PRISMA 2020 Checklist

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
TITLE			
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review.	Title.
ABSTRACT			
Abstract	2	See the PRISMA 2020 for Abstracts checklist.	Abstract.
INTRODUCTION			
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of existing knowledge.	1. Introduction, paragraph 2–7.
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of the objective(s) or question(s) the review addresses.	1. Introduction, paragraph 7.
METHODS			
Eligibility criteria	5	Specify the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the review and how studies were grouped for the syntheses.	2. Methods, 2.2 Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria; Table 2.
Information sources	6	Specify all databases, registers, websites, organisations, reference lists and other sources searched or consulted to identify studies. Specify the date when each source was last searched or consulted.	2. Methods, 2.1. Search Strategy, paragraph 1.
Search strategy	7	Present the full search strategies for all databases, registers and websites, including any filters and limits used.	2. Methods, 2.1. Search Strategy; Table 1.
Selection process	8	Specify the methods used to decide whether a study met the inclusion criteria of the review, including how many reviewers screened each record and each report retrieved, whether they worked independently, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process.	2. Methods, 2.2. Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria and Table 2; 3. Results, paragraph 1 and Figure 3.
Data collection process	9	Specify the methods used to collect data from reports, including how many reviewers collected data from each report, whether they worked independently, any processes for obtaining or confirming data from study investigators, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process.	Methods, 2.3. Data Extraction and Analysis.
Data items	10a	List and define all outcomes for which data were sought. Specify whether all results that were compatible with each outcome domain in each study were sought (e.g. for all measures, time points, analyses), and if not, the methods used to decide which results to collect.	1. Introduction (conceptual definition of the three hierarchical pro-nature behavior outcomes: visitation, usage habits, alignment with nature); 3. Results, 3.2. Characteristics of Greenway-Related Pro-Nature

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
			Behaviors (description of their characteristics as primary outcomes of interest).
	10b	List and define all other variables for which data were sought (e.g. participant and intervention characteristics, funding sources). Describe any assumptions made about any missing or unclear information.	2. Methods, 2.3. Data Extraction and Analysis (definitions of behavior-type categories used for coding in Table 4, and greenway network–place variables used for data extraction in Table 5).
Study risk of bias assessment	11	Specify the methods used to assess risk of bias in the included studies, including details of the tool(s) used, how many reviewers assessed each study and whether they worked independently, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process.	2. Methods, 2.3. Data Extraction and Analysis, paragraph 1.
Effect measures	12	Specify for each outcome the effect measure(s) (e.g. risk ratio, mean difference) used in the synthesis or presentation of results.	Not applicable. No statistical effect measures were used; findings were synthesized narratively and through categorical frameworks.
Synthesis methods	13a	Describe the processes used to decide which studies were eligible for each synthesis (e.g. tabulating the study intervention characteristics and comparing against the planned groups for each synthesis (item #5)).	2. Methods, 2.3. Data Extraction and Analysis; 3. Results, 3.2. Characteristics of Greenway-Related Pro-Nature Behaviors, 3.3. Associations Between Pro-Nature Behaviors and Greenway Environments.
	13b	Describe any methods required to prepare the data for presentation or synthesis, such as handling of missing summary statistics, or data conversions.	Not applicable. This review is based on

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
			descriptive and categorical synthesis only and did not involve quantitative pooling, data conversions, or handling of missing summary statistics.
	13c	Describe any methods used to tabulate or visually display results of individual studies and syntheses.	2. Methods, 2.3. Data Extraction and Analysis; 3. Results, 3.3. Associations Between Pro-Nature Behaviors and Greenway Environments; Figures 1–3, 4–8; Tables 4–8; Supplementary Materials Tables S1–S3.
	13d	Describe any methods used to synthesize results and provide a rationale for the choice(s). If meta-analysis was performed, describe the model(s), method(s) to identify the presence and extent of statistical heterogeneity, and software package(s) used.	2. Methods, 2.3. Data Extraction and Analysis; 3. Results, 3.2. Characteristics of Greenway-Related Pro-Nature Behaviors, 3.3. Associations Between Pro-Nature Behaviors and Greenway Environments; 4. Discussion, 4.1. Activation Effect of Urban-Greenway–Ecological Network Coupling, 4.2. Anchoring and Enrichment Effect of Composite Place-Based Attributes, 4.3. Nurturing Effect

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
			Through Sustained Human–Nature Interaction.
	13e	Describe any methods used to explore possible causes of heterogeneity among study results (e.g. subgroup analysis, meta-regression).	2. Methods, 2.3. Data Extraction and Analysis; 3. Results, 3.2. Characteristics of Greenway-Related Pro-Nature Behaviors, 3.3. Associations Between Pro-Nature Behaviors and Greenway Environments Note: No statistical subgroup analyses or meta-regression were conducted in this review, and no software was used to detect statistical heterogeneity. Instead, we qualitatively explored potential sources of variation in study findings by (1) grouping and synthesizing the included studies according to three types of pro-nature behaviors (visitation, usage habits, and alignment with nature), and (2) comparing the roles of the same environmental indicators across these behavioral levels within the proposed network–

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
			place analytical framework.
	13f	Describe any sensitivity analyses conducted to assess robustness of the synthesized results.	Not applicable. No sensitivity analyses were conducted. Note: Although study quality was assessed using the CCAT (2. Methods, 2.3. Data Extraction and Analysis; 3. Results, 3.1.2. Quality Assessment), no additional sensitivity analyses were performed to test the robustness of the synthesized results.
Reporting bias assessment	14	Describe any methods used to assess risk of bias due to missing results in a synthesis (arising from reporting biases).	Not applicable. No methods were used to assess risk of bias due to missing results (reporting biases). Although study quality was assessed using the CCAT (2. Methods, 2.3. Data Extraction and Analysis; 3. Results, 3.1.2. Quality Assessment), no additional assessments of reporting bias or missing results were conducted.
Certainty assessment	15	Describe any methods used to assess certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for an outcome.	Not applicable. No specific methods were used to assess certainty

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
			(or confidence) in the overall body of evidence for any outcome. Although the methodological quality of individual studies was appraised using the CCAT (2. Methods, 2.3. Data Extraction and Analysis; 3. Results, 3.1.2. Quality Assessment), these assessments were not translated into a formal certainty-of-evidence rating for outcomes.
RESULTS			
Study selection	16a	Describe the results of the search and selection process, from the number of records identified in the search to the number of studies included in the review, ideally using a flow diagram.	3. Results, paragraph 1; Figure 3.
	16b	Cite studies that might appear to meet the inclusion criteria, but which were excluded, and explain why they were excluded.	2. Methods, 2.2. Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria, paragraph 2.
Study characteristics	17	Cite each included study and present its characteristics.	3. Results; 2. Methods, 2.3. Data Extraction and Table 4.
Risk of bias in studies	18	Present assessments of risk of bias for each included study.	2. Methods, 2.3. Data Extraction and Analysis; 3. Results, 3.1.2. Quality Assessment.
Results of individual studies	19	For all outcomes, present, for each study: (a) summary statistics for each group (where appropriate) and (b) an effect estimate and its precision (e.g. confidence/credible interval), ideally using structured tables or plots.	Not applicable – this review synthesizes findings narratively without study-level effect estimates for

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
			each outcome.
Results of syntheses	20a	For each synthesis, briefly summarise the characteristics and risk of bias among contributing studies.	3. Results, 3.1.1 Distribution of Study; 3.1.2 Quality Assessment; 3.2 Characteristics of Greenway-Related Pro-Nature Behaviors.
	20b	Present results of all statistical syntheses conducted. If meta-analysis was done, present for each the summary estimate and its precision (e.g. confidence/credible interval) and measures of statistical heterogeneity. If comparing groups, describe the direction of the effect.	Not applicable – no statistical syntheses or meta-analyses were conducted in this review.
	20c	Present results of all investigations of possible causes of heterogeneity among study results.	Not applicable – no formal investigations of causes of heterogeneity were conducted.
	20d	Present results of all sensitivity analyses conducted to assess the robustness of the synthesized results.	Not applicable – no sensitivity analyses were conducted to assess the robustness of the synthesized results.
Reporting biases	21	Present assessments of risk of bias due to missing results (arising from reporting biases) for each synthesis assessed.	Not applicable – no formal assessment of risk of bias due to missing results (reporting biases) was conducted in this review.
Certainty of evidence	22	Present assessments of certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for each outcome assessed.	Not applicable – no formal assessment of certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence was conducted in this review.
DISCUSSION			

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
Discussion	23a	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence.	4. Discussion; synthesized in 6. Conclusions.
	23b	Discuss any limitations of the evidence included in the review.	5. Limitations and Future Recommendations, paragraphs 2–3.
	23c	Discuss any limitations of the review processes used.	5. Limitations and Future Recommendations, paragraph 1 and paragraph 4.
	23d	Discuss implications of the results for practice, policy, and future research.	4. Discussion; 5. Limitations and Future Recommendations; and 6. Conclusions.
OTHER INFORMATION			
Registration and protocol	24a	Provide registration information for the review, including register name and registration number, or state that the review was not registered.	Note: This systematic review was not registered in any international or national prospective register of systematic reviews.
	24b	Indicate where the review protocol can be accessed, or state that a protocol was not prepared.	Note: A formal standalone review protocol was not prepared prior to conducting this systematic review. All pre-defined methodological details (e.g., search strategy, inclusion and exclusion criteria, and data extraction and analysis method) are comprehensively reported in 2.

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
			Methods and visualized via a PRISMA flow diagram (Figure 3) to ensure transparency.
	24c	Describe and explain any amendments to information provided at registration or in the protocol.	Note: There are no amendments to registration information or protocol content to report.
Support	25	Describe sources of financial or non-financial support for the review, and the role of the funders or sponsors in the review.	Funding.
Competing interests	26	Declare any competing interests of review authors.	Conflicts of Interest.
Availability of data, code and other materials	27	Report which of the following are publicly available and where they can be found: template data collection forms; data extracted from included studies; data used for all analyses; analytic code; any other materials used in the review.	Data Availability Statement.

From: Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. BMJ 2021;372:n71. doi: 10.1136/bmj.n71. This work is licensed under CC BY 4.0. To view a copy of this license, visit https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/