

Supplementary A

Summary of four systematic reviews in similar topic

No	Author/ Year	Objective	Databases	Inclusion Criteria	Exclusion criteria	n	Descriptions and findings
1	Harrandi et al. (2017)	To investigate the effect size of the relationship between social support and mental health in studies in Iran.	Iranian Research Institute of Information Science and Technology (IRANDOC), Scientific Information Database (SID), Magiran, Comprehensive Portal of Human Sciences, Noor specialized magazine, Proquest, PubMed, Scopus, ERIC, Iranmedex, Google Scholar.	1) Unpublished or published studies, thesis or dissertations. 2) Studies should be performed on the correlation of social support with mental health. 3) The theses should be related to the M.Sc. or Ph.D. degree (available in IRANDOC). 4) The method should be experimental, quasi-experimental, post-event, or correlational. 5) Studies should be performed during the years 1996 through 2015. 6) Language include Persian and English.	1) Failure to investigate the relationship between social support and mental health. 2) Absence of full-text of article. 3) Failure to report statistics to calculate effect sizes. 4) Descriptive study or review.	64	General population in Iran including older adults. The mean effect size of the total studies was 0.356 (fixed-effect model) and 0.330 (random-effect model). Nine studies with older adults as the population had a mean effect size of 0.257 ($p < 0.001$).
2	Gariepy et al. (2016)	To summarise existing knowledge on social support and protection from depression.	PubMed Medline, ISI, Web of Science, PsychINFO.	1) Observational study from the general population, across any life period 2) Assessed the association between social support and depression or depressive symptoms. 3) Original publications based on individual-level data. 4) Provides quantitative measure of association. 5) Western studies.	1) Excluded studies on specific subpopulations.	100	Studies were divided into children ($n = 31$) and adolescents ($n = 36$), adults, and older adults ($n = 33$). The older adults were 50 years and above. Over 90% of the studies among older adults found a significant association between social support and protection from depression (pooled OR = 0.56, 95% CI 0.55-0.57, OR range = 0.06 to 1.49). Spouses were the main source of support associated with lower depression, followed by friends. Evidence for family support were less consistent. Emotional and instrumental

3	Schwarzbach et al. (2014)	To analyse the association of social relations and depression in older adults.	MEDLINE, Web of Science, Cochrane Library, PSYNDEXplus, EMBASE, and PsychInfo	<p>6) Language: English, French, Finnish.</p> <p>1) Papers published from January 2000 to December 2012.</p> <p>2) Populations aged 60 years and above.</p> <p>3) Language: English and German.</p> <p>4) Studies assessing social support, network, or relations as risk factors of depression</p> <p>5) Nationally or regionally representative studies</p> <p>6) Multivariate analysis adjusting for confounders</p> <p>7) Acceptable definition of depression (diagnostic criteria or cut-off on a depression rating scale).</p>	37	<p>support was also associated with protection from depression.</p> <p>Older adults in 13 countries. 10 studies from South and East Asia were included in the study. Social relationship terminology was used encompassing a wide range of dimensions in a comprehensive framework.</p> <p>Social support, quality of relations, and presence of confidants were factors of social relations that were found to be associated with depression.</p> <p>Cultural differences was found in terms of frequency of contact and marital status and their association with depression among eastern and western countries.</p>
4	Tajvar et al. (2013)	To systematically review quantitative studies exploring the association between social support (SS) and the health of older people in Middle Eastern countries.	Embase (since 1974), Medline via Ovid (since 1948), Ovid: Full Text Journals PubMed, Web of Science, PsycEXTRA, PsycINFO, Global Health, Age Info, Eldis, IMEMR, Asia-Pacific Population Journal, Eastern Mediterranean Health Journal, Middle East Journal of Age and Ageing, Iran Medical	<p>1) Original studies conducted in the Middle East.</p> <p>1) Studies that included only participants younger than 60 years old.</p> <p>2) Studies which measured both SS and health but did not examine the association between them; qualitative studies, commentaries, editorial letters</p>	22	<p>General population including older adults. Nine studies had older adults only. It included studies with population with specific diseases and multiple health outcomes; mental health, functional health, health related quality of life and self-rated health.</p> <p>Perceived social support was the most researched, showing strong association with mental health compared to received social support. Strong and positive relationship was found between social support and mental health, while inconsistent results were found with other health outcomes.</p>

Index, Iranian
Information and
Documentation Centre
(IRANDOC), Scientific
Information Database,
Iranian Journal of
Ageing.

and descriptive
discussions.



Supplementary B

Search protocol performed in PubMed

#1	Search (((((((((((((((((((((((('social support'[Title/Abstract]) OR 'social relation*'[Title/Abstract]) OR 'social relationship*'[Title/Abstract]) OR 'social network*'[Title/Abstract]) OR 'social capital'[Title/Abstract]) OR 'social isolation'[Title/Abstract]) OR 'social participation'[Title/Abstract]) OR 'interpersonal relation*'[Title/Abstract]) OR 'interpersonal support'[Title/Abstract]) OR 'family support'[Title/Abstract]) OR 'family structure'[Title/Abstract]) OR 'familial context'[Title/Abstract]) OR 'family relations*'[Title/Abstract]) OR 'familial support'[Title/Abstract]) OR 'emotional support'[Title/Abstract]) OR 'financial support'[Title/Abstract]) OR 'instrumental support'[Title/Abstract]) OR 'tangible support'[Title/Abstract]) OR 'informational support'[Title/Abstract]) OR 'appraisal support'[Title/Abstract]) OR 'companionship support'[Title/Abstract]) OR 'structural support'[Title/Abstract]) OR 'functional support'[Title/Abstract]) OR 'perceived social support'[Title/Abstract]) OR 'received social support'[Title/Abstract]) OR 'perceived isolation'[Title/Abstract]) OR 'received support'[Title/Abstract]) OR 'social resources'[Title/Abstract]) OR 'support satisfaction'[Title/Abstract]) OR 'relationship satisfaction'[Title/Abstract])))	Concept 1
#2	Search (((((((((((((((((((((((ag\$ing[MeSH Terms]) OR retire*[MeSH Terms]) OR "middle age*" [MeSH Terms]) OR "older person*" [MeSH Terms]) OR geriatric*[MeSH Terms]) OR senior*[MeSH Terms]) OR elder*[MeSH Terms]) OR old*[MeSH Terms]) OR aged[MeSH Terms]) OR ag\$ing[Title/Abstract]) OR retire*[Title/Abstract]) OR "middle age*" [Title/Abstract]) OR "older person*" [Title/Abstract]) OR geriatric*[Title/Abstract]) OR senior*[Title/Abstract]) OR elder*[Title/Abstract]) OR old*[Title/Abstract]) OR aged[Title/Abstract])))	Concept 2
#3	Search ((((((community[Title/Abstract]) OR 'community\$dwelling'[Title/Abstract]) OR community[MeSH Terms]) OR 'community\$dwelling'[MeSH Terms])))	Concept 3
#4	Search (((((((((((health[Title/Abstract]) OR health[MeSH Terms]) OR 'health outcome'[Title/Abstract]) OR 'health outcome'[MeSH Terms]) OR 'mental health'[Title/Abstract]) OR 'mental health'[MeSH Terms]) OR 'physical health'[Title/Abstract]) OR 'physical health'[MeSH Terms]) OR depression[Title/Abstract]) OR depression[MeSH Terms]) OR depressive[Title/Abstract]) OR depressive[MeSH Terms]	Concept 4
#5	#1 AND #2 AND ## AND #4	All

Search protocol in CINAHL, Psychology and Behavioural Sciences Collection and SociINDEX via Ebscohost.

S1	TI "social support*" OR TI "social relation*" OR TI "social relationship*" OR TI "social network*" OR TI "social capital" OR TI "social isolation" OR TI "social participation" OR TI "interpersonal relation*" OR TI "interpersonal support" OR TI "family support" OR TI "family structure" OR TI "familial context" OR TI "family relation*" OR TI "familial support" OR TI "emotional support" OR TI "financial support" OR TI "instrumental support" OR TI "tangible support" OR TI "informational support" OR TI "appraisal support" OR TI "companionship support" OR TI "structural social support" OR TI "functional social support" OR TI "perceived support" OR TI "received support" OR TI "social resources" OR TI "perceives isolation" OR TI "received support" OR TI "support satisfaction" OR TI "relationship satisfaction"	Concept 1
S2	AB "social support*" OR AB "social relation*" OR AB "social relationship" OR AB "social network*" OR AB "social capital"" OR AB "social isolation" OR AB "social participation" OR AB "interpersonal relation*" OR AB "interpersonal support" OR AB "family support" OR AB "family structure" OR AB "familial context" OR AB "family relation*" OR AB "familial support" OR AB "emotional support" OR AB "financial support" OR AB "instrumental support" OR AB "tangible support" OR AB "informational support" OR AB "appraisal support" OR AB "companionship support" OR AB "structural social support" OR AB "functional social support" OR AB "perceived support" OR AB "received support" OR AB "social resources" OR AB "perceives isolation" OR AB "received support" OR AB "support satisfaction" OR AB "relationship satisfaction"	Concept 1
S3	MW "social support*" OR MW "social relation*" OR MW "social relationship" OR MW "social network*" OR MW "social capital"" OR MW "social isolation" OR MW "social participation" OR MW "interpersonal relation*" OR MW "interpersonal support" OR MW "family support" OR MW "family structure" OR MW "familial context" OR MW "family relation*" OR MW "familial support" OR MW "emotional support" OR MW "financial support" OR MW "instrumental support" OR MW "tangible support" OR MW "informational support" OR MW "appraisal support" OR MW "companionship support" OR MW "structural social support" OR MW "functional social support" OR MW "perceived support" OR MW "received support" OR MW "social resources" OR MW "perceives isolation" OR MW "received support" OR MW "support satisfaction" OR MW "relationship satisfaction"	Concept 1
S4	TI aged OR TI old* OR TI elder* OR TI senior* OR TI geriatric OR TI "older person*" OR TI "middle age*" OR TI retire* OR TI ageing OR TI aging OR AB aged OR AB old* OR AB elder* OR AB senior* OR AB geriatric OR AB "older person*" OR AB "middle age*" OR AB retire* OR AB ageing OR AB aging OR	Concept 2

	MW aged OR MW old* OR MW elder* OR MW senior* OR MW geriatric OR MW "older person*" OR MW "middle age*" OR MW retire* OR MW ageing OR MW aging	
S5	TI community OR AB community OR MW community OR TI "community*dwelling" OR AB "community*dwelling" OR MW "community*dwelling"	Concept 3
S6	TI health OR AB health OR MW health OR TI "health outcome*" OR AB "health outcome*" OR MW "health outcome*" OR TI "mental health" OR AB "mental health" OR MW "mental health" OR TI "physical health" OR AB "physical health" OR MW "physical health" OR TI depression OR MW depression OR TI depressive OR MW depressive	Concept 4
S7	S1 OR S2 OR S3	Concept 1
S8	(S1 OR S2 OR S3) AND (S4 AND S5 AND S6 AND S7)	All

Search protocol in PsychINFO

#1	(<social support*> or <social relation*> or <social relationship> or <social capital> or <social network*> or <social isolation or <social participation> or <interpersonal relation*> or <interpersonal support> or <family support> or <family structure> or <familial context> or <family relationship*> or <familial support> or <emotional support> or <financial support> or <Instrumental support> or <tangible support> or <Informational support> or <appraisal support> or <companionship support> or <structural social support> or <functional social support> or <perceived social support> or <received social support> or <perceived isolation> or <received support> or <received support> or <social resource*> or <relationship satisfaction> or <support satisfaction>).ab.	Concept 1
#2	TOPIC: ("perceived isolation") OR TOPIC: ("received support") OR TOPIC: ("social (<social support*> or <social relation*> or <social relationship> or <social capital> or <social network*> or <social isolation or <social participation> or <interpersonal relation*> or <interpersonal support> or <family support> or <family structure> or <familial context> or <family relationship*> or <familial support> or <emotional support> or <financial support> or <Instrumental support> or <tangible support> or <Informational support> or <appraisal support> or <companionship support> or <structural social support> or <functional social support> or <perceived social support> or <received social support> or <perceived isolation> or <received support> or <received support> or <social resource*> or <relationship satisfaction> or <support satisfaction>).mh.	Concept 1
#3	(<social support*> or <social relation*> or <social relationship> or <social capital> or <social network*> or <social isolation or <social participation> or	Concept 1

	<interpersonal relation*> or <interpersonal support> or <family support> or <family structure> or <familial context> or <family relationship*> or <familial support> or <emotional support> or <financial support> or <Instrumental support> or <tangible support> or <Informational support> or <appraisal support> or <companionship support> or <structural social support> or <functional social support> or <perceived social support> or <received social support> or <perceived isolation> or <received support> or <received support> or <social resource*> or <relationship satisfaction> or <support satisfaction>).ti.	
#4	1 or 2 or 3	Concept 1
#5	(aged or old* or elder* or senior* or geriatric or <older person*> or <middle age*> or retire* or ageing or aging).ti.	Concept 2
#6	(aged or old* or elder* or senior* or geriatric or <older person*> or <middle age*> or retire* or ageing or aging).ab.	Concept 2
#7	(aged or old* or elder* or senior* or geriatric or <older person*> or <middle age*> or retire* or ageing or aging).mh.	Concept 2
#8	5 or 6 or 7	Concept 2
#9	(community or <community*dwelling>).mh. or (community or <community*dwelling>).ab. or (community or <community*dwelling>).ti.	Concept 3
#10	(<quality of life> or health or <health outcome*> or <mental health> or <physical health> or depression or depressive).mh. or (<quality of life> or health or <health outcome*> or <mental health> or <physical health> or depression or depressive).ab. or (<quality of life> or health or <health outcome*> or <mental health> or <physical health> or depression or depressive).ti.	Concept 3
#11	(health or <health outcome*> or <mental health> or <physical health> or <depression> or <depressive>).mh. or (health or <health outcome*> or <mental health> or <physical health> or <depression> or <depressive>).ab. or (health or <health outcome*> or <mental health> or <physical health> or <depression> or <depressive>).ti.	Concept 3
#12	9 or 10 or 11	Concept 3
#13	4 or 8 or 12	All

Search protocol in Web of Science

#1	<p>TOPIC: ("social support*") OR TOPIC: ("social relation*") OR TOPIC: ("social relationship*") OR TOPIC: ("social capital") OR TOPIC: ("social network*") OR TOPIC: ("social isolation") OR TOPIC: ("social participation") OR TOPIC: ("interpersonal relation*") OR TOPIC: ("interpersonal support") OR TOPIC: ("family support") OR TOPIC: ("family structure") OR TOPIC: ("familial context") OR TOPIC: ("family relationship*") OR TOPIC: ("familial support") OR TOPIC: ("emotional support") OR TOPIC: ("financial support") OR TOPIC: ("instrumental support") OR TOPIC: ("tangible support") OR TOPIC: ("informational support") OR TOPIC: ("appraisal support") OR TOPIC: ("companionship support") OR TOPIC: ("structural social support") OR TOPIC: ("functional social support") OR TOPIC: ("perceived social support") OR TOPIC: ("received social support")</p> <p><i>Indexes=SCI-EXPANDED, SSCI, A&HCI, CPCI-S, CPCI-SSH, ESCI Timespan=All years</i></p>	Concept 1
#2	<p>TOPIC: ("perceived isolation") OR TOPIC: ("received support") OR TOPIC: ("social resources") OR TOPIC: ("relationship satisfaction") OR TOPIC: ("support satisfaction")</p> <p><i>Indexes=SCI-EXPANDED, SSCI, A&HCI, CPCI-S, CPCI-SSH, ESCI Timespan=All years</i></p>	Concept 1
#3	<p>#1 OR #2</p> <p><i>Indexes=SCI-EXPANDED, SSCI, A&HCI, CPCI-S, CPCI-SSH, ESCI Timespan=All years</i></p>	Concept 1
#4	<p>TOPIC: ("aged") OR TOPIC: ("elder") OR TOPIC: ("senior") OR TOPIC: ("geriatric") OR TOPIC: ("older person") OR TOPIC: ("middle age") OR TOPIC: ("retire") OR TOPIC: ("aging")</p> <p><i>Indexes=SCI-EXPANDED, SSCI, A&HCI, CPCI-S, CPCI-SSH, ESCI Timespan=All years</i></p>	Concept 2
#5	<p>TOPIC: (community) OR TOPIC: (community-dwelling) OR TOPIC: (community dwelling)</p> <p><i>Indexes=SCI-EXPANDED, SSCI, A&HCI, CPCI-S, CPCI-SSH, ESCI Timespan=All years</i></p>	Concept 3
#6	<p>TOPIC: (health) OR TOPIC: ("mental health") OR TOPIC: ("physical health") OR TOPIC: ("health outcome*") OR TOPIC: (depression) OR TOPIC: (depressive)</p> <p><i>Indexes=SCI-EXPANDED, SSCI, A&HCI, CPCI-S, CPCI-SSH, ESCI Timespan=All years</i></p>	Concept 4
#7	<p>#3 AND #4 AND #5 AND #6</p> <p><i>Indexes=SCI-EXPANDED, SSCI, A&HCI, CPCI-S, CPCI-SSH, ESCI Timespan=All years</i></p>	All

Supplementary C

DATA EXTRACTION FORM

Title		Year
Author(s)		

Country/ setting	
Aims	
Clear objectives?	
Ethics	
Study design	Cohort / Cross sectional
Sampling method	
Population	
Sampling frame	
Sample size	
Recruitment	
Time study conducted	
Response rate	
Inclusion	
Exclusion	
Is there a comparator grp?	

Definition			
Social support			
Methods			
	Exposure	Tools	Validation
1			
2			
3			
4			
5			

OUTCOME

	Outcome	Tools	Validation
1			
2			
3			
4			
5			

RESULTS

Outcome	Effect size	Confounding factors	Statistical test	Is the test appropriate? yes/no
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				

SUMMARY FINDINGS

Supplementary D

NEWCASTLE-OTTAWA SCALE (adapted for cross-sectional studies)

Article/ Author: _____

Title: _____

I	Selection: (Maximum 5 stars)	Notes
	1) Representativeness of the sample: a) Truly representative of the average in the target population. * (all subjects or random sampling). b) Somewhat representative of the average in the target population. * (nonrandom sampling). c) Selected group of users. d) No description of the sampling strategy.	
	2) Sample size: a) Justified and satisfactory. * b) Not justified.	
	3) Non-respondents: a) Comparability between respondents and non-respondents characteristic cross-sectional is established, and the response rate is satisfactory. * b) The response rate is unsatisfactory, or the comparability between respondents and non-respondents is unsatisfactory. c) No description of the response rate or the characteristic cross- sectional of the responders and the non-responders.	
	4) Ascertainment of the exposure (risk factor): a) Validated measurement tool. ** b) Non-validated measurement tool, but the tool is available or described.* c) No description of the measurement tool.	
II	Comparability: (Maximum 2 stars)	
	1) The subjects in different outcome groups are comparable, based on the study design or analysis. Confounding factors are controlled. a) The study controls for the most important factor (select one). * b) The study control for any additional factor. *	
III	Outcome: (Maximum 3 stars)	
	1) Assessment of the outcome: a) Independent blind assessment. ** b) Record linkage. ** c) Self report. * d) No description.	

	2) Statistical test: a) The statistical test used to analyze the data is clearly described and appropriate, and the measurement of the association is presented, including confidence intervals and the probability level (p value). * b) The statistical test is not appropriate, not described or incomplete.	
--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

Thresholds for converting the Newcastle-Ottawa scales to AHRQ standards (good, fair, and poor):

- **Good quality:** 3 or 4 stars in selection domain AND 1 or 2 stars in comparability domain AND 2 or 3 stars in outcome/exposure domain
- **Fair quality:** 2 stars in selection domain AND 1 or 2 stars in comparability domain AND 2 or 3 stars in outcome/exposure domain
- **Poor quality:** 0 or 1 star in selection domain OR 0 stars in comparability domain OR 0 or 1 stars in outcome/exposure domain

Supplementary E

Newcastle-Ottawa Quality Assessment Form for Cohort Studies

Note: A study can be given a maximum of one star for each numbered item within the Selection and Outcome categories. A maximum of two stars can be given for Comparability.

I	Selection (Maximum 4 stars)	Notes
	1) Representativeness of the exposed cohort a) Truly representative * b) Somewhat representative * c) Selected group d) No description of the derivation of the cohort	
	2) Selection of the non-exposed cohort a) Drawn from the same community as the exposed cohort * b) Drawn from a different source c) No description of the derivation of the non-exposed cohort	
	3) Ascertainment of exposure a) Secure record (e.g., surgical record) * b) Structured interview * c) Written self-report d) No description e) Other	
	4) Demonstration that outcome of interest was not present at start of study a) Yes * b) No	
II	Comparability (Maximum 2 stars)	
	1) Comparability of cohorts on the basis of the design or analysis controlled for confounders a) The study controls for age, sex, and marital status * b) Study controls for other factors (list) _____ * c) Cohorts are not comparable on the basis of the design or analysis controlled for confounders	
III	Outcome (Maximum 3 stars)	
	1) Assessment of outcome a) Independent blind assessment * b) Record linkage * c) Self report d) No description e) Other	

	2) Was follow-up long enough for outcomes to occur a) Yes * b) No Indicate the median duration of follow-up and a brief rationale for the assessment above: _____	
	3) Adequacy of follow-up of cohorts a) Complete follow up- all subject accounted for * b) Subjects lost to follow up unlikely to introduce bias- number lost less than or equal to 20% or description of those lost suggested no different from those followed. * c) Follow up rate less than 80% and no description of those lost d) No statement	

Thresholds for converting the Newcastle-Ottawa scales to AHRQ standards (good, fair, and poor):

- **Good quality:** 3 or 4 stars in selection domain AND 1 or 2 stars in comparability domain AND 2 or 3 stars in outcome/exposure domain.
- **Fair quality:** 2 stars in selection domain AND 1 or 2 stars in comparability domain AND 2 or 3 stars in outcome/exposure domain.
- **Poor quality:** 0 or 1 star in selection domain OR 0 stars in comparability domain OR 0 or 1 stars in outcome/exposure domain.

Supplementary F

List of excluded articles

No	Citation	Reason for exclusion
1	Bai X, Lai DWL, Guo A. Ageism and Depression: Perceptions of Older People as a Burden in China. <i>J Soc Issues</i> 2016; 72 :26–46. doi:10.1111/josi.12154	Article not retrieved
2	Tong H, Lai D, Guo A. Social exclusion and mental well-being of older people in rural China. <i>Int J aging Soc</i> 2016; 6 :1–15. http://hdl.handle.net/10397/68912	Article not retrieved
3	Chou KL, Chi I, Boey KW. Determinants of depressive symptoms among elderly Chinese living alone. <i>Clin Gerontol</i> 1999; 20 :15–27	Did not fulfill population definition
4	Lin HW, Hsu HC, Chang MC. Gender differences in the association between stress trajectories and depressive symptoms among middle aged and older adults in Taiwan. <i>J Women Aging</i> 2011; 23 :233–45. doi:10.1080/08952841.2011.587738	Did not fulfill population definition
5	Lin PC, Wang HH. Factors associated with depressive symptoms among older adults living alone: An analysis of sex difference. <i>Aging Ment Heal</i> 2011; 15 :1038–44. doi:10.1080/13607863.2011.583623	Did not fulfill population definition
6	Wang J, Zhao X, Liu L, <i>et al.</i> Family functioning, social support and depression in a Chinese population. <i>Psychopathology</i> 2012; 45 :334. doi:10.1159/000336218	Did not fulfill population definition
7	Wu CS, Yu SH, Lee CY, <i>et al.</i> Prevalence of and risk factors for minor and major depression among community-dwelling older adults in Taiwan. <i>Int Psychogeriatrics</i> 2017; 29 :1113–21. doi:10.1017/S1041610217000199	Did not fulfill population definition
8	Xie LQ, Zhang JP, Peng F, <i>et al.</i> Prevalence and related influencing factors of depressive symptoms for empty-nest elderly living in the rural area of YongZhou, China. <i>Arch Gerontol Geriatr</i> 2010; 50 :24–9. doi:10.1016/j.archger.2009.01.003	Did not fulfill population definition

9	Zimmer Z, Chen FF. Social support and change in depression among older adults in Taiwan. <i>J Appl Gerontol</i> 2012; 31 :764–82.	Did not fulfill population definition
10	Chan SWC, Shoumei JIA, Thompson DR, <i>et al.</i> A cross-sectional study on the health related quality of life of depressed Chinese older people in Shanghai. <i>Int J Geriatr Psychiatry</i> 2006; 21 :883–9. doi:10.1002/gps.1578	Depression not the outcome
11	Chan SWC, Chiu H, Chien WT, <i>et al.</i> Predicting changes in the health-related quality of life of Chinese depressed older people. <i>Int J Geriatr Psychiatry</i> 2009; 24 :41–7. doi:10.1002/gps.2068	Depression not the outcome
12	Chung S, Jeon H, Song A. The Influence of social networks and social support on health among older Koreans at high risk of depression. <i>Care Manag Journals</i> 2016; 17 :70–80. doi:10.1891/1521-0987.17.2.70	Depression not the outcome
13	Ibrahim N, Din NC, Ahmad M, <i>et al.</i> Relationships between social support and depression, and quality of life of the elderly in a rural community in Malaysia. <i>Asia-Pacific Psychiatry</i> 2013; 5 :59–66. doi:10.1111/appy.12068	Depression not the outcome
14	Yang PS. Surviving social support: Care challenges facing Taiwanese centenarians. <i>Int J Soc Welf</i> 2013; 22 :396–405. doi:10.1111/ijsw.12004	Depression not the outcome
15	Wang CW, Iwaya T, Kumano H, <i>et al.</i> Relationship of health status and social support to the life satisfaction of older adults. <i>Tohoku J Exp Med</i> 2002; 198 :141–9. doi:https://doi.org/10.1620/tjem.198.141	Depression not the outcome
16	Zhang JP, Huang HS, Ye M, <i>et al.</i> Factors influencing the subjective well being (SWB) in a sample of older adults in an economically depressed area of China. <i>Arch Gerontol Geriatr</i> 2008; 46 :335–47. doi:10.1016/j.archger.2007.05.006	Depression not the outcome
17	Chou KL, Chi I. Social comparison in Chinese older adults. <i>Aging Ment Health</i> 2001; 5 :242–52. doi:https://doi.org/10.1080/13607860120065032	Not relevant
18	Kuroda A, Tanaka T, Hirano H, <i>et al.</i> Eating Alone as Social Disengagement is Strongly Associated With Depressive Symptoms in Japanese Community-Dwelling Older Adults. <i>J Am Med Dir Assoc</i> 2015; 16 :578–85. doi:10.1016/j.jamda.2015.01.078	Not relevant

19	Lee H, Park S, Kwon E, <i>et al.</i> Socioeconomic disparity in later-year group trajectories of depressive symptoms: Role of health and social engagement change. <i>Int J Environ Res Public Health</i> 2017; 14 :588. doi:10.3390/ijerph14060588	Not relevant
20	Vaingankar JA, Subramaniam M, Abdin E, <i>et al.</i> Socio-demographic correlates of positive mental health and differences by depression and anxiety in an Asian community sample. <i>Ann Acad Med Singapore</i> 2013; 42 :514–23.	Not relevant
21	Li J, Theng YL, Foo S. Does psychological resilience mediate the impact of social support on geriatric depression? An exploratory study among Chinese older adults in Singapore. <i>Asian J Psychiatr</i> 2015; 14 :22–7.	Did not adjust for confounders
22	Munshi YI, Iqbal M, Rafique H, <i>et al.</i> Geriatric morbidity pattern and depression in relation to family support in aged population of Kashmir valley. <i>Internet J Geriatr Gerontol</i> 2008; 4 .	Did not adjust for confounders
23	Patil B, Shetty N, Subramanyam A, <i>et al.</i> Study of perceived and received social support in elderly depressed patients. <i>J Geriatr Ment Heal</i> 2014; 1 :28–31.	Did not adjust for confounders
24	Rajendra K, Ramegowda. A Sociological study on the Prevalence of Depression among Elderly. <i>IOSR J Humanit Soc Sci</i> 2014; 19 :24–6.	Did not adjust for confounders
25	Ambo H, Meguro K, Ishizaki J, <i>et al.</i> Depressive symptoms and associated factors in a cognitively normal elderly population: the Tajiri Project. <i>Int J Geriatr Psychiatry</i> 2001; 16 :780–8. doi:https://doi.org/10.1002/gps.431	Social support not the exposure
26	Barua A, Acharya D, Nagaraj K, <i>et al.</i> Depression in elderly: A cross-sectional study in rural south India. <i>JIMSA</i> 2007; 20 :259–61	Social support not the exposure
27	Chen W, Ishimoto Y, Kimura Y, <i>et al.</i> Association Between Geriatric Function and Subjective Economy in Elderly Adults Living in a Rural Community in Japan. <i>J Am Geriatr Soc</i> 2012; 60 :802–3. doi:10.1111/j.1532-5415.2012.03875.x	Social support not the exposure
28	Chiao C, Weng LJ, Botticello AL. Social participation reduces depressive symptoms among older adults: An 18-year longitudinal	Social support not the exposure

analysis in Taiwan. *BMC Public Health* 2011;**11**:292. doi:10.1186/1471-2458-11-292

- 29 Chou K-L, Chi I. Stressful Events and Depressive Symptoms among Old Women and Men: A Longitudinal Study. *Int J Aging Hum Dev* 2000;**51**:275–93. doi:10.2190/vnjc-tq4w-6t3r-6v9k Social support not the exposure
- 30 Chou K-L, Chi I. Stressful Life Events and Depressive Symptoms: Social Support and Sense of Control as Mediators or Moderators? *Int J Aging Hum Dev* 2001;**52**:155–71. doi:10.2190/9c97-lca5-ewb7-xk2w Social support not the exposure
- 31 Chou KL. Everyday competence and depressive symptoms: social support and sense of control as mediators or moderators? *Aging Ment Heal* 2005;**9**:177–83. Social support not the exposure
- 32 Jeon SW, Han C, Lee J, *et al.* Perspectives on the happiness of community-dwelling elderly in Korea. *Psychiatry Investig* 2016;**13**:50. doi:10.4306/pi.2016.13.1.50 Social support not the exposure
- 33 Kaneko Y, Motohashi Y, Sasaki H, *et al.* Prevalence of depressive symptoms and related risk factors for depressive symptoms among elderly persons living in a rural Japanese community: A cross-sectional study. *Community Ment Health J* 2007;**43**:583–90. doi:10.1007/s10597-007-9096-5 Social support not the exposure
- 34 Katsumata Y, Arai A, Ishida K, *et al.* Which categories of social and lifestyle activities moderate the association between negative life events and depressive symptoms among community-dwelling older adults in Japan? *Int Psychogeriatrics* 2012;**24**:307–315. doi:10.1017/S1041610211001736 Social support not the exposure
- 35 Kim JI, Choe MA, Chae YR. Prevalence and predictors of geriatric depression in community-dwelling elderly. *Asian Nurs Res (Korean Soc Nurs Sci)* 2009;**3**:121–9. doi:10.1016/S1976-1317(09)60023-2 Social support not the exposure
- 36 Lu CH, Liu CY, Yu S. Depressive disorders among the Chinese elderly in a suburban community. *Public Health Nurs* 1998;**15**:196–200. doi:https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1525-1446.1998.tb00339.x Social support not the exposure

- | | | |
|----|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 37 | Lu L. Leisure experiences and depressive symptoms among Chinese older people: A national survey in Taiwan. <i>Educ Gerontol</i> 2011; 37 :753–71. doi:10.1080/03601271003744632 | Social support not the exposure |
| 38 | Malhotra R, Chan A, Ostbye T. Prevalence and correlates of clinically significant depressive symptoms among elderly people in Sri Lanka: Findings from a national survey. <i>Int Psychogeriatrics</i> 2010; 22 :227–36 | Social support not the exposure |
| 39 | Rajkumar AP, Thangadurai P, Senthilkumar P, <i>et al.</i> Nature, prevalence and factors associated with depression among the elderly in a rural south Indian community. <i>Int Psychogeriatrics</i> 2009; 21 :372–8. doi:10.1017/S1041610209008527 | Social support not the exposure |
| 40 | Shao P, Xu Y, Pan C-W. Factors associated with and prevalence of depressive features amongst older adults in an urban city in eastern China. <i>South African J Psychiatry</i> 2017; 23 :1–7. doi:10.4102/sajpsychiatry.v23i0.1064 | Social support not the exposure |
| 41 | Shibusawa T, Chen S. Determinants of depressive symptoms among Japanese elders receiving care from spouses, daughters and daughters-in-law. <i>Clin Gerontol</i> 2003; 26 :31–42. doi:https://doi.org/10.1300/J018v26n01_04 | Social support not the exposure |
| 42 | Takagi D, Kondo K, Kondo N, <i>et al.</i> (2013). Social disorganization/social fragmentation and risk of depression among older people in Japan: Multilevel investigation of indices of social distance. <i>Soc Sci Med</i> 2013; 83 :81–9. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2013.01.001 | Social support not the exposure |
| 43 | Tani Y, Sasaki Y, Haseda M, <i>et al.</i> Eating alone and depression in older men and women by cohabitation status: The JAGES longitudinal survey. <i>Age Ageing</i> 2015; 44 :1019–26. doi:10.1093/ageing/afv145 | Social support not the exposure |
| 44 | Zhang B, Li J. Gender and marital status differences in depressive symptoms among elderly adults: The roles of family support and friend support. <i>Aging Ment Heal</i> 2011; 15 :844–54. doi:10.1080/13607863.2011.569481 | Social support not the exposure |

Supplementary G

Prevalence of depression reported in the studies

Author (Year of Publication)	Prevalence of depression
Chan et al. (2009)	11.9%
Chan et al. (2011)	8.6%
Chen et al. (2012)	11.3%
Gong et al. (2012)	Mild 16.5% Moderate to severe 7.2%
Hashimoto et al. (1999)	31%
Li et al. (2015)	34.6%
Li et al. (2016)	2.549 higher points in the rural area compare to the urban area
Ng et al. (2014)	7.8%
Piboon et al. (2012)	Overall 46% Mild 36% Moderate 9% Severe 1%
Suttajit et al. (2010)	27.2%
Tsai et al. (2005)	27.5%
Wee et al. (2005)	Japan 19.8% Korea 15.2%
Wee et al. (2014)	22.9%

Supplementary H

Results of appraisal with the Newcastle Ottawa Scale.

Cross-sectional studies

No	Author	Year	Selection (Maximum score 5)	Comparability (Maximum score 2)	Outcome (Maximum score 3)	Total	Quality
1	Ang & Malhotra	2016	3	2	2	7	Good
2	Chan & Zeng	2009	4	2	2	8	Good
3	Chan & Zeng	2011	4	2	2	8	Good
4	Chi & Chou	2001	2	2	2	6	Fair
5	Gong et al.	2012	2	2	2	6	Fair
6	Lee et al.	2005	3	2	2	8	Good
7	Leung et al.	2007	3	2	2	7	Good
8	Li et al.	2016	2	2	2	6	Fair
9	Li et al.	2015	2	1	2	5	Poor
10	Ng et al.	2014	2	2	2	6	Fair
11	Piboon et al.	2012	3	2	2	7	Good
12	Shin et al.	2008	3	2	2	7	Good
13	Suttajit	2010	3	2	2	7	Good
14	Tiedt	2010	2	2	2	6	Fair
15	Tsai et al.	2005	3	2	2	7	Good
16	Tsuboi	2016	3	2	2	7	Good
17	Wang et al.	2012	3	2	2	7	Good
18	Wee et al.	2014	3	2	2	7	Good
19	Yoo et al.	2016	4	2	2	8	Good

Cohort studies

No	Author	Year	Selection (Maximum score 5)	Comparability (Maximum score 2)	Outcome (Maximum score 3)	Total	Quality
20	Chao	2011	4	2	1	7	Good
21	Chen et al	2012	4	2	1	7	Good
22	Chou & Chi	2003	4	2	2	8	Good
23	Hashimoto et al.	1999	3	2	1	6	Fair
24	Koizumi et al	2005	4	2	2	8	Good

Supplementary I

Measurement description for social support reported in included articles.

	Author (Year)	Social support measurement	Measurement	Validation
1	Ang et al. (2016)		Number of types of received social support. In the past 12 months, did you receive [item] from any of your family members, other than your spouse? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Money • Housework • Help to go to the doctors, market, shopping, go out to visit friends, using public transportation • Emotional support or advice 	No
2	Chan & Zeng (2009)	Lubben Social Network Scale-10	A questionnaire that consists of 10 items that explores social relationship. It measures three aspects of social networks: family network, networks of friends, confidence in relationships and living arrangements.	Yes
3	Chan & Zeng (2011)	Lubben Social Network Scale-10	As previously described	Yes
4	Chao (2011)	Social Support	Structural : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Social network size • Composition • Frequency of contact • Proximity Received social support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Types • Helping others • Satisfaction with support 	No
5	Chen et al. (2012)		Living arrangement Lubben Social Network Scale	Yes
6	Chi et al. (2001)		1. Social network size 2. Network composition 3. Social contact frequency 4. Satisfaction of social support 5. Instrumental/ emotional support: Lubben Social Network Scale 6. Helping others	Yes
7	Chou & Chi (2003)	Lubben Social Network Scale 6	A questionnaire that consists of 6 items that explores social relationship. It measures family network, networks of friends, frequency of contact, confidant, and availability of help.	Yes
8	Gong et al. (2012)	Family characteristic of social support	Living with spouse Living with descendant. Support of family members. Assess support of family members from 5 sources: 1. Spouse 2. Parents 3. Sons and/or daughters 4. Siblings 5. Other relatives Self-reported family economic status.	No

9	Hashimoto et al. (1999)	Social Support Questionnaire (SSQ)	The scale rates the degree of 5 relational provision = spouses, other family members which are living with, neighbours, social welfare communicators, and others to supply four support (two emotional and two instrumental). Items of support are on a five-point scale with a higher score indicating higher social support.	Yes
10	Koizumi et al. (2005)		Five questions asking about the social support availability to each participant. Do you have someone with whom you can consult when you are in trouble? Do you have someone with whom you can consult when your physical condition is not good? Do you have someone who can help you with your daily housework? Do you have someone who can take care of you to a hospital when you do not feel well? Do you have someone who can take care of you when you are ill in bed?	No
11	Lee et al. (2005)	Social Support Index	The questionnaire consists of receiving and giving social support. Do you have someone to: 1. have a good time with 2. get together with for relaxation 3. do things to get mind off things 4. do something enjoyable with? Total score ranges from 0 to 16.	Yes
12	Leung et al. (2007)	Social Support Rating Scale (SSRS)	This scale measures perceived instrumental and emotional support. It is a 20-item questionnaire with a score range between 10-40.	Yes
13	Li et al. (2015)	DUKE Social Support Index-10	This questionnaire consists of 10 items designed to assess subjective social support among the elderly. It asks about social interaction and satisfaction with social support. Score ranges from 10 to 30.	Yes
14	Li et al. (2016)	Social support and participation	Social support and participation: 1. partnered status: marital status 2. children nearby: living with children or living in the same community 3. social participation 4. elderly activity centre in community	No
15	Ng et al. (2014)		Living arrangement Frequency spending leisure time Whether they feel socially isolated	No
16	Piboon et al. (2012)	Personal Resource Questionnaire	15 items were used to measure social support. The scale was designed to measure the respondents' perceived level of social support. Each item was rated on a seven- point scale from "strongly disagree" (1) to "strongly agree" (7). The total score ranges from 15 to 105. A high scores indicate higher levels of perceived social support.	Yes
17	Shin et al. (2008)	Medical Outcome Study Social	Consists of 19 item questionnaire covering emotional/ informational, tangible and affectionate	Yes

		Support Survey (MOS-SSS)	support, positive social interaction. It is a self-administered measure of functional social support in community dwelling.	
18	Suttajit et al. (2010)	Six social support deficits	<p>This questionnaire consists of 6 questions regarding the lack of social support. These questions were found to be highly salient to depression.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Living alone with your child or other relative 2. Seeing a child or other relative less often than once per week 3. Lack reciprocity with neighbours, through asking about amount to which neighbours depend on each other in their village 4. Lack of reciprocity between children and extended family members, through asking about amount to which children and relatives care about each other 5. Difficulty in relationship with one or more relatives, through asking about severe problems in relationships between the participant and any of their children or relatives in the last year lasting more than a few weeks 6. Dissatisfaction with support from children. 7. Each item was scored 0 or 1 and summed to produce a score. A higher score represents a higher level of social support deficit. 	No
19	Tiedt (2010)	Social support and its inverse state	<p>Social support and its inverse state, isolation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Marital status • Household size • Co-residency • Community contact • Transfers both to and from adult children 	No
20	Tsai et al. (2005)		<p>This scale consists of three subscales: social support network, quantities of social support, and satisfaction with social support subscales from 5 sources (spouse, children, relatives, neighbours, friends).</p> <p>Each item has a four point Likert scale response.</p>	Yes
21	Tsuboi (2016)	2-Way Social Support Scale	<p>The dimensions consist of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (a) receiving emotional support (RES) (b) giving (providing) emotional support (GES) (c) receiving instrumental (tangible) support (RIS) (d) giving instrumental support (GIS) <p>Each support was measured by a single item from different sources: "spouse," "children," and "neighbours or friends."</p>	Yes
22	Wang et al. (2012)	Multidimensional Scale Perceived Social Support (MSPSS)	<p>This scale consists of a 12-item self-report instrument with a seven-point scale.</p> <p>It also asks the different sources of support:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Family 2. Friends 3. Significant others 	Yes
23	Wee et al. (2014)	Lubben Social Network Scale-6	6 questions from the Lubben Social Network Scale.	Yes

24	Yoo et al. (2016)	Perceived Social Support Scale	Consists of 20 items that assesses four domains of support: informational, tangible, emotional support, and self-esteem. Participants were asked to indicate how often they received support from significant others, using a 4-point Likert. The total score ranges from 20 to 80. Higher scores indicate greater perceived social support.	Yes
----	----------------------	-----------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----

Supplementary J

Table of significant outcomes between social support and depression.

Social Support	Description	Effect size	Author (Year publication)	Quality
Structural				
Marital status	Marital status	B= -1.343 SE B= 0.650, β = -0.067	Chi et al. (2001)	Fair
	Partnered	Coef=-0.738 (SE= 0.200) $p < 0.001$	Li et al (2016)	Fair
	Marital status	B= -1.914 $p < 0.036$ (- 0.181- 3.069)	Wang et al. (2012)	Good
	Married men and women have more significant association between social support and depression compared to single men and women	As described in types of social support	Tsuboi et al. (2012)	Good
Living arrangement	Living alone compared to living with someone	B= 0.551, SE= 0.373, $p = 0.035^*$, OR= 0.57, 95% CI (0.68-1.68)	Chen et al. (2012)	Good
	Living alone or with domestic helper compared to living with spouse with children/ grandchildren	Adjusted OR= 2.73 95% CI (1.31-5.69) $p = 0.007$	Ng et al. (2014)	Fair
	Living with son	Health model: $b = -0.80$, B= 0.29 $p < 0.01$ Gender differences: $b = -0.90$, B= 0.28, $p < 0.01$	Tiedt et al. (2010)	Fair
	Living with daughter	Health model: $b = -0.68$, B= 0.33 $p < 0.05$ Gender differences: $b = -0.74$, B= 0.33, $p < 0.05$	Tiedt et al. (2010)	Fair
	Living with a married son	E= -0.106 SE (0.012) $p \leq 0.001$	Chao (2011)	Good
Size of network	With spouse	E= -0.105 SE (0.013) $p \leq 0.001$	Chao (2011)	Good
	No of children	E= -0.009 SE (0.002) $p \leq 0.001$	Chao (2011)	Good

	No of relatives	E= -0.069 SE (0.007) p≤0.001	Chao (2011)	Good
	No of friends	E= -0.061 SE (0.007) p≤0.001	Chao (2011)	Good
	Number of friends feel close to	B= -0.314, SE B= 0.128, β= -0.136 p< 0.05	Chi et al. (2001)	Fair
	Number of relatives felt close to	B= -0.299, SE B= 0.064, β= -0.157 p< 0.0001	Chi et al. (2001)	Fair
	Social support network	OR= 0.88, 95% CI (0.82, 0.94) p<0.01	Tsai et al. (2005)	Good
Frequency of contact		E= -0.052 SE (0.006) p≤0.001	Chao (2011)	Good
	Frequency of contact with relatives	B= -0.549, SE B= 0.183, β= -0.087	Chi et al. (2001)	Fair
	Frequency of leisure time spent Less than once a month Reference: at least once a month	Adjusted OR= 1.51 95% CI (1.04-2.19) p= 0.028	Ng et al. (2014)	Fair
	Frequency of leisure time spent Childless Reference: at least once a month	Adjusted OR= 1.14 95% CI (1.14-2.60) p= 0.009	Ng et al. (2014)	Fair
Composition	Family = 25-49.99%	E= -0.128 SE (0.041) p≤0.001	Chao (2011)	Good
Source of support	Social support from family members not living with elders	b =-0.59, β =-0.11,* p<0.05	Chou (2003)	Good
	Support from family:	Bad OR= 6.93** (3.26, 14.70)	Gong et al. (2012)	Fair
	Bad support	Fair OR= 2.90** (1.52, 5.53)		
	Fair support			
	Good support	Good 1.00 P <0.01		
	Lack of reciprocity with neighbours	Adjusted OR= 1.9 95% CI (1.4, 2.5)	Suttajit et al. (2010)	Good
	Lack of reciprocity between children and extended family	Adjusted OR= 2.6, 95% CI (1.9, 3.6)	Suttajit et al. (2010)	Good

	Friend support	B= 0.229, $p < 0.002^{**}$, 0.091 to 0.369	Wang et al. (2012)	Good
Functional support				
Overall social support	Direct effect of social support on depressive symptoms among females	$\beta = -0.29$ (bootstrap SE= 0.07) $p < 0.001$	Ang et al. (2016)	Good
	Social support score of 19 and below	OR= 3.63, 95% CI (2.35-5.60) $p < 0.001^{**}$	Chan et al. (2009)	Good
	Poor compared to enough/ good	OR= 3.63 95% CI (2.35-5.60) $p < 0.001$	Chan et al. (2009)	Good
	Social support score of 19 and below	OR= 2.2, 95% CI (1.26-3.83) $p = 0.005$	Chan et al. (2011)	Good
	Poor compared to enough/ good	OR= 2.2 95% CI (1.26-3.83) $p < 0.01$	Chan et al. (2011)	Good
	Low social support	M= 17.6, $p < 0.05$, F=11.5, d.f (2,159)	Hashimoto et al. (1999)	Fair
	Middle social support	M= 15, $p < 0.05$, F=11.5, d.f (2,159)	Hashimoto et al. (1999)	Fair
	High social support	M= 15, $p < 0.05$, F=11.5, d.f (2,159)	Hashimoto et al. (1999)	Fair
	Low social support	Anyang OR= 0.85 95% CI (0.79-0.91) $p < 0.05$ Yoita OR= 0.94 95% CI (0.89-0.99) $p < 0.05$ Total OR= 0.90 95% CI (0.86-0.94) $p < 0.05$	Lee et al. (2005)	Good
	Duke score	$\beta = -0.18$ $p < 0.05$	Li et al. (2015)	Poor
	Overall social support	$\gamma = -0.21$, $p < 0.001$	Piboon et al. (2012)	Good
	Poor social support	OR= 3.05, 95% CI (1.77-5.27)	Shin et al. (2008)	Good
	Social support score of >12 (good) vs ≤ 12 (poor)	Adjusted OR= 0.27 95% CI (0.14-0.51) $p < 0.001$	Wee et al. (2014)	Good

	Social support Group I: older adults with low incomes who stayed at home most of the time and used visiting health services from public health centres.	Group I: $\beta = -0.11$, $p = 0.04$	Yoo et al. 2016	Good
Types of social support	No assistance (instrumental)	$E = 0.183$, SE (0.019) $p \leq 0.001$	Chao (2011)	Good
	Emotional support	$E = -0.103$, SE (0.005) $p \leq 0.001$	Chao (2011)	Good
	Emotional support	P.E. = -0.227 , S.E (0.084) $p < 0.01$	Leung et al. (2007)	Good
	Emotional support from child	Health model $b = -0.51$, $B = 0.26$ $p < 0.05$ Gender differences: $b = -0.69$, $B = 0.31$ $p < 0.05$	Tiedt et al. (2010)	Fair
	Receiving emotional Married men & women	From partner: Men: $B = 0.045$, 95% CI (-0.43, -0.10) $p < 0.005$ Women: $B = -0.068$, 95% CI (-0.55, -0.21) $p < 0.0005$	Tsuboi et al. (2016)	Good
	Receiving emotional Married men & women	From children: Men: $B = 0.045$, 95% CI (0.12, 0.41) $p < 0.0005$	Tsuboi et al. (2016)	Good
	Financial support	$E = -0.053$ SE (0.012) $p \leq 0.001$	Chao (2011)	Good
	Tangible help from relatives living with respondent (instrumental)	$B = -0.239$, SE $B = 0.133$, $\beta = -0.060$	Chi et al. (2001)	Fair
	Reliable in giving care when ill (instrumental)	$B = -0.719$, SE $B = 0.317$, $\beta = -0.076$ $p < 0.05$	Chi et al. (2001)	Fair
	To take care of you (instrumental)	OR = 3.0 95% CI (1.4-6.1)	Koizumi et al. (2005)	Good
	Instrumental support from child	Baseline: $b = 0.86$, $B = 0.35$, $p < 0.05$	Tiedt et al. (2010)	Fair

		Health model: 0.83, 0.34, $p < 0.05$		
		Gender differences: 0.16, 0.36.		
	Receiving Instrumental support Married men & women	From partner: Men: $B = -0.024$, 95% CI (-0.47, -0.02) $p < 0.05$ Women: $B = -0.058$, 95% CI (-0.54, -0.19) $p < 0.0005$	Tsuboi et al. (2016)	Good
	Receiving Instrumental support Married men & women	From children: Men: $B = -0.041$, 95% CI (-0.36, -0.09) $p < 0.005$ Women: $B = -0.044$, 95% CI (-0.38, -0.08) $p < 0.005$	Tsuboi et al. (2016)	Good
	Receiving Instrumental support Married men & women	From outside: Men: $B = 0.030$, 95% CI (0.15, 0.84) $p < 0.005$	Tsuboi et al. (2016)	Good
	To consult in trouble	OR= 2.6, 95% CI (1.2- 5.3)	Koizumi et al. (2005)	Good
	Frequency of discussion about decisions	$B = -0.285$, SE $B =$ 0.242, $\beta = -0.043$	Chi et al. (2001)	Fair
Satisfaction with support	Dissatisfaction with support from children	Adjusted OR=1.9, 95% CI (1.2, 3.0)	Suttajit et al. (2010)	Good
	Satisfaction with support	$E = -0.208$ SE (0.006), $p \leq 0.001$	Chao (2011)	Good
	Satisfaction with social support	$B = -1.777$, SE $B =$ 0.389, $\beta = -0.146$, $p < 0.0001$	Chi et al. (2001)	Fair
Functional support	Difficulty in relationship with one or more relatives	Adjusted OR=2.3, 95% CI (1.4, 3.7)	Suttajit et al. (2010)	Good
	Poor positive social interaction	OR= 2.25, 95% CI (1.07-4.73) $p < 0.05$	Shin et al. (2008)	Good

Social isolation	Occasionally of often Reference never or rarely	Adjusted OR= 7.12, 95% CI (4.87-10.40) p<0.001	Ng et al. (2014)	Fair
------------------	----------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------	------------------	------

Table of non-significant outcomes between social support and depression.

Social Support	Description	Effect size	Author (Year publication)	Quality
Structural				
Marital status	Not married	Health model: b= 0.45, B= 0.27 Gender differences: b= 0.47, B= 0.26	Tiedt et al. (2010)	Fair
Living arrangement	Spouse only	OR= 1.05, 95% CI (0.57-1.93)	Ng et al. (2014)	Fair
	Reference against spouse with children/ grandchildren			
	Children/ grandchildren	OR= 0.74, 95% CI (0.31-1.77)	Ng et al. (2014)	Fair
	Reference against spouse with children/ grandchildren			
	Others	OR= 1.82, 95% CI (0.78-4.24) p=0.166	Ng et al. (2014)	Fair
	Reference against spouse with children/ grandchildren			
	Living alone without a child or other relative	OR= 0.7, 95% CI (0.4-1.1)	Suttajit et al. (2010)	Good
	Living with spouse No compared to yes	OR= 0.80, 95% CI (0.56-1.14)	Gong et al (2012)	Fair
Proximity	Living with descendant No compared to Yes	OR= 1.02, 95% CI (0.73-1.42)	Gong et al (2012)	Fair
	Children nearby	Coef= -0.163 (SE= 0.220) p>0.05	Li et al. (2016)	Poor
Size of network	Number of relatives	B=0.025, SE B= 0.040, β = 0.023	Chi et al. (2001)	Fair
	Number of relatives seen once a month	B= -0.057, SE B= 0.054, β = 0.047	Chi et al. (2001)	Fair

	Number of friends seen once a month	B= -0.234, SE B= 0.139, β =-0.101	Chi et al. (2001)	Fair
	Number of friends felt close to	B= 0.128, SE B= 0.153, β = 0.050	Chi et al. (2001)	Fair
Frequency of contact	Frequency of contact with friends	B= -.282, SE B= 0.181, β = -0.055	Chi et al. (2001)	Fair
	Seeing a child or other relative less often than once per week	Adjusted OR= 1.3 95% CI (0.5-3.1)	Suttajit et al. (2010)	Good
Composition	Network composition of relatives and friends felt close to	B= -0.405, SE B= 0.374, β = -0.050	Chi et al. (2001)	Fair
	Family <24.99%	E= -0.076 SE (0.045)	Chao 2011	Good
	Family 50-99.99%	E= -0.076 SE (0.038)	Chao 2011	Good
Source of support	Social support from family members living with elders	b= -0.17, β = -0.06	Chou et al. (2003)	Good
	Family social support	B= 0.243, p=0.180 95% CI (-0.599 to -0.114)	Wang et al (2012)	Good
	Other	B= 0.049 p= 0.778, 95% CI (-0.391 to -0.294)	Wang et al (2012)	Good
	Family social support		Chen et al. (2012)	Good
	Support from children, neighbours, friends, spouse, relatives.		Tsai et al. (2005)	Good

Functional support

Overall Social support	Group II: Older adults who visited small community halls; Group III: Older adults who visited senior welfare centres.	Group II: β = -0.14, p= 0.06 Group III: β = 0.07, p= 0.27	Yoo et al. (2016)	Good
	Direct effect of social support on depressive symptoms among males	β = -0.01 (bootstrap SE= 0.07)	Ang et al. (2016)	Good

Types of social support	Poor emotional/ information support	OR= 1.90 95% CI (0.98-3.68)	Shin et al. (2008)	Good
	Poor tangible support	OR= 1.24 95% CI (0.63-2.44)	Shin et al. (2008)	Good
	Poor affectionate support (emotional)	OR= 0.89 95% CI (0.42-1.90)	Shin et al. (2008)	Good
	Frequency of discussion about decisions (emotional)	B= -0.285, SE B= 0.242, β = -0.043	Chi et al. (2001)	Fair
	Tangible help from relatives not living with respondents (instrumental)	B= -4.70, SE B= 0.125, β = -0.118, $p < 0.0001$	Chi et al. (2001)	Fair
	Willing to listen to respondents problems (emotional)	B= -0.11, SE B= 0.330, β = 0.00, $p < 0.0001$	Chi et al. (2001)	Fair
	Receiving emotional support Single men & women	From children: Men: B= 0.028, 95% CI (-0.27, 0.60) Women: B= -0.028, 95% CI (-0.35, 0.04) From outside: Men: B= -0.006, 95% CI (-0.51, 0.44) Women: B= 0.028, 95% CI (-0.05, 0.35)	Tsuboi et al. (2016)	Good
	Receiving emotional Married men & women	From children: Women: B= 0.018, 95% CI (-0.06, 0.24)	Tsuboi et al. (2016)	Good
	Receiving emotional support Married men & women	From outside: Men: B= -0.014, 95% CI (-0.24, 0.07) Women: B= 0.014, 95% CI (-0.09, 0.23)	Tsuboi et al. (2016)	Good
	Receiving instrumental support Married men & women	From outside: Women: B= -0.015, 95% CI (-0.42, 0.11)	Tsuboi et al. (2016)	Good
	Receiving instrumental support Single men & women	From children: Men: B= -0.129, 95% CI (-1.29, -0.39)	Tsuboi et al. (2016)	Good

		Women: B= -0.037, 95% CI (-0.49, - 0.03)		
	To consult in bad physical condition (emotional)	OR= 1.7, 95% CI (0.8-3.7)	Koizumi et al. (2005)	Good
	To help with your daily housework (emotional)	OR= 1.1, 95% CI (0.6-2.3)	Koizumi et al. (2005)	Good
	To take to a hospital	OR= 1.8, 95% CI (0.9-3.8)	Koizumi et al. (2005)	Good
Satisfaction with support	Satisfaction of social support, Satisfaction with emotional support, satisfaction with informational support, satisfaction with instrumental support, satisfaction with approval support.		Tsai et al. (2005)	Good

M= Male; F= Female; E= estimate; OR= Odds Ratio; M= least square mean for depression; B= Beta coefficient; P.E.= parameter estimate; SE= Standard error.