Supplementary Data

Table S1. Search strategies and number of records retrieved in the original search (13 February 2025)

Database	Search String	Number of Records
Web of Science	(TS=(mindfulness OR "mindfulness meditation" OR "mindful practice" OR "awareness training" OR "present moment awareness" OR "focused attention" OR "open monitoring" OR "meditation practice") AND TS=(creativity OR "creative thinking" OR "innovative thinking" OR "idea generation" OR "problem-solving" OR "divergent thinking" OR "convergent thinking" OR "creative solutions" OR innovation) AND TS=(workplace OR "organizational context" OR "work environment" OR "corporate creativity" OR "employee creativity" OR "team creativity" OR "organization" OR "business context" OR "corporate environment" OR "professional creativity") AND TS=(intervention OR program OR training OR practice OR "brief intervention" OR "short-term intervention" OR "employee training" OR "mindfulness program" OR "mindfulness intervention" OR "meditation training"))	77
PubMed	(mindfulness OR "mindful practice" OR "mindfulness meditation" OR "awareness training") AND (creativity OR "creative thinking" OR innovation OR "problem-solving" OR "divergent thinking" OR "convergent thinking") AND (workplace OR employee OR organization OR "work environment" OR "organizational context" OR team)	69
Scopus	TITLE-ABS-KEY(mindfulness OR "mindfulness meditation" OR "mindful practice" OR "awareness training" OR "present moment awareness" OR "focused attention" OR "open monitoring" OR "meditation practice") AND TITLE-ABS-KEY(creativity OR "creative thinking" OR "innovative thinking" OR "idea generation" OR "problem-solving" OR "divergent thinking" OR "convergent thinking" OR	49

	"creative solutions" OR innovation OR "cognitive flexibility") AND TITLE-ABS-KEY(workplace OR "organizational context" OR "work environment" OR "corporate creativity" OR "employee creativity" OR "team creativity" OR "organizational innovation" OR "business context" OR "corporate environment" OR "professional creativity") AND TITLE-ABS-KEY(intervention OR program OR training OR practice OR "brief intervention" OR "short-term intervention" OR "employee training" OR "mindfulness program" OR "mindfulness intervention" OR "meditation training")	
TOTAL		195

Note. The search was updated in September 2026 using the same databases and search strings, yielding 58 additional records (PubMed n = 16; Scopus n = 28; Web of Science n = 14). After removal of three duplicates, 55 records were screened, two full-text articles were assessed, and one study was included (see Section 5.7 and Figure 1 of the manuscript).

Table S2. Studies excluded at the full-text stage for not meeting intervention or outcome-assessment criteria, and reasons for exclusion

Study	Reason for exclusion
Byrne & Thatchenkery (2019)	Reported creativity outcomes only in descriptive form, without statistical analyses, limiting interpretability.
Molina-García et al. (2023)	Examined innovation outcomes based solely on descriptive self-ratings (percentages), without means, standard deviations, or inferential statistics.
Li et al. (2026)	Identified through the September 2026 search update; not included following full-text screening. Excluded because mindfulness was assessed as a measured variable rather than delivered as an intervention.

PRISMA 2020 Checklist

Manuscript title: Mindfulness and Creativity in Workplace Contexts: A Critical Narrative Review of an Emerging Field

Note: This manuscript is a critical narrative review; PRISMA 2020 is used here to support transparent reporting of the systematic search and study-selection procedures.

Section/Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
TITLE			
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review.	Title page ("A Critical Narrative Review of an Emerging Field")
ABSTRACT			
Abstract	2	See the PRISMA 2020 for Abstracts checklist.	Abstract
INTRODUCTION			
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of existing knowledge.	Introduction (Sections 1–4)
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of the objective(s) or question(s) the review addresses.	Introduction, closing paragraph
METHODS			
Eligibility criteria	5	Specify the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the review and how studies were grouped for the syntheses.	Section 5.2 (Eligibility Criteria, PICO)
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.	Section 5.3 (PubMed, Scopus, Web of Science; original search 13 February 2025); Section 5.7 (updated search, September 2026)
Search strategy	7	Present the full search strategies for all databases, registers and websites, including any filters and limits used.	Supplementary Table S1 (full search strings); Sections 5.3 and 5.7
Selection process	8	Specify the methods used to decide whether a study met the inclusion criteria of the review, including how many reviewers screened each record and each report retrieved, whether they worked independently, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process.	Section 5.4 (Study Screening and Selection Process); Fig. 1 (PRISMA flow diagram)

Data collection process	9	Specify the methods used to collect data from reports, including how many reviewers collected data from each report, whether they worked independently, any processes for obtaining or confirming data from study investigators, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process.	Section 5.5 (Data Extraction)
Data items	10a	List and define all outcomes for which data were sought. Specify whether all results that were compatible with each outcome domain in each study were sought (e.g. for all measures, time points, analyses), and if not, the methods used to decide which results to collect.	Section 5.2, 5.5; Table 2
Data items	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.	Section 5.2, 5.5; Table 1
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.	Not conducted; the methodological rationale and deviation from the original protocol are described in Section 5.6
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.	Table 2 (effect sizes as reported by original studies, e.g., Cohen's d, η^2)
Synthesis methods	13a	Describe the processes used to decide which studies were eligible for each synthesis (e.g. tabulating the study intervention characteristics and comparing against the planned groups for each synthesis (item #5)).	Section 5.6 — all five included studies were considered together for narrative synthesis
	13b	Describe any methods required to prepare the data for presentation or synthesis, such as handling of missing	N/A — no data conversions or handling of missing summary statistics were required; effect sizes are presented

		summary statistics, or data conversions.	as reported by the original studies (Table 2)
	13c	Describe any methods used to tabulate or visually display results of individual studies and syntheses.	Tables 1–2
	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.	Narrative synthesis; rationale described in Section 5.6. Meta-analysis was not performed
	13e	Describe any methods used to explore possible causes of heterogeneity among study results (e.g. subgroup analysis, meta-regression).	N/A — no formal exploration of heterogeneity (e.g., subgroup analysis, meta-regression) was conducted
	13f	Describe any sensitivity analyses conducted to assess robustness of the synthesized results.	N/A — no sensitivity analyses were conducted
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 — no formal reporting-bias assessment was conducted
Certainty assessment	15	Describe any methods used to assess certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for an outcome.	N/A — no formal certainty-of-evidence assessment was conducted
RESULTS			
Study selection	16a	Describe the results of the search and selection process, from the number of records identified in the search to the number of studies included in the review, ideally using a flow diagram.	Sections 5.4, 5.7 and 6.1; Fig. 1 (PRISMA flow diagram)
	16b	Cite studies that might appear to meet the inclusion criteria, but which were excluded, and explain why they were excluded.	Supplementary Table S2 (excluded studies and reasons); Section 6.1
Study characteristics	17	Cite each included study and present its characteristics.	Section 6.2 (Characteristics of the Included Studies); Table 1
Risk of bias in studies	18	Present assessments of risk of bias for each included study.	N/A — no formal study-level risk-of-bias assessment was conducted; see Sections 5.6 and 7.4
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	Table 2; Section 7.2

		precision (e.g. confidence/credible interval), ideally using structured tables or plots.	
Results of syntheses	20a	Briefly summarise the characteristics and risk of bias among studies contributing to the synthesis.	Study characteristics summarised in Table 1; formal risk of bias not assessed (see Item 18)
	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 — no statistical synthesis (meta-analysis) was conducted; narrative synthesis presented in Section 7 (Discussion)
	20c	Present results of all investigations of possible causes of heterogeneity among study results.	N/A — no formal investigation of heterogeneity was conducted
	20d	Present results of all sensitivity analyses conducted to assess the robustness of the synthesized results.	N/A — no sensitivity analyses were conducted
Reporting biases	21	Present assessments of risk of bias due to missing results (arising from reporting biases) for each synthesis assessed.	N/A — no formal reporting-bias assessment was conducted
Certainty of evidence	22	Present assessments of certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for each outcome assessed.	N/A — no formal certainty-of-evidence assessment was conducted
DISCUSSION			
Discussion	23a	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence.	Section 7.1–7.3
	23b	Discuss any limitations of the evidence included in the review.	Section 7.4
	23c	Discuss any limitations of the review processes used.	Section 5.6, 7.4
	23d	Discuss implications of the results for practice, policy, and future research.	Sections 7.5 and 7.6
OTHER INFORMATION			
Registration and protocol	24a	Provide registration information for the review, including register name and registration number, or state that the review was not registered.	PROSPERO (ID: CRD42024627551); Section 5.1
	24b	Indicate where the review protocol can be accessed,	PROSPERO record (see registration ID above)

		or state that a protocol was not prepared.	
	24c	Describe and explain any amendments to information provided at registration or in the protocol.	Amendments from the original protocol, including the adoption of a critical narrative synthesis and the decision not to implement the planned formal risk-of-bias assessment, are described and justified in Section 5.6. A further amendment, involving an updated literature search conducted in September 2026, is described in Section 5.7.
Support	25	Describe sources of financial or non-financial support for the review, and the role of the funders or sponsors in the review.	Funding statement
Competing interests	26	Declare any competing interests of review authors.	Conflicts of Interest statement
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.	Data Availability Statement; all extracted information summarized in Tables 1–2 and Supplementary Files

This checklist is based on: Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. BMJ 2021;372:n71. doi: 10.1136/bmj.n71