

1

2 The relationship between natural outdoor environments and cognitive functioning and its mediators

3

4

5 This is an Author's Original Manuscript of an article published by Elsevier in *Environmental Research* in

6

2017 available online at doi: 10.1016/j.envres.2017.02.017.

7

8

9

10

11 Zijlema, W. L., Triguero-Mas, M., Smith, G., Cirach, M., Martinez, D., Dadvand, P., Gascon, M., Jones,
12 M., Gidlow, C., Hurst, G., Masterson, D., Ellis, N., van den Berg, M., Maas, J., van Kamp I., van
13 den Hazel, P., Kruize, H., Nieuwenhuijsen, M. J., Julvez, J. (in press). The relationship between
14 natural outdoor environments and cognitive functioning and its mediators. *Environmental*
15 *Research*, 27, 55, 268-275.

16

17 Title
18 The relationship between natural outdoor environments and cognitive functioning and its mediators
19 Authors
20 Wilma L. Zijlema^{1,2,3}, Margarita Triguero-Mas^{1,2,3}, Graham Smith⁴, Marta Cirach^{1,2,3}, David Martinez^{1,2,3},
21 Payam Dadvand^{1,2,3}, Mireia Gascon^{1,2,3}, Marc Jones⁴, Christopher Gidlow⁴, Gemma Hurst⁴, Daniel
22 Masterson⁴, Naomi Ellis⁴, Magdalena van den Berg⁵, Jolanda Maas⁶, Irene van Kamp⁷, Peter van den
23 Hazel⁸, Hanneke Kruize⁷, Mark J. Nieuwenhuijsen^{1,2,3}, Jordi Julvez^{1,2,3}

24 Affiliations

25 ¹Barcelona Institute for Global Health (ISGlobal), Doctor Aiguader 88, 08003 Barcelona, Spain
26 ²Universitat Pompeu Fabra (UPF), Doctor Aiguader 88, 08003 Barcelona, Spain
27 ³CIBER Epidemiología y Salud Pública (CIBERESP), Melchor Fernández Almagro, 3-5, 28029 Madrid,
28 Spain
29 ⁴Staffordshire University, Leek Road, Stoke-on-Trent, ST4 2DF, UK
30 ⁵Department of Public & Occupational Health and EMGO Institute for Health and Care research, VU
31 University Medical Center, De Boelelaan 1105, 1081 HV Amsterdam, the Netherlands
32 ⁶Department of Clinical, Neuro and Developmental Psychology, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, De
33 Boelelaan 1105, 1081 HV Amsterdam, the Netherlands
34 ⁷RIVM, Antonie van Leeuwenhoeklaan 9, 3721 MA Bilthoven, the Netherlands
35 ⁸VGGM, Eusebiusbuitensingel 43, 6828 HZ Arnhem, the Netherlands

36

37

38 Corresponding authors

39 Wilma L. Zijlema PhD
40 Barcelona Institute for Global Health (ISGlobal)
41 Barcelona Biomedical Research Park (PRBB)
42 Doctor Aiguader 88, 08003 Barcelona, Spain
43 Tel: +34 932147300, Fax: +34 93 214 73 02, E-mail: wilma.zijlema-at-isglobal.org

44 Jordi Julvez PhD

45 E-mail: jordi.julvez@isglobal.org

46 Running title

47 Natural outdoor environments and cognition

48

49

50 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

51 The research leading to these results has received funding from the European Community's Seventh
52 Framework Programme (FP7/2007-2013) under grant agreement no 282996. Margarita Triguero-Mas is
53 funded by a pre-doctoral grant from the Catalan Government (AGAUR FI-DGR-2013). Payam Dadvand is
54 funded by a Ramón y Cajal fellowship (RYC-2012-10995) awarded by the Spanish Ministry of Economy
55 and Competitiveness. ISGlobal is a member of the CERCA Programme, Generalitat de Catalunya. The
56 funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the
57 manuscript. This study has been funded by Instituto de Salud Carlos III through the projects "CP14/00108
58 & PI16/00261" (Co-funded by European Regional Development Fund "A way to make Europe"). Jordi
59 Julvez was funded by a Miguel Servet fellowship (MS14/00108) awarded by the Spanish Institute of Health
60 Carlos III (Ministry of Economy and Competitiveness).

61 COMPETING FINANCIAL INTERESTS DECLARATION

62 The authors declare they have no actual or potential competing financial interests.

63 ABSTRACT

64 Background

65 Urban residents may experience cognitive fatigue and little opportunity for mental restoration due to a
66 lack of access to nature. Natural outdoor environments (NOE) are thought to be beneficial for cognitive
67 functioning, but underlying mechanisms are not clear.

68 Objectives

69 To investigate the long-term association between NOE and cognitive function, and its potential mediators.

70 Methods

71 This cross-sectional study was based on adult participants of the Positive Health Effects of the Natural
72 Outdoor Environment in Typical Populations in Different Regions in Europe (PHENOTYPE) project.
73 Data were collected in Barcelona, Spain; Doetinchem, the Netherlands; and Stoke-on-Trent, United
74 Kingdom. We assessed residential distance to NOE, residential surrounding greenness, perceived amount
75 of neighborhood NOE, and engagement with NOE. Cognitive function was assessed with the Color Trails
76 Test (CTT). Mediation analysis was undertaken following Baron and Kenny.

77 Results

78 Each 100m increase in residential distance to NOE was associated with a longer CTT completion time of
79 1.50% (95% CI 0.13, 2.89). No associations were found for other NOE indicators and cognitive function.
80 Neighborhood social cohesion was (marginally) significantly associated with both residential distance to
81 NOE and CTT completion time, but no evidence for mediation was found. Nor were there indications for
82 mediation by physical activity, social interaction with neighbors, loneliness, mental health, air pollution
83 worries, or noise annoyance.

84 Conclusions

85 Our findings provide some indication that proximity to nature may benefit cognitive function. We could
86 not establish which mechanisms may explain this relationship.

87

88 Keywords: Natural outdoor environments; green space; cognition; mediation; environmental
89 epidemiology; built environment

90 INTRODUCTION

91 Natural outdoor environments (NOE) are places with natural ('green and blue') elements such as parks,
92 forests, and recreation areas. Contact with natural outdoor environments has been suggested to be beneficial
93 to human health and wellbeing [1]. However, a large proportion of the world's population currently lives
94 in urban areas, where they are often deprived of contact with nature. One particular concern of city living
95 is that residents may experience more stress than rural residents [2,3], making them more vulnerable to
96 developing mental illnesses [4]. Urban environments contain many stimuli that require directed attention
97 due to, for example, traffic and crowding. Directed attention refers to the effortful, conscious attention for
98 focusing on specific stimuli, while avoiding distractions. As a result, urban residents may experience more
99 cognitive fatigue and little opportunity for mental restoration [5].

100 The attention restoration theory (ART) proposes that directed attention, i.e. attention directed by cognitive
101 control processes, is restored by interaction with nature. Natural environments are thought to have minimum
102 requirements for directed attention, allowing for directed attention functions to restore [6]. According to
103 another theory, the stress reduction theory (SRT), nature helps to decrease stress by lowering states of
104 arousal and negative thoughts. Natural places with certain characteristics (e.g. visible horizons for spotting
105 of predators, availability of food) are from an evolutionary perspective better for survival, and may
106 automatically evoke positive responses [7].

107 Evidence for a relation between NOE and improved cognitive function mainly originates from experimental
108 studies typically focusing on short-term exposures (for a review, see [5]). Studies have observed
109 improvements in memory capacity and attention after walking in natural environments, compared to
110 walking in urban environments [8–12]. Other studies have evaluated visibility of NOE and relations with
111 cognition; it has been found that people with a window facing a green space reported less concentration
112 problems than those without a green view [13], and that people were less likely to be forgetful and
113 disorganized [14]. Similarly, students with the most natural window view had better directed attention than
114 those with built or concrete window views [15]. Even viewing pictures of natural environments resulted in
115 improved scores on attention tests [8,16]. Other observational studies evaluating the beneficial effects of
116 access to NOE on cognition have for example focused on working memory and behavioral development in
117 children [17,18] and on cognitive function and dementia in older adults [19,20]. A recent review
118 summarizing these studies reported that the number of available studies are limited and concluded that
119 current evidence for such an association is inadequate [21].

120 While most of the previous research focused on cognition benefits associated with NOE visibility, more
121 indirect pathways may also be relevant to explore. Access to NOE may affect cognition indirectly by
122 encouraging physical activity [22], facilitating social interaction [23], and by improving mood [24], which
123 may all be beneficial for cognitive function [25,26]. Conversely, in environments with little nature,
124 residents may be increasingly exposed to air pollution [27] and traffic noise [28]. The exposure to air
125 pollutants and noise and related worries and annoyance may influence cognitive functions [29–32].

126 There is, however, little evidence of the mechanisms underlying the relation between cognitive function
127 and NOE. Evidence about the duration of these effects and its causality is also lacking. Another unresolved
128 question is what type of interaction with NOE is needed for beneficial cognition effects. While most
129 previous observational studies focused on residential distance to nature or surrounding greenness, the actual
130 engagement with and perceived amount of nature in ones surroundings may also be important [33].

131 To gain further insight into the relation between long-term exposure to nature and cognitive function, we
132 investigated the association between multiple NOE indicators and performance on the Color Trails Test
133 (CTT), which assesses attention and executive function. We also evaluated the potential mediating roles of
134 physical activity, social interaction, mental health, air pollution worries, and noise annoyance.

135

136 **METHODS**

137 *Study design and participants*

138 The study was undertaken within the Positive Health Effects of the Natural Outdoor environment in Typical
139 Populations in different regions in Europe (PHENOTYPE) project. This project was established to
140 investigate the relationship between exposure to NOE and health and its underlying mechanisms in a sample
141 of residents from four European cities: Barcelona (Spain); Doetinchem (the Netherlands); Kaunas
142 (Lithuania); and Stoke-on-Trent (United Kingdom) [34]. Participants were recruited from 30
143 neighborhoods per city that were selected in order to have variability in access to natural outdoor
144 environments and socioeconomic status. From these neighborhoods, a random sample of 30-35 adults aged
145 18-75 were invited to participate, resulting in a sample of around 1000 participants per city (response rates
146 were 46.9% in Barcelona; 8.4% in Doetinchem; 21.3% in Kaunas; and 36.9% in Stoke-on-Trent, see further
147 details in [35]). Data were collected alongside a face-to-face questionnaire administered at participants'
148 residences during May-November 2013. In Kaunas (Lithuania), data were collected using a postal

149 questionnaire and for this reason the CTT (our measure of cognitive function) could not be assessed in
150 participants from Kaunas. Therefore, in the current study, only data from Barcelona, Doetinchem, and
151 Stoke-on-Trent were used. All participants provided written informed consent and study protocols were
152 approved by the local ethical committees.

153 A total of 1628 participants completed the CTT. From this sample, participants with incomplete data
154 regarding indicators of the natural environment (n=83), mediators (n=222), and covariates (n=26) were
155 excluded from the corresponding analyses, leaving between n=1493 and n=1602 participants for the current
156 analyses depending on the exposure and mediator (see Tables 2-5).

157

158 *Characterization of the natural outdoor environment*

159 NOE were characterized with data using geographical information systems (GIS) and face-to-face
160 questionnaires [34]. Participants' residential addresses were collected and subsequently geocoded.

161 - Residential distance to NOE was based on Urban Atlas 2006 [36] (Barcelona and Stoke-On-Trent) and
162 Top10NL [37] (Doetinchem) databases. Both databases use a 1:10,000 scale and a minimum
163 represented unit of 0.25ha (Top10NL was adapted to be consistent with Urban Atlas). The Euclidean
164 distance from residences to natural spaces >1 hectare [38] was calculated for the following land use
165 categories: green urban areas (e.g. public gardens, parks) (14100), agricultural land, semi-natural areas,
166 wetlands (20000), forests (30000), water bodies (50000) [39].

167 - Residential surrounding greenness was assessed with the normalized difference vegetation index
168 (NDVI). The NDVI is a measure of level of vegetation in a certain area and was derived from satellite
169 images available from Landsat 8 at a resolution of 30 m × 30 m. We aimed to find cloud-free images
170 within the greenest season (May to September) in the relevant period for this study (2011-2013), and
171 obtained images from 16th April 2013 (Barcelona area), 21st July 2013 (The Netherlands East), and
172 21st April 2011 (Stoke-on-Trent). The NDVI is based on the fact that healthy vegetation absorbs most
173 visible light and reflects large parts of near-infrared light, while sparse vegetation reflects more visible
174 light and less near-infrared light. Based on this distinction and excluding large water bodies, a value
175 between -1 and +1 was calculated, with higher values indicating higher density of green vegetation [40].
176 The average NDVI values were calculated within (Euclidean) buffers of 100m, 300m, and 500m around
177 the residence, as was done in previous research [33,41].

- 178 - Perceived amount of neighborhood NOE was assessed with questions ‘How would you describe your
179 a) neighborhood, b) street c) window view in terms of green or blue space’ with answers on a five-point
180 scale ranging from ‘not at all’ (1) to ‘very’ (5). With these questions a sum score of a, b and c questions
181 was calculated with higher scores indicating a higher degree of nature in the neighborhood.
- 182 - Visits to NOE was assessed with questions ‘How often did you visit a green or blue space in the last 4
183 weeks on purpose a) near your home, b) in your city, c) close to your city’ with answers on a five-point
184 scale ranging from ‘never’ (1) to ‘(almost) daily’ (5).
- 185 - Total time spent visiting NOE was calculated by combining data on the number of visits to NOE (see
186 above) with questions: ‘How much time did you spend in a green or blue space a) near your home, b)
187 in your city, c) close to your city in the last four weeks’, with answers on a 4-point scale ranging from
188 <1 hours (1) to 6-10 hours (4). Middle values of each answer category for frequency (e.g. <1
189 times/month was coded as 0.5 times/month) were multiplied with middle values of each answer category
190 for duration (e.g. <1 hours/month was coded as 0.5 hours/month) and summed.

191

192 *Cognitive function*

193 Cognitive function was assessed with the Color Trails Test (CTT). The CTT is a language- and culture-free
194 neuropsychological test that measures visual attention, and effortful executive processing abilities [42]. The
195 test consists of numbered coloured circles from 1 to 25 in pink and yellow. Participants are required to
196 rapidly connect the circles in sequence, but to alternate between the pink and yellow colors. Such a task is
197 thought to be demanding for sustained and divided attention, and poorer CTT results have been reported in
198 ageing populations [43] and in clinical populations with impaired cognitive function [44].

199 The CTT was completed at the participant’s home, after the completion of the structured face-to-face
200 questionnaire. Completion time and errors were recorded by the interviewer. Both were used as outcomes
201 in the current study, with shorter completion time and fewer errors reflecting better cognitive function.

202 Participants had 5 minutes to complete the test; if after 5 minutes the test was not completed, a CTT time
203 of 300 seconds was recorded. CTT test quality was recorded by the interviewer after completion of the test.

204 For example, if the participant had raised the pencil from the paper during the test, this was rated as ‘poor
205 quality.’

206

207 *Mediators*

- 208 - Physical activity was assessed with questions from the Short Questionnaire to Assess Health-enhancing
209 physical activity (SQUASH) [45]. Total minutes per week of active commuting (walking and biking)
210 and being physically active during leisure time were calculated and summed.
- 211 - Social interaction with neighbors was assessed with the question ‘How often do you have contact with
212 your neighbors?’ and was scored on a 5-point scale ranging from ‘at least once a week’ (1) to ‘seldom
213 or never’ (5), and was dichotomized into ≥ 1 per month and < 1 per month.
- 214 - Loneliness was assessed with six statements based on the UCLA loneliness scale (e.g. feelings of
215 isolation, feeling as part of a group of friends) [46]. Participants were asked to indicate to what extent
216 they agreed with the statements on a 5-point scale ranging from ‘totally agree’ (1) to ‘totally disagree’
217 (5). A sum score was calculated with higher scores indicating greater feelings of loneliness.
- 218 - Neighborhood social cohesion was assessed with the Social Cohesion and Trust Scale, consisting of 5
219 items (e.g. ‘people are willing to help their neighbors’) [47]. Questions were scored on a 5-point scale
220 and a sum score was calculated with higher scores indicating a higher degree of social cohesion.
- 221 - Perceived mental health was assessed with 5 questions from the Medical Outcome Study Short Form
222 (SF-36) mental health subscale, assessing nervousness and feelings of depression in the past month.
223 Questions were scored on a 6-point scale ranging from ‘all of the time’ (1) to ‘none of the time’ (6). A
224 sum score was calculated and transformed into a scale ranging from 0 to 100 according to guidelines
225 [48] with higher scores indicating better mental health.
- 226 - Traffic noise annoyance was assessed with one question about the degree of annoyance caused by traffic
227 noise, which was scored on a scale ranging from ‘not annoyed at all’ (0) to ‘extremely annoyed’ (10)
228 [49]. The response scale was transformed into a scale from 0 to 100, and a score of > 72 was considered
229 being highly annoyed by traffic noise [50].
- 230 - Worry about air pollution was assessed by asking to what extent participants were worried that the air
231 pollution in their neighborhood could lead to health problems. Worries could be indicated on a scale
232 ranging from ‘not worried at all’ (0) to ‘extremely worried’ (10). Participants were considered to be
233 worried about air pollution when they scored > 7 .

234

235 *Covariates*

236 Covariates were chosen a priori based on previous literature [33,42,51]. Data on sex, age, educational level
237 (primary school or no education; secondary school/ further education (up to 18 years); university degree or

238 higher), time spent away from home, and start date of residence at the current address were obtained from
239 face-to-face questionnaires. Neighborhood socioeconomic status (low; intermediate; high) was based on
240 country-specific data, and CTT test quality (good; poor) was recorded by the interviewer.

241

242 *Statistical analysis*

243 Descriptive statistics were calculated for the total study population and separately for each of the three
244 cities. Parametric and non-parametric tests were used to test for significant differences between cities. To
245 account for clustering within cities and neighborhoods, associations were analyzed with multilevel analysis
246 with a random intercept defined at the city and neighborhood level. City-specific associations between the
247 NOE indicators and CTT were also investigated to evaluate differences between cities.

248 Mediation analysis was undertaken in four steps following Baron and Kenny (1986) and previous research
249 [33]. Conditions for mediation are that the predictor variable (NOE) must affect the mediator; and that the
250 mediator must affect the outcome variable (CTT); and that the association between the predictor and
251 outcome is eliminated or weakened when the mediator is included in the model.

252 1. The association between NOE and cognitive function. Linear and logistic multilevel models with
253 random intercept for city and neighborhood were developed separately for CTT completion time (log
254 transformed for normal distribution) and CTT errors (no errors/ 1 or more error(s)) as outcomes.
255 Models were adjusted for age, sex, educational level, neighborhood socioeconomic status, time spent
256 away from home, and CTT test quality.

257 2. The association between NOE and mediators. Multilevel models with random intercept for city and
258 neighborhood were developed in which we specified the mediators physical activity, social
259 interaction, loneliness, neighborhood social cohesion, mental health, air pollution worries, and noise
260 annoyance as the outcome (one at a time), and indicators of NOE as the predictor. Models were
261 adjusted for the same covariates as specified in step 1.

262 3. The association between mediators and cognitive function. Multilevel models with random intercept
263 for city and neighborhood were developed in which we specified the mediators (see step 2) as
264 predictors and the CTT as outcome. Models were adjusted for the same covariates as specified in step
265 1.

266 4. The association between NOE, mediators and cognitive function. Mediators were added to the
267 multilevel models as specified in step 1, allowing for estimation of associations between indicators of
268 NOE and the CTT, while adjusting for the mediators.

269 Finally, if the conditions for mediation were met, the proportion of the total effect mediated (i.e. the
270 combined effect of the exposure and mediator divided by the effect of the exposure) was calculated to
271 quantify the relative contribution of each mediator. The proportion and the 95% confidence interval were
272 obtained through bootstrapping [33].

273 The analyses in step 1 were repeated while excluding participants with a poor CTT test quality (n= 38;
274 instead of using CTT quality as a covariate) to assess robustness of our findings. We also repeated analyses
275 in step 1 while excluding those living at their residence <1 year (n=86) to assess whether residence time
276 affected the results.

277 In order to report results in a consistent manner, we calculated the percentage difference per one unit
278 increase of the predictor for each of the estimates and 95% confidence intervals (except for CTT errors).
279 For log-transformed outcome variables, we calculated the exponential of the coefficients and subsequently
280 the percentage difference in the outcome per one unit increase of the independent variable: $(\exp(\beta)-1)*100$
281 [53]. For odds ratios and coefficients for untransformed outcome variables the percentage difference was
282 calculated as $(\text{odds ratio}-1)*100$ or $(\beta/\text{range of outcome variable})*100$. All analyses were performed in
283 STATA 14.1 [54]. Associations were considered statistically significant if the 95% confidence intervals
284 did not include zero (β) or one (odds ratios).

285

286 **RESULTS**

287 *Population characteristics*

288 Population characteristics are presented in Table 1. Participants were on average 48 (SD=15.2) years old
289 and 54.1% were female. Median CTT completion time varied significantly between cities and was longest
290 in Barcelona and shortest in Doetinchem. Over a quarter (28.5%) of the participants made one or more
291 errors on the CTT and this was similar across the three cities. The median residential distance to NOE was
292 largest in Barcelona, and much smaller in Doetinchem and Stoke-on-Trent ($p<.001$). Similarly, surrounding
293 greenness was highest in Doetinchem, followed by Stoke-on-Trent, and lowest in Barcelona ($p<.001$). Also
294 the perceived amount of NOE in the neighborhood was lower in Barcelona than in the other cities ($p<.001$).

295 Furthermore, participants from Doetinchem visited NOE most often ($p < .01$) and spent most time there
 296 ($p < .05$), compared to participants from Barcelona and Stoke-on-Trent (Table 1). Correlations between
 297 objective NOE measures and the perceived amount of NOE ranged from -0.58 (residential distance to NOE)
 298 to 0.61 (residential surrounding greenness in 100m buffer). The use of NOE and objective NOE measures
 299 were less strongly correlated, we observed for example a correlation of -0.25 between residential distance
 300 to NOE and NOE visits, and 0.22 between residential surrounding greenness (100m buffer) and NOE visits
 301 (all correlations $p < .001$; Supplemental Material Table S1).

302

303 Table 1 Characteristics of study population

	Total (n=1628)	Barcelona, Spain (n=732)	Doetinchem, the Netherlands (n=567)	Stoke-on- Trent, UK (n=329)	p value
Females, %	54.1	52.3	57.6	51.8	>.05
Age, mean \pm SD	48.1 (15.2)	44.3 (15.2)	55.6 (12.1)	43.6 (15.4)	<.001 ^a
Educational level, %					<.001 ^b
Primary school	6.6	13.4	0.9	0.9	
Secondary school	45.3	37.6	44.0	65.1	
University degree	48.1	49.0	55.1	34.0	
Neighborhood SES, %					<.05 ^c
Low	29.6	31.1	28.4	28.1	
Medium	35.0	31.7	39.9	33.8	
High	35.5	37.2	31.7	38.1	
CTT time (s), median (IQR)	93 \pm 54	107 \pm 54	83 \pm 38	90 \pm 61	<.001 ^b
CTT \geq 1 errors, %	28.5	28.3	27.0	31.8	>.05
Residential distance to NOE (m), median (IQR)	119.6 (243.2)	310.2 (331.1)	45.5 (80.0)	83.2 (106.8)	<.001 ^b
Residential surrounding greenness, mean \pm SD					
100 m buffer	0.38 \pm 0.18	0.22 \pm 0.09	0.54 \pm 0.12	0.46 \pm 0.08	<.001 ^b
300 m buffer	0.39 \pm 0.18	0.23 \pm 0.11	0.55 \pm 0.09	0.49 \pm 0.09	<.001 ^b
500 m buffer	0.40 \pm 0.18	0.24 \pm 0.11	0.57 \pm 0.08	0.50 \pm 0.09	<.001 ^b
Perceived amount of NOE, median (IQR)	7 (6)	5 (6)	10 (3)	7 (4)	<.001 ^b
NOE total visits last 4 wks, median (IQR)	11 (21)	8 (19.5)	18.5 (22)	8 (18.5)	<.01 ^a
NOE total time spent visiting (hours spent last 4 wks), median (IQR)	14.0 (31.5)	12.0 (30.5)	18.0 (27.8)	12.0 (44)	<.05 ^b
Physical activity min/week, median (IQR)	420 (580)	240 (420)	670 (570)	360 (540)	<.05 ^b

Social interaction neighbors <1/month, %	9.6	15.4	3.0	7.6	<.01 ^b
Social cohesion, mean ± SD	13.0 ± 4	12.0 ± 3.0	14.0 ± 3.1	13.2 ± 3.7	<.001 ^b
Loneliness, median (IQR)	11 (5)	10 (5)	10 (4)	13 (3.5)	<.05 ^d
Mental health, median (IQR)	80 (20)	76 (20)	84 (12)	76 (24)	<.05 ^b
Air pollution worries, %	23.3	40.9	7.9	10.6	<.001 ^e
Noise annoyance, %	14.4	23.1	6.7	8.2	<.001 ^e
Hours away from home (per week), median (IQR)	10 (10)	10 (11)	11 (8)	8 (10)	<.05 ^b

304 CTT: color trails test; NOE: natural outdoor environments; NDVI: normalized difference vegetation index;

305 SD: standard deviation; IQR: interquartile range. ^a NL different from SP and UK; ^b all groups differ; ^c NL

306 different from SP; ^d UK different from SP and NL; ^e SP different from NL and UK.

307

308 *Associations between natural outdoor environments and CTT*

309 Each 100m increase in residential distance to NOE was associated with a longer CTT completion time of

310 1.50% (95% CI 0.13, 2.89) (Table 2). No associations were found between any of the other indicators of

311 NOE exposure and CTT completion time. No associations were found between any of the NOE indicators

312 and CTT errors (Table 2). City-specific associations between residential distance to NOE and CTT

313 completion time were only statistically significant for participants from Barcelona (Supplemental Material

314 Table S2). Similar to the pooled analyses, city-specific associations between the other indicators of natural

315 outdoor environments and CTT completion time and CTT errors were not statistically significant, with one

316 exception: we observed a significant association between surrounding greenness (in 500 m buffer) and

317 longer CTT completion time for participants from Doetinchem (Supplemental Material Table S2).

318 Sensitivity analysis showed that exclusion of participants with a poor CTT test quality (n= 38) and those

319 with time of residence <1 year (n=86) did not change the results (data not shown).

320

321 Table 2 Associations between NOE and CTT completion time and errors

	% Difference in CTT time (95% confidence interval)	OR ≥1 CTT errors (95% confidence interval)
Residential distance to NOE (per 100 m) (n=1602)	1.50 (0.13, 2.89)	1.02 (0.97, 1.07)
Residential surrounding greenness 100 m buffer per IQR 0.313 (n=1602)	-0.60 (-7.27, 6.55)	0.93 (0.74, 1.16)
Residential surrounding greenness 300 m buffer per IQR 0.336 (n=1602)	-0.27 (-8.59, 8.81)	0.91 (0.72, 1.16)

Residential surrounding greenness 500 m buffer per IQR 0.349 (n=1602)	-1.63 (-10.53, 8.15)	0.89 (0.70, 1.13)
Perceived amount of NOE in neighborhood (n=1599)	-0.13 (-0.78, 0.51)	1.01 (0.97, 1.05)
NOE visits (n=1602)	-0.04 (-0.15, 0.08)	1.00 (1.00, 1.01)
NOE total time spent visiting (n=1567)	-0.01 (-0.04, 0.03)	1.00 (1.00, 1.00)

322 CTT: color trails test; NOE: natural outdoor environments; OR: odds ratio; IQR: interquartile range. Models
323 were adjusted for age, sex, educational level, neighborhood socioeconomic status, time spent away from
324 home, and CTT test quality and random intercepts were specified for cities (n=3) and neighborhoods
325 (n=93).

326

327 ***Associations between natural outdoor environments and potential mediators***

328 No statistically significant associations were observed between residential distance to NOE and any of the
329 potential mediators (Table 3). The association between residential distance to NOE and neighborhood social
330 cohesion was marginally statistically significant (p=0.078) (Table 3).

331

332 Table 3 Associations between residential distance to NOE and potential mediators

	% Difference (95% confidence interval)						
	Physical activity (n=1526)	Social interaction with neighbors (n=1602)	Social cohesion neighborhood (n=1493)	Loneliness (n=1570)	Mental health (n=1590)	Air pollution worries (n=1601)	Noise annoyance (n=1602)
Residential distance to NOE (per 100 m)	1.64 (-1.30, 4.67)	-1.20 (-13.15, 12.39)	-0.60 (-1.26, 0.07)	0.91 (-0.27, 2.11)	-0.25 (-0.71, 0.22)	4.76 (-3.25, 13.43)	5.08 (-4.39, 15.48)

333 NOE: natural outdoor environments. Models were adjusted for age, sex, educational level, neighborhood
334 socioeconomic status, time spent away from home, and CTT test quality, and random intercepts were
335 specified for cities (n=3) and neighborhoods (n=93).

336

337 ***Associations between potential mediators and cognitive function***

338 Higher loneliness and more air pollution worries were associated with longer CTT completion time, while
339 higher social cohesion and better mental health were related to shorter CTT completion time (Table 4).
340 Physical activity, social interaction with neighbors, and noise annoyance were not statistically significantly
341 associated with CTT time (Table 4).

342

343 Table 4 Associations between potential mediators and CTT time

Mediator	% Difference in CTT time
----------	--------------------------

	(95% confidence interval)
Physical activity (n=1602)	0.001 (-0.003, 0.005)
Social interaction neighbors (n=1602)	-4.10 (-9.78, 1.94)
Social cohesion neighborhood (n=1493)	-0.94 (-1.50, -0.37)
Loneliness (n=1570)	1.48 (0.93, 2.04)
Mental health (n=1590)	-0.22 (-0.34, -0.10)
Air pollution worries (n=1601)	5.43 (0.79, 10.30)
Noise annoyance (n=1602)	1.02 (-4.09, 6.41)

344 CTT: color trails test. Models were adjusted for age, sex, educational level, neighborhood socioeconomic
345 status, time spent away from home, and CTT test quality and random intercepts were specified for cities
346 (n=3) and neighborhoods (n=93).

347

348 *Associations between natural outdoor environments, mediators and cognitive function*

349 Finally, none of the potential mediators were significantly associated with both residential distance to NOE
350 and CTT completion time. Since neighborhood social cohesion was (marginally) significantly associated
351 with both residential distance to NOE and CTT completion time, we investigated the association between
352 residential distance to NOE and CTT completion time, while adjusting for neighborhood social cohesion.
353 However, in this model, the association between residential distance to NOE and CTT completion time
354 increased slightly (Table 5). These results give no clear indication for mediation of the association between
355 residential distance to NOE and cognitive function by neighborhood social cohesion.

356

357 Table 5 Associations between distance to NOE, neighborhood social cohesion and CTT time

	% Difference in CTT time (95% confidence interval)
Residential distance to NOE (per 100 m)	1.58 (0.19, 3.00)
Social cohesion neighborhood (n=1493)	-0.91 (-1.48, -0.35)

358 NOE: natural outdoor environments; CTT: color trails test. Model was adjusted for age, sex, educational
359 level, neighborhood socioeconomic status, time spent away from home, and CTT test quality and random
360 intercepts were specified for cities (n=3) and neighborhoods (n=93).

361

362

363 **DISCUSSION**

364 An increase in residential distance to NOE was related to longer completion time of the CTT. This may
365 indicate that people living further away from nature have lower scores in cognitive function, specifically
366 for visual attention, and effortful executive processing abilities. There were no associations between

367 cognitive function and (i) residential surrounding greenness, (ii) perceived amount of NOE in
368 neighborhoods, and (iii) engagement with NOE. We found no clear indications for mediation by physical
369 activity, social interaction with neighbors, neighborhood social cohesion, loneliness, mental health, air
370 pollution worries, or noise annoyance.

371

372 Some of our results are in line with previous studies that also observed relations between access to NOE
373 and cognitive function. One previous observational study that was performed in primary schoolchildren
374 reported improvements in the development of working memory and attention after 12 months that was
375 related to surrounding greenness in residential, school and commuting areas [17]. Another study could not
376 find an association between proportion of parks in the neighborhood and cognitive function [19], while a
377 UK study found surrounding greenness and private gardens to be a risk factor for cognitive impairment and
378 dementia [20]. We are not aware of previous studies investigating the relation between access to NOE and
379 cognitive function measured with the CTT. Most of the other previous studies had an experimental design
380 and assessed short-term effects of exposure to nature [8,11,55]. We carried out an observational study, with
381 subjects in their residential environments, assessing a more general, and perhaps a more sustained relation
382 between NOE and cognitive function.

383

384 While residential distance to NOE was related to cognitive function, other indicators of NOE showed no
385 consistent association with cognition. We found no evidence for an association between surrounding
386 greenness, as measured with the NDVI, and cognitive function. The NDVI is relatively easy to obtain and
387 provides a useful measure of residential greenness relevant for studies of potential cognitive benefits of
388 natural outdoor environments. However, it's a rather coarse measure of greenness that does not differentiate
389 between size, type and function of greenness [56].

390

391 Furthermore, we did not find an association between engagement with NOE and cognitive function.
392 Engagement with nature may not reach its full potential for cognitive benefits when people are distracted
393 with other things while they are in the natural space (e.g. mobile phones, crowding). Another explanation
394 may be that especially the larger natural spaces are of importance for cognitive function, since spaces of >1
395 hectare were captured in the distance to natural outdoor environments indicator, while there was no such
396 requirement in the other indicators. However, viewing nature from windows, which could include spaces

397 as small as a street trees, has been related to benefits for cognitive function [15,55], but we did not find
398 such relations with our perceptions of NOE indicator which included window views. Lastly, another reason
399 may be that the unintentional use of NOE, which was not captured in our measure of engagement with
400 NOE, may be important for cognitive benefits, and may help explain our null findings.

401

402 We hypothesized that people living closer to nature feel less lonely, perceive higher social cohesion in their
403 neighborhood, and have more contact with their neighbors, but could not find clear evidence for this. A
404 Dutch study found that loneliness and shortage of social support mediated the relation between green space
405 and health, but found no support for a mediating role of contact with neighbors [23]. They hypothesized
406 that green spaces may be especially important for a sense of community through place attachment (i.e. the
407 bond between individuals and places) and not because of actual contact with neighbors [23]. In a study
408 about perceived greenness and mental health, social interaction with neighbors was not associated with
409 mental health, while social cohesion was. It was postulated that more close social interaction than was
410 assessed with their measure (e.g. waved, said hello, chatted) may be needed to confer health benefits [57].
411 Another study found that urban gardening activities were beneficial for health through social involvement
412 and neighborhood attachment [58]. If proximity to NOE does reduce loneliness and enhance social
413 cohesion, it might support the hypothesis that this could partially mediate cognitive performance, as
414 perceived social isolation has been identified as a risk factor for poorer overall cognitive performance, faster
415 cognitive decline and poorer executive functioning [59]. The increase in cognitive load from worry and
416 chronic surveillance for threat in the environment associated with social isolation may leave fewer cognitive
417 resources to devote to completing the CTT, but the current results do not support this and further research
418 is needed.

419

420 We could not establish mediation by physical activity, mental health, air pollution worries, or noise
421 annoyance. Two previous studies reported mediation of the relation between green space and general health
422 by social cohesion, but physical activity was less important [33,51]. One explanation could be that both
423 here and in previous studies, the mediation of physical activity in general was investigated, rather than
424 activity in natural outdoor environments, which may have distorted the relation. Furthermore, stress may
425 be an important mediator, since it was found to play a large role in explaining the relation between green
426 space and health [51], and may also be relevant for the relation with cognitive function. Unfortunately, no

427 data on stress were available in our sample. Another analysis of the Doetinchem PHENOTYPE data
428 revealed that the perceived sound quality (i.e. soundscape) of people's favorite NOE could contribute to
429 perceived restoration after visiting such a place [60].

430

431

432 No associations were found between any of the natural outdoor environment indicators and CTT errors.
433 While completing the CTT as fast as possible is thought to be associated with visual attention, completing
434 the CTT without errors is thought to be associated with impulse inhibition, another function related to
435 executive functioning [61]. Our findings might indicate that contact with nature is more related to
436 improvements in the visual attention functions, than with impulse inhibition. However, low variability of
437 CTT errors in our data may also be the reason for our null findings. Future research could further investigate
438 these and other aspects of cognitive function to establish what aspects of cognition may be relevant for
439 effects of NOE.

440

441 Our study has several strengths and limitations. Strengths are the use of a variety of objective and validated
442 instruments for exposure, mediators, and outcome assessments; and the investigation of different study
443 populations from three European countries using the same methodology. Cognitive function was assessed
444 with the CTT, which is regarded to be a language- and culture-free instrument. The use of such an
445 instrument is important considering the international nature of our study. One of the limitations includes
446 the relatively low response rates in our study, especially for Doetinchem. Non-response analysis for the
447 Doetinchem sample showed that respondents had less often poor general health and rated NOE to be of
448 higher importance for physical activity and relaxation compared to non-responders [35]. This might have
449 affected the generalizability of our study. Another limitation is the missing data for the CTT, with more
450 tests missing in Doetinchem and Stoke-on-Trent than in Barcelona, which resulted in unequal population
451 sizes. The cognition test was taken after the questionnaire was completed, but if this exceeded one hour,
452 the CTT was not taken. This may have resulted in potential bias by not having cognition test scores from
453 those participants that took longer to complete the questionnaire. However, it is unlikely that this is
454 associated with exposure to NOE and should not have introduced bias. We did observe that associations
455 between residential distance to NOE and CTT completion time were only statistically significant for
456 Barcelona, the city with the largest sample size, which may have driven the significant association in the

457 total sample. Another reason for this result might be that the smaller amount of NOE in Barcelona makes
458 it easier to detect associations, and when there already is a certain amount of NOE, increasing levels of
459 NOE have little additional value. Nonetheless, we must be cautious when interpreting these results
460 considering the possibility that our observed associations were due to chance. Although efforts were made
461 to take into account several covariates, estimates may have residual confounding by unknown factors that
462 could vary between study areas. Finally, with our mediation analysis we assume a certain sequence of
463 effects, while the cross-sectional nature of our study limits us to establish the directions of these effects.
464 This is a general limitation of cross-sectional studies and underlines the need for longitudinal studies to
465 gain knowledge on the potential causal link between NOE and cognition and its mechanisms [21].

466

467 **CONCLUSIONS**

468 In this cross-cultural study, we found an association between distance to NOE and CTT completion time,
469 providing some indication that proximity to nature may benefit cognitive function, particularly visual
470 attention. We observed no associations between other exposure indicators of NOE and cognitive function,
471 nor could we establish mediation by physical activity, social interaction with neighbors, neighborhood
472 social cohesion, loneliness, mental health, air pollution worries, or noise annoyance. When future research
473 provides more evidence for an association between nature and cognition, and when more knowledge
474 becomes available on what particular form of nature is beneficial to cognitive health and to whom, these
475 findings could have implications for urban spatial planning policies targeted at improving access to nature
476 in cities.

477

478 **REFERENCES**

- 479 1 Hartig T, Mitchell R, de Vries S, *et al.* Nature and health. *Annu Rev Public Health* 2014;**35**:207–
480 28. doi:10.1146/annurev-publhealth-032013-182443
- 481 2 Lederbogen F, Kirsch P, Haddad L, *et al.* City living and urban upbringing affect neural social
482 stress processing in humans. *Nature* 2011;**474**:498–501. doi:10.1038/nature10190
- 483 3 Gidlow CJ, Randall J, Gillman J, *et al.* Natural environments and chronic stress measured by hair
484 cortisol. *Landsc Urban Plan* 2016;**148**:61–7. doi:10.1016/j.landurbplan.2015.12.009

- 485 4 Peen J, Schoevers RA, Beekman AT, *et al.* The current status of urban-rural differences in
486 psychiatric disorders. *Acta Psychiatr Scand* 2010;**121**:84–93. doi:10.1111/j.1600-
487 0447.2009.01438.x
- 488 5 Bratman GN, Hamilton JP, Daily GC. The impacts of nature experience on human cognitive
489 function and mental health. *Ann N Y Acad Sci* 2012;**1249**:118–36. doi:10.1111/j.1749-
490 6632.2011.06400.x
- 491 6 Kaplan R, Kaplan S. *The Experience of Nature: A Psychological Perspective. Manuscript,*
492 *University of Nevada, Reno.* Cambridge: : Cambridge University Press 1989.
- 493 7 Ulrich RS, Simons RF, Losito BD, *et al.* Stress recovery during exposure to natural and urban
494 environments. *J Environ Psychol* 1991;**11**:201–30. doi:10.1016/S0272-4944(05)80184-7
- 495 8 Berman MG, Jonides J, Kaplan S. The Cognitive Benefits of Interacting With Nature. *Psychol Sci*
496 2008;**19**:1207–12. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9280.2008.02225.x
- 497 9 Berman MG, Kross E, Krpan KM, *et al.* Interacting with nature improves cognition and affect for
498 individuals with depression. 2012. doi:10.1016/j.jad.2012.03.012
- 499 10 Bratman GN, Daily GC, Levy BJ, *et al.* The benefits of nature experience: Improved affect and
500 cognition. *Landsc Urban Plan* 2015;**138**:41–50. doi:10.1016/j.landurbplan.2015.02.005
- 501 11 Gidlow CJ, Jones M V., Hurst G, *et al.* Where to put your best foot forward: Psycho-
502 physiological responses to walking in natural and urban environments. *J Environ Psychol*
503 2016;**45**:22–9. doi:10.1016/j.jenvp.2015.11.003
- 504 12 Hartig T, Evans GW, Jamner LD, *et al.* Tracking restoration in natural and urban field settings. *J*
505 *Environ Psychol* 2003;**23**:109–23. doi:10.1016/S0272-4944(02)00109-3
- 506 13 Bodin T, Björk J, Ardö J, *et al.* Annoyance, Sleep and Concentration Problems due to Combined
507 Traffic Noise and the Benefit of Quiet Side. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* 2015;**12**:1612–28.
508 doi:10.3390/ijerph120201612
- 509 14 Kaplan R. The Nature of the View from Home: Psychological Benefits. *Environ Behav*
510 2001;**33**:507–42. doi:10.1177/00139160121973115

- 511 15 Tennessen CM, Cimprich B. Views to nature: Effects on attention. *J Environ Psychol*
512 1995;**15**:77–85. doi:10.1016/0272-4944(95)90016-0
- 513 16 Berto R. Exposure to restorative environments helps restore attentional capacity. *J Environ*
514 *Psychol* 2005;**25**:249–59. doi:10.1016/j.jenvp.2005.07.001
- 515 17 Dadvand P, Nieuwenhuijsen MJ, Esnaola M, *et al.* Green spaces and cognitive development in
516 primary schoolchildren. *Proc Natl Acad Sci* 2015;**112**:201503402. doi:10.1073/pnas.1503402112
- 517 18 Amoly E, Dadvand P, Fornis J, *et al.* Green and Blue Spaces and Behavioral Development in
518 Barcelona Schoolchildren: The BREATHE Project. *Environ Health Perspect* Published Online
519 First: 9 September 2014. doi:10.1289/ehp.1408215
- 520 19 Clarke PJ, Ailshire JA, House JS, *et al.* Cognitive function in the community setting: the
521 neighbourhood as a source of ‘cognitive reserve’? *J Epidemiol Community Health* 2012;**66**:730–
522 6. doi:10.1136/jech.2010.128116
- 523 20 Wu Y-T, Prina AM, Jones AP, *et al.* Community environment, cognitive impairment and
524 dementia in later life: results from the Cognitive Function and Ageing Study. *Age Ageing*
525 2015;**44**:1005–11. doi:10.1093/ageing/afv137
- 526 21 de Keijzer C, Gascon M, Nieuwenhuijsen MJ, *et al.* Long-Term Green Space Exposure and
527 Cognition Across the Life Course: a Systematic Review. *Curr Environ Heal Reports* 2016;:1–10.
528 doi:10.1007/s40572-016-0116-x
- 529 22 Bancroft C, Joshi S, Rundle A, *et al.* Association of proximity and density of parks and
530 objectively measured physical activity in the United States: A systematic review. *Soc Sci Med*
531 2015;**138**:22–30. doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2015.05.034
- 532 23 Maas J, van Dillen SME, Verheij RA, *et al.* Social contacts as a possible mechanism behind the
533 relation between green space and health. *Health Place* 2009;**15**:586–95.
534 doi:10.1016/j.healthplace.2008.09.006
- 535 24 Gascon M, Triguero-Mas M, Martínez D, *et al.* Mental Health Benefits of Long-Term Exposure
536 to Residential Green and Blue Spaces: A Systematic Review. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*
537 2015;**12**:4354–79. doi:10.3390/ijerph120404354

- 538 25 Kuiper JS, Zuidersma M, Zuidema SU, *et al.* Social relationships and cognitive decline: a
539 systematic review and meta-analysis of longitudinal cohort studies. *Int J Epidemiol* Published
540 Online First: 6 June 2016. doi:10.1093/ije/dyw089
- 541 26 Falck RS, Davis JC, Liu-Ambrose T. What is the association between sedentary behaviour and
542 cognitive function? A systematic review. *Br J Sports Med* Published Online First: 6 May 2016.
543 doi:10.1136/bjsports-2015-095551
- 544 27 Dadvand P, Rivas I, Basagaña X, *et al.* The association between greenness and traffic-related air
545 pollution at schools. *Sci Total Environ* 2015;**523**:59–63. doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2015.03.103
- 546 28 Gidlöf-Gunnarsson A, Öhrström E. Noise and well-being in urban residential environments: The
547 potential role of perceived availability to nearby green areas. *Landsc Urban Plan* 2007;**83**:115–
548 26. doi:10.1016/j.landurbplan.2007.03.003
- 549 29 Tzivian L, Winkler A, Dlugaj M, *et al.* Effect of long-term outdoor air pollution and noise on
550 cognitive and psychological functions in adults. *Int J Hyg Environ Health* 2015;**218**:1–11.
551 doi:10.1016/j.ijheh.2014.08.002
- 552 30 Clifford A, Lang L, Chen R, *et al.* Exposure to air pollution and cognitive functioning across the
553 life course--A systematic literature review. *Environ Res* 2016;**147**:383–98.
554 doi:10.1016/j.envres.2016.01.018
- 555 31 Guxens M, Garcia-Esteban R, Giorgis-Allemand L, *et al.* Air pollution during pregnancy and
556 childhood cognitive and psychomotor development: six European birth cohorts. *Epidemiology*
557 2014;**25**:636–47. doi:10.1097/EDE.0000000000000133
- 558 32 Sunyer J, Suades-González E, García-Esteban R, *et al.* Traffic-related air pollution and attention
559 in primary school children. *Epidemiology* 2016;:1. doi:10.1097/EDE.0000000000000603
- 560 33 Dadvand P, Bartoll X, Basagaña X, *et al.* Green spaces and General Health: Roles of mental
561 health status, social support, and physical activity. *Environ Int* 2016;**91**:161–7.
562 doi:10.1016/j.envint.2016.02.029
- 563 34 Nieuwenhuijsen MJ, Kruize H, Gidlow C, *et al.* Positive health effects of the natural outdoor
564 environment in typical populations in different regions in Europe (PHENOTYPE): a study

565 programme protocol. *BMJ Open* 2014;**4**:e004951. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2014-004951

566 35 van den Berg M, van Poppel M, van Kamp I, *et al.* Visiting green space is associated with mental
567 health and vitality: A cross-sectional study in four european cities. *Health Place* 2016;**38**:8–15.
568 doi:10.1016/j.healthplace.2016.01.003

569 36 European Environment Agency. Urban Atlas. 2014.[http://www.eea.europa.eu/data-and-](http://www.eea.europa.eu/data-and-maps/data/urban-atlas/#parent-fieldname-title)
570 [maps/data/urban-atlas/#parent-fieldname-title](http://www.eea.europa.eu/data-and-maps/data/urban-atlas/#parent-fieldname-title). (accessed 30 Sep2016).

571 37 Kadaster. TOP10NL. doi:<http://www.kadaster.nl/web/artikel/producten/TOP10NL.htm>

572 38 Annerstedt van den Bosch M, Mudu P, Uscila V, *et al.* Development of an urban green space
573 indicator and the public health rationale. *Scand J Public Health* 2016;**44**:159–67.
574 doi:10.1177/1403494815615444

575 39 European Environment Agency. Mapping Guide for a European Urban Atlas. Copenhagen: 2006.
576 <http://www.eea.europa.eu/data-and-maps/data/urban-atlas#tab-methodology>

577 40 Weier J, Herring D. Measuring Vegetation (NDVI & EVI).
578 2000.[http://earthobservatory.nasa.gov/Features/MeasuringVegetation/measuring_vegetation_2.ph](http://earthobservatory.nasa.gov/Features/MeasuringVegetation/measuring_vegetation_2.php)
579 [p](http://earthobservatory.nasa.gov/Features/MeasuringVegetation/measuring_vegetation_2.php) (accessed 28 Jun2016).

580 41 McEachan RRC, Prady SL, Smith G, *et al.* The association between green space and depressive
581 symptoms in pregnant women: moderating roles of socioeconomic status and physical activity. *J*
582 *Epidemiol Community Health* 2016;**70**:253–9. doi:10.1136/jech-2015-205954

583 42 Dugbartey AT, Townes BD, Mahurin RK. Equivalence of the Color Trails Test and Trail Making
584 Test in Nonnative English-Speakers. *Arch Clin Neuropsychol* 2000;**15**:425–31.
585 doi:10.1016/S0887-6177(99)00034-7

586 43 Kenny RA, Coen RF, Frewen J, *et al.* Normative Values of Cognitive and Physical Function in
587 Older Adults: Findings from The Irish Longitudinal Study on Ageing. *J Am Geriatr Soc*
588 2013;**61**:S279–90. doi:10.1111/jgs.12195

589 44 Messinis L, Malegiannaki A-C, Christodoulou T, *et al.* Color Trails Test: Normative Data and
590 Criterion Validity for the Greek Adult Population. *Arch Clin Neuropsychol* 2011;**26**:322–30.

- 591 doi:10.1093/arclin/acr027
- 592 45 Wendel-Vos GCW, Schuit AJ, Saris WHM, *et al.* Reproducibility and relative validity of the
593 short questionnaire to assess health-enhancing physical activity. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2003;**56**:1163–
594 9.<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/14680666> (accessed 15 Jun2016).
- 595 46 Russell DW. UCLA Loneliness Scale (Version 3): reliability, validity, and factor structure. *J Pers*
596 *Assess* 1996;**66**:20–40. doi:10.1207/s15327752jpa6601_2
- 597 47 Sampson RJ, Raudenbush SW, Earls F. Neighborhoods and Violent Crime: A Multilevel Study of
598 Collective Efficacy. *Science (80-)* 1997;**277**.
- 599 48 Ware JE, Sherbourne CD. The Mos 36-Item Short-Form Health Survey (Sf-36) .1. Conceptual-
600 Framework and Item Selection. *Med Care* 1992;**30**:473–83. doi:10.1097/00005650-199206000-
601 00002
- 602 49 International Organization for Standardization (ISO). Acoustics – Assessment of Noise
603 Annoyance by Means of Social and Socio-acoustic Surveys; ISO/TS 15666. Geneva, Switzerland:
604 2003.
- 605 50 Miedema HM, Oudshoorn CG. Annoyance from transportation noise: relationships with exposure
606 metrics DNL and DENL and their confidence intervals. *Environ Health Perspect* 2001;**109**:409–
607 16.<http://www.pubmedcentral.nih.gov/articlerender.fcgi?artid=1240282&tool=pmcentrez&render>
608 type=abstract (accessed 16 Dec2014).
- 609 51 de Vries S, van Dillen SME, Groenewegen PP, *et al.* Streetscape greenery and health: stress,
610 social cohesion and physical activity as mediators. *Soc Sci Med* 2013;**94**:26–33.
611 doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2013.06.030
- 612 52 Baron RM, Kenny DA. The moderator-mediator variable distinction in social psychological
613 research: conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. *J Pers Soc Psychol* 1986;**51**:1173–
614 82.<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/3806354> (accessed 22 Jun2016).
- 615 53 Barrera-Gómez J, Basagaña X. Models with Transformed Variables. *Epidemiology* 2015;**26**:e16–
616 7. doi:10.1097/EDE.0000000000000247

617 54 StataCorp. Stata Statistical Software: Release 14. 2015.

618 55 Lee KE, Williams KJH, Sargent LD, *et al.* 40-second green roof views sustain attention: The role
619 of micro-breaks in attention restoration. *J Environ Psychol* 2015;**42**:182–9.
620 doi:10.1016/j.jenvp.2015.04.003

621 56 Gascon M, Cirach M, Martínez D, *et al.* Normalized difference vegetation index (NDVI) as a
622 marker of surrounding greenness in epidemiological studies: The case of Barcelona city. *Urban
623 For Urban Green* 2016;**19**:88–94. doi:10.1016/j.ufug.2016.07.001

624 57 Sugiyama T, Leslie E, Giles-Corti B, *et al.* Associations of neighbourhood greenness with
625 physical and mental health: do walking, social coherence and local social interaction explain the
626 relationships? *J Epidemiol Community Health* 2008;**62**:e9. doi:10.1136/JECH.2007.064287

627 58 Litt JS, Schmiege SJ, Hale JW, *et al.* Exploring ecological, emotional and social levers of self-
628 rated health for urban gardeners and non-gardeners: A path analysis. *Soc Sci Med* 2015;**144**:1–8.
629 doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2015.09.004

630 59 Cacioppo JT, Hawkey LC. Perceived social isolation and cognition. *Trends Cogn Sci*
631 2009;**13**:447–54. doi:10.1016/j.tics.2009.06.005

632 60 van Kamp I, van Kempen E, Klaeboe R, *et al.* Soundscapes , human restoration and quality of
633 life. In: *Paper presented at INTER-NOISE 2016: Towards a Quieter Future*. Hamburg: 2016.

634 61 Mitrushina M, Boone K, Razani J, *et al.* *Handbook for Normative Data for Neuropsychological
635 Assessment*. 2nd ed. New York, NY: : Oxford University Press 2005.

636

637