

INPLASY

Examining the relationship between Animal-friendly infrastructures and space, and health outcomes

INPLASY2024110002

doi: 10.37766/inplasy2024.11.0002

Received: 31 October 2024

Published: 1 November 2024

Bansal, P; Ru, SY; Parzniewski, S; Wu, HR.

Corresponding author:

Parth Bansal

parth.b@dal.ca

Author Affiliation:

Dalhousie University.

ADMINISTRATIVE INFORMATION

Support - This research is being supported by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, Knowledge Synthesis Grants (Award #872-2021-0016), Partnership Engage Grants (Award #892-2021-3013), Partnership Development Grants (Award #890-2023-0121), and Insight Development Grants (Award #430-2023-00749 and Award #430-2024-01020). This research was also undertaken, in part, thanks to funding from the Canada Research Chairs Program (Award # CRC-2020-00128).

Review Stage at time of this submission - Data extraction.

Conflicts of interest - None declared.

INPLASY registration number: INPLASY2024110002

Amendments - This protocol was registered with the International Platform of Registered Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis Protocols (INPLASY) on 1 November 2024 and was last updated on 1 November 2024.

INTRODUCTION

Review question / Objective What are the effects of animal friendly infrastructure and spaces on health and wellbeing of guardians and companion animals.

Condition being studied Health and wellbeing outcomes.

METHODS

Search strategy (Pet* OR Animal*) AND (friend* OR inclusive OR Assist* OR Support*) AND Space* OR Place* OR house* OR infrastructure* OR amenities* AND Health* OR wellness OR welfare OR well-being

Scopus, Web of Science, PubMed.

Participant or population Animal friendly infrastructure and spaces users.

Intervention Visitors or users of animal friendly infrastructure and spaces.

Comparator Visitors or users of generic spaces.

Study designs to be included PRISMA.

Eligibility criteria

Inclusion criteria:

1. Is in English.
2. Is published after 2015
3. Is research paper.
4. Discusses the presence of parks, infrastructure, any services, and its effect on pet/human/family/

neighborhood/an area's health of any form (physical/mental/social).

5. Discusses the presence of parks, infrastructure, any services, and its effect on the bond between pet-owner, owner-family members, community members, etc.

6. Discusses the nature/characteristics/design of parks, infrastructure, any services, and the presence or absence of pets, interaction between pets-owners, health outcomes.

7. Discusses the presence of pets in any setting other than pet owner's home and its effect on pet/human/family/neighborhood/an area's health of any form (physical/mental/social).

Information sources Scopus, Web of Science, PubMed.

Main outcome(s) Human or companion animal's physical health, mental health, or their indicators or precursors.

Data management COVIDENCE.

Quality assessment / Risk of bias analysis

During extraction, reviewer will make their subjective judgement on the quality. Author will report if any specific study is judged to be of low quality.

Strategy of data synthesis Assessment of effect sizes, effect significance, any moderators, interview fragments.

Subgroup analysis None.

Sensitivity analysis None.

Language restriction English.

Country(ies) involved Canada.

Keywords Animal-friendly infrastructure, dog parks, human health, companion animal health.

Contributions of each author

Author 1 - Parth Bansal.

Author 2 - Siyu Ru.

Author 3 - Szymon Parzniewski.

Author 4 - Haorui Wu.