

Mindfulness related changes in grey matter: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis.

Cyril R. Pernet^{1*}, Nikolai Belov², Arnaud Delorme^{3,4} & Alison Zammit¹

1 Centre for Clinical Brain Sciences, Edinburgh Imaging, The University of Edinburgh, UK

2 Dept. of Psychology, Otto von Guericke University Magdeburg, Germany

3 CerCo, CNRS, Paul Sabatier University, Toulouse, France

4 SCCN, INC, University of California San Diego, La Jolla, CA, USA

* Corresponding author: cyril.pernet@ed.ac.uk tel: +44 (0)131 465 9530

Word count: 3637

1 **Abstract**

2
3 Knowing target regions undergoing structural changes caused by behavioural interventions is
4 paramount in evaluating the effectiveness of such practices. Here, using a systematic review
5 approach, we identified 25 peer-reviewed magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) studies
6 demonstrating grey matter changes related to mindfulness meditation. The activation likelihood
7 estimation (ALE) analysis (n=16) revealed the right anterior ventral insula as the only significant
8 region with consistent effect across studies, whilst an additional functional connectivity analysis
9 indicates that both left and right insulae, inferior post-central gyri and the anterior cingulate gyrus
10 with adjacent paracingulate gyri should also be considered in future studies. Statistical meta-
11 analyses suggest medium to strong effect sizes from Cohen's $d \sim 0.7$ in the right insula to ~ 1 using
12 maxima across the whole brain. The systematic review revealed design issues with selection,
13 information, attrition and confirmation biases, in addition to weak statistical power. In conclusion,
14 our analyses show that mindfulness meditation practice does induce grey matter changes but
15 also that improvements in methodology are needed to establish mindfulness as a therapeutic
16 intervention.

17
18 **Keywords:** mindfulness meditation, systematic review, meta-analysis, MRI, grey matter

19 Introduction

20

21 The relatively recent increase in the popularity of meditation in the Western world has received
22 much attention, with many claiming associated mental health benefits. Concerns about the
23 qualities of studies and potential harm to patients have nevertheless also been raised (Farias &
24 Wikholm, 2016) given that up to a quarter of meditators have reported unpleasant and potentially
25 deleterious meditation-related experiences (Schlosser et al., 2019). Medical intervention using
26 meditation (in various forms) has been used predominantly in the treatment of chronic pain, and
27 to a lesser extent in the treatment of obesity, aging, dementia, and psychiatric disorders. Literature
28 reviews and meta analyses show some evidence for lowering perceived pain along with improving
29 associated symptoms such as depression and anxiety (Edwards & Loprinzi, 2018) or sleep
30 disorders (Kwekkeboom & Bratzke, 2016), usually with no change in actual symptoms (Hood &
31 Jedel, 2017; see however Ball, Nur Shafina Muhammad Sharizan, Franklin, & Rogozinska, 2017).
32 Such intervention seems also ineffective in 'heavy' patients such as those in palliative care
33 (Latorraca et al., 2017). Meditation has shown benefits in promoting better eating behaviours
34 therefore assisting weight regulation (Dunn et al., 2018), enhancing cognitive efficiency in healthy
35 aging (Sperduti et al., 2017) and reducing cognitive decline in dementia (Russell-Williams et al.,
36 2018). Finally, there is also evidence that meditation improves patients with mental illnesses, with
37 reductions in psychotic symptoms, depression scores, and improved level of functioning (Potes
38 et al., 2018). In most reviews, meditation has been shown to improve quality of life (Edwards &
39 Loprinzi, 2018; Hilton et al., 2017; Hood & Jedel, 2017; Potes et al., 2018; Russell-Williams et al.,
40 2018). Accumulating evidence for benefits, risks and mechanisms of meditation is therefore
41 valuable to improve patients' health whilst reducing interventions and healthcare costs (Innes &
42 Selfe, 2014).

43

44 ElectroEncephaloGraphy (EEG) and structural/functional MRI have been used extensively to
45 study brain changes underpinning behavioural effects of meditation. A previous meta-analysis by
46 Boccia et al. (2015) suggests functional changes in meditators relative to controls in the thalamus,
47 striatum and frontal cortex along with structural changes in some of these regions. The
48 mechanism leading to grey matter (GM) changes is unknown, although EEG findings support the
49 hypothesis that meditation increases neuronal communication which in turn causes GM changes
50 via synaptic plasticity. For instance, meditation tends to increase fast oscillations of 12–30 Hz,
51 which are usually associated with high vigilance levels (Braboszcz & Delorme, 2011; Laufs et al.,
52 2006) and increase in phase-locking gamma-band oscillations (Lutz et al., 2004). Such increases

53 in neural communication and connectivity might mediate observed long-term brain structural
54 changes.

55
56 Our review focused on studies looking at GM and aimed at (1) investigating the strength of
57 reported associations and (2) establishing evidence for local GM changes due to meditation.
58 Meditation is here strictly defined as the practice of focused attention or awareness with the aim
59 of cultivating a calm and stable mental state, which typically corresponds to what has been termed
60 mindfulness. Consequently, we excluded from our analyses any studies that included movement
61 therapies, such as yoga alongside meditation (Boccia et al., 2015; Fox et al., 2014; Last et al.,
62 2017) since these additional practices may act as confounding factors (Colcombe et al., 2006;
63 Erickson et al., 2014). Since proposed meditation interventions often hypothesize brain changes
64 that will regulate different aspects of behaviour, it is essential to establish which brain regions
65 show changes. For example, if patients show an alteration in one brain region, imaging can
66 address whether an intervention may re-establish a normal range of values in this region or if
67 behavioural changes are mediated by compensatory mechanisms (Bishop, 2013). Although many
68 brain changes are functional by nature (change in activation level, frequency of activity or activity
69 coupling), we focussed here on structural Grey Matter (GM) changes only, because it provides
70 evidence of neural plasticity for long term mental health changes.

71

72 **Material and method**

73

74 **Systematic Review**

75

76 *Search strategy:* The Ovid interface was used to search MEDLINE, EMBASE, PsycINFO, AMED
77 and Global Health. The following terms were searched separately on the 10th of October 2018,
78 using the multi-field search tool with “All Fields” enabled: (1) Meditat* OR Mindfulness (2)
79 Magnetic Resonance Imaging OR MRI OR MR Imaging OR sMRI OR Neuroimaging (3) Grey
80 Matter OR Grey Matter OR GM OR Cortical Thickness OR Cortex OR Brain. Searches 1-3 were
81 combined with a Boolean AND function. The high number of hits returned from PsycINFO was
82 reduced by consulting relevant subject headings, and performing an advanced search (as follows)
83 with ‘map to subject headings’ and ‘Auto Explode’ enabled: (1) Meditation OR Mindfulness (2)
84 Magnetic Resonance Imaging or Neuroimaging (3) Grey Matter or Cerebral Cortex. Again,
85 searches 1-3 were combined using a Boolean AND function.

86

87 *Inclusion Criteria:* Articles included must have met the following criteria: (i) Involve meditation or
88 mindfulness (ii) Use structural MRI (iii) Measure GM density, volume or thickness.

89
90 *Exclusion criteria:* To produce a focused report and avoid confounding effects, the exclusion
91 criteria comprised of (i) Articles involving physical movement alongside meditation: For example,
92 the mindfulness-based stress reduction (MBSR) program developed by Kabat-Zinn, which
93 incorporates yoga (Santorelli et al., 2017), (ii) Articles where structural MRI was not performed,
94 and (iii) Articles that do not measure grey matter volume (GMV)/density (GMD) or cortical
95 thickness (CTh): Measurement outcomes such as WM changes and gyrification patterns were not
96 included.

97
98 *Bias Analysis:* Articles were assessed for bias using the Clinical Appraisal Skills Programme
99 checklists <https://casp-uk.net/casp-tools-checklists/>. We report here specifically on selection,
100 information and attrition biases.

101
102 **Meta-Analyses**

103
104 *Amplitude of morphological changes?* For each study included, the maximum reported effect was
105 extracted (e.g. t-values, regression slope or Pearson's' r correlation coefficients) either directly
106 from the text or inferred from figures. Importantly, the maximum effect size was used irrespective
107 of the location in space, thus establishing a generic evidence for an effect of meditation on GM.
108 For Chételat et al. (2017) and Murakami et al. (2012) data points were extracted from scatter plots
109 using WebPlotDigitizer (Rohatgi, A., 2019) while for Kumar et al. (2014), t-value was taken from
110 the maximum of the figure colour scale. From these values and number of participants, Hedges'
111 g effect sizes were obtained and a random-effect meta-analysis (Maximum-likelihood as
112 estimator) was computed using the *dmetar* R package (Harrer, M. et al., 2019). An additional
113 meta-analysis was also conducted for the right insula, based on the a-posteriori observation of
114 the spatial distribution of reported effects. From the confidence intervals of the meta-analyses
115 effect sizes, Hedges' g was transformed to Cohen's d and G-power (Faul et al., 2007, 2009) was
116 used to estimate the number of subjects needed for 80% and 95% statistical power of a two-
117 sample t-test. Extracted data (studies with sample size, effect size, covariates, degrees of
118 freedom), R-scripts to compute standardized effect sizes and meta-analyses, Matlab scripts for
119 functional connectivity summary, and coordinates for ALE with all resulting maps are available
120 @ (https://github.com/CPernet/meta_meditation).

121 *Where in the brain can we see changes?:* For each study showing structural brain differences in
122 meditators, and when available, coordinates from significantly different regions were entered into
123 an anatomic likelihood estimation analysis using GingerALE version 3.02 (Eickhoff et al., 2012;
124 Eickhoff, S.B. et al., 2009; Turkeltaub et al., 2012), which estimates the likelihood that a region
125 contains an effect taking into account both reported locations and sample sizes (here using the
126 degrees of freedom of the test from which coordinates were used). The ALE map was thresholded
127 at a p-value of 0.05 after family-wise error cluster correction with 1000 permutations and the
128 default $p=0.001$ cluster forming threshold. From the region showing significant changes with
129 meditation, all local coordinates were used as seeds for functional connectivity maps in
130 NeuroSynth (Yarkoni et al., 2011), and the summary map (sum of binarized connectivity maps
131 thresholded at 0.2) was thresholded for significance at 88%, i.e. above the 95% upper bound of
132 the chance level confidence interval.

133

134 **Results**

135

136 **Search Results**

137 The total number of references gathered was 867 (MEDLINE=234, Embase=545 AMED= 3,
138 Global Health= 2, PsycINFO= 83). After deleting duplicates this was reduced to 698. Of these,
139 530 were excluded following abstract screening based on the criteria defined previously. The full
140 texts of 143 articles were examined, of which 25 met inclusion criteria (Chételat et al., 2017;
141 Engen et al., 2018; Fahmy et al., 2018; Fayed, N. et al., 2017; Friedel et al., 2015; Grant et al.,
142 2010, 2013; Hernández et al., 2016; Hölzel et al., 2008; Kober et al., 2017; Kumar et al., 2014;
143 Kurth, Cherbuin, et al., 2015; Kurth, MacKenzie-Graham, et al., 2015; Lazar et al., 2005; Leung
144 et al., 2013; Lu et al., 2014; Luders, Cherbuin, et al., 2015; Luders et al., 2009; Luders, Kurth, et
145 al., 2013; Luders, Thompson, et al., 2013, 2015; Murakami et al., 2012; Pagnoni & Cekic, 2007;
146 Taren et al., 2013; Vestergaard-Poulsen et al., 2009). Cross-checking with other reviews (e.g.
147 (Boccia et al., 2015) revealed a high number of matches, which was taken as evidence of a good
148 search strategy.

149

150 *Study range and characteristics:* The sum of the participants included in the 25 selected studies
151 was 1646. Accounting for overlapping samples reduced this to 1406 participants (mean: 56.24,
152 range: 19-247). Participant age ranged from 12 to 87 years old, and various
153 meditation/mindfulness disciplines were studied.

154

155 **Strength of associations and bias**

156

157 Twenty-four out the 25 included studies reported significant changes associated with meditation.
158 Nineteen of them compared directly meditators to non-meditators (only 18 used in the analysis
159 as 1 study only reported values of the difference to patients, even if controls were present) and
160 the six remaining studies reporting associations with the amount of meditation. The meta-analysis
161 random-effect-model across all 23 studies from which we had data, for the strongest effect
162 independently of the brain area and design, showed an estimated effect of $g = 0.8244$ [95% CI
163 0.4495 1.1994] ($t = 4.56$, $p = .0002$) with an estimated variance $\tau^2 = 0.1709$ and heterogeneity I^2
164 $= 77.9\%$ ($Q(22)=99.45$, $p < .0001$). Looking only at the 18 studies comparing directly meditators
165 to control ($N=395$ vs. 454), the effect size was slightly larger: $g=1.0250$ [0.6055 1.4445] $t=5.16$
166 $p<.0001$, $\tau^2 = .1053$ $I^2 = 75.4\%$ $Q(17)=69.11$, $p < .0001$ (figure 1).

167

168 *Selection bias:* unrepresentative samples limit our ability to generalise results, which was
169 apparent in most of the studies in this review. Examples include the use of healthcare workers as
170 controls, samples consisting solely of volunteers or college students and geographically limited
171 recruitment. There are also instances where recruitment procedures are not described. A number
172 of studies have included controls from databases of healthy adults, and while these may seem
173 appropriate, there is concern over their prior experience with meditation given around 8% of the
174 general (western societies) population meditation (Clarke et al., 2015). Since this is not specified,
175 in some studies, it is not possible to assess whether the controls are appropriate (Martínez-Mesa
176 et al., 2016). Another issue is the inclusion of participants from various or unspecified meditation
177 backgrounds within the same study, which implies that various meditation/mindfulness disciplines
178 are equal in effect -- as only acknowledged as a limitation in only one study (Chételat et al., 2017).

179

180 *Information bias* is commonly seen with self-reporting, which may reduce study validity (Althubaiti,
181 2016). Most studies in this review recorded participants' prior meditation experience in hours or
182 years, this may be problematic because reliance on memory and honesty reduces objectivity and
183 increases the risk of including incorrect information. Studies using mindfulness questionnaires
184 may also add to this problem, for example the five-facet mindfulness questionnaire (FFMQ), which
185 was shown to have issues with construct validity (Goldberg et al., 2016). Furthermore,
186 questionable classification methods increase the risk of biased or incorrect information: for
187 example, one study divides participants into high versus low frequency meditation/prayer groups
188 based on no established classification method.

189 *Attrition bias:* Several cases of unaccounted dropouts have, again, limited the formation of a
190 definite conclusion regarding meditation and GM. Although there are situations where dropouts
191 may not affect bias (Bell et al., 2013), this review includes cases where bias is likely (see Table
192 1).

193
194 *Blinding:* Most studies were observational, retrospective and cross-sectional, where participant
195 blinding was not performed since it was unnecessary. Of the studies that were longitudinal in
196 nature, one did not mention participant blinding and the other did not involve any intervention,
197 rendering this unnecessary. Investigator blinding was not required in studies using automatic
198 methods of GM measurement, however those using semi-automatic measurement, or manual
199 delineation of GM would require blinding since over/underestimation is possible with knowledge
200 of the participant group. Some studies included here employed manual methods with no mention
201 of observer blinding, which could lead to confirmation bias (Althubaiti, 2016).

202
203 *Publication bias:* as expected from analysing maxima and illustrated on the funnel plot, the meta-
204 analysis effect size is biased such as studies follow the expected null slope with weaker effects
205 for higher precision studies and conversely stronger effects for lower precision studies.
206 Importantly, no non-significant maxima were present because all studies, but one, found effects,
207 and the one not finding a difference did not report on effect size.

208

	<i>Selection bias</i>	<i>Information bias</i>	<i>Attrition bias</i>	Confirmation bias
Chételat, 2017	✓	? Most likely that info was obtained by interviewing participants	X	✓
Engen, 2018	✓	✓	X	✓? No mention of blinding
Fahmy, 2018	✓	✓ MBI which was adapted from the original MBSR	✓	? No mention of blinding, but also no mention of manual input
Fayed, 2017	✓	✓	X	X (check in text citations to match this)
Friedel, 2015	X	✓	✓ (245 agreed, 82 final)	✓
Grant, 2010	✓	✓	X	X
Grant, 2013	✓	✓	X	X
Hernandez, 2016	✓	✓	X	? No mention of blinding during manual input
Holzel, 2007	✓	✓	X	X
Kober, 2017	✓	✓	X	X
Kumar, 2013	✓	✓	X	? Methods not clear-possible manual input. Blinding not mentioned.
Kurth, 2014	✓	✓	X	X
Kurth, 2015	✓	✓	X	X
Lazar, 2005	✓	✓	X	? Not mentioned
Leung, 2012	✓	✓	X	? Not mentioned


Lu, 2014	✓	✓	✓ scans with artefacts not included	? Not mentioned
Luders, 2009	✓	✓	X	X
Luders, meditation...mapping	✓	✓	X	X
Luders, global.. practitioners	✓	✓	X	✓ likely. Manual input. Blinding Not mentioned
Luders, 2015 Forever... younger	✓	✓	X	Not mentioned
Luders, 2015 Larger...men	✓	✓	X	✓ likely. Manual input and no mention of blinding
Murakami, 2012	✓	✓	X	X
Pagnoni, 2007	✓	✓	✓ image with artefact was not included	X
Taren, 2013	✓	✓	✓ 10 excluded due to missing data	? semi-automated ROI segmentation. No mention of blinding.
Vestergaard-Poulsen, 2009	✓	✓	X	X No mention of manual input during segmentation. However, the authors used histological samples.

209 **Table 1 - Bias analysis showing for each of the 25 studies** (✓ indicates bias, X indicates no bias, ?
210 unclear) .

211 **Spatial meta-analysis and connectivity**

212

213 Of the 25 studies included, 16 provided anatomical coordinates of regions showing significantly
 214 increased GM in meditators or following an intervention. Four studies had overlapping samples,
 215 with however no overlapping coordinates. The meta-analysis from all data demonstrated one
 216 significant cluster in the short insular gyrus extending to the claustrum (from [26 8 -18] to [38 14 -
 217 8] with a peak at [32 10 -14]). Overall, 6 studies reported effects in the right insula, 3 of them
 218 participated in the ALE cluster. Since all 6 studies were neighbouring coordinates, all were used
 219 to create a summary functional connectivity map. This analysis showed that the right insula is
 220 associated with the left insular cortex, the left/right inferior post-central gyri, the anterior cingulate
 221 gyrus and adjacent paracingulate gyri (figure 1).
 222



223

224 Figure 1. The top of the figure shows results for maxima reported anywhere in the brain as shown on the
 225 left (maxima locations) for studies comparing directly meditators to controls (n=18), leading to estimate an
 226 overall strength of evidence (forest plot of maxima) from which one can estimate how many subjects are
 227 needed in future studies (power curves with black horizontal bars representing the 95% CI bounds of the
 228 meta-analysis effect), knowing however that there is an publication bias since only significant results were
 229 used (funnel plot excluding Vestergaard-Poulsen et al., 2009 - weight = 0) with the null effect shown with
 230 the grey triangle vs. computed effect in blue). The bottom of the figure shows the location of the significant
 231 ALE cluster over the right anterior insula along with an estimate of the effect size for this area (forest plot)
 232 and the expected connected areas derived from functional MRI.
 233

234 Discussion

235

236 Our meta-analysis indicates that meditation has a relatively strong effect on GM (Cohen's $d \sim 1$)
237 with effects spread out throughout the brain. The only area that shows spatial consistency, i.e.
238 the right anterior ventral insula, has a medium effect size (Cohen's $d \sim 0.74$). These results are
239 concordant with both, an effect of meditation on expected brain areas, and a high spatial variance
240 caused by methodological biases.

241

242 *Effect of meditation:* The ALE meta-analysis reveals a significant cluster over the right anterior
243 insula, going over the extreme capsule to the claustrum, an overlap from ROI from Fahmy et al.
244 (2018 - opioid patients meditators > opioid patients control in the claustrum), Hernández et al.
245 (2016 - meditators > controls in the short insula gyrus) and Murakami et al. (2012 - correlation with
246 mindfulness in the short insula gyrus), a sub-region typically associated with emotion (Kurth et
247 al., 2010). Lazar and colleagues (2005) were the first to observe important structural changes
248 associated with sustained meditation practice in this region (although not included in the ALE
249 analysis because no coordinates were reported in the article), but also the auditory, somato-
250 sensorial and prefrontal cortices. The other studies reviewed reporting right insular differences
251 were more posterior or dorsal, sub-regions associated with sensorimotor afference or empathy
252 (Kurth et al., 2010), altogether arguing for GM changes associated with classical cognitive effects
253 of meditation (Srinivasan, 2019). These cognitive traits are also typically associated with the left
254 insula, which we showed to be functionally connected with the right insula. Results from the four
255 studies reporting left insular changes were however spatially too dispersed to show ALE overlap.
256 Other functionally connected regions, in particular the anterior cingulate have also been linked to
257 meditation (see Boccia et al., 2015) and should therefore also be considered as a-priori region of
258 interest in future studies.

259

260 *Spatial heterogeneity of effects:* Often, the strongest effects were observed in different locations
261 in the brain which may be partly attributed to a lack of statistical power. In our main effect size
262 meta-analysis, only the strongest effects were used leading to a small dispersion of effects
263 (Hedges' g from 0.18 to 2.07 – excluding Vestergaard-Poulsen et al., 2009) along the expected
264 null line of the funnel plot. This indicates that the population effect size is overestimated, calling
265 to use the lower bound of the confidence interval as a safe assumption on how many subjects are
266 needed to properly estimate/quantify the effect of the influence of meditation on grey matter. For
267 95% statistical power, 35 subjects per group (70 in total) would be necessary, which is more

268 participants than most studies have used. Because lack of power increases false positives (Button
269 et al., 2013; Pernet, 2017) and because of the non-stationary nature of the grey matter values
270 derived from the MRI signal (Hayasaka et al., 2004), larger effects than real ones (i.e. false
271 positives) can be observed at random locations, explaining the observed spatial heterogeneity.
272 Other factors related to design and analysis might also contribute to this variability (see below).

273
274 *Strengths and weaknesses of methods:* This systematic review utilised multiple databases for the
275 literature search and excluded studies that involved movement therapy as part of the
276 meditation/mindfulness intervention. These factors increase the likelihood that all relevant studies
277 were included and that the results obtained were not affected by confounding factors. On the
278 other hand, it should be noted that of the studies included here, some involve participants with
279 pain disorders and other illnesses, as well as adolescents, all of which could possibly bias results.
280 Compared with the most recent ALE analysis (Boccia et al., 2015), we included more studies and
281 used the updated software version that has a stricter type 1 Family-Wise error rate (permutation
282 of maxima rather than FDR), and thus it would not be reasonable to expect too many similarities
283 given those restrictive criteria.

284
285 *Moving forward research on the effect of mindfulness on the brain:* The biggest concern on the
286 observed results is the spatial variability across studies. As discussed above, the total sample
287 size is an important contributing factor and future studies must power up if one wants, for instance,
288 to demonstrate up or down regulation of a given brain region by meditation in patients. The bias
289 analysis also revealed issues with (i) demographics, (ii) analyses, (iii) reporting, and (iv)
290 experimental design. Variation in age, sex, ethnicity, education, socio-economic status,
291 handedness and illnesses may confound the data, leading to the creation of inaccurate results.
292 Apart from this, many studies did not include important demographic information, creating
293 additional ambiguity surrounding the data and any conclusions that may be drawn from it. It is
294 also important to consider the impact of neurological and psychiatric illnesses, as these may affect
295 GM. The studies reviewed that did not report these were excluded, and of those that do mention
296 exclusion, not all specify the measures used to assess such illnesses. Another important issue is
297 the variability of meditation practices. It may be possible that some practices have more profound
298 effects than others. Since only a limited number of studies with different meditation practices is
299 available, it is not possible to assess whether this is true, or if any differences among practices
300 exist at all. When studying meditation, we must acknowledge that experienced participants are
301 likely to have had exposure to many practices over the years, and so it may be incorrect to assume

302 that the practice measured at the time of the study is responsible for the differences seen.
303 Furthermore, one must also keep in mind that accurate measurement of meditation itself is not
304 entirely possible and concerns surrounding the validity of the various measurement tools used
305 have been raised (Park et al., 2013). Because of the variability in demographics, it is also essential
306 to include covariates in the brain data analyses. Less than half of studies however reported the
307 inclusion of factors such as age, gender and total intracranial volume although those are essential
308 to interpret results, no matter if significantly different between groups (Pernet, 2018). While a few
309 articles made data available, most do not mention data sharing. Essential to reproductive and
310 cumulative science (Nichols et al., 2017), details of the analyses are often missing (for instance
311 having to figure out if and what covariates were used) and summary statistics maps never
312 available (for instance sharing on NeuroVault (Gorgolewski et al., 2015) the unthresholded t-value
313 map of difference controls vs. experts which would allow computing effect sizes for any brain
314 region). Finally, in terms of design, most studies that met the inclusion criteria were cross-
315 sectional and observational. Although this is enough to show the presence of an effect, there is a
316 need for more randomised controlled trials and longitudinal studies to demonstrate therapeutic
317 benefits. Longitudinal studies should span lengthy periods of time and involve regular scan
318 intervals in order to examine effects over time. Despite their appeal, there are also several issues
319 making them problematic. Of particular interest here, studies were performed over a condensed
320 period of time, likely due to cost and time limitations making it difficult to determine long-term
321 effects. At present, there is no defined interval time after which it is agreed that the effects of
322 meditation should be apparent, and we have not yet concluded whether the effects of meditation
323 practice are cumulative, that is, whether the reported changes are related to the amount of
324 experience alone. Furthermore, we have not come to a conclusion on whether the effects are
325 long-lasting beyond the intervention time frame. Improvements in study design, such as blinding
326 are also essential in order to move forward.

327

328 **Conclusions**

329 There is mounting evidence that meditation induces functional and structural changes in the brain.
330 Our review shows that effects are relatively strong for structural changes ([0.5 1.5]) with consistent
331 changes observed in the right insula, but methodological improvements are required to establish
332 mindfulness meditation as a therapeutic tool.

333

334 **Acknowledgments**

335 Thank you to D. Lakens for publishing YouTube tutorial videos on meta-analysis and bias.

336 **Author Contributions**

337 CP and AZ conceptualized the review and conducted the ALE analysis, AZ conducted the
338 systematic review and bias analysis, CP and NB conducted the statistical meta-analyses and AD
339 helped edit the manuscript. All co-authors have contributed to the preparation of the manuscript,
340 provided important intellectual content and read and approved the final version.

341 **Funding Sources**

342 NB received funding from the European Union Erasmus exchange fund.

343

344 **Conflict of Interest**

345 None of the authors have a conflict of interest to declare.

346

347 **References**

348

349 Althubaiti, A. (2016). Information bias in health research: Definition, pitfalls, and adjustment
350 methods. *Journal of Multidisciplinary Healthcare*, 9, 211–217.

351 <https://doi.org/10.2147/JMDH.S104807>

352 Ball, E. F., Nur Shafina Muhammad Sharizan, E., Franklin, G., & Rogozinska, E. (2017). Does
353 mindfulness meditation improve chronic pain? A systematic review. *Current Opinion in*
354 *Obstetrics and Gynecology*, 29(6). [https://journals.lww.com/co-](https://journals.lww.com/co-obgyn/Fulltext/2017/12000/Does_mindfulness_meditation_improve_chronic_pain_.2.aspx)

355 [obgyn/Fulltext/2017/12000/Does_mindfulness_meditation_improve_chronic_pain_.2.aspx](https://journals.lww.com/co-obgyn/Fulltext/2017/12000/Does_mindfulness_meditation_improve_chronic_pain_.2.aspx)

356 x

357 Bell, M. L., Kenward, M. G., Fairclough, D. L., & Horton, N. J. (2013). Differential dropout and
358 bias in randomised controlled trials: When it matters and when it may not. *BMJ*, 346.

359 <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.e8668>

360 Boccia, M., Piccardi, L., & Guariglia, P. (2015). The Meditative Mind: A Comprehensive Meta-
361 Analysis of MRI Studies. *BioMed Research International*, 2015, 1–11.

362 <https://doi.org/10.1155/2015/419808>

- 363 Button, K. S., Ioannidis, J. P. A., Mokrysz, C., Nosek, B. A., Flint, J., Robinson, E. S. J., &
364 Munafò, M. R. (2013). Power failure: Why small sample size undermines the reliability of
365 neuroscience. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, *14*, 365.
- 366 Chételat, G., Mézenge, F., Tomadesso, C., Landeau, B., Arenaza-Urquijo, E., Rauchs, G.,
367 André, C., de Flores, R., Egret, S., Gonneaud, J., Poisnel, G., Chocat, A., Quillard, A.,
368 Desgranges, B., Bloch, J.-G., Ricard, M., & Lutz, A. (2017). Reduced age-associated
369 brain changes in expert meditators: A multimodal neuroimaging pilot study. *Scientific*
370 *Reports*, *7*(1). <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-017-07764-x>
- 371 Clarke, T. C., Stussman, B. J., & Nahin, R. L. (2015). *Trends in the Use of Complementary*
372 *Health Approaches Among Adults: United States, 2002–2012*. *79*, 16.
- 373 Dunn, C., Haubenreiser, M., Johnson, M., Nordby, K., Aggarwal, S., Myer, S., & Thomas, C.
374 (2018). Mindfulness Approaches and Weight Loss, Weight Maintenance, and Weight
375 Regain. *Current Obesity Reports*, *7*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13679-018-0299-6>
- 376 Edwards, M. K., & Loprinzi, P. D. (2018). Comparative effects of meditation and exercise on
377 physical and psychosocial health outcomes: A review of randomized controlled trials.
378 *Postgraduate Medicine*, *130*(2), 222–228.
379 <https://doi.org/10.1080/00325481.2018.1409049>
- 380 Eickhoff, S. B., Bzdok, D., Laird, A. R., Kurth, F., & Fox, P. T. (2012). Activation likelihood
381 estimation meta-analysis revisited. *NeuroImage*, *59*(3), 2349–2361.
382 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2011.09.017>
- 383 Eickhoff, S.B., Laird, A.R., Grefkes, C., Wang, L.E., Zilles, K., & Fox, P.T. (2009). Coordinate-
384 based activation likelihood estimation meta-analysis of neuroimaging data: A random-
385 effects approach based on empirical estimates of spatial uncertainty. *Human Brain*
386 *Mapping*, *30*(9), 2907–2926.
- 387 Engen, H. G., Bernhardt, B. C., Skottnik, L., Ricard, M., & Singer, T. (2018). Structural changes
388 in socio-affective networks: Multi-modal MRI findings in long-term meditation

389 practitioners. *Neuropsychologia*, 116, 26–33.
390 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2017.08.024>

391 Fahmy, R., Wasfi, M., Mamdouh, R., Moussa, K., Wahba, A., Wittemann, M., Hirjak, D., Kubera,
392 K. M., Wolf, N. D., Sambataro, F., & Wolf, R. C. (2018). Mindfulness-based interventions
393 modulate structural network strength in patients with opioid dependence. *Addictive*
394 *Behaviors*, 82, 50–56. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.addbeh.2018.02.013>

395 Farias, M., & Wikholm, C. (2016). Has the science of mindfulness lost its mind? *BJPsych*
396 *Bulletin*, 40(6), 329–332. <https://doi.org/10.1192/pb.bp.116.053686>

397 Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Buchner, A., & Lang, A.-G. (2009). Statistical power analyses using
398 G*Power 3.1: Tests for correlation and regression analyses. *Behavior Research*
399 *Methods*, 41(4), 1149–1160. <https://doi.org/10.3758/BRM.41.4.1149>

400 Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Lang, A.-G., & Buchner, A. (2007). G*Power 3: A flexible statistical power
401 analysis program for the social, behavioral, and biomedical sciences. *Behavior Research*
402 *Methods*, 39(2), 175–191. <https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03193146>

403 Fayed, N., Garcia-Marti, G., Sanz-Requena, R., Marti-Bonmati, L., & Garcia-Campayo, R.
404 (2017). Difference in Regional Brain Volume between Fibromyalgia Patients and Long-
405 Term Meditators. *Actas Españolas de Psiquiatría*, 45(6), 268–276.

406 Friedel, S., Whittle, S. L., Vijayakumar, N., Simmons, J. G., Byrne, M. L., Schwartz, O. S., &
407 Allen, N. B. (2015). Dispositional mindfulness is predicted by structural development of
408 the insula during late adolescence. *Developmental Cognitive Neuroscience*, 14, 62–70.
409 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dcn.2015.07.001>

410 Goldberg, S. B., Wielgosz, J., Dahl, C., Schuyler, B., MacCoon, D. S., Rosenkranz, M., Lutz, A.,
411 Sebranek, C. A., & Davidson, R. J. (2016). Does the Five Facet Mindfulness
412 Questionnaire measure what we think it does? Construct validity evidence from an active
413 controlled randomized clinical trial. *Psychological Assessment*, 28(8), 1009–1014.
414 <https://doi.org/10.1037/pas0000233>

- 415 Gorgolewski, K. J., Varoquaux, G., Rivera, G., Schwarz, Y., Ghosh, S. S., Maumet, C., Sochat,
416 V. V., Nichols, T. E., Poldrack, R. A., Poline, J.-B., Yarkoni, T., & Margulies, D. S.
417 (2015). NeuroVault.org: A web-based repository for collecting and sharing unthresholded
418 statistical maps of the human brain. *Frontiers in Neuroinformatics*, 9.
419 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fninf.2015.00008>
- 420 Grant, J. A., Courtemanche, J., Duerden, E. G., Duncan, G. H., & Rainville, P. (2010). Cortical
421 thickness and pain sensitivity in zen meditators. *Emotion*, 10(1), 43–53.
422 <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0018334>
- 423 Grant, J. A., Duerden, E. G., Courtemanche, J., Cherkasova, M., Duncan, G. H., & Rainville, P.
424 (2013). Cortical thickness, mental absorption and meditative practice: Possible
425 implications for disorders of attention. *Biological Psychology*, 92(2), 275–281.
426 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsycho.2012.09.007>
- 427 Harrer, M., Cuijpers, P., Furukawa, T.A., & Ebert, D.D. (2019). *Dmetar: Companion R Package*
428 *For The Guide “Doing Meta-Analysis in R”. R package (Version 0.0.9) [R].*
429 <https://dmetar.protectlab.org/authors.html>
- 430 Hayasaka, S., Phan, K. L., Liberzon, I., Worsley, K. J., & Nichols, T. E. (2004). Nonstationary
431 cluster-size inference with random field and permutation methods. *NeuroImage*, 22(2),
432 676–687. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2004.01.041>
- 433 Hernández, S. E., Suero, J., Barros, A., González-Mora, J. L., & Rubia, K. (2016). Increased
434 Grey Matter Associated with Long-Term Sahaja Yoga Meditation: A Voxel-Based
435 Morphometry Study. *PLOS ONE*, 11(3), e0150757.
436 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0150757>
- 437 Hilton, L., Hempel, S., Ewing, B. A., Apaydin, E., Xenakis, L., Newberry, S., Colaiaco, B.,
438 Maher, A. R., Shanman, R. M., Sorbero, M. E., & Maglione, M. A. (2017). Mindfulness
439 Meditation for Chronic Pain: Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *Annals of Behavioral*
440 *Medicine*, 51(2), 199–213. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12160-016-9844-2>

- 441 Hölzel, B. K., Ott, U., Gard, T., Hempel, H., Weygandt, M., Morgen, K., & Vaitl, D. (2008).
442 Investigation of mindfulness meditation practitioners with voxel-based morphometry.
443 *Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience*, 3(1), 55–61.
444 <https://doi.org/10.1093/scan/nsm038>
- 445 Hood, M. M., & Jedel, S. (2017). Mindfulness-Based Interventions in Inflammatory Bowel
446 Disease. *Gastroenterology Clinics of North America*, 46(4), 859–874.
447 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gtc.2017.08.008>
- 448 Innes, K. E., & Selfe, T. K. (2014). Meditation as a Therapeutic Intervention for Adults at Risk for
449 Alzheimer’s Disease – Potential Benefits and Underlying Mechanisms. *Frontiers in*
450 *Psychiatry*, 5. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsy.2014.00040>
- 451 Kober, S. E., Witte, M., Ninaus, M., Koschutnig, K., Wiesen, D., Zaiser, G., Neuper, C., & Wood,
452 G. (2017). Ability to Gain Control Over One’s Own Brain Activity and its Relation to
453 Spiritual Practice: A Multimodal Imaging Study. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, 11.
454 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2017.00271>
- 455 Kumar, U., Guleria, A., Kishan, S. S. K., & Khetrpal, C. L. (2014). Effect of SOHAM Meditation
456 on Human Brain: A Voxel-Based Morphometry Study: Effect of SOHAM Meditation on
457 Human Brain. *Journal of Neuroimaging*, 24(2), 187–190.
458 <https://doi.org/10.1111/jon.12040>
- 459 Kurth, F., Cherbuin, N., & Luders, E. (2015). Reduced age-related degeneration of the
460 hippocampal subiculum in long-term meditators. *Psychiatry Research: Neuroimaging*,
461 232(3), 214–218. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychresns.2015.03.008>
- 462 Kurth, F., MacKenzie-Graham, A., Toga, A. W., & Luders, E. (2015). Shifting brain asymmetry:
463 The link between meditation and structural lateralization. *Social Cognitive and Affective*
464 *Neuroscience*, 10(1), 55–61. <https://doi.org/10.1093/scan/nsu029>
- 465 Kurth, F., Zilles, K., Fox, P. T., Laird, A. R., & Eickhoff, S. B. (2010). A link between the
466 systems: Functional differentiation and integration within the human insula revealed by

- 467 meta-analysis. *Brain Structure and Function*, 214(5–6), 519–534.
468 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00429-010-0255-z>
- 469 Kwekkeboom, K. L., & Bratzke, L. C. (2016). A Systematic Review of Relaxation, Meditation,
470 and Guided Imagery Strategies for Symptom Management in Heart Failure: *The Journal*
471 *of Cardiovascular Nursing*, 31(5), 457–468.
472 <https://doi.org/10.1097/JCN.0000000000000274>
- 473 Latorraca, C. de O. C., Martimbianco, A. L. C., Pachito, D. V., Pacheco, R. L., & Riera, R.
474 (2017). Mindfulness for palliative care patients. Systematic review. *International Journal*
475 *of Clinical Practice*, 71(12), e13034. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijcp.13034>
- 476 Lazar, S. W., Kerr, C. E., Wasserman, R. H., Gray, J. R., Greve, D. N., Treadway, M. T.,
477 McGarvey, M., Quinn, B. T., Dusek, J. A., Benson, H., Rauch, S. L., Moore, C. I., &
478 Fischl, B. (2005). Meditation experience is associated with increased cortical thickness:
479 *NeuroReport*, 16(17), 1893–1897. <https://doi.org/10.1097/01.wnr.0000186598.66243.19>
- 480 Leung, M.-K., Chan, C. C. H., Yin, J., Lee, C.-F., So, K.-F., & Lee, T. M. C. (2013). Increased
481 gray matter volume in the right angular and posterior parahippocampal gyri in loving-
482 kindness meditators. *Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience*, 8(1), 34–39.
483 <https://doi.org/10.1093/scan/nss076>
- 484 Lu, H., Song, Y., Xu, M., Wang, X., Li, X., & Liu, J. (2014). The brain structure correlates of
485 individual differences in trait mindfulness: A voxel-based morphometry study.
486 *Neuroscience*, 272, 21–28. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroscience.2014.04.051>
- 487 Luders, E., Cherbuin, N., & Kurth, F. (2015). Forever Young(er): Potential age-defying effects of
488 long-term meditation on gray matter atrophy. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 5.
489 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2014.01551>
- 490 Luders, E., Kurth, F., Toga, A. W., Narr, K. L., & Gaser, C. (2013). Meditation effects within the
491 hippocampal complex revealed by voxel-based morphometry and cytoarchitectonic
492 probabilistic mapping. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 4.

- 493 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2013.00398>
- 494 Luders, E., Thompson, P. M., & Kurth, F. (2015). Larger hippocampal dimensions in meditation
495 practitioners: Differential effects in women and men. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 6.
496 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2015.00186>
- 497 Luders, E., Thompson, P. M., Kurth, F., Hong, J.-Y., Phillips, O. R., Wang, Y., Gutman, B. A.,
498 Chou, Y.-Y., Narr, K. L., & Toga, A. W. (2013). Global and regional alterations of
499 hippocampal anatomy in long-term meditation practitioners: Mapping the Hippocampus
500 in Meditators. *Human Brain Mapping*, 34(12), 3369–3375.
501 <https://doi.org/10.1002/hbm.22153>
- 502 Luders, E., Toga, A. W., Lepore, N., & Gaser, C. (2009). The underlying anatomical correlates
503 of long-term meditation: Larger hippocampal and frontal volumes of gray matter.
504 *NeuroImage*, 45(3), 672–678. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2008.12.061>
- 505 Martínez-Mesa, J., González-Chica, D. A., Duquia, R. P., Bonamigo, R. R., Bastos, J. L.,
506 Martínez-Mesa, J., González-Chica, D. A., Duquia, R. P., Bonamigo, R. R., & Bastos, J.
507 L. (2016). Sampling: How to select participants in my research study? *Anais Brasileiros*
508 *de Dermatologia*, 91(3), 326–330. <https://doi.org/10.1590/abd1806-4841.20165254>
- 509 Murakami, H., Nakao, T., Matsunaga, M., Kasuya, Y., Shinoda, J., Yamada, J., & Ohira, H.
510 (2012). The Structure of Mindful Brain. *PLoS ONE*, 7(9), e46377.
511 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0046377>
- 512 Nichols, T. E., Das, S., Eickhoff, S. B., Evans, A. C., Glatard, T., Hanke, M., Kriegeskorte, N.,
513 Milham, M. P., Poldrack, R. A., Poline, J.-B., Proal, E., Thirion, B., Essen, D. C. V.,
514 White, T., & Yeo, B. T. T. (2017). Best practices in data analysis and sharing in
515 neuroimaging using MRI. *Nature Neuroscience*, 20(3), 299–303.
516 <https://doi.org/10.1038/nn.4500>
- 517 Pagnoni, G., & Cekic, M. (2007). Age effects on gray matter volume and attentional
518 performance in Zen meditation. *Neurobiology of Aging*, 28(10), 1623–1627.

- 519 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neurobiolaging.2007.06.008>
- 520 Park, T., Reilly-Spong, M., & Gross, C. R. (2013). Mindfulness: A systematic review of
521 instruments to measure an emergent patient-reported outcome (PRO). *Quality of Life*
522 *Research : An International Journal of Quality of Life Aspects of Treatment, Care and*
523 *Rehabilitation*, 22(10). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11136-013-0395-8>
- 524 Pernet, C.R. (2017). Null hypothesis significance testing: A guide to commonly misunderstood
525 concepts and recommendations for good practice. *F1000Research*, 4, 621.
526 <https://doi.org/10.12688/f1000research.6963.5>
- 527 Pernet, Cyril R. (2018). The General Linear Model: Theory and practicalities in brain
528 morphometric analyses. *Brain Morphometry: Methods and Clinical Applications*, 75–85.
- 529 Potes, A., Souza, G., Nikolitch, K., Penheiro, R., Moussa, Y., Jarvis, E., Looper, K., & Rej, S.
530 (2018). Mindfulness in severe and persistent mental illness: A systematic review.
531 *International Journal of Psychiatry in Clinical Practice*, 22(4), 253–261.
532 <https://doi.org/10.1080/13651501.2018.1433857>
- 533 Rohatgi, A. (2019). *WebPlotDigitizer* (Version 4.2) [Computer software].
534 <https://automeris.io/WebPlotDigitizer>
- 535 Russell-Williams, J., Jaroudi, W., Perich, T., Hoscheidt, S., El Haj, M., & Moustafa, A. A. (2018).
536 Mindfulness and meditation: Treating cognitive impairment and reducing stress in
537 dementia. *Reviews in the Neurosciences*, 29(7), 791–804.
538 <https://doi.org/10.1515/revneuro-2017-0066>
- 539 Santorelli, S. F., Meleo-Meyer, F., Koerbel, L., & Kabat-Zinn, J. (2017). *Mindfulness-Based*
540 *Stress Reduction (MBSR) Authorized Curriculum Guide*.
541 [https://www.umassmed.edu/globalassets/center-for-mindfulness/documents/mbsr-](https://www.umassmed.edu/globalassets/center-for-mindfulness/documents/mbsr-curriculum-guide-2017.pdf)
542 [curriculum-guide-2017.pdf](https://www.umassmed.edu/globalassets/center-for-mindfulness/documents/mbsr-curriculum-guide-2017.pdf)
- 543 Schlosser, M., Sparby, T., Vörös, S., Jones, R., & Marchant, N. L. (2019). Unpleasant
544 meditation-related experiences in regular meditators: Prevalence, predictors, and

- 545 conceptual considerations. *PLOS ONE*, 14(5), e0216643.
546 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0216643>
- 547 Sperduti, M., Makowski, D., Blonde, P., & Piolino, P. (2017). Meditation and successful aging:
548 Can meditative practices counteract age-related cognitive decline? *Geriatric et*
549 *Psychologie Neuropsychiatrie Du Vieillissement*, 15(2), 205–213.
550 <https://doi.org/10.1684/pnv.2017.0672>
- 551 Srinivasan, N. (Ed.). (2019). *Meditation* (Vol. 244). Academic Press.
- 552 Taren, A. A., Creswell, J. D., & Gianaros, P. J. (2013). Dispositional Mindfulness Co-Varies with
553 Smaller Amygdala and Caudate Volumes in Community Adults. *PLoS ONE*, 8(5),
554 e64574. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0064574>
- 555 Turkeltaub, P. E., Eickhoff, S. B., Laird, A. R., Fox, M., Wiener, M., & Fox, P. (2012). Minimizing
556 within-experiment and within-group effects in activation likelihood estimation meta-
557 analyses. *Human Brain Mapping*, 33(1), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hbm.21186>
- 558 Vestergaard-Poulsen, P., van Beek, M., Skewes, J., Bjarkam, C. R., Stubberup, M., Bertelsen,
559 J., & Roepstorff, A. (2009). Long-term meditation is associated with increased gray
560 matter density in the brain stem: *NeuroReport*, 20(2), 170–174.
561 <https://doi.org/10.1097/WNR.0b013e328320012a>
- 562 Yarkoni, T., Poldrack, R. A., Nichols, T. E., Van Essen, D. C., & Wager, T. D. (2011). Large-
563 scale automated synthesis of human functional neuroimaging data. *Nature Methods*,
564 8(8), 665–670. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nmeth.1635>