

ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT • OPEN ACCESS

Mental health and wellbeing outcomes of climate change mitigation and adaptation strategies: A systematic review

To cite this article before publication: Elaine C. Flores *et al* 2023 *Environ. Res. Lett.* in press <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/ad153f>

Manuscript version: Accepted Manuscript

Accepted Manuscript is “the version of the article accepted for publication including all changes made as a result of the peer review process, and which may also include the addition to the article by IOP Publishing of a header, an article ID, a cover sheet and/or an ‘Accepted Manuscript’ watermark, but excluding any other editing, typesetting or other changes made by IOP Publishing and/or its licensors”

This Accepted Manuscript is © 2023 The Author(s). Published by IOP Publishing Ltd.



As the Version of Record of this article is going to be / has been published on a gold open access basis under a CC BY 4.0 licence, this Accepted Manuscript is available for reuse under a CC BY 4.0 licence immediately.

Everyone is permitted to use all or part of the original content in this article, provided that they adhere to all the terms of the licence <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>

Although reasonable endeavours have been taken to obtain all necessary permissions from third parties to include their copyrighted content within this article, their full citation and copyright line may not be present in this Accepted Manuscript version. Before using any content from this article, please refer to the Version of Record on IOPscience once published for full citation and copyright details, as permissions may be required. All third party content is fully copyright protected and is not published on a gold open access basis under a CC BY licence, unless that is specifically stated in the figure caption in the Version of Record.

View the [article online](#) for updates and enhancements.

Mental health and wellbeing outcomes of climate change mitigation and adaptation strategies: A systematic review

Elaine C. Flores^{*1-3}, Laura J. Brown⁴, Ritsuko Kakuma³, Julian Eaton³, Alan D. Dangour¹

¹ Centre on Climate Change & Planetary Health, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, London, United Kingdom

² Stanford Center for Innovation in Global Health, Stanford University, Stanford, USA

³ Centre for Global Mental Health, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, London, United Kingdom

⁴ Institute for Global Health, University College London, London, United Kingdom

* Corresponding author: elaine.flores@lshtm.ac.uk

Abstract

Background. Climate change has already impacted the health and wellbeing of ~5 billion people globally. However, the potential influence of climate change mitigation and adaptation strategies on mental health and wellbeing outcomes in low-and-middle-income countries (LMICs) remains insufficiently understood. We aimed to determine the effect of these strategies on mental health and wellbeing outcomes among LMIC beneficiaries.

Methods. We carried out a systematic review to identify intervention and case studies published from 2013 to 2022, searching OVID Medline, Embase, PsycINFO, Global Health, Cochrane Library, GreenFile, Web of Science, and a subset of studies from the 'Global Adaptation Mapping Initiative' database. We included controlled, quasi-experimental, pilot, and focussed case studies reporting mental health or wellbeing outcomes assessments of climate change mitigation and adaptation strategies. We categorised studies by design, geographic region, target population, setting, environmental hazard, strategy type and primary outcomes. PROSPERO registry: CRD42021262711.

Results. 9,532 studies were initially retrieved, and 15 studies involving 12,255 participants met the inclusion criteria. Among these, twelve studies described evidence from single-adaptation strategies in nine LMICs, while three reported mitigation programmes. Only two randomised evaluations assessed common mental disorders such as depression, trauma or anxiety using validated scales. Most studies evaluated broader wellbeing at the community and individual levels. Nine studies (53.3%) reported significant beneficial changes in mental health or wellbeing outcomes among beneficiaries, while six (46.7%) obtained mixed results linked to local and sociocultural factors. The interventions' practical significance and overall impact remained unclear due to the heterogeneous reporting in program effectiveness, gaps in effect size assessments or qualitative insights.

Discussion. Our review highlights the scarcity and limited nature of the current evidence, underscoring the need for further equitable research. The ongoing global climate and mental health crises press us to fully understand and address these strategies' psychosocial impacts and translate these findings into effective policy and transdisciplinary action as an opportunity to prevent and ameliorate significant, long-term problems in the population's mental health and wellbeing.

Keywords: *Climate change, adaptation, mitigation, systematic review, low-and middle-income countries, mental health, wellbeing*

1. Introduction

The climate change crisis negatively affects human health[1-3], particularly mental health and overall wellbeing[4, 5]. Low-and-middle-income countries (LMICs) are disproportionately vulnerable to these impacts and have the least resources to prepare for

[6, 7] and recover from them[8]. The interconnected consequences include far-reaching, profound impacts[9], such as increased frequency and severity of extreme weather events, sea level rise and coastal erosion, changes in precipitation patterns, food and water insecurity, displacement, and loss of livelihoods[10]. Unfortunately, there is a lack of research on the mechanisms and extent of these impacts,

1
2
3 including the effects of protective interventions on
4 mental health, particularly in LMICs[7].

5 Climate change exacerbates the risk factors,
6 mechanisms, and drivers of poor mental health and
7 psychosocial wellbeing at both population and
8 individual levels. The World Health Organization
9 (WHO) acknowledges that "*Several environmental,
10 social, and economic determinants of mental health are
11 negatively affected by climate change*"[11]. These
12 effects include increased rates of common mental
13 disorders, decreased social cohesion, and increased
14 violence[12], especially targeting historically
15 marginalised groups[13, 14].

16 On the other hand, climate change mitigation and
17 adaptation responses can positively impact human
18 health and wellbeing[15] by addressing risks[16],
19 promoting resilience, improving global health and
20 benefiting vulnerable populations[17, 18]. Globally,
21 climate change mitigation strategies such as
22 transitioning to clean energy sources can improve air
23 and water quality, reduce noise pollution, and create
24 new economic opportunities[19]. Adaptation
25 strategies[20], such as building resilient infrastructure
26 and early surveillance systems for environmental
27 hazards, can improve safety and reduce the negative
28 impacts of extreme weather events. These strategies
29 have been linked to general health co-benefits [15, 21],
30 although their specific impact on mental health and
31 wellbeing outcomes[19], especially in LMICs, remains
32 limited. For example, providing agricultural extension
33 services and financial resources can alleviate stress and
34 anxiety among subsistence farmers[22]. Implementing
35 integrated screening programs and participatory
36 community-level activities can decrease depression and
37 domestic violence and increase conflict resolution and
38 community resilience in post-flooding settings[23].
39 Successful recovery efforts from flooding events require
40 local knowledge and interdisciplinary collaboration,
41 with careful consideration of unintended consequences
42 associated with psychosocial interventions.[24] Urban
43 centres can benefit from adaptation actions such as
44 expanding green spaces, strengthening health systems,
45 and building resilient infrastructure[25]. However, these
46 strategies need greater attention and consideration for
47 underserved communities and their potential impact on
48 mental health and wellbeing in LMICs.

49 Despite the well-established evidence on the negative
50 impact of climate change on mental health and
51 wellbeing, few ongoing efforts to implement mitigation
52 and adaptation strategies incorporate mental health
53 measurements into their evaluation. To effectively
54 address the impacts of climate change, it is crucial to

integrate mental health considerations into the design
and evaluation of these strategies. This comprehensive
approach allows us to understand the full impact of these
strategies and consider the complex interplay between
socioeconomic, structural, and political factors that
contribute to human vulnerability to climate change
effects and extreme weather events[26, 27].

Considering mental health and wellbeing as key
outcomes that cut across the lifespan in response to
climate change can improve mitigation and adaptation
planning efforts and ensure effective and equitable
results. Such an approach would address the root causes
of climate change threats, structural vulnerabilities, and
contextual synergies that affect communities with high
climatic and environmental exposures. It could provide
an argument for a more streamlined, coordinated, and
cost-efficient climate action approach across
households, researchers, and policymakers.

Despite the reported benefits of these strategies,
depending on population groups and geographical
contexts they can also be harmful[17] linked to complex
social dynamics. For example, programs that relocate at-
risk communities can potentially cause distress linked to
loss of cultural identity and disruption of social
cohesion[28] Particularly if these strategies are not
implemented widely across communities or fail to
consider unique local aspects, they can lead to local
injustices. For instance, a renewable energy-based
electrification project in rural communities of
Cajamarca, Peru[29] caused community discord when
some households were selected for the intervention
while others were not. Similarly, projects focusing on
livelihood diversification through technology can
address environmental shocks and poverty but may also
exacerbate income and wellbeing inequities for those
facing structural entry barriers[30].

The evidence base regarding the co-benefits of mental
health and wellbeing remains limited, highlighting the
need for further studies exploring the effects of climate
change responses on human health. Existing reviews
have addressed specific aspects but have not fully
assessed the effects of both mitigation and adaptation
strategies on mental health outcomes. For example, a
systematic mapping of global research on climate
change adaptation interventions and health emphasized
the scarcity of evidence in this area[16]. A recent
systematic review[31] focussed on the conceptual
framings of individual and community-level mitigation
actions and explored mental health themes but did not
specifically assess the effects of mitigation strategies.
Another scoping review[32] examined the health
impacts of adaptation strategies in informal settlements

in LMICs but did not report results on mental health outcomes. Finally, a systematic review on urban green spaces and wellbeing [33] found positive effects on human wellbeing, including health aspects; however, evidence regarding mental health and wellbeing outcomes related to climate change mitigation and adaptation strategies remains scarce.

This review addresses this knowledge gap by compiling and assessing evidence on the co-benefits of climate change mitigation and adaptation interventions for mental health and wellbeing in LMICs by (1) examining the impact of climate change mitigation and adaptation interventions on mental health and wellbeing outcomes in LMICs, (2) reviewing the evidence base of this association, and (3) evaluating the effects of those interventions by type, climatic/environmental risk, and by their impact on different population groups and context.

This systematic review is timely given the major impacts of climate events on mental health outcomes in LMICs [7, 34] and the increasing implementation of climate change adaptation and mitigation strategies in these settings[35, 36]. Health and human wellbeing must be central in climate action, and research is critically needed to inform evidence-based policy and practice in this area.

2. Methods

2.1 Search Strategy and selection criteria

In this systematic review, we defined climate change mitigation activities as those that *"contributes to stabilising greenhouse gas (GHG) concentrations in the atmosphere to prevent anthropogenic interference with the climate system by reducing or limiting GHG emissions or enhancing GHG sequestration"*. A climate change adaptation refers to *"activities that reduce the vulnerability of human or natural systems to the impacts of climate change and climate-related risks, and enhance adaptive capacity and resilience"* [37]. The term 'adaptation' was deliberately not included in the search. Some authors may not have explicitly framed their studies about adaptation but would have incorporated key elements that matched this review's definition and inclusion criteria. Kelly and Adjer[38] define vulnerability as the capacity to *"anticipate, cope with, resist, and recover from a natural hazard"* and highlight that reducing vulnerability is essential for adaptation.

For mental health and wellbeing outcomes, we considered mental and behavioural disorders classified

in the International Classification of Diseases 11th Revision (ICD-11)[39] or The Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, Fifth Edition (DSM-V)[40], respectively, measured in the general adult population, as well as pertinent psychosocial proxies. Wellbeing was understood as a multidimensional construct encompassing different aspects such as good social relations, freedom of choice and action, security, health, and essential materials for living well and can be measured subjectively or objectively using composite indicators [41].

This systematic review followed the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Review and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) guidelines[42].

The protocol for this systematic review was registered on PROSPERO (doi:10.15124/CRD42021262711).

We systematically searched seven databases that provide comprehensive coverage of research done in climate change, health, mental health, and LMICs (OVID MEDLINE, EMBASE, Global Health, PsycINFO, Web of Science Core Collection, COCHRANE and GreenFILE) for studies published from 1 January 2013 until 10 September 2022 with no language restrictions. We excluded papers published before January 1st, 2013, using the 5th IPCC report – published in 2014 - as a reference point [43].

We used a combination of MeSH (medical subject heading) terms and keywords related to climate change, mental health, wellbeing and LMICs. Our OVID MEDLINE search strategy is appended online (Supplementary File 1). Additional records were identified from the outputs Scheelbeek[16] and colleagues reported using the 'Global Adaptation Mapping Initiative' (GAMI) database, which was constructed through systematic literature searches in Scopus, Web of Science and Google Scholar from 2013 to 2020[44]. The search methods of the GAMI database are made available in detail elsewhere [45-47] Finally, we conducted manual backward search of reference lists and a forward-citation search for all included papers and related reviews..

2.2 Eligibility Criteria

Study inclusion and exclusion criteria were defined a priori (Supplementary File 2). We included peer-reviewed, published studies that: (1) examined mental health or wellbeing outcomes related to climate change mitigation and adaptation strategies in general adult populations (>18 years old) living in LMICs, (2) the studies could use controlled evaluations, quasi-experimental methods, pilot assessments or focussed

case study designs to collect quantitative or qualitative data; (3) measured mental health and behavioural conditions measured using self-report tool, assessments by mental health workers or broad wellbeing outcomes and psychosocial proxies; and (4) included indicators of successful mitigation and/or adaptation interventions linked to a change in mental health outcomes (e.g., change in depression scores or change in the proportion of those diagnosed with a mental disorder), change in social functioning skills (e.g., improved coping skills, social functioning, self-esteem) and any other secondary outcomes related to psychosocial conditions and wellbeing (e.g., quality of life) were also considered.

2.3 Selection Process

We screened titles and abstracts initially and collated them using EndNote referencing software[48]. After de-duplication, the first author (ECF) screened titles and abstracts against the eligibility criteria and uploaded the selected references for full-text screening into Rayyan[49]. Approximately one-third of the articles and full-text screening was performed by two co-authors independently, who resolved disagreements through discussion. Articles fulfilling all the inclusion criteria were included in the review. See Supplementary File 3 for the details of excluded studies.

2.4 Data extraction and analytic approach

All studies were in English except for one in Portuguese. This article was double translated into English and Spanish, and data were extracted by ECF, a native speaker of Spanish and fluent in English. Data were extracted from each included study:

- a) Bibliographic information: first author, country, year of publication, language
- b) Study characteristics: objectives, aim, context (country development level, setting where the programme operates), design, sample size, exclusions, and attrition rate.
- c) Participants of strategy/programme details: behavioural and psychosocial disorder diagnosis, mode of diagnosis, severity, treatment (if applicable), age of diagnosis
- d) Exposure measurement: climatic/environmental risk, adaptation strategy characteristics/ description, comparison group

- e) Outcome assessment: measure/assessment used, blinding, score standardisation, use of classification criteria.
- f) Measures of effect: effectiveness of climate change mitigation/adaptation strategy, assessment times and follow-up, studies' results, and conclusions

2.5 Quality assessment

Due to the variety of included study designs, we used the Specialist Unit for Review Evidence (SURE) for the critical appraisal of randomised controlled trials and other experimental studies[50], the Joanna Briggs Institute guidelines for quasi-experimental studies[51] and the Critical Appraisal Skills Programme (CASP) checklist[52] to assess qualitative case studies. The quality assessment (Supplemental file 4) did not exclude low-quality articles, but their limitations were discussed.

2.6 Data Analysis

Due to the heterogeneity of research designs, assessment approaches, and strategies, it was not possible to pool the results for meta-analysis. Therefore, we provide a narrative description of the findings.

3. Results

3.1 Study selection

The results of the search are summarised below in Figure 1. A total of 9,514 records were identified in the database search and an additional 18 were found through additional methods.

Fifteen studies were ultimately included in the review comprising data from 12,255 participants.

3.2 Study characteristics

Details for the fifteen included studies are shown in Table 1.


Figure 1. PRISMA flow diagram of study selection

Table 1: General characteristics and summary results of the studies included in the review, grouped by study design (n=15)

Author, Year	Country	Country development level	Type of Strategy	Climatic / Environmental hazard	Mental health or Wellbeing outcome	Main Result
Studies with experimental design						
Araban, M., 2017	Iran	Upper-middle income	Adaptation	Air Pollution	Wellbeing, self-efficacy	↑ Behavioural prevention changes, ↑ Self-efficacy
Bedran-Martins, A.M, 2018	Brazil	Upper-middle income	Adaptation	Drought and vulnerability (e.g. food insecurity)	Subjective Wellbeing, Material QoL (MQoL)	↑ MQoL ↔ Mixed results in perceived vulnerabilities (health, safety)
Binh, P., 2020	Vietnam	Middle-income	Adaptation	Reduce vulnerability to floods	Self-efficacy, Self-satisfaction, negative emotions	↑ Positive outcomes in threat and coping appraisals and motivation to act to mitigate floods
Dauids, R., 2022	South Africa	Upper-middle income	Adaptation	Ecosystem services, Biodiversity protection	QoL	↑ QoL
Duchelle, A. E., 2017	Brazil, Peru, Cameroon, Tanzania, Indonesia, Vietnam	Upper & Lower middle income	Mitigation	Deforestation	Subjective Wellbeing (*)	↓ Perceived tenure security & Wellbeing (among those without incentives), ↑ Wellbeing when social safeguards added
James, L. E., 2020	Haiti	Low-income country	Adaptation	Environmental Hazards (Floods, Storms, earthquakes)	Disaster preparedness, Depression, PTSD, Anxiety, Functional impairment (fx), social cohesion, help-giving, and help-seeking behaviour	↑ disaster preparedness, ↓ symptoms of depression, PTSD, anxiety, and fx, ↑ peer-based help-giving and help-seeking
Nunes A., 2021	Brazil	Upper-middle income	Adaptation	Access to safe water supply	Perceived Wellbeing based	↑ Living conditions (e.g., comfort, privacy, safety) ↓ time spent on domestic activities (e.g., fetching river water, washing in the river). No effects on other health impacts
Weston, P., 2015	Ghana	Lower-middle income	Adaptation	Deforestation	Subjective Wellbeing	↑ Psychosocial Wellbeing (optimism, leadership, community solidarity)

Williams, K., 2020	Peru	Upper-middle income	Mitigation	Household Air Pollution	QoL	↑ Perceived QoL, ↑ Saved time (for leisure, rest, and income-generating activities)
Studies with quasi-experimental design						
Gori Maia, A., 2021	Brazil	Upper-middle income	Adaptation	Drought, deforestation, soil degradation	Subjective Wellbeing (**), QoL	↑ Subjective measures of income, Quality of work, and QoL in general. No other differences (e.g., food quantity satisfaction)
Gros, C., 2019	Bangladesh	Lower-middle income	Adaptation	Extreme weather events (e.g., floods)	Psychosocial distress (feelings of unhappiness, being miserable, anxious, or depressed)	↓ Frequency of psychological distress or negative feelings
Sunderlin, W., 2018	Brazil, Peru, Cameroon, Tanzania, Indonesia	Upper & Lower middle income	Mitigation	Deforestation	Subjective Community Wellbeing	↑ Perceived tenure security (Cameroon) and Wellbeing (in 3 5 countries). No effects on tenure preparedness.
Studies with pilot/focused case studies design						
Kundo, H. K., 2022	Bangladesh	Low-income country	Adaptation	Climate-induced short-term shocks (floods, cyclones) & long-term stresses (drought, sea-level rise).	Perceived Wellbeing, resilience, vulnerability	NJLIP programme vs EGPP ↑ resilience. Mixed psychosocial wellbeing outcomes in both programmes
Li, H., 2021	China	Upper-middle income	Adaptation	Air Pollution	Emotions (positive and negative) Mood subscales, perceived restorativeness of environment	Daytime green environment ↑ positive emotions. Urban walking ↓ benefits, except during nighttime where benefits ↑ in both green and urban spaces
McMichael, C., 2021	Fiji	Upper-middle income	Adaptation	Sea-level rise, coastal flooding, erosion, and saltwater intrusion	Mental Wellbeing, emotions (anxiety, sadness), communal culture and identity	↑ Key facilitators for good health and Wellbeing, ↓ anxiety related to environmental stressors, ↑ risks and communal detachment/community culture

(*) Merriam-Webster (2010) definition of subjective Wellbeing, as “the state of being happy, healthy and prosperous”

(**) Life and income satisfaction

QoL: Quality of Life; PTSD: Post Traumatic Stress Disorder; EGPP: Employment Generation Programme for the Poorest; NJLIP: Nuton Jibon livelihood Improvement Project

The Sample sizes of the included studies varied between 48 and 4,000, and their designs were heterogeneous. Three (20%) were randomised clinical trials (RCTs)[53-55], four (26.7%) were randomised evaluations of interventions[56-59], four (26.7%) were quasi-experimental studies[60-63], two (13.3%) were

qualitative evaluations of interventions[28, 64], and the remaining two (13.3%) were field experimental studies[65, 66]. The most common regions where the studies occurred were South America, South Asia, and sub-Saharan Africa.




Figure 2. Map with included studies distribution

Of the included studies, two (13.3%) targeted specific population groups (e.g., pregnant women[53], older adults [66]) in urban areas, and the other thirteen (86.7%) were population-based studies[28, 54-65] in rural areas considered at high-risk for environmental hazards. Two studies[53, 55] had all-female samples, one had an all-male sample[66], and two[28, 64] reported gender-disaggregated data in the qualitative analysis. The remaining ten studies[54, 56-63] did not report data differentiated by sex or gender, although some mentioned females were a significant component of their samples.

3.3. Sources of Bias

Supplementary File 4 contains the results of the quality assessment. Generally, controlled, and experimental studies were scored as medium quality using the SURE checklist, and only three were appraised as high quality. The risk of bias was not discussed in five of the nine controlled studies, only three offered an appraisal of the generalisability of their results, and only four disclosed funding or conflict of interest information. Across the thirteen quantitative studies, the statistical methods were described sparsely in three of them. Common shortcomings of the qualitative studies included not referring to bias or author's positionality, not clearly showing thorough data interpretation and providing

data. Other recurrent issues were the lack of recruitment details or a thorough assessment of the limitations of chosen methods. Validity testing of assessment tools for the study settings was largely absent, along with verification to establish credibility and reflexivity. Unvalidated tools may be culturally inappropriate or not accurately interpreted, leading to errors in responses, and translations might not convey the intended meaning accurately, leading to information bias. The evidence base could be improved by greater attention to sources of bias and appropriate generalisability of results.

3.4 Environmental Hazards

Studies investigated seven loose groups of environmental threats: three studies (20%) assessed air pollution[53, 55, 66], two (13.3%) evaluated droughts and food insecurity[56, 60], four (26.7%) investigated extreme weather events such as floods and storms[54, 63-65], three (20%) evaluated deforestation[58, 59, 62], one (6.7%) focused on the sea-level rise[28], one (6.7%) explored biodiversity protection[57], and the last one (6.7%) assessed access to safe water[61].

3.5 Adaptation and Mitigation strategies

The types of strategy included in the fifteen studies had heterogeneous designs, and differed in their goals and

scale, as the adaptation studies focused on localised interventions. Twelve studies (80%) examined the effects of single adaptation strategies across nine LMICs[28, 53, 54, 56, 57, 59-61, 63-66]. Of the studies that assessed air pollution, two were adaptation studies based on behavioural interventions; One study used an RCT design[53] (n=110) and the other a field experiment[66] (n=48) to evaluate external air pollution. Droughts were assessed in two adaptation studies based on cash transfer programmes for farmers. One was a randomised evaluation[56] of anti-poverty programmes implemented by the Brazilian government (n=850), and the other (n=100) was a quasi-experimental study[60]. Of the four studies assessing extreme climatic events, all were adaptation strategies. One study (n=480) conducted a field experiment to decrease flood vulnerability[65], another one (n=480) did an RCT on disaster preparedness[54], another (n=100) used a quasi-experimental design of unconditional cash transfers to flood-prone rural communities[63], and the last one (n=223) conducted a randomised evaluation of two governmental programmes aimed at vulnerable groups to climate stressors[64]. A qualitative case study (n=89) evaluated a planned relocation governmental programme for sea-level rise and coastal erosion[28]. One adaptation study on deforestation and forest degradation was a randomised evaluation[59] (n=400). Meanwhile three studies (20%) examined the effects of mitigation programmes[55, 58, 62]. For instance, the study by Williams (n=180) used an RCT design to assess a household air pollution mitigation strategy involving cleaner cookstoves[55]. Two other studies assessed the same multi-country deforestation and forest degradation mitigation strategy: one study[58] performed a randomised evaluation (n=4000), and the other (n=3754) had a quasi-experimental design[62].

3.6 Mental health and wellbeing outcomes

Most studies (twelve out of fifteen) used quantitative methods to assess the outcomes of climate change mitigation and adaptation strategies on mental health and wellbeing. Only two included studies[54, 63] used validated scales to assess common mental disorders. The study led by James [54] used the Zanmi Lasante Depression Symptom Inventory[67] (ZLDSI), the Modified Post Traumatic Syndrome Disorder Symptom Scale[68] (MPSS), the Beck Anxiety Inventory[69] (BAI), the functional impairment items tools adapted from Kaiser et al.[70] and the adapted Social Cohesion

Scale by Fone and collaborators[71]. The study conducted by Gros[63] adapted the standardised Perceived Stress Scale (PSS) to assess psychosocial distress. The remaining thirteen studies assessed broader terms of wellbeing at the community and individual levels, such as subjective wellbeing[56, 58-62, 64], emotions and mood[28, 72], quality of life[55, 57] and self-efficacy[53, 65].

3.7 Primary findings

The included studies had overall mixed outcomes; with most (eight out of fifteen) reporting positive effects of climate change mitigation and adaptation strategies on mental health[54, 63] and wellbeing[53, 55, 57, 59, 60, 65] In contrast, the remaining ones (seven out of fifteen) reported no significant impact[61] or mixed outcomes[28, 56, 58, 62, 64, 66] within the intervention groups. None reported adverse effects. In general, the findings from the fifteen studies provide important insights into the effects of these interventions on mental health and wellbeing outcomes. However, the lack of specific effect sizes limits our ability to fully assess the magnitude and practical significance of the observed improvements.

Table 2. Characteristics of the interventions included in the review, grouped by study design (n=15)

Author, Year	Design	Setting (Country)	Sample size	Population (Age)	Intervention	Follow-up assessment	Control group
Studies with experimental design							
Araban, M., 2017	RCT	Pregnant Women - Prenatal hospital ward, urban setting (Iran)	110	Healthy pregnant women (18-35 years), gestational age 20–24 weeks	Theory-based educational intervention. 3 components including: 1. One-hour motivational interviewing session focused on preventive behaviours to air pollution exposure; 2. Daily small message service (SMS) over a one-month span; 3. An educational booklet on air pollution impacts.	1 Month	Assigned to routine prenatal care
Bedran-Martins, A.M, 2018	Randomised evaluation of Anti-Poverty Government Programmes	Rural farmers living in high-drought areas (Brazil)	850	Adults (≥ 18 years) Age mean: 55 years)	<i>Bolsa Familia (BF)</i> : state-sponsored cash transfer programme for farming households with a monthly income ≥1.5 monthly minimum wages, or low-income farming households in an area where an official declaration of drought emergency has been issued. <i>Rural Pension (RP)</i> : safety net for rural workers >60 (males) and >55 (females) provided they had worked >15 years and are associated with a rural labour union or association.	N/A - data compared with survey data from 15 years before the programme implementation	Urban households
Binh, P., 2020	Field experiment, using people-centered risk communication	Flood-prone rural communities (Vietnam)	480	Adults (≥ 18 years)	Field experiment to assess 6 groups where informal and formal people-centered risk communication for flooding were allocated through an income-stratified sampling process: Control groups (A1) with and without (A2) wife participation; Informal (B1) (C1) and formal (B2) (C2) communication groups with and without wife's participation respectively. The risk communication message covered five issues: information about the risk (i.e. causes, probability, and impact), fear appeal (i.e. images recall the horror of the 2011 floods), pros and cons of structural flood defences, coping capacities, and flood personal experience.	N/A assessment done at the end of the intervention (groups B1, C1, B2, C2) and One week after the initial survey (groups A1 and A2)	Groups A1 and A2

1							
2							
3							
4							
5	6	7	8	9	10	11	
12	13	14	15	16	17	18	
19	20	21	22	23	24	25	
26	27	28	29	30	31	32	
33	34	35	36	37	38	39	
40	41	42	43	44	45	46	
	Environmental Impact assessment of WWWC programme interventions implemented in two low income, peri-urban communities	20 sites distributed along the Golokodo & Mbokodweni Rivers: Folweni (± urban) and Ezimbokodweni (rural-peri-urban), in Durban (South Africa)	126 (n=60) intervention beneficiaries randomly selected; n=60 random houses, n=6 online surveys to stakeholders	Adults (≥ 18 years)	WWWC initiative: Civic ecology programme grouping 6 environmental management interventions: (1) Solid waste management and removal: removal of waste from aquatic and terrestrial areas; (2) Recycling: waste collection and storage for recycling; (3) Invasive alien plant control: identification and control along rivers and streams; (4) Water quality monitoring: monthly biophysical monitoring of river water quality; (5) Community vegetable gardens: vegetable production (two gardens) using permaculture methods; (6) Community engagement: door-to-door community engagement, surveys & knowledge sharing.	N/A assessment done after 3 years interventions were undertaken	Randomly selected households in the same areas
	Randomised evaluation of REDD+ programme	Rural villages with reported forest clearing (Brazil, Peru, Cameroon, Tanzania, Indonesia, Vietnam)	4000 households / 130 villages across 6 countries	Adults (≥ 18 years)	REDD+ initiatives aims to reduce emissions from deforestation across tropical countries. The authors assessed the impacts of REDD+ interventions (incentives vs. disincentives vs. a mixed portfolio of incentives and disincentives) on key safeguard-relevant indicators (i.e., tenure security, participation, and subjective Wellbeing), as well as on reported forest clearing on rural households.	N/A data was compared with survey data from 2 years after the programme implementation	Non-REDD+ rural villages
	RCT	Community members living in high risk for extreme events in metropolitan Port-au-Prince (Haiti)	480	Adults (18-65 years, mean: 37 years)	3-day mental health integrated disaster preparedness group intervention. Day 1: discussions on mental health and psychosocial reactions to disaster-related stress & coping strategies. Day 2: disaster preparedness, facilitated discussions on links between common attributions for disasters (e.g., natural causes, God's will) and preparedness motivation. Days 2-3: practice on disaster and mental health related peer support through a "mini disaster simulation" in which participants practice and demonstrate learned skills.	Baseline & Allocation (T1) assessment at 3 months (T2), and follow-up assessment 2 at 6 months (T3)	Wait-list

1							
2							
3							
4		Mixed-methods	21 riverside rural	169	Adults (≥ 18 years)	Water Supply System (SAA) initiative	Group 1: 5 communities
5		assessment of	communities (Middle	(Qualitative)		implemented by the Mamirauá	with active SAA for 7-14
6	Nunes A.,	socio-	Solimões River region,	217 (Survey)		Sustainable Development Institute. The	years; 14 communities
7	2021	environmental	(Amazonas State)			SAA uses photovoltaic solar energy,	with inactive SAA for 7-
8		impacts in the	facing both seasonal			local timber resources, and users'	14 years. Group 2 (water
9		communities	floods and droughts			workforce to capture water from the	with parasites +): 3
10		where the SAAs	(Brazil)			surface of rivers, pumping it to a central	control communities, and
11		were				reservoir for pre-treatment (removal of	3 with active SAA
12		implemented				coarse solids) and distribution by	between 7-14 years.
13						pipeline to households. Complementary	
14						actions, such as guidance to users on	
15						simplified home water treatment	
16						techniques (e.g., filtering and boiling	
17						water), improved the water quality.	
18							
19							
20	Weston, P.,	End-of-project	Farmers and youth	400	Adults (≥ 18 years)	FMNR is a 3-year agroforestry project	Comparison
21	2015	evaluation of a	groups living in	households	and youth groups	approach to arable land restoration and	households, living
22		FMNR project	vulnerable rural	(104		reforestation that seeks to reconcile	outside the project
23		in Talensi,	communities in dryland	intervention,		sustained food production, conservation	area but within the
24		Ghana,	zones of Talensi	154		of soils, and protection of biodiversity. It	same district, geo-
25		evaluating on	(Ghana)	neighbouring,		involves selecting and protecting the	climatic, ethnic,
26		livelihoods (**)		and 142		most vigorous stems regrowing from live	and economic zone
27		impact		controls); 12		stumps of felled trees, pruning off all	
28				FGD		other stems, and pollarding the chosen	
29						stems to grow into straight trunks to	
30	Williams, K.,		High-altitude Aymara	180 (90	Adults 25-64 years	achieve the regeneration of woody plant	
31	2020	RCT	and Quechua	intervention,	(Mean: 37 years),	cover in farming and mixed land use	
32			indigenous resident	90 controls)	non-pregnant	areas.	
33			users of traditional		women	Cardiopulmonary outcomes and	
34			biomass stoves (Peru)			Household Air Pollution (CHAP) RCT,	
35						which aimed to test the impact of a	
36						liquefied petroleum gas) (LPG)	
37						intervention on air quality and health	
38						outcomes. Intervention participants	
39						received a locally-produced LPG stove,	
40						free continuous LPG refills delivered	
41						directly to their home for one year, and	
42						behavioural training and reinforcement	
43						for LPG use.	
44							
45							
46							

Studies with quasi-experimental design

Gori Maia, A., 2021	Quasi experimental study	Rural, smallholder family farmers in the Brazilian semiarid region of Sertão (Brazil)	100	Adults (Age not reported)	MAIS: is a set of agricultural production practices and technologies with specific goals to improve sheep milk and meat yields and climate resilience. The programme helps to support smallholder livestock and dairy farmers through both seasonal and longer-run climate variability by teaching farmers to grow extra, forage and manage herds appropriately, while also regenerating and protecting their natural capital assets in compliance with the Brazilian Forest Code (*).	N/A analyses used post-intervention cross-sectional data (2018) and a sub-sample pre-post panel dataset (2015 and 2018)	Non-MAIS farmers
Gros, C., 2019	Quasi-experimental, mixed methods	Highly vulnerable, rural flood-prone communities in the Brahmaputra River basin before an early flood peak (Bangladesh)	1,039 households	Adults (≥ 18 years)	Forecast-based unconditional cash transfer in anticipation of extreme weather event on the target population of vulnerable households in 4 communities	N/A	Comparison communities (counterfactual)
Sunderlin, W., 2018	Quasi experimental study of REDD+ programme	Rural villages with reported forest clearing (Brazil, Peru, Cameroon, Tanzania, Indonesia)	3754 households / 141 villages / countries	Adults (≥ 18 years)	REDD+ initiatives aims to reduce emissions from deforestation across tropical countries. This study assessed the impacts of REDD+ interventions RFAC (restrictions on forest access and conversion) and TC (tenure clarification) on community subjective wellbeing perceived in rural households.	N/A data was compared with survey data from 2 years after the programme was implemented	Non-REDD+ rural villages

Studies with pilot/focused case studies design

Kundo, H. K. 2022	Randomised evaluation of two Governmental programmes	15 villages. 6 from the Southwestern coastal and 9 from the Northwestern drought-prone zones (Bangladesh)	223	Adult women, males, and youth (Age not reported)	NJLIP: aims to build resilience to extreme weather shocks and stresses by integrating disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation concerns with regular social assistance measures such as cash transfers ("adaptive" programme) or EGPP, a social protection programme ("conventional" programme).	N/A assessment was done years after programmes were implemented: 11 years (EGPP) and 4 years (NJLIP)	No control group
-------------------	--	---	-----	--	---	--	------------------

Li, H., 2021	Pilot field experiment	Middle-aged and older people from a polluted urban community in Chengdu, Sichuan (China)	48	Adults (40-71 years)	Experimental setting with a pre-post walking intervention assessment at individual and environmental level, including real-time air quality index for the area. Two circular routes (1.6km each) were set up in flat and illuminated walkways among the selected green space and urban area, which can be finished in +/- 20 min while monitored. An indoor checkpoint was established on each route for pre-and post-test measurements.	N/A pre-post assessment after experiment completion	N/A sample allocated to 4 walking groups: green areas (daytime/night-time) and urban areas (daytime/night-time)
McMichael, C. 2021	Qualitative multi-year evaluation of a governmental planned relocation programme	Indigenous coastal village residents (Fiji)	77-89	Adults (≥ 18 years, range: 20-84 years)	State-programmed planned relocation (defined as 'a solution-oriented measure, involving the State, in which a community is physically moved to another location and resettled permanently there'). Relocation ensured access to basic human rights including water, food, health, work, education, and a clean and healthy environment. Evaluation data collected over a five-year period using <i>talanoa</i> discussions (talking or telling stories without concealment), qualitative interviews with individuals and small groups, and observation of the built and 'natural' environment and everyday activities.	N/A data was collected in 4 time points over a 5-year period post relocation.	No control group

(*) Brazilian Forest Code states that 20% of native habitat in semiarid regions must be maintained and conserved

(**) Livelihood has been described as assets, capabilities and activities to provide a living (Scoones 1998:5)

RCT: Randomised Controlled Trial; WWWC: Wise Wayz Water Care programme; REDD+: Reducing carbon Emissions through avoided Deforestation and forest Degradation and enhancement of carbon stocks; MAIS: Módulo Agroclimático Inteligente e Sustentável; EGPP: Employment Generation Programme for the Poorest; NJLIP: Nuton Jibon livelihood Improvement Project; FGD: Focus Group Discussion; LPG: Liquefied petroleum gas; FbF: Forecast-based cash transfer; FMNR: Farmer-Managed Natural Regeneration project

Table 3. Adaptation or Mitigation and Mental Health & Wellbeing assessments characteristics of the studies included in the review, grouped by study design (n=15)

Author, Year	Analysis	Effectiveness of the strategy / program	Indicator of interest	Key findings	Implications & remarks
Studies with experimental design					
Araban, M., 2017	Comparison of two groups' mean scores with an independent t-test or a Mann Whitney U test	Score changes between Intervention and control groups: Perceived benefits 2.04 (4.16) $p=0.003$; Self-efficacy 3.35 (3.34) $p=0.0001$	Stage of behavioral change, perceived benefits, and self-efficacy in \downarrow exposure to air pollution for pregnant vulnerable women	Significant group differences in terms of stages of change in self-efficacy, perceived benefits and practice regarding air pollution preventive behaviors at follow-up assessment ($P < 0.05$). At 1 month FU: Stages of change: Action 46 (86.8) intervention vs control 3 (5.9) $p<0.001$	Educational intervention strategies based on a transtheoretical model can \uparrow preventive behaviors in pregnant women and \downarrow exposure to air pollution.
Bedran-Martins, A.M, 2018	Change of SWB and MQoL across 4 groups (Urban Pension (UP) Rural Pension (RP), Urban Bolsa Familia (UBF) Rural Bolsa Familia (RBF) using ANOVA	Change of SWB: RP 0.46 (1.10) UP 0.66 (1.56) RBF 0.27 (1.39) UBF 1.11 (1.11) F Test 3.48 (0.01) Change of perception of MQoL 1.25 (0.99) 0.89 (1.52) 0.73 (1.20) 0.46 (1.31) 3.78 (0.01)	UP and UBF had significantly higher levels of positive changes in their SWB. UBF expressed significantly lower levels of positive changes in perception of MQoL. RP had significantly higher levels of positive changes in MQoL.	Mixed. Improvement in perception of MQoL and SWB among some households, however, the persistence of extreme food insecurity allied to other unintended effects of cash transfer can actually not only offset but also worsen households' Wellbeing	Material gains in QoL promoted by social programs may not be sufficient to transform households' SWB perception, especially if they are vulnerable to drought. The relationship between MQoL and SWB is not linear and appears to be particularly affected by how households are affected by drought.
Binh, P., 2020	Principal-component factor method to classify protective measures into five groups of measures: structural, property, livelihood, emergency, and financial	Modest, for informal communication training participants	Fear feelings (FEAR) and structural measures 0.20 ($p=0.043$), livelihoods measures 0.15 ($p=.032$), Emergency measures 0.12 ($P=0.036$) and Self-efficacy structural measures (SE) 0.37($p=0.041$) property measures 0.24 ($p=0.045$), livelihoods measures 0.34 ($p=0.041$) 0.36($p=0.044$) and 0.33 ($p=0.090$)	Risk perceptions and coping capacities $>$ when respondent had better flood information. Formal risk communication not change people's perceived consequences, emergency mitigation intentions and had a modest impact on their risk perception. Informal risk communication performed better changing households' perception of consequences, fear feelings, and coping capacities associated with emergency measures. Household's mitigation intention seemed to depend on self-efficacy. Women's participation in flood-related intentions of households did not have significant differences.	Informal risk communication: perceived stronger feelings of flood threat and \uparrow intentions to take property and financial measures. Formal risk communication: had lower feelings of flood threat, and much lower effect of fear feelings on mitigation intention. Better knowledge of flooding led to higher intentions to take additional mitigation measures. Households living farther from the main river and/or a

Davids, R., 2022	EIA to assess the impact significance of 37 ranked and scored outcomes from 6 interventions in terms of 5 impact assessment criteria. Authors used bipartite analysis to describe the pattern, and visualise the strengths of linkages, between the interventions and outcomes.	Outcomes' Impact significance (high ≥ 17 , moderate $10 \geq < 17$, or low < 10) and Interventions' relative cumulative impact across ecological, socio-economic, and health categories (high impact = 10, moderate = 5 and low = 3). Relative cumulative impact factor: 1. Extent (E): spatial scale; 2. Magnitude degree (M); 3. Duration (D): time scale; 4. Reversibility (R) degree; and 5. Probability (P): of occurrence outcomes. Significance indicator is estimated by: $S = C (E + M + D + R) / 4 \times P$.	Improved QoL of beneficiaries, community members and external stakeholders (including funders, government, etc). Data collected in site visits (direct field observations & discussions with program beneficiaries), stakeholder engagement (surveys & interviews), a social-ecological workshop and specialist study reviews.	Interventions resulted in 37 outcomes (36 +, 1 -) compared through their impact assessment significance scores. The socio-economic outcomes were the greatest (21), followed by ecological (11) and health outcomes (6). Outcomes included access to education & training; \uparrow QoL; \uparrow terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems; \uparrow in recreation and cultural uses of natural areas; \downarrow health risks and \uparrow nutrition. The $\uparrow \uparrow$ ecological outcomes were from invasive alien plant control and solid waste removal and water quality monitoring. The $\uparrow \uparrow$ health outcomes were from solid waste removal and vegetable gardens; the $\uparrow \uparrow$ social-economic outcomes were from the general operation of WWWC, solid waste removal, and invasive alien plant control.	nearby channel had weaker incentives to implement structural measures.
Duchelle, A. E. 2017	Mixed effects models. For interventions effects on Wellbeing, the outcome was the relative, pairwise difference between intervention types using only Phase 2 data. For overall wellbeing outcomes to examine changes over time for households exposed to different intervention types, Phase 1 and Phase 2 data were used.	1. Significant score changes (Rank) of household-level averages (and SD) of wellbeing scores between groups of interventions at global/country level and 2. Significant changes in overall SWB scores (better off and worse off) over time at global level for those receiving or no interventions.	Reported change in overall household SWB when compared with two years prior. Proportion of households exposed to the different intervention types, including no interventions at all, that reported being better off and those that reported being worse off in Phases 1 and 2., and the evaluation of the effect of specific interventions on household wellbeing, using an average score from the Likert responses in phase 2.	Globally: + correlation with Wellbeing for all interventions (incentives, disincentives, both) at baseline. Phase 2: among households on disincentives \downarrow in the number of better off households and \uparrow in those worse off. No changes amongst those receiving both (general worsening of Wellbeing due to disincentives was alleviated by addition of incentives) Indonesia: households on incentives were worse off at baseline. Wellbeing \uparrow significantly on Phase 2. Peru: households on disincentives (with/ without incentives) had no significant changes over time. Tanzania: disincentives households were less worse off over time, strengthening local land rights and increasing SWB.	Findings highlight the importance of ensuring that interventions designed to protect forests also benefit local people. Disincentives can have (-) impacts on smallholders' rights and Wellbeing, and possibly even more so when they effectively \downarrow forest clearing, impacting local livelihoods. Incentives can alleviate the burden of disincentives, but the right balance is needed. Local perceptions of the social impacts of forest interventions must be prioritized in safeguards monitoring because individual farmers and communities across the tropics will ultimately make

James, L. E. 2020	<p>Intention To Treat analysis to assess the main intervention effect analysis: the change in scales values in the intervention group relative to control from T1 to T2 or T1 to T3. Data were analysed in a three-level linear mixed effects model with fixed effects interactions of time point and intervention and random intercepts at community and participant level.</p>	<p>Intervention ↑ disaster preparedness (T1 to T2 4.18, $p < 0.001$ and T1 to T3 2.90, $p < 0.001$; ↓ symptoms of depression (T1 to T2 0.35 $p < 0.001$, T1 to T3 -0.21, $p < 0.01$), PTSD (T1 to T2 -0.46, $p < 0.001$ and T1 to T3 -0.28, $p < 0.01$), anxiety (T1 to T2 -0.27, $p < 0.001$ and T1 to T3 -0.15, $p < 0.05$), functional impairment (T1 to T2 -0.35, $p < 0.05$), and ↑ peer-based help-giving (T1 to T2 1.71, $p < 0.001$ and T1 to T3 1.37, $p > 0.001$) and disaster-focused help-seeking (T1 to T2 0.59 $p = 0.05$).</p>	<p>Depression cases evaluated with Zanmi Lasante Depression Symptom Inventory (ZLDSI); PTSD, with the Modified PTSD Symptom Scale (MPSS); Anxiety with the Beck Anxiety Inventory (BAI); functional impairment (Five items for women, four items for men, adapted from Kaiser <i>et al.</i> (2013) and social cohesion (Five items, adapted from Sampson <i>et al.</i> (1997).</p>	<p>The intervention was effective, ↑ disaster preparedness, ↓ depression associated symptoms, post-traumatic stress disorder, anxiety, functional impairment, and ↑ peer-based help-giving and help-seeking. There were no significant effects on MH related help-seeking. This may be due to the difficulty in interpreting this concept, despite it to capture even informal help-seeking not only formal MH services that are extremely limited and hard to access. The effect of the intervention on preparedness was mediated by mental health, and the effects on MH were mediated by preparedness.</p>	<p>the collective difference in how forests are managed.</p>
Nunes A., 2021	<p>Mixed methods evaluation of health and Wellbeing. Data was collected through 19 FGDs, 19 Semi-structured interviews, 217 questionnaires, 393 parasitological examinations and 33 analysis of water quality.</p>	<p>In communities with active SAA: benefits in work dynamics, house cleaning and personal hygiene (more comfort, privacy and safety to showering indoors) 55% reported more time for women to do additional income-generating activities, rest or leisure. 11% reported benefits in avoiding weight-carrying (water, bowls and clothes) from the riverbank to the households, and a ↓ in related back pain among those collecting the water.</p>	<p>SWB and impacts on household / domestic infrastructure.</p>	<p>The SAAs had impacts ↑ comfort, privacy and ↓ of the time employed in domestic activities (e.g. fetching water in the river or washing clothes, having an indoor toilet) related to ↑ in life conditions, and ↓ in the risk of accidents related to going to the riverbank, from a wellbeing point of view. It did not have a reduction of parasitosis prevalence.</p>	<p>In general, in communities with active SAA, the Quality of tap water presented median better results than water from the river (e.g., the turbidity parameters) but could not supply drinking water due to parasitosis prevalence and did not lessen the health risks due to inadequate disposal of human waste. Despite this, the SAAs hold social impacts related to the comfort of domestic tasks and privacy for personal hygiene and represents an improvement in the living conditions of the communities.</p>

Weston, P., 2015	<p>SROI analysis interpret social and environmental variables and economic value creation using estimated proxy monetary values. Additionally, qualitative, and quantitative outcome changes were collected with the project's primary stakeholders</p>	<p>Proxy financial values among intervention stakeholders increased in 100% comparing outcomes at the end of project (Year 3) with 4 years after project close (Year 7) for: Increased optimism towards future, Enhanced leadership roles (especially for women) and community solidarity</p>	<p>Psychosocial wellbeing outcomes, individual and community aggregated livelihood impact</p>	<p>SROI which entails conceptualising proxy monetary values for social benefits of an initiative and allowing to determine individual and aggregate values of perceived changes on households' livelihoods from adopting FMNR (1) ↑ increased assets in the form of tree stocks and ↑ livestock; (2) ↑ wild resources (especially wild foods and construction inputs) for household consumption and sale and associated dietary health benefits; (3) ↑ psychosocial Wellbeing related to having a pleasing and comfortable community and work environment, ↑ leadership capacity of FMNR group members, and a more positive outlook; and (4) improved soil fertility and crop yields.</p>	<p>FMNR project is a field and forest restoration technique, that is also an embodiment of rural landscape management that empowers land users and creates space for ecological dynamics to restore soil and natural resources.</p>
Williams, K. 2020	<p>Mixed methods. 1. Intention to treat analysis: Two-tailed t-tests to compare differences in time spent collecting fuel between participants. 2. Thematic analysis on Qualitative interviews data collected from a sub sample.</p>	<p>Qualitative interviews found that adoption of LPG improved participants' QoL. Women appreciated that they could sleep more and that they and their families could consume more hot meals.</p>	<p>Perceived QoL through saved time that can be dedicated to leisure, rest, and income generation activities</p>	<p>Quantitative evidence of temperature-based stove use monitors, supported by self-reported survey data, that cooking with LPG can save significant time compared to cooking with biomass fuels, up to 5.8 hours saved per week. Participants perceived this time savings as a positive change</p>	<p>Use of LPG may provide benefits beyond potential improvements to air quality and health that can be integrated into LPG promotion efforts. By quantifying the impact of LPG on time, this study provides evidence for one of the most promoted benefits of LPG.</p>

Studies with quasi-experimental design

Gori
Maia, A.,
2021

Difference-in-difference (DID) estimators; Two-stage regression estimators; and methods derived from the propensity score (PS)

SWB OLS estimates on satisfaction: Income (0.270, p<0.001) work (0.324 p<0.001) and life (0.233 p<0.01). Food satisfaction was NS. The annual average farm income of MAIS farmers was 95% higher than non-MAIS farmers.

Measures of economic welfare and SWB (Income & Wellbeing - Farm income, Income, food, work, and life satisfaction).

MAIS farmers (survey 2018) reported their perceptions on variations in the income sufficiency (22% points ↑), quality of work (30% points↑), and Quality of life in general (16% points↑). No significant difference on the variation in the quantity of food satisfaction in the last 2 years. This may be because the program prioritized cash crop productions (milk and sheep meat) rather than the food sufficiency of impoverished farmers.

1st study to evaluate the impacts of a climate resilience program in the Brazilian semi-arid region, where family farmers have historically suffered from recurrent and prolonged droughts that have worsened in the last decades. Simple farm management strategies may be an effective tool for building resilience into rural agricultural systems.

Gros, C.,
2019

Logistic regression analysis of household surveys and qualitative data analysis

FbF-assisted households experience less psychosocial distress than non-FbF-assisted households in the aftermath of the flood.

Psychosocial distress (feelings of unhappiness, being miserable, anxious or depressed)

The survey data show that households who did not receive FbF assistance felt miserable or unhappy significantly more frequently after the flood than the intervention group who received cash assistance. Similarly, FbF-assisted households were significantly less likely to have felt anxious or depressed in the last seven days before the survey (29 vs. 43%)

The FbF cash transfer increased the regularity and Quality of beneficiary households' food intake, reduced the need to take out high-interest loans and appears to have reduced psychosocial stress in the aftermath of the flood. The intervention may have also prevented households from having to make destitution sales of valuable assets when compared to similarly affected households.

Sunderlin,
W., 2018

Difference-in-difference (DID) estimators; Counterfactual analysis and local perceptions of the drivers of observed changes and the effects of REDD+ activities on Wellbeing among intervention and control villages and households.

In analysing the wellbeing effect of tenure-related interventions, the perceived effects were classified at the village level (negative, neutral, positive) by country, and by type of intervention (RFAC alone, TC alone, and the aggregated RFAC and TC).

Perceived effect of tenure related interventions on community wellbeing at the village and household levels

All countries: net positive view at the village level + (16.7% of villages had a negative view, 55.1% a neutral view, and 28.3% a positive view) and at the household level (18.6% holding a negative view, 35.5% a neutral view, and 46.0% a positive view). Respondents from **Cameroon, Tanzania, and Indonesia** have a net positive evaluation of the wellbeing impact of tenure-related interventions with a tendency toward a higher share of non-negative responses, whereas **Brazil** and **Peru** have a net negative evaluation, with fewer villages reporting positive responses (In Peru, the reasons for higher tenure insecurity have largely to do with “problems with or fear/distrust of government authorities” and “natural conditions are poor/pose risk.”)

The results suggest a somewhat less positive evaluation of the impact of restrictions on RFAC than TC interventions, both at the village and household level, especially in Brazil and in Peru, where also TC interventions had a negative evaluation at the village level. In Cameroon and Tanzania this was not significant at the village level. The importance of national-level action to

successfully restrain the "BAU-Business as usual" interests that continue to have the upper hand in tropical land use decisions is crucial on the achievement of REDD+. The role played by companies and by governments is central, and concerted efforts by civil society may be needed to bring about change.

Studies with pilot/focused case studies design

Kundo, H.
K. 2022

Thematic content analysis. Data validity was achieved through triangulation of data collected through FGD, LHI and KII to women, men and youth beneficiaries, and national and local officials.

N/A Program effectiveness was not reported. Rather, authors assessed the interviewees' vulnerabilities and resilience capacities and the contribution of the programmes to their desired self-reported wellbeing indicators

Self-reported wellbeing indicators, resilience, and vulnerability

Mixed. Perceived EGPP & NJLIP effectiveness varies across regions due to socio-economic and political factors. EGPPs are prioritised by local political actors without community consultation. Both fail to address structural barriers for gender equity (e.g., women ↑ livelihoods). NJLIP contributed modestly to long-term capacities to deal with climatic stresses. Outcomes of material Wellbeing (e.g., food consumption, expenditure) provide immediate poverty relief but fail to clear precarity or debt. Psychosocial Wellbeing (aspirations, confidence, purpose of life views) were not improved.

Repeated and predictable public works programmes reduce distress migration and improve food security outcomes compared with one-off short-term programmes. Multipronged adaptive programmes that explicitly integrate climate change concerns perform better than conventional programmes. Cash programmes that fail to incorporate climate risk reduction in their design have ↓ potentiality to build resilience or enable households' preparedness for facing adverse climatic events.

<p>Li, H., 2021</p>	<p>Two-way ANOVA to determine the effects of time and location. Fisher's exact test and the Chi-squared test to check the preferred difference between the two walking environments.</p>	<p>The median score of PANAS-positive ↑ significantly after daytime green walking (p = 0.03) and nighttime urban walking (p = 0.046). The median score of Vigor ↑ significantly after daytime green walking (p = 0.034) and nighttime urban walking (p = 0.024). In daytime, the PRS score in green walking was significantly > than urban walking (p < 0.001). In the urban walking, the PRS score in nighttime was significantly > than daytime walking (p = 0.037).</p>	<p>Positive and negative emotions (PANAS), Six subscales of mood (POMS assessing Tension or anxiety (T), anger or hostility (A), fatigue (F), depression or dejection (D), Vigor (V), and confusion or bewilderment), perceived restorativeness of environment (PRS) and properties of the environments that contributed to the restorative outcomes (ROS)</p>	<p>Blood pressure (SBP, DBP, and MAP), and some psychological parameters (PANAS-positive and POMS-Vigor) demonstrated reduction after the daytime urban walking. The nighttime urban walking was associated with significant improvements in moods (PANAS-positive, POMS-vigor, and POMS-TMD) and blood pressure (SBP and MAP). In addition, the nighttime PRS score of the urban area was significantly higher than the daytime counterpart.</p>	<p>Daytime green environments are advantageous to mental relaxation and can help to lower blood pressure, while the urban environments are negatively associated with walking exercise and may attenuate positive effects of physical activities. The psychological influences may be subtle during the nighttime green walking, and nighttime walking in both urban areas and green spaces may provide similar benefits. Considering the limitations of the present study, we would recommend the urban citizens start nighttime green walking after work, and nighttime urban walking is also advisable when the air is less polluted.</p>
<p>McMichael I, C. 2021</p>	<p>Thematic content analysis. Data validity was achieved through triangulation of <i>tanaloa</i> data, individual and small groups interviews and interactive mobile interviews</p>	<p>N/A Program effectiveness was not reported. Rather, villagers relocated in the state program reported health and wellbeing benefits and challenges following planned relocation.</p>	<p>Disrupted place attachment, mental Wellbeing</p>	<p>Key facilitators for good health and wellbeing (movement away from environmental risks to health, livelihoods diversification) and challenges and risks (disruption of culture and place attachment, communal laws, ↓ mental Wellbeing). These determinants are also mediated by wider processes of sociocultural change that operate at the local, national, and global levels. Reported health risks —i.e., altered diet, increased consumption of alcohol and tobacco—were understood to be the result of diminished traditional values and practices.</p>	<p>These results highlight the need for context-specific planning and adaptation programs that include meaningful involvement of community members in ongoing decision making, and call for an understanding of diverse social determinants of health that emerge and evolve in contexts of planned relocation.</p>

SWB: Subjective Wellbeing; MQoL: Material Quality of life; UP: Urban Pension; RP: Rural Pension; UBF: Urban Bolsa Familia; RBF: Rural Bolsa Familia; EIA: Environmental Impact Assessment; FGD: Focus Group Discussions, LHI: Life History Interviews; KII: Key Informant Interviews; EGPP: Employment Generation Programme for the Poorest; NJLIP: Nuton Jibon livelihood Improvement Project; PANAS: Positive and Negative Affect Schedule; PRS: Perceived Restorativeness Scale; POMS: Mood States questionnaire; ROS: Restorative Outcome Scale; RFAC: Restrictions on Forest Access and Control; TC: Tenure Clarification; SAA: Water Supply System; LPG: Liquefied petroleum gas; QoL: Quality of Life; FbF: Forecast-based cash transfer; SROI: Social Return On Investment.

1
2
3 For example, the study led by Araban[53] obtained
4 positive effects on the individual's perceived benefits
5 and self-efficacy in the intervention group compared to
6 the control group. Similarly, the study by Bedran-
7 Martin[56], showed varied changes in subjective
8 wellbeing and perception of material quality of life
9 varied across groups, indicating small to moderate
10 improvements between the intervention groups. Binh's
11 study[65] reported positive findings for fear feelings,
12 structural measures, livelihoods measures, and self-
13 efficacy among the groups participating in the
14 intervention. Davids[57] used a comprehensive
15 approach across ecological, socioeconomic and health
16 categories to assess the impact significance of wellbeing
17 outcomes and found improved social-economic
18 outcomes among the participants. Gori Maia[60] found
19 positive associations between participants' wellbeing
20 and income, work, and life satisfaction. The study led by
21 James[54] showed positive effects of the intervention on
22 disaster preparedness and mental health outcomes, such
23 as depression, trauma, anxiety, and functional
24 impairment, as well as social outcomes, such as help-
25 giving and help-seeking behaviours. However, despite
26 the positive effects found in the studies mentioned, the
27 specific effect sizes values across the studies were not
28 reported, making it difficult to assess the magnitude of
29 the improvements and the significance of these changes.
30 Additionally, confirming the long-term effects of these
31 interventions is challenging due to the varied evaluation
32 periods and availability of post-intervention
33 assessments. For example, five studies[55, 57, 63, 65,
34 66] did not report conducting follow-up assessments,
35 and the remaining ten did. However, their timelines
36 ranged from one-month follow-up evaluation post-
37 intervention[53] to fifteen years[56], as in the study led
38 by Bedran-Martins.

39
40
41 On the other hand, there were studies with mixed or non-
42 significant changes among intervention participants. For
43 instance, Duchelle's randomised evaluation of the anti-
44 deforestation multi-country program[58] found mixed
45 effects of specific intervention components across
46 countries, highlighting the importance of local factors in
47 real-life conditions and the need to prioritise meeting
48 communities' needs. Additionally, qualitative
49 evaluations conducted by Kundo[64] of two
50 governmental programs for communities at high-risk for
51 short and long-term climatic stressors and
52 McMichael[28] on the longitudinal assessment of a
53 relocated community due to coastal erosion and sea-
54 level rise provided valuable insights into the
55 intervention participants' perspectives but also obtained
56 mixed results in terms of the perceived effectiveness and
57
58
59
60

improvements that these strategies brought across
regions. These findings highlight sociocultural,
socioeconomic, and political factors' role in wellbeing
indicators and emphasise the need to involve target
communities into context-specific participatory design
planning meaningfully.

4. Discussion

This systematic review summarises the existing
evidence on the effects of climate change mitigation and
adaptation strategies on mental health and wellbeing
outcomes among adult populations living in LMICs.
Most included studies focused on adaptation
interventions, with only a few examining mitigation
programmes. There was limited evidence on the effects
of climate action on common mental disorders.
Furthermore, no studies assessed the linkages between
mental health variables and mitigation programmes.

The study designs, types of intervention, and their active
components varied widely across studies, reflecting the
diverse range of strategies being implemented, the
different climatic hazards being addressed, and the
various assessment tools and approaches used to
measure mental health and wellbeing outcomes.

Factors significantly associated with wellbeing
outcomes ranged broadly between studies, but most
findings highlighted the critical role of contextual and
sociocultural factors in achieving beneficial effects. For
example, there was a consistent link between cash
transfer programmes and integrated interventions that
strengthen community ties and improve material living
conditions or wellbeing. This findings aligns with the
broader literature on underserved communities and
climatic events[73] and external stressors[74].
However, while cash transfers programs, especially
unconditioned ones can increase participant's wellbeing
levels by helping them meet their basic needs, they may
require an integrated approach to achieve longer-term
wellbeing effects, as reported elsewhere[75].
Evaluations of anti-poverty governmental programs [56,
64] implemented in underserved communities and
multi-country anti-deforestation programs[58, 62]
highlighted the need for tailored community protective
measures that go beyond providing access to cash funds
for high-risk groups affected by climatic stressors.

Notably, none of the included studies reported on
additional related mental health topics, such as forced
migration, gender-based violence, or substance use. The
limited evidence in this area may be attributed to mental
health not being a primary focus of evaluations of
climate change mitigation and adaptation strategies in

LMICs[76] and the lack of validated scales and tools for measuring these outcomes in co-benefits studies in LMICs[77].

The reporting of gender-disaggregated data across the included studies was scarce. Women, who often experience higher rates of mental conditions, primarily due to depression[78], are disproportionately affected by the impacts of climate change[79]. Given that nine out of the fifteen included studies assessed populations living in high-risk areas for cyclical extreme weather events, the lack of reported outcomes with gender-differentiated data is concerning considering the increased economic pressures faced by female beneficiaries of climate mitigation and adaptation programmes. Women often become heads of households after extreme weather events[80], experience displacement[81], partner's economic migration or endure gender-based violence[82], all of which have well-documented mental health consequences[13]. Ensuring equal inclusion in leadership and decision-making of women and minorities, especially those belonging to Indigenous groups in high-risk areas for climatic stressors, is crucial to address their mental and wellbeing needs while incorporating their unique knowledge of ecosystem handling and protection.

Improvement in quality of life[55-57, 60] and perceived wellbeing[28, 53, 56, 58-62, 64] were the two most commonly reported positive outcomes across the strategies, with fewer studies reporting decreased psychosocial distress, self-efficacy and resilience. This finding broadly resonates with the more extensive evidence base on co-benefits amongst high-risk communities affected by climatic hazards in LMICs[16].

The relationship between the co-benefits of adaptation and mitigation strategies and mental health outcomes among LMIC populations is still largely unknown, with limited quantitative research to date. Two studies that measured mental health outcomes quantitatively were also limited by methodological constraints in conducting research in humanitarian settings. One study[54] conducted 3-day mental health integrated disaster preparedness group intervention, used validated scales and conducted follow-up assessments three and six months after the study. The other study[63] provided unconditional cash transfers in anticipation of extreme weather events, used a survey with a shortened version of a standardised scale, and did not report a follow-up assessment, limiting the understanding of the temporal relationship between these strategies and the possible

mental health co-benefits they bring to beneficiaries and communities.

The countries and regions identified as having extensive exposure to climate change hazards are primarily located in the tropics and subtropics[83]. With large regions affected by climate change hazards, Brazil has the largest population exposed to wet-bulb temperatures of 30°C and above[84]. This review's findings align with this evidence, as five out of fifteen studies were conducted in Brazil. Peru and Indonesia were the next most common countries, with three studies each. Most studies (twelve out of fifteen) were implemented in rural or peri-urban villages located in various settings and exposed to different environmental threats, providing a clearer understanding of where these strategies can potentially have an impact. However, various methods were used to measure the most frequent wellbeing outcomes, and most studies did not report their translation process or validation of the surveys or tools used for individual data collection, which may weaken the reliability of the findings. Future research should incorporate validated tools to provide more accurate data on the impact of these strategies. The absence of widespread formal evaluations of these strategies' mental health and wellbeing outcomes limits policymakers' ability to make informed decisions considering the holistic impact of climate change mitigation and adaptation strategies at both population and individual levels.

Despite the increase in recent evidence on the threats of climatic hazards and their impacts on health and wellbeing, global estimates and projections often need to be revised at regional and local levels. Higher temperatures and various extreme weather events may have different effects in different areas. However, social vulnerability factors and individual susceptibilities mediate their local impact on human populations, such as the marginalisation of certain groups like Indigenous People, lack of communication and support features for rural villages, poorly planned urban and peri-urban characteristics, and high prevalence of comorbidities. These factors tend to increase the risk of adverse health outcomes within populations[8, 10].

4.1 Strengths and Limitations

The strengths of this review lie in the comprehensiveness of the search strategy and the rigorous inclusion criteria used. We included controlled, quasi-experimental, and pilot studies and focused case studies that reported on the impact of climate change mitigation and adaptation strategies on

1
2
3 mental health and wellbeing outcomes. Also, only one
4 included study[54] directly focused on mental health
5 outcomes rather than assessing mental health as a
6 secondary benefit of other climate adaptation activities.
7 This aligns with the broader lack of research examining
8 mental health as a primary outcome in climate change
9 intervention studies[7, 85, 86]. The shortage of studies
10 focused specifically on mental health measures
11 highlights a key gap in the evidence base and
12 underscores the need for future intervention studies to
13 deliberately incorporate and prioritise validated mental
14 health assessments. The limited number of studies that
15 met the inclusion criteria underscores the need for
16 further research in this area.

17
18 Nevertheless, as awareness of the potential mental
19 health and wellbeing co-benefits of mitigation and
20 adaptation efforts increases, these aspects are expected
21 to be more deliberately considered to augment
22 population benefits. However, more research is needed
23 to strengthen this review's relatively weak evidence
24 base. Our restriction to adult populations may have
25 omitted overarching evidence across the lifespan.
26 However, this approach is justified since most
27 participants and beneficiaries of these strategies and
28 programs are adults. Additionally, four studies included
29 subpopulations with increased vulnerability to risk
30 factors, such as older adults [66], youth[59, 64],
31 indigenous women[55] and pregnant women[53].

32 This review included published peer-reviewed studies
33 reporting quantitative and qualitative outcomes in
34 English and Portuguese. Data extraction was completed
35 by a single author, which introduces the potential for
36 selection and extraction bias. However, this bias is
37 mitigated by oversight and discussion with a second
38 author during the screening, data extraction and quality
39 appraisal processes. Future review should also consider
40 including grey literature for a more comprehensive
41 search in this area. Due to the heterogeneity of
42 outcomes, conducting meta-analysis or meta-synthesis
43 of quantitative and qualitative studies was impossible,
44 thereby preventing the pooling of results.

47 4.2 Future Research Recommendations

48
49 Further research should focus on collecting more data
50 targeting local population groups with heightened
51 vulnerabilities. This will contribute to a more
52 comprehensive understanding of the cross-cultural
53 impacts of these strategies. Detailed and country-
54 specific evaluation analyses and focused data on the
55 most affected groups are needed to inform
56 policymakers, the public, and key stakeholders.

Additionally, joint co-design of targeted interventions
with the communities at the forefront of adaptation
efforts, ensuring research equity and inclusion, is crucial
to understand better the magnitude of climate change
impacts on population health and wellbeing and to
identify and leverage the protective factors of mitigation
and adaptation programs. More attention and efforts
should be directed towards the potential negative
impacts of implemented mitigation and adaptation
strategies, such as displacement through relocation[64]
and loss of livelihoods[58]. This can be achieved by
more frequent and better measurement of mental health
outcomes, considering such potential negative impacts,
and ensuring that they are minimised with strong,
culturally sensitive co-produced, and participatory local
adaptation measures. We have included studies that
have assessed mental health and wellbeing outcomes at
the individual level but there are also social-ecological
level factors with an undeniable influence at both the
individual and the community level, which should be
explored accordingly. Furthermore, strategies should
also ensure that affected communities are adequately
compensated for economic and material losses and
empowered to face the effects of climate change.

It is crucial to recognise that populations living in
LMICs are among the most vulnerable and neglected
groups, often lacking support from their governments.
They have been forced to be at the forefront of
adaptation activities, with little or no engagement from
local authorities. Therefore, their needs, vulnerabilities
and contextual factors must be considered when scaling
up multisectoral approaches that harness the co-benefits
of these strategies to alleviate the burden on their mental
health and wellbeing.

Addressing these potential co-benefits for populations
living in LMICs requires a holistic and transdisciplinary
approach. It is essential to consider the specific needs
and vulnerabilities of target population groups,
including those living with disabilities, women, the
elderly, and youth, living in high-risk areas for climatic
events and environmental hazards in LMICs. This
consideration ensures that these strategies are practical,
equitable and capable of bringing population-wide
indirect effects that positively impact sustainable
development, poverty reduction and wellbeing in these
countries, although more evidence is still needed.

Our findings should be interpreted with caution due to
the possibility of reporting and publication bias.
Additionally, the small number of studies, the lack of
specific size values reported, and the heterogeneity of
the study designs and populations make it challenging
to draw firm conclusions. Further research is needed to

fully understand the potential co-benefits of these strategies for mental health and wellbeing in LMIC settings.

The results of this review underscore the need for greater attention to the psychosocial impact of climate change mitigation and adaptation strategies, both in terms of measuring mental health and wellbeing as outcomes, and in designing interventions. The concurrent global climate and mental health crises require the prioritisation of evidence-based policies that prioritise the mental health and wellbeing of the population. Such policies should promote preparedness, resilience, and recovery facing climate change effects, foster social cohesion and community engagement, and empower individuals and communities in LMICs.

5. Conclusion

This review identified limited and disparate evidence regarding the effects of climate change mitigation and adaptation strategies on mental health and wellbeing in LMICs. Despite the widespread implementation of programming in this area, formal evaluations that measure these critical outcomes are lacking. Given the current global climate and mental health crises, this scarcity of evidence represents a missed opportunity to address significant long-term problems for population mental health and wellbeing. Urgent research is needed to explore how these interventions work and how to better address mental health responses, considering local factors and adopting a transdisciplinary approach at all levels to facilitate the translation of findings into policy and action.

Acknowledgements

Sincere thanks to Ms Jane Falconer for her support in the search strategy development and Prof. Pauline Scheelbeck and her collaborators for sharing the outputs of their work using the GAMI database.

Declaration of interests statement

The authors declare no competing interests.

Funding details

This research was partly funded by ECF's postdoctoral fellowship from the Gordon and Betty Moore Foundation at LSHTM and Stanford University Faculty of Medicine. The funders were not involved in the study design; in the collection, analysis, and interpretation of data; in the report's writing; and in the decision to submit the article for publication.

Credit Author Statement

Elaine C. Flores / Alan D. Dangour: Conceptualization, Methodology. Elaine C. Flores / Laura J. Brown: Data collection; Elaine C. Flores: Analysis, Writing, Original draft preparation, and Editing. Laura J. Brown / Ritsuko Kakuma / Julian Eaton / Alan D. Dangour: Analysis, Writing- Reviewing, and Editing.

References

- Haines A, Kovats RS, Campbell-Lendrum D, Corvalán C. Climate change and human health: impacts, vulnerability and public health. *Public health*. 2006;120(7):585-96.
- Cianconi P, Betrò S, Janiri L. The Impact of Climate Change on Mental Health: A Systematic Descriptive Review. *Frontiers in Psychiatry*. 2020;11.10.3389/fpsyt.2020.00074.
- Hwong AR, Wang M, Khan H, Chagwedera DN, Grzenda A, Doty B, et al. Climate change and mental health research methods, gaps, and priorities: a scoping review. *The Lancet Planetary Health*. 2022;6(3):e281-e91. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2542-5196\(22\)00012-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2542-5196(22)00012-2).
- Berry HL, Bowen K, Kjellstrom T. Climate change and mental health: a causal pathways framework. *International Journal of Public Health*. 2010;55(2):123-32.10.1007/s00038-009-0112-0.
- Crandon TJ, Dey C, Scott JG, Thomas HJ, Ali S, Charlson FJ. The clinical implications of climate change for mental health. *Nature Human Behaviour*. 2022;6(11):1474-81.10.1038/s41562-022-01477-6.
- Byers E, Gidden M, Leclère D, Balkovic J, Burek P, Ebi K, et al. Global exposure and vulnerability to multi-sector development and climate change hotspots. *Environmental Research Letters*. 2018;13(5):055012.
- Sharpe I, Davison CM. Climate change, climate-related disasters and mental disorder in low- and middle-income countries: a scoping review. *BMJ Open*. 2021;11(10):e051908.10.1136/bmjopen-2021-051908.
- Watts N, Amann M, Ayeb-Karlsson S, Belesova K, Bouley T, Boykoff M, et al. The Lancet Countdown on health and climate change: from 25 years of inaction to a global transformation for public health. *Lancet*. 2018;391(10120):581-630.10.1016/s0140-6736(17)32464-9.
- Corvalan C, Gray BL, Villalobos Prats E, Sena A, Hanna F, Campbell-Lendrum DH. Mental health and the global climate crisis. *Epidemiology and Psychiatric Sciences*. 2022;31.
- Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change - IPCC. Climate Change 2022: Impacts, Adaptation, and Vulnerability. Contribution of Working Group II to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change UK; 2022. Available from: https://www.ipcc.ch/report/ar6/wg2/downloads/report/IPCC_AR6_WGII_FinalDraft_FullReport.pdf.
- World Health Organization - WHO. Mental health and climate change: policy brief. Geneva: World Health

- Organization; 2022. Available from: <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240045125>.
12. Eaton J, Nwefoh E, Duncan J, Sangare O, Weekes Y, Adams B. Addressing mental health and wellbeing in the context of climate change: Examples of interventions to inform future practice. *Intervention*. 2022;20(1):107-13.10.4103/intv.intv_35_21.
13. Stone K, Blinn N, Spencer R. Mental Health Impacts of Climate Change on Women: a Scoping Review. *Curr Environ Health Rep*. 2022;9(2):228-43.10.1007/s40572-022-00346-8.
14. Lebel L, Paquin V, Kenny TA, Fletcher C, Nadeau L, Chachamovich E, et al. Climate change and Indigenous mental health in the Circumpolar North: A systematic review to inform clinical practice. *Transcult Psychiatry*. 2022;59(3):312-36.10.1177/13634615211066698.
15. Milner J, Hamilton I, Woodcock J, Williams M, Davies M, Wilkinson P, et al. Health benefits of policies to reduce carbon emissions. *BMJ*. 2020;368:l6758.10.1136/bmj.l6758.
16. Scheelbeek PFD, Dangour AD, Jarmul S, Turner G, Sietsma AJ, Minx JC, et al. The effects on public health of climate change adaptation responses: a systematic review of evidence from low- and middle-income countries. *Environmental Research Letters*. 2021;16(7):073001.10.1088/1748-9326/ac092c.
17. Thomas F, Sabel CE, Morton K, Hiscock R, Depledge MH. Extended impacts of climate change on health and wellbeing. *Environmental Science & Policy*. 2014;44:271-8.<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2014.08.011>.
18. Bikomeye JC, Rublee CS, Beyer KMM. Positive Externalities of Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation for Human Health: A Review and Conceptual Framework for Public Health Research. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*. 2021;18(5):2481.
19. Creutzig F, Niamir L, Bai X, Callaghan M, Cullen J, Díaz-José J, et al. Demand-side solutions to climate change mitigation consistent with high levels of well-being. *Nature Climate Change*. 2022;12(1):36-46.10.1038/s41558-021-01219-y.
20. Berrang-Ford L, Siders AR, Lesnikowski A, Fischer AP, Callaghan MW, Haddaway NR, et al. A systematic global stocktake of evidence on human adaptation to climate change. *Nature Climate Change*. 2021;11(11):989-1000.10.1038/s41558-021-01170-y.
21. Gao J, Kovats S, Vardoulakis S, Wilkinson P, Woodward A, Li J, et al. Public health co-benefits of greenhouse gas emissions reduction: A systematic review. *Sci Total Environ*. 2018;627:388-402.10.1016/j.scitotenv.2018.01.193.
22. Sorgho R, Mank I, Kagoné M, Souares A, Danquah I, Sauerborn R. "We Will Always Ask Ourselves the Question of How to Feed the Family": Subsistence Farmers' Perceptions on Adaptation to Climate Change in Burkina Faso. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*. 2020;17(19):7200.
23. Contreras C, Aguilar M, Eappen B, Guzmán C, Carrasco P, Millones AK, et al. Community strengthening and mental health system linking after flooding in two informal human settlements in Peru: a model for small-scale disaster response. *Glob Ment Health (Camb)*. 2018;5:e11.10.1017/gmh.2017.33.
24. Hayes K, Poland B, Cole DC, Agic B. Psychosocial adaptation to climate change in High River, Alberta: implications for policy and practice. *Canadian Journal of Public Health*. 2020;111(6):880-9.10.17269/s41997-020-00380-9.
25. Romanello M, McGushin A, Di Napoli C, Drummond P, Hughes N, Jamart L, et al. The 2021 report of the Lancet Countdown on health and climate change: code red for a healthy future. *The Lancet*. 2021;398(10311):1619-62.10.1016/S0140-6736(21)01787-6.
26. Clarke B, Otto F, Stuart-Smith R, Harrington L. Extreme weather impacts of climate change: an attribution perspective. *Environmental Research: Climate*. 2022;1(1):012001.10.1088/2752-5295/ac6e7d.
27. Thomas K, Hardy RD, Lazrus H, Mendez M, Orlove B, Rivera-Collazo I, et al. Explaining differential vulnerability to climate change: A social science review. *Wiley Interdiscip Rev Clim Change*. 2019;10(2):e565.10.1002/wcc.565.
28. McMichael C, Powell T. Planned Relocation and Health: A Case Study from Fiji. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*. 2021;18(8):4355.
29. Fernández-Baldor Á, Boni A, Lillo P, Hueso A. Are technological projects reducing social inequalities and improving people's well-being? A capability approach analysis of renewable energy-based electrification projects in Cajamarca, Peru. *Journal of Human Development and Capabilities*. 2014;15(1):13-27.10.1080/19452829.2013.837035.
30. Gautam Y, Andersen P. Rural livelihood diversification and household well-being: Insights from Humla, Nepal. *Journal of Rural Studies*. 2016;44:239-49.<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2016.02.001>.
31. Robison R, van Bommel M, Rohse M. Relationships Between Climate Mitigation Actions and Mental Health: A Systematic Review of the Research Landscape. *Frontiers in Climate*. 2022;4.10.3389/fclim.2022.794669.
32. Borg FH, Greibe Andersen J, Karekezi C, Yonga G, Furu P, Kallestrup P, et al. Climate change and health in urban informal settlements in low- and middle-income countries – a scoping review of health impacts and adaptation strategies. *Global Health Action*. 2021;14(1):1908064.10.1080/16549716.2021.1908064.
33. Reyes-Riveros R, Altamirano A, De La Barrera F, Rozas-Vásquez D, Vieli L, Meli P. Linking public urban green spaces and human well-being: A systematic review. *Urban Forestry & Urban Greening*. 2021;61:127105.<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ufug.2021.127105>.

34. Palinkas LA, Wong M. Global climate change and mental health. *Current Opinion in Psychology*. 2020;32:12-6. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2019.06.023>.
35. NAP-GSP. National Adaptation Global Support Programme-NAP-GSP Geneva: UNDP-UN Environment 2023 [Available from: <https://www.globalsupportprogramme.org/nap-gsp>].
36. Global Center on Adaptation -GCA. Locally Led Adaptation The Netherlands 2023 [Available from: <https://gca.org/programs/locally-led-adaptation/>].
37. OECD-The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. Handbook on the OECD-DAC Climate Markers. Paris, France: OECD; 2011. Available from: <https://www.oecd.org/dac/financing-sustainable-development/development-finance-standards/48785310.pdf>.
38. Kelly PM, Adger WN. Theory and Practice in Assessing Vulnerability to Climate Change and Facilitating Adaptation. *Climatic Change*. 2000;47(4):325-52.10.1023/A:1005627828199.
39. WHO WHO-. Mental, behavioural or neurodevelopmental disorders In International statistical classification of diseases and related health problems (11th ed.). Geneva: WHO; 2019. Available from: <https://icd.who.int/browse11/l-m/en/#/http%3a%2f%2fid.who.int%2fclid%2fentity%2f334423054>.
40. American Psychiatric Association-APA. Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders: DSM-5-TR. 5th ed: American Psychiatric Association Publishing; 2022.
41. Development O-TOFEC-oa. How's Life? 2020: Measuring Well-being. Paris, France: OECD Publishing; 2020. Available from: <https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/content/publication/9870c393-en>.
42. Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman D, The PRISMA Group. Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA Statement. *PLoS Medicine*. 2009;6(7):e1000097.
43. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change - IPCC. Climate Change 2014: Synthesis Report. Contribution of Working Groups I, II and III to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change Geneva, Switzerland: IPCC; 2014. Available from: <https://www.ipcc.ch/report/ar5/syr/>.
44. Berrang-Ford L, Sietsma AJ, Callaghan M, Minx JC, Scheelbeek PFD, Haddaway NR, et al. Systematic mapping of global research on climate and health: a machine learning review. *Lancet Planet Health*. 2021;5(8):e514-e25.10.1016/s2542-5196(21)00179-0.
45. Berrang-Ford L, L, A., Fischer P., et al. . The Global Adaptation Mapping Initiative (GAMI): Part 1 – Introduction and overview of methods. PROTOCOL (Version 1) Protocol exchange. 2021. <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.pex-1240/v1>.
46. Fischer A, Paige C, M., Berrang-Ford L., et al. . The Global Adaptation Mapping Initiative (GAMI): Part 2 – Screening protocol. PROTOCOL (Version 1). 2021. <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.pex-1241/v1>.
47. Lesnikowski A, Berrang-Ford L., Siders A. R., et al.,. The Global Adaptation Mapping Initiative (GAMI): Part 3 – Coding protocol. Protocol Exchange 2021;PROTOCOL (Version 1). <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.pex-1242/v1>.
48. Clarivate Analytics. EndNote v.X9 [computer program]. Philadelphia: Clarivate Analytics; 2018.
49. Ouzzani M, Hammady H, Fedorowicz Z, Elmagarmid A. Rayyan—a web and mobile app for systematic reviews. *Systematic Reviews*. 2016;5(1):210.10.1186/s13643-016-0384-4.
50. Specialist Unit for Review Evidence (SURE). Questions to assist with the critical appraisal of randomised controlled trials and other experimental studies 2018.
51. Joanna Briggs Institute J. Critical Appraisal Tools 2018 [Available from: <https://jbi.global/critical-appraisal-tools>].
52. Critical Appraisal Skills Programme. CASP Checklist: 10 questions to help you make sense of Qualitative research. Oxford, UK: CASP; 2018.
53. Araban M, Tavafian SS, Zarandi SM, Hidarnia AR, Burri A, Montazeri A. A behavioral strategy to minimize air pollution exposure in pregnant women: a randomized controlled trial. *Environ Health Prev Med*. 2017;22(1):26.10.1186/s12199-017-0633-8.
54. James LE, Welton-Mitchell C, Noel JR, James AS. Integrating mental health and disaster preparedness in intervention: a randomized controlled trial with earthquake and flood-affected communities in Haiti. *Psychological Medicine*. 2020;50(2):342-52.10.1017/S0033291719000163.
55. Williams KN, Kephart JL, Fandiño-Del-Rio M, Simkovich SM, Koehler K, Harvey SA, et al. Exploring the impact of a liquefied petroleum gas intervention on time use in rural Peru: A mixed methods study on perceptions, use, and implications of time savings. *Environment International*. 2020;145:105932. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2020.105932>.
56. Bedran-Martins AM, Lemos MC, Philippi A. Relationship between subjective well-being and material quality of life in face of climate vulnerability in NE Brazil. *Climatic Change*. 2018;147(1):283-97.10.1007/s10584-017-2105-y.
57. Davids R, Rouget M, Burger M, Mahood K, Dithale N, Slotow R. An impact assessment tool to identify, quantify and select optimal social-economic, ecological and health outcomes of civic environmental management interventions, in Durban South Africa. *Journal of Environmental Management*. 2022;302:113966. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2021.113966>.
58. Duchelle AE, de Sassi C, Jagger P, Cromberg M, Larson AM, Sunderlin WD, et al. Balancing carrots and sticks in REDD+: implications for social safeguards. *Ecology and Society*. 2017;22(3).10.5751/ES-09334-220302.
59. Weston P, Hong R, Kaboré C, Kull CA. Farmer-managed natural regeneration enhances rural livelihoods in

- dryland west Africa. *Environ Manage.* 2015;55(6):1402-17.10.1007/s00267-015-0469-1.
60. Gori Maia A, Burney JA, Morales Martínez JD, Cesano D. Improving production and quality of life for smallholder farmers through a climate resilience program: An experience in the Brazilian Sertão. *PLOS ONE.* 2021;16(5):e0251531.10.1371/journal.pone.0251531.
61. Nunes ACP, Nascimento A, Corrêa DSS, Penteadó IM, Pedro JPB, Gomes M, et al. [Technology for access to water in the Amazonian floodplain: positive impacts on the lives of riverine communities in the Middle Solimões, Amazonas State, Brazil]. *Cad Saude Publica.* 2021;37(3):e00084520.10.1590/0102-311x00084520.
62. Sunderlin WD, de Sassi C, Sills EO, Duchelle AE, Larson AM, Resosudarmo IAP, et al. Creating an appropriate tenure foundation for REDD+: The record to date and prospects for the future. *World Development.* 2018;106:376-92.<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2018.01.010>.
63. Gros C, Bailey M, Schwager S, Hassan A, Zingg R, Uddin MM, et al. Household-level effects of providing forecast-based cash in anticipation of extreme weather events: Quasi-experimental evidence from humanitarian interventions in the 2017 floods in Bangladesh. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction.* 2019;41:101275.<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdrr.2019.101275>.
64. Kundo HK, Brueckner M, Spencer R, Davis JK. Enhancing the resilience and well-being of rural poor to climate risks: are the economic functions of social protection enough? *Disasters.* 2022.10.1111/disa.12559.
65. Binh PT, Zhu X, Groeneveld RA, van Ierland EC. Risk communication, women's participation and flood mitigation in Vietnam: An experimental study. *Land Use Policy: Elsevier;* 2020. p. 104436.
66. Li H, Liu H, Yang Z, Bi S, Cao Y, Zhang G. The Effects of Green and Urban Walking in Different Time Frames on Physio-Psychological Responses of Middle-Aged and Older People in Chengdu, China. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health.* 2021;18(1):90.
67. Rasmussen A, Eustache E, Raviola G, Kaiser B, Grelotti DJ, Belkin GS. Development and validation of a Haitian Creole screening instrument for depression. *Transcultural psychiatry.* 2015;52(1):33-57.
68. Falsetti SA, Resnick HS, Resick PA, Kilpatrick DG. The Modified PTSD Symptom Scale: A brief self-report measure of posttraumatic stress disorder. *the Behavior Therapist.* 1993;16:161-2.
69. Beck AT, Epstein N, Brown G, Steer R. Beck anxiety inventory. *Journal of consulting and clinical psychology.* 1993.
70. Kaiser BN, Kohrt BA, Keys HM, Khoury NM, Brewster AR. Strategies for assessing mental health in Haiti: local instrument development and transcultural translation. *Transcult Psychiatry.* 2013;50(4):532-58.10.1177/1363461513502697.
71. Fone D, Dunstan F, Lloyd K, Williams G, Watkins J, Palmer S. Does social cohesion modify the association between area income deprivation and mental health? A multilevel analysis. *Int J Epidemiol.* 2007;36(2):338-45.10.1093/ije/dym004.
72. Li Z, Sjödin A, Romanoff LC, Horton K, Fitzgerald CL, Eppler A, et al. Evaluation of exposure reduction to indoor air pollution in stove intervention projects in Peru by urinary biomonitoring of polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbon metabolites. *Environment International: Elsevier B.V.;* 2011. p. 1157-63.
73. Kerblat Y AA, Walsh BJ, Simpson AL, Hallegatte S., Overlooked : examining the impact of disasters and climate shocks on poverty in the europe and central asia region. . World Bank, GFDRR; 2021. Available from: <https://documents.worldbank.org/en/publication/documents-reports/documentdetail/493181607687673440/overlooked-examining-the-impact-of-disasters-and-climate-shocks-on-poverty-in-the-europe-and-central-asia-region>
74. Banerjee A FM, Krueger A, et al.,. The effects of a universal basic income during the COVID-19 pandemic in Kenya. . Abdul Latif Jameel Poverty Action Lab; 2020. Available from: <https://www.povertyactionlab.org/evaluation/effects-universal-basic-income-during-covid-19-pandemic-kenya>.
75. McGuire J, Kaiser C, Bach-Mortensen AM. A systematic review and meta-analysis of the impact of cash transfers on subjective well-being and mental health in low- and middle-income countries. *Nature Human Behaviour.* 2022;6(3):359-70.10.1038/s41562-021-01252-z.
76. World Bank Group. World Bank Group Climate Change Action Plan 2021–2025: Supporting Green, Resilient, and Inclusive Development. . Washington, DC.: World Bank; 2021. Available from: <http://hdl.handle.net/10986/35799>.
77. Massazza A, Teyton A, Charlson F, Benmarhnia T, Augustinavicius JL. Quantitative methods for climate change and mental health research: current trends and future directions. *The Lancet Planetary Health.* 2022;6(7):e613-e27.[https://doi.org/10.1016/S2542-5196\(22\)00120-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2542-5196(22)00120-6).
78. Peters SA, Woodward, M., Jha, V., Kennedy, S., Norton, R.,. Women's Health: a New Global Agenda. . BMJ Glob Health. 2016;3(1):e000080.
79. Rao N, Lawson ET, Raditloaneng WN, Solomon D, Angula MN. Gendered vulnerabilities to climate change: insights from the semi-arid regions of Africa and Asia. *Climate and Development.* 2019;11(1):14-26.10.1080/17565529.2017.1372266.
80. Sophie AE DVA, Stephan R, Thies F, Kabir K, Maruo M. . Gender Dimensions of Disaster Risk and Resilience: Existing Evidence. Washington, DC: World Bank; 2021. Available from: <https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/handle/10986/35202>
81. Klugman J. The gender dimensions of forced displacement: a synthesis of new research. . Reliefweb; 2022. Available from: <https://reliefweb.int/report/world/gender-dimensions-forced-displacement-synthesis-new-research>
82. van Daalen KR, Kallesøe SS, Davey F, Dada S, Jung L, Singh L, et al. Extreme events and gender-based

- 1
2
3 violence: a mixed-methods systematic review. *The Lancet*
4 *Planetary Health*. 2022;6(6):e504-e23.10.1016/S2542-
5 5196(22)00088-2.
6 83. Guo Y, Gasparrini A, Li S, Sera F, Vicedo-Cabrera
7 AM, de Sousa Zanotti Stagliorio Coelho M, et al.
8 Quantifying excess deaths related to heatwaves under
9 climate change scenarios: A multicountry time series
10 modelling study. *PLOS Medicine*.
11 2018;15(7):e1002629.10.1371/journal.pmed.1002629.
12 84. Wang F, Zhang J. Heat Stress Response to
13 National-Committed Emission Reductions under the Paris
14 Agreement. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*.
15 2019;16(12).10.3390/ijerph16122202.
16 85. Berry HL, Waite TD, Dear KBG, Capon AG,
17 Murray V. The case for systems thinking about climate
18 change and mental health. *Nature Climate Change*.
19 2018;8(4):282-90.10.1038/s41558-018-0102-4.
20 86. Charlson F, Ali S, Augustinavicius J, Benmarhnia
21 T, Birch S, Clayton S, et al. Global priorities for climate
22 change and mental health research. *Environment*
23 *International*.
24 2022;158:106984.[https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2021.1069](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2021.106984)
25 [84](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2021.106984).