Table S1. Rating using an adapted version of the Newcastle-Ottawa Quality assessment scale (adapted from Rotenstein et al. [8]).

Study	Representativeness of the Sample	Sample Size	Ascertainment of Burnout	Ascertainment of Flow	Quality of Descriptive Statistics Reporting	Sum
Bakker & Geurts, 2004 [77]	1	1	1	0	1	4
Baumgarten et al., 2020 [80]	1	0	1	1	0	3
Demerouti et al., 2012 [82]	1	0	1	1	1	4
Kasa & Hassan, 2015 [84]	1	0	1	1	0	3
Kasa & Hassan, 2016 [86]	1	1	1	1	0	4
Kasa & Hassan, 2019 [87]	1	0	1	1	0	3
Lavigne et al., 2012 [89] (Study 1)	0	0	1	1	1	3
Lavigne et al., 2012 [89] (Study 2)	1	1	1	1	1	5
Ljubin-Golub et al., 2020 [93]	0.5	0	1	1	1	3.5
Mäkikangas et al., 2010 [95]	0.5	1	1	1	1	4.5
Martínez-Zaragoza et al., 2014 [96]	1	0	1	1	1	4
Martínez-Zaragoza et al., 2017 [98]	1	0	1	1	1	4
Mosing et al., 2018 [99]	1	1	1	1	0.5	4.5
Rodríguez-Sánchez et al., 2011 [101]	1	0	0.5	0	1	2.5
Schiefele et al., 2013 [103]	1	0	1	1	1	4
Xanthopoulou et al., 2018 [107]	1	0	1	1	1	4
Xie et al., 2019 [108]	1	1	1	1	1	5
Zito et al., 2016 [109]	0	0	1	1	1	3

1) Representativeness of the sample
   1 point: Population contained multiple specialties and/or multiple institutions
   0 points: Population contained a single specialty and a single institution
2) Sample size:
   1 point: Sample size was ≥300 participants
   0 points: Sample size was <300 participants
3) Ascertainment of burnout:
   1 point: Well described and/or validated measurement tool, e.g., the MBI
   0 points: Poorly described measurement tool of uncertain validity or non-validated
   single-question screening tool
4) Ascertainment of flow:

1 point: Well described and/or validated measurement tool, e.g., the WOLF

0 points: Poorly described measurement tool of uncertain validity or non-validated

single-question screening tool or tools assessing another construct

5) Quality of descriptive statistics reporting:

1 point: Reported descriptive statistics to describe the population (e.g., age, sex)

with proper measures of dispersion (e.g., mean, standard deviation)

0 points: Descriptive statistics were not reported, were incomplete, or did not

include proper measures of dispersion

Note: This scale assesses quality in several domains: sample representativeness and size, ascertainment of burnout and flow, and statistical reporting quality.

Table S2. Additional multifactorial results.

Source	Multifactorial Results
Demerouti et al., 2012 [82]	**Multilevel estimates** • EE at work (Y) ○ AB (X): Estimate = −0.09 ○ EN (X): Estimate = −0.19 * ○ IM (X): Estimate = −0.08 ○ AB*recovery (X): −0.12 ○ EN*recovery (X): 0.34 *** ○ IM*recovery (X): 0.09 • EE at bedtime (Y) ○ AB (X): Estimate = −0.04 ○ EN (X): Estimate = −0.16 * ○ IM (X): Estimate = −0.13 ○ AB *detachment (X) = 0.09 ○ EN *detachment (X) = −0.26 * ○ IM *detachment (X) = 0.14
Kasa & Hassan, 2015[a] [84]	**Mediation** burnout symptoms (X) → flow (M) → OCB (Y): n.s
Kasa & Hassan, 2016 [86]	**Moderation** burnout symptoms (X) and socio-cultural factor (MO) → flow (Y): n.s.
Kasa & Hassan, 2019[a] [87]	**Mediation** burnout symptoms (X) → flow (M) → work-family conflict (Y): 0.08, −0.12: n.s.
Lavigne et al., 2012 [89] (Study 1)	**Path analysis** • flow (Y) ○ Harmonious passion (X): γ = 0.58 *** ○ Obsessive passion (X): β = −0.00 • flow (X) ○ EE (Y): β = −0.09 ○ CY (Y): β = −0.43 *** ○ RPA (Y): β = −0.54 *** **Mediation *(Sobel Test z-Values)*** Harmonious passion (X) → flow (M) → EE (Y): −0.89 Harmonious passion (X) → flow (M) → CY (Y): 3.79 *** Harmonious passion (X) → flow (M) → RPA (Y): 4.84 ***
Lavigne et al., 2012 [89] (Study 2)	**Cross-lag panel model** • flow at T2 (Y) ○ Harmonious passion at T1 (X): γ = 0.32 *** ○ Obsessive passion at T1 (X): γ = 0.09 ○ flow at T1 (X): γ = 0.50 *** • flow at T2 (X) ○ EE at T2 (Y): β = −0.31 ***

	○ CY at T2 (Y): β = −0.34 ***
	○ RPA at T2 (Y): β = −0.55 ***
	flow at T1 did not predict burnout symptoms at T2
	Mediation *(Sobel test z-values)*
	Harmonious passion at T1 (X) → flow at T2 (M) → EE at T2 (Y): −3.84 ***
	Harmonious passion at T1 (X) → flow at T2 (M) → CY at T2 (Y): −4.16 ***
	Harmonious passion at T1 (X) → flow at T2 (M) → RPA at T2 (Y): −4.53 ***
	Obsessive passion at T1 (X) → flow at T2 (M) → EE at T2 (Y): −1.30
	Obsessive passion at T1 (X) → flow at T2 (M) → CY at T2 (Y): −1.29
	Obsessive passion at T1 (X) → flow at T2 (M) → RPA at T2 (Y): −1.32
Ljubin-Golub et al., 2020 [93]	**Mediation** Autonomous motivation (X) → flow (M) → burnout symptoms (Y) Indirect effect: β = −0.44 *** Teachers' autonomy support (X) → autonomous motivation (M1) → flow (M2) → burnout symptoms (Y) Indirect effect: β = −0.31 *** flow (M2) → burnout symptoms (Y): −0.59 ***
Mäkikangas et al., 2010 [95]	**Moderation** Job resources (X) and EE (MO) → flow (Y): n.s. **Latent growth curve model** Initial level of EE → initial level of flow: β = −0.31 *** and initial level for job resources: β = −0.39 *** Initial level of EE → latent change factors of flow and job resources: n.s.
Martínez-Zaragoza et al., 2017 [98]	**Structural and measurement model** [b] Associations between flow, health, burnout symptoms and approach coping are described Flow as antecedent model: flow (X) → RPA (Y) = −0.16 **
Mosing et al. (2018) [99]	**Genetic and environmental influences** r_g (flow proneness; emotional exhaustion) = −0.58 (genetic correlation) r_e(flow proneness; emotional exhaustion) = −0.23 (environmental correlation) *r*(flow proneness; emotional exhaustion) = −0.23 (controlled for shared genetic and familial factors) ***
Schiefele et al. (2013) [103]	**Structural equation model** [b] Exogenous variables: self-efficacy, didactic interest, educational interest and subject interest Outcomes: EE, RPA, CY, enjoyment and flow • flow (Y) ○ EE (Y): n.s. ○ CY (Y) = n.s ○ RPA (Y) = n.s.
Xanthopoulou et al., 2018 [107]	**Multilevel path analysis** • flow (M) ○ deep acting (X)= 0.13 ** ○ surface acting (X) = −0.09 * ○ need for recovery (Y) = −0.25 ** • EE (M) ○ deep acting (X)= −0.13 * ○ surface acting (X) = 0.24 *** ○ need for recovery (Y): 0.45 *** **flow & EE: Unstandardized estimates = −0.07 *** **
Zito et al., 2016 [109]	**Mediation** • flow (M) ○ Job resources (X): 0.49 ○ Job demands (X): −0.27 ○ EX (Y): −0.70 Indirect effects: Job resources (X)→ flow (M) → EX (Y): Estimate = −0.34 *** Job demands (X)→ flow (M) → EX (Y): Estimate = 0.19 ***

Note. EE = emotional exhaustion, CY = cynicism, RPA = reduced personal accomplishment, EX = exhaustion, AB = absorption, EN = enjoyment, IM = intrinsic motivation, T = timepoint, X = independent variable, M = mediator, MO = Moderator, Y = dependent variable, OCB = organizational citizenship behavior, n.s. = not significant (statistical parameters not given). [a] The studies may have been based on the same data. [b] Due to the large number of factors considered in the models, a presentation of all interrelationships has been omitted. * $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$. For reasons of clarity and comprehensibility, the labels of the various subscales were harmonized and reversed recoded where appropriate.