



HAL
open science

Dog behaviours in veterinary consultations: Part 1. Effect of the owner's presence or absence

C. Girault, Nathalie Priymenko, M. Helsly, C. Durantou, F. Gaunet

► To cite this version:

C. Girault, Nathalie Priymenko, M. Helsly, C. Durantou, F. Gaunet. Dog behaviours in veterinary consultations: Part 1. Effect of the owner's presence or absence. *Veterinary Journal*, 2022, 280, 10.1016/j.tvjl.2022.105788 . hal-03601844

HAL Id: hal-03601844

<https://hal.inrae.fr/hal-03601844v1>

Submitted on 22 Jul 2024

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution - NonCommercial 4.0 International License

1 **Original Article**

2
3

4 **Dog behaviours in veterinary consultations: Part 1. Effect of the owner's presence or**
5 **absence**

6
7

8 C. Girault ^{a, *}, N. Priymenko ^b, M. Helsly ^a, C. Duranton ^{c, d}, F. Gaunet ^d

9

10 ^a *Ecole Nationale Vétérinaire de Toulouse, ENVT, 23 chemin des Capelles, BP 87614, 31076*
11 *Toulouse Cedex, France*

12 ^b *TOXALIM, Université de Toulouse, INRA, ENVT, 23 chemin des Capelles, BP 87614, 31076*
13 *Toulouse cedex, France*

14 ^c *AVA Association, Cuy-Saint-Fiacre, France*

15 ^d *Laboratoire de Psychologie Cognitive, AMU, CNRS, Fédération 3C Aix-Marseille Université,*
16 *UMR 7290, Marseille, France*

17

18

19

20

21 * Corresponding author. Tel.: +33 6 95 10 02 76.

22 *E-mail address:* ciska.girault@gmail.com (C. Girault).

23 **Abstract**

24 Veterinary practices can be stressful places for dogs. Decreasing stress during
25 veterinary consultations is therefore a major concern, since animal welfare matters both for
26 owners and veterinarians. Stress can be expressed through behaviour modifications;
27 monitoring canine behaviour is thus one way to assess stress levels. We also know that the
28 owner can affect dog behaviour in different ways. The aim of this study was therefore to
29 assess the effect of the presence of owners on the behaviour of their dogs in veterinary
30 consultations. We studied 25 dog-owner dyads at two standardised veterinary consultations,
31 conducted at intervals of 5-7 weeks; the owner was present for the first consultation and
32 absent for the second (O/NoO group, $n=12$), or vice versa (NoO/O group, $n=13$). A
33 consultation consisted in three phases: exploration, examination, greeting. Dog behaviours
34 were compared between the two conditions using a video recording.

35
36 Despite some limitations (e.g. no male owners, the exclusion of aggressive dogs, a
37 limited sample size, minimally invasive veterinary examinations, restricted owner-dog
38 interactions), our results showed that the presence or absence of the owner had no significant
39 effect on the stress-related behaviour of the dog or the veterinarian's ability to handle the
40 animal during the examination phase ($P > 0.05$). Nevertheless, the behaviour of the dogs
41 towards people was affected before, during, and after the veterinary examination. In the
42 presence of their owner, dogs were more willing to enter the consultation room ($P < 0.05$),
43 and they appeared more relaxed during the exploration phase ($P < 0.01$). During the
44 examination, dogs looked in direction of their owner in both situations (owner present and
45 behind the door, respectively; $P < 0.001$). These results suggest that allowing the owner to
46 stay in the room during veterinary consultations is a better option for canine welfare.

47

48 *Keywords:* Dog behaviour; Owner presence; Owner absence; Stress; Veterinary consultation

49 **Introduction**

50 Improving animal welfare during veterinary consultations is a key concern of
51 veterinarians, researchers and owners alike. Dogs frequently experience stress in these
52 situations (Lind, 2017; Edwards, 2019) which can be assessed by monitoring behaviour
53 (Beerda et al., 1997; Maximino et al., 2010; Koolhaas et al., 2011), e.g., when entering the
54 veterinary practice (Stanford, 1981; Mariti et al., 2017), during time spent in the waiting room
55 (Mariti et al., 2015; Csoltova et al., 2017; Mariti et al., 2017), and during the examination
56 itself (Döring et al., 2009; Mariti et al., 2017). In a study by Döring et al. (2009), 80% of dogs
57 showed stress-related behaviours on the examination table; 56.3% panted, 61.5% shivered,
58 and 71.9% displayed avoidance behaviour. Glardon et al. (2010) reported that approximately
59 25% of dogs could not be handled during the examination. Published studies have also
60 reported physiological signs of stress, such as increased plasma cortisol levels, pulse rates,
61 and blood pressure (Kallet et al., 1997; Vonderen et al., 1998).

62
63 Chronic stress can cause impaired welfare which can have negative effects on health,
64 potentially leading to reduced immune performance (Herbert and Cohen, 1993; Stowell et al.,
65 2001; Gimsa et al., 2018), increased rates of neoplasia (Riley, 1975; Dai et al., 2020), and
66 premature aging (Epel et al., 2004). Acute stress, as expected in veterinary consultations, can
67 lead to dysregulation of the autonomic response if the stress is extremely intense or recurrent
68 (Chrapusta et al., 1997; De Kloet et al., 2005; Vaessen et al., 2015). Stress also modifies the
69 behaviour of dogs and may increase aggression. When faced with a threatening situation,
70 dogs tend to react in three different ways: freeze; fight; and/or flight (Bracha, 2004). Canine
71 aggression is also dangerous for veterinarians and owners. In Australia, 48% of veterinarians
72 reported that they had been bitten by a dog at work between one and five times in the previous
73 12 months (Fritschi et al., 2006).

74

75 The ways in which dogs tend to react depends on their temperament (Goodloe and
76 Borchelt, 1998; Serpell and Hsu, 2001; Svartberg, 2002; Bray et al., 2017); coping style
77 (Koolhaas et al., 1999; Horváth et al., 2007; Diverio et al., 2017); genetics (Wilsson and
78 Sundgren, 1997; Saetre et al., 2006; Meyer et al., 2012; Arvelius et al., 2014; Persson et al.,
79 2015); and previous experiences (Seligman et al., 1979; Döring et al., 2009; Douglas et al.,
80 2012). According to Döring et al. (2009), even one past aversive experience increases stress-
81 related behaviour in dogs, thus modifying their behaviour at future visits to the veterinarian.

82

83 Many factors can be stressful for dogs in a veterinary practice (Edwards, 2019), such as
84 transportation between home and the practice (Beerda et al., 1997), the novel location (Beerda
85 et al., 1997), the ‘white coat effect’ (Kallet et al., 1997; Belew et al., 1999), the presence of
86 new people and animals (Scotney, 2010), and unusual sounds and activities (Beerda et al.,
87 1997; Wells et al., 2002). Even smells such as those released by stressed people and animals
88 can be stressful for dogs (Graham et al., 2005; Siniscalchi et al., 2011; Siniscalchi et al.,
89 2016). In addition, dogs can be fearful when entering a veterinary practice due to previous
90 experiences (Döring et al., 2009; Ziv, 2017). Veterinarians may also use gestures or postures
91 that are stressful for dogs (Mariti et al., 2017; Edwards, 2019), such as bending over them
92 (Vas et al., 2005; Györi et al., 2010; McGreevy et al., 2012), touching them (Payne et al.,
93 2015), placing them on the examination table (Döring et al., 2009). restraining them by force
94 (Beerda et al., 1997), holding their collar or closing their mouth (Kuhne et al., 2014), looking
95 at them directly in the eyes (Györi et al., 2010), or bringing their face close to the dog’s head
96 (Rezac et al., 2015). As a result, veterinary practices may be fearful places for dogs.

97

98 Other stressful factors can originate from the owner (Lind, 2017). Studies focused on
99 dog-owner attachment have shown that dogs can behave differently depending on whether
100 their owner is present or absent (Topál et al., 1998). In particular, when dogs are left in a
101 novel place without a familiar caregiver, they show higher activity (Tuber et al., 1996), higher
102 circulating glucocorticoid concentrations (Tuber et al., 1996; Palestini et al., 2005), higher
103 heart rates (Palestrini et al., 2005), and higher anxiety (Prato-Previde et al., 2003; Palestini et
104 al., 2005; Parthasarathy and Crowell-Davis, 2006), even if an unknown person is present
105 (Parthasarathy and Crowell-Davis, 2006). Miklosi et al. (2003) showed that dogs looked at
106 their owner when facing an unsolvable task, and Kerepesi et al. (2015) demonstrated that dogs
107 moved closer to their owner but not towards other individuals, even familiar ones, in
108 situations provoking anxiety or fear. Other studies have shown that dogs react in the same
109 way as their owner when confronted with a strange object (Merola et al., 2012) or an
110 unknown person (Duranton et al., 2016).

111

112 Owners can thus potentially modify the behaviour of their dog in a veterinary
113 consultation. This hypothesis has been observed anecdotally by veterinarians in the field.
114 Some believe that the very presence of owners can calm down their dog, whereas others
115 maintain that dogs are easier to handle in the absence of their owner. A study by Stellato et al.
116 (2020) investigated this question and reported positive effects of owner presence on
117 behavioural and physiological measures of fear in dogs during veterinary consultations.

118

119 In Part 1 of our study, we examined the effect of owner presence or absence on the
120 behaviours of dogs during a veterinary consultation, regardless of the owners' actions. Based
121 on the abovementioned literature, we expected the owner's presence to decrease stress-related
122 behaviours of dogs during the veterinary examination and hence facilitate their handling by

123 the veterinarian. In Part 2 of the study (Helsly et al., 2022), using the raw data from
124 consultations with the owner present, we explored whether owners' actions affected dog
125 behaviours by observing dog-owner dyads.

126

127 **Materials and methods**

128 *Participants*

129 All participants were volunteers and were recruited via social media. The owners (all
130 women) and dogs meeting the following criteria were selected: adult dogs between 12 months
131 and 10 years old and unfamiliar with the researchers, measuring less than 70 cm at the withers
132 in order to be easily lifted and examined on the table, in good general health, and
133 nonaggressive towards humans to avoid the use of a muzzle that could modify their
134 behaviour; owners not working as a veterinarian, assistant, or veterinary student. A total of 32
135 dog-owner dyads were recruited, but four dogs were excluded due to the owner's withdrawal
136 between the two appointments, another one due to aggressive behaviour and two due to
137 protocol deviation. Thus, the study finally included 25 owner-dog dyads. Participant
138 demographics are shown in Table 1.

139

140 *Experimental procedure*

141 The study protocol was approved by the Ethical Committee SSA (Science et Santé
142 Animale) Number115 (SSA_2018_008) on 18 July 2018. The experiment took place in an
143 examination room at the National Veterinary School of Toulouse (ENVT), France (Fig. 1).
144 All dogs underwent two videotaped veterinary consultations at an interval of 5-7 weeks
145 (Table 1), one in the presence of their owner and the other in their absence. Prior to each
146 consultation, all owners were told how to behave with their dogs. The veterinary consultations
147 were all carried out by the same two researchers: two female veterinary students, one in the

148 role of the veterinarian (C. G.) and the other in the role of the assistant (M. H.). During the
149 consultations, the researchers conducted the veterinary examination using as neutral a
150 disposition as possible: the researchers stayed still and did not talk to the dogs, pet them,
151 make eye contact with them, or punish them. The veterinary consultation was divided into
152 three main phases: phase 1: exploration; phase 2: examination; and phase 3: greeting. We
153 consider a ‘consultation’ to include all events between the times when the dog entered and
154 exited the examination room, whereas an ‘examination’ includes only the phase where the
155 dog was examined (see ‘Standardised protocol for the veterinary consultations’ below). Dogs
156 were randomly distributed into two groups using AB/BA crossover design: in the O/NoO
157 group ($n = 12$), the owner was present for the first veterinary consultation and absent for the
158 second, and vice versa in the NoO/O group ($n = 13$). Consultations were arranged by
159 appointment according to the availability of owners.

160

161 Raw data collected for this study was also used in Part 2 (Helsly et al., 2022). Part 2
162 focuses on data collected during consultations with the owner present. Four additional dogs
163 were included in Part 2 but not in Part 1 because these dyads did not attend the second
164 consultation with the owner absent.

165

166 *Data collection and analysis*

167 Consultations were videotaped from when the dog entered the consultation room until
168 the end of the greeting phase. We used two cameras (a Canon Legria HF S21 and a Panasonic
169 HC-WX970 with a Panasonic vW-W4907H wide-viewing angle) situated in two corners of
170 the room and facing the examination table. The recorded videos from the two cameras were
171 synchronised and assembled into a single video (Fig. 1).

172

173 The variables we studied, described below, differed depending on the phase of the
174 consultation. A summary of all studied variables and their availability for the three phases is
175 described in Supplementary Table S1 (see Appendix A: Supplementary material). Dog
176 behaviour was analysed using the Solomon Coder beta 17.03.22 program¹ and the behavioural
177 repertoire adapted from the literature (Beerda et al., 1998; Mills et al. 2006; Deldalle and
178 Gaunet, 2014; Csoltova et al., 2017, Table 2). Stress-related behaviours among these
179 behaviours are highlighted in Table 2. As the phase durations were variable, the durations of
180 behaviours were converted into a time percentage (behaviour duration/phase duration) for all
181 behaviours. Behavioural indices were further computed as detailed in Table 3. The Emotional
182 State of the dog is a subjective rate assessing stress, scored by using a three-point scale
183 defined as follows: relaxed, aroused, anxious, see definitions in Table 4. The dog's apparent
184 comfort when entering the room and the greeting intensity of the dogs towards their owner
185 and of owners towards dogs were evaluated using a five-point scale defined in Table 5. The
186 level of physical restraint was scored using a three-point scale defined as follows: low,
187 medium, high. All definitions are given in Table 6. The success and difficulty of the
188 manipulations were evaluated using a scale defined in Table 7.

189

190 *Standardised protocol for the veterinary consultations*

191 Owner: present condition

192 Exploration phase (phase 1): The owner entered the room with her dog on a leash and
193 sat on a chair (Fig. 2). The leash was dropped, and the dog explored the room freely for 2 min
194 30 s. Neither the owner or the researcher spontaneously interacted with the dog; the owner
195 could nevertheless respond to the dog's behaviour (physical, verbal and visual interactions

¹ See : Solomon Coder, András Péter, <https://solomoncoder.com> (Accessed 11 November, 2021).

196 were allowed). The researchers asked questions similar to those asked in a standard veterinary
197 consultation.

198

199 Examination phase (phase 2): The dog was put on the examination table by the
200 researchers; the owner stood one metre away from the table in a designated spot, facing the
201 dog. The veterinarian began a standardised veterinary examination following this predefined
202 sequence: examination of eyes, ears, teeth, gums, palpation of lymph nodes, examination of
203 scapular skin fold, abdominal palpation, heart and lung auscultation, measurement of rectal
204 temperature, and paw palpation. The assistant held the dog using a standardised restraint (Fig.
205 3): one hand on the chest and another on the base of the tail, using the minimal necessary
206 strength to keep the dog sitting or standing on the table. If a particular manipulation failed
207 because the dog was not cooperative for 5 s (for example, the dog struggled, resisted, or tried
208 to escape), the veterinarian did not repeat the manipulation and continued with the next one.
209 During the examination phase, the owner was only allowed to talk to or look at her dog
210 (verbal and visual interactions were allowed). If the dog showed any sign of aggression
211 toward the researchers or behaviour endangering them (for example, growling, showing teeth,
212 or trying to bite), the procedure was terminated, and the dog was excluded from the study.

213

214 Greeting phase (phase 3): This phase started when the dog was on the floor and the
215 owner in the room and lasted exactly 20 s. The dog was indeed taken down from the table by
216 the researchers, and the leash was given back to the owner. The researchers then stepped aside
217 and filled in forms in order to allow the owner and the dog to interact freely (physical, verbal
218 and visual interactions were allowed).

219

220 Owner: absent condition

221 The procedure was the same as with ‘Owner: present condition’, except that the owner
222 waited outside the room during the exploration and examination phases and only entered the
223 room for the greeting phase. During the exploration phase, the owner accompanied the dog to
224 the open door, gave the leash to the assistant and was free to interact with the dog in order to
225 encourage the dog to enter the room. The dog explored the room freely for 2 min 30 s while
226 still on the leash. During this phase, the researchers did not interact with the dog and spoke in
227 a neutral tone. The procedure of the examination phase was the same as described in ‘Owner:
228 present condition’. During the greeting phase, the dog was taken down from the table by the
229 researchers. Then, the assistant went outside to fetch the owner, and the leash was given back
230 to the owner when she came back in the room without specific instructions. The end of this
231 phase was the same as described in ‘Owner: present condition’ after having given the leash
232 back to the owner.

233

234 *Interobserver agreement*

235 Three assessors participated in the video analysis. The two researchers coded all the
236 behaviours in all the videos: half of the behaviours were coded by one researcher and the
237 other half by the second researcher. To assess the reproducibility of the behavioural analysis,
238 a third assessor who was unaware of the study hypotheses and aims coded 30% of the
239 behaviours in a random subset of 30% of the videos. Considering that a concordance, and not
240 only a correlation, was needed to assess the interobserver reproducibility, Lin’s concordance
241 correlation test was used (Lawrence et al., 1989; Barnhart et al., 2002; Barnhart et al., 2007).
242 Interobserver agreement between the two assessors was determined by calculating ρC values
243 and rated according to Landis and Koch (1977) ($\rho C = 0 - 0.2$: slight agreement, $\rho C = 0.21 -$
244 0.4 : fair agreement, $\rho C = 0.41 - 0.60$: moderate agreement, $\rho C = 0.61 - 0.8$: substantial
245 agreement, $\rho C > 0.81$: excellent agreement). Lin’s concordance correlation coefficients were

246 excellent ($\rho C > 0.98$) for whining, tail between the legs, and moving and gazing at the owner,
247 and substantial for contact with the assistant ($\rho C = 0.71$) and sniffing ($\rho C = 0.69$). Physical
248 restraint was evaluated by the assistant, the success and difficulty of the manipulations were
249 assessed by the veterinarian, and the other scores were rated by the three assessors.

250

251 *Statistical analysis*

252 The exploration, examination, and greeting phases were analysed separately.
253 Comparisons were carried out for each behaviour or behavioural index between the owner
254 absent and present conditions by paired Student's *t* test using R software².

255

256 **Results**

257 On average, the exploration phase lasted 155.43 ± 9.54 s and the examination phase
258 142.53 ± 16.4 s. The greeting phase, standardised in the study, lasted 20 s.

259

260 *Exploration phase (phase 1)*

261 Entering the room

262 Dogs appeared to enter the room more readily when the owner was present rather than
263 absent, and the difference was significant ($P < 0.05$, Table 8 and Video 1).

264

265 Emotional state

266 Dogs had a significantly lower score for emotional state during the exploration phase
267 when the owner was present rather than absent ($P < 0.05$, Table 8 and Video 2).

268

269 *Examination phase (phase 2)*

² See: The R Project for Statistical Computing. <http://www.r-project.org/h> (Accessed 11 November 2021)

270 Stress-related behaviour

271 No differences were observed regarding the stress-related behaviours or Total Stress
272 (defined in Table 3) during the examination phase in the presence or absence of the owners (P
273 > 0.05).

274

275 Behaviour towards the veterinarian and assistant

276 The dog contact with the veterinarian and/or assistant lasted significantly longer
277 during the examination phase if the owner was present rather than absent ($P < 0.001$, Table
278 9).

279

280 Behaviour towards the owner and/or door

281 During the examination phase, dogs looked straight ahead toward the assigned place
282 of the owner significantly more if the owner was present rather than absent. ($P < 0.001$, Table
283 9 and Video 3). Furthermore, dogs looked at the door significantly less when their owner was
284 present rather than absent ($P < 0.001$, Table 9 and Video 3).

285

286 Dog handling

287 No difference was observed regarding the restraint and the success and difficulty
288 scores of manipulations in the presence or absence of the owners ($P > 0.05$).

289

290 *Greeting phase (phase 3)*

291 Intensity of greeting

292 When the dog and owner were reunited after the examination phase, dogs greeted their
293 owners for a significantly shorter period of time ($P < 0.01$) and showed a lower reunion score
294 ($P < 0.0005$) if the owner was present rather than absent during the examination phase (Table

295 10 and Video 4). Nevertheless, the scores of owner behaviour towards their dog were similar
296 regardless of whether the owner was present or not in the previous phase ($P > 0.05$).

297

298 Door-directed gaze

299 There was not a statistically significant difference between whether owners were
300 present or absent regarding dogs gazing at the door ($P = 0.08$; Table 10 and Video 5).

301

302 **Discussion**

303 This experiment aimed to investigate whether the presence or absence of the dog owner
304 influenced canine behaviours in veterinary consultations. Our findings suggest that allowing
305 the owner to stay in the room during a veterinary consultations is a better option for the dog's
306 welfare. During the exploration phase, in the presence of their owner, dogs were more willing
307 to enter the consultation room and appeared more relaxed. During the examination phase,
308 dogs looked in direction of their owner when their owner was present (standing in front of the
309 dog); dogs looked straight ahead more often and at the door less often than when the owner
310 was absent. When the owner was absent during the examination phase (she had left the room
311 through the door), the dogs looked at the door more often and looked straight ahead less often
312 than when the owner was present. Physical contacts engaged by dogs with the researchers
313 lasted longer when their owners were present. Our results also indicated that the presence or
314 absence of the owner had no significant effect on the stress-related behaviour of the dog or the
315 veterinarian's ability to handle the animal during the examination phase. Finally, during the
316 greeting phase, our results showed that if the owner had never left the room, the dogs
317 exhibited less greeting behaviour than if the owner had been absent.

318

319 A study by Stellato et al. (2020) focused on the effect of the presence or absence of the
320 owner on dog behaviour in veterinary practices, comparing two standardised veterinary
321 consultations with owner present or absent. Dogs had a lower rate of vocalisation, higher rate
322 of yawning and lower mean axillary temperature in the presence of the owner. Thus, they
323 encouraged owners to remain with their dog during routine veterinary examinations. Note that
324 we did not find similar differences for vocalisation and yawning, but we did find significant
325 differences for other parameters. A study by Csoltova et al. (2017) focused on the active or
326 passive support of the owner during veterinary examinations. The authors compared
327 behavioural and physiological measures of dogs during a veterinary examination under two
328 conditions: the active presence of the owner (talking and petting), and the passive presence of
329 the owner (sitting quietly next to the examination table). They found heart rate and internal
330 temperature variations showing a beneficial effect of dog-owner interaction on the dogs' well-
331 being, but no significant behavioural changes. As mentioned in the Introduction, dog owners
332 can affect the behaviour of their dog. Studies have shown that dogs adjust their behaviour to
333 their owner's overall emotional body posture (Vas et al., 2005; Custance and Meyer 2012), to
334 the owner's behaviours (Millot, 1994; Merola et al., 2012; Horn et al., 2012; Duranton and
335 Gaunet, 2015); and to the owner's facial expressions (Deputte and Doll, 2011). Other studies
336 detailed in Part 2 of this study reported that physical contact did not have the same effect on
337 dog behaviour as talking (Helsly et al., 2022). The effect of the presence of the owner is thus
338 difficult to accurately predict, as it can depend on the owner's behaviour and mood.

339

340 In the present study, several factors could explain the absence of any significant
341 differences in stress-related behaviours during the examination phase. Firstly, physical contact
342 between the owners and dogs was not allowed during the examination phase, to control
343 parameters not being studied. Csoltova et al. (2017) showed a beneficial effect of contact

344 during veterinary examinations, although Part 2 of our study reported that talking and
345 physical contact did not have the same effect (Helsly et al., 2022). Our study also subjectively
346 evaluated stress (emotional state). This evaluation showed higher levels of stress during the
347 exploration phase (phase 1) when the owner was absent than when the owner was present. In
348 contrast, during the examination phase (phase 2), no difference was found in the subjective
349 evaluation by the judges (emotional state) or the video analyses (stress-related behaviours).
350 Firnkes et al. (2017) demonstrated that some stress-related behaviours ('licking of lips' and
351 'looking away') decrease even when the intensity of the stressor increases. We thus postulate
352 that the dogs reached a high threshold of stress in the 'Owner: absent condition' that
353 prevented them from displaying additional stress-related behaviours. Potentially, too many
354 stressors may mask the display of stress-related behaviour at some point. Alternatively, the
355 absence of any difference may show that dogs are not actually more stressed when the owner
356 is absent during a veterinary examination. In the examination phase, dogs engaged in more
357 physical contact with the researchers when their owner was present than when their owner
358 was absent. This engagement with researchers suggests that in an interventionist situation, if
359 we had imposed physical contact on the dogs to keep them on the table, the presence of the
360 owner would act as a social reference for the dog towards the veterinarian and assistant. That
361 is, the presence of the owner could help dogs to handle this difficulty. Even if no significant
362 differences were shown in terms of stress-related behaviours during examination phase, other
363 results suggest that the owner does play a role. For instance, dogs looked in the direction of
364 their owner whether they were present or absent. This also emphasizes the importance of the
365 owner's presence to help dogs cope with the situation (e.g. social referencing in Merola et al.,
366 2012; Duranton et al., 2016; Salamon et al., 2020; and also Part 2 of this review (Helsly et al.,
367 2022). Furthermore, greeting behaviours during the two reunion conditions differed. Once
368 dogs were placed back on the floor and the leash was given back to the owner, dogs showed

369 more greetings when the owner returned than if the owner had never left the room. This is in
370 accordance with studies reporting that greeting behaviour is more marked when dogs spend a
371 stressful time without their owner (Konok et al., 2011; Rehn and Keeling, 2011). In our study,
372 there was no significant difference in gazing at the door during the greeting phase when the
373 owner had come back compared to when the owner had never left. Dogs are known to look at
374 a desirable object (Gaunet, 2008; Gaunet, 2010; Gaunet and Deputte, 2011), and thus they
375 may have been more motivated to leave the room when their owner was absent, since the time
376 they spent in the room was more stressful, in accordance with the emotional state evaluation
377 during the exploration phase. Finally, the presence of the owner had no detrimental effect and
378 some beneficial effects on the dogs in our study. Dogs were neither more stressed or more
379 difficult to handle during examination phase and appeared less stressed during the exploration
380 phase. To summarise, the presence of owners appeared to be more beneficial than their
381 absence during veterinary examinations.

382

383 There were several limitations in this study. Our sample size was small, the veterinary
384 examination was minimally invasive; puppies, old dogs and dogs > 70cm high were not
385 included, and aggressive dogs were excluded from our study for safety reasons. Glardon et al.
386 (2010) estimated that 16% of dogs displayed aggressive behaviour during veterinary
387 examinations. If these dogs had been included in the study, the results may have been
388 different, since aggressive dogs can be less tolerant of manipulations. Additionally, the
389 manipulations used in this study were standard but minimally invasive. The dogs' tolerance of
390 manipulation could have changed if we had employed more invasive or painful procedures
391 (Holton et al., 2001; Hansen, 2003), and the presence or absence of the owner could have had
392 a different effect in these cases. Owner and researcher behaviour could also have differed
393 from a real-life scenario, as owners were not allowed to touch their dogs during the

394 examination phase, and researchers kept a neutral disposition and did not initiate interaction
395 toward dogs or respond to their requests for attention. The dogs in our study were healthy and
396 did not need any invasive manipulation. Owners may be more stressed in a real veterinary
397 examination and therefore have a different effect on dog behaviour than in the controlled
398 experimental conditions. While it has been shown that dogs react differently to men and
399 women (Hennessy et al., 1998; Wells and Hepper, 1999; Deputte and Doll, 2011), we were
400 not able to study the gender effects of owners and researchers on the behaviours of the dogs,
401 as both the owners and researchers were all women. In the present study, we focused on
402 canine behaviour, although physiological measures such as plasma or salivary cortisol, heart
403 rate, and infrared thermography can also be used. These measures could provide additional
404 information about the stress experienced by dogs during veterinary consultations and help
405 highlight the differences that cannot be observed by behaviour analysis alone, such as
406 behaviours with high interindividual variation (Firnkes et al., 2017). We thus encourage
407 further studies to focus on neurochemical and physiological differences in conjunction with
408 behavioural differences, to use a larger sample of dogs and to study the effect of owner
409 gender.

410

411 **Conclusions**

412 In summary, despite some limitations (e.g. no male owners, no dog > 70cm high, no old
413 dogs or puppies, no aggressive dogs, 25 dogs/dyad, minimally invasive examinations,
414 restricted owner-dog interactions), the current study shows that the presence of the owner in
415 veterinary consultations (constituted by exploration, examination and greeting phases) may
416 help to reduce the stress-related behaviours of dogs before veterinary examinations. During
417 examination phase, dogs looked at their owners and appear to seek social information from
418 owner, whereas when their owners were absent, they looked for them. Behaviours such as

419 greeting their owners and door-related behaviours suggest that even if no significant
420 differences were shown for stress-related behaviours in terms of the absence or presence of
421 owners, dogs were less stressed during examination phase when their owner was present.
422 Given these results, it seems more appropriate to allow owners to attend veterinary
423 examinations with their dog, as only positive effects were observed in terms of the dogs'
424 behaviour and well-being, in spite of the previously mentioned limitations.

425

426 **Conflict of interest statement**

427 None of the authors has any financial or personal relationships that could
428 inappropriately influence or bias the content of the paper.

429

430 **Acknowledgements**

431 We are grateful to Elodie Losserand who helped us during the study. We thank all the dog
432 owners who voluntarily participated in this study. We are also grateful to Caniplex, Bagat-en-
433 Quercy, France, for providing thank-you gifts to all the volunteers. Preliminary results were
434 presented during a confidential veterinary thesis defence at the Ecole Nationale Vétérinaire de
435 Toulouse on 13 December 2017.

436

437 **Supplementary material**

438 Supplementary data associated with this article can be found, in the online version, at
439 doi: ...

440

441 **References**

442 Arvelius, P., Asp, H.E., Fikse, W.F., Strandberg, E., Nilsson, K. 2014. Genetic analysis of a
443 temperament test as a tool to select against everyday life fearfulness in Rough Collie.
444 Journal of Animal Science 92, 4843-4855.

445

446 Barnhart, H.X., Haber, M., Song, J., 2002. Overall concordance correlation coefficient for
447 evaluating agreement among multiple observers. *Biometrics* 58, 1020–1027.
448

449 Barnhart, H.X., Haber, M.J., Lin, L.I., 2007. An overview on assessing agreement with
450 continuous measurements. *Journal of Biopharmaceutical Statistics* 17, 529–69.
451

452 Beerda, B., Schilder, M.B., Van Hooff, J.A., De Vries, H.W., 1997. Manifestations of chronic
453 and acute stress in dogs. *Applied Animal Behaviour Science* 52, 307–319.
454

455 Beerda, B., Schilder, M.B., Van Hooff, J.A., De Vries, H.W., Mol, J.A., 1998. Behavioural,
456 saliva cortisol and heart rate responses to different types of stimuli in dogs. *Applied*
457 *Animal Behaviour Science* 58, 365–381.
458

459 Belew, A.M., Barlett, T., Brown, S.A., 1999. Evaluation of the white-coat effect in cats.
460 *Journal of Veterinary Internal Medicine* 13, 134-142.
461

462 Bracha, H.S., 2004. Freeze, flight, fight, fright, faint: Adaptationist perspectives on the acute
463 stress response spectrum. *CNS Spectrums* 9, 679–685.
464

465 Bray, E.E., Sammel, M.D., Cheney, D.L., Serpell, J.A., Seyfarth, R.M. 2017. Effects of
466 maternal investment, temperament, and cognition on guide dog success. *Proceedings*
467 *of the National Academy of Sciences* 114, 9128-9133.
468

469 Chrapusta, S. J., Wyatt, R. J., Masserano, J. M., 1997. Effects of single and repeated
470 footshock on dopamine release and metabolism in the brains of Fischer rats. *Journal of*
471 *Neurochemistry* 68, 2024-2031.
472

473 Csoltova, E., Martineau, M., Boissy, A., Gilbert, C., 2017. Behavioral and physiological
474 reactions in dogs to a veterinary examination: Owner-dog interactions improve canine
475 well-being. *Physiology and Behavior* 177, 270–281.
476

477 Custance, D., Mayer, J., 2012. Empathic-like responding by domestic dogs (*Canis familiaris*)
478 to distress in humans: an exploratory study. *Animal Cognition* 15, 851-859.
479

480 Dai, S., Mo, Y., Wang, Y., Xiang, B., Liao, Q., Zhou, M., Zeng, Z., 2020. Chronic stress
481 promotes cancer development. *Frontiers in Oncology* 10, 1492.
482

483 De Kloet, E. R., Joëls, M., Holsboer, F., 2005. Stress and the brain: from adaptation to
484 disease. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience* 6, 463-475.
485

486 Deldalle, S., Gaunet, F., 2014. Effects of 2 training methods on stress-related behaviors of the
487 dog (*Canis familiaris*) and on the dog–owner relationship. *Journal of Veterinary*
488 *Behavior: Clinical Applications and Research* 9, 58–65.
489

490 Deputte, B.L., Doll, A., 2011. Do dogs understand human facial expressions? *Journal of*
491 *Veterinary Behavior: Clinical Applications and Research* 1, 78-79.
492

493 Diverio, S., Menchetti, L., Riggio, G., Azzari, C., Iaboni, M., Zasso, R., Santoro, M.M. 2017.
494 Dogs' coping styles and dog-handler relationships influence avalanche search team
495 performance. *Applied Animal Behaviour Science* 191, 67-77.
496

497 Döring, D., Roscher, A., Scheipl, F., Küchenhoff, H., Erhard, M.H., 2009. Fear-related
498 behaviour of dogs in veterinary practice. *The Veterinary Journal* 182, 38–43.
499

500 Douglas, C., Bateson, M., Walsh, C., Bédué, A., Edwards, S.A., 2012. Environmental
501 enrichment induces optimistic cognitive biases in pigs. *Applied Animal Behaviour*
502 *Science* 139, 65-73.
503

504 Duranton, C., Gaunet, F., 2015. *Canis sensitivus*: Affiliation and dogs' sensitivity to others'
505 behavior as the basis for synchronization with humans? *Journal of Veterinary*
506 *Behavior: Clinical Applications and Research* 10, 513–524.
507

508 Duranton, C., Bedossa, T., Gaunet, F., 2016. When facing an unfamiliar person, pet dogs
509 present social referencing based on their owners' direction of movement alone.
510 *Animal Behaviour* 113, 147-156.
511

512 Edwards, P.T., Smith, B.P., McArthur, M.L., Hazel, S.J., 2019. Fearful fido: Investigating
513 dog experience in the veterinary context in an effort to reduce distress. *Applied*
514 *Animal Behaviour Science* 213, 14-25.
515

516 Epel, E.S., Blackburn, E., Lin, J., Dhabhar, F.S., Adler, N.E., Morrow, J.D., Cawthon, R.M.,
517 2004. Accelerated telomere shortening in response to life stress. *Proceedings of the*
518 *National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 101, 17312–17315.
519

520 Firnkes, A., Bartels, A., Bidoli, E., Erhard, M., 2017. Appeasement signals used by dogs
521 during dog–human communication. *Journal of Veterinary Behavior: Clinical*
522 *Applications and Research* 19, 35–44.
523

524 Fritschi, L., Day, L., Shirangi, A., Robertson, I., Lucas, M., Vizard, A., 2006. Injury in
525 Australian veterinarians. *Occupational Medicine* 56, 199-203.
526

527 Gaunet, F., 2008. How do guide dogs of blind owners and pet dogs of sighted owners (*Canis*
528 *familiaris*) ask their owners for food? *Animal Cognition* 11, 475-483.
529

530 Gaunet, F., 2010. How do guide dogs and pet dogs (*Canis familiaris*) ask their owners for
531 their toy and for playing? *Animal Cognition* 13, 311-323.
532

533 Gaunet, F., Deputte, B. L., 2011. Functionally referential and intentional communication in
534 the domestic dog: effects of spatial and social contexts. *Animal Cognition* 14, 849-
535 860.
536

537 Gimsa, U., Tuchscherer, M., Kanitz, E., 2018. Psychosocial stress and immunity - what can
538 we learn from pig studies? *Frontiers in Behavioral Neuroscience* 12, 64.
539

540 Glardon, J., Hartnack, S., Horisberger, L., 2010. Analyse du comportement des chiens et des
541 chats pendant l'examen physique en cabinet vétérinaire. *Schweizer Archiv für*
542 *Tierheilkunde* 152, 69–75.
543

544 Godbout, M., Palestini, C., Beauchamp, G., Frank, D., 2007. Puppy behavior at the
545 veterinary clinic: A pilot study. *Journal of Veterinary Behavior: Clinical Applications*
546 *and Research* 2, 126–135.
547

548 Goodloe, L.P., Borchelt, P.L., 1998. Companion dog temperament traits. *Journal of Applied*
549 *Animal Welfare Science* 1, 303-338.
550

551 Graham, L., Wells, D L., Hepper, P.G., 2005. The influence of olfactory stimulation on the
552 behaviour of dogs housed in a rescue shelter. *Applied Animal Behaviour Science* 91,
553 143-153.
554

555 Györi, B., Gácsi, M., Miklósi, A., 2010. Friend or foe: Context dependent sensitivity to
556 human behaviour in dogs. *Applied Animal Behaviour Science* 128, 69–77.
557

558 Hansen, B.D., 2003. Assessment of pain in dogs: veterinary clinical studies. *Institute for*
559 *Laboratory Animal Research Journal* 44, 197–205.
560

561 Helsly, M., Priymenko, N., Girault, C., Duranton, C., Gaunet, F., 2022. Dog behaviours in
562 veterinary consultations: Part 2. The relationship between the behaviours of dogs and
563 owners. *The Veterinary Journal*, *In press*.
564

565 Hennessy, M.B., Williams, M.T., Miller, D.D., Douglas, C.W., Voith, V.L., 1998. Influence
566 of male and female petters on plasma cortisol and behaviour: can human interaction
567 reduce the stress of dogs in a public animal shelter? *Applied Animal Behaviour*
568 *Science* 61, 63-77.
569

570 Herbert, T.B., Cohen, S., 1993. Stress and immunity in humans: a meta-analytic review.
571 *Psychosomatic Medicine* 55, 364–379.
572

573 Holton, L., Pawson, P., Nolan, A., Reid, J., Scott, E.M., 2001. Development of a behaviour-
574 based scale to measure acute pain in dogs. *The Veterinary Record* 148, 525–531.
575

576 Horn, L., Virányi, Z., Miklósi, Á., Huber, L., Range, F., 2012. Domestic dogs (*Canis*
577 *familiaris*) flexibly adjust their human-directed behavior to the actions of their human
578 partners in a problem situation. *Animal Cognition* 15, 57-71.
579

580 Horváth, Z., Igyártó, B.Z., Magyar, A., Miklósi, Á. 2007. Three different coping styles in
581 police dogs exposed to a short-term challenge. *Hormones and Behavior* 52, 621-630.
582

583 Kallet, A.J., Cowgill, L.D. and Kass, P.H., 1997. Comparison of blood pressure
584 measurements obtained in dogs by use of indirect oscillometry in a veterinary clinic
585 versus at home. *Journal of the American Veterinary Medical Association* 210, 651–
586 654.
587

588 Kaminski, J., Neumann, M., Bräuer, J., Call, J., Tomasello, M., 2011. Dogs, *Canis familiaris*,
589 communicate with humans to request but not to inform. *Animal Behaviour* 82, 651–
590 658.

591

592 Kerepesi, A., Dóka, A., Miklósi, Á., 2015. Dogs and their human companions: the effect of
593 familiarity on dog–human interactions. *Behavioural Processes* 110, 27-36.

594

595 Konok, V., Dóka, A., Miklósi, A., 2011. The behavior of the domestic dog (*Canis familiaris*)
596 during separation from and reunion with the owner: A questionnaire and an
597 experimental study. *Applied Animal Behaviour Science* 135, 300–308.

598

599 Koolhaas, J.M., Korte, S.M., De Boer, S.F., Van Der Vegt, B.J., Van Reenen, C.G., Hopster,
600 H., De Jong I.C., Ruis M.A.W., Blokhuis, H.J., 1999. Coping styles in animals:
601 current status in behavior and stress-physiology. *Neuroscience and Biobehavioral*
602 *Reviews* 23, 925-935.

603

604 Koolhaas, J. M., Bartolomucci, A., Buwalda, B., de Boer, S. F., Flügge, G., Korte, S. M.,
605 Meerlo, P., Murisong, R., Olivier, B., Palanzak, P., Richter-Levine, G., Sgoifok, A.,
606 Steimerj, T., Stiedl, O., van Dijkh, G., Wöhrd, M., Fuchs, E., 2011. Stress revisited: a
607 critical evaluation of the stress concept. *Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Reviews* 35,
608 1291-1301.

609

610 Kuhne, F., Hößler, J. C., Struwe, R., 2014. Emotions in dogs being petted by a familiar or
611 unfamiliar person: Validating behavioural indicators of emotional states using heart
612 rate variability. *Applied Animal Behaviour Science* 161, 113-120.

613

614 Landis, J.R., Koch, G.G., 1977. The measurement of observer agreement for categorical data.
615 *Biometrics*, 159-174.

616

617 Lawrence, I., Lin, L.I., 1989. A concordance correlation coefficient to evaluate
618 reproducibility. *Biometrics* 45, 255–268.

619

620 Lind, A.K., Hydbring-Sandberg, E., Forkman, B., Keeling, L.J., 2017. Assessing stress in
621 dogs during a visit to the veterinary clinic: Correlations between dog behavior in
622 standardized tests and assessments by veterinary staff and owners. *Journal of*
623 *Veterinary Behavior* 17, 24-31.

624

625 Mariti, C., Raspanti, E., Zilocchi, M., Carlone, B., Gazzano, A., 2015. The assessment of dog
626 welfare in the waiting room of a veterinary clinic. *Animal Welfare* 24, 299-305.

627

628 Mariti, C., Pierantoni, L., Sighieri, C., Gazzano, A., 2017. Guardians' perceptions of dogs'
629 welfare and behaviors related to visiting the veterinary clinic. *Journal of Applied*
630 *Animal Welfare Science* 20, 24–33.

631

632 Maximino, C., de Brito, T. M., da Silva Batista, A. W., Herculano, A. M., Morato, S.,
633 Gouveia Jr, A., 2010. Measuring anxiety in zebrafish: a critical review. *Behavioural*
634 *Brain Research* 214, 157-171.

635

- 636 McGreevy, P.D., Starling, M., Branson, N.J., Cobb, M.L., Calnon, D., 2012. An overview of
637 the dog–human dyad and ethograms within it. *Journal of Veterinary Behavior: Clinical*
638 *Applications and Research* 7, 103–117.
- 639
- 640 Merola, I., Prato-Previde, E., Marshall-Pescini, S., 2012. Social referencing in dog-owner
641 dyads? *Animal Cognition* 15, 175–185.
- 642
- 643 Meyer, F., Schawalder, P., Gaillard, C., Dolf, G., 2012. Estimation of genetic parameters for
644 behavior based on results of German Shepherd Dogs in Switzerland. *Applied Animal*
645 *Behaviour Science* 140, 53-61.
- 646
- 647 Miklósi, Á., Kubinyi, E., Topál, J., Gácsi, M., Virányi, Z., Csányi, V., 2003. A simple reason
648 for a big difference: wolves do not look back at humans, but dogs do. *Current*
649 *Biology* 13, 763–766.
- 650
- 651 Millot, J.L. 1994. Olfactory and visual cues in the interaction systems between dogs and
652 children. *Behavioural Processes* 33, 177-188.
- 653
- 654 Mills, D.S., Ramos, D., Estelles, M.G., Hargrave, C., 2006. A triple blind placebo-controlled
655 investigation into the assessment of the effect of Dog Appeasing Pheromone (DAP) on
656 anxiety related behaviour of problem dogs in the veterinary clinic. *Applied Animal*
657 *Behaviour Science* 98, 114–126.
- 658
- 659 Palestirini, C., Previde, E.P., Spiezio, C., Verga, M., 2005. Heart rate and behavioural
660 responses of dogs in the Ainsworth's Strange Situation: A pilot study. *Applied Animal*
661 *Behaviour Science* 94, 75-88.
- 662
- 663 Parthasarathy, V., Crowell-Davis, S.L. 2006. Relationship between attachment to owners and
664 separation anxiety in pet dogs (*Canis lupus familiaris*). *Journal of Veterinary Behavior*
665 1, 109-120.
- 666
- 667 Pastore, C., Pirrone, F., Balzarotti, F., Faustini, M., Pierantoni, L., Albertini, M., 2011.
668 Evaluation of physiological and behavioral stress-dependent parameters in agility
669 dogs. *Journal of Veterinary Behavior: Clinical Applications and Research* 6, 188–194.
- 670
- 671 Payne, E., Boot, M., Starling, M., Henshall, C., McLean, A., Bennett, P., McGreevy, P., 2015.
672 Evidence of horsemanship and dogmanship and their application in veterinary
673 contexts. *The Veterinary Journal* 204, 247–254.
- 674
- 675 Persson, M.E., Roth, L.S.V., Johnsson, M., Wright, D., Jensen, P., 2015. Human-directed
676 social behaviour in dogs shows significant heritability. *Genes, Brain and Behavior* 14,
677 337-344.
- 678
- 679 Prato-Previde, E., Spiezio, C., Sabatini, F., Custance, D.M. 2003. Is the dog-human
680 relationship an attachment bond? An observational study using Ainsworth's strange
681 situation. *Behaviour* 140, 225-254.
- 682
- 683 Rehn, T., Keeling, L.J., 2011. The effect of time left alone at home on dog welfare. *Applied*
684 *Animal Behaviour Science* 129, 129–135.

685
686 Rezac, P., Rezac, K., Slama, P., 2015. Human behavior preceding dog bites to the face. *The*
687 *Veterinary Journal* 206, 284–288.
688
689 Riley, V., 1975. Mouse mammary tumors: alteration of incidence as apparent function of
690 stress. *Science* 189, 465–467.
691
692 Saetre, P., Strandberg, E., Sundgren, P.E., Pettersson, U., Jazin, E., & Bergström, T.F., 2006.
693 The genetic contribution to canine personality. *Genes, Brain and Behavior* 5, 240-248.
694
695 Scotney, R.L., 2010. Environmental enrichment in veterinary practice. *The Veterinary Nurse*
696 1, 140-149.
697
698 Seligman, M.E., Maier, S.F., Geer, J., 1979. Alleviation of learned helplessness in the dog. In
699 *Origins of Madness*, Pergamon, 401-409.
700
701 Serpell, J.A., Hsu, Y., 2001. Development and validation of a novel method for evaluating
702 behavior and temperament in guide dogs. *Applied Animal Behaviour Science* 72, 347-
703 364.
704
705 Siniscalchi, M., Sasso, R., Pepe, A.M., Dimatteo, S., Vallortigara, G., Quaranta, A., 2011.
706 Sniffing with the right nostril: lateralization of response to odour stimuli by dogs.
707 *Animal Behaviour* 82, 399–404.
708
709 Siniscalchi, M., d’Ingeo, S., Quaranta, A., 2016. The dog nose ‘KNOWS’ fear: Asymmetric
710 nostril use during sniffing at canine and human emotional stimuli. *Behavioural Brain*
711 *Research* 304, 34-41.
712
713 Stanford, T.L., 1981. Behavior of dogs entering a veterinary clinic. *Applied Animal*
714 *Ethology* 7, 271–279.
715
716 Stellato, A.C., Dewey, C.E., Widowski, T.M., Niel, L., 2020. Evaluation of associations
717 between owner presence and indicators of fear in dogs during routine veterinary
718 examinations. *Journal of the American Veterinary Medical Association* 257, 1031-
719 1040.
720
721 Stowell, J.R., Kiecolt-Glaser, J.K., Glaser, R., 2001. Perceived stress and cellular immunity:
722 When coping counts. *Journal of Behavioral Medicine* 24, 323-339.
723
724 Svartberg, K. 2002. Shyness–boldness predicts performance in working dogs. *Applied*
725 *Animal Behaviour Science* 79, 157-174.
726
727 Topál, J., Miklósi, A., Csányi, V., Dóka, A., 1998. Attachment behavior in dogs (*Canis*
728 *familiaris*): a new application of Ainsworth’s (1969) Strange Situation Test. *Journal of*
729 *Comparative Psychology* 112, 219–229.
730
731 Tuber, D.S., Hennessy, M.B., Sanders, S., Miller, J.A., 1996. Behavioral and glucocorticoid
732 responses of adult domestic dogs (*Canis familiaris*) to companionship and social
733 separation. *Journal of Comparative Psychology* 110, 103–108.

734
735 Vaessen, T., Hernaes, D., Myin-Germeys, I., van Amelsvoort, T., 2015. The dopaminergic
736 response to acute stress in health and psychopathology: a systematic review.
737 *Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Reviews* 56, 241-251.
738
739 Vas, J., Topál, J., Gácsi, M., Miklósi, A., Csányi, V., 2005. A friend or an enemy? Dogs'
740 reaction to an unfamiliar person showing behavioural cues of threat and friendliness at
741 different times. *Applied Animal Behaviour Science* 94, 99–115.
742
743 Vonderen, I.K., Kooistra, H.S. and Rijnberk, A.D., 1998. Influence of veterinary care on the
744 urinary corticoid: creatinine ratio in dogs. *Journal of Veterinary Internal*
745 *Medicine* 12, 431–435.
746
747 Wells, D.L., Hepper, P.G., 1999. Male and female dogs respond differently to men and
748 women. *Applied Animal Behaviour Science* 61, 341-349.
749
750 Wells, D.L., Graham, L., Hepper, P.G., 2002. The influence of auditory stimulation on the
751 behaviour of dogs housed in a rescue shelter. *Animal Welfare* 11, 385-393.
752
753 Wilsson, E., Sundgren, P. E., 1997. The use of a behaviour test for selection of dogs for
754 service and breeding. II. Heritability for tested parameters and effect of selection
755 based on service dog characteristics. *Applied Animal Behaviour Science* 54, 235-241.
756
757 Ziv, G., 2017. The effects of using aversive training methods in dogs—A review. *Journal of*
758 *Veterinary Behavior: Clinical Applications and Research* 19, 50–60.
759

760 **Table 1**

761 Characteristics of owners and dogs.

Dogs	Experimental group	Interval between visits (weeks)	Dog age (years)	Sex of dogs	Dog breed	Age of owners
1	NoO/O	5	3	FN	Mixed shepherd	25-40
2	NoO/O	5	1	MN	Mixed Retriever	25-40
3	NoO/O	6	4	FN	Cavalier King Charles	41-60
4	O/NoO	5	2.5	FN	Beauceron	25-40
5	O/NoO	7	3	FN	Schapendoes	<25
6	O/NoO	5	5	FE	Mixed terrier	25-40
7	O/NoO	6	5	FN	Mixed terrier	>60 ^a
8	O/NoO	6	5	ME	Mixed terrier	>60 ^a
9	O/NoO	6	7.5	MN	Labrador	41-60
10	O/NoO	6	2.5	ME	Boxer	25-40
11	NoO/O	5	5	MN	Mixed terrier	25-40 ^a
12	O/NoO	5	6	MN	Mini Australian shepherd	25-40 ^a
13	NoO/O	7	2.5	MN	Whippet	25-40
14	O/NoO	5	2	ME	Boxer	41-60
15	NoO/O	6	2	MN	French bulldog	41-60
16	O/NoO	5	1.5	ME	German shepherd	41-60
17	O/NoO	7	7	FN	Spitz	25-40
18	O/NoO	6	2	FE	Boxer	41-60
19	NoO/O	7	4	MN	Whippet	>60
20	NoO/O	6	3.5	FN	Cotton Tulear	25-40
21	NoO/O	5	3.5	MN	White Swiss shepherd	25-40
22	NoO/O	7	9	FN	Australian shepherd	41-60 ^a
23	O/NoO	7	3	FN	Australian shepherd	41-60 ^a
24	NoO/O	6	4	FE	Groenendael	25-40
25	NoO/O	7	5	ME	Malinois	41-60

762 NoO/O, Owner was absent for the first veterinary consultation and present for the second;

763 O/NoO, Owner was present for the first veterinary consultation and absent for the second; F,

764 Female; M, Male; N, Neutered; E, Entire.

765 ^a Owners participating with more than one dog.

766 **Table 2**

767 Recorded dog behaviours during the examination and greeting phases and their definitions.

768

Observed behaviour	Definition
Non-exclusive stress-related behaviours	
Scratching ^a / Sniffing ^a / Shivering ^a / Shaking ^a	The dog scratched itself / The dog sniffed the ground or straight ahead / The dog trembled / The dog shook
Low postures ^a	The dog's tail was lowered, its ears faced backwards, or its legs were bent; at least two of these postures were exhibited
Mouth (exclusive behaviours)	
Yawning ^a / Panting ^a / Licking ^a	The dog yawned / The dog panted / The dog licked its mouth
Vocalisations (exclusive behaviours)	
Whining ^a / Barking ^a	The dog whined / The dog barked
Gaze (exclusive behaviours)	
Gaze at a person	The dog gazed with its head oriented towards the owner (Gaze O), the veterinarian (Gaze V), the assistant (Gaze A), or the veterinarian and the assistant (Gaze VA)
Gaze at an object or thing	The dog gazed with its head oriented towards the door (Gaze D) or straight ahead when on the table (Gaze Ad)
Avoidance (exclusive behaviours)	
Avoidance	The dog stepped backwards away from the veterinarian or the assistant following one of their actions
Situation (exclusive behaviours)	
Situation / somebody	Half of the dog's body (head and chest) was situated less than 50 cm from the owner (Situation O) or from the veterinarian and the assistant (Situation VA)
Situation / something	Half of the dog's body (head and chest) was situated less than 1 m from the door (Situation D), or the dog was not in one of the previous locations (Situation E)
Movement (exclusive behaviours)	
Move	The dog moved its four limbs with less than 1 s between the movement of each limb
Contact (exclusive behaviours)	
Contact	The dog intentionally touched the owner (Contact O), the veterinarian (Contact V), or the assistant (Contact A)

Tail (exclusive behaviours)

Tail wagging Tail wagged below the spine but was not between the legs

Tail between legs ^a Tail was between the rear limbs

Tail low Tail was below the spine but was not wagging or between legs

Tail high Tail was above the spine, whether wagging or not

769 ^a Stress-related behaviours

770 **Table 3**

771 Behavioural indices calculated using several behaviours shown in Table 2.

772

Index (Unit)	Definition	Formula
Total Stress (%)	Sum of percentages of time spent yawning, panting, scratching, adopting low posture, shivering, sniffing, whining, barking and licking	Total Stress (%) = Yawning (%) + Panting (%) + Shivering (%) + Low postures (%) + Shaking (%) + Sniffing (%) + Whining (%) + Barking (%) + Licking (%)
Contact V+A (%)	Sum of percentages of time spent in contact with veterinarian (V) and/or assistant (A)	Contact V+A (%) = Contact V (%) + Contact A (%)
Gaze V+A (%)	Sum of percentages of time spent gazing at veterinarian (V) and/or assistant (A)	Gaze V+A (%) = Gaze V (%) + Gaze A (%) + Gaze VA (%)
Gaze O+Ad (%)	Sum of percentages of time spent gazing at owner (O) when present or straight ahead (Ad) when absent	Gaze O+Ad (%) = Gaze O (%) + Gaze Ad (%)
Behav. Tow. Owner (%) (dog behaviours towards owner)	Sum of percentages of time spent gazing at, having contact with, and seeking proximity to the owner	Behav. Tow. Owner (%) = Gaze O (%) + Contact O (%) + Situation O (%)

773 %, Time percentage (behaviour duration/phase duration); Yawning, The dog yawned;
774 Panting, The dog panted; Scratching, The dog scratched itself; Low posture, The dog's tail
775 was lowered, its ears faced backwards, or its legs were bent, at least two of these postures
776 were exhibited; Shaking, The dog shook; Sniffing, The dog sniffed the ground or straight
777 ahead; Whining, The dog whined; Barking, The dog barked; Licking, The dog licked its
778 mouth; Contact V, The dog intentionally touched the veterinarian; Contact A, The dog
779 intentionally touched the assistant; Gaze V, The dog gazed with its head oriented towards the
780 veterinarian; Gaze A, The dog gazed with its head oriented towards the assistant; Gaze VA,
781 The dog gazed with its head oriented towards the veterinarian and the assistant; Gaze O, The
782 dog gazed with its head oriented towards the owner; Gaze Ad, The dog gazed with its head
783 oriented straight ahead when on the table; Contact O, The dog intentionally touched the
784 owner; Situation O, Half of the dog's body (head and chest) was situated less than 50 cm from
785 the owner.

786 **Table 4**

787 Rated emotional states of dogs during exploration, examination, and greeting phases, their
788 definition, and their score.

789

Emotional state	Definition	Score
Relaxed	No or low frequency of movement, with no visual evidence of tension in the body	1
Aroused	Tense, with high frequency of movement, but no visual evidence of anxious behaviours	2
Anxious	Tense, with licking, yawning, crying, agitation or observable fearful posture	3

790 **Table 5**

791 Rated scores of dogs when entering the examination room (exploration phase) and reuniting
 792 with the owner after the veterinary examination (greeting phase), along with the name of the
 793 factor and the signification of the score.
 794

Factor	Name of factor	Score (from 1 to 5)
Apparent comfort in entering the room	Entering Room	1, Has to be drawn to enter 5, Enters voluntarily, pulls on leash
Greeting intensity by dog towards owner	Reunion / Dog	1, Indifferent, 5, Very happy, jumps on the owner, requests contact
Greeting intensity by owner towards dog	Reunion / Owner	1, Indifferent 5, Talks to the dog, pets the dog a lot

795 **Table 6**

796 Rated levels of dog restraint performed by the assistant during the examination phase, along
797 with their definition and score.

798

Restraint	Definition	Score
Low	The assistant did not need to use force to keep the dog in the right position. The dog was voluntarily almost immobile.	1
Medium	The assistant needed to increase her restraint of the dog to keep it in the same position. The dog was agitated/moved frequently.	2
High	The assistant had to hold the dog firmly to keep it on the examination table or help the veterinarian perform the clinical examination. The dog tried to escape.	3

799 **Table 7**

800 Rated manipulations performed by the veterinarian during the examination phase and the
 801 meaning of their success and difficulty score.

Manipulation	Definition	Score and Value	
Table	Dog was picked up and lifted onto the examination table	Failure, 0 ^a Success, 1	Difficulty (from 1 to 5) 1, Easy / 5, Difficult
Eye	Eye and mucosa observation	Failure, 0 Success, 1	Difficulty (from 1 to 5) 1, Easy / 5, Difficult
Ear	Ear manipulation and observation	Failure, 0 Success, 1	Difficulty (from 1 to 5) 1, Easy / 5, Difficult
Mouth	Examination of teeth and mouth mucosa	Failure, 0 Success, 1	Difficulty (from 1 to 5) 1, Easy / 5, Difficult
Palpation	Abdominal and lymph node palpation	Failure, 0 Success, 1	Difficulty (from 1 to 5) 1, Easy / 5, Difficult
Skin fold	Examination of scapular skin fold	Failure, 0 Success, 1	Difficulty (from 1 to 5) 1, Easy / 5, Difficult
Auscultation	Cardiac and pulmonary auscultation	Failure, 0 Success, 1	Difficulty (from 1 to 5) 1, Easy / 5, Difficult
Thermometer	Measuring rectal temperature	Failure, 0 Success, 1	Difficulty (from 1 to 5) 1, Easy / 5, Difficult
Paws	Manipulating paws	Failure, 0 Success, 1	Difficulty (from 1 to 5) 1, Easy / 5, Difficult

802 ^a Each dog received a score of 0 or 1, these scores were used to calculate the percentage of
 803 success of all 25 dogs.

804 **Table 8**

805 Emotional state of dogs in a veterinary practice with the presence or absence of the owner
 806 during the exploration phase. Results are expressed as the mean \pm standard error.

Behaviours (units)	Owner present condition	Owner absent condition	t	P	1- β (%)
Entering room (score)	3.24 \pm 0.76	2.72 \pm 1.27	-2.7	0.012	100
Emotional State (score)	1.76 \pm 0.63	2.22 \pm 0.69	3.682	0.001	69.2

807 Entering room, Rated apparent comfort in entering the room (1 = Dog has to be drawn to
 808 enter, 5 = Dog enters voluntarily, pulls on leash; also see Table 5); Emotional State, Rated
 809 emotional states of dogs (1 = Relaxed, No or low frequency of movement, with no visual
 810 evidence of tension in the body; 2 = Aroused, Tense, with high frequency of movement, but
 811 no visual evidence of anxious behaviours; 3 = Tense, with licking, yawning, crying, agitation
 812 or observable fearful posture; also see Table 4).

813 **Table 9**

814 Behaviour of dogs in a veterinary practice with the presence or absence of the owner during
 815 the examination phase. Results are expressed as the mean \pm standard error. Non-significant
 816 results are not presented.

817

Behaviours (units)		Owner present condition	Owner absent condition	<i>t</i>	<i>P</i>	1- β (%)
Behaviour towards veterinarian and/or assistant						
Contact V+A	Duration (% time)	2.33 \pm 4.91	1.34 \pm 3.86	-2.187	0.039	12.2
Behaviour towards owner and/or door						
Gaze O+Ad	Duration (% time)	37.32 \pm 19.33	21.64 \pm 12.17	3.342	0.0008	93
Gaze Door	Duration (% time)	12.46 \pm 9.56	25.15 \pm 13.52	3.813	0.0008	96.9

818 Contact V+A, Sum of percentages of time spent in contact with veterinarian (V) and/or
 819 assistant (A); Gaze O+Ad, Sum of percentages of time spent gazing at owner (O) when
 820 present or straight ahead (Ad) when absent; Gaze Door, Sum of percentages of time spent
 821 gazing at the door; % time, Percentage of time (behaviour duration/phase duration; also see
 822 Table 3).

823 **Table 10**

824 Behaviour of dogs in a consultation room with the presence or absence of the owner during
 825 the greeting phase. Results are expressed as the mean \pm standard error. Non-significant results
 826 are not presented.

Behaviours (units)		Owner present condition	Owner absent condition	<i>t</i>	<i>P</i>	1- β (%)
Behav. Tow. Owner	Duration (% time)	129.24 \pm 50.70	170.76 \pm 49.70	3.455	0.002	83.3
Reunion / Dog	Score	3.11 \pm 1.29	4.24 \pm 0.79	5.106	0.00003	96.2
Gaze Door	Duration (% time)	8.12 \pm 8.95	12.32 \pm 13.50	1.818	0.081	25.4

827 Behav. Tow. Owner, Behaviour Towards Owner, Sum of percentages of time spent gazing at,
 828 having contact with, and seeking proximity to the owner (also see Table 3); Reunion / Dog,
 829 Rated greeting intensity by dog towards owner (1 = indifferent; 5 = very happy, jumps on the
 830 owner, seeks contact; also see Table 5); % time, Percentage of time (behaviour duration/phase
 831 duration); Gaze Door, Percentage of time spent gazing at the door.

832 **Figure legends**

833

834 Fig. 1. Image of the experimental room, with the two videos assembled in a single image.

835 Left: 'Owner: absent condition'. Right: 'Owner: present condition'

836

837 Fig. 2. Layout of the experimental room. A: veterinarian's chair, B: assistant's chair, C:

838 owner's chair, X: owner's position during the veterinary examination


839

840 Fig. 3. Image of the standardised restraint by the assistant on the examination table. One hand

841 on the chest and another on the base of the tail, with the minimal necessary strength to keep

842 the dog sitting or standing on the table.







ATTEPS DE LABORATOIRE URINAIRE

Votre animal a-t-il des difficultés à se déplacer ?
Demandez conseil

Votre animal est-il en excès de poids ?
Une alimentation adaptée peut l'aider

Votre animal a-t-il des problèmes de peau ?
Demandez conseil

Votre animal a-t-il des problèmes de digestion ?
Demandez conseil

ALVET
LAIGRE
1216