PRISMA 2020 Main Checklist

Topic	No.	Item	Location where item is reported
TITLE			
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review.	Title does not explicitly include "systematic review", but if it requires, I am flexible to change the title to "Stakeholder-Centred Value Creation Framework for Advancing Circular Economy Practices in the Construction Industry: A Systematic Literature Review"
ABSTRACT			
Abstract	2	See the PRISMA 2020 for Abstracts checklist	
INTRODUCTION			
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of existing knowledge.	Introduction, Line 72-108
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of the objective(s) or question(s) the review addresses.	Line 109-116
METHODS			
Eligibility criteria	5	Specify the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the review and how studies were grouped for the syntheses.	Line 131-170
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.	Line 135-148
Search strategy	7	Present the full search strategies for all databases, registers and websites, including any filters and limits used.	Line 132-134, Line 150-157

Topic	No.	Item	Location where item is reported
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.	The study selection process was conducted by T. Liyanawatta, who screened titles, abstracts, and full texts of the identified articles according to the predefined inclusion criteria. M. Teo supervised and reviewed the selection process at each stage, verifying the applied criteria and the final set of included studies to ensure consistency. No automation tools were used in the screening process.
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.	Data extraction was conducted by T. Liyanawatta, who reviewed and extracted relevant information from all included studies. M. Teo supervised and verified the process at each stage, reviewing the applied criteria and the selected articles to ensure consistency and methodological rigour. No automation tools were used in the data extraction process.
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.	The review extracted conceptual information related to definitions of value, value creation mechanisms, and characteristics of value creation and co-creation models across different sectors. Particular attention was given to identifying key components, processes, stakeholder perspectives, and sustainability dimensions associated with value creation models.
	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.	Additional study characteristics were extracted from each article, including author(s), country/ geographical context, sector/ industry context, and the main intervention or key focus of the study. These characteristics are summarised in **Table 1**.
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.	Not applicable – this study is a conceptual systematic literature review and did not assess risk of bias of individual studies.

Topic	No.	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 – no quantitative outcomes or effect measures were analysed in this review.
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)).	Studies were synthesised using a qualitative narrative synthesis approach. The included studies were analysed to identify key themes related to the conceptualisation of value, value creation processes, stakeholder engagement, collaboration mechanisms, and sustainability-oriented value creation models across different sectors.
	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 data preparation or transformation was required, as the review employed a qualitative narrative synthesis.
	13c	Describe any methods used to tabulate or visually display results of individual studies and syntheses.	The results of the included studies were organised and presented using tables and conceptual figures, including the table summarising the characteristics of the included studies (Table 1) and conceptual illustrations used to explain value concepts and model categorisation.
	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.	Not applicable – no statistical synthesis or meta-analysis was conducted.
	13e	Describe any methods used to explore possible causes of heterogeneity among study results (e.g. subgroup analysis, meta-regression).	Not applicable – investigation of statistical heterogeneity was not undertaken, as the study employed qualitative narrative synthesis.
	13f	Describe any sensitivity analyses conducted to assess robustness of the synthesized results.	Not applicable – sensitivity analyses were not conducted because no quantitative synthesis was performed.

Topic	No.	Item	Location where item is reported
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 applicable – reporting bias assessment was not conducted because the study did not perform statistical synthesis or meta-analysis.
Certainty assessment	15	Describe any methods used to assess certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for an outcome.	Not applicable – certainty of evidence assessment was not undertaken because the study employed qualitative narrative synthesis rather than quantitative evidence synthesis.
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.	Section 2, Line 129, Figure 1
	16b	Cite studies that might appear to meet the inclusion criteria, but which were excluded, and explain why they were excluded.	Section 2, Line 163-171
Study characteristics	17	Cite each included study and present its characteristics.	Line 171, Table 1
Risk of bias in studies	18	Present assessments of risk of bias for each included study.	Not applicable – the study is a conceptual systematic literature review and did not perform quantitative evidence synthesis or 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.	The findings of the included studies are summarised using descriptive tables and narrative analysis. Study characteristics are presented in Table 1, while key conceptual insights related to value and value creation are synthesised in Tables 2 and 3 and discussed in Section 3.

Topic	No.	Item	Location where item is reported
Results of syntheses	20a	For each synthesis, briefly summarise the characteristics and risk of bias among contributing studies.	The synthesis of the included studies identified several key themes relating to the conceptualisation of value, value creation mechanisms, stakeholder engagement, collaboration processes, and sustainability-oriented value creation models. These insights informed the development of the stakeholder-centred conceptual value creation framework proposed in this study.
	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 synthesis or meta-analysis was conducted.
	20c	Present results of all investigations of possible causes of heterogeneity among study results.	Section 3 discussed the results of synthesis analysis, thus, no investigation of heterogeneity was performed as the review relied on qualitative narrative synthesis.
	20d	Present results of all sensitivity analyses conducted to assess the robustness of the synthesized results.	Not applicable – sensitivity analyses were not conducted because no quantitative synthesis was undertaken.
Reporting biases	21	Present assessments of risk of bias due to missing results (arising from reporting biases) for each synthesis assessed.	Not applicable – the study is a conceptual systematic literature review and did not perform quantitative evidence synthesis or risk-of-bias assessment.
Certainty of evidence	22	Present assessments of certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for each outcome assessed.	Not applicable – the study is a conceptual systematic literature review and did not perform quantitative evidence synthesis or risk-of-bias assessment.
DISCUSSION			
Discussion	23a	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence.	Section 4: Line 545-652
	23b	Discuss any limitations of the evidence included in the review.	Section 4: Line 545-652

Topic	No.	Item	Location where item is reported
	23c	Discuss any limitations of the review processes used.	Section 4: Line 545-652
	23d	Discuss implications of the results for practice, policy, and future research.	Section 4: Line 545-652
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.	Review was not registered
	24b	Indicate where the review protocol can be accessed, or state that a protocol was not prepared.	No protocol prepared
	24c	Describe and explain any amendments to information provided at registration or in the protocol.	Not applicable
Support	25	Describe sources of financial or non-financial support for the review, and the role of the funders or sponsors in the review.	Not applicable
Competing interests	26	Declare any competing interests of review authors.	Line 660
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.	Line 656-657

PRIMSA Abstract Checklist

Topic	No.	Item	Reported?
TITLE			
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review.	No
BACKGROUND			
Objectives	2	Provide an explicit statement of the main objective(s) or question(s) the review addresses.	Yes
METHODS			
Eligibility criteria	3	Specify the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the review.	Yes
Information sources	4	Specify the information sources (e.g. databases, registers) used to identify studies and the date when each was last searched.	Yes
Risk of bias	5	Specify the methods used to assess risk of bias in the included studies.	No
Synthesis of results	6	Specify the methods used to present and synthesize results.	Yes
RESULTS			
Included studies	7	Give the total number of included studies and participants and summarise relevant characteristics of studies.	Yes
Synthesis of results	8	Present results for main outcomes, preferably indicating the number of included studies and participants for each. If meta-analysis was done, report the summary estimate and confidence/credible interval. If comparing groups, indicate the direction of the effect (i.e. which group is favoured).	Yes
DISCUSSION			
Limitations of evidence	9	Provide a brief summary of the limitations of the evidence included in the review (e.g. study risk of bias, inconsistency and imprecision).	No
Interpretation	10	Provide a general interpretation of the results and important implications.	Yes
OTHER			
Funding	11	Specify the primary source of funding for the review.	Yes
Registration	12	Provide the register name and registration number.	No

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. MetaArXiv. 2020, September 14. DOI: 10.31222/osf.io/v7gm2. For more information, visit: www.prisma-statement.org