



HAL
open science

Development and validation of the mindful eating scale (mind-eat scale) in a general population

Marion van Beekum, Rebecca Shankland, Angélique Rodhain, Margaux Robert, Camille Marchand, Athéna Herry, Clémentine Prioux, Mathilde Touvier, Marie Barday, Roxane Turgon, et al.

► To cite this version:

Marion van Beekum, Rebecca Shankland, Angélique Rodhain, Margaux Robert, Camille Marchand, et al.. Development and validation of the mindful eating scale (mind-eat scale) in a general population. *Appetite*, 2024, 199, pp.107398. 10.1016/j.appet.2024.107398 . hal-04582024

HAL Id: hal-04582024

<https://hal.science/hal-04582024v1>

Submitted on 21 May 2024

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

1 **Development and validation of the mindful eating scale (Mind-Eat Scale) in a general**
2 **population**

3 Marion Van Beekum^{1,4,5}, Rebecca Shankland^{2,3}, Angélique Rodhain⁴, Margaux Robert¹, Camille
4 Marchand¹, Athéna Herry¹, Clémentine Prioux¹, Mathilde Touvier¹, Marie Barday¹, Roxane Turgon²,
5 Antoine Avignon^{5,6}, Christophe Leys⁷, Sandrine Péneau¹

6

7 ¹Université Sorbonne Paris Nord and Université Paris Cité, Inserm, INRAE, CNAM, Center of
8 Research in Epidemiology and Statistics (CRESS), Nutritional Epidemiology Research Team
9 (EREN), F-93017 Bobigny, France.

10 ²Department of Psychology, Univ. Lumière Lyon 2, DIPHE, Bron Cedex, France.

11 ³Institut Universitaire de France.

12 ⁴University of Montpellier, Montpellier Research in Management (MRM), Place Eugène Bataillon –
13 CC 19001 – bâtiment 19, 34095 Montpellier, France.

14 ⁵Institute Desbrest of Epidemiology and Public Health, University of Montpellier, INSERM, 34090
15 Montpellier, France.

16 ⁶Nutrition-Diabetes Department, University Hospital of Montpellier, 34090 Montpellier, France

17 ⁷Faculty of Psychology, Educational Sciences, and Speech and Language Therapy, Université Libre
18 de Bruxelles, Avenue Franklin Roosevelt, 50 - CP191, 1050 Brussels, Belgium.

19

20

21 **Corresponding author:**

22 Marion Van Beekum

23 Université Sorbonne Paris Nord and Université Paris Cité, INSERM, INRAE, CNAM, Center of
24 Research in Epidemiology and Statistics (CRESS), Nutritional Epidemiology Research Team
25 (EREN)

26 74, rue Marcel Cachin, 93017 Bobigny, France

27 E-mail: marion.vanbeekum@gmail.com

28 **Short title:** Validation of the Mindful Eating Scale (Mind-Eat Scale)

29 **Keywords:** Mindful Eating, Mindfulness, Eating Behavior, Questionnaire, Validation

30 **Word count in abstract:** 264

31 **Word count in text** (excluding abstract, acknowledgments, references, and tables): 6159

32 **Number of tables:** 6

33 **Number of figures:** 1

34 **Abbreviations:** TLI, Tucker-Lewis Index; TFEQ-R21, Three-Factor Eating Questionnaire; SWLS,
35 Satisfaction with Life Scale; SRMR, Root Mean Square Residual; STAI, State Trait Anxiety
36 Inventory; SCOFF, Sick Control One Fat Food questionnaire; RSES, Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale;
37 RMSEA, Root Mean Square Error of Approximation; PNNS-GS, Programme national nutrition
38 santé-Guideline Score; Mind-eat scale, Mindful Eating scale; MES, Mindful Eating Scale; MEQ-
39 short, Mindful Eating Questionnaire Short; MEQ, Mindful Eating Questionnaire; MEI, Mindful
40 Eating Inventory; MEBS, Mindful Eating Behavior Questionnaire; MBSR, Mindfulness-Based Stress
41 Reduction; LOT-R, Life Orientation Test Revised; KMO, Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Test; IRB,
42 Institutional Review Board of the French Institute for Health and Medical Research; IES-2, Intuitive
43 eating Scale-2; ICC, Intraclass Correlation Coefficient; GQ-6, Gratitude Questionnaire; FMI,
44 Freiburg Mindfulness Inventory; FFMQ, Five Facets Mindfulness Questionnaire; FFaMES, Four
45 Facet Mindful Eating Scale; EFA, Exploratory Factor Analysis; CNIL, Commission Nationale
46 Informatique et Libertés; CFI, Comparative Fit Index; CFA, Confirmatory Factor Analysis; CES-D,
47 Center for Epidemiologic Studies-Depression; BRS, Brief Resilience Scale; BMI, Body Mass Index.

48

49 No reprints requested.

50 **Abstract**

51 *Background:* Mindful eating is a concept that is increasingly being used to promote healthy
52 eating. Observational studies have suggested associations with healthier eating behaviors, lower
53 weight status, and favorable cardiovascular biomarkers. However, existing scales assessing
54 mindful eating have some limitations. Our study aimed to develop and validate a scale assessing
55 the level of mindful eating in a general population. *Methods:* The Mind-Eat Scale was
56 developed in four main steps: 1. Generating an initial item pool covering all aspects of mindful
57 eating; 2. Reviewing items with experts and naive individuals; 3. Administering the scale to a
58 large and representative sample from the NutriNet-Santé cohort (N=3102); 4. Conducting
59 psychometric analyses. Construct validity was assessed using exploratory (EFA) (N₁=1302)
60 and confirmatory (CFA) (N₂=1302, N₃=498) factor analyses. Content, discriminant,
61 convergent, and divergent validity, internal consistency, and test-retest reliability were
62 examined. *Results:* The initial pool of 95 items was refined to 24 items using EFA. The EFA
63 highlighted six dimensions: Awareness, Non-reactivity, Openness, Gratitude, Non-judgement,
64 and Hunger/Satiety, consisting of four items per dimension. CFAs showed a good fit for first
65 and second-order models. Adequate content validity was confirmed. Discriminant, convergent,
66 and divergent validity were supported by significant differences between subgroups of
67 individuals, and correlations with eating behaviors and psychological well-being scales. The
68 Mind-Eat Scale showed good reliability for all six dimensions, with high McDonald's ω and
69 adequate intraclass correlation coefficients (ICC). *Conclusions:* This study validated the first
70 tool assessing a total mindful eating score and its sub-dimensions in a general population. This
71 scale can be an asset for clinical and epidemiological research on dietary behavior and related
72 chronic diseases.

73

74 **Keywords:** Mindful Eating, Mindfulness, Eating Behavior, Questionnaire, Validation

75 1. INTRODUCTION

76 Mindfulness has been defined as “*The awareness that emerges through paying attention on*
77 *purpose, in the present moment, and nonjudgmentally to the unfolding of experience moment*
78 *by moment.*” (Kabat-Zinn, 2003). Mindfulness is an innate disposition, reflected in a general
79 tendency to be mindful in daily life, but can also be acquired through the practice of meditation
80 (Kabat-Zinn, 2003). Mindfulness meditation has been introduced into medicine and healthcare
81 as an adjunct to medical treatment to help patients cope with stress, pain, and disability (Kabat-
82 Zinn, 2003). Since then, many systematic reviews and meta-analyses have confirmed the
83 positive impacts of mindfulness on mental and physical health (Dossett et al., 2020; Lee et al.,
84 2020; Scott-Sheldon et al., 2020), leading the American Heart Association (AHA) to
85 recommend it as an adjunct to other methods of reducing cardiovascular risk (Levine et al.,
86 2021). More recently, mindfulness-based interventions have been used for the treatment of
87 obesity-related eating behaviors showing promising results (O’Reilly et al., 2014), while
88 dispositional mindfulness has been associated with weight status (Camilleri, Méjean, Bellisle,
89 Hercberg, et al., 2015). However, it is worth considering mindfulness in the context of eating
90 as its effects may vary depending on the specific situation, and will allow for a better
91 understanding of the specific mechanisms of action of mindfulness on eating behavior (Oliveira
92 et al., 2023).

93 Despite the growing body of literature on mindful eating, no universally accepted definition of
94 mindful eating has emerged, leading to the creation of a non-exhaustive list of common key
95 features of mindful eating practices (Tapper, 2022). These key principles include present-
96 moment awareness of the sensory properties of food, internal bodily sensations, and cues that
97 elicit eating or the urge to eat, but also, acceptance of cravings, acceptance and/or decentering
98 from food-related thoughts, and decentering from cravings (Tapper, 2022). A recent narrative
99 review recommended narrowing the concept by distinguishing mindful eating behavior from

100 mindful decision-making around eating (Mantzios, 2023b). By contrast, other authors have
101 expanded this concept to include other principles such as an awareness of the
102 interconnectedness of all living beings and the earth (Altman et al., 2013; Fung et al., 2016;
103 Peitz et al., 2021).

104 Given the relative novelty of the concept of mindful eating, the literature examining
105 associations between dispositional mindful eating and nutrition, or health is still limited. Data
106 have already shown associations between mindful eating and healthier eating behavior
107 (Kawasaki et al., 2021; Salvo et al., 2022), weight status (Spadaro et al., 2018; Timmerman &
108 Brown, 2012), and negative affect (Oliveira et al., 2023; Pintado-Cucarella & Rodríguez-
109 Salgado, 2016). However, further research, particularly in population-based samples, is needed
110 to improve knowledge of mindful eating. Appropriate instruments to assess mindful eating are
111 therefore needed (Tapper, 2017). Over the past decade, seven multidimensional mindful eating
112 questionnaires have been developed, as it is generally accepted that mindfulness is a
113 multifaceted construct (Baer et al., 2006). These questionnaires ranged from two (Clementi et
114 al., 2017; Mantzios, 2023a) to seven (Peitz et al., 2021) dimensions, corresponding to different
115 definitions of mindful eating. These questionnaires have made important contributions to the
116 field, but they also have specificities and limitations. Some of the scales omit important
117 dimensions that are generally accepted as part of the concept of mindful eating, such as non-
118 judgment or acceptance (Clementi et al., 2017; Framson et al., 2009; Winkens et al., 2018).
119 Furthermore, the majority of existing questionnaires are not based on the experience of
120 individuals who practice mindful eating in their daily lives. Developing an instrument that
121 considers both theory and practice would therefore be useful. Another limitation of these scales
122 is that they do not allow for the calculation of a comprehensive total score for mindful eating
123 that has been validated by confirmatory factor analysis (CFA). A total score would be useful in
124 clinical and epidemiological research to facilitate comparisons between individuals or groups

125 and to monitor changes over time. Some questionnaires also include items that are not
126 universally applicable to all individuals, such as items about snacking (Clementi et al., 2017;
127 Framson et al., 2009; Hulbert-Williams et al., 2014; Winkens et al., 2018), or items that involve
128 complex concepts, such as metacognition (Carrière et al., 2022). Finally, some scales have been
129 validated on samples that are small (Carrière et al., 2022; Framson et al., 2009; Hulbert-
130 Williams et al., 2014; Mantzios, 2023a) or not representative of the general adult population
131 (Hulbert-Williams et al., 2014), and validation methods lack robustness in some cases, such as
132 the lack of CFA to support the factor model (Framson et al., 2009).

133 The objective of this study was therefore to develop and validate a comprehensive mindful
134 eating scale, that covers all aspects of the concept and allows the computation of an overall
135 score. The content validity, reproducibility, construct validity, discriminant validity, and
136 reliability of our questionnaire were assessed, and internal validity was determined using
137 exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses.

138

139 **2. METHODS**

140 To develop and validate the Mind-Eat Scale, the COSMIN Risk of Bias Checklist (Mokkink et
141 al., 2018) and Boateng (Boateng et al., 2018) recommendations for validating a questionnaire
142 were followed as reference methods. Four steps were implemented (Figure 1).

143

144 ***Step 1: Item generation***

145 The first step was to create a pool of items representing all aspects of mindful eating. Items
146 were selected and adapted from existing mindful eating and mindfulness questionnaires.

147 Additional items were created based on a thorough literature review, supplemented by semi-
148 structured interviews and think-aloud sessions (further details provided below). The entire
149 process was coordinated by a group of six mindful eating experts from various disciplines

150 (psychology, nutrition, epidemiology). The focus was on the development of a diverse set of
151 potential items, aiming to encompass essential aspects emphasized in recent reviews (Mantzios,
152 2023b; Tapper, 2022), be comparable to generic mindfulness assessments (such as the FFMQ
153 (Baer et al., 2006) or CHIME- β (Bergomi et al., 2013)), and reflect as closely as possible how
154 mindful eating users and experts practice mindful eating. This approach is expected to result in
155 an instrument with broader and more practice-oriented dimensions, compared to instruments
156 based on more theory-based definitions, such as the recent Trait and State Mindful Eating
157 Behaviour Scale (Mantzios, 2023a). Items had to be concise, clear, and relevant to all
158 populations. Special care was taken to create items that individuals could connect with in their
159 daily lives, enhancing the reliability of responses. Both positively and negatively worded items
160 were included, with the latter representing less than 25% of the questionnaire. In addition, two
161 different five-point response scales were designed: a Likert scale and a frequency scale.

162

163 *Translation of existing mindful eating questionnaires*

164 The six mindful eating questionnaires available at the time of the study (Carrière et al., 2022;
165 Clementi et al., 2017; Framson et al., 2009; Hulbert-Williams et al., 2014; Peitz et al., 2021;
166 Winkens et al., 2018) were translated from English into French by three individuals who
167 collaborated to produce the best translation, and then two English speakers independently
168 provided back-translations to ensure accuracy.

169

170 *Semi-structured interviews*

171 Semi-structured interviews were conducted with 14 mindfulness professionals (71.4% of
172 women, mean age 46.0 ± 8.8) including teachers of yoga, meditation, or Mindfulness-Based
173 Stress Reduction (MBSR) (Kabat-Zinn, 1982), and 12 individuals practicing mindfulness for
174 at least two years (58% of women, mean age 41.6 ± 10.3), recruited through word of mouth or

175 social networks, and varied in age and sex. The interviews aimed to create new items using
176 easy-to-understand language suitable for non-experts in mindfulness.

177

178 *Think-aloud*

179 An initial Mind-Eat Scale of 138 items was developed and later refined using think-aloud
180 interviews with 10 adults who were unfamiliar with mindful eating and nutrition (60% females,
181 mean age 34.4 ± 14.1). Participants, recruited by word of mouth and representing a wide range
182 of ages, sexes, and educational levels, were instructed to read each item orally and explain their
183 understanding. Their feedback led to modifying or removing items that were not easily
184 understood, resulting in a final pool of 126 items suitable for people new to mindfulness
185 concepts.

186

187 ***Step 2: Evaluation by experts and naive individuals***

188 The 126-item Mind-Eat Scale was reviewed by experts and naive individuals to ensure clarity,
189 content and face validity, and even response distribution. The two response scales were also
190 tested.

191

192 *Evaluation by experts in mindful eating and mindfulness*

193 Sixteen mindfulness and mindful eating experts, including mindfulness teachers, meditators,
194 psychiatrists, nutritionists, and dieticians, participated in a two-round Delphi method. They
195 each used a 7-point scale ranging from "totally irrelevant" to "totally relevant" to rate the
196 relevance of dimensions and items to the concept of mindful eating. Dimensions and items
197 scoring less than 50% above 5 were removed, 51-60% were revised or removed and at least
198 61% were retained. In general, unclear, redundant, imprecise, or irrelevant items were adjusted
199 or removed, and the balance of items between dimensions was assessed. Experts also assessed

200 the most appropriate five-point response scale. In the final step of this process, all experts
201 provided an assessment of whether the scale measured the construct it was intended to measure,
202 thereby confirming the adequate content validity of the scale.

203

204 *Evaluation by experts in scale development and eating behavior*

205 Ten experts in eating behavior and scale development from different disciplines (epidemiology,
206 psychology, nutrition) provided their input on item composition, length, language, and the
207 balance of positive and negative items. They also voted on the most appropriate five-point
208 response scale.

209

210 *Evaluation by naive individuals*

211 Twenty participants, diverse in age, sex, and level of education or socio-professional status,
212 completed the scale (75% females, mean age 39.7 ± 19.0). Item responses were analyzed to
213 ensure heterogeneity and items with a limited range of responses were adjusted or removed.
214 Participants also rated the clarity and comprehensibility of the scale and reported difficulties in
215 answering or understanding items, leading to necessary modifications.

216

217 This step resulted in the reduction of the Mind-Eat Scale to 95 items.

218

219 ***Step 3: Survey administration***

220 The 95-item Mind-Eat Scale was further administered to a large sample of individuals
221 representative of the French population.

222

223

224

225 *Population*

226 Participants were adult volunteers (age \geq 18 years) recruited from the general French population
227 and included in the NutriNet-Santé study. This study is a large, ongoing, web-based prospective
228 cohort launched in France in May 2009. Its design and methods have been described previously
229 (Herberg et al., 2010). It aims to explore the relationships between diet and health and between
230 the determinants of dietary behavior and nutritional status. Participants are asked to fill in
231 monthly web-based questionnaires on various nutrition-related topics (e.g., dietary behavior,
232 physical activity, anthropometric characteristics, lifestyle, socioeconomic conditions, and
233 health status). The 95-item Mind-Eat Scale was sent to a sub-sample of 9790 participants. This
234 sample of individuals was randomly selected within the NutriNet-Santé cohort to be
235 representative of the French population in terms of age, sex, BMI, and educational level (French
236 National Institute of Statistics and of Economic Studies (INSEE), 2022). The NutriNet-Santé
237 study is conducted in accordance with the guidelines of the Declaration of Helsinki, and all
238 study procedures were approved by the Institutional Review Board of the French Institute for
239 Health and Medical Research (IRB Inserm n° 0000388FWA00005831) and by the Commission
240 Nationale Informatique et Libertés (CNIL n° 908450 and n° 909216). Electronic informed
241 consent was obtained from all participants. The NutriNet-Santé study is registered in
242 ClinicalTrials (N°NCT03335644).

243

244 *Mindful eating*

245 The 95-item Mind-Eat Scale was administered in April 2022 to the 9790 participants initially
246 selected. A total of 3,102 individuals completed the questionnaire. Their characteristics are
247 shown in Table 1. Among these 3102 participants, 2363 individuals completed the
248 questionnaire a second time with a mean test-retest interval of 48.6 days (SD = 9.5, range = 21-
249 79 days). See Supplemental Table S1 for their characteristics. Given the length of the

250 questionnaire, four versions were created with different orderings between items to avoid the
251 fatigue effect affecting the same items. Responses were rated on a 5-point frequency scale
252 ranging from 1 "never or almost" to 5 "always or almost", with each point on the scale
253 represented by a word anchor. The final score was divided by the number of items, resulting in
254 a final total score ranging from 1 (low level of mindful eating) to 5 (high level of mindful
255 eating).

256

257 *Socio-demographic, anthropometric, and lifestyle*

258 Socio-demographic, anthropometric, and lifestyle data were collected at inclusion and annually.
259 The latest available data up to the date of completion of the Mind-Eat Scale were used with a
260 mean (\pm SD) difference between mindful eating and covariate scores of 8.16 ± 9.13 months.
261 Data collected included: sex (male, female), age (years), self-reported height and weight,
262 educational level (primary, secondary, university), employment status (unemployed, student,
263 self-employed or farmer, employee or manual worker, intermediate professions, managerial
264 staff or intellectual profession, and retired), children in the household (yes, no), history of diet
265 (past/current, never), physical activity level (low, moderate, high), and meditation practice
266 (current, former, never). BMI was calculated as the ratio of self-reported weight to height
267 (kg/m^2). Physical activity was assessed using the short form of the French version of the
268 International Physical Activity Questionnaire (Craig et al., 2003). Weekly sitting time and
269 various levels of physical activity were assessed and quantified into Metabolic Equivalent Task
270 (MET) values to determine physical activity in METs per minute per week (MET.min.week-
271 1). It categorizes individuals into three levels of physical activity (low, moderate, or high).

272

273

274

275 *Nutritional quality and eating behavior*

276 At inclusion and every six months thereafter, participants in the NutriNet-Santé study are asked
277 to complete a set of three validated nonconsecutive web-based 24h-dietary records. Participants
278 reported all foods and beverages consumed at each eating occasion, and estimated consumed
279 portion sizes using validated photographs (Nutrinet Santé, 2013). Adherence to the French
280 food-based dietary guidelines (FBDG) was assessed with the modified French National
281 Nutrition and Health Program Guideline Score (PNNS-GS2), an *a priori* nutritional diet quality
282 (Chaltiel et al., 2019). Higher scores indicate better nutritional quality. Participants completed
283 the French version of the revised 21-item Three-Factor Eating Questionnaire (TFEQ-R21)
284 (Tholin et al., 2005) (March to November 2017), which covers three dimensions of eating
285 behavior: cognitive restraint (6 items), emotional eating (6 items), and uncontrolled eating (9
286 items). Items are scored on 4-point scales and raw scores for each dimension were transformed
287 to a 0-100 scale (a higher score indicates greater cognitive restraint, emotional eating, and
288 uncontrolled eating). Intuitive eating was assessed using the French version of the Intuitive
289 Eating Scale-2 (IES-2) (Camilleri, Méjean, Bellisle, Andreeva, et al., 2015) (December 2013
290 to June 2014), which covers three dimensions of eating behavior: eating for physical rather than
291 emotional reasons (8 items), reliance on hunger and satiety cues (6 items), and unconditional
292 permission to eat (4 items). Items are rated on a 5-point Likert scale. The IES-2 total score and
293 subscale scores range from 1 (low intuitive eating) to 5 (high intuitive eating).

294

295 *Psychological well-being*

296 Mindfulness was assessed using the 39-item Five Facets Mindfulness Questionnaire (FFMQ)
297 (Baer et al., 2006) (January to June 2013). Items are scored on a 5-point scale. The FFMQ total
298 score ranges from 1 (low mindfulness) to 5 (high mindfulness). Global self-esteem was assessed
299 using the French version of the 10-item Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (RSES) (Vallieres &

300 Vallerand, 1990) (October to December 2016). Items are scored on 4-point scales. The RSES
301 total score ranges from 10 (low self-esteem) to 40 (high self-esteem). Satisfaction with life was
302 assessed using the French version of the 5-item Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWLS) (Blais et
303 al., 1989) (October to December 2016). Items are scored on 7-point scales. The SWLS total
304 score ranges from 5 (low satisfaction with life) to 35 (high satisfaction with life). Optimism
305 was evaluated with the French version of the 6-item Life Orientation Test-Revised (LOT-R)
306 (Trottier et al., 2008) (October to December 2016). Items are rated on a 5-point scale. The LOT-
307 R total score ranges from 0 (low optimism) to 24 (high optimism). Resilience was evaluated
308 with the 6-item Brief Resilience Scale (BRS) (Smith et al., 2008) (January to July 2017). Items
309 are rated on a 5-point scale. The BRS total score ranges from 1 (low resilience) to 5 (high
310 resilience). Gratitude was assessed using the 6-item Gratitude Questionnaire (GQ-6)
311 (McCullough et al., 2002) (January to July 2017). Items are scored on 7-point scales. The GQ-
312 6 total score ranges from 6 (low gratitude) to 42 (high gratitude). Depressive symptomatology
313 was assessed using the 20-item Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale (CES-D)
314 (Radloff, 1977) (November 2021 to May 2022). Items are scored on 4-point scales. The CES-
315 D total score ranges from 0 (lower depressive symptomatology) to 60 (higher depressive
316 symptomatology). Anxiety was assessed with the French version of the subscale of the 20-item
317 State-Trait Anxiety Inventory (STAI-T) (Langevin et al., 2012) (March to September 2020).
318 Items are scored on 4-point scales. The STAI-T total score ranges from 20 (lower anxiety) to
319 80 (higher anxiety).

320

321 ***Step 4: Psychometric analyses and item reduction***

322 Individuals who completed the 95-item Mind-Eat Scale in the NutriNet-Santé study (N = 3102)
323 were separated into three non-overlapping datasets to avoid performing both exploratory factor
324 analysis (EFA) and confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) on the same dataset. First, a subsample

325 of participants (Sample 3, N=498) was drawn to represent the French population in terms of
326 age, sex, BMI, and educational level (French National Institute of Statistics and of Economic
327 Studies (INSEE), 2022). The remaining sample of 2,604 participants was randomly divided into
328 two datasets of 1302 participants each to conduct an EFA and a CFA respectively (Sample 1
329 and Sample 2). A final CFA was performed in sample 3. See Supplemental Table S1 for the
330 characteristics of the participants in these three samples.

331

332 *Exploratory factor analysis*

333 An initial EFA was conducted on the first subsample of participants (Sample 1, N=1302) to
334 identify latent variables. EFA with maximum likelihood estimation and oblique rotation
335 (oblimin) was performed on the 95 items. The purpose of this step is to determine the underlying
336 factorial structure and to eliminate items that do not clearly measure one of the latent factors.
337 Before the EFA, the common variance adequacy of the items for factor analysis was verified:
338 Bartlett's test which indicates the probability of the absence of correlations must be significant
339 (Hair et al., 2010), and the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) test, which indicates the coherence of
340 the set formed by the items, must have a KMO per item greater than 0.50 (Hair et al., 2010).
341 Following this check, the number of factors to be extracted was based on the scree plot (Cattell,
342 1966), the proportion of variance explained globally (> 60%) (Carricano et al., 2010), and for
343 each factor (>5–10%) (Hatcher & O'Rourke, 2014) and parallel analysis (Horn, 1965). In
344 interpreting the rotated factor pattern, items with a factor loading of 0.40 or greater were
345 considered to represent a given factor. If an item showed a negligible loading (<0.30) on two
346 or more factors, it was deleted.

347

348

349

350 *Confirmatory factor analysis*

351 A first CFA using maximum likelihood estimation was carried out on the second sample of
352 participants (Sample 2, N=1302) to test the existence of the latent factors identified in the EFA
353 on a first-order multifactor model. Modification indices were processed to identify correlations
354 between disturbances of items within the same factor that needed to be estimated. A second
355 CFA was then performed to test a second-order one-factor model on the same subsample of
356 1,302 participants. Finally, a last CFA was performed on the representative sample of 498
357 participants (Sample 3), to confirm our second-order one-factor model. It is recommended to
358 use multiple fit indices to assess model fit (Kline, 2015). Five main indices were assessed for
359 the goodness of fit: the chi-square by degrees of freedom index (χ^2/df) (< 5) (Hair et al., 2010),
360 the Comparative Fit Index (CFI ≥ 0.95 good, ≥ 0.90 acceptable), the Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI
361 ≥ 0.95 good, ≥ 0.90 acceptable), the Standardized Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR ≤ 0.08
362 good), and the Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA ≤ 0.05 good, ≤ 0.08
363 acceptable) (Boateng et al., 2018). The χ^2/df tests on the covariance matrix derived from the
364 model represent the population covariance (Alavi et al., 2020). The CFI and TLI compare the
365 fit of a hypothesized model with that of a baseline model (i.e., a model with the worst fit) (Xia
366 & Yang, 2019). The SRMR summarizes the differences between the observed and implied
367 covariance matrices of the model (Alhija, 2010). The RMSEA assesses how far a hypothesized
368 model is from a perfect model. Configural, metric, and scalar invariance were tested.
369 To assess model invariance, sensitivity analyses were conducted on two subgroups. A first CFA
370 was conducted on meditation practitioners (N=471) given the potential differences between
371 meditators and non-meditators in response patterns related to conscious attention (Van Dam et
372 al., 2009). A second CFA was conducted in individuals with overweight or obesity (N=1540)
373 to ensure the relevance and validity of the questionnaire for those with weight-related concerns.
374 See Supplemental Table S1 for the characteristics of the participants in these samples.

375 *Hypothesis testing*

376 Convergent and divergent validity of the Mind-Eat Scale were assessed by evaluating
377 correlations between mindful eating and other scales on nutritional quality and eating behavior
378 (PNNS-GS2, TFEQ-R21, IES-S2) and psychological well-being (FFMQ, RSES, SWLS, LOT-
379 R, BRS, GQ-6, CES-D, STAI-T) using Spearman's correlation. Discriminant validity was
380 assessed by comparing mindful eating scores between subgroups of individuals with different
381 sexes, ages, BMI, educational level, employment status, presence of children in the household,
382 history of diet, physical activity level, and meditation practice, by using Student's t-test or
383 ANOVA's test, as appropriate.

384

385 *Reliability*

386 The reliability of the scale was assessed using McDonald's omega (ω) coefficient ($\omega > 0.80$
387 indicates good reliability). Test-retest analyses were performed on the participants who
388 completed the questionnaire twice (N=2363). The level of consistency between the successive
389 measurements was estimated using the intraclass correlation coefficient (ICC), calculated as
390 the ratio of the subject variance by the sum of the subject variance and the residual variance.
391 An ICC greater than 0.75 indicates good reliability, i.e. the questionnaire is reproducible (Koo
392 & Li, 2016).

393

394 *Softwares*

395 All tests of significance were two-sided, and a p-value < 0.05 was considered significant. EFA
396 was performed using Jamovi version 2.3.19.0. CFA and the other statistical analyses were
397 performed using R version 4.2.1 (Chambers, Murray Hill, NJ, USA).

398

399

400 *Content validity*

401 The content validity of the final 24-item version of the scale was assessed by eight experts in
402 mindful eating from a variety of disciplines (psychology, nutrition, epidemiology, medicine,
403 statistics, and social marketing). The experts confirmed that the scale measured the construct it
404 was intended to measure and that there were no omissions.

405

406 **3. RESULTS**

407

408 *Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA)*

409 Bartlett 's test performed on the 95-item Mind-Eat Scale indicated a strong relationship between
410 the variables ($P < 0.001$) while the KMO test indicated good sampling adequacy (ranging from
411 0.78 to 0.93). Using a scree plot and parallel analysis, the EFA resulted in a solution with a
412 maximum of 13 factors. Items with primary factor loadings < 0.40 and no clear assignment to a
413 factor were excluded. Only the 24 items with factor loadings between 0.40 and > 0.70 were
414 retained. As a result, six factors emerged from the EFA which accounted for 61.55% of the total
415 variance (Table 2). The following factors emerged: Awareness (11.16%), Non-reactivity
416 (11.01% of the variance), Openness (10.26%), Gratitude (9.93%), Non-judgment (9.55%), and
417 Hunger/Satiety (9.64%). Each factor consisted of four items resulting in a 24-item Mind-Eat
418 Scale. The final version of the Mind-Eat Scale is presented in Supplemental Table S2.

419

420 *Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA)*

421 The CFAs conducted on the 24-item Mind-Eat Scale suggested an adequate fit for all five
422 indices (χ^2/df , CFI, TLI, SRMR, RMSEA) to a first-order six-factor model in Sample 2 and to
423 a second-order one-factor model in Samples 2 and 3 (Table 3) (see Supplemental Table S3).

424 Configural, metric, and scalar invariance models were applied, and showed identical results.
425 These results validate that it is possible to calculate a total score of mindful eating.

426
427 The sensitivity analyses, performed on a subgroup of meditation practitioners (N=471) and
428 another subgroup of individuals with overweight/obesity (N=1540) indicated that both the first-
429 and second-order models showed a satisfactory fit for all five indices (see Table 4). These
430 results confirm the validity of the Mind-Eat Scale in these specific populations.

431

432 *Hypothesis testing*

433 Convergent and divergent validity were confirmed by associations with other scales assessing
434 nutritional quality, eating behavior, and psychological well-being (Table 5). Mindful eating was
435 positively associated with higher nutritional quality, intuitive eating subscale “Reliance on
436 hunger and satiety cues”, mindfulness and its subscales, self-esteem, satisfaction with life,
437 optimism, resilience, and gratitude ($P<0.001$). Mindful eating was negatively correlated with
438 the three subscales of eating behavior (cognitive restraint, emotional eating, uncontrolled
439 eating), with depressive symptomatology and anxiety ($P<0.001$). No associations were found
440 with the intuitive eating subscales “Eating for physical rather than emotional reasons” and
441 “Unconditional permission to eat”.

442 The discriminant validity of the Mind-Eat Scale was confirmed (Table 1). The total mindful
443 eating score was significantly higher in males, those who were older, had a lower BMI, were
444 retired and self-employed or farmers, had children in the household, had never dieted, had
445 higher levels of physical activity, and those who currently practiced meditation ($P<0.001$)
446 (Table 1). Mindful eating scores were also lower in students ($P<0.001$), although no significant
447 differences were observed according to educational level.

448

449 **Reliability**

450 McDonald's ω indicated good internal consistency for the six dimensions: Awareness ($\omega =$
451 0.88), Non-reactivity ($\omega = 0.88$), Openness ($\omega = 0.86$), Gratitude ($\omega = 0.84$), Non-judgment (ω
452 = 0.84), and Hunger/Satiety ($\omega = 0.84$).

453 Overall, interdimensional robust correlation coefficients were observed between Awareness,
454 Openness, Gratitude, and Hunger/Satiety, and between Non-judgment, Non-reactivity, and
455 Hunger/Satiety (Table 6). Non-judgment was weakly associated with Awareness, and
456 Gratitude, and showed no association with Openness. In addition, non-reactivity was not
457 significantly associated with Openness and Gratitude.

458 Test-retest over a 51-day period revealed high reliability with good ICCs for all dimensions:
459 Awareness (0.82 95% CI [0.80; 0.83]), Non-reactivity (0.74 95% CI [0.72; 0.76]), Openness
460 (0.81 95% CI [0.80; 0.83]), Gratitude (0.79 95% CI [0.77; 0.80]), Non-judgment (0.78 95% CI
461 [0.77; 0.80]), and Hunger/Satiety (0.79 95% CI [0.78; 0.81]).

462

463 **4. DISCUSSION**

464 In this study, we aimed at developing and validating a questionnaire to assess the level of
465 mindful eating in a general population. The developed Mind-Eat Scale consists of 24 items
466 divided into six dimensions: Non-reactivity, Awareness, Openness, Gratitude, Non-judgment,
467 and Hunger/Satiety. Unlike existing mindful eating scales, ours introduces two new
468 dimensions: Openness and Gratitude. A second-order factor that includes all six dimensions
469 allows us to calculate a total mindful eating score. All other scales developed in previous years
470 have allowed for the calculation of scores by dimensions only (Carrière et al., 2022; Clementi
471 et al., 2017; Framson et al., 2009; Hulbert-Williams et al., 2014; Peitz et al., 2021; Winkens et
472 al., 2018). The scale showed good psychometric properties, adequate discriminant, convergent
473 and divergent validity, satisfactory internal consistency, and reliable test-retest reliability. This

474 study validated the first tool to assess a total mindful eating score and its subdimensions in a
475 general population.

476

477 *Exploring mindful eating dimensions*

478 The present study confirms the multidimensionality of the mindful eating construct as
479 suggested by previous studies (Peitz & Warschburger, 2022). The dimensions identified in the
480 Mind-Eat Scale cover a variety of attitudes and behaviors, that are generally accepted as part of
481 the concept of mindful eating.

482 The *Awareness* dimension describes the ability to be fully present and attentive to the sensory
483 experiences, thoughts, and emotions that arise during food experiences. Awareness is a core
484 aspect of mindful eating and this dimension has been included in all mindful eating scales
485 (Carrière et al., 2022; Clementi et al., 2017; Framson et al., 2009; Hulbert-Williams et al., 2014;
486 Mantzios, 2023a; Peitz et al., 2021; Winkens et al., 2018). This heightened awareness allows
487 individuals to make conscious and intentional choices, savor the flavors and textures of food,
488 and develop a healthier relationship with food (Bays & Kabat-Zinn, 2009). It is important to
489 note that our awareness subscale differs slightly from other mindful eating scales in that it
490 includes aspects of slower eating. Research has shown that slower eating is associated with
491 healthier eating (Robinson et al., 2014). Slowing down the rate of eating can be a practical way
492 for individuals to increase their sensory exposure (Tapper, 2022) and, consequently, their
493 awareness. Our scale was developed based on mindful eating practice rather than theory, which
494 may explain why this aspect emerged in our scale.

495 The *Non-reactivity* dimension refers to the ability to observe thoughts, emotions, and cravings
496 related to food without immediately acting upon them or being driven by them. This dimension
497 is included in three mindful eating questionnaires (Carrière et al., 2022; Hulbert-Williams et

498 al., 2014; Peitz et al., 2021) and in the FFMQ (Baer et al., 2006). A higher level of non-reactivity
499 allows for a pause between the stimulus (e.g. craving) and the response (e.g. eating) and creates
500 space for a more mindful decision about whether to act on the craving. This can be described
501 as an improvement in cognitive flexibility (Zou et al., 2020). This dimension overlaps with the
502 “External eating” dimension of the DEBQ, which refers to eating in response to external cues
503 such as environmental or situational triggers (van Strien et al., 1986).

504 The *Openness* dimension involves adopting an open and curious mindset towards food,
505 embracing the present moment with curiosity instead of seeking rigid control over overeating
506 experiences (Albers, 2009). Mindfulness requires that individuals approach their moment-by-
507 moment experiences with openness (Barner & Barner, 2011; Bishop et al., 2004; Kabat-Zinn,
508 2005). However, this aspect is not included in other assessments of mindfulness or mindful
509 eating besides the Freiburg Mindfulness Inventory (FMI) (Walach et al., 2006). Increased
510 openness is expected to help individuals let go of biases, making it easier to discover new foods
511 and flavors with a more flexible and receptive approach. The relevance of this subscale within
512 the mindful eating concept needs further confirmation.

513 The *Gratitude* dimension expresses an awareness and a sense of recognition for those
514 contributing to meals. Gratitude is an important form of mindfulness and a tenet of Buddhist
515 psychology (Rosenzweig, 2013). Some mindfulness-based interventions now incorporate
516 teachings and practices around gratitude (Kabat-Zinn, 2013). However, this dimension has not
517 been included in other scales except for the MEI which integrates some aspects of it in the
518 “Connectedness” dimension (Peitz et al., 2021) and its relevance should be further assessed.
519 Gratitude may hold an important role in mindful eating by acknowledging a broader awareness
520 of the origin of the food that consumers have been increasingly concerned about in the last
521 decades (Baudry et al., 2017). In addition, the inclusion of gratitude offers a more

522 comprehensive perspective, that addresses not only awareness of physical aspects but also
523 emotional aspects of the eating experience (McCullough et al., 2002).

524 The *Non-judgment* dimension is defined by the ability to avoid negative self-judgment of
525 ourselves and our food choices and eating behaviors. This refers to an attitude of acceptance,
526 accepting things as they are in the present moment, including thoughts, emotions, and
527 sensations, without resistance and without trying to change or control them. This dimension is
528 a well-accepted aspect of mindfulness and has been included in all mindful eating
529 questionnaires except for the MEQ (Framson et al., 2009), and MEQ-short (Clementi et al.,
530 2017). A limit of this dimension is that like in most questionnaires on mindful eating (Carrière
531 et al., 2022; Clementi et al., 2017; Framson et al., 2009; Hulbert-Williams et al., 2014; Peitz et
532 al., 2021; Winkens et al., 2018) and mindfulness (Baer et al., 2006; Bergomi et al., 2013), it
533 mainly consists of reverse items that assess self-judgment rather than non-judgment, which are
534 not strict opposite constructs as has been shown with the concepts of mindfulness and
535 mindlessness (Van Dam et al., 2009). Although the 95-item version of the scale included an
536 adequate number of items related to non-judgment, none of them were retained in the final
537 solution. Items related to judgment may be more relatable to individuals' daily experiences than
538 those related to non-judgment.

539

540 The *Hunger/Satiety* dimension is defined by present-moment awareness and trust in internal
541 bodily sensations. It contributes to a stronger connection with hunger and satiety signals.
542 Increased awareness of these signals enables individuals to make more conscious dietary
543 choices, potentially reducing overeating and mindless eating driven by emotions or external
544 cues (Kristeller et al., 2014). This dimension aligns well with common mindful eating practices
545 (Tapper, 2022) and is included in various mindful eating questionnaires (Clementi et al., 2017;
546 Framson et al., 2009; Peitz et al., 2021; Winkens et al., 2018). However, the relevance of this

547 dimension with the concept of mindful eating was questioned (Mantzios, 2023a). Concerns
548 included the fact that hunger and satiety necessarily involve judgment and reaction, the
549 multiplicity of other motives that can lead to the initiation or end of consumption, and potential
550 implications for overconsumption (Mantzios, 2023a). It must be noted that similar dimensions
551 can be found in other measures of dietary behavior such as the “Reliance on hunger and satiety
552 cues” dimension of the intuitive eating questionnaire (IES-2) (Tylka & Kroon Van Diest, 2013).

553

554 Our data suggest a close relationship or shared measurement of mindful eating aspects within
555 two groups of dimensions: Awareness, Openness, Gratitude, and Hunger/Satiety on one side,
556 and Non-judgment, Non-reactivity, and Hunger/Satiety on the other side. However, most
557 dimensions showed limited associations with each other confirming that they are relatively
558 independent and measure distinct aspects of mindful eating.

559

560 *Hypothesis testing and tool validity*

561 Our findings support our hypothesis by revealing positive correlations with nutritional quality,
562 mindfulness, self-esteem, satisfaction with life, optimism, resilience, and gratitude. Only the
563 'Reliance on hunger and satiety cues' dimension from the IES-2 questionnaire (Camilleri,
564 Méjean, Bellisle, Andreeva, et al., 2015) exhibited a significant positive correlation with our
565 Mind-Eat Scale, indicating that the intuitive eating concept differs from mindful eating.
566 Negative correlations were observed with cognitive restraint, emotional eating, uncontrolled
567 eating, depressive symptomatology, and anxiety. These findings are consistent with the core
568 tenets of the mindful eating concept and highlight its role in promoting a healthier relationship
569 with food (Jordan et al., 2014) and psychological well-being (Goyal et al., 2014).

570 Our study suggests that the Mind-Eat Scale is a valid tool to assess mindful eating in individuals
571 who meditate or live with overweight/obesity. It identifies varying levels of mindful eating,

572 among diverse populations such as lower overall mindful eating scores in individuals with
573 overweight or obesity. This research could enhance clinical nutrition practice, and promote
574 well-being, given the positive impact of mindful eating on physical and mental health (Khan &
575 Zadeh, 2014). It could be particularly beneficial for healthcare professionals' practice, as it
576 supports patients in cultivating a healthier relationship with food. Assessing dietary patterns in
577 this population is crucial for personalized recommendations and comprehensive care. Mindful
578 eating assessment can also raise awareness of eating behavior, by fostering positive changes
579 and improved weight management. Finally, the Mind-Eat Scale can aid in evaluating
580 interventions for individuals with overweight or obesity, allowing tailored follow-up plans and
581 progress monitoring.

582

583 *Strengths and limitations*

584 A major strength of this study is its careful adherence to the recommended validation steps for
585 scale development (Boateng et al., 2018) increasing its overall robustness. Another strength of
586 this study is the representativeness of its population. Sample 3, used for the last CFA, had
587 similar sex, BMI, and education distribution to the wider French population (French National
588 Institute of Statistics and of Economic Studies (INSEE), 2022) and differed only in terms of
589 age distribution. However, caution should be exercised in generalizing our results because the
590 NutriNet-Santé study relies on voluntary, long-term, web-based recruitment. Hence, the study
591 sample probably consists of health-conscious individuals interested in nutrition (Andreeva et
592 al., 2016). This questionnaire possesses an added advantage as it incorporates both theoretical
593 foundations and practical elements. Consequently, it becomes an instrument with more
594 extensive and practice-oriented dimensions compared to the majority of other questionnaires.
595 The relevance of some dimensions to the mindful eating concept such as gratitude,
596 hunger/satiety, or openness dimensions should however be further assessed. Another limitation

597 is related to the bivariate correlations in hypothesis testing that may introduce bias (Bishara &
598 Hittner, 2015). Finally, the temporality of the data can be a limit, as covariates and some of the
599 dietary quality, dietary behavior, and psychological well-being questionnaires were collected
600 several months, or in specific cases even years, earlier. As a result, they may not accurately
601 reflect the current status or behavior of the participants. However, dietary behaviors (Mikkilä
602 et al., 2005) and psychological traits (Johnson et al., 2005) tend to remain relatively stable over
603 time.

604

605 **5. CONCLUSIONS**

606 In this study, the Mind-Eat Scale was developed and validated to assess the level of mindful
607 eating in the general population. This work resulted in a 24-item scale distributed into six
608 dimensions, which showed good psychometric properties. This tool is the first to calculate a
609 CFA-validated total mindful eating score, in addition to a score by dimension. Mindful eating
610 total score differed between sub-groups of individuals and was associated with favorable
611 nutritional quality, eating behavior, and psychological well-being characteristics. This scale
612 may prove useful to better understand the role of mindful eating in nutrition and associated
613 health outcomes. It can also be useful for health professionals in managing patients, particularly
614 in the context of overweight and obesity.

615

616

617

618

619

620 **DECLARATIONS**

621

622 **Ethics approval and consent to participate**

623 The NutriNet-Santé study is conducted according to the Declaration of Helsinki guidelines and
624 was approved by the Institutional Review Board of the French Institute for Health and Medical
625 Research (IRB Inserm n°0000388FWA00005831) and the “Commission Nationale de
626 l’Informatique et des Libertés” (CNIL n°908450/n°909216). The study protocol is recorded at
627 Clinicaltrials.gov under the number: NCT03335644. All subjects provided informed consent.

628

629 **Consent for publication**

630 Not applicable.

631

632 **Availability of data and materials**

633 **DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT**

634 Researchers from public institutions can submit a collaboration request to Dr. Mathilde Touvier
635 via collaboration@etude-nutrinet-sante.fr, including information on the institution and a brief
636 description of the project. All requests will be reviewed by the steering committee of the
637 NutriNet-Santé study. If the collaboration is accepted, a data access agreement will be
638 necessary, and appropriate authorizations from competent administrative authorities may be
639 needed. In accordance with existing regulations, no personal data will be accessible. The
640 analysis code can be requested from the authors.

640

641

642 **Competing interests**

643 All authors report that they have no known competing financial interests or personal
644 relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

645

646 **Funding**

647 This research was part of the MIND-EAT project, which was supported by the Institute for
648 Public Health Research (IReSP) (2021-2024).

649 The NutriNet-Santé study is supported by the French Ministry of Solidarity and Health, the
650 National Agency for Public Health (Santé Publique France), the National Institute for Health
651 and Medical Research (INSERM), the National Research Institute for Agriculture, Food and
652 Environment (INRAE), the National Conservatory of Arts and Crafts (CNAM), the Centre for
653 Epidemiological Research and Statistics (CRESS) and Sorbonne Paris Nord University. The
654 funders had no role in the design of the study, in the collection, analyses, or interpretation of
655 data, in the writing of the manuscript, or in the decision to publish the results.

656

657 **Authors' contributions**

658 MVB conducted the literature review and drafted the manuscript. MVB, CL, and SP performed
659 the statistical analyses. SP, MVB, RS, AR, and CL were responsible for developing the design
660 and protocol of the study. SP, MVB, RS, and AR were responsible for collecting the data. All
661 authors participated in the editing and critical revision of the manuscript and approved the final
662 version of the manuscript for publication.

663

664 Acknowledgments

665 We wish to warmly thank all the experts, translators, and naïve individuals who provided
666 feedback and advice during the development of the scale. The authors thank Cédric Agaesse
667 (dietary data manager) and Alexandre De-Sa (dietitian); Selim Aloui (IT manager), Thi Hong
668 Van Duong, Régis Gatibelza, Jagatjit Mohinder and Aladi Timera (computer scientists); Julien
669 Allegre, Nathalie Arnault, Laurent Bourhis, Nicolas Dechamp (biostatisticians), and Fabien
670 Szabo de Edelenyi, Ph.D. (biostatistics team manager); Maria Gomes and Mirette Foham
671 (NutriNet-Santé participant support) and Paola Yvroud, M.D. (health event validator)(all
672 affiliated with CRESS-EREN) for their technical contribution to the NutriNet-Santé study. The
673 authors sincerely thank all the volunteers of the NutriNet-Santé cohort.

674

675

676

677

678

679

680

681

682

683

684

685

686 REFERENCES

- 687 Alavi, M., Visentin, D. C., Thapa, D. K., Hunt, G. E., Watson, R., & Cleary, M. (2020). Chi-
 688 square for model fit in confirmatory factor analysis. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 76(9),
 689 2209- 2211. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jan.14399>
- 690 Albers, S. (2009). *Eat, Drink, and Be Mindful : How to End Your Struggle with Mindless Eating*
 691 *and Start Savoring Food with Intention and Joy* (Enfield: New Harbinger; Publishers Group
 692 UK [distributor]).
- 693 Alhija, F. A. N. (2010). Factor Analysis : An Overview and Some Contemporary Advances. In
 694 *International Encyclopedia of Education* (p. 162- 170). Elsevier. [https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-](https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-08-044894-7.01328-2)
 695 [0-08-044894-7.01328-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-08-044894-7.01328-2)
- 696 Altman, D., Amala, D., Baerten, C., Bays, J. C., & Blackwood, M. (2013). *The principles of*
 697 *mindful eating*. [http://thecenterformindfuleating.org/Resource](http://thecenterformindfuleating.org/Resources/Documents/principles_handout_1_22.pdf)
 698 [s/Documents/principles_handout_1_22.pdf](http://thecenterformindfuleating.org/Resources/Documents/principles_handout_1_22.pdf)
- 699 Andreeva, V. A., Deschamps, V., Salanave, B., Castetbon, K., Verdot, C., Kesse-Guyot, E., &
 700 Hercberg, S. (2016). Comparison of Dietary Intakes Between a Large Online Cohort Study
 701 (Etude NutriNet-Santé) and a Nationally Representative Cross-Sectional Study (Etude
 702 Nationale Nutrition Santé) in France : Addressing the Issue of Generalizability in E-
 703 Epidemiology. *American Journal of Epidemiology*, 184(9), 660- 669.
 704 <https://doi.org/10.1093/aje/kww016>
- 705 Baer, R. A., Smith, G. T., Hopkins, J., Krietemeyer, J., & Toney, L. (2006). Using Self-Report
 706 Assessment Methods to Explore Facets of Mindfulness. *Assessment*, 13(1), 27- 45.
 707 <https://doi.org/10.1177/1073191105283504>
- 708 Baudry, J., Péneau, S., Allès, B., Touvier, M., Hercberg, S., Galan, P., Amiot, M.-J., Lairon,
 709 D., Méjean, C., & Kesse-Guyot, E. (2017). Food Choice Motives When Purchasing in Organic
 710 and Conventional Consumer Clusters : Focus on Sustainable Concerns (The NutriNet-Santé
 711 Cohort Study). *Nutrients*, 9(2), 88. <https://doi.org/10.3390/nu9020088>
- 712 Bays, J. C., & Kabat-Zinn, J. (2009). *Mindful eating : A guide to rediscovering a healthy and*
 713 *joyful relationship with food* (1st ed). Shambhala ; distributed in the U.S. by Random House.
- 714 Bergomi, C., Tschacher, W., & Kupper, Z. (2013). Measuring Mindfulness : First Steps
 715 Towards the Development of a Comprehensive Mindfulness Scale. *Mindfulness*, 4(1), 18- 32.
 716 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12671-012-0102-9>
- 717 Bishara, A. J., & Hittner, J. B. (2015). Reducing Bias and Error in the Correlation Coefficient
 718 Due to Nonnormality. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 75(5), 785- 804.
 719 <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164414557639>
- 720 Blais, M. R., Vallerand, R. J., Pelletier, L. G., & Brière, N. M. (1989). L'échelle de satisfaction
 721 de vie : Validation canadienne-française du « Satisfaction with Life Scale. » *Canadian Journal*
 722 *of Behavioural Science / Revue Canadienne Des Sciences Du Comportement*, 21(2), 210- 223.
 723 <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0079854>
- 724 Boateng, G. O., Neilands, T. B., Frongillo, E. A., Melgar-Quiñonez, H. R., & Young, S. L.
 725 (2018). Best Practices for Developing and Validating Scales for Health, Social, and Behavioral
 726 Research : A Primer. *Frontiers in Public Health*, 6, 149.
 727 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2018.00149>
- 728 Camilleri, G. M., Méjean, C., Bellisle, F., Andreeva, V. A., Sautron, V., Hercberg, S., &
 729 Péneau, S. (2015). Cross-cultural validity of the Intuitive Eating Scale-2. Psychometric
 730 evaluation in a sample of the general French population. *Appetite*, 84, 34- 42.
 731 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2014.09.009>
- 732 Camilleri, G. M., Méjean, C., Bellisle, F., Hercberg, S., & Péneau, S. (2015). Association
 733 between Mindfulness and Weight Status in a General Population from the NutriNet-Santé
 734 Study. *PLOS ONE*, 10(6), e0127447. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0127447>

- 735 Carricano, M., Poujol, F., & Bertrandias, L. (2010). *Décrire les données. Analyse de données*
736 *avec SPSS, Synthex (2e éd.)*. Pearson Education.
- 737 Carrière, K., Shireen, S. H., Siemers, N., Preißner, C. E., Starr, J., Falk, C., & Knäuper, B.
738 (2022). Development and Validation of the Four Facet Mindful Eating Scale (FFaMES).
739 *Appetite*, 168, 105689. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2021.105689>
- 740 Cattell, R. B. (1966). The Scree Test For The Number Of Factors. *Multivariate Behavioral*
741 *Research*, 1(2), 245- 276. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327906mbr0102_10
- 742 Chaltiel, D., Adjibade, M., Deschamps, V., Touvier, M., Hercberg, S., Julia, C., & Kesse-
743 Guyot, E. (2019). Programme National Nutrition Santé – guidelines score 2 (PNNS-GS2) :
744 Development and validation of a diet quality score reflecting the 2017 French dietary
745 guidelines. *British Journal of Nutrition*, 122(03), 331- 342.
746 <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0007114519001181>
- 747 Clementi, C., Casu, G., & Gremigni, P. (2017). An Abbreviated Version of the Mindful Eating
748 Questionnaire. *Journal of Nutrition Education and Behavior*, 49(4), 352-356.e1.
749 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jneb.2017.01.016>
- 750 Craig, C. L., Marshall, A. L., Sjöström, M., Bauman, A. E., Booth, M. L., Ainsworth, B. E.,
751 Pratt, M., Ekelund, U., Yngve, A., Sallis, J. F., & Oja, P. (2003). International physical activity
752 questionnaire : 12-country reliability and validity. *Medicine and Science in Sports and Exercise*,
753 35(8), 1381- 1395. <https://doi.org/10.1249/01.MSS.0000078924.61453.FB>
- 754 Dossett, M. L., Fricchione, G. L., & Benson, H. (2020). A New Era for Mind–Body Medicine.
755 *New England Journal of Medicine*, 382(15), 1390- 1391.
756 <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMp1917461>
- 757 Framson, C., Kristal, A. R., Schenk, J. M., Littman, A. J., Zeliadt, S., & Benitez, D. (2009).
758 Development and Validation of the Mindful Eating Questionnaire. *Journal of the American*
759 *Dietetic Association*, 109(8), 1439- 1444. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jada.2009.05.006>
- 760 French National Institute of Statistics and of Economic Studies (INSEE). (2022). *French*
761 *National Census Data 2022*. <https://www.insee.fr/fr/statistiques>
- 762 Fung, T. T., Long, M. W., Hung, P., & Cheung, L. W. Y. (2016). An Expanded Model for
763 Mindful Eating for Health Promotion and Sustainability : Issues and Challenges for Dietetics
764 Practice. *Journal of the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics*, 116(7), 1081- 1086.
765 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jand.2016.03.013>
- 766 Goyal, M., Singh, S., Sibinga, E. M. S., Gould, N. F., Rowland-Seymour, A., Sharma, R.,
767 Berger, Z., Sleicher, D., Maron, D. D., Shihab, H. M., Ranasinghe, P. D., Linn, S., Saha, S.,
768 Bass, E. B., & Haythornthwaite, J. A. (2014). Meditation Programs for Psychological Stress
769 and Well-being : A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *JAMA Internal Medicine*, 174(3),
770 357. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamainternmed.2013.13018>
- 771 Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2010). *Factor analysis. In*
772 *Multivariate Data Analysis: Vol. 7ème édition* (Prentice Hall).
- 773 Hatcher, L., & O'Rourke, N. (2014). *A step-by-step approach to using SAS for factor analysis*
774 *and structural equation modeling* (2nd ed). SAS Institute.
- 775 Hercberg, S., Castetbon, K., Czernichow, S., Malon, A., Mejean, C., Kesse, E., Touvier, M., &
776 Galan, P. (2010). The Nutrinet-Santé Study : A web-based prospective study on the relationship
777 between nutrition and health and determinants of dietary patterns and nutritional status. *BMC*
778 *Public Health*, 10(1), 242. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2458-10-242>
- 779 Horn, J. L. (1965). A rationale and test for the number of factors in factor analysis.
780 *Psychometrika*, 30(2), 179- 185. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02289447>
- 781 Hulbert-Williams, L., Nicholls, W., Joy, J., & Hulbert-Williams, N. (2014). Initial Validation
782 of the Mindful Eating Scale. *Mindfulness*, 5(6), 719- 729. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12671-013-0227-5>
- 783
- 784 Johnson, W., McGue, M., & Krueger, R. F. (2005). Personality Stability in Late Adulthood : A

- 785 Behavioral Genetic Analysis. *Journal of Personality*, 73(2), 523- 552.
 786 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.2005.00319.x>
- 787 Jordan, C. H., Wang, W., Donatoni, L., & Meier, B. P. (2014). Mindful eating : Trait and state
 788 mindfulness predict healthier eating behavior. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 68,
 789 107- 111. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2014.04.013>
- 790 Kabat-Zinn, J. (1982). An outpatient program in behavioral medicine for chronic pain patients
 791 based on the practice of mindfulness meditation : Theoretical considerations and preliminary
 792 results. *General Hospital Psychiatry*, 4(1), 33- 47. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0163-](https://doi.org/10.1016/0163-8343(82)90026-3)
 793 [8343\(82\)90026-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/0163-8343(82)90026-3)
- 794 Kabat-Zinn, J. (2003). Mindfulness-based interventions in context : Past, present, and future.
 795 *Clinical Psychology: Science and Practice*, 10(2), 144- 156.
 796 <https://doi.org/10.1093/clipsy.bpg016>
- 797 Kabat-Zinn, J. (2013). *Full Catastrophe Living, Revised Edition : How to cope with stress, pain*
 798 *and illness using mindfulness meditation* (Piatkus (24 Sept. 2013)).
- 799 Kawasaki, Y., Akamatsu, R., Fujiwara, Y., Omori, M., Sugawara, M., Yamazaki, Y.,
 800 Matsumoto, S., Iwakabe, S., & Kobayashi, T. (2021). Is mindful eating sustainable and healthy?
 801 A focus on nutritional intake, food consumption, and plant-based dietary patterns among lean
 802 and normal-weight female university students in Japan. *Eating and Weight Disorders - Studies*
 803 *on Anorexia, Bulimia and Obesity*, 26(7), 2183- 2199. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s40519-020-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s40519-020-01093-1)
 804 [01093-1](https://doi.org/10.1007/s40519-020-01093-1)
- 805 Khan, Z., & Zadeh, Z. F. (2014). Mindful Eating and it's Relationship with Mental Well-being.
 806 *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 159, 69- 73.
 807 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.12.330>
- 808 Kline, R. B. (2015). *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling (4th ed.)* (Guilford
 809 Press).
- 810 Koo, T. K., & Li, M. Y. (2016). A Guideline of Selecting and Reporting Intraclass Correlation
 811 Coefficients for Reliability Research. *Journal of Chiropractic Medicine*, 15(2), 155- 163.
 812 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcm.2016.02.012>
- 813 Kristeller, J., Wolever, R. Q., & Sheets, V. (2014). Mindfulness-Based Eating Awareness
 814 Training (MB-EAT) for Binge Eating : A Randomized Clinical Trial. *Mindfulness*, 5(3),
 815 282- 297. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12671-012-0179-1>
- 816 Langevin, V., Boini, S., François, M., & Riou, A. (2012). *Inventaire d'anxiété état-trait forme*
 817 *Y [State-Trait Anxiety Inventory (STAI-Y)]*. vol. 131, p. 161-4.
- 818 Lee, E. K. P., Yeung, N. C. Y., Xu, Z., Zhang, D., Yu, C.-P., & Wong, S. Y. S. (2020). Effect
 819 and Acceptability of Mindfulness-Based Stress Reduction Program on Patients With Elevated
 820 Blood Pressure or Hypertension : A Meta-Analysis of Randomized Controlled Trials.
 821 *Hypertension*, 76(6), 1992- 2001. <https://doi.org/10.1161/HYPERTENSIONAHA.120.16160>
- 822 Levine, G. N., Cohen, B. E., Commodore-Mensah, Y., Fleury, J., Huffman, J. C., Khalid, U.,
 823 Labarthe, D. R., Lavretsky, H., Michos, E. D., Spatz, E. S., Kubzansky, L. D., & On behalf of
 824 the American Heart Association Council on Clinical Cardiology; Council on Arteriosclerosis,
 825 Thrombosis and Vascular Biology; Council on Cardiovascular and Stroke Nursing; and Council
 826 on Lifestyle and Cardiometabolic Health. (2021). Psychological Health, Well-Being, and the
 827 Mind-Heart-Body Connection : A Scientific Statement From the American Heart Association.
 828 *Circulation*, 143(10). <https://doi.org/10.1161/CIR.0000000000000947>
- 829 Mantzios, M. (2023a). Development and initial validation of the trait and state Mindful Eating
 830 Behaviour Scales. *Eating and Weight Disorders - Studies on Anorexia, Bulimia and Obesity*,
 831 28(1), 88. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40519-023-01614-8>
- 832 Mantzios, M. (2023b). Mindful eating : A conceptual critical review of the literature,
 833 measurement and intervention development. *Nutrition and Health*, 29(3), 435- 441.
 834 <https://doi.org/10.1177/02601060231153427>

- 835 McCullough, M. E., Emmons, R. A., & Tsang, J.-A. (2002). The grateful disposition : A
836 conceptual and empirical topography. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 82(1),
837 112- 127. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.82.1.112>
- 838 Mikkilä, V., Räsänen, L., Raitakari, O. T., Pietinen, P., & Viikari, J. (2005). Consistent dietary
839 patterns identified from childhood to adulthood : The Cardiovascular Risk in Young Finns
840 Study. *British Journal of Nutrition*, 93(6), 923- 931. <https://doi.org/10.1079/BJN20051418>
- 841 Mokkink, L. B., de Vet, H. C. W., Prinsen, C. A. C., Patrick, D. L., Alonso, J., Bouter, L. M.,
842 & Terwee, C. B. (2018). COSMIN Risk of Bias checklist for systematic reviews of Patient-
843 Reported Outcome Measures. *Quality of Life Research*, 27(5), 1171- 1179.
844 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11136-017-1765-4>
- 845 Nutrinet Santé. (2013). *Table de composition des aliments* (Economica).
846 [https://www.economica.fr/livre-table-de-composition-des-aliments-etude-nutrinet-sante-](https://www.economica.fr/livre-table-de-composition-des-aliments-etude-nutrinet-sante-c2x32211075?PGFLngID=0)
847 [c2x32211075?PGFLngID=0](https://www.economica.fr/livre-table-de-composition-des-aliments-etude-nutrinet-sante-c2x32211075?PGFLngID=0)
- 848 Oliveira, J. P. T., Do Carmo, S. G., Aragão, B. D. A., Cunha, J., & Botelho, P. B. (2023).
849 Meditation practices and their relationship with eating behavior, weight changes, and mental
850 health in adults from different regions of Brazil : A cross-sectional study. *Nutrition*, 109,
851 111972. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nut.2023.111972>
- 852 O'Reilly, G. A., Cook, L., Spruijt-Metz, D., & Black, D. S. (2014). Mindfulness-based
853 interventions for obesity-related eating behaviours : A literature review: Mindfulness
854 interventions for eating behaviours. *Obesity Reviews*, 15(6), 453- 461.
855 <https://doi.org/10.1111/obr.12156>
- 856 Peitz, D., Schulze, J., & Warschburger, P. (2021). Getting a deeper understanding of
857 mindfulness in the context of eating behavior : Development and validation of the Mindful
858 Eating Inventory. *Appetite*, 159, 105039. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2020.105039>
- 859 Peitz, D., & Warschburger, P. (2022). Taking a closer look at mindful eating : Incremental
860 validity and importance of subfacets. *Eating and Weight Disorders - Studies on Anorexia,*
861 *Bulimia and Obesity*, 27(7), 2507- 2514. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40519-022-01383-w>
- 862 Pintado-Cucarella, S., & Rodríguez-Salgado, P. (2016). Mindful eating and its relationship with
863 body mass index, binge eating, anxiety and negative affect. *Journal of Behavior, Health &*
864 *Social Issues*, 8(2), 19- 24. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbhsi.2016.11.003>
- 865 Radloff, L. S. (1977). The CES-D Scale : A Self-Report Depression Scale for Research in the
866 General Population. *Applied Psychological Measurement*, 1(3), 385- 401.
867 <https://doi.org/10.1177/014662167700100306>
- 868 Robinson, E., Almiron-Roig, E., Rutters, F., De Graaf, C., Forde, C. G., Tudur Smith, C., Nolan,
869 S. J., & Jebb, S. A. (2014). A systematic review and meta-analysis examining the effect of
870 eating rate on energy intake and hunger. *The American Journal of Clinical Nutrition*, 100(1),
871 123- 151. <https://doi.org/10.3945/ajcn.113.081745>
- 872 Rosenzweig, D. (2013). The Sisters of Mindfulness. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 69(8),
873 793- 804. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jclp.22015>
- 874 Salvo, V., Curado, D. F., Sanudo, A., Kristeller, J., Schveitzer, M. C., Favarato, M. L., Isidoro,
875 W., & Demarzo, M. (2022). Comparative effectiveness of mindfulness and mindful eating
876 programmes among low-income overweight women in primary health care : A randomised
877 controlled pragmatic study with psychological, biochemical, and anthropometric outcomes.
878 *Appetite*, 177, 106131. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2022.106131>
- 879 Scott-Sheldon, L. A. J., Gathright, E. C., Donahue, M. L., Balletto, B., Feulner, M. M.,
880 DeCosta, J., Cruess, D. G., Wing, R. R., Carey, M. P., & Salmoirago-Blotcher, E. (2020).
881 Mindfulness-Based Interventions for Adults with Cardiovascular Disease : A Systematic
882 Review and Meta-Analysis. *Annals of Behavioral Medicine*, 54(1), 67- 73.
883 <https://doi.org/10.1093/abm/kaz020>
- 884 Smith, B. W., Dalen, J., Wiggins, K., Tooley, E., Christopher, P., & Bernard, J. (2008). The

- 885 brief resilience scale : Assessing the ability to bounce back. *International Journal of Behavioral*
 886 *Medicine*, 15(3), 194- 200. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10705500802222972>
- 887 Spadaro, K. C., Davis, K. K., Sereika, S. M., Gibbs, B. B., Jakicic, J. M., & Cohen, S. M.
 888 (2018). Effect of mindfulness meditation on short-term weight loss and eating behaviors in
 889 overweight and obese adults : A randomized controlled trial. *Journal of Complementary and*
 890 *Integrative Medicine*, 15(2), 20160048. <https://doi.org/10.1515/jcim-2016-0048>
- 891 Tapper, K. (2017). Can mindfulness influence weight management related eating behaviors? If
 892 so, how? *Clinical Psychology Review*, 53, 122- 134. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2017.03.003>
- 893 Tapper, K. (2022). Mindful eating : What we know so far. *Nutrition Bulletin*, 47(2), 168- 185.
 894 <https://doi.org/10.1111/nbu.12559>
- 895 Tholin, S., Rasmussen, F., Tynelius, P., & Karlsson, J. (2005). Genetic and environmental
 896 influences on eating behavior : The Swedish Young Male Twins Study. *The American Journal*
 897 *of Clinical Nutrition*, 81(3), 564- 569. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ajcn/81.3.564>
- 898 Timmerman, G. M., & Brown, A. (2012). The Effect of a Mindful Restaurant Eating
 899 Intervention on Weight Management in Women. *Journal of Nutrition Education and Behavior*,
 900 44(1), 22- 28. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jneb.2011.03.143>
- 901 Trottier, C., Mageau, G., Trudel, P., & Halliwell, W. R. (2008). Validation de la version
 902 canadienne-française du Life Orientation Test-Revised. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural*
 903 *Science / Revue Canadienne Des Sciences Du Comportement*, 40(4), 238- 243.
 904 <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0013244>
- 905 Tylka, T. L., & Kroon Van Diest, A. M. (2013). The Intuitive Eating Scale-2 : Item refinement
 906 and psychometric evaluation with college women and men. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*,
 907 60(1), 137- 153. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0030893>
- 908 Vallieres, E. F., & Vallerand, R. J. (1990). Traduction et Validation Canadienne-Française de
 909 L'échelle de L'estime de Soi de Rosenberg. *International Journal of Psychology*, 25(2),
 910 305- 316. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00207599008247865>
- 911 Van Dam, N. T., Earleywine, M., & Danoff-Burg, S. (2009). Differential item function across
 912 meditators and non-meditators on the Five Facet Mindfulness Questionnaire. *Personality and*
 913 *Individual Differences*, 47(5), 516- 521. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2009.05.005>
- 914 van Strien, T., Frijters, J. E. R., Bergers, G. P. A., & Defares, P. B. (1986). The Dutch Eating
 915 Behavior Questionnaire (DEBQ) for assessment of restrained, emotional, and external eating
 916 behavior. *International Journal of Eating Disorders*, 5(2), 295- 315.
 917 [https://doi.org/10.1002/1098-108X\(198602\)5:2<295::AID-EAT2260050209>3.0.CO;2-T](https://doi.org/10.1002/1098-108X(198602)5:2<295::AID-EAT2260050209>3.0.CO;2-T)
- 918 Walach, H., Buchheld, N., Buttenmüller, V., Kleinknecht, N., & Schmidt, S. (2006). Measuring
 919 mindfulness—The Freiburg Mindfulness Inventory (FMI). *Personality and Individual*
 920 *Differences*, 40(8), 1543- 1555. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2005.11.025>
- 921 Winkens, L. H. H., van Strien, T., Barrada, J. R., Brouwer, I. A., Penninx, B. W. J. H., & Visser,
 922 M. (2018). The Mindful Eating Behavior Scale : Development and Psychometric Properties in
 923 a Sample of Dutch Adults Aged 55 Years and Older. *Journal of the Academy of Nutrition and*
 924 *Dietetics*, 118(7), 1277-1290.e4. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jand.2018.01.015>
- 925 Xia, Y., & Yang, Y. (2019). RMSEA, CFI, and TLI in structural equation modeling with
 926 ordered categorical data : The story they tell depends on the estimation methods. *Behavior*
 927 *Research Methods*, 51(1), 409- 428. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-018-1055-2>
- 928 Zou, Y., Li, P., Hofmann, S. G., & Liu, X. (2020). The Mediating Role of Non-reactivity to
 929 Mindfulness Training and Cognitive Flexibility : A Randomized Controlled Trial. *Frontiers in*
 930 *Psychology*, 11, 1053. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.01053>
- 931

Table 1

Sample characteristics and differences in Mind-Eat Scale total scores across categories of individuals (N=3102, NutriNet-Santé)

	N (%)	Mind-Eat Scale total score (mean ± SD)	P-value ¹
Sex			<0.001
Male	1436 (46.3)	3.82 ± 0.54	
Female	1666 (53.7)	3.67 ± 0.62	
Age			<0.001
18-39y	458 (14.8)	3.64 ± 0.03	
40-59y	993 (32.0)	3.67 ± 0.02	
≥ 60y	1651 (53.2)	3.82 ± 0.01	
Body mass index			<0.001
Underweight (< 18.5 kg/m ²)	108 (3.5)	3.91 ± 0.06	
Normal weight (≥ 18.5 and < 25 kg/m ²)	1454 (46.9)	3.86 ± 0.02	
Overweight (≥ 25 and <30 kg/m ²)	1070 (34.5)	3.67 ± 0.02	
Obese (≥ 30 kg/m ²)	470 (15.2)	3.52 ± 0.03	
Educational level			0.36
Primary	1138 (36.7)	3.77 ± 0.02	
Secondary	895 (28.9)	3.73 ± 0.02	
University	1050 (33.8)	3.72 ± 0.02	
Missing data	19 (0.6)	-	
Employment status			<0.001
Unemployed	250 (8.1)	3.69 ± 0.04	
Student	47 (1.5)	3.51 ± 0.08	
Self-employed, farmer	88 (2.8)	3.78 ± 0.06	
Employee, manual worker	548 (17.7)	3.63 ± 0.02	
Intermediate professions	226 (7.3)	3.64 ± 0.04	
Managerial staff, intellectual profession	447 (14.4)	3.72 ± 0.03	
Retired	1495 (48.2)	3.82 ± 0.02	
Missing data	1 (0.0)		
Children in the household			<0.001
Yes	2327 (75.0)	3.77 ± 0.57	
No	775 (25.0)	3.67 ± 0.63	
History of diet			<0.001
Past/current dieter	1339 (43.2)	3.60 ± 0.60	
Never dieter	1624 (52.4)	3.86 ± 0.55	
Missing data	139 (4.4)	-	
Physical activity level (IPAQ)			<0.001
Low	554 (17.9)	3.65 ± 0.02	
Moderate	1119 (36.1)	3.70 ± 0.02	
High	1426 (45.9)	3.81 ± 0.02	
Missing data	3 (0.1)	-	
Meditation practice (%)			<0.001
Current	471 (15.2)	3.91 ± 0.03	
Former	342 (11.0)	3.70 ± 0.03	
Never	2289 (73.8)	3.72 ± 0.01	

¹ P value based on Student's t-test or ANOVA, as appropriate.

Table 2
Factor structure of the 24-item Mind-Eat Scale using EFA¹ (N = 1302)

	Factor loadings ²					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
F1. Awareness						
14. When I eat, I take the time to appreciate the taste of food.	0.861					
1. When I eat, I take the time to savor the food.	0.830					
18. When I eat, I take the time to taste each food.	0.749					
23. I savor the food I'm eating, even if it's a food I eat often.	0.692					
F2. Non-reactivity						
20*. When I see a food I want, I can't help but eat it.		0.895				
2*. When I see foods I like, I find it hard not to eat them.		0.808				
5*. If I want a certain food, I can't help but eat it.		0.762				
8*. When I smell something tasty, I find it hard not to eat it.		0.734				
F3. Openness						
13. I try new foods without reluctance.			0.853			
21. I like to discover new foods.			0.847			
6. I try new foods, even if I have a preconceived negative opinion about them.			0.707			
9. I like to choose unfamiliar foods (meals at home or out).			0.691			
F4. Gratitude						
16. When I eat, I feel gratitude for the planet that has provided me with food.				0.837		
24. When I eat, I think of the people or elements that produced my food (farmers, rain, animals, etc.).				0.835		
11. When I eat, I feel gratitude to the people who made it possible for the food to reach my plate.				0.769		
3. I feel gratitude for the people who prepared the food I eat.				0.452		
F5. Non-judgement						
17*. I blame myself when I feel like I have eaten too much.					0.887	

	Factor loadings ²					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
4*. I blame myself if I have eaten more than my body needs.					0.880	
22*. I feel guilty when I eat foods that I consider bad for my health.					0.662	
10*. I criticize myself for the way I eat.					0.497	
F6. Hunger/Satiety						
7. I trust my body to know how much to eat.						0.908
12. I trust my body to know when to stop eating.						0.867
19. I trust my body to know what foods to eat.						0.578
15. I stop eating when I'm no longer hungry, even when it's a food I like.						0.518

¹ EFA = Exploratory Factor analysis

² Maximum Likelihood¹ extraction method with an 'oblimin' rotation.

* = inverted items

Table 3CFA¹ model fit statistics and reliability of the Mind-Eat Scale in two samples (N2=1,302, N3=498)

	First-order six-factor model (Sample 2, N=1302)	Second-order one-factor model (Sample 2, N=1302)	Second-order one-factor model (Sample 3, N=498)²
χ^2/df	3.13	4.29	2.43
CFI	0.97	0.95	0.94
TLI	0.96	0.94	0.94
SRMR	0.05	0.08	0.08
RMSEA	0.04	0.05	0.05
	90% CI [0.03; 0.04]	90% CI [0.04; 0.05]	90% CI [0.05; 0.06]

¹ CFA = Confirmatory Factor analysis² The CFA model is presented in Supplemental Table S1

χ^2/df = chi-square, CFI = comparative fit index, TLI = Tucker-Lewis Index, SRMR = standardized root mean square residual, RMSEA = root mean square error of approximation, 90% CI = 90% confidence interval.

Table 4CFA¹s in individuals practicing meditation (N=471) and overweight/obese individuals (N=1,540)

	Meditation practitioners (N=471)		Overweight/obese individuals (N=1540)	
	Six-factor model	One-factor model	Six-factor model	One-factor model
χ^2/df	2.20	2.45	3.63	4.53
CFI	0.95	0.94	0.95	0.93
TLI	0.95	0.93	0.94	0.92
SRMR	0.06	0.08	0.05	0.09
RMSEA	0.05	0.06	0.05	0.06
	90% CI [0.05; 0.06]	90% CI [0.05; 0.06]	90% CI [0.04; 0.05]	90% CI [0.05; 0.06]

¹ CFA = Confirmatory Factor analysis

χ^2/df = chi-square CFI = comparative fit index TLI = Tucker-Lewis Index SRMR = standardized root mean square residual RMSEA = root mean square error of approximation, 90% CI = 90% confidence interval.

Table 5

Correlation coefficients between the Mind-Eat Scale and nutritional quality, eating behavior, and psychological well-being scales

	N	r¹	P-value
Nutritional quality (PNNS-GS2)	2056	0.11	<0.001
Three-Factor Eating Questionnaire (TFEQ-R21)			
Cognitive restraint	2235	-0.20	<0.001
Emotional eating	2235	-0.38	<0.001
Uncontrolled eating	2235	-0.41	<0.001
Intuitive eating (IES-2)	2214	0.33	<0.001
Eating for physical rather than emotional reasons	2214	0.04	0.05
Reliance on hunger and satiety cues	2214	0.37	<0.001
Unconditional permission to eat	2214	-0.01	0.83
Mindfulness (FFMQ)	2355	0.38	<0.001
Observe	2355	0.32	<0.001
Description	2355	0.24	<0.001
Awareness	2355	0.21	<0.001
Non-judgement	2355	0.16	<0.001
Non-reactivity	2355	0.27	<0.001
Self-esteem (RSES)	2079	0.24	<0.001
Satisfaction with life (SWLS)	2084	0.22	<0.001
Optimism (LOT-R)	2075	0.17	<0.001
Resilience (BRS)	2179	0.25	<0.001
Gratitude (GQ-6)	2178	0.22	<0.001
Depressive symptomatology (CES-D)	2968	-0.29	<0.001
Anxiety (STAI-T)	2869	-0.32	<0.001

¹ r = Rho de Spearman

Table 6
Interdimensional correlation coefficients between the six dimensions of the Mind-Eat Scale

		Awareness	Non-reactivity	Openness	Gratitude	Non-judgement	Hunger/Satiety
Awareness	r^1	—					
	<i>P</i> -value	—					
Non-reactivity	r^1	0.17 ***	—				
	<i>P</i> -value	< 0.001	—				
Openness	r^1	0.39 ***	0.00	—			
	<i>P</i> -value	< 0.001	0.99	—			
Gratitude	r^1	0.47 ***	0.02	0.26 ***	—		
	<i>P</i> -value	< 0.001	0.48	< 0.001	—		
Non-judgement	r^1	0.09 ***	0.37 ***	-0.05	-0.08 **	—	
	<i>P</i> -value	< 0.001	< 0.001	0.051	0.005	—	
Hunger/Satiety	r^1	0.52 ***	0.25 ***	0.14 ***	0.32 ***	0.27 ***	—
	<i>P</i> -value	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	—

Note. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

¹ r = Rho de Spearman

Figure 1 Development and validation of the Mind-Eat Scale in four steps

