How Mindfulness Meditation Training Reshapes Somatomotor Edge-Centric Connectivity: Insights for Healthy and Depressed Individuals

Yuwen He[a,b,c], Seng Hang Lei[d], Weng Si Che[e], Matthew D. Sacchet[f], Amy Jing-Wen Yin[a,g,h], Wenyue Gao[a], Anqi Gu[i,j], Natalia Chan[a], Xinyun Xiao[a], Jiaze Li[a], Jieting Chen[k], Mek Wong[d,h], Elvo Kuai Long Sou[d,h], Yizhong Shen[l], Jingju Quan[l], Weng Ieong Tou[m], Lin Ian Lio[m], Chih Chiang Chou[m], Peng Zhang[c], Bin Liu[n], Zhen Yuan[a,b]*

[a] Centre for Cognitive and Brain Sciences, University of Macau, Macau

[b] Faculty of Health Sciences, University of Macau, Macau

[c] State Key Laboratory of Brain and Cognitive Science, Institute of Biophysics, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, China

[d] Student Counselling Section, University of Macau, Macau

[e] Tranquil Mindfulness Centre, Macau

[f] Department of Psychiatry, Massachusetts General Hospital, Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA, USA

[g] Department of Psychiatry, Affiliated Hospital of Guangdong Medical University, Zhanjiang, China

[h] Department of Psychology, Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Macau, Macau

[i] Centre for Data Science, Institute of Collaborative Innovation, University of Macau, Macau

[j] Department of Computer and Information Science, Faculty of Science and Technology, University of Macau, Macau

[k] Department of Radiology, State Key Laboratory of Oncology in South China, Guangdong Provincial Clinical Research Center for Cancer, Sun Yat-Sen University, Guangzhou, Guangdong Province, China

[l] Zhuhai Third People's Hospital, Zhuhai, China

[m] Macau Psychiatric Association, Macau

[n] Emergency Department, Zhujiang Hospital, Southern Medical University, Guangzhou, China

***Corresponding author:** Prof. Zhen Yuan; Email: zhenyuan@um.edu.mo

Abstract

Somatic awareness is a fundamental practice for novice mindfulness practitioners. It has been proposed that mindfulness meditation training enhances brain function through somatic awareness in both non-clinical and clinical populations. However, the neural signatures underlying this mechanism remain poorly understood. In our study, we conducted single-blind mindfulness interventions in both healthy and depressed populations and examined whether somatomotor network (SMN)-related edge-centric functional connectivity (eFC) is modulated by mindfulness. Our findings revealed population-common eFC changes involving the SMN and attentional networks. Additionally, we identified population-specific eFC profiles engaging SMN-subcortical networks in the healthy population and SMN-default mode network interactions in the depressed population. Furthermore, support vector regression analysis demonstrated that these altered eFCs significantly predicted improvements in clinical measures after meditation training, including anxiety and insomnia, in both groups. In summary, our results highlight both shared and distinct neural signatures underlying mindfulness-related mental health improvements via somatic awareness.

Key words: Mindfulness meditation training; Edge-centric functional connectivity; Somatic awareness; Major depressive disorder; Functioning mechanism.

MAIN TEXT

Introduction

The effectiveness of mindfulness in improving both mental and physical health across clinical and non-clinical populations has been well documented [1, 2, 3]. As this evidence base has grown, researchers have increasingly turned their attention to an equally important question: How do mindfulness-based interventions (MBIs) yield such diverse and far-reaching benefits [4, 5]? Neuroimaging studies have proposed that several large-scale functional networks including the default mode network (DMN), salience network (SN), and frontoparietal network (FPN) are the key neural substrates underlying mindfulness [6, 7]. In addition, emerging evidence highlights the involvement of fronto-limbic circuits[8], along with the insula's role [9] and the cingulate cortex [10]. While these findings underscore the importance of higher-order associative and limbic regions, the potential contributions of somatosensory cortices to mindfulness remain underexplored [11]. More importantly, this gap is particularly striking given that somatic awareness practices, such as body scans and breath-focused attention, are foundational to many mindfulness training programs, particularly for beginners [12, 13]. These practices cultivate present-moment awareness of bodily sensations and serve as entry points for developing the attentional focus, self-awareness, emotion regulation, and other key capacities linked to the therapeutic effects of mindfulness meditation [5]. Therefore, somatosensory processing might play a crucial mediating role in the early stages and effectiveness of mindfulness meditation. However, the specific neural mechanism by which somatosensory regions contribute to mindfulness remains poorly understood. The present study aims to address this gap by examining the role of somatomotor network (SMN), including somatosensory cortices, in MBIs.

SMN consists of the postcentral regions (somatosensory regions), superior temporal regions, premotor and paracentral areas, as well as parts of the insula and superior parietal lobule [14]. These regions maintain extensive connections with both frontal and subcortical brain structures [15] positioning them as potential key mediators in mindfulness-related processes. For example, mindfulness practices have been shown to enhance somatosensory attention [11, 16] and improve perceptual decision-making [17]. Additional magnetoencephalography studies indicate that mindfulness practice enhances local alpha modulation [18], with somatosensory regions playing a central role in these neural changes. Meanwhile, advanced meditation has been related to altered brain network activity and connectivity of somatomotor networks including during advanced concentrative absorption meditation which includes experiences of complete cessation of bodily awareness [19, 20]. Further, [11] emphasized that mindfulness practice often begins with focused attention on bodily sensations, highlighting the importance of somatic awareness. To investigate how mindfulness meditation training (MMT) modulates connectivity between somatosensory regions and other brain networks, SMN-related edge-centric functional connectivity (eFC) were constructed in this study to uncover the neural substrates involved in the functioning mechanisms of mindfulness.

The eFC is a recently developed neuroimaging method that captures intricate neural encoding and processing patterns by examining connectivity between pairs of edges (i.e., connections between brain nodes) [21]. This approach reveals rich information about neural communication and has been shown to reliably involve sensorimotor and attentional networks [21]. Recent work also illustrated eFC's utility in studying cognitive functions [22], neurological disorders [23, 24], and even its heritability in relation to clinical symptoms [25]. Consequently, eFC is an ideal tool for exploring how MMT modulates

SMN-related functional connectivity, offering deeper insights into the neural signatures underlying how MMT functions via somatic awareness.

Meanwhile, MBIs have demonstrated benefits for both clinical and non-clinical populations, though their underlying neural mechanisms might vary depending on the targeted symptoms and cognitive domains. In the healthy population, mindfulness training has been associated with reduced stress, improved sleep quality, and enhanced emotion regulation [26, 27, 28]. Among clinical groups, such as individuals with major depressive disorder (MDD), mindfulness practices have been shown to alleviate symptoms and improve cognitive function [29, 30]. While MBIs share fundamental principles across populations, emerging evidence suggests that their neural effects may differ based on the specific cognitive or affective processes being addressed. For example, distinct brain circuits might support different aspects of MMT target, such as emotion regulation versus attentional control [7]. This implies that mindfulness meditation can engage varying neural pathways when applied to conditions like anxiety compared to insomnia. There were extensive neuroimaging studies further highlighting these differences. In MDD patients, MBIs primarily modulate activity in the prefrontal cortex, basal ganglia, cingulate, and parietal cortex [31], whereas in healthy individuals, changes are more prominently observed in the cingulate cortex [10]. These findings suggest that while some eFC patterns might be common across populations, others are more specific to clinical or non-clinical groups. Given the central role of somatic awareness in mindfulness meditation, further study should be performed to clarify how these neural mechanisms, underlying somatic awareness in mindfulness meditation, function across different contexts.

In this study, we hypothesized that MMT would modulate SMN-related eFC networks. The resulting changes in SMN-related eFCs can serve as neural signatures

underlying how mindfulness achieves its therapeutic effects through somatic awareness in both healthy and MDD individuals. Accordingly, two MMT programs were conducted in healthy and MDD populations separately to examine our hypotheses. Specifically, it is expected from the present study that: 1) Mindfulness training regulates SMN-related eFCs, reflecting on the functioning mechanism of mindfulness meditation via somatic awareness, 2) both population-common and population-specific eFC profiles are modulated by mindfulness meditation, explaining its common and differential functioning effects across groups, and 3) these SMN-related eFCs can predict improvements in mental health outcomes, such as reductions in anxiety and insomnia, in the healthy and MDD populations. By investigating these dynamics, we aim to elucidate how MMT reshapes brain connectivity to improve mental health, offering insights into its neural mechanisms in both healthy and clinical populations.

Results

The eFCs modulated by mindfulness meditation training in the healthy population

Thirty-four healthy participants were assigned to the MMT group (MD), while twenty-one demographically matched healthy participants were assigned to the non-treatment group (NC) (Figure 1. A). Participants in the MD group underwent a 4-week MMT program specifically developed for college students, while participants in the NC group received no treatment during the same period. Repeated measures ANOVAs were performed to examine the group (MD & NC) × time (pre- & post-intervention) interaction effects on SMN-related eFCs. As shown in Figure 2. A & D, widespread eFCs were modulated by MMT in the healthy population ($p < 0.001$ or $p < 0.01$). Most of these SMN-related eFCs, showing group × time interaction, engaged

brain regions in the inferior frontal gyrus (IFG), cuneus, medial, superior frontal gyrus (SFG), and posterior temporal cortex (Figure 2. B & E, Table S4). Figure 2. C & F show the network-related eFCs modulated by MMT corresponding to two threshold sets ($p < 0.001$ or $p < 0.01$; Tables S5 & S6). We further summarized the eFCs pattern modulated by MMT into eight network categories, including SMN-subcortical network (Sub), SMN-visual network (Vis), SMN-SMN, SMN-ventral attention network (VAN), SMN-dorsal attention network (DAN), SMN-limbic network (Lim), SMN-frontoparietal network (FPN), and SMN-default mode network (DMN). After the permutation test in both threshold sets, it was evident that MMT mainly modulated eFCs in SMN-DAN, SMN-VAN, SMN-Sub and SMN-Vis related categories. Of note, in the threshold set ($p < 0.001$), the SMN-VAN-SMN-DAN had the largest number of eFCs modulated by mindfulness meditation training, indicating that MMT in the healthy population may significantly influence the interaction between DAN and VAN via the regulation of SMN. Meanwhile, in another threshold set ($p < 0.01$), the eFCs belonging to SMN-Sub-SMN-DAN and SMN-Sub-SMN-Vis had the largest number of significant eFCs, indicating MMT also significantly modulated the interaction among SMN, DAN, subcortical, and visual networks, which may relate to top-down regulation of the perception.

The eFCs modulated by mindfulness meditation training in the MDD Population

Nineteen remitted patients with MDD were assigned to the MMT group (MD), while sixteen demographically matched remitted patients with MDD were assigned to the waitlist group (WL) (Figure 1. B). Patients with MDD in the MD group underwent a standard 8-week mindfulness-based cognitive therapy (MBCT) tailored for patients

with MDD, in addition to their usual medicine treatment, while patients with MDD in the WL group received no further treatment, in addition to their usual medicine treatment during the same period. Repeated measures ANOVA were performed to examine the group × time interaction effects on SMN-related eFCs. As shown in Figure 3. A & D, diverse eFCs were modulated by MMT in patients with MDD ($p < 0.001$ or $p < 0.01$). Most of these SMN-related eFCs, showing group × time interaction, engaged brain regions in the bilateral middle frontal gyrus (MFG), interior parietal lobule, temporoparietal junction, IFG, cuneus, right posterior cingulate cortex (PCC), and anterior cingulate cortex (ACC), right precuneus, and medial frontal cortex (mPFC) (Figure 3. B & E; Table S4). Figure 3. C & F show the network-related eFCs modulated by MMT corresponding to two threshold sets ($p < 0.001$ or $p < 0.01$; Tables S9 & S10). After the permutation test at the network category level in both threshold sets, it was observed that MMT mainly modulated eFCs in SMN-DMN, SMN-FPN, SMN-VAN and SMN-DAN categories. Of note, the eFCs in the SMN-DMN-SMN-Sub, SMN-DMN-SMN-Vis, SMN-DMN-SMN-VAN, SMN-DMN-SMN-FPN, and SMN-DMN-SMN-DMN categories were reliably modulated by MMT in both threshold sets ($p < 0.001$ or $p < 0.01$), indicating MMT might significantly help to enhance cognition and emotional regulation in patients with MDD via SMN-DMN-related eFCs. Meanwhile, the eFCs in the SMN-FPN-SMN-VAN, SMN-Lim-SMN-VAN also showed reliable group × time interaction effects in both threshold sets.

The prediction results of clinical outcomes with eFCs in the healthy population

The clinical targets of MMT for healthy participants included reduction of anxiety and insomnia severity. It was observed that MMT significantly reduced anxiety and insomnia severity in the MD group (Figure S1). As shown in Figure 4, the support vector regression prediction model revealed that eFCs (in the set of $p < 0.001$) can significantly predict the anxiety level ($r=0.23$, $p = 0.017$) and the insomnia severity in the healthy population ($r=0.28$, $p = 0.004$), indicating the eFCs modulated by MMT may be involved in the improvement of anxiety and insomnia in the healthy population. The other set of eFCs ($p < 0.01$) cannot significantly predict any clinical measurements.

The edges of eFCs in SMN-VAN, SMN-SMN, and SMN-DMN showed evident contributions in predicting anxiety (Figure 4. B, bootstrapping $p < 0.005$; Table S7), while the edges of eFCs in the SMN-Vis, SMN-VAN showed evident contributions in predicting insomnia (Figure 4. D, Bootstrapping $p < 0.005$; Table S8).

The prediction results of clinical outcomes with eFCs in the MDD Population

The clinical targets of MMT for depressed participants included reduction of depressive symptoms and insomnia severity. However, we did not observe the reduction of depressive symptoms in the MD group after MMT (Figure S2. A), while the reduction of insomnia severity in the MD group was observed (Figure S2. B). As shown in Figure 5, the support vector regression prediction model revealed that eFCs (in the set of $p < 0.01$) can significantly predict the insomnia severity in patients with MDD (Figure 5. A, $r = 0.36$, $p = 0.003$). The edges of eFCs in widespread categories, including SMN-DAN, SMN-VAN, SMN-Vis, and SMN-DMN, contribute significantly to predicting insomnia (Figure 5. B, Bootstrapping $p < 0.005$; Table

S11), indicating the eFCs modulated by MMT may be involved in the improvement of insomnia in patients with MDD.

Discussion

Our study identified both shared and population-specific profiles of SMN-related eFCs in the healthy and MDD populations. These findings provide novel insights into the neural signatures underlying the functional mechanisms of mindfulness—particularly those involving somatic awareness—across different populations. Furthermore, the population-specific eFC patterns highlight differential neural engagements that may relate to distinct clinical targets across populations. Further analyses revealed that these eFCs significantly predicted anxiety and insomnia severity in the healthy population, while in the MDD population, they were predictive of insomnia severity. These results suggest that the eFCs modulated by MMT may play a critical role in the clinical improvements observed in both populations.

We found that MMT primarily modulated eFCs in the SMN-DAN, SMN-VAN, and SMN-Sub categories. A foundational review by [11] first proposed that somatic awareness in mindfulness practices, such as the Koru Mindfulness curriculum and Mindfulness-Based Cognitive Therapy (MBCT), facilitates the filtering of sensory inputs to the primary sensory cortex and helps organize the flow of sensory information in the brain, thereby enhancing attentional regulation. Extending this hypothesis, our findings reveal specific functional connectivity patterns modulated by mindfulness meditation that may serve as neural signatures of its mechanisms in improving cognitive and affective functions through somatic awareness. The dorsal

attention network (DAN) plays a central role in attentional control and executive functioning [32], while the ventral attention network (VAN) is involved in salience detection and attentional reorientation [33]. Our observation that mindfulness meditation robustly modulated eFCs in SMN-DAN and SMN-VAN categories in the healthy population underscores complex interactions among the SMN, DAN, and VAN during mindfulness practice. These interactions may underlie the enhanced attentional control associated with somatic awareness, providing further neural evidence in support of Kerr et al.'s (2013) hypothesis. The subcortical network (Sub), as defined in our study, includes the amygdala, hippocampus, basal ganglia, and thalamus. We found numerous SMN-Sub eFCs to be modulated by MMT in the healthy population, suggesting that these connections may underlie the influence of mindfulness on automatic behavioral patterns, basic perception, and salience processing. Although prior studies have reported changes in functional connectivity involving subcortical regions—such as the amygdala, putamen, and thalamus [34, 35, 36]—few have specifically examined the connectivity between the SMN and subcortical networks in the context of mindfulness meditation. Moreover, the functional implications of these subcortical changes remain underexplored. Future research should further investigate the clinical and cognitive implications of mindfulness-induced modulation of SMN-Sub eFCs.

Similar to the findings in the healthy population, MBCT modulated eFCs within the SMN-DAN and SMN-VAN categories in the MDD population. These modulations may represent neural signatures underlying how MBCT enhances attentional control through somatic awareness in individuals with MDD. Notably, MBCT also uniquely modulated eFCs in the SMN-DMN category. These changes may underlie

improvements in self-related processes among patients with MDD and provide insight into the broader mechanisms by which mindfulness enhances other cognitive functions through the regulation of self-related processing. The DMN plays a central role in self-referential thought, particularly involving regions such as the precuneus and posterior cingulate cortex [37]. The MBCT-induced modulation of SMN-DMN eFCs suggests significant interactions between these networks during mindfulness practice. Kerr et al. (2013) proposed that somatic attention might compete with internally focused rumination—a hallmark of MDD. In support of this hypothesis, our findings provide neural evidence that MBCT may help reduce maladaptive self-referential processing via enhanced somatic awareness. Moreover, the widespread modulation of SMN-DMN eFCs may reflect not only the influence of MBCT on various cognitive functions through SMN-DMN interactions, but also the reciprocal influence of these functions on the SMN-DMN circuitry. However, because eFCs do not indicate directional connectivity, we cannot determine the directionality of these effects. While many studies have documented DMN alterations associated with mindfulness meditation [6, 38, 39], relatively few have examined DMN changes following mindfulness-based interventions specifically in patients with MDD. Notably, [40] reported DMN modulation in MDD patients after mindfulness training, and a pilot study by [41] found that reducing DMN connectivity via mindfulness-based fMRI neurofeedback increased state mindfulness in adolescents with a history of affective disorders. Despite these findings, neuroimaging evidence remains limited. Our study highlights the critical role of SMN-DMN interactions in the neural mechanisms through which MBCT exerts its therapeutic effects in MDD.

Population-common eFCs modulated by MMT—particularly those involving SMN-DAN and SMN-VAN—suggest a potentially shared neural mechanism across populations. These findings support the hypothesis that enhancement of attentional control via somatic awareness is a core function of diverse mindfulness-based interventions [4, 5, 11]. At the same time, our study revealed population-specific eFCs modulated by mindfulness meditation, which likely reflect differences in clinical focus across groups. These distinctions may arise from varied therapeutic targets tailored to the needs of different populations, such as stress or anxiety [42], MDD [12], or university students [43]. Since interventions target different clinical outcomes—such as anxiety or depressive symptoms—distinct brain systems may be differentially engaged [44, 45]. These population-specific profiles align with a review by [7], which suggested that specific alterations in functional connectivity correspond to the modulation of different cognitive functions in clinical versus non-clinical populations, indicating MMT brings about target-centered neural adaptation for mental health improvements. Such findings have practical implications for future research, particularly in the development of neuromodulation strategies to augment mindfulness-based interventions. They suggest that different brain targets should be considered when seeking to enhance the therapeutic efficacy of mindfulness practices in distinct populations.

Our further analysis revealed that SMN-related eFCs modulated by MMT in both the healthy and MDD populations significantly predicted changes in clinical measures, including anxiety and insomnia severity. These findings suggest that the modulated SMN-related eFCs may serve as neural signatures underlying the mental health improvements associated with mindfulness meditation across populations.

Specifically, in the healthy population, eFCs involving the SMN-VAN, SMN-DMN, SMN-caudate, and SMN-fusiform contributed significantly to predictive performance. This implies that interactions between the SMN and these brain regions may be critical for supporting the mental health benefits of mindfulness in non-clinical individuals. In the MDD sample, eFCs involving the SMN, VAN, SMN-caudate, and SMN-visual cortex (SMN-Vis) were most predictive, highlighting the importance of these interactions in mediating symptom reduction through MBCT in clinical populations. Collectively, these findings indicate that the eFCs identified in our study may represent essential neural mechanisms through which mindfulness meditation, facilitated by somatic awareness, contributes to clinical improvement in both healthy and MDD populations. In addition, the SMN-related eFCs may also be crucial in advanced concentrative absorption meditation, which was demonstrated to engage somatic brain connectivity and would bring more positive effects on mental health [19, 20]. Future studies should investigate the broad benefits underlain SMN-related eFCs.

Despite these promising results, our study has several limitations. First, the mindfulness workshops were tailored for different populations and did not follow identical intervention durations. This difference may have introduced confounding effects in identifying population-specific eFC profiles. However, we posit that intervention duration likely affects the magnitude of connectivity changes more than the pattern of eFC alterations. Nonetheless, future research should replicate our findings using standardized protocols across populations. Second, the sample size for the MDD group was relatively small. This limitation stemmed partly from a high dropout rate, and partly from recruitment challenges in a geographically limited area with minimal policy and institutional support for clinical research. Future studies with

larger and more representative clinical samples will be necessary to validate our findings and assess their generalizability.

Conclusion

In conclusion, our study identified population-common changes in eFCs—particularly within the SMN-DAN and SMN-VAN categories—modulated by mindfulness meditation training. At the same time, we uncovered population-specific alterations: the healthy population showed modulations in SMN-Sub-related eFCs, whereas the MDD population exhibited changes in SMN-DMN-related eFCs. Importantly, these eFCs were associated with improvements in anxiety and insomnia in both groups. These results offer novel insights into the distinct and shared neural mechanisms underlying mindfulness-based interventions and suggest future opportunities for enhancing mindfulness effects through targeted neuromodulation of specific brain regions involved in these eFCs.

Materials and methods

Participants and Study Protocol

Healthy Population

Sixty-five participants without any mental disorder history were recruited at the University of Macau through online advertisements. Among them (Fig. 1), 40 participants were assigned to a 4-week brief mindfulness workshop, which was adapted from the *Koru Mindfulness* curriculum [43], a standardized intervention designed for college students to enhance stress management and emotional regulation. The program

was condensed into four weekly 1.5–2 hours group sessions facilitated by a psychological counsellor at the university. The remaining 25 participants were assigned to an NC group, receiving no intervention during the mindfulness workshop period.

In the intervention group, thirty-five participants attended at least half of the in-person mindfulness sessions, and one participant did not have complete data. In the NC group, two participants dropped out, and two others had incomplete data. Ultimately, 34 participants in the MD group and 21 in the NC group were included in the final analysis. The two groups were demographically matched in age, sex, and education level (Table 1).

All participants were right-handed, had no prior experience with mindfulness practice, and reported no history of mental disorders or physical illnesses during their participation. Meanwhile, all participants did not any metal implant inside the body; no claustrophobia history; and their body weight was not exceeding 135 kg.

MDD Population

Forty-eight participants with MDD were recruited to join a single-blind random control trial study of mindfulness-based cognitive therapy (MBCT). Among them, 4 participants dropped out after the first MRI scan. The remaining participants were randomly assigned to a MD group or a WL group. Participants in the mindfulness group attended a standard 8-week MBCT workshop in addition to their usual treatment before taking the second set of tests and MRI scans. In contrast, participants in the WL group would wait at least 8 weeks after taking the first set of tests and MRI scans, during which they were taking their usual treatment. Then they were invited to take the second set of tests and MRI scans before taking an 8-week intervention workshop. At last, 6 participants in the MD group dropped out, and 3 participants in

the WL group dropped out, resulting in 16 participants in the MD group and 19 participants in the WL group.

The recruitment was facilitated by online advertisement and referral from local hospitals. All participants with MDD were diagnosed by a psychiatrist according Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM). All the participants should meet the inclusion criteria: 1) met the diagnostic criteria for major depressive disorder in the fifth edition of the American Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM-5), with multiple episodes; 2) aged 18-45 years (including 18 and 45 years old); 3) During a remission period or have recovered from the latest episode; 4) The patient himself signs the informed consent form; 5) Without any metal implant inside the body; 6) No claustrophobia history; 7) Body weight not exceeding 135 kg; 8) Right-handed. Participants who had any conditions specified below would be excluded: 1) Previously clear mania or hypomanic episode; 2) Previous diagnosis people with bipolar disorder, schizophrenia, schizoaffective mental disorder, and other mental disorders accompanied by other diseases; 3) patients with a previous history of alcohol and drug dependence and acute poisoning; 4) Women patients during pregnancy or lactation; 5) According to the interview, the suicide risk assessment in patient is currently at a high risk of suicide; 6) The current participants with serious physical diseases are not suitable for entry into the group.

The studies were approved by the Ethics Committee of the University of Macau. All participants provided written informed consent before participation.

Clinical Measurements

The target clinical measurements of the MMTwere anxiety and insomnia severity in the healthy population, while the target clinical measurements of the MBCT were depressive symptoms and insomnia severity. The Generalized Anxiety Disorder Scale (GAD-7) [46] was used to assess the anxiety level in participants in the healthy population.. The Beck depression inventory (BDI) [47] was used to assess the depressive symptoms in the patients with MDD. The insomnia severity index was used to evaluate the insomnia severity both in the healthy and depressed populations [48].

MRI Data Acquisition

The MRI data acquisition was performed with a 3T Siemens Prisma scanner. Participants in the healthy population underwent a structural scan and two sessions of resting-state functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI) scans of 10 minutes in the pre- and post-intervention visits. Participants in the depressed population underwent a structural scan and one session of resting-state fMRI scans of 6 minutes in the pre- and post-intervention visits. Except for the scanning duration, participants in two populations underwent scans with the same parameters.

The parameters of structural scan included time of echo (TE): 2.26 ms; ; time of repetition (TR): 2300 ms; field of view (FoV): 256×256 mm; phase encoding matrix: 256×256; slice thickness: 1 mm; slice number: 176; slice distance: 50%; slice orientation: sagittal.; .

The parameters for resting-state fMRI scan included TE: 30 ms; TR: 1000 ms; FoV: 192×192 mm; phase encoding matrix: 96×96; voxel size: 2×2×2 mm^3; slice number: 65; slice thickness: 2 mm; phase encoding direction: anterior to posterior; flip angle: 90 degrees.

MRI Data Preprocessing

Preprocessing was performed using a SPM-based (https://www.fil.ion.ucl.ac.uk/spm/) MATLAB package, DPABI [49]. The procedures included 1) Realignment to correct for head-motion artifacts, 2) co-registration of structural images to functional space, followed by segmentation of the structural images, 3) normalization to MNI space using each individual's structural images with segmentation information, and 4) smoothing of the data with a 4 mm Gaussian kernel. We did not perform slice timing procedures since our data were generated from a multi-band sequence scan.

Regions of Interest

The Brainnetome atlas was developed based on the structural and functional connectivity profiles of each brain voxel [50]. We took 246 subregions in this atlas for our initial regions of interest (ROIs). In later analysis, the ROIs were assigned a Yeo's resting network label [14] according to the maximum percentage of a subregion in Yeo's 7 resting-state brain networks plus a subcortical network, resulting 8 brain networks including the subcortical network (Sub), visual network (Vis), SMN, dorsal attention network (DAN), ventral attention network (VAN), limbic network (Lim), frontoparietal network (FPN), and default mode network (DMN).

Calculation of the Edge-centric Functional Connectivity

We calculated the edge-centric functional connectivity (eFC) according to the procedures proposed by [21]. The time series in each ROI was extracted and z-scored,

and then the dot product of each pair of ROIs was used to index the edge time series of the pair of ROIs, which resulted in 30,135 edge time series. For each pair of edges, the eFC was calculated with Pearson's correlation with the time series of the two edges. This process generated 454,044,045 eFCs for each participant.

Statistical Analysis

In our current study, we focused on the SMN-related eFCs. We extracted these eFCs that at least involved a brain region in the SMN, which resulted in 28,550,346 eFCs. To reveal the eFCs that were modulated by mindfulness meditation training, we performed repeated-measure ANOVA analysis in each sample (healthy and depressed populations) for each eFC. It was followed by counting the eFCs, showing a significant group × time interaction effect ($p < 0.001$ or $p < 0.01$). We then grouped these significant eFCs into categories according to Yeo's network. For example, if an edge included a region in the SMN and another region in the DMN, then this edge would be classified as category SMN-DMN; then if an eFC included two edges, one edge was classified in SMN-DMN, another was in SMN-DAN, this eFC would be grouped in the eFC category SMN-DMN-SMN-DAN. In addition, we also counted the frequency of a brain region involved in the eFCs showing significant interaction effects in the two data samples.

Permutation test

We used a random permutation algorithm built in MATLAB to shuffle the significant statistical p-values of all eFCs in the abovementioned repeated-measurement ANOVA. In each permutation, the abovementioned frequency of counted significant

eFCs belonging to each category or involved in each ROI was calculated and recorded. These permutation procedures were repeated 10,000 times to generate a null hypothesis probability distribution for each eFC category. We then regarded the frequency of eFC with significant interaction effects in an eFC category as a reliably significant result, showing reliable modulation effects from mindfulness meditation training, when the frequency of eFC is higher than 95% of the values in the corresponding category, simulated in the null distribution.

Support vector regression analysis

In the healthy and MDD populations, we included the eFCs with significant interaction ($p < 0.001$ or $p < 0.01$) to a support vector regression model following procedures used by previous studies [51, 52] to predict clinical measurements significantly improved by mindfulness meditation training. We conducted this multivariate prediction analysis with the Spider toolbox with a linear kernel function (C=1), epsilon was set to 0.1, and 10-fold cross-validation was used to estimate the prediction power. Meanwhile, we also adopted a bootstrapping method to determine the contribution of each eFC to the predictive results. We categorized the eFCs as significant contributors when their corresponding Bootstrapping $p < 0.005$.

Reference

1. Creswell JD, Way BM, Eisenberger NI, Lieberman MD. Neural correlates of dispositional mindfulness during affect labeling. *Psychosom Med* **69**, 560-565 (2007).

2. Hodann-Caudevilla RM, Diaz-Silveira C, Burgos-Julian FA, Santed MA. Mindfulness-Based Interventions for People with Schizophrenia: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* **17**, (2020).

3. Piet J, Hougaard E. The effect of mindfulness-based cognitive therapy for prevention of relapse in recurrent major depressive disorder: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Clin Psychol Rev* **31**, 1032-1040 (2011).

4. Shapiro SL, Carlson LE, Astin JA, Freedman B. Mechanisms of mindfulness. *Journal of clinical psychology* **62**, 373-386 (2006).

5. Tang YY, Holzel BK, Posner MI. The neuroscience of mindfulness meditation. *Nat Rev Neurosci* **16**, 213-225 (2015).

6. Rahrig H, Vago DR, Passarelli MA, Auten A, Lynn NA, Brown KW. Meta-analytic evidence that mindfulness training alters resting state default mode network connectivity. *Sci Rep* **12**, 12260 (2022).

7. Sezer I, Pizzagalli DA, Sacchet MD. Resting-state fMRI functional connectivity and mindfulness in clinical and non-clinical contexts: A review and synthesis. *Neurosci Biobehav Rev* **135**, 104583 (2022).

8. Melis M*, et al*. The Impact of Mindfulness-Based Interventions on Brain Functional Connectivity: a Systematic Review. *Mindfulness* **13**, 1857-1875 (2022).

9. Young KS*, et al*. The impact of mindfulness-based interventions on brain activity: A systematic review of functional magnetic resonance imaging studies. *Neurosci Biobehav Rev* **84**, 424-433 (2018).

10. Zsadanyi SE, Kurth F, Luders E. The Effects of Mindfulness and Meditation on the Cingulate Cortex in the Healthy Human Brain: A Review. *Mindfulness* **12**, 2371-2387 (2021).

11. Kerr CE, Sacchet MD, Lazar SW, Moore CI, Jones SR. Mindfulness starts with the body: somatosensory attention and top-down modulation of cortical alpha rhythms in mindfulness meditation. *Frontiers in human neuroscience* **7**, 12 (2013).

12. Segal Z, Williams M, Teasdale J. *Mindfulness-based cognitive therapy for depression*. Guilford press (2012).

13. Williams M, Penman D. *Mindfulness: A practical guide to finding peace in a frantic world*. Hachette UK (2011).

14. Yeo BT*, et al.* The organization of the human cerebral cortex estimated by intrinsic functional connectivity. *J Neurophysiol* **106**, 1125-1165 (2011).

15. Kropf E, Syan SK, Minuzzi L, Frey BN. From anatomy to function: the role of the somatosensory cortex in emotional regulation. *Brazilian Journal of Psychiatry* **41**, 261-269 (2018).

16. Bokk O, Forster B. The effect of a short mindfulness meditation on somatosensory attention. *Mindfulness* **13**, 2022-2030 (2022).

17. Mirams L, Poliakoff E, Brown RJ, Lloyd DM. Brief body-scan meditation practice improves somatosensory perceptual decision making. *Consciousness and Cognition* **22**, 348-359 (2013).

18. Kerr CE*, et al.* Effects of mindfulness meditation training on anticipatory alpha modulation in primary somatosensory cortex. *Brain research bulletin* **85**, 96-103 (2011).

19. Treves IN, Yang WFZ, Sparby T, Sacchet MD. Dynamic brain states underlying advanced concentrative absorption meditation: A 7-T fMRI-intensive case study. *Netw Neurosci* **9**, 125-145 (2025).

20. Yang WFZ, Chowdhury A, Bianciardi M, van Lutterveld R, Sparby T, Sacchet MD. Intensive whole-brain 7T MRI case study of volitional control of brain activity in deep absorptive meditation states. *Cereb Cortex* **34**, (2024).

21. Faskowitz J, Esfahlani FZ, Jo Y, Sporns O, Betzel RF. Edge-centric functional network representations of human cerebral cortex reveal overlapping system-level architecture. *Nat Neurosci* **23**, 1644-1654 (2020).

22. Jiang L*, et al.* Edge-centric functional network predicts risk propensity in economic decision-making: evidence from a resting-state fMRI study. *Cerebral Cortex* **33**, 8904-8912 (2023).

23. Yang B*, et al.* Edge-centric functional network analyses reveal disrupted network configuration in autism spectrum disorder. *Journal of Affective Disorders* **336**, 74-80 (2023).

24. Wang W, *et al.* Edge-centric functional network reveals new spatiotemporal biomarkers of early mild cognitive impairment. *Brain-X* **1**, e35 (2023).

25. Chen Z, *et al.* Edge-centric connectome-genetic markers of bridging factor to comorbidity between depression and anxiety. *Nature Communications* **15**, (2024).

26. Brown KW, Ryan RM. The benefits of being present: Mindfulness and its role in psychological well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* **84**, 822-848 (2003).

27. Winbush NY, Gross CR, Kreitzer MJ. The effects of mindfulness-based stress reduction on sleep disturbance: a systematic review. *Explore (NY)* **3**, 585-591 (2007).

28. Li S, Liu ZY, Che LP, Gong Y, Liu SJ, Guo XY. The neural mechanisms underlying the modulation of attentional deployment on emotional stability. *Exp Brain Res* **240**, 1823-1832 (2022).

29. Kuyken W, *et al.* Mindfulness-based cognitive therapy to prevent relapse in recurrent depression. *J Consult Clin Psychol* **76**, 966-978 (2008).

30. Cernasov P, *et al.* Attenuated Default Mode Network Functional Connectivity is Associated With Improvement in Depressive Symptoms Following Mindfulness-Based Cognitive Therapy in a Transdiagnostic Anhedonic Sample. *Biol Psychiat* **85**, S158-S159 (2019).

31. Vignaud P, Donde C, Sadki T, Poulet E, Brunelin J. Neural effects of mindfulness-based interventions on patients with major depressive disorder: A systematic review. *Neurosci Biobehav Rev* **88**, 98-105 (2018).

32. Vossel S, Geng JJ, Fink GR. Dorsal and ventral attention systems: distinct neural circuits but collaborative roles. *Neuroscientist* **20**, 150-159 (2014).

33. Seeley WW, *et al.* Dissociable intrinsic connectivity networks for salience processing and executive control. *J Neurosci* **27**, 2349-2356 (2007).

34. Hölzel BK, *et al.* Neural mechanisms of symptom improvements in generalized anxiety disorder following mindfulness training. *NeuroImage: Clinical* **2**, 448-458 (2013).

35. Santarnecchi E, *et al.* Mindfulness-based stress reduction training modulates striatal and cerebellar connectivity. *J Neurosci Res* **99**, 1236-1252 (2021).

36. Prakash RS*, et al.* Mindfulness Meditation and Network Neuroscience: Review, Synthesis, and Future Directions. *Biol Psychiatry Cogn Neurosci Neuroimaging* **10**, 350-358 (2025).

37. Raichle ME. The brain's default mode network. *Annu Rev Neurosci* **38**, 433-447 (2015).

38. King AP*, et al.* Altered default mode network (DMN) resting state functional connectivity following a mindfulness-based exposure therapy for posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD) in combat veterans of Afghanistan and Iraq. *Depression and anxiety* **33**, 289-299 (2016).

39. Chou T, Dougherty DD, Nierenberg AA, Deckersbach T. Restoration of default mode network and task positive network anti-correlation associated with mindfulness-based cognitive therapy for bipolar disorder. *Psychiatry Research: Neuroimaging* **319**, 111419 (2022).

40. Chen F*, et al.* Body–mind relaxation meditation modulates the thalamocortical functional connectivity in major depressive disorder: a preliminary resting-state fMRI study. *Translational psychiatry* **11**, 546 (2021).

41. Zhang J*, et al.* Reducing default mode network connectivity with mindfulness-based fMRI neurofeedback: a pilot study among adolescents with affective disorder history. *Molecular psychiatry* **28**, 2540-2548 (2023).

42. Kabat-Zinn J. Mindfulness-based stress reduction (MBSR). *Constructivism in the human sciences* **8**, 73 (2003).

43. Greeson JM, Juberg MK, Maytan M, James K, Rogers H. A randomized controlled trial of Koru: a mindfulness program for college students and other emerging adults. *J Am Coll Health* **62**, 222-233 (2014).

44. Mochcovitch MD, da Rocha Freire RC, Garcia RF, Nardi AE. A systematic review of fMRI studies in generalized anxiety disorder: evaluating its neural and cognitive basis. *Journal of affective disorders* **167**, 336-342 (2014).

45. Wang L, Hermens DF, Hickie IB, Lagopoulos J. A systematic review of resting-state functional-MRI studies in major depression. *Journal of affective disorders* **142**, 6-12 (2012).

46. Spitzer RL, Kroenke K, Williams JBW, Löwe B. A brief measure for assessing generalized anxiety disorder -: The GAD-7. *Arch Intern Med* **166**, 1092-1097 (2006).

47. Beck AT, Ward C, Mendelson M, Mock J, Erbauch J. *Beck depression inventory (BDI)* (1961).

48. Bastien CH, Vallieres A, Morin CM. Validation of the Insomnia Severity Index as an outcome measure for insomnia research. *Sleep Med* **2**, 297-307 (2001).

49. Yan C-G, Wang X-D, Zuo X-N, Zang Y-F. DPABI: data processing & analysis for (resting-state) brain imaging. *Neuroinformatics* **14**, 339-351 (2016).

50. Fan L*, et al*. The Human Brainnetome Atlas: A New Brain Atlas Based on Connectional Architecture. *Cereb Cortex* **26**, 3508-3526 (2016).

51. Liu X*, et al*. A neural signature for the subjective experience of threat anticipation under uncertainty. *Nat Commun* **15**, 1544 (2024).

52. Ceko M, Kragel PA, Woo CW, Lopez-Sola M, Wager TD. Common and stimulus-type-specific brain representations of negative affect. *Nat Neurosci* **25**, 760-770 (2022).

Acknowledgements

We thank Professor Yuan Zhou's lab for their valuable suggestions; thank Ms Joanna Kong for her assistance in recruiting participants.

This work was supported by the University of Macau (MYRG2022-00054-FHS, MYRG-GRG2023-00038-FHS-UMDF, and MYRG-GRG2024-00259-FHS), and the Macao Science and Technology Development Fund (FDCT 0014/2024/RIB1).

Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no competing interests

Figures



Figure 1. The flow chart of participant recruitment. A: The flow chart of participant recruitment in the healthy population; B: The flow chart of the recruitment of patients with MDD



Figure 2 The eFC profile in the healthy population showing a significant group × time interaction. A\D: the frequency of edges involved in eFCs showing a significant group × time interaction with $p < 0.001$ (A) or $p < 0.01$ (D); warmer color of edges indicates higher frequency of engagement; B\E: the frequency of brain regions involved in eFCs showing a significant group × time interaction with $p < 0.001$ (B) or $p < 0.01$ (E); C\F: the frequency of eFCs, showing significant interaction with p < 0.001 (C) or

p < 0.01 (F), summarized in network categories; the upper triangular parts display frequencies survived a permutation test; the lower triangular parts display frequencies without correction.



Figure 3. The eFC profile in the MDD population showing a significant group × time interaction. A\D: the frequency of edges involved in eFCs showing a significant group × time interaction with $p < 0.001$ (A) or $p < 0.01$ (D); warmer color of edges indicates higher frequency of engagement; B\E: the frequency of brain regions involved in eFCs showing a significant group × time interaction with $p < 0.001$ (B) or $p < 0.01$ (E); C\F: the frequency of eFCs, showing significant interaction with $p < 0.001$ (C) or $p < 0.01$ (F), summarized in network categories; the upper triangular parts display frequencies survived a permutation test; the lower triangular parts display frequencies without correction.



Figure 4. The prediction results of clinical measurements with eFCs, showing significant group × time $p < 0.001$, in the healthy population. A: the association between true anxiety and predicted anxiety; B: the frequency of edges involved in eFCs having significant contributions to predicting anxiety ($p < 0.005$); warmer colors indicate higher frequency of edges; C: the association between true insomnia and predicted insomnia; D: the frequency of edges involved in eFCs having significant contributions to predicting insomnia ($p < 0.005$). warmer colors indicate higher frequency of edges.



Figure 5. The prediction results of insomnia with eFCs, showing significant group × time $p < 0.01$, in the MDD population. A: the association between true insomnia and predicted insomnia; B: the frequency of edges involved in eFCs having significant contributions to predicting insomnia ($p < 0.005$); warmer colors indicate higher frequency of edges.