**Supplementary Materials**

*Checklist for quality scores*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Quality criteria | Boyle et al. (2017) | Branstrom et al. (2010) | Branstrom et al. (2013) | Chambers et al. (2017) | Johannsen et al. (2018) | Johns et al. (2016) | Labelle et al. (2010) | Labelle et al. (2015a) | Labelle et al. (2015b) | Lengacher *et al.* (2014) | Lengacher et al. (2021) | Schellekens et al. (2017a) | Schellekens et al. (2017b) |
| 1) Did the study cite a theoretical framework? | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| 2) Were the psychometric characteristics of the mediator variable(s) tested within the study and within accepted ranges (e.g. Cronbach's alpha/test-retest reliability > .7)? | Yes | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes |
| 3) Were the psychometric characteristics of the outcome variable(s) tested within the study and within accepted ranges (e.g. Cronbach's alpha/test-retest reliability > .7)? | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes |
| 4) Did the study report a power calculation to determine sample size and was the study adequately powered to detect mediation? | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | Yes |
| 5) Did the study have an active control group? | No | No | No | No | No | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | Yes | No |
| 6) Was the study described as randomised? | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| 7) Was the method used to generate the sequence of randomisation described and appropriate (table of random numbers, computer-generated, etc)? | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | No | Yes | No | No | Yes |
| 8) Was information about participant flow provided (numbers of participants assigned to each condition, analysed and dropped out)? | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| 9) Did the study report the experience/qualifications of the MBI facilitator(s) or means of protocol adherence? | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes |
| 10) Was change in the proposed mediator(s) used in mediation analysis measured before the outcome? | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes |
| 11) Was change in the proposed mediator(s) used in mediation analysis measured during treatment? | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | No | Yes | Yes |
| 12) Did the study report the proportion of participants in the intervention condition who received an adequate dose of the MBI (> 4 out of 8 sessions)? | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | Yes | Yes |
| 13) Was mediation analysis carried out using only the participants who received an adequate dose of the MBI? | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | No | Yes | Yes |
| 14) Was post-intervention outcome controlled for baseline outcome? | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Quality score (/14) | 10 | 10 | 7 | 9 | 10 | 7 | 4 | 9 | 9 | 5 | 7 | 9 | 12 |

*Note.* MBI = mindfulness-based intervention; RCT = randomised controlled trial.