A Dose of Nature
Addressing chronic health conditions by using the environment

A summary of relevant research

In a nutshell
Medical research from around the world demonstrates that a Green Prescription can deliver physiological and psychological benefits for patients, even if the exact mechanisms by which these accrue are not yet fully understood. The evidence also shows that doctors are ready and willing to give Green Prescriptions, and that an effective partnership with other providers is required.

1 Introduction
Evidence for the effectiveness of Green Prescriptions - doses of nature tailored to patients’ needs - comes from many disciplines, but this brief summary concentrates on the medical and public health literature. The research demonstrates numerous correlations between different indices of health and wellbeing and exposure to nature, and the most recent overview shows that the evidence regarding these benefits is strong (Hartig et al 2014). What is missing, largely because studies for such interventions are often hard to design, is knowledge about cause-and-effect relationships.

2 Evidence concerning primary and clinical care
2.1 We know, via a randomised control trial (RCT) published in the British Medical Journal, that referral to a suitable voluntary sector project results in additional patient benefits compared with general practitioner care alone, in managing psychosocial problems (Grant et al 2000). This is particularly the case when the referral process is mediated by a dedicated person (Grayer et al 2008). We also know that, in particular, general practitioners would prefer to give a specifically ‘green’ social prescription but need to feel confident about patient follow-up mechanisms and the overall sustainability of such activities (Swinburn et al 1997).

2.2 The best evidence that can meet that need comes from the Green Prescription programme run directly by the New Zealand Ministry of Health. Studies published in the British Medical Journal found that a Green Prescription increases physical activity levels and improves quality of life over 12 months, without evidence of adverse effects. Such an initiative was found to be sustainable in general practice as for every ten Green Prescriptions written one person achieved and sustained 150 minutes of moderate or vigorous leisure activity (using up an additional 1000 kcal) per week; a 20–30 percent risk reduction in all-cause mortality (Elley et al 2003).
Such prescriptions were also shown, via an RCT, to be **cost effective at three different quality-adjusted life year thresholds**, for adults who were previously inactive (Leung et al 2012).

2.3 The New Zealand programme has also been subject to regular patient surveys. The most recent, from 2013\(^1\), showed that six to eight months after receiving their Green Prescription: **63 percent of patients are still more active than they were before**; 72 percent have noticed positive changes in their health; 46 percent have lost weight; and 64 percent encouraged others to be active.

2.4 There is also clinical evidence from Asia, published in the *Journal of Cardiology*, that **spending time in a forest has therapeutic effects on hypertension** and induces inhibition of the renin-angiotensin system and inflammation, and is thus preventively efficacious against cardiovascular disorders (Mao et al, 2012). The same practice also results in improved immune function; regular trips to the forest result in an increase in natural killer cell activity (Li 2010).

2.5 We also know that **nature reduces the experience of pain**. A picture of a nature scene by the bed, and an audio tape of nature sounds, have been shown via an RCT to significantly reduce pain in patients undergoing flexible bronchoscopy (Diette et al 2003).

3 Evidence from a public health perspective

3.1 Such studies are backed up by epidemiological evidence that is strong enough to support calls for nature-assisted therapies to be part of public health and health promotion policies. **Significant improvements were found for varied outcomes in diverse diagnoses from obesity to schizophrenia** (Maller et al 2006). To be effective this means **bring together primary health, social care and environmental management sectors** (Annerstedt and Währborg 2011). Systematic reviews and individual studies have demonstrated a number of factors, as follows.

3.2 **A population that is close to nature is healthier**. A study in the Netherlands looked at physician-assessed morbidity in 196 Dutch general practices, for 24 disease clusters, and after controlling for socio-economic factors found that disease prevalence was lower the more green space there was in a 1km radius (Maas et al 2009). The benefit of greater access to nature is pronounced in early to mid adulthood (Astell-Burt et al 2014). A study published in *The Lancet* (Mitchell and Popham 2008) found that populations exposed to the greenest environments also have the lowest levels of health inequality related to income deprivation.

3.3 In studies relating to obesity there is **a positive association between access to greenspace and physical activity**, weight and associated health conditions (Lachowycz and Jones 2011).

3.4 There is an **additional positive benefit** of a walk or run in a natural environment in comparison to a synthetic environment (Bowler et al 2010).

---

4 Psychological dimensions
4.1 A lot of the medical literature on the relationship between nature and wellbeing looks at psychological health in particular; the perceived greenness of a neighbourhood is more strongly associated with mental health than it is with physical health (Sugiyama et al 2008). Research has indicated a range of specific benefits.

4.2 Exercising in natural environments - compared to exercising indoors - is associated with greater feelings of revitalisation, and a greater intention to repeat the activity (Coon et al 2011).

4.3 Gardening provides relief from acute stress (van den Berg and Custers 2011).

4.4 Walking in nature, or even viewing nature, improves the capacity to direct and restore attention (Berman et al 2008), a result backed up experimentally (Berto 2005), and in patients facing particular clinical situations such as newly diagnosed breast cancer (Cimprich and Ronis 2003).

4.5 Being in an arboretum for 50 minutes provides cognitive and affective benefits for people suffering depression (Berman et al 2012).

4.6 Short and intense engagements in outdoor exercise have the greatest dose-responses for two other key indicators of mental health, self-esteem and mood (Barton and Pretty 2010).

4.7 Green outdoor settings reduce ADHD symptoms in children across a wide range of individual, residential, and case characteristics (Kuo and Taylor 2004).

4.8 When immersed in nature a common response is of a connected fascination; this has been demonstrated empirically to be an active element in generating positive psychological affect (Gonzalez et al 2010).

5 Aspects of nature
5.1 Determining how exposure to nature actually results in such benefits - the mechanisms that are involved in delivering a ‘natural health service’ - remains a generally elusive goal. However some elements of the natural environment have been studied with this in mind.

5.2 In England there is evidence that the closer one lives to the coast the better one’s health, and that this effect might be greater in deprived communities (Wheeler et al 2012).

5.3 Another meta-analysis of 1252 patients showed that, whilst every green environment improved both self esteem and mood, the presence of water generated greater effects (Barton and Pretty 2010).

5.4 There is evidence of a positive relationship between the mental wellbeing of greenspace users and both perceived (Dallimer et al 2012) and actual (Fuller et al 2007) levels of biodiversity, and this is supported by a recent systematic review (Lovell et al 2014).

5.5 A RCT in the British Medical Journal demonstrated that there is a direct therapeutic benefit to be gained from engaging with animals (Antonioli and Reveley 2005).
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