

Supplementary Materials

We examined the correlation of variables using bivariate correlation analysis (Table S1). The perceived quantity of UGS was found to be significantly and positively correlated with total UGS and greenery coverage. Total UGS was also significantly and positively associated with greenery coverage. To explore the interaction among different UGS types, we examined the correlation between cropland, forest, grassland, and the sum of them. The results (Table S2) showed that the quantity of grasslands was found to be significantly and positively correlated with the number of forests only, and the correlation was rather weak (Spearman's coefficient = 0.161, $p < 0.05$). The farmland and forests were significantly and positively correlated with the total amount of UGS.

Table S1. Correlation check of perceived UGS quantity variables.

	Perceived Quantity	Total number	Greenery coverage
Perceived Quantity	1.000		
Total number of UGS	.612**	1.000	
Greenery coverage	.489**	.424**	1.000

*. At the 0.05 level (two-tailed), the correlation is significant; **. At the 0.01 level (two-tailed), the correlation is significant.

Table S2. Correlation check of the UGS quantity in the 400m -buffer zone.

	cropland-buf400perc	forest-buf400perc	grass-buf400perc	sum(cropland-forest-grass)
cropland-buf400perc	1.000			
forest-buf400perc	.459**	1.000		
grass-buf400perc	0.007	.161**	1.000	
sum(cropland-forest-grass)	.983**	.567**	0.058	1.000

*. At the 0.05 level (two-tailed), the correlation is significant; **. At the 0.01 level (two-tailed), the correlation is significant.

Table S3. Indicators of UGS quantity of nearby UGS.

Variables	Sample size (Proportion)	
Perceived quantity	Very inadequate	7 (0.7)
	Inadequate	258 (25.8)
	General	273 (27.3)
	Adequate	442 (44.2)
	Very adequate	20 (2.0)
Total amount	1-2	476 (47.6)
	3-4	468 (46.8)
	5-6	55 (5.5)
	7-8	0 (0)
	More than 8	1 (0.1)
Greenery coverage	0-10%	4 (0.4)
	10-20%	121 (12.1)
	20-30%	471 (47.1)
	30-40%	393 (39.3)
	50-60%	11 (1.1)

Table S4. Perceived quality of different types of UGS.

Variables		Sample size (Proportion)	Variables		Sample size (Proportion)
The most frequently visited UGS	Very bad	0 (0)	Community UGS	Very bad	4 (0.4)
	Bad	2 (0.2)		Bad	153 (15.3)
	General	167 (16.7)		General	468 (46.8)
	Good	611 (61.1)		Good	319 (31.9)
	Very good	201 (20.1)		Very good	0 (0)
Favorite UGS	Very bad	0 (0)	Workplace UGS	Very bad	56 (5.6)
	Bad	0 (0)		Bad	1 (0.1)
	General	7 (0.7)		General	59 (5.9)
	Good	122 (12.2)		Good	130 (13.0)
Nearby UGS	Very good	50 (5.0)		Very good	27 (2.7)
	Very bad	1 (0.1)			
	Bad	1 (0.1)			
	General	310 (31.0)			
	Good	624 (62.4)			
	Very good	64 (6.4)			

Table S5. Results of descriptive statistics for 20 activities.

Activities	Sitting	Chatting	Dating	Picnic Gathering	Walking	Cycling	Running	Ball games	Dancing	Fitness facilities	
Demand	Average value	3.80	3.73	3.58	2.84	4.06	3.00	2.85	3.15	3.18	3.44
Supply	Average value	3.39	3.37	3.20	2.42	4.01	2.68	2.58	2.90	3.03	3.30
Quality (supply– demand variance)	Average value	-0.42	-0.36	-0.38	-0.42	-0.05	-0.32	-0.27	-0.24	-0.15	-0.14
Activities	Viewing	Water- friendly	Playing chess and cards	Singing	Gardening	Dog walking	Playing	Parent- child	Festivals and events	Popular Science	
Demand	Average value	3.56	3.52	3.38	3.29	3.06	2.12	2.74	3.08	3.21	3.19
Supply	Average value	3.29	3.14	3.30	3.15	2.48	1.68	2.53	2.92	2.79	2.76
Quality (supply– demand variance)	Average value	-0.26	-0.37	-0.08	-0.14	-0.58	-0.44	-0.21	-0.16	-0.41	-0.43

