Benefits and risks associated with children's and adolescents' interactions with electronic screens: An umbrella review

Taren Sanders[1], Michael Noetel[2], Philip Parker[1], Borja Del Pozo Cruz[3], Stuart Biddle[4], Rimante Ronto[5], Ryan Hulteen[6], Rhiannon Parker[7], George Thomas[8], Katrien De Cocker[5], Jo Salmon[9], Kylie Hesketh[9], Nicole Weeks[1], Hugh Arnott[1], Emma Devine[10], Roberta Vasconcellos[1], & Chris Lonsdale[1]

[1] Institute for Positive Psychology and Education, Australian Catholic University

[2] School of Health and Behavioural Sciences, Australian Catholic University

[3] Department of Sport Science and Clinical Biomechanics, University of Southern Denmark

[4] School of Psychology and Counselling, University of Southern Queensland

[5] Department of Health Systems and Populations, Faculty of Medicine, Health and Human Sciences, Macquarie University

[6] School of Kinesiology, Louisiana State University

[7] School of Medicine and Health, Sydney University

[8] Faculty of Health Sciences, Curtin University

[9] Institute for Physical Activity and Nutrition, Deakin University

[10] The Matilda Centre for Research in Mental Health and Substance Use, University of Sydney

Author Note

Add author notes here

The authors made the following contributions. Taren Sanders: Conceptualization, Data curation, Writing - Original Draft; Michael Noetel: Conceptualization, Writing - Original Draft; Philip Parker: Conceptualization, Writing - Original Draft; Borja Del Pozo Cruz: Writing - Review & Editing; Stuart Biddle: Writing - Review & Editing; Rimante Ronto: Writing - Review & Editing; Ryan Hulteen: Writing - Review & Editing; Rhiannon Parker: Writing - Review & Editing; George Thomas: Writing - Review & Editing; Katrien De Cocker: Writing - Review & Editing; Jo Salmon: Writing - Review & Editing; Kylie Hesketh: Writing - Review & Editing; Nicole Weeks: Writing - Review & Editing; Hugh Arnott: Writing - Review & Editing; Emma Devine: Writing - Review & Editing; Roberta Vasconcellos: Writing - Review & Editing; Chris Lonsdale: Writing - Original Draft, Project Administration.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Taren Sanders, 33 Berry St, North Sydney, NSW, Australia. E-mail: Taren.Sanders@acu.edu.au

Abstract

Add abstract here

Keywords: keywords

Word count: X

Benefits and risks associated with children's and adolescents' interactions with electronic screens: An umbrella review

Summary

Children's engagement in screen time is a complex issue. Parents, policymakers, and educators needing to weigh the risks that sedentary use of screens present alongside the potential benefits for learning and social connectedness. Hampering efforts to make an informed decision is the lack of comprehensive evidence. As a Lancet editorial [1] suggested, "Our understanding of the benefits, harms, and risks of our rapidly changing digital landscape is sorely lacking." In this study, we systematically harmonize data from existing meta-analyses of screen time on a range of outcomes, including health, education, and psychology, and identify the most statistically robust relationships. We show that some forms of screen time—such as social media—show consistent evidence of harm for children, with no clear evidence of a benefit. Other relationships are more complex. Video games, for example, are associated with poorer body composition and learning outcomes. However, video games for a specific educational purpose (such as numeracy) are associated with improvements in that subject area. Caregivers must therefore weigh the health risk against the educational benefit. The findings of this study provide parents and other caregivers with the information to make these informed decisions.

Background

In the 16th century, hysteria reigned around a new technology that threatened to be "confusing and harmful" to the mind. The cause of such concern? The widespread availability of books brought about by the invention of the printing press [2]. In the early 19th century, concerns about schooling "exhausting the children's brains" followed, with the medical community accepting that excessive study could be a cause of madness [3]. By the 20th century, the invention of the radio was accompanied by assertions that it would distract children from their reading (which by this point was no longer considered confusing and harmful) leading to impaired learning [4].

Today, the same arguments that were once leveled against reading, schooling, and radio are being made about screen use (e.g., television, mobile phones, and computers) [5]. Excessive screen time use is the number one concern parents have about their children's health and behaviour, ahead of nutrition, bullying, and physical inactivity [6]. Yet, the evidence to support parents' concerns is inadequate. A Lancet editorial [1] suggested that, "Our understanding of the benefits, harms, and risks of our rapidly changing digital landscape is sorely lacking."

While some forms of screen use (e.g., television viewing) may be detrimental to health and wellbeing [7,8], evidence for other forms of screen exposure (e.g., video games or online communication, such as Zoom™) remains less certain and, in some cases, may even be beneficial [9,10]. Thus, according to a Nature Human Behaviour editorial, research to determine the effect of screen exposure on youth is "a defining question of our age" [11]. With concerns over the impact of screen use including education, health, social development, and psychological well-being, a broad overview that identifies potential benefits and risks is needed.

Citing the negative effects of screens on health (e.g., increased risk of obesity) and

health-related behaviours (e.g., sleep), guidelines from the World Health Organisation [12] and numerous government agencies [13,14] and statements by expert groups [15] have recommended that young people's time spent using electronic media devices for entertainment purposes should be limited. For example, the Australian Government guidelines regarding sedentary behaviour recommend that young children (under the age of two) should not spend any time watching screens. They also recommend that children aged 2-5 years should spend a maximum of one hour engaged in recreational sedentary screen use per day, while children aged 5-12 and adolescents should spend no more than two hours. In contrast, some recent evidence suggests that exposure to electronic entertainment media that exceeds these guidelines (e.g., 3-4 hours per day) may not have meaningful adverse effects on children's behaviour or mental health, and might, in fact, benefit their well-being, as long as this exposure does not reach extreme levels (e.g., 7 hours per day)[16]. Some research also indicates that content (e.g., video games vs television programs) plays an important role in determining the potential benefit or harm of youths' exposure to screen-based media [17]. Indeed, educational screen time is positively related to educational outcomes [18]. This evidence has led some researchers to argue that a more nuanced approach to screen time guidelines is required [19].

In 2016, the American Academy of Pediatrics used a narrative review to examine the benefits and risks of children and adolescents' electronic media [20] as a basis for updating their guidelines about screen use [15]. Since then, a large number of systematic reviews and meta-analyses have provided evidence about the potential benefits and risks of screen use. Yet, no review has synthesised the evidence available across a broad range of outcome domains, such as physical health, education, physical and cognitive development, behaviour, and well-being.

In order to synthesise the evidence and support further evidence-based guideline development and refinement, we reviewed published meta-analyses examining the effects of

screen use on children and youth. This review synthesises evidence on any plausible outcome of electronic media exposure. Adopting this broad approach allowed us to provide a holistic perspective on the influence of screens on children's lives. By synthesising across life domains (e.g., school and home), this review provides evidence to inform guidelines and advice for parents, teachers, pediatricians and other professionals in order to maximise human functioning.

Methods

Eligibility criteria. *Population*: To be eligible for inclusion, meta-analyses needed to include meta-analytic effect sizes for children or adolescents (age 0-18 years). We included meta-analyses containing studies that combined data from adults and youth if meta-analytic effect size estimates specific to participants aged 18 years or less could be extracted (i.e., the highest individual study from the meta-analysis had a mean age was < 18 years). We excluded meta-analyses that only contained evidence gathered from adults (age >18 years).

Exposure: We included meta-analyses examining all types of electronic screens including (but not necessarily limited to) television, gaming consoles, computers, tablets, and mobile phones. We also included analyses of all types of content on these devices, including (but not necessarily limited to) recreational content (e.g., television programs, movies, games), homework, and communication (e.g., video chat). In this review we adopted a population-level perspective, meaning that we examined electronic media exposure that occurs during typical daily living activities (e.g., home, school-based electronic media exposure). Consistent with this population-level approach, we excluded technology-based treatments for clinical conditions. However, we included studies examining the effect of screen exposure on non-clinical outcomes (e.g., learning) for children and youth with a clinical condition. For example, a meta-analysis of the effect of television watching on learning among adolescents diagnosed with depression would be included. However, a meta-analysis of interventions designed to *treat* clinical depression delivered by a mobile phone app would be excluded.

Outcomes: We included all reported outcomes.

Publications: We included meta-analyses (or meta-regressions) of quantitative evidence. To be included, meta-analyses needed to analyse data from studies identified in a systematic review. For our purposes, a systematic review was one in which the authors attempted to

acquire all the research evidence that pertained to their research question(s). We excluded meta-analyses that did not attempt to summarise all the available evidence (e.g., a meta-analysis of all studies from one laboratory). We included meta-analyses regardless of the study designs included in the review (e.g., laboratory-based experimental studies, randomised controlled trials, non-randomised controlled trials, longitudinal, cross-sectional, case studies), as long as the studies in the review collected quantitative evidence. We excluded systematic reviews of qualitative evidence. We did not formulate inclusion/exclusion criteria related to the risk of bias of the review. We did, however, employ a risk of bias tool to help interpret the results. We included full-text, peer-reviewed meta-analyses published or 'in-press' in English. We excluded conference abstracts and meta-analyses that were unpublished.

Information sources. We searched records contained in the following databases: Pubmed, MEDLINE, CINAHL, PsycINFO, SPORTDiscus, Education Source, Embase, Cochrane Library, Scopus, Web of Science, ProQuest Social Science Premium Collection, and ERIC. We conducted an initial search on August 17, 2018 and refreshed the search on May 13, 2020. We searched reference lists of included papers in order to identify additional eligible meta-analyses. We also searched PROSPERO to identify relevant protocols and contacted authors to determine if these reviews have been completed and published.

Search strategy. The search strategy associated with each of the 12 databases can be found here. We hand searched reference lists from any relevant umbrella reviews to identify systematic meta-analyses that our search may have missed.

Selection process. Using Covidence software (Veritas Health Innovation, Melbourne, Australia), two researchers independently screened all titles and abstracts. Two researchers then independently reviewed full-text articles. We resolved disagreements at each stage of the process by consensus, with a third researcher employed, when needed.

Data collection process. From each included meta-analysis, two researchers independently extracted data into a custom-designed database.

Data items. From each meta-analysis we extracted the following items: First author, year of publication, study design restrictions (e.g., cross-sectional, observational, experimental), region restrictions (e.g., specific countries), earliest and latest study publication dates, sample age (mean), lowest and highest mean age reported, outcomes reported, and exposures reported.

Study risk of bias assessment. For each meta-analysis, two researchers independently completed the National Health, Lung and Blood Institute's Quality Assessment of Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses tool [21] (see Table **??**). We resolved disagreements by consensus, with a third researcher employed when needed. We did not assess risk of bias in the individual studies that were included in each meta-analysis.

Effect measures. Two researchers independently extracted all quantitative meta-analytic effect sizes, including moderation results. Where possible, they also extracted effect sizes from primary studies included in each meta-analysis. To facilitate comparisons, we converted effect sizes to Pearson's r using established formulae [22–24]. We excluded relative risk ratios from this conversion because meta-analyses did not contain sufficient information to meaningfully convert. Effect sizes on the original metric are provided in Supplementary File 1.

Synthesis methods. After extracting data, we examined the combinations of exposure and outcomes and removed any effects that appeared more than once, keeping the effect with the largest total sample size. In instances where effect sizes from the same combination of exposure and outcome were drawn from different populations (e.g., children vs adolescents) we retained both estimates in our dataset.

We excluded effect size estimates when the authors did not provide a sample size. We descriptively present the remaining meta-analytic effect sizes. To remove the differences in approach to meta-analyses across the reviews, we reran the effect size estimate using a random effects meta-analysis via the metafor package [25] in R [26] (version 4.1.3) when the meta-analysis's authors provided primary study data associated with these effects. When

required, we imputed missing sample sizes using mean imputation from the other studies within that review. From our reanalysis we also extracted I^2 values. To test for publication bias, we conducted Egger's test [27] when the number of studies within the review was ten or more [28], and conducted a test of excess significance [29]. We contacted authors who did not provide primary study data in their published article. Where authors did not provide data in a format that could be re-analysed, we used the published results of their original meta-analysis.

Evidence assessment criteria. *Statistical Credibility.* We employed a statistical classification approach to grade the credibility of the effect sizes in the literature. To be considered 'credible' an effect needed to be derived from a combined sample of >1,000 [30] and have non-significant tests of publication bias (i.e., Egger's test and excess significance test). We performed these analyses, and therefore the review needed to provide usable study-level data in order to be included.

Consistency of Effect within the Population. We also examined the consistency of the effect size using the I^2 measure. We considered $I^2 < 50\%$ to indicate effects that were relatively consistent across the population of interest. I^2 values of $> 50\%$ were taken to indicate an effect was potentially heterogeneous within the population.

Direction of Effect. Finally, we examined the extent to which significance testing suggested screen exposure was associated with benefit, harm, or no effect on outcomes. We used thresholds of $P < .05$ for weak evidence and $P < 10^{-3}$ for strong evidence. An effect that was neither significant at $P < .05$ or 10^{-3} that also passed the criteria for statistical credibility was taken to indicate no association of interest.

Deviations from protocol. We initially planned to include systematic reviews without meta-analyses in a narrative summary alongside the main meta-analytic findings. However, we determined that combining results from the meta-analyses allowed readers to compare relative strength of associations more easily. Readers interested in the relevant

systematic reviews (i.e., without meta-analysis) can consult the list of references in Supplementary File 2.

We altered our evidence assessment plan when we identified that, as written, it could not classify precise evidence of null effects (i.e., from large reviews with low heterogeneity and low risk of publication bias) as 'credible' because a highly-significant P-value was a criteria. This would have significantly harmed knowledge gained from our review as it would have restricted our ability to show where the empirical evidence strongly indicated that there was no association between screen time and a given outcome.

Results

Search Results. The searches yielded 41,928 results, of which 24,023 were duplicates. After screening titles and abstracts, we assessed 1,964 full-texts for inclusion. Of those, 117 met the inclusion criteria and we extracted the data from all of these meta-analyses. Figure 1 presents the full results of the selection process.

The most frequently reported exposures were general TV programs and movies (n = 26), physically active video games ($n = 15$), screen-based lifestyle risk behaviour interventions (at school) ($n = 14$), and general screen use ($n = 13$). Supplementary File 3 provides a list of all exposures identified. The most frequently reported outcomes were body composition ($n = 34$), general physical activity ($n = 15$), general literacy ($n = 13$), general learning ($n = 12$), and sleep duration ($n = 9$). In most cases (121/197), there was only one exposure/outcome combination for an age group, with 20 appearing twice, and 8 appearing three or more times. Full characteristics of the included studies are provided in Table **??**. After removing reviews with duplicate exposure/outcome combinations, our process yielded 165 unique effect/outcome combinations contributed from 51 reviews. These effects represent the findings of 2,171 primary studies comprised of 1,652,944 participants.



Figure 1. PRISMA Diagram

Table 1

Review characteristics for studies providing unique effects

First Author	Year	Design Restrictions	Regions Restrictions	Study Range	Sample Age Restrictions	Outcomes Assessed	Exposures Assessed
Abrami	2015	Include: Experimental; Quasi-experimental	None specified	2009 - 2015	Early childhood; School-age Children (Primary/Elementary)	Literacy: Listening comprehension Literacy: Phonics Literacy: Phonomic awareness Literacy: Reading comprehension Literacy: Reading fluency Literacy: Vocabulary knowledge	Intervention: Literacy (Abracadabra; in schools)
Adelantado-Renau	2019	Include: Cross-sectional studies	None specified	1982 - 2019	Children; Adolescents	Learning: General Literacy: General Numeracy: General	Screen use: General TV programs and movies: General Video games: General
Aghasi	2020	Include: Observational	None specified	2007 - 2016	All	Body composition	Internet use: General
Andrade	2019	Include: Interventions	None specified	2010 - 2017	Children; Adolescents	Healthy behavior: Self-efficacy Psychological health: Depression Psychological health: Enjoyment Self-perceptions: General Self-perceptions: Self-esteem	Video games: Physically active
Bartel	2015	None	None specified	2004 - 2014	Adolescents	Sleep: Bedtime Sleep: Duration Sleep: Time to fall asleep	Computer use: General Internet use: General Screen use: General (mobile phone) TV programs and movies: General Video games: General

Table 1

Review characteristics for studies providing unique effects (continued)

First Author	Year	Design Restrictions	Regions Restrictions	Study Range	Sample Age Restrictions	Outcomes Assessed	Exposures Assessed
Blok	2002	None	None specified	1990 - 2000	All	Literacy: Reading fluency	Intervention: Literacy
Bossen	2020	Include: Randomised controlled trials	None specified	2011 - 2018	Children	Body composition Cardiometabolic health: Fitness Physical activity: General Physical health: Muscular fitness	Video games: Health promoting content
Boyland	2016	Include: Experimental	None specified	2004 - 2015	Children; Adolescents	Diet: Food intake	Advertising: Unhealthy food
Byun	2018	Include: All quantitative designs	None specified	2006 - 2014	School-age Children	Numeracy: General	Video games: Numeracy
Carter	2016	Include: All quantitative designs	None specified	2011 - 2015	Children; Adolescents	Sleep: Inadequate duration Sleep: Lethargy Sleep: Poor quality	Screen use: General (mobile phone at bed time)
Champion	2019	Include: Randomised controlled trials	None specified	2003 - 2017	School-age Children	Body composition Diet: Fat consumption Diet: Fruit and vegetable intake Diet: Fruit intake Diet: Sugary drinks and snacks Physical activity: General Physical activity: Moderate-to-vigorous intensity Risky behavior: Alcohol consumption Risky behavior: Smoking Screen time: General	Intervention: Lifestyle risk behaviour (at school)

Table 1

Review characteristics for studies providing unique effects (continued)

First Author	Year	Design Restrictions	Regions Restrictions	Study Range	Sample Age Restrictions	Outcomes Assessed	Exposures Assessed
Chan	2014	Include: Experimental; Quasi-experimental	None specified	2002 - 2012	School-age Children	Numeracy: General	Intervention: Dynamic geometry software
Cheung	2012	Include: Randomised controlled trials	None specified	1982 - 2010	School-age Children	Literacy: Reading	Intervention: Reading (in schools)
Cheung	2013	Include: Experimental; Quasi-experimental	None specified	1980 - 2010	School-age Children	Numeracy: General	Intervention: Mathematics (in schools)
Coyne	2018	None	None specified	1975 - 2017	Children; Adolescents	Prosocial Behavior: General	Screen use: Prosocial content
Cushing	2010	Include: All quantitative designs; Experimental	None specified	1989 - 2009	Children; Adolescents	Healthy behavior: General	Intervention: Health behaviours
Darling	2017	Include: Intervention	None specified	2006 - 2016	Children; Adolescents	Body composition Diet: Healthy dietary behaviour Physical activity: General	Intervention: To promote health (via mobile phone)
de Oliveira	2016	Include: Observational	None specified	2010 - 2014	Adolescents	Cardiometabolic health: Metabolic Syndrome	Screen use: General
Fang	2019	Include: Cohort; Case-control; Cross-sectional	None specified	2006 - 2019	Children; Adolescents	Body composition	Computer use: General Screen use: General TV programs and movies: General

Table 1

Review characteristics for studies providing unique effects (continued)

First Author	Year	Design Restrictions	Regions Restrictions	Study Range	Sample Age Restrictions	Outcomes Assessed	Exposures Assessed
Ferguson	2017	None	None specified	2005 - 2017	Children; Adolescents	Risky behavior: Sexual activity Risky behavior: Sexual activity (initiation of sex)	Screen use: Sexual content
Folkvord	2018	Include: Interventions	None specified	2007 - 2018	Children; Adolescents	Diet: Food intake (calories)	Advertising: Advergames
Gardella	2017	Include: Cross-sectional	Include: North America	2006 - 2014	Adolescents	Learning: Educational achievement problems Learning: School attendance problems	Internet use: Cyberbullying victimization
Ghobadi	2018	Include: Cohort; Case-control; Cross-sectional Exclude: Interventions	None specified	2009 - 2014	Children; Adolescents	Body composition	TV programs and movies: Mealtime
Graham	2015	Include: Experimental; Quasi-experimental	None specified	2004 - 2011	School-age Children (Primary/Elementary/Middle School)	Literacy: Writing	Intervention: Writing feedback
Hammersley	2016	Include: Randomised controlled trials	None specified	2003 - 2013	Children; Adolescents	Body composition	Intervention: To promote healthy weight (obesity prevention)
Hassan-Saleh	2019	Include: Experimental; Quasi-experimental	None specified	2008 - 2016	Children; Adolescents	Literacy: Pronunciation	Intervention: Pronunciation

Table 1

Review characteristics for studies providing unique effects (continued)

First Author	Year	Design Restrictions	Regions Restrictions	Study Range	Sample Age Restrictions	Outcomes Assessed	Exposures Assessed
Hernandez-Jimenez	2019	Include: Experimental; Quasi-experimental	None specified	2009 - 2017	Children; Adolescents	Body composition	Video games: Physically active
Hurwitz	2018	None	Include: North America	1997 - 2018	Early childhood/pre-school; School-age Children (Early Primary/Elementary)	Literacy: General	Intervention: Literacy videos
Janssen	2020	Include: Experimental; Cross-sectional; Longitudial	None specified	2007 - 2019	Children	Sleep: Duration	Screen use: General
Kates	2018	None	None specified	2008 - 2016	School-age Children	Learning: General	Screen use: General (mobile phone)
Kroesbergen	2003	Include: Within subject design; between subject design	None specified	1985 - 1999	School-age Children (Primary/Elementary)	Numeracy: General	Intervention: Mathematics (via computer in classrooms)
Kucukalkan	2019	Include: Experimental	None specified	2007 - 2016	School-age Children (Primary/Elementary)	Numeracy: General	Intervention: Mathematics
Lanca	2020	Include: Cohort; Case-control; Cross-sectional; Intervention trials. Exclude: Case reports; Retrospective studies.	None specified	2007 - 2016	Children; Adolescents	Eye health: Myopia	Screen use: General

Table 1

Review characteristics for studies providing unique effects (continued)

First Author	Year	Design Restrictions	Regions Restrictions	Study Range	Sample Age Restrictions	Outcomes Assessed	Exposures Assessed
Li	2010	Include: Experimental; Quasi-experimental	None specified	1991 - 2005	School-age Children	Numeracy: General	Intervention: Mathematics
Liao	2008	Include: All quantitative designs	Include: Taiwan	1990 - 2003	School-age Children (Primary/Elementary)	Learning: General	Intervention: Education (via computer)
Liao	2014	Include: Randomised controlled trials	None specified	1999 - 2012	Children; Adolescents	Body composition	Intervention: Screentime reduction
Liu	2016	Include: Cross-sectional; Case-control; Longitudinal	None specified	2001 - 2014	All	Psychological health: Depression	Screen use: General
Liu	2019	Include: All quantitative designs	None specified	2007 - 2014	All	Psychological health: Anxiety Psychological health: Depression Psychological health: Satisfaction	Social Media: Instant messaging Video games: General

Table 1

Review characteristics for studies providing unique effects (continued)

First Author	Year	Design Restrictions	Regions Restrictions	Study Range	Sample Age Restrictions	Outcomes Assessed	Exposures Assessed
Madigan	2020	Include: Observational Exclude: Qualitative	None specified	1973 - 2019	Children	Literacy: General	Intervention: Education (general) Screen use: General Screen use: General (coviewing) TV programs and movies: Coviewing TV programs and movies: Educational TV programs and movies: General TV programs and movies: General (in background)
Mares	2005	None	None specified	1969 - 1989	Children	Aggression: Towards peers Cognition: Reducing stereotypes Prosocial Behavior: Altruism Social interactions: General	TV programs and movies: General
Mares	2013	Exclude: Experimental	Exclude: North America	1973 - 2010	Children	Cognition: Moral reasoning and perception of out-groups Learning: General Learning: Literacy and numeracy Learning: Physical and social environment	Intervention: Sesame Street
Marshall	2004	None	None specified	1985 - 2002	Children; Adolescents	Body composition Physical activity: General	TV programs and movies: General Video games: General

Table 1

Review characteristics for studies providing unique effects (continued)

First Author	Year	Design Restrictions	Regions Restrictions	Study Range	Sample Age Restrictions	Outcomes Assessed	Exposures Assessed
Martins	2019	Include: All quantitative designs	None specified	2003 - 2018	All	Aggression: Towards peers	Screen use: General
McArthur	2012	Include: Randomised controlled trials and quasi-RCTs.	None specified	1994 - 2009	All	Literacy: Phonics	Intervention: Literacy (phonics; via computer)
McArthur	2018	Include: Randomised controlled trials and quasi-RCTs.	Include: English speaking countries	1994 - 2015	Children; Adolescents	Literacy: General	Intervention: Literacy
Oldrati	2020	Include: Group-control experimental design	None specified	2006 - 2018	School-age Children	Cognition: Cognitive Functioning Cognition: Executive Functioning Cognition: Verbal skills Cognition: Visuospatial skills Numeracy: General Psychological health: Adjustment	Intervention: Cognitive training
Paik	1994	None	None specified	NA - NA	Children; Adolescents	Antisocial Behaviour: General	TV programs and movies: Violent content
Pearce	2016	Include: All quantitative designs	None specified	1986 - 2012	Children; Adolescents	Psychological health: Internalizing	TV programs and movies: Scary content

Table 1

Review characteristics for studies providing unique effects (continued)

First Author	Year	Design Restrictions	Regions Restrictions	Study Range	Sample Age Restrictions	Outcomes Assessed	Exposures Assessed
Peng	2011	None	None specified	2001 - 2010	Children; Adolescents	Cardiometabolic health: Maximum oxygen consumption Physical activity: Energy expenditure Physical activity: Heart rate	Video games: Physically active
Poorolajal	2020	Include: Observational	None specified	1995 - 2018	Children; Adolescents	Body composition	TV programs and movies: General Video games: General
Prescott	2018	Include: Longitudinal	None specified	2008 - 2017	All	Aggression: Towards peers	Video games: Violent content
Rodriguez-Rocha	2019	Include: Experimental; Quasi-experimental	None specified	1999 - 2018	All	Diet: Fruit and vegetable intake	Intervention: Fruit and vegetable
Sadeghirad	2016	Include: Randomised controlled trials	None specified	1978 - 2014	Children; Adolescents	Diet: Unhealthy food choice	Advertising: Unhealthy food
Schroeder	2013	Include: Experimental; Quasi-experimental	None specified	2001 - 2009	All	Learning: General	Intervention: With digital characters
Scionti	2019	Include: Interventions	None specifed	2009 - 2019	Children	Cognition: Executive functioning	Intervention: Cognitive training

Table 1

Review characteristics for studies providing unique effects (continued)

First Author	Year	Design Restrictions	Regions Restrictions	Study Range	Sample Age Restrictions	Outcomes Assessed	Exposures Assessed
Shin	2019	Include: Interventions	None specified	2013 - 2018	Children; Adolescents	Body composition Diet: Sugary drinks Physical activity: General Screen time: General	Intervention: To promote health (via mobile phone app) Intervention: To promote health (via mobile phone) Intervention: To promote health (via text message)
Slavin	2014	Include: Randomised controlled trials; Quasi-experimental; Observational	None specified	2000 - 2011	School-age Children (Primary/Elementary)	Science: General	Intervention: Science (in schools)
Takacs	2014	Include: Experimental; Quasi-experimental	None specified	1980 - 2014	NA	Learning: General	e-Books: Narration
Takacs	2019	Include: Randomised controlled trials and quasi-RCTs.	None specified	2001 - 2016	Children	Cognition: Executive Functioning (accuracy) Cognition: Executive Functioning (cognitive flexibility) Cognition: Executive Functioning (inhibition) Cognition: Executive Functioning (working memory)	Intervention: Education (via computer)
Tekedere	2016	None	None specified	2010 - 2015	All	Learning: General	Intervention: Augmented reality (in schools)

Table 1

Review characteristics for studies providing unique effects (continued)

First Author	Year	Design Restrictions	Regions Restrictions	Study Range	Sample Age Restrictions	Outcomes Assessed	Exposures Assessed
Vahedi	2018	Include: Interventions (pre-post or controlled). Exclude: Cross-sectional	None specified	2015 - 2016	School-age Children (Middle/High School)	Risky behavior: Media literacy Risky behavior: Risk taking (attitude)	Intervention: Media literacy (web-based)
Vannucci	2020	Exclude: Qualitative; Case studies	None specified	2011 - 2018	Adolescents	Risky behavior: Risk taking (general) Risky behavior: Risky sexual behaviour Risky behavior: Substance abuse	Social Media: General
Xie	2018	Include: Experimental; Quasi-experimental; Pre-test post-test	None specified	2010 - 2018	Children	Learning: General	Intervention: Education (via touch screen)
Zhang	2016	Include: Cohort; Case-control; Cross-sectional	None specified	2001 - 2014	Children	Body composition	TV programs and movies: General
Zhou	2020	Exclude: Non-empirical studies; Qualitative; Systematic reviews or meta-analyses	None specified	2009 - 2018	All	Healthy behavior: General Healthy behavior: Self-efficacy Psychological health: Enjoyment	Video games: Health promoting content

Table 1

Review characteristics for studies providing unique effects (continued)

First Author	Year	Design Restrictions	Regions Restrictions	Study Range	Sample Age Restrictions	Outcomes Assessed	Exposures Assessed
Zucker	2009	Include: Randomised controlled trials; Quasi-experimental; Observational	None specified	1997 - 2006	School-age Children (Primary/Elementary)	Literacy: Decoding Literacy: Reading comprehension	e-Books: General

*

The quality of the included meta-analyses was mixed (see Table **??**). Most assessed heterogeneity (n low risk = 59/66, 89% of meta-analyses), reported the characteristics of the included studies (n low risk = 57/66, 86%), and used a comprehensive and systematic search strategy (n low risk = 56/66, 85%). Most reviews did not clearly report if their eligibility criteria were predefined (n unclear = 45/66, 68%). Many papers also did not complete dual independent screening of abstracts and full text (n high risk = 16/66, 24%) or did not clearly report the method of screening (n unclear = 21/66, 32%). A similar trend was observed for dual independent quality assessment (n high risk = 31/66, 47%; n unclear = 19/66, 29%). Overall, only 5 meta-analyses were graded as low risk of bias on all criteria.

Education Outcomes. There were 46 unique effects associated with education outcomes, including general learning outcomes, literacy, numeracy, and science. We removed 20 effects that did not provide individual study-level data, 7 effects with samples < 1,000, and 8 effects with a significant Egger's test or insufficient studies to conduct the test. Effects not meeting one or more of these standards are presented in Supplementary File 4. The remaining 12 effects met our criteria for statistical credibility and are described in Figure 2. These 12 effects came from 8 meta-analytic reviews analysing data from 226 empirical studies with 186,631 individual participants.

Among the statistically credible effects, general screen use, television viewing, and video games were all negatively associated with learning. E-books that included narration, as well as touch screen education interventions, and augmented reality education interventions were positively associated with learning. General screen use was negatively associated with literacy outcomes. However, if the screen use involved co-viewing (e.g., watching with a parent), or the content of television programs was educational, the association with literacy was positive and significant at the 95% confidence level (weak evidence). Numeracy outcomes were positively associated with screen-based mathematics interventions and video games that contained numeracy content.



Figure 2. Education outcomes

As shown in Figure 2, most of the credible results (10 of 12 effects) showed statistically significant associations, with 99.9% confidence intervals not encompassing zero (strong evidence). The remaining two associations were significant at the 95% confidence level (weak evidence). All credible effects related to education outcomes were small-to-moderate. Screen-based interventions designed to influence an outcome (e.g., a computer based program designed to enhance learning [31]) tended to have larger effect sizes than exposures that were not specifically intended to influence any of the measured outcomes (e.g., the association between television viewing and learning [32]). The largest effect size observed was for augmented reality-based education interventions on general learning ($r = 0.33, k = 15, N = 1,474$). Most effects showed high levels of heterogeneity (10 of 12 with $I^2 > 50\%$).

Health and Health-related Behaviours. We identified 119 unique outcome-exposure combinations associated with health or health-related behaviour outcomes.

We removed 31 effects that did not provide individual study-level data, 30 effects with samples < 1,000, and 43 effects with a significant Egger's test or insufficient studies to conduct the test. No remaining studies showed evidence of excessive significance. Effects not meeting one or more of these standards are presented in Supplementary File 5. The remaining 17 meta-analytic associations met our criteria for credible evidence and are described below (see also Figure 3). These 17 effects came from 12 meta-analytic reviews analysing data from 231 empirical studies with 676,331 individual participants.



Figure 3. Health and health-related behaviour outcomes

Digital advertising of unhealthy foods—both traditional advertising and video games developed by a brand for promotion—were associated with higher unhealthy food intake. Social media use and sexual content were positively associated with risky behaviors (e.g., sexual activity, risk taking, and substance abuse). General screen use was positively associated with depression. Television viewing was negatively correlated with sleep duration, but only at the 95% confidence level (weak evidence). All forms of screen use (general,

294 television, and video games) were associated with body composition (e.g., higher BMI),
295 although the association was smaller for children than for adolescents or for combined
296 populations. Screen-based interventions which target health behaviours appeared effective.

297 Across the health outcomes, most (14 of 17) effects were statistically significant at the
298 99.9% confidence interval level, with the remaining three significant at 95% confidence.
299 However, most of the credible effects exhibited high levels of heterogeneity, with all but one
300 having $I^2 > 75\%$. Additionally, most effects were small, with the association between
301 unhealthy food advertising and intake the largest at $r = 0.25$ ($k = 13, N = 1,756$). Most of
302 the effect sizes (14/17) had an absolute value of $r < 0.2$.

303 ## Discussion

304 The primary goal of this review was to provide a holistic perspective on the influence
305 of screens on children's lives across a broad range of outcomes. We found that when
306 meta-analyses examined general screen use, and did not specify the content, context or
307 device, there was strong evidence showing potentially harmful associations with general
308 learning, literacy, body composition, and depression. However, when meta-analyses included
309 a more nuanced examination of exposures, a more complex picture appeared.

310 As an example, consider children watching television programs—an often cited form of
311 screen time harm. We found robust evidence for a small association with poorer academic
312 performance and literacy skills [32]. However, we also found evidence that if the content of
313 the program was educational, or the child was watching the program with a parent (i.e.,
314 co-viewing), this exposure was instead associated with better literacy [33]. Thus, parents may
315 play an important role in selecting content that is likely to benefit their children or, perhaps,
316 interact with their children in ways that may foster literacy (e.g., asking their children
317 questions about the program). Similar nuanced findings were observed for video games. The
318 credible evidence we identified showed that video game playing was associated with poorer

body composition and learning [32,34]. However, when the video game were designed specifically to teach numeracy, playing these games showed learning benefits [35]. One might expect that video games designed to be physically active could confer health benefits, but none of the meta-analyses examining this hypothesis met our thresholds for statistical credibility (see Supplementary Files 4 & 5) therefore this hypothesis could not be addressed.

Social media was one type of exposure that showed consistent risks to health, with no indication of potential benefit. Social media showed strong evidence of harmful associations with risk taking in general, as well as unsafe sex and substance abuse [36]. These results align with meta-analytic evidence from adults indicating that social media use is also associated with increased risk of depression [37,38]. Recent evidence from social media companies themselves suggest there may also be negative effects of social media on the mental health of young people, especially teenage girls [39].

One category of exposure appeared to consistently confer benefits: screen-based interventions designed to promote learning or health behaviours. This finding indicates that interventions can be effectively delivered using electronic media platforms, but does not necessarily indicate that screens are more effective than other methods (e.g., face-to-face, printed material). Rather, it reinforces that the content of the screen time may be the most important aspect. The way that a young person interacts with digital screens may also be important. We found evidence that touch screens had strong evidence for benefits on learning [31], as did augmented reality [40].

Largely owing to a small number of studies or missing individual study data, there were few age-based conclusions that could be drawn from reviews which met our criteria for statistical certainty. If we expand to include those reviews which did not meet this threshold, there remained no clear pattern although there were some age-specific differences in associations (data avilable in Supplementary Materials). For example, advertising of unhealthy food was associated with unhealthy food choice for young children, but was not

statistically significant for other age groups [41]. Conversely, TV programs and movies were more strongly associated with lower physical activity for adolescents than for younger age groups [42].

Among studies that met our criteria for statistical certainty heterogeneity was high, with almost all effects having $I^2 > 50\%$. Much of this heterogeneity is likely explained by differences in measures across pooled studies, or in some cases, the generic nature of some of the exposures. For example, "TV programs and movies" covers a substantial range of content, which may explain the heterogeneous association with education outcomes.

Implications for Policy and Practice

Broadly, our findings align with the recommendations of others who suggest that current guidelines may be too simplistic, mischaracterise the strength of the evidence, or do not acknowledge the important nuances of the issue [43–45]. Our findings suggest that screen use is a complex issue, with associations based not just on duration and device type, but also on the content and the environment in which the exposure occurs. Many current guidelines simplify this complex relationship as something that should be minimised in all instances [12,13]. We suggest that future guidelines need to embrace the complexity of the issue, to give parents and clinicians specific information to weigh the pros and cons of interactions with screens.

Implications for Future Research

Screen use research is extensive, varied, and rapidly growing. Reviews tended to be general (e.g., all screen time) and even when more targeted (e.g., social media) nuances related to specific content (e.g., Instagram vs Facebook) have not been meta-analysed or have not produced credible evidence. Fewer than 20% of the effects identified met our criteria for statistical credibility. Most studies which did not meet our critiera failed to provide study-level data (or did not provide sufficent data, such as including effect estimates

but not sample sizes). Newer reviews were more likely to provide this information than older reviews, but it highlights the importance of data and code sharing as recommended in the PRISMA guidelines [46]. When study level data was available, many effects were removed because the pooled sample size was small, or because there were fewer than ten studies on which to perform an Egger's test. It seems that much of the current screen time research is small in scale, and there is a need for larger, high-quality studies.

Screen time research has a well-established measurement problem, which impacts the individual studies of this umbrella review. The vast majority of screen time research relies on self-reported data, which not only lacks the nuance required for understanding the effects of screen time, but may also be inaccurate. In one systematic review on screen time and sleep [7], 66 of the 67 included studies used self-reported data for *both* the exposure and outcome variable. It has been established that self-reported screen time data has questionnable validity. In a meta-analysis of 47 studies comparing self-reported media use with logged measures, Parry et al [47] found that the measures were only moderately correlated ($r = 0.38$), with self-reported problematic usage fairing worse ($r = 0.25$). Indeed, of 622 studies which measured the screen time of 0—6 year-olds, only 69 provided any sort of psychometric properties for their measure, with only 19 studies reporting validity [48]. While some researchers have started using newer methods of capturing screen behaviours—such as wearable cameras [49] or device-based loggers [50]—these are still not widely adopted. It may be that the field of screen time research cannot be sufficiently advanced until accurate, validated, and nuanced measures are more widely available and adopted.

Strengths and Limitations

Our primary goal for this umbrella review was to provide a high-level synthesis of screen time research, by examining a range of exposures and the associations with a broad scope of outcomes. Our results represent the findings from 2,171 primary studies comprised of 1,652,944 participants. To ensure findings could be compared on a common metric, we

extracted and reanalysed individual study data where possible.

Our high-level approach limits the feasibility of examining fine-grained details of the individual studies. For example, we did not examine moderators beyond age, nor did we rate the risk of bias for the individual studies. Thus, our assessment of evidence quality was restricted to statistical credibility, rather than a more complete assessment of quality (e.g., GRADE [51]). As such, we made decisions regarding the credibility of evidence, where others may have used different thresholds or metrics. For this reason, we provide the complete results in the supplementary material, along with the dataset for others to consider alternative criteria. In addition, reviews provide only historical evidence which may not keep up with the changing ways children can engage with screens. While our synthesis of the existing evidence provides information about how screens might have influenced children in the past, it is difficult to know if these findings will translate to new forms of technology in the future.

Conclusions

Screen time is a topic of significant interest, as shown by the wide variety of academic domains involved, parents' concerns, and the growing pervasiveness into society. Our findings showed that the impact of screen time can be both positive (e.g., educational video games were associated with improved literacy) and negative (e.g., general screen use was associated with poorer body composition). The interplay of these findings show that parents, teachers, and other caregivers need to carefully weigh the pros and cons of each specific activity for potential harms and benefits. However, our findings also suggest that in order to aid caregivers to make this judgement, researchers need to conduct more careful and nuanced measurement and analysis of screen time, with less emphasis on measures that aggregate screen time and instead focus on the content, context, and environment in which the exposure occurs.

References

References marked with an asterisk indicate studies which were included in the synthesis.

1.
The Lancet. Social media, screen time, and young people's mental health. The Lancet. 2019;393(10172):611.

2.
Blair A. Reading Strategies for Coping With Information Overload ca.1550-1700. Journal of the History of Ideas. 2003;64(1):11–28.

3.
Bell AN. The sanitarian. Vol. 11. AN Bell; 1883.

4.
Dill KE. The Oxford handbook of media psychology. Oxford University Press; 2013.

5.
Wartella EA, Jennings N. Children and computers: New technology. Old concerns. The future of children. 2000;31–43.

6.
Rhodes A. Top ten child health problems: What the public thinks. The Royal Children's Hospital Melbourne; 2015.

7.
Hale L, Guan S. Screen time and sleep among school-aged children and adolescents: A systematic literature review. Sleep Medicine Reviews. 2015;21:50–8.

8.

Sweetser P, Johnson D, Ozdowska A, Wyeth P. Active versus passive screen time for young children. Australasian Journal of Early Childhood. 2012;37(4):94–8.

9.

Li X, Atkins MS. Early childhood computer experience and cognitive and motor development. Pediatrics. 2004;113(6):1715–22.

10.

Warburton W, Highfield K. Children and technology in a smart device world. In: Children, Families and Communities. Oxford University Press; 2017. p. 195–221.

*11.

Nature Human Behaviour. Screen time: How much is too much? Nature. 2019;565(7739):265–6.

12.

World Health Organization. Guidelines on physical activity, sedentary behaviour and sleep for children under 5 years of age. World Health Organization; 2019.

13.

Australian Government. Physical activity and exercise guidelines for all Australians. Department of Health; 2021.

14.

Canadian Society for Exercise Physiology. Canadian 24-Hour Movement Guidelines for Children and Youth: An Integration of Physical Activity, Sedentary Behaviour, and Sleep. Canadian Society for Exercise Physiology; 2016.

15.

Council On Communication and Media. Media Use in School-Aged Children and Adolescents. Pediatrics. 2016;138(5):e20162592.

16.

Ferguson CJ. Everything in Moderation: Moderate Use of Screens Unassociated with Child Behavior Problems. Psychiatric Quarterly. 2017;88(4):797–805.

17.

Przybylski AK, Weinstein N. A Large-Scale Test of the Goldilocks Hypothesis: Quantifying the Relations Between Digital-Screen Use and the Mental Well-Being of Adolescents. Psychological Science. 2017;28(2):204–15.

*18.

Sanders T, Parker PD, del Pozo-Cruz B, Noetel M, Lonsdale C. Type of screen time moderates effects on outcomes in 4013 children: Evidence from the Longitudinal Study of Australian Children. International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity. 2019;16(1):1–0.

19.

Kaye LK, Orben A, Ellis DA, Hunter SC, Houghton S. The Conceptual and Methodological Mayhem of "Screen Time." International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health. 2020;17(10):3661.

20.

Chassiakos YLR, Radesky J, Christakis D, Moreno MA, Cross C, Council On Communication and Media. Children and Adolescents and Digital Media. Pediatrics. 2016;138(5):e20162593.

21.

484 National Health, Lung, and Blood Institute. Quality Assessment of Systematic Reviews
485 and Meta-Analyses. National Health, Lung, and Blood Institute; 2014.

486 22.
487 Bonett DG. Transforming odds ratios into correlations for meta-analytic research.
488 American Psychologist. 2007;62(3):254–5.

489 23.
490 Bowman NA. Effect Sizes and Statistical Methods for Meta-Analysis in Higher Educa-
491 tion. Research in Higher Education. 2012;53(3):375–82.

492 24.
493 Jacobs P, Viechtbauer W. Estimation of the biserial correlation and its sampling
variance for use in meta-analysis: Biserial Correlation. Research Synthesis Methods.
494 2017;8(2):161–80.

495 25.
496 Viechtbauer W. Metafor: Meta-analysis package for r [Internet]. 2021. Available from:
497 https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=metafor

498 26.
499 R Core Team. R: A language and environment for statistical computing [Internet].
Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing; 2022. Available from:
500 https://www.R-project.org/

501 27.
502 Egger M, Smith GD, Schneider M, Minder C. Bias in meta-analysis detected by a
503 simple, graphical test. BMJ. 1997;315(7109):629–34.

504 28.

505 Page MJ, Higgins JP, Sterne JA. Chapter 13: Assessing risk of bias due to missing results in a synthesis. In: Higgins JP, Thomas J, Chandler J, Cumpston M, Li T, Page MJ, et al., editors. Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions. 6.2 ed. Cochrane; 2021.

507 29.

508 Ioannidis JP, Trikalinos TA. An exploratory test for an excess of significant findings. Clinical Trials. 2007;4(3):245–53.

510 30.

511 Papadimitriou N, Markozannes G, Kanellopoulou A, Critselis E, Alhardan S, Karafousia V, et al. An umbrella review of the evidence associating diet and cancer risk at 11 anatomical sites. Nature Communications. 2021;12(1):4579.

513 *31.

514 Xie H, Peng J, Qin M, Huang X, Tian F, Zhou Z. Can Touchscreen Devices be Used to Facilitate Young Children's Learning? A Meta-Analysis of Touchscreen Learning Effect. Frontiers in Psychology. 2018;9:2580.

516 *32.

517 Adelantado-Renau M, Moliner-Urdiales D, Cavero-Redondo I, Beltran-Valls MR, Martínez-Vizcaíno V, Álvarez-Bueno C. Association Between Screen Media Use and Academic Performance Among Children and Adolescents: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. JAMA Pediatrics. 2019;173(11):1058.

519 *33.

Madigan S, McArthur BA, Anhorn C, Eirich R, Christakis DA. Associations Between Screen Use and Child Language Skills: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. JAMA Pediatrics. 2020;174(7):665.

*34.

Poorolajal J, Sahraei F, Mohamdadi Y, Doosti-Irani A, Moradi L. Behavioral factors influencing childhood obesity: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Obesity Research & Clinical Practice. 2020;14(2):109–18.

*35.

Byun J, Joung E. Digital game-based learning for K-12 mathematics education: A meta-analysis. School Science and Mathematics. 2018;118(3-4):113–26.

*36.

Vannucci A, Simpson EG, Gagnon S, Ohannessian CM. Social media use and risky behaviors in adolescents: A meta-analysis. Journal of Adolescence. 2020;79:258–74.

37.

Yoon S, Kleinman M, Mertz J, Brannick M. Is social network site usage related to depression? A meta-analysis of Facebook–depression relations. Journal of Affective Disorders. 2019;248:65–72.

38.

Vahedi Z, Zannella L. The association between self-reported depressive symptoms and the use of social networking sites (SNS): A meta-analysis. Current Psychology. 2021;40(5):2174–89.

39.

538 Seetharaman GW Jeff Horwitz and Deepa. Facebook Knows Instagram Is Toxic for
539 Teen Girls, Company Documents Show. Wall Street Journal. 2021;

540 *40.
541 Tekedere H, Göke H. Examining the Effectiveness of Augmented Reality Applications
in Education: A Meta-Analysis. International Journal of Environmental and Science
542 Education. 2016;11(16):9469–81.

543 *41.
544 Sadeghirad B, Duhaney T, Motaghipisheh S, Campbell NRC, Johnston BC. Influence
of unhealthy food and beverage marketing on children's dietary intake and prefer-
ence: A systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized trials. Obesity Reviews.
545 2016;17(10):945–59.

546 *42.
547 Marshall SJ, Biddle SJH, Gorely T, Cameron N, Murdey I. Relationships between
media use, body fatness and physical activity in children and youth: A meta-analysis.
548 International Journal of Obesity. 2004;28(10):1238–46.

549 43.
550 Elson M, Ferguson CJ, Gregerson M, Hogg JL, Ivory J, Klisanin D, et al. Do policy
statements on media rffects faithfully represent the science? Advances in Methods and
551 Practices in Psychological Science. 2019;2(1):12–25.

552 44.
553 Ashton JJ, Beattie RM. Screen time in children and adolescents: Is there evidence to
554 guide parents and policy? The Lancet Child & Adolescent Health. 2019;3(5):292–4.

555 45.

556 Royal College of Paediatrics and Child Health. The health impacts of screen time: A
557 guide for clinicians and parents. Royal College of Paediatrics and Child Health; 2019.

558 46.
559 Page MJ, McKenzie J, Bossuyt P, Boutron I, Hoffmann T, mulrow cindy d, et al.
The PRISMA 2020 statement: An updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews.
560 MetaArXiv; 2020.

561 *47.
562 Parry DA, Davidson BI, Sewall CJR, Fisher JT, Mieczkowski H, Quintana DS. A
systematic review and meta-analysis of discrepancies between logged and self-reported
563 digital media use. Nature Human Behaviour. 2021;5(11):1535–47.

564 48.
565 Byrne R, Terranova CO, Trost SG. Measurement of screen time among young children
566 aged 0–6 years: A systematic review. Obesity Reviews. 2021;22(8).

567 49.
568 Smith C, Galland BC, de Bruin WE, Taylor RW. Feasibility of automated cameras
to measure screen use in adolescents. American journal of preventive medicine.
569 2019;57(3):417–24.

570 50.
571 Ryding FC, Kuss DJ. Passive objective measures in the assessment of problematic
572 smartphone use: A systematic review. Addictive Behaviors Reports. 2020;11:100257.

573 51.

574 Guyatt G, Oxman AD, Akl EA, Kunz R, Vist G, Brozek J, et al. GRADE guidelines:
1. Introduction—GRADE evidence profiles and summary of findings tables. Journal
575 of Clinical Epidemiology. 2011;64(4):383–94.

576 *52.
577 Abrami P, Borohkovski E, Lysenko L. The effects of ABRACADABRA on reading
outcomes: A meta-analysis of applied field research. Journal of Interactive Learning
578 Research. 2015;26(4):337–67.

579 *53.
580 Aghasi M, Matinfar A, Golzarand M, Salari-Moghaddam A, Ebrahimpour-Koujan
S. Internet Use in Relation to Overweight and Obesity: A Systematic Review and
581 Meta-Analysis of Cross-Sectional Studies. Advances in Nutrition. 2019;nmz073.

582 *54.
583 Ameryoun A, Sanaeinasab H, Saffari M, Koenig HG. Impact of Game-Based Health
Promotion Programs on Body Mass Index in Overweight/Obese Children and Ado-
lescents: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Randomized Controlled Trials.
584 Childhood Obesity. 2018;14(2):67–80.

585 *55.
586 Anderson CA, Shibuya A, Ihori N, Swing EL, Bushman BJ, Sakamoto A, et al. Violent
video game effects on aggression, empathy, and prosocial behavior in eastern and
587 western countries: A meta-analytic review. Psychological bulletin. 2010;136(2):151.

588 *56.
589 Andrade A, Correia CK, Coimbra DR. The Psychological Effects of Exergames for
Children and Adolescents with Obesity: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis.
590 Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking. 2019;22(11):724–35.

*57.
Aspiranti KB, Larwin KH, Schade BP. iPads/tablets and students with autism: A meta-analysis of academic effects. Assistive Technology. 2020;32(1):23–30.

*58.
Barnett A, Cerin E, Baranowski T. Active video games for youth: A systematic review. Journal of Physical Activity and Health. 2011;8(5):724–37.

*59.
Bartel KA, Gradisar M, Williamson P. Protective and risk factors for adolescent sleep: A meta-analytic review. Sleep medicine reviews. 2015;21:72–85.

*60.
Bayraktar S. A meta-analysis of the effectiveness of computer-assisted instruction in science education. Journal of research on technology in education. 2001;34(2):173–88.

*61.
Blok H, Oostdam R, Otter ME, Overmaat M. Computer-assisted instruction in support of beginning reading instruction: A review. Review of educational research. 2002;72(1):101–30.

*62.
Bochner RE, Sorensen KM, Belamarich PF. The Impact of Active Video Gaming on Weight in Youth: A Meta-Analysis. Clinical Pediatrics. 2015;54(7):620–8.

*63.

610 Bossen D, Broekema A, Visser B, Brons A, Timmerman A, van Etten-Jamaludin F, et al. Effectiveness of Serious Games to Increase Physical Activity in Children With a Chronic Disease: Systematic Review With Meta-Analysis. Journal of Medical Internet
611 Research. 2020;22(4):e14549.

612 *64.
613 Boyland EJ, Nolan S, Kelly B, Tudur-Smith C, Jones A, Halford JC, et al. Advertising as a cue to consume: A systematic review and meta-analysis of the effects of acute exposure to unhealthy food and nonalcoholic beverage advertising on intake in children
614 and adults, 2. The American journal of clinical nutrition. 2016;103(2):519–33.

615 *65.
616 Carter B, Rees P, Hale L, Bhattacharjee D, Paradkar MS. Association between portable screen-based media device access or use and sleep outcomes: A systematic review and
617 meta-analysis. JAMA pediatrics. 2016;170(12):1202–8.

618 *66.
619 Champion KE, Parmenter B, McGowan C, Spring B, Wafford QE, Gardner LA, et al. Effectiveness of school-based eHealth interventions to prevent multiple lifestyle risk behaviours among adolescents: A systematic review and meta-analysis. The Lancet
620 Digital Health. 2019;1(5):e206–21.

621 *67.
622 Chan KK, Leung SW. Dynamic geometry software improves mathematical achievement: Systematic review and meta-analysis. Journal of Educational Computing Research.
623 2014;51(3):311–25.

624 *68.

Chen L, Ho SS, Lwin MO. A meta-analysis of factors predicting cyberbullying perpetration and victimization: From the social cognitive and media effects approach. New Media & Society. 2017;19(8):1194–213.

*69.
Cheung AC, Slavin RE. The effectiveness of educational technology applications for enhancing mathematics achievement in K-12 classrooms: A meta-analysis. Educational research review. 2013;9:88–113.

*70.
Cheung AC, Slavin RE. Effects of educational technology applications on reading outcomes for struggling readers: A best-evidence synthesis. Reading Research Quarterly. 2013;48(3):277–99.

*71.
Cheung AC, Slavin RE. How features of educational technology applications affect student reading outcomes: A meta-analysis. Educational Research Review. 2012;7(3):198–215.

*72.
Chodura S, Kuhn J-T, Holling H. Interventions for children with mathematical difficulties. Zeitschrift für Psychologie. 2015;

*73.
Cox R, Skouteris H, Rutherford L, Fuller-Tyszkiewicz M. The Association between Television Viewing and Preschool Child Body Mass Index: A systematic review of English papers published from 1995 to 2010. Journal of Children and Media. 2012;6(2):198–220.

642 *74.

643 Coyne SM, Padilla-Walker LM, Holmgren HG, Davis EJ, Collier KM, Memmott-Elison MK, et al. A meta-analysis of prosocial media on prosocial behavior, aggression, and empathic concern: A multidimensional approach. Developmental Psychology. 2018;54(2):331–47.

644

645 *75.

646 Cushing CC, Steele RG. A Meta-Analytic Review of eHealth Interventions for Pediatric Health Promoting and Maintaining Behaviors. Journal of Pediatric Psychology. 2010;35(9):937–49.

647

648 *76.

649 Darling KE, Sato AF. Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis Examining the Effectiveness of Mobile Health Technologies in Using Self-Monitoring for Pediatric Weight Management. Childhood Obesity. 2017;13(5):347–55.

650

651 *77.

652 Davey S, Davey A. Assessment of smartphone addiction in Indian adolescents: A mixed method study by systematic-review and meta-analysis approach. International journal of preventive medicine. 2014;5(12):1500.

653

654 *78.

655 de Ribera OS, Trajtenberg N, Shenderovich Y, Murray J. Correlates of youth violence in low- and middle-income countries: A meta-analysis. Aggression and Violent Behavior. 2019;49:101306.

656

657 *79.

Fang K, Mu M, Liu K, He Y. Screen time and childhood overweight/obesity: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Child: Care, Health and Development. 2019;45(5):744–53.

*80.
Fedele DA, Cushing CC, Fritz A, Amaro CM, Ortega A. Mobile Health Interventions for Improving Health Outcomes in Youth: A Meta-analysis. JAMA Pediatrics. 2017;171(5):461.

*81.
Ferguson CJ. 13 Reasons Why Not: A Methodological and Meta-Analytic Review of Evidence Regarding Suicide Contagion by Fictional Media. Suicide and Life-Threatening Behavior. 2019;49(4):1178–86.

*82.
Ferguson CJ. Do Angry Birds Make for Angry Children? A Meta-Analysis of Video Game Influences on Children's and Adolescents' Aggression, Mental Health, Prosocial Behavior, and Academic Performance. Perspectives on Psychological Science. 2015;10(5):646–66.

*83.
Ferguson CJ, Nielsen RK, Markey PM. Does sexy media promote teen sex? A meta-analytic and methodological review. Psychiatric quarterly. 2017;88(2):349–58.

*84.
Fischer P, Greitemeyer T, Kastenmüller A, Vogrincic C, Sauer A. The effects of risk-glorifying media exposure on risk-positive cognitions, emotions, and behaviors: A meta-analytic review. Psychological bulletin. 2011;137(3):367.

675 *85.

676 Folkvord F, van 't Riet J. The persuasive effect of advergames promoting unhealthy
677 foods among children: A meta-analysis. Appetite. 2018;129:245–51.

678 *86.

679 Gao Z, Chen S, Pasco D, Pope Z. A meta-analysis of active video games on health
outcomes among children and adolescents: A meta-analysis of active video games.
680 Obesity Reviews. 2015;16(9):783–94.

681 *87.

682 Gardella JH, Fisher BW, Teurbe-Tolon AR. A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis
of Cyber-Victimization and Educational Outcomes for Adolescents. Review of Educa-
683 tional Research. 2017;87(2):283–308.

684 *88.

685 Ghobadi S, Hassanzadeh-Rostami Z, Salehi-Marzijarani M, Bellissimo N, Brett NR,
Totosy de Zepetnek JO, et al. Association of eating while television viewing and
overweight/obesity among children and adolescents: A systematic review and meta-
analysis of observational studies: Television viewing, overweight, obesity, children.
686 Obesity Reviews. 2018;19(3):313–20.

687 *89.

688 Grabe S, Ward LM, Hyde JS. The role of the media in body image concerns among
women: A meta-analysis of experimental and correlational studies. Psychological
689 bulletin. 2008;134(3):460.

690 *90.

691 Graham S, Hebert M, Harris KR. Formative assessment and writing: A meta-analysis.
692 The Elementary School Journal. 2015;115(4):523–47.

693 *91.

694 Hammersley ML, Jones RA, Okely AD. Parent-focused childhood and adolescent overweight and obesity eHealth interventions: A systematic review and meta-analysis. 695 Journal of medical Internet research. 2016;18(7):e5893.

696 *92.

697 Hernández-Jiménez C, Sarabia R, Paz-Zulueta M, Paras-Bravo P, Pellico A, Ruiz Azcona L, et al. Impact of Active Video Games on Body Mass Index in Children and Adolescents: Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis Evaluating the Quality of Primary Studies. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health. 698 2019;16(13):2424.

699 *93.

700 Huang Q, Peng W, Ahn S. When media become the mirror: A meta-analysis on media and body image. Media Psychology. 2021;24(4):437–89. 701

702 *94.

703 Hurwitz LB. Getting a Read on Ready To Learn Media: A Meta-analytic Review of Effects on Literacy. Child Development. 2019;90(5):1754–71. 704

705 *95.

706 Janssen X, Martin A, Hughes AR, Hill CM, Kotronoulas G, Hesketh KR. Associations of screen time, sedentary time and physical activity with sleep in under 5s: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Sleep Medicine Reviews. 2020;49:101226. 707

708 *96.

709 Kates AW, Wu H, Coryn CLS. The effects of mobile phone use on academic performance: A meta-analysis. Computers & Education. 2018;127:107–12. 710

*97.
Kroesbergen EH, Van Luit JE. Mathematics interventions for children with special educational needs: A meta-analysis. Remedial and special education. 2003;24(2):97–114.

*98.
Küçükalkan K, Beyazsaçlı M, Öz AŞ. Examination of the effects of computer-based mathematics instruction methods in children with mathematical learning difficulties: A meta-analysis. Behaviour & Information Technology. 2019;38(9):913–23.

*99.
Lanca C, Saw S-M. The association between digital screen time and myopia: A systematic review. Ophthalmic and Physiological Optics. 2020;40(2):216–29.

*100.
Larwin KH, Aspiranti KB. Measuring the Academic Outcomes of iPads for Students with Autism: A Meta-Analysis. Review Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders. 2019;6(2):233–41.

*101.
Lee J, Piao M, Byun A, Kim J. A systematic review and meta-analysis of intervention for pediatric obesity using mobile technology. Nursing Informatics 2016. 2016;491–4.

*102.
Liao YC, Chang H, Chen Y. Effects of Computer Applications on Elementary School Students' Achievement. Computers in the Schools. 2007;24(3):43.

*103.

730 Liao Y-K. Effects of computer-assisted instruction on cognitive outcomes: A meta-
731 analysis. Journal of Research on Computing in Education. 1992;24(3):367–80.

732 *104.
733 Liao Y, Liao J, Durand CP, Dunton GF. Which type of sedentary behaviour inter-
vention is more effective at reducing body mass index in children? A meta-analytic
734 review. Obesity reviews. 2014;15(3):159–68.

735 *105.
736 Li Q, Ma X. A meta-analysis of the effects of computer technology on school students'
737 mathematics learning. Educational Psychology Review. 2010;22(3):215–43.

738 *106.
739 Liu D, Baumeister R, Yang C, Hu B. Digital Communication Media Use and Psycho-
logical Well-Being: A Meta-Analysis. Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication.
740 2019;24:259–73.

741 *107.
742 Liu M, Wu L, Yao S. Dose–response association of screen time-based sedentary
behaviour in children and adolescents and depression: A meta-analysis of observational
743 studies. British Journal of Sports Medicine. 2016;50(20):1252–8.

744 *108.
745 Luckner H, Moss JR, Gericke CA. Effectiveness of interventions to promote healthy
weight in general populations of children and adults: A meta-analysis. European
746 Journal of Public Health. 2012;22(4):491–7.

747 *109.

748 Mahdi HS, Al Khateeb AA. The effectiveness of computer-assisted pronunciation
749 training: A meta-analysis. Review of Education. 2019;7(3):733–53.

750 *110.
751 Mares M-L, Pan Z. Effects of Sesame Street: A meta-analysis of children's learning in
752 15 countries. Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology. 2013;34(3):140–51.

753 *111.
754 Mares M-L, Woodard E. Positive Effects of Television on Children's Social Interactions:
755 A Meta-Analysis. Media Psychology. 2005;7(3):301–22.

756 *112.
757 Martins N, Weaver A. The role of media exposure on relational aggression: A meta-
758 analysis. Aggression and Violent Behavior. 2019;47:90–9.

759 *113.
760 McArthur G, Eve PM, Jones K, Banales E, Kohnen S, Anandakumar T, et al. Phonics
training for English-speaking poor readers. Cochrane Developmental, Psychosocial
and Learning Problems Group, editor. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews.
761 2012;

762 *114.
763 McArthur G, Sheehan Y, Badcock NA, Francis DA, Wang H-C, Kohnen S, et al. Phon-
ics training for English-speaking poor readers. Cochrane Developmental, Psychosocial
and Learning Problems Group, editor. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews.
764 2018;2018(11).

765 *115.

766 Moran J, Ferdig RE, Pearson PD, Wardrop J, Blomeyer RL. Technology and Reading Performance in the Middle-School Grades: A Meta-Analysis with Recommendations
767 for Policy and Practice. Journal of Literacy Research. 2008;40(1):6–58.

768 *116.
769 Nikkelen SWC, Valkenburg PM, Huizinga M, Bushman BJ. Media use and ADHD-related behaviors in children and adolescents: A meta-analysis. Developmental
770 Psychology. 2014;50(9):2228–41.

771 *117.
772 Oldrati V, Corti C, Poggi G, Borgatti R, Urgesi C, Bardoni A. Effectiveness of Computerized Cognitive Training Programs (CCTP) with Game-like Features in Children with or without Neuropsychological Disorders: A Meta-Analytic Investigation.
773 Neuropsychology Review. 2020;30(1):126–41.

774 *118.
775 Oliveira CB, Pinto RZ, Saraiva BTC, Tebar WR, Delfino LD, Franco MR, et al. Effects of active video games on children and adolescents: A systematic review with
776 meta-analysis. Scandinavian Journal of Medicine & Science in Sports. 2020;30(1):4–12.

777 *119.
778 Oliveira RG de, Guedes DP. Physical Activity, Sedentary Behavior, Cardiorespiratory Fitness and Metabolic Syndrome in Adolescents: Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis
779 of Observational Evidence. Rosenfeld CS, editor. PLOS ONE. 2016;11(12):e0168503.

780 *120.
781 Ozdemir M, Sahin C, Arcagok S, Demir MK. The Effect of Augmented Reality Applications in the Learning Process: A MetaAnalysis Study. Eurasian Journal of
782 Educational Research. 2018;18:1–22.

783 *121.

784 Paik H, Comstock G. The Effects of Television Violence on Antisocial Behavior: A

785 Meta-Analysis. Communication Research. 1994;21(4):516–46.

786 *122.

787 Pearce LJ, Field AP. The Impact of "Scary" TV and Film on Children's Internalizing

788 Emotions: A Meta-Analysis. Human Communication Research. 2016;42(1):98–121.

789 *123.

790 Peng W, Lin J-H, Crouse J. Is Playing Exergames Really Exercising? A Meta-Analysis

of Energy Expenditure in Active Video Games. Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social

791 Networking. 2011;14(11):681–8.

792 *124.

793 Prescott AT, Sargent JD, Hull JG. Metaanalysis of the relationship between violent

video game play and physical aggression over time. Proceedings of the National

794 Academy of Sciences. 2018;115(40):9882–8.

795 *125.

796 Prizant-Passal S, Shechner T, Aderka IM. Social anxiety and internet use – A meta-

analysis: What do we know? What are we missing? Computers in Human Behavior.

797 2016;62:221–9.

798 *126.

799 Rodriguez Rocha NP, Kim H. eHealth Interventions for Fruit and Vegetable Intake: A

800 Meta-Analysis of Effectiveness. Health Education & Behavior. 2019;46(6):947–59.

801 *127.

802 Russell SJ, Croker H, Viner RM. The effect of screen advertising on children's dietary
803 intake: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Obesity Reviews. 2019;20(4):554–68.

804 *128.
805 Ryan AW. Meta-Analysis of Achievement Effects of Microcomputer Applications in
806 Elementary Schools. Educational Administration Quarterly. 1991;27(2):161–84.

807 *129.
808 Scherer R, Siddiq F, Sánchez Viveros B. The cognitive benefits of learning computer
programming: A meta-analysis of transfer effects. Journal of Educational Psychology.
809 2019;111(5):764–92.

810 *130.
811 Schroeder NL, Adesope OO, Gilbert RB. How Effective are Pedagogical Agents for
Learning? A Meta-Analytic Review. Journal of Educational Computing Research.
812 2013;49(1):1–39.

813 *131.
814 Scionti N, Cavallero M, Zogmaister C, Marzocchi GM. Is Cognitive Training Effective
for Improving Executive Functions in Preschoolers? A Systematic Review and Meta-
815 Analysis. Frontiers in Psychology. 2020;10:2812.

816 *132.
817 Shahab L, McEwen A. Online support for smoking cessation: A systematic review of
818 the literature. Addiction. 2009;104(11):1792–804.

819 *133.

820 Shin Y, Kim SK, Lee M. Mobile phone interventions to improve adolescents' physical health: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Public Health Nursing. 2019;36(6):787–
821 99.

822 *134.
823 Slavin RE, Lake C. Effective Programs in Elementary Mathematics: A Best-Evidence
824 Synthesis. Review of Educational Research. 2008;78(3):427–515.

825 *135.
826 Slavin RE, Lake C, Groff C. Effective Programs in Middle and High School Mathemat-
827 ics: A Best-Evidence Synthesis. Review of Educational Research. 2009;79(2):839–911.

828 *136.
829 Slavin RE, Lake C, Hanley P, Thurston A. Experimental evaluations of elementary science programs: A best-evidence synthesis. Journal of Research in Science Teaching.
830 2014;51(7):870–901.

831 *137.
832 Slavin RE. Reading Effects of IBM's "Writing to Read" Program: A Review of
833 Evaluations. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis. 1991;13(1):1.

834 *138.
835 Stavrinos D, Pope CN, Shen J, Schwebel DC. Distracted Walking, Bicycling, and Driving: Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Mobile Technology and Youth
836 Crash Risk. Child Development. 2018;89(1):118–28.

837 *139.
838 Steele JL, Bozick R, Davis LM. Education for Incarcerated Juveniles: A Meta-Analysis.
839 Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk (JESPAR). 2016;21(2):65–89.

*140.

Strong GK, Torgerson CJ, Torgerson D, Hulme C. A systematic meta-analytic review of evidence for the effectiveness of the 'Fast ForWord' language intervention program. Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry. 2011;52(3):224–35.

*141.

Takacs ZK, Swart EK, Bus AG. Benefits and Pitfalls of Multimedia and Interactive Features in Technology-Enhanced Storybooks: A Meta-Analysis. Review of Educational Research. 2015;85(4):698–739.

*142.

Takacs ZK, Swart EK, Bus AG. Can the computer replace the adult for storybook reading? A meta-analysis on the effects of multimedia stories as compared to sharing print stories with an adult. Frontiers in Psychology. 2014;5.

*143.

Takacs ZK, Kassai R. The efficacy of different interventions to foster children's executive function skills: A series of meta-analyses. Psychological Bulletin. 2019;145(7):653–97.

*144.

Tamim RM, Bernard RM, Borokhovski E, Abrami PC, Schmid RF. What Forty Years of Research Says About the Impact of Technology on Learning: A Second-Order Meta-Analysis and Validation Study. Review of Educational Research. 2011;81(1):4–28.

*145.

Tingir S, Cavlazoglu B, Caliskan O, Koklu O, Intepe-Tingir S. Effects of mobile devices on K-12 students' achievement: A meta-analysis: Effects of mobile devices. Journal of Computer Assisted Learning. 2017;33(4):355–69.

*146.

Tremblay MS, LeBlanc AG, Kho ME, Saunders TJ, Larouche R, Colley RC, et al. Systematic review of sedentary behaviour and health indicators in school-aged children and youth. International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity. 2011;8(1):98.

*147.

Vahedi Z, Sibalis A, Sutherland JE. Are media literacy interventions effective at changing attitudes and intentions towards risky health behaviors in adolescents? A meta-analytic review. Journal of Adolescence. 2018;67:140–52.

*148.

van Ekris E, Altenburg TM, Singh AS, Proper KI, Heymans MW, Chinapaw MJM. An evidence-update on the prospective relationship between childhood sedentary behaviour and biomedical health indicators: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Obesity Reviews. 2016;17(9):833–49.

*149.

van Grieken A, Ezendam NP, Paulis WD, van der Wouden JC, Raat H. Primary prevention of overweight in children and adolescents: A meta-analysis of the effectiveness of interventions aiming to decrease sedentary behaviour. International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity. 2012;9(1):1–1.

*150.

van 't Riet J, Crutzen R, Lu AS. How effective are active videogames among the young and the old? Adding meta-analyses to two recent systematic reviews. GAMES FOR HEALTH: Research, Development, and Clinical Applications. 2014;3(5):311–8.

*151.

874 Villegas-Navas V, Montero-Simo M-J, Araque-Padilla RA. The Effects of Foods Embedded in Entertainment Media on Children's Food Choices and Food Intake: A
875 Systematic Review and Meta-Analyses. Nutrients. 2020;12(4):964.

876 *152.
877 Wahi G, Parkin PC, Beyene J, Uleryk EM, Birken CS. Effectiveness of interventions aimed at reducing screen time in children: A systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. Archives of pediatrics & adolescent medicine.
878 2011;165(11):979–86.

879 *153.
880 Weng P-L, Maeda Y, Bouck EC. Effectiveness of cognitive skills-based computer-assisted instruction for students with disabilities: A synthesis. Remedial and Special
881 Education. 2014;35(3):167–80.

882 *154.
883 Williams PA, Haertel EH, Haertel GD, Walberg HJ. The impact of leisure-time television on school learning: A research synthesis. American educational research
884 journal. 1982;19(1):19–50.

885 *155.
886 Wood W, Wong FY, Chachere JG. Effects of media violence on viewers' aggression in
887 unconstrained social interaction. Psychological bulletin. 1991;109(3):371.

888 *156.
889 Zhang G, Wu L, Zhou L, Lu W, Mao C. Television watching and risk of childhood
890 obesity: A meta-analysis. The European Journal of Public Health. 2016;26(1):13–8.

891 *157.

892 Zhou C, Occa A, Kim S, Morgan S. A Meta-analysis of Narrative Game-based Interventions for Promoting Healthy Behaviors. Journal of Health Communication. 2020;25(1):54–65.
893

894 *158.

895 Zucker TA, Moody AK, McKenna MC. The effects of electronic books on pre-kindergarten-to-grade 5 students' literacy and language outcomes: A research synthesis. Journal of educational computing research. 2009;40(1):47–87.
896