

Non-replication of structural brain changes from Mindfulness-Based Stress Reduction: Two combined randomized controlled trials

Tammi RA Kral^{1,2,3,4}, Kaley Davis¹, Cole Korponay^{1,5}, Matthew J. Hirshberg¹, Rachel Hoel¹, Lawrence Y Tello¹, Robin I Goldman^{1,3}, Melissa A Rosenkranz^{1,3,4}, Antoine Lutz^{3,6}, Richard J Davidson^{*1,2,3,4}

1. Center for Healthy Minds, University of Wisconsin – Madison
2. Department of Psychology, University of Wisconsin – Madison
3. Waisman Laboratory for Brain Imaging and Behavior, University of Wisconsin – Madison
4. Department of Psychiatry, University of Wisconsin – Madison
5. Harvard Medical School, Boston
6. Lyon Neuroscience Research Center, Lyon 1 University, Lyon

* Richard J Davidson, Center for Healthy Minds, University of Wisconsin – Madison, 625 West Washington Avenue, Madison, WI, USA 53703; Phone: (608) 265-8189

Email: rjdavids@wisc.edu

ORCID IDs:

TRAK: 0000-0002-0999-1424

KD: 0000-0003-4826-2934

CK: 0000-0003-2562-9617

MJH: 0000-0001-9070-1270

RH: 0000-0001-9195-0316

LYT: 0000-0002-9051-8342

RIG: 0000-0002-4957-2486

MAR: 0000-0001-8432-9011

AL: 0000-0002-0258-3233

RJD: 0000-0002-8506-4964

This PDF file includes:

Main Text

Figures 1 to 2

Tables 1 to 2

Abstract

Studies purporting to show changes in brain structure following the popular, eight-week Mindfulness-Based Stress Reduction (MBSR) course are widely referenced despite major methodological limitations. Here, we present findings from a large, combined dataset of two, three-arm randomized controlled trials with active and waitlist (WL) control groups. Meditation-naive participants (n=218) completed structural MRI scans during two visits: baseline and post-intervention period. After baseline, participants were randomly assigned to WL (n=70), an 8-week MBSR program (n=75), or a validated, matched active control (n=73). We assessed changes in gray matter volume, gray matter density, and cortical thickness. In the largest and most rigorously controlled study to date, we failed to replicate prior findings and found no evidence that MBSR produced neuroplastic changes compared to either control group, at either the whole-brain level or in regions of interest drawn from prior MBSR studies.

Introduction

Research on mindfulness-based interventions has increased in response to a growing interest in alternative treatments for reducing stress and improving well-being. Yet, a recent meta-analysis found that the proportion of high quality publications in this domain have not improved over time, although there are a growing number of high quality studies being conducted (Goldberg *et al.*, 2018). Moreover, findings from a few small studies have permeated popular media with the notion that a few weeks of training in Mindfulness-Based Stress Reduction (MBSR) can lead to measurable changes in brain structure (Congleton, Hölzel and Lazar, 2015; Schulte, no date), despite a lack of replication or confirmatory analysis of these findings in a fully randomized trial, and reliance on a single measure of structural neuroplasticity.

MBSR is a popular, manualized mindfulness intervention that was originally developed for use in clinical settings to improve patients' ability to cope with pain (Kabat-Zinn, 1982; Kabat-Zinn, Lipworth and Burney, 1985). MBSR is efficacious for ameliorating symptoms of multiple psychopathologies (Wielgosz *et al.*, 2019) and for reducing stress (Chiesa and Serretti, 2009). Studies have begun elucidating cognitive and neural mechanisms underlying mindfulness training-related changes in affect (Desbordes *et al.*, 2012; Hölzel *et al.*, 2013; Kral *et al.*, 2018), cognition (Jha *et al.*, 2010; Chiesa, Calati and Serretti, 2011; Mrazek *et al.*, 2013; Gallant, 2016), and pain (Gard *et al.*, 2012; Zeidan and Vago, 2016), among other processes. Studies have also examined whether mindfulness meditation practice leads to changes in brain structure, as described in a meta-analysis by Fox *et al.* (2014), in light of numerous studies demonstrating changes in brain structure following behavioral training in other domains (Draganski *et al.*, 2004, 2006; Colcombe *et al.*, 2006; Ilg *et al.*, 2008). However, only three studies included in the meta-analysis assessed changes specifically following training with MBSR. The majority of included studies focused on cross-sectional research of long-term meditation practitioners from a variety of meditation traditions, who may have pre-existing differences relative to non-meditators, and idiosyncratic lifestyle factors associated with engaging in long duration meditation practice and meditation retreats. Conversely, MBSR is a standardized, manualized intervention in which participants receive similar training over an 8-week period, where pre-post design research can control for individual differences at baseline. Thus, we

focus the current investigation specifically on the effects of MBSR. Prior research has reported that participants who completed MBSR had increased gray matter density (GMD) in the hippocampus, posterior cingulate cortex (PCC), temporo-parietal junction (TPJ), cerebellum, and brainstem (Hölzel *et al.*, 2011), and increased gray matter volume (GMV) in left caudate (Farb, Segal and Anderson, 2013). While prior research on MBSR lacked measures of cortical thickness (CT), research on meditation more broadly has reported regional increases in CT, including in the insula (Fox *et al.*, 2014). More recent studies of the impact of short-term mindfulness meditation training on brain structure have consisted of pilot trials, with fewer than 15 subjects and no control group (e.g., Yang *et al.*, 2019).

However, prior studies on MBSR-related changes in brain structure had marked limitations. These included a lack of active control groups and randomization, reliance on circular analysis (Kriegeskorte *et al.*, 2009), and small sample sizes – methodological limitations that are prevalent in meditation research more broadly (Chiesa and Serretti, 2009; Davidson and Kaszniak, 2015). The current study aimed to address these limitations by integrating a waitlist and a well-matched active control group with larger sample sizes (i.e., a minimum of 70 participants per group), in a set of two, rigorous, randomized controlled trials with a pre-post designs from which we created a combined dataset. In this way, we were able to test for structural changes that were specific to mindfulness meditation training, rather than non-specific effects associated with wellbeing interventions more generally. Recent literature also stresses the need for replication (Ioannidis, 2005; Moonesinghe, Khoury and Janssens, 2007; Button *et al.*, 2013), especially for meditation research (Fox *et al.*, 2014).

Prior research used varied measures of structural neuroplasticity, including GMV, GMD and/ or CT. GMV provides a measure of the size of a region of interest (ROI) in mm³, whereas GMD indicates the concentration of gray matter within an ROI (or within each voxel). CT indicates the thickness of the cortical sheet between the white matter and pial surfaces, and thus is not available for sub-cortical regions. All three measures can be estimated with voxel-based morphometry using information about the deformation of voxels between native and group space. Surface-based analysis can also be used to calculate GMV and CT using information derived from geometric models of the cortical surface. Growth in any of these measures putatively reflects the same underlying processes, including synaptogenesis and gliogenesis

(Zatorre, Fields and Johansen-Berg, 2012). However, some prior research has found that surface-based analysis was more effective (e.g. with higher sensitivity and lower variability) for subcortical volume estimation (i.e., in error-prone regions) (Dewey *et al.*, 2010), provided the best estimates for change over time in longitudinal models (Clarkson *et al.*, 2011), and had better sensitivity to detect differences in brain volumes between clinical groups compared to a tensor-based analysis pipeline (Schmitter *et al.*, 2015). Therefore, we used a surface-based analysis pipeline for the present study, though we subsequently re-processed the data using tensor-based methods as well, for sensitivity analysis (see Supplementary Information).

Changes in brain structure in association with mindfulness meditation training would provide evidence of structural neuroplasticity and may elucidate potential mechanisms underlying benefits of mindfulness meditation. In prior work, hippocampus and insula were selected as ROIs *a priori*, due to their role in emotion control and awareness (respectively), their activation during meditative states, and prior associations with long-term meditation training and increased GMV in these regions (Hölzel *et al.*, 2011). The insula, amygdala and anterior cingulate contribute to the salience network, which is associated with emotional reactivity and subjective awareness processes that are hypothesized to change with mindfulness training (Seeley *et al.*, 2007; Lutz *et al.*, 2015). PCC and TPJ are major nodes within the default mode network, which is implicated in self-referential thought and mind-wandering (Spreng, Mar and Kim, 2008; Fox *et al.*, 2015), that have been shown to change with mindfulness training (Jain *et al.*, 2007; Mrazek *et al.*, 2013). Given the evidence for mindfulness-related changes in function and psychological processes associated with these brain regions (Brewer *et al.*, 2011; Allen *et al.*, 2012; Desbordes *et al.*, 2012; Creswell *et al.*, 2016; Fox *et al.*, 2016; Kral *et al.*, 2018; Wielgosz *et al.*, 2019), structural changes in gray matter might also be expected. Indeed, prior research provides evidence for mindfulness-related changes in brain structure in the default mode and salience networks, among other regions (Hölzel *et al.*, 2011; Farb, Segal and Anderson, 2013; Fox *et al.*, 2014).

We attempted to replicate prior findings of increased GMD following MBSR in hippocampus, PCC, TPJ, cerebellum, and brainstem, and increased GMV in caudate. In addition to the aforementioned regions, we also assessed structural changes in the amygdala and insula, as these regions are involved in

affective processing that may change with mindfulness training (Allen *et al.*, 2012; Desbordes *et al.*, 2012).

While prior research did not find associations between structural changes and amount of MBSR practice time, we tested for such associations, given the broader range of MBSR practice time in the current study relative to prior work. We hypothesized that MBSR practice time would be associated with increased GMV, GMD and CT in all ROIs except amygdala, where we expected an inverse relationship between size and practice time, given the inverse relationship between MBSR-related reductions in amygdala GMD and stress in prior research (Hölzel *et al.*, 2010). Thus, the current research sought to replicate and extend the literature on structural neuroplasticity associated with short-term mindfulness meditation practice in MBSR.


Results

Whole-brain analysis

There were no significant group differences for change in brain structure (GMV, GMD, or CT) for MBSR compared to the Health Enhancement Program (HEP) active control group, or the waitlist (WL) control group, in the whole-brain analysis. This is consistent with a prior whole-brain analysis of GMV conducted with sample one (Korponay *et al.*, 2019). There were no significant interactions between MBSR and HEP practice time and change in GMV in the whole-brain analysis. Un-thresholded statistical maps are available on NeuroVault (Gorgolewski *et al.*, 2015) at this link: <https://identifiers.org/neurovault.collection:7634>.

ROI analysis

There were no significant group differences for change in brain structure for MBSR compared to HEP or WL for any of the ROIs ($ps > 0.1$). The non-significant result for right amygdala is depicted in Figure 1a. See Supplementary Table 1 for results of statistical tests of change in GMV for all ROIs. Results are consistent regardless of the inclusion or exclusion of influential outliers. Non-significant results of sensitivity analysis using multiple imputation to account for missing data, as well as analysis of GMD from SPM12 and SPM-CAT12 are presented in Supplementary Tables 3-8.



MBSR practice time

MBSR participants practiced at home an average of 32 hours (standard deviation=20 hours, range=2–85 hours), and HEP participants practiced at home an average of 56 hours (standard deviation=33 hours, range=7–255 hours). MBSR participants attended 8.14 of 9 possible classes, on average (range = 4 to 9 classes), and HEP participants attended 8.44 of 9 possible classes, on average (range = 2 to 9 classes). Significant effects of MBSR practice time were limited to the amygdala, and relationships with the other 8 ROIs were non-significant ($p > 0.05$). MBSR practice time was associated with reduction in right amygdala volume significantly more than HEP practice ($t(128) = -3.30$, $p = 0.001$, $p^* = 0.01$, $p\eta^2 = 0.08$; Figure 1b). See Supplementary Table 2 for results of all statistical tests examining the impact of practice time on change in GMV. However, the group by practice time interaction was trend-level or non-significant in the sensitivity analyses using multiple imputation and GMD (see Supplementary Tables 4, 6, and 8).

Mindfulness

We examined self-reported mindfulness based on the FFMQ to gauge the effectiveness of the MBSR intervention. A prior study reported on the results for sample one, whereby MBSR was associated with increased mindfulness ($p < 0.05$, within-group) that marginally differed from WL ($p = 0.09$), but did not differ from HEP ($p = 0.33$) (Goldberg *et al.*, 2015). When collapsing across both studies, results were consistent with the prior report, whereby MBSR differed significantly from WL ($t(208) = -2.70$, $p = 0.01$), but not from HEP ($t(208) = -1.01$, $p = 0.31$), $p\eta^2 = 0.05$. Across both samples, mindfulness increased following MBSR ($t(70) = 3.86$, $p < 0.001$, $p\eta^2 = 0.18$) and HEP ($t(65) = 3.39$, $p = 0.001$, $p\eta^2 = 0.15$).

Discussion

The current study sought to replicate and extend the functional significance of prior work demonstrating increased GMD following mindfulness meditation training in hippocampus, posterior cingulate, cerebellum, brainstem, and temporoparietal junction (Hölzel *et al.*, 2011), and increased GMV in caudate (Farb, Segal and Anderson, 2013). We combined two datasets to yield sample sizes of 70 or more participants per group. Both datasets were collected with the same rigorous methods and three-arm randomized controlled trial design, using MBSR, a well-matched, active control (HEP), and a waitlist control. We expected to replicate prior results of increased GMD following short-term MBSR training in hippocampus, caudate, TPJ, and PCC, and reduced volume for amygdala, and we also hypothesized that these effects would be larger for participants who spent more time practicing mindfulness meditation. We failed to find any group differences in GMV, GMD, or CT in support of these hypotheses.

It is unlikely that the failure to replicate prior work was due to ineffective training. The MBSR intervention was effective with regard to expected changes in neural, psychological, and cognitive outcomes: MBSR reduced amygdala reactivity and increased amygdala-VMPFC functional connectivity to emotional stimuli in sample one (Kral *et al.*, 2018), increased PCC resting functional connectivity with dorsolateral prefrontal cortex in sample two (Kral *et al.*, 2019), and increased self-reported mindfulness (reported in Goldberg *et al.*, 2015 for sample one, in addition to the results presented here). The active control intervention, HEP, also increased self-reported mindfulness, and MBSR participants did not differ significantly from HEP on this measure. The current study lends evidence that MBSR-related

improvements in self-reported mindfulness may not be specific to mindfulness meditation practice, but rather, related to other aspects of the course that are common to similar interventions (e.g., benefits from learning well-being skills from experts in HEP; for an in-depth discussion see Rosenkranz et al.) (Rosenkranz, Dunne and Davidson, 2019). Participants in the current study were at least as engaged with the MBSR coursework as in the prior research, if not more engaged, based on the time they reported practicing meditation at home (which ranged from 2 to 85 hours with a mean of 32 hours in the current study, compared to a range of 7 to 42 hours and a mean of 23 hours in prior work) (Hölzel *et al.*, 2010).

Despite the lack of group differences in change in regional brain structure, we observed a significant interaction of group (MBSR versus HEP) and practice time on change in right amygdala GMV. The more time participants spent practicing MBSR outside of class, the larger their reduction in right amygdala volume following the intervention compared to practice with HEP, the active control intervention. On average, participants with less than 27 hours of total MBSR practice time had no change in amygdala volume, and the lower bound of the confidence interval at this point was 20 hours of total MBSR practice time (or an average of about 22 minutes per day). Therefore, practicing mindfulness meditation for less than 22 minutes per day for a few months is unlikely to lead to structural change in the amygdala. In addition, changes in the early stages of mindfulness meditation training, such as during MBSR training in previously untrained individuals, may be different than in later stages or for longer interventions. Along these lines, a recent, well-powered study assessing meditation training similar to mindfulness meditation, but with a 50% longer duration than MBSR, found significant increases in CT relative to two active control interventions in prefrontal cortex extending to anterior cingulate, and in bilateral occipital cortex extending to inferior temporal cortex (Valk *et al.*, 2017). While the current study thus provides initial evidence that MBSR-related reductions in amygdala volume may depend on the degree of engagement with practice, the effect was small and failed to survive the sensitivity analyses. Thus, it should be interpreted with caution and warrants attempts to replicate in future work.

The results of the current study failed to support the hypothesis that short-term training in mindfulness meditation is associated with significant group differences in change in regional brain structure

compared to a well-matched, active control intervention or a waitlist control group in an adequately powered, rigorous RCT design. Despite previous research suggesting that short-term mindfulness meditation training impacts the structure of the brain, results of the present study failed to replicate these group differences. While this highlights the importance of replication studies, it also raises new questions. There were important differences between the current study and prior work, including the populations from which participants were drawn and differences in the study design and methods. Prior work recruited participants who elected to participate in an MBSR course (Hölzel *et al.*, 2011; Farb, Segal and Anderson, 2013), and were thus not randomly assigned, while the current study utilized a rigorous randomized controlled trial design. The participants in prior studies may have had more “room for improvement”, since they sought out a course for stress reduction, with some samples recruited specifically based on the presence of high stress in participants the month prior to study participation (Hölzel *et al.*, 2010). In contrast, the current set of RCTs employed a relatively long list of inclusion/ exclusion criteria, including exclusion for use of psychotropic medication or psychiatric diagnosis in the past year, resulting in unusually healthy samples with, e.g., very low levels (or absence) of baseline anxiety and negative affect. While the RCT design employed here provides the strongest scientific methodology, this increased rigor likely comes at the expense of ecological validity – the simple act of choosing to enroll in MBSR may be associated with increased benefit.

It is notable that the current study also had sample sizes over 3 times that of prior work (e.g., $n=75$ MBSR participants in our final sample compared to $n=20$ or less participants per group in prior work) (Hölzel *et al.*, 2011; Farb, Segal and Anderson, 2013). Given the low sample sizes of prior work, and the larger samples and lack of replication in the current study, there is a possibility that prior results suffered from inflated effect sizes and low positive predictive value (Button *et al.*, 2013). For example, we found medium effect sizes (ranging from *Cohen's* $d = 0.39$ to $d = 0.43$) for the significant group differences between MBSR and WL in self-reported mindfulness (from pre- to post-intervention), whereas the prior research found large effect sizes (ranging from *Cohen's* $d = 0.77$ to $d = 1.48$). Moreover, the very small magnitude of standard effect size estimates for the non-significant group differences in change in regional GMV in the current study can be interpreted as “no effect” (e.g., partial $\eta^2 = 0.01$ for the difference

between MBSR and HEP for change in left hippocampus GMV). These null effects, in conjunction with our large sample size and rigorous matched comparison condition, allow us to conclude that MBSR had no effect on altering brain structure.

As more research is conducted on this topic, the importance of reporting results of replication attempts should be emphasized in light of known publication bias for positive findings (Ioannidis *et al.*, 2014; Coronado-Montoya *et al.*, 2016). Likewise, it is important for future research to examine individual differences in engagement and efficacy of MBSR, as well as the optimum length and duration of daily practice for a mindfulness meditation intervention to confer benefits. The lack of significant group differences between MBSR and control groups in the current study suggests that interventions lasting longer than the standard 8-week MBSR course might be required to confer changes in brain structure.

Materials and Methods

The present study was registered with ClinicalTrials.gov, and combined data across two clinical trials (NCT01057368 and NCT02157766), which started approximately 5 years apart. Baseline data collection (T1) for sample 1 occurred between February 2010 and May 2011, and data collection following the intervention period (T2) occurred between June 2010 and October 2011. For sample 2, baseline data (T1) collection occurred between November 2014 and March 2017, and data collection following the intervention period (T2) occurred between March 2015 and July 2017. The experimental design was comparable across both data sets (see Supplementary Figures 1 and 2 for the CONSORT diagrams from each trial). Both clinical trials ended upon completion.

Participants

Data were combined for meditation-naïve participants (MNP) from samples one (n=124, average age 48.1 ± 10.7 years, 79 female) and two (n=139, average age 44.1 ± 12.7 years, 82 female). Sample size for each data set was determined with a power analysis. We recruited healthy human participants within the Madison, WI community using flyers, online advertisements, and advertisements in local media for a study of “health and well-being” or the “benefits of health wellness classes.” Participants were included if they were adults between 18 and 65 years old with no prior training or formal practice in meditation or mind-

body techniques (e.g., Tai-Chi), or expertise in physical activity, music, or nutrition. Participants were excluded from enrollment if they had used psychotropic or nervous system altering medication, a current diagnosis of sleep disorder, a psychiatric diagnosis in the past year, any history of bipolar or schizophrenic disorders, history of brain damage or seizures, or a medical condition that would affect the participants ability to safely participate in study procedures. There were no differences in socio-economic status between MBSR and either control group based on the Hollingshead Index ($ps>0.10$) (Hollingshead, 1975).

Following baseline data collection, participants were randomized to one of three groups using a stratified block assignment procedure to ensure age- and gender-balanced groups: MBSR (N=90, average age 46.6 ± 11.8 years, 53 female), WL (N=84, average age 46.0 ± 11.7 years, 53 female) or the HEP active control intervention (N=90, average age 45.4 ± 12.5 years, 55 female), which has been validated in a separate study in which the intervention procedures are described in further detail (MacCoon *et al.*, 2012). (See Table 1 for detailed demographic information for each group.) All study staff, except the participant coordinator and project manager (and their undergraduate assistants), were blind to group assignment. Blinded group indicators were used, and only the participant coordinator had access to the key.

Six participants were excluded due to brain abnormalities, and two participants were missing structural data due to technical difficulties, resulting in 256 participants (average age 45.7 ± 12.0 years, 156 female) with baseline (T1) structural MRI data. Eighteen participants withdrew prior to T2 data collection (8 MBSR, 1 HEP, 9 WL), thirteen participants were excluded because they failed to attend a minimum of 2 classes for the assigned intervention (9 HEP, 4 MBSR), and seven participants were missing T2 structural MRI data due to technical difficulties, resulting in 75 MBSR (average age 47.3 ± 11.9 years, 43 female), 73 HEP (average age 46.0 ± 12.7 years, 43 female), and 70 WL (average age 46.8 ± 11.6 years, 46 female) participants with T2 structural MRI data.

The MBSR courses were delivered by experienced and certified MBSR instructors and consisted of practices and teachings aimed at increasing mindfulness, including yoga, meditation, and body awareness. The HEP course served as an active control, which was matched to MBSR and consisted of

Table 1. Detailed demographic information.

		Dataset 1			Dataset 2		
		MBSR (n=35)	HEP (n=36)	WL (n=35)	MBSR (n=40)	HEP (n=37)	WL (n=35)
Age	Mean	50.2	47.9	48.4	44.8	44.2	45.2
	SD	9.4	12.5	10.5	13.3	12.8	12.5
	Minimum	26	26	26	25	25	25
	Maximum	65	66	65	64	65	65
Sex	Female	23	20	23	20	23	23
	Male	12	16	12	20	14	12
Race	American Indian/ Alaska Native	1	0	0	1	1	1
	Asian	1	1	0	5	1	6
	Black/ African American	0	0	0	0	2	0
	Native Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander	0	0	0	0	0	1
	Multi-racial	1	1	1	2	1	3
	White	32	34	32	30	31	24
	Declined response	0	0	2	2	1	0
Ethnicity	Hispanic	1	1	6	3	3	1
	Not Hispanic	34	35	29	37	33	34

exercise, music therapy, and nutrition education and practices. The intervention and randomization procedures were identical to those detailed by MacCoon et al (2012). MBSR and HEP participants recorded logs of the minutes they spent each day on the respective practices at home (i.e., outside of class), which were summed to calculate a variable for total minutes of practice for each participant (except those in the WL group). Classes for both interventions (MBSR and HEP) were taught through the University of Wisconsin Health, Integrative Health department in Madison, Wisconsin.

Data collection

Participants completed a baseline data collection visit prior to randomization, and a second visit following the 8-week intervention period. Both visits took place at the Waisman Laboratory for Brain Imaging and Behavior at the University of Wisconsin – Madison. The second sample of MNP also completed a third, long-term follow-up session approximately six months after the second visit that was not included in the current analysis. At each visit, participants attended a 24-hour lab session that

included an MRI scan and the Five Facet Mindfulness Questionnaire (FFMQ) (Baer *et al.*, 2008), among other measures as part of a larger multi-session, multi-project study. We examined the FFMQ to gauge the efficacy of MBSR for improving mindfulness, given its use in the prior studies that we attempt to replicate here (Hölzel *et al.*, 2011), and despite its apparent limitations (Baer *et al.*, 2008; Davidson and Kaszniak, 2015; Goldberg *et al.*, 2015; Van Dam *et al.*, 2017). Experimenters were blind to the group assignment during data collection. UW – Madison’s Health Sciences Institutional Review Board approved the protocol, and all participants provided consent and were given monetary compensation for their participation.

Image Acquisition

Anatomical images for sample one were acquired on a GE X750-3.0 Tesla MRI scanner device with an 8-channel head coil, and consisted of a high-resolution 3D T1-weighted inversion recovery fast gradient echo image (inversion time = 450 msec, 256x256 in- plane resolution, 256 mm FOV, 124x1.0 mm axial slices). Anatomical images for sample two were acquired on the same scanner using a 32-channel head coil with the same scan sequence, except with 192x1.0 mm axial slices.

Anatomical Image Processing

Image processing was conducted in FreeSurfer using the automated longitudinal pipeline (stable release version 6.0), which included skull-stripping, registration, intensity normalization, Talairach transformation, tissue segmentation, and surface tessellation (Fischl and Dale, 2000; Reuter *et al.*, 2012). Hand edits were conducted to correct errors in the automated processing, primarily to the base, and if needed, to the subsequently generated longitudinal images. Manual edits in the base included editing the Talairach registration, *wm.mgz*, and *brainmask.mgz* volumes. Edits to the Talairach registration occurred when the initial registration was a poor fit to the subject brain. In both the base and longitudinal phases, control points were added to correct intensity normalization errors and white matter omissions. Additionally, if the white and pial surfaces did not follow white and gray matter boundaries, voxel edits were made on the *wm.mgz* and *brainmask.mgz* volumes, respectively. Images were resampled to fsaverage space using the FreeSurfer program *mrisc_preproc*, and difference maps were generated for each subject

(T2-T1) using the “paired-diff” option. The resulting difference maps were then smoothed to 8 mm full-width half maximum with `mri_surf2surf`, and used as inputs for subsequent group analysis.

FreeSurfer’s automated brain segmentation tool (Aseg) (Fischl and Dale, 2000) was used to extract measures of GMV from sub-cortical regions (see Figure 1c for depiction of the right amygdala ROI), and the Desikan-Killany atlas was used to extract GMV for the insula (Desikan *et al.*, 2006). A mask of clusters with significant change in MBSR participants was provided by Hölzel (Hölzel *et al.*, 2011), which was registered to individual subject space using the FreeSurfer command `mri_label2vol` using transformation matrices generated for each subject with the FreeSurfer command `mni152reg`. The resultant TPJ, PCC and 2 cerebellar masks (depicted in the MNI152 template space in Figure 2) were then used to extract GMV measures for each subject using the FreeSurfer program `mrisc_segstats`. We masked each of these cortical ROIs to exclude white matter based on each subject’s white matter segmentation, as generated in the FreeSurfer processing pipeline with the program `recon-all`. The significance of results does not change using the original ROIs, without additional masking.

We also completed sensitivity analysis with multiple imputation for ROI analyses, and with data processed using Statistical Parametric Mapping (SPM) software to verify that the absence of significant results and lack of replication of prior work were not due to differences in software or the specific structural measures employed (e.g., GMV versus GMD). Details for multiple imputation and SPM pipelines are available in the Supplementary




Figure 2. Masks defined from prior research. Regions of interest (ROIs) for posterior cingulate (yellow), left temporoparietal junction (dark blue), cerebellum (green), and cerebellum/ brainstem (teal) were defined based on a thresholded statistical map in which increased gray matter volume was previously reported following Mindfulness-Based Stress Reduction (Hölzel *et al.*, 2011). White matter was masked from the cortical ROIs for each subject prior to extraction of GMV. R=right; A=anterior; P=posterior; S=superior

Information and included both standard SPM12 and SPM12 Computational Anatomy Toolbox (CAT12) longitudinal pipelines, the latter being calibrated to detect smaller changes in brain structure than earlier software. Full results of sensitivity analysis are presented in Supplementary Tables 3-8.

Statistical Analysis – Voxelwise

Whole-brain analysis was performed on GMV and CT difference maps (T2-T1) using the FreeSurfer program `mri_glmfit` with a single, 3-level variable of interest to model Group (MBSR, HEP or WL) with covariates to control for age, gender, total (whole-brain) GMV, and sample. The FreeSurfer program `mri_glmfit-sim` was then used to correct for multiple comparisons with gaussian random fields and an added correction to control for comparisons across the two hemispheres. Analysis of the effect of home practice included an additional regressor with total home practice minutes and modeled a contrast for the interaction of Group x Practice.

Statistical Analysis – Regions of interest

All ROI analyses were performed using the `lm` function in R statistics software (R Core Team, 2013), and *p*-value computation used the `modelSummary` function of the `lmSupport` package (Curtin, 2015). The GMV difference (T2-T1) for each ROI was regressed (separately) on Group with covariates to control for participant age, gender, sample (i.e., one versus two), and total whole-brain GMV. Analysis of the impact of home practice time on GMV included the addition of total home practice minutes and its interaction with Group. Outliers were identified based on Cook's D using a cutoff threshold of $4/(N-P)$, where N and P correspond to the sample size and number of model parameters, respectively, and removed from analyses. The number of outliers per group ranged from two to eight for MBSR, from three to six for HEP, and from one to six for WL. We used a false discovery rate (FDR) correction to control for multiple comparisons across all 12 ROIs using the `p.adjust` function. Corrected *p*-values are indicated by *p** in the text. A summary of descriptive statistics for average GMV for all ROIs is presented in Table 2, and results of all statistical tests are presented in Supplementary Tables 1 to 8.

Table 2. Descriptive statistics.

Measure:	Left amygdala GMV (mm ³)				Right amygdala GMV (mm ³)				Left TPJ GMV (mm ³)			
Group	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Min</i>	<i>Max</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Min</i>	<i>Max</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Min</i>	<i>Max</i>
T1 MBSR	1541	191	1113	1882	1846	234	1272	2631	1916	196	1452	2438
T1 HEP	1594	215	1134	2277	1873	226	1427	2511	1914	219	1479	2572
T1 WL	1565	216	1107	2101	1839	240	1237	2578	1928	194	1375	2390
T2 MBSR	1549	202	1103	1987	1843	239	1299	2577	1910	216	1420	2384
T2 HEP	1591	222	1179	2430	1876	227	1437	2492	1899	186	1550	2319
T2 WL	1565	217	1059	2087	1847	221	1402	2439	1922	190	1430	2396
Measure:	Left hippocampus GMV (mm ³)				Right hippocampus GMV (mm ³)				Posterior cingulate GMV (mm ³)			
Group	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Min</i>	<i>Max</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Min</i>	<i>Max</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Min</i>	<i>Max</i>
T1 MBSR	4212	465	3131	5162	4294	418	3283	5225	2604	291	1993	3373
T1 HEP	4284	433	3574	5367	4340	447	3546	5720	2628	332	1984	3661
T1 WL	4233	436	3320	5431	4282	420	3261	5407	2663	305	1819	3408
T2 MBSR	4190	484	3006	5190	4270	427	3288	5172	2591	302	1860	3327
T2 HEP	4273	439	3600	5440	4338	457	3470	5717	2579	301	1985	3305
T2 WL	4218	429	3234	5614	4263	418	3255	5491	2640	302	1843	3368
Measure:	Left caudate GMV (mm ³)				Right caudate GMV (mm ³)				Cerebellum GMV (mm ³)			
Group	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Min</i>	<i>Max</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Min</i>	<i>Max</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Min</i>	<i>Max</i>
T1 MBSR	3561	483	3472	5275	3728	518	2563	5373	2225	225	1730	2704
T1 HEP	3572	479	2516	4794	3731	502	2905	5043	2220	245	1701	2966
T1 WL	3596	434	2731	4561	3741	428	2758	4897	2230	221	1676	2762
T2 MBSR	3560	490	2516	5242	3734	521	2518	5416	2233	223	1750	2747
T2 HEP	3554	490	2512	4864	3730	505	2912	5155	2231	245	1737	2950
T2 WL	3594	435	2718	4601	3758	433	2734	4886	2239	218	1666	2825
Measure:	Left insula GMV (mm ³)				Right insula GMV (mm ³)				Cerebellum/ Brainstem GMV (mm ³)			
Group	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Min</i>	<i>Max</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Min</i>	<i>Max</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Min</i>	<i>Max</i>
T1 MBSR	7074	783	5335	8542	6997	750	5191	8512	3375	348	2607	4056
T1 HEP	7189	816	5959	9221	7012	842	5656	10023	3374	374	2620	4482
T1 WL	7017	744	5509	8834	6962	854	5390	9269	3387	341	2567	4177
T2 MBSR	7103	823	5290	8856	6998	749	5140	8598	3382	341	2621	4056
T2 HEP	7199	834	5801	9348	7066	880	5795	10565	3377	373	2633	4499
T2 WL	7024	756	5515	8943	6933	847	5349	9170	3401	328	2548	4185

Mean (M), standard deviation (SD), minimum (Min), and maximum (Max) for all measures. GMV = gray matter volume; TPJ = temporoparietal junction; LTM = long-term meditators; MNP = meditation-naïve participants; MBSR = Mindfulness-Based Stress Reduction; HEP = Health Enhancement Program active control; WL = waitlist control

Data Availability: Data are available upon request to the corresponding author. Un-thresholded statistical maps are available on NeuroVault at this link: <https://identifiers.org/neurovault.collection:7634>.

Code Availability: Code for the data processing and analysis can be found at the Open Science Framework at this link: <https://osf.io/jrpnq/>

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by the National Center for Complementary and Alternative Medicine (NCCAM) P01AT004952 to RJD, grants from the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH) R01-MH43454, P50-MH084051 to RJD, grants from the Fetzer Institute and the John Templeton Foundation to RJD, core grants to the Waisman Center from the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development [P30 HD003352-449015, U54 HD090256]. TRAK was supported by the National Institute of Mental Health award number T32MH018931.

We would like to thank Michael Anderle, Ron Fisher, Lisa Angelos, Heather Hessenthaler, Trina Nelson, Amelia Cayo, Michael Kruepke, Jon Brumbaugh, Sarah Christens, Jane Sachs, Jeanne Harris, Mariah Brown, Elizabeth Nord, Gina Bednarek, Kara Chung, Pema Lhamo, David Bachhuber, Amelia Cayo, Christopher Harty, Sonam Kindy and Dan Dewitz for assistance with recruitment and/or data collection.

We would also like to thank Katherine Bonus, Devin Coogan, Bob Gillespie, Diana Grove, Lori Gustafson, Matthew Hirshberg, Peggy Kalscheur, Chad McGehee, Vincent Minichiello, Laura Pinger, Lisa Thomas Prince, Kristi Rietz, Sara Shatz, Chris Smith, Heather Sorensen, Jude Sullivan, Julie Thurlow, Michael Waupoose, Sandy Wojtal-Weber and Pam Young for teaching and/or coordinating the interventions, and John Koger, Ty Christian, David Thompson, John Ollinger, Martina Ly, Nate Vack, and Andy Schoen for technical assistance.

Author Contributions

T.R.A.K., K.D., and R.H. contributed to data collection. T.R.A.K., K.D., R.H., C.K., and L.Y.T. processed the data. T.R.A.K. analyzed the data and wrote the manuscript. C.K. and R.G. contributed to planning the analysis. M.H. conducted the multiple imputation analysis. R.G., M.A.R., and A.L. contributed to the

design of the study. R.J.D. designed and supervised the study. All authors contributed to writing the manuscript.

Competing Interests

Dr. Richard J. Davidson is the founder, president, and serves on the board of directors for the non-profit organization, Healthy Minds Innovations, Inc. No donors, either anonymous or identified, have participated in the design, conduct, or reporting of research results in this manuscript.

References

- Allen, M. *et al.* (2012) ‘Cognitive-affective neural plasticity following active-controlled mindfulness intervention’, *Journal of Neuroscience*, 32(44), pp. 15601–15610. doi: 10.1523/JNEUROSCI.2957-12.2012.
- Baer, R. A. *et al.* (2008) ‘Construct Validity of the Five Facet Mindfulness Questionnaire in Meditating and Nonmeditating Samples’, *Assessment*, 15(3), pp. 329–342. doi: 10.1177/1073191107313003.
- Brewer, J. A. *et al.* (2011) ‘Meditation experience is associated with differences in default mode network activity and connectivity’, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 108(50), pp. 20254–20259. doi: 10.1073/pnas.1112029108.
- Button, K. S. *et al.* (2013) ‘Power failure: why small sample size undermines the reliability of neuroscience’, *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, 14(5), pp. 365–376. doi: 10.1038/nrn3475.
- Chiesa, A., Calati, R. and Serretti, A. (2011) ‘Does mindfulness training improve cognitive abilities? A systematic review of neuropsychological findings’, *Clinical Psychology Review*, 31(3), pp. 449–464. doi: 10.1016/j.cpr.2010.11.003.
- Chiesa, A. and Serretti, A. (2009) ‘Mindfulness-Based Stress Reduction for Stress Management in Healthy People: A Review and Meta-Analysis’, *The Journal of Alternative and Complementary Medicine*, 15(5), pp. 593–600. doi: 10.1089/acm.2008.0495.
- Clarkson, M. J. *et al.* (2011) ‘A comparison of voxel and surface based cortical thickness estimation methods’, *NeuroImage*, 57(3), pp. 856–865. doi: 10.1016/j.neuroimage.2011.05.053.
- Colcombe, S. J. *et al.* (2006) ‘Aerobic Exercise Training Increases Brain Volume in Aging Humans’, *The Journals of Gerontology: Series A*, 61(11), pp. 1166–1170. doi: 10.1093/gerona/61.11.1166.
- Congleton, C., Hölzel, B. K. and Lazar, S. W. (2015) ‘Mindfulness Can Literally Change Your Brain’, *Harvard Business Review*, 8 January. Available at: <https://hbr.org/2015/01/mindfulness-can-literally-change-your-brain> (Accessed: 11 April 2021).
- Coronado-Montoya, S. *et al.* (2016) ‘Reporting of Positive Results in Randomized Controlled Trials of Mindfulness-Based Mental Health Interventions’, *PLOS ONE*, 11(4), p. e0153220. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0153220.

Creswell, J. D. *et al.* (2016) 'Alterations in Resting-State Functional Connectivity Link Mindfulness Meditation With Reduced Interleukin-6: A Randomized Controlled Trial', *Biological Psychiatry*, 80(1), pp. 53–61. doi: 10.1016/j.biopsych.2016.01.008.

Curtin, J. (2015) *lmSupport: Support for linear models*.

Davidson, R. J. and Kaszniak, A. W. (2015) 'Conceptual and methodological issues in research on mindfulness and meditation', *American Psychologist*, 70(7), pp. 581–592. doi: 10.1037/a0039512.

Desbordes, G. *et al.* (2012) 'Effects of mindful-attention and compassion meditation training on amygdala response to emotional stimuli in an ordinary, non-meditative state', *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, 6. doi: 10.3389/fnhum.2012.00292.

Desikan, R. S. *et al.* (2006) 'An automated labeling system for subdividing the human cerebral cortex on MRI scans into gyral based regions of interest', *NeuroImage*, 31(3), pp. 968–980. doi: 10.1016/j.neuroimage.2006.01.021.

Dewey, J. *et al.* (2010) 'Reliability and validity of MRI-based automated volumetry software relative to auto-assisted manual measurement of subcortical structures in HIV-infected patients from a multisite study', *NeuroImage*, 51(4), pp. 1334–1344. doi: 10.1016/j.neuroimage.2010.03.033.

Draganski, B. *et al.* (2004) 'Neuroplasticity: Changes in grey matter induced by training', *Nature*, 427(6972), pp. 311–312. doi: 10.1038/427311a.

Draganski, B. *et al.* (2006) 'Temporal and Spatial Dynamics of Brain Structure Changes during Extensive Learning', *Journal of Neuroscience*, 26(23), pp. 6314–6317. doi: 10.1523/JNEUROSCI.4628-05.2006.

Farb, N. A. S., Segal, Z. V. and Anderson, A. K. (2013) 'Mindfulness meditation training alters cortical representations of interoceptive attention', *Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience*, 8(1), pp. 15–26. doi: 10.1093/scan/nss066.

Fischl, B. and Dale, A. M. (2000) 'Measuring the thickness of the human cerebral cortex from magnetic resonance images', *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 97(20), pp. 11050–11055. doi: 10.1073/pnas.200033797.

Fox, K. C. R. *et al.* (2014) 'Is meditation associated with altered brain structure? A systematic review and meta-analysis of morphometric neuroimaging in meditation practitioners', *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*, 43, pp. 48–73. doi: 10.1016/j.neubiorev.2014.03.016.

Fox, K. C. R. *et al.* (2015) 'The wandering brain: Meta-analysis of functional neuroimaging studies of mind-wandering and related spontaneous thought processes', *NeuroImage*, 111, pp. 611–621. doi: 10.1016/j.neuroimage.2015.02.039.

Fox, K. C. R. *et al.* (2016) 'Functional neuroanatomy of meditation: A review and meta-analysis of 78 functional neuroimaging investigations', *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*, 65, pp. 208–228. doi: 10.1016/j.neubiorev.2016.03.021.

Gallant, S. N. (2016) 'Mindfulness meditation practice and executive functioning: Breaking down the benefit', *Consciousness and Cognition*, 40, pp. 116–130. doi: 10.1016/j.concog.2016.01.005.

Gard, T. *et al.* (2012) 'Pain Attenuation through Mindfulness is Associated with Decreased Cognitive Control and Increased Sensory Processing in the Brain', *Cerebral Cortex*, 22(11), pp. 2692–2702. doi: 10.1093/cercor/bhr352.

Goldberg, S. B. *et al.* (2015) 'Does the five facet mindfulness questionnaire measure what we think it does? Construct validity evidence from an active controlled randomized clinical trial', *Psychological Assessment*. doi: 10.1037/pas0000233.

Goldberg, S. B. *et al.* (2018) 'Mindfulness-based interventions for psychiatric disorders: a systematic review and meta-analysis', *Clinical Psychology Review*, 59, pp. 52–60. doi: 10.1016/j.cpr.2017.10.011.

Gorgolewski, K. J. *et al.* (2015) 'NeuroVault.org: a web-based repository for collecting and sharing unthresholded statistical maps of the human brain', *Frontiers in Neuroinformatics*, 9. doi: 10.3389/fninf.2015.00008.

Hollingshead, A. (1975) 'Four Factor Index of Social Status'. New Haven, CT: Yale University Department of Psychology.

Hölzel, B. K. *et al.* (2010) 'Stress reduction correlates with structural changes in the amygdala', *Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience*, 5(1), pp. 11–17. doi: 10.1093/scan/nsp034.

Hölzel, B. K. *et al.* (2011) 'Mindfulness practice leads to increases in regional brain gray matter density', *Psychiatry Research: Neuroimaging*, 191(1), pp. 36–43. doi: 10.1016/j.pscychresns.2010.08.006.

Hölzel, B. K. *et al.* (2013) 'Neural mechanisms of symptom improvements in generalized anxiety disorder following mindfulness training', *NeuroImage: Clinical*, 2, pp. 448–458. doi: 10.1016/j.nicl.2013.03.011.

Ilg, R. *et al.* (2008) 'Gray Matter Increase Induced by Practice Correlates with Task-Specific Activation: A Combined Functional and Morphometric Magnetic Resonance Imaging Study', *Journal of Neuroscience*, 28(16), pp. 4210–4215. doi: 10.1523/JNEUROSCI.5722-07.2008.

Ioannidis, J. P. A. (2005) 'Why Most Published Research Findings Are False', *PLOS Medicine*, 2(8), p. e124. doi: 10.1371/journal.pmed.0020124.

Ioannidis, J. P. A. *et al.* (2014) 'Publication and other reporting biases in cognitive sciences: detection, prevalence, and prevention', *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 18(5), pp. 235–241. doi: 10.1016/j.tics.2014.02.010.

Jain, S. *et al.* (2007) 'A randomized controlled trial of mindfulness meditation versus relaxation training: Effects on distress, positive states of mind, rumination, and distraction', *Annals of Behavioral Medicine*, 33(1), pp. 11–21. doi: 10.1207/s15324796abm3301_2.

Jha, A. P. *et al.* (2010) 'Examining the protective effects of mindfulness training on working memory capacity and affective experience', *Emotion (Washington, D.C.)*, 10(1), pp. 54–64. doi: 10.1037/a0018438.

Kabat-Zinn, J. (1982) 'An outpatient program in behavioral medicine for chronic pain patients based on the practice of mindfulness meditation: Theoretical considerations and preliminary results', *General Hospital Psychiatry*, 4(1), pp. 33–47. doi: 10.1016/0163-8343(82)90026-3.

Kabat-Zinn, J., Lipworth, L. and Burney, R. (1985) 'The clinical use of mindfulness meditation for the self-regulation of chronic pain', *Journal of Behavioral Medicine*, 8(2), pp. 163–190.

Korponay, C. *et al.* (2019) 'The Effect of Mindfulness Meditation on Impulsivity and its Neurobiological Correlates in Healthy Adults', *Scientific Reports*, 9(1), pp. 1–17. doi: 10.1038/s41598-019-47662-y.

Kral, T. R. A. *et al.* (2018) 'Impact of short- and long-term mindfulness meditation training on amygdala reactivity to emotional stimuli.', *NeuroImage*.

- Kral, T. R. A. *et al.* (2019) 'Mindfulness-Based Stress Reduction-related changes in posterior cingulate resting brain connectivity', *Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience*. doi: 10.1093/scan/nsz050.
- Kriegeskorte, N. *et al.* (2009) 'Circular analysis in systems neuroscience – the dangers of double dipping', *Nature neuroscience*, 12(5), pp. 535–540. doi: 10.1038/nn.2303.
- Lutz, A. *et al.* (2015) 'Investigating the phenomenological matrix of mindfulness-related practices from a neurocognitive perspective', *American Psychologist*, 70(7), pp. 632–658. doi: 10.1037/a0039585.
- MacCoon, D. G. *et al.* (2012) 'The validation of an active control intervention for Mindfulness Based Stress Reduction (MBSR)', *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 50(1), pp. 3–12. doi: 10.1016/j.brat.2011.10.011.
- Moonesinghe, R., Khoury, M. J. and Janssens, A. C. J. W. (2007) 'Most Published Research Findings Are False—But a Little Replication Goes a Long Way', *PLoS Medicine*, 4(2). doi: 10.1371/journal.pmed.0040028.
- Mrazek, M. D. *et al.* (2013) 'Mindfulness Training Improves Working Memory Capacity and GRE Performance While Reducing Mind Wandering', *Psychological Science*, 24(5), pp. 776–781. doi: 10.1177/0956797612459659.
- R Core Team (2013) *R: A language and environment for statistical computing*. Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing. Available at: <http://www.R-project.org/>.
- Reuter, M. *et al.* (2012) 'Within-subject template estimation for unbiased longitudinal image analysis', *NeuroImage*, 61(4), pp. 1402–1418. doi: 10.1016/j.neuroimage.2012.02.084.
- Rosenkranz, M. A., Dunne, J. D. and Davidson, R. J. (2019) 'The next generation of mindfulness-based intervention research: what have we learned and where are we headed?', *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 28, pp. 179–183. doi: 10.1016/j.copsyc.2018.12.022.
- Schmitter, D. *et al.* (2015) 'An evaluation of volume-based morphometry for prediction of mild cognitive impairment and Alzheimer's disease', *NeuroImage: Clinical*, 7, pp. 7–17. doi: 10.1016/j.nicl.2014.11.001.
- Schulte, B. (no date) 'Harvard neuroscientist: Meditation not only reduces stress, here's how it changes your brain', *Washington Post*. Available at: <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/inspired-life/wp/2015/05/26/harvard-neuroscientist-meditation-not-only-reduces-stress-it-literally-changes-your-brain/> (Accessed: 11 April 2021).
- Seeley, W. W. *et al.* (2007) 'Dissociable Intrinsic Connectivity Networks for Salience Processing and Executive Control', *Journal of Neuroscience*, 27(9), pp. 2349–2356. doi: 10.1523/JNEUROSCI.5587-06.2007.
- Spreng, R. N., Mar, R. A. and Kim, A. S. N. (2008) 'The Common Neural Basis of Autobiographical Memory, Propection, Navigation, Theory of Mind, and the Default Mode: A Quantitative Meta-analysis', *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 21(3), pp. 489–510. doi: 10.1162/jocn.2008.21029.
- Valk, S. L. *et al.* (2017) 'Structural plasticity of the social brain: Differential change after socio-affective and cognitive mental training', *Science Advances*, 3(10), p. e1700489. doi: 10.1126/sciadv.1700489.
- Van Dam, N. T. *et al.* (2017) 'Mind the hype: a critical evaluation and prescriptive agenda for research on mindfulness and meditation', *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, p. 1745691617709589. doi: 10.1177/1745691617709589.

Wielgosz, J. *et al.* (2019) ‘Mindfulness Meditation and Psychopathology’, *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology*, 15(1), p. null. doi: 10.1146/annurev-clinpsy-021815-093423.

Yang, C.-C. *et al.* (2019) ‘Alterations in Brain Structure and Amplitude of Low-frequency after 8 weeks of Mindfulness Meditation Training in Meditation-Naïve Subjects’, *Scientific Reports*, 9(1), pp. 1–10. doi: 10.1038/s41598-019-47470-4.

Zatorre, R. J., Fields, R. D. and Johansen-Berg, H. (2012) ‘Plasticity in gray and white: neuroimaging changes in brain structure during learning’, *Nature Neuroscience*, 15(4), pp. 528–536. doi: 10.1038/nn.3045.

Zeidan, F. and Vago, D. R. (2016) ‘Mindfulness meditation–based pain relief: a mechanistic account’, *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 1373(1), pp. 114–127. doi: 10.1111/nyas.13153.