . . . Tian, D. S. (2020). Dysregulation of Immune Response in Patients With Coronavirus 2019 (COVID-19) in Wuhan, China. *Clin Infect Dis, 71*(15), 762-768.
108. Qiu, Y., Zuo, S., Yu, Z., Zhan, Y., & Ren, Y. (2021). Discovering the effects of integrated green space air regulation on human health: A bibliometric and meta-analysis. *Ecological Indicators, 132*, 108292.
109. Reid, C. E., Clougherty, J. E., Shmool, J. L., & Kubzansky, L. D. (2017). Is all urban green space the same? A comparison of the health benefits of trees and grass in New York City. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 14*(11), 1411.
110. Ribeiro, A. I., Tavares, C., Guttentag, A., & Barros, H. (2019). Association between neighbourhood green space and biological markers in school-aged children. Findings from the Generation XXI birth cohort. *Environment international, 132*, 105070.
111. Richardson, E. A., Mitchell, R., Hartig, T., De Vries, S., Astell-Burt, T., & Frumkin, H. (2012). Green cities and health: a question of scale? *J Epidemiol Community Health, 66*(2), 160-165.
112. Roslund, M. I., Puhakka, R., Grönroos, M., Nurminen, N., Oikarinen, S., Gazali, A. M., . . . Vari, H. K. (2020). Biodiversity intervention enhances immune regulation and health-associated commensal microbiota among daycare children. *Science Advances, 6*(42), eaba2578.
113. Roviello, V., & Roviello, G. N. (2021). Less COVID-19 deaths in southern and insular Italy explained by forest bathing, Mediterranean environment, and antiviral plant volatile organic compounds. *Environmental Chemistry Letters*, 1-11.

114. Roviello, V., Gilhen-Baker, M., Vicidomini, C., & Roviello, G. N. (2021). Forest-bathing and physical activity as weapons against COVID-19: a review. *Environmental Chemistry Letters*, 1-10.
115. Russette, Helen, Jon Graham, Zachary Holden, Erin O Semmens, Elizabeth Williams, and Erin L Landguth. 2021. "Greenspace exposure and COVID-19 mortality in the United States: January–July 2020." *Environmental research* 198: 111195.
116. Shen, Y.-S., & Lung, S.-C. C. (2017). Mediation pathways and effects of green structures on respiratory mortality via reducing air pollution. *Scientific reports, 7*(1), 1-9.
117. Smith, M Kyle S, Izak PJ Smit, Louise K Swemmer, Mohlamatsane M Mokhatla, Stefanie Freitag, Dirk J Roux, and Luthando Dziba. 2021. "Sustainability of protected areas: Vulnerabilities and opportunities as revealed by COVID-19 in a national park management agency." *Biological Conservation* 255: 108985.
118. Soga, M., Evans, M. J., Tsuchiya, K., & Fukano, Y. (2021). A room with a green view: the importance of nearby nature for mental health during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Ecological Applications, 31*(2), e2248.
119. Sorichetta, A., Hornby, G. M., Stevens, F. R., Gaughan, A. E., Linard, C., & Tatem, A. J. (2015). High-resolution gridded population datasets for Latin America and the Caribbean in 2010, 2015, and 2020. *Scientific data, 2*(1), 1-12.
120. Spotswood, E. N., Benjamin, M., Stoneburner, L., Wheeler, M. M., Beller, E. E., Balk, D., . . . McDonald, R. I. (2021). Nature inequity and higher COVID-19 case rates in less-green neighbourhoods in the United States. *Nature Sustainability, 4*(12), 1092-1098.
121. Steptoe, A., Hamer, M., & Chida, Y. (2007). The effects of acute psychological stress on circulating inflammatory factors in humans: a review and meta-analysis. *Brain, behavior, and immunity, 21*(7), 901-912.
122. Team, R. C. (2015). R: A language and environment for statistical computing. Vienna, Austria; 2014. In.
123. Tsao, T.-M., Tsai, M.-J., Hwang, J.-S., Cheng, W.-F., Wu, C.-F., Chou, C.-C. K., & Su, T.-C. (2018). Health effects of a forest environment on natural killer cells in humans: an observational pilot study. *Oncotarget, 9*(23), 16501-16511.
124. Ugolini, F., Massetti, L., Calaza-Martínez, P., Cariñanos, P., Dobbs, C., Ostoic, S. K., . . . Šaulienė, I. (2020). Effects of the COVID-19 pandemic on the use and perceptions of urban green space: an international exploratory study. *Urban Forestry & Urban Greening*, 126888.
125. Ulrich, R. S., Simons, R. F., Losito, B. D., Fiorito, E., Miles, M. A., & Zelson, M. (1991). Stress recovery during exposure to natural and urban environments. *Journal of environmental psychology, 11*(3), 201-230.
126. Van Ingen, T., Brown, K. A., Buchan, S. A., Akingbola, S., Daneman, N., & Smith, B. T. (2021). Neighbourhood-level risk factors of COVID-19 incidence and mortality. *medRxiv*.
127. Venter, Z. S., Barton, D. N., Gundersen, V., Figari, H., & Nowell, M. S. (2021). Back to nature: Norwegians sustain increased recreational use of urban green space months after the COVID-19 outbreak. *Landscape and Urban Planning, 214*, 104175.
128. Venter, Z., Barton, D., Gundersen, V., Figari, H., & Nowell, M. (2020). Urban nature in a time of crisis: recreational use of green space increases during the COVID-19 outbreak in Oslo, Norway. *Environmental Research Letters*.

129. Viglione, G. (2020). How many people has the coronavirus killed? Retrieved from https://www.nature.com/articles/d41586-020-02497-w

130. Villeneuve, P. J., Jerrett, M., G. Su, J., Burnett, R. T., Chen, H., Wheeler, A. J., & Goldberg, M. S. (2012). A cohort study relating urban green space with mortality in Ontario, Canada. *Environmental Research, 115*, 51-58.

131. Volenec, Z. M., Abraham, J. O., Becker, A. D., & Dobson, A. P. (2021). Public parks and the pandemic: How park usage has been affected by COVID-19 policies. *PloS one, 16*(5), e0251799.

132. VoPham, T., Weaver, M. D., Hart, J. E., Ton, M., White, E., & Newcomb, P. A. (2020). Effect of social distancing on COVID-19 incidence and mortality in the US. *medRxiv*.

133. Wang, Jingjing, Xueying Wu, Ruoyu Wang, Dongsheng He, Dongying Li, Linchuan Yang, Yiyang Yang, and Yi Lu. 2021. "Review of associations between built environment characteristics and severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 infection risk." *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* 18 (14): 7561.

134. Wang, M., Hu, C., Zhao, Q., Feng, R., Wang, Q., Cai, H., . . . Guo, C. (2021). Acute psychological impact on COVID-19 patients in Hubei: a multicenter observational study. *Translational psychiatry, 11*(1), 1-9.

135. Yang, B.-Y., Hu, L.-W., Jalaludin, B., Knibbs, L. D., Markevych, I., Heinrich, J., . . . Dong, G.-H. (2020). Association Between Residential Greenness, Cardiometabolic Disorders, and Cardiovascular Disease Among Adults in China. *JAMA Network Open, 3*(9), e2017507-e2017507.

136. Yang, L., Jin, S., Danielson, P., Homer, C., Gass, L., Bender, S. M., . . . Fry, J. (2018). A new generation of the United States National Land Cover Database: Requirements, research priorities, design, and implementation strategies. *ISPRS Journal of Photogrammetry and Remote Sensing, 146*, 108-123.

137. Yang, Y., & Diez-Roux, V. A. (2012). Walking Distance by Trip Purpose and Population Subgroups. *American journal of preventive medicine, 43*(1), 11-19.

138. Yeoh, Y. K., Zuo, T., Lui, G. C.-Y., Zhang, F., Liu, Q., Li, A. Y., . . . Fung, K. S. (2021). Gut microbiota composition reflects disease severity and dysfunctional immune responses in patients with COVID-19. *Gut, 70*(4), 698-706.

139. Yokoyama, W. M. (2005). Natural killer cell immune responses. *Immunol Res, 32*(1-3), 317-325.

140. Zuo, T., Zhang, F., Lui, G. C. Y., Yeoh, Y. K., Li, A. Y. L., Zhan, H., . . . Ng, S. C. (2020). Alterations in Gut Microbiota of Patients With COVID-19 During Time of Hospitalization. *Gastroenterology, 159*(3), 944-955.e948.