

# Mindfulness Meditation and Network Neuroscience: Review, Synthesis, and Future Directions

Ruchika S. Prakash, Anita Shankar, Vaibhav Tripathi, Winson F.Z. Yang, Megan Fisher, Clemens C.C. Bauer, Richard Betzel, and Matthew D. Sacchet

## ABSTRACT

Network neuroscience is an interdisciplinary field, which can be used to understand the brain by examining the connections between its constituent elements. In recent years, the application of network neuroscience approaches to study the intricate nature of the structural and functional relationships within the human brain has yielded unique insights into its organization. In this review, we begin by defining network neuroscience and providing an overview of the common metrics that describe the topology of human structural and functional brain networks. Then, we present a detailed overview of a limited but growing body of literature that has leveraged network neuroscience metrics to demonstrate the impact of mindfulness meditation on modulating the fundamental structural and functional network properties of segregation, integration, and influence. Although preliminary, results across studies suggest that mindfulness meditation results in a shift in connector hubs, such as the anterior cingulate cortex, the thalamus, and the mid-insula. Although there is mixed evidence regarding the impact of mindfulness training on global metrics of connectivity, the default mode network exhibits reduced intraconnectivity following mindfulness training. Our review also underscores essential directions for future research, including a more comprehensive examination of mindfulness training and its potential to influence structural and functional connections at the nodal, network, and whole-brain levels. Furthermore, we emphasize the importance of open science, adoption of rigorous study designs to improve the internal validity of studies, and the inclusion of diverse samples in neuroimaging studies to comprehensively characterize the impact of mindfulness on brain organization.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bpsc.2024.11.005>

Mindfulness meditation comprises a family of practices that originate from Buddhist contemplative traditions and emphasize the cultivation of focused attention and nonjudgmental internal awareness. Scientific investigations on meditation began to proliferate in the 1960s, when psychophysiological tools were used to study acute and long-term effects of diverse meditation techniques in experienced practitioners (1–3). By 1979, Jon Kabat-Zinn had developed mindfulness-based stress reduction (4), a seminal 8-week training program for novices that has now become the most well-researched structured mindfulness training program to date (5,6).

Over the past 2 decades, there has been significant interest in using structural and functional magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) to examine the effects of mindfulness meditation on the brain. Many early neuroimaging studies that characterized the neural correlates of mindfulness-based stress reduction relied on univariate methods, including general linear models. Typically, these studies involved using general linear models to compare the activity of specific brain metrics—whether derived at the voxel level, within region-of-interest parcellations, or across networks—to identify statistically significant patterns of brain activation following mindfulness-based stress reduction training. With the advent of functional and structural

connectivity approaches, there has also been a growing interest in examining large-scale network changes in mindfulness meditation, including the functional reorganization of attentional networks including the frontoparietal network (FPN), the salience network (SN), and the default mode network (DMN) (7,8) together with changes in functional connectivity between sensory networks and attentional networks.

However, most neuroimaging investigations of mindfulness meditation have primarily adopted methodological approaches that have focused on specific sets of brain regions, small constellations of connections, and canonical brain systems in isolation and have mostly examined pairwise associations between these regions. Meanwhile, the broader human neuroimaging community has adopted techniques from network science—the study of complex systems of interacting elements—to understand the structure and function of the nervous system. Despite these advancements, network science techniques have not yet been widely implemented by the mindfulness meditation community. In this review, we 1) outline the network neuroscience approach, focusing on its contributions to our understanding of brain organization, 2) review current approaches for studying brain-based correlates of mindfulness, and 3) present a path for future research that

has the potential to rigorously and causally demonstrate effects of mindfulness meditation on structural and functional features of the human brain.

## INTRODUCTION TO NETWORK NEUROSCIENCE

Network science is a multidisciplinary field where systems of interacting elements are modeled as graphs or networks. The application of network science to the study of nervous systems constitutes the broad field of network neuroscience. Nervous systems are multiscale, complex, dynamic systems (9,10) composed of neural elements, such as neurons, populations, and areas that interact with one another, forming extensive brainwide connectivity patterns. It is through and along these connectomes that neural elements signal one another. Both the physical connections and the outcome of the signaling processes can be modeled and understood through a network science lens (11).

Brain networks are typically differentiated based on the imaging modality from which they were reconstructed and based on the connections that they represent. Figure 1 outlines the basic methodology of network neuroscience approaches. These networks can be decomposed into its nodes and edges, representing the elements of the system and their pairwise interactions, respectively. In human imaging, nodes can be defined at different spatial resolutions, from fine-scale voxels and surface vertices to coarse-scale parcels and regions (11). As shown in Figure 1, edges can represent both structural and functional connections. In structural networks, edges often correspond to white matter fascicles linking pairs of gray matter parcels (12). Functional connectivity is estimated as a measure of statistical dependence between the activities recorded from 2 different nodes (13). Although this definition allows for any measure of dependence, most studies have defined functional connectivity as the bivariate product-moment correlation between the time series of 2 nodes. Generally, regions that are strongly functionally connected are thought to be communicating or engaged in similar functions (14). For example, Figure 1 represents the correlation between time series of nodes 2 and 3 to measure the functional connection between these 2 nodes. Both types of connectivity can be modeled as networks and studied using network science.

### What Have We Learned About Brain Network Organization?


Network neuroscience is a relatively young field; nonetheless, an impressive set of canonical network features have been

compiled that have clear functional significance and are consistent across structural and functional networks, phylogeny, and spatiotemporal scales.

**Small-World Properties.** At their core, connectomes are communication networks. A network is said to exhibit small-world properties if its clustering coefficient—a measure of whether nodes' neighbors are connected to one another—is relatively large, while its characteristic path length—the mean number of hops in the shortest path from a source to a target node—is sufficiently short. In other words, small-world networks exhibit dense, local circuitry for carrying out specialized information processing and short processing paths so that signals can be delivered rapidly from one location to another. Importantly, small worldness is ubiquitous across connectomes (15–17); it has been observed in the synaptic wiring of the nematode *C. elegans* (18), interareal connectomes of flies (19), mice, rats, and nonhuman primates, and the human connectome reconstructed from diffusion-weighted MRI data (10).

**Hubs and Rich Clubs.** Another ubiquitous feature of connectomes is their heterogeneity with respect to the connectivity patterns of specific nodes; some nodes occupy positions of influence and importance within a network while others do not (20). For example, we can identify influential nodes in the network by counting the number of connections that they make (their degree) or the total weights of their connections (their strength) (12). Like social media influencers with large numbers of followers, nodes that are more connected exhibit a greater capacity for influence within the network and are imbued with the ability to deliver signals to many parts of the brain quickly. However, degree is only one method for quantifying node properties; it describes node influences in terms of their structural position. However, even low-degree and weakly connected nodes can be central to dynamic processes unfolding over the network. Perhaps the best-known measure of importance is the metric of betweenness centrality, which counts the number of shortest paths in the network that involve a given node (21).

Influential nodes can also form higher-order structures, including rich clubs (21). A rich club refers to a collection of high-degree nodes that are more densely connected to one another than would be expected under a chance model. This type of structure appears in other complex networks, for example in air travel networks, where hub airports often



**Figure 1.** Network neuroscience methods. The application of network science to study the functional or structural organization of the brain typically involves parcellating brain regions into nodes (points where paths intersect) and examining their edges (the functional or structural connections between nodes). Panel (A) includes several constructs that are described in the main text, including nodes, edges, modules, hubs, and rich clubs. Edges can be defined either functionally (e.g., correlation between blood oxygen level-dependent functional magnetic resonance imaging time courses) or structurally (e.g., criteria related to tractography as computed from

diffusion-weighted imaging). Panel (B) depicts a connectivity matrix generated through computing relationships (e.g., cross-correlations) between all pairs of regions of the brain.

## Mindfulness Meditation and Network Neuroscience

maintain direct flights to other hubs, whereas nonhub peripheral airports connect indirectly via hubs. Rich clubs act as highly integrative structures within the human connectome. For example, [Figure 1A and B](#) highlight nodes 6, 13, 17, and 23 as forming the rich club due to their central role in connecting nodes of different modules with one another. Most of the shortest paths in connectomes must traverse through these rich-club nodes, which are represented in virtually every functional system. Thus, these rich clubs integrate information and signals across specialized subsystems.

**Modules.** Another key architectural feature of brain networks is their propensity to be organized into subnetworks called modules or communities. As an example, [Figure 1](#) showcases 4 modules: module 1 (green), module 2 (blue), module 3 (yellow), and module 4 (brown). These modules are typically defined to be internally dense and externally sparse, a feature thought to support specialization of function. In functional networks, detected modules resemble the brain's functional systems (even at rest), with module boundaries sometimes circumscribing task activations. Modules in structural brain networks tend to exhibit weaker correspondence with functional systems (22). In both cases, modules can be used to further characterize the hubness or importance of nodes in the network. As shown in [Figure 1](#), nodes 6, 13, 17, and 23 function as hubs due to their connections with nodes in other modules, as well as their connections with one another. Measures like the participation coefficient describe how a node's connections are concentrated within a single module (low participation) or uniformly distributed across modules (high participation). Participation tends to be much lower in unimodal and sensory systems and greater in higher-order, heteromodal systems (23), which is thought to reflect differences in both the complexity and breadth of computations that those systems support.

**Cost-Efficient Spatial Embedding.** Small worldness, hubs and rich clubs, and modules all have functional significance. They facilitate reduced processing time (24), integration of information across brain systems (24), and performance of specialized information processing (25). The brain must balance the formation of these functionally adaptive features with volumetric, material, and metabolic constraints (26). Connectomes favor cost-efficient, short-range (low-cost) connections because shorter connections require proportionally less material to form and less energy to maintain and use for signaling over longer, more expensive connections, a feature evident across phylogeny (27). This exposes tradeoffs in the brain; given the finite budget for space and energy, the formation of costly meso-scale features means that other costly features cannot be formed (28).

To summarize, network neuroscience approaches can offer insights into the topological properties of brain networks. The canonical features of brain organization, reviewed in this section, are increasingly being investigated as mechanistic and outcome variables in studies that investigate the effects of mindfulness meditation on the brain. One of the key advantages of applying network neuroscience approaches to the study of mindfulness is that these measures allow us to go beyond simply describing specific connection changes

following mindfulness training to understanding how these connections evolve and their impact on signaling processes for local and global efficiency. As mindfulness meditation is increasingly investigated in the context of emergent behaviors, including cognition (29), known to have emergent properties, the application of network neuroscience enables us to study the dynamics of brain regions and how they work in concert to support the prophylactic effects of mindfulness meditation.

In the following section, we briefly review early research that used univariate approaches to investigate changes in brain activity and connectivity following mindfulness training. Then, we provide a comprehensive review of the current, although limited, literature that builds on these univariate studies, focusing specifically on how changes in connections between brain regions may contribute to more efficient local and global neural circuitry.

## MINDFULNESS MEDITATION AND THE BRAIN

Pioneering neuroimaging studies on mindfulness meditation aimed to achieve 2 primary objectives. First, researchers sought to identify neural processes associated with mindfulness meditation, examining brain activity differences between expert meditators and novices as well as studying changes in activity before, during, and after meditation (30–39). Second, these studies aimed to understand relationships among neural activation patterns and psychological processes involved in meditation, including the assessment of behavior, cognition, and emotion (40,41).

These studies revealed discrete regions that are involved in mindfulness meditation, including the posterior cingulate cortex (PCC) (42), the medial prefrontal cortex (PFC) (43,44), the dorsal anterior cingulate cortex (ACC) (33), the anterior insula (45), and the striatum (46–48). To illustrate, the PCC and medial PFC, which are commonly associated with self-related processing (49,50) may support attenuating self-related processing (51) during meditation (42–44). Similarly, the dorsal ACC and anterior insula, often involved in salience detection and attentional control (52,53), may support attentional processes during meditation (33,45). Finally, the striatum, linked to reward processing (53,54), may contribute to emotion regulation in mindfulness meditation (46,48). However, these methods have largely remained within univariate-based general linear model frameworks, examining brain activation within single or small sets of regions.

Resting-state functional connectivity is an approach that can be used to examine the intrinsic functional organization of the brain by analyzing data acquired when an individual is not engaged in any specific task. The resting state was initially hypothesized to mirror the experience of meditative practices and launched a new era in mindfulness studies. Many of these studies examined changes in functional connectivity between nodes that had previously been found to be involved in task-based studies, such as the PCC and the dorsolateral PFC (dlPFC), with more recent investigations examining changes in total intra- and inter-network connectivity of several canonical brain networks.

This research on mindfulness training and resting-state functional connectivity has revealed insights into the impact of mindfulness practices on large-scale network changes,

including the functional reorganization of attentional networks including the FPN, the SN, and the DMN (7,8,40) together with changes in functional connectivity between sensory networks and attentional networks (55). The FPN—sometimes divided into the dorsal and lateral FPN (56)—involves regions such as the middle frontal gyrus, anterior inferior and superior parietal lobules, intraparietal sulcus, midcingulate gyrus, intraparietal sulcus, middle temporal cortex, ventral motor cortex, and right-lateralized dlPFC (56). Broadly, the FPN is largely responsible for goal-directed thinking, inhibitory control and working memory, and task switching (56–58). Relatedly, the SN encompasses the bilateral anterior insula, anterior mid-cingulate cortex, inferior parietal cortex, right temporoparietal junction, lateral PFC, and subcortical structures (56). The primary role of the SN is to detect behaviorally relevant stimuli that arise from both external and internal sources (56,59). Lastly, the core regions of the DMN include the medial PFC, PCC, posterior portions of the inferior parietal lobule, inferior frontal gyrus, middle temporal gyrus, superior temporal sulcus, and the parahippocampal cortex (59). Although the functions of the DMN are widespread, its primary role involves detecting the associative relevance of both internal and external information, and it has often been implicated in imagination, memory, and self-referential processes such as mind wandering or spontaneous thought (56,60–62).

However, a definitive conclusion has yet to be reached due to mixed findings across studies, such as increased and decreased functional connectivity in key brain networks (40). For example, mindfulness training has been associated with increased connectivity within and between auditory and visual networks (55), as well as decreased connectivity between regions of the posteroventral DMN and nodes of the task-positive networks, including the SN (55,63), FPN (55), and auditory networks (55). In contrast, other research has also reported increased connectivity between nodes of the DMN (i.e., PCC) and task-positive networks, such as the dlPFC, following mindfulness training (64). Furthermore, inconsistencies in the directionality of functional connectivity changes between the rostral ACC and dorsomedial PFC are also present, with mindfulness training either increasing (65) or decreasing (66) connectivity. Many inconsistencies in this literature are likely due to differences in training programs, with duration varying from 3-day intensive retreats to 8-week training programs; differences in the populations studied, ranging from community participants to those with neurological or psychiatric disorders; and varying analytic pipelines. Nonetheless, these findings underscore the potential effects of mindfulness on brain networks related to attention, self-awareness, and emotional processing, highlighting key networks that may undergo reorganization following mindfulness practices.

### Applying Network Neuroscience to Mindfulness Meditation


The functional connectivity studies summarized above have been instrumental in helping us understand the role of key canonical networks by primarily providing information about the strength of connections at the nodal, network, or whole-brain levels. Building on previous functional connectivity research, network neuroscience studies of mindfulness

meditation use graph theoretical methods to provide a more comprehensive understanding of the integration and segregation of nodes and networks. Additionally, these studies examine reconfiguration of both functional and structural architectures across various levels, including the nodal, network, or whole-brain level.

In contrast to the extensive literature focused on univariate functional connectivity analyses, only a few studies have investigated multivariate metrics of segregation and integration following mindfulness training. Figure 2 summarizes the preliminary results of mindfulness meditation on select metrics from network neuroscience. One of the first studies used graph theory methods to examine the efficiency and connectivity of the ACC after 11 hours of mindfulness training in an undergraduate cohort (67). The ACC showed increased network efficiency and degree connectivity in participants who practiced mindfulness meditation compared with those who engaged in relaxation training. Following mindfulness training, the ACC not only demonstrated increased connectivity with various other brain regions but also showed more efficient information transfer to distributed regions of the brain. Network efficiency, a measure of the mean inverse shortest path length within a local subnetwork, is commonly used to measure the small-world properties of a network. This preliminary study suggests that mindfulness training enhances efficient information flow through the ACC. In contrast, the supplementary motor area was characterized by a decrease in degree connectivity and efficiency following mindfulness training, which suggests that reduced connections within this part of the motor network may potentially facilitate the meditative state of being.

Cross-sectional studies that have compared expert to novice meditators, and those that have examined individual differences in dispositional mindfulness and nodal properties, have provided further insight into how the various regions of the brain typically activated in mindfulness training studies reconfigure or shift alliance in more mindful individuals. For example, the caudate, a key region of the striatum, is known for its flexible functional coupling with various brain networks to prioritize task-relevant motivational signals (68). Furthermore, univariate mindfulness studies have shown an increase in caudate activity following mindfulness training (36), an elevated blood oxygen level-dependent response in this region and others within the striatum among meditators compared with novices (69,70), and an increase in the volume of the caudate post mindfulness training (71). Building on this literature, Gard *et al.* (72) and Lardone *et al.* (73) demonstrated higher betweenness centrality of the caudate in meditators than novices, with the increased functional coupling underscoring the hub-like nature of the caudate for information transfer across the entire functional connectome following mindfulness meditation. Similarly, Wang *et al.* (74) found a negative correlation between a trait measure of mindfulness and network properties of the thalamus, indicating that more mindful individuals exhibited lower global efficiency, lower clustering coefficient, and lower degree connectivity between the thalamus and the other nodes of the DMN. Wang *et al.*'s findings (74), which extend beyond the functional connectivity studies, also suggest that the segregation of the thalamus from the other canonical regions of the DMN is a significant correlate of dispositional mindfulness.

## Mindfulness Meditation and Network Neuroscience



**Figure 2.** Network properties investigated in relation to mindfulness meditation. From metrics assessing local to global connectivity, (A) degree connectivity is increased in the anterior cingulate cortex and decreased in the supplementary motor area after mindfulness training (67). Trait mindfulness is linked to lower degree connectivity between the thalamus and other nodes of the default mode network (74), and nodes within several canonical networks (default mode network, frontoparietal network) demonstrate increased degree connectivity during meditative states. (B) Clustering coefficient is lower between the thalamus and other nodes of the default mode network (74) and predicted meditation practice participation and class attendance (78). (C) Betweenness centrality of the caudate is higher in meditators than in novices (72,73). (D) Path length is shorter on average in meditators than in novices, and an association between path length and the Five Factor Mindfulness Questionnaire demonstrated that average path length decreases as trait mindfulness increases (95). (E) Network (local) efficiency of the anterior cingulate cortex is shown to increase in participants who receive mindfulness training, whereas network efficiency of the supplementary motor area decreased (67). (F) Global efficiency has been shown to be higher in individuals with higher trait mindfulness (95).

Adding to these nodal studies, Jao *et al.* (75) examined state-dependent shifts in the reconfiguration of hubs during meditation compared with rest. No differences in global topology networks were identified between the meditative and rest states in experienced meditators. However, experienced meditators showed expertise-dependent reorganization of the hubs, particularly in regions of the sensorimotor cortex, the primary visual cortex, and the auditory cortex. Nodes of these regions showed the highest degree of connectivity during rest, but during meditation, their connectivity was significantly reduced. In contrast, key regions of the DMN and the FPN, including the precuneus, the medial PFC, the intraparietal lobule, and the dlPFC, showed increased degree connectivity in the meditative state. Together, these node-based examinations of network properties corroborate previous literature while providing additional insights into their specific connectivity patterns within the functional brain connectome.

One of the fundamental principles in the organization of connectomes, as discussed above, is the tendency to minimize communication cost while simultaneously enhancing global communication and information transfer. This balance is often quantified using metrics of segregation like the clustering coefficient. This measure quantifies the density of connections among spatially adjacent nodes. Alternatively, integration measures, such as global efficiency, quantify efficient neural communication between spatially and functionally distant brain regions. Mindfulness training has been shown to reduce functional segregation between the DMN, dorsal attention network, SN, and FPN in individuals with cancer (76). Similarly, a brief mindfulness training program in older adults resulted in reduced intraconnectivity among the nodes of the DMN, SN, and somatomotor networks (77). A study that examined adherence to meditative practices (focused attention and open monitoring)

found that system segregation and clustering were predictive of participation and the number of classes attended (78).

System-wide integration metrics, such as path length and global efficiency, have been increasingly examined in studies comparing experienced and novice meditators (79). In a study of aging meditators compared with novices, Gard *et al.* reported shorter path lengths in meditators, with scores on the Five Factor Mindfulness Questionnaire (80) correlating positively with global efficiency and negatively with path length. In related research, Van Lutterveld *et al.* (81) used electroencephalography to examine differences in functional network topology in the theta, alpha, and lower-beta frequency bands between experienced and novice meditators. They found increased network integration (higher betweenness centrality, decreased diameter, and decreased eccentricity) in meditators compared with novices, particularly in the alpha band. Relatedly, greater overall alpha connectivity has also been observed before and after cessation events—momentary lapses of consciousness that occur with mastery of mindfulness meditation and are followed by reports of incredible clarity and calm (82).

To summarize, network science provides a formal structure for investigating brain connectivity. While its application in mindfulness meditation is in its early stages, the handful of investigations conducted so far are providing further insight on how the organization and operation of different nodal structures and networks restructure following engagement in mindfulness meditation. However, there are key limitations to these studies, which we discuss in the next section, in which we also offer avenues for future research.

### LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

Most research reported to date has focused on exploring functional connectivity differences among various brain

regions resulting from engagement in meditative practices. However, relatively few studies have examined whole-brain, network, or nodal reconfiguration through metrics of segregation, integration, or influence. Because these metrics can be computed on existing resting-state and task-based functional MRI data, we encourage future research to utilize readily available toolkits, such as the Brain Connectivity Toolbox (83), to examine changes in network segregation and integration measures.

Another key limitation of much of this research is the predominant focus on resting-state functional connectivity. Increasing evidence suggests that participants experience various mental states during resting-state paradigms, including mind wandering, introspection, and consolidation of episodic memory (84,85). Thus, there may be significant mental state variability among participants during resting-state data collection that may influence global and local properties of brain networks. In an attempt to address this issue, a recent study by Dixon *et al.* (86) examined global and local metrics of segregation and integration during a mindful acceptance condition and compared these with nodal and network reconfigurations during an elaborative narrative form of processing. Notably, there was an increase in overall global network connectivity, within-network connectivity, and between-network connectivity in the acceptance versus the narrative-elaborative condition. These conditions also differed with respect to connector and provincial hubs. During the acceptance condition, areas of the FPN, including the dlPFC, the inferior frontal sulcus, and the intraparietal sulcus, served as connector hubs exerting cognitive control and meta-awareness. In contrast, the left PCC, the left inferior frontal gyrus (near Broca's area), and the mid-cingulate cortex were identified as the hubs during the narrative evaluation condition. These regions are canonical nodes of the DMN and have been implicated in self-referential processing. Thus, it is crucial for future research to integrate the phenomenology of self-reported experiences with graph theoretical metrics of brain organization because this triangulation is necessary to develop a comprehensive understanding of how mindfulness influences the landscape of brain connectivity.

Several developments in the field of network neuroscience will facilitate future research. For example, future studies may move beyond static measures of functional connectivity to include time-varying or dynamic functional connectivity (87). This approach builds on the intuition that the connectivity estimated over a 5- to 30-minute scan window only offers a static view of brain organization and that, over shorter intervals, brain network architecture is variable. Implicitly, approaches for estimating time-varying connectivity ascribe observed fluctuations in network structure to ongoing thought, physiological responses, and changes in brain state, with promising support for mindfulness training to increase the frequency of brain states associated with focused attention (88) Dynamic functional connectivity studies, which use network neuroscience, can also track variation in network attributes across time with the aim of developing a better understanding of the principle by which networks reconfigure. Recent studies of time-varying modularity have been especially influential, yielding the measure flexibility, which can describe how frequently a node can change its community

assignment across time (89–91). Flexibility appears to be a powerful biomarker and can be examined in future mindfulness training studies to examine how network properties can reconfigure following training.

Relatedly, brain-based fingerprinting and precision mapping have recently been employed in neuroimaging to identify individualized network features. In a study that applied these techniques to mindfulness meditation, Kajimura *et al.* (92) acquired over 50 hours of functional MRI data from a single participant engaged in meditation practice. Despite being a single-case experiment, the study demonstrated changes in the community size of the FPN and DMN over time, with nodes in the FPN showing enhanced flexibility as practice increased. Although the generalizability of these results is limited due to the focus on a single participant, combining precision neuroscience with network neuroscience approaches in the future, particularly in novice meditators, could offer valuable insights into individual differences in the reconfiguration of nodes and networks.

Finally, it is important to note that, similar to the broader mindfulness literature, significant methodological concerns compromise the internal and external validity of network neuroscience studies on mindfulness meditation. As critiqued in Prakash *et al.* (93), many mindfulness meditation studies have small sample sizes (e.g.,  $N = 10$ ); provide limited information on the content of training, which makes comparisons challenging across studies; and do not adequately quantify expectancy effects that could potentially influence study results. Studies involving expert meditators, in addition to having small sample sizes, have often grouped various meditation practices into a single broad category, thus missing nuanced distinctions between different meditation traditions that may influence brain network properties. Additionally, most mindfulness studies continue to oversample non-Hispanic White individuals, with limited recruitment of participants from minoritized groups (94). It is critical for future research to consider and address these threats to internal and external validity to ensure rigorous scientific study of mindfulness meditation.

## CONCLUSIONS

In the approximately 2 decades since the advent of network neuroscience, the field has matured and developed its own set of tools and subdisciplines. This brief review highlights a select set of these approaches as applied to the study of mindfulness meditation. Preliminary evidence suggests that mindfulness meditation has the potential to alter both the global and local properties of brain organization, with several notable trends. Specifically, increased engagement with mindfulness meditation, whether in novices undergoing brief training or in those with extended experience, appears to shift connector hubs that facilitate the efficient flow of information. These nodes include the ACC, the PCC, and the mid-insula. Additionally, the DMN shows reduced segregation among its canonical nodes following mindfulness training. There is mixed evidence on whether mindfulness training can impact the global landscape of interconnectivity, and future studies would benefit from further exploration of the effects of mindfulness meditation on global metrics of integration, segregation, and influence.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS AND DISCLOSURES

RSP was supported by the National Institute on Aging of the National Institutes of Health (Grant Nos. R01AG054427 and R61AG081982). RFB was supported by the National Institute on Aging (Grant No. R01 AG075044) and National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke (Grant No. RF1 NS125026) of the National Institutes of Health and the National Science Foundation (Award No. 2023985). MDS was supported by the National Institute of Mental Health (Grant No. R01MH125850), the Dimension Giving Fund, Ad Astra Chandaria Foundation, Brain & Behavior Research Foundation (Grant No. 28972), BIAL Foundation Grant (Grant No. 099/2020), and individual donors.

The authors report no biomedical financial interests or potential conflicts of interest.

## ARTICLE INFORMATION

From the Department of Psychology, The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio (RSP, AS, MF); Center for Cognitive and Behavioral Brain Imaging, The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio (RSP, AS, MF); Center for Brain Science & Department of Psychology, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts (VT); Department of Psychological and Brain Sciences, Boston University, Boston, Massachusetts (VT); Meditation Research Program, Department of Psychiatry, Massachusetts General Hospital, Harvard Medical School, Boston, Massachusetts (WFZY, MDS); Athinoula A. Martinos Center for Biomedical Imaging, Department of Radiology, Massachusetts General Hospital, Harvard Medical School, Boston, Massachusetts (WFZY, MDS); Department of Psychology, Northeastern University, Boston, Massachusetts (CCCB); Department of Brain and Cognitive Science, McGovern Institute for Brain Research, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Massachusetts (CCCB); Center for Precision Psychiatry, Department of Psychiatry, Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston, Massachusetts (CCCB); and Department of Psychological and Brain Sciences, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana (RB).

Address correspondence to Ruchika S. Prakash, Ph.D., at [prakash.30@osu.edu](mailto:prakash.30@osu.edu).

Received May 30, 2024; revised Nov 8, 2024; accepted Nov 12, 2024.

## REFERENCES

- Banquet JP (1973): Spectral analysis of the EEG in meditation. *Electroencephalogr Clin Neurophysiol* 35:143–151.
- Benson H, Beary JF, Carol MP (1974): The relaxation response. *Psychiatry* 37:37–46.
- Kasamatsu A, Hirai T (1966): An electroencephalographic study on the Zen Meditation (zazen). *Folia Psychiatr Neurol Jpn* 20:315–336.
- Kabat-Zinn J (1990): Full Catastrophe Living: The Program of the Stress Reduction Clinic at the University of Massachusetts Medical Center. New York, NY: Delta.
- Goldberg SB, Riordan KM, Sun S, Davidson RJ (2022): The empirical status of mindfulness-based interventions: A systematic review of 44 meta-analyses of randomized controlled trials. *Perspect Psychol Sci* 17:108–130.
- Kabat-Zinn J (2011): Some reflections on the origins of MBSR, skillful means, and the trouble with maps. *Contemp Buddhism* 12:281–306.
- Hasenkamp W, Barsalou LW (2012): Effects of meditation experience on functional connectivity of distributed brain networks. *Front Hum Neurosci* 6:38.
- Ganesan S, Beyer E, Moffat B, Van Dam NT, Lorenzetti V, Zalesky A (2022): Focused attention meditation in healthy adults: A systematic review and meta-analysis of cross-sectional functional MRI studies. *Neurosci Biobehav Rev* 141:104846.
- Bassett DS, Sporns O (2017): Network neuroscience. *Nat Neurosci* 20:353–364.
- Sporns O, Chialvo DR, Kaiser M, Hilgetag CC (2004): Organization, development and function of complex brain networks. *Trends Cogn Sci* 8:418–425.
- Eickhoff SB, Yeo BTT, Genovese S (2018): Imaging-based parcellations of the human brain. *Nat Rev Neurosci* 19:672–686.
- Hagmann P, Cammoun L, Gigandet X, Meuli R, Honey CJ, Wedeen VJ, Sporns O (2008): Mapping the structural core of human cerebral cortex. *PLoS Biol* 6:e159.
- Friston KJ (1994): Functional and effective connectivity in neuroimaging: A synthesis. *Hum Brain Mapp* 2:56–78.
- Smith SM, Fox PT, Miller KL, Glahn DC, Fox PM, Mackay CE, et al. (2009): Correspondence of the brain's functional architecture during activation and rest. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 106:13040–13045.
- Bassett DS, Bullmore E (2006): Small-world brain networks. *Neuroscientist* 12:512–523.
- Bassett DS, Bullmore ET (2017): Small-world brain networks revisited. *Neuroscientist* 23:499–516.
- Mattar MG, Betzel RF, Bassett DS (2016): The flexible brain. *Brain* 139:2110–2112.
- Watts DJ, Strogatz SH (1998): Collective dynamics of 'small-world' networks. *Nature* 393:440–442.
- Shih C-T, Sporns O, Yuan S-L, Su T-S, Lin Y-J, Chuang C-C, et al. (2015): Connectomics-based analysis of information flow in the drosophila brain. *Curr Biol* 25:1249–1258.
- Barabási AL, Albert R (1999): Emergence of scaling in random networks. *Science* 286:509–512.
- Freeman LC, Borgatti SP, White DR (1991): Centrality in valued graphs: A measure of betweenness based on network flow. *Soc Netw* 13:141–154.
- Suárez LE, Markello RD, Betzel RF, Misisic B (2020): Linking structure and function in macroscale brain networks. *Trends Cogn Sci* 24:302–315.
- Power JD, Schlaggar BL, Lessov-Schlaggar CN, Petersen SE (2013): Evidence for hubs in human functional brain networks. *Neuron* 79:798–813.
- Van Den Heuvel MP, Kahn RS, Goñi J, Sporns O (2012): High-cost, high-capacity backbone for global brain communication. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 109:11372–11377.
- Van Den Heuvel MP, Sporns O (2013): An anatomical substrate for integration among functional networks in human cortex. *J Neurosci* 33:14489–14500.
- Bullmore E, Sporns O (2012): The economy of brain network organization. *Nat Rev Neurosci* 13:336–349.
- Betzel RF, Bassett DS (2018): Specificity and robustness of long-distance connections in weighted, interareal connectomes. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 115:E4880–E4889.
- Rubinov M (2016): Constraints and spandrels of interareal connectomes. *Nat Commun* 7:13812.
- Miller EK, Brincat SL, Roy JE (2024): Cognition is an emergent property. *Curr Opin Behav Sci* 57:101388.
- Brefczynski-Lewis JA, Lutz A, Schaefer HS, Levinson DB, Davidson RJ (2007): Neural correlates of attentional expertise in long-term meditation practitioners. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 104:11483–11488.
- Farb NAS, Segal ZV, Mayberg H, Bean J, McKeon D, Fatima Z, Anderson AK (2007): Attending to the present: Mindfulness meditation reveals distinct neural modes of self-reference. *Soc Cogn Affect Neurosci* 2:313–322.
- Haynes J-D, Rees G (2006): Decoding mental states from brain activity in humans. *Nat Rev Neurosci* 7:523–534.
- Hölzel BK, Ott U, Gard T, Hempel H, Weygandt M, Morgen K, Vaitl D (2008): Investigation of mindfulness meditation practitioners with voxel-based morphometry. *Soc Cogn Affect Neurosci* 3:55–61.
- Kjaer TW, Bertelsen C, Piccini P, Brooks D, Alving J, Lou HC (2002): Increased dopamine tone during meditation-induced change of consciousness. *Brain Res Cogn Brain Res* 13:255–259.
- Lazar SW, Kerr CE, Wasserman RH, Gray JR, Greve DN, Treadway MT, et al. (2005): Meditation experience is associated with increased cortical thickness. *Neuroreport* 16:1893–1897.
- Lazar SW, Bush G, Gollub RL, Fricchione GL, Khalsa G, Benson H (2000): Functional brain mapping of the relaxation response and meditation. *Neuroreport* 11:1581–1585.
- Lutz A, Slagter HA, Rawlings NB, Francis AD, Greischar LL, Davidson RJ (2009): Mental training enhances attentional stability: Neural and behavioral evidence. *J Neurosci* 29:13418–13427.
- Slagter HA, Lutz A, Greischar LL, Francis AD, Nieuwenhuis S, Davis JM, Davidson RJ (2007): Mental training affects distribution of limited brain resources. *PLoS Biol* 5:e138.

39. Tang Y-Y, Ma Y, Wang J, Fan Y, Feng S, Lu Q, *et al.* (2007): Short-term meditation training improves attention and self-regulation. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 104:17152–17156.
40. Sezer I, Pizzagalli DA, Sacchet MD (2022): Resting-state fMRI functional connectivity and mindfulness in clinical and non-clinical contexts: A review and synthesis. *Neurosci Biobehav Rev* 135:104583.
41. Tang Y-Y, Hölzel BK, Posner MI (2015): The neuroscience of mindfulness meditation. *Nat Rev Neurosci* 16:213–225.
42. Brewer JA, Worhunsky PD, Gray JR, Tang Y-Y, Weber J, Kober H (2011): Meditation experience is associated with differences in default mode network activity and connectivity. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 108:20254–20259.
43. Lutz J, Brühl AB, Doering N, Scheerer H, Achermann R, Weibel A, *et al.* (2016): Altered processing of self-related emotional stimuli in mindfulness meditators. *Neuroimage* 124:958–967.
44. Pagnoni G (2012): Dynamical properties of BOLD activity from the ventral Posteromedial cortex associated with meditation and attentional skills. *J Neurosci* 32:5242–5249.
45. Lutz A, McFarlin DR, Perlman DM, Salomons TV, Davidson RJ (2013): Altered anterior insula activation during anticipation and experience of painful stimuli in expert meditators. *Neuroimage* 64:538–546.
46. Kirk U, Brown KW, Downar J (2015): Adaptive neural reward processing during anticipation and receipt of monetary rewards in mindfulness meditators. *Soc Cogn Affect Neurosci* 10:752–759.
47. Kirk U, Pagnoni G, Héту S, Montague R (2019): Short-term mindfulness practice attenuates reward prediction errors signals in the brain. *Sci Rep* 9:6964.
48. Kirk U, Montague PR (2015): Mindfulness meditation modulates reward prediction errors in a passive conditioning task. *Front Psychol* 6:90.
49. Andrews-Hanna JR, Reidler JS, Huang C, Buckner RL (2010): Evidence for the default network's role in spontaneous cognition. *J Neurophysiol* 104:322–335.
50. Andrews-Hanna JR (2012): The Brain's default network and its adaptive role in internal mentation. *Neuroscientist* 18:251–270.
51. Shi Z, He L (2020): Mindfulness: Attenuating self-referential processing and strengthening other-referential processing. *Mindfulness* 11:599–605.
52. Seeley WW, Menon V, Schatzberg AF, Keller J, Glover GH, Kenna H, *et al.* (2007): Dissociable intrinsic connectivity networks for salience processing and executive control. *J Neurosci* 27:2349–2356.
53. Rademacher L, Krach S, Kohls G, Irmak A, Grönder G, Spreckelmeyer KN (2010): Dissociation of neural networks for anticipation and consumption of monetary and social rewards. *Neuroimage* 49:3276–3285.
54. Lichtenberg NT, Pennington ZT, Holley SM, Greenfield VY, Cepeda C, Levine MS, Wassum KM (2017): Basolateral amygdala to orbitofrontal cortex projections enable cue-triggered reward expectations. *J Neurosci* 37:8374–8384.
55. Kilpatrick LA, Suyenobu BY, Smith SR, Bueller JA, Goodman T, Creswell JD, *et al.* (2011): Impact of mindfulness-based stress reduction training on intrinsic brain connectivity. *Neuroimage* 56:290–298.
56. Uddin LQ, Yeo BTT, Spreng RN (2019): Towards a universal taxonomy of macro-scale functional human brain networks. *Brain Topogr* 32:926–942.
57. Zhang R, Geng X, Lee TMC (2017): Large-scale functional neural network correlates of response inhibition: An fMRI meta-analysis. *Brain Struct Funct* 222:3973–3990.
58. Chai WJ, Abd Hamid AI, Abdullah JM (2018): Working memory from the psychological and neurosciences perspectives: A review. *Front Psychol* 9:401.
59. Uddin LQ (2015): Salience processing and insular cortical function and dysfunction. *Nat Rev Neurosci* 16:55–61.
60. Smallwood J, Bernhardt BC, Leech R, Bzdok D, Jefferies E, Margulies DS (2021): The default mode network in cognition: A topographical perspective. *Nat Rev Neurosci* 22:503–513.
61. Fox KCR, Spreng RN, Ellamil M, Andrews-Hanna JR, Christoff K (2015): The wandering brain: Meta-analysis of functional neuroimaging studies of mind-wandering and related spontaneous thought processes. *Neuroimage* 111:611–621.
62. Christoff K, Irving ZC, Fox KCR, Spreng RN, Andrews-Hanna JR (2016): Mind-wandering as spontaneous thought: A dynamic framework. *Nat Rev Neurosci* 17:718–731.
63. Doll A, Hölzel BK, Boucard CC, Wohlschläger AM, Sorg C (2015): Mindfulness is associated with intrinsic functional connectivity between default mode and salience networks. *Front Hum Neurosci* 9:461.
64. Kral TRA, Imhoff-Smith T, Dean DC, Grupe D, Adluru N, Patsenko E, *et al.* (2019): Mindfulness-Based Stress Reduction-related changes in posterior cingulate resting brain connectivity. *Soc Cogn Affect Neurosci* 14:777–787.
65. Kwak S, Lee TY, Jung WH, Hur J-W, Bae D, Hwang WJ, *et al.* (2019): The immediate and sustained positive effects of meditation on resilience are mediated by changes in the resting brain. *Front Hum Neurosci* 13:101.
66. Yang R, Tracy EL, Wang H (2019): Longitudinal associations of depressive symptoms, subjective memory decline, and cognitive functioning among Chinese older adults: Between-person and within-person perspective. *Arch Gerontol Geriatr* 81:105–110.
67. Xue S, Tang Y-Y, Posner MI (2011): Short-term meditation increases network efficiency of the anterior cingulate cortex. *Neuroreport* 22:570–574.
68. Gerraty RT, Davidow JY, Foerde K, Galvan A, Bassett DS, Shohamy D (2018): Dynamic flexibility in striatal-cortical circuits supports reinforcement learning. *J Neurosci* 38:2442–2453.
69. Baerentsen KB, Stødkilde-Jørgensen H, Sommerlund B, Hartmann T, Damsgaard-Madsen J, Fosnaes M, Green AC (2010): An investigation of brain processes supporting meditation. *Cogn Process* 11:57–84.
70. Sperduti M, Martinelli P, Piolino P (2012): A neurocognitive model of meditation based on activation likelihood estimation (ALE) meta-analysis. *Conscious Cogn* 21:269–276.
71. Pickut BA, Van Hecke W, Kerckhofs E, Mariën P, Vanneste S, Cras P, Parizel PM (2013): Mindfulness based intervention in Parkinson's disease leads to structural brain changes on MRI: A randomized controlled longitudinal trial. *Clin Neurol Neurosurg* 115:2419–2425.
72. Gard T, Taquet M, Dixit R, Hölzel BK, Dickerson BC, Lazar SW (2015): Greater widespread functional connectivity of the caudate in older adults who practice kripalu yoga and vipassana meditation than in controls. *Front Hum Neurosci* 9:137.
73. Lardone A, Liparoti M, Sorrentino P, Minino R, Polverino A, Lopez ET, *et al.* (2022): Topological changes of brain network during mindfulness meditation: An exploratory source level magnetoencephalographic study. *AIMS Neurosci* 9:250–263.
74. Wang X, Xu M, Song Y, Li X, Zhen Z, Yang Z, Liu J (2014): The network property of the thalamus in the default mode network is correlated with trait mindfulness. *Neuroscience* 278:291–301.
75. Jao T, Li C-W, Vértes PE, Wu CW, Achard S, Hsieh C-H, *et al.* (2016): Large-scale functional brain network reorganization during taoist meditation. *Brain Connect* 6:9–24.
76. Melis M, Schroyen G, Blommaert J, Leenaerts N, Smeets A, Van Der Gucht K, *et al.* (2023): The impact of mindfulness on functional brain connectivity and peripheral inflammation in breast cancer survivors with cognitive complaints. *Cancers* 15:3632.
77. Cotier FA, Zhang R, Lee TMC (2017): A longitudinal study of the effect of short-term meditation training on functional network organization of the aging brain. *Sci Rep* 7:598.
78. Saghai M, Greenberg J, O'Grady C, Varno F, Hashmi MA, Bracken B, *et al.* (2020): Brain network topology predicts participant adherence to mental training programs. *Netw Neurosci* 4:528–555.
79. Gard T, Taquet M, Dixit R, Hölzel BK, De Montjoye Y-A, Brach N, *et al.* (2014): Fluid intelligence and brain functional organization in aging yoga and meditation practitioners. *Front Aging Neurosci* 6:76.
80. Baer R (2019): Assessment of mindfulness by self-report. *Curr Opin Psychol* 28:42–48.
81. Van Lutterveld R, Van Dellen E, Pal P, Yang H, Stam CJ, Brewer J (2017): Meditation is associated with increased brain network integration. *Neuroimage* 158:18–25.



## Mindfulness Meditation and Network Neuroscience

82. Van Lutterveld R, Chowdhury A, Ingram DM, Sacchet MD (2024): Neurophenomenological investigation of mindfulness meditation “cessation” experiences using EEG network analysis in an intensively sampled adept meditator. *Brain Topogr* 37:849–858.
83. Rubinov M, Sporns O (2010): Complex network measures of brain connectivity: Uses and interpretations. *Neuroimage* 52:1059–1069.
84. Buckner RL (2013): The cerebellum and cognitive function: 25 years of insight from anatomy and neuroimaging. *Neuron* 80:807–815.
85. Krienen FM, Yeo BTT, Buckner RL (2014): Reconfigurable task-dependent functional coupling modes cluster around a core functional architecture. *Philos Trans R Soc B Biol Sci* 369:20130526.
86. Dixon ML, Girn M, Christoff K (2020): Brain Network Organization During Mindful Acceptance of Emotions. Available at: [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/340370382\\_Brain\\_Network\\_Organization\\_During\\_Mindful\\_Acceptance\\_of\\_Emotions](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/340370382_Brain_Network_Organization_During_Mindful_Acceptance_of_Emotions). Accessed January 15, 2024.
87. Lurie DJ, Kessler D, Bassett DS, Betzel RF, Breakspear M, Kheilholz S, *et al.* (2020): Questions and controversies in the study of time-varying functional connectivity in resting fMRI. *Netw Neurosci* 4:30–69.
88. Mooneyham BW, Mrazek MD, Mrazek AJ, Mrazek KL, Phillips DT, Schooler JW (2017): States of mind: Characterizing the neural bases of focus and mind-wandering through dynamic functional connectivity. *J Cogn Neurosci* 29:495–506.
89. Calhoun VD, Miller R, Pearson G, Adali T (2014): The chronnectome: Time-varying connectivity networks as the next frontier in fMRI data discovery. *Neuron* 84:262–274.
90. Braun U, Schäfer A, Walter H, Erk S, Romanczuk-Seiferth N, Haddad L, *et al.* (2015): Dynamic reconfiguration of frontal brain networks during executive cognition in humans. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 112:11678–11683.
91. Chinichian N, Kruschwitz JD, Reinhardt P, Palm M, Wellan SA, Erk S, *et al.* (2023): A fast and intuitive method for calculating dynamic network reconfiguration and node flexibility. *Front Neurosci* 17:1025428.
92. Kajimura S, Masuda N, Lau JKL, Murayama K (2020): Focused attention meditation changes the boundary and configuration of functional networks in the brain. *Sci Rep* 10:18426.
93. Prakash RS, Fountain-Zaragoza S, Kramer AF, Samimy S, Wegman J (2020): Mindfulness and attention: Current state-of-affairs and future considerations. *J Cogn Enhanc* 4:340–367.
94. Waldron EM, Hong S, Moskowitz JT, Burnett-Zeigler I (2018): A systematic review of the demographic characteristics of participants in US-based randomized controlled trials of mindfulness-based interventions. *Mindfulness* 9:1671–1692.
95. Baer RA, Smith GT, Lykins E, Button D, Krietemeyer J, Sauer S, *et al.* (2008): Construct validity of the five facet mindfulness questionnaire in meditating and nonmeditating samples. *Assessment* 15:329–342.