

Supplementary Table S1. Quality and Bias Assessment Parameters for Included Studies.

Assessment Parameter	Score & Rating
Degree of Pertinence (Fitness)	<p>3: The study focuses on, and directly addresses, one or more of this review's focal chronic disease (i.e., CVD, T2D, or obesity), and clearly defines pet ownership. It further identifies participants and/or groups using established biomarkers or components of CVD, T2D, or obesity.</p> <p>2: The study focuses on, and directly addresses, one or more of this review's focal chronic disease (i.e., CVD, T2D, or obesity), and clearly defines pet ownership.</p> <p>1: The study directly addresses one or more of this review's focal chronic diseases (i.e., CVD, T2D, or obesity).</p>
Quality of outcomes	<p>3: The study's outcome measures appropriately identify and describe variables of interests; outcomes are clearly defined and were objectively obtained.</p> <p>2: The study's outcome measures appropriately identify and describe variables of interests; either outcomes are not clearly defined or were subjectively obtained (e.g., self-report).</p> <p>1: The study's outcome measures appropriately identify and describe variables of interests; the outcomes are not clearly defined and/or were subjectively obtained (e.g., self-report).</p>
Instrumentation Validity	<p>3: Study uses a previously validated instrument for data collection or study sources data from a previously conducted survey that used a validated survey instrument.</p> <p>2: Study uses elements from, or adapts, a validated instrument for data collection.</p> <p>1: Study uses an unvalidated instrument for data collection, or the author does not report whether or not the instrument has been validated.</p>
Degree of Generalizability	<p>3: Generalizable to the national population.</p> <p>2: Limited generalizability (i.e., generalizable to localized populations and/or population segments).</p> <p>1: Not generalizable.</p>
Summary score (sum of all scores)	<p>12: High quality</p> <p>8: Medium quality</p> <p>4: Lesser quality</p>

Supplementary Table S2. Studies (n=14) that Met All Inclusion Criteria.

Study	Purpose	Description	Measures	Outcomes
Cardiovascular Disease (CVD)				
Chowdhury et al., 2017 [20]	Assess the association of pet ownership, all-cause mortality, and cardiovascular mortality over a long-term follow-up (~11 years) among elderly hypertensive participants	<p>Country Australia: 5 states (family practice)</p> <p>Study design comparative outcome trial (subsample of Second Australian National Blood Pressure)</p> <p>Study sample 65-84 years old with treated hypertension N=4,039 (never owners=549, current owners=1,456, previous owners=2,034)</p> <p>Time period 1995-1997, mid-2000s</p>	<p>Independent variable pet-ownership: cat, dog, other</p> <p>Dependent variable all-cause mortality, CVD mortality</p> <p>CVD measures BMI ¹, SBP ², DBP ³, total cholesterol, HDL ⁴, LDL ⁵, eGFR ⁶, PA ⁷, ACE ⁸</p> <p>Pet ownership 5-item instrument: currently owned or had ever owned, type & number of pets, lived inside or outside home, walked dog (daily, most days, rarely or never)</p>	<p>All-cause mortality 16% reduction in previous owners, 11% reduction in current owners vs never-owners, p=.06</p> <p>CVD mortality 22% reduction in previous owners, 26% reduction in current owners vs never-owners, p=.05</p>

Ding et al., 2018 [21]	Examine the association of dog ownership with all-cause mortality and CVD mortality	Country England	Independent variable pet-ownership: dog	All-cause mortality hazard ratio=1.03, 95% confidence interval (CI)=0.98-1.09 (no significant association)
Dog ownership and mortality in England: a pooled analysis of six population-based cohorts		Study design multistage stratified probability design (Health Surveys for England)	Dependent variable all-cause mortality, CVD mortality	CVD mortality hazard ratio=1.07, 95% CI=0.96-1.18 (no significant association)
		Study sample ≥16 years old N=59,352 (dog owners=17,071, non-owners=42,281)	CVD measures diabetes mellitus, smoking status, alcohol consumption	
		Time period 1995, 1996, 1997, 2001, 2002, 2004	Pet ownership head of household asked: "Do you keep any household pets inside your house/flat?", type of pet	
Krittanawong et al., 2020 [22]	Assess the association between pet ownership (dog or cat) and CVD health in a heterogeneous population	Country USA	Independent variable pet-ownership: cat, dog	CAD ⁹ either dog or cat: odds ratio (OR)=0.97 (95% CI=0.72-1.29, p=0.82)
Pet ownership and cardiovascular health in the U.S. general population		Study design longitudinal prospective (National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey [NHANES])	Dependent variable CAD ⁹ , heart failure, diabetes mellitus, stroke systemic hypertension	Heart failure either dog or cat: OR=1.05 (95% CI=0.77-1.43, p=0.73)
		Study sample N=10,905 (dog owners=4,577, cat owners=6,328)	CVD measures SBP ² , DBP ³ , total cholesterol, HDL ⁴ , LDL ⁵ , TG ¹⁰ , hyperlipidemia, Framingham risk score, cigarette smoking	Diabetes mellitus either dog or cat: OR=0.87 (95% CI=0.74-1.03, p=0.08)
		Time period 1999-2016	Pet ownership 4 items: "Dog in house now. Dog in house, last 12 months. Cat in house now. Cat in house, last 12 months."	Stroke either dog or cat: OR=0.83 (95% CI=0.61-1.12, p=0.22)
				Systemic hypertension dog & cat: OR=0.69 (95% CI=0.54-0.89, p=0.01)

Mubanga et al., 2017 [23]	Assess the association of dog ownership with CVD and mortality in a registered-based prospective nation-wide cohort with up to 12 years of follow-up	Country Sweden	Independent variable pet-ownership: dog	All-cause mortality (RTP) hazard ratio=0.80, 95% CI=0.79-0.82
Dog ownership and the risk of cardiovascular disease and death - a nationwide cohort study		Study design Longitudinal prospective (Register of the Total Population [RTP], Swedish Twin Registry [STR]: Screening Across the Lifespan Twin study)	Dependent variable all-cause mortality, acute MI ¹¹ , heart failure, ischemic stroke, hemorrhagic stroke, composite CVD incidents, CVD mortality	Acute MI ¹¹ mortality (RTP) hazard ratio=0.97, 95% CI=0.95-0.99
		Study sample 40-80 years RTP: N=3,432,153 STR: N= 34,202	CVD measures N/A ¹²	CVD mortality (RTP) hazard ratio=0.77, 95% CI=0.73-0.80
		Time period RTP: 1/1/2001-12/31/2012 STR: 1/1/2001-12/31/2014	Pet ownership registered or having a partner registered as a dog owner in either of two national dog registers	
Mubanga et al., 2019 [24]	Assess the association of dog ownership with survival and recurrent events after a major cardiovascular event in a large prospective, nationwide register-based cohort study	Country Sweden	Independent variable pet-ownership: dog	Acute MI ¹¹ mortality living alone: hazard ratio=0.67, 95% CI=0.61-0.75 living with partner/child: hazard ratio=0.85, 95% CI=0.80-0.90
Dog ownership and survival after a major cardiovascular event: a register-based prospective study		Study design Longitudinal prospective (Swedish National Patient Register)	Dependent variable acute MI ¹¹ , ischemic stroke	
		Study sample 40-85 years acute MI ¹¹ : n=181,696 (10,287 dog owners) ischemic stroke: n=154,617 (7,344 dog owners)	CVD measures use of medication for hypertension, dyslipidemia, diabetes mellitus	Ischemic stroke mortality living alone: hazard ratio=0.73, 95% CI=0.66-0.80 living with partner/child: hazard ratio=0.88, 95% CI=0.83-0.93
		Time period 1/1/2001-12/31/2012 no event 1999-2001	Pet ownership registered as a dog owner in either of two national dog registers	

Ogechi et al., 2016 [25]	Examine the association between pet ownership and CVD risk in people without established CVD	Country USA	Independent variable pet-ownership: cat, dog, other	CVD mortality hazard ratio=0.69, 95%, CI=0.45-1.07 among women (weak association – cat ownership)
Pet ownership and the risk of dying from cardiovascular disease among adults without major chronic medical conditions		Study design longitudinal prospective (NHANES III)	Dependent variable CVD mortality, acute ischemia, stroke, hypertension	
		Study sample ≥50 years without chronic disease diagnosis at baseline N=3,964	CVD measures PA ⁷ level, BMI ¹ , cigarette smoking, alcohol consumption	Stroke mortality hazard ratio=0.54, 95%, CI=0.28-1.01 among women (weak association – cat ownership)
		Time period 1988-1994, 2006	Pet ownership 2-part questionnaire: “Does a pet live here? If yes, what type of pet is it?”	
Parker et al., 2010 [26]	Re-examine findings from previous studies reporting an association between pet ownership and coronary artery disease survival at 12 months in patients hospitalized with acute coronary syndrome	Country Australia: Sydney (large teaching hospital) & surrounding districts	Independent variable pet-ownership: cat, dog, bird	Univariate analyses pet owners (those who had a household pet at baseline) were more likely to experience an ACS ¹³ readmission or cardiac-related death over 12 months (22.2%) than non-pet owners, 13.6%, X ² = 4.7, df=1, p=0.030
Survival following an acute coronary syndrome: a pet theory put to the test		Study design longitudinal prospective	Dependent variable ACS ¹³ readmission, CVD mortality	Multivariate analyses no difference in rates of ACS ¹³ readmission & cardiac death for dog owners (21.9%) vs non-dog-owners (16.3%, X ² =1.3, df=1, p= 0.249)
		Study sample patients hospitalized with ACS ¹³ , including MI ¹¹ & unstable angina N=424 (12 withdrew/unable to contact)	CVD measures diabetes on admission, CVA ¹⁴ or TIA ¹⁵ on admission, LVEF ¹⁶ , CABG ¹⁷ , post-ACS ¹³ onset depression	difference in rates of ACS readmission & cardiac death for cat owners (27.3%) vs non-cat owners (16.2%) approached significance (X ² =3.25, df=1, p= 0.071)
		Time period 2-year period	Pet ownership participants asked if they had a pet in their household, type of pet, whether that pet belonged to them	

Qureshi et al., 2009 [27]	Determine the effect of pet ownership on fatal cardiovascular events in a nationally representative cohort followed for mean period of 13.4±3.6 years	Country USA	Independent variable pet-ownership: cat, dog	MI mortality lower relative risk in previous cat owners than non-cat owners (RR=0.63, 95% CI=0.44-0.88)
Cat ownership and the risk of fatal cardiovascular diseases. Results from the second National Health and Nutrition Examination Study mortality follow-up study		Study design longitudinal prospective (NHANES II follow-up study)	Dependent variable all-cause mortality, MI mortality, CVD (MI or stroke) mortality, stroke	CVD mortality increased risk for death due to CVD in non-cat owners than cat owners (RR=0.74, 95% CI=0.55-1.0)
		Study sample 18-74 years old N=4,435	CVD measures SBP ² , serum cholesterol level, BMI ¹ , diabetes mellitus, cigarette smoking	
		Time period 1976-1980	Pet ownership owned or currently owned a cat or dog	
Ruzic et al., 2011 [28]	Determine the influence of regular (every day) dog-walking on the physical capacity in patients during the first year after myocardial infarction	Country Croatia	Independent variable dog-walking (3x15 minutes/day), walking (30 minutes/day)	Physical capacity maximal workload higher in the dog-walking group (72.5±10.75) than in non-dog walking group (67.6±11.6, p<0.05)
Regular dog-walking improves physical capacity in elderly patients after myocardial infarction		Study design longitudinal prospective & controlled	Dependent variable physical capacity from Bruce bicycle-ergometry test 1-year after MI ¹¹ (workload, heart rate, BP ¹⁸)	maximal heart rate and maximal BP not significantly different at the beginning or the end of the intervention for either group
		Study sample older adult patients who were hospitalized for MI ¹¹ N=59 males (owners=29, non-owners=30)	CVD measures workload, heart rate, BP ¹⁸	
		Time period 12 months	Pet ownership not described	

Xie et al., 2017 [29]	Assess the association between pet ownership and CAD ⁹ patients in a Chinese population	Country China	Independent variable pet-ownership: cat, dog	CAD ⁹ diagnosis decreased CAD ⁹ risk among pet owners (OR=0.504; 95% CI=0.310–0.819)
Association between pet ownership and coronary artery disease in a Chinese population		Study design retrospective	Dependent variable CAD ⁹ diagnosis (Judkins arteriography technique: stenosis of $\geq 50\%$ in any of major coronary arteries)	reduced CAD ⁹ risk among dog owners (OR=0.420, 95% CI=0.242–0.728) compared with cat owners (OR=0.738; 95% CI=0.240–2.266) & compared with cat & dog owners (OR=1.052; 95% CI=0.330–3.355)
		Study sample 30-89 years old, suffered from typical or atypical chest pain or abnormal ST segment, T wave changes, & admitted for coronary arteriography N=561 (males=376, females=185, CAD ⁹ patients=378, non-CAD ⁹ patients=183)	CVD measures BMI ¹ , hypertension, hyperlipidemia, PA ⁷ , diabetes mellitus, smoking status, drinking status, family history of CAD ⁹	duration of pet ownership is inversely related to CAD ⁹ risk (p for trend=0.008) & time playing with pets per day (p for trend=0.001)
		Time period October 2015-May 2016	Pet ownership questionnaire: current cat owner, current dog owner, current cat & dog owner, pet owners asked: <i>"How long have you kept pets? How long do you stay with your pets per day? When did you start to keep pets?"</i>	

Obesity				
Heuberger & Wakshlag, 2011 [30]	Examine differences in diet and lifestyle between cat and dog owners and their pets	Country USA	Independent variable pet ownership: cat, dog	BMI ¹ overweight (BMI>25 kg/m ²) in dog owners was inversely related to age of dog (p<0.01)
Characteristics of ageing pets and their owners: dogs v. cats		Study design cross-sectional	Dependent variable PA ⁷ (exercise), dietary intake, fast food consumption, BMI ¹ , health status	younger dog owners with obesity more likely to have a dog with overweight (p<0.04)
		Study sample >17 years old, pet owner N=473	Obesity measures BMI, health status (not described), dietary intake (not described), PA ⁷ (not described)	Dietary intake fast food consumption by dog owners was inversely related to age of dog (p<0.05)
		Time period not described	Pet ownership 1-page questionnaire	PA ⁷ exercise by dog owners was inversely related to age of dog (p<0.05)

Kushner et al., 2006 [31]	Assess the effectiveness of a combined people and pets (PP) weight loss program where both human participants and companion dogs were obese	Country USA	Independent variable pet-ownership: dog	BMI ¹ no significant difference in mean percentage weight loss at 12 months (LOCF) for dog owners vs non-owners
The PPET study: People and pets exercising together		Study design Prospective, controlled trial	Dependent variable BMI ¹ (weight loss), PA ⁷ , social support & exercise readiness scores, social support (qualitative)	PA ⁷ dog owners: mean total PA ⁷ increased 39% (2.8 hr/wk at baseline to 3.9 hrs/wk at 12 months, p<0.05)
		Study sample 21-65 years old with BMI>25kg/m ² in good health N=92	Obesity measures BMI ¹ , PA ⁷ (20-30 minutes/day) recorded in log, ~1400 calories/day recorded in log, social support & exercise readiness scores	non-owners: mean total PA ⁷ increased 87% (1.9 hr/wk at baseline to 3.5 hrs/wk, p<0.05)
		Time period 1-year	Pet ownership self-reported, confirmed in telephone screen	dog owners : two-thirds of total PA ⁷ spent with as dog- related activity
				Social support & exercise readiness scores No difference between dog owners & non-owners

Niese et al., 2021 [32]	Evaluate the potential mutual effects of a weight loss program for both dogs and owners on each other	Country Netherlands	Independent variable 1-day food diary, steps per day, lifestyle knowledge, attitudes, & beliefs, diet & physical activity behaviors	Weight loss 2.6% mean weight loss in owner-dog group vs 2.3% mean weight loss in owner only, $p>0.05$
Evaluating the potential benefit of a combined weight loss program in dogs and their owners		Study design 2 randomized clinical trials (human & dog) each with 2 arms (human clinical trial: owner-dog & owner only)	Dependent variable weight loss	
		Study sample adult with BMI \geq 25 and able to walk for at least 1 hour/day N=60 (owner-dog: n=29, owner only: n=31)	Obesity measures body weight, fat percentage, waist circumference	
		Time period 8 weeks	Pet ownership self-reported (not described)	

Stephens et al., 2012 [33]	Describe baseline characteristics of dog owners' physical health and their levels of pet attachment	Country USA	Independent variable BMI ¹ , perceived physical health	Perceived health BMI ¹ inversely correlated with perceived physical health ($r=-0.20$, $p=0.10$)
Health perceptions and levels of attachment: owners and pets exercising together	Owners & Pets Exercising Together (OPET) trial	Study design cross-sectional	Dependent variable PA ⁷ , stress, social support, level of attachment with dog	PA ⁷ no correlation between BMI ¹ and PA ⁷
		Study sample ≥18 years old able to engage in regular PA and owned a dog (at least 2 years old) N=75	Obesity measures BMI ¹ , PA ⁷ , stress, social support	perceived physical health correlated with PA ⁷ ($r=0.26$, $p=0.03$)
		Time period not described	Pet ownership self-reported (not described)	Stress no correlation between BMI ¹ and stress
				Social support BMI ¹ inversely correlated with social support ($r=-0.27$, $p=0.02$)
				Attachment with dog BMI ¹ correlated with attachment to dog ($r=0.29$, $p=0.03$)

¹ BMI: body mass index, ² SBP: systolic blood pressure, ³ DBP: diastolic blood pressure, ⁴ HDL: high-density lipoprotein cholesterol, ⁵ LDL: low-density lipoprotein cholesterol, ⁶ eGFR: kidney glomerular filtration rate, ⁷ PA: physical activity, ⁸ ACE: angiotensin converting enzyme inhibitor, ⁹ CAD: coronary artery disease, ¹⁰ TG: triglycerides, ¹¹ MI: myocardial infarction, ¹² N/A: not applicable, ¹³ ACS: acute coronary syndrome, ¹⁴ CVA: cerebrovascular accident, ¹⁵ TIA: transient ischemic attack, ¹⁶ LVEF: left ventricular ejection fraction, ¹⁷ CABG: coronary artery bypass graft, ¹⁸ BP: blood pressure