

# Supplementary Information

## Nurturing Resilient Cities: A Systematic Literature Review of Community Gardens' Contribution to Sustainability, 1992-2021

Galia Oriya Cukierman, Demi Coenraads, Emmy Iwarsson, Tong Wu, Alon Shepon

**Table S1** - Keywords applied in the literature review

Field of Research	Keywords applied in the literature review
UA	<b>In title:</b> "urban agri*" OR "urban farm*" OR "city agri*"  <b>Excluding from the keywords (AND NOT):</b> "community garden*" OR "resident* garden*" OR "neighborhood garden*"
CG	<b>In title:</b> "community garden*" OR "resident* garden*" OR "neighborhood garden*"

**Table S2** – Sources of Databases Used in the Research

Sources of databases used for academic literature
CAB Abstracts, OpenAIRE, Scopus®, Gale Academic OneFile, Agricola, Complementary Index, Social Sciences Citation Index, Academic Search Premier, JSTOR Journals, Business Source Complete, Science Citation Index Expanded, SocINDEX with Full Text, RePEc, EconLit, GreenFILE, ScienceDirect, MEDLINE, OpenDissertations, Springer Nature Journals, Arts & Humanities Citation Index, Education Source, J-STAGE, MLA International Bibliography with Full Text, ERIC, Political Science Complete, Gale OneFile: LegalTrac, GeoRef, HeinOnline, Historical Abstracts with Full Text, Times Digital Archive, LexisNexis Academic: Law Reviews, Directory of Open Access Journals, eScholarship, CINAHL Complete, Atla Religion Database with AtlaSerials, Index Islamicus, Art Index (H.W. Wilson), eBook Academic Collection (EBSCOhost), eBook Index, eBook Collection (EBSCOhost)

### S3 - Locations of the research of CGs after reading the articles:

America leads the research on CGs with 59% of all the articles, followed by Europe (20%) and Australia (10%).

The lowest proportion of CGs research is conducted in Asia (6%) and Africa (4%).

### S4 - Examples of topic combinations in the literature:

- Articles combining **social** and **health** topics are mostly centered on well-being, a sense of community, social benefits, social connections, and inclusiveness.
- **Environmental** and **health** topics are often focused on soil contamination.
- Articles dealing with **social** topics and **food** deal primarily with education about growing food, food justice, civic engagement, social relationships, child development, food security, and accessibility.
- Articles blending **social** topics and **urbanism** present drivers and barriers of CGs, citizenship, governance, urban greening, garden management, and public space planning.
- Articles on **food** and **health** topics address consumption patterns, dietary choices, nutrition, healthy food perceptions, and attitudes.

### S5 - The PRISMA 2020 Checklist

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
<b>TITLE</b>			
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review.	p. 1
<b>ABSTRACT</b>			
Abstract	2	1. Identify the report as a systematic review	p.2
		2. Provide an explicit statement of the main objective(s) or question(s) the review addresses	p.2
		3. Specify the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the review	p.2
		4. Specify the information sources (such as databases, registers) used to identify studies and the date when each was last searched	p.2
		5. Specify the methods used to assess risk of bias in the included studies	N/A
		6. Specify the methods used to present and synthesise results	p.2
		7. Give the total number of included studies and participants and summarise relevant characteristics of studies	p.2

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
		8. Present results for main outcomes, preferably indicating the number of included studies and participants for each. If meta-analysis was done, report the summary estimate and confidence/credible interval. If comparing groups, indicate the direction of the effect (that is, which group is favoured)	p.2
		9. Provide a brief summary of the limitations of the evidence included in the review (such as study risk of bias, inconsistency, and imprecision)	N/A
		10. Provide a general interpretation of the results and important implications	p.2
		11. Specify the primary source of funding for the review	p.17
		12. Provide the register name and registration number	-
INTRODUCTION			
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of existing knowledge.	pp. 3-4
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of the objective(s) or question(s) the review addresses.	p. 4
METHODS			
Eligibility criteria	5	Specify the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the review and how studies were grouped for the syntheses.	p. 8
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.	pp. 5-6
Search strategy	7	Present the full search strategies for all databases, registers and websites, including any filters and limits used.	pp. 5-6
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.	p.8
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.	p.8
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.	p.8 + Supplementary
	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.	p. 8
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.	N/A
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.	N/A
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)).	N/A
	13b	Describe any methods required to prepare the data for presentation or synthesis, such as handling of missing summary statistics, or data conversions.	p. 8 + Supplementary
	13c	Describe any methods used to tabulate or visually display results of individual studies and syntheses.	p. 8 + Supplementary
	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.	N/A
	13e	Describe any methods used to explore possible causes of heterogeneity among study results (e.g. subgroup analysis, meta-regression).	N/A
	13f	Describe any sensitivity analyses conducted to assess robustness of the synthesized results.	N/A
Reporting bias assessment	14	Describe any methods used to assess risk of bias due to missing results in a synthesis (arising from reporting biases).	N/A
Certainty	15	Describe any methods used to assess certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for an outcome.	N/A

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
assessment			
<b>RESULTS</b>			
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.	p. 7
	16b	Cite studies that might appear to meet the inclusion criteria, but which were excluded, and explain why they were excluded.	p. 8
Study characteristics	17	Cite each included study and present its characteristics.	Supplementary
Risk of bias in studies	18	Present assessments of risk of bias for each included study.	N/A
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.	N/A
Results of syntheses	20a	For each synthesis, briefly summarise the characteristics and risk of bias among contributing studies.	N/A
	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.	N/A
	20c	Present results of all investigations of possible causes of heterogeneity among study results.	N/A
	20d	Present results of all sensitivity analyses conducted to assess the robustness of the synthesized results.	N/A
Reporting biases	21	Present assessments of risk of bias due to missing results (arising from reporting biases) for each synthesis assessed.	N/A
Certainty of evidence	22	Present assessments of certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for each outcome assessed.	N/A
<b>DISCUSSION</b>			
Discussion	23a	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence.	pp. 15-17
	23b	Discuss any limitations of the evidence included in the review.	pp. 15-16
	23c	Discuss any limitations of the review processes used.	pp. 5-6; 8; 12
	23d	Discuss implications of the results for practice, policy, and future research.	pp. 15-17
<b>OTHER INFORMATION</b>			
Registration and protocol	24a	Provide registration information for the review, including register name and registration number, or state that the review was not registered.	-
	24b	Indicate where the review protocol can be accessed, or state that a protocol was not prepared.	-
	24c	Describe and explain any amendments to information provided at registration or in the protocol.	-
Support	25	Describe sources of financial or non-financial support for the review, and the role of the funders or sponsors in the review.	p. 17
Competing interests	26	Declare any competing interests of review authors.	p. 17
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.	p. 17

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

For more information, visit: <http://www.prisma-statement.org/>