

1 **Animals in higher education settings: Do animal-assisted**
2 **interventions improve mental and cognitive health**
3 **outcomes of students? A systematic review and meta-**
4 **analysis**

5

6 Annalena Huber^{1,2*}, Stefanie J. Klug¹, Annette Abraham^{2,3}, Erica Westenberg², Veronika
7 Schmidt^{2,3}, Andrea S. Winkler^{2,3}

8

9 ¹Department of Sport and Health Sciences, Technical University of Munich, Munich,
10 Germany

11

12 ²Department of Neurology, Center for Global Health, Klinikum Rechts der Isar, Technical
13 University of Munich, Munich, Germany

14

15 ³Centre for Global Health, Institute of Health and Society, University of Oslo, Oslo, Norway

16

17 *Corresponding author

18 E-mail: a95.huber@tum.de (AH)

19

20

21

22

23

24 Abstract

25 **Background:** Due to the high burden of mental health issues among students at
26 higher education institutions world-wide, animal-assisted interventions (AAIs) are being
27 increasingly used to relieve student stress. The objective of this study was to systematically
28 review of the effects of AAIs on the mental and cognitive health outcomes of higher
29 education students.

30 **Methods:** Randomized controlled trials using any unfamiliar animal as the sole
31 intervention tool were included in the systematic review. Study quality was assessed using
32 the Cochrane Risk-of-Bias tool. Where possible, effect sizes (Hedges' g) were pooled for
33 individual outcomes using random-effects meta-analyses. Albatross plots were used to
34 supplement the data synthesis.

35 **Results:** Of 2.401 identified studies, 35 were included. Almost all studies used dogs
36 as the intervention animal. The quality of most included studies was rated as moderate.
37 Studies showed an overall reduction of acute anxiety ($g = -0.57$ (95%CI $-1.45; 0.31$)) and
38 stress. For other mental outcomes, studies showed an overall small reduction of negative
39 affect ($g = -0.47$ (95%CI $-1.46; 0.52$)), chronic stress ($g = -0.23$ (95%CI $-0.57; 0.11$)) and
40 depression, as well as small increases in arousal, happiness and positive affect ($g = 0.06$
41 (95%CI $-0.78; 0.90$)). Studies showed no effect on heart rate and heart rate variability, a small
42 reduction in salivary cortisol and mixed effects on blood pressure. No effect on cognitive
43 outcomes was found.

44 **Conclusion:** Overall, evidence suggests that AAIs are effective at improving mental,
45 but not physiological or cognitive outcomes of students. Strong methodological heterogeneity
46 between studies limited the ability to draw clear conclusions.

47

48

49 **Introduction**

50 As highlighted by ongoing events such as climate change and the COVID-19
51 pandemic, which is strongly suspected to have zoonotic origins [1], it is essential to
52 acknowledge the interconnectedness of humans, animals and the environment. This thought
53 is at the core of the One Health concept, which aims to highlight the “synergistic benefit of
54 closer cooperation between human, animal and environmental health sciences” [2]. One
55 example of a benefit derived from the connection between humans and animals is animal-
56 assisted interventions (AAIs). The term “AAI” has become an umbrella term in the human-
57 animal interaction (HAI) field, referring to all interventions that incorporate some element of
58 HAI to achieve the desired outcome [3,4]. Based on the definition presented by López-
59 Cepero, in this review AAIs are defined as any intervention that incorporates an element of
60 HAI with an unfamiliar animal, with the aim of improving a human health outcome [4].
61 Unfamiliar animals are defined as animals that are not owned by or living with participants.
62 Most commonly AAIs use dogs as the intervention animal, but other animals such as cats,
63 horses, birds or fish are also sometimes used [5,6].

64

65 Past research has predominantly focused on the benefits of AAIs for clinical
66 populations, and has found generally beneficial effects [7,8]. Among autism and dementia
67 patients, AAIs have been found to improve social interaction as well as reduce problematic
68 behaviors such as aggression or agitation [9–12]. AAIs are especially beneficial for patients
69 with mental disorders. Several systematic reviews have shown reductions of clinical
70 symptoms of disorders such as anxiety, depression and schizophrenia after an AAI [6,13].
71 Simultaneously, AAIs have improved engagement and social interaction among patients with
72 mental disorders [14]. In addition, AAIs have been shown to reduce stress and improve well-

73 being among non-clinical populations, including the elderly, children and higher education
74 students [6,15,16].

75 There is a particularly strong need for stress-reducing interventions among students at
76 higher education institutions. A higher education institution is “any postsecondary institution
77 of learning that usually affords, at the end of a course of study, a named degree, diploma, or
78 certificate of higher studies” [17]. Due to a multitude of factors including navigating a new
79 environment, a high academic workload and financial pressures, the prevalence of stress as
80 well as symptoms of depression and anxiety disorders are worryingly high among higher
81 education students worldwide (27). According to the Anxiety and Depression Association of
82 America, for example, 85% of students feel overwhelmed by academic expectations and
83 demands, 40% of students state that anxiety is a top concern, and 30% of students state that
84 stress negatively affects their academic performance [19,20]. Similar results have been
85 replicated among higher education students around the world [18,21,22]. The burden of
86 mental health problems among students has been continuously increasing over the past years,
87 and has been further exacerbated by decreased social contact and increased worries about
88 health and finances during the COVID-19 pandemic [22,23].

89

90 In light of these findings, AAIs are becoming increasingly common at higher
91 education institutions to improve and promote student mental health [24]. Such programs
92 most commonly take the form of drop-in events where groups of students can freely interact
93 with dogs and their handlers [25]. AAIs in higher education settings are low-cost and easily
94 scalable, allowing them to reach a large proportion of the student body [24,26–28]. In
95 addition, AAIs are not stigmatized like other traditional mental health services due to the
96 overwhelmingly positive perception of AAIs among higher education students [24]. This
97 makes AAIs an ideal universal intervention for mental health promotion efforts at higher

98 education institutions [29,30]. To confidently implement AAIs in higher education settings, a
99 comprehensive overview of the current state of research and good evidence on the effects of
100 AAIs on the mental and cognitive outcomes of students is needed.

101 The objective of this systematic review was therefore to estimate the effects of AAIs
102 implemented in higher education settings on (1) the mental health outcomes and (2) the
103 cognitive outcomes of students. This review also aims to contribute evidence to the “shared
104 medicines and interventions” subgroup of *The Lancet One Health Commission*.

105

106

107

108

109

110

111

112

113

114

115

116

117

118

119 **Methods**

120 **Protocol and registration**

121 A systematic review protocol was developed in keeping with the PRISMA-P 2015
122 statement [31]. This protocol was registered on PROSPERO on August 12th 2020 with the
123 registration number CRD42020196283 [32].

124

125 **Sources, search methods and eligibility criteria**

126 The literature search was conducted from June 10th to June 20th 2020, and was
127 designed to identify all published and unpublished experimental and observational trials on
128 AAIs conducted in higher education settings. Medline/PubMed, PsycInfo, CINAHL, Web of
129 Science, Embase, ERIC, and Scopus were searched. In addition, WALTHAM Science,
130 HABRI Central and Animal and Society Institute as well as the database OpenGrey were
131 searched. Reference lists from relevant systematic reviews and included studies were hand-
132 searched for potentially relevant publications. Due to the large number of retrieved results,
133 only randomized controlled trials (RCTs) that were published in a peer-reviewed journal
134 were included in this review. Studies were included if they assessed the effect of an
135 intervention using a living animal that was unfamiliar to participants as the sole intervention
136 tool, for any mental health or cognitive outcome of higher education students. Mental health
137 outcomes were considered those that describe a person's emotional or psychological state
138 [33], for example through self-perceived assessments of stress, anxiety or depression. We
139 also included physiological outcome measures that reliably correlate with acute stress, such
140 as blood pressure (BP), heart rate (HR) or cortisol levels [34]. By contrast, we considered
141 cognitive outcomes those that describe a person's cognitive functioning [35], for example

142 through assessments of intelligence, concentration or attention. Specifically in the higher
143 education context, we also considered cognitive outcomes to include academic outcomes
144 such as test performance. Details on the eligibility criteria can be found in S1 Table, while
145 details on the search strategy can be found in S2 File and S2 Table.

146

147 **Study selection**

148 The selection process was conducted in two steps, using Covidence [36]. First, two
149 independent reviewers (AH and EW) screened articles by title and abstract and voted on
150 eligibility. Potential disagreements were resolved through regular discussions. Second, the
151 full text of remaining articles was evaluated by both reviewers (AH and EW). If articles
152 could not be found, the corresponding author was contacted. If there was no response within
153 two weeks, the articles were excluded. Articles both reviewers agreed upon were included in
154 the systematic review.

155

156 **Quality assessment**

157 Only quantitative outcomes that were assessed by at least three studies and could thus
158 be meaningfully combined in a quantitative synthesis were included in the quality assessment
159 process. The risk of bias of the included studies was assessed independently by two reviewers
160 (AH and EW), using the Cochrane Risk-of-Bias tool for Randomized Trials 2 (RoB 2) [37].
161 The version for individually randomized, parallel-group trials as well as the version for
162 crossover trials were used [38,39].

163

164 **Data extraction**

165 Data extraction was independently conducted by AH and EW using an Excel sheet.
166 Data was collected on the study design, study participants, the intervention condition, the
167 control condition, and reported outcomes. Conflicts were resolved through regular
168 discussions. A full list of the extracted data items can be found in S3 File.

169

170 **Data synthesis**

171 All studies were grouped according to the qualitative or quantitative outcomes they
172 assessed. For stress, anxiety and depression, we further differentiated between chronic (long-
173 term) and acute (short-term) outcomes. We defined acute outcomes as measuring how a
174 person is feeling in a given moment, and chronic outcomes as measuring how a person is
175 feeling over a longer period of time.

176

177 **Qualitative synthesis**

178 Quantitative outcomes reported by less than three studies, as well as all qualitative
179 outcomes, were summarized in a qualitative synthesis. Study results were briefly summarized
180 for each outcome. Studies assessing mental health outcomes, physiological outcomes and
181 cognitive outcomes were grouped together, and common trends in results were described.

182

183 **Quantitative synthesis**

184 Quantitative outcomes reported by three or more studies were included in the
185 quantitative synthesis. For both the meta-analyses and the albatross plots, potential
186 multiplicity was eliminated by applying the following rules: First, if an outcome was reported
187 across multiple time-points, the last reported measurement of the outcome which was not yet
188 part of follow-up measurements was chosen. Second, if an outcome was reported using
189 multiple measures and the reported measures were assumed to be interchangeable, only one

190 of the included measures was chosen. This was the case in studies reporting both systolic and
191 diastolic BP, where systolic BP was chosen, and in studies reporting both HF (high-
192 frequency) and rMSSD (root mean square of successive differences) heart rate variability
193 (HRV), where HF HRV was chosen.

194

195 To be included in a meta-analysis, studies needed to supply an effect size (Hedges' g)
196 of the post-test difference in mental health or cognitive outcomes between an intervention
197 group and a control group, and had to be of good quality (rated as "low risk" or "some
198 concerns" by the RoB 2). In addition, studies had to use comparable intervention and control
199 conditions. Interventions generally fell into two categories: (1) interventions that allowed
200 participants to freely interact with animals and their handlers (active intervention), and (2)
201 interventions where an animal was present while participants' primary focus was on a task
202 (passive intervention). These tasks typically aimed to increase the stress levels of participants
203 (stressors), such as timed math tasks. Interventions were additionally categorized based on
204 the animal species used in the intervention condition. Control conditions broadly fell into
205 four categories: (1) control groups that replaced the presence of an animal with a human
206 (active human control), (2) control groups that replaced the presence of the animal with a
207 different animal, a toy animal, or pictures/videos of an animal (active animal control), (3)
208 control groups with an active component that was not a human or a different animal like yoga
209 (active other control), and (4) control groups without any active component (no-treatment
210 control). Meta-analyses were conducted for all outcomes where at least three studies reported
211 an effect size, were of good quality, and used comparable intervention and control conditions.
212 Due to the small number of studies included in each meta-analysis, it was not possible to
213 conduct moderator analyses.

214

215 For eligible outcomes, meta-analyses were conducted using RStudio Version 1.3.959
216 [40]. Summary effect sizes as well as the corresponding 95% confidence interval (CI) were
217 calculated using a random-effects model, and visualized using forest plots. The heterogeneity
218 between included studies was assessed using the Q and I^2 statistics. If Hedges' g and its
219 standard error (SE) was not reported in the original study, it was computed in RStudio
220 Version 1.3.959, using the package "esc" [41]. Details of the conducted calculations can be
221 found in S4 Table. Funnel plots were used to explore publication bias, and Egger's test for
222 funnel plot asymmetry was conducted.

223

224 Due to the limited number of studies included in the meta-analyses, albatross plots
225 were used to extend the quantitative data synthesis. The albatross plot is a graphical tool that
226 allows an approximation of effect sizes based on p-value and sample size. A detailed
227 explanation of the albatross plot and the mathematical background can be found in the
228 corresponding paper by Harrison et al. [42]. The eligibility criteria in place for the meta-
229 analyses were not required for inclusion in the albatross plots. Albatross plots were created
230 using Stata/SE 16.1 (Stata Statistical Software. College Station, TX: StataCorp LLC; 2019).
231 Effect size contours were calculated based on the standardized mean difference (SMD).
232 Contours corresponded to the effect sizes 0.2 (small effect), 0.5 (medium effect) and 0.8
233 (large effect). Since all included studies were randomized, an equal group size was assumed.
234 As suggested by Harrison et al., if a p-value was presented as a threshold instead of an exact
235 value (e.g. $p < 0.05$), the threshold value was used as the exact value [42]. In addition, for any
236 non-significant outcome without an exact p-value (e.g. $p > 0.05$), a p-value of 1 was
237 substituted [42]. If not reported in the original study, p-values were calculated by conducting
238 unpaired two-sided Student's t-tests in RStudio Version 1.3.959, using the command "t.test"

239 and the mean, standard deviation and sample size provided [40]. If not otherwise specified in
240 the study, a normal distribution of the data was assumed.

241 The threshold for statistical significance was set at $p < 0.05$ for all conducted
242 calculations. The code used for all calculations can be found under DOI:
243 10.6084/m9.figshare.19368047.

244

245

246

247

248

249

250

251

252

253

254

255

256

257

258

259 **Results**

260 **Study selection**

261 A complete search of all databases as described above yielded a total of 2,431 search
262 results. Screening of the reference lists of included articles and identified systematic reviews
263 contributed an additional 63 search results, giving a total of 2,494 identified results. Details
264 on the exact number of results obtained from each database can be found in S2 Table. After
265 removing duplicates and screening the articles by title and abstract, a total of 218 articles
266 remained for full text screening. After the full text screening, 32 articles remained for
267 inclusion in this systematic review. Of these 32 articles, three reported two separate eligible
268 studies [43–45], bringing the total of individual studies included in this review to 35.
269 Common reasons for study exclusion can be found in the PRISMA flow chart (Fig 1). Of the
270 35 studies, 30 were included in the quantitative data synthesis. After assessing eligibility,
271 eight studies were included in the meta-analyses and 28 studies were included in the albatross
272 plots.

273

274 **Fig 1: PRISMA flow chart.** ¹Quantitative outcomes assessed by less than three
275 studies as well as qualitative outcomes were not eligible for inclusion in the meta-analyses.
276 ²Methodological heterogeneity = heterogeneous for type of intervention condition
277 (active/passive), animal used or type of control condition (active animal/active human/active
278 other or no-treatment).

279 Study characteristics

280 An overview of the most important extracted data items and study results can be
281 found in the data extraction table (Table 1). Information on additional important study
282 characteristics can be found in S5 Table. In general, most studies had more female than male
283 participants, and participants were mostly of “typical” undergraduate age (mean 20.2 years,
284 median 19.7 years). In almost all studies (n=29) the intervention animal was a dog
285 [43,43,44,46–70]. Most studies (n=27) used active intervention conditions [43–
286 45,45,46,50,52–55,57,59–62,64–69,71–74], with most taking place in a group setting. In
287 studies with active interventions, the animal-to-participant ratio was generally 1:3–5
288 participants. The remaining studies (n=8) [47–49,51,56,58,63,70] used passive intervention
289 conditions that mostly took place in individual settings and included a stressor. In studies
290 with passive interventions, the animal-to-participant ratio was generally 1:1. The most
291 common control condition was a no-treatment control condition (n=27) [43,45,48–60,62–
292 67,69–72]. In most studies (n=28), intervention sessions took place only once per participant
293 [43,43–45,45,47,48,50–58,60,64–66,68,70–74]. In general, intervention sessions were
294 relatively short (mean 20.7 minutes, median 15 minutes).

295

296

297

298

Table 1. Data extraction table (n=35).

Animal	Year of publication	Reference	Design	N	Results of studies included in qualitative synthesis ^{a,b}	Direction of effect ^{c,d}	Results of studies included in quantitative synthesis ^{a,b}	Direction of effect ^{c,d}
Dog	2020	Caparelli [56]	RCT	64	N/A	N/A	Passive intervention vs no treatment control: Performance on a memory task: p=0.8	Null
Dog	2020	Pendry [46]	RCT	309	Active intervention vs other control (alternative stress management techniques only): WILL-subscale: p=0.021 SELFREGULATION-subscale: p=0.215 SKILL-subscale: p>0.05 Active intervention vs other control (human-animal interaction and alternative stress management techniques): WILL-subscale: p>0.05 SELFREGULATION-subscale: N/A SKILL-subscale: p>0.05	Positive Null Null Null N/A Null	N/A	N/A
Dog	2019	Gebhart [67]	RCT	57	Active intervention vs no treatment control (no exam): IgA: N/A Active intervention vs no treatment control (exam): IgA: N/A Active intervention vs other control: IgA: N/A	N/A N/A N/A	Active intervention vs no treatment control (no exam): Acute self-perceived stress: p<0.01 Acute anxiety: p<0.01 Salivary cortisol: N/A Active intervention vs no treatment control (exam): Acute self-perceived stress: p>0.5 Acute anxiety: p>0.5 Salivary cortisol: N/A Active intervention vs other control: Acute self-perceived stress: N/A Acute anxiety: N/A Salivary cortisol: N/A	Negative Negative N/A Null Null N/A N/A N/A N/A
Dog	2019	Pendry [61]	RCT	228	Active intervention vs other controls (alternative stress management techniques only; human-animal interaction and alternative stress management techniques): Behaviour change: p=0.31 Changes in home-practice: p=0.44 Qualitative interviews revealed students' favourite part of dog interaction was positive effect on mood.	Null Null Positive	N/A	N/A

Dog	2019	Trammell [63]	RCT	44	N/A	N/A	Passive intervention vs no treatment control: Acute self-perceived stress: p=0.03 Arousal: p>0.05 Happiness: p>0.001 Performance on a memory task: p=0.34	Negative Null Positive Negative
Dog	2018	Banks [53]	RCT	56	Active intervention vs no treatment control: Cognitive test anxiety: p=0.62 Concentration: p>0.05	Null Null	Active intervention vs no treatment control: Acute anxiety: p=0.023 Negative affect: p=0.84 Chronic self-perceived stress: p=0.042 Positive affect: p=0.97	Negative Null Negative Null
Dog	2018	Hall [59]	RCT	98	N/A	N/A	Active intervention vs no treatment control: Acute anxiety: p=0.008	Negative
Dog	2018	Ward-Griffin [64]	RCT	246	Active intervention vs no treatment control: Social support: p=0.25 Life satisfaction: p=0.87	Null Null	Active intervention vs no treatment control: Negative affect: p=0.5 Chronic self-perceived stress: p=0.95 Happiness: p=0.89 Positive affect: p=0.76	Negative Null Null Null
Dog	2017	Barker [55]	RCT	74	Active intervention vs no treatment control: Distance between self and family members: p=0.562 Distance to personal stressors: p=0.02 Distance to other stressors: p=0.05	Null Negative Null	N/A	N/A
Dog	2017	Bin fet [66]	RCT	163	Active intervention vs no treatment control: Homesickness: p<0.05 Sense of belonging in school: p=0.002	Negative Positive	Active intervention vs no treatment control: Chronic self-perceived stress: p=0.019 ^c	Negative
Dog	2017	Fiocco & Hunse [65]	RCT	61	Active intervention vs no treatment control: Galvanic skin response: N/A	N/A	Active intervention vs no treatment control: Negative affect: N/A positive affect: N/A	N/A
Dog	2017	Grajfoner [68]	RCT	132	Active intervention vs human control vs animal control: Mood: p=0.011 Well-being: p<0.001	Negative (higher in animal control than other conditions) Positive (higher in intervention and animal control compared to no treatment)	Active intervention vs human control: Acute anxiety: p<0.001 Active intervention vs animal control: Acute anxiety: p<0.001	Negative Positive

						control)		
Dog	2017	McDonald [60]	RCT	48	N/A	N/A	Active intervention vs no treatment control: BP: p<0.001	Negative
Dog	2017	Trammell - Study 2 [44]	RCT	44	Active intervention vs animal control: Study effort for final exam: p>0.43	Null	Active intervention vs animal control: Acute self-perceived stress: p=0.02 Performance on a memory task: p=0.62	Negative Null
Dog	2017	Trammell - Study 3 [44]	RCT	45	Active intervention vs animal control: Study effort for final exam: p>0.10	Null	Active intervention vs animal control: Acute self-perceived stress: p=0.30 Performance on a memory task: p=0.67	Negative Null
Dog	2016	Barker [54]	cRCT	57	Active intervention vs no treatment control: sAA: p=0.356 sNGF: dropped from analysis	Null N/A	Active intervention vs no treatment control: Acute self-perceived stress: p=0.0001	Negative
Dog	2016	Gonzalez-Ramirez [69]	RCT	14	Active intervention vs no treatment control: Stress caused by public speaking: p>0.05 Stress management: p=0.805	Null Null	N/A	N/A
Dog	2015	Crossman [57]	RCT	67	N/A	N/A	Active intervention vs no treatment control: Acute anxiety: p<0.0001 ^e Negative affect: p<0.0001 ^e Positive affect: p=0.076 Active intervention vs animal control: Acute anxiety: p<0.0001 ^e Negative affect: p<0.0001 ^e Positive affect: p=0.1	Negative Negative Positive Negative Negative Positive
Dog	2015	Crump - Study I [43]	cRCT	27	N/A	N/A	Active intervention vs no treatment control: Acute self-perceived stress: p=0.029 Arousal: p=0.006 HR: p>0.05 BP: p=0.039	Negative Positive Null Positive
Dog	2015	Crump - Study II [43]	RCT	61	N/A	N/A	Active intervention vs no treatment control: Acute self-perceived stress: p=0.046 Chronic self-perceived stress: p>0.05 Arousal: p=0.007 Salivary cortisol: p>0.05	Negative Null Positive Null
Dog	2015	Gee [58]	cRCT	31	N/A	N/A	Passive intervention vs no treatment control vs animal control vs human control: HR: p=0.55 HRV: p=0.49	Null Positive

							Passive intervention (touch) vs no treatment control vs human control: Performance on a memory task: p<0.05 Passive intervention (no touch) vs no treatment control vs human control: Performance on a memory task: p>0.05	Negative Null
Dog	2015	Shearer [62]	RCT	74	Active intervention vs no treatment control vs other control: Mindfulness: p>0.5	Null	Active intervention vs no treatment control: Acute anxiety: p<0.05 Negative affect: p=0.001 HRV: p>0.05 Active intervention vs other control: Acute anxiety: p<0.05 Negative affect: p>0.05 HRV: p<0.05 Active intervention vs no treatment control vs other control: Chronic depression: p>0.05	Negative Null Positive Null Negative Null
Dog	2014	Gee [47]	cRCT	53	N/A	N/A	Passive intervention vs animal control vs human control: HR: p=0.046 HRV: p=0.88 Performance on a memory task: N/A	N/A Null N/A
Dog	2014	Hunt & Chizkov [49]	RCT	107	N/A	N/A	Passive intervention vs no treatment control: Chronic depression: p<0.05 Negative affect: N/A Acute anxiety: N/A	Negative N/A N/A
Dog	2014	Polheber & Matchock [70]	RCT	48	N/A	N/A	Passive intervention vs no treatment control vs human control: Acute anxiety: p>0.05 HR: p>0.5 Passive intervention vs no treatment control: Salivary cortisol: p=0.024 Passive intervention vs human control: Salivary cortisol: p=0.045	Null Null Negative Negative
Dog	2013	Stewart & Strickland [48]	RCT	128	N/A	N/A	Passive intervention vs no treatment control: Acute anxiety: p=0.09	Negative

Dog	2004	Charnetski [50]	RCT	55	Active intervention vs no treatment control vs animal control: IgA: p>0.05	Null	N/A	N/A
Dog	1997	Straatman [51]	RCT	36	Passive intervention vs no treatment control: MAP: p=0.0338	Null	Passive intervention vs no treatment control: HR: p=0.338 BP: p=0.338 Acute anxiety: N/A	Negative Positive N/A
Dog	1987	Wilson [52]	cRCT	92	Active intervention vs no treatment control: MAP: p=0.0005 Chronic anxiety: p=0.761 Active intervention vs other control: MAP: p=0.0005 Chronic anxiety: p=0.317	Positive Null Negative Null	Active intervention vs no treatment control: Acute anxiety: p=0.937 HR: p=0.001 BP: p=0.0005 Active intervention vs other control: Acute anxiety: p=0.0005 HR: p=0.0005 BP: p=0.0005	Null Positive Positive Negative Negative Negative
Dogs, cats	2019	Pendry & Vandagriff [71]	RCT	249	N/A	N/A	Active intervention vs no treatment control: Salivary cortisol: p=0.033 Active intervention vs animal control (slideshow): Salivary cortisol: p=0.046 Active intervention vs animal control (observation): Salivary cortisol: p=0.04	Negative Negative Negative
Dogs, cats	2019	Pendry (Clinical depression) [73]	RCT	192	Active intervention vs no treatment control vs animal control: Irritability: N/A Contentness: N/A Acute depression: N/A	N/A	Active intervention vs no treatment control vs animal control: Acute anxiety: N/A Chronic depression: N/A	N/A
Dogs, cats	2018	Pendry [72]	RCT	182	Active intervention vs animal control: Contentness: p<0.01 Irritability: p=0.03 Acute depression: p>0.05 Active intervention vs no treatment control: Contentness: p<0.001 Irritability: p=0.02 Acute depression: p>0.05	Positive Negative Null Positive Negative Null	Active intervention vs animal control: Acute anxiety: p<0.01 Active intervention vs no treatment control: Acute anxiety: p=0.03	Negative Negative
Fish	2019	Gee - Experiment 1 [45]	cRCT	35	Active intervention vs no treatment control: Relaxation: p=0.001 Active intervention vs animal control:	Positive	Active intervention vs no treatment control: Happiness: p<0.001 HR: p>0.05	Positive Null

					Relaxation: p<0.001	Positive	Active intervention vs animal control: Happiness: N/A HR: p=0.006 Active intervention vs no treatment control vs animal control: HRV: p>0.05	N/A Negative Null
Fish	2019	Gee - Experiment 2 [45]	RCT	39	Active intervention vs no treatment control: Relaxation: p=0.001 Active intervention vs animal control: Relaxation: N/A	Positive N/A	Active intervention vs no treatment control: Acute anxiety: p<0.001 Active intervention vs animal control: Acute anxiety: N/A Active intervention vs no treatment control vs animal control: HR: p>0.05 Active intervention vs no treatment control vs animal control: HRV: p>0.05	Negative N/A Null Null
Cat	2017	Kobayashi [74]	cRCT	30	Active intervention vs animal control: Levels of oxygenated hemoglobin in prefrontal cortex: N/A Pleasure: p<0.0001	N/A Positive	Active intervention vs no treatment control: Arousal: p>0.05	Null

300 cRCT: crossover RCT.
 301 N/A: not applicable (information not given, or no p-value or direction of effect available/calculatable).
 302 N: number of participants.
 303 ^aAbbreviations for outcomes: Blood pressure (BP), heart rate (HR), heart rate variability (HRV), mean arterial pressure (MAP), salivary nerve growth factor (sNGF), salivary alpha amylase (sAA), Immunoglobulin A (IgA)
 304 ^bResults for main effect of condition at post-test
 305 ^cNegative direction of effect: levels of outcome were lower in intervention compared to the control group. Positive direction of effect: levels of outcome were higher in intervention compared to control group.
 306 ^dEffect sizes were described as “null”, indicating no effect of the intervention on the corresponding outcome, if the p-value corresponding to the effect size was non-significant and the effect size was very small (less than 0.2). If the effect size was above 0.2, the direction of effect was specified even if the associated p-value was non-significant.
 307 ^ep-value calculated by AH.

310 Outcomes were grouped into mental health outcomes, physiological outcomes and
311 cognitive outcomes. Mental health outcomes were by far the most common (n=26) [43–
312 45,48,49,51–55,57,59,62–68,70,72–74], followed by physiological outcomes (n=14)
313 [43,45,47,50,51,54,58,60,62,65,67,70,71,74] and cognitive outcomes (n=9)
314 [44,46,47,53,56,58,61,63,69]. Most reported cognitive outcomes were related to students'
315 academic performance.

316

317 **Risk of bias within studies**

318 Thirty studies were included in the quality assessment. Overall, 60 outcomes from 27
319 studies were classed as “some concerns” [43–45,47,48,51–54,56–58,60,62–68,70,71,73,74],
320 8 outcomes from 5 studies were classed as “high risk” [49,51,59,62,72], and no studies were
321 classed as “low risk”. Common limitations included not reporting the method of allocation
322 sequence generation or allocation sequence concealment. Additionally, blinding of
323 participants and study personnel to a participants’ allocated condition was generally not
324 possible due to the animal presence, although some studies tried to conceal the true study
325 purpose from participants. Nonetheless, in most studies, both participants and study personnel
326 were probably aware of their assigned condition, which may have affected self-reported
327 outcomes. Finally, none of the included crossover RCTs gave information about potential
328 carryover effects. An overview of quality assessment results for RCTs and crossover RCTs
329 can be found in S6 and S7 Figs. Quality assessment results at the individual outcome level
330 can be found in S6 and S7 Tables.

331

332

333

334 **Synthesis of results**

335 **Qualitative synthesis**

336 Consistent with the study hypotheses, most studies reporting on negative mental
337 health outcomes, including acute depression, homesickness and irritability, reported lower
338 levels of these outcomes in the intervention group compared to the control group at post-test
339 [52,66,72,73]. Only Wilson et al. did not report an effect of the intervention on chronic
340 anxiety [52]. Similarly, some studies reporting on positive mental health outcomes reported
341 higher levels of these outcomes in the intervention group compared to the control group at
342 post-test [45,55,61,66,68,72–74]. However, a few studies also reported no effect of the
343 intervention on positive mental health outcomes, including mood, life satisfaction and
344 mindfulness [55,62,64,68]. Most studies reporting on physiological outcomes reported no
345 effect of the intervention [50,51,54], although Fiocco & Hunse reported a smaller
346 electrodermal response after a stressor in the intervention compared to the control group [65],
347 and Wilson et al. found mean arterial pressure (MAP) to be significantly higher in the
348 intervention compared to the control condition [52]. Similarly, most studies reporting on
349 cognitive outcomes showed no effect of the intervention [46,53,61,69]. Only Pendry et al.
350 found an improvement in test anxiety, attitude and study motivation [46] (Table 1).

351

352 **Quantitative synthesis**

353 The following outcomes were included in the quantitative synthesis: acute self-
354 perceived stress, chronic self-perceived stress, negative affect, acute anxiety, arousal, chronic
355 depression, happiness, positive affect, BP, HR, HRV, salivary cortisol, and performance on a
356 memory task. Of these, meta-analyses were conducted for chronic self-perceived stress,
357 negative affect, acute anxiety, positive affect and BP. All studies included in the meta-
358 analyses used an active intervention condition, a dog as the intervention animal and a no-

359 treatment control condition. The most important results are presented below. Detailed results
360 for the remaining outcomes, including the albatross plots and the meta-analyses, can be found
361 in S8 - S19 Figs.

362

363 Mental health outcomes were most common. For acute anxiety and self-perceived
364 stress, most included studies showed a significant reduction at post-test. Acute anxiety was
365 reported by 14 studies, of which four studies were combined in a meta-analysis
366 [52,53,57,62]. The pooled Hedges' g was -0.57 (95% CI -1.45, 0.31; Q=12.5, I²=76%,
367 p=0.006), indicating a medium-sized negative effect of the intervention (Fig 2). This result
368 was mirrored by the albatross plot, where most studies clustered around the 0.5 to the 0.8
369 negative effect size contours (Fig 3). Acute self-perceived stress was reported by seven
370 studies. Although not combinable in a meta-analysis, the albatross plot demonstrated that
371 included studies showed a reduction of self-perceived stress with a medium to large effect
372 size, with most results clustering around the 0.5 to the 0.8 negative effect size contours of the
373 albatross plot (Fig 4).

374

375 **Fig 2. Forest plot acute anxiety (n=4).** TE: Hedges' g. seTE: standard error of Hedges' g.
376 N(i): number of participants in intervention condition. N(c): number of participants in control
377 condition.

378

379 **Fig 3. Albatross plot acute anxiety (n=11).**

380

381 **Fig 4. Albatross plot acute self-perceived stress (n=7).**

382

383 Negative affect was reported by 6 studies, of which 4 studies were combined in a
384 meta-analysis [53,57,62,64]. The pooled Hedges' g was -0.47 (95% CI -1.46, 0.52; Q=15.3,
385 I²=80.4%, p=0.016), indicating a small- to medium-sized negative effect of the intervention
386 (Fig 5). The albatross plot showed that while some studies showed a reduction of negative
387 affect, other studies showed no effect (Fig 6).

388

389 **Fig 5. Forest plot negative affect (n=4).** TE: Hedges' g. seTE: standard error of Hedges' g.
390 N(i): number of participants in intervention condition. N(c): number of participants in control
391 condition.

392

393 **Fig 6. Albatross plot negative affect (n=5).**

394

395 The tendency for some studies to show the expected effect while other studies showed
396 no effect was also observed for the remaining mental health outcomes. Accordingly, a small
397 negative effect of the intervention was observed for chronic self-perceived stress (pooled
398 Hedges' g: -0.23 (95% CI -0.57, 0.11; heterogeneity: Q=1.44, I²=0%, p=0.49) and chronic
399 depression, and a small positive effect was observed for positive affect (pooled Hedges' g:
400 0.06 (95% CI -0.78, 0.90; heterogeneity: Q=3.97, I²=49.6%, p=0.138), arousal and
401 happiness. Forest plots and albatross plots for these outcomes can be found in S8 - S14 Figs.

402

403 Among the physiological outcomes, salivary cortisol was the only outcome to
404 demonstrate the expected direction of effect. Salivary cortisol was reported by four studies.
405 Although not combinable in a meta-analysis, included studies showed a small to medium
406 negative effect on cortisol, with most results falling between the 0.3 and 0.8 effect size
407 contours of the albatross plot. In contrast, among the 8 studies assessing HR, most included

408 studies showed no effect on HR, with most results clustered around the middle of the
409 albatross plot (Fig 7). This trend was mirrored by the studies assessing HRV.

410

411 **Fig 7. Albatross plot heart rate (n=8).**

412

413 Interestingly, studies reporting on BP were very heterogeneous in terms of outcome.
414 BP was reported by four studies, three of which were combinable in a meta-analysis.
415 However, despite correcting for methodological heterogeneity, the results of studies included
416 in the meta-analyses were very disparate in terms of both size and direction of effect.
417 Additionally, the forest plot showed a very high, statistically significant level of
418 heterogeneity between the included studies ($Q=45.5$, $I^2=95.6\%$, $p<0.0001$). These levels of
419 heterogeneity were significantly higher than for any other meta-analysis conducted.
420 Accordingly, it was deemed inappropriate to statistically combine BP outcomes, and no
421 pooled effect size was calculated. This strong heterogeneity was mirrored in the albatross
422 plot, where results were spread out throughout the plot. Forest plots and albatross plots for
423 physiological outcomes can be found in S15 - S18 Figs.

424

425 The only cognitive outcome included in the quantitative synthesis was performance
426 on a memory task, reported by six studies. Overall, included studies suggested a very small
427 negative effect of the intervention on memory task performance, with most results clustering
428 around the 0.2 effect size contour of the albatross plot. The albatross plot can be found in S19
429 Fig.

430

431 **Risk of bias across studies**

432 The funnel plot showed no evidence of publication bias, as confirmed by Egger's
433 regression test for funnel plot asymmetry ($z = -1.74$, $p = 0.081$). The funnel plot can be found
434 in S20 Fig.

435 **Discussion**

436 **Summary of findings**

437 The aim of this systematic review and meta-analysis was to assess the effect of AAIs
438 implemented in higher education settings on the mental and cognitive outcomes of students.
439 Additionally, we assessed the overall quality of included studies. In general, the results of this
440 review suggest that AAIs in higher education settings are particularly effective at reducing
441 acute feelings of anxiety and stress. The evidence is less clear for other mental health
442 outcomes assessed in this review, but the included studies suggest a beneficial effect of AAIs
443 on these outcomes as well. This review does not suggest a beneficial effect of AAIs on
444 physiological or cognitive outcomes of students. Overall, the quality of included studies was
445 moderate, with most studies being classed as "some concerns".

446

447 **Mental health outcomes**

448 The beneficial effects on acute mental health outcomes found in this review are in
449 keeping with previous systematic reviews, which have shown AAIs to improve mental health
450 outcomes in a large variety of populations. Several previous systematic reviews have shown
451 significant reductions in self-perceived stress and anxiety in populations with and without
452 pre-existing health conditions [5,8,15]. Similarly, previous reviews have shown AAIs to
453 promote a positive mood, increase happiness and reduce depressive symptoms [6,8,75,76].
454 While the overall direction of effect of the included mental health outcomes was beneficial as
455 expected, some studies reporting on mental health outcomes showed no effect of the

456 intervention. Since formal moderator analyses were not possible in this review, we cannot say
457 with certainty which, if any study characteristics are associated with this. The comparatively
458 smaller effect sizes of chronic stress and depression, both assessed with instruments designed
459 to detect changes in the mental state over longer periods of time, may point to limited long-
460 term effects of AAIs, as suggested in previous literature [77–79].

461

462 Another possible contributor to differences in study results could be related to
463 intervention design. Beetz et al. suggest that the beneficial effects of HAI could stem from an
464 activation of the oxytocin (OT) system through sensory stimulation [8]. Specifically, they
465 state that the closeness of the connection between human and animal, including the duration
466 of the gaze from the animal as well as the presence and duration of physical contact with the
467 animal, is an important factor in if and how much OT is released during HAI [8]. Since
468 participants in studies using a passive intervention and stressors were not able to focus
469 completely on the present animal and often did not even touch the animal in question, it is
470 possible that not enough OT was released, thus explaining the lack of expected effects on
471 mental health outcomes seen in some of these studies [48,49]. Since moderator analyses to
472 confirm this hypothesis were not possible in this review, future research could explore
473 whether the use of passive interventions and stressors is indeed associated with a reduced
474 effect of AAIs on the mental health outcomes of higher education students.

475

476 **Physiological outcomes**

477 Only three of the included studies provided results for cortisol, with two studies
478 reporting reductions and one study reporting no effect on salivary cortisol at post-test
479 [43,70,71]. This trend towards a reduction of cortisol at post-test is in keeping with other
480 literature [8,80]. By contrast, studies assessing BP showed very mixed outcomes. This mixed

481 effect of AAIs on BP has been reported in other systematic reviews, even though the overall
482 trend seems to be that BP decreases post-AAI [5,8]. One possible explanation for the large
483 discrepancies between BP results in this review and past reviews could be the poor reliability
484 of BP as an outcome measure. Indeed, a study by Kelsey et al. showed that measures of
485 cardiovascular reactivity, including BP, have a poor reliability across different typical
486 stressor tasks [81]. BP can be affected by variables such as the posture of the participant,
487 movement, respiration, sensory input or varying task demands [81]. All of these factors
488 differed between the studies included in this review. Additionally, while all studies used a BP
489 monitor, measurements were taken from different locations including the upper arm [43,52],
490 the wrist [60] or the finger [51], which may also have contributed to the heterogeneity in
491 results.

492 Interestingly, most included studies showed no effect of the intervention on HR or
493 HRV. This is different from findings of other reviews, which have found an overall reduction
494 of HR after an AAI in a variety of populations [5,82]. It is possible that AAIs may have less
495 of an effect on physiological outcomes in a young, healthy population. Indeed, while Nimer
496 & Lundahl found a significant improvement of physiological outcomes after an AAI,
497 moderator analyses revealed that populations with disabilities showed significantly larger
498 improvements than healthy populations did [16]. Additionally, it is possible that differences
499 in effects between studies are again associated with intervention design: Most studies that
500 assessed HR and HRV included a stressor in their intervention, thus likely triggering an acute
501 stress response among participants. It is well established that, in response to an acute stressor,
502 HR increases while HRV decreases [83]. Accordingly, it is possible that in studies with a
503 stressor, the potential effect of an AAI on these physiological outcomes was not strong
504 enough to compete with or alter the effects of the acute stress response. More studies without

505 an incorporated stressor would be needed to judge the effects of AAIs on the physiological
506 outcomes of students in a non-stressful situation.

507

508

509 **Cognitive outcomes**

510 The studies included in this review showed no effect on the intervention on cognitive
511 outcomes. This is an interesting finding, especially considering that past systematic reviews
512 assessing the impact of AAIs on cognitive outcomes of children have found that the presence
513 of animals to helps to create a productive learning environment [8,84]. Although these
514 systematic reviews point out that there is little evidence that AAIs directly improve academic
515 performance, they have nevertheless been shown to improve related cognitive outcomes like
516 concentration, motivation, attention and social functioning [8,84]. However, Banks et al.
517 hypothesized that while the presence of an animal may be beneficial for children, whose
518 cognitive functions are still developing, there is less of an impact on these outcomes among
519 higher education students, who are already at their peak of cognitive functioning [53]. The
520 primary benefits of AAIs for this population therefore seem to be affective, not cognitive.

521

522 **Limitations of included evidence**

523 Past systematic reviews in the AAI field have cited a limited availability of RCTs as a
524 central limitation. However, our literature search yielded enough RCTs to answer our
525 research questions. Of the 32 papers included in this review, 25 were published in 2015 or
526 later, showing that this increase in RCT availability is quite a recent development. This is an
527 encouraging finding, signaling the strong interest in this field from the scientific community.

528 The quality of the RCTs included in this review was also judged to be satisfactory by the
529 RoB2.

530

531 Nevertheless, some characteristics shared by the included studies may limit the
532 generalizability of the results found in this review. First, participants in included studies were
533 overwhelmingly female. This may be attributable to an increased interest in AAIs among
534 females, as most studies recruited participants via self-selection, or to recruitment from
535 traditionally majority-female degree programs, such as psychology or nursing (150,151).
536 Since previous research has shown differences between males and females in, for example,
537 responses to stressors, it is possible that the results may not be generalizable to both male and
538 female students (152,153). Second, although the search strategy was designed to find
539 publications using any intervention animal, almost all included studies used dogs. This may
540 be due to the popularity of dogs as companion animals and the feelings of empathy and
541 companionship associated with them, making them a popular choice for AAIs [85].
542 Additionally, dogs may have been the easiest option logistically since some studies
543 cooperated with established university-based AAI programs that were already using dogs
544 [44,46,53–55,61,68,71–73], and some studies used pet dogs of the researchers [71–73].
545 Nonetheless, it should be kept in mind that the results of this review represent the effects of
546 AAIs using dogs and are likely less applicable to AAIs using other animals. Other limitations
547 of included studies were small sample sizes, lack of sample size calculations and general lack
548 of follow-up assessments.

549

550 **Limitations of the review process**

551 The strength of this review lies in the use of the albatross plots to enrich the
552 quantitative data synthesis, as well as the inclusion of RCTs only. Nonetheless some
553 important limitations remain.

554 First, the strong methodological heterogeneity severely limited the comparability of
555 included studies, as has been the case with many other reviews in the AAI field [5,6,13]. The
556 heterogeneity also limited the number of studies included in the individual meta-analyses and
557 limited our ability to conduct moderator analyses. This heterogeneity is at least partly
558 attributable to the broadly defined eligibility criteria used in this review. Kazdin et al. have
559 remarked that such broad eligibility criteria, where inclusion is based on the presence of an
560 animal in the intervention as opposed to the proposed mechanism of the intervention, is one
561 of the reasons for the methodological heterogeneity in most reviews in the AAI field [86].
562 This lack of a guiding theoretical framework in most reviews is exacerbated by the lack of an
563 unanimously accepted theory on the mechanism of AAI effectiveness in the field [87]. In
564 order to limit this issue in future research, systematic reviews should settle on a specific
565 theoretical framework to guide their eligibility criteria in order to include only logically
566 comparable studies [86].

567 Second, the albatross plots in this review were explicitly meant to allow a more
568 inclusive overview of available data than what was available based on meta-analyses alone
569 and were not meant to generate a usable summary statistic. The effect size contours
570 superimposed on the plot are only approximations of the actual effect size (100). While they
571 allow a visual interpretation of the general trend of the included studies in terms of effect size
572 and direction, they are not exact and are not to be interpreted as such (100).

573

574 **Research gaps and implications**

575 If possible, future reviews in this field could conduct moderator analyses to assess
576 whether any study characteristics have an influence on study results, while future studies
577 could focus on comparing different aspects of AAIs, perhaps by using multiple intervention
578 conditions. For example, studies could explore whether incorporating a stressor in the study
579 design or conducting an AAI in either a group or an individual setting influences the effect of
580 AAIs on health outcomes.

581 Additionally, while a recent review suggested that AAI participation has no adverse
582 effects for participating animals, research is limited and results remain conflicting [88].
583 There is even less research on potential benefits of AAI participation for animals [88].
584 Interestingly, research has suggested that following stress, trauma or abuse, animals can
585 exhibit behavior similar to symptoms of human mental disorders such as depression or post-
586 traumatic stress disorder [89,90]. Taking this into account, it is essential that the physical and
587 mental health of animals participating in AAIs is protected. In the best case, AAIs should be
588 mutually beneficial to animals and humans, thus making them a truly shared intervention in
589 the spirit of One Health.

590

591 One of the goals of this review was to provide an evidence base that administrators at
592 higher education institutions can use to decide whether to implement AAIs at their own
593 campus. Despite the methodological limitations listed above, this review shows that AAIs
594 can be effective in improving student mental health, especially acute feelings of anxiety and
595 stress. Taking into consideration the high burden of mental health issues among students at
596 higher education institutions, along with the unprecedented stress caused by the COVID-19
597 pandemic, higher education institutions will likely be facing an increasing demand for mental
598 health support [29,91,92]. Due to their low cost, easy scalability and high popularity, AAIs
599 present a good option for higher education institutions to improve student mental health [26].

600 This opportunity could be taken up particularly by universities outside of the US and Canada,
601 where AAI programs are still rare. It has to be kept in mind, however, that while stress
602 reduction efforts can certainly help, more structural changes should be implemented, which
603 aim to reduce academic, social and financial pressures that impact students' mental health.
604 These could include, for example, an increased mental health budget at higher education
605 institutions, reduced tuition fees and a mandatory salary for student internships [21,93,94].

606

607

608 **Conclusion**

609 Overall, the results of this review suggest that AAIs in higher education settings can
610 be effective at improving mental health outcomes of students and are particularly effective at
611 reducing acute feelings of anxiety and stress. These findings have been replicated in many
612 different settings and with a variety of populations. However, contrary to prior research, this
613 review does not suggest a beneficial effect of AAIs on physiological or cognitive outcomes
614 of students.

615

616

617

618

619

620

621

622

623

624

625

626

627

628

629

630

631

632 Acknowledgements

633 The authors gratefully acknowledge Hélène Carabin for intellectual input at the
634 beginning of the review process. Furthermore, we would like to thank Hilde Iren Flaatten,
635 Medical Librarian at the University of Oslo, for her leading role in conducting the literature
636 search.

637 References

- 638 1. Andersen KG, Rambaut A, Lipkin WI, Holmes EC, Garry RF. The proximal origin of
639 SARS-CoV-2. *Nat Med.* 2020 Apr;26(4):450–2.
- 640 2. Amuasi JH, Lucas T, Horton R, Winkler AS. Reconnecting for our future: The Lancet
641 One Health Commission. *The Lancet.* 2020 May 9;395(10235):1469–71.
- 642 3. AVMA. Animal-assisted interventions: Definitions [Internet]. American Veterinary
643 Medical Association. [cited 2020 May 4]. Available from:
644 <https://www.avma.org/policies/animal-assisted-interventions-definitions>
- 645 4. López-Cepero J. Current Status of Animal-Assisted Interventions in Scientific
646 Literature: A Critical Comment on Their Internal Validity. *Animals.* 2020
647 Jun;10(6):985.
- 648 5. Bert F, Gualano M, Camussi E, Pieve G, Voglino G, Siliquini R. Animal Assisted
649 Intervention: a systematic review of benefits and risks. *European Journal of Integrative
650 Medicine.* 2016 May 1;695–709.

- 651 6. Kamioka H, Okada S, Tsutani K, Park H, Okuzumi H, Handa S, et al. Effectiveness of
652 animal-assisted therapy: A systematic review of randomized controlled trials.
653 Complement Ther Med. 2014 Apr;22(2):371–90.
- 654 7. Maujean A, Pepping CA, Kendall E. A Systematic Review of Randomized Controlled
655 Trials of Animal-Assisted Therapy on Psychosocial Outcomes. Anthrozoös. 2015 Mar
656 1;28(1):23–36.
- 657 8. Beetz A, Uvnäs-Moberg K, Julius H, Kotrschal K. Psychosocial and
658 Psychophysiological Effects of Human-Animal Interactions: The Possible Role of
659 Oxytocin. Front Psychol [Internet]. 2012 Jul 9 [cited 2021 Mar 9];3. Available from:
660 <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3408111/>
- 661 9. Wood W, Fields B, Rose M, McLure M. Animal-Assisted Therapies and Dementia: A
662 Systematic Mapping Review Using the Lived Environment Life Quality (LELQ) Model.
663 Am J Occup Ther. 2017 Oct;71(5):7105190030p1–10.
- 664 10. Yakimicki ML, Edwards NE, Richards E, Beck AM. Animal-Assisted Intervention and
665 Dementia: A Systematic Review. Clin Nurs Res. 2019;28(1):9–29.
- 666 11. O’Haire ME. Animal-assisted intervention for autism spectrum disorder: a systematic
667 literature review. J Autism Dev Disord. 2013 Jul;43(7):1606–22.
- 668 12. Berry A, Borgi M, Francia N, Alleva E, Cirulli F. Use of assistance and therapy dogs for
669 children with autism spectrum disorders: a critical review of the current evidence. J
670 Altern Complement Med. 2013 Feb;19(2):73–80.
- 671 13. Brooks HL, Rushton K, Lovell K, Bee P, Walker L, Grant L, et al. The power of support
672 from companion animals for people living with mental health problems: a systematic
673 review and narrative synthesis of the evidence. BMC Psychiatry. 2018 05;18(1):31.
- 674 14. Jones MG, Rice SM, Cotton SM. Incorporating animal-assisted therapy in mental health
675 treatments for adolescents: A systematic review of canine assisted psychotherapy. PLoS
676 One [Internet]. 2019 Jan 17 [cited 2020 May 16];14(1). Available from:
677 <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC6336278/>
- 678 15. Ein N, Li L, Vickers K. The effect of pet therapy on the physiological and subjective
679 stress response: A meta-analysis. Stress Health. 2018 Oct;34(4):477–89.
- 680 16. Nimer J, Lundahl B. Animal-assisted therapy: A meta-analysis. Anthrozoös.
681 2007;20(3):225–38.
- 682 17. Higher education [Internet]. Encyclopedia Britannica. [cited 2020 May 19]. Available
683 from: <https://www.britannica.com/topic/higher-education>
- 684 18. Mortier P, Cuijpers P, Kiekens G, Auerbach RP, Demyttenaere K, Green JG, et al. The
685 prevalence of suicidal thoughts and behaviours among college students: a meta-analysis.
686 Psychol Med. 2018 Mar;48(4):554–65.
- 687 19. Facts | Anxiety and Depression Association of America, ADAA [Internet]. [cited 2020
688 May 4]. Available from: <https://adaa.org/finding-help/helping-others/college-students/facts>

- 690 20. Austin E, Saklofske D, Mastoras S. Emotional intelligence, coping and exam-related
691 stress in Canadian undergraduate students. *Australian Journal of Psychology*. 2010 Mar
692 1;62(1):42–50.
- 693 21. Bayram N, Bilgel N. The prevalence and socio-demographic correlations of depression,
694 anxiety and stress among a group of university students. *Soc Psychiatry Psychiatr
695 Epidemiol*. 2008 Aug;43(8):667–72.
- 696 22. Grützmacher J, Gusy B, Lesener T, Sudheimer S, Willige J. *Gesundheit Studierender in
697 Deutschland* 2017. :168.
- 698 23. Campus Mental Health [Internet]. <https://www.apa.org>. [cited 2020 May 20]. Available
699 from: <https://www.apa.org/advocacy/higher-education/mental-health/index>
- 700 24. Crossman MK, Kazdin AE. Chapter 24 - Animal Visitation Programs in Colleges and
701 Universities: An Efficient Model for Reducing Student Stress. In: Fine AH, editor.
702 *Handbook on Animal-Assisted Therapy (Fourth Edition)* [Internet]. San Diego:
703 Academic Press; 2015 [cited 2020 Oct 3]. p. 333–7. Available from:
704 <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/B9780128012925000249>
- 705 25. Gee NR, Fine AH, McCardle P. *How Animals Help Students Learn: Research and
706 Practice for Educators and Mental-Health Professionals*. Taylor & Francis; 2017. 251 p.
- 707 26. Reynolds JA, Rabschutz L. Studying for Exams Just Got More Relaxing—Animal-
708 Assisted Activities at the University of Connecticut Library. *College & Undergraduate
709 Libraries*. 2011 Oct 1;18(4):359–67.
- 710 27. Wood E, Ohlsen S, Thompson J, Hulin J, Knowles L. The feasibility of brief dog-
711 assisted therapy on university students stress levels: the PAwS study. *J Ment Health*.
712 2018 Jun;27(3):263–8.
- 713 28. Bell A. Paws for a Study Break: Running an Animal-Assisted Therapy Program at the
714 Gerstein Science Information Centre. Partnership: *The Canadian Journal of Library and
715 Information Practice and Research* [Internet]. 2013 Jun 1 [cited 2020 Sep 29];8(1).
716 Available from: <https://doaj.org>
- 717 29. Vadivel R, Shoib S, El Halabi S, El Hayek S, Essam L, Gashi Bytyçi D, et al. Mental
718 health in the post-COVID-19 era: challenges and the way forward. *Gen Psychiatr*.
719 2021;34(1):e100424.
- 720 30. Greenberg MT, Abenavoli R. Universal Interventions: Fully Exploring Their Impacts
721 and Potential to Produce Population-Level Impacts. *Journal of Research on Educational
722 Effectiveness*. 2017 Jan 2;10(1):40–67.
- 723 31. Moher D, Shamseer L, Clarke M, Ghersi D, Liberati A, Petticrew M, et al. Preferred
724 reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015
725 statement. *Systematic Reviews*. 2015 Jan 1;4(1):1.
- 726 32. PROSPERO International Prospective Register of Systematic Reviews [Internet].
727 Animals in higher education settings: Do animal-assisted interventions improve
728 physiological and subjective health outcomes of students? [cited 2020 Nov 15].

- 729 Available from:
730 https://www.crd.york.ac.uk/prospero/display_record.php?RecordID=196283
- 731 33. WHO | Mental health: a state of well-being [Internet]. WHO. World Health
732 Organization; [cited 2020 May 30]. Available from:
733 http://origin.who.int/features/factfiles/mental_health/en/
- 734 34. APA. Stress effects on the body [Internet]. <https://www.apa.org>. [cited 2020 Nov 15].
735 Available from: <https://www.apa.org/topics/stress-body>
- 736 35. Henderson C, Clements S, Corney S, Humin Y, Karmas R. Cognitive functioning:
737 supporting people with mental health conditions [Internet]. Mental Health Coordinating
738 Council (MHCC); 2015. Available from: https://www.mhcc.org.au/wp-content/uploads/2018/05/2016.02.17._supporting_cognitive_functioning_mhcc_version__v._11_.pdf
- 741 36. Covidence - Better systematic review management [Internet]. [cited 2020 May 30].
742 Available from: <https://www.covidence.org/home>
- 743 37. Sterne JAC, Savović J, Page MJ, Elbers RG, Blencowe NS, Boutron I, et al. RoB 2: A
744 revised tool for assessing risk of bias in randomised trials. BMJ. 2019;366:l4898.
- 745 38. Cochrane Methods. RoB 2.0 Guidance document for Parallel Trials [Internet]. Google
746 Docs. [cited 2020 Dec 8]. Available from:
747 https://drive.google.com/file/d/19R9savfPdCHC8XLz2iiMvL_71lPJERWK/view?usp=embed_facebook
- 749 39. Cochrane Methods. RoB 2.0 Guidance Document for Crossover Trials [Internet].
750 Google Docs. [cited 2020 Dec 8]. Available from: https://drive.google.com/file/d/18Ek-uW8HYQsUja8Lakp1yOhoFk0EMfPO/view?usp=embed_facebook
- 752 40. RStudio Team. RStudio: Integrated Development Environment for R. RStudio
753 [Internet]. Boston, MA; 2020. Available from: <http://www.rstudio.com/>
- 754 41. Lüdecke D. esc: Effect Size Computation for Meta Analysis [Internet]. 2019 [cited 2021
755 Feb 25]. Available from: <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=esc>
- 756 42. Harrison S, Jones HE, Martin RM, Lewis SJ, Higgins JPT. The albatross plot: A novel
757 graphical tool for presenting results of diversely reported studies in a systematic review.
758 Research Synthesis Methods. 2017;8(3):281–9.
- 759 43. Crump C, Derting TL. Effects of Pet Therapy on the Psychological and Physiological
760 Stress Levels of First-Year Female Undergraduates. North American Journal of
761 Psychology. 2015 Sep;17(3):575–90.
- 762 44. Trammell JP. The effect of therapy dogs on exam stress and memory. Anthrozoös.
763 2017;30(4):607–21.
- 764 45. Gee NR, Reed T, Whiting A, Friedmann E, Snellgrove D, Sloman KA. Observing Live
765 Fish Improves Perceptions of Mood, Relaxation and Anxiety, But Does Not
766 Consistently Alter Heart Rate or Heart Rate Variability. International Journal of
767 Environmental Research and Public Health. 2019 Jan;16(17):3113.

- 768 46. Pendry P, Carr AM, Gee NR, Vandagriff JL. Randomized Trial Examining Effects of
769 Animal Assisted Intervention and Stress Related Symptoms on College Students'
770 Learning and Study Skills. *Int J Environ Res Public Health.* 2020;15(6).
- 771 47. Gee NR, Friedmann E, Stendahl M, Fisk A, Coglitore V. Heart rate variability during a
772 working memory task: Does touching a dog or person affect the response? *Anthrozoös.*
773 2014;27(4):513–28.
- 774 48. Stewart A, Strickland O. A Companion Animal in a Work Simulation: The Roles of
775 Task Difficulty and Prior Companion-Animal Guardianship in State Anxiety. *Society &*
776 *Animals.* 2013 Jan;1;21(3):249–65.
- 777 49. Hunt MG, Chizkov RR. Are Therapy Dogs Like Xanax? Does Animal-Assisted
778 Therapy Impact Processes Relevant to Cognitive Behavioral Psychotherapy?
779 *Anthrozoös.* 2014 Sep;1;27(3):457–69.
- 780 50. Charnetski CJ, Riggers S, Brennan FX. Effect of petting a dog on immune system
781 function. *Psychol Rep.* 2004 Dec;95(3 Pt 2):1087–91.
- 782 51. Straatman I, Hanson EKS, Endenburg N, Mol JA. The Influence of a Dog on Male
783 Students During a Stressor. *Anthrozoös.* 1997 Dec;2;10(4):191–7.
- 784 52. Wilson CC. Physiological responses of college students to a pet. *Journal of Nervous and*
785 *Mental Disease.* 1987;175(10):606–12.
- 786 53. Banks J, McCoy C, Trzcinski C. Examining the Impact of a Brief Human-Canine
787 Interaction on Stress and Attention. *Human-Animal Interaction Bulletin.* 2018 Jun
788 1;6(1):1–13.
- 789 54. Barker SB, Barker RT, McCain NL, Schubert CM. A Randomized Cross-over
790 Exploratory Study of the Effect of Visiting Therapy Dogs on College Student Stress
791 Before Final Exams. *Anthrozoös.* 2016 Jan;2;29(1):35–46.
- 792 55. Barker SB, Barker RT, McCain NL, Schubert CM. The Effect of a Canine-assisted
793 Activity on College Student Perceptions of Family Supports and Current Stressors.
794 *Anthrozoös.* 2017 Oct;2;30(4):595–606.
- 795 56. Capparelli AL, Miller QC, Wright DB, London K. Canine-Assisted Interviews Bolster
796 Informativeness for Negative Autobiographical Memories. *Psychol Rep.* 2020
797 Feb;123(1):159–78.
- 798 57. Crossman MK, Kazdin AE, Knudson K. Brief unstructured interaction with a dog
799 reduces distress. *Anthrozoös.* 2015;28(4):649–59.
- 800 58. Gee NR, Friedmann E, Coglitore V, Fisk A, Stendahl M. Does Physical Contact with a
801 Dog or Person Affect Performance of a Working Memory Task? *Anthrozoös.* 2015 Sep
802 2;28(3):483–500.
- 803 59. Hall D. Nursing Campus Therapy Dog: A Pilot Study. *Teaching and Learning in*
804 *Nursing.* 2018 Oct;1;13(4):202–6.

- 805 60. McDonald S, McDonald E, Roberts A. Effects of novel dog exposure on college
806 students' stress prior to examination. *North American Journal of Psychology*.
807 2017;19(2):477–84.
- 808 61. Pendry P, Kuzara S, Gee NR. Evaluation of Undergraduate Students' Responsiveness to
809 a 4-Week University-Based Animal-Assisted Stress Prevention Program. *Int J Environ*
810 *Res Public Health*. 2019 Sep 10;16(18).
- 811 62. Shearer A, Hunt M, Chowdhury M, Nicol L. Effects of a brief mindfulness meditation
812 intervention on student stress and heart rate variability. *International Journal of Stress*
813 *Management*. 2016;23(2):232–54.
- 814 63. Trammell J. Therapy Dogs Improve Student Affect but Not Memory. *Anthrozoös*. 2019
815 Sep 3;32:691–9.
- 816 64. Ward-Griffin E, Klaiber P, Collins HK, Owens RL, Coren S, Chen FS. Petting away
817 pre-exam stress: The effect of therapy dog sessions on student well-being. *Stress Health*.
818 2018 Aug;34(3):468–73.
- 819 65. Fiocco AJ, Hunse AM. The Buffer Effect of Therapy Dog Exposure on Stress
820 Reactivity in Undergraduate Students. *Int J Environ Res Public Health [Internet]*. 2017
821 Jul [cited 2020 Dec 15];14(7). Available from:
822 <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5551145/>
- 823 66. Binet J-T. The Effects of Group-Administered Canine Therapy on University Students'
824 Wellbeing: A Randomized Controlled Trial. *Anthrozoös*. 2017 Jul 3;30(3):397–414.
- 825 67. Gebhart V, Buchberger W, Klotz I, Neururer S, Rungg C, Tucek G, et al. Distraction-
826 focused interventions on examination stress in nursing students: Effects on
827 psychological stress and biomarker levels. A randomized controlled trial. *Int J Nurs*
828 *Pract*. 2020 Feb;26(1):e12788.
- 829 68. Grajfoner D, Harte E, Potter LM, McGuigan N. The Effect of Dog-Assisted Intervention
830 on Student Well-Being, Mood, and Anxiety. *Int J Environ Res Public Health [Internet]*.
831 2017 May [cited 2020 Dec 15];14(5). Available from:
832 <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5451934/>
- 833 69. González-Ramírez MT, Landaverde-Molina ÓD, Morales-Rodríguez D, Landero-
834 Hernández R. Taller de manejo de ansiedad a hablar en público con la participación de
835 perros de terapia. *Ansiedad y Estrés*. 2016 Jan 1;22(1):5–10.
- 836 70. Polheber JP, Matchock RL. The presence of a dog attenuates cortisol and heart rate in
837 the Trier Social Stress Test compared to human friends. *J Behav Med*. 2014
838 Oct;37(5):860–7.
- 839 71. Pendry P, Vandagriff JL. Animal Visitation Program (AVP) Reduces Cortisol Levels of
840 University Students: A Randomized Controlled Trial. *AERA Open*. 2019 Apr
841 1;5(2):2332858419852592.
- 842 72. Pendry P, Carr A, Roeter S, Vandagriff J. Experimental trial demonstrates effects of
843 animal-assisted stress prevention program on college students' positive and negative
844 emotion. 2018 Mar 1;81–97.

- 845 73. Pendry P, Vandagriff J, Carr A. Clinical depression moderates effects of animal-assisted
846 stress prevention program on college students' emotion. *Journal of Public Mental
847 Health*. 2019 May 31;18.
- 848 74. Kobayashi A, Yamaguchi Y, Ohtani N, Ohta M. The effects of touching and stroking a
849 cat on the inferior frontal gyrus in people. *Anthrozoös*. 2017;30(3):473–86.
- 850 75. Morrison M. Health Benefits of Animal-Assisted Interventions. *Complementary Health
851 Practice Review*. 2007 Jan 1;12:51–62.
- 852 76. Souter MA, Miller MD. Do animal-assisted activities effectively treat depression: a
853 meta-analysis [Internet]. Database of Abstracts of Reviews of Effects (DARE): Quality-
854 assessed Reviews [Internet]. Centre for Reviews and Dissemination (UK); 2007 [cited
855 2020 May 4]. Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK74080/>
- 856 77. Hillen N. Animal-assisted intervention on college campuses. *TCNJ Journal of Student
857 Scholarship*. 2020;22:11.
- 858 78. Stern C, Chur-Hansen A. Methodological Considerations in Designing and Evaluating
859 Animal-Assisted Interventions. *Animals*. 2013 Mar;3(1):127–41.
- 860 79. Serpell J, McCune S, Gee N, Griffin JA. Current challenges to research on animal-
861 assisted interventions. *Applied Developmental Science*. 2017 Jul 3;21(3):223–33.
- 862 80. Lundqvist M, Carlsson P, Sjödahl R, Theodorsson E, Levin L-Å. Patient benefit of dog-
863 assisted interventions in health care: a systematic review. *BMC Complement Altern
864 Med*. 2017 Jul 10;17(1):358.
- 865 81. Kelsey RM, Ornduff SR, Alpert BS. Reliability of cardiovascular reactivity to stress:
866 internal consistency. *Psychophysiology*. 2007 Mar;44(2):216–25.
- 867 82. Ein N, Li L, Vickers K. The effect of pet therapy on the physiological and subjective
868 stress response: A meta-analysis. *Stress and Health*. 2018 Jun 8;34.
- 869 83. Chu B, Marwaha K, Sanvictores T, Ayers D. Physiology, Stress Reaction. In: StatPearls
870 [Internet]. Treasure Island (FL): StatPearls Publishing; 2021 [cited 2021 Apr 21].
871 Available from: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK541120/>
- 872 84. Brelsford VL, Meints K, Gee NR, Pfeffer K. Animal-Assisted Interventions in the
873 Classroom—A Systematic Review. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* [Internet]. 2017 Jul
874 [cited 2020 May 4];14(7). Available from:
875 <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5551107/>
- 876 85. Custance D, Mayer J. Empathic-like responding by domestic dogs (*Canis familiaris*) to
877 distress in humans: an exploratory study. *Anim Cogn*. 2012 Sep 1;15(5):851–9.
- 878 86. Kazdin AE. Strategies to improve the evidence base of animal-assisted interventions.
879 *Applied Developmental Science*. 2017 Apr 3;21(2):150–64.
- 880 87. Borrego J, Rodríguez-Franco L, Perea-Mediavilla M, Blanco N, Tejada A, Blanco A.
881 Animal-assisted Interventions: Review of Current Status and Future Challenges.
882 *International Journal of Psychology and Psychological Therapy*. 2014 Mar 1;14:85–101.

- 883 88. Glenk LM. Current Perspectives on Therapy Dog Welfare in Animal-Assisted
884 Interventions. Animals. 2017 Feb;7(2):7.
- 885 89. Ferdowsian HR, Durham DL, Kimwele C, Kranendonk G, Otali E, Akugizibwe T, et al.
886 Signs of Mood and Anxiety Disorders in Chimpanzees. PLOS ONE. 2011 Jun
887 16;6(6):e19855.
- 888 90. PTSD in Dogs [Internet]. CVMBS News. 2010 [cited 2021 Apr 22]. Available from:
889 <https://vetmed.tamu.edu/news/pet-talk/ptsd-in-dogs/>
- 890 91. Son C, Hegde S, Smith A, Wang X, Sasangohar F. Effects of COVID-19 on College
891 Students' Mental Health in the United States: Interview Survey Study. J Med Internet
892 Res [Internet]. 2020 Sep 3 [cited 2021 Mar 9];22(9). Available from:
893 <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7473764/>
- 894 92. Cao W, Fang Z, Hou G, Han M, Xu X, Dong J, et al. The psychological impact of the
895 COVID-19 epidemic on college students in China. Psychiatry Research. 2020 May
896 1;287:112934.
- 897 93. Heckman S, Lim H, Montaldo C. Factors Related to Financial Stress among College
898 Students. Journal of Financial Therapy. 2014 Aug 1;5.
- 899 94. Hamaideh S. Stressors and Reactions to Stressors Among University Students. The
900 International journal of social psychiatry. 2011 Jan 20;57:69–80.

901

902 **Supporting information**

903 **S1 Table. Eligibility criteria.** ^aWe defined a parallel control group as a control group that
904 experienced the control condition at the same time as the intervention group experienced the
905 intervention condition. ^bWe defined randomization as true random allocation to either the
906 intervention and control groups, or in the case of crossover studies, to the order of
907 intervention and control groups.

908 **S2 File. Search strategy.**

909 **S2 Table. Overview of search results.**

910 **S3 File. List of extracted data items.**

911 **S4 Table. Calculations for meta-analysis.**

912 **S5 Table. Supplemental data extraction table.** n/s: not specified. ^aWhether the intervention

913 included a stressor (yes), no stressor (no) or took place shortly before exams. ^bWhether the
914 intervention took place in a group or individual format. ^cFrequency sessions: whether
915 sessions took place once (1) or more than once (>1).

916 **S6 Table. Quality assessment results for RCTs at the individual outcome level**

917 **(n(outcomes)=51).**

918 **S6 Figure. Overview of quality assessment results for RCTs (n(outcomes)=51).** Results in
919 %, absolute number of outcomes are inside the bars. Green corresponds to a rating of “low
920 risk”, yellow to “some concerns”, and red to “high risk”.

921 **S7 Table. Quality assessment results for crossover RCTs at the individual outcome level**

922 **(n(outcomes)=17).**

923 **S7 Figure. Overview of quality assessment results for crossover RCTs**
924 **(n(outcomes)=17).** Results in %, absolute number of outcomes are inside the bars. Green
925 corresponds to a rating of “low risk”, yellow to “some concerns”, and red to “high risk”.

926 **S8 Figure. Forest plot chronic self-perceived stress (n=3).** TE: Hedges' g. seTE: standard
927 error of Hedges' g. N(i): number of participants in intervention condition. N(c): number of
928 participants in control condition.

929 **S9 Figure. Albatross plot chronic self-perceived stress (n=4).**

930 **S10 Figure. Albatross plot chronic depression (n=2).**

931 **S11 Figure. Albatross plot arousal (n=4).**

932 **S12 Figure. Albatross plot happiness (n=3).**

933 **S13 Figure. Forest plot positive affect (n=3).** TE: Hedges' g. seTE: standard error of
934 Hedges' g. N(i): number of participants in intervention condition. N(c): number of
935 participants in control condition.

936 **S14 Figure. Albatross plot positive affect (n=3).**

937 **S15 Figure. Albatross plot heart rate variability (n=5).**

938 **S16 Figure. Albatross plot salivary cortisol (n=3).**

939 **S17 Figure. Forest plot blood pressure (n=3).** TE: Hedges' g. seTE: standard error of
940 Hedges' g. N(i): number of participants in intervention condition. N(c): number of
941 participants in control condition.


942 **S18 Figure. Albatross plot blood pressure (n=4).**


943 **S19 Figure. Albatross plot performance on a memory task (n=5).**


944 **S20 Figure. Funnel plot (n=11).**

945 **S21 Table. Completed PRISMA 2020 Checklist.**

946









Effect contours drawn using a ratio of group sizes (r) of 1.00		
Grouped by: Studyauthorsandyear		
SMD = ± 0.20	SMD = ± 0.50	SMD = ± 0.80
● Banks et al. (2018)	○ Crossman et al. (2015)	● Gebhart et al. (2018)
▲ Gee et al. (2019) - Experiment 2	△ Grajfer et al. (2017)	▲ Hall (2018)
■ Pendry et al. (2018)	□ Polheber & Matchock (2014)	■ Shearer et al. (2015)
△ Stewart & Strickland (2013)	● Wilson (1987)	


Effect contours drawn using a ratio of group sizes (r) of 1.00


Grouped by: Studyauthorsandyear



Effect contours drawn using a ratio of group sizes (r) of 1.00

Grouped by: Study authors and year





Effect contours drawn using a ratio of group sizes (r) of 1.00

Grouped by: Studyauthorsandyear

