## https://doi.org/10.1027/1016-9040/a000478

Author(s)	Title	Reason(s) for exclusion
Barbovski & Marinescu	Being in contact with strangers: Teenagers' exploration of	- Focus only on risk experience and not association
(2011)	alternative identities online	with wellbeing, online resilience, or digital literacy
Cao & Lin (2015)	How do victims react to cyberbullying on social	- Focus on bystander reaction strategies to
	networking sites? The influence of previous cyberbullying	cyberbullying
	victimization experiences	
Ferrari (2013)	DIGCOMP: A framework for developing and	- Framework of digital competence; online risks,
	understanding digital competence in Europe	online resilience or wellbeing not included
Görzig (2016)	Adolescents' experience of offline and online risks:	- Focus on online risk experiences, not association
	Separate and joint propensities	with online resilience, digital literacy, or wellbeing
Hatlevik et al. (2015)	Predictors of digital competence in 7th grade: A multilevel	- Association of digital competence with risk
	analysis	experiences, online resilience, or wellbeing was not
		tested
Hatlevik et al. (2018)	Students' ICT self-efficacy and computer and information	- Association of digital competence with risk
	literacy: Determinants and relationships	experiences, online resilience, or wellbeing was not
		tested
Jacobs et al. (2014)	Determinants of adolescents' ineffective and improved	- Delphi study with experts
	coping with cyberbullying: A Delphi study	
James et al. (2017)	New challenges in adolescent safeguarding	- Review article instead of empirical study

## Table E4. Overview of studies subjected to full-text review but excluded from the final review

## https://doi.org/10.1027/1016-9040/a000478

Jonsson et al. (2015)	Online sexual behaviours among Swedish youth:	- Minimum age is 16, does not include larger range of
	Associations to background factors, behaviours and abuse	secondary school age (12 to 18)
Lough et al. (2015)	Mapping real-world to online vulnerability in young people	- Review article instead of empirical study
	with developmental disorders: Illustrations from autism	
	and Williams syndrome	
Machackova et al. (2013)	Effectiveness of coping strategies for victims of	- Focus on effectiveness of coping strategies, not on
	cyberbullying	association with digital literacy or wellbeing
Navarro et al. (2018)	Differences between preadolescent victims and non-victims	- Age of sample is too young (10 to 12 years old)
	of cyberbullying in cyber-relationship motives and coping	
	strategies for handling problems with peers	
Pereira & Matos (2016)	Cyber-stalking victimization: What predicts fear among	- Focus on experience with cyber-stalking, not on
	Portuguese adolescents?	association with online resilience, digital literacy, or
		wellbeing
Pereira et al. (2016)	Cyber-harassment victimization in Portugal: Prevalence,	- Focus on risk experience, not on association with
	fear and help-seeking among adolescents	online resilience, digital literacy, or wellbeing
Resnik & Bellmore (2019)	Connecting online and offline social skills to adolescents'	- Measure of peer victimization also includes offline
	peer victimization and psychological adjustment	victimization
Savimäki & Kaakinen	Disquieted by online hate: Negative experiences of Finnish	- Focus on risk experience, not on association with
(2018)	adolescents and young adults	online resilience, digital literacy, or wellbeing
Singh (2018)	Mapping online child safety in Asia and the Pacific	- Review article instead of empirical study

Soldatova & Rasskazova	Adolescent safety on the internet	- Sample includes children younger than 12 years old
(2016)		- Focus on risk experience, not on association with
		online resilience, digital literacy, or wellbeing
Sumter & Baumgartner	Psychosomatic complaints in adolescence: Untangling the	- Focus on psychosomatic complaints rather than
(2017)	relationship between offline and online peer victimization,	psychological wellbeing
	psychosomatic complaints and social support	
Van Ingen & Matzat	Inequality in mobilizing online help after a negative life	- Minimum age is 16, does not include larger range of
(2019)	event: the role of education, digital skills, and capital-	secondary school age (12 to 18)
	enhancing Internet use	
Van Ingen et al. (2016)	Online coping after negative life events: Measurement,	- Minimum age is 16, does not include larger range of
	prevalence, and relation with internet activities and well-	secondary school age (12 to 18)
	being	
Youn (2009)	Determinants of online privacy concern and its influence	- Focus on concern about risk and not actual risk
	on privacy protection behaviors among young adolescents	experience
Zilka (2018)	eSafety and sharing habits with family and friends among	- Focus on digital literacy, not on association with
	children and adolescents	online risk experience, online resilience, or wellbeing