## Figure 2. Meta-analyses for outcomes assessed post-intervention in two or more studies

Figure 2a. Results for the meta-analysis on disease-specific HRQOL Figure 2b. Results for the meta-analysis on levels of mindfulness

	Experimental Conf			Control			Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference		
Study or Subgroup	Mean	ean SD Total Mean SD			Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% CI		
Chan 2015	5.07	1.1	16	4.09	1	19	28.3%	0.91 [0.21, 1.62]	-	
Mularski 2009	-56.1	10.35	20	-53.7	12.99	29	33.1%	-0.20 [-0.77, 0.37]	+	
Pbert 2012	5.61	1.1	42	5.57	1.09	41	38.6%	0.04 [-0.39, 0.47]	<u>†</u>	
Total (95% CI)			78			89	100.0%	0.21 [-0.36, 0.78]	<b>•</b>	
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> =				-10 -5 0 5 10						
Test for overall effect	Z = 0.71		Favours control Favours mindfulness							

	Exp	eriment	tal	Control				Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference		
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% CI	IV, Fixed, 95% CI		
Chan 2015	40.43	8.25	16	40.09	7.84	22	43.9%	0.04 [-0.60, 0.69]	<del>-</del>		
Mularski 2009	133.2	10.35	20	131	20.63	29	56.1%	0.13 [-0.44, 0.70]	+		
Total (95% CI)			36			51	100.0%	0.09 [-0.34, 0.52]	<b>*</b>		
Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = Test for overall effect				² = 0%				-4 -2 0 2 4 Favours control Favours mindfulness			

Figure 2c. Results for the meta-analysis on stress levels

	Mindfulness Control				Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference					
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% C	IV, Fixed	1, 95% CI	
Mularski 2009	14.6	7.01	20	14.4	4.82	29	36.4%	0.03 [-0.54, 0.60	)] -	•	
Pbert 2012	13	6.48	42	14.3	6.4	41	63.6%	-0.20 [-0.63, 0.23	3]	•	
Total (95% CI)			62			70	100.0%	-0.11 [-0.46, 0.23	<b>3</b> ]	•	
Heterogeneity: Chi²=	0.41, df	= 1 (P	= 0.52)	); <b>I²</b> = 09		-10 -5	<u> </u>	10			
Test for overall effect:	Z = 0.65	(P = 0	0.51)				Favours Mindfulness Favours control				