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**Data on Ecosystem Services of Urban Agriculture**: this document contains the databases of perceived ecosystem services at either project leader, stakeholders and general public levels as compared with results retrieved from previous literature and with regard to Ecosystem Service typology, as discussed and elaborated in the publication.

**Table A1.** Perceived ecosystem services at the project leader, stakeholders and general public levels, including a comparison with the results from Camps-Calvet et al. [[28](https://www.mdpi.com/2071-1050/12/24/10446#B28-sustainability-12-10446)] by ES type. Values display the averages of the Likert-scale evaluation from 0 (lowest) to 5 (highest) ES perceived, numbers in parentheses are standard errors. Difference between Stakeholders and General public was tested by independent sample t-test, \* p < 0.05; \*\* p < 0.01; \*\*\* p < 0.001. For Project leaders n = 6; Stakeholders n = 19–20; general public n = 252–379.

| **Ecosystem Services** | **Project Leader** | **Stakeholders** | **GeneralPublic** | **Camps-Calvet [**[**28**](https://www.mdpi.com/2071-1050/12/24/10446#B28-sustainability-12-10446)**]** | **Stakeholders—General Public Difference** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Provision | Food provision | 3.7 (0.67) | 4.1 (0.19) | 4.5 (0.04) | 3.8 | \*\* |
| Provision of medicinal plants and herbs | 2.0 (0.36) | 3.6 (0.26) | 4.6 (0.04) | 3.4 | \*\* |
| Provision of other raw materials (e.g., wool) | 2.0 (0.68) | 2.4 (0.24) | 4.1 (0.06) | n.a. | \*\*\* |
| Average provision | 2.6 (0.38) | 3.3 (0.20) | 4.4 (0.04) | 3.6 | \*\*\* |
| Regulating | Improvement of local micro-climate | 3.0 (0.68) | 4.1 (0.18) | 3.8 (0.07) | 4.0 |  |
| Improvement of air quality | 3.2 (0.70) | 3.9 (0.25) | 4.0 (0.07) | 4.1 |  |
| Enhancement of carbon sequestration | 2.8 (0.48) | 3.4 (0.22) | 3.7 (0.09) | 3.9 |  |
| Enhancement of pollination | 4.2 (0.65) | 4.3 (0.16) | 4.3 (0.05) | 4.3 |  |
| Limitation of extreme weather events | 2.0 (0.68) | 3.1 (0.25) | 3.0 (1.0) | 3.9 |  |
| Soil erosion prevention and maintenance | 3.0 (0.68) | 4.2 (0.23) | 3.4 (0.09) | 4.4 | \*\* |
| Regulation of urban metabolism (e.g., organic waste) | 2.0 (0.52) | 4.2 (0.21) | 3.6 (0.09) | n.a. | \*\* |
| Average regulating | 2.9 (0.45) | 3.9 (0.16) | 3.7 (0.05) | 4.1 |  |
| Habitat | Provision of habitat for fauna | 3.0 (0.63) | 4.1 (0.17) | 4.0 (0.07) | n.a. |  |
| Conservation of genetic variability | 3.5 (0.81) | 3.9 (0.18) | 4.1 (0.06) | n.a. |  |
| Increase in global biodiversity | 3.5 (0.72) | 4.1 (0.17) | 4.0 (0.07) | 4.3 |  |
| Average habitat ES | 3.3 (0.63) | 4.2 (0.13) | 4.0 (0.06) | 4.3 |  |
| Socio-cultural | Contribution to training and education | 4.0 (0.26) | 4.5 (0.14) | 4.7 (0.03) | 4.5 |  |
| New forms of recreation | 3.3 (0.76) | 4.5 (0.14) | 4.8 (0.02) | 4.5 |  |
| Improvement of touristic attractions in the city | 2.7 (0.62) | 3.8 (0.19) | 4.2 (0.06) | n.a. |  |
| Improvement of mental health | 3.3 (0.76) | 4.7 (0.11) | 4.7 (0.03) | 4.6 |  |
| Improvement of physical health | 3.5 (0.67) | 4.5 (0.17) | 4.6 (0.04) | 4.4 |  |
| Enhancement of the contact with nature and spirituality | 3.8 (0.60) | 4.2 (0.20) | 4.7 (0.03) | 4.7 | \* |
| Improvement of urban aesthetics and art inspiration | 3.3 (0.76) | 4.5 (0.14) | 4.6 (0.04) | 4.5 |  |
| Preservation of cultural knowledge and heritage | 3.3 (0.67) | 4.1 (0.25) | 4.2 (0.05) | 4.6 |  |
| Improvement of community building | 2.8 (0.70) | 4.2 (0.21) | 4.4 (0.05) | 4.4 |  |
| Improvement of social cohesion | 2.8 (0.70) | 4.3 (0.19) | 4.4 (0.05) | 4.4 |  |
| Improvement of place attachment | 3.0 (0.78) | 4.1 (0.19) | 4.3 (0.05) | 4.6 |  |
| Contribution to political realization | 2.5 (0.62) | 3.3 (0.27) | 3.4 (0.09) | 4.1 |  |
| Average socio-cultural | 3.2 (0.56) | 4.2 (0.12) | 4.4 (0.03) | 4.5 | \* |
| TOTAL AVERAGE | 3.1 (0.48) | 4.0 (0.11) | 4.2 (0.03) | 4.0 |  |

**Table A2.** Perceived ecosystem services at the project leader level: Total average, average for socially oriented cases, average for technologically oriented cases and ratio social/technological, by ecosystem service type (provision, regulating, habitat, socio-cultural). Values display the averages of the Likert-scale evaluation from 0 (lowest) to 5 (highest) ES perceived. N = 6; for standard errors of total see [Table A1](https://www.mdpi.com/2071-1050/12/24/10446#table_body_display_sustainability-12-10446-t0A1).

| **Ecosystem Services** | **Total** | **Social** | **Technological** | **RatioSoc/Tec** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Provision | Food provision | 3.7 | 4.0 | 3.0 | 1.3 |
| Provision of medicinal plants and herbs | 2.0 | 2.3 | 1.5 | 1.5 |
| Provision of other raw materials (e.g., wool) | 2.0 | 2.5 | 1.0 | 2.5 |
| Average provision | 2.6 | 2.9 | 1.8 | 1.8 |
| Regulating | Improvement of local micro-climate | 3.0 | 4.0 | 1.0 | 4.0 |
| Improvement of air quality | 3.2 | 4.3 | 1.0 | 4.3 |
| Enhancement of carbon sequestration | 2.8 | 3.3 | 2.0 | 1.6 |
| Enhancement of pollination | 4.2 | 4.8 | 3.0 | 1.6 |
| Limitation of extreme weather events | 2.0 | 2.5 | 1.0 | 2.5 |
| Soil erosion prevention and maintenance | 3.0 | 3.5 | 2.0 | 1.8 |
| Regulation of urban metabolism (e.g., organic waste) | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 1.0 |
| Average regulating | 2.9 | 3.5 | 1.7 | 2.4 |
| Habitat | Provision of habitat for fauna | 3.0 | 3.3 | 2.5 | 1.3 |
| Conservation of genetic variability | 3.5 | 4.0 | 2.5 | 1.6 |
| Increase in global biodiversity | 3.5 | 4.5 | 1.5 | 3.0 |
| Average habitat ES | 3.3 | 3.9 | 2.2 | 2.0 |
| Socio-cultural | Contribution to training and education | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 1.0 |
| New forms of recreation | 3.3 | 4.5 | 1.0 | 4.5 |
| Improvement of touristic attractions in the city | 2.7 | 3.5 | 1.0 | 3.5 |
| Improvement of mental health | 3.3 | 4.5 | 1.0 | 4.5 |
| Improvement of physical health | 3.5 | 4.5 | 1.5 | 3.0 |
| Enhancement of the contact with nature and spirituality | 3.8 | 4.5 | 2.5 | 1.8 |
| Improvement of urban aesthetics and art inspiration | 3.3 | 4.5 | 1.0 | 4.5 |
| Preservation of cultural knowledge and heritage | 3.3 | 4.3 | 1.5 | 2.8 |
| Improvement of community building | 2.8 | 3.8 | 1.0 | 3.8 |
| Improvement of social cohesion | 2.8 | 3.8 | 1.0 | 3.8 |
| Improvement of place attachment | 3.0 | 4.0 | 1.0 | 4.0 |
| Contribution to political realization | 2.5 | 3.3 | 1.0 | 3.3 |
| Average socio-cultural ES | 3.2 | 4.1 | 1.5 | 3.4 |
| TOTAL AVERAGE | 3.1 | 3.8 | 1.7 | 2.7 |