Supplementary Materials 3

Methodological Quality Assessments

CASP Randomised Controlled Trial Checklist	**Max Score 22**
Intervention Name	Cares of Life (Afwape, et al. 2010)(33)
Did the trial address a clearly focused issue?	Yes
Was the assignment of patients who entered the trial properly accounted for at conclusion?	Yes
Were patients, health workers and study personnel 'blind' to treatment?	Yes
Were the groups similar at the start of the trial?	Yes
Aside from the experimental intervention, were the groups treated equally?	Yes
How large was the treatment effect?	Unclear
How precise was the estimate of the treatment?	Unclear
Can the results be applied to the local population or in your context?	Yes
Were all clinically important outcomes considered?	Yes
Are the benefits worth the harms and costs?	Yes
Total CASP Checklist Score	**20**
(Yes=2, Unclear=1, No=0)	

The Risk of Bias in Non-Randomised Studies of Interventions ROBINS-I	
Intervention Name No name provided (Carnes et al 2017)(41)	
Bias due to confounding	
1.1 Is there potential for confounding of the effect of intervention in this study?	Yes
1.2. Was the analysis based on splitting participants' follow up time according to intervention received?	No
1.3. Were intervention discontinuations or switches likely to be related to factors that are prognostic for the outcome?	N/A
Questions relating to baseline confounding only	
1.4. Did the authors use an appropriate analysis method that controlled for all the important confounding domains?	**Yes**
1.5. Were confounding domains that were controlled for measured validly and reliably by the variables available in this study?	Yes
1.6. Did the authors control for any post-intervention variables that could have been affected by the intervention?	No
Questions relating to baseline and time-varying confounding	
1.7. Did the authors use an appropriate analysis method that controlled for all the important confounding domains and for time-varying confounding?	NA
1.8. Were confounding domains that were controlled for measured validly and reliably by the variables available in this study?	NA
Risk of bias judgement	**Moderate**
Bias in selection of participants into the study	
2.1. Was selection of participants into the study (or into the analysis) based on participant characteristics observed after the start of intervention?	No
2.2. Were the post-intervention variables that influenced selection likely to be associated with intervention?	N/A
2.3 Were the post-intervention variables that influenced selection likely to be influenced by the outcome or a cause of the outcome?	N/A
2.4. Do start of follow-up and start of intervention coincide for most participants?	Yes
2.5. Were adjustment techniques used that are likely to correct for the presence of selection biases?	N/A
Risk of bias judgement	Low

Bias in classification of interventions	
3.1 Were intervention groups clearly defined?	Yes
3.2 Was the information used to define intervention groups recorded at the start of the intervention?	Yes
3.3 Could classification of intervention status have been affected by knowledge of the outcome or risk of the outcome?	No
Risk of bias judgement	Low
Bias due to deviations from intended interventions	
4.1. Were there deviations from the intended intervention beyond what would be expected in usual practice?	No information
4.2. Were these deviations from intended intervention unbalanced between groups *and* likely to have affected the outcome?	No information
Risk of bias judgement	No information
Bias due to missing data	
5.1 Were outcome data available for all, or nearly all, participants?	Yes
5.2 Were participants excluded due to missing data on intervention status?	No
5.3 Were participants excluded due to missing data on other variables needed for the analysis?	No
5.4 Are the proportion of participants and reasons for missing data similar across interventions?	N/A
5.5 Is there evidence that results were robust to the presence of missing data?	Yes
Risk of bias judgement	Moderate
Bias in measurement of outcomes	
6.1 Could the outcome measure have been influenced by knowledge of the intervention received?	No
6.2 Were outcome assessors aware of the intervention received by study participants?	No information
6.3 Were the methods of outcome assessment comparable across intervention groups?	Yes
6.4 Were any systematic errors in measurement of the outcome related to intervention received?	No information
Risk of bias judgement	Moderate
Bias in selection of the reported result	
Is the reported effect estimate likely to be selected, on the basis of the results, from...	
7.1. ... multiple outcome *measurements* within the outcome domain?	No
7.2 ... multiple *analyses* of the intervention-outcome relationship?	No
7.3 ... different *subgroups*?	No
Risk of bias judgement	Moderate
Overall bias Risk of bias judgement	**Moderate**

NHLBI Quality Assessment Tool for Before-After (Pre-Post) Studies										
Intervention Name	**Art Lift**				**Art Shine**	**British Red Cross; Connecting Communities**	**Cadwyn Mon**	**Fife SP (Mood Café)**	**GROW: Art, Park and Wellbeing**	**Luton SP Programme**
Author(s) of Corresponding Study(s)	**Crone, et al. 2013 (26)**	**Crone, et al. 2018(27)**	**Sumner, et al. 2019(28)**	**Sumner, et al. 2021(29)**	**van de Venter, et al. 2014(30)**	**Foster, et al. 2020(31)**	**Roberts, et al. 2020(32)**	**Morton, et al. 2015(34)**	**Thomson, et al. 2020(35)**	**Pescheny, et al. 2019(36)**
Was the study question or objective clearly stated?	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**
Were eligibility/ selection criteria for the study population prespecified and clearly described?	**No**	**No**	**Yes**	**No**	**Yes**	**No**	**Yes**	**No**	**No**	**Yes**
Were the participants in the study representative of those who would be eligible for the test/service/intervention in the general or clinical population of interest?	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**
Were all eligible participants that met the prespecified entry criteria enrolled?	**Yes**	**UC**	**UC**	**UC**	**No**	**UC**	**No**	**UC**	**UC**	**UC**
Was the sample size sufficiently large to provide confidence in the findings?	**UC**	**UC**	**UC**	**UC**	**UC**	**UC**	**UC**	**UC**	**UC**	**UC**
Was the test/ service/ intervention clearly described and delivered consistently across the - study population?	**UC**	**Yes**	**No**	**No**	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**	**No**	**No**	**Yes**

Were the outcome measures prespecified, clearly defined, valid, reliable, and assessed consistently across all study participants?	**No**	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**
Were the people assessing the outcomes blinded to the participants' exposures/interventions?	**N/A***	**N/A***	**N/A***	**N/A***	**N/A***	**N/A***	**N/A***	**N/A***	**N/A***	**N/A***
Was the loss to follow-up after baseline 20% or less? Were those lost to follow-up accounted for in the analysis?	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**UC**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**UC**	**No**
Did the statistical methods examine changes in outcome measures from before to after the intervention? Were statistical tests done that provided *p* values for the pre-to-post changes?	**UC**	**UC**	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**
Were outcome measures of interest taken multiple times before the intervention and multiple times after the intervention (i.e., did they use an interrupted time-series design)?	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**
Total Checklist Score *(Yes=2, Unclear=1, No=0)* Max=22	**9**	**11**	**12**	**10**	**14**	**12**	**13**	**10**	**11**	**14**

***N/A = not applicable. Due to only one intervention arm and no comparison group**

NHLBI NHLBI Quality Assessment Tool for Before-After (Pre-Post) Studies …continued					
Intervention Name	**Museums on Prescriptions**	**Social Cure and SP**		**Southwest Wellbeing Programme**	**Wetlands for Wellbeing**
Author(s) of Corresponding Article(s)	**Thomson, et al. 2018(37)**	**Kellezi, et al. 2019(38)**	**Wakefield, et al. 2022(39)**	**Jones, et al. 2013(40)**	**Maund, et al. 2019(42)**
Was the study question or objective clearly stated?	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**
Were eligibility/ selection criteria for the study population prespecified and clearly described?	**Yes**	**No**	**No**	**Yes**	**Yes**
Were the participants in the study representative of those who would be eligible for the test/service/intervention in the general or clinical population of interest?	**Yes**	**UC**	**UC**	**Yes**	**Yes**
Were all eligible participants that met the prespecified entry criteria enrolled?	**UC**	**UC**	**UC**	**No**	**No**
Was the sample size sufficiently large to provide confidence in the findings?	**UC**	**Yes**	**UC**	**UC**	**UC**
Was the test/ service/ intervention clearly described and delivered consistently across the study population?	**UC**	**Yes**	**No**	**Yes**	**Yes**
Were the outcome measures prespecified, clearly defined, valid, reliable, and assessed	**Yes**	**No**	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**

consistently across all study participants?					
Were the people assessing the outcomes blinded to the participants' exposures/interventions?	**N/A***	**N/A***	**N/A***	**N/A***	**N/A***
Was the loss to follow-up after baseline 20% or less? Were those lost to follow-up accounted for in the analysis?	**UC**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**UC**
Did the statistical methods examine changes in outcome measures from before to after the intervention? Were statistical tests done that provided *p* values for the pre-to-post changes?	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**
Were outcome measures of interest taken multiple times before the intervention and multiple times after the intervention (i.e., did they use an interrupted time-series design)?	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**
Total Checklist Score *(Yes=2, Unclear=1, No=0)* Max=22	**14**	**10**	**9**	**13**	**14**

***N/A = not applicable. Due to only one intervention arm and no comparison group**