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
ABSTRACT			
Abstract	2	See the PRISMA 2020 for Abstracts checklist.	Completed and attached
INTRODUCTION			
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of existing knowledge.	Introduction and Methods.
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of the objective(s) or question(s) the review addresses.	Introduction and Methods.
METHODS			
Eligibility criteria	5	Specify the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the review and how studies were grouped for the syntheses.	The inclusion and exclusion criteria are specified in Section 3.3, and the grouping of studies for synthesis is described in Sections 3.4 and 4.2
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.	All information sources are specified in Section 3.2
Search strategy	7	Present the full search strategies for all databases, registers and websites, including any filters and limits used.	Section 3.2.4 and Table 1 Sections 3.2.1–3.2.2.
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.	Section 3.3
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.	Section 3.4
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.	Section 3.4, and t Sections 4.2.1–4.2.5
	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.	implicitly specified in Section 3.4 and operationalised in Sections 4.1–4.2 and Tables 4–9

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
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.	end of Section 3.4
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.	Section 3.4 Section 4.2.5 Figure 3
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)).	Section 3.3 Section 3.4 Sections 4.2.1–4.2.4 (Tables 5–8)
	13b	Describe any methods required to prepare the data for presentation or synthesis, such as handling of missing summary statistics, or data conversions.	Data preparation methods are described in Section 3.4, with additional synthesis-handling assumptions stated in Section 4.2.5.
	13c	Describe any methods used to tabulate or visually display results of individual studies and syntheses.	Tables 3–9 (Sections 4.1–4.2.5) Figures 1–3 Section 4.2.5 (network analysis using Gephi)
	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.	Sections 3.4 and 4.2.5, (Tables 5–9) No meta-analysis was performed, so statistical heterogeneity methods are not applicable.
	13e	Describe any methods used to explore possible causes of heterogeneity among study results (e.g. subgroup analysis, meta-regression).	Not applicable because your review does not perform meta-analysis or effect-size synthesis

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
	13f	Describe any sensitivity analyses conducted to assess robustness of the synthesized results.	No formal sensitivity analyses were conducted because the synthesis is construct-mapping and network-structural in nature rather than effect-estimate based
Reporting bias assessment	14	Describe any methods used to assess risk of bias due to missing results in a synthesis (arising from reporting biases).	Reporting bias was not formally assessed (e.g., publication-bias tests) because no effect-size synthesis was undertaken
Certainty assessment	15	Describe any methods used to assess certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for an outcome.	Certainty (confidence) in the body of evidence was not formally assessed (e.g., GRADE/CERQual) because the review synthesises readiness constructs rather than estimating causal effects
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 3.3 and summarised in Figure 1what
	16b	Cite studies that might appear to meet the inclusion criteria, but which were excluded, and explain why they were excluded.	Studies were excluded at the full-text stage if they (i) were not related to any of the SCV dimensions (agility, resilience,

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
			sustainability, digitalisation), (ii) did not address readiness-related constructs such as drivers, enablers, antecedents, or capabilities, (iii) fell outside the defined publication window (2015–2025), or (iv) were not peer-reviewed journal articles.
Study characteristics	17	Cite each included study and present its characteristics.	Supplementary material
Risk of bias in studies	18	Present assessments of risk of bias for each included study.	Risk of bias for individual studies was not formally assessed in this review. This is because the study aimed to conduct a conceptual and thematic synthesis of readiness factors across supply chain viability dimensions, integrating evidence from diverse research designs, including conceptual papers, empirical studies, and mixed-method approaches. To ensure comprehensive factor identification, all included studies were treated equally, and no

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
			quality-based weighting or bias assessment was applied during synthesis.
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.	No quantitative synthesis (meta-analysis) was undertaken; therefore, summary statistics and effect estimates were not applicable. This is consistent with the study's objective of conceptual integration and readiness factor mapping rather than effect-size estimation.
Results of syntheses	20a	For each synthesis, briefly summarise the characteristics and risk of bias among contributing studies.	The included studies vary in methodological approach and sectoral application, covering multiple industries and supply chains. The synthesis integrates conceptual, empirical, and mixed-method studies; however, no formal risk-of-bias assessment or quality weighting was applied during analysis.
	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.	No formal meta-analysis was

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
			conducted. Instead, a thematic synthesis approach and network-based analysis were applied to identify and map 36 readiness factors across SCV dimensions. Relationships were analysed using a two-mode network and degree centrality to assess structural connectivity between factors and dimensions.
	20c	Present results of all investigations of possible causes of heterogeneity among study results.	Heterogeneity among studies was explored conceptually through comparative synthesis and network analysis, highlighting differences in factor distribution across SCV dimensions and identifying cross-dimensional readiness factors. No statistical heterogeneity tests were performed.
	20d	Present results of all sensitivity analyses conducted to assess the robustness of the synthesized results.	Sensitivity analyses were not conducted, as the review did not employ quantitative meta-

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
			analytic techniques.
Reporting biases	21	Present assessments of risk of bias due to missing results (arising from reporting biases) for each synthesis assessed.	Reporting bias was not formally assessed; however, the use of systematic search strategies across Scopus and Google Scholar, combined with snowballing techniques, was intended to minimise selection and database bias.
Certainty of evidence	22	Present assessments of certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for each outcome assessed.	The certainty of evidence was not formally evaluated. All included studies were synthesised without applying quality-based weighting, and findings should therefore be interpreted as conceptually integrated rather than quantitatively validated.
DISCUSSION			
Discussion	23a	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence.	Section 5: Discussion
	23b	Discuss any limitations of the evidence included in the review.	Section 6: Conclusions
	23c	Discuss any limitations of the review processes used.	section 6: Conclusions — limitations paragraph
	23d	Discuss implications of the results for practice, policy, and future research.	Section 5: Discussion

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
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.	Section 3.3
	24b	Indicate where the review protocol can be accessed, or state that a protocol was not prepared.	Section 3.3
	24c	Describe and explain any amendments to information provided at registration or in the protocol.	N/A
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 section
Competing interests	26	Declare any competing interests of review authors.	Conflicts of Interest" section
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.	N|A

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/