

Online Source 2a: Quality assessment table

Table S3.

Quality assessment.

<i>Study</i>	<i>Social cognitive construct</i>	<i>Country</i>	<i>Study design</i>	<i>Sample characteristics</i>	<i>Quality assessment</i>
Aldridge et al., 2020	Peer connectedness	AUS	CS: Structural Equational Modeling (SEM)	$N = 6,120$ $M_{age} = N/A$ Female = 53.8% RR = 76.2%	Sample: ★★☆☆☆ Measures: ★★☆☆☆ Method: ★★☆☆☆ Total: 8
Arató et al., 2020	Empathy	HUN	CS: MANOVA	$N = 524$ $M_{age} = 15.7$ Female = 59.2% RR = N/A	Sample: ★★☆☆☆ Measures: ★★☆☆☆ Method: ★★☆☆☆ Total: 9
Athanasiades et al., 2016	Empathy	GRC	L: Correlation	$N = 440$ $M_{age} = 12.7$ Female = 46.1% RR = N/A	Sample: ★★☆☆☆ Measures: ★☆☆☆☆ Method: ★★☆☆☆ Total: 7
Audley et al., 2020	Peer perception	USA	CS: Correlation	$N = 216$ $M_{age} = 10.3$ Female = 51.4% RR = 96.4%	Sample: ★★★★★☆ Measures: ★★★★★☆ Method: ★★☆☆☆ Total: 10
Baird et al., 2010	Emotion recognition	USA	CS: No test, due to ceiling effect of the task	$N = 14$ $M_{age} = 14.2$ Female = 100% RR = N/A	Sample: ★☆☆☆☆☆ Measures: ☆☆☆☆☆☆ Method: ☆☆☆☆☆☆ Total: 1
Balan et al., 2018	Threat interpretation	ROU	CS: Path model & Correlation	$N = 476$ $M_{age} = 14.0$ Female = 58.2% RR = N/A	Sample: ★★☆☆☆ Measures: ★★★★★☆ Method: ★★☆☆☆ Total: 11
Baroncelli & Ciucci, 2014	Emotion recognition	ITA	CS: Correlation	$N = 529$ $M_{age} = 12.6$ Female = 53.3% RR = 79.1%	Sample: ★★★★★☆ Measures: ★★★★★☆ Method: ★★☆☆☆ Total: 10
Barzeva et al., 2020	School social climate	NLD	L: Correlation	$N = 2,772$ $M_{age} = 11.1$ Female = 47.5% RR = 76.0%	Sample: ★★★★★★ Measures: ★☆☆☆☆☆ Method: ★★★★★☆ Total: 10
Bayar & Uçanok, 2012	Peer perception	TUR	CS: MANOVA	$N = 1,263$ $M_{age} = 14.9$ Female = 51.5% RR = N/A	Sample: ★★☆☆☆ Measures: ★★☆☆☆ Method: ★★☆☆☆ Total: 7
Belacchi & Benelli, 2020	Empathy	ITA	CS: Correlation	$N = 117$ $M_{age} = 9.9$ Female = 44.0% RR = N/A	Sample: ★★★★★☆ Measures: ★★☆☆☆ Method: ★☆☆☆☆ Total: 8
Belacchi & Farina, 2010	Emotion recognition	ITA	CS: Correlation	$N = 188$ $M_{age} = 4.1$ Female = 45.7% RR = N/A	Sample: ★★☆☆☆ Measures: ★★☆☆☆ Method: ★☆☆☆☆ Total: 6
Belacchi & Farina, 2012	Empathy	ITA	CS: Correlation	$N = 188$ $M_{age} = 4.1$ Female = 45.7%	Sample: ★★☆☆☆ Measures: ★★☆☆☆ Method: ★☆☆☆☆

				RR = N/A	Total: 6
Berg & Aber, 2015	Peer perception	USA	L: Multilevel model	$N = 3,416$ $M_{age} = 8.5$ Female = 51.0% RR = 63.0%	Sample: ★★★★★☆ Measures: ★★★★★☆ Method: ★★★★★☆ Total: 11
Berg & Aber, 2015	Empathy	USA	CS: Correlation (empathy and victimization were measured in the same wave)	$N = 3,416$ $M_{age} = 8.5$ Female = 51.0% RR = 63.0%	Sample: ★★★★★☆ Measures: ★★★★★☆ Method: ★★★★★☆ Total: 7
Betts et al., 2017	Peer perception	GBR	CS: Path model (multigroup)	$N = 280$ $M_{age} = 13.3$ Female = 53.6% RR = 67.0%	Sample: ★★★★★☆ Measures: ★★★★★☆ Method: ★★★★★☆ Total: 10
Calleja & Rapee, 2020	Threat interpretation	AUS	CS: Regression	$N = 267$ $M_{age} = 12.6$ Female = 100% RR = N/A	Sample: ★★★★★☆ Measures: ★★★★★☆ Method: ★★★★★☆ Total: 8
Calvete et al., 2018	Threat interpretation	ESP	L: Patha analysis	$N = 1,328$ $M_{age} = 15.1$ Female = 43.6% RR = 89.8%	Sample: ★★★★★☆ Measures: ★★★★★☆ Method: ★★★★★☆ Total: 13
Camodeca & Goossens, 2005	Accurate registration	NLD	CS: ANOVA	$N = 226$ $M_{age} = 9.8$ Female = 49.6% RR = 90.0%	Sample: ★★★★★☆ Measures: ★★★★★☆ Method: ★★★★★☆ Total: 7
Camodeca & Goossens, 2005	Intent attribution	NLD	CS: ANOVA	$N = 226$ $M_{age} = 9.8$ Female = 49.6% RR = 90.0%	Sample: ★★★★★☆ Measures: ★★★★★☆ Method: ★★★★★☆ Total: 7
Camodeca et al., 2003	Intent attribution	NLD	L: MANOVA	$N = 236$ $M_{age} = 7.6$ Female = 53.4% RR = 90.0%	Sample: ★★★★★☆ Measures: ★★★★★☆ Method: ★★★★★☆ Total: 7
Caravita et al., 2010	Empathy	ITA	CS: Path model	$N = 211$ $M_{age} = 10.2$ Female = 53.6% RR = 77.6%	Sample: ★★★★★☆ Measures: ★★★★★☆ Method: ★★★★★☆ Total: 11
Caravita et al., 2010	Theory of Mind	ITA	CS: Path model	$N = 211$ $M_{age} = 10.2$ Female = 53.6% RR = 77.6%	Sample: ★★★★★☆ Measures: ★★★★★☆ Method: ★★★★★☆ Total: 10
Caravita et al., 2019	Situation attribution	ITA	CS: Correlation	$N = 634$ $M_{age} = 10.8$ Female = 48.7% RR = 86.4%	Sample: ★★★★★☆ Measures: ★★★★★☆ Method: ★★★★★☆ Total: 5
Chan & Wong, 2015	Empathy	HKG	CS: Bivariate probit model	$N = 1,862$ $M_{age} = 13.5$ Female = 45.0% RR = N/A	Sample: ★★★★★☆ Measures: ★★★★★☆ Method: ★★★★★☆ Total: 7
Chen et al., 2021	Empathy	HKG	CS: Correlation	$N = 4,676$ $M_{age} = 11.8$ Female = 38.0% RR = N/A	Sample: ★★★★★☆ Measures: ★★★★★☆ Method: ★★★★★☆ Total: 8
Choi & Park, 2018	Threat appraisal	KOR	L: SEM and Correlation	$N = 3,660$ $M_{age} = N/A$ Female = 48.5% RR = N/A	Sample: ★★★★★☆ Measures: ★★★★★☆ Method: ★★★★★☆ Total: 8

Ciucci et al., 2014	Emotion recognition	ITA	CS: Regression (logistic)	$N = 526$ $M_{age} = 12.6$ Female = 46.8% RR = N/A	Sample: ★★★★★☆ Measures: ★★★★★☆ Method: ★★★★★☆ Total: 10
Correia & Dalbert, 2008	Empathy	PRT	CS: Correlation	$N = 187$ $M_{age} = 14.5$ Female = 48.1% RR = N/A	Sample: ★★★★★☆ Measures: ★★★★★☆ Method: ★★★★★☆ Total: 9
DePaolis & Williford, 2019	Peer perception	USA	L: Latent Growth Curve Modeling	$N = 960$ $M_{age} = 9.4$ Female = 51.3% RR = 54.0%	Sample: ★★★★★☆ Measures: ★★★★★☆ Method: ★★★★★☆ Total: 10
Ding, Fu et al., 2020	Threat interpretation	CHN	CS: Regression	$N = 654$ $M_{age} = 11.4$ Female = 47.4% RR = 96.0%	Sample: ★★★★★☆ Measures: ★★★★★☆ Method: ★★★★★☆ Total: 12
Ding, Li et al., 2020	School social climate	CHN	CS: Regression (logistic)	$N = 1,529$ $M_{age} = 14.7\%$ Female = 48.0% RR = 95.0%	Sample: ★★★★★☆ Measures: ★★★★★☆ Method: ★★★★★☆ Total: 9
Donat et al., 2020	Empathy	DEU	CS: Correlation	$N = 1,045$ $M_{age} = 14.1$ Female = 48.2% RR = N/A	Sample: ★★★★★☆ Measures: ★★★★★☆ Method: ★★★★★☆ Total: 7
Elsaesser et al., 2013	Peer perception	USA	L: Multilevel model	$N = 5,625$ $M_{age} = N/A$ Female = 49.2% RR = N/A	Sample: ★★★★★☆ Measures: ★★★★★☆ Method: ★★★★★☆ Total: 8
Espelage, Hong, et al., 2018	Empathy	USA	CS: Regression	$N = 310$ $M_{age} = 12.6$ Female = 50.3% RR = N/A	Sample: ★★★★★☆ Measures: ★★★★★☆ Method: ★★★★★☆ Total: 9
Espelage, Hong, et al., 2018	Theory of Mind	USA	CS: Regression	$N = 310$ $M_{age} = 12.6$ Female = 50.3% RR = N/A	Sample: ★★★★★☆ Measures: ★★★★★☆ Method: ★★★★★☆ Total: 8
Espelage, Merrin, et al., 2018	Empathy	USA	L: Correlation	$N = 1,655$ $M_{age} = 13.0$ Female = 50.0% RR = 95.0%	Sample: ★★★★★☆ Measures: ★★★★★☆ Method: ★★★★★☆ Total: 11
Estévez et al., 2019	Threat interpretation	ESP	CS: Regression (logistic)	$N = 1,318$ $M_{age} = 13.8$ Female = 53.0% RR = 99.0%	Sample: ★★★★★☆ Measures: ★★★★★☆ Method: ★★★★★☆ Total: 9
Estévez et al., 2019	Empathy	ESP	CS: Regression (logistic)	$N = 1,318$ $M_{age} = 13.8$ Female = 53.0% RR = 99.0%	Sample: ★★★★★☆ Measures: ★★★★★☆ Method: ★★★★★☆ Total: 9
Farrell et al., 2018	Empathy	ITA	CS: Correlation	$N = 727$ $M_{age} = N/A$ Female = 52.0% RR = 71.0%	Sample: ★★★★★☆ Measures: ★★★★★☆ Method: ★★★★★☆ Total: 8
Garandeau & Lansu, 2019	Accurate registration	NLD	CS: Regression	$N = 1,035$ $M_{age} = 14.2$ Female = 52.2% RR = 100%	Sample: ★★★★★☆ Measures: ★★★★★☆ Method: ★★★★★☆ Total: 9

Garandeau & Lansu, 2019	Peer perception	NLD	CS: Regression	$N = 601$ $M_{age} = 12.9$ Female = 48.2% RR = 87.6%	Sample: ★★★★★☆ Measures: ★★★★★☆ Method: ★★★★★☆ Total: 10
Garner & Lemerise, 2007	Emotion recognition	USA	CS: Regression	$N = 94$ $M_{age} = 4.6$ Female = 48.9% RR = 90.0%	Sample: ★★★★★☆ Measures: ★★★★★☆ Method: ★★★★★☆ Total: 8
Garner & Lemerise, 2007	Intent attribution	USA	CS: Regression	$N = 95$ $M_{age} = 4.6$ Female = 48.9% RR = 90.0%	Sample: ★★★★★☆ Measures: ★★★★★☆ Method: ★★★★★☆ Total: 9
Gasser & Keller, 2009	Theory of Mind	CHE	CS: MANOVA	$N = 212$ $M_{age} = 8.0$ Female = 45.8% RR = 92.6%	Sample: ★★★★★☆ Measures: ★★★★★☆ Method: ★★★★★☆ Total: 10
Giannotta et al., 2012	Threat interpretation	ITA	CS: Correlation	$N = 155$ $M_{age} = 12.2$ Female = 52.3% RR = 100%	Sample: ★★★★★☆ Measures: ★★★★★☆ Method: ★★★★★☆ Total: 10
Gini, 2006	Theory of Mind	ITA	CS: ANOVA	$N = 204$ $M_{age} = N/A$ Female = 50.0% RR = N/A	Sample: ★★★★★☆ Measures: ★★★★★☆ Method: ★★★★★☆ Total: 8
Gini, 2008	Peer perception	ITA	CS: Correlation	$N = 246$ $M_{age} = 11.1$ Female = 49.6 RR = N/A	Sample: ★★★★★☆ Measures: ★★★★★☆ Method: ★★★★★☆ Total: 8
Goldstein et al., 2020	Peer perception	USA	CS: Regression and correlation	$N = 774$ $M_{age} = 12.8$ Female = 52.6% RR = 83.0%	Sample: ★★★★★☆ Measures: ★★★★★☆ Method: ★★★★★☆ Total: 10
González-Díez et al., 2017	Threat interpretation	ESP	L: Correlation	$N = 550$ $M_{age} = 17.0$ Female = 55.8% RR = 96.0%	Sample: ★★★★★☆ Measures: ★★★★★☆ Method: ★★★★★☆ Total: 12
Gómez-Ortiz et al., 2018	Threat interpretation	ESP	CS: Correlation	$N = 2,060$ $M_{age} = 14.3$ Female = 47.9% RR = N/A	Sample: ★★★★★☆ Measures: ★★★★★☆ Method: ★★★★★☆ Total: 10
Guo et al., 2021	Peer perception	USA	CS: Regression (multinomial)	$N = 12,642$ $M_{age} = 12.9$ Female = 48.6% RR = 90.0%	Sample: ★★★★★☆ Measures: ★★★★★☆ Method: ★★★★★☆ Total: 10
Guy et al., 2017	Emotion recognition	GBR	CS: ANOVA	$N = 754$ $M_{age} = 14.0$ Female = 53.9% RR = 53.4%	Sample: ★★★★★☆ Measures: ★★★★★☆ Method: ★★★★★☆ Total: 11
Guy et al., 2017	Intent attribution	GBR	CS: ANOVA	$N = 754$ $M_{age} = 14.0$ Female = 53.9% RR = 53.4%	Sample: ★★★★★☆ Measures: ★★★★★☆ Method: ★★★★★☆ Total: 9
Harks & Hannover, 2020	School social climate	DEU	CS: Multilevel model	$N = 1,139$ $M_{age} = 12.9$ Female = 52.6% RR = 70.3%	Sample: ★★★★★☆ Measures: ★★★★★☆ Method: ★★★★★☆ Total: 9

Heinze et al., 2015	Emotion recognition	USA	CS: Regression	$N = 134$ $M_{age} = 5.0$ Female = 58.0% RR = N/A	Sample: ★★★★★☆ Measures: ★★★★★☆ Method: ★★★★★☆ Total: 10
Hoglund & Leadbeater, 2007	Intent attribution	CAN	CS: Path model	$N = 337$ $M_{age} = 12.5$ Female = 57.3% RR = 62.5%	Sample: ★★★★★☆ Measures: ★★★★★☆ Method: ★★★★★☆ Total: 11
Holfeld & Baitz, 2020	School social climate	USA	CS: Correlation	$N = 1,151$ $M_{age} = 12.7$ Female = 48.6% RR = 80.2%	Sample: ★★★★★☆ Measures: ★★★★★☆ Method: ★★★★★☆ Total: 10
Hong et al., 2019	Peer perception	USA	CS: Correlation	$N = 12,642$ $M_{age} = 13.8$ Female = 48.3% RR = N/A	Sample: ★★★★★☆ Measures: ★★★★★☆ Method: ★★★★★☆ Total: 7
Hong et al., 2021	Peer perception	USA	CS: Regression	$N = 4,573$ $M_{age} = 13.4$ Female = 51.9% RR = N/A	Sample: ★★★★★☆ Measures: ★★★★★☆ Method: ★★★★★☆ Total: 9
Hood & Duffy, 2018	Empathy	AUS	CS: Correlation	$N = 175$ $M_{age} = 14.8$ Female = 47.0% RR = N/A	Sample: ★★★★★☆ Measures: ★★★★★☆ Method: ★★★★★☆ Total: 8
Hsieh et al., 2019	Emotion recognition	TWN	CS: Correlation	$N = 6,233$ $M_{age} = N/A$ Female = 49.7% RR = 99.9%	Sample: ★★★★★☆ Measures: ★★★★★☆ Method: ★★★★★☆ Total: 9
Hsieh et al., 2019	Theory of Mind	TWN	CS: Correlation	$N = 6,233$ $M_{age} = N/A$ Female = 49.7% RR = 99.9%	Sample: ★★★★★☆ Measures: ★★★★★☆ Method: ★★★★★☆ Total: 7
Hung et al., 2017	Intent attribution	USA	CS: Correlation	$N = 130$ $M_{age} = 11.9$ Female = 43.8% RR = 59.9%	Sample: ★★★★★☆ Measures: ★★★★★☆ Method: ★★★★★☆ Total: 8
Hunter et al., 2010	Threat appraisal	GBR	CS: Correlation and Regression	$N = 473$ $M_{age} = 9.81$ Female = 46.0% RR = 76.25%	Sample: ★★★★★☆ Measures: ★★★★★☆ Method: ★★★★★☆ Total: 8
Hussein, 2013	Attention	EGY	CS: Regression (multinomial)	$N = 623$ $M_{age} = 11.5$ Female = 44.6% RR = N/A	Sample: ★★★★★☆ Measures: ★★★★★☆ Method: ★★★★★☆ Total: 10
Jenkins et al., 2016	Empathy	USA	CS Regression	$N = 636$ $M_{age} = N/A$ Female = 47.0% RR = 75.0%	Sample: ★★★★★☆ Measures: ★★★★★☆ Method: ★★★★★☆ Total: 11
Jenkins et al., 2017	Empathy	USA	CS: Correlation	$N = 246$ $M_{age} = N/A$ Female = 44.7% RR = 72.0%	Sample: ★★★★★☆ Measures: ★★★★★☆ Method: ★★★★★☆ Total: 11
Jenkins & Nickerson, 2017	Attention	USA	CS: Regression	$N = 299$ $M_{age} = N/A$ Female = 57.2% RR = 99.7%	Sample: ★★★★★☆ Measures: ★★★★★☆ Method: ★★★★★☆ Total: 8

Jenkins & Nickerson, 2017	Threat interpretation	USA	CS: Regression	$N = 299$ $M_{age} = N/A$ Female = 57.2% RR = 99.7%	Sample: ★★★★★☆ Measures: ★★★★★☆ Method: ★★★★★☆ Total: 9
Joo et al., 2020	Empathy	USA	CS: Correlation	$N = 477$ $M_{age} = N/A$ Female = 47.2% RR = N/A	Sample: ★★★★★☆ Measures: ★★★★★☆ Method: ★★★★★☆ Total: 7
Kawabata et al., 2013	Intent attribution	JPN, USA	CS: Regression	$N = 272$ $M_{age} = N/A$ Female = 54.7% RR = N/A	Sample: ★★★★★☆ Measures: ★★★★★☆ Method: ★★★★★☆ Total: 8
Kiekens et al., 2020	Threat interpretation	NLD	L: Correlation	$N = 2,230$ $M_{age} = 11.1$ Female = 50.8% RR = 76.0%	Sample: ★★★★★☆ Measures: ★★★★★☆ Method: ★★★★★☆ Total: 8
Kokkinos & Kipritsi, 2012	Empathy	GRC	CS: Correlation and Regression	$N = 206$ $M_{age} = N/A$ Female = 53.9% RR = N/A	Sample: ★★★★★☆ Measures: ★★★★★☆ Method: ★★★★★☆ Total: 9
Kokkinos & Voulgaridou, 2018	Intent attribution	GRC	CS: Regression	$N = 228$ $M_{age} = N/A$ Female = 49.6% RR = 97.0%	Sample: ★★★★★☆ Measures: ★★★★★☆ Method: ★★★★★☆ Total: 12
Ladd & Troop-Gordon, 2003	Peer perception	USA	L: Correlataions	$N = 399$ $M_{age} = 5.5$ Female = 48.4% RR = 95.0%	Sample: ★★★★★☆ Measures: ★★★★★☆ Method: ★★★★★☆ Total: 8
Lansu et al., 2017	Accurate registration	NLD	CS: Regression (regular & logistic)	$N = 564$ $M_{age} = 9.9$ Female = 49.1% RR = 95.5%	Sample: ★★★★★☆ Measures: ★★★★★☆ Method: ★★★★★☆ Total: 9
Laurent et al., 2018	Emotion recognition	CAN	CS: Correlation	$N = 50$ $M_{age} = 4.5$ Female = 52.0% RR = 96.2%	Sample: ★★★★★☆ Measures: ★★★★★☆ Method: ★★★★★☆ Total: 8
Lázaro-Visa et al., 2019	School social climate	ESP	CS: Correlation	$N = 639$ $M_{age} = 12.9$ Female = 53.3% RR = N/A	Sample: ★★★★★☆ Measures: ★★★★★☆ Method: ★★★★★☆ Total: 9
Lázaro-Visa et al., 2019	Empathy	ESP	CS: Correlation	$N = 639$ $M_{age} = 12.9$ Female = 53.3% RR = N/A	Sample: ★★★★★☆ Measures: ★★★★★☆ Method: ★★★★★☆ Total: 9
Leadbeater et al., 2015	Peer perception	CAN	L: CLPM	$N = 1,217$ $M_{age} = 9.3$ Female = 51.0% RR = N/A	Sample: ★★★★★☆ Measures: ★★★★★☆ Method: ★★★★★☆ Total: 9
Lee et al., 2020	Threat interpretation	USA	CS: Regression	$N = 503$ $M_{age} = 15.3$ Female = 49.7% RR = N/A	Sample: ★★★★★☆ Measures: ★★★★★☆ Method: ★★★★★☆ Total: 8
Leff et al., 2014	Intent attribution	USA	CS: Correlation	$N = 109$ $M_{age} = 11.1$ Female = 63.3% RR = N/A	Sample: ★★★★★☆ Measures: ★★★★★☆ Method: ★★★★★☆ Total: 8

Lomas et al., 2012	Empathy	AUS	CS: Regression	$N = 68$ $M_{age} = 13.9$ Female = 54.4% RR = 4.9%	Sample: ★☆☆☆☆ Measures: ★★★★★ Method: ★☆☆☆☆ Total: 7
Malti et al., 2010	Empathy	CHE	L: Correlation	$N = 175$ $M_{age} = 6.1$ Female = 49.0% RR = N/A	Sample: ★★☆☆☆ Measures: ★★☆☆☆ Method: ★★☆☆☆ Total: 8
Martínez et al., 2020	Empathy	PER	CS: Regression (multinomial)	$N = 607$ $M_{age} = 14.5$ Female = 48.3% RR = N/A	Sample: ★★☆☆☆ Measures: ★★★★★ Method: ★☆☆☆☆ Total: 8
Mathieson et al., 2011	Intent attribution	USA	CS: Correlation	$N = 635$ $M_{age} = N/A$ Female = 50.2% RR = N/A	Sample: ★★☆☆☆ Measures: ★★★★★ Method: ★★☆☆☆ Total: 9
McQuade et al., 2019	Intent attribution	USA	CS: Correlation	$N = 125$ $M_{age} = 11.3$ Female = 45.0% RR = N/A	Sample: ★★☆☆☆ Measures: ★★☆☆☆ Method: ★★☆☆☆ Total: 8
Mendoza-González et al., 2020	Empathy	MEX	CS: ANOVA	$N = 1,190$ $M_{age} = 11.4$ Female = 50.3% RR = N/A	Sample: ★★☆☆☆ Measures: ★★☆☆☆ Method: ★★☆☆☆ Total: 7
Mertens et al., 2021	School social climate	NLD	L: Correlation	$N = 152$ $M_{age} = 12.4$ Female = 46.2% RR = N/A	Sample: ★★☆☆☆ Measures: ☆☆☆☆☆ Method: ★★☆☆☆ Total: 6
Miller et al., 2005	Emotion recognition	USA	L: Regression	$N = 131$ $M_{age} = N/A$ Female = 58.0% RR = 100%	Sample: ★★☆☆☆ Measures: ★★☆☆☆ Method: ★★☆☆☆ Total: 8
Monks et al., 2005	Theory of Mind	GBR	CS: ANCOVA	$N = 61$ $M_{age} = 5.4$ Female = 57.0% RR = 58.1%	Sample: ★★☆☆☆ Measures: ★★★★★ Method: ★★☆☆☆ Total: 9
Morrow et al., 2019	Intent attribution	USA	CS: Multilevel model	$N = 532$ $M_{age} = 10.0$ Female = 54.3 RR = 64.0%	Sample: ★★★★★☆ Measures: ★★★★★ Method: ★★☆☆☆ Total: 9
Moyano et al., 2019	Peer perception	ESP	CS: SEM	$N = 3,407$ $M_{age} = 11.0$ Female = 52.4% RR = N/A	Sample: ★★☆☆☆ Measures: ★★☆☆☆ Method: ★☆☆☆☆ Total: 6
Nasaescu et al., 2018	Empathy	ESP	CS: Correlation	$N = 2,139$ $M_{age} = 13.8$ Female = 51.5% RR = 95.0%	Sample: ★★★★★☆ Measures: ★★★★★ Method: ★☆☆☆☆ Total: 8
Ogelman & Seven, 2012	Accurate registration	TUR	CS: Regression	$N = 60$ $M_{age} = 6.2$ Female = 50.0% RR = 60.0%	Sample: ★★★★★☆ Measures: ★★★★★ Method: ★★☆☆☆ Total: 10
Ogelman & Seven, 2012	Intent attribution	TUR	CS: Regression	$N = 60$ $M_{age} = 6.2$ Female = 51.0% RR = 60.0%	Sample: ★★★★★☆ Measures: ★★★★★ Method: ★★☆☆☆ Total: 10

Pabian, 2019	Threat interpretation	BEL	L: CLPM	$N = 234$ $M_{age} = N/A$ Female = N/A RR = N/A	Sample: ★☆☆☆☆ Measures: ★★☆☆☆ Method: ★★☆☆☆ Total: 7
Perren et al., 2013	Intent attribution	USA	L: Path model	$N = 478$ $M_{age} = 10.6$ Female = 49.8 RR = 95.0%	Sample: ★★☆☆☆☆ Measures: ★★★★★ Method: ★★☆☆☆ Total: 10
Pistella et al., 2020	Empathy	ITA	CS: Regression	$N = 284$ $M_{age} = 4.8$ Female = 49.6% RR = 97.0%	Sample: ★★★★★☆ Measures: ★★☆☆☆ Method: ★★☆☆☆ Total: 10
Pornari & Wood, 2010	Intent attribution	GBR	CS: Regressions	$N = 325$ $M_{age} = 13.3$ Female = 53.1% RR = N/A	Sample: ★★☆☆☆☆ Measures: ★☆☆☆☆ Method: ★★☆☆☆ Total: 7
Pouwels et al., 2017	Peer perception	NLD	L: ANOVA	$N = 163$ $M_{age} = 16.3$ Female = 57.7% RR = 11.0%	Sample: ★★☆☆☆☆ Measures: ★★☆☆☆ Method: ★★☆☆☆ Total: 6
Pouwels et al., 2016	Threat appraisal	NLD	CS: ANOVA	$N = 390$ $M_{age} = 10.3$ Female = 49.0% RR = 93.1%	Sample: ★★★★★☆ Measures: ★★☆☆☆ Method: ★★☆☆☆ Total: 10
Pozzoli et al., 2017	Emotion recognition	ITA	CS: Bayesian logistic mixed-effect models	$N = 117$ $M_{age} = 12.4$ Female = 45.3% RR = 90.7%	Sample: ★★☆☆☆☆ Measures: ★★☆☆☆ Method: ★☆☆☆☆ Total: 7
Prinstein et al., 2005	Intent attribution	USA	CS: Regression	$N_1 = 116$ $M_{age} = N/A$ Female = 53.0% RR = 73.0%	Sample: ★★★★★☆ Measures: ★★☆☆☆ Method: ★★☆☆☆ Total: 10
Prinstein et al., 2005	Intent attribution	USA	CS: Regression	$N_2 = 159$ $M_{age} = 16.3$ Female = 61.0% RR = 65.0%	Sample: ★★★★★☆ Measures: ★★☆☆☆ Method: ★★☆☆☆ Total: 8
Purcell et al., 2021	Peer perception	CAN	CS: Correlation	$N = 81$ $M_{age} = 12.8$ Female = 64.2% RR = N/A	Sample: ★★☆☆☆☆ Measures: ★★☆☆☆ Method: ★★☆☆☆ Total: 8
Razjouyan et al., 2018	Empathy	IRN	CS: ANOVA	$N = 505$ $M_{age} = N/A$ Female = 42.0% RR = N/A	Sample: ★★☆☆☆☆ Measures: ★★☆☆☆ Method: ☆☆☆☆☆ Total: 4
Renati et al., 2012	Empathy	ITA	CS: ANOVA	$N = 816$ $M_{age} = 16.1$ Female = 66.8% RR = N/A	Sample: ★★☆☆☆☆ Measures: ★★☆☆☆ Method: ★☆☆☆☆ Total: 5
Renouf et al., 2010	Theory of Mind	CAN	L: Correlation	$N = 574$ $M_{age} = 5.3$ Female = 51.9% RR = N/A	Sample: ★★☆☆☆☆ Measures: ★☆☆☆☆ Method: ★★☆☆☆ Total: 7
Röder & Müller, 2020	Threat interpretation	DEU	CS: Correlation	$N = 144$ $M_{age} = 9.7$ Female = 50.7% RR = N/A	Sample: ★★☆☆☆☆ Measures: ★★☆☆☆ Method: ★★☆☆☆ Total: 7

Rodríguez-Hidalgo et al., 2020	Empathy	ESP, ECU	CS: SEM	$N = 24,943$ $M_{age} = 13.9$ Female = 49.9% RR = N/A	Sample: ★★★★★☆ Measures: ★★★★★☆ Method: ★☆☆☆☆ Total: 8
Rodríguez-Hidalgo et al., 2019	Empathy	ESP, ECU	CS: Regression	$N = 25,190$ $M_{age} = 13.9$ Female = 49.9% RR = N/A	Sample: ★★★★★☆ Measures: ★★★★★☆ Method: ★☆☆☆☆ Total: 10
Rodríguez-Hidalgo et al., 2018	Empathy	ESP	CS: Regression	$N = 25,684$ $M_{age} = 13.9$ Female = 51.2% RR = 69.7%	Sample: ★★★★★☆ Measures: ★★★★★☆ Method: ★☆☆☆☆ Total: 11
Rosen et al., 2007	Attention	USA	CS: Regression	$N = 82$ $M_{age} = 11.0$ Female = 42.7% RR = N/A	Sample: ★★☆☆☆☆ Measures: ★★★★★☆ Method: ★★☆☆☆ Total: 10
Rotenberg & Boulton, 2013	Peer perception	GBR	CS: Regressions	$N = 505$ $M_{age} = 9.8$ Female = 52.9% RR = N/A	Sample: ★★★★★☆ Measures: ★★★★★☆ Method: ★★☆☆☆ Total: 9
Rowe et al., 2015	Threat interpretation	AUS	CS: Correlation	$N = 601$ $M_{age} = 11.0$ Female = 49.0% RR = 70.0%	Sample: ★★★★★☆ Measures: ★★★★★☆ Method: ★★☆☆☆ Total: 9
Rudolph, 2010	Peer perception	USA	CS: Correlation	$N = 206$ $M_{age} = 10.1$ Female = 53.4% RR = N/A	Sample: ★★☆☆☆☆ Measures: ★★☆☆☆ Method: ★★☆☆☆ Total: 6
Rudolph et al., 2016	Threat interpretation	USA	CS: T-Test	$N = 47$ $M_{age} = 15.5$ Female = 100% RR = N/A	Sample: ★☆☆☆☆☆ Measures: ★★★★★☆ Method: ★★☆☆☆ Total: 8
Rudolph et al., 2021	Emotion recognition	USA	CS: Regression	$N = 43$ $M_{age} = 15.4$ Female = 100% RR = N/A	Sample: ★☆☆☆☆☆ Measures: ★★★★★☆ Method: ★★☆☆☆ Total: 7
Rudolph et al., 2021	Threat Interpretation	USA	CS: Correlation	$N = 43$ $M_{age} = 15.4$ Female = 100% RR = N/A	Sample: ★☆☆☆☆☆ Measures: ★★★★★☆ Method: ★★☆☆☆ Total: 7
Rudolph et al., 2009	Peer perception	USA	CS: Multilevel model	$N = 206$ $M_{age} = 10.1$ Female = 53.4% RR = N/A	Sample: ★★☆☆☆☆ Measures: ★★★★★☆ Method: ★★☆☆☆ Total: 8
Sainio et al., 2013	Peer perception	FIN	L: Multilevel model	$N = 4,941$ $M_{age} = 14.4$ Female = 52.3% RR = 86.6%	Sample: ★★★★★☆ Measures: ★★★★★☆ Method: ★★☆☆☆ Total: 11
Salmivalli & Isaacs, 2005	Peer perception	FIN	L: Path model	$N = 212$ $M_{age} = N/A$ Female = 49.52 RR = 99.1%	Sample: ★★★★★☆ Measures: ★★★★★☆ Method: ★★☆☆☆ Total: 9
Schacter & Juvonen, 2018	Peer perception	USA	CS: Correlation	$N = 5,991$ $M_{age} = N/A$ Female = 52.0% RR = 84.0%	Sample: ★★★★★☆ Measures: ★★☆☆☆ Method: ★★☆☆☆ Total: 7

Schoeps et al., 2018	Empathy	ESP	L: Correlation	$N = 148$ $M_{age} = 12.6$ Female = 56.8% RR = N/A	Sample: ★★☆☆☆☆ Measures: ★★☆☆☆ Method: ★★☆☆☆ Total: 8
Schokman et al., 2014	Empathy	AUS	CS: Regression	$N = 284$ $M_{age} = N/A$ Female = 20.8% RR = N/A	Sample: ★★☆☆☆☆ Measures: ★★★★★ Method: ★★☆☆☆ Total: 10
Schultze-Krumbholz et al., 2020	Empathy	DEU	CS: Multilevel mediation model	$N = 897$ $M_{age} = 13.5$ Female = 51.3% RR = N/A	Sample: ★★☆☆☆☆ Measures: ★★☆☆☆ Method: ★★☆☆☆ Total: 8
Schultze-Krumbholz & Scheithauer, 2013	Empathy	DEU	L: Hierarchical quasi-poisson regression	$N = 77$ $M_{age} = 12/5$ Female = 45.5% RR = N/A	Sample: ★★☆☆☆☆ Measures: ★★☆☆☆ Method: ★★★★★ Total: 9
Schwartz et al., 1998	Intent attribution	USA	CS: Correlation	$N = 66$ $M_{age} = 8.0$ Female = 0.0% RR = 79.0%	Sample: ★★☆☆☆☆ Measures: ★☆☆☆☆ Method: ★★☆☆☆ Total: 6
Shakoor et al., 2012	Theory of Mind	GBR	L: Regression (logistic)	$N = 2,232$ $M_{age} = N/A$ Female = N/A RR = 93.0%	Sample: ★★☆☆☆☆ Measures: ★★☆☆☆ Method: ★★☆☆☆ Total: 7
Smalley & Banerjee, 2014	Intent attribution	N/A	CS: Regression	$N = 181$ $M_{age} = 9.1$ Female = 50.3% RR = 100%	Sample: ★★★★★☆ Measures: ★★☆☆☆ Method: ★★☆☆☆ Total: 9
Smorti & Ciucci, 2000	Intent attribution	ITA	CS: Kruskal-Wallis & Mann-Whitney tests	$N = 207$ $M_{age} = N/A$ Female = 52.2 RR = N/A	Sample: ★★☆☆☆☆ Measures: ★☆☆☆☆ Method: ★☆☆☆☆ Total: 4
Stubbs-Richardson & May, 2020	Threat interpretation	USA	CS: Regression (logistic)	$N = 369$ $M_{age} = 16.0$ Female = 55.7% RR = 40.1%	Sample: ★★☆☆☆☆ Measures: ★★☆☆☆ Method: ★★☆☆☆ Total: 7
Taylor et al., 2013	Threat interpretation	USA	L: Path model	$N = 326$ $M_{age} = 12.1$ Female = 53.7% RR = 63.0%	Sample: ★★★★★☆ Measures: ★★★★★ Method: ★★★★★ Total: 12
Telzer et al., 2020	Accurate registration	USA	L: Correlation	$N = 38$ $M_{age} = 15.4$ Female = 100% RR = N/A	Sample: ★☆☆☆☆☆ Measures: ★★☆☆☆ Method: ★★☆☆☆ Total: 7
Telzer et al., 2020	Peer perception	USA	L: Correlation	$N = 38$ $M_{age} = 15.4$ Female = 100% RR = N/A	Sample: ★☆☆☆☆☆ Measures: ★★☆☆☆ Method: ★★☆☆☆ Total: 7
Troop-Gordon, Frosch, et al., 2019	Empathy	USA	L: Correlation	$N = 484$ $M_{age} = 10.3$ Female = 49.4% RR = 86.7%	Sample: ★★★★★☆ Measures: ★★★★★ Method: ★★☆☆☆ Total: 10
Troop-Gordon, Gordon, et al., 2019	Attention	USA	CS: Correlation & Regression	$N = 72$ $M_{age} = 11.7$ Female = 52.8% RR = 28.5%	Sample: ★☆☆☆☆☆ Measures: ★★★★★ Method: ★★☆☆☆ Total: 7

Troop-Gordon & Ladd, 2005	Peer perception	USA	L: Latent Growth Curve Modeling	$N = 381$ $M_{age} = 5.5$ Female = 48.4% RR = N/A	Sample: ★★☆☆☆☆ Measures: ★★☆☆☆ Method: ★★☆☆☆ Total: 8
van der Ploeg et al., 2017	Empathy	FIN	L: Correlation	$N = 4,209$ $M_{age} = 11.3$ Female = 50.0% RR = N/A	Sample: ★★☆☆☆☆ Measures: ★☆☆☆☆ Method: ★★☆☆☆ Total: 7
van Dijk et al., 2017	Intent attribution	NLD	CS: Correlation	$N = 143$ $M_{age} = 6.7$ Female = 41.0% RR = 25.3%	Sample: ★★☆☆☆☆ Measures: ★★☆☆☆ Method: ★★☆☆☆ Total: 7
van Dijk et al., 2017	Theory of Mind	NLD	CS: Correlation	$N = 143$ $M_{age} = 6.7$ Female = 41.0% RR = 25.3%	Sample: ★★☆☆☆☆ Measures: ★★☆☆☆ Method: ★★☆☆☆ Total: 9
van Noorden, Bukowski, et al., 2016	Empathy	NLD	CS: Regression	$N = 800$ $M_{age} = 10.0$ Female = 49.5% RR = 95.5%	Sample: ★★★★★☆ Measures: ★★☆☆☆ Method: ★★☆☆☆ Total: 10
van Noorden et al., 2017	Empathy	NLD	CS: ANOVA	$N = 264$ $M_{age} = 10.0$ Female = 50.0% RR = 98.4%	Sample: ★★★★★☆ Measures: ★★☆☆☆ Method: ★★☆☆☆ Total: 10
van Noorden et al., 2014	Peer perception	NLD	CS: Regression	$N = 800$ $M_{age} = 10.0$ Female = 49.5% RR = 95.5%	Sample: ★★★★★☆ Measures: ★★☆☆☆ Method: ★★☆☆☆ Total: 9
van Noorden, Haselager, et al., 2016	Peer perception	NLD	CS: ANOVA	$N = 669$ $M_{age} = 10.7$ Female = 49.9% RR = 90.6%	Sample: ★★★★★☆ Measures: ★★☆☆☆ Method: ★★☆☆☆ Total: 9
Warden & Mackinnon, 2003	Threat interpretation	GB-SCT	CS: ANCOVA	$N = 58$ $M_{age} = N/A$ Female = 41.4% RR = 30.1%	Sample: ★☆☆☆☆☆ Measures: ★★☆☆☆ Method: ★☆☆☆☆ Total: 5
Warden & Mackinnon, 2003	Empathy	GB-SCT	CS: ANCOVA	$N = 58$ $M_{age} = N/A$ Female = 41.4% RR = 30.1%	Sample: ★☆☆☆☆☆ Measures: ★★☆☆☆ Method: ★☆☆☆☆ Total: 4
Williford et al., 2016	Empathy	USA	L: LGCM	$N = 431$ $M_{age} = 10.2$ Female = 52.0% RR = 68.0%	Sample: ★★☆☆☆☆ Measures: ★★★★★ Method: ★★☆☆☆ Total: 11
Williford et al., 2014	Empathy	USA	L: Latent Transitional Analysis	$N = 1,077$ $M_{age} = 10.2$ Female = 51.0% RR = 78.3%	Sample: ★★★★★☆ Measures: ★★★★★ Method: ★★☆☆☆ Total: 11
Yang et al., 2020	Empathy	USA	CS: Multilevel model	$N = 23,532$ $M_{age} = N/A$ Female = 51.9 RR = N/A	Sample: ★★☆☆☆☆ Measures: ★★☆☆☆ Method: ★★☆☆☆ Total: 7
Yeung & Leadbeater, 2007	Intent attribution	CAN	L: Correlation	$N = 140$ $M_{age} = 9.9$ Female = 53.6% RR = 64.0%	Sample: ★★★★★☆ Measures: ★★★★★ Method: ★★☆☆☆ Total: 12

Yudes et al., 2020	Empathy	ESP	CS: Correlation	$N = 2,039$ $M_{age} = 14.6$ Female = 53.9% RR = N/A	Sample: ★★★★★☆ Measures: ★★★★★☆ Method: ★☆☆☆☆ Total: 8
Zimmer-Gembeck, 2015	Threat interpretation	AUS	L: Correlation	$N = 711$ $M_{age} = 11.2$ Female = 52.0% RR = 76.0%	Sample: ★★★★★☆ Measures: ★★★★★☆ Method: ★★★★★☆ Total: 11
Zimmer-Gembeck & Duffy, 2014	Threat interpretation	AUS	L: Correlation	$N = 358$ $M_{age} = 11.0$ Female = 51.0% RR = 73.0%	Sample: ★★★★★☆ Measures: ★★★★★☆ Method: ★★★★★☆ Total: 10
Zimmer-Gembeck et al., 2013	Accurate registration	AUS	CS: Regression	$N = 359$ $M_{age} = 11.0$ Female = 48.0% RR = 70.0%	Sample: ★★★★★☆ Measures: ★★★★★☆ Method: ★★★★★☆ Total: 10
Zimmer-Gembeck et al., 2013	Threat interpretation	AUS	CS: Correlation	$N = 359$ $M_{age} = 11.0$ Female = 48.0% RR = 70.0%	Sample: ★★★★★☆ Measures: ★★★★★☆ Method: ★★★★★☆ Total: 9
Zimmer-Gembeck et al., 2014	Threat interpretation	AUS	CS: SEM & Correlation	$N = 601$ $M_{age} = 12.1$ Female = 50.5% RR = 73.0%	Sample: ★★★★★☆ Measures: ★★★★★☆ Method: ★★★★★☆ Total: 10
Ziv et al., 2013	Threat interpretation	ISR	CS: MANCOVA	$N = 105$ $M_{age} = 13.1$ Female = 51.4% RR = N/A	Sample: ★★★★★☆ Measures: ★★★★★☆ Method: ★★★★★☆ Total: 6

Note. CS = Cross-sectional, L = Longitudinal, RR = Response rate. Fifteen studies received double quality assessment, once per SIP-phase examined. See Online Source 2 for the detailed quality assessment.