Full article title:

Well-being biomarkers and psychological functioning of adult patients during chemotherapy treatment: the effects of hospital clowns and hosting conditions

Marta Simões<sup>1,2</sup>, Albertina Oliveira<sup>3,4</sup>, Rosário Pinheiro<sup>3,5</sup>, Manuela Vilar<sup>3,5</sup>, Diana Agante<sup>6</sup>, Isabel Pazos<sup>6</sup>, Bárbara Oliveiros<sup>1,7</sup>, Manuela Grazina<sup>\*1,2,7</sup>

 CIBB - Center for Innovative Biomedicine and Biotechnology (www.cibb.uc.pt/), Coimbra, Portugal;

2. Laboratory of Mitochondrial Biomedicine and Theranostics, CNC - Center for Neuroscience and Cell Biology, University of Coimbra, Coimbra, Portugal;

 Faculty of Psychology and Education Sciences, University of Coimbra, Coimbra, Portugal;

4. CEIS20 Centre for Interdisciplinary Studies, University of Coimbra, Portugal;

5. CINEICC The Center for Research in Neuropsychology and Cognitive and Behavioral Intervention, Coimbra, Portugal;

6. IPO - Portuguese Institute of Oncology of Coimbra, Coimbra, Portugal;

7. FMUC - Faculty of Medicine, University of Coimbra, Coimbra, Portugal.

## \*To whom correspondence should be addressed. Tel: (+351)239-480040;

Email: <u>mgrazina.fmuc@gmail.com</u> Address: Faculty of Medicine, University of Coimbra, Pólo III – Subunit 1, 2º andar, Gab 2.31., Azinhaga de Sta. Comba, Celas, PT–3000-354 Coimbra (Portugal)

Short/running title:

Well-being biomarkers (BIOSMILE) & psychology in cancer

# Key Words:

Well-being; biomarkers; cortisol; psychological functioning; ambulatory cancer chemotherapy; hospital clowns

#### Abstract

**Background** Pharmacological oncological treatments interfere with the patient's quality of life on physical, psychological, and social dimensions. Besides all the care in hosting conditions, hospital clowns (HCs) use artistic sketches aiming to reduce distress, but studies analyzing their effects on biomarkers in association with psychological states are scarce. This study examined biomarkers and psychological functioning related to its effects, in adult patients of an ambulatory chemotherapy hospital setting.

**Methods** Following a pilot study with pre-testing/post-testing, 64 women were analysed: experimental group (EG; n=36; HCs intervention plus hosting conditions) *versus* control group (CG; n=28; hosting conditions). Oxytocin, cortisol, serotonin and ATP saliva levels were measured. Psychological assessment covered positive and negative affect (PA; NA), emotional states (PESS), mindfulness attention' quality (CAMS-R), cognitive functioning (CDT) and satisfaction with HCs.

**Results** Data did not reveal statistically significant differences in biomarkers between groups; EG showed improvements in psychological functioning, in which NA had significantly decreased, compared to CG; PESS and CAMS-R have also improved. Association analyses suggest a role of serotonin in moderating the relationship between (PA&scholarity)&CAMS-R with NA&age; serotonin and ATP changes are more related to psychological features; PESS seems to modulate those relationships in EG.

**Conclusions** Although similar results were found for the two groups in study, concerning biomarkers, the psychological functioning showed that short-term interventions during ambulatory chemotherapy might increase well-being of adult cancer patients. Certainly, a larger sample is needed, both to ascertain salivary biomarkers variations and psychological benefits, but this study is undoubtedly pioneer.

#### Main text

### Introduction

Well-being is characterized by feelings of trust, strong social networks and ability to relate with others. Nevertheless, fear, anxiety, isolation, lack of social support as well as physiological risk factors, such as high blood pressure and release of stress hormones, are harmful factors to emotional and physical well-being (1, 2). Oncological diseases are one of the most disruptive and challenging life events, triggering high negative symptoms. In addition to the shock of the diagnosis, physical symptoms (e.g., pain, fatigue, nausea, etc.) and high psychological stress affect the dynamic balances of well-being and negatively influence the recovery process and quality of life of oncological patients (3, 4).

Among the theories explaining the perception of well-being in adulthood, the conceptualizations around subjective well-being by Diener (5) stands out. This model includes a cognitive dimension related to cognitive judgments about life satisfaction and an affective component regarding emotional reactions to life events, the latter divided into positive and negative affect (6). In general, people with high positive affectivity deal better with stress-inducing situations and perceive themselves to be more in control of their own lives. Within the scope of this theory, strategies that increase positive affect and decrease negative affect improve the perception of well-being.

Besides the comfort given by hospital's hosting conditions, arts' activities can be considered as complex interventions that combine different components, such as the involvement of the imagination, sensory activation, evocation of emotion and cognitive stimulation. In addition, they also involve social interaction, physical activity, engagement and interaction with health issues/environments. Social interaction can reduce loneliness and lack of social support, which are both linked with adverse physiological responses, cognitive, functional and motor decline (7). Studies focusing on humor and laughter (e.g., 8) have shown that these could be assumed as a coping strategy to deal with stress (9-13). In the hospital context, particularly in the case of highly stressful illnesses, like cancer, humor and laughter have gained importance as tools to reduce the negative impact of the illness. This approach enhances positive emotions, allowing patients to deal better with their condition (10, 14), although the majority of studies comes from pediatric settings (e.g., 15-17). The main purpose of Hospital Clowns (HCs) is to promote the wellbeing of all individuals with whom they interact. The HCs are artistic performers trained to generate a positive atmosphere at the Hospital (18), developing warm interpersonal relations with patients and health staff through play and laughter (13, 19). Stimulating interaction through creative performance, they are also trained to capture patients' attention to the present moment, helping to focus and being aware of what's happening in the moment and thus distracting them from the negative impact of disease stressors (19-21). However, quantitative studies appraising its impact in human health and wellbeing are still missing.

Research in the fields of behavioral and psychosomatic medicine revealed associations of psychological well-being levels with subsequent physical health outcomes (e.g., 22). Accordingly, the analysis of several biomarkers can be correlated to well-being, in order to evaluate the impact of HCs intervention, besides to hosting conditions, in biochemical parameters.

It is well known that oxytocin is synthesized in hypothalamus with projections to neurohypophysis and sites within the central nervous system (23), playing a key role in fear conditioning, social cognition, social behaviors and affiliation and maternal bonding (24). It has also an important role in social anxiety and impaired social functioning disorders; in clinical reports, oxytocin was related to psychiatric disorders like depression, autism, anxiety disorder and post-traumatic stress disorder (25-28).

Cortisol is an adrenal hormone released in response to stress (29), being a wellestablished biomarker of psychological stress and related mental or physical diseases (30-33). A response to chronic stress with prolonged cortisol secretion may increase individual's susceptibility to poor health and disease (34-37).

Serotonin is a neurotransmitter synthesized in brain, platelets, intestinal myenteric plexus and gut enterochromaffin cells (38, 39). It is well known for its role in mood regulation and impact in numerous peripheral physiological functions (40). Several studies have shown an association between a trait of empathy and helping behavior, such like care for the baby's crying (41). Serotonin system may be involved in individual empathic abilities, since it plays a key role in modulating emotional states (42).

Furthermore, ATP biology is intrinsic to mitochondria, which own signaling enabling stress adaptation (43). An emerging concept proposes that mitochondria detect, integrate and translate psychosocial and behavioral factors into cellular and molecular changes, and in turn contribute to the biological embedding of psychological states. Clinical features of mitochondrial defects indicate that both the hypothalamic-pituitary-adrenal (HPA) and sympathetic-adrenal-medullary (SAM) axes activities may be directly modulated by mitochondrial function (43, 44). Chronic stress-induced mitochondrial allostatic load lowers mitochondrial bioenergetics capability and increases depressive mood states, as depressive symptoms can ameliorate by enhancing mitochondrial function, including ATP synthesis (45).

Accordingly, the detection of quoted substances in biological fluids have gained importance in emotional state indicators analysis (46, 47), being potential biomarkers of well-being.

Therefore, an innovative approach is herein presented, concerning the implementation, evaluation and monitoring methodology, in order to assess biomarkers of the well-being status. To our knowledge, this is the first study assessing changes in biomarkers and psychological symptoms in adults with cancer, in particular related to clown performances in treatment rooms.

### **Methods and Materials**

### Study design

A pilot study with a factorial repeated measures design (group x time) was implemented, in order to evaluate biomarkers' levels and psychological functioning upon HCs intervention. "Group" refers to participants' exposure (intervention plus hosting conditions - experimental group, EG, and hosting conditions only - control group, CG); "time" refers to repeated measures (pre- and post-test). Pre-test and post-test procedure was similar for all participants, saliva collection followed by psychological assessment, considering the intervention's duration (see Supplemental Information).

### Participants, Recruitment, and Procedures

This study was carried out at ambulatory service (See Supplemental Information) in the Portuguese Institute of Oncology of Coimbra (IPO). A sample of 64 subjects was included in the study (n=36, EG; n=28, CG), evaluated in two moments (basal and after

90 minutes (intervention for EG). In order to avoid gender bias related to variations in the parameters in study, only adult women were included, aged 57±12 (32–90) years old. Data were obtained after participants signing informed consent, according to Law no.12/2005, DL no.131/2014 and the Norm 015/2013 of the Directorate-General of Health (DGS), following the Tenets of the Helsinki Declaration. Samples were anonymized following the European Union General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR - EU 2016/679) and the Portuguese Law (Law no.58/2019).

Supplementary table (S1) contains sociodemographic data, including age, educational level, marital status and profession.

Detailed information on samples' collection, determination of biomarkers' levels and psychological evaluation is detailed in Supplemental Information.

## Intervention

The HCs "Palhaços D'Opital (PdO)" have a program aiming to bring joy, affection and good mood to adults and elders in hospital environment. They work in pairs, dressed in colorful costumes and they prepared sketches in advance. Their performances recreate day-to-day situations (e.g., clowns trying to install a new TV screen; planning a wedding between the clowns and asking the public for their ideas), ending with specific closure, in order to indicate to the audience that the session had finished and to promote a positive environment after their departure. Each intervention lasted around 15 minutes.

## Results

### Effect on biomarkers

The variation in biomarkers concentration before and after the HCs' intervention – EG – (or equivalent waiting time – CG) was analyzed, in order to assess the impact at the biochemical level. In the case of oxytocin, serotonin and ATP, there was no pre-post evaluation variation in concentration (Table 1). A statistically significant effect was found for cortisol levels, in pre-post evaluation (p=0.045) in the overall sample (both groups), with an estimated overall mean decrease of  $1.0 \pm 0.5$  units, although the lack of statistical significance in the comparison between EG and CG, paired for time of observation (Table 1), with higher difference observed in the CG.

The results reveal no statistically significant differences concerning the effect of time, group or interaction concerning biomarkers.

### Effect on psychological evaluation

Concerning interaction between group and moment of evaluation, a statistically significant effect on NA was found (p=0.032). There was a statistically significant difference between CG and EG either for pre-test (p=0.042) or post-test evaluation (p<0.001), with a higher value for CG. There was an overall decrease in the values between both evaluations (p=0.013) attributed to the difference presented by EG (p=0.001) [Table 2, Figure 1A]. No statistically significant interaction was found for other psychological characteristics evaluated.

Regarding both moments of evaluation, a statistically significant difference was found for PESS (p< 0.001) and CAMS-R (p=0.044), due to differences in the EG (PESS: p< 0.001; CAMS-R: p=0.037) and between groups, particularly in the post-test evaluation: pre and post-test comparisons between groups - PESS: p=0.014 and p<0.001; CAMS-R: p=0.059 and p=0.005 (Table 2). There was an increase in CAMS-R (EG with higher values than

CG) and a decrease in PESS between both evaluations (EG presented lower values than

CG) (Figure 1 - B, C).

Both CG and EG presented statistically significant differences in PA and CDT in post-test

(p=0.036 and p=0.037, respectively; Table 2, Figure S1-D, E).

## Associating biomarkers' levels and psychological evaluation

Data correlation analysis (Table 3) revealed statistically significant results for cortisol/ATP levels variation in the EG (r=0.357) and between serotonin and both oxytocin or ATP variations in the CG (r=0.336, r=0.456, respectively). Additionally, there were a few moderate correlations for the psychological parameters in the EG (PA correlated negatively to CDT and positively to CAMS-R changes (r=-0.449, r=0.491, respectively), whereas NA was positively correlated to PESS (r=0.523). On the other hand, there were statistically significant negative correlations between oxytocin and both PA and CAMS-R changes in the CG (r=-0.355, r=-0.433, respectively).

A hierarchical cluster analysis on variables using the Manhattan distance and single linkage identifies clusters as follows (Figure 2): the variation in PA modulated by the education level (scholarity) and CAMS-R are related, similarly to the impact of age in NA. It also shows that serotonin may play a role in moderating the relationship between the clusters identified above ((PA&scholarity) & CAMS-R with NA&age). Moreover, CDT and PESS are closely related (Figure 2). Separated group analyses can be seen in supplemental Figure S2.

### Discussion

The present study is a control compared, pre-post study of a time-limited intervention, aiming to identify any associations between biochemical/psychological changes upon clowning performances versus hosting conditions, in patients undergoing oncological treatment in ambulatory hospital rooms.

Findings in previous reported clown interventions with pediatric oncology patients undergoing chemotherapy, revealed a significant decrease of saliva cortisol levels, and improvement of psychological stress and fatigue in pre-post evaluation at four selected time points (48, 49). Although differences found were not statistically significant at all time points, the sample size was much reduced (n=6/16) and possible biases (e.g., sex) disregarded. Here, no significant reduced salivary cortisol is observed, but PdO intervention session is shorter, although with larger sample (n=64) and sex bias is valued. Other studies showed lower cortisol levels after clowns' session with pediatric patients in acute conditions (e.g., 50), with clowns visits to two independent groups (n=18 patients each), for 90 minutes. In contrast, a pilot study conducted at a pediatric emergency department (51), the clowns reduced distress from venipuncture in 29 children (24 controls), which is identical to our groups' size, but no effect on cortisol levels was observed. Nevertheless, independently of the PdO intervention, a significant decrease in cortisol levels (p=0.045) is observed, possibly linked with stress reduction in both groups that can be related with hosting conditions, since cortisol reduction was associated with relaxing environments (52).

Contrary to the present results, effective increase of children's salivary oxytocin and lower anxiety ratings pre-post evaluated difference attributed to HCs intervention (5-120 minutes) was observed before (53), but not concerning emotional dimensions (n=17 (intervention), n=14 (controls)). Oxytocin was known to mediate positive affect and

emotions, and sociability, providing chronic stress-deadening effects (54). Taylor (55) suggested that oxytocin system was involved in social affiliation through stress regulation, having an important biological role in stress-protective effects of positive social interactions (56). We undertake that PdO intervention is not influencing oxytocin-related functions in order to induce physiological changes, namely in social cognition and related behaviors for the groups in study. Moreover, oxytocin seems to correlate negatively to PA and CAMS-R in CG (Table 3), suggesting an involvement between these variables under hosting conditions only.

Regarding serotonin levels, no statistically significant differences are observed. Salivary serotonin was negatively linked with happiness in socially-positive settings (57), with individual's current mood from collegiate runners before and after physical activity (58), which is in agreement with the trend of the results herein obtained (see also Figures 2 and S2). Furthermore, the diurnal rhythm of salivary serotonin concentration proved to differ between healthy individuals, who tended to have lower morning levels, and patients suffering from depression (59). The current data align with literature, and a link is found between serotonin variations and psychological changes, independently of PdO intervention, suggesting that serotonin may play a role in moderating the relationship between (PA&scholarity) and CAMS-R with (NA&age) (Figure 2). In CG, serotonin seems to have a role in psychological variations (more in PA and NA than CDT, PESS and CAMS-R) and linked to ATP levels (Figure S2, Table 3); in EG, serotonin is also somehow differently associated to these variables (Figure S2).

Salivary ATP levels do not show statistical significance in pre-post evaluation, seemingly, the HCs intervention stimulus is not sufficient to induce a mitochondrial bioenergetics alteration like ATP synthesis modification reflected in saliva. Still, ATP levels appear to be associated with psychological profiles and serotonin (Figure S2 and Table 3). Biomarkers pre-post analyzed are located further away in clusters diagram of the patients evaluated, except for serotonin (Figure 2). Also, they organize not similarly in each one of the groups, due to ATP becomes nearly associated to other variables as serotonin (Figure S2). Additionally, higher ATP levels is significantly correlated with higher serotonin in CG, and with higher cortisol in EG in pre-post evaluation differences (Table 3). This suggests that biomarkers may be interlinked in the responses triggered, as a way to improve well-being conditions, involved as players in the HPA and SAM activities, and serotoninergic transmission. Besides, cortisol and oxytocin differences seem to be independent from the PdO intervention in their role of modulating changes of psychological status, serotonin and ATP levels (Figure S2).

The psychological status herein explored reveal improvements due to HCs performances, namely in negative affect (NA), positive emotional states (PESS) and mindfulness qualities (CAMS-R) of patients (Table 2). The intervention has a beneficial influence on NA in EG, compared to CG (p=0.032), meaning that the negative humor state of EG's patients significantly decreases (e.g., distress, anxiety, fear, guilt). These results reinforce the conclusion of Casellas-Grau et al. (10), using clowning performances of 15 minutes with 99 adult cancer patients, helped to reduce the level of negative psychological symptoms (discouragement, anxiety, sadness, anger, worries, deception or fear) and fatigue feelings, also ameliorating the positive symptoms (feeling like laughing, happiness). Our results showed a tendency to be activated, enough to produce changes only in post-test difference between EG and CG (p=0.036). The CAMS-R values also increase from pre- to post-test in EG (p=0.037), suggesting the occurrence of a trend for improvement in attention, tolerance and acceptance of the present moment after intervention. The positive emotions (PESS) changes from pre- to post-intervention in EG, reflecting a better emotional functioning of these patients (p<0.001). The cognitive

functioning, evaluated by CDT, is not significant in pre-post evaluation (p=0.442), indicating that the HCs intervention has no statistically significant impact on the learning effect.

Former research based on HCs visits during chemotherapy focused mainly in children, reporting higher levels of calm and happiness, less fatigue, pain, and distress, when compared to control group (n=41 both groups) (15). Moreover, these positive effects were higher in patients receiving HCs during two sessions, indicating that their intervention may extend for a longer effect on the well-being. In a different clinical context with children undergoing surgery, whom interacted with HCs during 15 minutes (n=35; n=35 controls), reported significantly less worries and showed improvement in emotional states, with decreased stress, suggesting that children are more predisposed to HCs interventions effects (60). A meta-analysis focused on the attempt to achieve a deeper psychological and shadings of the understanding of HCs encounters with ailing children suggested that the clowns meeting created the magical safe area, when children played and tested their possibilities (61). Children had the opportunity to recognize themselves in the state they were in at that exact moment and no longer focusing on their illness or limitations (1, 61, 62). Nevertheless, clowning intervention gained popularity in clinical care of adults and elderly (18). One of the first studies showed that HCs effectively led to lung function improvements of patients with chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, compared to controls (63). Others showed that HCs elicited amusement, feelings of transcendence, translated by feelings of being uplifted and surpassing the ordinary (64). Also, the clown effect of 1-day humor session followed by 9-12 humor-therapy sessions did not significantly reduce depression but significantly reduced agitation on a large group of elderly nursing home residents (65).

Our results are concordant with the above studies, meaning that HCs have a positive influence on psychological status of adult patients. The EG patients report high satisfaction with the HCs intervention (Supplements). Regardless, a follow-up intervention(s), an evaluation of a probable overcome in physical symptoms (e.g., fatigue) or improvement in results of disease treatment, which could reveal more details concerning the well-being of patients in analysis, were not performed.

The lack of significant differences in EG positive affect can be due to the fact that the evaluation subscale used terms referring states related to a high level of excitement, and which could be interpreted by patients as such and then be underappreciated, bearing in mind their illness context (e.g., feeling enthusiasm, inspiration). This explanation is consistent with the improvements in positive emotional states evaluated by PESS, since it captures emotional functioning easier to change with performances, such as feeling calmer, joyful, relaxed and communicative. Theoretically, the affective component of subjective well-being (PA and NA) requires high levels of positive affect and, conversely, lower levels of negative affect (5). Considering these dynamics, the empirical data suggest that PdO brief performances impacts on oncological patients' well-being, mainly via decreasing negative psychological symptoms (they are living a condition of highly distress), more than improving positive affect, although the emotional states more aroused by what is happening in the moment also improved. In fact, NA is highly positively correlated to PESS in EG pre-post evaluation (Table 3), suggesting that there may be a mutual change of both parameters. Moreover, PA and CAMS-R share a link (Table 3).

Furthermore, there are no significant differences in all psychological aspects for CG, although variations in CDT, NA, PESS and CAMS-R all had a beneficial tendency (table 1). Accordingly, a normal oncological treatment session is not marked by stressful

triggers for the patients, due to the supportive room environment, and it could reflect the quality of the interaction between the evaluation team and the patients since it was marked by kindness, active listening, availability, further reinforcing the good treatment atmosphere. This result is reinforced by the observed global decrease in cortisol, mentioned previously, in pre-post evaluation.

Although statistically significant differences were verified between groups in the pre-test evaluation of psychological features of PESS (p=0.014) and NA (p=0.042), it is assumed that this fact occurred by chance in the distribution into small size groups.

The emotional state and perception may be influenced by age and scholar level. The variation in PA is modulated by the education level (PA&scholarity), which is associated with CAMS-R (Figure 2). This is reinforced in EG as seen in Table 3 and Figure S2). It may strengthen the aspect of PA variation in EG, although not significantly different to CG per se (Table 2). The education level factor here may be influencing this relationship. Additionally, this cluster is attached to NA&age (Figure 2), suggesting that the observed significant decreasing of negative mood states (NA) of patients is moderating the effect of the improvement in attention, tolerance and acceptance in and of the present moment (CAMS-R) and positive affect (PA) relationship. Notably, as already noted that salivary serotonin is linked inversely with happiness and current mood (57, 58), it may play a role in moderating the relationship between those clusters (Figure 2), suggesting that the observed significant improvements in these psychological features is associated with this biomarker drifts, independently of the HCs intervention. Figure S2 shows that serotonin has a role in psychological profiles, closer to PA and NA, only emerging in CG. Serotonin and ATP levels' differences are also closely related to CDT and CAMS-R differences in both groups (Figure S2), but in EG, a trade between scholarity and PESS occurs, evidencing a turn to a modulating role of the emotional feelings to the other psychological features changes and serotonin and ATP changes of EG.

The attempt to comprehensively examine the effectiveness of the HCs (PdO) intervention for enhancing emotional and behavioral processes using biomarkers, may be further ameliorated. Some studies might indicate clues for these approaches (49-51). Most likely it would take a higher number of sessions and/or longer HCs sessions for changes to occur, or even increasing the sample size, by perhaps doing collection of more than one saliva samples in pre- and post- interventions in order to obtain a more differentiating effect between groups. However, the particular circumstances of the patients in study may also contribute to the results obtained.

Although presenting some limitations, such as the fact that the population in study included adult women with a wide age range being treated for different types of cancer, the novelty of analyzing well-being biomarkers is undeniable. Certainly, additional research that would include males, narrower age groups with higher number of subjects and stratified according to the subtypes of cancer is an open field to explore. The sample size did not allow the subdivision of data to explore deeper additional factors, like age and educational level's effects.

Despite the recognition of HCs as supporting agents in health care settings, this study does not show changes in the biomarkers studied, possibly because of the short duration of its intervention or related to the nature of the intervention that affect immediate emotional states, but do not influence the cognitive functions. It is remarkable to notice that the good hosting conditions of Hospital are reducing patients' stress, which is essential for the treatment success and well-being of the patients in an ambulatory chemotherapy hospital setting.

In conclusion, psychological functioning evidences observed show that short-term HCs interventions effects during ambulatory chemotherapy seem to contribute to increasing the well-being of adult cancer patients, reinforcing the importance of this kind of interventions in ambulatory treatment conditions environment. Future randomized research studies with higher control levels and larger samples are needed, to both ascertain psychological benefits and salivary biomarkers variations, and consolidate the relevant variables.

Additionally, although preliminary, due the nature of the study (pilot), it is important to stress out the novelty of this work, in which a set of well-being biomarkers was implemented, in correlation with psychological evaluation including cognitive function, besides emotional states, and all evaluated by cluster analysis. This experimental approach can be used in any study examining the effect of any type of intervention possibly related to well-being in mental health studies, HCs or any other artistic/social interventions, sports, disease settings or work environments.

### Acknowledgements

The authors especially grateful the remarkable dedication of health professionals from the Portuguese Institute of Oncology of Coimbra (IPO) (Instituto Português de Oncologia de Coimbra Francisco Gentil, E.P.E. (IPOCFG, E.P.E.)), with special thanks to Dr. Margarida Ornelas (President of the Administrative Council), Dr. Ana Pais (Clinical Director), and to Dr. Gabriela Sousa (Director of Medical Oncology Service). The authors are especially grateful to Vanessa Costa (former MSc student at LBioMiT), for all her efforts and relevant contribution to the development of this study. The authors also acknowledge the clowns from "Palhaços D'Opital" for their collaboration in the performance for the intervention to the experimental group (EG). The authors truly thank all women for their participation in this study, which allowed the accomplishment of the project aims. The authors are thankful to Paulo Matafome for the fruitful discussions concerning ELISA and to Professor Teresa Gonçalves and Chantal Fernandes for the availability of using the lyophilizer (serotonin evaluation).

This work was partially financed by European Social Fund, as part of the Portugal 2020 Partnership Agreement, within the scope of Portugal Social Innovation initiative (POISE-03-4639-FSE-000427). Additional support was granted by the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF), through the Centro 2020 Regional Operational Programme under project CENTRO-01-0145-FEDER-000012-N2323 and CENTRO-07-ST24-FEDER-002002/6/ and through the COMPETE 2020 - Operational Programme for Competitiveness and Internationalization and portuguese national funds via FCT – Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia, under project[s] POCI-01-0145-FEDER-007440, and UIDB/04539/2020, UIDP/04539/2020 and LA/P/0058/2020.

## Disclosures

The authors declare no biomedical financial interests or potential conflicts of interest.

## References

1. Dahl CJ, Wilson-Mendenhalla CD, Davidson RJ (2020). The plasticity of well-being: A training-based framework for the cultivation of human flourishing. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 117: 32197–32206.

2. Jones C, Barrera I, Brothers S, King R, Wahlestedt C (2017). Oxytocin and social functioning. Dialogues in Clinical Neuroscience 19: 193-201.

3. Nunes MD, Bomfim EO, Olson K, Lopes-Junior LC, Silva-Rodriguez FM, Garcia de Lima RA, et al. (2018). Interventions minimizing fatigue in children/adolescents with cancer: An integrative review. J Child Health Care 22: 186–204.

4. Segrin C, Badger TA (2010). Psychological distress in different social network members of breast and prostate cancer survivors. Res Nurs Health 33: 450–464.

5. Diener E (2009): Subjective well-being. In: Diener E, editors. The science of wellbeing: The collected works of Ed Diener, Springer, pp 11-58.

6. Diener E, Oishi S, Lucas RE (2003). Personality, culture, and subjective well-being: Emotional and cognitive evaluations of life. Annu Rev Psychol 54: 403–424.

7. Fancourt D, Garnett C, Spiro N, West R, Müllensiefen D (2019). How do artistic creative activities regulate our emotions? Validation of the Emotion Regulation Strategies for Artistic Creative Activities Scale (ERS-ACA). PLoS One 14: e0211362.

8. Savage BM, Lujan HL, Thipparthi RR, DiCarlo SE (2017). Humor, laughter, learning, and health! A brief review. Adv Physiol Educ 41: 341–347.

9. Cann A, Holt K, Calhoun LG (1999). The roles of humor and sense of humor in responses to stressors. International Journal of Humor Research 12: 177–193.

10. Casellas-Grau A, Ochoaa CM, De Frutosa ML, Flix-Vallea A, Rosales A, Gil F (2021). Perceived changes in psychological and physical symptoms after hospital clown performances in a cancer setting. Arts Health 13: 189-203.

11. Kuiper N, Nicholl S (2004). Thoughts of feeling better? Sense of humor and physical health. Humor: International Journal of Humor Research 17: 37–66.

12. Martin R (2001). Humor, laughter, and physical health: Methodological issues and research findings. Psychol Bull 127: 504–519.

13. Martin RA (2006). Psychology of humor: An integrative approach, 1st ed. Academic Press.

14. Tanay MAL, Roberts J, Ream E (2013). Humour in adult cancer care: A concept analysis. J Adv Nurs 69: 2131–2140.

15. Arriaga P, Melo AS, Caires S (2020). The Effects of Hospital Clowning on Physical and Emotional States of Pediatric Patients During Chemotherapy Treatment. Child Youth Care Forum 49: 365–381.

16. Sridharan K, Sivaramakrishnan G (2016). Therapeutic clowns in pediatrics: A systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. Eur J Pediatr 175: 1353–1360.

17. Zhang Y, Yang Y, Lau WY, Garg S, Lao J (2016). The effectiveness of pre-operative clown intervention on psychological distress: A systematic review and meta-analysis. J Paediatr Child Health 53, 237–245.

18. Dionigi A, Canestrari C (2016). Clowning in health care settings: The point of view of adults. Eur J Psychol 12: 473–488.

19. Spitzer P (2006). Essay: Hospital clowns-modern-day court jesters at work. Lancet 368: S34–S35.

20. Auerbach S (2017). Are clowns good for everyone? The influence of trait cheerfulness on emotional reactions to a hospital clown intervention. Front Psychol 8: 1973.

21. Del Castanhel F, Liberali R (2018). Mindfulness-based stress reduction on breast cancer symptoms: systematic review and meta-analysis. Einstein (São Paulo) 16: eRW4383.

22. Trudel-Fitzgerald C, Millstein RA, von Hippel C, Howe CJ, Tomasso LP, Wagner GR, et al. (2019). Psychological well-being as part of the public health debate? Insight into dimensions, interventions, and policy. BMC Public Health 19, 1712.

23. Insel TR (1992). Oxytocin--a neuropeptide for affiliation: evidence from behavioral, receptor autoradiographic, and comparative studies. Psychoneuroendocrinology 17: 3-35.

24. Meguro Y, Miyano K, Hirayama S, Yoshida Y, Ishibashi N, Ogino T, et al. (2018). Neuropeptide oxytocin enhances  $\mu$  opioid receptor signaling as a positive allosteric modulator. J Pharmacol Sci 137: 67-75.

25. Neumann ID, Landgraf R (2012). Balance of brain oxytocin and vasopressin: implications for anxiety, depression, and social behaviors. Trends Neurosci 35: 649-659.

26. Neumann ID, Slattery DA (2016). Oxytocin in General Anxiety and Social Fear: A Translational Approach. Biol Psychiatry 79: 213-221.

27. Frijling JL (2017). Preventing PTSD with oxytocin: effects of oxytocin administration on fear neurocircuitry and PTSD symptom development in recently trauma-exposed individuals. Eur J Psychotraumatol 8: 1302652.

28. Ferreira AC, Osório FL (2022). Peripheral oxytocin concentrations in psychiatric disorders - A systematic review and methanalysis: Further evidence. Prog Neuropsychopharmacol Biol Psychiatry 117: 110561.

29. Ockenfels MC, Porter L, Smyth J, Kirschbaum C, Hellhammer DH, Stone AA (1995). Effect of chronic stress associated with unemployment on salivary cortisol: overall cortisol levels, diurnal rhythm, and acute stress reactivity. Psychosom Med 57: 460-467.

30. Heim C, Ehlert U, Hellhammer DH (2000). The potential role of hypocortisolism in the pathophysiology of stress-related bodily disorders. Psychoneuroendocrinology 25: 1-35.

31. Miller GE, Chen E, Zhou ES (2007). If it goes up, must it come down? Chronic stress and the hypothalamic-pituitary-adrenocortical axis in humans. Psychol Bull 133: 25-45.

32. Hellhammer DH, Wüst S, Kudielka BM (2009). Salivary cortisol as a biomarker in stress research. Psychoneuroendocrinology 34: 163-171.

33. Chojnowska S, Ptaszyńska-Sarosiek I, Kępka A, Knaś M, Waszkiewicz N (2021). Salivary Biomarkers of Stress, Anxiety and Depression. J Clin Med 10: 517. 34. Baig A, Siddiqui I, Naqvi H, Sabir S, Jabbar J, Shahid M (2006). Correlation of serum cortisol levels and stress among medical doctors working in emergency departments. J Coll Physicians Surg Pak 16: 576-580.

35. Quartana PJ, Buenaver LF, Edwards RR, Klick B, Haythornthwaite JA, Smith MT (2010). Pain catastrophizing and salivary cortisol responses to laboratory pain testing in temporomandibular disorder and healthy participants. J Pain 11: 186-194.

36. Müller MJ (2011). Helplessness and perceived pain intensity: relations to cortisol concentrations after electrocutaneous stimulation in healthy young men. Biopsychosoc Med 5: 8.

37. lob E, Steptoe A (2019). Cardiovascular Disease and Hair Cortisol: a Novel Biomarker of Chronic Stress. Curr Cardiol Rep 21: 116.

38. Keszthelyi D, Troost FJ, Masclee AA (2009). Understanding the role of tryptophan and serotonin metabolism in gastrointestinal function. Neurogastroenterol Motil 21: 1239-1249.

39. Lesch KP, Araragi N, Waider J, van den Hove D, Gutknecht L (2012). Targeting brain serotonin synthesis: insights into neurodevelopmental disorders with long-term outcomes related to negative emotionality, aggression and antisocial behaviour. Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci 367: 2426-2443.

40. David DJ, Gardier AM (2016). Les bases de pharmacologie fondamentale du système sérotoninergique: application à la réponse antidépressive [The pharmacological basis of the serotonin system: Application to antidepressant response]. Encephale 42: 255-263.

41. Lin H-C, McFatter R (2012). Empathy and distress: Two distinct but related emotions in response to infant crying. Infant Behav Dev 35: 887–897.

42. Preller KH, Pokorny T, Hock A, Kraehenmann R, Stämpfli P, Seifritz E, et al. (2016). Effects of serotonin 2A/1A receptor stimulation on social exclusion processing. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 113: 5119-5124.

43. Picard M, McEwen BS, Epel ES, Sandi C (2018). An energetic view of stress: Focus on mitochondria. Front Neuroendocrinol 49: 72-85.

44. Picard M, McEwen BS (2018). Psychological Stress and Mitochondria: A Conceptual Framework. Psychosom Med 80: 126-140.

45. Allen J, Caruncho HJ, Kalynchuk LE (2021). Severe life stress, mitochondrial dysfunction, and depressive behavior: A pathophysiological and therapeutic perspective. Mitochondrion 56: 111-117.

46. Feldman R (2017). The Neurobiology of Human Attachments. Trends Cogn Sci 21: 80-99.

47. Steckl AJ, Ray P (2018). Stress Biomarkers in Biological Fluids and Their Point-of-Use Detection. ACS Sens 3: 2025-2044.

48. Lopes-Júnior LC, Pereira-da-Silva G, Silveira DSC, Veronez LC, Santos JC, Alonso JB, et al. (2018). The Effect of Clown Intervention on Self-Report and Biomarker Measures of Stress and Fatigue in Pediatric Osteosarcoma Inpatients: A Pilot Study. Integr Cancer Ther 17: 928-940.

49. Lopes-Junior LC, Silveira DSC, Olson K, Bomfim EO, Veronez LC, Santos JC, et al. (2020). Clown Intervention on Psychological Stress and Fatigue in Pediatric Patients With Cancer Undergoing Chemotherapy. Cancer Nurs 43: 290-299.

50. Saliba FG, Adiwardana NS, Uehara EU, Silvestre RN, Leite VV, Faleiros FT, et al. (2016). Salivary Cortisol Levels: The Importance of Clown Doctors to Reduce Stress. Pediatr Rep 8: 6188.

51. Rimon A, Shalom S, Wolyniez I, Gruber A, Schachter-Davidov A, Glatstein M (2016). Medical Clowns and Cortisol levels in Children Undergoing Venipuncture in the Emergency Department: A Pilot Study. Isr Med Assoc J 18: 680-683.

52. Oomen-Welke K, Schlachter E, Hilbich T, Naumann J, Müller A, Hinterberger T, et al. (2022). Spending Time in the Forest or the Field: Investigations on Stress Perception and Psychological Well-Being-A Randomized Cross-Over Trial in Highly Sensitive Persons. Int J Environ Res Public Health 19: 15322.

53. Scheel T, Hoeppner D, Grotevendt A, Barthlen W (2017). Clowns in Paediatric Surgery: Less Anxiety and More Oxytocin? A Pilot Study. Klin Padiatr 229: 274-280.

54. Isgett SF, Kok BE, Baczkowski BM, Algoe SB, Grewen KM, Fredrickson BL (2017). Influences of oxytocin and respiratory sinus arrhythmia on emotions and social behavior in daily life. Emotion 17, 1156-1165.

55. Taylor SE (2006). Tend and Befriend: Biobehavioral Bases of Affiliation Under Stress. Curr Dir Psychol Sci 15, 273–277. 56. Heinrichs M, Baumgartner T, Kirschbaum C, Ehlert U (2003). Social support and oxytocin interact to suppress cortisol and subjective responses to psychosocial stress. Biol Psychiatry 54: 1389-1398.

57. Matsunaga M, Ishii K, Ohtsubo Y, Noguchi Y, Ochi M, Yamasue H (2017). Association between salivary serotonin and the social sharing of happiness. PLoS One 12: e0180391.

58. Karbownik MS, Hicks SD (2022). The Association of Salivary Serotonin With Mood and Cardio-Autonomic Function: A Preliminary Report. Front Psychiatry 13: 788153.

59. Tan ZL, Bao AM, Tao M, Liu YJ, Zhou JN (2007). Circadian rhythm of salivary serotonin in patients with major depressive disorder. Neuro Endocrinol Lett 28: 395-400.

60. Fernandes SC, Arriaga P (2010). The effects of clown intervention on worries and emotional responses in children undergoing surgery. J Health Psychol 15: 405-415.

61. Linge L (2013). Joyful and serious intentions in the work of hospital clowns: a metaanalysis based on a 7-year research project conducted in three parts. Int J Qual Stud Health Well-being 8: 1-8.

62. Esteves CH, Antunes C, Caires S (2014). Humanization in a pediatric context: the role of clowns in improving the environment experienced by hospitalized children. Interface: Communication, Health, Education 18: 697-708.

63. Brutsche MH, Grossman P, Müller RE, Wiegand J, Pello, Baty F, et al. (2008). Impact of laughter on air trapping in severe chronic obstructive lung disease. Int J Chron Obstruct Pulmon Dis 3: 185-192. 64. Auerbach S, Hofmann J, Platt T, Ruch WF (2014). An investigation of the emotions elicited by hospital clowns in comparison to circus clowns and nursing staff. The European Journal of Humour Research 1: 26-53.

65. Low LF, Brodaty H, Goodenough B, Spitzer P, Bell JP, Fleming R, et al. (2013). The Sydney Multisite Intervention of LaughterBosses and ElderClowns (SMILE) study: cluster randomised trial of humour therapy in nursing homes. BMJ Open 3: e002072.

		Cont	rol (CG)			Expe	rimental (EG)			р
		n	Min-Max	Mean (SD)	Med[Q1;Q3]	n	Min-Max	Mean (SD)	Med [Q1;Q3]	
Oxytocin (pg/ml)	Before	28	4.8 - 79.8	20.2 (21.1)	12.4 [7.8; 19.8]	36	5.4 - 114.5	30.8 (28.1)	20 [9.8; 44.8]	0.095
p = 0.173 <sup>6</sup>	After	28	3.8 – 183.2	25.1 (39.9)	10.8 [7.9; 22.6]	36	2.6 – 257.2	37.5 (46.1)	25.1 [9; 52.2]	0.097
	p				0.964 <sup>4</sup>				0.3004	0.835
Cortisol (x10 <sup>3</sup> ) (pg/ml)	Before	23	1.1 – 21.8	5.0 (4.7)	4.0 [2.8; 4.7]	27	2.1 – 23.3	4.9 (4.0)	4.1 [2.9; 4.8]	0.929
$p = 0.045^6$	After	22	1.9 – 5.6	3.5 (1.2)	3.4 [2.5; 4.8]	27	1.4 - 6.4	3.6 (1.3)	3.8 [2.6; 4.3]	0.778
	р			0.238 <sup>3</sup>				0.092 <sup>3</sup>		0.583 <sup>t</sup>
Serotonin (ng/ml)	Before	25	0.7 – 24.9	6.1 (6)	4.7 [2.6; 6.7]	29	0.7 – 17	5.8 (4.3)	5 [3.2; 6.4]	0.6842
$p = 0.227^6$	After	25	0.5 – 23.8	5.5 (5.5)	4.3 [2.8; 5.6]	30	0.4 – 10.2	4.5 (2.7)	4.1 [2.3; 6]	0.839
	p				0.757 <sup>4</sup>				0.1774	0.673
ATP (x10 <sup>9</sup> ) (mol/mg)	Before	26	0 – 1.5	0.3 (0.4)	0.1 [0; 0.4]	30	0 – 5.7	0.7 (1.6)	0.1 [0; 0.3]	0.8312
$p = 0.908^{6}$	After	27	0 - 0.8	0.2 (0.2)	0.2 [0.1; 0.3]	31	0 – 20.6	0.8 (3.7)	0.1 [0; 0.3]	0.265
	р				0.751 <sup>4</sup>				0.299 <sup>4</sup>	0.735 <sup>t</sup>
<sup>1</sup> Student's t test i group	for independ interactio		nples; <sup>2</sup> Mann-Wh <sup>6</sup> Repeat		Student's t test for pa measures		amples; ⁴Wilcoxo OVA	n Test; ⁵Repeate (time	d measures ANO\ main	/A (time * effect)

Table 1: Descriptive statistics of biomarkers evaluation and comparisons between groups

		Control (	CG)			Experim	ental (EG)			р
		n	Min-Max	Mean (SD)	Med [Q1; Q3]	n	Min-Max	Mean (SD)	Med [Q1; Q3]	
CDT	Pre-test	26	6 – 17	13.8 (2.8)	15 [14; 15]	32	5 – 18	13.4 (4)	15 [9; 17]	0.664 <sup>2</sup>
$p = 0.432^{6}$	Post-test	26	8 - 17	14 (2.2)	14.5 [14; 15]	27	1 – 18	14.4 (4.3)	16 [14; 17]	0.037 <sup>2</sup>
	Р				1.000 <sup>4</sup>				0.442 <sup>4</sup>	0.702 <sup>5</sup>
PESS	Pre-test	28	8 - 47	22.5 (10.7)	23 [14; 26.5]	36	8 – 27	16.8 (5.3)	17.5 [13.5; 19.5]	0.014 <sup>1</sup>
p < 0.001 <sup>6</sup>	Post-test	28	8 - 45	20.6 (9.7)	20.5 [13; 26.5]	36	8 – 20	12.6 (3.9)	12 [8.5; 16]	< 0.001 <sup>1</sup>
	Р			0.068 <sup>3</sup>				< 0.001 <sup>3</sup>		0.074 <sup>5</sup>
PA	Pre-test	28	10 - 24	16 (3.4)	16 [13.5; 18]	36	10 – 24	16.8 (3.3)	16 [14.5; 18.5]	0.345 <sup>1</sup>
$p = 0.996^6$	Post-test	28	9 - 25	15.3 (4.4)	14.5 [11.5; 19]	36	11 – 25	17.4 (3.4)	17 [15; 20]	0.036 <sup>1</sup>
	Р			0.211 <sup>3</sup>				0.277 <sup>3</sup>		0.111 <sup>5</sup>
NA	Pre-test	28	5 - 19	8.8 (3.6)	8 [5.5; 10.5]	36	5 – 17	7.1 (2.6)	6 [5; 7.5]	0.042 <sup>2</sup>
p = 0.013 <sup>6</sup>	Post-test	28	5 - 21	8.6 (4.1)	7.5 [5; 10]	36	5 – 11	5.6 (1.2)	5 [5; 6]	< 0.001 <sup>2</sup>
	Р				0.622 <sup>4</sup>				0.001 <sup>4</sup>	0.032 <sup>5</sup>
CAMS-R	Pre-test	28	13 - 23	16.8 (2.9)	17 [14.5; 19]	36	12 – 24	18.1 (2.6)	18 [16; 20]	0.059 <sup>1</sup>
$p = 0.044^{6}$	Post-test	28	9 - 22	17.1 (2.9)	17 [15; 19]	29	14 – 27	19.5 (3.2)	19 [17; 21]	0.005 <sup>1</sup>
	Р			0.585 <sup>3</sup>				0.037 <sup>3</sup>		0.173 <sup>5</sup>

**Table 2**: Descriptive statistics of psychological evaluation and comparisons between groups.

<sup>1</sup> Student's t-test for independent samples; <sup>2</sup> Mann-Whitney U-Test; <sup>3</sup> Student's t test for paired samples; <sup>4</sup> Wilcoxon Test; <sup>5</sup> Repeated measures ANOVA (time \* group interaction); <sup>6</sup> Repeated measures ANOVA (time main effect).

CAMS-R, Cognitive and Affective Mindfulness measured by the Cognitive and Affective Mindfulness Scale-Revised, CDT, Cognitive functioning assessed by the Clock-Drawing Test, NA and PA, Affectivity assessed by the Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS), PESS, Emotional States assessed by the Perception of Emotional States Scale.

Arron         n = 27         n = 29         n = 30         n = 27         n = 36         n = 27         n = 27         n = 23         n = 21         n = 27         n = 23         n = 21         n = 27         n = 23         n = 23         n = 20         n = 30         n = 27         n = 27         n = 27         n = 22         n = 22         n = 22         n = 23<	$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		Oxytocin	Cortisol	Serotonin	ATP	CDT	PESS	PA	NA	CAMS-R
Cortisol $-0.231^{*}(0.301);$ n = 22 $0.029^{*}(0.888);$ n = 26 $0.357^{*}(0.087);$ n = 27 $0.173^{*}(0.39);$ n = 27 $-0.260^{*}(0.19);$ n = 27 $0.285^{*}(0.149);$ n = 27 $0.285^{*}(0.149);$ n = 27 $0.260^{*}(0.19);$ n = 27 $0.285^{*}(0.19);$ n = 27 $0.285^{*}(0.19);$ n = 27 $0.285^{*}(0.19);$ n = 27 $0.285^{*}(0.29);$ n = 27 $0.285^{*}(0.29)^{*}(0.882);$ n = 20 $0.000^{*}(1.000);$ n = 25 $0.296^{*}(0.290);$ n = 21 $0.296^{*}(0.290);$ n = 20 $0.029^{*}(0.882);$ n = 21 $0.000^{*}(1.020);$ n = 29 $0.296^{*}(0.892);$ n = 20 $0.029^{*}(0.882);$ n = 20 $0.000^{*}(0.076);$ n = 20 $0.029^{*}(0.882);$ n = 20 $0.029^{*}(0.882);$ n = 20 $0.000^{*}(0.076);$ n = 29 $0.29^{*}(0.290);$ n = 29 $0.29^{*}(0.290);$ n = 29 $0.29^{*}(0.290);$ n = 20 $0.232^{*}(0.288);$ n = 20 $0.107^{*}(0.573);$ n = 20 $0.000^{*}(0.000);$ n = 20 $0.000^{*}(0.020);$ n = 20 $0.000^{*}(0.020);$ n = 20 $0.000^{*}(0.890);$ n = 20 $0.140(0.90);$ n = 28 $n = 25$ $n = 26$ $n = 27$ $n = 27$ $n = 27$ $n = 27$ $n = 20$ PA $0.0120(0.620);$ n = 28 $0.020(0.929)$ $0.131(0.534);$ n = 28 $0.225(0.249);$ n = 28 $n = 26$ $n = 26$ $n = 28$ $n = 26$ $n = 28$ <th< td=""><td><math display="block"> \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc</math></td><td>Dxytocin</td><td></td><td></td><td>· · · ·</td><td>· · · ·</td><td></td><td></td><td>· · · ·</td><td>· · · ·</td><td></td></th<>	$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Dxytocin			· · · ·	· · · ·			· · · ·	· · · ·	
erotonin0.336* (0.1); n = 250.000* (1.000); n = 250.251* (0.228); n = 250.039 (0.865); n = 26-0.024 (0.902); n = 29-0.029* (0.882); n = 29-0.060* (0.756); n = 290.296 (0.19); n = 29ATP0.085* (0.679); n = 26-0.288* (0.205); n = 210.456* (0.029); n = 230.456* (0.029); n = 230.039 (0.865); n = 23-0.024 (0.902); n = 29-0.060* (0.756); n = 290.296 (0.19); n = 29CDT-0.105* (0.611); n = 260.083* (0.721); n = 210.138* (0.529); n = 230.072* (0.740); n = 230.105* (0.602); n = 23-0.449* (0.019); n = 270.027* (0.969); n = 270.027* (0.894); n = 270.014* (0.994); n = 280.019* (0.294); n = 260.027* (0.790); n = 260.027* (0.710); n = 260.028* (0.021); n = 260.028* (0.021); n = 260.028* (0.021); n = 260.028* (0.021); n = 260.012* (0.567); n = 260.114* (0.580); n = 260.015* (0.419); n = 260.046* (0.817); n = 280.012* (0.957); n = 260.114* (0.580); n = 260.015* (0.419); n = 260.006* (0.729); n = 280.012* (0.94	$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Cortisol			0.029* (0.888);	0.357* (0.087);	0.128* (0.579);	0.173* (0.39);	-0.260* (0.19);	0.285* (0.149);	-0.268* (0.21
ATP $-0.085^{*}(0.679); -0.288^{*}(0.205); 0.456^{*}(0.029); n = 230.232^{*}(0.288); 0.107^{*}(0.573); n = 30-0.240^{*}(0.201); 0.007^{*}(0.969); 0.007^{*}(0.969); 0.203^{*}(0.969); 0.107^{*}(0.969); 0.107^{*}(0.969); 0.107^{*}(0.969); 0.107^{*}(0.969); 0.107^{*}(0.969); 0.107^{*}(0.969); 0.107^{*}(0.969); 0.107^{*}(0.969); 0.105^{*}(0.969); 0.105^{*}(0.969); 0.105^{*}(0.969); 0.105^{*}(0.969); 0.105^{*}(0.969); 0.105^{*}(0.969); 0.007^{*}(0.969); 0.105^{*}(0.969); 0.007^{*}(0.969); 0.105^{*}(0.969); 0.007^{*}(0.969); 0.105^{*}(0.969); 0.007^{*}(0.969); 0.105^{*}(0.969); 0.007^{*}(0.969); 0.105^{*}(0.969); 0.007^{*}(0.969); 0.105^{*}(0.969); 0.007^{*}(0.969); 0.105^{*}(0.969); 0.007^{*}(0.969); 0.105^{*}(0.969); 0.007^{*}(0.969); 0.105^{*}(0.969); 0.007^{*}(0.969); 0.105^{*}(0.969); 0.107^{*}(0.969); 0.105^{*}(0.969); 0.007^{*}(0.969); 0.105^{*}(0.969); 0.107^{*}(0.969); 0.107^{*}(0.969); 0.107^{*}(0.969); 0.107^{*}(0.969); 0.107^{*}(0.969); 0.107^{*}(0.969); 0.0027^{*}(0.969); 0.007^{*}(0.969); 0.107^{*}(0.969); 0.107^{*}(0.969); 0.107^{*}(0.969); 0.107^{*}(0.969); 0.107^{*}(0.969); 0.107^{*}(0.969); 0.107^{*}(0.969); 0.107^{*}(0.969); 0.107^{*}(0.969); 0.107^{*}(0.969); 0.107^{*}(0.969); 0.107^{*}(0.969); 0.107^{*}(0.969); 0.108^{*}(0.901); 0.007^{*}(0.969); 0.114^{*}(0.963); 0.232^{*}(0.963); 0.007^{*}(0.701); 0.180^{*}(0.294); 0.323^{*}(0.021); n = 28n = 28n = 26n = 26n = 28n = 36n = 36n = 28NAn = 28n = 22n = 25n = 26n = 26n = 28n = 28n = 28n = 28NAn = 28n = 22n = 25n = 26n = 28n = 28n = 28n = 28CAMS-Rn = 28n = 22n = 25n = 26n = 28n = 28n = 28n = 28<$	$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	erotonin	0.336* (0.1);		11 - 20	0.251* (0.228);	0.039 (0.865);	-0.024 (0.902);	-0.029* (0.882);	-0.060* (0.756);	0.296 (0.152
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	ATP	-0.085* (0.679);	-0.288* (0.205);		11 = 25	0.232* (0.288);	0.107* (0.573);	-0.240* (0.201);	-0.007* (0.969);	-0.203* (0.32
PESS       -0.144 (0.465); n = 28       0.020 (0.929) n = 28       0.131 (0.534); n = 28       0.232 (0.254); n = 26       0.077 (0.710); n = 26       0.180 (0.294) n = 26       0.523 (0.001); n = 36       0.119 (0.53) n = 28         PA       -0.355* (0.063); n = 28       0.072* (0.750); n = 28       -0.187* (0.37); n = 22       -0.096* (0.639); n = 26       0.035* (0.865); n = 26       0.042* (0.834); n = 28       -0.046* (0.729); n = 36       0.491* (0.0 n = 36         NA       -0.030* (0.879); n = 28       0.146* (0.516); n = 22       -0.120* (0.567); n = 26       0.114* (0.580); n = 26       -0.173* (0.399); n = 26       0.159* (0.419); n = 28       -0.046 (0.817); n = 28       -0.0156* (0.4 n = 28         CAMS-R       -0.030* (0.879); n = 28       0.146* (0.704); n = 22       -0.12* (0.953); n = 25       0.224* (0.272); n = 26       -0.156* (0.426); n = 26       0.276 (0.155); n = 28       -0.225 (0.249); n = 28       -0.255 (0.249); n = 28       -0.225 (0.249); n = 28       -0.225 (0.249); n = 28       -0.225 (0.249); n = 28       -0.28       n = 28       n = 28 <td>PESS<math>-0.144 (0.465); \\ n = 28 \\ n = 25 \\ n = 26 \\ n = 28 \\ n = 28 \\ n = 28 \\ n = 28 \\ n = 22 \\ n = 25 \\ n = 25 \\ n = 26 \\ n = 28 \\ n = 22 \\ n = 25 \\ n = 25 \\ n = 26 \\ n = 28 \\ n = 22 \\ n = 25 \\ n = 25 \\ n = 26 \\ n = 26 \\ n = 26 \\ n = 26 \\ n = 28 \\ n = 22 \\ n = 25 \\ n = 25 \\ n = 26 \\ n = 28 \\</math></td> <td>CDT</td> <td>-0.105* (0.611);</td> <td>0.083* (0.721);</td> <td>0.138* (0.529);</td> <td></td> <td>11 = 23</td> <td>0.105 (0.602);</td> <td>-0.449* (0.019);</td> <td>0.027* (0.894);</td> <td>0.014 (0.949</td>	PESS $-0.144 (0.465); \\ n = 28 \\ n = 25 \\ n = 26 \\ n = 28 \\ n = 28 \\ n = 28 \\ n = 28 \\ n = 22 \\ n = 25 \\ n = 25 \\ n = 26 \\ n = 28 \\ n = 22 \\ n = 25 \\ n = 25 \\ n = 26 \\ n = 28 \\ n = 22 \\ n = 25 \\ n = 25 \\ n = 26 \\ n = 26 \\ n = 26 \\ n = 26 \\ n = 28 \\ n = 22 \\ n = 25 \\ n = 25 \\ n = 26 \\ n = 28 \\$	CDT	-0.105* (0.611);	0.083* (0.721);	0.138* (0.529);		11 = 23	0.105 (0.602);	-0.449* (0.019);	0.027* (0.894);	0.014 (0.949
PA $-0.355^{\circ}$ (0.063); 0.072 <sup>\circ</sup> (0.750); 0.187 <sup>\circ</sup> (0.37); 0.096 <sup>\circ</sup> (0.639); 0.035 <sup>\circ</sup> (0.865); 0.042 <sup>\circ</sup> (0.834); $-0.060^{\circ} (0.729);$ 0.491 <sup>*</sup> (0.0 n = 28NA $-0.030^{\circ} (0.879);$ 0.146 <sup>\circ</sup> (0.516); -0.120 <sup>\circ</sup> (0.567); 0.114 <sup>*</sup> (0.580); -0.173 <sup>*</sup> (0.399); 0.159 <sup>*</sup> (0.419); -0.046 (0.817); n = 28 $-0.156^{\circ} (0.42)^{\circ}$ n = 25 $-0.120^{\circ} (0.567);$ 0.114 <sup>*</sup> (0.580); -0.173 <sup>*</sup> (0.399); 0.159 <sup>*</sup> (0.419); -0.046 (0.817); n = 28 $-0.156^{\circ} (0.41)^{\circ}$ n = 25 $-0.156^{\circ} (0.41)^{\circ}$ n = 26 $-0.255^{\circ} (0.210)^{\circ}$ n = 28 $-0.255^{\circ} (0.249)^{\circ}$ ; n = 26 $-0.156^{\circ} (0.419)^{\circ}$ n = 28 $-0.255^{\circ} (0.249)^{\circ}$ ; n = 28 $-0.156^{\circ} (0.41)^{\circ}$ n = 28 $-0.255^{\circ} (0.249)^{\circ}$ ; n = 28 <t< td=""><td>PA       -0.355* (0.063); n = 28       0.072* (0.750); n = 28       -0.187* (0.37); n = 25       -0.096* (0.639); n = 26       0.035* (0.865); n = 26       0.042* (0.834); n = 28       -0.060* (0.729); n = 36       0.491* (0.007); n = 36         NA       -0.030* (0.879); n = 28       0.146* (0.516); n = 28       -0.120* (0.567); n = 25       0.114* (0.580); n = 26       -0.173* (0.399); n = 26       0.159* (0.419); n = 28       -0.046 (0.817); n = 28       -0.156* (0.412); n = 29         AMS-R       -0.433* (0.021); n = 28       -0.086* (0.704); n = 22       -0.012* (0.953); n = 25       0.224* (0.272); n = 26       -0.066* (0.750); n = 26       0.157* (0.426); n = 28       0.276 (0.155); n = 28       -0.225 (0.249); n = 28</td><td>PESS</td><td>-0.144 (0.465);</td><td>0.020 (0.929)</td><td>0.131 (0.534);</td><td>0.232 (0.254);</td><td></td><td>n = 27</td><td>0.180 (0.294)</td><td>0.523 (0.001);</td><td>0.119 (0.539</td></t<>	PA       -0.355* (0.063); n = 28       0.072* (0.750); n = 28       -0.187* (0.37); n = 25       -0.096* (0.639); n = 26       0.035* (0.865); n = 26       0.042* (0.834); n = 28       -0.060* (0.729); n = 36       0.491* (0.007); n = 36         NA       -0.030* (0.879); n = 28       0.146* (0.516); n = 28       -0.120* (0.567); n = 25       0.114* (0.580); n = 26       -0.173* (0.399); n = 26       0.159* (0.419); n = 28       -0.046 (0.817); n = 28       -0.156* (0.412); n = 29         AMS-R       -0.433* (0.021); n = 28       -0.086* (0.704); n = 22       -0.012* (0.953); n = 25       0.224* (0.272); n = 26       -0.066* (0.750); n = 26       0.157* (0.426); n = 28       0.276 (0.155); n = 28       -0.225 (0.249); n = 28	PESS	-0.144 (0.465);	0.020 (0.929)	0.131 (0.534);	0.232 (0.254);		n = 27	0.180 (0.294)	0.523 (0.001);	0.119 (0.539
NA $-0.030^{*}(0.879); 0.146^{*}(0.516); -0.120^{*}(0.567); 0.114^{*}(0.580); -0.173^{*}(0.399); 0.159^{*}(0.419); -0.046(0.817); -0.046(0.817); n = 28 n = 22 n = 25 n = 26 n = 26 n = 26 n = 28 $	NA $-0.030^{\circ}(0.879);$ $0.146^{\circ}(0.516);$ $-0.120^{\circ}(0.567);$ $0.114^{\circ}(0.580);$ $-0.173^{\circ}(0.399);$ $0.159^{\circ}(0.419);$ $-0.046(0.817);$ $-0.156^{\circ}(0.419);$ $n = 28$ $n = 22$ $n = 25$ $n = 26$ $n = 26$ $n = 28$						0.035* (0.865);		11 = 30	-0.060* (0.729);	0.491* (0.007
<b>AMS-R</b> $\begin{array}{c} -0.433^{*} (0.021); & -0.086^{*} (0.704); & -0.012^{*} (0.953); & 0.224^{*} (0.272); & -0.066^{*} (0.750); & 0.157^{*} (0.426); & 0.276 (0.155); & -0.225 (0.249); \\ n = 28 & n = 22 & n = 25 & n = 26 & n = 26 & n = 28 & n = 28 \\ \mbox{ht grey} - correlation coefficients (p-value): number of cases analysed, in the control group; dark grey shaded cells: correlation coefficients (p-value); number of cases analysed, in the control group; dark grey shaded cells: correlation coefficients (p-value); number of cases analysed, in the control group; dark grey shaded cells: correlation coefficients (p-value); number of cases analysed, in the control group; dark grey shaded cells: correlation coefficients (p-value); number of cases analysed, in the control group; dark grey shaded cells: correlation coefficients (p-value); number of cases analysed, in the control group; dark grey shaded cells: correlation coefficients (p-value); number of cases analysed, in the control group; dark grey shaded cells: correlation coefficients (p-value); number of cases analysed, in the control group; dark grey shaded cells: correlation coefficients (p-value); number of cases analysed, in the control group; dark grey shaded cells: correlation coefficients (p-value); number of cases analysed, in the control group; dark grey shaded cells: correlation coefficients (p-value); number of cases analysed, in the control group; dark grey shaded cells: correlation coefficients (p-value); number of cases analysed, in the control group; dark grey shaded cells: correlation at 10% significance level (with absolute relation above 0.3) are in italic bold. *Spearman rank order correlations; otherwise Pearson correlations were determined. MS-R, Cognitive and Affective Mindfulness Scale-Revised, CDT, Cognitive functioning assessed by the pock-Drawing Test, NA and PA, Affectivity assessed by the Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS), PESS, Emotional States assessed by the Perception and the cost of the cost of the cost of the cost of t$	AMS-R $-0.433^{*}(0.021); -0.086^{*}(0.704); -0.012^{*}(0.953); 0.224^{*}(0.272); -0.066^{*}(0.750); 0.157^{*}(0.426); 0.276(0.155); -0.225(0.249);$	PA	• • • •	· /·		· 00	~ ^^				
ht grey – correlation coefficients (p-value): number of cases analysed, in the control group; dark grey shaded cells: correlation coefficients (p-value); number of ses analysed, in the experimental group. Statistically significant correlations at 5% significant level are in bold and at 10% significance level (with absolute rrelation above 0.3) are in italic bold. *Spearman rank order correlations; otherwise Pearson correlations were determined. MS-R, Cognitive and Affective Mindfulness measured by the Cognitive and Affective Mindfulness Scale-Revised, CDT, Cognitive functioning assessed by the pock-Drawing Test, NA and PA, Affectivity assessed by the Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS), PESS, Emotional States assessed by the Perception	n = 20n = 22n = 25n = 26n = 26n = 28n = 28n = 28n = 28ht grey – correlation coefficients (p-value): number of cases analysed, in the control group; dark grey shaded cells: correlation coefficients (p-value); number of ses analysed, in the experimental group. Statistically significant correlations at 5% significant level are in bold and at 10% significance level (with absolute relation above 0.3) are in italic bold. *Spearman rank order correlations; otherwise Pearson correlations were determined.MS-R, Cognitive and Affective Mindfulness measured by the Cognitive and Affective Mindfulness Scale-Revised, CDT, Cognitive functioning assessed by the positive and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS), PESS, Emotional States assessed by the Perception EmotionalEmotionalStates		<b>n = 28</b> -0.030* (0.879);	n = 22 0.146* (0.516);	n = 25 -0.120* (0.567);	0.114* (0.580);	-0.173* (0.399);	0.159* (0.419);		n = 36	-0.156* (0.41
Emotional States Scale		NA AMS-R nt grey – es analys	n = 28 -0.030* (0.879); n = 28 -0.433* (0.021); n = 28 correlation coeffic sed, in the experi	<u>n = 22</u> 0.146* (0.516); n = 22 -0.086* (0.704); <u>n = 22</u> iients (p-value): ni imental group. St	$\begin{array}{r} n = 25 \\ -0.120^{*} \ (0.567); \\ n = 25 \\ -0.012^{*} \ (0.953); \\ n = 25 \\ \end{array}$	0.114* (0.580); n = 26 0.224* (0.272); n = 26 nalysed, in the co ant correlations a	-0.173* (0.399); n = 26 -0.066 * (0.750); n = 26 ontrol group; dark at 5% significant I	0.159* (0.419); n = 28 0.157* (0.426); n = 28 grey shaded cells evel are in bold	n = 28 0.276 (0.155); n = 28 s: correlation coef and at 10% sign	-0.225 (0.249); n = 28 fficients (p-value);	-0.156* (0.41 n = 29
		NA AMS-R nt grey – es analys relation al MS-R, Co	<i>n</i> = 28 -0.030* (0.879); n = 28 -0.433* (0.021); n = 28 correlation coeffic sed, in the experi bove 0.3) are in ita ognitive and Affect	<u>n = 22</u> 0.146* (0.516); n = 22 -0.086* (0.704); <u>n = 22</u> ients (p-value): n imental group. St alic bold. *Spearm tive Mindfulness n	$\begin{array}{r} n = 25 \\ \hline -0.120^{*} (0.567); \\ n = 25 \\ \hline -0.012^{*} (0.953); \\ n = 25 \\ \hline number of cases an tatistically signification rank order correst measured by the essed by the Positive statement of the provide the set of the provide the providet the provide the provid$	0.114* (0.580); n = 26 0.224* (0.272); n = 26 nalysed, in the co ant correlations a relations; otherwis Cognitive and Af	-0.173* (0.399); n = 26 -0.066 * (0.750); n = 26 ontrol group; dark at 5% significant I se Pearson correla fective Mindfulnes	0.159* (0.419); n = 28 0.157* (0.426); n = 28 grey shaded cells evel are in bold tions were determ s Scale-Revised, (PANAS), PESS,	n = 28 0.276 (0.155); n = 28 s: correlation coel and at 10% sign hined. CDT, Cognitive	-0.225 (0.249); n = 28 fficients (p-value); ificance level (wit functioning assess	-0.156* (0.41 n = 29
		NA AMS-R ht grey – es analys relation al MS-R, Co	<i>n</i> = 28 -0.030* (0.879); n = 28 -0.433* (0.021); n = 28 correlation coeffic sed, in the experi bove 0.3) are in ita ognitive and Affect	<u>n = 22</u> 0.146* (0.516); n = 22 -0.086* (0.704); <u>n = 22</u> ients (p-value): n imental group. St alic bold. *Spearm tive Mindfulness n	$\begin{array}{r} n = 25 \\ \hline -0.120^{*} (0.567); \\ n = 25 \\ \hline -0.012^{*} (0.953); \\ n = 25 \\ \hline number of cases an tatistically signification rank order correst measured by the essed by the Positive statement of the provide the set of the provide the providet the provide the provid$	0.114* (0.580); n = 26 0.224* (0.272); n = 26 nalysed, in the co ant correlations a relations; otherwis Cognitive and Af	-0.173* (0.399); n = 26 -0.066 * (0.750); n = 26 ontrol group; dark at 5% significant I se Pearson correla fective Mindfulnes	0.159* (0.419); n = 28 0.157* (0.426); n = 28 grey shaded cells evel are in bold tions were determ s Scale-Revised, (PANAS), PESS,	n = 28 0.276 (0.155); n = 28 s: correlation coel and at 10% sign hined. CDT, Cognitive	-0.225 (0.249); n = 28 fficients (p-value); ificance level (wit functioning assess	-0.156* (0.41 n = 29
		NA AMS-R es analys relation al MS-R, Co	<i>n</i> = 28 -0.030* (0.879); n = 28 -0.433* (0.021); n = 28 correlation coeffic sed, in the experi bove 0.3) are in ita ognitive and Affect	<u>n = 22</u> 0.146* (0.516); n = 22 -0.086* (0.704); <u>n = 22</u> ients (p-value): n imental group. St alic bold. *Spearm tive Mindfulness n	$\begin{array}{r} n = 25 \\ \hline -0.120^{*} (0.567); \\ n = 25 \\ \hline -0.012^{*} (0.953); \\ n = 25 \\ \hline number of cases an tatistically signification rank order correst measured by the essed by the Positive statement of the provide the set of the provide the providet the provide the provid$	0.114* (0.580); n = 26 0.224* (0.272); n = 26 nalysed, in the co ant correlations a relations; otherwis Cognitive and Af	-0.173* (0.399); n = 26 -0.066 * (0.750); n = 26 ontrol group; dark at 5% significant I se Pearson correla fective Mindfulnes	0.159* (0.419); n = 28 0.157* (0.426); n = 28 grey shaded cells evel are in bold tions were determ s Scale-Revised, (PANAS), PESS,	n = 28 0.276 (0.155); n = 28 s: correlation coel and at 10% sign hined. CDT, Cognitive	-0.225 (0.249); n = 28 fficients (p-value); ificance level (wit functioning assess	-0.156* (0.41 n = 29 number of h absolute sed by the Perception

**Figure 1** – Psychological functioning variation between pre- and post-test evaluations for both CG and EG. A) NA (no statistically significant variation found in the CG – p = 0.622 – but there is statistical evidence for differences in the EG – p=0.001); B) PESS (statistically significant variation found for the EG – p < 0.001. No evidence of statistically significant variation in CG – p=0.068); C) CAMS-R (statistically significant variation found for the EG – p=0.037 – but no evidence of statistically significant variation in the CG – p = 0.585).

CAMS-R, Cognitive and Affective Mindfulness measured by the Cognitive and Affective Mindfulness Scale-Revised, NA, Negative Affectivity assessed by the Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS), PESS, Emotional States assessed by the Perception of Emotional States Scale.

Figure 2 – Dendogram obtained for hierarchical cluster analysis by columns considering a single linkage algorithm and using the Manhattan distance on variables measured in CG and EG. CDT and PESS seem to have a closer relation (cluster C5) while another cluster appears when serotonin moderates the effect the association between clusters formed by the association of PESS NA and age (NA&age) and the association between CAMS-R with PESS PA and level of education ((PA&scholarity) & CAMS-R) (cluster C4). Cortisol changes showed to be associated to the clusters associated before (cluster C3), followed by oxytocin and ATP levels variations (clusters C2 and C1).

CAMS-R, Cognitive and Affective Mindfulness measured by the Cognitive and Affective Mindfulness Scale-Revised, CDT, Cognitive functioning assessed by the Clock-Drawing Test, NA and PA, Affectivity assessed by the Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS), PESS, Emotional States assessed by the Perception of Emotional States Scale



