1 Table 1. Studies included in the review in temporal order. The table show the main characteristics: species, type of stimuli, tasks, manipulation

2 to induce the putative affective state and a brief description of main findings.

Species	Reference	Cue Type	Response	+ Reinforcer	- Reinforcer	Affect manipulation	Main finding
Rat (Rattus norvegicus)	Harding <i>et al</i> (2004)	Auditory stimuli	Go/No-Go (lever press)	Food	Noise	Unpredictable vs. predictable housing	Rats in the unpredictable housing condition were slower to respond and tended to show fewer responses to ambiguous tones close to the positive tone and to the tone itself
European Starling (Sturnus vulgaris)	Bateson & Matheson (2007)	Visual stimuli (grey scale)	Go/No-Go (lid- flipping)	Food	Unpalatable food	Enriched vs. standard housing	Starlings moved from an enriched to a standard cage were less likely to approach and flip the intermediate grey lid. An opposing trend was found in the birds that had been moved from the standard to the enriched cage
Rat (Rattus norvegicus)	Burman <i>et al</i> (2008a)	Spatial location	Go/No-Go (locomotion)	Food	No food	Enriched vs. standard housing	Rats housed without enrichment took longer to approach an ambiguous probe when this was positioned closest to the unrewarded location than rats in the enriched housing condition
Rat (Rattus norvegicus)	Burman <i>et al</i> (2008b)	Speed of running	Successive negative contrast (SNC) paradigm	Food	Fewer food items per session	Enriched vs. standard housing	Unenriched rats displayed a prolonged response to a decrease in anticipated food reward
European Starling (Sturnus vulgaris)	Matheson <i>et al</i> (2008)	Visual stimuli (key peck illuminated at different times)	Active choice (coloured key peck)	Food delivered instantaneousl y (1 s)	Food delivered with delay (15 s)	Enriched vs. standard cage	Starlings housed in larger, enriched cages showed significantly increased optimism than animals housed in smaller, standard cages

Species	Reference	Cue Type	Response	+ Reinforcer	- Reinforcer	Affect manipulation	Main finding
European Starling (Sturnus vulgaris)	Brilot <i>et al</i> (2009)	Visual stimuli (eyespots)	Go/No-Go (approach to the food bowl)	None	None	4 auditory stimuli set up to elicit fear/anxiety	Ambiguous eyespots were treated no differently from the visual stimulus without eyespots. No evidence was found that the auditory stimuli eliciting fear/anxiety caused increased aversion to ambiguous eyespots
Rat (Rattus norvegicus)	Burman <i>et al</i> (2009)	Spatial location	Go/No-Go (locomotion)	Food	Unpalatable food	High light level vs. low light level	Rats that switched from high to low light levels displayed a more positive judgement of ambiguous locations compared to those that switched from low to high light levels
European Starling (Sturnus vulgaris)	Brilot <i>et al</i> (2010)	Visual stimuli (grey scale background)	Active choice	Food (high reward 3 mealworm)	Food (low reward 1 mealworm)	Enriched vs. standard housing	Stereotyping starlings were more likely to choose the dish associated with the smaller food reward in the presence of the most ambiguous discriminative stimulus
Sheep (Ovis aries)	Doyle <i>et al</i> (2010)	Spatial location	Go/No-Go (locomotion)	Food	No food + presence of a dog	Restraint and isolation stress (RIS)	Restrained and isolated sheep were more likely to approach the ambiguous bucket locations, suggesting RIS-treated animals had a more optimistic-like judgement bias
Dog (Canis lupus familiaris)	Mendl <i>et al</i> (2010b)	Spatial location	Go/No-Go (locomotion)	Food	No food	Different separation- related behaviour (SRB) scores	Dogs expressing more SRB behaviour showed a more 'pessimistic' judgement of ambiguous test locations
Honeybee (Apis mellifera)	Bateson <i>et al</i> (2011)	Odour stimuli	Go/No-GO (proboscis extended or withhold in response to stimulation)	Food reward of high value (CS+)	Food reward of less value (CS-)	60 s of shaking	Agitated bees were more likely to classify ambiguous stimuli as predicting punishment

Species	Reference	Cue Type	Response	+ Reinforcer	- Reinforcer	Affect manipulation	Main finding
Dogs (Canis lupus familiaris)	Burman <i>et al</i> (2011)	Visual stimuli (grey scale)	Go/No-Go (locomotion)	Food	No food	'Neutral' treatment vs. 'Post-consumption' treatment (food)	Rewarded dogs took significantly longer to approach an intermediate ambiguous stimulus, suggesting that they were less likely to anticipate food (negative judgement) compared to dogs in the 'Neutral' treatment group
Sheep (Ovis aries)	Doyle <i>et al</i> (2011a)	Spatial location	Go/No-Go (locomotion)	Food	No food + fan-forced blower	Chronic, intermittent stressor events (3weeks)	Exposure to unpredictable, aversive events over a long period of time generated a negative judgement bias in lambs, as reflected in the lower number of approaches of the stressed sheep to the bucket located 1.15 m from the positive location
Sheep (Ovis aries)	Doyle et al (2011b)	Spatial location	Go/No-Go (locomotion)	Food	No Food + presence of dog	Administration of p-Chlorophenylanine 50 mg/ml and water solution in a control group	Following 5 days of treatment, p-Chlorophenylanine (pCPA) treated group approached the positive ambiguous location significantly less than the control group a similar trend after the cessation of the treatment, showing a negative judgment bias
Chicks (Gallus gallus)	Salmeto <i>et al</i> (2011)	Visual Stimuli (aversive or appetitive morphed silhouettes from chick to owl)	Go/No-Go (locomotion)	None	None	Control condition vs. isolation stressor of 5 m (anxiety-like state) or isolation stressor of 60 m (depressive-like state)	In the control group, runway start and goal latencies increased as a function of amounts of aversive characteristics in the cues. In the anxiety-like state, runway latencies were increased to aversive ambiguous cues, reflecting more pessimistic-like behaviour. In the depression-like state, runway latencies were increased to both aversive and appetitive ambiguous cues, reflecting more pessimistic-like and less optimistic- like behaviour

Species	Reference	Cue Type	Response	+ Reinforcer	- Reinforcer	Affect manipulation	Main finding
Sheep (Ovis aries)	Sanger <i>et al</i> (2011)	Spatial location	Go/No-Go task	Food	No food + presence of dog	Short-term stress of shearing (hypothermia)	In one cohort group the shorn sheep displayed a more positive judgement bias than control sheep. In the second cohort the shorn sheep were no different from controls in judgement bias
Mice (Mus musculus)	Boleij <i>et al</i> (2012)	Odour stimuli	Go/No-Go	Palatable food	Unpalatable food	White vs. red light	BALB/c mice showed a negative judgment bias under both the negative and positive conditions
Rat (Rattus norvegicus)	Brydges <i>et al</i> (2012)	Tactile discrimination (sandpaper texture)	Active choice	Food reward of high value	Food reward of less value	Juvenile stress (JS)	JS animals were lighter than controls and were more optimistic in the cognitive bias test. JS animals were also faster than controls to make a decision when presented with an ambiguous stimulus
Sheep (Ovis aries)	Destrez <i>et al</i> (2012)	Spatial location	Go/No-Go (locomotion)	Food	No food + fan-forced blower	Administration of diazepam (0.10mg/kg) and saline in equal concentration in the control group	Control lamb increased their approach to one of the ambiguous stimuli while the treated animals maintained the same latency
Pig (Sus scrofa)	Douglas <i>et al</i> (2012)	Auditory stimuli	Go/No-Go task	Food	Aversive experience	Enriched vs. standard housing	Pigs had more optimistic judgement biases in enriched environments. Also, pigs that have spent time in an enriched environment reacted more negatively to being subsequently housed in a barren environment
Tufted capuchin (Cebus apella)	Pomerantz <i>et al</i> (2012)	Visual stimuli	Active choice	Food reward of High value	Food reward of less value	Levels of stereotypic and non-stereotypic activity (head twirls and durations of pacing)	Capuchins with higher levels of stereotypic head twirls exhibited a negative bias while judging ambiguous stimuli and had higher levels of faecal corticoids compared to subjects with lower levels of head twirls

Species	Reference	Cue Type	Response	+ Reinforcer	- Reinforcer	Affect manipulation	Main finding
Rat (Rattus norvegicus)	Richter <i>et al</i> (2012)	Spatial location	Go/No-Go	Food	Unpalatable food	Enriched vs. standard housing	Enrichment was associated with more optimistic interpretation of ambiguous cues in both "helpless" and "non- helpless" male rats
Rat (Rattus norvegicus)	Rygula <i>et al</i> (2012)	Auditory stimuli	Operant Skinner box (lever press)	Food	Mild electric shock	Manual stimulation – tickling inducing a positive affective	Tickling induced positive emotions, as indexed by rat's laughter, and was associated with more optimistic choices under ambiguous stimuli
Hens (Gallus gallus)	Wichman <i>et al</i> (2012)	Spatial location	Go/No-Go task (locomotion)	Food	No food	Enriched vs. standard housing	No significant differences between treatments were found
Goat (Capra hircus)	Briefer and McElligott (2013)	Spatial location	Go/No-Go task (locomotion)	Food	No food	Past experience of poor care vs. control group (general good care condition)	Rescued female goats with poor care experience displayed optimistic moods or similar as male without experience of poor care
Sheep (Ovis aries)	Destrez et al (2013)	Spatial location	Go/No-Go task	Food	No food + fan-forced blower	Chronic stress treatment for 9 weeks (unpredictable, uncontrollable aversive events such as predator, dog, conspecific signals and human signals)	Sheep stressed chronically for 9 weeks spend more time reaching the ambiguous location of the stimuli, indicating a negative judgement bias
Grizzly bear (Ursus arctos horribilis)	Keen <i>et al</i> (2013)	Visual stimuli	Positive reinforcement techniques (Active choice)	Food reward of High value	Food reward of less value	2.1 h of exposure to enrichment items varying in attractiveness	Results were unaffected by enrichment type or time spent interacting with enrichment items. A positive relationship between stereotypic behaviour (pacing) and 'optimistic' response bias was found

Species	Reference	Cue Type	Response	+ Reinforcer	- Reinforcer	Affect manipulation	Main finding
Cattle (Bos taurus)	Neave <i>et al</i> (2013)	Visual stimuli	Go/No-Go task	Milk (0.14L)	No food	Dehorning	After dehorning calves judge more negative the ambiguous stimuli. First evidence that a pain procedure (dehorning) are able to change the emotional state of calves
Rats (Rattus norvegicus)	Papciak <i>et al</i> (2013)	Auditory stimuli	Active choice	Food reward	Electric shock	Social defeat in the resident-intruder paradigm for 3 weeks (stressed group) and daily manipulation (control group)	Stressed group made more pessimistic choice at ambiguous cues
Cattle (Bos taurus)	Daros et al (2014)	Visual stimuli	Go/No-Go task	Milk	1 min of delay to the next trial + noise whistle sound	 Separation from the mother Dehorning 	Maternal separation calves judge the ambiguous stimuli more negatively. Also separation from the mother generates a similar judgement bias highlighted during the dehorning procedure (see also Neave <i>et al</i> 2013)
Sheep (Ovis aries)	Verbeek <i>et al</i> (2014a)	Visual and spatial stimuli	Go/No-Go task	Social reward (sheep)	Dog	Level of feeding restriction. Two groups: high feeding level and low feeding level for 7 days	Sheep under prolonged food restriction express more positive interpretation of ambiguous cues compared with a group of sheep with high feeding level
Sheep (Ovis aries)	Verbeek <i>et al</i> (2014b)	Visual and spatial stimuli	Go/No-Go task	Social reward (sheep)	Dog	Palatable and unpalatable food and subsequent administration of opioid agonist (Morphine 1 mg/Kg), administration of opioid antagonist (Naloxone 2 mg/Kg) and sterile water (10 mg/Kg)	Palatable food induces positive judgement bias in the animals that received the unpalatable food. Also a near-significant interaction treatment and location/cue when injected with morphine, which enhanced the positive bias

3 Study identification: Harding *et al* 2004; Bateson and Matheson 2007; Burman *et al* 2008a; Burman *et al* 2008b; Matheson *et al* 2008; Brilot *et*

4 al 2008; Burman et al 2009; Brilot et al 2010; Doyle et al 2010; Mendl et al 2010b; Bateson et al 2011; Burman et al 2011; Doyle et al 2011a, b;

5 Salmeto et al 2011; Sanger et al 2011; Boleij et al 2012; Brydges et al 2012; Destrez et al 2012, 2013; Douglas et al 2012; Pomerantz et al

6 2012; Richter et al 2012; Rygula et al 2012; Wichman et al 2012; Briefer et al 2013; Keen et al 2013; Neave et al 2013; Papciak et al 2013;

7 Daros *et al* 2014; Verbeek *et al* 2014a, b.

- 8 Table 2. Studies included in this review in temporal order. The table shows the main
- 9 characteristics of each: species used, reference, number of cues utilized, behaviours
- 10 measured in the judgement task, prediction in relation to judgment bias, outcome (prediction
- 11 confirmed or not), and bias location.

Species	Reference	No. of cues utilized	Behaviours measured	Prediction	Outcome	Bias location detected
Rat (Rattus norvegicus)	Harding <i>et</i> al (2004)	3 (1 ambiguous)	Proportion of tones responses; Time to respond to the tone	Negative bias	Confirmed	Nearest cue to the positive training cue
European Starling (Sturnus vulgaris)	Bateson & Matheson (2007)	5 (3 ambiguous)	Proportion of lids flipped	Negative bias	Confirmed	Nearest cue to the positive training cue
Rat (Rattus norvegicus)	Burman <i>et</i> <i>al</i> (2008a)	5 (3 ambiguous)	Average time to reach the cue	Negative bias after moving from an enriched to a standard housing condition	Confirmed	Nearest cue to the unrewarded location
Rat (Rattus norvegicus)	Burman <i>et</i> <i>al</i> (2008b)	None	Time to reach the cue; Time to feed	Negative bias in rats housed in standard conditions	Confirmed	None
European Starling (Sturnus vulgaris)	Matheson <i>et al</i> (2008)	9 (7 ambiguous)	Choice of cue	Positive judgement bias associated with enriched cage	Confirmed	None
European Starling (Sturnus vulgaris)	Brilot <i>et al</i> (2009)	4 (2 ambiguous)	Proportion of time spent in each zone in the cage; Latency to make first movement; Latency to first approach the food bowl; Proportion of time spent facing the eyespot stimulus	Interaction between the state of the birds and their response to the eyespot stimuli	Not confirmed	None
Rat (Rattus norvegicus)	Burman <i>et</i> <i>al</i> (2009)	5 (3 ambiguous)	Latency to reach the goal pot	Contrast in the judgement of ambiguous stimuli in two groups of rats tested under high and low levels of light	Confirmed	No specific locations of ambiguous cues

Species	Reference	No. of cues utilized	Behaviours measured	Prediction	Outcome	Bias location
European Starling (Sturnus vulgaris)	Brilot <i>et al</i> (2010)	5 (3 ambiguous)	Choice of cue; Latency between presentation of cue and choice	Negative judgement bias in non-enriched conditions compared with enriched conditions	Not confirmed	None
Sheep (Ovis aries)	Doyle <i>et al</i> (2010)	5 (3 ambiguous)	Average time to approach the cue	Sheep exposed to the stressor would show negative judgement bias compared to control sheep	Negative bias not confirmed. Found a positive bias instead. Sheep exposed to the stressor showed a positive judgement bias	Central cue
Dog (Canis lupus familiaris)	Mendl <i>et al</i> (2010b)	5 (3 ambiguous)	Latency to reach the cue	Dogs with higher levels of separation-related behaviour (SRB) would show negative judgement bias	Confirmed	Central cue and near negative cue
Honeybee (Apis mellifera)	Bateson <i>et</i> <i>al</i> (2011)	5 (3 ambiguous)	Extension of proboscis	Shaken bees would exhibit negative judgement bias	Confirmed	Near negative cue
Dogs (Canis lupus familiaris)	Burman <i>et</i> <i>al</i> (2011)	5 (3 ambiguous)	Latency to approach the cue	Dogs with a rewarding experience before testing would exhibit a positive judgment bias compared with a control group	Negative bias not confirmed. Positive bias found instead. Rewarded dogs showed a pessimistic judgment bias	Central cue
Sheep (Ovis aries)	Doyle <i>et al</i> (2011a)	7 (5 ambiguous)	Latency to approach the cue	Stressed sheep would have a more negative judgement bias	Confirmed	Near positive cue
Sheep (Ovis aries)	Doyle <i>et al</i> (2011b)	5 (3 ambiguous)	Latency to approach the cue	Sheep treated with (pCPA) would have more negative judgement bias compared with the a control group	Partially confirmed. No difference following three days of treatment, but a negative bias found followed 5 days of treatment and a trend after 5 days from the cessation of treatment	Central cue and near to the positive cue

Species	Reference	No. of cues utilized	Behaviours measured	Prediction	Outcome	Bias location detected
Chicks (Gallus gallus)	Salmeto <i>et</i> <i>al</i> (2011)	5 (3 ambiguous)	Start latency (time to step outside the start box); Goal latency (time to cross a defined mark located 10 cm away from the cue)	Non stressed chick runway latencies would differ according to the cue used; Chicks isolated for 5 min less approach behaviour to ambiguous cues close to the negative cue; Chicks isolated for 60 min less approach behaviour to ambiguous cues closest to both positive or negative	Confirmed	Central cue and near negative cue
Sheep (Ovis aries)	Sanger <i>et al</i> (2011)	5 (3 ambiguous)	Approach the cues	Sheep released from the short- term stress of shearing would show positive judgement bias	Confirmed	Central cue
Mice (Mus musculus)	Boleij <i>et al</i> (2012)	5 (3 ambiguous)	Latency to eat; Latency and duration of exploratory behaviour; Locomotor behaviours; Picking up the food	BALB/c mice more negative judgement bias compared with129P3; BALB/c mice tested under white light condition more negative judgement than mice tested under dark light condition	Confirmed	None
Rat (Rattus norvegicus)	Brydges et al (2012)	4 (2 ambiguous)	Choice of bowl (Chocolate recorded as an optimistic choice and Cheerio recorded as a pessimistic choice)	Animals with juvenile stress would show negative cognitive bias compared to control animals	Negative bias not confirmed. Positive bias found instead.	None

Species	Reference	No. of cues utilized	Behaviours measured	Prediction	Outcome	Bias location
Sheep (Ovis aries)	Destrez et al (2012)	5 (3 ambiguous)	Latencies to approach the cue	Ability of diazepam treatment to induce an optimistic-like judgement bias	Confirmed	Close to the positive cue
Pig (Sus scrofa)	Douglas <i>et</i> <i>al</i> (2012)	3 (1 ambiguous cues)	Approach behaviour to the cue; Latency to approach the cue	Pigs housed in enriched pens would show positive judgement bias compared with pigs housed in barren pens; Experience of barren pen following the enrichment condition would increase negative judgment bias	Confirmed	None
Tufted capuchin (Cebus apella)	Pomerantz <i>et al</i> (2012)	3 (1 ambiguous cue)	Choice associated with preferred reward; Pacing behaviour; Head-twirls	Association between stereotypic behaviour and negative judgement bias	Confirmed. Monkeys with head twirls displayed negative judgement bias	None
Rat (Rattus norvegicus)	Richter <i>et al</i> (2012)	5 (3 ambiguous)	Latency to "reach" the cue (time taken to touch the cue); Latency to "choose" the cue (time taken to place nose in food bowl); Number of arm choices; Number of head dips; Number of rearing (standing upright on its hind limbs)	Enrichment would affect judgment biases in helpless and non-helpless rats	Partially confirmed. Enrichment housing condition increased positive judgement bias in both groups (only evident in latency to choose behaviour)	None
Rat (Rattus norvegicus)	Rygula <i>et al</i> (2012)	3 (1 ambiguous cues)	Response to cues; Number of omissions	Association between positive emotion (induced by tickling) and positive judgement bias compared with handled rats	Partially confirmed. No differences in judgement bias between tickling and handled group. Only rats that emitted 50 kHz vocalization after tickling showed more positive judgement bias	None

Species	Reference	No. of cues utilized	Behaviours measured	Prediction	Outcome	Bias location
Hens (Gallus gallus)	Wichman <i>et</i> <i>al</i> (2012)	5 (3 ambiguous)	Latency between leaving the start box and pecking the cue	Difference in enriched and standard housing conditions	No confirmed	None (trend toward Central cue)
Goat (Capra hircus)	Briefer and McElligott (2013)	5 (3 ambiguous)	Latency to reach the location of cue	Goats with poor welfare experience more negative judgement bias; Absence of negative judgement bias would indicate recovery	Partially Confirmed. Only females with poor welfare experience showed a positive judgement bias	Close to the positive cue and close to the negative cue
Sheep (Ovis aries)	Destrez et al (2013)	5 (3 ambiguous)	Latency to reach the location of cue	Chronic stress treatment for 9 weeks induce a negative mood	Confirmed	Negative, close to negative middle and closed to positive cues
Grizzly bear (Ursus arctos horribilis)	Keen <i>et al</i> (2013)	5 (3 ambiguous)	Response to the central cue; Time interaction with the enrichment item; Pacing behaviour (repetition of the same route with or without head tossing/ pirouetting)	Bears would show more positive judgement bias to the central cue after long interaction with enrichment item (associated with high reward); bears would show negative judgement bias towards central cue after longer periods engaged in stereotypic behaviour (associated with low reward)	Not Confirmed. Enrichment was not a significant predictor of cognitive bias response at the central cue. Pacing behaviour was associated with a positive judgement bias	None
Cattle (Bos taurus)	Neave <i>et al</i> (2013)	5 (3 ambiguous)	Responses to ambiguous cue	Experience of dehorning associated with pessimistic bias	Confirmed	Central cue and Near negative cue
Rats (Rattus norvegicus)	Papciak <i>et</i> <i>al</i> (2013)	3 (1 ambiguous)	Response to the cues; Number of omissions	Effect of psychosocial stress (resident- intruder paradigm) on negative judgement bias	Confirmed	None
Cattle (Bos taurus)	Daros <i>et al</i> (2014)	5 (3 ambiguous)	Response to the cues; Number of omissions	Separation from the mother to induce a negative judgement bias	Confirmed	Near negative and central cue

Species	Reference	No. of cues utilized	Behaviours measured	Prediction	Outcome	Bias location
Cattle (Bos taurus)	Daros et al (2014)	5 (3 ambiguous)	Response to the cues; Number of omissions	Separation from the dam induce a negative judgement bias	Confirmed	Near negative and central cue
Sheep (Ovis aries)	Verbeek et al (2014a)	5 (3 ambiguous)	Approach response to the cue; Number of steps, Number of vocalisations Number of oral manipulations of the walls and floor	Chronic food restriction would lead to a negative judgement bias	Negative judgment bias not found. Positive judgment bias found instead	None
Sheep (Ovis aries)	Verbeek et al (2014b)	5 (3 ambiguous)	Approach response to the cue	Consuming palatable food reward induces positive judgement bias compared when receiving unpalatable food. Also morphine administration boosts the positive bias after consuming the food reward and reduces the negative bias after receiving the unpalatable food. Naloxone would prevent the formation of positive judgement bias after consumption of food reward and little effect after receiving the unpalatable food	Partially confirmed. Consuming food reward induces positive judgement bias compared when receiving unpalatable food. Morphine administration boosts the positive bias after receiving the food reward. No evidence of reduction of negative bias after the consuming the unpalatable food with the administration of morphine. Noloxone had no effect in these experiments	None

Study identification: Harding *et al* 2004; Bateson and Matheson 2007; Burman *et al* 2008a; Burman *et al* 2008b; Matheson *et al* 2008; Brilot *et al* 2008; Burman *et al* 2009; Brilot *et al* 2010; Doyle *et al* 2010; Mendl *et al* 2010b; Bateson *et al* 2011; Burman *et al* 2011; Doyle *et al* 2011; Doyle *et al* 2011; Sanger *et al* 2011; Boleij *et al* 2012; Brydges *et al* 2012; Destrez *et al* 2012, 2013; Douglas *et al* 2012; Pomerantz *et al* 2012; Richter *et al* 2012; Rygula *et al* 2012; Wichman *et al* 2012; Briefer *et al* 2013; Keen *et al* 2013; Neave *et al* 2013; Papciak *et al* 2013; Daros *et al* 2014; Verbeek *et al* 2014a,