Healthy Together: How Pets Can Help Us Move More, Feel Connected, and Live Well

Human Health Strategies® | Patient and family education

A dog waiting by the door can make a walk feel less like an assignment. A cat settling nearby can make a quiet evening feel less empty. Feeding a bird, maintaining an aquarium, or learning a rabbit's preferences can give the day a rhythm that matters to someone besides ourselves.

The pleasures are familiar; the health possibilities are worth exploring. A shared walk adds movement. A friendly greeting offers connection. Caring for another creature gives a day structure. Research has examined these experiences, sometimes finding measurable benefits and sometimes finding a more complicated picture. The encouraging part is that a relationship need not be a miracle treatment to make everyday life better.

The healthiest question is not "Which pet will fix my health?" It is "Could this relationship be good for both of us, given our actual lives?" Sometimes the answer is an enthusiastic yes. Sometimes it is a smaller commitment, a different species, or not now. All can be caring decisions.

A companion, not a replacement for care: Pets, service dogs, and animal-assisted programs do not replace medical assessment, prescribed medicines, psychotherapy, rehabilitation, or an emergency plan. This guide is educational, not individualized medical, veterinary, or legal advice.

Evidence Summary

• Movement is one of the clearest opportunities, especially with dogs. Dog owners often report more walking, but ownership does not guarantee exercise. Much of the evidence is observational, so healthier or more active people choosing dogs may explain part of the association. [1] [2]

• Brief animal contact can reduce a short-term stress measure. In a randomized study of 249 undergraduates, a 10-minute hands-on visit with cats and dogs produced lower post-session salivary cortisol than comparison conditions. That is not proof that owning a pet treats an anxiety disorder or prevents disease. [3]

• Social connection matters for health, but a pet is not a mortality intervention. Large observational reviews associate stronger human relationships with higher survival odds, and loneliness, isolation, and living alone with higher mortality odds. These are different measures, not a prediction for an individual or evidence that adopting an animal reverses the association. Pets may offer companionship and opportunities to meet people, but loneliness findings are mixed. [4] [5] [6]

• Depression deserves care, not a pet-only solution. A large cohort synthesis links diagnosed depression with higher mortality, with substantial variation between studies. Depression is treatable; an animal may support routines but cannot replace human support, psychotherapy, or medication when appropriate. [7] [8] [9]

• Purpose and routine are plausible, meaningful benefits—not guaranteed clinical outcomes. People living with mental-health problems describe animals as sources of emotional support, identity, and daily structure. The same research describes expense, responsibility, and distress after loss. [9]

• Cardiovascular findings are encouraging but inconsistent. Some studies associate ownership with better cardiovascular outcomes, while pooled findings differ by outcome, species, and adjustment. They do not establish a longevity guarantee. The American Heart Association advises against acquiring a pet primarily to reduce cardiovascular risk. [10] [11]

• Specialized assistance deserves specialized evidence. Service dogs perform disability-related tasks. PTSD findings include both encouraging nonrandomized results and a randomized comparison with emotional-support dogs that did not show superiority on its primary functioning and quality-of-life outcomes. Seizure response is different from dependable advance warning. [12] [13] [14] [15]

• Fit and safety determine whether the relationship can flourish. Allergies, falls, infection risk, cost, housing, caregiver backup, and animal welfare belong in the decision. There are no truly hypoallergenic dog or cat breeds, and reptiles or amphibians are not a simple allergy-safe substitute. [16] [17] [18]

1. What science can—and cannot—tell us

“Pets improve health” bundles together very different questions. Does living with a dog change walking? Does stroking an unfamiliar cat briefly affect stress? Does a trained dog help someone perform a disability-related task? Does a scheduled animal-assisted session help a person with dementia? These are different exposures, populations, and outcomes.

Pet ownership is an ongoing relationship involving care, money, household arrangements, and an animal’s changing needs. Animal-assisted interventions are organized activities or treatment-related sessions. Service-dog partnerships involve trained disability-related tasks. A result in one category cannot simply be transferred to another.

Observational studies compare people who already differ. Pet owners and nonowners may differ in income, housing, mobility, family support, access to green space, or prior health. Illness may prevent someone from keeping an animal; an active lifestyle may make dog ownership attractive. Researchers can adjust for measured differences, but adjustment cannot remove everything.

Randomized trials can strengthen causal conclusions, yet animal studies have practical limits. Participants generally know whether they are interacting with an animal, expectations may influence reports, and people who dislike or fear animals may not volunteer. A short laboratory effect may not survive the complications of daily life. Reviews repeatedly identify these limitations. [1] [19] [20]

This does not make a comforting relationship “just an anecdote.” Personal experience matters when deciding what enriches a life. It means we should distinguish a benefit someone genuinely experiences from a benefit everyone should expect. An animal does not have to lower a laboratory value to be loved.

There is also no sound basis here for a dose-response prescription: one pet good, three pets better. More animals mean more care, cost, space, and potential conflict. The goal is a sustainable relationship, not a collection with a health claim attached.

2. Dogs and movement: the walk is the active ingredient

For many people, a dog turns intention into action. A person can negotiate with an exercise app. Negotiations with a dog holding a leash tend to be shorter.

A review of dog ownership and physical activity found a generally favorable association, while emphasizing that the evidence was dominated by cross-sectional studies. Importantly, not every owner walked the dog. The household member who does the walking may receive a different benefit from the person whose main contribution is opening the treat cupboard. [1]

In a 2019 UK community study, researchers surveyed 191 dog-owning adults and 455 adults without dogs, plus children. Dog owners had higher adjusted odds of meeting the study’s physical-activity benchmark of 150 minutes weekly: odds ratio 4.10, with a 95% confidence interval of 2.05–8.19. That means approximately four times the odds, not four times the probability, and certainly not four times the fitness. Activity was mainly self-reported, with accelerometer validation in a small subset; this was not a trial assigning people dogs. [2]

The finding is useful because it identifies a practical opportunity, not a requirement to adopt. A dog can provide an external cue, an enjoyable destination, and accountability. But unsafe sidewalks, severe weather, pain, fatigue, fear of falls, or a dog that pulls can turn that opportunity into a problem.

Build a routine both bodies can manage

• Start with a duration and pace that fit your current health and the dog's age, fitness, and veterinary needs.

• If balance, breathlessness, a recent operation, or a heart or lung condition limits activity, ask your clinician about appropriate exercise and leash-handling arrangements.

• Use safe routes, suitable footwear, visibility in low light, and humane training that helps the dog walk without pulling.

• Let the dog sniff and explore. A satisfying dog walk is not always a continuous brisk human workout.

• If the dog needs more activity than you can provide, arrange reliable help rather than pushing either of you beyond safe limits.

These are practical planning suggestions, not a tested prescription for a specific step count. A slow sniffing walk may still offer fresh air, routine, and pleasure; someone seeking aerobic exercise may need additional activity. Conversely, a dog recovering from surgery does not become a fitness coach because its owner bought new shoes.

Hypothetical example: Someone who already has a suitable dog could add a short afternoon loop to an established morning routine and see whether energy, comfort, and consistency improve. Someone without a dog could try a walking group or an agreed walk with a neighbor's well-matched dog. The experiment is about making movement easier—not using adoption as an exercise compliance device.

Cats and other pets may encourage play and caretaking activity, but the dog-walking findings do not establish equivalent exercise benefits from cat, bird, or fish ownership.

3. Bonding and stress: small moments can count

Attention can narrow around illness, work, or worry. A calm interaction with an animal may briefly redirect it toward touch, breathing, play, or another creature's behavior. Many people recognize the experience; researchers have tested parts of it.

In a randomized trial, 249 undergraduates were assigned to one of four 10-minute conditions: petting cats and dogs, watching other people interact with them, viewing images of the same animals, or waiting. After accounting for waking cortisol, the waking-to-pretest cortisol slope, and hours awake, the hands-on group had lower posttest salivary cortisol than the comparison groups. [3]

This is stronger evidence for a short-term effect than asking pet owners whether their animals make them feel better. Its boundaries are equally important: the participants were students, the activity was a structured visit, the outcome was a stress-related hormone, and follow-up was short. It did not demonstrate lasting treatment of depression, generalized anxiety, insomnia, or high blood pressure.

NIH's overview describes research into human–animal interaction while emphasizing that findings are mixed and that different people may respond to different animals. A person frightened by dogs should not be expected to relax because an intervention is labeled therapeutic. [21]

Make bonding an invitation, not a demand

Learn the individual animal's preferences. Some enjoy stroking; others prefer play, training, quiet proximity, or simply watching the room from a safe perch. A cat sitting nearby may be offering exactly the amount of togetherness it wants. Accepting that arrangement is good diplomacy.

Do not force contact, wake an animal for comfort, or expect it to tolerate handling when it is trying to withdraw. Ask a veterinarian or qualified behavior professional about signs of fear, pain, or stress. Respecting an animal's boundaries protects both welfare and safety.

The bond itself is not a simple mental-health score. A 2025 systematic review found positive, negative, mixed, and null associations between attachment to pets and mental health. Much of the evidence was cross-sectional, so it could not determine direction: people experiencing greater distress may rely more strongly on their animals, rather than strong attachment causing distress. [22]

The humane interpretation is neither "attachment cures us" nor "loving a pet is unhealthy." It is that a loving relationship can coexist with illness, and people deserve support beyond what an animal can provide.

4. Connection, loneliness, and the social doorway

An animal can offer companionship without conversation. It can also start conversations that otherwise would not happen: a question about a dog's name, a shared laugh over a muddy paw, or advice exchanged about an aquarium.

In a survey across four cities in Australia and the United States, researchers found that companion animals could be a route to getting to know people, forming friendships, and receiving social support. These were reported associations, not proof that acquiring a pet creates a reliable support network. Still, the study supports a useful idea: animals can be social catalysts, not only companions. [23]

Loneliness is the felt gap between the relationships someone wants and has. Social isolation is limited contact or a small social network, whether or not it feels lonely. Living alone describes a household arrangement, not the quality of someone's relationships. Someone can have frequent conversations and still feel lonely; someone living alone can feel connected. Clinical depression is a health condition involving persistent low mood or loss of interest and other symptoms that interfere with life; it is not the same as having few contacts or a quiet evening. These experiences can overlap, but no single measure stands in for the others. [8]

The distinction matters beyond quality of life. A 2010 synthesis of 148 studies and 308,849 participants found that people with stronger social relationships had higher odds of survival (pooled odds ratio 1.50) than those with weaker relationships. This does not mean a 50% longer lifespan or that improving one person's social calendar will change their survival odds by that amount. A separate 2015 meta-analysis estimated adjusted odds of death, compared with relevant less-exposed groups, to be 26% higher with loneliness, 29% with social isolation, and 32% with living alone. These are odds, not absolute death rates or percentage-point increases; the exposures can overlap and the estimates should not be added. Differences in health and circumstances can persist despite statistical adjustment. Neither review tested pet adoption. [4] [5]

These findings are a reason to take unwanted disconnection seriously, not to fear every period of solitude. A headline comparing social disconnection with a number of cigarettes is not a measured dose equivalence, and it cannot tell us that a pet offsets smoking or any other mortality risk. Direct comparisons in two cohorts found smoking more strongly associated with overall and cancer mortality than loneliness or isolation, while isolation and smoking had more similar cardiovascular associations; those comparisons are observational too. [24]

A systematic review of 24 observational studies found inconsistent results for loneliness. Associations sometimes differed before and during the COVID-19 pandemic, and the review did not establish one universally superior pet species. The findings argue against promises that a pet will "cure loneliness." [6]

A smaller prospective study followed 71 adults in three groups for eight months. Seventeen acquired a dog; other participants delayed acquisition or did not intend to acquire one. Loneliness fell in the acquisition group, but the study did not show broad improvement across all mental-wellbeing measures. People chose their groups, and the acquisition group was small, so selection and uncertainty remain important. [25]

Let the relationship open outward

If it suits you and the animal, consider a humane training class, a familiar walking route, or a carefully chosen community activity. An accessible local or online animal-interest group, regular check-in with someone you trust, or an agreed walk with a friend can build human connection whether or not you own an animal. Keep existing friendships and healthcare appointments. A pet should not become the only reason someone sees daylight—or the only source of comfort available when life becomes difficult.

For people who cannot own an animal, suitable volunteering may combine human contact with animal-related purpose. Ask shelters about orientation, age requirements, lifting demands, infection precautions, and the emotional realities of the work. Not every role involves handling animals; laundry, administrative help, or fundraising may be valuable.

Volunteering is not a proven substitute for treatment or a guaranteed loneliness intervention. It is one possible way to connect while helping an organization meet real needs.

When low mood needs more than companionship

Depression is not a personal failing or an inevitable consequence of living alone. In a 2025 synthesis of 268 cohort-study publications, diagnosed depression was associated with greater all-cause mortality relative to no-depression or general-population comparison groups (pooled relative risk 2.10). In a different analysis matching people for medical comorbidities, the relative risk was 1.29. These are not sequential steps to subtract or combine: comparator groups and analyses differ. Study results varied greatly; illness, socioeconomic circumstances, and other unmeasured factors may contribute. The very large reported comparator total aggregates counts across studies, not necessarily unique individuals. Neither estimate predicts an individual's lifespan or tests the effect of acquiring a pet. [7]

Some treatment groups in that review also had lower observed death rates, but observational comparisons cannot show that antidepressants or other treatment caused a particular reduction in mortality. Psychotherapy, medication, or both can help treat depression; a clinician can discuss what fits. If low mood or loss of interest lasts about two weeks, or begins to interfere with functioning, reach out to a healthcare professional. Seek help sooner for severe or worsening symptoms—there is no need to wait two weeks in a crisis. Animal companionship, if welcome and sustainable, can sit alongside care, not replace it. [7] [8]

If someone is in suicidal crisis or emotional distress in the U.S., call or text 988 for immediate support. For immediate physical danger or a life-threatening emergency, call 911 or go to an emergency department. Outside the U.S., use local crisis and emergency services. This information is here so help is easy to find, not because loneliness means a person is suicidal. [26]

5. Caring for someone: routine, responsibility, and purpose

An animal needs breakfast whether the day feels promising or not. For some people, that is a burden; for others, it is a helpful point of orientation. Often it is both.

A systematic review of companion animals in the lives of people with mental-health problems described emotional support, companionship, distraction from symptoms, and help with identity and everyday routines. Quantitative findings were mixed. The review also documented practical burdens and the distress associated with losing an animal. [9]

This supports a careful account of purpose: being needed may make a day feel more structured or meaningful, but responsibility is not automatically therapeutic. A person with disabling fatigue, unstable housing, or a financial crisis may experience the same tasks as overwhelming.

Hypothetical example: Feeding an existing cat can become a cue to eat breakfast and begin a morning routine. That does not mean the cat should supervise medication, replace a reminder system, or become responsible for the owner's recovery. A useful cue remains useful only if someone can reliably meet the cat's needs too.

Older adults: preserve choice and plan backup

Longitudinal data from the Baltimore Longitudinal Study of Aging associated pet ownership with slower decline in several physical-function measures. Owners were younger and had fewer health conditions than nonowners, and the analysis could not eliminate every difference. Changes in leisure-time physical activity did not differ by ownership. This is promising observational evidence, not proof that pets prevent frailty. [27]

For an older adult considering an animal, discuss mobility, hearing and vision, falls, transportation to a veterinarian, daily care, and who would step in during hospitalization. Do not surprise someone with a pet "for their health." The intended companion should have a genuine say in the relationship.

When dementia is present, structured animal-assisted visits are a different proposition from placing full-time care demands on the person. A Cochrane review of nine randomized trials involving 305 participants found that animal-assisted therapy might slightly reduce depressive symptoms, with low-certainty evidence, but did not show clear improvement in quality of life. Adverse-event information was lacking. [20]

Enjoyment during a well-run visit may be worthwhile even when a broad clinical outcome does not improve. But the visit should be appropriate, supervised, and responsive to the person's and animal's comfort.

6. Children, cats, and other companions: there is no universal best pet

Children can practice gentle handling, noticing another creature's needs, and contributing to daily care. Reviews report some favorable associations between companion animals or child–animal bonds and outcomes such as empathy, social support, and self-esteem. They also report inconsistent findings and limitations that prevent confident causal claims. [19] [28]

A pet is therefore not a guaranteed lesson in responsibility, a treatment for developmental differences, or protection against mental illness. Adults remain responsible for the animal even when a child is enthusiastic. Children need supervision and instruction; an animal should have a safe place to retreat.

The best match is an individual animal in a particular household—not a ranking of species by health benefit.

Companion	Possible everyday opportunities	Important boundaries
Dog	Shared walks, training, play, neighborhood contact	Exercise and behavior needs vary greatly; leash pulling, barking, separation distress, and care demands matter.
Cat	Quiet companionship, interactive play, predictable care routines	Not every cat enjoys touch; allergy, scratches, litter hygiene, and adequate enrichment need attention.
Bird	Observation, responsive interaction, learning individual behaviors	Specialized housing, social needs, lifespan, noise, and infection precautions require preparation.
Fish	Observation and a regular care routine	Tanks require knowledgeable maintenance; aquarium water and equipment are not germ-free.
Rabbit or other small mammal	Gentle observation and species-appropriate interaction	Small size does not mean simple care, suitability for rough handling, or absence of allergens.

Reptile or amphibian	Fascinating observation for a suitable, informed household	Specialized husbandry and Salmonella risk make these inappropriate choices for some households.

This table describes practical possibilities, not equally proven medical effects. Most clinical and walking research concerns dogs; cats and other species should not receive borrowed evidence. CDC provides species-specific guidance for cats, birds, fish, and reptiles or amphibians, including infection precautions. [29] [30] [31] [18]

An aquarium may be absorbing and beautiful without being a validated treatment. A bird may be a cherished companion without making a home quiet. A cat may support a daily routine while maintaining a vigorous personal objection to your chosen schedule.

7. Heart health: an encouraging association, not a life-extension contract

There are plausible paths from a good pet relationship to cardiovascular wellbeing: more walking, less sedentary time, social connection, or brief reductions in stress. Plausibility, however, is not the same as demonstrating fewer heart attacks or longer life.

A systematic review and meta-analysis of 26 studies found some favorable cardiovascular associations, but results differed across outcomes and analyses. Adjusted cardiovascular mortality was lower among pet owners in pooled data, while the adjusted all-cause mortality result was not statistically significant and was very imprecise. Species-specific findings also differed. [10]

These inconsistencies matter. Different studies include different ages, illnesses, kinds of ownership, confounder adjustments, and follow-up periods. Pooling observational studies does not make their confounding disappear. A headline about survival should not become a promise to an individual deciding whether to adopt.

The American Heart Association’s scientific-statement summary says pet ownership, particularly dog ownership, may have a role in reducing cardiovascular risk, but advises against acquiring a pet primarily for that purpose. [11]

For someone who already enjoys a suitable animal relationship, it is reasonable to build on the behaviors it supports. Keep taking prescribed blood-pressure or cholesterol medication, follow recommended medical care, avoid smoking, and pursue appropriate physical activity. A wagging tail is an excellent greeting, not a replacement cardiology department.

8. Service dogs: important work, precise claims

Some dogs do much more than provide companionship. A guide dog can assist a person who is blind with way-finding. A hearing dog can alert a person who is deaf or has hearing loss to a person approaching or another relevant sound. Mobility-related tasks can include providing stability while walking, pulling a wheelchair, or retrieving a dropped or needed object. These concrete, trained actions can support practical independence in everyday life; they are not evidence that every partnership produces the same health outcome. [12] [32]

Under the U.S. Department of Justice rules for the Americans with Disabilities Act, a service animal is a dog individually trained to do disability-related work or tasks. Comfort alone does not meet that definition. A psychiatric service dog can qualify through trained tasks; an emotional-support animal does not gain ADA public-access rights simply because its presence is calming. Therapy animals visiting facilities have another role. Housing and other legal settings have separate rules. [12]

ADA guidance does not require professional training, an online registration, a vest, or certification. People with disabilities may train their own dogs. This legal point should not be confused with practical ease: developing and maintaining a safe, effective partnership takes work, resources, and an animal suited to the tasks and environment. [12]

The ADA regulations also contain a separate miniature-horse provision; they do not redefine miniature horses as service dogs. Covered entities must make reasonable policy modifications for a miniature horse individually trained to perform disability-related work or tasks where it can reasonably be accommodated. The assessment includes whether the horse is housebroken and under control, whether the facility can accommodate its type, size, and weight, and whether its presence would compromise legitimate safety requirements. [32]

PTSD: encouraging findings, but compare the right groups

A 2024 nonrandomized study of 156 veterans and military members compared a service-dog group with a wait-list group receiving usual care. At three months, the service-dog group had better PTSD-related outcomes, including clinician-rated symptoms. Allocation was not random, and differences between groups or expectations could contribute to the findings. This study was not an RCT and did not establish a cure. [13]

A separate VA randomized trial compared service dogs with emotional-support dogs, not with no dog. It found no significant between-group difference in its primary outcomes of overall functioning and quality of life. The service-dog group had greater improvement in PTSD symptoms and better antidepressant adherence on secondary outcomes. Participants could not be blinded, and without a no-dog group the study could not isolate the effect of receiving either kind of dog versus usual care alone. [14]

Together, these studies support considering trained partnerships as possible complements for selected people—not replacing trauma-focused treatment, medication when appropriate, or crisis services.

Seizures: response is not the same as prediction

A seizure-response dog performs actions during or after a seizure, such as obtaining help or activating a trained assistance response. A seizure-alert claim concerns warning before onset. Some owners report advance-warning behavior, but a scoping review found the evidence sparse and methodologically weak. It did not establish dependable real-world prediction, a standard warning time, or a reliable training method for every dog. [15]

Newer evidence deserves attention without erasing that distinction. The Dutch EPISODE study used a stepped-wedge randomized design in which adults with severe treatment-resistant epilepsy received seizure dogs in randomized sequence. Data came from 25 participants, with 20 crossing into the intervention condition. The study reported improved diary-based seizure frequency and some quality-of-life outcomes, but no effect on its seizure-severity measure. Its small size, unblinded participation, and diary outcomes limit certainty. It was not a validation study proving reliable advance prediction. [33]

Someone considering such a partnership should involve their epilepsy team, maintain medicines and their seizure action plan, and ask the program exactly which tasks are trained and how performance is evaluated. A shelter dog that is affectionate or attentive is not automatically a seizure-alert dog. Neither a spontaneous behavior nor a marketing claim justifies relaxing ordinary safety precautions.

9. Healthier together means safer together

Allergies and asthma

Pet allergy generally involves proteins in skin flakes, saliva, or urine, rather than hair itself. Fur can also carry other allergens. There are no truly hypoallergenic dog or cat breeds; low shedding and short hair do not guarantee safety. [16]

Before adopting, someone with allergy symptoms or asthma should discuss the situation with an allergist or other clinician rather than relying on a breed label or one symptom-free visit. Pet allergens spread on clothing and furnishings and may persist after an animal leaves. Exposure-reduction measures can help some households, but do not make a pet allergen-free. [34]

Depending on the clinical situation, measures may include keeping the animal out of the bedroom, reducing allergen-trapping furnishings, appropriate filtration and cleaning, and prescribed treatment. Do not stop asthma medication because a pet seems well tolerated. Significant wheezing or breathing difficulty needs medical attention.

Reptiles and amphibians are not a simple workaround

These animals can carry Salmonella while looking clean and healthy. Their habitats, water, equipment, food, and surrounding surfaces can become contaminated; direct handling is not the only exposure route.

CDC does not recommend reptiles or amphibians for children under five, adults 65 and older, or people with weakened immune systems. Young children should not handle them or their environments. Keep animals and supplies away from kitchens and food areas, wash hands after contact, and follow CDC's habitat-cleaning precautions. Do not kiss or snuggle them. Hygiene reduces risk; it cannot certify a household or animal as Salmonella-free. [18]

Replacing fur with scales does not remove the need for an individualized safety assessment.

Germs, bites, scratches, and falls

Regular veterinary care, appropriate vaccination and parasite prevention, handwashing, safe food handling, and prompt cleanup of waste help protect both species. People who are pregnant, immunocompromised, or otherwise at higher risk should ask their clinical team about species-specific precautions. Cat-litter and soil exposure need particular discussion in pregnancy. [17] [29]

Avoid rough play and supervise children. Respect an animal eating, resting, or trying to escape attention. Wash bites or scratches promptly and seek medical advice for significant wounds, possible rabies exposure, worsening redness or swelling, or if immune suppression increases risk. [29]

Falls are another real issue. CDC surveillance documented injuries involving tripping over animals or their equipment and other pet-related circumstances. Those data are historical, not a current personal risk estimate, but they support practical prevention: clear pathways, good lighting, sensible placement of bowls and beds, and help with a dog whose strength exceeds yours. [35]

Money, sleep, and grief count too

Budget for food, preventive and urgent veterinary care, supplies, training, boarding, transportation, and aging-related needs. Consider nighttime disruption and the effects of illness or difficult behavior. An animal's needs may increase precisely when a human caregiver's health becomes less predictable.

Bereavement after an animal dies can be profound. The mental-health review describes both the support animals provide and the distress of loss. Grief deserves compassion, not "it was only a pet." Human support, counseling when needed, and a thoughtful end-of-life plan can help; immediate replacement is not an obligation. [9]

10. Adoption, alternatives, and the animal's side of the bargain

A shelter or rescue can be a wonderful place to begin a relationship. Go curious: the right companion may not be the size, age, or species you first imagined. Adoption means choosing to care for an animal whose needs fit your household; the possibility of more movement, companionship, and shared enjoyment is a lovely reason to explore that choice, without expecting a medical result.

Ask what staff know about health, behavior, handling preferences, exercise, compatibility with children or other animals, and time alone. Ask what remains unknown. Behavior in a shelter may not fully predict behavior at home, and no responsible placement can guarantee a health outcome for the adopter.

Plan a calm transition, veterinary follow-up, appropriate enrichment, and humane support if problems arise. A quiet adult animal may fit some households better than a puppy or kitten, but age alone does not establish temperament or care needs. Let the individual animal—not an appealing photograph or a health headline—guide the conversation.

The animal's benefit is not a footnote. Secure shelter, suitable food, veterinary care, opportunities for species-appropriate behavior, and freedom from frightening or forced interaction are part of the relationship. An animal should not have to remain distressed so that someone can call the arrangement therapeutic.

If ownership is not right, consider occasional contact with a familiar animal, a reputable supervised visiting program, or a shelter role that matches your abilities. Fostering may be worthwhile, but it is real caregiving, not a commitment-free trial: ask about medical responsibilities, costs, behavior support, duration, and what happens if the placement becomes unsuitable.

Walking someone else's dog requires permission, suitable handling skills, and a clear emergency plan. Allergy or infection risks may still apply to visiting, volunteering, or fostering. Sometimes the best alternative is an activity without animals: a walking partner, gardening group, creative project, or regular social visit.

11. Frequently asked questions

Will getting a pet improve my depression or anxiety?

It might add comfort, routine, activity, or connection, but ownership is not a proven treatment for clinical depression or anxiety. A review of pet ownership and depression found no significant overall association, and responsibilities can also increase stress. Continue care with a clinician, including psychotherapy or medication when appropriate; if low mood or loss of interest persists for about two weeks or interferes with daily life, ask for help sooner rather than waiting if symptoms are severe. Consider whether the animal's needs remain manageable on difficult days. [36] [8] [9]

Do the social-connection survival statistics mean adopting a pet will help me live longer?

No. The 2010 finding is about odds of survival among people with stronger versus weaker social relationships, not years added to life. The 2015 loneliness, isolation, and living-alone estimates are adjusted odds of death in observational cohorts, not a pet prescription. Pet companionship and walks may enrich life, but studies have not shown that getting a pet reverses these population associations or prevents premature death. Consider human relationships and professional support alongside a pet, and adopt only if you can meet its needs. [4] [5] [6]

Is a dog healthier than a cat?

Dogs have the clearest direct connection to shared walking. That does not make them universally better companions or prove superior overall mental-health effects. Species comparisons are limited and inconsistent; individual fit matters more than a health ranking. [1] [6]

If one pet helps, would two help more?

There is no established health dose-response in the evidence reviewed here. A second animal introduces additional costs, care, and compatibility questions. Decide on welfare and capacity, not the idea of doubling a therapeutic effect.

Can I buy a certificate that makes my pet a service animal?

No. Under ADA guidance, a certificate does not substitute for disability-related task training. Emotional support alone is not an ADA service-animal task. Other laws may apply differently, so use the guidance relevant to the setting. [12]

Can an ordinary dog learn to predict seizures?

Reliable advance prediction is not something this evidence allows anyone to promise. Some dogs show reported warning behavior; response tasks are a separate issue. Discuss your actual safety needs with your clinical team and carefully evaluate any program's claims. [15] [33]

Should we get a pet to teach our child responsibility?

Only if adults want and can sustain the full responsibility themselves. Children can participate in age-appropriate, supervised care, but developmental benefits are not guaranteed and the animal's welfare cannot depend on a child remaining enthusiastic. [19] [28]

What if I love animals but cannot safely have one?

Not owning an animal is not a health failure. Depending on your circumstances, safe occasional contact, a nonhandling volunteer role, or an entirely different source of movement and connection may be better. Avoid exposures your clinician advises against.

12. Before the shelter visit: a warm, honest readiness checklist

This is not a test of whether you deserve an animal. It is a way to give a possible friendship a fair beginning.

• I want the relationship, not a promised medical result. I would value this animal even if my symptoms or test results did not change.

• Everyone affected has a voice. Household members agree, children will be supervised, and existing animals' needs have been considered.

• Our home can legally and practically accommodate the animal. Housing rules, space, noise, safe access, and escape prevention are addressed.

• We have discussed relevant health risks. Allergies, asthma, immune suppression, pregnancy-related precautions, falls, and species-specific concerns are not being left to chance.

• Our ordinary schedule works. Feeding, toileting, exercise, enrichment, cleaning, and companionship fit real weekdays—not only ideal weekends.

• We can meet the costs. There is a realistic plan for preventive care, emergencies, and increasing needs with age.

• There is dependable backup. Someone has agreed to help during travel, illness, hospitalization, or a change in mobility.

• We will ask detailed questions and accept uncertainty. We are willing to wait for a better match rather than make a rushed choice.

• We can respect this animal's individuality. Affection will not be forced; training and support will be humane.

• We have room for a lifelong commitment—and permission to pause. If now is not right, we can still help animals in another way.

A shelter-visit "prescription"—for consideration, not medical treatment

Start with a conversation. Tell shelter staff about your real schedule, health needs, home, and experience—not the idealized version in which you suddenly become a dawn jogger.

Ask for a thoughtful match. Meet suitable animals, learn their needs, and take the time the shelter recommends. Bring the household into the decision; affection is a wonderful start, but a workable care plan helps it last.

Plan something to enjoy together. Depending on the animal, that might be a comfortable walk, gentle play, training, or quiet companionship. Leave room for the animal to have preferences too.

Continue with kindness, curiosity, and backup. Keep your own healthcare on track, arrange veterinary care, and ask for help when either of you needs it.

A good match can make life more active, more connected, and more enjoyable. It can also give an animal safety, care, and a place to belong. If the checklist fits, a visit to your local shelter could be the beginning of something genuinely good for both of you. You may go looking for a companion and discover a new favorite part of your day.

About the evidence and source access

This guide uses selected primary studies, systematic reviews, and government or specialist guidance; it is not an exhaustive systematic review. Most ownership and mortality evidence is observational, and findings should not be generalized across species, settings, or medical conditions without support. Where original PubMed Central pages returned access challenges, substantive article text was retrieved through Europe PMC. Some long article captures are partial; the cardiovascular meta-analysis and dog-walking review were assessed from accessible abstracts, and the VA randomized PTSD comparison from its official research brief. The 2015 social-isolation publisher abstract supports the reported odds ratios but not an independently verified participant count here. Those limits are recorded in the source registry. No blocked page is treated as evidence.

Sources

1. Dog Ownership and Physical Activity: A Review of the Evidence.

Journal of Physical Activity and Health / Purdue University repository | 2013 | systematic evidence review; repository abstract

https://docs.lib.purdue.edu/nursingpubs/9/

2. Dog owners are more likely to meet physical activity guidelines than people without a dog: An investigation of the association between dog ownership and physical activity levels in a UK community

Scientific Reports | 2019-04-18 | cross-sectional community study

https://www.nature.com/articles/s41598-019-41254-6

3. Animal Visitation Program (AVP) Reduces Cortisol Levels of University Students: A Randomized Controlled Trial

AERA Open | 2019 | randomized controlled trial

https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/2332858419852592

4. Social Relationships and Mortality Risk: A Meta-analytic Review

PLOS Medicine | 2010-07-27 | meta-analysis of observational studies

https://journals.plos.org/plosmedicine/article?id=10.1371/journal.pmed.1000316

5. Loneliness and Social Isolation as Risk Factors for Mortality: A Meta-Analytic Review

Perspectives on Psychological Science | 2015 | meta-analysis; publisher abstract

https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1745691614568352

6. Pet ownership, loneliness, and social isolation: a systematic review

Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology | 2022 | systematic review of observational studies

https://europepmc.org/articles/PMC9272860

7. All-cause and cause-specific mortality in people with depression: a large-scale systematic review and meta-analysis

World Psychiatry | 2025-09-15 | meta-analysis of 268 cohort-study publications

https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/wps.21354

8. Depression

National Institute of Mental Health | undated | government patient guidance

https://www.nimh.nih.gov/health/publications/depression

9. The power of support from companion animals for people living with mental health problems: a systematic review and narrative synthesis of the evidence

BMC Psychiatry | 2018 | systematic review and narrative synthesis

https://bmcpsychiatry.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12888-018-1613-2

10. Association between pet ownership and cardiovascular risks and mortality: a systematic review and meta-analysis

Blood Pressure Monitoring | 2019 | systematic review and meta-analysis; abstract

https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/31815850

11. Pet Ownership and Cardiovascular Risk: Top Things to Know

American Heart Association | 2013 | scientific-statement summary

https://professional.heart.org/en/science-news/pet-ownership-and-cardiovascular-risk/top-things-to-know

12. Frequently Asked Questions about Service Animals and the ADA

U.S. Department of Justice | 2020-02-28 | official legal guidance

https://www.ada.gov/resources/service-animals-faqs/

13. Service Dogs for Veterans and Military Members With Posttraumatic Stress Disorder: A Nonrandomized Controlled Trial

JAMA Network Open | 2024 | nonrandomized controlled trial

https://europepmc.org/articles/PMC11151141

14. No Differences in Overall Functioning and Quality of Life among Veterans with PTSD Receiving a Service vs. Emotional Support Dog, with both Providing Benefit

U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs HSR | 2023 | official research brief of randomized trial

https://www.hsrd.research.va.gov/research/citations/pubbriefs/articles.cfm?RecordID=1207

15. Dog alerting and/or responding to epileptic seizures: A scoping review

PLOS ONE | 2018 | scoping review

https://europepmc.org/articles/PMC6279040

16. Pet Allergy

American Academy of Allergy, Asthma & Immunology | undated | specialist patient guidance

https://www.aaaai.org/conditions-treatments/allergies/pet-allergy

17. Ways to Stay Healthy Around Animals

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention | 2026-05-04 | public-health guidance

https://www.cdc.gov/healthy-pets/about/index.html

18. Reptiles and Amphibians

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention | 2026-01-13 | public-health guidance

https://www.cdc.gov/healthy-pets/about/reptiles-and-amphibians.html

19. Companion Animals and Child/Adolescent Development: A Systematic Review of the Evidence

International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health | 2017 | systematic review

https://europepmc.org/articles/PMC5369070

20. Animal-assisted therapy for people with dementia

Cochrane | 2019 | systematic review of randomized trials

https://www.cochrane.org/evidence/CD013243animal-assisted-therapy-people-dementia

21. The Power of Pets

National Institutes of Health | 2018-02 | government health explainer

https://newsinhealth.nih.gov/2018/02/power-pets

22. The Relationship Between Attachment to Pets and Mental Health and Wellbeing: A Systematic Review

Animals | 2025 | systematic review

https://europepmc.org/articles/PMC12023967

23. The Pet Factor - Companion Animals as a Conduit for Getting to Know People, Friendship Formation and Social Support

PLOS ONE | 2015 | cross-sectional four-city survey

https://europepmc.org/articles/PMC4414420

24. Are a lack of social relationships and cigarette smoking really equally powerful predictors of mortality? Analyses of data from two cohort studies

Public Health in Practice | 2021 | observational two-cohort comparison

https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2666535221000653

25. Companion dog acquisition and mental well-being: a community-based three-arm controlled study

BMC Public Health | 2019 | nonrandomized prospective controlled study

https://europepmc.org/articles/PMC6829935

26. Help for Mental Illnesses

National Institute of Mental Health | undated | government help guidance

https://www.nimh.nih.gov/health/find-help

27. Pet Ownership and Maintenance of Physical Function in Older Adults—Evidence From the Baltimore Longitudinal Study of Aging (BLSA)

Innovation in Aging | 2022 | longitudinal observational study

https://europepmc.org/articles/PMC10006577

28. Children's bond with companion animals and associations with psychosocial health: A systematic review

Frontiers in Psychology | 2023 | systematic review

https://europepmc.org/articles/PMC10328088

29. Cats

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention | undated | public-health guidance

https://www.cdc.gov/healthy-pets/about/cats.html

30. Birds

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention | undated | public-health guidance

https://www.cdc.gov/healthy-pets/about/birds.html

31. Fish

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention | undated | public-health guidance

https://www.cdc.gov/healthy-pets/about/fish.html

32. ADA Requirements: Service Animals

U.S. Department of Justice | 2020-02-28 | official legal guidance

https://www.ada.gov/resources/service-animals-2010-requirements/

33. Effectiveness of Seizure Dogs for People With Severe Refractory Epilepsy: Results From the EPISODE Study

Neurology | 2024 | small stepped-wedge randomized trial

https://europepmc.org/articles/PMC11033982

34. Pet Allergens

National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences | undated | government health guidance

https://www.niehs.nih.gov/health/topics/agents/allergens/pets

35. Nonfatal Fall-Related Injuries Associated with Dogs and Cats — United States, 2001–2006

CDC MMWR | 2009-03-27 | emergency-department injury surveillance

https://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/preview/mmwrhtml/mm5811a1.htm

36. Pet ownership and risk of depression: a systematic review and meta-analysis

Annals of General Psychiatry | 2025-11-05 | systematic review and meta-analysis of observational studies

https://link.springer.com/article/10.1186/s12991-025-00600-x