

1 **A global meta-analysis of effects of green infrastructure on COVID-19 infection**
2 **and mortality rates**

3 Bopaki Phogole and Kowiyou Yessoufou*

4 Department of Geography, Environmental Management, and Energy Studies,
5 University of Johannesburg, Johannesburg, South Africa

6

7

8 *Correspondence: kowiyouy@uj.ac.za

9

10 Abstract

11 Evidence of the benefits of greenspaces or greenness to human wellbeing in the
 12 context of COVID-19 is fragmented and sometimes contradictory. This calls for a
 13 meta-analysis of existing studies to clarify the matter. Here, we identified 621 studies
 14 across the world, which were then filtered down to 13 relevant studies covering
 15 Africa, Asia, Europe, and USA. These studies were meta-analysed, with the impacts
 16 of greenspaces on COVID-19 infection rate quantified using regression estimates
 17 whereas impacts on mortality was measured using mortality rate ratios. We found
 18 evidence of significant negative correlations between greenness and both COVID-19
 19 infection and mortality rates. We further found that the impacts on COVID-19
 20 infection and mortality are moderated by year of publication, greenness metrics,
 21 sample size, health and political covariates. This clarification has far-reaching
 22 implications on policy development towards the establishment and management of
 23 green infrastructure for the benefits of human wellbeing.

24 Introduction

25 Global human population is changing rapidly following an exponential growth path,
 26 putting tremendous pressures on natural resources. Currently, it is approximately 7.9
 27 billion people¹ and is predicted to reach above 9 billion by 2050 or 11 billion by
 28 2100². In response, nature fights back in various ways to bring down global
 29 population to a sustainable level. One of these ways is through global pandemics,
 30 e.g., COVID-19. Indeed, the world has been witnessing COVID-19 pandemic since
 31 2020, with over half a million of infection cases and over 20,000 deaths in 2020³. In
 32 2022, these figures grew tremendously, reaching over 600 million cumulative cases
 33 with over 6 million cumulative deaths⁴. Subsequently, various studies, using different
 34 metrics of greenness (the total amount of vegetation in an area), were conducted
 35 across the globe to investigate whether greenness act as buffer infrastructure
 36 against the spread of COVID-19 infection rates and severity.

37
 38 However, the findings reported in these studies are mixed^{5,6}. For example, ref.⁷
 39 found that a 0.1 increase in NDVI is linked to 4.1% reduction in COVID-19 incidence
 40 rate ratio in the USA. A similar pattern was observed using street-level indicators of
 41 greenness⁸. The mitigating effects of greenness have also been reported elsewhere:
 42 in China and India, an increase in greenness shows a strong negative association
 43 with the spread of COVID-19 infections and mortalities^{9,10}. These negative effects
 44 may be interpreted as follows: activities of the Natural Killer (NK) cells in human
 45 body are boosted with frequent exposure to vegetation^{3,11} – NK cells, as part of the
 46 immune system, attack to eliminate virus-infected cells¹². Also, by safeguarding
 47 against air pollution, vegetation contributes to lower health risks that may aggravate
 48 the severity of COVID-19 infection^{13,14}. Additionally, green infrastructure often
 49 provides spacious environment for physical exercise, recreation, and social events
 50 with reduced chances of person-to-person contact^{15,16}. As opposed to these negative
 51 correlations between greenness and COVID-19 infection rates, reports of positive
 52 correlations are also documented. For example, ref.⁶ found that urban greenspaces
 53 were associated with an increase in the spread of COVID-19 infections (see also
 54 ref.^{15,16}).

55

56 These mixed findings could be linked to the differences in how COVID-19 severity
57 was measured, e.g., as hospitalization rates, mortality rates, admission rate to ICU,
58 etc. Additional sources of differences in findings may be linked to differences in
59 sample size, type and number of covariates considered, and choice of statistical
60 tests^{17,18}. Furthermore, the mixed findings may be linked to differences in how
61 greenness was measured in different studies. Indeed, greenness was variously
62 measured as street trees, botanical gardens, natural forests and grasslands, and
63 residential gardens or as amount of greenness captured in NDVI or EVI or as quality
64 of green infrastructure^{7,8,19,20}. For example, ref.¹⁵ measured greenness as 'green
65 space density' which is the proportion of specific vegetation types in a given spatial
66 unit which they correlated with COVI-19 infection risk measured as 'venue density'
67 (number of buildings visited by confirmed COVID-19 positive cases). Since
68 greenspaces are attraction sites, they attract increasing number of visitors, thus
69 increasing the infection risks, and leading to a positive correlation between
70 greenness and infection rate¹⁵. Furthermore, the mixed findings may be linked to the
71 use of various confounding factors in the model of COVID-19 infection and mortality
72 rates. These factors may be age²¹, ethnicity²², and poverty level²³, among others.

73
74 The emergence of conflicting findings presents a challenge with regards to the
75 generalization of the benefits of greenness to human wellbeing in the context of
76 COVID-19 pandemic. In such context, a meta-analysis of existing evidence presents
77 an opportunity to integrate the conflicting reported effects of greenness on COVID-19
78 infection rates and severity to investigate whether generalization is possible.
79 Scientifically rigorous methodologies are increasingly adopted in various studies to
80 improve the validity of findings and lower between-study heterogeneity. These
81 include the use of larger sample sizes, use of multiple predictors, choice of relevant
82 statistical tests and covariates, and use of fine spatial scales²³⁻²⁶. Regardless of
83 these advances, consolidation of measured effect sizes and determination of
84 between-study heterogeneity is still needed. To date, several studies have
85 investigated the relationships between the provision and quantity of greenness and
86 its effects on the spread and severity of COVID-19^{5,7,10,20}. However, in the context of
87 conflictual findings reported, a meta-analysis imposes itself or becomes an obligation
88 if we are to clarify how greenness or green infrastructure relates to COVID-19. In the
89 present study, our main objective is to provide such clarifications.

90 **Results**

91 ***Characteristics of studies included in the meta-analysis***

92 A total of 621 studies across the world (Figure 1A) were identified through the search
93 of Scopus, PubMed, and Google scholar platforms. After removing irrelevant and
94 duplicate studies, 25 studies remained, covering Africa, Asia, Europe, and USA
95 (Figure 1B). A review of the 25 full-text articles resulted in a removal of 12 studies
96 that were either review/commentary in nature or did not report the required statistical
97 parameters for meta-analysis.

98

99 The study characteristics are summarized in Table S1. Nine studies that tested the
100 relationships between greenness and COVID-19 infections and four studies that
101 investigated the relationships between greenness and COVID-19 mortality rates
102 were included in the final synthesis. Most of the studies (nine out of 13) were
103 conducted in the United States of America (USA) whereas China, England, India,
104 and South Africa each had one study (Figure 1B). A total of 7 out of 13 studies used
105 more than one predictor of COVID-19 impact in each study with normalised
106 difference vegetation index (NDVI) and abundance of greenness as the mostly used
107 measures of greenness (Figure 2A). Because multiple predictors are used in a single
108 study, a total of 45 different correlations between infection rates and greenness were
109 produced in all 13 studies and 14 correlations between mortality rates and
110 greenness were produced from four studies of COVID-19. We classified covariates
111 into five broad groups: climatic, demographic, economic, health, and political. All 13
112 studies considered at least one demographic covariate in their analyses, and only
113 four studies included climatic, demographic, economic, health, and political
114 covariates (Figure 2B).

115

116 ***Greenness and COVID-19 infections***

117 We found a statistically significant negative effect of greenness on COVID-19
118 infections ($\beta = -0.08$, 95% CI: $-0.1396 - -0.0252$; $t=-2.90$; $p=0.006$) with a prediction
119 interval of $[-0.3601 - 0.1954]$ (95% CI) (Figure 3). Between-study heterogeneity
120 variance was estimated at $\tau^2 = 0.0184$ (95% CI: $0.0185 - -0.0813$), with an I^2 value of
121 94.1% (95% CI: 92.9% – 95.1%). Subgroup analyses reveal that between-study
122 heterogeneity can be attributed to year of publication ($X^2=8.24$; $p=0.02$), choice of

predictors ($X^2=129.68$; $p<0.01$), and use of political covariates ($X^2=8.27$; $p<0.01$) (see Table 1 and Figures S1 – S6).

Greenness and COVID-19 mortalities

We found that an increase in greenness was strongly linked to lower mortality rate ratio (MRR= 0.9272; 95% CI: 0.8788 – 0.9783; $t=-3.05$; $p=0.009$) with a prediction interval of [0.7683 – 1.1189] (95% CI) (Figure 4). Furthermore, an estimated 0.0069 between-study heterogeneity variance (95% CI: 0.0032 – 0.0228) was observed with an I^2 value of 92% (95% CI: 88.3% – 94.5%). We also found that year of publication ($X^2=19.10$; $p<0.01$), sample size ($X^2=7.92$; $p<0.01$), choice of predictors ($X^2=14.92$; $p<0.01$), and use of health ($X^2=7.92$; $p<0.01$) and political ($X^2=22.75$; $p<0.01$) covariates strongly impact the degree of heterogeneity (see Table 2 & Figures S7 – S13).

Publication bias

Existence of publication bias was investigated using the Funnel approach and Orwin fail-safe number. The presence of funnel plot symmetry (Figure 5A) indicated a lack of publication bias for studies that investigate the effect of greenness on COVID-19 infections (Fail-safe N: 45). Publication bias was, however, observed for studies that test the relationship between greenness and COVID-19 mortalities (Figure 5B; Fail-safe N: 14).

Discussion

Our meta-analysis provides evidence that an increase in abundance or exposure to greenness is associated with a significant reduction in COVID-19 infection rates and death cases^{10,19,27}. However, we found high heterogeneity between the studies that were included in the meta-analysis. Subgroup analyses revealed that heterogeneity in studies on COVID-19 infections and mortality is strongly predicted by the studies' years of publication, choices of predictors (metrics of greenness), and inclusion of political covariates. Additionally, sample size and consideration of health covariates strongly affect heterogeneity of studies on COVID-19 mortalities.

The sensitivity of effect size to year of publication can be attributed to availability of data to adequately model the impact of COVID-19. The spread of COVID-19 and increased global testing for COVID-19 infection accelerated overtime, thus allowing successive studies to have an increasingly larger data pool^{28,29}. This may also impact sample sizes that are adopted in each study. As more regions produce more data on COVID-19 infections and mortality, their eligibility to be included in studies investigating the correlations between COVID-19 and greenness may enhance study designs. In our subgroup analysis, we found that studies that used smaller sample sizes ($n < 2000$) are likely to report larger effect sizes compared to studies with larger sample sizes. Given the importance of selecting an appropriate sample size³⁰, the need to define an appropriate sample size for investigating the health benefits of green infrastructure remains critical.

The diversity of greenness metrics, ranging from street trees to large forests, presents a unique challenge while measuring their impacts. Commonly, studies that cover large study areas use vegetation indices such as NDVI or EVI which are retrieved from satellite imagery³¹⁻³³. Since health benefits of greenness are usually felt closer to the greenness^{34,35}, several studies consider local greenness such as household gardens³⁶, street trees^{37,38}, and local parks^{39,40} in their analysis. However, this approach is only feasible when focusing on smaller areas. In some cases, subjective measures of greenness were used^{41,42}. Our findings in the present study suggest that the choice of greenness metrics adopted in different studies affects the its effect size. The use of NDVI, EVI or vegetation canopy size produces large effects of greenness against COVID-19 infections and mortalities. In contrast, studies that use proximity or visitation patterns are likely to report marginal effects.

All studies in our meta-analysis have included demographic covariates, and 92% of studies included economic covariates. While modelling the effects of greenness, the inclusion of demographic variables such as population density and age structure, as well as economic indicators such as gross domestic product (GDP) and household income level as covariates have been largely adopted^{7,9,27,43}. Furthermore, the use of health covariates featured in several studies^{5,19,26}. However, consideration of political covariates in the modelling of greenness benefits to human wellbeing in the context of COVID-19 is only starting to emerge^{5,6}. Political factors such as promulgation of

mobility restrictions^{15,44} and face-masks mandates⁴⁵ have shown to be significant predictors of COVID-19 impacts, although their inclusion in studies linking greenness to COVID-19 infection and severity remains limited. We found that the use of political covariates significantly affects the effect size. Inclusion of political covariables resulted in a greater effect size in studies of COVID-19 mortality and in a smaller effect size in studies of COVID-19 infections. This may suggest that existing policies are more effective in reducing COVID-19 fatalities than curbing the spread of infections.

Overall, meta-analysing studies from Africa, Asia, Europe, and USA, we found strong support for beneficial effects of greenness to human in the face of COVID-19 infection and severity, suggesting that positive correlations reported in some studies between greenness vs. infection and mortality rates^{15,16} might simply imply that the greenness metrics used in those studies (e.g., green space density or accessibility to greenspaces) do not fully capture important facets of greenness. This calls for a need to homogenize greenness metrics in studies to come. There is also a need for homogenization of COVID-19 severity metrics since we could not include hospitalization rate in the present study as a measure of COVID-19 severity because very limited studies have investigated hospitalization rate. Lastly, our results showed high degree of between-study heterogeneity which can be explained by year of publication, sample size, and choice of predictor variables and covariates. However, evidence from existing studies show that green infrastructure moderates the impact of COVID-19 by reducing prevalence of infections and associated mortalities.

Nevertheless, our findings have some far-reaching implications for the establishment and management of green infrastructure: greenspaces must be acknowledged as critical infrastructure that has substantial broader public health values, and as such, deserve enough fundings from governments worldwide, especially in the developing world.

Methods

Study selection

The Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) guidelines⁴⁶ were followed to search for literature that focus on green infrastructure and its impact on COVID-19. All search results were reviewed for relevance based on their title and abstract to be considered for meta-analysis (Figure 6). Furthermore, reference lists of all included articles were reviewed to identify studies that meet the inclusion criteria.

Search strategy

Literature search was limited to PubMed, Scopus, and Google Scholar. The following search string was used to search for literature on the 17th of April 2023: ("Greenspace" or "green space" or "greenery" or "greenness" or "vegetation" or "trees" or "forest" or "grass" or "grassland") and ("COVID-19" or "SARS-CoV-2" or "coronavirus" or "COVID"). We did not apply any restrictions on publication date in the search.

Eligibility criteria

Inclusion criteria for this study were as follow: (a) original research that investigates effects of green infrastructure on COVID-19 infections and related mortalities; (b) full-text is available; (c) publication is in English; (d) required statistical parameters for meta-analysis are reported in the main article or supplementary files (i.e., regression estimates for predicting COVID-19 infections, and mortality rate ratios for predicting COVID-19 mortalities). Exclusion criteria were review or commentary articles, articles without required parameters, and articles not in English (see Figure 6).

Data extraction and analysis

A predetermined template was used to collect study characteristics which are surname of first author, year of publication, country of study, measure of green infrastructure, temporal extent of study, sample size, measure of COVID-19, effect type, effect size, standard error or confidence interval, and list of covariates. All data analysed in this study are available as Supplemental Information (Appendix 1).

All analyses were conducted in R version 4.2.3⁴⁷ (see R script in Supplemental Information). Two separate meta-analyses were conducted, focusing on impacts of greenness on COVID-19 infections (*meta-analysis 1*) and COVID-19 mortalities (*meta-analysis 2*). Regression estimates were used as pre-calculated effect type when analysing COVID-19 infections, and mortality rate ratios (MRR) were used as pre-calculated effect type when analysing COVID-19 mortalities. Subsequently, subgroup analyses were applied to the same data to test the effects of predictor variables, sample size, and selection of covariates. Random models were selected in each analysis using *metagen* function found in the “Metafor” R library⁴⁸.

Outcomes are reported as pooled regression estimates for COVID-19 infections and as pooled MRR for COVID-19 deaths. Furthermore, in each case, a 95% confidence interval (CI), t-value, and p-values are reported with $p < 0.005$ considered as an indicator of statistical significance. Between-studies heterogeneity was quantified using Higgins & Thompson’s I^2 statistic⁴⁹ with the I^2 value of less than 25%, 50% and 75% indicating low, moderate, or high heterogeneity, respectively. Heterogeneity variance and prediction interval were also reported to measure the extent of between-study heterogeneity. Publication bias was tested using the Funnel approach⁵⁰ (Sterne & Egger 2001) and the Orwin’s fail-safe number⁵¹.

276 **Acknowledgements:**

277 KY acknowledges the South Africa's National Research Foundation (grant #
278 SRUG22051210107).

279 **Author Contributions:**

280 KY conceived the project, BP collected the data, BP analysed the data, KY and BP
281 wrote the paper.

282 **Data Availability:**

283 All data generated or analysed in this study are included in this article (and its
284 Supplementary Information files).

285 **Conflict of Interest Statement**

286 The authors declare no conflict of interests.

287 **Code availability:** Code to replicate all results in this paper is available as
288 Supplemental Information.

References

- 1- UN DESA (United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs). Global Population Growth and Sustainable Development Goals. 2021. Available online: https://www.un.org/development/desa/pd/sites/www.un.org.development.desa.pd/files/undesa_pd_2022_global_population_growth.pdf (accessed on 12 December 2021).
- 2- Bongaarts, J. 2016. Development: Slow down population growth. *Nature* **530**, 409–412.
- 3- WHO (World Health Organisation). 2020. Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19), Situation Report– 65. Available at <https://www.who.int/publications/m/item/situation-report---65>
- 4- WHO (World Health Organisation). 2022. WHO coronavirus (COVID-19) dashboard. Available at <https://covid19.who.int/>
- 5- Yang, Y., Lu, Y. & Jiang, B. (2022). Population-weighted exposure to green spaces tied to lower COVID-19 mortality rates: A nationwide dose-response study in the USA. *Science of The Total Environment*, 851: 158333. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2022.158333>.
- 6- Zhai, W., Yue, H. & Deng, Y. (2022). Examining the association between urban green space and viral transmission of COVID-19 during the early outbreak. *Applied Geography*, 147: 102768. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apgeog.2022.102768>.
- 7- Spotswood, E.N., Benjamin, M., Stoneburner, L., Wheeler, M. M., Beller, E. E., Balk, D., McPhearson, T., Kuo, M. & McDonald, R. I. (2021). Nature inequity and higher COVID-19 case rates in less-green neighbourhoods in the United States. *Nature Sustainability*, 4(12): 1092–1098. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41893-021-00781-9>.
- 8- Nguyen, Q.C., Huang, Y., Kumar, A., Duan, H., Keralis, J.M., Dwivedi, P., Meng, H.W., Brunisholz, K.D., Jay, J., Javanmardi, M. & Tasdizen, T. (2020). Using 164 Million Google Street View Images to Derive Built Environment Predictors of COVID-19 Cases. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 17(17): 6359. Doi: 10.3390/ijerph17176359. PMID: 32882867; PMCID: PMC7504319.
- 9- Peng, W., Dong, Y., Tian, M., Yuan, J., Kan, H., Jia, X. & Wang, W. (2022). City-level greenness exposure is associated with covid-19 incidence in China. *Environmental Research*, 209: 112871. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2022.112871>.
- 10-Sikarwar, A., Rani, R., Duthé, G. & Golaz, V. (2023). Association of Greenness with covid-19 deaths in India: An Ecological Study at district level. *Environmental Research*, 217: 114906. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2022.114906>.
- 11-Li, Q. 2010. Effects of forest bathing trips on human immune function. *Environmental Health and Preventive Medicine*, 15, 9–17.
- 12-Vivier, E., Tomasello, E., Baratin, M., Walzer, T. & Ugolini, S. 2008. Functions of natural killer cells. *Nature Immunology*, 9, 503–510.
- 13-Chen, Q.X., Huang, C.L., Yuan, Y. & Tan, H.P. 2020. Influence of COVID-19 event on air quality and their association in mainland China. *Aerosol and Air Quality Research*, 20: 1541–1551.

337 14-Lin, J., Kroll, C. N., Nowak, D. J., & Greenfield, E. J. (2019). A review of urban
338 forest modeling: Implications for management and future research. *Urban*
339 *Forestry & Urban Greening*, 43, Article 126366

340 15-Huang, X., Shao, X., Xing, L., Hu, Y., Sin, D.D. & Zhang, X. (2021). The
341 impact of lockdown timing on COVID-19 transmission across US counties.
342 *EClinicalMedicine*, 38: 101035. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eclinm.2021.101035>.

343 16- Pan J., Bardhan R., Jin Y. *, Ying Jin 2021. Spatial distributive effects
344 of public green space and COVID-19 infection in London

345 17- Zhang, L. & Tan, P.Y. (2019). Associations between Urban Green
346 Spaces and Health are Dependent on the Analytical Scale and How Urban
347 Green Spaces are Measured. *International Journal of Environmental*
348 *Research and Public Health*, 16(4): 578.
349 <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph16040578>

350 18- Labib S.M., Lindley S. & Huck J.J. (2020). Scale effects in remotely
351 sensed greenspace metrics and how to mitigate them for environmental
352 health exposure assessment. *Computers, Environment and Urban Systems*,
353 82: 101501. Doi: 10.1016/j.compenvurbsys.2020.101501.

354 19- Jiang, B., Yang, Y., Chen, L., Liu, X., Wu, X., Chen, B., Webster, C.,
355 Sullivan, W. C., Larsen, L., Wang, J., & Lu, Y. (2022). Green spaces,
356 especially nearby forest, may reduce the SARS-CoV-2 infection rate: A
357 nationwide study in the United States. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 228:
358 104583. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landurbplan.2022.104583>.

359 20- Chen, K., Klomp maker, J. O., Roscoe, C. J., Nguyen, L. H., Drew, D.
360 A., James, P., Laden, F., Fecht, D., Wang, W., Gulliver, J., Wolf, J., Steves, C.
361 J., Spector, T. D., Chan, A. T. & Hart, J. E. (2023). Associations between
362 greenness and predicted COVID-19-like illness incidence in the United States
363 and the United Kingdom. *Environmental Epidemiology (Philadelphia, Pa.)*,
364 7(1): e244. <https://doi.org/10.1097/EE9.0000000000000244>.

365 21- Bajaj, V., Gadi, N., Spihlman, A. P., Wu, S. C., Choi, C. H. & Moulton, V.
366 R. (2021). Aging, Immunity, and COVID-19: How Age Influences the Host
367 Immune Response to Coronavirus Infections? *Frontiers in Physiology*, 11.
368 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fphys.2020.571416>.

369 22- Mathur, R., Rentsch, C.T., Morton, C.E., Hulme, W.J., Schultze, A.,
370 Mackenna, B., Eggo, R.M., Bhaskaran, K., Wong, A.Y.S., Williamson, E.J.,
371 Forbes, H., Wing, K., McDonald, H.I., Bates, C., Bacon, S., Walker, A.J.,
372 Evans, D., Inglesby, P., Mehrkar, A., Curtis, H.J., Devito, N.J., Croker, R.,
373 Drysdale, H., Cockburn, J., Parry, J., Hester, F., Harper, S., Douglas, I.J.,
374 Tomlinson, L., Evans, S.J.W., Grieve, R., Harrison, D., Rowan, K., Khunti, K.,
375 Chaturvedi, N., Smeeth, L. & Goldacre, B. (2021). Ethnic differences in
376 SARS-CoV-2 infection and COVID-19-related hospitalisation, intensive care
377 unit admission, and death in 17 million adults in England: an observational
378 cohort study using the OpenSAFELY platform. *The Lancet*, 397(10286): 1711
379 – 1724.

380 23- Hussey, H., Zinyakatira, N., Morden, E., Ismail, M., Paleker, M., Bam,
381 L., London, L., Boulle, A. & Davies, A. (2021). Higher COVID-19 mortality in
382 low-income communities in the City of Cape Town – a descriptive ecological
383 study. *Gates Open Research*, 5.
384 <https://doi.org/10.12688/gatesopenres.13288.1>.

385 24- Lu, Y., Chen, L., Liu, X., Yang, Y., Sullivan, W. C., Xu, W., Webster, C.
386 & Jiang, B. (2021). Green spaces mitigate racial disparity of health: A higher

ratio of green spaces indicates a lower racial disparity in SARS-COV-2 infection rates in the USA. *Environment International*, 152: 106465. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2021.106465>.

25- Li, H., Zhang, G. & Cao, Y. (2022). Forest Area, CO2 Emission, and COVID-19 Case-Fatality Rate: A Worldwide Ecological Study Using Spatial Regression Analysis. *Forests*, 13(5), 736. <https://doi.org/10.3390/f13050736>.

26- Lin, J., Huang, B., Kwan, M.P., Chen, M. & Wang, Q. (2023). Covid-19 infection rate but not severity is associated with availability of greenness in the United States. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 233: 104704. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landurbplan.2023.104704>.

27- Klomp maker, J.O., Hart, J.E., Holland, I., Sabath, M.B., Wu, X., Laden, F., Dominici, F. & James, P. (2020). County-level exposures to Greenness and associations with covid-19 incidence and mortality in the United States. *Science of the Total Environment*, 199: 111331. <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.26.20181644>.

28- Singh, S., Chowdhury, C., Panja, A. K. & Neogy, S. (2021). Time Series Analysis of COVID-19 Data to Study the Effect of Lockdown and Unlock in India. *Journal of The Institution of Engineers (India): Series B*, 102(6): 1275-1281. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40031-021-00585-7>

29- OWD (Our World in Data). 2023. Total COVID-19 tests. <https://ourworldindata.org/grapher/full-list-total-tests-for-covid-19>. (Accessed 02.05.2023).

30- Springate, S. D. (2012). The effect of sample size and bias on the reliability of estimates of error: A comparative study of Dahlberg's formula. *European Journal of Orthodontics*, 34(2): 158-163. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ejo/cjr010>

31- Fong, K., Hart, J. E. & James, P. (2018). A Review of Epidemiologic Studies on Greenness and Health: Updated Literature Through 2017. *Current environmental health reports*, 5(1): 77. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40572-018-0179-y>.

32- Brochu, P., Jimenez, M. P., James, P., Kinney, P. L. & Lane, K. (2022). Benefits of Increasing Greenness on All-Cause Mortality in the Largest Metropolitan Areas of the United States Within the Past Two Decades. *Frontiers in Public Health*, 10. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2022.841936>.

33- Grigsby-Toussaint, D.S. & Shin, J.C. (2022). Covid-19, Green Space Exposure, and Mask Mandates. *Science of The Total Environment*, 836: 155302. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2022.155302>.

34- Ngom, R., Gosselin, P., Blais, C. & Rochette, L. (2016). Type and Proximity of Green Spaces Are Important for Preventing Cardiovascular Morbidity and Diabetes—A Cross-Sectional Study for Quebec, Canada. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 13(4). <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph13040423>.

35- Dennis, M., Cook, P.A., James, P., Wheeler, P. & Lindley, S.J. (2020). Relationships between health outcomes in older populations and urban green infrastructure size, quality and proximity. *BMC Public Health* 20, 626. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-020-08762-x>.

36- Chalmin-Pui, L. S., Griffiths, A., Roe, J., Heaton, T. & Cameron, R. (2021). Why garden? – Attitudes and the perceived health benefits of home gardening. *Cities*, 112: 103118. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2021.103118>.

436 37- Marselle, M. R., Bowler, D. E., Watzema, J., Eichenberg, D., Kirsten, T.,
437 & Bonn, A. (2020). Urban street tree biodiversity and antidepressant
438 prescriptions. *Scientific Reports*, 10(1), 1-11. [https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-020-79924-5)
439 020-79924-5.

440 38- Wolf, K. L., Lam, S. T., McKeen, J. K., Richardson, R. A. & Bardekjian,
441 A. C. (2020). Urban Trees and Human Health: A Scoping Review.
442 *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 17(12).
443 <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17124371>

444 39- Orstad, S. L., Szuhany, K., Tamura, K., Thorpe, L. E. & Jay, M. (2020).
445 Park Proximity and Use for Physical Activity among Urban Residents:
446 Associations with Mental Health. *International Journal of Environmental*
447 *Research and Public Health*, 17(13): 4885.
448 <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17134885>.

449 40- Weber, K.A., Yang, W., Carmichael, S. L., Collins, R.T., Luben, T.J.,
450 Desrosiers, T.A., Insuf, T.I., Le, M.T., Evans, S.P., Romitti, P.A., Yazdy, M.M.,
451 Nembhard, W.N. & Shaw, G.M. (2023). The National Birth Defects Prevention
452 Study. (2023). Assessing associations between residential proximity to
453 greenspace and birth defects in the national birth defects prevention study.
454 *Environmental Research*, 216: 114760 doi:10.1016/j.envres.2022.114760.

455 41- Yessoufou, K., Sithole, M. & Elansary, H. O. (2020). Effects of urban
456 green spaces on human perceived health improvements: Provision of green
457 spaces is not enough but how people use them matters. *PLOS ONE*, 15(9):
458 e0239314. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0239314>.

459 42- Lehberger, M., Kleih, A. & Sparke, K. (2021). Self-reported well-being
460 and the importance of green spaces – A comparison of garden owners and
461 non-garden owners in times of COVID-19. *Landscape and Urban Planning*,
462 212, 104108. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landurbplan.2021.104108>.

463 43- Russette, H., Graham, J., Holden, Z., Semmens, E.O., Williams, E. &
464 Landguth, E.L. (2021). Greenspace exposure and covid-19 mortality in the
465 United States: January–July 2020. *Environmental Research*, 198: 111195.
466 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2021.111195>.

467 44- Haug, N., Geyrhofer, L., Londei, A., Dervic, E., Loreto, V., Pinior, B.,
468 Thurner, S. & Klimek, P. (2020). Ranking the effectiveness of worldwide
469 COVID-19 government interventions. *Nature Human Behaviour*, 4(12): 1303-
470 1312. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-020-01009-0>.

471 45- Aravindakshan, A., Boehnke, J., Gholami, E. & Nayak, A. (2022). The
472 impact of mask-wearing in mitigating the spread of COVID-19 during the early
473 phases of the pandemic. *PLOS Global Public Health* 2(9): e0000954.
474 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pgph.0000954>.

475 46- Page, M.J., McKenzie, J.E., Bossuyt, P.M., Boutron, I., Hoffmann, T.C.,
476 Mulrow, C.D., Shamseer, L., Tetzlaff, J.M., Akl, E.A., Brennan, S.E., Chou, R.,
477 Glanville, J., Grimshaw, J.M., Hróbjartsson, A., Lalu, M.M., Li, T., Loder, E.W.,
478 Mayo-Wilson, E., McDonald, S., McGuinness, L.A., Stewart, L.A., Thomas, J.,
479 Tricco, A.C., Welch, V.A., Whiting, P. & Moher, D. (2021). The PRISMA 2020
480 statement: An updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *PLoS Med*
481 18(3): e1003583. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1003583>.

482 47- R Core Team. (2021). R: A language and environment for statistical
483 computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria.
484 <https://www.R-project.org/>.

485 48- Viechtbauer, W. (2010). Conducting meta-analyses in R with the
486 metafor package. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 36(3): 1-48.
487 <https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v036.i03>.
488 49- Higgins, J.P. & Thompson, S.G. (2002). Quantifying heterogeneity in a
489 meta-analysis. *Statistics in Medicine*, 21(11): 1539 – 1558.
490 <https://doi.org/10.1002/sim.1186>.
491 50- Sterne, J.A.C. & Egger, M. (2001). Funnel plots for detecting bias in
492 meta-analysis: guidelines on choice of axis. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology*,
493 54:1046–1055
494 51- Orwin RG. A fail-safe N for effect size in meta-analysis. *Journal of*
495 *Educational Statistics*. 1983;8(2):157–159.
496

Table 1: Stratified analyses of pooled estimate of COVID-19 infections and green infrastructure.

Stratified analysis	Number of results	Pooled estimate [95% CI]	Subgroup difference χ^2 , df (p-value)
Study year	45	-0.08 [-0.14; -0.03]	8.24, df = 2 (p = 0.02)
2021	15	-0.07 [-0.15; 0.01]	
2022	20	-0.02 [-0.06; 0.02]	
2023	10	-0.32 [-0.57; -0.07]	
Sample size	45	-0.08 [-0.14; -0.03]	0.01, df = 1 (p = 0.91)
Small (n<2000)	19	-0.09 [-0.16; -0.02]	
Large (n≥2000)	26	-0.08 [-0.18; 0.02]	
Predictor	45	-0.08 [-0.14; -0.03]	129.68, df = 4 (p < 0.01)
Abundance	25	-0.06 [-0.12; -0.00]	
NDVI/EVI	11	-0.24 [-0.55; 0.07]	
Canopy	3	-0.44 [-0.62; -0.27]	
Visitation	5	0.01 [0.00; 0.01]	
Proximity	1	-0.02 [-0.08; 0.04]	
Covariates: demographic	45	-0.08 [-0.14; -0.03]	NA
With demographic covariates	45	-0.08 [-0.14; -0.03]	
Without demographic covariates	0		
Covariates: health	45	-0.08 [-0.14; -0.03]	1.35, df = 1 (p = 0.25)
With health covariates	37	-0.06 [-0.11; 0.00]	
Without health covariates	8	-0.13 [-0.28; 0.01]	
Covariates: economic	45	-0.08 [-0.14; -0.03]	NA
With economic covariates	45	-0.08 [-0.14; -0.03]	
Without economic covariates	0		
Covariates: climatic	45	-0.08 [-0.14; -0.03]	0.35, df = 1 (p = 0.56)
With climatic covariates	19	-0.12 [-0.27; 0.03]	
Without climatic covariates	26	-0.08 [-0.14; -0.02]	
Covariates: political	45	-0.08 [-0.14; -0.03]	8.27, df = 1 (p < 0.01)
With political covariates	14	-0.01 [-0.04; 0.01]	
Without political covariates	31	-0.15 [-0.24; -0.05]	

*NDVI=Normalised Difference Vegetation Index; EVI= Enhanced Vegetation Index

Table 2: Stratified analyses of pooled mortality rate ratio of COVID-19 deaths.

Stratified analysis	Number of results	Pooled mortality rate ratio [95% CI]	Subgroup difference χ^2 , df (p-value)
Year of publication	14	0.93 [0.88; 0.98]	19.10, df = 2 (p< 0.01)
2021	4	0.90 [0.78; 1.03]	
2022	6	0.99 [0.96; 1.02]	
2023	4	0.83 [0.73; 0.96]	
Sample size	14	0.93 [0.88; 0.98]	7.92, df = 1 (p< 0.01)
Small (n<2000)	4	0.83 [0.73; 0.96]	
Large (n≥2000)	10	0.96 [0.91; 1.01]	
Predictor	14	0.93 [0.88; 0.98]	14.92, df = 2 (p< 0.01)
Canopy	3	0.87 [0.72; 1.05]	
NDVI/EVI	5	0.87 [0.76; 0.99]	
Abundance	6	0.99 [0.96; 1.02]	
Covariates: demographic	14	0.93 [0.88; 0.98]	NA
With demographic covariates	14	0.93 [0.88; 0.98]	
Without demographic covariates	0		
Covariates: health	14	0.93 [0.88; 0.98]	7.92, df = 1 (p< 0.01)
With health covariates	10	0.96 [0.91; 1.01]	
Without health covariates	4	0.83 [0.73; 0.96]	
Covariates: economic	14	0.93 [0.88; 0.98]	2.60, df = 1 (p= 0.11)
With economic covariates	11	0.95 [0.89; 1.01]	
Without economic covariates	3	0.87 [0.72; 1.05]	
Covariates: climatic	14	0.93 [0.88; 0.98]	2.60, df = 1 (P = 0.11)
With climatic covariates	11	0.95 [0.89; 1.01]	
Without climatic covariates	3	0.87 [0.72; 1.05]	
Covariates: political	14	0.93 [0.88; 0.98]	22.75, df = 1 (p< 0.01)
With political covariates	7	0.85 [0.80; 0.92]	
Without political covariates	7	0.99 [0.97; 1.01]	

*NDVI=Normalised Difference Vegetation Index; EVI= Enhanced Vegetation Index

526 **FIGURE CAPTIONS**

527 **Figure 1.** Geography of studies investigating the effects of greenness on COVID-19
528 infection and mortality rates. (A) Geographical distribution of 621 studies that were
529 retrieved through the search of Scopus, PubMed, and Google scholar; (B)
530 Geographical distribution of studies from our search that focus specifically on the
531 effects of greenness on COVID-19 infections and severity.

532 **Figure 2.** Venn diagram showing the shared factors used in multiple studies that
533 investigate the effects of greenness on COVID-19 infection and mortality rates. A)
534 different metrics of greenness; B) socio-environmental and economic co-variates
535 used those studies.

536 **Figure 3.** Forest plot of the relationship between greenness and COVID-19
537 infections.

538 **Figure 4.** Forest plot of the relationship between greenness and COVID-19
539 mortalities.

540 **Figure 5.** Funnel plot to test for publication bias in studies on A) COVID-19
541 infections, and B) on COVID-19 mortality.

542 **Figure 6.** PRISMA low diagram for literature search and screening.

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

TABLES

Table S1. Characteristics of all studies included in the present meta-analysis.

Figures S1-S6. Subgroup analyses of between-study heterogeneity can be attributed to year of publication ($X^2=8.24$; $p=0.02$), choice of predictors ($X^2=129.68$; $p<0.01$), and use of political covariates ($X^2=8.27$; $p<0.01$).


Figures S7-S13. Between-study heterogeneity of variance showing that year of publication ($X^2=19.10$; $p<0.01$), sample size ($X^2=7.92$; $p<0.01$), choice of predictors ($X^2=14.92$; $p<0.01$), and use of health ($X^2=7.92$; $p<0.01$) and political ($X^2=22.75$; $p<0.01$) covariates strongly impact the degree of heterogeneity.

Appendices


Appendix 1. Data collected and analysed in this study.



Appendix 2. R script used to reproduce the present study.


A





B



A**B**





A**B**