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: "a Systematic Review of academic literature" (Stated as a systematic literature).
ABSTRACT			
Abstract	2	See the PRISMA 2020 for Abstracts checklist.	Abstract section: "systematically review the greenwashing literature" and "using the Systematic Literature Review (SLR) method".
INTRODUCTION			
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of existing knowledge.	1. Introduction: Paragraphs defining the problem of greenwashing and the need to focus particularly on the tourism/hospitality sector.
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of the objective(s) or question(s) the review addresses.	1. Introduction - Research Questions: Clearly stated under the headings RQ1, RQ2, and RQ3.
METHODS			
Eligibility criteria	5	Specify the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the review and how studies were grouped for the syntheses.	2.1. Selection Process: Inclusion criteria (focus on "greenwashing" and "tourism and hospitality") and Exclusion criteria (Review, Early access, editorial material, etc.); Synthesis groups (seven main thematic categories).
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. Materials and Methods: Web of Science and Scopus databases. Last search date: June 2025.

PRISMA 2020 Checklist

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
Search strategy	7	Present the full search strategies for all databases, registers and websites, including any filters and limits used.	2.1. Selection Process: Keywords and search fields used for Web of Science and Scopus (“greenwashing” and 'tourism' or 'hospitality', article title/abstract/keywords).
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.	2.1. Selection Process: Step-by-step selection process using criterion sampling and the PRISMA flow chart (Figure 1). (The number of independent reviewers during the screening phase is not explicitly detailed).
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.	2.1. Selection Process - Data analysis process: "Each article was read independently by two researchers".
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.	Data analysis process: Classification of studies under seven main thematic categories.
	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.	Data analysis process: Variables sought for descriptive analysis (sample structure, data collection techniques, methodological approach, theoretical framework, country/regional context, and variables used).
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.	This information is not explicitly detailed in the available excerpts. No formal risk of bias assessment tool or method for included studies is presented.

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
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. The study is a thematic synthesis and content analysis, not a quantitative meta-analysis.
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)).	Data analysis process: "open and then axial coding" with "seven main thematic categories were created by considering the similarities and differences between the codes"
	13b	Describe any methods required to prepare the data for presentation or synthesis, such as handling of missing summary statistics, or data conversions.	Data analysis process: Adoption of a thematic analysis approach based on Hsieh and Shannon's (2005) qualitative content analysis.
	13c	Describe any methods used to tabulate or visually display results of individual studies and syntheses.	Table 1 (summary of articles) and Figures 2, 3, 4 (descriptive analysis distributions).
	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.	Data analysis process: Thematic analysis and qualitative content analysis; rationale: "to deliver not only systematic synthesis... but also a theoretical and practical framework".
	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 assessment	15	Describe any methods used to assess certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for an outcome.	N/A
RESULTS			

PRISMA 2020 Checklist

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
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.	Figure 1. PRISMA flowchart.
	16b	Cite studies that might appear to meet the inclusion criteria, but which were excluded, and explain why they were excluded.	Figure 1. PRISMA flowchart.
Study characteristics	17	Cite each included study and present its characteristics.	Table 1. Summary of articles on greenwashing in tourism and hospitality (article aim, journal, sample, country, method, etc.).
Risk of bias in studies	18	Present assessments of risk of bias for each included study.	No formal risk of bias assessment tool was specified in the methods, so results are not reported.
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.	The "Findings" column in Table 1.
Results of syntheses	20a	For each synthesis, briefly summarise the characteristics and risk of bias among contributing studies.	2.2. Research Profiling (Author, discipline, country, methodology, and year distributions) and findings related to the Seven Thematic Categories.
	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.	2.2. Research Profiling (Author, discipline, country, methodology, and year distributions) and findings related to the Seven Thematic Categories.
	20c	Present results of all investigations of possible causes of heterogeneity among study results.	2.2. Research Profiling (Author, discipline, country, methodology, and year distributions) and findings related to the Seven Thematic Categories.
	20d	Present results of all sensitivity analyses conducted to assess the robustness of the synthesized results.	2.2. Research Profiling (Author, discipline, country, methodology, and year distributions) and findings related to

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
			the Seven Thematic Categories.
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.	Not reported using a formal certainty tool (e.g., GRADE), but the conclusion discusses the strength and gaps of the synthesized evidence.
DISCUSSION			
Discussion	23a	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence.	Discussion/Conclusion section: Compares the study's holistic framework to previous single-focused approaches in the literature.
	23b	Discuss any limitations of the evidence included in the review.	Same as Item 21 (addressed in the Discussion/Conclusion).
	23c	Discuss any limitations of the review processes used.	Same as Item 22 (addressed in the Discussion/Conclusion).
	23d	Discuss implications of the results for practice, policy, and future research.	Abstract and Discussion/Conclusion section: Aims to provide "a guiding framework" for future studies and "guidance for regulatory agencies and businesses".
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.	This information is not provided.
	24b	Indicate where the review protocol can be accessed, or state that a protocol was not prepared.	This information is not provided.
	24c	Describe and explain any amendments to information provided at registration or in the protocol.	This information is not provided.
Support	25	Describe sources of financial or non-financial support for the review, and the role of the funders or sponsors in the review.	This information is not provided.
Competing	26	Declare any competing interests of review authors.	Conflicts of Interest

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
interests			statement: "The authors declare no 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.	This information is not explicitly detailed.

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/