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[9], Jo Salmon[10], Kylie Hesketh[10], Nicole Weeks[1], Hugh Arnott[1], Emma Devine[11], 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] Centre for Health Research, 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] Department of Movement and Sport Science, Ghent University

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

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

Author Note

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: Conceptualization, 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

Children's engagement in screen time is a complex issue. While some forms of screen time have consistently been associated with harm, others have been associated with gains, making it difficult to weigh the risks and benefits of use. In this umbrella review, we systematically collate and synthesise meta-analyses examining the effects of screen use on children and youth. We converted results onto a common metric to make comparisons simple, and where possible we reanalysed study-level data to standardise the approach across meta-analyses. We identified 224 meta-analyses, and extracted 275 unique exposure/outcome combinations. These effects represent the findings of 3,103 primary studies comprised of 3,141,213 participants. When focusing on the meta-analyses with the most statistically robust evidence, we found that general screen use (when content was not indicated), was associated with potentially harmful impacts on learning, literacy, body composition, and depression. Like-wise, social media was consistently associated with risks to health, with no identified benefits. However, we also found that these harms could often be mitigated by certain kinds of content (e.g., educational), or by modifying the context (e.g., co-viewing with a parent). In summary, our findings point to the need for careful and nuanced guidelines that support parents to make the best decisions for their children.

Keywords: screen time; youth; health; education

Word count: 4739

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. We aim to provide a summary on the current research into children's screen time. By summarising and synthesising all evidence in one overview, we provide a reference point for the field and allow for easier comparison of risks and benefits for the same behaviour.

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

We prospectively registered our methods on the International Prospective Register of Systematic Reviews (PROSPERO; CRD42017076051).

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 in Supplementary File 1. 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 1). 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 2.

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 4.2.2) 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 3.

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 50,656 results, of which 28,675 were duplicates. After screening titles and abstracts, we assessed 2,557 full-texts for inclusion. Of those, 224 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 screen use ($n = 45$), general TV programs and movies ($n = 28$), physically active video games ($n = 22$), and literacy (abracadabra; in schools) intervention ($n = 15$). Supplementary File 4 provides a list of all exposures identified. The most frequently reported outcomes were general learning ($n = 46$), body composition ($n = 37$), general physical activity ($n = 22$), depression psychological health ($n = 17$), and sleep duration ($n = 15$). In 175 cases there was only one exposure/outcome combination for an age group, with 37 appearing twice, and 26 appearing three or more times. Full characteristics of the included studies are provided in Table 1.



Figure 1. PRISMA Diagram

After removing reviews with duplicate exposure/outcome combinations, our process yielded 275 unique effect/outcome combinations contributed from 118 reviews. These effects represent the findings of 3,103 primary studies comprised of 3,141,213 participants.

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	2020	Include: Experimental designs	None specified	2009 - 2019	Pre K to Grade 3	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
Arztmann	2022	None specified	None specified	2008 - 2020	K - Grade 8	Learning: Behavior Learning: Motivation	Video games: Educational (with competition)
Aspiranti	2020	Include: Interventions	None specified	2013 - 2015	School-age Children (Primary/Elementary)	Learning: General	Intervention: Education (via touch screen)

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
Baradaran Mahdavi	2021	Include: Observational Exclude: Experimental	None specified	1999 - 2019	None specified	Physical health: Lower back pain	Screen use: General (excluding TV) TV programs and movies: General
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
Beck Silva	2022	Include: Randomised controlled trials and quasi-RCTs.	None specified	1999 - 2019	10 - 19 years	Diet: Fat consumption	Intervention: Nutrition (in schools)
Benavides-Varela	2020	Include: Randomised controlled trials	None specified	2006 - 2018	Children	Numeracy: Mathematics	Intervention: Mathematics
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

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
Byun	2018	Include: All quantitative designs	None specified	2006 - 2014	School-age Children	Numeracy: General	Video games: Numeracy
Cao	2020	Include: designs with control groups	None specified	2002 - 2019	3-12 years	Cognition: Executive functioning Cognition: Executive Functioning (cognitive flexibility) Cognition: Executive Functioning (inhibition) Cognition: Executive Functioning (working memory)	Computer use: Executive functioning training
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
Chauhan	2017	Include: pre-post designs with or without control group	None specified	2001 - 2016	Elementary school students	Learning: General	Screen use: General (in schools)
Chen	2020	Include: Experimental designs	None specified	2008 - 2019	None specified	Learning: General	Video games: Educational (with competition)
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)
Cho	2018	Include: experiemental designs with control group	None specified	2008 - 2013	None specified	Learning: Second language	Screen use: General (mobile phone for language learning)
Claussen	2022	Include: Longitudinal; Retrospective	None specified	2004 - 2018	None specified	Psychological health: ADHD Psychological health: ADHD Symptoms (Inattention)	Screen use: General
Clinton	2019	Include: randomised experimental designs	None specified	2011 - 2016	None specified	Literacy: Reading performance	Screen use: Reading (vs paper)

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
Comeras-Chueca	2021	include: randomized and non-randomized controlled trials (control group with no intervention or traditional exercise intervention)	None specified	2008 - 2019	Under 18	Body composition: BMI Cardiometabolic health: Fitness	Video games: Physically active
Comeras-Chueca	2021	Include: randomized and non-randomized controlled with control group with no intervention or traditional exercise intervention	None specified	2010 - 2020	Under 18	Body composition: BMI Body composition: BMI z-score Body composition: Body fat percentage Body composition: Fat-free mass Body composition: Waist circumference	Video games: Physically active
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)

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
Eirich	2022	Include: experimental or observational	None specified	1978 - 2021	12 or under	Psychological health: Externalizing Psychological health: Internalizing	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
Feng	2021	Include: Quantitative designs	None specified	2017 - 2019	1 month - 4.99 years old	Body composition: BMI z-score	Screen use: General (meeting guidelines)
Ferguson	2017	None	None specified	2005 - 2017	Children; Adolescents	Risky behavior: Sexual activity Risky behavior: Sexual activity (initiation of sex)	Screen use: Sexual content
Ferguson	2020	Include: Experimental, correlational, or longitudinal	None specified	2009 - 2013	None specified	Agression: General	Video games: Violent content
Folkvord	2018	Include: Interventions	None specified	2007 - 2018	Children; Adolescents	Diet: Food intake (calories)	Advertising: Advergames
Foreman	2021	Include: observational and intervention studies	None specified	2015 - 2020	None specified	Eye health: Myopia	Screen use: General Screen use: General (phone or tablet)
Furenes	2021	Include: experimental or quasi-experimental	None specified	2002 - 2019	1-8 years old	Literacy: Reading comprehension Literacy: Vocabulary learning	e-Books: 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
Gardella	2017	Include: Cross-sectional	Include: North America	2006 - 2014	Adolescents	Learning: Educational achievement problems Learning: School attendance problems	Internet use: Cyberbullying victimization
Garzón	2019	Include: Experimental with control group	None specified	NA - NA	None specified	Learning: General	Intervention: Augmented reality (in schools)
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
Haghjoo	2022	Include: observational designs	None specified	2008 - 2021	10-20 years old	Body composition: Overweight/obesity	Screen use: General
Hammersley	2016	Include: Randomised controlled trials	None specified	2003 - 2013	Children; Adolescents	Body composition	Intervention: To promote healthy weight (obesity prevention)
Hao	2021	Include: Experimental with control group	None specified	2012 - 2018	preschool-college	Learning: Second language vocabulary	Intervention: English as foreign language
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
He	2021	Include: Randomised controlled trials	None specified	2009 - 2018	6-18 years	Physical activity: General	Intervention: To promote physical activity (via mobile phone)
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
Ivie	2020	Include: Correlational studies	None specified	2012 - 2019	11-18 years	Psychological health: Depression	Social Media: General
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)
Kim	2021	Include: experimental or quasi-experimental	None specified	2010 - 2018	Preschool to Grade 3 (3-9 years old)	Learning: Literacy and numeracy Literacy: General Numeracy: General	Screen use: Educational apps
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

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
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
Li	2010	Include: Experimental; Quasi-experimental	None specified	1991 - 2005	School-age Children	Numeracy: General	Intervention: Mathematics
Li	2020	None specified	None specified	2005 - 2019	Infants, toddlers, and preschoolers (0-7 years)	Body composition: Overweight/obesity Sleep: Duration	Screen use: General
Li	2022	Include: Randomised controlled trials	None specified	2012 - 2020	3-18 years	Developmental: Gross motor (locomotor) Developmental: Gross motor (non-locomotor) Developmental: Gross motor (object control skills)	Intervention: Active video games for motor skills
Li	2022	Include: experimental or quasi-experimental	None specified	2014 - 2021	None specified	Learning: Computational thinking	Computer use: Programming exercises
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

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
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
Liu	2022	Include: studies with control group	None specified	NA - NA	None specified	Cognition: Creativity	Screen use: General
Liu	2022	Include: Observational	None specified	2012 - 2021	10-19 years	Psychological health: Depression	Social Media: General (duration)
Lu	2021	Include: Cross-sectional only	China	2014 - 2018	Adolescents	Psychological health: Negative coping style Psychological health: Positive coping style	Screen use: General (mobile phone addiction)
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)

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
Major	2021	Include: Randomised controlled trials	Low- or middle-income per World Bank	2007 - 2020	5-18 years	Learning: General	Intervention: Literacy (Abracadabra; in schools)
Mallawaarachchi	2022	Include: Cross-sectional or longitudinal	None specified	2014 - 2020	1-6 years and prior to school entry	Cognition: Cognitive Functioning Cognition: Executive Functioning Developmental: General Developmental: Language or speech Psychological health: Psychosocial factors Psychological health: Self-regulation Sleep: General	Screen use: General (mobile phone or tablet)
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
Marker	2022	None specified	None specified	2001 - 15	None specified	Body composition	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
Marshall	2004	None	None specified	1985 - 2002	Children; Adolescents	Body composition Physical activity: General	TV programs and movies: General Video games: General
Martins	2019	Include: All quantitative designs	None specified	2003 - 2018	All	Aggression: Towards peers	Screen use: General
Martins	2022	Include: Cross-over or parallel randomized controlled trials	None specified	2006 - 2017	1-18 years	Diet: Food intake (calories)	TV programs and movies: Mealtime
Mazeas	2022	Include: Randomised controlled trials	None specified	2015 - 2019	None specified	Physical activity: General	Intervention: To promote physical activity (via gamification)
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
Mei	2018	Include: cross-sectional, case-control, and cohort studies	None specified	2004 - 2018	11-20	Sleep: Duration Sleep: Problems Sleep: Time to fall asleep	Screen use: General (excessive)

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
Merchant	2014	Include: Experimental with control group	None specified	NA - NA	K-12	Learning: General	Screen use: Virtual reality simulations (Educational) Screen use: Virtual reality worlds (Educational) Video games: Virtual reality (Educational)
Mori	2019	None specified	None specified	2013 - 2018	<18 years	Psychological health: Internalizing Risky behavior: Alcohol consumption Risky behavior: Delinquency Risky behavior: Drug use Risky behavior: Sexual activity Risky behavior: Sexual activity (contraception use) Risky behavior: Sexual activity (multiple partners) Risky behavior: Smoking	Screen use: Sexting
Neitzel	2022	Include: random assignment or quasi-experimental	Include: United States,Europe, Israel, Australia, and New Zealand	2004 - 2020	Kindergarten-Grade 6	Literacy: Reading	Intervention: Reading (technology supported)

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
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
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
Powers	2013	Include: Experimental or quasi-experimental designs	None specified	1985 - 2012	None specified	Cognition: Information processing	Video games: General
Prescott	2018	Include: Longitudinal	None specified	2008 - 2017	All	Aggression: Towards peers	Video games: Violent 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
Reynard	2022	None specified	None specified	2016 - 2020	8-14 years	Psychological health: Emotion experience Psychological health: Emotion regulation	Intervention: To improve emotional regulation Intervention: To improve emotional regulation (via digital games)
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
Scherer	2020	Include: Experimental or quasi-experimental designs	None specified	1973 - 2017	None specified	Learning: Programming skills	Intervention: Education (programming)
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
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)

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
Slavin	2014	Include: Randomised controlled trials; Quasi-experimental; Observational	None specified	2000 - 2011	School-age Children (Primary/Elementary)	Science: General	Intervention: Science (in schools)
Strouse	2021	Include: experimental and quasi-experimental designs	None specified	1994 - 2019	Average 6 years, all must be less than 8 years	Learning: General	Screen use: Video (vs face-to-face)
Takacs	2014	Include: Experimental; Quasi-experimental	None specified	1980 - 2014	All	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)
Tokac	2019	Include: desgins with a control group	None specified	2006 - 2016	PreK-12th grade	Numeracy: Mathematics	Video games: Educational

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
Wang	2020	Include: longitudinal, cohort, case-control, cross-sectional, or controlled trials	None specified	2016 - 2020	<=18 years	Eye health: Visual impairment	Screen use: General (mobile phone)
Wouters	2013	Include: experimental designs	None specified	2005 - 2012	None specified	Learning: Motivation	Video games: Educational
Wouters	2013	Include: Experimental with control group	None specified	1993 - 2007	None specified	Learning: General	Video games: Educational (with instructional support)
Xie	2018	Include: Experimental; Quasi-experimental; Pre-test post-test	None specified	2010 - 2018	Children	Learning: General	Intervention: Education (via touch screen)

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
Xie	2018	Include: experimental, quasi-experimental, or pre-post test	None specified	2010 - 2018	0-5	Learning: General	Screen use: Touchscreens
Yin	2019	None specified	None specified	2006 - 2016	None specified	Psychological health: General Psychological health: Positive mental health	Social Media: General
Zhang	2016	Include: Cohort; Case-control; Cross-sectional	None specified	2001 - 2014	Children	Body composition	TV programs and movies: General
Zhang	2022	Include: longitudinal or cohort designs	None specified	2001 - 2021	2-19 years	Psychological health: Other mental health problems	Screen use: General
Zhang	2022	Include: Observational or experimental designs	Mainland China, Hong Kong, Macau and Taiwan	2009 - 2020	6-18 years (or grade 1-12)	Body composition Cardiometabolic health: Poor fitness Cardiometabolic health: Risks Eye health: Myopia Physical health: Health Issues Psychological health: Emotion problems	Screen use: 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
Zou	2021	Include: observational cross-sectional, case-control, or longitudinal designs	None specified	2009 - 2021	<20 years	Psychological health: Depression	Computer use: General Screen use: General Screen use: General (mobile phone) TV programs and movies: General Video games: General
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
de Oliveira	2016	Include: Observational	None specified	2010 - 2014	Adolescents	Cardiometabolic health: Metabolic Syndrome	Screen use: General
*							

The quality of the included meta-analyses was mixed (see Table 1). Most assessed heterogeneity (n low risk = 110/118, 93% of meta-analyses), reported the characteristics of the included studies (n low risk = 102/118, 86%), and used a comprehensive and systematic search strategy (n low risk = 86/118, 73%). Most reviews did not clearly report if their eligibility criteria were predefined (n unclear = 84/118, 71%). Many papers also did not complete dual independent screening of abstracts and full text (n high risk = 21/118, 18%) or did not clearly report the method of screening (n unclear = 42/118, 36%). A similar trend was observed for dual independent quality assessment (n high risk = 54/118, 46%; n high risk = 28/118, 24%). Overall, only 8 meta-analyses were graded as low risk of bias on all criteria.

Education Outcomes. There were 80 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, 19 effects with samples < 1,000, and 17 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 5. The remaining 28 effects met our criteria for statistical credibility and are described in Figure 2. These 28 effects came from 19 meta-analytic reviews analysing data from 372 empirical studies with 265,648 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.

As shown in Figure 2, most of the credible results (16 of 28 effects) showed statistically



Figure 2. Education outcomes

significant associations, with 99.9% confidence intervals not encompassing zero (strong evidence). The remaining nine 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 (24 of 28 with $I^2 > 50\%$).

Health and Health-related Behaviours. We identified 195 unique outcome-exposure combinations associated with health or health-related behaviour outcomes. We removed 35 effects that did not provide individual study-level data, 50 effects with samples < 1,000, and 81 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 6. The remaining 40 meta-analytic associations met our criteria for credible evidence and are described below (see also Figure 3). These 40 effects came from 24 meta-analytic reviews analysing data from 449 empirical studies with 1,293,284 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, with stronger associations observed for adolescents than other groups. Television viewing was negatively correlated with sleep duration, but with stronger evidence only observed for younger children. All forms of screen use (general, television, and video games) were associated with body composition (e.g., higher BMI). Screen-based interventions which target health behaviours appeared mostly effective.

Across the health outcomes, most (25 of 40) effects were statistically significant at the 99.9% confidence interval level, with the remaining ten significant at 95% confidence. However, most of the credible effects exhibited high levels of heterogeneity, with all but two having $I^2 > 75\%$. Additionally, most effects were small, with the association between screen use and sleep duration the largest at $r = -0.37$ ($k = 10, N = 56,720$). Most of the effect sizes (36/40) had an absolute value of $r < 0.2$.

Discussion

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

As an example, consider children watching television programs—an often cited form of screen time harm. We found robust evidence for a small association with poorer academic performance and literacy skills for general television watching[32]. However, we also found evidence that if the content of the program was educational, or the child was watching the program with a parent (i.e., co-viewing), this exposure was instead associated with better

literacy.[33] Thus, parents may play an important role in selecting content that is likely to benefit their children or, perhaps, interact with their children in ways that may foster literacy (e.g., asking their children questions about the program). Similar nuanced findings were observed for video games. The 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 5 & 6) 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.

Our results highlight the need for the field to more carefully consider if the term 'screen time' remains appropriate for providing advice to parents. Instead, our results suggest that more nuanced and detailed descriptions of the behaviours to be modified may be required. Rather than suggesting parents limit 'screen time', for example, it may be better to suggest that parents promote interactive educational experiences but limit exposure to advertising.

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 3,103 primary studies comprised of 3,141,213 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

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

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

3. Bell, A. N. *The sanitarian.* vol. 11 (AN Bell, 1883).

4. Dill, K. E. *The Oxford handbook of media psychology.* (Oxford University Press, 2013).

5. Wartella, E. A. & Jennings, N. Children and computers: New technology. Old concerns. *The future of children* 31–43 (2000).

6. Rhodes, A. *Top ten child health problems: What the public thinks.* (2015).

7. Hale, L. & Guan, S. Screen time and sleep among school-aged children and adolescents: A systematic literature review. *Sleep Medicine Reviews* **21**, 50–58 (2015).

8. Sweetser, P., Johnson, D., Ozdowska, A. & Wyeth, P. Active versus passive screen time for young children. *Australasian Journal of Early Childhood* **37**, 94–98 (2012).

9. Li, X. & Atkins, M. S. Early childhood computer experience and cognitive and motor development. *Pediatrics* **113**, 1715–1722 (2004).

10. Warburton, W. & Highfield, K. Children and technology in a smart device world. in *Children, Families and Communities* 195–221 (Oxford University Press, 2017).

11. Nature Human Behaviour. Screen time: How much is too much? *Nature* **565**, 265–266 (2019).

12. World Health Organization. *Guidelines on physical activity, sedentary behaviour and sleep for children under 5 years of age.* 33 p. (World Health Organization, 2019).

13. Australian Government. *Physical activity and exercise guidelines for all Australians.* (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.* (2016).

15. Council On Communication and Media. Media Use in School-Aged Children and Adolescents. *Pediatrics* **138**, e20162592 (2016).

16. Ferguson, C. J. Everything in Moderation: Moderate Use of Screens Unassociated with Child Behavior Problems. *Psychiatric Quarterly* **88**, 797–805 (2017).

17. Przybylski, A. K. & 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* **28**, 204–215 (2017).

18. Sanders, T., Parker, P. D., 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* **16**, 117 (2019).

19. Kaye, L. K., Orben, A., Ellis, D. A., Hunter, S. C. & Houghton, S. The Conceptual and Methodological Mayhem of 'Screen Time'. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* **17**, 3661 (2020).

20. Chassiakos, Y. L. R. *et al.* Children and Adolescents and Digital Media. *Pediatrics* **138**, e20162593 (2016).

21. National Health, Lung, and Blood Institute. *Quality Assessment of Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses.* (2014).

22. Bonett, D. G. Transforming odds ratios into correlations for meta-analytic research. *American Psychologist* **62**, 254–255 (2007).

494 23. Bowman, N. A. Effect Sizes and Statistical Methods for Meta-Analysis in Higher
495 Education. *Research in Higher Education* **53**, 375–382 (2012).

496 24. Jacobs, P. & Viechtbauer, W. Estimation of the biserial correlation and its
497 sampling variance for use in meta-analysis: Biserial Correlation. *Research Synthesis Methods*
498 **8**, 161–180 (2017).

499 25. Viechtbauer, W. *Metafor: Meta-analysis package for r.* (2022).

500 26. R Core Team. *R: A language and environment for statistical computing.* (R
501 Foundation for Statistical Computing, 2022).

502 27. Egger, M., Smith, G. D., Schneider, M. & Minder, C. Bias in meta-analysis
503 detected by a simple, graphical test. *BMJ* **315**, 629–634 (1997).

504 28. Page, M. J., Higgins, J. P. & Sterne, J. A. Chapter 13: Assessing risk of bias due
505 to missing results in a synthesis. in *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of*
506 *Interventions* (eds. Higgins, J. P. et al.) (Cochrane, 2021).

507 29. Ioannidis, J. P. & Trikalinos, T. A. An exploratory test for an excess of significant
508 findings. *Clinical Trials* **4**, 245–253 (2007).

509 30. Papadimitriou, N. *et al.* An umbrella review of the evidence associating diet and
510 cancer risk at 11 anatomical sites. *Nature Communications* **12**, 4579 (2021).

511 31. Xie, H. *et al.* Can Touchscreen Devices be Used to Facilitate Young Children's
512 Learning? A Meta-Analysis of Touchscreen Learning Effect. *Frontiers in Psychology* **9**, 2580
513 (2018).

514 32. Adelantado-Renau, M. *et al.* Association Between Screen Media Use and Academic
515 Performance Among Children and Adolescents: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis.
516 *JAMA Pediatrics* **173**, 1058 (2019).

517 33. Madigan, S., McArthur, B. A., Anhorn, C., Eirich, R. & Christakis, D. A.
518 Associations Between Screen Use and Child Language Skills: A Systematic Review and

519 Meta-analysis. *JAMA Pediatrics* **174**, 665 (2020).

520 34. Poorolajal, J., Sahraei, F., Mohamdadi, Y., Doosti-Irani, A. & Moradi, L.
521 Behavioral factors influencing childhood obesity: A systematic review and meta-analysis.
522 *Obesity Research & Clinical Practice* **14**, 109–118 (2020).

523 35. Byun, J. & Joung, E. Digital game-based learning for K-12 mathematics education:
524 A meta-analysis. *School Science and Mathematics* **118**, 113–126 (2018).

525 36. Vannucci, A., Simpson, E. G., Gagnon, S. & Ohannessian, C. M. Social media use
526 and risky behaviors in adolescents: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Adolescence* **79**, 258–274
527 (2020).

528 37. Yoon, S., Kleinman, M., Mertz, J. & Brannick, M. Is social network site usage
529 related to depression? A meta-analysis of FacebookDepression relations. *Journal of Affective*
530 *Disorders* **248**, 65–72 (2019).

531 38. Vahedi, Z. & Zannella, L. The association between self-reported depressive
532 symptoms and the use of social networking sites (SNS): A meta-analysis. *Current Psychology*
533 **40**, 2174–2189 (2021).

534 39. Seetharaman, G. W., Jeff Horwitz and Deepa. Facebook Knows Instagram Is Toxic
535 for Teen Girls, Company Documents Show. *Wall Street Journal* (2021).

536 40. Tekedere, H. & Göke, H. Examining the Effectiveness of Augmented Reality
537 Applications in Education: A Meta-Analysis. *International Journal of Environmental and*
538 *Science Education* **11**, 9469–9481 (2016).

539 41. Sadeghirad, B., Duhaney, T., Motaghipisheh, S., Campbell, N. R. C. & Johnston,
540 B. C. Influence of unhealthy food and beverage marketing on children's dietary intake and
541 preference: A systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized trials. *Obesity Reviews* **17**,
542 945–959 (2016).

543 42. Marshall, S. J., Biddle, S. J. H., Gorely, T., Cameron, N. & Murdey, I.

544 Relationships between media use, body fatness and physical activity in children and youth:
545 A meta-analysis. *International Journal of Obesity* **28**, 1238–1246 (2004).

546 43. Elson, M. *et al.* Do policy statements on media effects faithfully represent the
547 science? *Advances in Methods and Practices in Psychological Science* **2**, 12–25 (2019).

548 44. Ashton, J. J. & Beattie, R. M. Screen time in children and adolescents: Is there
549 evidence to guide parents and policy? *The Lancet Child & Adolescent Health* **3**, 292–294
550 (2019).

551 45. Royal College of Paediatrics and Child Health. *The health impacts of screen time:*
552 *A guide for clinicians and parents.* (2019).

553 46. Page, M. J. *et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: An updated guideline for*
554 *reporting systematic reviews.* (2020) doi:10.31222/osf.io/v7gm2.

555 47. Parry, D. A. *et al.* A systematic review and meta-analysis of discrepancies between
556 logged and self-reported digital media use. *Nature Human Behaviour* **5**, 1535–1547 (2021).

557 48. Byrne, R., Terranova, C. O. & Trost, S. G. Measurement of screen time among
558 young children aged 0 years: A systematic review. *Obesity Reviews* **22**, (2021).

559 49. Smith, C., Galland, B. C., de Bruin, W. E. & Taylor, R. W. Feasibility of
560 automated cameras to measure screen use in adolescents. *American journal of preventive*
561 *medicine* **57**, 417–424 (2019).

562 50. Ryding, F. C. & Kuss, D. J. Passive objective measures in the assessment of
563 problematic smartphone use: A systematic review. *Addictive Behaviors Reports* **11**, 100257
564 (2020).

565 51. Guyatt, G. *et al.* GRADE guidelines: 1. IntroductionGRADE evidence profiles
566 and summary of findings tables. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology* **64**, 383–394 (2011).