

Table S3.1. Meta-regression models with the best model fit for explaining standard mean differences in yoga interventions.

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
	β (SE)				
Intercept	-0.62 (0.21)**	-0.99 (0.32)**	-0.21 (0.199)	-0.42 (0.17)*	-0.30 (0.16)
Breathing technique^a	0.34 (0.23)	0.53 (0.26)	-	-	-
Group setting^a	-	0.35 (0.24)	-	0.11 (0.23)	-
Mental practice^a	-	-	-0.19 (0.23)	-	-
Physical effort^a	-	-	-	-	-0.10 (0.22)
Total intervention Time^b	-0.03 (0.09)	-0.11 (0.11)	-0.03 (0.10)	-0.04 (0.11)	0.00 (0.11)
AICc	39.43	39.91	41.11	41.66	41.71
Weight	0.15	0.12	0.06	0.05	0.05

a 1=yes; 0=no.

b Variable was z-standardized and fixed in all models.

Note: β: regression coefficient; SE: standard error; AICc: Akaike's information criterion corrected; * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$.

Five best models based on their AICc are shown (apart from intercept-only model); negative regression coefficients indicate a higher intervention effect on cancer-related fatigue.

Variety between sessions was not identified as relevant variable in the top-5 models.

Table S3.2. Meta-regression models with the best model fit for explaining standard mean differences in psychosocial interventions.

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
	β (SE)				
Intercept	-0.09 (0.21)	-0.17 (0.20)	-0.12 (0.20)	-0.00 (0.24)	-0.01 (0.28)
Group setting^a	-0.66 (0.20)**	-0.59 (0.20)**	-0.63 (0.22)**	-0.67 (0.20)**	-0.66 (0.20)**
Relaxation^a	0.73 (0.16)***	0.79 (0.16)***	0.56 (0.16)**	0.71 (0.17)***	0.72 (0.16)***
Work on cognitions^a	-0.72 (0.17)***	-0.85 (0.18)***	-0.74 (0.19)***	-0.78 (0.19)***	-0.74 (0.18)***
CRF education^a	0.37 (0.15)*	0.40 (0.15)*	-	0.43 (0.17)*	0.39 (0.16)*
Social resources	-	0.22 (0.14)	-	-	-
Focus on fatigue^a	-	-	-	-0.12 (0.17)	-
Work on behavior^a	-	-	-	-	-0.10 (0.21)
Total Intervention Time^b	0.23 (0.10)*	0.19 (0.10)	0.19 (0.11)	0.22 (0.10)*	0.24 (0.10)*
AICc	33.15	33.98	35.99	36.25	36.55
Weight	0.18	0.13	0.06	0.05	0.04

a 1=yes; 0=no.

b Variable was z-standardized and fixed in all models.

Note: β: regression coefficient; SE: standard error; AICc: Akaike's information criterion corrected; CRF=cancer-related fatigue;

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$.

Five best models based on their AICc are shown; negative regression coefficients indicate a higher intervention effect on cancer-related fatigue. Work on emotions was not identified as relevant variable in the top-5 models.

Table S3.3. Meta-regression models with the best model fit for explaining standard mean differences in mindfulness-based interventions.

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
	β (SE)	β (SE)	β (SE)	β (SE)
Intercept	-0.60 (0.16)**	-0.30 (0.63)	-0.53 (0.27)	-0.64 (0.17)
CRF education^a	-0.39 (0.48)	-	-	-
Group setting^a	-	-0.36 (0.67)	-	-
Yoga exercises^a	-	-	-0.14 (0.34)	-
Work on cognitions^a	-	-	-	0.05 (0.35)
Total intervention time^{b, c}	0.06 (0.15)	0.10 (0.22)	0.04 (0.16)	0.01 (0.15)
CRF as inclusion criterion^{a, c}	-0.33 (0.45)	-0.65 (0.41)	-0.61 (0.39)	-0.56 (0.38)
AICc	36.34	36.91	37.06	37.30
Weight	0.10	0.08	0.07	0.06

a 1=yes; 0=no.

b Variable was z-standardized.

c Variable was fixed in all models.

Note: β: regression coefficient; SE: standard error; AICc: Akaike's information criterion corrected;

CRF=cancer-related fatigue; ** $p < .01$.

All four models within six units of the AICc of the best model are shown (apart from intercept-only model; negative regression coefficients indicate a higher intervention effect on cancer-related fatigue).