The impact of housing condition interventions on mental health: a systematic review

Eleanor Shiels, Kaya Grocott, Kate Mason, Rebecca Bentley, Ang Li

Centre of Research Excellence in Healthy Housing, Melbourne School of Population and Global Health, The University of Melbourne, Australia

Abstract

Housing conditions have been increasingly recognised as a critical determinant of health, with emerging evidence highlighting their impact on mental well-being. However, there is a lack of research syntheses to provide a comprehensive overview of the mental health benefits of interventions aimed at improving indoor home environments. This review synthesises studies examining the effects of housing quality improvements on mental health, identifying which interventions, if any, are associated with improved mental well-being and to what extent. A comprehensive search of MEDLINE, Web of Science and PsycINFO was conducted for interventional studies published between January 2013 and April 2023. Results were analysed using frequency and thematic analyses, and the effect sizes of each intervention's impact on mental health were summarised. The risk of bias was assessed using the ROBINS-I tool for non-randomised interventional studies. Fourteen studies met the inclusion criteria and were categorised according to the type of intervention. Findings showed significant mental health benefits following improvements to lighting, heating, kitchen, bathrooms, windows, and water heaters, with mixed evidence of mental health benefits from door installation, insulation, ventilation, and fabric works. Most studies had a moderate to severe risk of bias. Further research should explore the generalisability of findings to broader populations, disentangle the health effects of individual interventions from confounders, and examine long-term mental health outcomes of housing condition interventions.

Keywords: Housing condition; Housing quality; Housing intervention; Housing improvement; Mental health

Introduction

Mental distress and mental illness have been steadily rising for decades, with a noticeable acceleration since the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic [1]. Housing plays a central role in shaping people's mental health and wellbeing, as evidenced by a growing body of observational studies that have established links between housing security, affordability, and quality, and the wellbeing of residents [2-5]. Indoor temperature and other physical conditions of people's homes have a known link to physical and mental health [6,7]. Living in a house of poor quality with inadequate ventilation or insulation can be hazardous for residents' health and wellbeing [8,9]. The changing climate further exacerbates the health effects of poor housing conditions [10,11]. These links between housing and health have contributed to a move by many governments towards legislating for minimum housing standards.

However, the evidence base remains limited on whether, and to what extent, improvements in housing conditions affect the health and wellbeing of resident [5]. Despite the increasing need for housing standards to promote population health, there has been a lack of comprehensive synthesis of evidence that examines how housing interventions impact on mental health and wellbeing as well as the magnitude of these effects. While there have been reviews on the association between health and housing quality conducted in the past [12-14], previous reviews date back a decade and all had inconclusive results, which highlights the need for an updated overview of the literature. There is also a paucity of reviews focused on mental health as the primary outcome and causal study designs.

This systematic review aims to synthesis the research evidence on the association between housing-focussed interventions and mental health from recent interventional studies. This review will enable a better understanding of how housing interventions can be effectively utilised to improve people's mental health and prevent mental issues that may result from an unhealthy or unsafe living environment. This review will address the gap in the literature on housing research focusing on the link between mental health outcomes and housing interventions across domains, to inform future decisions by governments and policymakers.

Methods

Search strategy

MEDLINE, Web of Science and PsycINFO were searched on 19 April 2023 for housing intervention studies published between 2013 and 2023, inclusive, and searches were restricted to human studies published in English. Search terms consisted of four blocks of search terms: dwelling ("house" or "housing" or "dwelling" or "home" or "residential"); changes in housing condition ("decrease" or "increase" or "evaluation" or "change" or "intervention" or "improve" or "effect" or "impact"); mental health ("mental" NEAR/2 ("health" OR "illness") or "depression" or "anxiety" or "psychological distress"); and indoor environment ("indoor" or "thermal" or "heat" or "insulation" or "mould" or "double glazing" or "pest" or "damp" or "lightning" or "retrofit" or "ventilation" or "refurbish" or "overcrowd" or "crowding" or " noise" or "asbestos" or "lead" or "radon" or "sanitation" or "safety" or "injury" or draught" or "allergen" or "renovation" or "repair"). We used the Boolean operators 'AND' and 'OR' as well as wildcards to allow for variations of the search words and included alternative spellings and synonyms. The review was registered on Prospero (ID CRD42023445233).

Inclusion and exclusion criteria

Studies were excluded if they did not include one of the four components. Qualitative studies and studies that did not include an intervention were excluded. Studies examining interventions to address adverse effects of lead, poor air quality, or radon were not included because these are environmental hazards, rather than poor quality housing. Housing settings that were not individual residences, such as residential aged care facilities were excluded. Studies with an exclusively child (under 18 years) population were excluded, and where studies reported outcomes for both children and adult participants separately, only the results for adults were used. Covidence was used for both abstract and full text screening.

Study selection

Studies that used experimental or quasi-experimental approaches to examine the mental health effects of housing improvements were included. Outcome measures included any quantitative measure of mental health, including wellbeing, quality of life, depression, stress, and anxiety. The studies were required to provide a measurement of mental health either pre- and post-intervention for the intervention group, or post-intervention for both intervention and control/comparison groups. Housing interventions were defined as a change or renovation in a residence, which was implemented by a study or program, such as increased lighting, central heating installation, new doors and windows, kitchen and bathroom renovations, major repairs and upgrades and asbestos removal. Housing interventions did not include changes to workplaces or other non-residential spaces, or changes to the surrounding environment such as tree planting.

Data extraction

A data extraction sheet was created with the following data extracted from each study: Citation (Journal, authors, title, year of publication, volume, page numbers/article number); Methods (Aim, study design, setting, study period, intervention(s), type of measurement used; any variables controlled for during analysis); Demographics (Age, gender, household size, type of housing); Sample size (before and after follow-up); Results (Overall mental health, anxiety, depression, stress) for each of the following: Control group before/after, intervention group before/after, mean difference for both control and intervention groups, significance of the mental health change in each group. Data was extracted by two reviewers independently, and disagreements were resolved with the team. When a specific piece of information was unavailable, but similar data was available then that data was extracted instead. If a specific piece of information was unavailable, and no similar data was available then these fields were left blank. Results of the process were reported in the study summary and synthesis.

Study quality assessment

The ROBINS-I tool for non-randomised interventional studies was used to conduct a risk-of-bias assessment for all included studies [15]. A scale with values of low, moderate, serious, and critical was used to assess each domain and the overall risk of bias.

Methods of synthesis

Where possible, studies were categorised based on the intervention target (e.g. lighting, heating). The data was synthesised narratively using frequency and thematic analyses, with substantive findings analysed and synthesised separately for each intervention category. Given the high heterogeneity in study design, interventions, and measurements, meta-analysis was not appropriate for this review.

Due to heterogeneity in measurements between studies, only the primary or "overall" mental health score was extracted unless otherwise specified. Where multiple outcomes are listed, the study did not have a main mental health measure and instead had several measures of different aspects of mental health. The mean difference between pre- and post-intervention mental health scores and significance level were included in the results. For studies that did not report this value, the mean difference was calculated by taking the mean post-intervention mental health and subtracting the mean pre-intervention mental health. Some studies had a control or comparison group while others only had an intervention group; where applicable, results are listed for both groups.

Interventions were grouped into heating (including central heating), insulation (including cavity wall insulation, external wall insulation, loft/attic insulation, roof insulation, exterior duct insulation and air sealing), ventilation (kitchen and bathroom exhaust vented externally, new building ventilation on roof, mechanical ventilation), lighting (increasing light levels), fabric works (stabilizing and restoring concrete structure, painting, repairs to walls), windows (replacement with new double glazed windows), water heating (replacement with new water heater), kitchen and bathroom renovation (installation of new kitchen and bathroom), and doors (new door installation), based on the definitions provided by the studies.

Results

Summary characteristics of reviewed studies

Initial searches identified 772 studies after deduplication. After title and abstract screening, 20 papers remained. Six of these were excluded at the full text screening stage; four were qualitative studies, one did not have an intervention and was purely observational, and one did not report the relationship between mental health and the housing interventions. Detailed reasons for exclusion of each study are reported in the Appendix (Table A1). The PRISMA flow diagram is displayed in Figure 1, which was generated using Covidence. A total of fourteen papers were included in the review after screening.

Figure.1 PRISMA flow diagram



Table 1 presents the demographics of participants in each included study. All but three studies reported either an age range or mean age in their sample, and all but one study reported the gender ratio. Overall,

most studies reporting a mean age had a population that was primarily over 50 years old and female. This may be due to societal factors resulting in women having less financial security in their lifetimes, and therefore being more likely to live in lower quality housing, particularly in old age. Older people may also be more likely to live in low quality housing requiring renovations due to retirement or decreased ability to work. Six studies assessed the effects of interventions on public housing. Two crossover studies, seven cohort studies, and five cross-sectional studies were eligible for inclusion.

Table 1. Demographics of study participants

Author Year, Country	**Group (control or intervention)**	**Age group (range or mean)**	**Gender ratio (% female)**	**Initial sample size**	**Final sample size**	**Type of housing**
Tonn 2021, USA [16]	Control	59 years	79%	152	100	Owner-occupied homes
	Intervention	56 years	77%	99	79	
Falkenberg 2019, Norway [17]	Control	77 years	47%	30	29	Private homes
	Intervention	77 years	57%	30	29	
Tonn 2023, USA [18]	Control	60 years	60%	1273	700	Multifamily units without weatherisation
	Intervention	60 years	73%	742	309	Multifamily units that received weatherisation in the past 5 years
Nagare 2021, USA [19]	Intervention only	21-77 years	55%	20	20	Luxury apartment complex
Jacobs 2014, USA [20]	Intervention only	38 years	93%	57	27	Low-income housing
Jacobs 2015, USA [21]	Control	33 years	90.1%	91	Not stated	Public or federally subsidised housing
	Intervention	43 years	79.5%	298	Not stated	
Breysse 2015, USA [22]	Control	33-86 years	70%	40	40	Low-income
	Intervention	33-86 years	70%	40	40	Public housing
Curl 2015, UK [23]	Control	Not stated	Not stated	602	602	Public housing
	Intervention	Not stated	Not stated	1933	1334	
Grey 2017, UK [24]	Control	Not stated	59.7%	852	418	Private homes
	Intervention	Not stated	58.8%	656	364	
Poortinga 2017, UK [25]	Intervention only	18+ years	69%	2075	1709	Public housing
Sawyer 2022, UK [26]	Intervention only	22-93 years	71.4%	149	78	Private homes
Curl 2015, UK [27]	Control	Not stated	62.8%	602	602	Public housing
	Intervention	Not stated	60.5%	1933	1334	
Bray 2017, UK [28]	Intervention only	25+ years	75.6%	389	228	Public housing
Shishegar 2022, USA [29]	Intervention only	76.81 years	76%	21	21	Independent living communities

Mental health outcome measures

Outcome measures included wellbeing, quality of life, depression, stress, and anxiety (Table 2). For most studies, an overall mental health measurement was recorded, which was the primary mental health outcome used in the study. Some studies did not record an overall mental health measurement but reported a score in one or more other mental health categories, while other studies stratified results by intervention. Details of the outcome measures and measurements used were extremely heterogeneous, and few studies used the same measure as any other. Many studies used a reverse scale, in which a higher score indicates worse mental health.

Table 2. Outcome measures

Author Year, Country	**Mental health outcome measure(s)**	**Numerical measurement**
Tonn 2021, USA [16]	Number of days in the past 30 days when mental health was not good	Number of days
Falkenberg 2019, Norway [17]	Aggregated score from the mental health part of the SF-36 (Norwegian version)	Score from 0 to 100 (lower score indicates better mental health)
Tonn 2023, USA [18]	Number of days in the past 30 days when mental health was not good	Number of days
Nagare 2021, UK [19]	PROMIS positive affect 15a instrument T-score	Standardised score with a mean of 50 and a standard deviation of 10, and normalised score between 0-1 for certain outcomes
***Jacobs 2014,* USA** [20]	Interview with participant scoring them on six indicators of poor mental health: “Worthless”, “Everything was effort”, “Hopeless”, “Restless”, “Nervous”, “Sad”	Score of 1-5 based on how often they feel each emotion, where 1 is “all of the time” and 5 is “none of the time”
***Jacobs 2015,* USA** [21]	Interview with participant scoring them on five indicators of poor mental health: “Sad", “Restless or fidgety”, “Nervous”, “Hopeless”, “Everything was an effort”	Score of 1-5 based on how often they feel each emotion, where 1 is “all of the time” and 5 is “none of the time”
Breysse 2015, USA [22]	Veterans RAND 12-Item Health Survey (VR-12)	Score from 0-100 (higher scores indicate better quality of life)
Curl 2015, UK [23]	Odds ratio of not reporting a mental health condition after the intervention, when one was reported before the intervention	Odds ratio
***Grey 2017,* UK** [24]	Short form 12 Item Health Survey (SF12v2) mental health and subjective wellbeing	MCS (mental health): scale from 0-100 Subjective wellbeing: scale from 0-10
***Poortinga 2017,* UK** [25]	Scale created using five survey questions relating to the participant's mental health	Regression coefficients for the association between each intervention and mental health
***Sawyer 2022,* UK** [26]	Warwick-Edinburgh Mental Wellbeing Scale	Score from 14-70 (higher scores indicate better mental health)

Curl 2015, UK [27]	SF-12v2 Mental Health Component Summary Scale	Score from 0-100 (higher scores indicate better mental health)
***Bray 2017,* UK** [28]	Short Warwick-Edinburgh Wellbeing Scale, adapted Office for National Statistics personal wellbeing questions	Score from 7 to 35 (higher scores indicate better mental health) Score from 0-10 (higher scores indicate better mental health) Score from 0-10 (higher scores indicate more anxiety)
***Shishegar 2022,* USA** [29]	Geriatric Depression Scale (GDS)	Score from 0-9 (higher scores indicate more depression)

Housing interventions

The most common interventions reported were heating (8), window replacement (6), insulation (6), ventilation (4), water heating (4), new doors (3), kitchen and bathroom renovations (3), and lighting (3). Interventions that were present in fewer than three studies were included in the table of results but not the narrative synthesis.

Effects of interventions

Table 3 reports the study outcomes and findings. The results based on the main measure of mental health given in each study are reported. Some studies reported more than one main measure of mental health, and where applicable, these have been listed separately. Seven [16,21-23,25-27] of the eleven non-lighting studies found positive effects on mental health from the improvements, while four studies [18,20,24,28] found insufficient evidence of an impact on mental health.

Table 3. Study outcomes and findings

Author Year, Country	**Intervention category**	**Group (control or intervention)**	**Mean difference in mental health score before and after intervention**	**Overall effect (+, - or no effect)**	**p-value**	**Study findings**
Tonn 2021, USA [16]	Insulation, water heating, heating, lighting.	Control	-0.2^	No effect	0.91	The interventions improved health, including mental health
		Intervention	**-4.2^**	+	0.025	

Falkenberg 2019, Norway [17]	Lighting.	Control	-2.1^	No effect	0.68	The interventions improved quality of life by making it easier to perform daily tasks, but did not affect mental health
		Intervention	-0.5^	No effect	0.54	
Tonn 2023, USA [18]	Insulation, heating, cooling, ventilation, windows, safety measures.	Control	**-1.16^**	+	<0.01	There was no evidence of mental health improvements following interventions
		Intervention	0.18^	No effect	>0.1	
Nagare 2021, USA [19]	Lighting.	Intervention only	Anxiety: **-0.11^** Stress: -0.09^ Depression: -0.04^	+ No effect No effect	Anxiety: 0.023 Stress: 0.075 Depression: 0.30	The EC glass intervention improved mental health when compared to plain glass with blinds
Jacobs 2014, USA [20]	Ventilation, pest removal, mould/asbestos removal, fabric repairs.	Intervention only	Worthless: -0.2^ Everything was effort: 0.4^ Hopeless: -0.3^ Restless: 0.0^ Nervous: -0.1^ Sad: 0.0^	No effect No effect No effect No effect No effect	Worthless: 0.317 Everything was effort: 0.413 Hopeless: 0.134 Restless: 0.879 Nervous: 0.593 Sad: 1.00	Adult mental health did not change significantly
Jacobs 2015, USA [21]	Heating, ventilation, windows, water proofing, carpet removal, sound insulation, water/energy saving, safety measures.	Control	Not reported			The interventions improved health, including mental health
		Intervention	Sad: **-0.4^** Restless or fidgety: **-0.3^** Nervous: **-0.4^** Hopeless: **-0.3^** Everything was an effort: **-0.1^**	+ + + + +	$p < 0.05$ for all comparisons between current study and control, and comparisons between current and previous study groups.	
Breysse 2015, USA [22]	Fabric works, heating, ventilation, insulation, windows, mould/asbestos removal, common area renovations, smoking restrictions.	Control	-1.5	No effect	0.167	The interventions had a positive effect on mental health of residents
		Intervention	**1.6**	No effect	0.066 p (between groups): 0.026	
Curl 2015, UK [23]	Fabric works, kitchen and bathroom	Control	Not applicable (odds ratios reported)			The interventions had a curative

	renovations, heating, new doors.	Intervention	Fabric works: **3.55** Doors: 2.35 Kitchen, bathroom, and rewiring: 1.88	+ No effect No effect	Fabric works: <0.05 All other associations had p-values greater than 0.05	effect on mental health, but not a preventative effect
Grey 2017, UK [24]	Insulation, water heating, heating, gas connection.	Control	Mental health: 0.83 Subjective wellbeing: -0.04		p-values were reported for difference between groups	The intervention was significantly associated with improved subjective wellbeing, but there was no association with mental health
		Intervention	Mental health: 0.81 Subjective wellbeing: **0.34**	No effect +	Mental health: 1.00 Subjective wellbeing: 0.004	
Poortinga 2017, UK [25]	Windows, water heating, insulation, kitchen and bathroom renovations, new doors.	Intervention only	Windows and doors: **2.523** Boilers: **1.975** Kitchens: **1.909** Bathrooms: **1.660** Electrics: **2.216** Loft insulation: **4.281** Cavity wall insulation: **-2.052** External wall insulation: **2.657**	+ + + + + + - +	Windows and doors: <0.01 Boilers: <0.01 Kitchens: <0.01 Bathrooms: <0.01 Electrics: <0.001 Loft insulation: <0.001 Cavity wall insulation: <0.05 External wall insulation: <0.01	All interventions except cavity wall insulation were significantly associated with improved mental health
Sawyer 2022, UK [26]	Insulation, heating.	Intervention only	**3.18**	+	0.001	The interventions resulted in improved wellbeing
Curl 2015, UK [27]	Fabric works, windows, common area renovations, kitchen and bathroom renovations, new doors, heating.	Control	Not reported			
		Intervention	Kitchen and bathroom: **1.25** Central heating: -0.31 Doors: -0.22 Fabric works: 1.09	+ No effect No effect No effect	Kitchen and bathroom: <0.05 All other associations had p-values greater than 0.05	Fabric works and kitchen and bathroom interventions had a positive effect on mental health, but new doors and central heating did not have a significant impact
Bray 2017, UK [28]	Water heating, windows.	Intervention only	Wellbeing: 0.46 Life satisfaction: 0.09 Happiness: 0.25 Anxiety: -0.39^	No effect No effect No effect No effect	Wellbeing: 0.162 Life satisfaction: 0.539 Happiness: 0.117 Anxiety: 0.131	The interventions may have improved anxiety, particularly in the older age group, but the impact on

						wellbeing is limited
Shishegar 2022, USA [29]	Lighting.	Intervention only	Baseline 1 - LP: -**1.48**^ Baseline 1 - LT: -**3.43**^ Baseline 1 – Baseline 2: -1.24^	+ + No effect	Baseline 1 – LP: 0.030 Baseline 2 – LT: 0.001 Baseline 1 – Baseline 2: 0.121	The interventions improved mood.

Note: Boldface indicates statistical significance (p<0.05). ^ Reverse scale used (lower score indicates better mental health).

Risk of bias assessment

The ROBINS-I tool was used to assess the risk of bias for each study included in the review, on a scale from low to critical to indicate the risk of bias present in the study (Table 4).

Table 4. Risk of Bias assessment

Author, publication year	**Confounding**	**The selection of participants**	**Classification of interventions**	**Deviations from intended interventions**	**Missing data**	**Measurement of outcomes**	**Selective outcome reporting**	**Overall risk**
Tonn 2021	Serious	Low	Low	Low	Low	Moderate	Moderate	Serious
Falkenberg 2019	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate
Tonn 2023	Serious	Serious	Moderate	Low	NI	Serious	Moderate	Serious
Nagare 2021	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
Jacobs 2014	Moderate	Low	Low	Low	Low	Serious	Moderate	Serious
Jacobs 2015	Moderate	Low	Low	Low	Low	Serious	Moderate	Serious
Breysse 2015	Moderate	Serious	Low	Low	Low	Moderate	Moderate	Serious
Curl 2015	Serious	Low	Low	Low	Moderate	Low	Moderate	Serious
Grey 2017	Moderate	Low	Low	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate
Poortinga 2017	Moderate	Low	Low	Low	Low	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate
Sawyer 2022	NI	Low	Low	Low	Moderate	Serious	Moderate	Serious
Curl 2015	Moderate	Low	Low	Low	NI	Low	Moderate	Moderate
Bray 2017	Moderate	Low	Low	Low	Serious	Moderate	Moderate	Serious
Shishegar 2022	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Moderate	Moderate

Notes: NI (no information) was used if not enough information was available to make an assessment.

Eight of the fourteen studies [16,18,20-23,26,28] had a serious risk of bias in at least one domain, indicating that those studies had some serious problems. Five studies [17,24,25,27,29] had a moderate risk of bias in at least one domain, but no domain had a serious risk, meaning that the study is sound for a non-randomised study but cannot be considered comparable to a well-performed randomised trial. One study [19] had an overall low risk of bias and can be considered comparable to a well-performed randomised trial. Six of these studies used a baseline measurement of the intervention group but not the control/comparison group, and four studies had fewer than 50 participants in each group. Two studies did not report the period of data collection or analysis.

Of the lighting studies, one of them had a low risk and the other two had a moderate risk. Of the non-lighting studies, eight of eleven had a serious risk, three had a moderate risk of bias and none had a low risk. This difference is most likely because the lighting interventions were easier to reverse, faster to implement, and the groups could be randomised beforehand, while the non-lighting interventions were usually part of a program outside the study and the researchers were aiming to measure the effects of this.

Discussion

Eight of the fourteen studies [16,19,21-23,25,27,29] found significant evidence supporting a link between housing interventions (including heating, lighting, windows, water heating, and kitchen and bathroom renovations) and mental health benefits. Three additional studies [17,24,26] found improvements in other outcomes (quality of life, wellbeing etc), but unchanged mental health. Three studies [18,20,28] found that the interventions did not have a significant impact on any measure of mental health. The quality of evidence supporting a link between positive outcomes and lighting interventions is strong, with all lighting studies having low or moderate risk of bias. Other studies are affected by moderate or serious risks of bias.

Heating

Heating was the most common intervention in the included studies, with 8 out of 14 studies [16,18,21-24,26,27] assessing heating in some way. Four of these studies showed statistically significant improvements in mental health after heating improvements were completed, and two studies showed improvements in wellbeing, but not mental health. It is likely that heating at least improves mental wellbeing but may not affect conditions such as depression and anxiety.

Insulation

Insulation was another common intervention, with 6 studies [16,18,22,24-26] involving insulation improvements. Three studies [16,22,25] found that at least one type of insulation installed resulted in mental health improvements, and two additional studies [24,26] found improvements in wellbeing. One study [25] reported separate associations between mental health and three different insulation types: loft insulation, cavity wall insulation, and external wall insulation. It was found that loft insulation and external wall insulation were significantly associated with better mental health, while cavity wall insulation appeared to be significantly associated with worsened mental health at follow-up. The study hypothesised that this is due to cavity wall insulation being installed without accompanying ventilation, and therefore increasing humidity inside the home. It was noted that external wall insulation was installed with extractor fans, which resulted in an improvement in mental health, and that the negative health effects of cavity wall insulation have been reported in other studies.

Ventilation

Four studies [18,20-22] examined the mental health effects of ventilation, but only two of these [21,22] studies found an improvement following the interventions. All four studies included other interventions, such as heating, mould removal, window replacement and insulation, suggesting that ventilation may not be impacting mental health alone, but may work in conjunction with other interventions to improve the overall home environment. This is supported by the findings of one study [25], which found that cavity wall insulation

without ventilation appeared to worsen mental health, while external wall insulation with ventilation resulted in improvements in mental health.

Lighting

All three lighting studies [17,19,29] showed positive results from their interventions, although only two showed significant improvement in mental health, and the interventions themselves were highly heterogeneous in their methodology.

Fabric works/repairs

The three studies [22,23,27] that reported fabric works as part of their interventions found fabric works was associated with improved mental health at follow-up, and one of these associations [23] was statistically significant. The study that included fabric repairs [20] reported no significant change in mental health. It is possible that aesthetic interventions such as painting were more likely to result in mental health improvements than structural interventions such as repair of holes in walls, or that minor repairs were inadequate to substantially improve participants' mental health and wellbeing. Overall, it is unclear whether fabric works or repairs affect mental health, and this is complicated by the heterogeneity of interventions that fall under these broad terms.

Windows

Window replacement was a very common intervention, with six studies [18,21,22,25,27,28] including window replacement with energy efficient double-glazed windows, of which four studies [21,22,25,27] found that interventions including window replacement resulted in improved mental health or wellbeing.

Water heating

Four studies [16,24,25,28] completed water heating upgrades, including the replacement of water heaters with new, more efficient ones. Three of these reported improvements in at least one measure of mental health, while one study [28] reported no significant changes.

Kitchen and bathroom renovations

Three studies included kitchen and bathroom renovations [23,25,27], all of them found positive associations with mental health, and two [25,27] of these results were statistically significant. It is likely that improvements in mental health were at least partly due to improved internal appearance and functionality of the homes.

Doors

Three studies included new doors in their interventions, and all three stratified their results by intervention. Two of these studies [23,25] found that new doors had a positive effect on mental health, while the other study found no effect.

Limitations

This review has some limitations. First, the outcome measures were highly heterogeneous, and the quality of studies varied considerably. Most studies examined the effects of multiple interventions at once, which made it difficult to separate the effects of each intervention and draw conclusions about the magnitude and direction of the effect of specific interventions. Second, grey literature and studies in languages other than English were not included. Third, a meta-analysis was unable to be performed due to the heterogeneity of the data.

Strengths

By synthesising interventional studies only, we reduce the influence of unmeasured confounding on our overall conclusions. While many studies were available to include in the study, few had a quasi-experimental design, meaning that they may have an increased risk of bias as participants may choose their

interventions or there may not be any baseline measurement. Excluding these studies at the screening stage resulted in a stronger evidence base from which to draw conclusions.

Implications for practice

These studies support future policies requiring minimum standards. There is evidence supporting the mental health benefits of improvements to lighting, heating, kitchens and bathrooms, windows, and water heaters, which should be considered in housing and rental standards to support the health and wellbeing of residents. As natural lighting is better for mental health than artificial lighting, governments should require new developments to have a minimum amount of natural lighting.

Implications for further research

As the populations in some studies were limited to the elderly, further research is needed to determine whether these findings can be applied to the general population. Further research is required to understand the way different types of insulation affect mental health when installed with and without ventilation. As fabric works is a very broad category, these improvements could be broken down into smaller subcategories such as painting, over-cladding etc. Further research should also be done on the effects of new doors on mental health over time, as initial improvements appear to wear off over time which may be due to perceived safety effects.

We found that most studies showed a significant and positive relationship between housing improvements and mental health. There was strong evidence supporting improvements to lighting, heating, kitchen, bathrooms, windows, and water heaters. Evidence supporting other interventions was inconsistent, and more research is required to determine if and under what circumstances these improvements are beneficial.

Registration

This review was registered on PROSPERO under ID CRD42023445233.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

Ethical considerations

There are no human participants in this article and informed consent is not required.

Conflicting interests

The authors declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Funding statement

The authors received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

References

1. Li A, Mansour A, Bentley R. Green and blue spaces, COVID-19 lockdowns, and mental health: An Australian population-based longitudinal analysis. *Health & Place*. 2023/09/01/ 2023;83:103103. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.healthplace.2023.103103
2. Jacobs DE, Brown MJ, Baeder A, et al. A systematic review of housing interventions and health: introduction, methods, and summary findings. *Journal of Public Health Management and Practice*. 2010;16(5):S5-S10.
3. Arundel R, Li A, Baker E, Bentley R. Housing unaffordability and mental health: dynamics across age and tenure. *International Journal of Housing Policy*. 2022:1-31. doi:10.1080/19491247.2022.2106541
4. Li A, Baker E, Bentley R. Understanding the mental health effects of instability in the private rental sector: A longitudinal analysis of a national cohort. *Soc Sci Med*. Mar 2022;296:114778. doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2022.114778
5. Thomson H, Thomas S, Sellström E, Petticrew M. Housing improvements for health and associated socio‐economic outcomes: A systematic review. *Campbell Systematic Reviews*. 2013;9(1):1-348.
6. Li A, Martino E, Mansour A, Bentley R. Environmental Noise Exposure and Mental Health: Evidence From a Population-Based Longitudinal Study. *Am J Prev Med*. Aug 2022;63(2):e39-e48. doi:10.1016/j.amepre.2022.02.020

7. Bentley R, Daniel L, Li Y, Baker E, Li A. The effect of energy poverty on mental health, cardiovascular disease and respiratory health: a longitudinal analysis. *The Lancet Regional Health – Western Pacific*. 2023;35doi:10.1016/j.lanwpc.2023.100734
8. Gatto MR, Mansour A, Li A, Bentley R. A State-of-the-Science Review of the Effect of Damp-and Mold-Affected Housing on Mental Health. *Environmental Health Perspectives*. 2024;132(8):086001.
9. Li A, Toll M, Bentley R. Health and housing consequences of climate-related disasters: a matched case-control study using population-based longitudinal data in Australia. *The Lancet Planetary Health*. 2023;7(6):e490-e500.
10. Li A, Toll M, Bentley R. The risk of energy hardship increases with extreme heat and cold in Australia. *Communications Earth & Environment*. 2024;5(1):595.
11. Li A, Toll M, Bentley R. Mapping social vulnerability indicators to understand the health impacts of climate change: a scoping review. *The Lancet Planetary Health*. 2023;7(11):e925-e937.
12. Thomson H, Petticrew M, Morrison D. Health effects of housing improvement: systematic review of intervention studies. *BMJ*. 2001;323(7306):187-190. doi:10.1136/bmj.323.7306.187
13. Thomson H, Thomas S, Sellstrom E, Petticrew M. Housing improvements for health and associated socio‐economic outcomes. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*. 2013;(2)doi:10.1002/14651858.CD008657.pub2
14. Howden-Chapman P, Bennett J, Edwards R, Jacobs D, Nathan K, Ormandy D. Review of the Impact of Housing Quality on Inequalities in Health and Well-Being. *Annual Review of Public Health*. 2023;44(1):233-254. doi:10.1146/annurev-publhealth-071521-111836
15. Jonathan ACS, Miguel AH, Barnaby CR, et al. ROBINS-I: a tool for assessing risk of bias in non-randomised studies of interventions. *BMJ*. 2016;355:i4919. doi:10.1136/bmj.i4919
16. Tonn B, Rose E, Hawkins B, Marincic M. Health and financial benefits of weatherizing low-income homes in the southeastern United States. *Building and Environment*. 2021/06/15/ 2021;197:107847. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2021.107847
17. Falkenberg HK, Kvikstad TM, Eilertsen G. Improved indoor lighting improved healthy aging at home - an intervention study in 77-year-old Norwegians. *J Multidiscip Healthc*. 2019;12:315-324. doi:10.2147/jmdh.S198763
18. Tonn B, Hawkins B, Rose E, Marincic M, Pigg S, Cowan C. Saving lives by saving energy? Examining the health benefits of energy efficiency in multifamily buildings in the United States. *Building and Environment*. 2023/01/15/ 2023;228:109716. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2022.109716
19. Nagare R, Woo M, MacNaughton P, Plitnick B, Tinianov B, Figueiro M. Access to Daylight at Home Improves Circadian Alignment, Sleep, and Mental Health in Healthy Adults: A Crossover Study. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. Sep 23 2021;18(19)doi:10.3390/ijerph18199980
20. Jacobs DE, Breysse J, Dixon SL, et al. Health and housing outcomes from green renovation of low-income housing in Washington, DC. *J Environ Health*. Mar 2014;76(7):8-16; quiz 60.
21. Jacobs DE, Ahonen E, Dixon SL, et al. Moving into green healthy housing. *J Public Health Manag Pract*. Jul-Aug 2015;21(4):345-54. doi:10.1097/phh.0000000000000047
22. Breysse J, Dixon SL, Jacobs DE, Lopez J, Weber W. Self-reported health outcomes associated with green-renovated public housing among primarily elderly residents. *J Public Health Manag Pract*. Jul-Aug 2015;21(4):355-67. doi:10.1097/phh.0000000000000199
23. Curl A, Kearns A. Can housing improvements cure or prevent the onset of health conditions over time in deprived areas? *BMC Public Health*. 2015/11/28 2015;15(1):1191. doi:10.1186/s12889-015-2524-5
24. Grey CN, Jiang S, Nascimento C, et al. The short-term health and psychosocial impacts of domestic energy efficiency investments in low-income areas: a controlled before and after study. *BMC Public Health*. Jan 31 2017;17(1):140. doi:10.1186/s12889-017-4075-4

25. Poortinga W, Jones N, Lannon S, Jenkins H. Social and health outcomes following upgrades to a national housing standard: a multilevel analysis of a five-wave repeated cross-sectional survey. *BMC Public Health*. 2017/12/02 2017;17(1):927. doi:10.1186/s12889-017-4928-x
26. Sawyer A, Sherriff N, Bishop D, Darking M, Huber JW. “It’s changed my life not to have the continual worry of being warm” – health and wellbeing impacts of a local fuel poverty programme: a mixed-methods evaluation. *BMC Public Health*. 2022/04/19 2022;22(1):786. doi:10.1186/s12889-022-12994-4
27. Curl A, Kearns A, Mason P, Egan M, Tannahill C, Ellaway A. Physical and mental health outcomes following housing improvements: evidence from the GoWell study. *J Epidemiol Community Health*. Jan 2015;69(1):12-9. doi:10.1136/jech-2014-204064
28. Bray N, Burns P, Jones A, Winrow E, Edwards RT. Costs and outcomes of improving population health through better social housing: a cohort study and economic analysis. *Int J Public Health*. Dec 2017;62(9):1039-1050. doi:10.1007/s00038-017-0989-y
29. Shishegar N, Boubekri M. Lighting up living spaces to improve mood and cognitive performance in older adults. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*. 2022/08/01/ 2022;82:101845. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2022.101845
30. Avino CJ, Peralta A, Carrere J, Mari-Dell'Olmo M, Benach J, Lopez MJ. Qualitative evaluation of an intervention to reduce energy poverty: Effects perceived by participants according to typologies of social vulnerability. *ENERGY POLICY*. 2022;167doi:10.1016/j.enpol.2022.113006
31. Curl A, Kearns A. Housing improvements, fuel payment difficulties and mental health in deprived communities. *International Journal of Housing Policy*. 2017/07/03 2017;17(3):417-443. doi:10.1080/14616718.2016.1248526
32. Leung MY, Yu JY, Chow HY. Impact of indoor facilities management on the quality of life of the elderly in public housing. *FACILITIES*. 2016;34(9-10):564-579. doi:10.1108/F-06-2015-0044
33. O'Connell B, Sloop A, Intagliata N, Quinn M. They Built My Soul: A Qualitative Analysis of the Impacts of Home Repairs in Rural Tennessee. *Journal of Appalachian health*. 2022;4(1):9-19. doi:https://dx.doi.org/10.13023/jah.0401.03
34. Perreault K, Lapalme J, Potvin L, Riva M. "We're Home Now": How a Rehousing Intervention Shapes the Mental Well-Being of Inuit Adults in Nunavut, Canada. *International journal of environmental research and public health*. 2022;19(11)doi:https://dx.doi.org/10.3390/ijerph19116432
35. Walker LA. The Cost of Good Intentions: Thermal Discomfort in Traditional Public Housing Units With Preset Thermostats. *HOUSING POLICY DEBATE*. 2015;25(1):152-178. doi:10.1080/10511482.2014.924024

Appendix

Table A1. Excluded studies

Author Year, Country	**Reason for exclusion**
Avino 2022[30], Spain	Qualitative study design, relationship between mental health and housing interventions was not reported
Curl 2017[31], UK	Relationship between mental health and housing interventions was not reported
Leung 2016[32], China	No intervention
O'Connell 2022[33], USA	Qualitative study design
Perreault 2022[34], Canada	Qualitative study design
Walker 2015[35], USA	Qualitative study design