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, p. 1 ("...: A Systematic Literature Review").
ABSTRACT			
Abstract	2	See the PRISMA 2020 for Abstracts checklist.	Abstract, p. 1 (structured: background, methods, results, conclusions).
INTRODUCTION			
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of existing knowledge.	Sec. 1 Introduction, pp. 1-2; Sec. 2 Background, pp. 2-5.
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of the objective(s) or question(s) the review addresses.	Sec. 1, p. 1 (RQ1-RQ3); Sec. 3.1 and Table 3, p. 6.
METHODS			
Eligibility criteria	5	Specify the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the review and how studies were grouped for the syntheses.	Sec. 3.2, p. 6 (publication years 2010-2023, article/review, English); Sec. 3.3, pp. 7-8; Table 5, p. 8 (IC1-IC4, EC1-EC5). Grouping of studies for synthesis: Sec. 3.5, pp. 9-10.
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.	Sec. 3.2, p. 6 (Scopus and Web of Science; search run in 2024, exact date not recorded); Sec. 3.3, p. 7 (snowballing). Data access date: Sec. 1, p. 2.
Search strategy	7	Present the full search strategies for all databases, registers and websites, including any filters and limits used.	Sec. 3.2 and Table 4, p. 6 (full search strings for Scopus and WoS with record counts). Refined queries with year, document-type and language filters: selection workbook, sheet "Search Strings".
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.	Sec. 3.3, pp. 7-8 and Figure 3, p. 8; Sec. 3.6, p. 10 (one assigned reviewer per record, no independent second screening log). Per-record screening flags and notes for the full-text stage: selection workbook, sheet "Soft SLR Abs Title". No automation tools reported. See also Limitations, p. 16.
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.	Sec. 3.4, p. 9 (structured extraction template); Sec. 3.5, pp. 9-10; Sec. 3.6, p. 10 (one assigned reviewer per record; no independent verification or consensus log).
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.	Sec. 3.1, p. 6 (RQ3); Sec. 3.5 and Tables 6-7, pp. 9-10 (reported enablers/barriers); Sec. 4.4, p. 14 (outcomes reported or measured).
	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.	Sec. 3.4, p. 9 (extraction fields); Sec. 3.5, pp. 9-10 (focal construct, study country, industry, SME context, study design, principal finding, evidence type). Incomplete reporting in source studies: Limitations, p. 16.
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.	Sec. 3.6, p. 10: provisional, single-reader appraisal of reporting completeness (SME context, sample/case, data source, analysis, limitations; Y/P/N/NA). Not a validated risk-of-bias tool; stated as a limitation, p. 16.
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. No effect measures were used; the synthesis is narrative/thematic (Sec. 3.5, pp. 9-10; Limitations, p. 16).
Synthesis	13a	Describe the processes used to decide which studies were eligible for each	Sec. 3.5, pp. 9-10: four mutually exclusive construct codes (direct,

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
methods		synthesis (e.g. tabulating the study intervention characteristics and comparing against the planned groups for each synthesis (item #5)).	adjacent, capability, peripheral); 44 non-peripheral records form the domain-focused synthesis, nine peripheral records kept as a separate stratum.
	13b	Describe any methods required to prepare the data for presentation or synthesis, such as handling of missing summary statistics, or data conversions.	Not applicable. No quantitative results were converted, imputed or harmonized.
	13c	Describe any methods used to tabulate or visually display results of individual studies and syntheses.	Sec. 3.5 and Tables 6-7, pp. 9-10 (drivers and barriers); Appendix A, Tables A1-A2, pp. 17-22; Figures 4-7, pp. 11-13 (bibliometric overview).
	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.	Narrative/thematic synthesis: Sec. 3.5, pp. 9-10; Sec. 4.4, p. 14. No meta-analysis; heterogeneity of designs precludes pooling (Limitations, p. 16).
	13e	Describe any methods used to explore possible causes of heterogeneity among study results (e.g. subgroup analysis, meta-regression).	Not applicable (no statistical investigation of heterogeneity). Studies were stratified descriptively by construct code, evidence type and design: Sec. 3.5, pp. 9-10; Sec. 4.2, p. 13.
	13f	Describe any sensitivity analyses conducted to assess robustness of the synthesized results.	Not applicable. No sensitivity analyses were performed.
Reporting bias assessment	14	Describe any methods used to assess risk of bias due to missing results in a synthesis (arising from reporting biases).	Not formally assessed. Related limitations (no gray literature, restrictive SME search term, possible sample overlap between two papers): Limitations, p. 16.
Certainty assessment	15	Describe any methods used to assess certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for an outcome.	Not assessed. Sec. 3.6, p. 10, and Limitations, p. 16, state that no validated risk-of-bias or certainty assessment was done; conclusions are qualified accordingly (Abstract, p. 1).
RESULTS			
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.	Sec. 3.2, p. 6 (288 Scopus + 214 WoS = 502); Sec. 3.3, pp. 7-8 and Figure 3, p. 8 (502 > 238 > 170 > 165 > 85 > 48 > 51 > 53). Records retained at each stage: selection workbook (one sheet per stage).
	16b	Cite studies that might appear to meet the inclusion criteria, but which were excluded, and explain why they were excluded.	Partly reported. Sec. 3.3, p. 7, and Limitations, p. 16: for the full-text stage the selection workbook flags 35 of the 37 records not carried forward as rejected and gives a free-text note for each (sheet "Soft SLR Abs Title"), not coded by exclusion criterion. No reasons were recorded for the 80 title/abstract exclusions, the 5 EC3/EC4 exclusions or the two reinstated records.
Study characteristics	17	Cite each included study and present its characteristics.	Appendix A, Table A1 (pp. 17-18) and Table A2 (pp. 18-22): all 53 studies with construct code, country, industry, SME context, design and principal finding; citations in References, pp. 23-25.
Risk of bias in studies	18	Present assessments of risk of bias for each included study.	Not presented per study in the manuscript. Reporting-completeness codes are in the companion file data/study_evidence.csv (Sec. 3.6, p. 10); no formal risk-of-bias assessment.
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.	Not applicable (no effect estimates). Principal finding and design of each study: Appendix A, Table A2, pp. 18-22.

PRISMA 2020 Checklist

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
Results of syntheses	20a	For each synthesis, briefly summarise the characteristics and risk of bias among contributing studies.	Sec. 4.1-4.4, pp. 10-14; Tables 6-7, p. 10; Figures 4-7, pp. 11-13; Appendix A, pp. 16-22.
	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.	Not applicable. No statistical syntheses were conducted.
	20c	Present results of all investigations of possible causes of heterogeneity among study results.	Not applicable. No statistical investigation of heterogeneity was conducted.
	20d	Present results of all sensitivity analyses conducted to assess the robustness of the synthesized results.	Not applicable. No sensitivity analyses were conducted.
Reporting biases	21	Present assessments of risk of bias due to missing results (arising from reporting biases) for each synthesis assessed.	Not assessed (see item 14).
Certainty of evidence	22	Present assessments of certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for each outcome assessed.	Not assessed (see item 15 and Limitations, p. 16).
DISCUSSION			
Discussion	23a	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence.	Sec. 4.2-4.4, pp. 13-14; Sec. 6 Conclusions, p. 15.
	23b	Discuss any limitations of the evidence included in the review.	Limitations, p. 16 (heterogeneous designs, proposed vs. observed practice, incompletely reported contexts, possible sample overlap); Sec. 3.6, p. 10.
	23c	Discuss any limitations of the review processes used.	Limitations, p. 16; Sec. 3.2, p. 6, and Sec. 3.3, p. 7 (no gray literature, no pilot log or exact search date, exclusion reasons not coded, one reviewer per record, no inter-rater statistic); Sec. 3.6, p. 10.
	23d	Discuss implications of the results for practice, policy, and future research.	Sec. 6 Conclusions, pp. 15-16 (implications for SME managers and policymakers); Sec. 5 Future Research Agenda, pp. 14-15.
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.	Not reported. The manuscript gives no registration name or number.
	24b	Indicate where the review protocol can be accessed, or state that a protocol was not prepared.	Not reported. No review protocol is cited or made available.
	24c	Describe and explain any amendments to information provided at registration or in the protocol.	No protocol amendments reported. Limits of the revisited historical search and screening are described in Sec. 3.2-3.3, pp. 6-7, and Limitations, p. 16.
Support	25	Describe sources of financial or non-financial support for the review, and the role of the funders or sponsors in the review.	Funding, p. 16: "This research received no external funding."
Competing interests	26	Declare any competing interests of review authors.	Conflicts of Interest, p. 16: 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.	Data Availability Statement, p. 16, and Sec. 1, p. 2 (list of selected papers at each stage, https://tinyurl.com/paper-agile-slr, accessed 28 February 2025). Extraction fields: Sec. 3.4, p. 9. Extracted data: Appendix A, pp. 16-22, and companion file data/study_evidence.csv.

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
			Analysis/figure code was not preserved (Sec. 4.1, p. 10).

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/