© The University of Queensland 2024 This content is protected and may not be shared, uploaded, or distributed.



# Greenspace and health in the UK Biobank Cohort

Nick Osborne and colleagues

### University of Queensland, Australia

Chinonso Christian Odebeatu, Darsy Darssan, Joana A. Revez, Charlotte Roscoe, Phu Do, Simon Reid



#### **Over half a million participants across England, Wales and Scotland**









# **Exposures and outcomes**

- Expsoures
  - NDVI satellite derived
  - % greenspace
  - Distance to parks/greenspace
  - Type of greenspace, from land use mapping including
    - Private garden
    - Public greenspace
    - Other.....natural, camping, golf course, playing field

#### Outcomes

- Cancer outcomes from cancer registry
- Vitamin D
- Metabolic syndrome



0 0.1 0.2 0.4 0.6 0.8 Kilometer

#### OSMM Greenspace category

- Private Garden
- Public Park Or Garden
  Amenity Transport
- Allotments Or Community Growing Spaces
- Amenity Residential Or Business
- Bowling Green
- Camping Or Caravan Park
- Cemetery Golf Course
- Institutional Grounds
- Land Use Changing
- Natural
- Other Sports Facility
- Play Space
- Playing Field
- Religious Grounds
- School Grounds
- Tennis Court



-1 -02 -0.1 0 0.1 0.2 0.3 0.4 0.5 0.8 0.7 0.8 0.9



## Increasing greenspace increased vitamin D – cross-sectional





Cancer type	Cases	Total greenspace	HR (95% CI)	Private residential gardens	HR (95% CI)	Other greenspace types	HR (95% CI)
ORC with prostrate	13,681	<b>(</b>	0.96 (0.94 - 0.99)	HI-H	0.93 (0.90 - 0.97)	•	0.97 (0.94 - 1.00)
ORC without prostrate	9,550	HI-L	0.95 (0.92 - 0.98)	<b>⊢</b> ♦-1	0.92 (0.88 - 0.96)	++-	0.96 (0.92 - 1.00)
Prostate	4,130	<b>⊨</b> ♦=1	0.98 (0.94 - 1.03)	<b>⊢♦</b> −−1	0.95 (0.89 - 1.02)	<b>⊢♦</b> -1	1.00 (0.94 - 1.05)
Breast	3,793	⊢◆-1	0.95 (0.90 - 1.00)	<b>⊢♦</b> −1	0.91 (0.84 - 0.98)	<b>⊢</b> ♦−1	0.96 (0.90 - 1.03)
Colorectum	2152	<b>⊢</b> •	0.99 (0.93 - 1.06)	<b>⊢_</b>	0.99 (0.89 - 1.09)	F	1.00 (0.92 - 1.08)
Uterus	637	<b>⊢</b>	0.86 (0.76 - 0.96)	<b>⊢</b> •	0.80 (0.67 - 0.96)	<b>⊢</b>	0.85 (0.73 - 0.99)
Kidney	501	<b>⊢</b>	0.98 (0.86 - 1.12)	<b>⊢</b>	0.97 (0.79 - 1.19)	<b>⊢</b>	0.99 (0.84 - 1.16)
Pancreas	441	<b>⊢</b>	0.90 (0.78 - 1.03)	<b>⊢</b>	0.81 (0.66 - 1.00)	<b>⊢</b>	0.94 (0.80 - 1.11)
Oesophagus	411	<b></b>	1.01 (0.87 - 1.16)	<b>⊢</b>	1.05 (0.84 - 1.31)	<b>⊢</b>	0.97 (0.83 - 1.33)
Ovary	405	<b>⊢</b>	0.91 (0.78 - 1.06)	<b>⊢</b>	0.92 (0.72 - 1.17)	<b>⊢</b>	0.85 (0.70 - 1.05)
Multiple myeloma	385	<b>⊢</b>	0.94 (0.81 - 1.08)	<b>⊢</b>	0.84 (0.67 - 1.06)	<b></b>	0.99 (0.83 - 1.19)
Stomach	272	<b>⊢</b>	0.99 (0.83 - 1.18)	<b>⊢</b>	0.97 (0.73 - 1.27)	••	1.02 (0.82 - 1.26)
Liver	231	<b>⊢</b>	0.85 (0.71 - 1.02)	<b>↓</b>	0.81 (0.61 - 1.08)	► <b>•</b> • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	0.83 (0.65 - 1.05)
	0.5	1	1.5 0.5	1	1.5 0.5	1	1.5

#### **Exposure-response curve plots with restricted cubic spline (3 degree of freedom)**







Mediator	Total greenspace		Private residential gardens		Other greenspace types	
	Proportion mediated (95 % CI)	Р	Proportion mediated (95% CI)	Р	Proportion mediated (95% CI)	Р
Physical activity	0.01 (-0.002, 0.017)	0.11	0.01 (-0.002, 0.014)	0.16	0.01 (-0.003, 0.022)	0.16
Deseasoned 25(OH)D	0.02 (-0.003, 0.052)	0.08	0.02 (-0.001, 0.043)	0.06	0.03 (-0.025, 0.090)	0.27
PM <sub>2.5</sub>	0.08 (-0.236, 0.402)	0.61	0.07 (-0.242, 0.379)	0.66	0.07 (-0.259, 0.403)	0.67
$NO_2$	-0.41 (-0.756, -0.079)	0.01	-0.36 (-0.644, -0.078)	0.01	-0.52 (-1.073, 0.031)	0.06

• Greenspace within immediate vicinity of residential addresses may capture the mitigation of adverse impacts of air pollutants such as NO<sub>2</sub> (Kayyal-Tarabeia et al., 2022; Markevych et al., 2017)



## **Greenspace and Metabolic Syndrome**





Shift workers (including nighttime shift workers had higher vitamin D levels than non-shift workers.....spend time outside in afternoons?