Data supplement to Gariépy et al. Social support and protection from depression: systematic review of current findings in Western countries. Br J Psychiatry doi: 10.1192/bjp.bp.115.169094

Online Supplement DS1. Example of Pubmed database search strategy

("Social Support"[Mesh] OR "Social Isolation"[Mesh] OR family support[Title/Abstract] OR familial support[Title/Abstract] OR family structure[Title/Abstract] OR living alone[Title/Abstract] OR social environment[Title/Abstract] OR social context[Title/Abstract] OR social relationship[Title/Abstract] OR social relationships[Title/Abstract] OR social ties[Title/Abstract] OR social network[Title/Abstract] OR social networks[Title/Abstract] OR social engagement[Title/Abstract] OR social isolation[Title/Abstract] OR perceived isolation[Title/Abstract] OR social contacts[Title/Abstract] OR social contact[Title/Abstract] OR social integration[Title/Abstract] OR social resource[Title/Abstract] OR social resources[Title/Abstract] OR emotional support[Title/Abstract] OR tangible support[Title/Abstract] OR informational support[Title/Abstract] OR instrumental support[Title/Abstract] OR companionship support[Title/Abstract] OR perceived support[Title/Abstract] OR received support[Title/Abstract] OR friendship[Title/Abstract] OR friendships[Title/Abstract])
AND (depressive[Title/Abstract] OR depression[Title/Abstract] OR affective disorder[Title/Abstract] OR affective disorders[Title/Abstract])

Online Supplement DS2. Items of the quality assessment scale

We relied on a modified version of the Newcastle-Ottawa scale (1). We evaluated components of the checklist (criteria met; criteria not met; not reported) and appraised the overall quality of evidence of the study (poor; moderate; high). High-quality studies had satisfactory ratings on items related to measurement and confounder control and up to one unsatisfactory rating for other items. Medium quality studies had one unsatisfactory rating on items related to either measurement or confounder control and up to one unsatisfactory rating for other items, or up to two unsatisfactory items. Low quality studies had unsatisfactory rating on items related to measurement and confounder control, or up to three unsatisfactory items.

SELECTION

1. Were study participants representative of the study base?
2. Were people with different levels of social support drawn from the same population?
3. Was the overall participation rate > 60%?
4. Was lost to follow-up unlikely to introduce bias? (Cohort study)

MEASUREMENT

5. Was social support assessed from validated tool?
6. Were depressive symptoms assessed using validated scale or structured interview?
7. Were social support and depression assessed in the same way for entire study population?
8. Were adequate measures taken to determine that the cohort did not have depression at baseline? (Cohort study)

CONFOUNDING

9. Did the study control for at least 3 important confounders? (e.g., age, gender, marital status, income, education)

Online Table DS1. Overview of social support and depression measures in the literature

	Children and adolescents % (n/total n)	Adults and general population % (n/total n)	Older adults % (n/total n)	All % (n/total n)
Social support measure				
Most used instruments	No instrument used more than once	ISEL: 12% (3/36)	No instrument used more than once	ISEL: 4% (4/100)
Number of studies using validated measure social support	45% (14/31)	33% (12/36)	21% (7/33)	33% (33/100)
Depression measure				
Most used instruments or modified version of the instrument	CDI : 25% (8/31) BDI : 23% (7/31) CES-D: 16% (5/31)	CES-D: 36% (13/36) CIDI: 19% (7/36) BDI: 11% (4/36)	CES-D: 52% (17/33) GMS: 9% (3/33)	CES-D: 35% (35/100)
Number of studies using validated measure of depression	81% (25/31)	89% (32/36)	100% (33/33)	90% (90/100)
Number of studies measuring dichotomous depression outcome	26% (8/31)	36% (13/36)	39% (13/33)	34% (34/100)

CES-D: Center for Epidemiologic Studies; CIDI-SF MD: Composite Diagnostic Interview Schedule Short Form for major depression; DSM-IV: Diagnostic and Statistical Manual
BDI: Beck's Depression Inventory; CDI: Children's Depression Inventory; CES-D: Center for Epidemiology Studies Depression scale; CIDI: Composite International Diagnostic Instrument; GMS: Geriatric Mental State; ISEL: Interpersonal Support Evaluation List

Online Table DS2. Data extraction of selected studies in children

First author, year, country	Study design	Sample description	Depression measurement	Social support measurement	Method of analysis	Covariates included in analysis	Association
Feldman, 1988, USA (2)	Cross-sectional	N=103 6th graders	Children's Depression Inventory (CDI): Symptoms in past 2 weeks; 27 items; Continuous score ranging from 0-54.	Friendship Support Scale: 21 items adapted from pre-existing scales; 9 positive, 12 negative items; Score range 21-105. Family Adaptability and Cohesion Evaluation Scale (FACES III): 2 subscales for family cohesion and family adaptability; 10 items/subscale. Parent-Adolescent Communication Scale: 2 subscales for family openness in communication and extent of problems in communication; 10 items/subscale.	Linear regression	Sex, family structure, cohesion, adaptability, mother communication	Girls Cohesion: β -0.52, p<.001 Mother communication: β -0.05, NS Friendship support: β -0.40, p<.001 Boys Cohesion: β -0.52, p<.001 Mother communication: β -0.18, NS Friendship support: β -0.40, p<.001
Slavin, 1990, USA (3)	Cohort 8 months	N=333 Age range 14-18 Students from a predominantly white middle class high school	Children's Depression Inventory (CDI): Symptoms in past 2 weeks; 27 items; Continuous score ranging from 0-54.	Perceived Emotional/ Personal Support Scale (PEPSS): 3 subscales on family, nonfamily, friends support; 4 items/subscale; Score range 1-4/subscale.	Linear regression	Baseline depressive symptoms; Stratified by sex	Girls Family: β -0.06, p>0.05 Adult : β 0.15, p<0.01 Friend : β -0.11, p<0.05 Boys Family: β 0.03, p>0.05 Adult : β -0.1, p>0.05 Friend: β 0.1, p>0.05
Rubin, 1992, USA (4)	Cross-sectional	N=300 Age range 13-19 Students	Beck Depression Inventory (BDI): Symptoms past 2 weeks; 21 items; Continuous score ranging from 0-63	Adolescent Friendship Inventory (AFI): 6 dimensions of adolescent peer relationships: social comfort, amount of time with friends, emotional support and intimacy, family support for peer relationship, loyalty-trust, and ambivalence-conflict;	Linear regression	Total stress, school performance, acting out, family cohesion and positive friendship	Boys Family cohesion: β -0.123, p>0.05 Positive friendship: β -0.169, p<0.05 Girls Family cohesion: β -0.296, p<0.001

				16 items; Continuous score. FACES II – Family Cohesion subscale: 16 items on perception of positive emotional involvement of family, time together, consultative decision making, common interests/ activities; Continuous score.			Positive friendship: β -0.296, p<0.001
Oldenburg, 1997, USA (5)	Cross-sectional	N=322 From 5th and 8th grades	Children's Depression Inventory (CDI): Symptoms in past 2 weeks; 27 items; Continuous score ranging from 0-54 Depression Self-Rating Scale for Children (DSRS): Symptoms in past week; 18 items; Continuous score ranging from 18-54 Two scales summed to create index of depressive symptoms	Friendship Quality Questionnaire (FQQ): Quality of friendship with best friend; 5 subscales on validation and caring, conflict resolution, intimate exchange, companionship, conflict and betrayal; Total summed score.	Linear regression	Grade, gender, popularity	Friend quality: β -0.38, p<0.001
Patten, 1997, USA (6)	Cross-sectional	N=5,531 Age range 12-17 California Youth Tobacco Survey	Kandel and Davies scale; Symptoms in past 12 months; 6 items; Continuous score ranging from 0-18; Depression using cut-off score >13	Perceived Parental Support: Adolescent naming parents as someone they could talk to about problems; Categorized in 4 categories: both parents supportive; mother only supportive; father only supportive; neither parent supportive.	Logistic regression	Family structure, age, race; Stratified by sex	Reference group: both parents supportive in two-parent household Boys Two-parent household Father not supportive: OR 1.96 (1.00-3.87) Mother not supportive: OR 1.81 (0.62-5.26) Neither supportive: OR 2.72 (1.65-4.50)

							Single-mother household Mother supportive: OR 1.77 (1.76-4.16) Mother not supportive: OR 2.63 (1.23-5.61) Single-father household Father supportive: OR 1.77 (0.71-4.39) Father not supportive: OR 3.11 (1.06-9.12) Neither parent in household OR 1.29 (0.54-3.09) Girls Two-parent household Father not supportive: OR 2.32 (1.53-3.53) Mother not supportive: OR 3.58 (0.53-24.05) Neither supportive: OR 2.84 (1.86-4.33) Single-mother household Mother supportive: OR 1.62 (1.05-2.50) Mother not supportive: OR 3.55 (2.00-6.33) Single-father household Father supportive: OR 0.62 (0.27-1.44) Father not supportive: OR 5.55 (1.95-15.76) Neither parent in household OR 1.96 (0.96-4.03)
Sheeber, 1997, USA (7)	Cohort 1 year	N=420 (adolescent and mother pairs) Age range 14-20 Oregon Adolescent Depression Project	Adolescent depression construct using confirmatory analysis which combines BDI score, CES-D score, suicidal ideation score Continuous score	Family support construct using confirmatory analysis from the following scales: <u>Family Environment Scale (Cohesion subscale)</u>: 5 items, administered to both adolescent and mother Parent Attitude Research Instrument (PARI) & Conflict Behavior Questionnaire (CBQ) derived 6-item scale on maternal support completed by adolescent.	Structural equation modeling	Depression score at baseline	Familial support: β -0.145, $p<0.05$

				Family conflict construct: 5-item maternal conflict scale derived from CBQ and PARI + mother and adolescent reports of areas of disagreement.			
Donnelly, 1999, Ireland (8)	Cross-sectional	N=887 Age range 11-15 Students	Children's Depression Inventory (CDI): Symptoms in past 2 weeks; 27 items; Continuous score ranging from 0-54	Family Relationships Index (FRI): 2 subscales on family cohesion and family conflict; 9 items/subscale; Continuous score.	Linear regression	Family cohesiveness, unknown control for success, negative impact, family conflict, internality for failure (cognitive domain), powerful others for failure, internality for success, unknown control for failure	Family cohesiveness: β -1.67, p<0.05 Family conflict: β 0.71, p<0.05
Hussong, 2000, USA (9)	Cross-sectional	N=456 Age range 16-19 Students attending 2 schools from white farming or working class families	Beck Depression Inventory (BDI): Symptoms in past 6 months; 20 items; Continuous score ranging from 0-60	Number of close friends Positive friendship quality: using 12-item subscale of Network of Relationships Inventory (measures self-disclosure/ intimacy, companionship, loyalty/reliable alliance, affection) Negative friendship quality: using mean of 12-item Conflict scale (measures frequency, duration, intensity and diversity of conflict topics) and 17-item Peer Control scale (measures overt behavioral/verbal control, covert behavioral/verbal control)	Linear regression	Social desirability, gender	Number of close friends: β -0.05, p>0.05 Positive friendship: β -0.01, p>0.05 Negative friendship: β 0.06, p>0.05
Kaltiala-Heino, 2001, Finland (10)	Cross-sectional	N=16,464 Age range 14-16 Students	Beck Depression Inventory – Short Form (BDI-SF): Symptoms in past 2 weeks; 13 items; Continuous score ranging from 0-39; Depression using cut-off score >8	Perceived support from parents: 1 item per parent; Dichotomized as no support vs. some support	Logistic regression	Age, sex, grade at school, region, degree of urbanisation of living area, education of parents, years since moving to current residential area, unemployment of parent(s) and family structure	Girls Lack of support from parents: OR 3.7 (3.1–4.4) From teachers: OR 2.1 (1.7–2.5) From peers: OR 3.1 (2.4–3.9) Boys Lack of support from parents: OR 2.6 (2.1–3.3) From teachers: OR 2.5 (2.0–3.1) From peers:

							OR 1.9 (1.5–2.4)
Marcotte, 2002, Canada (11)	Cross-sectional	N=550 Mean age 15 Students from 2 public schools in communities with high unemployment	Beck Depression Inventory (BDI) – French version: Symptoms in past 2 weeks; 21 items; Continuous score ranging from 0-63	Perceived Social Support – Family: Level of satisfaction regarding support, information and feedback needs that are met by the family; 20 items; Continuous score ranging from 20-120.	Linear regression	Gender, age, dysfunctional attitudes related to success, dependency and self-control	Family support: β -0.32, p<0.001
Colarossi, 2003, USA (12)	Cohort 1 year	N=217 Age range 15-18 Students from suburban Midwestern communities	Symptoms Checklist-Revised: Symptoms in past-month; 9 items; Continuous score ranging from 1-7	Derived from Iowa Youth and Family Inventory: Perceived frequency of functional social support from mother, father, friend 6 items Score range 6-30 Perceived teacher support 6 items Score range 0-42	Structural equation modeling	Depression and self-esteem score at baseline; Stratified by sex	All Mother support: β -0.14, p<0.05 Father support: β 0.11, NS Teacher support: β -0.13, p<0.05 Peer support: β -0.13, p<0.05 Girls Mother support: β -0.17, p<0.05 Father support: β 0.06, NS Teacher support: β -0.18, p<0.05 Peer support: β -0.14, NS Boys Mother support: β -0.08, NS Father support: β 0.18, NS Teacher support: β -0.03, p<0.05 Peer support: β -0.13, NS
Cornwell, 2003, USA (13)	Cohort 1-2 years	N=11,835 Mean age 16 National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health	Index of questions from CES-D: Symptoms in past week; 19 items; Sum score divided by number of items (logged)	Parent support: 8 items selected from the in-home interview that capture "closeness with parents" Score range 1-5 Logged score Friend support:	Linear regression	Baseline depression score, parental support change, sex, age, race/ethnicity; Used study weights to account for complex study design	Parent support (logged score): β -0.116, p<0.001 Friend support (logged score): β -0.072, p<0.001

				1 item asking "How much do you think your friends care about you?" Score range 1-5 Logged score			
Galambos, 2004, Canada (14)	Cohort 4 years	N=1,322 Age range 12-19 National Population Health Survey (NPHS)	Composite International Diagnostic Interview (CIDI): Symptoms in past year; 9 items; Major depressive episode (yes/no) determined from DSM-IV criteria	Perceived social support: 4 items asking if person has someone to confide in, to count on for help, to count on for advice, who makes them feel loved Score range 0-4	Logistic regression	Sex, BMI, physical activity level, smoking	Perceived social support: OR 0.90, NS
Stice, 2004, USA (15)	Cohort 2 years	N=492 Age range 11-15 Female students	Affective Disorders and Schizophrenia for School-Age Children: Current disorders; Semi-structured interview; Cases defined as having sub-threshold or threshold diagnostic criteria for major depression	Network of Relationships Inventory: Measures companionship, intimacy, affection, admiration and reliable alliance from parents and peers 12 items	Latent growth curve and logistic regression	Depression symptoms at baseline	Results from LGC Parental support : β -0.03 (-0.053, -0.07) Peer support: β -0.009 (-0.033, 0.015) Results from logistic regression among non-depressed girls at baseline Parental support: OR 0.46, p=0.001 Peer support: OR 0.65, p=0.11
La Greca, 2005, USA (16)	Cross-sectional	N=421 Age range 14-19 Students	Beck Depression Inventory (BDI) – Revised: Symptoms in past 2 weeks; 21 items; Continuous score ranging from 0-63	Network of Relationship Inventory – Revised: Measures 9 positive qualities in relationships (companionship, affection, disclosure, nurturance, instrumental aid, approval, support, reliable alliance, and satisfaction) and 5 negative qualities (conflict, criticism, exclusion, dominance, pressure) Each quality is measured with 3 items Total 42 items Summed score for positive and negative qualities	Linear regression	Sex, general peer relations, school social status (average, popular/jock, burnout/alternative) relational victimization, overt victimization, dating	Best friend Positive quality score: β -0.04, p>0.05 Negative quality score: β 2.14, p<0.05 Romantic relationship Positive quality score: β -0.69, p>0.05 Negative quality score: β 3.52, p<0.05
Bosacki, 2007,	Cross-	N=7,290	Center for	Inventory of Parent and Peer	Linear	Gender, direct and	Friendship support:

Canada (17)	sectional	Age range 13-18 Students	Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale (CES-D): Symptoms in past week; 20 items; Continuous score Range 0-60	Attachment: Assesses trust, communication and alienation in friendships 18 items Summed score	regression	indirect victimization, social isolation, friendship trust, friendship alienation, friendship conflict	β 0.00, p>0.05
Hall-Lande, 2007, USA (18)	Cross-sectional	N=4,746 Age range 11-18 Students from 31 schools in a large metropolitan area Eating Among Teens (EAT) Project	Depression scale: Symptoms in past year; 6 items; Continuous score ranging from 6-18	Single survey item, "Do you have one or more close friends you can talk to about your problems?" A “no” response categorized as socially isolated	Linear regression	Social isolation, race, school level, socioeconomic status, BMI, family connectedness, GPA, school connectedness	No close friends (vs one or more close friends): Boys β 0.81, p<0.001 Girls β 0.66, p=0.01
Klima, 2008, USA (19)	Cohort 2 years	N=247 From 4th grade followed until 6th grade UCLA Family Development Study	Children’s Depression Inventory (CDI): Symptoms in past 2 weeks; 27 items; Continuous score ranging from 0-54	Social Support Scale for Children – Close Friend Support subscale: Assesses whether children perceive that they have a caring, understanding friend to whom they can disclose problems and feelings; 6 items; Averaged score on each item; Range 1-4	Linear regression	Baseline depression score	Close friend support: β -0.03, p>0.05
Ellonen, 2008, Finland (20)	Cross-sectional	N=95,103 Age range 14-16	Beck Depression Inventory (BDI) – Finnish version: Symptoms in past 2 weeks; 13 items; No or mild depression, (scores 0-7) vs. moderate or severe depression (scores 8-36)	Perceived classmate support: 2 items Perceived teacher support: 5 items Derived from factor analysis of 7 statements (e.g., ”Teachers encourage me to express my own opinion in class”) Scores recoded as never, sometimes, often/always	Multilevel logistic regression	Sex, age, family structure, parental education, parental unemployment	Perceived teacher social support (ref: often/always) Sometimes: OR 2.5 (2.1–2.9) Never: OR 8.1 (7.7–8.5) Perceived classmate support (ref: often/always) Sometimes: OR 1.7 (1.4–2.0) Never: OR 3.4 (3.0–3.8)
Ge, 2009, USA (21)	Cohort 3 years	N=756 (378 pairs of siblings) Age range 9-18 Nonshared Environment in Adolescent	Children’s Depression Inventory (CDI): Symptoms in past 2 weeks; 27 items; Continuous score	Parent-Child Relationship Scale: For each child, mothers and fathers independently 4 items include “how close are you to your child?”, “how loving are you to your child?”, “how much does your child understand	Multilevel linear regression	Sex, age, depressive symptoms at baseline, family events	Closeness to mother: β -0.32, p<0.001 Closeness to father: β -0.24, p<0.001

		Development (NEAD) Project	ranging from 0-54	you?", and "how much do your child enjoy spending time alone with you?" Continuous score Score range 4-20 per parent			
Murberg, 2009, Norway (22)	Cohort 1 year	N=198 Age range 16-18 Students from one high school	7 depression-related items selected from the 25-item version of the Hopkins Symptoms Checklist; Past week symptoms; Continuous score ranging from 7-28	Teacher support: 8 items Continuous score Classmate support: 4 items Continuous score	Linear regression	Depressive score at baseline, stressful life events, classmate and teacher support	Teacher support: Standardized β -0.147, p=0.017 Classmate support: Standardized β -0.031, p>0.05
Piko, 2009, Hungary (23)	Cross-sectional	N=881 Age range 14-20	Children's Depression Inventory (CDI) – Short version: Symptoms in past 2 weeks; 8 items; Continuous score; Weighted by a factor of 3.375 for comparison with original CDI score ranging from 0-54	Perceived Social Support Scale: Subscale for mother and father 6 items/subscale Continuous score Range from 6-24 per subscale Single item measuring how often adolescent talked to parent about personal problems, score 1 (never) to 5 (always) Single item measuring how often adolescent talked to teacher about personal problems, score 1 (never) to 5 (always)	Linear regression	Social support from father, social support from mother, dinner with family, talking about problems with parents, high academic achievement, talking about problems with teacher, happy with school; Stratified by sex	Boys: Social support from father: β -0.23, p<0.001 Social support from mother: β -0.04, p>0.05 Talking about problems with parents: β -0.01, p>0.05 Talking about problems with teachers: β -0.08, p>0.05 Girls: Social support from father: β -0.15, p<0.001 Social support from mother: β -0.26, p<0.01 Talking about problems with parents: β -0.22, p<0.001 Talking about problems with teachers: β 0.13, p<0.05 (Standardized coefficient)
Rueger, 2010, USA (24)	Cohort About 8 months	N=636 Students from 7th and 8th grades in a large suburban school	Behavioral Assessment System for Children, Version 2, Adolescent Version:	Child and Adolescent Social Support Scale (CASSS): Rates frequency with which students perceive supportive behaviors from parents, teachers, classmates, close	Linear regression	All 5 forms of social support were entered simultaneously in model; Stratified by gender	Girls Parent support: β -0.22, p<0.01 Teacher support: β -0.04, NS Classmate support:

			Depression subscale; Depressive symptoms in the past several months; Measures depressed feelings, negative affect, sadness and loneliness	friends and the school; 60 items; Score range 12-72			β -0.10, NS Friend support: β -0.03, NS School support: β 0.04, NS Boys Parent support: β -0.16, p<0.01 Teacher support: β 0.12, p<0.05 Classmate support: β -0.14, p<0.05 Friend support: β 0.01, NS School support: β 0.02, NS
Samm, 2010, Estonia (25)	Cross-sectional	N=4,389 Ages 11, 13 and 15 Health Behavior in School-Aged Children (HBSC) study	Single item (yes/no): "Over the past 12 months, have you sometimes, daily for 2 weeks or more at a time, felt so sad that you have given up your usual activities?"; Past year measure	Single item (easy/difficult): "How easy is it for you to talk about your worries to the following people" List of people included mother and father	Logistic regression	Gender, family economic deprivation, family communication and family structure; Stratified by age	Reference: difficult communication with parent Age 11 years Mother communication: Easy: OR 0.5 (0.29-0.89) No mother: OR 0.3 (0.08-1.16) Father communication: Easy: OR 0.6 (0.41-0.87) No father: OR 0.7 (0.40-1.37) Age 13 years Mother communication: Easy: OR 0.6 (0.38-0.84) No mother: OR 0.4 (0.10-1.37) Father communication: Easy: OR 0.6 (0.46-0.85) No father: OR 0.7 (0.41-1.09) Age 15 years Mother communication: Easy: OR 0.8 (0.56-1.11) No mother: OR 0.6 (0.23-1.54) Father communication: Easy: OR 0.6 (0.43-0.73) No father: OR 0.7 (0.48-1.10)
Auerbach, 2011, Canada (26)	Cohort 6 months	N=258 Age range 12-18 Students from one high school	Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale	Social Support Scale for Children and Adolescents (SSSCA): Assesses support in the domains of peer, parent, and classmate	Multilevel linear regression	Age, gender, initial depressive symptoms; total, peer, classmate, and parent social	Total social support : β -1.58, p<0.01 Peer social support :

			(CES-D): Symptoms in past week; 20 items; Continuous score ranging from 0-60	relationships 6 items/subscale Range score from 0-18/ subscale Range score 0-54 for total social support		support	β -0.28, p>0.05 Classmate social support β -1.73, p<0.001 Parent social support β -1.34, p<0.01
Smojver-Azic, 2011, Croatia (27)	Cross-sectional	N=1,191 Age range 14-19 Students who live with both parents	Depressive Symptoms Scale (DSS): Developed by authors; Current symptoms; 11 items; Continuous score ranging from 0-44	Parental Acceptance-Rejection Scale (PARS): Parental warmth and affection; 6 items; Score range 0-18 Parental aggression and hostility; 5 items; Score range 0-15	Linear regression	Family activities, parental conflict strategies, warmth/affection – mother/father, aggression/hostility – mother/father; stratified by sex	Boys Warmth/affection – mother: β -0.04, p=0.402 Warmth/affection – father: β 0.08, p=0.103 Aggression/hostility – mother: β 0.22, p<0.001 Aggression/hostility – father: β 0.03, p=0.535 Girls Warmth/affection – mother: β 0.08, p=0.112 Warmth/affection – father: β -0.16, p=0.002 Aggression/hostility – mother: β 0.20, p<0.001 Aggression/hostility – father: β 0.05, p=0.313
Khatib, 2013, UK (28)	Cohort 2 years	N=821 Age range 11-14 Research with East London Adolescents Community Health Survey (RELACHS)	Short Moods and Feelings Questionnaire: Symptoms in past 2 weeks; 13 items; Score range 0-36; Depression using cut-off score >8	Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support: Assessed support from family, friends and special person 12 items Score range 0-84 Split into tertiles	Logistic regression	Age, gender, interaction between age and gender, eligibility for free school meals, parental employment status, parental ownership of vehicle, Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire score at baseline, country of birth, length of time in the UK, ethnicity	Reference: high support Low family social support: OR 2.25 (1.43, 3.54) Low levels of support from friends: OR 1.22 (0.80, 1.85) Low levels of support from special person: OR 1.32 (0.85, 2.03) Low levels of total support: OR 1.51 (0.97, 2.33)
Tummala-Narra, 2013, USA (29)	Cross-sectional	N=707 Age range 12-18 Students from an urban area	Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale (CES-D): Symptoms in past week;	2 item from the Polling Justice Survey: Perceived support from adults at home: 1 item; response on 4 point Likert-type scale	Linear regression	Stratified by sex and SES	Stratified by sex Perceived support from adults at home Boys: β -0.75, p>0.05 Girls:

			20 items; Continuous score ranging from 0-60	Perceived support from adults at school: 1 item; response on 4 point Likert-type scale			β -3.02, p<0.01 Perceived support from adults at school Boys: β -0.53, p>0.05 Girls: β -0.06, p>0.05 Stratified by SES Perceived support from adults at home Higher SES: β -2.01, p<0.05 Low SES: β -2.08, p<0.01 Perceived support from adults at school Higher SES: β -1,50, p>0.05 Low SES: β 0.49, p>0.05
Galand, 2013, Belgium (30)	Cross-sectional	N=400 Age range 11-16	Depressive symptoms: 10 items; Current; 5-point Likert scale (0 = never to 4 = very often); Score 0-20	Teacher support: 8 items; 5-point Likert scale (0 = totally false to 4 = totally true) Peer support: 8 items; Assess peer acceptance/ support; 5-point Likert scale (as above) Parental support: 8 items; Parental availability/family climate; 5-point Likert scale (as above)	Linear regression	Gender, grade retention, peer victimization, parental support, teacher support, peer support	Parental support β -0.19, p<0.001 Teacher support β -0.25, p<.0001 Peer support β -0.01, p>0.05
Colman, 2014, Canada (31)	Cohort, 14 years, 6 waves	N = 1,137 Age range 16-17	Composite International Diagnostic Interview – Short Form (CIDI-SF): 9 items; Past-year; Major depressive	<u>Social support</u>: 4 items; Scale 0-4, dichotomized into high (4) and low (0-3);	Logistic regression	Gender, severity of depressive symptoms at baseline, childhood traumatic events, SES (high/middle vs. low family income)	Social support on depression: OR 0.76 (0.43-1.34)

			episode using DSM-IV criteria				
Minkkinen, 2014, Finland (32)	Cross-sectional	N = 502 Age range 9-13	Children's Depression Inventory – Short Form (CDI-SF): 10 items; symptoms past two weeks; 3-point Likert scale (0-2); Score 0-20	Teacher social support: 3 items; 3-point scale; Peer social support: 1 item, "If you are happy or sad with whom are you able to talk?"; no friends = poor support Family protective factors: Having parents to talk to (1 item), parental presence (1 item), parent-child activities (1 item)	Linear regression	Gender, class size, immigrant family, money at home, country, family protective factors	<u>Finland</u> Family protective factors: Parents to talk to β -0.00, ns Parental presence β -0.06, ns Parent-child activities β -0.07, ns School variables: Teacher social support (sq. root) β **-0.12**, p<.05 Peer social support β -0.01, ns <u>Norway</u> Family protective factors: Parents to talk to β -0.04, ns Parental presence β -0.05, ns Parent-child activities β -0.09, ns School variables: Teacher social support (sq. root) β **-0.17**, p<.01 Peer social support β -0.11, ns

Online Table DS3. Quality assessment of selected studies in children

First author, year, country	Study participants represent study base	People with different social support drawn from the same population	Overall participation rate > 60%	Social support assessed from validated tool	Depressive symptoms assessed from validated tool	Social support and depressive symptoms assessed in same way for entire sample	Adjustment for baseline depression / depressive score*	Bias due to lost to follow-up*	Controlled for at least three important confounders	Most important design flaw(s)	Overall quality
Feldman, 1988, USA (2)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	Yes		High
Slavin, 1990, USA (3)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Possible. 50% attrition.	No	Confounder control, potential selection bias, short follow-up period (8 months)	Low
Rubin, 1992, USA (4)	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	Yes	Low participation rate (27%)	High
Oldenburg, 1997, USA (5)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	Yes		High
Patten, 1997, USA (6)	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	Yes	Validity of social support scale	Moderate
Sheeber, 1997, USA (7)	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Unlikely	No	Validity of social support and depression scales, confounder control	Low
Donnelly, 1999, Ireland (8)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	No	Confounder control	Moderate
Hussong, 2000, USA (9)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	No	Confounder control	Moderate
Kaltiala-Heino, 2001, Finland (10)	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	Yes	Validity of social support scale	Moderate
Marcotte, 2002, Canada (11)	Somewhat	Yes	Unable to tell	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	Yes	Generalizability (sample from high unemployment rate area)	Moderate

Colarossi, 2003, USA (12)	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unlikely	No	Confounder control	Moderate
Cornwell, 2003, USA (13)	Yes	Yes	Unable to tell	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unable to tell	Yes	Validity of social support scale, missing information on cohort selection and follow-up rate	Moderate
Galambos, 2004, Canada (14)	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unlikely	Yes	Validity of social support scale	Moderate
Stice, 2004, USA (15)	Somewhat	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unlikely	No	Confounder control, low participation rate (56%)	Moderate
La Greca, 2005, USA (16)	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	Yes	Low participation rate (50%)	High
Bosacki, 2007, Canada (17)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	Yes		High
Hall-Lande, 2007, USA (18)	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	N/A	N/A	Yes	Validity of social support and depression scale	Moderate
Klima, 2008, USA (19)	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unlikely	No	Confounder control, low participation rate	Moderate
Ellonen, 2008, Finland (20)	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	Yes	Validity of social support scale	Moderate
Ge, 2009, USA (21)	Somewhat	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Likely	Yes	Potential for selection bias, generalizability	Moderate
Murberg, 2009, Norway (22)	Somewhat	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Unlikely	Yes	Validity of social support and depression scales	Moderate
Piko, 2009, Hungary (23)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	Yes	Validity of social support scale	High
Rueger, 2010, USA (24)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unable to tell	Yes	No	Unable to tell	No	Confounder control, missing information	Low

										follow-up rates, no control for baseline depression	
Samm, 2010, Estonia (25)	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	N/A	N/A	Yes	Validity of social support and depression scales	Moderate
Auerbach, 2011, Canada (26)	Yes	Yes	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Likely	Yes	Potential selection bias	High
Smojver-Azic, 2011, Croatia (27)	Yes	Yes	Unable to tell	No	No	Yes	N/A	N/A	No	Validity of social support and depression scales, confounder control	Low
Khatib, 2013, UK (28)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Likely	Yes	Potential selection bias	High
Tummala-Narra, 2013, USA (29)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	N/A	N/A	No	Validity of social support scale, confounder control	Low
Galand, 2013, Belgium (30)	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Validity of depression and social support scales	Moderate
Colman, 2014, Canada (31)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		High
Minkkinen, 2014, Finland (32)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Validity of social support scale	Moderate

* Assessed in cohort studies only
N/A: Not applicable

Online Table DS4. Data extraction of selected studies in adults

First author, year, country	Study design	Sample description	Depression measurement	Social support measurement	Method of analysis	Covariates included in analysis	Association
Golding, 1989, USA (33)	Cross-sectional	N=1,294 Non-Hispanic white participants Age range 18 + Los Angeles Epidemiologic Catchment Area (LA-ECA) project	Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale (CES-D): Past week symptoms; 20 items; Continuous score ranging from 0-60	Social Support Scale (Schafer, 1981): Support from spouse, work supervisor and co-workers; Asks whether person is reliable, shows caring, can be confided in; Score 0-4/item; Score range 0-12/type of support	Stepwise linear regression	Marital events, employment events, employment strain, marital support, supervisor support, coworker support, gender, age, job status, missing data variable; Stratified by employment status and marital status	Marital support (x 10^3): Married employed: β -0.22, p<0.01 Married unemployed: β -0.22, p<0.001 Work supervisor support: Married employed: β -0.02, p<0.01 Unmarried employed: β -0.02, NS Coworker support: Married employed: β -0.01, NS Unmarried employed: β -0.01, NS
Ross, 1989, USA (34)	Cross-sectional	N=809 Age range 18-85	Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale (CES-D) – Modified: Past week symptoms; Continuous score ranging from 0-42	Perceived support: Sense of having a supportive person to talk and turn to in times of trouble; 2 items; Score range 2-10	Linear regression	Age, education, family income, married, white, religion, perceived control, problem solving, talking to others	Perceived support: β -1.184, p<0.001
Franks, 1992, USA (35)	Cross-sectional	N=83 Age range 40+ Family practice patients	SCL-90 – Depression Subscale: Past week symptoms; 13 items; Continuous score ranging from 0-52	Interpersonal Support Evaluation List (ISEL): 3 social support functions: belonging, appraisal, tangible support (self-esteem excluded); 10 items/scale; Range 10-30/scale with higher score representing lower support	Linear regression	Life events, emotional involvement, perceived criticism	Appraisal social support: β 2.60, NS Other types of support: NS
Okun, 1998, USA (36)	Cross-sectional	N=1,301 Young adults Age range 28-59 N=452 Older adults	Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale (CES-D) – Modified: Past week	Positive social exchanges: 2 items; Indicate how much each of 3 sources: 1) make them feel loved; 2) is willing to listen to talk about problems; Range 2-10	Linear regression	Age, gender, black, education, number of contacts with friends or family members, number of contacts with child, functional health status; positive	Older adults: *Positive social exchange with*: Spouse: β -0.17, p<0.01 Children: β -0.25, p<0.001 Friend/relative:

		Age range 60-92 N=849 Have spouse, at least one child 17+ years old living outside home Americans Changing Lives (ACL) Survey	symptoms; 11 items; Continuous score ranging from 11-33	<u>Negative social exchanges</u>: 2 items; Indicate how much each of 3 sources: 1) makes too many demands; 2) is critical of them or what they do; Sources were spouse, children, relative/friend; Range 2-10		social exchange with spouse, children and other friend/relative; negative social exchange with spouse, children other friend/relative; Stratified by age group	β -0.21, p<0.001 *Negative social exchange with*: Spouse: β 0.23, p<0.001 Children: β 0.02, NS Friend/relative: β 0.21, p<0.05 <u>Younger adults</u>: *Positive social exchange with*: Spouse: β -0.54, p<0.001 Children: β -0.01, NS Friend/relative: β -0.12, NS *Negative social exchange with*: Spouse: β 0.26, p<0.05 Children: β 0.04, NS Friend/relative: β 0.23, NS
Lin, 1999, USA (37)	Cross-sectional	N=1,261 Mean age 47 Adults from Albany Survey	Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale (CES-D): Past week symptoms; 20 items; Continuous score ranging from 0-60	<u>Perceived/actual instrumental and expressive support</u>: Derived from factor analysis and 4 scales measuring: Perceived crisis support, 10 items; Actual crisis support, 10 items; Perceived routine support, 10 items; Actual routine support, 10 items	Linear regression	Gender, age, income, undesirable life events, participation in community organizations, number of weekly contacts, intimate relationships	Perceived instrumental support: β 0.03, NS Actual instrumental support: β -0.35, NS Perceived expressive support: β -0.63, p<0.01 Actual expressive support: β -0.10, NS
Bullers, 2000, USA (38)	Cross-sectional	N=488 Age range 19-89 Randomly selected residents of North Carolina	Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale (CES-D) – Modified: Past month symptoms; 7 items; Mean Continuous score ranging from 1-4	<u>Measure of 4 social ties</u>: Emotional support (2 items), instrumental support (2 items), number of close ties (max. 35), and demanding social ties (2 items)	Linear regression	Age, education, sex	<u>All</u> Emotional support: β -0.207, p<0.01 Instrumental support: β -0.058, NS Demanding social ties: β 0.355, p<0.01 Number of close ties: β -0.090, p<0.05 <u>Women</u> Emotional SS:

							β -.221, p<.01 Instrumental SS: β -.025, NS Demanding ST: β .404, p<.01 Number of close ties: β -.073, NS <u>Men</u> Emotional SS: β -.210, p<.01 Instrumental SS: B -.135, p<.05 Demanding ST: β .245, p<.01 Number of close ties: β -.114, NS
Peirce, 2000, USA (39)	Cohort 7 years	N=1,192 Age range 18+ (baseline)	Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale (CES-D) – Modified: Past month symptoms; 20 items; Continuous score ranging from 20-80	<u>Interpersonal Support Evaluation List (ISEL)</u>: 20 items from the original 40; 4 social support functions: belonging, appraisal, tangible, and self-esteem support; Range 1-4 per item	Structural equation modeling	Age, race, sex, education, family income	Social support at time 1 on depression at time 2: Standardized β -0.13, p<0.001 Social support at time 2 on depression at time 3: Standardized β -0.09, p<0.01
Wade, 2000, USA (40)	Cohort About 5 years	N=1,033 (Wave 1) N=854 (Wave 2) Age range 17-54 Caucasian female twin pairs without chronic depression at baseline	Structural Clinical Interview (SCID): Current; Diagnosis of MD was made by computer algorithm using questions from the Structured Clinical Interview for DSM-III-R	<u>Institute for Social Research Social Interaction Scale</u>: 24 items; 8 dimensions including spouse problems, spousal support, relative problems, relative support, friend problems, friend support, confidants, and social integration; Spouse items on 5-poin-scale"; All other items on 4-point scale.	Generalized Estimating Equation (GEE) Modeling and Structural equation modeling (SEM)	None	<u>GEE estimates for depression at times 1 and 2</u> Spousal support: OR 0.71, p<0.001 Lack of spouse problems: OR 0.66, p<0.001 Relative support: OR 0.81, p<0.001 Lack of relative problems: OR 0.65, p<0.001 Friend support: OR 0.96, NS Lack of friend problems: OR 0.80, p<0.001 Confidants: OR 0.98, NS Social integration: OR 1.07, NS

							<u>SEM estimates for social support at time 1 and depression at time 2</u> Lack of spouse problems: Standardized β -0.10, p<0.05 Social integration: Standardized β -0.04, p<0.05 All other subscales: NS
Wade, 2000, Canada (41)	Cross-sectional	N=16,291 Age range 18+ National Population Health Survey (NPHS)	Composite International Diagnostic Interview (CIDI) – Short Form for Depression: Past year; 9 items; Depression identified if answered "yes" to 4+ symptoms in addition to primary stem items	<u>Four dimensions of perceived social support</u>: Respondents were prompted to answer yes or no to 4 questions asking whether they had someone: who they could confide in, count on, who could give them advice, and who makes them feel loved	Logistic regression	Age, sex, marital status, income adequacy, education, province, immigrant status, work status, work classification, social stressors, health status, self-esteem, mastery	Social support: β -0.109, NS
Aro, 2001, Finland (42)	Cross-sectional	N=1,851 Age range 48-50 Women	Beck Depression Inventory (BDI): Symptoms past 2 weeks; 21 items; Continuous score ranging from 0-63	<u>Social support</u>: 6 items; Number of friends, frequency of meeting friends, satisfaction with received support, and quality with intimate relationships, frequency of support given, and having someone close to discuss problems with	Linear regression	Marital status, number of household members, education, urbanization, socioeconomic status, income, work status, self-rated health, number of doctors' appointments, number of sick days, diagnosed disease during past 12 months; Sample restricted sex (female only) and age (48-50 years old)	Number of friends: β -0.03, NS Frequency of meeting friends: β 0.06, p<0.05 Satisfaction with received support: β 0.21, p<0.001 Quality with intimate relationships: β 0.16, p<0.001 Frequency of support given: β -0.05, p<0.01 Having someone close to discuss problems: β 0.06, p<0.05
Elliot, 2001, USA (43)	Cross-sectional	N=395 Age range 45-74 Urban adults	Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale (CES-D) – Short Form:	<u>Subjective social support</u>: Measured by asking respondents if they agree that "you have someone you can turn to for support and understanding when things get rough," and "you have	Linear regression	Female, socioeconomic status, age, married, employed, kids in home, financial strain, marital conflict, neighborhood	Subjective social support: β 2.047, NS Social integration: β 2.059, NS

			Past month symptoms; 10 items; Continuous score	someone you really like to talk to" (yes/no) <u>Social integration</u>: Measured by frequency of talking on the phone, going out with or visiting friends in each other's homes, and attendance at religious or non-religious meetings		dangerous, life events, fatalism, mastery	
Patten, 2001, Canada (44)	Cross-sectional	N=2,542 Age range 18+ Calgary household residents	Composite International Diagnostic Interview for Depression – Short Form (CIDI-SF): Past year; 9 items; Depression identified if answered "yes" to 4+ symptoms in addition to primary stem items	4 items; Anyone to confide in, to count on in a crisis situation, to count on for advice in making important decisions, to make them feel loved and cared for; 4-point scale	Logistic regression	None	No one to confide in about private feelings or concerns: PR 2.22 (1.68, 2.93) No one to count on in a crisis situation: PR 2.57 (1.93, 3.43) No one to count on for advice in making important decisions: PR 2.48 (1.95, 3.16) No one in their life to make them feel loved and cared for: PR 2.96 (2.26, 3.86)
Segrin, 2003, USA (45)	Cross-sectional	N=325 Age range 19-85	Beck Depression Inventory – Short Form (BDI-SF): Symptoms past 2 weeks; 13 items; Continuous score	<u>Social Support-Friend Scale (PSS-FR)</u> and the <u>Perceived Social Support-Family Scale (PSS-FA)</u> (Procidano & Heller, 1983): 20 items per index, included family and spouse Spousal support measured using <u>House and Kahn's (1985) Positive Support Index</u>: 2 items Contact with family and friends: Asks how much time they spend with friends or relatives; 5-point Likert scale	Linear regression	Age	Social support from family: β -0.30, p<0.01 Social support from friends: β -0.33, p<0.001 Social support from spouse: β -0.40, p<0.001 Contact with family member: β -0.15, p<0.01 Contact with friends: β -0.32, p<0.001
Shaw, 2004, USA (46)	Cross-sectional	N=2,783 Age range 25-74 National Survey of Midlife	Depressive symptoms; Past 30 days; 6 items; 5-point Likert	<u>Early parental support</u>: 2 subscales: 1) availability of support from mother and 2) from father; 6 items/subscale;	Linear regression	Gender, education, race, age, childhood physical health, childhood mental health	Early parental support: β -0.207, p<0.001 Family emotional support: β -0.042, p<.05

		Development in the United States	scale; Continuous score ranging from 5-30	Sum score Range 6-24 <u>Current emotional support</u>: Regarding family and friends (4 items each); Scored on 4-point Likert scale; Separate scores for family and friend support <u>Negative interaction</u>: Regarding family and friends (4 items each); Scored on 5-point Likert scale (1 – never to 4 – often); Separate scores for family and friends			Friend emotional support : β 0.031, NS Family negative interaction: β 0.075, p<.001 Friend negative interaction : β 0.026, NS
Kendler, 2005, USA (47)	Cohort 1 year	N=1,057 pairs Age range 21-58 (time 2) Opposite-sex dizygotic twins Virginia Adult Twin Study of Psychiatric and Substance Use Disorders	Depression diagnosis: 14 items representing 14 depressive symptoms not caused by physical illness; Past year; Diagnosis of depression from computer algorithm	<u>Social support</u>: 24-item scale; Measures frequency of attending social gatherings, frequency of contact with co-twin, friends and other relatives, quality of social support received (emotional and instrumental support), presence and number of confidantes; Used factor analysis to estimate global support	Conditional logistic regression	Modelling controls for shared genetic and shared environmental factors; Stratified by sex	<u>Women</u> *Global support*: OR 0.60 (0.51-0.74), p<0.0001 *Co-twin*: OR 0.77, p<0.01 *Other relatives*: OR 0.68, p<0.0001 *Friends*: OR 0.84, p<0.05 *Parents*: OR 0.65, p<0.0001 *Spouse*: OR 0.79, p<0.01 *Children*: OR 0.85, NS *Social integration*: OR 0.80, p<0.05 <u>Men</u> *Global support*: OR 0.95 (0.78-1.14), NS *Co-twin*: OR 1.14, NS *Other relatives*: OR 0.96, NS *Friends*: OR 0.98, NS *Parents*: OR 0.88, NS *Spouse*: OR 1.17, NS

							Children: OR 1.08, NS *Social integration*: OR 0.93, NS <u>Women and men combined</u> OR 0.74, p<0.01
Dalgard, 2006, Multinational (Finland, England, Ireland, Spain, Norway) (48)	Cross-sectional	N=8,787 Age range 18-64 ODIN (Outcome of Depression in Europe Network) Project	Beck Depression Inventory (BDI): Symptoms past 2 weeks; 21 items; Range 0-63; Depression cut-off score >12	<u>Oslo Support Scale</u>: Questions about number of close confidantes, sense of concern or interest from other people, and relationship to neighbours; Categorized as 'Lots of help', 'Some help' and 'No help'	Logistic regression	Age and country; Stratified by sex	Compared to "Lots of help" <u>Women</u>: Some help: OR 2.7 (2.1, 3.5) No help: OR 4.8 (3.4, 6.8) <u>Men</u>: Some help: OR 2.2 (1.6, 3.1) No help: OR 2.4 (1.6, 3.5)
Fiori, 2006, USA (49)	Cross-sectional	N=719 428 middle-aged (age 35-59) and 291 older adults (age 60+) Social Relations and Mental Health over the Life Course Study	Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale (CES-D): Past week symptoms; 20 items; Continuous score ranging from 0-60	<u>Social networks</u>: Number of people in network; Network mapping procedure Respondents were asked a series of questions concerning the quality of their relationships with spouse, (closest) child, and same-sex best friend; Composite measures of positive and negative quality of family relations were constructed by averaging the positive and negative items	Linear regression	Age, sex, race, education, health, and family composition; Stratified by age	<u>Middle-aged adults</u> Positive family: β -4.90, p<0.01 Negative family: β 1.46, p<0.001 Total network, positive friend and negative friend: NS <u>Older adults</u> Total network: β -0.26, p<0.01 Positive family: β -3.12, NS Negative family: β 1.42, p<0.01 Positive friend: β -4.23, p<0.05 Negative friend: NS
Heponiemi, 2006, Finland (50)	Cohort 5 years	N=1,413 Age range 20-35 553 male and 860 female Cardiovascular Risk in Young Finns study	Beck Depression Inventory (BDI) – Modified: Symptoms past 2 weeks; 21 items; Mean score; Range 1-5	<u>Perceived Social Support Scale – Revised</u>: 12 items; Measures perceived support from friends, family and significant others; Mean score range 1-5 per type of support	Linear regression	Baseline depressive score, age, gender	Social support: β -0.08, p=0.002

Ruiz, 2007, USA (51)	Cross-sectional	N=925 Age range 18-23 National Survey of Families and Households (NSFH)	Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale (CES-D): Past week symptoms; 20 items; Continuous score ranging from 0-60	<u>Quality of child-parent relationship</u>: Reports about quality of relationships to mothers and/or fathers; Scale ranging from 0 to 10 <u>Social cohesion with grandparents</u>: 3 subscales: strength of emotional closeness, frequency of contact, and source of social support	Linear regression	Gender, ethnicity, age, education, family of origin poverty ratio, family structure	Quality of relationship with parents: β -0.357, p<0.001 Cohesion with grand-parents: β -0.81, p<0.01
Wareham, 2007, Canada (52)	Cross-sectional	N=6,316 Age range 20-64 Canadian Community Health Survey	Composite International Diagnostic Interview Short Form for Major Depression (CIDI-SFMD): Past year; 9 items; Continuous score ranging from 1-8	<u>Medical Outcomes Study (MOS) Social Support Survey</u>: 19 items; Measures 4 domains of support : tangible (score 0-16), affective (score 0-12), positive social interaction (score 0-16), and emotional/informational (score 0-32)	Stepwise regression	Gender	<u>All</u> Positive social interaction: β -0.058, p<0.001 Emotional/informational: β 0.009, p<0.05 Other types of support: NS <u>Women</u> Positive social interaction: β -0.050, p<0.001 Tangible: β 0.020, p<0.01 Affection: β -0.031, p<0.05 Emotional/informational: NS <u>Men</u> Positive social interaction: β -0.069, p<0.001 Emotional/informational: β 0.024, p<0.001 Tangible: NS Affection: NS
Stojanovic-Spehar, 2009, Croatia (53)	Cross-sectional	N = 17,290 Age range 21+	Diagnosis of Depressive episode from medical file (ICD 10)	Respondents were asked if they have a close confidence and if they would receive any help in case of illness	Logistic regression	Age, gender, marital status, economic status, education, physical independence, life satisfaction, appearance, difficult patient, suicide attempt	Having close confident OR 1.40 CI 0.54, 3.66 Help in case of illness OR 0.95 CI 0.28, 3.27
Hefner, 2009, USA (54)	Cross-sectional	N=1,378 Undergraduate college students	Patient Health Questionnaire (PHQ):	<u>Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support (MPSS)</u>: Perception of social support	Logistic regression	Gender, age, race, nationality, sexual orientation, graduate	<u>Social support scale</u>: OR 0.65, p<0.001

		Healthy Minds Study	9 items; Past 2 weeks Depressive disorder determined using standard algorithms	quality; 12 items; 3 subscales, 4 items/subscale		status, financial situation, living situation	
Moak, 2010, USA (55)	Cross-sectional	N=34,653 Age range 21-99 Participants in 2nd wave of the National Institutes of Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism for the National Epidemiological Survey on Alcohol and Related Conditions (NESARC)	Alcohol Use Disorders and Associated Disabilities Interview (AUDADIS): Lifetime; Major depressive disorder based on DSM-IV criteria	Perceived interpersonal social support: 12 items from the ISEL; Continuous score Response 1-4; Range 12-48; Split in quartiles for analysis	Logistic regression	Gender, age, ethnicity and living below the poverty line, other physical and mental conditions	Ref: Highest support Intermediate high SS: OR 1.19 (1.09, 1.39), p<.001 Intermediate low SS: OR 1.30 (1.19, 1.42), p<.001 Low SS: OR 1.55 (1.41, 1.71), p<.001
Patten, 2010, Canada (56)	Cohort 8 years	N=12,351 Age range 12+ No major depression at baseline National Population Health Survey (NPHS)	Composite International Diagnostic Interview Short Form for Major Depression (CIDI-SFMD): Past year; 9 items; Depression identified if answered "yes" to 4+ symptoms in addition to primary stem items	Medical Outcomes Study Social Support Scale (MOSSS): 19 items; Measures functional support; 4 subscales: informational/emotional support, tangible support, positive social interaction and affection support; Divided in quartiles	Proportional hazard model	Age, sex, marital status, education, employment	Lower quartile subscale scores vs. higher quartile scores Informational/emotional support: HR 1.7 (1.5, 2.0) Tangible support: HR 1.5 (1.3, 1.8) Positive social interaction: HR 1.7 (1.4, 2.0) Affection support: HR 1.6 (1.4, 1.9)
Simon, 2010, USA (57)	Cross-sectional	N=789 Age range 18-23 Partnered, never married adults	Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale (CES-D) – Modified: Past month; 20 items; 4-point response scale;	Partner support: 6 items capturing respondents' perceptions of supportive interactions with their partner; Score range 1-5 Partner strain: 5 items regarding respondents' perceptions of negative interactions with partner;	Linear regression	Gender, race, age, family socioeconomic status, education, working status, parent, partner strain	Partner support: β -0.05, p<0.001 Partner strain: β 0.14, p<0.001

			Score range 20-73; Log of continuous score	Score range 1-3			
Almeida, 2011, USA (58)	Cohort 5 years	N=2,673 Age range 18-25 Primary care givers of children, 94% women Project on Human Development in Chicago Neighbourhoods (PHDCN)	Composite International Diagnostic Interview Short Form for Major Depression (CIDI-SFMD): Past year; 9 items; Depression identified if answered "yes" to 4+ symptoms in addition to primary stem items	<u>Adapted Version Provision of Social Relation Scale (PSR)</u>: Assesses support from family and friends separately; 15 items out of original 18; Revised 3-point scale	Logistic regression	Ethnicity, gender, age, marital status, income, education, employment	Family support: OR 0.50 (0.37, 0.69) Friend support: OR 0.76 (0.57, 1.01)
Grumer, 2011, Germany (59)	Cross-sectional	N=2,522 Age range 16-42 Not in school Jena Study on Social Change and Human Development	Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI): Short form of SCL-90; Past week; 6 items; 7-point Likert scale	<u>Berlin Social Support Scale</u>: 8 items; 7 Likert-point scale	Structural equation modeling	Gender, age, education, region, employment status	Social support: Standardized β -0.24, p<0.01
Sherman, 2011, USA (60)	Cross-sectional	N=249 Age range 41-89 Women Robeson County Outreach Screening and Education (ROSE) project	Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale (CES-D): Past week symptoms; 20 items; Continuous score ranging from 0-56	<u>Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support (MSPSS)</u>: 12 items; Assess perceived social support provided to respondent from three different sources: friends, family, and partner	Linear regression	Age, marital status, medical conditions, education, ethnicity, strain	Social support: β -3.53, p<0.01
Stafford, 2011, UK (61)	Cohort 2 years	N=7,985 Age range 50+ English Longitudinal Study of Ageing	Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale (CES-D) – Modified: Past week symptoms; 8 items;	<u>Self-Completion Questionnaire</u>: Asked if had husband/wife/ partner, children, other immediate family, friends; Each relationship assessed for positive (3 items; empathy, dependability, confiding) and negative (3 items; criticism, being let down, and annoyance)	Logistic regression	Age, gender, household wealth, long-term limiting illness, prior depressive symptoms	<u>Positive exchange</u> From all types combined: OR 0.78 (0.71, 0.86) From partner: OR 0.79 (0.73, 0.85) From children: OR 0.83 (0.77, 0.89) From other family: OR 0.92 (0.86, 0.99)

			Y/N response re. symptoms experience; Depression with 4+ symptoms	exchanges; Each item assessed for 4 types of relationships; Score range 0 (not at all) to 3 (a lot); 0-9 per category			From friends: OR 0.98 (0.91, 1.05) <u>Negative exchange</u> From all types combined: OR 1.31 (1.20, 1.43) From partner: OR 1.29 (1.19, 1.40) From children: OR 1.22 (1.14, 1.31) From other family: OR 1.18 (1.10, 1.27) From friends: OR 1.07 (1.00, 1.15)
Biehle, 2012, USA (62)	Cross-sectional	N=100 Age range 19-46 Married for less than 7 years; Recruited from university (staff, faculty, students)	Profile of Mood States (POMS): 25 items; Depression factor; Mean score 1-5	<u>Provision of support</u>: 6 items; How much support they showed their spouse; Scale 1-5; Mean score <u>Receipt of emotional support</u>: 6 items; How much support their spouse shows them; Mean score <u>Unacknowledged support provision</u>: Difference score between an individual's report of how much support they provided minus how much support their spouse reported receiving from them <u>Invisible support receipt</u>: Opposite of above – how much support not reported by received	Linear regression	Stratified by sex	<u>Provision of support:</u> Husband, reported: β -0.14, p<0.01 Husband, unacknowledged: β 0.10, p>0.05 Wife, reported: β -0.29, p<0.001 Wife, unacknowledged: β 0.17, p<0.05 <u>Receipt of support:</u> Husband, reported: β -0.24, p<0.01 Husband, invisible: β -0.08, p>0.05 Wife, reported: β -0.17, p<0.05 Wife, invisible: β -0.11, p>0.05
Grav, 2012, Norway (63)	Cross-sectional	N=40,659 Age range 20-89 Nord-Trondelag Health Study (HUNT)	Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale (HADS): Current symptoms; 14 items; 4 point scale; cut-off score of 8	<u>Tangible and emotional support</u>: 1 item each; Tangible support: 'Do you have friends that can help you when you need them?'; Emotional support: 'Do you have friends that you can speak to confidentially?'; Yes/no;	Logistic regression	Age, gender	Friend emotional support: OR 2.80 (2.53, 3.10) Friend tangible support: OR 2.46 (2.18, 2.77)

				Compound index of low (no to both Qs), medium (one no), and high (both yes)			
Teo, 2013, USA (64)	Cohort 10 years	N=3,154 Age range 25-75 No depression at baseline Midlife in the United States (MIDUS) survey	Composite International Diagnostic Interview Short Form (CIDI-SF): Past year; 9 items; Depression based on DSM-III-R criteria	Positive/supportive, and negative/straining social aspects; Partner, family and friends; 4 items; Scale 1-4; Mean composite score of positive and negative social support	Logistic regression	Age, ethnicity, sex, household income, education, generalized anxiety disorder, alcohol misuse, overall physical and mental health	Overall poor quality of support: OR 2.54 (1.71, 3.76) Social strain: OR 2.33 (1.64, 3.29) Lack of social support: OR 1.57 (1.14, 2.16)
McKenzie, 2013, US (65)	Cross-sectional	N = 5,681 Age range 40+	Patient Health Questionnaire (PHQ): Depressive symptoms in last 2 weeks; 4-point Likert scale (0 = not at all to 3 = nearly every day); Cut-off score 10+ for depression	Social Support Questionnaire (SSQ): number of close friends [none; 1-4; 5-9; 10+])	Logistic regression	Age, race, family income, education, smoking and drinking, total # of people in household, history of major medical illness	Men Number of friends: No friends OR 4.01 (1.89-8.50,) 1-4 friends OR 2.10 (1.18-3.74) 5-9 friends OR 1.32 (0.76-2.29) 10+ friends (Reference) Women Number of friends: No friends OR 1.86 (0.92-3.79) 1-4 friends OR 1.54 (0.99-2.40) 5-9 friends OR 1.10 (0.69-1.76) 10+ friends (Reference)
Barger, USA, 2014 (66)	Cross-sectional	N = 12,286 Age range 18+	Composite International Diagnostic Interview – Short Form (CIDI-SF): Major depressive episode in past 12 months using DSM-III-R criteria Depression Screening Questionnaire (DSQ): Depressive symptoms in past 2 weeks; Score range 0-20	Has Confidant – yes/no; Unmet support needs - yes/no; Tangible support – yes/no; Social contacts – 5 items; frequency of meeting/phoning friends/relatives and participating in group activities; ordinal responses coded as 0-4, summed/ recoded into five categories for analysis (0-9, 10-12, 13-14, 15-16, 17-21)	Negative binomial regression	Age, gender, education, regional language, nationality	Major depression Confidant RR 0.59 (0.38-0.92) Unmet support RR 2.11 (1.63-2.73) Tangible support RR 0.58 (0.40-0.84) Social contact: 0-9 (Reference) 10-12: RR 0.78 (0.54-1.13) 13-14: RR 0.66 (0.44-0.97) 15-16: RR 0.50 (0.31-0.80) 17-21: RR 0.65 (0.39-1.08) Depressive symptoms Confidant RR 0.86 (0.79-0.94) Unmet support RR 1.47 (1.39-1.54) Tangible support RR 0.78 (0.72-0.84) Social contact: 0-9 (Reference) 10-12: RR 0.90 (0.83-0.98) 13-14: RR 0.87 (0.80-0.95)

							15-16: RR 0.81 (0.74-0.89) 17-21: RR 0.78 (0.71-0.86)
Barth, 2014, Switzerland (67)	Cross-sectional	N = 5,236 men Age range 18-25	Patient Health Questionnaire (PHQ-9): 9 depressive symptoms in past 2 weeks; Three diagnostic groups: Depression 5+ symptoms, including depressed mood or anhedonia; Subthreshold depression: 2-4 symptoms, including depressed mood or anhedonia	Number of friends: <3, 3-4, >4 close friends Perceived amount of support: Average score on emotional support, 4-point Likert scale (1 = not sufficient at all to 4 = much) and perceived amount of material support, 4-point Likert scale (same as above)	Logistic regression	Education, parent's education, household equivalent income, low satisfaction with social relations, low self-efficacy, satisfaction with job/training/school	Number of friends <3 : OR 1.88 (1.16-3.06) 3-4: OR 1.27 (0.86-1.88) >4 : Reference Low perceived amount of support : OR 1.28, 0.94-1.76, ns
Lewis, 2014, UK (68)	Cross-sectional	N = 555 187 males, mean age = 43.07 368 females, mean age = 40.78	Inventory of Depressive Symptomatology (IDS): 30 items	Social Support Questionnaire – Short Version (SSQ-6): 6 items; level of satisfaction for support in 6 scenarios (1 = very unsatisfied to 6 = very satisfied); Summed score	Structural equation modeling	5 personality traits (agreeableness, extraversion, neuroticism, openness, conscientiousness)	Social support on depression symptoms: β -0.06, p<.05
Wilson, 2014, USA (69)	Cross-sectional	N = 240 female Mean age 21.4 (SD 5.0)	Center for Epidemiologic Studies – Depression Scale (CES-D): 20-item version; Past week symptoms; Cut-off score of 16	Self-reported strong social support group (1 item, Y/N)	Logistic regression	Class year, race/ethnicity, nation of birth (US/other), residence (on-/off-campus), nightly hours of sleep, sleep quality, family member with previous mental health diagnosis, relationship status, exercise, previous mental health clinical diagnoses or treatment	Association with depression: Absence of strong social support group OR = 4.3, 95% CI 1.4-13.7

Online Table DS5. Quality assessment of selected studies in adults

First author, year, country	Study participants represent study base	People with different social support drawn from the same population	Overall participation rate > 60%	Social support assessed from validated tool	Depressive symptoms assessed from validated tool	Social support and depressive symptoms assessed in same way for entire sample	Adjustment for baseline depression / depressive score*	Bias due to lost to follow-up*	Controlled for at least three important confounders	Most important design flaw(s)	Overall quality
Golding, 1989, USA (33)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	Yes	Generalizability	High
Ross, 1989, USA (34)	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	Yes	Validity of social support scale	Moderate
Franks, 1992, USA (35)	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	Yes	Generalizability (small sample size), low participation rate (55%)	Moderate
Okun, 1998, USA (36)	Somewhat	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	N/A	N/A	Yes	Generalizability, validity of social support and depression scales	Moderate
Lin, 1999, USA (37)	Yes	Yes	Unable to tell	No	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	Yes	Validity of social support scale	Moderate
Bullers, 2000, USA (38)	Yes	Yes	Unable to tell	No	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	Yes	Validity of social support scale	Moderate
Peirce, 2000, USA (39)	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Likely	Yes	Validity of social support scale, potential for selection bias	Moderate
Wade, 2000, USA (40)	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Excluded those with chronic depression	Possible	No	Validity of social support scale, confounder control, control for baseline depression (only excluded those with chronic depression),	Low
Wade, 2000, Canada (41)	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	Yes	Validity of social support scale	Moderate
Aro, 2001, Finland (42)	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	Yes	Low participation rate (57%),	Moderate

										validity of social support scale	
Elliot, 2001, USA (43)	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	Yes	Validity of social support scale	Moderate
Patten, 2001, Canada (44)	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	No	Validity of social support scale, confounder control	Low
Segrin, 2003, USA (45)	Yes	Yes	Unable to tell	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	No	Confounder control	Moderate
Shaw, 2004, USA (46)	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	N/A	N/A	Yes	Validity of social support and depression scales	Moderate
Kendler, 2005, USA (47)	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Likely.	Yes	Validity of social support scale, control for baseline depression, generalizability	Low
Dalgard, 2006, Multinational (Finland, England, Ireland, Spain, Norway) (48)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	Yes		High
Fiori, 2006, USA (49)	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	Yes	Validity of social support scale	Moderate
Heponiemi, 2006, Finland (50)	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unlikely	Yes	Validity of social support scale	Moderate
Ruiz, 2007, USA (51)	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	Yes	Validity of social support scale	Moderate
Wareham, 2007, Canada (52)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	No	Confounder control	Moderate
Stojanovic-Spehar, 2009, Croatia (53)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	N/A	N/A	Yes	Validity of social support scale	Moderate
Hefner, 2009, USA (54)	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	Yes	Generalizability, low participation rate (57%)	Moderate
Moak, 2010, USA (55)	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	Yes	Validity of social support scale	Moderate
Patten, 2010,	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Likely	Yes	Potential for	High

Canada (56)										selection bias.	
Simon, 2010, USA (57)	Somewhat, partnered never married	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Validity of social support scale, generalizability	Moderate
Almeida, 2011, USA (58)	No	Yes	Unable to tell	No	Yes	Yes	No	Unable to tell	Yes	Generalizability, validity of social support scale, control for baseline depression, missing information on participation rates and lost to follow-up	Low
Grumer, 2011, Germany (59)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	Yes		High
Sherman, 2011, USA (60)	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	Yes		High
Stafford, 2011, UK (61)	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Likely	Yes	Validity of social support scale, selection bias	Moderate
Biehle, 2012, USA (62)	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	No	Generalizability (young couple volunteers in first marriage), validity of social support scale, confounder control	Low
Grav, 2012, Norway (63)	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	No	Low participation rate (>60%), validity of social support scale, confounder control	Low
Teo, 2013, USA (64)	Yes	Yes	Unable to tell	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Likely	Yes	Validity of social support scale, potential selection bias	Moderate
McKenzie, 2013, US (65)	Yes	Yes	Unable to tell	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	Yes		High
Barger, USA, 2014 (66)	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	Yes	Validity of social support scale	Moderate
Barth, 2014,	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	Yes	Validity of social	Moderate

Switzerland (67)										support scale	
Lewis, 2014, UK (68)	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	No	Validity of social support scale, confounder control	Low
Wilson, 2014, USA (69)	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	Yes	Generalizability, low participation rate, validity of social support scale	Low

* Assessed in cohort studies only
N/A: Not applicable

Online Table DS6. Data extraction of selected studies in older adults

First author, year, country	Study design	Sample description	Depression measurement	Social support measurement	Method of analysis	Covariates included in analysis	Association
Grant, 1988, USA (70)	Cohort 2 years	N=118 Age range 65-92 Living independently in the community	Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI): Past week; 53 items; 7-point Likert scale; Continuous score	Social Support Questionnaire (SSQ): 6 questions; 4 types of support: thing giving, help giving, emotional support, advice giving; 5-point Likert scale; Composite category called "high-quality supports" for high consistency over interview and high emotional support satisfaction score (4+ score)	Linear regression	None	Number of high quality support relatives significantly associated with current depressive symptoms, but no change of symptoms over time
Krause, 1989, USA (71)	Cohort About 19 months	N=265 Age range 65+	Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale (CES-D): Past week symptoms; 20 items; Continuous score ranging from 0-60; 3-factor construct using factor analysis	Social Support Index: 3 subscales: informational support, tangible help, and emotional assistance from significant others; Binary variable to measure satisfaction within each subscale	Structural equation modeling	Age, sex, marital status, education, depressive symptoms at time 1	Satisfaction with support at T1 predicting depressive score at T2: Standardized β 0.201, $p<0.05$
Dean, 1990, USA (72)	Cross-sectional	N=997 Age range 50+ Married and widowed adults	Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale (CES-D): Past week symptoms; 20 items; Continuous score ranging from 0-60	Expressive support: 5 items; Past 6 months; Support from each of four sources: spouse, children, other relatives, and friend; 3-point scale; Categorized as unavailable, low, medium and high	Linear regression	Sex, disability, undesirable life events, financial strain	Reference: no support Spousal support: Low: β 0.563, $p<0.01$ Medium: β 0.030, $p>0.05$ High: β -0.363, $p<0.001$ Children support: Low: β 0.347 , $p>0.05$ Medium: β 0.285, $p>0.05$ High:

							β 0.162, p>0.05 <u>Relative support:</u> Low: β 0.165 , p>0.05 Medium: β -0.122, p>0.05 High: β 0.117, p>0.05 <u>Friend support:</u> Low: β -0.204 , p>0.05 Medium: β -0.442, p<0.01 High: β -0.618, p<0.001
Palinkas, 1990, USA (73)	Cross-sectional	N=1,615 Age range 65+	Beck Depression Inventory – Modified: Symptoms past 2 weeks; 18 items; Continuous score ranging from 0-63	<u>Social Activity Score</u>: Number of social clubs and voluntary associations to which subject belonged <u>Social Network Index</u> <u>Frequency of face-to-face contacts</u>: Close family and friends (1 or more/week vs. <1/week) <u>Social distance of a special person</u>: Subject's primary source of support (spouse, child, relative, friend, other, none) <u>Number of friends and family</u>: Mean number	Stepwise linear regression	Age, sex, number of chronic conditions	Social activity score: β -0.474, p<0.01 Social distance from special someone: β 0.249, p<0.01 Social network index: NS Frequency of contact: NS Number of friends: β 0.034, p<0.05 Number of family: NS Church participation: β -0.583, p<0.01
Russell, 1991, USA (74)	Cohort 1 year	N=301 Age range 65+	Zung Depression Scale: Symptoms in past several days; 20 items; Range 20-80	<u>Social Provisions Scale (SPS)</u>: 24 items; Yes/no scale (instead of 4-point scale); Divided into 6 subscales: nurturance, guidance, reliable alliance, attachment, reassurance of worth, social integration; Summary score	Structural equation modeling	Initial depression	Social support <u>Direct effects</u>: Standardized β -0.161, p<0.05 <u>Indirect effects</u>: Standardized β -0.049, p<0.05
Oxman, 1992,	Cohort	N=1,861	Center for	<u>Social network:</u>	Linear	Education, marital	No. of children seen weekly:

USA (75)	3 years	Age range 65+ New Haven Establishment of Populations for Epidemiologic Study of the Elderly	Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale (CES-D): Past week symptoms; 20 items; Continuous score ranging from 0-60	Included number according to kinship (children, close relatives, friends) and number making each of two types of contact (face-to-face visits and phoning/writing) <u>Perceived tangible support</u>: 2 items <u>Perceived emotional support</u>: 2 items	regression	status, baseline depression score, baseline disability index; Stratification variable (Age, sex, race/ ethnicity, income not entered because not significant)	β -0.347, p=0.015 No. of relatives phoning/writing yearly: β -0.123, p=0.055 No. of friends phoning/writing yearly: β -0.041, p=0.359 Adequacy of tangible support: β -0.855, p=0.005 Adequacy of emotional support: β -0.617, p=0.042
Kivela, 1996, Finland (76)	Cohort 5 years	N=679	Clinical interview: Depression determined using the DSM-III criteria	<u>Social network and activities</u>: Assessed children living in same city, siblings living in same city, being alone often, relationship with spouse, social participation, visitors, relationship with neighbors	Contrast between those with and without depression at follow-up	Stratified by sex	<u>Men</u> Relationship with spouse (moderate-poor): RR 3.4 (1.2, 9.3) Relationship with neighbors (moderate-poor): RR 1.4 (0.6, 3.2) <u>Women</u> Relationship with spouse (moderate-poor): RR 1.5 (0.7, 3.3) Relationship with neighbors (good vs moderate-poor) : RR 1.4 (0.7-2.6)
Antonucci, 1997, France (77)	Cross-sectional	N=3,777 Age range 65+ PAQUID Research Program	Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale (CES-D): Past week symptoms; 20 items; Continuous score ranging from 0-60	<u>Social Networks in Adult Life Questionnaire</u>: How many people in their network do not understand them (4 = no one, 3 = a few people, 2 = most people, 1 = everyone); If they are satisfied with the quality of their relationships with their network (yes/no)	Linear regression	Age, gender, impairment, social network size and composition	Satisfaction with social support: β -3.10, p<0.001 Understanding: β -3.34, p<0.001
Prince, 1997, UK (78)	Cross-sectional	N=654 Age range 65+	Short-Comprehensive Assessment and Referral Evaluation (CARE): 6 indicator scales;	<u>Social support deficits (SSDs)</u>: (1) living alone; (2) seeing a relative less often than once a week; (3) having no supportive neighbours; (4) having one or less supportive friends; (5) experiencing upset/bother in a	Logistic regression	Change of residence, gender, age, life events	<u>Number of social support deficits</u> Ref: None 1: OR 1.4 (0.6, 3.1) 2: OR 1.7 (0.7, 3.8) 3: OR 1.9 (0.8, 4.5) 4: OR 3.9 (1.4, 10.9) 5 or 6: OR 17.5 (4.1, 74.3)

			Past month; Pervasive depression	relationship with a child; (6) experiencing dissatisfaction with support received from friends; Calculated number of social support deficits			
Fernandez, 1998, USA (79)	Cohort 2 years	N=728 Age range 58-64 (baseline) Working full-time	Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale (CES-D): Past week symptoms; 20 items; Continuous score ranging from 0-60	<u>Degree of satisfaction with dating or marital relationships</u>: 1 item; How satisfied they were with their relationships; 4-point scale <u>Frequency of visits</u>: Visits from 3 close friends/ family and who do not live with respondent; Response scale 0-6 (no visit to >1 visit a week); Score range 0-18	Linear regression	Sex, race, education, income T1, medical conditions T1, retired T2, depressive symptoms T1, self-esteem T1, has partner T1	Satisfaction with partner/spouse at T1: β -0.439, p>0.05 Satisfaction with partner/spouse at T2: β -0.584, p<0.05 Frequency of interactions with friends and relatives at T2: β 0.164, p>0.05
Bisconti, 1999, USA (80)	Cross-sectional	N=268 Age 65-95 81% female	Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale (CES-D): Past week symptoms; 20 items; Continuous score ranging from 0-60	<u>Modified Interview Schedule for Social Interaction</u> (ISSI; Henderson, 1990): 8 items; Each item has 2 parts; 1) quantity of social support from family and from friends (5-point Likert scale – nobody to 11+ sources of support); 2) perceived satisfaction with support (binary)	Linear regression	Age, gender	Friend support: β -0.35, p<0.001 Family support: β -0.27, p<0.001 Perceived support: β -0.25, p<0.001
Schoevers, 2000, Netherlands (81)	Cohort 3 years	N=1,940 Non-depressed community-living elderly	Geriatric Mental State (GMS-AGECAT): Semi-structured questionnaire; Current cases of depression	1 item: 'Do you get help from children or neighbours?'	Logistic regression	Socioeconomic variables, social support, stressors	OR not significant in multivariate stepwise regression OR 1.16 (0.89, 1.51) in univariate model
Antonucci, 2001, USA (82)	Cross-sectional	N=128 Age range 60-91 Married, with best friend of same gender Social Relations Study	Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale (CES-D): Past week symptoms; 20 items; Continuous score ranging from 0-60	<u>Positive and negative aspects of social relationships</u>: Support from spouse and same-sex friend; 2 items: "I share my private feelings and concerns with my friend/ spouse", "My friend/spouse gets on my nerves"; 5-point response scale;	Linear regression	Sex, age, current health	Confide in spouse: β -0.16, p>0.05 Spouse gets on nerves β 0.29, p<0.01 Confide in same-sex friend: β -0.05, p>0.05 Same-sex friend gets on nerve gets

				Score range 1-5			on nerves: β 0.13, p>0.05
Wallace, 2001, USA (83)	Cross-sectional	N=443 Age range 60-95	Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale (CES-D): Past week symptoms; 20 items; Continuous score ranging from 0-60	<u>Modified Interview Schedule for Social Interaction</u> (ISSI; Henderson, 1990): 8 items; Each item has 2 parts: 1) quantity of social support from family and from friends (5-point Likert scale – nobody to 11+ sources of support); 2) perceived satisfaction with support (binary)	Linear regression	Age, gender, hardiness	Family support: β -0.21, p<0.001 Friend support: β -0.33, p<0.001
Zunzunegui, 2001, Spain (84)	Cross-sectional	N=1,028 Age range 65+ Parents with living children	Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale (CES-D): Past week symptoms; 20 items; Continuous score ranging from 0-60	<u>Emotional support from children</u>: 6 items; 4-point response scale; How frequently do you feel loved by your children? How frequently do you feel you are listened to by your children? How frequently do you feel you can have confidence in your children? How frequently do you feel you help your children? How frequently do you feel useful to your children? How often do you feel you have an important role for your children?; Categorized as lowest quartile vs. not <u>Instrumental support</u>: Received instrumental help from children for any of seven basic and ten instrumental activities of daily living	Linear regression	Age, gender, education, functional status	<u>Lack of emotional support from children – lowest quartile</u> (vs. other): β 3.9, p<0.001 <u>Lack of instrumental support</u> (vs no lack): β 0.9, p>0.05
Minicuci, 2002, Italy (85)	Cross-sectional	N=2,398 Age range 65 Non-institutionalized	Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale (CES-D): Past week symptoms; 20 items; Continuous score ranging from 0-60; Cut-off 16 for case	<u>Frequency of contacts with family members, other relatives, and friends</u>: Response: never, every 6 months, every 2 to 3 months, every month, more often <u>Support expected</u>: 1 item; "In case of need, do you expect your family (or relatives, or friends) would help you?"	Logistic regression	SES variables, health and functioning, life habits, social relations	<u>Men</u> Strong association with negative expectations of support from family members in case of financial need (OR 2.43, CI 1.51, 3.92) Other measure of social support: NS <u>Women</u> All measure of social support: NS (Results not reported)

			of depression				
Osborn, 2003, UK (86)	Cross-sectional	N=14,217 Age range 75+ 53 practices in UK; Excluded those in LT nursing care or with terminal disease MRC Trial of the Assessment and Management of Older People in the Community	Geriatric Depression Scale (GDS15): Past week; 15 items; Cut-off ≥6 for case of depression Mini-Mental State Examination (MMSE): Those with score below 17/did not complete language component deemed cognitively impaired, excluded	<u>Confiding relationships</u>: 1 item; 'When you need to talk about private matters or when you are worried or stressed who can you really count on, or feel at ease with?'; Number of people	Logistic regression	Sex, age, home ownership, Marital status, life events, living alone, current smoker, alcohol use, serious illnesses	Confiding in no one (vs. >1 person): OR 3.45 (2.44, 4.87) Confiding in one person (vs. >1 person): OR 1.14 (0.95, 1.37)
Vanderhorst, 2005, Australia (87)	Cross-sectional	N=110 Age range 75+ 79% female; People registered with local city council's home care program	Zung Depression Scale: Symptoms in past several days; 20 items; Range 20-80	<u>Social Support Subscale of the Coping Resources Inventory</u> (Hammer, 1988): Measures extent to which participant is involved in social networks that are able to provide support during times of stress; 13 items; 4-point Likert scale	Linear regression	Gender, age, education, marital status, sense of belonging	Social support during times of stress: β -0.68, p<0.001
Cacioppo, 2006, USA – Study 1 (88)	Cross-sectional	N=1,945 Age range 54+ Health and Retirement Study	Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale – Short Form (CES-D-SF): 7 items; Excluded item on loneliness; Past week; Score range 0-7	<u>Loneliness scale</u>: 3 items; Such as: How often do you feel that you lack companionship; Standardized score <u>Social support</u>: 2 items; How often felt could talk to friends about worries and how often could rely on friends for help if had problems; 3-point scale: hardly ever/ never/some of the time/often	Negative binomial regression	Perceived stress, sex, race, age, education, income, marital status, loneliness	Loneliness: β 0.20, p<0.01 Social support: β -0.09, p<0.05
Cacioppo, 2006, USA – Study 2 (88)	Cohort 3 years	N=212 Age range 50-67	Center for Epidemiologic Studies	<u>R-UCLA Loneliness scale</u>: 20 items; Measures general feelings of	Regression analyses (baseline data	Perceived stress, sex, race, age, education, income, marital status,	*Cross-sectional analysis*: Loneliness:

	Cross-sectional data included in this review	Chicago Health, Aging, and Social Relations Study	Depression Scale (CES-D): Past week symptoms; 19 items; Excluded item on loneliness; Continuous score ranging from 0-57	social isolation, loneliness, and dissatisfaction with one's social interactions; Standardized score <u>Interpersonal Support Evaluation List (ISEL)</u>: Assesses 3 forms of social support: tangible, appraisal, and belonging; 12 items; 4-point Likert scale; Overall score ranging 4-16	only)	hostility	β 2.62, p<0.001 Social support: β 0.66, p>0.05
Harris, 2006, UK (89)	Cohort 2 years	N=945 Age range 65+ Without depression at baseline; Registered with two South London practices	Geriatric Depression Scale (GDS15): Past week; 15 items; Cut-off >5 for case of depression	Availability of support and frequency of contact; Existence of a confidante; Satisfaction with support; Experience of conflict or upset in close relationships; Adapted from General Household Survey, Health Insurance Study, Gospel Oak Project	Forward stepwise logistic regression	Age, sex, practice, baseline GDS-15 score	Not satisfied with support (vs. satisfied) at time 1: OR 2.3 (1.3, 4.2)
St John, 2006, Canada (90)	Cross-sectional	N=1,382 Age range 65+ Manitoba Study of Health and Aging	Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale (CES-D): Past week symptoms; 20 items; Continuous score ranging from 0-60	<u>Number of companions</u>: How many people in total would you say visit you or provide companionship?'; Response range 0-65	Logistic regression	Geographic residence, gender, age, education, living arrangement, adequacy of income, self-rated health, functional impairment	Number of companions: OR 0.93 (0.89, 0.98)
Golden, 2009, Ireland (91)	Cross-sectional	N=1,299 Age range 65+	Geriatric Mental State Exam (GMS): Past month symptoms; Case of depressed mood determined from interview	<u>Practitioner Assessment of Network Type Schedule</u>: Developed by Wenger (Wenger, 1991; Wenger and Tucker, 2002); Locally integrated social network (optimal in older age) vs. four other types of network (restricted = family-dependent; transitional)	Logistic regression	Age, widowhood, physical disability	Non-integrated social network: OR 1.8, p=0.009
Golden, 2009, Ireland (92)	Cross-sectional	N=1,334 Age range 65-98	Geriatric Mental State (GMS): Past month symptoms; Case of	<u>Social network</u>: 8 items; Availability of close local family (3 items); Level of involvement of family,	Logistic regression	Age, gender	Family domain: OR 0.99 (0.79, 1.2) Social engagement domain: OR 0.48 (0.38, 0.60)

			depression defined as significant depressed mood or significant loss of interest in the previous month	friends and neighbours (3 items); Level of interaction with community and voluntary groups (2 items); 2 clusters from latent cluster analysis: family and social engagement domain			
Mechakra-Tahiri, 2010, Canada (93)	Cross-sectional	N=2,670 Age range 65+ ESA (Etude de Sante des Aines)	ESA-Q: Depressive disorder based on the DSM-IV criteria	3 questions about: (1) availability of a confidante to talk to about various problems; (2) presence of someone who could provide instrumental help; (3) presence of someone who could provide emotional support; Good predictive and construct validity; Sum score 0-3	Logistic regression	Age, income, type of region, number of chronic health problems, perceived physical health	<u>Women</u> No presence of confidante: OR 1.56 (1.08, 2.26) No instrumental support: OR 1.32 (0.74, 2.32) No emotional support: OR 1.55 (0.89, 2.69) <u>Men</u> No presence of a confidante: OR 1.88 (1.11, 3.21) No instrumental support: OR 2.33 (0.99, 5.46) No emotional support: OR 1.23 (0.51, 2.98)
Choi, 2011, USA (94)	Cross-sectional	N=2,759 Age range 57-85 National Social Life, Health, and Aging Project (NSHAP)	Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale (CES-D) – Modified: Past week symptoms; 11 items; Continuous score ranging from 0-33	<u>Spousal support</u>: 4 items; Can you open up to partner if need to talk about your worries, can you rely on him/her for help if problem, do they make too many demands, criticize you; Response scale 1-4; Sum scores 4-12; No support (no partner), low (score 4–8), medium (score 9–10), high (score 11–12) <u>Family and friend support</u>: 4 items; Same as spousal support; 3-point response scale (1-3); Continuous score 4-12	Linear regression	Age, race, education, household income, chronic medical conditions, activity of daily living impairment, frequency of physical activity, religious service attending	<u>Women</u> Family/friend support: β -0.26, p<0.001 *Spouse/partner support* (ref: no support): Low support: β 2.15, p<0.001 Medium support: β -0.30, p>0.05 High support: β -0.89, p<0.05 <u>Men</u> Family/friend support: β -0.26, p<0.001 *Spouse/partner support* (ref: no support): Low support: β 0.21, p>0.05 Medium support: β -0.21, p>0.05 High support: β -2.15, p<0.001
Coleman, 2011, Bulgaria and	Cross-sectional	N=160 in Romania, 160 in Bulgaria	Hospital Anxiety and Depression	<u>MOS Social Support Survey</u>: 19-item;	Linear regression	Country, age, gender, living alone, physical	Social support: β -0.07, p<.001

Romania (95)		Age range 60+ Predominantly rural areas	Scale – Depression Subscale (HAD-D): Focus on anhedonia; 7 items	5-point scale; Self-report questionnaire; Measure functional support; 4 subscales (informational/ emotional, tangible, positive social interaction, affection); Continuous score Score range 19-95		limitations, strength of belief	
Glaesmer, 2011, Germany (96)	Cross-sectional	N=1,659 Age range 60-85	Patient Health Questionnaire (PHQ-9): Past 2 weeks; 9 items; Score 0-27	<u>Oslo Social Support Scale</u>: 3 items; Perception of social support from family, friends, neighbors.	Linear regression	Gender, age, education, household income, living with partner, number of medical conditions, social support	<u>All</u> Social support: β -0.195, p<0.001 <u>Men</u> Social support: β -0.239, p<0.001 <u>Women</u> Social support: β -0.157, p<0.001
Sonnenberg, 2013, Netherlands (97)	Cohort 13 years	N=1,928 Age range 55-85 Without depression at baseline Longitudinal Aging Study Amsterdam (LASA)	Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale (CES-D): Past week symptoms; 20 items; Score range 0-60; Depression if score >16	<u>Presence of partner</u>: 1 item; Yes/no <u>Personal network size</u>: Range from 0-75; Small network if <11 <u>Emotional support</u>: Measures how often in previous year participant talked to these 9 closest network members about personal experiences and feelings; Score 0 (never) to 3 (often); Low support if mean score <2	Cox proportional hazard regression	Age, gender, level of education, cognitive impairment, functional limitations	<u>All</u> No partner in household: HR 1.17 (0.95, 1.45) Small network (<11): HR 1.29 (1.07, 1.55) Low emotional support: HR 0.85 (0.70, 1.03) <u>Men</u> No partner in household: HR 1.70 (1.19, 2.43) Small network (<11): HR 1.71 (1.25, 2.34) Low emotional support: HR 0.87 (0.62, 1.21) <u>Women</u> No partner in household: HR 1.06 (0.82, 1.35) Small network (<11): HR 1.10 (0.87, 1.40) Low emotional support: HR 0.86 (0.68, 1.09)
Sjoberg, 2013, Sweden (98)	Cohort 5 years, 2 waves	<u>1901/02 Cohort</u> N=245 <u>1930 Cohort</u> N=310	DSM-IV-TR: 9 items; Past-month symptoms; Diagnosis of	Subjective contacts (too little contact/good enough) with children, neighbors or others	Logistic regression	Sex, marital status	<u>Cohort 1901/02</u> Perceived contacts: Too little contact with All: OR 1.12 (0.21-5.87) Children: N/A

		Baseline age 70 years	major depression, requiring presence of at least 5 out of 9 symptoms				Neighbors: OR 2.21 (0.24-20.83) Others: OR 2.53 (0.48-13.32) <u>Cohort 1930</u> Perceived contacts: Too little contact with All: OR 2.43 (0.21-28.14) Children: N/A Neighbors: N/A Others: OR 5.62 (0.47-67.26)
Uebelacker, 2013, USA (99)	Cross-sectional	N=91,912 women Age range 50-79 years	Center for Epidemiological Studies – Depression Scale (CES-D): 6 items; Past week symptoms; Score range 0-18; High depressive symptoms using cut-off 5+	<u>Medical Outcomes Study – Social Support Questionnaire</u>: 9 items; 4 types of social support (emotional/ informational, affection, tangible, positive social interaction); Score 9-45	Logistic regression	Age, race/ethnicity, marital status	Social support: Women: OR 0.50 (0.49-0.51)
Djundeva, 2014, Holland/UK (100)	Cross-sectional	N=6,268 Aged 65+ years Have at least one adult, non-resident child	EURO-D scale: 12 items; Past month; Dichotomized using score 4+ as depression	Reported frequency of instrumental support from adult child (sporadically, weekly, daily)	Logistic regression	Age, family members respondent lives with, education, employment, subjective appraisal of economic situation, occurrence of stressful events in last 2 years (death of spouse, divorce), # children, volunteering activity, previous history of depressive mood, proximity of grown child, support given by parent, support from sources other than child, gender, activity of daily living limitations, living situation, contact with child, country regime	Instrumental support from child (ref: no support) Sporadic: OR 1.32 (1.07-1.64) Every week: OR 1.15 (0.93-1.43) Daily: OR 1.49 (1.14-1.95)
Park, 2014, USA (101)	Cross-sectional	N=1,432 Aged 65+ years	Center for Epidemiological Studies –	Social support: 1 item, "In times of trouble, can you count on at least some of	Linear regression	SES, gender, age, education, marital status, annual	Social support as a predictor of depressive symptoms: β -1.86, p<.001

			Depression Scale (CES-D): 10 items; Past week symptoms; 4-point Likert scale (0 = rarely to 3 = most of the time); Score 0-30	your family or friends?” 3-point Likert scale (1 = hardly ever to 3 = most of the time)		household income, health risk groups, religious attendance	

Online Table DS7. Quality assessment of selected studies in older adults

First author, year, country	Study participants represent study base	People with different social support drawn from the same population	Overall participation rate > 60%	Social support assessed from validated tool	Depressive symptoms assessed from validated tool	Social support and depressive symptoms assessed in same way for entire sample	Adjustment for baseline depression/ depressive score*	Bias due to lost to follow-up*	Controlled for at least three important confounders	Most important design flaw(s)	Overall quality
Grant, 1988, USA (70)	No	Yes	N/A	No	Yes	Yes	In some analysis	Unlikely	No	Validity of social support scale, generalizability, confounder control	Low
Krause, 1989, USA (71)	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unlikely	Yes	Validity of social support scale	Moderate
Dean, 1990, USA (72)	Yes	Yes	Unable to tell	No	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	Yes	Validity of social support scale	Moderate
Palinkas, 1990, USA (73)	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	Yes	Validity of social support scale	Moderate
Russell, 1991, USA (74)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unlikely	No	Confounder control	Moderate
Oxman, 1992, USA (75)	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unlikely	Yes	Validity of social support scale	Moderate
Kivela, 1996, Finland (76)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unable to tell	Yes	Yes	Yes	Likely	No	Confounder control, potential selection bias	Moderate
Antonucci, 1997, France (77)	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	Yes	Validity of social support scale	Moderate
Prince, 1997, UK (78)	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	Yes	Validity of social support scale	Moderate
Fernandez, 1998, USA (79)	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unlikely	Yes	Validity of social support scale	Moderate
Bisconti, 1999, USA (80)	Unable to tell	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	No	Confounder control	Moderate
Schoevers, 2000, Netherlands (81)	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Likely	Yes	Validity of social support scale, potential selection bias	Moderate
Antonucci, 2001, USA (82)	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	Yes	Validity of social support scale	Moderate
Wallace, 2001, USA (83)	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	Yes	Validity of social support scale	Moderate

Zunzunegui, 2001, Spain (84)	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	Yes	Validity of social support scale	Moderate
Minicuci, 2002, Italy (85)	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	Yes	Validity of social support scale	Moderate
Osborn, 2003, UK (86)	Yes	Yes	Unable to tell	No	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	Yes	Validity of social support scale	Moderate
Vanderhorst, 2005, Australia (87)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	Yes		High
Cacioppo, 2006, USA – Study 1 (88)	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	Yes	Validity of social support scale	Moderate
Cacioppo, 2006, USA – Study 2 (88)	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	Yes	Low participation rate (45%)	High
Harris, 2006, UK (89)	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unlikely	Yes	Validity of social support scale	Moderate
St John, 2006, Canada (90)	Yes	Yes	Unable to tell	No	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	Yes	Validity of social support scale	Moderate
Golden, 2009, Ireland (91)	Yes	Yes	Unable to tell	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	Yes	Potential for selection bias	High
Golden, 2009, Ireland (92)	Yes	Yes	Unable to tell	No	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	No	Validity of social support scale, confounder control	Low
Mechakra-Tahiri, 2010, Canada (93)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	Yes		High
Choi, 2011, USA (94)	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	Yes	Validity of social support scale	Moderate
Coleman, 2011, Bulgaria and Romania (95)	Unable to tell	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	Yes	Generalizability (mainly rural, recruitment unreported)	High
Glaesmer, 2011, Germany (96)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	Yes		High
Sonnenberg, 2013, Netherlands (97)	Yes	Yes	Unable to tell	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Likely	Yes	Validity of social support scale, selection bias	Moderate
Sjoberg, 2013, Sweden (98)	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unable to tell	No	Validity of social support scale, confounder control	Moderate
Uebelacker,	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	Yes	Validity of social	Moderate

2013, USA (99)										support scale	
Djundeva, 2014, Holland/UK (100)	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	Yes	Validity of social support scale	Moderate
Park, 2014, USA (101)	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	Yes	Validity of social support scale	Moderate

* Assessed in cohort studies only
N/A: Not applicable

References for Supplemental files

1. GA Wells BS, D O'Connell, J Peterson, V Welch, M Losos, P Tugwell. The Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (NOS) for assessing the quality of nonrandomised studies in meta-analyses. Ottawa: Ottawa Health Research Institute. http://www.ohri.ca/programs/clinical_epidemiology/oxford.htm.

2. Feldman S, Rubenstein JL, Rubin C. Depressive affect and restraint in early adolescents: Relationships with family structure, family process and friendship support. The Journal of Early Adolescence. 1988; 8(3): 279-96.

3. Slavin LA, Rainer KL. Gender differences in emotional support and depressive symptoms among adolescents: A prospective analysis. American Journal of Community Psychology. 1990; 18(3): 407-21.

4. Rubin C, Rubenstein JL, Stechler G, Heeren T, Halton A, Housman D, et al. Depressive affect in "normal" adolescents: relationship to life stress, family, and friends. The American journal of orthopsychiatry. 1992; 62(3): 430-41.

5. Oldenburg CM, Kerns KA. Associations between peer relationships and depressive symptoms: Testing moderator effects of gender and age. The Journal of Early Adolescence. 1997; 17(3): 319-37.

6. Patten CA, Gillin J, Farkas AJ, Gilpin EA, Berry CC, Pierce JP. Depressive symptoms in California adolescents: Family structure and parental support. Journal of Adolescent Health. 1997; 20(4): 271-8.

7. Sheeber L, Hops H, Alpert A, Davis B, Andrews J. Family support and conflict: Prospective relations to adolescent depression. Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology. 1997; 25(4): 333-44.

8. Donnelly M. Factors associated with depressed mood among adolescents in Northern Ireland. Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology. 1999; 9(1): 47-59.

9. Hussong AM. Perceived peer context and adolescent adjustment. Journal of Research on Adolescence. 2000; 10(4): 391-415.

10. Kaltiala-Heino R, Rimpela M, Rantanen P, Laippala P. Adolescent depression: The role of discontinuities in life course and social support. Journal of Affective Disorders. 2001; 64(2-3): 155-66.

11. Marcotte G, Marcotte D, Bouffard T. The influence of familial support and dysfunctional attitudes on depression and delinquency in an adolescent population. European Journal of Psychology of Education. 2002; 17(4): 363-76.

12. Colarossi LG, Eccles JS. Differential effects of support providers on adolescents' mental health. Social Work Research. 2003; 27(1): 19-30.

13. Cornwell B. The Dynamic Properties of Social Support: Decay, Growth, and Staticity, and Their Effects on Adolescent Depression. Social Forces. 2003; 81(3): 953-78.

14. Galambos NL, Leadbeater BJ, Barker ET. Gender differences in and risk factors for depression in adolescence: A 4-year longitudinal study. International Journal of Behavioral Development. 2004; 28(1): 16-25.

15. Stice E, Ragan J, Randall P. Prospective Relations Between Social Support and Depression: Differential Direction of Effects for Parent and Peer Support? Journal of Abnormal Psychology. 2004; 113(1): 155-9.

16. La Greca AM, Harrison HM. Adolescent Peer Relations, Friendships, and Romantic Relationships: Do They Predict Social Anxiety and Depression? Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology. 2005; 34(1): 49-61.

17. Bosacki S, Dane A, Marini Z. Peer relationships and internalizing problems in adolescents: Mediating role of self-esteem. Emotional & Behavioural Difficulties. 2007; 12(4): 261-82.

18. Hall-Lande JA, Eisenberg ME, Christenson SL, Neumark-Sztainer D. Social isolation, psychological health, and protective factors in adolescence. Adolescence. 2007; 42(166): 265-86.

19. Klima T, Repetti RL. Children's peer relations and their psychological adjustment: Differences between close friendships and the larger peer group. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly. 2008; 54(2): 151-78.

20. Ellonen N, Kaariainen J, Autio V. Adolescent depression and school social support: A multilevel analysis of a Finnish sample. Journal of Community Psychology. 2008; 36(4): 552-67.

21. Ge X, Natsuaki MN, Neiderhiser JM, Reiss D. The longitudinal effects of stressful life events on adolescent depression are buffered by parent-child closeness. Development and Psychopathology. 2009; 21(2): 621-35.

22. Murberg TA, Bru E. The relationships between negative life events, perceived support in the school environment and depressive symptoms among Norwegian senior high school students: A prospective study. Social Psychology of Education. 2009; 12(3): 361-70.

23. Piko BF, Kovacs E, Fitzpatrick KM. What makes a difference? Understanding the role of protective factors in Hungarian adolescents' depressive symptomatology. European child & adolescent psychiatry. 2009; 18(10): 617-24.

24. Rueger SY, Malecki CK, Demaray MK. Relationship between multiple sources of perceived social support and psychological and academic adjustment in early adolescence: Comparisons across gender. Journal of Youth and Adolescence. 2010; 39(1): 47-61.

25. Samm A, Tooding L-M, Sisask M, Kolves K, Aasvee K, Varnik A. Suicidal thoughts and depressive feelings amongst Estonian schoolchildren: Effect of family relationship and family structure. European child & adolescent psychiatry. 2010; 19(5): 457-68.

26. Auerbach RP, Bigda-Peyton JS, Eberhart NK, Webb CA, Ho M-HR. Conceptualizing the prospective relationship between social support, stress, and depressive symptoms among adolescents. Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology. 2011; 39(4): 475-87.

27. Smojver-Azic S, Bezinovic P. Sex differences in patterns of relations between family interactions and depressive symptoms in adolescents. Croatian Medical Journal. 2011; 52(4): 469-77.

28. Khatib Y, Bhui K, Stansfeld SA. Does social support protect against depression & psychological distress? Findings from the RELACHS study of East London adolescents. Journal of Adolescence. 2013; 36(2): 393-402.

29. Tummala-Narra P, Sathasivam-Rueckert N. Perceived support from adults, interactions with police, and adolescents' depressive symptomology: An examination of sex, race, and social class. Journal of Adolescence. 2013; 36(1): 209-19.

30. Galand B, Hospel V. Peer victimization and school disaffection: exploring the moderation effect of social support and the mediation effect of depression. The British journal of educational psychology. 2013; 83(Pt 4): 569-90.

31. Colman I, Zeng Y, McMartin SE, Naicker K, Ataullahjan A, Weeks M, et al. Protective factors against depression during the transition from adolescence to adulthood: Findings from a national Canadian cohort. Preventive Medicine. 2014; 65: 28-32.

32. Minkkinen J. Associations between school-related factors and depressive symptoms among children: A comparative study, Finland and Norway. School Psychology International. 2014; 35(5): 463-74.

33. Golding JM. Role occupancy and role-specific stress and social support as predictors of depression. Basic and Applied Social Psychology. 1989; 10(2): 173-95.

34. Ross CE, Mirowsky J. Explaining the social patterns of depression: Control and problem solving: or Support and talking? Journal of Health and Social Behavior. 1989; 30(2): 206-19.

35. Franks P, Shields C, Campbell T, McDaniel S, Harp J, Botelho RJ. Association of social relationships with depressive symptoms: Testing an alternative to social support. Journal of Family Psychology. 1992; 6(1): 49-59.

36. Okun MA, Keith VM. Effects of positive and negative social exchanges with various sources on depressive symptoms in younger and older adults. Journals of Gerontology - Series B Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences. 1998; 53(1): P4-P20.

37. Lin N, Ye X, Ensel WM. Social support and depressed mood: A structural analysis. Journal of Health and Social Behavior. 1999; 40(4): 344-59.

38. Bullers S. The mediating role of perceived control in the relationship between social ties and depressive symptoms. Women & Health. 2000; 31(2-3): 97-116.

39. Peirce RS, Frone MR, Russell M, Cooper M, Mudar P. A longitudinal model of social contact, social support, depression, and alcohol use. Health Psychology. 2000; 19(1): 28-38.

40. Wade TD, Kendler KS. The relationship between social support and major depression: Cross-sectional, longitudinal, and genetic perspectives. Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease. 2000; 188(5): 251-8.

41. Wade TJ, Cairney J. The effect of sociodemographics, social stressors, health status and psychosocial resources on the age-depression relationship. Canadian journal of public health = Revue canadienne de sante publique. 2000; 91(4): 307-12.

42. Aro AR, Nyberg N, Absetz P, Henriksson M, Lonnqvist J. Depressive symptoms in middle-aged women are more strongly associated with physical health and social support than with socioeconomic factors. Nordic Journal of Psychiatry. 2001; 55(3): 191-8.

43. Elliot M. Gender differences in causes of depression. Women & Health. 2001; 33(3-4): 163-77.

44. Patten SB. Descriptive epidemiology of a depressive syndrome in a western Canadian community population. Canadian Journal of Public Health. 2001; 92(5): 392-5.

45. Segrin C. Age Moderates the Relationship Between Social Support and Psychosocial Problems. Human Communication Research. 2003; 29(3): 317-42.

46. Shaw BA, Krause N, Chatters LM, Connell CM, Ingersoll-Dayton B. Emotional Support From Parents Early in Life, Aging, and Health. Psychology and Aging. 2004; 19(1): 4-12.

47. Kendler KS, Myers J, Prescott CA. Sex Differences in the Relationship Between Social Support and Risk for Major Depression: A Longitudinal Study of Opposite-Sex Twin Pairs. The American Journal of Psychiatry. 2005; 162(2): 250-6.

48. Dalgard OS, Dowrick C, Lehtinen V, Vazquez-Barquero JL, Casey P, Wilkinson G, et al. Negative life events, social support and gender difference in depression: A multinational community survey with data from the ODIN study. Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology. 2006; 41(6): 444-51.

49. Fiori KL, McIlvane JM, Brown EE, Antonucci TC. Social relations and depressive symptomatology: self-efficacy as a mediator. Aging & mental health. 2006; 10(3): 227-39.

50. Heponiemi T, Elovainio M, Kivimaki M, Pulkki L, Puttonen S, Keltikangas-Jarvinen L. The longitudinal effects of social support and hostility on depressive tendencies. Social Science & Medicine. 2006; 63(5): 1374-82.

51. Ruiz SA, Silverstein M. Relationships with grandparents and the emotional well-being of late adolescent and young adult grandchildren. Journal of Social Issues. 2007; 63(4): 793-808.

52. Wareham S, Fowler K, Pike A. Determinants of depression severity and duration in Canadian adults: The moderating effects of gender and social support. Journal of Applied Social Psychology. 2007; 37(12): 2951-79.

53. Stojanovic-Spehar S, Blazekovic-Milakovic S, Amerl-Sakic V, Kolic N, Supe S. Depression prevalence and estimation of psychosocial parameters within adult population in city of Zagreb. Psychiatria Danubina. 2009; 21(4): 497-507.

54. Hefner J, Eisenberg D. Social support and mental health among college students. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry. 2009; 79(4): 491-9.

55. Moak ZB, Agrawal A. The association between perceived interpersonal social support and physical and mental health: results from the national epidemiological survey on alcohol and related conditions. Journal of Public Health. 2010; 32(2): 191-201.

56. Patten SB, Williams JV, Lavorato DH, Bulloch AG. Reciprocal effects of social support in major depression epidemiology. Clinical Practice and Epidemiology in Mental Health. 2010; 6: 126-31.

57. Simon RW, Barrett AE. Nonmarital romantic relationships and mental health in early adulthood: Does the association differ for women and men? Journal of Health and Social Behavior. 2010; 51(2): 168-82.

58. Almeida J, Subramanian S, Kawachi I, Molnar B. Is blood thicker than water? Social support, depression and the modifying role of ethnicity/nativity status. Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health. 2011; 65(1): 51-6.

59. Grumer S, Pinquart M. Perceived changes in personal circumstances related to social change: Associations with psychosocial resources and depressive symptoms. European Psychologist. 2011; 16(1): 68-78.

60. Sherman AM, Skrzypek A, Bell R, Tatum C, Paskett ED. The contribution of social support and social strain to depressive symptoms in African American, Native American, and European American women. Journal of Social and Personal Relationships. 2011; 28(8): 1104-29.

61. Stafford M, McMunn A, Zaninotto P, Nazroo J. Positive and negative exchanges in social relationships as predictors of depression: Evidence from the English Longitudinal Study of Aging. Journal of Aging and Health. 2011; 23(4): 607-28.

62. Biehle SN, Mickelson KD. Provision and receipt of emotional spousal support: The impact of visibility on well-being. Couple and Family Psychology: Research and Practice. 2012; 1(3): 244-51.

63. Grav S, Hellzen O, Romild U, Stordal E. Association between social support and depression in the general population: The HUNT study, a cross-sectional survey. Journal of Clinical Nursing. 2012; 21(1-2): 111-20.

64. Teo AR, Choi H, Valenstein M. Social relationships and depression: ten-year follow-up from a nationally representative study. PloS one. 2013; 8(4): e62396.

65. McKenzie LE, Polur RN, Wesley C, Allen JD, McKeown RE, Zhang J. Social contacts and depression in middle and advanced adulthood: findings from a US national survey, 2005-2008. The International journal of social psychiatry. 2013; 59(7): 627-35.

66. Barger SD, Messerli-Buergy N, Barth J. Social relationship correlates of major depressive disorder and depressive symptoms in Switzerland: nationally representative cross sectional study. Bmc Public Health. 2014; 14.

67. Barth J, Hofmann K, Schori D. Depression in early adulthood: prevalence and psychosocial correlates among young Swiss men. Swiss medical weekly. 2014; 144: w13945.

68. Lewis GJ, Bates TC, Posthuma D, Polderman TJC. Core Dimensions of Personality Broadly Account for the Link from Perceived Social Support to Symptoms of Depression and Anxiety. Journal of Personality. 2014; 82(4): 329-39.

69. Wilson KT, Bohnert AE, Ambrose A, Davis DY, Jones DM, Magee MJ. Social, behavioral, and sleep characteristics associated with depression symptoms among undergraduate students at a women's college: a cross-sectional depression survey, 2012. Bmc Womens Health. 2014; 14.

70. Grant I, Patterson TL, Yager J. Social supports in relation to physical health and symptoms of depression in the elderly. The American Journal of Psychiatry. 1988; 145(10): 1254-8.

71. Krause N, Liang J, Yatomi N. Satisfaction with social support and depressive symptoms: A panel analysis. Psychology and Aging. 1989; 4(1): 88-97.

72. Dean A, Kolody B, Wood P. Effects of social support from various sources on depression in elderly persons. Journal of Health and Social Behavior. 1990; 31(2): 148-61.

73. Palinkas LA, Wingard DL, Barrett-Connor E. The biocultural context of social networks and depression among the elderly. Social Science & Medicine. 1990; 30(4): 441-7.

74. Russell DW, Cutrona CE. Social support, stress, and depressive symptoms among the elderly: Test of a process model. Psychology and Aging. 1991; 6(2): 190-201.

75. Oxman TE, Berkman LF, Kasl S, Freeman DH, Jr., Barrett J. Social support and depressive symptoms in the elderly. American journal of epidemiology. 1992; 135(4): 356-68.

76. Kivela S-L, Kongas-Saviaro P, Laippala P, Pahkala K, Kesti E. Social and psychosocial factors predicting depression in old age: A longitudinal study. International Psychogeriatrics. 1996; 8(4): 635-44.

77. Antonucci TC, Fuhrer R, Dartigues J-F. Social relations and depressive symptomatology in a sample of community-dwelling French older adults. Psychology and Aging. 1997; 12(1): 189-95.

78. Prince M, Harwood R, Blizard R, Thomas A. Social support deficits, loneliness and life events as risk factors for depression in old age. The Gospel Oak Project VI. Psychological Medicine. 1997; 27(2): 323-32.

79. Fernandez ME, Mutran EJ, Reitzes DC. Moderating the effects of stress on depressive symptoms. Research on Aging. 1998; 20(2): 163-82.

80. Bisconti TL, Bergeman C. Perceived social control as a mediator of the relationships among social support, psychological well-being, and perceived health. The Gerontologist. 1999; 39(1): 94-103.

81. Schoevers RA, Beekman ATF, Deeg DJH, Geerlings MI, Jonker C, Van Tilburg W. Risk factors for depression in later life; results of a prospective community based study (AMSTEL). Journal of Affective Disorders. 2000; 59(2): 127-37.

82. Antonucci TC, Lansford JE, Akiyama H. Impact of positive and negative aspects of marital relationships and friendships on well-being of older adults. Applied Developmental Science. 2001; 5(2): 68-75.

83. Wallace K, Bisconti TL, Bergeman C. The mediational effect of hardiness on social support and optimal outcomes in later life. Basic and Applied Social Psychology. 2001; 23(4): 267-79.

84. Zunzunegui MV, Beland F, Otero A. Support from children, living arrangements, self-rated health and depressive symptoms of older people in Spain. International Journal of Epidemiology. 2001; 30(5): 1090-9.

85. Minicuci N, Maggi S, Pavan M, Enzi G, Crepaldi G. Prevalence rate and correlates of depressive symptoms in older individuals: The Veneto study. Journals of Gerontology - Series A Biological Sciences and Medical Sciences. 2002; 57(3): M155-M61.

86. Osborn DP, Fletcher AE, Smeeth L, Stirling S, Bulpitt CJ, Breeze E, et al. Factors associated with depression in a representative sample of 14 217 people aged 75 and over in the United Kingdom: Results from the MRC trial of assessment and management of older people in the community. International Journal of Geriatric Psychiatry. 2003; 18(7): 623-30.

87. Vanderhorst R, McLaren S. Social relationships as predictors of depression and suicidal ideation in older adults. Aging & mental health. 2005; 9(6): 517-25.

88. Cacioppo JT, Hughes ME, Waite LJ, Hawkley LC, Thisted RA. Loneliness as a specific risk factor for depressive symptoms: Cross-sectional and longitudinal analyses. Psychology and Aging. 2006; 21(1): 140-51.

89. Harris T, Cook DG, Victor C, DeWilde S, Beighton C. Onset and persistence of depression in older people - Results from a 2-year community follow-up study. Age and Ageing. 2006; 35(1): 25-32.

90. St John PD, Blandford AA, Strain LA. Depressive symptoms among older adults in urban and rural areas. International Journal of Geriatric Psychiatry. 2006; 21(12): 1175-80.

91. Golden J, Conroy RM, Bruce I, Denihan A, Greene E, Kirby M, et al. Loneliness, social support networks, mood and wellbeing in community-dwelling elderly. International Journal of Geriatric Psychiatry. 2009; 24(7): 694-700.

92. Golden J, Conroy RM, Lawlor BA. Social support network structure in older people: Underlying dimensions and association with psychological and physical health. Psychology, Health & Medicine. 2009; 14(3): 280-90.

93. Mechakra-Tahiri SD, Zunzunegui MV, Preville M, Dube M. Gender, social relationships and depressive disorders in adults aged 65 and over in Quebec. Chronic diseases in Canada. 2010; 30(2): 56-65.

94. Choi NG, Ha JH. Relationship between spouse/partner support and depressive symptoms in older adults: gender difference. Aging & mental health. 2011; 15(3): 307-17.

95. Coleman PG, Carare RO, Petrov I, Forbes E, Saigal A, Spreadbury JH, et al. Spiritual belief, social support, physical functioning and depression among older people in Bulgaria and Romania. Aging & mental health. 2011; 15(3): 327-33.

96. Glaesmer H, Riedel-Heller S, Braehler E, Spangenberg L, Luppa M. Age- and gender-specific prevalence and risk factors for depressive symptoms in the elderly: a population-based study. International psychogeriatrics / IPA. 2011; 23(8): 1294-300.

97. Sonnenberg C, Deeg D, van Tilburg T, Vink D, Stek M, Beekman A. Gender differences in the relation between depression and social support in later life. International Psychogeriatrics. 2013; 25(1): 61-70.

98. Sjoberg L, Ostling S, Falk H, Sundh V, Waern M, Skoog I. Secular changes in the relation between social factors and depression: a study of two birth cohorts of Swedish septuagenarians followed for 5 years. J Affect Disord. 2013; 150(2): 245-52.

99. Uebelacker LA, Eaton CB, Weisberg R, Sands M, Williams C, Calhoun D, et al. Social support and physical activity as moderators of life stress in predicting baseline depression and change in depression over time in the Women's Health Initiative. Soc Psychiatry Psychiatr Epidemiol. 2013; 48(12): 1971-82.

100. Djundeva M, Mills M, Wittek R, Steverink N. Receiving Instrumental Support in Late Parent-Child Relationships and Parental Depression. The journals of gerontology Series B, Psychological sciences and social sciences. 2014.

101. Park NS, Jang Y, Lee BS, Ko JE, Chiriboga DA. The Impact of Social Resources on Depressive Symptoms in Racially and Ethnically Diverse Older Adults: Variations by Groups With Differing Health Risks. Research on Aging. 2014; 36(3): 322-42.