Impact of canine-assisted interventions on the health and well-being of older people residing in long-term care: a mixed methods systematic review protocol

The experiences and effectiveness of canine-assisted interventions (CAIs) on the health and well-being of older people residing in long-term care: A mixed methods systematic review protocol

Abstract

Objective: To synthesize and integrate the best available evidence on the experiences and effectiveness of canine-assisted interventions (CAIs) on the health and well-being of older people residing in long-term care.

Introduction: Canine-assisted interventions (CAIs) are commonly used as an adjunct therapy to enhance health and well-being and are often implemented in long-term care facilities. The number of studies undertaken in this area has increased substantially over the last five years; therefore, an update of two previous systematic reviews is warranted.

Inclusion criteria: This review will consider older people who reside in long-term care facilities and who receive CAIs. For the quantitative component, CAIs will be compared to usual care, alternative therapeutic interventions or no interventions and outcomes will be grouped under the following headings: biological, psychological and social. For the qualitative component, the experiences of older people receiving CAIs as well as the views of people directly or indirectly involved in delivering CAIs will be explored. Quantitative, qualitative and mixed methods studies published from 2009 to the present will be considered.

Methods: A search of 10 bibliographic databases and other various resources for published and unpublished English language studies will be undertaken. Study selection, critical appraisal, data extraction and data synthesis will be undertaken following the segregated JBI approach to mixed methods reviews.

Systematic review registration number: PROSPERO XXXXX.

Review questions

The aim of this mixed methods review is to synthesize and integrate the best available evidence on the experiences and effectiveness of canine-assisted interventions (CAIs) on the health and well-being of older people residing in long-term care. More specifically the review questions are:

- What are the experiences of older people residing in long-term care who receive CAIs?
- What are the views of people directly or indirectly involved in delivering CAIs to older adults (such as family and friends of the residents, healthcare workers and volunteers) regarding CAIs for older people residing in long-term care facilities?
- What is the effectiveness of CAIs on the health and well-being of older people residing in long-term care facilities?

Introduction

The term 'human-animal bond' refers to the connection people and animals experience, considered to be mutually beneficial and enhancing health and well-being.[1] This two-way relationship (which some

consider links to Bowlby's attachment theory)[2,3] has led to the introduction of animals being used in therapeutic roles such as animal-assisted interventions (AAI, the focus of this review) and service animals.[4] Animal-assisted interventions refers to the "utilization of various species of animals in diverse manners beneficial to humans"[5para4] and are often further grouped into animal-assisted therapies (AAT), animal-assisted activities (AAA) and animal-assisted education (AAE) (See Table 1 for explanation of terms).

<Table 1. Types of animal-assisted interventions[5]>

Commonly used as an adjunct to both pharmacological and non-pharmacological therapies, AAIs can be delivered one-on-one or in group formats with a range of animals being used. Shen and colleagues suggest AAIs are highly accepted interventions across different populations, conditions and settings[6] with the most common species utilized being canines [6-8] The holistic nature of AAIs suggests potential benefits may extend across the physical, emotional and social spectrum however results are varied. [6,7,9-18] Nimer and Lundahl showed AAIs produced moderate effect sizes to improve emotional well-being, behavioural problems, medical difficulties as well as autism spectrum symptoms.[8] In this meta-analysis, dogs were consistently associated with moderate effect sizes which did not occur in the other animals examined.[8] Reviews in this area generally indicate some small benefit in outcomes but go on to acknowledge that the lack of methodological rigour in studies impacts on the results of research. Despite these limitations, popularity of AAIs continues to increase with the number of published studies rising. A search of "animal-assisted therapy" in PubMed produced close to 450 results with over 50% of papers being published over the last five years (search undertaken 9th May 2019).

One population and setting where AAIs are used is with older people in long-term care facilities. With an increasingly ageing population[19,20] there is a demand for high quality long-term care. Additionally once a person enters a care facility, increases in physical and psychosocial morbidities can occur.[21] Animal-assisted interventions may be able to play a role in improving health and well-being of residents for example by reducing depression and improving quality of life.[7] This type of intervention seems particularly relevant to older people living in long-term care facilities as human animal-interactions are not dependent on a high level of cognitive function[22] nor high physical and functioning ability.[23] Further Maclean suggests that people with mental health issues that may be reluctant to use conventional treatment may prefer alternative treatments such as AAIs.[24]

Two systematic reviews undertaken in 2011[23,25] focused exclusively on canine-assisted interventions (CAIs) for this population. The first looked at the effects of CAIs while the other explored the experiences of residents involved in CAIs. Heterogeneity across interventions and outcomes prohibited pooling of studies in the quantitative review however, results from individual studies indicated some physical and emotional short-term benefits. The review went on to acknowledge that CAIs were no more effective than other interventions that were provided such as visits from people.[23] The qualitative synthesis included only two studies with meta-aggregation producing two synthesized

findings. The first indicated that residents involved in CAI's may experience a range of mental, emotional, physiological and social benefits while the second finding related to the practical and safety concerns associated with CAI's.[25] With popularity of CAI's increasing (as demonstrated by the rise in primary research recently undertaken), the ageing population and the potential of these interventions to improve the health and well-being of residents in long-term care facilities, it is considered appropriate to strengthen the evidence by updating the original reviews. This aligns to the decision framework developed by Garner et al to assess systematic reviews for updating.[26] The importance of keeping reviews as current as possible has been recognized[26,27] with Garner and colleagues highlighting that by not updating reviews, authors are compromising a review's integrity, potentially misleading readers about the current state of the science.[26]

New guidance for the conduct of mixed methods reviews[28] provides the opportunity to combine the two reviews into one thereby allowing the integration of qualitative and quantitative evidence. Mixed methods reviews bring together the findings of effectiveness (quantitative evidence) and patient, family, staff or other's experiences (qualitative evidence) to enhance their usefulness to clinicians and clinical, policy or organizational decision-makers.[28] They broaden the focus of a systematic review allowing for a more in-depth exploration of healthcare phenomena thereby maximizing the findings that one method alone could not achieve.[29]

A preliminary search of PubMed, CINAHL, PROSPERO, *The JBI Database of Systematic Reviews and Implementation Reports* and The Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews indicated a number of single method reviews have been conducted since the original reviews were published however most have not focused specifically on this population (older people), the setting (long-term care) and the intervention (canines).[6,7,9,10,12-15,17,18] Cipriani et al (2013) did examine the effect of canine-assisted therapies (CAT) on older adults residing in long-term care however the search was undertaken up until 2010.[11] Out of the 19 studies included in the review, twelve demonstrated statistically significant improvement in outcomes for residents. No mixed methods reviews were located in the search. A PROSPERO record registered in 2017[30] indicates a systematic review containing both qualitative and quantitative evidence is in progress which focuses on older people in long-term care however the review is not restricted to canines and the approach to bringing the results together is not clearly detailed. The authors have been contacted for additional information regarding the approach being taken to integration and when the review is anticipated to be completed (since the expected date provided has passed); however, no further details were provided. Therefore the overall aim of this review is to update and combine two previous systematic reviews to explore the experiences and effectiveness of CAIs on the health and social care of older people who reside in long-term care.

Keywords

animal-assisted; canine, dog; pet therapy; mixed methods; qualitative; quantitative

Inclusion Criteria

Participants

The review will consider studies that include older people (60 years and older) who reside in long-term care facilities and who receive CAIs. Studies that contain people younger than 60 will be included as long as the mean age is 60. There will be no exclusions based on medical conditions or co-morbidities.

Additionally for the qualitative component, the views of people directly or indirectly involved in delivering CAIs to older adults such as family and friends of the residents, healthcare workers and volunteers will also be considered

Intervention

The quantitative component of the review will consider studies that evaluate CAIs. Interventions will be grouped as either canine-assisted activities (CAAs) or canine-assisted therapies (CATs). For the purpose of this review definitions will be based on those provided by the American Veterinary Medical Associations.[5] Canine-assisted activities "provide opportunities for motivational, educational, and/or recreational benefits to enhance quality of life."[5para7] Canine-assisted therapies are "a goal directed intervention directed and/or delivered by a health/human service professional with specialised expertise, and within the scope of practice of his/her profession."[5para5] Canine-assisted education will not be considered since this intervention is rarely measured in studies in this area. There will be no limitations to the duration of interventions or the required follow-up.

Comparator

The quantitative component of the review will consider studies that compare the intervention to usual care, alternative therapeutic interventions or no intervention.

Outcomes

The quantitative component of this review will consider studies that include outcomes related to health and well-being including but not limited to: loneliness, depression, anxiety, well-being, quality of life, mood, satisfaction, morale, self-esteem, activity participation/involvment, activities of daily living, blood pressure, and social interaction. Where possible review outcomes will be grouped under the biopsychosocial model[31] e.g.:

- Biological (e.g. blood pressure)
- Psychological (e.g. depression)
- Social (e.g. social interaction)

Outcomes can be measured using any validated instrument, via observation or by self-report, and measured during or immediately after the intervention or at a follow-up period.

Phenomena of interest

The qualitative component of this review will consider studies that investigate the experiences of older people receiving the CAIs as well as the views of people directly or indirectly involved in delivering CAIs to them such as family and friends of the residents, healthcare workers and volunteers.

Context

The review will consider studies undertaken in long-term care facilities which will include any setting for older people who are unable to manage independently in the community including nursing homes, skilled aged care facilities, assisted living facilities and hostels for the aged. There will be no limits regarding cultural factors or geographical location.

Types of studies

This review will consider quantitative, qualitative and mixed methods studies. Quantitative studies will include experimental and quasi-experimental study designs, analytical observational studies, analytical cross-sectional studies and descriptive observational study designs. Randomized controlled trials (RCTs) will be considered as the primary focus however in their absence other research designs will be considered. Qualitative studies will include designs such as phenomenology, grounded theory, ethnography, qualitative description, action research and feminist research. Mixed method studies will be considered if data from the quantitative or qualitative components can be clearly extracted. Where data is not reported, authors will be contacted.

Studies published in English will be included. Studies published from April 2009 to the present will be included as this is an update of two previous systematic reviews.[23,25]

Methods

The proposed systematic review will be conducted in accordance with the Joanna Briggs Institute (JBI) methodology for Mixed Methods Systematic Review (MMSR).[28] This review title has been registered in PROSPERO, registration number XXX.

Search strategy

The search strategy will aim to find both published and unpublished studies. An initial limited search of MEDLINE and CINAHL was undertaken to identify articles on the topic. The text words contained in the titles and abstracts of relevant articles, and the index terms used to describe the articles were used to develop a full search strategy for CINAHL (see Appendix I). The search strategy, including all

identified keywords and index terms will be adapted for each included information source. The reference list of all studies selected for critical appraisal will be screened for additional studies.

Information Sources

The databases to be searched include: PubMed, CINAHL (EBSCO Host), EMBASE (Elsevier), PsycINFO (Ovid), PsycARTICLES (Ovid), AUSThealth (Informit), Scopus (Elsevier), Web of Science (Web of Science Core Collection; CABI; Current Contents Connect), OT seeker and PEDro.

The trial registers to be searched include: Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials, Clinicaltrials.gov (For quantitative studies only)

The search for unpublished studies and gray literature will include: Trove, The Networked Digital Library of Theses and Dissertations (NDLTD), Proquest Dissertations and Theses (Global), Delta Society Australia website (https://www.deltasociety.com.au), Pet Partners website (https://petpartners.org/) (previously known as the Delta Society)

Study selection

Following the search, all identified citations will be loaded into EndNote version 8 (Clarivate Analytics, PA, USA) and duplicates removed. Titles and abstracts will then be screened by two independent reviewers for assessment against the inclusion criteria for the review. Potentially relevant studies will be retrieved in full and their citation details imported into the Joanna Briggs Institute's System for the Unified Management, Assessment and Review of Information (JBI SUMARI; Joanna Briggs Institute, Adelaide, Australia). The full text of selected citations will be assessed in detail against the inclusion criteria by two independent reviewers. Reasons for exclusion of full text studies that do not meet the inclusion criteria will be recorded and reported in the systematic review. Any disagreements that arise between the reviewers at each stage of the study selection process will be resolved through discussion, or with a third reviewer. The results of the search will be reported in full in the final review and presented in a Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-analyses (PRISMA) flow diagram.[32]

Assessment of methodological quality

Quantitative papers (and quantitative component of mixed methods papers) selected for retrieval will be assessed by two independent reviewers for methodological validity prior to inclusion in the review using standardized critical appraisal instruments from JBI SUMARI based on study design e.g. RCT, quasi-experimental studies etc.[33]

Qualitative papers (and qualitative component of mixed methods papers) selected for retrieval will be assessed by two independent reviewers for methodological validity prior to inclusion in the review using the standard JBI critical appraisal checklist for Qualitative Research available in JBI SUMARI.[34]

Authors of papers will be contacted to request missing or additional data for clarification, where required. Any disagreements that arise between the reviewers will be resolved through discussion, or with a third reviewer. The results of critical appraisal will be reported in narrative form and in a table.

All studies, regardless of the results of their methodological quality, will undergo data extraction and synthesis (where possible) and the impact of methodological quality will be considered when developing conclusions and recommendations for practice.

Data extraction

For the quantitative component, data will be extracted from quantitative and mixed methods (quantitative component only) studies included in the review by two independent reviewers using the standardized Joanna Briggs Institute data extraction tool in JBI SUMARI.[33] The data extracted will include specific details about the populations, study methods, interventions, and outcomes of significance to the review objective.

For the qualitative component, data will be extracted from qualitative and mixed methods (qualitative component only) studies included in the review by two independent reviewers using the standardized Joanna Briggs Institute data extraction tool in JBI SUMARI[34] The data extracted will include specific details about the population, context, culture, geographical location, study methods and the phenomena of interest relevant to the review objective. Findings, and their illustrations will be extracted and assigned a level of credibility using the JBI ranking scale available through JBI SUMARI.

Any disagreements that arise between the reviewers will be resolved through discussion, or with a third reviewer. Authors of papers will be contacted to request missing or additional data, where required.

Data synthesis

This review will follow a convergent segregated approach to synthesis and integration according to the JBI methodology for MMSR using JBI SUMARI.[28] This will involve separate quantitative and qualitative synthesis followed by integration of the resultant quantitative evidence and qualitative evidence.

Quantitative synthesis

Studies will, where possible, be pooled with statistical meta-analysis using JBI SUMARI. Effect sizes will be expressed as either odds ratios (for dichotomous data) or weighted (or standardized) final post-intervention mean differences (for continuous data) and their 95% confidence intervals will be calculated for analysis. Heterogeneity will be assessed statistically using the standard chi squared and I^2 tests. The choice of model (random or fixed effects) and method for meta-analysis will be

based on the guidance by Tufunaru et al.[33] Subgroup analyses will be conducted where there is sufficient data to investigate CATs and CAAs and morbidities. Sensitivity analyses will be conducted to test decisions made regarding methodological quality. Where statistical pooling is not possible the findings will be presented in narrative form including tables and figures to aid in data presentation, where appropriate. A funnel plot will be generated to assess publication bias if there are 10 or more studies included in a meta-analysis. Statistical tests for funnel plot asymmetry (Egger test, Begg test, Harbord test) will be performed where appropriate.

Qualitative synthesis

Qualitative research findings will, where possible be pooled using JBI SUMARI with the meta-aggregation approach.[34] This will involve the aggregation or synthesis of findings to generate a set of statements that represent that aggregation, through assembling the findings and categorizing these findings based on similarity in meaning. These categories are then subjected to a synthesis to produce a comprehensive set of synthesized findings that can be used as a basis for evidence-based practice. Where textual pooling is not possible the findings will be presented in narrative form.

Integration of quantitative evidence and qualitative evidence

The findings of each single method synthesis included in this review will then be configured according to the JBI methodology for mixed methods systematic reviews.[28] This will involve quantitative evidence and qualitative evidence being juxtaposed together and organized/linked into a line of argument to produce an overall configured analysis. Where configuration is not possible the findings will be presented in narrative form

References

1. American Veterinary Medical Association (AVMA). Human-Animal Bond; [internet]. [cited Available from: https://www.avma.org/KB/Resources/Reference/human-animal-bond/Pages/Human-Animal-Bond-AVMA.aspx accessed 9th May 2019.
2. Cookman CA. Older people and attachment to things, places, pets, and ideas. Image J Nurs Sch 1996; 28(3): 227-231.
3. Zilcha-Mano S, Mikulincer M and Shaver PR. Pet in the therapy room: an attachment perspective on Animal-Assisted Therapy. Attach Hum Dev 2011; 13(6): 541-561.
4. Ernst L. Animal-Assisted Therapy: An Exploration of Its History, Healing Benefits, and How Skilled Nursing Facilities Can Set Up Programs. Annals of Long-Term Care: Clinical Care and Aging 2014; 22(10): 27-32.
5. American Veterinary Medical Association (AVMA). Animal-Assisted Interventions: Definitions; [internet]. [cited Available from: https://www.avma.org/KB/Policies/Pages/Animal-Assisted-Interventions-Definitions.aspx accessed 9th May 2019.
6. Shen RZZ, Xiong P, Chou UI and Hall BJ. "We need them as much as they need us": A systematic review of the qualitative evidence for possible mechanisms of effectiveness of animal-assisted intervention (AAI). Complement Ther Med 2018; 41: 203-207.
7. Farid A. 111REVIEW OF ANIMAL ASSISTED THERAPY WITH VISITING DOGS IN DEMENTIA. Age and Ageing 2019; 48(Supplement_1): i32-i35.
8. Nimer J and Lundahl B. Animal-assisted therapy: A meta-analysis. Anthrozoös 2007; 20(3): 225-238.

9. Charry-Sanchez JD, Pradilla I and Talero-Gutierrez C. Animal-assisted therapy in adults: A systematic review. Complement Ther Clin Pract 2018; 32: 169-180.
10. Charry-Sanchez JD, Pradilla I and Talero-Gutierrez C. Effectiveness of Animal-Assisted Therapy in the Pediatric Population: Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Controlled Studies. J Dev Behav Pediatr 2018; 39(7): 580-590.
11. Cipriani J, Cooper M, DiGiovanni NM, Litchkofski A, Nichols AL and Ramsey A. Dog-Assisted Therapy for Residents of Long-Term Care Facilities: An Evidence-Based Review with Implications for Occupational Therapy. Physical & Occupational Therapy In Geriatrics 2013; 31(3): 214-240.
12. Hoagwood KE, Acri M, Morrissey M and Peth-Pierce R. Animal-Assisted Therapies for Youth with or at risk for Mental Health Problems: A Systematic Review. Appl Dev Sci 2017; 21(1): 1-13.
13. Hu M, Zhang P, Leng M, Li C and Chen L. Animal-assisted intervention for individuals with cognitive impairment: A meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials and quasi-randomized controlled trials. Psychiatry Res 2018; 260: 418-427.
14. Jones MG, Rice SM and Cotton SM. Incorporating animal-assisted therapy in mental health treatments for adolescents: A systematic review of canine assisted psychotherapy. PLoS One 2019; 14(1): e0210761.
15. Lundqvist M, Carlsson P, Sjodahl R, Theodorsson E and Levin LA. Patient benefit of dog-assisted interventions in health care: a systematic review. BMC Complement Altern Med 2017; 17(1): 358.
16. Stern C and Chur-Hansen A. Methodological Considerations in Designing and Evaluating Animal-Assisted Interventions. Animals (Basel) 2013; 3(1): 127-141.
17. Yakimicki ML, Edwards NE, Richards E and Beck AM. Animal-Assisted Intervention and Dementia: A Systematic Review. Clinical Nursing Research 2019; 28(1): 9-29.
18. Zafra-Tanaka JH, Pacheco-Barrios K, Tellez WA and Taype-Rondan A. Effects of dog-assisted therapy in adults with dementia: a systematic review and meta-analysis. BMC Psychiatry 2019; 19(1): 41.
19. Australian Bureau of Statistics. 2071.0 - Census of Population and Housing: Reflecting Australia - Stories from the Census, 2016 2017.
20. United Nations. World Population Prospects. Key findings and advance tables. In: Division DoEaSAP editor. New York2017. p. Working Paper No. ESA/P/WP/248.
21. Richards S. The experiences of older people permanently relocating from their home in the community to a long term care facility: a systematic review. Faculty of Health Science. Adelaide: University of Adelaide; 2011.
22. Marx MS, Cohen-Mansfield J, Regier NG, Dakheel-Ali M, Srihari A and Thein K. The impact of different dog-related stimuli on engagement of persons with dementia. Am J Alzheimers Dis Other Demen 2010; 25(1): 37-45.
23. Stern C and Konno R. The effects of Canine-Assisted Interventions (CAIs) on the health and social care of older people residing in long term care: a systematic review. JBI Libr Syst Rev 2011; 9(6): 146-206.
24. MacLean B. Equine-assisted therapy. Journal of Rehabilitation Research & Development 2011; 48(7): xi-xii.
25. Stern C. The meaningfulness of Canine-Assisted Interventions (CAIs) on the health and social care of older people residing in long term care: a systematic review. JBI Libr Syst Rev 2011; 9(21): 727-790.
26. Garner P, Hopewell S, Chandler J, MacLehose H, Schunemann HJ, Akl EA, et al. When and how to update systematic reviews: consensus and checklist. BMJ 2016; 354: i3507.
27. Higgins JPT, Green S and Scholten RJPM. Chapter 3: Maintaining reviews: updates, amendments and feedback. In: T HJP and Green S, eds. Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions, 2011.
28. Lizarondo L, Stern C, Carrier J, Godfrey C, Rieger K, Salmond S, et al. Chapter 8: Mixed methods systematic reviews. In: Aromataris E and Munn Z, eds. Joanna Briggs Institute Reviewer's Manual, The Joanna Briggs Institute, 2017.

29. Bressan V, Bagnasco A, Aleo G, Timmins F, Barisone M, Bianchi M, et al. Mixed-methods research in nursing - a critical review. Journal of Clinical Nursing 2016; 26(19-20): 2878-2890.
30. Orr N, Bethel A, Whear R, Abbot R, Garside R, Thompson-Coon J, et al. What are the effects of human-animal interaction on the health and wellbeing of residents in care homes? A synthesis of qualitative and quantitative evidence; [internet]. [cited Available from: PROSPERO 2017 CRD42017058201 Available from: http://www.crd.york.ac.uk/PROSPERO/display_record.php?ID=CRD42017058201 accessed.
31. Engle G. The clinical application of the biopsychosocial model. American Journal of Psychiatry 1980; 137(5): 535-544.
32. Liberati A, Altman DG, Tetzlaff J, Mulrow C, Gotzsche PC, Ioannidis JP, et al. The PRISMA statement for reporting systematic reviews and meta-analyses of studies that evaluate health care interventions: explanation and elaboration. J Clin Epidemiol 2009; 62(10): e1-34.
33. Tufanaru C, Munn Z, Aromataris E, Campbell J and Hopp L. Chapter 3: Systematic reviews of effectiveness. In: Aromataris E and Munn Z, eds. Joanna Briggs Institute Reviewer's Manual, 2015/09/12 edn. The Joanna Briggs Institute, 2017.
34. The Joanna Briggs Institute, Lockwood C, Porrit K, Munn Z, Rittenmeyer L, Salmond S, et al. Chapter 2: Systematic reviews of qualitative evidence. In: Aromataris E and Z. M, eds. Joanna Briggs Institute Reviewer's Manual 2017.

Appendix I - Search Strategy

CINAHL - search conducted 16th May 2019

S1 ((MH "Aged") OR (MH "Frail Elderly") OR (MH "Aged, 80 and Over")) OR TI ("aged" OR "elderly" OR "senior" OR "older people" OR "geriatric" OR "older person") OR AB ("aged" OR "elderly" OR "senior" OR "older people" OR "geriatric" OR "older person") OR ((MH "Nursing Home Patients") OR (MH "Residential Facilities") OR (MH "Long Term Care") OR (MH "Residential Care") OR (MH "Nursing Homes") OR (MH "Housing for the Elderly") OR (MH "Gerontologic Care")) OR TI ("nursing home resident" OR "residential facilit*" OR "long term care" OR "residential care" OR "nursing home" OR "aged care") OR AB ("nursing home resident" OR "residential facilit*" OR "long term care" OR "residential care" OR "nursing home" OR "aged care") **(879,304)**

S2((MH "Animal Assisted Therapy (Iowa NIC)") OR (MH "Pet Therapy") OR (MH "Dogs")) OR TI ("animal-assisted" OR "pet therapy" OR "animal facilitated therapy" OR "pet facilitated therapy" OR "dogs") OR AB ("animal-assisted" OR "pet therapy" OR "animal facilitated therapy" OR "pet facilitated therapy" OR "dogs") **(10,518)**

S3 S1 AND S2 **(851)**

S4 S1 AND S2 Limiters - Published Date: 20090401-20190531; English Language **(480)**