

Table E2. Assessment of weight of evidence

Author(s)	Methodological trustworthiness	Relevance to the review
Bahramian et al. (2018)	Medium	High
Cabello-Hutt et al. (2018)	High	Medium
El Asam & Katz (2018)	High	Medium
Hinduja & Patchin (2017)	High	Medium
Hudson et al. (2016)	High	Medium
Jacobs et al. (2015)	Medium	Medium
Keipi et al. (2018)	High	Medium
Lee & Chae (2012)	Medium	Medium
Livingstone & Helsper (2010)	High	Medium
Livingstone et al. (2017)	High	Medium
Lwin et al. (2012)	Medium	Medium
McHugh et al. (2017)	Medium	High
McHugh et al. (2018)	Medium	High
Modecki & Barber (2013)	High	Medium
Nansen et al. (2012)	Medium	High
Notten & Nikken (2016)	High	Medium
Priebe & Svedin (2012)	Medium	Medium
Racatau (2014)	Medium	Medium
Ramos-Soler et al. (2018)	Medium	Medium
Rodriguez-de-Dios et al. (2018)	High	Medium
Rose & Tynes (2015)	High	Medium
Sevcikova et al. (2014)	High	Medium
Soldatova & Zotova (2013)	Medium	Medium
Sonck & de Haan (2013)	High	Medium
Staksrud et al. (2013)	High	Medium
Teimouri et al. (2018)	Medium	Medium
Van Den Eijnden et al. (2014)	Medium	Medium
Vandoninck & d'Haenens (2015)	Medium	Medium
Vandoninck et al. (2010)	Medium	High

Vandoninck et al. (2013)

Medium

High

Notes. Criteria for the assessment of methodological trustworthiness: study design, context, sampling, data collection, data analysis, claims and evidence

Criteria for the assessment of relevance: study one central concept in relation to risks (= medium score), study association between two or more concepts (= high score)