Residential surrounding greenspace and age at menopause:

A 20-year European study (ECRHS)

Kai Triebner[1, 2], Iana Markevych[3, 4], Steinar Hustad[1, 2], Bryndís Benediktsdóttir[5], Bertil Forsberg[6], Karl A Franklin[7], José Antonio Gullón Blanco[8], Mathias Holm[9], Bénédicte Jaquemin[10], Debbie Jarvis[11], Rain Jõgi[12], Bénédicte Leynaert[13, 14], Eva Lindberg[15], Jesús Martínez-Moratalla[16, 17], Nerea Muniozguren Agirre[18], Isabelle Pin[19, 20, 21], José Luis Sánchez-Ramos[22], Joachim Heinrich[3, 23], Francisco Gómez Real[1, 24*] and Payam Dadvand[10*]

*shared last authorship

[1]Department of Clinical Science, University of Bergen, Bergen, Norway;
[2]Core Facility for Metabolomics, University of Bergen, Bergen, Norway;
[3]Institute and Clinic for Occupational, Social and Environmental Medicine, University Hospital, LMU Munich, Munich, Germany
[4]Institute of Epidemiology, Helmholtz Zentrum München - German Research Center for Environmental Health, Neuherberg, Germany
[5]Faculty of Medicine, University of Iceland, Reykjavik, Iceland,
[6]Department of Public Health and Clinical Medicine, Umeå University, Umeå, Sweden
[7]Department of Surgical and Perioperative Sciences, Surgery, Umea University, Umea, Sweden;
[8]Pneumology Department University Hospital San Agustín, Avilés, Spain;
[9]Department of Occupational and Environmental Medicine, University of Gothenburg, Sahlgrenska University Hospital, Gothenburg, Sweden;
[10]Barcelona Institute for Global Health, Barcelona, Spain;
[11]National Heart and Lung Institute, Imperial College, London, United Kingdom;
[12]Tartu University Hospital, Lung Clinic
[13]INSERM UMR1152, Paris, France;
[14]INSERM U1168, VIMA Villejuif, France
[15]Department of Medical Sciences, Respiratory, allergy and sleep research, Uppsala University, Uppsala, Sweden;
[16]Pulmonology Service, Albacete University Hospital Complex, Health Service of Castilla - La Mancha. Albacete, Spain;
[17]Faculty of Medicine of Albacete, Castilla-La Mancha University, Albacete, Spain;
[18]Unit of Epidemiology and Public Health, Department of Health, Basque Government, Bilbao, Spain;
[19]Department of Pediatrics, CHU Grenoble Alpes, Grenoble, France;
[20]INSERM, Institute for Advanced Biosciences, Grenoble, France;
[21]Université Grenoble Alpes, Grenoble, France;
[22]Department of Nursing, University of Huelva, Huelva, Spain;
[23]Allergy and Lung Health Unit, Melbourne School of Population and Global Health, University of Melbourne, Carlton, Australia;
[24]Department of Gynecology and Obstetrics, Haukeland University Hospital, Bergen, Norway;

Corresponding author:
Kai Triebner, PhD
Department of Clinical Science
University of Bergen
Jonas Lies veg 65
5021 Bergen
Norway
Telephone: +47 45 031 557
E-mail: kai.triebner@uib.no

Declarations of interest: None

Online data supplement: This article has an online data supplement.

Abstract

Background: Menopause is associated with a number of adverse health effects and its timing has been reported to be influenced by several lifestyle factors. Whether greenspace exposure is associated with age at menopause has not yet been investigated.

Objective: To investigate whether residential surrounding greenspace is associated with age at menopause and thus reproductive aging.

Methods: This longitudinal study was based on the 20-year follow-up of 1955 aging women from a large, population-based European cohort (ECRHS). Residential surrounding greenspace was abstracted as the average of satellite-based Normalized Difference Vegetation Index (NDVI) across a circular buffer of 300m around the residential addresses of each participant during the course of the study. We applied mixed effects Cox models with centre as random effect, menopause as the survival object, age as time indicator and residential surrounding greenspace as time-varying predictor. All models were adjusted for smoking habit, body mass index, parity, age at menarche, ever-use of contraception and age at completed full-time education as socio-economic proxy.

Results: An increase of one interquartile range of residential surrounding greenspace was associated with a 13% lower risk of being menopausal (Hazard Ratio: 0.87, 95% Confidence Interval: 0.79 – 0.95). Correspondingly the predicted median age at menopause was 1.4 years older in the highest compared to the lowest NDVI quartile. Results remained stable after additional adjustment for air pollution and traffic related noise amongst others.

Conclusions: Living in greener neighbourhoods is associated with older age at menopause and might slow reproductive aging. These are novel findings with broad implications. Further studies are needed to see whether our findings can be replicated in different populations and to explore the potential mechanisms underlying this association.

Key words

Greenspace; menopause; NDVI; reproductive aging; sex hormones;

Abbreviations

BMI: Body Mass Index

CI: Confidence Interval

ECRHS: European Community Respiratory Health Survey

FSH: Follicle Stimulating Hormone

HR: Hazard Ratio

HRT: Hormone Replacement Therapy

IQR: Interquartile Range

IU/L: International Units per Litre

NDVI: Normalized Difference Vegetation Index

NIR: Near-Infrared Light

PCOS: Polycystic Ovary Syndrome

pmol/L: Picomol per Litre

RED: Visible red light

1. INTRODUCTION

Age at menopause is of fundamental interest at an individual as well as at a population level. It is a marker of health and disease[1-3] and may be associated with undesirable alterations in body physiology and mental health.[4-8] Later age at natural menopause has been positively associated with overall survival, life expectancy[9] and reduced all-cause and cardiovascular mortality.[10, 11] The timing of menopause has been reported to be influenced by lifestyle factors such as smoking, obesity, physical activity, parity and oral contraceptive use.[12-15] Evidence on the potential influence of environmental factors on the timing of menopause is still scarce, but exposure to greenspace has been associated with improvement of physical and mental health and wellbeing.[16-21] Reducing stress, increasing physical activity, enhancing social cohesion and interaction and mitigating exposure to urban-related environmental hazards such as air pollution, noise and heat have been suggested to underlie the health benefits of greenspace.[22] Through mechanisms such as physical activity[12] and stress reduction[23], exposure to greenspace could be associated with age at menopause, but evidence on such an association is non-existent. The aim of the present study was to investigate whether long-term exposure to residential surrounding greenspace is associated with the age at menopause in a large, population-based cohort of European women.

2. METHODS

2.1. Study population

The European Community Respiratory Health Survey (ECRHS) is a population-based, international and prospective cohort study started in 1990.[24, 25] The participants were followed-up, in 1999-2001 and in 2010-2013. The present analysis is based on women participating in all three surveys (over 20 years) from 18 study centres in nine countries (Huelva, Albacete, Barcelona, Galdakao and Oviedo in Spain, Grenoble and Paris in France, Erfurt in Germany, Antwerp South and Antwerp City in Belgium, Ipswich and Norwich in the United Kingdom, Gothenburg, Uppsala and Umea in Sweden, Tartu in Estonia, Reykjavik in Iceland as well as Bergen in Norway). For the current study, we excluded women with premature menopause before the age of 40 years (N=157), thus we included a total of 1955 women. The examinations consisted of an interviewer-led questionnaire on anthropometrics, lifestyle factors and reproductive health as well as blood sampling for a subgroup of the population. Further details about the cohort have been published elsewhere.[25, 26] Ethical approval was obtained from the appropriate ethics committees of each study centre and all participants provided informed written consent.

2.2. Outcome characterization

To define the outcome, age at menopause, we used the reported age at the last menstrual period. Women for whom hormone measurements were available (N=1308) were classified as menopausal if 17β-estradiol was below 74 pmol/L and at the same time Follicle Stimulating Hormone (FSH) was above 80 IU/L. For study centres with available blood samples, we measured FSH using enzyme-linked immunosorbent assays (Demeditec Diagnostics, Germany) and 17β-estradiol was measured using liquid chromatography-tandem mass spectrometry at the Core Facility for Metabolomics (University of Bergen, 2017).[27] The

between day coefficient of variation, expressed as the standard deviation of the daily means of the quality control samples multiplied by 100, divided by their total mean, for the FSH analysis was 7.0% and accuracy was 106%. The between day coefficients of variation for the 17β-estradiol analysis ranged from 4.4% to 7.8% (high to low concentrations) and accuracy was 96%. Women lacking hormone measurements were classified as menopausal if they reported the removal of both ovaries (bilateral oophorectomy) or no menstrual periods (amenorrhea) for at least 12 months.

2.3. Greenspace exposure

We applied Normalized Difference Vegetation Index (NDVI) to characterize greenspace surrounding residential addresses of each participant during the course of the study.[28] NDVI is a satellite-derived index, calculated based on the knowledge that plants strongly absorb visible red light (RED) for use in photosynthesis while strongly reflecting near-infrared light (NIR) to prevent overheating. The equation for NDVI is based on spectral reflectance measurements acquired in corresponding light wavelengths: NDVI = (NIR – RED) / (NIR + RED). Thus, NDVI values are unitless and range from −1 to +1, with higher numbers indicating more photosynthetically active land-cover.[29] The NDVI was calculated from Landsat 4-5 Thematic Mapper satellite images for all included study centres from satellite images taken during most vegetation-rich months close in time to all three ECRHS surveys at a resolution of 30m by 30m. The specific images are listed in the online data supplement (Supplementary table 1). Residential surrounding greenspace was defined as the mean value of NDVI in a circular 300m buffer around each participant's residential address at each survey. Thus, all NDVI variables are time-specific even if the home address of a participant remained the same across study waves. For the statistical analysis, time-specific NDVI estimates were averaged over available surveys in line with Dadvand et al.[30]

2.4. Statistical analyses

2.4.1. Main analyses

Given the multi-level nature of our data (individuals within study centres), we conducted survival analysis, applying a mixed effects Cox regression model with menopause as the survival object (event), age as the time indicator, residential surrounding greenspace as the time-varying fixed effect predictor, and centre as random effect. For nonmenopausal women, the age at the third survey was included as censored observation. The model was adjusted for an *a priori* selected set of covariates: smoking habit at the third survey (lifelong non-smoker (reference); ex-smoker; current smoker), body mass index (BMI) at baseline, parity (continuous), age at menarche (continuous), ever-use of oral contraception (yes/no), and age at completed full-time education (<17 years (reference); 17-20 years; >20 years) as a proxy for socioeconomic status. The exponential of the resulting regression coefficient, the Hazard Ratio (HR), represents an instantaneous risk of the event. Hazard ratios are reported for increments of one interquartile range and the predicted median age at menopause is reported for the overall population as well as for each quartile of NDVI. We evaluated linearity by plotting a locally weighted estimate smooth of the NDVI against the Martingale residuals of the null Cox proportional hazards model (Supplementary figure 2).

2.4.2. Sensitivity analyses

For our main analyses, we chose a circular 300m buffer to abstract residential surrounding greenspace. To investigate the robustness of our findings to this choice, we abstracted alternative sets of residential surrounding greenspace, using buffers of 100m and 500m. We repeated the analyses using these exposure estimates. To explore consistency across geographic and cultural borders, we conducted a random effects meta-analysis of the centre-specific associations. To investigate potential differences due to urbanicity we repeated the

analyses separately for areas that were classified as densely or thinly populated throughout the study period, according to the standard European classification of degree of urbanisation.[31] In order to ensure results were not driven by surgical menopause or gynaecological conditions we repeated the analyses, separately by excluding women who reported oophorectomy, removal of the womb (hysterectomy), persistent irregular menstruation, which is suggestive of polycystic ovary syndrome (PCOS) or had ever used hormone replacement therapy (HRT). Furthermore, to increase the understanding of the relationship between residential surrounding greenspace and age at menopause we ran models with additional adjustment for a proxy of air pollution (averaged nitrogen dioxide exposure estimated at the participants' residential address(es) in 2005, 2006, 2007 and 2010[32, 33]), averaged particulate matter with a diameter of 2.5 μm or less, measured at each survey (PM$_{2.5}$), averaged particulate matter with a diameter between 2.5 and 10 μm, measured at each survey (PM$_{10}$), traffic noise (approximated by the self-reported frequency of cars and trucks passing in close proximity to the residential address), occupation (managers and professionals, non-manual labourer; manual labourer; unclassifiable) and physical activity (self-reported frequency and duration at the second survey, as baseline data was not available), respectively. Lastly, since residential surrounding greenspace is included as a time varying variable in the model it is possible that part of the exposure happens only after the event (e.g. participants moving to a greener area after menopause). To ensure this was not distorting associations, we repeated the analysis limited to participants who lived in areas with similar greenspace across the study period (NDVI ±0.05, N=763).

2.4.3. Further analyses

We carried out stratified analyses and tested for interactions as the effect of greenspace on age at menopause, e.g. through specific use, may depend in some way on smoking habits, as

current smoking is a strong predictor of earlier menopause,[12] BMI categories (18-25 kg/m²; <18 kg/m²; 25-30 kg/m²; >30 kg/m²), as adipose tissue has endocrine activity,[34] age at completed full-time education, since health benefits of exposure to greenspace might vary across the strata of education[35, 36] and an older age at completed full-time education is associated with an older age at menopause[37, 38]; We further stratified the study population into Southern Europe (Albacete, Huelva, Galdakao, Oviedo and Barcelona), Central Europe (Grenoble, Paris, Erfurt, Antwerp South, Antwerp City, Ipswich and Norwich) and Northern Europe (Gothenburg, Tartu, Uppsala, Bergen, Umea and Reykjavik) to evaluate potential differences of the effect of greenspace between different parts of Europe. We tested as well for an exposure – response relationship using the Mann Kendall trend test. All analyses were performed using R (version 3.5.1).[39-42]

3. RESULTS

The current study included 1955 women of whom 1224 became menopausal during the study period. Characteristics of all participants and participants stratified by menopausal status at the third survey are presented in Table 1. The median NDVI for the 300m buffer was 0.263 (IQR: 0.116 – 0.366). The NDVI distribution across centres is presented as boxplot in the supplementary material (Supplementary figure 1).

Table 1. Characteristics of the study population by menopausal status, median [IQR] unless specified otherwise;

	All	Nonmenopausal	Menopausal	p-value[1]
N	1955	731	1224	
Age (3rd survey), [years]	54.2 [48.1 - 59.8]	46.7 [44.0 - 49.8]	58.0 [54.4 - 62.1]	<0.001
Age at menarche, [years]	13.0 [12.0 - 14.0]	13.0 [12.0 - 14.0]	13.0 [12.0 - 14.0]	0.317
Age at completed education, n (%)				<0.001
< 17 years	400 (20.5)	101 (13.8)	299 (24.4)	
17-20 years	656 (33.6)	258 (35.3)	398 (32.5)	
> 20 years	899 (46.0)	372 (50.9)	527 (43.1)	
BMI (baseline), [kg/m^2]	22.5 [20.6 - 25.0]	22.0 [20.2 - 24.5]	22.8 [20.9 - 25.3]	<0.001
Smoking habit (3rd survey), n (%)				0.002
Lifelong nonsmoker	944 (48.3)	354 (48.4)	590 (48.2)	
Ex-smoker	676 (34.6)	226 (30.9)	450 (36.8)	
Current smoker	335 (17.1)	151 (20.7)	184 (15.0)	
17β-estradiol (3rd survey), [pmol/L]	23.0 [8.8 - 185.6]	218.4 [115.6 - 381.5]	11.9 [6.6 - 23.3]	<0.001
FSH^2 (3rd survey), [IU/L]	87.5 [17.9 - 147.2]	14.3 [8.9 - 26.2]	131.0 [92.2 - 174.2]	<0.001
Parity	2.0 [1.0 - 2.0]	2.0 [1.0 - 2.0]	2.0 [1.0 - 2.0]	0.947
Ever use of oral contraception, n (%)	1513 (77.4)	602 (82.4)	911 (74.4)	<0.001

[1]Difference between menopausal and nonmenopausal women (Chi squared test for categorical variables and Mann-Whitney U test for continuous variables)
[2]Follicle Stimulating Hormone

3.1. Main analyses

A one IQR increase in residential surrounding greenspace was associated with a 19% lower risk of being menopausal (Hazard ratio (HR): 0.81, 95% CI: 0.73 – 0.88) in the crude model and a 13% lower risk of being menopausal (HR: 0.87, 95% CI: 0.79 – 0.95) in the adjusted model. The estimated median age at menopause was 50.6 years (95% Confidence Interval (CI): 50.3 – 50.9 years), adjusted for smoking habit at the third survey, BMI at baseline, parity, age at menarche, ever-use of oral contraception and age at completed full-time

education. Stratified by quartiles of NDVI, the estimated ages at menopause were 50.3 years (95% CI: 49.9 – 50.7 years), 50.0 years (95% CI: 49.7 – 50.9 years), 51.0 years (95% CI: 50.5 – 51.4 years) and 51.7 years (95% CI: 51.0 – 52.0 years), for the first, second, third, and fourth quartile, respectively (see Figure 1).

Women living in areas with little greenspace (1st NDVI quartile) became menopausal 1.4 years earlier compared with women living in highly green areas (4th NDVI quartile). The Mann-Kendall trend test did not show a statistically significant exposure – response relationship (p_{trend}=0.17) for the median age at menopause. However, women exposed to NDVI below the median (quartiles 1 and 2) had a significantly lower age at menopause (50.0 years, 95% CI: 49.8 – 50.5 years) compared to women in quartiles 3 and 4, who were exposed to NDVI above the median (51.3 years, 95% CI: 50.7 – 51.7, p_{T-Test}=0.008).


Figure 1. Survival curves for each quartile of NDVI (dashed lines: median age at menopause for each group)

3.2. Sensitivity analyses

The combined estimate resulting from the random effects meta-analysis was consistent with that of the main analysis in terms of direction, strength, and statistical significance (HR: 0.88, 95%CI: 0.78 – 0.98; I^2 = 48.6%, 95% CI: 6.6% – 71.7%), despite the inverse association of the study centre Albacete and formally not significant trends for several other centres (Figure 2). The sensitivity analysis, investigating consistently urban and rural areas separately, showed a lower HR for rural areas, although confidence intervals completely overlapped (Supplementary figure 3). Sensitivity analyses using the exposure estimates of 100m and 500m buffers, excluding gynaecological conditions and further adjustment of the analyses for air pollution, traffic related noise, occupation and physical activity, showed similar results compared with the main analysis (Supplementary figure 3).

Study centre	95%-CI	Weight
Huelva	1.16 [0.63; 1.69]	2.7%
Albacete	1.63 [1.10; 2.16]	2.7%
Barcelona	1.11 [0.53; 1.70]	2.3%
Galdakao	1.08 [0.74; 1.42]	5.2%
Oviedo	0.88 [0.63; 1.14]	7.4%
Grenoble	0.74 [0.56; 0.92]	9.8%
Paris	0.92 [0.75; 1.09]	10.2%
Erfurt	0.95 [0.72; 1.18]	8.2%
Antwerp South	1.21 [0.60; 1.82]	2.1%
Antwerp City	0.79 [0.25; 1.32]	2.6%
Ipswich	0.56 [0.30; 0.83]	7.0%
Norwich	1.21 [0.74; 1.69]	3.2%
Gothenburg	0.68 [0.41; 0.94]	7.1%
Tartu	0.65 [0.28; 1.01]	4.8%
Uppsala	0.70 [0.45; 0.95]	7.5%
Bergen	0.79 [0.47; 1.11]	5.6%
Umea	1.03 [0.62; 1.44]	4.0%
Reykjavik	0.95 [0.70; 1.19]	7.6%
Summary	0.88 [0.78; 0.98]	100.0%

Hazard ratio

Figure 2. Meta-analysis of study centres specific associations, ordered by ascending geographical latitude;

3.2. Further analyses

Stratifying the main model by age at completed full-time education, BMI, geographic location and smoking habits showed an interaction between NDVI and age at completed full-time education ($p_{interaction}$=0.002), as well as with geographic location ($p_{interaction}$=0.01), but not with BMI or smoking habit (Supplementary figure 4). While there was no clear pattern for age at completed full-time education, we found that the effect of greenspace is strongest in Northern Europe, it becomes weaker in Central Europe and attenuates in Southern Europe.

4. DISCUSSION

To our knowledge, this is the first study investigating associations between exposure to greenspace and age at menopause. It was based on prospectively collected data of a well-established representative cohort including 1955 women living across Europe who were followed over 20 years, together with time-varying measures of greenspace over the course of the study. We observed that higher residential surrounding greenspace was associated with an older age at menopause and these findings were robust to a number of sensitivity analyses. Due to the lack of other studies it is not possible to compare our findings with those of others; however, our observed associations are plausible because of several potential underlying mechanisms: Stress in humans is reflected by a high level of cortisol,[43] which is reduced by exposure to greenspace.[44-47] Lower cortisol levels have in turn been associated with higher 17β-estradiol levels,[48] which makes it plausible that women with less stress, thus lower cortisol, might maintain higher 17β-estradiol levels and therefore transition later into menopause. It seems nevertheless likely that this process is multi-factorial, since both 17β-estradiol and cortisol play crucial roles in many physiological processes. Other possible influence may originate from 17β-estradiol increasing the cortisol-mediated negative feedback on adrenocorticotropic hormone secretion.[49] Additionally, exposure to greenspace is

associated with reduced mental health conditions, such as depression,[50] which in turn is associated with younger age at menopause.[51] Unfortunately, we did not have appropriate data on stress to validate this assumption.

We found only minor changes in effect estimates after additional adjustment for several factors, which are generally being hypothesized to facilitate beneficial mechanisms of greenspace (urbanicity, air pollution, traffic noise). While these factors are associated with greenspace, there appears to be no association with age at menopause. The results were also not driven by changing address, surgical menopause, gynaecological conditions, or smoking, as there appears to be an association with age at menopause, but not with greenspace exposure. The existing evidence for an association of physical activity with age at menopause is rather weak[12] and inconsistent, concerning the association with greenspace.[22, 52] It seems likely that different components of greenspace exposure promote different health benefits.

We observed a suggestion for potentially different associations for categories of age at completed full-time education and geographic location. Concerning education, associations are strongest for the low and high education levels at the same time, which hints towards differing mechanisms. Population groups with low socioeconomic status are hypothesized to have the worst health status and may therefore benefit more from their surrounding greenspace than groups with an intermediate socioeconomic status, hence better health despite a similar living environment. In comparison, the group with the highest socioeconomic status is able to afford living in areas with the highest exposure to greenspace and possesses over the highest mobility, which may explain the observed association. The stratified analyses showed further that the effect of greenspace becomes stronger from Southern to Northern Europe, which might be due to different land use and socioeconomic situations. We have however no evidence-supported explanation for the variation between proximate centres and the inverse association in the study centre Albacete. We suppose there

are two main factors influencing the observed variation; one is the available amount of greenspace and the other is the type and/or quality of greenspace, which predefines use.

It is noteworthy that the median residential surrounding greenspace in the three southernmost centres (Huelva, Albacete and Barcelona) is extremely low ($NDVI_{Huelva}$ = 0.03, ~~median~~ $NDVI_{Albacete}$ = 0.02 $NDVI_{Barcelona}$ = 0.06 vs. $NDVI_{All\ centres}$ = 0.26), which might explain the observed associations. For the other two centres with an effect estimate above 1.10 (Antwerp South and Norwich) it is less clear, why effect estimates are as high, especially compared to neighbouring centres (Antwerp City and Ipswich). We hypothesize that subtle differences in location (use of greenspace) and microclimate as well as seasonal fluctuations (availability of greenspace) might be responsible for the differences. For instance, both Antwerp City and Ipswich are located in close proximity to a natural river delta, which might be used recreationally.

Our study faced some limitations. We did not have information on the use of greenspace or the time spent in the neighborhood. Applying satellite-derived NDVI enabled us to characterize greenspace surrounding residential addresses of participants in different parts of Europe and different time points in a standardized and objective way; however, NDVI, is not able to separate different types of vegetation nor provide information on quality aspects of greenspace which may affect the use of greenspace and in consequence could have influenced our findings. Also investigations of health effects of greenspace should ideally be additionally adjusted for socio-economic status at a neighbourhood level to minimize the likelihood of residual confounding. Despite not having access to indicators of neighbourhood socio-economic status, our findings were robust to adjustment for the age at completed full-time education, as well as to additional adjustment for occupation.

Moreover, we did not have appropriate stress data and to determine the menopausal status for women without available hormone measurements we relied on self-reported data on menstruation and oophorectomy, which could have introduced recall bias. However, existing literature shows that women report reproductive data with high reliability.[53-58] Since menopause can only be determined retrospectively, the well-established criteria (12 months without menstrual period)[59] could have lead to minor misclassifications e.g. excluding women who became recently menopausal or including women with amenorrhea due to other reasons.

Conclusions

We observed that living in greener neighbourhoods is associated with 1.4 years older median age at menopause (1st NDVI quartile vs. 4th NDVI quartile), even after adjusting for smoking and factors related to socioeconomic status. Residing in green spaces might reduce stress- and thereby promote an older age at menopause. These findings, if confirmed by future studies, could add to the evidence base for policymakers to implement interventions aimed at decelerating reproductive aging in our rapidly urbanizing world. In order to shed more light on this topic, further studies should focus on mechanisms of greenspace and their effect on likely underlying processes for menopause such as the ovarian follicle count.

5. References

1.   Lawlor DA, Ebrahim S, Smith GD. The association of socio-economic position across the life course and age at menopause: the British Women's Heart and Health Study. BJOG: An International Journal of Obstetrics & Gynaecology 2004; 110:1078-87.
2.   Parazzini F, Negri E, La Vecchia C. Reproductive and general lifestyle determinants of age at menopause. Maturitas 1992; 15:141-9.
3.   Gold EB. The Timing of the Age at Which Natural Menopause Occurs. Obstetrics and Gynecology Clinics 2011; 38:425-40.
4.   Triebner K, Matulonga B, Johannessen A, Suske S, Benediktsdottir B, Demoly P, et al. Menopause Is Associated with Accelerated Lung Function Decline. Am J Respir Crit Care Med 2017; 195:1058-65.
5.   Triebner K, Johannessen A, Puggini L, Benediktsdottir B, Bertelsen RJ, Bifulco E, et al. Menopause as a predictor of new-onset asthma: A longitudinal Northern European population study. J Allergy Clin Immunol 2016; 137:50-7 e6.
6.   Levine ME, Lu AT, Chen BH, Hernandez DG, Singleton AB, Ferrucci L, et al. Menopause accelerates biological aging. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 2016; 113:9327-32.
7.   Martinez Perez JA, Palacios S, Garcia FC, Perez M. Assessing osteoporosis risk factors in Spanish menopausal women. Gynecol Endocrinol 2011; 27:807-13.
8.   Blumel JE, Castelo-Branco C, Binfa L, Gramegna G, Tacla X, Aracena B, et al. Quality of life after the menopause: a population study. Maturitas 2000; 34:17-23.
9.   Ossewaarde ME, Bots ML, Verbeek AL, Peeters PH, van der Graaf Y, Grobbee DE, et al. Age at menopause, cause-specific mortality and total life expectancy. Epidemiology 2005; 16:556-62.
10.   Jacobsen BK, Heuch I, Kvale G. Age at natural menopause and all-cause mortality: a 37-year follow-up of 19,731 Norwegian women. Am J Epidemiol 2003; 157:923-9.
11.   van der Schouw YT, van der Graaf Y, Steyerberg EW, Eijkemans JC, Banga JD. Age at menopause as a risk factor for cardiovascular mortality. Lancet 1996; 347:714-8.
12.   Dratva J, Gomez Real F, Schindler C, Ackermann-Liebrich U, Gerbase MW, Probst-Hensch NM, et al. Is age at menopause increasing across Europe? Results on age at menopause and determinants from two population-based studies. Menopause 2009; 16:385-94.
13.   Parazzini F. Determinants of age at menopause in women attending menopause clinics in Italy. Maturitas 2007; 56:280-7.
14.   Gold EB, Bromberger J, Crawford S, Samuels S, Greendale GA, Harlow SD, et al. Factors Associated with Age at Natural Menopause in a Multiethnic Sample of Midlife Women. American Journal of Epidemiology 2001; 153:865-74.
15.   Nagel G, Altenburg H-P, Nieters A, Boffetta P, Linseisen J. Reproductive and dietary determinants of the age at menopause in EPIC-Heidelberg. Maturitas 2005; 52:337-47.
16.   Twohig-Bennett C, Jones A. The health benefits of the great outdoors: A systematic review and meta-analysis of greenspace exposure and health outcomes. Environ Res 2018; 166:628-37.
17.   Gascon M, Triguero-Mas M, Martinez D, Dadvand P, Forns J, Plasencia A, et al. Mental health benefits of long-term exposure to residential green and blue spaces: a systematic review. Int J Environ Res Public Health 2015; 12:4354-79.
18.   Kondo MC, Fluehr JM, McKeon T, Branas CC. Urban Green Space and Its Impact on Human Health. Int J Environ Res Public Health 2018; 15.

19. Gidlow CJ, Jones MV, Hurst G, Masterson D, Clark-Carter D, Tarvainen MP, et al. Where to put your best foot forward: Psycho-physiological responses to walking in natural and urban environments. Journal of Environmental Psychology 2016; 45:22-9.

20. Roe JJ, Thompson CW, Aspinall PA, Brewer MJ, Duff EI, Miller D, et al. Green space and stress: evidence from cortisol measures in deprived urban communities. Int J Environ Res Public Health 2013; 10:4086-103.

21. Lee J, Park BJ, Tsunetsugu Y, Ohira T, Kagawa T, Miyazaki Y. Effect of forest bathing on physiological and psychological responses in young Japanese male subjects. Public Health 2011; 125:93-100.

22. Markevych I, Schoierer J, Hartig T, Chudnovsky A, Hystad P, Dzhambov AM, et al. Exploring pathways linking greenspace to health: Theoretical and methodological guidance. Environ Res 2017; 158:301-17.

23. Bromberger JT, Matthews KA, Kuller LH, Wing RR, Meilahn EN, Plantinga P. Prospective Study of the Determinants of Age at Menopause. American Journal of Epidemiology 1997; 145:124-33.

24. Janson C, Anto J, Burney P, Chinn S, de Marco R, Heinrich J, et al. The European Community Respiratory Health Survey: what are the main results so far? European Community Respiratory Health Survey II. Eur Respir J 2001; 18:598-611.

25. Burney PG, Luczynska C, Chinn S, Jarvis D. The European Community Respiratory Health Survey. Eur Respir J 1994; 7:954-60.

26. Committee. TECRHSIS. The European Community Respiratory Health Survey II. Eur Resp J:1071-9.

27. Triebner K, Bifulco E, Real F, Hustad S. A sensitive method for estrogen profiling in human serum by liquid chromatography–tandem mass spectrometry. 16th European Congress of Endocrinology. Wrocław, Poland: Endocrine Abstracts (2014), 2014.

28. Tucker CJ. Red and photographic infrared linear combinations for monitoring vegetation. Remote Sensing of Environment 1979; 8:127-50.

29. National Aeronautics and Space Administration. NASA earth observatory. 2018.

30. Dadvand P, Tischer C, Estarlich M, Llop S, Dalmau-Bueno A, Lopez-Vicente M, et al. Lifelong Residential Exposure to Green Space and Attention: A Population-based Prospective Study. Environ Health Perspect 2017; 125:097016.

31. European Commission. Degree of urbanisation classification - 2011 revision. 2011:DG AGRI and DG REGIO of the European Commission with the support of the Joint Research Center (JRC) and Eurostat.

32. Sunyer J, Jarvis D, Gotschi T, Garcia-Esteban R, Jacquemin B, Aguilera I, et al. Chronic bronchitis and urban air pollution in an international study. Occupational and Environmental Medicine 2006; 63:836.

33. Castro-Giner F, Künzli N, Jacquemin B, Forsberg B, de Cid R, Sunyer J, et al. Traffic-related air pollution, oxidative stress genes, and asthma (ECHRS). Environmental health perspectives 2009; 117:1919-24.

34. Kershaw EE, Flier JS. Adipose tissue as an endocrine organ. J Clin Endocrinol Metab 2004; 89:2548-56.

35. Maas J, Verheij RA, Groenewegen PP, de Vries S, Spreeuwenberg P. Green space, urbanity, and health: how strong is the relation? Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health 2006; 60:587-92.

36. McEachan RRC, Prady SL, Smith G, Fairley L, Cabieses B, Gidlow C, et al. The association between green space and depressive symptoms in pregnant women: moderating roles of socioeconomic status and physical activity. Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health 2016; 70:253.

37.   Li L, Wu J, Pu D, Zhao Y, Wan C, Sun L, et al. Factors associated with the age of natural menopause and menopausal symptoms in Chinese women. Maturitas 2012; 73:354-60.

38.   Gold EB, Crawford SL, Avis NE, Crandall CJ, Matthews KA, Waetjen LE, et al. Factors related to age at natural menopause: longitudinal analyses from SWAN. Am J Epidemiol 2013; 178:70-83.

39.   R Development Core Team. R: A language and environment for statistical computing.: R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria, 2018.

40.   Therneau Terry. A Package for Survival Analysis in S. 2015.

41.   Therneau TM. coxme: Mixed Effects Cox Models. 2018.

42.   Gordon M, Lumley T. forestplot: Advanced Forest Plot Using 'grid' Graphics. 2017.

43.   Kudielka BM, Kirschbaum C. Sex differences in HPA axis responses to stress: a review. Biol Psychol 2005; 69:113-32.

44.   Tyrväinen L, Ojala A, Korpela K, Lanki T, Tsunetsugu Y, Kagawa T. The influence of urban green environments on stress relief measures: A field experiment. Journal of Environmental Psychology 2014; 38:1-9.

45.   Beil K, Hanes D. The influence of urban natural and built environments on physiological and psychological measures of stress--a pilot study. Int J Environ Res Public Health 2013; 10:1250-67.

46.   Van Den Berg AE, Custers MH. Gardening promotes neuroendocrine and affective restoration from stress. J Health Psychol 2011; 16:3-11.

47.   Ewert A, Chang Y. Levels of Nature and Stress Response. Behav Sci (Basel) 2018; 8.

48.   Roney JR, Simmons ZL. Elevated Psychological Stress Predicts Reduced Estradiol Concentrations in Young Women. Adaptive Human Behavior and Physiology 2015; 1:30-40.

49.   Sharma AN, Aoun P, Wigham JR, Weist SM, Veldhuis JD. Estradiol, but not testosterone, heightens cortisol-mediated negative feedback on pulsatile ACTH secretion and ACTH approximate entropy in unstressed older men and women. American Journal of Physiology - Regulatory, Integrative and Comparative Physiology 2014; 306:R627-R35.

50.   Sugiyama T, Leslie E, Giles-Corti B, Owen N. Associations of neighbourhood greenness with physical and mental health: do walking, social coherence and local social interaction explain the relationships? Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health 2008; 62:e9.

51.   Harlow BL, Cramer DW, Annis KM. Association of Medically Treated Depression and Age at Natural Menopause. American Journal of Epidemiology 1995; 141:1170-6.

52.   Lachowycz K, Jones AP. Greenspace and obesity: a systematic review of the evidence. Obes Rev 2011; 12:e183-9.

53.   Garamszegi C, Dennerstein L, Dudley E, Guthrie JR, Ryan M, Burger H. Menopausal status: subjectively and objectively defined. J Psychosom Obstet Gynaecol 1998; 19:165-73.

54.   Taylor SM, Kinney AM, Kline JK. Menopausal transition: predicting time to menopause for women 44 years or older from simple questions on menstrual variability. Menopause 2004; 11:40-8.

55.   Real FG, Svanes C, Omenaas ER, Anto JM, Plana E, Jarvis D, et al. Lung function, respiratory symptoms, and the menopausal transition. J Allergy Clin Immunol 2008; 121:72-80.e3.

56.   Real FG, Svanes C, Omenaas ER, Anto JM, Plana E, Janson C, et al. Menstrual irregularity and asthma and lung function. J Allergy Clin Immunol 2007; 120:557-64.

57. Harlow SD, Crawford SL, Sommer B, Greendale GA. Self-defined menopausal status in a multi-ethnic sample of midlife women. Maturitas 2000; 36:93-112.

58. Brambilla DJ, McKinlay SM, Johannes CB. Defining the perimenopause for application in epidemiologic investigations. Am J Epidemiol 1994; 140:1091-5.

59. Harlow SD, Gass M, Hall JE, Lobo R, Maki P, Rebar RW, et al. Executive summary of the Stages of Reproductive Aging Workshop + 10: addressing the unfinished agenda of staging reproductive aging. Menopause 2012; 19:387-95.