PRISMA 2020 Checklist

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
TITLE			
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review.	See Page 1
ABSTRACT			
Abstract	2	See the PRISMA 2020 for Abstracts checklist.	see Page 1
INTRODUCTION			
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of existing knowledge.	- Rationale: see Page 2-3, Paras 1-4; - Literature Review: see Page 3-4 (Green marketing, and Green marketing in South Africa)
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of the objective(s) or question(s) the review addresses.	- Introduction: see page 2, Para 4 - Methodology: see page 5, - Section 3.1.1-Designing (review questions 1–3)
METHODS			
Eligibility criteria	5	Specify the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the review and how studies were grouped for the syntheses.	- Methodology: see Page 5 - Section 3.1.2-Inclusion/Exclusion Criteria - Table 1- see Page 6
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.	- Methodology: see Page 6 - 3.1.2.1- Search Strategy (see Page 6) - Table 2 - database specification (see Page 7) - The date each source was last searched: August 2026
Search strategy	7	Present the full search strategies for all databases, registers and websites, including any filters and limits used.	- Methodology: see Page 6 - 3.1.2.1- Search Strategy (see Page 6) - Table 2 & 3 - Boolean strings were conducted and keywords were used to meet each database-specific interface (see page 6, line3-4)
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.	- Methodology: see Page 5 - 3.0- Materials and Methods- two researchers screened and coded the studies. - 3.0- Study Selection: An automation tool named Rayyan was used to support the screening process, as well as a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet (para 2, line 8-13) Number of reviewers: 2
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 and Synthesis- see Supplementary Material 1 (Appendix 1) - The number of reviewers- 2 (see Page 5, para 2, line 8-13) - Automation tools for data screening- Rayyan software and Microsoft Excel spreadsheet (see Page 5, para 2, line 8-13)
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 Extraction and Synthesis- Appendix 2 (See Supplementary Material 1) Results — Table 4, Table 5, Figure 3 (see Page 9) All results compatible with each domain were sought from every included study
	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 Extraction and Synthesis- (see Appendix 1 & 2) (See Supplementary Material 1) - Results - Table 4, Table 5, Figure 3 (see Page 9) - All articles were scrutinised before being included in the studies. Information like the theories was left blank if it was unavailable

PRISMA 2020 Checklist

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.	See Supplementary Material 2 see Page 5, para 2, line 13-14
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.
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)).	- 3.1.2: Inclusion/Exclusion Criteria - Supplementary material: Appendix 1: 1-4
	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
	13c	Describe any methods used to tabulate or visually display results of individual studies and syntheses.	see Supplementary Material 1- (Appendices 2–4) Result- Table 5-9, Figure 2-3
	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.	- Supplementary material 1: Appendices 4
	13e	Describe any methods used to explore possible causes of heterogeneity among study results (e.g. subgroup analysis, meta-regression).	Not applicable
	13f	Describe any sensitivity analyses conducted to assess robustness of the synthesized results.	Not applicable
Reporting bias assessment	14	Describe any methods used to assess risk of bias due to missing results in a synthesis (arising from reporting biases).	All studies included met pre-specified eligibility criteria, but risk of bias due to missing results was not assessed
Certainty assessment	15	Describe any methods used to assess certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for an outcome.	No outcome-level rating was produced as the purpose of the study is to integrate the conditions and consequences of green marketing adoption reported across a heterogeneous literature, not to estimate a pooled effect for any single outcome.
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.	- 3.1.2.2- Study Selection - Figure 2 - PRISMA flow diagram
	16b	Cite studies that might appear to meet the inclusion criteria, but which were excluded, and explain why they were excluded.	Edeh, M. B. (2020). Green marketing as a marketing tool and consumer purchase behavior. Journal of Global Social Sciences, 1(3), 37-54. This study examines South Africa and other countries, but antecedents or outcomes could not be identified See Appendix 8 (See Supplementary Material 1)
Study characteristics	17	Cite each included study and present its characteristics.	- Results - Characteristics of Studies Included (see Page 8) - Appendix 1- full bibliography of the included studies (See Supplementary Material 1) - Table 4 & 5; Figures 3 & 4
Risk of bias in studies	18	Present assessments of risk of bias for each included study.	See Supplementary Material 2

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is 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.	Not applicable
Results of syntheses	20a	For each synthesis, briefly summarise the characteristics and risk of bias among contributing studies.	The scope of both syntheses (the conditions and consequences of green marketing adoption) is mostly based on convenience samples in cross-sectional survey studies. A majority of studies had adequate ratings for measurement. Qualitative and mixed methods studies fulfilled their respective criteria. The profile of the risk of bias is comparable in the two syntheses.
	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
	20c	Present results of all investigations of possible causes of heterogeneity among study results.	Not applicable
	20d	Present results of all sensitivity analyses conducted to assess the robustness of the synthesized results.	Not applicable
Reporting biases	21	Present assessments of risk of bias due to missing results (arising from reporting biases) for each synthesis assessed.	For both syntheses, the risk of missing results was not formally assessed. All of the non-significant findings are likely to be under-represented since both syntheses are based on published studies.
Certainty of evidence	22	Present assessments of certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for each outcome assessed.	There is not formally assessed for any outcome because the review is thematic in nature rather than meta-analytic
DISCUSSION			
Discussion	23a	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence.	Discussion- see Page21 (Implications and Future Research Directions)
	23b	Discuss any limitations of the evidence included in the review.	5.3-Limitation of the Study (see Page 22)
	23c	Discuss any limitations of the review processes used.	5.3-Limitation of the Study (see Page 22)
	23d	Discuss implications of the results for practice, policy, and future research.	Discussion- see Page21 (Implications and Future Research Directions)
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.	The review was not registered.
	24b	Indicate where the review protocol can be accessed, or state that a protocol was not prepared.	The Review Protocol can be found in the material and methods section
	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.	This research received no external funding
Competing interests	26	Declare any competing interests of review authors.	The authors declare no conflicts of interest
Availability of data, code and	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	The data are all found in the supplementary materials. They are available from the corresponding author on request

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
other materials		other materials used in the review.	

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/