

Supplementary Table 3. Logistic Regression Predicting Child PC Use on Weekend Days by Parental Control and Parental Nurturance, with Parental Efficacy To Restrict Screen Viewing as a Potential Mediator

Parental control	Adjusted ^a (with clustering)		
Step 1: Outcome = child PC use on weekend days ^b Parental control (C)	OR 1.04	95% CI 0.95–1.15	p 0.329
	Pseudo-R ² , 0.003; p = 0.3776		
Step 2a: Predictor: parental control (a) Outcome: Efficacy to influence screen viewing (A1)	Coeff 0.25	95% CI 0.14–0.36	p <0.001
	R ² 0.035; p < 0.001		
Step 2b: Mediator on outcome Efficacy to influence screen viewing (B)	OR 0.95	95% CI 0.87–1.03	p 0.208
	Pseudo R ² , 0.004; p = 0.2576		
Step 3: Outcome = child PC use on weekend days ^b Parental control (C')	OR 1.06	95% CI 0.97–1.17	p 0.206
Efficacy to influence screen viewing	0.94	0.87–1.03	0.165
	R ² , 0.05; p = 0.2724		
Mediation statistics:		Bias-corrected 95% CI	
Indirect effect	–0.01	–0.02 to 0.002	
Proportion of total effect mediated	–0.32		
Parental nurturance	Adjusted ^a (with clustering)		
Step 1: Outcome = child PC use on weekend days ^b Parental nurturance (C)	OR 0.99	95% CI 0.95–1.03	p 0.721
	Pseudo-R ² , 0.031; p = 0.4179		
Step 2a: Predictor: parental nurturance (a) Outcome: efficacy to influence screen viewing (A)	Coeff 0.12	95% CI 0.09–0.15	p <0.001
	R ² , 0.089; p < 0.001		
Step 2b: Mediator on outcome Efficacy to influence screen viewing (B)	OR 0.94	95% CI 0.87–1.03	p 0.208
	Pseudo-R ² , 0.004; p = 0.2576		
Step 3: Outcome = child PC use on weekend days ^b Parental nurturance (C')	OR 1.00	95% CI 0.96–1.04	p 0.967
Efficacy to influence screen viewing	0.95	0.87–1.04	0.242
	R ² , 0.043; p = 0.3713		
Mediation statistics:		Bias-corrected 95% CI	
Indirect effect	–0.01	–0.04 to 0.006	
Proportion of total effect mediated	0.88		

^aAdjusted for child BMI z-score, IMD, and parental weekend PC use.

^bSome use versus no use.

PC, personal computer; IMD, index of multiple deprivation; OR, odds ratio; Coeff, coefficient; CI, confidence interval.