Supplementary Table S1

PRISMA 2020 checklist

Manuscript: Institutional Responses to Generative Artificial Intelligence in Global South Higher Education: A Systematic Review Stratified by Unit of Analysis. Submitted to Encyclopedia (MDPI).

Item	Topic	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
TITLE			
1	Title	Identify the report as a systematic review.	Title. The title identifies the report as "A Systematic Review Stratified by Unit of Analysis".
ABSTRACT			
2	Abstract	See the PRISMA 2020 for Abstracts checklist.	Abstract. Reports the question, databases, eligibility window, records identified and studies included, appraisal instrument, principal findings, limitations and interpretation.
INTRODUCTION			
3	Rationale	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of existing knowledge.	Section 1. Existing syntheses do not distinguish studies that examine institutional artefacts from studies that record accounts given by people.
4	Objectives	Provide an explicit statement of the objective(s) or question(s) the review addresses.	Section 1, final paragraph. Four objectives and the question organising the review are stated.
METHODS			
5	Eligibility criteria	Specify the inclusion and exclusion criteria and how studies were grouped for the syntheses.	Section 2.1 (inclusion and exclusion criteria, set a priori) and Section 2.2 (grouping of studies by unit of analysis for the synthesis).
6	Information sources	Specify all databases, registers, websites, organisations and other sources searched, and the date when each was last searched.	Section 2.3 and Table 1. Scopus, Web of Science, ERIC and SciELO, all searched on 8 August 2026.
7	Search strategy	Present the full search strategies for all databases, registers and websites, including any filters and limits used.	Section 2.3 (four Boolean blocks and adaptations by interface); full search strings, filters and limits in Supplementary Table S2.
8	Selection process	Specify the methods used to decide whether a study met the inclusion criteria, including how many reviewers screened each record and whether they worked independently.	Sections 2.3 and 2.4, and Table 1. Screening by a single reviewer, declared explicitly; classification by unit of analysis verified by an independent second reviewer (Section 2.4).
9	Data collection process	Specify the methods used to collect data from reports, including how many reviewers collected data and whether they worked independently.	Sections 2.3 and 2.4. Extraction by a single reviewer; every decision anchored to a textual fragment of the report, recorded in Supplementary File S1.
10a	Data items: outcomes	List and define all outcomes for which data were sought.	Sections 2.1 and 2.3. Adscription to the four dimensions: regulatory responses and institutional policy, institutional readiness and governance, quality assurance and academic integrity, and capacity building.
10b	Data items: other variables	List and define all other variables for which data were sought.	Section 2.3. Country, unit of analysis, design, sample size and composition, analytical procedures, theoretical framework, ethical approval and

			acknowledged limitations.
11	Study risk of bias assessment	Specify the methods used to assess risk of bias in the included studies.	Section 2.3. Joanna Briggs Institute checklists matched to each design; thresholds of 70 and 50 per cent of applicable items; pooling rule for mixed-methods studies.
12	Effect measures	Specify for each outcome the effect measure used in the synthesis or presentation of results.	Not applicable. No quantitative synthesis was conducted, so no effect measure was used (Section 2.5).
13a	Synthesis methods: eligibility	Describe the processes used to decide which studies were eligible for each synthesis.	Sections 2.2 and 2.5. Studies were assigned to a stratum by unit of analysis and synthesised within each stratum before comparison across strata.
13b	Synthesis methods: data preparation	Describe any methods required to prepare the data for presentation or synthesis.	Sections 2.2 to 2.4. Deduplication by normalised digital identifier and title; classification rule for mixed populations; extraction and coding anchored to textual evidence.
13c	Synthesis methods: tabulation	Describe any methods used to tabulate or visually display results of individual studies and syntheses.	Section 3. Figure 1 and Tables 1 to 6; study-level data in Supplementary File S1.
13d	Synthesis methods: synthesis	Describe any methods used to synthesise results and provide a rationale for the choice(s).	Section 2.5. Narrative synthesis within each stratum following SWiM reporting recommendations; meta-analysis ruled out by heterogeneity of designs and contexts.
13e	Synthesis methods: heterogeneity	Describe any methods used to explore possible causes of heterogeneity among study results.	Section 2.5. Coverage cross-tabulated by region and by design; results in Sections 3.5 and 3.7.
13f	Synthesis methods: sensitivity	Describe any sensitivity analyses conducted to assess robustness of the synthesised results.	Section 2.5. Sensitivity analysis excluding studies rated low quality; results in Section 3.7.
14	Reporting bias assessment	Describe any methods used to assess risk of bias due to missing results in a synthesis.	Not undertaken. Declared and justified in Section 4.2.
15	Certainty assessment	Describe any methods used to assess certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for an outcome.	Not undertaken. Declared and justified in Section 4.2.
RESULTS			
16a	Study selection: numbers	Describe the results of the search and selection process, ideally using a flow diagram.	Section 3.1, Table 1 and Figure 1. 3707 records identified; 39 studies included.
16b	Study selection: exclusions	Cite studies that appeared to meet the inclusion criteria but were excluded, and explain why.	Section 3.1 and Figure 1. Reasons are given for the five reports excluded after full-text reading and for the five records withdrawn after document-type verification; the withdrawn records are named in Supplementary File S1 (Sheets S1.4 and S1.7).
17	Study characteristics	Cite each included study and present its characteristics.	Section 3.1 and Table 3; each included study is cited in Sections 3.2 to 3.4; study-level characteristics in Supplementary File S1 (Sheet S1.2).
18	Risk of bias in studies	Present assessments of risk of bias for each included study.	Section 3.6 and Table 5; item-by-item appraisal of each study in Supplementary File S1 (Sheet S1.6).
19	Results of individual studies	For all outcomes, present for each study summary statistics or summary data and effect estimates.	Sections 3.2 to 3.4 and Table 2; study-level data in Supplementary File S1

			(Sheets S1.2, S1.3 and S1.9). No effect estimates were computed.
20a	Results of syntheses: characteristics	For each synthesis, briefly summarise the characteristics and risk of bias among contributing studies.	Sections 3.1 to 3.4 and 3.6; Table 2 for the composition of each stratum and Table 5 for appraisal.
20b	Results of syntheses: results	Present results of all statistical syntheses conducted.	Not applicable. No statistical synthesis was conducted; results of the narrative synthesis are given in Sections 3.2 to 3.4.
20c	Results of syntheses: heterogeneity	Present results of all investigations of possible causes of heterogeneity.	Sections 3.5 and 3.7; Tables 4 and 6.
20d	Results of syntheses: sensitivity	Present results of all sensitivity analyses conducted.	Section 3.7.
21	Reporting biases	Present assessments of risk of bias due to missing results for each synthesis assessed.	Not undertaken. Declared in Section 4.2.
22	Certainty of evidence	Present assessments of certainty in the body of evidence for each outcome assessed.	Not undertaken. Declared in Section 4.2.
DISCUSSION			
23a	Discussion: interpretation	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence.	Section 4.
23b	Discussion: limitations of evidence	Discuss any limitations of the evidence included in the review.	Sections 3.6 and 4.2.
23c	Discussion: limitations of processes	Discuss any limitations of the review processes used.	Section 4.2. Single-reviewer procedure, retrieval, absence of a registered protocol, classification dependent on reporting, operationalisation of the Global South and language restriction, and allocation of records to a companion review.
23d	Discussion: implications	Discuss implications of the results for practice, policy and future research.	Sections 4.1 and 5.
OTHER INFORMATION			
24a	Registration	Provide registration information for the review, including register name and registration number, or state that the review was not registered.	Section 2, opening paragraph, and Section 4.2. The review was not registered in PROSPERO or in any other public registry; this is stated explicitly.
24b	Protocol	Indicate where the review protocol can be accessed, or state that a protocol was not prepared.	Section 2, opening paragraph, and Section 4.2. No protocol was deposited in a public registry; criteria, stratification rules and thresholds were fixed a priori and are reported in full in Section 2.
24c	Amendments	Describe and explain any amendments to information provided at registration or in the protocol.	Not applicable. No registered or publicly deposited protocol exists.
25	Support	Describe sources of financial or non-financial support for the review, and the role of the funders.	Funding statement. This research received no external funding.
26	Competing interests	Declare any competing interests of review authors.	Conflicts of Interest statement. The authors declare no conflicts of interest.
27	Availability of data, code and other materials	Report which of the following are publicly available and where: template data collection forms; data extracted; data used in analyses; analytic code; other materials.	Data Availability Statement and Supplementary Materials. List of included studies, extraction data, textual evidence for each classification, verification worksheet and item-level appraisal in Supplementary File S1; search strategies in Supplementary Table S2.

Note. Checklist items follow Page, M.J.; McKenzie, J.E.; Bossuyt, P.M.; Boutron, I.; Hoffmann, T.C.; Mulrow, C.D.; et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: An updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. BMJ 2021, 372, n71. Items 14, 15, 21 and 22 were not undertaken, and the reasons are stated in Section 4.2 of the manuscript; items 12 and 20b do not apply because no statistical synthesis was conducted. Section numbers refer to the revised manuscript.