REVIEW ARTICLE



A Meta-analytic Review of the Relationship Between Posttraumatic Growth, Anxiety, and Depression

Laura J. Long¹ · Colleen A. Phillips¹ · Nina Glover² · Angela L. Richardson¹ · Johann M. D'Souza¹ · Pelin Cunningham-Erdogdu³ · Matthew W. Gallagher¹

Accepted: 1 February 2021 / Published online: 10 March 2021 © The Author(s), under exclusive licence to Springer Nature B.V. part of Springer Nature 2021

Abstract

The present meta-analysis consolidated research examining how posttraumatic growth relates to global anxiety and depression. Articles were identified by searching PTSDpubs, PsycINFO, PubMed, and ProQuest Dissertations and Theses databases, as well as searching the reference sections of relevant review articles. Meta-analytic review of 129 included studies indicated that neither overall posttraumatic growth nor its subcomponents were meaningfully associated with symptoms of depression and anxiety when the literature was considered in aggregate, as effect sizes for these relationships were generally weak ($\leq |.10|$) and/or bordered on zero. The moderator analysis indicated significant heterogeneity in effects. The pattern of results indicated that depression was more strongly associated with less posttraumatic growth in samples with cancer compared to samples without cancer, while certain facets of posttraumatic growth were related to greater anxiety in non-cancer samples, though the effect sizes for these relationships remained small. The present findings support the perspective that outcomes representing positive functioning are separable and not dependent on the absence of mental illness. Future research should identify moderators of the relationships between posttraumatic growth and symptoms of anxiety and depression.

Keywords Posttraumatic growth · Anxiety · Depression · Meta-analysis

Laura J. Long laura.long@times.uh.edu

¹ Department of Psychology, Texas Institute for Measurement, Evaluation, and Statistics, University of Houston, 4849 Calhoun Rd, Rm 483, Houston, TX, USA

² Department of Psychology, Louisiana State University, 236 Audubon Hall, Baton Rouge, LA 70808, USA

³ Department of Psychology, The University of Texas at Austin, 108 E. Dean Keeton Stop A8000, Austin, TX 78712, USA

1 Introduction

Traumatic experiences are unfortunately common, with 89.7% of Americans endorsing at least one trauma in their lifetime (Kilpatrick et al. 2013). Following traumatic experiences, some individuals may experience mental health issues such as symptoms of emotional disorders, including posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD), anxiety, and depression (Boscarino et al. 2014; Galea et al. 2007; Kessler et al. 2008; Schwartz et al. 2015). Yet a large portion of trauma survivors are able to recover (Southwick et al. 2014), and some may even experience positive personal change as a result of traumatic circumstances in the form of posttraumatic growth (PTG; Bonanno et al. 2011; Southwick et al. 2014; Tedeschi and Calhoun 2004). Though symptoms of psychopathology and positive functioning are traditionally assumed to be diametrically opposed, increasing evidence suggests that mental illness and wellness are separable and exist on a dual continuums (Huppert and Whittington 2013; Keyes 2005). Positive and negative outcomes of trauma such as symptoms of mental illness and PTG may even be experienced concurrently (Jin et al. 2014; Lowe et al. 2013). More extensive research has examined how PTG relates to PTSD following traumatic events, suggesting that there may be a positive association between the two outcomes (Shakespeare-Finch and Lurie-Beck 2014). However, fewer studies have examined how PTG relates to other mental health outcomes following trauma, such as anxiety and depression. Thus, the present meta-analyses sought to consolidate prior research examining the relationship between PTG and symptoms of anxiety and depression.

1.1 Posttraumatic Growth

Although research has shown that traumatic events can have a negative psychological impact, many survivors experience positive outcomes following trauma. One positive outcome that may occur after a traumatic experience is PTG. Tedeschi and Calhoun (1996) conceptualize PTG as the experience of positive change after a trauma. When people experience a traumatic event, their core beliefs about the world are disrupted (Janoff-Bulman 1989; Schuler and Boals 2016). As survivors process the trauma and its influence on their belief systems, emotional responses, and functioning, they may experience PTG if they are able to resolve challenges and perceive benefits associated with their struggles. Thus, PTG can be considered both a process and eventual outcome of trauma (Tedeschi and Calhoun 1996). PTG is comprised of five distinct domains: relating to others, new possibilities, personal strength, spiritual change, and appreciation of life (Tedeschi and Calhoun 2004). Relating to others consists of positive changes in relationships, such as more meaningful social connections. New possibilities consists of identifying and pursuing new hobbies, interests, and paths in life. Personal strength is related to the perceived capacity to handle stressful situations in the future. Spiritual change occurs when people experience a greater involvement in religious or existential questions. Finally, appreciation of life is a sense of appreciation of the small elements of living that may have gone unnoticed or were taken for granted before the trauma. There is growing evidence that people experience PTG following various types of traumatic events, including natural disasters (Cook et al. 2013), cancer (Cordova et al. 2001), assault (Kleim and Ehlers 2009), combat (Solomon and Dekel 2007) and traffic accidents (Nishi et al. 2010).

Similar concepts have emerged in the literature to describe positive changes in response to traumatic events, such as stress-related growth, benefit-finding, and thriving, which, along with PTG, have been collectively referred to as adversarial growth (Linley and Joseph 2004). However, Tedeschi and Calhoun (2004) highlight notable distinctions between PTG and such related terms. For instance, stress-related growth (Park et al. 1996) encompasses enhancements in social and personal resources more broadly, while also including improvements in coping skills. PTG is considered an ongoing process or an outcome of trauma, as opposed to a way of coping, and is theorized to occur after major crises rather than stress in general (Tedeschi and Calhoun 2004). In addition, Tedeschi and Calhoun (2004) emphasize that PTG refers to actual positive changes in specific domains, as opposed to perceived benefits from adversity indicated by the term benefit-finding (Affleck and Tennen 1996). Finally, Tedeschi and Calhoun (2004) underscore that PTG may necessitate a traumatic experience that shatters fundamental belief systems and thus may coincide with symptoms of distress, which is not captured by terms such as thriving.

1.2 Posttraumatic Growth and Distress

Much of the research examining how PTG relates to mental illness after a trauma has focused on symptoms of PTSD. A recent meta-analysis examining the association between PTG and PTSD found that these constructs were positively linearly related, but also demonstrated a stronger curvilinear relationship such that a moderate level of posttraumatic stress symptoms is associated with the greatest degree of PTG (Shakespeare-Finch and Lurie-Beck 2014). Thus, too little distress resulting from a traumatic event may indicate that the event was not significant enough to disrupt one's belief system, while too much distress may preclude positive personal growth. Traumatic events that disrupt one's conceptualization of the world are associated with posttraumatic stress symptoms following the event, but also with greater PTG (Groleau et al. 2013). Some research has suggested that this relationship may be explained by factors such as event centrality, the extent to which a traumatic event acts as a reference point for one's identity and worldview (Berntsen and Rubin 2006). Events that are more central to identity may lead to greater cognitive disruption, which can contribute to distress (e.g. symptoms of emotional disorders such as PTSD) but also PTG (Groleau et al. 2013; Schuettler and Boals 2011).

In addition to PTSD, anxiety and depression are common consequences of exposure to traumatic events (Freedy et al. 1993; Lustig et al. 2004; Suris and Lind 2008), and these symptoms are often comorbid (Ginzburg et al. 2010). In a study comparing traumatized and non-traumatized students, undergraduates who experienced trauma had significantly higher levels of both anxiety and depression, and this relationship was stronger among those who had experienced a greater number of traumatic events (Vrana and Lauterbach 1994). In addition, a history of child abuse was found to be significantly associated with greater lifetime incidence and greater chronicity of both anxiety and depression among adults (Hovens et al. 2012). Among veterans, the rate of comorbidity for PTSD, anxiety, and depression was greater than the rate of PTSD alone (Ginzburg et al. 2010). Furthermore, comorbid symptoms of PTSD, anxiety, and depression were associated with greater distress than PTSD alone among child survivors of Hurricane Katrina (Lai et al. 2015). Thus, examining the relationship between PTG and other trauma-related outcomes such

as anxiety and depression will allow for a more complete understanding of how traumatic events influence mental health.

1.3 Anxiety, Depression, and PTG

Studies examining how PTG relates to anxiety and depression have generated mixed results. An earlier meta-analysis suggested that benefit finding and growth following stressors were weakly related to lower levels of depression but unrelated to anxiety (Helgeson et al. 2006). Since then, many more studies have examined the psychological correlates of PTG. In particular, a large number of studies have examined these relationships in cancer populations. A recent meta-analysis examining psychological distress and PTG specifically among cancer patients found that depression demonstrated a weak inverse relationship with PTG while anxiety showed a very weak positive relationship to PTG, which was not statistically significant (Shand et al. 2015). PTG and mental health have also been examined in other specific populations with mixed findings. A review of PTG and mental health among individuals with a serious medical condition reflected inconsistent results, as half of the studies examining PTG and depression found an inverse relationship and half found no significant association between PTG and depression (Barskova and Oesterreich 2009). In addition, some of the studies found a positive relationship between PTG and anxiety, while others found an inverse relationship or no relationship to Barskova and Oesterreich 2009).

While symptoms of anxiety, depression, and PTSD are common among survivors of trauma, PTSD is uniquely anchored to a traumatic event in a way that the other emotional disorders are not. In the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual Version 5 (DSM-5), depression, anxiety, and PTSD are separated in distinct categories (American Psychological Association 2013). Although these disorders share common features and symptoms, PTSD is distinct in its direct association with a necessary Criterion A traumatic event. Despite the prevalence of anxiety and depression following stressors, these disorders are less sensitive and specific to posttraumatic reactions to stressors (Friedman et al. 2011). Survivors may not relate symptoms of anxiety and depression associated with the trauma to the trauma itself, particularly if a greater amount of time has passed since the trauma (NICE 2005). In a study of combat veterans, those with PTSD showed greater physiological reactivity to imaginal exposure to the traumatic event compared to those with non-PTSD anxiety (Pitman et al. 1993). This may suggest that the event itself is more strongly associated to symptoms of PTSD compared to anxiety, which may indicate that anxiety has a weaker association than PTSD with PTG. Further, while depression and PTSD are often comorbid following trauma, depression without PTSD is predicted by different factors than PTSD. In a group of injury survivors, characteristics of the traumatic event predicted PTSD as well as comorbid PTSD and depression, but did not predict depression alone (O'Donnell et al. 2004). This suggests that, similarly to anxiety, depression is less directly related to the traumatic event than PTSD and may show a weaker relationship to PTG compared to PTSD. The literature suggests that while trauma can be a risk factor for the development of PTSD, anxiety, and depression, the three disorders are distinct outcomes. Thus, the relationships between these mental health issues and PTG may differ, possibly due differences in how they are connected to the traumatic event.

1.4 The Present Study

Given the mixed findings from studies investigating the relationships between PTG and symptoms of anxiety and depression, the present meta-analysis aimed to synthesize the existing literature examining how global anxiety and depression are associated with the positive outcome of PTG following a variety of traumatic experiences. The present research will also expand on prior reviews by examining the associations between the subcomponents of PTG and these outcomes. We hypothesized that both anxiety and depression would have a weak inverse association with PTG given that symptoms of anxiety and depression are less directly anchored to trauma-related cognitive processing compared to PTG and other outcomes of trauma such as PTSD. Furthermore, because a large portion of the present literature consists of studies conducted with cancer survivors, it is important to consider whether there are any notable differences in these relationships between cancer survivors and survivors of other traumas when reviewing the literature as a whole. Thus, we also aimed to examine whether cancer status is a moderator of the relationships between PTG and symptoms of anxiety and depression. In addition, we examined whether relevant demographic characteristics of the samples (e.g. age and gender) influenced this relationship.

2 Methods

2.1 Literature Search

A comprehensive literature review was conducted by searching relevant databases (see Fig. 1) for appropriate articles in accordance with PRSIMA guidelines. Searches of PTS-Dpubs (formerly Published International Literature on Traumatic Stress), PsycINFO, Pub-Med, and ProQuest Dissertations and Theses online databases conducted in September, 2019 identified a total of 3968 available articles. Search parameters included various combinations of the phrases "anxiety" and "depress*," along with "posttraumatic growth", "post-traumatic growth," "post traumatic growth," and "PTG." Database searches identified these terms within keywords, titles, test or measures, abstracts, and full text when possible. In addition, articles were identified by examining the reference sections of relevant systematic and meta-analytic reviews (Barskova and Oesterreich 2009; Casellas-Grau et al. 2017; Chan et al. 2016; Grace et al. 2015; Habib et al. 2018; Helgeson et al. 2006; Linley and Joseph 2004; Meyerson et al. 2011; Schubert et al. 2015; Shand et al., 2015; Sherr et al. 2011; Turner et al. 2018; Warsini et al. 2014; Zoellner and Maercker 2006). In total, 4553 articles were identified from both online database searches and the reference sections of relevant review articles (before duplicates were removed). Articles that were identified by searching databases or relevant review articles were then screened to determine whether they met the inclusion criteria.

2.2 Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

In order to be included in the meta-analyses studies had to include: (a) a continuous measure of global anxiety or depression, (b) The Posttraumatic Growth Inventory (PTGI; either the complete 21-item version or 10-item short form i.e. Cann et al., 2010; Tedeschi &



Fig. 1 PRISMA literature search flow diagram

Calhoun, 1996), (c) text in the English language, (d) a reported Pearson's r cross-sectional effect size (ES) or sufficient information to calculate this ES, (e) and unique data that were not present in full or part in another published study. Figure 1 depicts a flow chart of the

literature search process. A total of 1770 studies were identified through the literature search after duplicates were removed, and 1169 studies passed the screening for potential inclusion. Of these, 129 met inclusion criteria for the meta-analysis.

2.3 Coding Procedure

Relevant information from the studies was recorded onto a coding form. This included (a) report information (i.e., full bibliographic reference), (b) publication type (e.g., peer reviewed journal article, dissertation), (c) study design (e.g., treatment outcome, cross-sectional, longitudinal), (d) sample characteristics (e.g., total *n*, mean age, child versus adult, race, clinical versus non-clinical, diagnostic status, trauma type, (e) anxiety measure (e.g., STAIT) (f) depression measure (e.g., BDI-II), (g) Posttraumatic Growth Inventory version (e.g., full or short-form) and (h) ES information. Of the studies identified for further review, 75% were independently coded by two different authors and the agreement rate for study inclusion was 97%. Discrepancies were resolved through discussion.

2.4 Converting and Calculating Effect Sizes

Effect sizes characterizing the cross-sectional relationship between total PTG or a PTGI subscale and either global anxiety or depression symptoms were identified during article coding (if longitudinal studies reported more than one cross-sectional ES, the ES from the first measurement timepoint was used).Given that Pearson's correlation coefficient r was the most commonly reported ES, other reported ES (e.g. R^2 values for univariate regressions) were converted to r (Lipsey and Wilson 2001). When correlations for each component subscale of the PTGI were reported without including a correlation for the total PTGI, subscale correlations were averaged to create an ES for the relationship between total PTG and anxiety or depression symptoms.

Afterwards, resulting ES were transformed into Fisher *z* scores in order to address nonnormal distribution due to the bounded properties of *r*. Sampling error was also corrected by weighting the Fisher's *z* ES by sample size based on assumptions that ES from larger samples would be more accurate representations of the population statistic. Next, resulting Fisher's *z* ES were weighted in accordance with a random effects model. The resulting weighted mean fisher's *z* ES were then converted back to Pearson's *r* weighted mean ES with 95% confidence intervals (CI). Forest plots and funnel plots were created using the metafor package for R (Version 3.5.3).

Next, we examined the heterogeneity of effects in order to determine whether moderators were likely to influence the strength of the relationships between PTG and global anxiety and depression. A significant Q statistic indicated significant variance in an effect, suggesting the presence of moderators. We then examined whether cancer status (i.e., cancer vs. non-cancer sample) and gender (e.g., majority male vs. majority female) moderated the relationships between PTG and global anxiety and depression. We also examined whether age (e.g., adult vs. child/adolescent) moderated the relationship between PTG and total depression (while all included studies described the age characteristics of their samples, only studies examining the relationship between PTG and total depression demonstrated sufficient variability in age to conduct these analyses). All moderator analyses were calculated using the MetaF SPSS Macro developed by Lipsey and Wilson (2001).

3 Results

A total of 129 manuscripts were included in the meta-analysis that reported cross-sectional associations between PTG and global anxiety and depression.

3.1 Anxiety and Total PTG

Figure 2 presents the ES and 95% confidence intervals for individual studies examining the association between anxiety and total PTG. The associations (r) between anxiety and total PTG ranged from -0.54 to 0.54. Based on k = 55 studies resulting in a



Fig. 2 Forest plot with anxiety effect sizes

3711

combined sample size of n = 9425, the weighted mean ES for the association between anxiety and total PTG was 0.04 (95% CI -0.01: 0.10). Given the very small, non-statistically significant ES, the results suggest that global anxiety and PTG are practically unrelated when the literature is considered in aggregate. The fail safe N for this effect was 184 and a funnel plot with included effects sizes appeared symmetrical (See Supplemental Figure 1), which suggests that this is a robust finding that is unlikely to be due to spurious results associated with publication bias. However, the heterogeneity analysis for the cross-sectional associations indicated significant variance in the ES (Q= 369.62, df = 54, p < 0.001).

3.2 Depression and Total PTG

Figure 3 presents the ES and 95% confidence intervals for individual studies examining the association between depression and total PTG. The associations (*r*) between depression and total PTG ranged from -0.53 to 0.47. Based on k=121 studies resulting in a combined sample size of n=30,550, the weighted mean ES for the cross-sectional association between depression and total PTG was -0.04 (95% CI -0.07: -0.001. This indicates that depression and PTG are generally unrelated when the literature is considered in aggregate. The fail safe N for this effect was 574 and a funnel plot with ES from included studies appeared symmetrical (See Supplemental Figure 2), which suggest that this is a robust finding that is unlikely to be due to spurious results. Heterogeneity analysis for the cross-sectional associations indicated significant variance in the depression and PTG ES (Q = 1032.59, df = 120, p < 0.001).

3.3 Anxiety and PTG Components

Table 1 presents the results of the meta-analytic review of the relationships between anxiety and PTG components (a list of ES and associated 95% CIs from included studies are also available in Figs. 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8). The number of studies (k) included in the analyses ranged from 15 to 16, and the combined sample size (n) ranged from 2593 to 2652. The weighted mean ES for these relationships were generally small, ranging from 0.03 to 0.10. While all but two of these relationships were statistically significant, the magnitude of the ES indicated generally weak relationships between PTG components and greater anxiety, which are unlikely to hold clinical significance. In addition, the fail-safe Ns and visual inspection of associated funnel plots (See Supplemental Figures 3–7) suggest that these results are unlikely to reflect bias due to unpublished null findings. However, heterogeneity analysis for these associations indicated significant variance in the effect sizes (except for in the case of the association between anxiety and personal strength).

Fig. 3 Forest plot with total depression effect sizes

Down, 2009 Developm, 2019 Developm, 2019 De	dy		ES (r) 95% CI
Development, noti Contest & Constant, Status,	nah, 2009		0.47 [0.34, 0.60]
Conset a Locar, 2019 Dark & Locar, 2019 Dark & Locar, 2019 Dark & Locar, 2019 Department House Aurol, 2019 Department Hou	ckstrom, 2013 kel Ein-Dor, & Solomon, 2012		0.38 [0.23, 0.53]
Dave 8 (no. 2013 Profest, Nomer, Radiett, Kurer, & Elong, 200 Profest, Nomer, Radiett, Kurer, & Elong, 200 Profest, Nomer, Radiett, Kurer, & Elong, 200 Profest, Scale, Hendra, Vascemeye, & Karsas, 2019 Profest, Scale, Hendra, Vascemeye, & Karsas, 2019 Profest, Scale, Radiett, Scale, 2019 Profest, Scale, Radiett, Scale, 2019 Profest, Scale, Scale, Scale, Scale, 2019 Profest, Scale, Scale, Scale, Scale, Scale, 2019 Profest, Scale, Scale, Scale, Scale, Scale, 2019 Profest, Scale, Scale, Scale, Scale, Scale, Scale, 2019 Profest, Scale, Sc	ville & Cream, 2009		0.33 [0.06, 0.60]
Papes, Names, Hance, Burne, Steps, 2019 Warrisk, Caute, Halman, Lebran, Rama, 2014 Warrisk, Sahara, Journe, Lebran, 2019 Warrisk, Sahara, Journe, Journe, 2019 Warrisk, Sahara, Journe, Journe, 2019 Warrisk, Sahara, Journe, Journe, Journe, 2019 Warrisk, Sahara, Journe, 2019 Warrisk, Sahara, Journe, 2019 Warrisk, Sahara, Journe, 2019 Warrisk, Sahara, Journe, Journe, 2019 Warrisk, Sahara, 2	/is & Novoa, 2013	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	0.31 [0.07, 0.55]
Songer, 1977 Songer, 1977 Merz, Stawer, Hanting, Vereinnyer, & Katesia, 2019 Merz, Stawer, Hanting, Vereinnyer, & Katesia, 2019 Songer, 1977 Exc., Stawer, Hanting, A., Stawer, 2015 Songer, 2007 Exc., 2006 Magger-Angers, Exc., Stawer, 2015 Songer, 2007 Exc., 2006 Magger-Angers, Exc., Stawer, 2015 Songer, 2007 Exc., 2007 Magger-Angers, Exc., Stawer, 2015 Songer, 2017 Songer, 20	elps, Williams, Raichle, Turner, & Ehde, 2008 perstrom, Eisenlohr-Moul, Evans, & Ram, 2014		0.28 [0.11, 0.45]
Watersie, Staden, Sterene, A. Lecher, 2019 Water St. 2006 Charge Patients, A. Adams, 2016 Restryater, 494, Adversie, 2017 Restryater, 494, Adversie, 2018 Restry, 404, Restryater, 404, Restry, 2016 Restryater, 494, Restry, 404, Restry, 2016 Restryater, 494, Restry, 404, Restry, 2016 Restryater, 494, Restry, 404, Restry, 2016 Restryater, 404, Restry, 4016 Restryater, 404, Restry, 4016 Restry	ape, 1997		0.28 [0.02, 0.54]
Valet. Jankow, Nov. Reven, A. Laner, 201 Valet. Jankow, Jankow, Kaner, Jankow, Jankow	zniak, Caudle, Harding, Vieselmeyer, & Mezulis, 2019	. ⊢ ∎-1	0.25 (0.15, 0.35)
Data de Juno d	iez, Stanton, Hoyt, Tennen, & Lechner, 2011 Depaid, 2009		0.25 [0.10, 0.40]
Chapter, Person, Pana, 2017 Margaret, Pers, Advance, Data Pana, 2007 Margaret, Pers, Advance, Data Pana, 2007 Barret, Pers, Cells, & Farrans, 2013 Locoy, Neton, Advance, Advance, 2017 Barret, Pers, 2007 Barret, Barret,	a et al., 2012		0.22 [0.05, 0.39]
Ranguez (Heg A Advors-Tapa, 2017) Particle (Heg A Advors-Tapa, 2017) Marry, Simpon, Ecste, & Forshen, 2013 Marcy, Simpon, Ecste, & Forshen, 2013 Marcy, Steppen, Advorse, Tapo, 2018 Marcy, Steppen, Advorse, Tapo, 2018 Marcy, Steppen, Advorse, Rohmen, 2013 Marcy, Steppen, Advorse, Rohmen, 2010 Marcy, Steppen, Advorse, Rohmen, 2010 Marcy, Steppen, Advorse, Rohmen, 2010 Marcy, Steppen, 2016 Marcy, Steppen, 2016 Marcy, Steppen, 2016 Marcy, Steppen, 2016 Marcy, Steppen, 2017 Marcy, 201	opko, Palmieri, & Adams, 2016	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	0.20 [0.06, 0.34]
Dan 200 Waters Support, Science, F. Persona, 2015 Waters Support, Andress, Andress, 2015 Waters Support, Andress, Andress, 2015 Waters Support, Science, Andress, 2015 Waters Support, Science, Science, 2015 Waters, 2010 Water, Support, Science, F. Persona, 2015 Waters, 2010 Water, Support, Science, F. Persona, 2017 Harr, Josef, Geyn, A. Perer, 2017 Water, Support, Science, F. Persona, 8. Maericer, 2009 Water, 2007 Water, Support, Science, F. Persona, 7. 2007 Water, Support, Science, F. Persona, 8. Maericer, 2009 Water, Support, Science, F. Persona, 8. Maericer, 2009 Water, Support, Science, F. Persona, 8. Maericer, 2009 Water, Support, Science, F. Persona, 7. 2015 Water, Support, Science, Science, F. Persona, 7. 2017 Water, Support, Science, Science, 7. 2017 Water, Support, Science, Science, 7. 2017 Water, Support, Science, Science, Science, 7. 2017 Water, Support, Science, Science, 7. 2017 Water, Science, Sci	driguez-Rey & Alonso-Tapia, 2017 vaira & Paraira, 2012		0.20 [0.04, 0.36]
Marry, Smpton, Ectors, & Fortune, 2019 Webstread, 2010 Smst, 2000 Smst, 200	3, 2006		0.18[-0.15, 0.51]
Witkensel, 2011 Image: The North State State State, 2010 Image: The North State Strender et al., 2019 Image: The North State Strender State Strender et al., 2019 Strender State Strender State Strender State Strender State Strender State Strender Strender, North Strender, 2014 Strender Strender, 2017 Image: The Strender, 2014 Strender Strender, 2014 Image: The Strender, 2014 Strender Strender, 2017 Image: The Strender, 2014 Strender Strender, 2014 Image: The Strender, 2014 Strender Strender, 2014 Image: The Strender, 2014 Strender Strender, 2014 Image: The Strender, 2014 Str	rray, Simpson, Eccles, & Forshaw, 2015	· ⊢	0.18[-0.06, 0.42]
magner manner (Horner, 2010 Smart, 2006 Smart, 2007 Smort, 2007 Sm	itehead, 2011		0.18 [0.07, 0.29]
Face, 2010 Hogpran,	gyar-Russell, Pargament, Trevino, & Sherman, 2013 Cour, Nielson, Andersen, & Madsen, 2015		0.17[-0.06, 0.40]
Sinstr. 2006 Sinstr. 2006 Sinstr. 2006 Sinstr. 2006 Sinstr. 2007 Rever, Arrandowal, Schware, Roberson, & Moye, 2012 Sinstr. 2007 Rever, Arrandowal, Schware, Roberson, 2009 Morell, 2007 Morell, 2007 Sinstr. 2007 Sins	ne, 2010	i ⊢ ∎−i	0.15[0.03, 0.27]
<pre>nogetam (soft, and (soft, an</pre>	art, 2006		0.15[-0.22, 0.52]
Lindtorm, 2014 Shonder et al. 2019 Therwa, Antona, Schudter, Rohnston, 8. Maye, 2012 Therwa, Antona, Schudter, Rohnston, 8. Maye, 2012 Therwa, Antona, Schudter, Rohnston, 8. Maexier, 2009 Morni et al. 2008 Shonder et al. 2019 Shonder et al. 2019 Shonder et al. 2019 Shonder et al. 2019 Shonder et al. 2017 Shonder	nchi et al., 2017		0.12 [0.01, 0.23]
Schneider Hal, 2019 Horway, Achtagunki, Schuarer, Rochardson, & Moye, 2012 Horway, Achtagunki, Schuarer, Rochardson, & Moye, 2012 Horway, Achtagunki, Schuarer, Schuerer, 2017 Harry, Jong Mill, Schuerer, 2017 Send-Gurar, K. Aywalk, 2000 Weller, Shakepszer-Frein, 2013 Sawer, K. Book, A. Refr. 2015 January, Zacheck, China, & Song, 2018 Sawer, K. Book, A. Refr. 2015 January, Zacheck, China, & Song, 2018 Sawer, K. Book, A. Refr. 2015 January, Zacheck, China, & Song, 2018 Sawer, K. Book, A. Refr. 2015 January, Zacheck, China, & Song, 2018 Sawer, K. Book, A. Refr. 2015 January, Zacheck, China, & Song, 2018 Sawer, K. Book, A. Refr. 2015 January, Zacheck, China, & Song, 2018 Sawer, K. Book, A. Refr. 2015 January, Zacheck, China, & Song, 2018 Sawer, K. Book, A. Refr. 2017 The Sawer, S. Book, J. Refr. 2017 The Sawer, S. Book, J. Refr. 2017 The Sawer, S. Book, J. Refr. 2017 Samer, Eds., Book, J. Refr. 2017 The Sawer, S. Book, J. Refr. 2017 Samer, Eds., Book, J. Refr. 2017 Samer, Eds., Jose, Cather, S. Anapin, 2018 Samer, S. L. Samer, 2017 Samer, S. L. Samer, 2017 Samer, S. L. Samer, 2017 Samer, S. Cameron, 2017 Corrent, J. Zamarra, S. Nater, 2018 Samer, S. L. Samer, 2017 Samer, S. L. Samer, 2018 Samer, S. L. Samer, 2017 Samer, S. L. Samer, 2018 Samer, S. Samer, Samer, 2018 Samer, S. L. Samer, 2018 Samer, S. L. Samer, 2018 Samer, S. L. Samer, 2018 Samer, S. L. Samer, 2018 Samer, S. Samer, Samer, 2018 Samer, S. Samer, Samer, 2018 Samer, S. Samer, Samer, 2018 Samer, S. Samer, Samer, 2018 Samer, 2018 Samer, S. Samer, Samer, 2018 Samer, S. Samer, Samer, 2018 Samer, Samer, Samer, 2018 Samer, Samer, Samer, Samer, 201	dstrom, 2014		0.12[-0.11, 0.35]
The mark 2012 The Mark 2012 Mark 2012 Mark 2017 Freedmeer, Neuer, Später, Properger (& Marcker, 2009 Roman, Spater, Neuer, 2010 Marks, Shallows, 2010 Marks, Shallows, 2010 Marks, Shallows, 2010 Marker, Marker, 2010 Marker, Shallows, 2010 Marker, Marker,	nneider et al., 2019 Vice, Ambambault, Schuster, Disbardson, S. Maus, 2012		0.12 [0.07, 0.17]
Num. Josepi, Coph., & Peter. 2017 Hars, 2017 Fredmert R. J. 2007 Weber, Shattorss, & Fouth. 2010 Weber, Shattorss, & Fouth. 2010 Weber, Shattorss, & Fouth. 2010 Send-Durk, & Ayvask, 2010 January, Zebrack, Chran, & Styge, 2011 January, Zebrack, Fouth, 2013 January, Zebrack, Fouth, 2013 January, Zebrack, Merkand, 2017 Send-Durk, Balancian, Self, 2016 Syn, Correvet, Strong, 2014 Syn, Correvet, Strong, 2014 Syn, 2006 Sender, 2014 Syn, 2007 Syn, 2007 Sender, 2014 Syn, 2007 Syn, 2007 Sender, 2010 Syn, 2007 Syn	wartz 2012		0.12[=0.17, 0.41]
Hars, 2017 Fordmetr, Juncz, Proyberger, & Maercker, 2009 Fordmetr, Juncz, Schulz, 2010 Warst, Sharlos, S. Fordu, 2013 Larcaster, S. Korlus, 2013 Larcaster, S. Korlus, 2013 Larcaster, S. Korlus, 2013 Bank, S. Marst, 2014 Hooper, Tomes, Bond, & Reirenz, 2014 Hooper, Tomes, Bond, & Reirenz, 2014 Hooper, Tomes, Bond, & Reirenz, 2014 Devel, Glano, & Colin, 2012 Samey, Testa, 2004 Samey, Testa, 2005 Samey, Testa, 2004 Samey, Testa, 2004 Samey, Testa, 2	nz, Joseph, Geyh, & Peter, 2017	i÷-∎i	0.10[-0.07, 0.27]
Tommutany, Investig Number 2000 Tommutany, Investig Number 2000 Water, Sankors, S. Pivush, 2010 Image: Server, 2000 Water, Sankors, S. Pivush, 2010 Image: Server, 2000 Band Junk, Alwawa, 2010 Image: Server, 2000 Band Junk, Sankors, S. Pivush, 2011 Image: Server, 2000 Sankors, Sankors, S. Revers, 2014 Image: Server, 2000 Person, Distributing, 2010 Image: Server, 2014 Sankors, Contern, Sankors, S. Revers, 2014 Image: Server, 2014 Person, 2006 Image: Server, 2014 Sanker, Chever, Backer, 2016 Image: Server, 2014 Sanker, Chever, Server, 2016 Image: Server, 2014 Sanker, Chever, Backer, 2016 Image: Server, 2014 Sanker, Chever, Server, 2016 Image: Server, 2014 Correr, Mack, Server, 2016 Image: Server, 2014 Sanker, Chever, Server, 2016 Image: 2014 Sanker, 2016	ws, 2017		0.09[-0.34, 0.52]
Boals, Service, Service, Schuetter, 2010 Were, Shallows, Schuet, 2010 Were, Shallows, Schuet, 2010 Were, Shallows, Schuer, 2017 Boals, Schuer, 2017 Were et al., 2017 Shallows, Schuer, 2016 Were, Stankows, Schuer, 2016 Shallows, Schuer, 2017 Were, Stankows, Schuer, 2018 Shallows, Schuer, 2017 Shallows, Schuer, 2017 Shallows, Schuer, 2017 Shallows, Schuer, 2017 Shallows, Schuer, 2017 Shallows, Schuer, 2018 Shallows, Schuer, 2017 Shallows, Schuer, 2017 Shallows, Schuer, 2018 Shallows, Schuer, 2018 Shallows	stmeter, kuwert, Spitzer, Freyberger, & Maercker, 2009 rrill et al., 2008		0.09[-0.10, 0.28]
Water, Salicos, J. Pivut, 2013 Emed-Uraz, A, Avaik, 2010 Send-Uraz, A, Avaik, 2010 Send-Uraz, A, Morkin, 2010 Januar, Zendhi, China, A, Vapet, 2015 Januar, Zendhi, China, A, Vapet, 2016 Vapet, Clinet, Badon, Agrin, 2016 Salier, Chana, Badon, Agrin, 2016 Salier, Chana, Badon, Agrin, 2016 Salier, Chana, Badon, Agrin, 2016 Salier, Chana, Badon, Agrin, 2018 Salier, Chana, Badon, Rabitcherk, 2016 Salier, Chana, Badon, Agrin, 2018 Salier, Chana, Kana, Salier, 2018 Salier, Chana, Kana, Salier, 2018 Salier, Chana, Kana, Salier, 2018 Salier, Salier, Salier, Chana, Agrin, 2018 Salier, Chana, Kana, Salier, 2018 Salier, Salier, Salier, 2019 Salier, Salier, Salier, Salier, 2018 Salier, Salier, Chana, Kana, 2017 Salier, Salier, Salier, 2018 Salier, Salier, Chana, Salier, 2018 Salier, Salier, Salier, 2018 Salier, Salier, Chana, Salier, 2018 Salier, Salier, Chana, Salier, 2018 Salier, Salier, Salier, 2018 Salier	als, Steward, & Schuettler, 2010	: Heri	0.08 [0.04, 0.12]
Larcaser, curstor, 4019 Barcel Care, 2 Analy, 2010 Barcel Care, 2 Analy, 2 Anany, 2 Analy, 2 Analy,	ters, Shallcross, & Fivush, 2013	F −	0.07[-0.12, 0.26]
December Strucks: Chance Struc	icaster & Carlson, 2015 nol-Durak & Avvasik, 2010		0.07[-0.07, 0.21]
Books & Schuer, 2017 Level et al., 2017 Hooper, Trome, Bond, & Reir, 2015 January, Zechork, China, & Yong, 2015 Hooper, Trome, Bond, & Reir, 2015 January, Zechork, China, & Yong, 2015 Hooper, Trome, Bond, & Mickissape, 2018 Kaler, Elsen, & Schurksange, 2018 Kaler, Elsen, & Mutkissape, 2018 Kaler, Elsen, & Mutkissape, 2018 Kaler, Elsen, Rottschu, Abel, 2010 Sinder, Steek, Takasek, Abel, 2012 Jaarnan, Pool, Sanderman, & Rottschuer, 2016 Sinder, Steek, Caler, Carton, & Annaykowski, 2001 Sinder, Bool, Sanderman, R. Annaykowski, 2011 Sinder, Bool, Sanderman, R. Kond, 2013 Sinder, Bool, Sanderman, R. Kond, 2013 Sinder, Bool, Sanderman, R. Kond, 2013 Sinder, Bool, Sanderman, 2017 PacacoRootski, Contra, Carlas, K. Annaykowski, 2019 Sinder, Steek, Carlas, K. Sonder, 2018 Sinder, Steek, Sander, 2019 Annayka Al, 2015 Triget, 2013 Trig, 2014 Carral, 2010 Mins, Jong, Sander, Sander, 2018 Carral, 2019 Mins, Mins, Mark, & Kond, 2013 Sinder, Steek, Sander, 2018 Carlas, 2017 Triget, 2013 Trig, 2014 Carral, 2017 Triget, 2013 Trig, 2014 Carral, 2017 Triget, 2013 Trig, 2014 Carral, 2017 Triget, 2013 Triget, 2013	iatkowska, Knysz, G?siorowski, ?uszczy?ska, G?adysz. 2011		0.05[-0.17, 0.24]
Lidel et al. 2013 Marce, Tours, Bond, & Ref. 2015 Sino, Carreton, Stakepezer-Ench, 2013 Samey, Franka, Zong, Zong Barrighto, Stakepezer-Ench, 2013 Samey, Facaba, Apers, & Burrenz, 2014 Percel, Giton, & Carreton, 2014 Percel, Giton, & Carreton, 2014 Percel, Giton, & Carreton, 2014 Percel, Giton, & Stakepezer-Ench, 2013 Samey, Facaba, Apers, & Burrenz, 2014 Percel, Giton, & Stakepezer-Ench, 2013 Samey, Facaba, 2015 Samey, Facaba, 2016 Samey, Facaba, 2016 Samey, Facaba, 2016 Samey, Facaba, 2017 Samey, Facaba, 2018 Samey, Samey, Samey, 2018 Samey, Samey,	als & Schuler, 2017	⊢ =-1	0.05[-0.03, 0.13]
<pre>unages_unume_</pre>	el et al., 2013 mar Tamek Rond & Reif 2016	H-i=-I	0.05[-0.09, 0.19]
Sha, Cumserth, Sheek, Seriering, 2011 Alkagan, Wingt, A. Egner, 2016 Barnight al., 2017 Alkagan, Kingt, A. Enger, 2016 Samon, E. Schweither, 2017 Prastin, 2005 Samon, Fact, 2017 Prastin, 2005 Samon, Fact, 2017 Samon, Samon, Samon, Samon, 2017 Samon, Samon, Samon,	uary, Zebracki, Chlan, & Vogel, 2015		0.04 [-0.02, 0.10]
Allaugn, Mirgt, & Folger, 2016 Gargori & L. 2017 Cargori & L. 2017 Cargori & L. 2017 Night galage - Think, 2019 Cargori & L. 2017 Night galage, 2009 Roma, Currier, Polys-There, & Herner, 2014 Powel, Bloom, & Collin, 2012 Cargori & L. 2017 Subscription, & Collin, 2012 Subscription, & Collin, 2016 Subscription, & Collin, 2017 Carlera, & Mulchavage, 2019 Schneder, 2010 Michael, Carler, Carlon, & Anny Aven, 701 Carlera, & Audores, 2016 Cordona, Curring, Carlon, & Anny Aven, Michel, & Carlon, 2017 Carlera, & Mulchave, 2017 Carlora, & Kubsch, Carlon, 2017 Carlora, & Kubsch, Carlon, & Anny Aven, 701 Carlora, Russen, Septrom, 2018 Watter, 2007 Watter, 2007 Watter, 2007 Watter, 2010 Michael, Schward, 2019 Subscription, Kong, Stephen, 2018 Subscription, Revent, 2018 Carlora, 2010 Michael, Lapon, 2017 Carlora, Russen, Septrom, 2018 Carlora, 2010 Michael, Lapon, 2017 Carlora, Russen, Septrom, 2018 Carlora, 2019 Michael, Lapon, 2016 Carlora, Carlora, S. Rehner, 2018 Subscription, S. Stephen, 2018 Carlora, 2018 Autory et al., 2001 Carlora, S. Corten, S. Rehner, 2018 Subscription, S. Michael, Schward, 2018 Carlora, 2017 Carlora, Russen, Septrom, 2016 Carlora, Carlora, S. Rehner, 2018 Carlora, 2017 Carlora, S. Corten, S. Rehner, 2018 Carlora, 2018 Carlora, S. Corten, S. Stephene, 2018 Carlora, 2018 Carlora, 2018 Carlora, S. Corten, S. Stephene, 7018 Carlora, S. Corten, S. Stephene, 7019 Carlora, Carlora, S. Stephene, 7019 Carlora, Carlora, S. Stephene, 7019 Carlora, S. Corten, S. Stephene, 7019 Carlora, S. Corten, S. Stephene, 7018 Carlora, 2018 Carlor	a, Ownsworth, Shields, & Fleming, 2011		0.04 [-0.22, 0.30]
onanugana a summergrafter-FIRID, 4013 Samos, Academy, & Blanchaut, 2013 Murphigale, 2003 Roland, Currier, Folgos-Flores, & Herrens, 2014 Perel, Glinos, Carrier, Status-Perel, 2018 Samos, Faculta Acade, Sevenzy, 2011 Uman, 2009 LiBoccs, Scogn, Hilgmans, Bindha, & Chaplin, 2018 Samos, Faculta, 2016 Samos, Faculta, 2017 Samos, Faculta, 2018 Samos, Sperstrom, Becrifting, Cartion, & Andrykowski, 2009 Wanser-Alarce, 1016 Carrey, Linang, Han, Tat, & Erber, 2013 Samos, Sperstrom, Stein, Miller, & Hordt, 2018 Samos, Sperstrom, Stein, Miller, & Hordt, 2	augh, Wright, & Folger, 2016	_ ⊢_ =1	0.03[-0.12, 0.18]
Samper, Enson, S., & Burn, 2016 Lumb, Beadry, & Burn, 2017 Nightragaz, 2009 Rolland, Currer, Popals-Theres, & Heren, 2014 Parels, Riolan, Atoxis, Parameter, 2014 Subar, Carlos, Roll, Atoxis, 2017 Carlos, Score, Higen, Andres, 2018 Subar, Bioten, Roll, Atoxis, 2017 Carlos, Score, Higen, Sindh, Canagin, 2018 Sao, & Shemeran, 2018 Subars, Bioten, Scalet, Hamsworth, 2018 Subars, Bioten, Scalet, Hamsworth, 2017 Carlos, Score, Higen, Andres, 2018 Stones, Beater, Carlos, R., Atoxis, Carlos, Scalet, Hamsworth, 2018 Stones, Stele, Cadel, Hensworth, 2017 Carlos, Score, Migen, Atoxis, Carlos, Scalet, Hamsworth, 2017 Carlos, Stones, Hegen, R., 2014 Stones, Stele, Cadel, Hensworth, 2017 Carlos, Stones, Micros, A., Atoxis, Scalet, Jones, Scalet, Hamsworth, 2017 Carlos, Stones, Micros, A., Atoxis, Scalet, Jones, Scalet, Hamsworth, 2017 Carlos, Stones, Micros, A., Andykowski, 2001 Stones, Stalet, Carlos, S., Andykowski, 2001 Watas-Jacore, Howell, Schwartz, & Hasseln, 2018 Genes, 2010 Mytabidout ctil., 2008 Carlos, 2010 Mytabidout ctil., 2008 Carlos, 2010 Mytabidout ctil., 2008 Carlos, 2010 Mytabidout ctil., 2007 Carlos, 2010 Mytabidout ctil., 2008 Carlos, 2010 Carlos, 2	mington & Shakespeare-Hinch, 2013 snari et al.: 2017		0.03[-0.16, 0.22]
Lunch, Beauchy, & Blanchard, 2017 Radand, Currer, Polya, -Flores, & Herrers, 2014 Presel, Glauos, Carrens, Polya, -Flores, & Herrers, 2014 Presel, Glauos, Carrens, Polya, -Flores, 8, Herrers, 2018 Salter, Clauma, 16, Musikawage, 2010 Salter, Clauma, 16, Musikawage, 2018 Salter, Clauma, 16, Musikawage, 2018 Salter, Clauma, 16, Musikawage, 2018 Salter, Clauma, 2007 Salter, 2010 Genes, 8, McCare, 2017 Salter, Clauma, 2017 Salter, Clauma, 2017 Salter, Rother, Salter, 2018 Salter, Clauma, 2017 Salter, Clauma, 2017 Salter, Beyerston, Berctring, Cartison, 8, Andrykowski, 2009 Wanaser-Alarone, Hones, 2018 Salter, 2010 Salter, 2010 Genes, 2010 Genes, 2010 Genes, 2013 Salter, 2018 Salter,	wyer, Rados, Ayers, & Burn, 2015		0.03[-0.07, 0.13]
Hightings: 2009 Result. 2007; Result. 2009 Concert, Linson, 1990; Alberten, 2014 Surgers, 2009 Surgers, 2013 Samos, Robust, 2014 Samos, Robust, 2014 Samos, Robust, 2014 Samos, Robust, 2014 Samos, Robust, 2016 Samos, Robust, 2016 Samos, Robust, 2016 Samos, Robust, 2016 Samos, Robust, 2017 Samos, Robust, 2016 Samos, Robust, 2017 Samos, Robust, 2017 Samos, Robust, 2017 Samos, Robust, 2017 Samos, Robust, 2017 Samos, Robust, 2017 Samos, Robust, 2017 Corrow, Junan, Ham, Tank, 2 Rabust, 2017 Samos, Robust, 2016 Corton, Corrow, Juna, 2018 Samos, Robust, 2017 Corrow, Junan, Ham, Tank, 2 Rabust, 2019 Samos, Robust, 2016 Corton, Corrow, Juna, 807 Samos, Robust, 2016 Corton, Corrow, Juna, 2018 Samos, Robust, 2017 Corrow, Junan, Ham, Tank, & Erber, 2018 Samos, Robust, 2017 Corrow, Junan, Ham, Tank, & Erber, 2018 Samos, Robust, 2016 Corton, Corrow, Juna, 807 Samos, Robust, 2018 Corrow, Junan, Ham, Tank, & Erber, 2018 Corrow, Junan, Kank, 2018 Corrow, Junan, Steam, 2017 Corrow, Junan, Ham, Tank, Samos, 2017 Corrow, Junan, Ham, Tank, Samos, 2017 Corrow, Junan, Samos, Corrow, 2017 Corrow, Junan, Kank, Junan, 2017 Corrow, Junan, Kank, Junan, 2017 Corrow, Junan, Kank, Junan, 2017 Corrow, Junan, Ham, Kank, 2017 Corrow, Junan, Kank, Junan, 2017 Corrow, Junan, Ham, Tank, Birke, Kindt, 2018 Corrow, Junan, Kanka, Juna, 2017 Corrow,	nb, Beaudry, & Blanchard, 2017	<u>⊢ </u>	0.02[-0.18, 0.22]
nobality context, notify notes, is netted, 2014 Proveding, 2005 Proveding, 2005 Proveding, 2007 Proveding, 2007 Provedin	htingale, 2009	<u>⊢</u>	0.02[-0.16, 0.20]
Frankin: 2006 Costel et al. 2014 Su 2013 Su 2013 Subcission, Elgender, Londy, EPApury, 2011 Wahn et al. 2018 Simon Elber, Discorpt, LANDE, & PApury, 2011 Wahn et al. 2019 Samon, Papered, Romon, 2017 Samon, Papered, Romon, 2018 Samon, Papered, Romon, 2017 Samon, Papered, Romon, 2017 Samon, Papered, Romon, 2017 Samon, Papered, Romon, 2018 Samon, Romon, Stellan, All, 2018 Samon, Samon, Romon, Samon, Samon, 2018 Samon, Romon, Stellan, Romon, 2018 Samon, Romon, Stellan, 2018 Samon, Romon, 2018 Samon, Romon, Stellan, 20	vell. Gilson. & Collin. 2012		0.02[-0.43, 0.47]
Casel et al. 2014 Sup 2010 Sup 201	nklin, 2006	' ⊢ <u></u> ∔ '	0.01 [-0.23, 0.25]
Shame Characterized Science 2018 Marker Edex : Reserval, Adapt, APLAINE, 2011 Wash et al., 2018 Shipmento, Low, Robus, AR. Adaptany, 2011 Wash et al., 2010 Shime Marker, Marker, AR. Adaptany, 2018 So Shimman, Degradman, Shindh, 2. Chapin, 2018 Sono, Rigered, S. Jonno, 2017 Shime Steller, Cadel, Henniverth, 2. 2011 Shime Steller, Cadel, Henniverth, 2. 2017 Hime St. Usas, 2017 Common, Marzath, Ronto, Marton, 2015 Common, Marzath, Ronto, Marton, 2017 Common, Marzath, Ronto, Marton, 2017 Common, Marzath, Ronto, Marton, 2016 Common, Marzath, Ronto, Marton, 2017 Common, Marzath, Ronto, Marton, 2017 Shime, Septer, Vold, Schward, 2. 2018 Marzath, Ronto, Matter, 2. Hasseler, 2018 Marzath, Ronto, Marton, 2017 Ronto, Lieb, Cotran, & Rehter, 2019 Pateor/Porticity, 2014 Cardia, 2. 016 Advatant et al., 2016 Marzath, Ronton, Steller, 2013 Shime, Septer, Com, 8. Hay, 2014 Cardia, 2. 016 Marzath, Ronton, Steller, 2019 Marzath, Ronton, Steller, 2019 Marzath, Ronton, Steller, 2019 Marzath, Ronton, Steller, 2010 Cardia, 2. 2016 Marzath, Cons, R. 2019 Marzath, Ronton, Steller, 2010 Cardia, 2. 2016 Marzath, Ronton, Steller, 2010 Cardia, 2. 2016 Marzath, Ronton, Steller, 2010 Cardia, 2. 2016 Marzath, Ronton, Steller, 2010 Cardia, 2. 2017 Marzath, Ronton, Steller, 2010 Cardia, 2. 2018 Marzath, Ronton, Steller, 2010 Marzath, Steller, Marzath, Steller, 2010 Marzath, Steller, 2017 Marzath, Steller, 2017 Marzath, Steller, 2017 Marzath, Steller, 2017 Marzath, Steller, 2017 Marzath, Steller, 2017 Marzath, Ronton, 2017 Marzath,	dell et al., 2014	· · · • · · ·	0.01 [-0.11, 0.13]
Kaler, Enes, Resisch, Abbi, 2 Polusny, 2011 Shigeneto, Low, Borowa, & Robtscherk, 2016 Shigeneto, Low, Borowa, & Robtscherk, 2016 Shigeneto, Low, Borowa, & Robtscherk, 2016 Shigeneto, K. Abel, 2012 Jaarsma, Pool, Sanderman, B Anchor, 2006 Shores, Boroek, & Abel, 2012 Jaarsma, Pool, Sanderman, B Anchor, 2006 Shinos, Boroek, & Abel, 2017 Shiko, Moreta, & Canavaro, 2018 Shiko, Shiko, 2017 Shiko, Moreta, & Canavaro, 2018 Shiko, Shiko, 2017 Shiko, Moreta, & Canavaro, 2018 Shiko, Shiko, 2017 Shiko, Shiko, 2017	tler, Claramita, & Muskavage, 2018		0.00[-0.22, 0.22]
Wash et al., 2016	er, Erbes, Tedeschi, Arbisi, & Polusny, 2011	'⊢ ∔ ⊣ '	-0.01 [-0.12, 0.10]
Singenton, Dum, S. Morolitzmer, Juli 6 	Ish et al., 2018	<u>⊢</u> ,	-0.01 [-0.14, 0.12]
Landoca, Socia, Hayman, Smith, & Chaptin, 2018 Samos, Rock, & Aket, 2012 Samos, Rock, & Aket, 2012 Samos, Rock, Samosma, Rancher, 2006 Samos, Rock, & Aket, 2017 Salour, Bjoeke, & Johnson, 2017 Salour, Bjoeke, & Johnson, 2017 Sano, Morra, & Camaron, 2017 Sano, Morra, & Camaron, 2017 Sano, Marcha, 2010 Sano, Marcha, 2010 Sano, Sano, 2014 Activoy et al., 2001 Sano, Sano, 2014 Sano, Sano, 2016 Sano, Sano, 2016 Sano, Sano, 2016 Sano, Sano, 2016 Sano, Sano, Sano, 2017 Sano, Marcha, 2018 Sano, Sano, 2016 Sano, Sano, 2017 Sano, Sano, 2016 Sano, Sano, 2017 Sano, Sano, 2016 Sano, Sano, 2017 Sano, Sano, 2016 Sano, Sano, 2016 Sano, Sano, 2017 Sano, Sano, 2016 Sano, Sano, 2017 Sano, Sano, 2016 Sano, Sano, 2017 Sano, Sano, 2016 Sano, Sano, 2016 Sano, 2017 Sano, Sano, 2017 Sano, 2017 Sano, 2018 Sano, 2018 Sano, 2018 Sano, 2018 Sano, 2017 Sano, 2018 Sano, 20	gemoto, Low, Borowa, & Robitschek, 2016 5ao, 2009		-0.01 [-0.13, 0.10]
Soo & Shman, 2015 Soo & Shman, Rotta, & Abet, 2012 Jasarua, Picot, Sandoman, & Rancher, 2006 Jasarua, Picot, Sandoman, & Rancher, 2006 Jasarua, Picot, Sandoman, & Lotti J Green & Alcohom, 2017 Green & Alcohom, 2017 Green & Alcohom, 2017 Green & Alcohom, 2017 Green & Standar, 2010 Green, 2010	Rocca, Scogin, Hilgeman, Smith, & Chaplin, 2018		-0.03[-0.20, 0.14]
Samos, Acons, Schuler, Johnson, 2005 Somoder, Steel, Call, Hennisoch, 2005 Somoder, Steel, Call, Hennisoch, 2011 Sahour, Bjoeke, & Johnson, 2017 Sahour, Bjoeke, & Johnson, 2017 Sahour, Bjoeke, & Johnson, 2018 Somoder, Steel, Call, Kansuelle, 2018 Sahour, Bjoerston, Beerting, Cartion, & Andrykowski, 2009 Widdens, 2002 Orbuiet, 2010 Sahour, Bjoerston, Beerting, Cartion, & Andrykowski, 2009 Widdens, 2002 Orbuiet, 2010 Greau, 2010 Sahour, Bjoerston, Beerting, Cartion, & Andrykowski, 2009 Widdens, 2002 Orbuiet, 2010 Greau, 2010 Sahour, Bjoerston, Beerting, Cartion, & Andrykowski, 2009 Widdens, 2002 Orbuiet, 2010 Sahour, Bjoerston, Beerting, Cartion, & Andrykowski, 2009 Widdens, 2002 Orbuiet, 2008 Sahour, Bjoerston, Beerting, Cartion, & Andrykowski, 2009 Widdens, 2002 Sahour, Bjoerston, Beerting, Cartion, & Andrykowski, 2009 Widdens, 2002 Sabot, Bjoerston, Beerting, Cartion, & Andrykowski, 2009 Widdens, 2002 Sabot, Bjoerston, Unit, Beerting, 2018 Deck, 2010 Deck, 2018 Deck, 2017 Deck, 2018 Deck, 2017 Deck, 2018 Deck, 2018 Deck, 2018 Deck, 2019 Deck, 2019 Deck	o & Sherman, 2015	, ⊢ =;	-0.03[-0.18, 0.11]
Schneider, Stelenk, Catolel, Hennwerth, & 2011 Schneider, Stelenk, Catolel, Hennwerth, & 2011 Greene & MicGovern, 2017 Greene & MicGovern, 2017 Greene & KicGovern, 2017 Greene & KicGovern, 2017 Greene & KicGovern, 2018 Greene & Camavorra, 2012 Kunnenumz, Javids, Rief, & Earner, 2018 Greene, 2010 Micdover, Catolina, Carton, Kandykowski, 2001 Greene, 2010 Micdover, 2011 Greene, 2010 Micdover, 2011 Greene, 2010 Micdover, 2011 Greene, 2010 Micdover, 2017 Greene, 2017 Greene, 2017 Greene, 2017 Greene, 2017 Greene, 2017 Greene, 2017 Greene, 2018 Greene, 2017 Greene, 201	mos, Rodzik, & Abel, 2012 Irsma, Rodi, Sanderman, & Ranchor, 2006		-0.04[-0.29, 0.21]
Salour, Bjoeke, & Johnov, 2017 Genere & McGover, 2017 Genere & McGover, 2017 Shay, Moreta, & Cansvorra, 2012 Shay, Moreta, & Cansvorra, 2012 Shay, Moreta, & Cansvorra, 2012 Shay, Moreta, & Cansvorra, 2012 Common, Muzzatali, Ronko, Xalouta, 2017 Common, Hexerting, Cartison, & AndryKowski, 2009 Wantser-Alarovej, Hobel, Schwartz, & Hassele, 2018 Grabus, Beyrstrom, Electring, Cartison, & AndryKowski, 2009 Wantser-Alarovej, Hobel, Schwartz, & Hassele, 2018 Grabus, Beyrstrom, Cartison, & Referer, 2019 Butch, Beyrstrom, Schwart, & Hassele, 2018 Grabus, Beyrstrom, Schwartz, & Hassele, 2018 Deber, 2010 Deber, 2010 Deber, 2010 Grabus, Beyrstrom, Schwartz, All, Berner, 2019 Grabus, Beyrstrom, Schwartz, & Hassele, 2018 Morris, 2011 Herber, Lings, A. Cong, 2019 Jones, Milling, Huggrano, Durn, & Morison, 2013 Herber, Ult, Mass, G. Cow, 2009 Jones, Milling, Huggrano, Durn, & Morison, 2013 Herber, Ult, Mass, G. Cow, 2019 Jones, Milling, Huggrano, Durn, & Morison, 2013 Herber, Ult, Mass, G. Schward, 2017 Grabus, Jong Jones, Millings, Huggrano, Durn, & Morison, 2013 Herber, Ult, Mass, G. Schward, 2018 Herber, Ult, Mass, G. Schward, 2018 Herber, Haster, Kark, Bartsmart, 2010 Deber, 2019 Jones, Millings, Huggrano, Durn, & Morison, 2013 Herber, Huster, Kark, Bartsmart, 2010 Herber, Ult, Mass, Com, 2010 Herber, Huster, Kark, Jones, 2018 Herber, Huster, Kark, Jones, 2018 Herber, Huster, Kark, Jones, 2018 Herber, Huster, Kark, Jones,	ineider, Steele, Cadell, Hernsworth, & 2011		-0.04 [-0.16, 0.08]
Greene & MicCovern, 2017 Line & Bankowski, 2018 Shanna, Sagertone, Mattolia, A Annucista, 2017 Corrus, Mascen, Rack, Mattolia, A Annucista, 2019 Widows, 2002 Offourke, 2011 Green, 2010 Mytadout et al., 2005 Shans, Seperty, Nov. Schwartz, & Hassele, 2018 Grabauja, Fereink, 2007 Mascense et al., 2014 Adadata et al., 2016 Mascense et al., 2014 Adadata et al., 2015 Paper, Corran, & Lehner, 2019 Mascense et al., 2014 Adadata et al., 2015 Paper, Thukayama, Evaderi, 2018 Grabauja, Riggrand, Batole, & Lagawickreme, 2018 Martin, The, & Ercher, 2013 Scheckowski, Hayman, Schen, Miller, & Kottl, 2013 Explosible, Michae, Corran, & Rehrer, 2019 Mascense et al., 2014 Adadata et al., 2015 Paper, Corran, R., Enther, 2013 Scheckowski, Hayman, Schen, Miller, & Kottl, 2013 Explosible, Michae, 2018 Dans, Bioppy, Michae, Charn, & Lathor, 2011 Ban, Biopp, Michae, Charn, & Minkay, 2014 Matton, 2017 Reage, Elayama, Forgeard, Blacke, & Lagawickreme, 2018 Martin, 2017 Reage, Cana, Thora, & Lehne, 2013 Heet, 100 Heet, 10	loum, Bjoerke, & Johnco, 2017		-0.05[-0.26, 0.16]
Pone 8 a. 2014 Nen 8 Uuda, 2017 Shaw, Morra, & Cansvoro, 2012 Shaw, Morra, & Cansvoro, 2012 Shaw, Morra, & Cansvoro, 2012 Shaw, Morra, & Cansvoro, 2013 Shaw, Morra, & Chara, 2016 Wanser-Harroy, Hovel, Schwartz, & Hassele, 2018 Oriouxe, 2017 Shub, Speptr, Yuo, S, LUB, 2019 Wanser-Harroy, Hovel, Schwartz, & Hassele, 2018 Gracular, 2017 Pakac/OCOrsider, Clark, & CSullivon, 2017 Region, Benchmay, Bether, 2018 Shub, Shaw, Jan, 2018 Wanser-Harroy, Hovel, Schwartz, & Hassele, 2018 Gracular, 2017 Pakac/OCOrsider, Clark, & CSullivon, 2017 Region, Benchmay, Bether, 2018 Shub, Shaw, Jan, 2018 Wang, Chang, Chen, Chen, Altsu, 2017 Region, Benchmay, Stellar, Miller, & Hordt, 2013 Shub, Shaw, Jan, 2017 Region, Benchmay, Stellar, Miller, & Hordt, 2013 Shub, Shaw, Jan, 2017 Region, Benchmay, Stellar, Miller, & Hordt, 2013 Shub, Shaw, Jan, 2017 Region, Benchmay, Stellar, 2019 Hard, 2010 Shub, Shaw, Jan, 2017 Region, Ling, Janna, Stellar, 2019 Hard, 2010 Shub, Shaw, Janna, Stellar, 2019 Hard, 2010 Shub, Shaw, Janna, Stellar, 2019 Hard, 2017 Reneo, 11, 2017 Ren	ene & McGovern, 2017		-0.06[-0.17, 0.04]
Nien & Subada, 2017 Kaarenamu, Zainko, Ref, & Enner, 2016 Kaarenamu, Zainko, Ref, & Enner, 2016 Contola, Curringham, Cattor, & Andrykowski, 2001 Sabana, Gegerston, Bereting, Cattor, & Andrykowski, 2009 Witkows, 2007 Witkows, 2007 Greek, 2010 Myntaidoud et al., 2008 Witkows, 2017 Greek, 2010 Greek, 2010 G	a et al., 2014		-0.07[-0.19, 0.05]
Sike, Merren, & Canavarro, 2012 20 Morentanuz, Jakon, Kel, & Enner, 2012 20 Morenanuz, Jakon, Kel, & Enner, 2018 20 Green, 2010 20 Green,	hi & Usuda, 2017	. ⊢ ∎	-0.07[-0.25, 0.11]
Correr, Unang, Tang, Testing, & Andrykowski, 2001 Cortoba, Curanityaan, Cartino, & Andrykowski, 2001 Cortoba, Curanityaan, Cartino, & Andrykowski, 2001 Salaman, Segerstrom, Beetrang, Cartino, & Andrykowski, 2009 Mytashout et al., 2000 Mytashout et al., 2008 Salat, Segerst, Yuok, B. Starvartz, & Hassele, 2018 Mytashout et al., 2001 Built et al., 2001 Built et al., 2001 Built et al., 2016 Dela, 2019 Built et al., 2016 Dela, 2017 Tigtett, 2013 Dela, 2018 Dela, 2018 Dela, 2018 Dela, 2019 Dela, 2018 Dela, 2019 Dela, 2019	ra, Moreira, & Canavarro, 2012 anamund Zwick, Bief & Exper 2016		-0.07 [-0.29, 0.15]
Gunst, Laston, & Coldbeck, 2016 Control, Curron, Pan, Carlson, & Andrykowski, 2009 Skinama, Signerstram, Brectman, Carlson, & Andrykowski, 2009 Okoskies, 2011 Green, 2010 Mynatakou et al., 2008 Wanaser-Alarmey, Hovell, Schwartz, & Hassele, 2018 Green, 2010 Mynatakou et al., 2019 Nakogawa et al., 2014 Ackard et al., 2014 Ackard et al., 2015 Tait, 2014 Morrill, 2011 Marg, Chang, Chen, Chen, Stau, 2019 Europation, Statemant, 2019 Morrill, 2011 Morrill, 2017 Europation, 2019 Morrill, 2011 Morrill, 2011 Morrill, 2011 Morrill, 2017 Europation, 2019 Morrill, 2011 Morrill, 2017 Europation, 2019 Morrill, 2011 Morrill, 2017 Europation, 2010 Morrill, 2011 Morrill, 2017 Europation, 2010 Morrill, 2011 Morrill, 2017 Europation, 2010 Morrill, 2017 Morrill, 2017 Morril	mio, Muzzatti, Romito, Mattioli, & Annunziata, 2017		-0.08[-0.16, 0.01]
Cardos, a. Curangtain, Cartino, A. Andrykowski, 2003 Salaman, Segerom, Electrini, C. Straison, A. Andrykowski, 2003 Great, 2010 Great, 2010 Great, 2010 Mydiakod, et al., 2008 Statis, Segerity, Yoo, S. Litte, 2019 Statis, Segerity, Yoo, S. Litte, 2019 Statis, Segerity, Yoo, S. Litte, 2019 Factor/Orocrafeer, Cark, & O'Salkivon, 2017 Factor/Orocrafeer, Cark, & S. Chall, 2018 Dela, 2018 Dela, 2018 Dela, 2018 Dela, 2018 Dela, 2018 Dela, 2018 Dela, 2019 Factor/Orocrafeer, Cark, & S. Challon, 2017 Tat. 2014 Dela, 2018 Dela, 2018 Dela, 2018 Dela, 2018 Dela, 2018 Dela, 2018 Dela, 2019 Dela, 2018 Dela, 2018 Dela, 2019 Dela, 2019 Dela, 2018 Dela, 2019 Dela, 2018 Dela, 2019 Dela, 20	nst, Kaatsch, & Goldbeck, 2016	, ì••⊀ ,	-0.08 [-0.15, -0.01]
Wigner, 2021 State State State <td>rdova, Cunningham, Carlson, & Andrykowski, 2001 eman, Separatrom, Brachting, Carlson, & Andrykowski, 2009</td> <td></td> <td>-0.09[-0.33, 0.15]</td>	rdova, Cunningham, Carlson, & Andrykowski, 2001 eman, Separatrom, Brachting, Carlson, & Andrykowski, 2009		-0.09[-0.33, 0.15]
O'Roure, 2011 O'Roure, 201 Wytalkover, 2018 O'Roure, 2019	dows, 2002	' '	-0.09[-0.32, 0.14]
Orders, 2010 208 Ordeaugn, P. Result, 2009	courke, 2011	i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i	-0.10[-0.32, 0.12]
Wanser-Aaroney, Howell, Schwardt, & Hasselle, 2018	en, 2010 stakidou et al		-0.11[-0.29, 0.07]
Grabaugh R Resick, 2007 Grabaugh R Resick, 2007 Hildagawa et al., 2014 ArkAnyot et al., 2014 Hildagawa et al., 2014 ArkAnyot et al., 2014 Hildagawa et al., 2014 Hildagawa et al., 2015 Hildagawa et al., 2016 Hildagawa et al., 2016 Hildag	mser-Nanney, Howell, Schwartz, & Hasselle, 2018	'⊢ - €'	-0.11[-0.20, -0.02]
anaeseries, nov. cutere, 2019 anaeseries, 2019 anaeseries	abaugh & Resick, 2007	H	-0.13[-0.33, 0.07]
Actroget 81, 2011 Bucht ed. 2007 Packo 2007km, & Rehner, 2019 Bucht ed. 2007 Packo 2007km, & Corkyn, & Staden, 2017 Packo 2007km, 2018 Packo 2007km, 2018 Packo	us, speigrit, Y00, & Little, 2019 kaoawa et al 2014		-0.13[-0.30, 0.04]
Lee, Blackmon, Lee, Cotrans, & Rehner, 2019 Borch et al., 2007 Palaco/Rootsteer, Clark, & O'Sulfwan, 2017 Palaco/Rootsteer, Clark, & Soldwan, 2017 Palaco/Rootsteer, Lansk, Alaska, Barber, 2018 Aboulan et al., 2019 Tati, 2014 Correl, Lansk, Harls, Bat, & Erbes, 2013 Correl, Lansk, Harls, Bat, & Erbes, 2013 Exposite, 2016 Morill, 2011 Wang, Chang, Chen, Chen, A. Huu, 2011 Wang, Chang, Chen, Chen, A. Huu, 2011 Water, 2010 Correl, 2010 Correl, 2010 Correl, 2010 Correl, 2010 Correl, 2010 Correl, 2010 Li, Maio, Canz, Zhang, & Cheng, 2016 Li, Maio, Canz, Jang, & Khortson, 2013 Linest, Unity, Maio, Lagen, 2019 Correl, Jangers, & Sternard, 2010 Correl, Jangers, & Sternard, 2010 Correl, 2019 Correl, 2016 Correl, 2017 Correl, Correl, Jano, 2016 Linest, Lagen, 2019 Correl, 2016 Correl, 2017 Correl, 2016 Correl, 2017 Correl, 2017	royd et al., 2011		-0.13[-0.37, 0.10]
Durit et al., Adv/ Patech/Conztex, Clark, & O'Sullivan, 2017 Patech/Conztex, Clark, & O'Sullivan, 2017 Patech/Conztex, Johnson, 2018 Aboutant et al., 2017 Aboutant et al.,	e, Blackmon, Lee, Cochran, & Rehner, 2019	⊢ ∎{	-0.13 [-0.27, -0.00]
Angele, Denton, Truskyama, & Ynden, 2019 Image: Constant State of Constant State	metal., 2007 acio?González, Clark, & O'Sullivan, 2017		-0.14[-0.41, 0.13]
Dile, 2019 Adduith et al., 2015 Trigett, 2013 Stacztowski, Hayman, Stetlan, Miler, & Krott, 2013 Stacztowski, Hayman, Stetlan, Miler, & Krott, 2013 Stacztowski, Hayman, Stetlan, King, & Erices, 2013 Stacztowski, Hayman, Stetlan, Chen, & Stal, Jayewickreme, 2018 Stacztowski, Hayman, Stetlan, Chen, & Stal, 2014 Stacztowski, Staterski, Staterski, 2019 Stacztowski, Basterski, Staterski, 2019 Stacstar, Lasterski, Staterski, Staterski, 2019 Staterski, Takzerski, Zakamier, 2010 Staterski, Takzerski, Zakamier, 2018 Staterski, Takzerski, Zakamier, 2017 Staterski, Takzerski, Zakamier, 2018 Staterski, Zakamier, 2018 Staterski, Takzerski, Zakamier, 2017 Staterski, Zakamier, 2018 Staterski, Zakamie	epke, Benson, Tsukayama, & Yaden, 2018	⊢ ∎−-i	-0.14 [-0.29, 0.01]
Aucular at a., 017 Typel: 2013 Currier, Luman, Hamis, Tait, & Erber, 2013 Succession, Hamman, Stelan, Miller, & Krott, 2013 Egyosta, 2016 Bunn, Stopp, McCann, & Lucko, 2011 Bunn, Stopp,	b, 2018	· 	-0.15[-0.38, 0.08]
Tat. 2014	ouran et al., 2015 Nett. 2013		-0.15[-0.43, 0.13]
Currier, Luman, Ham, Tate, Eltres, 2013 Eryosta, 2016 Eryosta, 2016 Eryosta, 2016 Eryosta, 2016 Eryosta, 2017 Bunk, Stopp, McCann, & Luthon, 2011 Bunk, Stopp, 2018 Humer, Berk, Ussis, Stopp, 2018 Stock, 2014 Dotter, Jagars, & Sterhard, 2010 Stock, 2014 Dotter, Jagars, & Sterhard, 2010 Stock, 2014 Dotter, Jagars, & Sterhard, 2010 Pather, Berk, Ussis, Stopp, 2018 Pather, Grax, & Accretent, 2018 P	, 2014		-0.17[-0.36, 0.02]
suic.com, regimer, Steffan, Miller, & HYGIT, 2013 Lipotal, 2016 Lipotal, 2016 Lipotal, 2017 Lipotal, 2017 Li	rrier, Lisman, Harris, Tait, & Erbes, 2013	i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i	-0.18[-0.37, 0.01]
Boogsa, Trussman, Forgerd, Blacke, & Jajowichreme, 2018 Image: Change Chan	асскомзкі, Hayman, Streian, Miller, & Knott, 2013 posita, 2016		-0.18[-0.33, -0.03]
Morrill, 2011 Morrill, 2011 Marg, Chang, Chen, Chen, S. Hsiu, 2014 Lawn, Skipp, Mickann, & Lunton, 2011 Li, Maio, Can, Zhang, & Cheng, 2016 Mirdinana, Filipsiana, S. Cheng, 2016 Mirdinana, Filipsiana, S. Cheng, 2019 Direns, Shipp, Mirdinana, S. Mird, 2019 Direns, Shipp, Mirdinana, S. Mird, 2019 Direns, Shipp, Mirdinana, S. Mird, 2019 Direns, Mirdinana, Filipsiana, S. Mird, 2019 Direns, Shipp, S	epke, Tsukayama, Forgeard, Blackie, & Javawickreme. 2018		-0.19[-0.37, -0.01]
Varing, Christing, Christing, Christing, 2014 Image: Christing, 2014 Burn, Silong, JackCarin, & Luston, 2011 Image: Christing, 2016 Burn, Silong, Christing, 2016 Image: Christing, 2016 Withmann et al., 2017 Image: Christing, 2016 Pring, Silong, 2018 Image: Christing, 2016 Colong, 2009 Image: Christing, 2016 Distance, Stopp, 2016 Image: Christing, 2016 Universe, Stopp, 2018 Image: Christing, 2016 Stock, 2014 Christing, 2016	rrill, 2011	· ─ •─1	-0.20 [-0.35, -0.05]
Damb TicSongo McCann, & Luckon, 2011 Figure 1 U, Misso, Can, Zhang, & Cheng, 2016 Figure 1 Wittern, 2017 Figure 1 Romeo et al., 2019 Figure 1 Bring, Su, Huang, & Motion, 2013 Figure 1 Bring, Su, Huang, & Motion, 2013 Figure 1 Jones, Mulligan, Higgrison, Durn, & Mortion, 2013 Figure 1 Jones, Mulligan, Huggrison, Durn, & Mortion, 2013 Figure 1 Sock, 2014 Figure 1 Postickin IrakeWook, Staterinaer, 1010 Stock, 2014 Stock, 2014 Figure 1 Hothmark, Figures, Name, Venderckröte Leuw, & 2017 Figure 1 Hothmark, Figures, Name, Venderckröte Leuw, & 2017 Figure 1 Hothmark, Figures, Logma, 2018 Figure 1 Parmer, Groxa, & Occreent, 2018 Figure 1	ng, Chang, Chen, Chen, & Hsu, 2014 hrai, 2010		-0.20[-0.37, -0.03]
Willston, 2019	sh, Skopp, McCann, & Luxton, 2011		-0.24 [-0.27, -0.21]
L, Mido, Ganz, Zhang, & Cheng, 2016 Wathann et al., 2017 Romool et al., 2017 Romool et al., 2019 Gene, 2019 G	liston, 2013	⊢ <u> </u>	-0.25[-0.49, -0.01]
American Structure America	Miao, Gan, Zhang, & Cheng, 2016 tmann et al. 2017		-0.26 [-0.39, -0.12]
Perg, Su, Huang, & Hu, 2019 Guo, San, & Tong, 2018 Biana, Lerretrik, Strobet, Bolen, & Schut, 2019 Golen, 2009 Jones, Malagar, Higginzen, Duns, & Morison, 2013 Jones, Malagar, Higginzen, Duns, & Morison, 2013 Junes Malagar, Higginzen, Duns, & Morison, 2013 Stock, 2014 Dolber, Jaggers, Sterinard, 2010 Pather, Krass, Bock, Roma, & Tonoda, 2018 Pather, Grax, & Occretell, 2016	meo et al., 2019		-0.26[-0.430.01]
Guo, Gan, X Tong, 2013 Guo, Gan, X Tong, 2013 Guoma, Larefranc, X Storebe, Boelen, A, Schut, 2019 Guema, Mulligar, Miggirson, Churn, & Morrison, 2013 Letterson, Um, Yright, K Logan, 2019 Letterson, Um, Yright, K Logan, 2019 Letterson, Um, Yright, K Logan, 2019 Distribut, Jaganse, A Servinaer, 2010 Strekter, Hazehwood, & Strakesgeaar–Finch, 2014 Strekter, Strekter, Stre	ng, Su, Huang, & Hu, 2019	⊢ −−−1 :	-0.27 [-0.41, -0.12]
Luma, surram, survate, BURL, 8 SURL, 4019	o, Gan, & Tong, 2013		-0.27 [-0.37, -0.17]
Jores Muligan, Hugarsen, Durn, & Montson, 2013 Hume-Beck, Logara, 2019 Hume-Beck, Logara, 2018 Stock, 2014 Stock, 2014	ina, Lemennik, Stroebe, Boelen, & Schut, 2019 len, 2009		-0.28[-0.3/, -0.19] -0.28[-0.44, -0.12]
Netson, UW, Vinght, & Logan, 2019	es, Mulligan, Higginson, Dunn, & Morrison, 2013		-0.30 [-0.54, -0.05]
Luter-berg, Lupssa, 645W, 2008 Viet al., 2016 Stock, 2014 Stock, 2014 Stock, 2014 Stock, 2014 Stock, 2014 Stock, 2014 Stockser, Lupssa, Schirdmart, 2010 Strekter, Hazerkand, Statikespear-Findh, 2014 Fillmans, Stepk, Storker, Lupensa, 2010 Fillmans, Storker, Jonga, A Strada, 2010 Fillmans, Storker, Jonga, 2010	ison, Uhl, Wright, & Logan, 2019	_ ⊢_	-0.30[-0.53, -0.06]
Stock, 2014	енск, LIOSSIS, & GOW, 2008 et al., 2016		-0.30[-0.71, 0.11]
Dolleter, Jagays, & Sternant, 2010	ck, 2014		-0.31 [-0.48, -0.14]
Stretuer, rateewood, s. Strakesgeare-Find, 2014	bier, Jaggars, & Steinhardt, 2010		-0.31 [-0.55, -0.07]
Tamana Shana, Sanzar A Alimawa 2010 Instance a dari Tamana Shana Angina A Simoda 2018 Herei Patiner, Graza, & Occretti, 2018 Herei Patiner, Graza, 80 Certetti, 2018 Herei Tamana Shana Angina A Simoda 2018 Herei Herei Tamana Shana Angina A Simoda 2018 Herei Herei Herei Tamana Shana Angina A Simoda 2018 Herei	ecker, Hazelwood, & Shakespeare-Finch, 2014 Imaat Snek, Culliners Leemans, Verslondk2de Leerer, 9, 2017		-0.31 [-0.64, 0.02]
Nishikawa, Kojima, & Tomoda, 2018	man, Shaw, Schultz, & Altrnaier. 2010		-0.36[-0.74. 0.021
Pamer, Graca, & Occhietti, 2016	hikawa, Fujisawa, Kojima, & Tomoda, 2018	. ⊢∎⊣	-0.38 [-0.43, -0.32]
ieuuuiescu et al., 2012 -	mer, Graca, & Occhietti, 2016		-0.44 [-0.55, -0.33]
Minetal. 2014	net al., 2014		-0.46 [-0.70, -0.23] -0.48 [-0.77, -0.19]
Gangstad, Norman, & Barton, 2009 -	ngstad, Norman, & Barton, 2009		-0.53[-0.75, -0.31]
	~		

Г -1 -0.5

0

0.5

1

Outcomes	k	п	ES	95% CI	ES range	Fail-safe N	Q	df	р
Anxiety with									
Relating with others	16	2652	.07	.002 .13	14 to .29	91	36.61	15	<.001
New possibilities	16	2652	.07	002: .13	13 to .27	-	39.89	15	<.001
Personal strength	16	2652	.03	01: .07	22 to .22	-	19.33	15	.20
Spiritual change	15	2593	.10	.04: .15	15 to .37	132	28.17	14	.01
Appreciation of life	15	2593	.07	.02: .13	20 to .25	93	26.71	14	.02
Depression with									
Relating with others	28	6922	04	11: .03	38 to .25	-	213.27	27	<.001
New possibilities	29	7189	01	08: .06	42 to .23	-	226.85	28	<.001
Personal strength	28	6922	07	13:01	41 to .18	225	128.15	27	<.001
Spiritual change	25	4644	.01	03: .06	39 to .23	-	55.28	24	<.001
Appreciation of life	28	6939	04	11: .03	40 to .24	-	204.61	27	<.001

Table 1 Results from the posttraumatic growth components analysis

n designates the combined sample size for all included studies



Fig. 4 Anxiety and posttraumatic growth inventory-relating to others subscale effect sizes

3.4 Depression and PTG Components

The results of the meta-analytic review of the relationships between depression and PTG components are also presented in Table 2 (a list of ES and associated 95% CIs from included studies are also available in Figs. 9, 10, 11, 12, 13). The number of studies included in the analyses (*k*) ranged from 25 to 29, and the combined sample size (*n*) ranged from 4644 to 7189. Again, the weighted mean ES for these relationships were generally small, ranging from -0.07 to 0.01, suggesting that PTG components are weakly related with lower levels of depression in general (with the exception of spiritual change, which showed a positive but negligible correlation with depression). In addition, the fail-safe Ns and visual inspection of associated funnel plots (See Supplemental Figures 8–12) suggest that these results are unlikely to reflect bias due to unpublished null findings. Yet heterogeneity analysis for these associations indicated significant variance in the effect sizes.

Study					ES (r) 95%	6 CI
Kunz, Joseph, Geyh, & Peter, 2017			•i		0.27 [0.11,	0.43]
Lurie-Beck, Liossis, & Gow, 2008	H	-		—	0.26 [-0.15,	0.67]
Teixeira & Pereira, 2013		⊢_∎			0.24 [0.11	0.37]
Kira et al., 2012		⊢∎			0.19 [0.02,	0.36]
Strecker, Hazelwood, & Shakespeare-Finch, 2014	— —				0.15 [-0.20,	0.50]
Bianchi et al., 2017		⊢ ∎→			0.14 [0.03,	0.25]
Cabral, 2010	⊢				0.10 [-0.06,	0.26]
Forstmeier, Kuwert, Spitzer, Freyberger, & Maercker, 200	09 —		4		0.09 [-0.10,	0.28]
Jaarsma, Pool, Sanderman, & Ranchor, 2006	⊢				0.09 [-0.04,	0.22]
Nakagawa et al., 2014		-	1		0.01 [-0.25,	0.27]
Walsh et al., 2018	—				0.01 [-0.12,	0.14]
Barrington & Shakespeare-Finch, 2013	⊢∎				-0.03 [-0.22,	0.16]
Soo & Sherman, 2015	⊢∎				-0.04 [-0.18,	0.10]
Cormio, Muzzatti, Romito, Mattioli, & Annunziata, 2017	⊢-∎	4		-	-0.08 [-0.17,	-0.00]
Mystakidou et al., 2008					-0.10 [-0.29,	0.10]
Canavarro, Silva, & Moreira, 2015					-0.13 [-0.33,	0.07]
Overall		•			0.07 [-0.00,	0.13]
Γ		i				
-0.4	-0.2	0 0.2	0.4	0.6	0.8	

Fig. 5 Anxiety and posttraumatic growth inventory-new possibilities subscale effect sizes





3.5 Moderator Analysis

Results from the cancer status moderator analysis are presented in Table 2. The results provided some evidence that the relationships between PTG and symptoms of depression and anxiety were not fully uniform across cancer and non-cancer samples, however, observed differences were relatively small and not definitive. The effect size for the relationship between depression and total PTG was close to zero among individuals without

Study				ES (<i>r</i>)	95% CI
Lurie-Beck, Liossis, & Gow, 2008 Teixeira & Pereira, 2013 Kunz, Joseph, Geyh, & Peter, 2017 Bianchi et al., 2017 Cabral, 2010 Forstmeier, Kuwert, Spitzer, Freyberger, & Maercker, Mystakidou et al., 2008 Jaarsma, Pool, Sanderman, & Ranchor, 2006 Cormio, Muzzatti, Romito, Mattioli, & Annunziata, 20 Kira et al., 2012 Soo & Sherman, 2015 Barrington & Shakespeare-Finch, 2013 Walsh et al., 2018	2009 17			0.37 [- 0.26 [0.21 [0.20 [0.16 [- 0.15 [- 0.11 [- 0.11 [- 0.11 [- 0.14 [- -0.02 [- -0.03 [-	0.03, 0.77 0.14, 0.39 0.05, 0.37 0.09, 0.31 0.00, 0.32 0.04, 0.34 0.08, 0.31 0.02, 0.24 0.02, 0.13 0.02, 0.13 0.13, 0.21 0.16, 0.12 0.22, 0.16 0.16, 0.10
Canavarro, Silva, & Moreira, 2015 Strecker, Hazelwood, & Shakespeare-Finch, 2014	ı			-0.10 [- -0.15 [-	0.30, 0.10] 0.50, 0.20]
Overall		•		0.10[0	.04, 0.15]
					
_	05	0	05	1	

Fig. 7 Anxiety and posttraumatic growth inventory-spiritual change subscale effect sizes



Fig. 8 Anxiety and posttraumatic growth inventory-appreciation of life subscale effect sizes

cancer (k=93, ES = -0.02, -0.06: 0.02) and was slightly stronger among those with cancer (k=29, ES = -0.10, -0.17: -0.03), though still small in magnitude ($Q_B=3.77$, df=1, p=0.05). When the relationships between depression and specific components of PTG were examined, significant differences between cancer and non-cancer effect did not emerge.

The relationship between anxiety and total PTG did not appear to differ between cancer and non-cancer samples ($Q_{\rm B}$ =0.90, df=1 p=0.34), however, the findings regarding the



Fig. 9 Depression and posttraumatic growth inventory-relating to others subscale effect sizes



Fig. 10 Depression and posttraumatic growth inventory-new possibilities subscale effect sizes

Study				ES (r) 95% CI
Kira et al., 2012			· · · · ·	- 0.18 [0.01, 0.35]
Whitehead, 2011			⊢ ∎1	0.17 [0.06, 0.28]
Donah Burke, 2009			∎	0.16 [0.01, 0.31]
Forstmeier, Kuwert, Spitzer, Freybe	rger, & Maercker, 20	09		0.11 [-0.08, 0.30]
Teixeira & Pereira, 2013			⊢∔∎−−−1	0.06 [-0.07, 0.20]
Barrington & Shakespeare-Finch, 2	2013		⊢	0.05 [-0.14, 0.24]
Lancaster & Carlson, 2015			⊢∔∎−−−1	0.04 [-0.10, 0.18]
Kunz, Joseph, Geyh, & Peter, 2017			⊢⊷∔∎−−−−1	0.04 [-0.13, 0.21]
Senol-Durak & Ayvasik, 2010			⊢ 	-0.01 [-0.18, 0.16]
Soo & Sherman, 2015			⊢ _	-0.02 [-0.16, 0.12]
Walsh et al., 2018				-0.02 [-0.15, 0.11]
Bianchi et al., 2017			⊢ _ ∎:1	-0.03 [-0.14, 0.08]
Cadell et al., 2014			⊢−∎∔−−1	-0.04 [-0.16, 0.08]
Cordova, Cunningham, Carlson, &	Andrykowski, 2001	⊢		-0.07 [-0.31, 0.17]
Schneider, Steele, Cadell, & Hemsy	worth, 2011		┝──■─┊┥	-0.07 [-0.19, 0.04]
Jaarsma, Pool, Sanderman, & Rand	chor, 2006		⊢−∎-∔₁	-0.09 [-0.22, 0.04]
Mystakidou et al., 2008		H		-0.11 [-0.31, 0.09]
Nakagawa et al., 2014		H		-0.13 [-0.39, 0.13]
Cormio, Muzzatti, Romito, Mattioli,	& Annunziata, 2017		⊢∎→	-0.13 [-0.22, -0.05]
Grubaugh & Resick, 2007		⊢	_	-0.14 [-0.34, 0.06]
Guo, Fu, Xing, Qu, & Wang, 2017			HEH	-0.14 [-0.19, -0.09]
Nishi & Usuda, 2017		⊢—	- 	-0.20 [-0.38, -0.02]
Lee, Blackmon, Lee, Cochran, & Re	ehner, 2019	⊢		-0.21 [-0.34, -0.08]
Xie, Wu & Shen, 2019		F		-0.22 [-0.29, -0.15]
Cabral, 2010		⊢ − ∎		-0.27 [-0.43, -0.11]
Strecker, Hazelwood, & Shakespea	re-Finch, 2014			-0.30 [-0.64, 0.04]
Lurie-Beck, Liossis, & Gow, 2008	H		i	-0.38 [-0.78, 0.02]
Palmer, Graca, & Occhietti, 2016		┝──╋──┤		-0.41 [-0.52, -0.30]
Overall			•	-0.07 [-0.13, -0.01]
	-1	-0.5	0	0.5
		0.0		0.0

Fig. 11 Depression and posttraumatic growth inventory-personal strength subscale effect sizes

Study				E	ES(r) 9	5% Cl
Teixeira & Pereira, 2013				- - C	.23 [0.1	0. 0.361
Kira et al., 2012				■ C	0.010101	2. 0.361
Bianchi et al., 2017			⊢ _∎	C	1410.0	3 0.251
Lurie-Beck, Liossis, & Gow, 2008			_ _		13 -0.2	9. 0.551
Kunz, Joseph, Gevh, & Peter, 2017			·	0.	11 -0.0	6. 0.281
Cormio, Muzzatti, Romito, Mattioli, & Ar	nunziata. 20	17	—	H C	0.0101.01	1. 0.181
Jaarsma, Pool, Sanderman, & Ranchor	2006			- 0.	0.0-180	5. 0.211
Cadell et al., 2014				- 0.	07 -0.0	5. 0.191
Lancaster & Carlson, 2015				н О.	05 1-0.0	9 0.19
Barrington & Shakespeare-Finch 2013	1			- 0	05 -0 1	4 0 241
Donah Burke, 2009				н 0.	04 [-0.1	1. 0.191
Whitehead, 2011				. 0	04 -0.0	7 0.151
Schneider, Steele, Cadell, & Hemsworth	h. 2011			0	01 -0.1	1. 0.131
Cordova, Cunningham, Carlson, & And	vkowski. 200)1	· · · ·	- 0.	00 -0.2	4. 0.241
Forstmeier Kuwert Spitzer Frevberger	& Maercker	2009	· · · · ·	н 0.	001-02	0 201
Nishi & Usuda, 2017	,		· · · ·	-0.	01 -0.1	9. 0.171
Walsh et al. 2018			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	-0	01 -0.1	4 0 121
Lee. Blackmon, Lee. Cochran, & Rehne	er. 2019			-0.	04 [-0.1	7. 0.091
Soo & Sherman, 2015	.,			-0.	05 -0.1	9. 0.091
Cabral 2010				-0	08 -0 2	4 0.081
Mystakidou et al. 2008				-0	10 -0 3	0 0.091
Senol-Durak & Avvasik, 2010				-0	13 -0.3	0.0.041
Grubaugh & Resick 2007				-0	18 -0 3	7 0 011
Palmer Graca & Occhietti 2016				-0.3	201-032	-0.081
Strecker, Hazelwood & Shakespeare-F	inch 2014		· • ·	-0.3	39 [-0 71	-0.071
	11011, 2014			0.0	50 [0.7]	, 0.07]
Overall			•	0.	01 [-0.0	3, 0.06]
				I		
	-1	-0.5	0	0.5		1

Fig. 12 Depression and posttraumatic growth inventory-spiritual change subscale effect sizes

Study			ES (r) 95% CI
Kira et al., 2012			0.24 [0.07, 0.41]
Whitehead, 2011			0.17 0.06, 0.28
Nishi & Usuda, 2017		L.	0.14 [-0.04, 0.32]
Teixeira & Pereira, 2013			0.12 -0.02, 0.25
Lancaster & Carlson, 2015		i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i	0.12 -0.02, 0.25
Bianchi et al., 2017		, in the second s	■ 0.09 i−0.02, 0.20i
Kunz, Joseph, Gevh, & Peter, 2017		L	0.06 [-0.11, 0.23]
Barrington & Shakespeare-Finch, 2013	3	L	0.05 [-0.14, 0.24]
Mystakidou et al., 2008		⊢	0.01 [-0.19, 0.20]
Soo & Sherman, 2015		· · · · · ·	
Cleary & Stanton 2015 HP		⊢	-0.01 [-0.24, 0.22]
Senol–Durak & Ayvasik, 2010		⊢ ∎	-0.01 [-0.18, 0.16]
Schneider, Steele, Cadell, & Hemswort	h, 2011	, ⊢_ ∎	⊣ −0.02 [−0.14, 0.10]
Donah Burke, 2009		⊢ _	-0.02 [-0.17, 0.13]
Walsh et al., 2018		⊢ ∎	⊣ −0.02 [−0.15, 0.11]
Cadell et al., 2014		⊢	+ -0.03 [-0.15, 0.09]
Jaarsma, Pool, Sanderman, & Ranchor	, 2006	⊢	+ -0.05 [-0.18, 0.08]
Lee, Blackmon, Lee, Cochran, & Rehne	er, 2019	⊢_∎	+ -0.05 [-0.18, 0.08]
Grubaugh & Resick, 2007		⊢	-0.07 [-0.27, 0.13]
Cormio, Muzzatti, Romito, Mattioli, & Ar	nnunziata, 2017	⊢_∎_ ÷I	-0.07 [-0.16, 0.01]
Forstmeier, Kuwert, Spitzer, Freyberger	, & Maercker, 2009	⊢∎	-0.08 [-0.27, 0.11]
Guo, Fu, Xing, Qu, & Wang, 2017		⊢∎⊣	-0.09 [-0.14, -0.04]
Cordova, Cunningham, Carlson, & And	rykowski, 2001	⊢ _	+ -0.15 [-0.38, 0.08]
Cabral, 2010		⊢−−− ∎−−−−1	-0.18 [-0.34, -0.02]
Strecker, Hazelwood, & Shakespeare-I	Finch, 2014 ⊢		-0.23 [-0.57, 0.11]
Lurie-Beck, Liossis, & Gow, 2008	H		-0.36 [-0.76, 0.04]
Xie, Wu & Shen, 2019		⊢∎⊣	-0.39 [-0.45, -0.33]
Palmer, Graca, & Occhietti, 2016		┝──╋──┤	-0.40 [-0.51, -0.29]
Overall		•	-0.04 [-0.11, 0.03]
		1 1	
	-1 -	-0.5 0	0.5

Fig. 13 Depression and posttraumatic growth inventory-appreciation of life subscale effect sizes

Outcomes	Q _T	$Q_{\rm B}\left(df\right)$	$Q_{\mathrm{W}}\left(df\right)$	Car	Cancer		Nor	n-cance	er
				k	ES	95% CI	k	ES	95% CI
Anxiety with									
Full PTGI	50.94	0.90(1)	50.04 (53)	21	.01	08: .10	34	.07	01: .14
Relating with others	15.45	1.99 (1)	13.46 (14)	7	.03	06: .11	9	.11	.02: .20
New possibilities	16.68	4.05 (1)*	12.64 (14)	7	.01	07: .09	9	.13	.04: .21
Personal strength	18.11	4.04 (1)*	14.07 (14)	7	01	06: .04	9	.08	.01: .14
Spiritual change	14.59	0.75 (1)	13.83 (13)	7	.07	01: .15	8	.13	.04: .21
Appreciation of life	18.46	4.90 (1)*	13.56 (13)	7	.02	04: .09	8	.13	.06: .21
Depression with									
Full PTGI	116.53	3.77 (1)*	112.75 (119)	29	10	17:03	93	02	06: .02
Relating with others	20.28	0.00(1)	20.28 (26)	7	04	18: .11	21	04	12: .04
New possibilities	22.27	0.01 (1)	22.26 (27)	7	01	16: .14	22	01	09: .08
Personal strength	28.16	0.39(1)	27.78 (26)	7	04	15: .07	21	08	14:02
Spiritual change	24.88	0.88 (1)	23.99 (23)	7	.05	04: .13	18	.00	06: .06
Appreciation of life	17.92	0.02(1)	17.90 (26)	7	05	19: .10	21	04	12: .05

 Table 2
 Moderator analysis for cancer versus non-cancer samples

ES effect size, PTGI posttraumatic growth inventory

*p < .05,

Outcomes	Q_{T}	$Q_{\rm B}\left(df\right)$	$Q_{\rm W}(df)$ Maj		Majority male		Ma	jority fe	emale
				k	ES	95% CI	k	ES	95% CI
Anxiety with									
Full PTGI	49.63	0.98 (1)	48.65 (51)	27	.02	07: .10	26	.08	01: .16
Relating with others	13.10	1.99 (1)	13.46 (14)	8	.05	04: .14	8	.09	13: .18
New possibilities	15.48	3.43 (1)	12.04 (14)	8	.01	07: .10	8	.13	.04: .22
Personal strength	15.16	1.04 (1)	14.12 (14)	8	.01	05: .07	8	.06	01: .13
Spiritual change	13.74	0.11(1)	13.63 (13)	8	.09	.01: .17	7	.11	.01: .20
Appreciation of life	15.26	2.18(1)	13.08 (13)	8	.04	03: .11	7	.12	.04: .20
Depression with									
Full PTGI	134.65	1.99 (1)	132.66 (117)	68	01	06: .03	51	06	12:01
Relating with others	20.13	0.00(1)	20.23 (26)	19	04	12: .05	9	04	17: .09
New possibilities	22.52	0.00(1)	22.53 (27)	20	01	09: .08	9	01	14: .12
Personal strength	26.68	0.04 (1)	26.64 (26)	19	07	13: .00	9	08	18: .03
Spiritual change	23.81	0.00(1)	13.81 (23)	17	.01	04: .07	8	.01	08: .10
Appreciation of life	18.97	0.18 (1)	18.79 (26)	20	03	11: .05	8	06	20: .07

 Table 3
 Moderator analysis for gender

ES effect size, PTGI posttraumatic growth inventory

*p < .05

relationships between anxiety and the different components of PTG were more mixed. The average ESs were generally greater for samples without cancer than for samples of cancer survivors, but ES were still relatively small in magnitude, ranging from 0.07 to 0.13 among non-cancer samples. The Q statistics between cancer and non-cancer samples were statistically significant for the relationships between anxiety and new possibilities, personal strength, and spiritual change, but not relating to others or appreciation of life.

The moderator analysis examining the influence of age on the relationship between depression and PTG did not reflect significant differences between adult and child/adolescent samples. The relationship between PTG and lower levels of depression was stronger in magnitude among child/adolescent samples (k=116, ES = -0.17, -0.32: -0.001) compared to adult samples, in which this relationship bordered on zero (k=5, ES = -0.03, -0.08: 0.00). However the difference between these groups was not statistically significant ($Q_B = 2.46$, df = 1 p = 0.12; $Q_W = 120.80$, df = 119 p = 0.44; $Q_T = 123.26$, df = 120 p = 0.40). In addition, there was no evidence that gender moderated the relationships between PTG and symptoms of anxiety or depression (see Table 3).

4 Discussion

The present study meta-analytically reviewed the relationships between PTG and global anxiety and depression. The results indicate that PTG is broadly unrelated to global anxiety and depression when the literature is considered in aggregate. PTG demonstrated a negligible association with greater anxiety and was very weakly related to lower levels of depression, with both effect sizes bordering on zero. While the relationship between PTG and depression was statistically significant, the magnitude of the effect size did not suggest a clinically significant relationship.

The findings regarding the relationships between specific components of PTG and global anxiety and depression were somewhat more mixed, though the magnitude of these associations were also weak (i.e. $all \le 0.10$) and thus unlikely to hold clinical significance. Generally, components of PTG were weakly related to greater anxiety, and a number of these relationships did not reach statistical significance. The strongest relationship was between anxiety and spiritual change, followed by relating to others and appreciation of life, however, ES were weak and ≤ 1.10 . The relationships between anxiety and other PTG components were not statistically significant. Depression was generally inversely related to components of PTG, but the magnitude of the ES were weak. Only the relationship between depression and personal strength was statistically significant, and the other effect sizes for the relationships between PTG components and depression were ≤ 1.05 .

Given that a sizable portion of the identified studies included participants effected by cancer, it was important to consider whether there are any differences in the relationships between PTG and symptoms of anxiety and depression within this population compared to other trauma-exposed populations, which could impact the general conclusions drawn from a meta-analytic review of the broader literature. The moderator analysis indicated that these relationships were not completely uniform across cancer and non-cancer samples, but observed differences between these samples were relatively small. Certain components of PTG were more strongly related to anxiety in non-cancer samples compared to cancer samples (i.e. new possibilities, personal strength, and appreciation of life). However, the ES for these relationships were generally small in magnitude. Thus, it is less likely that these distinctions are clinically significant. Furthermore, the results suggest that neither age nor gender moderated the relationships between PTG and symptoms of anxiety and depression, though few studies were conducting using samples of children or adolescents.

The present findings are generally consistent with results from early reviews and the contemporary literature examining how PTG is related to depression and anxiety within specific sub-populations, such as cancer patients (Casellas-Grau et al. 2017). During the previous decade, Helgeson et al. (2006) meta-analytically reviewed the relationship between broader benefit finding behavior (which is was inclusive of PTG) and outcomes including anxiety (k=9) and depression (k=17). The results indicated very weak relationships between benefit finding and both outcomes, which only reached statistical significance for the outcome of depression. While there was a positive association between PTG and anxiety, this effect size was close to zero and not statistically significant. Since this review was published, increasing scientific interest in PTG has spurred a great amount of research in this area, with a considerable number of studies focusing on PTG in the context of cancer. A more recent meta-analysis examining these relationships specifically among cancer survivors found results that were consistent with the present findings, indicating a weak inverse relationship between PTG and depression and a positive but not statistically significant relationship between PTG and anxiety (Shand et al. 2015). Effect sizes for associations between PTG and these mental health outcomes have generally been small to the point of bordering on zero, which likely contributes to fluctuations in the direction of previously observed effect sizes.

The results of the present meta-analytic review contribute to growing evidence that mental well-being and mental illness are not opposite ends of a single spectrum of mental health. Some have expressed skepticism regarding whether positive outcomes such as PTG routinely occur alongside significant struggles with mental illness in the aftermath of a trauma. Yet if PTG and symptoms of mental illness like anxiety and depression represented opposing outcomes following a traumatic event, we would expect to see relatively large, inverse relationships between them upon meta-analytic review. Actual observed effect sizes were generally small, bordering on zero. These results indicate that the development of PTG is not dependent on whether survivors are free of mental illness.

Though symptoms of anxiety and depression are common outcomes of trauma, the relationship between PTG and another type of emotional disorder, PTSD, has generally received more research attention. Meta-analytic review of this area has indicated a more complicated relationship in which greater symptoms of PTSD are associated with greater PTG, or even a curvilinear relationship in which PTG is greatest at moderate levels of PTSD (Liu et al. 2017; Shakespeare-Finch and Lurie-Beck 2014; Wang et al. 2016). PTSD may be more strongly related to PTG compared to anxiety and depression because both PTSD symptoms and PTG are uniquely positioned in terms of the traumatic event. PTG involves reflecting on changes in important domains after a traumatic event has occurred. PTSD is the only psychological disorder (other than acute stress disorder) in which symptoms are explicitly anchored to a required criterion A traumatic event, and symptom clusters are strongly linked to the trauma. For example, when intrusion symptoms occur, the traumatic event is brought into the forefront of consciousness. Thus, intrusion symptoms may prompt processing of the trauma in a way that general symptoms of anxiety and depression do not. Avoidance of distressing trauma reminders and associated emotions may paradoxically trigger more trauma-related intrusions (Amstadter and Vernon 2006; Shipherd and Beck 2005; Wenzlaff and Wegner 2000). This may prompt trauma-related processing that is necessary for PTG.

While the findings from the current meta-analysis demonstrated very weak associations between PTG and symptoms of depression and anxiety when the literature was considered in aggregate, it would be imprudent to conclude that PTG is unrelated to depression and anxiety in all contexts. The moderator analysis indicated that there was a large degree of heterogeneity in effect sizes across the included studies, and visual examination of their range, magnitude, and direction reflects that they were quite variable as opposed to uniformly bordering zero, which would indicate the presence of generally null relationships. This suggests that other factors may influence how PTG relates to anxiety and depression. It is possible that under certain conditions, PTG is more strongly related to these outcomes, and the direction of the effect could go be positive or negative depending on the circumstances. For example, prior research has indicated that greater symptoms of depression and anxiety are associated with lower levels of PTG when the trauma is perceived as more central to one's identity (i.e. conditions of high event centrality; Berntsen and Rubin 2006; Schuettler and Boals 2011). As previously mentioned, greater event centrality may suggest that the experience of the trauma was more disruptive to core beliefs, which may lead to greater distress but also PTG as the trauma is processed and challenges are resolved. Relatively little research has examined how event centrality influences the development and interrelationships between PTG and symptoms of mental illness other than posttraumatic stress, and this may be a fruitful area of future study.

Additionally, trauma type has been implicated as a potential moderator of the relationship between PTG and PTSD (Shakespeare-Finch and Lurie-Beck 2014) and may also influence the relationship between PTG and other emotional disorders such as anxiety and depression. PTG appears to be more strongly linked to symptoms of PTSD among civilians in conflict zones, survivors of natural disasters, and children, while this relationship is weaker among survivors of sexual abuse and those who are either experiencing or caring for someone with a medical illness. These findings may also be relevant to the relationship between PTG and other emotional disorders. Examining unique aspects posttraumatic functioning after specific types of traumatic experiences is complicated given that traumatic events are relatively common and many experience more than one trauma in

their lifetime. For example, Kilpatrick et al. (2013) found that 89.7% of a national sample of adults endorsed a criterion A trauma, and the modal number of traumatic events participants experienced was 3. Studies examining posttraumatic functioning among traumaexposed community samples and college students typically reflect exposure to a wide range of trauma types, and even studies that focus on specific trauma-exposed populations indicate that participants have experienced a variety of types of criterion A events. Such studies examining posttraumatic functioning after specific types of trauma or within specific trauma-exposed populations routinely fail to control for prior trauma exposure, including prior exposure to different categories of traumatic events. However, prior trauma appears to increase the risk of developing PTSD after a subsequent traumatic event (Breslau et al. 1999), and trauma exposure early in life has been implicated in the development of other mental health problems such as depression and anxiety disorders (Vitriol et al. 2014). These challenges dilute the capacity for broader meta-analytic reviews to draw meaningfully conclusions about unique aspects posttraumatic functioning after specific types of trauma. Studies examining posttraumatic functioning among specific populations or after specific types of trauma should be mindful about reporting and controlling for prior trauma exposure, which may set the stage for meaningful targeted reviews of post-trauma functioning in specific contexts.

4.1 Strengths and Limitations

A major strength of present research was the large number of studies that were included in the meta-analysis. Database search terms were developed to be exhaustive, and a large number of relevant review articles were chosen to identify potential studies for inclusion. In general, the results from the fail safe N analysis provide evidence for the validity of the results and suggest that the present findings were not significantly impacted by publication bias. The present study also extended the findings from previous meta-analytic reviews by examining the relationship between symptoms of emotional disorders and different subcomponents of PTG. Finally, the scope of the present meta-analysis focused on studies using versions of the PTGI, the most widely used measure of PTG associated with the most prominent model of PTG (Steffens and Andrykowski 2015). This approach reduces variability due to differences in measurement and conceptualization of PTG, which has its strengths in light of common criticism regarding inconsistencies in the way positive change after trauma is defined. However, this approach necessarily precludes other research examining how anxiety and depression are associated with other similar or related constructs. Future research may examine the relationships of depression and anxiety with broader stress-related growth and related constructs such a benefit finding using a broader range of measures.

In response to the controversy surrounding the "replication crisis" within the psychological sciences, meta-analysis has been proposed as a way to aggregate and evaluate the validity of findings from individual studies (Sharpe and Poets 2020). However, critics note that meta-analyses may still overestimate the magnitude of effect sizes due to selective reporting bias (e.g., bias due to pressures to publish novel findings and practices such as conducting selective analyses aimed towards produce statistically significant results), and the quality of the results will ultimately depend on the quality of the included studies. While some work has indicated that selective reporting bias is minimal across meta-analytics reviews, problems such as inadequate statistical power of original studies and significant betweenstudy heterogeneity have the potential to limit the conclusions of meta-analyses (Stanley et al. 2018). Furthermore, correcting for unreliability is one way to address the potentially inflated of effect sizes due to measurement error. However, this method could not be utilized in the present meta-analysis due inconsistent reporting of the internal consistencies for the measures that were included in the individual studies. As a result, the quality of included measures was somewhat unclear. Future studies should make ensure to report internal consistencies for included measures to aid in later meta-analytic review.

In addition, the scope of the present meta-analysis focused on cross-sectional studies and is therefore bound by the limitations of this research design, which precludes any conclusions regarding causality or directionality of relationships. It remains unclear how symptoms of depression and anxiety are related to PTG over time, which is particularly relevant given that PTG is conceptualized as a process that unfolds as time passes. Furthermore, cross-sectional studies that utilize self-report measures of PTG rely on respondents to retrospectively assess the extent to which they have grown after a trauma, which may be influence by biased recall (Jayawickreme and Blackie 2014). This process is mentally taxing given that it requires respondents to make an accurate assessment of their current level of functioning in a certain domain and then compare it to prior levels of functioning, while also determining the degree of change that has resulted specifically from the trauma (Ford et al. 2008). Thus, survivors may overestimate the amount of growth they experienced after a trauma when directly questioned (Frazier et al., 2009). The majority of studies focusing on PTG have collected data from survivors after trauma exposure given the challenges inherent to conducting prospective research. Yet additional prospective and longitudinal research should be conducted to overcome the limitations of cross-sectional and self-report methods. Studies should utilize additional objective methods for assessing PTG, as well as non-trauma exposed control groups to ensure that genuine posttraumatic growth after a traumatic event is occuring, as opposed to changes related other phenomena such as maturation or the cumulative effects of daily experiences (versus significant life events). (Jayawickreme and Blackie 2014; Jayawickreme and Blackie 2016; Rzeszutek and Gruszczyńska 2018; Tennen and Affleck 2009). This work will be vital given the current debate surrounding the actual or illusory nature of PTG. While Tedeschi and Calhoun (2004) maintain that PTG reflects truth growth in the wake of a trauma, other work has suggested that survivors may be perceiving that they have experienced PTG in the absence of real positive change (Mangelsdorf et al. 2019). Thus, it has been argued that PTG could be conceptualized as an illusory compensation strategy (Maercker and Zoellner 2004) or a method of coping similar to positive re-appraisal (Nolen-Hoeksema and Davis 2004). More longitudinal and prospective research will help clarify the true nature of PTG.

Furthermore, the present meta-analysis focused on cancer vs. non-cancer sample type as a potential moderator of the relationships between PTG and global anxiety and depression due the comparably large literature examining these relationships within this subpopulation. Other potential moderating variables such as trauma type and time since trauma were coded but not included in the analytic plan due to sparse and inconsistent reporting, as well as issues due to the heterogeneity of trauma samples as referenced above. Future research should work to identify moderators that influence the relationship between PTG and global anxiety and depression, such as exposure to specific types of traumatic events and event centrality. These studies must fully report sample characteristics and carefully consider the role of prior exposure to other traumatic events in order to allow for more broad synthesis of findings clarifying how PTG relates to symptoms of emotional disorders. Additional research should also be conducted to determine the relationship between PTG and symptoms of anxiety among children and adolescents. Furthermore, the present study focused on the relationships between PTG and global depression and anxiety more broadly due to a lack of studies focusing on specific depressive or anxiety-related disorders. Future research may examine whether PTG is more strongly related to symptoms of specific emotional disorders.

5 Conclusions

The results from the present meta-analysis indicate that PTG is practically unrelated to global anxiety and depression when the literature is considered in aggregate. While findings regarding the relationships between these symptoms and specific facets of PTG were more mixed, the magnitudes of these associations were also very weak and unlikely to be clinically significant. However, the moderator analysis indicated that there was a significant heterogeneity within the literature, thus, there may be certain conditions under which PTG is more meaningfully related to anxiety and depression. Additional research will help identify influential moderators of this relationship. Nevertheless, the present findings support the assertion that positive and negative outcomes of trauma separable and distinct rather than opposing stages of the recovery process.

Supplementary Information The online version contains supplementary material available at https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-021-00370-9.

Declaration

Conflict of interest The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

Ethical Approval As the present research reviewed previously published studies, it did not involve the recruitment of (or data collection from) human or animal subjects.

Informed Consent The present research did not necessitate informed consent nor approval from an institutional IRB.

References

Affleck, G., & Tennen, H. (1996). Construing benefits from adversity: adaptational significance and dispositional underpinnings. *Journal of Personality*, 64(4), 899–922. https://doi. org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.1996.tb00948.x

American Psychiatric Association. (2013). Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders (5th ed.).

- Amstadter, A. B., & Vernon, L. L. (2006). Suppression of neutral and trauma targets: Implications for posttraumatic stress disorder. *Journal of Traumatic Stress*, 19(4), 517–526. https://doi.org/10.1002/ jts.20142
- Barskova, T., & Oesterreich, R. (2009). Post-traumatic growth in people living with a serious medical condition and its relations to physical and mental health: A systematic review. *Disability and Rehabilitation*, 31(21), 1709–1733. https://doi.org/10.1080/09638280902738441
- Berntsen, D., & Rubin, D. C. (2006). The centrality of event scale: A measure of integrating a trauma into one's identity and its relation to post-traumatic stress disorder symptoms. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 44(2), 219–231. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brat.2005.01.009
- Bonanno, G. A., Westphal, M., & Mancini, A. D. (2011). Resilience to loss and potential trauma. Annual Review of Clinical Psychology, 7(511–535), 1. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-clinpsy-032210-10452 6
- Boscarino, J. A., Hoffman, S. N., Adams, R. E., Figley, C. R., & Solhkhah, R. (2014). Mental health outcomes among vulnerable residents after Hurricane Sandy: Implications for disaster research and planning. American Journal of Disaster Medicine, 9(2), 97–106. https://doi.org/10.5055/ajdm.2014.0147

- Breslau, N., Chilcoat, H. D., Kessler, R. C., & Davis, G. C. (1999). Previous exposure to trauma and PTSD effects of subsequent trauma: Results from the Detroit Area Survey of Trauma. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 156(6), 902–907. https://doi.org/10.1176/ajp.156.6.902
- Cann, A., Calhoun, L. G., Tedeschi, R. G., Taku, K., Vishnevsky, T., Triplett, K. N., & Danhauer, S. C. (2010). A short form of the posttraumatic growth inventory. *Anxiety, Stress and Coping*, 23(2), 127– 137. https://doi.org/10.1002/10.1080/10615800903094273
- Casellas-Grau, A., Ochoa, C., & Ruini, C. (2017). Psychological and clinical correlates of posttraumatic growth in cancer: A systematic and critical review. *Psycho-Oncology*, 26(12), 2007–2018. https://doi. org/10.1002/10.1002/pon.4426
- Chan, K. J., Young, M. Y., & Sharif, N. (2016). Well-being after trauma: A review of posttraumatic growth among refugees. *Canadian Psychology/Psychologie Canadienne*, 57(4), 291–299. https://doi. org/10.1002/10.1037/cap0000065
- Cook, S. W., Aten, J. D., Moore, M., Hook, J. N., & Davis, D. E. (2013). Resource loss, religiousness, health, and posttraumatic growth following Hurricane Katrina. *Mental Health, Religion and Culture*, 16(4), 352–366. https://doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2012.667395
- Cordova, M. J., Cunningham, L. L., Carlson, C. R., & Andrykowski, M. A. (2001). Posttraumatic growth following breast cancer: A controlled comparison study. *Health Psychology: Official Journal of the Division of Health Psychology, American Psychological Association, 20*(3), 176–185. https://doi. org/10.1037/0278-6133.20.3.176
- Ford, J. D., Tennen, H., & Albert, D. (2008). A contrarian view of growth following adversity. In S. Joseph & P. A. Linley (Eds.), *Trauma, recovery, and growth: Positive psychological perspectives on posttraumatic stress* (pp. 297–324). Wiley.
- Freedy, J. R., Kilpatrick, D. G., & Resnick, H. S. (1993). Natural disasters and mental health: Theory, assessment, and intervention. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality*, 8(5), 49. https://doi. org/10.1080/20008198.2019.1661813
- Frazier, P., Tennen, H., Gavian, M., Park, C., Tomich, P., & Tashiro, T. (2009). Does self-reported posttraumatic growth reflect genuine positive change? *Psychological Science*, 20, 912–919. https://doi.org/10.1 111/j.1467-9280.2009.02381.x
- Friedman, M. J., Resick, P. A., Bryant, R. A., & Brewin, C. R. (2011). Considering PTSD for DSM-5. Depression and Anxiety, 28(9), 750–769. https://doi.org/10.1002/da.20767
- Galea, S., Brewin, C. R., Gruber, M., Jones, R. T., King, D. W., King, L. A., et al. (2007). Exposure to hurricane-related stressors and mental illness after Hurricane Katrina. Archives of General Psychiatry, 64(12), 1427–1434. https://doi.org/10.1001/archpsyc.64.12.1427
- Ginzburg, K., Ein-Dor, T., & Solomon, Z. (2010). Comorbidity of posttraumatic stress disorder, anxiety and depression: A 20-year longitudinal study of war veterans. *Journal of Affective Disorders*, 123(1–3), 249–257. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2009.08.006
- Grace, J. J., Kinsella, E. L., Muldoon, O. T., & Fortune, D. G. (2015). Post-traumatic growth following acquired brain injury: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 6, 1162. https:// doi.org/10.1002/10.3389/fpsyg.2015.01162
- Groleau, J. M., Calhoun, L. G., Cann, A., & Tedeschi, R. G. (2013). The role of centrality of events in posttraumatic distress and posttraumatic growth. *Psychological Trauma: Theory, Research, Practice, and Policy*, 5(5), 477. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0028809
- Habib, A., Stevelink, S. A. M., Greenberg, N., & Williamson, V. (2018). Post-traumatic growth in (ex-) military personnel: Review and qualitative synthesis. *Occupational Medicine*, 68(9), 617–625. https:// doi.org/10.1002/10.1093/occmed/kqy140
- Helgeson, V. S., Reynolds, K. A., & Tomich, P. L. (2006). A meta-analytic review of benefit finding and growth. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 74(5), 797. https://doi. org/10.1037/0022-006X.74.5.797
- Hovens, J. G., Giltay, E. J., Wiersma, J. E., Spinhoven, P., Penninx, B. W., & Zitman, F. G. (2012). Impact of childhood life events and trauma on the course of depressive and anxiety disorders. *Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica*, *126*(3), 198–207. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0447.2011.01828.x
- Huppert, F. A., & Whittington, J. E. (2003). Evidence for the independence of positive and negative wellbeing: Implications for quality of life assessment. *British Journal of Health Psychology*, 8(1), 107– 122. https://doi.org/10.1348/135910703762879246
- Janoff-Bulman, R. (1989). Assumptive worlds and the stress of traumatic events: Applications of the schema construct. Social Cognition, 7(2), 113–136. https://doi.org/10.1002/10.1521/soco.1989.7.2.113
- Jayawickreme, E., & Blackie, L. (2016). Methodologies for the study of posttraumatic growth: Some new directions. In E. Jayawickreme & L. Blackie (Eds.), *Exploring the Psychological Benefits of Hardship:* A Critical Reassessment of Posttraumatic Growth (pp. 33–38). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-47989-7_4

- Jayawickreme, E., & Blackie, L. (2014). Posttraumatic growth as positive personality change: Evidence, controversies and future directions. *European Journal of Personality*, 28, 312–331. https://doi. org/10.1002/per.1963
- Jin, Y., Xu, J., & Liu, D. (2014). The relationship between post traumatic stress disorder and post traumatic growth: Gender differences in PTG and PTSD subgroups. *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemi*ology, 49(12), 1903–1910. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00127-014-0865-5
- Kessler, R. C., Galea, S., Gruber, M. J., Sampson, N. A., Ursano, R. J., & Wessely, S. (2008). Trends in mental illness and suicidality after Hurricane Katrina. *Molecular Psychiatry*, 13(4), 374. https://doi. org/10.1038/sj.mp.4002119
- Keyes, C. L. (2005). Mental illness and/or mental health? Investigating axioms of the complete state model of health. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 73(3), 539. https://doi. org/10.1037/0022-006X.73.3.539
- Kilpatrick, D. G., Resnick, H. S., Milanak, M. E., Miller, M. W., Keyes, K. M., & Friedman, M. J. (2013). National estimates of exposure to traumatic events and PTSD prevalence using DSM-IV and DSM-5 criteria. *Journal of Traumatic Stress*, 26(5), 537–547. https://doi.org/10.1002/jts.21848
- Kleim, B., & Ehlers, A. (2009). Evidence for a curvilinear relationship between posttraumatic growth and posttrauma depression and PTSD in assault survivors. *Journal of Traumatic Stress: Official Publication of The International Society for Traumatic Stress Studies*, 22(1), 45–52. https://doi.org/10.1002/ jts.20378
- Lai, B. S., Kelley, M. L., Harrison, K. M., Thompson, J. E., & Self-Brown, S. (2015). Posttraumatic stress, anxiety, and depression symptoms among children after Hurricane Katrina: A latent profile analysis. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 24(5), 1262–1270. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10826-014-9934-3
- Linley, P. A., & Joseph, S. (2004). Positive change following trauma and adversity: A review. Journal of Traumatic Stress, 17(1), 11–21. https://doi.org/10.1002/10.1023/B:JOTS.0000014671.27856.7e
- Lipsey, M. W., & Wilson, D. B. (2001). Applied social research methods series. Practical meta-analysis. Sage Publications.
- Liu, A. N., Wang, L. L., Li, H. P., Gong, J., & Liu, X. H. (2017). Correlation between posttraumatic growth and posttraumatic stress disorder symptoms based on Pearson correlation coefficient: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease*, 205(5), 380–389. https://doi.org/10.1097/NMD.000000000 000605
- Lowe, S. R., Manove, E. E., & Rhodes, J. E. (2013). Posttraumatic stress and posttraumatic growth among low-income mothers who survived Hurricane Katrina. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 81(5), 877. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0033252
- Lustig, S. L., Kia-Keating, M., Knight, W. G., Geltman, P., Ellis, H., Kinzie, J. D., et al. (2004). Review of child and adolescent refugee mental health. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, 43(1), 24–36. https://doi.org/10.1097/00004583-200401000-00012
- Maercker, A., & Zoellner, T. (2004). The janus face of self-perceived growth: Toward a two-component model of posttraumatic growth. *Psychological Inquiry*, 15(1), 41–48.
- Mangelsdorf, J., Eid, M., & Luhmann, M. (2019). Does growth require suffering? A systematic review and meta-analysis on genuine posttraumatic and postecstatic growth. *Psychological Bulletin*, 145(3), 302– 338. https://doi.org/10.1037/bul0000173
- Meyerson, D. A., Grant, K. E., Carter, J. S., & Kilmer, R. P. (2011). Posttraumatic growth among children and adolescents: A systematic review. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 31(6), 949–964. https://doi. org/10.1002/10.1016/j.cpr.2011.06.003
- National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence. (2005). Post traumatic stress disorder: The management of PTSD in adults and children in primary and secondary care. Gaskell and the British Psychological Society.
- Nishi, D., Matsuoka, Y., Yonemoto, N., Noguchi, H., Kim, Y., & Kanba, S. (2010). Peritraumatic Distress Inventory as a predictor of post-traumatic stress disorder after a severe motor vehicle accident. *Psychi*atry and Clinical Neurosciences, 64(2), 149–156. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1440-1819.2010.02065.x
- Nolen-Hoeksema, S., & Davis, C. G. (2004). Theoretical and methodological issues in the assessment and interpretation of posttraumatic growth. *Psychological Inquiry: An International Journal of Peer Commentary and Review*, 15(1), 60–64.
- O'Donnell, M. L., Creamer, M., & Pattison, P. (2004). Posttraumatic stress disorder and depression following trauma: Understanding comorbidity. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 161(8), 1390–1396. https:// doi.org/10.1176/appi.ajp.161.8.1390
- Park, C. L., Cohen, L. H., & Murch, R. L. (1996). Assessment and prediction of stress-related growth. Journal of Personality, 64(1), 71–105. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.1996.tb00815.x

- Pitman, R. K., Orr, S. P., & Lasko, N. B. (1993). Effects of intranasal vasopressin and oxytocin on physiologic responding during personal combat imagery in Vietnam veterans with posttraumatic stress disorder. *Psychiatry Research*, 48(2), 107–117. https://doi.org/10.1016/0165-1781(93)90035-f
- Rzeszutek, M., & Gruszczyńska, E. (2018). Posttraumatic growth among people living with HIV: A systematic review. Journal of Psychosomatic Research, 114(81–91), 55. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpsychores .2018.09.006
- Schubert, C. F., Schmidt, U., & Rosner, R. (2015). Posttraumatic growth in populations with posttraumatic stress disorder: A systematic review on growth-related psychological constructs and biological variables. *Clinical Psychology & Psychotherapy*, 23(6), 469–486. https://doi.org/10.1002/10.1002/cpp.1985
- Schuettler, D., & Boals, A. (2011). The path to posttraumatic growth versus posttraumatic stress disorder: Contributions of event centrality and coping. *Journal of Loss and Trauma*, 16(2), 180–194. https://doi. org/10.1080/15325024.2010.519273
- Schuler, E. R., & Boals, A. (2016). Shattering world assumptions: A prospective view of the impact of adverse events on world assumptions. *Psychological Trauma: Theory, Research, Practice, and Policy*, 8(3), 259–266. https://doi.org/10.1002/10.1037/tra0000073
- Schwartz, R. M., Sison, C., Kerath, S. M., Murphy, L., Breil, T., Sikavi, D., & Taioli, E. (2015). The impact of Hurricane Sandy on the mental health of New York area residents. *American Journal of Disaster Medicine*, 10(4), 339–346. https://doi.org/10.5055/ajdm.2015.0216
- Shakespeare-Finch, J., & Lurie-Beck, J. (2014). A meta-analytic clarification of the relationship between posttraumatic growth and symptoms of posttraumatic distress disorder. *Journal of Anxiety Disorders*, 28(2), 223–229. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.janxdis.2013.10.005
- Shand, L. K., Cowlishaw, S., Brooker, J. E., Burney, S., & Ricciardelli, L. A. (2015). Correlates of posttraumatic stress symptoms and growth in cancer patients: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Psycho-Oncology*, 24(6), 624–634. https://doi.org/10.1002/pon.3719
- Sharpe, D., & Poets, S. (2020). Meta-analysis as a response to the replication crisis. *Canadian Psychology*, 61(4), 377–387. https://doi.org/10.1037/cap0000215
- Sherr, L., Nagra, N., Kulubya, G., Catalan, J., Clucas, C., & Harding, R. (2011). HIV infection associated post-traumatic stress disorder and post-traumatic growth: A systematic review. *Psychology, Health and Medicine, 16*(5), 612–629. https://doi.org/10.1002/10.1080/13548506.2011.579991
- Shipherd, J. C., & Beck, J. G. (2005). The role of thought suppression in posttraumatic stress disorder. Behavior Therapy, 36(3), 277–287. https://doi.org/10.1002/10.1016/s0005-7894(05)80076-0
- Solomon, Z., & Dekel, R. (2007). Posttraumatic stress disorder and posttraumatic growth among Israeli ex-pows. Journal of Traumatic Stress: Official Publication of the International Society for Traumatic Stress Studies, 20(3), 303–312. https://doi.org/10.1002/jts.20216
- Southwick, S. M., Bonanno, G. A., Masten, A. S., Panter-Brick, C., & Yehuda, R. (2014). Resilience definitions, theory, and challenges: Interdisciplinary perspectives. *European Journal of Psychotraumatology*, 5(1), 25338. https://doi.org/10.3402/ejpt.v5.25338
- Stanley, T. D., Carter, E. C., & Doucouliagos, H. (2018). What meta-analyses reveal about the replicability of psychological research. *Psychological Bulletin*, 144(12), 1325–1346. https://doi.org/10.1037/bul00 00169.supp(Supplemental)
- Steffens, R. F., & Andrykowski, M. A. (2015). Posttraumatic growth inventory: Overview. Comprehensive Guide to Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder. https://doi.org/10.1002/10.1007/978-3-319-08613-2_12-1
- Surís, A., & Lind, L. (2008). Military sexual trauma: A review of prevalence and associated health consequences in veterans. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse, 9*(4), 250–269. https://doi.org/10.1177/1524838008 324419
- Tedeschi, R. G., & Calhoun, L. G. (1996). The Posttraumatic Growth Inventory: Measuring the positive legacy of trauma. Journal of Traumatic Stress, 9(3), 455–471. https://doi.org/10.1002/jts.2490090305
- Tedeschi, R. G., & Calhoun, L. G. (2004). Posttraumatic growth: Conceptual foundations and empirical evidence. Psychological Inquiry, 15(1), 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327965pli1501_01
- Tennen, H., & Affleck, G. (2009). Assessing positive life change: In search of meticulous methods. In C. L. Park, S. C. Lechner, M. H. Antoni, & A. L. Stanton (Eds.), *Medical illness and positive life change: Can crisis lead to personal transformation*? (pp. 31–49). American Psychological Association.
- Turner, J. K., Hutchinson, A., & Wilson, C. (2018). Correlates of post-traumatic growth following childhood and adolescent cancer: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Psycho-Oncology*, 27(4), 1100– 1109. https://doi.org/10.1002/10.1002/pon.4577
- Vitriol, V., Cancino, A., Weil, K., Salgado, C., Asenjo, M. A., & Potthoff, S. (2014). Depression and psychological Trauma: An overview integrating current research and specific evidence of studies in the treatment of depression in public mental health services in Chile. *Depression Research and Treatment*, 2014, 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1155/2014/608671

- Vrana, S., & Lauterbach, D. (1994). Prevalence of traumatic events and post-traumatic psychological symptoms in a nonclinical sample of college students. *Journal of Traumatic Stress*, 7(2), 289–302. https:// doi.org/10.1002/jts.2490070209
- Wang, L. L., Liu, A. N., Li, H. P., & Gong, J. (2016). A meta-analysis of relationship between posttraumatic growth and posttraumatic stress disorder symptoms. *Chinese Mental Health Journal*, 30(1), 23–28. https://doi.org/10.1126/scitranslmed.aav4522
- Warsini, S., West, C., Mills, J., & Usher, K. (2014). The psychosocial impact of natural disasters among adult survivors: An integrative review. *Issues in Mental Health Nursing*, 35(6), 420–436. https://doi. org/10.1002/10.3109/01612840.2013.875085
- Wenzlaff, R. M., & Wegner, D. M. (2000). Thought suppression. Annual Review of Psychology, 51(1), 59–91. https://doi.org/10.1002/10.1146/psych.2000.51.issue-1
- Zoellner, T., & Maercker, A. (2006). Posttraumatic growth in clinical psychology—A critical review and introduction of a two component model. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 26(5), 626–653. https://doi. org/10.1002/10.1016/j.cpr.2006.01.00

Publisher's Note Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.