RESPONSES TO REVIEWER COMMENTS

Thank you for this feedback and suggestions for revision. Changes made and explanations are itemised below.

Green = changed as suggested in manuscript

Black = explanation and / or adjustment in manuscript, addressed by comments here

Reviewer 2

Point	Comments	Status
1	Introduction: This section contains broad coverage of the relevant literature, however some areas lack clarity and some claims are made without sufficient evidence to support them. The introduction describes characteristics from Buddhists texts and art that are expected to support mindfulness practice, however this is an assumption and empirical evidence to support these claims is not provided.	Empirical examples are at the end of the section to demonstrate the characteristics from Buddhist texts and arts. They are all built to accommodate the Buddhist practices including mindfulness practice. However, to clarify things a bit more, sentences are revised.
2	It would be preferable to use definitions of terms from the relevant scholarly literature rather than from dictionaries and encyclopaedias.	Definitions from scholarly literature has been added for 'Sacred space'.
3	In addition, some Buddhist terms are introduced without a definition or sufficient explanation (e.g. the five desires, P.4 line 185).	**Added**
4	P.1-2 lines 44-45: When discussing clinical guidelines I suggest being specific about what exactly is being recommended so as to avoid potentially misleading readers. E.g. consider changing "It has also been recommended as a treatment therapy by the…" to "It has also been incorporated into a treatment therapy (mindfulness-based cognitive therapy), recommended by the…".	**Modified**
5	P.3 lines 124-126: This sentence compares the "effort" of MBSR with that of Buddhist practice and states MBSR offers "the calmness that people can seek". However, no	**Modified**

	supporting references are provided and this is a false equivalence. Consider revising or providing supporting evidence.	
6	P.3 lines 127-128: The sentence introducing this paragraph refers to "Buddhist mindfulness" yet the quote from Birtwell et al. 2018 provides a definition of formal mindfulness practice that is not specifically Buddhist.	Although Birtwell et al.'s definition is not specifically Buddhist, this definition is still relevant and applicable for both Buddhist and secular mindfulness practices. Despite the differences in motivations (goals), they are still similar as an activity.
7	Further, in lines 132-133 the phrase "weaving mindfulness into existing routines" is a direct quote from the Birtwell et al. 2018 paper yet the phrase is not in quotation marks and the reference is not provided. In fact, the full description of informal mindfulness practice provided is closer to the Birtwell explanation than Shonin 2015, yet only Shonin 2015 is cited. Either revise the text or include the appropriate citation and quotation marks.	**Modified**
8	P.3 lines 137-139: "In general understanding, mindfulness is … allowing people … to experience the benefits themselves (Mental Health Foundation 2021). As not everyone benefits from mindfulness practice and there are known adverse effects, consider rephrasing to "… to experience mindfulness practice themselves".	**Modified**
9	P.3 lines 142-144: "growing media coverage" is not evidence of the effects of mindfulness practice. That is an inappropriate claim to make.	**Changed to show the growing evidence**
10	P.4 lines 172-176: to which Buddhist teachings are you referring?	**Added**
11	Methods: The research questions are not clearly stated. The end of the introduction poses different questions compared to the topic of investigation as described at the start of the methods section.	The overriding question is in the abstract and introduction e.g. If mindfulness can be learned and practiced via an online app, what is the role of physical place in general, and sacred space in the Buddhist context in particular? What and how can Buddhist sacred space support wellbeing in contemporary urban life and settings? The later questions are a reflexive

		expansion / response to the overriding qn being investigated
12	The methods are poorly described. There is no reference to how data about the Buddhist Centre was collected. There is no mention of informed consent from the interview participant, how they were recruited, whether the interview was in-person, via telephone or video call, how long the interview lasted, whether the interview was recorded and transcribed, or who conducted the interview. For the questionnaire, it is not clear how participants were recruited, how the questionnaire was developed (e.g. was it based on any existing questionnaires?), or whether questions were open, closed, or a mix. Please add a list of the questions included in the questionnaire to the appendix.	**Modified** The question lists are added in the appendix.
13	Some information in methods section 3.3 "participant observation" would be better placed in the results section. It is not clear whether attendees at the meditation sessions were informed about the observations or whether consent was sought. As this section states the 'observer' engaged in brief conversations with attendees, their observer role should be clarified in relation to the research methods literature, e.g. were they "participant as observer"?	Some information moved to RESULTS. The intention of the visit was informed to the Lama.
14	There is no section on reflexivity, how the background and position of the authors influenced the study design, data collection and analysis. Of most concern, there is no description of the methods of data analysis employed, or how the different types of data were brought together to draw conclusions. The description of the methods would benefit from the use of a checklist, such as the COREQ (COnsolidated criteria for REporting Qualitative research).	Reflexivity is indeed part of this approach, and text has been added to acknowledge awareness of this. The data analysis followed a process of identifying emergent themes within the 3 data sets (spatial analysis / observation, survey + interview.) guided by the research qn and the findings of the literature review (i.e. 3 characteristics of Buddhist scared space + 'debates' about relative importance of meditation location.

		Thank you – did not use this method for this one interview analysis but will consider as part of the wider study of which this one case forms one component.
15	Results: The results section begins with background information about the Centre but there is no explanation in the methods section about how or from where this background information was obtained, and the decision-making process for what sources of information to include or exclude.	Source of information was added to the METHODS section and explained the data collected for the centre.
16	The results section is far too brief and does not describe all of the results for the study. In 4.3 "questionnaire results" it should be made clear that "the top three qualities" (p.11, line 392) were from a predetermined list, and not spontaneously stated by participants.	**Modified and information added.**
17	"Table 8: theme of interview" does not describe any themes generated from interview data, it simply states a list of questions.	There are four themes: 1. Does it have an influence? 2. What are the influences? 3. How to influence? 4. To what extent?
18	These interview questions should appear in the methods section.	**Modified**
19	Discussion: The first line of the discussion section (P.12, lines 406-408) claims "Both literature and results from interview and questionnaire point towards the answer that, yes, the location where one is practicing does have an influence on the practitioner." This is not supported by the results section as there is a lack of data reported.	This claim is explained in the following sentences, and evidenced by the environment that people prefer, the location choice for KSDL, and the locations that Buddhist teachings suggested. These are all backing up the claim.
20	Data and figures are presented for the first time in the discussion section, yet they should be presented in the results section. This renders the discussion of the results very confusing. Claims are made in the discussion that are not backed up sufficiently by the data, but appear to be the opinion of the authors.	Data and figures moved to the RESULTS section. We have reviewed the discussion section and hope the preceding improvements, as well as reordering the final paragraph, has addressed this concern.

21	Spelling, language and grammar: Spelling and grammar could be improved throughout. For example: P.1 line 36: consider changing “or deteriorating the” to “or the deterioration of”.	**Done**
22	P.2 lines 86-87: The meaning of this sentence is unclear: “There are mindfulness rooted in other religions, for example, Hinduism, Judaism…” Should this be “There are examples of mindfulness…” or “There are practices equivalent to mindfulness…” or something else?	**Done**
23	P.3 line 128: typo - “of definitions” is stated twice.	**Done**
24	P.3 line 142: “chronical illnesses” should be “chronic illnesses”.	**Done**