

Supplementary material

Table S1: Curriculum of the PARTS and NBSR-T control intervention programs.

Week	PARTS	NBSR-T
1	Basic Concepts of the IFS PARTS program and Creating a Brave and Supportive Container	Orientation & Curriculum Introduction
2	Overview of IFS and How it Helps with Trauma	Basic Concepts and Components of the program
3	Finding Self - Curious, Clear, Compassionate	Turning Towards the Sounds and Sights of Nature
4	Un-blending; Parts Separate from Self	Qualities of Nature
5	Getting Permission from Parts	The Natural World and the Mind, Part I
6	Getting to Know our Parts (those we rely on the most or who take on extreme roles)	The Natural World and the Mind, Part II
7	Deepening Self Energy (Be with Your Heart)	Confronting Fears of Nature, Part I
8	Find, Focus, Flesh out Parts and Home Practice	Confronting Fears of Nature, Part II
9	Negotiating with Protectors to Un-blend	How Nature Can Improve Health, Part I
10	Speaking for Parts & Listening from Self	How Nature Can Improve Health, Part II
11	How the PARTS Program is landing inside	Your Relationship with the Natural World, Part I
12	Getting Permission to Help Exiles	Your Relationship with the Natural World, Part II
13	Legacy Burdens and Gifts	Caring About our Natural World, Part I
14	Accessing Exiles	Caring About our Natural World, Part II
15	Assessing Future Goals and Saying Goodbye	Nature Show & Tell, River of Life
16	Loving your Parts as the Journey Continues	Setting up Your 'Return to Nature Plan'

Table S2: Reasons of attrition in each treatment arm.

	PARTS	NBSR-T
Attrition from research, without post-intervention data		
Lost to follow-up (unable to contact, reasons unknown)	4	2
Withdrew from research procedures (see reasons below)	0	8
Distress related	0	5
Schedule or other logistic reasons	0	3

Table S3: Average rating of each item of the satisfaction survey in each treatment arm. For items 1-10, subjects were instructed to rate on a 5-point scale in which 1 indicates “strongly disagree” while 5 indicates “strongly agree”. For items 11-12, subjects were instructed to rate on a 5-point scale in which 1 indicates “poor” while 5 indicates “excellent”. Data was from n=22 patients in PARTS and n=19 in NBSR-T who completed the satisfaction survey after the end of the interventions. Raw p-values from two-sample t-tests of the ratings are listed in the table.

Due to the fact that this satisfaction survey was a custom-made questionnaire without prior validation, and the fact that the item ratings are highly correlated (see Table S4), therefore no correction for multiple comparison was conducted, and these results are to be interpreted with caution.

	PARTS (n=22)		NBSR-T (n=19)		Raw p-value
1. I found this program helpful.	4.55	0.86	4.26	0.87	0.30
2. The group was well organized.	4.59	0.80	4.32	0.89	0.30
3. The group leader(s) cared about me as a person.	4.91	0.29	4.58	0.77	0.07
4. I was able to participate and express myself in the group.	4.68	0.57	4.32	0.82	0.10
5. The group leader(s) were authentic, honest, and real.	4.86	0.47	4.74	0.56	0.44
6. I learned what I was hoping to learn.	4.27	0.94	4.00	1.05	0.39
7. The group leader(s) had good timing when providing examples.	4.55	0.67	4.26	0.81	0.23
8. I would be willing to participate in the program again if it were possible to do so.	4.64	0.73	4.11	1.24	0.10
9. The group leader(s) were easy to understand.	4.77	0.53	4.84	0.50	0.67
10. I would recommend this program to a friend.	4.73	0.70	4.47	0.90	0.32
11. Overall rating of the facilitator(s)	4.77	0.61	4.37	0.90	0.10
12. Overall rating of the group	4.59	0.67	4.11	0.88	0.05

Table S4: Correlation coefficients of single item satisfaction rating in the satisfaction survey with overall satisfaction of the facilitators (item 11) and the group (item 12), as well as CAPS-5 score change at the end of the 16-week program (Δ CAPS), in the pooled data from both treatment arms (n=41). Correlation coefficients with raw p value < 0.05 are highlighted in **bold**. Δ CAPS was only correlated with item #6: “I learned what I was hoping to learn. The overall satisfaction rating of facilitators and group were correlated with all the individual items of the survey.

Due to the fact that the satisfaction survey was a custom-made questionnaire without prior validation, and the fact that the item ratings are highly correlated, therefore no correction for multiple comparison was conducted for these correlation coefficients, and these results are to be interpreted with caution.

	Δ CAPS	Facilitator	Group	Item 1	Item 2	Item 3	Item 4	Item 5	Item 6	Item 7	Item 8	Item 9	Item 10
Δ CAPS	1.00	0.02	0.06	0.15	0.20	0.28	0.24	0.24	0.36	0.13	0.12	0.24	0.10
Facilitator	0.02	1.00	0.82	0.60	0.80	0.77	0.58	0.68	0.44	0.74	0.75	0.49	0.74
Group	0.06	0.82	1.00	0.64	0.82	0.68	0.50	0.61	0.37	0.67	0.74	0.49	0.74
Item 1	0.15	0.60	0.64	1.00	0.62	0.40	0.30	0.41	0.54	0.47	0.75	0.30	0.74
Item 2	0.20	0.80	0.82	0.62	1.00	0.65	0.56	0.62	0.58	0.69	0.69	0.57	0.87
Item 3	0.28	0.77	0.68	0.40	0.65	1.00	0.73	0.68	0.28	0.65	0.75	0.51	0.59
Item 4	0.24	0.58	0.50	0.30	0.56	0.73	1.00	0.49	0.35	0.63	0.61	0.49	0.45
Item 5	0.24	0.68	0.61	0.41	0.62	0.68	0.49	1.00	0.35	0.55	0.63	0.81	0.54
Item 6	0.36	0.44	0.37	0.54	0.58	0.28	0.35	0.35	1.00	0.46	0.41	0.35	0.58
Item 7	0.13	0.74	0.67	0.47	0.69	0.65	0.63	0.55	0.46	1.00	0.57	0.42	0.62
Item 8	0.12	0.75	0.74	0.75	0.69	0.75	0.61	0.63	0.41	0.57	1.00	0.48	0.77
Item 9	0.24	0.49	0.49	0.30	0.57	0.51	0.49	0.81	0.35	0.42	0.48	1.00	0.42
Item 10	0.10	0.74	0.74	0.74	0.87	0.59	0.45	0.54	0.58	0.62	0.77	0.42	1.00