

**INFLUENCIA DE LOS FACTORES INTERNOS  
DIFERENCIALES EN LAS MYPYME EN COLOMBIA:  
REVISION SISTEMATICA.**

**INFLUENCE OF INTERNAL DIFFERENTIAL  
FACTORS IN MYPYMES IN COLOMBIA.**

Fabio Herrera Rhenals<sup>1</sup>  
María José Hernández Bolívar<sup>2</sup>

**Contador Público Universidad Autónoma del Caribe  
Contador Público Universidad Popular del Cesar**

**Resumen.**

El presente artículo de revisión bibliográfica tuvo como objetivo; analizar la influencia de los factores internos diferenciales en las MiPyme en Colombia, mediante una revisión sistemática. Las pequeñas empresas a nivel general son las que potencian la economía de un país, es necesario que, a nivel interno, el liderazgo fortalezca la actitud de todos los empleados para un buen desempeño y rendimiento productivo con calidad. Autores como Barrero (2020), Porter (2011), Mazzucato, (2018), Solis et al. (2021) entre otros. Aportaron fundamentos útiles para el desarrollo del presente análisis. La metodología fue en base a una revisión sistemática, donde se incluyeron 44 estudios y se seleccionaron en el Flujograma de datos prisma 35 artículos para dar respuesta a los objetivos planteados. En los resultados de la revisión se encontró, que las MiPymes siguen siendo en este momento la forma generadora de mayores posibilidades de empleo para la población colombiana, sigue proporcionando el 80% de empleos en la nación, de acuerdo a los datos proporcionados por el DANE- Departamento Administrativo Nacional de Estadística (2021). En el segundo trimestre del presente año hubo un aumento del 9,5% de micronegocios, aumentando en 8,5% la ocupación laboral gracias a este repunte de las medianas, pequeñas y microempresas. Concluyendo, que es necesario que estas empresas se mantengan en el mercado con el apoyo de la fidelidad de los clientes, obteniendo así una plena solidez financiera aportando al país alternativas en productos y servicios, además de generación de empleos y pagos de impuestos.

**Palabras clave:** Mipymes, factores de crecimiento MiPymes, micronegocios, satisfacción al cliente, solidez financiera MiPymes.

**Abstract.**

The present bibliographical review article had as objective; analyze the influence of differential internal factors in MSMEs in Colombia, through a systematic review. Small companies at a general level are the ones that boost the economy of a country, it is necessary that internally, leadership strengthens the attitude of all employees for good performance and productive performance with quality. Authors such as Escarria (2021), Porter (2011), Mazzucato, (2018), Solis et al. (2021) among others. They provided useful foundations for the development of this analysis. The methodology was based on a systematic review, where 44 studies were included to respond to the stated objectives. In the results of the review, it

---

<sup>1</sup> Contador Público Universidad Autónoma del Caribe

<sup>2</sup> Contador Público Universidad Popular del Cesar

was found that MiPymes continue to be at this time the generating form of greater employment possibilities for the Colombian population, 80% of jobs in the nation are still required, according to the data provided by DANE. -National Administrative Department of Statistics (2021). In the second quarter of this year there was an increase of 9.5% in micro-businesses, increasing employment by 8.5% thanks to this rebound in medium, small and micro-enterprises. In conclusion, it is necessary for these companies to remain in the market with the support of customer loyalty, thus obtaining full financial strength, providing the country with alternative products and services, in addition to generating jobs and paying taxes.

**Keywords:** MSMEs, MSMEs growth factors, microbusinesses, customer satisfaction, MSMEs financial strength.

## **Introducción**

Las MiPymes han estado participando y siguen jugando un papel de primer orden en el desarrollo económico del país, según Barrero y Parra (2020) estas microempresas son generadoras de 80% del empleo y representan alrededor del 90% del sector productivo de la nación. De acuerdo a los datos de Florian y Sarmiento (2019) en relación con la facturación electrónica de las MiPymes, alrededor de cinco millones de micronegocios están registrando ingresos superiores a los 2124 billones de pesos, los cuales les aportan al Estado impuestos que contribuyen para llevar a cabo el propósito requerido.

Por consiguiente, por medio del desarrollo del presente artículo de revisión sistemática se tiene el objetivo de; analizar la influencia de los factores internos diferenciales en las MiPyme en Colombia. Asimismo, se plantean las acciones relacionadas con los objetivos específicos tales como: describir el crecimiento económico y la posición de mercado nacional e internacional de las MiPymes, evaluando así de distintas maneras las quejas y complacencias. Algunos de los métodos que se utilizan para obtener los datos de agrado del cliente del bien adquirido son redes sociales, formularios o encuestas tanto online como físicos, estudiando el total de compra o contratación de la empresa.

De acuerdo a lo anterior, se efectúa una revisión sistemática sobre los conceptos entorno a los factores internos diferenciales, en las MiPymes abordadas teóricamente a nivel nacional e internacional. Así mismo, como evaluar la influencia de información al cliente postulados por las MiPymes exitosas en Colombia. Igualmente, se plasman las razones o la justificación acerca de la importancia de llevar a cabo este escrito, tanto en el aspecto económico, como social.

Con relación al componente teórico, se tienen en cuenta algunos antecedentes de carácter internacional y nacional, realizados con el fin de dar a comprender la manera de proceder de las medianas, pequeñas y microempresas en el desempeño de las labores correspondientes, principalmente en el aspecto relacionado con la información al cliente, también se abordan los temas asociados con factores internos diferenciales de información, el cliente y la solidez financiera.

De igual modo, se lleva a cabo el análisis de los resultados obtenidos por medio de la discusión de los mismos, los cuales presentan los principales efectos que el desarrollo de la información al cliente posibilita en las MiPymes esa solidez financiera que les permita servir de aporte al desarrollo de la nación por medio de la generación de empleos y apoyo a la población colombiana en la prestación de los servicios en los que se encuentran inmersas. El artículo contiene en último término las conclusiones, en las que se destaca la importancia de que el estado junto a entidades financieras les brinde un mejor aporte a todas las MiPymes, especialmente aquellas que requieren del alcance de esa solidez económica para consolidarse.

### **Descripción del Problema**

Actualmente, a nivel mundial existe la situación sanitaria ocasionada por la pandemia del Covid 19, lo que indudablemente ha traído consigo no solo problemas de salud, sino que también ha impactado fuertemente la economía en todos los países y por ende en las MiPymes, muchas de las cuales han debido realizar recortes de personal, como consecuencia de los altos índices de desempleo tanto en países desarrollados como subdesarrollados, lo cual ha llevado a muchas personas a tomar la decisión de crear empresa. Lo que indudablemente repercute de manera positiva en la búsqueda de alternativas, sin embargo, es importante que quienes están al frente de estas pequeñas y medianas empresas tengan en cuenta la importancia de conocer con mayor claridad y precisión los factores internos diferenciales relacionados con la información al cliente, de manera que estos tengan la posibilidad de conocer algunos aspectos que ofrece la empresa que les beneficia por encima de otras; de igual manera se hace indispensable conocer la manera como aquellas MiPymes de mayor relevancia y solidez financiera en Colombia llevan a cabo este proceso de aplicación de los factores relacionados con la información al cliente.

Ante lo planteado, resulta interesante y necesario detenerse a identificar y examinar a las MiPymes en Colombia, con la intención de saber o entender cuáles han buscado

estrategias para afrontar la situación sanitaria, además identificar las que tienen mayor solidez, interpretación y aplicación de los factores internos de atención al cliente, que les permita actuar y poder resaltar frente a las demás empresas, de la misma forma a obtener ventas más altas y finanzas más solventes.

Desde un punto estadístico y tomando en cuenta el estudio de Aragón (2010) donde las MiPymes concentran en el país el 80% de la carga laboral, es decir con una fuente generadora de empleo, de allí la necesidad de impulsar en ellas la importancia de aplicar los factores que posibilitan la información al cliente, lo que indudablemente repercute de manera positiva en el asentamiento y consolidación para mayor capacidad de generar dichos empleos, en especial, aquellas empresas que requieren el impulso necesario para continuar en el campo empresarial, habida cuenta que de acuerdo a los datos del DANE (2020), de cada 100 nuevas micro, pequeñas y medianas empresas, tan solo 43 mantienen la existencia, por lo que resulta relevante saber la manera como aplican esos factores internos diferenciales relacionados con la información al cliente, con el fin de poder impulsar en las otras estos mecanismos que contribuyan a su permanencia en el mercado empresarial.

## **Objetivos**

### **Objetivo general**

Analizar la influencia de los factores internos diferenciales en las MiPyme en Colombia, mediante una revisión sistemática.

### **Objetivos específicos**

- Realizar una revisión sistemática para conocer el potencial del sector de las pequeñas y medianas empresas en el mercado nacional.
- Describir el crecimiento económico y la posición de mercado nacional e internacional de las MiPymes.
- Valorar la influencia de los factores internos diferenciales de información al cliente postulados por las MiPymes exitosas en Colombia.

### **Justificación**

La importancia del presente estudio se justifica, a razón del tema interesante representado por las pequeñas y medianas empresas asimismo factores internos diferenciales y la solidez financiera en Colombia, tanto de carácter financiero, social y laboral. Desde una mirada Latinoamericana Zevallos (2003) muestra como las actividades comerciales se están

incrementando por causa de las MiPymes, se fortalece el sistema financiero y se pone en práctica la atención de calidad al cliente en los productos y servicios ofrecidos.

De igual manera, señalan Medina y Naranjo (2014) este sector importante para la economía, debe consolidarse en el mercado nacional, no sólo con aquellas MiPymes que poseen una solidez financiera, sino también a quienes emprenden proyectos en este sentido con el ánimo de generar utilidades y beneficiar a la población en general mediante la generación de empleo. Por su parte, Delgado (2021) manifiesta que hay factores que determinan la permanencia de las microempresas en el mercado productor de bienes y servicios, siendo uno de esos mecanismos que ayudan a dicha consolidación a la aplicación de los elementos que propician la información al cliente, en especial cuando se debe enfrentar al reto de aumentar la existencia de estas MiPymes a una cifra superior al 60%.

Por otra parte, según Cortés (2020) uno de los factores internos diferenciales principalmente es el liderazgo, por ser la habilidad que tiene un gerente para promover el rendimiento y la calidad en todos sus productos o servicios. Para Chatman (1991) un líder tiene la actitud para influenciar a las personas de la organización, a desempeñarse eficientemente de forma voluntaria y así alcanzar los objetivos de la organización.

En ese sentido, para un correcto desempeño del liderazgo la persona debe tener una actitud estratégica apoyada en la disposición para llevar a cabo la adaptación de la organización y de las personas a los cambios del entorno. Pero además fomenta la capacidad de enfrentarse al entorno y la competencia profesional para responder a los retos, las amenazas y las oportunidades que el mismo ambiente ofrece.

Finalmente, la temática propuesta permitirá establecer la importancia de la solidez de las MiPymes en Colombia, y así mismo recopilar, organizar y documentar la información de tal manera que pueda agregar el mayor valor posible a los empresarios o emprendedores para que puedan tener una referencia clara de los elementos a considerar y adaptarlos a la situación particular de su organización o compañía. En síntesis, es indispensable identificar los principales factores internos diferenciales de información al cliente de algunas MiPymes para evitar pérdida y por ende desempleo, que sirvan como partida para otras empresas nuevas o que lleven algún tiempo en el mercado, mejorando la solides de las MiPymes en Colombia, optimizando sus indicadores financieros, extendiendo así la probabilidad de supervivencia en el tiempo.

## Antecedentes

Desde el punto de vista internacional se han abordado antecedentes que resaltan la importancia de las MiPymes en diferentes países, pero también de los aspectos financieros que forman parte del andamiaje y posibilita la existencia de estas pequeñas y medianas empresas, pero de igual manera de otros sectores de la economía mundial; al respecto se manifiestan los siguientes estudios:

En Argentina Dini y Stumpo (2020) llevan a cabo un análisis acerca de los problemas y debilidades que vienen enfrentando el sector de las MiPymes en el nuevo continente, los cuales se atribuyen específicamente a la carencia de formación empresarial y financiera; pero también, como en el caso actual los problemas ocasionados por la pandemia del Covid 19, trayendo con sí el cierre de muchas microempresas y también existen otras causales en las que se han visto envueltas estas entidades microempresariales, no sólo en Argentina y Chile, sino en el resto de América Latina; en especial la falta de un acompañamiento eficaz de las políticas monetarias que cada nación presenta, pero que desde luego, provienen de las pautas establecidas por quienes tienen el manejo de la banca internacional y entidades como el BID, entre otros. Por este motivo, y a través del extenso estudio desarrollado los autores del texto reconocen que en estas dos naciones Chile y Argentina, las MiPymes poseen una alta connotación y un interés por parte del Estado para propiciarles la ayuda financiera requerida, por este motivo, sugieren a las entidades financieras internacionales que brinden mejor apoyo a estas pequeñas y medianas empresas que existen en la región, debido a que son las que mayoritariamente se han convertido en generación de empleos a la población.

Otro estudio desarrollado con respecto a las pequeñas y medianas empresas integrado a los factores financieros que le posibilitan la consolidación en el mercado empresarial, fue elaborado en el Ecuador por Solís, Neira, Ormaza, y Quevedo (2021); quienes llevan a efecto el análisis de las dimensiones que inciden en el emprendimiento y la innovación de las MiPymes en un contexto geográfico específico, en este caso en Azores-Ecuador. Las dimensiones que abordan se relacionan con el Valor para el cliente, transformación digital, ventaja competitiva y liderazgo; para ello realizan una metodología de tipo exploratorio con un enfoque cualicuantitativo, en el que se hace una correlación, explicación y descripción de la revisión literaria que realizan acerca de las dimensiones descritas.

Encontrando en este procedimiento la necesidad de darle relevancia al valor al cliente

y la ventaja competitiva para poder desarrollar un buen proceso financiero y empresarial en este sector. Para lo cual hacen una recomendación centrada en el reconocimiento de la importancia de prestarle mucha atención al cliente.

Con respecto a los antecedentes nacionales, estos se abordan de acuerdo al desarrollo que se manifiestan en las diferentes ciudades, pero también de manera generalizada, especialmente se tienen en cuenta los estudios que se relacionan con aquellas ciudades donde el papel de las MiPymes es relevante y ante la escasa presencia de grandes empresas generadoras de gran número de empleos.

De manera generalizada la Asociación Bancaria y de Entidades Financieras ASOBANCARIA, (2018), realizó un estudio denominado “*supervivencia de las MiPyme: un problema por resolver*”; en él se aborda la situación que presentan estas pequeñas y medianas empresas en Colombia de manera particular en el año 2018, de allí que el objetivo se encaminó hacia analizar la necesidad del acceso a la financiación formal que estas MiPymes requieren para seguir siendo uno de los elementos claves en la economía nacional, y generadora de fuentes de empleo. Mediante el uso de una metodología descriptiva y analítica, el documento presenta, en primer lugar los problemas de crédito que enfrentan estas microempresas y, en segundo término, las oportunidades que se ciernen sobre ellas a corto, mediano y largo plazo, considerando que existen un conjunto de medidas que contribuyen en la mitigación de los riesgos que deben enfrentar, concluyendo así, que con el desarrollo de programas relacionados con la educación financiera, estas MiPymes tienen muchas posibilidades de mejorar los indicadores financieros y renovar el aparato productivo que les permita alcanzar la supervivencia en el tiempo.

En la ciudad de Bogotá, Barrera y Parra (2020) realizaron una investigación titulada “*Factores determinantes para el acceso de las MIPYME al crédito gota a gota*”; cuyo objetivo se encaminó a identificar los factores determinantes que llevan a las micro, pequeñas y medianas empresas - MiPyme a tomar créditos gota a gota, con el fin de reconocer los efectos negativos que se puedan derivar de esta práctica por parte de los propietarios de estas pequeñas y medianas empresas, pero de igual manera sobre el recurso humano que forma parte activa de ellas. Mediante una metodología con un enfoque cuantitativa y de tipo exploratorio, los autores recolectan la información por medio de una encuesta dirigida a un grupo determinado por administradores de estas MiPymes, encontrando que existe casi el 30% de ellos que acuden a la consecución del crédito gota a

gota, porque no tienen que realizar muchos trámites para conseguirlo; por consiguiente, a manera de conclusión, los autores recomiendan al sector financiero disminuir los tramites que esas personas emprendedoras requieren para adquirir los recursos financieros que les permita continuar con la labor de ser generadores de progreso al país.

### **Marco teórico.**

El marco teórico contempla los aportes de diversos investigadores con respecto a los temas relacionados con las pymes, desde el punto de vista del espíritu empresarial, el cliente y la solidez financiera. En el tema de la solidez financiera, según Lu (2001) es sin duda un aspecto en el que la empresa tiene la posibilidad de poder determinar la manera como se encuentra conformado la estructura de capital de una organización empresarial, bien sea pequeña, mediana o gran empresa. Este es sin duda para Morales, Percy, y Monzón (2019) el mecanismo que permite saber del movimiento de los activos de la empresa. En términos generales, se hace referencia a la manera como la empresa reconoce que cuenta con los recursos económicos necesarios para continuar llevando a cabo las metas y objetivos propuestos.

La solidez financiera está conformada según Mazzucato (2018) por una serie de elementos que hacen posible conocer hasta qué punto la empresa se encuentra en buenas condiciones económicas. También, la International Labour Organization. (2019) y Cuevas (2015) señalan que esta solidez se relaciona con la estabilidad financiera, teniendo en cuenta que se refiere sencillamente a toda ausencia de crisis económica en cualquier empresa u organización, en el caso de las MiPymes, se manifiesta a través de la carencia de dificultades económicas, es decir, que los productos y/o servicios que prestan están generando utilidades, las cuales permiten cancelar los compromisos con los proveedores, generando utilidades para los dueños o socios.

Para lograr una proyección económica fuerte, se debe poseer el espíritu empresarial el cual es una actitud positiva. Según Espinosa (2012) se trata de una manera de razonar, pensar y actuar, enmarcada en una obsesión por la oportunidad para desarrollar proyectos emprendedores. Al respecto, Vieira (2016) lo define como un proceso humano que tiene desarrollo en cada persona que decide asimilarlo y hacerlo su guía, su motor, su fuerza. sentimiento de superación y progreso, alta motivación y fuerza vital; sueño de logro e independencia que está en cada uno de nosotros.



Tal como lo manifiesta Ipinnaiye (2017) se enmarca dentro de espíritu empresarial que debe orientarse en los estudiantes y los jóvenes, es el impulso que los motiva a generar estrategias con nuevas iniciativas emprendedoras que le ayuden a hacer realidad sus sueños e ideales. Según Malagón, (2013) y Hauser (2013) se puede considerar el espíritu emprendedor como esa capacidad que posee el ser humano para desarrollar nueva idea o transformar una que ya se encuentra presente para traducirla en una actividad social rentable y productiva. No obstante, estas personas para Yuriev (2018) poseen la visión, la creatividad y la determinación tradicionalmente asociada a los emprendedores o lo importante que es emprender una idea, una propuesta o hasta un sueño. Sin duda alguna, el espíritu empresarial es arriesgado y requiere confianza en uno mismo y autonomía, así como su éxito y su fracaso son inherentes a la realidad contextual, como lo considera Gutiérrez, (2013).

En el contexto Latinoamericano, Varela y Bedoya, (2014) identifican una serie de características que debe tener una persona con espíritu empresarial; estas características se manifiestan en actitudes como la capacidad para identificar nuevas oportunidades de negocio; las habilidades y la innovación. Para Tarapuez y Lima (2016) el empresario puede desarrollarse, generarse, cultivarse y fortalecerse a través de un proceso educativo.

Con relación a los clientes, Cortés (2020) y Porter (2008) manifiestan que estos son la clave para que cualquier negocio alcance el éxito. En la atención al cliente, Porter (2011) y Mintzberg (2000) señalan que todo empresario o microempresario, poseedor de cualquier negocio debe tener presente que la persona que acude a la búsqueda de una prestación de un servicio es alguien que le está aportando los recursos económicos que necesita para el sostenimiento de la empresa o negocio. Por lo tanto, Escudero (2012) indica que el éxito de cualquier organización empresarial tiene la dependencia en los clientes, sin ellos no tendría razón de ser. Adicionalmente, según Acs (2006) la tecnología promueve la atención de calidad en aplicaciones o redes sociales, por lo tanto, toda organización debe orientar en gran proporción un buen servicio personalizado para cada cliente.

Otro aspecto que debe tener en cuenta una organización según Guerrero y Peña (2013) es que los clientes son fundamentales para mantenerse en el mercado. Manifiesta Da Silva (2020) generalmente los usuarios presentan diferentes características, las cuales van desde ser alguien muy informado, discutiendo, impulsivo, pasando por ser silencioso, indeciso, confundido y leal, hasta clientes fuertemente negociadores. Sin embargo, para Siepel (2020)

ante cada una de estas características debe existir un conocimiento acerca de la manera de tratar con ellos. Dentro de este marco, Sánchez (2020) considera relevante tener una buena comunicación organizacional; es necesario el aprovechamiento de los recursos digitales haciendo uso de las redes sociales, plataformas, sitios web, blogs, entre otros.

## **Métodos**

Se realizó una revisión sistemática de literatura basada (Kitchenham, 2004) lo que plantea una evaluación de la literatura existente, tras la aplicación de un método de revisión, que a futuro permitirá replicar el proceso. Los criterios de inclusión fueron todos los documentos que: el tema de las MiPymes en el ámbito de los factores internos, artículos en idioma inglés y español. Criterios de exclusión: Documentos en otros idiomas y que no se refieran al tema en estudio.

La búsqueda arrojó 165 documentos como resultado, se eligieron 44 y se evaluaron bajo la base Prisma 35 artículos, todos están referenciados en el Flujograma de procesos de Prisma. El periodo de revisión fue desde el año 2000 a 2021 generando así una traza de información amplia para el proceso de recolección de fuentes y ayudará a disipar las dudas que se puedan plantear en el proceso, a la revisión bibliográfica. Esta ecuación plantea la forma de selección y revisión de las fuentes oficiales y no oficiales, para realizar el análisis de resultados con los hallazgos encontrados.

## **Resultados.**

Teniendo en cuenta la revisión sistemática de los 35 artículos analizados en la base Prisma con fuentes de información confiable relacionadas con la temática abordada. Según los hallazgos encontrados cabe señalar, que aun antes las dificultades por las que pasaron una parte de las pequeñas, medianas y microempresas a nivel mundial y de manera particular en el país, por el Covid 19; de acuerdo a las estadísticas del Dane (2021), hasta el primer semestre del 2021 durante este tiempo fueron cerrados alrededor de 510.000 micronegocios. Sin embargo, en el desarrollo de la búsqueda de información acerca del comportamiento de las mipymes se pudo evidenciar que existe una recuperación en este sector de la economía y la productividad en Colombia, hasta el punto que actualmente se presentan más de mil de ellas que se encuentran en una buena posición económica financiera. Por otra parte, se pudo evidenciar que la gran mayoría de las MiPymes de mayor solidez financiera y las de bajo crecimiento están haciendo uso de las redes sociales, Otro aspecto destacable son los clientes, quienes para todas las pequeñas, medianas y microempresas son el eje central del logro de los

propósitos, metas y objetivos establecidos.

### **Discusión de resultados.**

Los resultados obtenidos, en el tema del posicionamiento de las pymes en el mercado de servicios, corrobora el planteamiento de Mejía (2018) y Cortés (2020), al hacer referencia que el cliente es la clave preponderante para alcanzar el éxito en cualquier tipo de negocio. Es decir, la atención de calidad es fundamental para lograr la fidelidad y satisfacción del cliente. Por su parte, según la Superintendencia financiera de Colombia (2019) señala que en Colombia existen más de cinco millones de MiPymes en diferentes sectores de la economía, es decir en el ramo del comercio, manufacturas, informática, tecnología, agrícolas. Por lo tanto, la generación de empleo es un factor diferencial interno en cada una de estas pequeñas organizaciones.

En cuanto a conocer la manera como diversas pequeñas y medianas empresas se destacan en el mercado nacional debido al crecimiento económico logrado y la aceptación de los clientes en Colombia; según la Superintendencia financiera de Colombia (2019) consideran que en Colombia existen más de cinco millones de MiPymes en diferentes sectores de la economía, es decir en el ramo del comercio, manufacturas, informática, tecnología, agrícolas. Es importante mencionar, que las empresas están catalogadas en medianas, pequeñas y microempresas por el Ministerio de Comercio, industria y turismo (2019) por medio del Decreto 957 de 2019, allí se estipula que una empresa es mediana cuando factura entre los 4800 y 78.000 millones de pesos anualmente; pequeña cuando lo hace entre los 855 y 4790 millones de pesos al año y, las microempresas, cuando la facturación anual se encuentra por debajo del rango de la pequeña empresa.

En el tema de la solidez financiera, según Lu (2001) es sin duda un aspecto en el que la empresa tiene la posibilidad de poder determinar la manera como se encuentra conformado la estructura de capital de una organización empresarial, bien sea pequeña, mediana o gran empresa, con la importancia que se le otorga a la clientela, no sólo en esas empresas que se distinguen financieramente por ser exitosas, sino también en aquellas que no lo son, pero que mantienen un buen servicio al cliente a pesar de que las utilidades o ganancias no son las que realmente desearían obtener.

## **Conclusiones.**

El desarrollo del presente artículo mediante una revisión sistemática, para analizar e identificar los factores internos diferenciales de información al cliente que caracterizan a las MiPymes con mayor solidez financiera, se realizó teniendo en cuenta cada uno de los requerimientos establecidos para la elaboración del artículo, en primer término, se puso de manifiesto la descripción del problema, en este caso, el conocimiento acerca de la manera cómo las MiPymes llevan a cabo la información para que los clientes conozcan acerca de la existencia y el servicio que prestan. De igual manera se presentaron los motivos considerados relevantes para desarrollarlo, en este caso la justificación pertinente.

Los objetivos planteados, tanto el general, como los específicos fueron esbozados con el fin de desarrollarlos a lo largo del escrito, los cuales se cumplieron a cabalidad, en este caso, el desarrollo de la revisión bibliográfica se elaboró teniendo en cuenta investigaciones realizadas en torno a la temática planteada, realizando en este aspecto algunos antecedentes en el nivel internacional y nacional. Además, se tuvieron en cuenta el análisis de las categorías propias de la revisión bibliográfica, en este caso, factores internos diferenciales de información, el cliente y solidez financiera, llevados a cabo por investigadores y expertos en cada uno de los temas.

En este proceso se logró conocer las principales MiPymes existentes en el territorio nacional que mantienen una solidez financiera, en este caso, se hace referencia a aquellas que presentan altas utilidades financieras mediante el desarrollo de las actividades comerciales que realizan en los distintos campos de la productividad; también se pudieron establecer los mecanismos informativos que manifiestan con relación a los medios internos de información utilizados para atraer a los clientes y hacer de ellos asiduos consumidores de los servicios o productos ofrecidos por cada una de las empresas en los distintos campos de la producción donde prestan dichos servicios.

De igual manera se manifestó la necesidad de lograr que esas MiPymes existentes en el territorio colombiano debido a la trascendencia que tienen en el desarrollo económico nacional al ser generadoras de empleos, fuentes de tributación al estado y los diversos entes territoriales que lo conforman y medios de producción; requieren de mayor interés por parte de las entidades financieras al momento de suministrar los recursos económicos necesarios para consolidarse en el mercado empresarial y ayuda técnica y formativa que les permita

alcanzar la solidez financiera necesaria para la continuación de la labor que ejercen en el contexto económico del país.

En último lugar, el proceso llevado a cabo respecto a la revisión bibliográfica con el fin de poder identificar esos factores internos diferenciales de información al cliente que caracterizan las MiPymes con mayor solidez financiera, contribuyó al conocimiento de los mecanismos que deben tenerse en cuenta para lograr el éxito empresarial y poder de esta manera ser transmitidos a aquellas personas que están impulsando este tipo de empresas puedan consolidarse en un sitio de preferencia en los consumidores de los distintos productos, bienes o servicios que presta.

Sin duda alguna, hoy día el espíritu emprendedor ha ido abriéndose campo en la vida de las personas, a pesar de que en el ámbito tanto económico, político y social algunas personas han llevado a demostrar niveles elevados de conformismo. Porque para ello se requiere implementar una idea innovadora que produzca un cambio social significativo; una visión emprendedora a la hora de realizar sus proyectos.

### **Referencias Bibliográficas**

- Aragón, A. Rubio, A., Serna A. y Chablé, J. (2010). Estrategia y competitividad empresarial; un estudio en las pymes de tabasco. *Revista Investigación y Ciencia*, (47), pp. 4-12.
- Acs, Z. (2006). How is entrepreneurship good for economic growth? *Innovations: Technology, Governance, Globalization*, 1(1), 97-107.
- ASOBANCARIA. (2018). Supervivencia de las MiPyme: un problema por resolver, edición 1145. *Semana económica*, 1-14.
- Barrera, J., y Parra, S. (2020). Factores determinantes para el acceso de las MIPYME al crédito gota a gota. *Revista Republicana* • ISSN: 1909 - 4450 Núm. 28, enero-junio, 1-20.
- Bart van Hoof, Juanita Duque-Hernández y Huang Yu Tang Zhu Los Andes University. Bogotá D.C., Colombia. Differential performance in CP dissemination in Colombia and Mexico. Recuperado de: <https://repositorio.uniandes.edu.co/bitstream/handle/1992/39237/u821133.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>
- Cantillo, R., Retamoso, J., Ruíz, A., Zapata, O., y Segura, S. (2021). Análisis sobre el nivel de reactivación económica en las micro, pequeñas y medianas empresas (MIPYMES) en Barranquilla post-emergencia sanitaria (Covid-19). Barranquilla: Universidad Simón Bolívar.
- Chatman, j.a. (1991): "Matching people and organizations: Selection and socialization in public accounting firms", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol.36, No.3, pp.459-489
- Cuevas-Vargas, H., Aguilera, L. González, M. y Servín, J. (2015). The use of icts and its relation with the competitiveness of Mexican smes. *European Scientific Journal*, 11 (13), 294-310.
- Delgado, V. (2021). Factores que determinan la permanencia de las micro y pequeñas empresas: Estudio de caso en Santa Ana Chiautempan, Tlaxcala. *Temas de Ciencia y Tecnología*. 25 (74). Mayo - agosto 2021.

- Dini, M., y Stumpo, G. (2020). MIPYMES en América Latina un frágil desempeño y nuevos desafíos para las políticas de fomento. Santiago de Chile: Naciones Unidas.
- Escudero, M. (2012). Gestión comercial y servicio de atención al cliente. Madrid: Paraninfo.
- Florian, J. y Sarmiento, N. (2019). La factura electrónica como mecanismo de planeación tributaria de las pymes en Colombia.
- González, N., Valenzuela, R., Chairez, A., Moreno, M., Aceves, J., y Ochoa, R. (2013). Plan de alternativas de solución para PYMES en el área financiera: controles internos. México: ITSON.
- Guerrero, M. y Peña-Legazkue, I. (2013). The effect of intrapreneurial experience on corporate venturing: Evidence from developed economies. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*. doi:10.1007/s11365-013-0260-9
- Hauser, C., Hogenacker, J. y Wagner, K. (2013). International market diversification of innovative European SMEs – what role do various innovation strategies play? *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Venturing*, 5(3), 310-326. doi:10.1504/IJEV.2013.055296
- International Labour Organization. (2019). Small matters: Global evidence on the contribution to employment by the self-employed, micro-enterprises and SMEs. Global Report.
- International Labour Organization – ACT/EMP. (2021). Leading business in times of COVID crisis. Analysis of the activities of employer and business membership organizations in the COVID-19 pandemic and what comes next. Ginebra.
- Ipinnaiye, O., Dineen D. y Lenihan, H. (2017). Drivers of SME performance: A holistic and multivariate approach. *Small Business Economics*, 48, 883-911
- Kitchenham, B. (2004). Procedures for performing systematic reviews . Keele, UK, Keele University, 33(TR/SE0401), 28. doi:http://doi.org/10.1.1.122.3308
- Lu, J. W. y Beamish, P. W. (2001). The internationalization and performance of SMEs. *Strategic Management Journal*, 22(6-7), 565-586.
- Mazzucato, M. (2018). The value of everything. Making & taking in the global economy. Nueva York: Hachette Book Group
- Malagón, F. (2013). ¿Cómo orientar el espíritu emprendedor hacia la creación de empresas? *Revista Escuela de administración de Negocios* No. 48 mayo-agosto, 72-81.
- Medina, M. y Naranjo, I. (2014). Variables relevantes en el diseño de estrategias para la competitividad en pymes. *Orbis. Revista Científica Ciencias Humanas*, 9(27), pp.116-129.
- Mejia, S., Van Hoof, B., y Quiñones, A. (2018) ‘Shrinking effects’ of cleaner production dissemination: An analysis of a Colombian programme
- Mintzberg, H. (2000). View from the top: Henry Mintzberg on strategy and management. *Academy of Management Executive*, 14(3), 31-42.
- Morales, A., Percy, I., y Monzón, R. (2019). Salud financiera de las empresas socialmente. *YACHANA Revista Científica*, vol. 8, núm. 1 (enero-junio), 1-19.
- rcnradio. (2018). El 70% de las Mipymes en Colombia fracasan en los primeros cinco años. Bogotá.
- Porter, M. (2008). The Five Competitive Forces That Shap Strategy. *Harvard Business Review*. No. 35, pp. 1-10.
- Porter, M. E. y Kramer, M. (2011). Creating shared value: Redefining capitalism and the role of the corporation in society. *Harvard Business Review*.
- Sánchez, H. (junio de 2020). Estrategias para lograr una comunicación efectiva. Obtenido de <https://www.latinpymes.com>: <https://www.latinpymes.com/estrategias-para-lograr-una-comunicacion-efectiva/>
- Siepel, J. y Dejardin, M. (2020). How do we measure firm performance? A review of issues

- facing entrepreneurship researchers.
- Solís, J., Neira, M., Ormaza, J., y Quevedo, J. (2021). Emprendimiento e innovación: Dimensiones para el estudio de las MiPymes de Azogues-Ecuador. *Revista de Ciencias Sociales*, Vol. XXVII, No. 1, 1-20.
- Superintendencia financiera de Colombia (2019). Conformación del sistema financiero. Disponible en:  
<https://www.superfinanciera.gov.co/jsp/Publicaciones/publicaciones/loadContenidoPublicacion/id/11268/dPrint/1/c/00> recuperado: 22 de abril de 2022
- Tarapuez, E., y Lima, C. (2016). *Creatividad empresarial*, cuarta edición. Bogotá: Ecoe, ediciones.
- Varela, R., y Bedoya, O. (2014). Modelo conceptual de desarrollo empresarial basado en competencias. *Revista EAN* N° 57, mayo-agosto, 1-15.
- Vieira, L. y Amaral, F. (2015) Barriers and strategies applying Cleaner Production: a systematic review. *Journal of Cleaner Production* 113 (2016) 5-16
- Yuriev, A., Boiral, O., Francoeur, V., y Paillé, P. (2018). Overcoming the barriers to pro-environmental behaviors in the workplace: A systematic review. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 182, 379-394.
- Zevallos, E. (2003). Micro, pequeñas y medianas empresas en América Latina *Revista de la CEPAL*, (79), pp. 53-70, recuperado el 25/06/2019 de <http://repositorio.cepal.org>
- Declaración prisma (2020). Plantilla de revisión. Documento en línea. Recuperado de:  
<http://www.prisma-statement.org/>  
<http://www.prismastatement.org/PRISMAStatement/Checklist>
- Cortés, E. (julio de 2020). Por qué conocer mejor a tus clientes. Obtenido de <https://www.sage.com>: <https://www.sage.com/es-es/blog/por-que-conocer-clientes/>
- Da Silva, D. (4 de agosto de 2020). Los 11 tipos de clientes y sus características: todo lo que necesitas saber para mejorar la relación con tus clientes. Obtenido de <https://www.zendesk.com.mx/blog/tipos-de-clientes-caracteristicas/>:  
<https://www.zendesk.com.mx/blog/tipos-de-clientes-caracteristicas/>
- Espinosa, L. (septiembre de 2012). El emprendimiento. Obtenido de <http://www.gerencie.com>: <http://www.gerencie.com>
- DANE-Departamento Administrativo Nacional de Estadística. (30 de agosto de 2021). Encuesta de micronegocios. Obtenido de <https://www.dane.gov.co>:  
<https://www.dane.gov.co/index.php/estadisticas-por-tema/mercado-laboral/micronegocios>
- El espíritu empresarial y emprendedor. (s.f.). Obtenido de [gestiopolis.com](http://www.gestiopolis.com): <http://www.gestiopolis.com/espiritu-empresarial-y-emprendedor/>
- Escarria, S. (25 de junio de 2021). Pymes: su importancia y datos que debes saber. Obtenido de [www.jelpit.com](http://www.jelpit.com): <https://www.jelpit.com/blog/empresas/emprendimiento/pymes-en-colombia-todo-lo-que-debes-conocer/>
- Ministerio de Comercio, industria y turismo. (2019). Decreto 957, de 2019. Bogotá: Diario Oficial.



# PRISMA 2020 Checklist

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
<b>TITLE:</b> Aragón, A. Rubio, A., Serna A. y Chablé, J. (2010). Estrategia y competitividad empresarial; un estudio en las pymes de tabasco. Revista Investigación y Ciencia, (47), pp. 4-12.			
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review.	p4
<b>ABSTRACT</b>			
Abstract	2	See the PRISMA 2020 for Abstracts checklist.	P4
<b>INTRODUCTION</b>			
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of existing knowledge.	P4-5
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of the objective(s) or question(s) the review addresses.	p-5
<b>METHODS</b>			
Eligibility criteria	5	Specify the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the review and how studies were grouped for the syntheses.	p-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.	N/A
Search strategy	7	Present the full search strategies for all databases, registers and websites, including any filters and limits used.	N/A
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.	N/A
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.	N/A
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.	N/A
	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.	N/A
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.	N/A
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.	N/A
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)).	N/A
	13b	Describe any methods required to prepare the data for presentation or synthesis, such as handling of missing summary statistics, or data conversions.	N/A
	13c	Describe any methods used to tabulate or visually display results of individual studies and syntheses.	N/A
	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.	N/A
	13e	Describe any methods used to explore possible causes of heterogeneity among study results (e.g. subgroup analysis, meta-regression).	N/A
	13f	Describe any sensitivity analyses conducted to assess robustness of the synthesized results.	N/A
Reporting bias assessment	14	Describe any methods used to assess risk of bias due to missing results in a synthesis (arising from reporting biases).	N/A





## PRISMA 2020 Checklist

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
Certainty assessment	15	Describe any methods used to assess certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for an outcome.	P7-8
<b>RESULTS</b>			
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.	p-8
	16b	Cite studies that might appear to meet the inclusion criteria, but which were excluded, and explain why they were excluded.	N/A
Study characteristics	17	Cite each included study and present its characteristics.	N/A
Risk of bias in studies	18	Present assessments of risk of bias for each included study.	N/A
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.	N/A
Results of syntheses	20a	For each synthesis, briefly summarise the characteristics and risk of bias among contributing studies.	N/A
	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.	N/A
	20c	Present results of all investigations of possible causes of heterogeneity among study results.	N/A
	20d	Present results of all sensitivity analyses conducted to assess the robustness of the synthesized results.	N/A
Reporting biases	21	Present assessments of risk of bias due to missing results (arising from reporting biases) for each synthesis assessed.	N/A
Certainty of evidence	22	Present assessments of certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for each outcome assessed.	N/A
<b>DISCUSSION</b>			
Discussion	23a	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence.	P10-11
	23b	Discuss any limitations of the evidence included in the review.	N/A
	23c	Discuss any limitations of the review processes used.	N/A
	23d	Discuss implications of the results for practice, policy, and future research.	N/A
<b>OTHER INFORMATION</b>			
Registration and protocol	24a	Provide registration information for the review, including register name and registration number, or state that the review was not registered.	N/A
	24b	Indicate where the review protocol can be accessed, or state that a protocol was not prepared.	N/A
	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.	N/A
Competing interests	26	Declare any competing interests of review authors.	N/A
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



## PRISMA 2020 Checklist

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
<b>TITLE:</b> Barrera, J., y Parra, S. (2020). Factores determinantes para el acceso de las MIPYME al crédito gota a gota. <i>Revista Republicana</i> • ISSN: 1909 - 4450 Núm. 28, enero-junio, 1-20			
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review.	P217
<b>ABSTRACT</b>			
Abstract	2	See the PRISMA 2020 for Abstracts checklist.	P217
<b>INTRODUCTION</b>			
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of existing knowledge.	P218
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of the objective(s) or question(s) the review addresses.	P219
<b>METHODS</b>			
Eligibility criteria	5	Specify the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the review and how studies were grouped for the syntheses.	P225
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.	N/A
Search strategy	7	Present the full search strategies for all databases, registers and websites, including any filters and limits used.	N/A
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.	N/A
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.	N/A
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.	N/A
	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.	N/A
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.	N/A
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.	N/A
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)).	N/A
	13b	Describe any methods required to prepare the data for presentation or synthesis, such as handling of missing summary statistics, or data conversions.	N/A
	13c	Describe any methods used to tabulate or visually display results of individual studies and syntheses.	N/A
	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.	N/A
	13e	Describe any methods used to explore possible causes of heterogeneity among study results (e.g. subgroup analysis, meta-regression).	N/A
	13f	Describe any sensitivity analyses conducted to assess robustness of the synthesized results.	N/A
Reporting bias assessment	14	Describe any methods used to assess risk of bias due to missing results in a synthesis (arising from reporting biases).	N/A



## PRISMA 2020 Checklist

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
Certainty assessment	15	Describe any methods used to assess certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for an outcome.	N/A
<b>RESULTS</b>			
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.	P226
	16b	Cite studies that might appear to meet the inclusion criteria, but which were excluded, and explain why they were excluded.	N/A
Study characteristics	17	Cite each included study and present its characteristics.	N/A
Risk of bias in studies	18	Present assessments of risk of bias for each included study.	N/A
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.	N/A
Results of syntheses	20a	For each synthesis, briefly summarise the characteristics and risk of bias among contributing studies.	N/A
	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.	N/A
	20c	Present results of all investigations of possible causes of heterogeneity among study results.	N/A
	20d	Present results of all sensitivity analyses conducted to assess the robustness of the synthesized results.	N/A
Reporting biases	21	Present assessments of risk of bias due to missing results (arising from reporting biases) for each synthesis assessed.	N/A
Certainty of evidence	22	Present assessments of certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for each outcome assessed.	N/A
<b>DISCUSSION</b>			
Discussion	23a	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence.	P231
	23b	Discuss any limitations of the evidence included in the review.	N/A
	23c	Discuss any limitations of the review processes used.	N/A
	23d	Discuss implications of the results for practice, policy, and future research.	N/A
<b>OTHER INFORMATION</b>			
Registration and protocol	24a	Provide registration information for the review, including register name and registration number, or state that the review was not registered.	N/A
	24b	Indicate where the review protocol can be accessed, or state that a protocol was not prepared.	N/A
	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.	N/A
Competing interests	26	Declare any competing interests of review authors.	N/A



## PRISMA 2020 Checklist

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
<b>TITLE:</b> Delgado, V. (2021). Factores que determinan la permanencia de las micro y pequeñas empresas: Estudio de caso en Santa Ana Chiautempan, Tlaxcala. Temas de Ciencia y Tecnología vol. 25 número 74 Mayo - Agosto 2021.			
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review.	P.31
<b>ABSTRACT</b>			
Abstract	2	See the PRISMA 2020 for Abstracts checklist.	P.31
<b>INTRODUCTION</b>			
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of existing knowledge.	P.32
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of the objective(s) or question(s) the review addresses.	P.32
<b>METHODS</b>			
Eligibility criteria	5	Specify the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the review and how studies were grouped for the syntheses.	N/A
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.	N/A
Search strategy	7	Present the full search strategies for all databases, registers and websites, including any filters and limits used.	N/A
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.	N/A
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.	N/A
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.	N/A
	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.	N/A
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.	N/A
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.	N/A
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)).	N/A
	13b	Describe any methods required to prepare the data for presentation or synthesis, such as handling of missing summary statistics, or data conversions.	N/A
	13c	Describe any methods used to tabulate or visually display results of individual studies and syntheses.	N/A
	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.	N/A
	13e	Describe any methods used to explore possible causes of heterogeneity among study results (e.g. subgroup analysis, meta-regression).	N/A
	13f	Describe any sensitivity analyses conducted to assess robustness of the synthesized results.	N/A
Reporting bias assessment	14	Describe any methods used to assess risk of bias due to missing results in a synthesis (arising from reporting biases).	P.40



## PRISMA 2020 Checklist

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
Certainty assessment	15	Describe any methods used to assess certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for an outcome.	9.40
<b>RESULTS</b>			
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.	P.41
	16b	Cite studies that might appear to meet the inclusion criteria, but which were excluded, and explain why they were excluded.	P.41
Study characteristics	17	Cite each included study and present its characteristics.	P.46-47
Risk of bias in studies	18	Present assessments of risk of bias for each included study.	N/A
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.	N/A
Results of syntheses	20a	For each synthesis, briefly summarise the characteristics and risk of bias among contributing studies.	N/A
	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.	N/A
	20c	Present results of all investigations of possible causes of heterogeneity among study results.	N/A
	20d	Present results of all sensitivity analyses conducted to assess the robustness of the synthesized results.	N/A
Reporting biases	21	Present assessments of risk of bias due to missing results (arising from reporting biases) for each synthesis assessed.	N/A
Certainty of evidence	22	Present assessments of certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for each outcome assessed.	N/A
<b>DISCUSSION</b>			
Discussion	23a	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence.	N/A
	23b	Discuss any limitations of the evidence included in the review.	N/A
	23c	Discuss any limitations of the review processes used.	N/A
	23d	Discuss implications of the results for practice, policy, and future research.	N/A
<b>OTHER INFORMATION</b>			
Registration and protocol	24a	Provide registration information for the review, including register name and registration number, or state that the review was not registered.	N/A
	24b	Indicate where the review protocol can be accessed, or state that a protocol was not prepared.	N/A
	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.	N/A
Competing interests	26	Declare any competing interests of review authors.	N/A
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



## PRISMA 2020 Checklist

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
<b>TITLE: ASOBANCARIA. (2018). Supervivencia de las MiPyme: un problema por resolver, edición 1145. <i>Semana económica</i>, 1-14.</b>			
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review.	P.1
<b>ABSTRACT</b>			
Abstract	2	See the PRISMA 2020 for Abstracts checklist.	N/A
<b>INTRODUCTION</b>			
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of existing knowledge.	N/A
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of the objective(s) or question(s) the review addresses.	N/A
<b>METHODS</b>			
Eligibility criteria	5	Specify the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the review and how studies were grouped for the syntheses.	N/A
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.	N/A
Search strategy	7	Present the full search strategies for all databases, registers and websites, including any filters and limits used.	N/A
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.	N/A
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.	N/A
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.	N/A
	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.	N/A
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.	N/A
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.	N/A
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)).	N/A
	13b	Describe any methods required to prepare the data for presentation or synthesis, such as handling of missing summary statistics, or data conversions.	N/A
	13c	Describe any methods used to tabulate or visually display results of individual studies and syntheses.	N/A
	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.	N/A
	13e	Describe any methods used to explore possible causes of heterogeneity among study results (e.g. subgroup analysis, meta-regression).	N/A
	13f	Describe any sensitivity analyses conducted to assess robustness of the synthesized results.	N/A
Reporting bias assessment	14	Describe any methods used to assess risk of bias due to missing results in a synthesis (arising from reporting biases).	P.5
Certainty	15	Describe any methods used to assess certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for an outcome.	P. 6



## PRISMA 2020 Checklist

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
assessment			
<b>RESULTS</b>			
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.	P.9
	16b	Cite studies that might appear to meet the inclusion criteria, but which were excluded, and explain why they were excluded.	N/A
Study characteristics	17	Cite each included study and present its characteristics.	N/A
Risk of bias in studies	18	Present assessments of risk of bias for each included study.	N/A
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.	N/A
Results of syntheses	20a	For each synthesis, briefly summarise the characteristics and risk of bias among contributing studies.	N/A
	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.	N/A
	20c	Present results of all investigations of possible causes of heterogeneity among study results.	N/A
	20d	Present results of all sensitivity analyses conducted to assess the robustness of the synthesized results.	N/A
Reporting biases	21	Present assessments of risk of bias due to missing results (arising from reporting biases) for each synthesis assessed.	N/A
Certainty of evidence	22	Present assessments of certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for each outcome assessed.	N/A
<b>DISCUSSION</b>			
Discussion	23a	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence.	N/A
	23b	Discuss any limitations of the evidence included in the review.	N/A
	23c	Discuss any limitations of the review processes used.	N/A
	23d	Discuss implications of the results for practice, policy, and future research.	N/A
<b>OTHER INFORMATION</b>			
Registration and protocol	24a	Provide registration information for the review, including register name and registration number, or state that the review was not registered.	N/A
	24b	Indicate where the review protocol can be accessed, or state that a protocol was not prepared.	N/A
	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.	N/A
Competing interests	26	Declare any competing interests of review authors.	N/A
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





## PRISMA 2020 Checklist

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
<b>TITLE:</b> Acs, Z. (2006). How is entrepreneurship good for economic growth? Innovations: Technology, Governance, Globalization, 1(1), 97-107.			
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review.	p-501
<b>ABSTRACT</b>			
Abstract	2	See the PRISMA 2020 for Abstracts checklist.	P501
<b>INTRODUCTION</b>			
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of existing knowledge.	P503
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of the objective(s) or question(s) the review addresses.	P503
<b>METHODS</b>			
Eligibility criteria	5	Specify the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the review and how studies were grouped for the syntheses.	P504
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.	N/A
Search strategy	7	Present the full search strategies for all databases, registers and websites, including any filters and limits used.	N/A
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.	N/A
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.	N/A
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.	N/A
	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.	N/A
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.	N/A
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.	N/A
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)).	N/A
	13b	Describe any methods required to prepare the data for presentation or synthesis, such as handling of missing summary statistics, or data conversions.	N/A
	13c	Describe any methods used to tabulate or visually display results of individual studies and syntheses.	N/A
	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.	N/A
	13e	Describe any methods used to explore possible causes of heterogeneity among study results (e.g. subgroup analysis, meta-regression).	N/A
	13f	Describe any sensitivity analyses conducted to assess robustness of the synthesized results.	N/A
Reporting bias assessment	14	Describe any methods used to assess risk of bias due to missing results in a synthesis (arising from reporting biases).	N/A





## PRISMA 2020 Checklist

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
Certainty assessment	15	Describe any methods used to assess certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for an outcome.	
<b>RESULTS</b>			
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.	P510
	16b	Cite studies that might appear to meet the inclusion criteria, but which were excluded, and explain why they were excluded.	N/A
Study characteristics	17	Cite each included study and present its characteristics.	N/A
Risk of bias in studies	18	Present assessments of risk of bias for each included study.	N/A
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.	N/A
Results of syntheses	20a	For each synthesis, briefly summarise the characteristics and risk of bias among contributing studies.	N/A
	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.	N/A
	20c	Present results of all investigations of possible causes of heterogeneity among study results.	N/A
	20d	Present results of all sensitivity analyses conducted to assess the robustness of the synthesized results.	N/A
Reporting biases	21	Present assessments of risk of bias due to missing results (arising from reporting biases) for each synthesis assessed.	N/A
Certainty of evidence	22	Present assessments of certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for each outcome assessed.	N/A
<b>DISCUSSION</b>			
Discussion	23a	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence.	P510
	23b	Discuss any limitations of the evidence included in the review.	N/A
	23c	Discuss any limitations of the review processes used.	N/A
	23d	Discuss implications of the results for practice, policy, and future research.	N/A
<b>OTHER INFORMATION</b>			
Registration and protocol	24a	Provide registration information for the review, including register name and registration number, or state that the review was not registered.	N/A
	24b	Indicate where the review protocol can be accessed, or state that a protocol was not prepared.	N/A
	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.	N/A
Competing interests	26	Declare any competing interests of review authors.	N/A
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.	P512



## PRISMA 2020 Checklist

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
<b>TITLE:</b> Cantillo, et al. (2021). Análisis sobre el nivel de reactivación económica en las micro, pequeñas y medianas empresas (MIPYMES) en Barranquilla post-emergencia sanitaria (Covid-19). Barranquilla: Universidad Simón Bolívar.			
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review.	P1
<b>ABSTRACT</b>			
Abstract	2	See the PRISMA 2020 for Abstracts checklist.	P2
<b>INTRODUCTION</b>			
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of existing knowledge.	P2
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of the objective(s) or question(s) the review addresses.	P3
<b>METHODS</b>			
Eligibility criteria	5	Specify the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the review and how studies were grouped for the syntheses.	N/A
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.	N/A
Search strategy	7	Present the full search strategies for all databases, registers and websites, including any filters and limits used.	N/A
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.	N/A
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.	N/A
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.	N/A
	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.	N/A
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.	N/A
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.	N/A
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)).	N/A
	13b	Describe any methods required to prepare the data for presentation or synthesis, such as handling of missing summary statistics, or data conversions.	N/A
	13c	Describe any methods used to tabulate or visually display results of individual studies and syntheses.	N/A
	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.	N/A
	13e	Describe any methods used to explore possible causes of heterogeneity among study results (e.g. subgroup analysis, meta-regression).	N/A
	13f	Describe any sensitivity analyses conducted to assess robustness of the synthesized results.	N/A
Reporting bias assessment	14	Describe any methods used to assess risk of bias due to missing results in a synthesis (arising from reporting biases).	N/A



## PRISMA 2020 Checklist

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
Certainty assessment	15	Describe any methods used to assess certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for an outcome.	N/A
<b>RESULTS</b>			
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.	P,12
	16b	Cite studies that might appear to meet the inclusion criteria, but which were excluded, and explain why they were excluded.	N/A
Study characteristics	17	Cite each included study and present its characteristics.	N/A
Risk of bias in studies	18	Present assessments of risk of bias for each included study.	N/A
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.	N/A
Results of syntheses	20a	For each synthesis, briefly summarise the characteristics and risk of bias among contributing studies.	N/A
	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.	N/A
	20c	Present results of all investigations of possible causes of heterogeneity among study results.	N/A
	20d	Present results of all sensitivity analyses conducted to assess the robustness of the synthesized results.	N/A
Reporting biases	21	Present assessments of risk of bias due to missing results (arising from reporting biases) for each synthesis assessed.	N/A
Certainty of evidence	22	Present assessments of certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for each outcome assessed.	N/A
<b>DISCUSSION</b>			
Discussion	23a	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence.	P14
	23b	Discuss any limitations of the evidence included in the review.	N/A
	23c	Discuss any limitations of the review processes used.	N/A
	23d	Discuss implications of the results for practice, policy, and future research.	N/A
<b>OTHER INFORMATION</b>			
Registration and protocol	24a	Provide registration information for the review, including register name and registration number, or state that the review was not registered.	N/A
	24b	Indicate where the review protocol can be accessed, or state that a protocol was not prepared.	N/A
	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.	N/A
Competing interests	26	Declare any competing interests of review authors.	N/A
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



## PRISMA 2020 Checklist

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
<b>TITLE:</b> Chatman, j.a. (1991): "Matching people and organizations: Selection and socialization in public accounting firms", <i>Administrative Science Quarterly</i> , Vol.36, No.3, pp.459-489			
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review.	P459
<b>ABSTRACT</b>			
Abstract	2	See the PRISMA 2020 for Abstracts checklist.	P459
<b>INTRODUCTION</b>			
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of existing knowledge.	P461
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of the objective(s) or question(s) the review addresses.	P467
<b>METHODS</b>			
Eligibility criteria	5	Specify the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the review and how studies were grouped for the syntheses.	P467
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.	N/A
Search strategy	7	Present the full search strategies for all databases, registers and websites, including any filters and limits used.	N/A
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.	N/A
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.	N/A
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.	N/A
	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.	N/A
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.	N/A
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.	N/A
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)).	N/A
	13b	Describe any methods required to prepare the data for presentation or synthesis, such as handling of missing summary statistics, or data conversions.	N/A
	13c	Describe any methods used to tabulate or visually display results of individual studies and syntheses.	N/A
	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.	N/A
	13e	Describe any methods used to explore possible causes of heterogeneity among study results (e.g. subgroup analysis, meta-regression).	N/A
	13f	Describe any sensitivity analyses conducted to assess robustness of the synthesized results.	N/A
Reporting bias assessment	14	Describe any methods used to assess risk of bias due to missing results in a synthesis (arising from reporting biases).	N/A
Certainty	15	Describe any methods used to assess certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for an outcome.	



## PRISMA 2020 Checklist

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
assessment			
<b>RESULTS</b>			
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.	P421
	16b	Cite studies that might appear to meet the inclusion criteria, but which were excluded, and explain why they were excluded.	N/A
Study characteristics	17	Cite each included study and present its characteristics.	N/A
Risk of bias in studies	18	Present assessments of risk of bias for each included study.	N/A
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.	N/A
Results of syntheses	20a	For each synthesis, briefly summarise the characteristics and risk of bias among contributing studies.	N/A
	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.	N/A
	20c	Present results of all investigations of possible causes of heterogeneity among study results.	N/A
	20d	Present results of all sensitivity analyses conducted to assess the robustness of the synthesized results.	N/A
Reporting biases	21	Present assessments of risk of bias due to missing results (arising from reporting biases) for each synthesis assessed.	N/A
Certainty of evidence	22	Present assessments of certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for each outcome assessed.	N/A
<b>DISCUSSION</b>			
Discussion	23a	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence.	N/A
	23b	Discuss any limitations of the evidence included in the review.	N/A
	23c	Discuss any limitations of the review processes used.	N/A
	23d	Discuss implications of the results for practice, policy, and future research.	N/A
<b>OTHER INFORMATION</b>			
Registration and protocol	24a	Provide registration information for the review, including register name and registration number, or state that the review was not registered.	N/A
	24b	Indicate where the review protocol can be accessed, or state that a protocol was not prepared.	N/A
	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.	N/A
Competing interests	26	Declare any competing interests of review authors.	N/A
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



## PRISMA 2020 Checklist

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
<b>TITLE</b> Cuevas-Vargas, H., Aguilera, L. González, M. y Servín, J. (2015). The use of icts and its relation with the competitiveness of Mexican smes. European Scientific Journal, 11 (13), 294-310.			
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review.	P294
<b>ABSTRACT</b>			
Abstract	2	See the PRISMA 2020 for Abstracts checklist.	P294
<b>INTRODUCTION</b>			
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of existing knowledge.	P296
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of the objective(s) or question(s) the review addresses.	P296
<b>METHODS</b>			
Eligibility criteria	5	Specify the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the review and how studies were grouped for the syntheses.	P299
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.	N/A
Search strategy	7	Present the full search strategies for all databases, registers and websites, including any filters and limits used.	N/A
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.	N/A
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.	N/A
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.	N/A
	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.	N/A
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.	N/A
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.	N/A
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)).	N/A
	13b	Describe any methods required to prepare the data for presentation or synthesis, such as handling of missing summary statistics, or data conversions.	N/A
	13c	Describe any methods used to tabulate or visually display results of individual studies and syntheses.	N/A
	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.	N/A
	13e	Describe any methods used to explore possible causes of heterogeneity among study results (e.g. subgroup analysis, meta-regression).	N/A
	13f	Describe any sensitivity analyses conducted to assess robustness of the synthesized results.	N/A
Reporting bias assessment	14	Describe any methods used to assess risk of bias due to missing results in a synthesis (arising from reporting biases).	N/A



## PRISMA 2020 Checklist

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
Certainty assessment	15	Describe any methods used to assess certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for an outcome.	N/A
<b>RESULTS</b>			
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.	P302
	16b	Cite studies that might appear to meet the inclusion criteria, but which were excluded, and explain why they were excluded.	N/A
Study characteristics	17	Cite each included study and present its characteristics.	N/A
Risk of bias in studies	18	Present assessments of risk of bias for each included study.	N/A
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.	N/A
Results of syntheses	20a	For each synthesis, briefly summarise the characteristics and risk of bias among contributing studies.	N/A
	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.	N/A
	20c	Present results of all investigations of possible causes of heterogeneity among study results.	N/A
	20d	Present results of all sensitivity analyses conducted to assess the robustness of the synthesized results.	N/A
Reporting biases	21	Present assessments of risk of bias due to missing results (arising from reporting biases) for each synthesis assessed.	N/A
Certainty of evidence	22	Present assessments of certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for each outcome assessed.	N/A
<b>DISCUSSION</b>			
Discussion	23a	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence.	P306
	23b	Discuss any limitations of the evidence included in the review.	N/A
	23c	Discuss any limitations of the review processes used.	N/A
	23d	Discuss implications of the results for practice, policy, and future research.	N/A
<b>OTHER INFORMATION</b>			
Registration and protocol	24a	Provide registration information for the review, including register name and registration number, or state that the review was not registered.	N/A
	24b	Indicate where the review protocol can be accessed, or state that a protocol was not prepared.	N/A
	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.	N/A
Competing interests	26	Declare any competing interests of review authors.	N/A
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





## PRISMA 2020 Checklist

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
<b>TITLE : Dini, M., y Stumpo, G. (2020). MIPYMES en América Latina un frágil desempeño y nuevos desafíos para las políticas de fomento. Santiago de Chile: Naciones unidas.</b>			
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review.	P14
<b>ABSTRACT</b>			
Abstract	2	See the PRISMA 2020 for Abstracts checklist.	P14
<b>INTRODUCTION</b>			
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of existing knowledge.	P17
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of the objective(s) or question(s) the review addresses.	P17
<b>METHODS</b>			
Eligibility criteria	5	Specify the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the review and how studies were grouped for the syntheses.	P19
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.	N/A
Search strategy	7	Present the full search strategies for all databases, registers and websites, including any filters and limits used.	N/A
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.	N/A
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.	N/A
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.	N/A
	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.	N/A
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.	N/A
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.	N/A
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)).	N/A
	13b	Describe any methods required to prepare the data for presentation or synthesis, such as handling of missing summary statistics, or data conversions.	N/A
	13c	Describe any methods used to tabulate or visually display results of individual studies and syntheses.	N/A
	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.	N/A
	13e	Describe any methods used to explore possible causes of heterogeneity among study results (e.g. subgroup analysis, meta-regression).	N/A
	13f	Describe any sensitivity analyses conducted to assess robustness of the synthesized results.	N/A
Reporting bias assessment	14	Describe any methods used to assess risk of bias due to missing results in a synthesis (arising from reporting biases).	N/A
Certainty	15	Describe any methods used to assess certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for an outcome.	N/A





## PRISMA 2020 Checklist

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
assessment			
<b>RESULTS</b>			
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.	P21
	16b	Cite studies that might appear to meet the inclusion criteria, but which were excluded, and explain why they were excluded.	N/A
Study characteristics	17	Cite each included study and present its characteristics.	N/A
Risk of bias in studies	18	Present assessments of risk of bias for each included study.	N/A
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.	N/A
Results of syntheses	20a	For each synthesis, briefly summarise the characteristics and risk of bias among contributing studies.	N/A
	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.	N/A
	20c	Present results of all investigations of possible causes of heterogeneity among study results.	N/A
	20d	Present results of all sensitivity analyses conducted to assess the robustness of the synthesized results.	N/A
Reporting biases	21	Present assessments of risk of bias due to missing results (arising from reporting biases) for each synthesis assessed.	N/A
Certainty of evidence	22	Present assessments of certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for each outcome assessed.	N/A
<b>DISCUSSION</b>			
Discussion	23a	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence.	N/A
	23b	Discuss any limitations of the evidence included in the review.	N/A
	23c	Discuss any limitations of the review processes used.	N/A
	23d	Discuss implications of the results for practice, policy, and future research.	N/A
<b>OTHER INFORMATION</b>			
Registration and protocol	24a	Provide registration information for the review, including register name and registration number, or state that the review was not registered.	N/A
	24b	Indicate where the review protocol can be accessed, or state that a protocol was not prepared.	N/A
	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.	N/A
Competing interests	26	Declare any competing interests of review authors.	N/A
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



## PRISMA 2020 Checklist

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
<b>TITLE:</b> Escudero, m. (2012). Gestión comercial y servicio de atención al cliente. Madrid: paraninfo.			
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review.	N/A
<b>ABSTRACT</b>			
Abstract	2	See the PRISMA 2020 for Abstracts checklist.	N/A
<b>INTRODUCTION</b>			
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of existing knowledge.	N/A
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of the objective(s) or question(s) the review addresses.	N/A
<b>METHODS</b>			
Eligibility criteria	5	Specify the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the review and how studies were grouped for the syntheses.	N/A
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.	N/A
Search strategy	7	Present the full search strategies for all databases, registers and websites, including any filters and limits used.	N/A
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.	N/A
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.	N/A
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.	N/A
	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.	N/A
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.	N/A
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.	N/A
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)).	N/A
	13b	Describe any methods required to prepare the data for presentation or synthesis, such as handling of missing summary statistics, or data conversions.	N/A
	13c	Describe any methods used to tabulate or visually display results of individual studies and syntheses.	N/A
	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.	N/A
	13e	Describe any methods used to explore possible causes of heterogeneity among study results (e.g. subgroup analysis, meta-regression).	N/A
	13f	Describe any sensitivity analyses conducted to assess robustness of the synthesized results.	N/A
Reporting bias assessment	14	Describe any methods used to assess risk of bias due to missing results in a synthesis (arising from reporting biases).	N/A



## PRISMA 2020 Checklist

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
Certainty assessment	15	Describe any methods used to assess certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for an outcome.	N/A
<b>RESULTS</b>			
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.	N/A
	16b	Cite studies that might appear to meet the inclusion criteria, but which were excluded, and explain why they were excluded.	N/A
Study characteristics	17	Cite each included study and present its characteristics.	N/A
Risk of bias in studies	18	Present assessments of risk of bias for each included study.	N/A
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.	N/A
Results of syntheses	20a	For each synthesis, briefly summarise the characteristics and risk of bias among contributing studies.	N/A
	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.	N/A
	20c	Present results of all investigations of possible causes of heterogeneity among study results.	N/A
	20d	Present results of all sensitivity analyses conducted to assess the robustness of the synthesized results.	N/A
Reporting biases	21	Present assessments of risk of bias due to missing results (arising from reporting biases) for each synthesis assessed.	N/A
Certainty of evidence	22	Present assessments of certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for each outcome assessed.	N/A
<b>DISCUSSION</b>			
Discussion	23a	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence.	N/A
	23b	Discuss any limitations of the evidence included in the review.	N/A
	23c	Discuss any limitations of the review processes used.	N/A
	23d	Discuss implications of the results for practice, policy, and future research.	N/A
<b>OTHER INFORMATION</b>			
Registration and protocol	24a	Provide registration information for the review, including register name and registration number, or state that the review was not registered.	N/A
	24b	Indicate where the review protocol can be accessed, or state that a protocol was not prepared.	N/A
	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.	N/A
Competing interests	26	Declare any competing interests of review authors.	N/A
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



## PRISMA 2020 Checklist

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
<b>TITLE;</b> Florian, J. y Sarmiento, N. (2019). La factura electrónica como mecanismo de planeación tributaria de las pymes en Colombia. <a href="https://expeditiorepositorio.utadeo.edu.co/bitstream/handle/20.500.12010/7539/Trabajo%20de%20grado.pdf?sequence=1&amp;isAllowed=y">https://expeditiorepositorio.utadeo.edu.co/bitstream/handle/20.500.12010/7539/Trabajo%20de%20grado.pdf?sequence=1&amp;isAllowed=y</a>			
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review.	P1
<b>ABSTRACT</b>			
Abstract	2	See the PRISMA 2020 for Abstracts checklist.	P1
<b>INTRODUCTION</b>			
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of existing knowledge.	P1
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of the objective(s) or question(s) the review addresses.	P2
<b>METHODS</b>			
Eligibility criteria	5	Specify the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the review and how studies were grouped for the syntheses.	
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.	N/A
Search strategy	7	Present the full search strategies for all databases, registers and websites, including any filters and limits used.	N/A
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.	N/A
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.	N/A
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.	N/A
	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.	N/A
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.	N/A
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.	N/A
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)).	N/A
	13b	Describe any methods required to prepare the data for presentation or synthesis, such as handling of missing summary statistics, or data conversions.	N/A
	13c	Describe any methods used to tabulate or visually display results of individual studies and syntheses.	N/A
	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.	N/A
	13e	Describe any methods used to explore possible causes of heterogeneity among study results (e.g. subgroup analysis, meta-regression).	N/A
	13f	Describe any sensitivity analyses conducted to assess robustness of the synthesized results.	N/A
Reporting bias assessment	14	Describe any methods used to assess risk of bias due to missing results in a synthesis (arising from reporting biases).	N/A



## PRISMA 2020 Checklist

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
Certainty assessment	15	Describe any methods used to assess certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for an outcome.	
<b>RESULTS</b>			
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.	N/A
	16b	Cite studies that might appear to meet the inclusion criteria, but which were excluded, and explain why they were excluded.	N/A
Study characteristics	17	Cite each included study and present its characteristics.	N/A
Risk of bias in studies	18	Present assessments of risk of bias for each included study.	N/A
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.	N/A
Results of syntheses	20a	For each synthesis, briefly summarise the characteristics and risk of bias among contributing studies.	N/A
	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.	N/A
	20c	Present results of all investigations of possible causes of heterogeneity among study results.	N/A
	20d	Present results of all sensitivity analyses conducted to assess the robustness of the synthesized results.	N/A
Reporting biases	21	Present assessments of risk of bias due to missing results (arising from reporting biases) for each synthesis assessed.	N/A
Certainty of evidence	22	Present assessments of certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for each outcome assessed.	N/A
<b>DISCUSSION</b>			
Discussion	23a	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence.	N/A
	23b	Discuss any limitations of the evidence included in the review.	N/A
	23c	Discuss any limitations of the review processes used.	N/A
	23d	Discuss implications of the results for practice, policy, and future research.	N/A
<b>OTHER INFORMATION</b>			
Registration and protocol	24a	Provide registration information for the review, including register name and registration number, or state that the review was not registered.	N/A
	24b	Indicate where the review protocol can be accessed, or state that a protocol was not prepared.	N/A
	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.	N/A
Competing interests	26	Declare any competing interests of review authors.	N/A
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



## PRISMA 2020 Checklist

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
<b>TITLE:</b> González, N., Valenzuela, R., Chairez, A., Moreno, M., Aceves, J., y Ochoa, R. (2013). Plan de alternativas de solución para PYMES en el área financiera: controles internos. México: ITSON.			
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review.	P397
<b>ABSTRACT</b>			
Abstract	2	See the PRISMA 2020 for Abstracts checklist.	P397
<b>INTRODUCTION</b>			
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of existing knowledge.	P398
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of the objective(s) or question(s) the review addresses.	P399
<b>METHODS</b>			
Eligibility criteria	5	Specify the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the review and how studies were grouped for the syntheses.	N/A
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.	N/A
Search strategy	7	Present the full search strategies for all databases, registers and websites, including any filters and limits used.	N/A
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.	N/A
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.	N/A
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.	N/A
	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.	N/A
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.	N/A
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.	N/A
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)).	N/A
	13b	Describe any methods required to prepare the data for presentation or synthesis, such as handling of missing summary statistics, or data conversions.	N/A
	13c	Describe any methods used to tabulate or visually display results of individual studies and syntheses.	
	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.	N/A
	13e	Describe any methods used to explore possible causes of heterogeneity among study results (e.g. subgroup analysis, meta-regression).	N/A
	13f	Describe any sensitivity analyses conducted to assess robustness of the synthesized results.	N/A
Reporting bias assessment	14	Describe any methods used to assess risk of bias due to missing results in a synthesis (arising from reporting biases).	N/A
Certainty assessment	15	Describe any methods used to assess certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for an outcome.	
<b>RESULTS</b>			



## PRISMA 2020 Checklist

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
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.	N/A
	16b	Cite studies that might appear to meet the inclusion criteria, but which were excluded, and explain why they were excluded.	N/A
Study characteristics	17	Cite each included study and present its characteristics.	N/A
Risk of bias in studies	18	Present assessments of risk of bias for each included study.	N/A
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.	N/A
Results of syntheses	20a	For each synthesis, briefly summarise the characteristics and risk of bias among contributing studies.	N/A
	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.	N/A
	20c	Present results of all investigations of possible causes of heterogeneity among study results.	N/A
	20d	Present results of all sensitivity analyses conducted to assess the robustness of the synthesized results.	N/A
Reporting biases	21	Present assessments of risk of bias due to missing results (arising from reporting biases) for each synthesis assessed.	N/A
Certainty of evidence	22	Present assessments of certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for each outcome assessed.	N/A
<b>DISCUSSION</b>			
Discussion	23a	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence.	N/A
	23b	Discuss any limitations of the evidence included in the review.	N/A
	23c	Discuss any limitations of the review processes used.	N/A
	23d	Discuss implications of the results for practice, policy, and future research.	N/A
<b>OTHER INFORMATION</b>			
Registration and protocol	24a	Provide registration information for the review, including register name and registration number, or state that the review was not registered.	N/A
	24b	Indicate where the review protocol can be accessed, or state that a protocol was not prepared.	N/A
	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.	N/A
Competing interests	26	Declare any competing interests of review authors.	N/A
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





## PRISMA 2020 Checklist

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
1. <b>TITLE:</b> Guerrero, M. y Peña-Legazkue, I. (2013). The effect of intrapreneurial experience on corporate venturing: Evidence from developed economies. International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal. doi:10.1007/s11365-013-0260-9			
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review.	P397
<b>ABSTRACT</b>			
Abstract	2	See the PRISMA 2020 for Abstracts checklist.	P397
<b>INTRODUCTION</b>			
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of existing knowledge.	P398
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of the objective(s) or question(s) the review addresses.	P399
<b>METHODS</b>			
Eligibility criteria	5	Specify the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the review and how studies were grouped for the syntheses.	P401
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.	N/A
Search strategy	7	Present the full search strategies for all databases, registers and websites, including any filters and limits used.	N/A
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.	N/A
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.	N/A
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.	N/A
	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.	N/A
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.	N/A
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.	N/A
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)).	N/A
	13b	Describe any methods required to prepare the data for presentation or synthesis, such as handling of missing summary statistics, or data conversions.	N/A
	13c	Describe any methods used to tabulate or visually display results of individual studies and syntheses.	
	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.	N/A
	13e	Describe any methods used to explore possible causes of heterogeneity among study results (e.g. subgroup analysis, meta-regression).	N/A
	13f	Describe any sensitivity analyses conducted to assess robustness of the synthesized results.	N/A
Reporting bias assessment	14	Describe any methods used to assess risk of bias due to missing results in a synthesis (arising from reporting biases).	N/A





## PRISMA 2020 Checklist

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
Certainty assessment	15	Describe any methods used to assess certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for an outcome.	
<b>RESULTS</b>			
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.	412
	16b	Cite studies that might appear to meet the inclusion criteria, but which were excluded, and explain why they were excluded.	N/A
Study characteristics	17	Cite each included study and present its characteristics.	N/A
Risk of bias in studies	18	Present assessments of risk of bias for each included study.	N/A
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.	N/A
Results of syntheses	20a	For each synthesis, briefly summarise the characteristics and risk of bias among contributing studies.	N/A
	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.	N/A
	20c	Present results of all investigations of possible causes of heterogeneity among study results.	N/A
	20d	Present results of all sensitivity analyses conducted to assess the robustness of the synthesized results.	N/A
Reporting biases	21	Present assessments of risk of bias due to missing results (arising from reporting biases) for each synthesis assessed.	N/A
Certainty of evidence	22	Present assessments of certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for each outcome assessed.	N/A
<b>DISCUSSION</b>			
Discussion	23a	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence.	413
	23b	Discuss any limitations of the evidence included in the review.	N/A
	23c	Discuss any limitations of the review processes used.	N/A
	23d	Discuss implications of the results for practice, policy, and future research.	N/A
<b>OTHER INFORMATION</b>			
Registration and protocol	24a	Provide registration information for the review, including register name and registration number, or state that the review was not registered.	N/A
	24b	Indicate where the review protocol can be accessed, or state that a protocol was not prepared.	N/A
	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.	N/A
Competing interests	26	Declare any competing interests of review authors.	N/A



## PRISMA 2020 Checklist

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
<b>1. TITLE</b> Hauser, C., Hogenacker, J. y Wagner, K. (2013). International market diversification of innovative European SMEs – what role do various innovation strategies play? <i>International Journal of Entrepreneurial Venturing</i> , 5(3), 310-326. doi:10.1504/IJEV.2013.055296			
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review.	P310
<b>ABSTRACT</b>			
Abstract	2	See the PRISMA 2020 for Abstracts checklist.	P310
<b>INTRODUCTION</b>			
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of existing knowledge.	P311
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of the objective(s) or question(s) the review addresses.	P312
<b>METHODS</b>			
Eligibility criteria	5	Specify the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the review and how studies were grouped for the syntheses.	P314
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.	N/A
Search strategy	7	Present the full search strategies for all databases, registers and websites, including any filters and limits used.	N/A
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.	N/A
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.	N/A
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.	N/A
	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.	N/A
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.	N/A
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.	N/A
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)).	N/A
	13b	Describe any methods required to prepare the data for presentation or synthesis, such as handling of missing summary statistics, or data conversions.	N/A
	13c	Describe any methods used to tabulate or visually display results of individual studies and syntheses.	
	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.	N/A
	13e	Describe any methods used to explore possible causes of heterogeneity among study results (e.g. subgroup analysis, meta-regression).	N/A
	13f	Describe any sensitivity analyses conducted to assess robustness of the synthesized results.	N/A
Reporting bias assessment	14	Describe any methods used to assess risk of bias due to missing results in a synthesis (arising from reporting biases).	N/A



## PRISMA 2020 Checklist

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
Certainty assessment	15	Describe any methods used to assess certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for an outcome.	
<b>RESULTS</b>			
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.	P322
	16b	Cite studies that might appear to meet the inclusion criteria, but which were excluded, and explain why they were excluded.	N/A
Study characteristics	17	Cite each included study and present its characteristics.	N/A
Risk of bias in studies	18	Present assessments of risk of bias for each included study.	N/A
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.	N/A
Results of syntheses	20a	For each synthesis, briefly summarise the characteristics and risk of bias among contributing studies.	N/A
	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.	N/A
	20c	Present results of all investigations of possible causes of heterogeneity among study results.	N/A
	20d	Present results of all sensitivity analyses conducted to assess the robustness of the synthesized results.	N/A
Reporting biases	21	Present assessments of risk of bias due to missing results (arising from reporting biases) for each synthesis assessed.	N/A
Certainty of evidence	22	Present assessments of certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for each outcome assessed.	N/A
<b>DISCUSSION</b>			
Discussion	23a	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence.	P324
	23b	Discuss any limitations of the evidence included in the review.	N/A
	23c	Discuss any limitations of the review processes used.	N/A
	23d	Discuss implications of the results for practice, policy, and future research.	N/A
<b>OTHER INFORMATION</b>			
Registration and protocol	24a	Provide registration information for the review, including register name and registration number, or state that the review was not registered.	N/A
	24b	Indicate where the review protocol can be accessed, or state that a protocol was not prepared.	N/A
	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.	N/A
Competing interests	26	Declare any competing interests of review authors.	N/A



## PRISMA 2020 Checklist

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
<b>1. TITLE : Ipinnaiye, O., Dineen D. y Lenihan, H. (2017). Drivers of SME performance: A holistic and multivariate approach. Small Business Economics, 48, 883-911</b>			
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review.	P883
<b>ABSTRACT</b>			
Abstract	2	See the PRISMA 2020 for Abstracts checklist.	P883
<b>INTRODUCTION</b>			
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of existing knowledge.	P883
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of the objective(s) or question(s) the review addresses.	P884
<b>METHODS</b>			
Eligibility criteria	5	Specify the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the review and how studies were grouped for the syntheses.	P886
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.	N/A
Search strategy	7	Present the full search strategies for all databases, registers and websites, including any filters and limits used.	N/A
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.	N/A
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.	N/A
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.	N/A
	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.	N/A
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.	N/A
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.	N/A
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)).	N/A
	13b	Describe any methods required to prepare the data for presentation or synthesis, such as handling of missing summary statistics, or data conversions.	N/A
	13c	Describe any methods used to tabulate or visually display results of individual studies and syntheses.	
	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.	N/A
	13e	Describe any methods used to explore possible causes of heterogeneity among study results (e.g. subgroup analysis, meta-regression).	N/A
	13f	Describe any sensitivity analyses conducted to assess robustness of the synthesized results.	N/A
Reporting bias assessment	14	Describe any methods used to assess risk of bias due to missing results in a synthesis (arising from reporting biases).	N/A
Certainty	15	Describe any methods used to assess certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for an outcome.	



## PRISMA 2020 Checklist

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
assessment			
<b>RESULTS</b>			
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.	P894
	16b	Cite studies that might appear to meet the inclusion criteria, but which were excluded, and explain why they were excluded.	N/A
Study characteristics	17	Cite each included study and present its characteristics.	N/A
Risk of bias in studies	18	Present assessments of risk of bias for each included study.	N/A
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.	N/A
Results of syntheses	20a	For each synthesis, briefly summarise the characteristics and risk of bias among contributing studies.	N/A
	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.	N/A
	20c	Present results of all investigations of possible causes of heterogeneity among study results.	N/A
	20d	Present results of all sensitivity analyses conducted to assess the robustness of the synthesized results.	N/A
Reporting biases	21	Present assessments of risk of bias due to missing results (arising from reporting biases) for each synthesis assessed.	N/A
Certainty of evidence	22	Present assessments of certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for each outcome assessed.	N/A
<b>DISCUSSION</b>			
Discussion	23a	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence.	P898
	23b	Discuss any limitations of the evidence included in the review.	N/A
	23c	Discuss any limitations of the review processes used.	N/A
	23d	Discuss implications of the results for practice, policy, and future research.	N/A
<b>OTHER INFORMATION</b>			
Registration and protocol	24a	Provide registration information for the review, including register name and registration number, or state that the review was not registered.	N/A
	24b	Indicate where the review protocol can be accessed, or state that a protocol was not prepared.	N/A
	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.	N/A
Competing interests	26	Declare any competing interests of review authors.	N/A
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



## PRISMA 2020 Checklist

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
<b>TITLE</b> Strategic Management Journal Lu, J. W. y Beamish, P. W. (2001). The internationalization and performance of SMEs., 22(6-7), 565-586.			
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review.	P565
<b>ABSTRACT</b>			
Abstract	2	See the PRISMA 2020 for Abstracts checklist.	P565
<b>INTRODUCTION</b>			
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of existing knowledge.	P567
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of the objective(s) or question(s) the review addresses.	P566
<b>METHODS</b>			
Eligibility criteria	5	Specify the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the review and how studies were grouped for the syntheses.	P568
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.	N/A
Search strategy	7	Present the full search strategies for all databases, registers and websites, including any filters and limits used.	N/A
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.	N/A
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.	N/A
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.	N/A
	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.	N/A
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.	N/A
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.	N/A
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)).	N/A
	13b	Describe any methods required to prepare the data for presentation or synthesis, such as handling of missing summary statistics, or data conversions.	N/A
	13c	Describe any methods used to tabulate or visually display results of individual studies and syntheses.	
	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.	N/A
	13e	Describe any methods used to explore possible causes of heterogeneity among study results (e.g. subgroup analysis, meta-regression).	N/A
	13f	Describe any sensitivity analyses conducted to assess robustness of the synthesized results.	N/A
Reporting bias assessment	14	Describe any methods used to assess risk of bias due to missing results in a synthesis (arising from reporting biases).	N/A



## PRISMA 2020 Checklist

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
Certainty assessment	15	Describe any methods used to assess certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for an outcome.	
<b>RESULTS</b>			
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.	575
	16b	Cite studies that might appear to meet the inclusion criteria, but which were excluded, and explain why they were excluded.	N/A
Study characteristics	17	Cite each included study and present its characteristics.	N/A
Risk of bias in studies	18	Present assessments of risk of bias for each included study.	N/A
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.	N/A
Results of syntheses	20a	For each synthesis, briefly summarise the characteristics and risk of bias among contributing studies.	N/A
	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.	N/A
	20c	Present results of all investigations of possible causes of heterogeneity among study results.	N/A
	20d	Present results of all sensitivity analyses conducted to assess the robustness of the synthesized results.	N/A
Reporting biases	21	Present assessments of risk of bias due to missing results (arising from reporting biases) for each synthesis assessed.	N/A
Certainty of evidence	22	Present assessments of certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for each outcome assessed.	N/A
<b>DISCUSSION</b>			
Discussion	23a	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence.	P580
	23b	Discuss any limitations of the evidence included in the review.	N/A
	23c	Discuss any limitations of the review processes used.	N/A
	23d	Discuss implications of the results for practice, policy, and future research.	N/A
<b>OTHER INFORMATION</b>			
Registration and protocol	24a	Provide registration information for the review, including register name and registration number, or state that the review was not registered.	N/A
	24b	Indicate where the review protocol can be accessed, or state that a protocol was not prepared.	N/A
	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.	N/A
Competing interests	26	Declare any competing interests of review authors.	N/A





## PRISMA 2020 Checklist

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
1. <b>TITLE</b> Malagón, F. (2013). ¿Cómo orientar el espíritu emprendedor hacia la creación de empresas? Revista Escuela de administración de Negocios No. 48 mayo-agosto, 72-81.			
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review.	P72
<b>ABSTRACT</b>			
Abstract	2	See the PRISMA 2020 for Abstracts checklist.	P72
<b>INTRODUCTION</b>			
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of existing knowledge.	P73
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of the objective(s) or question(s) the review addresses.	P75
<b>METHODS</b>			
Eligibility criteria	5	Specify the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the review and how studies were grouped for the syntheses.	P77
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.	N/A
Search strategy	7	Present the full search strategies for all databases, registers and websites, including any filters and limits used.	N/A
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.	N/A
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.	N/A
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.	N/A
	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.	N/A
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.	N/A
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.	N/A
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)).	N/A
	13b	Describe any methods required to prepare the data for presentation or synthesis, such as handling of missing summary statistics, or data conversions.	N/A
	13c	Describe any methods used to tabulate or visually display results of individual studies and syntheses.	
	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.	N/A
	13e	Describe any methods used to explore possible causes of heterogeneity among study results (e.g. subgroup analysis, meta-regression).	N/A
	13f	Describe any sensitivity analyses conducted to assess robustness of the synthesized results.	N/A
Reporting bias assessment	14	Describe any methods used to assess risk of bias due to missing results in a synthesis (arising from reporting biases).	N/A





## PRISMA 2020 Checklist

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
Certainty assessment	15	Describe any methods used to assess certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for an outcome.	
<b>RESULTS</b>			
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.	P79
	16b	Cite studies that might appear to meet the inclusion criteria, but which were excluded, and explain why they were excluded.	N/A
Study characteristics	17	Cite each included study and present its characteristics.	N/A
Risk of bias in studies	18	Present assessments of risk of bias for each included study.	N/A
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.	N/A
Results of syntheses	20a	For each synthesis, briefly summarise the characteristics and risk of bias among contributing studies.	N/A
	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.	N/A
	20c	Present results of all investigations of possible causes of heterogeneity among study results.	N/A
	20d	Present results of all sensitivity analyses conducted to assess the robustness of the synthesized results.	N/A
Reporting biases	21	Present assessments of risk of bias due to missing results (arising from reporting biases) for each synthesis assessed.	N/A
Certainty of evidence	22	Present assessments of certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for each outcome assessed.	N/A
<b>DISCUSSION</b>			
Discussion	23a	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence.	P80
	23b	Discuss any limitations of the evidence included in the review.	N/A
	23c	Discuss any limitations of the review processes used.	N/A
	23d	Discuss implications of the results for practice, policy, and future research.	N/A
<b>OTHER INFORMATION</b>			
Registration and protocol	24a	Provide registration information for the review, including register name and registration number, or state that the review was not registered.	N/A
	24b	Indicate where the review protocol can be accessed, or state that a protocol was not prepared.	N/A
	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.	N/A
Competing interests	26	Declare any competing interests of review authors.	N/A



## PRISMA 2020 Checklist

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
<b>TITLE</b> Medina, M. y Naranjo, I. (2014). Variables relevantes en el diseño de estrategias para la competitividad en pymes. <i>Orbis. Revista Científica Ciencias Humanas</i> , 9(27), pp.116-129.			
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review.	P116
<b>ABSTRACT</b>			
Abstract	2	See the PRISMA 2020 for Abstracts checklist.	P116
<b>INTRODUCTION</b>			
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of existing knowledge.	P117
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of the objective(s) or question(s) the review addresses.	P118
<b>METHODS</b>			
Eligibility criteria	5	Specify the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the review and how studies were grouped for the syntheses.	P120
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.	N/A
Search strategy	7	Present the full search strategies for all databases, registers and websites, including any filters and limits used.	N/A
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.	N/A
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.	N/A
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.	N/A
	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.	N/A
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.	N/A
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.	N/A
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)).	N/A
	13b	Describe any methods required to prepare the data for presentation or synthesis, such as handling of missing summary statistics, or data conversions.	N/A
	13c	Describe any methods used to tabulate or visually display results of individual studies and syntheses.	
	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.	N/A
	13e	Describe any methods used to explore possible causes of heterogeneity among study results (e.g. subgroup analysis, meta-regression).	N/A
	13f	Describe any sensitivity analyses conducted to assess robustness of the synthesized results.	N/A
Reporting bias assessment	14	Describe any methods used to assess risk of bias due to missing results in a synthesis (arising from reporting biases).	N/A



## PRISMA 2020 Checklist

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
Certainty assessment	15	Describe any methods used to assess certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for an outcome.	
<b>RESULTS</b>			
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.	P124
	16b	Cite studies that might appear to meet the inclusion criteria, but which were excluded, and explain why they were excluded.	N/A
Study characteristics	17	Cite each included study and present its characteristics.	N/A
Risk of bias in studies	18	Present assessments of risk of bias for each included study.	N/A
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.	N/A
Results of syntheses	20a	For each synthesis, briefly summarise the characteristics and risk of bias among contributing studies.	N/A
	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.	N/A
	20c	Present results of all investigations of possible causes of heterogeneity among study results.	N/A
	20d	Present results of all sensitivity analyses conducted to assess the robustness of the synthesized results.	N/A
Reporting biases	21	Present assessments of risk of bias due to missing results (arising from reporting biases) for each synthesis assessed.	N/A
Certainty of evidence	22	Present assessments of certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for each outcome assessed.	N/A
<b>DISCUSSION</b>			
Discussion	23a	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence.	P127
	23b	Discuss any limitations of the evidence included in the review.	N/A
	23c	Discuss any limitations of the review processes used.	N/A
	23d	Discuss implications of the results for practice, policy, and future research.	N/A
<b>OTHER INFORMATION</b>			
Registration and protocol	24a	Provide registration information for the review, including register name and registration number, or state that the review was not registered.	N/A
	24b	Indicate where the review protocol can be accessed, or state that a protocol was not prepared.	N/A
	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.	N/A
Competing interests	26	Declare any competing interests of review authors.	N/A



## PRISMA 2020 Checklist

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
Morales, A., Percy, I., y Monzón, R. (2019). Salud financiera de las empresas socialmente. YACHANA Revista Científica, vol. 8, núm. 1 (enero-junio), 1-19.			
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review.	P1
<b>ABSTRACT</b>			
Abstract	2	See the PRISMA 2020 for Abstracts checklist.	P1
<b>INTRODUCTION</b>			
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of existing knowledge.	P2
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of the objective(s) or question(s) the review addresses.	P3
<b>METHODS</b>			
Eligibility criteria	5	Specify the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the review and how studies were grouped for the syntheses.	P5
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.	N/A
Search strategy	7	Present the full search strategies for all databases, registers and websites, including any filters and limits used.	N/A
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.	N/A
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.	N/A
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.	N/A
	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.	N/A
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.	N/A
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.	N/A
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)).	N/A
	13b	Describe any methods required to prepare the data for presentation or synthesis, such as handling of missing summary statistics, or data conversions.	N/A
	13c	Describe any methods used to tabulate or visually display results of individual studies and syntheses.	
	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.	N/A
	13e	Describe any methods used to explore possible causes of heterogeneity among study results (e.g. subgroup analysis, meta-regression).	N/A
	13f	Describe any sensitivity analyses conducted to assess robustness of the synthesized results.	N/A
Reporting bias assessment	14	Describe any methods used to assess risk of bias due to missing results in a synthesis (arising from reporting biases).	N/A



## PRISMA 2020 Checklist

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
Certainty assessment	15	Describe any methods used to assess certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for an outcome.	
<b>RESULTS</b>			
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.	P8
	16b	Cite studies that might appear to meet the inclusion criteria, but which were excluded, and explain why they were excluded.	N/A
Study characteristics	17	Cite each included study and present its characteristics.	N/A
Risk of bias in studies	18	Present assessments of risk of bias for each included study.	N/A
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.	N/A
Results of syntheses	20a	For each synthesis, briefly summarise the characteristics and risk of bias among contributing studies.	N/A
	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.	N/A
	20c	Present results of all investigations of possible causes of heterogeneity among study results.	N/A
	20d	Present results of all sensitivity analyses conducted to assess the robustness of the synthesized results.	N/A
Reporting biases	21	Present assessments of risk of bias due to missing results (arising from reporting biases) for each synthesis assessed.	N/A
Certainty of evidence	22	Present assessments of certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for each outcome assessed.	N/A
<b>DISCUSSION</b>			
Discussion	23a	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence.	P15
	23b	Discuss any limitations of the evidence included in the review.	N/A
	23c	Discuss any limitations of the review processes used.	N/A
	23d	Discuss implications of the results for practice, policy, and future research.	N/A
<b>OTHER INFORMATION</b>			
Registration and protocol	24a	Provide registration information for the review, including register name and registration number, or state that the review was not registered.	N/A
	24b	Indicate where the review protocol can be accessed, or state that a protocol was not prepared.	N/A
	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.	N/A
Competing interests	26	Declare any competing interests of review authors.	N/A



## PRISMA 2020 Checklist

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
2. Porter, M. (2008). The Five Competitive Forces That Shape Strategy. Harvard Business Review. No. 35, pp. 1-10.			
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review.	P1
<b>ABSTRACT</b>			
Abstract	2	See the PRISMA 2020 for Abstracts checklist.	P1
<b>INTRODUCTION</b>			
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of existing knowledge.	P2
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of the objective(s) or question(s) the review addresses.	P3
<b>METHODS</b>			
Eligibility criteria	5	Specify the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the review and how studies were grouped for the syntheses.	P5
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.	N/A
Search strategy	7	Present the full search strategies for all databases, registers and websites, including any filters and limits used.	N/A
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.	N/A
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.	N/A
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.	N/A
	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.	N/A
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.	N/A
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.	N/A
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)).	N/A
	13b	Describe any methods required to prepare the data for presentation or synthesis, such as handling of missing summary statistics, or data conversions.	N/A
	13c	Describe any methods used to tabulate or visually display results of individual studies and syntheses.	
	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.	N/A
	13e	Describe any methods used to explore possible causes of heterogeneity among study results (e.g. subgroup analysis, meta-regression).	N/A
	13f	Describe any sensitivity analyses conducted to assess robustness of the synthesized results.	N/A
Reporting bias assessment	14	Describe any methods used to assess risk of bias due to missing results in a synthesis (arising from reporting biases).	N/A



## PRISMA 2020 Checklist

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
Certainty assessment	15	Describe any methods used to assess certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for an outcome.	
<b>RESULTS</b>			
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.	P7
	16b	Cite studies that might appear to meet the inclusion criteria, but which were excluded, and explain why they were excluded.	N/A
Study characteristics	17	Cite each included study and present its characteristics.	N/A
Risk of bias in studies	18	Present assessments of risk of bias for each included study.	N/A
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.	N/A
Results of syntheses	20a	For each synthesis, briefly summarise the characteristics and risk of bias among contributing studies.	N/A
	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.	N/A
	20c	Present results of all investigations of possible causes of heterogeneity among study results.	N/A
	20d	Present results of all sensitivity analyses conducted to assess the robustness of the synthesized results.	N/A
Reporting biases	21	Present assessments of risk of bias due to missing results (arising from reporting biases) for each synthesis assessed.	N/A
Certainty of evidence	22	Present assessments of certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for each outcome assessed.	N/A
<b>DISCUSSION</b>			
Discussion	23a	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence.	P8
	23b	Discuss any limitations of the evidence included in the review.	N/A
	23c	Discuss any limitations of the review processes used.	N/A
	23d	Discuss implications of the results for practice, policy, and future research.	N/A
<b>OTHER INFORMATION</b>			
Registration and protocol	24a	Provide registration information for the review, including register name and registration number, or state that the review was not registered.	N/A
	24b	Indicate where the review protocol can be accessed, or state that a protocol was not prepared.	N/A
	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.	N/A
Competing interests	26	Declare any competing interests of review authors.	N/A





## PRISMA 2020 Checklist

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
<b>TITLE</b> Siepel, J. y Dejardin, M. (2020). How do we measure firm performance? A review of issues facing entrepreneurship researchers			
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review.	P2
<b>ABSTRACT</b>			
Abstract	2	See the PRISMA 2020 for Abstracts checklist.	P2
<b>INTRODUCTION</b>			
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of existing knowledge.	P3
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of the objective(s) or question(s) the review addresses.	N/A
<b>METHODS</b>			
Eligibility criteria	5	Specify the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the review and how studies were grouped for the syntheses.	N/A
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.	N/A
Search strategy	7	Present the full search strategies for all databases, registers and websites, including any filters and limits used.	N/A
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.	N/A
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.	N/A
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.	N/A
	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.	N/A
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.	N/A
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.	N/A
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)).	N/A
	13b	Describe any methods required to prepare the data for presentation or synthesis, such as handling of missing summary statistics, or data conversions.	N/A
	13c	Describe any methods used to tabulate or visually display results of individual studies and syntheses.	
	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.	N/A
	13e	Describe any methods used to explore possible causes of heterogeneity among study results (e.g. subgroup analysis, meta-regression).	N/A
	13f	Describe any sensitivity analyses conducted to assess robustness of the synthesized results.	N/A
Reporting bias assessment	14	Describe any methods used to assess risk of bias due to missing results in a synthesis (arising from reporting biases).	N/A





## PRISMA 2020 Checklist

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
Certainty assessment	15	Describe any methods used to assess certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for an outcome.	
<b>RESULTS</b>			
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.	N/A
	16b	Cite studies that might appear to meet the inclusion criteria, but which were excluded, and explain why they were excluded.	N/A
Study characteristics	17	Cite each included study and present its characteristics.	N/A
Risk of bias in studies	18	Present assessments of risk of bias for each included study.	N/A
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.	N/A
Results of syntheses	20a	For each synthesis, briefly summarise the characteristics and risk of bias among contributing studies.	N/A
	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.	N/A
	20c	Present results of all investigations of possible causes of heterogeneity among study results.	N/A
	20d	Present results of all sensitivity analyses conducted to assess the robustness of the synthesized results.	N/A
Reporting biases	21	Present assessments of risk of bias due to missing results (arising from reporting biases) for each synthesis assessed.	N/A
Certainty of evidence	22	Present assessments of certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for each outcome assessed.	N/A
<b>DISCUSSION</b>			
Discussion	23a	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence.	
	23b	Discuss any limitations of the evidence included in the review.	N/A
	23c	Discuss any limitations of the review processes used.	N/A
	23d	Discuss implications of the results for practice, policy, and future research.	N/A
<b>OTHER INFORMATION</b>			
Registration and protocol	24a	Provide registration information for the review, including register name and registration number, or state that the review was not registered.	N/A
	24b	Indicate where the review protocol can be accessed, or state that a protocol was not prepared.	N/A
	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.	N/A
Competing interests	26	Declare any competing interests of review authors.	N/A



## PRISMA 2020 Checklist

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
Solís, J., Neira, M., Ormaza, J., y Quevedo, J. (2021). Emprendimiento e innovación: Dimensiones para el estudio de las MiPymes de Azogues-Ecuador. Revista de Ciencias Sociales, Vol. XXVII, No. 1, 1-20			
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review.	P1
<b>ABSTRACT</b>			
Abstract	2	See the PRISMA 2020 for Abstracts checklist.	P2
<b>INTRODUCTION</b>			
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of existing knowledge.	P2
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of the objective(s) or question(s) the review addresses.	P4
<b>METHODS</b>			
Eligibility criteria	5	Specify the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the review and how studies were grouped for the syntheses.	P6
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.	N/A
Search strategy	7	Present the full search strategies for all databases, registers and websites, including any filters and limits used.	N/A
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.	N/A
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.	N/A
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.	N/A
	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.	N/A
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.	N/A
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.	N/A
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)).	N/A
	13b	Describe any methods required to prepare the data for presentation or synthesis, such as handling of missing summary statistics, or data conversions.	N/A
	13c	Describe any methods used to tabulate or visually display results of individual studies and syntheses.	
	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.	N/A
	13e	Describe any methods used to explore possible causes of heterogeneity among study results (e.g. subgroup analysis, meta-regression).	N/A
	13f	Describe any sensitivity analyses conducted to assess robustness of the synthesized results.	N/A
Reporting bias assessment	14	Describe any methods used to assess risk of bias due to missing results in a synthesis (arising from reporting biases).	N/A



## PRISMA 2020 Checklist

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
Certainty assessment	15	Describe any methods used to assess certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for an outcome.	
<b>RESULTS</b>			
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.	P8
	16b	Cite studies that might appear to meet the inclusion criteria, but which were excluded, and explain why they were excluded.	N/A
Study characteristics	17	Cite each included study and present its characteristics.	N/A
Risk of bias in studies	18	Present assessments of risk of bias for each included study.	N/A
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.	N/A
Results of syntheses	20a	For each synthesis, briefly summarise the characteristics and risk of bias among contributing studies.	N/A
	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.	N/A
	20c	Present results of all investigations of possible causes of heterogeneity among study results.	N/A
	20d	Present results of all sensitivity analyses conducted to assess the robustness of the synthesized results.	N/A
Reporting biases	21	Present assessments of risk of bias due to missing results (arising from reporting biases) for each synthesis assessed.	N/A
Certainty of evidence	22	Present assessments of certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for each outcome assessed.	N/A
<b>DISCUSSION</b>			
Discussion	23a	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence.	P15
	23b	Discuss any limitations of the evidence included in the review.	N/A
	23c	Discuss any limitations of the review processes used.	N/A
	23d	Discuss implications of the results for practice, policy, and future research.	N/A
<b>OTHER INFORMATION</b>			
Registration and protocol	24a	Provide registration information for the review, including register name and registration number, or state that the review was not registered.	N/A
	24b	Indicate where the review protocol can be accessed, or state that a protocol was not prepared.	N/A
	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.	N/A
Competing interests	26	Declare any competing interests of review authors.	N/A
Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item



## PRISMA 2020 Checklist

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
			is reported
<b>TITLE</b> Varela, R., y Bedoya, O. (2014). Modelo conceptual de desarrollo empresarial basado en competencias. Revista EAN N° 57, mayo-agosto, 1-15.			
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review.	P1
<b>ABSTRACT</b>			
Abstract	2	See the PRISMA 2020 for Abstracts checklist.	P2
<b>INTRODUCTION</b>			
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of existing knowledge.	P2
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of the objective(s) or question(s) the review addresses.	P5
<b>METHODS</b>			
Eligibility criteria	5	Specify the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the review and how studies were grouped for the syntheses.	P8
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.	N/A
Search strategy	7	Present the full search strategies for all databases, registers and websites, including any filters and limits used.	N/A
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.	N/A
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.	N/A
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.	N/A
	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.	N/A
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.	N/A
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.	N/A
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)).	N/A
	13b	Describe any methods required to prepare the data for presentation or synthesis, such as handling of missing summary statistics, or data conversions.	N/A
	13c	Describe any methods used to tabulate or visually display results of individual studies and syntheses.	
	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.	N/A
	13e	Describe any methods used to explore possible causes of heterogeneity among study results (e.g. subgroup analysis, meta-regression).	N/A
	13f	Describe any sensitivity analyses conducted to assess robustness of the synthesized results.	N/A
Reporting bias assessment	14	Describe any methods used to assess risk of bias due to missing results in a synthesis (arising from reporting biases).	N/A



## PRISMA 2020 Checklist

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
Certainty assessment	15	Describe any methods used to assess certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for an outcome.	
<b>RESULTS</b>			
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.	
	16b	Cite studies that might appear to meet the inclusion criteria, but which were excluded, and explain why they were excluded.	N/A
Study characteristics	17	Cite each included study and present its characteristics.	N/A
Risk of bias in studies	18	Present assessments of risk of bias for each included study.	N/A
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.	N/A
Results of syntheses	20a	For each synthesis, briefly summarise the characteristics and risk of bias among contributing studies.	N/A
	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.	N/A
	20c	Present results of all investigations of possible causes of heterogeneity among study results.	N/A
	20d	Present results of all sensitivity analyses conducted to assess the robustness of the synthesized results.	N/A
Reporting biases	21	Present assessments of risk of bias due to missing results (arising from reporting biases) for each synthesis assessed.	N/A
Certainty of evidence	22	Present assessments of certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for each outcome assessed.	N/A
<b>DISCUSSION</b>			
Discussion	23a	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence.	
	23b	Discuss any limitations of the evidence included in the review.	N/A
	23c	Discuss any limitations of the review processes used.	N/A
	23d	Discuss implications of the results for practice, policy, and future research.	N/A
<b>OTHER INFORMATION</b>			
Registration and protocol	24a	Provide registration information for the review, including register name and registration number, or state that the review was not registered.	N/A
	24b	Indicate where the review protocol can be accessed, or state that a protocol was not prepared.	N/A
	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.	N/A
Competing interests	26	Declare any competing interests of review authors.	N/A



# PRISMA 2020 Checklist

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
<b>1. TITLE</b> Vieira, L. y Amaral. F (2015) Barriers and strategies applying Cleaner Production: a systematic review. Journal of Cleaner Production 113 (2016) 5-16			
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review.	P5
<b>ABSTRACT</b>			
Abstract	2	See the PRISMA 2020 for Abstracts checklist.	P5
<b>INTRODUCTION</b>			
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of existing knowledge.	P6
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of the objective(s) or question(s) the review addresses.	P8
<b>METHODS</b>			
Eligibility criteria	5	Specify the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the review and how studies were grouped for the syntheses.	P11
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.	N/A
Search strategy	7	Present the full search strategies for all databases, registers and websites, including any filters and limits used.	N/A
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.	N/A
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.	N/A
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.	N/A
	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.	N/A
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.	N/A
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.	N/A
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)).	N/A
	13b	Describe any methods required to prepare the data for presentation or synthesis, such as handling of missing summary statistics, or data conversions.	N/A
	13c	Describe any methods used to tabulate or visually display results of individual studies and syntheses.	
	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.	N/A
	13e	Describe any methods used to explore possible causes of heterogeneity among study results (e.g. subgroup analysis, meta-regression).	N/A
	13f	Describe any sensitivity analyses conducted to assess robustness of the synthesized results.	N/A
Reporting bias assessment	14	Describe any methods used to assess risk of bias due to missing results in a synthesis (arising from reporting biases).	N/A



## PRISMA 2020 Checklist

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
Certainty assessment	15	Describe any methods used to assess certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for an outcome.	
<b>RESULTS</b>			
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.	P13
	16b	Cite studies that might appear to meet the inclusion criteria, but which were excluded, and explain why they were excluded.	N/A
Study characteristics	17	Cite each included study and present its characteristics.	N/A
Risk of bias in studies	18	Present assessments of risk of bias for each included study.	N/A
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.	N/A
Results of syntheses	20a	For each synthesis, briefly summarise the characteristics and risk of bias among contributing studies.	N/A
	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.	N/A
	20c	Present results of all investigations of possible causes of heterogeneity among study results.	N/A
	20d	Present results of all sensitivity analyses conducted to assess the robustness of the synthesized results.	N/A
Reporting biases	21	Present assessments of risk of bias due to missing results (arising from reporting biases) for each synthesis assessed.	N/A
Certainty of evidence	22	Present assessments of certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for each outcome assessed.	N/A
<b>DISCUSSION</b>			
Discussion	23a	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence.	P18
	23b	Discuss any limitations of the evidence included in the review.	N/A
	23c	Discuss any limitations of the review processes used.	N/A
	23d	Discuss implications of the results for practice, policy, and future research.	N/A
<b>OTHER INFORMATION</b>			
Registration and protocol	24a	Provide registration information for the review, including register name and registration number, or state that the review was not registered.	N/A
	24b	Indicate where the review protocol can be accessed, or state that a protocol was not prepared.	N/A
	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.	N/A
Competing interests	26	Declare any competing interests of review authors.	N/A





## PRISMA 2020 Checklist

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
Yuriev, A., Boiral, O., Francoeur, V., y Paillé, P. (2018). Overcoming the barriers to pro-environmental behaviors in the workplace: A systematic review. Journal of Cleaner Production, 182, 379-394.			
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review.	P379
<b>ABSTRACT</b>			
Abstract	2	See the PRISMA 2020 for Abstracts checklist.	P379
<b>INTRODUCTION</b>			
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of existing knowledge.	P380
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of the objective(s) or question(s) the review addresses.	P383
<b>METHODS</b>			
Eligibility criteria	5	Specify the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the review and how studies were grouped for the syntheses.	P385
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.	N/A
Search strategy	7	Present the full search strategies for all databases, registers and websites, including any filters and limits used.	N/A
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.	N/A
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.	N/A
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.	N/A
	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.	N/A
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.	N/A
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.	N/A
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)).	N/A
	13b	Describe any methods required to prepare the data for presentation or synthesis, such as handling of missing summary statistics, or data conversions.	N/A
	13c	Describe any methods used to tabulate or visually display results of individual studies and syntheses.	
	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.	N/A
	13e	Describe any methods used to explore possible causes of heterogeneity among study results (e.g. subgroup analysis, meta-regression).	N/A
	13f	Describe any sensitivity analyses conducted to assess robustness of the synthesized results.	N/A
Reporting bias	14	Describe any methods used to assess risk of bias due to missing results in a synthesis (arising from reporting biases).	N/A





## PRISMA 2020 Checklist

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
assessment			
Certainty assessment	15	Describe any methods used to assess certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for an outcome.	
<b>RESULTS</b>			
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.	P386
	16b	Cite studies that might appear to meet the inclusion criteria, but which were excluded, and explain why they were excluded.	N/A
Study characteristics	17	Cite each included study and present its characteristics.	N/A
Risk of bias in studies	18	Present assessments of risk of bias for each included study.	N/A
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.	N/A
Results of syntheses	20a	For each synthesis, briefly summarise the characteristics and risk of bias among contributing studies.	N/A
	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.	N/A
	20c	Present results of all investigations of possible causes of heterogeneity among study results.	N/A
	20d	Present results of all sensitivity analyses conducted to assess the robustness of the synthesized results.	N/A
Reporting biases	21	Present assessments of risk of bias due to missing results (arising from reporting biases) for each synthesis assessed.	N/A
Certainty of evidence	22	Present assessments of certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for each outcome assessed.	N/A
<b>DISCUSSION</b>			
Discussion	23a	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence.	P389
	23b	Discuss any limitations of the evidence included in the review.	N/A
	23c	Discuss any limitations of the review processes used.	N/A
	23d	Discuss implications of the results for practice, policy, and future research.	N/A
<b>OTHER INFORMATION</b>			
Registration and protocol	24a	Provide registration information for the review, including register name and registration number, or state that the review was not registered.	N/A
	24b	Indicate where the review protocol can be accessed, or state that a protocol was not prepared.	N/A
	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.	N/A
Competing interests	26	Declare any competing interests of review authors.	N/A



## PRISMA 2020 Checklist

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
<b>TITLE</b> Zevallos, E. (2003). Micro, pequeñas y medianas empresas en América Latina Revista de la CEPAL, (79), pp. 53-70, recuperado el 25/06/2019 de <a href="http://repositorio.cepal.org/15">http://repositorio.cepal.org/15</a>			
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review.	P53
<b>ABSTRACT</b>			
Abstract	2	See the PRISMA 2020 for Abstracts checklist.	P53
<b>INTRODUCTION</b>			
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of existing knowledge.	P54
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of the objective(s) or question(s) the review addresses.	P56
<b>METHODS</b>			
Eligibility criteria	5	Specify the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the review and how studies were grouped for the syntheses.	P60
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.	N/A
Search strategy	7	Present the full search strategies for all databases, registers and websites, including any filters and limits used.	N/A
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.	N/A
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.	N/A
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.	N/A
	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.	N/A
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.	N/A
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.	N/A
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)).	N/A
	13b	Describe any methods required to prepare the data for presentation or synthesis, such as handling of missing summary statistics, or data conversions.	N/A
	13c	Describe any methods used to tabulate or visually display results of individual studies and syntheses.	
	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.	N/A
	13e	Describe any methods used to explore possible causes of heterogeneity among study results (e.g. subgroup analysis, meta-regression).	N/A
	13f	Describe any sensitivity analyses conducted to assess robustness of the synthesized results.	N/A
Reporting bias assessment	14	Describe any methods used to assess risk of bias due to missing results in a synthesis (arising from reporting biases).	N/A



## PRISMA 2020 Checklist

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
Certainty assessment	15	Describe any methods used to assess certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for an outcome.	N/A
<b>RESULTS</b>			
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.	P63
	16b	Cite studies that might appear to meet the inclusion criteria, but which were excluded, and explain why they were excluded.	N/A
Study characteristics	17	Cite each included study and present its characteristics.	N/A
Risk of bias in studies	18	Present assessments of risk of bias for each included study.	N/A
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.	N/A
Results of syntheses	20a	For each synthesis, briefly summarise the characteristics and risk of bias among contributing studies.	N/A
	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.	N/A
	20c	Present results of all investigations of possible causes of heterogeneity among study results.	N/A
	20d	Present results of all sensitivity analyses conducted to assess the robustness of the synthesized results.	N/A
Reporting biases	21	Present assessments of risk of bias due to missing results (arising from reporting biases) for each synthesis assessed.	N/A
Certainty of evidence	22	Present assessments of certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for each outcome assessed.	N/A
<b>DISCUSSION</b>			
Discussion	23a	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence.	P65
	23b	Discuss any limitations of the evidence included in the review.	N/A
	23c	Discuss any limitations of the review processes used.	N/A
	23d	Discuss implications of the results for practice, policy, and future research.	N/A
<b>OTHER INFORMATION</b>			
Registration and protocol	24a	Provide registration information for the review, including register name and registration number, or state that the review was not registered.	N/A
	24b	Indicate where the review protocol can be accessed, or state that a protocol was not prepared.	N/A
	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.	N/A
Competing interests	26	Declare any competing interests of review authors.	N/A



## PRISMA 2020 Checklist

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
<b>TITLE</b> Mazzucato, M. (2018). The value of everything. Making & taking in the global economy. Nueva York: Hachette Book Group			
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review.	N/A
<b>ABSTRACT</b>			
Abstract	2	See the PRISMA 2020 for Abstracts checklist.	N/A
<b>INTRODUCTION</b>			
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of existing knowledge.	N/A
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of the objective(s) or question(s) the review addresses.	N/A
<b>METHODS</b>			
Eligibility criteria	5	Specify the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the review and how studies were grouped for the syntheses.	N/A
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.	N/A
Search strategy	7	Present the full search strategies for all databases, registers and websites, including any filters and limits used.	N/A
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.	N/A
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.	N/A
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.	N/A
	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.	N/A
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.	N/A
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.	N/A
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)).	N/A
	13b	Describe any methods required to prepare the data for presentation or synthesis, such as handling of missing summary statistics, or data conversions.	N/A
	13c	Describe any methods used to tabulate or visually display results of individual studies and syntheses.	
	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.	N/A
	13e	Describe any methods used to explore possible causes of heterogeneity among study results (e.g. subgroup analysis, meta-regression).	N/A
	13f	Describe any sensitivity analyses conducted to assess robustness of the synthesized results.	N/A
Reporting bias assessment	14	Describe any methods used to assess risk of bias due to missing results in a synthesis (arising from reporting biases).	N/A
Certainty	15	Describe any methods used to assess certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for an outcome.	



## PRISMA 2020 Checklist

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
assessment			
<b>RESULTS</b>			
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.	N/A
	16b	Cite studies that might appear to meet the inclusion criteria, but which were excluded, and explain why they were excluded.	N/A
Study characteristics	17	Cite each included study and present its characteristics.	N/A
Risk of bias in studies	18	Present assessments of risk of bias for each included study.	N/A
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.	N/A
Results of syntheses	20a	For each synthesis, briefly summarise the characteristics and risk of bias among contributing studies.	N/A
	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.	N/A
	20c	Present results of all investigations of possible causes of heterogeneity among study results.	N/A
	20d	Present results of all sensitivity analyses conducted to assess the robustness of the synthesized results.	N/A
Reporting biases	21	Present assessments of risk of bias due to missing results (arising from reporting biases) for each synthesis assessed.	N/A
Certainty of evidence	22	Present assessments of certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for each outcome assessed.	N/A
<b>DISCUSSION</b>			
Discussion	23a	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence.	N/A
	23b	Discuss any limitations of the evidence included in the review.	N/A
	23c	Discuss any limitations of the review processes used.	N/A
	23d	Discuss implications of the results for practice, policy, and future research.	N/A
<b>OTHER INFORMATION</b>			
Registration and protocol	24a	Provide registration information for the review, including register name and registration number, or state that the review was not registered.	N/A
	24b	Indicate where the review protocol can be accessed, or state that a protocol was not prepared.	N/A
	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.	N/A
Competing interests	26	Declare any competing interests of review authors.	N/A
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



## PRISMA 2020 Checklist

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
<b>TITLE</b> Thiel, Mejia, S., Van Hoof, B., y Quiñones, A. (2018). Shrinking effects. of cleaner production dissemination: An analysis of a Colombian programme			
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review.	N/A
<b>ABSTRACT</b>			
Abstract	2	See the PRISMA 2020 for Abstracts checklist.	N/A
<b>INTRODUCTION</b>			
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of existing knowledge.	N/A
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of the objective(s) or question(s) the review addresses.	N/A
<b>METHODS</b>			
Eligibility criteria	5	Specify the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the review and how studies were grouped for the syntheses.	N/A
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.	N/A
Search strategy	7	Present the full search strategies for all databases, registers and websites, including any filters and limits used.	N/A
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.	N/A
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.	N/A
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.	N/A
	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.	N/A
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.	N/A
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.	N/A
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)).	N/A
	13b	Describe any methods required to prepare the data for presentation or synthesis, such as handling of missing summary statistics, or data conversions.	N/A
	13c	Describe any methods used to tabulate or visually display results of individual studies and syntheses.	
	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.	N/A
	13e	Describe any methods used to explore possible causes of heterogeneity among study results (e.g. subgroup analysis, meta-regression).	N/A
	13f	Describe any sensitivity analyses conducted to assess robustness of the synthesized results.	N/A
Reporting bias assessment	14	Describe any methods used to assess risk of bias due to missing results in a synthesis (arising from reporting biases).	N/A
Certainty	15	Describe any methods used to assess certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for an outcome.	



## PRISMA 2020 Checklist

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
assessment			
<b>RESULTS</b>			
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.	N/A
	16b	Cite studies that might appear to meet the inclusion criteria, but which were excluded, and explain why they were excluded.	N/A
Study characteristics	17	Cite each included study and present its characteristics.	N/A
Risk of bias in studies	18	Present assessments of risk of bias for each included study.	N/A
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.	N/A
Results of syntheses	20a	For each synthesis, briefly summarise the characteristics and risk of bias among contributing studies.	N/A
	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.	N/A
	20c	Present results of all investigations of possible causes of heterogeneity among study results.	N/A
	20d	Present results of all sensitivity analyses conducted to assess the robustness of the synthesized results.	N/A
Reporting biases	21	Present assessments of risk of bias due to missing results (arising from reporting biases) for each synthesis assessed.	N/A
Certainty of evidence	22	Present assessments of certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for each outcome assessed.	N/A
<b>DISCUSSION</b>			
Discussion	23a	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence.	
	23b	Discuss any limitations of the evidence included in the review.	N/A
	23c	Discuss any limitations of the review processes used.	N/A
	23d	Discuss implications of the results for practice, policy, and future research.	N/A
<b>OTHER INFORMATION</b>			
Registration and protocol	24a	Provide registration information for the review, including register name and registration number, or state that the review was not registered.	N/A
	24b	Indicate where the review protocol can be accessed, or state that a protocol was not prepared.	N/A
	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.	N/A
Competing interests	26	Declare any competing interests of review authors.	N/A
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





## PRISMA 2020 Checklist

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
<b>TITLE</b> Porter, M. E. y Kramer, M. (2011). Creating shared value: Redefining capitalism and the role of the corporation in society. Harvard Business Review			
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review.	p.130
<b>ABSTRACT</b>			
Abstract	2	See the PRISMA 2020 for Abstracts checklist.	P130
<b>INTRODUCTION</b>			
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of existing knowledge.	131
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of the objective(s) or question(s) the review addresses.	131
<b>METHODS</b>			
Eligibility criteria	5	Specify the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the review and how studies were grouped for the syntheses.	N/A
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.	N/A
Search strategy	7	Present the full search strategies for all databases, registers and websites, including any filters and limits used.	N/A
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.	N/A
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.	N/A
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.	N/A
	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.	N/A
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.	N/A
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.	N/A
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)).	N/A
	13b	Describe any methods required to prepare the data for presentation or synthesis, such as handling of missing summary statistics, or data conversions.	N/A
	13c	Describe any methods used to tabulate or visually display results of individual studies and syntheses.	
	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.	N/A
	13e	Describe any methods used to explore possible causes of heterogeneity among study results (e.g. subgroup analysis, meta-regression).	N/A
	13f	Describe any sensitivity analyses conducted to assess robustness of the synthesized results.	N/A
Reporting bias assessment	14	Describe any methods used to assess risk of bias due to missing results in a synthesis (arising from reporting biases).	N/A
Certainty	15	Describe any methods used to assess certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for an outcome.	





## PRISMA 2020 Checklist

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
assessment			
<b>RESULTS</b>			
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.	N/A
	16b	Cite studies that might appear to meet the inclusion criteria, but which were excluded, and explain why they were excluded.	N/A
Study characteristics	17	Cite each included study and present its characteristics.	N/A
Risk of bias in studies	18	Present assessments of risk of bias for each included study.	N/A
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.	N/A
Results of syntheses	20a	For each synthesis, briefly summarise the characteristics and risk of bias among contributing studies.	N/A
	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.	N/A
	20c	Present results of all investigations of possible causes of heterogeneity among study results.	N/A
	20d	Present results of all sensitivity analyses conducted to assess the robustness of the synthesized results.	N/A
Reporting biases	21	Present assessments of risk of bias due to missing results (arising from reporting biases) for each synthesis assessed.	N/A
Certainty of evidence	22	Present assessments of certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for each outcome assessed.	N/A
<b>DISCUSSION</b>			
Discussion	23a	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence.	P141
	23b	Discuss any limitations of the evidence included in the review.	N/A
	23c	Discuss any limitations of the review processes used.	N/A
	23d	Discuss implications of the results for practice, policy, and future research.	N/A
<b>OTHER INFORMATION</b>			
Registration and protocol	24a	Provide registration information for the review, including register name and registration number, or state that the review was not registered.	N/A
	24b	Indicate where the review protocol can be accessed, or state that a protocol was not prepared.	N/A
	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.	N/A
Competing interests	26	Declare any competing interests of review authors.	N/A
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



## PRISMA 2020 Checklist

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
<b>TITLE</b> Escarria, S. (25 de junio de 2021). Pymes: su importancia y datos que debes saber.			
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review.	N/A
<b>ABSTRACT</b>			
Abstract	2	See the PRISMA 2020 for Abstracts checklist.	N/A
<b>INTRODUCTION</b>			
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of existing knowledge.	N/A
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of the objective(s) or question(s) the review addresses.	N/A
<b>METHODS</b>			
Eligibility criteria	5	Specify the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the review and how studies were grouped for the syntheses.	N/A
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.	N/A
Search strategy	7	Present the full search strategies for all databases, registers and websites, including any filters and limits used.	N/A
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.	N/A
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.	N/A
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.	N/A
	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.	N/A
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.	N/A
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.	N/A
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)).	N/A
	13b	Describe any methods required to prepare the data for presentation or synthesis, such as handling of missing summary statistics, or data conversions.	N/A
	13c	Describe any methods used to tabulate or visually display results of individual studies and syntheses.	
	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.	N/A
	13e	Describe any methods used to explore possible causes of heterogeneity among study results (e.g. subgroup analysis, meta-regression).	N/A
	13f	Describe any sensitivity analyses conducted to assess robustness of the synthesized results.	N/A
Reporting bias assessment	14	Describe any methods used to assess risk of bias due to missing results in a synthesis (arising from reporting biases).	N/A
Certainty	15	Describe any methods used to assess certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for an outcome.	



## PRISMA 2020 Checklist

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
assessment			
<b>RESULTS</b>			
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.	N/A
	16b	Cite studies that might appear to meet the inclusion criteria, but which were excluded, and explain why they were excluded.	N/A
Study characteristics	17	Cite each included study and present its characteristics.	N/A
Risk of bias in studies	18	Present assessments of risk of bias for each included study.	N/A
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.	N/A
Results of syntheses	20a	For each synthesis, briefly summarise the characteristics and risk of bias among contributing studies.	N/A
	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.	N/A
	20c	Present results of all investigations of possible causes of heterogeneity among study results.	N/A
	20d	Present results of all sensitivity analyses conducted to assess the robustness of the synthesized results.	N/A
Reporting biases	21	Present assessments of risk of bias due to missing results (arising from reporting biases) for each synthesis assessed.	N/A
Certainty of evidence	22	Present assessments of certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for each outcome assessed.	N/A
<b>DISCUSSION</b>			
Discussion	23a	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence.	
	23b	Discuss any limitations of the evidence included in the review.	N/A
	23c	Discuss any limitations of the review processes used.	N/A
	23d	Discuss implications of the results for practice, policy, and future research.	N/A
<b>OTHER INFORMATION</b>			
Registration and protocol	24a	Provide registration information for the review, including register name and registration number, or state that the review was not registered.	N/A
	24b	Indicate where the review protocol can be accessed, or state that a protocol was not prepared.	N/A
	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.	N/A
Competing interests	26	Declare any competing interests of review authors.	N/A
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



## PRISMA 2020 Checklist