Supplementary Table S1. Details of the research study's neurobehavioural assessment

Domains	Modalities	Measures	Description						
Executive	competences								
	Parent questionnaire								
	Behaviour Rating Inventory of Executive Function, parent version (BRIEF) [1]								
	The BRIEF parent questionnaire provides an index of attention and executive abilities in everyday life. The BRIEF comprises 86								
	items over two index containing subscales: (i) Behavioural Regulation Index (BRI) comprising 3 subscores including, Inhibit,								
	Shift, Emotional Control; (ii) Metacognition index (MCI) comprising 5 subscores including, Initiate, Working Memory,								
	Plan/Organise, Organisation of Materials, Monitor; as well as a global score called the Global Executive Composite (GEC).								
	Neuropsycho	logical tests							
		Letter-Numb	ber Sequencing (WISC-IV) [2]						
			The letter-number sequencing is a working memory task. Sequences of number and letters are read to the participant, and he/she						
			is then asked to re-sequence the numbers in numerical order from lowest to nignest and then to sequence the letters in alphabetical						
		Tompo Test	Oldel. Dekenen [2]						
		Tempo Test	The Tempo Test Rekenen is an arithmetic test consisting of 200 arithmetic number fact problems presented in five rows (one row						
			with addition one row with subtraction one row with division one row with multiplication and one mixed problem row). Within						
			each row the problems increase in difficulty. Participant are asked to solve as many items as possible within 1 min per row						
	Neurocognitive computerised tasks								
	Flanker Visual Filtering Task [4]								
	The Flanker Visual Filtering Task was used to assess attentional control and information processing speed. Each trial showed a								
			horizontal row of five fish. The participant was asked to respond as quickly as possible to whether the central fish was facing to						
			the left or right. Congruent trials were the ones with all five fish in the horizontal row pointing in the same direction and incongruent						
			trials were the ones with the four distracting fishes pointing in the opposite direction of the central target fish.						
		Reality Filte	ring Task [5]						
			The Reality Filtering task child-adapted version was used to assess recognition memory and orbitofrontal reality filtering. It						
			consisted of a continuous recognition task composed of two runs with the same picture set but arranged in different order. The first						
			run measures storage and recognition capacity (item memory), the second run measures reality filtering.						
Behaviour	and socio-emo	tional compe	tences						
	Parent questi	onnaire							
		Strength and	Difficulties Questionnaire, parent version (SDQ) [6]						
			The SDQ parent questionnaire assess overall behaviour problems, emotional symptoms, hyperactivity and inattention, peer						
			relationship problems, and prosocial behaviour. It rates participant's behaviour over the previous 6 months. The SDQ is scored on						
			a Likert scale and includes 25 items, providing five subscales: Emotional Symptoms, Conduct Symptoms, Hyperactivity-						
	0.10 1	,. ·	Inattention, Peer Problems, Prosocial Behaviour. A Total Difficulties score is also derived from the subscales.						
	Self-reported	questionnaire	S						

KIDSCREEN	77 [7]
T	The KIDSCREEN-27 is a self-reported questionnaire providing an index of health-related quality of life in children and
а	adolescents. This instrument scored on a Likert scale and includes 27 items, providing five subscales: physical well-being (5 items),
p	psychological well-being (7 items), autonomy and parent relation (7 items), social supports and peers (4 items), and school
e	environment (4 items).
Social Goal Sc	cale (SGS)[8]
]	The SGS is a self-reported questionnaire providing an index of social responsiveness and of goals setting which ultimately gets
У	you involve with some social work. This instrument scored on a Likert scale and includes 11 items providing one score.
Self-Compassi	ion Scale – Short form (SCS) [9]
]	The SCS is a self-reported questionnaire comprising 12 items, which produces a total global score that can also be classified into
t	wo subscores: negative behaviours toward the self (6 items) or positive behaviours towards the self (6 items).
Neuropsychological tests	
Affect Recogn	ition (NEPSY-II) [10]
]	The affect recognition subtest assesses the ability to recognise facial emotional expressions (happy, sad, anger, fear, disgust, and
r	neutral) from photographs of children's faces in several matching tasks. In the first task, the participant selected one of the four
t	taces that depicted the same emotion as a child's face at the top of the page. In a second task, the participant selected two
p	photographs of faces that displayed the same affect from a selection of four photographs. Finally, the participant examined a
p	photograph of a child's face for 5 seconds, and then from memory, selected two photographs that matched the same emotion as the
Theory of Min	
	u (NEFS 1-11) [10] The theory of mind subtest measures understanding of mental functions and other people's perspectives
I I	In the first task, questions are asked to the participant about different verbal scenarios measuring understanding of beliefs.
	in the first task, questions are asked to the participant about unrefer verbal scenarios measuring understanding of benefs, intentions, others' thoughts, ideas and comprehension of figurative language. In the second task, participants have to match facial
e	emotional expressions, from photographs of children's faces, to a scenario.
Neurocognitive computerised	tasks
Emotion Regu	lation task [11]
	The Emotion Regulation task was used to assessed emotional regulation capacities. Participants were asked to watch positive,
n	negative and neutral film clips, after which they were asked to calm down and concentrate on their breath. They had to rate the
f	film clips from 1 (positive) to 5 (negative) on a Likert scale. Film clips videotaped by amateurs were taken from Samson and
с	colleagues (2016).[11] During this task, physiological responses (heart rate, skin conductance and respiration) were acquired in
t	he MRI scanner as well as in the simulated "mock" MRI.
Recognition of	f Emotion in Contextual Scene Task [12]
1	The Recognition of Emotion in Contextual Scene task was used to assessed facial emotional expression recognition based on
C	contextual and facial cues. Participants were first presented with a visual scene from one of the two condition: (a) scene that
1	ncluded a character interacting with a peer or with meaningful objects, called context condition; and (b) scene that included a
С	character but in the absence of any peers or meaningful objects, called no-context condition. Three emotional facial expressions
a	among anger, disgust, nappiness, fear, and sadness were then presented to the participant who had to choose the emotion felt by
t	ne character in the scene.

Supplementary Table S2. Neonatal characteristics of: (a) all young adolescents enrolled the study (RCT and PPI together), n=63); (b) young adolescents enrolled in the RCT only (n=56), as well IG and WG comparisons; (c) young adolescents enrolled in the PPI only (n=7).

	All young RCT, n=56			PPI, n=7	
	adolescents enrolled (RCT and PPI), n=63	Intervention group (IG) n=29	Waiting group (WG) n=27	Group comparison (IG vs WG)	
Birth weight, mean (SD) [range] in grams	1249.21 (371.94) [510:1980]	1284.83 (351.41) [650:1810]	1210 (400.85)	t(54)=0.744, p=0.460, q=	1252.86 (379.24)
Gestational age, mean (SD) [range] in weeks	29.20 (1.89) [24.71;31.86]	29.29 (1.92) [24.71; 31.86]	29.12 (1.93) [26;31.71]	t(54)=0.317 p=0.753, q= 0.795	29.04 (2.01) [25.71;30.86]
Head circumference, mean (SD) [range] in cm	26.16 (2.64) [21;31]	26.55 (2.57) [21;31]	25.65 (2.82) [21;31]	t(53)=1.234, p=0.223, q= 0.595	26.46 (2.21) [22;29]
Length of hospitalisation, mean (SD) [range] in days	61.87 (29.68) [17;151]	59.56 (26.79) [23;131]	63 (33.69) [17;151]	t(52)=-0.416,p=0.679, q= 0.776	66.43 (26.96) [36;123]
Multiple births, n (%)	24 (38.1%)	13 (44.8%)	7 (25.9%)	χ ² (2)=2.202, p=0.333, q= 0.656	4 (57.1%)
cPVL, n(%)	1 (1.6%)	1 (3.4%)	0	χ ² (1)=0.903, p=0.342, q= 0.656	0
IVH - Grades III and IV, n (%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	-	0
BPD, n (%)	12 (19%)	5 (17.2%)	6 (22.2%)	$\chi^2(1)=0.534$, p=0.465, q=0.656	1 (14.3%)

Note: Abbreviations: Cystic Periventricular Leukomalacia = cPVL, Intraventricular haemorrhage = IVH, Bronchopulmonary dysplasia = BPD; Independent-sample t-test, Chisquare as appropriate were used to compare the randomised groups. All p-values that survived false discovery rate (FDR) correction (q < 0.05) are indicated in bold. **Supplementary Table S3.** Demographic characteristics at baseline of: (a) all young adolescents enrolled in the study (RCT and PPI together), n=63); (b) young adolescents enrolled in the RCT only (n=56), as well IG and WG comparisons; (c) young adolescents enrolled in the PPI only (n=7).

		All young adolescents		PPI, n=7		
		enrolled (RCT and PPI), n=63	Intervention group (IG), n=29*	Waiting group (WG), n=27*	Group comparison (IG vs WG)	
Gender	Female, n	35 (55.6%)	14 (48.3%)	16 (59.3%)	$\chi^2(1)=0.678$, p=0.410, q= 0.656	5 (71.4%)
	Male, n	28 (44.4%)	15 (51.7%)	11 (40.7%)		2 (28.6%)
Age at baseline, mean (SD) [range] in years	12.24 (1.32) [10.08;14.85]	12.05 (1.23) [10.08;14.24]	12.26 (1.37) [10.38;14.85]	t(50)=-0.585, p=0.561, q= 0.692	13 (1.49) [11.59;14,84]
Index of general ability [range]	r (GAI), mean (SD)	107.97 (11.15) [83;132]	106.67 (11.47) [83;132]	108.76 (11.23) [87;130]	t(50)=-0.664, p=.0.510, q=0.680	110.5 (10.31) [101;127]
Socio-economic status ([range]	(SES), mean (SD)	4.16 (2.43) [2;12]	4.78 (2.62) [2;12]	3.76 (2.35) [2;12]	t(50)=1.470, p=0.148, q= 0.459	3 (0.894) [2;4]
Mother's nationality	Swiss, n (%) French, n (%) Other, n (%) Unknown, n (%)	30 (47.6%) 15 (23.8%) 13 (22.4%) 5 (7.9%)	17 (58.6%) 6 (20.7%) 4 (13.8%) 2 (6.9%)	12 (44.4%) 6 (22.2%) 7 (25.9%) 2 (7.4%)	χ ² (2)=1.606, p=0.448, q= 0.656	1 (14.3%) 3 (42.9%) 2 (28.6%) 1 (14.3%)
Father's nationality	Swiss, n (%) French, n (%) Other, n (%) Unknown, n (%)	29 (46%) 16 (25.4%) 12 (19%) 5 (7.9%)	14 (48.3%) 7 (24.1%) 5 (17.2%) 3 (10.3%)	12 (44.4%) 6 (22.2%) 7 (25.9%) 2 (7.4%)	χ ² (2)=0.545, p=0.762, q= 0.795	3 (42.9%) 3 (42.9%) 0 1 (14.3%)
Mother's native language	French, n (%) Other, n (%) Unknown, n (%)	38 (60.3%) 18 (28.6%) 7 (11.1%)	18 (62.1%) 9 (31%) 2 (6.9%)	17 (63%) 6 (22.2%) 4 (14.8%)	χ ² (1)=0.311, p=0.577, q= 0.692	3 (42.9%) 3 (42.9%) 1 (14.3%)
Father's native language	French, n (%) Other, n (%) Unknown, n (%)	40 (63.5%) 15 (23.8%) 8 (12.7%)	19 (65.5%) 6 (20.7%) 4 (13.8%)	15 (55.6%) 9 (33.3%) 3 (11.1%)	χ ² (1)=1.051, p=0.305, q= 0.656	6 (85.7%) 0 1 (14.3%)

Note: *there was missing data for the following measures: (i) age at baseline, IG n=27, WG n=25, PPI n=6; (ii) Index of general ability, IG n=27, WG n=25, PPI n=6; (iii) SES, IG n=27, WG n=25, PPI n=6. Independent-sample t-test or Chi-Square were used to compare the intervention and the waiting randomised groups. All p-values that survived false discovery rate (FDR) correction (q < 0.05) are indicated in bold.

Supplementary Table S4. Parents' questionnaire on their young adolescent schooling, friendship, medical history and global health

		All young adolescents	RCT, n=56		PPI, n=4
		enrolled (RCT and PPI), n=63	Intervention group (IG), n=29	Waiting group (WG), n=27	
Repeated a school year	yes unknown	6 (9.5%) 7 (11 1%)	3 (10.3%) 2 (6 9%)	2 (7.4%) 4 (14 8%)	1 (14.3%) 1 (14.3%)
Skipped a grade	yes unknown	2 (3.2%) 7 (11.1%)	1 (3.4%) 2 (6.9%)	0 (0.0%) 4 (14.8%)	1 (14.3%) 1 (14.3%) 1 (14.3%)
Friends' number	2 or less more than 2 unknown	9 (14.3%) 45 (71.4%) 9 (14.3%)	5 (17.2%) 21 (72.4%) 3 (10.3%)	4 (14.8%) 19 (70.4%) 4 (14.8%)	0 (0.0%) 5 (71.4%) 2 (28.6%)
Motor disabilities	yes unknown	2 (3.2%) 7 (11.1%)	1 (3.4%) 2 (6.9%)	1 (3.7%) 4 (14.8%)	0 1 (14.3%)
Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder	yes unknown	7 (11.1%) 7 (11.1%)	4 (13.8%) 2 (6.9%)	2 (7.4%) 4 (14.8%)	1 (14.3%) 1 (14.3%)
School difficulties	yes unknown	21 (33.3%) 9 (14.3%)	9 (31%) 2 (6.9%)	10 (37%) 5 (18.5%)	2 (28.6%) 2 (28.6%)
School support	yes unknown	17 (27%) 8 (12.7%)	7 (24.1%) 2 (6.9%)	10 (37%) 4 (14.8%)	0 2 (28.6%)
Neurodevelopmental diagnosis (options include dyslexia, dysorthographia, dyscalculia, dysgraphia, dyspraxia, high intellectual capacities, autism spectrum disorder)	reported unknown	11 (17.5%) 8 (12.7%)	6 (20.7%; dyslexia n=2, dyspraxia, n=1, high intellectual capacities n=1, unknown n=2)	3 (11.1%; dyslexia n=2, high intellectual capacities n=1) 4 (14.8%)	2 (28.6%; dyslexia n=1, unknown n=1) 2 (28.6%)
Intermentions	anaach thavany	10 (20 29/)	2(6.9%)	10 (270/)	2 (28.6%)
	speech therapy speech therapy ongoing physiotherapy	19 (30.2%) 5 (7.9%) 10 (15.9%)	7(24.1%) 0 (0.0%) 3 (10.3%)	3 (11.1%) 6 (22.2%)	2 (28.6%) 2 (28.6%) 1 (14.3%)
	physiotherapy ongoing psychomotor therapy psychomotor therapy	1 (1.6%) 8 (12.7%) 2 (3.2%)	0 (0.0%) 3 (10.3%)	1 (3.7%) 3 (11.1%)	0 2 (28.6%)
	ongoing occupational therapy	7 (11.1%)	0 (0.0%) 2 (6.9%)	0 (0.0%) 4 (14.8%)	2 (28.6%) 1 (14.3%)

	occupational therapy ongoing	3 (4.8%)	2 (6.9%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (14.3%)
	psychotherapy	13 (20.6%)	8 (27.6%)	4 (14.8%)	1 (14.3%)
	psychotherapy ongoing	5 (7.9%)	3 (10.3%)	1 (3.7%)	1 (14.3%)
	unknown	8 (12.7%)	2 (6.9%)	4 (14.8%)	2 (28.6%)
Ongoing medication	psychostimulant treatment	3 (4.8%)	2 (6.9%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (14.3%)
	growth hormones	1 (1.6%)	0	1 (4.5%)	0
	unknown	7 (11.1%)	2 (6.9%)	4 (14.8%)	1 (14.3%)
Health	participant not in good	3 (4.8%)	1 (3.4%)	2 (7.4%)	0
	health	25 (39.7%)	12 (41.4%)	10 (37%)	3 (42.9%)
	participant wears glasses	1 (1.6%)	0(0.0%)	1(2,70/)	0(0.0%)
	hearing aid	8 (12.7%)	2(6.0%)	1(3.770) 1(14.8%)	0(0.076) 2(28.6%)
	unknown		2 (0.978)	4 (14.870)	2 (28.070)
Participant already took part in Mindfulness program		0	0	0	0

Note: If psychostimulant treatment was an ongoing medication, the treatment was taken by the participant consistently throughout the study and during the assessments.

Supplementary Table S5. Self-reported questionnaire on schooling, friendship, activities and family organisation

		All young adolescents	RCT, n=56		PPI, n=7
		enrolled (RCT and PPI), n=63	Intervention group (IG), n=29	Waiting group (WG), n=27	
School degree (Swiss system)	6 th grade	2 (3.2%)	0 (0%)	1 (3.7%)	1 (14.3%)
	7 th grade	12 (19%)	6 (20.7%)	6 (22.2%)	0 (0%)
	8 th grade	19 (30.2%)	11 (37.9%)	7 (25.9%)	1 (14.3%)
	9 th grade	13 (20.6%)	4 (13.8%)	6 (22.2 %)	3 (42.9%)
	10 th grade	4 (6.3%)	3 (10.3%)	1 (3.7%)	0 (0%)
	11 th grade	6 (9.5%)	2 (6.9%)	3 (11.1%)	1 (14.3%)
	unknown	7 (11.1%)	3 (10.3%)	3 (11.1%)	1 (14.3%)
Feel competent in maths?	yes	42 (66.7%)	21 (72.4%)	17 (63%)	4 (57.1%)
	no	14 (22.2%)	5 (17.2%)	7 (25.9%)	2 (28.6%)
	unknown	7 (11.1%	3 (10.3%)	3 (11.1%)	1 (14.3%)
Feel competent in French literacy?	yes	42 (66.7%)	19 (65.5%)	19 (70.4%)	4 (57.1%)
	no	14 (22.2%)	7 (24.1)	5 (18.5%)	2 (28.6%)
	unknown	7 (11.1%)	3 (10.3%)	3 (11.1%)	1 (14.3%)
Feel competent in sport?	yes	45 (71.4%)	19 (65.5%)	20 (74.1%)	6 (85.7%)
	no	11 (17.5%)	7 (24.1%)	4 (14.8%)	0 (0%)
	unknown	7 (11.1%)	3 (10.3%)	3 (11.1%)	1 (14.3%)
Do you have a best friend?	yes	49 (77.8%)	23 (79.3%)	20 (74.1%)	6 (85.7%)
	no	6 (9.5%)	3 (10.3%)	3 (11.1%)	0 (0%)
	unknown	8 (12.7%)	3 (10.3%)	4 (14.8%)	1 (14.3%)
Activities outside school	sport	37 (58.7%)	18 (62.1%)	15 (55.6%)	4 (57.1%)
	art & music	28 (44.4%)	12 (48.3%)	10 (37%)	6 (85.7%)
	other	10(15.9%)	3(10.3%)	7 (25.9%)	0(0%)
		/(11.1%)	3(10.5%)	<u>3 (11.1%)</u> 10 (70.40()	1(14.5%)
Participant living with:	2 biological parents	43(/1.4%) 10(15.0%)	20(69%) 5(17.20/)	19 (70.4%)	6(85.7%)
	1 biological parent	10(13.9%) 1(1.6%)	3(1/.2%) 1(2.4%)	5(18.5%)	0(0%)
	unknown	7(111%)	3(10.3%)	3(11.1%)	1(14.3%)
Number of siblings	single child	3 (4 8%)	1(3.4%)	1 (3 7%)	1 (14.3%)
itemper of storings	1 sibling	28 (44 4%)	13 (44 8%)	14 (51 9%)	1(14.3%)
	2 siblings	20 (31.7%)	9 (31%)	6 (22.2%)	5 (71.4%)

	3 siblings	4 (6.3%)	1 (3.4%)	3 (11.1%)	0 (0%)
	4 siblings	1 (1.6%)	1 (3.4%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	Unknown	7 (11.1%)	4 (13.8%)	3 (11.1%)	0 (0%)
Language spoken at home	French	49 (77.8%)	24 (82.8%)	19 (70.4%)	6 (85.7%)
	other	7 (11.1%)	2 (6.9%)	5 (18.5%)	0 (0%)
	unknown	7 (11.1%)	3 (10.3%)	3 (11.1%)	1 (14.3%)
Preferred spoken language	French	47 (74.6%)	24 (82.8%)	17 (63%)	6 (85.7%)
	other	9 (14.3%)	2 (6.9%)	7 (25.9%)	0 (0%)
	unknown	7 (11.1%)	3 (10.3%)	3 (11.1%)	1 (14.3%)

REFERENCES OF SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS

- 1. Gioia G, Isquith P, Guy S, Kenworthy L: **BRIEF Behavior Rating Inventory of Executive Function. Professional manual**. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources Inc; 2000.
- 2. Wechsler D: Manual for the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children-IV. New York: Psychological Corporation; 2003.
- 3. De Vos T: **TTR: Tempotest rekenen**. Lisse, The Netherlands Swets & Zeitlinger; 1992.
- 4. Christ SE, Kester LE, Bodner KE, Miles JH: Evidence for selective inhibitory impairment in individuals with autism spectrum disorder. *Neuropsychology* 2011, **25**(6):690-701.
- 5. Liverani MC, Manuel AL, Nahum L, Guardabassi V, Tomasetto C, Schnider A: Children's sense of reality: The development of orbitofrontal reality filtering. *Child neuropsychology : a journal on normal and abnormal development in childhood and adolescence* 2017, 23(4):408-421.
- 6. Goodman R: **Psychometric properties of the strengths and difficulties questionnaire**. *J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry* 2001, **40**(11):1337-1345.
- 7. Robitail S, Ravens-Sieberer U, Simeoni MC, Rajmil L, Bruil J, Power M, Duer W, Cloetta B, Czemy L, Mazur J *et al*: Testing the structural and cross-cultural validity of the KIDSCREEN-27 quality of life questionnaire. *Qual Life Res* 2007, 16(8):1335-1345.
- 8. Wentzel KR: Relations of social goal pursuit to social acceptance, classroom behavior, and perceived social support. *Journal of Educational Psychology* 1994, **86**(2):173-182.
- 9. Raes F, Pommier E, Neff KD, Van Gucht D: Construction and factorial validation of a short form of the Self-Compassion Scale. *Clin Psychol Psychother* 2011, **18**(3):250-255.
- 10. Korkman M, Kirk U, Kemp S: NEPSY-II: A developmental neuropsychological assessment, second edition. San Antonio, TX; 2007.

- 11. Samson AC, Kreibig SD, Soderstrom B, Wade AA, Gross JJ: Eliciting positive, negative and mixed emotional states: A film library for affective scientists. *Cognition & emotion* 2016, **30**(5):827-856.
- 12. Theurel A, Witt A, Malsert J, Lejeune F, Fiorentini C, Barisnikov K, Gentaz E: The integration of visual context information in facial emotion recognition in 5- to 15-year-olds. *Journal of experimental child psychology* 2016, 150:252-271.