Conceptualising Creative Autonomy in People, AI, and Their Interaction: A Scoping Review Protocol

Maija Välimäki and **Christian Guckelsberger**
Autotelic Interaction Research (AIR) Group
Department of Computer Science
Aalto University
Espoo, 01250 Finland
christian.guckelsberger@aalto.fi

Abstract

"Creative autonomy" is a prominent concept in historic and present discourses on creativity in humans, AI and their interaction. It is key to addressing some of the most pressing questions of our times and can serve as a boundary object to develop shared problem definitions and fostering cross-disciplinary research across AI, HCI, ethics and social science research, amongst others. Crucially though, it is presently unclear how robust creative autonomy – as used across contexts, disciplines and communities – is in its meaning, and how it relates to neighbouring concepts as well as autonomy more generally. This short paper presents the protocol for the first holistic and systematic scoping review of creative autonomy, seeking to fill this gap.

Introduction

Research on Artificial Intelligence (AI) and creativity has a long history (Boden, 2015); however, only with the advancement of powerful Generative AI (GenAI) systems in the last few years have people begun engaging with AI in (co-)creative practices at a large scale. This transformative development has catapulted some of the most eminent questions of (computational) creativity into the wider academic and public space: What shapes our perception of artificial systems as mere tools or genuine partners (e.g. Vimpari et al., 2023)? Is human creativity inherently different from artificial creativity, and if so, how (Runco, 2025)? How does integrating AI into creative workflows impact feelings of ownership, authorship and satisfaction (Dwivedi et al., 2023)? Fields including (but not limited to) AI and Human–Computer Interaction (HCI) research, social sciences and ethics have made big strides and continue to address these questions of theoretical and empirical contributions.

In the historic and present discourse, "creative autonomy" is a prominent concept. In Computational Creativity (CC) (Colton and Wiggins, 2012), creative autonomy has been advocated as a quality of artificial creative systems and goal of CC research, differentiating such systems from cognitive science models, creativity support tools, and the corresponding research agendas (e.g. Saunders, 2012). In HCI and media research, it has been identified as core human characteristics challenged when co-creating with GenAI (e.g. Bansal et al., 2024). In AI ethics research, creative autonomy has been defined as a facet of human autonomy that may be at stake when interacting with various, more general algorithmic systems (e.g. Catena, Tummolini, and Santucci, 2025).

These examples demonstrate not only that creative autonomy is attributed to both people and AI, but also highlight its role in characterising human-AI interaction. Moreover, they support that creative autonomy may serve as a *boundary object* (Star, 2010), characterising constructs that are utilised across various communities and may enable the coordination of their individual perspectives (Star, 2010).

The relationships between AI and (human) creativity are complex and wide-ranging. To understand and study them rigorously, with potency and on a solid ethical foundation, the corresponding research must draw on perspectives and contributions beyond its contextual, disciplinary and community confinements (Hemment and Kommers, 2025; Daniele and Song, 2019). To this end, boundary objects are essential, allowing for the development of shared problem definitions robust knowledge across multiple domains (Bennett et al., 2023). Crucially, boundary objects must balance a flexibility in meaning with sufficient robustness to support communication and negotiation within and between these communities (Bennett et al., 2023; Velt, Benford, and Reeves, 2020). At present, it is unclear how robust creative autonomy – as used across contexts, disciplines and communities – is in its meaning, and how it relates to neighbouring concepts as well as to autonomy more generally.

Our work seeks to answer this question. To the best of our knowledge, no research synthesis on the concept of creative autonomy exists. A systematic literature review by Bennett et al. (2023) focuses on autonomy and agency more generally, within people and HCI more specifically. Similarly, Catena (2026) put forward a systematic review of autonomy more generally, specifically within philosophical and ethical literature discussing the impact of AI on human autonomy. Both, Bennett et al. (2023) and Catena (2026) find that different studies on autonomy are underpinned by different conceptualisations of the concept, which supports misinterpretation and threatens adequate comparison and research progress. The closest related work comes from Catena, Tummolini, and Santucci (2025), who seek to distinguish creative from decisional autonomy, offering a small and unsystematic review only as a footnote.

We seek to address this research gap with a more holistic and systematic scoping review of creative autonomy across the contexts of human, AI and their interaction. A type of systematic literature review if conceived more widely (e.g. Kraus et al., 2022), a scoping review is the method of choice to clarify concepts and recognise knowledge gaps across a wide range of literature (Munn et al., 2018). Our review implements the PRISMA-ScR (Tricco et al., 2018) checklist and explanation for scoping reviews, augmented with the PRISMA-S (Rethlefsen et al., 2021) checklist, explanation and elaboration for conducting literature searches. Furthermore, we utilised the JBI guidelines for scoping reviews for further orientation (Aromataris et al., 2024, p. 417–474). Our research question (RQ) is threefold:

RQ1 What explicit and implicit uses of "creative autonomy" in (a) humans, (b) AI and (c) their interactions are presented in existing research?

We study both, "explicit" and "implicit" uses of the concept. With the former, we denote meaning at a semantic, surface level; with the latter, we refer to latent meanings that may require interpretation and "reading between the lines" (Braun and Clarke, 2006). Further sub-questions (SQs) include:

SQ1 In which research domains is creative autonomy used?

SQ2 How are understandings of creative autonomy informed?

SQ3 How is creative autonomy related to close-by concepts such as agency, autonomy, creativity and co-creation?

This paper seeks to make this project known to the CC community, but its relevance arguably extends far beyond, in particular into HCI, social sciences, psychology, philosophy and ethics. We seek to probe creative autonomy's present status as a boundary concept through an overview of its conceptualisations and uses across contexts, disciplines and communities. In the short run, this can prevent jingle-jangle fallacies (Lawson and Robins, 2021) on the concept; in the long run, it can contribute to the maintenance or becoming of creative autonomy as a boundary concept through a more detailed understanding of its different conceptualisations, potentially conditional on context of use. This reduction in ambiguity and increase in granularity could inform further theoretical and empirical work on human, AI and human-AI co-creativity across many disciplines, including those mentioned above. This work also responds to the call for integrative research on autonomy more generally, articulating its nature as a multi-faceted, situated concept by providing insights on its constituents in the form of situated and contextual understandings and their relationships (Bennett et al., 2023; Catena, Tummolini, and Santucci, 2025).

In the following, we describe the scoping review eligibility criteria and search strategy. We outline plans for the data charting, analysis, presentation and contextualisation, concluding with the current status of the project and future work. This protocol has also been registered on osf.io.

Eligibility Criteria

Due to the relevance of creative autonomy to various fields and the long research heritage on (computational) creativity, we will not limit our search based on discipline or time of publication. However, as the main inclusion criteria, we require that the literature under review discusses creativity and autonomy together, in the same context. We accomplish this by means of our search string/fields and manual screening.

As sources of evidence, we will permit full-length, peer-reviewed scientific research papers and preprints, including primary studies, systematic reviews and meta-analyses as well as book chapters. We will exclude e.g. research commentaries and (extended) abstracts, book reviews as well as Bachelor or Master level theses. We do not limit publication years, but require the full text to be available and in English.

After completing the first version of the protocol on 2025-12-16, we moved forward with the selection of sources of evidence as described later. In that process, we recognised two instances in which "artistic autonomy" is used similarly to "creative autonomy". As an exploratory search in Scopus (2025-12-19) with "artistic autonomy" in title, abstract and keywords yielded 198 results and the overlap with our initial corpus is minor, it became evident that this issue requires our attention. "Artistic autonomy" appears related and potentially synonymous with our central construct of "creative autonomy" in the context of artistic practice, i.e. its use could invite a context-sensitive jangle fallacy (Lawson and Robins, 2021). Because clarifying such entanglements is one of our key objectives, we recognised a need to augment our corpus. The eligibility criteria we apply is identical to what is described above, but the wording we are looking for is "artistic autonomy". The detailed search strategy is described next.

The Literature Search

At the time of writing this protocol, the search strategy has been developed and final searches conducted. The following subsections document the involved steps; the next section describes the future screening of the retrieved corpus and all subsequent steps. The search was carried out and documented with respect to the PRISMA-S guidelines (Rethlefsen et al., 2021) to ensure both clarity and reproducibility. The filled out checklist can be found in the appendix.

Information sources and methods

Scopus was chosen as the main literature search platform as it enables searching simultaneously across several publishers, including most of the ACM Digital Library, and many publications on AI and HCI as arguably the most promising venues for relevant work. For additional coverage, the ACM Digital Library has also been searched separately.

Given the extent of academic publication cycles and fast pace of research on AI and creativity, we also took preprints into account. Scopus covers several preprints published 2017 onwards on several servers, including arXiv.org and SSRN as the main venues for preprints in technical fields and social sciences. To catch any relevant publications prior to 2017, we complemented the Scopus search with direct searches on arXiv and SSRN. In addition, a search in PsyArxiv (not listed in Scopus) was conducted to include preprints on (psychological) creativity research.

Crucially, research on AI and/or human creativity is now conducted in many other communities and venues beyond

what may be indexed by above services. Consequently, the above searches were further complemented with hits from the first 20 pages on Google Scholar.

Additionally, we met with Catena, Tummolini, and Santucci (2025) to inquire about any relevant literature we were unaware of. This did not yield any further inclusions.

Since our search through titles, keywords and abstracts (next section) may miss out on relevant publications, we last plan to conduct backward and forward snowballing on related work papers (Catena, Tummolini, and Santucci, 2025; Catena, 2026; Bennett et al., 2023) and on key papers surfaced from the reviewed corpus.

Search strategy

Our search strategy was designed iteratively, initially informed by the reading of known relevant work (e.g. Saunders, 2012; Jennings, 2010; Catena, Tummolini, and Santucci, 2025) and advanced via exploratory Scopus queries.

As described earlier, the concept of creative autonomy is present in contexts of human and AI creativity individually as well as their interaction. Conducting three separate searches was considered early on in the process, but soon dismissed as an inefficient approach: Exploratory test queries showed that terms like "human", "AI" or "co-creation" are not always explicitly mentioned, as they might be contextually obvious. Moreover, they , or might be expressed through different wording, accounting for which would have required developing several lists of synonyms while yet retaining a considerable risk of insufficient coverage. As we gathered insights into the extent of the overall corpus, it became clear that sorting through everything and coding it according to these three cases was feasible.

To support our inclusion criteria of the concept's central importance for the publication, the searches were limited to title, abstract and keywords where possible.

Due to an evident lack of a shared definition for *creative autonomy* but relevance in different communities with potentially varying terminology, it was of great importance to ensure that the search is broad enough. The goal was to capture work that discusses e.g. *creative autonomy* or *autonomous creativity* with potential inflections. The first iteration of the corresponding Scopus search string was:

> TITLE-ABS-KEY("creativ* autonom*" OR "autonom* creativ*")

The above-mentioned search was conducted in Scopus on 2025-11-02 to test the strategy and develop further exclusion criteria. The first 50 titles and abstracts were read by the first author and marked as *yes*, *no* or *maybe*. The authors discussed instances from each category to ensure alignment. This informed two additional exclusion criteria:

- Records are to be excluded if autonom* and creativ* are only listed separately. This applied to 19/50 samples, often signalled by comma separation in the abstract.
- Records are to be excluded if they only discuss *creative destruction*, a distinct concept from economics.

Based on these findings, the search string was fine-tuned and a list of potential synonyms for creative autonomy was developed. The search string's **second and final form** was:

> (TITLE-ABS-KEY (("creativ* autonom*" OR "autonom* creativ*"))) AND NOT
> (TITLE-ABS-KEY (("creativity, autonomy" OR "autonomy, creativity" OR "creative destruction") AND NOT ("autonomous creative" OR "autonomous creativity" OR "autonomously creative" OR "autonomy-driven creative" OR "autonomy-driven creativity" OR "autonomy-enabled creative" OR "autonomy-enabled creativity" OR "creative autonomy" OR "creativity-driven autonomy" OR "creativity-enabled autonomy" OR "creatively autonomous")))

The updated query now excludes many instances in which there is *only a list* or a *mention of creative destruction*, but no direct coupling of autonomy and creativity (or variants). The final search on Scopus was conducted on 2025-11-26.

We faced challenges in using wildcard expressions in other databases but Scopus. Therefore, adapted search queries for these databases make use of the list of potential synonyms of creative autonomy developed during the second iteration of the search string. The final searches in Google Scholar, the ACM Digital Library, arXiv, PsyArxiv and SSRN were conducted on the 2025-11-05. The full queries for each database are included in the appendix.

The strategy was discussed between the authors throughout the development process in weekly meetings, including reflections on results of test queries and database limitations. As the **final stage** of the search strategy, key papers will be backward and forward citation searched (see above).

To also probe "artistic autonomy" as a potentially closely related concept (further justification above), we searched for "artistic autonomy" in title, abstract and keywords on Scopus on 2025-12-19. In an effort to balance comprehensive inclusion of this potentially related concept and feasibility in processing, we exported only the 50 most recent publications for further eligibility screening. We believe that the most relevant older accounts will emerge via snowballing.

Managing records

All search results were exported to an Excel file. For Google Scholar, only full text sources from the first 20 pages were saved and results marked "citations" were dismissed. The number of records and dates of retrieval from each source are presented in Table 1, including the "artistic autonomy" addition on 2025-12-19. The initial corpus consisted of 442 records. Duplicates were deleted using Excel's power query tools. The final number of records was 378. The results of the "artistic autonomy" search on Scopus were checked for overlap, yielding an addition of 48 records. Thus, the title, abstract and keyword screening (described next) will be conducted on a corpus of **426** records.

Selection of Sources of Evidence

To mitigate bias, all authors will collaborate on the screening of titles and abstracts, separately applying the eligibility criteria to the first 20 % (n = 75) of the corpus. Decisions for inclusion will be compared and the level of agreement will be reported using Cohen's κ. Differing opinions will be

Source	No. of records	Date
Scopus	267	2025-11-26
Scopus preprints	12	
Google Scholar	148	2025-11-05
ACM Digital Library	6	
arXiv	0	
SSRN	9	
PsyArXiv	0	
Contacting Catena, Tummolini & Santucci	0	2025-10-07
Snowballing	TBD	upcoming
Initial no. of records, incl. duplicates	442	
Final no. of records, w/o duplicates	378	
Scopus on "artistic autonomy w/o overlap"	48	2025-10-19

Table 1: Number of records retrieved from each source.

discussed in live meetings until consensus is reached. This collaboration might result in further eligibility criteria.

The screening process will be conducted in the Excel file, where inclusion status as well as the possible rationale for exclusion will be documented to be shared later. We expect that some records will already at this stage require us to fetch the full text to make an informed decision of inclusion.

Based on the collaborative screening, the first author will apply the eligibility criteria to all **titles** and **abstracts**. Difficult cases will be collected and discussed together with the second author. For all records fulfilling the eligibility criteria based on title and abstract, the full text will be downloaded. The latter will be checked for eligibility by the first author and read in sufficient detail to extract all targeted data and mentions of our core concepts with context-sensitivity.

The full process will be documented, including a PRISMA flowchart with numbers of records at all stages. A copy of the full with reasons for exclusion will be included as Supplementary Material with the final publication.

Data Charting Process

"Data charting" denotes the process of extracting surface-level data for a scoping review (Tricco et al., 2018). We will chart the data by first coding the full-texts in the qualitative data analysis software ATLAS.ti, to be later moved into a tabular representation for further processing. We rely on ATLAS.ti to facilitate simultaneous and integrated data charting and in-depth interpretative analysis (next section).

Data charting will rely on a priori codes, including:

- basic bibliographic data: author(s), year, title
- domain: e.g. HCI, psychology, social science
- overall contribution type: empirical, theoretical, etc.
- subject: human / AI / interaction
- wording used: e.g. creative autonomy, autonomous creativity, creatively autonomous, autonomously creative
- type of creative autonomy definition: implicit/explicit
- (if applicable) how is the understanding of creative autonomy arrived at: e.g. by reference, original theoretical, original empirical inquiry

If further needs are recognised, additions will be made and/or codes will be further specified.

Data Analysis Process & Presentation

We additionally recognise a need for a more interpretive, in-depth analysis especially to identify implicit/latent understandings of creative autonomy. Additionally, to answer SQ3 (proximity to other concepts), simple frequency counts are not adequate but instead a closer reading of the material's relation to agency, autonomy and creativity is required. We thus plan to reach beyond our a priori data charting with a template analysis (Brooks et al., 2015), a specific type of thematic analysis in which a coding template is successively developed and revised during the coding process to build an understanding of qualitative data (Brooks et al., 2015). By supporting a mix of a priori and inductive codes, template analysis facilitates our integrated process of surface-level data charting and interpretative analysis.

Our template analysis will draw on a rich theoretical basis, differentiating forms of creativity and autonomy informed by classic and recent creativity research (e.g. Rhodes, 1961; Runco, 2025) and human-machine co-creativity (e.g. Kantosalo and Toivonen, 2016; Issak, Rezwana, and Harteveld, 2025) frameworks as well as classical (e.g. Colburn, 2022) and more relational (e.g. Mackenzie and Stoljar, 2000) conceptualisations of autonomy and their embedding in other theories, including motivational psychology (e.g. Vansteenkiste, Ryan, and Soenens, 2020). "Artistic autonomy" will be analysed to support contrast with "creative autonomy" and alternative phrasings.

To support our main RQ and SQs 1–2 (see Introduction), data frequencies will be reported; for more interpretative content, prevalence statements will be used. Key figures and distributions from the data charting will be presented. From the template analysis, a thematic map and the code hierarchy are likely outcomes. Further means of presentation may be chosen to capture the richness and heterogeneity of our data.

Conclusions & Future Work

We seek to conduct the first holistic and systematic scoping review of creative autonomy across the contexts of human, AI and their interaction. At the time of submitting this paper, the data charting and analyses are underway. We are looking forward to discussions with the ICCC community on the overall goals and methodology of this project and in particular appropriate frameworks to contextualise our findings.

Author Contributions

Contributions by author index via the CRediT Taxonomy (NISO, 2026): Conceptualisation (1,2), Methodology (1,2), Investigation (1,2), Data Curation (1), Visualisation (1,2), Writing (1,2), Funding Acquisition (2), Supervision (2).

Acknowledgments

We thank Niki Pennanen for feedback on the protocol draft, and our reviewers for excellent pointers moving forward.

References

Aromataris, E.; Lockwood, C.; Porritt, K.; Pilla, B.; and Jordan, Z., eds. 2024. *JBI Manual for Evidence Synthesis*.

Bansal, G.; Nawal, A.; Chamola, V.; and Herencsar, N. 2024. Revolutionizing Visuals: The Role of Generative AI in Modern Image Generation. *ACM Trans. Multimedia Comput. Commun. Appl.* 20(11).

Bennett, D.; Metatla, O.; Roudaut, A.; and Mekler, E. D. 2023. How does HCI Understand Human Agency and Autonomy? In *Proceedings of the CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, CHI '23, 1–18.

Boden, M. A. 2015. Foreword: How computational creativity began. *Computational creativity research: towards creative machines* 7.

Braun, V., and Clarke, V. 2006. Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology* 3(2):77–101.

Brooks, J.; McCluskey, S.; Turley, E.; and King, N. 2015. The Utility of Template Analysis in Qualitative Psychology Research. *Qualitative Research in Psychology* 12(2):202–222.

Catena, E.; Tummolini, L.; and Santucci, V. G. 2025. Human autonomy with AI in the loop. *Philosophical Psychology* 1–28.

Catena, E. 2026. Ai and human autonomy: a literature review. *AI and Ethics* 6(1):126.

Colburn, B., ed. 2022. *The Routledge Handbook of Autonomy*. London: Routledge.

Colton, S., and Wiggins, G. A. 2012. Computational creativity: The final frontier? In *Ecai*, volume 12, 21–26.

Daniele, A., and Song, Y.-Z. 2019. AI + Art = Human. In *Proceedings of the AAAI/ACM Conference on AI, Ethics, and Society*, AIES '19, 155–161.

Dwivedi, Y. K.; Kshetri, N.; Hughes, L.; Slade, E. L.; (...); and Wright, R. 2023. Opinion Paper: "So what if ChatGPT wrote it?" Multidisciplinary perspectives on opportunities, challenges and implications of generative conversational AI for research, practice and policy. *International Journal of Information Management* 71:102642.

Hemment, D., and Kommers. 2025. Doing AI Differently: Rethinking the foundations of ai via the humanities.

Issak, A.; Rezwana, J.; and Harteveld, C. 2025. Mosaaic: Managing optimization towards shared autonomy, authority, and initiative in co-creation. *Proc. ICCC*.

Jennings, K. E. 2010. Developing Creativity: Artificial Barriers in Artificial Intelligence. *Minds and Machines* 20(4):489–501.

Kantosalo, A., and Toivonen, H. 2016. Modes for Creative Human-Computer Collaboration. *Proc. ICCC* 77–84.

Kraus, S.; Breier, M.; Lim, W. M.; Dabić, M.; Kumar, S.; Kanbach, D.; Mukherjee, D.; Corvello, V.; Piñeiro-Chousa, J.; Liguori, E.; et al. 2022. Literature reviews as independent studies: guidelines for academic practice. *Review of managerial science* 16(8):2577–2595.

Lawson, K. M., and Robins, R. W. 2021. Sibling Constructs: What Are They, Why Do They Matter, and How Should You Handle Them? *Personality and Social Psychology Review* 25(4):344–366. SAGE Publications Inc.

Mackenzie, C., and Stoljar, N. 2000. Introduction: Autonomy refigured. In Mackenzie, C., and Stoljar, N., eds., *Relational autonomy: feminist perspectives on autonomy, agency, and the social self*. Oxford University Press.

Munn, Z.; Peters, M. D. J.; Stern, C.; Tufanaru, C.; McArthur, A.; and Aromataris, E. 2018. Systematic review or scoping review? Guidance for authors when choosing between a systematic or scoping review approach. *BMC Medical Research Methodology* 18(1):143.

NISO. 2026. Contributor Roles Taxonomy (CRediT). http://credit.niso.org/.

Rethlefsen, M. L.; Kirtley, S.; Waffenschmidt, S.; (...); and PRISMA-S Group. 2021. PRISMA-S: an extension to the PRISMA Statement for Reporting Literature Searches in Systematic Reviews. *Systematic Reviews* 10(1):39.

Rhodes, M. 1961. An Analysis of Creativity. *The Phi Delta Kappan* 42(7):305–310.

Runco, M. A. 2025. Updating the Standard Definition of Creativity to Account for the Artificial Creativity of AI. *Creativity Research Journal* 37(1):1–5.

Saunders, R. 2012. Towards Autonomous Creative Systems: A Computational Approach. *Cognitive Computation* 4(3):216–225.

Star, S. L. 2010. This is Not a Boundary Object: Reflections on the Origin of a Concept. *Science, Technology, & Human Values* 35(5):601–617.

Tricco, A. C.; Lillie, E.; Zarin, W.; (...); and Straus, S. E. 2018. PRISMA Extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR): Checklist and Explanation. *Annals of Internal Medicine* 169(7):467–473.

Vansteenkiste, M.; Ryan, R. M.; and Soenens, B. 2020. Basic psychological need theory: Advancements, critical themes, and future directions. *Motivation and emotion* 44(1):1–31.

Velt, R.; Benford, S.; and Reeves, S. 2020. Translations and boundaries in the gap between hci theory and design practice. *ACM Transactions on Computer-Human Interaction (TOCHI)* 27(4):1–28.

Vimpari, V.; Kultima, A.; Hämäläinen, P.; and Guckelsberger, C. 2023. "An Adapt-or-Die Type of Situation": Perception, Adoption, and Use of Text-to-Image-Generation AI by Game Industry Professionals. *Proc. of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction* 7(CHI PLAY):131–164.

Appendix

Full search strategies for all databases

The ACM Digital library was searched on 2025-11-05 and limited to the title, abstract and keywords to have the same limitations as in Scopus. It yielded 7 results.

> [Abstract: ”autonomous creative”] OR [Abstract: ”autonomous creativity”] OR [Abstract: ”autonomously creative”] OR [Abstract: ”autonomy-driven creative”] OR [Abstract: ”autonomy-driven creativity”] OR [Abstract: ”autonomy-enabled creative”] OR [Abstract: ”autonomy-enabled creativity”] OR [Abstract: ”creative autonomy”] OR [Abstract: ”creativity-driven autonomy”] OR [Abstract: ”creativity-enabled autonomy”] OR [Abstract: ”creatively autonomous”] OR [Title: ”autonomous creative”] OR [Title: ”autonomous creativity”] OR [Title: ”autonomously creative”] OR [Title: ”autonomy-driven creative”] OR [Title: ”autonomy-driven creativity”] OR [Title: ”autonomy-enabled creative”] OR [Title: ”autonomy-enabled creativity”] OR [Title: ”creative autonomy”] OR [Title: ”creativity-driven autonomy”] OR [Title: ”creativity-enabled autonomy”] OR [Title: ”creatively autonomous”] OR [Keywords: ”autonomous creative”] OR [Keywords: ”autonomous creativity”] OR [Keywords: ”autonomously creative”] OR [Keywords: ”autonomy-driven creative”] OR [Keywords: ”autonomy-driven creativity”] OR [Keywords: ”autonomy-enabled creative”] OR [Keywords: ”autonomy-enabled creativity”] OR [Keywords: ”creative autonomy”] OR [Keywords: ”creativity-driven autonomy”] OR [Keywords: ”creativity-enabled autonomy”] OR [Keywords: ”creatively autonomous”]

ArXiv was searched on 2025-11-05 with the advanced search function, searching the list of fit couplings on abstract and title. It was limited to the end of 2016, as newer hits are included in the Scopus pre-prints search. The final query (below) had no search results.

> order: -announced_date_first; size: 50; date_range: to 2016-12-31;
> include_cross_list: True; terms: AND title=”autonomous creative” OR ”autonomous creativity” OR ”autonomously creative” OR ”autonomy-driven creative” OR ”autonomy-driven creativity” OR ”autonomy-enabled creative” OR ”autonomy-enabled creativity” OR ”creative autonomy” OR ”creativity-driven autonomy” OR ”creativity-enabled autonomy” OR ”creatively autonomous”; OR abstract=”autonomous creative” OR ”autonomous creativity” OR ”autonomously creative” OR ”autonomy-driven creative” OR ”autonomy-driven creativity” OR ”autonomy-enabled creative” OR ”autonomy-enabled creativity” OR ”creative autonomy” OR ”creativity-driven autonomy” OR ”creativity-enabled autonomy” OR ”creatively autonomous”

SSRN was searched on 2025-11-05 using the advanced and boolean search options. The list of fit couplings was searched from title, abstract and keywords, mirroring the search strategy in Scopus. It was not possible to limit the date. Searching with the query below yielded 9 results.

> ”autonomous creative” OR ”autonomous creativity” OR ”autonomously creative” OR ”autonomy-driven creative” OR ”autonomy-driven creativity” OR ”autonomy-enabled creative” OR ”autonomy-enabled creativity” OR ”creative autonomy” OR ”creativity-driven autonomy” OR ”creativity-enabled autonomy” OR ”creatively autonomous”

PsyArxiv was searched via OSF on 2025-11-05. The platform offers only a simple search, in which the following search string was pasted. There were no hits.

> ”autonomous creative” OR ”autonomous creativity” OR ”autonomously creative” OR ”autonomy-driven creative” OR ”autonomy-driven creativity” OR ”autonomy-enabled creative” OR ”autonomy-enabled creativity” OR ”creative autonomy” OR ”creativity-driven autonomy” OR ”creativity-enabled autonomy” OR ”creatively autonomous”

Google Scholar was searched on 2025-11-05. The following search string was pasted into the search field and no additional criteria were used.

> ”autonomous creative” OR ”autonomous creativity” OR ”autonomously creative” OR ”autonomy-driven creative” OR ”autonomy-driven creativity” OR ”autonomy-enabled creative” OR ”autonomy-enabled creativity” OR ”creative autonomy” OR ”creativity-driven autonomy” OR ”creativity-enabled autonomy” OR ”creatively autonomous”

The first 20 pages of results were reviewed and all full text sources were exported. Results marked “citations” were dismissed and not exported.

Scopus for “artistic autonomy” was searched on 2025-12-19 with the following search string. The search was limited to title, abstract and keywords only.

> TITLE-ABS-KEY (”artistic autonomy”)

The search yielded 198 results, out of which the most recent 50 were exported. The results were compared to the existing corpus for overlap, resulting in an addition of 48 records.

PRISMA-S Checklist

The filled out PRISMA-S checklist can be found on the next, final page of the appendix.

Section/topic	#	Checklist item	Location(s) Reported
INFORMATION SOURCES AND METHODS			
Database name	1	Name each individual database searched, stating the platform for each.	pp. 2-3
Multi-database searching	2	If databases were searched simultaneously on a single platform, state the name of the platform, listing all of the databases searched.	-
Study registries	3	List any study registries searched.	-
Online resources and browsing	4	Describe any online or print source purposefully searched or browsed (e.g., tables of contents, print conference proceedings, web sites), and how this was done.	-
Citation searching	5	Indicate whether cited references or citing references were examined, and describe any methods used for locating cited/citing references (e.g., browsing reference lists, using a citation index, setting up email alerts for references citing included studies).	p. 3
Contacts	6	Indicate whether additional studies or data were sought by contacting authors, experts, manufacturers, or others.	p. 3
Other methods	7	Describe any additional information sources or search methods used.	-
SEARCH STRATEGIES			
Full search strategies	8	Include the search strategies for each database and information source, copied and pasted exactly as run.	p. 3 p. 6
Limits and restrictions	9	Specify that no limits were used, or describe any limits or restrictions applied to a search (e.g., date or time period, language, study design) and provide justification for their use.	p. 2 p. 6
Search filters	10	Indicate whether published search filters were used (as originally designed or modified), and if so, cite the filter(s) used.	-
Prior work	11	Indicate when search strategies from other literature reviews were adapted or reused for a substantive part or all of the search, citing the previous review(s).	-
Updates	12	Report the methods used to update the search(es) (e.g., rerunning searches, email alerts).	-
Dates of searches	13	For each search strategy, provide the date when the last search occurred.	p. 4 (Table 1)
PEER REVIEW			
Peer review	14	Describe any search peer review process.	pp. 3-4
MANAGING RECORDS			
Total Records	15	Document the total number of records identified from each database and other information sources.	p. 4 (Table 1)
Deduplication	16	Describe the processes and any software used to deduplicate records from multiple database searches and other information sources.	p. 3

PRISMA-S: An Extension to the PRISMA Statement for Reporting Literature Searches in Systematic Reviews
Rethlefsen ML, Kirtley S, Waffenschmidt S, Ayala AP, Moher D, Page MJ, Koffel JB, PRISMA-S Group.
Last updated February 27, 2020.