A Systematic Review of Randomised Controlled Trials on the Effectiveness of Ecotherapy Interventions for Treating Mental Disorders

Williams, T.,¹ Barnwell, G.C.,² & Stein, D.J.¹

¹SAMRC Unit on Risk & Resilience in Mental Disorders, Dept of Psychiatry and Neuroscience Institute, University of Cape Town, Western Cape Province, South Africa.

²Nelson Mandela University, Eastern Cape, South Africa.

Author Note

Garret C Barnwell. ORCID iD. <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9414-2776>

Dan J Stein. ORCID iD. <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7218-7810>

This study was registered with PROSPERO, international prospective register of systematic reviews (CRD42019130944). Garret Barnwell received funding from the South African Medical Research Council (SAMRC) through its Division of Research Capacity Development under the National Health Scholarship Programme from funding received from the Public Health Enhancement Fund/South African National Department of Health. The content hereof is the sole responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of the SAMRC. Dan Stein has received research grants and/or consultancy honoraria from Lundbeck and Sun.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Dr Taryn Williams, Department of Psychiatry and Neuroscience Institute, University of Cape Town, Groote Schuur Hospital, Observatory, Cape Town, tarynamos@gmail.com

Abstract

Background: Systematic reviews on ecotherapy interventions (i.e. environmental therapies and animal-assisted therapies) in the general population have demonstrated promising findings. However, there is a need for systematic assessment of the evidence for the use of these interventions in people living with mental disorders. Hence, we conducted a systematic review of randomised control trials (RCTs) on exposure to ecotherapy interventions (i.e. environmental therapy, animal-assisted therapy, wilderness therapy) for individuals with mental disorders.

Methods: The search was completed in September 2019 and comprised: Science Direct, PubMed Central, EBSCOHOST (via Academic Search Premier), the Cochrane Library, and Google Scholar. The primary outcomes that were assessed include: treatment efficacy (on the CGI-I or similar), symptom severity, and/or dropout rates. Secondary outcome measures assessed included self-efficacy, perceived control, hope, quality of life, life skills, and coping.

Results: A total of 2415 reports were identified, of which 94 were assessed for eligibility. Eight environmental therapy trials (i.e. gardening, forest therapy, horticultural therapy, nature adventure rehabilitation, and adventure-based therapy) and ten animal-assisted therapy trials (i.e. dogs, horses or dolphins) were included in the review. Risk of bias assessment was conducted, and qualitative analysis performed to describe the efficacy of the RCTs. The findings suggest that environmental therapies or animal-assisted therapies are efficacious in reducing symptoms of anxiety, depressive, substance-related and addictive, schizophrenia-spectrum and trauma- and stress-related disorders.

Conclusion: There is suggestive, but not conclusive, evidence for the efficacy of some ecotherapy interventions in mental disorders. In particular, there are: four environmental therapy trials and five animal-assisted therapy trials for depression and/or anxiety; one environmental therapy trial for post-traumatic stress disorder; three environmental therapy and animal assisted therapy trials for general psychiatric disorders; one environmental therapy trial and two animal assisted therapy trials for substance use disorders; and, one environmental therapy and two animal-assisted trials for people living with schizophrenia spectrum disorder. The use of standard reporting guidelines may improve evidence quality of future ecotherapy RCTs, and provide a foundation meta-analysis of the evidence.

Keywords: ecotherapy, systematic review, horticultural therapy, forest bathing, animal-assisted therapy, psychiatric disorders

1. Introduction

Mental disorders, excluding neurological disorders, affect around 1 billion people globally and account for 7% of the global burden of disease, causing premature death and ill health and increased risk of high medical and societal costs (Rehm & Shield, 2019; The World Health Organisation, 2001, 2013). Evidence of the burden of mental disorder has helped focus attention on the social and environmental determinants of mental disorders, in the hope that these might lead to targeted interventions to address these conditions (Lancet Commission on Mental Disorders and Sustainable Development).

Studies on the impacts of environments on mental health grew rapidly in the 1960s alongside growing environmental concerns (Steg, et al., 2018). There is growing evidence that lack of green spaces and presence of pollution are associated with an increased risk of depression and anxiety (Nutsford, et al., 2013; Power, et al., 2015; Rautio, et al., 2019; Tomita, 2017). Positive associations have been found between poverty indicators, such as food insecurity and poor housing conditions, with common mental disorders (Lund, et al. 2010). It has also been suggested that pollution may be a possible risk factor in schizophrenia (Attademo, et al., 2017; Gao, et al. 2017). While it is well accepted that poor environmental conditions are bad for mental health, exposure to the natural environment may also assist in recovery.

Anecdotal evidence for the benefits of nature on health extends at least as far back as the ancient Greek authors. However, in 1984, environmental psychologist Robert Ulrich published a paper called *View Through a Window May Influence Recovery from Surgery*. The paper shared results of the first comparison ecotherapy study (N=46) where half of the post-surgery patients were assigned to a room with their windows facing a brick wall, while the other half looked out over a garden. Ulrich found that those with a view of trees had shorter postoperative stays compared to their counterparts. Numerous studies have since emerged to understand the links that exist between exposure to nature and patient recovery. Yet, it is only recently that ecotherapy interventions have been developed and deployed by clinicians as primary or complementary interventions to manage and treat mental illness (Buzzell & Chalquist 2009; Jordan & Hinds 2016). Ecotherapy has become an emerging clinical modality and an umbrella term for techniques and practices that draw

from the natural world's therapeutic benefits. Modalities include environmental therapies (e.g. horticultural therapy, gardening, forest bathing) and animal-assisted therapy.

Systematic reviews have been conducted on environmental therapies and animal-assisted therapies in healthy individuals (Kamioka, et al., 2014; Kondo, et al., 2018; Lee, et al., 2017; Wen, et al., 2019; Roberts, et al., 2019). These reviews raise concerns over the methodological rigour of the evidence-base (Kamioka, et al., 2014; Kondo, et al., 2018; Wen, et al., 2019; Roberts, et al., 2019). For instance, a systematic review on forest bathing, as an environmental therapy, found significant improvements in anxiety and depressive mood, and general enhancements in emotional states in healthy individuals (Wen, et al., 2019). Similarly, forest bathing has been shown to improve adult depressive features in the general population (Lee, et al., 2017). Although, Roberts et al. (2019) found contradictory evidence after they reviewed 33 studies on short-term exposure to the natural environment on depressive mood in healthy individuals, finding small variation in effect size. The limited number of high-quality studies on ecotherapies also creates barriers for issuing detailed clinical guidance (Oh, et al., 2017). That said, 'Green prescriptions' are being considered more widely as a cost-effective complementary intervention (Shanahan, et al. 2019). It would be timely, therefore, to undertake a systematic review of randomised controlled ecotherapy trials for the treatment of mental disorders. Therefore, we undertake a review of such trials.

2. Aims and Objectives

2.1 Aim

To systematically review randomised control trials on ecotherapy interventions for the treatment of psychiatric disorders.

2.2 Objectives

Objective 1: To describe the efficacy of randomised control trials on ecotherapy interventions for the treatment of psychiatric disorders.

Objective 2: To assess the quality of evidence (i.e. CONSORT) of randomised control trials on ecotherapy interventions for the treatment of psychiatric disorders;

3. Methods

This section outlines the methodology employed by the systematic review.

3.1 Data Collection and Search Strategy

Science Direct, PubMed Central, EBSCOHOST (via Academic Search Premier), the Cochrane Library, and Google Scholar were all searched for therapies as defined by nature (i.e. environmental therapy and animal-assisted therapy) published up until November 2015, including reference lists of related articles. A comprehensive review was concluded in September 2019 to update the previous search.

3.1.1 Search Terms

The following search terms were used: Mental Disorders [MeSH] OR 'Psychiatric illness' OR 'Psychiatric diseases' OR 'Diagnosis, Psychiatric' OR 'Psychiatric Diagnosis' OR 'Mentally Ill Persons' AND Nature [MeSH] OR 'Plant' OR 'Ornamental Plants' OR Animal [MeSH] OR 'Animal' OR 'Animalia' OR 'Metazoa' AND Randomized Controlled Trials [MeSH] OR 'Clinical Trials, Randomized' OR 'Controlled Clinical Trials, Randomized' OR 'Trials, Randomized Clinical'. In addition to these terms the following terms were used by previous studies and were added to the search strategy: Animal-Assisted Therapy [MeSH] OR 'Animal Facilitated Therapy' OR 'Pet Facilitated Therapy' OR 'Pet Therapy' OR Equine-Assisted Therapy [MeSH] OR 'Equine-Assisted Psychotherapy' OR 'Hippotherapy' OR 'Horseback Riding Therapy' OR 'Recreational Horseback Riding Therapy' OR 'Green Care' OR 'Green Space' OR 'Horticultural Therapy' OR 'Wilderness Therapy' OR 'Forest Therapy' OR 'Outdoor Gardening' OR 'Outdoor Adventure Therapy' OR 'Ecotherapy'.

3.1.1 Eligibility Criteria

We included all randomised controlled trials of therapies comprising of environmental therapy and animal-assisted therapy compared with a control group or alternative intervention for the treatment of psychiatric disorders. No restrictions were placed on language, gender, publication date and setting. However, participants between the age of 18 years and older with a psychiatric disorder defined by the Diagnostic Statistical Manual for Mental Disorders (DSM) (i.e. Axis I and II) or other specified measure were included. Studies focusing on behavioural, cognitive and neurocognitive disorders were

excluded as well as general medical conditions such as cancer or pain disorders.

Preventative studies were also excluded.

3.2 Description of Search Results

A total of 2415 study reports were found through the search process (Science Direct 540, PubMed Central 98, EbscoHost 329, the Cochrane Library 31, and Google Scholar 1417). The title and abstract of each study were screened for eligibility, and seventy studies initially seemed relevant. After further inspection, we excluded 76 of these studies. These studies were excluded because the disorders were not psychiatric disorders defined within our inclusion criteria. Eighteen RCTs met study inclusion and were included in the review.

Figure 1 presents the Prisma diagram.

Figure 1. Prisma diagram - Study Eligibility.

3.3 Data Extraction

Data extraction included the following data items (See *Table 1: Study Characteristics*): 1) study ID (author, year); 2) health outcomes; 3) funding; 4) country/setting; 5) intervention; 6) comparison group; 7) weeks/days; 8) total sample; 9) mean age of sample/range; 10) mental health measures; 11) drop-outs; 12) loss to follow up. Furthermore, CONSORT 2010 Checklist (i.e. standards for information to include in the reporting of randomised control trials) items were used for extraction for the assessment of the quality of evidence.

3.3.1 Independent Checks

Two authors independently assessed RCTs identified from the search for inclusion first based on information included in the title and abstract and then by the retrieval of the full-text article. Any confusion or clarity around studies was resolved with one of the co-authors.

3.4 Data Analysis and Synthesis

Percentages were calculated on CONSORT 2010 data to assess the quality of evidence. These descriptive information are presented in the findings subsection, Quality of Evidence. Furthermore, a qualitative narration was provided to describe the effectiveness of randomised control trials on ecotherapy interventions for the treatment of psychiatric disorders (see *Findings* subsection *Reported Effects of Ecotherapies*)

4. Findings

4.1 Description of Included Studies

Eighteen studies were included in the review. Eight studies included participants with a diagnosis of depression (Antonioli & Reveley, 2005; Berman, et al. 2012; Hoffmann et al., 2009; Kim, et al. 2009; McCaffrey, 2007; Pedersen et al., 2012; Shin et al., 2012), two included patients with both anxiety and depression (Berget et al., 2011; Le Roux & Kemp, 2009), one included patients with depression and comorbid obesity (Irandoost & Taheri, 2017), two included patients with substance dependence disorder (Wesley et al., 2009; Wesley et al., 2006), three included patients with schizophrenia (Barak et al., 2001; Villalta et al., 2009; Zhu, et al. 2016), one included patients with depression, schizophrenia or bipolar disorder (Kam & Siu, 2010), one included patients with schizophrenia, affective disorders, anxiety and personality disorders (Berget et al., 2008), and one included patients with post-traumatic stress disorder (Gelkopf et al., 2013). A total of 1,025 participants (N=17) between the age range of 18 - 75 years were included across thirteen RCT studies. The remaining five RCTs did not provide information on age (reference the five studies here). Ninety participants dropped out of the trials due to any cause (N=13). The participants were recruited as out-patient (N= #?) or through in-patient care facilities (e.g. rehabilitation centre, inpatient psychiatric care, hospitals and senior centres; N = #?). The eighteen studies (duration: 3 sessions to one year) (Hoffmann et al., 2009; Barak et al., 2001, respectively) included eight environmental therapy (i.e. gardening, forest therapy, horticultural therapy, nature adventure rehabilitation and adventure-based therapy) and ten animal-assisted therapy trials (i.e. dogs, horses or dolphins).

All eighteen studies had an intervention and comparison group. Eleven compared an environmental therapy or animal-assisted therapy to a control group (i.e. no treatment group) (Barak et al., 2001; Berget et al., 2011; Berget et al., 2008; Berman, 2012; Gelkopf et al., 2013; Hoffmann et al., 2009; Irandoost & Taheri, 2017; Le Roux & Kemp, 2009; Pedersen et al., 2012; Shin et al., 2012; Wesley et al., 2009), whereas seven trials compared these interventions to an alternative intervention (Antonioli & Reveley, 2005; Kam & Siu, 2010; Kim et al., 2009; McCaffrey, 2007; Villalta et al., 2009; Wesley, 2006; Zhu, et al., 2016). The primary outcomes that were assessed include: treatment efficacy (on the CGI-I or similar), symptom severity, and/or dropout rates. Secondary outcome measures assessed included self-efficacy, perceived control, hope, quality of life, life skills, and coping.

Seven studies were supported by funding (Berget et al., 2011; Berget et al., 2008; Berman, 2012; McCaffrey, 2007; Pedersen et al., 2012; Villalta et al., 2009; Zhu, et al. 2016). Studies were conducted in several countries, namely: China, Germany, Honduras, Iran, Israel, Norway, South Africa, South Korea, Spain and the United States of America. Twelve studies are single-centre trials (Barak et al., 2001; Berman, 2012; Gelkopf et al., 2013; Hoffmann et al., 2009; Irandoust & Taheri, 2017; Kam & Siu, 2010; Kim, et al., 2009; Le Roux & Kemp, 2009; Shin et al., 2012; Villalta et al., 2009; Wesley et al., 2009; Zhu, et al., 2016) and five are multi-centre trials (Antonioli & Reveley, 2005; Berget et al., 2011; Berget et al., 2008; McCaffrey, 2007; Pedersen et al., 2012).

4.2 Assessment of Quality of Evidence

Each included RCT was assessed across 25 criteria (See *Table 2: CONSORT 2010 Data*). Forty-four percent of the RCTs described the method used to generate random allocation sequence (Barak et al., 2001; Berget et al., 2008; Gelkopf et al., 2013; Kam & Siu, 2010; Pedersen et al., 2012; Villalta et al., 2009; Berget et al., 2011; Zhu et al., 2016) and the type of randomisation used (for example, block randomization) (Antonioli & Reveley, 2005; Berget et al., 2008; Gelkopf et al., 2013; Kam & Siu, 2010; Pedersen et al., 2012; Wesley et al., 2009; Berget et al., 2011; Zhu, et al., 2016). Thirty-three percent of the trials provided the numbers of participants who were randomly assigned, received intended treatment, and were analysed for the primary outcome (Antonioli & Reveley, 2005; Barak et al., 2001; Berget et al., 2008; Kam & Siu, 2010; Kim, et al., 2009; Irandoust & Taheri, 2017). Eighty-three percent of the trials did not provide information on the mechanism used to implement the random allocation sequence and any steps taken to conceal the sequence until interventions were assigned (except for Berget et al., 2008; Kam & Siu, 2010; and, Zhu, et al., 2016). The blinding of participants and personnel was difficult to assess given that the 'nature' interventions could not be blinded. Two trials reported that they were single blind (Antonioli & Reveley, 2005; Kam & Siu, 2010). Zhu et al. (2016) was the only trial to be identified as a double-blind study, however. For attrition bias, losses and exclusions after randomisation, together with reasons were only reported by three trials (Antonioli & Reveley, 2005; Barak et al., 2001; Berget et al., 2008). Sixty-two percent of the trials reported primary and secondary outcomes, for each group. However, only five trials

reported the estimated effect size and its precision (Antonioli & Reveley, 2005; Kam & Siu, 2010; Kim, et. al., 2009; Wesley et al., 2009; Zhu, et al., 2016). Binary outcomes were reported for each group for three trials, however the presentation of both absolute and relative effect sizes was not reported (Berget et al., 2008; Kim, et. al., 2009; Pedersen et al., 2012). Trial limitations, addressing sources of potential bias, imprecision, and, if relevant, multiplicity of analyses were reported by thirty-nine percent of the included trials (Antonioli & Reveley, 2005; Berman, 2012; Kam & Siu, 2010; Kim, et al. 2009; Hoffmann et al., 2009; Irandoust & Taheri, 2017; Zhu, et al., 2016). Generalisability was addressed in forty four percent of the trials. However, the balancing of benefits and harms were only reported in thirty-three percent of studies. Fifty percent of the trials were funded and the protocols for each of these trials could not be found (Berget et al., 2011; Berget et al., 2008; Berman, 2012; McCaffrey, 2007; Pedersen et al., 2012; Villalta et al., 2009; Zhu, et al., 2016).

4.3. Reported Effects of Ecotherapy

4.3.1 *Environmental Therapy*

Eight studies used environmental interventions for the treatment of mental health disorders. Four of these trials focussed on depression, while one investigated depression and co-morbid alcohol use disorder. Berman, et al. (2012) found that individuals diagnoses with major depressive disorder showed significant cognitive improvements after nature walks than when compared to urban walks ($p < .001$). Nature walks also had a significant effect on positive affect when compared to urban walks ($p < .001$). However, changes in positive affects did not correlate with changes in cognitive improvements ($ps > .19$). The effect size of these improvements in a clinical population was said to be five times than that of a study previously conducted with a non-clinical population (Berman, et al. 2012; Berman, 2008).

Interventions were combined in some studies. McCaffrey (2007) found a significant difference for garden walks alone, garden walks with guided imagery, and/or art therapy for older adults with mild to moderate depression. In their study, group one, who received garden walks alone, reported that the natural environment gave them a sense of peace and serenity, as well as time for reflection about the meaning of life. The participants of group two, who received garden walks with a guided imagery leader, stated that crossing the

bridge at the beginning of their walk was symbolic of leaving their problems of the past behind. Instead, they focused on a pleasant and fulfilling future. The additional group who painted in a natural environment found that it helped them with exploring who they were as an individual as well as the identification of their own strengths and weaknesses.

CBT-based psychotherapy for people living with depression that was applied in a forest environment significantly outperformed traditionally CBT-based psychotherapy (Kim, et al., 2009). The results suggested that CBT-based psychotherapy that is integrated into treatment in a forest environment can assist in the remission of depressive features. Additionally, Irandoust and Taheri (2017) studied the effects of vitamin D supplements alone and in combination outdoor exercise on depressive features in women with depression and comorbid obesity. The study found that a combination of outdoor physical activity and vitamin D supplements significantly improved depressive features ($P = 0.001$) compared to outdoor exercise or vitamin D alone. Furthermore, an improvement was observed amongst depressed patients with comorbid alcohol use disorder who attended a forest camp compared to the control group who continued to follow their daily routine. The difference between the two groups was statistically significant ($p = 0.001$). Participants who had substance use disorders receiving the intervention also found it less difficult to fall asleep ($p = 0.001$) and stay asleep ($p = 0.009$) (Shin et al., 2001).

Participants with psychiatric disorders (i.e. schizophrenia spectrum, major depressive and bipolar disorders) receiving horticultural therapy compared with those receiving a conventional workshop, reported a significant difference in change scores measured by a depression, anxiety and stress scale ($p = 0.01$). No significant differences in change scores measured by the personal well-being index (p ranges from 0.08 to 0.79) and the work behaviour assessment ($p = 0.84$) were found, however. The participants also expressed that they enjoyed being in a natural environment and that this benefited them on a social, occupational and spiritual level (Kam, et al., 2010). In addition, Gelkopf (2013), found a significant reduction in post-traumatic symptoms ($p = 0.05$) when participants received a nature adventure rehabilitation (NAR) intervention compared with the waiting list control group. A reduction in depression symptoms ($p = 0.05$), emotional and social quality of life ($p = 0.01$), perceived control over illness ($p = 0.01$), and hope and functioning ($p = 0.001$) was

also observed. Overtime these reductions in symptoms were significantly related to an improved sense of personal control.

One randomised, double-blind, placebo-controlled study investigated the treatment effect of horticultural therapy on people living with schizophrenia (Zhu, et al., 2016). Zhu et al., (2016) found that patients who were on antipsychotics and living with schizophrenia symptoms (positive and negative) significantly improved ($p = 0.001$) when exposed to horticultural therapy compared to the placebo-control group.

4.3.2 Animal-Assisted Therapy

Ten animal-assisted therapy trials were found. Participants with a diagnosis of depression reported reduced symptoms after two weeks of exposure with animal-assisted therapy with dolphins than the control outdoor nature programme group they were exposed to. These findings were observed on the Hamilton Depression Rating Scale ($p = 0.002$) and the Beck Depression Inventory ($P = 0.006$) (Antonioli & Reveley, 2005). Hoffmann et al. (2009) found a significant reduction in hospitalized patients with major depression and state anxiety, after the presence of a dog in the room ($p = 0.016$) in their post-treatment controlled crossover trial.

Villalta-Gil et al., (2012) found that there were no significant differences in the treatment of schizophrenia for inpatients in the treatment group who received dog-assisted psychotherapy and the control group who received psychotherapy alone. Nevertheless, those receiving dog-assisted therapy had significant improvements with social contact ($p = 0.041$), positive ($p = 0.005$) and negative symptom dimensions ($p = 0.005$), and quality of life related with social relationships ($p = 0.024$) when compared to those receiving treatment as usual.

A 12-week study assessing farm animals (i.e. cows, horses, and goats) and their effect on depression among psychiatric patients reported that anxiety and depression symptoms did not decrease during the intervention, although these symptoms were significantly lower at follow-up ($p = 0.002$) compared to the treatment-as-usual control group. Patients with the largest reduction in depression symptoms also experienced an increase in coping ($p = 0.0006$), mood ($p = 0.049$), self-esteem ($p = 0.004$), and extroversion ($p = 0.06$). No significant correlations were found with working ability or physical contact

with animals, although physical contact with farm animals was strongly correlated with improved mood ($p < 0.0001$) (Berget et al., 2011). Furthermore, residents in a long-term care facility also report a significant difference in the reduction of depression symptoms ($p = 0.017$) when exposed to animal-assisted activities compared to those receiving treatment as usual. There was however no evidence of a difference in the reduction of anxiety symptoms for both groups (Le Roux 2009). Pedersen (2012) examined the effect of a 12-week farm animal-assisted therapy intervention on levels of depression, anxiety, and self-efficacy in people with clinical depression. A significant decline in symptoms of depression ($p = 0.003$) was found in the intervention group compared to the wait-list control group at endpoint. A significant increase in self-efficacy scores ($p = 0.045$) was also reported. However, no significant decrease in state anxiety symptoms was found ($p = 0.059$).

Amongst patients diagnosed with schizophrenia, the use of animal-assisted therapy did not demonstrate statistically significant improvements of instrumental and self-care, but improvements in social functioning were statistically significant compared to treatment as usual (Barak et al., 2001). Furthermore, a significant increase in self-efficacy was reported for psychiatric patients who were exposed to animal-assisted therapy with farm animals after six months of follow-up compared to treatment as usual (Berget et al., 2008). Although, no changes in quality of life were reported. Coping ability did show a positive change in scores for the treatment group. Nonetheless, patients with the largest increase in self-efficacy during the intervention also showed the largest increase in coping ($p = 0.0029$). Similarly, the patients with the largest increase in coping strategy reported the largest improvement in mood ($p = 0.02$), and they favoured to a larger extent physical contact with the animals ($p = 0.03$).

Finally, two trials investigated substance dependence and animal-assisted therapy. Wesley et al. (2006) and Wesley et al. (2009) reported that the therapeutic alliance was enhanced with the addition of a therapy dog. The addition of a therapy dog also lowered heart and diastolic blood pressure rates than those without exposure to a therapy dog. These results were not found amongst patients with a dual diagnosis.

5. Discussion

We found eighteen randomised control trials utilising an ecotherapy interventions (i.e. eight environmental therapy interventions and ten animal-assisted therapy

interventions). A significant reduction in depression symptoms was reported by eleven RCTs (Antonioli & Reveley, 2005; Berman, et al., 2012; Berget et al., 2011; Gelkopf et al., 2013; Irandoust & Taheri 2017; Kam & Siu, 2010; Kim, et al., 2009; Le Roux & Kemp, 2009; McCaffrey, 2007; Pedersen et al., 2012; Shin et al., 2012), while a number of studies also reported a significant reduction in anxiety (Kam & Siu, 2010; Hoffmann et al., 2009; Le Roux & Kemp, 2009; Pedersen et al., 2012), post-traumatic stress symptoms (Gelkopf et al., 2013), schizophrenia (Barak et al., 2001; Zhu, et al., 2016) and addictive disorders (Wesley et al., 2009; Wesley et al., 2006). The evidence of this study on ecotherapy interventions for people living with mental health conditions is consistent with findings of previous systematic reviews on environmental and animal-assisted therapies in healthy populations. For instance, a significant reduction in depressive and anxiety features were found in systematic reviews on environmental therapies by Wen, et al. (2019) and Lee, et al. (2017).

The study has a number of limitations. It only searched articles published in the English language and underwent two updates since the primary systematic review. A meta-analysis was not performed owing to the heterogeneity of evidence.

There are also limitations to the evidence of these studies. The findings of this review specifically look at mood, anxiety, substance dependence, schizophrenia, and stressor-related psychiatric disorders. The studies and sample size of the included studies are few and small and this raises concerns around the overestimation of the effects of these interventions. There were more single-centre than multi-centre trials which may have biased the study findings and its generalisability across institutions (Higgins & Greens, 2011). Studies specifically assessing depression and anxiety used self-report measures. The lack of blinding and the reporting of effect estimates may have also biased the findings. Furthermore, findings from the assessment of quality of evidence suggest inconsistencies in standards of reporting across RCTs. These limitations of evidence are similar to those mentioned by other systematic reviews conducted on ecotherapies in healthy populations (Kamioka, et al., 2014; Kondo, et al., 2018; Wen, et al., 2019; Roberts, et al., 2019). Considering the complexity and multiple confounding variables, the appropriateness of RCTs for ecotherapy modalities is in question and should be further explored (Gabrielsen, 2016).

6. Conclusion

There is suggestive, but not conclusive, evidence for the efficacy of some ecotherapy interventions in mental disorders. Environmental therapies were effective in both the improvement and treatment of depressive, post-traumatic stress, alcohol use and schizophrenia spectrum disorders. Animal-assisted therapies have been shown to be effective for depressive, anxiety, alcohol use and schizophrenia spectrum disorders. In particular, there are: four environmental therapy trials and five animal-assisted therapy trials for depression and/or anxiety; one environmental therapy trial for post-traumatic stress disorder; three environmental therapy and animal assisted therapy trials for general psychiatric disorders; one environmental therapy trial and two animal assisted therapy trials for substance use disorders; and, one environmental therapy and two animal-assisted trials for people living with schizophrenia spectrum disorder. The use of standard reporting guidelines may improve evidence quality of future ecotherapy RCTs, and provide a foundation meta-analysis of the evidence.

References

- Antonioli, C., & Reveley, M.A. (2005). Randomised controlled trial of animal facilitated therapy with dolphins in the treatment of depression. *BMJ*, 331, 1-4.
<http://doi.org/bs4wrd>
- Attademo, L., Bernardini, F., Garinella, R., & Compton, M. T. (2017). Environmental pollution and risk of psychotic disorders: A review of the science to date. *Schizophrenia research*, 181, 55-59. <http://doi.org/f9zvjm>
- Barak, Y. (2001). Animal-assisted therapy for elderly schizophrenic patients: A one-year controlled trial. *The American Journal of Geriatric Psychiatry*, 9(4), 439-442.
<http://doi.org/dmqwbh>
- Berget, B., Ekeberg, Ø., & Braastad, B. O. (2008). Animal-assisted therapy with farm animals for persons with psychiatric disorders: effects on self-efficacy, coping ability and quality of life, a randomized controlled trial. *Clinical Practice and Epidemiology in Mental Health*, 4(9), 1-7. <http://doi.org/bb9zpn>
- Berget, B., Ekeberg, Ø., Pedersen, I., & Braastad, B.O. (2011). Animal-assisted therapy with farm animals for persons with psychiatric disorders: affects on anxiety and depression, a randomized controlled trial. *Occupational Therapy in Mental Health*, 27, 50-64. <http://doi.org/c5x4gk>
- Berget, B., & Grepperud, S. (2011). Animal-assisted interventions for psychiatric patients: beliefs in treatment effects among practitioners. *European Journal of Integrative Medicine*, 3, e91–e96. <http://doi.org/c8wn2z>
- Berman, M.G., Jonides, J., Kaplan, S., 2008. The cognitive benefits of interacting with nature. *Psychological Science* 19 (12), 1207. <http://doi.org/c97t5p>
- Berman, M. G., Kross, E., Krpan, K. M., Askren, M. K., Burson, A., Deldin, P. J., ... & Jonides, J. (2012). Interacting with nature improves cognition and affect for individuals with depression. *Journal of affective disorders*, 140(3), 300-305. <http://doi.org/f369vx>
- Buzzell, L., & Chalquist, C. (2009). *Ecotherapy: Healing with nature in mind*. Sierra Club Books, San Fransisco.
- Buzzell, L. (2016). The many ecotherapies. In (M. Jordan & J Hinds (Eds.) *Ecotherapy: Theory, research & practice*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Gabrielsen, L. E., Fernee, C. R., Aasen, G. O., & Eskedal, L. T. (2016). Why randomized trials are challenging within adventure therapy research: Lessons learned in Norway. *Journal of Experiential Education*, 39(1), 5-14. <http://doi.org/dqr5>
- Gao, Q., Xu, Q., Guo, X., Fan, H., & Zhu, H. (2017). Particulate matter air pollution associated with hospital admissions for mental disorders: a time-series study in Beijing, China. *European Psychiatry*, 44, 68-75. <http://doi.org/dqr4>
- Gelkopf, M., Hasson-Ohayon, I., Bikman, M., & Kravetz, S. (2013). Nature adventure rehabilitation for combat-related posttraumatic chronic stress disorder: A randomized control trial. *Psychiatry Research*, 1-9. <http://doi.org/f5g8d2>
- Gu, X., Liu, Q., Deng, F., Wang, X., Lin, H., Guo, X., & Wu, S. (2019). Association between particulate matter air pollution and risk of depression and suicide: systematic review and meta-analysis. *The British Journal of Psychiatry*, 1-12. <http://doi.org/dqr6>
- Higgins, J.P.T., & Greens, S. (2011). *Cochrane Handbook for systematic reviews of interventions Version 5.1.0*. [updated March 2011]. The Cochrane Collaboration. <https://handbook-5-1.cochrane.org>
- Hoffmann, A.O.M., Lee, A.H., Wertenauer, F., Ricken, R., Jansen, J.J., Gallinat, J., & Lang, U.E. (2009). Dog-assisted intervention significantly reduces anxiety in hospitalized patients with major depression. *European Journal of Integrative Medicine* 1, 145–148. <http://doi.org/fgp3nj>
- Irandoust, K., & Taheri, M. (2017). The effect of vitamin D supplement and indoor vs outdoor physical activity on depression of obese depressed women. *Asian journal of sports medicine*, 8(3). <http://doi.org/dqr7>
- Jordan, M., & Hinds, J. (Eds.) (2016). *Ecotherapy: Theory, research and practice*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kam, M.C.Y., & Siu, A.M.H. (2010). Evaluation of Horticultural Activity Programmes for Persons with Psychiatric Illness. *Hong Kong Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 20(2), 80–86. <http://doi.org/dqr8>
- Kamioka, H., Okada, S., Tsutani, K., Park, H., Okuizumi, H., Handa, S., ... & Honda, T. (2014b). Effectiveness of animal-assisted therapy: A systematic review of randomized

controlled trials. *Complementary therapies in medicine*, 22(2), 371-390.

<http://doi.org/f55jtc>

Kamioka, H., Tsutani, K., Yamada, M., Park, H., Okuizumi, H., Honda, T., ... & Handa, S.

(2014a). Effectiveness of horticultural therapy: a systematic review of randomized controlled trials. *Complementary therapies in medicine*, 22(5), 930-943.

<http://doi.org/f6nh8g>

Kim, W., Lim, S. K., Chung, E. J., & Woo, J. M. (2009). The effect of cognitive behavior

therapy-based psychotherapy applied in a forest environment on physiological

changes and remission of major depressive disorder. *Psychiatry investigation*, 6(4),

245. <http://doi.org/d856fc>

Kondo, M. C., Fluehr, J. M., McKeon, T., & Branas, C. C. (2018). Urban green space and its

impact on human health. *International journal of environmental research and public*

health, 15(3), 445. <http://doi.org/gdcjhm>

Lee, I., Choi, H., Bang, K. S., Kim, S., Song, M., & Lee, B. (2017). Effects of forest therapy on

depressive symptoms among adults: A systematic review. *International journal of*

environmental research and public health, 14(3), 321. <http://doi.org/f9228m>

Le Roux, M.C., & Kemp, R. (2009). Effect of a companion dog on depression and anxiety

levels of elderly residents in a long-term care facility. *Journal of the American*

Geriatrics Society, 9, 23–26. <http://doi.org/d975s7>

Lund, C., Breen, A., Flisher, A. J., Kakuma, R., Corrigall, J., Joska, J. A., ... & Patel,

V. (2010). Poverty and common mental disorders in low and middle income

countries: A systematic review. *Social science & medicine*, 71(3), 517-528.

<http://doi.org/cj8bsg>

Maujean, A., Pepping, C. A., & Kendall, E. (2015). A systematic review of randomized

controlled trials of animal-assisted therapy on psychosocial outcomes. *Anthrozoös*,

28(1), 23-36. <http://doi.org/dqsc>

Mascayano, F., Armijo, J.E., & HsinYang, L. (2015). Addressing stigma relating to mental

illness in low- and middle-income countries. *Frontiers in Psychiatry*, 6, 1-2.

<http://doi.org/dqsb>

McCaffrey, R. (2007). The effect of healing gardens and art therapy on older adults with mild

to moderate depression. *Holistic Nursing Practice*, 21(2), 79-84. <http://doi.org/dqr9>

- Nutsford, D., Pearson, A. L., & Kingham, S. (2013). An ecological study investigating the association between access to urban green space and mental health. *Public health*, 127(11), 1005-1011. <http://doi.org/gcx9mc>
- Oh, B., Lee, K. J., Zaslowski, C., Yeung, A., Rosenthal, D., Larkey, L., & Back, M. (2017). Health and well-being benefits of spending time in forests: systematic review. *Environmental health and preventive medicine*, 22(1), 71. <http://doi.org/gddmxb>
- Pedersen, I., Martinsen, E.W., Berget, B., & Braastad, B.O. (2012). Farm animal-assisted intervention for people with clinical depression: A randomized controlled trial. *Anthrozoös*, 25(2), 149–160. <http://doi.org/f3zsn4>
- Power, M. C., Kioumourtzoglou, M. A., Hart, J. E., Okereke, O. I., Laden, F., & Weisskopf, M. G. (2015). The relation between past exposure to fine particulate air pollution and prevalent anxiety: observational cohort study. *BMJ*, 350, h1111. <http://doi.org/gb3sx3>
- Rehm, J., & Shield, K. D. (2019). Global burden of disease and the impact of mental and addictive disorders. *Current psychiatry reports*, 21(2), 10. <http://doi.org/dqrz>
- Rautio, N., Filatova, S., Lehtiniemi, H., & Miettunen, J. (2018). Living environment and its relationship to depressive mood: A systematic review. *International Journal of Social Psychiatry*, 64(1), 92-103. <http://doi.org/dqr2>
- Roberts, H., Van Lissa, C., Hagedoorn, P., Kellar, I., & Helbich, M. (2019). The effect of short-term exposure to the natural environment on depressive mood: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Environmental research*, 108606. <http://doi.org/dqrw>
- Shanahan, D. F., Astell-Burt, T., Barber, E. A., Brymer, E., Cox, D. T., Dean, J., ... & Jones, A. (2019). Nature-based interventions for improving health and wellbeing: The purpose, the people and the outcomes. *Sports*, 7(6), 141. <http://doi.org/dppr>
- Shin, W.S., Shin, C.S., & Yeoun, P.S. (2012). The influence of forest therapy camp on depression in alcoholics. *Environmental Health and Preventive Medicine*, 17, 73–76. <http://doi.org/b6g4m6>
- Steg, L., van den Berg, A. E., & de Groot, J. I. (2018). Environmental psychology: History, scope, and methods. In Steg, L., van den Berg, A. E., & de Groot, J. I.

(Eds.). *Environmental psychology: an introduction*. New Jersey: Wiley-Blackwell. <http://doi.org/dqrv>

The World Health Organisation. (2013). *Mental health action plan 2013-2020*. WHO Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data. WHO Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data. <https://bit.ly/2V01gpB>

The World Health Organisation. (2001). *The World health report: 2001: Mental health: new understanding, new hope*. Publications, World Health Organization, Geneva, Switzerland. <https://bit.ly/33UKMD2>

Tomita, A., Vandormael, A. M., Cuadros, D., Di Minin, E., Heikinheimo, V., Tanser, F., ... & Burns, J. K. (2017). Green environment and incident depression in South Africa: a geospatial analysis and mental health implications in a resource-limited setting. *The Lancet Planetary Health*, 1(4), e152-e162. <http://doi.org/dqrt>

Villalta-Gil, V., Roca, M., Gonzalez, N., Domenec, E., Cuca, Escanilla, A., Asensio, M.R., Esteban, M.E., Ochoa, S., Haro, J.M. (2009). Dog-assisted therapy in the treatment of chronic schizophrenia inpatients. *Anthrozoos*. v22 i2, 149(11). <http://doi.org/fh9mzr>

Wen, Y., Yan, Q., Pan, Y., Gu, X., & Liu, Y. (2019). Medical empirical research on forest bathing (Shinrin-yoku): a systematic review. *Environmental Health and Preventive Medicine*, 24(1), 70. <http://doi.org/dqsd>

Wesley, M.C., Minatrea, N.B., & Watson, J.C. (2009). Animal-Assisted Therapy in the Treatment of Substance Dependence. *Anthrozoös*, 22(2), 137-148. <http://doi.org/b52v26>

Wesley, M. C. (2006). Animal-assisted therapy and the therapeutic alliance in the treatment of substance dependence. Walden University.

Zhu, S., Wan, H., Lu, Z., Wu, H., Zhang, Q., Qian, X., & Ye, C. (2016). Treatment effect of antipsychotics in combination with horticultural therapy on patients with schizophrenia: a randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled study. *Shanghai archives of psychiatry*, 28(4), 195. <http://doi.org/dqsf>

Table 1: Study characteristics.

Study ID	Health outcome	Fun- ding	Count ry/ Settin gs	Interv ention	Compari son Group	Wk s/d ays	Tot al (N)	Gen der	Mean age of samp le/ rang e	Mental health measures	Dro p- outs	Lo st to foll ow -up
Environmental Therapy												
1. Berman 2012	Major Depressi ve Disorder	Yes	United State of Ameri ca (Singl e centre)	Nature walk	Repeat control (urban walking)	50 - 55 min ute wal k	20	12 Fem ale; 8 Male	26	BDI, SCID	0	0
2. Gelkopf 2013	Combat- related posttrau matic chronic stress disorder	NS	Israel (Singl e centre)	Nature Adven ture Rehab ilitatio n (NAR)	Waiting list (WL) control	1 yea r	42	All male	38.3 ± 1.6 (24- 59)	SASRQ, BDI-FS, PCIQ, HSS, a 7- item functional scale, HS	6	NS
3. Irandou st, 2017	Women living with comorbid depressi on and obesity	NS	Iran (Singl e centre)	Indoor and outdo or physic al activit y with or withou t vitami n B supple menta tion	The control group did not perform any regular ex- ercise during the 12- week period	12 wee ks	75	All fema le	43.2 ± 12.4 years	BDI, BMI, Laboratory measures.	12	0

4. Kam 2010	Psychiatric illnesses: schizophrenia spectrum disorders, bipolar disorder, or major depression)	NS	Hong Kong (Single centre)	Horticultural therapy (HT)	Control (conventional sheltered workshop training)	2 weeks	24	7 Females; 17 Males	44.3 ± 11.04	DASS21, WBA, PWI-C, semi-structured interviews	2	NS
5. Kim 2009	MDD	NS	Korea (Single centre)	CBT-based psychotherapy applied in the forest environment	CBT-based psychotherapy applied in traditional setting	4 sessions over 4 weeks	63	54 Female; 9 Male	Forest group: 43.39 ± 12.14; Hospital group: 44.26 ± 13.49; Control: 48.76 ± 9.63	HAM-D; MADRS	2	0
6. McCaffrey 2007	Depression	Yes	Florida (Multi-centre)	Group 1: garden walks alone	Group 2: garden walks with guided imagery Group 3: garden walks with art therapy	6 weeks	60	Not reported	75	Storytelling, GDS	NS	NS
7. Shin 2012	Depression and comorbid alcohol use d/o	NS	Korea (Single centre)	Forest therapy	Control (normal daily routines)	9 days	92	8 Females; 84 Males	45.26 ± 3.89	BDI	NS	NS

8. Zhu 2016	Schizophrenia	Yes	China (Single centre)	Horticultural therapy	Treatment as usual	12 weeks	55	31 Females; 24 Males	46.5	PANSS	6	0
Animal Assisted Therapy												
9. Antoniolini 2005	Depression	None	Honduras (Multi-centre)	Dolphin	Control (outdoor nature programme)	2 weeks	30	27 Females; 3 Males	18-65	HAM-D, BDI, ZSRAS	5	NS
10. Barak 2001	Schizophrenia	NS	Israel (Single centre)	Animal-assisted therapy (AAT)	Matched control group	1 year	20	14 Females; 6 Males	79.1 ± 6.7	SAFE	0	0
11. Berget 2011	Psychiatric disorders : Anxiety and Depression	Yes	Norway (Multi-centre)	Farm animals (i.e. cows, horses and goats)	Control	12 weeks	90	Not reported	34.7 ± 10.7 (18–58)	BDI, STAI, 5 point scale	22	NS
12. Berget 2008	Psychiatric disorders : schizophrenia, affective disorders, anxiety, and personality disorders	Yes	Norway (Multi-centre)	Cows, sheep, horses, rabbits, poultry, pigs, cats or dogs.	Control	12 weeks	90	59 Females; 31 Males	34.7 ± 10.7 (18–58)	GSE, CSS, QOLS-N	21	NS
13. Hoffmann 2009	Major Depression	None	Berlin (Single centre)	Dog	Control	3 sessions	12	6 Females; 6 Males	40.5 ± 10	STAI	NS	NS

14. Le Roux 2009	Depression and anxiety levels of elderly residents in a long-term care facility	NS	Cape Town (Single centre)	Dog	Control	6 weeks	16	8 Female; 8 Male	65 and older	BDI, BAI	1	NS
15. Pederse n 2012	Clinical Depression	Yes	Norway (Multi-centre)	Farm animals (i.e. cows)	Wait-list control	12 weeks	29	11 Female and 3 male in intervention	37.8 (23–58)	BDI-IA, STAI-SS, GSE	10	NS
16. Villalta-Gil 2009	Schizophrenia	Yes	Spain (Single centre)	IG + Dog	Control (IG)	25 sessions	21	Not reported	50 years	PANSS, LSP, WHOQOL-BREF, STQ	3	NS
17. Wesley 2009	Substance Dependence	NS	Kentucky (Single centre)	Dog	Control	26 sessions	231	117 Female; 114 Males	18-55 years	PAS, HAQ-II	NS	NS
18. Wesley 2006	Substance Dependence	NS	NS	Therapy + Dog	Therapy + no Dog	NS	NS	Not reported	NS	NS	NS	NS

LEGEND: wks: weeks; NS: not specified. BAI: Beck Anxiety Inventory; BDI/BDI-IA: Beck Depression Inventory; BDI-FS: Beck Depression Inventory Fast Screen; BMI: Body Mass Index; BSI: Brief Symptom Inventory; CSS: Coping Strategies Scale; DASS21: Chinese Depression Anxiety Stress Scale 21; ECA: Efficacy for coping with anxiety in novel situations; ESG: Efficacy for Working and Problem-Solving in a Group; GDS: Geriatric Depression Scale; GSE: Generalized Self-Efficacy Scale; HAM-D: Hamilton Depression Rating Scale; HSS: Human Service Scale; HS: Hope Scale; LSP: Living Skills Profile; MADRS: Montgomery-Asberg Depression Rating Scales; PANSS: Positive and Negative Syndrome Scale; PAS: Pet Attitude Scale; PCIQ: Perceived Control over Illness Questionnaire; POMS: Profile of Mood States;

PSE: Physical Self-efficacy Scale; QOLS-N: Quality of Life Scale; RSE: Rosenberg Self-esteem Scale; PWI-C: Personal Wellbeing Index; SAFE: Scale for Social Adaptive Functioning Evaluation; SASRQ: 30-item Stanford Acute Stress Reaction Questionnaire; SCID: Structured Clinical Interview (SCID); S-EFF: Adolescent Self-efficacy Scale; SSE: Self-efficacy Scale; STAI: State-Trait Anxiety Inventory; STAI-SS: State-Trait Anxiety Inventory-State Subscale; STQ: Satisfaction with Treatment Questionnaire; WBA: Work Behavior Assessment; ZSRAS: Zung self-rating anxiety scale; WHOQOL-BREF: Brief World Health Organization Quality of Life Assessment-Spanish version.

Table 2: CONSORT 2010 Data.

CONSORT 2010 checklist of information to include when reporting a randomised trial*

Section/Topic	Item No	Checklist item	No. of studies (N = 18, %)
Title and abstract			
	1a	Identification as a randomised trial in the title	7 (39%)
	1b	Structured summary of trial design, methods, results, and conclusions (for specific guidance see CONSORT for abstracts)	0 (0%)
Introduction			
Background and objectives	2a	Scientific background and explanation of rationale	17 (94%)
	2b	Specific objectives or hypotheses	18 (100%)
Methods			
Trial design	3a	Description of trial design (such as parallel, factorial) including allocation ratio	4 (22%)
	3b	Important changes to methods after trial commencement (such as eligibility criteria), with reasons	NA
Participants	4a	Eligibility criteria for participants	16 (89%)
	4b	Settings and locations where the data were collected	16 (89%)
Interventions	5	The interventions for each group with sufficient details to allow replication, including how and when they were actually administered	17 (94%)
Outcomes	6a	Completely defined pre-specified primary and secondary outcome measures, including how and when they were assessed	9 (50%)

	6b	Any changes to trial outcomes after the trial commenced, with reasons	NA
Sample size	7a	How sample size was determined	7 (39%)
	7b	When applicable, explanation of any interim analyses and stopping guidelines	NA
Randomisation:			
	8a	Method used to generate the random allocation sequence	8 (44%)
S e q u e n c e g e n e r a t i o n	8b	Type of randomisation; details of any restriction (such as blocking and block size)	8 (44%)
	9	Mechanism used to implement the random allocation sequence (such as sequentially numbered containers), describing any steps taken to conceal the sequence until interventions were assigned	3 (17%)
A l l o c a t i o n c o n c e a l m			

e n t m e c h a n i s m			
Implementati on	10	Who generated the random allocation sequence, who enrolled participants, and who assigned participants to interventions	4 (22%)
Blinding	11a	If done, who was blinded after assignment to interventions (for example, participants, care providers, those assessing outcomes) and how	NA – nature interventions – cannot be blinded – single blind
	11b	If relevant, description of the similarity of interventions	NA – not normally reported
Statistical methods	12a	Statistical methods used to compare groups for primary and secondary outcomes	15 (83%)
	12b	Methods for additional analyses, such as subgroup analyses and adjusted analyses	1 (6%)
Results			
Participant flow (a diagram is	13a	For each group, the numbers of participants who were randomly assigned, received intended treatment, and were analysed for the primary outcome	6 (33%)

strongly recommended)	13b	For each group, losses and exclusions after randomisation, together with reasons	5 (28%)
Recruitment	14a	Dates defining the periods of recruitment and follow-up	NA – methods
	14b	Why the trial ended or was stopped	NA
Baseline data	15	A table showing baseline demographic and clinical characteristics for each group	6 (33%)
Numbers analysed	16	For each group, number of participants (denominator) included in each analysis and whether the analysis was by original assigned groups	6 (33%)
Outcomes and estimation	17a	For each primary and secondary outcome, results for each group, and the estimated effect size and its precision (such as 95% confidence interval)	10 (56%)
	17b	For binary outcomes, presentation of both absolute and relative effect sizes is recommended – not normally reported – ten studies only reported continuous data based on their outcome measured	3 (17%)
Ancillary analyses	18	Results of any other analyses performed, including subgroup analyses and adjusted analyses, distinguishing pre-specified from exploratory	1 (6%)
Harms	19	All important harms or unintended effects in each group (for specific guidance see CONSORT for harms) – sometimes reported in the discussion section	2 (11%)
Discussion			
Limitations	20	Trial limitations, addressing sources of potential bias, imprecision, and, if relevant, multiplicity of analyses	7 (39%)
Generalisability	21	Generalisability (external validity, applicability) of the trial findings	8 (44%)
Interpretation	22	Interpretation consistent with results, balancing benefits and harms, and considering other relevant evidence	6 (33%)
Other information			

Registration	23	Registration number and name of trial registry	1 (6%)
Protocol	24	Where the full trial protocol can be accessed, if available	0 (0%)
Funding	25	Sources of funding and other support (such as supply of drugs), role of funders	9 (50%)

*We strongly recommend reading this statement in conjunction with the CONSORT 2010 Explanation and Elaboration for important clarifications on all the items. If relevant, we also recommend reading CONSORT extensions for cluster randomised trials, non-inferiority and equivalence trials, non-pharmacological treatments, herbal interventions, and pragmatic trials. Additional extensions are forthcoming: for those and for up to date references relevant to this checklist, see www.consort-statement.org.

Figure 1. Prisma diagram - Study Eligibility.