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| **Table 1A.** Macro-categories and independent variables extracted from studies |
| **Macro-Categories (independent variables)** | **Independent variables for consumers** | **Independent variables for farmers** | **Total independent variables** | **Independent variables for consumers considered in the study**  | **Independent variables for farmers considered in the study**  | **Total independent variables considered in the study**  |
| Education | 16 | 30 | 46 | 16 | 30 | 46 |
| Age  | 15 | 26 | 41 | 15 | 26 | 41 |
| Knowledge about technology/food | 13 | 22 | 35 | 13 | 22 | 35 |
| Gender (female) | 15 | 19 | 34 | 15 | 19 | 34 |
| Income | 8 | 22 | 30 | 8 | 22 | 30 |
| Farm size | 0 | 24 | 24 |   | 24 | 24 |
| Membership group | 0 | 23 | 23 |   | 23 | 23 |
| Attitude towards technology/foods | 17 | 5 | 22 | 17 | 5 | 22 |
| educational opportunity | 0 | 19 | 19 |   | 19 | 19 |
| Perceived economic benefits | 5 | 11 | 16 | 5 | 11 | 16 |
| Sustainable consumption | 15 | 0 | 15 | 15 |   | 15 |
| Farm technologicity  | 0 | 15 | 15 |   | 15 | 15 |
| Ease of use | 0 | 15 | 15 |   | 15 | 15 |
| Attitude towards environment | 12 | 2 | 14 | 12 |   | 12 |
| Quality perception of product | 14 | 0 | 14 | 14 |   | 14 |
| Perceived environmental benefits  | 11 | 3 | 14 | 11 | 3 | 14 |
| Perceived health benefits | 13 | 0 | 13 | 13 |   | 13 |
| Credit availability | 0 | 13 | 13 |   | 13 | 13 |
| Trust in institutions | 3 | 9 | 12 | 3 | 9 | 12 |
| Workforce | 0 | 12 | 12 |   | 12 | 12 |
| Government support | 0 | 12 | 12 |   | 12 | 12 |
| Negative emotions towards technology | 1 | 10 | 11 |   | 10 | 10 |
| water availability | 0 | 11 | 11 |   | 11 | 11 |
| Food Technology neophobia | 10 | 0 | 10 | 10 |   | 10 |
| Subjective norms | 3 | 7 | 10 | 3 | 7 | 10 |
| Place of consumption (outside) | 9 | 0 | 9 | 9 |   | 9 |
| innovativeness | 6 | 3 | 9 | 6 | 3 | 9 |
| Knowledge about environmental thematic | 3 | 6 | 9 | 3 | 6 | 9 |
| Household size | 3 | 6 | 9 | 3 | 6 | 9 |
| Position of farm | 0 | 9 | 9 |   | 9 | 9 |
| Living area (city) | 8 | 0 | 8 | 8 |   | 8 |
| Distance from market  | 0 | 8 | 8 |   | 8 | 8 |
| Positive emotions towards technology | 2 | 5 | 7 |   | 5 | 5 |
| Personal experience of farming | 0 | 7 | 7 |   | 7 | 7 |
| Perceived social benefits | 2 | 4 | 6 |   | 4 | 4 |
| Perceived usefulness of technology | 1 | 5 | 6 |   | 5 | 5 |
| Attitude towards labels | 6 | 0 | 6 | 6 |   | 6 |
| Trust in Technology | 0 | 6 | 6 |   | 6 | 6 |
| Perceived economic risks | 0 | 6 | 6 |   | 6 | 6 |
| Land typology | 0 | 6 | 6 |   | 6 | 6 |
| Occupation (mainly farmer) | 0 | 5 | 5 |   | 5 | 5 |
| Fertile soil | 0 | 5 | 5 |   | 5 | 5 |
| Trust in Privacy | 0 | 5 | 5 |   | 5 | 5 |
| Ownership | 0 | 5 | 5 |   | 5 | 5 |
| Cost of investment | 0 | 5 | 5 |   | 5 | 5 |
| Quality of information | 2 | 2 | 4 |   |   |   |
| Food Neophobia | 4 | 0 | 4 | 4 |   | 4 |
| Price/cost of food | 4 | 0 | 4 | 4 |   | 4 |
| Management decisions (woman) | 0 | 4 | 4 |   | 4 | 4 |
| Experience about environmental thematic | 0 | 4 | 4 |   | 4 | 4 |
| Price/cost of raw materials | 0 | 4 | 4 |   | 4 | 4 |
| Social Responsibility | 2 | 1 | 3 |   |   |   |
| trust in certification/labels | 2 | 1 | 3 |   |   |   |
| Personal value (egoistic) | 3 | 0 | 3 | 3 |   | 3 |
| Perceived health risk | 3 | 0 | 3 | 3 |   | 3 |
| Attitude towards health | 3 | 0 | 3 | 3 |   | 3 |
| Social status (high) | 0 | 3 | 3 |   | 3 | 3 |
| Self-efficacy | 0 | 0 | 2 |   |   |   |
| Involvement in food | 2 | 0 | 2 |   |   |   |
| Attitude towards brand | 2 | 0 | 2 |   |   |   |
| Respect of workers | 2 | 0 | 2 |   |   |   |
| nationality (not European) | 2 | 0 | 2 |   |   |   |
| Soil erosion | 0 | 2 | 2 |   |   |   |
| Land productivity | 0 | 2 | 2 |   |   |   |
| Political orientation (right) | 1 | 0 | 1 |   |   |   |
| Decision-making style (cognitive) | 1 | 0 | 1 |   |   |   |
| Physical Activity | 1 | 0 | 1 |   |   |   |
| Market trend (Unpredictability) | 0 | 1 | 1 |   |   |   |
| Marital status (married) | 0 | 1 | 1 |   |   |   |
| High temperature | 0 | 1 | 1 |   |   |   |
| high farm regulations  | 0 | 1 | 1 |   |   |   |
| Customary rights | 0 | 1 | 1 |   |   |   |
| Water soil retention | 0 | 1 | 1 |   |   |   |
| Soil quality | 0 | 1 | 1 |   |   |   |
| Production specialization | 0 | 1 | 1 |   |   |   |
| religion | 0 | 1 | 1 |   |   |   |
|  | **245** | **438** | **685** | **222** | **419** | **641** |

**Table 2A.** Definition of the technologies considered in the studies.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***Cluster of technology in the studies*** | ***Definition***  | ***Example***  |
| Resource use efficiency  | Technologies and production approaches in this category aim to optimize the use of natural resources while minimizing waste | Circular economy approaches; Smart irrigation systems (Liu et al., 2021) |
| Gene technology  | These innovations involve genetic modification and genome editing to improve crop resilience, productivity, and sustainability | CRISPR and genome-wide selection; Genetically modified organisms (GMOs) (Qui et al., 2024) |
| Inputs  | These technologies focus on improving input efficiency and increasing productivity with minimal environmental impact. | Eco-friendly fertilizers and biopesticides; water (Lu et al., 2024) |
| Intensification  | Maximizes yield and resources use using controlled environments  | Vertical and indoor farming (Kaiser et al., 2024) |
| Digital agriculture  | This category includes technologies that leverage digital tools to optimize agricultural processes | Precision agriculture; Robotics and automation; Big data and decision-support systems (31. Fuentes-Peñailillo et al., 2024) |
| Replacement food and feed  | Innovations in this category seek to develop alternative food and feed sources that reduce environmental impact | Seaweed-based animal feed; Plant-based and cultured proteins (Vastolo et al., 2024) |