SILESIAN UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY PUBLISHING HOUSE

SCIENTIFIC PAPERS OF SILESIAN UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY 2025
ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT SERIES NO. 227

DON'T WRITE, MANAGE! RESEARCHER AS MANAGER OF SYSTEMATIC LITERATURE REVIEW PROCESS IN MANAGEMENT

Przemysław TOMCZYK

Kozminski University, Warszawa; ptomczyk@kozminski.edu.pl, ORCID: 0000-0002-7069-6918

Purpose: This article proposes a methodological procedure for integrating Generative Artificial Intelligence (GAI) into the process of preparing systematic literature reviews (SLRs) for management. It addresses a gap in the literature related to the researcher's evolving role, from executors to managers, in AI-assisted academic writing.
Design/methodology/approach: This study adopted a conceptual and methodological approach. Building on the literature on SLRs, process management, and AI, this study introduces a model in which the researcher manages the SLR process, supported by GAI tools such as ChatGPT, Elicit, and SciSpace. The model follows the sequential stages of SLRs and adapts each step to collaboration with AI.
Findings: This article presents a detailed step-by-step framework, showing how GAI can support scoping review, research problem formulation, literature selection, data extraction, and synthesis. The study illustrates that GAI can improve efficiency, transparency, and accessibility, while emphasizing the critical role of the researcher in quality control and decision-making.
Research limitations/implications: This study is methodological-conceptual, and does not empirically test the proposed framework. Future studies should validate its effectiveness in various academic disciplines and examine the ethical challenges related to AI-generated content, authorship, and academic integrity.
Practical implications: The proposed model could serve as a practical guide for researchers and institutions seeking to integrate GAI into their research workflow. This may be particularly useful for early career scholars and non-native English speakers seeking support in literature review processes.
Social implications: GAI may democratize access to academic publishing by simplifying complex systenatic literature review processes. However, it also raises societal questions about intellectual labor, transparency, and responsibility in scholarly communication.
Originality/value: This article is among the first to conceptualize the researcher as a manager of AI-driven writing processes in SLRs. It provides an innovative, structured approach for integrating GAI into academic research and is relevant to management scholars and those interested in innovation in research methodology.
Keywords: generative artificial intelligence, large language models, academic writing, systematic literature review, ChatGPT.
Category of the paper: Conceptual paper.

1. Introduction

Generative Artificial Intelligence (GAI) technology operates at a level never observed before. Mustafa Suleyman (2024) called it a "new species". It is no longer just a provider of modern solutions but is becoming a new intermediary in the relationship between the individual and the problem. It plays a servant role, allowing problems to be solved faster and more effectively than humans. However, it must be controlled, as it is not a decision-making center in itself (Alshami et al., 2023; de la Torre-López et al., 2023).

Systematic literature reviews (SLRs), on the other hand, shape science in many disciplines as they function as an objectified and verifiable method of synthesizing the results of existing considerations and scientific research from various angles. This justifies the need to apply modern technologies to further improve the efficiency of their development (Denyer, Tranfield, 2009; Tranfield, Denyer, Smart, 2003; Tsafnat et al., 2013).

Conducting a systematic literature review using artificial intelligence involves changing the traditional role of the researcher from that of a doer/executor to that of a manager of the writing process. In management, managers plan, organize, coordinate, and control work (Sommerville et al., 2010), and employees perform specific tasks. By applying this logic to the process of creating a systematic literature review, a manager can plan its course, organize the work, coordinate the use of AI applications as employees, and control their impact on the work. The entire process was carried out according to the logic of a systematic literature review (see Denyer, Tranfield, 2003; Vrontis, Christofi, 2021).

This review aims to propose a procedure for integrating GAI into the SLR development process. The literature is dominated by a technical approach, focusing on the capabilities of individual applications, while there is a lack of in-depth reflection on the change in the role of the researcher himself, from the executor to the manager of the research process (Tomczyk, Buggemann, Vrontis, 2024). Meanwhile, the use of GAI tools in the process of creating a scientific publication requires planning, organizing, controlling, and making strategic decisions, which leads to the need to redefine the competences of the scientist. This study fills this gap by presenting a conceptual model of the researcher as a GAI-assisted SLR process manager. In the application dimension, the proposed approach can be a starting point for building new academic practices in the field of the effective and responsible use of GAI tools in scientific research.

In this study, I attempt to formulate a proposal for future cooperation between humans and artificial intelligence based on current technological developments in the field of scientific literature. This development is moving away from the use of technology as a tool (supportive model) and towards human-machine collaboration (collaborative model) (Przegalińska, Triantoro, 2024). The collaborative model allows for manager-employee relationships and artificial intelligence to be treated as a task performer. Giving commands and receiving

responses in natural language allows the process manager to control the quality of the effects and technology to improve according to the manager's comments. The introduction of the collaborative model has become possible on a large scale since 2022, with the introduction of genetic artificial intelligence in the form of ChatGPT. The introduced solution was a breakthrough and the basis for the creation of dozens of generative artificial intelligence applications dedicated to learning (Tomczyk et al., 2024). With reference to the purpose of the study, I formulated the following research question connected with the aim of the article:

How can artificial intelligence support the process of preparing a systematic literature review in collaborative management?

To answer this question, I used my knowledge of generative AI tools dedicated to scientific research. The following considerations are an attempt to answer the research question posed in the form of a proposal for the procedure to be followed.

This study is methodical in nature. Its aim is not to develop theories or present the results of empirical research but to propose a practical approach to managing the SLR process using GAI. In this approach, the researcher primarily plays the role of manager in the research process, not only its executor. This article aims to support scientists in the integration of GAI tools in the various phases of preparing a literature review, from planning, through analysis and synthesis of sources, to reporting results. This approach could be particularly useful for researchers in fields where systematic literature reviews are gaining importance, such as in management science.

2. A systematic literature review in management and its phases

To describe the process of the systematic literature review, I used the procedure developed by Vrontis and Christofi (2021). I chose it because it is embedded in the classic management scheme for creating a systematic literature review described by Tranfield and Denyer (2003, 2009). This procedure consists of the following steps:

Scoping analysis: This analysis defines the limits of scientific cognition in a given area, defines the research field and potential problems to be solved, and identifies major research trends and gaps (Vrontis, Christofi, 2021).

Identifying the research objective and research question: In this step, the researcher identifies the research objective and research question, defining the scope and subject of the study. On this basis, he formulated the research hypotheses (Pereira et al., 2023).

Context analysis: This involves an analysis of the environment, conditions, or background in which the study takes place. It includes the industry being studied, cultural characteristics of the participants, geographical location, time periods, and all elements that may influence the

topic of the study or its results. Its inclusion may increase the attractiveness of the research question (Vrontis et al., 2020).

Literature identification: This is the process of pre-searching for publications and scholarly research related to a given topic or issue. It is usually performed based on a keyword search in databases such as Scopus or Web of Science (Jain et al., 2022).

Literature selection: In this step, the researcher selected adequate publications from the collection acquired at the above point. This process involves establishing selection criteria (inclusions and exclusions), such as the time range, type, and quality of sources. Thus, the researcher identifies and selects the most valuable sources for further research (Christofi, 2017).

Data extraction and synthesis: Data extraction is the collection of relevant data from selected articles or other scientific papers, according to predefined criteria. This includes identifying and recording specific information such as publication details, author details, article type, methods used, key findings, and other relevant variables., data synthesisa synthesis, involves the analysis of the collected material in terms of patterns, relationships, or common themes in the literature (Christofi et al., 2021).

Report preparation and recommendations: The authors summarize and synthesize the results of peer-reviewed studies in a structured and transparent manner. The main results, themes, and conclusions drawn from the literature were organized and presented in a comprehensive way. The authors of the review propose future directions and recommendations for scientists and practitioners based on an analysis of selected studies (Christofi et al., 2017; Pereira et al., 2023).

Based on the presented procedure, a model for preparing a systematic literature review using artificial proposed. The model has the same stages at which AI agents are "employed". By agents, I understand the applications dedicated to performing specific tasks.

3. A new approach – a researcher as a manager of the process of writing a SLR

The manager talks to the artificial intelligence as a research collaborator, consults, controls, and accepts the results of the algorithm's work.

At the initial review stage (*scoping analysis*), the manager's job is to talk to applications such as Elicit, SciSpace, ResearchKick, Consensus or Scopus AI. These applications offer access to metadata databases of scientific publications from around the world (e.g., semantic scholars). They quickly accessed article summaries on a specific topic, without defining keywords. As a result, the researcher received a list of articles with a short, one-sentence answer to the research question. Thanks to this, he quickly acquired general knowledge on a specific

topic. In addition, the consensus prepares a chart showing the distribution of answers to the questions asked. For example, if a researcher asks, ‘Does customer satisfaction affect customer loyalty?’, the app will show a distribution of "yes”, "no" or "probably" answers based on the metadata of scientific articles found. The downside of this phase is the incomplete selection of articles and the lack of reproducible results (Tomczyk et al., 2024). At the initial stage, however, this approach allows the researcher to familiarize themselves with the literature on the subject to formulate an initial research question.

The researcher proposes a *research question*, discussing the legitimacy and possibility of its verification with the application, being open to the algorithm's suggestions. If a researcher asks the question again in consensus: "Does customer satisfaction affect customer loyalty?" and receives a 100% answer "yes”, it probably means that there is no basis for conducting research in this area. In this case, it makes sense to expand the question to a specific market (B2B vs. B2C) or area (Western Europe vs. Eastern Europe) to obtain a greater variety of results. In this way, the researcher identified the research gap and formulated the purpose of the study. The researcher selects a specific problem based on consultation with the algorithm.

Context analysis requires asking questions regarding the background of the problem being studied. Using the same category of applications, the researcher asks, for example, ‘In which industries has research been conducted on the relationship between customer satisfaction and customer loyalty?’ What are the prospects for the development of loyalty-based marketing strategies?" What are the barriers to the impact of customer satisfaction on loyalty?" etc. Analysis of summaries offered by applications (e.g., Scite, Elicit, or SciSpace) allows the researcher to quickly understand the possibilities of the development of the studied area. In addition, the researcher in this phase can also use classic text analysis tools that speed up the process of assessing the context (da Silva Júnior, Dutra, 2021; Sundaram, Berleant, 2023).

The researchers then instructed the algorithms to search for sources (*literature identification*). At the current stage of development, AI applications do not guarantee that they will find all items on a given topic (Tomczyk et al., 2024). Therefore, researchers should use classic applications for scientific queries (SCOPUS, Web of Science), using artificial intelligence algorithms only as an auxiliary at this stage. AI co-creates keywords and queries for classic applications to identify literature. Notably, Scopus introduced its AI version in 2024, which works in a manner similar to Elicit and SciSpace. Its advantage is that it uses a clearly defined set of articles (Scopus database). Other applications provide examples of databases they use on their websites, which means that the range of searched articles is not limited to them (they mainly use Semantic Scholar, an open metadata database containing, according to the prodecent's declaration as 18.01.2025, over 223 million scientific items). To supplement the identified resources, the researcher enters queries into applications that use natural language queries (e.g., Elicit and SciSpace). Research indicates that, at this stage, the results of work in AI applications and desktop applications complement each other (Tomczyk et al., 2024).

Subsequently, using the same applications, the researcher selected the literature based on specific criteria of inclusion and exclusion (*literature selecion*). It uses natural language to determine preferences, and the algorithm returns specific results. In case of doubt, the researcher performed manual verification.

Next, the algorithm uses metadata to prepare a database of articles for analysis (*data extraction and synthesis*). The database is in the form of a spreadsheet with records of selected texts in rows and variables in columns, and is readable in Excel. Applications such as Elicit and SciSpace automatically prepare this database. The manager checked the titles and abstracts with ChatGPT and verified them manually, if necessary. In addition, at this stage, the researcher obtains the full texts in PDF format, as automatic downloading of PDF files is not possible because of the copyright of the publishers. The researcher becomes acquainted with them and controls the work of the AI at further stages. Then, to extract and synthesize the data, the manager consults the algorithm on the scope and structure of the thematic part. ChatGPT can be used to analyze Excel files created in the previous stage for repeated threads in abstracts or other elements (e.g., summaries generated by applications). Subsequently, the researcher evaluates the threads in terms of their substantive value and uniqueness and proposes a list of key threads. Thus, a detailed structure of the thematic part of the systematic literature review was created. It should then be filled with content.

Filling a structure with content in the SLR procedure involves *reporting and making recommendations*. From a creative perspective, this is the most interesting stage. It also raises the most controversy because it is at this stage that the AI de facto prepares a thematic analysis project. The algorithm fills the structure with content and prepares an introduction and an abstract. The researcher then verifies and accepts or rejects the proposed content. In the case of content rejection, the researcher suggests modifications. The algorithm prepares a new version and the process repeats until the researcher accepts the version proposed by the algorithm. The most interesting applications for this purpose were ChatDOC, NoteBookLM, and AnswerThis. Once the draft is ready, the manager can add individual paragraphs using applications such as Scite. This is how a draft of the thematic review (draft and pre-writing) was created. The researcher then completed the sketch with footnotes (Mendeley, Zotero, etc.) and prepared his own version based on it. Therefore, he treated the draft as a starting point for preparing the final version of the text. It then analyzes the content of the AI plagiarism. It is important to note that the final form is his work. However, the use of AI to draft a text is controversial, as publishers generally limit the use of AI to source search or proofread (Ganjavi et al., 2024). What is extraordinary, however, is that such work is now possible, and the quality of the resulting prose is satisfactory (Alshami et al., 2023).

Table 1 summarizes the role of the researcher as a manager in the process of creating a systematic review of the literature, which I have proposed in this study, based on the functionalities of currently available AI tools for writing scientific articles.

Table 1.
Roles of AI and researchers in SLR phases

SLR phase	The role of artificial intelligence	AI tools	The role of the researcher
Scope Analysis	Talks to databases using natural language for initial research field.	Elicit, SciSpace, Consensus	Discusses, suggests and approves of content found by the algorithm.
Identification of the research objective and research questions	Validates the proposed research questions. It presents current research results.	ChatGPT, Research Kick, Consensus, Scopus AI	Accepts the algorithm's proposals.
Context analysis	It verifies whether the topic is worth studying in context.	Consensus, Scite, Elicit, SciSpace	Accepts the final version of the research question.
Literature identification	Uses natural language to contribute keywords and queries for Scopus/WoS, looks for additional literature.	ChatGPT, Scopus AI, Elicit, SciSpace, Consensus	He accepts sophisticated literature.
Literature selection	Analyzes titles and abstracts. Creates an Excel database.	Scopus AI, Elicit, SciSpace, ChatGPT	**Accepts the selection results.**
Data extraction and synthesis	Talks to summaries to identify plots. Classifies and codes articles.	ChatGPT, Claude, Elicit, SciSpace, Consensus	Accepts data extraction and synthesis results.
Preparation of the report and recommendations	Writes, adds separate sentences, paraphrases, detects AI abuse, formats to specific requirements of the journal.	ChatDOC, AnswerThis, Scite, SciSpace, Quilbot, DrPaper	It accepts, paraphrases and prepares the final content.

Source: Author's own study based on the author's practical experience in conducting systematic literature reviews using AI tools as well as on the analysis of the literature discussed in the article. The table is an attempt to synthesize the observed applications of AI in the individual stages of SLR and may be a starting point for further empirical research. It is worth noting that the presented table is not a complete or closed catalog of the AI functions in the research process. Its purpose is to illustrate a new approach to the role of the researcher as a process manager rather than a formal classification of tools. In this sense, it has a conceptual function rather than a normative one.

Table 1 shows the SLR procedure with the proposed use of AI as a research collaborator, and the controlling role of the process manager. The tools they contained were created after November 2022 as a result of the generative artificial intelligence revolution (ChatGPT) and large language models (*LLMs*). The idea of cooperation between artificial intelligence and humans in this process is that the researcher discusses the implementation of individual stages with the algorithm as if they were implementing them with a human. This has given rise to new opportunities and numerous challenges.

4. A new paradigm of a researcher?

With the introduction of advanced AI tools into the process of creating systematic reviews, the role of the scientist is fundamentally transformed from a performer of literature analysis to a manager of its course. This shift in function can be interpreted as part of a broader research

paradigm in which technology not only supports, but also co-creates knowledge. So far, the role of the researcher has been to independently acquire, select, and synthesize sources, and he now manages an automated process, assuming a function similar to that of a research process manager. This is consistent with the theory of process management, in which the key role is not execution but the design and supervision of the system (Sommerville et al., 2010). Although it is too early to speak unequivocally about the full paradigm of AI-driven research, this shift deserves careful tracking and analysis, as it redefines both research practices and principles of scientific responsibility (Gao et al., 2023; Masukume, 2024).

The discussion on the use of GAI in science is gaining intensity, but it still remains insufficiently explored, especially in the context of the impact of GAI on the role of scientists and the formation of a new paradigm of research work. Although it cannot be denied that GAI provides real support in the process of conducting SLR, we should be cautious about forecasts that assume a radical transformation of the researcher's role in managing the process. Such a re-evaluation assumes the readiness of the scientific community to delegate some of its traditional prerogatives, such as analysis, synthesis, or interpretation of data, to algorithms. Meanwhile, many voices in the debate raise the limitations that come with it – technical, epistemological, and ethical (Masukume, 2024; Chemaya, Martin, 2023).

Among the most frequently indicated concerns are problems with the transparency of generative processes (the so-called "black box"), the risk of hallucinations of content, unethical use, or difficulties with attribution. GAI can support, but not replace, the critical thinking and research accountability that underpins science (Spillias et al., 2024). Therefore, rather than discussing a complete paradigm universal, it seems more reasonable to point out that scientists today face the challenge of redefining their own role, not as being replaced by technology, but as those who can manage the research process in a reflective and responsible way, using GAI as a tool – not as a partner in the full sense of the word (Wagner et al., 2022).

In this context, we can speak of evolution rather than revolution: the scientist in the new model does not give up his function as an intellectual leader but expands it with technological competence and the ability to critically cooperate with the machine (Christofi et al., 2021). This also raises new questions: Who is responsible for erroneous conclusions based on data processed by the GAI? How can the integrity of the research process be maintained when an increasing number of elements are partially automated? The answers to these questions are not unambiguous today, but they must certainly be part of a reflection on the future of systematic literature reviews and on the role of the scholar as creator, curator, and manager.

5. Summary

This review aims to propose a procedure for integrating GAI into the SLR development process. In this article, I present the concept of the researcher as a manager of the research process, and then, based on the literature and the practice of SLR automation in health sciences, I propose a framework for the integration of GAI in individual phases of the review. The achieved goal not only allows for a theoretical arrangement of possible applications of AI but also provides researchers with tools for conscious management of the review process with its participation. Future research should empirically analyze how the proposed procedure is implemented in practice, how it affects the quality and transparency of research, and how it changes the competences and role of the researcher in the AI-supported science ecosystem.

Systematic literature review can become an automated task for data analysis. Currently, no one is surprised by the use of IBM SPSS Statistics or RStudio software for data analysis, and in the future, no one may be surprised by the use of AI algorithms to write scientific articles under the supervision of researchers. An article created in this manner is usually produced faster and consumes fewer resources. It also contains elements that it would not contain if it were created entirely by man.

However, the proposed procedure faces numerous challenges, including procedural, substantive, and mental. Key concerns relate to the lack of compliance with the applicable moral norms of attribution to a researcher who only controls the process of generating content and the limited cognitive value of AI-generated content. In addition, articles created by artificial intelligence are often devoid of individual characters, which can lead to a decrease in the cognitive competence of researchers who overdelegate AI tasks. Ethical issues, including publishing policies restricting the use of AI, are also a significant challenge in the implementation of this model. Ultimately, although AI cannot be considered a co-author, it remains a tool with great potential, the proper use of which can improve the quality of scientific research.

Acknowledgement

As an English non-native speaker, I used the ChatGPT, Quillbot, and PaperPal applications to improve the quality of English. These applications use AI technology to analyze and correct the grammar and syntax of texts.

References

1. Alshami, A., Elsayed, M., Ali, E., Eltoukhy, A.E.E., Zayed, T. (2023). Harnessing the Power of ChatGPT for Automating Systematic Review Process: Methodology, Case Study, Limitations, and Future Directions. *Systems*, *11*(7), doi: https://doi.org/10.3390/systems11070351
2. Chemaya, N., Martin, D. (2023). AI Use in Manuscript Preparation for Academic Journals. *CoRR*, doi: https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0304807
3. Christofi, M., Leonidou, E., Vrontis, D. (2017). Marketing research on mergers and acquisitions: a systematic review and future directions. *International Marketing Review*, *Vol. 34, Iss. 5,* pp. 629-651, doi: https://doi.org/10.1108/imr-03-2015-0100
4. Christofi, M., Vrontis, D., Cadogan, J.W. (2021). Micro-foundational ambidexterity and multinational enterprises: A systematic review and a conceptual framework. *International Business Review*, *30*(1), doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ibusrev.2019.101625
5. da Silva Júnior, E.M., Dutra, M.L. (2021). A roadmap toward the automatic composition of systematic literature reviews. *Iberoamerican Journal of Science Measurement and Communication*, *1*(2), doi: https://doi.org/10.47909/ijsmc.52
6. de la Torre-López, J., Ramírez, A., Romero, J.R. (2023). Artificial intelligence to automate the systematic review of scientific literature. *Computing*, *105*(10), 2171-2194, doi: https://doi.org/10.1007/s00607-023-01181-x
7. Denyer, Tranfield (2009). Producing a Systematic Review. In: D.A. Buchanan, A. Bryman (Eds.), *Organizational Research Methods*. Sage.
8. Ganjavi, C., Eppler, M.B., Pekcan, A., Biedermann, B., Abreu, A., Collins, G.S., Gill, I.S., Cacciamani, G.E. (2024). Publishers' and journals' instructions to authors on use of generative artificial intelligence in academic and scientific publishing: bibliometric analysis BMJ. *BMJ, Vol. 384*, e077192, https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj-2023-077192
9. Gao, C.A., Howard, F.M., Markov, N.S., Dyer, E.C., Ramesh, S., Luo, Y., Pearson, A.T. (2023). Comparing scientific abstracts generated by ChatGPT to real abstracts with detectors and blinded human reviewers. *NPJ digital medicine*, *6*(1), 75, doi: https://doi.org/10.1038/s41746-023-00819-6
10. Jain, R., Jain, K., Behl, A., Pereira, V., Del Giudice, M., Vrontis, D. (2022). Mainstreaming fashion rental consumption: A systematic and thematic review of literature. *Journal of Business Research*, *139*, 1525-1539, doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2021.10.071
11. Masukume, G. (2024). The Impact of AI on Scientific Literature: A Surge in AI-Associated Words in Academic and Biomedical Writing. *medRxiv*, 2024-05, doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.31.24308296
12. Pereira, V., Hadjielias, E., Christofi, M., Vrontis, D. (2023). A systematic literature review on the impact of artificial intelligence on workplace outcomes: A multi-process perspective.

Human Resource Management Review, *33*(1), doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2021.100857

13. Przegalinska, A., Triantoro, T. (2024). *Converging Minds: The Creative Potential of Collaborative AI.* CRC Press, doi: https://doi.org/10.1201/9781032656618
14. Sommerville, J., Craig, N., Hendry, J. (2010). The role of the project manager: all things to all people? *Structural Survey*, 28(2), 132-141, doi: https://doi.org/10.1108/02630801011044235
15. Spillias, S., Tuohy, P., Andreotta, M., Annand-Jones, R., Boschetti, F., Cvitanovic, C., Trebilco, R. (2024). Human-AI collaboration to identify literature for evidence synthesis. *Cell Reports Sustainability*, 1(7), doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.crsus.2024.100132
16. Sundaram, G., Berleant, D. (2023). Automating Systematic Literature Reviews with Natural Language Processing and Text Mining: a Systematic Literature Review. *International Congress on Information and Communication Technology*, *1*, 73-92, doi: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-99-3243-6_7
17. TED (2024). What is an AI anyway? Mustafa Suleyman. TED [Video]. YouTube.
18. Tomczyk, P., Brüggemann, P., Vrontis, D. (2024). AI meets academia: transforming systematic literature reviews. *EuroMed Journal of Business*, doi: https://doi.org/10.1108/emjb-03-2024-0055
19. Tomczyk, P., Brüggemann, P., Mergner, N., Petrescu, M. (2024). Are AI tools better than traditional tools in literature searching? Evidence from E-commerce research. *Journal of Librarianship and Information Science*, 09610006241295802, doi: https://doi.org/10.1177/09610006241295802
20. Tranfield, D., Denyer, D., Smart, P. (2003). Towards a Methodology for Developing Evidence-Informed Management Knowledge by Means of Systematic Review. *British Journal of Management*, *14*(3), 207-222, doi: https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8551.00375
21. Tsafnat, G., Dunn, A., Glasziou, P., Coiera, E. (2013). The automation of systematic reviews. *BMJ, Vol. 345, Iss. 7891,* doi: https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.f139
22. Vrontis, D., Christofi, M. (2021). R&D internationalization and innovation: A systematic review, integrative framework and future research directions. *Journal of Business Research*, *128*, 812-823, doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.03.031
23. Vrontis, D., Leonidou, E., Christofi, M., Kaufmann Hans, R., Kitchen, P.J. (2020). Intercultural service encounters: a systematic review and a conceptual framework on trust development. *EuroMed Journal of Business, Vol. 16, Iss. 3,* pp. 306-323, doi: https://doi.org/10.1108/emjb-03-2019-0044
24. Wagner, G., Lukyanenko, R., Paré, G. (2022). Artificial intelligence and the conduct of literature reviews. *Journal of Information Technology*, *37*(2), 209-226, doi: https://doi.org/10.1177/02683962211048201